"Great Is Diana" of Shakespeare's Ephesus
Author(s): F. Elizabeth Hart
Source: *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900,* Vol. 43, No. 2, Tudor and Stuart Drama (Spring, 2003), pp. 347-374
Published by: Rice University
Stable URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/4625072
Accessed: 21-03-2020 16:08 UTC

SEL 43, 2 (Spring 2003): 347–374
ISSN 0039-3657

"Great is Diana" of Shakespeare's Ephesus

F. ELIZABETH HART

Critics have offered a range of interpretations of the West Asian city of Ephesus as a setting for Shakespeare's *The Comedy of Errors* and *Pericles*. Many acknowledge the city's early modern familiarity as the vituperative trade center described in the New Testament book of Acts and addressed by Paul in his Letters to the Ephesians.[1] Its status as an early and even model Christian community did not prevent it from taking on apparently contradictory meanings for the early moderns; for instance, while it was often associated with the regenerative spirit of Pauline scripture,[2] it could also be linked to images of religious division, possibly becoming an image for Protestant reformers of "Popish backsliding" by the official Church.[3] Recently, critics have also begun to stress the diversity of social and religious life in Ephesus, pointing out, for example, that in the city of Paul's day, Christians, Jews, and pagan Greeks lived and worked together—not always harmoniously, but at least together; or that in Shakespeare's own time, Ephesus was known as one of the eastern Mediterranean sites that had been conquered and occupied by Muslim Arabs and Turks.[4]

This wider angle on social and religious culture has caused attention to shift to another of the city's central religious figures: the fertility goddess Diana of Ephesus, the "Great Mother" whose famous temple in Ephesus—considered one of the seven wonders of the world—served as bank, asylum, and civic center for centuries before and after Paul's arrival. Diana was one of a group of powerful "Mothers" who had long been venerated in the east-

F. Elizabeth Hart is associate professor of English at the University of Connecticut, Storrs. This article is part of a book in progress tentatively titled "The Sixteenth-Century Diana."

ern Mediterranean: among them, Cybele of Anatolia, Inanna and Ishtar of Syria, Isis of Egypt, Rhea of Crete, Astarte of Palestine, and Aphrodite and Demeter of Greece. Diana was the Latinate name for Artemis of Ephesus, who was herself a hybrid of mainland Greek traditions and traditions long ritualized by the people of Anatolia. In Ephesus, Artemis, a chaste woodland goddess, became synthesized with the much more ancient Cybele of Anatolia, a Phrygian goddess associated with Mount Ida, near Troy, and linked to moon worship, agrarianism, and fertility. Called the *Magna Mater* by the Romans who officially adopted her and made her a symbol of empire,[5] Cybele remained bound to the pagan practices of the East, with that region's emphases on live sacrifice, ritualized sexual intercourse, the self-castration of male priests, and the orgiastic devotions of female cult celebrants.[6] The Romans labeled these practices "savage" and kept their official distance from them; yet they also accepted the status of the eastern goddesses and honored the *Magna Mater* for her ties to Troy. It is Cybele's "savagery" in particular that the Greek Artemis combined with to become Artemis—and then Diana—of Ephesus. Critics now considering Diana's legacy in Ephesus suggest that Shakespeare was likely to have known of her cult there and that he may have exploited her associations with fertility in *The Comedy of Errors* and *Pericles*.[7]

Interest in Diana may reflect a renewed concern for ritual in early modern studies, a concern anticipated by Linda Woodbridge and Edward Berry in their introduction to *True Rites and Maimed Rites* (1992). Woodbridge and Berry propose that, in the aftermath of Carl Jung and Northrop Frye, ritual be re-defined for early modern scholarship not as "archetype" but as "discourse," and as discourse whose intersections with political culture may provide points of entry for new historicist analysis. Citing evidence that pagan "magical thinking" still underlay the fertility rites, rites of passage, and even carnival of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, they conclude that this "mental universe . . . deep dyed in ritual" must be as susceptible to ideological reading as are other early modern discourses.[8] Among these rituals, they note, the fertility rite seems especially poised for rediscovery by feminist critics, "given the link between fertility and the female."[9] Indeed, the critic Jeanne Addison Roberts has already explored some connections between early modern patriarchy and ancient mythology—including fertility myths—in a theory of "the Shakespearean Wild" that may encompass what critics now sense in Shakespeare's Diana. Roberts argues that Shakespeare's rep-

resentations of women and of his often-female-inflected animals and green worlds are projections of male imagination and anxiety about the perils of interaction with an unfathomable other. She calls this male imaginative world "Culture" and includes within it the traits of Christian (i.e., not Jew, not Muslim) and European/white (not African, not American). The "Wild" that both opposes and defines male Culture is "most unsettling[ly]"[10] female but also includes animals and non-Christian, non-European/white males, anything, in other words, that lies outside of Culture. Despite the terrors of mingling with the Wild, Culture must eventually confront, embrace, and finally coerce the Wild, and especially the female Wild, if progeny and thus a "male future"[11] are to occur. For Roberts, Shakespeare's plays enact myriad variations on this process, repeatedly dramatizing the tensions implicit in these confrontations that sometimes end benignly after pleasurable erotic delay (comedy); or sometimes disastrously when incorporation of the Wild into Culture unleashes dreaded chaos, resulting in the near or total collapse of Culture (history, tragedy); or with variations and negotiations in between (problem comedies, romances). Significantly, Roberts frequently turns to the figures of classical goddesses, especially those of the eastern Mediterranean, whom she summarizes as figures of the "Great Goddess" and views as woven into the fabric of play after play.

Roberts's ideas provide a suggestive context for Caroline Bicks's considerations of *Pericles*' Diana, and of the threat that early modern women's Catholic postpartum "churching" habits posed to Protestant Church officials who attempted to reconfigure such customs within a Protestant theological frame. Reading Thaisa's fourteen-plus-years disappearance into the temple of Diana at Ephesus as a prolonged, symbolic form of churching, Bicks points to the apparently contradictory nature of the Diana of *Pericles*, in which Diana serves as both a goddess of virginity (guardian over the chaste Marina) and a goddess of childbirth (to whom Thaisa retreats after giving birth). Bicks explains the latter, and I think rightly, as a function of the "wild" Asian Artemis overlain by the traditional Greek virgin Artemis. "Wild" in Bicks's use indicates Artemis's ties to animals and vegetation—nature—and to the generative principle of life—birth—in short, to fertility. That the generative or fertility principles of nature infuse the threateningly female landscapes of Shakespeare's Wilds is one of the central tenets of Roberts's theory.

I find both Roberts's and Bicks's arguments provocative, and in the following discussion I will attempt to complement them by

giving a deeper gloss to the "wild" dimension of the melded Artemis/Diana figure of Ephesus.[12] Her wildness, I argue, traces its lineage through her more archaic ancestor, the "savage" Anatolian Cybele, who, despite her strangeness to the Romans, became an icon for them of majestic motherhood and empire. My analysis probes beyond the specificity of Diana's fertility connotations to embrace a category of authority that stemmed from this fertility: the authority of a providential God-as-Mother. I will examine Shakespeare's two plays set in Ephesus, *The Comedy of Errors* and *Pericles*, to gauge how this specter of virginal-maternal authority functions ideologically within the patriarchal systems respective to each play. I am most interested in her image as a stage spectacle, as an icon of great dramaturgical power that Shakespeare knew would be recognizable to his audiences. During these moments, which occur at each play's "miraculous"[13] ending—comparable in both cases to the final scene of *The Winter's Tale*—Diana and the characters who represent her appropriate the magnitude of the ancient Mothers. This female authority is raised in each play—and here I agree with Roberts's assessment—not to challenge patriarchy but to offer it her blessing. She represents a benevolent female spirit within an otherwise frightening female Wild, a power whose force is erected momentarily only to be subsumed back into the patriarchy that it ultimately supports.

But before examining these plays' endings, I feel I must establish a sense of how the early moderns would have known about Diana's relationship to Ephesus and—even more to the point—whether or not they would have known to connect her with the "savage" authority of a goddess like Cybele. Diana's connection to Ephesus was a feature of both religious and secular discourses of the period. As others have pointed out, anyone who read the Bible or went to church—most, if not all—would have known her from repeated references in Acts 19. There the craftsmen and other citizens of Ephesus, outraged by the presence of Paul's Christian missionaries, cry, "Great *is* Diana of the Ephesians,"[14] "which all Asia and the worlde worshippeth."[15] Critics have traced mention of either Diana or her Ephesian temple to at least four different Protestant sermons of the period.[16] And I have shown elsewhere that her name and temple statue became targets for at least one Stuart-era, antidemonology tract.[17] In the secular domain of scholarship and literature, there were a number of reference tools that would have made Diana's link to Ephesus explicit: there were Renaissance dictionaries of ancient mythology, for

example, such as the *Dictionarium Historicum, Geographicum, Poeticum* of Charles Stephanus; as well as the Italian mythographical "manuals" of Vincenzo Cartari, Natale Conti, and Lilio Gregorio Giraldi, sources often consulted by English artists, playwrights, and masque composers.[18] Ovid, a frequent source for poets and playwrights, does not tie Diana explicitly to Ephesus in his *Metamorphoses*, but that poem and his *Fasti* both generously blend the religious traditions of East and West, as did many of Ovid's Renaissance commentators.[19]

There was also a kind of popular literature in which Diana was represented quite prominently, along with her temple in Ephesus, her priesthood, and the "mysteries" associated with her Ephesian cult. The latter decades of the sixteenth century had seen the translation and publication of a number of Greek and Roman romances, or "novels," originating from Rome's far-eastern provinces between A.D. 100 and 600.[20] It is clear from their multiple commentaries and editions that these works were in demand in Shakespeare's London; their popularity may, in fact, help explain the enormous appeal of the first staged *Pericles*, since the play's ultimate source was itself a classical romance, the anonymous *Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri*.[21] Diana of Ephesus is represented in several of these novels—the 1597 translation of Achilles Tatius's *Loves of Clitophon and Leucippe*; Xenophon's *Ephesiaka*, a background source for *Romeo and Juliet*;[22] and the just-named *Historia Apollonii*, retold in Shakespeare's direct sources for *Pericles*, John Gower's *Confessio Amantis*, and Lawrence Twine's *The Patterne of Painefull Adventures* (1594). In each of these stories, either Diana or a priest from her temple injects her or himself into the lives of the characters, serving, as does the Diana of Shakespeare's *Pericles*, as the catalyst for regeneration and transformation.[23]

Bicks writes: "Long before [Diana's] Greco-Roman incarnations . . . she was an Anatolian mother goddess. She often merged with other such figures: Gaia, Rhea, Isis, Kybele, Kore, and Demeter."[24] Contrary to what this description may imply, these Mothers were not strictly interchangeable with one another since each one reflected the customs and beliefs of a specific group of people in a specific place; however, they were easily associated because each seems to have incorporated within her the same or similar metaphor of a feminized nature—of "Mother Earth"—her authority deriving from the fertility component within this metaphor.[25] The metaphor is extremely ancient—possibly even Paleolithic—in its origins, and much scholarship has gone into

investigating its impact on the early Mediterranean and other cultures throughout the world.[26] Diana shared a geographical location and thus an added dimension of correspondence with Cybele, but Bicks is also correct to point out her frequent links to many of the other Mothers throughout the region. The nature component in each Mother's persona gave her a quality of wildness, even "savagery," that Diana of Ephesus inherited and retained.

We find clear evidence of Diana's associations with these Mothers in two important sources for early modern literary artists: Apuleius's *Asinus Aureus* (also called the *Metamorphoses*), translated in 1566 as *The Golden Ass of Lucius Apuleius*; and Vincenzo Cartari's *Imagines Deorum*, translated in 1599 as *The Fountaine of Ancient Fiction: Wherein Is Lively Depictured the Images and Statues of the Gods and the Ancients*. *The Golden Ass*, which Margaret Doody considers among the two most influential of the ancient novels on the culture of the Renaissance, may have served, according to J. J. M. Tobin, as a source for as many as twenty-eight of Shakespeare's plays and poems.[27] It tells the pseudo-autobiographical tale of a wanderer named Lucius Apuleius, who mingles unwisely with witches and becomes transformed into a comically unlucky ass. After episodes involving hardship, labor, and hilarious bawdry, Lucius finds himself alone on a beach just outside of Corinth, falling into a despairing sleep. Waking to a moon-soaked midnight, he is inspired to invoke the moon by the name of Ceres, "whom [he] saw shining before [his] eyes."[28] Lucius's prayer to Ceres actively associates her with other Mothers and their corresponding place names, including that of Diana ("the sister of the good Phoebus") with Ephesus.[29] When Lucius falls back to sleep, an image of the goddess herself rises to him in a dream, "by little and little . . . the whole figure of her body mounting out of the sea and standing before [him]."[30] She speaks, and her self-description at this moment both affirms her identity as a multiple goddess and insists on her "proper" name as "Queen Isis":

> I am she that is the natural mother of all things, mistress and governess of all the elements, the initial progeny of worlds, chief of the powers divine, queen of heaven, the principal of the gods celestial, the light of the goddesses. At my will the planets of the air, the wholesome winds of the seas and the silences of hell be disposed. My name, my divinity, is adored throughout all the world, in divers manners, in variable customs and in many names, for

> the Phrygians call me the mother of the gods; the Athenians, Minerva; the Cyprians, Venus; the Candians, Diana; the Sicilians, Proserpina; the Eleusians, Ceres; some Juno, others Bellona, others Hecate; and . . . the Egyptians, who are excellent in all kinds of ancient doctrine, and by their proper ceremonies accustom to worship me, do call me Queen Isis.[31]

She is clearly a nature deity—"the natural mother of all things, mistress of all the elements," disposer of winds, seas, and "the silences of hell." After she speaks, she offers Lucius freedom from his ass's shape on the condition that he become an initiate to her cult, even offering to override his fate if he will become a devotee: "And if I perceive that thou art obedient to my commandment, addict to my religion, and merit my divine grace, know thou that I will prolong thy days above the time that the fates have appointed and the celestial planets ordained."[32] The episode depicts Isis's power as providential, and it hints at the same or similar powers in Diana, associated variously here with Candia (Crete) and Ephesus.

We find a more direct link between Diana and Cybele in Cartari's *Fountaine of Ancient Fiction*, one of the Italian-authored mythographies whose descriptive essays on the classical deities were a source for early modern literary artists. Cartari's essay on Diana first describes her "Triforme" nature as Luna, Diana, and Hecate, or Proserpina, and then her role as pastoral huntress among "pleasant groues, shrub-bearing hils, and christal-faced fountaines."[33] Cartari then identifies Diana's Luna aspect with Isis through their shared roles as goddesses of the moon.[34] He writes that Luna is worshiped *as* Isis, the same sacrifices made in her honor that "the Ægyptians vsed so to offer vp to Isis," with the wild, percussive music integral to the cults of both Isis and Cybele here described as part of Luna's celebrations: "[T]he women accustomed to play on Cymbals, and the men on tabors, honouring such their feastiuals with infinite sorts of rites & ceremonies of solēnization."[35] Cartari then subsumes within the figure of Luna not only Isis but Ceres and Cybele as well: "*Martianus* writeth, That Philologia entring into that spheare of the Moone, saw there many and diuers-framed Cymbals, and likewise the torches of Ceres, the bow of Diana, the Timbrell of Cibele, and a kind of shape also with three hornes, which I haue already said to bee in the Moone: all which things are appropriated and due vnto Luna."[36] The essay ends with a general description of the

moon goddess's influence over the earth itself, in this moment also aligning Diana with "Dea Natura."[37] In a later essay entitled "*Terra, o La Gran Madre*," Cartari sweeps through the names of the many goddesses associated with *Terra*, Earth, citing Ops, Rhea, Vesta, Ceres, and Proserpina; but he pauses noticeably over the figure of Cybele: "And this goddesse was also called . . . Cibele, which name (according to the opinions of manie) came of a certaine mount so entearmed."[38] Since Diana has already been linked to both Dea Natura and Cybele, it is not difficult to imagine an ease of association between Diana of Ephesus and Cybele's "Mother Earth" aspect, an association based upon, but also mythically transcending, geographical coincidence.

It is probably not a coincidence, considering Apuleius's early modern popularity, that the very source that Cartari cites to correlate Diana's Luna aspect to Isis is the Isis episode from *The Golden Ass*, discussed above.[39] Cartari writes: "Apuleius reporteth, that after his recouerie from his transmutation into the forme of an asse, hee dreamed to haue seene Isis appeare one night before him in a vision, and hee there so describes her, as it may bee easily gathered that shee was the very same as I haue alreadie set downe Luna to be, and which the Ægyptians with so straunge and new-found ceremonies so adored."[40] Such sources offered ample and mutually reinforcing means by which the early moderns could categorize the ancient Mothers: both in terms of their relations to each other and in terms of their relationship to nature—to the great fertile Wild.

These connections between Diana, Cybele, and other earth goddesses should prompt us to consider the function of Diana—and of her aspect of Roberts's fertile Wild—within the patriarchal worlds of Shakespeare's two Ephesus plays, *The Comedy of Errors* and *Pericles*. It may seem odd at first to discuss Diana in the context of *The Comedy of Errors*, where, unlike in *Pericles*, the goddess is never mentioned or represented. But critics have long noted the final-act resemblance between Emilia, the "Abbess" of *Errors*, and Thaisa, Diana's "high priestess" in *Pericles*, both women emerging from their respective sanctuaries for re-entry into their secular roles as wives and mothers. Some have even asserted that, in *Errors*, Shakespeare is actually alluding to Diana and her Ephesian temple through the character of the Abbess: Laurie Maguire states, for instance, that "it is logical to conclude that the 'Abbess' and the 'priory' of *Errors* act V are but superficially Christianized references to the pagan Temple of Diana."[41]

Bicks similarly finds that "Aemilia . . . presents a theological paradox: She is the abbess of the Temple of Diana. As Aemilia performs her healing mysteries, the Ephesian Diana is present in both her physical and sacred functions."[42]

The exclusion of Diana from *this* Ephesus—and her replacement at play's end by an alternative figure of female authority—should have been enough to make her absence conspicuous, rendering her present by the very virtue of her absence.[43] This would be especially true for those in Shakespeare's audience who were readers of the ancient novels, viewers primed by popular fictional convention to gaze on the goddess in the play's final moments. For them, prior knowledge of Diana and her temple would have provided a foundational context through which to situate the Abbess and her priory within the Christian discourses, both Catholic and Protestant, that circulate throughout the play.[44] They would have found, for instance, no mere coincidence and perhaps much pleasure in the fact that the Abbess is revealed to be a mother in the familial sense but also in the sense of a nun-like Mother Superior. In fact, a direct correspondence between the play's representation of female ecclesiastical status and the feminine bureaucracy of Diana's temple is suggested in both the *Historia Apollonii* and the *Confessio Amantis*, in which the wife and mother who has been separated from her family retires to Ephesus to become "abbesse"—Gower's word—in the great temple of Diana.[45]

The Comedy of Errors, like many of Shakespeare's later plays, contemplates the emotional, social, and political consequences of the fractured patriarchal family. It opens on the despair of Egeon, who has tried but failed in a search for his wife and twin sons, lost at sea before the action of the play begins. The presence—unbeknown to them—of both Antipholus twins and their twin servants in Ephesus causes rampant confusions of identity that entangle, as well, the lives of five female characters: Adriana, the wife of the twin Antipholus of Ephesus; her chaste sister Luciana, with whom Antipholus of Syracuse falls in love; a Courtesan, companion to Antipholus of Ephesus; a sexually aggressive kitchen maid named Luce; and finally, Emilia, Egeon's long-lost wife, who now serves as Abbess in the priory at Ephesus. The cacophony of this "one day's error"[46] threatens several once-peaceful relationships: those between Adriana and her sister, between Antipholus of Syracuse and Dromio of Syracuse, and perhaps most obviously between Antipholus of Ephesus and Adriana, the latter suspecting her husband of infidelity with the Courtesan.

Roberts views this Ephesus as "a male Culture but a deranged one," in which male characters represent divided sides of masculine identity, each one chaotically failing to "achieve a rapprochement with the females from whom they are separated or estranged."[47] The women, all childless except the last, are simplified types of Roberts's "female Wild" (all products, she emphasizes, of the male imagination): the virgin Luciana, tamed into the service of male dominance; the shrewish wife Adriana, whose discontentment locks her husband from his own home; the whore, figured in both the Courtesan and Luce; and Emilia, the crone, a woman past childbearing age who is sometimes given the authority to speak by virtue of her long life's wisdom.[48] The crone-Abbess's "miraculous importation" at play's end unites the family toward a reconstituted patriarchy: the reunion of brothers coincides with the assimilation, through marriage, and by Culture (using Roberts's sense of it), of some of the play's fertile women (Luciana, Adriana, and Luce, who is to marry one of the Dromios) and the active suppression of others (the Courtesan).[49] This promise of controlled female fertility offers, as Roberts puts it, "real relief that the rebirth of the male will make the birth of the future possible."[50]

But the crone-Abbess's authority is not solely a function of her age and wisdom. It derives, as well, from her stage entry as *proxy* to Diana of Ephesus, whom audiences, again, prompted by fictional convention, would be expecting to see. Emilia's V.i entrance from the doorway of her abbey—occurring at the point when "mad" misunderstandings have escalated into open violence (IV.iv.143–5; V.i.32)—signals immediately her public authority: "Be quiet, people," she commands. "Wherefore throng you hither?" (V.i.38). Despite Adriana's insistence that she be allowed to "diet [the] sickness" (V.i.99) of her husband, Emilia refuses to release him from the abbey in which his twin, mistaken for him, has taken sanctuary. She refuses on grounds that her "approvèd means," her "charitable . . . order" make her the more fit to nurse him, using terms to describe her "duty" that link her unmistakably to an ecclesiastical bureaucracy with Catholic overtones:

> Be patient, for I will not let him stir
> Till I have used the approvèd means I have,
> With wholesome syrups, drugs, and holy prayers,
> To make of him a formal man again.
> It is a branch and parcel of mine oath,
> A charitable duty of my order.
>
> (V.i.102–7)

The Abbess's second entrance before the gathered crowd (V.i.331), accompanied by Antipholus and Dromio of Syracuse, achieves at a glance the resolution of the "errors" that the duke, only a moment before, has despaired of solving. This moment, as Roberts repeatedly declares, bears the force of a miracle and is complemented by Adriana's expression of wonder: "I see two husbands, or mine eyes deceive me" (V.i.332).

The Abbess's Diana-like authority in these moments is compounded by repeated references to the church building associated with her, references that emphasize its connection, remarked on earlier, with that other famous Ephesian place of worship, Diana's temple. The references escalate as the play draws nearer to resolution. It is first "the melancholy vale, / The place of death and sorry execution" (V.i.120–1) where the forlorn Egeon is scheduled to die. Subsequently, characters' repeated mentions of it keep it central—and visually so on stage—to the action: "Then they fled," Adriana tells the duke about her alleged husband and servant, "*Into this abbey*, whither we pursued them; / And here the Abbess shuts the gates on us" (V.i.154–6).[51] "Even now we housed him *in the abbey here*, / And now he's there, past thought of human reason" (V.i.188–9), she continues. "And then you fled *into this abbey here*, / From whence, I think, you are come by miracle" (V.i.264–5), marvels the Second Merchant upon seeing Antipholus of Ephesus at liberty. "I never came *within these abbey walls*" (V.i.266), replies this Antipholus, gesturing, no doubt, to emphasize the abbey's stage presence. After the recognition scene, when all the play's "errors" have finally been resolved, the Abbess herself draws final attention to the church, where the all-important "gossips' feast" will occur:

> Renownèd Duke, vouchsafe to take the pains
> To go with us *into the abbey here*
> And hear at large discoursèd all our fortunes,
> And all that are assembled *in this place*,
> That by this sympathizèd one day's error
> Have suffered wrong.
>
> (V.i.394–9)

The play's final image is that of characters exiting through the stage door of the abbey, the brothers Dromio drawing the audience's eyes to this door as they join "hand in hand" (V.i.427) and cross its threshold together.

The visual spectacle of the Abbess at the door of her priory-temple may equal if not rival the power of the oblique Christian

reference that critics detect in her final speech: her mention of thirty-three years' "travail" to new "nativity" in terms pointing not only to Christ—thirty-three was Jesus' age when he died—but to Emilia's own status as the deliverer of this "joy":

> Thirty-three years have I but gone in travail
> Of you, my sons, and till this present hour
> My heavy burden ne'er deliverèd.
> The Duke, my husband, and my children both,
> And you the calendars of their nativity,
> Go to a gossips' feast, and joy with me;
> After so long grief, such nativity!
>
> (V.i.401–7)

Critics have noted the iconic similarities not only between this moment and its parallel at the end of *Pericles*, but also between both revelations and the final scene of *The Winter's Tale*, one of (if not *the*) most visually striking stage moments in all of Shakespeare.[52] The Abbess and her dramatic descendants in Thaisa and Hermione all offer what Roberts calls a "rarity" in Shakespeare's plays: positive images of living mothers.[53] Their sudden realizations of lost motherhood envelop the stage with the drama of the completed birth rite—the reunion of mother and child—and of these women's personal rites of passage from a suspended state of "virginity" back into the roles of mother and wife. The mother's (re)appearance and exercise of her rites are necessary for the sense of emotional closure for each play: "[T]he maternal body—the 'spotted' goddess—must be recovered at Ephesus in order for familial reunion and salvation to occur."[54] But this closure is also political to the extent that each mother's ritualistic display—her Wild authority borrowed from the trope of the fertile goddess—also aids in the reconstitution of patriarchy, an ironic abetting that is especially operative in *Errors*: "Female though she is, [the Abbess] is here an ultimate instrument of patriarchal power, who ensures reconciliation, fertility, and the survival of the deposed and threatened patriarch by enforcing the total submission of the rebellious wife and countenancing the union of the sister, already proven suitably docile, with her eager suitor."[55]

There is an important difference, however, between the Abbess of *Errors* and her later incarnations in Thaisa and Hermione, a difference that relates specifically to Ephesus as a setting. Critics occasionally remark on the visual resemblance between the

(presumably) habited Abbess and the Virgin Mary at the very moment when she alludes to Christ's birth.[56] However, no one, to my knowledge, has drawn attention to the fact that it was in Ephesus in A.D. 431 that the third ecumenical council of the early Christian Church first declared Mary *Theotokos*, "god-bearer," Mother of God. Catholic myth has traditionally alleged—and still alleges to this day—that after Jesus' death the historical Mary retired to Ephesus where she supposedly lived to an old age and died.[57] It is possible that for Shakespeare's audience, the Abbess appeared not just in the casual outlines of Mary, but as a deeper, cannier exploitation of the popular tradition that linked Ephesus to Christianity's preeminent icon of virginal motherhood. This iconic Mary is not only *like* what we have already encountered in Diana of Ephesus; she may actually *derive from* the Cybele/Diana mythic type insofar as scholars believe that the virginal-maternal aspect of Marian tradition evolved out of the goddess-venerating cultures of the East, where "virgin," "mother," and "divinity" had been synonymous concepts in official practice for thousands of years. In particular, Mary's appointment as *Theotokos* at Ephesus was inspired by, and seems to have inspired in turn, direct links between Mary and the goddesses long cherished there.[58] Some elements of this tradition survived in Marian art and literature of the Middle Ages and early Renaissance, when recognizable attributes of the goddesses became subsumed into the Marian cult, which reached its apex between the eleventh and fifteenth centuries.[59]

The triple representation I am therefore suggesting—that of Cybele overlain by Diana and Mary in a complex of pagan and Christian figures—may bear the added weight of allusion to the aged Queen Elizabeth, consistent, as it is, with the evolved style of royal panegyric that was contemporary with the mid-1590s staging of *Errors*. According to Helen Hackett's chronological survey of Elizabethan panegyric, the 1590s saw an increase in praise of Elizabeth using images of both Diana and Mary through the conceit of Elizabeth as Cynthia, the name that Sir Walter Raleigh had popularized for her. "Cynthia" was, of course, one of the names for Diana's lunar aspect. Because one of the attributes Mary had always shared with the eastern goddesses was the symbol of the crescent moon, her image overlapping that of Diana's became increasingly common, as Hackett notes, on "Marian occasions" such as Christmastide when panegyrists tended toward boldness in their uses of Mary as a figure for Elizabeth.[60] Such details become meaningful in light of the fact that the two known perfor-

mances of *Errors* in Shakespeare's lifetime both took place at Christmastide, the first as part of the Christmas revels at Grey's Inn (on 28 December 1594) and the second ten years later to the day (on 28 December 1604) before the Stuart court.

If, in fact, Shakespeare is alluding to Elizabeth in terms recognizable from both court poetry and the Wild-inflected, virginal-maternal image, then his compliment to her is both genuine and double edged: genuine in its recognition of a distinctive and historically familiar form of female empowerment; double edged in the coercion of this power into a patriarchy whose very existence depends on the control of female fertility. The Abbess, after all, "seems to side with the men" in resolving the disputes brought before her, particularly that between a wife and her husband: "The voice of the Abbess . . . is, finally, the voice of patriarchy, incorporating but confining the female."[61] Shakespeare displays a tendency, as Roberts notes, both to evoke the power of female fertility *and* to stage its active suppression, although the degree of this suppression seems to vary from play to play. (Roberts writes: "Shakespeare will return to this scene near the end of his career, in *The Winter's Tale*, and rewrite it with far deeper understanding and much more profound emotional resonance."[62]) The ambivalence inherent in this kind of staging finds echoes in contemporary expressions of discontentment as well as reverence toward Elizabeth. A church official, remembering the latter years of Elizabeth's reign, notes that "the Court was very much neglected, and in effect the people were very generally weary of an old woman's government."[63] Hackett writes: "The remarks in [John] Manningham's diary that 'Wee prayd to Ladyes in the *Queen's* tyme,' and that 'This supersticion shall be abolished we hope in our kings raigne,' can be read as voicing a contemporary sense that professions of adoration of Elizabeth were *produced by her gender*, and that subjugation to a female ruler was an unsettling aberration."[64] I have added the emphasis to Hackett's statement here to show her implicit acknowledgment of something that Roberts argues consistently: that what power does accrue to the mythical categories of "virgin" and "mother" are products, by the early modern period, of a male imagination that fragments the feminine into discernible types, which can then be assigned value on the basis of their relative utility to patriarchy. In effect, any attributions of power to Elizabeth based on these types could be restricted or withdrawn arbitrarily on the basis of these roles' *social* value—or lack thereof—within the patriarchy that, despite female rulership, still characterized her reign. In-

deed, the very moon imagery often used to flatter Elizabeth was easily manipulated by her male courtiers to figure the dark side of being ruled by her.[65]

Shakespeare's use of Diana to signal the virginal-maternal Wild is different in *Pericles*, the play to which I now turn. The difference, as I will try to show, is at least partly a function of the shifting nature of early modern patriarchy and the politics of monarchy that we find to be characteristic of King James's early reign. We must note first, however, that the most basic difference between *Errors* and *Pericles* is that, in the latter, Diana is an overt, ubiquitous force, appearing early as the object of characters' oaths and prayers: as when Thaisa makes her false vow of chastity (II.iv.10–2); and when Thaisa and Pericles both address her, Thaisa upon awaking from her coma (III.ii.107), and Pericles in vowing never to cut his hair until Marina, their daughter, has married (III.iii.29–32).[66] The goddess gradually gains in importance as Cerimon, after restoring Thaisa to new life, nudges Thaisa into Diana's priesthood (III.iv.12–3, III.v.3–4). Then, in unwitting parallel to her mother, Marina implores Diana to be her guardian spirit of chastity during her ordeal as a prisoner in the brothel at Mytilene ("If fires be hot, knives sharp, or waters deep, / Untied I still my virgin knot will keep. / Diana aid my purpose!" [IV.ii.146–8]). Finally, Diana dominates the play's last act, appearing in a dream vision to Pericles and commanding that he take the journey to Ephesus that results, on the steps of her temple, in the reunion of husband, wife, and daughter. In the moments preceding Diana's entrance, Pericles hears the music of the spheres (V.i.233, 236) and then falls into a vision of the goddess reminiscent of Apuleius's hard-luck Lucius. Shakespeare's audience is made privy to Pericles' dream, as stage directions indicate Diana's appearance and give her ten spoken lines:

> My temple stands in Ephesus. Hie thee thither
> And do upon mine altar sacrifice.
> There, when my maiden priests are met together
> Before the people all,
> Reveal how thou at sea didst lose thy wife.
> To mourn thy crosses, with thy daughter's, call
> And give them repetition to the life.
> Or perform my bidding, or thou livest in woe;
> Do't, and happy, by my silver bow!
> Awake, and tell thy dream.
>
> (V.i.243–52)

Whereas in *Errors* a kind of "Every Family" serves as the basis for figuring the reconstitution of patriarchy, the family that metaphorizes this same process in *Pericles* has seemed to critics to be more specific to the family that, in the most literal sense of "patriarchy," defined James's role as father/Father: the Stuart royal family itself.[67] In this context, the virginal-maternal Diana, with the imagery of the great eastern Mothers behind her, enables a dramatic reclamation of threatened patriarchy that may allude to James's own theories of monarchical rights and responsibilities. She does so, however, not by siding with the men, as does the Abbess, but through a subtly subversive negotiation of the mother/Mother's place within this patriarchy that seems to offer the authority necessary actually to *legitimate* the authority of the father/Father. The difference between the two plays' uses of this trope is therefore more one of degree than of kind: the degree of authority invested in the mother/Mother, and the degree to which this authority becomes a structural component of restored patriarchy. Shakespeare seems here and later, at the parallel moment in *The Winter's Tale*, to insist on a substantive place for the mother through the figure of the fertile Mother—this potent representative of a benevolent female Wild—who calls forth by her very presence a distinctively feminine form of magnitude.

We may find the origins of this more evocative function for the goddess, not surprisingly, in the original Greek tale from which *Pericles* derives, the Latinized *Historia Apollonii*, discussed earlier in this essay as a distant source for the play. Doody, in her attempts to read the *Historia Apollonii* and other of the ancient novels from within their original cultural contexts, stresses the sense in which these texts were products of Greco-Roman imperialism and patriarchy. Her readings place these fictions within the familial and governmental structures that characterized both Greek and Roman empires, concluding that in some ways the romance tradition, with its emphasis on the divine female spirit, must have evolved as a political reaction to abuses of patriarchal power, especially with respect to women and slaves.[68] The incest motif embedded in the story of Apollonius (most evident in the King of Antioch and his daughter) may be an address to a social system that, in the interests of codifying paternal status, deprived female family members of proprietary rights over their bodies. Doody argues that in Greece and Rome, incest was not so much a moral or a sexual issue as it was a hierarchy issue:

> Incest is important primarily when it is a violation of family hierarchy, as when a son takes one of his father's

> women, such as his own sister or—above all—the father's wife or concubine. . . . But that the patriarch himself could suffer from lust for his own progeny is one of the unmentionable things that the ancient law does not want to look at. As woman has no rights in her own body but is the property of her father and often of her husband, it would be hard to discover in the context of ancient law the legal person to whom wrong is done in the case of father-child incest. The novels break the silence on the subject of females' rights to their own bodies, arguing for a personhood not only not unrestricted [sic] as to gender, but also unmodified by hierarchy.[69]

Though the men in the *Historia Apollonii* are the ones who must grapple with the guilty amorphousness of paternal lust, including, though indirectly, Apollonius himself, it is the women who suffer actual loss of control over self and over body. The only recourse for the lucky ones such as Apollonius's daughter (Marina in Shakespeare's version) is to strike out on their own, outside the family structure, enduring perilous journeys and threats of rape but eventually establishing for themselves a degree of self-sufficiency unusual for women in classical literature—a form of female autonomy that may, in fact, reflect the essence of "chastity" as a concept in the classical period.[70] Finally, family reunion can take place only after female chastity has been achieved, usually through, as Doody puts it, "the courageous resistance of the women who have shown that they have power to create change, even though no legal or social right of resistance resides in them."[71]

Moreover, the reconciliations that mark the endings of some of the ancient novels are incomplete until they are sanctified through the appearance of the Mother, either through her literal appearance, as occurs when Diana visits Apollonius (Pericles in Shakespeare's play), or indirectly through the interventions of members of her priesthood, as is the case with the ending of *The Loves of Clitophon and Leucippe* (and in *Pericles* through the characters of Cerimon and Thaisa). The sanctifying presence of the Mother in women's lives has the effect not of overturning patriarchy—since patriarchy persists in its material forms as civic and legal structure—but of providing instead a formally amplified counterimage to the image of the Father and of the Father's all-encompassing Law through a balancing image of the blessings of the Mother. Doody writes about the final episode of the *Historia Apollonii*: "Tharsia [the daughter] makes no direct appeal to the goddess in the brothel scene, yet we may presume that her

mother's prayers to Artemis in Ephesus have been efficacious. When the mother appears at the end of the novel, she comes in queenly habit, adorned with gems and in a purple robe . . . Tharsia's mother seems the image of the goddess. On seeing her, 'Apollonius and his daughter . . . prostrated themselves at her feet. Such was the splendor of beauty that emanated from her, *that they believed her to be the goddess Diana.*'"[72] "It is not only unusual but practically unheard of for a man to kneel *to his wife*," Doody concludes.[73] And to the extent that family and state serve interchangeably as metaphors for each other, such a reconciliation can also be seen to project the image of a reformed patriarchy, reformed in terms that idealize female freedom while simultaneously acceding to masculine authority in all aspects of the political domain. But this submission to masculine authority is balanced by the fact that such authority depends upon the blessing of the goddess: the final impact of Apollonius's encounter with Diana is that his political rule is reconstituted—his authority rescued from its enfeebled state—as a direct result of receiving her endorsement.

Some of these ideological patterns may still hold true, despite the gap of many centuries, in Shakespeare's rendering of this tale in *Pericles*, which critics today read quite similarly in terms of Stuart ideologies of absolutist monarchy. One such critic is Constance Jordan, whose analysis of how the play presents an "analogy between the governments of the family and the state" is remarkably compatible with Doody's view, not least in her similar description of the function of the mother at the play's end.[74] In "'Eating the Mother': Property and Propriety in *Pericles*," Jordan examines Shakespeare's use of kinship relations to dramatize the tensions between supporters of James's absolutist views of monarchy and the opposing constitutionalists, who challenged James's "propriety" over the lands and goods of his English subjects. Apparently, one of the rhetorical features of this debate was its use of domestic relations to figure the struggle over ultimate authority, with the image of the mother/wife at the figure's center. Jordan relates how centuries-old constitutional practice had dictated that "[t]he commonwealth, the 'mother' to whom the monarch is married, retains a degree of independence which is typically associated with the representatives of the people in Parliament and expressed as the right of that 'body' to determine when the monarch can tax the people and by how much."[75]

In keeping with this debate, Jordan finds in *Pericles* a meditation on the specter of irresponsible monarchy, first, through

incest as a metaphor for tyranny, and second, through the drama of abdication, in which the "father" is shown to neglect his guardianship responsibilities, forcing lawless "children" into anarchy. Vacillating between these threats of tyranny and anarchy, *Pericles* represents its patriarch/monarch as perpetually challenged. In recognizing the incest of King Antiochus, Pericles expunges his own unlawful "lust" (for his subjects' property), only to sink into resignation after improperly disposing of his wife and daughter. After a chance reunion with the teenaged Marina, whom he has believed dead, Pericles is able to complete his "education in the art of government," working out "what a proper relationship to a wife and child would be."[76] Shakespeare "portray[s] the monarch as restored to strength and to a proper relation to his people, to the commonwealth [figured as mother], and to law by a moral enlightenment, a position that forces the monarch to see in the very images of desire and power the signs of a necessary and concomitant frustration and weakness."[77] The agent of this miraculous re-education is Marina, whose virtue, Jordan writes, is "divinely inspired" and "has the effect of law."[78] Marina, in other words, is the play's representative of divine law.

What I would add to Jordan's useful analysis is some greater recognition of how Shakespeare depicts Marina's "divinity" as stemming directly from the sponsorship of Diana ("Diana aid my purpose!" [IV.ii.148]), the same Diana to whom her mother has appealed for help (III.ii.107), and whom Thaisa now serves in the famous temple at Ephesus. Daughter and mother, in their respective allegiances to—even representations of—the goddess, comprise in their duality the virginal-maternal powers of Diana, this "wild" Mother who owes as much of her persona to Asian fertility rites as she does to Greco-Roman concepts of female chastity. The implication is that the divine law that reshapes monarchical law is specifically *Diana's* law, the law of the Mother, which answers to, blesses, and ultimately confers legitimacy upon the father/Father in his role as monarch. Jordan clearly delineates this status for the mother along with the father's necessary "subservience" to her authority: "According to constitutionalists, all monarchs must acknowledge the condition in which they, like their subjects, are *under* the laws of the commonwealth, nurtured and protected by them equally. The familial relationship describing this condition is that between brothers, the children of a single mother. It is, of course, *this subservience of the monarch to a mother who is positive law* and Parliament that absolutists decline to accept."[79]

The principle of the monarch's acquiescence to his "mother" commonwealth is captured in the stage image of Pericles' awe, first, before the vision of Diana, and then at the specter of Thaisa, who seems, in the moment of her emergence from Diana's temple, to be newly resurrected from the dead, compounding what Roberts repeatedly describes as the experience of a stage miracle. The image remains faithful to its parallel in the *Historia Apollonii*; and it prefigures, even more so than the Abbess of *Errors*, the similar "resurrection" of Hermione in *The Winter's Tale*. All three, the Abbess, Thaisa, and Hermione, are remarkable for the extent to which they overcome, perhaps only fleetingly, the male Culture's anxiety toward wives and mothers, an abiding hostility to which Roberts devotes much of her discussion.[80] As she puts it, "The male's problem . . . is somehow to unify and accept the figures of virgin, erotically active woman, and asexual older woman. It is no easy task; and male fiction, when it deals with women at all, endlessly retraces [this] process [of reconciliation]," only occasionally representing "an integrated woman," one who is "attractive, sensual, independent, determined, and frightening, a powerful and actively erotic woman, easily confused in the male imagination with a whore or a witch."[81]

Positive—much less benignly powerful—mothers are rare in Shakespeare because of the contradictions inherent in patriarchal constructions of the feminine, which separate and make logically insuperable the full range of human traits in the figure of a woman. Shakespeare's "uncanny"[82] empathy enables such occasional representations, mystified and locked within parameters but nonetheless moving as icons, as stage spectacles, in which the language of *image* momentarily transcends the unrelenting logic of patriarchy. Significantly, when Shakespeare offers such an image, he often does so using the setting of Ephesus to code its credibility, to symbolize a place where female Wildness inspires *wonder* as well as terror. In these moments, Ephesus serves to reconcile the powers of the virginal and the maternal, embodied emblematically in the figure of Diana. Diana's deep roots in Cybele and other of the fertile Mother earth goddesses of the East—her associations, as Bicks writes, "with the dark mysteries of nature"—render her far more, for Shakespeare's audience, "than a virgin goddess who purified women's bodies for a greater patriarchal . . . good."[83]

NOTES

[1] Both Acts 19 and Paul's Letters to the Ephesians are accepted sources for *The Comedy of Errors*.

[2] See Glyn Austen, "Ephesus Restored: Sacramentalism and Redemption in *The Comedy of Errors*," *Journal of Literature and Theology* 1, 1 (March 1987): 54–69; Arthur Kinney, "Shakespeare's *Comedy of Errors* and the Nature of Kinds," *SP* 85, 1 (Winter 1988): 29–52; and R. Chris Hassel, *Renaissance Drama and the English Church Year* (Lincoln: Univ. of Nebraska Press, 1979), pp. 40–4, and "*The Comedy of Errors* in Context and Performance," *UCrow* 17 (1997): 23–39.

[3] Laurie Maguire, "The Girls from Ephesus," in *The Comedy of Errors: Critical Essays*, ed. Robert S. Miola (New York: Garland Publishing, 1997), pp. 355–91, esp. 360–6; and Caroline Bicks, "Backsliding at Ephesus: Shakespeare's Diana and the Churching of Women," in "*Pericles*": *Critical Essays*, ed. David Skeele (New York: Garland Publishing, 2000), pp. 205–27.

[4] Walter Cohen stresses this diversity in his introduction to *A Reconstructed Text of Pericles, Prince of Tyre* in *The Norton Shakespeare*, ed. Stephen Greenblatt (New York: W. W. Norton, 1997), pp. 2709–18, esp. 2712. See also Linda McJannet, "Genre and Geography: The Eastern Mediterranean in *Pericles* and *The Comedy of Errors*," in *Playing the Globe: Genre and Geography in English Renaissance Drama*, ed. John Gillies and Virginia Mason Vaughan (London: Associated Univ. Presses, 1998), pp. 86–106, esp. 98–100.

[5] Emphasizing the three-tiered towers that Cybele often wears as a crown, Virgil figures her in the *Aeneid* (trans. Robert Fitzgerald [New York: Vintage Books, 1984]) as an emblem of civilization and Roman imperialism (see, for instance book 10, lines 348–55, Aeneas's prayer to "Benignant / Lady of Ida, Mother of Gods . . . / . . . and towered cities" [lines 348–50]). For a discussion of Cybele's transmission through medieval and early modern English poetry, in which she comes to represent English nationhood, see Peter S. Hawkins, "From Mythography to Myth-Making: Spenser and the *Magna Mater* Cybele," *SCJ* 12, 3 (Autumn 1981): 51–64.

[6] For a study of Cybele's presence in Rome—her retention of cult practices associated with Anatolia even after her integration into official Roman religion—see Robert Turcan, *The Cults of the Roman Empire*, trans. Antonia Nevill (Oxford: Blackwell, 1996), pp. 28–74.

[7] Jeanne Addison Roberts notes the fertility symbolism in Diana's "multi-breasted" statue in Ephesus with respect to both *Pericles* and *The Comedy of Errors* ("Shakespeare's Maimed Birth Rites," in *True Rites and Maimed Rites: Ritual and Anti-Ritual in Shakespeare and His Age*, ed. Linda Woodbridge and Edward Berry [Urbana: Univ. of Illinois Press, 1992], pp. 123–44, 136). Maguire's essay on *The Comedy of Errors* mentions Diana's fertility cult and documents the early modern renown of her temple (pp. 364–5). Bicks offers the most extended discussion, giving a detailed history of the cult, citations of sources—including Protestant sermons and early English historiography—that situate the Ephesian Diana in early modern discourse, ending with a comparison between Catholic and Reformed doc-

trines on the "churching" of postpartum women as reflections of traditional responses to Diana and her temple and as exemplified through Thaisa's character in *Pericles*. My article "Cerimon's 'Rough' Music in *Pericles*, 3.2" (*SQ* 51, 3 [Autumn 2000]: pp. 313–31) touches on Diana's fertility function but places more emphasis on the "rough" aspects of her cult.

[8] Woodbridge and Berry, pp. 1–43, 29.

[9] Woodbridge and Berry, p. 3.

[10] Roberts, *The Shakespearean Wild: Geography, Genus, and Gender* (Lincoln: Univ. of Nebraska Press, 1991), p. 23.

[11] Roberts, *Shakespearean Wild*, p. 124.

[12] This figure, referred to as "Artemis" in the Greek New Testament, appears as "Diana" in early modern Bible translations as well as translations of the various literary works that featured her cult in Ephesus. For the sake of clarity, I, too, will refer to her henceforth as "Diana."

[13] Roberts, *Shakespearean Wild*, p. 20.

[14] Acts 19:28, 34, quoted from the Geneva Bible, 1599 edition, as are subsequent citations.

[15] Acts 19:27.

[16] Sampson Price, *Ephesus Warning before Her Woe. A Sermon Preached at Pauls Crosse on Passion Sunday, the 17. Of March Last* (London, 1616), cited in Maguire (p. 364) and Bicks (p. 206); Edward Chaloner, *Ephesus Common Pleas. Handled in a Sermon before the Judges in Saint Maries, at the Assises Held at Oxford, An. 1618* (London, 1623), cited in Maguire (p. 364) and Bicks (p. 213); John Prideaux, *Ephesus Backsliding Considered and Applyed to These Times* (London, 1614), cited in Bicks (pp. 210–1); and John Vicars, *Babylons Beautie* (London, 1644), cited in Bicks (p. 211).

[17] I discuss James Mason's *The Anatomie of Sorcerie Wherein the Wicked Impietie of Charmers, Inchanters, and Such Like, Is Discouered and Confuted* (London, 1612) in "Cerimon's 'Rough' Music," pp. 321–2.

[18] The mythographies were guidebooks based on the model of Giovanni Boccaccio's fourteenth-century *Genealogie Deorum Gentilium Libri*. For detailed descriptions, see Jean Seznec, *The Survival of the Pagan Gods: The Mythological Tradition and Its Place in Renaissance Humanism and Art*, trans. Barbara Sessions, Bollingen Series 38 (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1953; rprt. 1995); and Don Cameron Allen, *Mysteriously Meant: The Rediscovery of Pagan Symbolism and Allegorical Interpretation in the Renaissance* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, 1970). Intended originally for Italian artists, these works were translated into a number of European languages and served as handbooks to pre-Christian belief that "no seventeenth-century scholar, man of letters, or artist could do without" (Allen, p. 233). Scholars have noted the influence of these mythographies on the plays of John Marston, the masques of Ben Jonson, Samuel Daniel, and George Chapman, and speculatively on the plays of Shakespeare.

[19] See, for instance, the 1632 edition of George Sandys's *Ovid's Metamorphoses Englished, Mythologiz'd, and Represented in Figures* (Oxford, 1632); available in facsimile, ed. Stephen Orgel (New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1976). Sandys's *Ovid* was highly derivative (and therefore representative) of a number of preceding editions and commentaries, including Georg Schuler's *Metamorphosis Seu Fabulae Poeticae* (Frankfurt,

1589), Natale Conti's *Mythologiae Sive Explicationum Favularum Libri Decem* (Venice, 1567), and Lilio Gregorio Giraldi's *De Deis Gentium* (Basel, 1548). The closest Sandys comes in his commentary to identifying Diana with Ephesus is to point out her fabled birthplace at Ortygia, a grove near Ephesus (see pp. 197, 223, Garland facsimile).

[20] Margaret Doody calls these works "novels" in *The True Story of the Novel* (New Brunswick NJ: Rutgers Univ. Press, 1996), finding their generic traits and even aspects of their realism to be continuous with eighteenth- and post-eighteenth-century novels. Doody's work is an invaluable guide to understanding these novels' influence on the medieval and early modern periods and on the Renaissance in particular. At least three book-length studies have been published on Shakespeare's uses of them: Carol Gesner's *Shakespeare and the Greek Romance: A Study of Origins* (Lexington: Univ. Press of Kentucky, 1970); Barbara Mowat's *The Dramaturgy of Shakespeare's Romances* (Athens: Univ. of Georgia Press, 1976); and J. J. M. Tobin's *Shakespeare's Favorite Novel: A Study of "The Golden Asse" as Prime Source* (Lanham MD, New York, and London: Univ. Press of America, 1984). Incidentally, while these critics carefully document Shakespeare's interest in these fictions, none but Doody highlights the novels' emphasis on female deities and mystery rites.

[21] Shakespeareans have long puzzled over the popularity of *Pericles* on its first staging. The text that has come down to us is irremediably corrupt, and the play has fared poorly with critics compared with the other late romances. Its uneven style and exclusion from the 1623 First Folio have even prompted suspicions that portions of it were written by someone other than Shakespeare, the most likely candidate, considered of late, being the playwright George Wilkins. I consider this authorship debate in detail in "Cerimon's 'Rough' Music," pp. 318–20.

[22] Although unavailable in English translation until the eighteenth century, Xenophon's *Ephesiaka* (or *Ephesiaca*, to note the Latinate spelling) was available in Greek manuscript in Florence during the Renaissance and served as one basis for Italian and French texts that in turn became sources for Arthur Brooke's *The Tragicall Historye of Romeus and Juliet* (1562). It is unlikely that the *Ephesiaka* was widely known in its original outside of Italy; nevertheless, it proved influential throughout Europe, especially with its tale of a heroine who takes a sleeping potion to feign death. See Doody, pp. 254-6; and Geoffrey Bullough, *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare*, 8 vols. (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul; New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1957), 1:269-76.

[23] For a discussion of these novels' frequent focus on Ephesus and on Diana as its central religious figure, see Christine Thomas, "At Home in the City of Artemis: Religion in Ephesos in the Literary Imagination of the Roman Period," in *Ephesos: Metropolis of Asia: An Interdisciplinary Approach to Its Archeology, Religion, and Culture*, ed. Helmut Koester, Harvard Theological Series (Valley Forge PA: Trinity Press International, 1995), pp. 81–117.

[24] Bicks, p. 212.

[25] My use of the term "metaphor" here is not meant to imply "archetype," a concept that I disavow. While archetype implies a universal feature em-

bedded within an unconscious Jungian (as distinct from Freudian) psyche, metaphor requires only the commonality of experience, which may manifest itself transculturally and transhistorically without the mediating presence of an unconscious. Such a distinction allows not only for widespread similarities but also for the vast differences that mark expressions of the Mother goddesses from region to region and over time.

[26] A selective, chronological bibliography of studies beginning in the early twentieth century would include Robert Briffault, *The Mothers: A Study of the Origins of Sentiments and Institutions*, 3 vols. (New York: Macmillan, 1927); M. Esther Harding, *Woman's Mysteries, Ancient and Modern* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1935); Erich Neumann, *The Great Mother: An Analysis of the Archetype*, Bollingen Series 47, trans. Ralph Manheim (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1955); Robert Graves, *The White Goddess: A Historical Grammar of Poetic Myth* (New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 1948; rprt. 1966); Edwin O. James, *The Cult of the Mother Goddess* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1959); Joseph Campbell, *The Masks of God: Occidental Mythology* (New York: Viking Press, 1964); Marija Gimbutas, *The Gods and Goddesses of Old Europe: 7000 to 3500 BC* (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1974); Karl Kerényi, *Eleusis: Archetypal Image of Mother and Daughter*, trans. Ralph Manheim (New York: Schocken Books, 1977); Gerda Lerner, *The Creation of Patriarchy* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1986); and Anne Baring and Jules Cashford, *The Myth of the Goddess: Evolution of an Image* (London: Arkana, 1991).

[27] Doody, pp. 113–24 and 217–26. (The other novel she considers influential is the *Satyricon* of Petronius.) J. J. M. Tobin's *Shakespeare's Favorite Novel* is the source of this estimate of twenty-eight plays, although in his recent capacity as the general editor of *The Riverside Shakespeare*, 2d edn. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1997), Tobin is more conservative, limiting his assertions of Apuleius's status as a "definite" or "probable" source to one poem and seven plays (pp. 77–87). Nevertheless, Shakespeare's acquaintance with Apuleius—and the general acquaintance of the reading and theater-going public—are undisputed.

[28] Apuleius, *The Golden Ass of Lucius Apuleius*, trans. William Adlington, 1566, facsimile edn. (New York: Hogarth Press, n.d.), p. 333.

[29] Apuleius, pp. 333–5.

[30] Apuleius, p. 335.

[31] Apuleius, pp. 336–7.

[32] Apuleius, p. 338.

[33] Vincenzo Cartari, *The Fountaine of Ancient Fiction: Wherein Is Lively Depictured the Images and Statues of the Gods and the Ancients*, trans. R. Linche, 1599, STC 4691; Reel 202; sigs. Hv through H4. This quotation appears on H2v.

[34] Cartari, sig. H4.

[35] Cartari, sig. I2v.

[36] Cartari, sig. Iv. The repeated image of the cymbal in several of these goddesses' descriptions is an indicator of the importance of percussive music in the eastern rites, a trait among others that made them seem especially unruly to the Romans. See Hart, pp. 326–30.

[37] This, at least, is how Allen interprets Cartari at this moment, p. 232.

[38] Cartari, sigs. Nv and N.

[39] Both Cartari and Shakespeare would also have learned details of Isis's myth from the "Isis and Osiris" essay of Plutarch's *Moralia*.

[40] Cartari, sigs. H4 through Iv.

[41] Maguire, p. 364.

[42] Bicks, p. 217.

[43] Critics note that Shakespeare actively switched the setting for this play from the Epidamnum of his Plautine source to Ephesus.

[44] That the play is open to a range of theological interpretations has been attested to by the variety of approaches. For example, for a reading of the play as a descendant of the medieval mystery and cycle plays, see Kinney's "*Comedy of Errors* and the Nature of Kinds"; for a new historicist reading in the context of 1580s and 1590s ecclesiastical disputes within the reformed Church, see Donna Hamilton, *Shakespeare and the Politics of Protestant England* (Lexington: Univ. of Kentucky Press, 1996), pp. 63–6.

[45] I am not the first to point out this correspondence. See Bullough, 1:53; R. A. Foakes, introduction to *The Comedy of Errors*, ed. Foakes (London: Methuen, 1962), pp. xxix–xxxii; and Dorothea Kehler, "Shakespeare's Emilias and the Politics of Celibacy," in *In Another Country: Feminist Perspectives on Renaissance Drama*, ed. Kehler and Susan Baker (London: Scarecrow Press, 1991), pp. 157–78, n. 172. Foakes offers the most detailed correlations, speculating that Shakespeare might have read *The Excellent and Pleasant Works of Julius Solinus Polyhistor* (1587), which contains the remark that "The beauty of *Ephesus* is the Temple of *Diana*, buylded by the Amazons" (qtd. in Foakes, pp. xxix–xxx).

[46] *The Comedy of Errors* in *The Complete Works of Shakespeare*, ed. David Bevington, 4th edn. (New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 1992), V.i.398. All further Shakespeare references are to this edition and will be cited parenthetically in the text by act, scene, and line number.

[47] Roberts, *Shakespearean Wild*, p. 119.

[48] Maguire comments on the dual nature—the split into "divine and dangerous"—of women in this play:

> The love-stricken Antipholus of Syracuse employs the vocabulary of the worshipping Petrarchan wooer: "your grace," "more than earth divine," "Are you a god?" are the terms he uses for the resisting Luciana in 3.2. In the contrasting episode, which follows immediately, Dromio of Syracuse describes his pursuit by the sexual Luce in the language of demonology: Luce "haunts" him, she is a "diviner" [witch], she knows "what privy marks" he has, so that he "amaz'd, ran from her as a witch" (3.2.144). The common root of these two women's names (Luce and Luciana) shows that the demonic female (the diviner who would possess the male) and the divine female (the goddess whom the male wishes to possess) are but two sides of the same female stereotype.
>
> (p. 367)

[49] Roberts, *Shakespearean Wild*, pp. 119. She also writes: "The courtesan is tolerated but suppressed, and only the nightmarish 'mountain of mad

flesh' [Luce] who claims marriage with Dromio of Syracuse remains a threatening remnant of the Wild, though she too is a candidate for wife at play's end" (p. 120).

[50] Roberts, *Shakespearean Wild*, p. 120.

[51] Emphasis is added here and in subsequent quotations.

[52] Interestingly, all three may be associated with Ephesus. Bicks writes that "An early tradition of the church claimed that the holy martyr Hermione, daughter of the Apostle Philip, was one of the three women who, with John the Evangelist, blessed Ephesus after the church was founded there by Paul's disciple Timothy. This tradition must have affected Shakespeare's choice of names as he constructed the relationship between Paulina and Hermione" (p. 217).

[53] Roberts, "Shakespeare's Maimed Birth Rites," p. 132.

[54] Bicks, p. 219.

[55] Roberts, *Shakespearean Wild*, pp. 119–20. I will detail momentarily how Thaisa's entrance pertains to *Pericles*' reconstruction of an enfeebled patriarchy; as for *The Winter's Tale*, perhaps the clearest indication of Leontes' restored authority at that play's end is his last-minute enforced marriage of Paulina to Camillo. Roberts writes: "A subliminal reminder of the goddess of the underworld, [Paulina] takes on also the mantle of the Great Mother as she saves the newborn child and brings Hermione, like Proserpina, back to the world of the living. But for the male her power verges on excess. Marrying her off . . . diminishes her stature . . . Paulina is surely the greatest of the invented older women of Shakespeare's comedies and romances, but she has a Wildness that must be comfortably contained to accommodate the demands of patriarchal Culture" (*Shakespearean Wild*, p. 165).

[56] See, for instance, Kinney, p. 48; or Maguire, p. 367.

[57] The 25 August 1997 issue of *Newsweek* (pp. 49–55) contains an article entitled "Hail, Mary," featuring a photograph of chapel ruins in Ephesus that the Catholic Church reportedly "accepts . . . as Mary's final home" (p. 53). For a history of the third ecumenical council and Mary's legend in Ephesus, see Vasiliki Limberis, "The Council of Ephesos: The Demise of the See of Ephesos and the Rise of the Cult of the Theotokos," in *Ephesos: Metropolis of Asia*, pp. 321–40.

[58] Woodbridge and Berry comment on Mary's historical amalgamation with the ancient goddesses (p. 5). Baring and Cashford describe this amalgamation as follows:

> The cult of Artemis or Diana had been repressed in A.D. 380 . . . and the people, deprived of their goddess, readily turned to Mary instead . . . Portraits from the end of the fourth century and beginning of the fifth show Mary seated in the same position as Isis with Horus, wearing the mural crown of Cybele or Diana, and with the gorgon of Athena painted on her breast . . . It had taken less than a century for Mary to take over the role of Isis, Cybele, and Diana, the remaining goddesses, whose cults had dwindled with the decline of the Roman Empire . . . In fact, it looks as if the imagery of the older goddesses had passed di-

> rectly on to the figure of Mary . . . Sometime between A.D. 400 and 500 the Temple of Isis at Soissons in France was dedicated to the "Blessed Virgin Mary." Isis and Cybele had been "Mother of the Gods"; Mary was now "Mother of God."
>
> (pp. 550–1)

[59] For images and literary examples, see Marina Warner, *Alone of All Her Sex: The Myth and the Cult of the Virgin Mary* (New York: Alfred Knopf, 1976), pp. 206–23, 285–98, and plates on pp. 32–6; and Baring and Cashford, pp. 547–608. See also Pamela Berger, *The Goddess Obscured: Transformation of the Grain Protectress from Goddess to Saint* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1985), pp. 89–104.

[60] Helen Hackett, *Virgin Mother, Maiden Queen: Elizabeth I and the Cult of the Virgin Mary* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995), pp. 174–82, 201, 217.

[61] Roberts, *Shakespearean Wild*, pp. 165, 152.

[62] Roberts, *Shakespearean Wild*, p. 152. See also Roberts's discussion of this tendency with respect to *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, pp. 45–56.

[63] Quoted in Hackett, p. 181. Hackett, in turn, is quoting from Penry Williams, "Court and Polity Under Elizabeth I," *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library of Manchester* 65, 2 (Spring 1983): 259–86, 270.

[64] Hackett, p. 240. Emphasis added.

[65] Hackett, pp. 182–97.

[66] In the discussion that follows, I choose not to pursue the authorship debate surrounding the text of *Pericles*. I will, instead, follow the example of a number of recent critics who have declined to incorporate the issue into their analyses. See, for instance, Constance Jordan, "Pericles," in *Shakespeare's Monarchies: Ruler and Subject in the Romances* (Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Press, 1997), pp. 35–67; Stuart M. Kurland, "'The Care . . . of Subjects' Good': *Pericles*, James I, and the Neglect of Government," *CompD* 30, 2 (Summer 1996): pp. 220–44; and Dana Lloyd Spradley, "*Pericles* and the Jacobean Family Romance of Union," *Assays: Critical Approaches to Medieval and Renaissance Texts* 7 (1992): 87–118.

[67] Critics who read *Pericles* as a reflection of the early Stuarts include Jordan, *Shakespeare's Monarchies*, pp. 35–67; Jordan, "'Eating the Mother': Property and Propriety in *Pericles*," in *Creative Imitation: New Essays on Renaissance Literature in Honor of Thomas M. Greene*, ed. David Quint, Margaret W. Ferguson, G. W. Pigman III, and Wayne A. Rebhorn (Binghamton: State Univ. of New York, 1992), pp. 331–53; Kurland; Spradley; Leonard Tennenhouse, *Power on Display: The Politics of Shakespeare's Genres* (New York: Methuen, 1986); and David Bergeron, *Shakespeare's Romances and the Royal Family* (Lawrence: Univ. Press of Kansas, 1985).

[68] Doody, pp. 15–172.

[69] Doody, p. 83.

[70] The Jungian scholar Harding explores the shifting connotations of "chastity" in her *Women's Mysteries, Ancient and Modern* (1935): "Under our Western patriarchal system the unmarried girl belongs to her father, but in earlier days, as still in some primitive communities, she was her own mistress until she married. Then she gave up the right to dispose of her own

person" (p. 79, but see pp. 76–80). More recently, Marina Warner has stated: "In the case of Artemis . . . and of Hippolyte, the Amazon queen, and of Athene Parthenos, the Maid, their sacred virginity symbolized their autonomy, and had little or no moral connotation. They spurned men because they were preeminent, independent, and alone, which is why the title virgin could be used of a goddess who entertained lovers. Her virginity signified she had retained freedom of choice: to take lovers or to reject them" (p. 48). See also Doody, pp. 62–81.

[71] Doody, p. 88.

[72] Ibid. Quoted lines from the *Historia Appolonii* are from Doody's translation (though emphasis of the final line is mine).

[73] Ibid. Author's emphasis.

[74] Jordan, "Eating the Mother," p. 332.

[75] Jordan, "Eating the Mother," p. 340.

[76] Jordan, "Eating the Mother," pp. 344, 345.

[77] Jordan, "Eating the Mother," p. 353.

[78] Jordan, "Eating the Mother," p. 351.

[79] Jordan, "Eating the Mother," p. 352, emphasis added.

[80] This theme appears often in *Shakespearean Wild* and bears the status of thesis in "Shakespeare's Maimed Birth Rites" owing to that work's emphasis on the early modern need to stage images of the "purification" of the maternal body.

[81] Roberts, *Shakespearean Wild*, pp. 154, 155.

[82] This is Roberts's word used to describe Shakespeare's "humane vision" (*Shakespearean Wild*, p. 75).

[83] Bicks, p. 221.