

Doctoral Dissertation

Male Friendship in William Shakespeare's Roman Plays

MINAKO NAKAMURA

Graduate School of Humanities and Sciences

Tokyo Woman's Christian University

Doctoral Dissertation

Male Friendship in William Shakespeare's Roman Plays

ウィリアム・シェイクスピアのローマ史劇における
男性間のフレンドシップ

November 28, 2013

MINAKO NAKAMURA

Graduate School of Humanities and Sciences

Tokyo Woman's Christian University

	in <i>Coriolanus</i>	114
1. The Power of the Plebeians		116
2. The Representations of Women and Male Friendship		125
3. Martius's Concept of Manhood and Male Friendship		131
4. The Plebeians' Influence upon Male Friendship		136
Conclusion		148
Works Cited		157

Introduction

Marcus Tullius Cicero (106-43 BC), the influential Roman orator and statesman, wrote a famous essay, *De Amicitia*, which William Shakespeare most probably read while studying in grammar school in Stratford (Enterline 12). The title of this essay is generally translated as *On Friendship*. Friendship was valued highly in ancient Rome and its various aspects are deeply examined in this work although female relationships are entirely excluded from it; it is even suggested that people should “place friendship above every other human concern that can be imagined” (185). Discussing the issue of friendship, Cicero often refers to human goodness. Gaius Laelius, the principal speaker in *De Amicitia*, says:

No one can be a friend unless he is a good man. But next to goodness itself, I entreat you to regard friendship as the finest thing in all the world. (227)

According to his idea, both human goodness and friendship are essential to life in Rome.

Cicero regards friendship as more ideologically-based than Shakespeare does, asserting that people should not “expect their friends to provide what they themselves are incapable of supplying” (217). Laelius says:

The reason why we count friendship as a blessing is not because we are hoping for a material return. It is

because the union is quite enough profit in itself.

(193)

He implies that one should not build friendship with the aim of material gain. Friendship originates in goodness, without which the former cannot be formed. The narrator even says:

It is quite untrue to say that people only form friendships because there is some deficiency in themselves. On the contrary, the most generous and liberal friends are those who have the very least need of anyone else, because they themselves already possess wealth and power and, above all, goodness, which is the strongest resource a man can command.

(204)

Since an ideal friendship in *De Amicitia* is defined as one between good men, the requirement to construct friendship “is to find someone not different from oneself, but the same” (217). In other words, giving and receiving is not required between friends, and friendship works as a means to unite male human hearts of good quality.

By contrast, in Shakespeare’s Roman plays, male friendship is equivalent to cooperation in the political activities of the plays. As a term “friend” is defined in *The Oxford English Dictionary* (henceforth, the *OED*) as “One joined to another in mutual benevolence and intimacy” (A.n.1.a), mutual assistance is indispensable in constructing male friendship with others.

Male friendship is different from male companionship in that the latter refers merely to close relationship between men. Although Shakespeare set his Roman plays in ancient Rome, the social situations and value system of Renaissance England are reflected in his works. He seems to have intentionally changed the concepts of male friendship in Cicero's work which he most probably read, to those appropriate to his original audience. This becomes clear in the comparison of Cicero's male friendship in the work with the representations of those in Shakespeare's Roman plays. The comparison is effective in studying the system of values in early modern England.

The term friendship implies a variety of meanings, such as companionship and love. Concerning the concepts of male friendship, Tom MacFaul states in *Male Friendship in Shakespeare and His Contemporaries*: "Shakespeare's plays, then, were performed at what seems a particularly important time in the history of friendship, as older feudal modes of allegiance gave way to modern friendship of affection" (5). According to MacFaul, while Renaissance Humanism considered, as derived from Cicero, that men were equal in friendship to each other, dramatists at that time including Shakespeare regarded friendship as based on human differences (5).

This dissertation explores representations of male friendship in William Shakespeare's Roman plays in relation to the social realities in early modern England. In the case of his

English history plays, due to the censorship at that time, Shakespeare could not present issues closely related to contemporary politics such as republicanism and the problems of succession, with which his audience were deeply concerned (Clegg 32-35). In *Shakespeare and Republicanism*, Andrew Hadfield argues on the duty of dramatists:

In such a professional climate, dramatists—and writers in general—had to produce material quickly, take risks and hope that what they wrote appealed to a wide audience (or a few powerful and influential courtiers). One way of doing this was to be topical and to refer to recent events, whether in the main plot or more allusively and occasionally. . . . There was a long court tradition of drama that was inherently political in seeking to advise the monarch either forcefully, or subtly. . . . (4)

He suggests that dramatists in the Elizabethan period had to deal with contemporary political issues in order to appeal to a wide audience. In such a situation, Shakespeare chose as the setting of his plays ancient Rome, which was entirely a different country.

English people felt a special familiarity with and deep respect for Rome since it was regarded as the origin of English society. In *Roman Shakespeare: Warriors, Wounds, and Women*, Coppélia Kahn states:

In English chronicle histories, the founding of Britain was connected to the founding of Rome through Brutus, the grandson of Aeneas, founder of Rome. (3)

Rome remained important in early modern England. As Lisa Hopkins argues, ancient Rome was considered a model to follow by English people in general for its external and internal policies (142). In particular, republicanism seems to have been one of the main factors which attracted the English people at the time to Rome:

Taken together, *The Rape of Lucrece* and *Titus Andronicus* argue forcefully that hereditary monarchy may be an undesirable form of government. Both represent tyrants who are conspicuously less virtuous and competent as rulers than other prominent Roman citizens, implying that England might suffer from equally bad rule. Both works are also quite clear that alternative forms of government, which would involve either dispensing with or curbing the power of the head of the state, are possible and desirable for Rome.

(Hadfield, *Renaissance Politics* 111)

According to Hadfield, republicanism could be a preferable form of government to Rome in Shakespeare's works. It is quite natural that English people at that time, who thought that

Rome had been their origin and model, should also consider republicanism as “possible and desirable” for England.

Shakespeare composed a series of Roman plays, representing the transitional period in English society at that time. Concerning the representations of Rome in Shakespeare’s plays, Robert S. Miola says:

This “city,” of course, Shakespeare defines variously: Rome is an extension of Collatine’s household in *Lucrece*, a wilderness settlement in *Titus Andronicus*, a political arena in *Julius Caesar*, an Empire in *Antony and Cleopatra*, a sharply drawn *urbs* in *Coriolanus*, and a vaguely localized anomaly, part ancient, part modern, in *Cymbeline*. It is sometimes metaphor, sometimes myth, sometimes both, sometimes neither. Despite its metamorphoses, Rome maintains a distinct identity.

(Shakespeare’s Rome 16-17)

Pointing out that ancient Rome is described as possessing a variety of aspects in Shakespeare’s works, Miola does not mention the significance of the deficient states of the Roman society presented by Shakespeare. What is most significant is that the Roman society either of the Empire or of the Republic presented in Shakespeare’s plays does not function properly. Interestingly enough, problems of Shakespeare’s England are reflected in these works. What Shakespeare presented was not

how the real Rome had been but what his contemporaries imagined about it. Hence, a study of Shakespeare's Roman plays with a focus on the theme of male friendship will help to make clear the nature of the male world in early modern England.

England in Shakespeare's time was similar to ancient Rome in that honour was regarded as important. The ethics of honour, basically a pagan idea, had come to hold an almost equal footing with those of Christianity. As Curtis Brown Watson argues, Shakespeare describes honour as more predominant code of behavior than Christianity:

Shakespeare was a man of his age and that his plays therefore reflect, with an inconsistency which has to be admitted and accepted, both the Christian and the pagan-humanist values of his period . . . he favours those definitions of good and evil which his age had inherited from the pagan humanists. (6)

The society in early modern England could maintain inconsistent moral ideologies.

The Roman concepts of honour, including *virtus*, are highlighted in every Shakespearean Roman play. R. Malcolm Smuts discusses the importance of honour in English society at that time:

At the heart of this cultural system lay a concept of honour that structured both patterns of behaviour and a distinctive vision of society. In some senses

honour mattered at all levels of society, among both women and men, but its richest meanings applied exclusively to peers and gentlemen. For women honour consisted chiefly in the passive virtue of chastity, while for tradesmen and husbandmen it involved qualities of honesty and sobriety, appropriate to a middling station in life.

(Culture and Power 8)

Not only men but also women in England attached great importance to their sense of honour, although their concepts of this virtue are different.

Ancient Rome is pre-Christian, but the medieval concepts of chivalry are dealt with in Shakespeare's Roman plays:

Beginning with a revival in the later fifteenth century, the chivalric tradition has remained capable of reviving and of modifying attitudes toward honor, war, and love virtually to our own day. (Ferguson 1)

Since the matter of chivalry is effective in Shakespeare's works, his Roman male characters often speak of knighthood such as Titus in *Titus Andronicus* (1.1). Chivalry in Shakespeare's works implies "an all-important code of behaviour for the honourable person in civil society" (Meron 4). The issue of military glory and honour, which is thought highly of in ancient Rome, is compatible with medieval chivalry.

On the other hand, in Renaissance England, strongly

governed by the principle of patriarchy, it was generally accepted that men should rule or control women. As to the situation in which male characters in Shakespeare's plays are placed, Coppélia Kahn thinks that Shakespeare's "male characters are engaged in a continuous struggle, first to form a masculine identity, then to be secure and productive in it" (*Man's* 1). And yet, while women in general were ruled by their patriarchs such as their fathers or their husbands, men themselves were also controlled by their superiors in patriarchal society.

As MacFaul discusses, male characters in Renaissance plays struggle to build relationships with other men since "friendship with other men was crucial to a man's sense of identity" (3). Both Kahn and MacFaul pay special attention to the issue of male identity in Renaissance England. Although Kahn and MacFaul discuss the issue of male friendship in Shakespeare's works, unlike the argument in this dissertation, their arguments do not center on the Roman plays.

In the meanwhile, although the society in Shakespeare's Roman plays is described as being controlled with patriarchal norms, there appear some women who are described as energetic and masculine. Fulvia, Antony's wife, raises an army against Caesar, while Volumnia, Coriolanus's mother, is described as so energetic as to be referred to as "mad" (4.2.11). What drives them to act in such violent ways is their deep

concern for their husband or son; it is said that Fulvia fights against Caesar in order to bring back Antony from Egypt to Rome, and Volumnia behaves like Coriolanus's father in order to educate him to become a splendid Roman warrior. Their deviation from the social norms of womanhood is derived from their devotion to men.

Men often unconsciously identify themselves with these powerful women, trying to prove their manly independence in Roman society. Though excluded from the male world, the existence of wives is undoubtedly essential to the survival of their husbands since only wives can produce legitimate heirs who can continue their patriarchal authority in Roman society. Wives were not regarded as equals, but indispensable to husbands, at least as a means to produce an heir. These men are heavily dependent upon their wives to continue their genealogy.

While the conditions of both men and women are to be discussed in this dissertation, the representations of "fellow-travellers" in Shakespeare's Roman plays will also be studied. Based on MacFaul's view, a "fellow-traveller" is defined as a man who, like Berowne in *Love's Labour's Lost* (1595), not embodying a male sense of honour himself, but only accompanies men who pursue "the concept of honour and therefore [are] closer to the women's position than the other men"(153). Accepting the importance of honour in the male world and being interested in matters related to it, a

“fellow-traveller” is separated from men whose sense of identity is deeply based on honour. In this dissertation, a “fellow-traveller” is characterized as one who tries to obtain not honour but actual power in society. The examination of the representations of “fellow-travellers” in Shakespeare’s Roman plays is effective in studying the social condition in which male characters are set.

Shakespeare composed four Roman plays, *Titus Andronicus* (1594), *Julius Caesar* (1599), *Antony and Cleopatra* (1607), and *Coriolanus* (1608), drawing his knowledge on Rome from books such as Plutarch’s *The Parallel Lives of the Noble Grecians and Romans* (1579), Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* (A.D. 1-8), and Giovanni Boccaccio’s *De cacibus virorum illustrium* (1355-74). He even wrote a poem on the Roman theme, *The Rape of Lucrece* (1593-4). This dissertation will consist of four chapters, which deal with these four plays chronologically. His portrayal of the political system of the male world of power, as it will be examined in this dissertation, reflects the one in early modern England.

In this dissertation, male friendship is regarded as the close relationship between men that can influence their social positions and help to construct their sense of self. The significance of male friendship is to be explored in the light of the social ideology in early modern England, which helped men to secure their identity in the male world of politics. The issue

of male friendship portrayed in Shakespeare's Roman plays is vital to understand the nature of patriarchal society in early modern England.

There are some critical books which deal with either male friendship or Roman Republicanism, such as those by Tom MacFaul or Andrew Hadfield, but the relationship of these two issues has hardly been examined in previous studies. This dissertation intends to explore the significance of male friendship in Roman Republicanism represented in William Shakespeare's Roman plays. In this respect, it will open a new sphere, which throws a new perspective on social realities in England when Shakespeare wrote in his Roman plays.

Chapter I. Male Friendship and Negotiation

in *Titus Andronicus*

Titus Andronicus, Shakespeare's first Roman play, was published in 1594. At that time, England was threatened by foreign powers based in Catholic countries (Doran 51-61); the most serious problem in England concerned who would succeed Elizabeth I. In 1588, Spain sent its Armada to invade England, and the menace lasted for a long time until the end of Elizabeth's reign. In order to intercept the recovery of Spanish naval power and refill the exchequer with Spanish silver, Elizabeth conferred privateers such as Sir John Norris "letters of marque" (Williams 325-48). Parma was still advancing in the Netherlands, and the French Catholic League threatened the Channel ports (Hammer 154-82). England at that time was also having troubles with Ireland which would eventually develop into the Nine Years War, in particular Tyrone's Rebellion, continuing from 1594 to 1603 (Williams 349-59).

In the meanwhile, the problem of an increasing number of the Moors in Elizabethan England was causing concerns even for Queen Elizabeth. "An open letter to the Lord Maiour of London and th'Aldermen his brethren, and to all other Maiours, Sheryfes, &c.," which was registered on the 11th of July 1596, states:

Her majestie understanding that there are of late divers blackmoores brought into this realme, of which kinde of people there are already here to manie, consideringe howe God hath blessed this land with great increase of people of our owne nation as anie countrie in the world, whereof manie for want of service and means to sett them on worck fall to idleness and to great extremitie. Her majesty's pleasure therefore ys that those kinde of pople should be sent forth of the lande, and for that purpose there ys direction given to this bearer Edwarde Banes to take blackmoores that in this last voyage. . . . (*Acts of Privy Council* 16)

Furthermore, according to "An open warrant to the Lord Maiour of London and to all Vyce-Admyralles, Maiours and other publicke officers whatsoever to whom yt may appertaine," registered on the 18th of July 1596, Elizabeth I allowed a German merchant to take the Moors in England to Spain and Portugal in exchange for her eighty-nine subjects who had been imprisoned by the Spanish and the Portuguese (*Acts of Privy Council* 20).

This play, written against such a backdrop, describes the end of the Roman Empire, presenting issues of the hereditary monarchy and wars against foreign countries. In this chapter, the term "a foreigner" is defined to refer to the Goths and the

Moors in ancient Rome. The threat of foreign countries as well as swelling number of the Moors in England is presented by those people. Foreigners such as Tamora, Queen of the Goths, and Aaron, a Moor, who is brought to Rome with the Goths, are described as having power enough to prevent Titus from building male friendships. Since Titus kills Alarbus, Tamora's eldest son, as a sacrifice in memory of his sons who have been slain by the Goths, she revenges herself upon Titus. As Louise Noble argues, the reason why they have such power is that the setting of the time is when the Roman Empire, not functioning properly, is losing its strength:

. . . both Aaron and Tamora merely employ the disturbed situation they find in Rome—exhibitions of cruel and rapacious imperialism supported by a revenge logic that fuels perceptions of insult and dishonor—to their own advantage. (690)

Lavinia, Titus's daughter, can be regarded as in the same situation with the foreigners; she is a woman and hence cannot belong to the male world, where only Roman males have controlling power. Therefore, the foreigners and Lavinia can be categorized as "others," who are excluded from the male world. The existence of "others" clarifies the nature of the Roman concept of male honour, which is important in constructing male friendship and to which Titus feels strongly bound.

When the play opens, Titus Andronicus triumphantly

returns to the Roman Empire after a war against the Goths, and the election of the next emperor takes place. He is chosen as emperor by the people because of his great victory against the Goths. Being admired by the public, he could become emperor if he wants. Nonetheless, he would rather follow the law of primogeniture and chooses to make Saturninus emperor than take the role himself. He is loyal to this Roman tradition, being “the tyranny of tradition and an unquestioning allegiance to an orthodox humanist intellectual heritage” (Ian Smith 288). Throughout the play, he keeps his identity by fighting. Though concerned with the issue of honour, he cannot understand how male honour functions in society. His incapability leads to his failure to establish either male friendship or family bondship in Roman society.

This chapter will consider the issue of male friendship in *Titus Andronicus* in terms of “negotiation.” In the play world where sense of value is undergoing major changes, male friendship can hardly be constructed. When male friendship is built in this play, it is transformed into negotiation, which requires a certain amount of intelligence for both parties.

1. Titus’s Concept of Male Honour

It is clear that Titus is portrayed as a great warrior, but he does not understand the concept of male honour in the play world to which he has returned. This change in the concept of

male honour portrayed in this play reflects how it is considered in early modern England:

There can be said to be two different kinds of honour: vertical and horizontal honour. Vertical honour can be defined as a right to special respect due to one's superiority. As this definition implies, vertical honour can be increased, and it is therefore also called positive honour. It can be contrasted with horizontal honour, which can be defined as a right to respect due to an equal. Horizontal honour thus presupposes an honour group which follows the same code of conduct and honour.

(Peltonen, *The Duel* 35)

The honour which Titus tries to attain through his loyalty can be defined as vertical one, but what he should try to achieve in order to survive in the society is horizontal one. During his absence from Rome, as republican thought spreads, the concept of male honour which was formerly based on loyalty to Roman emperor has been lacking in its set code.

Titus's triumph and the election of the emperor indicate two important issues in the play; that is, foreign policy and succession. The importance of the matter of succession is represented in the dispute between Saturninus, the eldest son of the previous king and Bassianus, his younger brother:

Saturninus: I am his first-born son that was the last

That wore the imperial diadem of Rome:
 Then let my father's honours live in me,
 Nor wrong mine age with this indignity.

Bassianus: Romans, friends, followers. . . .

.

But let desert in pure election shine,
 And, Romans, fight for freedom in your
 choice.

(1.1.5-17)

Here, Saturninus asserts the legitimacy of primogeniture while Bassianus believes in the rightfulness of a democratic process.

In the meanwhile, Marcus, Titus's brother and a tribune of the people, nominates Titus as the Roman emperor, but he rejects the offer, saying, "this suit I make,/ That you create our emperor's eldest son" (1.1.227-28). Thinking highly of the law of primogeniture, he proposes that Saturninus should be a new emperor without thinking whether he might be personally worthy of the post. He is blindly alleged to primogeniture, not possessing "the ability or the imagination to break free of traditional, constricting conventions and ideas" (Hadfield, *Renaissance Politics* 122). His own ideal image of absolute loyalty to the Roman emperorship has made him old-fashioned since his concept of male honour has been changing in Rome presented in the play.

In spite of Titus's belief in the righteousness of inherited

titles, Saturninus is evidently unfit for the role, often revealing his personal follies as well as his passion for absolute power.

Mistakenly thinking that Titus wants to become the next emperor, he accuses that Titus has manipulated people's minds:

Saturninus: Andronicus, would thou were shipped
to hell

Rather than rob me of the people's hearts.

Lucius: Proud Saturnine, interrupter of the good

That noble-minded Titus means to thee.

Titus: Content thee, prince, I will restore to thee

The people's hearts, and wean them from
themselves.

(1.1.210-15)

His unreasonable claim towards Titus points to a possibility of his tyrannical character. The inclination towards absolutism is implied in his remark since "he places the principle of primogeniture over that of people's 'voice'" (Ray 33). This view can also be applied to Titus, who has ignored the nomination of the tribune.

In the case of Titus, his possibility of absolutism is turned to his family. According to the patriarchal value, he believes that his children should be loyal to their father. He does not seem to have constructed familial bondship with his children. When we look to his relationship with Lavinia, it should be noted that she holds a distance in her relationship to Titus. His

long engagement in the wars abroad causes this distance. When he returns to Rome from battlefield, Lavinia greets her father:

In peace and honour, live Lord Titus long:

My noble lord and father, live in fame!

.

[*kneeling*] And at thy feet I kneel with tears of joy

Shed on this earth for thy return to Rome.

O bless me here with thy victorious hand,

Whose fortunes Rome's best citizens applaud.

(1.1.160-67)

This passage makes it clear Lavinia's attitude towards her father is overtly formal and ceremonious. She appears to be pleased at the return of "Lord Titus," a great warrior, not of her father.

Meanwhile, Titus regards Lavinia as a means to promote his own relationship with the emperor, which he thinks will raise his sense of male honour. Titus expects that, through Lavinia's marriage to Saturninus, he will be strongly tied to the emperor, who he thinks of as the absolute authority in the society of the play.

It is not only with Lavinia but also with his sons, that he has failed to establish firm familial relationships with his children in Rome. When his sons, Lucius, Quintus, Martius and Mutius, support Bassianus, who declares Lavinia as his bride, he refers to their act as "Treason" (1.1.288). Titus even kills

Mutius, who dares to protest openly against his father's marrying Lavinia to Saturninus:

Titus: What, villain boy, barr'st me my way in Rome?

He kills him.

Mutius: Help, Lucius, help!

Lucius: [*returning*]

My lord, you are unjust, and more than so:

In wrongful quarrel you have slain your son.

Titus: Nor thou, nor he, are any sons of mine:

My sons would never so dishonour me.

Traitor, restore Lavinia to the emperor.

(1.1.295-301)

Evidently he thinks that his sons are committing a serious crime by defying Titus and the emperor. For Titus, there is little difference between "sacrificing the enemy's son and executing one's own" (Heather James 52). Both acts originate in his allegiance to his concept of Roman values. At this stage, he places priority on the emperor and on Rome before his family, seeking not material gain but promotion of male honour. He believes that if he leaves Mutius unpunished, his allegiance to Roman patriarchy will be impaired.

The divergence of Titus's values from those of his children does not necessarily come from the generation gap between them. Having served abroad in wars against the Goths for ten years, he is behind the changes which were happening during

his absence to the concept of male honour, in which priority was given to one's loyalty to the Roman emperor. It is remarkable that Marcus's relationship with Titus's children is much stronger than that of Titus's. For instance, just after Titus kills Mutius, Marcus speaks to him:

Suffer thy brother Marcus to inter
His noble nephew here in noble virtue's nest,
That died in honour and Lavinia's cause.

Thou art a Roman, be not barbarous. (1.1.380-83)

Marcus stands by Mutius's side, referring to him as "noble" while calling Titus "barbarous." Even if Marcus and Titus belong to the same generation, their codes of value are different from each other's.

In "The Tragical History of Titus Andronicus, & c.," one of Shakespeare's probable sources, the Roman society is presented as less corrupt than that in Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus*. Here, Rome is ruled by the old value system, which is disappearing in Shakespeare's play. For example, although Shakespeare's Saturninus marries the Queen of the Goths sheerly because of his lust, the Roman Emperor is "kind good-natur'd" (Bullough 6: 39) and marries the Queen with the aim of ending the war against her people. By contrast, the Queen takes the initiative in undertaking a variety of wicked deeds, using the Moor as a tool. The tragedy of Titus's family is caused by the enmity of the Goths.

On the other hand, in *Titus Andronicus*, though the power of foreigners is highlighted, it is not the foreigners that destroy Rome. Titus, giving primogeniture priority over republicanism, is chargeable upon the destruction of the city. Having no need to cooperate with other Roman warriors owing to his supreme military acuity, he wants to construct male friendship only with the Roman emperor, whom he thinks holds the absolute power. As Gilberta Golinelli discusses, though the unstable social condition is underlined by the existence of foreigners, Rome has already been deprived of its controlling power:

Rome is a city already contaminated and fragmented before the encounter with otherness, represented metaphorically by the Goths and heightened by the possibility that the future emperor of Rome might be the “black” son of Tamora and Aaron. (137)

As the value system in the present Rome is incomprehensible to Titus, it leads to his daughter’s ruin and eventually the ruin of the Roman Empire. Lucius, his son, attacks Rome, destroying his home country together with the Goths. Though Lucius is a Roman, he becomes a destroyer of Rome. Thus, Rome is presented in this play as destroying itself in various senses.

Since he is behind the times, Titus’s concept of male honour does not work and he cannot construct male friendship, which is deeply related to male honour. After Lavinia’s rape and the murder of Bassianus, Titus begins to realize the change of

values in his society. This happens when he repeatedly asserts the innocence of his sons, Martius and Quintus, not guilty of the murder of Bassianus, none of the tribunes of Rome listens to him. Lucius draws attention to the indifference of the Roman tribunes:

O noble father, you lament in vain:
 The tribunes hear you not, no man is by,
 And you recount your sorrows to a stone. (3.1.27-29)

All Titus can do here is to respond emotionally. To him, Rome is no longer a place for human beings. He even admits his powerlessness, regarding himself and his family as prey for wild animals:

Why, foolish Lucius, dost thou not perceive
 That Rome is but a wilderness of tigers?
 Tigers must prey, and Rome affords no prey
 But me and mine. How happy art thou then
 From these devourers to be banished. (3.1.53-57)

Even if he still possesses military acuity, it does not help to reconcile him to other Romans. Here, Titus is no longer an honourable Roman warrior. The old values, which attached much importance to military achievements, have now changed into a new system of values, in which negotiations are of the utmost importance.

As will be discussed later, Titus's children and the foreigners are described as endowed with the skill of

manipulation and cunning. These qualities can be called negotiations, to which male friendship has given way. In the play world, while military ability is still appreciated, negotiations are indispensable in order to stabilize one's social position or achieve one's purpose.

2. Titus's Attempt to Reconstruct His Identity

Losing his identity as a prominent Roman warrior, Titus tries to construct one as an ideal father. Though he has neglected his family, devoting himself to the war, he begins to construct firm relationships with his family members. Told by Aaron that if Titus, Marcus, or Lucius chops off his hand and send it to the emperor, the emperor will send Titus's sons, Martius and Quintus, back alive, Titus offers to cut off one of his hands:

With all my heart I'll send the emperor my hand.

Good Aaron, wilt thou help to chop it off?

(3.1.161-62)

Calling the Moor "gentle Aaron" (3.1.158) and "Good Aaron" (3.1.162), he is willing to mutilate himself and offers to the emperor as proof of his loyalty a hand, which "hath thrown down so many enemies" (3.1.164). He has made a choice to become an affectionate father rather than a Roman warrior. Learning that he has been deceived by Aaron, and his two sons have been killed despite his offering his hand, he now feels that

he has lost his identity either as a Roman warrior or as an ideal father.

In order to retain his identity in either sense, Titus starts to revenge on the Goths. The object of his fighting has changed from the protection of his country to that of his daughter. Consequently, his attitude towards fighting is evidently different from that in the earlier part of the play. When Marcus kills a fly, he takes the side of a fly:

Out on thee, murderer. Thou kill'st my heart.

Mine eyes are cloyed with view of tyranny;

A deed of death done on the innocent

Becomes not Titus' brother. . . . (3.2.54-57)

Identifying his own powerlessness with that of "Poor harmless fly" (3.2.64), he even sympathizes with its parents. He blames Marcus for his pitilessness, saying "that fly had a father and a mother" (3.2.61). For the first time he is on the beater's side. By censuring Marcus for killing a fly, Titus, who has killed his own son for the sake of his own honour, denies his way of life.

However, his compassion for the fly is instantly gone. When Marcus says, "it was a black ill-favoured fly,/ Like to the empress' Moor" (3.2.67-68), Titus responds to Marcus's words:

Then pardon me for reprehending thee,

For thou hast done a charitable deed.

Give me thy knife; I will insult on him,

Flattering myself as if it were the Moor

Come hither purposely to poison me. (3.2.70-74)

Once he regards the fly as his enemy, he starts tormenting it. His unstable attitudes towards the fly emphasize his strong enmity against Aaron.

In Shakespeare's Roman plays, although some women are described as energetic and masculine, women in general are assumed to be constructed as "melting spirits" (*Caesar* 2.1.121); they have no firm sense of self, being modest and subservient to men. In this sense, although both Fulvia in *Antony and Cleopatra* (1607) and Volumnia in *Coriolanus* (1608), described as energetic and masculine, seem to defy the social norms for women, their motivations for their acts actually stem from their deep concern about their husband or son. It can be said that these women, in serving men, do not essentially go against the social norms which require women to be loyal to their husband or father.

Unlike these courageously mannish women in Shakespeare's Roman plays, Lavinia is unique in that she does not show her mannish attitude towards her superior males, but through her use of knowledge she fulfills her will. She is represented as being connected to manipulations and cunningness. Sharon Hamilton regards her as "simply the object of the men's pity and the spur to their revenge" (74). And yet, though reticent, Lavinia is not portrayed as a passive woman at all.

The reason why Titus cannot construct male friendship with Saturninus is partly because of Lavinia's disobedience to him. Against the will of both her father and the emperor, she dares to marry Bassianus. Her mental strength is underlined by the fact that she keeps silent to Saturninus's marriage proposal in the public space, but she later takes action to demonstrate her refusal to the marriage; told by her father to marry Saturninus, she keeps silence. When accused severely by Titus of the relationship with Bassianus, she simply runs away with him. In fact, she speaks only once in this scene, when Saturninus begs her pardon for having praised Tamora, she forgives him. Her silence is part of a policy to avoid further conflict with others at this moment.

Lavinia is not presented as being silent by nature. She seems to adapt herself to the ideal womanhood; women should be chaste, silent, and obedient (Hull 31-32). In contrast to her silence before her father and the emperor, she speaks a great deal to foreigners such as Tamora. When meeting Tamora and Aaron in the woods, she abuses them severely, implying their adulterous relationship: "barbarous Tamora,/ For no name fits thy nature but thy own" (2.2.118-19). Even though Tamora is now a Roman queen, Lavinia evidently looks down upon her for her race. Furthermore, when Demetrius and Chiron try to rape her, she speaks fluently to them, trying to change their mind.

Eugene M. Waith thinks that Lavinia is immature and

absurd: “to many critics she has seemed smug in her contemptuous speeches to Tamora (ii. iii, 66ff.), and intolerably pathetic or ludicrous thereafter” (“The Metamorphosis” 46). On the contrary, she is portrayed as highly educated, deeply related to books. As Marcus, her uncle, says, she has taught her nephew, reading poetry and books:

Ah, boy, Cornelia never with more care
Read to her sons than she hath read to thee
Sweet poetry and Tully’s *Orator*. (4.1.12-14)

The reference to Tully’s *The Orator* highlights her intelligence; unlike *Metamorphoses*, which used to entertain people, it is an academic work. In the meantime, the reference to the book of *Metamorphoses* is also noticeable:

Within the sum of Shakespeare’s drama a specific material book appears in only two plays, which mark the length of his career, *Titus Andronicus* and *Cymbeline*. In both plays it is Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*, and the text is the rape of Philomel. (Scott 26)

It plays an important role in the play since it enables the tongueless Lavinia to reveal to her family what she has suffered from.

Shakespeare seems to have intentionally portrayed Lavinia as a mentally strong and highly educated woman. Lavinia in the source, “The Tragical History of Titus Andronicus, & c.,” is not presented as a woman of strong will. In

contrast to Shakespeare's Lavinia, she does not defy the wish of her father and the emperor:

. . . brought up in all singular Virtues, humble, courteous and modest, insomuch that the Emperor's only Son, by a former Wife fell extremely in love with her, seeking her Favour by all vertuous and honourable Ways, insomuch, that after a long Courtship with her Father and the Emperor's Consent she was betrothed to him. (Bullough 6: 39)

In this source, where the old values are effective, Lavinia is described as a model of meek womanhood, which Shakespeare's Titus would expect his daughter to be. On the other hand, unlike Shakespeare's Lavinia, her education and knowledge are not particularly mentioned who discloses what has happened to her by using a book.

There is a difference in the descriptions of the character of Lavinia between *Titus Andronicus* and the source. As has been argued, while Lavinia in the source is described as obedient, Shakespeare's Lavinia is portrayed as active. Her body even represents, in Leonard Tennenhouse's words, the "aristocratic body." People in Elizabethan society got used to the equation between the body of Queen Elizabeth and the social state (Tennenhouse 79). Even though Lavinia is not a queen of Rome, she is highly valued by other Romans; Bassianus refers her as "Rome's rich ornament" (1.1.55) while Saturninus, the Roman

emperor, has made marriage proposal to her as soon as he has met her. If Titus had become emperor, she would have been an emperor's daughter. Therefore, the violence done to Lavinia's body can be compared to the one done to the land of Rome. In the light of Tennenhouse's view of the equation of the queen's body and the social state, the rape of Lavinia can be regarded as the violation of Rome by foreigners.

While Lavinia is portrayed as highly educated, the image of learning is dominant in the play world:

By virtue of their reading and imitation of Ovid and other classical authors, the characters in the play come to resemble students in grammar school and university. (Bate 104)

Among the characters, it is Titus who that has to learn most; he can neither understand his daughter nor the present condition in Rome. Hardly understanding her "meaning" at this moment, he portrays Lavinia by using an image of books:

I can interpret all her martyred signs. . . . (3.2.36)

But I of these will wrest an alphabet

And by still practice learn to know thy meaning.

(3.2.44-45)

Though he intends to construe it, Titus, having been out of Rome to fight against the Goths, knows little about his daughter and other members of his family.

After his own downfall in society, Titus starts to try to understand Lavinia as if he were reading her as a book. The change in his attitude towards his family can be seen in his suggestion to Lavinia that she should divert herself from her sorrows by reading books:

But thou art deeper read and better skilled:

Come and take choice of all my library,

And so beguile thy sorrow till the heavens

Reveal the damned contriver of this deed. (4.1.33-36)

He tells her that she should simply wait by reading till the criminal is revealed by God. Yet Lavinia in the play is not so passive, by using the book of *Metamorphoses* and by writing their names on sand she herself uncovers what has been done to her and who the criminals are. She leads Titus to take revenge on her enemies by means of her power of knowledge. Hence, she is more self-assertive and independent-minded than her father assumes to be.

Titus has been fighting against Lavinia's enemies in order to protect her and to regain the honour through revenge. He kills Lavinia after having achieved his revenge for her sake upon Tamora and her sons, saying:

Die, die, Lavinia, and thy shame with thee,

And with thy shame thy father's sorrow die.

He kills her.

(5.3.45-46)

As these words show, he thinks that a woman who was raped and mutilated should die. He wants her to die honourably rather than to live with shame. Coppélia Kahn discusses that he thinks that she has disgraced his honour:

He proves his title of *paterfamilias*, one might say, with a vengeance—not only on those who violated and injured her so brutally but on the girl herself, when he murders her. (*Roman* 48).

In Kahn's view, Titus revenges himself upon Lavinia as well as upon the foreigners, regarding her as one of his enemies.

However, he kills Lavinia in order to end his "sorrow" that is caused by her shame. In the earlier part of the play, he has highly valued her "fame" and "virtue":

Lavinia live, outlive thy father's days
And fame's eternal date, for virtue's praise.

(1.1.170-71)

He kills the defiled Lavinia, showing the fulfillment of his revenge upon his enemies. Thus, Titus ruins his children, Rome, and finally himself. He is, after all, a warrior, who can achieve nothing but destruction; he is too far removed from negotiation.

3. The Relationship of Titus and the Foreigners

In "A Lamentable Ballad," one of Shakespeare's probable sources of the play, the Blackmoor is portrayed as a mere savage, referred to as "filthy," "savage," and "vile" (lines 83, 103, 119:

Bullough 6). Contrastingly, his master, a lord in Rome, is described as gallant and noble while his wife as virtuous, and his two children as fair. Since his master, hoping to amend his attitudes, punished him for his offence in the woods; for this he revenges himself upon the whole members of his master's household. Despite the master's repeated entreaties, he rapes the wife, killing her and their children cruelly in the highest tower, whose gates are bolted very fast that nobody can enter; in order to save his wife's life, the master, told by the Moor to do so, cuts off his own nose by himself and dies. Thus, the Moor in the ballad shows neither affection nor intelligence, and does not construct any bondship with others.

By contrast, in Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus*, Tamora and Aaron are described as intelligent and clever, speaking in blank verse throughout the play. Looked down on by the Romans as outsiders, they are affectionate towards their own families, proud of their own races and themselves. In comparison of *Titus Andronicus* with "A Lamentable Ballad," it is clear that Shakespeare presents people of other races as possessing their human complexities in the play. The social climate at the time when the play was written, seem to have influenced Shakespeare's representations of the foreigners, especially the Moor. The Moors were not so rare in Shakespeare's England: "he must also have met 'moors' of North Africa, and even West African, origin" (Wood 273). Shakespeare does not portray black

people as monsters, but since their numbers had been growing in Elizabethan England especially since the 1570s (Ian Smith 298), he rather seemed to have been concerned with the influential power Moors had in society.

As has been argued, foreigners as well as Lavinia prevent Titus from establishing male friendship with Saturninus. Though a foreigner, Tamora deeply involves herself in the politics of the Roman world of power where only Roman males are supposed to have dominance. Making use of her female sexual attraction, she marries Saturninus, the emperor, and attempts to revenge herself on Titus, who has killed Alarbus, her eldest son, at the beginning of the play. As Naomi Conn Liebler points out, the Roman sacrificial custom is nothing but a barbarous act for Tamora: “the tragedy is set in motion by conflicting ritual observance, a set of relatives, a clash of cultures” (145). Her cruelty is emphasized through the process of her revenge, but it derives from the cruelty of the Roman custom of sacrifice itself. She feels strong bondship with Alarbus, who has the possibility of restoring the honour of the Goths, whereas Titus fails to build a family bondship with his children. Tamora’s sense of honour is thus based on the royal lineage of the Goths.

Tamora consistently keeps her identity, displaying her authority as a patriarch of the royal family of the Goths. She orders her sons to kill Bassianus and violate Lavinia:

Tamora: Revenge it as you love your mother's life,
 Or be ye not henceforth called my children.

Demetrius: This is a witness that I am thy son.

[*Stabs him.*]

Chiron: And this for me, struck home to shew my
 strength.

(2.2.114-17)

Having been blamed for her own "foul desire" (2.2.79) by Bassianus and Lavinia in the previous scene, the enraged Tamora entertains her utmost hatred against them. Nonetheless, before her sons come to her, she puts up with their insults, saying, "I have patience to endure all this" (2.2.88). However, in response to Lavinia's ardent plea to protect her from her sons' attack, she pitilessly turns it down, saying:

Hadst thou in person ne'er offended me,

Even for his sake am I pitiless.

Remember, boys, I poured forth tears in vain

To save your brother from the sacrifice,

But fierce Andronicus would not relent. (2.2.161-65)

Here, she tells a lie to her sons with regard to her motivation for her revenge upon Bassianus and Lavinia. She tries to conceal her affairs with Aaron from them, pretending to revenge herself upon the Romans for the sake of her eldest son. Throughout the play, exerting her controlling power over her sons, she regards her family bondship with them as essential.

In the latter part of the play, however, she abandons her own child she bore to Aaron. According to the Nurse, Tamora says that her black baby shall not live. The difference in her attitudes towards the deaths of Alarbus and her black baby comes from their lineage; Alarbus is her successor of the Goths while the baby is the outcome of her adulterous relation with Aaron and his black skin possibly bringing her adultery into light. Tamora bears a resemblance to Titus, “killing Mutius in response to being dishonoured” (Leggatt, *Shakespeare’s Tragedies* 15). The reason why she does not feel any love for the baby lies in its skin colour. While Aaron, the Moor, can be accepted as her servant and lover, she cannot accept him as the member of her family, nor the baby as her child. She considers the baby as an outsider who is inferior as he does not belong to the Goths. She tries to maintain her identity as Queen of the Goths by killing her own baby, adjusting herself to her ideal image of the royal family of the Goths by excluding it.

In contrast to Tamora, Aaron entertains deep affection for his baby. He identifies himself with it, calling it “my flesh and blood” (4.2.86). When Demetrius and Chiron, to whom the baby is actually a half-brother, insist on killing it, he retorts against them:

My mistress is my mistress, this myself,
 The vigour and the picture of my youth.
 This before all the world do I prefer,

This maugre all the world will I keep safe,
Or some of you shall smoke for it in Rome.

(4.2.109-13)

Although Tamora, Demetrius and Chiron, the members of the royal family of the Goths, do not regard the baby as a family member, for Aaron, it is his “first-born son and heir” (4.2.94). Aaron, who has not built up any bondship with others, feels strong familial ties with his black baby.

The contrasting attitudes of Tamora and Aaron towards their baby highlight the importance of family as “a public unit.” In Renaissance England, family was an important unit by which one is to decide one’s position in society:

The family in the Renaissance is inevitably a public unit. Marriages occurred between families; diplomacy was carried on through marriage; kings more and more stressed their legitimacy by pointing to their lineage and invented ancestries to further the sense that genealogy was destiny. (Goldberg 7)

Family was the fundamental social institution, and therefore, central to social order. The members of a family were supposed to share a common form and common ideals (Amussen 35-38). Following this concept of England at that time, Tamora and Aaron think that the baby can decisively influence their social position; by accepting the baby as a family member, Tamora will be ruined while Aaron can reconstruct his identity.

Though the Goths and Aaron are both outsiders seen from the perspectives of the Romans in the play, they are not situated in the same condition; Aaron, the Moor, is considered by other people inferior to the Goths owing to the colour of his skin. According to Virginia Mason Vaughan: “The association between damnation and blackness became commonplace in Elizabethan discourse” (24). On the other hand, it can be said that Aaron has constructed his sense of self on his being a Moor through the colour of his skin:

Skin color thus bears an arbitrary rather than necessary relation to the essential racial identity negritude is assigned to express. It is precisely this inessential status that made negritude vulnerable to the obsessive economy of the visual. (Callaghan 80)

Although despised by other races, Aaron emphasizes his pride on the blackness of his skin. He retorts to the Nurse, “is black so base a hue?” (4.2.73).

Tamora for him is a tool to achieve his political ambition for power. Aaron is Tamora’s collaborator in her act of revenge upon the Romans: “Tamora becomes Aaron’s inventive and brutal collaborator in an improvisational theater of revenge” (Willis 39). Yet Aaron seems to take the initiative in their attack upon the Romans. When Tamora is married to Saturninus, Aaron plans to make use of her high position in the Roman society:

Then, Aaron, arm thy heart and fit thy thoughts
 To mount aloft with thy imperial mistress,
 And mount her pitch whom thou in triumph long
 Hast prisoner held, fettered in amorous chains
 And faster bound to Aaron's charming eyes
 Than is Prometheus ties to Caucasus.
 Away with slavish weeds and servile thought!

(1.1.511-17)

Though an outsider, he starts to relate himself to the male world of power in Rome through his sexual relationship with Tamora, the Roman Empress.

Aaron also regards Demetrius and Chiron as his tools to achieve his ambition to ruin the Romans. His inciting of Tamora's sons to rape Lavinia and kill Bassianus functions as a part of his strategy. In front of them, he politely calls them "lord," but uses the term "an ass" (4.2.25) in referring to them. He does not have any sense of loyalty towards them; when they insist on killing his child, he abuses them openly:

Sooner this sword shall plough thy bowels up.

[Draws his sword and takes the child.]

Stay, murderous villains, will you kill your brother?

(4.2.89-90)

His deep antipathy towards them is revealed in this scene when he refers to the brothers as "murderous villains," addressing them, "thou," instead of "you."

Aaron's way of associating himself with Roman society is unique; he tries to obtain actual power, not a high social position. He himself seems to be deeply conscious that he can neither become the leader of Rome nor construct friendship with white males who can lead the Goths or the Romans. According to Tom MacFaul's definition (153), Aaron can be categorized as a "fellow-traveller." In this dissertation, a "fellow-traveller" is defined as a man who does not try to obtain male honour but accompanies men who seek for it, understanding the code of male honour in the society. The reason why he travels with men is that he seeks for actual power. Consequently, a "fellow-traveller" is not a friend of men with whom he acts. Although Aaron is not concerned to embody the Roman ideal of honour, he still wants to gain great influence on Rome. He tries to reconstruct his own identity as a powerful black commander through his child, who has "royal blood" (5.1.49) of the Goths.

He obviously thinks that his baby's life to be better and of more value than his. His words to his baby, "To be a warrior and command a camp" (4.2.182), indicate his great hopes for his child. Having lived a life despised by people of other races, he hopes that his son may be able to lead the Goths as a warrior of royal blood. He thinks that only his baby will help him to succeed in the Roman male world of either Romans or Goths.

His paternal love for his baby makes him totally different

from the parents such as Titus and Tamora, who ruin their children in order to maintain their honour. To save his baby's life, Aaron negotiates with Lucius, proposing that he should give useful information to him:

Lucius, save the child,
 And bear it from me to the empress.
 If thou do this, I'll show thee wondrous things
 That highly may advantage thee to hear. (5.1.53-56)

Even though he is such a villain, saying, "nothing grieves me heartily indeed/ But that I cannot do ten thousand more" (5.1.143-44) of hideous deeds, he reveals to Lucius who is the true father of the baby, who has killed Bassianus, raped and mutilated Lavinia. However, he is not penitent of his evil acts at all in the final scene of the play:

Ten thousand worse than ever yet I did
 Would I perform if I might have my will.
 If one good deed in all my life I did
 I do repent it from my very soul. (5.3.186-89)

What makes him negotiate with Lucius is his wish to save his baby's life. Although he, unlike Titus, can perform manipulation and cunningness from the beginning of the play, it is the first time that he negotiates with others. He has changed his way of living for the sake of his son.

In the meanwhile, not understanding the concept of male honour in the society, Titus cannot even become a

“fellow-traveller” but remains a destroyer in various respects throughout the play. And yet, in the end he succeeds in deceiving Tamora, making her eat pasties of her own sons’ flesh.

He states:

Hark, villains, I will grind your bones to dust,
 And with your blood and it I’ll make a paste,
 And of the paste a coffin I will rear,
 And make two pasties of your shameful heads,
 And bid that strumpet, your unhallowed dam,
 Like to the earth swallow her own increase.

(5.2.186-91)

He is not satisfied with his murder of Demetrius and Chiron, but wants to revenge himself upon her in the cruelest way. He makes her a beast, feeding on her own children:

Trapping the human tiger, Tamora, he brutally butchers her “young ones,” matters reaching a crescendo, as in Ovid, with the human beast unwittingly devouring its own kind. (Taylor 69)

By having her eat meat pies made from her sons’ flesh, Titus makes her a “tiger,” denying her intelligence and affection towards her sons. Titus at this moment employs a kind of cunningness which he had nothing to do with in the earlier part of the play.

As to the descriptions of the black baby, in “The Tragical History of Titus Andronicus, & c.,” a source material

Shakespeare used, there is no description of the relationship between the mixed-blood baby and its parents. Though it is written that Queen of the Goths had a baby with the Moor, how it is dealt with after birth is not told:

. . . she grew pregnant, and brought forth a
 Blackmoor Child: This grieved the Emperor
 extremely, but she allayed his Anger, by telling
 him it was conceived by the Force of
 Imagination. . . . (Bullough 6: 39)

It becomes clear that Shakespeare intentionally emphasizes the future possibilities of the Moorish baby. At the time the play was written, the issue of foreign policy became serious in England; England had been in financial difficulties owing to sea warfare against Spain and reinforcement to Henri IV of France (Hammer 154-82). On the other hand, the succession problem of Queen Elizabeth I attracted a great deal of attention from people in England; since she had no child, who would ascend the throne was widely noticed. In such a social situation, Shakespeare presented a new perspective on this issue of succession through Aaron's baby with the royal blood of the Goths.

At the end of the play, Saturninus dies without an heir. This gives a great impact on the political situation in Rome and the Goths; the Roman Empire is to be destroyed by Lucius's attack together with the Goths. In the meanwhile, the survival

of the children in the play, Young Lucius and Aaron's baby, suggests the intermixture of the races in the future Rome. The survival of the mixed-blood black baby marks the end of the revenge cycle of the older generation:

Yet, in a play where death and murderous execution reign in excess, Shakespeare's emphatic resistance to the absolute, brutal logic of revenge in saving Aaron's son constitutes a crucial aporia that amounts to an apologia. (Ian Smith 287)

The fact that Lucius saves the life of Aaron's baby highlights a difference between Titus and Lucius, his son. As has been discussed, in the earlier part of the play, Titus murders Alarbus, Tamora's eldest son no matter how desperately she begs him not to do so, considering Roman military culture as most important. Aaron's baby stands for the end of the old values, which have attached the highest importance to military prowess. He symbolizes not "a sign of racial tolerance" (Lomba 85) but the new value system, putting to an end to the cycle of revenge.

Andrew Hadfield refers to the society presented in this play as "a society that finds it impossible to end conflict and transform itself from a culture of war to one of peace" (*Republicanism* 158). However, what makes Lucius save the baby comes from his new sense of values, which directs his attention to those of "others." The value system Lucius supports does not depend entirely upon violence but upon negotiations,

which Titus never learns to understand.

Chapter II. Male Friendship and Ideal Manhood in *Julius Caesar*

The year 1599, when Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* was performed at the Globe probably at its opening, was a critical time when several important political incidents occurred both inside and outside England. As to the incidents outside, England had been in great trouble in its military campaign against Ireland while the Spanish threat was increasing (Shapiro 43-57, 173-87). On the other hand, the most serious problem in England was about the successor of the aging and childless queen, while the 1590s saw plagues, massive price inflation, heavy taxation, depression both in overseas trade and in the volume of domestic demand, large-scale unemployment, and escalating crime and vagrancy (Archer 9-14). Shakespeare's original audience must have taken a great interest in the political situation which this play presents. In order to reflect his contemporary audience's concern about the unstable political situation in England, Shakespeare seems to represent the decayed state of republicanism and emerging tyranny in Rome.

Shakespeare presented in the characters of the play some aspects of real people who attracted public attention at that time. Robin Headlam Wells, comparing Caesar with Queen

Elizabeth, parallels Cassius with the Earl of Essex, who wanted Elizabeth to resign her throne so that he could reform the government: “[he had a] desire to remove what seemed to him a tyrannical ruler and reform government” (“*Julius Caesar*, Machiavelli” 211). In the meanwhile, Katherine Duncan-Jones and Barbara L. Parker also compare people in Elizabethan England to the characters in the play. Comparing Elizabeth both to Cassius and Caesar, Duncan-Jones suggests that in this play Shakespeare tries to emphasize that Elizabeth has lost her ability to reign in England (107-09). On the other hand, Parker regards both Cassius and Caesar as Essex. Whichever contemporary figures may be reflected in the play, special features of those who held political power in Shakespeare’s England are portrayed in the characters (*Plato’s Republic* 116).

In the society where the principles of Republicanism no longer work properly, the gender distinction becomes ambiguous. Though the social norms define ideal manhood as “mettle” (2.1.133) and women, constructed of “melting spirits” (2.1.121), are assumed to be modest and subordinate to men, men and women are described not as entirely different from each other. The term “mettle” is to be explained in detail later. Although men try to prove their manly independence in the Roman society, they often unconsciously identify themselves with their wives. Women are separated from the male world, but undoubtedly are essential to their husbands. By examining the

representations of both men and women, the concept of ideal manhood in the play will become clear.

The disorder presented in the play is clearly reflective of that in England at the time. Even though the Queen and Parliament had been generally on good terms, in the final years of Elizabeth's reign, they often fell out over the matters such as freedom of speech and monopolies and patents. The costs of war being weighty on England, Elizabeth's resources had become drained. In order to compensate for the loss, the Queen sold monopolies and patents.

This chapter aims to discuss the issue of male friendship as represented in *Julius Caesar*, focusing on the concept of ideal manhood. In this play world, masculine value is most highly admired, the term "honourable" being given particularly strong significance while patricians are supposed to be equal to each other and the lower-class plebeians are inferior and must obey them. In the meanwhile, Roman Republicanism is represented as not working well. Caesar behaves like a tyrant and neither men nor women observe the social norms in a true sense.

1. Brutus and "Male" Friendship with Portia

Brutus expresses his love for Caesar to Cassius (1.2.82), while Cassius thinks that Caesar loves Brutus (1.2.312). Yet they cannot build up male friendship since their political ideologies are entirely different from each other's. Brutus,

worrying about the destruction of Roman Republicanism, cannot let Caesar become a king. He shows his loyalty to Roman Republicanism:

If it be aught toward the general good,
Set honour in one eye, and death i'th' other,
And I will look on both indifferently.
For let the gods so speed me as I love
The name of honour more than I fear death.

(1.2.85-89)

For Brutus, the observance of existing political institution is connected to male honour. He believes that the ideology of manhood depends on ardent devotion to Roman Republicanism: “where Cassius attempts to persuade Brutus to join the conspiracy, each mention of ‘Rome’ or ‘Roman’ suggests that to be a true Roman is to be a republican” (Chernaik 80). Not regarding Caesar, who neglects Roman Republicanism, as honourable, Brutus cannot construct male friendship with him despite their personal attachment or respect for each other.

Strangely enough, Brutus almost succeeds in establishing male friendship with his wife, Portia, though she is a woman. For Brutus, his wife plays an important role in his mentality; they are portrayed as “an affectionate and well-matched couple in their only scene together” (Hadfield, *Republicanism* 173). Brutus goes so far to say that she is dear to him as “the ruddy drops/ That visit” his heart (2.1.288-89); by comparing his wife

to his blood, he acknowledges that she is part of him.

The relationship between Brutus and Portia is evidently influenced by the one between husband and wife in Shakespeare's England. The position of wife became better with the concept of partnership between husband and wife:

The emergence of a new concept of the family, largely inaugurated by Protestantism, . . . on the one hand, a husband still (in theory) maintained absolute authority within the family, a position legitimated by his analogous relationship to God and to the king; but on the other hand, the idea of marriage as a compassionate partnership characterized by mutual respect appeared to elevate the wife's position from a merely subordinate role. (Breitenberg 25)

Though this play is set in ancient Rome, reflecting the improvement of the position of wives in Renaissance England, Brutus and Portia are described as having built up strong ties.

In the meanwhile, the change in the position of wives at that time caused a confusion:

The new model of marriage in the sixteenth century, however, identified wives precisely as friends, and the texts of the period bring to light some of the uncertainties and anxieties which attend the process of redefinition. (Belsey 52)

By using the term "friends," Belsey emphasizes the close

relationship between husband and wife. Yet the marital bondship which Belsey refers to as “friendship” is totally different from male friendship, which is identical to cooperation in the political activities. Hence, in *Julius Caesar*, despite their strong marital bondship, Brutus does not let Portia meddle in the affairs of the Roman male world until she proves her own “mettle.”

In Act 2 Scene 1, his sense of identification with his wife is particularly foregrounded in their private conversation in the garden. Portia is characterized as a woman of exceedingly strong will. Her mental strength seems to be equivalent to male Roman *virtus*, which is repeatedly expressed as “mettle” in the play. The term “mettle” is defined in the *OED* (*n.* 3.) as “Ardent or spirited temperament; spirit, courage.” Appealing to her husband that she is entitled to share the secret with him, Portia undertakes a strikingly violent action to injure herself to prove her masculine inner strength, saying:

Think you I am no stronger than my sex
 Being so fathered and so husbanded?
 Tell me your counsels. I will not disclose 'em.
 I have made strong proof of my constancy,
 Giving myself a voluntary wound. . . . (2.1.295-99)

She attempts to resolve the gender distinction which separates her from her husband, by becoming involved in the Roman male world through the knowledge of her husband’s secret.

Interestingly, it is in the garden that Shakespeare sets this scene where Portia assumes masculinity both in her speech and action, trying to persuade her husband to reveal his secrecy. The garden can be defined as a point midway between the private and the public spheres, that is, the domestic domain and the male Roman society, to which Portia's husband belongs:

. . . men of feeling are often associated with domestic spaces—a castle, a nursery, a private chamber, a shepherd's cottage. The notion of domesticity commonly refers to one's family, house, or country.

(Vaught 171)

The "feeling" which Vaught refers to in this passage can be called "melting spirits." Following her view, men who are ruled by the "melting spirits" in them are related to private spaces. Consequently, the garden, in the middle of men's sphere and women's, is supposed to render gender distinction unclear in this play. For Portia, it is a proper place to assert her "mettle" as well as her right as a wife.

Finally, Brutus changes his mind, deciding to tell her about the very important issue of assassination, although he happens to be prevented from doing so. To share an important secret with her husband, Portia tries to construct a male friendship with Brutus, assuming masculinity:

Portia shows, as it were, a fine discernment in this strategy of constructing herself as a man, for as I

suggested earlier, men mutually confirm their identities as Roman through bonds with each other. Brutus can trust Portia only as a man.

(Kahn, *Roman* 99)

The mutual confirmation which Kahn points out embodies male friendship, for which men in Shakespeare's Roman plays cooperate with each other. She perceives that, despite their strong marital bondship, she cannot be told about his secret of political matters unless she becomes a man. However, her aim is not achieved in this scene due to Ligarius's interference.

In accepting male strength in his wife, Brutus displays his inconstancy in his sense of maleness, which is defined in this play as "melting spirits," a female characteristic. There was a great contradiction inherent in the English patriarchal society itself at the time when Shakespeare wrote the play; since it was Queen Elizabeth that ruled England, "the power she enjoyed at the apex of the social hierarchy caused anxieties about male privilege up and down the line" (Bruce R. Smith, *Homosexual Desire* 104).

The word "honourable" is one of the key words in the Roman world of power. Portia blames Brutus for not telling her his secret, insisting, "Portia is Brutus's harlot, not his wife" (2.1.286). Brutus responds to her with great respect: "You are my true and honourable wife" (2.1.287; Emphasis mine). According to the *OED*, one of the meanings of the word

“honourable” is “Worthy of being honoured; entitled to honour, respect, or reverence” (*A.adj.1.a*). The word “honourable” is rarely used to describe women in Shakespeare’s works; women of high social rank such as Olivia in *Twelfth Night* (1601) and Portia in *The Merchant of Venice* (1596) are sometimes referred to as “honourable” by their social inferiors, but it is exceptional to call one’s own wife “honourable.” Brutus shows his respect to Portia because of her masculinity. Hence, Brutus’s reference to his wife as “honourable” makes it clear that he acknowledges her excellence in masculine qualities.

The most remarkable usage of “honourable” can be seen in Act 3 scene 2 where Antony pretends to justify the plebeians the assassination of Caesar by his rhetorical speech, using the word “honourable” repeatedly. He is well aware of the power of this word and makes clever use of it to appeal to the plebeians about the injustice of the assassination:

Here, under leave of Brutus and the rest

(For Brutus is an honourable man;

So are they all, all honourable men)

Come I to speak in Caesar’s funeral.

He was my friend, faithful and just to me;

But Brutus says, he was ambitious,

And Brutus is an honourable man. (3.2.82-88)

Brutus has allowed Antony to speak “in the pulpit, as becomes a friend,/ Speak in the order of his funeral” (3.1.229-30) on

conditions that Brutus speaks to the plebeians before Antony does and that Antony will not speak ill of the assassins. By using the word “honourable” effectively, Antony succeeds to evoke the plebeians’ hostility towards the conspirators. In Antony’s speech, although Brutus’s goodness is specifically stressed, the conspirators’ treachery in fact is emphasized; the plebeians considered him “noble” (3.2.11) a short while before, but they now start to call him one of “traitors, villains” (3.2.197).

This process of Antony’s transforming the attitude of the plebeians towards Brutus illustrates the importance of the term “honourable” in the play. Soon after Brutus refers to Portia as “honourable,” Ligarius enters and admires Brutus, saying that he was a “Soul of Rome” (2.1.320) and “Brave son,” “derived from honourable loins” (2.1.321). Thus, Brutus is widely respected for his masculinity and great hereditary descent, of which he himself is well aware. On the other hand, in comparing his wife to his “ruddy drops” (2.1.288), Brutus, an exemplar of masculine virtue, identifies himself with a woman. Portia’s masculine quality allows him to identify himself with his wife. Overwhelmed by Portia’s courage in injuring herself to prove her male strength, Brutus refers to her as “honourable.” Though she is a woman, he is impressed by her masculinity, displaying to her his great respect, which he normally pays to men.

The term “honourable” in this play is clearly connected to the male virtue of *virtus*, for which the term “mettle” is frequently used. To examine the way in which “honourable” is used in the play helps to understand the special features of the male relationship. Men tend to employ the term “honourable” when they praise each other’s masculinity:

Cassius: . . . Thy honourable mettle may be wrought
From that it is disposed.

(1.2.308-09; Emphasis mine)

Cassius: . . . To undergo with me an enterprise
Of honourable dangerous consequence. . . .

(1.3.123-24; Emphasis mine)

Brutus: . . . Young man, thou couldst not die more
honourable.

(5.1.59; Emphasis mine)

Thus, the term “honourable” is generally used to praise a man for possessing the masculine virtue, in particular, courage.

In public, his respect to her masculinity and his sense of identification with her completely disappear from his speech. Admitting her courage, Brutus cannot accept Portia’s masculinity publicly, trying not to defy the social norms about women. Brutus utters his response to her death in terms of her femininity:

Impatient of my absence,
 And grief that young Octavius with Mark Antony
 Have made themselves so strong—for with her death
 That tidings came—with this she fell distract,
 And, her attendants absent, swallowed fire.

(4.3.150-54)

His comments reveal that he applies to his wife's death the assumption about women's suicide commonly accepted in early modern England. He says that Portia has killed herself due to her "distraction," that is, madness, which is connected to inconstancy. He is unwilling to talk about her death, saying to Cassius, "Speak no more of her" (4.3.156). Some critics associate his unwillingness with his integrity. Thomas Clayton argues:

His response to a cause of deep personal grief is to suppress his feelings and keep his public duty firmly to the fore and on course, not without a touch of pride, however. (247)

In Clayton's view, Brutus's attitude towards Portia's death is affected by his strong inclination for political matters. Likewise, Warren D. Smith indicates:

Throughout the play if there is one characteristic of Brutus that stands out in sharp relief, it is in his willingness and ability to conceal private distress for the sake of others. (159)

Smith attributes Brutus's brusque reply to her suicide to his self-sacrificial quality. And yet, what he intends to conceal is not only his own anguish caused by her death but also the bold way he kills himself.

In view of Portia's characterization in the earlier scene, it is difficult to accept his view on her suicide. Portia is portrayed as possessing male constancy, which men in Rome think highly of. As has been mentioned, male constancy is an important element which constitutes the Roman *virtus*. Possessing the mental strength of male constancy, she cannot be regarded as a typical woman with femininity, that is, "melting spirits." Despite his denial of her male constancy, it is because of her "mettle" that Brutus could almost establish his male friendship with Portia in the earlier part of the play.

Ironically, in the latter part of the play, Brutus is presented as inconstant in his way of thinking. His mental state is portrayed as a mixture of Christian ethics and the Roman concept of virtues. He tells Cassius that he will not commit suicide, regarding the act as unhonourable:

. . . But I do find it cowardly and vile,
 For fear of what might fall, so prevent
 The time of life—arming myself with patience
 To stay the providence of some high powers
 That governs us below. (5.1.103-07)

Though the play is situated in ancient Rome, he speaks in

accordance with the Christian doctrine against suicide. Men in Rome traditionally esteemed suicide as an extremely noble deed; suicide is the only means for men to uphold their male virtue in the play world (Kishi 108).

His death reveals his inner contradiction. He still does not want to accept his self-contradiction, but tries to convince himself that he does not kill himself but the ghost of Caesar takes revenge upon him. This idea of Caesar's revenge upon him often appears in Brutus's speeches towards the end of the play:

O Julius Caesar, thou art mighty yet.

Thy spirit walks abroad and turns our swords

In our own proper entrails. (5.3.94-96)

He emphasizes that his death is not caused by his voluntary will, but by Caesar's ghost.

Brutus's view on Portia's suicide is related to the cause of his own suicide. With regard to Portia's death, as has been pointed out, he believes that its cause lies in her "distraction" since she was unable to bear his absence and his defeat by Antony and Octavius. According to him, women tend to kill themselves owing to their mental weakness while men embody Roman *virtus*. Yet it is Brutus, not Portia, that kills himself because of "distraction." Driven into the desperate situation in which he has no way but to kill himself, he tries to justify his suicide by thinking that Caesar takes revenge upon him. He is apparently deviated from the ideal manhood since his "sense of

honour has become merely self-productive, isolated from any concern but its own preservation” (Council 69).

Thus, Brutus, whose inner state opposes to male constancy, cannot fulfill the Roman ideal manhood. Although men in Rome are shown to be deficient, male constancy, that is, “mettle,” is still regarded as an indispensable quality of men. In such a social situation, men are without male constancy and consequently cannot establish male friendship. This is the reason why Brutus cannot build male friendship with other men in the play.

2. Caesar and His Embodiment of Manhood

In Plutarch’s *Lives of Noble Grecians and Romans* translated by Sir Thomas North (1579), Caesar is regarded as a tyrant by the Senate and the plebeians. In the meanwhile, as Hartsock points out, Shakespeare’s Caesar is portrayed as “neither clearly a tyrant nor clearly a patriot” (Hartsock 58). On the other hand, as Robert S. Miola argues, those who destroy the existing political institution, can be referred to as tyrants: “By Shakespeare’s day, then, the term ‘tyrant’ could apply to any usurper of power by force as well as to any lawful ruler who governed viciously” (“Julius Caesar” 275). Following Miola’s view, Caesar, who neglects Roman republicanism, can be considered as a potential tyrant in the Roman society.

He regards himself and is regarded by the Romans as a

fierce animal that feeds on others. While Cassius refers to him as a “wolf” (1.3.104), Caesar describes himself in terms of danger as “two lions littered in one day” (2.2.46). When Metellus, Brutus, and Cassius appeal to Caesar to recall Metellus’s banished brother, Caesar says, despising Metellus as “a cur” (3.1.46): “These couchings and these lowly courtesies/ Might fire the blood of ordinary men” (3.1.36-37). He proudly asserts his constancy, trying to foreground his honour:

But I am constant as the northern star,
Of whose true-fixed and resting quality
There is no fellow in the firmament. (3.1.60-62)

Caesar thinks of himself as a man far superior to any other in Rome; other men seem to be trivial. His attitude towards Metellus shows that he is too arrogant to listen to other men’s opinions.

In Act 1 Scene 2, when Caesar ignores other people’s advice that could have saved him from assassination, his tyrannical bent is highlighted. A soothsayer says to him, “Beware the Ides of March” (1.2.23), while Artemidorus tries to give him a scroll that informs him of the assassination plan. Nevertheless, Caesar despises and ignores these warnings entirely. Thus, from the beginning of the play, he is presented as a tyrant, who thinks that he should not accept other men’s words because of his superiority. This is frequently shown in his speeches; “The things that threatened me/ Ne’er looked on my

back” (2.2.10-11) or “I could be well moved if I were as you” (3.1.58). He shows off his charismatic power, which is fully recognized in Rome. In this sense, he is constructed of male constancy.

Barbara L. Parker states that “Caesar’s marital frigidity is affirmed in his dialogue with Decius, which pointedly juxtaposes that with Calphurnia” (“The Whore of Babylon” 253). Asserting the sodomitical aspect of the play world, Parker concludes that Caesar’s attitude towards his wife, Calphurnia, is cold. In the meanwhile, his response to her represents his flexibility. In Act 2 Scene 2 where she asks him not to go to the Senate House, he does not tell her not to interfere with his political affairs. Though he later changes his decision again by talking with Decius, going to the Senate House, he is almost persuaded by her. It is important that his wife actually succeeds in changing his decision at least once. The wives’ sphere was considered to be within the home in Elizabethan England, but wives in the play can actually influence their husbands’ social conditions through their indirect power of the marital bondship in the play.

In this play, though considered inferior to men, women are portrayed as essential to their husbands. In Shakespeare’s later plays, this contradictory situation is often highlighted. For example, in *Cymbeline* (1609) Posthumus grieves over the male incapacity to produce heirs without female power: “Is there no

way for men to be, but women/ Must be half-workers?"

(2.4.153-54). In the play world of strictly patriarchal Rome, it is a serious problem for a man of power to have no heir; having no legitimate heir means their legacy will fall into other men's hands. In this sense, a wife plays a very important role for her husband, influencing her husband's social status as well as the future of their households.

In his first appearance of the play, Caesar tells her to stand in Antony's way and Antony to touch Calphurnia because it is believed that "The barren touched in this holy chase/ Shake off their sterile curse" (1.2.8-9). Caesar has no legitimate son and ardently wants to have one; he thinks that through Antony's touch his wife's sterility can be removed. Calphurnia is profoundly necessary for Caesar to continue his legitimate genealogy.

He is arrogant and scornful towards other patricians, but to the plebeians he never shows his despise. For example, in Act 1 Scene 2, Caska reports Brutus that Caesar has demonstrated to the plebeians his unwillingness to become their emperor. Caesar performs his lack of ambition in order to acquire popularity with the plebeians. His strategy seems to work successfully: according to Caska, "the rabblement hooted, and clapped their chopped hands, and threw up their sweaty nightcaps, and uttered such a deal of stinking breath because Caesar refused the crown" (1.2.243-46). Caesar is familiar with

the way how to win the plebeians' favour.

Meanwhile, the plebeians are shown to be unreliable.

When Brutus insists on his justification for the assassination of Caesar, they are easily persuaded by him and start to praise Brutus, saying, "Let him be Caesar" and "Caesar's better parts/ Shall be crowned in Brutus" (3.2.51-52). As to their admiration in this scene, A. D. Nuttall states that "The people are not cheering for Republicanism. Witlessly, they are cheering for Brutus, the new star" (174). However, what is important here is that they still remember Caesar, while applauding the new star. What they are most concerned about is which star will give them a greater benefit.

Even if his assassination takes place in the middle of the play (3.1), he does not disappear throughout the play in a true sense. He even appears as a ghost after his death. Whether the ghost is the outcome of Brutus's delusion is not clear, but even after his death, Brutus feels scared by Caesar. In committing suicide, he says, "Caesar, now be still./ I killed not thee with half so good a will" (5.5.50-51). He thinks of Caesar even at his last moment whom he regards as the embodiment of Roman *virtus*.

His strong presence functions to emphasize the deficiency of "mettle" of other Roman males throughout the play. Being unrelated to "melting spirits," he is the only man that is eligible to construct male friendship in the play. Though he behaves

rudely towards other patricians and dares not build male friendship, it does not point to his unadaptableness for the society in the play world.

Caesar's insolence is closely connected to his concept of honour. Regarding honour highly, he behaves in accordance with his great honour in order to maintain a public trust; at this point he is similar to Brutus in that he is forced to "act in a manner worthy of the figure he has invented" (Alvis 143). This view seems to contradict his overbearing attitude towards patricians, but he aims to promote his honour by his arrogant attitudes. To highlight his prominence, he does not want to form a partnership with his comrades.

Caesar as well as Brutus follows the standard for Roman warriors attaching the greatest importance to honour:

. . . not only does *Julius Caesar* reveal that the Roman aristocrats no longer seek to serve the interests of the patria, but it suggests that their behavior, which is still defined in ideal terms as that of warriors and heroes, actually opposes them to it.

(Rebhorn 84)

The divergence in their sense of honour stems from the changing social condition in the society. In the meanwhile, what drives Brutus and Caesar to seek for honour is their sense of emulation, which is also different from each other's.

Seeking for his concept of honour by obtaining absolute

controlling power in the Roman society, Caesar does not need to construct male friendship with other patricians. On the other hand, his wife and the plebeians are essential for him to consolidate his social position; the plebeians enable him to underline his overwhelming power in Rome, and only his wife can provide him with a legitimate heir. Accordingly, he dares not construct male friendships with other patricians.

3. Cassius as a “Fellow-Traveller”

Cassius is convinced that Caesar neglects him and will eventually ignore his existence. To maintain his position in the Roman male world, Cassius believes that Caesar, who is expected to become Emperor of Rome, must die. Although he himself knows that he is of little power in Rome, he tries to live through the male world by controlling the men around him. The reason why he involves Brutus in the conspiracy against Caesar is that the existence of the former is important in justifying the assassination, so that other men will join the conspirators; he tries to make use of Brutus’s “good nature, universal popularity and high principles”(Hadfield, *Republicanism* 175).

When Cassius tries to persuade Brutus, he expresses his view of the male world of power he is in: “The fault . . . is not in our stars/ But in ourselves, that we are underlings” (1.2.139-40). In this speech he accepts that he himself and Brutus are Caesar’s subordinates; he reveals his strong sense of inferiority

to Caesar. He thinks that by killing Caesar he can improve his status in the male society of Rome. Since it is obviously unlikely for him to be promoted in the world of power ruled by Caesar, he intentionally locates himself on the edge of the male world of power, so that he can avoid his direct encounter with Caesar.

Although he eventually commits suicide, he, unlike Brutus, is not concerned about his “honour” at all; Cassius kills himself without making any justification for his suicide. He asks his servant Pindarus to kill him on the condition that Pindarus will be freed from slavery by doing so. Certainly he says, “honour is the subject of my story” (1.2.92), but these words are spoken to entice Brutus into the conspiracy. On the other hand, Brutus claims, “I love/ The name of honour more than I fear death” (1.2.88-89). When Brutus implores his servants to help him with killing himself, three of them refuse to do so. Finally one of them helps him only out of his sense of loyalty to Brutus, his “lord.” Cassius does not behave in a masculine way. He rarely displays his manly independence, although he strives not to be separated entirely from the masculine world.

On the other hand, women are not completely different from men because they have a certain amount of subjectivity that is often regarded as male privilege: “Shakespeare’s women are not an isolated phenomenon in their emancipation, their sufficiency, and their evasion of stereotypes” (Dusinberre,

Introduction 5). In fact, women in Shakespeare's plays are described as not so essentially different from men; like Portia, they often show their "mettle," a special manly quality in the Roman society in the play.

Cassius, though he is a man, intentionally feminizes himself by referring to the social norms that define men as being completely different from women. He appears to be aware of men's "womanish" quality:

. . . we are governed with our mothers' spirits:

Our yoke and sufferance show us womanish.

(1.3.83-84)

Portia tries to be involved in the Roman male world from which she is excluded because of her gender. On the other hand, Cassius also feels himself separated from the male world to which he is supposed to belong. Even if Portia's statement, "I have a man's mind, but a woman's might" (2.4.8), apparently makes a striking contrast to his remarks on his own womanishness, Cassius and Portia have something essentially in common because both of them feel a sense of alienation from the Roman male world.

This sense of alienation which Cassius and Portia share is well connected to their deliberate deviation from the social norms which draw a sharp line between men and women. While Cassius chooses to go against the gender distinction in order to compensate for his own incompetence as a Roman warrior,

is different from either Caesar's or Calphurnia's; though he understands the Roman *virtus*, he intentionally ignores it. Meanwhile, Cassius and Calphurnia share a common feature in disregarding the Roman *virtus*. Actually, Cassius is often linked to women in the play. In this respect, following an argument advanced by Tom MacFaul, he can be defined as a "fellow-traveller." This term a "fellow-traveller" is defined as a man who, not embodying a male sense of honour himself, accompanies those who represent "the concept of honour and therefore closer to the women's position than the other men" (153). Though accepting the importance of honour in the male world and being interested in matters related to honour, a "fellow-traveller" is separated from men whose sense of identity is deeply based on honour. Consequently, a "fellow-traveller," neglecting "mettle," which is the source of male honour, does not build male friendship. Cassius, who understands the male virtue of honour but neither adapts himself to the ideal concept of manhood nor tries to act honourably, may well be regarded as such a "fellow-traveller."

As a "fellow-traveller," Cassius neither displays his masculine quality nor seriously follows the male code of value, but internalizes the importance of the system of values in the society. When Brutus blames Cassius for accepting bribes in Act 4 Scene 3, Cassius's internalization of this value becomes clear. While Brutus speaks of Cassius's offence, Cassius says that

and Brutus, who can build up intimate relationships with men around them.

Since suicide is thought to be an act of honour in Roman society, Cassius's suicide shows that there still remains a certain amount of masculine quality in him. His suicide is the proof of his honour: "Ashamed of all his unmanly qualities, he intends his suicide to repudiate the side of his nature that allows him to choose death thinking of anything but his honor" (Blits 13). The reason why he decides to kill himself is that he is informed by Pindarus that Titinius, whom he regards as his "best friend" (5.3.35), has been taken by the enemies. This is the scene where his male companionship is revealed for the first time in the play though the information turns out to be incorrect and Titinius is still alive.

Cassius's death leaves a rather awkward impression on the audience. He dies for the love of Titinius, who is a nobleman but not his equal. Titinius as well as Cassius is driven to death by his mistaken perception. Titinius also kills himself, saying "see how I regarded Caius Cassius. . . . This is a Roman's part" (5.3.88-89); he wants to follow Cassius, the "sun of Rome" (5.3.63). At this moment, Titinius's high estimation of Cassius is revealed although Cassius is not portrayed as "honourable" throughout the play. In this respect, Titinius also dies because of his mistaken judgment of Cassius. Nonetheless, Cassius's companionship with Titinius becomes a kind of evidence that he

still maintains his masculinity in valuing his companionship with his male friend, who also regards their relationship as most important in the play. The close relationship between Cassius and Titinius cannot be considered as male friendship because it would not assist each other's political position.

As the Roman Republic in the play is portrayed as in decline, the characters can no longer play the ideal role allotted to them by the social norms:

The state's integrity lies in accepted subordination of the lower to the higher, justice—the real subject of the *Republic*—depending upon each class maintaining its bounds and function. Injustice, conversely, results when, in a meddling and restless spirit, one class infringes the bounds and vocation of another. (Parker, “A Thing Unfirm” 32)

None of Brutus, Caesar or Cassius can represent the ideal manhood. Both women and the plebeians, who are regarded as inferior to the patricians in the Roman society, sometimes overwhelm those above them, who do not possess sufficient power to keep them under control. Though the patricians still lead the society, the social hierarchy is presented as being destroyed in the play.

This disorderly condition of society in the play world is most effectively presented in the scene in which the plebeians kill Cinna, the poet. The popular disturbance portrayed in the

play indicates a series of riots in England around 1599:

Between 1581 and 1602, the city was disturbed by no fewer than 35 outbreaks of disorder. Since there were at least 96 insurrections, riots, and lawful assemblies in London between 1517 and 1640, this means that more than one-third of the instances of popular disorder during that century-and-a-quarter were concentrated within a 20-year period.

(Manning 187)

Reflecting the riots occurred at that time, the plebeians are presented as having no reason for killing an innocent man. It is just because he happens to have the same name as one of the assassins that they attack the poet. Possibly, they are quite aware that Cinna they are killing is not the one for whom they seek:

Cinna: I am Cinna the poet, I am Cinna the poet.

4 Plebeian: Tear him for his bad verses, tear him for
his bad verses.

Cinna: I am not Cinna the conspirator.

4 Plebeian: It is no matter, his name's Cinna. Pluck
but his name out of his heart and turn
him going. (3.3.29-34)

One of the mob declares that Cinna shall die just because his name is the same as that of a member of the conspirators. The uncontrollable power of violence of the plebeians and its

absurdity are presented in this scene with great effect.

The Roman society in the play is so unstable that the patricians lack the power to control the plebeians. As Parker points out, the mob plays an important role:

Indeed, it may not be an overstatement to assert that the mob is the play's real protagonist, for they control not only Caesar and the other patricians but virtually the entire course of events.

(Plato's Republic 80)

The mob possesses such a powerful influence that, persuaded by Antony in Act 3 Scene 2, they transform Brutus's title from "honourable" to one of the "traitors, villains," eventually causing his destruction. However, compared with those in *Coriolanus* (1608), the plebeians in this plays are presented as less influential. As will be discussed later in this dissertation, in *Coriolanus* where male constancy is not thought highly of, the plebeians hold so great a power that they can decide the social status of Martius, an excellent warrior; he is banished from Rome not by other patricians but by the plebeians.

Men in Shakespeare's Roman plays seek for honour though the representations of honour in each play are affected by the social situation: "The Romans Shakespeare chose for his subjects were driven by intense pressures to compete for power and distinction" (Gary B. Miles 259). The "power and distinction" which Miles refers to is related to the concept of

honour.

The unstable social situation in which Elizabethan England was set seems to have affected the description of Shakespeare's Caesar. The main source of his popularity among the plebeians seems to be the prospect of his ruling smoothly, being able to end the disordered situation. In early modern England where the aged Queen was confronted with both domestic and overseas troubles, a leader of absolute controlling power was demanded.

In *Julius Caesar*, Caesar's concept of honour, which leads him to neglect male friendship with other patricians, symbolizes the decline of the Roman Republicanism. The fact that the plebeians can influence the patricians also underlines the weakness of the Roman society dramatized in this play. In the play world, where male friendship cannot be established because of the deficiency of male "mettle," the only patrician who is represented as capable of suppressing the disorder in Rome is Caesar. That is the reason why the play was entitled *Julius Caesar* even though he is killed in the middle of it.

Chapter III. Male Friendship and Male Rivalry in *Antony and Cleopatra*

From the beginning of Elizabeth's reign, Virgo-Astraea symbol was used in order to worship her like a celestial object. In her book on imperialism, Frances A. Yates states that "The Elizabethan age is the great age of the English Renaissance, and in this sense the golden age theme lies behind it" (38).

When King James I ascended to the throne in 1603, the expectation that King James would bring new glory to England was entertained. As Catherine Loomis states that "the succession of a new monarch promised other kinds of changes" (2), out-of-favoured courtiers, religious malcontents and English subjects who objected to being under a woman's control thought that their condition would be improved.

On the other hand, owing to the accession of James I, republican thought came to be suppressed in England. Having published *The Trew Law of Free Monarchies* (1598) as James VI of Scotland, he advocated the divine right of kings (Jordan 14-16). Subsequently, in 1604, James concluded the Treaty of London in order to end Anglo-Spanish War, which had broken out in 1585. Offended by this peace negotiation, Catholics caused political struggles such as the Gunpowder Plot in 1605. A series of policies carried out by James aroused people's

antipathy against him, and Elizabethan revival happened.

In such a social context, Shakespeare presented the destruction of the Roman Republic in *Antony and Cleopatra* (1607). In this play, Cleopatra, the Egyptian queen, bears resemblance to Elizabeth I. As the bondship between Cleopatra and her female servants, Charmian and Isis, is highlighted in the play, Queen Elizabeth formed close attachments to her female attendants. In *Calender of the Manuscripts of the Most Honourable the Marquess of Salisbury Preserved at Hatfield House*, Elizabeth's attitudes towards one of her female attendants are presented:

. . . News from Ireland of the lamentable defeat at Carlew and death of Sir Coniers Clifford and Sir Alexander Ractliffe. Mrs. Ractliffe as yet hears nothing of her brother's death; "by the Queen's command yt is kept from her, who is determined to break yt unto herself."

(*Calender of the Manuscripts 2: 384*)

. . . Mrs. Ractliffe was buried this day at Westminister, as a nobleman's daughter by the Queen's command. . . .

(*Calender of the Manuscripts 2: 417*)

When the brother of Mrs. Radcliffe, one of her female attendants, had died, Elizabeth I kept the news secret from her.

In the case of Mrs. Radcliffe's death, the Queen ordered that she should be courteously treated. Her female attendants, despite the inequality of rank, evidently offered companionship to Elizabeth.

In the meanwhile, Octavius Caesar, a man of Roman *virtus*, seems to reflect James I: "Few in Shakespeare's audience, least of all the king himself, would have failed to identify Octavius with James, an identification James zealously promoted from the outset" (Parker, *Plato's Republic* 105). Since Caesar is the founder of the Roman Empire, King James himself was willing to be compared to Caesar. And yet, while Cleopatra is shown to be attractive, outshining Caesar in some sense, Caesar, despite his excellent military acuity and complete male constancy, is described as an entirely ideal leader. Through the representations of both Cleopatra and Caesar, Egypt and Rome, the issue of the change of the political institution is described in the play.

This chapter aims to discuss the issue of male friendship in the light of male rivalry presented in *Antony and Cleopatra*. In the society of the play, male friendship, which is essential for men to construct their identity in the male world of power, is transformed into male rivalry; masters fight with each other to win greater power, neglecting the concept of republicanism. On the other hand, the supremacy of loyalty over one's material benefit is undermined; followers desert those masters who are

no longer powerful. The Romans tend to ignore male friendship, hoping to serve their own political ends.

1. Male Friendship and Dualism in Rome

One of the characteristics of the play is various kinds of duality, which are strongly connected to the issue of male friendship and male rivalry. The most essential duality is caused by the co-existence of Rome and Egypt. The messengers and the followers, serving to connect these two worlds, play an important role: “the dispersed locations, sweeping scope, and rapid turns of the action required a heavy use of reporters and intermediaries” (Heffner 162). They continually appear on the stage to convey notes of love or reports of the war to their superiors: “this play is scored with the ceaseless circulation of messages, ‘reporters,’ and ‘news’” (Charnes 106). The messengers in this play have a duty to connect Rome with Alexandria, the cities where the systems of value are entirely different from each other.

It is useful to focus on the secondary characters to examine the relationships and social states portrayed in *Antony and Cleopatra*. In Shakespeare’s dramatic works, it is usually protagonists who reveal their intention through their asides, but, in this play, the followers of those of higher social rank such as Enobarbus, or the sea captain, Ventidius, confess their real intention in their asides or conversations with their peers

in the play. The followers pay their utmost attention to their masters since their masters' fate controls their lives. Through the asides of male servants the nature of war and the social hierarchy of men are presented.

People in Shakespearean plays, regardless of their position, are supposed to serve. Yet the system of service in the play does not work properly:

Ideally, the Shakespearean world could be viewed as a hierarchy of service corresponding to the hierarchy of classes, in which the upper classes serve God, king, and country by performing valuable and dangerous services, such as diplomacy and fighting, for reasons of loyalty, patriotism, and honor, while the lower classes perform less important service. . . .

(Anderson 19)

In the play world, Roman males give precedence to promotion over service. While the messengers and the followers in Rome endeavour to be promoted within their hierarchy, their masters compete with each other to win the greatest power. The "triple pillars" of Rome, Octavius Caesar, Mark Antony and Lepidus, though they are supposed to be allies, are engaged in fierce competition in order to obtain the greatest power while Sextus Pompey, a former ally, rebels against them. Among these "triple pillars," Lepidus behaves moderately towards his rivals; when Caesar criticizes Antony for his

womanish quality, saying that he is “not more manlike/ Than Cleopatra” (1.4.5-6), Lepidus defends Antony:

I must not think there are
Evils enough to darken all his goodness.
His faults, in him, seem as the spots of heaven,
More fiery by night’s blackness. . . . (1.4.10-13)

Though not denying Antony’s faults, he still emphasizes his good qualities. The reason why Lepidus acts so generously towards both Antony and Caesar is because “Both he loves” (3.2.19). What is more, he tries to unite Caesar to Antony since Pompey, their mutual enemy, is winning power. He believes that, in order to defeat Pompey, they have to be bound to strengthen their unity. In the end, a temporal reconciliation between them is brought about by Agrippa (2.2). Even so, despite his affection for both Antony and Caesar, they cannot construct male friendship or male bondship between them because of their fierce rivalry.

While Rome is in a divided situation where the struggles of the powerful males cause tension, Antony stays away, indulging in his pleasures with Cleopatra, Queen of Egypt. There, he seems to be concerned neither with male friendship nor with male rivalry. In the opening scene of this play, Philo, a messenger from Rome, refers to Antony as “a strumpet’s fool” (1.1.13); Philo thinks that he has lost his interest in the power struggle in Rome and thus has lost valour suitable to Roman

males. Soon after this speech by Philo, Antony enters the stage with Cleopatra, showing that he attaches little importance to Rome:

Antony: Let Rome in Tiber melt, and the wide arch
Of the ranged empire fall! Here is my space!
Kingdoms are clay! (1.1.34-36)

He emphasizes his love for Cleopatra, the embodiment of Egypt, a country which he says is his universe now. It turns out, however, that his remark is to calm her jealousy over his attachment to Rome and to his wife, Fulvia. In the next scene, where Cleopatra does not appear, he talks with a Roman messenger about the state of the war there.

He is still deeply concerned about the Roman political condition, being evidently aware of his own dishonourable behaviour as a warrior in Egypt. He tells the messenger:

Speak to me home; mince not the general tongue;
Name Cleopatra as she is called in Rome;
Rail thou in Fulvia's phrase, and taunt my faults
With such full licence as both truth and malice
Have power to utter. (1.2.111-15)

These speeches indicate, contrary to his earlier words, that he cannot ignore the Roman system of military values. He also says:

These strong Egyptian fetters I must break,
Or lose myself in dotage. (1.2.122-23)

Knowing his wife's death and the political state of Rome, he decides to go back to his soldiership.

The duality of the masters affects values of their followers. Concerning the loyalty presented in the play, Paul Yachnin points out:

. . . *Antony and Cleopatra* displayed "absolutist loyalty" in such elaborate detail that absolutism's deeply conflicted dependence on "sovereign subjectivity" was able to emerge into the consciousness of the members of its 1606-1607 audiences. (345)

In his view, representing the social situation in real England at that time, the world in the play is ruled by the norms of absolutism. And yet, in Rome, followers place priority on their promotion in society over the loyalty to their master. When Ventidius, a follower of Antony, speaks with Silius, he states how a person of "A lower place" should behave. He thinks that if one surpasses his master in fighting, he will be in a difficult position:

Ventidius:	A lower place, note well, May make too great an act. For learn this,
	Silius:
	Better to leave undone than, by our deed, Acquire too high a fame when him we serve's away.

(3.1.12-15)

Although men in Rome are supposed to fight with their full strength for their country, followers, as Ventidius says, try not to outdo their superiors. If they want to be promoted in Roman society, they should achieve less fame than their masters. Men like Ventidius intentionally adjust themselves to this Roman way of male thinking in order to increase their standing within the social hierarchy.

In Rome, the relationship between master and servant becomes complicated; unless a master keeps his power, his servant will desert him. Faced with the defeat in the fight of Actium, Enobarbus, one of Antony's most important followers, feels a dilemma over whether he should leave his master or not. He speaks to himself about the fame earned by following "a fallen lord":

The loyalty well held to fools does make
Our faith mere folly. Yet he that can endure
To follow with allegiance a fallen lord
Does conquer him that did his master conquer,
And earns a place i'th' story. (3.13.43-47)

The reason why he hesitates to leave is his belief that loyalty to the defeated master may give him more fame than deserting him. In this speech, Enobarbus does not refer specifically to his duty as a follower even though he says that his "honesty" and his own feelings are beginning to diverge. All he is concerned

about at this point is the benefit he can get from his superior. Male servants in Rome try to promote themselves through their relationship with a powerful master:

It is through friendship with the great, Shakespeare suggests, even though that friendship may be severely compromised, that the ordinary man's life becomes meaningful, both in theatrical terms, and in terms of his own significance to himself.

(MacFaul 195)

Through the promotion of one's master, changing one's allegiance to a more powerful master, or keeping loyalty to a defeated master, they can attain honour and be promoted in the society.

Male rivalry of a servant overcomes his bondship with his master, that is, loyalty. By judging that Antony is no longer useful in terms of material profits, Enobarbus finally decides to desert him without feeling any particular guilt at that time. He considers that, having lost his leadership in war, Antony is no longer a trustworthy master. He expresses his own feelings in leaving:

. . . I see still
A diminution in our captain's brain
Restores his heart. When valour preys on reason,
It eats the sword it fights with. I will seek
Some way to leave him. (3.13.202-06)

His words indicate that he objectively estimates his master's chances in the forthcoming battle against Octavius Caesar. Foreseeing Antony's defeat, he decides to leave. Enobarbus's eagerness to take side with the winner overwhelms his sense of "honesty" (3.13.42) as a servant.

After deserting, Enobarbus comes to realize that his decision has been wrong. His awareness of the duty of a servant overwhelms him:

Alexas did revolt and went to Jewry on
Affairs to Antony; there did dissuade
Great Herod to incline himself to Caesar
And leave his master Antony. For this pains
Caesar hath hanged him. Canidius and the rest
That fell away have entertainment but
No honourable trust. I have done ill,
Of which I do accuse myself so sorely
That I will joy no more. (4.6.12-20)

Alexas, Candidius, and the rest who have deserted Antony, and taken Caesar's side, are badly treated by the latter. This fact makes Enobarbus realize that leaving one's master only gains mistrust of the new master.

He also suffers from another kind of disappointment here. Soon after he finishes his aside, a soldier comes to say to him: "Antony/ Hath after thee sent all thy treasure, with/ His bounty overplus" (4.6.21-23). Moved by Antony's great generosity, he

repents of his betrayal against him, referring himself as “the villain of the earth” (4.6.31):

I am alone the villain of the earth,
 And feel I am so most. O Antony,
 Thou mine of bounty, how wouldst thou have paid
 My better service, when my turpitude
 Thou dost so crown with gold! This blows my heart.

 I fight against thee? No, I will go seek
 Some ditch wherein to die; the foul’st best fits
 My latter part of my life. (4.6.31-40)

His self-hatred is caused by his disgust at his own betrayal as well as by his disappointment at the mistreatment by Caesar. Undoubtedly he attaches great importance to his own profits; “fame” and “gold” play important roles in his decision for the future of his military and political career. These two senses of self-reproach Enobarbus feels are connected to his dual sense of loyalty and his own desire for promotion, that is, male bondship and male rivalry.

Not only Enobarbus, but also other followers display duality, which is a characteristic feature of this play. In the opening scene, Philo, who has just arrived from Rome as a messenger from Caesar, describes Antony’s degeneration:

Those his goodly eyes,
 That o’er the files and musters of the war

Have glowed like plated Mars, now bend, now turn
 The office and devotion of their view
 Upon a tawny front. His captain's heart,
 Which in the scuffles of great fights hath burst
 The buckles on his breast, reneges all temper
 And is become the bellows and the fan
 To cool a gipsy's lust. (1.1.2-10)

Philo thinks that Antony no longer has any interest in the war, for which Caesar wants him back in Rome. Yet Antony and Cleopatra, who shortly appear on the stage, show that Philo's words are not necessarily true. Cleopatra makes sarcastic remarks to Antony about his position there, while Antony, despite his dismissal of Philo, is keen to hear the news of the war conveyed from home. The gap between how Philo describes Antony and Cleopatra thinks about him points at Antony's duality. Antony, engaged with pleasure embodied by Egyptian culture, is deeply concerned with Roman military life.

Thus, the messengers and the followers in this play highlight their duality. Michael Neill's view on the situation in which servants were placed in early modern England can be applied to the master-servant relationship described in this play: "the social identity of a servant was in some sense subsumed in that of his master (whose 'creature' he might quite properly be called)" (Neill, *Putting* 19). Servants do not feel completely united with their masters since their sense of

identity does not correspond to their sense of social position. That is the reason why male rivalry overwhelms their bondship with their masters.

The feudal society was hierarchal in structure, its essence being the bond of loyalty and dependence between lord and man. This assumption could be applied to relatively static agricultural society while the sixteenth-century society was becoming more mobile; masterless men were no longer regarded as outlaws but existed in alarming numbers (Christopher Hill, *World Turned* 32). No vagabond appearing in this play, Shakespeare evidently presents here the change of master-servant relationship as well as that of male friendship in early modern England.

2. Female Bondship and Immutability in Egypt

Cleopatra, an absolute monarch of Egypt, provides a more solid social situation to its people than Rome. Consequently, in comparison to male servants of Rome, Egyptian female servants maintain loyalty to Cleopatra throughout the play. Shakespeare uses the associations of Cleopatra with Isis. Since Isis is an Egyptian goddess of fertility, who is wife of Osiris and mother of Horus, Cleopatra is represented as an embodiment of great power related to the Egyptian climate (Lloyd 94).

Unlike Rome, Egypt keeps its traditional ideology of duality, regarded as circulation. The Nile in Egypt, the longest

river in the world, often produces floods, which yield both the fertile plains and destruction to the Egyptian people. Floods are generally considered as merely destructive, but the river Nile also brings about an abundant crop in Egypt. About the paradoxical aspects of the river, Antony explains to Caesar:

. . . By th'height, the lowness, or the mean, if dearth
 Or foison follow. The higher the Nilus swells,
 The more it promises. As it ebbs, the seedsman
 Upon the slime and ooze scatters his grain,
 And shortly comes to harvest. (2.7.19-23)

As Antony says, the nourishment contained in the slime of the Nile causes good harvests in the land of Egypt after a flood. Here, the flood of the Nile is represented as having two kinds of effect, which can be defined as duality; in Janet Adelman's words, "in Egypt, loss is the only way to gain" (Adelman, *Common* 130). Flooding thus signifies both destruction and revival.

In response to the news of Antony's marriage to Octavia, Cleopatra expresses her anger in her typically Egyptian way, saying, "Melt Egypt into Nile, and kindly creatures/ Turn all to serpents!" (2.5.78-79). Even in her rage, though she wishes that Egypt will sink into the Nile, she still wants its inhabitants not to die but to revive as snakes. On the other hand, she expresses her anger to the Romans, saying, "Sink Rome, and their tongues rot/ That speak against us!" (3.7.15-16); she wants Rome to be

ruined, knowing that Rome cannot revive after being sunk in water. Not only through contact with her Roman lovers, Antony, Julius Caesar, and Pompey, but also with messengers and followers, she has acquired the Roman way of thinking in which destruction does not lead to revival. Thus, Cleopatra embodies the dualism, which constitutes the central theme of the play.

Under the queen's absolute rule, the female attendants of Cleopatra, Charmian and Iras, do not engage in political power struggles. In contrast to the male messengers and the followers of Rome, they serve their queen without entertaining any doubts about their loyalty. In comparison with the Roman male servants, the Egyptian female servants hold close relationship with their mistress:

. . . one based on Roman custom, independent of the particular personality of the master, tending, indeed, to form the character of the master, or at least the way that character expresses itself within this context, and the other based on particular personality of the mistress, responsive, adaptable, even changeable. (Evetts 161)

When enjoying themselves talking to a soothsayer in Act 1 Scene 2, they order him only to tell their own future, not that of their mistress. Unlike the Roman male characters discussed in the previous section, they never deliver asides nor discuss the political state of Egypt with their equals throughout the play;

what they speak about to each other is mostly about their mistress, Cleopatra. They do not entertain any views independent of their mistress or those who are incompatible with her.

In the Egyptian monument, “a royal mausoleum consecrated to a queen’s immortal fame” (Neill, *Issues* 312), Antony and Cleopatra believe that they shall be united with each other. Both, being ruled by Egyptian views of death, feel that they will meet again. Although she does not seem to make “any meaningful sacrifice for love” (Harris 226) for the sake of Antony, she changes her relationship with him in the face of death. While committing suicide, she says, “Husband, I come!” (5.2.286). Her remark can imply the prospective change in their relationship in a life after death. At this moment, it is Cleopatra, dressed in her best attires to show her “like a queen” (5.2.226), that makes a movement towards Antony, referring to him as her husband for the first time in this play: “she becomes *both* the goddess Isis, with an asp at her breast, as well as Antony’s Roman wife” (Loomba 133). Keeping her role as an Egyptian queen, Cleopatra allots herself a new one as Antony’s wife.

Ancient Egyptians used to believe that people would regenerate after death, since Osiris, a god connected with fertility in Egyptian mythology, is said to have revived as the ruler of afterlife with the aid of Isis, his wife. Cleopatra states:

can be observed in both Antony and Cleopatra.

Even if both Antony and Cleopatra possess mixed-up views, they are situated in opposing ideological positions. To the end, Cleopatra, obeying the ideology of Egyptian flexibility, changes her position or takes in the Roman way of thinking. Her former conducts can be interpreted as consistently dominated by the idea of Egyptian dualism. Meanwhile, to Antony, fickleness means a deviation from the norm, that is, the Roman constancy.

In *Antony and Cleopatra* as well as in *Julius Caesar* (1599), the symbolisms of stars are used to represent the ideology of a country; one of the main characters is mentioned as a star. Admitting that Cleopatra is no longer “the fleeting moon” (5.2.239), Charmian refers to her as the “eastern star” (5.2.307). While the moon, a symbol of womanliness, waxes and wanes, the “eastern star,” keeping the same shape, changes its position. Referring to Cleopatra as the “eastern star,” which represents both fluxional and constant aspects, Charmian suggests that she has contradictory characteristics, constantly changing while remaining fixed. On the other hand, stars represent constancy in *Julius Caesar*. Julius Caesar refers to himself as a star:

But I am constant as the northern star,
Of whose true-fixed and resting quality
There is no fellow in the firmament. (3.1.60-62)

Using the image of “the northern star,” he stresses his constancy. And yet, there is a wide difference between these stars; while the “eastern star” changes its position, the northern one neither changes its shape nor its position. Namely, “the northern star” stands for steadfastness. That is because Julius Caesar is supposed to hold absolute constancy, which is regarded as *virtus* in Roman society.

Charmian and Iras’s loyalty to Cleopatra is most dramatically presented when they commit suicide without hesitation after the death of their mistress. Unlike Roman males, they are free from conflicts:

. . . Cleopatra’s women have no family ties and no obligations to anyone apart from her, and this contrast to the elaborate network of Elizabeth’s court exposes the extent of Cleopatra’s political isolation. (Brown 136)

When Dolabella informs Cleopatra that Caesar plans to bring her to Rome as a captive, she immediately shows her intention to kill herself rather than to survive. They choose to follow their mistress by committing suicide. Iras states that she cannot bear to think of the humiliation Cleopatra will go through in Rome:

I’ll never see’t, for I am sure my nails
Are stronger than mine eyes! (5.2.222-23)

She thinks that she would rather damage her eyes than see her queen taken captive, hoping that Cleopatra will not lose her

dignity as Queen of Egypt. Actually, Iras commits suicide before Cleopatra's death. In the case of Charmian, she kills herself after Cleopatra dies, having mended Cleopatra's "awry" crown. In the meanwhile, Cleopatra does not expect Charmian to follow her in death. She tells her:

. . . And when thou hast done this chare, I'll give thee
leave

To play till dooms day. (5.2.230-31; Emphasis mine)

Cleopatra allows her female servant the freedom to enjoy herself until her life ends naturally. Even so, in the face of her death, Charmian takes the meaning of the word, "play," to "to act, operate, work" (*OED* v. I.1), that is, in this specific situation, to commit suicide.

Even though Antony's dualism which consists of Roman and Egyptian elements is shared by Cleopatra, their social conditions are entirely different from each other. While Antony is abandoned by his follower, Cleopatra's female attendants serve her loyally to the end. This contrast derives from the difference between the social climates of these countries. In Egypt, a country in which femininity holds a high position, represented by Cleopatra, neither male friendship nor male rivalry dominates the characters. Unlike male characters in Rome, Egyptian women including Cleopatra, maintain their bondship, which is formed not by political motivations, but by their affection for each other.

3. The Relationships between Masters and Servants

The messengers and the followers, coming and going between Rome and Egypt, tend to know more and better than their masters; they can get direct knowledge of both countries while their masters, including Antony, acquire the knowledge of each country indirectly through their reports. There is an important difference in the recognition of each other between masters and their servants. The masters tend to misunderstand the social situation around themselves and the real motivation of their servants' loyalty.

This can be said, in particular, of Enobarbus, who can understand the circumstances of Antony's marriage to Octavia and predict their future more correctly than the leading patricians in Rome. Against their expectation, the marriage deals a fatal blow to the relationship between Antony and Caesar; Antony goes back to Cleopatra after all, defying Caesar's wish for his sister's happiness. He tells Menas, one of Pompey's followers: "the band that seems to tie their friendship together will be the very strangler of their amity" (2.6.122-24). With regard to Octavia, Enobarbus knows that she cannot hold Antony:

Enobarbus: Octavia is of a holy, cold and still
conversation.

Menas: Who would not have his wife so?

Enobarbus: Not he that himself is not so; which is
 Mark Antony. He will to his Egyptian
 dish again. (2.6.124-28)

He thinks that although she embodies the ideal womanhood in Rome, Antony cannot be attracted by her but continues to love Cleopatra, with whom he has too much in common.

What is more, when Antony says that Cleopatra is more cunning than men think, Enobarbus objects to his image of Cleopatra:

. . . her passions are made of nothing but the finest part of pure love. We cannot call her winds and waters sighs and tears; they are greater storms and tempests than almanacs can report. This cannot be cunning in her. If it be, she makes a shower of rain as well as Jove. (1.2.153-58)

He explains to Antony that though she is exceedingly passionate, she is at the same time pure and attractive. Being Queen of Egypt, she cannot fit into the Roman standard of womanhood. However, her difference in this regard is what attracts Antony and Enobarbus, both Roman soldiers.

Particularly enamoured by Cleopatra, Antony comes to be ruled by both the Roman and the Egyptian value systems.

In contrast, Octavius Caesar can be regarded as a model figure of the Roman value system. There is a notable difference between Caesar and Antony:

In *The Tragedy of Antony and Cleopatra*, disunity is dealt with on three different levels: in the individual, in the family, and in the state. . . . Eventually, personal disunity becomes obvious in all the main characters except Octavius. . . . (Bowling 239)

It is natural that Caesar should be enraged with Antony, who is now fully engaged in his pleasures in Egypt. Caesar, thinking that power is the most important thing of all and that men should fight with their full strength to obtain it, says to Lepidus, one of the “triple pillars”:

It is not Caesar's natural vice to hate
Our great competitor. From Alexandria
This is the news: he fishes, drinks, and wastes
The lamps of night in revel; is not more manlike
Than Cleopatra, nor the Queen of Ptolemy
More womanly than he; hardly gave audience, or
Vouchsafed to think he had partners. You shall find
there
A man who is the abstract of all faults
That all men follow. (1.4.2-10)

He considers that while he has great possibilities in military acuity, Antony is not qualified as a Roman warrior.

Caesar, being aware of the gap between them, goes so far to tell Antony that they cannot “remain in friendship” because of their “conditions/ So differing in their acts” (2.2.120-21). To

bridge this gap between Antony and Caesar, Agrippa makes a proposal of the marriage of Antony and Octavia, thinking that Antony and Caesar can hold their perpetual bondship through this marriage. Agrippa portrays her as an exemplar of womanhood:

. . . whose beauty claims

No worse a husband than the best of men;

Whose virtue and whose general graces speak

That which none else can utter. (2.2.135-38)

Octavia is shown to be a model image of womanhood in Rome.

The virtues to which both Octavia and her brother devote themselves represent the values of Rome. While her brother is a soldier who stoically pursues power, she possesses typical female virtues defined by her society. It seems likely that Caesar, who portrays her as “the piece of virtue” (3.2.28), loves his sister dearly because they both pursue traditional Roman values single-mindedly.

Unlike Caesar, both masters and servants in the play often deviate from the norms of Roman society to which they belong. For instance, Fulvia, Antony’s wife, is bold enough to rebel against Caesar in order to bring Antony back from Egypt where he has been absorbed in pleasures with Cleopatra. She dies of illness in the field when she stays in Sicyon with Antony’s brother, Lucius. After he is informed of her death, Antony says:

Truth is that Fulvia,
 To have me out of Egypt, made wars here,
 For which myself, the ignorant motive, do
 So far ask pardon as befits mine honour
 To stoop in such a case. (2.2.100-04)

He indicates that he is sorry for having neglected his wife. Even though he has thought little of her, he seems to regard her as of great value after her death. Here, he never condemns her for her defiance against the Roman social order:

There's a great spirit gone! Thus did I desire it.
 What our contempts doth often hurl from us
 We wish it ours again. . . .

.

The hand could pluck her back that shoved her on.
 I must from this enchanting queen break off.

(1.2.129-35)

Although Fulvia, a woman, fought against men, he sets a high value on her courage. He commends her through a Roman sense of male values, which constrains men to be valiant. Although her conduct may well be considered as “a direct usurpation of male military means to power” (Jankowski 102) by the Roman standard, Antony even feels a kind of male friendship with his wife though she is a woman. Having been affected by Cleopatra, Antony's value system has become different from the one in Rome. His view on Roman values seems to be mixed with

Egyptian ones. Deeply and unconsciously affected by the Egyptian value system, he comes to admire, after her death, Fulvia, a misfit in terms of the Roman ideal image of womanhood.

Other masters, including Sextus Pompey and Agrippa, also show duality in their system of values. Unlike Brutus, Pompey is not completely devoted to Roman military values, facing the dilemma between the supreme power in Rome and his sense of honour as a Roman warrior. Therefore, he accepts the peace negotiations proposed by the “triple pillars” though, immediately before the proposal, he shows his indignation over them. Concerning the change of his mind about the conflict with the “triple pillars,” Menas points out in his aside the difference between Pompey, his master, and Pompey’s father:

[*aside*] Thy father, Pompey, would ne’er have made
this treaty. [*To Enobarbus*] You and I have
known, sir. (2.6.82-84)

Menas considers that although Pompey the Great can be regarded as a symbol of the Roman Empire, his son, Sextus Pompey, does not follow the way of Roman soldiers shown by his father. He tries to instigate his master to allow him to kill the “triple pillars” on the ship during the feast in order to make him act in a soldierly way:

These three world-sharers, these competitors,
Are in thy vessel. Let me cut the cable,

And when we are put off, fall to their throats.

All then is thine. (2.7.71-74)

Menas wants his master to obtain the supreme military position in Rome, thinking that he himself will gain more power as a loyal servant to the man in the highest office.

In the meanwhile, Pompey, his master, does not understand Menas's real intention to urge him to kill his competitors, being ignorant of the motive with which servants work for their masters. There is a gap between the masters' recognition of their servants' loyalty and of the servants' real motivation behind their loyalty. Paying attention to the issue of his own honour, Pompey tells Menas:

Ah, this thou shouldst have done

And not have spoke on't. In me 'tis villainy;

In thee't had been good service. Thou must know

'Tis not my profit that does lead mine honour;

Mine honour, it. Repent that e'er thy tongue

Hath so betrayed thine act. Being done unknown,

I should have found it afterwards well done,

But must condemn it now. Desist and drink.

(2.7.74-81)

He insinuates that, for the sake of his own honour, he would not allow Menas to betray and kill the "triple pillars" though he actually wants them to be dead. Pompey cannot decide whether he should attach a higher priority to his honour or a profitable

result. Also, it is clear from Pompey's words that he does not doubt his servant's fidelity.

Menas also possess a self-centered way of thinking. Pompey's misunderstanding of the nature of the master-servant relationship is presented in Menas's aside:

For this,
I'll never follow thy palled fortunes more.
Who seeks and will not take, when once 'tis offered,
Shall never find it more. (2.7.82-85)

Menas decides to abandon Pompey, judging that his master can no longer provide great profit to himself. While Pompey believes in Menas's loyalty to him, the latter shows his own sense of value in which profit is placed in a more important position than loyalty. As to the gap between Pompey and Menas, David Schalkwyk argues that "He has a relationship of trust to his guests; his servant has a relationship of obedience only to him" (204). Pointing out the existence of "rivalry between Rome and Egypt, Venus and Mars" (197), he does not acknowledge male rivalry dominating the Roman society. What makes Menas advise Pompey to become the "lord of all the world" (2.7.62) is actually his own desire to be promoted in the male world by serving a man of supreme power.

In the Roman male world of power, the motivation of male servants seems to be to obtain status for themselves by serving their masters. The only character who is not so motivated this

category is Eros, Antony's follower. He is the only servant that does not abandon Antony even after his defeat against Caesar in Act 3 Scene 11 and he commits suicide because of his love for Antony. Believing Mardian's report that Cleopatra is dead, Antony orders Eros to help him to kill himself. However, Eros chooses to commit suicide. In his final speech, he states:

Why, there then! *Kills himself.*

Thus I do escape the sorrow

Of Antony's death. (4.14.95-96)

Since Eros would like to die rather than witness Antony's death, his love for him is underlined. Coppélia Kahn comments on this scene, relating Eros's action to his name, "Eros":

. . . a close look at the scene (4.14) in which Eros agrees to kill Antony but then turns the knife against himself suggests a different meaning for that name, as a signifier of love specifically between men.

(Roman 130)

As suggested by his name itself, "Eros," which means "love" (*OED* 1), it may well be said that his self-sacrifice for Antony is caused by his personal love for his master not by his sense of duty. Eros is presented as being closely related to Cleopatra:

Shakespeare suggests the connection by repeatedly conflating her with Antony's attendant, Eros, whereby, through the device of apposition, the two characters become one and the same. Examples of

such conflation include the following: “she, Eros, has/ Packed cards with Caesar” (4.14.18-19); “Eros! —I come, my queen. —Eros! —Stay for me” (4.14.50); “No, my chuck. Eros . . .” (4.4.2); and “My queen and Eros” (4.14.97). (Parker, *Plato’s Republic* 95)

This connection is striking because Cleopatra and Eros are of different genders. And yet, Eros’s homosexual love for Antony can be a reason for the conflation; both Cleopatra and Eros conceive sexual love for Antony. In this respect, although they are firmly united to each other, Eros’s fidelity to Antony cannot be considered as male bondship in a strict sense, but rather as male homosexual love, which is rarely described in Shakespeare’s Roman plays.

On the other hand, Antony himself seems not to feel homosexual love for Eros, but male bondship, trusting his fidelity. There is also a gap between them even though, unlike other servants, he continues to serve his master loyally.

Concerning the relationship between male friendship and homosexual love, Bruce R. Smith states, referring to Plato’s idea: “male friendship and sexual attraction, far from being opposites, are two aspects of the same bond” (*Homosexual* 37). Smith thinks that male friendship and sexual attraction originate in the same friendship. Nonetheless, since male friendship in this dissertation is the one defined as “cooperation in the political activities of the plays,” his idea cannot be

applied to the relationship between Antony and Eros.

Though Eros disobeys his master's will by killing himself, Antony does not condemn him. After Eros's death, Antony says, showing respect to him:

Thrice nobler than myself!

Thou teachest me, O valiant Eros, what

I should and thou couldst not! My queen and Eros

Have by their brave instruction got upon me

A nobleness in record. (4.14.96-100)

He thinks that both Cleopatra and Eros, who have succeeded in committing suicide, are superior to him in valiance and nobility. Antony's admiration of them for having done so derives from his sense of values as a Roman. On the contrary, it can also be noted that Egyptian value system in him allows him to regard Cleopatra, a woman, and Eros, his follower, as "nobler" than himself; women and servants would normally be regarded as inferior to a Roman soldier who possesses great military prowess.

Unlike Cleopatra's female servants, who never think of abandoning her, her male servants in Egypt, such as Seleucus and Alex, betray her. Seleucus, her treasurer, reports to Caesar that she has tried to deceive him, reserving a great amount of treasures for herself. She becomes greatly upset when she realizes that he has betrayed her:

See, Caesar! O behold

How pomp is followed! Mine will now be yours
 And, should we shift estates, yours would be mine.

(5.2.149-51)

Her female servants' fidelity is patently opposed to her male servants' infidelity, which enrages the queen. Though an Egyptian, Seleucus's sense of values stems from the Roman concept of male political power.

The reason why Mardian, a eunuch, who serves Cleopatra at the Egyptian court, never becomes disloyal to Cleopatra is deeply related to his characteristics as a eunuch. In the Introduction to the Oxford edition of *Anthony and Cleopatra*, Michael Neill argues: "In gender, as in politics, there is no midway between extremes: to be stripped of the properties of masculinity is to become feminine" (Introduction 113). According to Neill, Mardian, having being castrated, is set in a female position. And yet, he can still be categorized as a male. When Cleopatra asks him if he has affections, he replies, making a joke upon his own sexual inability:

Not in deed, madam, for I can do nothing
 But what indeed is honest to be done.
 Yet have I fierce affections, and think
 What did Venus did with Mars. (1.5.16-19)

He implies that he takes an interest in sexual acts, which he cannot perform. Retaining his sexuality to some extent, he entertains his objective point of view, neither ardently

supporting his queen nor betraying her.

On the other hand, even though situated in a position near women, Mardian is not a “fellow-traveller.” According to MacFaul, a “fellow-traveller” does not embody a male sense of honour himself, but accompanies men who pursue “the concept of honour and therefore [are] closer to the women’s position than the other men” (153). Yet Mardian, not travelling with other men who seek for honour, cannot be defined as one.

Even if Octavius Caesar declares that “The time of universal peace is near” (4.6.5), the end of the play implies that the Roman male world of power is not necessarily a triumph in a true sense. Caesar, an ideal Roman of high military acuity, wins against Egypt, but fails to make Cleopatra one of his “signs of conquest” in Rome (5.2.134). His political scheme is completely defeated by the Egyptian queen, who kills herself without being taken to Rome. As a consequent, the commonplace interpretation of regarding him as “an ideal prince who stands as the moral superior of the dissolute Antony” (Kalmey 275) becomes dubious.

Although, in principle, it intends impartiality in society, republicanism does not function well in the play world. This destruction of social institution makes male friendship unable to function properly. While Rome is presented as a site of male power struggles, the female productiveness of Egypt is emphasized in this play: “The contest between Caesar and

Cleopatra, Rome and Egypt, is in part a contest between male scarcity and female bounty” (Adelman, *Suffocating* 177). This contrast between the two countries is brought about partly by the difference in the political systems. The “male scarcity” in Rome is brought about by the ideology of Roman republicanism, which has no absolute monarch.

Caesar’s triumphal return to Rome can be compared with King James’s entry into London in March 1604. While Caesar tries to make use of Cleopatra in order to add a special touch to his military merit, the King, though splendidly welcomed, owed himself to the old Queen’s symbolism at the welcoming ceremonies. He was in need of an image whose association would be familiar to the English (Parry 1). Besides, the Egyptian concept of regeneration after death portrayed in the play can be applied to Queen Elizabeth. After her death and James’s accession, she remained the subject of worship:

In 1603, however, as Elizabeth’s state funeral ritually un-performed the ceremonies by which she had been crowned forty-four years earlier, it was by no means obvious that the “late queen of glorious memory” would become the focus of this enduring national sentiment of loss and veneration.

(Dobson 31)

The founding of the nostalgic cult of Gloriana is referred to as Elizabethan revival. Although declaring “free and absolute

monarch,” King James as well as Caesar was surpassed by a female monarch.

In the Roman world described in *Antony and Cleopatra*, the decline of social hierarchy is illustrated. Followers’ loyalty to and dependence upon their masters is detracted while the “triple pillars” compete with each other. Both loyalty to one’s master and male friendship with other man is converted into male rivalry; it can be considered as a new standard for men to make one’s social position secure in the play. In this sense, male rivalry does not essentially conflict with male friendship.

**Chapter IV. Male Friendship and Male Companionship
in *Coriolanus***

The opening scene of *Coriolanus* (1608) is closely related to political issues important to the original audience in Shakespeare's time:

Coriolanus is Shakespeare's most political play. It is also, despite its austere Roman authenticity, his most topical. The Midlands corn riots of 1607, and the arguments in parliament three years earlier over the right of the House of Commons to initiate legislation, form a well-documented part of the play's political context. (Wells, *Masculinity* 146-47)

A chain of riots is clearly reflected in the play; agrarian protests against the enclosure of formerly open-field farming led to the Midland Revolt, a series of riots in Northamptonshire in 1607. In the Introduction to the Cambridge edition of *Coriolanus*, its editor, Lee Bliss explains the repercussions of the riots brought about in society:

Despite the fact that the Midland Revolt was non-violent and aimed only at levelling hedges and restoring common lands to the people's use, it alarmed the authorities for a number of reasons. It was large and apparently well-organised as well as

well-disciplined. Rioting began in Northamptonshire in early May, but soon three counties were involved, more were feared at risk, and in several places the levellers numbered as many as 5,000.

(Introduction 18-19)

Though these riots did not involve violence, the power of the plebeians was acknowledged as having a great impact on English society. It was not merely a series of enclosure riots since it lacked gentry leadership, explicitly representing social conflict (Manning 235).

The warlike attitudes of the citizens in the play reflect those of the Oxfordshire rebellion of 1596 and the London riots of 1595, in which its leaders threatened violence against the gentry. Unlike the Midland Revolt, it was small-scale and poorly-organised, but these rebellions were menacing to the authorities; different from rebellions in the earlier period, they posed a dangerous threat to society. Furthermore, the rebels required the authorities to fulfill their paternalistic obligations. This means that the basic social conflict as well as the immediate economic difficulties was the cause for the rebellion. It seems that Shakespeare reflected the threat felt in English society at that time in various elements of *Coriolanus*.

This chapter will discuss the issue of male friendship in *Coriolanus* in the light of the relationships between patricians and plebeians. In this play, male companionship between them

rather than male friendship between patricians holds influential power over social conditions. In the Roman society in this play, it is necessary for the patricians to act gently towards the plebeians in order to get along well with them because their sense of duty to the patricians has decreased. Nonetheless, Martius refuses to adjust himself to such social codes, which are to keep patricians and plebeians on good terms.

1. The Power of the Plebeians

It is illuminating to compare the populace represented in Shakespeare's *Coriolanus* and those in *The Lives of the Noble Grecians and Romanes*, translated from Plutarch's Greek version by Thomas North in 1579. The plebeians in Plutarch are presented as more oppressed than Shakespeare's:

. . . it fortun'd there grewe sedition in the cittie,
 bicause the Senate dyd favour the riche against the
 people, who dyd complaine of the sore oppression of
 usurers, of whom they borrowed money. For those that
 had little, were yet spoyled of that litle they had by
 their creditours, for lacke of abilitie to paye the
 userie: who offer'd their goodes to be solde, to them
 that would geve most. (Bullough 5: 509)

They fought against Sabynes because the rich men and the chief of the Senate had promised to treat them more generously. The

cause of the tumult originated from the breach of the promise. Since they had found no redress after the rebellion, the plebeians forsook Rome and encamped themselves upon a hill; they decided neither to execute any violence nor to make any show of rebellion against Rome: “to dwell at Rome was nothing els but to be slaine, or hurte with continuall warres, and fighting for defence of the riche mens goodes” (Bullough 5: 510). Plutarch’s plebeians are portrayed as seeking only a peaceful life.

On the other hand, in Shakespeare’s *Coriolanus*, the plebeians’ truculent attitudes towards the patricians are foregrounded:

Coriolanus challenges expectations concerning “home” as protected space, the source of familiarity and comfort, by constructing public and private in mutually constituting tension. . . . (Christensen 296)

Representing the real society, the Roman one in the play is set in a domestically disordered state. As the stage direction shows, in the opening scene, they are armed with various kinds of weapons such as staves and clubs. To get corn at a fair price, they have decided to fight against the patricians. They would rather die in a battle against the patricians than starve:

First Citizen: You are all resolved rather to die to
than famish?

All: Resolved, resolved. (1.1.3-4)

Because he rejects their demand immediately with insulting words, Martius is abused by plebeians:

First Citizen: Let us kill him, and we'll have corn at
our own price. Is't a verdict?

All: No more talking on't. Let it be done. Away, away!

(1.1.8-10)

Ignoring his contribution to protecting Rome in the past, they regard him as their enemy, calling him "proud":

All: Against him first. He's a very dog to the
commonalty.

Second Citizen: Consider you what services he has
done for his country?

First Citizen: Very well, and could be content to give
him good report for't, but that he pays
himself with being proud. (1.1.21-25)

For plebeians, for whom their profits are most important, Martius is so "proud" that he hampers their profits.

While Shakespeare follows Plutarch closely in writing *Coriolanus*, Plutarch's original protagonist is represented as more admirable than Shakespeare's. Martius in Plutarch is not presented as arrogant; he humiliates neither patricians nor plebeians by acting insolently. In this play, Shakespeare portrays Martius as a man who wants to survive in Roman society through his own military ability. From plebeians' point of view, he looks like a "chief enemy to the people" (1.1.5-6)

regardless of his martial feats; despite his outstanding achievements in wars, they call him a “very dog.”

On the other hand, Menenius Agrippa, a supporter of Martius, treats them politely in persuading them not to start a riot in spite of his contempt against them. While Martius calls plebeians “rogues” (1.1.147) and “curs” (1.1.151), Menenius describes them “masters, my good friends, mine honest neighbours” (1.1.48), though, in fact, like Martius, he despises them. In the conversation with Martius, he describes them as: “abundantly they lack discretion,/ Yet are they passingly cowardly” (1.1.185-86). The reason of his gentle attitude towards plebeians is that he is well aware of the importance of their power.

The plebeians’ concern with their own profits affects the social conditions in the play, controlled by the overwhelming power of the plebeians over the patricians. The Roman society in the play is shown to be in two kinds of conflict; the class struggle between patricians and plebeians and the war against Volsces. Their understanding of the significance of war and peace is clearly shown in the following conversation between two servingmen:

First Servingman: Let me have war, say I. . . .

Peace is a very apoplexy,
lethargy; mulled, deaf, sleepy,
insensible; a getter of more bastard

children than war's a destroyer of
men.

.

First Servingman: Ay, and it makes men hate
one another.

Second Servingman: Reason: because they then less
need one another. (4.5.213-21)

They prefer war to peace because it brings more liveliness and male solidarity to the city. Peace cannot be “an unmixed blessing” in the society presented in the play (Leggatt, *Political Drama* 194). The plebeians, who seek for material gain, do not consider peace as good; it is their way of thinking to gain profits by means of a struggle against the patricians.

Concerning the reason why Roman citizens would rather have war; “Rome is a noble place of high heroic deeds and honor, as well as a sordid center of selfish scheming and political infighting” (Miola, *Shakespeare's Rome* 164). In the Roman society of this play, the plebeians have such controlling power in society that things cannot be interpreted in a single way. Martius is regarded as either a hero or an enemy, depending upon where the populace's material gains are located. Therefore, as R. F. Hill points out, when there is no war against enemies, Roman citizens tend to fight against other Romans: “in war they are frightened, in peace they are proud” (19). They need Martius's military prowess only when Rome is exposed to the

danger of being assaulted by people outside it. In peace they do not need him, and even hate him as an enemy to their material gain.

In the meanwhile, Martius's problem is, however modestly he pretends to be, his behaviour becomes arrogant and self-righteous. Due to his great victory in the battle against Volsces, Martius is offered a tenth of the booty from Corioles by other patricians. He tells them not to give him special preferment, referring to their proposal as "a bribe." He only accepts his new name, Coriolanus, declaring, "I have done/ As you have done, that's what I can" (1.9.15-16). Believing that the name is the one that he has earned by himself, he thinks that it can form his new sense of self. He appears to think that "his sense of self arising from the honorific name" (Sanders 397) enables him to be independent from others.

His rigid attitudes stem from his endeavour to be independent from others. He thinks that his sense of self is supported by his self-reliance: "for his entire sense of himself depends on his being able to see himself as a self-sufficient creature" (Adelman, "Anger's My Meat" 111). He does not understand at this stage that his name, which he regards as his new sense of self, is, after all, given to him by Cominius, another man. He has to realize later that his new sense of self also includes his dependence upon others. As a consequent, all he asks the patricians is to give his former host, now, a Roman

prisoner, freedom even if he cannot recall this man's name. He does not want to feel indebted to any other person.

Martius thinks that the Roman society is so corrupted that it is "not worth serving" (Rabkin 205). Yet Rome itself seems to be important for him while the plebeians are equivalent to enemies for him and Rome. Nevertheless, he himself is represented in the play as having great flaws in his personality; he is impudent, insolent, and far from tactical, depending only upon his excellent military acuity. Thus, Martius is eager to be independent from others, and, therefore, when he is recommended to be a consul, he refuses to beg the plebeians in the market place, dressed in humble clothes, to get their approval. For him, such a conduct is so intolerable a shame that "The divergence of outlook between himself and his fellow patricians now increases perceptibly" (Colman 7). His refusal of appealing to the populace indicates that he situates himself in a position remote from other patricians. Although former consuls did this in the public space, he is greatly opposed to doing so, complaining, "Must I/ With my base tongue give to my noble heart/ A lie that it must bear?" (3.2.100-02). From his words, it becomes clear that Martius considers himself as too noble a man to follow former consuls in such acts.

There are contradictions in his remarks about his self-recognition. Though he refers to his martial merits as not special, he regards himself as too "noble" to follow the Roman

custom:

If his modesty were genuine and unforced, there would be no hardship for him in being required to don the customary “gowne of Humility” as a candidate for the Consulship, but his surly reluctance to do so is a measure of his sense of having *deserved* that office. . . . (Browning 25)

Consequently, his remark, “I have done/ As you have done, that’s what I can” (1.9.15-16), becomes unreliable. In

“Coriolanus: The failure of Words,” Carol Sicherman states that “Coriolanus, however, never learns to speak his feelings with precision, in part because he is often unsure just what he means” (189). Schierman attributes his contradictory remarks partly to his inability to articulate “what he means,” however, the main reason seems to be his fake modesty. He regards himself as a Roman warrior of extraordinary military acuity. His desire to be an honourable soldier is motivated by his sense that male honour enables a man to be independent from other Romans. Martius misconstrues the nature of honour: “To be sure, Roman honor—as we saw in *Coriolanus*—is primarily a public virtue and such is determined by external evaluation” (Simmons 122). He does not realize that in the Roman value system male companionship between patricians and plebeians is indispensable, believing that he can be successful only if he achieves outstanding martial merits.

Though he is persuaded by his mother to flatter the plebeians (3.2), they have concluded that he should die. Sicinius, a tribune of the people, denounces him as “a traitor to the people” (3.3.71). At this moment, despite the fact that he is virtually exiled from Rome, for which he has been fighting as one of “defenders” (3.3.136), Martius abuses the people:

. . . I banish you.

And here remain with your uncertainty!

.

For you the city, thus I turn my back. (3.3.131-42)

It is Martius himself that is banished from the society although he says that he expells the ungrateful Romans. He is well aware of the fact that he is banished from the society because of his inability to get along with others.

Giving up the name which his countrymen, now his new enemies, has given him, he abandons “his identity as a Roman and role in a community of speaking men” (Miola, *Shakespeare's Rome* 192). He goes to Corioles to meet Tullus Aufidius, the general of the Volscian army. At the gate of Aufidius's house, he declares:

My birthplace hate I, and my love's upon

This enemy town. I'll enter. If he slay me,

He does fair justice; if he give me way,

I'll do this country service. (4.4.23-26)

Now, Martius has become an enemy to Rome by establishing

male friendship with Aufidius, his old enemy. He has begun to search for his new identity in Corioles: “in his own mind he has become a nobody, deprived of his title Coriolanus” (Hunt 311). The given name, Coriolanus, does not last long. It disappears when he leaves the Roman body politic.

2. The Representations of Women and Male Friendship

The more heavily Martius puts emphases on his own military prowess as a Roman soldier, the more unstable his relationship with other men in Rome becomes. By contrast, his bondship with his mother, Volumnia, is exceedingly strong. The great influence of Volumnia upon him is frequently noted. Losing his father when he was a child, Martius has been always taught by his mother how to act as a warrior:

She dominates him. She it is who has made him the man he is (and kept him the “boy” he is)—to her the credit and the blame. (Rouda 104)

Her concept of ideal manhood is represented in her belief that a “bloody brow” (1.3.29) makes a man. She even says that if she had a dozen sons, she “had rather had eleven die nobly for their country than one voluptuously surfeit out of action” (1.3.19-20).

Nonetheless, when Martius has trouble with the populace, it is Volumnia who urges him to flatter them. Though persuaded by his mother to use “policy” to obtain power, he is surprised at her suggestion and asks:

Why did you wish me milder? Would you have me
 False to my nature? Rather say I play
 The man I am. (3.2.15-17)

He appears perplexed by his mother's advice. At this moment, he finally becomes aware that his love for male honour and Rome has been taught by her.

However, there is a great difference in their views of how he obtains honour. Although Volumnia has told him to behave in a straightforwardly manly way, she urges him to use tactics when he is in trouble with the plebeians in becoming a consul. In contrast, he refuses to make conciliation with others, especially the plebeians, even in an emergency. It is because he thinks that he should "play/ The man" (3.2.16-17) and that all he depends upon is his excellent military acuity: "Rome's men do great deeds on behalf of Rome, and Rome rewards them with honour (praise) and honours (titles, triumphs, consulships)" (Geoffrey Miles 155). Nevertheless, in the Roman society presented in the play, not only great deeds but also conciliations with the plebeians are required for the warriors in order to obtain honour. As might be expected, he cannot thrive in Roman society because he hates to act in accordance with the plebeians even when necessary.

In the meanwhile, Virgilia, Martius's wife, plays an important role in the play. She is so calm a woman as to be referred to as possessing "gracious silence" (2.1.148) by her

husband, but she sometimes displays her internal strength. For example, being persistently commanded by her mother-in-law to go visiting “the good lady that lies in” (1.3.70) with Valeria, a friend to Caius’s family, Virgilia firmly insists that she “will not out of doors” (1.3. 64). She does not want to go “over the threshold” (1.3.67) till her husband’s return from the wars, and in the end Volumnia gives in. She is presented as a character of rare quality in Roman society:

Virgilia’s quiet articulation of an intensely personal ethos represents the only possible alternative here to the predominant aristocratic code of public commitment, but Virgilia herself retreats to a negative posture of stolid resistance, and her point of view prevails only in the privacy of her silent thoughts. (Paster 129)

After her husband’s exile, she fearlessly curses Sincius to his face, one of the tribunes who have driven Martius out of Rome: “He’d make an end of thy posterity” (4.2.28). Since she takes her own way without being influenced by others, she can be more manly and independent than she appears to be.

Volumnia and Martius are sharply contrasted with Virgilia; being much occupied with the matter of “honour,” her husband and her mother-in-law behave overbearingly and aggressively:

Shakespeare begins by presenting two women who

are utterly polarized—the gentle, “feminine” Virgilia and the powerful “masculine” Volumnia. Yet the distinction soon blurs. Virgilia can also be strong and stubborn; Volumnia summons up powerful maternal feelings as support for their antithesis. . . .

(Luckyj 330)

Volumnia is not portrayed as a woman constructed of masculinity. Despite their confident attitudes, Martius and Volumnia often reveal their inconstant qualities. Though being an excellent Roman soldier, Martius cannot defy his mother’s petition not to attack Rome despite his awareness that it leads to his final ruin. Volumnia, who is referred to as “mad” by the Romans because of her strong self-assertiveness, changes her concept of male honour and orders her son to flatter the populace. Thus, unlike Virgilia, they are affected by others after all.

Volumnia regards Martius as more than a son. This becomes clear through the use of the symbol of a married pair of gods, Jupiter (Jove) and Juno. Jupiter, Jove in Greek, who is the ruler of the divine world, is frequently referred to in this play. Nonetheless, Volumnia speaks only of Juno, Jupiter’s wife and the goddess of marriage:

Volumnia: . . . the love of Juno, let’s go. (2.1.82)

Volumnia: Leave this faint puling and lament as I do,

In anger, Juno-like. (4.2.54-55)

It is clear that she connects herself with the image of Juno.

Although she behaves like a patriarch of the family, she is well aware of her gender. Being a woman, she herself cannot take part in the Roman male world, she entrusts to her son her hope for the promotion of her family.

Thus, while identifying herself with her son, she commits herself to the Roman male world not directly, but through her son. In this sense, Volumnia is regarded as a “fellow-traveller” though the term is usually used for men. Kept away from the male world, she tries to promote her family in the Roman society through her son’s military achievements. She wants to bring Roman male honour to her family, knowing, unlike Portia in *Julius Caesar*, that she herself cannot take part in the power struggle.

Martius is not a “fellow-traveller,” either. His male sense of self is totally based on the concept of honour imposed by his mother, which is one of the honours acquired through martial feats. In fact, he is pursuing male honour, thinking that he can obtain it with his incomparable military prowess. However, Romans dislike him because their concept of Roman honour is different from that of Martius and his mother. He adapts himself to his mother’s idealized image of strong manhood. He thinks that honour brought about by his incomparable military exploits will resolve all difficulties which might arise in his life

with other Romans.

After being persuaded by his family not to attack, Martius makes up his mind to make Corioles and Rome reconciled. It appears as if Martius accepted Volumnia's plea although he gets deeply disappointed by her when she tells him again to flatter the plebeians. Leggatt points out their distance here, referring to the stage direction, "*holds her by the hand, silent*"

(5.3.183.SD) :

It is worth noticing that he takes her by the hand, but does not embrace her. He is both making contact and keeping her at arm's length.

(Political Drama 212)

The close relationship which existed before seems to disappear although they can hardly be independent from each other.

Markku Peltonen discusses that Martius has been led to his fatal decision "by the powers of eloquence" ("Political Rhetoric" 243-44). In Peltonen's view, what makes Martius change his mind is the power of his mother's words. However, he seems to have been ruled by his mother, obeying her will throughout his life: he "begins and ends his tragic career as a 'boy,' lacking a developed and authentic manly self" (Kahn, *Man's* 192). In fact, he rescues Rome, but dies bloodily for it—he dies a manly death, which is exactly what his mother wanted for him to do in Act 1 Scene 3.

3. Martius's Concept of Manhood and Male Friendship

What brings his ruin to Martius is his misunderstanding of the situation he is in. He only accepts the name Coriolanus as a reward for his conquest of Corioles, assuming that this can establish his sense of self. As a matter of course, the name gives a certain influence upon his social condition. As Jarrett Walker refers to the name as “the hero’s most characteristic move, the reification of a single violent act (in this case, the conquest of Corioles) into a stable, eternal condition” (171), Martius expects that the given name, Coriolanus, is so influential as to help him to be freed from all the restraints imposed by his mother as well as by the Roman society, for the new name is not anything inherited but rather won by his own ability and achievements. Yet the name turns out to be of less power than he has thought. He can no longer be Coriolanus when he is banished from Rome since the name is bestowed by Roman society. Thus, his expectation of the power of his name Coriolanus fails to fulfill his desire to be freed from the pressures given by his mother and Rome. Martius comes to realize the indispensability of the companionship with other males throughout his struggles against it.

Nevertheless, despite his rejection of male companionship, Martius has strong relationships with three men, Cominius, Menenius and Aufidius. Cominius is a Roman consul and commander-in-chief of the army. He admires Martius as a

“Flower of warriors” (1.6.33) while Martius respects him. When they meet again in the battlefield against Volsces, Martius treats Cominius as if he were his bride:

O! Let me clip ye
 In arms as sound as when I wooed, in heart
 As merry as when our nuptial day was done
 And tapers burned to bedward. (1.6.29-32)

This is the first time that Martius displays his strong attachment to a man in the play. Though he also maintains a good relationship with Menenius, he does not indicate such an intimate feeling for him as he does to Cominius. Martius, who loathes flattering others, entreats Cominius to allow him formally to attack the Volsces, saying that he has built up male friendship with him:

I do beseech you,
 By all the battles wherein we have fought,
 By th'blood we have shed together, by th'vows we
have made
 To endure friends, that you directly set me
 Against Aufidius and his Antiates, (1.6.55-59)

In entreating Cominius, Martius refers to the battles where they fought together and the blood they shed as well as the vows of their friendship. Thus, their friendship is closely related to the wars in which they fought together; Martius regards Cominius as his friend since he thinks that he is a respectful

warrior.

In the case of Menenius Agrippa, he highly values Martius and takes his side when other Romans abuse him:

. . . Yet you must be saying Martius is proud, who, in a cheap estimation, is worth all our predecessors since Deucalion, though peradventure some of the best of 'em were hereditary hangmen. (2.1.72-75)

He considers Martius as a high-minded Roman, but is aware that he does not fit into the Roman society. In his response to a patrician's words that Martius "has marred his fortune" (3.1.256), he states:

His nature is too noble for the world.
 He would not flatter Neptune for his trident
 Or Jove for's power to thunder. His heart's his
mouth.

What his breast forges, that his tongue must vent,
 And, being angry, does forget that ever
 He heard the name of death. (3.1.257-62)

As Menenius states, it is not Martius but the system of Roman society that makes him a misfit. Thus, both Cominius and Menenius highly adores Martius's "noble service" (2.2.34) in the battle against Volscies, trying to protect Martius throughout the play. Towards Menenius, he shows less respect and affection than he has done towards Cominius. Since Menenius is too old to fight as a soldier, Martius shows no respect towards him.

Martius, like Menenius, is conscious of his old age:

Coriolanus: Thou hast years upon thee, and thou art
too full
 Of the wars' surfeits to go rove with one
 That's yet unbruised. Bring me but out at
gate.

.....

Menenius: . . . If I could shake off but one seven
years
 From these old arms and legs, by the good
gods,
 I'd with thee every foot. (4.1.45-57)

As presented in this passage, what makes Martius respect other men is their excellent military ability.

On the other hand, Tullus Aufidius, a general of the Volscian army, gets much more deeply involved with Martius. After being banished from Rome, Martius goes to Antium to join Aufidius's army in order to take revenge upon Rome. For him, it is no longer his home country. At this moment, he does not want to save his own life, but desires to revenge himself upon the "banishers" (4.5.80). Therefore, he offers to Aufidius the chance to destroy Rome together, stressing his own excellent military skill:

. . . And make my misery serve thy turn. So use it
 That my revengeful services may prove

A benefits to thee, for I will fight
 Against my cankered country with the spleen
 Of all the under-fiends. (4.5.85-89)

The reason why Martius chooses Aufidius as his co-fighter is the latter's military ability. Having listened to his speech, Aufidius, who accepts him as an extraordinary warrior, referring to him as "all-noble Martius" (4.5.103). Although having fought against each other, they entertain companionship, admiring each other's martial qualities.

Furthermore, Aufidius says that his joy in accepting Martius exceeds the one in his taking of a wife:

. . . I loved the maid I married; never man
 Sighed truer breath. But that I see thee here,
 Thou noble thing, more dances my rapt heart
 Than when I first my wedded mistress saw
 Bestride my threshold. (4.5.111-15)

Martius also adopts the imagery of a bride when describing his friendship with Cominius. In the world where male companionship is highly valued, the close relationship between men can be compared to one between husband and wife.

Even so, their friendship is represented as just a temporary relationship. With the assistance of Martius, the Volsces succeed in invading Rome for the first time. Nonetheless, Aufidius becomes disgusted by Martius's arrogance. He speaks to his Lieutenant about him:

. . . He bears himself more proudlier,
 Even to my person, than I thought he would
 When first I did embrace him. . . . (4.7.8-10)

Thus, their friendship does not last long since it is constructed through their hatred against Rome. Therefore, when Rome is destroyed, there is no need for them to maintain their friendship.

On the other hand, possessing strong bondship with his mother, Martius cannot be freed from the patriarchal pressures that his mother imposes upon him. In this sense, he is constrained by the social norms of manhood although he struggles to be independent. He shows “so little growth and change in character” at the end of the play (Rabkin 211). In fact, before Martius dies, he reverts to his former self as a protector of Rome, even if he has changed his ways of life by hating and destroying Rome. He continues to be a warrior throughout the play as he has been instructed by his mother.

4. The Plebeians’ Influence upon Male Friendship

Martius expresses his affection for the populace, saying, “I had rather be their servant in my way/ Than sway with them in theirs” (2.1.177-78). Although he insolently and decisively refuses the populace’s request, he says that he wants to serve them. Menenius says to the plebeians: “He loves your people,/ But tie him not to be their bedfellow” (2.2.58-59). Menenius

attests Martius's love for the people to the tribunes, who keep abusing him. He insists that it is no use controlling him as they like, emphasizing his love for the plebeians. However, he is also aware that Martius cannot subjugate himself to the plebeians; despite his use of the term, "serve," Martius does not intend to obey them. To him, to serve means to fight for. The reason why he behaves overbearingly to the populace is explained in his remark:

Whoever gave that counsel to give forth
 The corn o'th'storehouse graits, as 'twas used
 Sometime in Greece—. . . .
 Though there the people had more absolute power—
 I say they nourished disobedience, fed
 The ruin of the state. (3.1.114-19)

He is afraid that, if the plebeians become too powerful, following the example of ancient Greece, Rome will be ruined. He thinks that fighting for Rome and controlling the plebeians is the duty of Roman warriors.

The plebeians, on the other hand, regard themselves as the leading force in the Roman society in the play. They even refer to themselves as the embodiment of Rome:

All Plebeians: True. The people are the city.
 Brutus: By the consent of all we were established
 The people's magistrates. (3.1.201-03)

The phrase "The people" suggests the original audience while

“the city” points to London. By using these terms, the projected figure of the citizens around 1608 becomes more evident.

Implying their independence and even superiority to the patricians, Shakespeare tried to present the menacing power of the people over the authorities.

James Holstun thinks the tribunes’ revulsion against Martius derives from their “fear” of his potential monarchy:

The tribunes’ opposition to Coriolanus is not the product of some plebeian *ressentiment* for the most noble of the nobles, but their genuine fear that he will institute a revolutionary monarchy that will destroy the new republican balance. (493)

Yet the power of populace seems to have surpassed that of the patricians. The plebeians in *Coriolanus* think that it is they themselves that can control Roman political conditions. In fact, they decide how to deal with Martius; he cannot become a consul because he cannot flatter them. Sicinius says to Martius: “in the name o’th’people/ And in the power of us the tribunes, we, / Ev’n from this instant, banish him our city” (3.3.106-08). Sicinius, a representative of the populace, sentences Martius to banishment in the name of the people. In comparison to this play, in Shakespeare’s other Roman plays including *Julius Caesar* (1599), even though the plebeians hold influence, they cannot directly decide the social status of a patrician. The Roman society presented in *Coriolanus* is one in which the

plebeians hold the greatest power. This leads to the condition that the patricians are required to cooperate not only with other patricians but also with the plebeians.

There often appear images of gods related to Martius in the play. He can generally be looked on as a man who is different from other men in society. His unusual great power leads to these divine images. Brutus, one of the tribunes, says about Martius: "Such a pother/ As if that whatsoever god who leads him/ Were slyly crept into his human powers" (2.1.192-94). He himself makes efforts to "imitate the graces of the gods" (5.3.150) in order to "rise above humanity and to cut himself off from human ties and human weakness" (Geoffrey Miles 163). The course of Martius's action corresponds to the divine right of kings which King James I advocated. Ironically, Martius is mistaken in doing so because true manhood belongs not to the territory of the gods, but to that of men. His superhuman capability does not suggest his superiority to other men:

True manhood is a comprehensive ideal, growing out of the familiar Christian concept that man is between the beasts and the angels in the hierarchy of creation. To be worthy of this station a man must show more than the physical valor which characterizes the soldier and traditionally distinguishes the male of the species.

(Waith, "Manhood and Valor" 263)

The images of a god applied to him merely emphasize the fact that he is isolated from the human society for which he fights as a “god.”

It is worth comparing *Coriolanus* with *Timon of Athens* (1607), since both plays have a protagonist who destroys himself owing to his misunderstanding of the concept of male friendship and male companionship. Even if Martius and Timon lead the same course of life, leaving their country and hating their countrymen, they are quite different from each other. Martius never ceases to live in society even though he is a misfit; he cannot live by himself since he keeps his sense of self by fighting with other men as a warrior.

Meanwhile, as Coppélia Kahn discusses, the reason why Timon gives all he has to other men is obviously his strong desire to be connected to them (“Magic” 39). He becomes a great misanthrope because of betrayals of his “friends,” who have used to praise him for his extraordinary generosity. While trying to acquire the “bond of men” (1.1.148) through the power of his money, he fails to acquire his sense of self, which is based on his friendship with the males in Athens. Thus, Timon constructs his sense of self on the basis of his money, which, he thinks, can buy male friendship and companionship. Having lost all his money, he has no choice but to live in the woods. Thus, unlike Martius, who can construct his new identity in another community, Timon cannot do so since he no longer

possesses the means of building up male companionship, that is money.

While Timon strongly believes in and desires a “bond in men,” Martius does not, or rather, cannot have it. In short, Martius is anxious for his independence from others while Timon overestimates his “friendship” that he has bought by means of the power of money. While they are quite different from each other in several aspects, they share something in common; both fail to understand male friendship. Martius does not completely abandon his principle of valour as “the chiefest virtue” (2.2.78) independent from others, a principle implanted by his mother, even at his death, though he comes to recognize the realities of the world.

As Leggatt argues, Martius saves Rome from Volscies, despite his awareness that it will lead to his death:

All he can do is provoke his own death, leaving us to wonder if the provocation is fully conscious or not.

He attacks Corioles; he attacks Rome; and finally he tears himself apart. (*Political Drama* 214)

Even after his banishment from Rome, Martius says that “There is a world elsewhere” (3.3.143), that is, a world where he can continue to live as a warrior. In other words, he does not change his way of living as a warrior throughout the play. On the other hand, while betrayed by men in Athens, Timon gives up his public life, going into the forest. Unlike Timon, whose sense of

self is constructed by male friendship bought by money, Martius's sense of self depends on his being a warrior. In this sense, Martius is similar to Titus in *Titus Andronicus*, who continues to live a life of Roman warrior throughout the play.

It is interesting to examine some images that are applied to Martius and Timon. Timon is referred to as both a gull and a phoenix by his creditors:

. . . Lord Timon will be left a naked gull,
Which flashes now a phoenix. (2.1.31-32)

These lines suggest that Timon becomes wretched like "a naked gull" despite his burning brightly like "a phoenix." Meantime, one of the most impressive images associated with Martius is that of a dragon:

Menenius: This Martius is grown from man to
dragon. He has wings; he's more than a
creeping thing. (5.4.10-11)

By referring to Martius as a dragon, Menenius describes his fierce nature and the great distance between him and other men. The image of a dragon represents the situation in which Martius stands, so the image of phoenix has done for Timon. Both men are ruined by their own acts that do not accord with the norms of the society in which they live.

Thus, *Coriolanus*, Shakespeare's last Roman play, is unique in that, while honour is highly valued in all of his Roman plays, practical values of living rather than the concept

of honour are ardently pursued. The Roman society is set in an oligarchy, being “based on property valuation, with sovereignty accruing to society’s richest members” (Parker, *Plato’s Republic* 54). Shakespeare presents the plebeians as having so great a power that they can affect the political matters in society. They hold enough power to ruin a patrician like Martius. In the meanwhile, the plebeians in *Julius Caesar* are powerful enough to make use of their strength to affect the political situation; Mark Antony can reverse their decisions through his rhetoric so that they stand with him against Brutus. However, in Rome of *Julius Caesar*, they cannot directly make decisions about the affairs of patricians.

Despite his awareness that to be in good terms with the populace would make his position stable, Martius chooses not to stay on good terms with them. He tells them:

He that will give good words to thee will flatter
Beneath abhorring. (1.1.150-51)

On the other hand, Sicinius, a tribune, thinks that the same can be said for Martius. Sicinius says to them:

He will require them
As if he did contemn what he requested
Should be in them to give. (2.2.151-53)

The plebeians think that patricians should accept what they request, regarding themselves as the leading people of their country. Nonetheless, some citizens talk to each other that they

should requite his feats for Rome:

Ingratitude is monstrous, and for the multitude to be
ingrateful were to make a monster of the multitude,
of which we, being members, should bring ourselves
to be monstrous members. (2.3.8-11)

Therefore, they accept Martius's request to recommend him as consul in the market place. Although he speaks to them rather insolently and one of them even feels that "this is something odd" (2.3.74), there is nobody who refuses his demand. And yet, the state of affairs is overturned once Sicinius and Brutus incite the people to revert their decision.

Martius calls the plebeians represented as "the many-headed multitude" (2.3.14), who often change their opinions. This image of Hydra, often appearing in Shakespeare's plays such as *King Henry IV part II* (1597), *King Henry V* (1599) and *Othello* (1604), can also be applied to the patricians themselves since they are required to act flexibly in order to succeed in a society controlled by the populace. For example, Menenius, with whom Martius has entered into male companionship, can act in cooperation with the plebeians while expressing his own critical thoughts. When he meets the tribunes after Martius's banishment, they talk about the latter:

Sicinius: Your Coriolanus is not much missed

But with his friends. The commonwealth

doth stand,

And so would do were he more angry at it.

Menenius: All's well, and might have been much

better if

He could have temporised. (4.6.14-18)

At this moment, Menenius, who has reproached Sicinius's act of banishing Martius face to face, speaks to him in a polite manner. Sicinius says, "he is grown most kind of late" (4.6.11); after Martius's banishment, Menenius conducts himself in a more flexible manner than before. He seems to know that he should behave obediently towards the plebeians after having experienced conflicts with them. Hence, he, unlike Martius, is not considered ill-natured by the plebeians. In *Coriolanus*, Roman warriors do not depend only upon their own military acuity. Martius's ruin originates from his total indifference to the importance of male companionship between patricians and plebeians since it plays the most important part in the male military world.

The negligence of the social hierarchy portrayed in the play is the representation of that in early modern England. The social function had been undergoing a change:

The transfer during the 1540s and the early 1550s of perhaps a quarter of the land of England from institutional to private hands, and the throwing of it upon the private real-estate market, profoundly affected the whole evolution of English landed

society until the end of the nineteenth century and later. (Stone, *Open Elite* 25)

Enclosure caused fundamental changes in the system of values. On the other hand, pointing out “growing movement towards individualism” at that time in *The Crisis of Aristocracy 1558-1641*, Lawrence Stone draws attention to the concept of hierarchy:

Whether in heaven or hell, in the universe or on earth, in the state or in the family, it was a self-evident truth that peace and order could only be preserved by the maintenance of grades and distinctions and by relentless emphasis on the overriding need for subjection of the individual will to that of superior authority. (15)

The supreme virtue continues to be subjection to superiors. Nonetheless, there emerged “signs of belief in equality of opportunity among the urban bourgeoisie” and “the rumblings of radical social egalitarianism.” New ideas and values were leading to social mobility.

Consequently, male friendship, constructed between patricians, is outdone by male companionship, between patricians and plebeians, in *Coriolanus*. The patricians have to get along with the populace in order to secure their social position. On the other hand, what Martius depends upon is neither male friendship nor male companionship, but his own

military prowess. The cause of Martius's ruin originates in his misunderstanding of the transition of social hierarchy, but he seems not to be able to adapt himself to the old one, either.

Hoping to be independent from others, he tries to shut himself out from the social hierarchy in the play. The essence of his tragedy lies in his desire to be alone, which is fatal to men in any hierarchical society.

Conclusion

This dissertation has explored how male friendship is represented in Shakespeare's Roman plays in view of the political situations in Renaissance England. Since ancient Rome was regarded by the English people at that time as the origin of their nation, William Shakespeare made use of ancient Rome to consider the social problems in England in his time rather than to portray real ancient Rome. We have to regard that he was considering under the strict censorship forbidding people to deal with political issues in contemporary England. What is most remarkable about these four plays is that social issues in Shakespeare's England are in subtle ways reflected in them. The issue of male friendship is assumed to be of great significance in all Shakespeare's Roman plays, closely related to politics in England in the period.

As this dissertation has shown, male friendship is considered most important in the societies dramatized in all four of the Roman plays. However, the social systems dramatized in the Roman societies do not function effectively. Hence, it is difficult for any kind of male friendship to be formed in these societies. This situation represented in the Roman plays reflects various social problems people in Shakespeare's England were faced with. To study his Roman

plays with a focus on male friendship casts a new light in understanding the nature of the male world in early modern England.

As has been argued in this dissertation, honour is given great significance in Shakespeare's Roman plays. The high estimation of honour in the plays is reflective of the social climate in early modern England:

A man's honour, in this period, was the essence of his reputation in the eyes of his social equals: it gave him his sense of worth and his claim to pride in his community and it contributed to his sense of identity with than community. (Fletcher 93)

A man's identity consisted in his honour, through which his equal appreciated his fame. Consequently, honour in this dissertation can be regarded as being strongly connected to the issue of male friendship as it fundamentally affects a man's esteem by his peers.

While honour was deemed as the product of virtue, it could protect virtue in that it "could both legitimize and provide moral reinforcement for a politics of violence" (James 309). Honour and violence were closely associated with each other before Shakespeare's time:

. . . during the first half of the sixteenth century the medieval forms of single combat were refashioned in Italy into a duel of honour which

replaced the vendetta. This development has been seen as a civilizing process, because it decreased the level of violence: a gentleman's honour became private, individual, and he was no longer obliged to continue the old cycles of revenge.

(Peltonen, *The Duel* 4)

With the alteration of the forms of single combat, the transformation of the medieval concept of honour into a modern one had occurred. Through this change, honour persisted in giving men the justification for combats as well as a means of winning people's approbation and even respect. As to the new concept of honour, it is worthy of mention that it had become the private affair.

On the other hand, in Shakespeare's works, a man's honour is well connected to his personal excellence:

. . . in the neo-chivalric cult, honor is not concerned with public service. . . . it is concerned with maintaining the reputation for the personal courage and the spirit sensitive to anything remotely resembling a slight deemed to be proper for a man of birth. (Siegel 42)

Using the term "neo-chivalric cult of honour," which he defines as originating in "the chivalric notion of military glory" (41), Siegel notes that honour derives not from one's public service but from one's personal courage and noble sensitive spirit. The

society in Shakespeare's plays as well as in real England has come to be governed with individualism.

Following the transformation of the political situation in real England, the representations of male friendship, supposed to be constructed between men of rather higher social rank, vary in Shakespeare's Roman plays. The liability of male friendship to alteration is explained: "civil behavior was a flexible code by which the civil man could define and redefine his relationships within civil society" (Bryson 96). What is also to be noted is that the populace is also described as being subject to the influence of the social change.

In *Titus Andronicus* (1594) and *Julius Caesar* (1599), which were explored in Chapter I and Chapter II, Shakespeare deals with the relationships among the patricians. In *Titus Andronicus*, Shakespeare highlights the association between those of high social rank, presenting the social situation where male friendship is converted into "negotiation." Shakespeare set this play in the end of the Roman Empire, presenting the issues of the system of hereditary monarch and those of the threatening foreign power. People in England at that time were most concerned about the problems of the successor of Elizabeth I and the threats from Spain.

In such a social context, the foreigners and Lavinia, being referred to as "others" in this dissertation, are presented as holding influence. Though they are supposed to be excluded

from the Roman male world, their power and intelligence suggest the movement towards new sense of values, however, they, except Aaron, belong to the higher-class.

In the meanwhile, the patricians still hold controlling power over the populace in *Julius Caesar*. England at that time was in great trouble with its military campaign against Ireland and the Spanish threat was increasing while the most serious problem in England was still about the successor of the queen. Meanwhile, plagues, massive price inflation, heavy taxation, depression both in overseas trade and in the volume of domestic demand, large-scale unemployment, and escalating crime and vagrancy occurred in the 1590s. The disordered situation in real England is echoed in the play; the social norms are no longer observed in the Roman society.

In the play world, where the ideal concept of manhood is not embodied except by Julius Caesar, male friendship is not constructed. While the uncontrollable power of violence of the plebeians is portrayed in *Julius Caesar*, the populace do not openly defy the patricians; exerting influence, they cannot directly decide the social status of a patrician. Describing their increasing prominence, Shakespeare does not look on the plebeians as the leading force of the society in the play.

Thus, in both plays, though male friendship is hard to be built, its ideology still exists in the Roman society. Loyalty to one's superior is still tenable. Consequently, controlling power

of patricians over patricians is recognized. Though the Roman society is in decline, the social hierarchy is fundamentally observed.

On the other hand, as has been discussed in Chapter III, male friendship in *Antony and Cleopatra* (1607) bears a new aspect. Owing to the accession of King James I, who advocated the divine right of kings, in 1603, republican thought came to be suppressed in England. A chain of policies carried out by him provoked people's antipathy against him, and the Elizabethan revival came into being.

Reflecting the social situation in England at that time, Shakespeare presented the destruction of the Roman Republic, illustrating the decline of social hierarchy. While the "triple pillars" compete with each other, the followers' loyalty to and dependence upon their masters is detracted. Considering their material gain as predominant over their loyalty to their master, they desert the masters who are no longer powerful. Being supposed to be essential for men to construct their identity in the male world of power, male friendship is transformed into male rivalry.

Shakespeare further explores the negligence of the social hierarchy in *Coriolanus* (1608). The important political issue to which the original audience in Shakespeare's England directed their attention was the popular revolt; the Midland Revolt, a series of riots in Northamptonshire in 1607, was caused by

agrarian protests against the enclosure of formerly open-field farming while the Oxfordshire rebellion of 1596 and the London riots of 1595 were rooted in the basic social conflict as well as the in the immediate economic difficulties.

As has been shown in Chapter IV, the plebeians' sense of duty to patricians has evidently decreased. It is not male friendship between patricians but male companionship between patricians and plebeians that directly decide the social status of a patrician and affects the political situation in Rome. Since those who hold leading power in the society are the populace, the patricians accommodate them. The Roman society presented in the play is the one where practical values have more significance than the concept of honour.

In *Antony and Cleopatra* and *Coriolanus*, unlike in *Titus Andronicus* and *Julius Caesar*, the ideology of loyalty no longer works. The difference in the presentation of the plebeians of the later plays from the earlier ones stems from the change in political situation in early modern England.

The representations of "fellow-travellers" are also affected by the political situation in each play. The dissertation has argued that, in *Titus Andronicus*, it is Aaron, a Moor, who is considered a "fellow-traveller." Although he is despised by both the Romans and the Goths, he seeks for power in the Roman society through Tamora, his mistress, and the black baby he has with Tamora. On the other hand, Cassius, a Roman, is

categorized as a “fellow-traveller” in *Julius Caesar*. He thinks that, in the play world where masculinity is most highly valued, he tries to improve his position not through his own power of “mettle,” which he himself does not possess, but through his manipulation of other men of great military prowess.

On the other hand, in Shakespeare’s later Roman plays, *Antony and Cleopatra* and *Coriolanus*, there is no one who can be regarded as a “fellow-traveller” in a true sense. In the case of *Antony and Cleopatra*, there appears no one who can be defined as a “fellow-traveller” while Volumnia, a woman, in *Coriolanus* is exceptionally referred to as one. She knows that, being a woman, she herself cannot pursue honour in the Roman society; she hopes for the promotion of her family through her son’s military exploits.

While there exist the characters who regard honour as of the utmost importance in Shakespeare’s earlier Roman plays, in his later ones, the concept of honour is changed to mere fulfillment of selfish pursuit of power. Being defined as a man who does not embody a male sense of honour himself, but only accompanies men who pursue the concept of honour, a “fellow-traveller” cannot come into existence without a man who tries to attain honour. Consequently, in the later plays where material profits take precedence over honour, a “fellow traveller” can hardly appear. Thus, the changing nature of a “fellow-traveller” reflects the political condition in each of

Shakespeare's Roman plays.

By studying Shakespeare's Roman plays chronologically, the social mobility in early modern England has been made clear. Shakespeare's Roman plays were written in the transitional epoch:

Given the traditional and conservative value system of the age, this great increase in mobility of all kinds in the hundred years from 1540 to 1640 created discontent rather than satisfaction, due primarily to the wide discrepancies which developed between the three sectors of wealth, status and power.

(Stone, *English Revolution* 111-12)

The social mobility continued after Shakespeare wrote his last Roman play, *Coriolanus*, in 1608. For example, the phrase in the play, "the many-headed multitude" (2.3.14), stands for the unreliability of the plebeians. And yet, the expression "many-headed" became equivalent to "headless": "The many-headed monster was composed of masterless men, those for whom nobody responsible answered" (Christopher Hill, *Change and Continuity*, 183). As has been pointed out in Chapter III, although not being described in Shakespeare's Roman plays, a multitude of masterless men emerged in real England. The movement of the negligence of social hierarchy, represented in the plays, was leading to the English Civil War.

Works Cited

I. Primary Sources

(1) Texts

- Shakespeare, William. *Antony and Cleopatra*. Ed. John Wilders. London: Routledge, 1995. Print. The Second Arden Shakespeare Series.
- . *Antony and Cleopatra*. Ed. Michael Neill. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1994. Print. The Oxford Shakespeare.
- . *Coriolanus*. Ed. Lee Bliss. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000. Print.
- . *Cymbeline*. Ed. J. M. Nosworthy. Walton-on-Thames: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1997. Print. The Second Arden Shakespeare Series.
- . *Julius Caesar*. Ed. David Daniell. Walton-on-Thames: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1998. Print. The Third Arden Shakespeare Series.
- . *Julius Caesar*. Ed. Jonathan Bate and Eric Rasmussen. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011. Print. RSC Shakespeare.
- . *Timon of Athens*. Ed. Karl Klein. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001. Print.
- . *Titus Andronicus*. Ed. Jonathan Bate. Walton-on-Thames: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1995. Print. The Third Arden Shakespeare Series.

(2) Others

Bullough, Geoffrey, ed. *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of*

Shakespeare. Vol. 5. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1964. Print.

---. ed. *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare*. Vol. 6.

London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1966. Print.

Calender of the Manuscripts of the Most Honourable the

Marquess of Salisbury Preserved at Hatfield House. Vol. 2.

Ed. Edward Salisbury. London: Historical Manuscripts Commission, 1883-1923. Print.

Cicero. "On Friendship." *On the Good Life*. Trans. Michael

Grant. London: Penguin, 1971. 172-227. Print.

Dasent, John Roche, ed. *Acts of the Privy Council of England*.

Vol. 26. London: Kraus Reprint, 1974. Print.

Harbage, Alfred. *Annals of English Drama 975-1700: An*

Analytical Record of All Plays, Extant or Lost,

Chronologically Arranged and Indexed by Authors, Titles,

and Dramatic Companies & C. 3rd ed. Rev. Sylvia Stoler

Wagonheim. London: Routledge, 1989. Print.

The date of the plays are generally based on *Annals of*

English Drama 975-1700.

II. Secondary Sources

Adelman, Janet. "‘Anger’s My Meat’: Feeding, Dependency, and

- Aggression in *Coriolanus*." *Shakespeare: Pattern of Excelling Nature*. Ed. David Bevington and Jay L. Halio. Newark: U of Delaware P, 1978. 108-24. Print.
- . *The Common Liar: An Essay on "Antony and Cleopatra."* New Haven: Yale UP, 1973. Print.
- . *Suffocating Mothers: Fantasies of Maternal Origin in Shakespeare's Plays, "Hamlet" to "The Tempest."* London: Routledge, 1992. Print.
- Alvis, John. *Shakespeare's Understanding of Honor*. Durham: Carolina Academic P and The Claremont Institute for the Study of Statesmanship and Political Philosophy, 1990. Print.
- Amussen, Susan Dwyer. *An Ordered Society: Gender and Class in Early Modern England*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1988. Print.
- Anderson, Linda. *A Place in the Story: Servants and Service in Shakespeare's Plays*. Newark: U of Delaware P, 2005. Print.
- Archer, Ian W. *The Pursuit of Stability: Social Relations in Elizabethan London*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1991. Print.
- Bate, Jonathan. *Shakespeare and Ovid*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1993. Print.
- Belsey, Catherine. "Love in Venice." *Shakespeare Survey* 44 (1992): 41-53. Print.

- Blits, Jan H. *The End of Ancient Republic: Essays on "Julius Caesar."* Durham: Carolina Academic P, 1982. Print.
- Bowling, Lawrence Edward. "Antony's Internal Disunity." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 4.2 (1964): 239-46. Print.
- Breitenberg, Mark. *Anxious Masculinity in Early Modern England.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996. Print.
- Brown, Elizabeth A. "'Companion Me with My Mistress': Cleopatra, Elizabeth I, and Their Waiting Women." *Maids and Mistress, Cousins and Queens: Women's Alliances in Early Modern England.* Ed. Susan Frye and Karen Robertson. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1999. 131-45. Print.
- Browning, I. R. "Coriolanus: Boy of Tears." *Essays in Criticism* 5 (1955): 18-31. Print.
- Bryson, Anna. *From Courtesy to Civility: Changing Codes of Conduct in Early Modern England.* Oxford: Clarendon, 1998. Print.
- Callaghan, Dympna. *Shakespeare without Women: Representing Gender and Race on the Renaissance Stage.* London: Routledge, 2000. Print.
- Charnes, Linda. *Notorious Identity: Materializing the Subject in Shakespeare.* Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1993. Print.
- Chernaik, Warren. *The Myth of Rome in Shakespeare and his Contemporaries.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2011. Print.
- Christensen, Ann C. "The Return of the Domestic in

Coriolanus." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*
37.2 (1997): 295-316. Print.

Clayton, Thomas. "Should Brutus Never Taste of Portia's Death
but Once?' Text and Performance in *Julius Caesar.*"
Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900 23.2 (1983):
237-55. Print.

Clegg, Cyndia Susan. *Press Censorship in Elizabethan England.*
Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997. Print.

Colman, E. A. M. "The End of Coriolanus." *ELH* 34.1 (1967):
1-20. Print.

Council, Norman. *When Honour's at the Stake: Ideas of Honour
in Shakespeare's Plays.* London: George Allen & Unwin,
1973. Print.

Dobson, Michael and Nichola J. Watson. *England's Elizabeth:
An Afterlife in Fame and Fantasy.* Oxford: Oxford UP,
2002. Print.

Doran, Susan. *Elizabeth I and Foreign Policy, 1558-1603.*
London: Routledge, 2000. Print.

Duncan-Jones, Katherine. *Ungentle Shakespeare: Scenes from
His Life.* London: Thomson Learning, 2001. Print.

Dusinberre, Juliet. *Shakespeare and the Nature of Women.* 2nd
ed. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 1996. Print.

Enterline, Lynn. *Shakespeare's Schoolroom: Rhetoric,
Discipline, Emotion.* Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P,
2012. Print.

- “Eros.” Def. 1. *The Oxford English Dictionary*. 2nd ed. 1989. Print.
- Evett, David. *Discourses of Service in Shakespeare’s England*. Gordonsville: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005. Print.
- Ferguson, Arthur B. *The Chivalric Tradition in Renaissance England*. Cranbury: Associated UP, 1986. Print.
- Fletcher, A. J. “Honour, Reputation and Local Officeholding in Elizabethan and Stuart England.” *Order and Disorder in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1985. 92-115. Print.
- “Friend.” Def. A.n.1.a. *The Oxford English Dictionary*. 2nd ed. 1989. Print.
- Goldberg, Jonathan. “Fatherly Authority: The Politics of Stuart Family Images.” *Rewriting the Renaissance: The Discourses of Sexual Difference in Early Modern Europe*. Ed. Margaret W. Ferguson, et al. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1986. 3-32. Print.
- Golinelli, Gilberta. “In Dialogue with the New: Theorizations on the New World in *Titus Andronicus*.” *Identity, Otherness and Empire in Shakespeare’s Rome*. Ed. Maria Del Sapiro Garbero. Surrey: Ashgate, 2009. 131-44. Print.
- Hadfield, Andrew. *Shakespeare and Renaissance Politics*. London: Thomson Learning, 2004. Print.
- . *Shakespeare and Republicanism*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2005. Print.

- Hamilton, Sharon. *Shakespeare's Daughters*. Jefferson, North Carolina: McFarland, 2003. Print.
- Hammer, Paul E. J. *Elizabeth's Wars: War, Government and Society in Tudor England, 1544-1604*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003. Print.
- Harris, Duncan S. "Again for Cydnus': The Dramaturgical Resolution of Antony and Cleopatra." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 17.2 (1977): 219-31. Print.
- Hartsock, Mildred E. "The Complexity of *Julius Caesar*." *PMLA*. 81.1 (1966): 56-62. Print.
- Heffner, Ray L., Jr. "The Messengers in Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra*." *ELH* 43.2 (1976): 154-62. Print.
- Hill, Christopher. *Change and Continuity in 17th-Century England*. Rev. ed. New Haven: Yale UP, 1991. Print.
- . *The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas during the English Revolution*. London: Temple Smith, 1972. Print.
- Hill, R. F. "Coriolanus: Violence Contrariety." *Essays and Studies* 17 (1964): 12-23. Print.
- Holstun, James. "Tragic Superfluity in *Coriolanus*." *ELH* 50.3 (1983): 485-507. Print.
- "Honourable." Def. A. *adj.*1.a *The Oxford English Dictionary*. 2nd ed. 1989. Print.
- Hopkins, Lisa. *The Cultural Uses of the Caesars on the English Renaissance Stage*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008. Print.
- Hull, Suzanne W. *Chaste, Silent & Obedient: English Books for*

Women 1475-1640. San Marino: Huntington Library, 1982.
Print.

Hunt, Maurice. "Violent'st' Complementarity: The Double
Warriors of *Coriolanus*." *Studies in English Literature,
1500-1900* 31.2 (1991): 309-25. Print.

James, Heather. *Shakespeare's Troy: Drama, Politics, and the
Translation of Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997.
Print.

James, Mervyn. *Society, Politics and Culture: Studies in Early
Modern Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1986. Print.

Jankowski, Theodora A. "As I am Egypt's Queen': Cleopatra,
Elizabeth I, and the Female Body Politic." *Assays: Critical
Approaches to Medieval and Renaissance Texts* 5 (1989):
91-110. Print.

Jordan, Constance. *Shakespeare's Monarchies: Ruler and
Subject in the Romances*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1997. Print.

Kahn, Coppélia. "Magic of Bounty: *Timon of Athens*, Jacobean
Patronage, and Maternal Power" *Shakespeare Quarterly*
38.1 (1987): 34-57. Print.

---. *Man's Estate: Masculine Identity in Shakespeare*. Berkeley:
California UP, 1981. Print.

---. *Roman Shakespeare: Warriors, Wounds, and Women*.
London: Routledge, 1997. Print.

Kalmey, Robert P. "Shakespeare's Octavius and Elizabethan
Roman History." *Studies in English Literature 1500-1900*

18.2 (1978): 275-87. Print.

King, Laura Severt. "Blessed when They were Riggish: Shakespeare's Cleopatra and Christianity's Penitent Prostitute." *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 22.3 (1992): 429-49. Print.

Kishi, Tetuo. "When Suicide Becomes an Act of Honour: *Julius Caesar* and *Hamlet* in Late Nineteenth-Century Japan." *Shakespeare Survey* 54 (2001): 108-14. Print.

Leggatt, Alexander. *Shakespeare's Political Drama: The History Plays and the Roman Plays*. London: Routledge, 1988. Print.

---. *Shakespeare's Tragedies: Violation and Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2005. Print.

Liebler, Naomi Conn. *Shakespeare's Festive Tragedy: The Ritual Foundations of Genre*. London: Routledge, 1995.

Lloyd, Michael. "Cleopatra as Isis." *Shakespeare Survey* 12. 1959: 88-94. Print.

Loomba, Ania. *Shakespeare, Race, and Colonialism*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2002. Print.

Loomis, Catherine. *The Death of Elizabeth I: Remembering and Reconstructing the Virgin Queen*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010. Print.

Luckyj, Christina. "Volumnia's Silence." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 31.2 (1991): 327-42. Print.

MacFaul, Tom. *Male Friendship in Shakespeare and His*

- Contemporaries*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007. Print.
- Manning, Roger B. *Village Revolts: Social Protests and Popular Disturbances in England 1509-1640*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1988. Print.
- Meron, Theodor. *Bloody Constraint: War and Chivalry in Shakespeare*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1998. Print.
- “Mettle.” Def. *n.* 3. *The Oxford English Dictionary*. 2nd ed. 1989. Print.
- Miles, Gary B. “How Romans are Shakespeare’s ‘Romans?’” *Shakespeare Quarterly* 40.3 (1989): 257-83. Print.
- Miles, Geoffrey. *Shakespeare and the Constant Romans*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1996. Print.
- Miola, Robert S. “Julius Caesar and the Tyrannicide Debate.” *Renaissance Quarterly* 38.2 (1985): 271-89. Print.
- . *Shakespeare’s Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1983. Print.
- Neill, Michael. *Putting History to the Question: Power, Politics, and Society in English Renaissance Drama*. New York: Columbia UP, 2000. Print.
- . *Issues of Death: Morality and Identity in English Renaissance Tragedy*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1997. Print.
- Noble, Louise. “‘And make two pasties of your shameful heads’: Medicinal Cannibalism and Healing the Body Politic in *Titus Andronicus*,” *English Literary History* 70.3 (2003): 677-708. Print.
- Nuttall, A. D. *Shakespeare the Thinker*. New Haven: Yale UP,

2007. Print.

Parker, Barbara L. *Plato's Republic and Shakespeare's Rome: A Political Study of the Roman Works*. Newark: U of

Delaware P, 2005. Print.

---. "A Thing Unfirm': Plato's *Republic* and Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*." *Shakespeare's Quarterly* 44.1 (1993):

30-43. Print.

---. "The Whore of Babylon and Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 35.2 (1995):

251-69. Print.

Parry, Graham. *The Golden Age Restor'd: The Culture of the Stuart Court, 1603-42*. Oxford: Manchester UP, 1981.

Print.

Paster, Gail Kern. "To Starve with Feeding." *Shakespeare Studies* 2 (1978): 123-44. Print.

Peltonen, Markku. *The Duel in Early Modern England: Civility, Politeness and Honour*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2003.

Print.

---. "Political Rhetoric and Citizenship in *Coriolanus*."

Shakespeare and Early Modern Political Thought. Oxford:

Oxford UP, 2009. 217-52. Print.

"Play." Def. v. I.1. *The Oxford English Dictionary*. 2nd ed. 1989.

Print.

Rabkin, Norman. "*Coriolanus*: The Tragedy of Politics."

Shakespeare Quarterly 17.3 (1967): 195-212. Print.

- Ray, Sid. "‘Rape, I fear, was root of thy annoy’: The Politics of Consent in *Titus Andronicus*," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 49.1 (1998): 22-39. Print.
- Rebhorn, Wayne A. "The Crisis of the Aristocracy in *Julius Caesar*." *Renaissance Quarterly* 43.1 (1990): 75-111. Print.
- Rouda, F. H. "*Coriolanus*—A Tragedy of Youth." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 12.2 (1961): 103-10. Print.
- Sanders, Eve Rachele. "The Body of the Actor in *Coriolanus*." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 57.4 (2006): 387-410. Print.
- Schalkwyk, David. *Shakespeare, Love and Service*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2008. Print.
- Scott, Charlotte. *Shakespeare and the Idea of the Book*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2007. Print.
- Shapiro, James. *A Year in the Life of William Shakespeare: 1599*. New York: Harper Collins, 2005. Print.
- Sicherman, Carol M. "*Coriolanus*: The Failure of Words." *ELH* 39.2 (1972): 189-207. Print.
- Siegel, Paul N. "Shakespeare and the Neo-chivalric Cult of Honor." *The Centennial Review of Arts and Science* 8 (1964): 39-70. Print.
- Simmons, J. L. *Shakespeare's Pagan World: The Roman Tragedies*. Stanford: The Harvester P, 1973. Print.
- Smith, Bruce R. *Homosexual Desire in Shakespeare's England: A Cultural Poetics*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1991. Print.
- Smith, Ian. "*Titus Andronicus*: A Time for Race and Revenge." *A*

Companion to Shakespeare's Works. Ed. Richard Dutton and Jane E. Howard. Vol. 1. Malden: Blackwell, 2003. 284-355. Print.

Smith, Warren D. "The Duplicate Revelation of Portia's Death." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 4.2 (1953): 153-61. Print.

Smuts, R. Malcolm. *Court Culture and the Origins of a Royalist Tradition in Early Stuart England*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1999. Print.

---. *Culture and Power in England 1585-1685*. New York: St. Martin's, 1999. Print.

Stone, Lawrence and Jeanne C. Fawtier Stone. *An Open Elite?: England 1540-1880*. Abr. ed. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1986. Print.

---. *Causes of the English Revolution 1529-1642*. London: Routledge, 1972. Print.

---. *The Crisis of Aristocracy 1558-1641*. Abr. ed. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1967. Print.

Taylor, A. B. "Animals in 'manly shape as too the outward showe' moralizing and metamorphosis in *Titus Andronicus*." *Shakespeare's Ovid*. Ed. A. B. Taylor. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000. 66-80. Print.

Tennenhouse, Leonard. "Violence done to women on the Renaissance stage." *The Violence of Representation: Literature and the History of Violence*. Ed. Nancy Armstrong and Leonard Tennenhouse. London: Routledge,

1989. 77-96. Print.

Vaughan, Virginia Mason. *Performing Blackness on English Stages, 1500-1800*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2005.

Print.

Vaught, Jennifer C. *Masculinity and Emotion in Early Modern English Literature*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008. Print.

Waith, Eugene M. "Manhood and Valor in Two Shakespearean Tragedies." *English Literary History* 17.4 (1950): 262-73.

Print.

---. "The Metamorphosis of Violence in *Titus Andronicus*."

Shakespeare Survey 10 (1962): 39-49. Print.

Walker, Jarrett. "Voiceless Bodies and Bodiless Voices: The Drama of Human Perception in *Coriolanus*." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 43.2 (1992): 170-85. Print.

Watson, Curtis Brown. *Shakespeare and the Renaissance Concept of Honor*. Princeton, Princeton UP, 1960. Print.

Wells, Robin Headlam. "*Julius Caesar*, Machiavelli, and the Uses of History." *Shakespeare Survey* 55 (2002): 209-18.

Print.

---. *Shakespeare on Masculinity*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000. Print.

Williams, Penry. *The Late Tudors: England 1547-1603*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1995. Print.

Willis, Deborah. "'The gnawing vulture': Revenge, Trauma Theory, and *Titus Andronicus*." *Shakespeare Quarterly*

53.1 (2002): 21-52. Print.

Wood, Michael. *In Search of Shakespeare*. London: BBC Books, 2003. Print.

Yachnin, Paul. "Shakespeare's Politics of Loyalty: Sovereignty and Subjectivity in *Antony and Cleopatra*." *Studies in English Literature 1500-1900*, 33.2 (1993): 343-63. Print.

Yates, Frances A. *Astraea: The Imperial Theme in the Sixteenth Century*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1975. Print.

Acknowledgements

My greatest debt is due to Dr Akiko Kusunoki, Professor Emeritus of Tokyo Woman's Christian University. If it had not been for her painstaking help and appropriate guidance, it would have been impossible for me to complete my doctoral dissertation. I would like to express my profound gratitude to my supervisor, Professor Eiichi Hara, for his support, astute advice and unfailing encouragement. I am also deeply grateful to Professor Emi Hamana of Tsukuba University, Professors Noriyuki Harada, Dorsey Kleitz of Tokyo Woman's Christian University, who examined my doctoral dissertation. I am also very thankful to faculty members in the Department of English and American Literature of Tokyo Woman's Christian University.