

Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky
Filozofická fakulta
Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci

Jaroslav Marek
Anglická filologie

Transcendence of Political Love in Shakespeare's Roman Tragedies
Transcendence politické lásky v římských tragédiích Williama Shakespeara

Diplomová práce

Vedoucí diplomové práce: Mgr. David Livingstone, Ph.D.
Olomouc 2016

Prohlašuji, že jsem diplomovou práci vypracoval samostatně a uvedl veškeré použité prameny a literaturu.

V Olomouci dne

Mé poděkování patří Davidu Livingstonovi, Ph.D. za jeho cenné připomínky a odborné rady. Chtěl bych poděkovat také Lence a své rodině za jejich neutuchající trpělivost a podporu.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction.....	1
2. Love.....	4
2.1. Storge.....	7
2.2. Eros.....	7
2.3. Philia.....	9
3. Love in the Tragedies and Comedies.....	12
4. Coriolanus.....	23
5. Julius Caesar.....	33
6. Anthony and Cleopatra.....	48
7. Conclusion.....	67
Czech Summary.....	69
Works Cited.....	75

1. Introduction

“I have a very bad feeling about this.”
-Luke Skywalker

The beginning of April brought an interesting discovery from Scotland. Shakespeare’s First Folio was discovered in the library of Mount Stuart on the Isle of Brute. The authenticity of the copy was confirmed by Emma Smith from Oxford University.¹ Coincidentally, the Folio was discovered in the year which is celebrated as the 400th anniversary of Shakespeare’s death. The Folio, published 1623, is treated as a sacred book, containing 36 of Shakespeare’s plays. However, it is valued even more, for without the work of John Heminges and Henry Condell, Shakespeare’s fellow actors in The King’s Men, 18 of his unpublished plays would have been lost. Yet, the Folio is not all that rare, some 230 copies are still in existence.

A question might arise as to why is why is Shakespeare such a mainstay in the world of arts? One of the possible explanations might be found in a letter from 1817, addressed to George and Thomas Keats, in which John Keats writes,

[S]everal things dovetailed in my mind, & at once it struck me, what quality went to form a Man of Achievement especially in Literature & which Shakespeare possessed so enormously—I mean *Negative Capability*, that is when man is capable of being in uncertainties, Mysteries, doubts, without any irritable reaching after fact & reason[.]²

Keats’ proposition is that literature should be sought for its aesthetic pleasure. Applying the “negative capability” to the “upstart Crow, beautified with [their] feathers,”³ it might justify for the plethora of possible readings and interpretations.

The plays which are collectively known as the Roman tragedies comprise *Titus Andronicus*, *Julius Caesar*, *Anthony and Cleopatra*, and *Coriolanus*. In the First Folio, these plays are categorized under tragedies, however one cannot deny their

1 Sean Coughlan, “Shakespeare First Folio discovered on Scottish island,” *BBC*, April 7, 2016, www.bbc.com/news/education-35973094.

2 John Keats, “Letter to George and Thomas Keats,” in *The Norton Anthology of English Literature, Volume 2* 6th ed, ed. M. H. Abrams, et al. (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1993), 830

3 Robert Greene, *Groats-worth of Wit*, in *The Norton Shakespeare*, ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al. (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1997), 3321.

historical as well as their then contemporary importance. Although the title claims “Roman Tragedies,” I will attempt to analyse only three of them, excluding *Titus Andronicus*. I do not hold any form of hatred or contempt against *Titus Andronicus*, on the contrary, the play, composed pre-1592 is a testing ground for Shakespeare’s later, more mature characters.⁴

Rather, where the plays differ is the overall approach of Shakespeare. *Julius Caesar*, *Anthony and Cleopatra*, and *Coriolanus* apart from being tragedies of their protagonists, discuss also important political milestones in the history of Rome. *Titus Andronicus*, on the other hand, is set in some indefinite time of the Roman Empire, probably near the end, and the closing of the play centres around Titus’ personal revenge rather than having implications for the future of Rome.

Lastly, there is the question of sources. For *Julius Caesar*, *Anthony and Cleopatra*, and *Coriolanus* Shakespeare found his source in Thomas North’s English translation of Jacques Amyot’s French translation of Plutarch’s *Lives*. For *Titus Andronicus*, Shakespeare had no such source, rather he amalgamated different sources.⁵

The question I attempt to answer in this thesis is whether or not love influences the characters’ decisions that relate to the politics of the world in the plays. All of the protagonists were ‘prominent’ figures in the world of politics in Rome, and their decisions could have affected the lives of Roman citizens. I also opted to explore this intersection of love and influence because love as desire is the variation primarily ‘exploited’ in the comedies. I wanted to explore other forms of love, whether or not they have the same power over characters as desire has.

Love should not be understood only as desire but as a broader concept, not narrowly definable. Therefore I use the Greek words because the words carry denotations which are readily graspable. Since love is a difficult concept to be understood fully on only a few pages, I opted to shorten the description to elements which I believe are relevant to my discussion and which are based on the approach to the concept of love as it was understood in classical times.

4 For a discussion of the date of *Titus Andronicus* see William Shakespeare, *Titus Andronicus*, ed. Eugene M. Waith (1984; repr., Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 4–11.

5 *Ibid.*, 27–38.

I entirely omit a chapter on the influence of Renaissance writing on English contemplation on love and friendship. The reason may be purely selfish. For the English Renaissance literature was influenced by Petrarch and the thinking of Marsilio Ficino, who himself was a Neoplatonist. The Petrarchian “opposition between the spiritual aspect of love and the mortal [aspect] [. . .] is met and overcome philosophically by Marsilio Ficino.”⁶ Ficino and his school follows Plato’s thinking on love, therefore I opted only for a description of Plato’s approach.

Similarly, the omission of Cicero’s *De Amicitia* is a conscious decision. Irrespective of Cicero’s importance in the humanist world of the Renaissance, he owed much of his thinking about friendship to Plato and to Aristotle,⁷ therefore I shortly discuss only Aristotle’s friendship with an occasional digression to Plato. I do not expect that Shakespeare will strictly adhere to what had been written before him, but rather present his own ‘mutation’ of friendship to fit the worlds of his plays.

In the second part (which one may conveniently call ‘practical’) I will attempt to answer the question I put forth. By analysing the actions of the characters I hope to show that love is not only vital to the comedies but to the tragedies as well.⁸

6 Neil L. Goldstein, “Love’s Labour’s Lost and the Renaissance Vision of Love,” *Shakespeare Quarterly* 25 (1974): 337.

7 See e.g. Tom MacFaul, *Male Friendship in Shakespeare and his Contemporaries* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 6–9. Also John D. Cox, “Shakespeare and the Ethics of Friendship,” *Religion & Literature* 40 (2008): 12f.

8 A number of scholars have attempted to describe the concept of love in terms other than desire. See for example Maurice Charney, *Shakespeare on Love & Lust* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2000). Tom MacFaul, *Male Friendship in Shakespeare*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), esp. 65–90. Marcus Nordlund, *Shakespeare and the Nature of Love: Literature, Culture, Evolution* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2007). David Schalkwyk, *Shakespeare, Love and Service* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008).

2. Love

We've made a great mess of love
since we made an ideal of it.⁹
D. H. Lawrence

The question ‘What is love?’ has perplexed humanity since the time of the Ancient Greeks and still remains in the spotlight of philosophy, theology, psychology, literature, and other fields which deal with human emotions. Love is an abstract term with no graspable borders and its definition poses a problem. Love is multifaceted, there is no denying it; love of a parent to his child is different than of a protégé to his mentor. The former case is an example of love more natural than the latter.

Greek distinguishes three words for personal love: *eros*, *philia*, and *agape*,¹⁰ each of which denotes a different type of personal relationship. There is another Greek word which bears the meaning of affectionate personal relationship, i.e. *storge*. *Agape*, although being a personal love, is what came to be accepted as the love of God and God’s love as well as “brotherly love for all humanity.”¹¹ It is the highest of loves because it is altruistic, the person does not expect his love to be returned. C.S. Lewis refers to it as charity. I do not believe that this love would be utilized in the analysis, therefore I will exclude it from my description and focus on selfish loves instead. Therefore, for my discussion I will restrict myself to *eros*, *philia*, and *storge*.

Love is an emotion that people tend to share with others, it is a projection of ourselves to another person. It is thus closely grouped with words that denote a certain relationship—family, friendship, partnership, etc. Ancient philosophers started systematically enquiring into the nature of love, specifically friendship, because friendship, or *philia*, has been the most unnatural love a human being can experience;¹² it is based on personal decision, not on forces, one cannot control. Plato and Aristotle were not the only ones who delved into the subject. Love and

9 D. H. Lawrence, “The Mess Of Love,” in *Selected Poems* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1968), 147.

10 Bennett Helm, “Love,” in *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, accessed March 19, 2016, available at <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/love/>

11 Alexander Moseley, “Philosophy of Love,” in *The Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, accessed March 19, 2016, available at <http://www.iep.utm.edu/love/>.

12 C. S. Lewis, *The Four Loves* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1960), 88.

friendship has remained a topic of discussion in the following generations of philosophers. Yet, the body of work produced to this day has provided no consensus on the nature of love and even on the nature of individual forms. There is no unison on the nature of *eros*, *agape*, *storge*, and other forms. Having no consensus on the nature, there are only accepted views as to what love is.¹³

The definition of love proves to be an slippery undertaking. Love is readily adaptable, changeable, and it can be tailor-fitted to suit one's framework. Therefore it would be apt to categorize love into groups which are more inclined to adapt, rather than working within the more restricted categories. Jules Toner in his *Love and Friendship* shortly talks about such divisions.¹⁴

The English word *love* is confusing, at least in the sense that it could be used to denote an attachment to a material as well as an immaterial object. By saying *I love my mother* is not the same as *I love my fiancée* or *My grandfather loved his old, worn slippers* or even *I love the idea of cooking together*. Although in all these instances the word love is used, one perceives that loving one's fiancée is diametrically different from the sentimental liking of old slippers. Additionally, loving the idea is not the same as enjoying the moment of cooking. This is the other face of the perception of love. Apart from philosophical and psychological description, one can utilize the biocultural perspective, to which Irving Singer says,

Each variety of love [of self, of mankind, of nature, of material possessions, of food or drink, . . .], involving its special object, has its own phenomenology, its own iridescence within the spectrum that delimits human experience.

To be studied adequately, every type requires a separate analysis. From one to the other, their ingredients will often have little or nothing in common.¹⁵

13 For different treatments of love, see e.g. Bryan Strong, Christine DeVault, and Theodore F. Cohen, *The Marriage and Family Experience: Intimate Relationships in a Changing Society*, 11th ed. (Wadsworth Publishing, 2011), 149–51.

14 Jules Tones, *Love and Friendship* (Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 2003), 22–7 and 188–90.

15 Irving Singer, *The Nature of Love, Vol. 3* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1989), 431–32, quoted in Marcus Nordlund, *Shakespeare and the Nature of Love*, 21.

Marcus Nordlund establishes “subsidiary distinctions” among love—a disposition, an emotion, and an action. Disposition is the capacity for love; emotions are “recognizable feelings and bodily states;” and action is the expression of an emotion.¹⁶ Emotions need to arise from dispositions, however actions do not. Actions may be performed without disposition and without emotions and the person still might achieve his intended goal. Here I would like to point out the opening scene of *King Lear* in which Lear is prepared to divide his kingdom among his daughters, Goneril, Regan, and Cordelia. Goneril and Regan see the opportunity to obtain the best portion of the land and flatter accordingly. In my opinion, their words are emotionless actions and fit what Nordlund says,

<p>Goneril Sir, I love you more than word can wield the matter Dearer than eyesight, space, and liberty; Beyond what can be valued, rich or rare; No less than life, with grace, health, beauty, honour; As much as child o'er lov'd, or father found; A love that makes breath poor and speech unable; Beyond all manner of so much I love you. (1.1.54–60)¹⁷</p>	<p>Regan I am made of that self metal as my sister, And prize me at her worth. In my true heart I find she names my very deed of love; Only she come too short, that I profess Myself and enemy to all other joys Which the most precious square of sense possesses, And find I am alone felicitate In your dear Highness' love. (1.1.68–75)</p>
--	--

However, as Nordlund’s overall approach does not fit my purpose, I will not pay attention to this “biocultural perspective.”

For my purpose I will work within the concept of love as a human effort, an interpersonal relationship. Note that what follows will not be an exhaustive description, because it would be far beyond the scope of this work. The borderlines of love are not strict and can mingle, thus it is possible to experience more variations of love towards one person. That is, what starts as an affection might easily end in the higher form. Therefore it is recommended that individual variants should not be approached as isolated.

¹⁶ Nordlund, *Shakespeare and the Nature of Love*, 22f.

¹⁷ If not stated otherwise, line numbering of Shakespeare’s plays follows *The Norton Shakespeare*, ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al.

2.1. Storge

Storge is the most natural, basest of loves. C. S. Lewis calls it affection and recognises it as the “widely diffused of loves” in which “our experience seems to differ least from that of the animals.”¹⁸ The *Greek-English Lexicon* defines *storge* as “love, affection, esp. of parents and children”¹⁹ and vice versa. However, *storge* goes beyond close familial ties and can extend to the wider family, people with whom we are familiar, and relationships in which one finds themselves not of their choice due to forces beyond their control.²⁰

It is possible to argue that within a family, affection is liable to overlook faults and is still felt even after quarrels. Yet affection cannot survive on its own, it needs to be reciprocal. The weakness of it is that affection dies easily if it is not properly nurtured. In other words the love we give, we expect it to be returned. Yet, the same rules that applies in a family might apply even between friends and acquaintances. We are liable to overlook bad behaviour in situations that would not end the relationship abruptly. I think that in the simplicity of this love lies its weakness. People tend to overlook faults they can equally commit, but once the faults are incompatible and are beyond reasoning the relationship might be terminated. Thus for this form of love to exist, change is not desirable. It is founded on firm grounds of trust, knowledge, non-sexuality, and possibly respect. It can grow and fade but will return to its original state.²¹

Storge is non-invasive. The love between the two (or more) starts to manifest itself gradually, it is not impulsive. The couple does not delight in the tactile and the sensual and rarely the intimate distance is violated. *Storge* lovers rarely express their love verbally and do not require reassurance of their relationship.

2.2. Eros

Eros is the name of the Greek god of love who is the embodiment of desire and sexual power, hence *eros* as love may also be called erotic love, desire, sexuality.

18 Lewis, *The Four Loves*, 53.

19 Henry George Lidell and Robert Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940), s.v. “στοργή,” accessed March 18, 2016, <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.04.0057%3Aentry%3Dstorgh%2F>.

20 Lewis, *The Four Loves*, 50–2.

21 “General Theories of Love,” 9, accessed March 19, 2016, http://www.sagepub.com/sites/default/files/upm-binaries/3222_ReganChapter1_Final.pdf. Also Brian Strong et al., *The Marriage and Family Experience*, 149.

Yet, it is fallible to use the term *eros* to denote only the bodily love. Rather it would be useful to divide *eros* into sub-concepts whilst stating that they may be linked to *eros* in some of their features but not in other. *Eros* has been a popular concept, or love variation, among philosophers and writers in the course of the centuries. It has been repeatedly treated, dissected, approached from various perspectives that it has become a mainstay in Western culture and writings. At one time *eros* gained considerable popularity that it was a zeitgeist. Yet *eros* itself poses insecurities when analysing it.

Lewis recognises the “animally sexual element within Eros” as Venus, and it is sexual in the obvious way; Venus would be the sexual appetite that has nothing in common with love.²² Eros is for him a refined version of sexuality which differentiates humans from animals, transcends the visible and aims at higher values than bodily pleasure.

His conception of *eros* derived possibly from Plato who developed his own ideas about love in *Lysis*, *Symposium*, and *Phaedrus*.²³ His vision of *eros* is twofold, there are two independent forms of *eros*—vulgar *eros* and heavenly *eros*. Vulgar *eros* refers to bodily needs, it can take forms and is of lesser importance to the philosopher. Heavenly *eros* is the form the philosopher needs to pursue and achieve, because it allows to enter into “immortal union,” “Absolute Beauty”²⁴ or “immaterial good.”²⁵ This union is paramount, without it we are incomplete. Once the union is achieved, *eros* diminishes until it ceases to exist, but can be recalled because the union, the beauty, only appears in flashes. Thus to experience the flashes again, one needs to turn to *eros* repeatedly. However, Plato does not condemn vulgar *eros* entirely, but recognizes that vulgar *eros*, or in this case being attracted to a person, might be a necessary step to achieve the ultimate goal. Thus *eros* is desire for what we do not have.

Psychologists take a different approach, they divide *eros* based on the experience of the lover. Therefore, they have established two phases—the

22 Lewis, *The Four Loves*, 131f.

23 For the discussion of Plato’s treatment, see e.g. A. W. Price, *Love and Friendship in Plato and Aristotle* (1989; repr., Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2004), chs. 1, 2, 3. For inconsistencies between Plato’s *Lysis* and *Symposium*, see Catherine Osborne, *Eros Unveiled: Plato and the God of Love* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002), 54–61, esp. 58–61.

24 Toner, *Love and Friendship*, 24.

25 Osborne, *Eros Unveiled*, 54.

passionate love, which is experienced at the start of the relationship; and companionate love after the passionate phase subsides.²⁶ The couple needs not achieve companionate love, once the passion ends and the transitory period is not successful, the relationship terminates. Passionate love, vulgar eros, *eros* is the state of longing for the beloved. The lovers are attracted to the form, the sensual, the immediate and are fascinated by their beloved. This phase is associated with ardour however it can die as easily as it started.²⁷

I am fully aware that literature concerning *eros* abounds in numbers. However for my discussion of Shakespeare, it is futile to incorporate more recent views and theories.

2.3. Philia

Philia translates in English as affectionate regard, friendship, usually between equals.²⁸ “To the Ancients, Friendship seemed the happiest and most fully human of all loves,”²⁹ it was celebrated as a virtue and, unlike *storge* and *eros*, was an optional social relationship one willingly chose. Lewis wrote that we can live without friendship, on the other hand, Francis Bacon contradicts him, “[w]hosoever is delighted in solitude is either a wild beast or a god.”³⁰ Bacon viewed friendship as a nutrient, one a person cannot live without, because it facilitated one’s intellect and eased the discomfort of one’s mind and heart. The writings of both reflect the general tendencies and attitudes towards friendship, which was “highly revered [. . .] during the European Renaissance,”³¹ but nowadays, in Lewis’ view, it is not so valued. What might seem to be the basis of Lewis’ statement is that he was writing under the influence of Plato. Plato held that good men are in no need of friends,³² they are virtuous, whereas Lewis’

26 See Frank Tallis, “Crazy for you,” *The Psychologist* 18 (2005): 72. Also Strong et al. *The Marriage and Family Experience*, 150. This model has been proposed by Hatfield and Sprecher.

27 Tallis, “Crazy for you,” 72. Strong et al., *The Marriage and Family Experience*, 149.

28 Lidell and Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, s.v. “φιλι-α,” accessed March 18, 2016, <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.04.0057%3Aentry%3Dfili%2Fa>

29 Lewis, *The Four Loves*, 87.

30 Francis Bacon, “Essay XXVII.—Of Friendship,” in *Essays* (1906; repr., London: J. M. Dent & Sons Ltd., 1946), 80.

31 Peter M. Nardi, “‘Seamless Souls’: An Introduction to Men’s Friendship,” in *Men’s Friendship*, ed. Peter M. Nardi (Newbury Park: Sage Publications, 1992), 2.

32 See Julia Annas, “Plato and Aristotle on Friendship and Altruism,” *Mind* 344 (1977): 550.

statement is broader in its implication. Plato's statement also excludes women who then, if properly understood, were not virtuous and hence not capable of friendship. Bacon was on the other hand following Aristotle.

To my knowledge, Aristotle tried to define friendship in a consistent way. He recognized three forms of friendship: complete friendship, friendship for pleasure, and friendship for usefulness. He did so in order to clarify the relationship between friends and to clarify whether there is a classification of friendship.³³ His concept of friendship involves reciprocity and symmetry between equals and is "complete or best in the case of those who feel *philia* for one another, and [. . .] desire good things for one another, because they regard each other as good."³⁴ There must be an altruistic wish for the good of your partner and this wish must be present in both members of the relationship. If the person is a good, useful, and pleasant human being, is virtuous and behaves accordingly—has to be good "in his own right"—then Aristotle talks of a complete friendship.³⁵ A. W. Price is sceptical about the target of one's love—do we love a person for his qualities (good and pleasant) or do we love him for himself?³⁶

For the other types, Aristotle distinguishes two more forms, he states that if the person is only good "in relation to you" he is useful to us, he calls this type friendship for usefulness. If the person is pleasant "in relation to you" then he is entertaining, he calls this type friendship for pleasure. These two variants need not necessarily appear jointly, yet have to be based on reciprocity. The word friendship evokes some sort of affectionate relationship, but what Aristotle meant by friendship is also acquaintance or a completely emotionless relationship. However, Michael Peachin argues that "the standard modern view of Roman friendship tends to reduce significantly the emotional aspect of the relationship among the Romans, and to make of it a rather pragmatic business" whilst holding the same for Greek *philia*.³⁷

33 See Michael Pakaluk, "Friendship," in *A Companion to Aristotle*, ed. Georgios Anagnostopoulos (Chicester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009), 471f.

34 David Konstan, "Aristotle on Love and Friendship," *ΣΧΟΛΗ* Vol. II. 2 (2008): 210, accessed March 18, 2016, available at <http://www.nsu.ru/classics/schole/2/2-2-konstan.pdf>.

35 Pakaluk, "Friendship," p. 473. Also Annas, "Plato and Aristotle," 547.

36 Price, *Love and Friendship in Plato and Aristotle*, 103. A similar problem is tackled in Annas, "Plato and Aristotle," esp. 544–46.

37 Michael Peachin, *Aspects of Friendship in the Graeco-Roman World*, quoted in Konstan, "Aristotle on Love and Friendship," 207.

Aristotle also treats other types of relationships, those based on inequality, e.g. associations, commercial relationships, relationship between the government and the governed, and works out the different behavioural patterns that are appropriate to both parties.³⁸ These would be called “objectively based social relationships.”³⁹

Love is an immensely obstinate concept not ready to yield a unified answer. It has withstood two and a half millennium of attempts from the ranks of established and widely recognized philosophers, theologians, and more recently psychologists. My aim was not to provide an exhaustive review of this broad and multilayered concept, but to point out certain questions, or elements, which Shakespeare attempts to incorporate in his Roman plays. Essays and books that delve deeper into the issue provide more elaborate and consistent discussion than the present one.

38 See Annas, “Plato and Aristotle on Friendship and Altruism,” 552.

39 Ibid., 553. A discussion of Aristotle’s varieties is in Price, *Love and Friendship*, 131–61.

3. Love in the Tragedies and Comedies

‘Nature,’ I told her, ‘was the voice of God, which men disobey at peril; and if we were thus dumbly drawn together, ay, even as by a miracle of love, it must imply a divine fitness in our souls; we must be made,’ I said – ‘made for one another. We should be mad rebels,’ I cried out – ‘mad rebels against God, not to obey this instinct.’⁴⁰

Shakespeare was not reluctant to use the concept of love in his work, the comedies literally required it. His sonnets express desire towards an untoward lover; his comedies a series of conundrums after which the audience sympathizes with the lovers; lastly his tragedies in which love is a means to portray the tragedy of the protagonist(s).

Shakespeare’s comedies are plays of festivities, joys, but also of personal hardship and struggle. Love, the concept, is put through a series of obstacles at the end of which awaits relief, liberation, and marriage. Love is celebrated as a virtue and in its biological meaning also as a vision of family and continuation of one’s lineage.

A Midsummer Night’s Dream is a love comedy *par excellence*.⁴¹ One can argue that it is a prototype, almost a paradigm against which his other comedies should be compared. At the centre of the plot is a love rectangle, composed of Hermia, Helena, Demetrius, and Lysander, which shifts throughout the play due to unforeseen forces outside their reach. Their quadruplex relationship in the plot is enriched by the relationships of Theseus and Hippolyta, Oberon and Titania, and staged love of Pyramus and Thisbe. This pentad of couples gives rich possibilities on how to resolve the individual differences between them.

Lysander’s “ever [. . .] by tale or history, / The course of true love never did run smooth” is a universal commentary on love in literature (1.1.133–4). The bumpy road, the lovers face, is the “generator of plot in the comedies”⁴² which Shakespeare throughout his comedic canon alters to show a different voyage of lovers almost each time.

40 Robert Louis Stevenson, *Olalla* (London: Penguin Random House, 2015), 38.

41 *The Twelfth Night* and *A Midsummer’s Night Dream* are equally ingenious. Especially in *The Twelfth Night*, in which on a Renaissance stage a boy, dressed as a girl had to play a boy whilst being a girl.

42 Charney, *Shakespeare on Love & Lust*, 29.

In *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, Shakespeare introduces one of the more universal themes in comedies, i.e. rebellion against established norms. In the opening scene of the *Dream* Hermia chose a partner, Lysander, which was not approved and chosen by her father, Egeus and forms the initial tension in the play. The problem of partnership must then be resolved by a higher, worldly authority, Theseus, or suffer dire consequences, death or banishment. The lovers in the plot face a series of perturbations, hardship, twists, and after successfully overcoming all the obstructions placed in their way are rewarded with a marriage. These obstructions are placed by a force out of the control of the lovers. *A Midsummer Night's Dream* ends in multiple marriages, and the newly wed couples are shown a different love story, the tragic tale of Pyramus and Thisbe. The tale, taken from Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, strongly resemble that of *Romeo and Juliet*, which was written about the same time as *A Midsummer Night's Dream*.

I do not claim that the sequence of events in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* is applicable universally across the comedic canon. It would be apt to subject the principle of rebellion to flexibility, because a playwright as diverse and as adaptable as Shakespeare would not adhere to a single modus operandi. Rather he would change the plot twists, forced them to mutate whilst still positioning desire in the midst of the plot and let the characters strive for its recognition. The embodiment of the object of desire is a female character.

The Taming of the Shrew treats love differently, almost violently with its depiction of verbal cruelty and female humiliation which borders with a strong distaste against humanity. Katherine, the female protagonist of the play, is not easily intimidated and proves to be a sturdy adversary to men. Petruccio likes challenges and to help out a friend, he marries Katherine, the vicious daughter of a rich merchant. The marriage however does not take place at the end of the play, but near the middle in order for Shakespeare to show the actual process of taming, which is twofold, and happens to both Petruccio and Katherine. Petruccio hardly knew a worthy adversary in his games, and Katherine fills this gap. It is not a physically violent process, rather psychological, full of witty combat and puns.

I view their post-marital courting (taming) as the bumpy road they need to travel in order to emerge as a transformed, satisfied couple. Contrary to the

expected nature of the bumpiness as being set by external influences, the hardiness of their voyage comes from within themselves, thus in order to undergo the transformation, they have to look inward.

Not all of the comedies end satisfactorily for all involved parties. Such an example might be Malvolio in *The Twelfth Night*, who is the victim of a cruel joke and willingly refuses to participate in the marital merriment of Orsino and Viola. Another comedy which ends contrary to the comedic *modus* is *Love Labour's Lost*. Shakespeare goes to greater lengths and through the words of Biron says that '[t]hat's too long for a play' (5.2.855), referring to the 'twelvemonth' Biron and the King have to endure in order to get married with Rosaline and the Queen, respectively. The audience senses that the marriage is never going to happen.

Francis Bacon wrote that "love is ever the matter of comedies, and now and then of tragedies."⁴³ Shakespeare's most vocal "tragedies of love,"⁴⁴ *Romeo and Juliet*, *Othello*, and *Anthony and Cleopatra*, are his attempt to incorporate love into the fabric of these three tragedies. Tragic love may be celebrated as liberating in the selves of the characters, not in the plot, as is celebrated in the comedies. Love in tragedies is an essential component of the character and the power it wields is destructive.

David Schalkwyk comments on the criticism of the concept of love in Shakespeare,

One of the apparent advantages of *reducing* love to desire lies in the considerable narrowing and thus simplification of these relations in the reduced concept. [. . .] [W]e need to see love not as a single state but as a *complex* of interwoven orientations to the self and the world, embodied in forms of action rather than confined to the inscrutability of an interior affect. [. . .] "Love" is not merely a value produced within an abstract system of differences but is constituted out of its changing, lived relations with concepts such as desire and friendship, as well as tenderness and anger, indignation and generosity, want and repletion, satisfaction and resentment, pleasure and pain, exultation and grief.⁴⁵

43 Francis Bacon, "Essay X.—Of Love," in *Essays*, 29.

44 Catherine Bates, "Shakespeare's tragedies of love," in *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespearean Tragedy*, ed. Claire McEacher (2002; repr., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 182.

45 David Schalkwyk, *Shakespeare, Love and Service*, 7f. Italics are mine.

In my reading of this statement, by “desire,” he is referring to desire as *eros*, the predominant form of love in the comedies. Following his statement, “tragedies of love” are in fact tragedies of desire, and that one should not view love in the simplified concept of desire, but as a complex relationship with other affective states, even the darker, not sought ones. Understanding love solely as vulgar *eros* is to simultaneously underestimate and reject the richness and complexity of the world.

Shakespeare employs the pattern of the rebellion against the established norms and obstructions they meet along the road in *Romeo and Juliet* and in *Othello*. If we consider *Romeo and Juliet*, his first “tragedy of love,” the play may fit the pattern. They are also closest to the general framework of *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*.

It traces the wooing of the young lovers and the obstacles they need to overcome in order to celebrate their union. The obstacles are positioned by the patriarchal world of Verona and by the sworn enmity of the House of Montague and the House of Capulet. The only way to defeat the world is to rebel which may win them their love but places an imminent menace on their identity. Capulet speaks openly after he learns that Juliet will not marry Paris, the would-be husband that her parents picked for her because of his noble bearings,

Hang thee, young baggage, disobedient wretch!
I tell thee what: get thee to church o’ Thursday
Or never after look me in the face.
Speak not, reply not, do not answer me.
My fingers itch. Wife, we scarce thought us blest
That God had lent us but this only child,
But now I see this one is one too much,
And that we have a curse in having her.
Out on her, hilding! (3.5.160–8)

Juliet faces banishment if she does not subdue to her father’s will, authority, and command.

The world they live in is only the background that provides the necessary ‘fuel’ to the tragedy. The real tragedy are the lovers themselves; they are not only ignorant to the enmity of their houses, but rebel against the Cosmos as well, “[a] pair of star-crossed lovers” opens the Prologue (0.0.6). Friar Laurence also shares

in their unhappy ending. As Julia's confidant, he concocts a plot that would fool everyone into thinking that Julia is dead. The genius of the plan fails ironically in the timing. Romeo's rashness in killing himself is followed by Julia who, after waking up, spots Romeo lying dead and ends her own life. Was not there a greater scheme at play to end the ancient strife, since the Prince addresses Capulet and Montague with, "[s]ee what a scourge is laid upon your hate, / That heaven finds means to kill your joys with love?" (5.3.291–2)?⁴⁶

Where Romeo has the advantage of his youth, Othello has the advantage of an experienced middle-aged man. The maturity is also visible in Shakespeare's different handling of the plot and different character treatment. *Othello* was written some nine years after *Romeo and Juliet*.⁴⁷ By marrying Othello with Desdemona before the play starts, Shakespeare gives himself more room to manipulate his characters and the personal tragedy the characters are susceptible to. In *Romeo and Juliet* he surrendered this room and places their marriage later in the play, exploring the possibilities of innocent, yet still sexually charged, pre-marital games.

The rebellion against the norms in *Othello* is now carried out only by Desdemona. She, as Juliet does, rebels against her father and this time marries not an enemy of her own house, but a Moor, a representative of the Other.⁴⁸ What drove Desdemona to marry a Moor rather than a Venetian? According to Brabantio, her father, Othello "enchanted her" and "[a]bused her delicate youth with drugs or minerals" (1.3.64, 75). Brabantio is not finished with his cursing,

If she in chains of magic were not bound,
Whether a maid so tender, fair, and happy,
So opposite to marriage that she shunned
The wealthy curlèd darlings of our nation,
Would ever have, t'incur a general mock,

46 Paul N. Siegel, "Christianity and the Religion of Love in *Romeo and Juliet*," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 12 (1961), looks at plays which had the same Italian novelle as the source/inspiration, positioning on one side the "crudely mechanical mixture of a glorification of passionate love and a Christian moralistic condemnation of it," on the other Shakespeare's "subtle blend of these two ingredients" (p. 372), while at the same time recognising the unity of those two and the "pull in opposite directions" to create an artistic unity (p. 372).

47 A discussion on the dating of *Othello* is in William Shakespeare, *Othello, the Moor of Venice*, ed. Michael Neill (2006; repr., Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 399–404.

48 A discussion about the Other in Renaissance is in Emily C. Bartels, "Making more of the Moor: Aaron, Othello, and Renaissance Refashionings of Race," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 41 (1990).

Run from her guardage to the sooty bosom
Of such a thing as thou—to fear, not to delight. (1.3.66–72)

They married without the blessing of Desdemona's father, just as Romeo and Juliet did. However, Desdemona's love is different than Othello's. In my view, Othello is a Platonic character, at least at the beginning of the play, for initially he had no feelings for Desdemona, he was just a visitor to the house of Brabantio. Gradually, Othello grew fond of Desdemona, because of her expressed pity over his life ordeals. The love she projects is not of bodily desire but an infatuation by the idea of an experienced foreigner, the Otherness (cf. 1.3.249–53). Infatuation tend to vanish quickly, as Iago thinks, but Desdemona proves that her sins are “loves I bear to you [i.e. Othello]” (5.2.43), and contradicts him. Othello on the other hand does not aspire on ideal beauty of Desdemona but on the vision of Absolute Beauty, the unison of their souls.⁴⁹ The way, he defines his relationship with Desdemona before the Senate defends his honour,

Vouch with me heaven, I therefor beg it not
To please the palate of my appetite,
Nor to comply with heat—the young affects
In me defunct—and proper satisfaction
And heaven defend your good souls that you think
I will your serious and great business scant
When she is with me. (1.3.260–7)

One of the possible explanations as to why Othello loves Desdemona is that she does pay attention to who he is but rather what he is. “I have but an hour / Of love, of wordly matter and direction / To spend with thee,” says Othello to Desdemona (1.3.299–300), and fulfils his marital duties; if he would feel any lust, then “[l]et housewives make a skillet of my helm” (1.3.271). Lust for Othello is a product of the youth, which he dismisses being. The “heat” will not affect his judgement and jeopardize Othello's mission in Cyprus as the Senate fears.

49 R. N. Hallstead in “Idolatrous Love: A New Approach to Othello,” *Shakespeare Quarterly* 19 (1968), proposes a different vision of Othello's love—of idolatry, which ends in renunciation and penance. “The act of penance, or satisfaction, is the only possible one: Othello kills the ‘turban'd Turk’, the heathen that sin has made of him. No priestly absolution is possible either in the framework of the play or on the stage of Shakespeare's Day. But the pattern is completed: Othello dies “upon a kiss”, a kiss that is not only once more within the sanctity of marriage but which is placed upon the lips of Desdemona, who has forgiven the murder—even as Christ has” (p. 124).

Iago, Othello's lieutenant and the principal villain, does not see love the same way as his general. Love is a "sect or scion" of lust (1.3.327), and embarks on a voyage to prove himself right. His action will wake an emotion, stronger and more destructive than love, jealousy. Justice is the cause, Othello claims, to vindicate the murder of Desdemona.

Schalkwyk's statement cited above refers to the body of studies accumulated up to the publication of his book. In my understanding, he is referring mostly to the comedies, however it is possible to broaden his statement to "tragedies of love" as well. In my view, love of Romeo and Juliet might be simplified to desire, but the reduction to desire is only partly applicable in the case of Othello and Desdemona, and to some degree also in *Anthony and Cleopatra*. Othello's love aims higher, to transcend the physical form and appreciate the mental form to achieve a union. Iago does not believe in such a possibility and as such represents the other side of Plato's love, vulgar eros. It is possible to argue that Shakespeare was following Plato's vision of heavenly eros and tested how, if put alongside each other, will they interact. Sadly, the heavenly eros descended and became jealousy, the emotion that is a part of the "heat" Othello talks of.

It is understandable that Schalkwyk rejects the simplification of love because his study of master-servant relationship enables him to explore other relationships other than those of the lovers, such as Prospero and Ariel in *The Tempest*, Prince Hal and the company from Eastcheap in *1 Henry IV*, or Pompey and Menas and Anthony and Enobarbus in *Anthony and Cleopatra*. His approach even opens new possibilities on how to analyse *The Taming of the Shrew* and *A Midsummer Night's Dream*.

King Lear is among the plays analysed in terms of service⁵⁰ and service and love.⁵¹ Shortly in the play, Lear, when ready to divide his kingdom among his three daughters says, "[w]hich of you shall we say doth love us most, / That we our largest bounty may extend / Where nature doth with merit challenge?"

50 See Jonas A. Barish and Marshall Waingrow, "'Service' in King Lear," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 9 (1958).

51 See David Schalkwyk, *Shakespeare, Love and Service*, esp. 214–45. Similar issue is in Kenneth J. E. Graham, "'Without the Form of Justice': Plainness and the Performance of Love in 'King Lear,'" *Shakespeare Quarterly* 42 (1991). I am fully aware of the intrinsic complexity of the play, however, for my brief statement about Shakespeare's utilisation of love, I will limit myself to one motif only.

(1.1.49–51). He initiates a competition in flattery in which the one with the most bombast words will win the best portion of the kingdom. Lear is an unimaginative king and associates love with richness and unfathomable devotion and it is precisely exploited by Goneril and Regan who, knowing how to choose the proper words, flatter Lear into submission.⁵² As they were dependent on him, now he is dependent on them. Lear's unimaginative character and his emasculation lead him on a dangerous voyage into his consciousness and to reevaluate his ideas about family and true love.

Cordelia knows that love (in this case affection, *storge*) cannot be put into words, she “cannot heave / [her] heart into [her] mouth,” and all she can do is to remain silent (1.1.89–90). Her silence and truth enrages Lear that he disowns and ostracises her. Cordelia's love prevented her to speak deceitfully but Lear does not recognise it initially. He learns the values of honesty between the time of Cordelia's banishment and their subsequent reunion. Her silence falls heavily on the mental state of Lear and this silence gives him time to reconsider the nature of filial love.

Traces of love can be spotted in Kent's relationship with his master. It is a type of *philia*, here translates as a regard towards one's superior.⁵³ Kent defends Cordelia and tries to persuade Lear that what she did was in fact honourable. In his fit Lear banishes him and is left with no true friends, marginalizing himself without his knowledge. Lear's want of love is the desire of worship. Although *King Lear* can hardly be called “tragedy of love,” the broad concept of love constitutes an important part in the plot. Lear's skewed version of love directly influences the lapses in his judgement.

52 The Czech fairy tale *Byl jednou jeden král* and *Sůl nad zlato* share a common root with *King Lear* (Martin Hilský shortly talks about the root of *King Lear*, see *Divadlo a jeviště svět* [Praha: Academia, 2010], 586–88.) In the fairy tale, the king's two daughters flatter him as well, however this time they compare their love to precious gemstone, gold, and other worldly items which signify the position of the owner. The youngest daughter says that she loves him as salt, an ordinary item, and for this statement she is banished.

53 Cf. with Xenophon's *Anabasis*, 1.6.3: “Then Orontas, thinking that his horsemen were assured him, wrote a letter to the King saying that he would come to him with as many horsemen as he could get; and he urged the King to direct his own cavalry to receive him as a friend. The letter also contained reminders of his former *friendship* and *fidelity*.” Xenophon, *Xenophon in Seven Volumes*, transl. Carleton Lewis Brownson (Cambridge: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann, Ltd., 1922), accessed April 1, 2016, available at <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:abo:tlg.0032,006:1:6:3&lang=original>. Italics are mine.

Macbeth shares with *King Lear* an element of the supernatural which influences the mental health of both kings, but also the fact that both protagonists are susceptible to surrender to words of their female counterparts. Lady Macbeth's hidden ambitions allow her to utilize the status of wife without asserting any form of affectionate bond with Macbeth. Indeed, the lack of almost any emotion (e.g. cf. 1.5.39–41) is a necessary prerequisite if she plots to murder the monarch of Scotland in a clandestine fashion. Macbeth himself is ambitious but grew softer of late as he tells Lady Macbeth, who sees the opportunity and assaults his manhood and his rank. Ironically, Macbeth knows that, “[b]loody instructions which, being taught, return / To plague th’inventor” (1.7.9–10), but disregards this premonition after Lady Macbeth's intervention. He follows her without questioning her motives.

Lady Macbeth's unsexing proved to be tragic as well. Being willingly stripped of any emotions, she is not able to recuperate and dies a death about the nature of which the audience can only speculate.

Trying to trace love in *Macbeth* proves to be difficult. Macbeth uses the word love on several occasions, but only to address Lady Macbeth and not in defining their relationship. However, one cannot entirely discredit the leading couple in not feeling any reciprocal emotions, at least in the character of Macbeth. Lady Macbeth proves to be adamant in her emotionlessness. Love bears a different connotation in the play, especially if one talks about love of the King to his vassals and vice versa, which is respect and loyalty. It would be more fruitful to analyze the play in terms of service and master-servant relationship.

Love reduced to desire as the subject matter is an important element in the comedies, where with confusion are the pivotal themes around which the plays revolve. The ending of comedies is predictable, the audience sympathises with the protagonists in their struggle and as a reward after the hardship, the protagonists and the audience are rewarded with marriage or reunion. The pursuance of the union is steadfast and withholds all impediments, disturbances, and other external influences to reach a denouement that is at the same time rewarding, prosperous, and liberating. On the other hand, love in tragedies other than “tragedies of love”

seems to be a mere motif, subtly projecting itself, often taking the guise of other forms of relationships.

Another important distinction is that love must not be mistaken for lust. For Iago's cynical remark that love is a "sect or scion" of lust does not simply hold, because lust is bodily, sexual desire that does not separate us from animals. Maurice Charney states, that in comedies, the role of the lustful character is often employed by clowns.⁵⁴ A good example of such a clown is Feste in *The Twelfth Night*. His songs, especially in 2.3.35–40 and 43–8 mention the word "love," with the meaning of lust. Touchstone in *As You Like It* behaves similarly. His sexual puns on genitalia are rude, but not taken seriously. I would like to point out that the Czech translation sometimes appear to be more bawdy than the original.⁵⁵ Compare, for example, 3.3,

I am here with thee and thy goats as the most Capricious poet hones Ovid was among the Goths (3.3.5–6)	Mám tu tebe a tvoje kozy a žiju si tu jako ten starej kozel Ovidius, kduž ho poslali z Říma ke všem kozlům (3.3.5–6)
--	--

or in 2.4, when Touchstone says,

For my part, I had rather bear with you than bear you. Yet, I should bear no cross if I did bear you, for I think you have no money in your purse (2.4.8–10)	Co se mě teje, já vás klidně snesu, hlavně že vás přitom nemusím nést, to bych nesnesl, třebaže bych vás asi unesl, protože obtěžkaná zrovna nejste – myslím penězi (2.4.8–10)
---	--

One can feel that Touchstone is referring to the size of her breast or at least bodily proportions.

Lust is then the domain of lower class characters and antagonists/villains in the tragedies and histories employed to provide a sense of relief from the tension. The role of the comedic clown is often given to a different character, like Falstaff in *I Henry IV*, and the fool serves a deeper, more profound interest in the play, the most exemplary being the Fool in *King Lear*. Similarly, *Romeo and Juliet* opens with Gregory and Samson talking about how will they murder "[a] dog of the house of Montague" (1.1.7), but shortly after, the conversation is led astray and they talk about ravaging their maids. "'Tis true, and therefore women, being the weaker / vessels, are ever thrust to the wall; therefore I will push / Montague's men from the wall, and thrust his maids to the wall," to which Gregory replies,

54 Maurice Charney, *Shakespeare on Love & Lust* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2000), 187.

55 William Shakespeare, *Jak se vám líbí*, transl. Martin Hilský (Brno: Atlantis, 2007).

“[t]hey must take it in sense that feel it” (1.1.14–6, 24), and Samson’s answer, “[m]e they shall feel while I am able to stand, and ’tis / known I am a pretty piece of flesh” (25–6). Similarly the very first words, Juliet’s Nurse says in front of Lady Capulet are not exactly fitting her role as an attendant to a young lady. Lady Capulet’s ignorance of Nurse’s, “Now, by my maidenhead at twelve year old,” is exquisite. Lust does not suit the nobleness of the higher class.

4. Coriolanus

“Thou art my warrior”

Shakespeare’s last play from the realm of Ancient Rome which brings the Roman tragedy series to an end. It was written probably in the late 1608 to early 1609, and was the last tragedy Shakespeare wrote.⁵⁶ In terms of chronology, *Coriolanus* takes place at the beginning of the Roman Republic, circa in the late fifth century BC. in a period of an important political and national shift in which Rome struggled to define itself on the Apennine Peninsula. The power of Rome was not as extensive as it is portrayed in *Julius Caesar* or *Anthony and Cleopatra* and the Romans were dealing with threats more imminent, waiting at their doorstep. The Roman plays are political, each depicting an important event in the history of Rome and the history of the world. *Coriolanus* slightly differs from the two other Roman plays in terms of its overtness. The world of politics and the struggle for identity resonate through the play on state level as well as on personal level.

Shakespeare’s progress of character treatment is also distinct. *Coriolanus* with its lack of soliloquies is the most opaque Roman play. Where in *Julius Caesar*, Shakespeare allowed the reader to look into the private worlds of both Brutus and Julius Caesar as well as in their thoughts, in *Anthony and Cleopatra* he reduced the private world to bare minimum, utilizing ‘semi-soliloquies’⁵⁷ to explain characters’ motives. In *Coriolanus*, the private world is non-existent, everything is inferior to the public world and public places, not a single line is said without the presence of at least one other character. In the political tone, *Coriolanus* is closer to *Julius Caesar* than to *Anthony and Cleopatra*.

The world of *Coriolanus* is bleak and so is the language. It disrupts, persuades, lies in order to achieve the desired effect,⁵⁸ being transfigured and violated to an extent that cannot be summed up easily. Yet the language is the carrier of the constant tumult of Rome which from the beginning founds itself threatened from

56 A discussion on the dating of the play is in William Shakespeare, *The Tragedy of Coriolanus*, ed. R. B. Parker (1994; repr., Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 2–7. Line numbering will follow the same edition.

57 I use this term to refer to lines in which characters appear in presence of other characters and their lines may resemble a soliloquy. Such an example might be found in *Anthony and Cleopatra* in 1.2.121–130 or in 5.2.236–241.

58 More on the issue of language and its relation to the world see James L. Calderwood, “Coriolanus: Wordless Meanings and Meaningless Words,” *Studies in English Literature, 1500–1900* 6 (1966).

the inside as well as from the outside. A series of accidents which culminates in Coriolanus' banishment is pervaded with spiteful words which coming from the mouths of two radical adversaries carry the bane of Rome. Menenius who stands between these two extremes exercises great speech skills to attempt to settle and ease the tension between the two poles. He knows the true value of words and is a surrogate father to Coriolanus providing much needed guidance in the finer world of politics. To some extent, he reminds the audience of the corpulent knight in *Henry IV*, however Menenius still lacks the fine qualities and wisdom of Falstaff.

The analysis that will follow is going to be a shorter one. The emphasis on politics and on dichotomy skews the characters and what Shakespeare left of their emotions is hanging by a threat.

Coriolanus opens in a middle of a revolt. Rome suffers from a lack of corn which is according to the plebeians withheld by the patricians, and especially by Caius Martius,⁵⁹ to control the lower classes of the society. Martius is immediately recognized as the “chief enemy to the people” and his reputation is recognized as being motivated by selfish reason (1.1.7–8),

I say unto you, what he hath done famously,
He did it to that [proud] end. Though soft-conscienced
men can be content to say it was for his country, he
did it to please his mother and to be partly proud—
which he is, even to the altitude of his virtue. (1.1.33–37)

The second citizen defends him, “[w]hat he cannot help in his nature you / account a vice in him. You must in no way say he is / covetous” (1.1.38–40). The duality of perspectives provides the conundrum on how to interpret Martius' deeds. Both of the citizens speak truthfully, Martius is indeed driven by pride, however it is only a façade to a much bigger issue that Martius is struggling with personally.

Caroline Spurgeon notes that Coriolanus' “central symbol” is a “very definite one” that is “obvious, and rather laboured and overworked one at best.”⁶⁰ The fable of the body (see 1.1.93ff) sets the tone that permeates itself through the rest of the play and the hierarchical structure of the body resonates in other symbols as

59 Caius Martius is later given the name Coriolanus, ergo the names can be used interchangeably.

60 Caroline Spurgeon, *Shakespeare Imagery and What It Tells Us* (1935; repr., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 347f.

well.⁶¹ Menenius arrived first at the scene of the rebellion and tries to calm down the crowd knowing that when Martius will be present, the heated situation might get out of control. Indeed, Martius' first words to address the crowd are filled with his contempt towards the plebeians, "[w]hat's the matter, you dissentious rogues, / That, rubbing the poor itch of your opinion, / Make yourself scabs?" (1.1.161–63) and towards what they represent. He does not abate until he learns that the Volscian army is on the move.

Martius is married to the idea of Rome being a sovereign state which controls the outside as well as the inside. He is willing to sacrifice everything in attaining the dominance. Martius needs to live in a state of constant battle, or struggle, he is not fitted for a world of peace. For the battles outside of Rome provide him with valour and a sense of identity. In Rome he is constantly being commanded by his closest and attacked by those that he despises. Those are forces not in his control.

Martius' radical patriotism is altruistic. He rejects the spoils that Cominius tries to bestow on him, "I thank you, general, / But cannot make my sword my heart consent to take / A bribe to pay my sword" (1.10.35–37). Cominius does not realize that he is in fact making a mistake by trying to appraise Martius for who he is, not for his deeds. The recognition leads to events which will culminate in Martius' banishment.

The Senate is similarly obstinate. They fail to foresee what will happen when they name Coriolanus consul. They think that the consulship is a reward fitting a renowned warrior. However, warrior's virtue is valour, not honour and command of the "bolted language" of the politics (3.1.324). Valour is honour gained in battle and honour is recognition of one's deeds in the public sector. Both are virtues but both require a different skill set and hence are incompatible. The Senate's failure in assessing a situation will prove catastrophic in the long run, they know that Martius is not accepted well in the lower classes. One might argue that the plebeians in fact loved Martius once he returned victorious from Corioles (see 1.8.75–86, 2.1.158ff, and stage directions in 1.10.40), however, compare the scene to *Julius Caesar* 1.1 and one will find similar traits in the crowd mentality.

61 For a brief overview see Hilský, *Divadlo a jeviště svět*, 684. For a more general discussion see E. M. W. Tillyard, *The Elizabethan World Picture* (1943; repr., London: Penguin Books, 1990), 17–25, 33–44.

Martius' love for his country is selfless, however, the Senate perceives it as selfish and wishes to repay his "nothings."

Martius' relationship with his mother, Volumnia, is distressing and disturbing. When one first learns of her, she sheds light on her relationship with her son,

If my son were my husband
I should freelier rejoice in that absence wherein
he won honour than in the embracements of his bed
where he would show most love. (1.3.2–5)

and continues, "I had rather had eleven die nobly for their country than / one voluptuously surfeit out of action" (1.3.24–25). Her words are meant to console Virgilia, however they come from a proud woman with desires outside her reach. The absence of Martius' father gave Volumnia the opportunity to shape Martius to her liking and breed an efficient weapon that actively seeks warfare. He is an imprint of her that cannot lift his complex and free himself from his mother.

Martius will always be Volumnia's "boy." By losing control over him, she will lose the only item that gives her recognition in Rome, and she is willing to reside to manipulation and blackmail if all other means came to naught. Once Martius does not succeed in defending his status as a consul, Volumnia aptly recognizes that her reputation is threatened. Martius is aware that consulship is against his nature, however, Volumnia forces him to reconsider attacking his masculinity,

Cor.: Rather I play / The man I am.
Vol.: O, sir, sir, sir,
I would have had you put your power well on
Before you had worn it out.
Cor.: Let 't go.
Vol.: You might have been enough the man you are
With striving less to be so. Lesser had been
The trying of your dispositions if
You had not showed them how you were disposed
Ere they lacked the power to cross you. (3.2.15–23)

Yet Martius does not yield to her pressure and so Volumnia resorts to emotional blackmail (see 3.2.125–32) to which Martius subdues again, "Pray, be content. / Mother, I am going to the market-place. / Chide me no more" (3.2.132–34). In her presence, Martius is still her "boy," and fails to liberate himself from her power.

Once Martius is expelled from Rome, Volumnia's reputation is threatened. Undeniably, she greatly hates the plebeians, yet fears them as well. For when Rome is destroyed by the Volscian army, she might suffer a similar punishment as her son. Therefore, I think that her visit of Coriolanus when he leads the Volscian army is selfish. It is again in 5.3 in which Volumnia's manipulative craft is at its best. "But out, affection! / All bond and privilege of nature break; / Let it be virtuous to be obstinate" (5.3.24–26), proclaims Coriolanus, when he spots his mother, his wife, and his child. Coriolanus is indeed obstinate and when every possible mean to persuade Coriolanus is futile, Volumnia resorts to emotional blackmail again,

There is no man in the world
More bound to 's mother, yet here he lets me prate
Like on i'th' stocks. Thou hast never in thy life
Showed thy dear mother any courtesy,
When she, poor hen, fond of no second brood,
Has clucked thee to the wars and safely home,
Loaden with honour.
[. . .]

So, we will to Rome
And die among our neighbours.—Nay, behold's.
This boy, that cannot tell what he would have,
But kneels and holds up hands for fellowship (5.3.159–65, 173–
76)

The answer of Coriolanus is not surprising,

O mother, mother!
What have you done? Behold the heavens do ope,
The gods look down, and this unnatural scene
They laugh at. (5.3.183–86)

Not only the gods laugh but the Volscians laugh at Coriolanus as well. His subjection is in fact a renunciation of his masculinity and consequently his valour by which he was recognized and respected. It is his grave mistake not to remain obstinate, a mistake from which Aufidius will profit, "I am glad thou hast set thy mercy and thy honour / At difference in thee. Out of that I'll work / Myself a former fortune" (5.3.201–03).

In my reading, Volumnia is an eloquent, and manipulative woman that does not fear to utilize blackmail to gain what she desires. Her relationship with her son is

second to her relationship with honour. I did not find a hint of emotions projected towards her son, not even *storge*, the basest of loves. Reciprocity on which *storge* is based is in their case only a single channelling of Coriolanus' emotions. In his struggle to separate himself from his mother, Coriolanus inadvertently acknowledges her supremacy.

Friendship is the sole emotion Shakespeare explores in Coriolanus. It is not amity as between Brutus and Cassius, but rather amity based on mutual respect and admiration. It is camaraderie between generals, men respected for their valour. Their language is charged with homoerotic imagination, as when Martius, besmeared with blood greets Cominius, his general,

O, let me clip ye
In arms so sound as when I wooed, in heart
As mercy as when our nuptial day was done,
And tapers burnt to bedward! (1.7.29–32)

Cominius addresses him “Flower of warriors,” an oxymoronic expression that might threaten his masculinity in front of Cominius' soldiers. However, one can ignore the statement as being threatening, for it celebrates and recognizes the bond between them. Ironically, if one compares their greeting to Martius' reunion with Virgilia,

My gracious silence, hail.
Wouldst thou have laughed had I come coffined home,
That weep'st to see me triumph? Ah, my dear,
Such eyes the widows in Corioles wear,
And mothers that lack sons. (2.1.171–75)

One comes to learn that Martius is a loving husband, whose bride is the idea of death. The reunion should be a merry event, however, Coriolanus paints Virgilia fantasizing about the death he caused.

The strong enmity between Martius and Aufidius is based on equality. “I sin in envying his nobility,” confesses Martius openly and likens their competition to a lion hunt (1.1.228, 233–34). Similarly, when they meet face-to-face in battle, Aufidius says, “We hate alike” (1.9.2). They engage in battle with no result, Martius suffered a wound and Aufidius suffered a wounded valour. This urges him to declare his vendetta,

Mine emulation
Hath not that honour in't it had, for where
I thought to crush him in an equal force,
True sword to sword, I'll potch at him some way,
Or wrath or craft may get him. (1.11.12–16)

If Aufidius cannot defeat Martius in battle, he will do so with treachery. He as well bases his renown and masculinity on valour. As long as Martius lives, he is the “stain” on Aufidius’ valour.

An opportunity is presented when Martius in his naïveté seeks haven in Antium. Martius, having been banished from Rome, wishes to join forces with the Volsces to strike a retaliating offence. He hopes to find in the hatred of Rome a form of understanding of his present situation, however, Martius muses,

O world, thy slippery turns!
[. . .]
So fellest foes,
Whose passions and whose plots have broke their sleep
Some trick not worth an egg, shall grow dear friends
And interjoin their issues. So with me.
My birthplace hate I, and my love’s upon
This enemy town. I’ll enter. (4.4.12, 18–24)

It is possible to argue that Martius is aware of the slippery nature of the future, would-be friendship.

When Martius meets Aufidius in his house, he offers him either his “services [that] might prove / As benefits” or his throat “which not to cut would show [Aufidius] but a fool” (4.5.90–91, 98). It is an attack on Aufidius’ integrity, however strong, is spoken from a position of submission in which Martius temporarily relinquishes his superiority, preferring equality over dominance. Aufidius readily dispels any previous enmity, “O Martius, Martius! / Each word thou hast spoke hath weeded from my heart / A root of ancient envy / [. . .] / Let me twine / Mine arms about that body” (4.5.102–04, 107–08) while confirming their sameness and competitiveness rooted in the sameness,

Here I clip
The anvil of my sword, and do contest
As hotly and as nobly with thy love

As ever in ambitious strength I did
Contend against thy valour. (4.5.110–14)

Aufidius' recognition of Martius as his "friend" is confirmed with words similar to those of Martius to Cominius,

Know thou first,
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. (4.5.114–19)

The homoerotic desires apply to their relationship as well, and they are strengthened when Aufidius tells Martius of his dreams, "I have nightly since / Dreamt of encounters 'twixt thyself and me— / We have been down together in my sleep, / Unbuckling helms, fisting each other's throat—" (4.5.123–27). As Martius dreamt of violence when he was reunited with Virgilia, Aufidius dreams of violence in terms of erotics.

Martius is given command over a half of Aufidius' troops. The equality which should have defined their relationship is soon transformed again into Martius' sovereignty. "You are darkened in his actions," tells a lieutenant to Aufidius, to which Aufidius replies that his action of befriending Martius "shall break his neck or mine / Whene'er we come to our account" (4.7.5, 25–26). Aufidius has started a dangerous game he is aware of, the outcome of which will either be his death or his victory. It is a plan how to regain the superiority which he himself subjected to the friendship. Martius' surrender to claims of his mother only serve to Aufidius' justification of Martius' murder, but the murder would have happened even if Martius stood true to his promise and defeated Rome, "When, Caius, Rome is thine, / Thou art poor'st of all; then shortly art thou mine" (4.7.56–57).

Shakespeare in 5.7 again recalls the infatuation with hierarchy. Marius is returned to Rome and celebrated as the bearer of the peace, which enables Aufidius to complete his fiendish plan. When they meet again for the last time, the amity between them is a buried and they struggle for supremacy in battle once again. Aufidius having named Martius "boy of tears" assails Martius' masculinity and inflames their ancient rivalry (5.6.103). "Boy" in the context of the play is an

offensive word, it is a discredit of one's martial prowess, and attacking Martius in his weak spot enrages him. Yet it also provides evidence that neither of them is ready to attenuate their valour.

Martius' death effectively killed Aufidius' 'rage.' It is an emotion as well as a symbol for Martius whose death brought reconciliation. Their friendship at the beginning was meant to resemble an almost perfect form of friendship based on reciprocity, sameness, and respect. However honest were Aufidius' words when he met Martius is Actium for the first time, they are soon belittled and the friendship is recognized as friendship for usefulness, at the same time leading to realize that Aufidius is not different from Martius in his infatuation with masculinity, hierarchy, and superiority. Their relationship is based on envy of their opposite that forces them to compete in excellence. Shakespeare also shows that what is to be a true friendship takes long time to develop, the emotion cannot be felt instantly.

The only traceable amount of emotion of any sort is in this relationship between Martius and Aufidius. Aufidius being Martius outside of Rome understands his resentment and provides refuge after Martius' solitary voyage to fulfil his grudge against the city he adored the most. However, I was not able to find definite instances which would support my idea that love influences decisions the characters make. One could argue that Volumnia fits within the limits of this notion, however I am not convinced that feelings she expresses towards her son are based on positive and affectionate emotions. In 5.3 she persuades Martius to end his crusade and he complies because of love he feels to his closest family. This might be the only instance in which emotions influence decisions.

Shakespeare repeats the *modus* he used in *Julius Caesar*. Martius had never been a person fit to be a public servant. It was not his conscious choice to become a consul, he was presented the position as a recognition of his loyal service to Rome. Military and political careers should never be held by the same person, for both require a unique skill set. The institutions of newly emerging Roman republic have no needs for heroes,⁶² they will celebrate political prowess. It was hinted at

62 See Katharine Eisaman Maus, "Coriolanus," in *The Norton Shakespeare*, ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al, 2788.

in *Coriolanus* and *Anthony and Cleopatra* will confirm what was started in fifth century BC.

5. Julius Caesar

“Wilt thou lift up Olympus?”

Written in 1599, *Julius Caesar* was Shakespeare’s first use of North’s translation of Plutarch’s *Lives of the Noble Greeks and Romans* and his second attempt to stage a play from the Roman period in an Elizabethan theatre.⁶³ *Julius Caesar*, unlike *Coriolanus* and *Anthony and Cleopatra*, follows Plutarch more closely. The play takes place between 45 (44) BC, the year of Caesar’s defeat of Pompey’s sons and 42 BC, when the Battle of Philippi took place, and retells the story of Caesar’s assassination and the pursuit and death of his killers, Caius Cassius and Marcus Brutus.⁶⁴ The period which is discussed in the play frames a crucial time of the Roman Republic in which republicanism was threatened by imperialism, personified in Julius Caesar. He was a general and a politician whose military exploits brought him fame and grew strong enough to confront the Senate and consequently Rome.⁶⁵

The events of three years are condensed in five acts and follow two falls, contradictory to the title of the play. One being the fall of Julius Caesar, the second the fall of Brutus. I am inclined to say that *Julius Caesar* is more a tragedy of Brutus than its titular hero.⁶⁶ In comparison with other Shakespeare’s tragedies, *Julius Caesar* opens shortly before Caesar is to be named emperor, and although he makes a series of mistakes, none of them stand out as tragic.⁶⁷ The play does not build up on events that led to Caesar’s death. His presence on the stage is abruptly ended in act 3, from which the play changes the course of events and the focus is shifted to the conspirators and to their pursuers, Antony and Octavius. However, one can sense the presence of Caesar’s ‘spirit’ in the second half. By giving prominence to Brutus and Cassius in the second part, Shakespeare slightly

63 It is not audacious to argue that Roman plays were popular in Elizabethan and Jacobean drama. To name a few: *Caesar and Pompey* by George Chapman; *Cleopatra* by Samuel Daniel; *The Virtuous Octavia* by Samuel Brandon.

64 There were more conspirators, however the play focuses the story of these two.

65 For a discussion of Caesar’s rise to power, see Lily Ross Taylor, “The Rise of Julius Caesar,” *Greece & Rome* 4 (1957). For a discussion of the use of his power see Robert S. Miola, “Julius Caesar and the Tyrannicide Debate,” *Renaissance Quarterly* 38 (1985).

66 I will not discuss the genre. All of Shakespeare’s Roman plays are tragedies/histories as they deal with events important in the canon of world history.

67 More on the topic of tragic errors see D. J. Palmer, “Tragic Error in *Julius Caesar*,” *Shakespeare Quarterly* 21 (1970).

overlooks Antony and Octavius. In 4.1 and in 5.1 he hints that there might be a sequel to *Julius Caesar*, as the actions of Antony and Octavius are left unnoticed.

The play may also be perceived as political in dealing with the struggle between republicanism and imperialism. The struggle is then carried between two factions, one of which has to logically emerge victorious. Yet, I believe that the contradictory views of both factions are only background against which Shakespeare portrayed the more prominent aspect of the play, choice and dilemma. The motif of choice permeates the fabric of the play and is strikingly visible in Brutus, the “noblest Roman of them all” (5.5.69).⁶⁸ Nevertheless, politics are not absent and compose a vital part of the plot. One of its aspects which are political is oration, for which the Romans were well-known. Simply put: you can sway a crowd with big words.

Julius Caesar poses complexities on how to perceive the play. Mildred Hartsock writes,

[. . .] Julius Caesar cannot be resolved and [] Shakespeare’s use of his source shows that he did not intend for them to be resolved. This is not to call the play a dramatic failure[.] [. . .] One cannot settle the matter by looking at any one of the four principal people: the meaning of one involves the meaning of all.⁶⁹

The “principal people” are intertwined and without considering that one provides clues how to interpret another character is misinterpretation. Only then we can see the *logic* behind individual’s motives. That does not mean, that the less “principal people” do not contribute to the overall perception of the play, even 1.1, 3.2, and 3.3 provide elements on how we are to treat the play at its base.

Politics are the background against which we must assess the motives of individual characters. A political alliance, known as the First triumvirate, of which Caesar was a member ceased to exist, because of the growing rivalry between Julius Caesar and Pompey the Great. Julius Caesar’s growing power resulted in disposition of Pompey and his followers who would still oppose Caesar.

68 Line numbering will follow Oxford’s 1984 edition by Arthur Humphreys. William Shakespeare, *Julius Caesar*, ed. Arthur Humphreys (1984; repr., Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008).

69 Mildred E. Hartsock, “The Complexity of Julius Caesar,” *PMLA* 81 (1966): 58

Caesar is now returning to Rome which celebrates him as a hero. The celebration is not well received by Flavius and Marullus, tribunes of the people who, with Caesar's growing influence, fear his clandestine intentions. The opening scene in which these two tribunes argue with the representatives of the common people, a carpenter and a cobbler, is, additionally to being humorous, also full of puns.⁷⁰ However, the scene is vital in showing the general mood of Caesar's reception. "How like a deer, stricken by many princess", says Antony of dead Caesar (3.1.209), the fear then accumulates only in the hearts of politicians, not in the hearts of the common folk. Marullus points out the indifference,

O you hard hearts, you cruel men of Rome,
Knew you not Pompey? Many a time and oft
Have you climbed up to walls and battlements,
To towers and windows, yea, to chimney-tops,
Your infant in your arms, and there have sat
The livelong day, with patient expectation,
To see great Pompey pass the streets of Rome. (1.1.36–42)

The commoners are not interested in who leads them, as long as they have somebody to celebrate. They do not see Caesar as a tyrant, they see him as a person which spreads the fame of Rome. Tribunes are resolved to pluck the feathers from Caesar's wings, so that the ceremonies do not encourage him to "soar above the view of men" (1.1.73). However, shortly after Caesar is murdered, Brutus talks to the public, justifying his motives, situating them in a greater framework. Once Brutus finishes his speech, the watching plebeians cry out, "Let him be Caesar" and "Caesar's better parts / Shall be crowned in Brutus," ironizing Brutus' idea of his task (3.2.50–51). Should he be the new ruler, he will be a better version of Caesar.

What the tribunes fear is Caesar's spirit, and to what lengths is he willing to go to picture himself positively. For his first appearance on the stage does not reflect his magnanimousness. He is surrounded by a troop of followers, which may act as bodyguards, the most loyal of them, Antony, recognizes Caesar's stature, "When Caesar says 'Do this', it is performed" (1.1.10). Caesar is not given to any superstition as he dismissed the soothsayer as "a dreamer" (1.2.24), after he is

⁷⁰ See Athanasios Boulukos, "The Cobbler and the Tribunes in 'Julius Caesar'," *MLN* 119 (2004) for a discussion of puns in this scene

invited to “[l]ook upon Caesar” (1.2.21). Not paying heed to unnatural occurrences and warnings is Caesar’s ‘philosophy’. The initial perception of Caesar is framed with arrogance, with god-like ideas—traits which are not accepted by some of the politicians. The assassination seems to be almost justifiable.

The art of oration was one of the skills an able politician ought to master. Public space of *Julius Caesar* reflects the outcomes oration could deliver in persuading disinterested parties to join one’s cause. Although Caesar made “good showing in his speeches,”⁷¹ Shakespeare does not permit him to utilize it and apart from two longer entries in 3.1, Caesar’s public appearance is limited to short sentences. Brutus, Cassius, and Antony are given situations in which they can utilize their art. Brutus and Cassius tend to use the same style to address their audience; Antony from reasons to be known uses a different style. After Caesar and his train has left, Cassius and Brutus are left alone. Their conversation is key in how to interpret their characters and their consequent actions. Cassius employs rhetoric to gain advantage over Brutus and secure his favour. His technique and words are not invented on the spot, but rather carefully prepared and rehearsed speech in order to provoke thought. He does not want to win Brutus straight away, Cassius is too cunning and knows that Brutus’ adamant mind will not be subjected easily. Brutus is an educated man, a man of philosophy, and his person is identified with an almost perfect picture of a Roman public servant. However, everyone is fallible and Cassius realizes that.

Therefore Cassius offers a mirror in order to reflect a Brutus, the Brutus does not know about, a hidden potential. “That you would have me seek into myself / For that which is not in me?” asks Brutus Cassius, to which Cassius replies,

Therefore, good Brutus, be prepared to hear.
And since you know you cannot see yourself
So well as by reflection, I, your glass,
Will modestly discover to yourself
That of yourself which you yet know not of (1.2.64–70)

Yet Brutus is man who does not want to change his situation, because he enjoys renown. Therefore he says, “I do fear the people / Choose Caesar for their king”

⁷¹ Taylor, “The Rise of Julius Caesar,” 13.

(1.2.79–80), in other words, with the will of people I cannot do nothing about. Later he adds, “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 / [. . .] I love / The name of honour more than I fear death” (1.2.85–89). Death is ephemeral, honour is ever-lasting. Brutus’ honour is diametrically different from Hotspur’s and from Coriolanus’ honour. For Hotspur and Coriolanus, honour is won in battle, it is the recognition of one’s deeds when facing grave danger. Their honour is valour. Brutus’ honour, on the other hand, is gained in times of peace and is a reflection of one’s qualities, one’s dedication to public services. To be honourable is to be known for one’s strength of character. Ironically, his strongest feature is his *kryptonite* and Cassius realizes that, “Well, Brutus, thou art noble, yet I see / Thy honourable mettle may be wrought / From that it is disposed. [. . .] For who so firm that cannot be seduced?” (1.2.305–07, 309). To mask his cause even greater, he will toss messages “from several citizen, [. . .] tending to the great opinion / That Rome holds of his [Brutus] name” (1.2.314–16).

In Cassius’ speech, Caesar is a mere mortal, not the god-like character, he portrays himself. Why would then Caesar be the omnipotent ruler of the world and they only his underlings? Cassius’ speech (1.2.90–131) is his personal abhorrence, possibly his reason behind Caesar’s disposition, but it also points out Cassius’ ambition. He does not believe that the events which led to Caesar’s current might were gods’ plans, “The fault, dear Brutus, is not in our stars, / But in ourselves” (1.2.140–41).⁷² By the time Caesar arrives back from the Capitol, Cassius’ reasoning has succeeded and has disrupted Brutus’ current view of affairs, he “had rather be a villager / Than to repute himself a son of Rome / Under these hard conditions as this time / Is like to lay upon us” (1.2.172–75).

Cassius persuasion relies partly on attacking mutual love, “I have not from your eyes that gentleness / And show of love as I was wont to have. / You bear to stubborn and to strange a hand / Over your friend that loves you” (1.2.33–36). Their love is their bond of friendship. By situating himself to be a mirror to Brutus, Cassius plays on the Aristotelian idea that true friendship is based on

⁷² Cassius probably followed Epicureanism (see 5.1.77), a philosophy that holds that gods do not interest themselves in the affairs of men. More on this topic in David Konstan, “Epicurus,” in *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, accessed March 03, 2016, <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/epicurus/>.

equality and that true friends serve to enhance the other's self and virtuosity. Cassius uses this idea as an entry point to further manipulate Brutus, for it is reasonable to argue that Brutus would have dismissed Cassius' idea in the first place.

Saturnine Caesar is returning from the Capitol and intercepts Brutus and Cassius. The hostility between Caesar and Cassius is mutual and Caesar rightly observes than Cassius "thinks too much. Such men are dangerous" (1.2.195). This is an instance in which Caesar commits a mistake by not making his intuition his cause of perturbation, because his name is not liable to fear. This is his public persona speaking. Whilst at the Capitol, Caesar three times refused the crown presented to him. In my reading of his character, this was premeditated. He cannot accept the crown just yet as it would be hasty. The refusal caters his credit and his image as a humble and morally strong politician. His glumness sprung from his fall at the market, a public place. This was unexpected and might undermine his carefully constructed aura.

Casca informs Brutus and Cassius what happened at the Capitol and one can spot the difference in his speech. His manner is more relaxed, not flowery. It is possibly another distinction between the personal and public space in Rome. Although they are talking at a public place, the speech is not aimed to persuade.

The Elizabethans believed that "order in the state duplicates the order of the macrocosmos."⁷³ In several Shakespeare's play, unnatural phenomena occur before a sinister action which dramatically changes the natural order happens. This is visible in *Macbeth*, shortly before Duncan is murdered, when the horses eat each other, the owl attacks a falcon, and whenever the witches appear on stage. More notably is this visible in *King Lear* in which Shakespeare makes use of unnatural occurrences on a grander scale. Lear's storm within his mind is reflected in the stormy nature during his voyage.⁷⁴ Thus directly after we learn about Cassius' plan, Casca reports that he went "through a tempest dropping fire" (1.3.10), he saw a flaming hand of a slave, lions loose in the streets, burning men,

73 Tillyard, *The Elizabethan World Picture*, 96.

74 Storm is also incorporated in various film adaptations of Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein*. The force of the roaring tempest gives live to an unnatural abomination.

he spotted an owl in the middle of a day.⁷⁵ He is superstitious, but cannot make much sense of it, he cannot positively link the occurrences with the forthcoming assassination. Cassius roams the streets like a madman, he pays attention to what is happening around him. He is resolute to carry out his mission, if it means to commit suicide in an unwanted outcome.⁷⁶

There are two instances in the play in which Shakespeare invites the audience into the private lives of the protagonists—these scenes occur directly after each other and are mirroring themselves. There are also the rare instances in which women appear, but their role is not diminished. Both of the women, Portia, wife of Brutus, and Calpurnia, wife of Caesar, fulfil several roles. Milan Lukeš notes that women in Shakespeare's histories or tragedies fulfil the role of a dedicated and caring wife, a disruptive element, and a helpless victim.⁷⁷ However, contrary to his observation, Portia and Calpurnia are both also very perceptive and intelligent, almost forming the rational part of their husbands. Therefore Portia questions Brutus about the nature of his perplexity. This whole scene feels to me like Brutus' dream (2.1.65, cf. with 2.1.46, 48), in which Brutus 1, the conspirator, tries to persuade Brutus 2, the moral person, about the validity of Caesar's murder. The persuasion is reflected in the ornate language. Yet as Brutus insists that he has "no personal cause to spurn" at Caesar (2.1.11), some lines after one may feel that he has now started to hate him personally. Brutus' orchard is the meeting place of the conspirators and Lucius, the attendant to Brutus, goes to the gate to invite the conspirators in. When he returns, he reports that "their hats are plucked about their ears" (2.1.73). The whole charade reminds me of a secret cult, but Brutus does not see this, he only sees the faces of his comrades. Yet why so secretive? If the *people* want to remain under republicanism, it must be a public undertaking. Do the conspirators fear for their lives by being spotted with Cassius? Nevertheless, there is a parallel at play here, in which Cassius and his train resemble Caesar and his train in 1.2. For such a task, Cassius needed to recruit followers, as Caesar did; he is dedicated to his cause, as Caesar is; he believes that Rome needs to be rid of

75 Cf. Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, ed. E. J. Kenney, trans. A. D. Melville (1986; repr. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 376, xv. 785–814. *Metamorphoses* are the source for these phenomena, since Plutarch does not mention them in his *Lives*.

76 Suicide was permissible within Epicurean doctrine.

77 Milan Lukeš, *Shakespeare a okolí: II. Shakespeareovské souvislosti* (Praha: Svět a divadlo ve spolupráci s Institutem umění – Divadelním ústavem, 2010), 155.

Caesar, as Caesar believes that Rome needs to be rid of its relative freedom. This lead me to assess that Cassius is in fact not different from Caesar.

Unlike Caesar, Cassius loses command of his plan. He needs Brutus, he needs someone intimately close to Caesar and someone of whom public thinks highly of, a man of integrity. Brutus is the one who now leads the group. When they are deciding whether to kill Mark Antony or spare him, Brutus intervenes and vouches for his safety, because Antony is “but a limb of Caesar” and is given to revelry (2.1.166). “Our course will seem to bloody, Caius Cassius, / To cut the head off and then hack the limbs, / [. . .] Let us be sacrificers, but not butchers, Caius. / [. . .] Let’s kill him [Caesar] boldly, but not wrathfully; / Let’s carve him as a dish fit for the gods” (2.1.163–64, 167, 173–74), says Brutus to the conspirators. The clash between the idealism of Brutus and practicality of Cassius is apparent here, since Cassius wants to murder Antony from fear of punishment, but Brutus remains constant and spares Antony. Brutus believes that only Caesar embodies the tyranny. I believe that, in fact, Brutus errs not once, but twice—the saving of Antony being first. As Brutus persuaded himself, in the process he sacrificed his carefully catered soul.

The following scene shows Caesar in his private world, even in his nightgown, wandering in thunder and lightning after Calpurnia dreamt about his death. Caesar recognizes that something is amiss and even Calpurnia bids him to stay, but he dismisses this idea based on his status, itself emitting fear. Calpurnia who “never stood on ceremonies” urges Caesar to not go to the Capitol on that day because of her dreadful dream (2.2.13). Caesar tries to persuade her, as he had his followers, that he is no commoner and does not pay attention to the supernatural, but at the end he succumbs to her wishes and promises to stay home. However, after commanding Decius to bear his message of his absence, Decius questions him and questions his cause. “This dream is all amiss interpreted. / It was a vision fair and fortunate” (2.2.83–84), he informs Caesar. The interpretation of dreams is always problematic in the sense that one cannot fully grasp a definite meaning. Calpurnia’s vision is catastrophic but Decius uses the dream to his advantage. The whole conspiracy rests on his shoulders, he cannot fail, otherwise all would be in vain. Therefore he offers his interpretation, which, as he knows, will please the

great Caesar whilst simultaneously diminishing the importance of Calpurnia's presence. With Decius' persuasion Caesar becomes vain, and his intuition fails him again. He should have listened to Calpurnia, but that would lesser his importance.

The end of the scene is almost anti-climactic in the sense that Caesar invites the body of conspirators to drink some wine, "Good friends, go in, and taste some wine with me, / And we, like friends, will straightway go together" (2.2.126–27). All of them behave, as they agreed, as Roman actors.

"The Ides of March are come" and Caesar in a triumphant gait is heading to Capitol to receive the crown (3.1.1). On his way, he does not pay attention to Artemidorus who is to present a proof that Caesar's life is endangered. Caesar's reply, "What touches us ourself shall be last served" (3.1.8), is Caesar in public persona, and is again indifferent to events touching his person; some may perceive this as an act of greatness, some of calculation. When the conspirators start kneeling around Caesar and asking to pardon Publius Cimber, Caesar utters (I will quote the entirety because it is such a masterful expression of arrogance that one almost does not feel sorry for what is about to happen),

I could be well moved, if I were as you;
If I could pray to move, prayers would move me.
But I am constant as the northern star,
Of whose true-fixed and resting quality
There is no fellow in the firmament.
The skies are painted with unnumbered sparks,
They are all fire, and every one doth shine;
But there's but one in all doth hold his place.
So in the world: 'tis furnished well with men,
And men are flesh and blood, and apprehensive;
Yet in the number I do know but one
That unassailable holds on his rank,
Unshaked of motion; and that I am he,
Let me a little show, even in this –
That I was constant Cimber should be banished,
And constant do remain to keep him so.
[. . .]
Hence! Wilt thou lift up Olympus? (3.1.58–74)

The last line is Caesar's transcendence of arrogance and self-absorption.

The murder is a spectacle of its own. His ‘friends’ surround him and Casca administers the initial blow from behind; the rest joins and Brutus joins the last person. This is the culmination of the unnatural sightings, and if the Romans did not know, how to interpret them, now they have understood as they show signs of panic. “[L]et no man abide this deed / But we the doers” (3.1.94–95), says Brutus and contradicts his persuasion that the murder was requested by the people. It is possible he has diverted from the initial believe and fears that punishment might take place.

Mark Antony did not witness Caesar’s murder as Trebonius led him away. Antony then sends a servant through whom he asks of Brutus’ audience, which he is granted. ‘Welcome, Mark Antony!’ speaks Brutus (3.1.147), to which Antony answers, “O mighty Caesar! Dost thou lie so low? / Are all thy conquests, glories, triumphs, spoils, / Shrunk to this little measure? Fare thee well” (3.1.148–50). He rightfully fears that he might be disposed of as well, but Brutus assures him that it will not be the case. Strikingly, majority of lines that Antony utters are directed towards Caesar’s body. Antony requests to speak at Caesar’s funeral, which is granted as well. Brutus’ intention is clear, “Caesar shall / Have all true rites, and lawful ceremonies, / It shall advantage more than do us wrong” (3.1.240–42), he still holds his shield of honour and wants to show compassion even when he may be called murderer. Cassius is warier and urges Brutus not to consent, “Know you how much the people may be moved / By that which he will utter?” (3.1.234–35). Brutus does not heed Cassius’ warning and gullibly trusts Antony that he will not counter their activities. This is Brutus’ second mistake of grave consequences. When they clear the stage, Mark Antony soliloquises, refuting his promises.

The scene in 3.1 when Antony’s messenger enters is of importance here. It sheds light on the hierarchy of ‘emotions’ an honourable Roman upholds. The messenger reports Antony’s words, “Say I love Brutus and I honour him; / Say I feared Caesar, honoured him, and loved him” (3.1.128–29). The specific order of verbs serves again to manipulate one’s prospective decision. By referring to friendship first, Antony secures Brutus’ favour and gives himself a window to devise a plan. It is reminiscent of Cassius’ first address of Brutus, revealing that the word ‘love’ denoting friendship has a strong influence. By claiming friendship

first, Antony defines his equality and virtuousness. By honouring their relationship, Antony professes a sign of respect, and Brutus is left with no other chance than to consent to meet Antony.

Mark Antony's presence in the play was predominantly associated with Julius Caesar. Shakespeare does not hint at the relationship between Brutus and Antony, but it is reasonable to expect that they must have shared some sort of relationship, since both were associated with Julius Caesar. Antony's fear tied him irreversibly to Caesar making it the primordial emotion defining their association. According to Antony, there was no friendship felt, if it was it sprung from the previous two states—fear and honour. However, Antony's sincerity of his statement may easily be refuted by his following actions.

Mark Antony likes the people to believe that he is a reveller. He is a surprisingly cunning tactician, well-aware of his abilities. He is no politician, but a skilled warrior. As such, he is not inclined to employ oratory when he addresses the public. Thomas Wilson in *The Arte of Rhetorique* writes,

Therefore, when the hearers are somewhat calmed, we may enter by little and little into the matter and say that those things which our adversary doth mislike in the person accused we also do mislike the same.

And when the hearers are thus won, we may say that all which was said nothing toucheth us and that we mind to speak nothing at all against our adversaries, neither this was nor that way. Neither were it wisdom openly to speak against them which are generally well esteemed and taken for honest men. And yet, it were not amiss for the furtherance of our own causes closely to speak our fantasy, and so straight to alter their hearts.

[. . .]

Among all other lessons, this should first be learned, that we never affect any strange inkhorn terms, but so speak as is commonly received, neither seeking to be overfine, nor yet living overcareless, using our speech as most men do, and ordering our wits as the fewest have done.⁷⁸

Precisely this technique Antony uses, he chooses simple words and at the end he rouses the crowd that it becomes an angry mob which will seek justice on those

78 Thomas Wilson, *Arte of Rhetorique*, in *Shakespeare's World: Background Readings in the English Renaissance*, eds. Gerald M. Pinciss, and Roger Lockyer (New York: Continuum, 1990), 175–176, 178.

that murdered Caesar. Indeed some twenty lines after the end of the speech, Brutus and Cassius are driven out of Rome. However, not only words did persuade the crowd, Antony fiendishly exploits Caesar's dead body so that it becomes a relic, a symbol of profanity, and additionally he reads Caesar's will which discloses his generosity. Although Brutus promised Cassius that he will personally oversee Antony's speech, Brutus erroneously leaves Antony to talk freely.

Not only does "the power-game and competition in flattery"⁷⁹ unfavourably influences the current state of Rome, it appears that commoners, under the spell of the orators, behave irrationally. Cinna the Poet leaves his house and encounters the mob, roused to action by Antony in the previous scene. By having the same name as one of the conspirators, Cinna pays with his life. This scene shows the mentality of a gang that is determined to push their resolution to extreme limits.

First Plebeian: Your name, sir, truly.

Cinna: Truly, my name is Cinna.

First Plebeian: Tear him to pieces, he's a conspirator!

Cinna: I am Cinna the poet! I am Cinna the poet!

Fourth Plebeian: Tear him for his bad verses, tear him for his bad verses!

Cinna: I am not Cinna the conspirator.

Fourth Plebeian: It is no matter, his name's Cinna! (3.3.26–32)

The plebeians then dismember him and proceed to hunt down the real conspirators. This scene is immediately followed by the meeting of the second triumvirate of Antony, Octavius, and Lepidus.

The meeting of Antony, Octavius, and Lepidus is a mirror scene to the meeting of the conspirators in Brutus' orchard in 2.1. Where the conspirators appeared as gentle in their decisions, the newly formed triumvirate is not. What they have put down is a purge, sacrificing even their close relatives with ease. Their apathy is miraculous. Is this the ideal the conspirators wanted to achieve? Antony and Octavius position themselves as the leaders, with Lepidus is a mere appendix. Octavius defends Lepidus' name but Antony has no feelings towards Lepidus. I

⁷⁹ Margot Heinemann, "Political Drama," in *The Cambridge Companion to English Renaissance Drama*, eds. A. R. Braunmuller and Michael Hattaway (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 178.

believe that is the reason, as to why was Lepidus deposed in *Antony and Cleopatra*.

The night before the battle Cassius and Brutus struggle to settle their differences. “Before the eyes of both our armies here, / Which should perceive nothing but love from us, Let us not wrangle” (4.2.44–45), because the hostility of honourable men could prove disastrous for their current enterprise. Brutus chides Cassius for not sending the promised financial support, for his “proud heart,” and for his choleric nature, to which Cassius replies, “A friend should bear his friend’s infirmities” (4.2.137). It is expectable that Brutus would by this time be crossed with Cassius’ original idea. These infirmities, Brutus correctly recognizes were “practise[d]” on him. Cassius, being desperate and weary from the situation that has gone astray, accuses Brutus,

Cas.: You love me not.

Bru.: I do not like your faults.

Cas.: A friendly eye could never see such faults.

Bru.: A flatterer’s would not, though they do appear
As huge as high Olympus. (4.2.140–43)

Cassius uses the old and familiar technique of attacking and questioning one’s inclination towards the other.

It is almost imperative that Brutus and Cassius would reach reconciliation. “For shame, you generals! [. . .] / Love and be friends, as two such men should be” (4.2.180–81), morally rebukes them a poet, struggling to enter their tent. Cassius and Brutus are a perfect example which shows that friendship is capable of condonation. The difference in their characters and natures is tested in their relationship and, unlike *storge* or *eros*, friendship is allowed to continue due to its “flexibility.”

Caesar’s ghost is Brutus’ haunting consciousness. Unlike the ghost of the assassinated king in *Hamlet* in 1.1. Caesar’s is visible only to Brutus, it might as well be a hallucination because of the “murd’rous slumber” (4.2.317). That might be a possible explanation as to why Brutus does not recognise the ghost, “Art thou any thing? / Art thou some god, some angel, or some devil”, to which the ghost answers, “Thy evil spirit, Brutus” (4.2.328–29, 332). Caesar’s spirit is also the legacy that lives within Brutus. However, he seems to not mind that the ghost is

an ill omen and looks forward to meeting him again at Philippi. Earlier in the scene, Brutus assessed his acts retrospectively and concluded that their intention might have seemed noble, but now went astray, allowing for doubt to enter his mind. In my view, the doubt is the haunting ghost of Caesar and the fact that Brutus has almost come to terms with the notion that their cause will lose (cf. 4.2.277).

Caesar's revenge by killing Cassius and Brutus is not carried out by Caesar's followers, they only provide the settings that influence the decisions of the two. Cassius' sight "was ever thick" and he relies on the vision of others to report the news of the fight (5.3.21). Pindarus, Cassius' personal slave, uses Cassius' defect to his advantage. He tricks him into believing that Titinius was slain (5.3.28–33) and when Cassius asks Pindarus to kill him, Pindarus complies without hesitancy and by killing Cassius sets himself free. "Caesar, thou are revenged" cries Cassius and affirms what the audience has been expecting (5.3.46). The ghost of Caesar's hovers over Philippi and is now finalizing his doom. Ironically, Cassius' death was premature, for the battle was favouring the rebels and Titinius survived.

The battle weary Brutus has by now collected the "poor remains of friends" and one by one entrusts them with the task of killing him (5.5.1). They all refuse, but Brutus is adamant in his resolve, he knew, this our would come, "Night hangs upon mine eyes; my bones would rest, / That have but laboured to attain this hour" (5.5.41–42). Brutus is a politician, no warrior used to the dreary task of fighting and the death of Cassius affects him greatly. The killing of Brutus is metaphorical in its nature, for Brutus killed himself after agreeing to Cassius' proposal. Brutus asks Strato to hold his sword and he impales himself with ease on the sword that killed Caesar.

Julius Caesar shows that even when one decapitates the head of the body, the body will continue to live. It was a dreadful mistake of Brutus to join another man's cause. Howsoever was Brutus indispensable in the murder, a vicious killing, acted upon one man's grudge and a notion of personal failure, will never go unpunished. Brutus' belief in the validity of his act prevents him to use Caesar as a scapegoat; Antony is well-aware of the value of Caesar's body and turns him

into a martyr. The circle of revenge is now closed, the weapons that killed Caesar and released his ghost ended the lives of the conspirators.

Brutus is, like Coriolanus, a man that was not destined to perform the task others persuaded him to do. Where Coriolanus was more or less forced to consulship, Brutus makes a conscious decision to kill Caesar. The moment Brutus gullibly believed Cassius that their intentions are noble, he sealed his fate from which he could not have recuperated no matter his efforts.

Shakespeare in *Julius Caesar* explores the boundaries of friendship and in the actions of Brutus and Cassius tries to provide an answer whether or not the concept of ideal friendship is admissible in a world dominated by political sleight. The answer which Shakespeare provides is unfavourable. Cassius' manipulative lines are, as he says, rooted in his love for Brutus, however one soon learns that what he calls love is just a word which resonates in Brutus as strongly as honour does. It is a safe word one can fall back on to bury past misdoings. Friendship is portrayed as an emotion equally as destructive as *eros*. Yet friendship is punished more severely than *eros*, because the 'victim' believes that his friend performs an action in honesty, ergo not violating the trust that is established between them. Persuasion then can use the veil of mutual trust to mask true intentions and to advance one's, even purely selfish, cause.

6. Anthony and Cleopatra⁸⁰

“The stroke of death is a lover’s pinch”

Anthony and Cleopatra was Shakespeare’s second excursion into the realm of Ancient Rome. Chronologically it is the last play, taking place between 41 BC to 30 BC. The First triumvirate ended with the death of Julius Caesar, and the threat of Rome becoming an empire was temporarily evaded. Caius Cassius and Marcus Brutus were hunted down and the pursuers, Octavius Caesar and Marcus Antonius, along with Lepidus, entered the Second triumvirate. They became the unlimited rulers of the then known Earth, each of them having one third of the Roman empire under its command. Italy remained under command of the Senate.

The Second triumvirate had slowly begun to resemble the First triumvirate in the area of interpersonal and interpolitical relationships. In a group of politicians who are united under a common goal, one is liable to soon try to have the upper hand. The play transports us to the period which was behind the initial stir, which in the end led to the fall of the triumvirate and ascension of Octavius Caesar to the Roman Emperor. In the condensation of circa eleven years of events of critical importance, and the ease with which Shakespeare jumps from one continent to another the Aristotelian unity of action, time, and place are moved to the background just to allow Shakespeare’s audacity of a conscious artist to shine through. By the time *Anthony and Cleopatra* was staged, he had already written his most acclaimed, psychological tragedies. In relation to these tragedies, some scholars did not treat *Anthony and Cleopatra* kindly.⁸¹ Others highlighted individual feats within the play, stressing that the play should not be criticized in terms of its overall effect, but approached warily by appreciating the more isolated ‘chapters’. A. C. Bradley highlighted Cleopatra as a person of “infinite variety” and placed her in line with Falstaff and Hamlet.⁸² Caroline Spurgeon praises the imagery which Shakespeare used in the play. She says that the imagination “is a

80 I will retain the spelling of Anthony, as used in Oxford’s 1994 edition by Michael Neill, a brief discussion of which is at pp. 134–135. Throughout the course of this chapter line numbering will be from the same edition. William Shakespeare, *Anthony and Cleopatra*, ed. Michael Neill (1994; repr., Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008).

81 For a small overview: Sylvan Barnet, “Recognition and Reversal in Antony and Cleopatra.” *Shakespeare Quarterly* 8 (1957). Duncan S. Harris, “‘Again for Cydnus’: The Dramaturgical Resolution of Antony and Cleopatra,” *Studies in English Literature, 1500–1900* 17 (1977); William D. Wolf, “‘New Heaven, New Earth’: The Escape from Mutability In Antony and Cleopatra,” *Shakespeare Quarterly* 33 (1982). The criticism was aimed at the play as a whole.

pure flame driving throughout, fanned by emotion, whose heat purifies, fuses and transmutes into gold all kinds of material.”⁸³ Anthony Caputi speaks of the lack of terror, which in a “tragedy” is defective, yet, at the end of his article, he writes,

Instead of focussing as he [Shakespeare] had on characters in the process of discovering themselves in the face of a mysterious universe, here he had dealt with characters who have already acquiesced in the mystery and who are now in the process of losing the richness to be gained through that acquiesce. To accept as they have is to recognize the magnificent dimensions of the possible. [. . .] But Shakespeare’s emphasis on the grandeur of the attempt and the sadness of the loss leaves no room for terror.⁸⁴

If one accepts that Shakespeare was working towards different effects than in his major tragedies, we may appreciate the ‘grandeur’ at which he was aiming. No matter how one is to criticize Shakespeare’s attempts or look for inconsistencies within the play, they must keep in mind that this was a work of an established playwright.

Together with *Julius Caesar* and *Coriolanus*, *Anthony and Cleopatra* form a loose trilogy;⁸⁵ *Coriolanus* takes place at the beginning of the Roman Republic and *Julius Caesar* and *Anthony and Cleopatra* at the end. Thus it is understandable that the plays would share similar themes and motifs. As *Anthony and Cleopatra* is a continuation of *Julius Caesar*, one of the shared themes is imperialism. Yet where in *Julius Caesar* it is accompanied by revolution, in *Anthony and Cleopatra* it is with desire. The play might thus be considered a study of love in a world of power which is inevitably collapsing. The core of the play is based on opposites, even contradictories, such as: Rome and Egypt, mind and matter, pragmatism and emotions, politics and leisure time, to name a few.⁸⁶

To differentiate between the two countries, there are two differing world views: the Roman and the Egyptian. The philosophy of each of the countries is defined

82 See A. C. Bradley, *Oxford Lectures on Poetry* (New York: St Martin’s Press, 1965), 299. Accessed February 2, 2016, <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/36773/36773-h/36773-h.htm>.

83 Spurgeon, *Shakespeare’s Imagery*, 349.

84 Anthony Caputi, “Shakespeare’s Antony and Cleopatra: Tragedy Without Terror,” *Shakespeare Quarterly* 16 (1965): 190.

85 See Michael Neill, ed., *Anthony and Cleopatra*, 7.

86 See Hilský, *Shakespeare a jeviště svět*, 656. The topic of polarity is also discussed in Michael Payne, “Erotic Irony and Polarity in Antony and Cleopatra,” *Shakespeare Quarterly* 24 (1973).

against the other country. Michael Payne points out that the differing viewpoints are defined at the beginning in the words of Philo,⁸⁷

Nay, but this dotage of our General's
O'erflows the measure: 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 gypsy's lust.

Look where they come:
Take but good note, and you shall see in him
The triple pillar of the world transformed
Into a strumpet's fool. Behold and see. (1.1.1–13)

Philo guides the audience on how to interpret Anthony's behaviour. Philo's world view is primarily Roman, therefore he sees Anthony as "a strumpet's fool." A strumpet is an unpleasant perception of a person and Anthony and Cleopatra's opening dialogue contradicts Philo's statement and signalizes a sort of tenderness in their relationship,

Cleo.: If it be love indeed, tell me how much.
Anth.: There's beggary in the love that can be reckoned.
Cleo.: I'll set a bourn how far to be beloved.
Anth.: Then must thou needs find out new heaven, new earth.
(1.1.14–17)

"[N]ew heaven, new earth" would mean that their love lacks definition in a material world. It is almost eternal. The Book of Isaiah (65:17) reads: "See, I will create / new heavens and a new earth. / The former things will not be remembered, / nor will they come to mind".⁸⁸ Thus according to the Bible, new realm will allow the inhabitants to live their lives freely without the burden of their past. Anthony is hinting at the possible outcome of their relationship. It could be argued that this passage in the play is one of the several instances which might

87 See Payne, "Erotic Irony and Polarity," 266.

88 "The Book of Isaiah, New International Version," accessed February 6, 2016, <https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?version=NIV&search=Isaiah%2065>.

provide information to the overall outcome.⁸⁹ Their love is a play and they decided to stage it within the play. Love in Anthony and Cleopatra's presentation is unstable. It shifts with the rapidity of scene change in act 4. What first starts as heavenly relationship, soon reveals its nature. "The word 'love' as it is [. . .] means nothing until we know the context in which it is used."⁹⁰ If the emotional attachment that holds between them is love then, according to the words of Anthony and Cleopatra, it is catastrophic. This claim is further supported by Anthony (1.1.35–42) and by Cleopatra respectively (3.13.159–68).

Being a triumvir entitles you to command one-third of the world. To command such a vast area it is mandatory to delegate the supervision to one's lieutenants and other amicable followers. Anthony was still not satisfied and fled to Egypt to find solace in the hands of Cleopatra, an emotional queen who is able to rule her lands with words, sword, and heart. By the opening of the play, Anthony had already relocated to Egypt. He attached himself to Cleopatra whilst still being married to Fulvia, his Roman wife.

As is written above, polarity comprises an important factor in the play. One needs typicality in order to make the comparison. Not only the men, but also the women of the world in the play need to be compared and in Anthony and Cleopatra only two women are given liberty to speak, Octavia and Cleoptra. Both of them serve as archetypes of women of their respective countries. Enobarbus pertinently defines Octavia as "of a holy, cold / and still conversation" (2.6.121–2), whereas the Egyptians choose a different set of words: "dull of tongue and dwarfish", "creeps", "round [face], even to faultiness", "forehead / As low as she would wish it" (3.3.16, 18, 30, 32–3). Pompey sees Cleopatra as "witchcraft join[ed] with beauty" (2.1.22). The discrepancy is one of the possible explanations of Anthony's departure for Egypt. Octavius comments,

It hath been taught us from the primal state
That he which is was wished until he were;
And the ebb'd man, ne'er loved till ne'er worth love,
Comes deard by being lacked. (1.4.41–44)

⁸⁹ In fact, Ovid's *Metamorphoses* already provide the unfavourable outcome of their love. See Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, 377, xv. 815–44.

⁹⁰ Harold C. Goddard, *The Meaning of Shakespeare I* (Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press, 1967), 192.

This longing is dangerous and multifaceted and works both ways to Egypt, as well as to Rome. Anthony confirms it, when he says similar words after the disclosure of the death of his Fulvia,

Forbear me.
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 present pleasure,
By revolution low'ring, does become
The opposite of itself. She's good being gone—
[. . .]
I must from this enchanting queen break off (1.2.121–28)

Cleopatra's association with witchcraft, as reported by Pompey, bestows her with the ability to metamorphose. Anthony, spellbound by her words and her display, succumbed to her charm and landed at her feet. Michal Peprník points out,

Metamorphosis as a disguise is often used by the devil and his earthly servants, sorcerers and witches. Their goal is to fool their victim who, often due to its own doings, found itself balancing, to finish its doom and bring about the victim's fall. This function has a distinct ethical outcome—it indicates the foolishness to rely on one's own wits, the false feeling of safety and self-confidence. [. . .] [I]t proves that in order to avoid fall, it is imperative to follow basic moral rules.⁹¹

Thus following his statement, Cleopatra's metamorphosis should not be taken as a physical change, but rather a change in habiliments and frame of mind. The troubling fact is how it could have happened. Anthony is thirteen years Cleopatra's senior. If they are in one room, they often stage a drama in which Cleopatra has often the upper hand and acts in a hostile manner towards Anthony. He finds himself in a submissive position, scolded for his behaviour. Once a worthy general, the model of Roman valour, honour, and virtue is abased to a mere dog, who when musters enough courage to reply is chided again. Is it possible to assume that Cleopatra simply fished for Anthony as her trophy? Enobarbus paints her picture, “[a]ge cannot wither her, nor custom stale / Her infinite variety” (2.2.242–43).⁹² Another section which may point to her ability

91 Michal Peprník, *Metamorfóza jako kulturní metafora: James Hogg, R. L. Stevenson a George Mac Donald* (Olomouc: Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci, 2003), 14. Translation is mine.

and her success in hunting for Anthony is Enobarbus' vivid description of her river voyage,

The barge she sat in, like a burnished throne
Burned on the water; the poop was beaten gold,
Purple the nails, and so perfumèd that
The winds were lovesick with them; the oars were silver,
Which the tune of flutes kept stroke, and made
The water which they beat to follow faster,
As amorous of their strokes. For her own person,
It beggared all description: she did lie
In her pavilion—cloth-of-gold of tissue—
O'er-picturing that Venus where we see
The fancy out-work nature; on each side her
Stood pretty, dimpled boys, like smiling Cupids,
With divers-coloured fans, whose wind did seem
To glow the delicate cheeks which they did cool,
And what they undid did. (2.2.198–212)

Enobarbus is observant and is not afraid to comment on the obvious which should remain non-commented. "That truth should be silent, I had almost forgot," he bitingly answers Anthony (2.2.113). Enobarbus' description is the beginning of Anthony and Cleopatra's affair. Cleopatra could not have failed, otherwise her status as a dominant queen would be jeopardized. She mobilized all means necessary to enchant Anthony. She succeeded, for he attached to her picture of physical beauty. At this stage, Anthony is attracted to ideal beauty, failing to see through it, failing to assess the true nature of Cleopatra. I consider this stage to represent the vulgar eros. This is no noble version of love Plato spoke of. As such, it is liable to end as abruptly as it started. However, Shakespeare does not end it suddenly and simply.

Cleopatra's hunt or game was certainly motivated. It was not just a pastime, because Cleopatra's beauty overcame the goddess Venus herself. She can metamorphose willingly and uses her ability throughout the play on numerous occasions. It can be said that each of her changes are guises or masks she puts on and each of them have destructive or other tendency that tends towards bad

92 Her ability to metamorphose is not solely her own trait, other women may have this ability as well. One thing that strikes me here is the fact that if we accept Philo's description of Cleopatra being a strumpet, it is possible to assume that strumpets, or promiscuous women, will never cease to exist. They will only transform in the course of time.

decisions. Her good deeds cannot balance the ill behaviour. She can be a dominant queen, a fury, a consolatory companion. Her last transformation is her suicide, a ritual with which she becomes Cleopatra again. Her instability may be the reason why Anthony fled to Egypt. The longing for the new, the unknown, and the potent is not solely devoted to definite elements, but to indefinite as well. Octavius, the adopted son of Julius Caesar, has “inherited” certain absolutistic traits, which were so offensive to Cassius and Brutus. Julius Caesar rid himself of Gneaus Pompeius but he was prevented to fulfil his desire. Octavius finds himself in a similar situation. Unlike in *Julius Caesar*, in which he was pictured as the weaker one, in *Anthony and Cleopatra* Shakespeare gives him more space to develop his true nature. Anthony is now Octavius’ enemy, and if both were carrying Caesar’s legacy in *Julius Caesar*, in *Anthony and Cleopatra* Anthony is now trying to prevent Octavius from becoming the new Caesar. Through Octavius, Caesar’s legacy succeeds and in a milder manner than with murder and bloodshed.

II

Octavius is willing to accept Anthony’s misbehaviour, therefore, at the beginning of the play the triumvirate is still stable. The stability starts to fall apart because Octavius plots to depose of the other trimviri. This is a clever political play. The moments he allows one to follow his private world, it is easily discernible that he is not as noble as Rome thinks. For a long time one cannot know his hidden intentions, for he uncovers them only after he incarcerates Lepidus.

Political connections play a major role in the world of the Romans and with the help of them, one can temporarily prevent a catastrophe. At the beginning of the play, Octavius says,

You may see, Lepidus, and henceforth know
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. (1.4.1–10)

In his eyes, Anthony is a libertine, who forgot to fulfil his duties and enjoys only in Egyptian pleasures which are not taken favourably by the Romans. I think that Octavius cunningly masks his scorn via reporting society's general contempt.⁹³ The word competitor has two meanings: modern-day competitor, and the original meaning of associate, partner. Even though Octavius sees Anthony as a competing party, he still respects him. He cannot make the same mistake as Julius Caesar did, Octavius waits before he makes his initial move. Lepidus, another triumvir, respects Anthony and defends him. The political union is thus formal and is free of any warm feelings which is bewildering, especially if one considers the fact, that Anthony and Octavius revenged the murder of Julius Caesar. The triumvirate is faced with a rebellion, led by Pompey the Great's son, Pompey. Pompey detests Anthony's way of living. "Menas, I did not think / This amorous surfeiter would have donned his helm / For such a petty war; his soldiership / Is twice the other twain" (2.1.32–35) says Pompey after learning that Anthony is about to return to Italy. He soon realizes his mistake, "I should have given less matter / A better ear" (2.1.31–32). Anthony's return poses a great problem, and in that case Pompey's chances of winning are close to naught.

Egypt provides Anthony an escape, almost oblivion, from reality, a place of sensuality, emotions, and unlike Rome, direct in expressions and free of political machinations. His time of relative peace is disrupted by messengers who bear the news of Fulvia's death, and the upheaval she and Anthony's brother, Lucius, caused. Anthony is forced to return to Rome to lesser the possible outcome if the matter is left unresolved. He is not the warrior as he used to be, Egypt deprived him of his manhood. Cleopatra and Fulvia are behind his emasculation, from which he suffers almost half of the play.⁹⁴ Fulvia set an example that even a woman is able to arise and conquer a part of Rome's territory, she is not the type of women Octavia or Virgilia represent but resembles Tamora, Volumnia or even Cleopatra. One might speculate whether or not Fulvia had recognized Octavius' imperial intentions. Her attempt to stop him resulted in her death and into a clash

93 I consider this an impersonation. For a discussion of the use of guises see Susan Baker, "Personating Persons: Rethinking Shakespearean Disguises," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 43 (1992).

94 See Gordon P. James, "The 'Strumpet's Fool' in Antony and Cleopatra," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 34 (1983).

which will negatively project itself on to Anthony as a man who was not able to control his wife. It is possible that Fulvia unofficially claimed Anthony's responsibility as a protector of Rome and consequently his manhood and his readiness.

The triumviri are required to work on and follow the same goals, yet during their only meeting in Rome, Anthony and Octavius ignore one another on the stage. Now Lepidus must interfere to rouse their consciousness in order to start the peace talks,

Noble friends,
That which combined us was most great, and let not
A leaner action rend us. What's amiss,
May it be gently heard. When we debate
Out trivial difference loud, we do commit
Murder in healing wounds. Then, noble partners,
(The rather for I earnestly beseech)
Touch you the sourest points which sweetest terms,
Nor curstness grow to the matter. (2.2.17–25)

Shakespeare prepared a simple task for Lepidus, to act as an intermediary. He is a follower and as such is divided between two worlds which he can readily identify. They face problems that need to be solved, but Octavius does not know, how to settle Fulvia's rebellion, "Yet, if I knew / What hoop should hold us staunch, from edge to edge / O'the'world I would pursue it" (2.2.119–21), and how to attend to Anthony's lack of interest in dealings of Rome. Agrippa, Octavius' lieutenant, swiftly offers a solution—a marriage to Octavia. "[H]er love to both / Would each to other and all loves to both / Draw after her" (2.2.141–44), is basically an offer of universal peace on both personal and political level. If Anthony and Octavius would set an example, the nation would follow them and would forgive not just the upheaval caused by Fulvia, but also Anthony's misbehaviour. To validate their agreement, they shake hands. Similarly does Anthony, Octavius, and Pompey in

2.7

Octa.: Good Anthony, your hand.
 Pomp.: I'll try you on the shore.
 Anth.: And shall, sir—give's your hand.
 Pomp.: O Anthony,
 You have my father's house. But what, we are friends?
 Come down into the boat.
 Enob.: Take heed you fall not. (2.7.125–28)

Enobarbus' biting comment refers to Cleopatra's voyage on Nile. If it is a trap, Anthony cannot fall for it again. This act might be perceived as homoerotic⁹⁵ and Enobarbus' comment supports this idea. In Ancient Rome the exchange of rings was not the custom, rather the newly wed couple joined right hands.⁹⁶ Political marriage was common to secure the prestige and survival of a house. It was agreed upon by the heads of the interested houses, the bride and the groom had no opportunity to express themselves. Often their marriage was settled before they could reach adulthood.

Octavia is therefore the "hoop" which is to unite Rome and remedy the delicate situation. Lepidus has performed his duties as a mediator. He is the insect with two wings and performs the task of an interlink (3.2.20). The struggle for power is carried out between the two wings and Lepidus, as the least ambitious of the triumviri, does not simply know with whom to side. Agrippa and Enobarbus comment on his hesitancy, outperforming one another (3.2.1–22).

Octavius' talk in which he concedes to the marriage is a political speech, rid of any emotions, "A sister I bequeath you," and the formal "bequeath" carries Octavius' power over Octavia. He behaves as her father and decides upon her future without even taking Octavia's opinion into consideration. Jean-Noël Robert says that in Ancient Rome, this behaviour was quite normal, because after the death of the head of a family, the son took up the responsibility and had the power to decide about the future of his sister(s).⁹⁷ "Hoop" is merely an object with one specific function. Octavius indeed treats his sister as an appendix, a token of his magnanimity. Anthony knows the truth behind the marriage (and he probably

95 See Jonathan Gil Harris, "'Narcissus in thy Face': Roman Desire and the Difference it Fakes in Antony and Cleopatra," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 45 (1994): 419–20.

96 R. Vashon Rogers, "Marriage in Old Rome," *The Green Bag* 7 (1906): 403, accessed January 10, 2016, http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/tgb18&div=69&g_sent=1&collection=journals.

97 See Jean-Noël Robert, *Řím 753 př. n. l. až 476 n.l.*, transl. Jitka Matějů (Praha: Nakladatelství Lidových novin, 2001), 211.

knew) when he confirms the words of Soothsayer that he “makes this marriage for [his] peace” (2.4.37). In their marriage there is no hint of the bases of loves, affection. Octavia is a wife of cold behaviour that stands in opposition to Cleopatra’s heat. Words of Anthony and his approach towards the whole marriage situation reminds of those of Prince Hal in his soliloquy,

My reformation, glitt’ring o’er my fault,
Shall show more goodly and attract more eyes. (1.2.191–92)

In a couple of instances, Octavius expresses his brotherly/patriarchal love to Octavia, but it is obvious that his motives are Machiavellian. By marrying Octavia, Octavius gives Anthony another chance to reform. It would mean that Anthony would have to subdue to young Octavius, recognize his authority, and live a life in Octavius’ shadow, which is not an option for the great general. Octavia is perceptive and is aware of her paradoxical position, “no midway / ’Twi’xt these extremes at all”, she tells Anthony as they depart for Athens (3.4.19–20). Octavius uses her as a queen to keep Anthony in check. Even Anthony tells her, shortly before they part ways, “If I lose mine honour, / I would lose my self: better I were not yours / Than yours so branchless” (3.4.22–24). His metaphor expresses what would become of Anthony if he stayed with Octavia: he would lose his renown, his honour, an article valued by him and all Romans above all, and would besmirch the house of Antonii.⁹⁸ He would remain a remnant of days gone.

Anthony informs Octavia of his frequent campaigns abroad and prolonged stays outside the Republic. Enobarbus comments on the overall situation, “as / I said before, that which is the strength of their amity / shall prove the immediate author of their variance. / Anthony will use his affection where it is. He married / but his occasion here” (2.6.127–30). Octavius is scared that “Let not the piece of virtue which is set / Betwixt us, as the cement of our love / To keep it builded, be the ram to batter / The fortress of it” (3.2.28–31), Anthony assures him that he “shall not find / . . . the least cause / For what you seem to fear” (3.2.34–36). Anthony is a ‘trouble-maker’, and his troubles are brought about mostly by

⁹⁸ More on honour is to be found in Gary B. Miles, “How Roman are Shakespeare’s Romans,” *Shakespeare Quarterly* 40 (1989).

himself. Obviously, the marriage has been doomed from the beginning.⁹⁹ By being separated from the object of his desire, Anthony's reason is overshadowed by his longings. He made a series of rash decisions, and the last of which, preferring Cleopatra over Octavia proved to be fortunate for Octavius. The prolonged separation of his beloved and the marginalization of reason urges him to send Octavia back to Rome and travel hastily to Egypt. His impulsiveness in decisions is the force which will secure his fall. Yet, to prove his ability to resist and to prove his valour which won him his renown, Anthony is now "levying / The kings o'th'earth for war" is of importance to Octavius (3.6.66–88), but Octavia's ignoble return to Rome is the last mistake Octavius has been waiting for. It is his impulse to act. "You are abused / Beyond the mark of thought; and the high god, / To do you justice, makes his ministers / Of us and those that love you" (3.6.87–90), tells Octavius his sister. Anthony's marginalization of reason is not only one of the causes of Octavius' declaration of war, but it is also the force behind much of his gaffes.

Lepidus and Mark Antony are not Octavius' only obstruction on his road to absolutism. The triumviri must work together to solve the problem of a rebellion, led by Sextus Pompey on Sicily. Whilst still in Rome, Anthony used the negotiations to his advantage and recalling a favour of old, Pompey agreed to an armistice. Octavius does not prefer the situation as it is and with the help of Lepidus breaks the armistice and starts a military conflict against Pompey. They succeed in defeating him, and Octavius initiates his plan. Lepidus is now redundant and his political affiliation is of no further use to Octavius. For the linearity of the play, he performed his role which was substituted with Octavia. His fight is not important, he was offered the place of triumvir as a friend of Julius Caesar and due to his command over a large troop. Rose points out that Lepidus' role in the play was supplementary, he had no friends and followers whom would support him in his endeavours.¹⁰⁰ Factors which led to his incarceration are at best blurred; information Eros provided points to the fact that Octavius imprisoned Lepidus "upon his own appeal" (3.5.10), which is later clarified to the point that

99 This is another example in which the time is condensed, their marriage lasted some eight years.

100 Paul Lawrence Rose, "The Politics of Antony and Cleopatra," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 20 (1969): 385.

Lepidus grew more violent. Whatsoever one may imagine, an official hindrance has been removed. Anthony did not partake in the fight as he was relocating to Egypt.

However, Cleopatra and especially Anthony are aware of Octavius' future moves and have started to rally kings of subjugated areas for their cause. The kings did not know that their armies are to be led by a woman. The gathered armies are mostly composed of infantry, but not paying heed to Enobarbus and Camidius' warnings that a sea battle is lost even before engaging the enemy, Anthony concedes to fight a naval battle, just because Octavius dares him to it and Cleopatra has "sixty sails, Caesar none better" (3.7.49). As a tactician, Anthony should have weighed the option and not make an irrational decision which is yet another example of their destructive love. The picture of the world they have painted is slowly falling apart and slowly fulfilling at the same time. The growing number of their miscalculations is implicit in their behaviour.

"[T]he wise gods seel our eyes" is Anthony's metaphorical reference to cognitive blindness in which the Gods take away rationality and leave the human to stumble to their own destruction. Thus if we take away rationality, we are left with sense, and whilst blind, Anthony entered the relationship relying on his senses. He was not able to pierce the veil and spot the real Cleopatra. He saw only an emanating aura of beauty and succumbed to her spell as Julius Caesar and Pompey the Great did before him. As if two distinct worlds call for two distinct versions of Anthony. In Rome in *Julius Caesar*, he was the merciless politician; in Egypt he is an impulsive boy.¹⁰¹

Baldassare Castiglione in his "A Little Discourse to Declare What Love is" writes,

who so thinketh in possessing the body to enjoy beauty, he is far deceived, and is moved to it, not with true knowledge by the choice of reason, but with false opinion by the longing of sense. . . . These kind of lovers therefore love most unlucky, for either they never come by their covetings, which is a great unluckiness; or else, if they do come by them, they come by their hurt and end their miseries with other greater miseries.¹⁰²

101 Cf. Julian Markels, *The Pillar of the World: Antony and Cleopatra in Shakespeare's Development* (Ohio State University Press, 1968), 20.

102 Baldassare Castiglione, "A Little Discourse to Declare What Love is," in *Shakespeare's World: Background Readings in the English Renaissance*, ed. Gerald M. Pincis and Roger

Anthony himself says “my heart was to thy rudder tied by th’strings” after the lost battle of Actium (3.11.56). Scarrus’ report tells that Anthony eventually had the upper hand, but at this critical moment, when the Egyptian fleet could have defeated the Romans, Cleopatra and her flagship turned and fled. Anthony “clasps on his sea-wing and like a dotting mallard, / Leaving the fight in height, flies after her. / I never saw an action of such shame— / Experience, manhood, honour, ne’er before / Did violate so itself” (3.10.19–23), a description not fitting a general. His flight is another fall he experiences; this time it has a destructive outcome: Egypt lost the favour of six kings it had recruited and Camidius, one of Anthony’s commanders, deserted to Octavius after eye-witnessing the humiliation. The scene shows us that “their [troops’] loyalty [. . .] depends upon Antony showing himself fit to fight.”¹⁰³ Here the proverb, the rats are abandoning a sinking ship, is apropos to the situation.

A discrete change in Anthony’s mental stability is perceptible after the lost battle of Actium. It is possible he verges on the madness.

Cleo.: Let me sit down. O Juno!
 Anth.: No, no, no, no, no.
 Eros: See you there, sir?
 Anth.: O fie, fie, fie!
 . . .
 Eros: Sir, sir—
 Anth.: Yes, my lord, yes!—He at Philippi kept . . . (3.1.28–35)

Aposiopesis of Anthony’s speech silently tells his inner contemplation over a situation which went horribly wrong. At this moment, Anthony is submerged, he is non-existent in the reality of the play. He would hardly call Eros “my lord” and goes on talking about the death of Brutus. As long as Anthony is sitting, he is ‘mad’, even pronounces, “I have offended reputation. / A most unnoble swerving” (3.11.48–49), that is the Roman Anthony speaking. The moment, he gets up, he immediately joins in by asking, “O whither hast thou led me, Egypt?” (3.11.50), transferring his previous deeds to Cleopatra to cleanse his shield, thus possibly regaining his valour, the only positive recognizable trait that he is left with. At this point, he has lost most of his honour and there is no opportunity to regain it.

Locker (New York: Continuum, 1990), 165.
 103 Rose, “The Politics of Antony and Cleopatra,” 387.

Cleopatra was hinting at this moment in act one, scene one where she says, “Anthony / Will be himself” (1.1.44–45).

The whipping of Octavius’ messenger; challenging Octavius to a fight one-to-one, even though Anthony knew that he “dealt on lieutenantry, and no practice had / In the brave squares of war” (3.11.39–40), are Anthony’s messages that he is not afraid of Octavius.¹⁰⁴ Anthony knew that Octavius would hide behind his lieutenants and would only observe how Anthony’s madness consumes him. However, Roman Anthony makes a good decision to engage Octavius’ forces by land and the fight soon looks promising. Unfortunately Cleopatra’s ships desert to the Romans and Anthony is left only with a land army. He, being a witness to this treason, loses all hope and falls into a state of despair.

Anthony has been left only with Eros and tells him, “there is left us / Ourselves to end ourselves” (4.15.21–22). Plutarch mentions that “Anthony had a trusty slave named Eros. Him Antony had long before engaged, in case of need, to kill him, and now demanded the fulfilment of his promise.”¹⁰⁵ Shakespeare endowed Eros with symbolical reference to the love of Anthony and Cleopatra. Eros is the version of love that was not favoured by Shakespeare’s Romans. In Anthony and Cleopatra’s relationship there is nothing reasonable, one is liable to make mistakes and disregard them. The momentum of the deepest personal crisis Shakespeare was building up is about to be released with catastrophic consequences. At this very moment, Mardian, Cleopatra’s eunuch, enters the stage and bears ill news about Cleopatra’s death. The very precise timing of Mardian’s enter is just another test—in this crucial moment, Cleopatra is testing Anthony’s loyalty, love, and reaction. It should not come as a surprise after Anthony has managed to shake off her command, she likes to reclaim what was hers from the very beginning.

Anthony is unable to come to terms that the desertion of the Egyptian fleet and Cleopatra’s death were so sudden. He sees suicide as his only option and entrusts Eros with the execution. Eros disobeys and instead kills himself, leaving Anthony

104 Cf. with 3.1.16–17. The problem here is that Anthony was the soldier type of general. He lead by example and expected his legions to follow. Caesar is his antipode, relying on lieutenants to carry out his orders; he does not directly engage in battle. But the lines 3.1.16–7 are concerned with both, thus signalling that even Anthony, as he aged, grew accustomed to rely on lieutenants.

105 Plutarch, *The Parallel Lives, vol. IX: The Life Of Antony* (Loeb Classical Library Edition, 1920), accessed April 8, 2016, available at http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Plutarch/Lives/Antony*.html.

to be deceived for the second time. When Anthony falls on the sword, he does not die, “How? Not dead? Not dead? / The guard, ho! O, dispatch me!” (3.15.103–04). There is a beautiful irony at play here. Anthony the great general was able to botch the suicide once he mustered enough courage to perform it. Brutus, on the other hand, a politician not schooled in the art of war managed to impale himself successfully. The guards who first arrive at the scene refuse to administer the coup de grâce. Whoever was close to Anthony is either dead, has deserted, or is not important in the plot any more, yet the guards assure Anthony that he “may not live to wear / All [his] true followers out” (4.16.134–35).

Anthony is borne to Cleopatra’s monument and in a brief moment dies. Here may be another element at play, as to why Anthony failed. If one recalls 2.5 and Cleopatra’s impulsive behaviour after she learned about Anthony’s marriage to Octavia, one might expect similar behaviour after Anthony’s sudden death. Therefore, Anthony must die before Cleopatra in order for her to witness it. She has time to come to the illicit terms and recuperate temporarily. If Anthony had died instantly, it is reasonable to argue that Cleopatra would commit to her impulsiveness and commit a suicide not worthy of an Egyptian queen. Anthony dies satisfied that he himself, not Octavius, managed to hunt Anthony down.¹⁰⁶

Having witnessed Anthony’s passing, Cleopatra is cleansed, humbled, and lowered to a mere mortal, “e’en a woman, and commanded / By such poor passion as the maid that milks / And does the meanest chores” (4.16.74–76). She is not the goddess who seduced a god, because Anthony showed her that even gods are susceptible to mistakes and death. Anthony retains his remaining valour because he refused to surrender and be humiliated before a nation which he loyally served. Cleopatra was given a guide, how to act in a situation where one will face lifelong humiliation. She has made her mind to depart in “high Roman fashion” (4.16.88). Her resolution is contradictory to how she perceives herself and is more in concord with a Roman woman, especially Octavia, who represented these

¹⁰⁶ According to Stoic philosophy, suicide was an accepted way to end one’s life. Marcus Aurelius in his *Meditations* writes: “[. . .] but if you feel that you are falling away and losing your hold, then withdraw undismayed to some corner where you can recover your grip, or even depart from life altogether, not in anger, but simply, freely, and modestly, having accomplished at least one fine action in your life.” Marcus Aurelius, *Meditations*, ed. Christopher Gill, trans. Robin Hard (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 96. This point is also mentioned in Mark Sacharoff, “Suicide and Brutus’ Philosophy in Julius Caesar,” *Journal of the History of Ideas* 33 (1972): 116.

“Roman fashion[s].” Is there any possibility that Cleopatra is talking about the “high Roman fashion” of a man? She was often identified with emasculating powers and bore Anthony’s sword.

Anthony’s death has brought forth a reaction in Octavius. “The death of Anthony / Is not a single doom, in the name lay / A moiety of the world” (5.1.17–19), and “it is tidings / To wash the eye of kings” (5.1.27–8), says Octavius, yet one can question the sincerity of the speech. His lack of emotion throughout the play was a necessary prerequisite to become the new Caesar. He puts on his public mask whenever he needs to win favour after a series of unpopular choices. With the death of Anthony, Octavius has not yet become the sole ruler of the world, because Anthony divided his share among Cleopatra, her son, and Anthony’s son. Octavius needs to convince Cleopatra and her son to surrender and recognize Octavius as a “universal landlord”. It is evident that Cleopatra wishes to return to her old way of living, but also that she is consumed by the fear of her end as well as by the values to which she aspires. Thus Octavius must start his last political mini-game, that is, to persuade Cleopatra not to commit suicide and allow him a display of his nobleness (cf. 5.2.44–46) by dragging her back to Rome as his trophy (“for her life in Rome / Would be eternal in our triumph” [5.1.65–6]). Proculeius is sent to carry Octavius’ message to Cleopatra, without knowing Octavius’ true motives. He bears a message that would make Octavius look truly noble in the eyes of Rome.

Cleopatra’s skill to enchant does not fade away, she is still able to spellbound strangers and hold them in suspense. Dolabella, one of Octavius’ followers, succumbs to her spell after Cleopatra tells him her vision of Anthony as a wonder of the world (see 5.2.76–94); her apotheosis is intensely vivid and emotionally strong. She is able to extract information which meant to be hidden and convert a Roman citizen. The fear of what Dolabella told her urges her to act, and if she aspires to the “high Roman” values then her “resolution is place[d]” (5.2.238). Once she discovers these values she can aim at immortality which she forewent after Anthony’s death.

Give me my robe, put on my crown—I have
Immortal longings in me. Now no more

The juice of Egypt's grape shall moist this lip
Yare, Yare, good Iras, quick—methinks I hear
Anthony call; I see him rouse himself
To praise my noble act; I hear him mock
The luck of Caesar, which the gods give men
To excuse their after wrath. Husband, I come!
Now to that name my courage prove my title!

...
The stroke of death is a lover's pinch
(5.2.279-287, 294)

Her death will bring her the desired meeting with Anthony, yet if she reaches the high values is disputable. She cannot suppress an Egyptian woman, her sensuality; her words “I have nothing / Of woman in me” however point to a Roman man (5.2.238–39). If at the beginning she was an unrestrained, dominating, changing, and volatile queen, now she is a calculating Egyptian, determined to fulfil her promise. Octavius' offer of Cleopatra's freedom is undoubtedly dishonest, but Cleopatra's behaviour after meeting Octavius for the first time is dishonest as well. She does not cheat in the game they play; she wants to secure a prospective future for her son, as Octavius wants for the world. Her moves are motivated; I do not think that she tries to buy her freedom, she is just delaying the inevitable end to set her plan in motion.

The death of Cleopatra is almost ceremonial. One might suppose that it was thought through, not the hasty decision, Anthony made. The asp symbolizes the product of the Nile, which sucks off her breast as a child—Cleopatra has become a loving mother, “Peace, peace! / Dost thou not see my baby at my breast, / That sucks the nurse asleep?” (5.2.307–09). There is no place for hesitancy and underestimation, she cannot fail Anthony and fall victim to Octavius. She wants to treat her “children” equally, “Nay, I will take thee too,” as she grasps a second asp and applies her as a certainty (5.2.311). Her choice of manner is non-conventional, presumably because Cleopatra abhors the conventional. More conventional methods of suicide might have marred her beauty, her physical vessel. Poison as an invisible, silent assassin is suitable for a queen, wishing to remain beautiful even after death. By accepting the asp, she could not suppress the Egyptian Cleopatra, however, if she managed to embrace the Roman Cleopatra is doubtful.

Contrary to what one might expect, Anthony himself is responsible for his fall. Much like Othello, he falls victim to the vulgar side of love and the course he had set up at the beginning went amiss. What first started as a hint of heavenly connection, an aspiration to higher values than physical is soon demasked to be a cause of irrationality, madness, and gullibility. If one considers *Anthony and Cleopatra's* place in the "tragedies of love," it stands at the pinnacle of a description of love that ends badly. For unlike *Romeo and Juliet*, the fault is not in the macrocosmos but in the microcosmos of Anthony and unlike Othello, Anthony is not capable to identify the mistakes he did. Anthony's decision-making is directly influenced by his desire to be reunited with Cleopatra. The pull effect does not only limit itself to the physical, it expands to the psychological and clouds Anthony's judgement.

With the death of Cleopatra, a world which glorified heroes and heroic deeds ends and starts a world which will value political sleight. Anthony's version of love and politics are not compatible any more. The deeds of both lovers indicated that the old world started to fall apart, and only Anthony was a remnant in a newly forming world. Similar phrase appeared in Ovid, "Ah, majesty and love go ill together, / Nor long share one abode!"¹⁰⁷ *Anthony and Cleopatra* is a play in which Shakespeare tried to capture a world of love and politics trying to play side-by-side. It is a world of preferences, public as well as personal, and Shakespeare attempted to record these aspects in all their permutations, how they affect the major characters which were taken from Plutarch and transported to a world of their own, condensed in the theatre.

¹⁰⁷ Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, 50, ii. 845–75.

7. Conclusion

Having attempted to analyse three Shakespeare's plays, I may now say that love indeed influences one's decisions. Love in the three Roman tragedies is not only desire but also friendship and affection (*storge*). Desire, the chief variant of love in the comedies, is known to influence one's decision—this variation was well treated in *Anthony and Cleopatra*, in which Shakespeare portrayed the decaying cult of the hero, who was responsible for his own fall due to a series of unfortunate decisions. These decisions were motivated by his separation from the object of his desire. Yet, even change in Cleopatra's behaviour is in line with how *eros* plays with her behaviour and psychology. She can be as irrational as Anthony in her actions and once they are reunited, her unpredictability coupled with Anthony's infatuation brings about the fall of both of them. *Eros* in Shakespeare is portrayed as a blindfold of rationality, for the apparently correct solution lies directly in front of the characters, however, they cannot perceive it and literally fall victim to the obvious. It is impossible to terminate the relationship without suffering dire consequence.

The blindness cannot be positively linked to *philia*. For *philia* denotes a choice and consequently free will. Thus the 'deceiver' must employ cunningness and persuasive techniques in order to win a favourable reception of his idea. In *Julius Caesar*, Cassius represents such a deceiver as he persuades Brutus to join his cause. His favourite technique seems to be questioning or attacking Brutus' integrity and honour. These emerge as Brutus' sole preoccupation in constituting a man, an iconic representative of Rome. In his behaviour, Brutus expects men of his social standing and rank to behave equally, and in his premiss lies his fallibility, for he is not able to question Cassius' motives and recognize the true intention, which is personal grudge. His *philia* for Cassius is malevolently exploited to have 'the upper hand' and Brutus soon finds himself in a vortex of ill incidents which sprang from incorrect decisions.

Coriolanus is different in the portrayal of love. The play is darker in its tone, more radical in the description of encounters and rather cruel in terms of manipulation. Martius falls victim to events and situations which he cannot control. On the battlefield he is able to command and navigate himself through the

perils, he is the man he wants to be. However, in the political Rome he is subjected to the influence of external forces against which he tries to unsuccessfully rebel, he is a mere puppet in the hands of manipulation and skewed ideologies. He is the warrior version of Brutus which is not fit for political office.

The principal deceiver in Martius' decisions is his mother, Volumnia. This 'matrona docta' exercises great power over her son, whom she brought up according to her ideals. Honour holds a prominent place in her way of living and it seems that her ambitions, which she was prevented to realize due to her gender, are fulfilled by Martius. He is the reminder of what she wished to have accomplished, therefore to lose power over him equals losing the reputation he was able to accumulate and consequently threaten her position among the nobles of Rome. None of Martius' closest companions (Menenius, Cominius) are unable to persuade him, however whensoever Volumnia enters the stage with the aim to 'talk some sense' into her son, she initially fails as well, yet is able to persuade him given her emotional blackmail or attacking vulnerabilities. Against these two forces, Martius is defenceless. In my understanding of their relationship, only Martius is capable of some form of love. This I would classify as *storge*, but omit the reciprocity of the emotion.

Shakespeare's treatment of love in the Roman tragedies is both in lieu with the perception of the destructive nature of *eros* and at the same time rebuking the institution of ideal friendship Aristotle spoke of. I acknowledge that my reading is merely one in multitude of possible interpretations, but I believe that the multilayered nature of Shakespeare's plays allow for my reading.

Czech Summary

Počátkem dubna 2016 byla světu sdělena překvapivá zpráva. Na skotské ostrově Bute bylo nalezeno Shakespearovo První Folio, jehož autenticita byla potvrzena profesorkou Emmou Smith z Oxfordu. Někdo tento nález může vnímat jako náhodu, protože tento rok je připomínán jako čtyřsté výročí smrti Shakespeara. První Folio je ale důležité z jiného hlediska, než jen připomínka Shakespearovy neutuchající slávy a vlivu. Bez Prvního Folia a bez práce Johna Hemingea a Henryho Condella by nikdy nebylo vydáno osmnáct z jeho her.

Právě *Julius Caesar*, *Antonius a Kleopatra*, a *Coriolanus* jsou mezi těmi hrami, které nebyly vydány v tzv. „quarto editions“, a poprvé byly otištěny až v Foliu. Společně s hrou *Titus Andronicus* tvoří celek, který se nazývá římské tragédie.

Ve své diplomové práci se budu zabírat otázkou, zda-li láska ovlivňuje úsudek protagonistů, jehož následek se promítne v politickém světě dané hry. K tomuto účelu jsem zvolil římské tragédie *Julia Caesara*, *Antonia a Kleopatru*, a *Coriolana*, protože tyto hry nejenže jsou tragédiemi, ale zároveň i historickými hrami, které jsou zasazeny do důležitých milníků antického světa. *Coriolanus* zachycuje období transformace Říma z království na republiku, kdy Řím nebyl tak mocný a snažil se nalézt vlastní identitu na Apeninské poloostrově. *Julius Caesar* a *Antonius a Kleopatra* pak stojí v opozici a zachycují přechod z republiky v císařství.

Lásku nesmíme ale chápat pouze jako touhu, která je v angličtině vyjádřena slovem *desire*, ale vnímat slovo láska jako „krycí“ termín pro další, interpersonální vztahy, jako je náklonnost, vyjádřená řeckým slovem *storge* či přátelství, které je v řečtině vyjádřeno slovem *philia*. Proto neomezují anglický termín *love* pouze na touhu, ale snažím se vysledovat, zda-li i ostatní lásky mají podobný vliv.

K tomuto účelu budu využívat řecká slova *eros*, které právě denotuje onu touhu, dále *philia* a *storge*, protože jsou již asociována s typem vztahu. Tyto tři typy lásky jsou sobecké, což bylo dalším důvodem, proč jsem je zvolil. Vztah lidí, kteří jsou spojeni jedním z těchto typů, je založen na reciprocitě. Anglické slovo *love* je slovo spíše vágní, které s neurčitostí specifikuje vztah lidí. Popisem

jednotlivých typů se budu zabývat v první kapitole. Ačkoli se může jevit jako nadbytečně zdlouhavá, je to pouze výtažek, protože snažit se zachytit všechny nuance ze všech dostupných materiálů by vyžadovalo hrdinskou trpělivost a tato syntéza by daleko přesahovala rámec mé práce.

Podobným způsobem jsem se postavil k exkluzi vlivu renesančního myšlení na anglické renesanční smýšlení o lásce. Jsem si vědom velkého vlivu Francesca Petrarce na uměleckou tvorbu renesanční Anglie a svým způsobem by krátký popis jeho vlivu zapadal do stylu mé práce. Totéž se dá říci o dalším Italovi, Marsiliu Ficinovi. Ficino byl neoplatonik, který zdokonalil Petrarcovy myšlenky o lásce, ovlivněné Platónovým pohledem na lásku. Stále ale byl Platón jejich výchozím bodem pohledu.

Cicerovo filozofické pojednání *Laelius de amicitia* mělo obdobně velký vliv na smýšlení o přátelství. Rozhodl jsem se ho ale vynechat, protože Cicero byl ovlivněn jak Aristotelovým pohledem na přátelství, tak i Platónovým. Zabývám se pouze Aristotelovým pojetím přátelství, s občasným přihlédnutím k Platónovi.

Láska jako náklonnost (*storge*) je pravděpodobně nejrozšířenějším druhem lásky na planetě. Je to láska rodičů k dětem a naopak. Tento typ se ale nevztahuje pouze na blízkou rodinu, může odkazovat i ke vztahu lidí, kteří se poznali poté, co byli silou, kterou nemohli kontrolovat, seznámeni. Takovým příkladem by mohli být žáci či studenti ve společné třídě. Vztah lidí, kteří jsou spojeni *storge* je založen na reciprocitě, ale jejich vzájemnost nevyžaduje, aby bylo vyjadřování explicitní. *Storge* mezi jinými osobami, než je blízká rodina, je neflexibilní. Kdykoli dojde ke změně, která jedna ze zúčastněných stran není schopna přijmout či odpustit dochází k ukončení vztahu. Změna tedy není přítelem náklonnosti.

Lásku jako touhu (*eros*) rozdělil Platón na dvě části: tělesnou touhu a nebeskou touhu.¹⁰⁸ Ona nebeská touha je vytoužená forma, jejíhož dosáhnutí by se měl filozof zabývat, protože mu dovoluje dosáhnout absolutní krásy, stavu dokonalého spojení. Ve svém snažení ale nesmí polevovat, protože stav absolutní krásy je pomíjivý. Tudíž *eros* je touha po věcech které postrádáme. Platón ale zcela neodsuzuje tělesnou touhu, naopak je si vědom toho, že tělesná touha může

108 Toto jsou mé překlady. Nečetl jsem Platónova díla pojednávající o lásce, proto nemohu poskytnout oficiální překlad.

pomoci při snaze dosáhnout absolutní krásy. *Eros*, jako forma lásky, byl nejčastěji zpracováván v literatuře.

Láska jako přátelství (*philia*) byla v antickém světě oslavována jako ctnost a byla považována za lásku nejdokonalejší, protože byla založena na vědomé volbě. V tom, jak na přátelství nahlížet se Platón a Aristotelés rozcházel. Platón tvrdil, že člověk ctnostný nepotřebuje přátele, je soběstačný. S tím Aristotelés nesouhlasil a v *Etice Nikomachově* se snažil dokázat opak. Snažil se i jakýmsi způsobem stratifikovat přátelství na úplné přátelství, přátelství pro požitky, a přátelství pro užitečnost, stále ale přihlížející k rovnosti mezi oběma druhy. Úplné přátelství je přátelství nejdokonalejší, kdy se jeden druhému snaží pomoci dosáhnout lepšího já, dopomoci ke štěstí, *eudaimonii*. Přátelství je také založené na reciprocitě.

Láska jako touha je dominantním typem v Shakespearových komediích, protože jejich struktura to vyžaduje. K získání své vyvolené či svého vyvoleného musí překonat „trnitou cestu“, která je neustále zhušťována vlivy, které oni nemohou změnit. Odměnou jim je shledání a následné manželství, ke kterému ze začátku hry nemělo dojít, protože patriarchální svět nedovoloval nevěstinu volbu ženicha. Samozřejmě, že v Shakespearově kánonu komedií není tento postup repetitivní, natožpak univerzální. Pokud se ale pozmění *modus operandi*, pak překonávání „trnité cesty“ se dá považovat za příznak komedií.

V Shakespearových tragédiích je skupina tří tragédií, které se dají označit za „tragédie lásky“ – *Romeo a Julie*, *Othello*, a *Antonius a Kleopatra*. Pokud přijmeme simplifikaci, že láska v Shakespearově díle je touha, potom by to správně měly být „tragédie touhy“. Domnívám se, že Shakespeare, jako vždy, není tak jednoznačný, jak bychom měli vnímat lásku v tragédiích. *Romeo a Julie*, ačkoli je to hra, která je často přirovnávána k archetypu čisté lásky, je, dle mého mínění, onou „tragédií touhy“. Zjednodušení vztahu mezi Desdemonou a Othellem na touhu není tak jednoznačné. Othello je již zkušený člověk, který o Desdemonu neměl v první řadě zájem, všichni se ale domnívají, že Othello podlehl kráse Desdemony a že jeho poblouznění ovlivní jeho misi na Kypru. Sám Othello benátský senát přesvědčí, že jeho láska není založena na tělesné touze, ale na touze daleko bližší nebeské, nebude tedy ovlivňovat jeho úsudek při plnění

povinností. Iago není ale přesvědčen o upřímnosti Othellově výpovědi a snaží se dokázat, že Othella a Desdemonu k sobě poutá pouhý chtíč po fyzickém styku. Jeho činy bohužel probudí v Othellovi žárlivost a ve svém amoku Othello Desdemonu zabije.

Nyní se v krátkosti zmíním o své analýze tří římských tragédií. První je *Coriolanus*. Tato hra představovala největší problém z římských tragédií, protože je nejvíce ovlivněna politickým podtextem. Soukromý život je podřízen životu veřejnému. Coriolanus (jeho vlastní jméno je Caius Martius) je věhlasný vojevůdce, který je opěvován Římem, především patricijskými vrstvami. Jeho vztah k nižším vrstvám je ale negativní. Téměř každá jeho akce je podmíněna touhou po cti, kterou získává především v bitvě. Byl tak totiž vychován svou matkou, Volumnií, které nebylo v patriarchálním světě římské republiky dovoleno projevit své touhy. Martius tedy může být vnímán jako její prodloužené ego. Martius se snaží najít svou vlastní identitu, na bojišti se mu to vždy daří, protože je schopen ovládat své akce. V politickém světě Říma je ale často vystaven machinacím, které se snaží konfrontovat pro něj tak typickým přístupem – útokem.

Za své činy byl Coriolanus jmenován konzulem, ale aby byl formálně uznán jako konzul musí čelit lidu, aby získal jeho svolení vykonávat svou funkci. Lid svolí, ale při následném setkání v senátu je Coriolanus napadán dvěma tribunami lidu. Ty pobuřují lid a tak se Coriolanus musí vydat na tržisté podruhé, aby odprosil svá slova. Zpočátku se zdráhá, jeho matka ho ale začne citově vydírat a Coriolanus jí podlehne a svolí. Jeho svolení je současně zpečetěním jeho pobytu v Římě, jelikož je krátce poté vyhnán.

Útočiště nalézá v městě Antium, kde se nachází jeho úhlavní nepřítel, Aufidius. Tito dva se rychle sblíží, a svůj vztah se nebojí nazvat přátelstvím. Aufidius ale má jiné plány s tím, až se Coriolanus vydá na Řím, aby ho zničil. Když už se armáda dostane před Řím, všichni si uvědomí katastrofické následky, pokud by Coriolanus zkázu dokončil. Jeho přátelé se za ním vydají, a je to opět jeho matka, která ho donutí pomocí napadání a citového vydírání změnit názor. Coriolanovo rozhodnutí uzavřít s Římem mír se mu opět nevyplácí, protože tentokrát za rozhodnutí zaplatí životem. Hlavním elementem, který ovlivňuje Coriolanovo

rozhodnutí je jeho matka. Jejich vztah se ale nedá nazvat vzájemným, je pouze jednostranným. Má percepce Volumnie je, že jako matka nechová žádné city ke svému synovi, pouze k představě hrdinství a cti, kterou její syn symbolizuje.

V *Juliu Caesarovi* se Shakespeare snažil zachytit úplné přátelství mezi Cassiem a Brutem. Bohužel se ale přiklání k tomu, že úplné přátelství neexistuje, protože neexistuje dokonalá rovnost mezi druhy. *Julius Caesar* pojednává o smrti Julia Caesara, o pronásledování jeho vrahů, Cassia a Bruta, a o druhém triumvirátu, který se zformoval, aby je potrestal. Řím se v té době nacházel v posledním období své existence jako republika a hrozilo, že se brzy vrátí pod absolutistickou moc jednoho panovníka, jak tomu bylo v době království. Cassius se tomu snaží zabránit a pro potřebu povstání „zverbuje“ Bruta. Ten je ale morální člověk, navíc Caesarův přítel, a k tomuto činu by nesvolil. Proto Cassius, aby narušil Brutovu integritu začne útočit na jejich vzájemné přátelství a na Brutovu čest. Brutus podlehe jeho slovům a v té chvíli ztrácí svou duši, svou veřejnou personu a dostává se do víru špatných rozhodnutí, která kulminují v jeho sebevraždu u Phillip. Cassius je tedy ten, který zapříčiní Brutův pád, ten, který se dovolává *philia*, když se snaží přesvědčit Bruta o své pravdě. *Philia* tak může mít následky takřka stejné jako touha (*eros*).

Právě touha je hlavní formou lásky v *Antoniově a Kleopatře*. Jejich láska je nejbližší lásce, kterou Shakespeare líčí v komediích, totiž láskou zaslepenou, iracionální. Druhý triumvirát, který se skládal z Octaviana, Marka Antonia, a Lepida se podobně, jako první triumvirát rozpadl a dva jeho členové se nyní nacházejí v pozici, že se Antonius snaží zabránit Octavianovi v tom, aby se stal císařem a dokončil tak Caesarovo dílo. Antonius podlehl kouzlu Kleopatry, která ho očarovala a tím zaslepila. Musí se ale navrátit do Říma, aby vyřešil problémy, které způsobila jeho žena Fulvia a také aby se pokusil zvrátit nepříznivé veřejné mínění, které o něm Řím má. Proto se dohodnou s Octaviem na politické svatbě s jeho sestrou Octavií. Antonius je ale tažen zpět do Egypta, aby se opět shledal s Kleopatrou a pošle Octavii zpět do Říma. Toto byla chyba, na kterou Octavius čekal, aby mohl zasáhnout proti spojeným silám Antonia a Kleopatry. Při bojích je Antonius opět zrazen svým úsudkem, který je stále pod vlivem touhy po Kleopatře.

Antonius se téměř v každé situaci chová proti zdravému úsudku římského generála, jeho úsudek je přímo ovlivněn buď odloučením od Kleopatry nebo její mocí, když se nachází v její přítomnosti. Je metaforicky slepý a není schopen spatřit čím Kleopatra skutečně je a kam vede její moc.

Shakespeare se tak chová k touze stejně jako se k ní chová ve svých komediích. Navíc se snaží ukázat, že přátelství je vztah, který není schopen přežít v politickém světě a zneužití přátelství může mít stejně katastrofické následky jako touha. *Storge*, jak je pochopeno v *Coriolanovi*, může mít srovnatelný vliv na úsudek jedince jako touha. Nicméně ale musím dodat, že pokud se mluví o jiné formě lásky, než je touha, je často zapotřebí zapojit ještě další metody jako přesvědčování, vydírání, či útok na hodnoty, kterých si oběť váží nejvíce.

Works Cited

- Annas, Julia. "Plato and Aristotle on Friendship and Altruism." *Mind* 344 (1997): 532–554.
- Aurelius, Marcus. *Meditations*. Translated by Robin Hard. Edited by Christopher Gill. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Bacon, Francis. *Essays*. 1906. Reprint, London: J. M. Dent & Sons, Ltd., 1946.
- Baker, Susan. "Personating Persons: Rethinking Shakespearean Disguises." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 43 (1992): 303–316.
- Barish, Jonas A., and Marshall Waingrow. "'Service' in King Lear." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 9 (1958): 347–355.
- Barnet, Sylvan. "Recognition and Reversal in Antony and Cleopatra." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 8 (1957): 331–334.
- Bartels, Emily C. "Making more of the Moor: Aaron, Othello, and Renaissance Refashionings of Race." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 41 (1990): 433–454.
- Bates, Catherine. "Shakespeare's tragedies of Love." In *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespearean Tragedy*, edited by Claire McEachern, 182–203. 2002. Reprint, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Boulukos, Athanasios. "The Cobbler and the Tribunes in 'Julius Caesar'." *MLN* 119 (2004): 1083–1089.
- Calderwood, James L. "Coriolanus: Wordless Meanings and Meaningless Words." *Studies in English Literature, 1500–1900* 6 (1966): 211–224.
- Caputi, Anthony. "Shakespeare's Antony and Cleopatra: Tragedy Without Terror." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 16 (1965): 183–191.
- Castiglione, Baldassare. "A Little Discourse to Declare What Love is." In *Shakespeare's World: Background Readings in the English Renaissance*, edited by Gerald M. Pinciss, and Roger Lockyer, 162–170. New York: Continuum, 1990.
- Charney, Maurice. *Shakespeare on Love & Lust*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2000.
- Cox, John D. "Shakespeare and the Ethics of Friendship." *Religion & Literature* 40 (2008): 1–29.
- Goddard, Harold C. *The Meaning of Shakespeare I*. Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press, 1967.
- Goldstein, Neil L. "Love's Labour's Lost and the Renaissance Vision of Love." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 25 (1974): 335–350.
- Grahan, Kenneth J. E. "'Without the Form of Justice': Plainness and the Performance of Love in 'King Lear'." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 42 (1991): 438–461.
- Greenblatt, Stephen, Walter Cohen, Jean E. Howard, and Katharine Eisaman Maus, eds. *The Norton Shakespeare*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1997.

- Greene, Robert. *Groats-worth of Wit*. In *The Norton Shakespeare*, edited by Stephen Greenblatt, Walter Cohen, Jean E. Howard, Katharine Eisaman Maus, 3321–22. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1997.
- Hallstead, R. N. “Idoltrous Love: A New Approach to Othello.” *Shakespeare Quarterly* 19 (1968): 107–124.
- Harris, Duncan S. “‘Again for Cydnus’: The Dramaturgical Resolution of Antony and Cleopatra.” *Studies in English Literature, 1500–1900* 17 (1977): 219–231.
- Harris, Jonathan Gil. “‘Narcissus in thy face’: Roman Desire and the Difference it Fakes in Antony and Cleopatra.” *Shakespeare Quarterly* 45 (1994): 408–425.
- Hartsock, Mildred E. “The Complexity of Julius Caesar.” *PMLA* 81 (1966): 56–62.
- Heinemann, Margot. “Political Drama.” In *The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Drama*, edited by A. R. Braunmuller, and Michael Hattaway, 161–203. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Hilský, Martin. *Divadlo a jeviště svět*. Praha: Academia, 2010.
- James, Gordon P. “The ‘Strumpet’s Fool’ in Antony and Cleopatra.” *Shakespeare Quarterly* 34 (1983): 62–68.
- Keats, John. “Letter to George and Thomas Keats.” In *The Norton Anthology of English Literature, Volume 2*, edited by M. H. Abrams et al. 6th ed. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1993.
- Konstan, David. “Aristotle on Love and Friendship.” *ΣΧΟΛΗ* Vol. II. 2 (2008): 207–212.
- Lawrence, D. H. *Selected Poems*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1968.
- Lewis, C. S. *The Four Loves*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1960.
- Lukeš, Milan. *Shakespeare a okolí: II. Shakespearovské souvislosti*. Praha: Svět a divadlo ve spolupráci s Institutem umění – Divadelním ústavem, 2010.
- MacFaul, Tom. *Male Friendship in Shakespeare and His Contemporaries*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Markels, Julian. *The Pillar of the World: Antony and Cleopatra in Shakespeare’s Development*. Ohio State University Press, 1968.
- Miles, Gary B. “How Roman are Shakespeare’s ‘Romans’?” *Shakespeare Quarterly* 40 (1989): 257–283.
- Miola, Robert S. “Julius Caesar and the Tyrannicide Debate.” *Renaissance Quarterly* 38 (1985): 271–289.
- Nardi, Peter M. “‘Seamless Souls’: An Introduction to Men’s Friendship.” In *Men’s Friendship*, edited by Peter M. Nardi. Newbury Park: Sage Publications, 1992.
- Nordlund, Marcus. *Shakespeare and the Nature of Love: Literature, Culture, Evolution*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2007.

- Osborne, Catherine. *Eros Unveiled: Plato and the God of Love*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002.
- Ovid. *Metamorphoses*. Edited by E. J. Kenney. Translated by A. D. Melville. 1986. Reprint Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Pakaluk, Michael. "Friendship." In *A Companion to Aristotle*, edited by Georgios Anagnostopoulos, 471–482. Chicester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009.
- Palmer, D. J. "Tragic Error in Julius Caesar." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 21 (1970): 399–409.
- Payne, Michael. "Erotic Irony and Polarity in Antony and Cleopatra." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 24 (1973): 265–279.
- Peprník, Michal. *Metamorfóza jako kulturní metafora: James Hogg, R. L. Stevenson a George Mac Donald*. Olomouc: Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci, 2003.
- Price, A. W. *Love and Friendship in Plato and Aristotle*. 1989. Reprint, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2004.
- Robert, Jean-Noël. *Řím 753 př. n. l. až 476 n.l.*. Translated by Jitka Matějů. Praha: Nakladatelství Lidových novin, 2001.
- Rogers, R. Vashon. "Marriage in Old Rome." *Green Bag* 18 (1906):
- Rose, Paul Lawrence. "The Politics of Antony and Cleopatra." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 20 (1969): 379–389.
- Sacharoff, Mark. "Suicide and Brutus' Philosophy in Julius Caesar." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 33 (1972): 115–122.
- Schalkwyk, David. *Shakespeare, Love and Service*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Shakespeare, William. *Anthony and Cleopatra*. Edited by Michael Neill. 1994. Reprint, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Shakespeare, William. *Jak se vám líbí*. Translated by Martin Hilský. Brno: Atlantis, 2007.
- Shakespeare, William. *Julius Caesar*. Edited by Arthur Humphreys. 1984. Reprint, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Shakespeare, William. *The Tragedy of Coriolanus*. Edited by R. B. Parker. 1994. Reprint, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Shakespeare, William. *Othello, the Moor of Venice*. Edited by Michael Neill. 2006. Reprint, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Shakespeare, William. *Titus Andronicus*. Edited by Eugene M. Waith. 1984. Reprint, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Siegel, Paul N. "Christianity and the Religion of Love in Romeo and Juliet." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 12 (1981): 371–392.
- Singer, Irving. *The Nature of Love, Vol. 3*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1989.

- Spurgeon, Caroline. *Shakespeare Imagery and What It Tells Us*. 1935. Reprint, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Stevenson, Robert Louis. *Olalla*. London: Penguin Random House, 2015.
- Strong, Bryan, Christine DeVault, and Theodore F. Cohen, eds. *The Marriage and Family Experience*. 11th ed. Wadsworth Publishing, 2011.
- Tallis, Frank. "Crazy for you." *The Psychologist* 18 (2005): 72–74.
- Taylor, Lily Ross. "The Rise of Julius Caesar." *Greece & Rome* 4 (1957): 10–18.
- Tillyard, E. M. W. *The Elizabethan World Picture*. 1943. Reprint, London: Penguin Books, 1990.
- Tones, Jules. *Love and Friendship*. Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 2003.
- Wilson, Thomas. *The Arte of Rhetorique*. In *Shakespeare's World: Background Readings in the English Renaissance*, edited by Gerald M. Pinciss, and Roger Lockyer, 171–179. New York: Continuum, 1990.
- Wolf, William D. "'New Heave, New Earth': The Escape from Mutability In Antony and Cleopatra." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 33 (1982): 328–335.

Internet Sources

- "General Theories of Love." Available at http://www.sagepub.com/sites/default/files/upm-binaries/3222_ReganChapter1_Final.pdf.
- Bible Gateway. New International Version. Available at <https://www.biblegateway.com/>.
- Bradley, A. C. *Oxford Lectures on Poetry*. New York: St Martin's Press, 1965. Available at <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/36773/36773-h/36773-h.htm>.
- Coughlan, Sean. "Shakespeare First Folio discovered on Scottish Island." *BBC*, April 7, 2016. Accessed May 1, 2016. www.bbc.com/news/education-35973094.
- Helm, Bennett. "Love." In *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, principal editor Edward N. Zalta. Stanford University, 1997–. Article first published April 8, 2005, revised June 21, 2013. Accessed March 19, 2016. <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/love/>.
- Kastan, David Scott. "Did He Even Know He Was Shakespeare? What the history of the First Folio tells us about our greatest playwright." *Humanities* 37 (2016). Accessed April 20, 2016. www.neh.gov/humanities/2016/januaryfebruary/feature/did-he-even-know-he-was-shakespeare.
- Konstan, David. "Epicurus." In *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, principal editor Edward N. Zalta. Stanford University, 1997–. Article first published January 10, 2005, revised April 20, 2014. Accessed March 19, 2016. <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/epicurus/>.

- Lidell, Henry George, and Robert Scott. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940. Available at <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu>.
- Moseley, Alexander. "Philosophy of Love." In *The Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, general editors James Fieser, Bradley Dowden. 1995-. Accessed March 19, 2016. <http://www.iep.utm.edu/love/>.
- Plutarch. *The Parallel Lives*. Loeb Classical Library Edition, 1920. Available at <http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Plutarch/Lives/home.html>.
- Xenophon. *Xenophon in Seven Volumes*. Translated by Carleton Lewis Brownson. Cambridge: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann, Ltd., 1922. Available at <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3atext%3a1999.01.0202>.