

**Shakespeare's Roman Honour: Military, Morals, and Masculinity**

by

© Stephanie Dohey

A thesis submitted to the

School of Graduate Studies

in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

**Master of Arts**

**English**

**Memorial University of Newfoundland**

**April 2016**

St. John's

Newfoundland and Labrador

**ABSTRACT**

This thesis examines Shakespeare's concept of Roman honour in *Titus Andronicus* and *Julius Caesar* through an analysis of keywords, imagery of the body politic, and source alterations. In the creation of Titus, Shakespeare focuses on medieval ideals of honour, emphasizing the importance of military and monarchical allegiance. However, in the shaping of Brutus' character, the playwright clearly highlights aspects of Renaissance moral virtue and interpersonal honesty and integrity. In both plays, while the many meanings of honour may change, masculinity remains a constant factor in Roman virtue.

## **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

I would like sincerely to thank Doctors Gordon Jones, Robert Ormsby, Danine Farquharson, and Jennifer Lokash; without your support and knowledge, this thesis would not have been possible. I would also like to give heartfelt thanks my partner, Derek, as well as my mother, my brother, and my friends Sarah, Leah, and Roxanne, for their wealth of support. Finally, I express my utmost gratitude to Memorial University of Newfoundland and the Social Sciences Humanities Research Council of Canada for their funding and the receipt of the Joseph-Armand Bombardier Canada Graduate Scholarship.

**Table of Contents**

ABSTRACT.....2

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....3

Table of Contents.....4

Introduction.....5

Chapter One: Honour.....12

Chapter Two: Honour, bodies, and the body politic.....48

Chapter Three: Alterations in source materials and implications of honour.....72

Conclusion.....86

Works Cited and Consulted.....91

## Introduction

This thesis asks several questions of William Shakespeare's model Roman citizenry in *Titus Andronicus* and *Julius Caesar*: What is the definition of honour and virtue in Shakespeare's Rome? What connection does the virtuous Roman have with the body politic and how is this represented in imagery? What details of the plays' original source materials have been preserved, omitted, or modified, and what relevance do these changes have in shaping the context of honour? And how do these examinations reflect early modern English social values and virtue? Contextualizing Shakespeare's concept of Roman honour by analyzing the occurrence of words such as honour and virtue clarify the playwright's interpretation of the terms within *Titus* and *Caesar*, thereby allowing a comparison to Elizabethan ideals of honour. In turn, this research enables a study of virtue as it relates to elements of the body politic and Shakespeare's divergences from source materials. By altering his source materials, Shakespeare employs imagery of the body politic to create a portrait of the virtuous Roman citizen and reflect Elizabethan shifting codes of honour. The occurrences of the words honour and virtue reveal Shakespeare's definition of Roman honour, and linking these words to the body politic and source material alterations exposes the influence of the changing status of honour in Elizabethan England.

Chapter One of this dissertation focuses on first defining honour in modern and Elizabethan terms and then contextualizing the instances of the word honour in each play. Historical definitions of honour provide the framework for an understanding of Shakespeare's interpretation of Roman virtue in *Titus* and *Caesar*; and each time honour or virtue appears in the dialogue valuable information is revealed regarding the speaker and his or her relationship with Rome. Historicizing the plays by linking Elizabethan sociopolitical and dramatic contexts leads

into an analysis of the body politic in Shakespeare's Rome and England, which is the basis of Chapter Two. Mapping the definitions of virtue and honour onto representations of the body politic enables an analysis of the dynamic between Rome and its citizens in each play and allows for a comparison to the broader Elizabethan context. Lastly, Chapter Three examines what Shakespeare's changes to source materials signify with regards to Elizabethan notions of honour and how the alterations were made to suit the playwright's audience. In this chapter, in addition to analyzing *Titus* and *Caesar*, I will work with Shakespeare's source materials in editions contemporary to the playwright; these sources include Plutarch's *Lives of the Noble Grecians and Romans* as translated by Thomas North, Ovid's *Metamorphoses* translated by Arthur Golding, and Seneca's *Thyestes* translated by Jasper Heywood. By understanding Shakespeare's selective use of details from ancient writers in *Titus* and *Caesar*, we gain a greater insight into the shaping of tragic protagonists and antagonists.

In order to derive a comprehensive definition of honour and virtue within the context of *Caesar* and *Titus*, one must analyze the occurrences of these particular words. However, this analysis is best conducted alongside an assessment of the multifaceted concept of Renaissance honour, specifically Elizabethan understandings of the term. Of course, the definitions of honour and virtue are complexly interwoven, in the texts and in social definitions, often appearing as synonyms. Consequently, one must also consider the antithesis of honour in the instances of words such as dishonour. Examined contextually and surveyed thematically, occurrences of these significant words in *Titus* and *Caesar* are the foundation of a study encompassing Shakespeare's maturing conception of the city-state and its citizens as well as his intentional or unintentional dramatic applications in reflecting Elizabethan principles of virtue. Every instance of honour and virtue adds to the growing textual mosaic that represents Shakespeare's concept of Rome.

In terms of the honour of the main protagonists, Titus and Brutus demonstrate intense passion when it comes to duty to the Roman state, but the morals behind their actions, as well as Shakespeare's representations of their personalities and temperaments, differ greatly. Titus Andronicus' "first utterance is a formal speech of some length [...], and] he is fluent" (Brown 286), triumphant, and confident in his return to Rome. In contrast, Brutus' initial dialogue suggests a man ill at ease with language. His first communication identifies the soothsayer and reiterates his warning to Caesar: "A soothsayer bids you beware the Ides of March" (1.2.19). Brutus does not speak at greater length until Cassius encourages him to share his feelings. However, there are points of intersection between the individual dispositions of the initially verbose Titus and laconic Brutus; both characters share stock Roman values and "their desire[s] for glory and honor [make] them lead lives of self-denial and heroism all for the sake of their city" (Barroll 333). Each tragic protagonist is more than willing to sacrifice his life for the good of the Roman state. Shakespeare's definition of an ideally honourable Roman citizen lies within the parameters of these similarities and differences.

An analysis of this remodeling of primary materials reveals the nature of Shakespeare's Roman protagonists. In molding a narrative into a drama, Shakespeare manipulates elements of Plutarch's *Lives*, for instance, emphasizing Caesar's physical sickness, reducing elements of Antony's cowardice, and inventing Calpurnia's infertility. However, Shakespeare's greatest efforts in manipulating the *Lives* lie in his reshaping of Brutus' character as a completely moral hero. Sidney Homan remarks that Shakespeare "read 'The Life of Brutus' with a purpose different from that of a critic. [...] Brutus would be what he wanted him to be, or what Brutus had to be within the larger design of the play" (196). Similarly, Shakespeare modifies elements of his ancient sources in *Titus*: Demetrius and Chiron sever Lavinia's hands, rendering her

incapable of the written communication utilized by Philomela in Ovid. Also, as frequently noted in criticism, Shakespeare eliminates the avenging-sister plot, leaving revenge to the male Andronici. Thus, Titus replaces both Procne and Atreus as chef of the cannibalistic banquet in the final scene. In consequence, another alteration is made: while in the stories from Seneca and Ovid it is solely the father who consumes the flesh of his child, in *Titus* numerous guests attend the meal and it is the mother of the murdered Chiron and Demetrius who dies with the flesh of her children inside her once again. Each of these refashionings marks a conscious decision by Shakespeare to remove or add certain characteristics, thereby modifying the portrayal of the protagonists and antagonists.

The details Shakespeare maintains from his sources also reveal important characteristics of each play's major figures and the Roman body politic. In *Titus*, Shakespeare retains certain images. For example, both Ovid and Seneca compare child-murdering relatives to tigers. In *Thyestes*, Atreus is the tiger, killing his brother's "calf" (66-67); in *Metamorphoses*, Procne slays her own child and is compared to a "Tyger [that] gets a little Calfe" (57). In *Titus*, Tamora is twice referred to as a tiger (2.3.142, 5.3.194) and Lavinia is the deer (3.1.89-91) or doe (2.1.94, 2.1.118, 2.2.26). While one might expect Titus, who is the murderer of Tamora's children, to assume the characterization of "tiger," it is Tamora, the female outsider, whom Shakespeare likens to a wild predator. This choice emphasizes the alterity of Tamora and conveys the threat she poses to Roman civilization. There are other similarities: Ovid takes care to note that Philomela wraps her arms around her father three times in less than ten lines (607-14) before departing from her home with Tereus, her future rapist; and when Marcus Andronicus finds Lavinia, he laments that her attackers have made her body "bare / Of her two branches, those sweet ornaments, / Whose circling shadows kings have sought to sleep in" (2.4.17-19). In both



cases, female appendages are connected with patriarchal power. Shakespeare specifically refers to the story of Philomela while Aaron plots Lavinia's rape (2.3.43), but Chiron and Demetrius take their revenge a step further than Tereus when they sever Lavinia's hands in order to ensure her silence. Marcus observes the augmentation of Tereus' methods when he first encounters the ravished Lavinia: "Fair Philomela, why she but lost her tongue, / ... A craftier Tereus, cousin, hast thou met, / And he hath cut those pretty fingers off" (2.4.38-42). As well, both Ovid and Seneca have the initial murder or rape take place in isolated, dark woods, while the ultimate revenge killings and acts of cannibalism occur in domestic settings. Shakespeare retains the alien atmosphere for Lavinia's mutilation and situates the deaths of Chiron, Demetrius, and Tamora in Rome, presumably in Titus' own house. Lavinia is attacked and raped by foreigners in an isolated location, away from heavily populated areas, and, as she personifies the city-state, this signifies the fall of Rome and the stable body politic. Locating the Gothic enemies' deaths within the city, portraying a purifying justice or revenge at "home," signifies the acclamation of a new head of state, the rebirth of a newly founded Rome, and the reestablishment of the power of the patriarchy.

The concept of a state as a metaphorical body was commonplace in Shakespeare's time. In their article "Shakespeare and the Body Politic," Bernard Dobski and Dustin Gish observed that the Elizabethan and Jacobian era "was ripe with the discussion of the body politic as one of the most significant political metaphors for describing England's constitution and dissecting the constituent parts of the political community" (9). An early modern instance of the analogy is found in King James' speech to Parliament on March 19<sup>th</sup>, 1604. In this speech, King James clearly identifies England as a body and himself as the head of this body. James claims that his audience is "here presently assembled to represent the Body of the whole Kingdome" (132). He

refers to himself as “the head wherein that great Body is vnited” (135). This sentiment is similar to Marcus’ statement to Titus that he should “help set a head on headless Rome” (1.1.186). Brutus also refers to Caesar as the head of Rome when he discourages Cassius from targeting other Romans, who are the appendages of Rome: “Our course will seem too bloody, Caius Cassius, / To cut the head off and then hack the limbs” (2.1.163-64). Clearly, Shakespeare envisioned Rome, and perhaps England, as a political body that needed a “head.” As a head requires a functional body, each citizen represents a body part in the metaphorical political body. In particular to the body politic, references to hearts in *Titus* and *Caesar* most often indicate the harmonious or discordant relationship between the speaker and Rome, with special emphasis on controlling other Romans through cooperation with or manipulation of the Roman code of honour. Intrinsically linked with the heart, blood represents the destruction of Rome and human life, acting as a persistent auditory and visual signifier of carnage in both plays.

Focusing on *Titus* and *Caesar*, amongst all other plays, offers valuable insight into Shakespeare’s portrayal of Roman honour. In particular, these two dramas focus on ambition, virtue, and justice within the city-state. *Antony and Cleopatra* is of more imperial interest than domestic and focuses, among many things, on Rome’s growth as an empire and is split in its focus between Rome and Egypt. *Coriolanus* is invaluable in its richness of language centered on the body politic, but, again, there is the presence of a foreign enemy, the Volsci, and the location is not set solely on Roman territory. *Titus* and *Caesar* are set apart in that they are Roman plays centered on conflicts between Romans. While *others* exist on-stage as Goths in *Titus*, they enter Rome as part of Titus’ military triumph and are specifically made “incorporate” in Rome, “adopted happily” (1.1.462-63). Even if they turn out to be transplants ultimately rejected by the Roman body politic, the Gothic queen and her sons are temporarily made part of their

surroundings, and, in the final act, the Gothic army is led into Rome by Lucius in order to restore justice and heal the city's body. The main action of *Caesar* and *Titus* takes place on Roman territory within the city-state or empire of Rome and revolves around the intricacies of Roman terms of honour. *Titus*, written early in the author's career and set late in the Roman empire, is the playwright's first dramatic image of Rome; *Caesar*, written later in the playwright's life and set in an earlier Rome, offers a glimpse into a matured Shakespearean comprehension of Rome and the values he attributed to it. Both dramas bring together common themes of Romans dealing with what exactly it means to be a functioning part of Rome and define the varying possibilities of what it means to value and protect Roman justice above all personal matters.

## Chapter One: Honour

### *Modern and Early Modern English definitions*

In order to understand and appreciate Shakespeare's use of honour in *Julius Caesar* and *Titus Andronicus*, it is first necessary to comprehend what honour means in modern terms and in Shakespeare's own era. The *Oxford English Dictionary (OED)* provides several meanings for the word honour, from the Latin *honos* and *honor*, the most relevant being: "high respect [or] great esteem;" a "person or thing that brings esteem" or a "title of respect;" "[the] quality of knowing and doing what is morally right;" "[a] woman's chastity or her reputation for being chaste;" and "[a] thing conferred as a distinction, especially an official award for bravery or achievement." These modern definitions largely coincide with that of the Renaissance. However, this parallel in meaning did not always exist. During the Elizabethan era the classification of honour began to split off into several distinct subsections. First, the dichotomy of honour branched out into the public and private realms. Public honour referred to the oldest traditions, pursuing or claiming virtue through either military achievements or lineage and social rank. The newly emerging theme of private honour concerned personal and interpersonal honour. During the Renaissance, codes of honour began to shift and emerge as more morally than militarily focused:

Men were no longer considered honorable simply by right of birth, nor were they able to claim to be men of honor by producing a long list of heroic deeds. Rather, honor was becoming, by the seventeenth century, a matter of conscience; honorable men needed to seek, in every situation, to behave in such a way as to please both their state and their God. That is not to say that there did not exist a residual chivalric sense of honor which emphasized the importance of blood and lineage as well as martial prowess. Rather, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries this medieval concept of honor both co-existed

and overlapped with a more modern code of honor which simultaneously emphasized both godliness and political allegiance to the collective state. (Terry 1071)

Thus, in Shakespeare's time, honour became intertwined with personal and religious conscience. This duality presented early modern England with a new focus on how the individual acted in terms of godliness and moral integrity. The definition of honour itself is complex and multi-dimensional; however, Curtis Brown Watson suggests that the most succinct concept is, actually, rather simple. For this simple definition, Watson refers to French writer and priest François Rabelais (1494-1553), who had a single rule for behaviour in his monastery, which was "DO WHAT THOU WILT." Continuing to quote Rabelais, Watson provides the reason for this one rule: "Because men that are free, well-borne, well-bred, and conversant in honest companies, have naturally an instinct and spur that prompteth them unto virtuous actions, and withdraws them from vice, *which is called honor*" (Watson 91; emphasis added). Rabelais' interpretation of honour is possession of a natural instinct towards virtuosity and away from corruption. However, it is specifically men who are free citizens of aristocratic lineage and who keep honest company that have the natural disposition towards virtue. Rabelais' concept is emblematic of Renaissance attitudes towards honour and virtue, as is Robert Ashley's work titled *Of Honour*, written circa 1596, in which Ashley reports that some people did not understand how one may cultivate honour, only how one may inherit it: "I haue heard some say sometimes that they cold not skylle of this thing called honour, and that they knew not what yt meant because they thought that indeed there was no such thing but only a name and tittle which people had taken vp" (31). In the centuries before Ashley, honour would have been focused on class and military gains; as I argue below, Shakespeare conceptualizes this shifting tone of the Renaissance societies' concern with personal honour in *Titus* and *Caesar*. In *Caesar*, especially, the significance of honesty is closely

tied with virtuosity, whereas *Titus* focuses more on the fluctuating importance of military merit and the constant concern for patriarchy.

Before continuing, it is necessary to explain that the words honour and virtue were “practically synonymous” in Shakespeare’s era (Watson 11). Indeed, the words today have correlating definitions; as cited above, the *OED* defines honour as the “quality of knowing and doing what is morally right,” coinciding with the meaning of virtue, which is “valour, merit, [or] moral perfection.” This modern melding of definitions was not present in England before the Renaissance: “In brief, honour at no time in the Middle Ages was considered in any formal ethical system as synonymous with virtue, as it frequently was in the moral philosophies of Greece, Rome, and the Renaissance” (Watson 47). The change of definition occurred in early modern England and remains until today: honour changed to incorporate the meaning of moral excellence. With less focus on titles and the triumph of military prowess, honour became synonymous with personal integrity. Watson explains that honour “results from the pursuit of virtue and is inextricably connected with it,” referring to the Renaissance metaphor of virtue and honour linked together as a body and its shadow (94). To seek honour without regard for virtue is a misguided endeavor: “It was often suggested that one should seek virtue, and honour will follow like a shadow, whereas it would be folly to pursue honour for its own sake” (94).

It is also important to bear in mind that, in terms of personal and private realms, honour had a second duality, referring to either “an inner quality [... or] a sign of public respect” (Watson 94). In tune with the morphing terms of honour, this public respect was not based solely on terms of aristocratic class or militaristic achievements; rather, it was “an exclusively social virtue” (11). So, then, in the dichotomy of the existing seventeenth-century codes of honour, there was another divergence in the decoding of the term when social virtue became more than

the aforementioned fame that comes as a result of physical acts of heroic accomplishments; it now involved interpersonal moral integrity within the confines of Elizabethan virtue. Honour moved from the singular association with military and aristocratic success and grew to include personal integrity, which naturally branches into individual and interpersonal codes of honour. Concerns with old-fashioned militaristic virtue and newer ideals of social virtue are evident in both *Caesar* and *Titus*. In particular, *Caesar* opens with a conflict of military power and value in the tribunes' questioning of the citizens' intent in celebrating the fall of Pompey and the rise of Caesar. The tribunes represent Rome's political personnel, and they recognize the civil strife forced upon Rome by one Roman, Caesar, waging war against and defeating another Roman, Pompey. The tribunes grasp the changing and fragile nature of the body politic regarding internal affairs; Pompey, so recently a ruler beloved of the citizens, is easily replaced by Caesar in the people's hearts. Meanwhile, the citizens decorating Caesar's statue appear ignorant of the domestic distress, abandoning the tribunes' dilemmas of inner conflict in favour of eager acceptance of the head of the body politic presented to them. However, the emphasis on moral integrity is, of course, best represented in the private and interpersonal struggles of Brutus. Meanwhile, Titus' moral virtue is degraded when the new emperor, Saturninus, whom he chose to elect, refuses to acknowledge the Andronici clan's military efforts as more significant than the personal slight he suffers at the hands of Titus' children and brother. Thus, Titus begins to lose his function in the body politic. The lack of personal integrity and the ingratitude shown towards Titus, and thus Rome, by Saturninus and his foreign company are the foundational elements in the collapse of the cooperative body politic and Titus' revenge.

### *Honour in Julius Caesar*

In *Caesar*, varying terms of honour and virtue define the Roman citizen, which is

especially seen in Brutus' struggle to maintain moral integrity within his personal and public lives. Virtue is linked with a citizen's functional significance in the body politic, and the virtuous Roman fits vital criteria: male, of Roman origin and aristocratic lineage, and actively supports and protects the city-state and empire. It takes only seventy lines of text, less than thirty of his own, once Brutus begins speaking for him to establish that honour is his topmost priority.

Appropriately, given his concern for moral integrity, he is the first character to speak the word honour in *Caesar*. Virtue and honour first come into play in dialogue when Cassius approaches Brutus in 1.2, telling him that citizens "of the best respect in Rome [...] wish that noble Brutus had his eyes" (1.2.59-62). These lines establish Brutus as well-born, being noble and keeping the attention of the best respected citizens of Rome. Ever concerned with honour, Brutus questions Cassius' intentions in the conversation:

If it be aught toward the general good,

Set honour in one eye and death i'th'other

And I will look on both indifferently;

For let the gods so speed me as I love

The name of honour more than I fear death. (1.2.85-89)

This speech, with its double juxtaposition of honour and death, drives home Brutus' moral integrity; he has more passion and respect for honour than aversion to death itself. Moreover, Cassius establishes that a high regard for honour is itself a virtue (1.2.90). Correctly, Cassius states that "honour is the subject of [his] story" (1.2.92). However, Cassius also phrases his speeches in order to attract Brutus with the central theme of honour in what they discuss. Brutus



places so much significance on the “general good,” the good of the people of Rome and the city itself, that he will act on their behalf whether it ends in his honour or his death. He is impartial regarding how his actions on behalf of Rome will affect his own life. Brutus only cares for the greater good, evidence of both his patriotism and his interest in social virtue. Given his interest in private and interpersonal honour, Brutus reflects the changing notions of Elizabethan virtue. If his concept of honour was based purely on heritage and military might, then he should find Caesar an adequate ruler.

The next occurrence of honour juxtaposes Brutus’ concern for personal and interpersonal ethics with Caesar’s political and social dominance. Brutus and Cassius hear the shouts of the public nearby and Brutus “[believes] that these applauses are / For some new honours that are heaped on Caesar” (1.2.132-35). This comment contrasts Brutus’ established interest in social virtue with the purely titular and imperially linked honours bestowed on Caesar; moreover, the word “heaped” suggests a mere piling up of titles, lacking the moral substance and integrity seen so frequently in Brutus. Cassius laments that Caesar “doth bestride the narrow world / Like a Colossus, and we petty men / Walk under his huge legs and peep about / To find ourselves dishonourable graves” (1.2.135-38). Given Brutus’ fear that the people earlier chose Caesar as their king, and granted Cassius’ attitude towards Caesar, it is obvious that neither thinks Caesar deserves the honour that is being offered to him. As cited above, Brutus sees honour in serving “the general good,” so his fear of Caesar’s “new honour” is based on the theory that Caesar will not serve the general good. Cassius retorts that, while Caesar enjoys the ultimate seat of power, other men are left to “dishonourable graves,” graves without honour, not found in serving the general good, with no significance attached to the citizen’s life or death, regardless of his services to the city-state. From the context of Cassius’ dialogue, a dishonourable grave is found

when a man has no control over his actions in life and death. When Caesar looms over them “Like a colossus,” Brutus and Cassius, and the rest of Rome, are not “masters of their fates” (1.2.136-39). To be an honourable Roman, a man must determine his own means of living and dying. Cassius further pushes Brutus to take action by saying their fault is not in their stars (1.2.140), meaning that it was not predetermined or preordained that Caesar must be the ruler and Romans followers. Instead, Cassius suggests, the fault lies within themselves that they are underlings (1.2.141); there is no objective reason that they should be subservient to Caesar. While Caesar is preoccupied with the honours heaped upon him, Cassius and Brutus consider their future dishonour brought about by allowing one man to be king of Rome. Removing the Republican foundation of Rome in favour of monarchy diminishes the power of the citizens, in effect making the entire population servants to their ruler. Thus, as garnered through dialogue between Brutus and Cassius, dishonour is related to a loss of public power.

Cassius and the conspirators make it clear that Brutus is unanimously viewed throughout Rome as a noble and honourable citizen. When Cassius states that Brutus is nearly convinced to take part in the assassination plot, Casca claims that Brutus:

... sits high in all the people's hearts;

And that which would appear offense in us,

His countenance, like richest alchemy,

Will change to virtue and worthiness. (1.3.157-60)

Brutus, then, is so well recognized for virtue that his presence alone will lend credibility to his causes and associates. Just as alchemists were reputed to change base metals into gold, so the

conspirators believe that Brutus' renowned honour will turn the offense of their conspiracy into worthiness and virtue (Arnold 23). Brutus' purity in honour will, in effect, transmute any ill intentions of the conspirators into a virtuous endeavour, ensuring that they will appear as "sacrificers, but not butchers" (2.1.167). The establishment of Brutus' honourable reputation confirms Cassius' statements regarding Brutus' virtue and ensures that the audience is well aware of Brutus' social influence, while also emphasizing Renaissance integrity-based social honour.

Brutus alone shows special regard for aligning his public motives and his private code of honour and ensuring full ethical transparency. In order to endorse fully Cassius' plot, Brutus must find a logical reasoning for the assassination that coincides with the betterment of Rome and his own personal judgment. As Brutus ponders all that Cassius has told him in 1.2, he makes the first direct mention of Caesar's impending death. It is only while alone in his orchard that Brutus acknowledges that "It must be by his death" (2.1.10) that Caesar's political power ends. Instead of immediately viewing the assassination as a plot to be manipulated to gain public favour, like Antony, Brutus must first be alone with his thoughts before he can even speak aloud the consequences of Cassius' plan. As soon as Brutus realizes that Caesar must die, he also admits that he has "no personal cause to spurn him, / But for the general" (2.1.11-12); thus, he is concerned with finding individual moral motives for his actions resulting in social and political repercussions. Brutus is constant in his honesty, which reflects the emerging Elizabethan ideals of private honour and the consequential alteration of existing public codes of honour; Brutus could gain public, titular honour by defeating Caesar militarily, much like Caesar's victory over Pompey, but his sense of personal honour demands that he find an honest reason why Caesar is a threat to Rome. While Caesar does not presently have sole control over Rome, Brutus fears that Caesar's apparent humbleness is only a characteristic that comes before he climbs "young

ambition's ladder" (2.1.22). Thus, Brutus thinks of Caesar as a serpent's egg, "Which, hatched, would, as his kind, grow mischievous" (2.1.33). As Brutus ponders his motives and possible actions, Cassius and the conspirators visit him, reminding him that "no man here / But honours [him]" and "every one doth wish / [He] had but that opinion of [himself] / Which every noble Roman bears of [him]" (2.1.90-93). Again, Cassius manipulates key terms such as honour and noble in order to catch and maintain Brutus' attention. However, in this instance, Cassius persuades Brutus that Brutus should think of himself what every other Roman thinks him to be: honest, honourable, and constant in logic and integrity. Subtly, Cassius influences Brutus to accept public opinion and honour as ethical validation for the consequences of their conspiracy.

Brutus insists that the conspirators possess and act upon the same personal integrity and honour that governs his own life, encouraging them to show the same honesty and constancy. As Brutus officially joins the conspirators, Cassius suggests that they "swear [their] resolution" (2.1.113). Brutus, now acting as leader of the group, denies the importance of an oath, saying that true Romans need no promise in order to keep their word. Brutus' speech (2.1.114-40) serves as a contextual basis for defining Romans and Roman honour, even if relying on near utopian values. To Brutus, there is no need for Romans to swear an oath, because their citizenship entails consistency in honesty and interpersonal integrity; if their cause and ancestry are not reason enough to risk their lives and commit to total secrecy, then an oath will not ensure any further resolve. But, if they choose to abandon their mission, "high-sighted tyranny" (2.1.118) will rule Rome. Thus, tyranny is associated with misplaced ambition, and it is the duty of true, honourable Romans to attack the source of tyranny. Even cowards and weak-spirited citizens, the less virtuous Romans, will be spurred on by their cause and find inspiration in the honour of their intent (2.1.121-24). Brutus values honesty perhaps as much as he values honour, stating they

need no oath other than “honesty to honesty engaged” (2.1.126). The words honesty and honour were closely associated in ancient Rome and in Shakespeare’s own era: “honour and honesty were practically interchangeable in the Renaissance [... and the] Latin word *honestas* meant worth, virtue, honourable character, probity” (Watson 97). Furthermore, Brutus says that to need an oath would “stain / The even virtue of our enterprise” (2.1.132-33). The only people who need to swear oaths are those who “welcome wrongs” (2.1.131). Their virtue, then, is based on consistency and honesty. The blood that a true Roman “nobly bears” (2.1.136-37) is evidence enough of his trustworthiness and honour. Brutus’ speech marks the last occurrence of the words honour and virtue for several scenes, as the terms are absent during his personal scene with Portia as well as Caesar’s scene with Calpurnia. Honour does not appear again in dialogue until after Caesar’s assassination, when Antony sends his servant to plead with the conspirators for his own personal safety. This gap in the occurrence of honour in dialogue establishes that Antony, along with Cassius, knows that the best way to manipulate an audience, in particular Brutus, is to play on the love of honour; while references to honour are minimal or nonexistent between the time the conspiracy is established and enacted, they again occur with frequency when Antony must win over the audience with his concept of honour, just as Cassius did with Brutus.

Brutus’ oration at Caesar’s funeral is candid and logical, much like his own character, and lacks the manipulative nature of Antony’s speech. Before he begins speaking, the plebeians establish their affection for him by calling him “noble Brutus” (3.2.11). Speaking in prose based on what he believes to be genuine, honest emotions and justifications, Brutus hits the key theme of his oration, which is honour, four times in his relatively short speech of thirty lines. Cassius and the other conspirators establish the knowledge of Brutus’ virtuosity early in the play, but there is direct evidence that the plebeians, too, respect his reputation, as they refer to him as

noble and fall silent for his speech. He asks the crowd to “Believe me for mine honour, and have respect to mine honour, that you may believe” (3.2.14-15), basing his credibility on his reputation as steadfastly virtuous. Despite addressing the crowd in prose, Brutus at times speaks with a deliberate and steady rhythm, often using parallel construction and juxtaposition. His plea to the crowd to believe and respect his honour is, consciously or not, carefully structured: seven syllables ending with honour; a connector word, seven more syllables again followed by a reference to honour; and five more syllables. Brutus’ words, much like his own temperament, are constant in their emphasis on honour. The endpoint, the true goal of all his action and dialogue, is honour. Brutus speaks honestly and without ulterior motive, calling upon the citizens’ wisdom and reason to judge his actions. He acknowledges both the good and bad that was in Caesar: “as he was valiant, I honour him; but as he was ambitious, I slew him. There is tears for his love; joy for his fortune; honour for his valour, and death for his ambition” (3.2.25-27). Through careful and effective use of parallel construction and juxtaposition, Brutus contrasts honour and virtue with death and ambition. As valiance is rewarded with honour, so it is opposed to ambition, both in terms of definition and in Brutus’ use of parallel construction, as both words take the same position in similar sentences. In the same way, the effect of the structure contrasts death and honour. More specifically, honour is contrasted with death as a result of ambitious undertakings that threaten the body of Rome. Valiant is defined as “courage and determination,” and valour is “great courage in the face of danger, especially battle,” whereas ambition is “the strong desire to do or achieve something” (*OED*); Brutus commends Caesar’s excellence but condemns the late ruler’s *desire* for excellence. Caesar’s achievements and the aptitudes that accompany such achievements are positive Roman attributes, but according to Brutus, his egotism caused him to be overly ambitious and self-assured, which compromised the well-being of Rome.

While constructed similarly to Brutus' oration in terms of parallelism and juxtaposition, Antony's speech is designed purely to manipulate the plebeians into rising against the conspirators. Inviting Antony on stage, and at the same time introducing Caesar's corpse to the crowd, Brutus unwisely expects the same level-headedness and honourable intent from Antony. Like Brutus, Antony is addressed as noble by the third plebeian as he approaches the pulpit (3.2.11, 64). Antony's repetition of the words honourable and ambitious come closer to overt ridicule with each iteration; his speech turns into a mockery of Brutus' beliefs of honour and Caesar's alleged ambition. Antony is inviting the crowd to analyze the words through their frequent repetition and association with less favourable words. He calls Brutus honourable five times in nineteen lines of text and Caesar ambitious seven in eighteen, but his frequent repetition of the words and direct questioning of the context presented by Brutus raises a key question to the crowd when speaking of Caesar:

But Brutus says he was ambitious

And Brutus is an honourable man.

He hath brought many captives home to Rome,

Whose ransoms did the general coffers fill.

Did this in Caesar seem ambitious? (3.2.86-90)

Antony provokes the crowd into analyzing the situation from his own personal perspective, into questioning what has been done by the conspirators. Antony does not outright condemn their acts, but neither does he whole-heartedly endorse them, adding in subtle hints of uneasiness:

... The noble Brutus

Hath told you Caesar was ambitious.

*If* it were so, it was a grievous fault,

And grievously hath Caesar answered it. (3.2.77-80; emphasis added)

Antony uses the word “if” to plant a seed of doubt amongst the plebeians, and he does so again with “grievous,” suggesting that Caesar’s faults were as deplorable as his assassination. He reminds the crowd of how Caesar refused the crown, an emblem of public honour and ambition, at the Lupercal. Antony skilfully crafts his language when he declares that judgment has “fled to brutish beasts, / And men have lost their reason” (3.2.104), playing on “brutish” and “Brutus,” both coming from the Latin “brutus,” meaning insensible, unreasonable, or irrational. While presenting himself as “no orator” (3.2.210), Antony expertly plays on the crowd’s sympathy and gains their favour, delivering “a speech which is the epitome of persuasive rhetoric” (Watson 260). Unlike the tribunes at the beginning of the play who call the plebeians “you blocks, you stones, you worse than senseless things” (1.1.35), Antony appeals to the self-interest of the crowd and claims the contents of the will would move them too much: “You are not wood, you are not stones, but men” (3.2.142). Finally, it is clear that his lesson on the meaning of honour has been received by the crowd when the fourth plebeian responds to Antony’s prompting:

ANTONY: I fear I wrong the honourable men

Whose daggers have stabbed Caesar; I do fear it.

FOURTH PLEBEIAN: They were traitors. ‘Honourable men’! (3.2.151-53)



The juxtaposition of his phrasing, the “[s]pecious praise suddenly undercut by shocking reality” (3.2.151-52n), marks Antony’s abandonment of rhetoric and reveals the façade of his belief of the conspirators’ honourable intentions; Antony makes the leap from implying a negative perspective on Caesar’s assassination to using reality to shock the crowd into completely falling under his manipulation.

Furthermore, in contrast to Brutus’ personal code of honour and straightforward justification of his actions, Antony woos his audience with reminders of Caesar’s military achievements and the bequests he was able to make them in his will, large amounts of property and a sum of money to each citizen. Naturally, Caesar can only leave these things in his will because he was born into the right lineage to have such political strength and wealth. In this sense, Antony’s presentation of Caesar focuses on the military triumphs and heritage, which is reminiscent of the older, more traditional Renaissance way of conceiving honour. Brutus, on the other hand, is purely concerned with personal honour, the well-being of his fellow citizens, and, most importantly, the well-being of Rome.

Antony’s unsynchronized personal and public personas are indicative of his amoral nature and indifference towards interpersonal honour, which is the antithesis of Renaissance virtue. For instance, there is a passing reference to honour, next, in 4.1, when Antony reviews his plans with Octavius. Antony mentions that they “lay [...] honours” (4.1.19) on Lepidus merely to lighten their own load, and that Lepidus “shall but bear [these honours] as the ass bears gold” (4.1.21). This flippant reference to honour reveals Antony’s insolent attitude toward (inter)personal respect and honesty. Octavius claims that Lepidus is a “tried and valiant soldier” (4.1.28), asserting that Lepidus’ military background proves his worth and valor, but Antony belittles his ally by retorting that his horse can boast a similar battle record. Antony insulting

Lepidus, as well as his coolly signing off on the deaths of soldiers and relatives (4.1.1-9), is a signifier of his declined moral state and the incongruences between his private and public personae. Antony's willingness to "play the part" when he needs to, even when it contradicts his underlying beliefs in order to seem more honourable in the eyes of the public or his chosen audience, is a characteristic that defines him as dishonourable.

The remaining instances of the term honourable are rather scattered but worth noting for their military and social themes, as well as their importance in signifying Brutus' downfall. In 4.2, Brutus is unnerved by the death of Portia and by Cassius' questionable actions taken in order to acquire war funds. While Pindarus, Cassius' slave, announces that his "noble master will appear / Such as he is, full of regard and honour" (4.1.11-12), Brutus openly accepts the comment without doubt but then immediately turns to his own servant to inquire as to Cassius' true mood. Brutus questions the morality of Cassius' actions and clearly doubts his accomplice's loyalty. This instance of honour reveals Brutus' degrading emotional state and the turbulence in his relationship with Cassius; as well, it touches on the subjective nature of honour, as Pindarus believes Cassius honourable but Brutus does not. Shortly after this dialogue, Brutus himself uses the key term twice in order to voice his displeasure with Cassius. When Brutus accuses Cassius of buying and selling political favours, he says, "The name of Cassius honours this corruption" (4.2.67), which combines elements of social and personal honour. Brutus implies that Cassius' name carries honour and then juxtaposes the idea by saying his name honours corruption. In his unscrupulous personal morals, according to Brutus, Cassius poorly reflects Roman values. By accepting bribes, Cassius taints the honourable ideal that Brutus had established for their conspiracy. Brutus accuses him of "sell[ing] the mighty space of [their] honours" (4.2.77), trading money for morals. However, when Brutus chastises Cassius for not sending money to

pay Brutus' legions, it becomes clear that Brutus is unable to fund his military campaign personally. Brutus cannot carry out the immoral actions necessary to collect the money he needs, but he has no problem receiving the money and having an indirect connection to the dirty work. As Arthur Humphreys notes in the Oxford edition, "the way Brutus [...] demands money gained by Cassius' extortions since he himself cannot stoop to such conduct is distasteful, a sign of the idealist so at odds with practical necessities as to have collapsed into moral chaos" (4.2.198n). Marking Brutus' imminent collapse, these are the last references to honour that do not concern mortality.

Thematically consistent with the remaining instances of the word honour, Brutus and Cassius are mainly concerned now with honour in death. When Brutus and Cassius meet Antony and Octavius in 5.1, the former pair have put aside their differences and come together again in defining honour. Octavius declares that he does not plan to "die on Brutus' sword" (5.1.58) and Brutus claims that the youth "couldst not die more honourable" (5.1.60), while Cassius retorts that Octavius would be "worthless of such honour" (5.1.61). Brutus is suggesting that Octavius would gain personal and military-based honour if he were to die at Brutus' sword, as if in death honour could be conducted from one person to another. While they currently imagine their enemies dying with vicarious honour, all of the occurrences of the use of the word honour that remain focus on the honour of Brutus' and Cassius' own deaths. Again, Shakespeare conveys the notion that the killer can gain honour in ending the life of an honourable subject when Lucilius claims to be Brutus and tells a soldier that in killing him the man would "be honoured in his death" (5.4.14). Revealing his true identity, Lucilius states that "Brutus is safe enough" (5.4.20) and assures his captors that "no enemy / Shall ever take alive the noble Brutus. / The gods defend him from so great a shame!" (5.4.21-23). Obviously, there is great dishonour associated with

military defeat.

The final two occurrences of honour in *Caesar* remain on the topic of death, now dealing directly with Brutus' method of self-annihilation. When Brutus seeks assistance in his suicide, each Clitus, Dardanius, and Volumnius refuse to hold the sword while Brutus runs on it. Having asked a soldier, a servant, and a supporter, respectively, for aid, finally Brutus turns to Strato, another supporter, whose "life hath had some smatch of honour in it" (5.5.47). Brutus' statement may reflect his settling for less and less honour in the assistance of his suicide; first his own soldier, then his own slave, then two people, his last resorts, who are only listed as friends or supporters of the army. With each progressing choice, Brutus moves down the hierarchy of sociopolitical power and responsibility. Strato states that, in the act of taking his own life by his own choice, Brutus is free from bondage, having "only overc[o]me himself [...] no man else hath honour by his death" (5.5.56-59). The notion of dying with honour is heavily present in *Caesar*; as cited earlier, Brutus early on in the first act established that his love for honour was greater than his fear of death (1.2.88-89). Thus, in his death, Brutus allows his final act to secure his honour as a free Roman, enslaved by no man, and constant in his beliefs and honesty.

Even Antony, who, in his manipulation and abuse of power, lacks the moral honours that Brutus possesses, agrees that the late hero was an exceptional role model:

This was the noblest Roman of them all.

All the conspirators save only he

Did that they did in envy of great Caesar.

He only, in general honest thought

And common good to all, made one of them.

His life was gentle, and the elements

So mixed in him that Nature might stand up

And say to all the world 'This was a man!' (5.5.69-76)

While this speech follows a classical tradition of ending a drama with the victor, who has proven to be less than ideal, speaking over the dead body of the defeated, Antony's speech depicts the essence of the virtuous Roman, and Elizabethan, when he refers to the pure honesty and honour that Brutus held steadfastly. Brutus was only moved to motion when Cassius wrote "in several hands" (1.2.313), in the guise of numerous forgeries, in order to make it appear to Brutus that the citizens of Rome called upon him to help them for the betterment of the body politic. Urged on by his need to protect the stability of Rome to the utmost of his abilities, Shakespeare's Brutus acts as the archetype of virtue within the Roman canon, reflecting classical and Renaissance ideals of honour. Brutus' steadfast concern with the alignment of private and public morals parallels the Renaissance shift from purely military and hereditary honour to the inclusion of individual and social honesty and virtue. Certainly, within the play, Shakespeare's focus on Brutus aids in an examination of Renaissance honour as it came increasingly to include a sense of private and public morals.

#### *Honour in Titus Andronicus*

While *Caesar's* Brutus focuses on private morals and the social reputation of honour, *Titus* emphasizes the titular character's preoccupation with honour gained through military methods or familial fame. Both plays focus on old and new, that is, medieval and Renaissance,

understandings of honour, but *Titus* places special significance on themes of patriarchy, patriotism and military triumph, and the loss of honour. Without the structure and security of Rome's full support gained through military means and strict loyalty to the emperor, Titus is unable to adapt to the shifting concept of honour. Once Titus loses Rome's favour, he immediately loses all aspects of honour he knows; he is no longer functional as a soldier, citizen, or patriarch.

The introductory speeches of Saturninus and Bassianus juxtapose old and new concepts of honour, while also characterizing the morals of each brother. Saturninus calls upon the "Noble patricians" to "Defend the justice of [his] cause with arms" (1.1.1-2). He then calls on his countrymen, his "loving followers," to plead his "successive title with [their] swords" (1.1.3-4). Saturninus first addresses the nobility, suggesting they fight for his justice with "arms," perhaps a metaphorical reference to the body politic, not involving literal weapons. Saturninus separately and secondly recognizes the common people, demanding that they physically arm themselves with swords to defend his inheritance of the throne. He claims that, as firstborn son of the last emperor, it would be an indignity not to "let [his] father's honours live in [him]" (1.1.5-8). From this short speech, we learn of Saturninus' reliance on traditional primogeniture, his preference for high-ranking social positions, and that his understandings of honour relies on patriarchy and royal status. His only direct reference to honour is to say that, through the crown, he would carry on his father's honours, using honours to refer to the former patriarch's title and associated respect and power. Bassianus, on the other hand, speaks to "Romans, friends, followers, [and] favourers of [his] right" (1.1.9), ignoring the class distinction established by Saturninus. He also confirms that he has friends in his audience, suggesting individual and personal bonds with citizens rather than purely political alliances, perhaps hinting at the Renaissance awakening of

social and interpersonal honour outside the system of monarchy. Bassianus does mimic his brother's reference to a father or figurehead of Rome, calling himself "Caesar's son" (1.1.10), boasting either a literal or figurative connection to Rome through ancient ancestral roots. In either case, he makes reference to the last Republican leader of Rome; Caesar was the last elected figurehead before the destruction of Republicanism, which would be, in a sense, reinstated by Bassianus through his election to, rather than inheritance of, the throne. While both brothers rely on lineage in their claims for the throne, Saturninus makes his claim more immediate and based on generational inheritance; Bassianus openly encourages "freedom [of] choice" (1.1.17).

The election of Bassianus would be a result of the free choice of citizens relying on their moral natures to choose an emperor, reflecting the growing concern with Renaissance personal honour rather than strict allegiance to tradition. Bassianus states that if he was ever "gracious in the eyes of royal Rome" (1.1.11) then his followers should "suffer not dishonour to approach / The imperial seat, to virtue consecrate, / To justice, continence, and nobility" (1.1.13-15). Rather than referring to his or his father's honours, Bassianus encourages his followers not to let Saturninus approach the throne, as this would be dishonourable and a desecration of virtue. As Humphreys points out, Bassianus' language suggests "some previous degradation" of Saturninus (279), as if he has already been determined to be an unfit ruler. Thus, Bassianus suggests that the citizens should "let desert in pure election shine" and "fight for freedom in [their] choice" (1.1.16-17), encouraging the people to vote based on who will be the best leader and not to be swayed by the traditional concepts of political honour and allegiance to the inherited ruler. In their two relatively short speeches, Saturninus and Bassianus reveal their personal and political viewpoints regarding tradition and alteration of honour, while also setting the scene for the

presentation of a third candidate.

The introduction of Titus by Marcus and an unnamed captain establishes the sociopolitical significance of military honour in Rome. Whereas Bassianus and Saturninus compete “Ambitiously for rule and empery” (1.1.19), Marcus claims that Titus has “by common voice [...been elected...] for the Roman empery” (1.1.21-22). The word ambitious, which Shakespeare later uses to signal Caesar’s perilous thirst for power, suggests an element of danger or greed, a kind of anti-honour. Titus, however, is recognized for his patriotic duty as the noblest man and bravest warrior living within the city of Rome (1.1.23-25). Titus is clearly renowned for his militaristic value to Rome, but his honour is solely focused on the sociopolitical significance of his triumphs of war. Marcus acknowledges this marks Titus’ fifth homecoming during his ten-year campaign against the Goths, each time “bearing his valiant sons / In coffins from the field” (1.1.34-35). However, Marcus immediately juxtaposes this image when he announces that Titus has finally returned to Rome “laden with honour’s spoils” (1.1.36). While Titus does later present Saturninus with his Gothic prisoners, sword, and chariot, the close positioning of the images of coffins and “honour’s spoils” suggests that these losses of life are included as honourable military tokens of political value. Marcus continues to emphasize the importance of honour, beseeching the royal brothers to withdraw their competition “by honour of [Titus’] name” (1.1.39) and for the sake of “the Capitol and senate’s right, / Whom [they] pretend to honour and adore” (1.1.41-42). Using repetition to the point of “formulaic utterance” (Chernaik 64), Marcus repeats the word honour three times in seven lines, and the three speakers thus far have directly referred to Rome or Romans ten times in under forty lines. As well as establishing setting and key themes, this repetition signifies the direct link between the concept of honour and loyalty to the social construct of the city-state. Clearly, the sociopolitical recognition of honour is



held in high regard; the mere mention of the honour associated with Titus' name and the reverence held for the public right of political powers of Rome is enough to dissuade Saturninus from his candidacy. Bassianus, emphasizing his characterization as the more justifiable potential leader, echoes Marcus' repetition of honour when he says that his "love and honour" (1.1.49) for the Andronicus family, along with his trust in Marcus' judgment, is enough to have him disband his followers and "Commit [his] cause in balance to be weighed" (1.1.55). And finally, before Titus enters the stage, a captain introduces the Andronicus patriarch as a "Patron of virtue [and] Rome's best champion [...] With honour and with fortune" returning to Rome (1.1.65-67). This final introduction by a member of the military reinforces the ideal characterization of Titus as the embodiment of patriotic duty; now, Titus has been recognized as honourable by Marcus, his brother and a tribune; Bassianus, a member of the royal family and the moral superior to his brother; and a captain, whom likely has first-hand experience witnessing Titus on the battlefield. Chernaik notes that the captain's dialogue is a "formal, ceremonial utterance, associating Titus with 'virtue', 'honour', and 'fortune', present[ing] Titus as a victorious warrior, proving his worth in battle" (64). In any case, the entrance of the captain prepares the audience for the aggressively nationalistic persona of Titus.

Titus' obsessive loyalty to the codes patriarchy, patriotism, and military honour is clearly established in his initial dialogues, largely through the use of repetition and juxtaposition. Immediately, Titus reveals the depth of his reverence for military honour when he recognizes Rome as "victorious in thy mourning weeds" (1.1.70); Titus acknowledges the grieving for the most recently dead Andronicus sons, yet he still identifies the scene as victorious. This juxtaposition shows that, to Titus, military triumph in the name of Rome is more significant than the loss of his sons in those same battles. Titus' military virtue dictates that his prime loyalty is to

his country, not his family, which foreshadows his allegiance to Saturninus over his sons. Confirming his mindset, Titus makes another ironic statement: he “re-salutes his country with his tears, / Tears of true joy for his return to Rome” (1.1.75-76). As he has just entered the stage bearing one coffin, though twice referring to multiple deceased sons awaiting burial (1.1.93, 97), Titus is naturally expected to acknowledge the tears as a manifestation of grief; instead, he again emphasizes his dominant love for Rome when he says that the tears are a sign of happiness for his return home. In *Shakespeare's Rome*, Robert Miola suggests that this particular conflicting image of Titus, weeping tears of joy alongside his son's coffin, “carefully illustrates the operation of [Titus' military] code [of honour]” (46). In under ten lines, Shakespeare has Titus eloquently and purposefully affirm the previous speakers' claims of Titus' utmost devotion to Rome, while also adding to the hero's characterization. His overly poised articulation conveys the sense that Titus has delivered similar speeches in the past, each time returning to Rome with the pressing need to satisfy ancestral funeral rites.

The burial tomb of the Andronici sons reinforces the idea that death found in patriotic battle is deeply honourable, and it provides another chance to analyze the Roman context of honour. As he chastises himself for taking the time for a lengthy speech and thus delaying his sons' burial, Titus addresses the tomb directly:

[...] And sleep in peace, slain in your country's wars.

O sacred receptacle of my joys,

Sweet cell of virtue and nobility [...] (1.1.91-93)

The alliteration of “s” sounds gives the dialogue an emphasized rhythm and structure, reconfirming Titus' ease with carefully constructed speech and again suggesting that he has made similar speeches in the past. The tomb is the physical centre of Titus' honour; it is a “cell of

virtue” because it is the resting place of the Andronicus ancestors and allows those kin killed in war to “sleep in peace.” This image of peace is particularly important to Titus, as he twice refers to the concept in his next reference to the tomb:

In peace and honour rest you here, my sons,  
 Rome’s readiest champions, repose you here in rest,  
 Secure from worldly chances and mishaps!  
 Here lurks no treason, here no envy swells,  
 Here grow no damnèd drugs, here are no storms,  
 No noise, but silence and eternal sleep.

In peace and honour rest you here, my sons! (1.1.150-56)

Again, in the next line, Lavinia’s first words echo her father’s phrasing: “In peace and honour live Lord Titus long” (1.1.157). The repetition of honour clearly reflects the traditional virtue inherent in a military life and death, and the tomb, the final resting place of “Rome’s readiest champions” (1.1.151), is a physical space holding the embodiments of Roman honour in terms of patriotism and death, thus representing the most sacred elements of ancestral honour. The Andronici about to be buried are the readiest champions because they died in active duty defending their country. One might expect the readiest champions to be the surviving sons, but the reverence for death in military duty is so ingrained in Roman thought that it is considered a “safer triumph” to “[aspire] to Solon’s happiness” (1.1.176-77), referring to the ancient Athenian lawgiver who declared that no man could truly be called happy before death (1.1.177n). Following such a train of thought, Marcus states that death on the battlefield is a “[triumph] over chance in honour’s bed” (1.1.178); with the constant threat of dishonour in life and death, an active military fatality is the ideal fate, rewarded with eternal honour.

The tomb is also a significant structure in revealing shared values within the Andronicus family relating to patriarchy and ancestry, as well as illustrating how these values and codes of honour differ between family members. The tomb is used as a device to reflect the traditional military codes of honour expanding to encompass moral integrity within oneself and one's transactions with others. After Titus slays his own son, Mutius, for defying the rights of patriarchy and monarchism, he argues with his remaining sons and brother that Mutius does not deserve burial in the ancestral tomb. Titus says that "none but soldiers and Rome's servitors / Repose in fame; none basely slain in brawls" (1.1.352-53). The brawl and possession of Lavinia as they shape the context of honour will be discussed further, but here it is important to acknowledge the burial of Mutius and its revelations regarding traditional and modern Renaissance honour. Mutius was a soldier who fought alongside his family in Rome's wars; had he died mere days earlier he would have been honoured with his brothers. But, to Titus, because Mutius rose up in defiance against his and the emperor's will, the nature of his death does not allow for burial in the family tomb. While Marcus still considers Mutius "a virtuous son" (1.1.342), Titus refuses even to acknowledge him as a son, nor any of his family who were "confederates in the deed / That hath dishonoured all [their] family" (1.1.344-45), calling his brother and sons unworthy (1.1.346); because they contradicted the conventional code of honour, they are unworthy of the family name and its connection with honour. According to Christian Froebenius, Titus' cruel murder "shows that Titus values observance to Roman rule more than his children's life [...and] suggests furthermore that the stability of Roman tradition and precedent is deeply connected with the stability of Titus' identity" (Section II). In some ways, as well, Titus is acting in ways that reflect Elizabethan culture:

In the Elizabethan era, for a daughter to give a pledge to a man without her father's

approval and for a son to lift up a sword against his father are equal to treason against the state and to Satanic rebellion against God. The Mosaic law, for example, prescribes death for striking a parent. [...] In this sense, Titus acts like an Elizabethan father and courtier. (Hur 149)

Thus, *Titus* blends the values of classic, medieval, and early modern honour in the dominant sociopolitical position of males, particularly the patriarchs, which will be discussed at further length in Chapter Three. However, the other members of the Andronicus family present the rather revolutionary idea of valuing morality over patriarchy. Marcus calls Titus' judgment an "impiety" (1.1.355), starkly contradicting his earlier reference to the surname, Pius, given to Titus by the people of Rome (1.1.23) and establishing the divergence of opinion between the father and his family regarding the honourable value of Mutius' death. While Titus is only concerned with family honour as it is represented politically, his sons and brother call Mutius' attempt to protect individual "Roman justice" (1.1.280) a "virtu[ous] cause" (1.1.390); that is, they believe that Bassianus' pre-existing ownership of Lavinia is more lawful and honourable than Saturninus' claim on her as a political tool "to advance / [Titus'] name and honourable family" (1.1.238-39).

The priority of moral consideration over strict loyalty to a governing ruler suggests that Marcus and the Andronicus sons adhere to a Renaissance code of honour, as opposed to Titus' medieval frame of mind. Although Titus claims his family has wounded his honour (1.1.365), their focus on familial language and their citation of literary history are traditional enough for Titus to accept. While kneeling, every speaker reminds Titus of their family bond:

MARCUS: *Brother*, for in that name doth nature plead –

MARTIUS: *Father*, and in that name doth nature speak –

...

LUCIUS: Dear *father*, soul and substance of us all –

MARCUS: Suffer thy *brother* Marcus to inter

His noble nephew here in virtue's nest

That died in honour and Lavinia's cause. [...] (1.1.370-77; emphasis added)

Marcus, Martius, and Lucius remind Titus of his power status as patriarch, kneeling in front of him and emphasizing their family ties with the words brother, father, and nephew. After establishing their subordination in the politics of family hierarchy, Marcus uses the phrases “virtue's nest” and “died in honour” to appeal to Titus' sense of tradition and ancestry.

Furthermore, reminding Titus that he is a Roman and not a barbarian (1.1.378), Marcus cites the story of Ajax as ancient precedence for an unconventional burial (1.1.379). Marcus skilfully uses Titus' own language and code of ancestral honour to elicit a sympathetic response. He associates the term virtue with the family tomb as Titus does (1.1.93, 1.1.376) and utilizes the key term honour in order to remind Titus of their sophistication as Romans; and he parallels Titus' final words to Mutius, “Barr'st me my way in Rome?” (1.1.291), when he begs “Let not young Mutius [...] Be barred his entrance here” (1.1.382-83). Titus acknowledges that he has been dishonoured by his sons (1.1.385) but allows Mutius' burial in the family tomb, marking his first divergence from a traditional, medieval code of honour to a more individualized and morally based system of belief.

In the dialogue between Marcus' nomination of Titus as emperor and Lavinia's abduction, the occurrences of honour serve to emphasize Titus and Saturninus' preoccupation with the sociopolitical significance and physical representation of their honour. When Titus refuses the emperorship, he cites age as his main deterrent for accepting the crown, but he also

takes care to mention the he has been Rome's soldier for forty years, successful in his battles and having "buried one-and-twenty valiant sons, / Knighted in field, slain manfully in arms, / In right and service of their noble country" (1.1.193-97). Titus' focus on his military career implies that he is unable or unwilling to make the drastic move from casque to cushion, perhaps because his comfort is centred upon his known military code of honour. Focusing on material signifiers of honour, Titus suggests that he be given "a staff of honour for [his] age, / But not a sceptre to control the world" (1.1.198-99). Juxtaposing the older traditions and obstinate temperaments of Titus and Saturninus, Bassianus speaks of honour with a more modern, more morally-focused virtue:

BASSIANUS: Andronicus, I do not flatter thee,  
 But honour thee, and will do till I die.  
 My faction if thou strengthened with thy friends,  
 I will most thankful be, and thanks to men  
 Of noble minds is honourable meed. (1.1.212-16)

Bassianus refers only to moral and internal honour; this "internalization of honor" (Terry 1074) is completely absent in Saturninus and Titus thus far. Bassianus promises to honour Titus for all of his life, regardless of the outcome of the election, and recognizes that abstract concepts of honour, such as gratitude and respect, are worthwhile rewards to noble men. Completely disregarding Bassianus' words and Saturninus' irrational behaviour, Titus rules in favour of primogeniture and chooses Saturninus as the new emperor. Ironically, Titus hopes that Saturninus' "virtues will [...] ripen justice in this commonweal" (1.1.225-27). Given the eldest prince's recent impertinence, Titus is blind to Saturninus' gracelessness in comparison to Bassianus, but Titus chooses as he does in order to uphold "the maintenance of order in a

community” (López-Peláez Casellas 85) and his traditional concept of honour.

The conservation of social hierarchy is Titus’ top priority, which is highly reflective of Elizabethan values. Published several years before first performance of *Titus*, Ashley’s *Of Honour*, as quoted in López-Peláez Casellas, establishes the keen significance of this chain of command: “by honour are cities kept, families preserved, the society of men quietly and peaceably continued, the common wealth defended” (López-Peláez Casellas 85). For Titus, selecting Saturninus as the new emperor is a way of preserving his conventional terms of honour, and Saturninus validates this conservation of tradition by “advanc[ing] / [Titus’] name and honourable family” (1.1.238-39). The particular occurrences of “thankful/thanks” and “honourable” in Bassianus’ and Saturninus’ dialogue to Titus (1.1.215-16, 236-39) highlight their differences of personal, internalized honour and politically-driven, externalized honour; while Bassianus offers abstract, genuine thanks as a reward for Titus’ potential support, Saturninus, following “*a long flourish*” (SD) to “Proclaim [their] honours” (1.1.275), awards Titus with a public announcement of political allegiance through marriage to Lavinia. Shakespeare’s Romans, as those in Shakespeare’s England, often overlooked virtuosity in favour of the constitutional stability of the city. Referencing early seventeenth century works *The institution of a young noble man* by James Cleland and *A Discourse of Civill Life* by Lodowick Bryskett, López-Peláez Casellas notes that “it seems reasonably clear that honour is actually a reward, but not of ‘vertue’, as they pretended, but of a certain behaviour that our community esteems useful for the maintenance of its main structures of power” (86). By ignoring the moral “superiority of Bassianus to Saturninus” (Alvis 47) and allowing the new emperor to marry Lavinia, Titus reflects the sociopolitical foundations of Elizabethan England when he rewards the wrong virtue. Titus maintains tradition through his consistent favouritism of patriarchy, patriotism, and



primogeniture. Acting his part in a show of military might and political tribute, Titus regards himself as “highly honoured” (1.1.245) with his social advancement, “consecrate[ing his] sword, [his] chariot, and [his] prisoners” to the “wide world’s emperor” (1.1.248-49). Titus considers these items to be his “honour’s ensigns” (1.1.252), physical tokens of his triumph as a Roman. Titus’ constantly military-focused concepts of honour and triumph validate his position as a commander and citizen.

The presence and seizure of Lavinia also conveys the degree to which the patriarch and monarch are revered within the honour system and introduces a moralized code of honour based on Roman law. Lavinia is completely submissive to the males around her; she is used as a token to advance the family name, and, as a woman, the only honour she is capable of attaining is through maintaining chastity or acting as a conduit for the political power of her husband and family, her legal possessors by Roman, and Elizabethan, custom. When Bassianus seizes Lavinia and claims ownership of her, Marcus justifies the action by citing legal regulation: “*Suum cuique* is our Roman justice; / This prince in justice seizeth but his own” (1.1.280-81). While legality and justice may be on Bassianus’ side, in Shakespeare’s Rome, as in Shakespeare’s England, a “subject acquires and keeps honour by means of his obedience to the king; this fundamental subordination is placed far above any other obligation a given individual may have” (López-Peláez Casellas 86). Thus, when Bassianus impedes on Titus’ ability to remain obedient to Saturninus, Titus finds his personal and social honour discredited. Lucius, as well, dedicates himself to Bassianus’ cause, further compromising Titus’ position as a dutiful patriarch to his family and subject to the emperor. Lucius’ refusal to acknowledge the absolute power of Titus as the family figurehead and Saturninus as the head of state is a double blow to the Andronici’s socially perceived virtue. The importance of political honour is Titus’ ultimate priority, so much

so that he murders his own son for physically blocking his retrieval of Lavinia. Signifying the parallels in their conception of honour, Titus and Saturninus introduce, nearly simultaneously, the term “dishonour” (1.1.295, 303) in reference to the dispute over Lavinia. Their medieval point of reference for honour excludes any divergence from complete obedience to the crown.

There are nine instances of dishonour in act one, and all but two serve to illustrate Titus’ total dependence on the working patriarchal and patriotic systems of Rome; the remaining two instances introduce the manipulation of honour by the Goths and Saturninus. In the first instance of dishonour, Bassianus implies that to choose Saturninus over himself would be to dishonour the political virtue of Rome (1.1.12), “[a]pparently [...intending...] to point to some previous degradation” (Sommers 279). As no concrete reason for his judgment is given, the audience is left to assume that Saturninus is morally lacking in comparison to his younger brother, as is suggested by their styles of speech: for instance, “...Bassianus asks modestly while Saturninus commands his followers to draw their swords...” (Alvis 47). Despite this observation, Titus is blind to the superiority of Bassianus in favour of maintaining the patriotically driven traditions of patriarchy and primogeniture, which constantly benefit the eldest males. These social rules make the uprising of Lucius, Titus’ eldest son, perhaps more painful to his father than the actions of the remaining family members; Titus is the next to mention dishonour, not before or while he murders Mutius, but immediately after Lucius calls his father’s actions unjust and wrong (1.1.292-93). Lucius and the rest of the Andronicus family support “justice” and “lawful [promise]” (1.1.280, 298), rather than the strict law of patriarchy and imperial rule, and so Titus denounces them as sons in order to support the emperor. However, Saturninus does not recognize Titus’ individual actions and labels the entire family “Confederates all thus to dishonour [him]” (1.1.303). The alienation that comes with this dishonour physically separates Titus from the

royalty he so eagerly supports: “I am not bid to wait upon this bride. / Titus, when wert thou wont to walk alone, / Dishonoured thus and challengèd of wrongs?” (1.1.338-40). Having lost the political structure and military activity that gave value to his life, Titus mimics Saturninus’ language, calling his family “confederates in the deed / That hath dishonoured all our family” (1.1.344-45). Titus’ absolute devotion to his political leader is another sign of his dependence on the “medieval code of honour [which] was based on loyalty and allegiance to one’s lord” (Terry 1078). Reta Terry quotes Maurice Keen’s 1984 work titled *Chivalry*, stating that “to betray one’s lord has from the earliest days of chivalry and before been held the darkest of all crimes with which the knight or warrior could be charged” (1078). Hence Titus’ priority to Saturninus over his own family and his subsequent grief over his political dissent, rather than his own murder of his son. Even after allowing Mutius to be buried in the family tomb, Titus acknowledges that this is the “dismall’st day” he has ever seen, “To be dishonoured by [his] sons in Rome” (1.1.384-85). When Bassianus attempts to plead Titus’ innocence to Saturninus, Titus attempts to keep himself separated from the dissenters by openly acknowledging that the young prince and his family “have dishonoured” him, while all he did was “[love] and [honour] Saturnine” (1.1.425-27). Again, every instance of Titus using the words honour or dishonour directly support his unwavering traditional concept of honour. Willing to manipulate the code of honour to her own advantage and suddenly finding herself in a position of power, which are circumstances comparable to that of Antony at Caesar’s funeral, Tamora convinces Saturninus to appear to “be dishonoured openly” (1.1.432) by accepting Titus’ apology. She publicly claims that she will not “be author to dishonour” Saturninus and swears on her own honour (1.1.435-36) that she will support the emperor’s reestablishment of allegiance with Titus. While she further claims it is her honour to reconcile the two (1.1.466-67), these claims are established as deceptive in her aside to

Saturninus where she swears to find a day “to massacre” the Andronicus family (1.1.450). Lucius and Marcus claim that they acted in defence of their family honour by following Roman law and contradicting the wishes of the emperor (1.1.476-77), and so the reconciliation with the imperial couple begins the desecration of Roman honour and the Andronicus family.

The remaining instances of honour and its word forms, while sparse in comparison to act one, serve to define alterations of the context of honour based on individual (im)moral circumstance: the Goths use their knowledge of Roman honour to achieve elaborate vengeance, which is mimicked by Titus after he realizes who Lavina’s attackers are. Tamora introduces the manipulation of honour in act one when she begins her façade of kindness to Titus, and Aaron elaborates on this theme in act two when he states that “Upon [Tamora’s] wit doth earthly honour wait, / And virtue stoops and trembles at her frown” (2.1.10-11). He suggests that Tamora is able to alter the concept of honour through her intelligence, being able to navigate and manipulate Roman social systems to her own advantage. Aaron also shows these malevolent skills; when he intervenes between Chiron and Demetrius arguing over possession of the now married Lavinia, his concern is not with the morality of their desired affairs but for how openly they express ideas that are clearly against the Roman code of honour (2.1.47). Aaron knows that the Gothic sons’ misdemeanours would bring dishonour to their mother (2.1.50-51), while Demetrius finds that he has been dishonoured by his younger brother’s “reproachful speeches” (2.1.55-56). Inverting the Roman systems of patriarchy and honour, Aaron and the Goths show concern for their reflection upon the matriarch of their group and, while sharing values of primogeniture, this argument over Lavinia is in stark contrast to that of Saturninus and Bassianus, lacking any legal or political right to her possession and solely focusing on sexual pursuit. The only other mention of honour in act two is amongst Bassianus and Lavinia’s speeches reprimanding Tamora. Both Lavinia and

Bassianus show unprecedented verbal aggression while mocking Tamora and Aaron. Bassianus states that Aaron's physical darkness reflects "his body's hue" onto Tamora's honour (2.3.73). In addition to its reference to race, Bassianus' mention of honour reminds the audience that women's honour can only be expressed through their relationship to their possessing male. Lavinia, now mimicking her husband's actions and engaging in his terms of honour, takes part in the verbal abuse of Tamora, whose own honour is compromised when she is revealed to be in an illicit relationship. Each instance of the word honour within the Gothic context establishes and maintains the degradation of the concept of honour in Rome.

The instances of honour in act four advance the collapsing integrity of Rome by introducing Titus' malevolent manipulation of honour to his own advantage, thereby mimicking the Goths. As the Andronicus family realize the names of Lavinia's attackers and the extent of her abuse, Marcus compares their circumstances with that of Lucrece, swearing with his family, as "father of that chaste dishonoured dame, / Lord Junius Brutus sware for Lucrece' rape" (4.1.89-90), that they will seek revenge upon the Goths. It is after this point that the Andronici's use of honour changes its context and is employed, instead of referring to Rome in military or political might and allegiance, to further their revenge plot. For instance, Titus sends his grandson to deliver gifts with a hidden message to Chiron and Demetrius, in order to "gratify [the] honourable youth" (4.2.12), and young Lucius immediately greets them with false "humbleness" and "honours from Andronicus" (4.2.4-5). This is the first time a Roman citizen, other than Saturninus, lies about his or her intended honour and marks Titus' imminent downfall. Lucius, however, as the redeeming figure, returns having redefined the Roman and Gothic contexts of honour by joining the two armies. The Gothic soldiers refer to Titus' "high exploits and honourable deeds" (5.1.11), marking their incorporation into Rome by praising traditional

military virtue, as was seen in the play's opening scene. Suitably, the last occurrence of honour is spoken when Marcus claims that Titus has "ordained to an honourable end" (5.3.22). To the company present at the feast, this honourable end seems to refer to the end of war between the Andronici and the Goths present in Rome; however, as Marcus knows, the honourable end is the death that Titus has arranged for himself, Lavinia, and the imperial couple. Whereas Cassius and Brutus find honour in their suicides because they instigated their own fatalities at their own will, Titus is not without power in his own end. By arranging the grotesque banquet and murdering Tamora, Titus engineers his own murder at the hands of Saturninus and, in turn, Saturninus' death at the hands of Lucius, one retribution killing after another. In plotting and achieving the circumstances of his own death, which, judging by Marcus' lack of surprise or grief, must have been part of the final plan, Titus regains a measure of his honour after ensuring the death of his dishonoured daughter and her attackers. As in *Caesar*, the drama ends with the foremost character seeking a last measure of honour in the circumstances of his own death.

The two plays share many definitions of honour, which are especially significant when viewed through an Elizabethan lens. By historicizing Brutus' preoccupation with honesty and Titus' obsession with political and familial honour, common themes of medieval and Renaissance virtue become visible. Titus, along with Saturninus to a lesser extent, represent the older traditional medieval value placed on public military honour, lineage, and social rank. These values are seen in different degrees in Brutus, Cassius, and Antony, but Brutus is the only character in either play to be consistently concerned with ethical harmony between himself and what is best for Rome. Brutus possesses the natural instinct for honesty and love of virtue, which was so valued in the Elizabethan era. In contrast, every occurrence of honour spoken by Titus supports his own traditional concept of honour; and, while Antony, Cassius, and the Goths so

frequently use the terms and ideas of honour for manipulation, it is Brutus alone who remains constant in his notion of honour.

## Chapter Two: Honour, bodies, and the body politic

### *Imagery, hearts, and blood*

Shakespeare “often treated Rome as an archetype of civil strife” (Barroll 328), exploring the nature of the body politic through imagery of the human body. More specifically, language centred around bodies, with significant mention of hearts and blood, constructs a system of imagery that depicts a society in the midst of turmoil and destruction. The bodies portray problematic elements of the Roman body politic and provide symbolic evidence of characters’ cooperative function or dysfunction within the body politic. In turn, the self-seeking manipulation of body imagery and the body politic provides a contextual basis for analysing the speaker’s relationship with honour. Visual or spoken reference to blood acts as a signifier of disruption within the society – the blood on the hands of Demetrius and Chiron in *Titus*, and the conspirators in *Caesar*, depicts a community in the midst of individual and political conflict. Of course, blood also represents the mortality of the human body, with focus on the fragility of the body politic, often indicating vengeful and violent intentions. The heart and head are both recognized as being symbolic for the king or ruler, but in both plays imagery of the heart is mainly indicative of the speaker’s harmony or disharmony with(in) the body politic. The heart is also referenced to indicate the general or specific humour of the speaker and others. Furthermore, imagery portraying the fragmented or damaged human form parallels the state of political disruption in each respective Roman society. Within this frame, images of bodies, as well as the heart and blood, serve to reflect the state of personal and political disorder in Rome, specifically in relation to disrupted codes of honour.

In terms of honour and the body politic, imagery of the heart represents honesty and



harmony, or lack thereof, between characters and Rome. Dishonesty between intentions and actions is indicative of a destructive role in the political and social systems, thus showing discord between a member and the rest of the body politic. In the case of Antony, Cassius, and Tamora, manipulation of the heart is suggestive of dishonesty, creating disharmony between the speaker and the political body of Rome. Furthermore, as was common in the Elizabethan era, the heart is often referred to as the seat of humors, which reveals the state of harmony or disharmony in the body politic and reveals emotional traits of characters.

*Hearts, blood, and the body in Caesar*

As *Caesar* opens, the tribunes associate the heart with interpersonal conflict and political disruption, as does Cassius in the next scene. The first reference to hearts indicates the state of discord within Rome: Marullus tells the plebeians that they have hard hearts (1.1.34) when they celebrate Caesar's recent political and military triumph over Pompey. Here, hearts refer to the calloused humours of the Roman public, as they disregard any mourning for Pompey in favour of glorifying Caesar's victory. Juxtaposing the loss of one political figure with the rise of another, the tribunes claim that Caesar is "in triumph over Pompey's blood" (1.1.51). The image of blood signifying disruption of the body politic is constant throughout *Caesar*, and it also reminds the audience of the fragility of both human and political bodies, allowing individual bodies or body parts to draw attention to danger in the body politic. For instance, in the next scene, Cassius uses a physical description of Caesar's body as sick and feminine in his speech to Brutus. Cassius' intention is to cast doubt upon Caesar's masculine honour and physical health, in order to emphasize his inability to act as head. Cassius also identifies his and Caesar's hearts as the seat

of their personal controversy. Describing their perilous swim across the stormy Tiber, Cassius states: “The torrent roared, and we did buffet it / With lusty sinews, throwing it aside, / And stemming it with hearts of controversy” (1.2.107-09). Cassius’ wording suggests that their competitive drive against each other was the fuel that allowed them to “[make] headway against” (1.2.109n) agitated waters. Thus, hearts are associated with public and personal political discord involving the citizens and the tribunes, as well as Cassius and Caesar.

Caesar continues the motif of disharmonious hearts when he refers to Cassius’ heart as being agitated and discontented. Caesar asserts that men like Cassius, who smile only with insincerity or mockery, are “never at heart’s ease” (1.2.208), or never in a state of peace and balance. Caesar refers to a danger he is unaware of and his statement foreshadows the inharmoniousness of Cassius’ personal and public morals, unlike that seen in Brutus. Cassius’ lack of interpersonal honour and honesty, as evident in his manipulation of Brutus’ loyalty to honour and the forging of notes to trick him, is a disruption in the natural function of the body politic. This dissonance extends to Caesar’s claim that Cassius “hears no music” (1.2.204); Humphreys references Plato when he notes that “music was held to symbolize the metaphysical harmony of natural order and the equable balance of human temperament” (1.2.204n), which further indicates Cassius’ social and personal incongruity with certain political members of Rome. Significantly, Humphreys reminds the reader that “Brutus, the man of harmonious temper (5.5.74-6), loves music (4.2.306-22)” (1.2.204n), symbolizing his balanced personality and political outlook. Thus far, references to hearts have established and contributed to the growing characterization of Caesar and Cassius, with special attention to their personal state of discord.

However, while there is friction between Cassius and Caesar, language of hearts reveals that the public exists in a state of harmony with their ruler and also with Brutus. Speaking with

Cassius, Casca claims that the plebeians forgave Caesar's epileptic episode "with all their hearts" (1.2.270). Continuing the association of the heart with emotion and humors, the language signifies the love, however fickle, the crowd possesses for Caesar based on his political and military merit. In contrast to the previous allusions to hearts, this occurrence of the word refers to harmony, rather than disharmony, introducing a new persona for Caesar that stands in contrast to Cassius' reports, thus bringing into question Cassius' honesty and Caesar's public image. Similarly, Casca comments to Cassius that Brutus "sits high in all the people's hearts" (1.3.157). This reference to hearts again demonstrates a state of accord, this time between Brutus and the citizens of Rome. However, rather than cooperation based on military or politics, Brutus is well known for his personal and social integrity. In this way, hearts designate the different public images of honour: the medieval preoccupation with military and political gain associated with Caesar and the Renaissance concern with conscientiousness and honesty attributed to Brutus. Cassius and Casca know that Brutus is renowned for his honourable reputation, hence the imagery of esteem associated with the heart, and they are both willing to manipulate the state of harmony within Rome for their own advantage. This clash between private and public intention, as seen in Chapter One, is indicative of dishonour in newly emerging Renaissance codes focusing on morality and honesty.

While Cassius concentrates on changing the personal nature of Brutus, Antony uses imagery of the body, at times focusing on blood and the heart, to rile the citizens of Rome into mutiny against the conspirators. Antony knows that having control over the displaying of Caesar's body during his funeral oration will enable him to secure the support of the crowd:

Thus, in the funeral oration, Antony's rhetorical task is not only to deconstruct the term 'honourable,' which Brutus has appropriated for the conspirators, but to recuperate

Caesar's body for his own political uses by redefining Caesar's blood and Caesar's bleeding. (Paster 286)

Brutus avoids any mention of body parts until Antony enters the scene of the funeral; even then, Brutus only acknowledges that Antony "had no hand in [Caesar's] death" (3.2.41). While his oratorical skills are supremely effective, Antony's ultimate manipulation of body imagery in order to win over the crowd and gain control of the body politic is a dishonourable abuse of skill and power. During Brutus' speech, Antony enters with his supporters and Caesar's corpse. Possessing Caesar's body is a powerful visual tactic and adds to the emphasis of language focused on the body. Antony begins his speech by asking the crowd to lend him their ears (3.2.73). While Caesar earlier acknowledged his own deafness in the left ear, symbolizing his inability to be aware of or "hear" problematic elements within the body politic, and Cassius' hearing "is so keen that he can determine the identity of one of the conspirators by the sound of his steps in a thunderstorm" (Kalnin 18), Antony ignores his own hearing in favour of remarking upon the crowd's ability to hear his speech. In this way, Antony begins to manipulate body imagery so that the citizens feel they are in control and wish to invite him to join their symbolic social body.

Antony continues his moulding of the public's humour via imagery of the heart, body, and blood, using each symbol as a means of separating the conspirators from the body politic. During his first pause, Antony asks the crowd for patience as his "heart is in the coffin there with Caesar" (3.2.106). Humphreys notes that, while "his grief is genuine, [... Antony] is acting and not acting simultaneously" (3.2.107n). As seen in Chapter One, and as will be further examined in Chapter Three, constancy in honesty is Brutus' most revered quality. In contrast, while Antony does express sincere emotion upon the discovery of Caesar's body, his funeral oration is

unquestionably manipulative. Antony uses imagery of the heart to harmonize his emotions with the crowd, ensuring in his momentary pause that the plebeians agree with his stance: “His pause is a test of the strength of his position, fortified by a show of emotion” (Styan as quoted 3.2.107ln). This show of emotion focuses on the image of the heart in the coffin with Caesar’s body, and its success renders Antony confident in continuing to focus on body imagery in order to connect with the crowd and become incorporated in the new body politic. Allowing the plebeians to think they are in control, Antony calls them “masters” and says that if he were so “disposed to stir / [Their] hearts and minds to mutiny and rage” (3.2.121-22) then he would be wronging the supposedly honourable conspirators. He encourages the crowd to analyze the circumstances of Caesar’s death from a perspective other than the conspirators’, baiting them further by revealing Caesar’s will. Antony claims that if the people knew the contents of Caesar’s will they would kiss Caesar’s wounds and make relics of his “sacred blood” (3.2.132-33). Now incorporating into his rhetoric Caesar’s physical body as well as imagery of the plebeians’ bodies, Antony’s acceptance into the body politic is made literal when he descends from the stage and asks the public to “make a ring about the corpse of Caesar” (3.2.158), although he is sufficiently aware of the potential danger to ask them not to crowd his own person (3.2.164). Confident with his incorporation into the social body, Antony begins to present Caesar’s torn and bloody cloak, taking special care to point out the evidence of stabbing by particular conspirators. Of course, as Antony was not on the scene when Caesar was attacked, he is dishonestly using Caesar’s body to insert memories that are in fact suppositions. In showing the blood that rushed from the wound inflicted by Brutus, Antony is utilizing the image of blood to further increase the separation of the conspirators from the body politic and, as such, the plebeians’ favour. Antony claims that it was Brutus’ attack in particular that “burst [Caesar’s] mighty heart” (3.2.183),

emphasizing the presence of blood during the assassination in order to amplify the discord between the body politic and the conspirators. Finally, Antony removes the cloak from Caesar's corpse in order to show the crowd Caesar's mangled remains. It is this action, the revelation of Caesar's powerless and maimed body, that stirs the Romans into an unstoppable uproar and assures Antony his victory. The plebeians then take physical possession of Caesar's body in order to carry out cremation; this seizure of Caesar's corpse by the common people is symbolic of the political upheaval in the state of Rome and the definite loss of control by the conspirators.

In his speech arguing that Antony's life should be spared before the assassination, Brutus displays knowledge of the anatomy of the body politic and concern with properly honouring its natural harmony as much as possible during Caesar's death. Brutus largely avoids language centred on the body until he is unofficially selected as leader of the conspirators; at this point, he begins to be more vocal about body imagery and the honour that must accompany their assassination. Brutus insists that killing Antony would make their assassination "seem too bloody," not wanting to "cut the head off and then hack the limbs [...] For Antony is but a limb of Caesar" (2.1.163-66). Despite his denial of Antony's power as a member of the political system of Rome, Brutus recognizes the composition of the body politic, both in this speech and earlier in the scene when he likens "the state of man [...] to a little kingdom" (2.1.61-62). Given his general harmony with Rome and the body politic, "[it] is highly ironic, though typical of a character who so easily deludes himself, that Brutus can use the body politic analogy thus [...] and then not see himself as a subordinate instrument to Caesar" (Jewett 67). While Brutus believes himself to be in tune with the body politic, he ignores the logical repercussions of dismembering the head of the metaphorical body and devoutly believes himself to be more than a mere limb, as he describes Antony. His innate and clearly defined moral compass shows a

natural predisposition to honour, such as was idealized in the Renaissance. However, the gratuitous display of violence is imminent, as foreshadowed in Calpurnia's dream.

Calpurnia's report of blood on the Capitol and the disparaging omen in the augurs' sacrifice are especially significant in the portrayal of Rome as a bodily system being dismembered, and the scene reveals Caesar's disharmonious private and political selves. Despite the vivid imagery of the removal of the heart in Calpurnia's dream and the lack of a heart in the sacrificial animal, Caesar is too proud and concerned with the senate's opinion of him to respect anything that is not to his immediate advantage. Caesar is concerned only with his personal pride in his public image whereas Brutus desires honesty and transparency. Brutus also recognizes the importance of harmony in his marriage, apparently revealing to Portia the conspirators' plan to assassinate Caesar, which represents the synchronizing of his private and public personas. Calpurnia, on the other hand, describes to Caesar the horrible night taking place outside their home, where clouds rain blood upon the Capitol (2.2.19-21), and Caesar is unmoved by her pleas for his safety. While Rome literally bleeds, supporting Calpurnia's claims of danger, a servant enters announcing that the augurs found no heart within the beast they sacrificed to foretell Caesar's fortune. As Brutus denies the necessary bloodshed needed in order to rebuild and stabilize the body politic, Caesar denies the clear omen of his misfortune. He fears that, if he stays at home due to the prophetic signs of his demise, he will be viewed as the one without a heart or, in other words, a coward (2.2.41-43). However, responsive to Calpurnia's kneeling as Brutus was to Portia, Caesar decides that "for [Calpurnia's] humor [he] will stay at home." (2.2.56).

Focusing on blood and the heart, Calpurnia's prophetic dream and Decius' reinterpretation of it are clear signifiers of Caesar's and Rome's downfall. Calpurnia's dream

foretells a statue of Caesar pouring with blood from numerous openings while “lustful” Romans smile and rub his blood on their hands (2.2.76-79). The image of Caesar bleeding from dozens of wounds of course foreshadows his assassination, but the image of blood pouring out of many “spouts” (2.2.77) is reminiscent of the heart. John Anson suggests that “the image of the bleeding fountain [...] emerges at once as Rome’s wounded heart and its core of vitality” (22). According to common Elizabethan belief, “the heart dilates or contracts, thus disposing the humors and passions, and, ultimately, all behaviour” (18). And as the heart rules the physical body, the king rules the body politic. In “Shakespeare, the Body Politic, and Liberal Democracy,” Bernard Dobski and Dustin Gish note that the Elizabethan view of the body politic gave “due attention to the role of the king as head, heart, or even soul” (183), and Anson concurs that contemporary evidence “regularly described [the heart] as king and commander of the body” (18); thus, the idea of Caesar as the heart of Rome is well documented. Therefore, equating Caesar with the heart of Rome, Calpurnia’s dream designates Caesar as the dying heart of the body of Rome and its political system. Willing to manipulate the circumstances to the personal advantage of the conspirators, Decius twists the images of the dream as “a vision fair and fortunate” (2.2.84), insisting that the blood and smiling citizens signify that from Caesar “great Rome shall suck / Reviving blood” (2.2.85-88). Focusing on blood as a sign of life rather than death, Decius reimagines the political image to hide the conspirators’ true intentions.

Of course, the assassination and its aftermath are scenes filled with the visual and auditory references to blood signifying the destruction of Rome and the disharmony between the conspirators and the reality of their actions. Just before he is killed, Caesar indicates that he is above human qualities and claims to retain a godlike status, comparing himself to the Northern star in constancy as he attempts to separate his image from the world of “flesh and blood”



(3.1.67). Accordingly, Anson finds that Caesar, convinced that he does not possess “the blood of ordinary men” (3.1.37), “dissevers himself perforce from his own flesh and blood” (16). The ruler is completely absorbed in the world of military and political honour, blinded to his own danger and the danger to Rome. Using his political deafness to their advantage, the conspirators depose Caesar and “bathe [their] hands in [his] blood” (3.1.106); blood that is now clearly mortal. In this action, “the conspirators use blood as a signifier that differentiates their bodies from Caesar’s” (Paster 286). According to Gail Kern Paster, the “bleeding body signifies as a shameful token of uncontrol, as a failure of physical self-mastery associated with women” (284). Thus, not only does Caesar’s bleeding represent the downfall of the Roman body politic, it also “cause[s] the fallen patriarch to reveal a womanly inability to stop bleeding” (286). As has been established and will be discussed further, masculinity and misogyny are the consistently marshaled elements of social and political honour. Given the conspirators’ bloody appearance, and with stage directions indicating that the onlookers of the assassination show signs of panic, it is surprising that the group believes that entering the marketplace with blood smeared on their bodies and weapons will have a reassuring effect on the public. While, “[t]hrough these conventional signs of ritual sacrifice, Brutus hopes to persuade his audience of Romans that Caesar’s murder was a heroic act” (Bulman 55), the sight of the bloody assassins clearly instills fear and panic in the crowd of observers. The conspirators’ lack of awareness regarding the reality of the social repercussions of their actions is a retreat from the personal and public awareness that first so concerned Brutus. Like believing that saving Antony’s life is the right choice due to honour rather than reason, Brutus believes that his own personal honour is more powerful than the clearly violent image of the conspirators covered in blood.

Upon Antony’s discovery of Caesar’s body, however, Brutus focuses on blood and body

parts in his acknowledgement of the conspirators' incongruity in appearance and intention, and Antony begins to concentrate as well on images of the body in his grieving over Caesar's death. After the initial shock of seeing Caesar's corpse, Antony's primary concern is if he too "must be let blood" (3.1.152). However, he acknowledges that, if he must die, "there is no hour so fit / As Caesar's death hour" (3.1.154) and no weapons better than those presently stained with "the most noble blood of all this world" (3.1.156). Still, the sight or mention of Caesar's blood is a potent signifier of political honour. In his dialogue, Antony wavers between loyalty to Caesar and his own personal well-being and advantage. Brutus has already guaranteed his safe passage, so Antony's willingness to die with Caesar is a "gesture [that] incurs no danger; yet it still rings with genuine feeling" (Humphreys 3.1.153-56n). In fact, Antony's offering of his own blood is the first of his manipulative moves to gain favour with the conspirators. Becoming suddenly aware of blood covering his own body and the violence it signifies, Brutus makes frequent references to body imagery in his response to Antony in an attempt to regain control:

Though now we must appear *bloody* and cruel,

As by our *hands* and this our present act

You see we do, yet see you but our *hands*,

And this *bleeding* business they have done.

Our *hearts* you see not; they are pitiful .... (3.1.165-69; emphasis added)

Brutus' bloody appearance contradicts the image he had proposed for himself and the conspirators as honourable sacrifices rather than violent butchers (2.1.167). He argues that, while their bodies appear bloody, the sight is not indicative of the humour in their hearts nor the honour they mean for Rome. The conspirators are also willing to be harmonized, with "hearts / Of brothers' temper" (3.1.174-75), with Antony, making reference to the image of their hearts in

order to invite Antony to partake of the rebuilding of the body politic.

Focusing on body imagery, Brutus desperately tries to pass off their assassination as an honourable deed, and Antony, willing to forgo interpersonal honesty, makes a show of shaking the bloody hand of each killer before becoming distracted by Caesar's body, which still "stream[s] forth [his] blood" (3.1.201). The blood still coursing from Caesar's fresh corpse signifies the destruction Antony has in mind for the conspirators, and the blood on the killers' hands represents their complete undoing of Rome's social and political body. Momentarily overwhelmed by the carnage and his loyalty to Caesar, Antony apologizes to the remains of his friend for "[s]haking the bloody fingers of [his] foes" (3.1.199) and compares him to a hart, obviously a homonym for "heart," having been brutalized by hunters and then directly calls him the heart of the world (3.1.204-08). Antony is uniquely aware of the workings of the body politic and the functions of its members as it was under Caesar, and, as opposed to the conspirators, Antony acknowledges that the public supported their former ruler. As Cassius calls Antony to attention, Antony pardons himself, recalls having taken all their hands, and requests permission to carry Caesar's body to the public funeral where he will speak. Again too concerned with appearing honourable and unaware of the effect Caesar's corpse will have on the political workings of Rome, Brutus agrees with Antony's requests, completely ignoring the danger of his agreement. When Brutus loses possession of Caesar's body, he loses awareness in harmony with the body politic.

After the conspirators leave the scene, Antony's body-centered language anticipates his imminent manipulation of the citizens and the total downfall of the Roman body politic. While Antony knows how to exploit the conspirators, emphasizing his acceptance of their extended and literally bloody hands, once he is alone with Caesar's body he shows that he truly honoured the

former ruler. Antony begs forgiveness of Caesar's "bleeding" (3.1.254) corpse, showing his true feelings and a different perspective on Caesar's nobility and value to the harmony of Rome than what the conspirators had thus far presented in their opinions. Concentrating on Caesar's "costly blood," Antony makes a prophecy over the wounds, "Which like dumb mouths do ope their ruby lips," declaring "Woe to the hand" (3.1.258-60) that cost Caesar his life. Antony describes Caesar's bleeding corpse and costly blood, as well as the forthcoming "Blood and destruction" (3.1.265) bound to destroy the body of Rome. Antony and Brutus both have interests in the body politic, be it for personal gain or the dream of a better state, and their references to blood and hearts are indicative of their levels of private and social honour. Antony's dishonesty in his relationship to blood represents his inherent dishonour and willingness to manipulate regardless of morals. The manipulation itself is a dishonourable form of trickery and violates the interpersonal ethics of modern day and Elizabethan terms of honour.

After the funeral speeches, corporeal language is largely avoided until 4.2 when Brutus and Cassius have a personal argument over honour; the dialogue is laden with images of fragmented or conflicted body parts, symbolizing the disharmony between the two friends which draws attention to Brutus' idealized obsession with honesty. With the repeated references to hearts, blood, and hands, Brutus and Cassius vary in degrees of their moral integrity, a variance highlighted by their separation from the body politic. When Brutus accuses Cassius of accepting bribes and possessing "an itching palm" (4.2.62), he reminds him that Caesar "[bled] for justice" and not one of them "touched his body" (4.2.71-72) without justice in mind. Brutus' assumption of the selflessness of the conspirators is "[n]aively ironic in view of the motives of Cassius and the rest" (4.2.72-73n), especially given that Cassius' personal complaints of Caesar lacked any strong political basis. The reference to Cassius' itching palm signifies his dishonourable

acceptance of bribes, and Brutus accuses him of “[contaminating their] fingers with base bribes / And sell[ing] the mighty space of [their] large honours” (4.2.76-77). Perhaps recalling the image of the conspirators’ hands covered in Caesar’s blood, Brutus refers to fingers and honours with the plural possessive pronoun, suggesting that the hands of Cassius represent the hands of all the conspirators.

Threatened with dishonour and already being separated from the body politic of Rome, Brutus focuses on the physical body parts of his own body and the bodies around him. Appropriately, at the peak of their conflict, Brutus alludes to imagery of the heart and harmony when he tells Cassius to “Fret till [his] proud heart break[s]” (4.2.94). According to Humphreys:

There is a submerged association between [fret and heart]: *fret* as well as its modern sense ‘chafe, be vexed’ could mean to furnish a musical instrument with frets; a *heart* was imagined as having ‘strings’ (as in ‘heart –strings’), which could *break* (like those of an instrument). (4.2.94n)

Brutus points out Cassius’ discordant temper with a musical analogy, much as Caesar did earlier in the play. Meanwhile, Brutus’ own honesty is so constant that he would “rather coin [his] heart, / And drop [his] blood for drachmas, than to wring / From the hard hands of peasants” (4.2.124-26). Again, Brutus is confirming that he values constancy to his code of honour more than his own life. Yet, when Cassius claims that Brutus has broken his heart (4.2.136) and offers his own physical heart as recompense, with a sudden change in humour, but without Rome and the body politic, Brutus compromises his steadfast honour and accepts Cassius’ immorality, receiving his friend’s hand in a sign of accord and offering his own heart in response (4.2.168-69).

Symbolizing the final disconnection of the Roman body politic and further separation from the Roman code of honour, the body parts of Brutus and Cassius must replace the dismembered

organs and limbs of the political system from which they have been rejected.

*Hearts, blood, and the body in Titus*

In *Titus*, as in *Caesar*, language of bodies is indicative of honour and harmony between the characters and the Roman body politic, while blood signifies disruption of the social codes of honour in its connection with the mutilation of the human body. Both images are used extensively in the destruction of the Andronicus family and reflect a society in the midst of political and personal turmoil. Allusions to the heart allow insight into the context of Roman honour and highlight the cooperative function or dysfunction of the characters' interactions with body politic and other human bodies. While *Caesar* has many allusions to blood and blood is visibly present in the assassination scene, *Titus* is infamous for its violence and gore on stage. With only fictional sources as his primary material, Shakespeare takes the opportunity in *Titus* to create some of the goriest, most blood-filled scenes in his entire canon. The display of blood, often seen as gratuitous by modern standards, was perceived differently in Elizabethan England:

[The drama of Renaissance England] reveals that blood is a sacred substance that expresses the relationships of a human being to the world. Blood, whether it is thought of as the literal liquid in the veins or the less substantial feelings connoted by blood, defines personality, relationships with fellows and with God. (Hall 2)

Blood, then, like honour, can be physically or emotionally based. Metaphorically, blood represents ancestry in association with honour. Physically, bleeding can signify military or mortal efforts of the human body to uphold a code of honour in war or conflict. Furthermore, in terms of physical presence, direct contact with or the sight of blood was much more commonplace to the

Renaissance public. As such, “[blood was] used to express the conflicts man faces and balancing the obligations of public and private life” (Hall 76). Duels, public hangings, and human dissections performed in the theatre all added to the visual presence of blood for the Elizabethan audience. In terms of physical representation of honour in this “sacred substance,” bloodshed was often a signifier of the conflict of public or personal honour. The blood itself serves as an image for lineage and also key moments of strong adherence to personal codes of honour. Whereas a modern audience is often overcome by the horror of a production of *Titus*, for the Elizabethans bloodshed offered key moments of analysis in the destruction of social and physical bodies.

As mentioned above, *Titus* depends on physical representations of honour, focusing on military and political trophies, and human bodies are another physical medium through which he expresses public and private honour. For example, *Titus* presents his prisoners as trophies to Saturninus, along with his sword and chariot, as if they are each mere materials in his possession, in an effort to maintain complete loyalty to the political leader. Alarbus is presented as a non-optional sacrifice to uphold Roman tradition, despite his mother’s intense pleas for mercy. Furthermore, *Titus* uses his own children as tokens of honour or dishonour: Lavinia is passed to Saturninus in an effort to align the new emperor with the Andronici; the dead Andronicus sons are not bodies to be mourned but rather celebrated as heroes of Rome’s military championship; and Mutius is quickly cast away from his family, regardless of his history as a soldier of Rome, and killed by *Titus* for using his own body to bar his father’s path. *Titus*’ relationship with the bodies of Rome is purely political; even his own family members are tools or embodiments of his desire to maintain his level of political honour and patriarchal power.

In act one, *Titus* proves that, of all aspects of his life, political allegiance with Rome, and,

thus, the crown, is his most critical point of honour yet, unable or unwilling to offer his body to serve as emperor, in this action Titus begins his separation from the body politic. In turn, he is unable properly to assess the danger that the Roman body politic is in, much as Brutus is unable to do the same because of his complete obsession with ethical and moral honour. The first example of his disconnection with the natural, cooperative functioning of the body politic is when Marcus suggests that Titus become the head of state and “help to set a head on headless Rome” (1.1.186). Titus is unable to imagine the transition of his literal body into a metaphorical one, claiming that he is too old to be a candidate for the throne and surmising that his elderly body would only subject Rome to another election in the near future. The common voice selected Titus in a communal act, and Titus weighs his belief in the significance of primogeniture and lineage as more important than the voice of the body politic itself. As a result of defying or ignoring the best potential action for the well-being of the body politic, Titus eventually loses his honour and status in Roman society.

Lavinia’s body, always possessed by or commented upon by men, is an important means of conveying political and familial honour. As an instrument of patriarchal validation, Lavinia’s body is a reflection of her family’s honour. Having spoken only eight lines, all directly to her father, Lavinia does not speak again until she is requested to do so by Saturninus, her newly betrothed. She dutifully acquiesces, as he is her most recent possessor and she must now reflect his public honour. While Lavinia’s voice is rarely heard, a “muteness [...] clearly juxtaposed with Tamora’s consistent fluency” (Fawcett 267), her body is almost always in sight in act one. She is off stage for just over 100 lines of dialogue while she and Bassianus quickly elope and return, an action through which she is again claimed by a new male owner. The physical movements of Lavinia’s body on stage, from man to man, all in the name of patriarchal political,



familial, or personal honour, are visual signifiers of her complete possession by men. As such, a large part of Lavinia's representation of masculine honour is linked with her sociopolitical influence:

Because Lavinia's body acts as an instrument of political power, the two candidates for emperor must not only deliver campaign speeches to the people of Rome but also fight for Lavinia's hand. The symmetry of the events encourages the audience to make an analogy between the struggle for power over Rome and the struggle for dominion over Lavinia. (Ray 31)

Thus, possession of Lavinia's body is equated with possession of the metaphorical Roman body. As Saturninus, Bassianus, and Titus court candidacy for ownership of the crown, so do they compete for custody of Lavinia. Furthermore, her dependence on masculinity is clarified through Saturninus' reference to her as a mistress: Saturninus identifies Lavinia as "Rome's royal mistress, mistress of my heart" (1.1.241); Lavinia is the royal mistress of Rome the metaphorical body and also the mistress of Rome's literal royal body, represented by the emperor's heart. The momentary reference to the heart acknowledges the potential harmony between the Andronici and Saturninus as they both ascend the political ladder of Rome. However, Saturninus' reference to Lavinia as a mistress proposes several potential definitions of her social position as a female member of Rome. The *OED* cites numerous definitions for mistress that could be linked to Lavinia's status as a woman. Focusing on contextually plausible definitions established previous to or during Shakespeare's own era, and excluding definitions created after this time, a mistress was one, or more, of the following: "[a] woman having control or authority"; "[the] female head of a family... (or) a woman holding such a position in conjunction with a male counterpart"; "[a] female patron or inspirer of an art, religion, way of life, etc."; "[a] woman [...who...] has control

over a person or is regarded as a protecting or guiding influence”; “[a] woman loved and courted by a man.” As is evident, there are several definitions of mistress that would convey a sense of independence and power, but Lavinia possesses no control or authority; she is not the head of her family nor does she possess a male counterpart, until she marries; she is not a patron, a protector, or a guider, but she is courted by more than one man. In act one Lavinia’s body, as the body of Rome, is completely defined by the men around her and the codes of honour that she must adhere to and represent for the sake of her brothers, father, and uncle.

In defining Lavinia’s role in the representation of masculine honour and the medieval associations with ownership of women, the two rapes are the most compelling evidence of total patriarchal control. Her first rape, as Saturninus calls it (1.1.404), is not a rape by modern or early modern definition:

Early statutory law dating from the late thirteenth century conflated sexual assault with abduction, blurring the distinction between the two. Long understood as a property crime, ‘rape’ either by physical abduction [...] or by ‘defilement against her will’ fell into the same category of wrong.” (Detmer-Goebel 77)

However, in the Renaissance “rape and abduction were beginning to be distinguished as separate entities through a series of court cases” (Lugo 412). Lavinia’s mandatory silence while being passed from Titus to Saturninus to Bassianus renders her unable to vocalize her own emotions. Technically, in the instance of Saturninus “Lavinia is given the option to object [and] chooses to abide polite silence” (Lugo 412), but permitting her to speak is just another show of ownership, confirming that Saturninus now dictates her actions. Given Lavinia’s inability to speak freely, Detmer-Goebel suggests that “[b]y calling Lavinia’s abduction ‘rape,’ the play illustrates women’s customary lack of authority to define rape in the medieval form of the law” (79). It is

noteworthy, as well, that, while Lavinia remains silent during her seizure, Bassianus specifically asks Titus for his permission before he takes her way: “Lord Titus, by your leave, this maid is mine.” (1.1.276). This statement testifies to Titus’ ownership of Lavinia, and even Bassianus, in his previously established Renaissance themed honour, acknowledges and respects the father’s complete possession of his daughter. Indeed, one dependable consistency throughout medieval and Renaissance eras, among many other centuries, is the dominance of the patriarchy in family and societal structure.

While Lavinia’s first rape, her abduction, exemplifies the ruling masculine politics of Rome, her second, this time sexual, rape depicts the total male appropriation of her trauma; Lavinia’s loss of blood serves to signify the mortality of the Andronicus family and the destruction of Rome, but it also speaks to the male-centred code of honour, where a woman’s well-being is secondary to her status as a symbol of virtue for her family. Completely absorbed in their own reactions to Lavinia’s violation, Marcus, Titus, and Lucius recognize nothing but their own pain and dishonour in her violation. Marcus acknowledges the sexual rape with veiled allusions to female genitalia when he comments on Lavinia’s blood: “Alas, a crimson river of warm blood, / Like to a bubbling fountain stirred with wind, / Doth rise and fall between thy rosèd lips” (2.4.22-24). Paster cites Albert Tricomi in her analysis of imagery:

The fountain [...] ‘is conventionally associated with female sexual organs’ [...]. Thus,] in a precise and wholly conventional metonymic replacement of mouth for vagina, the blood flowing from Lavinia’s mutilated mouth stands for the vaginal wound which cannot be staged or represented. (289)

Marcus recognizes that “some Tereus hath deflowered [Lavinia]” (2.4.26) and remarks on how, “notwithstanding all this loss of blood” (2.4.29), she still blushes, a testimony to her shame over

losing the one degree of honour that women possess in sexual chastity. Indeed, it is the sexual assault more than the brutal mutilation of her body that causes Marcus' concern for Lavinia. Once noting her heavy and ongoing loss of blood, "As from a conduit with three issuing spouts" (2.4.30), Marcus laments his own emotional turmoil, turning the focus on himself: "O, that *I* knew *thy* heart, and knew the beast, / That *I* might rail at *him* to ease *my* mind!" (2.4.34-35; emphasis added). Marcus refers once to Lavinia and once to the male violator, yet three times he brings the focus back to himself with first-person pronouns. Significantly, he specifically wishes that he knew who the perpetrator is so that he can ease his own heart; he wishes he knew Lavinia's "heart" (2.4.34), which is here equated with honesty or truth, in order to assist him in dealing with her ravishment. Totally absorbed in the egotistical patriarchal codes of honour, his immediate and self-centred concern is that his "Sorrow concealèd like an oven stopped, / Doth burn the heart to cinders where it is" (2.4.36-37). After "Marcus's imitation of Ovidian poetry [delays] urgently needed medical attention" (Tempera 114) for almost 60 lines of text, emphasizing the preoccupation with patriarchal significance over feminine well-being, Marcus finally leads Lavinia off in order to show her to her father.

Unsurprisingly, Titus and Lucius also use their maleness to appropriate Lavinia's trauma, again representing women's lack of control in the patriarchy. Immediately upon her presentation to Titus and Lucius, Lucius shouts "Ay me!" (3.1.64), beginning the appropriation, as Marcus did, with first-person pronouns. Oakley-Brown also criticizes the masculine possession of Lavinia's assault:

Instead of dwelling upon the dismembered body of the woman, the focus turns to Lucius as he states "this object kills *me*" (III.i.65 my emphasis). To be sure, Titus immediately demands that "Faint-hearted" Lucius "arise and look upon her" (III.i.66) and he later

exclaims “Look, Marcus, ah, son, Lucius, look on her!” (III.i.111). Nevertheless Titus, Lucius and Marcus continually render Lavinia in, and on, their terms. (331-32)

Again completely disregarding her physical well-being, Titus is concerned only with the addition of this grief on top of his previously established misfortunes. Lavinia’s father and brother can only see her mutilation through the lens of masculine honour and patriarchy. In further evidence, prompting Lavinia to reveal her attacker, Titus wails:

What fool hath added water to the sea,  
 Or brought a faggot to bright-burning Troy?  
 My grief was at the height before thou cam’st,  
 And now it like Nilus it disdaineth bounds.

Give me a sword, I’ll chop off my hands too,

...

‘Tis well, Lavinia, that thou hast no hands,

For hands to do Rome service is but in vain. (3.1.68-80)

Titus makes the tragedy his own, ignoring Lavinia’s personal grief and focusing only on the burden the patriarch bears due to her violation. He compares his exile from the body politic as a sea of agony or a fire that lays waste to an entire city; yet, Lavinia’s rape and mutilation is but another drop of water in his sea or a single bundle of sticks added to his fire. According to Titus, then, Lavinia’s misfortune is relatively trivial in comparison to his political losses, but it does cause his grief to go beyond measure, as the Nile, filled by floods, overflows its riverbanks. Callously, Titus willingly offers to amputate his own hands and tells Lavinia that her loss of limbs is, in fact, a blessing in that she can no longer benefit Rome. For the time being, the loss of her chastity is not the primary concern; it is the male reaction to her violation that takes up the

first half of 3.1. It is not until 4.1 that Marcus instructs Lavinia to guide a staff with her feet and mouth in order to write the names of her attackers in the sand. In this instance, Lavinia does get to choose the word to describe her rape, but she is unable to communicate without the aid and instruction of her male family members. Thus, even in her revelation of Chiron and Demetrius as the rapists, Lavinia is still controlled by, and now fully dependent on, men.

With focus on “sanguine imagery” (Antonucci 149), the bloody pit in which Bassianus is found represents the ongoing violation of Lavinia offstage and the inversion of the Roman patriarchal system. Just as Lavinia is led offstage, Quintus enters the scene and recognizes the pit as a “mouth” that is newly trimmed in blood (2.3.198-201). This “bloodstained hole” (2.3.210) could easily be associated with the soon-to-be-discovered oral and vaginal wounds suffered by Lavinia. Certainly, the images of “maiden blood” and a “swallowing womb” support this parallelism (2.3.232, 239). Furthermore, as the pit consumes the blood of Bassianus literally and that of Quintus and Martius metaphorically in their later sentence to execution, Titus also frequently refers to Rome drinking the blood of his sons as they are wrongfully executed for murder. As Rome’s body politic and structural codes of honour are devastated by Tamora’s presence and newly gained power, the literal earth of Rome seems to turn on the Andronici, who before now have only lost blood fighting for Rome in the battlefield. However, in a cyclical pattern, Lavinia holds the dish to receive the blood of Chiron and Demetrius as they are killed by her father. The blood to be used in the feast represents the blood taken from Titus, Martius, Quintus, Bassianus, and Lavinia due to the intervention of the Goths. Titus feeds this blood to the usurping matriarch in an act that instigates the final act of copious bloodshed. Ultimately, “Titus would have been too tainted to rule the new Empire; his blood has to be purged and renewed in the frame of his son” (Hur 155). Metaphorically, his death “mirrors the sacrifice of Alarbus from

the opening scene [...] putting an end to bloodshed for the sake of his remaining son, of his family, and of Rome” (St. Hilaire 325). Thus, the literal bleeding of Titus’ body represents the death of the Gothic control and reinstatement of honour in the Roman body politic.

### Chapter 3: Alterations in source materials and implications of honour

The previous chapter's examination of the roles of honour, and its explanations of political bodies, inform this chapter's analysis of Shakespeare's alterations to his source materials and determine the significance of these changes with regards to the representation of medieval or Renaissance honour. In particular, deciphering Brutus' honour becomes much more complex in a parallel reading with North's Plutarch. As for *Titus*, Shakespeare's alterations of Ovid and Seneca largely emphasize the strictly patriarchal code of honour and masculine possession of personal and political bodies. Themes and images both retained and changed strictly adhere to patriarchal power and exclude women. While Plutarch's Brutus is, like Shakespeare's, renowned for his honesty and social virtue, a number of alterations between the two texts serve to inflate and even glorify Brutus' personal honour. By omitting the personal, political, and military history between Brutus and Cassius, and Brutus and Caesar, Shakespeare portrays a more politically independent and unbiased hero in the character of Brutus.

Shakespeare invents insights into the inner workings of Brutus' mind, something unknowable, of course, emphasizing his constant loyalty to Rome and his commitment to honesty above all else. These insights into Brutus' personal character are most clearly seen in his relationship with Portia, particularly their scene together in the orchard. Furthermore, in his detailing of Brutus in the *Lives*, Plutarch offers evidence of a man more aware of the physical danger of their conspiracy and more realistic about the requirements of war. Finally, Shakespeare chooses a key moment in Brutus' downfall to inform the audience of Portia's death, whereas Plutarch simply notes her suicide at the end of *The Life of Brutus*. Each revision on behalf of Shakespeare greatly



enhances the sympathetic viewing of Brutus as an honourable figure.

*Introduction to North's Plutarch*

Before analysing the text of *Caesar* in relation to Plutarch's *Lives*, it is important to appreciate the literary history of the particular text that Shakespeare referenced. North's translation of Plutarch's *Lives*, published in 1579, provides the histories of, among many others, Julius Caesar, Marcus Brutus, and Marcus Antonious, the foundational material of the drama Shakespeare produced. The editorial history of the text is long and complex: based on events that happened almost half a century before his own birth, Plutarch wrote the original text in the late first century to early second century A.D. As T. J. B. Spencer explains in the introduction to *Shakespeare's Plutarch*, which is the source used for all references to the *Lives* in this paper, the text is itself a Roman history written by a Greek and was "greatly admired in Europe in the sixteenth century" (8). Then, in 1559, Jacques Amyot translated the text from Latin to French. Twenty years later, this work, which "is commonly regarded as one of the masterpieces of sixteenth-century French prose" (Spencer 8-9), was translated into English by North. Thus, the text itself has nearly 1500 years of editorial history; each new translator brought new language and narrative to the *Lives*.

North and Amyot gravitate toward personal, cultural, or historical expressions of favour in interpreting the source materials, and this is especially relevant in North's use of the words honour and noble. To consider a specific example of this type of modification in the writings on Pericles, Ruben Brower provides an original translation from Plutarch "simply written 'deeds', [or] *praxeis*" (210). Amyot translated the word into a phrase: "*la grandeur de ses faits*", directly

translated as “the greatness of his deeds,” and from this North made the alteration to “the ‘greatnes of his noble actes’” (Brower 210). As in this instance, North frequently uses noble where there is “no exact equivalent in the Greek, though there is often something of the sort in Amyot” (210). The emphasis on nobility as linked with morality is, in large part, an adjustment of North’s, using the word “nearly equivalent to ‘heroic’” (213). This small fluctuation of language from translator to translator marks the Renaissance shift in the definition of honour and nobility; no longer were the words strictly associated with military exploits but, instead, they became synonymous with the virtue of the individual. As Gary Miles writes of the subject: “In contrast to the English ‘honorable,’ the Latin *honorabilis*, then, refers exclusively to outward condition and political position, not to inner character” (276) and “*nobilis* [...] means, most generally, ‘well-known’” in a specifically political context (277). These changes in language are important to bear in mind in the overall reading of Shakespeare’s *Caesar* in terms of honour: Shakespeare is following the English version of the source material in greatly emphasizing Brutus’ moral integrity.

#### *Source alterations and Shakespeare’s Brutus*

Shakespeare creates a Brutus who possesses greater public and private harmony than that of his Plutarchian counterpart; he is a man without antagonists or critics. As noted by Vivian Thomas, Plutarch suggests that Caesar was a little wary of Brutus and Cassius (49). In Shakespeare’s text, Caesar names Cassius alone as having “a lean and hungry look” (1.2.194). In North’s translation, both Cassius and Brutus are specifically called the “pale-visaged and carrion lean” (85) or “lean and whitely-faced fellows” (109). In his line notes, Humphreys recognizes

that “Shakespeare strikingly applies this [remark] to Cassius alone” (1.2.192-5n); indeed, the omission is especially noteworthy in Shakespeare’s fashioning of Brutus’ honour. Brutus, the dramatic protagonist, is never regarded with anything but the utmost social and interpersonal favour: he is a Renaissance hero of morality. But, in Plutarch, he has a personal history like anyone else, along with his reputation of honour. Along these lines, Shakespeare also omits conflict between Brutus and Cassius prior to the play’s beginning. Both men were candidates for the same political position, the Praetor of the City, and both were supposedly given personal preference by Caesar. As in Shakespeare, Brutus is renowned for his “virtue and good name,” whereas Cassius was famous for his “many noble exploits in arms” (108). In this particular instance of phrasing, it is probable that North added the word noble in order to highlight Brutus’ revolutionary, Renaissance-themed moral honour versus the traditional military virtue so revered in medieval tradition. In fact, Shakespeare rarely mentions military-related history regarding any of the main characters of *Caesar*. In the case with Brutus and Cassius, however, it was not the moral or military virtue of either that won the position of praetor, as Caesar declared that, though “Cassius’ cause is the juster [...] Brutus must be first preferred” (Spencer 108). This personal favour shown by Caesar casts a faint shadow on Brutus’ character. Surely, Shakespeare’s Brutus would refuse his own advancement at the cost of justice. Historically, Cassius was given the secondary, non-urban praetorship, a fact Plutarch records as having caused conflict between Brutus and Cassius for some time, but Caesar’s scorn in this and other instances caused Cassius to “[hate] Caesar privately, more than he did the tyranny openly” (109). Shakespeare retains the image of Cassius disdaining Caesar personally, but the playwright carefully “clears [Brutus and Cassius’] relationship from any competitiveness” (1.2.32-34n). Brutus is loved by all, leaving his political and social virtue spotless.

A number of other personal details omitted from Plutarch's history regarding Caesar and Brutus' personal relationship have indirect effects on the portrayal of honour. For instance, Plutarch surmises from his own sources that Caesar was reputed to be Brutus' father, as Caesar had a rather publicly known affair with Servilia around the time of the birth of Brutus (Spencer 106). As Jean-Marie Maguin points out, "[it] is interesting to add that Shakespeare rejected the father-son relationship for the occasion of the play," since the playwright makes reference to "Brutus' bastard hand" in *Henry VI, Part 2* (28). Caesar demonstrates obvious political bias towards Brutus in the praetorship election, but he was also known to show personal favour to Brutus: while Brutus sided with Pompey against Caesar, Caesar ordered his men not to kill or harm Brutus in battle and offered him a full pardon when they were finally brought into the same company (Spencer 105-06). Leaving out this information allows Brutus to possess a sort of moral *tabula rasa* as far as the audience is concerned; Shakespeare's Brutus has no reason to bear any personal or political bias or ill-will towards Caesar. Showing Caesar's fondness for Brutus would only make the assassination less ethically plausible for Brutus and would contradict Shakespeare's image of a sympathetic hero. On a final note, Shakespeare also omits the specifics of what Antony calls Brutus' "most unkindest cut of all" (3.2.108): in Plutarch, the final blow to Caesar is Brutus' "one wound about his privities" (Spencer 94). Drawing attention to Brutus' supposed "unkindest cut" is, perhaps, unnecessarily distracting or sexualized; or, as suggested by Maguin, in this particular omission "Shakespeare deliberately plays it cool and rejects whatever might place insuperable obstacles between his character and the sympathy of the audience" (28). In the shaping of "Renaissance Brutus," Shakespeare portrays Brutus as less politically and militarily involved previous to the conspiracy, as if driven by pure, independent virtue without a trace of possible bias.

The more objective, public details of Brutus's history as related by Plutarch frequently parallel those in Shakespeare's drama; however, the personal insights the audience gains into Brutus' mind and the logic of his morality are Shakespearean invention used to shape Brutus into a personified symbol of moralized Renaissance honour. Shakespeare's Brutus is endowed with unique sensitivity when it comes to personal and patriotic honour; there is evidence of such behaviour in Plutarch, but in the dramatic rendition Shakespeare fills in the blanks of Plutarch's history with narrative aimed at exposing the inner workings of Brutus' code of honour.

Shakespeare arranges certain private scenes and relationships to show how gentle and loyal Brutus is in domestic settings: his interactions with Lucius and Portia reveal the non-political Brutus. In his orchard, a personal setting, Brutus' "political argument is mitigated by his courteous treatment of the boy Lucius, and its humanity heightened by his affection for his wife Portia" (2.1n, quoting J. L. Styan). Brutus' rather affectionate treatment of Lucius in this scene and in later ones provide a rare opportunity to observe genuinely honourable conduct between master and servant. This behaviour portrays Brutus as especially kind and concerned with the well-being of all citizens, with a sense of equality and tenderness not shown in Caesar, Cassius, or Antony.

Similarly, in the meeting between Portia and Brutus following the visit from the conspirators, Shakespeare provides evidence of Brutus' personal honour by his active engagement in seeking honesty and harmony with his wife, another trait not seen in any other character. Plutarch acknowledges that Brutus kept his composure during the day but "when night came that he was in his own house [... he] was clean changed," describing Brutus as sleepless at nights and distracted during the day (116-17). From this description, Shakespeare invents the intimate conversation in which Portia confronts Brutus about his recent and troublesome change

in nature. Plutarch reports that Portia is a woman “of a noble courage” (118), naming her father in an attempt to convey honour through her patriarchal roots and recounting her display of the voluntary wound to Brutus, just as in Shakespeare. Taking much of the material straight from Plutarch, Humphreys notes that the scene with Portia is “one of many examples of Shakespeare’s reworking of the prose original into living poetry while retaining its exact details” (2.1.234-310n). While this is true for Portia’s speech when she refers to the bond of marriage with Brutus and the importance of her father’s constancy to her own disposition, and for the details of her wound and reputed weak condition as a woman, Shakespeare does create the dialogue between them regarding Portia’s concern for her husband’s health. The emotional and sympathetic harmony between the couple establishes Brutus’ treatment of his wife as an equal in their relationship, revealing complete parallelism in the honest composure of his public and personal personae. Plutarch includes Brutus’ amazed and grateful response to Portia’s self-inflicted wound, but Shakespeare takes great care to express the synchronicity and equilibrium of their marriage, so different from that shown by Caesar and Calpurnia. Significantly, Shakespeare has Brutus agree to tell his wife all of his secrets, whereas in Plutarch no such claim is explicitly made, although Brutus does “comfort her the best he could” (119) and her later breakdown regarding her husband’s welfare on the day of the assassination certainly indicates that she was aware of the conspiracy. Clearly, Shakespeare viewed Brutus in an even higher honourable regard than the reports of Plutarch suggested of his character.

At times, the Plutarchian Brutus shows realistic fears and judgments that Shakespeare’s Brutus dismisses with ideals of honesty and constancy. On the night Portia confronts Brutus about his strange behaviour, Shakespeare portrays Brutus in emotional turmoil, questioning the honour and general good of the conspiracy. Plutarch, however, records that Brutus’ main concern

was “all the dangers that might happen”; he is concerned with the fact that “for his sake all the noblest, valiantest, and most courageous men of Rome did venture their lives” (116-17). On the contrary, “Shakespeare’s Brutus is concerned exclusively with the morality of the action” (Thomas 51); it is the honour of the deed that concerns Brutus, rather than the risk to any particular lives. For instance, as examined in Chapter One, in act one Shakespeare has Brutus swear that he would “Set honour in one eye, and death i’th’ other” and accept both equally and willingly “If it be aught toward the general good” (1.2.85-87), claiming he values honour more than he fears death when it comes to the well-being of Rome (1.2.88-89). Shakespeare modifies Brutus’ selfless concern for honour in slightly altering Plutarch’s record: Brutus claims that he would “rather die than lose [his] liberty” (112). Shakespeare’s change from “liberty” to “honour,” however, marks the playwright’s concern with portraying Brutus as the ultimately virtuous Roman, concerned not only with his physical freedom but also with the pursuit of justice for the citizens of Rome. Shakespeare’s remodelling introduces a willingness to face death not just for personal independence but for all that Brutus’ complex code of honour implies, which involves both military and moral matters.

Shakespeare chooses to time the announcement of Portia’s death in such a way that it will explain Brutus’ passion in his single conflict with Cassius, using Brutus’ mourning to contextualize emotions described in Plutarch but given no personal context. Varying from Plutarch’s history, Shakespeare transforms the revelation of Portia’s death in order to impact the portrayal of Brutus as a sympathetic character. The dramatist chooses a key moment, Brutus’ most heated argument with Cassius over morals and the implications of their individual political actions, for Brutus to announce his knowledge of Portia’s death. As Humphreys notes, “[in] the play it becomes a tragic element in [Brutus’] sense of doom” (4.2.202-06n). As well, Brower

argues that the revelation Portia's death renews audience sympathy for Brutus, ensuring that he is "the enduring hero" (231). While Shakespeare conflates two arguments into one, no source in Plutarch suggests that Portia was an influence upon Brutus' temper at that time. Quite the contrary, Plutarch reveals Portia's death and the method by which she died at the very end of *The Life of Brutus*, after the account of Brutus' own death. In a similar modification, Shakespeare omits Plutarch's report that, immediately prior to the assassination, Portia swooned and one of Brutus' men falsely reported her to be dead to his master (Spencer 121). While the news grieved Brutus, he remained composed, showed no sign of alarm, and did not travel home to see Portia. This constancy to the cause for Rome may be honourable in a military sense but presupposes an alternate set of moral values than the one Shakespeare frequently represents in Brutus' character. To show Brutus insensitive to his wife's ailment would lessen the sympathetic value of the protagonist, perhaps showing discord between the public and private honour so recently established in his home environment.

In a final example of idealizing Brutus and denying his realistic behaviour, Shakespeare renders Brutus unable to perform what he considers to be dishonourable acts even to fund his own army. When Brutus and Cassius argue over ethical and monetary matters, both Shakespeare and Plutarch include Brutus' discontent with Cassius' treatment of Lucius Pella (4.2.54; Spencer 147). However, Shakespeare invents the accusation that Cassius refused Brutus' request for aid to pay his legions. In Plutarch, Cassius sends Brutus one third of his very large reserve of money, against the advice of his close friends, and Brutus only requests the money after he has spent all of his own on the construction of ships (140-41). Shakespeare leaves out the detail that, as noted by Humphreys (4.2.131-6ln), Brutus requires the money because he has spent all of his own available funds on his navy; and not, as it is implied by Shakespeare, because he is too moral to



reap the profits of war. Revealing the ethical disharmony between Cassius and Brutus, this alteration allows Brutus to seem more righteous; he is a man who “can raise no money by vile means” (4.2.123), and who is completely unwilling to tax the peasants of the cities he conquers. In contrast, “Plutarch’s Brutus supplied his army by making moderate levies on the citizens of captured towns and by receiving a share of Cassius’ outrageous extortions: he is, in short, realistic. The demand for absolute perfection is only in Shakespeare” (Simmons 21). Thus, in the depiction of Brutus’s character as he argues with Cassius, Shakespeare renders Brutus again less pragmatic and rational in his prosecution of the war and more concerned with the morality of the assassination and subsequent military efforts. Moreover, diminishing Brutus’ intelligence by denying his realistic understanding of war-funding tactics implies a military shortcoming in his character. In turn, this is a final metamorphosis of Brutus’ persona into an ideal example of Renaissance honour.

#### *Source alterations and Titus*

The changes in source material in *Caesar* centre on the glorification of Brutus’ moral constancy, but the alterations for *Titus* focus almost exclusively on the ultimate authority of the patriarchy. Modifications of Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* in *Titus* largely emphasize the strictly patriarchal code of honour and masculine possession of personal and political bodies. Themes and images both retained and changed strictly adhere to the power of patriarchy and forcefully exclude women. In terms of source materials, the change from “well-documented histories found in Plutarch” (Thomas 23) to allusions to works of mythology and drama, mainly Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* and, to a lesser extent, Seneca’s *Thyestes*, allowed Shakespeare “a great deal of

freedom in shaping the characters, events and society portrayed in *Titus*” (Thomas 23). Indeed, the only act of the play in which little can be directly or indirectly linked to Seneca and Ovid is act one, when Shakespeare takes pains to establish the dramatic context of honour that centers on masculine politics and proprietorship. Robert Adger Law notes that Shakespeare did not seem to work with source materials in the composition of act one, as there is no literary basis for Titus’ triumphal entry and refusal of the title or Lavinia’s marriage proposal and kidnapping (146.) *Thyestes* includes rivalry between brothers over ownership of the kingdom, but that is the extent to which the conflicts of Atreus and Thyestes parallel the circumstances of Saturninus and Bassianus. While Titus regards the importance of primogeniture as the deciding factor in the debate over which brother should be Rome’s ruler, the public’s choice of Titus rather than either royal candidate reflects the significance of military patriarchy, which is granted even more public and private honour in the play than the title of prince. Although Titus refuses the emperorship, the reaction to his return to Rome and the appraisal of his character establish his position at the apex of the social and political hierarchy. And, of course, the fight over possession of Lavinia exemplifies the totally masculine occupation of honour in Rome and renders the one Roman female a token of power to be exchanged amongst males. Each of these events is integral to creating the atmosphere of total patriarchal power.

Through alterations and references to the story of Philomela, Shakespeare defeminizes the conduits of political and personal power in Roman society of *Titus*. The most obvious omission from Ovid’s story of Philomela compared to that of Lavinia’s is the absence of any female allies for the latter. Lavinia has no sisters among her greatly numerous siblings; there is no allusion to a mother or mothers of the over two dozen Andronicus sons; and the mother of boy Lucius, mentioned only once, is inexplicably absent. In contrast, Philomela, upon her eventual

discovery, “can count on the support of her sister and other women” (Romeo 89-90). Frances Teague observes that “one may not only seek the presence of a source, but also its absence, recognizing that what a writer decides to ignore or challenge can illuminate a work” (Teague 87); similarly, one may seek the presence and absence of characters and categories omitted from such a source. In this case, other than Lavinia, an entire gender of Romans is missing. Lavinia has only male family members to aid and represent her, being completely powerless to communicate her crisis without the intervention of the men in her family. Philomela, however, has no masculine helper and relies entirely on women: it is a woman to whom she gives her secret tapestry to deliver to her sister, her sister who engineers her rescue under cover of the solely feminine Bacchic ritual, and both sisters who plan and carry out the revenge plot. In Shakespeare, the possibility of women with power is ignored or made villainous. Lavinia takes an active role in identifying Chiron and Demetrius as the rapists and assisting in their murder, but this is the only female intervention from the Andronicus side of the revenge plot. Furthermore, during the murder of the Gothic sons, Titus swears: “Far worse than Philomel you used my daughter, / And worse than Procne I will be revenged” (5.2.194-95). According to Romeo, this remark is “an ultimate patriarchal appropriation of the specifically feminine form of revenge” (110). Titus thinks of himself as the main victim of the tragic losses his family has endured; as the male head of the family, he is in the position to hold all of the honour and most intimately feel the tragic loss of social and personal virtue. In “*Titus Andronicus* and the Mythos of Shakespeare’s Rome,” Miola notes that, whereas Titus, as a male and a father, utilizes his status of honour to “[play] the part of Pandion, the injured father, and then that of Procne, the revenger” (Miola 87), Lavinia is stuck in the one-dimensional existence of a dishonoured female without a voice. Even before the savage glossectomies, “Lavinia’s silence versus Philomela’s eloquence”

(Romeo 84) is in obvious contrast. Lavinia, as “a woman who has not been admitted into the male discourse” (84) is unable to speak freely because of the pressure of the patriarchy. And while Philomela “talk[s] back in response to the male violation” (84), she loses her means of speech as a consequence of her verbal backlash and threat to reveal Tereus as a villain. In both cases, women are denied verbal communication so they cannot report their accusers. However, the difference in avengers, entirely female in Ovid and entirely male in Shakespeare, conveys the significance of absolute male possession of female and political bodies.

It is not Lavinia alone who is at a political and personal disadvantage because of her gender; there are several parallels of language and setting in the relevant works of Seneca and Ovid that disallow Tamora any sense of honour or justification in her revenge while simultaneously validating Titus for his own comparable causes. In Seneca and Ovid the murderers of the cannibalized children are called tigers. Titus murders Chiron and Demetrius, the cannibalized sons, and therefore should logically assume the role of tiger since he mimics the actions of Atreus and Procne. But, it is Tamora who is twice directly named as a tiger by Titus’ children (2.3.142, 5.3.194). This inversion of the predatory status frees Titus of any possible dishonour and, instead, points the blame at the single alien female. While Tamora clearly portrays the anti-Roman antagonist from the start, Titus is responsible for as many or more deaths in Rome than she. The effect of calling Tamora the tiger is further to vilify her and further glorify Titus. Due to the structure of patriarchal and patriotic honour, foreigners and females are less worthy of being viewed as virtuous. Further disesteeming the presence of women, Shakespeare alters the anthropophagic parent from male to female. Both Ovid and Seneca feature the fathers eating their sons, while in Shakespeare Tamora is the only parent to consume the flesh of her own child. In another parallelism, Tamora, too, is associated with the deaths and violations

that occur in the dark and isolated location outside of Rome, exactly the circumstances of Tereus' plot. Whereas Atreus commits his multiple murders in a dark and isolated part of the castle, the theme of gloom and seclusion remains, casting further illegitimacy and immorality on the circumstances of the murders. In contrast, Titus kills only in Rome or on Rome's battlefields, always in a physical space that validates his maleness and code of honour.

In a final act of silencing female power, Shakespeare has Titus kill both his only daughter and Tamora. Tamora herself is dishonoured without a proper burial or funeral rites; instead, Lucius declares that her corpse will be thrown "forth to beasts and birds of prey" (5.3.197). Tamora's body, left to be devoured by scavenging birds, has quite the opposite fate of Philomela, who is transformed into a nightingale as she is being pursued again by her attacker, rescued by Ovid's familiar *Deus ex machina*. Lavinia, though, arguably "endure[s] a worse fate than Philomela: she is silenced, while Philomela, changed into a nightingale, sings" (Arkins 81). In her death, Titus rationalizes his filicide by citing precedence in Virginius, who "killed his daughter to *prevent* her from being raped" (5.3.36-8ln). Thus, just as he does by likening himself to the avengers of Lucrece and Philomela, "Titus locates the pattern of rape and revenge in a historical continuum, legitimizing his role as a patriarchal avenger and authority figure" (Ganguli 109). Titus appropriates the revenge, making the honour of the patriarchy the primary concern, one that trumps his daughter's well-being or personal vindication. Before he kills her, Titus has Saturninus agree that it was wisely done of Virginius "To slay his daughter with his own right hand, / Because she was enforced, stained, and deflowered" (5.3.36-38). Then, in his final words to his daughter, he coldly proclaims: "Die, die, Lavinia, and thy shame with thee, / And with that shame thy father's sorrow die" (5.3.45-46). Since the action is done without any indication of struggle from Lavinia, it can be assumed that she was prepared to meet her fate; nonetheless,

Titus insists that his dishonour in Lavinia's ravishment is more severe and more significant than her own when he proclaims that it is *his* dishonour that dies with her. Even in death, Lavinia is denied any sense of personal power in favour of the patriarchy.

### **Conclusion**

While *Caesar* focuses on the shift in honour to include the significance of morality and ethics, the world of *Titus* strictly depends on military and social honour. For Brutus, the definition of honour is linked with personal and public integrity, honesty, and constancy; for Titus, it is dependent on military, familial, and political status. However, each man's sense of virtue relies on his active membership in the body politic, and dishonour is associated with the loss of individual and public control. Brutus' unique regard for ethical transparency contrasts with the self-serving interests of Cassius and Antony, and his dedication to truth reflects the Renaissance shift in concepts of honour coming to include morality. Due to the early modern deviation from medieval honour, the ties of virtue with military and ancestral sources were deemphasized:

The Renaissance was a period in which the honor code underwent a significant metamorphosis. The medieval chivalric code of honor, with its emphasis on lineage, allegiance to one's lord and violence, evolved into an honor code that was both more moral and political in that it began to emphasize the individual conscience and allegiance to the state. (Terry 1070)

As the "ideal Renaissance gentleman was a man of absolute honesty and integrity" (Watson 97), Brutus is a near-perfect representation of early modern honour; he is "just as much the prototype of the Renaissance man of honor as he is the dramatic personification of Shakespeare's conception of nobility" (206). However, Titus is obsessed not with the good of Rome, as Brutus

is, but with the maintenance of traditionally defined honour. His preoccupations are solely focused on the interest of the monarchy, the military, and masculinity. Jessica Lugo observes that, in the creation of *Titus*, Shakespeare “eliminate[s] the whispers of morality that would otherwise prevent his characters from completely submitting to their inner darkness” (407). As such, Shakespeare focuses on the Renaissance shift toward moral honour. In her examination of the relationship between *Caesar* and *King Lear*, Frances Teague argues that the playwright looks back on his own work when re-envisioning English history by the recurring motif of false letters:

When Shakespeare wishes to write of his own nation’s early history, he reads and rewrites not Plutarch, but rather himself. In the events of his play, *Julius Caesar*, he reads the events of his own nation and then borrows a stage motif from the earlier work to tell the story of an English King. (98)

In just such a way, I suggest that Shakespeare alludes to the shift in English honour in the parallels and contrasts between Titus and Brutus. *Titus*, written earlier in Shakespeare’s career, emphasizes the traditional, medieval system of honour, while *Caesar* stresses relatively newer Renaissance themes of virtue gained through morality, honesty, and personal integrity. Morality, such as that so stringently adhered to by Brutus, is what truly differentiates the honour of *Titus* from that of *Caesar*. In the parallels between Titus and Brutus exist largely universal and timeless themes of honour: both protagonists are deeply devoted to the political stability of their city-state, fear loss of honour over loss of life, and greatly respect ancestry. Both men identify themselves primarily as protectors of Rome. When their defence of the city-state results in homicide, Brutus and Titus classify themselves as sacrificers instead of slaughterers. In response to Tamora’s pleas to save her son Alarbus, Titus insists that his tradition requires “a sacrifice” (1.1.124), and, when Cassius suggests killing Antony, Brutus urges that they must act as

“sacrificers, but not butchers” (2.1.168). Similarly, James Bulman observes that:

Like a chivalric defender of national honor in the early histories, or even more like Titus who takes great risks to preserve Rome’s honor, Brutus would define his role in Caesar’s death as that of heroic justicer. He would prefer to regard the murder as consonant with public rather than private honor.... (52).

Regarding the conspiracy, Brutus obliges himself to find logical causes that must be “toward the general good” (1.2.85). In contrast, Titus denies the public’s request to make him emperor because of his personal concerns over age, instead choosing to preserve the laws of monarchy and primogeniture. In this way, the protagonists’ degrees of loyalty to established political and social systems highlight the ethically concerned nature of Brutus against that of Titus.

Again focusing on individual and interpersonal virtue, in *Caesar* imagery of the body, including hearts and blood, is used to emphasize the speaker’s personal and political relation to the Roman body politic, be it constructive or destructive. Blood, of course, is most often indicative of the fragility of human, as well as political, bodies. The heart, in particular, frequently alludes to harmony or disharmony with(in) the structure of the Roman body politic. Cassius and Antony manipulate language of the body and representations of the heart to mould the minds of Brutus and the public. In turn, allusions to the body, particularly the heart, indicate the favour of the public, at times preferring each Caesar, Brutus, or Antony. Brutus’ unique concern for the stability of the body politic throughout the planning and enactment of the conspiracy is unparalleled in any other Roman; thus, even after his death, he is universally recognized as “the noblest Roman of them all” (5.5.69).

Titus, however, is obsessively preoccupied with physical representations of honour, particularly those defining his political and patriarchal power. He uses the bodies around him as



mediums through which he can express his control and inordinate concern for tradition and reputation. The most important instrument in the conveyance of Titus' familial and masculine honour, Lavinia, the sole Andronicus female, is consistently used by the males around her to elevate or emphasize masculine notions of virtue or dishonour. She is constantly possessed by men and has her trauma appropriated by her male family members in order to further their personal revenge plots. Lavinia's body and bleeding draw attention to the obsessively masculine concerns of Roman honour in *Titus*.

Ultimately, Titus and Brutus are so obsessed with their own personal and public understandings of honour that they are blinded to the actual needs of the body politic, as emphasized through body imagery. While the honourable Roman is deeply concerned with and active within the Roman body politic, Brutus' and Titus' individual concepts of honour and the drastic changes these concepts undergo eventually separate them from the body politic of which they are initially such integral members. Brutus' wish to improve the sociopolitical environment of Rome with the assassination of Caesar and Titus' wish to improve Rome by upholding honourable tradition and choosing primogeniture over common election eventually lead to the decimation of the body politic as it existed. While each character's initial intentions are driven by steadfast devotion to honour and the welfare of Rome, Brutus' and Titus' obsessions with particular aspects of honour, ethical or military, are the fundamental reasons for their separation from the body politic.

Finally, source alterations highlight relative medieval or Renaissance concepts of honour in both Roman societies depicted in the two plays. In *Caesar*, "the character of Brutus [...] is portrayed as an entirely moral and upright citizen" (Pestritto 64), whereas in Plutarch Brutus is virtuous but is also characterized by irrational fears and judgments that Shakespeare ignores. The

dramatist omits personal and political details of Brutus' past and present that could influence the audience's sympathy for the protagonist. While source alterations in *Caesar* focus on Brutus' moral constancy and social harmony, the changes in material for *Titus* focus almost exclusively on defeminizing individual and political power. Lavinia and, to a lesser degree, Tamora are at clear disadvantages because of their gender. Lavinia, unlike her parallel character Philomela, exists in a completely male-occupied world, with only the alien, sexualized, and villainized Tamora sharing the occupation of womanhood. Lavinia alone possesses no independent power or honour, which is similar to the defeminizing of power in *Caesar*: Portia calls upon her patriarchal roots to convince Brutus of her honour and then loses her strength when her husband is not by her side; and, while Calpurnia is temporarily able to convince Caesar of the danger he is in, Calpurnia's opinion is worthless when Decius arrives and offers his own advice. In each instance, females are considered individually helpless, worthless, and honourless.

In conclusion, Titus and Brutus share a similar devotion to Rome and a preoccupation with their own masculinity, but the main differential between their sense of honour lies in their individual concern for public or personal welfare. As Bulman remarks, "[t]o honor Rome means, for Titus, to honor himself, for he sees in Rome a reflection of himself; and by Rome's constancy he looks to verify his own heroic identity" (45). Brutus, however, wishes to honour the people of Rome when he considers the consequences of the conspiracy. Titus seeks to validate his personal and political worth in his interactions with Rome. As one looks within himself for the definition of honour, the other looks to the public. Neither protagonist is free of fault, but both share the adoration of Rome. Simply put, the honourable Roman loves Rome more than he loves himself.

## Works Cited and Consulted

- Alvis, John. *Shakespeare's Understanding of Honor*. Durham, N.C.: Carolina Academic Press, 1990. Print.
- Anson, John S. "Julius Caesar: The Politics of the Hardened Heart." *Shakespeare Studies* 2 (1966): 11-33. Print.
- Antonucci, Barbara. "Blood in Language: the Galenic Paradigm of Humors in *The Rape of Lucrece* and *Titus Andronicus*." Maria Del Sapio Garbero, Nancy Isenberg, and Maddalena Pennacchia 149-59.
- Archer, John Michael. *Citizen Shakespeare: Freeman and Aliens in the Language of the Plays*. Gordonsville, VA: Palgrave Macmillan. Web.
- Arkins, Brian. *What Shakespeare Stole from Rome*. Dublin: Carysfort Press, 2012. Print.
- Arnold, Oliver, ed. Introduction. *Julius Caesar*. By William Shakespeare. New York: Longman, 2010. Print.
- Ashley, Robert. *Of Honour*. Ed. Virgil B. Heltzel. California: Huntington Library, 1947. Print.
- Barroll, J. Leeds. "Shakespeare and Roman History." *The Modern Language Review* 53.3 (1958): 327-43. Web.
- Belling, Catherine. "Infectious Rape, Therapeutic Revenge: Bloodletting and the Health of Rome's Body." *Disease, Diagnosis, and Cure on the Early Modern Stage*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2004. 113-32. Print.
- Bott, Robin L. "'O, keep me from their worse than killing lust': Ideologies of Rape and Mutilation in Chaucer's *Physician's Tale* and Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus*." *Representing Rape*. Eds. Elizabeth Robertson and Christine M. Rose. New York: Palgrave. 2001. 189-211. Print.

- Boulukos, Athanasios. "The Cobbler and the Tribunes in *Julius Casesar*." *Modern Language Notes* 119 (2004): 1083-89. Web.
- Braden, Gordon. "Plutarch, Shakespeare, and the Alpha Males." *Shakespeare and the Classics*. Eds. Charles Martindale and A.B. Taylor. Cambridge: Cambridge UP. 2004. 188-205. Print.
- Brockbank, Philip. "Myth and History in Shakespeare's Rome." Ed. Marie-Therese Jones-Davies. *Mythe et histoire*. Paris: Jean Touzot. 1983. 95-111. Print.
- Brower, Ruben A. *Hero & Saint: Shakespeare and the Graeco-Roman Heroic Tradition*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971. Print.
- Brown, Huntington. "Enter the Shakespearean Tragic Hero." *Essays in Criticism* 3 (1953): 285-302. Web.
- Bulman, James. C. *The Heroic Idiom of Shakespearean Tragedy*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1985. Print.
- Chernaik, Warren. *The Myth of Rome in Shakespeare and His Contemporaries*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge UP, 2011. Print
- Crystal, David and Ben Crystal. *Shakespeare's Words: A Glossary & Language Companion*. London: Penguin, 2002. Print.
- Cunningham, Karen. "'Scars can witness': Trials by Ordeal and Lavinia's Body in *Titus Andronicus*." *Women and Violence*. Ed. Katherine Anne Ackley. New York: Garland Publishing. 1990. 139 -62. Print.
- Dachslager, Earl L. "'The most unkindest cut': A Note on *Julius Caesar* III.ii.187." *English Language Notes* 11 (1974): 258-59. Web.
- Del Sapio Garbero, Maria, Nancy Isenberg, and Maddalena Pennacchia, eds. *Questioning Bodies*

- in Shakespeare's Rome. Interfacing Science, Literature, and the Humanities ACUME 2. Volume 4. Goettingen: V&R unipress, 2010. Print*
- Detmer-Goebel, Emily. "The Need for Lavinia's Voice: *Titus Andronicus* and the Telling of Rape." *Shakespeare Studies* 29 (2001): 75-92. Print.
- Dillon, Janette. "'Solitariness': Shakespeare and Plutarch." *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 78 (1979): 325-44. Web.
- Dobski, Bernard J. and Dustin Gish. "Shakespeare and the Body Politic." Eds. Bernard J. Dobski and Dustin Gish. *Shakespeare and the Body Politic*. Lanham: Lexington Books, 2013. 1-27. Print.
- "Shakespeare, the Body Politic, and Liberal Democracy." *Perspectives on Political Science* 41.4 (2012): 181-89. Web.
- Dunn-Hensley, Susan. "Whore Queens: The Sexualized Female Body and the State." *"High and Mighty Queens" of Early Modern England*. Ed. Carole Levin. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. 2003. 101-16. Print.
- Ettinger, Andrew V. "Shakespeare's First Roman Tragedy." *English Literary History* 37.3 (1970): 325-41. Web.
- Fawcett, Mary Laughlin. "Arms/Words/Tears: Language and the Body in *Titus Andronicus*." *English Literary History* 50.2 (1983): 261-77. Web.
- Frank, M. "Did Shakespeare Owe Anything To Seneca? The Debate Outlined." *Akroterion* 42 (1997): 36-42. Web.
- Frobenius, Christian. "Cannibal Punishment: The Banquet Scene in *Titus Andronicus*." *Shakespearean Foodways: Feasting, Fasting, Playing and Digesting. Wissenschaftliches Seminar Online* 6 (2008): n. pag. Web.

- Ganguli, Swati. "'A craftier Tereus, cousin, has thou met': Shakespeare's Metamorphosis of Ovid in *Titus Andronicus*." *Shakespeare's Intellectual Background*. Ed. Bhim S. Dahiya. New Delhi: Viva Books, 2008. 104-21. Print.
- Gill, Roma. "The Craft of Shakespeare's Art." *Aligarh Journal of English Studies* 10 (1985): 9-16. Web.
- Green, Douglas E. "Interpreting 'Her Martyr'd Signs': Gender and Tragedy in *Titus Andronicus*." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 40.3 (1989): 317-26. Web.
- Hall, Elizabeth J. *A Study of the Change in Attitude towards Blood in the Renaissance Drama 1589-1642*. Diss. U of Kentucky, 1978. Ann Arbor: UMI, 1981. Print.
- Hansen, Jørgen Wildt. "Two Notes on Seneca and *Titus Andronicus*." *Anglia* 93 (1975): 161-65. Web.
- Helms, Lorraine. "'The High Roman Fashion': Sacrifice, Suicide, and the Shakespearean Stage." *PMLA* 107.3 (1992): 554-65. Web.
- Homan, Sidney. "Dion, Alexander, and Demetrius – Plutarch's Forgotten *Parallel Lives* – as Mirrors for Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*." *Shakespeare Studies* 8 (1975): 195-210. Print.
- Huffman, Clifford Chalmers. "*Titus Andronicus*: Metamorphosis and Renewal." *Modern Language Review* 67 (1972): 730-41. Web.
- Hunt, Maurice. "Compelling Art in *Titus Andronicus*." *Studies in English Literature 1500-1900* 28 (1998): 197-218. Print.
- Hur, Myung-Soo. "Vengeance Rot You All! Blood-Oriented Revengers in *Titus Andronicus*." *Shakespeare's Theories of Blood, Character, and Class*. Eds. Alan Smith, Peter C. Collins, and Robert F. Wilson. New York: Peter Lang Publishing Inc., 2001. 131-62. Print.

- Jagendorf, Zvi. "Coriolanus: Body Politic and Private Parts." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 41 (1990): 455-69. Web.
- James, Heather. "Cultural Disintegration in *Titus Andronicus*: Mutilating Titus, Vergil, and Rome." *Violence in Drama*. Ed. James Redmond. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1991. 123-40. Print.
- James I, King of England. "Speech to parliament of 19 March 1604." *King James VI and I: Political Writings*. Ed. Johann P. Sommerville. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994. 132-46. Print.
- Jewett, Mike. *Shakespeare's Body Politic Imagery*. Diss. University of Missouri, 1972. Print.
- Kalnin, Martha A. *Shakespeare's Knowledgeable Body: Ways of Knowing in the Shakespearean Body Politic*. Diss. Baylor U, 2002. Ann Arbor: UMI, 2002. Print.
- Kisery, Andras. "Emblems of the Polity: The Wounds of Rhetoric and of the Body Politic in Shakespeare's Rome." *Iconography of Power: Ideas and Images of Rulership on the English Renaissance Stage*. Ed. Gyorgy E. Szonyi. Szeged: JATE Press. 2000. 161-79. Print.
- Kistner, A.L. and M.K. Kistner. "The Senecan Background of Despair in *The Spanish Tragedy* and *Titus Andronicus*." *Shakespeare Studies* 7 (1974): 1-9. Web.
- Law, Robert Adger. "The Roman Background of 'Titus Andronicus.'" *Studies in Philology* 40.2 (1943): 145-53. Web.
- Liebler, Naomi Conn. "Getting It All Right: Titus Andronicus and Roman History." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 45.3 (1994): 263-78. Web.
- López-Peláez Casellas, Jesús. "Social Function of the Renaissance Concept of Honour: an Introduction." *Yearbook of the Spanish and Portuguese Society for English Renaissance*

- Studies* 8 (1997): 83-87. Web.
- Lugo, Jessica. "Blood, Barbarism, and Belly Laughs: Shakespeare's *Titus* and Ovid's Philomela." *English Studies* 88.4 (2007): 401-417. Web.
- Maguin, Jean-Marie. "Preface to a Critical Approach to *Julius Caesar*: Renaissance Interests in Caesar, Shakespeare and North's Plutarch." *Cahiers Élisabéthains* 2 (1973): 16-49. Web.
- Marshall, Cynthia. "Shakespeare, Crossing the Rubicon." *Shakespeare Survey* 53 (2000): 73-88. Web.
- Martindale, Charles. "Shakespeare and Virgil." *Shakespeare and the Classics*. Ed. Charles Martindale. Cambridge: Cambridge UP. 2004. 89-106. Print.
- Miles, Gary B. "How Roman are Shakespeare's 'Romans'?" *Shakespeare Quarterly* 40.3 (1989): 257-83. Web.
- Miola, Robert S. "*Titus Andronicus* and the Mythos of Shakespeare's Rome." *Shakespeare Studies* 14 (1981): 85-98. Web.
- "*Titus Andronicus*: Rome in the family." *Shakespeare's Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1983. 42-75. Print.
- Neill, Michael. "'Amphitheatres in the body': Playing with Hands on the Shakespearian Stage." *Shakespeare Survey* 48 (1996): 23-50. Web.
- Noble, Louise. "'And make two pasties of your shameful heads': Medicinal Cannibalism and Healing in the Body Politic in *Titus Andronicus*." *ELH* 70 (2003): 677-708. Web.
- Oakley-Brown, Liz. "*Titus Andronicus* and the Cultural Politics of Translation in Early Modern England." *Renaissance Studies* 19 (2005): 325-47. Web.
- Ovid. *Metamorphoses*. Trans. Arthur Golding. *Ovid's Metamorphoses*. Ed. John Frederick Nims. Philadelphia: Paul Dry Books. Print.



- Oxford English Dictionary*. 2016. Oxford UP. Web.
- Paster, Gail Kern. "'In the spirit of men there is no blood': Blood as Trope of Gender in *Julius Caesar*." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 40 (1989): 284-98. Web.
- Pestritto, Carrie. "Outlooks on Honor in *Henry V* and *Julius Caesar*." *Connotations* 17.1 (2007/2008): 61-67. Web.
- Pincombe, Michael. "Classical and Contemporary Sources of the 'Gloomy Woods' of *Titus Andronicus*: Ovid, Seneca, Spenser." *Shakespearean Continuities*. Ed. E. A. J. Honigmann. New York: St. Martin's Press. 1997. 40-55. Print.
- Rapple, Rory. *Martial Power and Elizabethan Political Culture: Military Men in England and Ireland, 1558–1594*. *Cambridge Studies in Early Modern British History*. Cambridge UP, 2009. Print.
- Ray, Sid. "'Rape, I Fear, Was Root of Thy Annoy': The Politics of Consent in *Titus Andronicus*." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 49.1 (1998): 22-39. Web.
- Rish, Shirley. "Shakespeare's and Plutarch's Brutus: Shakespeare's Dramatic Strategy to Undercut the Noble Image." *Journal of the Rocky Mountain Medieval and Renaissance Association* 3 (1982): 191-97. Web.
- Roe, John. "'Character' in Plutarch and Shakespeare: Brutus, Julius Caesar, and Mark Antony." *Shakespeare and the Classics*. Ed. Charles Martindale. Cambridge: Cambridge UP. 2004. 173-87. Print.
- Romeo, Caterina. "Engendering Silence, Articulating Alternative Languages: Lavinia in *Titus Andronicus*, Philomela in the *Metamorphoses*, and Marianna in *La Lunga Vita Di Marianna Ucria*." *Exit 9: The Rutgers Journal of Comparative Literature* 6 (2004): 83-98. Web.

- Rowe, Katherine A. "Dismembering and Forgetting in Titus Andronicus." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 45.3 (1994): 279-303. Web.
- Sale, Carolyn. "Representing Lavinia: The (In)significance of Women's Consent in Legal Discourses of Rape and Ravishment and Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus*." *Women, Violence, and English Renaissance Literature*. Ed. Paul A. Jorgensen. Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies. 2003. 1-27. Print.
- Seneca. *Thyestes*. Trans. Jasper Heywood. 1581. *ProQuest Literature Online*. 19 March 2016. Web.
- Simmons, J.L. "Shakespeare and the Antique Romans." *Rome in the Renaissance: The City and the Myth: Papers of the Thirteenth Annual Conference of the Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies*. Ed. Paul A. Ramsey. Binghamton: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies. 1982. 77-92. Print.
- . "Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*: The Roman Actor and the Man." *Tulane Studies in English* 16 (1968): 1-28. Web.
- Sommers, Alan. "Wilderness of Tigers: Structure and Symbolism in Titus Andronicus." *Essays in Criticism* 10 (1960): 275-89. Web.
- Spencer, T.J.B., ed. *Shakespeare's Plutarch*. By Plutarch. Trans. Thomas North. Middlesex: Penguin Books Ltd, 1968. Print.
- Shakespeare, William. *Julius Caesar*. Ed. Arthur Humphreys. Gen. ed. Stanley Wells. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1984. Print.
- . *Titus Andronicus*. Ed. Eugene M. Waith. Gen. ed. Stanley Wells. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1984. Print.

- St. Hilaire, Danielle A. "Allusion and Sacrifice in 'Titus Andronicus.'" *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 49.2 (2009): 311-31. Web.
- Taylor, Albert Booth. "Animals in 'manly shape as too the outward showe': Moralizing and Metamorphosis in *Titus Andronicus*." *Shakespeare's Ovid*. Ed. A.B. Taylor. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000. 66-80. Print.
- Teague, Frances. "Letters and Portents in *Julius Caesar* and *King Lear*." *Shakespeare Yearbook* 3 (1992): 87-104. Web.
- Tempera, Mariangela. "*Titus Andronicus*: Staging the Mutilated Roman Body." Del Sapio Garbero, Isenberg, and Pennacchia 109-19. Print.
- Terry, Reta A. "'Vows to the Blackest Devil': *Hamlet* and the Evolving Code of Honor in Early Modern England." *Renaissance Quarterly* 52.4 (1999): 1070-86. Web.
- Thomas, Vivian. *Shakespeare's Roman Worlds*. London: Routledge, 1989. Print.
- Tricomi, Albert H. "The Aesthetics of Mutilation in *Titus Andronicus*." *Shakespeare Survey* 27 (1974): 11-19. Web.
- Velz, John W. *Shakespeare and the Classical Tradition: A Critical Guide to Commentary 1660-1960*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1968. Print.
- Watson, Curtis Brown. *Shakespeare and the Renaissance Concept of Honour*. New Jersey: Princeton UP, 1960. Print.
- Woodbridge, Linda. "Palisading the Elizabethan Body Politic." *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 33 (1991): 327-54. Web.
- Wynne-Davies, Marion. "'The swallowing womb': Consumed and Consuming Women in *Titus Andronicus*." *Matter of Difference: Materialist Feminist Criticism of Shakespeare*. Ed. Valerie Wayne. Ithaca, New York: Cornell (1991): 129-51. Print.

Young, Antony. “‘Ripen Justice in this Commonweal’: Political Decay and Regeneration in *Titus Andronicus*.” *Renaissance Papers* (1998): 39-51. Web.