

10-10-2012

Shakespeare's Gardens and Nature Settings: Landscapes of the Reformation's Spiritual Individualism

Debra Lee Francis
Indiana University of Pennsylvania

Follow this and additional works at: <http://knowledge.library.iup.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Francis, Debra Lee, "Shakespeare's Gardens and Nature Settings: Landscapes of the Reformation's Spiritual Individualism" (2012).
Theses and Dissertations (All). 169.
<http://knowledge.library.iup.edu/etd/169>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by Knowledge Repository @ IUP. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations (All) by an authorized administrator of Knowledge Repository @ IUP. For more information, please contact cclouser@iup.edu, sara.parme@iup.edu.

SHAKESPEARE'S GARDENS AND NATURE SETTINGS:
LANDSCAPES OF THE REFORMATION'S SPIRITUAL INDIVIDUALISM

A Dissertation

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies and Research

in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

Debra Lee Frances

Indiana University of Pennsylvania

August 2012

© 2012 Debra Lee Frances

All Rights Reserved

Indiana University of Pennsylvania
School of Graduate Studies and Research
Department of English

We hereby approve the dissertation of

Debra Lee Frances

Candidate for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Ronald G. Shafer, Ph.D.
Professor Emeritus of English, Advisor

James M. Cahalan, Ph.D.
Professor of English

Christopher Kuipers, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of English

ACCEPTED

Timothy P. Mack, Ph.D.
Dean
School of Graduate Studies and Research

Title: Shakespeare's Gardens and Nature Settings:
Landscapes of the Reformation's Spiritual Individualism

Author: Debra Frances

Dissertation Chair: Dr. Ronald G. Shafer

Dissertation Committee Members: Dr. James M. Cahalan
Dr. Christopher Kuipers

A close examination of the garden and nature settings in ten of Shakespeare's plays reveals the spiritual effects of the Henrician Reformation on English men and women. Through a historical lens and inferred Elizabethan theological assumptions, such examination tracks the development of an individual and personal relationship with the God of Christianity. Although the obvious relationship of Shakespeare's garden settings to the Garden of Eden has been previously examined, to this date connections to the development of spiritual individuality engendered by the Henrician Reformation remain uncharted territory.

This research project explores in chronological order, according to Bevington's widely accepted explanation of first performances, specific nature scenes in *Titus Andronicus*, *Romeo and Juliet*, *Richard II*, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, *As You Like It*, *Twelfth Night*, *Othello*, *King Lear*, *The Winter's Tale*, and *The Tempest*. A historical analysis of each chosen scene portrays the effects on people of four reversals in state religion in about thirty-seven years.

In addition, Martin Luther's *Soli*—*Scriptura*, *Gratia*, and *Fida*—venture a theological foundation for reading Shakespeare's nature scenes as enactments of the rise of "atemporal religion"—my coinage for the change in religion from external practice to internal. This new approach to religion defines the spiritual bond that allows neither the

limits of man-made structures nor of a preacher's or priest's time schedules to hinder the spiritual bond of the Creator-created triad—a balanced relationship among the Creator, nature, and people. Atemporal religion, then, reveals the new Garden of Eden—a safe location the Creator produces within the soul of every individual and which the selected Shakespearian nature scenes reveal.

Advancing chronologically, each chosen garden or nature scene of these particular plays builds on the previous play's portrayal of a characteristic of a personal and individual relationship with the Creator. Characters' imitations of nature's traits or a depiction of them in relation to nature's non-human entities plot the course of the development and maturation of individual spiritual responsibility. The relationship among nature, people, and God in these scenes reveals the impact of the Henrician Reformation as the beginnings of the individual pursuit of a personal relationship with the Creator.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am deeply indebted to Dr. Shafer. In 2005, I took his class entitled “English 784: Seminar in British Literature – Shakespeare.” The title of my research paper was “‘I come to the garden alone’: Shakespeare’s Gardens and the British Reformation,” which was the beginnings of my current research. I will likely never be able to show to my students the support he has shown to me. He has blessed me many times with his freely offered time during hectic semesters, vacations, and even after several heart attacks. Next, Dr. Cahalan’s “English 785: Comparative Literary Theory: Ecocriticism applied to Irish and U. S. Nature Writers,” in 2005, introduced me to ecofeminism. His indispensable knowledge of ecofeminism, though not directly employed in my dissertation, influenced it. Then, Dr. Kuipers, bless him forever, stood in when we lost Dr. Dandurand and pointed me to a clearer understanding of pastoralism, including anti-, and post-. My dear friend, Erma, offered me a place to stay and study in Indiana, PA. Closer to home, my mother gave me a place in her home to work without distractions, and her always good home cooking kept me working into the wee hours. When the submission process really began to speed up, she bought a tool to bind together the pages of my research. Thanks to Pam for reading and comforting, to Deb for her laughter down the hall, and to Angela for her example. Rita read the first chapter so many times that I finally realized my direction. Thankfully, Kelsey proofread several times. Mynor, one of my past Freshman Composition students, listened for about an hour as I explained my research, including a diagram on the chalkboard. I am truly grateful to all these people and to those unnamed helpers and guides in this project. I give my eternal thanks to all of you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
ONE	LONDONER'S DISCOVER NATURE.....	1
TWO	EVOLUTION	32
THREE	THE RISE OF SPIRITUAL INDIVIDUALISM: BLOOD, SECRECY, RHYTHM, FANTASY	63
	<i>Titus Andronicus</i>	71
	<i>Romeo and Juliet</i>	79
	<i>Richard II</i>	85
	<i>A Midsummer Night's Dream</i>	90
	<i>Conclusion</i>	99
FOUR	MIMICKING NATURE: ENTERING THE NEW GARDEN OF EDEN	102
	<i>As You Like It</i>	105
	<i>Twelfth Night</i>	113
	<i>Othello</i>	132
	<i>King Lear</i>	147
	<i>Conclusion</i>	168
FIVE	FAIRY TALES, LOSS, AND TRIUMPH.....	175
	<i>The Winter's Tale</i>	182
	<i>The Tempest</i>	202
SIX	THIS OTHER EDEN, DEMI-PARADISE [. . .] THIS ENGLAND	223
	WORKS CITED.....	230

CHAPTER

ONE

LONDONER'S DISCOVER NATURE

Perhaps in the summer of 1614 Shakespeare could at last plant and prune his orchards. He had always been keenly interested in gardens and now he had the leisure to indulge his passion. (Weis 389)

The sixteenth century probably marks England's most sweeping religious reforms. By some accounts the Reformation in England, appropriated by Henry VIII, practically destroyed the soul of England (Asquith 257). John Shakespeare and his son, William, witnessed the losses. In fact, the fabric of English life, the Shakespeares' lives, woven into centuries-long social patterns and belief systems unraveled so suddenly, within about thirty-seven years, and so horrifically that people of every socio-economic level, of every age group, of every association to the land, and of all cultures felt the impact. Martin Luther's soul-searching and longing for a peaceful and true relationship with his God led to his *95 Theses* in 1517. Though Luther's realizations, presented as *Soli*, encouraged an inner spirituality, he did not foresee—and certainly did not sanction—the social, financial, and spiritual upheaval they spawned. He could neither foresee the effects in England. The Henrician¹ Reformation truly never began with a desire to improve the church or an individual's spiritual life. It began as a means to perpetuate Tudor control of the crown.

1. For the use of "Henrician" see, for example, Rankin 357, 358, and 362; Greg Walker's *Writing Under Tyranny: English Literature and the Henrician Reformation*.

Significantly, however, the roots of England's rise to the most powerful country in the world also began in this century. In addition to Henry VIII's decisions to break relations with the Church in Rome, dissolve the monasteries, and create the Church of England, Queen Elizabeth's navy—in the name of “protecting itself” from the vice-like spread of two Catholic countries, Spain and France, that threatened England into religious conformity—defeated the Spanish Armada, an unbelievable feat. Soon James I approved a translation of the Bible that provided centuries of readers many hours by the fireside, precious moments on Christmas morning, and a compass to navigate the turbulent terrain of the coming modernity.

Simultaneously to the religious rebellions and battles, Henry VIII's focus on royal gardens increased the public spotlight on garden architecture. Communication through nature became more prominent as religion and politics underwent turbulent vicissitudes, and Royal expressions of “divine right” intensified. In the 1520s one of the means by which Henry VIII emphasized such expressions, in addition to claiming the head of the church, developed, fascinatingly enough, through gardening. The Reformation, his overwhelming desire for a male heir, and recent advances in garden architecture theory intersected in the 1520s, with Cardinal Wolsey as the axis. In 1525, in an effort to appease the King when the Cardinal failed to achieve a divorce from, or even an annulment of the marriage to, Katharine of Aragón, Wolsey presented Hampton Court to the King, arguably the most envied, elaborate, and beautiful garden in the whole of England.

Garden architecture, partly because of this attempted placation, quickly became an obsession for Henry in the same decade. Castles became palaces with incomprehensibly

large landscaping, including orchards² and gardens for pleasure and parks³ and forests⁴ for hunting. Strong states:

During the decade following 1525 he [Henry VIII] carried through large extensions to [Hampton Court], including the building of a great hall and a series of state apartments around what is today Wren's Fountain Court. The gardens, however, were to be the palace's most startling innovation.

Nothing quite like them had ever been seen before and their design and layout are of major significance for the whole development of garden design in England down to the accession of James I. (25)

Strong's analysis reveals that as Henry's interest in garden architecture increased, so did two other demands: to satisfy his desire to create more beautiful and extravagant gardens and landscaping than Francis I, the King of France; and to satisfy his "need of a setting worthy of the extreme powers which were now attributed to him" as head of the church and King of England (25). Gardens, then, became a significant means of aesthetic expression and symbolized the monarch's increased lust for power and control.

2. The word "orchard" dates from before 900 CE. It originated from "garden yard," which in Old English is *ortgeard*. The first syllable "ort-" identifies with the Latin *hortus* or garden, and the second syllable "-geard" means "yard." Marie-Luis Gothein, in her extensive two-volume *History of Garden Art* (1928), uses the phrase "tree-garden" in her presentation of Hampton Court. She writes, "[t]he orchard, or rather the tree-garden, was the shady place, and therefore the place chosen for walks" (par. 15). Examining "orchards" in the list of kinds of scenes I discuss, therefore, does not deviate from my analysis.

3. Gothein explains parks as part of the gardens at Hampton Court (par. 3). Later, in the section of "Chapter X" titled "Elizabeth I of England and gardens at Nonsuch and Theobalds," she explains that "Hunting was at its very best in the park at Nonsuch, which was well stocked with wild animals" (par. 2). Such explanation allows my analysis to include parks.

4. In the same section as note 3 above, Gothein also speaks of "woods" as part of Queen Elizabeth's garden at Nonsuch. Such explanation allows my analysis to include forests/woods (see *Midsummer*, Act III, scene 2).

This kind of gardening, however, probably had little relation to the commoners' curiosity and practically innocent examination of nature. Deborah Harkness explains that "[w]hile members of the royal court occupied themselves with threats foreign and domestic, and the universities of Oxford and Cambridge still debated the authority of ancient texts, the residents of London were busy [. . .] studying the secrets of nature" (2). Shakespeare could walk from the Globe, where his plays were performed, into the streets of London and to St. Paul's Cathedral,

the intellectual epicenter of the realm, the source not only of religious debate but also of news sheets, broadsides, and thousands of printed books that spread the ideas of the Renaissance to eager readers[. . .] [S]tudents of nature flocked there to buy vernacular books on medicine and surgery, imported foreign botanical words, and the mathematical instruments that were often sold along with handbooks that helped explain their use. (3)

Harkness further describes the area around Shakespeare's Globe as a significant cultural center. His audiences knew of the respected surgeons, large instrument makers, and immigrant brewers that filled the area:

[T]he area around the Globe also housed a large hospital at St. Thomas's church which was known for its surgical staff, the workshops of several large-scale instrument makers who constructed parish clocks for the City and palace clocks for the royal court, and dozens of immigrant brewers who ran strange distillations and fermentation apparatus that astonished and intrigued the locals. (5)

In addition, the Agas Map of London⁵ shows a plot of land called “Pike Garden” just across the street to the west of the supposed site of the original Globe Theater. The presence of gardens for purposes other than Royal expressions of divine right and philosophical reflection may well have contributed to Shakespeare’s gardens and images of nature in his plays.

From the streets of London to Shakespeare’s stage, questions and debate surrounded and filled the Elizabethan mind. Their pursuit of a means to understand nature drove hundreds of men and women to study nature and “how that study could benefit human lives” (Harkness 2). Shakespeare’s evocative nature scenes, therefore, would have flourished in the Elizabethan mind. They would have stirred cravings for more knowledge but also for the peace endemic to nature, the escape provided by its beauty, and the refuge it promised.

Elizabethan connections to nature seem strange to twenty-first century readers but such connections were common knowledge and well-known during Shakespeare’s creative years. Gabriel Egan states, “Throughout the drama of Shakespeare, characters speak of the world around them as though it is alive, and this view is put into conflict with the emergent mechanistic view [. . .] [whereby] [. . .] the earth is merely an instrument of human self-fulfillment” (22). Egan quotes the ideas of another critic, Collingwood,⁶ “who points out, ‘the naturalistic philosophies of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries attributed to nature reason and sense, love and hate, pleasure and pain, and found in these faculties

5. “The ‘Agas’ Map is so-called because an eighteenth-century antiquarian thought that Ralph Agas was the originator. We now know that this assumption was wrong but, since the author has never been deduced, the name ‘Agas’ is a handy way of referring to this map” (Prockter).

6. See Collingwood.

and passions the causes of natural process” (22). Before the full force of the Industrial Revolution nature fed the minds of Elizabethans and heightened their curiosity.

Learning about and caring for the Creator’s best gift of life, people had not, yet, totally transformed their view of earth to merely exploiting it for gain.⁷ Viewing nature as “alive” intensified the effects of Shakespeare’s nature in often pivotal scenes. When that belief system collides with Reformation ideals and the ensuing political pressure, and Protestant cacophonous theological disagreements, his gardens and nature scenes would recall, on some level, the Garden of Eden. Belsey’s analysis of Eden images in exquisite needle work and wood carvings leads to the notion that views of nature often found expression in replications of that ancient garden. Tradition, religion, and Elizabethan studies of nature increase the impact of Shakespeare’s nature stagescapes.

Following that intriguing path into the world of nature, curious folks worked in their own gardens and kitchens to experiment with plants, chemicals, and the world of nature generally. They met with each other, or in groups, or even in passing, and excitedly shared information about experiments they had tried or wanted to try, and listened, always listened, to anyone talking about anything related to their own ideas, especially to the world of nature. Harkness describes Lime Street⁸ as the hotbed of natural history exploration:

7. Throughout this dissertation, I am assuming a belief in a divine Creator on the part of Shakespeare and the other people of his era. I share a belief in the Creator. I, however, refer to “the Creator” and “God,” throughout this study, as a belief held by Shakespeare and his contemporaries, rather than as referring to my own belief. I feel that even someone reading this dissertation who does not believe in God can recognize such a belief reflected in Shakespeare’s works and many of his Renaissance contexts—if such a reader finds my evidence and argument convincing.

8. In the Agas map of Elizabethan London, Lime Street was across the Thames from the Globe and several blocks to the west. Just past Lime Street the Agas map indicates large open fields where animals grazed.

Lime Street had a relatively low population density by Elizabethan standards, and was blissfully free from the apartment-style dwellings known as tenements—old houses converted into multihousehold [sic] residences. Behind high walls and through great gates were gardens and a tennis court, and everywhere there was an audible hum of activity. (20)

Shakespeare would have intimately known of and perhaps been involved in this scientific clamor, for the Globe situated near St. Paul's church and St. Thomas' hospital occupied, if not created, a significant cultural center.

Queen Elizabeth's Secretary and of the Privy Council, William Cecil's system of secrecy and spies had practically stopped any kind of communication with the continent; however, these people, driven by their extreme curiosity and discovery, operated a thriving exchange of ideas through a secret conduit run by the Dutch, and information continued to grow. Harkness describes a "Republic of Letters" through which people could share information with—such as results of an experiment, a new way to do something—or pose questions to anyone in Europe:

They could also post letters to their foreign correspondents, since the postmaster for the Dutch community lived on Lime Street and had an excellent network of friends who sped those letters on their way across Europe no matter how incompetent the political system, vicious the religious dispute, or violent the warfare. (18)

The mysteries of nature continued its pull on the Elizabethan mind, and the information shared with and received from the continent encouraged and emboldened these men and women.

Though England seemed practically paralyzed by religious turmoil and bloodshed, this curiosity about nature seemed to bring together simultaneously these pursuers of natural history with the artists, the carpenters, the engineers, the architects, and the writers to increase human knowledge. Spiller explains that these men and women had few preconceived notions, so their enthusiasm and drive slipped the lock on exclusivity and opened the doors to new considerations of knowledge and never closed them again. Spiller writes that

Aristotelian understandings of knowledge as eternal, unchanging, and ‘that which cannot be otherwise,’ involved a fundamental exclusion of the human from its categories; the historic shift in the early modern period away from that model of knowledge thus required the interjection of the human, the introduction of various forms of human invention and intervention, that is to say, art, into what counted as knowledge. In the mechanical arts (such as surveying, architecture, metallurgy, printing, alchemy, Paracelsian medicine, and drama), the act of creation was understood to both require and express knowledge. (24)

With these disparate kinds of people successfully working together on similar goals, the traditional ways of understanding, acquiring, building, and processing knowledge—constructed long before the birth of Christ—began to crumble. The artists, the individuals most driven by personal procurement of knowledge, created the link from the traditional thought patterns—that is, the essentially Aristotelian understanding of knowledge—to the inventive and intoxicating Christopher Columbus-type of exploration-based and experientially-gained knowledge acquisition. These great minds contributed to the

Elizabethan intellect as it gathered its own power. For Spiller, “Art unexpectedly became the mediating term that made it possible for early modern intellectual culture to abandon Aristotelian scholasticism and move toward experimentalism and fact-based knowledge models” (24). People no longer needed to lean on anyone or anything to grow. Intellectual freedom leaked into every household.

Their unquenchable desire to know through experience describes one of the important characteristics of these men and women. In order to know something, one had to be able to make it, to take it apart and rebuild it. Spiller explains that for these explorers, “Being able to make something was an act of knowledge; knowing something involved knowing how to make it” (27). She includes the making of plays and poems in this area of knowledge-making. The act of seeing something, holding it, hearing it, smelling it encompassed truth—consider Othello’s demand, “Give me the ocular proof”—and exemplified this knowledge-making society perfectly. Shakespeare lived in a most amazing time, and as a man of that time, he created for and spoke to the people of his time.

This means of gathering information, through the senses—a hands-on approach, according to Harkness—created an interesting juxtaposition to and component of the spiritual changes of the day (11). These early scientists—though the term will remain contested up to and after the creation of the Royal Society of London in 1660—took individual directions to understanding nature.⁹ They eagerly cooked various concoctions and asked questions that led to more concoctions, increasingly becoming aware of the

9. Deborah Harkness, in her discussion of the word “science” in Elizabethan London, explains that “the term was used to denote both the study of the natural world and a manipulation of the natural world for productive and profitable ends” (*Jewel* xv).

beneficial properties of plants. They understood the means to understand. In light of the activity of these explorers, the common people most affected by the Henrician Reformation knew the value of individuality and its opportunities. The two groups met in the world of nature.

Sir Francis Bacon, Lord Chancellor for James I in 1618,¹⁰ influenced and expanded this burgeoning field of natural science.¹¹ Sometimes called the Father of the Scientific Method—famous for inductive reasoning—he also eschewed the ancients, Aristotle in particular, in favor of a maker approach—to know how. Bacon, however, adds to that particular approach the information provided by “knowing-why.” Moving beyond sensuous exploration and into theory motivated Bacon. Klein explains that:

Bacon’s notion of form is made possible by integration into his matter theory, which (ideally) reduces the world of appearances to some minimal parts accessible and open to manipulation by the knower/maker. In contrast to Aristotle, Bacon’s knowing-why type of definition points towards the formulation of an efficient knowing-how type. (Section 2, par. 24)

Bacon’s own scientific pursuit, which paralleled the excited flurry of Londoners’ nature exploration, connected strongly to the religious atmosphere of the day. Klein makes that connection explaining that “From his [Bacon’s] point of view, which was influenced by Puritan conceptions, early modern society has to make sure that losses caused by the Fall are compensated for, primarily by man’s enlargement of knowledge” (Section 6, “Science

10. He served in this position until his impeachment by Parliament in 1621 on trumped up charges of judicial prejudice.

11. Harkness demonstrates that Bacon did not lead the scientific charge but that the bubbling and brewing of everyday Londoners’ curiosity and necessities founded the scientific revolution.

and Philosophy,” par. 1). The Fall of Man, when Adam and Eve lost the Garden of Eden, apparently propelled the pursuit of knowledge and became the very basis for that pursuit in Shakespeare’s England.

The human psyche never totally expunged that pristine location, the Garden of Eden. Shakespeare’s garden and nature scenes as the new Garden of Eden spoke directly to Elizabethan motivations—all of them. With one last piece of information, Klein connects the Elizabethan mind even more strongly to the effects of the Reformation: “Just as the Fall was not caused by knowledge of nature, but rather by moral knowledge of good and evil, so knowledge of natural philosophy is for Bacon a contribution to the magnifying of God’s glory, and, in this way, his plea for the growth of scientific knowledge becomes evident” (Section 5, “Scientific Method,” par. 9). Luther also connected to “the magnifying of God’s glory” in his *Sola Deo Gloria*, in which he states that only God’s glory—that is, Her¹² magnificence and Her grandeur—results from the newly created spiritual relationship with humans. Later in Queen Elizabeth’s reign, John Calvin,¹³ too, taught that human merit contributed nothing to God’s electing people into a relationship with Him. According to these theological premises, neither men nor women can take or accept credit for the Creator’s gifts of faith and grace. For Bacon, and perhaps Shakespeare, the human pursuit of knowledge provided a means of thanking God, the Creator, for the spiritual gifts and for the awe and wonder of life—interestingly enough, in

12. In this research, I intersperse the feminine and masculine pronouns along with “Creator” and “God” in reference to the Christian perspective of God.

13. Calvin’s theological ideas began to develop after 1535 when he apparently experienced a religious awakening. Because of his associations with Nicholas Cop, Rector of the University of Paris, when the rector announced support for Luther he had to flee from France, and Calvin followed. Today, the acronym TULIP provides an easy means to explain and remember his theological theory.

fact, one of Gifford's post-pastoral characteristics includes this awe and wonder (*Pastoral* 152).

Shakespeare's works most likely built on the atmosphere around him. The Reformation's effects in private lives and the religiously-engendered constriction of public expression strongly inform his work. In his discussion of *Merchant of Venice*, Klaus states, "[. . .] Shakespeare was intensely conscious not only of literary lore and legend, or contemporary realities of economics and race, of biblical codes and commandments, but of the politics of religion as it existed in his time and place" (70). The horrific changes of the religious upheaval left Elizabethan London with burned out and tumbling down churches and homes of dissidents and recusants.¹⁴ The dissolution of the monasteries provided money for the crown, but the destruction in the countryside evoked rebellion and bloodshed. People who could leave England did; those who could not leave conformed to the new religion or pretended to do so. Walker explains that

[o]thers conformed publicly, but privately recorded their misgivings[. . . .] The duke of Norfolk declared, in conversation with the Marquis of Dorset, that 'it was the devil and no one else who was the originator and promoter of this wretched scheme [for a divorce] (sic)[. . . .] There was an entire cadre of English scholars and intellectuals who were not in favour of the divorce or the pace or direction of religious reform, or both, who nonetheless remained in royal service, working for King and government to the best of their abilities. (15)

14. *The Cambridge History of English and American Literature* describes London as "a city of ruins [. . .] in the early days of Elizabeth. On every side lay the wreck of some religious house which had perished in the days of the dissolution, and had not been supplanted by new edifices" ("Chapter XVIII," par. 1). Harkness states that "Elizabeth I had launched numerous schemes, including a public lottery, in an effort to rebuild the damaged church," referring to St. Paul's cathedral (*Jewel* 2). The *Loseley Manuscripts* describe these lotteries in great detail, including winnings and ways winners would be paid (Alfred 226-56).

Some hoped for help from Rome, but when Elizabeth destroyed the Spanish Armada, hope could shift or die. It shifted.

John Shakespeare best portrays that shift. Shakespeare's childhood, no doubt, afforded him the best vantage point from which to observe, experience, and reveal the growth and power of the spiritual individual. John Shakespeare and his wife, Mary Arden, evidently raised their family in quite a religiously volatile environment. The spiritual atmosphere changed several times from Henry VIII to Elizabeth.

Henry VIII declared himself the head of the Church of England, insulting Pope Clement VII, when John Shakespeare was about five years old, between 1532 and 1534. Many scholars and historians have exhaustively documented Henry VIII's decisions and motivations. The effect on the English Church, however, is less heatedly discussed. That effect significantly impacted English parishioners. From Henry VIII until Edward VI's reign—a twenty-five year period—the country worshipped in the Church of England, not much different from the Roman Church. During Edward VI's six-year reign (1547 to 1553), however, the Church, under Puritan pressure, became more distinctly Protestant; then, commencing in 1553, Mary I abruptly, absolutely, and aggressively forced the English Church back to its Roman roots. For her short five-year reign, over 300 Protestants, about one every week of her reign, died under the executioner's axe (Brake 144). Bloody Mary's return to the Roman Church ravaged practically all traces of the Protestant Reformation and tormented the souls and perhaps consciences of most church attendees, whether Roman or Reformed. She only magnified the necessity for spiritual individuality. Because of the dangerous uncertainty of practicing religion in England, since no one knew what the next monarch might demand, the people learned to rely solely

on individual spiritual strength. The tenuous situation demanded it during these years because parishioners changed or died with the accession of each monarch.

While Elizabeth I ruled her forty-five years, though the first ten years of rule offered tolerance, an uncomfortable theological stance emerged between both forms of worship with some form of persecution of both. Dickens explains that “a cool humanism matched her cool temperament, and she had already seen enough of the opposing fanaticisms to inspire her with distaste for both” (350). This persecution often reflected the sharp divisions among Protestants, which rose to such uncompromising “ideological cacophony” that it eventually led to Charles I’s beheading in 1649 and the rise of Oliver Cromwell, the so-called leader of the Puritan forces (Lake 693). Significantly, therefore, the English church changed four times in about thirty-seven years, not quite one person’s lifetime. John Shakespeare survived all of them, which with little doubt radically influenced his children.

William Shakespeare, John and Mary’s third child, was born about six years after Queen Mary’s death. He grew up during the steady rise of Puritanism and probably witnessed much persecution of both Roman Catholic parishioners and the more radical Puritan reformers. Having perhaps his father’s stories of the grandeur of the Catholic churches—now destroyed—in his memory, knowing first-hand of the religion based persecution, and sensing if not experiencing the internal spiritual turmoil among the people, a case can be made for Shakespeare’s garden and gardening images as giving voice to the spiritual individual—that person who, set adrift among the effects of the regularly changing religious situation in England, probably desired personal release from spiritual fear, pain, and even aimlessness.

With that Shakespearean voice echoing among the nature settings, one can discern an apparent means to revel in the love of and personal relationship with the Creator. Evoking communal memories of the Garden of Eden, as do Shakespeare's garden settings, most likely strengthened spiritual longings for that pristine past. Though the loss of Eden also echoes in these kinds of nature scenes, I argue that Shakespeare's plays portray a new interpretation of the loss. The return path to such implied purity moves quietly, almost imperceptively, to the Creator's new Garden of Eden, one that blossomed from within the destruction of human perfection.

Acknowledging such personal spiritual longing among English men and women allows an examination of ten of Shakespeare's plays in light of the Reformation's spiritual challenge to England. Atemporal religion—my coinage to mean a religion not limited by architecturally inspiring buildings or preachers' or priests' time constraints—provides a means to read Shakespeare's garden and nature scenes. Literally, the words "atemporal religion" in this dissertation allow abbreviated references to the changes in religious worship from external locations to internal. This form of religion operates from within the soul of willing individuals to create a path and a means to enter the new Garden of Eden. Every person in Reformation England now had a privately accessible spirituality, whether Catholic or Protestant. With persecution likely for followers of either form of worship, secrecy significantly ruled life and, therefore, demanded an internal approach to religion. Through atemporal religion, therefore, people could learn of and even experience a significant closeness to their Creator that the often volatile atmosphere surrounding them in all likelihood regularly hampered. Even further, with easy access to the Bible—in the vernacular, at a reasonable price, and in a reasonable size—Elizabethans could now access

the information necessary for Luther's Bible-based spiritual life. Born of the spiritual advantages promised by Luther's teachings, atemporal religion allows a personal, individual, and private relationship with the Creator; it bonds the relationships within the Creator-created triad;¹⁵ and it paves the way to the new Garden of Eden—a return to the Holy God's intention for them, to live in God's loving care.

During his lifetime, Shakespeare's creative coding arguably focused on religion, but more significantly it communicated the necessity for a new direction in a religious life. In her analysis, Asquith observes that coding in plays and even in everyday surroundings delighted Shakespearean audience members. The Queen immensely enjoyed this “coded” language and the process of decoding it.¹⁶ Coding as a particular pleasure probably kept Shakespeare safe, for he “was the one sixteenth-century writer who, it appears, never ran afoul of the authorities” (29). Asquith further explains that late sixteenth-century England provided an especially ready audience for dissident codes:

[I]ts people were addicted to hidden meanings. Codes, devices and punning allusions were everywhere—in street songs and ballads, conversation, poems, plays, woodcuts, portraits, jewelry, costumes[. . .] [A] curious building, the triangular Rushton Lodge in Northamptonshire, was created by a Catholic nobleman, Sir Thomas Tresham, as a symbol of the Mass and the Holy Trinity[. . .] Queen Elizabeth herself delighted in word play, setting the emblematic tone at court with teasing nicknames for her

15. I coined the “Creator-created triad” to describe the relationship among the Creator, nature, and humans.

16. Jenny Uglow, in her book *A Little History of British Gardening*, explains that this expectation of coded messages filled the gardens, too, especially the water gardens—sometimes engineered for practical jokes, another favorite of the Elizabethans (60).

courtiers: [. . .] William Cecil was her ‘Spirit’; his diminutive son, Robert, her ‘Pygmy.’ (20)

Shakespearean audiences, therefore, literally expected him to create shadow plots with characters and scenes as codes. Such audiences would miss few if any coded message he incorporated into his plays. With his audiences’ close attention and the endemic spirituality of gardens and nature scenes, I argue that documenting the growth of the spiritual individual would not have caused Shakespeare much difficulty in this atmosphere. The religious crisis the Reformation engendered in England, which continued into Queen Elizabeth’s reign, drove most people, recusants and Protestants, to seek any reprieve, the theater included. Shakespeare’s knowledge, experience, and creativity produced a stage filled with coded messages, including spiritual, according to Clare Asquith, for which he employed nature. Those images and settings directly connected with the English interest in nature.

The societal focus on nature along with the subconscious longing for a return to the ancient Garden of Eden invites the metaphor of a new Garden of Eden to function in various scenes in his plays. These scenes enter the minds and psyche of his audience members to entertain them but to subtly challenge and intellectually stimulate, too. This idea of internal experience evokes the presence of the new Garden of Eden within them as a locus for their pursuit of a personal and individual relationship with the Christian view of a Holy God. The new Garden’s existence and its availability rest on God’s gifts to people of faith and grace—unavoidably referencing Luther’s teachings and perhaps John Calvin’s later in Elizabeth’s reign. The stability of this internal location, though not politically precarious, still requires tending. Its presence significantly relies on the Creator;

however, nature and people also play a role because nature portrays it and humans live in it. Although men and women do live in it and surrounded by it, they do not control the new Garden—that is, add to it or take away from it; however, their free will distresses it. A consistent balance between humans’ rational and irrational thoughts, decisions, and behavior allays the damage, but they cannot maintain this delicate balance without help. That assistance, intercession so to speak, has always existed in the relationships within the Creator-created triad, but now is more understandable and personally accessible through the crucial bond of the now necessary spiritual guide, atemporal religion. The eternal existence of the triad protects the new Garden of Eden, therefore, from vulnerabilities that threaten to extinguish it. The place and the life is quite beautifully provisioned and protected—nothing can or will harm that internal state.

Shakespeare’s audience members, often filled with nature enthusiasts as well as royal admirers and the groundlings, learn of the new Garden of Eden, the Creator-created triad, and atemporal religion in stages. First, they learn the effects of balance and imbalance between emotions and logic; next, the role of nature; then, two clear examples of life in the new Garden of Eden.

In Chapter 3 of this study, *Titus Andronicus*, *Romeo and Juliet*, *Richard II*, and *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* offer evidence of spirituality and provide figurative commentary on the English Reformation. *Titus Andronicus*, Shakespeare’s bloodiest play, portrays the violence of the Reformation. Wars and violence spawned by the Reformation, in fact, lasted for many years, as evidenced by the Thirty Years War of the seventeenth century and the English Civil War. In addition, Lavinia, the catalyst for Titus’ bloodshed, reflects the more personal torture and persecution of many followers of both the Roman

Church and Protestant belief systems. The play, then, symbolically portrays the first steps of any spiritual individual, borne through holy sacrifice.

Lavinia's father, Titus, and her uncle, Marcus, demonstrate two clearly demarcated responses to Lavinia's torture. Both correspond to the English Reformation which attempted to clarify the work of Jesus of the Christian faith—to create a means to a relationship with the Creator. The first response is emotional, vengeful, and the second is peaceful, thoughtful. Titus demonstrates the emotional, vengeful reaction. His desire for revenge after the execution of his sons, Quintus and Marcus, piques with Lavinia's rape and mutilation. His vengeful desires fill him with emotional irrationality; his understanding Lavinia's message in the forest turns him away from his life's purpose as an honorable soldier and away from the rationality of nature (Putnam 6). Shakespeare's Titus symbolizes an emotional response to his daughter's torture as do people to religious ideology that has often led to war, for example, the Crusades and, more recently, the September 11, 2001, attack on the United States.

The second response, enacted by Marcus, generally demonstrates the peaceful, thoughtful tack, especially as related to religious upheaval. An example of Marcus' response occurs after Aaron chops off Titus's hand. Marcus says to him, "But yet let reason govern thy lament" (III.1.218), encouraging a peaceful, less emotional reaction. The play, therefore, encourages audiences to choose Marcus' response, showing the result when Marcus survives to the end of the play. Peaceful thoughtfulness, then, means survival and an adherence to purpose, i.e. humans pursuing the Creator to enter that newly created garden.

In *Romeo and Juliet* the spiritual individual's purpose becomes essential to his or her survival as well as growth. To demonstrate, Shakespeare's two lovers must choose their purpose: to stand with family, or to stand as individuals and accept all the hazards involved. Similarly, as a result of the English Reformation, the spiritual individuals—the people forced to privately and secretly maintain their own spirituality—also had to choose their purpose: to be good subjects and follow the decrees of the King or Queen of England or to stand as individuals, discerning and pursuing their own, and individual, spirituality. This nature scene, the Capulet's secret, private garden where Romeo first speaks to Juliet, magnifies the potential dangers for people pursuing a spiritual life. Without secrecy both Romeo and Juliet could have suffered severe familial retribution, perhaps even immediate death for Romeo as a trespasser and an enemy of the Capulet family. The secrecy required for the two to marry further magnifies the danger mandated by the spiritual life during Shakespeare's day. Pursuing a relationship with God—a means to realign with the Creator—demanded secrecy and extremely thoughtful and purposeful, as well as individual, living.

The Romeo-Juliet relationship also argues that personal desire is simultaneously family desire whereby desire becomes the common link. Juliet's interest in fulfilling her heart's desire parallels her family's fulfilling each member's heart's desire as a respected family and the enemy of the Montagues. Juliet, thus, imitates familial desires by following her heart to Romeo. The emotional irrationality of the Capulets and Montagues reveals the necessary existence of each family in order for both to be a proud family of Verona. Romeo and Juliet, therefore, conform to their families' heritage of pride but convert hate to love. Their secrecy changes the identities of both families. With the deaths of the

lovers, the proud families declare peace and together mourn the loss of their children. Without Romeo and Juliet and their garden trysts, the two families never would have changed.

This play demonstrates that, just as the Montague and Capulet families changed their relationship but remained proud, the spiritual individual's attitude toward worship will change but the object of that worship, the Creator, remains the same. The traditional form of worship and the Protestant form sought the same goal but through different means—the Capulets and Montagues sought pride but achieved it only through a different means, the love of Romeo and Juliet. Eventually, however, these different means to practice spiritual worship would blur into acceptable public worship by any means. Before that future materialized, individual spirituality would inevitably continue to develop through the traditional form of worship, Catholicism—the accepted means for centuries—but surviving spiritually demanded secrecy as did the love between Romeo and Juliet. The traditional form of worship practiced in secret, therefore, remains traditional but changes because a tradition practiced in secret unavoidably becomes new; in other words, Catholicism practiced in secret is not the same Catholicism as practiced in public. Underground worship of any sort of previous public worship would essentially change that worship because secrecy, of course, inherently removes any characteristics of “public.” The most apparent examples are the loss of the beautiful churches and the well-known worship style. Hidden practices, however, can result in quick changes as represented in the hidden behavior of Romeo and Juliet. Secrecy can also bring a more sensible attitude just as the relationship between the Capulets and Montagues becomes more sensible: respect provides more sensibility than hate.

Building on rationality and the pursuit of purpose through the changes of secrecy, *Richard II* demonstrates that becoming a spiritual individual involves a conflict between one's wishes and desires—emotions—as represented by the Queen, and one's common sense—rationality—as represented by the gardener. The Queen's emotional reaction when she overhears the gardener's evaluation of the kingdom and of the king, Richard II, leads her to abandon her wisdom and, essentially, her senses. Her desire demands she and her husband return to ruling the kingdom; however, when confronted with reality she becomes angry, an emotional response as well as rejection of reality. She rebukes and censures the gardener as a result. The gardener apologizes but maintains his common sense by continuing his work in the garden after the Queen leaves. His is the sensible path; he maintains his harmony with his surroundings, thereby, staying within Nature's loci of "an answering rationale" and also within the natural rhythms as God's creation (Putnam 6).

Spirituality, therefore, remains a tenuous phenomenon: the individual spirit grows as he or she matures, but he or she still faces external critique, including recusant fees, beheading, and even self-recrimination, as well as internal critique (developed through Biblical information and private meditation)—all combining to create constant insecurity and unrest, whether in secret or not. The garden scene in *Richard II* allows Shakespeare to emphasize individual spirituality as sensible, especially during the English Reformation.

The forest scenes in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* evolve this conflict between emotion and common sense into a conflict between desire, again, and requirement, commuting one's lack of control over his or her life to insecurity. In other words, the play demonstrates that the new ways of choosing one's own love now war with the old ways of a father's assigning a daughter to a specific family for monetary gain. This societal war

reverberates with the war between the traditional church worship and the new. At times the old becomes an introduction for the new. For example, Helena, the jealous woman, shows an effect of the new overtaking the old. As Puck incorrectly fulfills Oberon's command, Helena finds herself wooed by both Lysander and Demetrius, when both formerly wooed Hermia. The new tack causes Helena to accuse the three of trying to trick her and leaves Hermia confused by Helena's response and Lysander's rejection.

The forest of this play acts as a spiritual place where confusion reigns. Puck is the embodiment of emotions' irrationalities: he makes a joke of love by not following Oberon's instructions. The mockery of spirituality endemic to the Henrician Reformation, a situation that forced the English people to choose between approaches to spirituality, paralleled Puck's mockery of love. Such mockery created insecurity for the humans in the forest as it also did for the spiritual individual caught in not only the Reformation's changes and but also its mockery of the traditional form of worship, exemplified in name calling such as "papist." Oberon's command, as king of the fairies, that Puck right his mistake imitates spiritual individuals' reliance on faith to produce appropriate spirituality. Oberon transforms Hermia's confusion and hurt into her heart's desire, returning her to her love, Lysander, and Helena's to her love, Demetrius. The spiritual confusion in this forest echoes the confusion of the English Reformation but also the faith required to maintain spirituality and to enter that inner garden prepared by the Creator. This play's focus on the conflict between the spirituality and the reality of Shakespeare's time reveals the insecurity and discomfort of life in England during the Reformation. It demonstrates the mistakes of spiritual pursuit but also the results of success: love and a return to nature—the Creator's desire and his reason for creating the new garden, a new person.

Surviving spiritually in the forest of the English Reformation demands faith—not one’s own behavior—and trust in the Bible as spiritual authority: two of the three fundamentals of the Protestant Reformation. Transformation curls around the edges of underground Catholicism.

Chapter 4 addresses the apparent portrayal of the necessities for the spiritual individual to survive. The nature scenes in *As You Like It*, *Twelfth Night*, *Othello*, and *King Lear* offered the situations that provoked thought. In conjunction, the Reformation practically demanded, as a means to survive, a very curious experience of self-exploration and a very uncomfortable personal focus on the new teacher, the Bible. For centuries the Bible had not been part of any tangible and immediately personal experience. Hall explains that “The Bible was the basis of the religious English tradition. It was mouthed, heard, and enacted in the Mystery Plays in the streets of towns and cities in England as late as 1569 in York, 1575 in Chester (Whitsun), and 1570 in Coventry” (27). The words “mouthed, heard, and enacted” imply impersonal experiences, something memorized and repeated, but not lived. In addition, the Mystery Plays performed at such late dates into the Henrician Reformation imply that traditional worship—Catholicism—still offered the villages and towns some normalcy.

As You Like It depicts the requisite acceptance of the unconventional. In the case of the spiritual individual, the unconventionality of self teaching becomes clearly obligatory—revealing the path to God’s new garden, the one situated within the destruction of human perfection. For example, Rosalind crossdresses, an unconventional means to teach, in order to rectify the essence of her world, that is, her love for Orlando and his inability to express his love for her. She, therefore, must instruct Orlando the means

to properly address a lady and also that that approach must occur. On one level, she represents the Catholic priests' teaching while in hiding, or disguised. On another, her determination to teach Orlando reflects the spiritual individual's determined and careful search for instruction. Orlando's poems posted on trees throughout the forest, unconventionally communicate need and desire, echoing the random accessibility of the Bible. Her riddles for Orlando mirror the priests' secrecy and even trickery of the authorities in their attempts to live and continue to teach willing people in the familiar ways. These men unwittingly often served as the bridge between the old and the new religion. In hiding they performed the mass and presented homilies for the souls of the traditional approach to spirituality. As Protestant authorities discovered their hiding places and their protectors lost in the Tower of London, the common people who participated would most likely and gradually move to the new form of worship.¹⁷ *As You Like It* focuses on the Creator's gift of allowing the spiritual followers to enter and become part of Her new garden.

Twelfth Night reiterates teaching secretly and introduces the effects of deception. The play serves as a transition from traditional, secret worship to a new form of worship for successful living in the Creator's new garden. In Olivia's garden, a maid fools Malvolio, a cross-dressed Viola (Cesario) teaches Olivia, and Viola's twin, Sebastian, promises to and marries Olivia. Olivia's garden produces deception, teaching, madness, and marriage. During the changes of the English Reformation, followers of the traditional religion lived carefully, using deception not only to stay alive but to secretly practice their

17. In both of Eamon Duffy's books, *The Stripping of the Altars* and *The Voices of Morebath: Reformation & Rebellion in an English Village*, he presents evidence that the common people resisted the reformed religion for years, often fighting skirmishes and suffering violence for their resistance and revolt.

worship by protecting priests, their teachers and tenuous connection to the Roman church. The priests lived only by the kindness of their rich parishioners and their deception and disguises (for example, “merchant” was a code name for Persons, Campion, and other travelling priests¹⁸) allowed them to celebrate the mass for many recusants and to teach them. Men charged with “finding” these priests also relied on deception and disguises. The trickery, hiding, pursuit, and potential death for all created a universal madness. Men and women were executed for following either form of worship. Commoners refused to follow royal decrees. Representatives of the state travelled from village to village to force change on the people. Determining who followed which form of worship became a mad game of hide and seek with the hiders and seekers changing positions so often that trusting one’s own friends became problematic.

In Olivia’s garden, too, the confusion about who is who ends finally with men married to women, a brother rejoined with his sister, and even the “madman” returned to his life. The return to “normalcy” occurs quickly, but the mad movement from one situation to another with characters switching places several times forces that resolution. The lives in the play could not sustain the confusion, no matter how hidden, for long, for they could not act on their own to resolve the situations. Viola’s efforts do not solve any dilemma; only surprise revelations and understanding of them offer resolution. The Reformation in England, too, though the change was not quick, created four changes in only thirty-seven years and later stirred war and a surprising takeover by Puritans and Cromwell. It engendered another surprise in the execution of Charles I (1649) and in the return to a monarchical rule, Charles II (1660), which then lead to a deep hatred of Puritans.

18. See Asquith 295.

The changes and “surprises” in the English Reformation at times seemed to leave the commoners lost in the switches from one Royal to the next, which Lake derisively calls “just kings and queens messing about” (xv). Almost no one in Shakespeare’s time seemed able to act on his or her own resolve. *Twelfth Night* restates that humans can neither act to please the Creator nor manage any spirituality without faith, a gift from the Creator.

Shakespeare’s *Othello* portrays the absolute requirement to recognize deception. In gardens where women seek diversion as in *Richard II* or privately converse as in *Twelfth Night* between Olivia and Viola/Cesario. In the Citadel garden, Iago successfully deceives Othello. The deception ends in the gruesome and unnecessary murder of his wife, Desdemona, and eventually Othello’s suicide. The English people of this time probably used deception to remain alive. Even though the characteristic of deception would for a while protect the spiritual individual from missing the loving effects of the Creator’s new garden, the play also shows the horrendous effects of experiencing deception through the depths of an evil presented by Iago. Deceiving and simultaneously avoiding being deceived warn of the dangers of spiritual pursuit during the English Reformation. Only the Bible, the Creator’s gift of entrance into that garden inside the soul, and endowment of faith could protect from deception, either spiritual or human.

The gradual turn to Protestantism develops more fully through Shakespeare’s *King Lear*. The unfortunate King Lear, in a possible interpretation of the Biblical character Job, experiences the loss of his favorite daughter, his self-respect, and any means of survival in his own kingdom. Such loss would be the lot of many during the English Reformation. Murdering the priests and their protectors caused the unavoidable loss of everything associated with the traditional religion, except a relationship with God and Her new

Garden within every man and woman who pursues Her. Though previously symbolic, spiritual individualism required personal salvation, much as Lear did. Specifically, however, salvation for the spiritual individual would be explained by Luther's main tenets: faith not works builds a relationship with the Creator; such relationships emphasized an individual means to God through Christianity's Christ; both of these tenets developed through a personal requirement to study the Bible—now, without a priest—and live by faith, that is, by nothing they could do to enter God's garden.

The play also presents stages in Lear's spiritual change. It begins with the fact of its existence, that both good and evil reside in nature and people, and that each exists separate from the other. As Lear speaks to Tom o' Bedlam, he cannot distinguish between good and evil; he sees Tom as good when Tom converses with demons, an apparent evil activity. With that inability added to his insanity, he loses his individuality, becoming just another lost human. If people cannot recognize good from evil, then they lose some of their individuality since they see the same as most everyone else does. Lear, Othello, and Rosalind demonstrate the gradual change from being guided by a spirituality dependent upon priests to a personal responsibility. Inevitably, the English people now must accept loss, discern deception, and learn through the new teacher, the Bible, none of which can occur without faith, God's gift.

An almost tangible longing seems to ooze, then trickle, then storm terribly as nature and humans attempt to reconnect, to live as they did in the Garden of Eden. Such attempts provide a focal point for Chapter 5. With rewards in sight or goals inviting continual attempts to achieve spiritual wholeness, surviving traumatic change and terrible persecution became an expectation even as gradual acceptance of Protestantism and

conversion to Anglicanism grew. The spirit could thrive by developing the expectations portrayed by *As You Like It*, *Twelfth Night*, *Othello*, and *King Lear*: accepting the unconventional, remaining wary, and realizing the potential for total loss of rights, both spiritual and material.

Chapter Five lifts the veil on life in the new Garden of Eden. A shepherd rescues Perdita after her father, King Leontes, disavows and abandons her by ordering her taken to “some remote and desert place” and abandoned (2.3.176). At this point, Act II, scene 3, has shown the Creator-created triad—the storm, the baby, and “some powerful spirit”—and retells one of Jesus’ parables (line 186). In this parable, a shepherd loses one of his sheep, so he leaves the fold to find the one. The story usually provides comfort to readers and listeners because they can see themselves as the lost sheep and understand that the Good Shepherd—the Creator—will not abandon them. That reminder of safety takes his audience members into the new Garden of Eden. They find here that Perdita’s adopted father raises her as a shepherdess, and in the fields with her sheep she learns to work with nature. Her conversation with the disguised King Polixenes reveals her knowledge of nature and her willingness to trust nature to create its best in the appropriate season. The king’s discovery that his son loves Perdita, a lowly shepherdess, causes him to fall into irrationality. His angry outburst distresses the sheepshearing feast, and Perdita must don a disguise to protect herself. Even in the new Garden, audience members, in short, learn that humans must carefully maintain their relationships not only with nature and the Creator, but also with other people.

In Hermione’s garden her husband, King Leontes, betrays his love for her by falsely accusing her of infidelity. The audience watches as Leontes refuses all information

and acts on pure fantasy—another example of an imbalanced mental state. He puts her in prison which so grieves his young son that he dies. Soon he learns that Hermione has died. Audience members feel the onslaught of disgust, a reflection of the Holy response to people who choose to not live with spiritual purpose but to sin. Feeling the emotions of the Creator aligns the audience members, or anyone for that matter, with the Creator and offers an opportunity to experience literally the Creator-created triad from several angles—as the human, as the Creator, and as the presence of nature—and provides no means to hide from the others.

The last garden scene, Paulina's garden, paints a hopeful picture of rebirth in the new Garden of Eden. Terrible loss still occurs, but surrounded by nature steeped in the Creator's love, no one feels abandoned or alone with his or her troubles. When everyone gathers in Paulina's garden, the wonders of the garden impress each of them, but the main attraction she promised, an amazing statue in the likeness of Hermione, awaits the group. As the statue of Hermione comes to life, steps down from the pedestal, and stands before them as mother and wife, Perdita and King Leontes stand in awe and amazement. The family reunites with Hermione's blessings and forgiveness. In a garden the three return to a balanced family—a healed family rests in the new Garden of Eden.

The last portrayal of a life in the new Garden of Eden takes audience members to a deserted island somewhere and nowhere. Here they meet Prospero and Miranda, Ariel and Caliban, and a band of Prospero's enemies. In *The Tempest's* forsaken landscape with "neither bush nor shrub" (2.2.19), Prospero surrounds himself with his books and learns to work within the secrets of nature. He stands beside nature and never questions his position; for example, he makes a storm and never doubts if he could have or not. He, so

comfortable with his life, portrays a man completely surrounded by atemporal religion. Ariel, his “servant,” enacts the wonder of working in tandem with nature. A spirit of air and fire, an angel, immortal, a sprite, Ariel plays music, sings songs, comforts Caliban—Prospero’s slave—and does Prospero’s bidding. He helped Prospero create the storm and confront the shipwrecked enemies to reveal their sins. Caliban, as necessary as Ariel, variously portrays post-colonial man, or post-lapsarian evil man, or the noble savage, but his anger, his plot to commit murder, and his expression of wonder at the sounds of the island unveil his humanity, his imperfection. He, too, lives in the new Garden of Eden. *The Tempest* with its presentation of the new Garden of Eden offers the ultimate spiritual lesson—all kinds of people live in it. Life still happens there. Problems arise. Pain. Fear. Anger. Desperation. Joy. Celebration. The beautiful and the ugly. The new Garden of Eden does not provide escape. It offers real life.

Shakespeare’s road of creative codes and portrayals provided the London of his time and the world of ours with valuable information and visions for protecting and maintaining a healthy soul. Whether or not he followed Catholicism or Protestantism does not matter; he followed a spirituality that filled his stage with life, death, love, hate, jealousy, and respect. His plays provided what the turmoil of the quick succession of four English rulers took away—spiritual contentment.

CHAPTER

TWO

EVOLUTION

So much religious and political change occurred from Henry VIII's reign through Elizabeth's that each person in England had to become personally responsible for his or her spirituality and the vicissitudes of his or her spiritual journey. As the Henrician Reformation progressed, the common people lost more and more of the church they had known for centuries. The priests who had stood before them regularly repeating the Mass eventually conducted services as royalty decreed—or pretended to—hid to maintain their beliefs, or died through execution or murder. The people of these congregations, if they chose to, had to continue their spiritual journeys alone to ensure safety or even to ensure the comfort of and progress in spiritual growth.

The common people had to learn to exercise what little spiritual freedom existed in Reformation England. They had to employ tools that they had only watched others demonstrate uses for them, such as revealed in religious Masses, and the rites of baptism, confirmation, marriage, and death conducted by Roman Catholic priests. Most people had known this approach to religion since their births. As the Reformation strengthened, Christianity soon became more deeply spiritual rather than simply religious rituals, and the individual, whether still in a form of the church or through a private creative means to relate to God, could revel in the love of a singular and personal relationship with the holiest of holies, God.

Shakespeare's nature settings, through my analysis, chronicle the rise and growth of this spiritual individual. Such settings, with their obvious relationship to and echoes of

the Garden of Eden, have been previously examined, but connections to spiritual individualism as a result of the Reformation remain unexplored to this date. Shakespeare's nature scenes in *Titus Andronicus*, *Romeo and Juliet*, *Richard II*, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, *As You Like It*, *Twelfth Night*, *Othello*, *King Lear*, *The Winter's Tale*, and *The Tempest* reveal the growth of individual spirituality in the cauldron of the Henrician Reformation.

Literary gardens unavoidably recall the Garden of Eden partly because that pristine garden excites the universal imagination. It provided the place where, many believe, plants, animals, birds, and humans began in perfection. In this place, also, that creation, humans in particular, began a slow decline, a fall from the Creator's perfect design. Religious leaders, thus, frequently refer to that ancient garden in sermons, lessons, or homilies, seeing in this fall the origins of human disintegration.

The idea of Eden—its purity, innocence, and even shame—attracts popular attention as well as religious. Reality TV recognizes this powerful attraction today, naming the 2008 fall season of *Survivor*, filmed in Gabon, “Earth's Last Eden.” The Eagles, a rock band of the 1970s, named their 2008 tour “Long Road out of Eden.” Book titles reveal Eden's impact on human creativity: Milton's *Paradise Lost* and *Paradise Regained*, Steinbeck's *East of Eden*, Hemingway's *Garden of Eden* and many titles of current Christian novels, such as Thomas Williams' *The Crown of Eden*, Linda Nichols' *In Search of Eden*, or Christopher Lane's *Eden's Gate*. It inspires nonfiction works, such as Carl Sagan's *Dragons of Eden: Speculations on the Evolution of Human Intelligence*. It even inspires large garden projects such as the Eden Project in Cornwall. This ancient and

pristine garden lives in the human subconscious as a potential beginning of humankind, created by a larger intelligence, but more significantly as a potential goal—returning to it.

Such allure seized the imagination of the greatest playwright in literary history, William Shakespeare. In fact, Eden, as one of his plays' defining and informing metaphors, echoes in pivotal scenes set in beautiful gardens as well as in expanded versions of pristine nature. The forests, or heaths¹⁹ as in *King Lear*, or the large carefully tended landscapes, such as gardens or orchards in *Twelfth Night*, provide more than just beautiful escapes, no matter how "temporary or imperfect." For the characters and audience members these environs represent visual evocations of the spiritual individual in the most ancient human training ground (Wilders 134). There, in Eden, the mythological first man, the first monotheist, named the animals and learned to tend the great garden given him, and soon the first woman worked beside him and adeptly contributed to their idyllic garden existence.

More importantly, as the Judeo-Christian belief systems teach, Adam and Eve lived intimately with the Creator, God. From Him, they gained knowledge of their reason for existence; they learned to revel in their Creator's amazing presence, furthering that presence in the growth of the garden through their work; and they became comfortable with and even confident in their original position in the Creator's garden—namely, as not only creations but also companions. The characters in Shakespeare's nature and garden settings intriguingly demonstrate longings for and loss of this relationship, but at the same time also signify the individual responsibility to tend his or her relationship with God.

19. In Gothein's section, "Francis Bacon on Gardens," she states that Bacon's essay "Of Gardens" includes heaths. According to Gothein, "The third division of Bacon's garden is what he calls 'the Heath.' This is to be half as big as the main garden, and as far as possible is to be of a natural wildness" (par. 1) Viewing heaths as part of the English garden allows me to include them in my analysis.

Lake argues that “in the theatre we are confronted with a sort of playpen in which participants could adopt and lay aside, ventriloquise and caricature, try on for size, text and discard a whole variety of subject positions, claims to cultural authority, arguments and counter-arguments about legitimacy and power” (xxxix). The experience of the English audience paralleled the struggles and adventures of Shakespeare’s characters as they explored and examined the spiritual opportunities and demands developing around them as provoked by the tumult of the Henrician Reformation.

One reading of Shakespeare’s gardens portrays them as invitations to enjoy the created escape of the play, but also to contemplate, while watching and even reading, an individual spirituality referenced by these garden scenes. They recall the peace and the spiritual safety of the mythological place lovingly created by God, Her Garden of Eden. Each scene whispers that as Adam and Eve learned from God so can the English men and women. The encouragement and instruction from Shakespeare’s nature and garden settings reinforce the notion that individuals may relate directly to God, as did Adam and Eve; thus an amazing relationship with God rises before the individual—namely atemporal religion and personal spirituality. Shakespeare’s nature settings overtly offer this well-known Judeo-Christian story to encourage the individual’s private course to God.

This shift in locus from external to atemporal is not to be taken lightly. Whereas during the Middle Ages, parishioners’ worship of God occurred in a structure—the edifice of a grand church building—Luther’s formulations caused a major shift: worship now took place, significantly, in the inner sanctum of the private human heart. Luther’s teachings infer that here willing individuals found the new Garden of Eden created by God—His gift to the human soul. Perhaps Milton referred to this new locus of the Garden

of Eden in his crescendoed finale of *Paradise Lost*: “then wilt thou not be loath / To leave this Paradise, but shalt possess / *A paradise within thee, happier far*” (Book XII, lines 585-87; emphasis added). The Creator’s gift of “a paradise within” links the very tangible beauty of nature to the burgeoning route through atemporal religion to the new Garden of Eden, now in men and women’s souls. With the Creator’s gift, then, nature and spirituality converge in the human psyche. Shakespeare’s apparent evocations of Eden act as a bridge between the physical reality of nature’s beauty and the reflection of that beauty in the human soul—the Creator’s new Garden of Eden.

Removing the link between Shakespeare’s nature scenes and the metaphoric Garden of Eden essentially eliminates his plays’ messages. Eden’s innate harmony of the perfect relationship among humans, nature, and the Creator—a triangle of perfection that I have coined the Creator-created triad—emanates from virtually each nature scene and defines each scene. Nature as the most perfect and ideal of all settings on the Shakespearean stage provided the sensation of gardens as protected environments and a place where the spiritual voice could be heard. In light of the religious upheaval and violence evident during this era, such renderings provide the Shakespearean audience a means not only to sense the spirituality that connects humans to nature and to the Creator but also to realize that each individual has a spiritual invitation from atemporal religion, that is, to a vibrant spiritual reality deep in the human soul where he or she has the opportunity to contemplate God and grapple with his or her new spiritual reality.

Gardens and gardening reach deeply into the soul of Shakespeare’s audiences since many theater-goers would have seen or known the beautiful gardens of Henry VIII’s Hampton Court, Theobalds, Wimbledon, and Nonesuch, among others. The English

garden of this time manifests a continental influence, especially Italian, but also a literary influence. Among these, two literary masterpieces, in particular, inspired Elizabethan gardens—Virgil’s *Eclogues* and Colonna’s *Hypnerotomachia*. Prompted in part by Virgil’s poetry, the English gardens provide locations for private meditation and philosophical discussions, in time integrating instruction, private contemplation, and entertainment functions. The shepherds’ songs and descriptions encourage a slower pace, allowing time to enjoy nature and realize humans’ companionship with it. Francesco Colonna’s *Hypnerotomachia*, 1499, a part of it translated by Robert Dallington in 1592, introduced romance-inspired gardens. Poliphilo’s dreamscape presents breathtaking descriptions, and the accompanying illustrative woodcuts wonderfully portray arches and topiaries. Such portrayals encouraged Elizabethans to create similar structures in their gardens, including knots, raised beds for carefully arranged vegetation. His romantic dream, replete with his efforts to woo Polia, fills the book with sensuality. Places of grand beauty and sensuous, as well as sensual, experiences, depicted by Virgil and Colonna, often featured a quiet path to a private place for love. Inspired by these literary gardens, the Elizabethan gardens bring to Shakespeare’s stage an experience with nature so deeply ingrained in his audiences that such evocative scenes would have flourished in the Elizabethan mind and stirred cravings for the escape of beauty and the promise of refuge.

Virgil’s *Eclogues* provide a model of living close to nature and suggests the “bucolic golden age” of the peaceful shepherd’s life and pursuit of his loves. Such pastoral scenes key on songs and poetry associated with natural settings. Gifford explains that “Virgil [. . .] created the literary distancing device of Arcadia that has become the generic name for the location of all pastoral retreats” (*Pastoral* 18). Michael C. J. Putnam,

however, offers an interpretation for *Eclogues* beyond the implications of pastoral: “the countryside for Virgil is only in a secondary sense to be viewed either literally or as a garden of Eden[. . .] Rather ‘pastoral,’ for Virgil, has significance on a still deeper level: it means [. . .] the life of the imagination and the poet’s concerned search for freedom to order experience” (8). The countryside, subsequently, offers Virgil a means to explore the imagination and, thereby, garner a means to achieve order in life.

According to Gifford, pastoralism, though a contested term today and somewhat complicated by ecocriticism, provides a means to examine the presence of nature in literary texts (*Pastoral* 4). Pastoral literature usually involves a retreat and a return during which the character(s) learns something valuable. It may also (or only) involve a juxtaposition of country and city with delightful country locations given higher value than city. Gifford adds two other terms, “anti-pastoral” and “post-pastoral,” to his discussion of pastoralism.

Anti-pastoral literature satirically or cynically critiques so-called pastoral texts. In this incarnation, then, a shepherd becomes angry that his life fits into a three-line text about the butterfly precariously perched on a sheep’s ear. That text marginalizes the sweat and smell of shepherding that allows that ear to be in that place for that butterfly. In addition, that picture glosses over the cost of feed for the sheep in a drought, or the effect of cows on the same land, or the true heartbreak and financial loss when a prize ram suddenly dies or some kid steals it as a joke and harms its ability to contribute financially to the ranch/farm/agribusiness (2).

Gifford presents post-pastoralism as taking into account the problematic concerns of ecocriticism and more recently of ecofeminism. He presents six characteristics of post-pastoral literature. Simply put, they include one or more of the following:

- an expression of wonder and awe in relation to nature (152)
- a realization and attention to the “dynamics of a creative-destructive universe” (154)
- “that our inner human nature can be understood in relation to external nature” (156)
- an awareness of which human creations bring people closer to nature and which ones do not (162)
- a state of consciousness creates a conscience or “our ability to take responsibility for our behavior towards the other species of the plain and towards the plain itself” (163)
- healing the earth involves healing human relationships (165)

Some texts may qualify as post-pastoral by incorporating only one of these characteristics or all of them. Lear, for example, in the storm experiences the “dynamics of a creative-destructive universe” (154). As Lear moves between sanity and insanity he parallels the action of the storm between dry lightning early in the play to a raging storm that Kent describes as the worst storm he has seen.²⁰

Putnam’s argument that *Eclogues* “convey[s] a message as well as [. . .] delight” (4) allows Virgil’s bucolic settings to portray nature’s response to human emotional chaos.

20. He states that such a storm he “never remember[s] to have heard” (3.2.47-48). Gloucester calls the night “tyrannous” in line 149 of Act III, scene 4, and “hell-black” in line 63 of Act III, scene 3.

Nature presents the loci of “an answering rationale, whereas man’s emotions defy logic and ruin harmony with his surroundings” (6). In this sense, Virgil’s shepherds in their emotional chaos—for example, judging others for their own losses (*Eclogue I*), longing for lost love (*Eclogue II*), singing competitions resulting from pride and jealousy (*Eclogues III, V, and VII*)—highlight their own failure, a failure provoked by a separation from God’s purpose for them.

When the shepherds’ emotional chaos causes spiritual disharmony, Virgil’s nature never ignores it. The shepherds mourn losses out of proportion to the actual loss, even expressing suicidal actions, and nature responds, perhaps a bit strangely: “Let wolves now run away from sheep, let the hard oak / Bear golden apples, let narcissus bloom on alder” (*Eclogue VIII*, ll. 51-53). When the shepherds lose their land, nature responds with survival: “For here in the hazel thicket just now dropping twins, / Ah, the flock’s hope, on naked flint, she abandoned them” (*Eclogue I*, ll. 13-14). When they compete for musical ascendancy to satisfy pride, nature responds with streams running dry or merry abundant rain (*Eclogue VIII*, ll. 56, 60). If they express unrequited love so emphatically that they shirk their work, nature responds with “cicadas’ screams,” and “Grim lions pursue the wolf, wolves in their turn the goat” (*Eclogue II*, ll. 12, 63). In each instance, nature responds as created. The shepherds’ emotional chaos separates them from their created role of tending the animals. Without such emotional overreactions, they care for their land and their herds without fail. They live the lives they love.

In *Eclogue I*, Meliboeus has lost his land to a soldier who receives that land as a prize for his loyalty and bravery. Meliboeus’ lamentations for his herds of sheep and goats and the harmful effects of the move on them reach the heights of emotional chaos. He has

been forced from his land, a position he finds very painful and a position against his purpose—to care for the land. The “godless veteran,” intended for war, now has the land: he, too, is apart from his purpose, for he is a warrior not a shepherd or farmer. Meliboeus with his sheep and goats, however, will spend one more night in the country on “Tyrtus” land, a shepherd, with the land, in his position as shepherd, and peacefully within the Creator’s original intention.

Other Eclogues do not end as well. In *Eclogue II*, Corydon mourns, “hurl[ing] his artless monologues at hills and woods” (l. 5), in exaggerated expressions of his unrequited love for a slave boy, Alexis, because he will never spend any time with the boy. In *Eclogue VII*, the shepherd Damon sings of such great loss with such emotional turmoil ensuing that he commits suicide. A woman’s song, which immediately follows Damon’s, suggests that witchcraft will recover Damon. Her effort to raise the dead expresses the extreme of actually forcing nature to act against itself, that is, to reverse the expected progress of death. Since death represents the ultimate return to nature that is always in harmony with the Creator, the woman’s efforts create imbalance in the Creator-created triad. In another example of bad endings, *Eclogue IV* portrays two nymphs kidnapping a shepherd, Silenus, just to hear him sing. Even though everyone touts Silenus’ singing as the very best and even though he often promises to sing but then does not, nothing can justify their extreme action of kidnapping him for their selfish aural satisfaction. Emotional chaos, in short, often rules these shepherds’ lives.

Losing their partnership with nature through emotional chaos disrupts the God-inspired spiritual harmony surrounding them. Putnam, however, asserts that physical action creates spiritual order (18); therefore, compelled to act, for waking involves moving

and working, humans cannot resist a realignment with nature, reestablishment of the partnership, and a return to a spiritually harmonious existence. Aligning and partnering with nature proves a marker for spiritual oneness with the Creator of people and of nature. The shepherds' physical efforts—tending sheep, mourning losses, singing praises, telling stories, comforting one another—open a means to repair the break between nature and men and women. Their turbulent emotional expressions, therefore, dissipate into the relief of order, and harmony with nature reestablishes as the shepherds return to their work of protecting and guiding sheep and goats, optimally re-engaging with the rhythms of their lives.

With Virgil as one of Shakespeare's distant literary ancestors, his message, as it addresses the chaotic human situation, also resides in nature. Shakespeare's garden and nature scenes also portray spiritual disharmony: Demetrius and Chiron's rape and mutilation of Lavinia; Puck's wreaking havoc by incorrectly administering Oberon's love potion in the magical forest; Viola's disguise of herself as her own brother to protect her own position and life; Iago's deception which incites Othello's jealousy in the beautiful Citadel garden; and Lear's insane howling in a storm ravaged heath. These characters and others do not behave as originally created, for they ignore the God-ordained design for human behavior through their acts of revenge, deception, pride, and greed. Shakespeare's garden scenes, paralleling Virgil's nature scenes, also indict the human situation—namely humanity's failure to live as designed by reveling in the God-man-nature relationship perfectly evident in the Garden of Eden. As does Virgil's, Shakespeare's nature always performs as expected: forests thrive; gardens beautifully bud and bloom; the grasses of

heaths bend and swirl in frightening storms. The humans in these scenes, however, do not. They implode into spiritual disharmony.

Shakespeare's social commentary descends, in part, from Virgil's. Putnam asserts that Virgil's landscapes suggest a social commentary by a nature filled with damning symbols "that move the intangible with the spiritual" (14-15). Shakespeare's nature and garden scenes choke with damning symbols: mutilation in a forest, illicit love in a private family garden then suicide in a family tomb, a duke overthrown and exiled by his own brother, a wife wrongfully accused of infidelity, and an honorable soldier deceived into murdering his own wife. Each of these scenes set in nature depicts the intangible attitudes of revenge, love, greed, jealousy, and deception. Nature offers appropriate behavior while the characters behave against their purposes; in other words, they do not respect other humans, express love with reverence, rule wisely, or trust and value spouses. Shakespeare's gardens, heaths, forests, orchards, and parks highlight poor human behavior but communicate more than condemnation, for nature in these settings demonstrates spiritual strength, always behaving as created, as a solution.

Nature—such as in gardens—does nothing contrary to its design, so its relationship with its Creator has never weakened. As a result, nature maintains a flawless spiritual existence, creating and revealing spiritual strength worth the human effort to emulate. Shakespeare's characters in these ten plays' particular nature settings reveal the necessity for spiritual strength, for without it each character demonstrates the disastrous results. His nature and garden scenes portray that spiritual strength offers the alternative—successful spiritual living. Such strength wielded by spiritual individualism moves intangible attitudes portrayed on his stage a physical reality, that is, the fall of humans

from perfection and the necessity to take responsibility and control of associating anew with the Creator. The situation of the English Reformation demanded such action; therefore, any actions taken to build a spiritual life destroy the disconnection between God-designed nature and humans that chaotic religious changes may provoke.

Shakespeare's garden and nature settings in one reading offer commentary on and provide solutions to the sudden changes the Henrician Reformation instituted that often obscured any means to a successful spirituality. Extrapolating from Virgil, Shakespeare's coded messages validate the power of spiritual accord. More importantly they forge a path for those English men and women who longed for the spiritual harmony of living purposefully, a life veiled by the Henrician Reformation.

Long after Virgil's bucolic gardens, the Italian Renaissance fashioned nature into beautiful and ordered gardens all created by human manipulation. Italy's experience with gardening occurred so long before England that as the Medici reclined in succulent gardens, England was a land of castles and motes still recovering from the War of Roses (Strong 22). Books, such as *Hypnerotomachia*, however, brought the gardening renaissance to England about the middle of the fourteenth century. Roy Strong explains that such books "preface the expansion in size and change in character of the garden during the late Elizabethan and Jacobean periods" (16). England would soon benefit from the Italian Renaissance.

The popularity of the book in England, partially translated by Robert Dallington in 1592, prompted the creation and planting of more sensual, as well as sensuous, gardens. The illustrations in the book provide amazingly detailed examples of garden construction.

For example, Poliphilo describes a scene in which nymphs guide him to a place of wonder:

And there in a fine order and appointed distance was awaye set on either side with Cyprus Trees[. . .] Which adorned way of a meete and conuenient breadth did lead directly on into a greene Clofure, from the beginning of whiche walke, iust betwixt the Cyprus Trees, to the entrance and opening of the aforefaide enclofure, was some four furlonges. Vnto which enclofure when wee came, I founde it equilateral, with three fences like a streight wall, as high as the Cyprus Trees vpon either sides of the waye, that wee had passed along[. . .] And aboue in conuenient places were made windowes, by meanes whereof, the bowghes in those places were to be seene bare, but for their greene leaues which yeelded a most sweet and pleafant verdure. (Dallington 45/107)

Such detailed descriptions invite mental images of verdant beauty, a garden of overwhelming sensuousness that forms a room, a “green closure,” creating a place of privacy to enjoy the pleasure of nature but also the pleasure of human sexuality.

Surrounded by such wondrously sensuous beauty, the nymphs and mythical creatures inhabiting Poliphilo’s garden dream world intensify the beauty of the garden by highlighting the pleasure of the garden. Their mythological aspect also lends them a spiritual aspect. With such spiritual inhabitants, Poliphilo’s artistic dreamscape expands to a spiritual location. These spiritual creatures also offer a different side to a sensuously inspired spiritual garden, for they often sensually pose in luxuriant nudity. One particular

woodcut in the book depicts a nude nymph accompanied by two satyr children and shaded by a sexually stimulated satyr. Poliphilo describes the nymph unabashedly:

That of the left breft did spin vp so high, that it did not weat or hinder any
that would fucke or drinke of the water that streamed and sprung out of the
right breft.... From hir head hir loef tresses laye wauing vppon the
suppressed couering, fowleded and plited as it were scorning the haire of
the inglomatede cloth, hir thighes of a conueniente bignes and hir fleshie
knees somewhat bending vpp, and retract towares hir. (34/83 and 35/84)

Poliphilo's spiritually inspired nature, housing such sensual behaviors, connects secretive, extremely private activities to gardens. Shakespearean gardens also reverberate with the sensuality described in *Hypnerotomachia*. For example, Romeo with Juliet, Mariana with Angelo (though a bed trick), and Othello and Desdemona meet and love in private gardens.

This physical aspect of these garden settings developed from the medieval "secret" garden that had two purposes: provision for privacy both for contemplation and physical intimacy. Roy Strong explains that the medieval "secret garden" created an

earthly paradise and [. . .] a setting for courtly dalliance[. . .] [The]
medieval *hortus conclusus*, the enclosed garden of the Virgin's chastity,
was developed as a potent symbol of the reality of happiness[. . .] [It] is a
symbol of the Immaculate Conception and is borrowed from the Song of
Solomon: 'A garden inclosed is my sister, my spouse; a spring shut up, a
fountain sealed.' Medieval paintings and illuminations depict the Virgin
and Child seated within this garden surrounded by the horticultural

attributes of the Virgin: the violet, the lily, the white and red rose. (20, 32, 49)

The power of gardens to recall such ideas would have inundated Shakespeare's nature scenes and his audience members' expectations.

The potential of such tangible happiness sociologically tied so closely to religion, blends the spirituality of the Garden of Eden with the physical, or tangible, through the second use for gardens, physical intimacy. Amy Tigner explains: "For [Pietro] Bembo, the beds were reserved for sleep, but the garden provides a larger world of sensuality [. . .] [He] illustrates Renaissance thought concerning the garden as an erotic space, 'Let sleep lie behind the curtains of our beds [while we] go into the Garden'" (116).

Connections between the spiritual and physical aspects of gardens permeate every garden and nature scene on Shakespeare's stage. The audiences expected it because tradition built it. The stage setting, presenting the physical sensations and sensuality of gardens, afforded a cover and protection for Shakespeare's possible portrayal of the spiritual individual.

Nature and spirituality, then, converge in the human psyche: nature becomes a lens or mirror through which one discerns the spiritual. Francis and Hester describe the phenomenon in relation to the Garden of Eden: "the Garden of Eden [. . .] [is] revealed as [a] place that lies partially and perhaps exclusively beyond physical reality as we know it. [It is a] conceptual bridge or symbol by which the human mind finds a link between so-called reality and something intangible behind it" (27). Shakespeare defined that intangible backdrop as spirituality engrained in individuals.

Garden and nature stagescapes provided, I maintain, the place for a most significant portrayal, the spiritual individual. A place known for its spirituality

communicating a spiritual revelation would attract immediate attention. Nature—with its provision of soft grasses, the scents of honeysuckle and roses, the trickle of water, calls of birds and leaves rustling, vibrant primary colors framing and filling every space—blends the spiritual and the sensuous. The beauty of nature in gardens, parks, forests, or heaths may renew the soul, but it also titillates physicality, reminiscent of Poliphilo's experiences. The beauty of nature's invitation to leave the pressures of reality and enter places of the soul follows a path created by the body; in other words, the physical creates spiritual order, as Putnam argues (80), and the industrious labor of humans and the sensuality required to motivate them create the gardens. In effect, the Garden of Eden evokes spirituality, but physical activity and sensuality propels the spiritual in that ancient garden. As God's creation, the garden engenders the development of the physical human as he or she works in it. That labor and pleasure evokes a spirituality shaped by God and by nature's echo that surrounds the human, leaving no space in either gardens or humans unaffected. Separating the two, the physical from the spiritual, devastates the essence of that ancient garden: real humans enwombed within nature, both in relation to a real God, which allows the most perfect setting on the Shakespearean stage. Such settings provide the physical sensations of gardens, a protected place and a place for spiritual messages. In light of the confusion and religious mayhem created by the Henrician Reformation, such renderings provide the Shakespearean audience a means not only to rest but also to see the individual as spiritually responsible. Their view of Shakespearean characters develops an understanding that people must personally maintain their own spiritual position with God.

My view of Shakespeare's nature settings, including gardens, forests, and heaths, as a chronologically ordered²¹ spiritual continuum differs substantially from current research on his nature loci. Most studies focus on particular kinds of gardens, the meanings attached to individual gardens, and the effects of the Garden of Eden reflected in them, but none analyze the impact of the Henrician Reformation reflected in Shakespeare's nature stagescapes. Representatives of these viewpoints include Terry Comito, Catherine Belsey, and John Wilders. In brief, Comito discusses different kinds of Shakespearean gardens—gardens of love, state, and history—which attentively reveal the complexity of Shakespeare's different types of gardens, but Comito does not adequately address the implications of the Reformation on Shakespeare's garden renderings. Belsey examines presentations of the Garden of Eden in glorious hand carvings, needlework, and grave statuary as representative of a change in the sociology of families, but she does not examine the religious implication of using images of the Garden of Eden in light of the Henrician Reformation. Wilders focuses, specifically, on the history plays and their connection to the Garden of Eden. He, however, views the Garden of Eden story in its negative light, as a loss. For Wilders, Shakespeare's view of the history plays mirrors his view of the human condition.

Understanding the garden scenes as representative of particular situations allows for a means to categorize them. Terry Comito's criticism organizes Shakespeare's garden scenes into three categories: "gardens of love, the political garden of the history plays and the fallen gardens that constitute the landscape of tragedy" (23). These gardens reveal

21. This order follows Bevington's explanation of first performance dates for each play as described in Appendix 1 of his *Complete Works of Shakespeare*.

Shakespeare's worldview, Comito argues, for they "...are not isolated or arbitrary images. They are complex norms, the very shapes by which particular understandings of the world are manifested in the imagination of the dramatist" (24). The gardens of love present specific images, such as moonlit scenes, dappled sunlight, and secret private places, echoing, again, the *hortus conclusus*. The political gardens depict, Comito further states, "the paradigm of the ruined paradise" (29), whereas the gardens of tragedy, always the loci of "wildness of growth" (27), expose that ruined paradise (28), a place of deception wherein the image of the snake lies to Eve. The gardens of state, or the political gardens, associate the history plays with contemporary sermons and pageantry (26). They do not depict the perfect beginning or end results of gardening, their "blossoming or fruition" (27); using scene 4 of *Richard II*, Comito argues that they show, instead, the importance of law and order that good government enforces (27).²² Well-tended gardens symbolize well-tended kingdoms. He does not consider the impact of Reformation events as the motivation for his categories.

In her analysis of the garden scenes, Catherine Belsey thoroughly examines Elizabethan exquisite handmade depictions of the Garden of Eden to demonstrate the relationship between marriage and the Genesis (the first book of the Pentateuch) story of humankind's fall from perfection. These handmade images show the whole story of Eden: creation of man, woman, and non-human entities, the Fall of Adam and Eve, and the subsequent removal from the Garden. Belsey maintains that the artistic burial statues and tombs, along with wood carvings on bed headboards and well-preserved needle work

22. Comito, for this argument, focuses on Act III, scene 4 of *Richard II*; this garden scene presents a significant and explicit echo of the Garden of Eden.

curtains and linens, reveal a change in family values during Shakespeare's life. She argues that the very personal and common appearance of these Garden of Eden images represent a shift in family values from arranged necessity to a site of love and hope. These garden portrayals offer sociological evidence of change, but she does not fully address the religious and spiritual change that they may also reveal. The shifting earthly family relationships also call attention to the change in the spiritual family, the God-man relationship. This family reaches beyond wood carvings and embroidery to the reality of a personal God who makes possible a renewed, paradisiacal God-man relationship. The important notion of Shakespeare's using the garden motif / natural settings to demonstrate the rise of the spiritual individual remains unexplored.

Pursuing another interpretive possibility, John Wilders alleges that the gardens embody the human ideal, the life that might have been if Adam and Eve had continued in prelapsarian bliss in the Garden of Eden. Employing the theological fall of man as explained above, Wilders addresses Shakespeare's view of the human condition as it is dramatized in the history plays. He argues that a theme of the history plays concludes that humans can never achieve in the fallen world what they achieved in their pristine state in the Garden of Eden. Shakespeare's nature scenes, especially in the history plays, present human spiritual potential but not actualization, according to Wilders.

Using the *Henry VI* plays, Wilders suggests that the constantly changing allegiances from one self-proclaimed king to another portrays decisions made "between two conflicting and equally demanding loyalties" (103). Wilders further draws a parallel between political and religious decisions, arguing that some people easily changed religion as England changed from one monarchy to another: "No doubt there were

thousands of simple, practical people who, with as little anguish of conscience, changed their religion on the accession of Mary or Elizabeth” (104). On the other hand, other people, those possibly more committed to internal values, could not change allegiances or religious means to spirituality, and thus they learned to live carefully. Richard Dutton confirms, “In that Counter-Reformation world, identities and allegiances depended as never before on inscrutable inner faith, in a way that generated suspicion, mistrust and false understandings” (26). In this light, then, their religious affiliations made them suspects, suspicious people, and, worse, as real threats to the state. Some English people vacillated while others made life-threatening sacrifices. Decision-making in the spiritual realm demanded attention as never before.

Unfortunately, by focusing on the negative side of the Fall, expulsion from the Garden of Eden, and, thereby, a devastated couple, i.e. Adam and Eve, Wilders’ argument loses the triumph of spiritual individualism that rose from that devastation. He does not address spiritual success only failure, insincerity, or ambiguity:

All the human insufficiencies that are accounted for in the myth of the Fall—the ignorance, the miscalculation, the misunderstanding of ourselves and others, the effects of age and death—are gathered together in the powerfully numinous presence of destiny, and it is this presence which gives to the history plays their weight, their excitement and their tragic potential. (77)

This negative view of the Fall, the disobedience and pride of Adam, even in the guise of destiny, ignores the positive outcomes, such as the wonder of choice. With choice came a deeper relationship with the Creator, for, rather than an automaton relationship in which

humans as part of nature only do as expected, it becomes the human prerogative to be in relation with the Creator or, further, a human purpose, not just an expectation. Wilders, however, only sees tragedy.

For him, nature or garden scenes become reminders of the “defectiveness of nature” (132). He further states that “Evil is [. . .] manifest in the natural destructiveness of tempests, gales and predatory beasts[,] and these postlapsarian phenomena are associated by Shakespeare with the absolute, ‘motiveless malignity’ of some of his characters” (133). For Wilders, Shakespeare’s nature settings do not provide a place to remember the wonders of the Garden of Eden but to remember the loss of it. Nature does not demonstrate the power and love of the Creator but its degradation caused by human disobedience. Instead of nature acting as anticipated through its rain, storms, blizzards, and searing heat, these weather phenomenon manifest evil, according to Wilders. By ignoring the beauty of such weather (for instance, the reflections of God’s power in it), however, the beauty of the rest of nature falls into question. For example, instead of enjoying the beauty of gardens, people may lament the time taken to maintain them that might be used in other ways. Instead of knowing the power and wonder of storms, worry develops about ships that can be lost, so nature seems ominous in Wilders’ view of Shakespeare’s nature scenes.

He does admit some less negative moments occur, however. For example, Jack Cade, Richard of Gloucester, and Falstaff, present “the stubborn vitality with which such people set about the impossible task of shaping their destinies” (77). These characters and others lend the history plays the potential for pleasure in life. Even as Wilders refers to these particular characters’ lives as full of abundance and zest, he interprets the ageing

Falstaff's words, "Give me life, as a "demand [that] is at the same time exhilarating and pathetic" (77). Wilders' regular reference to the negative results of the Fall—natural phenomenon and people as deteriorated and evil—obscures what I see as Shakespeare's positive depiction of the rise of spiritual individualism. Wilders glosses over the triumph of the spiritual individual, that person who stands before God as Adam and Eve did: strong within the Creator's loving creation. He literally misses the phoenix rising from the ashes.

From these ashes, in other words, the people of the abandoned "flock" created by the Henrician Reformation, a new garden develops: one situated within the destruction of human perfection. In that inner garden the personal pursuit of a relationship with the Creator could blossom. Individual people could discover a new position with God, one created by God to permeate the souls of these no longer abandoned "sheep." Spiritually responsible individuals then revel in a new garden that wonderfully offers an opportunity to know God almost as closely as did Adam and Eve. Shakespeare's plays present this new garden and a fresh opportunity to know God. Wilders, Comito, and Belsey do not address Shakespeare's gardens in this spiritual light.

Comito's love / state / tragedy categorization, Belsey's sociological reflections, and Wilders' treatment of gardens in the history plays, indicate the significance of these garden scenes. Additionally, the religious implications of these gardens, echoing as they do the Garden of Eden, lead other critics to muse about whether or not Shakespeare remained loyal to the Roman Church or followed the teachings of the Reformers or, perhaps, stood between the two by supporting tolerance for all. Walking this theological tight rope, Carol Asquith asserts that

[t]hroughout [Shakespeare's] work, he argues not for union of Catholic and Protestant, nor for the ascendancy of one over the other—but for reconciliation and mutual respect[. . .] [T]hese plays are judiciously balanced: though a return to the fold of universal Christendom is seen as England's best hope, Shakespeare avoids demonising Protestants or elevating Catholics. Both sides are equally faulty; the casualty is the whole world of English spirituality, tragically banished by the Reformation quarrel. (63, 65-66)

According to Asquith's perspective, Shakespeare would have been driven to attempt communication with his audience members of three stripes: those of his own belief system, those opposed to it, or those seeking reconciliation between the two.

As noted in Chapter One, Elizabethan audiences expected such communication and secret messages coded into plays. That penchant filled their conversations with puns and their gardens with practical jokes, as stated earlier.

Further arguments by Clare Asquith combined with those of John Klause, Gerald Pinciss, Maurice Hunt, John Cox, and others support the notion that Shakespeare did indeed successfully code messages into his plays, often specifically directed toward certain members of his audiences, including the Queen and her court. Wilders, however, disagrees with any argument involving Shakespeare and coded messages. In fact, he observes that “the licensing laws of 1559 did not allow [Shakespeare] [. . .] to include much religious or theological discussion in his plays[. . .] [In fact, it would have been] presumptuous for a journeyman playwright to advise statesmen and aristocrats like the Cecils on how to do their job...” (10, 8). The licensing law also established and

strengthened the power of the Revels Office. The Master of the Revels, in this appointed position, had the authority to license scripts that would proceed to stage performance. The guidelines for the office, filled with contradictions and quazi-legalese, allowed for general agreements between both sides, concerning “how far a writer could go in explicit address to the contentious issues of his day, how he could encode his opinions so that nobody would be *required* to make an example of him” (Pinciss 13). Apparently contrary to Wilders’ argument and with the stage open for veiled if not explicit interpretation and commentary, playwrights did code messages about contemporary issues; however, doing so in the sensitive area of religion still posed a problem on the stage.

Asquith offers a chronological reading of Shakespeare’s plays which parallels movements in Queen Elizabeth’s court as it worked to negotiate the Reformation minefields of contemporary England. Each play, according to Asquith, presents an argument to Queen Elizabeth about the Roman Church (later to be called the Catholic Church) and the effects of the Reformation on it. In her analysis of *The Comedy of Errors*, Asquith, for instance, theorizes that, “In Shakespeare’s work, this staple of the old fairy tales becomes an emotionally charged emblematic episode: fickle England attempts to pursue and appropriate an essentially foreign faith, rejecting and abusing its true partner, traditional English spirituality” (61). According to Asquith, Shakespeare’s apparent concern and position on spirituality pervade his plays. He, therefore, codes his concern and position into his garden and nature scenes thereby providing the intellectual stimulation that deciphering them demanded. His audience could not miss secret challenges.

Certain codes, according to Asquith, exist in most of Shakespeare's plays. In fact, the appendix of her book lists many words and her decoded interpretation for each. Though the word "garden" or any variation does not exist in the listing per se, related words do such as "grafting" and "Red Rose." For Asquith the word "grafting" works as "a metaphor for the way the new religion was seen by Catholics as a hostile parasite, altering the nature of the old..." (292). She cites as an example *The Winter's Tale* and Perdita's refusal to recognize the values of grafting even while pressured by those stronger and more powerful than she (293). Perdita, in this reading, represent Catholics who resisted the changes engendered by the Reformation as unwanted grafting onto the centuries-old church. Another example, the phrase "Red Rose," Asquith contends, offered an "all purpose image, but used specifically by Catholics for the old, 'beautiful' religion" (297). Through her familiarity with English history, especially of Elizabethan England, she traces a strong link of coded messages between garden images and England's religious turmoil.

Another researcher, John Klause, augments Asquith's theory by exploring Shakespeare's connections to Robert Southwell, one of the more outspoken Jesuit priests—a self-named "merchant of Rome," the code name for Jesuits in England. Defending what he views as Shakespeare's Catholic leanings, Klause uncovers a direct literary link between Shakespeare and Southwell, identifying strategic words from Southwell's *Epistles of Comfort* quoted in Shakespeare's *The Merchant of Venice*. As one example, he cites over sixty words from the *Epistles of Comfort* that Shakespeare quotes in Portia's speech to Shylock, in Act IV, scene 1. Klaus states, "The biblical and classical resonances in this text cannot be denied. Yet its individual words are mostly Southwell's"

(81-82).²³ These examples of Southwell's words in Shakespeare's play, Klause contends, suggest quite strongly that Shakespeare had a message and that he indeed coded messages for his audience members, particularly its Catholic members. Very few theater-goers could ignore the often graphic nature of these messages or their connections to the tangible world outside the plays.

Several other scholars also connect Robert Southwell to William Shakespeare and attempt to draw a picture of a Catholic Shakespeare. Richard Wilson calls Southwell a distant relative (2).²⁴ Unlike Clare Asquith, Wilson does not argue that Shakespeare sent coded messages to Queen Elizabeth and her court via his plays, but he does believe that Shakespeare coded Catholic messages into his plays because he probably could not stop them due to his background.²⁵ Joseph Pearce also connects Southwell and Shakespeare as "distant cousins [. . .] their relationship through the Ardens" (109). Like Klause, Pearce cites Christopher Devlin to support his claim that Shakespeare and Southwell may have been acquaintances. He cites Devlin's biographical work on the life of Southwell and states that: "several pages comparing parallel passages from each of the works [Shakespeare's "The Rape of Lucrece" and Southwell's *St. Peter's Complaint*] to

23. The Priest's words in Portia's speech significantly recall Southwell's martyrdom. According to Klaus, Shylock's reprieve highlights the opposite results for Southwell, whose "executioner [. . .] in compliance with the law and without hindrance [. . .] sliced through Southwell's rib cage to extract the still-beating organ" (Klaus 89).

24. Bruce Young finds a familial link in the 1200s, making Shakespeare and Southwell ninth cousins once removed. In this case, with such ancestral distance the two did not likely know they were cousins. In his online posting, Young states, "I also used a 'family search' program to look for a connection between Southwell and Shakespeare and discovered that both are descended from John Fitzalan and Isabelle de Mortimer, who lived in the 1200s. That makes Southwell and Shakespeare ninth cousins once removed. (If this connection hasn't been noticed before, I hereby claim priority of discovery.)" (par. 4). <http://www.shaksper.net/archives/2006/0142.html>

25. Richard Wilson states, "All the evidence points to the conclusion that the dramatist was born into a Catholic elite up to its neck in plots against Elizabeth on behalf of Mary Queen of Scots, in a suicidal Counter-Reformation milieu where whether 'to take arms' against persecution was, as Hamlet asserts, 'the question' of the age" [*Hamlet*, 3.1.58-61]. (295)

highlight the similarities” (114). In particular, Pearce examines dedications of Shakespeare’s poems to Southwell and advice as well as dedications to Shakespeare in Southwell’s works. Their attested relationship rests completely on the assumption that the name “Master W.S.” in Southwell’s dedication of one of his books of poetry stands for Master William Shakespeare. Pearce finds a less tenuous reason for the two to have known one another—their mutual acquaintance with the Third Earl of Southampton, Henry Wriothesley, Shakespeare’s second patron.²⁶ Citing Queen Elizabeth’s chief inquisitor, Richard Topcliffe, Pearce speculates that Southwell had been the priest whom Southampton consulted when commanded to marry William Cecil’s granddaughter. He states, “Years later it was discovered by Elizabeth’s chief inquisitor and torturer, that Southampton’s confessor and spiritual adviser was none other than the notorious and charismatic Jesuit Robert Southwell” (109). Connections to Southampton create a strong potential that the two men may have known of each other even if they hadn’t met. Such historical chronicles and links to Jesuit priests, including Campion²⁷, offer some support

26. Southampton was the grandson of Magdalen Browne, Viscountess Montague, second wife of the Viscount Montague, whom Asquith states “[. . .] is the subject of an extraordinary tribute in one of [Shakespeare’s] last and greatest plays, *The Winter’s Tale*, written shortly before her death in 1608” (37). His first patron, Lord Strange, Ferdinando Stanley, was her great-nephew.

27. At the beginning of Wilson’s argument he writes “The legend of this outlaw [Thomas Hoghton] from a Protestant state is significant, because it was in his mansion, with its fenced and forested park, that the young Shakespeare is said to have passed some of his mysterious ‘lost years’” (44; see also Milward, “Jesuit,” 60). Wilson argues that Edmund Campion hid near Stratford in 1580 about the time John Cottam, a Catholic, taught there (1579-81) and that the “tragic story of the Jesuits’ doomed children’s crusade,” connects Stratford to the Thomas Hoghton mansion (50 and 49). To this mansion, Wilson argues, recusant families sent their young boys to be taught as Catholics and here many Jesuit plays were performed for and by the boys—perhaps engendering William Shakespeare’s career, as the speculation might go (58-59). In addition, Campion apparently built a large library at the Hoghton mansion and, according to Wilson, “it would be strange if some of these tomes were not carted away by the boy named Shakeshafte when the priest’s library was broken up” (57). Wilson argues that had so much death not come to so many Catholic teachers around Shakespeare, he may have become a priest rather than a dramatist. Wilson states, “[. . .] what Shakespeare learned from his fathers, it seems, was that conscience makes not heroes but cowards of us all. For in an age which demanded visibility and uniformity, he produced a world of difference from a secrecy darker even than the priest-hole or confession” (65).

for the notion that Shakespeare throughout his lifetime may have remained Catholic, or at least closer to the traditional religion, as described by John Cox, rather than the reformed religion (“Review” 550, 556).²⁸

In any event, a spiritual interpretation of Shakespeare’s gardens and nature scenes corresponds to interesting speculation regarding Shakespeare’s friends and acquaintances, especially those closely tied to the Roman Church. Audience members’ expectations of secret coded messages and their motivation to search for them may have revealed Shakespeare’s vision of and apparent concern for the spiritual individual. The church reform, begun by Luther and expanded by Calvin and Knox, necessitated the encouragement to seize and even train for the individuals’ new role as protectors of their faith. Shakespeare’s concern for the people and his apparent associations with prominent Catholic recusants, combined with his childhood development and experiences, probably encouraged his concerns (see Wilson, Asquith, and Klause above). His nature and garden settings likely offered solace and direction to a people forcefully separated from their religious leaders and also coerced to accept new leaders and, to them, outlandish new doctrines. The confusion this situation must have created demanded some clarification and direction. Answering that demand, the particular stagescapes of my analysis reveal the process to achieve a personal and individual relationship with the Creator.

Entering and maneuvering within the new garden, however, demanded information. Admittance into the knowledge of the Bible provided a clearly demarcated path. With that access, the spiritual relationship between created and Creator became

28. Marotti believes that “he may have outwardly conformed to the official state religion, Shakespeare could not, and apparently did not wish to sever his or his culture’s ties to a Catholic past and its residual cultural presence” (232).

much more attainable than before common access to the Bible and even since the time of the Apostles. At that time, people learned face-to-face from many of the men who wrote the *New Testament*. A much different situation began as each of these men died and their evangelists after them. Soon all followers of Christianity had to learn from only the writings left behind.

As the Church developed, however, common people gradually lost any right of access to the Apostolic writings. The situation began to change as Tyndale's work to interpret the Bible to English, following the path forged by Wycliffe and the Lollards (1380s), would end the loss forever. Shakespeare's plays, then, stirring that communal memory of that Eden experience, drew attention to the increasingly available Bible. The spiritual individual, that person now required to discern, as well as to protect and to preserve, his or her own spiritual path, could develop and mature. Shakespeare's sensitivity to the path of the spiritual individual, then, joins the work that began the commoners' use of the Bible in the vernacular.

At first very few could access Wycliffe's English translations because, being handwritten, very large, and scarce, the price was prohibitive. Though common people had no personal, contemplative, access to the Bible, the way to a biblical knowledge of God, nevertheless, became more likely. In 1526, about one year after Wolsey gave Henry VIII Hampton court, Tyndale's English *New Testament*, the first printed with movable type, offered an even greater likelihood for everyday and public access to the Bible. Brake explains that despite attempts by London's Bishop Cuthbert to destroy these hand-held *New Testaments*, they "continued to pour into England, and the demand increased at an alarming rate" for authorities (100). These inexpensive *New Testaments*, "were easily

transported (or hidden), meaning that the Tyndale *New Testament* officially passed from the pulpit to the people” (Brake 105).

The impact of public entry into the knowledge provided by the Bible reiterates the story of Tyndale’s courageous efforts to accomplish that access and magnifies his influence on future generations, including Shakespeare’s.²⁹ That kind of courage propelled others to develop newer translations of the Bible that offered people increasingly deep, interpretive biblical experiences. One of the products, *The Geneva Bible*, in 1560, with its exegetical notes and hermeneutical commentary filling the margins, soon gained popularity. First printed in England in 1575, Shakespeare probably owned and used this Bible. His writings of the 1580s would have built on in part, then, the new tradition of—the often dangerous and subversive—worship and religious interpretation, which made possible the growth of spiritual individualism.

29. Brake explains, “Tyndale’s use and command of the English language had a positive influence on the works of Shakespeare” (106).

CHAPTER
THREE
THE RISE OF SPIRITUAL INDIVIDUALISM:
BLOOD, SECRECY, RHYTHM, FANTASY

Over many years atemporal religion gradually saturated English men's and women's souls. In fact, according to Clare Asquith, seventy-five years would pass before any change in religion would be fully acknowledged as a viable approach to the Creator (7). She explains that:

On a humbler level, parish records indicate a people deeply and contentedly committed to their own flourishing brand of Catholicism. On the eve of the Reformation in England, the time-honoured certainties and beauties of English Catholicism still penetrated every aspect of ordinary life. Distances were judged by the length of time it took to say familiar prayers, time was measured by feast days, and seasons were marked by great communal events like the Corpus Christi plays or the liturgical drama of Holy Week. (7)

Asquith quotes one historian, Diarmaid MacCulloch, who described Catholic events and celebrations as “fun” (7). External religion celebrated life and ordered it so deeply and unquestioningly that people, of course, would resist religious change of any sort. They did not welcome the new and radical means to order life. Centuries of religious tradition, obliquely founded on the teachings of Jesus' twelve apostles and hundreds of their disciples, so surrounded practically every season of the year and every part of people's lifetimes that change was intolerable; in fact, people died for their right to worship in the

way they understood and knew the best. In Reformation England, however, the less “radical” followers of Catholicism and even Protestantism—the people referred to as “the people of the time” in most research—made religious decisions most often in privacy, with little to no public fanfare. These people, living in London and in the whole of England would not, as religiously concerned as they were, experience the new garden of the Creator until they plumbed the nascent spirituality of their souls and the unique way to nurture them.

Shakespeare’s possible concern for the lives and spirituality of his contemporaries fills every garden and nature scene in his plays. These scenes show the rise of atemporal religion but also reflect the effects of the Henrician Reformation. In tandem, the two profoundly affect the people of England. The Reformation was filled with violence, love, and loss. Atemporal religion developed through the same. Added to violence, love, and loss, a touch of fantasy completes this Chapter’s demonstration of the chronological presentation of atemporal religion offered by Shakespeare’s plays. Mirroring the violence spawned by the English Reformation, Shakespeare’s characters in *Titus Andronicus* ritually sacrifice, rape, maim, murder, slaughter, and eat each other.

This representation evoked memories, no doubt, of Henry VIII’s quest for a male heir and Wolsey’s gift of Hampton court, which initiated intense changes in religion *on a political level* but not, immediately, on the level of the soul. When Henry married Anne Boleyn, she and her supporters, who avidly followed Luther, moved quickly to “clean” the country of Catholicism (Asquith 6). Upon her execution, however, a great debate occurred. The question became whether or not England would return to Catholicism or further reform the church. Henry VIII ordered the clergy to “seek a means to resolve the

religious divisions which had sprung up and especially ‘to set a stay for the unlearned people, whose consciences are in doubt what they may believe’” (Duffy 389). In the process of resolution, however, more problems arose. For example, the Protestant government leaders claimed that the people celebrated Catholic festivals and observed holy days instead of harvesting (Duffy 394). Ostensibly, then, to prevent the supposed loss of crops and in support of the attack on Catholic traditions in 1556 by Hugh Latimer, Bishop of Worcester, these Protestant leaders outlawed centuries-old traditions. The people, however, simply disobeyed and continued to practice traditions, as Duffy extensively reports (389-94).

Their disobedience included violent rebellion, a strong statement that English Catholic parishioners would not change easily. Several examples of their rebellion include, among others, the Lincolnshire rebellion in October, 1536; the plot in Walsingham, Norfolk, 1537; and, on a local level, a mob of women who attempted to stop the dissolution of the priory of St. Nicholas, 1537, Exeter (Duffy 396-97 and 403). They also fought to protect themselves in battle. In one instance, on November 10, 1580, in Ireland: after the Catholic rebels “unconditionally surrendered [. . .] some six hundred Spanish and Italian troops and their Irish allies, including several women and priests, were all massacred by English soldiers led by Walter Raleigh [sic]” (Greenblatt 106). Even earlier, in 1570, the surrender ending the Rebellion of the Northern Earls dispersed the rebels; however, “the reinforcements,” sent from London to relieve Henry Hunsdon’s victorious men, executed 800 Catholics (Asquith 123). Shakespeare likely would have known of most of these events and would know, as a result, to tread lightly.

On a deeper level, *Titus Andronicus* introduces atemporal religion through an easily identified relationship between irrational Titus and rational Marcus—a relationship, however, steeped in blood. *Romeo and Juliet*, which Asquith calls an “exploration of the journey of the soul,” continues the distinction between irrationality and rationality by focusing on decisions made contrary to one’s surroundings and the necessary secrecy those decisions often demanded (78). Undeniably, however, love motivates every decision Romeo and Juliet make. The main garden scene portrays the value and effects of love as Romeo invades the Capulet garden and declares his love to Juliet. This location portrays the love endemic to atemporal religion that embeds within the human soul and creates the foundation for the Creator’s new Garden of Eden. In the play, however, confusion and death destroy the young lovers, and that similarity to Reformation England simulates the delay of atemporal religion.

In the next stage of the continuum, *Richard II* further reiterates the difference between emotions and rationality, as begun in *Titus Andronicus*. King Richard’s loss of his kingdom strongly emphasizes the problem of losing spiritual rhythms, which are akin to nature’s rhythms. Implanted by the Creator, a perfect combination of emotion and logic fuels the rhythm of the soul. The conversation between Queen Isabella and the gardener, dubbed “Adam,” clearly defines the emotional and rational directions as begun by Titus and Marcus. Last, in the forest scene of *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* confusion and transformation perform a dance to create a thought-provoking fantasy within a forest, a place of “untended” beauty. The events in this forest of love demonstrate the confusion of religious changes—effected in the play by Oberon and Puck—on matters of the heart and

soul. The end result in this landscape of fantasy departs from dark codes of violence, death, and loss, to playfully emphasize the planned purpose of humans—to be in an appropriate relationship with each other, enwombed within nature, both drawn to the Creator. Beginning with violence, next to secret love, then to the loss of spiritual rhythm, and, last, to a fantasy, these four plays take Shakespeare’s audiences from external, often mechanical, expressions of religion to an intensely alive religious experience domiciled within the pulsating human soul—atemporal religion.

The characters in *Titus* incite and induce violence with each character’s death growing more grotesque than the previous. That pattern parallels the intensifying violence in Reformation England as followers of reformed worship, Protestantism, attempted to force followers of Catholicism to change and, in self-defense, followers of Catholicism attempted to protect their form of worship. The Protestant destruction of monasteries and churches through looting and desecration left visible marks in London even into Elizabeth’s reign. In any event, the violent confrontations between the two religions would continue—one to protect the centuries-old approach to the Creator, the other to usher in a new Bible-based approach—into the late seventeenth century and the English civil war.

Be that as it may, the garden scene in *Titus* (4.1) portrays the moment when Lavinia’s father, Titus, her uncle, Marcus, and her nephew, Lucius, learn who raped and mutilated her. The scene in old Titus’ garden has received little scholarly attention, but the play in general evokes different interpretations. David Bevington, opining that the play comments on ethical dilemmas, such as revenge, reasons that it could be a “burlesque of the revenge play then in vogue” (938). Harold Bloom, following suit, states that the play should be regarded “as a bloody farce, in the mode of Marlowe’s *The Jew of Malta*” (82).

In addition, he argues that Shakespeare wrote the play as a means to quash “Marlowe’s still overwhelming influence by attempting a parody of Marlowe, and a kind of shock therapy for himself and his public” (77). Neither Bevington nor Bloom seriously addresses any religious or spiritual implications of *Titus Andronicus*.

Shakespeare’s Catholic shades, in light of the violent reactions to the Henrician Reformation, become more significant, and the religious implications of the play arise more clearly. Clare Asquith, Richard Wilson, and Peter Milward continue their analyses of a strong Catholic influence in the play. Milward finds several phrases presenting many common experiences of Catholic followers. For example, the phrase “limbs are lop’d” (1.1.143), in reference to Tamara’s son, Alarbus, and to Titus’ daughter, Lavinia, echoes similar execution techniques used on Catholic “traitors” such as Edmund Campion, at Tyburn” (*Papist* 23). He sees the Andronicii as “somehow” Catholic, and Tamara and the Goths led by her as “somehow” Protestant (25).

A pursuit of the possibility of Shakespeare experiencing a strong Catholic influence, if not an actual follower, adds a spiritual component, perhaps more militant than atemporal religion, but a foundational aspect to my argument. Clare Asquith provides explanations for discerning whether or not a character may offer a representation of either Catholicism or Protestantism. In her primary argument, that Shakespeare did absolutely code messages to Catholic members of his audiences, Asquith introduces “twin terms that identify the polar opposites in Elizabethan England[. . .] They are the terms ‘high’ and ‘fair’, which always indicate Catholicism, and ‘low’ and ‘dark’, which always suggest Protestantism” (32). She also explains, however, that these dark and fair “markers are morally neutral”; fair characters can be corrupt and dark characters can be noble (33).

In her analysis of each play, she consistently identifies these terms and deploys them as Shakespeare's use of Catholic codes. She, thus, agrees with Milward that the Andronicii represent Catholicism and "includ[e] figures who range from the transcendent to the virtuous to the dangerously fanatical" (Asquith 92). The darker figures represent Protestantism—Tamara, Saturnine, and Aaron the Moor, whom Asquith calls the first evil character associated with Protestantism (92). Such taxonomy also portrays the divide between the people of England, as foreshadowed in Shakespeare's history plays.

The history plays' garden scenes, most written before the plays chosen for this analysis, foreshadow the messages clearly stated in the chosen plays. In *The First Part of King Henry VI*, the Temple Garden sets the stage for Act II, scene 4. Over this garden, which enacts the moment of choosing between representative roses, a specter hovers of tradition with birthright as the legitimate claim to the throne, or, on the other hand, the might to overcome that tradition and claim the throne. My analysis of *Titus* and the following plays of Chapter Three of this study maintains that Shakespeare's history plays seem to prepare for a noticeable focus on the traditional religion, Catholicism, and, perhaps more importantly, the means to overcome tradition and create a new religion—atemporal religion. Bevington, in his religiously-focused introduction to the play, states that Elizabethans reasoned that the Wars of the Roses (1455-1485) "were a manifestation of God's wrath, a divine punishment inflicted on the English people for their wayward behavior. The people and their rulers had brought civil war on themselves by self-serving ambition, arrogance, and disloyalty" (496). Bevington brings to the fore the intense linkage between English government and English religion, which does not seem to have dissolved until the 1800s. Shakespeare lived during a time of the strength of that link but

used his garden scenes to demonstrate his foresight into the results of that broken link—
atemporal religion and a government no longer driven by religion.

Shakespeare's plays, echoing those early governmental turnovers as they do, provide a means to code information into his plays. The scene in the Temple Garden of *The First Part of Henry VI*, Act II, scene 4, portrays the beginning of the thirty years of governmental instability and ambivalence. The Henrician Reformation, with its political underpinnings, also created years of instability. His history plays subtly communicate messages of atemporal religion, such as living as individuals and, thereby, protecting themselves from the external confusion of the English monarchy in the fifteenth century and the religious insecurity and confusion of the sixteenth century. Though his plays seemed to compliment the power of the Tudor dynasty and Elizabeth I, they also showed the power of the change from external worship to atemporal religion.

The Second Part of King Henry VI has a brief garden scene in Act IV, scene 10. Here the rebel, Jack Cade, dies in a sword fight in the garden of Alexander Iden, a gentleman and the sheriff of Kent. The historical rebellion in 1450, led by Jack Cade, just five years before that 30-year war, however, also argues for the use of might to overcome tradition—in Shakespeare's England the tradition of waging a futile war, specifically with France, and taxing the commoners to do so. The Henrician Reformation also angered and propelled the commoners to join rebellions, most led by aristocrats of Lancaster, that also attempted to use might; but in that extended struggle, might attempted to protect tradition as developed through Catholicism. Shakespeare, however, presents Cade as insignificant. Dunton-Downer and Riding state that Cade is a "buffoon" in this play (63). This garden scene, therefore, offers a demonstration of the commoners' success not only in this

rebellion but also in Reformation rebellions in support of Catholicism—they lose. In other words, using tradition to fight against tradition would be unsuccessful, whether waged by commoners or by aristocrats. Any attempts, therefore, to overcome the loss of tradition could not defeat the Creator’s new Garden of Eden.

With these History plays in mind, the English people watched with deep understanding as *Titus* dramatized the tale of two religions—the external and the atemporal. As each side on Shakespeare’s stage committed atrocities, even more horrific than the previous, audiences saw the ghastly results of revenge and the potential of a second choice, peace.

Titus Andronicus

Shakespeare’s concern for the possibility of spiritual pursuits without political consequences fills *Titus Andronicus*. The different outcomes for General Titus Andronicus and for Marcus, his brother, encourage the pursuit of peace rather than revenge. Richard Wilson explains that the divide between the English men and women and their pursuit of spirituality has the added dimension of death. He states that the play “compressed Roman history [. . .] into a choice between tyranny and martyrdom[. . .] Anyone born in the same time and place as Shakespeare would have been presented with the same prospects, and the same existential choice” (“Introduction” 19). Considering a pursuit of spirituality within the prospect of government control, Shakespeare’s option of peace or revenge warns his audience members to continue vigilance related to safety and to personal responsibility for a relationship with the Creator.

The English people of Shakespeare’s audiences would have watched the play and, since they expected coded messages, not only would they have understood the play’s

portrayal of revenge but also its results as the results of revenge perpetrated by one religious side upon the other. They also, however, would have sensed a deeper and more subtle message—namely, the choice to pursue the peace evoked by a religion that remained unaffected by outside forces, atemporal religion. Milward, Asquith, and Wilson clearly define two sides of religion in Shakespeare's plays and delineate the choice these sides created for English men and women. These three scholars associate particular characters with Catholicism or Protestantism and give reasons for shared experiences between Shakespeare's characters and his audience members.

The garden scene in *Titus*, the first Shakespearean garden scene in my analysis, establishes the locus of truth as the trust and faith necessary for the truth of atemporal religion. Trust and faith in truth binds righteousness, patience, dignity, and rationality to the loving relationship among nature, men and women, and God. In this garden scene, the Andronicus family leaders, Titus and Marcus, learn the truth that Tamara's sons, Demetrius and Chiron, raped and mutilated Lavinia. At this point Titus could have chosen peace, but his earlier choices now lead to his passionate urge for revenge. Evidence of the primal garden echoes in Titus' options. His learning the truth of Lavinia's rape parallels the revealed truth in the Garden of Eden that began the great choice for human beings: respect the rules or reject them. Adam and Eve could have chosen respect, or obedience, which would have insured peace, but they did not. They began the human slide to spiritual death and more pronounced swings from rational to irrational states of mind. A similar choice rises before men and women of Shakespeare's audience: the acceptance or

rejection—that belief system identified by Luther’s three *Soli*³⁰—of the peace of the New Garden of Eden. Lavinia’s revelation in the Andronicii garden creates a difficult decision. Titus can choose peace and help his daughter heal, or he can seek revenge. His decision echoes Adam and Eve’s who also could have avoided the fruit tree and continued their life with their Maker. Both Titus and Adam and Eve took the easy route—murdering his daughter’s attackers and her and eating the fruit of the forbidden tree.

Marcus stands squarely within the triune formation of nature, men and women, and God—the Creator-created triad. Titus, on the other hand, because of his lost dignity struggles in an ever deepening quagmire of irrationality. Like Job in the Bible, Titus loses self-respect and all but one of his remaining children. Unlike Job, however, Titus relinquishes any means to return to rationality: his only goal is emotional satisfaction, not righteousness.

Act IV, scene 1, opens in Titus’ garden. Two sides of the Andronicii family situation immediately arise, irrational and rational: first the emotional reactions to the external situation and, in tandem, the second, the deep, internal, rational drive to communicate. Two characters enter the dichotomy created by Titus and Marcus—Lucius and Lavinia. Each reacts differently to the dichotomy, for Lucius finds himself surrounded by rationality in the form of his Uncle Marcus, and Lavinia challenges the foundations of that rational-irrational dichotomy. As Lucius innocently runs from Lavinia, Shakespeare creates two subtle biblical references: to a proponent of the gospel of Christ, Luke, and

30. Luther’s teachings bear explanation now. Luther’s *Soli*—*Sola Scriptura*, *Sola Gratia*, *Sola Fide*—redefine the human soul and, thereby, hypothetically portray the Christian God’s view of humans: humans must have written reminders—the Bible—and they must have, as gifts, both grace and faith. Luther taught through these *Soli* that humans alone have no means to return to the purity of the first humans, Adam and Eve, and their easy relationship with the Creator in that ancient Garden of Eden.

also to a name for Christ, “the vine.” Lucius’ name is a variant of the name “Luke.” Sometimes called the Great Physician, Luke wrote the “Gospel of Luke” in the *New Testament*. More significantly, however, Lucius is Latin for “light,” by which John the Baptist refers to Christ (John 1.4³¹). Lucius’ running as he did brings attention to his Uncle Marcus and his father, Titus, in that he shines a light on the efforts of Lavinia to communicate with her family.

The second reference, the vine, comes through Lavinia’s name. It is pre-Roman for “purity,” and the word’s etymologically relates to “the vine.” The apostolic writings often refer to Christ as “the vine.”³² Christians then, and now, considered Christ the foundation of a new relationship with the Creator. Referencing a vine recalls nature, and in nature a vine takes nutrients through its roots and projects them to the tiny branches that lead to the leaves. Without the vine, then, the branches cannot produce leaves or even fruit as they should. In the life of the soul, naming Christ “the vine” announces that the Creator provides a means to draw from Her, as the root of all creation, the imperative means to live—spiritual food. Now, through Christ, that required food will never end and will always be readily available to the spiritually receptive and willing individual. Only through this method do men and women return to their originally created place with nature and the Creator. Atemporal religion, the spiritual food, strengthens souls. Just as these tiny branches cannot survive without the vine, the created men and women without Christ do not function purposefully and cannot survive spiritually. That one name, “Lavinia,” draws

31. John 1.4—“In him was life, and that life was the light of men.”

32. John, chapter 15.

a centuries-old belief system onto Shakespeare's stage, clarifies it, makes it personal, and fills it with passion.

When Marcus tells Lucius to "stand by me," he physically surrounds Lucius with rationality, initially protecting him (4.1.5). Through Marcus, Lucius' fear transforms to a better understanding of the situation. Lucius has the means for Lavinia to communicate, but his terror prevents him from knowing that he does. He runs from Lavinia and even throws down his books, or her communication devices. Marcus demonstrates for Lucius the calm and patience necessary to start the journey to understand Lavinia.

Metaphorically, then, biblical parallels become apparent; atemporal religion (Marcus) would provide the calm, and even power, necessary for Christ's light (Lucius) to shine and reveal his teachings and the crucifixion (Lavinia).³³ The coded text in this play demonstrates for Shakespeare's audiences that atemporal religion provides protection to pursue a practice of religion domiciled in the human soul. Unlike external religion, atemporal religion can be hidden from view and from attack, but also it provides a richer practice that motivates a personal and individual relationship with the Creator.

Lavinia's practically frantic demand to be understood calls into question the separation between rationality and irrationality. To Lucius she appears irrational. He cannot even guess why she might be chasing him (4.1.16). She frightens him so that he runs and drops his books. In his effort to understand, he says, "I have read that Hecuba of Troy / Ran mad for sorrow. That made me fear" (lines 20-21). Even when Marcus and Titus comfort him, he objects and says that she loves him "when my father was in Rome,"

33. The biblical story of the arrival of the "Holy Spirit" in the book of Acts, Chapter 2, literally demonstrates the piercing of the human soul to provide the discovery of the Creator's new Garden of Eden.

thereby implying that he needs his father's protection to make sure that Lavinia loves him (1. 7). Even with Lucius' emotional reaction to her, she has a goal—a rational goal—to communicate.

While Titus and Marcus have been calming Lucius, they also have been observing Lavinia. They watch as she fumbles through his books, scattered on the ground where he tossed them. Though she has frightened her nephew, Marcus and Titus begin to discern her purpose. She has a message for them and for Shakespeare's audience. She demonstrates the means to harness emotion to rationality. First, she is emotionally urgent but not emotionally irrational. Second, she chases her nephew to communicate with him and not to wreak her vengeance on him. Third, she fumbles through the books but does not destroy them in a rage. She enacts the perfect combination of the emotional and rational aspects of people. Though she has been brutally attacked and mutilated and though her father suggests that she kill herself, she finds a way to communicate, working rationally through her nephew's books (3.1.13-20). She combines her emotional pain with a rational search for a means to communicate. With Marcus, the master of the rational, she succeeds.

Titus, despite two examples of rationality, rejects it. From the beginning of the play, his decisions lead to this point of rejection. First, Titus, despite Tamara's pleas, sacrificially murders her oldest son, Alarbus. Then he murders his own son, Mutius, because he committed treason—or at least severely embarrassed Titus in front of Saturninus—by helping Lavinia escape with Bassianus. Significantly, Marcus' reprimand focuses on Titus' irrational decision: "O Titus, see, O, see what thou hast done! / In a bad quarrel slain a virtuous son" (1.1.342-43). "Bad quarrel" draws attention to Titus'

unwarranted reaction to the situation and his spontaneous murder of Mutius. If Titus had considered the events less emotionally, he might not have “slain a virtuous son.” If he, like Marcus, had been a calm and peaceful man—that is, rational—the situation probably would have ended differently.

Next, he sees Marcus teach Lavinia how to communicate, interprets the message she writes, and then moves into a much deeper and inescapable irrationality. He remains unaffected by Marcus’ request that all kneel and by his demand that all of them “swear with [him] [. . .] / That [they] will prosecute by good advice” (4.1. 91 and 94). He rationally requires that they “carefully deliberate, plan” (*Complete* 962, note 94). Titus, however, quickly sends his grandson, Lucius, to the court to deliver a message in Latin that only Aaron understands: “He who is spotless in life and free of crime, needs not the Moorish javelin or bow” (4.2.20-21; trans. Bevington, *Complete*). Then, he will shoot arrows into the court with various sayings on them (4.3). Next, he will kill Demetrius and Chiron, grind them up, and serve them to their mother, Tamara, as meatloaf (5.2.186-91 and 5.3.60-63). Then he will kill Tamara, and finally he will die by Saturninus’ avenging sword (5.3). He completely rejects rationality and covers the stage in blood, in fact, the bloodiest scene Shakespeare ever created. The message may be too obviously and emphatically stated, but it directs audiences to see the effects of irrationality, in this case of revenge, but more subtly the power of the perfect blend of rational and irrational that atemporal religion offers and that Marcus and Lavinia demonstrate.

At the end of Act IV, with Marcus’ soliloquy addressing the “heavens,” the play creates a wonderful code for God that would have been satisfying to both Catholic and Protestant members of his audience. Marcus’ prayer on Titus’ behalf further demonstrates

the best means to maintain that blend of the rational and irrational. Marcus describes Titus, expresses his situation, and requests the heavens to act before he does:

O heavens, can you hear a good man groan
And not relent, or not compassion him?
Marcus, attend him in his ecstasy,
That hath more scars of sorrow in his heart
Than foemen's marks upon his battered shield,
But yet so just that he will not revenge,
Revenge the heavens for old Andronicus! (ll. 125-31)

Marcus calls Titus a “good man” and describes him as having more emotional wounds of the heart than a soldier has physical wounds. Knowing the danger that Titus invites, Marcus stays with his brother and further prays that the heavens—God, in His justice—will act before Titus so that he will not seek revenge. Marcus knows that the value and power of the heavens’ revenge far exceeds any human’s efforts. His prayer, offered in privacy, provides the audience with knowledge of atemporal religion: it evokes the deepest desires and provides a means to express them appropriately to the “heavens,” an acceptable code for the Creator. Marcus addresses the heavens while alone in a garden, not in a building. He stands in nature and addresses the Creator, reflecting that first relationship now, however, in the new Garden of Eden.

In Titus’ garden, atemporal religion becomes the solution to a simple dichotomy. It offers options for the locus of truth—either the separation of the soul into rationality and irrationality, or the blend of the two as demonstrated by Lavinia. Though the irrational seems to bring the correct ending—in Titus’ case it would be the satisfaction of revenge—

the blend would have been much less painful and grotesque. Atemporal religion working from the inside out fills the human soul with the perfect blend of rationality and irrationality. It leads to the respectful relationship among nature, men and women, and God.

Romeo and Juliet

Marcus' soliloquy, his private speech, becomes a literal private space in Act II, scene 2, of *Romeo and Juliet*. Marcus' call to the heavens occurs in secret. Similarly, in the Capulet private garden, the lovers make secret plans that no one hears. The play, then, presents a secret garden, the *hortus conclusus*, as another locus of truth—a safe place of secrecy and privacy, the new Garden of Eden.

People need a new creation. The first humans experienced creation, their beautiful home, and all necessities for both, but rejected it; therefore, all subsequent humans would live the loss and require an experience with a different creation—a new blessed location that would reestablish the relationship among God, humans, and nature. The Capulet “*hortus conclusus*” provides a representation of the new creation and demonstrates the evolution of external religion to atemporal religion.

The Capulet private garden provides a tangible representation of the means to fashion the best combination of the rational and irrational or of the logical and emotional. Lavinia's behavior, as emotional but not irrational, exhibits the combination of emotion and logic as a reality. Romeo and Juliet enact the dichotomy—emotion versus logic—visually and show in practically slow motion the devolution of the dichotomy into a literal new form or new human that can inhabit the new Garden of Eden. As Romeo and Juliet move closer to marriage and, therefore, “two becoming one flesh,” they physically enact

the process (Genesis 2.24). Lavinia lives the balance of emotion and logic while Romeo and Juliet demonstrate how the balance occurs. That balanced creation, as portrayed in *Romeo*, functions as a silhouette of the work of atemporal religion, creating the perfect God-human-nature relationship that exists in the new Garden of Eden.

With such a safe and individually designed location as the Capulet garden, a demonstration of the transformation of external religion occurs. As Juliet gradually accepts Romeo's presence in such a dangerous place, as the two reveal their love for each other, and as that revelation becomes reality and demands action, the "story" begins of the conversion of external into atemporal religion.

First and foremost is the privacy and safety of the Capulet garden. No one outside it can see it or even secretly enter it. Wilders describes the Capulet garden as a "haven from the assaults of the world" (134). For these reasons Juliet asks Romeo how he found it (2.2.62). She asks him a second time, wanting to know who told him of the place: "By whose direction found'st thou out this place?" (line 79). With this second question, Juliet emphasizes that only she belongs in the garden. Her questions connote her logic and rationality: she knows the dangerous situation Romeo has created for both of them, and by her questions she acts rationally. Those particular questions also imply opposition to Romeo's extremely dangerous, and thereby irrational, decision to climb the garden wall and enter the Capulet private garden. Bevington explains that "She is the one who asks the pragmatic questions. [Romeo's] [. . .] courtly Petrarchan discourse must be brought down to earth [. . .] and give way to [her] insistence that danger is present" (*Seven* 75). She maintains her presence in the garden as appropriate and his as inappropriate, hers as safety and his as peril.

This garden accommodates the locus of truth as a position: one's God-prepared place that provides safety, but outside of that location or, in Romeo's case, invading another's location results in danger and death. Juliet's position in the garden and her questions of Romeo summon the ancient and pristine Garden of Eden. She belongs in her garden as did Adam and Eve, and also as they did, she thoroughly knows her garden. Juliet explicitly emphasizes Romeo's exclusion from the safety of her garden, saying "the orchard walls are high and hard to climb" (2.2.63). These words stress her knowledge of her garden and its means of producing safety. Her safety within those walls undeniably exists. Romeo's words, on the other hand, beg questions. Juliet asks and demands answers for how and why he entered the garden, who told him the location of the garden, and even what happens if her kinsmen find him there. Her presence appropriately in her garden, therefore, enacts the wisdom of Garden life—namely, understanding the rules and trusting them. Juliet knows the rules of privacy, of social behavior, and of respect for both. She purposely questions Romeo's comprehension of those rules. In this garden, wisdom attempts to teach the transgressor by allowing him or her to discern and possibly accept that transgression. Bevington calls Juliet "[Romeo's] instructor in true love" (*Seven* 75). Juliet's questions would allow Romeo to consider his lack of good judgment and understand true love; however, driven by emotion, thereby poor judgment, he rejects any recognition of his offence or of true love. His choice parallels Adam and Eve's decision that triggered the fall of humankind.

Since Romeo absolutely does not belong in the Capulet garden and since he does not accept Juliet's logic, he redefines the space but imperfectly. Shakespeare's Romeo seems to reiterate Luther's redefinition of humans—people need written reminders and the

gifts of both grace and faith. By first transforming Juliet, Romeo begins his new definition of the Capulet garden. He sees Juliet at her window that faces into the garden and calls her the sun. He commands his new creation to “arise [. . .] and kill the envious moon” (2.2.4). In that same speech he sends her eyes to the heavens and replaces them with stars. He worshipfully explains that “her eyes in heaven / Would through the airy region stream so bright / That birds would sing and think it were not night” (lines 20-22). He then fully renders her as a completely new being, a “bright angel.” Her angelic effect, says Romeo, replicates a “wingèd messenger of heaven” that “mortals [. . .] fall back to gaze on” (ll. 27, 28, and 30). In effect, he remakes her, transmuting her into a saint who, with just a look, can protect him from her kinsmen (ll. 55 and 72-73). Finally, she is his soul (l. 165). Of course, she is none of these, but Romeo’s imperfect recreation and love view her as such.

With Juliet cloaked by his vision, he then converts the garden to a welcoming place for him. His presence makes the garden “a place of death,” but his love weakens its “stony limits” and eliminates its impenetrability by “o’erperch[ing]” the walls thereby creating an entrance (2.2.64, 67, and 66). With his assumed control of the garden and the presence of night, he can now conceal himself from everyone (l. 75). He creates his safety through his imperfect reinvention of the Capulet garden. Through Romeo’s rendition of the garden, this play, in the reading I advance here, codes the change among God, nature, and humans inaugurated by the Christian teachings about Jesus. In this teaching, Adam and Eve’s rejection of the Creator’s rules made the Garden a place of death for them as the Capulet garden initially was for Romeo. Christianity argues that Jesus’ crucifixion clearly states God’s love for humans, which weakens the spiritual limits of humankind and simultaneously creates a new Garden of Eden within each man and woman. Atemporal

religion, then, fills the new Garden like amniotic fluid, and humans could rest, again joined to the purposeful connection with God and nature. Romeo's creation, however, has consequences; Juliet immediately expresses those consequences.

Within Romeo's new garden, Juliet now accepts the safety he creates but does so against her knowledge of the truth. She retreats from rationality and into irrationality and, like Romeo, allows her emotions to drive her. A false sense of security propels her to express private thoughts. She articulates her embarrassment that Romeo had intruded upon her privacy and heard the dreamy but private expression of her heart. She says that the night hides her blush "for that which thou hast heard me speak tonight. / Fain would I dwell on form—fain, fain, deny / What I have spoke; but farewell compliment" (2.2.87-89). With those words she leaves behind logic and focuses solely on emotion. For example, in the same speech, she easily moves into silly, swear-don't-swear commands (ll. 91-2, 109, 112, and 116). She can just as easily, however, state the logical description of their present situation, calling it "too rash, too unadvised, too sudden, / Too like the lightning, which doth cease to be / Ere one can say it lightens" (ll. 118-20). Despite that moment of rationality, she allows emotion to drive her and slides back into Romeo's redefined garden, assimilating his confidence in his plans. The two eventually marry and then die together in the Capulet vault—the ultimate joining of two souls but not an entry into the new Garden of Eden.

Romeo's inappropriate entry into and translation of the Capulet garden result in the destruction of both Romeo and Juliet. Wilders, having called the Capulet garden a "haven," further states that "These havens, however, are either temporary or imperfect and offer no lasting security" (134). Romeo as an outsider can neither create lasting security

nor new from old. Clearly he cannot become an insider by proclamation and remain alive. In addition, no one can support such proclamation, as did Juliet of Romeo's, and survive. These behaviors similarly imply that no one can declare external religion as atemporal or support such declaration without consequences. Mutually exclusive terms cannot become one.

Shakespeare's fictional world of Romeo and Juliet demonstrates the reality of the Henrician Reformation—the human effort to proclaim either Catholicism or Protestantism as the religion to live by when only the Creator of spirituality and religion can do so. The execution of both Catholics and Protestants, exemplified by the irrational and excessive bloodshed exacted by both, emphasizes the tragic results of human control. Luther's *Soli* clearly function as reality in *Romeo and Juliet*. As Romeo cannot, neither can any human successfully create any spiritual change or enter the new Garden of Eden through his or her own efforts. External religion, therefore, cannot bear the name of atemporal religion in and of itself. Only the Christian God's healing the human soul will imbue it with atemporal religion, culminating in an entirely new human who can, then, enter the Creator's new Garden of Eden—the very essence of atemporal religion. The relationship between Romeo and Juliet incurs consequences, but it also foretells the means for humans to enter the new Garden of Eden: they can do nothing by themselves. Through no means of their own can they achieve the safety of living the perfect blend of rationality and irrationality or attain the ideal relationship among God, nature, and humans. They cannot translate their fallen state into a perfect state. Romeo's effort clearly and devastatingly proves the results of such an attempt.

Richard II

Shakespeare transmutes the tragedy of the lovers in *Romeo* and the tragedy of human attempts to exact spiritual change into a portrayal of the loss of spiritual rhythm or the appropriate interplay of logic and emotion. As a result another human being, Queen Isabella, loses the way to the new Garden of Eden. Shakespeare's historic portrayal of her trapped by a weak king fills the garden scene of *Richard II* (3.4) with her embarrassment and anger. The Queen, as a guest, enters another's garden, the Duke of York's; she is not an intruder and not in any danger, so she follows neither Romeo's nor Juliet's behavior. She simply enters, finds offense, and leaves. Within that simplicity, however, the rational / irrational dichotomy explodes into pain and destruction as the Queen angrily rebukes the gardeners; nevertheless, the perfect blend of the two gently continues as the Master Gardener maintains his expected position in York's garden. The portrayal of the Master Gardener follows Lavinia's in *Titus*, who demonstrates the dichotomy as a perfect blend: her emotions contribute to her successful rational attempt to tell the truth. In *Romeo and Juliet* the dichotomy devolves through Romeo's translation of the Capulet garden and even of Juliet into a vision of humans in the new Garden of Eden. The result, though flawed by the death and failure that fallen humans create, reveals the enigma of atemporal religion. It demands change in the dichotomy of the human situation but must perform the change itself as driven by its creator, God as portrayed by Christianity. The Duke of York's castle garden in Bristol provides the setting for Shakespeare's next message about religious change—to lose a kingdom or tend a garden.

Historical analyses of *Richard II* connect the play not only to King Richard II, who reigned from 1377-1399, but also to Shakespeare's contemporaries. For example, Queen

Elizabeth made a connection between past and present, declaring that the king represented her: “I am Richard II, know ye not that!”³⁴ In addition, both Clare Asquith and Peter Milward closely associate the play with the Essex Rebellion of February, 1601. Apparently, the Earl of Essex’s followers called for a performance of the play the night before the rebellion (Asquith 81; Milward, *Papist*, 84; Burckhardt 216). Whether or not the play itself had any impact on the rebellion seems moot since the rebellion failed, and the implication of collusion never had much impact on the actors’ lives. According to Bentley, “Apparently the company’s innocence was established without much difficulty. There is no indication that their later performances or Shakespeare’s later writing were affected by the experience” (734). This particular play, with its presentation of the deposition of a king, the Queen’s belief that she was Richard II, and its proximity to the Essex Rebellion, nevertheless, had political implications for Elizabethan play-goers.

More importantly, however, with religion tightly woven into Elizabethan politics, scholars find significance in the religious associations of *Richard II*. Some center their attention on the obviously religious language. For example, focusing on the disaster of Richard’s reign, Coursen states that “[a] fallen world can only fall further” when he analyzes the use of “the Sacrament as a sanction for regicide.” He points to the Abbot in Act IV, scene 1, lines 327-31 and to the Duke of York in Act V, scene 2, lines 97-99 (295). Milward, in *Papist*, provides several examples of such language: the King’s advice to his Queen, “Hie thee to France, / And cloister thee in some religious house” (5.2.22-3);

34. Milward states, “Then the queen herself was said, by the antiquarian courtier William Lambarde, to have made the comment, not without indignation, ‘I am Richard II, know ye not that!’” (*Papist* 84). Asquith concurs and furnishes the queen’s declaration with historical significance: “It was after the [Essex] rebellion that Elizabeth revealed to the embarrassed scholar, Sir William Lambarde, that she was under no illusion as to the real meaning of such plays: ‘I am Richard II, know ye not that!’” (81).

in relation to their banishment, Bolingbroke's description of himself and Mowbray "like two men / That vow a long weary pilgrimage" (1.1.48-9); and John of Gaunt's "Methinks I am a prophet" in Act II, scene 1, line 31 (86 and 89). Gaunt's speech begun in the previous line—his famous exaltation of England—describes his country as "This other Eden, demi-paradise" (line 42). With that line and so many additional religious references—many directly from Catholicism³⁵ as well as overtly biblical—the garden scene in Act III, scene 4, requires little stage time since astute audience members would immediately see York's garden as the Garden of Eden.

As Queen Isabella leaves York's garden, a wake of loss follows her. She now knows that Richard has lost his kingdom and that her life will no longer be the same. John Wilders focuses on the history plays to argue for their consistent demonstration of the loss of paradise. Specifically about *Richard II*, he states, "The sense of a lost paradise and of a country falling into ruin after an ideal past is conveyed most powerfully [. . .] and more subtly in *Richard II* [. . .] than in any other Shakespearean play. By various dramatic means [Shakespeare] conveys the impression that the end of [Richard II's] reign is the end of an era[. . .]" (135 and 137). Every garden scene in my study expresses this loss of an ideal golden age as portrayed in *Richard II*. The deaths of all but three members of the Andronicus family, the deaths of Romeo and Juliet, and Richard's abdication and murder show the end of a golden age—the golden age of the Andronicus family with Titus' war successes and his many sons; the golden age of the love known to Romeo and Juliet; and the golden age of ruling by heredity right as did Richard II (Wilders 135).

35. Adding to the research arguing that Shakespeare pursued other religious paths, Milward focuses on the Catholicism he discerns in Shakespeare's plays and calls *Richard II* one of the plays "in which the heart of the Catholic dramatist is most clearly revealed . . ." (*Papist* 83).

Surrounding these endings of loss, however, Shakespearean plays' representations of the ancient Garden of Eden exploits the universal desire to return to a golden age to present a new ideal—the new Garden of Eden built by the Creator to fill every willing human's soul. All human efforts to return to a golden age or even to build a new one will not succeed, as Wilders consistently argues and as, specifically, *Romeo and Juliet* demonstrate; however, a new garden nurtured by atemporal religion and protected by the Creator can succeed. Atemporal religion moves the ideal past, the Golden Age, into an internal ideal—the new Garden of Eden—and allows for the realignment of humans to their original position in the relationship among God, nature, and humans. The ideal past cannot be recreated on the earth, but it can be within the human soul.

The Duke of York's garden, to which he invites Richard's queen, Isabella, grows lushly and beautifully under his Master Gardener's care. Exuding authority, the Master Gardener explains the power of properly tending the Duke's creation, the land set aside for the garden even as he compares it to Richard II's reign. He tells his men to support apricot-loaded branches and to trim the branches that have grown too fast and created uneven shapes in the garden, and he, then, will pull weeds (3.4.22, 34, and 37-38). The original Garden of Eden whispers among the gardeners and faintly echoes the work of Adam and Eve; it explodes onto the stage, however, as Queen Isabella undeniably demands its presence by calling the gardener "old Adam's likeness," and referring to his pronouncements about the kingdom and the king as fully evil: "What Eve, what serpent, hath suggested thee / To make a second fall of cursèd man?" (ll. 72 and 75-76). Instantly the Garden of Eden undeniably sits on the stage.

In this garden, the locus of truth combines the loci of *Titus*, which created a safe place of trust of and faith in truth, with that of *Romeo and Juliet*, which revealed the necessity of a safe place of secrecy and privacy—to become a safe and secret location filled with the trust of and faith in truth. *Richard II*'s garden scene, as noted above, portrays Eden as it should have been if not for the Fall and how the new Garden of Eden now exists. This garden scene's evocation of that ancient and pristine place provides a means to reiterate its loss. Her command recalls God's question to Adam, "Where are you?" (Genesis 3.9). Adam answers with a second question before he responds with the complete truth that he and Eve have violated the only rule the two had to obey. The Master Gardener of York's garden, when responding with the whole truth to Queen Isabella's command, illustrates that he had learned from Adam's failure. Shakespeare's stagescape, then, echoes Adam's and Eve's fall but offers a means to avoid repeating it—to live honestly with respect for supreme authority. The Master Gardener maintains his purpose, working in York's garden with honesty and respect. This commoner reiterates human possibility to recover from the Fall.

Shakespeare's audience members likely knew that no human could achieve the Master Gardener's behavior for any length of time. He plants rue to reflect Queen Isabella's tears, but the rue grows perennially, metaphorically reiterating, year after year, all human tears for the loss of the Garden of Eden—the ideal life that cannot be recovered. Wilders reminds people that the "ideal kingdom is never to be found here and how" (9). The garden scene of *Richard II* moves past the Garden of Eden as a symbol to a picture of the new Garden of Eden. Audience members, clearly aware that the scene on the stage represents loss, would know on some level that it not only presents the loss of Richard's

kingdom, Queen Isabella's loss of Richard and of her purpose, but also as a representation of the loss of the original and wondrous Garden of Eden. Although the Master Gardener's planting the pungent-smelling rue respects those losses and the tears, as a perennial it subtly evokes eternity. On that evocation the new Garden of Eden hovers peacefully over the stage. The Master Gardener's gift of rue to the Queen pulsates in rhythm with the gift of grace offered by the Creator. The gift of grace provides without request and reminds without reprimand. Similarly, the Master Gardener plants the rue without the Queen's or the Duke of York's request. He knew the necessity of being reminded, as would the smell of the rue, of the situation of Richard's reign, but he had no need or the power to punish anyone for it.

The Creator, too, provides grace to humankind despite their ignorance of their need and, thus, no request for it. Grace, like the rue, reminds all willing people of the state of their soul but offers healing not punishment. The Creator's gift of grace, along with faith, fuels atemporal religion, which offers a path into the new Garden of Eden. Shakespeare's garden in *Richard II* subtly allows audience members to grasp easily the new relationship within the Creator-created triad. This very short scene, only about 107 lines long, briefly shines light, like a flashbulb, on humans' life in the new Garden of Eden. Like the flashbulb, however, the view quickly disappears, and Richard dies. The feeling of loss instantly returns.

A Midsummer Night's Dream

This play occurs in a forest's shadows filled with the unknown: the flash of the new Garden of Eden in *Richard II*, dissolves into confusion. *Midsummer* removes any spiritual or secular control humans assume they have over their lives or their futures. The

“spirits” of the forest, Puck and Oberon in particular—whom Helena, Demetrius, Hermia, and Lysander cannot see—subject four lovers to their own anger, confusion, and an absolute loss of self-determination. Incredibly, the lovers have no knowledge or memory of their experiences in the wood. In Act III, scene 2, the locus of truth becomes truth controlled by spirituality. The previous garden scenes in my study reveal appropriate human behavior. Lavinia demonstrates the balance of appropriate human behavior because even as she attempts to communicate she expresses urgency but not emotional irrationality. The gradual combining of Romeo and Juliet into the oneness of marriage, on the one hand, demonstrates the work of atemporal religion to repair the lost balance between rational and irrational, but, also, it simultaneously reveals that the repair cannot last when effected by humans alone. Romeo’s reinterpretation of Juliet and even of the Capulet garden emphasizes that only failure results from all human effort to return to the perfection of the relationship with the Creator and nature. Lavinia’s and Romeo and Juliet’s successes and failures reiterated by York’s Master Gardener undeniably evoke the Garden of Eden in the Capulet *hortus conclusus* and the Duke of York’s garden. Here, in *Midsummer*, the presence of the new Garden of Eden glides onto the stage through the mist of spiritually-controlled truth.

In the same year as the approximate year of publication for *Midsummer*, 1595, Fr. Henry Walpole stood trial for high treason. When he would not take the oath of supremacy, the judges ordered his execution: hung, drawn and quartered. With such executions occurring at this point in Elizabeth’s reign, Shakespeare had to code his teachings carefully. Regina Buccola argues that this kind of setting allows Shakespeare’s plays to foreground religious perspective without fear of consequences. She explains that

Shakespeare “dodges the religious controversies encoded in the play’s fairy lore foundation by explicitly setting them in pre-Christian Athens” (163). The most interesting member of the fairies, Puck, offers a conduit for audience members to understand the effects of spirituality on humans. In the Athenian forest, Puck, though often regarded as mischievous, represents the revealing power of atemporal religion.

Puck’s work also offers an examination of the relationships between men and women. When Oberon orders Puck to anoint Demetrius’ eyes with the “love juice”—a connection to nature—to help Helena, he begins a centuries-long debate about relationships between men and women (2.2.260-67). Louis Montrose, exploring the female characters in the play, argues that the men in this festival atmosphere must wrest the women from their own downfall. He says, “[t]he festive conclusion of *Midsummer* depends upon the success of a process by which the female pride and power manifested in misanthropic warriors, possessive mothers, unruly wives, and willful daughters are brought under the control of lords and husbands” (501). For Montrose, the effect of the male characters controls and directs the growth and psychological development of the female characters. His theory, however, precludes the effect of Puck’s work. That work, in fact, forces male domination of the female into the shadows as the young lovers find successful male-female combinations through spirituality—namely, Puck’s efforts to reveal the souls of men and women. He subtly demonstrates the purpose of the masculine-feminine combination that in this play echoes the first human relationship created by God in the Garden of Eden.

Obviously love in Shakespeare’s plays invites scholarly commentary and hypotheses about how he may have viewed love. Stephen Greenblatt focuses on the love

confusion in the play. He compares *Midsummer* and *Romeo and Juliet*, explaining that Shakespeare could have worked on the two plays at the same time.³⁶ He argues that such simultaneity reveals Shakespeare's attitude toward love:

Shakespeare's works had long been wryly skeptical of official explanations and excuses—the accounts, whether psychological or theological, of why people behave the way they do. His plays had suggested that the choices people make in love are almost entirely inexplicable and irrational, which is the conviction that generates the comedy in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and the tragedy in *Romeo and Juliet*. (324)

In fact, these two particular plays demonstrate for Greenblatt that Shakespeare's concept of love did not offer much hope for its pursuit. He explains that,

Shakespeare's imagination did not easily conjure up a couple with long-term prospects for happiness. In *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, the love between Lysander and Hermia vanishes in a second while Demetrius and Helena will cherish each other as long as the love juice sprinkled in his eyes holds out. (134)

Such a view of love, that one couple's love could vanish and the other couple's could last under the effects of Oberon's love juice, enacts humans' inability to control their self-determination. The four cannot escape the effects of the fairies in order to be whom they choose.

36. David Bevington presents generally agreed upon composition dates for the plays used in my research: *Rom.* as composed between c. 1594 and 1596 (*Complete*, A-14); *R2* between c. 1595 to 1596 (A-10); *MND* in c. 1595 (A-4). I chose this order, but Greenblatt's notion that *MND* and *Rom.* could be in Shakespeare's mind simultaneously seems plausible, too.

In a similar fashion, humans cannot escape the effects of religion on their souls' states, more tangibly experienced in Reformation England. Humans cannot achieve their holy purpose as created beings without the spirituality proffered by atemporal religion; therefore, using magical juice applied by fairies allows this play to portray the effects of atemporal religion. Humans can do nothing to gain entrance into the Creator's new Garden of Eden just as the four young lovers could do nothing to escape the forest when they choose to or as they choose to be. In addition, just as only Oberon's "love juice" could free the four, only atemporal religion could achieve human freedom through a realignment of humans with the relationship among them, nature, and the Creator.

Shakespeare's plays most clearly portray the role of atemporal religion in the human connection to nature and the Creator. Focusing on the interaction among only three characters, Hermia, Lysander, and Puck, a microcosm of the human being appears. As representative of the relationship among humans, nature, and the Creator, the human being comprises four essences: the spiritual, emotional, intellectual, and physical. Building on Greenblatt's comparison of *Romeo and Julie* to *A Midsummer* and specifically employing Romeo's naming Juliet his soul, Hermia becomes Lysander's soul.³⁷ When Hermia literally fights Helena for Lysander, she demonstrates emotion but also the soul's work to return to its purpose-filled place—within the balanced workings of the human soul in connection with intellect, emotions, and physical body. Lysander's self-defense in Act I, scene 1, and his plan to live with his aunt on the other side of the forest reveals his thinking process and intellectuality (lines 99-110). The Fairy Puck acts on the spiritual

37. In Act III, scene 2, under Puck's medication Lysander calls Helena his soul (line 246). Presenting women as the souls of men creates a remarkable metaphor.

level providing a means to examine that soul. With successful balance, as the play suggests, humans can enjoy their purpose-filled relationship with nature and God. To enter that joy, the soul must effectively accomplish its goal but cannot do so unless atemporal religion tends to, feeds, and encourages the soul in its work. Puck's work, though considered the work of a trickster, does all three. Atemporal religion cannot work, however, without the cooperation of the human. The young lovers' sleep, in my interpretation, provided the cooperation for Puck to work. Shakespeare's audience members may have learned that without that cooperation, proper attention to their individual souls cannot proceed; therefore, their souls wither, and the balanced working among the body, spirit, intellect, and emotions tips as a four-legged chair would with a missing leg.

A Midsummer Night's Dream, in short, portrays the soul as unwilling to concede defeat. Hermia will literally fight for Lysander to the point of physically attacking Helena. As the situation draws near a crisis, Puck's interaction with Lysander reveals the man's troubled soul; Puck does not cause the trouble, in accord with the traditional interpretation, but he pulls back the curtains, as does atemporal religion, to allow everyone to see Lysander's condition. The play's representation of the human soul's activity encourages his audience members to examine their own souls—that "trying on" Lake describes (xxxi). This forest scene shows that a soul infused with atemporal religion will actively fight for survival through implementing the appropriate balance among the essences of the human being—the soul, intellect, emotions, and the physical body. That balance propels the human into the new Garden of Eden in which people, nature, and the Creator live in their harmonious relationship.

Representing atemporal religion, Puck acts as the catalyst in the forest of this microcosm of the human being. His role in the play requires his application of Oberon's love juice—a juice made by crushing a flower, called “love-in-idleness,” which one of Cupid's bolts strikes and which causes a sleeper to love whomever or whatever he or she sees upon awakening. Puck, in his new role, rather than tricks produces a revelation: souls will not allow their abandonment. Without Puck's administering the potion—that is, without atemporal religion preparing the human—the knowledge of the workings of the soul within people could not be understood, accepted, or utilized for healing. Lysander's pursuit of Helena opens a dialogue concerning the soul.

In Act II, scene 2, Hermia awakens and cannot find Lysander. She screams for him “To pluck this crawling serpent from my breast!”—clearly a product of her dream (lines 152 and 154). Whereas Eve's serpent tempted her in the Garden of Eden, Hermia's serpent attacks her body, perhaps symbolizing for original sin. As she tells more of her dream, Hermia believes Lysander found the attack entertaining: “And you [Lysander] sat smiling at his cruel [act of] prey[ing]” (l. 156). Puck reveals a part of Lysander that few women would want to know about their lovers—that he controls his own darkness, his own evil, for by choice he smiles at Hermia's danger instead of rescuing and protecting her. Even further, he first wants to marry Hermia and run away with her, thereby promising his undying love to her. Puck, however, through Hermia's dream, exposes Lysander's inner being and renders his love as only unstable shambles and, therefore, impossible to trust. Through Lysander's experience with Puck, though he will not fully remember it, he offers an important purpose for examining the state of one's soul—to understand that one can harm and perhaps murder it.

Hermia describes a murderous aspect of her dream: “Methought a serpent ate my heart away” (l. 155). As Lysander’s soul, Hermia experiences a significant symbolic event. A serpent’s involvement, as stated above, recalls Eve’s experience in the Garden of Eden and certainly implies that it embodies evil. Hermia’s serpent attacks a significant organ in the physical human body, for the heart moves oxygenated blood throughout the body, even to its extremities, to cleanse and feed it and then brings the blood back to itself through the lungs to begin the process again. With this work, clearly the heart assures the health of the human body. In addition, most people imbue the heart with an array of human emotions, such as love and hate, and their offspring, confusion. This one organ, then, combines two parts of the human essence—emotions and the human body. In Hermia’s dream a serpent eats her heart, thereby destroying it. Through the implication that danger surrounds the heart, her dream exposes the menace that something or someone exists that could destroy a soul’s very essence and its own central impulse—that is, its heart.

Hermia, however, demonstrates in Act III, scene 2, that a soul does not lose its heart or resign easily. When she fully realizes that she might possibly lose Lysander and that Helena is the cause, she threatens to scratch out Helena’s eyes: “O me! You juggler! You cankerblossom! / You thief of love! What, have you come by night / And stol’n my love’s heart from him?” (ll. 282-84). She calls Helena a cankerblossom, “a worm that destroys the flower bud, or wild rose,”³⁸ that equates her with a serpent that has power to destroy the soul in all its beauty. Even more significantly, the cankerworm, or the snake, can literally steal a heart and, therefore, destroy it because a heart cannot live outside its

38. Bevington, *Complete*, 166, note 282.

physical house, the human body. The scene describes Hermia as “flail[ing]” at Helena and Lysander’s restraining her (ll. 298 and 322). He refuses to listen to his soul, let her rescue him, or even tell him that he has been harmed and has lost his heart. He chooses to continue pursuing a potentially deadly situation.

A serpent, thus, eats Hermia’s heart and now has destroyed Lysander’s heart. Allegorically, the dream shows that the human heart can be stolen and that the soul will literally vie for the heart of its human, even with the threat of losing its own essence—its heart. Puck’s work on Lysander, however, allows an even more striking view of his heart: he views his own soul as a serpent. He tells Hermia, “I will shake thee from me like a serpent!” (3.2.261). He has completely lost any sense of himself, but especially any spiritual sense, by calling his soul a serpent and possibly himself, too. As with Eve, as stated earlier, the serpent represents evil, so by calling Hermia a serpent, he calls his soul evil. Such terrible confusion demands powerful healing, which only an infusion of atemporal religion will provide. With that infusion, his view will heal and return him to harmony with his soul. At the climax of the play, Act IV, scene 1, Puck, embodying atemporal religion, shows the value of the body-soul bond. He promises that “Jack shall have Jill; / Naught shall go ill” (lines 461-62). He heals Lysander and returns him to Hermia. Puck further promises, “The man shall have his mare again, and all shall be well” (l. 463). Now, according to Puck’s promise, the two will live together in harmony with nature, echoing the holy relationship among humans, creation, and the Creator.

In the play’s epilogue, Puck refers one last time to the serpent and emphasizes the absolute necessity for help if one is to escape it. He describes the means that removes the serpent’s power as “unearned luck” (5.1.427). The word “luck” often receives the credit

when people escape what could have been an extremely disruptive or deadly situation. By introducing “luck” in the very last lines of his play, Puck summons the still prevalent belief in fate. This subtle reference ushers onto Shakespeare’s stage the mythological Fates, the three goddesses who determine human destiny. It also evokes and confirms as viable an underlying superstition that outside forces cause human behavior and that humans have no control of those forces. Though the rational dimension and intellectually-based Christian religion should have dismissed such beliefs, it had been only partially successful.

Through these several links in Puck’s last speech—luck and superstition, which Christianity attempted to quash—he subtly introduces the concept of the gift of grace. First, people do not control the gift of grace as they cannot control luck. Next, the gift of grace protects people from terrible events as some believe luck can. Last, as Puck is to luck, atemporal religion is to the gift of grace. These parallels serve as reminders, albeit subtly, that without the gift of grace—as taught by Luther—the human soul withers and destabilizes human essences. Without that balance, the human falters and cannot adequately experience his or her relationship with nature and the Creator. That gift of grace, however, propels atemporal religion into the human soul, in the process preparing and positioning humans to discover the new Garden of Eden and to experience the joyful return to a balanced internal existence within the Creator-created triad.

Conclusion

From Lavinia to Juliet, from the Master Gardener to Puck, Shakespeare’s play creates a continuum of the slow but steady growth of atemporal religion in humans and the human choices that it makes available. They can live, as does Lavinia, with a balance of

irrational emotions and rational acts that occurs with spiritual maturity. They can indecisively seesaw between the rational and irrational and lose their way as does Juliet. They can live contentedly, accepting and enjoying their position in the new Garden of Eden as does the Master Gardener. All of these particular choices lead to Puck's revelation of the condition of the human soul: it desperately needs healing, the first effect of the gift of grace.

The nature scenes in *As You Like It*, *Twelfth Night*, *Othello*, and *King Lear* offer nature's characteristics to demonstrate the power of internal balance and a clear picture of a well-tended spiritual life. These four plays offer Shakespeare's commentary on the need for and attainment of atemporal religion, its effects, its relation to the new Garden of Eden, and its revelation of the human soul. In Chapter Four I interpret the next four plays as pedagogically addressing and reiterating the internal state of the human essences. In the process nature first becomes "civilized" with brooks being books for the Duke Senior and his men. Then it offers Viola an example in a storm from which she escapes and then imitates by creating more confusion and activity in Olivia's mind and soul. Iago reveals that people reject the example of nature and do not choose to act with a holy purpose; the embodiment of evil is now no longer a snake but a man who lives the epitome of evil—deception and murder. Nature reflects the rational-irrational dichotomy as Lear mimics the storm and in madness experiences the storm's hideous effects on the heath. Imitation, deceit, and pain further demonstrate the power and necessity of atemporal religion.

The examples offered by nature in these four plays provide Shakespeare's audience members a means to consider incorporating into their lives the examples of the characters as well as of nature. They could, as Lake says, "try on" a play's picture of

following the life God created for them and of living that life through God's gifts of trust and faith along with Her words of life in the Bible. Luther's *Soli* continue to fill Shakespeare's plays, imbuing nature with the characteristics and examples people need to achieve those same characteristics. Entering the peace of the new Garden of Eden requires the work of atemporal religion and its power to create propinquity among humans, nature, and the Creator.

CHAPTER
FOUR
MIMICKING NATURE:
ENTERING THE NEW GARDEN OF EDEN

“What counts is a new creation”

Galatians 6.15b (NIV)

Living in tune with the Creator requires the holy gifts of faith and grace, religious wisdom, comfort and peace, and in Reformation England, especially, safety, secrecy, and the like-mindedness specified by shared opposition. English men and women had to decide not only their own religion and approach to spirituality but also whom they could trust. They carefully found others who spiritually agreed and could willingly and with trust work together to protect themselves. With religion as a fact of life, chiefly since for many centuries most of everyday life functioned based on it, people literally had to take responsibility when the Henrician Reformation removed that foundation. The Henrician Reformation could have offered a means to order external daily life along with the soul. It did not, however. As a result, people had to defend their way of life, and many also had to find a new, and safer, way to express the spiritual aspect of their lives. With Catholicism under attack and dangerous to practice openly and with Protestantism often politically motivated, both were, as a result, unpalatable to many English men and women. Whether Catholic or Protestant, religious expression gradually, and unavoidably, evoked atemporal religion—that deep expression of a soul who safely rests inside the new Garden of Eden in propinquity with nature and the Creator.

To act and to exist as the Creator expected in the Garden of Eden essentially demands Socrates' examined life. Humans, of course, cannot literally return to the Garden of Eden and live as first created. The Fall from Eden moved that pristine life to no more than useless speculation. More specifically, however, living as gifted within the propinquity of humans, nature, and the Creator promotes an atmosphere of faith and grace—the Creator's gifts to people as Luther's *Soli* explain—that offer atemporal religion as the entrance to the new Garden of Eden.

Martin Luther, as emphasized in Chapter One, offers his three *Soli* not only to reform the Catholic Church but also to free the uneducated and religiously oppressed people he saw all around him and all across Europe. Luther, in arguing that God provided as gifts the necessary state of soul to be close to Him, removed many of the Catholic Church's demands of its parishioners. For example, the Church demanded Mass attendance and buying indulgences for absolution but also for special prayers for family members thought to be in Purgatory. Luther's teachings, however, removed all financial power and most spiritual power from the Catholic Church and returned it to individual men and women. Now the uneducated and oppressed people—without the mediation of priests—could look to God for personal and individual comfort and peace.

In addition access to the Bible in vernacular languages could completely free everyone's soul. Initially, Henry VIII's English Reformation changed the English Catholic Church only enough to separate it from the Roman control that prevented his divorce from Catherine of Aragón. Part of that separation eventually directed people into the knowledge of their individual religious and spiritual responsibility—especially now in that they would no longer have access to the guidance of priests or their centuries-long way of life. One of

the means offered by the English Reformation to learn of one's religious responsibility came through Cramner's *Book of Common Prayer* of the Anglican Church. Timothy Rosendale explains that Thomas Cramner's "official overhaul of the liturgy of English Christianity," in general, created a connection between the Bible and the individual (82):

[R]eal, constructive access to the printed Word was of course limited to the literate—a distinct minority in mid-Tudor England. It was the Prayerbook, and the programmatic structures of worship it created, which made possible for everyone—uneducated 'hearers' as well as 'readers'—genuine access to the entire Bible via its systematic oral transmission in the vernacular. (85)

His description of a typical Anglican service reveals ten to fifteen scripture readings, including several Psalms, an *Old Testament* and a *New Testament* chapter, a chapter from one of the Epistles and from one of the books of the Gospel (84). Rosendale concludes stating,

All of this, of course, while it takes place in a communal setting, implies individual comprehension of the Word. And the vernacularizing rhetoric in the Prayerbook consistently stresses the edification, understanding, and illumination—categories only truly meaningful on the individual level—that only the vernacular communication with God can provide. (85)

People had access to God's word, both visually and aurally, in the form of the Bible and church services but also in the Prayerbook that directed the Anglican service itself—now no longer in the "mumbling" of Latin worship (82). Common people could know the Bible for themselves. They could hear it or often read it and individually experience God as the early apostolic church did. They could learn about God's love, plans, and direction for

them. In essence, an individually defined spirituality truly began for the English people, and with such unprecedented access to the Bible, their spiritual growth could truly transform them.

With such enormous changes and with such increased knowledge of religion and theology readily available, I assert, Shakespeare's plays depict a world of uncontaminated, natural process: that is, they almost completely remove the ravages of human decay and the historical accretions and cultural encrustations. In this pristine state, men and women can once again find renewal and reinvigoration in the intellectual, emotional, physical, and spiritual realms. The nature scenes in the next four plays, *As You Like It*, *Twelfth Night*, *Othello*, and *King Lear*, provide characteristics of forests, gardens, and heaths that metaphorically offer spiritual examples for the Christian neophytes now equipped with readable Bibles. For instance, spiritual characteristics, such as grace, obedience, and unity, figuratively exist in forests and clearly portray how to experience the balance between rationality and irrationality and to enter the new Garden of Eden. Lear's heath allows a view of not only that balance but also pictures of the relationship between nature and people. A close reading of these plays focuses on Shakespeare's nature as a means to illustrate harmony and balance within the Creator-created triad and even a means to prepare for and achieve that goal.

As You Like It

Even though besmirched by human decisions in the ancient Garden of Eden, Shakespeare's forest provides examples that parallel human spirituality and, thereby, a path for humans to follow. The glorious characteristic of grace in the Forest of Arden echoes God's gift. Milward states that the grace Orlando attributes to Rosalind

“[s]omehow [. . .] extends to the whole forest” and that not even Corin’s “churlish” master of Act II, scene 4, can destroy its “prevailing atmosphere of heavenly grace” (*Papist* 117 and 118). A second spiritual example of the Forest takes the form of unity that noticeably functions in the ecosystem itself. Unless terribly disturbed, a forest and its many non-human members work harmoniously together, in perfect rhythm, to survive and thrive. When an ecosystem becomes disturbed because overwhelmed by a single member, such as a plant or animal, the system alters in order to bring balance, the third spiritual example. For instance, if predators overwhelm the system, they will reduce their food source due to sheer numbers. As a result, their population decreases simply through starvation. The forest, therefore, provides for and protects every part of it. Each member of the forest acts in concert with other members to produce food, to reproduce, and to express a means to protect its ecosystem. Merchant, speaking from the viewpoint of loss, says of ecosystems that “if one part is removed the system is weakened and loses stability[. . .] Each part contributes equal value to the healthy functioning of the whole” (*Death* 293). Typically only humans can destroy a forest’s unity and balance.

The forest’s characteristics—symbolizing grace, unity, and balance—allow physical and even spiritual experiences for humans: the peace and rest in the dappled shade of the forest; joy and pleasure in the songs of birds and murmur of brooks; and grace and gentleness in breezes sighing among the tree tops (Galatians 5.22-23, NIV). All of which affect people’s balance between the rational and irrational, between the mind and the heart that increase spiritual health and, then, allow harmony among people, nature, and the Creator. All of these characteristics clearly intertwine among the forest members but also among the people in the Forest of Arden.

Each character enters the Forest of Arden in one state of being and exits in another. All of them enter single, and the main characters exit in marriage or with new purpose, a holy vocation, or as the true king. The grace of the Forest offers release from the penalty of treason for Rosalind, Celia, Orlando, and Duke Senior and his followers, which, then, allows each character to assume his or her true position. The unity of the forest, each member of it working in concert with every other member, brings several characters together around Rosalind. She unifies Oliver and Aliena, Touchstone and Audrey, Silvius and Phoebe, as well as herself and Orlando, arranging the symmetrical marriages at the end of the play. She works among them living her life with them, laughing and talking with them, teaching and even scolding them. The only main character with whom she has little contact, Jaques, actually works in concert with her, though out of her purview, to rescue the marriage of Touchstone and Audrey from unsanctioned to more respectable, as enacted at the end of the play.

The characters radiating from Rosalind become pairs so obviously that Jaques says, "There is, sure, another flood toward, and these / couples are coming to the ark" (5.4.35-36). Greenblatt reflects Jaques' opinion, seeing the play as a cynical presentation of love. He writes, "The end of *As You Like It* succeeds only because no one is forced to contemplate the future home life of Rosalind and Orlando or of any of the other marriages at the end of the play" (135). Gifford, however, provides a more positive spin, stating "Marriage is Shakespeare's dramatic motif for natural harmony, generosity, humility and justice [. . .]" ("Pastoral" 220). The marriages echoing the unity of the forest, then, transport the play from the cynical to the spiritual. When Orlando tells Duke Senior that Ganymede's uncle is "a great magician, / Obscurèd in the circle of this forest" (5.4.33-34),

a type of spirituality stands squarely on the stage. Since in a forest, though, the reflection of the propinquity among people, nature, and the Creator engulfs the idea of magic and transforms it to the spirituality of atemporal religion. Rosalind emulating the forest's unity draws the men to the appropriate women and demonstrates the power of spiritual unity.

The beginning of the play displays a world out of balance. Orlando's lack of education, Rosalind falsely accused of treason, and Duke Frederick entangling the lives around him with fear, deception, and even disobedience demonstrate the results of imbalance—the irrational overpowering the rational, and evil overpowering good. The turning point, when Orlando, Rosalind, and Celia enter the Forest of Arden, begins the return to the balance between irrational human emotion and rational human logic. Rosalind's "teaching" time with Orlando exhibits a gradual return to that balance. Even the conversations between Jaques and Touchstone and Jaques and Orlando corroborate the power of balance. Jaques and Touchstone discuss seven kinds of quarrels. The number of quarrels balances with a middle and three kinds of quarrels on each side. That balance, combined with the balance between lies and honesty as explained by Touchstone, echoes the Forest's balance.

The Forest of Arden's grace, unity, and balance demonstrate the power of that Forest and the effects of that power on the people in it. As stated above, each character enters in one state and leaves in another. For example, Rosalind and Celia enter the forest as an exiled and accused traitor and the latter as a disobedient daughter. Outside of their royal purview they must change their names and their mode of dress. Rosalind as Ganymede dresses as a man, and Celia as Aliena³⁹ dresses in "poor and mean attire / And

39. Bevington explains the name Aliena means "The estranged one" (299, note 126).

with a kind of umber smirch[es her] face” (1.3.109-10). Unlike aristocratic women, Rosalind as Ganymede tells men what to do, such as her commands to Corin and Silvius, and even teaches a man, Orlando, in the ways of love. Even more damning, she poses as a woman, herself even, in order to steal a relationship with Orlando apart from the social mores of the time and without the attending censure. Even so, she, like Deborah, a Judge of ancient Jewish history,⁴⁰ assumes the role of a man when no others have the capability. As examples, Duke Frederick wants her dead; her father abandons her; Orlando cannot speak to her after his wrestling match or express his manly respect for her. None of these men act as created, to provide and protect. Under the canopy of the forest, and despite her attire—ostensibly for protection—she acts as a wise woman should, in honesty and as partner to her Orlando. At the end of the play, she places herself, her true undisguised self, under the aegis of her father, Duke Senior, and in marriage under the aegis of Orlando. She obediently chooses to live as equal partner to her Orlando.

Two men, Orlando and Touchstone, also choose obedience. Orlando before entering the forest complains that Oliver, his older brother, treats him as if he were no more than a beast in his father’s house. In Act I, scene 1, the first speech of the play, Orlando claims that his situation mirrors an ox in line 10, horses in line 10-13, animals in line 14, and a hind (deer) in line 19. In the Forest of Arden, however, he learns to be a true man: first, by caring for an elder, his old servant Adam; second, by saving Oliver from a lion; and third, as partner to Rosalind. He obediently chooses to live in the balance of the Creator-created triad.

40. See Judges 4-5 of the Old Testament for Deborah’s similar story.

The second character, Touchstone, the court clown, enters the Forest and meets Audrey, his apparent true love. Unlike Orlando after the wrestling match, Touchstone honestly tells her what she lacks, beauty and a certain ability to feign. Despite his word play, which only confuses her, she expresses her lack of concern that she has neither beauty nor his desired poetic ability. He, then, of course, accepts her as he sees her, saying, perhaps in the tone that only a fool can successfully use, “Well, praised be the gods for thy foulness! / Sluttishness may come hereafter. But be it as it / may be, I will marry thee” (3.3.37-39a). Eventually, Touchstone chooses to follow Jaques’ advice and marry Audrey appropriately in a church: “Come sweet Audrey. / We must be married, or we must live in bawdry” (ll. 88-89). He knows the true way to treat a woman, with respect, despite his hormonal desires. He chooses to live as a true man allowing a situation in which he can provide and protect a woman, his Audrey.

Orlando and Touchstone leave the Forest of Arden, having received a corrected perspective of life, the peace to live that new life, and grace and faith not only to maintain but also to pursue the new life. They locate the new Garden of Eden deep inside themselves. They demonstrate that the Forest’s example of obedience guides them to their own obedience. Among the trees of the Forest of Arden, obedience reigns and atemporal religion guides.

Interestingly, four characters—Celia/Aliena, Oliver, Duke Frederick, and Jaques—choose to remain in the Forest of Arden, a place as close to the Garden of Eden as can be accomplished in a post-lapsarian world. Celia remains her new self, Aliena, a name chosen to escape from a murdering father, and stays in the Forest with Oliver as her partner. She chooses the grace of the Forest, the reflection of God’s gift. For his part,

Oliver before entering the forest ruled his brother, Orlando, as if he were an animal, no brother and no son of Sir Rowland, a respected man of the court. He soon owes his life to Orlando, however, and determines to give him the family estate. He says, “For my father’s house and all the / revenue that were old Sir Rowland’s will I estate upon / you, and here live and die a shepherd” (5.2.10-12). He forsakes his estate and stays in the forest with Aliena, the name he knows and uses for her,⁴¹ to live his days in the country purity and health. He, too, chooses the grace of the Forest of Arden. When Duke Frederick, the usurper, enters the forest, he converts after speaking to an “old religious man” (5.4.158-60). He abandons his hunt to kill his brother, Duke Senior, (line 161a), and returns the kingdom to him and to all his “banished brethren” (l. 163-64). He, then, obediently follows the old man into seclusion, “converted [. . .] from the world” (ll. 160 and 161b). He chooses the grace of the forest. Jaques, too, chooses to stay in the Forest. When the other characters marry at the end of the play, he “marries” a holy vocation, determining to join Duke Frederick and the holy man to become a hermit for spiritual purposes. He, too, chooses the grace of the Forest of Arden. These characters join the forest in two ways: as did Adam and Eve, accepting spiritual work in the forest that echoes Eden; and as men

41. Orlando says,

Is’t possible that on so little acquaintance
 you should like her? That but seeing, you should love
 her? And loving, woo? And, wooing, she should
 grant? And will you persevere to enjoy her?

Oliver replies to Orlando,

Neither call the giddiness of it in question, the
 poverty of her, the small acquaintance, my sudden
 wooing, nor her sudden consenting;
 but say with me,
 ‘I love Aliena.’ (5.2.1-8a).

retiring from the world, as represented by the city or court, seeking peace and rest also available in the forest garden.

Spiritual unity ties the characters together who remain in the forest, for they will no longer struggle for power but act purposefully in concert with nature. Aliena and Oliver will work as did Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden but will emulate Abel,⁴² the gentle shepherd of his flocks. Egan states that “No one appears to be growing crops in the world of *As You Like It*; the rustics are all descendants of murdered Abel rather than murderer Cain” (105). As such, Oliver and Aliena, Corin, and Silvius and Phoebe work in the profession necessary for the relationship with the Judeo-Christian God of the centuries before the Christ.⁴³ Shakespeare’s characters join a great and mighty tradition of the cleansing of blood, but only a weak echo, for the Christian view of Jesus changed shepherding animals for blood sacrifices to shepherding people, through His own bloodshed and death. People could now choose to live within God’s gift of grace through

42. Abel and Cain are Adam and Eve’s sons born outside of Eden. Able was a shepherd and Cain a “tiller of the ground” (Genesis 4.1-2 NKJV).

43. The ancient Hebraic God demanded blood sacrifices of certain specific unblemished animals and shepherds provided them. A forerunner of this demand began in the Garden of Eden. When Adam made his fateful decision to follow Eve, he changed the lives of all people. The sixth and seventh verses in Genesis 3 state:

⁶When the woman saw that the fruit of the tree was good for food and pleasing to the eye, and also desirable for gaining wisdom, she took some and ate it. She also gave some to her husband, who was with her, and he ate it.

⁷Then the eyes of both of them were opened [. . .] (NKJV).

Their eyes opened to the knowledge of obedience and disobedience—good and evil—only after Adam’s decision to eat the fruit. His following Eve set in motion the Fall of humans from the Creator’s intentions and their expulsion from the Garden of Eden before they could eat from the tree of eternal life. To solve the main and most devastating penalty of the Fall, that is the separation of humans from God, the Creator God, clothed both of them in animal skins, believed by many theologians today to be a precursor to the blood sacrifices of unblemished animals instituted by the Judeo-Christian God soon after the two humans left Eden. The covering of animal skins provided an unspoken forgiveness to Adam and Eve, the forerunner of the gift of grace, which is a commuting of the death sentence evoked by the first humans’ transgression: breaking the absolute only rule of the Garden, not to eat from the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil.

His gift of faith. As a result of that change, people have absolutely all necessary means to accept the opportunity offered by atemporal religion to open the door to enter the new Garden of Eden and the balance among people, nature, and the Creator.

Duke Frederick and Jaques, who will join the old religious man (5.4.159) and stay in the forest, choose to retire from the world—represented by the city or court—to seek peace and rest also available in the forest garden. These two men will live in an even closer relationship to the spiritual unity among humans, nature, and the Creator. As noted earlier, Shakespeare’s audience would understand such effects of forests and wildernesses. Harrison describes the main reason people stayed in the forest: “There, in the forests’ asylum, they lived in the intimate presence of their God” (page 62). Imitating the Forest of Arden’s grace, unity, and balance introduces the characters to living as originally created in obedience and collects Shakespeare’s audience into the world of the new Garden of Eden.

Twelfth Night

With the example of the forest clearly portrayed in the Forest of Arden of *As You Like It*, Shakespeare’s orchard returns as well as the garden motif in what Milward calls “the happiest of his happy comedies, *Twelfth Night*” (*Papist* 119). In *Twelfth Night* the tended garden includes deception and another cross-dressed woman, neither of which seems to relate, according to several critics, to the epiphanic wonder of the Christ child’s presentation to the Magi.⁴⁴ Both, the woman and the deception, however, recall the festive spirit of this feast of fools, “with the customary order of life turned topsy-turvy or upside-

44. Some theologians believe this visit to represent the new life the Christ offered as also available to the Gentiles.

down” (*Papist*, 119). The orchard, on the other hand, houses a near sword fight and the arrest of Antonio, good friend to Sebastian. This “topsy-turvy” situation nearly ends in death.

In Act III, scene 4, Shakespeare portrays an orchard. Similarly to the orchard in *Romeo and Juliet*, it harbors danger and violence. Juliet asks Romeo

How camest thou hither, tell me, and wherefore?

The orchard walls are high and hard to climb,

And the place death, considering who thou art,

If any of my kinsmen find thee here. (2.2.62-65)

Romeo takes a great chance with his and Juliet’s lives when he enters the Capulet garden. If he stays too long, he will likely die. In *Twelfth Night*, Sir Andrew, a suitor of Olivia, becomes angry when he sees Olivia paying more attention to Viola/Cesario than she ever had to him. He says to Sir Toby and Fabian, “Marry, I saw your niece do more favors to / the Count’s serving man than ever she bestowed upon/ me. I saw ‘t i’ the orchard” (3.2.4-6).

This orchard fills with jealousy, and Sir Andrew will have satisfaction. Juliet express a kind of jealousy for Romeo in that she cares more about his staying alive than he apparently does. Sir Andrew wants Viola/Cesario dead because his jealousy has taken over his rationality. In Act III, scene 4, in an extremely comical situation, Sir Toby and Fabian convey threatening messages between Sir Andrew and Viola/Cesario that neither of them said. The two perform a gulling on the two unwitting enemies. This orchard and the Capulet orchard (called a garden for this analysis) express uneasiness. Romeo dares

death in his irrational state of mind, and Sir Toby and Fabian invite death in the name of a good gulling.

Two biblical uses of the word have no relation to death, but they offer a means to understand the presence of death. In Song of Solomon 4.13 the Beloved describes the Shulamite woman:

Thou art a garden locked up,

My sister, my bride;

You are a spring enclosed, a

Sealed fountain.

Your plants are an orchard of

Pomegranates

With choice fruits,

With henna and nard

[. . .]

You are a garden fountain,

A well of flowing water

Streaming down from Lebanon. (4.12, 13, and 15)

Both of these images, the orchard and the garden—both opened and closed—present their relationship before marriage and after. The description progresses from the “Sealed fountain”—virginity—then through the orchard and to the garden fountain—consummation. This progression significantly portrays the orchard as time. Between virginity and the well, time has passed as the orchard fills with pomegranates and choice fruit.

The orchard in *Twelfth Night* portrays the possibility of death or terrible injury until Antonio shows up “in the nick of time.” The time in the *Twelfth Night*, orchard shows no patience and parallels Viola/Cesario’s plea for time to untie the knot her life has become with Olivia loving her on one side and she loving Orsino on the other. Time significantly affects the *Romeo and Juliet* orchard also. Because Juliet will marry the next day, the two must act quickly. In these orchard scenes, Shakespeare portrays the effect of time in relation to the balance between the rational and the irrational human mental states. In both scenes, the characters avert the danger, but the events leave a mark—Romeo and Juliet elope and eventually die; as for Antonio’s intervention, the officers arrest him. Nature demonstrates that the rise of irrationality takes time away from thoughtful behavior and decisions. In other words, irrationality wastes time.

At the beginning of the play, however, nature plays a different role. The comedy begins with a raging storm and a shipwreck—a foreshadowing, perhaps, of the tragedies *Othello* and *King Lear*. From such storms, Traub suggests that “we expect [. . .] re-birthing from Shakespearian shipwrecks” (716). Greenblatt presents the shipwreck in the play as “an unforeseen catastrophe [. . .] [that] suddenly turns what had seemed like happy progress, prosperity, smooth sailing into disaster, terror, and loss” (85). He explains that Viola “has suffered a steep loss in social status,” for Viola must find a job (82). To do so she must protect herself in male clothing to avoid being harmed or becoming a chambermaid—though she does become a servant—neither of which had been necessary before the shipwreck (Belsey 7). Due to this catastrophe, Greenblatt states that “the son [Sebastian] wanders through his life as if in a dream” (82). Lewalski argues, though, that Viola and Sebastian may “be seen to reflect the dual nature and role of the incarnate

Divine Love Christ” (134). In addition, the storm affects the twins in that it completely changes the area upon which they act. Viola completely changes her own life, Olivia’s attitude toward marriage, and Orsino’s attitude toward love; Sebastian completely changes Viola’s rather problematic situation near the end of the play—a woman in love with her and she, dressed as a man, in love with a man. Milward’s description of the feast of fools as “topsy-turvy or upside-down” also describes Viola’s life; in addition, it reveals the storm as having its own ability to turn life topsy-turvy (*Papist* 119).

The play’s title, *Twelfth Night*, ushers in the celebration of the Magi. The characters’ lives enact the effects of unknown situations, such as the presence of a woman, Viola/Cesario, who looks like a man. In her disguise, she falls in love with Orsino, and Olivia falls in love with her. These two very real problems for Viola/Cesario cause her to admit her inability to alleviate the confusion and to call on “time” for help. She says, “O Time, thou must untangle this, not I; / It is too hard a knot for me t’ untie” (2.2.40-41). Bloom, however, not viewing this particular situation as “topsy-turvy,” calls the play “cheerfully secular” and further states that “We are not at Christmas season in the very odd dukedom of Illyria” (229). Though Asquith discusses two events that would possibly create a topsy-turvy situation, neither event fits a celebration of fools. She explains that this day, Twelfth Night, “may have held poignant memories for the Queen, for [Don Virginio] Orsini’s [—an Italian nobleman—] visit had occurred only a month before Essex’s rebellion and was one of the last official occasions in which she was seen in public before she took to her room, fallen prey to depression and illness” (165).

This play with the Shakespearean twins so creates confusion for the other characters and even for themselves that it truly echoes the Twelfth Day celebrations.

Barbara Lewalski argues that the play reveals restorative forces “working from within to reorder and perfect Illyria” (132). One of these forces, “sheer wit,” she finds in Maria (131). The second force, now represented by Feste the clown, “incarnate[s] the spirit of feast Good Will [sic]” (132). Each of these forces works to change Malvolio’s force—“Bad Will (self-love)” (131). In the end, Malvolio leaves Illyria, promising revenge, but he makes the way clear for the role of Viola as “the embodiment of selfless love” and for Sebastian who “manifests [. . .] to resolve the difficult situations which she must endure (132 and 133). Leaving the resolution of confusion by confusion, that between the twins, pronounces a problem of imbalance in the human psyche that creates imbalance within the Creator-created triad. Calling on audience expectations, Lewalski states that

an audience would be prepared through the significances commonly associated with the epiphany message to find in a play entitled Twelfth Night and presenting twins who embody complementary aspects of the role and power of love, a reflection of the dual manifestation of Christ’s action in the world as Divine Love incarnate. (134)

Her reference to the “role and power of [. . .] Divine Love” subtly invokes Luther’s *Sola Fida*, that the Creator provides faith and trust for the presence of Divine Love. Lewalski clearly accentuates the spiritual aspect of the play; the stagescape of the garden, however, does not play a role in her analysis.

Antonio, though playing a fairly minor role in the play, has a significant role in the spiritual aspect of the play. During his attempt in the orchard to protect Viola/Cesario, whom he thinks is Sebastian, officers arrive and arrest him for his piracy of Orsino’s ships. When later rescued by Sebastian, Antonio becomes the catalyst for the “solution” to

the terrible confusion, according to René Fortin. She first explains that Viola and Sebastian have “essentially undergone [. . .] a ritual of initiation into a higher form of being; the pattern of death and rebirth symbolizes [. . .] a spiritual transformation, an initiation into the mystery of love” (139). She presents Viola’s death and rebirth as apparent in her “quest for a new identity” (137). For Antonio, however, Fortin saves her most dramatic argument, portraying him as an

initiate to a sacred mystery whose mission it is to lead others to a higher spiritual state. The mystery in this case [. . .] is the mystery of human love[. . .] On another and more familiar level Antonio [. . .] is a redeemer figure, ready to give his life that another might live[. . .] Through Antonio, then, the initiation ritual undergone by Viola-Sebastian is awesomely expanded in meaning: the psychological renewal of the lovers [joined at the end of the play] is consummated by a spiritual renewal, and the mystery of human love is shadowed forth in all its splendor. (140-41)

This analysis would parallel, then, the change that the Christ child’s birth brought to the world—spiritual renewal and the commands to love God and one’s neighbor as oneself. Arriving at that point, however, demands Antonio’s willing sacrifice—that is, a redeemer’s willing sacrifice. The fourth *Soli*, evoked by the Reformation, *Sola Christus*, states that only Christ’s sacrifice produces salvation from a horrible separation from the one who cares the most about the created, the Creator. A fifth *Soli* precisely follows, *Sola Deo Gloria*—for God’s glory—or the Christ’s selflessness only increases the Creator’s revealed goodness and love, or glorification.

These spiritual interpretations of the play reach their fruition when critics address the culture of the feast of fools associated with the Twelfth Night celebration. Whether symbolic or a close facsimile to the Catholic celebration, the play would evoke strong memories in most of his audience members. Fortin states that Shakespeare drew “upon the symbolic imagination that he inherited from medieval culture” (137). Greenblatt supports her argument: “traditional festivities, though constantly under attack, endured throughout the late sixteenth century and beyond” (39), most of which would have been strengthened by the medieval plays.

Shakespeare probably could not have easily avoided the influence of his childhood. His home, his village, the farm work, the people spoke to his creativity. Greenblatt explains that Shakespeare’s relatives and the culture of the village and hamlets in England would strongly influence his life in the theater:

He [Shakespeare] had deep roots in the country. Virtually all of his close relatives were farmers, and in his childhood he clearly spent a great deal of time in their orchards and market gardens, in the surrounding fields and woods, and in tiny rural hamlets with their traditional seasonal festivals and folk customs[. . .] These folk customs, all firmly rooted in the midlands, had a significant impact upon Shakespeare’s imagination, fashioning his sense of theater even more than the morality plays that the touring companies brought to the provinces. Folk culture is everywhere in his work, in the web of allusions and in the underlying structures. (40 and 41)

His early life connected to his father as a supposed recusant and the virtually nonexistent information about his life in London reveal the emergence of a man truly, and secretly,

prepared to address spiritual issues among the high and low people of his audiences. So prepared, he reveals a means to enter the new Garden of Eden—atemporal religion.

The four garden scenes in *Twelfth Night* (2.5, 3.1, 3.4, and 4.3) demonstrate that nature working as expected, even under human affectation, offers further examples of grace, accord, and balance but also offers a clear and precise view of the human self, a new view of privacy and secrecy, and a vision of perfection. Like the Forest of Arden, the garden in this play validates the concept of balance in nature. None of the garden scenes, in particular, clearly portray the garden itself since no one refers to any of the garden entities, other than the “garden door,” or comments on any beauty demonstrated by the garden’s ecosystem (3.1.92). This garden transparently maintains its balance. The audience understands that someone works in the garden and maintains his or her vision for the garden, but it does not see the activity—at least not as the play’s staging implies. The garden acting as created but not seen in the act exemplifies human spiritual growth—the maturation of the soul—that occurs often unseen but purposed-filled. Even further this garden epitomizes the uselessness of unnecessary religious activity often expected by and from people. In that way, it offers a clearer self-image to people: they understand that atemporal religion requires no external demonstration from the people who follow it to their own new state of being as inhabitants of the new Garden of Eden. Luther’s understanding of faith and grace as God’s gifts removes any necessity for any outward show of religiosity and reinforces the privacy of the act of atemporal religion.

The first garden scene, Act II, scene 5, portrays a “gulling,” a tricking, even a humiliating of Olivia’s steward, Malvolio. The trickster in the garden, Maria, plants a letter she has forged in Olivia’s handwriting to make a “sport royal” of him (2.3.171). As

she prepares to fool him, she calls him “a kind of puritan,” which Bevington explains applies “insofar as he [Malvolio] is precise about moral conduct and censorious of others for immoral conduct, but that he is nothing consistently except a [. . .] sycophant[. . .] He is not, then, simply a satirical type of the Puritan sect” (*Complete* 340, notes 139 and 147). Milward, however, disagrees and sees the other characters’ attitudes toward Malvolio as an expression of anti-Puritanism in the play (*Papist* 123). Asquith, to offer further support, specifically capitalizes the word, calling him “Puritan Malvolio” (169). Whether a *Puritan* or a *puritan* or just Olivia’s mean steward, in this garden Maria gulls Malvolio with Sir Toby Belch, Sir Andrew Aguecheek, and Fabian hiding in a nearby boxtree to watch.

In this moment, the boxtree—an evergreen shrub, according to Bevington (*Complete* 342, n. 15)—as the significant nature character offers secrecy to three men, much like the Capulet garden—the *hortus conclusus*—did for Romeo and Juliet. The boxtree, however, protects tricksters, whereas the Capulet garden protects lovers. Both the nature entities act as created, providing protection; however, the three tricksters take advantage of the boxtree’s Godly design to gull Malvolio. Simultaneously the boxtree prevents Malvolio from realizing he is not alone so that his true self appears.

As the three men listen to Malvolio’s reaction to the forged letter, they refer to him as several non-human entities—sheep-biter, bear, turkey-cock, woodcock, brock, staniel, sowter, and cur. Through these names Malvolio’s diminished stature further strengthens as the other characters assign him characteristics of each of these animals and birds. For example, when Sir Toby calls Malvolio a sheep-biter in line 5,⁴⁵ audience members view

45. Literally, a dog that bites sheep (*Complete* 342, note 5).

him as a “sneak and censorious fellow” (342, n. 5). Farmer and Henley add the meaning “a slinking thief” (403). The effect not only deprecates but also imprecates Malvolio.

Maria’s earlier reference to him as a “kind of puritan” emphasizes both her view of Malvolio’s inflated sense of self and the unkind, even insulting, critical words for Sir Toby, Sir Andrew, Feste, and Maria in Act II, scene 3. Here Malvolio reprimands the four for making too much noise late at night and promptly breaks up their feast of fools. In the process, he calls them “mad [. . .] [having no] wit, manners, nor honesty,” even describing their party noise as “grabbl[ing] like tinkers,” and even further he accuses them of “making an alehouse of [his] lady’s house” (lines 86-89). He also rebukes their disrespect, saying they have no “remorse of voice[. . .] No respect of place, persons, nor time” (ll. 90-92). Malvolio as a “sheep-biter” reveals a problem that disrespectful criticism causes—not only the backlash in Act II, scene 5 and Act III, scene 4, but also a severe lack of respect for and awareness of others. That state of mind reveals an internal problem for Malvolio, and potentially demonstrating the difficulty of entering the new Garden of Eden without the spiritual gifts of grace and faith.

Three other characters in the play use nonhuman entities to further insult Malvolio and attack his self-respect. Maria calls him a trout; Sir Toby calls him a brock and a staniel; Fabian calls him a turkey-cock, woodcock, a sowter, and a cur. To justify their behavior, they slur Malvolio through association with nonhuman entities that Shakespeare’s audiences describe as mean, useless, stupid, or untrainable. In doing so, these characters, however, also reveal their own inner beings. Interestingly, their name-calling from the proverbial “behind the back” position reveals their inner states whereas a reprimand spoken directly to the late night revelers reveals Malvolio’s.

Sir Toby and Fabian do a majority of the name-calling, using birds and dogs, except for one notable difference—brock. Sir Toby's "brock" in line 102, according to Bevington, means to badger or worry or bother incessantly (343, n. 102), which summons up the cruel sport of badger-baiting;⁴⁶ however, Farmer and Henley's *Dictionary of Slang and Colloquial English* offers other meanings for brock. Their first definition describes a person or people who buy all of a product, especially corn, in order to increase the price—in other words, to corner the market. Their second definition is "river desperado,"⁴⁷ the third is "panel thief,"⁴⁸ and the fourth is "common prostitute" (22). Sir Toby's word choice, "brock," referring to badger-baiting, unfair business practices, thievery, and even prostitution, portrays him as less than a gentleman. He seems to know more wrong behavior than his niece, a rich countess, may want to have in her household, with which, of course, Malvolio threatens him when breaking up the late night and private feast of fools. In addition, calling a man a brock who may be a Puritan, or at the very least a man of extreme morals with high expectations of others, implies great hate on the part of the name-caller. Only a man like Sir Toby would know such words. The other insult, "staniel," refers to a windhover or kestrel, a sparrow hawk useless for falconry, according

46. "[I]n Elizabethan London the baiting of animals and the performing of plays were curiously intertwined. They both aroused the ire of the city authorities[. . .] They were attacked in similar terms by moralists and preachers, threatening divine vengeance upon all who took pleasure in filthy, godless shows. They attracted crowds of common people and at the same time were patronized and protected by aristocrats. They even took place in strikingly similar buildings" (Greenblatt 181-82).

47. River desperados are "Villains who rob near rivers, into which they throw the bodies of those they murder."

48. A common thief or a brothel run by a panel-thief.

to Bevington (343, n. 112).⁴⁹ Sir Toby refers to Malvolio's inability to determine the meaning of the four initials, M. O. A. I.,⁵⁰ in the forged letter, to imply that he is useless as the sparrow hawk for sport. Again, Sir Toby demonstrates his knowledge of sporting that probably involves betting. He uses words that imply he visits prostitutes and perhaps cheats and steals, if not property, then the good name of others, such as Malvolio's. Naming Malvolio an animal and a bird that earn little respect from people turns back on Sir Toby to reveal the depth of his hate for Malvolio. Such attitudes distance Sir Toby from the new Garden of Eden.

Fabian, the second character in the boxtree who insults Malvolio, calls him a "rare turkey-cock" in lines 30-31; a "wood-cock" in line 82; and a "sowter" in line 121, which he echoes as a "cur" in line 125. Portraying Malvolio as a fully plumed male turkey first literally implies that he eats greedily, according to Farmer and Henley (194). Another word, "bubbly jock," one of the words referenced in "turkey-cock," implies that Malvolio stupidly boasts as a turkey would that confronts no competing male turkey and, thus, no reason or real need to boast as fully plumed would imply (72). Fabian's use of the word reveals him as the same bird since he subtly, and unnecessarily, boasts his knowledge of

49. In the line, "And with what wing the staniel checks at it," the phrase "checks at it," according to Alexander Dyce means "a term in falconry, applied to a hawk when she forsakes her game, and follows some other inferior kind that crosses her in her flight" (86). Sir Toby's comment, again, makes Malvolio less than worthy of respect.

50. A literary conversation about the letters M.O.A.I. ends with a possible interpretation by Matthias Bauer:

Maria's "fustian riddle" works so well because it really allows Malvolio to try and discover his name in it, at the same time revealing the absurdity of his self-love. Malvolio's own words, however, tell us what makes it so difficult to read "M.O.A.I." as an anagram of his name: "M"—But then there is no consonancy in the sequel; that suffers under probation" (130-31). He realizes that "every one of these letters are in my name" (141)—but not all the letters of Malvolio's name are in the riddle. Two consonants are missing, L and V, indicating what is really lacking in him who is neither lover nor beloved. (273)

the turkey, which entered England in the early sixteenth century (“Turkey”). In short, Fabian also boasts like a turkey-cock because he feels pride in his own knowledge, perhaps thinking he knows more than most people. Next he calls Malvolio a “woodcock” in line 82. The bird, “proverbial for its stupidity” according to Bevington, implies that Malvolio has the same characteristic as the bird—as stupid as a woodcock (343, n. 82). To use such an insult places Fabian in the same mental state as the bird, which also emphasizes his ungentlemanly behavior. Whether his behavior occurs as a result of outrage or to return an insult, his disrespect only shows his stupidity, for in the last act he must explain the trickery.

The next insults, “sowter” and “cur” in lines 121 and 125, refer to dogs, the former trained and the latter a mongrel. People call a hound a sowter, according to Bevington, when it loses the scent of the hunted hare and chases after the scent of a fox instead, creating a rather frustrating hunt (343, n. 121-122). Presenting Malvolio as “off the scent,” as the word “sowter” implies, references, again, to his literal difficulty in deciphering the letters in the forged letter—M.O.A.I. The letters here must be understood by Sir Toby, Maria, and Fabian as nothing or as a common place reference, which allows them to laugh at Malvolio as off scent as a sowter because he must not understand such a well-known abbreviation. Add that insult to calling him a “cur,” in line 125, and Malvolio has lost most of his humanity. Malvolio lives in the world as a puritan, who sees every situation as black and white, right and wrong. As a result he has similar character traits as animals and birds that boast, express stupidity, ignore training, and act cruelly. Each of these characteristics, however, also describes the people in the boxtree.

This garden scene exposes the true character of Sir Toby and Fabian in particular, but their cruel ability to turn Malvolio's personality against him dives deeper into their souls. They lay bare the true evil in the human soul—that desire to be better than others and the urge to destroy anyone who prevents that desire. Bloom says of Malvolio's gulling that

[. . .] he social crucifixion of the virtuous steward passes the possible bounds of playful literary rancor [between Shakespeare and Jonson][. . . .] [I]t seems clear that Malvolio [. . .] wonderfully got away from Shakespeare[. . . .] [T]o see, [however,] the self-destruction of a personage who cannot laugh, and who hates laughter in others, becomes an experience of joyous exuberance for an audience that is scarcely allowed time to reflect upon its own aroused sadism. (239-40)

Such audience reaction, behavior on the Shakespearean stage, and Malvolio's gulling in Olivia's garden faintly echo the serpent's trickery in ancient Eden. The result for Malvolio mirrors Adam and Eve's in that he leaves his life of comfort in Olivia's household, all but thrown out by the feast of fools—although, unlike Adam and Eve, he vows revenge.

The next three garden scenes offer the completion of Malvolio's gulling, as well as conversations between Viola and Feste, Viola and Olivia, and Sebastian and Olivia.⁵¹ The most significant of these three, Act III, scene 1, portrays Viola as Cesario in conversation with two different characters, Feste and Olivia. The conversation between Viola and Feste offers simple word play in contrast to the previous scene with Malvolio's gulling and,

51. One of the next three garden scenes, Act III, scene 4, completes the gulling of Malvolio, ending with him shut in a dark place by Sir Toby, Fabian, and Maria (3.4.137). One of the other two garden scenes focuses on Viola and Feste, the court clown, and Viola and Olivia in Act III, scene 1. The last, Act IV, scene 3, presents Sebastian and Olivia when the two decide to marry and then do so off stage.

thereby, the portrayal of the tricksters' souls. It also prepares for the next part of the scene between Olivia and Viola. The conversation leads to the idea that words may cause trouble for those who "dally nicely with words," a nicely said description of the boxtree scene (3.1.14-15). Then Feste uses a fish for an explanation, saying "fools are as like husbands as pilchers are to herrings" (lines 33-34). This comparison calls attention to the ease with which a pilcher (pilchard) can be mistaken for a herring; in other words, Feste can only seem to be a husband just as the pilcher only seems to be a herring. That idea of seeming and being leads to the next part of this garden scene between Viola and Olivia.

This second part of the garden scene begins with the only reference in *Twelfth Night* to the word "garden." Olivia wishes to speak to Viola alone with no distractions and says, "Let the garden door be shut, and leave me to my hearing" (3.1.92-93). With the gate closed, Shakespeare's audience watches the extent to which people's desire rises to find the balance that only atemporal religion promotes among the Creator-created triad. Olivia expresses two negative relationships with nature, bear-baiting and the predator-prey paradox. The first refers to the cruelty humans often mount against nature for the pleasure of entertainment. Such treatment of nature, or attack on it, forces humans further away from the harmony of spiritual balance of the relationship between the Holy and the brokenness of humanity and nature. Indeed, attacking a member of that balance practically destroys any possible balance. Such an attack also can imply that a problem exists between the rational and emotional sides of people. Bear-baiting, badger-baiting, cock fights, dog fights, and so on, appeal to emotions by arousing the competitive state-of-being, such as the emotional expressions of support for the animals on whom one bets. The pleasure and extreme arousal of winning or the often dangerous reaction to losing

surely do not involve logic. For example, firing a gun to celebrate a win seems more dangerous than celebratory and defies thoughtful decision-making. A disrespectful, even cruel, relationship with nature prevents a balanced triune existence.

When Olivia states, “Have you not set mine honour at the stake / And baited it with all the unmuzzled thoughts / That tyrannous heart can think?” she evokes audience members’—or even readers’—memories of these kinds of violent acts against nature (3.1.118-20). This practically universal experience expresses Olivia’s perception of Viola’s attitude toward her. Olivia becomes an animal and presents Viola as cruel to her in the same way people treat animals cruel. Olivia becomes disempowered nature, a bear, and Viola becomes the cruel human attacker of a member of nature. This classic cross-dressed scene demonstrates the power that lack of balance can exert over human perception. It, furthermore, shows the spiritual distance to which humans can hurl themselves from the spiritual balance of the new Garden of Eden.

The predator-prey paradox refers to the nobility and strength of the hunter as well as the shame and weakness of the hunted; in other words, one must eat but one must not be eaten. An ecosystem will maintain its balance, but the balance between life and death is paradoxical—who eats and who dies? Olivia refers to this paradox in that the prey cannot choose its predator and proudly give itself to the nobler hunter. She says, “If one should be a prey, how much the better / To fall before the lion than the wolf” (3.1.128-29). Olivia believes she has no real choice as prey because she cannot choose her predator; in fact, she cannot attract the predator she prefers, Viola. In addition, she cannot be weak prey because her status as a rich countess prevents it, but she sets aside her strength to protect her lack of choice. The word “if” begins her statement in the subjunctive mood, a wish for

the impossible, in this case to be prey, an animal ignobly hunted by another. Using nature to make a wish for the impossible portrays a severe lack of balance with nature. Nature always acts as created; people participate with it appropriately or inappropriately, but nature still acts as expected, whether it helps or harms the human participant. Olivia attempts to be a member of nature but cannot through her freewill take the position of a hunted animal. Her metaphor describes a situation as impossible as is her relationship with Viola. In this part of the garden scene nature shows its truth—it is what it is, and no one need question its presence or existence. To be in a relationship with nature is to be in harmony with it but also with one's self. Neither can happen without the Creator completing the relationship. Olivia will not be part of Viola's life because she literally cannot be prey as defined in nature, and she cannot convert an uninterested, cross-dressed Viola into a predator.

Olivia's two kinds of predator, lion and wolf, moves Viola from a position of cruelty to animals, with Olivia as a bear, to a physically strong lion and the honor Olivia believes such resemblance entails. In this picture, Viola will be strong enough to repel Olivia but not strong enough to prevent prejudicing her against Orsino—Viola's master but also her desired predator. Earlier in Act II, scene 2, she appeals to the infinite: "O Time, thou must untangle this, not I; / It is too hard a knot for me t' untie" (lines 40-41). By addressing "Time" and, therefore, the Infinite Creator, Viola's appeal brings her closer to the balance among nature, herself, and the Creator.

The *Twelfth Night* garden scenes reveal the presence of trickery, name-calling, destruction of a man's self-respect, women's rejections, revelations of inner beings, and the tangled effects of time. Sir Toby, Fabien, and Maria bully, condemn, and insult

Malvolio, thereby, destroying his self-respect. In the process, however, the three tricksters reveal their inner corruption. Olivia as a bear and prey before a predator she cannot choose should learn to accept rejection—as Viola expresses—but instead finds her married life with Sebastian—Viola’s identical twin. Even Viola, whom Olivia renders as a predatory lion, with its strength and power, soon becomes the “lamb” and accepts death—as does Desdemona in the next play—imposed by Olivia’s longest suitor, Orsino. Only Sebastian’s arrival in Act V rescues Viola from the death that Orsino plans for his “lamb that [he does] love, / to spite a raven’s heart within a dove” (5.1.128-29).

One last time Viola and Olivia have animal characteristics, the first as a lamb and the second as a dove with a raven’s heart, but this time through Orsino. After all the previous animal comparisons, this last closely recalls the Christian perspective of the effect of the Christ. The dove echoes His death without fault to rescue humans in their intellectual unawareness of their damaged spiritual state—a state so damaged that they can naively declare themselves innocent of their spiritual crimes but still house hearts black as ravens. Though the play ends with everyone satisfied, except Malvolio, it also reveals how humans launch themselves out of and far from spiritual propinquity. Atemporal religion, however, always provides the path to the new Garden of Eden. Just as Sebastian appears and “time [. . .] untangle[s]” the problems built before his arrival, so does atemporal religion untangle the off-kilter relationship between the rational and the irrational and the imbalance among humans, nature, and the Creator (2.2.40).

The last two plays examine two road blocks to the new Garden of Eden: deception and madness. The significant scene in *Othello*, Act III, scene 3, takes place in the Citadel garden. Here Iago, in the guise of a trick—the handkerchief—convinces Othello that his

wife, Desdemona, cuckolds him with Cassio, his second in command. This Citadel garden filled with the beauty of nature and the innocence of Cassio and Desdemona and the love between her and Othello also harbors Iago, a strong reverberation of the snake in that perfect primeval Garden of Eden. This association through location demonstrates the power of beauty to evoke deadly pride. In the next play, *King Lear*, Act III portrays Lear in an “open place,” a heath, in the throes of the worst storm Kent can remember (3.2.445-48). That location reveals the power of nature to cleanse and then teach survival skills for the fury of a storm, whether natural or psychological. The nature settings in *As You Like It*, through *Twelfth Night*, *Othello*, and *Lear*, portray the power of nature and its necessary effect on humans. Without nature, humans cannot contribute to their bond with nature and the Creator; they cannot experience the purpose of atemporal religion.

Othello

The third play in this Chapter, portrays a much harsher story than *Twelfth Night*. The trickster in *Othello*, Iago, creates not a humorous unpacking of a “puritan’s” inner person but a horrible masking of true and faithful love by its opposite, a cuckolding. The results reveal a man’s potential for deception, creating a dead friend, two dead wives, and a dead husband. The Citadel garden—beauty surrounded by the machines and men of war—provides a location for the unpacking of human pride and the destruction of innocence; however, it stands silent.

References to the setting for Act III, scene 3, as the Citadel garden, usually appear in setting notes or even in theater tradition.⁵² Study guides for the scene also set it in the Citadel garden.⁵³ Styan places more emphasis on theatrical tradition stating, “today we study performance history. We can no longer talk about a Shakespeare character with any confidence, without reference to the spectrum of proven possibilities which the recent spate [. . .] of performance studies has revealed” (32). He gives examples of actors who offer interpretations of Lady Macbeth that he believes contribute to a modern critic’s analysis of the play (32). More interesting, however, women in other Shakespeare plays meet in gardens and talk. For example, Olivia and Viola meet and talk in Olivia’s garden. Queen Isabella in *Richard II* seeks respite in the Duke of York’s garden but does not go alone. Two Ladies, her female attendants, enter with her. The Queen says to them, “What sport shall we devise here in this garden, / to drive away the heavy thought of care?” (3.4.1-2). In *Winter’s Tale*, two gentlemen summarize the events at court with the return of Perdita. One of the references the statue of Hermione that Paulina had sculpted and placed in her garden. The “second gentleman” says of Paulina, “she hath privately twice or thrice a day, ever since the death of Hermione, visited that removed house” (5.2.6-8). One could imagine that “removed house” and the daily conversations between Paulina and Hermione surrounded by nature’s beauty. Perhaps gardens best house Shakespeare’s female friendships, and the relationship between Emilia and Desdemona would not be

52. On the *Theater Dance* website the synopsis of this scene begins “scene iii: The famous ‘corruption’ scene of the play takes place in the citadel’s garden and pivots upon the skillful manner in which Iago insinuates that Cassio and Desdemona are having an affair” (Holmes). “Act III, Scene III: The scene shifts to the garden of the castle. Cassio asks Desdemona to speak to Othello and convince him that he is still a trustworthy soldier and friend. Desdemona does not hesitate to help because she knows how deeply Cassio and Othello feel for one another” (Mabillard).

53. See for example “studyworld.com” or “endnotes.com.”

much different. For Act III, scene 3, beginning with a conversation involving Cassio, Desdemona, and Emilia, audience members most likely understood the location as a garden, specifically the Citadel garden.

Most of the scholarly work on *Othello* focuses on the main characters without much attention to the Citadel garden of Act III, scene 3. Scholars, as well as audience members, typically see Iago as “all-embracingly evil” (Bevington, *Seven*, 49). His means of evoking Othello’s jealousy and of reducing the man’s self-confidence to the point of a willingness to commit murder and suicide place Iago among Shakespeare’s most villainous characters. In fact, such character recalls the simple characters in the medieval morality plays. Greenblatt relates Iago to several characters in these early plays, including Envy, Riot, and Vice:

At times he [Shakespeare] greatly intensified the fear: Iago is immeasurably more disturbing—and more effective—than Envy or Riot [. . .] The word ‘vice,’ [. . .] [a reference to] the great subversive figure of the moralities [. . .] does not have to be directly invoked for the influence to be apparent. It is no accident that his diabolical plot against Othello and Desdemona takes the form of a practical joke [—the handkerchief—] an unbearably cruel version of the tricks played by the Vice. (33-34)

The trickster from *Twelfth Night* reappears in *Othello* but in its diabolical form. Desdemona’s handkerchief, picked up by Emilia and given to Iago, must be dubbed more than a practical joke. With it Iago causes Cassio’s bloody wound and the deaths of Roderigo, Emilia, Desdemona, and Othello. Even further, he literally tricks, gulls, and

fools Othello to commit murder and suicide, neither of which his honor as a warrior would have normally condoned.

The Citadel garden stands silent as Othello demands to see the evidence of Desdemona's cuckolding, silent as Desdemona obeys Othello's order that she go to bed, and silent as beyond its purview murder and suicide occur. Milward argues that the play "seems to be a morality play of damnation, while leaving hope for the salvation of Othello by reason of his continued love for Desdemona to the very end" (*Apocalypse* 63). Othello repents in the end, expressing his guilt and his love for his now dead wife. He dies as near her as he could. Asquith follows Greenblatt, placing *Othello* in the medieval dramatic tradition but describes the play's form as a psychomachia. She explains that in this form Iago as the bad spirit and Cassio as the good spirit literally fight to gain Othello's soul in the guise of respect and trust from their commander. Asquith explains:

A format for what looks like a distinctly modern type of drama in fact derives from the medieval tradition of morality plays such as *Everyman* and *Mankind*, in which a good and an evil spirit compete for the possession of a man's soul—a format known as a psychomachia[. . .] Cassio and Iago have the attributes of good and evil spirits engaged in a struggle over Othello's soul[. . .] In the style of morality plays, Othello's fall begins when his evil spirit deposes his good angel. (198)

Iago receives little scholarly admiration, but in light of the play's medieval influences Shakespeare's audiences would easily understand the message behind Iago: deception and trickery infect a human's soul, creating a beast with no rational command of his or her intellect. As a contrast, nature reveals in this garden that balance infused with atemporal

religion provides confidence and clarity of thought, prevents the results of pride and deception, and demonstrates the power of irrationality.

I begin my analysis when Iago responds to Roderigo's suicide threat while outside the Citadel garden. Roderigo does not want to live if his love for Desdemona remains unrequited. Roderigo says, "It is silliness to live when to live is torment; and / then have we a prescription to die when death is our physician" (1.3.311-13). Iago replies first by calling Desdemona a guinea-hen and, then, himself a baboon: "Ere I would say, I / would drown myself for the love of a guinea-hen, I / would change my humanity with a baboon" (1.3.317-19). Bevington explains that "guinea-hen" is slang for "prostitute" (1130, n. 318); however, it is literally a bird, interestingly, indigenous to Africa. Iago, then, would not kill himself for an African bird—in this case Desdemona—but would become a baboon—a 90-pound fear-evoking omnivore also indigenous to Africa. As a plant-eating animal, the baboon would most likely kill and eat the guinea-hen, a definite foreshadowing of Desdemona's violent end. Evil Iago, choosing two animals indigenous to Africa, insults Othello's skin color by bestializing him but also insults his valiant heroism and his love for his "fair warrior," Desdemona (2.1.181). Outside the Citadel garden, then, Iago already hints—in word play that rebukes Roderigo—about the effects

of his garden activities. Just as in Milton's *Paradise Lost*,⁵⁴ the possibility of the hero's future downfall arrives before the loss in the garden.

After embuing himself and Desdemona with nonhuman characteristics, insulting both her and Othello in the process, Iago further rebukes Roderigo. Through garden images, he reminds Roderigo that he always has a choice about his feelings and easily refutes Roderigo's belief that his virtue will not allow him to live and forget his feelings for Desdemona. Iago replies:

Virtue! A fig! 'Tis in ourselves that we are thus or
thus. Our bodies are our gardens, to the which our
wills are gardeners; so that if we will plant nettles, or
sow lettuce, set hyssop and weed up thyme, supply it
with one gender of herbs, or district it with many,
either to have it sterile with idleness, or manured with
industry, why, the power and corrigible authority of
this lies in our wills. (1.3.320-27a)

This introduction to the garden scene of Act III, scene 3 (the longest scene in *Othello*), reveals the spiritual state of free choice.

54. Published in 1667, Book II, line 1024-33, states heaven's, i.e. God's, permission for Satan to test the new human's freedom of choice:

Sin and Death amain /
Following his [Satan's] track, such was the will of Heav'n,
pay'd after him a broad and beat'n way
Over the dark Abyss, whose boiling Gulf
Tamely endur'd a Bridge of wondrous length
From Hell continu'd reaching th' utmost Orb
Of this frail World; by which the spirits perverse
With easy intercourse pass to and fro
To tempt or punish mortals, except whom
God and Good Angels guard by special grace.

(See also Job 1.11-12 and 2.4-6)

Iago knows that humans have the ability to make decisions that help or harm them. Close friends, society mores, or even personal beliefs need not limit people's behavior, for with each decision they exercise freedom of choice. Through this God-given characteristic, men and women decide how to behave, whether to follow their internal spiritual compass or to behave as they carnally choose. Every decision affects the balance between the rational and irrational parts of men and women. This balance leads to the appropriate location for people—within the Creator-created triad. Iago in the same speech also addresses the human problem with balance:

[. . .] If the beam⁵⁵ of our lives had not
one scale of reason to poise another of sensuality, the
blood and baseness of our natures would conduct us
to most preposterous conclusions: but we have reason
to cool our raging motions, our carnal stings, our
unbitted⁵⁶ lusts[. . . .] (1.3.329b-334)

With this statement, he adds his belief that the logical human can control the emotional.

Iago's explanation that reason prevents "preposterous conclusions" moves from his garden image of self-respect and self-control to the means to tend that internal garden, rationality. The word "reason" in line 333, "We have reason," projects at least two meanings: one refers to sagacity as in "we have our rationality to cool our raging," and the other refers to purpose as in "we have a goal to achieve by cooling our rage." The dual meaning fills his proposed garden of the human body with an air of wisdom, briefly

55. "Balance" (*Complete*, 1130, n. 329).

56. According to Bevington, "unbitten" means "unbridled, uncontrolled" (*Complete*, 1130, n. 334).

recalling the knowledge that the Garden of Eden provided to Adam and Eve; however, Iago's meaning turns to trickery, even mockery, as he moves Roderigo's emotional whining to a concern for his manhood. He taunts Roderigo: "Come be a man. Drown thyself? Drown / cats and blind puppies" (1.3.338-339). Commanding a man to "be a man" implies a negative opinion about his manliness or even his virility. The effect of such an opinion evokes anger, even violence, from most men.

Without that expected reaction, however, Iago increases the impact by suggesting that Roderigo's threat to drown himself makes him no better than a cat or blind puppy. In other words, drowning is not for men but for animals, especially those animals that serve little purpose. Though this line invokes nature, it expresses sarcastic cruelty. The line implies that destroying members of nature does no harm. Humans, however, can harm the Creator-created triad as they attempt to find solutions to all kinds of pain, especially emotional or psychological, even employing inherently deplorable acts, such as killing nonhuman creatures for no purpose other than self-aggrandizement.

Through harmful uses of human free will such as these, the bond that atemporal religion engenders among and within the triad stretches until so thin that it appears nonexistent. When people accept living harmoniously with the Creator and nature, however, atemporal religion strengthens the triad bond. Iago's freedom of choice, then, stretches his bond until so thin that he is willing to suggest killing animals for no purpose. His successful destruction of human life and of any sense of self-respect soon follows. He takes a position through which he can disrupt others' balance and bonds to the Creator-created triad and invites them onto the wide road created by Milton's Satan when he

escaped hell and entered the Garden of Eden. Othello, and even Roderigo, turn onto that road.

Iago accepts no failure and will successfully enact his revenge against Othello. Behaving as the baboon, he stalks Othello. He knows Othello's weakness and will use it to his ends. Iago targets that weakness in his first soliloquy:

The moor is of a free and open nature,
That thinks men honest that but seem to be so,
And will as tenderly be led by the nose
As asses are. (1.3.400-03)

Othello as an "ass" demonstrates his weakness of "a free and open nature" in two ways: first, as an animal similar to a horse but absolutely not a horse, implying perhaps fooling by fakery; and second, as a fool or stupid person. Interestingly, the wild ass is also indigenous to Africa (*Equus africanus*) and provides Iago another means to demean Othello. Iago undeniably knows Othello's weakness and how to pervert it to his own ends. Dehumanizing Othello rather than seeing him as an honorable man taints Iago's own soul. Viewing humans as animals perverts the Creator-created triad because each member exists as distinct and separate from the others, but each also bonds to the originally created state through atemporal religion. It bonds the three as a balanced triad not as some grotesque god-man-animal. Fortified with hate and hateful definitions and actions, tainted Iago meets Othello in the garden and begins his deception and trickery—his challenge to atemporal religion.

Another person in the garden, Desdemona, works as Iago's opposite and embodies nature's incorruptible innocence. Asquith states that "She is the aspect of creation that

provides an earthly garment for the creator” (200). In the Citadel garden, she reveals the state-of-being evoked by atemporal religion—that uncorrupted state alive in the ancient Garden of Eden, a vision of perfection. She maintains a relational balance by allowing Othello to lead—saying that she will obey him (3.3.97)—and by loving him enough to marry without her father’s permission and to leave her native land to be with her husband, even near a potential battle. Othello clearly describes her love, stating “She loved me for the dangers I had passed, / And I loved her that she did pity them” (1.3.169-70). His stories of his youth and his “battles, sieges, fortunes” innocently evoke her love (1.3.130 and 171). Bevington states that “Men need the admiration of the women they cherish and protect; women love to admire the men who offer this protection” (*Seven* 165). Her innocent tears induced by his stories reveal her to him and attract him to her. His heroism and her innocence join to create Shakespeare’s view of the ideal relationship. Bevington argues that

Shakespeare is fascinated with the paradox of two in one in his portrayal of innocent friendship, or, for that matter, of a romantic relationship at its ideal best[. . .] The idea was a Renaissance commonplace. For all its familiar features, nonetheless, the paradox is deeply expressive of a longing for communion with another human being that is ethereal, prelapsarian, and so incomprehensibly mysterious that words can hint at it only through logical impossibilities. (*Seven* 41)

In the Citadel garden, Othello and Desdemona’s love, based on mutual attraction and not money or an effort to change social status, reveals a kind of human relation that combines the rational warrior with the complementary power of feminine attraction. This balance,

then, infused by atemporal religion strengthens the Creator-created relationship. Prior to the imbalance of jealousy, Bevington's prelapsarian relationship exists in Shakespeare's Citadel garden. With the presence of Desdemona and her diametric opposite, Iago, the Citadel garden reflects the original situation of Eden with Desdemona and Othello as counterparts to Adam and Eve, and Iago as counterpart to the Serpent. Interestingly, Othello succumbs to deception, not Desdemona. The Citadel garden provides not only a reminder of the Eden tragedy but also what could have happened if Adam, not Eve, had been deceived first and then had enticed Eve.

When the trickster enters the garden, the balance of a loving relationship, and that among humans, nature, and the Creator, shudders. In Act III, scene 3, Iago and his "green-eyed monster" start Othello's slide to bestial jealousy with his very first speech (line 179). Iago says, "Ha? I like not that" upon Cassio's exit just as Othello and Iago enter (l. 35). He describes Cassio's exit as "steal[ing] away so guilty like," causing Othello to begin inching his way to full-blown jealousy (l. 40).

Soon Iago's hinting builds Othello's aggravation until he describes Iago's thoughts as "some monster [. . .] / Too hideous to be shown" (3.3.119). A quick examination of the word "monster" shows that the Latin root of monster, *mōnstrum*, means "a divine portent of misfortune, monster," and another Latin derivation, *monēre*, means "to admonish, warn." Two meanings for "monster," then, emerge from this line. First, Othello believes that Iago has seen an omen that he now conceals and, second, that Iago actually masks information so frightening that it engenders a monster—a frightening nonhuman creature. The non-human creature blends the psychological with the physical and, again, the human and the animal. Iago's infamous "green-eyed monster" appears nestled into his warning to

Othello about jealousy: “O, beware, my lord, of jealousy. / It is the green-eyed monster which doth mock / The meat it feeds on” (3.3.178-80a). This particular monster recalls the four humors, evoking a fairly well-known reference to health. In this case, green, or yellow, most often identifies with the choleric humor, which when out of balance produces irritability, reactivity, quick temper, and action without contemplation, all of which foreshadow Othello’s declining mental state.

The word “monster” appears again in association with jealousy in Act III, scene 4, in a conversation between Desdemona and Emilia. After Desdemona states that she has given no cause for Othello to be jealous, Emilia answers:

But jealous souls will not be answered so;

They are not ever jealous for the cause,

But jealous for they’re jealous. It is a monster

Begot upon itself, born on itself. (3.4.160-63; Italics added)

This use of “monster” also implies the two meanings—omen and / or terrible creature. Here, though, an added meaning emerges—monster as an out-of-control behavior that feeds on itself to fuel itself and, as a result, becomes worse, much as a snowball can grow into an avalanche. Interestingly, this monster has no purpose, no “cause.” In Emilia’s explanation, then, Othello acts jealously not for any logical reason but simply because he is jealous. It has no purpose. Without a purpose an emotion can cause imbalance, and the irrational overcomes the rational. The Citadel garden demonstrates a problem with imbalance, jealousy in particular: it creates purposelessness, emotional waste, and harm to others. Emilia’s words bring focus to the problem that the imbalance engendered by

jealousy begins nothing useful and ends with nothing useful. The monster arises because it exists and does not act in accord with necessity.

Othello denies the green-eyed monster and would rather be a “goat” than believe Iago’s inferences. He clearly states that emotion, guesses, or gossip do not drive him. He explains:

[. . .] Exchange me for a goat
When I shall turn the business of my soul
To such exsufflicate and blown surmises
Matching thy inference. (3.3.194b-97a)

Suggesting that he could as easily be a goat as a man, with the contemporary meaning of lechery or licentiousness, Othello implies that he, too, could be described as unfaithful if using similar intangible information as Iago uses to accuse Desdemona. He then demands tangible, visual proof for Iago’s accusations.

When Iago leaves at this point in the garden scene, Othello expresses two more nature images. First, he decides his actions if Desdemona proves untrue. Using terms of hawking, he explains that he will simply dismiss her and give her nothing further. She will have to take care of herself:

[. . .] If I do prove her haggard,
Though that her jesses were my dear heartstrings,
I’d whistle her off and let her down the wind
To prey at fortune. (3.3.276-79)

He describes Desdemona as a hawk, in fact, a wild female hawk or a “haggard” (Bevington, *Complete*, 1145, n. 276). First describing her as untrained, he continues with

images of a trained hawk. The straps around a trained hawk's legs, called "jesses," become Desdemona's connections to Othello's heart. He contrasts her to a well-trained hawk but implies that she lacks trustworthiness. In fact, he will let her go forever if she proves false, or untrained, as Bevington explains: to release a hawk downwind is "to invite it not to return" and to fend for itself or "prey at fortune" (1145, n. 278). At this point in his thinking, through Desdemona as non-human entities, Othello's plans clearly do not include murder but to simply let her go.

In the same speech, Othello further removes his humanity now suggesting that living as a toad, as terrible as he makes it sound, provides a better life than to share Desdemona (a thing):

[. . .] I had rather be a toad
And live upon the vapor of a dungeon
Than keep a corner in the thing I love
For others' uses[. . . .] (3.3.286b-89a)

Based on other Shakespearean uses of toads,⁵⁷ Othello translates himself as a base non-human entity most often perceived as evil because poisonous and, therefore, also easily related to political treachery and even an inhibitor of love. For Othello, a toad apparently gathers more evil and poison in a dungeon, a dark place filled with the tortured prisoners

57. Shakespeare presents the toad in several ways in his other plays. For example, in *Macbeth*, Act I, scene 1, it is a familiar, Paddock, to one of the three witches (line 9). In *Romeo and Juliet*, Juliet refers to the sunrise and Romeo's increasing danger, stating that "Some say the lark and loathèd toad changed eyes; / Oh, now I would they changed voices too" (3.5.31-32). In *Lear*, Edgar calls Edmund "A most toad-spotted traitor" (5.3.141). Duke Senior, in *As You Like It*, refers to the toad in his opening speech of Act II, scene 1, saying "Sweet are the uses of adversity, / Which, like the toad, ugly and venomous, / Wears yet a precious jewel in its head" (lines 13-14). This last use, invoking the "belief that the head of the toad contained a stone possessing great medicinal virtues, was among the vulgar errors of Shakespeare's time[. . . .] The 'precious jewel' in question was known by the name of the toad-stone" (Dyce 503).

who lie dead or dying; he would prefer such a dismal place than sexually sharing his “fair warrior” (2.1.180).

Despite Othello’s building emotion, in his earlier garden speech Iago argues that he has a choice, for Othello can control his emotions or be driven by them. Jeffrey and Grant explain that

He [Othello] shuts himself off from wisdom, love, good fame, and murders his wife. He becomes fortune’s fool, prey to circumstance, and to the tyranny of his own passions. His human nature is perverted, and he is reduced to incoherency as his noble poetry is debased by gross and bestial language[. . .] (422)

Othello’s language, in fact, does become more and more bestial as he follows Iago’s lead to baser passions.

In addition to his uses of “monster” and “monstrous,” in Act IV, scene 1, when Iago demands Othello be a man, Othello replies, “A horned man’s a monster and a beast” (line 62). Referring to himself in third person, he becomes an unidentified horrific creature—monster and beast. “Beast” originally referred to any animal except man, so, too, in this line. Iago, only further enraging Othello, gives reason for and, therefore, supports the beast: “There’s many a beast then in a populous city, / and many a civil monster” (4.1.63-64). Later more deeply enraged and inextricably linked to his beastly, base instincts, Othello says, “O, she [Desdemona] will sing the savageness out of a bear,” then repeats his earlier threat, “I’ll chop her into messes” (ll. 188-89 and 199). Othello has chosen the worst of his inner being, defining it as a perversion of nature’s members, and ignores any rational reasoning he may have had about the situation. He even ignores his

own nobility and his leadership and decision-making skills, both well-known on the battlefield. Othello, like Adam, falls from grace and will never return to the Citadel garden.

Iago's absolute perversion of the Creator-created triad reveals just how far humans can wander, either by choice or by deception, from their God-created lives. No one is supposed to be a murderer as was Cain who apparently brought that particular decision into the world. Even Othello, who murders his wife, knows his soldier's honorable life. The Citadel garden portrays the results of pride and deception and demonstrates the power of irrationality.

King Lear

Building on such portrayal and demonstration, *King Lear* increases the power of irrationality to insanity—the inability to return to rationality, which is the ultimate loss outside the human-nature-Creator relationship. Even more devastating Danby observes that in this scene “man, nature, and God now fall apart” (84).⁵⁸ For example, on the stormy heath, King Lear completely driven by emotion wildly howls at the storm: “Blow, winds, and crack your cheeks! Rage, blow! / You cataracts and hurricanoes, spout / Till you have drenched our steeples, drowned the cocks!” (3.2.1-3). A gentleman describes him as “Striv[ing] in his little world of man to outstorm / The to-and-fro-conflicting wind and rain” (3.1.10-11). In Act III, scene 3, Lear's behavior portrays his efforts to control if not become nature; such effort distorts the relationship between nature and people, and any connection between them “falls apart.” Shakespeare's concept of nature here plays a much more active role in the characters' lives, especially Lear's. He shows a view of

58. Danby also asserts that Reason is the “principle of coherence for all three” (84).

nature only hinted in his previous plays, such as in the storm and shipwreck of *TN* and the storm at sea in *Othello*. The tempest in the heath becomes a tempest in Lear's mind and another representation of the Creator-created relationship (3.4.12).

Greenblatt calls Shakespeare's *Lear* "the wildest and the strangest [. . .] of all his tragedies" (357). The strangeness begins when an old King, who is not ill or dying, decides to divide his kingdom among his three daughters. His plans derail, however, when he banishes his favorite daughter and his most trusted advisor; next his two older daughters, between whom he has divided his kingdom, refuse to care for him; then he screams in a storm, talks to a fool and to a crazy man, tears off his clothes, and then wears a crown of flowers. Servants try to help him; noblemen try to help him; disguised men try to help him; even one of his sons-in-law tries to help him. The strangeness increases with double plots, the King's and Gloucester's. Both tell the story of children deceiving and harming their parents. The play comments on old age, parents and children, trust and deception, and unnecessarily abdicating power. More importantly it provides a means to examine microscopically the relationship between humans and nature.

Edmund and Sir Gloucester offer two views of nature, the first as a goddess who has no impact on life, the second as controller of life. After King Lear banishes Cordelia and Kent, Edmund states in the very first words of scene 2, "Thou, Nature, art my goddess; to thy law / My services are bound" (1.2.1-2). According to Bevington, Edmund in this line "announc[es] his creed, that Nature sanctions ruthless competition in which the race goes to the swiftest. Conventions of morality are, in his eyes, social constructions designed by a culture to protect vested interests against innovation and competition" (Bevington, *Seven*, 142). Specifically, his bastardy prevents his familial rights and his

ability to achieve any personal success. Gloucester, on the other hand, believes people have little control over the events in their lives. He soon relates to the stars' control both of Lear's strange behavior and of Edgar's supposed "abominable villain[y]" (1.2.80 and 106-109). Gloucester, according to Bevington, echoes the Elizabethan belief system, stating that "Structures like monarchy and the family are divinely ordained and immutable; disorder in the cosmos signals disorder in the kingdom and family" (*Seven* 143). Edmund's view of nature, on the contrary, announces a different life for humans. His view parallels the changes in Elizabethan religion—personal responsibility:

This is the excellent foppery of the world, that
when we are sick in fortune—often the surfeits of our
own behavior—we make guilty of our disasters the
sun, the moon, and stars, as if we were villains on
necessity, fools by heavenly compulsion, knaves,
thieves, and treachers by spherical predominance,
drunkards, liars, and adulterers by the enforced obe-
dience of planetary influence, and all that we are evil
in, by a divine thrusting on. (1.2.121-29)

Edmund firmly believes that people must claim responsibility because astrology—"the sun, the moon and the stars"—has no impact on human fortunes or behavior—"the surfeits of our / own behavior." For him, "a divine thrusting on" never explains the villainy, foolishness, and treachery of men and women. Each person's responsibility for his or her behavior must be accepted, for each has the freedom to do so. Bevington states that

Edmund's critique [(1.2.121-36)] is devastating because it is so candid and so apt. His call for the right and power of the individual person to shape his or her destiny is a creed of intellectual freedom[. . .] Edmund is, par excellence, the self-made man. He is proud to be beholden to no one other than himself and his own wits, though he does understandably resent the out-of-date social structures that have left him no alternative" (*Seven* 144).

Gloucester and Edmund, as most scholars explain, present two views of nature and of life; however, the critics miss the reference to two approaches to religion: from Gloucester's view the traditional approach, and from Edmund's view the personally responsible approach.

In Act V, scene 3, Edmund reveals another effect of nature on people. He says "Some good I mean to do, / Despite of mine own nature" (lines 248-49). Now Edmund implies that nature controls people in that they are born who they are; he does not refer to astrology here. McGinn explains that Edmund's words suggest "that he is evil by nature, not by intention. He was just *made that way*" (124). McGinn further states:

It is not [. . .] that nature and society are entirely separate realms. People are products of nature too[. . .] Human nature is part of nature. This is quite a startling thought for someone of Shakespeare's time, since man was so regularly assigned to another order entirely—the religious order of souls and of God's designs. But in *Lear* evil is credited to nature, as if it were just one more turn of the great wheel of natural processes. (124)

McGinn's interpretation of nature and of Edmund's response to it combines nature and humans into one entity—in essence a combination of Gloucester's and Edmund's views of nature. This idea is indeed a “startling thought.”

Another scholar, John Wilders, attempts to keep humans and nature separate but agrees with Gloucester that forces beyond human control impact their lives. Wilders focuses on the difference between fortune and nature in his effort to maintain a separation between nature and people:

The difference is roughly one between [. . .] the gifts of fortune[. . .] the attributes bestowed on a person by circumstances such as social position, wealth and worldly possessions, and [gifts of nature,] the innate qualities with which he is born, such as strength, beauty and intelligence[. . .] But although Shakespeare's characters regularly make a distinction between these two influences, his plays indicate [. . .] that they are not so easily separated. Even this theory, moreover, implies that human action is confined by forces beyond our control. (33)

Though circumstance and nature impact human life, determining which of the two contribute what to a situation seems unfathomable from these perspectives of nature and fortune. Humans and nature seem impossible to separate.

Shakespeare's characters in *Lear*, with Edmund as the example, behave as they do because created to be who they are by forces they do not control. For McGinn and Wilders, humans have no choice to behave other than they do. That theory, however, sets aside the conventional Judeo-Christian belief of events in the Garden of Eden, the result of which reveals humans' freedom of choice and indicates that people can choose to have

control of their behavior. In addition, combining the three—people, nature, and the Creator—into one entity, as McGinn and Wilders seem to do, contradicts Judeo-Christian teachings. Though people, nature, and the Creator lived closely in tune with one another in the Garden of Eden, they each maintained separate entities but entwined. In addition, Adam and Eve’s Fall from perfection—and from grace, unity, and balance—further negates the idea that all three combine into one entity. In other words, God did not fall from perfection; the created would have very few if any experiences similar to the Creator’s because the two are not the same. In the same manner, nature, a created entity as are humans, would experience similar problems as people do and even similar effects from the loss of its life in Eden. In addition, the Christian perspective claims that combining the three parallels the idea of confusing good with evil: nature and humans in their fallen state cannot become one with the Creator since good cannot combine with evil and vice versa, just as water cannot combine with oil.⁵⁹

Since the three cannot become one—or even just two joining, such as nature and people, or people and God, or nature and God—then another cause for the situation in *Lear* must be considered, that is, the impact of people, nature, and the Creator on each other. Few would question that this relationship is clearly dynamic not static. Several critics argue, however, that God is (or the gods are) absent in the play, and, therefore, the Creator would have no impact. Though Bevington states, “The motions of the heavens

59. One example of this impossibility occurs when the Pharisees accuse Jesus of casting out demons through the work of Satan. They implied that evil would be fighting against itself. Jesus replied that “Every kingdom divided against itself will be ruined, and every city or household divided against itself will not stand” (Matthew 12.24). His argument was that performing good acts against evil through the power of evil was not possible, for those acts would mean that evil fought itself—an impossibility. Combining people and nature in their fallen states with the Creator, unchanged by the Fall, would compare to the inability of oil and water to mix. It just cannot happen.

determine human fate because all is coherently designed and presided over by a divine majesty,” he later argues that “The evidence suggests [. . .] overwhelmingly in this play [. . .] that the gods act very belatedly if at all” (*Seven* 143 and 146). He expresses this idea more emphatically in his introduction to the play: “In *King Lear* Shakespeare pushes to its limit the hypothesis of a malign or at least indifferent universe in which human life is meaningless and brutal” (*Complete*, 1167). An indifferent universe implies here that God—or the gods—probably would not participate in the lives of men and women.

The deity or gods offer no sound at all and seem completely absent. Marx notices the silence from the heavens, stating “[T]he deity in *King Lear*, though desperately called upon in sincere prayer, remains silent” (61). Lear’s howling at the storm could provide an example of such prayer as do lines 28-36 in Act III, scene 4, Lear’s prayer to understand the poor. McGinn’s view presents a complete absence of the gods: “Unlike other of Shakespeare’s plays, there is no supernatural element to the action—no ghosts or witches or soothsayers[. . .] There is nothing of the uncanny or divine about it. The gods, in this play, are conspicuous by their absence” (125). With such arguments about deities and gods, these scholars allow a close reading of the relation to God between humans and nature as revealed specifically in the heath.

The heath of Act III, scenes 2 and 4, produces spiritual, natural, and physical effects. The heath, which the stage directions call “an open place,” provides a view of a unique location in nature where humans and the Creator meet. Lear’s experience in the heath demonstrates the privacy of the encounter—mentally and physically. Kent and the Fool label Lear “mad” and, therefore, do not consider Lear’s condition beyond this instant and somewhat mindless assessment. As a result, they leave Lear, for all intents and

purposes, unaided. Even further separated from Lear's encounter, Goneril and Regan choose to stay out of the storm and away from their father. Lear, now abandoned by family, experiences private spirituality. He says to the storm while standing in it, "Rumble thy bellyful! Spit, fire! Spout, rain! / Nor rain, wind, thunder, fire are my daughters" (3.2.14-15), implying a closeness to nature that intensifies during such times of privacy not of one's choosing. Left physically and psychologically alone in the storm, he stands in the storm screaming.

In addition, Lear for his own part while in the heath also immediately separates his two daughters from the storm—the implication being that he chooses to be alone. Literally moments before he enters the storm, he calls his daughters "unnatural hags" (2.4.280). That name, seen in the context of Lear's disconnection from them during the storm, proves most accurate. Their position in the Creator-created triad clearly askew, Regan's and Goneril's deaths in the play demonstrates the result of attempting to circumvent an encounter with the universe or a holy God. They demonstrate the results of such avoidance, whereas Lear shows the positive results of a full-fledged, palpably-experienced encounter.

First, having angrily left his daughters, he faces the storm. Next, though earlier separating his daughters from the storm, he accuses it of acting on their part—of even having intentions as people do. He says to the storm,

[. . .] I call you servile ministers,
That will with two pernicious daughters join
Your high-engendered battles 'gainst a head
So old and white as this. Oho! 'Tis foul! (3.2.21-24)

He believes that not only his daughters but also nature stands against him. McGinn, however, does not agree with Lear:

[N]ature is not to blame for abusing Lear—it is showing no unkindness toward him, in contrast to his daughters[. . .] [T]here is nevertheless, in his mind, a kind of merging of hostilities between storm and daughters, as if they have colluded together (and these ideas are in some tension with each other)[. . .] Nature cannot be, literally, ‘nasty’ or ‘brutish,’ since these adjectives suggest sentience and intention; it is something much scarier—entirely oblivious. (122)

Lear separating humans, specifically his daughters, from nature in addition to his inability to disconnect nature’s behavior, the storm, from humans, reveals, in part, a result of the human expulsion from the Garden of Eden. Nature experiencing the effects of its own loss of Eden, as Wilders explains, would certainly seem to have little concern, or even sympathy, for humans (133). Combined with the effects on nature of the human loss of Eden,⁶⁰ however, the storm seems more involved in Lear’s night on the heath than McGinn perhaps acknowledges. Lear cries foul against nature’s storm and argues in his next speech with the much quoted line that he is “a man / More sinned against than

60. Romans 8.19-21 specifically states that the Fall of humans from the Garden of Evil affected nature:

¹⁹The creation waits in eager expectation for the sons of God to be revealed.

²⁰For the creation was subjected to frustration, not by its own choice, but by the will of the one who subjected it, in hope

²¹that the creation itself will be liberated from its bondage to decay and brought into the glorious freedom of the children of God.

The “one who subjected” the creation to frustration is the Creator. The subjection began at the end of the time in the Garden of Eden and continues until men and women rejoin the intended relationship with God—“the glorious freedom of the children of God.”

sinning” (3.2.59-60). He implies that he has been treated respectfully neither by his two daughters nor by the storm.

More importantly, the word “sin” in the above quotation echoes the Judeo-Christian perspective of sin, which defines it as to be permanently separated from God, resulting from the perpetual fallen state of men and women that began with their forceful removal from Eden. Such direct references to religion add a dimension to the human relationship with God and to the sights and sounds of Lear’s daughters and of the storm. His experience in the storm demonstrates that, counter to the critics, God’s presence clearly exists in the storm and in Shakespeare’s play. Lear’s view of an intentionally-oppositional nature turns him, no matter how unintentionally, to the Creator—the most holy member of the triad.

Lear advances incrementally closer to the Creator-human relationship engendered by the storm, saying to it, “I never gave you kingdom, called you children. / You owe me no subscription. Then let fall / Your horrible pleasure” (3.2.17-19). Lear believes he has done nothing inappropriate to nature but still states that nature’s ill treatment unfairly continues. He also connects the treatment to evil through the phrase “horrible pleasure.” The word “horrible,” the adjectival form of the word “horror,” assumes the idea of loathing as well as to tremble with fear (from L. *horrere*). Since “to loathe” means to hate, abhor, detest, abominate, the phrase “horrible pleasure,” then, implies “hateful, abhorrent, detestable pleasure.” Such words attribute evil to the storm, and such identification moves Lear closer to the Creator. Seeing evil as not good, he, ever so slightly, moves in the opposite direction toward good—that is, toward the Creator.

Lear, then, explains the severity of the storm as an effect of evil. Wilders, too, closely connects the heath to evil as well as to the Fall of Adam: “[t]he tendency of the landscape to become wild and disordered is not the only effect on nature of the Fall. Evil is also manifest in the [. . .] postlapsarian phenomenon [. . .] [of] the natural destructiveness of tempests, gales and predatory beasts” (133). Wilders’ information, therefore, adds that nature can express, or behave, evil as it seems to express good. The heath’s tremendous storm offers evidence. The undisturbed heath expresses little evil, but as a staging ground for a meeting between the Creator and the created, evil dramatically displays the sky darkening, the storm intensifying, and insanity ensuing. Interestingly, the more immediate presence of good seems to evoke a more immediate presence of evil. To that end, Milward describes Act III as “scenes of diabolic possession,” further emphasizing the more immediate presence of, and therefore effects of, evil in the storm (*Apocalypse* 71). McGinn agrees, viewing the connection in the heath as between nature and evil but as if no one would ever question it. He explains that “in *Lear* evil is credited to nature, as if it were just one more turn of the great wheel of natural processes” (124).

Harrison, on the other hand, calls nature the voice, as it were, of the cosmos, giving nature superior spiritual connections than evil offers. He states that “[t]he storm scene of act 3 appears as a cosmic response to the moral confusion” created by Edmund and Lear’s daughters (102). According to these scholars, apparently where good and evil meet, evil appears more visibly—the darkness, the terrible storm, and the frightened, maddened people—despite the superior spiritual connections of nature. Cunningham enlarges the effect of evil, describing Lear’s world “like that of the exiled Adam, [as] fallen and plagued by disease, enmity, darkness, physical and spiritual death,” so the heath

would be no different (465). Once again, Lear's recognition of evil, then, moves him closer to the Creator.

King Lear, furthermore, demonstrates a problematic psychological situation in the heath now filled with evil. Progressing from anger in Act II, scene 4, to a "tempest in [his] mind" in Act III, scene 4, line 12, he demonstrates the increasing psychological, as well as spiritual, strength of the Creator-created triad apparent in Act III, scenes 2 and 4. His awareness of his psychological problem begins, however, in a conversation with the Fool in Act I. Here Lear begs heaven to help him stay sane: "Oh, let me not be mad, not mad sweet heaven! / Keep me in temper; I would not be mad!" (1.5.45-46). In Act II, in yet another effort to discover who put Kent in the stocks, he says, "I prithee, daughter, do not make me mad" (2.4.219). He moves from heaven now to ask Regan to prevent his madness. Later in the same act, Lear ends his tirade against Goneril and Regan with words to the Fool: "I shall go mad" (2.4.288). Near the end of this scene, he leaves Gloucester's castle and enters the storm of Act III.

In the storm he progresses through several spiritually enlightening stages, moving him ever closer and closer to the Creator. His oncoming madness in my reading prepares him for the stages. In Act III, he senses his madness: "My wits begin to turn" (3.2.67). The speech before Kent seems to sense the same and strongly encourages Lear to enter the hovel that "some friendship will it lend [him] 'gainst the tempest" (line 63). After several of Kent's entreaties, Lear eventually replies

Thou think'st 'tis much that this contentious storm
Invades us to the skin
[. . .]

When the mind's free
The body's delicate. This tempest in my mind
Doth from my senses take all feeling else
Save what beats there. (3.4.6-7 and 11-14)

In this speech, he states his position as the storm clears his mind, for he knows that the “tempest in [his] mind” forces him to ignore his body’s needs and reactions to the soaking and only focus on the disrespect of his daughters. Bevington, on the contrary, interprets these lines to mean that when the mind “is free of anxiety [. . .] the body’s importunate needs can assert themselves” (*Complete* 1195, notes 3.4.11 and 12). Lear, however, ignores his bodily needs and introspectively focuses on the effects of his daughters. Such internal focus points to individual responsibility and its spiritual reflection. This new focus becomes clearer when, before he enters the hovel, he prays and reveals that he regrets his lack of attention to the poor whose experience in the storm would probably be worse than his (lines 27-36). He believes he should “take physic pomp,” or as Bevington explains “Cure yourself, O distempered great ones” (3.4.33 and *Complete*, 1195, n. 33). Lear senses that because the poor suffer and survive, he also should. Selflessness, another characteristic of spirituality, moves Lear still closer to the Creator, approaching the balance of the Creator-created triad. When he does finally enter the hovel, his conversations with Tom o’ Bedlam reveal his unchanged direction toward the Creator, with both men out of but still surrounded by the terrible storm.

Edgar, who pretends to be the insane Tom o’ Bedlam, reveals more about the relationship among the Creator and the created. He enacts the damage that could happen to people who do not attempt to pursue individual and personal relationships with God. In

this scene a man who leaves the human sphere and not only enters but becomes nature prevents his own ability to live appropriately in the Creator-created triad. In fact, such living causes, as noted earlier, an untoward situation for humans—in this case insanity. This contrast to an absolute differentiation between nature and humans and both from the Creator shows the damage of any unbalanced oneness among any of the members of the Creator-created triad.

As Lear speaks with Tom, he continues through his spiritual stages. First, Lear learns of evil. As they enter the hovel, Tom reacts and yells a warning, “Away! The foul fiend follows me” (3.4.45). He seems to be attempting to protect the intruders, but Edgar / Tom protects himself, too, disguised to clear his name and regain favor with his father, Gloucester. Tom refers to the “foul fiend” in eight of his thirteen speeches in this scene. One of these references uses the phrase “Prince of Darkness,” a direct reference to Satan.⁶¹ The presence of evil audibly proclaimed leaves no doubt that it exists. That presence, however, as discussed earlier, must include the presence of good—the presence of the Creator. This scene explains that good and evil exist—Lear’s first stage of spiritual growth.

Once in the hovel, King Lear in his wilting state of mind does not recognize Edgar, Gloucester’s biological son, now disguised as Tom o’ Bedlam. Though earlier Lear had not recognized Kent in his disguise, this moment of missed recognition occurs in the storm, during its guise as evil, where Lear will soon completely lose his wits. In fact, Tom’s insanity evokes Lear’s, and he follows insane Tom’s path. Now in Shakespeare’s

61. Before Satan and his followers rebelled in heaven, his name was Lucifer—the Shining One, Morning Star, Prince of Light (Isaiah 14.12, NKJV). After his sin of pride, he lost his perfection, and his brilliancy became works of night and darkness (Ezekiel 28. 11-16, NKJV, and Luke 10.18, NIV; see also Bildad’s description of the wicked in Job 18.5-21, NKJV).

King Lear's portrayal of insanity two tangible sides appear to that terribly lost state of mind—good and evil: Tom and his foul fiend represent evil, and Lear, struggling with madness, represents good. Significantly, as Lear and Tom reveal good and evil within themselves, the storm rages outside the hovel expressing a parallel good and evil. This second stage demonstrates that evil and good reside in both nature and people—an obvious effect of the Fall.

When Lear does not recognize people who, sane or insane, would help him, he is a bit closer to the Creator's assistance because he now begins to experience his aloneness and the necessity to accept personal responsibility. His prayer before the hovel displays his willingness to be responsible. More importantly, however, the gradual loss of his wits necessitates the help of the Creator, especially since Lear's disguised subjects cannot easily help. His situation emphasizes his crucial personal pathway to the Creator. During the process of learning to accept personal responsibility, his inability to recognize not only who can help but also how the person can help further affects his knowledge of good and evil. He cannot recognize the difference. In fact, by following Tom's path to complete insanity, Lear further handicaps his possibility to recognize the difference. The scene demonstrates the crucial ability to distinguish good from evil, Lear's third stage.

That ability to distinguish between the two, however, weakens and strengthens in waves as people attempt to move closer to the Creator. For example, despite Tom's declaration of the presence of and Lear remaining unaware of evil, he, becoming more and more mentally handicapped, still believes that Tom's daughters have caused his insanity, not evil. Lear asks, "Didst thou give all to thy daughters? And art / thou come to this?" (3.4.48-49). His question implies that insanity ensues when parents give too much to their

children, and those children, then, act ungratefully to the point of even harming their parents. He refers to human relationships here, not voicing the presence of evil and, therefore, not recognizing it. When the still disguised Kent tells Lear that Tom has no daughters, Lear condemns Kent: “Death traitor! Nothing could have subdued nature / To such a lowness but his unkind daughters” (ll. 69-70). He pronounces a rational judgment—“Death traitor!”—like a king but irrationally reiterates that Tom does have daughters and that they have “subdued nature” to a terrible “lowness.” He still does not recognize evil.

Using the pronoun “his” in the above quotation that simultaneously renames “nature” and references Tom, Lear actually conflates Tom with nature, thereby avoiding the knowledge of evil. In other words, for Lear Tom is just nature. Such inappropriate joining results from cycling through a release and retention of the knowledge of the difference between good and evil.⁶² Becoming nature removes the humanity necessary to live in balance. Insane and in the horrendous storm, therefore, Tom and Lear do not recognize the difference between good and evil, specifically in each other, or likely they would not associate with one another. Stage four reveals that if one loses or releases the ability to recognize the difference between good and evil, he or she will probably experience a loss of individuality and without that will lose the potential for a personal relationship with the Creator.

The fifth stage reveals the relationship between good and evil in people and nature as a constant movement from one state to the other. Anti-pastoralism, certainly at this

62. That situation mirrors the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil from which Eve and Adam ate and consequently lost their perfection in the Garden of Eden.

point in *Lear*, demonstrates the “dynamics of a creative-destructive universe” (Gifford 154). Nature continuously moves through the seasonal engendered changes and reflects the same movement in humans. Gifford explains that “that our inner human nature can be understood in relation to external nature” (156). The implication increases that to observe nature allows another means to delve into the human psyche, but also to ascertain the process of atemporal religion in the Creator-created dynamism. In fact, it reveals that movement as preventing even the possibility of people—through their own power—to become one with the Creator. In addition, to further prevent an inappropriate combination among the triad, the Creator, as evidenced by Tom and Lear, sets nature and humans in spiraling motion within the individual sphere of each, moving them through good and evil events and choices. For example, Lear in Act I banishes his favorite daughter and fails to recognize her goodness; however, in Act IV, scene 7, he recognizes Cordelia’s goodness and loyalty and asks her to forgive him. Gloucester, too, moves from determining Edmund as good and Edgar as evil in Act I, scene 2, to properly recognizing Edmund as evil and Edgar as good in Act V, scene 3. At least he dies enlightened to the truth but only after the storm in the heath—nature’s demonstrability.

The play emphasizes the Creator-created triad as dynamic, as in constant motion within each created part of the triad. From nature’s peace to storm and back, and men’s and women’s rationality to irrationality and back, both creations reveal that dynamism. As humans, in particular, spiral and even wobble—similar to the earth’s rotation—away from their created existence, they seem to lose sight of God. As humans and nature spiral in and out of the balance between rationality and irrationality and good and evil, they see or

experience something different in the Creator. Gloucester most clearly illustrates such movement:

These late eclipses in the sun and moon
portend no good to us. Though the wisdom of nature
can reason it thus and thus, yet nature finds itself
scourged by the sequent effects. Love cools, friend-
ship falls off, brothers divide; in cities, mutiny; in
countries discord; in palaces, treason; and the bond
cracked twixt son and father.

[. . .]

We have seen the best of our time.

Machinations, hollowness, treachery, and all ruinous
disorders follow us disquietly to our graves. (1.2.106-12 and 115-17)

Gloucester refers to situations in nature, such as eclipses, that reveal not good but evil.⁶³

Even further, humans see “the best of [their] times” and move to evil such as “Machinations, hollowness, treachery, and all ruinous / disorders.” Without understanding the situation of people and nature and the position of each member of the Creator-created triad, people’s view of the Creator, then, becomes distorted. They look to “late eclipses in the sun and moon,” which inappropriately combines nature with the Creator. Constantly moving between good and evil, people lose focus and even direction, confusing evil with good as well as losing an understanding of the separation among the members of the

63. According to Bevington, Gloucester’s phrase “the wisdom of nature” refers to “natural science,” another evidence of Shakespeare’s awareness of a burgeoning interest among English men and women in the late 16th and 17th centuries (*Complete* 1177, note 107). I argue, however, that as a member of the Creator-created triad, nature would demonstrate evil and good whether or not people express an interest.

Creator-created triad. With that confusion, neither nature nor people can harmonize with each other or with the Creator. As stated above, creation's spiraling and wobbling causes a different part of nature and humans to experience the Creator, not only distorting their view of God but also seemingly creating a different God. The God-ordained motion, however, offers choices to people as well as different events in nature but not a different God. Only a constant, never changing Creator could hold the triad in balance, and only free will for people and ever changing nature could exist in the purpose of the Creator. More specifically with atemporal religion strengthening that balance within the triad, people constantly learn about spirituality and also how to express themselves in tandem with nature. The sixth stage emphasizes the ability to accept spiritual change, reflecting the same requirement created by the English Reformation.

Next, *Lear* demonstrates a human problem with spiritual change, trusting evil rather than good, as evidenced in this play by demon possession. In Act III, scene 4, Lear relinquishes his self-determination and prefers to be a follower rather than accept personal responsibility. The evidence of Lear's attitude becomes apparent in Tom's speech. Tom says, apparently to Lear, "Beware my follower. Peace, Smulkin! Peace, thou fiend!" (l. 139). Bevington presents the "follower" as a "familiar, attendant fiend" (*Complete* 1197, note 139). I argue, however, that Tom refers to Lear; he figuratively transforms Lear to demon-possessed, calling him "Smulkin" and "fiend." In the same speech, Tom also makes Lear his follower, and a short time later Lear accepts Tom as leader. He asks Tom, "What is the cause of thunder," and calls him "learned Theban," "noble philosopher," and "good Athenian" (lines 153, 155, 171, and 179). This elementary question and these names indicate the state of follower rather than king or employer. Even the phrase "my

philosopher” implies discipleship or protégée status as do similar phrases, such as “my teacher” or “my preacher” (l. 175). The seventh stage, then, offers the result of following rather than working out one’s private and personal relationship with the Creator and with nature—a sinking into the insanity of relinquishing one’s own state of being to a possession by evil.

In Act IV, scene 6, Lear enters “fantastically dressed with wild flowers” and described as “mad” (line 80, stage directions). Apparently Kent no longer follows Lear because when he asks a “gentleman” to attend Lear, the scene ends (4.3.53). In Act IV, scene 6, the King next appears dressed in flowers to Gloucester and Edgar but without Kent. The gentleman that Kent employed finds Lear by chance, saying, “Oh, here he is,” as if he had no help to find the king (4.6.188). Between Kent’s asking the gentleman to attend Lear and the gentleman finding him, Lear apparently has been completely alone, another humbling experience since a king’s retinue typically surrounds him. Lear, now humbled and mad, becomes childlike and with absolutely no embarrassment.

The eighth stage requires childlike abandon—a state of mind through which one can rely with complete trust on the Creator to prevent evil from harming him or her—just as young children usually come near their parents. Now Lear shows that having a childlike trust of spirituality echoes one of Jesus’ teachings. He says to his disciples,

“Let the little children come to me, and do not hinder them, for the kingdom of God belongs to such as these. I tell you the truth, anyone who will not receive the kingdom of God like a little child will never enter it.”
And he took the children in his arms, put his hands on them and blessed them. (Mark.14b-16, NIV)

Witless Lear, in his childlike state of mind and now separated from Tom, Fool, and Kent releases worries and fears. He expresses kingly judgments that Edgar calls “Reason in madness” (4.6.175). Lear even expresses a childlike desire to cry, to become “a man of salt / to use his eyes for garden waterpots” (lines 195-96).⁶⁴ Cunningham sees Lear’s journey as baptism:

The journey of Lear and Gloucester away from the court, into storm, and out of it leaves them morally and spiritually reborn. In both cases the old is put off and the new is put on[. . .] Shakespeare recognizes in the contours of the two men’s moral and spiritual change a type of the mystic destruction and recreation thought to be effected sacramentally by baptism.

(464)

Lear’s baptism in the storm also results in his realizing the difference between good and evil as well as the problems of moving between them, and, even further, the problem of blindly following either. His new self sees Cordelia as the daughter he loved, but the sight of her allows him no peace. He learns too late and dies as did Gloucester—knowing the truth but dying from the pain of it.

Shakespeare’s *Lear*, with its terrible storm and portrayal of terrible human pain, reveals in slow motion the spiritual changes in people and the effects of nature on those changes. Lear’s experience in the storm depicts the necessity to understand the existence of good and evil and the significance of the separateness of the two.

64. The only use of the word “garden” in this play.

Conclusion

Nature in this play, then, expresses a path for Lear to follow, with the storm beginning as early as Act II, scene 1.⁶⁵ Along that path nature reveals its two sides, good and evil and, thereby, two sides of humans. Even further, however, nature reveals the effects of freewill on the human experience of good and evil and the impact of freewill as constant movement between the two. Nature creates the path to understanding in this play whereas in the previous three plays, it provided an example or revealed the depths of human depravity. It also highlights their wandering from the safety of the Creator-created triad, often stretching the bond of atemporal religion to a dangerous thinness, as seen in Iago's deception and in the resulting deaths in *Othello*. When Shakespeare's characters view others and themselves as non-human entities, as in the case of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, they reveal more about themselves than about the others at whom they direct their barbs.

That revelation demonstrates nature's ability to expose the human inner being. For example, Sir Toby's use of non-human transformations of others actually encourages the audience to understand more about Sir Toby, specifically that he gambles and visits prostitutes, than about "puritan" Malvolio. As Olivia, calling herself prey, attempts to choose her predator, she transforms Viola/Cesario into a lion and, therefore, a worthy predator (3.1.128-29). People mixing people with nature has dangerous results as revealed in *Lear*, but to show the danger, *Twelfth Night* first demonstrates the problem as comedy. It lays bare the absolute uselessness of mixing the two and then exposes the horror of it.

65. Regan calls the night "dark-eyed" (2.2.121), implying dark clouds fill the sky and hide the moon and stars, thus, creating an even darker night with portent of a storm.

Nature as completely separate from humans, as in *As You Like It*, makes the differences between the two more obvious. For example, the Forest of Arden maintains its pristine natural rhythm—to live as first created⁶⁶—thereby establishing balance and unity to maintain an ecosystem. The people in the forest, however, act out of character, for a woman, Rosalind, acts as a man and a princess, Celia, acts as a common shepherdess. Olivia's closed garden gate in *Twelfth Night* signifies that gardens provide privacy, but that people misuse it if not for self-discovery or self-revelation.

Nature reveals the absurdity of people's lives as they are tricked, deceived, or rejected. More importantly, nature shows the people within it the value of balance and unity and the power of the role of atemporal religion in that balance. Shakespeare's nature stagescapes encourage his audience members to envision living their lives as with spiritual purpose—in the balance of the Creator-created triad with atemporal religion as the guide to the new Garden of Eden.

The last two plays, *The Winter's Tale* and *The Tempest*, build on the ideas of nature as the example of balance between rationality and irrationality, and of nature as deeply involved in human's lives, even having parallel experiences with good and evil. *The Winter's Tale* demonstrates the effect of one person's irrationality on a family and a kingdom. King Leontes represents an attempt to control everyone's life but rejects the wisdom, patience, and even grace to do so and, thus, confuses good with evil. As a result of his truly faulty decision-making, three women's gardens become the focus of the play. Hermione's garden, filled with beauty and innocence, ends sullied and empty; Leontes

66. With the Elizabethan understanding only beginning to address the Great Chain of Being, they viewed nature as a living being. Seeing its "behavior" on stage would likely encourage a closer examination of its proffered information.

never enters her garden and never accepts the truth. If he had, his son and baby daughter's lives would have filled his old age with wonder and awe, and his wife would have spent the rest of her life loving him and making his life the best she could. Instead, though, no one mentions or enters her garden again. Leontes' false accusation, that Hermione committed adultery with his childhood friend, King Polixenes, destroys his family and his kingdom's respect for him.

Perdita's garden surrounded by sheep and pastures portrays nature's harmony and splendor. Having been rejected and abandoned on a desolate shore of Bohemia sixteen years prior to this scene, Perdita now lives as a shepherdess without rancor or discontent; she follows nature's example. In her "flower" debate with the disguised King Polixenes, she argues for the wonders of nature's producing every season with the predictability it usually does, but not as human-manipulated. Living in a balanced mental state allows a balanced membership in the Creator-created triad and the peace of accepting the gift of the new Garden of Eden.

The last garden, Paulina's, acts as the opposite to Hermione's, for wisdom, patience, and grace function mightily in her garden to bring Leontes to the truth. When the statue of a presumed dead Hermione "comes to life" at Paulina's command, the wonder evokes requests for blessings from her new-found daughter and for forgiveness from Leontes. Hearing and seeing his profound expressions of love and regret, Paulina says, "It is required / You do awake your faith[. . .] Music, awake her; strike! / 'Tis time. Descend. Be stone no more. Approach" (5.3.94-95, and 98-99). Hermione descends from the pedestal, blesses her daughter, and forgives her husband. Shakespeare, his audience now primed for recognizing it, unveils Paulina's garden as the new Garden of Eden.

Forgiveness, blessings, and love must occur in the new Garden because the human free will requires them. Atemporal religion, the path to that place of rest and peace, also offers wisdom and even correction in the new Garden of Eden that allows people to properly tend their new life.

Unlike *The Winter's Tale*, *The Tempest* portrays a man in practically perfect relation to nature. Unlike Lear or Leontes, Prospero recognizes both good and evil. Never confusing the two, Prospero expresses a balance between rationality and irrationality that he learns on his isolated island. For twelve years he, his daughter, and his beloved books have lived completely surrounded by nature. For that time he has watched nature and learned from it, and at the opening of the play, he knows how to work in conjunction with it. In fact, he can act only in concert with it since working against it would have surely brought death. Shakespeare, now, shows a life twelve years after entering the new Garden of Eden. With Prospero's mind filled with the knowledge he has gleaned from his books, from his life filled with his daughter, Miranda, and the island life around them, he has gained more than he lost when his brother usurped his dukedom and set him and his baby daughter afloat in a boat that "the very rats / instinctively ha[d] quit" (1.2.147-48).

Even with his new life, however, he still resents his being forced into a situation that could have killed him and his baby daughter. He wants revenge. When his enemies shipwreck on his island, only a quiet confrontation with one of the entities he finds on the island, Ariel, turns him to forgiveness. Through this wonderful embodiment of forgiveness, the play reveals the impact of the spiritual and the earthly on humankind. The shipwrecked men allow a portrayal of that impact. The king of Naples, Alonso, and most of his men learn these effects and accept the opportunity to change as a result. Prospero's

brother Antonio and Sebastian, Alonso's brother, however, reject the chance. The play leaves to conjecture the consequences of their rejection, but from other plays, particularly *King Lear*, audiences and readers can assume that the two brothers will experience extreme unhappiness and possibly death.

Prospero and his daughter, find two entities, one Ariel, already on the island when he and Miranda, "by Providence divine," wrecked on the island (1.2.160). That single recognition of some power beyond him that helps him tells Shakespeare's audience that someone watches and acts in their lives. Bevington argues that Prospero, however, watches, not God:

The metaphoric implications of this stage action seem clear: we humans are being watched by some unseen presence without our conscious awareness [. . .] Some invisible being knows our very thoughts. Yet this overseeing force is not divinity. On his island, Prospero assumes the role of God: he is both stage-manager of the drama he creates and supreme arbiter of his cosmos. (*Seven* 214)

Prospero's "role as God," however, does not infer that Prospero is God only that his behavior *seems* to control others around him as God might. Perception figures handily in this drama. The audience members' perception of a divine presence in their lives causes no harm; in fact, it fits into my view of Shakespeare's message.

Before Ariel, the shipwrecked father and daughter find Caliban, whom they call a "slave." He, at first willingly, aids Prospero and Miranda to survive by providing most of their physical needs. Called "a half-human of earth and water," he soon grows to resent the two interlopers (Bloom 666). Prospero blames Caliban's resentment on his

parentage—his mother a witch, or female demon, named Sycorax, and his father the devil. Caliban angrily accuses them of causing him more problems than he might have had with their teaching him language and civilizing him as far as they could. He so hates Prospero that he plots to kill him with Trinculo and Stephano. Prospero with the help of Ariel prevents their plan and sends frightening spirit dogs to chase them for a while.

Ariel, the second entity, as “an airy spirit,” acts at Prospero’s behest, performing much of the so-called magic attributed to Prospero (Walter 71). Bushnell associates Prospero’s magical performances as closely related to nature. He explains that Prospero’s “pretended spells are almost always wrought through the agency of familiar forms of external nature, and are almost always described in terms of everyday physical experience[. . .] Finally, in Prospero’s great abjuration speech of hail and farewell, his magic powers are celebrated as the powers of nature” (688). Prospero’s life lived in harmony with nature allows Ariel, his “servant,” to also perform as a spirit of air and fire or angel as Bloom calls him (663).

If Miranda, Ariel, and Caliban figure as parts of Prospero, some of Shakespeare’s audience members would probably watch with great interest as Prospero works to bring all three into harmony. Asquith concurs, “As the action unfolds, seventeenth-century spectators would quickly recognize that the group represented the ingredients of a single personality” (266). Prepared through previous plays, these viewers would also understand the play as closely related to them and even see the process to bring those parts of themselves into harmony.

Though many critics and teachers view this play as Shakespeare’s farewell to the stage, it also portrays his spiritual grand finale. *The Tempest* shows in full the final state of

men and women—in the place of the soul, the new Garden of Eden. Shakespeare explains that humans, when guided and taught by atemporal religion, work in concert with nature to lessen the distance between the created and the Creator. With his last fully attributable play, Shakespeare provides Reformation England with the course to resolution and inner peace. A personal and individual relationship with the Divine as demonstrated by nature and reinforced by atemporal religion supplies English men and women, common and royal, with the comprehensible solution. Unlike Titus, Iago, King Lear, and even Sir Toby, the people of England can accept the proffered resolution and the opportunity to pursue an individual and personal relationship with the Creator—a relationship hindered if not nearly destroyed by the almost constant religious upheaval of sixteenth century in England.

CHAPTER
FIVE
FAIRY TALES, LOSS, AND TRIUMPH

The death of Elizabeth and James' ascension to the throne of England gave hope to the people of England, but especially the followers of Catholicism, aristocrat and common. Many, as did John Shakespeare, had lived through the reigns of two kings and two queens. Each one in turn had drastically, and in many cases forcefully, moved the country from either the Catholic or Protestant forms of religion to the other. Now, however, James' apparent religious tolerance invited jubilation.

King James I, however, had problems. Apparently, he "had been assured that the numbers of English Catholics were relatively small," so when he took the throne he "pardoned recusants and remitted their fines" (Asquith 186). The Catholic response "unpleasantly" surprised him, however (186). The new air of tolerance encouraged a large number of people to return to Mass and Catholic writers to dedicate their works to him. In addition, the Royal Treasury could not support royal expectations and with a "vocal body of Puritans," Parliament would likely obstruct his reign (186). James took the now usual step—reestablishing the recusant fines with intolerant payment requirements (186-87). The celebratory atmosphere in England abruptly ended. In fact, to date no English government leader or body after Henry VIII seemed capable of religious tolerance. Even the last hope for followers of Catholicism, Prince Henry, James' son, ended unexpectedly when he died from typhoid in 1612.

In that state of affairs, Shakespeare's *The Winter's Tale* and *The Tempest* portray atemporal religion at work, binding each member of the Creator-created triad to the

others. The characters show changes as they move toward these gardens, and entering them provides audience members with the kind of life the new Garden offers. Frye sees a “rhythmic movement from normal world to green world and back again” in *Winter’s Tale* (97). In this “normal world,” the last spiritual rebellion of my analysis occurs as King Leontes rejects his role in his family and his relationship to nature. The results of his decisions bring attention to the women of the play, Paulina, Hermione, and Perdita.

In his last play Shakespeare no longer repeats or explains the ways and means of personal spiritual responsibility. In *The Tempest* Shakespeare now portrays a person who lives a balance between the rational and irrational states of mind and fully encompassed by the relationship within the Creator-created triad. Prospero lives that balance in tune with the elements of nature that surround him and his daughter on their island of exile. Bushnell states that “*The Tempest* is rather [Shakespeare’s] ultimate achievement in presenting the natural world and the supernatural side by side, in stressing the essential validity of each, and in echoing the ineffable sphere-musics that arise from their harmonious interplay” (698). Through the interaction between Caliban and Ariel, Shakespeare tangibly exhibits a view of the balance between the rational and irrational. In addition, Prospero’s interactions with his daughter and his enemies, the men shipwrecked on his island, demonstrate the humanity that develops while living in the new Garden, the place of peace that the Creator-created triad expresses. Prospero changes the loss of a kingdom and of his comfortable surroundings into personal responsibility and even his free will to accept his new life. Shakespeare presents Prospero as the example of a person bolstered by atemporal religion who lives by the peace of the Creator-created triad—in a

personal relationship with the divine—known most intimately within the new Garden of Eden.

These two plays, along with *Pericles* and *Cymbeline*, form a series that many scholars agree diverges from Shakespeare's style in prior plays. Several theories attempt to understand the change. Asquith, Milward, and Cox offer historical reasons; Bentley, however, offers a different insight and focuses on Blackfriars, the new venue for the King's men. He proposes that Shakespeare's style changes in order to complement its more intimate stage. Bentley explains that "the acting in the new Blackfriars before a sophisticated audience would have to be more quiet than in the large open-air Globe before the groundlings. It would be easier to emphasize points in the quiet candlelit surroundings" (737). Richard Burbage, a well-known actor in the Lord Chamberlain's / King's Men troupe, acquired the area in 1596, and twelve years later the King's Men began to perform there (Weis 215). Shakespeare's changed style, according to Bentley, resulted not only from the location but also from shared ownership in the property and the ensuing desire for his investment to succeed. Bentley argues that, as a result,

[Shakespeare] turned from his old and tested methods and produced a new kind of play for the new theatre and audience [. . .] the sophisticated and courtly audience in the private theatre at Blackfriars[. . .] Somewhat unsurely at first he wrote *Cymbeline* for them, then, with greater dexterity in his new medium, *The Winter's Tale*, and finally, triumphant in his old mastery, *The Tempest*. (743-44)

Apparently emphasizing that physical space determines art, Bentley offers an interesting means to understand the marked difference between these four plays and Shakespeare's

earlier work, according to McDonald in his introduction (728). Such an impact seems plausible, and, since the play was also performed at the Globe in 1611, Shakespeare's spiritual goal to demonstrate atemporal religion could reach intimate audiences as well as the larger and louder play-goers of the Globe. The quiet garden scenes in *Winter's Tale* and the cool comfort of Prospero's cave in *Tempest* create peaceful locations to portray the passage provided by atemporal religion into the new Garden of Eden.

Rather than just the impact of a location, James' son, Henry, Prince of Wales, however, may account for Shakespeare's new approach. This particular perspective engages the theories of other scholars. For example, Asquith and Milward continue their idea for a Catholic Shakespeare, addressing the impact of Prince Henry on these plays. Asquith continues her presentation of Shakespeare's coded artistry by describing these last plays as fairy tales. She argues that Shakespeare shifted to this form in order to communicate with the royal young boy (239). She writes that "designed to play on Henry's interest in mythic romance, authentic history and noble feats of arms, the freshness and energy of these late plays mirror the great hope that the Prince might come to the aid of a cause that seemed otherwise all but dead" (246). The cause, of course, remains religious for Shakespeare's last plays, and for Asquith the cause more specifically remained Catholicism.

Understanding the impact of the Queen and now James I on the lives of English men and women, some see royal characteristics in Shakespeare's characters. Milward, for example, finds character comparisons to royalty in *Winter's Tale* as "Shakespeare looks across the seas and the continent of Europe from Leontes's Sicilia to Henry's England" (*Papist* 259). In very brief statements with little explanation, Milward points to Hermione

as Katharine of Aragon. He argues that Hermione's appeal to the oracle at Delphi parallels Katharine's appeal to Rome. Both women expect the answer that would exonerate them—Katharine as the true wife and Hermione as innocent of adultery (259 and 261). By this point in Shakespeare's career, his audience members would need little explanation of character representations.

Even further, though, his audience members had little reason to dismiss any biblical references in characters. Cox offers more comparisons. He sees Hermione as reflecting King Herod's wife, Mariamne. He states that "Mariamne's story is relevant to Hermione's in that it deals with Herod's morbid sexual suspicion of his wife (with no basis in fact), his eventual trial of her and order for her execution, and his profound remorse after her death" ("Medieval" 246). Offering another comparison, Cox also envisions Hermione as the Virgin Mary, stating that "both Mary and Hermione courageously endure harsh suspicion, and reconciliation is effected in both cases not only by a once rejected child but by the fathers' [sic] repentance and their serene wives' readiness to forgive" (246). By directly connecting Hermione to the historical time of Christ and to His portrayal in biblical stories, Cox increases the evidence of the Bible's influence on Shakespeare.

In addition, Shakespeare's garden and nature stagescapes continue to connect to the physical reality of London, and, with his romances, especially to Prince Henry's reality. He and his mother, James' queen, Anne of Denmark, resided in part at Nonsuch palace, which the King had granted to her upon his accession to the English throne. One

of the Prince's tutors, Lord Lumley,⁶⁷ a known follower of Catholicism, lived at Nonsuch palace and "spent his time collecting paintings, studying history and medicine, and developing the first Italianate garden in England" (Asquith 245).⁶⁸ Strong provides wonderful descriptions of Lumley's gardens and states that his Grove of Diana at Nonsuch demonstrated that "Nature has been tamed by art to form a moral tableau which the visitor is asked to read on more than one level, in exactly the same way that he was meant to understand an allegorical painting or the allusions in a court entertainment" (69). The potential allegorical interpretations of the magnificent gardens in Prince Henry's life allowed Shakespeare's nature scenes to communicate interestingly and significantly.

Strong locates further evidence of the Prince's own intense interest in gardening in his chapter about Saloman de Caus, the "Renaissance engineer"⁶⁹ who first served Anne of Denmark. Interestingly, de Caus, too, had Catholic leanings, Strong explaining that his marriage occurred in a Catholic church in Brussels (110). Whatever his religious

67. Lord Lumley, one of the influential people who lived with Prince Henry and Queen Anne, inherited Nonsuch Palace from Henry Fitzalan, 12th Earl of Arundel, to whom Queen Mary sold it in 1556 after it being in royal hands from its start in April, 1538, by Henry VIII. "Lumley was forced to sell it to Queen Elizabeth to settle a debt. James I inherited the palace on Elizabeth's death in 1603. He granted it to his queen, Anne of Denmark, and the palace was also used as a residence by his son Henry, Prince of Wales" ("Nonsuch," par. 4-5). Asquith also argues that Lumley follows Catholicism "An elderly Lord Lumley, a scholar and aesthete [. . .] had travelled widely in Italy after being imprisoned during Elizabeth's reign for his alleged part in the Ridolfi Plot against the Queen's life" (245).

68. Asquith strengthens Lumley's impact on the Prince, specifically his Catholic impact, stating that Prince Henry's "admiration for [Lumley] amounted to discipleship; one scholar has said that Henry was Lumley's 'ideological heir' [stated again on 256]. Lumley left Henry his collection of priceless books, which was to become the foundation of the modern British Library" (245).

69. According to Strong, "The Renaissance engineer was an artist and an artisan, a military man, an organizer of court festivities, a man whose mind was of such complexity and genius that no effect was beyond his powers[. . .] [S]tudy of the engineering literature of antiquity [. . .] created an orbit of activity which embraced the sciences of measurement of surfaces (geodesy), of moving machines (automata), of the traction of heavy weights, [. . .] of weights and balances, of measuring instruments (metrology) and of lenses and mirrors" (75). Clearly, these men strongly influenced Elizabethan garden architecture with their knowledge and creativity.

focus, Strong clearly portrays his closeness to the Prince, pointing to de Caus's dedication of one of his books to Prince Henry in 1611. According to Strong, de Caus "states that he had been giving lessons on perspective to the young Prince for two or three years" (74).⁷⁰ Although such lessons demonstrate de Caus's closeness to Henry, more importantly they indicate the Prince's strong desire to know and understand the latest techniques in garden architecture, planning, and designing. In addition, Strong explains that "De Caus was occupied during this period [about 1609 to around 1612] with creating elaborate gardens and waterworks in the grounds of Richmond Palace," another of Prince Henry's palaces (74). When the Prince died in November, 1612, all work stopped; however, Strong describes designs and information from *The Works Account* revealing the Prince's involvement. His exposure to and interest in gardens clearly support his probable and understandable attraction to Shakespeare's last plays.⁷¹

In fact, capitalizing on the Prince's gardening interests, *The Winter's Tale* (1609) with the statue of Hermione coming to life probably would have had an intense impact on the Prince. With his popularity in England, then, impressions felt by Prince Henry would inevitably impact the kingdom; therefore, audience members would likely enjoy

70. "Perspective" refers to "scientific perspective" which is the development of line drawing much closer to reality than before. Strong points to Leonardo da Vinci as an influence on de Caus. He states, "Leonardo [. . .] only incidentally a painter, [was] primarily a military engineer, an architect, an expert on hydraulics, a geometrician preoccupied with the new art of scientific perspective and a designer of automata for Sforza court fetes" (75).

71. Clearly, Prince Henry would have had a very interested audience for Shakespeare because, according to Asquith, the Prince had interests in the theater, too. He enjoyed acting in plays performed at Nonsuch, such as the role of "Meliadus, a lost prince who returns to reclaim his own, or as Philisides—Philip Sidney's poetic alter ego [. . .] [upon whom, along with Essex] he consciously modeled himself" (Asquith 244). Calling him a "reluctant scholar," Asquith further argues that the Prince loved romances and did his best to bring them to life. A number of Henry's masques and tournaments take up the central theme of Arcadia: a mysterious prophecy that promised the recovery of something stolen but not lost. Shields at the tournaments set the tone with mottoes such as 'I revive the ancient glory.' (244). Young Prince Henry's interest in acting and in gardening provided Shakespeare ample means to communicate with the Prince.

Shakespeare's coded garden and nature scenes with renewed interest. Significantly, England's "golden boy" provided a strong symbol of hope and even of salvation, especially for citizens longing for an end to religious intolerance. Adding more support for her theory of a Catholic Shakespeare, Asquith states that *The Winter's Tale* "was to alert the future ruler of England to the role he could play in reversing the threatened extinction of the country's spirituality—still, for Shakespeare and his patrons, the one paramount issue" (258). Shakespeare's images of the new Garden of Eden now more strongly than ever connect with his audience members.

The Winter's Tale

This play wonderfully portrays three women: Paulina, Perdita, and Hermione. In Frye's "normal world" at the beginning and end of the play, Paulina, as Leontes' judge and prognosticator, firmly speaks the truth by asserting the falseness of accusing his wife of infidelity. Newell calls Paulina "the speaker of truth," who says "true words are like a medicine prescribed by a 'physician' (*Winter* II 3 [lines 36-39 and] 54)" (65). Grantley says of Paulina that "If Leontes occupies something of the position of a mankind figure, then she is in the role of his conscience" (242). With Paulina as the speaker of truth, Leontes does meet his conscience. She predicts that the truth will bring him sleep; instead, he rejects the truth and suffers endless sleeplessness. Hermione finds safety while protected in Paulina's garden. Interacting with Hermione every day, Paulina continues to fuel her fierce attitude toward Leontes.

The next female character, Hermione, takes the role of Leontes' soul, as proposed in Chapter Three with Hermia as Lysander's soul and Romeo naming Juliet his soul. Hermione's situation demonstrates the results of ignoring the needs of one's soul, such

needs as love, truth, and life, as did Leontes. His false accusation, therefore, pushes him from his love for his wife and from her love for him, which, in turn, places his soul, literally Hermione, in a painfully loveless metaphoric and literal prison. During her trial, she responds truthfully about her actions even though Leontes angrily rebukes her, denies her words, and thereby endangers his soul of its very existence. Hermione, while serving Leontes' prescribed sentence in prison, gives birth to her daughter, Perdita, providing a means to preserve the family's wholeness. Leontes, though, refuses the child as his own, and, reinforcing his rejection, he also discards the parent-child relationship, commanding Antigonus to abandon her to die in some remote place. Soon after such cruelty, Shakespeare literally portrays the death of Leontes' soul when Paulina reports Hermione's death.

In diametric opposition to Hermione's presumed death, Perdita lives, rescued by a shepherd and nurtured to be a shepherdess. In Frye's "green world," she demonstrates a life in harmony with nature and with the Creator. Her return to Leontes in the last Act begins the healing in the family. In this light, Grantley calls Perdita's life a "strong association with Nature [. . .] with all its suggestions of natural virtue and harmony, growth, change, and healing" (242). Her conversation with Polixenes in Act IV, scene 4, further demonstrates her closeness to nature and her ability to function within its realm. In contrast to Perdita's return as healing the family, Hermione's much more powerful "resurrection" re-forms the family into the necessary balance for a healthy life—the balance among the members of the family emotionally, intellectually, physically, and spiritually. They now more perfectly reflect the balance within the Creator-created triad. In the play's last scene, Hermione performs the most important moment in the pursuit of

the human connection to the Creator—forgiveness and grace. Luther's *Soli* still echo in Shakespeare's plays.

The play about a man who loses every one of his family members based on his irrational beliefs and ensuing irrational decisions brings the idea of family into the spotlight. Orgel focuses on the family issues by addressing Shakespeare's presentation of the family, lamenting Shakespeare's focus on the dark side of marriage. Orgel argues that

[m]ost Shakespearean marriages of longer duration are equally disheartening, with shrewishness, jealousy and manipulateness the norm in comedy, and real destructiveness in tragedy[. . .] This is the dark side of the culture's institutionalization of marriage and patriarchy—what is striking is how little of the bright side Shakespeare includes. All the fun is in the wooing; what happens after marriage, between husbands and wives, parents and children, is a subject for tragedy. (674)

Leontes certainly reveals the dark side of marriage when he accuses his queen of infidelity based solely on a walk in his palace garden taken by Hermione and Polixenes, his childhood friend.

Jane Smiley views the play more positively than Orgel. She briefly draws a comparison between *Winter's Tale* and *King Lear*, stating that Shakespeare's later play answers his earlier play:

[. . .] Shakespeare wrote *The Winter's Tale* to answer *King Lear* with hope. The crucial difference between Leontes and Lear is that Leontes lives to regret and rethink his early selfish definition of love [. . .] and to accept the miracle of Hermione's revival. The play redefines love as a

miracle and a gift, which, once accepted, allows all things, not only reappearances and resurrections, but even total forgiveness. (178)

Understanding *Winter's Tale* as a means to portray hope brings to the play a reminder of marriage as a process. King Leontes requires sixteen years to understand his tragic error in judgment and to find his love for Hermione. Though audiences do not literally watch the process, the implication remains that marriage even with its miracles and gifts demands constant tending, echoing the same idea in the Creator-created triad. More than a focus on the dark side of marriage, the play offers a picture of moving from falseness to forgiveness then to healing rather than death—poor Cordelia's end. Leontes' initial jealous reaction to his mate's walk in the garden with his best friend later turns to contentment—in his reaction to the statue—and even to magnanimity—his finding a wife for Paulina in Camillo (5.3.90-91 and 143-47). Relationships can heal, but the healing may take many years—sixteen in the case of Leontes and Hermione.

As Hermione and Polixenes leave for their walk in the garden, her statement, “If you would seek us, / We are yours i' the garden” implies an innocence and openness that would draw most husbands to accompany their wives in the garden. Her words also recall the invitation of the Creator to the created to join His offered relationship with the divine—now in the new Garden of Eden (1.2.177-78). Leontes interprets Hermione's invitation negatively and says, “To your own bents dispose you. You'll be found, / Be you beneath the sky” (lines 179-80). His apparent sarcasm, expressed in the assumption that she may not be beneath the sky, implies that he only hears feigned innocence, even infidelity, in his queen's invitation to the garden, only multiplied by her irresistible offer to Polixenes to extend his stay with them. Through Leontes not entering the garden and

walking with them, the King literally refuses the opportunity to enjoy his wife's love for him or see her efforts to please him by gaining more time to spend with his childhood friend. Leontes loses much by not entering the garden.

His accusation against Hermione puzzles many scholars⁷² and shocks his court. One of those scholars, Belsey, in her analysis of depictions of the Garden of Eden on tombs, wood work, and needlework, explains a connection between his arbitrary accusation and his family. She interprets the play as oppositional to societal portrayals of the family, specifically as portrayed in tombs through which images offer respect for the family and a view of death as outside family life. Shakespeare's play does not separate death from the family; he portrays it within the family unit—hence, the surprise and shock among the scholars and Leontes' court. Belsey argues that

The Winter's Tale shows death invading the concord of the family unit, but unlike the tombs, the play locates death at the heart of the intimate relationship between the loving couple. *Unpredicted* and *arbitrary*, sexual jealousy dismantle a marriage. The *unaccountable* rage of Leontes violently displaces parental care, as Mamillius dies of grief and his newborn sister is exposed to die. (102; emphasis added)

Belsey locates two results of Leontes' foul accusation: death through murderous parenting and death through false accusation.

72. Grantley states, "Leontes is given no comprehensible reason for the onset of his jealousy" (240); Bloom states, "To see sexual jealousy and metaphysical nihilism as modes of tyranny has its own interest, but it still leaves dark the cause of Leontes' madness" (645). Laroque calls Leontes' madness "sudden," and "uncanny" (249). Belsey states, "The text of *The Winter's Tale* [. . .] simply shows Leontes at one moment courtly and romantic, and at the next, beside himself with grief and rage" (103).

Belsey's words, "unpredicted," "arbitrary," and "unaccountable," to describe the King's motiveless behavior, echo in Leontes' court, whose members express just as much shock as the scholars. For example, Camillo calls Leontes' allegation a "diseased opinion" and later tells Polixenes "'tis safer to / Avoid what's grown than question how 'tis born" (1.2.296 and 431-32). A Lord swears "that the Queen is spotless / I' th' eyes of heaven and to you—I mean in this which you accuse her" (2.1.132-34). Antigonus, too, supports the Queen: "For every inch of woman in the world, / Ay, every dram of woman's flesh is false, / If she be" (2.3.138-40). As Paulina delivers Leontes' daughter to him, their conversation associates the word "good" with Hermione nine times from line 58 to 66, not even ten lines. Even the oracle at Delphos⁷³ pronounces Hermione innocent and calls her "chaste" (3.2.132). It also pronounces him "a jealous tyrant," but he heeds neither the oracle nor anyone in his court (3.2.133). Leontes has more evidence against his accusation than for it, yet he persists in his belief to the point of ordering his baby daughter, whom he believes Polixenes fathered, abandoned in "some remote and desert place quite out / Of our dominions" (2.3.176-77). Leontes acts on fabrication, ignoring all advice and evidence.

Leontes' unwarranted behavior and cruel decisions demonstrate for some not only a literal lost belief in love, but also a spiritual problem in that not entering the new Garden of Eden creates irrationality. Leontes essentially loses his rational mind, apparently to jealousy, in addition to losing his ability to judge wisely. By refusing to enter the garden with Hermione—analogue to entering the new Garden of Eden—he

73. Milward explains Shakespeare's use of "Delphos" as a confusion of Delphi and Delos that he combined into one (*Papist* 261).

refuses to balance his irrational reaction with a rational evaluation of the situation. Unlike Lavinia in *Titus Andronicus*, his irrationality does not obscure a rational attempt to communicate; it causes death and his own punishment of sleeplessness and sixteen years of regret.

Leontes' refusal sullies Hermione's garden innocence. As a result, he enacts a second spiritual problem: refusing to recognize the difference between good and evil, a similar issue for King Lear. Leontes has no excuse for his lack of recognition because for the length of the play, no "gray area" exists—that is, no location exists in which good and evil are not easily defined. For example, Leontes harbors no doubt that Hermione committed adultery, but no one else in his court agrees—polar opposites. Good becomes Hermione's innocence, and Leontes' false accusation defines evil. The two completely opposite views set up a very clear demarcation between right and wrong or good and evil; one or the other belief is right or good, the other wrong or evil. With no character wavering in his or her belief about Hermione, the separation between good and evil solidifies to an absolute separation between good and evil. Another problem arises when Leontes refuses to evaluate his court's opposition; as a result, he converts her innocent garden walk with Polixenes to guile. He sees good as evil, no gray area and no separation—each the same; in other words, Hermione simultaneously exists as all good and all evil. With his vision hampered by his position outside the garden, good and evil become indistinguishable, even to the extent that one is the other or the two are one. If Leontes had walked with them in the garden, this particular problem might not have arisen.

Astute audience members may well have felt encouraged to entertain the notion that one either enters the new Garden of Eden—literally accepts Hermione’s innocence—or one does not—literally rejects her innocence; therefore, entering entails a recognition and acceptance of true goodness, whereas not entering results in evil, or rejecting the presence and invitation to goodness. This unquestionable spiritual division in Hermione’s garden, which, I postulate, no Shakespeare play has bifurcated so demonstrably to this point, clearly reflects the effects of the Reformation in England. For example, a person accepted Protestantism or he or she did not; even more devastatingly, however, one embraces good Protestant Christianity or one embraces evil idolatrous Catholicism. In relation to the new Garden of Eden, Leontes challenges the audience members to decide not between ways of worshipping but between following atemporal religion into the new Garden of Eden—an apparent reflection of goodness—or moving in the opposite direction, away from the new Garden and atemporal religion—an apparent reflection of evil.

With that bifurcation clearly presented, perceptive audience members are metaphorically prepared to enter the rural countryside—a terrible storm, a hungry bear, and Perdita’s discovery by a shepherd and a clown in Act III, scene 3. Bevington points out that moving from Leontes’ court through the storm and death by bear, Perdita’s rescue seems to result from the storm and bear—implying nature’s means to preserve Perdita. Bevington addresses the role of nature:

[. . .] [T]he daughter lives because of kindly human intervention, and perhaps through the intervention of nature as well: the famous bear that

pursues Antigonus offstage [. . .] and then proceeds (as we are told) to
gnaw on his shoulder bone chooses not to molest the child. (*Seven* 204)

Without nature's intervention, Perdita's rescue may not have occurred, precipitating her death. One of nature's roles in the Creator-created triad once again appears: its example of clearly recognizing the difference between good and evil and of acting in the presence of both, a characteristic first presented in *Lear*. Estrin describes a divine presence alongside an expression of nature. She writes, "The tempest, as a heavenly force, and the bear, as an earthly one, suggest that the rebirth in the last acts will come through a proper fusing of the heights and depths of nature—the divine strength and animal instinct in which Hermione persists and whereby her daughter flourishes" (29).⁷⁴ Perdita's life surrounded by nature positively builds toward Hermione's resurrection, connecting the mother and daughter on a spiritual level. Her life surrounded by nature offers an answer to the problematic situation in Hermione's garden—that nature offers a means to distinguish between good and evil.

The chorus, in Act IV, scene 1, moves the audience sixteen years into the future with Perdita, now as a young woman, appearing in scene 4. This scene evokes a varied scholarly covering that encompasses love, nature, family, and Catholicism. Bloom describes this scene as "amazingly long (840 lines) and contain[ing] the most beautiful of all Shakespearean pastoral courtships in its opening sequence, where Perdita and Florizel declare and celebrate their mutual passion" (653). Bloom's focus on the first 54 lines highlights the absolute opposite expressions between Hermione and Leontes. The

74. Estrin views this scene in the standard scholarly mode by presenting nature—specifically, the tempest—as divine, essentially as God's expression of self. Attributing divinity to nature reiterates the problem of combining or usurping the position of the Creator by the created—this time, apparently, by scholars. Such seemingly pantheistic ideology only clouds scholarly argument in this case.

audience members' experience of Perdita's sheep shearing festival offers them respite through a complete change from the irrational emotions expressed in previous scenes.

Belsey and Asquith build social and historical connections to Perdita. In her analysis of the social expression of the family in Elizabethan England, Belsey discusses the flower dialogue between Perdita and Polixenes (4.4.70-108). She focuses on the value of love in relation to the success of the nuclear family—Leontes' failure:

As I read Perdita's speech, it calls into question any simple polarity between the court and nature, true love and blindness, pathology and health. The desire it evokes [. . .] is driven by lack and precipitates loss [. . .] The text we have gives no indication that, even in its pastoral mode, love is a sure guarantee of the stability of the nuclear family. Indeed, desire seems an improbable basis for the discipline that marriage is expected to entail. (126-27)

Belsey's polarity forms not in a garden but within the nuclear family, between the passion of love and the discipline of love, both of which, she argues, engender a successful marriage. Her assumption, which extends to encompass the absence of either passion or discipline, would precipitate a failed marriage, which destroys the power of the nuclear family. For example, from Belsey's view, Leontes' passion evoked by his wife reveals the absence of the discipline of love—that constant work required to build trust and respect between the members of a committed relationship. He demonstrates his lack of love's discipline as he makes decisions based on love's passion, evoking in turn irrational expressions. Leontes harmful passion expressed as jealousy destroys his marriage. With Leontes' particular focus, Belsey's view offers another way to understand

the human member of the Creator-created triad. The internal struggle to maintain a balance between the rational and irrational often results in an external struggle between people, specifically those people within human relationships and the pairings those relationships create.

The historical reference that Asquith locates within the Perdita-Polixenes flower dialogue creates a subtle connection to the theological debate of Reformation England. She calls the dialogue “a charming pastoral debate” that reflects the Catholic attitude toward the new religion (257). She explains that the word “grafting” became

a metaphor for the way the new religion was seen by Catholics as a hostile parasite, altering the nature of the old[. . .] Shakespeare uses grafting in this same negative sense: the most famous example is the extended debate [. . .] in which the artless Perdita refuses to be persuaded of the virtues of grafting, in spite of pressure from her social and intellectual superiors.

(291, 292, and 293)

In *Perdita*, Asquith believes she observes Shakespeare’s true belief system that presents the Reformation as the destruction of England’s spiritual state, “its native state” (257). For her, Shakespeare presents the situation in England as “the threatened extinction of the country’s spirituality—still for Shakespeare and his patrons, the one paramount issue” (258). Such spiritual concerns obviously clarify when right before *Perdita*’s and *Leontes*’ eyes *Hermione* seems to resurrect from death. As a resonance of the resurrection of Jesus in the Christian Bible, *Hermione* brings forgiveness and healing to her family, to Sicilia, and metaphorically to England. From this perspective, Shakespeare’s coded message

invites, if not demands, a more rational, disciplined attitude toward the effects of the English Reformation than the passionate irrational behavior of execution and murder.

Another critical view of the flower debate returns sharply to its location within a nature setting. Egan views the debate as the most significant moment in the play. The length of the debate alone comprises one-quarter of the play and, for Egan, emphasizes a focus on flora not fauna. He argues that this focus “makes clear the play’s concern with agricultural production,” work located solely in nature (128).⁷⁵ He clarifies his statement later: “shepherds live from the sale of wool, not lamb” (179, note 18). Perdita handing out flowers, not plates of food, exemplifies Egan’s evaluation. More importantly Perdita’s care for the flowers adds further evidence for the respect created by the relationship between nature and people in the Creator-created triad.

None of these scholars addresses Polixenes disguising himself to attend the sheepshearing festival. He plans to discover the cause of his son’s absence from court and an explanation for Camillo’s concern that the prince has been “less frequent to his princely exercises / than formerly he hath appeared” (4.2.32-33). Under this pretense he does not enter Perdita’s home in nature as himself. In this way Polixenes recalls Leontes’ refusal to enter the garden and even Leontes’ irrational behavior when he recognizes his son, Florizel, at the festival. Polixenes, in essence, sneaks into the nature location for his own ends, much as Romeo enters the Capulet enclosed garden. In Leontes’ and Polixenes’ refusal to enter, and to enter truthfully, either Hermione’s garden or Perdita’s nature surroundings, Shakespeare’s plays communicate quite clearly that one must enter

75. Earlier in his book, Egan emphasizes a difference between the animal and plant world, using a story from the Bible. He writes “[. . .] [T]he story of Noah makes a strong distinction between the plant world, which is not rescued in the ark, and the animal kingdom, which is” (105). The implication being that the animal world apparently depends more upon the Creator than the plant world.

the new Garden of Eden truthfully and bare one's soul in the presence of the Holy. Less than such an attitude harms the individual and others. For example, Polixenes' behavior in the scene loses audience members' empathy. They quickly forget him as a misinterpreted and innocent bystander in Hermione's garden who literally had to run for his life. He also loses Florizel's respect, for he must flee the nature surroundings within which he feels comfortable to escape his father's murderous threats. In addition, Perdita must flee with him, losing the only location she has known, nature. Interestingly, Florizel and Perdita must don disguises in order to leave their nature surroundings. Polixenes sneaks into nature's location, and Florizel and Perdita sneak out. Only when all of the characters meet in Paulina's garden will cleansing and healing occur—the preparation provided by atemporal religion—to enter the new Garden of Eden.

Seeing Leontes' and Polixene's refusing to enter and noting Perdita's nature surroundings, Shakespeare's audience knows the cue: they are in the new Garden of Eden. First, Perdita's life recalls the first humans. Adam and Eve lived simply, charged only to tend and keep the garden with only one rule to remember—not to eat from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil (Genesis 2.15-17). Similarly, Perdita lives in a relatively uncomplicated fashion. Compared to life in the city, but especially at court, Shakespeare's audience members would likely experience her carefree life as a kind of return to the pastoral golden age and, by extension, to the ancient Garden of Eden. For example, tending her sheep has fewer hazards when compared to the literal problem of spiritual survival in Elizabethan England. In addition, viewing Perdita as a shepherdess, some audience members may well have experienced a subtle echo of the Good Shepherd,

a name that Jesus applied to Himself (John 10.11, 14). The audience surely would have noted this simulated Eden-like environment.

The audience hears the second cue when Perdita calls her garden “rustic,” highlighting it as a country, not city, garden (4.4.84). The word also means “simple or unsophisticated,” which recalls Luther’s teaching that the Creator does all the work in the Creator-created triad; that is to say, people have only one prerequisite to live a balanced life in the triad, and that is to accept the Creator’s provision for them and enter the new Garden of Eden within them. In addition, the word “rustic” evokes archetypal memories of Adam and Eve’s simple life of tending God’s garden despite the probability that it would live as created with or without their participation. Such evocation reinforces the power of Perdita’s garden in that it requires less from her to produce its beauty than, for example, Prince Henry’s. Perdita’s produces as the seasons allow, Prince Henry’s as he chooses. The implication of Prince Henry’s garden, that it manipulates nature in order to produce as and when he chooses, contrasts to Perdita’s garden. As she states in the flower debate, she has no interest in experimentation, detesting hybrids of any kind, either naturally occurring or manmade. Perdita quite simply knows her garden’s riches but expresses patience as she waits for the appropriate time for them to appear—“the fairest flow’rs o’ th’ season,” she calls them (4.4.81). She reflects Adam and Eve’s work in that ancient garden, patient and innocent and as yet unmarred by the Fall.

Her strong distaste for hybrids in particular contrasts sharply not only to Prince Henry’s tastes and Polixenes’ belief but also to the interests in nature occurring in London. The Elizabethan naturalists, as they explored nature and ways to understand and use it, manipulated their garden plants and any natural object to which they had access in

order to learn more or discern ways to employ nature's riches. Interestingly, their explorations and discoveries continued unabated by the English Reformation. Harkness states that "[a]t a time when most of Europe was locked in war over matters of religion and imperial ambition, the exchange of natural objects prompted an intellectual civility that stood in stark contrast to national disputes" (31). Shakespeare's use of stagescapes set in gardens and larger areas of nature, such as forests and heaths, therefore, spoke quite directly to his time. His Perdita, however, stands in opposition to, as referred to above, Harkness' "audible hum of activity" heard among the naturalists as well as to the bloodshed of the Henrician Reformation (20). Her garden offers welcome to visitors at her sheepshearing celebration and provides them with "rustic" beauty, one unadulterated by experiments of human manipulation, such as hybridism, or human bloodshed (4.4.84). So sharply contrasted to the pre-scientific-method means to explore nature, Perdita's garden clearly reinforces Shakespeare's nature scenes as presentations of religion and of the new Garden of Eden—especially with its balance between human logic and emotion.

Perdita's rational/irrational balance through her interaction with Florizel and the disguised Polixenes at the festival reveals the third cue. First, her interaction with Polixenes in the flower debate sharply contrasts her innocent and firm stand in nature to Polixenes' stand on human natural ability. He reflects the growing interest in nature among practitioners of natural science in London. In direct opposition to King Polixenes' life, Perdita's growth and development as surrounded by nature sets her unequivocally in the balanced relationship of the Creator-created triad. She respects the positions of nature and, thereby, of the Creator. On the other hand, Polixenes shows a human usurping nature's position. Egan interprets Polixenes' as saying because "human beings are

products of nature [. . .] anything they do must perforce be a natural act” (130). Egan quickly refutes Polixenes: “If everything is nature (or politics, or ideology), then nothing is, for the word has nothing from which to distinguish itself” (130). In other words, for Egan, humans cannot be nature without destroying both, as presented in Chapter Four through the insanity of Tom o’ Bedlam and Lear.

The disguised Polixenes, however, enacts the human belief, while sane, that dominating nature, even conquering it by proclaiming oneself nature, destroys the true position of humans to nature. In other words, in the position of conquerors the balance of the purposeful human partnership within the Creator-created triad fades disastrously quickly. People no longer enjoy the completion or wholeness of the relationship. In addition, Polixenes’ disguise causes him to miss any potential pleasure, but when he removes his disguise, the result of conquering nature blatantly appears—irrationality. His instant rage when he recognizes his son, Florizel, and realizes his unsanctioned plans causes him to remove his disguise. He not only reveals his physical presence but also his irrationality. After threatening Florizel and Perdita, however, he abruptly leaves. Without his disguise he can no longer stay in Perdita’s garden. The contrast between his irrationality and his location in nature obstructs the Creator-created triad. With his behavior, Polixenes also replays Leontes’ irrationality but does so from within the garden and his dishonest entry. He must leave.

Florizel offers yet another means to illustrate Perdita’s balance. In her interactions with him, her expressions of love recall Juliet’s with Romeo. Juliet addresses their situation more logically than Romeo in her early interactions with him in that he speaks love, but she speaks caution. Perdita, too, rationally states their situation in her “I told

you so” speech: “How often have I told you ’twould be thus? / How often said my dignity would last / But till ’twere known?” (4.4.477-79). Her words imply that at some point outside the temporal setting of the play, she and Florizel have spoken about the consequences of or the fears about their love and their future. She thinks in that logical manner demonstrated by Juliet during similar conversations with Romeo.⁷⁶ In addition, Perdita remaining alive while Juliet dies offers audience members the option to examine the results of Perdita’s balance and understand that her method, more unwavering than Juliet’s, leads to healing and to a harmonious life.

Another portrayal of Perdita’s balance appears in Florizel’s apparent irrational decision-making in answer to Camillo’s cautionary statement to “be advised” (4.4.484). Florizel’s response reveals that his “fancy”⁷⁷ advises him. He says,

I am [advised], and by my fancy. If my reason
Will thereto be obedient, I have reason;
If not, my senses, better pleased with madness,
Do bid it welcome. (4.4.485-88)

Proclaiming “fancy,” or “desire,” as his drive, he clearly positions himself in the irrational state of mind. Unlike Romeo, however, Florizel’s plan for their new life ends in success, not death. Then, when the two arrive in Sicilia, Paulina’s garden fulfills their

76. Juliet, however, also expresses an irrational state of mind by following Romeo’s irrational plan that actually ends in their deaths, not the happy life they intended.

77. *No Fear Shakespeare: Merchant of Venice* translates “fancy” into “desire” in Act II, scene 2, page 3 (line 63 in Bevington, *Complete*). Foakes explains that the five wits or “five faculties of the mind [parallel] the five senses. Malone noted that in *The Pastime of Pleasure* (1517), by Stephen Hawes, they are identified as common wit, imagination, fantasy, estimation, and memory [*EETS (Early English Text Society)*, No. 173, page 108]” (Foakes 275, n. 57). In addition, the etymology for “fancy” includes “fantasy”—a wild, visionary fancy—and “imagination”—a mental image or arbitrary idea. Florizel’s word choice certainly connects him to the irrational state of mind and apparently drives his relationship with Perdita.

dreams of marriage and wraps healing around Leontes and Hermione. Belsey observes the implication of nature in Perdita and Florizel's marriage, stating that "The marriage of the children (Perdita and Florizel), it is implied, grounded in nature and mutual respect, will succeed where their parents failed" (121). Though not shown on Shakespeare's stage, their presumed successful marriage promises that the balance within each human extends to the balance between humans and also to their position in the Creator-created triad. When Florizel takes Perdita to Sicilia as Camillo suggests, Paulina's garden becomes their destiny.

The last scene of *Winter's Tale* occurs in Paulina's garden. Recalling several mannerist royal gardens, such as Robert Cecil's Theobalds and Hampton House, hers offers many delights and wonders. Leontes says, "Your gallery / Have we passed through, not without much content / In many singularities" (5.3.10-12). Bevington defines "singularities" as "rarities, curiosities," which bring to the stage Elizabethan London's fascination with movement in gardens; the Italian Renaissance now blooms in England (*Complete* 1523, n. 12). Only in this kind of garden, where the reality of nature magically allures people through entries into grottos of imaginary places, can Hermione's reappearance, or resurrection, occur.

Through mannerist gardens, humans reach to nature, building into it or around it a means to hear it, even to experience it; through Renaissance engineering and mechanical expressions, they aid nature, not subdue it or try to become it. Strong explains that court masques, however, often portrayed gardens as "wild nature tamed by art" (92 and 102). He further explains, though, that visitors experienced the gardens of late Renaissance Italy as "setting[s] first and foremost for sudden and miraculous mechanical

metamorphoses” (79). Nature acts as a location in which these created wonders speak to humans in their own language. Using hydraulic and solar energy,⁷⁸ these engineers and garden architects, such as Inigo Jones, Mountain Jennings, and Saloman de Caus, practiced a means for static objects to move and speak surrounded by gardens. Strong explains that “a tradition central to late Renaissance garden making [. . .] [was] automata. De Caus’s gardens, which feature giants and grottos, speaking statues and water organs, mobile sculptures and startling hydraulic effects, belong to the Renaissance rediscovery of the mechanics of the School of Alexandria” (75). Water works, solar energy, even fire enlivened the gardens, delighted humans, and the communication provided for nature evoked awe and even speechlessness.

That speechlessness and other reactions fill Paulina’s garden and evoke her power. For example, she must prod awestruck Leontes to speak (5.3.23). Perdita, enacting another example of the garden effects, kneels in her amazement and asks for a blessing from her mother’s statue. She says, “And give me leave, / And do not say ‘tis superstition, that / I kneel and then implore her blessing. Lady, / [*kneeling*] Dear Queen, that ended when I but began, / Give me that hand of yours to kiss” (lines 42-46). Before she can touch the statue, Paulina stops her, explaining that “The statue is but newly fixed; the color’s / Not dry” (47-48). Paulina also stops Leontes when he attempts to kiss the statue (80-83).

In every way she controls reactions and, further, withholds the truth from Hermione’s family, to the point of demanding they leave if they do not want to see even

78. De Caus took over work in Robert Cecil’s Hatfield House garden in November, 1610. Here he created a fountain involving “a huge rock with a reclining river god and the figure of Fame on the top, who sounded her trumpet by means of a hydraulic organ within the rock operated by solar energy” (Strong 105).

more amazing feats. She promises that she can make the statue move and even speak, but commands “It is required / You do awake your faith” (5.3.94b-95). The word “faith” implies “trust” but also “belief or principle.” With Paulina’s command, Luther’s *Sola Fida* sighs on stage—for only God gives faith to humans as a gift that allows belief and trust in God. Paulina quickly awakes her audience, and Shakespeare’s, to a spiritual perspective. In addition to *Sola Fida*, Hermione’s resurrection and ensuing return to her husband and daughter easily invites a comparison to the Christian foundational belief that Jesus resurrected from the dead and returned to His disciples for a time then bodily ascended into heaven.

Shakespeare’s Paulina firmly turns heads toward awe-inspiring ability provided by faith. Her acts seem to echo Jesus’ demonstrations of and his disciples’ given ability to raise several apparently dead people. To parallel her ability to that of Jesus and his disciples, Paulina objects to any accusation that she acts through the assistance of “wicked powers” (5.3.90-91). Grantley supports her, stating that “Paulina is probably the most straightforward moral figure of all in *The Winter’s Tale*” (242). In addition, he explains that “Not only is she a powerful creation but she is Shakespeare’s own and is not found in Greene’s story,” a demonstrated source for the play (242). As his own creation, Shakespeare changes Greene’s story to fit the Elizabethan audience for which he writes and the message he portrays.

This last garden builds an enticing picture of the healed relationship among the members of the Creator-created triad. The garden provides the setting, the engineer provides the statue, and Paulina provides the life. Here all three members of the triad—nature, human, and Creator—perform in concert. The almost perfect picture of the New

Garden of Eden ends the play, including, through Paulina's demand for awakened faith, a demonstration of atemporal religion.

The gardens of *Winter's Tale* delineate the effects of nature on human beliefs and behavior. For example, Hermione's garden reveals a need for rationality and the knowledge and understanding appropriate to enter her Garden and metaphorically the new Garden of Eden. Perdita's demonstrates existence in the new Garden and a brief demonstration of the balance between the irrational and rational states of mind while there. Last, Paulina's garden expresses the power of the Creator to heal, teach, and demonstrate humanity's place in the Creator-created triad. This last garden, furthermore, combines Hermione's and Perdita's into Paulina's, thereby revealing the wonders of human relations among each other, nature, and the Creator. In the next play, an isolated island serves as a place of nature in its barest sense and offers a location which reduces people to their true character essence all of this under the tutelage of a man who acts in concert with nature and the Holy. Bushnell, using more secular terms, lauds *The Tempest* as Shakespeare's "ultimate achievement in presenting the natural world and the supernatural side by side, in stressing the essential validity of each, and in echoing the ineffable sphere-musics (sic) that arise from their harmonious interplay" (698). The joy and wonder of the Creator-creator triad would surely evoke glorious music.

The Tempest

The Lord Almighty will come
with thunder, and earthquake and great noise,
with windstorm and tempest and flames of a devouring fire.

(Isaiah 29.6; NKJV)

In the reading I advance here, *The Tempest* portrays the many facets of living in the new Garden of Eden as similar to previous locations. For example, people require other people and, therefore, must still maintain and enjoy relationships with others. Families still have demands. Enemies still seem able to rattle even the safest and most peaceful places and states of mind. No matter a person's location, he or she cannot ignore physical needs. Most significantly for this play, choices require decisions. *The Tempest* presents a man living in the new Garden of Eden who must make a very difficult decision between forgiving and avenging. Prospero has the rare opportunity to avenge the wrongs committed against him but chooses to forgive instead. Shakespeare's *Tempest* reminds his audience that every person has the choice to forgive; however, similarly to Prospero, his or her decision proves more successful when in concert with nature and the Creator.

Prospero on his island of exile has lived literally very closely to nature, so close in fact that he has learned how to understand its magical qualities and even successfully work in concert with them to perform similar magic, such as storms, controlling people's perceptions, and even sending "spirits" to teach his enemies. His magic does no harm as Bloom states, "No one is harmed in the play, and forgiveness is extended to all" (673). He does not hide his acts or use the eye of a newt. Bushnell explains that his magical deeds occur in cooperation with nature; however, he also observes that Prospero's ability carried certain connotations in the late sixteenth century. He explains that Prospero's magic occurs

[. . .] in the full light of the sun, with the harmonious cooperation of the forces of nature, and they are not works of devils and fays but of a benevolent philosopher, a man[. . .] The naturalness of Prospero's magic

becomes even more striking when we remember the fantastic treatments of the supernatural that were common in Elizabethan days and even in Shakespeare's earlier plays. In the opinions of the dramatist's contemporaries, all sorcery was the work of the powers of darkness, not to be accomplished save with the devil's aid. (689)

This affirmed association with nature rather than with evil implies the opposite association, one with the divine.

Such ability could provide Prospero with the opportunity for anything; however, he only uses his magic for good purposes, specifically to remind his enemies of their evil deeds. According to Walter, Prospero "use[s] the island's intrinsic power to bring hidden motives into the open and to restore memory, for to have their lives [his enemies] made whole, the conspirators must imaginatively reexperience [sic] crucial moments when their natural feelings and consciences were insensible" (67). Prospero could simply destroy them. This play addresses men's and women's free will more simply and starkly than evidenced in any other Shakespearean play. In fact, his audience members, now fully primed for the spiritual concepts apparent in his plays, clearly discern Luther's *Sola Gratia* and *Sola Fida*. Prospero tangibly accepts these gifts, and with that faith and grace he accepts his own forgiveness from the Creator. To express his gratitude, Prospero emulates the Creator's forgiveness and forgives his enemies.

Prospero's act of forgiveness occurs within the first 28 lines of Act V, scene 1. He answers Ariel's quiet and simple belief with affirmation. That decision draws much critical attention. No one denies that Prospero has his enemies in the perfect place for revenge. They deposed him, and along with his baby daughter, they set him adrift in an

unseaworthy vessel to survive as they may. He now has on his island the people who perpetrated this act. In addition, they have none of the protection that they might have as royalty in Milan. He literally can do to them as he will.

While telling his story to Miranda, he reveals one piece of information, however, that explains, in part, his decision to forgive his enemies. At one point, Miranda asks, “How came we ashore?” Prospero answers, “by Providence divine” (2.2.159-60). Bevington’s Prospero “does allow for the role of a larger Providence beyond that sphere of his Island-theater” (*Seven* 218). In addition, however, Prospero’s admission given with no hesitation brings to light that he intimately knows the influence of the Creator, on both nature and humans. With this admission, no audience member or modern critic need entertain Prospero’s reasons for forgiving his enemies. He simply acts and reflects Adam and Eve’s prelapsarian existence in the original Garden of Eden.

As another example, when Ariel returns from the site of the shipwreck in Act I, scene 2, Prospero asks twice about the victims. He first asks if the ship had wrecked very far from shore to which Ariel offers his assurance of the men’s safety. Prospero asks again, “But are they, Ariel, safe?” (line 217). Ariel again assures him that “Not a hair perished” and that even their clothing had suffered nothing, even being “fresher than before” (ll. 218 and 220). Prospero’s honest concern for the shipwrecked people—his enemies—foreshadows his act of forgiveness. In my interpretation, *The Tempest* offers a portrayal of a person living in the new Garden of Eden; even these inhabitants, like Prospero, continue to express their free will.

Through that freedom, they may continue to express characteristics that often exemplify contradictions to their surroundings. For example, Prospero possesses the

ability and the desire to destroy his enemies but also the wisdom and the capacity to forgive. His actions from the beginning of the play imply that he will exact revenge; however, he forgives instead. Bloom believes that the widely divergent characters, Prospero, Ariel, and Caliban, and the powerful magic portrayed on the island intrigue readers and viewers. He says, “Part of *The Tempest*’s permanent fascination for so many play-goers and readers, in a myriad of national cultures, is its juxtaposition of a vengeful magus who turns to forgiveness, with a spirit of fire and air, and a half-human of earth and water” (666). First calling Prospero “a vengeful magus,” Bloom later says that “No one is harmed in the play, and forgiveness is extended to all” (666 and 673). These statements imply that as a man with supernatural or magical powers, Prospero has no impetus to forgive; in other words, no one to force his forgiveness. Prospero’s forgiveness, therefore, emanates from his free will. Bevington emphasizes that Prospero still has a difficult decision. He points out that to forgive no matter the difficulty permits Prospero to “acknowledg[e] his own human frailty as well” (*Seven* 216). That acknowledgment further supports Prospero’s familiarity with the divine and the effects of the human condition on that relationship. In fact, a focus on human frailty reminds people that they must vigilantly tend their relationships in the Creator-created triad. Human free will still affects those relationships and any life in the new Garden of Eden. Atemporal religion, providing the means for people to often understand and act on that understanding, also offers people the ability to live in the new Garden and to maintain that new existence.

Prospero’s turning point, when he orally expresses his decision to forgive, occurs immediately after Ariel’s softly spoken assessment of the men under Prospero’s control.

He and Ariel have just sent spirit dogs after Caliban and his murderous crew, which prompts Prospero's last speech of Act IV, scene 1: "At this hour. Lies at my mercy all mine enemies" (lines 264b-65). The very next speeches, at the beginning of Act V, portray a servant's courage to tell his master the truth—echoing the master gardener in *Richard II*. Their conversation depicts the work of atemporal religion. Ariel begins the conversation:

ARIEL. Your charms so strongly works 'em
That if you now beheld them your affections
Would become tender.

PROSPERO. Dost thou think so, spirit?

ARIEL. Mine would, sir, were I human. (5.1.16-19)

In director Julie Taymor's 2011 movie version of *The Tempest*, Prospero is female, "Prospera," played by Helen Mirren. With arms folded, Prospera looks at Ariel, then looks at the sea. Taymor's direction for this scene emphasizes that Prospero(a) made his decision thoughtfully. He asks for confirmation, considers, and then replies:

PROSPERO.

And mine shall.

Hast thou, which art but air, a touch, a feeling
Of their afflictions, and shall not myself,
One of their kind, that relish all as sharply
Passion as they, be kindlier moved than thou art? (ll. 20-24)

Respectfully, he compares his attitude toward his enemies to Ariel's attitude. He finds his attitude lacking and confronts himself:

Though with their high wrongs I am struck to th' quick,

Yet with my nobler reason 'gainst my fury

Do I take part. The rarer action is

In virtue than in vengeance. (ll. 25-28a)

“Reason” rises in this play not as a balance to irrationality but as the noble attitude.

Significantly, Prospero demonstrates that life in the new Garden of Eden still requires the direction of atemporal religion as a reminder for human attention to “that still small voice,”⁷⁹ in this case, Ariel, and to tend—as in tending a garden—the personal relationship with the Divine in the Creator-created triad. Prospero strengthens that relationship through his noble rationality and behavior as he grasps “the rarer action.”

Ariel’s effect on Prospero occurs so easily in part because he has earned Prospero’s respect. He never hesitates to obey Prospero, and, never questioning the commands, he expertly performs them. For example, at Prospero’s behest, Ariel creates a significant effect in Act III, scene 3. He provides food for the castaways with “strange shapes, bringing in a banquet, and dance about it with gentle actions of salutations; and, inviting the King, etc., to eat, they depart” (line 20 sd). Then Ariel, however, suddenly appears as a harpy, which Bevington describes as “a fabulous monster with a woman’s face and breasts and a vulture’s body, supposed to be a minister of divine vengeance” (*Complete* 1548, note 52 sd). For control and emphasis he interrupts the men’s advance on the table and “clap[ing] his wings on the table [. . .] the banquet disappears” (line 52 sd). The harpy Ariel condemns Alonso, Sebastian, and Antonio for their evil treatment of Prospero and explains the results of their foul deeds. He says:

79. I Kings 19.12—“And after the earthquake a fire; but the LORD was not in the fire: and after the fire *a still small voice*.” Another example from Isaiah 30.21 says, “Whether you turn to the right or to the left, your ears will hear *a voice behind you*, saying, “This is the way; walk in it” (emphasis added, NIV).

You three
From Milan did supplant good Prospero;
Exposed unto the sea, which hath requit⁸⁰ it,
Him and his innocent child; for which foul deed
The powers, delaying, not forgetting, have
Incensed the seas and shores, yea, all the creatures,
Against your peace. (4.1.69-75)

Ariel tells them that the sea shipwrecked them to avenge Prospero and Miranda, but in addition all the creatures will prevent their peace. Now the harpy Ariel shows the power of nature in balance with the Creator. He speaks for the heavens.

This speech invites a closer examination of Ariel, especially of his presumed power and his knowledge that all the creatures will prevent any peace for them. One word he uses, “powers,” provokes an explanatory note from Bevington. He calls the “powers,” to which Ariel refers, “heavenly powers” (*Complete* 1549, n. 79). He also describes Ariel as “immortal” (*Seven* 212). Bloom calls Ariel a “sprite or angel” (663). Hall validates Bloom’s reference, stating, “He [Ariel] can be taken, too, for the messenger of God, for his description is compatible with that of Psalm 104.4, which is quoted in Hebrews 1.7: ‘Who maketh his angels spirits, and his ministers a flame of fire.’ His representation both as a ‘flaming one’ and as a singer fit angelic descriptions” (66). She also finds the word, Ariel, in Isaiah 29.1 and explains that it means “City of David,” which, Hall argues, would bring to mind “Bethlehem,” also called the City of David (66).

80. “Requit” means “avenged,” according to Bevington (*Complete*, 1549, note 71).

More significantly, however, the name also appears in the marginalia of *The Geneva Bible*. Shakespeare may have known this explication of “Ariel” in Isaiah 29.1: “The Hebrew word Ariel signifies the lion of God and signifies altar, because the altar seemed to devour the sacrifice that was offered to God, as Ezek. 41,6 (sic)” (*Geneva*, updated with today’s spelling).⁸¹ The biblical significance of this name, Ariel, and its relative obscurity—one must really look to find it—strengthen the belief that Shakespeare read the Bible but even further strongly supports the notion that he studied it closely. His use of the contemporary expectation for coded messages and his knowledge of the Bible lend great significance to *Tempest*. They also bestow on Shakespeare the ability, in addition to the desire, to create stories about the new Garden of Eden and the peace and healing available there.

Another prominent character in the play, Caliban, behaves much differently than Ariel or any of the other characters in the play. He acts based purely on emotion. He expresses mainly anger toward Prospero and Miranda, whom he considers interlopers.⁸² For example, he angrily curses Prospero for interrupting his sexual attack on Miranda and his desire to “peopl[e] else / This isle with Calibans” (1.2.353-54a). She replies calling him “abhorrent slave” (1.2.354b). Caliban curses Miranda for teaching him to speak. To these examples of Caliban’s attitude and behavior Miko argues that “It is tempting, but I think too neat, to identify Caliban with some sort of reality principle, evil itself, or perhaps original sin” (15). Prospero, however, regularly punishes Caliban with physical

81. In his *Study Bible*, John MacArthur’s explication of Isaiah 29.1 states, “Ariel. The word means ‘lion of God,’ referring to the City’s strength, and perhaps ‘hearth of God,’ referring to the place where the altar of God always burns. Verses 7, 8 (sic) show this to be a name for Jerusalem . . .” (NKJV, 1997).

82. To the idea that Caliban represents colonized men, Bloom says, “Marxists, multiculturalists, feminists, nouveau historicists—the usual suspects—know their causes but not Shakespeare’s plays” (662).

discomforts and later calls him “a devil, a born devil, on whose nature / Nurture can never stick” (4.1.188-189).

With Trinculo and Stephano, however, he finds a means to kill Prospero and be free. In this scene Asquith imbues Caliban with religious conviction, comparing him to “the early Levellers and the German peasants who rebelled in the 1520s inspired by Luther’s doctrines” and calling him “a visionary who hates his enslavement and joins the rabble [Trinculo and Stephano] to overthrow his cruel master” (268). Ariel’s actions prevent the “rabble’s” plan, but, according to Bloom, he probably would not have had to do anything. Bloom explains that, “Cast out by Prospero, Caliban bides his time but will be too fearful to bite[. . . .] Half a Wild Man, half a sea beast, Caliban has his legitimate pathos, but he cannot be interpreted as being somehow admirable” (665). Asquith equates Caliban with the so-called noble savage, admirable or not. She writes, “Caliban belongs to the great contemporary debate about the moral nature of savages, of deep interest to those like Prince Henry and the Earl of Southampton who were investing in voyages to the new world” (269).

Caliban has another side that deepens the spiritual picture. In the scenes with Trinculo and Stephano, two victims of the shipwreck, he expresses fear, curiosity, awe, and jubilation. First, though, he demonstrates his fear of the power that Prospero projects. When Caliban sees Trinculo, he believes that Prospero has sent one of his spirits to “torment” him. For his solution, he says, “I’ll fall flat. / Perchance he will not mind me” (2.2.16-17). He simply lies down. He has no contingency plan. He just shivers. He portrays the results of the interaction between his limited knowledge and his even more limited direction for it; he just hopes Trinculo will not see him.

Of course, he sees Caliban, and as the scene progresses Shakespeare's audience watches as Caliban interprets the new people on the island. First, based on his experience of Stephano's liquor, he calls Stephano "a brave god" (2.2.117). Later the audience hears his words again with Miranda's last words of the play, her pronouncement of a "brave new world" (5.1.185). Unlike Miranda, who never speaks again in the play, Caliban follows his assertion with action. Kneeling to "god" Stephano, he says, "I'll swear upon that bottle to be / thy true subject, for the liquor is not earthly" (2.2.124-25). For all Prospero's experience with nature and spirituality, he has offered little information to Caliban that would aid his spiritual decision-making. The "monster," as Trinculo calls him, worships the first entity that offers physical stimulation, in this case drunkenness and protection. The scene moving through fear, confusion, drunkenness, and Caliban's attempt to kiss Stephano's feet ends in exuberant celebration (lines 147; 178-85). In fact, at the end of Act II, scene 2, filled with too much of Stephano's wine, Caliban believes he has found freedom with Stephano as his new master. Stephano calls him a "brave monster" as he watches Caliban's celebration (line 186). Though Stephano, too, follows his assessment with action, audience members hear his words again in Miranda's "brave new world."

The play engenders two wildly different impressions of Caliban—one dark and dangerously close to murder; the other curious, worshipful, joyful, full of song, and willing to give his untried spiritual ability to anyone offering not only a new physical experience and protection but also the potential to gain his freedom. Perception significantly affects Caliban. He sees and he believes—echoing Othello's demand. Miko comments on perception: "Behavior is controlled largely by controlling perception,

emphasizing that the world is as it is seen” (9). Caliban sees Stephano and accepts him as a god. Bushnell explains that *Tempest* invites more than just allegory because it invites belief in the wonder of just being alive. He explains that the play “is a profound revelation of the marvels of existence, and of the moral enlightenment to be derived from the perception of those marvels” (698). Caliban’s realization that he could have freedom truly produces marvel. He expresses amazement when he realizes that Trinculo and Stephano have no plans to harm him.

That marvelous perception sends him to a spiritual experience no matter how misunderstood. Bloom broadens the effect of perception, saying that “The audience perhaps begins to understand that perspective governs everything on Prospero’s island” (677). Interestingly, Fitz addresses the equation of perception by considering the effects of optimism and pessimism. He writes that “one’s view of the island really depends on whether one is disposed towards optimism or pessimism” (44). Caliban sees the island as his; meeting Stephano, in particular, replaces his anger with a more optimistic outlook—the belief that he can reclaim the island.

Ariel strongly affects these two sides of Caliban. Described earlier as immortal, an angel, and even providing an echo of the city of the Christ’s birth, his behavior toward Caliban brings the “monster” peace and even rapture. In Act III, scene 2, as the “rabble” approach Prospero’s cave, the three hear inexplicable sounds. Stephano expresses false bravado commanding the player to reveal himself (lines 130-31). Trinculo, on the other hand, confesses his sins (l. 132). Caliban offers them an explanation, apparently hoping to calm them. He beautifully describes the sounds and dreams that calm and fill him with peace and, at times, even longing:

Be not afeard. The isle is full of noises,
Sounds and sweet airs, that give delight and hurt not.
Sometimes a thousand twangling instruments
Will hum about mine ears, and sometimes voices
That, if I then had waked after long sleep,
Will make me sleep again; and then, in dreaming,
The clouds methought would open and show riches
Ready to drop upon me, that when I waked
I cried to dream again. (ll. 137-45)

The words “noises,” “twangling,” and “voices” imply messages that Ariel communicates. Often in his work Ariel uses all kinds of music and sounds. These messages confuse Caliban, so his response evokes descriptions of the messages as just noise or even cacophony. The phrase “twangling instruments / will hum about my ears” exposes a disconnection from the experience. Neill explains that in *Tempest* “the moral conflict [. . .] is repeatedly figured and played out in aural terms” (480). In this speech Caliban apparently attempts to avoid that conflict or at the very least not understand it or even accept its existence. Miko understands Caliban to “only show us that moral ideals exist in an imperfect world[. . .] [Such] can be seen as a reflection [. . .] of the need for grace, or help, or even a civilized culture to keep evil (both natural and unnatural) in check” (3). Caliban probably must hear the message, or the “moral ideal,” expressed in these sounds because his description remains external and that they never actually enter his ears to engage his thought patterns. Audience members could almost imagine Caliban with his hands over his ears during those sounds.

He reflects some people's reaction to similar situations. They reject them and attempt to protect themselves from the unknown or even the pain caused by the message. The scene demonstrates, however, that those sounds, as uncomfortable as they are, do become quiet in the presence of "that still small voice"; moreover, as Caliban's voices "make [him] sleep again," so will the people in the new Garden of Eden.⁸³ Demonstrating the different tones of communication within the Creator-created triad encourages patience, unlike Caliban's petulant reaction, for it brings answers, direction, and reconciliation.

Prospero probably does not know of the interaction between his servant and his slave. He cannot hear such sounds that nature speaks to Caliban and that Ariel creates. Neill explains that "there are [. . .] measures that he [Prospero] cannot hear: the noises and sounds, to which Caliban responds with such uncharacteristically tender lyricism, may be of quite another order than those [of] 'rough magic' ([5.1.]50)[. . .] The implication here [. . .] is of a harmony intrinsic to the very order of nature itself" (44 and 57). The idea that Prospero does not hear and, therefore, cannot know reminds audience members of the often unseen and uncelebrated spiritual effects in human lives. The relationship among Ariel, Caliban, and Prospero portrays the balance within the human psyche—irrational and rational, including confusion, fear, and anger—that nature exemplifies and the Creator offers in the new Garden of Eden. Ariel—immortal, angel, air and fire—balances the relationship between Prospero and Caliban and, furthermore, encourages the very holy act of forgiving one's enemies. Supporting the idea of the balanced relationship, Miko argues for equality among them. He says that "[w]ith many

83. I Kings 19.12

others I think Caliban should be promoted from a natural man, or a brute man, to Natural Man, and maybe even be Us” (13). Seeing Caliban as “us” creates a thought-provoking situation: all people, whether a Caliban or not, require an Ariel. The interpretation of the intertwined relationships of the Creator-created triad promoted here portrays such need. In addition, accepting that portrayal allows spiritual peace to reign, as it does for Caliban. *Sola Fida* floats onto the stage again.

One last set of symbols repeats in the play—Prospero’s books and his staff. Both represent his pursuit of knowledge, but that pursuit takes him off course. People who lose their direction and leave their reason create an imbalance in the Creator-created triad and ignore, or at least disturb, their spiritual life in the new Garden of Eden. The knowledge Prospero’s books provide presents in two ways in the play. First, they teach him to work with nature. Bushnell explains that “By solitary meditation over these volumes Prospero has at last learned to work in harmony with the forces of human and external nature; these books are the sole sources of his power” (689). Second, Prospero’s exclusive pursuit of it, however, takes his Dukedom from him. He admits that “[he] prizes [them] above [his] dukedom”; so instead of behaving as a ruler, he gives his ducal responsibilities to his brother, Antonio, and buries himself in his books, to some extent recalling an Ostrich’s reaction to fear (1.2.168-67). He literally trusted someone else to act his part in ruling his dukedom, metaphorically abandoning his spiritual responsibility in order to garner information about that responsibility. He behaves as the Apostle James’ “hearer only”—that is, an attempt to enjoy a personal relationship with the Creator by listening only, not practicing with, engaging, or acting on the words (James 1.23, NIV).

Prospero's staff, on the other hand, implies using the knowledge. It recalls the tools of teaching. Teachers sometimes point to significant information on a chalk or marker board or even on a screen; they may tap with one to gain attention; they may even use one as a talking stick, passing it around the classroom to indicate who has control of the discussion at any given moment. A staff / pointer used in the play as a magician's tool permeates the act of teaching with magic. Prospero, however, abandons teaching and replaces it with sovereign rule—his actual intended position. This act wonderfully separates the arts of teaching from ruling in Prospero's decision; he continues, however, to direct his audience members to the workings of and toward an individual and personal relation with the Creator. He shows that people can live a wonderful existence in the new Garden of Eden.

For Prospero to return to his true position, he realizes that he must destroy his book, now apparently one book, and his staff. He does so with solemnity but also with a sense of loss. Bloom states that "[l]eaving the enchanted isle is not in itself a loss for Prospero, but breaking his staff and drowning his book certainly constitute diminishments to the self" (667). Both, however, have led him away from his true person, so he must abjure both. Greenblatt explains that "*The Tempest* is a play not about possessing absolute power but about giving it up[. . .] [B]ecause something about the power that Prospero wields, though wielded in the name of justice and legitimacy, order and restoration, is dangerous [. . .] more than an ordinary mortal should have" (374-75). In a charmed circle, a very tangible representation of spirituality, Prospero states

... I'll break my staff,

Bury it certain fathoms in the earth,

And deeper than did ever plummet sound

I'll drown my book. (5.1.54-57)

Breaking his staff literally strengthens his connection to the Creator-created triad. His drowning the book, then, portrays the act of baptism, the immersion in water to cleanse and to publicly show the acceptance of a new life; for Christians that acceptance leads to the new life offered by the Creator through the sacrifice of His son—literally taken to mean the Creator sacrifices Himself to return to a relationship with His creation. Prospero chooses to return to his the life he was born to live.

Though the play does not offer a depiction of the life Prospero and Miranda will live in Milan, it does give the audience a hint. At three points in the last scene, Prospero expresses dark emotions. His release of Ariel demonstrates a result of his new direction. In the last words of the play, before the Epilogue, Prospero says, “to the elements / Be free, and fare thou well!” (lines 320-21). Despite their closeness and Prospero confirming his love for Ariel, the magical spirit leaves without another word or even a backwards glance. His longings for freedom finally fulfilled, he returns to purposeful living without regrets, questions, or misgivings.

The next hint reveals Prospero's attitude toward humans. Miranda expresses awe and amazement, when she sees Alonso, Gonzalo, and the others. She says the much quoted lines,

Oh, wonder!

How many goodly creatures are there here!

How beauteous mankind is! Oh, brave new world

That has such people in 't! (lines 183-86)

Her purity and innocence weave through her words. Her life has drastically changed in an extremely brief period. For example, she experiences love for the first time through Ferdinand; she sees a new protectiveness in her father and his blessings; now so many men appear in her presence that she cannot contain her reaction to the stimulus. Her awe overwhelms her, but Prospero's reaction does not support her. He simply comments, "'Tis new to thee" (line 186). His cynical expression may escape Miranda, but Shakespeare's audience would not miss it. In Taymor's direction for this scene, Helen Mirren's "Prospera" fills these lines with sarcasm and even a whisper of jealousy. Her artistic direction places wonderful emphasis on a problem: Prospero cannot return to the place in his life when innocence and purity created moments of pure delight and awe. In fact, he will no longer live in a place that could possibly evoke such expressions. He returns to Milan to rule as he should.

Last, Prospero reveals a kind of depression if not a death wish. Prospero says that he will, "retire me to my Milan, where / Every third thought shall be my grave" (lines 314-15). Free will complicates any human spirituality. Shakespeare's Prospero, though living in the new Garden of Eden, still experiences grief, which may move him to anger, or to pretend that the disappointment never happened. He, however, likely will accept the validity of leaving his island and quitting his magic to reacquaint himself with his responsibilities to his duchy and on a deeper level to the Creator-created triad.

I see *The Tempest* as giving Shakespeare's audiences an opportunity to view people living in the new Garden of Eden. Their behavior though shown only in a limited time frame—probably about two days based on his promise to free Ariel in that time period—allows audience members to glimpse living in balance as part of the Creator-

created triad and in the peace of the new Garden. One of the shipwrecked men, Gonzalo, offers Eden-like descriptions of the life on the island that he imagines could exist:

All things in common nature should produce
Without sweat or endeavor. Treason, felony,
Sword, pike, knife, gun, or need of any engine
Would I not have; but nature should bring forth,
Of its own kind, all foison, all abundance,
To feed my innocent people. (2.1.162-167)

Producing “without sweat or endeavor” recalls Adam’s prelapsarian life. After the fall, however, God told Adam that “In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground” (Gen. 3.19a, KJV). The island does offer a similar life that Adam and Eve lived before the fall. Even Caliban, a slave, seems to easily find food for Prospero and Miranda.

Prospero lives a relatively good life and a powerful one. In fact, his so-called magical abilities confirm the results of “moving mountains” with the faith of “a tiny mustard seed” (Matthew 17.20; Luke 17.6; NIV). His trust and faith exist on the stage as fully accepted; he simply acts without question. In fact, only Trinculo asks to be forgiven of his sins and that only when he hears invisible Ariel’s music; only Gonzalo asks for heavenly help: “some heavenly power guide us / Out of this country” (5.1.105-06a). Prospero and Miranda accept their lives and merely act accordingly. Bushnell, however, calls his ability “pretended spells” (688). Bloom, joining Bushnell, believes that “Prospero seeks a kind of secularized spiritual authority” (674). Neither accepts the spiritual reality, not secularly influenced, but produced by the Creator for his creation—a

reality in Prospero's life. Neill expresses his problem with the play more gently: "Steeped as it is in the language and motifs of scripture, *The Tempest* is a play that might easily be read as trespassing on sacred ground" (58). Even with his warning, he still sees the spiritual impact of Prospero's life on the island.

Reflecting as it does contemporary garden theories and architecture, the island location would fuel audience members' experience of the setting. Strong explains that the play encourages an experience that contemporary gardens offered:

The *Tempest* is a Mannerist fantasy in the visual sense. Its figures and phenomena are just such as could be found in the royal gardens in the years when the play was written: water nymphs, the monstrous Caliban [. . .] the 'strange shapes', simulated thunder and lightning, vanishing tables and spirits in the shape of dogs and hounds. We seem, in fact, at times, to be wandering through a garden by de Caus where we are suddenly confronted by dreamlike monsters, or entering a wild grotto to be struck suddenly, at the turn of a stopcock, with surprise and wonder at moving statues and magical music, as gods and goddesses spring to life and enact an intermezzo. (103)

Shakespeare's stage, so reminiscent of gardens that play-goers would see every day, allows audience members easily to suspend disbelief: they see it and from life experience accept it. On a spiritual level, gardens so easily evoke references to the Garden of Eden because Elizabethans saw biblical images, in particular the Garden of Eden, on a daily basis and heard Bible verses every Sunday. Many would have heard the resonance between Sunday's sermon and the weekday's play.

In the character of Perdita of *The Winter's Tale* and Prospero, audience member could have caught enough glimpses of the new Garden of Eden to understand the characters' representations. They already knew that atemporal religion provided people the means to live in balance as members of the Creator-created triad and also provided a means to enter and live in the new Garden of Eden. Seeing Perdita and Prospero live in the new Garden provided the last piece of information—what it looks like.

CHAPTER

SIX

THIS OTHER EDEN, DEMI-PARADISE [. . .]

THIS ENGLAND

(*Richard II*, 2.1.42 and 50)

Shakespeare's nature stagescapes speak to the collision of two fomenting trends in Elizabethan England: (1) the growing and enthusiastic interest in nature; (2) the roiling Henrician Reformation and the resulting cacophony and chaos of the vying among varied religious sects during Elizabeth's reign. The first appealed to audiences of Shakespeare's plays who delighted in the wonders of exploring nature and discovering its riches. The second evoked such sober contemplation of safety, secrecy, and outward appearances that audiences remained acutely aware of hidden or secret messages in Shakespeare's plays—much as they did in their daily lives. For many English men and women, such conflict motivated a strong spiritual drive toward an individual and personal relationship with the Creator—the essence of what I have called atemporal religion.

In fact, understanding the relationship between religion and nature on Shakespeare's stage provides, as we have learned, a valuable means to evaluate the genius of his plays, particularly the garden and nature scenes. The pain of the Andronicii garden, Lear's stormy heath, the imagined beauty of the Capulet garden, Olivia's orchard, or Paulina's garden of resurrection, replete with societal fantasies of the Garden of Eden, practically glow with the spiritual essence of the new Garden of Eden. A long sought-after return to that original human-nature-Creator harmony, though, seems attainable as portrayed on the Globe stage, Blackfriars', or even Elizabeth's court.

Dramatic depictions of the new Garden of Eden when combined with the spiritual perspective which atemporal religion affords occasioned heightened spiritual awareness of Shakespeare's plays. In a time when a man or woman could be executed based on sketchy, or worse, fabricated religious information, Shakespeare's rather courageous coded messages offered a new view of religion, particularly of Christianity, as my initial two chapters demonstrated.

The plays of my study demonstrate a chronologically-ordered—based on Bevington's first performance dates—representation of the rise of spiritual individuality and the ensuing personal responsibility for a relationship with the Creator. Luther's *Soli* provide a means to understand this new relationship. As his ideas seeped into England, violence increased but so did a parallel personal spiritual growth. England's fomenting religious upheavals demanded that people live carefully in order to maintain their religious foundations and tend them through the seemingly enforced changes. Surrounded by the spiritual struggle in England, Shakespeare was likely aware of the religious density with which he had, in my reading, imbued his garden and nature scenes.

Chapter Three of this study examines nature locations as loci of truth and the ways in which humans' imbalance between logic and emotion obscure the truth. With *Titus Andronicus*, *Romeo and Juliet*, *Richard II*, and *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, Shakespeare's audience members begin to grasp the meaning of personal responsibility as they compare characters in each play. For example, the plays encouraged the audience to contrast Marcus' rationality versus Titus' excessive irrationality. They could see the impact of Romeo's redefining Juliet as his soul. In the Duke of York's garden, they could experience a man living hand in hand with nature's rhythmic processes, and they could

simultaneously see the Queen who was out of natural harmony. Even Puck offers information, showing spiritual power as wielded by a trickster, a power from which humans can neither escape nor control or defeat.

Chapter Four demonstrates that Shakespeare's nature, evidencing the Creator-created triad, offers examples of harmonious living as paradisiacal created. In *As You Like It*, *Twelfth Night*, *Othello*, and *King Lear*, his audience members would see the power of gardens but also of the heaths and English forests. They watched as the characters, tainted by the Court, enter the Forest of Arden and exit with a marvelous awareness of their humanity and individuality. They would begin to understand the human position in the Creator-created triad as Sir Toby and his cohorts verbally abuse Malvolio behind his back. They would see the results of attempting to usurp nature's position as Iago rejects his humanity and his position in the Creator-created triad. Added to Lear's storm experience that reveals a spiritual progression, audience members would more clearly understand the Creator-created triad and the power of nature as an equal member of it.

Chapter Five lifts the veil on life in the new Garden of Eden. The three gardens of *The Winter's Tale* powerfully portray betrayal and rebirth. A king rejects his own soul, based on his own fabricated truth constructions. The notion arises that in the new Garden of Eden wrongs still occur, but that as members of the Creator-created triad people never suffer utterly alone or feel abandoned. Eventually, they realize that their experiences are never more than they can manage. In *The Tempest* which is set on a deserted island—nature unabated—"somewhere and nowhere," an exiled Duke and his daughter reveal the power of working closely with nature. Ariel, his "servant," portrays the wonder of

working in tandem with nature. Caliban, however, reinforces the uncomfortable reality of being human—imperfection. Prospero questions neither his ability in relation to nature nor his spiritual place in the Creator-created triad. The play thus shows the absolute engulfing of the imperfect human soul by atemporal religion and the wonders of living in the new Garden of Eden as a result. He speaks a language infused with experience that many have heard within themselves then and now.

From a deeper set of shared experiences, Shakespeare's plays, first, summon archetypal memories of the Garden of Eden and, then, magically reinvent them. In light of the Reformation and a heightened interest in nature, any whispers of mythological Eden on Shakespeare's stage would understandably transform into a new location for experience—the new Garden of Eden. Reinventing that ancient Garden into the new Garden of Eden assuredly dovetailed nicely with Londoners' nascent appreciation of nature as evident in recent discovery, scientific invention, colonizing exploration, and Renaissance gardening.

Reading these scenes as recreations of the Garden of Eden within the human soul allowed a fuller experience of reading or watching performances of the plays. Viewing that pristine, ancient Garden as indigenous to the archetypal human memory may well have encouraged some audience members to dive deeply into their souls and pursue an individual and personal relationship with the Creator as Lake describes above. The freedom to explore this relationship broadened as a result of Luther's teachings. People no longer felt an obsession to adhere meticulously to prescribed spiritual codification and then experience irrational guilt when failing to do so. They no longer needed to physically harm themselves to assuage the guilt, expiate their sins, or show their

repentant state. Buying indulgences as a tangible admission of guilt and reception of absolution, no longer drove people to physically crawl to and through sacerdotal places. Such behavior fits into that spiraling and wobbling movement between the rational and irrational states of the human mind that often present skewed views of God.

Accepting the new Garden of Eden as a gift from the Creator, an acceptance that Luther also describes as a gift, humbles and nurtures the human soul. Individuals can, now, enjoy a deeper experience of freedom to move through their private spiritual process governing their own spiritual quest. The secrecy created by the new Garden encouraged people's personal spiritual progress. The comfort of that safety eventually propelled them through private spiritual discoveries and potential reinterpretations of their past and their future lives. Acceptance of the Creator's purpose for Her creation, so simply described by Luther, encouraged the practically impossible option of people accepting their inner beings and outward selves. A heightened sense of self-awareness enhanced humility and self-respect. Pursuing an individual and personal relationship with a Holy God need not imply weakness or even fear, for She quite simply intended that pursuit.

Tending one's individual relationship with the Divine literally parallels the physical act of gardening. York's Master Gardener exemplifies this truth as he uses garden metaphors to evaluate the reign of King Richard II. Even when Queen Isabella rebukes him, his planting rue for her memory remains within his purview. Elizabethan Londoner's pursuit to understand nature and its potential uses reflects the same act: the longing for that ancient Garden of Eden evolved into an external examination of nature. The people gathered samples from all over the world, cataloged them, and shared

findings with others across Europe. They exchanged these samples and expected information in return. Explorations of the New World increased the building excitement. Even Prince Henry joined in the enthusiasm, organizing and funding an expedition to the New World. His death, however, prevented his fulfillment.

All the exhilaration eventually led to an objective view of nature that incrementally removed its life as a member of the Creator-created triad. In fact, today though meteorologists attempting to predict the course of nature's storms still often express wonder and awe, these objective observers likely would not view the storms as expressions of turmoil engendered by the Fall or as reflections of the internal turmoil of humans. The medical field similarly pursues the knowledge to control and even eradicate disease but rarely acknowledges disease as a result of imperfection. Instead, these researchers often ignore it and focus on their explorations and experiments as not only a means to healthy living but also, on some level, as a means to achieve perfection—even to eternal life. Such objectivity and explorations tend to skew the relationships within Creator-created triad.

The new Garden of Eden in Shakespeare's plays, just one of hundreds of interpretive possibilities for cavalier readers today, provided one of the very few means for spiritual survival in the Henrician Reformation England. The ubiquitous changes in religion, though they spawned violence, war, and death in England and across Europe, blazed the trail, so to speak, for an individual and personal relationship with the Creator—the Christian perspective of God. His plays render the unfathomable idea that the all-loving Creator admired His creation, even if that creation centered on terrible flaws. The new Garden wonderfully portrays the juxtaposition of imperfection and

unimaginable love. Atemporal religion, the internal worship of the soul, teaches about and leads to the new Garden of Eden.

This brand new place spills onto Shakespeare's stage even as he lives between the loss and gain of religion in England. His garden and nature scenes hold promises of something much different from what his audiences could know. Today, though, now on the other side of the Reformation trauma (war, murder, execution, fear, and expatriation) the benefits (education, personal and individual spirituality, peace and safety) seem so common that we may not even know their true wonder and awe anymore. The novel and courageous dramatic illustrations in Elizabethan England that provided a means to understand and grow spiritually seem now so commonplace that still many cannot appreciate them.

My research invites further exploration of Shakespeare's other works and also of his contemporaries' works. Viewing Elizabethan and Jacobean literary works through the lens of atemporal religion may reveal more behind those works than here addressed. More significantly, though, I am drawn simply to pursue Shakespeare's line of reasoning into my own individual and personal spirituality. The peace and contemplative opportunities he offers allow me to release my tight-fingered hold on the insignificant and bask in the wonders of the new Garden of Eden, protected by the Creator-created triad and directed by atemporal religion. The violence and turmoil of the Henrician Reformation rests with "Eternity in the hearts of men" (Ecclesiastes 3.11).

WORKS CITED

- Alfred, John Kemp, ed. *Loseley Manuscripts*. London: John Murray, 1836. *GoogleBooks*.
Web. 25 Apr 2010.
- Asquith, Clare. *Shadowplay*. New York: Public Affairs, 2005. Print.
- Battenhouse, Roy, ed. *Shakespeare's Christian Dimension: An Anthology of
Commentary*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1994. Print.
- Bauer, Matthias. "A Note in Reply to Alastair Fowler." *Connotations* 2.3 (1992): 271-74.
MLA International Bibliography. Web. 19 Mar. 2011.
- Belsey, Catherine. *Shakespeare and the Loss of Eden*. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP,
1999. Print.
- Bentley, Gerald Eades. "Shakespeare and Blackfriars Theatre." McDonald 732-44. Print.
- Bevington, David. *The Seven Ages of Human Experience*. 2nd ed. Malden, MA:
Blackwell, 2005. Print.
- , ed. *The Complete Works of Shakespeare*. 4th ed. New York: Harper Collins, 1992.
Print.
- Bloom, Harold. *Shakespeare: The Invention of the Human*. New York: Riverhead, 1998.
Print.
- Brake, Donald L. *A Visual History of the English Bible*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2008.
Print.
- Buccola, Regina M. "Shakespeare's Fairy Dance with Religio-Political Controversy in
The Merry Wives of Windsor." Taylor and Beauregard 159-79. Print.
- Burckhardt, Sigurd. "How Not to Murder Caesar." McDonald 209-19. Print.

- Bushnell, Nelson Sherwin. "Natural Supernaturalism in *The Tempest*." *PMLA* 47.3 (1932): 684-98. *MLA International Bibliography*. Web. 16 Aug. 2011.
- "Chapter XVIII. Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity: 2. The Elizabethan Settlement." *The Cambridge History of English and American Literature*. Eds. Sir Adolphus W. Ward, William P. Trent, et al. Vol. 3. New York: Putnam, 1907-21. *Bartleby.com*, 2000. Web. 25 June 2005.
- Collingwood, R. G. *The Idea of Nature*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1945. Print.
- Colonna, Francesco. *Hypnerotomachia*. Trans. Robert Dallington. London: Simon Waterson, 1592. *Project Gutenberg*. Web. 3 October 2007.
- Comito, Terry. "Caliban's Dream: The Topography of Some Shakespeare Gardens." *Shakespeare Studies* 14 (1981): 23-54. Print.
- Coupe, Lawrence, ed. *The Green Studies Reader: From Romanticism to Ecocriticism*. New York: Routledge, 2008. Print.
- Coursen, Herbert R., Jr. "Hollow Ritual in *Richard II*." *Battenhouse* 289-97. Print.
- Cox, John D. "Medieval Precedent in *The Winter's Tale*." *Battenhouse* 245-46. Print.
- . "Review Essay: Was Shakespeare a Christian, and If So, What Kind of Christian Was He?" *Christianity and Literature* 55.4 (2006): 539-66. Print.
- Danby, John F. "Shakespeare's Three Natures." *Coupe* 84-87. Print.
- Devlin, Christopher. *The Life of Robert Southwell, Poet and Martyr*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Cudahy, 1956. Print.
- Dickens, Arthur Geoffrey. *The English Reformation*. 2nd ed. University Park: Pennsylvania State UP, 1993. Print.
- Duffy, Eamon. *The Stripping of the Altars*. New Haven, CT: Yale UP, 2005. Print.

- . *The Voices of Morebath: Reformation and Rebellion in an English Village*. New Haven, CT: Yale UP, 2003. Print.
- Dunton-Downer, Leslie, and Alan Riding. *Essential Shakespeare Handbook*. New York: Dorling Kindersley, 2004. Print.
- Dutton, Richard. "The Comedy of Errors and The Calumny of Apelles: An Exercise in Source Study." *Religion and the Arts* 7.1-2 (2003): 11-30. *MLA International Bibliography*. Web. 25 Feb. 2006.
- Dutton, Richard, Alison Findlay, and Richard Wilson. *Theatre and Religion: Lancastrian Shakespeare*. New York: Manchester UP, 2003.
- Dyce, Alexander. *A General Glossary to Shakespeare's Works*. New York: Dutton, 1902. *GoogleBooks*. Web. 19 Mar. 2011.
- Egan, Gabriel. *Green Shakespeare: From Ecopolitics to Ecocriticism*. New York: Routledge, 2006. Print.
- Estrin, Barbara L. "The Foundling Plot: Stories in *The Winter's Tale*." *Modern Language Studies* 7.1 (1977): 27-38. *JSTOR*. Web. 16 Aug 2011.
- Farmer, John S., and William E. Henley. *A Dictionary of Slang and Colloquial English*. New York: Dutton, 1905. *GoogleBooks*. Web. 19 Mar. 2011.
- Fitz, L. T. "The Vocabulary of the Environment in *The Tempest*." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 26.1 (1975): 42-47. *JSTOR*. Web. 16 Aug. 2011.
- Foakes, R. A., ed. *King Lear*. London: Thomson Learning, 1997. *GoogleBooks*. Web. 1 Oct. 2011.
- Fortin, René E. "Twelfth Night: Drama of Initiation." *Battenhouse* 137-41. Print.
- Frye, Northrup. "The Argument of Comedy." *McDonald* 93-99. Print.

- Geneva Bible*. Geneva: Rowland Hall, 1560. Introd. Facsim. ed. Ed. Lloyd E. Berry. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2007. Print.
- Gifford, Terry. "Pastoral, Anti-Pastoral, Post-Pastoral." Coupe 219-22. Print.
- . *Pastoral*. New York: Routledge, 1999. Print.
- Gothain, Marie-Luis. "Chapter X." *History of Garden Art*. Trans. Laura Archer-Hind. Walter P. Wright, ed. New York: Dutton, 1928. *GardenVisit.com*. Tom Turner, ed. 2008. Web. 5 July 2010.
- Grantley, Daryll. "*The Winter's Tale* and Early Religious Drama." Battenhouse 236-45. Print.
- Greenblatt, Stephen. *Will in the World*. New York: Norton, 2004. Print.
- Hall, Grace R. W. *The Tempest as Mystery Play*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 1999. Print.
- Harkness, Deborah E. *The Jewel House: Elizabethan London and the Scientific Revolution*. New Haven, CT: Yale UP, 2007. Print.
- . "Elizabethan London's Naturalists and the Work of John White." *European Visions: American Voices*. Ed. Kim Sloan. London: British Museum Research Publication, 2009. 44-50. Print.
- Harrison, Robert Pogue. *Forests: The Shadow of Civilization*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1992. Print.
- Hemingway, Ernest. *Garden of Eden*. New York: Scribner, 1986. Print.
- Henry VIII. "The Defense of the Seven Sacraments." *English History in the Making*. Vol. I. Ed. William L. Sachse. 2 vols. Waltham, MA: Blaisdell, 1967. Print.
- Holmes, Vance. "Shakespeare's *Othello* On-Line." *TheatreDance.com*. TheatreDance Web Design. Jan. 2010. Web. 25 March 2012.

- Jeffrey, David L., and Patrick Grant. "Reputation in *Othello*." Battenhouse 418-22. Print.
- Klause, John. "Catholic and Protestant, Jesuit and Jew: Historical Religion in *The Merchant of Venice*." *Religion and the Arts* 7.1-2 (2003): 65-102. *MLA International Bibliography*. Web. 25 Feb. 2006.
- Klein, Juergen. "Francis Bacon." *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Ed. Edward N. Zalta. Summer 2011 ed. Web. 5 Jan. 2012.
- Lake, Peter with Michael Questier. *The Antichrist's Lewd Hat: Protestants, Papists and Players in Post-Reformation England*. New Haven, CT: Yale UP, 2002. Print.
- Lane, Christopher. *Eden's Gate*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1994. Print.
- Laroque, François. "Christian Liturgy and *The Winter's Tale*." Battenhouse 247-49. Print.
- Lewalski, Barbara K. "Thematic Patterns in *Twelfth Night*." Battenhouse 130-36. Print.
- The Life Application Bible*. Introd. Notes. Ed. John MacArthur. Wheaton: Tyndale, 1991. Print. New International Vers.
- Mabillard, Amanda. "*Othello* Plot Summary." *Shakespeare Online*. 20 Aug. 2000. Web. 24 Mar. 2012.
- The MacArthur Study Bible*. Introd. Notes. Ed. John MacArthur. Dallas: Thomas Nelson, 1997. Print. New King James Vers.
- MacCulloch, Diarmaid. *Reformation: Europe's House Divided, 1490-1700*. London: Penguin, 2003. Print.
- Marotti, Arthur F. "Shakespeare and Catholicism." Dutton, Findlay, and Wilson 218-41. Print.
- Marx, Steven. *Shakespeare and the Bible*. New York: Oxford UP, 2000. Print.

- McDonald, Russ, ed. *Shakespeare: An Anthology of Criticism and Theory 1945-2000*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2004. Print.
- McGinn, Colin. *Shakespeare's Philosophy: Discovering the Meaning Behind the Plays*. London: Harper, 2006. Print.
- Merchant, Carolyn. *The Death of Nature*. San Francisco: Harper, 1980. Print.
- Miko, Stephen J. "Tempest." *ELH* 49.1 (1982): 1-17. *JSTOR*. Web. 16 Aug. 2011.
- Milward, Peter. *Shakespeare's Apocalypse*. London: Saint Austin, 2000. Print.
- . "Shakespeare's Jesuit Schoolmasters." Dutton, Findlay, and Wilson 58-70. Print.
- . *Shakespeare the Papist*. Naples, FL: Ave Maria UP, 2005. Print.
- Neill, Michael. "'Noises, / Sounds, and sweet airs': The Burden of Shakespeare's *Tempest*." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 59.1 (2008): 36-59. *Project MUSE*. Web. 16 Aug. 2011.
- Newell, Philip. *Shakespeare and the Human Mystery*. New York: Paulist, 2003. Print.
- Nichols, Linda. *In Search of Eden*. Grand Rapids, MI: Bethany House, 2007. Print.
- "Nonsuch Palace." *Leisure, Arts, Libraries and Heritage*. London Borough of Sutton. 2008. Web. 11 Aug 2011.
- Novy, Marianne. *Transforming Shakespeare: Contemporary Women's Re-Visions in Literature and Performance*. New York: St. Martin's, 1999. Print.
- Pearce, Joseph. *The Quest for Shakespeare: The Bard of Avon and the Church of Rome*. San Francisco: Ignatius, 2008. Print.
- Pinciss, Gerald M. *Forbidden Matter: Religion in the Drama of Shakespeare and His Contemporaries*. Newark: U of Delaware P, 2000. Print.

- Prockter, Adrian. "Maps of London." *Know Your London*. 5 May 2011. Web. 5 Jan. 2012.
- Putnam, Michael C. J. *Virgil's Pastoral Art*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1970. Print.
- Rankin, Mark. "Henry VIII, Shakespeare, and the Jacobean Royal Court." *SEL Studies in English Literature 1500-1900* 51.2 (2011): 349-66. *Project MUSE*. Web. 3 May 2012.
- Rollins, James. *Altar of Eden*. New York: William Morrow, 2009. Print.
- Sagan, Carl. *Dragons of Eden: Speculation on the Evolution of Human Intelligence*. New York: Ballantine, 1986. Print.
- Shakespeare, William. *As You Like It*. 1598. *Complete* 288-325. Print.
- . *The Complete Works of Shakespeare*. Ed. David Bevington. 4th ed. New York: Harper Collins, 1992. Print.
- . *King Lear*. 1605. *Complete* 1167-218. Print.
- . *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. 1595. *Complete* 150-77. Print.
- . *Othello*. 1603. *Complete* 1117-66. Print.
- . *Richard the Second*. 1595. *Complete* 721-62. Print.
- . *Romeo and Juliet*. 1594. *Complete* 977-1020. Print.
- . *The Tempest*. 1611. *Complete* 1526-58. Print.
- . *Titus Andronicus*. c. 1589. *Complete* 938-76. Print.
- . *Twelfth Night*. 1600. *Complete* 326-61. Print.
- . *The Winter's Tale*. 1609. *Complete* 1484-525. Print.
- Smiley, Jane. "Shakespeare in Iceland." *Novy* 158-79. Print.

- Spiller, Elizabeth. "Shakespeare and the Making of Early Modern Science: Resituating Prospero's Art." *South Central Review* 26.1-2 (2009): 24-41. *Project MUSE*. Web. 16 August 2011.
- Strong, Roy. *The Renaissance Garden in England*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1979. Print.
- Styan, J. L. "Shakespeare's Use of His Stage." *Shakespeare and English History: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. Ed. Ronald G. Shafer. Indiana: Indiana University of Pennsylvania, 1976. 29-44. Print.
- Taylor, Dennis, and David N. Beauregard, eds. *Shakespeare and the Culture of Christianity in Early Modern England*. New York: Fordham UP, 2003. Print.
- The Tempest*. Screenplay by Julie Taymor. Dir. Julie Taymor. Perf. Helen Mirren, Russell Brand, Alfred Molina. Miramax, 2011. Film.
- Tigner, Amy. "The Winter's Tale: Gardens and the Marvels of Transformation." *English Literary Renaissance* 36.1 (2006): 114-34. Print.
- Tillich, Paul. *A History of Christian Thought*. New York: Schuster, 1968. Print.
- Traub, Valerie. "The Homoerotics of Shakespearean Comedy." McDonald 704-26. Print.
- "Turkey." *Funk and Wagnall's New Encyclopedia*. 1986 ed. Print.
- Uglow, Jenny. *A Little History of British Gardening*. New York: North Point, 2004. Print.
- Virgil. *Eclogues*. Trans. Guy Lee. New York: Penguin, 1984. Print.
- Walker, Greg. *Writing Under Tyranny: English Literature and the Henrician Reformation*. New York: Oxford UP, 2005. Print.

- Walter, James. "From *Tempest* to Epilogue: Augustine's Allegory in Shakespeare's Drama." *PMLA* 98.1 (1983): 60-76. *MLA International Bibliography*. Web. 16 Aug. 2011.
- Weis, Rene. *Decoding a Hidden Life: Shakespeare Unbound*. New York: Henry Holt, 2007. Print.
- Wilders, John. *The Lost Garden: A View of Shakespeare's English and Roman History Plays*. Totowa, NJ: Rowman and Littlefield, 1978. Print.
- Williams, Thomas. *The Crown of Eden*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1999. Print.
- Wilson, Richard. *Secret Shakespeare: Studies in Theatre, Religion, and Resistance*. New York: Manchester UP, 2004. Print.
- . "Introduction: A Torturing Hour—Shakespeare and the Martyrs." Dutton, Findlay, and Wilson 1-39. Print.
- Young, Bruce. "RE: SHK 17.0135 Royal Wards (or Shakespeare and Southwell)." Online posting. 8 Mar 2006. *SHAKSPER: The Global Electronic Shakespeare Conference*. Web. 1 Nov. 2009.