A Case of Psychological Impotence: Diagnosing Angelo Through Montaigne and Freud

Carole Schuyler
Dixie State College

Walter Pater asks whether Angelo is "indeed psychologically possible" before dismissing him and deciding the play is mainly about the sister and brother rather than the novice nun and ascetic.[1] Other characters in the play believe Angelo is beyond the human pale because of his secular sexual abstinence. For example, the Provost muses that "[a]ll sects, all ages smack of this vice [fornication]" (2.2.5),[2] for which Angelo has condemned Claudio to death. In contrast, Angelo, as Duke Vincentio tells Friar Thomas, "scarce confesses / That his blood flows; or that his appetite / Is more to bread than stone" (1.3.51-53). Similarly, Lucio depicts Angelo to Isabella as "a man whose blood / Is very snow-broth" (1.4.57-58) and who "blunt[s] his natural edge / With profits of the mind, study and fast" (1.4.60-61).

Being so unnatural, Angelo is implacable in applying the letter of the law to Claudio. But is Angelo's austere facade crack-free? Escalus admits Angelo's virtue, but prompts him,

> Had time coher'd with place, or place with wishing,
> Or that the resolute acting of your blood
> Could have attain'd th'effect of your own purpose,
> Whether you had not sometime in your life
> Err'd in this point, which now you censure him,
> And pull'd the law upon you. (2.1.11-16)

Isabella also prods Angelo twice on this point at their first interview: "If he had been as you, and you as he, / You would have slipp'd like him" (2.2.64-65), and "Go to your bosom, / Knock there, and ask your heart what it doth know / That's like my brother's fault" (2.2.137-39). (We'll return shortly to Angelo's responses.)

To the Duke, Angelo's conduct after the bed-trick is incomprehensible. Waiting in the prison, he assumes the message from Angelo to the Provost is Claudio's "purchas'd by such sin / For which the pardoner himself is in" (4.2.106-07). Blackmail,

rape, murder—the devolution into crime and sin must seem impossible to Angelo himself. After encountering Isabella, he is startled by self-recognition: "Blood, thou art blood. / Let's write good angel on the devil's horn" (2.4.15-16).

Before this speech, we may have come to doubt Angelo's straitlacedness. His response to Escalus's "[h]ad time cohered with place" prompt begins loftily: "'Tis one thing to be tempted . . . / Another thing to fall" (2.1.17-18), and ends equally so: "When I that censure him do so offend, / Let mine own judgement pattern out my death" (2.1.29-30). Sandwiched between, however, is a possible admission of consanguinity: "The jury passing on the prisoner's life / May in the sworn twelve have a thief, or two, / Guiltier than him they try" (2.1.19-21). Similarly, in response to Isabella's comparison of her brother and himself, he barks, "Pray you be gone" (2.2.66). Does he object more to being lowered to the fornicator's level or to Claudio's being raised above him as an administrator of justice?

Presumably, Angelo picks on Claudio as the first casualty of the revived law because evidence of the family jewels lay in his path, but why does he exhibit him to the public (1.2.108)—in the BBC and 2003 USF versions—in chains, before imprisonment? (The Provost explains, "I do it not in evil disposition, / But from Lord Angelo by special charge" [1.2.110-11]). Why not threaten to punish Froth and Pompey with worse than whipping? (2.1.136). May I suggest that dropping a fact about one of Shakespeare's probable sources—Montaigne's "Of the Force of Imagination"—will precipitate confusions and result in clarity? First, I'll focus on certain metaphors and images in light of a special condition of the deputy, then point out parallels between the play and the essay, and, finally—for the setting is Vienna—further support my hypothesis with Freud's "Contributions to the Psychology of Love."

I

Presumably, Angelo and Claudio as upper-class gentlemen know, or at least know of, each other (as Isabella tells Lucio that she knows Julietta [1.4.45-48] and the Duke that she knows of Mariana [3.1.2]), and in one trait, they are alike. Lucio is alarmed, in 1.2, for Claudio because "he promised to meet me two hours since, and he was ever precise in promise-keeping" (68-70). In the next scene, the Duke tells Friar Thomas that "Lord Angelo is precise" (1.3.50). In prison, Claudio's response to Isabella's telling him of the proposition is shock: "The precise Angelo!" (3.1.93).[3] We also come to know that Angelo's marriage plans, like Claudio's, have been thwarted because of dowry problems.

In a crucial respect, the men differ. Claudio is caught because the outcome of "most mutual entertainment" is "character too gross [which] is writ on Juliet" (1.2.143-44). Is Angelo capable of writing, minting, stamping, or other euphemisms for reproduction? Lucio declares to the Duke that Angelo is "a motion ungenerative" (3.2.107-08), i.e., "'a puppet without power of generation.'"[4] Later in the conversation, he refers to him as "ungenitured" (3.2.167-68, 89), i.e., "sterile, seedless; or without genitals."[5]

Is Angelo impotent? How can we judge the truth of Lucio's uncanny, unverifiable blurtings? (For he has also told the Duke, "[I]t is certain that when [Angelo] makes water, his urine is congealed ice" [3.2.105-07]). If Lucio is right, then partying, teeming Vienna reminds Angelo of his failing at every turn. Besides Julietta's pregnancy, he officiates (for a while) at the trial involving Elbow's "great-bellied" wife (2.1.88), and Escalus may tell him of Mistress Overdone's news about Kate Keep-down and Lucio's one-year-old son (3.2.192-97). Before his second interview with Isabella, Angelo feels in his "heart" (is this the right organ?) "the strong and swelling evil / Of [his] conception" (2.4.6-7). This is the bribe he'll offer Isabella; it's also his parents' coitus and coining of him. During the interview, he pleads, "Plainly conceive I love you" (2.4.140).[6]

Coincidentally, the other celibate in the play also leaps from act to issue. Had Isabella been "woman" as Angelo implored (2.4.134), she believed she'd give, first, a new life to her brother (to Claudio, she cries, "Wilt thou be made a man out of my vice?" [3.1.137]) and, second, a bastard to Angelo (to the Duke, she declares, "I had rather my brother die by the law, than my son should be unlawfully born" [3.2.188-90]). A little later, happily thinking of the plan the Duke has hatched with her, she comments, "I trust it will grow to a most prosperous perfection" (3.1.260-261). Like Angelo, she imbues nonsexual actions with sexual imagery.

Might Angelo have yielded to temptation with Mariana, but proved incapable? Did he reframe his failure as resisting sin? Hide his shame by slandering her reputation? Purify his passion in solitary work? Obliterate the memory, so that he can marvel, after meeting Isabella, "Ever till now / When men were fond, I smil'd, and wonder'd how" (2.2.186-87)?

II

Montaigne, from whom Shakespeare borrowed ideas and philosophical perspectives via John Florio's translation, likely

inspired him on the cause and prevention of psychological impotence in "Of the Force of Imagination."[7] According to Montaigne, "Such a mischiefe [impotence] is not to be feared, but in the enterprises, where our minde is beyond all measure bent with desire and respect; and chiefly where opportunitie comes unexpected, and requires a sudden dispatch"[8]. By the end of Act 2, Scene 4, Angelo is on target to override what I've conjectured as his problem. His desire for Isabella is overwhelming: "Heaven hath my empty words, / Whilst my invention, hearing not my tongue, / Anchors on Isabel" (2.4.2-4). And it is not checked by respect for her. (We'll see later in the section on Freud why Angelo might see the whore in the nun.) Observe how Angelo's admonition to Isabella—"Fit thy consent to my sharp appetite; / Lay by all nicety and prolixious blushes / That banish what they sue for" (2.4.160-62)—coincides with advice Montaigne cites:

> Now they [women] wrong us, to receive and admit us with their wanton, squeamish, quarrellous countenances, which setting us a fire, extinguish us.
>
> Pythagoras his neece was wont to say, "That a woman which lies with a man ought, together with her petie-coate, leave off all bashfulnesse, and with her petie-coate, take the same againe." The minde of the assailant molested with sundry different alarums, is easily dismaid. And he whom imagination hath once made to suffer this shame (and she hath caused the same to be felt but in the first acquaintances; because they are then burning and violent, and in the first acquaintance and comming together, or triall a man gives of himselfe, he is much more afraid and quaint to misse the marke he shoots at) having begun ill he fals into an ague or spite of this accident, which afterward continueth in succeeding occasions.[9]

Also note the use of "measure" above. Could yet another meaning of "measure for measure" be the degrading of Isabella to counteract the earlier overvaluation of Mariana?

Two other remedies pertain to Angelo. Montaigne recommends, "Before possession taken, a patient ought by sallies, and divers times, lightly assay and offer himselfe without vexing or opiniating himself, definitively to convince himselfe."[10] Recall that Angelo, in another tense situation—accepting the commission from the Duke—requests a preliminary trial of his powers: "Let there be some more test made of my metal, / Before so noble and so great a figure / Be stamp'd upon it" (1.1.48-50). Does anyone doubt that Angelo will be rehearsing his member for the midnight event with Isabella?

Montaigne describes another remedy in some detail. A young nobleman was marrying a beautiful lady who'd been coveted by a wedding guest, so that he worried about his performance in the bridal chamber. In the night, when Montaigne gets the signal for help, he presents the groom with what he later calls a handsel for good luck: "a peece of golden plate . . . wherein were ingraven certain celestiall figures, good against the Sunne-beames, and for the head-ach."[11] But he recommends it instead for "venerian" purposes and provides a complex cycle of prayers and series of motions to render it efficacious—as indeed it is.

This enchanted object with its prescribed ritual corresponds to the walk to bed through Angelo's erotically imaged garden. Isabella tells the Duke,

> He hath a garden circummur'd with brick,
> Whose western side is with a vineyard back'd;
> And to that vineyard is a planched gate,
> That makes his opening with this bigger key.
> This other doth command a little door
> Which from the vineyard to the garden leads. . . (4.1.28-33)

Angelo has practice-stepped the scene twice with her (4.1.41), so he can be sure that not only he, but she, can work the magic.

The play and essay further resonate in four ways: (1) a personality trait of the Duke, (2) a trial scene, (3) a description of Claudio, and (4) the frequent use of certain words.

(1) Montaigne deprecates his role assisting the bridegroom: "It was a ready and curious humour drew me to this effect, farre from my nature. I am an enemie to craftie and fained actions, and hate all suttletie in my hands, not only recreative, but also profitable."[12] This is reminiscent of the Duke's general manner according to Escalus (when the Duke questions him following Lucio's ego-deflating barbs): the Duke's pleasure was "[r]ather rejoicing to see another merry, than merry at anything which professed to make him rejoice" (3.2.229-30). Also echoing Montaigne is the Duke's implementation of the bed-trick when he affirms, "Craft against vice I must apply" (3.2.270, 95). Apparently, craft was not the Duke's *modus operandi* during the fourteen years of his lax rule (1.3.21).

(2) In Act 5, the Duke pardons Claudio. Montaigne might have defended Claudio—or, rather, his member—with this analogy from the courtroom:

> To conclude, I would urge in defence of my client, that it would please the Judges to consider, that concerning this

> matter, his cause being inseperably conjoyned to a consort, and indistinctly: yet will not a man addresse himselfe but to him, both by the arguments and charges, which can no way appertaine to his said consort. For, his effect is indeed sometime importunately to invite, but to refuse never: and also invite silently and quietly. Therefore is the sawcinesse and illegalitie of the accusers seene. Howsoever it be, protesting that Advocates and Judges may wrangle, contend, and give sentence, what, and how they please, Nature will in the meane time follow her course: who, had she endued this member with any particular privilege, yet had she done but right, and shewed but reason. Author of the only immortall worke, of mortall men.[13]

(Lucio and the Provost believe Claudio's member should continue propagating: the first says to Isabella, "[I]f myself might be his judge, / He should receive his punishment in thanks" [1.4.27-28]; the second, to Lodovico, ". . . a young man / More fit to do another such offence, / Than to die for this [2.3.13-14]).

(3) The Provost semi-excuses Claudio as "but offend[ing] in a dream" (2.1.4); Montaigne describes such a wet dream:

> Wee sweat, we shake, we grow pale, and we blush at the motions of our imaginations; and wallowing in our beds we feele our bodies agitated and turmoiled at their apprehensions, yea in such manner, as sometimes we are ready to yeeld up the spirit. And burning youth (although asleepe) is often therewith so possessed and enfolded, that dreaming it doth satisfie and enjoy her amorous desires.[14]

(4) Besides "test" and "assay," terms in common include variations on (a) "will/will not," (b) "liberty," and (c) "remedy."

(4a) Often a measure of "will" in the play conflicts with one of "will not." When Isabella first meets Angelo, for example, she describes herself as "At war 'twixt will and will not" (2.2.33). Angelo, too, experiences this state when told of the Duke's return: "Alack, when once our grace we have forgot, / Nothing goes right; we would, and we would not" (4.4.31-32). The essayist is more prolix than the dramatist:

> But our will, by whose privilege we advance this reproch, how much more likely, and consonant to trueth may we tax it of rebellion, and accuse it of sedition, by reason of its unrulinesse and disobedience? Will shee at all times doe that, which we would have her willingly to doe? Is she not often willing to effect that, which we forbid her to desire? and that to our manifest prejudice and dammage? Doth

> she suffer her selfe to be directed by the conclusions of our reason?[15]

(4b) Claudio tells Lucio that his present restraint in the hands of the Provost comes "[f]rom too much liberty" (I.2.117). Montaigne observes,

> Men have reason to checke the indocile libertie of this member, for so importunately insinuating himselfe when we have no need of him, and so importunately, or as I may say impertinently failing, at what time we have most need of him; and so imperiously contesting by his authority with our will, refusing with such fierceness and obstinacie our solicitations both mentall and manuall.[16]

(4c) Both Montaigne and Shakespeare search for a "remedy": Montaigne, for impotence, and Shakespeare, for a stay of Claudio's sentence of execution for his inconvenient potency:

> *Escalus:* It grieves me for the death of Claudio,
> But there's no remedy. (2.1.277-78)
>
> *Isabella:* Must he needs die?
> *Angelo:* Maiden, no remedy. (2.2.48)
>
> *Isabella:* Why, all the souls that were forfeit once;
> And He that might the vantage best have took
> Found out the remedy. (2.2.73-75)
>
> *Claudio:* Is there no remedy?
> *Isabella:* None, but such remedy as, to save a head,
> To cleave a heart in twain. (3.1.60-62)
>
> *Duke:* Therefore fasten your ear on my advisings: to the love I have in doing good a remedy presents itself. (3.1.196-98)

III

Why is Angelo so excited by Isabella?[17] He believes it's her purity: "Never could the strumpet / With all her double vigour, art and nature, / Once stir my temper: but this virtuous maid / Subdues me quite" (2.2.183-86). Using two essays in Freud's "Contributions to the Psychology of Love" trilogy,[18] I'll suggest other reasons for his attraction and then consider what deleterious effects Angelo and Mariana may have had on each other.

Beyond the speech of her body and her sometime way with words, Isabella beguiles Angelo because she fulfills the four requirements in "A Special Type of Object Choice Made by Men" (1910). The first is the "need for an injured third party"; the "object of love" is not independent or unattached but somehow belongs

to another who is "husband, betrothed, or near friend."[19] Or close relative? That Claudio has a sister is news to Angelo (2.2.19). Isabella compares the two men: "If he had been as you, and you as he, / You would have slipp'd like him, but he like you / Would not have been so stern" (2.2.64-66). Affection explains her contradictory position in pleading her brother's cause: "I something do excuse the thing I hate, / For his advantage that I dearly love" (2.4.119-20). Angelo has a second rival if he sets himself up as divine scourge of Vienna's sinners: Isabella reminds him that " all the souls that were, were forfeit once, / And He that might the vantage best have took / Found out the remedy" (2.2.73-75).

Because of her brother's lapse, Isabella also fulfills the second condition: "a virtuous and reputable woman never possesses the charm required to exalt her to an object of love; this attraction is exercised only by one who is more or less sexually discredited, whose fidelity and loyalty admit of some doubt."[20] Just before he admits Isabella, Angelo gives orders for care of "the fornicatress," Juliet (2.2.23). Does carnality run in the family? Isabella's dialogue is full of double-entendres, some conventional, all unintentional. In her first speech to him, she is a "suitor" to his honor (2.2.27); she calls him back at the conclusion of their first meeting with "Hark, how I'll bribe you" (2.2.146). She greets him at the second meeting with, "I am come to know your pleasure" (2.4.31). If necessary, she's absolute for the death of her body: "Th'impression of keen whips I'd wear as rubies, / And strip myself to death as to a bed / That longing have been sick for" (2.4.101-03). If this fire-and-ice girl were to get her wish for "a more strict restraint" (1.4.4) in the Poor Clares, would the repressed return with even more salaciousness?

Her brother has "great hope" in her power to "assay" Angelo; as he tells Lucio, "[I]n her youth / There is a prone and speechless dialect / Such as move men," in addition to her "play with reason and discourse" (1.2.171-775). He's right: Angelo reveals in an aside that "[s]he speaks, and 'tis such sense / That my sense breeds with it" (2.2.142-43). Understandably, Angelo questions her naïveté: "Your sense pursues not mine: either you are ignorant, / Or seem so, crafty; and that's not good" (2.4.74-75). Of course, neither knows at this point about her role as bawd to facilitate the bed-trick. These first two conditions for male object choice may occur together and each elicits its own emotion:

> While the first condition provides an opportunity for gratifying impulses of rivalry and hostility directed at the man from whom the loved woman is wrested, the second

> one, that of the woman's infidelity ["being like a prostitute" in the Standard Edition (11:166-67)], is connected with feelings of jealousy.[21]

Describing Angelo to Friar Thomas, the Duke says that he "[s]tands at a guard with Envy" (1.4.51), a near emotion to jealousy against which he feels the need to defend himself?

Postponing the third trait, let's consider the fourth and last, the desire to "rescue" the beloved where "[t]he man is convinced that the loved woman has need of him, that without him she would lose all hold on respectability and rapidly sink to a deplorable level"; her danger, though, may simply be in his imagination.[22] Isabella is completing her novitiate in the strictest order. Two options for Angelo's believing he must save her are these: First, he repeats (and puns on) the Duke's admonition to him about not cloistering one's assets:

> Be that you are.
> That is, a woman; if you be more, you're none.
> If you be one,—as you are well express'd
> By all external warrants,—show it now,
> By putting on the destined livery. (2.4.133-37)

Second, if there is a resonance of "nunnery" in its scurrilous sense, Isabella requires deliverance from a potential future as a whore, for she admits the frailty of her sex:

> Ay, as the glasses where they view themselves,
> Which are as easy broke as they make forms.
> Women?—Help, heaven! men their creations mar
> In profiting by them. Nay, call us ten times frail;
> For we are soft as our complexions are.
> And credulous to false prints. (2.4.124-29)

She demonstrates her need of rescue to him by referring, however unconsciously, to her soft complexion: touch me!

Given Angelo's anguished response to Isabella, shown in the BBC version as a change from a laced-up jacket with collar points meeting to a loose shirt revealing his bare chest, can he possibly have been thrown into such temptation by another woman? Before sublimating into the consummate Puritan, he may have so loved Mariana. Freud's third condition for the "special type of object choice made by men" is repetition of these passionate attachments while upholding his own ideal of fidelity.[23] Evidence is lacking, however, and there's more to learn about the effects of this affianced couple on each other from "The Taboo of Virginity" (1918).

In his concluding speech, the Duke exhorts, "[L]ove her, Angelo; / I have confess'd her, and I know her virtue" (5.1.523-24). Here the Duke affirms that Mariana fulfills "[t]he demand that the girl shall bring with her into marriage with one man no memory of sexual relations with another.[24] He thus refutes Angelo's calumny that he broke off the betrothal "in chief, / For that her reputation was disvalu'd / In levity" (5.1.219-21). In the BBC film, Mariana sits in a gazebo just large enough for herself: a bird in a white-ribbed cage while the boy singer sits on the steps. She assures the Duke, "I have sat here all day" (4.1.19-20). All day for five years, I'll bet, which would confirm her state of sexual bondage—even if the hypothesized attempt at intercourse left her physically intact. Freud explains,

> The maiden whose desire for love has for so long and with such difficulty been held in check, in whom the influences of environment and education have formed resistances, will take the man who gratifies her longing, and thereby overcomes her resistances, into a close and lasting relationship which will never again be available to any other man. This experience brings about a state of "thraldom" in the woman that assures the man lasting and undisturbed possession of her and makes her able to withstand new impressions and temptations from without.[25]

What characteristics of this compliant maid could have caused Angelo's impotence? Freud's four reasons seem pertinent here:

(1) Defloration causes loss of blood, thus invoking the blood taboo which includes prohibition against murder as well as various sexual regulations. The Duke has been "a scholar, a statesman, and a soldier" (3.2.142), whereas the reputedly "bloodless" Angelo may have had experience only of the first two roles and may thus be more fastidious.

(2) There is "anxious expectation"—reminiscent of Montaigne—which is most intense at the start of a new undertaking:

> This "anxious expectation" shows itself most intensely on all occasions that depart from what is usual . . .. It is also the origin of the ritual . . . that is observed in connection with beginning any new undertaking, with the commencement of each new period of time, or with the first-fruits of human, animal and plant life. The dangers which in his imagination menace the fearful are never expected to be more terrible than at the beginning of a perilous enterprise, and it is consequently only at that point

> that protective measures can avail him. The first act of intercourse in marriage certainly has sufficient importance to justify its being preceded by precautionary measures of this kind . . . all the more if it causes blood to flow."[26]

(3) For primitive men whom Freud uses as examples and from whom he generalizes to contemporary men, women themselves are virtually taboo—and taboos exist where a danger is feared:

> Man fears that his strength will be taken from him by woman, dreads becoming infected with her femininity and then proving himself a weakling. The effect of coitus in discharging tensions and inducing flaccidity may be a prototype of what these fears represent; and realization of the influence gained by the woman over a man as a result of sexual relations, and the favours she extorts by this means, may all conduce to justify the growth of these fears.[27]

Before the second interview with Isabella, Angelo worries,

> Why does my blood thus muster to my heart [again, is this a misplaced organ?],
> Making both it unable for itself,
> And dispossessing all my other parts
> Of necessary fitness? (2.4.20-23)

Ultimately, he—or any man—may descend to Lucio's status as the cuckolded husband of a Kate Keep-down or even to the nadir of Barnadine whom Pompey prods "to rise and be put to death" (4.3.28), decapitation being a substitute for castration.

(4) While the man fears loss of his own strength, he also fears the woman's rage during the first sexual act: the pain of defloration, "the narcissistic wound which follows the destruction of an organ,"[28] her recognition of decreased sexual value after perforation, her disappointment in the level of satisfaction, and the arousal of older emotions such as the priority of the first libidinal objects over him and even, perhaps, penis envy.[29]

How will Mariana and Angelo fare in their marriage? Alfred Harbage declares that "Angelo is disqualified as a husband for Mariana not so much by his villainy as by his indifference to her.[30] Through the bed-trick, however, Mariana achieves sexual bondage over Angelo. Freud refers to von Krafft-Ebing: "Where we have been able to study sexual thraldom in men it has proved to be the result of a victory over psychical impotence in respect of one particular woman, to whom the man in question thenceforward remained bound."[31] We may hope that Mariana and Angelo reward each other with pleasure for pleasure.

For me, Angelo is "indeed psychologically possible"; Montaigne and Freud unravel the mystery of his bedeviling behavior towards Mariana, Claudio, Isabella, Vincentio, and himself. As the Duke says to the Provost, "Put not yourself into amazement how these things should be; all difficulties are but easy when they are known" (4.2.203-05).

Notes

1. Walter Pater, "*Measure for Measure*" in *Selected Writings of Walter Pater*, ed. with an introduction and notes by Harold Bloom (New York: Columbia UP, 1982), 181-90. Yet Pater does give an explanation later in his essay. Unlike the characters in *Hamlet*, he says that those in *Measure for Measure* are ordinary humans, not exceptional ones. He notes that Shakespeare "conveys to us a strong sense of the tyranny of nature and circumstance over human action" and continues with two examples that apply respectively to Angelo and to Claudio: "The bloodless, impossible temperament does but wait for its opportunity, for the almost accidental coherence of time with place, and place with wishing, to annul its long and patient discipline, and become in a moment the very opposite of that which under conditions it seemed to be, even to itself. The mere resolute self-assertion of the blood brings to others special temptations, temptations which, as defects or over-growths, lie in the very qualities which make them otherwise imposing or attractive; the very advantage of men's gifts of intellect or sentiment being dependent on a balance in their use so delicate that men hardly maintain it always" (187).

But the motivation for Angelo's actions may go beyond failure to maintain this delicate temperamental balance and Pater's two other possibilities. He dismisses the notion that Angelo may be an "embodiment of pure evil" as "no proper subject of art" (185). He briefly considers "the complexion of the heavens, the skyey influences" and "the mere caprice of men exercised over each other in the dispensation of social or political order" (187). In this essay, I argue that Angelo's behavior is "possible" by applying a psycho-physical liability discussed by Montaigne and Freud.

2. William Shakespeare, *Measure for Measure*, ed. J. W. Lever (London: Methuen, 1965). All textual quotations are from this edition.

3. David Crystal and Ben Crystal, *Shakespeare's Words: A Glossary and Language Companion* (New York: Penguin Putnam 2002), 342. "Puritannical, strictly moral, scrupulously correct." The word and comparison remain in the forefront of our attention because malapropping Elbow calls Pompey and Froth "precise villains" (2.1.54). Lever tells us to interpret the misuse as "an ironic commentary on Angelo's principles" (30).

4. Lever, 87.

5. Lever, 89.

6. In speaking the line, "Were he my kinsman, brother, or my son" (2.2.81), Scott Coopwood, in the 2003 USF production, emphasized the words "my son."

7. Park Honan, *Shakespeare: A Life* (New York: Oxford UP, 1998), 343. Among other critics and biographers, Park Honan acknowledges that Shakespeare read Montaigne's *Essays*, "closely enough, it seems, to borrow ideas."

See also, Eleanor Prosser, "Shakespeare, Montaigne, and the Rarer Action," *Shakespeare Studies* 1 (1965), 261, 264. Prosser, however, presents a paradox. While most critics recognize that Montaigne influenced Shakespeare, few agree on parallels in word and content between a passage in a play and a corresponding one in the 1603 translation by John Florio that he would have used (and may have owned as Ben Jonson did). The single point of agreement at the time she wrote her essay was from 1781 when Edward Capell linked Gonzalo's speech on the ideal commonwealth to "Of the Caniballes." Prosser helpfully reviews the literature and less helpfully disparages John M. Robertson in a footnote.

John M. Robertson, *Montaigne and Shakespeare and Other Essays on Cognate Questions*, 2nd rev. ed. (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1909), 182, 107, 87. Robertson extensively supports his argument that "[t]he real clue to Montaigne's influence on Shakespeare beyond *Hamlet* . . . is *Measure for Measure*." No plays other than these two have "such a cluster of reminiscences." He pays particular attention to the Duke's "Be absolute for death" speech and parallels in the nineteenth essay, "That to Philosophie, is to learne how to die." The very next—the twentieth—essay is "Of the Force of Imagination."

8. John Florio, *Florio's Montaigne, The First Book*, The Tudor Translations, ed. W. E. Henley (1603. New York: AMS Press, 1967), 93.

9. Florio, 95-96.

10. Florio, 96.

11. Florio, 94.

12. Florio, 95.

13. Florio, 98. A more contemporary translation may make this point clearer, in Michel de Montaigne, *The Complete Works of Montaigne: Essays, Travel, Journal, Letters*, trans. Donald M. Frame (Stanford: Stanford UP, 1958), 73:

> To conclude, I would say this in defense of the honorable member whom I represent: May it please the court to take into consideration that in this matter, although my client's case is inseparably and indistinguishably linked with that of an accessory, nevertheless he alone has been brought to trial; and that the arguments and charges against him are such as cannot—in view of the status of the parties—be in any manner pertinent or relevant to the aforesaid accessory [Translator's note: Here the 1595 edition adds: "for it is indeed in the nature of my client to solicit inopportunely at times, but never to refuse; and to solicit wordlessly and silently at that."] Whereby is revealed his accusers' manifest animosity and disrespect for law. However that may be, Nature will meanwhile go her way, protesting that the lawyers and judges quarrel and pass sentence in vain. Indeed, she would have done no more than is right if she had endowed with some particular privilege this member, author of the sole immortal work of mortals.

Lucio acts like a prick at the trial. Unruly and impenitent, he irrupts in and disrupts the legal proceeding; for example,

> *Duke:* You were not bid to speak.
> *Lucio:* No my good lord;
> Nor wish'd to hold my peace. (5.1.81-82)

Lucio: Right.
Duke: It may be right; but you are i' the wrong
To speak before your time. (5.1.88-90)

As the Duke expected Angelo to empathize with and pardon Claudio, so he might well comprehend and dismiss his deputy's lust given his own desire for Isabella. Perhaps the Duke's anxiety over his marriage proposals is given expression by Lucio acting as the mischievous deputy phallus. Listen to how he proposes marriage the second time: "Dear Isabel, / I have a motion much imports your good" (5.1.531-32).

14. Florio, 91.

15. Florio, 98.

16. Florio, 96.

17. Harold Bloom, *Shakespeare: The Invention of the Human* (New York: Penguin Putnam, 1998), 365. Bloom is also intrigued: "It is one of Shakespeare's most effective outrages that Isabella is his most provocative female, far more seductive even than Cleopatra, the professional seductress."

In USF's 2003 production, the audience is made well-aware of Isabella's nubility and well-prepared for her acceptance of the Duke's proposal. At a talk-back/literary seminar, a male audience member asked why Elisabeth Adwin was chosen to play Isabella: how could anyone so beautiful be expected to enter a convent? Her wavy, reddish hair falls free and the princess-seamed dress complements her slim body: she is not obscured in a traditional nun's habit as was Kate Nelligan in the BBC version. Though Lucio holds her "enskied and sainted" (1.4.34) because of her renouncement, he openly admires her retreating figure. Perhaps she is aware of her appeal: in the scenes with Angelo, she appears in the simple dress without the embroidered tunic.

We see that, like Angelo, Isabella is "blood"; Adwin demonstrates the "moving graces" the Provost hopes for (2.2.37, 41) and "touch[es] . . . the vein" Lucio observes (2.2.70). She grasps Angelo's hand when he tells her that Claudio must "die tomorrow" (2.2.82); she puts her hand on his chest when she implores, "Go to your bosom" (2.2.37). She freezes, of course, when Angelo kneels before her, face in her belly, imploring "Plainly conceive, I love you" (2.2.140) and when, his cheek touching hers and his body covering hers, urges "give me love" (2.2.143).

But she hugs Friar Lodovico hard when he offers comforting words about Claudio's death; in turn, he holds his hands and arms away from her—although he'd probably prefer to return her affection. He shows the measure of his love and respect for her when Isabella is deciding whether to forgive Angelo and join Mariana in the plea for his life; he stands stage front where she can't see him, and a smile crosses his face at her words. Then, noting her silent plea, he becomes more lenient towards Lucio.

18. The second essay, "The Most Prevalent Form of Degradation in Erotic Life" (1912) discusses psychical impotence. The union of two currents of feeling in the male—the tender, affectionate and the sensual—may be thwarted by the boy's earliest object choice, i.e., his mother. I won't speculate about Angelo's development because I'm unaware of any clues about his mother—as there clearly are about Isabella's father.

19. Sigmund Freud, *Sexuality and the Psychology of Love*, intro. Philip Rieff (New York: Macmillan, 1963), 50.

20. Freud, 50.

21. Freud, 51.
22. Freud, 51.
23. Freud, 52.
24. Freud, 70.
25. Freud, 70.
26. Freud, 75.
27. Freud, 76.
28. Freud 79-80.
29. Freud, 81-83.
30. Alfred Harbage, *William Shakespeare: A Reader's Guide* (New York: The Noonday Press, 1963), 288.
31. Freud, 71.