

Humanist Rhetoric in Shakespeare:
Flattery, Advice, and
Womanly Persuasion

A Thesis
Presented to the Department
of English Language and Culture
Gakushuin University

In Partial Fulfilment
of the Requirements for the Degree
of Doctor of Philosophy

Kodai Takane
February 2019

Contents

Introduction	1
1. Recent studies on Shakespeare's thinking about political uses of rhetoric	4
2. Shakespeare and early modern thinking about the political uses of rhetoric	10
3. The problems with flattery in Shakespeare	16
4. Courtiers' medicinal advice of healing Shakespearean monarchs of tyranny	19
5. Women's advice in Shakespearean friendships and the art of rhetoric	22
Chapter 1. Flattery in tragedies	
Section 1. Brutus and his "honourable mettle" in <i>Julius Caesar</i>	25
Section 2. Encouragement and refusal of flattery in <i>Coriolanus</i>	45
Section 3. Timon, a victim of flatterers and flattering artists	65
Chapter 2. Advice in romances	
Section 1. Advice to tyrants and its medicinal effects in <i>Pericles</i>	85
Section 2. Courtiers' rhetoric in <i>The Winter's Tale</i>	102
Chapter 3. Advice and womanly persuasion in romantic comedies	
Section 1. Men's flattery and Women's advice in <i>The Two Gentlemen of Verona</i>	123
Section 2. Twofold love of Viola and Cesario in <i>Twelfth Night</i>	139
Conclusion	151
Bibliography	160

Introduction

This thesis explores how early modern political and ethical thinking about advice and flattery are reflected in the plays of William Shakespeare. In recent years, scholars have discussed Shakespeare's engagement with the humanist philosophy of rhetoric. Critics such as David Colclough, Cathy Shrank and Markku Peltonen explore how "early modern political thought placed enormous emphasis upon the role of political counsel and persuasion in the proper functioning of politics" (Armitage et al. 5) in their collaborative work, *Shakespeare and Early Modern Political Thought*. According to Shrank, "Indebted as it was to Cicero's writings, humanism naturally advocated eloquence as a crucial skill for effective government" (Shrank 118). Humanists believed that courtiers were able to maintain a wise and virtuous monarch by giving advice, and to keep him from becoming a tyrant. For example, in *The Book of the Courtier* (written in 1528 and translated by Sir Thomas Hoby in 1561), Baldassare Castiglione makes Ottaviano (L. Octavian) argue:

The ende therfore of a perfect Courtier (wherof hitherto nothinge hath bine spoken) I beleave is to purchase him, by the meane of the qualities whiche these Lordes have given him, in such wise the good will and favour of the Prince he is in service withall, that he may breake his minde to him, and alwaies enfourme hym francklye of the trueth of everie matter meete for him to understande, without fear or perill to displease him. And whan he knoweth his minde is bent to commit any

thinge unseemlie for him, to be bould to stande with him in it, and to take courage after an honest sort at the favour which he hath gotten him throughe his good qualities, to disswade him from everie ill pourpose, and to set him in the waye of vertue. (Castiglione 297)

Compared to counsel, little attention has been paid to flattery, which is an antonym of advice in classical ideas of rhetoric. Advice and flattery are the double edges of rhetoric: as Ottaviano argues, “men with lyes and flatterie and such naughtye meanes seeke to coorie favour wyth them [i.e. Princes], the [perfect] Courtier by the meane of those honest qualities ... may soone, and ought to go about so to purchase him the good will and allure unto him the minde of his Prince” (Castiglione 301). As long as courtier’s advice is given for public benefit, or for the benefit of the monarch, it is salutary and indispensable. However, if advice is given for the private benefit of the adviser, it degenerates into flattery. We need to pay more attention to these two morally opposing concepts of advice and flattery, because they affect Shakespeare’s dramaturgy. His tragedies are often caused by flattery disguised as advice, and his romances are brought to a happy ending by advice, which at first appears to be flattery.

The argument of this thesis is divided into three chapters: the first chapter reveals how rhetoric is abused and flattery causes social confusion in Shakespeare’s Greek and Roman tragedies, *Julius Caesar*, *Coriolanus* and *Timon of Athens*. The second chapter discusses how successful advice to tyrants is achieved in Shakespeare’s romances *Pericles* and *The Winter’s Tale*. Finally, the third chapter analyses women’s advice and friendship in

Shakespeare's comedies, *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* and *Twelfth Night*.

I will examine early modern and classical ideas of friendship, and the role of courtiers, and arguments in the defence of poetry, and in so doing treat the theatre as a political sphere where topics of contemporary importance are explored and debated.¹ These topics are deeply interconnected in that ideal friendship, courtiers and poetry were all supposed to be based on advice; furthermore, femininity was classically controversial in all of these topics.

Humanists' influence on Shakespeare is often discussed, but his plays do not simply reflect their ideas. Therefore, this thesis does not aim to identify particular ideas reflected in Shakespeare, but rather to explore the ideas that Shakespeare exhibited in his plays when he encountered humanists' works. In this sense, I follow Michael D. Bristol. He argues:

The project of reading Shakespeare's works as the reflection of philosophical interest isn't about trying to figure out his "world picture." It's possible, by means of historical research, to identify a framework of ideas that can plausibly be discovered in the plays, though this is not always that satisfying. A more genuinely philosophical approach to this material really begins with a consideration of what is called "story meaning" — figuring out what's true in the fiction. (Bristol 3)

¹ As for the social function of Shakespeare's theatre in Tudor and Stuart London, I share the view of Constance Jordan. She argues, "Any historicist study of Shakespeare's plays must take account of his theater: the work of specific companies, their repertory, their buildings, and more generally, the theater as a social institution" (Jordan 8). She also argues, "the experience of playgoing" was "a cultural phenomenon, contrasting its functions with the generally regulated practice of court, church and marketplace" (Jordan 8). Shakespeare's theatre was not only subject to influential discourses and texts, but also a place to reproduce its own political philosophy.

Shakespeare joined the controversy over what kind of rhetoric should be learnt and who is able to manipulate rhetoric, through writing his plays, and so did his audience. Analysing Shakespeare's deep interest in rhetoric will provide us with an understanding of the dramatic development of his plays.

1. Recent studies on Shakespeare's thinking about political uses of rhetoric

During the last decade, an increasing number of researchers have contributed to the study of how the Renaissance theories of rhetoric emerge in Shakespeare's plays.² *Shakespeare and Early Modern Political Thought* (Eds. Armitage et al. 2009) is a monumental work, where Shakespeare is examined from the perspective of early modern political thought, particularly, the theories of rhetoric and humanism. For Ciceronian humanists, such as Desiderius Erasmus, Baldassare Castiglione and Sir Thomas Elyot, whose works and conduct manuals were widely circulated in early modern England, the art of rhetoric was an indispensable skill in the counsel of a king, through which they could support and control him.³ David Colclough, one of the

² As some remarkable examples, see Maddalena Pennacchia, "Antony's Ring" in *Identity, Otherness, and Empire in Shakespeare* (2009), Garry Wills, *Rome and Rhetoric* (2011), Quentin Skinner, *Forensic Shakespeare* (2014), Gary Watt, *Shakespeare's Acts of Will* (2016). Above all, Skinner's work expatiates on classical rhetoric in Tudor England before reading Shakespeare's texts.

³ As to the impact of humanist conduct manuals, see Peter Mack, *Elizabethan Rhetoric*, 135-38. As to their shared theme, see also 164-75 in the same book.

contributors to this collaborative book, analyses *Julius Caesar*, where the art of rhetoric is easily abused and advice degenerates into flattery,⁴ arguing that the play “exposes the limits on political advice and action” (Colclough 232-33). Another contributor, Markku Peltonen discusses the conflict between the common people and aristocrats over whether “the usage of the powers of the *ars rhetorica* in particular should be limited” (“Political rhetoric and citizenship in *Coriolanus*” 236) to the aristocrats in *Coriolanus*.

Surprisingly, this book is the first influential study in this field. Of course, scholars have discussed Shakespeare in relation to political topics, such as social class, feminism, and republicanism. However, few scholars have paid enough attention to the political aspects of rhetoric in early modern England. Instead, most scholars have discussed Shakespeare from modern political viewpoints and from the viewpoints of Cultural Materialism and New Historicism.⁵ On the other hand, even scholars discussing forms of government in Shakespeare have contributed to new study fields in the political aspects of rhetoric. For example, in her monograph, *Shakespeare's Monarchies* (1997), Constance Jordan discusses conflicts between rulers and subjects in Shakespeare's romances, which, she argues, illustrates the social

⁴ His discussion based on the binary concepts of advice and flattery provides this thesis with a crucial hint and a starting point.

⁵ Marxist studies such as *Political Shakespeare* (Ed. Jonathan Dollimore and Alan Sinfield, 1994) discuss culture politically, but neither discuss political philosophy, nor closely analyse any political texts in early modern England. On the other hand, there are few precursors in the close study about Shakespeare related to the Renaissance theories of rhetoric until early 2000s. According to the editors of *Shakespeare and Early Modern Political Thought*, emphasis tended to be placed on “the institutional and constitutional arrangements of politics” (Armitage et al. 4). Instead, critics in this book focus in the ways in which early modern humanists relate their personal life to the polity, in short, courtly humanism, or the art of rhetoric, through which educated people realised their political goals in early modern England.

tension in Jacobean England, that is, James I's absolute monarchy vs. constitutionalism. Although she focuses on law and power, her argument is deeply related to the rhetoric of counsel that subjects give to their rulers. She argues that in the end of Shakespeare's romances, "their rulers appear to accept that they must govern and be governed by positive law, but they have been schooled in this discipline by the interventions and counsel of subordinates and the divine forces these subordinates are often allied with" (Jordan 33).

Andrew Hadfield is another researcher who discusses early modern politics in Shakespeare and suggests the importance of rhetoric. In his ground-breaking work, *Shakespeare and Republicanism* (2005), he explores Shakespeare's republicanism, relating it to diverse historical documents discussing forms of government: monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy. For example, in *De Republica Anglorum* (1583), Sir Thomas Smith discusses the English parliament, which was expected to achieve social harmony between different classes under the authority of a monarch, that is, the ideal of a mixed government of monarchy, aristocracy and democracy. Hadfield points out that Prince Edward in *Richard III* resembles Edward VI, who was the lost humanist Tudor king in such a mixed government and who died before Smith's treatise was written, arguing that the treatise "serves as a warning of what might happen if the ruling class lose sight of why they are where they are" (*Shakespeare and Republicanism* 129). Although both Jordan and Hadfield focus on authority and social conflict within different forms of government, I will argue that the key to solving the conflict between different classes was actually the art of rhetoric, or good counsel, which Smith

expected to function in the parliament.

Cicero argues in *De amicitia* (*On Friendship*, BC44) that good counsel plays a fundamental role in his theory of ideal friendship. The classical idea of friendship was based on likeness and equality in every aspect of two men, such as shape, appearance, social status, education and moral virtues. Such virtuous men were expected to give mutual advice to enhance their close friendship. Following Cicero, Renaissance humanists developed theories of the monarch–subject relationship based on advice, although the relationship was not always based on likeness and equality. For example, as Peter Mack argues, “Elyot’s celebration of the virtue of friendship, expressed in terms largely taken from *De amicitia* and linked with his discussion of good counsel, contributes to an argument about the place of classical education in the training of the political elite” (Mack 172). Discussion of friendship in Shakespeare is related to courtiers’ rhetoric; accordingly, it contributes to the study of Shakespeare’s political uses of rhetoric, as well as Jordan’s discussion of constitutionalism and Hadfield’s discussion of a mixed government and the English parliament.

Laurie Shannon’s *Sovereign Amity* (2002) discusses friendship in Shakespeare, citing Aristotle, Cicero and Plutarch. For example, Shannon argues, “As authors of a general amity through the practices of counsel enshrined in friendship doctrine, Paulina and Camillo are, in the strongest sense, the heroes of *The Winter’s Tale*” (218). Here, she shares Mack’s idea of humanists’ concern with Ciceronian friendship, arguing that the “affective figure of the intimate friend as a correcting advisor or fiduciary in a very real sense makes way for the emerging figure of the Renaissance humanist or

professional political counselor” (Shannon 50). Shannon is also interested in female-to-female friendship. Although most of the classical texts discussing friendship exclude women, she argues that *The Two Noble Kinsmen’s* Emilia “offers a rebuttal to Renaissance commonplace about the impossibility of female friendship” (Shannon 120).

In his monograph *Male Friendship in Shakespeare and his Contemporaries* (2007), Tom MacFaul also agrees that humanists adopted classical ideas of friendship based on likeness and equality in their theories of master–servant friendship (MacFaul 91), though he does not pay enough attention to the rhetoric of advice in Ciceronian friendship, but devoting more attention to reciprocal love. MacFaul argues that in *Timon of Athens*, Timon regards his servants as “his most loyal friends” with his steward Flavius as the servants’ “representative” (MacFaul 92), and that Tranio in *The Taming of the Shrew* is “the friendliest” servant in Shakespeare (MacFaul 97). Both Flavius and Tranio are not merely friendly to their masters. They also offer advice to their masters.

MacFaul does not focus on any of Shakespeare’s courtiers; even while he discusses the two servants, Launce and Speed in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, he does not refer to their masters, Proteus and Valentine as courtiers in the service of Duke of Milan.⁶ In contrast, another study of Shakespeare’s ideas of friendship is David Schalkwyk’s *Shakespeare, Love and Service* (2008), where he discusses the courtiers in *The Winter’s Tale*: Camillo, Antigonus, Paulina, and finally Autolycus, an ex-courtier in the service of

⁶ MacFaul has only a brief comment on Valentine as a lover / servant to Silvia (MacFaul 99).

Florizel. The most remarkable point in his argument is that he regards Shakespeare's courtiers as tutors to their monarchs. Even though the master-servant relationship is not equal in their social status, their virtues are almost equivalent. In analysing the relationship between Florizel and Camillo, Schalkwyk argues that a bond between the young prince and the old and experienced counsellor is "more deeply affective than that of mere master and servant" (Schalkwyk 278). However, again, it is regrettable that he does not closely analyse the rhetoric of each courtier's advice. After all, his whole discussion aims to reveal the courtiers' continued service, even after they find it difficult to continue to obey their monarchs.

Shakespeare scholarship focusing on forms of government and friendship has provided a new field of study with regard to Shakespeare's political uses of rhetoric. At the same time, some scholars studying Shakespeare's rhetoric pay attention only to various forms of "figures" or "amplifications," such as metaphor, similitude, example, repetition and so on.⁷ However, the heart of Cicero's and his followers' discussions on rhetoric is never such a technical concern, but a kind of philosophy of rhetoric: what to debate, or what to learn to be a rhetorician. In fact, Cicero's English follower, Thomas Wilson, devoted a large part of his book *The Art of Rhetoric* (1553) to the discussion of "invention," or the discovery of what to debate. Therefore, we should pay more attention to the philosophy of rhetoric than peripheral knowledge such as figures of speech.

Recent studies of Shakespeare's philosophy of rhetoric seem to have a

⁷ For example, Garry Wills conducts detailed analysis of the rhetorical figures in the speech of Caesar, Brutus, Antony, and Cassius in his *Rome and Rhetoric*.

wide range of topics, but I will suggest that the theory of political rhetoric, literary theories and ideas of friendship in Renaissance England all paid attention to the same value of rhetoric, that is to say, good advice, and that Shakespeare's plays reflect these theories and ideas particularly in the binary opposition of advice and flattery. Examining both classical texts and early modern texts, I will argue that flattery is disguised as advice in the tragedies, advice is enhanced by flattering words in the romances, and the virtues of rhetorical advice are found in female characters who try to achieve their love in the romantic comedies of Shakespeare.

2. Shakespeare and early modern thinking about the political uses of rhetoric

Renaissance humanists place Cicero at the centre of their discussions of friendship and rhetoric, who argues that true friendship requires good advice: good friends are supposed to “give and receive advice, the former freely but not harshly, the latter with patience and not willingly” and “there is no greater plague for friendships than flattery” (*On Friendship* 69). What Cicero outlines here is friendship supported by mutual advice, but for humanists like Erasmus, Castiglione and Elyot, whose arguments are written from a courtier's viewpoint, advice is given by courtiers to their monarch (Shannon 46-53). For example, Erasmus insists in *The Education of a Christian Prince* (1516) that subjects cannot choose a king in hereditary monarchism, so “getting a good prince hangs on his proper education” (Erasmus 5); furthermore that the tutor should “be a man who [knows] how to reprimand

without giving way to abuse and how to praise without giving way to flattery” (Erasmus 8).⁸ For Erasmus, the monarch–courtier relationship is regarded as the tutor-student relationship.

It is also remarkable that both Cicero and Erasmus put advice and flattery into a binary opposition. In fact, flattery, by which evil courtiers pretend to be obedient and deceitfully earn the favours of their monarch, or through which they defeat their rivals, is seen as a serious problem in Castiglione’s *The Book of the Courtier* and Elyot’s *The Boke Named the Governour* (Castiglione 85-86, 301, Elyot, *Governour* 2: 213-25).⁹ Frank Whigham suggests that the reason why flatterers were so problematic may have lain in a sharp increase in the gentlemen class and fierce competition for political success (Whigham 6-25).

The problem of flattery was mostly discussed in relation to courtiers who had learnt the art of rhetoric, and these consisted of gentlemen and the newly rising class. However, other social classes above and below them, that is to say, a ruler and common people could be involved with an abuse of rhetoric: a tyrant and corrupt people welcome flatterers by whom both of them are easily deceived. For Erasmus, a tyrant is an evil monarch who is pleased “with flatterers from whom he hears what he enjoys hearing” (28). For Elyot, on the other hand, the rule of the common people is “called a monster with many heads” (*Governour* 9). Coriolanus similarly calls the multitude of the

⁸ Actually, Erasmus cites Seneca, not Cicero, though both Seneca’s and Cicero’s ideas are closely similar. According to Lisa Jardine, this citation is from Seneca’s “On choosing teachers” in *Moral Letters* (Jardine 8n).

⁹ While these three books discuss flatterers from the courtiers’ viewpoint, Niccolò Machiavelli’s *The Prince* (1532) discuss from the monarchs’ viewpoint.

common people “The beast / With many heads” (4.1.1-2), because he believes that they have no firm ideas but still ignore virtuous advice from learned people. A tyrant can be also a flatterer himself as well as a supporter of flatterers. According to Richard Beacon, people should be careful about “the flattery and ambition” (127) of tyrants and one example of such a tyrannical orator for Beacon is Julius Caesar; unfortunately the corrupt people often help the tyrants “advance their ambition” and “are more easily held in subjection” (Beacon 125).¹⁰ This undesirable relationship between a tyrant and the corrupt people is depicted in Shakespeare’s tragedies. For example, in *Julius Caesar*, the tribune Flavius is afraid that the people will become “Caesar’s wing” (1.1.73) that will make Caesar “soar above the view of men” (1.1.75). In *Coriolanus*, Sicinius and Brutus are not tyrants but ambitious tribunes, and people are easily deceived and instigated by their flattery. In contrast with a tyrant, a true king was supposed to be the head of the body politic to control corrupt people in Elyot’s *The Boke Named the Governour* (1531), Smith’s *De Republic of Anglorum* and George Buchanan’s *A Dialogue on the Law of kingship among the Scots* (1579), the latter of whom was a tutor to James I (*Governour* 1: 11; Smith 49-64; Buchanan 20-27). These humanists assert that even a king requires good counsellors and that his prerogative sometimes needs to be restrained, though James I argues in *The True Law of Free Monarchies* (1598) that a king should listen to his counsellors, but he is always a better tutor than any counsellors among his subjects (James I 57).

¹⁰ Beacon’s *Solon, His Follie* (1594) discusses the Irish reformation in Elizabethan England, where people were expected to maintain civic virtue without being corrupted. As to Beacon’s discussion of persuasion by good counsel and seduction by flattery, see Markku Peltonen, *Classical Humanism and Republicanism in English Political Thought 1570-1640*, 73-102.

Renaissance humanists expected a counsellor to maintain a good king and discussed problems about flatterers. However, it is difficult to tell whether rhetoric is being exploited for good advice or for cunning flattery. In Ciceronian ideas of rhetoric which Renaissance humanists inherited, good persuasion should rarely be harsh, but instead be attractive, tempting and sometimes seductive. Therefore, an orator or rhetorician has not only to tell the truth to the listeners, but also to tell more than the truth, and even to hide the truth. This is a contradiction between the ideas of Ciceronian plain rhetoric and the figure of amplification.¹¹ Even if a counsellor seeks his own benefit instead of his counselee's, there is the possibility that the flatterer will not be accused. For example, Shakespeare's Mark Antony is depicted as an eloquent flatterer pretending to be a friend, as his speech after Caesar's death shows, and Brutus, Coriolanus and Timon are tragic heroes who suffer from flattery, or an ill use of rhetoric, and who are expelled from their own cities.

The humanists defended rhetoric against the attack that it was likely to be abused, with the thinking that rhetoricians do not express an object as it is, not because of dishonesty, but because they can express it more efficiently. The best example that describes this idea is Sir Philip Sidney's *An Apology for Poetry* (1595), where he argues that poetry can both teach and move

¹¹ As to Ciceronian plainness in Renaissance humanists, see Jennifer Richards, *Rhetoric and Courtliness in Early Modern Literature*, 69-72. According to Richards, Ciceronian plainness is originally the plainness of words, but it is misunderstood as the plain order in the whole debate, and the ornamentation of words is instead encouraged by Elyot and Wilson, though the idea of the plainness is still controversial among humanists, possibly within Shakespeare's works. As to Ciceronian antirhetorical plainness in Renaissance humanists, see Kenneth Graham, *The Performance of Conviction: Plainness and Rhetoric in the Early English Renaissance*, 22.

people to virtue, not directly but indirectly through delight, and that this is the ideal education (Sidney 86-102). In other words, poets are a kind of ‘flattering tutor.’ This desirable combination of advice and flattery is compared to magic and miracle, the art of medicine and music, and a poet is compared to a demi-god (Pincombe 145-47; Sidney 85, 95).¹² Shakespeare’s Marina and Cerimon in *Pericles* and Camillo and Paulina in *The Winter’s Tale* can be regarded as examples of this type of entertaining counsellor.

Humanist rhetoric was political in the sense that it was expected to be manipulated for both the social harmony between different classes and self-advancement. However, it also played an important role in gender politics. Aristotle, Cicero and Plutarch discuss male-to-male friendship, but they pay little attention to female-to-female friendship, though Aristotle has a brief comment on the marital relationship as a sort of friendship (*Nicomachean Ethics* 502-03). Likewise, Renaissance friendship does not focus on female-to-female friendship. For example, Michel de Montaigne excludes women from friendship in his *Essays* (published in 1580, and translated into English by John Florio in 1603), asserting that women’s mind do not seem “strong enough to endure the pulling of a knot [namely, friendship] so hard, so fast, and durable,” and that “this sex could never yet by any example attain it [friendship] and is by ancient schools rejected thence” (Montaigne 44).¹³

MacFaul focuses on male-to-male friendship in Shakespeare, not only

¹² Encouraging the metaphors of music and medicine in advice is also discussed in Castiglione’s *The Book of the Courtier* and Elyot’s *The Boke Named the Governour* (Castiglione 302; *Governour* 1: 38-41, 2: 427,).

¹³ As for Montaigne’s strict disbelief in women’s friendship, see Shannon, *Sovereign Amity*, 55.

because classical friendships exclude female-to-female friendship, but also because the relationship with both their father and husband was more important to women than that between women (MacFaul, 3). On the other hand, Shannon regards female friendship as a virtue parallel a male friendship, supported by the honest rhetoric. She argues that “virtuous female friendship shows a relation equally marked by self-sufficiency, refusals to flatter or beguile, and homonormative social relations, and it harbours in chastity’s social form” (57). This thesis also discusses female-to-female friendship as well as women’s friendship with men, focusing on women’s rhetoric.

In point of fact, women’s friendship is not always excluded by early modern humanists. On the contrary, Castiglione and Elyot appreciate women’s skill in giving advice, and their ideal courtiers’ advice includes female characteristic in that their courtiers can seduce and persuade their monarch into virtue (Castiglione 297; *The Defence of Good Women* 57) After all, even Montaigne approves of a woman’s friendship, though he doubts its existence, commenting that if it were possible, friendship with a woman would be “more complete and full” (quoted in Schalkwyk 136).¹⁴ Likewise, Shakespeare’s women often disguise themselves as young men who can give good counsel in the service of the master with whom these women fall in love. The friendship of such women can compensate for male-to-male friendship, while they are achieving their goals, typically love.

¹⁴ Here Schalkwyk discusses a friendship between a woman and a man, and female-to-female friendship is still excluded from discussion.

3. The problems with flattery in Shakespeare

In *Julius Caesar*, the titular character Caesar is murdered in the first scene of Act 3, but his dictatorship remains the main theme almost until the end of the play. Before and after the assassination of Caesar, Brutus persuades himself and then Roman citizens that Caesar must be eliminated before he becomes a tyrant. A tyrant is variously defined in early modern political thought, but the problem at stake in *Julius Caesar* seems to be whether Caesar is ready to consider advice from anyone but his followers. Ironically, Caesar shows his preference for flatterers, while the assassins including Brutus are also suspected to be flatterers and execute Caesar not for the sake of Rome, but for the sake of envy. The Roman citizens' agreement that noble Brutus is honourable is always refuted in the forum scene and throughout the play, just as Caesar's dictatorship is attacked by Brutus.

The forum scene, where Brutus and Antony dispute over Caesar's dictatorship and the rightfulness of the murder, illustrates how Antony abuses Ciceronian amplification, whereas Brutus refuses to. Thomas Wilson, one of the most famous rhetoricians in early modern England, argues, "Amplification is a figure in Rhetoric, which consisteth most in augmenting, and diminishing of any matter, and that divers waies" (Wilson 138). This means that a rhetorician does not express things as they are, but instead exaggerates them, and sometimes even invent the facts.¹⁵ Antony talks of the

¹⁵ Skinner points out that a rhetorician resorts to this technique "to alter the attitude of his audience and enlist them in his cause", so it provokes anxieties about its moral ambiguity (Skinner, *Visions of Politics* 2: 271).

murder as if he had actually been a witness, making up more cruelty than the murderers actually show in Act 3 Scene 2. Although Pennacchia appreciates his eloquence, compared with Brutus's boring speech (Pennacchia 56-59), the eloquence goes against the humanistic philosophy and the anti-rhetorical plainness of Ciceronian Rhetoric. In *Julius Caesar*, the art of rhetoric is abused and ultimately leads to civil war.

Coriolanus is also suspected to be a tyrannical figure like Caesar, but while Caesar is an ambitious flatterer, Coriolanus refuses to use any flatteries, especially to common people. He is proud of his excellent valour and military skill, which he thinks is the only criterion to decide who should rule others. In *Coriolanus*, he is often referred to as noble because of his pride and refusal to flatter. In this sense, he has an old aristocratic identity, which was being lost in early modern England, because "upstarts" were able to become gentlemen without any military achievements. Roman citizens are afraid that Coriolanus's arrogance makes him ignore all their opinions, insisting that "the people are the city" of Rome (3.1.199-200), but they are actually seduced by the tribunes and they appear to be a "Hydra" (3.1.94), the greedy and selfish multitude.

Volumnia, the mother of Coriolanus, is an example of one of Shakespeare's eloquent women, and she finally succeeds in persuading her son to cease attacking Rome. She encourages Coriolanus to flatter common people in order to gain the consulship. On the contrary, as a result of his refusal to flatter, Coriolanus is banished from Rome, and driven away from the people who are agitated by the tribunes, just as Brutus is excluded by the people moved by Antony in *Julius Caesar*. The similarity between Coriolanus

and Brutus is also seen when both of the Roman heroes are ironically called flatterers and traitors before leaving Rome and dying: Brutus by Antony, Coriolanus by the tribunes and Aufidius. The death of Coriolanus implies the end of the old aristocratic identity, and potential disorder in Roman society, and all of this, I contend, may have been caused by the abuse of rhetoric.

Like Brutus and Coriolanus, Timon is often referred to as noble. This is not because he refuses to flatter, but because he has no suspicion of Athenian flatterers. While the tragedy of Coriolanus results from his refusal to flatter, the tragedy of Timon results from his preference for flatterers, as a monarch who suffered from flatterers was often discussed in early modern political thought, such as in the works of Erasmus, Castiglione, Machiavelli and Elyot. Some critics like Coppélia Kahn, David Bevington, and David L. Smith, relate *Timon of Athens* to the reigns of Elizabeth I and James I in England, but the true reason for Timon's bankruptcy lies not in the poor management of his property, but in refusal of good advice. In fact, before his bankruptcy, his steward Flavius and the philosopher Apemantus frequently give him advice, but he always ignores them.

On the other hand, Timon listens to other Athenians including a poet, a painter and a masque of ladies dancing before him. According to Castiglione, as argued above, those arts are regarded as efficient instruments for couriers' advice to their monarch (Castiglione 297). Timon, who is a patron of these artists, is fond of the gorgeous appearance of their works, and cannot see Athenians' ingratitude. *Timon of Athens* illustrates the potential disadvantages of the arts that it was recommended for courtiers to acquire. However, at the end of the play, Alcibiades reads Timon's epitaph and

comments, “rich conceit / Taught thee to make vast Neptune weep for aye” (5.5.75-76), which implies that his own tragedy can move and teach the audience. Timon is like the ideal poet outlined by Sidney, and he is quite different from the flattering poet in *Timon of Athens*.

4. Courtiers’ medicinal advice of healing Shakespearean monarchs of tyranny

Whereas the tragedies depict the problematics of rhetoric, Shakespeare’s romances idealise it and regard rhetoric as the key to solving the problems. Courtiers give advice so that they can cure their monarch’s mental disorder, the quality that makes him tyrannical. As a result, royal families can reunite, connoting a healthy body politic. The second chapter argues that it is courtiers’ advice that brings the denouement to Shakespeare’s romances: While a sequence of miraculous incidents appears to create each satisfying conclusion, human virtues and rhetoric actually play a significant role in these incidents.

In *Pericles*, permanently tyrannical figures, such as Antiochus, Creon, and Dionyza, are in contrast with temporarily tyrannical figures, such as Pericles and Lysimachus. Pericles’s advice to Antiochus to repent his incest is given in vain, and Pericles is endangered by the tyrant. Creon and Dionyza are flatterers, who fall on their knees when they ask help of Pericles but betray him when they need no help. In Shakespeare, the monarch’s lust and incest is often related to a tyrannical nature, exemplified by Tamora and her son in *Titus Andronicus*, Claudius in *Hamlet*, Angelo in *Measure for Measure*,

and Cloten in *Cymbeline*.

Unlike these permanently tyrannical figures, Lysimachus and Pericles recover their kingly nature through Marina's advice and singing. However, before they meet Marina, they have tyrannical natures: regardless of his position as a governor of Mytilene, Lysimachus is a frequent visitor to the whorehouse, and his lust is similar to that of Antiochus. Likewise, Pericles despairs, closes his heart and almost abdicates his rule when he believes he has lost all of his family. He ignores Helicanus's counsel, and then beats Marina, who tries to give him therapy for mental illness.

Marina's counsel through song attracts Pericles, embodying humanists' ideal of good advice: her counsel is referred to as "sacred physic" (5.1.67) and Pericles is "a kingly patient" (5.1.64). The sacredness of her counsel makes the royal family's reunion a more moving scene, and makes Lysimachus's too-sudden repentance more wonderous and comical. On the other hand, there is a clear boundary between temporarily tyrannical figures and permanently tyrannical figures. The former group is saved by good counsel, while the latter group is destroyed by their own guilt, and by the rejection of advice or the abuse of flattery.

In *The Winter's Tale*, Leontes becomes a mad with intense jealousy, suspecting the relation between his wife and his friend Polixenes, and finally gives his counsellor Camillo the tyrannical order to kill Polixenes. Camillo faces the dilemma of whether to obey him or not: both choices lead to the ruin of his king as well as himself. In order to save his life and the life of his king's best friend, Camillo first gives moderate advice to the infuriated king and then pretends to obey him, so that they can escape. In addition, it is

remarkable that Camilo's advice is compared to medicine, because this suggests that courtiers' advice is expected to play a key role in removing the cause of tragedy which is implied in the monarch's mental illness, as it was expected by Renaissance humanists. Camilo beseeches Leontes to "be cured, / Of this diseased opinion" (1.2.294-95).

Camilo's moderate advice is in contrast with Paulina's harsh advice. In fact, this contrast between the two kinds of advice is discussed in Elyot's *Of the Knowledge Which Maketh a Wise Man* (1533).¹⁶ Paulina reproaches and rebukes Leontes immediately after the imprisonment of Hermione. Leontes does not listen to her at first, but after the prince Mamillius's death, he becomes eager to listen to her. Both the advice of Camillo and Paulina are ignored at first, but they are welcomed in the end.

The Winter's Tale focuses on the miraculous effect of courtiers' advice more than *Pericles*. Both courtiers who give marvellous advice are compared to demi-gods, just as Sidney argues in *The Apology for Poetry*: Camillo is called "something more than man" by Florizel (4.4.539-40), and the words of Paulina, which make Leontes see Hermione again, are called "magic" by him (5.3.110). Both Camillo and Paulina pretend to be obedient: Camillo seems to be against Leontes in the first half of the play, and against Florizel in the last half. Paulina keeps Hermione from Leontes for 16 years. However, their disguised obedience is justified in that it acts as a remedy for their rulers' madness and mental illness.

¹⁶ As to two different rhetorical traditions, see Arthur E. Walzer, "The Rhetoric of Counsel and Thomas Elyot's *Of the Knowledge Which Makes a Wise Man*." in *Philosophy and Rhetoric*. 24-45.

5. Women's advice in Shakespearean friendships and the art of rhetoric

Paulina is Shakespeare's own invention, and Robert Green's *Pandosto*, one of the sources for *The Winter's Tale*, does not include such a female courtier. This has interesting implications for other works of Shakespeare. The third chapter in this thesis argues that Shakespeare's concern with rhetoric is exemplified in women's advice about love and women's friendship, which is based on good counsel. Furthermore, this chapter explores how Shakespeare depicts women's rhetoric and friendship, and how Shakespeare's women who disguise themselves as boys succeed in their love and marriage.

Proteus and Valentine in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* are illustrated as so well-born and well-learned that they are suitable to serve in the court. Their friendship, which is based on equality and mutual advice, is typical of Ciceronian friendship. However, their friendship is tested when they fall in love with the same lady, Silvia, whose father is their master, the Duke of Milan. The two young gentlemen have to develop ideal relationships with their master, and simultaneously compete with their rivals both as courtiers and as lovers. Valentine advises and flatters the Duke, but he is not so approved of by the Duke as to be allowed to marry Silvia. On the other hand, Proteus advises and flatters his master to win his favour and does the same things to his rival Valentine in order to pretend to be a friend.

As already argued above, Elyot and Castiglione defend the court ladies whose virtues are not inferior to those of male courtiers. According to them, court ladies can modestly correct the errors of men. Likewise, in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, male-to-male friendship is corrected only through the

female advice reinforced by chastity and female-to-female friendship: Proteus and Valentine become reconciled through the advice of Silvia and Julia, an ex-lover of Proteus. Sexual difference does not matter in true friendship. In fact, regardless of sexuality, all kinds of friendship are referred to as love in the play: Proteus refers to his friendship with Valentine as love, comparing it with his love for Silvia (2.4.202-03), and Valentine refers to Proteus and Julia as friends (5.4.117). Moreover, ideal counsel is regarded as feminine by humanists like Castiglione and Sidney, because it does not offend the listeners, but indirectly moves them.

Viola in *Twelfth Night* is a moderate counsellor, because Viola is in the service of her beloved, like Julia in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*. Viola disguises herself at the beginning of the play, so that her love and her servant-to-master friendship are exhibited when she looks a boy. Viola is confident in her music skills, which she thinks are proper to have to serve in the court. She is deeply relied upon by Orsino as a counsellor, like Camillo in *The Winter's Tale*, as shown in his words, "I have unclasped / To thee the book even of my secret soul" (1.4.13-14) and her female-like moderate persuasion is referred to as "shrill and sound" to move Olivia to whom Orsino is wooing. Her method of persuasion is of course typical of ideal courtiers for Renaissance humanists.

At first, Orsino does not believe in women's true love, though Viola disagrees with him. However, it is through her loyal service as a male courtier that she can make him understand that even women can give good counsel and develop both a close friendship and genuine love. In fact, Orsino does not distinguish his love for Cesario (i.e., Viola), from his love for Viola,

a woman who loves him (5.1.263-64). Analysing the love and friendship of disguised and eloquent women leads to assertion that gender in Shakespeare's friendship is quite ambiguous. Moreover, it is plausible to say that Shakespeare's ideal rhetoric is feminine and entertaining through arts, such as poetry and music, just as argued by Renaissance humanists, such as Elyot, Castiglione, and Sidney.

Education in rhetoric was fundamental in early modern England. Therefore, the study of political use of rhetoric dramatized in Shakespeare's plays is directly connected to the study of Renaissance culture. Ciceronian rhetoric, on which Renaissance humanism was based, is a comprehensive knowledge for diverse goals, such as ideal friendship in the court and women's success in love. Shakespeare dramatized discourses concerning philosophy of rhetoric and engaged in the controversy between humanists over the power of rhetoric from the viewpoint of ethics and gender. This thesis explores Shakespeare's engagement with the humanist philosophy of rhetoric, and its ambiguous advantages and disadvantages in advice and flattery.

Chapter 1. Flattery in tragedies

Section 1. Brutus and his “honourable mettle” in *Julius Caesar*

Although Caesar is the titular character, Brutus is in fact the protagonist in *Julius Caesar*.¹⁷ Caesar disappears in the first half of the play, while Brutus is given a eulogy by Antony in the last scene, just like Hamlet by Fortinbras, who praises Hamlet as “he was likely, had he been put on, / To have proved most royal” (*Hamlet* 5.2.381-82). Antony evaluates Brutus’s virtue:

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 a general honest thought
 And common good to all, made one of them. (5.5.69-73)

Antony mentions here that Brutus joined the conspirators for “common good,” not for his “envy.” Nevertheless, in earlier scenes, Antony refers to “envy” of the conspirators including Brutus and calls them “flatterers,” who pretended to obey Caesar at first, but later betrayed him (5.1.44). It is remarkable that

¹⁷ Nevertheless, Hugh Grady argues that Julius Caesar in the title of this play has a “metonymic function: he stands as a figure for the system with which he is so closely associated and of which he forms a crucial part, the political structure out of which his image has emerged” (Grady 22). Brutus’s honour also functions as metonymy for early modern Republicanism and tyrannicide theories.

Antony juxtaposes a noble man with an envious flatterer. *OED* defines a flatterer as “one who employs false praises to obtain favour or otherwise serve his own purposes” (n. 1). Therefore, dedication to the public good is perfectly contradictory to the nature of a flatterer. It is obvious that Antony here corrects his former attack.

The question of whether Brutus is an honourable man is always a central concern throughout the play: for the conspirators, Brutus’s honour is indispensable to justify the plot. In the forum scene, Brutus reminds the plebeians of his honour to attract their attention. Antony subverts the idea that Brutus is an honourable man to agitate the plebeians. Even after the forum scene, Antony repeatedly calls the conspirators envious and ungrateful flatterers. The image of noble Brutus is invented by Cassius, who persuades him to join the plot, while the image of flattering Brutus is invented by his enemy Antony.

Although the ethical aspect of Brutus’s rhetoric is a central theme in this play, critics have long focused on his eloquence, and they have often considered that his downfall results from his inappropriate usage of the rhetoric, especially in the forum scene. Citing Thomas Wilson’s *The Art of Rhetoric*, Andrew Hadfield maintains that Brutus’s speech demonstrates “his lack of rhetorical skills,” while Antony abuses them (*Shakespeare and Republicanism* 181). Maddalena Pennacchia argues that Brutus simply follows the classical rhetoric and delivers his speech on the pulpit, while Antony customises his words as early modern rhetoric and takes a “spectacular approach” in the ring of his audience (59). These analyses may reveal how different the speeches of Brutus and Antony are, or how eloquent

Antony's speech is, but they still do not conclusively demonstrate that Brutus has no virtues in his rhetoric.

This section argues that Brutus, who refuses to flatter, is a heroic victim of flattery, and the image of Brutus is distorted by flatterers, such as Cassius and Antony. It also explores what problems are depicted in the changing image of Brutus and his tyrannicide, citing social debates on flattery in Renaissance England. Brutus's anti-rhetorical plainness and his consistency of words and actions are contrary to flattery, and such ethical virtues in his rhetoric are spoiled by flatterers who manipulate the rhetoric for their private good. Brutus's honour in his rhetoric is closely related with his justification of the assassination of Caesar, because if Caesar was far from a tyrant, Brutus would never be an honourable man. Therefore, this section begins with a discussion of the extent to which this assassination is justified in early modern tyrannicide debates, as well as the tyrannical preference of flattery, which is entirely opposed to honour in Brutus's rhetoric.

Tyrant and flattery

Just as Brutus's honour is disputable, so too is Caesar's. Even Brutus makes contradictory statements on this subject. Although he admits that he has never seen Caesar's "affections swayed / More than his reason" (2.1.20-21) before the assassination, he later reminds Cassius that Caesar was killed "for supporting robbers" (4.3.23). Critics evaluate Caesar variously. Maurice Charney argues that "Julius Caesar is a creature of strong and

determined personal will, a significant mark of the tyrant” (134). On the contrary, Timothy Burns highly evaluates Caesar’s attitude towards the law and equality, arguing that he is “no petty tyrant”, but instead is “living by the republican principle” (61). Warren Chernaik suggests a moderate interpretation, “At no point does the play give clear, unambiguous evidence as to whether Caesar is or is not a tyrant, actual or potential” (97).

Although it is difficult to make an incontrovertible argument about Caesar’s overall tyranny, it is possible still to regard him as a tyrant from the viewpoint of his attitude to flattery. The preference for flattery was considered to be a tyrant’s characteristic in Renaissance England, as seen in the ideas of Erasmus and Bacon, and already argued in the Introduction of this thesis. In fact, Caesar is practically associated with flattery in a binary sense: he likes flatterers and is himself a flatterer. Caesar’s flattery does not directly appear on the stage, but it is indirectly presented through the two conspirators, Caska and Cassius discussing Caesar’s refusal to receive the crown. Caska regards it as “mere foolery” (1.2.235), through which Caesar can pretend not to be ambitious. Cassius assumes that Caesar’s “falling sickness” (1.2.255) in front of the commoners does not afflict Caesar himself but other Roman aristocrats including Brutus, Caska and Cassius, because Caesar’s excessive tension may attract the commoners, whether it is real or fake. The conspirators are afraid that Caesar flatters the commoners and rises with the people’s support, though their assumptions may be distorted by their envy. In a metatheatrical sense, their assumptions are flattery directed at the audience.

Caesar’s flattery is indirectly presented, but his preference for flatterers

is more explicit. In Act 2 Scene 2, Caesar does not assent to his wife Calphurnia's advice, instead believing Decius's flattery.¹⁸ At first, Caesar almost follows his wife's advice that he should stay in home instead of going to the Senate House, because she had an ominous dream. However, when Decius, one of the conspirators reinterprets her dream and relates it to Caesar's coronation, Caesar changes his mind and follows Decius. Decius is confident in his rhetoric, telling his accomplices before visiting Caesar:

Never fear that. If he be so resolved
 I can o'ersway: for he loves to hear
 That unicorns may be betrayed with trees,
 And bears with glasses, elephants with holes,
 Lions with toils and men with flatterers. (2.1.201-05)

Decius is of course one of the "flatterers" to Caesar, the man of power, and therefore his nature implies that of a cunning courtier in Renaissance England. Likewise, Caesar's attitude towards advice and flattery vividly reflects the contrast between those kinds of rhetoric in classical friendship, such as outlined in the works of Aristotle, Cicero and Plutarch.¹⁹ Calphurnia advises Caesar for his own sake, while Decius flatters Caesar in support of the conspirators' plot to kill him, but Caesar prefers the flattery to the advice. Caesar's ambition, which makes him change his mind as well as his

¹⁸ David Colclough argues that it is noticeable that an honest counsel is delivered by Calpurnia, though women's advice and friendship are ignored in classical friendship (Colclough 221). This thesis focuses on women's rhetoric in the third chapter.

¹⁹ See the Introduction in this thesis, 11-13.

preference for flattery, is regarded as a component of a tyrannical nature. In an earlier scene, Caesar asks his follower Antony to “Come on my right hand, for this ear is deaf” (1.2.212-13). Shakespeare’s invention of Caesar’s deafness in his left ear implies the tyrant’s unbalanced auditory perception with regard to advice and flattery, caused by his desire for private benefit, reflected in a disorder of the head in the body politic.

This is an example that obviously exhibits Caesar’s preference for flattery, but in another scene, Caesar might be seen to reject flattery. In order to find the time to kill Caesar, Metellus Cimber offers his suit to Caesar, but he replies:

Thy brother by decree is banished.
 If thou dost bend and pray and fawn for him
 I spurn thee like a cur out of my way.
 Know, Caesar doth not wrong, nor without cause
 Will he be satisfied. (3.1.44-48)

Cimber’s actions which Caesar refers to with the words “bend and pray” and “fawn” evoke the image of a flatterer. Caesar does not listen to the flattery of Cimber, “Most high, most mighty and most puissant Caesar” (3.1.33), but instead strictly observes the law which banishes Cimber’s brother. Burns evaluates this constancy, and maintains, “Caesar will not be flattered” (61).

Of course, Burns’s analysis is true if it is restricted to this scene, but as it has already been seen, Caesar is susceptible to flattery if it stimulates his ambition. Therefore, his strictness can be lost when he becomes a king, as

Brutus is afraid of “Th’abuse of greatness” (2.1.17). Moreover, strict law enforcement is sometimes disputable in Shakespeare: merciful law enforcement saves Claudio and Angelo in *Measure for Measure*, while Shylock is blamed for his request that strict law enforcement should kill Antonio in *Merchant of Venice*, and Alcibiades becomes furious about unmerciful senators in *Timon of Athens*. Vincentio, the Duke in *Measure for Measure* considers that his deputy Angelo needs both “terror” and “love” (*Measure for Measure* 1.1.19). Likewise, Nasser Behnegar analyses *Julius Caesar*, pointing out that Caesar is heartless to ignore the conspirators’ plea to save Metellus Cimber, and regards Caesar “as the God of the Hebrew Bible” (86).

Sir Thomas Smith argues in his *De Republica Anglorum* that a tyrant “breaks laws already made at his pleasure,” and “makes other without the advice of the people” (53). In this scene, Caesar neither breaks the law nor makes another law, but he stubbornly ignores others’ opinions. Smith also maintains that the parliament “gives most free pardons and absolutions, restores in blood and name as the highest court, condemns or absolves them whom the Prince will put to that trial” (78). Of course, the conspirators are not in such an office, but they were likely to be identified as members of the parliament seeking “free pardons and absolution” by the audience in Southwark, an unsafe area of London in Renaissance England. Caesar is depicted as tyrannical to some extent, while the conspirators do not maintain the proper qualification to resist him. Neither of them is completely innocent by the standards of the tyrannicide theories in Renaissance England.

Caesar may appear to be lawful on the surface, but his ambition is likely

to spoil his strictness. Such a tyrannical person is expected to be eliminated even before he actually becomes a tyrant in *Vindiciae Contra Tyrannos* (1578), a Huguenot Monarchomach treatise written under the pseudonym of Stephanus Junius Brutus:

If those who represent the people see anything being done against the commonwealth by force or fraud, they should admonish the prince, and should not wait while the evil grows worse and gathers strength. Tyranny is like a hectic fever: at first it is easy to cure, but difficult to recognise; later it is easy to diagnose, but ends up extremely difficult to cure. (Brutus 155)

The assassination of Caesar before he becomes a tyrant may seem ferocious for people in the present time, as Burns points out that “We may well kill serpents in the egg, if we have reason to fear them. We don’t kill human beings who just *may* do bad things to us, for the same reason that we don’t praise and blame serpents” (Burns 55, italicized by Burns). However, this extreme justification of tyrannicide would not always have been so unnatural especially after Saint Bartholomew massacre in 1572, the direct motivation of this Huguenot treatise (Garnet 21). In fact, *Vindiciae* maintains that the conspirators against Caesar “could not be charged” (Brutus 153). Although the conspirators plan the assassination urgently, this does not mean that they falsely invent the justification of their plot.

Nevertheless, even if this extremist theory justifies the assassination of Caesar, the problem remains of whether Shakespeare’s conspirators truly

“represent the people.” If the conspirators are flatterers, as Antony condemns them, then they are just murderers motivated by their own private envy. As Andrew Hadfield argues, *Vindiciae* does not allow for a private tyrannicide (*Shakespeare and Republicanism* 176). Furthermore, Shakespeare deprives the conspirators of their positions as representatives for Roman citizens, by changing the letters from Roman citizens to Brutus in Plutarch into the one which Cassius invents (“the Life of Marcus Brutus” in *Lives* 112):

I will this night

In several hands in at his windows throw,
As if they came from several citizens,
Writings all tending to the great opinion
That Rome holds of his name—wherein obscurely
Caesar’s ambition shall be glanced at. (1.2.314-19)

Here “Caesar’s ambition” which makes him prefer flattery to advice, is multiplied by Cassius. His invention of the letter to Brutus can be also regarded as a kind of flattery, false manipulation of rhetoric for private reasons.²⁰

Julius Caesar reflects a wide range of topics concerning tyranny and flattery, but none of these particular discussions can easily determine who is the most blameworthy in the play. Caesar is possibly regarded as a tyrant preferring flattery, while Brutus is not fully able to justify the assassination

²⁰ Colclough regards Artemidorus’s petition warning Caesar as a written form of advice, while he regards the bills written by Cassius as a written form of flattery (Colclough 222-28).

of Caesar and forced to escape from the attack that he is also a flatterer. This ambiguity intensifies problems about flattery and the tragedy of Brutus, an honourable man, who avoids flattery.

Brutus and flattery

Critics often agree with the notion that Brutus's republicanism is obsolete, and that this is what provides him with a downfall (Burckhardt 9; Zeeveld 98; Kahn, *Roman Shakespeare* 87; Schulman 79). As Coppélia Kahn argues, the conspirators' dedication to the public good is disturbed by the plebeians who anticipate Caesar becoming a monarch and allow him to monopolize all the honour in Rome (*Roman Shakespeare* 86). Likewise, Alex Schulman mentions the plebeians' demand for an absolute leader, just after Brutus's republican speech, "Let him be Caesar" (3.2.51) (78). However, Brutus's honour and his dedication to the public good are not fully ignored in *Julius Caesar*. On the contrary, his honour is a key to attracting the plebeians' support, and in fact they are almost persuaded at least on the surface. Brutus's honour and dedication to the public good are closely connected with the ethical aspect of his rhetoric. For, if he is a flatterer, this means that he seeks private rather than public good. Therefore, he always exhibits his republican virtues by avoiding flattery and maintaining consistency in his words and actions.

Although Brutus's justification of the assassination is disputable, it is still obvious that Brutus maintains the virtues of Ciceronian friendship, which sets flattery against advice. Instead of flattery, Brutus gives advice to

Cassius even if it offends him. In Act 4 Scene 2, they quarrel with each other and discuss true friendship:

CASSIUS

A friend should bear his friend's infirmities,
But Brutus makes mine greater than they are.

BRUTUS

I do not, till you practice them on me.

CASSIUS

You love me not.

BRUTUS

I do not like your faults.

CASSIUS

A friendly eye could never see such faults.

BRUTUS

A flatterer's would not, though they do appear
As huge as high Olympus. (4.3.85-91)

For Cassius, a friend overlooks his friend's faults. This might be a virtue of tolerance, but Brutus regards it as a kind of flattery, which conceals the fault that should instead be removed with good advice. Concealment of a fault, as well as self-interest, is a characteristic of a flatterer: Plutarch argues that a flatterer creates "in every man deception towards himself and ignorance both of himself and of the good and evil that concerns himself" (*Moralia* 267). According to Brutus, Cassius seeks for a flatterer, not a friend. However,

Brutus avoids flattery and gives harsh advice to his friend Cassius. This is a virtue of honourable Brutus, which is an ideal in classical ideas of friendship and rhetoric. Brutus's nobility derives not only from his ends but also his means: his altruism and dedication to public benefit are made clear by his plain rhetoric and frank advice.

Brutus's rhetoric tends to be underestimated, because Brutus is forced to escape from the sedition instigated by Antony. For example, Chernaik argues that "Unlike Antony in the oration that follows, Brutus's appeal to the audience is based on formal logic" (82). Of course, Antony might be a great rhetorician, and his rhetoric is full of amplification, which is the heart of Ciceronian oratory: In his dialogue, *De Oratore*, Cicero makes Marcus Antonius (the grandfather of Mark Antony in *Julius Caesar*) argue that an orator should "make a digression by way of embellishment or amplification, then to sum up and conclude" (*Cicero on Oratory and Orator* 242). Nevertheless, Shakespeare's Antony is far from the Ciceronian ideal, because his rhetoric is manipulated not for advice, but for flattery. Advice is indispensable to Ciceronian friendship, and Ciceronian oratory requires humanistic virtues as well as rhetorical skill. On the other hand, Brutus's rhetoric might not include amplification so much, but his plain rhetoric is also Ciceronian. Cicero's Marcus Antonius also argues, "the detail may be probable, clear, and concise" (*Cicero on Oratory and Orator* 242). Kenneth J. E. Graham argues that "there is an antirhetorical element within humanist rhetoric" and calls this "anti-rhetorical plainness" (22) and he names John of Gaunt and Kent as examples of Shakespeare's great plain-speaking counsellors (9).

In order to maintain his plain rhetoric, Brutus pays attention to the consistency between actions and words. Brutus assumes that Caesar must be removed for Rome, but that Antony is not so dominant as Caesar and cannot become a tyrant. The murder of Antony would spoil the vindication of tyrannicide. If Brutus murders Antony together with Caesar, he cannot explain his plot to the commoners with his plain rhetoric. Accordingly, Brutus objects to Cassius, who insists that they should murder Antony:

Let's carve him as a dish fit for the gods,
 Not hew him as a carcass fit for hounds.
 And let our hearts, as subtle masters do,
 Stir up their servants to an act of rage
 And after seem to chide 'em. This shall make
 Our purpose necessary and not envious,
 Which so appearing to the common eyes,
 We shall be called purgers, not murderers. (2.1.172-79)

Some might assert that Brutus invents the holiness in ferocious assassination to pretend to be innocent in front of the commoners. However, justified assassination is only the premise for Brutus, whose ideology aligns with the Renaissance idea of tyrannicide. George Buchanan argues that “the body politic, like the physical body” (25) should maintain healthy balance so that excess should be removed “sometimes by blood-letting, sometimes by expelling harmful elements, as if by a purgative” (25). Brutus assumes that the conspirators will become “purgers” of the tyrant and excess for the body

politic, that is, excess for republican Rome. As he embodies the Renaissance idea of tyrannicide, Brutus believes here that tyrannicide is necessary without any justification, expecting that this sacred assassination will not degenerate into murder due to envy. In short, Brutus just seeks the consistency between actions of assassination and words of vindication.

Compared with Antony's speech in front of the Roman plebeians, Brutus's speech is relatively brief, and it includes no amplification. He just reveals his own reason for killing Caesar: "As Caesar loved me, I weep for him; as he was fortunate, I rejoice at it; as he was valiant, I honour him: but as he was ambitious, I slew him" (3.2.24-27). In repetition of same phrases, he clearly exhibits that his only reason for killing Caesar lies in Caesar's ambition, and that Brutus is not envious. Another important thing in this Brutus's lines is his focus on himself. Garry Wills points out, "in the speech of Brutus there is a monotonous dwelling on Brutus, his honour, his unquestionable standing. He asserts that Caesar was ambitious, but gives no shred of evidence for this" (54). Although Brutus mentions the evidence in the end of his speech, "The question of his death is enrolled in the Capitol" (3.2.37-38), he does not disclose it in front of the commoners.

This might be Brutus's fault in terms of Ciceronian rhetoric, because exemplification is a typical form of amplification. However, for Brutus and his fellow conspirators, Brutus's honour is more important than Caesar's ambition in persuading the commoner. Caska asserts about Brutus and his honour:

O he sits high in all the people's hearts:

And that which would appear offence in us
 His countenance, like richest alchemy,
 Will change to virtue and to worthiness. (1.3.157-60)

As mentioned above, Brutus does not believe that he needs to invent a justification for the murder, but for Caska, who presumably joined the plot from his envy, Brutus's joining the plot is so effective that it can invent "virtue" and "worthiness" like "alchemy." Cassius agrees with Caska, and Brutus also shares this at least when he starts his speech with asking the commoners, "Believe me for mine honour and have respect to mine honour, that you may believe" (3.2.14-17). Of course, honour itself can prove no facts in the present trials, but in *Julius Caesar*, Brutus's honour is depicted as if it were evidence, by which Brutus can prove Caesar's ambition.

Distortion of Brutus's "honourable mettle"

Brutus avoids flattery, and this makes him honourable. However, his honourable virtue in rhetoric suffers from others' flattery. Cassius implies this in his soliloquy just after he succeeds in persuading Brutus to join his plot:

Well, Brutus, thou art noble: yet I see
 Thy honourable mettle may be wrought
 From that it is disposed. Therefore it is meet
 That noble minds keep ever with their likes;

For who so firm that cannot be seduced?
 Caesar doth bear me hard, but he loves Brutus.
 If I were Brutus now, and he were Cassius,
 He should not humour me. (1.2.307-14)

As David Daniel annotates, “honourable mettle” means Brutus honourable virtue, but it also implies “metal”, which cannot “be wrought” in alchemy (Daniel 183n). Nevertheless, Cassius assumes that Brutus may be changed. In the use of this alchemical metaphor, Cassius makes a parody of Ciceronian friendship, which asserts that true friendship can be seen only in equally noble men, and that flattery spoils friendship. Accordingly, he suggests that “noble minds keep ever with their likes,” but ironically, he does not have the same “honourable mettle” as Brutus does. Even if Cassius “were Brutus,” Caesar should not “humour” Cassius like Brutus. On the other hand, Brutus may be “seduced” not only by his protector Caesar, but also by his friend Cassius.

Cassius flatters Brutus and amplifies his honourable virtues. At first, Brutus is anxious about republican Rome but has no brutal plot. Cassius invents the necessity that Brutus should kill Caesar, and seduces him to agree with the plan.

CASSIUS 'Tis just,
 And it is very much lamented, Brutus,
 That you have no such mirrors as will turn
 Your hidden worthiness into your eye,

That you might see your shadow: I have heard
 Where many of the best respect in Rome
 (Except immortal Caesar) speaking of Brutus,
 And groaning underneath this age's yoke,
 Have wished that noble Brutus had his eyes.

BRUTUS

Into what dangers would you lead me, Cassius,
 That you would have me seek into myself
 For that which is not in me? (1.2.54-65)

Here it is Cassius who calls Brutus “noble” for the first time throughout the play. Brutus’s nobility is related to “dangers,” before Brutus relates it to the public service. Cassius’s flattery that Brutus is noble multiplies his actual nobility, and then Cassius seduces Brutus to join the assassination of Caesar. Cassius pretends to be one of the “mirrors,” that can reflect Brutus’s “hidden worthiness” just as it is, but in fact he invents it with flattery and abuse of Ciceronian amplification.

It is not only Cassius but also Antony who manipulates flattery and abuses Ciceronian amplification.²¹ Unlike Brutus, Antony exhibits two pieces of evidence against the conspirators: one is Caesar’s will, and the other is Caesar’s wound. Caesar’s will might be certain evidence that Caesar sought the public benefit, implying that he was not ambitious. However,

²¹ Citing Thomas Wilson’s definition of rhetoric, Gary Watt argues that “rhetoric is an art of ‘handling’ or manipulation”, and that “Antony is the arch manipulator” of the fact (Watt 115). Here I suggest that Antony’s method of manipulation is actually the abuse of amplification.

Caesar's wound is described with much more cruelty than it actually shows through Antony's eloquence. In fact, Antony did not witness the assassination of Caesar, but he amplifies its cruelty while he is explaining it as though he had witnessed it:

Look, in this place ran Cassius' dagger through:

See what a rent the envious Casca made:

Through this, the well-beloved Brutus stabbed,

[...]

This was the most unkindest cut of all:

For when the noble Caesar saw him stab,

Ingratitude, more strong than traitor's arms,

Quite vanquished him: (3.2.172-74, 181-84)

Antony does not know who made each wound, but he assumes that the conspirators' attack was "envious," "unkindest," and filled with "Ingratitude," and cruelty, such that his illustration evokes something far from the holy image that Brutus expected. They are depicted just as murderers, not as purgers who offer a sacrifice to the gods. Furthermore, Antony implies that all the conspirators are flatterers, because an ungrateful flatterer betrays his master from envy. Antony is in fact a flatterer, who abuses Ciceronian amplification in order to gain his own profit. In other words, Antony attracts his audience by shifting his own image as a flatterer to the conspirators.

The flattery of Cassius and Antony distorts the image of honourable Brutus and represents him as a flatterer. Subsequently, Brutus gradually

becomes a flatterer indeed. While the conspirators are stopping Caesar by begging a pardon for Cimber's brother, Brutus also kneels in front of Caesar, and prays for him:

BRUTUS

I kiss thy hand, but not in flattery, Caesar,
Desiring thee that Publius Cimber may
Have an immediate freedom of repeal.

CAESAR

What, Brutus? (3.1.52-55)

Brutus insists that this is not flattery, but its exaggerated appeal is actually much like flattery. In fact, Cassius and Antony make the same excuse while they are flattering: Cassius affirms that he does not “fawn” (1.2.73) on Brutus, and Antony calls himself “a plain blunt man” (3.2.211). Here, Caesar is surprised not merely that Brutus is in front of him, but that honourable Brutus is also flattering him. Later, Caesar dismisses Decius, emphasising that even Brutus is “bootless” in kneeling (3.1.75). This image, that the conspirators, including Brutus flatter Caesar, before murdering him with a dagger of betrayal, supports Antony's faked explanation of Caesar's wound. Consequently, as Andrew Hadfield points out, the scene in which the conspirators soak their hands in Caesar's blood (3.1.104-07) may imply their cruelty rather than their holy image of purgers (*Shakespeare and Renaissance Politics* 143).

Brutus seeks the public benefits at first, but gradually he becomes

self-centred and self-righteous (Welsh 61, Wiegandt 61). Above all, it is fatal to Brutus's honour that he becomes indifferent to Cassius's advice. Brutus rejects the murder of Antony (2.1.149) and persists in advancing to Philippi (4.3.201-04). Each of these instances drives the conspirators into a difficult situation. In other words, Brutus's virtue in classical friendship based on mutual advice is lost, which subverts the proposition that Brutus is an honourable man, just as Antony does.

Brutus's words before his death illustrate that he has moved far from his former virtues, that is, plain words and pursuit of the public good. As Burns argues, Brutus sticks to his honour in that he dies for Rome (Burns 74). Brutus asserts, "I shall have glory by this losing day / More than Octavius and Mark Antony / By this vile conquest shall attain unto" (5.5.36-39). In order to achieve his honourable death,²² he flatters his companions. While Brutus insists that he killed Caesar as a friend in the forum scene, it is ironical that Brutus is dismissed by Volumnius, saying "That's not an office for a friend" (5.5.29). Finally, Brutus entreats his servant Strato, with flattering words:

I prithee, Strato, stay thou by thy lord.

Thou art a fellow of a good respect:

Thy life hath had some smatch of honour in it.

Hold then my sword, and turn away thy face,

While I do run upon it. Wilt thou, Strato? (5.5.45-49)

²² Jennifer Feather highly evaluates Brutus's suicide, which implies his continuing autonomy, and regards his plea to Strato as "an act committed for and in friendship" (96). However, this thesis agrees with Burns rather than Feather, and regards their relation as a mock friendship, taking Brutus's sudden and exaggerated praise to Strato into account.

Brutus refers to the servant as “a fellow of a good respect” with “honour”, and buys his consent. He achieves this death in the battlefield, but it does not necessarily mean that it is an honourable death, because in achieving it he has become flatterer, pursuing his own benefit while gaining the good will of others.

Julius Caesar depicts problems with tyrants and flattery. A tyrant likes to hear flattery and at the same time, he flatters. Caesar has a tyrannical nature to some extent, but it is always disputable throughout the play. Brutus’s honour which is used to justify the murder of Caesar, is also disputable. Brutus avoids flattery and gives plain speech and advice. However, flattery employed by Cassius and Antony distorts the image of honourable Brutus. In the quarrel scene, Cassius expects Brutus to become a flatterer rather than a friend. In the forum scene, Antony subverts the common sense in Roman citizens that Brutus is an honourable man, calling him a flatterer. In the end, Brutus can no longer avoid flattery.

Section 2. Encouragement and refusal of flattery in *Coriolanus*

Caesar and Coriolanus have numerous qualities in common. Both generals bring the spoils of war to Rome. Regardless of their dedication to the public good, they are removed from the country, because they are suspected to be a tyrant. Their enemies envy them and manipulate flattering words to

defeat them: As argued in Section 1 of this chapter, Caesar is killed while he is being solicited with sweet words begging for the pardon of Metellus Cimber by the conspirators; similarly, Coriolanus is sentenced to banishment in the confusion caused by the flattering tribunes.

On the other hand, one clear difference between the two characters is that Caesar flatters to the commoners, but Coriolanus does not, though preference for flattery is characteristic of a tyrant in Renaissance political thought, such as in the works of Erasmus and his followers. Coriolanus is far from a tyrant by this viewpoint: he refuses to flatter the people and insists, “He that will give good words to thee will flatter / Beneath abhorring” (1.1.162-63). As a result, he is regarded as a tyrant by the commoners, not because he flatters, but because he does not flatter.

In *Coriolanus*, it is not the tyrannical figure but the commoners who prefer flattery. For example, they demand mere superficial friendship rather than true love: when Coriolanus calls the citizens “dissentious rogues” (1.1.159), the Second Citizen ironically condemns his words as “good word” (1.1.161). Later, at the election of consulship, the First Citizen demands Coriolanus “to ask it kindly” (2.3.75) in return for their voting him. Unlike Coriolanus, however, Menenius is evaluated as “honest” (1.1.48) by the commoners, just because he manipulates with conciliating words. They also believe the tribunes’ words without any doubts and end up becoming agitated accordingly.

Julius Caesar involves problems with flattery concerning a tyrant, while *Coriolanus* includes disorder caused by flattery given to commoners. In the political thought in Renaissance England, such as in the works of Beacon and

Elyot, preference for flattery is a characteristic both of tyrants and the people. They do not manipulate the rhetoric of flattery, but instead they are subject to flattery. Kai Wiegandt argues that *Coriolanus* is a tragedy depicting “the autonomous citizens’ degeneration into a destructive mob, from body politic to many-headed monster” (97), but for Coriolanus, who refuses to flatter the commoners, they always appear to be cowardly, selfish and ungrateful from the beginning.

In his refusal to flatter, Coriolanus is more similar to Brutus than Caesar. In fact, Coriolanus’s honour lies not only in his valour and military skills but also in his plain speech. Menenius defends Coriolanus’s anger and insists, “His nature is too noble for the world, / He would not flatter Neptune for his trident, / Or Jove for’s power to thunder.” (3.1.257-59). Coriolanus bears some defects, such as pride, “choler” or anger and rude speech, so he might be regarded as a satiric figure. However, he should be still regarded as a tragic hero, provided that this play depicts disorder caused by dishonestly seducing language. This section, like the former, begins with discussing a problem with flattery and a particular class (here, the common people) and then explores how honourable Coriolanus becomes a victim of abused rhetoric.

Commoners and flattery

If Coriolanus is truly a tyrant, he might be naturally eliminated from Rome. However, just as Caesar’s tyrannical nature is controversial, it is

difficult to assert that Coriolanus is a tyrannical figure because the commoners' evaluation of him is too uncertain to be trustworthy. Nevertheless, some critics see Shakespeare's foresight of present successful democracies in *Coriolanus*. In this type of reading, Coriolanus tends to be regarded as a less heroic character, while people are the centred of the analysis. For example, Jeffrey Edward Green analyses "a theory of plebiscitary democracy" (133) in *Coriolanus*, and reveals that "the way in which the People in its capacity as a mass spectator does constitute a disciplinary, ocular force with real and potentially critical effects on those compelled to appear before it" (133). However, the ocular force of the people has a practical effect on the government only when they maintain civic virtue. People are expected to control themselves and have their own senses of judgement.

Ann Barton evaluates the commoners in *Coriolanus*: "The Roman people here are not distinguished by personal names. They speak, nonetheless, as individuals, not a mob" (140). Few critics disagree with her assertion, especially about the commoners rising up in the beginning of the play. Wiegandt explains this in more detail: "The First Citizen is a bold and witty leader and the Second Citizen a considerate, hesitant man. The Third and Fourth Citizens are determined followers of the First, while the Fifth Citizen is nearer the Second in kind" (78). According to Wiegandt, citizens in *Coriolanus* are more self-restrained than the plebeians in *Julius Caesar*, which is implied when they are referred to as "citizens" in stage directions, rather than plebeians or commoners (78).

The commoners are self-critical in general. Even in a later scene, they

show that they are conscious of their potential monstrous quality. The Third Citizen admits that they should not ignore Coriolanus's dedication to Rome, because "Ingratitude is monstrous" (2.3.9). Nevertheless, they cannot fully control themselves. As argued above, they evaluate their protector merely by his words. They are unaware of their susceptibility to flattery and instigation, and therefore, they cannot avoid being seduced. Before the election for consulship, the Second Officer explains the commoners' uncertain attitude towards their leaders:

'Faith, there hath been many great men that
 have flattered the people who ne'er loved them, and
 there be many that they have loved, they know not
 wherefore; [...]

Therefore, for Coriolanus
 neither to care whether they love or hate him manifests
 the true knowledge he has in their disposition [...].

(2.2.7-10, 11-13)

Although the tribunes in *Coriolanus* are far from "great men," they manipulate sweet words to give to the Roman people, so that the people support them without any reason except for their speech. The tribunes apparently stand for the people, but in fact they are mere a faction against Coriolanus and his supporters, such as Menenius, Cominius and other patricians. As Eric Nelson rightfully points out, the tribunes are "as

ambitious and self-interested as the ejectee” (266).²³ As a result, the commoners are not defended, but seduced by the tribunes, who want to defeat Coriolanus, their private rival.

So it must fall out

To him, or our authority's for an end.

We must suggest the people in what hatred

He still hath held them; [...]. (2.1.237-40)

As Peter Holland puts a note on the word “suggest”, this passage is cited in the *OED*'s definition of (2.b), “to insinuate into (a person's mind) the (false) idea that” (Holland 234n). The tribunes pretend to defend the people's liberty, while they in fact make the people defend the tribune's private benefit. In this sense, the tribunes are similar to Caesar and Antony in *Julius Caesar*. On the other hand, the commoners in *Coriolanus* are an object of seduction, just like the people in *Julius Caesar*. As the Second Officer sees through, Coriolanus knows the nature of the commoner and says in anger to them, “With every minute you do change a mind, / And call him noble that was now your hate, / Him vile that was your garland (1.1.177-79).

The commoners in *Coriolanus* prefer to be flattered, and are subject to

²³ Here, Eric Nelson refers to the author of *Vindiciae Contra Tyrannos*, one of the most radical tyrannicide theories, and his or her pseudonym, “Junius Brutus,” which is the same name as one of the tribunes in *Coriolanus* (265). However, Brutus the tribune is much less noble than Brutus the legendary hero of Republican Rome both in birth and in dedication to public benefit. Brutus in *Julius Caesar* is more similar to the legendary Brutus, as Cassius implies. One plausible candidate for the true author is Hubert Languet. As for the authorship of *Vindiciae Contra Tyrannos*, see George Garnett, lv-lxxvi.

focus on Coriolanus's heroic virtues more than active citizenship, such as Unhae Park Langis, pointing out, "Coriolanus is right in his assessment of the plebeians as presently lacking in the political skills necessary to fulfil their civic duties" (123).

As argued in Section 1 of this chapter, the honour of Brutus in *Julius Caesar* is much related to his consistency of speech and action. In order to maintain his consistency, Brutus avoids flattery. In Ciceronian friendship, frank advice with plain words was the most important virtue of all. The commoners in *Coriolanus* might have had active voices, but they still do not have virtue adequate to maintain their consistency of speech and action. They do not admit their previous ill treatment against Coriolanus, only to make the excuse that they are forced to follow the tribunes.

Coriolanus's refusal of flattery and change in aristocrats' identity

Coriolanus avoids flattery, though it brings his downfall. He refuses to gain more favour than anyone gives him. Surprisingly, this nobleness in his honest words has been long ignored or underestimated by critics. Instead, they have only suggested that Coriolanus lacks oratorical skills.²⁴ Against

²⁴ As for the countless works that attack Coriolanus's lack of oratory skills, see West and Silberstein 307-09. In recent studies, critics such as Eve Rachele Sanders and Manfred Pfister argue that Corionaus's "acting" is inadequate rather than his words. See Eve Rachele Sanders, "The Body of the Actor in "Coriolanus"" (2006) and Manfred Pfister, "Acting the Roman: *Coriolanus*" (2010). On the other hand, like West and Silberstein, John Plotz defend Coriolanus's rhetoric in his "Coriolanus and the failure of Performatives" (1996), though he maintains a more moderate view than West and Silberstein, who suggest that Coriolanus should be regarded as an anti-Ciceronian orator. Instead of evaluating Coriolanus's rhetoric, Plotz simply argues that the deception that Coriolanus refuses to use is not always

such a critical tradition, Michael West and Myron Silberstein defend Coriolanus's eloquence: "True, this republican hero rarely expresses himself with Ciceronian amplitude, but Cicero's was by no means only form of oratory admired in the Renaissance" (West and Silberstein 309). According to their study, there was also an anti-Ciceronian plainspoken rhetoric following Demosthenes in the Renaissance England (West and Silberstein 309).²⁵

Just as Coriolanus refuses to flatter, he also dislikes exaggerating his own honour. In other words, he maintains that the inside should always be consistent with the outside. This is not restricted within oral interaction. When he is extolled for achieving great military success in Corioli, he desires that flourish to be stopped:

May these same instruments which you profane
 Never sound more. When drums and trumpets shall
 I'th' field prove flatterers, let courts and cities be
 Made all of false-faced soothing. (1.9.40-43)

For Coriolanus, "drums and trumpets" should be military instruments in the battlefield. As long as they are used in the battlefield, they complement his valour. However, if they are used away from the battlefield, they suggest his valour while he is not actually exhibiting it. His valour is honourable even though it is not exhibited in public. The fact that he is brave and unparalleled

depicted as indispensable (812).

²⁵ West and Silberstein conclude that *Coriolanus* "enacts not only the tragedy of its hero but the larger tragedy of Renaissance rhetoric" (West and Silberstein 331). Their view encourages this thesis to discuss and relate the tragedy of the hero to the rhetorical theme of the play.

is the only reason for his dominance in Rome. If people give extra honour to him, they only “prove flatterers.” Flatterers were usually seen in “courts and cities” in Renaissance England, where newly rising gentlemen were generated without military service. Coriolanus’s wound is also a proof of his valour and he is repeatedly asked to exhibit it. To display the wounds away from the battlefield is to flatter to gain favour while concealing the actual situation. Therefore, Coriolanus feels, “I had rather have my wounds to heal again / Than hear say how I got them (2.2.67-68)”.

Coriolanus’s virtue includes not only consistency of speech and action, but also valour. He maintains a pure, old-fashioned aristocratic identity based on military service. He considers military service to be the best and absolute aristocratic value. His masculinity may provoke nostalgia, because the aristocracy’s opportunity to engage in warfare was almost obsolete when Coriolanus was supposedly written (Palliser 83). Robert Matz details this especially in the reign of Elizabeth I, who died just before the play was first performed:

The Elizabethan nobility lacked military experience even compared to their predecessors under Henry VIII. Elizabethan reluctance to involve England in expensive foreign wars, the ongoing centralization and bureaucratization of the English state, which shifted the locus of power to administrative functions within the court, the rise of the professional soldier, and the development of a system of national defense less reliant on feudal retaining, all helped to continue the pacification of the Tudor elite (Matz 61).

Because of this urgency, English humanists expected moral virtue and education to become replacement for military service as aristocratic virtues (Heal and Holmes 31). The best examples are Sir Thomas Elyot and Sir Philip Sidney. Both humanists were lower gentlemen, so new kinds of gentility were convenient to them. Education, widely open even to lower gentlemen, enabled them to solidify their status. (Matz 29, 56). On the other hand, military service remained the best aristocratic virtues (Heal and Holmes 30). In *The School of Abuse* (1579), Stephen Gosson expresses his nostalgic vision of “the aristocracy’s traditional warrior service (Matz 61). The Second Officer sympathizes with this nostalgia:

He hath deserved worthily of his country,
and his ascent is not by such easy degrees as those
who, having been supple and courteous to the people,
bonneted, without any further deed to have them at all
into their estimation and report. But he hath so planted
his honours in their eyes and his actions in their hearts
that for their tongues to be silent and not confess so
much were a kind of ungrateful injury. (2.2.23-30)

Coriolanus’s military service holds an absolute value, and it is worthy of esteem even if it is not pompously exhibited. The Second Officer as well as Coriolanus maintains this notion. Public service generally requires to be exposed to others’ opinions, but for the Second Officer, military service does

not require such process.

Regardless of his good old aristocratic virtues, Coriolanus allows the tribunes the chance to attack him. Langis evaluates Coriolanus as “hypervirtuous,” and argues that his excess virtue brings him to political failure (128-32). In fact, his valour and frankness are closely connected with his anger and rough speech. Langis’s analysis seems true, because it evokes Renaissance tyrannicide theories such as George Buchanan’s *A Dialogue on the Law of Kingship among the Scots* in which he argues that a tyrant is “excess” in the body politic to be removed (Buchanan 25). After all, excess virtue is a trigger as well to the other tragedies discussed in this chapter: Julius Caesar’s strictness, and Timon’s generosity.

The problem at stake in Coriolanus’s virtue does not lie only in excess. More importantly, it is old fashioned and difficult to accept. Unlike the First Officer and Roman aristocrats, the commoners think more highly of apparent dedication and moral virtues than military service. Such values require reputation in order to function as honour, though Coriolanus would not admit that he should be subject to the commoners’ opinions. The First Officer shares the perspective of the commoners. He asserts, “Now to seem to affect the malice and displeasure of the people is as bad as that which he dislikes, to flatter them for their love” (2.2.19-22).

The reputation and political success of Coriolanus in this play reflect the transformation in gentility from the military service to moral virtues and rhetorical education. Unlike Coriolanus, Volumnia and Menenius maintain the humanist idea of gentility. They manipulate rhetoric to win others’ goodwill instead of resorting to arms to win a war. Volumnia admonishes her

son, “it lies you on to speak / To th’ people” (3.2.53-54), and connects war and peace through the Machiavellian policy that the ends justify the means:

If it be honour in your wars to seem
 The same you are not, which for your best ends
 You adopt your policy, how is it less or worse
 That it shall hold companionship in peace
 With honour as in war, since that to both
 It stands in like request? (3.2.47-52)

Deception, either in speech or in warfare, might be against honour, but it can be justified for the sake of the stable order in Rome ruled by the military hero. Her connecting speech and arms urges Coriolanus to maintain a new aristocratic identity based on rhetorical skills. In fact, her greatest success in persuasion is seen when she kneels before her son in the battlefield. She flatters her son, which astonishes and moves him.

Menenius constantly manipulates flattering words throughout the play. Coriolanus refuses to flatter, but Menenius flatters persuasively. As Peltonen rightly points out, “Menenius and Caius Martius represent different aspects of the aristocratic notion of rhetoric” (“Political rhetoric and citizenship in *Coriolanus*” 252).²⁶ At first, Menenius persuades the commoners rising up

²⁶ Peltonen argues that Coriolanus “simply abhors rhetoric in all its forms and is convinced that it is necessarily popular” (“Political rhetoric and citizenship in *Coriolanus*” 247). However, as already argued, Coriolanus considers that flattery is usually witnessed in “court” as well as “city” (1.9.42), so that he is aware that it is not necessarily popular. Peltonen assumes that Coriolanus “had no liberal education,” but the general is not so much poor at rhetoric as he simply dislikes it. While Coriolanus does not

out of hunger to stop, and tells the belly fable:

The senators of Rome are this good belly,
 And you the mutinous members. For examine
 Their counsels and their cares, digest things rightly,
 Touching the weal o'th' common, you shall find
 No public benefit which you receive
 But it proceeds or comes from them to you,
 And no way from yourselves. (1.1.143-49)

This fable would remind the Renaissance audience of the body politic, where a king was often compared to the head. For example, citing *The True Law of Free Monarchies* (1598), Andrew Hadfield argues, “Menenius’s conception of the Roman republic is clearly in line with that of James, although he centralizes the belly as the commanding organ of the body, rather than the head” (*Shakespeare and Renaissance Politics* 176). If Menenius referred to the senators as the head, his persuasion would be too overbearing to sooth the furious commoners. In the belly fable, each organ has its own voice, but in the idea of the body politic supporting monarchism, the head unilaterally commands other parts of the body. In a sense, this is Menenius’s flattery to the commoners. He admits that they have each voice, and he is ready to talk with them.

Of course, it is ambiguous whether his persuasion is successful here,

discriminate rhetoric from flattery, he is actually eloquent when he is in fury before the commoners in Act 3 Scene 1.

because the commoners have almost no lines after Coriolanus appears. After his persuasion, Menenius informs Coriolanus that they are “almost thoroughly persuaded” (1.1.196). From this phrase, some critics regard his rhetoric as unsuccessful: Peltonen argues that Menenius “confesses that he has not been able to move them onto his side” (“Political rhetoric and citizenship in *Coriolanus*” 252), and Quentin Skinner summarises Peltonen’s work and concludes, “Menenius’s aristocratic rhetoric has no power to persuade the people” (“Afterward” 280). Holland annotates the phrase with the clarification, “Menenius may not be entirely sure that he has completed his task” (Holland 166n).

However, this is not the only one case wherein Menenius changes a part of early modern political thought in order to flatter. When he disputes with the tribunes and the violently agitated commoners over Coriolanus, Menenius compares Coriolanus to a limb, again avoiding the head. Sicinius insists, “He’s a disease that must be cut away” (3.1.296), and Menenius answers, “O, he’s a limb that has but a disease: / Mortal to cut it off, to cure it easy” (3.1.296-98). If Coriolanus would be the head of Rome, to cut him away is undoubtedly fatal. Coriolanus, worthy of consulship in the Roman Republic, is different from the head of a kingdom. To change their viewpoint further, the commoners are called not subjects, but active citizens. These are all Menenius’s flatteries. After all, the commoners easily become the agitated multitude. He finally succeeds in soothing them and promises to take Coriolanus to the trial.

Coriolanus’s tragedy caused by flatterers

Like Brutus in *Julius Caesar*, Coriolanus is a victim of flatterers: The two tribunes, the commoners, Volumnia and Aufidius. The tribunes flatter the commoners and agitate them. The commoners are ungrateful to Coriolanus, who is a military hero in Rome. They follow Coriolanus at first in the consul election, but later betray him. In a sense, the commoners are unconscious flatterers. Volumnia, of course, does not have any intention to betray her son, but her flattering persuasion leads to Coriolanus's decisive downfall in Volscia. Aufidius, who reconciles with Coriolanus, comes to pretend to be his friend, but ultimately betrays him. Like the Roman tribunes, Aufidius agitates the Volscian people to defeat him.

The tribunes flatter the commoners in order to gain support from them. Sicinius, one of the two tribunes, insists in front of them that "the people" are "the city" of Rome (3.1.199). Barton argues that this is false, because "Rome cannot be identified solely with her commons," (141) and that the city includes the patricians. Sicinius manipulates this, putting the commoners in the centre of Rome instead of the bottom of the hierarchy. Hearing this, the commoners are willing to support the tribunes, so that Brutus, the other tribune, can pronounce a "present death" (3.1.213) sentence on Coriolanus "Upon the part o'th people" (3.1.211).

Of course, the tribunes' manipulations of rhetoric are not restricted to sweet words to the people: they are also not reluctant to rail against Coriolanus in order to provoke him to lose his temper. Once he is filled with fury, Coriolanus cannot restrain his words, and cannot but resort to his sword, even if he is surrounded by his enemies. Then, all that the tribunes have to do

is to “observe and answer / The vantage of anger” (2.3.257). Although Volumnia urges her son to make his “use of anger / To better vantage” (3.2.29-32) and recommend him to “frown” and not to “fawn” on the commoners (3.2.68), Coriolanus cannot control his temper until he is banished from Rome.

In contrast to his susceptibility to other’s rhetoric when he is in Rome, Coriolanus becomes constant when he is in the Volscian army. Now he is a Machiavellian realist like his mother, so much so that he mercilessly ignores even his old companions such as Menenius and Cominius. Aufidius is surprised at this and addresses him, “You keep a constant temper” (5.2.93). Likewise, the Second Watchman extols him, “He’s the rock, the oak, not to be wind-shaken (5.2.108). As seen in Act 4 Scene 7, Aufidius actually envies Coriolanus, and he is looking for the opportunity to defeat his rival, but it is not as easy as the case in which the tribunes agitate the commoners against Coriolanus.

Aufidius anticipates Coriolanus’s ill fortune in his soliloquy: “Rights by rights falter, strengths by strengths do fail” (4.7.55). This is true: Coriolanus’s realistic policy and insusceptibility to other’s rhetoric are lost when he meets his mother Volumnia, the greatest rhetorician in Rome. Although she is respected by her son, she flatteringly but ironically shows him their subverted relationship by kneeling:

VOLUMNIA

I kneel before thee and unproperly

Show duty as mistaken all this while

Between the child and parent.

CORIOLANUS

What's this?

Your knees to me? To your corrected son? (5.3.54-57)

This is so shocking to Coriolanus that he cannot ignore her. As Caesar is astonished to see Brutus flatter and then kill him, Coriolanus a Roman republican hero, faces an emergency while he is flattered as if he embodied a monarch in the early modern court.

Volumnia's persuasion includes deception, just as she recommended it to her son in the election of consulship. Surprisingly, she resorts to this dishonest policy even against her son. She places reconciliation in opposition to the betrayal of the Volsces, though actually both of them lead to his dishonour as a Volscian general:

If it were so that our request did tend
 To save the Romans, thereby to destroy
 The Volsces whom you serve, you might condemn us
 As poisonous of your honour. No, our suit
 Is that you reconcile them: while the Volsces
 May say 'This mercy we have showed', the Romans
 'This we received', and each in either side
 Give the all-hail to thee and cry 'Be blest
 For making up this peace! (5.3.132-40)

For the Volscian people, Coriolanus, who was once the worst enemy, is a

Volscian general only when he is attacking Rome. Of course, reconciliation may not spoil his honour as a merciful Roman general, but it leads to discrepancy in his identity. As Chernaik argues, “A victory for Rome, saved from destruction, is a catastrophic, irremediable defeat for the man who has been Rome’s soldier and Rome’s sworn enemy” (194). As a result, Coriolanus becomes neither Roman nor Volscian. He is aware of this and addresses his mother:

You have won a happy victory to Rome
 But have your son, believe it, O, believe it,
 Most dangerously you have with him prevailed,
 If not most mortal to him. (5.3.186-89)

Thus, Volumnia’s rhetoric and her education of her son do not provide him with political success. On the contrary, her rhetoric including deception, in which she abuses Ciceronian amplification, crucially damages his newly achieved insusceptibility to flattery.

Aufidius does not miss the opportunity to defeat his rival. His way to attack Coriolanus closely resembles the tribunes’ and the way Antony does against Brutus in *Julius Caesar*: First, he falsely calls Coriolanus a flatterer and a traitor:

He watered his new plants with dews of flattery,
 Seducing so my friends, and to this end
 He bowed his nature, never known before

But to be rough, unswayable and free. (5.6.22-25)

Of course, it is Aufidius who manipulates the facts and flatters the Volscian people to defeat his rival. However, he lays the blame on his rival just as Antony does. Then he provokes Coriolanus in order to remove any routes to escape just as the tribunes do:

Measureless liar, thou hast made my heart
 Too great for what contains it. 'Boy'? O slave!—
 Pardon me, lords, 'tis the first time that ever
 I was forced to scold. (5.6.104-107)

Coriolanus's honour is injured when called "boy" by Aufidius, who Coriolanus thinks share the old aristocratic virtue based on military service, such that he has to vindicate his honour as an aristocrat, if possible, by duel. Unfortunately, this does not come true. Coriolanus's old-fashioned aristocratic identity is cleared away by the humanist identity of gentlemen including the potential danger of abusing Ciceronian rhetoric.

Coriolanus illustrates a disorder caused by the commoners' preference for flattery. Although they are often referred to as more autonomous than the public in *Julius Caesar*, they are still susceptible to flattery. On the other hand, Coriolanus is often regarded as too arrogant to be a leader in republican Rome, but his aristocratic virtue based on military service, which was

gradually replaced by the humanist identity of gentlemen, should have evoked nostalgia in Jacobean theatre. Flattery by the tribunes is always attacked by Menenius, who defends Coriolanus's plain rhetoric, while Ciceronian amplification by Volumnia, which ceases the war and brings glorious peace to Rome, is welcomed by the Roman people. Coriolanus' acute downfall after her persuasion implies a double-edged sword in the humanist notion of rhetoric.

Section 3. Timon, a victim of flatterers and flattering artists

In *Timon of Athens*, Timon, an Athenian aristocrat of wealth, generously gives presents to people, becomes a patron of merchants and artists, and offers financial support to those who are in need. His expense is so reckless that it leads to his bankruptcy, but the Athenian people under obligation to him do not save him. They are ungrateful flatterers who fawn on him at first, and later ignore him in need. As a result, Timon becomes a misanthrope, and dies alone away from the city.

In *Julius Caesar* and *Coriolanus*, Brutus and Coriolanus refuse to flatter, and they are beaten by their enemies, who willingly manipulate flattery to persuade the public of their goals. Timon is also a victim of flatterers, but his case is different from that of these tragic heroes. Like a king suffering from flatterers argued in early modern political texts, Timon is always surrounded by flatterers.²⁷ While persuasion by Cassius and Volumnia leads each noble

²⁷ As for the discussion of flattering courtiers in early modern England, discussed particularly by Erasmus and Elyot, see the Introduction in this thesis, 11-12. As for the discussion of the same topic by Niccolò Machiavelli

Roman to a crucial danger, the flattery of Brutus and Coriolanus is much less frequent than the flattery of Timon.²⁸ Compared with them, Timon is a direct victim of flatterers.

It is generally argued that the cause of Timon's bankruptcy is his reckless expenditure, but this section argues that it is his deafness to advice, encouraged by the flatterers surrounding him. The Poet who dedicates his works to Timon is a symbolic figure of such flatterers, and the character evokes a discussion in Sir Philip Sidney's *An Apology for Poetry*. It is difficult to tell flattery from deceit in the rhetoric of poets, and *Timon of Athens* seems to parody this topic.

Timon in the wood no longer suffers from flatterers and his own language is also reshaped. Therefore, this section focuses on Timon's violent and plain language. Rhetoric is useful in persuasion and advice, but it sometimes becomes too seductive, or worse, deceitful. After leaving Athens, Timon suspects that all rhetoric is deceitful. In Renaissance England, seductive language was regarded as effeminate. Timon rejects women as well as men as flatterers, but he does not consider women's language be any worse than men's. In addition, it should be mentioned that Timon is often linked to femininity. By analysing the femininity in Timon's language, this section aims to argue that while *Timon of Athens* problematizes rhetoric's seductiveness, it also exhibits a possible defence of rhetoric.

and Baldassare Castiglione, see Machiavelli, *The Prince*, 75-77, and Castiglione, *The Book of the Courtier*, 301.

²⁸ As already argued in Sections 1 and 2 of this Chapter, Brutus is persuaded to join the assassination, by Cassius, a flatterer, with invented letters, and Coriolanus is persuaded to cease the war against Rome by Volumnia, a great rhetorician and a master of Machiavellian tactics.

Timon's deafness to advice and reception of Athenian flatterers

The cause of Timon's tragedy lies in his deafness to advice, or ultimately his failure to develop Ciceronian friendship. Of course, his reckless expense might be problematic, but he would not give presents if he only recognised his real situation. In fact, Timon complains to Flavius that he was not informed of his financial emergency and Flavius answers him:

TIMON

You make me marvel wherefore ere this time
 Had you not fully laid my state before me,
 That I might so have rated my expense
 As I had leave of means.

FLAVIUS

You would not hear me:

At many leisures I proposed— (2.2.124-27)

If Flavius's allegation is true, Timon's bankruptcy is not just created by his lavish expenditure, but it is only the natural result of his deafness to advice. Instead of listening to what his steward says, Timon prefers to listen to flattery. Before his bankruptcy, the Athenians called him "Great Timon, noble, worthy, royal Timon" (2.2.168). Flavius reminds him that Timon was willing to "buy this praise" (2.2.169).

Apemantus, a philosopher gives the same admonition to Timon before the bankruptcy. When he faces Timon after the banquet, he expostulates with Timon on the wasteful extravagant, “Thus honest fools lay out their wealth on curtsies” (1.2.243). This maxim is suggestive. True, Timon is honest, but he is so extraordinarily honest that he becomes foolish. Flavius agrees with Apemantus’s view. He evaluates Timon as “so unwise” but “so kind” (2.2.6). In a later scene as well, when he finds Timon in the wood, he laments, “O, monument / And wonder of good deeds evilly bestowed! / What an alteration of honour has desperate want made” (4.3.455-57). Timon’s pure generosity might be a virtue, but it attracts flatterers and leads him to ignore advice. In a sense, his pure generosity is an excessive virtue in Athenian corrupt society, so that he is removed from its body politic, just like Caesar, Brutus, and Coriolanus in other Greco-Roman plays.

Among a series of stories about Timon derived from Plutarch’s *Lives of the Noble Grecian and Romans* and Lucian’s *Dialogues*, Shakespeare’s interest in Timon’s deafness to advice, caused by his indulgence in flattery, is quite unique and outstanding. Neither of the preceding texts pays very much attention to this. Plutarch briefly introduces the cause of Timon’s misanthropy as “the unthankfulness” of his friends, but does not refer to any detailed situation, or to Timon’s own fault (Plutarch, “The Life of Marcus Antonius” in *Lives* 215). In Lucian’s “Timon, or the Manhater,” there is also no detailed depiction of how he becomes a misanthrope, and it depicts only a story after he starts an isolated life. Instead, the cause of Timon’s bankruptcy is mentioned as “his folly, simplicity and indiscretion in making choice of his friends, not knowing that he bestowed his liberality upon crows and wolves

that tore out the very entrails of that miserable man like so many vultures” (Lucian 147).

Unlike the works of Plutarch and Lucian, the anonymous comedy entitled *Timon*, supposedly written between 1601 and 1605, depicts Timon’s wealthy days on stage. It is still disputable whether this comedy is a source of *Timon of Athens*, or conversely if it followed it, but a significant similarity is that this comedy also contains Timon’s steward, Laches, who gives faithful advice to his master. In the first scene, Laches admonishes Timon for his reckless gift-giving to Athenian flattering people, and he addresses, “I poor Laches, / Not Timon, if I were I would not see / My goods by crows devoured as they be.” (Anonymous, *Timon* 24-27). Laches continues to serve his master even though Timon ignores his advice. However, there is still no implication that flatterers intercept the advice, which leads to Timon’s bankruptcy and the end of his mock-friendship with Athenian people. In fact, Timon’s bankruptcy is suddenly brought when his ships are “drowned / In Neptune’s waves” (Anonymous, *Timon* 1505-06). Although the comedy depicts the flatterers’ vices and Timon’s recklessness, it does not focus on advice and flattery, which are keywords in concepts of classical friendship.

In *Timon of Athens*, Apemantus puts flattery on the opposite side of advice. At the end of the banquet, Timon requests Apemantus, who is always complaining about Timon’s lavishness, to bring “better music” in next time, but Apemantus gives harsh admonishment to him again:

TIMON Nay, an you begin to rail on society once, I am
 sworn not to give regard to you.

Farewell, and come with better music.

APEMANTUS

Thou wilt not hear me now, thou shalt not then.

I'll lock thy heaven from thee.

O, that men's ears should be

To counsel deaf, but not to flattery. (1.2.252-57)

Apemantus suggests that “flattery” prevents a man from listening to “counsel.” He interprets the “better music” that Timon demands as flattery, though it prevents his heavenly advice. In the Renaissance world picture, the heaven was supposed to be filled with musical harmony, which affected people on earth and kept them well balanced, though it was imperceptible.²⁹ This heavenly music could function as good advice, but Timon is unaware of it. Instead, Timon listens to the earthly music that attracts his ear, but it potentially disturbs his reason. Flattery can be identified with the earthly music in this scene. As he states, “lock thy heaven from thee,” Apemantus never gives any advice to Timon until Timon becomes bankrupt and goes away from Athens.

A man who prefers to listen to flattery tends to ignore advice: this dictum given by Apemantus evokes Ciceronian friendship based on advice, where flattery is regarded as the greatest plague for the bond.³⁰ Surrounded by numerous flatterers, Timon loses prudence and the ability to judge what is true and good to him; thus, he loses any opportunities to be given good advice.

²⁹ With regard to the ideas of heavenly music shared by Renaissance humanists, see David Lindley, *Shakespeare and Music*, 13-49.

³⁰ See the Introduction in this thesis, 10.

As a result, Timon's excessive virtue of generosity degenerates into prodigality. As Flavius rightly points out, flattery makes Timon "so senseless of expense / That he will neither know how to maintain it" (2.2.1-2).

A desirable relationship would be based on good mutual advice. However, Timon gives wealth instead of advice to the Athenian people, and receives flattery from them while he ignores advice from Flavius and Apemantus. His friendship is totally corrupted from the Renaissance humanist viewpoint. This is a direct cause of Timon's tragedy. Nevertheless, critics have related the tragedy to the economic difficulties in Tudor and Jacobean England. For example, Coppélia Kahn identifies Timon's generosity with patronage in these periods ("““Magic of bounty”: *Timon of Athens*, Jacobian Patronage, and Maternal Power”” 41-50). Both of these period's monarchs had to resort to gift-giving in order to achieve support from their subjects, just as Timon seeks for friendship. Likewise, David Bevington and David L. Smith dispute Timon's prodigality compared with that of James I. Interestingly, they point out that James I ignored his subjects' counsel just as Timon does (Bevington and Smith 63-64), though they still focus on his financial situation.

These critics are accurate in that they relate Timon to Elizabeth and James I, because Timon is not just an influential aristocrat, but he is depicted as a kingly character that is surrounded by flattering courtiers. After he withdraws from Athens, Timon talks with Apemantus and illustrates how he has suffered from the flatterers:

But myself—

Who had the world as my confectionary,
 The mouths, the tongues, the eyes and hearts of men
 At duty more than I could frame employment,
 That numberless upon me stuck as leaves
 Do on the oak, have with one winter's brush
 Fell from their boughs and left me open, bare
 For every storm that blows—I to bear this,
 That never know but better, is some burden. (4.3.258-66)

For Timon, almost all the Athenian people were neither merely his neighbours nor friends, but like his men upon whom he could “frame employment.” Their “mouths” and “tongues” could utter any sweet words if Timon demanded. They “stuck” and lived on him like parasitic plants, covering him completely and keeping him from “The icy precepts of respect” (4.3.257). These illustrations evoke the image of flatterers in the early modern court. What happens if a monarch is spoiled by flatterers and then falsely removed? *Timon of Athens* exhibits the answer of this question: a miserable death and invasion.

Timon's wasteful extravagance might seem foolish, and his indifference to counsel might also be his fault. However, *Timon of Athens* does not depict such a simple satire. It highlights the faults of ungrateful Athenian flatterers, who deprive Timon of opportunities to follow the good advice of Flavius and Apemantus.

The Poet's flattery and Timon's curse

Flavius and Apemantus are not the only ones who know of Timon's potential tragedy. The Poet and the Painter mention it while they are introducing their works with each other, which they intend to dedicate to Timon. The Poet summarises the last part of his work:

When Fortune in her shift and change of mood
 Spurns down her late beloved, all his dependants,
 Which laboured after him to the mountain's top
 Even on their knees and hands, let him slip down,
 Not one accompanying his declining foot. (1.1.86-90)

If Timon paid enough attention to the poem and was able to ignore "all his dependants" who flattered him just as they "Rain[ed] sacrificial whisperings on his ear" (1.1.83), he might have avoided his tragic end. In this sense, the poet's work, dedicated to Timon, is similar to Artemidorus's paper warning Caesar to take care with regard to the conspirators (*Julius Caesar* 2.3.1-9).³¹ Both of them are written forms of advice. However, one clear difference between them is that the Poet is not an honest counsellor but a flatterer. It is a paradox whether Timon should pay attention to the Poet, a flatterer, who in turn warns him to be wary of the Athenian flatterers. This makes the play more complicated but more suggestive.

In *Timon of Athens*, the Poet and the Painter are depicted as a pair of

³¹ As argued in Section 1 in this chapter, the conspirators are called flatterers by Antony.

flatterers. This characteristic is closely connected with their occupations. They dedicate their works to Timon, and expect rewards from him. In order to gain his favour, the Poet writes a poem whose central theme is Timon, who is loved by Fortune. The Painter draws a portrait, presumably of Timon, where the “grace / Speaks his own standing” (1.1.31-32). In short, they praise Timon in their works in return for his patronage, providing them with the roles of flatterers. The Poet and the Painter are Shakespeare’s original characters,³² and this suggests his particular concern about these professions. In fact, Shakespeare was also a poet and a playwright, who was patronised by the Earl of Southampton, the Lord Chamberlain, and James I.

The works of the Poet and the Painter imitate the life of Timon, but at the same time, make it “livelier than life” (1.1.39). In this regard, Shakespeare shares the ideas of the Renaissance literary theorists, such as Sir Philip Sidney and Roger Ascham. They defend poets from the attack that Plato regarded them as liars, insisting that instead of inventing a fiction, a poet can make things “better than Nature brings forth” (Sidney 85) and that “Imitation, is a facultie to expresse liuelie and perfitelie that example which ye go about to follow” (Ascham 5). However, from a negative viewpoint, this idea still suggests that the works of poets do not express objects as they are,

³² The *Timon* comedy includes an orator, Demeas, and a fiddler, Hermongenes, who respectively dedicate a speech and a song to Timon when he gets married to Callimaela. Sidney compares poetry with oratory, and maintains that there is an affinity in their “wordish consideration” (Sidney 115). However, unlike the Poet and the Painter, Demeas and Hermongenes do not share their roles and scenes. *Timon of Athens* is supposed to be a collaborative work of Shakespeare and Thomas Middleton, but Act 1 Scene1 and Act 5 Scene1, which involve the Poet and the Painter, are supposed to be written by Shakespeare. See Anthony B. Dawson and Gretchen E. Minton, “Appendix 2: Authorship” in their edition of *Timon of Athens*, 402, 407.

juts as the character of the Poet is. Timon ironically addresses the Poet, “And for thy fiction, / Why, thy verse swells with stuff so fine, and smooth / That thou art even natural in thine art” (5.1.81-83). Here, Timon makes an equivocal evaluation on the equivocation of the Poet’s verse and the character of the Poet. He means that the Poet’s “art” is as natural as what Nature created, though it is only an imitation, or a counterfeit, which makes the Poet a proficient liar and that the Poet plays the role of a liar or a flatterer on stage, which makes the character of the Poet natural as Nature creates it.

Although the Poet is depicted negatively, this does not lead to the conclusion that Shakespeare negatively evaluates his own profession. It is Timon in the woods who moves others, simultaneously providing advice to them, but never becoming a mere flatterer. In this sense, Timon is a true poet, though his only written work is his epitaph in the last scene. Or at least, Timon achieves advisory skills, which enables him to develop a Ciceronian friendship. Tom MacFaul maintains the opposite view. He argues that Timon “lacks a genuine capacity for friendship,” because Timon “places himself at the centre of every scene like a king” (MacFaul 142). However, taking into consideration that Ciceronian friendship is based on advice, it is not an exaggeration to assert that after Timon loses a mock friendship between Athenian people, he can develop a true friendship through his advice, though it is apparently his curse.

Before advising the Poet and the Painter that they are poor examples of the artists so that they should keep themselves away from each other (5.1.99), Timon is run into by Alcibiades accompanied by Timandra and Phrynia. As he did before his bankruptcy, Timon gives them money, but he also advises them

to “Make large confusion” (4.3.127) in Athens. Then, Alcibiades replies to him, “I’ll take the gold thou givest me, / Not all thy counsel” (4.3.129-30), and Timandra and Phrynia beg him, “More counsel with more money, bounteous Timon!” (4.3.166). Timon’s advice seems too aggressive and extreme, but it actually leads to a peaceful ending. As G. Wilson Knight rightfully points out, “Timon is always well *above* his own curses” (Knight 272, italicized by Knight). In fact, Alcibiades advances on Athens, but does not destroy it.

A more explicit example to show the ironic effect of Timon’s advice is seen when he is visited by thieves. The thieves try to deprive Timon of his treasure which he dug up in the wood, but instead they are encouraged to by Timon. He throws a curse on them that they should “Rob one another” (4.3.440) after gaining his treasure, because he assumes that “Each thing’s a thief” (4.3.437) in the world. Nevertheless, the thieves hesitate to rob, on the contrary:

3 THIEF He’s almost charmed me from my profession by
 persuading me to it.

1 THIEF ’Tis in the malice of mankind that he thus
 advises us, not to have us thrive in our mystery.

2 THIEF I’ll believe him as an enemy and give over my
 trade.

1 THIEF Let us first see peace in Athens; there is no time
 so miserable but a man may be true. (4.3.445-52)

Here Timon's rhetoric in persuasion or advice is compared with magic. It has an almost miraculous effect on the thieves. Unlike the majority of critics, Knight uniquely and highly evaluates Timon as "Christlike" (269). This should be true in that Timon's rhetoric has the characteristic of a "demi-god," which Sidney argues in his *Apology for Poetry*.³⁴ By illustrating more than what thieves are, Timon leads the thieves to virtue. The difference is that Timon's rhetoric includes no apparent pleasure, and he never flatters.

The Poet's work includes appropriate advice to Timon, but he is in fact a flatterer, so that the Poet never gives Timon a true notion of himself and of what is good or evil. Timon's words are far from the Poet's sweet words, but they actually bring the listeners to virtues.

Tears of Flavius and Neptune

There are few female characters in *Timon of Athens*, but remarkably, Timon is often linked to femininity. Kahn argues, "In the first three acts, Timon plays the role of Fortuna," ("Magic of bounty": *Timon of Athens*, Jacobian Patronage, and Maternal Power" 38), whose generosity seems infinite at first. His generosity towards the Athenian people ends when Fortuna follows her whim to stop loving him. Anthony B. Dawson and Gretchen E. Minton agree with Kahn and exhibit other examples (Dawson and Minton 84). In the banquet scene in Act 1, Cupid introduces the masque to Timon, "The five best senses acknowledge thee their patron and come freely to gratitude thy plenteous bosom" (1.2.122-4). According to Dawson and

³⁴ This is already argued in the Introduction, 14.

Minton, Timon's "plenteous bosom," which Cupid mentions is also linked to that of Mother Earth, when Timon hurls a curse at the thieves, "the earth's a thief / That feeds and breeds by a composture stol'n / From general excrement" (4.3.435-7).

Tears are another example of Timon's female characteristics. Unlike Lear, who rejects tears as "women's weapons" (*King Lear* 2.2.466), Timon does not hesitate to weep in front of others. He addresses, "mine eyes cannot hold out water" (1.2.104-5), but "To get their faults" (105), he drinks to his guests. In addition to his own tears, Timon does not reject others' tears. Far from that, he highly evaluates Flavius's tears. For Timon and his steward, tears are shed not for their own grief, but for pity for others. Flavius tries to remind Timon that he has "An honest poor servant" (4.3.470), when they meet again in the wood:

FLAVIUS

The gods are witness,
 Ne'er did poor steward wear a truer grief
 For his undone lord than mine eyes for you.

TIMON

What, dost thou weep? Come nearer then. I love thee
 Because thou art a woman and disclaim'st
 Flinty mankind, whose eyes do never give
 But thorough lust and laughter. Pity's sleeping. (4.3.474-80)

Timon asserts that Flavius is a woman, because he weeps for pity. For Timon,

tears naturally belong to women. At the same time, “Flinty mankind” means not merely human beings in general, but also males in particular.

Tears are not the only things that Timon welcomes as womanly. He evaluates women’s words more than men’s when he dislikes flattery. However, this does not mean that women’s words are always welcomed. Far from that, women’s words are generally problematized, though they should be defended. When Apemantus visits Timon in the wood, they discuss flatterers:

APEMANTUS What things in the world canst thou nearest
 compare to thy flatterers?

TIMON Women nearest; but men—men are the things
 themselves. (4.3.317-20)

Timon refers to women as flatterers, but he maintains that male flatterers are worse. The words of both men and women can move him, and they seek their own benefits. However, Timon believes that women weep for pity, which means they can consider others’ benefits as well as their own. Of course, this is not always true. In fact, Timandra and Phrynia are far from such characters. The only other women in *Timon of Athens* are the ladies performing a masque. Timon is a patron of them as well as merchants and artists including the Poet and the Painter. He welcomes the ladies, though Apemantus calls them “madwomen” (1.2.131) and their performance “a sweep of vanity” (1.2.130). Their performance moves Timon, but it is actually an illusion, so that Apemantus regards them as liars and flatterers like the Poet.

It has already been argued that, in a sense, Timon is a better poet than

the Poet in that he teaches virtue. Likewise, Timon evokes tears more than any female characters in *Timon of Athens*, though he welcomes femininity. Unlike the masque in the banquet scene, which instructs Timon in no virtue, he moves Flavius and gives an advisory curse, “Ne’er see thou man” (4.3.520). Flavius conversely keeps his relationship with others, and avoids becoming a misanthrope. Perhaps the audience shares the same feeling as the steward. The tragedy of Timon moves them to tears and provides an opportunity to consider the ethical problems in rhetoric.

Both in the theories of poetry and courtiers, seductive advice with arts or enjoyment was considered to be more or less effeminate and unmanly in Renaissance England.³⁵ Therefore, Sidney had to defend poetry and to declare that the excellence of poetry is “not of effeminateness, but of notable stirring of courage” (Sidney 108). On the other hand, femininity of poetry is not always supposed to be refused. In Castiglione’s *The Book of the Courtier*, Ottaviano Fregoso, a character based on a real person with the same name, shows the usefulness of seductive advice:

But I woulde say rather that manie of the qualities appointed him, as daunsing, singinge and sportinge, were lightnesse and vanitie, and in a man of estimation rather to be dispraised then commended : bicause

³⁵ As for blaming poetry for its effeminacy, see Robert Matz, *Defending Literature in Early Modern England*, 60-77, and Jenifer Richards, *Rhetoric and Courtliness in Early Modern Literature*, 44-45. Matz discusses Gosson’s attack on poetry and Sidney’s defence and inversion of Gosson’s attack. Richards points out that seductive advice which Baldassare Castiglione recommended in *The Book of the Courtier* (published in 1531, and translated in 1561), leads to the suspicion of effeminacy and a kind of flattery, and might be a reason why his book was not translated as soon as it was published.

those precise facions, the settinge furth ones selfe, meerie talke and such other matters belonginge to enterteinment of women and love (althoughe perhappes manie other be of a contrary opinion) do many times nothinge elles but womannish the mindes, corrupt youth, and bring them to a most wanton trade of livinge: [...] But in case the Courtiers doinges be directed to the good ende they ought to be and whiche I meane: me thinke then they should not onely not be hurtfull or vaine, but most profitable and deserve infinit praise. (Castiglione 297)

Castiglione's Ottaviano defends femininity in rhetoric, courtier's advice and arts including poetry. On the other hand, Shakespeare's illustration of the masque scene implies not only Timon's wasteful expenditure but also "lightnesse and vanitie," which "belonginge to enterteinment of women and love." In contrast, Timon's curse in the wood is far from a "meerie talke" but are full of allegories and maxims. They are ironically "directed to the good ende": by cursing the visitors, Timon moves and teaches them virtues. In short, while Timon welcomes femininity in shedding tears, his curse is a better form of advice than "women's" seductiveness.

Timon's tragedy is symbolised by his own epitaph. A Soldier finds it in a tomb, takes a wax impression of it, and then brings it to his general. Alcibiades reads the epitaph and adds his opinion:

Here lie I, Timon, who alive all living men did hate,

Pass by and curse thy fill, but pass and stay not here thy gate.³⁶

³⁶ Just in front of the epitaph, the Folio edition includes another epitaph,

These well express in thee thy latter spirits.
 Though thou abhorred'st in us our human griefs,
 Scorned'st our brains' flow and those our droplets which
 From niggard nature fall, yet Neptune weep for aye
 On thy low grave, on faults forgiven. (5.5.70-77)

Timon hated "all living men" before dying but he appears to have changed his mind in death. He does not mind if someone will "Pass by and curse" him, which suggests he is no longer a thorough misanthrope, though he chillingly adds "pass and stay not." He detested flatterer's "brains' flow" and "droplets" just as he said to Flavius (4.3.479-80), but now he makes "Neptune weep," which implies his divine eloquence will transcend the stage. His tragedy attracts the audience more than any flatteries attract him.

Timon of Athens represents a potential crisis in friendship which is caused by flattery. Timon's deafness to advice and preference to flattery lead to misunderstanding of his financial emergency, and then lead to his bankruptcy. The Poet rightfully grasps Timon's serious situation, but he conceals it with his sweet words. This implies an internal inconsistency within the definitions of the ideal poet: he depicts things better than they are. Although theories of Renaissance friendship assume that flattery and

"Heere lies a wretched Course, of wretched Soule bereft, / Seek not my name: A Plague consume you, wicked Caitifs left", which should have supposedly been omitted before publication. This is the alternative to the epitaph which Plutarch offers (Dawson and Minton 338n).

seductive advice are effeminate, Timon does not share the idea, because he believes both men and women are flatterers. Timon abhors all the flattery so that he hurls curses instead. His violent curses are apparently in the opposite side of seductive advice, and ironically, they attract the listeners and functions as persuasive advice. While ethical problems in rhetoric are suggested, the end of this play implies a possibility that rhetoric can avoid corruption of flattery.

Chapter 2. Advice in romances

Section 1. Advice to tyrants and its medicinal effects in *Pericles*

Pericles, a prince of Tyre, enrages Antiochus, a tyrant of Antioch by remonstrating on his incest with his daughter. This endangers the life of the prince, and moreover his subjects. Pericles becomes depressed, and his melancholy deprives him of peaceful sleep. Helicanus, a loyal counsellor, suggests a remedy: Pericles should hide himself, and temporarily leave his land. Although Pericles is able to escape from the tyrant's assassin, he repeatedly faces various trials and dangers throughout the play.

The beginning of *Pericles* exhibits the contrast between the tyrant and the wise prince: Antiochus is so arrogant that he ignores any advice and never corrects his faults, while Pericles is ready to listen to his counsellor. Helicanus supposedly derives from Hellican in *Confessio Amantis* (1390) by John Gower, but Hellican is not an important person in Gower's tale of Apollonius. Shakespeare's reshaping of this character implies that he was interested in the relationship between a king and his counsellor. Therefore, this section firstly discusses Pericles's words against Antiochus and Helicanus's words against Pericles.

Although Antiochus does not appear in later scenes, the contrast between a tyrant and a good monarch in their responses to advice is a central theme in the play.³⁷ For example, the father-daughter relationship between Simonides

³⁷ *Cymbeline* are similar to *Pericles* in that a clear boundary is seen between the temporarily and permanently tyrannical figures group. The former includes *Cymbeline* as well as *Posthumus*. *Cymbeline* gets angry with his

and Thaisa is in contradiction to the relationship between Antiochus and his daughter, though both families look for their daughter's suitors and test them by a riddle and a tournament, respectively. However, Simonides is a good monarch, while Antiochus is a tyrant. Pericles words for each monarch seem so moderate, but the responses are different. Another example of different responses to advice is reflected in the theme of lust. Antiochus does not stop his incest, but Lysimachus stops his use of prostitution. There is a clear line between those who listen to advice and those who do not. The former can recover from their internal disorder, but the latter cannot. This is the second topic in this section.

The last half of this play focuses on Marina, a daughter of Pericles. She almost gets killed by Creon and Dionyza, who were once saved by Pericles. Informed that Marina was killed, Pericles becomes depressed again. He is so desperate that he will not listen to anyone. Although Marina tries to talk with him, Pericles goes so far as to beat her without knowing that she is his daughter. In a sense, melancholy makes him tyrannical. However, Marina's honest and affectionate words draw his attention and finally cure his heart. In a sense, her words have medicinal effects, just as Helicanus eliminates his prince's anxiety by giving good advice. A difference between Marina and Helicanus is that Marina's words are given holy images. This is the third and

daughter Imogen, who wants to get married to Posthumus against her father's will. The latter includes the Queen as well as her son Cloten. The Queen pretends to be a good stepmother to Imogen, and receives the favour of Cymbeline, though she is in fact so wicked as to order Imogen killed. In this sense, she is regarded as an ambitious flatterer, while Cloten is a lustful tyrant. On the other hand, unlike in *Pericles*, there is no miraculous counsellor like Marina, and those who suffer from tyrants just wait for the tyrants to be destroyed by providence.

last topic.

Shakespeare follows many of the characters, the episodes, and the settings of Gower's *Confessio Amantis*, but of course, he has own interests. Above all, it is remarkable that Gower's Apollonius is perfectly subject to the Goddess of Fortuna's direction, while Shakespeare's Pericles is partly supported by the words of the people surrounding him. Through analysing how Pericles and his family overcome trials and dangers, this section aims to suggest that *Pericles* reflects humanist ideas regarding rhetoric as the wisdom to survive.

Advice to Antiochus and Pericles

Antiochus conceals the secret of incest within a riddle, which Pericles needs to discover in order to get married to the daughter of Antiochus. The price of his challenge is his life. If the young prince fails to solve the riddle, he is executed by Antiochus. A challenge for a marriage proposal is also seen in Bassanio's courtship of Portia in *The Merchant of Venice*, where Bassanio must stay unmarried for all his life if he fails it. Pericles's case is much more hopeless than Bassanio's. Even if Pericles discovers the secret of Antiochus, it will enrage the tyrant. However, if he fails to answer the riddle, Pericles will be killed.

This difficult situation should have evoked a real situation in a Renaissance court: to what extent a courtier can remonstrate against tyranny. Of course, Pericles is not a subject who serves Antiochus, but the tyrant is

much stronger than the young prince, as Pericles considers, “I am too little contend” (1.2.17) against the tyrant and “he’s so great can make his will his act” (1.2.18). In a sense, their relationship is similar to the one between a tyrant and a courtier. As the riddle conceals the secret of incest, to solve the riddle is to remonstrate against the tyrant’s sin at the risk of losing life. In order to overcome the difficulty, Pericles carefully chooses the words against the tyrant:

Great king,
 Few love to hear the sins they love to act.
 ’Twould braid yourself too near for me to tell it.
 Who has a book of all that monarchs do,
 He’s more secure to keep it shut than shown. (1.1.92-96)

Pericles knows that Antiochus is a tyrant, who commits incest and kills suitors in order to retain his lascivious relationship with his daughter. By putting the riddle to those who are interested in his daughter, namely, those who may become aware of the secret, Antiochus has found all the dangerous factors and removed them in advance. If Pericles chooses his words carelessly, his answer will result in his death. Pericles does not offend the tyrant, but instead calls him “Great king”. In his words, “’Twould braid yourself”, the young prince uses the subjunctive mood so as to avoid the offence against the tyrant as much as possible. He just implies that the sin is blameworthy, but does not directly mention it. Far from pleading for his life, Pericles goes so far as to worry about Antiochus and advises the tyrant to “keep it shut than

shown”.

In *the Boke Named the Governour*, Sir Thomas Elyot argues, “so counsailours garnished with lernyng and also experience shall thereby considre the places, tymes, and personages, examining the state of the mater than practiced” (441). When a tyrant is advised, a counsellor should consider his “personages.”³⁸ Elyot introduces an example of this in his *Of the Knowledge Which maketh a Wise Man* (1533). In this dialogue, Aristippus maintains that Plato did not know “wel inough kinge Dionise nature and disposicion,” so that he would “sodaynly imbrayde hym of his wordes so despitefully” (Elyot, *Of the Knowledge* B2r; Walzer 29).³⁹ Aristippus knows that a tyrant listens to a counsel “as longe as [the tyrant] thinketh that nothings that is spoken or done repugnith against his affections” (Elyot, *Of the Knowledge* B4v; Walzer 32).

In this sense, Pericles’s flattery to Antiochus is necessary for him not only to survive but also advise the tyrant, if it is possible. By declaring that he has solved the riddle, Pericles has a narrow escape from execution. At the same time, Pericles tries to persuade Antiochus from committing incest through flattery. As it is argued in the first chapter, flattery always causes tragedies and confusion in *Julius Caesar*, *Coriolanus* and *Timon of Athens*. Likewise, in *Pericles*, Cleon and Dionyza flatter Pericles when they are in need, but later betray him and send an assassin to kill his daughter Marina. On the other hand, Pericles’s flattering advice implies that there is possibility

³⁸ As argued in the following section, appropriate time to advise is more important in *Cymbeline* and *The Winter’s Tale* than in *Pericles*.

³⁹ As for the detailed discussion on Elyot’s *Of the Knowledge Which Maketh a Wise man*, see Arthur E. Walzer, “The Rhetoric of Counsel and Thomas Elyot’s *Of the Knowledge Which Maketh a Wise Man*.”

monarch is always accompanied by a loyal counsellor, while a tyrant is followed by a flatterer. The relationship between Pericles as a young prince and Helicanus as an experienced courtier is an ideal for Renaissance humanists such as Erasmus. In *The Education of a Christian Prince*, Erasmus argued that a monarch should be instructed “from the very cradle” (5) by a tutor “who have been taught by long practical experience and not just by petty maxims” (7). Helicanus is confident that he can “give experience tongue” (1.2.36) in the form of advice to his prince. The wisdom of the counsellor is so excellent that their positions seem reversed as if Helicanus was “a prince” and Pericles was his “servant.”

Hellican in *Confessio Amantis* does not play as an important role as Helicanus. There is only one scene where Hellican appears in Gower’s tale of Apollonius. After Apollonius, a young prince of Tyre, escapes from Antiochus, he runs across Hellican in Tharse (Tarsus in *Pericles*). His role is summarised within four lines: Hellican prays “his lord to have insight / Upon him self” and informs the lord, “How that the great Antiochus / Awaiteth, if he might him spille” (Gower 294). Unlike Helicanus, Hellican is not depicted as a chief counsellor.

Shakespeare’s invention of the character of Helicanus as a close adviser of Pericles implies the playwright’s interest in the relationship between a king and his counsellor. This corresponds with his changing the main theme of the play from that of its source. In the end of the tale of Apollonius, the story is concluded by insisting, “Fortune though she be nought stable, / Yet at sometime is favourable / To hem, that ben of love trewe” (Gower 342).⁴⁰

⁴⁰ Of course, “hem, that ben of love trewe” means Apollonius, and he is

Here, it is Fortune or the Goddess of Fortuna who brings Apollonius to a happy ending: while Apollonius' true love is admirable, it is not that he defeats Fortuna, but that she likes and helps him. Things are different in *Pericles*. In the Epilogue, John Gower, a narrator of the play explains the story: "Although assailed with Fortune fierce and keen, / Virtue preserved from fell destruction's blast, / Led on by heaven and crowned with joy at last" (Epilogue 4-6). Fortune does not care Pericles and his family, and their virtues or the personified Virtue plays a significant role.

Fortune in *Pericles* is not as dominant as she is in the tale of Apollonius in *Confessio Amantis*. Of course, she might be influential, but she is supposed to be overcome by human virtues in *Pericles*. Helicanus's frank advice to his good young prince and Pericles's flattering advice to the tyrant Antiochus are glorified as such virtues. This setting is shared by Renaissance humanists. As James S. Baumlin points out, "the ultimate goal of Humanist rhetorical education" is that "one might achieve mastery over fortune" (Baumlin 140).

In relating *Pericles* to Renaissance humanist idea of rhetoric, in addition to the key role of rhetorical skills in the fight against fortune, it is also remarkable that Helicanus's advice is compared to knowledge of medicine. After escaping from Antioch and coming back to Tyre, Pericles becomes melancholic, worrying about his country and subjects as well as his own life.⁴¹ He asks himself:

compared with Antiochus, who commits incest with his daughter. In the tale of Apollonius, the main theme is true love, but at the same time, the dominant power of Fortune over mankind is reiterated (Gower 295, 297, 311, 319, 328, 333) in addition to the direction by "a grace god" (Gower 323), or "he, that alle thing may keepe" (Gower 296). Nothing but true love is glorified as a human virtue.

⁴¹ This is an interesting example of difference between Gower's Apollonius

Why should this change of thoughts,
 The sad companion, dull-eyed melancholy,
 Be my so used a guest as not an hour
 In the day's glorious walk or peaceful night,
 The tomb where grief should sleep, can breed me quiet?
 [...]
 Our men be vanquished ere they do resist,
 And subjects punished that ne'er thought offence.
 Which care of them, not pity of myself,
 Who am no more but as the tops of trees
 Which fence the roots they grow by and defend them,
 Maketh both my body pine and soul to languish,
 And punish that before that he would punish. (1.2.1-5, 27-33)

Pericles does not want anybody to talk to him, but Helicanus prays for the opportunity to give advice to his lord, even if Pericles in a fury executes him, because Helicanus believes, “reproof, obedient and in order, / Fits kings as they are men, for they may err” (1.2.41-42). Pericles replies to Helicanus, “Thou speak'st like a physician, Helicanus, / That ministers a portion unto me / That thou wouldst tremble to receive thyself” (1.2.65-67).

and Shakespeare's (or his co-author George Wilkins's) Pericles. Pericles is a more responsible ruler than Apollonius, and this highlights his ideal relationship with his loyal counsellor Helicanus. Here, Pericles cares about his subjects, but Apollonius does not. Apollonius leaves Tyre without saying anything to his subjects so that his subjects lament that he abandons them: “Our prince, our heved, our governour, / Through whom we stonden in honour, / Without the comun assent, / That sodeinly is fro us went” (Gower 291-92).

Courtiers' advice was idealised as the way to give a remedy for the decay of a country in the Renaissance political thought. For example, Sir Thomas Elyot discusses the education of gentlemen's children and argues that the "ende of all doctrine and studie is good consayle (*Governour* 2: 433). Then, he explains how the decays of state are removed by courtiers' counsel:

THE griefes or diseases whiche of Aristotell be called the decayes of the publike weale beinge inuestigate, examined, and tried by the experience before expressed, than commethe the tyme and oportunitie of consultacion, wherby, as I sayd, is prouided the remedies moste necessary for the healinge of the sayd grefes or reparation of decayes. (*Governour* 2: 427)

Following Aristotle, Elyot regarded "the decayes of the publike weale"⁴² as grievances or diseases. In Shakespeare, especially in his romances, these griefs or diseases are symbolised in rulers' illnesses instead of their countries'. A ruler is the head of the body politic, so his illness directly affects his country and subjects, as Pericles in melancholy compares himself to "the tops of trees" and his subjects to "the roots." Constance Jordan argues that Shakespeare's romances "share a common subject – the restoration of good government. The plays depict the precarious state of rulers who by their absence invite anarchy apart from their subjects" (Jordan 1).

In *Pericles*, Helicanus gives a remedy to his lord and Tyre with his

⁴² Elyot prefers to choose "a publike weal" instead of "a commune weale," because he thinks that in the latter, "al men must be of one degre and sort" (*Governour* 1: 3).

“experienced tongue.” Following Helicanus’s advice, Pericles leaves Tyre in case Antiochus attacks his county in order to kill him. As a result, Pericles recovers from insomnia, and Tyre avoids being attacked by the tyrant.

Rhetoric as a remedy for amorous melancholy and lust

Antiochus’s incest with his daughter suggests an incurable illness at the top of body politic; conversely, Simonides, king of Pentapolis, who wants a husband for his daughter, has a curable illness that can be eliminated by getting an heir and making his kingdom stable. His daughter, Thaisa, is similar to the daughter of Antiochus in that they are both only one daughters of the kings, and suitors are looked for through challenges: a riddle and a tournament, respectively. However, these two daughters are different in their relationships with their fathers. The daughter of Antiochus never gets married because of her incest with her father, but Thaisa is rightfully admitted to her marriage and supported by her father.

As Pericles’s melancholy implies the emergent instability of Tyre, a melancholy that Simonides shares with his daughter, suggesting the potential instability of Pentapolis. When Pericles wins the tournament and is admitted as a suitor, Thaisa is captivated by Pericles, and she never wants to get married to any other man except him. If she cannot get married to Pericles, Simonides will not have an heir. At the banquet after the tournament, Thaisa is plunged in melancholy due to love and loses her appetite. Simonides also has no appetite without knowing the reason:

SIMONIDES

Sit, sir, sit.

[*aside*] By Jove I wonder, that is king of thoughts,

These cates resist me, he but thought upon.

THAISA [*aside*]

By Juno, that is queen of marriage,

All viands that I eat do seem unsavoury,

Wishing him my meat. [to *Simonides*] Sure he's a

gallant gentleman. (2.3.26-31)

As Suzanne Gossett annotates, Thaisa's sexual appetite to eat Pericles as her "meat" is contrast with the appetite of Antiochus's daughter (252n). Simonides' sharing of Thaisa's inability to eat is also a better version of Antiochus' sharing lust with his daughter. In the case of Antiochus and his daughter, the sin of incest is difficult to atone for, but Thaisa and Simonides' famine will be cured if Thaisa's love melancholy is removed.

Thaisa remains depressed after the banquet, and decides not to get married to any man except Pericles. It is only Pericles who can cure her melancholy. This remedy is achieved by his honest and moderate use of words, which makes Simonides consider him to be the best suitor. Simonides tests Pericles using the letter which Thaisa wrote to Pericles. This letter is also a comic version of Antiochus's riddle. Pericles keeps obedient to Simonides even when he is called a "Traitor" (2.5.53), as he does so when he is almost executed by Antiochus. Pericles's words are always given in a conciliating tone against a king in a fury. As already argued above, he uses the subjunctive in order to reproach Antiochus, and in so doing, he tries to avoid

enraging the tyrant. Again, he replies to Simonides in the subjunctive, “Even in his throat, unless it be the king, / That calls me traitor, I return the lie” (2.5.54-55). Then, Pericles insists that he has never tried to propose marriage to Thaisa without saying anything to Simonides:

PERICLES

Then as you are as virtuous as fair,
 Resolve your angry father if my tongue
 Did e’re solicit or my hand subscribe
 To any syllable that made love to you?

THAISA

Why, sir say if you had,
 Who takes offence at that would make me glad?

SIMONIDES

Yea, mistress, are you so peremptory?
(aside) I am glad on’t with all my heart. (2.5.65-70)

As Pericles believes the honest words of Helicanus, Simonides believes Pericles and Thaisa. Pericles’s honest counsel is not listened to by Antiochus the tyrant, but it is listened to by Simonides the wise king, which ultimately eliminates Thaisa’s love melancholy. Her love becomes approvable in the contract of marriage.

Rhetoric as a remedy for amorous melancholy and lust is more clearly seen in the daughter of Pericles, Marina. After she escapes from Leonine, the assassin who is ordered by Dionyza, Marina is sold to a whorehouse where

she persuades all the man visiting it to repent and have better lives. In the case of Lysimachus, the governor of Mytilene, his sudden change of mind seems ridiculous, but his conversion emphasises the effectiveness of Marina's sacred rhetoric:

MARINA

If you were born to honour, show it now;
 If put upon you, make the judgement good
 That thought you worthy of it.

LYSIMACHUS

How's this? How's this? Some more, be sage.

[...]

I did not think

Thou couldst have spoke so well, ne'ver dreamt thou couldst.

Had I brought hither a corrupted mind

Thy speech had altered it. (4.5.96-99, 106-09)

Lysimachus would not admit that he visited the whore house with “a corrupted mind,” but on the other hand, he is perfectly persuaded by Marina's “speech.” He can repent his lustful life, while Antiochus cannot. In *Pericles*, there is a clear line between those who can repent and those who cannot. Antiochus and his daughter, Cleon and Dionyza all destroy themselves because of their sins, as Gower refers to them in the Epilogue (Epilogue 1-2, 11-16).⁴³ Lysimachus, as well as Pericles, Simonides and Thaisa, can recover

⁴³ Compared to *Julius Caesar* and *Coriolanus*, in which tyrannicide theories

from temporary mental disorder by listening to good counsel. Pericles's honest words provide himself with his wife, and his daughter Marina also gets married to Lysimachus by showing her virtues through her counsel.

Rhetoric as a remedy for a sense of loss and deprivation

Pericles builds an emotional wall when he assumes that he has lost Marina in addition to Thaisa. He cannot return to Tyre because of his deep depression, and his ship stays long in port at Mytilene. His absence from Tyre directly means instability of the land, so that the illness of the body politic is expected to be cured by loyal subjects' counsel from the humanist viewpoint. However, this time, even Helicanus cannot cure the mental illness of Pericles. Sarah Beckwith argues that the reason why Helicanus's counsel cannot cure the mental illness of Pericles is that the cause of the illness is a sense of loss and deprivation of his family (99). Marina is his family member, so that she can cure Pericles. The familial bond is not her only advantage, however. For example, Jordan argues that Marina's "modest Justice" and "Patience" (5.1. 112, 129) cure Pericles's melancholy (66-67).

More importantly, Marina takes on the image of a counsellor whose rhetoric has medicinal power. Just as Elyot expects a courtier to cure the disease of the body politic as mentioned above, Marina cures Pericles's

are reflected, Pericles reflects James I's idea against tyrannicide, argued in *The True Law of Free Monarchies*. He argues, "a wicked king is sent by God for a curse to his people and a plague for their sins; but that it is lawful to them to shake off that curse at their own hand, which God hath laid on them, that I deny and may do so justly. [...] patience, earnest prayers to God, and amendment of their lives are the only lawful means to move God to relieve them of that heavy curse" (James I 77).

mental illness through her counsel, and, as a result, saves Tyre from losing a wise ruler. After Lysimachus visits the ship, he introduces Marina, a person who has a remedy for the sick lord. He knows her good counselling skills, through which she cured his lust. Lysimachus addresses to Marina:

Fair one, all goodness that consists in bounty
 Expect even here, where is a kingly patient.
 If that thy prosperous and artificial feat
 Can draw him but to answer thee in aught,
 Thy sacred physic shall receive such pay
 As thy desires can wish. (5.1.63-68)

Lysimachus calls Pericles “a kingly patient,” and Marina’s song and counsel “Thy sacred physic.” These images are close to the image of Helicanus as “a physician” (1.2.65). They also evoke Cerimon’s practical knowledge of medicine. Of course, she does not actually have as rich experience as Helicanus, which was considered to be necessary in Erasmus’s *The Education of a Christian Prince*, nor does she have the practical knowledge of medicine that Cerimon has. However, as argued in the discussion of *Timon of Athens* in the first chapter, female rhetoric is often idealised in Shakespeare’s plays. Marina’s counsel and song is an example of the womanly persuasion discussed by Castiglione. In his argument, singing songs helps a counsellor to be heeded.

Marina’s counsel sounds “godlike perfect” (5.1.196) to Pericles, which is supposedly the most advantageous of her characteristics as a counsellor,

and her rhetoric has a medicinal effect. Sidney argues that an ideal poet expresses things “with the force of a divine breath” better than Nature does (Sidney 86). Such a poet is like a demi-god in telling a story that teaches and delights: his combination of teaching and delighting is compared to sugar-coated medicine, and his words are “either accompanied with, or prepared for the well-enchanting skill of Music” (Sidney 95). At first, Marina’s song does not open Pericles’s heart, and she is pushed back by him. Nevertheless, she patiently speaks to him and gradually reveals her story, which attracts his interest. Pericles addresses to Marina:

I am great with woe, and shall deliver weeping.
 My dearest wife was like this maid, and such a one
 My daughter might have been. My queen’s square brows,
 Her stature to an inch, as wand-like straight,
 As silver-voiced, her eyes as jewel-like
 And cased as richly, in pace another Juno;
 Who starves the ears she feeds and makes them hungry
 The more she gives them speech. Where do you live? (5.1.97-104)

Pericles is reminded of his daughter by Marina’s story, and he anticipates that she is his daughter, because she looks like his wife. Marina’s sacredness is expressed by Pericles, when he evaluates her as “silver-voiced,” and comments that she is “another Juno.” Marina is also described as a maid who wears the goddess Diana’s “silver livery” (5.3.6-7).

Marina’s sacredness in her counsel and her image as Diana are finally

embodied in the scene where the goddess Diana appears with “heavenly music” (5.1.220). As Apemantus in *Timon of Athens* compares his advice to “heavenly music,” Marina’s counsel to Pericles is accompanied with the same. Diana directs Pericles to visit Ephesus and to tell his story, which provides him with the reunion with his wife. Marina’s telling her story makes her father to see her again, and then Diana’s direction allows him to be reunited with his wife.⁴⁴

Pericles and his family overcome various difficulties in their lives by keeping their minds healthy with medicinal counsel. Frank and honest words are listened to by those who are naturally affable, but even flattering advice is not truly listened to by Antiochus the tyrant, though it works for conciliating him. *Pericles*, which is narrated by Shakespeare’s Gower, is different in its main theme from the tale of Apollonius by John Gower. In this play, miraculous events are brought not only by Fortuna’s whim and other gods, but also by the art of rhetoric in advice, which was the most important of the liberal arts in Renaissance England.

Section 2. Courtiers’ rhetoric in *The Winter’s Tale*

In *The Winter’s Tale*, the royal family of Sicilia are separated by the

⁴⁴ Andrew Hiscock remarks that Marina inverts the father-daughter relationship by directing her father (Hiscock 28). This inversion is required for the characteristic of a good counsellor, as Helicanus does by directing his monarch in the first act of the play.

king Leontes, who goes mad with jealousy. He is originally a wise king, but jealousy changes him into a tyrannical figure who will not listen to his subjects' counsel. This setting of the story is shared by Robert Greene's *Pandosto* (1588), which is supposed to be one of the sources of *The Winter's Tale*. The madness of Pandosto is not cured throughout the prose romance, which leads to the king's death as well as his wife's. The madness of Leontes also brings the death of his son Mamillius. His wife and daughter, who are seemingly dead, actually survive, though the prince's death leaves a spot on the happy reunion at the end of the play.

This section discusses what saves the lives of Leontes and Hermione and brings the miraculous reunion of the royal family, both of which are significant differences between the plots of *The Winter's Tale* and *Pandosto*. In *The Winter's Tale*, not only Leontes but also Polixenes and Florizel temporarily lose their judgement because of jealousy, fury against a son and amorous melancholy, respectively.⁴⁵ Mental disorder in a royal family is likely to cause the absence of a legitimate heir and is a metaphor for the disorder of the body politic. I will suggest that it is loyal courtiers' advice that cures the monarchs of their madness.⁴⁶ Shakespeare remade Camillo as a courtier from the cupbearer Franion in *Pandosto* and created Paulina, a female courtier, who does not appear in his source. The subtitle of *Pandosto*

⁴⁵ Richard McCoy points out the similarity between Leontes's jealousy and Florizel's amorous melancholy, quoting the prince's declaration of himself as "heir to my affection" (4.4.486). This recalls Leontes's "Affection" (1.2.138). See McCoy, 130.

⁴⁶ *The Winter's Tale* focuses on the miraculous effect of courtiers' advice, more than *Pericles*, and much more than *Cymbeline*, where miraculous incidents are brought directly by divine messages from gods. The Oracle in *The Winter's Tale* does not lead the main characters so much as in *Pericles* and *Cymbeline*, and in fact Leontes ignores the divine message.

is “The Triumph of Time.” Although Time plays a key role in *The Winter’s Tale* too, and actually appears as chorus, this play exhibits the triumph of rhetoric rather than Time.

Leontes’s jealousy and courtiers’ counsels

Leontes gets madly jealous when he sees his wife Hermione wholeheartedly persuade his friend Polixenes to stay in Sicilia, though Hermione does so because Leontes asks her to. At first, Leontes admits that her persuasion looks natural and it “well become[s] the agent” (1.2.114). However, while he is seeing her “entertainment” (1.2.114), he is gradually becoming anxious that she has a hidden relationship with Polixenes. Leontes asks himself:

May’t be

Affection?—Thy intention stabs the centre,
 Thou dost make possible things not so held,
 Communicat’st with dreams—how can this be?—
 With what’s unreal thou coactive art,
 And fellow’st nothing. (1.2.137-42)

According to John Pitcher, “Affection” potentially means both Leontes’s and Hermione’s feelings: “(1) his (overwrought) mental condition; or (2) his jealous feelings; or (3) what he believes is Hermione’s lust” (161n). If

“Affection” means Hermione’s, here Leontes just condemns his wife for her lust and adultery. On the other hand, if it means Leontes’s temporary mental disorder, Leontes refers to his own delusion, whether or not he is aware of it.⁴⁷ Even if he believes that he “stabs the centre” of her adultery, his worries might be completely unfounded. His jealousy invents “what’s unreal” and “fellow’st nothing.”

Leontes is supposedly not a tyrant, and nobody surrounding him anticipates his sudden change. However, his jealousy turns him into a tyrannical figure who will not listen to any advice from loyal subjects. Such stubbornness is a typical characteristic of a tyrant as discussed by Renaissance humanists, as I have already argued in the previous sections. In addition to the humanists’ texts, the Jacobean context is congruent with the Sicilian courts in *The Winter’s Tale*. Stuart M. Kurland relates Leontes’s “unwillingness to be counselled in terms of the royal prerogative” to “the tensions between James I and his first Parliament” (367). Kurland argues further that the “importance of good advice is depicted” in both Sicilian and Bohemian courts, “especially when the kings’ emotions overcome their reason” (375). Leontes is inflamed with jealousy against his wife, and Polixenes gets angry with his son.⁴⁸ Both cases lead to a lack of legitimate

⁴⁷ Pitcher annotates the word “affection” with the definition from *OED*, “2. a. An affecting or moving of the mind in any way; a mental state brought about by any influence; an emotion or feeling.” (Pitcher 161n). In addition to the definition, I consider other definitions from *OED*: “9. A bodily state due to any influence., 10. esp. An abnormal state of body; malady, disease., 11. A temporary or non-essential state, condition, or relation of anything; a mode of being.” Leontes’s jealousy is a temporary condition or disease which is removed by counselling. Although it takes long time to treat, the disease is ultimately curable.

⁴⁸ In addition to both kings, I suggest that Florizel is also a prince whose emotion overcomes his reason, following McCoy as well as Kurland.

heirs, creating a risk of disorder in their respective countries. Constance Jordan also relates the kings' vulnerability in their mental health to potential disorder in the body politic, and argues that "images of the family and the physical body of the monarch function as political metaphors" (13) in romances. When he is madly jealous, Jordan argues, Leontes "is different from and indifferent to everyone" (109), like an absolute king.

A main cause of the tragedy in *The Winter's Tale* is Leontes's jealousy, which makes him indifferent to his subjects' advice. If he listened to his subjects, who rebuke him for imprisoning Hermione, he would not lose his wife and children. However, Leontes ignores all the subjects. Instead, he addresses Antigonus and other nobles:

Our prerogative

Calls not your counsels, but our natural goodness

Imparts this; which if you, or stupefied

Or seeming so in skill, cannot or will not

Relish a truth like us, inform yourselves

We need no more of your advice. (2.1.163-68)

Leontes asserts his royal "prerogative," and insists that he does not need any "counsels" or "advice." In *Pandosto*, jealousy is defined to be exceptionally incurable, while "other griefs are either to be appeased with sensible persuasions, to be cured with wholesome counsel, to be relieved in want, or by tract of time to be worn out" (Greene 406). Leontes would not listen to any advice, so his jealousy seems to be incurable at first. Nevertheless, there are

two differences between his case and Pandosto's: one is that unlike Pandosto, Leontes deeply repents his fault and becomes ready to listen to his subjects just after he hears that his son and wife are dead. The other is that Leontes meets his wife again sixteen years later when "tract of time" is "worn out."

Jealousy is depicted as curable in the end even if it takes long time. Its remedy is owed to loyal subjects' counsel. This is implied by Shakespeare's newly created courtiers who do not appear in his source, *Pandosto*: Camillo and Paulina. The central theme in *The Winter's Tale* is no longer jealousy itself, but its remedy.

Camillo plays a similar role to Franion in *Pandosto*, who is ordered by Pandosto to poison Egistus and tries to persuade him to change his mind. On the other hand, Franion is a "cupbearer" (Greene 409), while Camillo is a king's counsellor. Of course, Franion seems to be so honest that he does not want to follow the evil order, and he has the rhetorical skills to express his idea. However, Franion is not so relied on by his king as Camillo is by Leontes. In fact, Franion is ordered to poison Egistus, just because he has a chance to do it. In contrast, Camillo is so trusted that Leontes reveals his inner heart:

I have trusted thee, Camillo,
 With all the nearest things to my heart, as well
 My chamber-counsels, wherein, priest-like, thou
 Hast cleansed my bosom; I from thee departed
 Thy penitent reformed. (1.2.233-237)

Camillo is a counsellor with whom Leontes shares his “chamber-counsels,” which implies both “affairs of state” and “personal” counsels (Pitcher 170n). Camillo seemingly occupies an important post in the Sicilian court, and his personal counsels clean Leontes’s heart like a “priest.”⁴⁹ When he is ordered to poison Polixenes, Camillo admonishes Leontes and states, “Good my lord, be cured, / Of this diseased opinion” (1.2.294-95). He gives advice to his king, and in so doing, he tries to give a remedy for jealousy.

As this thesis has already discussed in its reading of *Pericles*, an ideal courtier was expected to remedy the decay of the state in early modern England. In *Pericles*, danger to Pericles directly means danger of Tyre, his land. In *The Winter’s Tale*, the decay of Sicilia is symbolised in the breakup of the royal family and the absence of a legitimate heir: Hermione is imprisoned, Mamillius dies because of worrying about his mother, and Perdita is abandoned. Camillo considers Mamillius to be “a gallant child: one that, indeed, physics the subject, makes old hearts fresh.” (1.1.38-39).⁵⁰ The legitimate heir is essential to maintain the health of all the subjects in Sicilia, and this corresponds to the health of the state. Polixenes calls Camillo “a gentleman, thereto / Clerk-like experienced” (1.2.388-89). If this evaluation is related to Elyot’s discussion of courtiers’ counsel, Camillo can investigate the disease of the king and Sicilia “by the experience”.

Camillo as a remaking of the cupbearer Franion is a closely similar case

⁴⁹ Laurie Shannon discusses Camillo’s role as a counsellor in relation to early modern friendship (204-07), while she points out that Camillo is both a “private friend and political servant” (204). This section focuses on the role of courtiers.

⁵⁰ Pitcher glosses the word “subject” as the plural, “subjects”, citing *OED* n. I. 1b (Pitcher 148n).

to that of Helicanus in *Pericles*, remade from Hellican in *Confessio Amantis*. On the other hand, Paulina is a character who does not even appear in *Pandosto*. She is a female courtier who serves her king and queen, and gives advice to them. As Camillo is compared to a priest who can cure the mental disorder of the king, Paulina compares herself as a physician, saying to Leontes, “your loyal servant, your physician, / Your most obedient counsellor” (2.3.53-54).

Paulina is often considered to be a defender of women against patriarchy, male-centred society, and tyranny of fathers and rulers. For example, Simon Palfrey argues that Paulina contests “with various male counsellors for the determining power behind Leontes’ throne” (196), as exemplified by her opposition to Dion’s suggestion about the king’s remarriage in Act 5 Scene 1. Randall Martin discusses Paulina’s fearless speech, and points out that she challenges “Humanist pedagogy to open its male-centered social agenda to women as equal practitioners” (64). Hiewon Shin further argues that “Paulina vigorously fights to protect the infant Perdita from the child’s outrageously jealous father Leontes” (670) like a nurse, though she is in fact a gentlewoman.

As Martin suggests, women’s rhetoric was often excluded from humanist ideas about rhetoric, friendship and courtiers. However, this was not always the case. Of course, when he discusses the education of gentlemen’s children, Elyot does not mention the education of women. On the other hand, in *The Defence of Good Women* (1540), Elyot discusses the case in which a woman makes the best use of her rhetorical skills. He makes Zenobia, an ancient honourable queen of Palmyra, argue that a woman “always useth a just

moderation, knowinge whan tyme is to speke, and whan to kepe silence” and that a wife can give her husband “wise counsaile” (Elyot, *The Defence of Good Women*, 57). Elyot also makes Candidus insist, “a woman is not a creature unperfyte, but as it seemeth more perfyte than man” (Elyot, *The Defence of Good Women*, 46).⁵¹ Paulina has the same view as Zenobia and Candidus and takes pride in her role as a counsellor to Leontes about his “unsafe lunes” (2.2.29), commenting, “He must be told on’it, and he shall. The office / Becomes a woman best; I’ll take’t upon me” (2.2.30-31).

Shakespeare created two courtiers, Camillo and Paulina, which suggests that jealousy is ultimately curable by counsels, though it is not in his source, *Pandosto*. At the same time, Paulina exhibits the case in which a female courtier’s advisory skills are not inferior to those of male courtiers.

Paulina’s frank advice

Knowing that Camillo and Polixenes left Sicilia, Leontes asserts that his counsellor betrayed him, and he throws Hermione into a prison. The king is so angry with the queen that he is without rest in night and day. Such is his anger that he considers, “say that she were gone, / given to the fire, a moiety of my rest / Might come to me again” (2.3.7-9). The king’s madness is now so serious that the royal family will be ruined unless it is cured. Facing the emergency of the kingdom of Sicilia, Paulina is determined to provide frank

⁵¹ Castiglione also suggests a similar idea: “manie [women] have bine occasion of infinite goodnesse to their men, and sometime broken them of manye errores” (Castiglione 232). Interestingly, in both dialogues of Elyot and Castiglione, women’s counselee is supposed to be their husband, and female-to-female relationship is not mentioned.

and fearless advice to her king. When she is dissuaded by her husband, Antigonus, and other aristocrats from rebuking the king, Paulina insists:

'Tis such as you,
 That creep like shadows by him and do sigh
 At each his needless heavings—such as you
 Nourish the cause of his awaking. I
 Do come with words as medicinal as true,
 Honest as either, to purge him of that humour
 That presses him from sleep. (2.3.32-38)

She denounces her husband and other aristocrats as those who “creep like shadows” behind the tyrannical king. In her opinion, if courtiers do not give counsels to the king even when they need to, they are blamed not only for their neglect of duty, but also for nourishing “the cause of his awaking.” On the other hand, she is sure that it is she who can cure the king’s madness and insomnia “with words as medicinal as true.”

Ideal courtiers were expected to give good counsel to their monarch, while flatterers were supposed to abuse rhetoric to gain the favour of their monarch in Renaissance courts. Flatterers were at the opposite side of counsellors, so those who would not advise their monarch because they worried about his fury were also a kind of flatterers. In *The Education of a Christian Prince*, Erasmus denounces flatterers:

I would like preachers to put forward a positive example of a good prince

without abuse and not to approve in the Christian prince by obsequious connivance what the pagans have condemned in pagan princes. Officers of state do not give frank advice and counsellors do not consult with him with enough openness of heart. (Erasmus 57)

For Erasmus, those who “do not give frank advice” approve wickedness “by obsequious connivance.” On the other hand, honest and loyal counsellors are called “preachers,” which is similar to Camilo’s “priest-like” (1.2.235) role. This is a bit ironical, because Camilo’s advice to Leontes is opportunistic when he finds it difficult to give frank advice. Erasmus’s preacher is closer to Paulina than to Camilo.

At first, Antigonus and other aristocrats try to persuade Leontes to liberate Hermione (2.1.126-61), but like Camillo, they give up fighting against the king when he acts against their advice. In contrast, Paulina never fears even when she is threatened to be burned at the stake (2.3.93-94). Antigonus continues to be obedient to the king, when he is ordered to desert Perdita. He decides to follow the evil order, though he realises that he should not. Antigonus meets Hermione in his dream, who addresses to him, “For this ungentle business / Put on thee by my lord, thou ne’er shalt see / Thy wife Paulina more” (3.3.33-35). This is an inverted version of Posthumus’s words in *Cymbeline*: “Every good servant does not all commands; / No bound but to do just ones (5.1.6-7).⁵² Like Pisanio, a servant of Posthumus, Camillo

⁵² Posthumus assumes that his beloved Imogen has betrayed, ordering Pisanio to kill her. Later, Posthumus learns that he misunderstood her, saying these words. Rational resistance to tyrannical orders and temperate advice are discussed by Castiglione, and he makes Federico (Syr Fridericke) insist, “yf he shoulde commaunde you to conspire treason, ye are not onely not bounde

secretly ignores the evil order, wedding Paulina in the end. On the other hand, Antigonus follows the evil order, which destines him to be separated from her.

It is not until Mamillius dies that Leontes realises his fault. Paulina's persuasion cannot cure his madness before the tragedy happens. Jealousy is depicted as curable in *The Winter's Tale*, but its remedy requires time. As already argued regarding *Pericles*, Elyot argues that a counsellor should consider the three points—the place, time, and person to be advised—and wait for an appropriate time of consultation. Among them, time plays a significant role in *The Winter's Tale*, where the personified Time appears on the stage. After all, his complete recovery requires 16 years of self-condemnation.

Although her counsel seemingly fails at first, she is in fact a master of counsel in the proper time. By fearlessly and harshly rebuking Leontes, Paulina gives the first aid to the temporarily tyrannical king, whose power and fury make his jealousy extremely difficult to deal with. Leontes shows his repentance when he is informed of Hermione's death, and addresses Paulina, "Thou canst not speak too much. I have deserved / All tongues to talk their bitterest" (3.2.211-12). His attitude drastically changes from one of stubbornness. However, Paulina takes enough time to deal with his jealousy completely. She does not need to hurry up: now that Leontes is willing to listen to her counsel, she can dissuade him from the second marriage, even when he is recommended to find a new wife. She keeps Hermione away from

to doe it, but ye are bounde not to doe it, bothe for your owne sake and for being a minister of the shame of your Lorde" (Castiglione 130).

Leontes until he experiences repentance from the bottom of his heart and she can truly reconstruct the royal family. In this sense, she gives him quick and slow advice.

Camillo's moderate advice

After his sixteen-year service to Polixenes in Bohemia, Camillo has become so trusted by the king that he is consulted about the prince Florizel, who meets Perdita, who was brought up as a shepherd's daughter. For Polixenes, the legitimate prince's love with a woman in a much lower class implies uncertainty in the future of Bohemia. Although he failed to cure Leontes's jealousy before, now through his counsel, Camillo is required to relieve the prince's amorous melancholy and Polixenes's anxiety about the heir. In order to determine how Florizel thinks about his love and future, Polixenes and Camillo disguise themselves and visit the shepherd. However, the situation becomes worse: Polixenes is enraged when he learns that Florizel is determined to secretly marry Perdita. Just like the case of Leontes, the problem is that both Florizel and Polixenes would not listen to any advice against their will. Florizel refuses to obtain his father's consent, because he is so afraid that he will not be allowed to get married. Polixenes renounces Florizel. Unlike the case of Leontes, Camillo gives up dissuading Polixenes before trying to do so.

In contrast to Paulina's fearless and frank advice, Camillo's advice is moderate and conciliating. He avoids giving harsh advice to rulers who are upset or furious. Camillo considers the temper of advisees, while Paulina

prioritizes considering time. Like the case of Leontes, Camillo gives up defending Florizel against Polixenes, because the king is temporarily tyrannical. Instead, he advises Florizel:

You know your father's temper. At this time

He will allow no speech, which I do guess

You do no purpose to him; [...]

Then till the fury of his highness settle,

Come not before him. (4.4.472-74, 476-77)

Of course, Camillo considers the “temper” of Polixenes, but he also considers time to advise. His scheme is to wait “till the fury” of the king has settled. In this sense, Camillo shares the way of advice with Paulina, his future wife.

Camillo observes that Polixenes has become stubborn because of his fury and he would not listen to any advice. This sudden change of feelings and attitudes towards advice are seen in Florizel too. Although Camillo asks Florizel to “Be advised” (4.4.486), this young prince would not listen to the old courtier. Then, Camillo gives moderate advice to Florizel, who seems so “desperate” (4.4.490) as to be determined to elope with Perdita at risk of death. This wise and experienced courtier does not refute the young prince. Florizel is now madly in love with Perdita, so Camillo finds him “irremovable” (4.4.512). Instead of persuading the prince, Camillo recommends that he leave Bohemia and go to Sicilia in order to “save him from danger” (4.4.515). At the same time, he seeks his own goal of serving Leontes again, and secretly decides to follow them later.

Richard McCoy argues that Camillo's priority is his own, and evaluates the courtier as "neither superhuman nor even particularly honourable, nor are his means supernatural" (McCoy 131). This is partly true: it is not uncertain why Camillo does not reveal his intention to Florizel, or what problems will happen to Camillo if he does. However, at least for Florizel, Camillo's plot looks "a miracle" (4.4.539) and he looks "something more than man" (4.4.540). Perhaps, it looks so, for spectators or readers, because his plot is compared to a plot of a play. Camillo promises Florizel, "I'll write you down, / the which shall point you forth at every sitting / What you must say" (4.4.565-67) and "The scene you play were mine" (4.4.598).

Camillo's deception in his obedience and rhetoric is compared to Autolycus's. After he exchanges clothes with Florizel, Autolycus pretends to be a courtier in front of the shepherd and the crown. Then, Autolycus finds himself having "a double occasion: gold, and a means to do the prince my master good" (4.4.830). Jordan points out that both Camillo and Autolycus act in their own as well as Florizel's interests (Jordan 141-42). McCoy evaluates Camillo "as devious a trickster as Autolycus" (McCoy 134).

On the other hand, a difference between the experienced courtier and the mock-courtier is whether they are conscious of what will happen: Camillo expects Leontes to help the lovers, and he is a playwright of his plot. He is confident that they can be helped by Leontes, because he cannot but believe that Perdita is not a daughter of a shepherd but a "fair princess" (4.4.449). Camillo recognizes Perdita's noble breeding and education, and addresses, "I cannot say 'tis pity / She lacks instructions, for she seems a mistress / To most that teach" (4. 4.586-88). In contrast, Autolycus just expects that "There

may be matter in it” (4.4.846), if he takes the shepherd and the crown to Florizel and Perdita. Although Jordan relates Pisanio in *Cymbeline* to Camillo and Autolycus (Jordan 142), Camillo is a little different from others.

Considering Florizel’s reaction, Camillo is idealised as a loyal courtier, at least within the play, whether or not he seems to be loyal from the viewpoint of a modern audience. David Schalkwyk defends Camillo’s loyalty and argues that this courtier puts a priority on his former master Leontes (Schalkwyk 266). Ignoring the orders, first, Camillo saves the life of Polixenes, the best friend of Leontes, and later saves the life of Florizel, the son of the new master, and finally he provides his masters with an opportunity to become reconciled. After all, if it works for his masters in the end, even if he seeks his own benefit as well, his disobedience is ultimately welcomed. In fact, Leontes reevaluates Camillo when he admits his fault and addresses:

For being transported by my jealousies
 To bloody thoughts and to revenge, I chose
 Camillo for the minister to poison
 My friend Polixenes, which had been done,
 But that good mind of Camillo tardied
 My swift command (3.2.155-160).

When Camillo arrives at the Sicilian court accompanied by Polixenes, Florizel assumes at first, “Camillo has betrayed me” (5.1.181). However, this is the last line in which Florizel refers to Camillo. They are supposed to be

reconciled.

Camillo's deceptive rhetoric may lead to misunderstanding, but it is not so much blameworthy as desirable for effective persuasion. Jordan evaluates Paulina's play until the last scene, which "follows a sequence of deceptions" and points out that Camillo's "plan involves deception" as well (Jordan 141). The more important point is that deception is encouraged in Renaissance theories of rhetoric. Baldassare Castiglione argues that courtiers instruct their lords "as the warie phisitiens do, who manye times when they minister to yonge and tender children in ther sicknesse, a medicin of a bitter taste, annoint the cupp about the brimm with some sweete licour" (Castiglione 302). Camillo and Paulina fascinate their masters through deception and lead them to happy and virtuous lives. Of course, deception is close to fraud and flattery, but such ethically problematic means can be defended if towards a good end, or worthy lesson.

Advice as a divine art

Leontes repents his tyranny when he is informed that Mamillius and Hermione are dead, but he still does not recover from an aftereffect of jealousy: a sense of sin. The king's illness implies a disorder of the state (i.e., absence of a legitimate heir). When he is advised to forgive himself to get married again, Leontes declines to do so and mentions Hermione:

Whilst I remember

Her and her virtues, I cannot forget

My blemishes in them, and so still think of
 The wrong I did myself, which was so much
 That heirless it hath made my kingdom, and
 Destroyed the sweet'st companion that e'er man
 Bred his hope out of. (5.1.6-129)

Paulina is a kingly counsellor who can cure his illness. It is also her duty to revive the marital relationship between Leontes and Hermione. In so doing, this female courtier can eradicate the instability of royal succession in Sicilia.

By reminding Leontes of the oracle who predicted, "King Leontes shall not have an heir / Till his lost child be found" (5.1.39-40), Paulina suggests that divine direction is required to cure the infertility. Perdita, "his lost child," is now believed to be dead, so Paulina finds it "monstrous to our human reason" (5.1.41). Then, Paulina tells Leontes that if it can be, it is when his "first queen's again in breath" (5.1.83), and this is also impossible without a miracle.

Divine power is overwhelming to human power, which is reiterated in the dialogue between Polixenes and Perdita. In the shepherd's house, she tells him that she does not like "streaked gillyvors" which are called "Nature's bastards" (4.4.82, 83), because "their piedness" is made by human art and "great creating Nature" (4.4.87, 88). Perdita also neglects rhetoric as a human art, and prefers plain words: "I cannot / Speak well, nothing so well, no, nor mean better" (4.4.385-86).

Divine power and nature created by the god are dominant in human

destiny and in creation of the world. On the other hand, it is not that human art is totally powerless. In fact, it is not in the pastoral area surrounded by nature but at court that the royal families in Sicilia and Bohemia are restored. Perdita prefers nature to art, but Polixenes disagrees with her: “Nature is made better by no mean / But Nature makes that mean” (4.4.89-90). No counterfeits are made by art, which is created by Nature.⁵³ For Polixenes, art does no harm to nature, but rather improves it.

Polixenes’s idea of art and nature evokes Renaissance theories of poetry where a poet was supposed to imitate nature effectively. Sir Philip Sidney argues in *An Apology for Poetry* that “with the force of a divine breath” (Sidney 86), a poet makes things better than nature does. Poetry exemplifies virtues, which men should learn, so it works as courtiers’ advice does. Sidney compares the poet’s way to “teach and delight” to the way of a doctor to conceal a bitter taste with “a pleasant taste” (Sidney 86, 95). Renaissance theories of both a courtier and a poet are compared to medicine.

Camillo and Paulina advise and surprise their masters, and recreate the more stable royal families. These courtiers’ advice is a human art and knowledge, but it also takes on divinity. For Florizel, Camillo’s plot seems divine art, which is misunderstood by the prince in the middle, but it eventually brings the prince to his father’s support for his marriage. Paulina moves Hermione in front of Leontes, who believes that he sees a statue of his wife. Paulina’s play and words as well as the beauty of Hermione, fascinate him, purify his heart and make him ready to love his wife forever.

⁵³ Sidney argues, “Poesy is an art of imitation,” “representing, counterfeiting, or figuring forth” “to teach and delight” (Sidney 86). Art is a kind of “counterfeiting,” but the way is justified by the end, effective teaching.

Paulina's steward introduces a statue which Paulina owns and which is known as a work by "Giulio Romano, who, had he himself eternity and could put breath into his work, would beguile Nature of her custom" (5.2.95-97). Romano is not a poet, but his art has a similar characteristic to that of poetry, that Sidney discusses. Paulina plays a role of Romano: with a divine "breath," she makes Hemione no worse than "Nature" does.

POLINA

It is required

You do awake your faith. Then all stand still.

Or those that think it is unlawful business

I am about, let them depart.

LEONTES

Proceed.

No foot shall stir. (5.3.94-98)

First, she explains that her words are not spells of "unlawful business." This evokes Sidney's defence of poetry: "The poet never maketh any circles about your imagination, to conjure you to believe for true what he writes" (Sidney 103). Then Polina starts her show after Leontes orders her, "Proceed." Virginia Lee Strain argues that this order implies the function of the king in the English parliament. She quotes Sir Thomas Smith's *De Republica Anglorum*, where "Smith explains that the authority of Parliament ensured that laws were passed "in peace & consultation where the Prince is to giue life, and the last and highest commaundement" to legislative act" (Strain 577).⁵⁴ Paulina, a female courtier advises and supports Leontes under his

⁵⁴ As for the passage which Strain quotes, see Sir Thomas Smith, *De*

authority. A king is a deputy of the god, so his order is compared to “divine breath”. The same allegory is used in *The Winter’s Tale* as in theories of courtiers and poetry. Rhetoric of this female courtier effectively cures disorders of the king and of his kingdom with divine power. It pleases him and at the same time instructs him in virtues regarding true love.

Leontes’s jealousy leads to separation of the royal family and a lack of an heir in Sicilia. The king’s mental disorder is linked to collapse of the kingdom, and it must be cured through courtiers’ advice. Camillo’s advice is moderate and conciliating, while Paulina’s advice is frank and fearless. On the other hand, both resort to deception for their master’s sake. Their marriage in the last scene implies that theories of Renaissance rhetoric consisted of these mutually exclusive ways of advice. Some humanists excluded women from their discussions of a good counsellor, but Shakespeare did not.

Although their first aids are effective to some extent, Camillo and Paulina fail to remove the disorder completely at first. Advice from courtiers considering time, place, and personage cures disorders both of their masters and states. By showing wonderful plays, it teaches and delights not only counselees but also audience and readers.

Chapter 3. Advice and womanly persuasion in romantic comedies

Section 1. Men's flattery and women's advice in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*

In *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, male-to-male friendship is endangered and advice is replaced by flattery. Proteus, a gentleman of Verona, loves Julia at first, but suddenly changes his mind and comes to love Silvia, who is loved by Valentine, a close friend of Proteus. By pretending to be a good adviser, Proteus is trusted by the Duke of Milan, the father of Silvia, and entices him to banish Valentine. Although he betrays his lover and friend, Proteus is forgiven in the end. Obviously, friendship as well as love is a main theme of this romantic comedy.

Ciceronian friendship idealises the relationship between men who are equally virtuous in the same social class. Following Cicero, Elyot, a Renaissance humanist argues that “frenshippe is betwene good men only, and is ingendred of opinion of virtue” (*Governour* 2: 162-63). Friends develop and maintain an ideal relationship through mutual advice. However, such a relationship was difficult to develop in early modern England, as Elyot lamented that the “liberte of speech” was “usurped by flaterars” and that it was unclear “howe nowe a dayes a man shal knowe or discerne suche admonicion from flattery” (*Governour* 2: 165). John D. Cox argues that Shakespeare was sceptical about this equality both of virtue and class in friendships, because of two “difficulties that invariably make the ideal impossible to achieve in fact: social inequality and competitive rivalry” (3).

The Two Gentlemen of Verona reflects this difficulty. At first Proteus and Valentine are Ciceronian friends. They are socially equal and well educated.⁵⁵ Their friendship is sustained by their mutual advice. However, their reciprocal support is replaced by competitive rivalry at court. Instead, both gentlemen develop a master–servant relationship with the Duke by giving advice. As it is developed and maintained by advice, their master–servant relationship is an applied form of the Ciceronian ideal of friendship, though the relationship is between different classes.

Friendship between different classes is often seen in other works of Shakespeare. For example, in *Hamlet*, Horatio describes himself as a “poor servant” (1.2.162), but Hamlet calls him “my good friend” (*Hamlet* 1.2.163). In *The Merchant of Venice*, Bassanio and Antonio are close friends, but they are respectively a gentleman and a merchant. Their friendship is unbalanced, and Bassanio is unilaterally supported by Antonio. As Joseph Pequigney points out regarding the similarity between the two Antonios in *The Merchant of Venice* and *The Twelfth Night*, this characteristic is also true of Antonio in *The Twelfth Night*.⁵⁶

Female-to-female friendship is another difference between Ciceronian friendship and the friendship depicted in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*. Most Renaissance humanists directly considered Ciceronian friendship and excluded women from the concept of the ideal friendship. They regarded men

⁵⁵ Similar examples are Leontes and Polixenes in *The Winter’s Tale*, and Palamon and Arcite in *The Two Noble Kinsmen*.

⁵⁶ As for the similarity between the two Antonios, Pequigney argues that “Each Antonio loves his friend more than anyone or anything else, is emotionally dependent on him, proves willing to risk his very life on the friend’s account, and provides him with funds, with painful consequences to himself” (201).

as superior to and more consistent than women. However, this play idealises women's constancy. Julia continues to love Proteus even after he changes his mind. Silvia sympathises with Julia's genuine love, and she rails against Proteus when she is courted by him. Silvia's chastity suggests not only her constancy but also that women's bond is no less consistent than that of male-to-male friendship.⁵⁷

This section explores how friendship is developed beyond classes and genders in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*. In so doing, it analyses what defects and anxieties are potentially included in the Renaissance ideas of friendship, and how Shakespeare dramatizes them and idealise female rhetoric and virtues in love and friendship in this romantic comedy.

Friendship and advice

The famous story of Titus and Gisippus introduced in Elyot's *The Boke named the Governour* is possibly one of the sources of *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, though William C. Carroll reasonably states that this story "may serve as a lens" ("Introduction" 19) to see the play through.⁵⁸ Valentine

⁵⁷ In *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, the female-to-female friendship and deep sympathy between Silvia and Julia is indirectly depicted through the relationship between Silvia and Sebastian until Sebastian reveals herself to be Julia in disguise in the last scene. In contrast, the female-to-female friendship is clearly exhibited between Rosalind and Celia in *As You Like It*, because they are close friends from the beginning of the play, more like Valentine and Proteus, whose social status and virtues of mutual advice are equal. As Laurie Shannon argues, friendship between Rosalind and Celia is based on their likeness and shared misfortune, as well as reciprocal advice-giving (Shannon 4-5).

⁵⁸ According to Carroll, there was a lost play entitled *The History of the*

introduces the Duke Proteus: “I knew him as myself, for whom our infancy / We have conversed and spent our hours together” (2.4.60-61). Like Valentine and Proteus, Titus and Gisippus has been close friends since they were children, and their virtues and personalities as well as appearance are totally equal: [t]hese two yonge gentlemen, as they semed to be one in fourme and personage, so, shortely after acquaintance, the same nature wrought in their hartes” a mutual affection (Elyot, *Governour* 1: 134). Not only the setting but also the ending of the play is notoriously similar to the plot of the story of Titus and Gisippus.⁵⁹ Gisippus offers Sophronia to Titus: “Here I renounce to you clerely all my title and interest that I nowe haue or mought haue in that faire mayden” (Elyot, *Governour* 1: 141-42). Unlike Proteus, however, Titus marries her.

Elyot does not emphasise the importance of mutual advice in the story of Titus and Gisippus, but he does in a different chapter, which is followed by the story. He argues that friendship is seldom developed between “a man sturdy, of opinion inflexible, and of sour countenance and speech” and a man who “is tractable, and with reason persuaded, and of sweet countenance and entertainment” (Elyot, *Governour* 2: 125). To give mutual advice, both adviser and advisee need to be affable in their speech and attitude. Elyot adds that friendship is also rarely seen between a man “which is elevate in authority” and “another of a very base estate or degree” (*Governour* 2: 125).

Titus and Gisippus, acted in 1577, and at least two English verse accounts of the story: “William Walter’s translation (c. 1530) of Philipppo Beroaldo’s 1491 Latin version of Boccaccio and Edward Lewicke’s 1562 version, adapted from Elyot” (“Introduction” 18-19). Gisippus is spelled Gysippus by Elyot, but I have followed Carroll.

⁵⁹ Gisippus’s offer appears in the middle of the story, though Valentine’s offer appears in the last part of the play.

Following Aristotle and Cicero, Elyot mentions the importance of equality among friends. On the other hand, as Elyot's ideal courtier is chosen from the sons of gentlemen, such a courtier can be a good counsellor to his ruler and develop a friendly relationship.

The friendship between Proteus and Valentine is developed by mutual advice and persuasion. However, it is suggested that this relationship is about to end in the opening of the play. In fact, it begins with Valentine's words to Proteus: "Cease to persuade" (1.1.1). Proteus persuades Valentine to stay in Verona, but Valentine will not. Valentine chooses to "see the wonder of the world abroad" (1.1.6), while Proteus stays in Verona because of his love for Julia. Then, Valentine also recommends that Proteus gain precious experience abroad and teases him about his love. Finally, Valentine stops his "counsel" (1.1.51) because he finds it a waste of time. On the other hand, Proteus is aware that his love for Julia makes him at "War with good counsel" (1.1.68).

Mutual advice from Proteus and Valentine is given again when they meet in Milan. The man whom Valentine consults about his beloved Silvia is his old friend Proteus. Valentine addresses him: "go with me to come to my chamber / In these affairs to aid me with thy counsel" (2.4.182-83). However, Proteus replies, "Go on before," and he discloses his new love for Silvia in a soliloquy. The distance in time and space between the two young gentlemen before counsel implies the decay of their friendship.

Advice is given in other relationships, but it is not mutual. For example, Antonio consults Pantino about his son, Proteus, and he adopts Pantino's suggestion that he should send Proteus to Milan: "I like thy counsel; well hast thou advised" (1.3.34). Lucetta is also a counsellor to Julia. In her first lines

in the play, Julia asks Lucetta, “Wouldst thou then counsel me to fall in love?” (1.2.2). Later, Julia asks for Lucetta’s advice when she wants to follow Proteus: “Counsel, Lucetta; gentle girl, assist me” (2.7.1). The Duke of Milan utilises a form of consultation about his own love when he prevents Valentine from eloping with Silvia: “I am to break with thee of some affairs / That touch me near” (3.1.59-60). The Duke also orders Proteus to give him advice about Turio’s courtship of Silvia: “Makes me the better to confer with thee” (3.2.19).

Almost all pieces of advice in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, are given in master–servant relationships, except for mutual advice from Proteus and Valentine. This kind of advice plays a key role for an ideal courtier as a counsellor. Proteus has the rhetorical skills for a counsellor, whether or not he rightfully manipulates them. To recommend Proteus as a servant, Valentine introduces his friend to the Duke:

VALENTINE

He is complete in feature and in mind,
With all good grace to grace a gentleman.

DUKE

Beshrew me, sir, but if he make this good,
He is as worthy for an empress’s love,
As meet to be an emperor’s counsellor. (2.4.71-75)

Of all “good grace to grace”, the Duke evaluates Proteus’s virtue as “an emperor’s counsellor”. The Duke admits that such a courtier is “as worthy for

an empress's love", but this seems an exaggeration. In fact, the man whom the Duke gives his daughter is neither Valentine nor Proteus, but Turio, whom the Duke calls "my friend Sir Turio" (3.1.62) and, who never gives advice to the Duke.

A master-servant relationship is highly estimated and idealised when a servant is a good counsellor. However, this does not mean that such a relationship simply replaces friendship between men of the same class. This is not only because it is not easy to overcome social differences, but also because a counsellor whose eloquence can attract a counselee is difficult to distinguish from a flatterer at first sight. Proteus flatters the Duke into banishing Valentine, a rival for his love, but the Duke assumes that Proteus is an honest counsellor. On the other hand, the Duke regards Valentine as a flatterer. He rails against Valentine when he finds Valentine's letter to Silvia and a rope ladder that Valentine has prepared to steal her away:

Go, base intruder, overweening slave,
 Bestow thy fawning smiles on equal mates,
 And think my patience, more than thy desert,
 Is privilege for thy departure hence. (3.1.157-160)

Here the Duke emphasises a social difference between him and Valentine. For the Duke, Valentine is a "base intruder" with "fawning smiles". They are not "equal mates". Valentine is not able to marry Silvia until he proves to have "unrivalled merit" (5.4.142) without exaggeration.

At first, Valentine fails to be trusted enough as a counsellor by the Duke

to be allowed to marry Silvia. On the other hand, Proteus's manipulation of rhetoric is superior to that of Valentine, though it is not in fact a counsel but flattery. To win the favour of the Duke, Proteus utilises an analogy between friendship and the master–servant relationship: He pretends to be an honest counsellor by showing that he has been Valentine's best friend. When he informs the Duke of Valentine's plot, Proteus addresses the Duke:

My gracious lord, that which I would discover
 The law of friendship bids me to conceal,
 But when I call to mind your gracious favours
 Done to me, undeserving as I am,
 My duty pricks me on to utter that
 Which else no worldly good should draw from me. (3.1.4-9)

Proteus emphasises that he is familiar with the “law of friendship”, though he is actually betraying his friend. The Duke would not believe Proteus, if he simply considered Proteus as betraying Valentine. However, the Duke believes Proteus, because this cunning courtier shows his sincerity regarding the Duke's “gracious favours” more than his friendship with Valentine by giving secret advice. Proteus abuses advice, which plays a key role in the Renaissance idea of friendship.

Not only Proteus but also Valentine pretends to be an honest counsellor to the Duke. While he is secretly preparing to steal Silvia, Valentine is asked by the Duke how to court “a lady of Verona” (3.1.88). Valentine advises the Duke to “Flatter and praise, commend, extol” (3.1.102) her graces. His advice

to the Duke implies his own dishonesty; amorous melancholy changes him into a dishonest flatterer. Of course, Valentine's love for Silvia is never doubted throughout the play, and he might be much more trustworthy as a friend than Proteus. However, concerning the ethical problem with his rhetoric, Valentine is hardly different from Proteus, whom he describes in the last scene as "Thou common friend, that's without faith or love" (5.4.62).

At first, Proteus and Valentine are Ciceronian friends who give advice to each other. However, their friendship is replaced by competitive rivalry in love and promotion seeking. Their mock advice and flattery imply the potential decay of friendship that humanists introduced to the Renaissance court. Friendships between men who have similar status and virtues were changed into master-servant associations. Both relationships are developed through advice; however, in the latter, advice is easily replaced by flattery through rivalry. *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* simulates such a situation on stage and provides its audience with an opportunity to reflect on the ideal friendship.

Female-to-female friendship and women's advice

Because of the madness of his love for Silvia, Proteus betrays Valentine, but he finally admits his fault and is forgiven by Valentine. This means that Proteus's madness is only temporal and can be removed, just like Leontes's jealousy and Lysimachus's lust in *The Winter's Tale*. Even if Proteus is a true friend as Valentine believes, such a man of virtue is subject to change. Regarding this change, Elyot argues:

And it is often tymes sene that diuers, which before they came in authoritie, were of good and vertuous condicions, beinge in their prosperitie were utterly chaunged, and dispisinge their olde frende set all their studie and pleasure on their newe acquaintance. Wherein men shall perceiue to be a wonderful blindnes, or (as I mought say) a madness, if they note diligently all that I shall here after write of friendship. (*Governour 2: 126-27*).

According to Elyot, a man in “authority” or “prosperitie” tends to ignore his old friend. Elyot calls this “a wonderful blindness” or “a madness.” In Proteus’s case, the cause of this change is undoubtedly love. As Leontes ignores all pieces of advice due to jealousy, Proteus’s amorous melancholy makes him ignore Valentine’s advice in Act 1 Scene 1. This decay of their friendship leads to further complications. Without any advice from his old friend, Proteus becomes uncertain. When he suddenly falls in love with Silvia, Proteus asks himself in his soliloquy:

O, but I love his lady too too much,
 And that’s the reason I love him so little.
 How shall I dote on her with more advice
 That thus without advice begin to love her?
 ’Tis but her picture I have yet beheld,
 And that hath dazzled my reason’s light;
 But when I look on her perfections,

There is no reason but I shall be blind. (2.4.202-09)

Carroll annotates the two usages of “advice” as “consideration” and “without advice” as “recklessly” (192n). These two usages do not directly mean counselling, but the latter usage implies that Proteus’s recklessness results from a lack of counselling. Proteus also repeats the word “reason” three times; this emphasises his recklessness. He is aware of “the reason” why he loves Valentine less than before, but he is also aware that his reason is weakened.

As already argued in the Introduction, Renaissance humanists such as Michel de Montaigne assumed that weakened reason and uncertainty belonged to women, who were supposed to be vulnerable and inconsistent.⁶⁰ This characteristic of women is mentioned in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*. Lucetta is consulted by Julia about her beloved Proteus, and evaluates him:

JULIA

Why not on Proteus, as of all the rest?

LUCETTA

Then thus: of many good, I think him best.

JULIA

Your reason?

LUCETTA

I have no other but a woman’s reason:

I think him so because I think him so. (1.2.20-24)

⁶⁰ See the Introduction of this thesis, 14-15.

Here the word “reason” is used with a twofold meaning again: Julia asks Lucetta the reason why she thinks Proteus best, but Lucetta changes the meaning of “reason” into a woman’s judgement. In so doing, Lucetta means that a woman’s reason does not always deal with a reason for something. Her answer, “I think him so because I think him so”, is just a tautology. This scene parodies prejudice against women in Renaissance England.

Some humanists were prejudiced women’s reason, but others were not. In his dialogue, *The Defence of Good Women*, Elyot makes Candidus ask, “What thynke you, is reason onely in men? is it not also in womenne suppose you?” and makes Caninius reply, “yes” and that the word “man” includes woman as well (41-42). Women’s reason was supposed to function well enough for them to give wise counsel. As already argued, Elyot and Castiglione defend women’s rhetoric.⁶¹

As is often seen in Shakespeare’s works, the women in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* are also not as weak as they were generally supposed to be in Renaissance England, nor are their words and advice to men. When she is courted by Proteus, Silvia definitely rejects him by addressing him:

Thou subtle, perjured, false, disloyal man
 Think’st thou I am so shallow, so conceitless,
 To be seduced by thy flattery
 That hast deceived so many with thy vows?
 Return, return, and make thy love amends. (4.2.92-96)

⁶¹ See Chapter 2 Section 2, 109-10.

Her harsh attack against him is similar to Paulina's attack against Leontes in *The Winter's Tale*. In the case of Leontes, he ignores any advice from his subjects. Here Proteus is blamed for his flattery and abuse of rhetoric. Finally, she advises him to return to his previous lover, Julia.

Julia and Silvia sympathise with each other about their love, which develops their female-to-female friendship. While she is disguising herself as Sebastian, Julia discloses her sadness to Silvia. For Julia, this functions as her consultation with Silvia, though Silvia believes that Julia is a boy. Silvia addresses Julia: "Alas, poor lady, desolate and left! / I weep myself to think upon thy words" (4.4.172-73). Then, Julia responds to Silvia:

And she shall thank you for't, if e'er you know her.

A virtuous gentlewoman, mild and beautiful.

I hope my master's suit will be but cold,

Since she respects my mistress' love so much. (4.4.177-180)

Julia shows her trust in Silvia; she is sure that Silvia is so chaste that Proteus's suit will be rejected. Of course, Julia serves Proteus as a boy, and her service is loyal to him. However, she does not manage to achieve her master's goal. The bond between the two women is no less important to Julia than her master-servant relationship with her beloved Proteus.

The female friendship between Julia and Silvia is indirectly exhibited through Julia's disguise. Likewise, her master-servant relationship with Proteus implies that her rhetoric of counsel is eloquent enough to develop a

friendship between a woman and a man. Proteus complains about Lance, stating that the servant incessantly brings shame to him. On the other hand, Proteus highly evaluates Sebastian and expects him to be a better servant:

Sebastian, I have entertained thee
 Partly that I have need of such a youth
 That can with some discretion do my business—
 For 'tis no trusting to yond foolish lout—
 But chiefly for thy face and thy behaviour,
 Which, if my augury deceive me not,
 Witness good bringing-up, fortune and truth. (4.4.61-67)

As shown by his words, Julia has “discretion” to do his “business”— that is, his courtship to Silvia. Although Lucetta insists that she has only “a woman’s reason”, Julia is far from a woman whose reason is absurd. Her “good bringing-up” implies her education and eloquent speech. Proteus believes that Julia can attract Silvia’s interest.

Julia’s disguise is contrasted with Proteus’s flattery, though both are a kind of deception for achieving their goals. Proteus is greedy and finally aims to “force” (5.4.58) Silvia to yield to his desire. On the other hand, Julia remains moderate until the end and is nevertheless highly persuasive. After he forgives Proteus, Valentine offers him Silvia: “All that was mine in Silvia I give thee” (5.4.83). This offer suggests that both Silvia and Julia have to marry a man they do not love. However, Julia does not directly oppose to the offer, but instead she just faints at hearing it. In so doing, she successfully

attracts others' attention without saying anything. Then, she passes a ring to Proteus by mistake, which was sent from him, not to Silvia but to Julia before. Again, this mistake surprisingly discloses her true identity. Carroll mentions the possibility that Julia deliberately gives the wrong ring to Proteus (277-78n). Whether it is deliberate or not, her series of actions attracts Proteus's interest and effectively moves him.

Julia's actions function as a moderate persuasion.⁶² This is an ideal characteristic of humanist rhetoric. Silvia's remonstrance against Proteus is similar to Paulina's harsh advice to Leontes in *The Winter's Tale*. Julia's fainting and passing the wrong ring theatrically surprise and attract her audience, just as Paulina's improvisation of moving a statue in the final scene does. When he learns that Sebastian is Julia, Proteus is ashamed of himself, stating "were man / But constant, he was perfect" (5.4.109-10). Here the distrust against women's constancy in the Renaissance discourse of friendship is perfectly inverted and directed at men's constancy.

Proteus's sudden change of mind and mad love for Silvia make him into a mischievous troublemaker. A series of troubles tests how male-to-male friendship is maintained in a love rivalry at court. Proteus asks Silvia, "In love / Who respects friend?" (5.4.53-54). The answer is women, though Silvia

⁶² Compared to Julia, Rosalind in *As You Like It*, is a more active counsellor to her beloved: she makes him swear his love for her. Her image as a female counsellor is similar to Paulina and Marina in *The Winter's Tale*, though Rosalind is a counsellor to her own lover, while Marina and Paulina are counsellors to their monarch. Like Paulina, she refers to her advice as "my physic" (*As You Like It* 3.2.345) and she is asked by Orlando to tell him her "remedy" (*As You Like It* 3.2.354). She also compares herself with "a magician" (*As You Like It* 5.2.69), who can lead to a miraculous settlement of all the problems and misunderstandings. As for the metaphors of medicine and miracle in the advice of Marina and Paulina, see Chapter 2 of this thesis, 98-101 and 119-21, respectively.

actually responds to him, “All men but Proteus” (5.4.54). There is no gender difference in the friendships in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, at least concerning the rhetoric of advice supporting friendship. In fact, Proteus and Valentine do not discriminate lovers and friends. Proteus expresses both his friendship with Valentine and his love for Silvia in the word “love”: “I love him not as I was wont. / O, but I love his lady too too much” (2.4.202-203). Again, Valentine calls Proteus and Julia “friends”: “Let me blest to make this happy close. / ’Twere pity two such friends should be long foes” (5.4.116-17).

Renaissance humanists based their idea of friendship on Cicero’s idea that friendship is only between good men. They thought that “good men” meant having high social status and learning. Therefore, the idea of friendship led to the idea that courtiers could develop a desirable relationship with their rulers through their advice. On the other hand, in such an unequal relationship, flattery was supposed to replace advice more easily for a competitive rivalry.

The Two Gentlemen of Verona reflects this social context. It depicts several relationships in which a master consults his or her servant. The classical friendship based on likeness between two men is only seen in decay through that between Proteus and Valentine. Not only Proteus but also Valentine abuse the rhetoric of advice and manipulate it as flattery. Proteus betrays Valentine, and Valentine forgives him. This might mean that Valentine is much more virtuous than Proteus. However, there is little

difference between them in terms of abuse of rhetoric.

Following the classical friendship, Renaissance humanists such as Montaigne developed the male-centred idea of friendship. They regarded “women’s” inconstancy and vulnerability as opposing characteristics to virtues in friendship. However, this idea contradicted their idea of rhetoric in which they welcomed the “womanly” nature they defined— that is, to be conciliating and attracting. *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* depicts not only friendship between the two gentlemen, but also a bond between women and their persuasion. Women’s friendship repairs male friendship in the play where the difference between genders in friendship is removed.

Section 2. Twofold love of Viola and Cesario in *Twelfth Night*

After the shipwreck in the storm, Viola a young aristocratic woman, loses everything but herself and is separated from Sebastian, her twin brother. The helpless woman disguises herself as a man named Cesario and starts to serve Orsino, the Duke of Illyria. Before long, she falls in love with the Duke. However, it seems impossible for her to fulfil her love, because the Duke does not know her true identity: if she revealed her identity and still did not fulfil her love, she would not continue to serve Orsino. Nevertheless, in the last scene, Orsino decides to marry her immediately after her true identity is disclosed. This too-sudden change suggests that Orsino loves her while she is serving him as Sebastian.

This section argues about how she gains his favour to the point of being proposed to while she is disguising herself as a man. Renaissance humanists

idealised male-to-male friendships, excluding women from their ideas of friendship. Likewise, the Duke's high evaluation of men and contempt for women are applied to his idea of love. For him, women's hearts are too small to hold strong passion. However, his idea of love is disproved by his love for Viola. He loves her as a male servant in a male-centred friendship, but later he learns that she is in fact a woman.

Male-to-male friendship and love

It is unclear whether Orsino loves Viola as a woman, or as a man. It seems that he does not care about gender difference in his love. In fact, he uses the word "love" to express his intimacy with both a man and a woman, as Proteus and Valentine do in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*. When he learns that Viola is a woman, Orsino suddenly forgets his love for Olivia and addresses to her:

ORSINO

Boy, thou hast said to me a thousand times
Thou never shouldst love woman like to me.

VIOLA

And all those sayings will I overswear,
And all those swearings keep as true in soul
As doth that orb'd continent the fire
That severs day from night.

ORSINO

Give me thy hand,

And let me see thee in thy woman's weeds. (5.1.263-69)

Orsino remembers that his male servant, Cesario, said to him that he loved him. Of course, he knows here that it was she who loved him. However, he received her words of love as those from his male servant. His favour for Cesario and trust in him, are presumably the only clear reasons for his sudden change of mind. For Orsino, love from his subject is interchangeable with love from a woman.

The word “love” means intimacy in a male-to-male relationship and a master–servant relationship. This is seen not only in the relationship between Orsino and Cesario, but also in the relationship between Sebastian and Antonio. When they first appear on the stage, they talk:

SEBASTIAN

Therefore I shall crave of you your

leave that I may bear my evils alone. It were a bad
recompense for your love to lay any of them on you.

[...]

ANTONIO If you will not murder me for my love, let me
be your servant. (2.1.5-7, 32-33)

Sebastian and Antonio mention Antonio's “love”, and this might evoke a homoerotic image in the modern audience and readers. Critics such as Elliot

Krieger, Pequigney and MacFaul discuss this image. There was an analogy between love and intimacy in the master–servant relationship in Renaissance England. Interestingly, these three critics argue that the friendship between Sebastian and Antonio is in fact a master–servant relationship, though there is no formal contract between them (Krieger 112-13; Pequigney 205; MacFaul 177).

As argued in the other chapters of this thesis, advice develops and maintains master–servant relationships. For example, Cesario is a counsellor to Orsino concerning his love for Olivia. When he sends Cesario to Olivia, Orsino says to him, “Cesario, / Thou knowst no less but all: I have unclasped / To thee the book even of my secret soul” (1.4.12-14). Cesario is still young but trusted enough to be informed of Orsino’s “secret soul”. This evokes Camillo’s role as a counsellor who knows “all the nearest things” (*The Winter’s Tale* 1.2.234) to Leontes’s heart. In addition to Camillo, other Shakespeare counsellors are usually old and experienced men: Menenius to Coriolanus and Helicanus to Pericles are discussed in other chapters; in addition, Kent to Lear and Friar Laurence to Romeo share the same characteristic. These aged male counsellors are typical examples of Erasmus’s ideal instructors to rulers. On the other hand, Cesario / Viola deviates from this category. Similar examples to Cesario / Viola are Sebastian / Julia and Ganymede / Rosalind. They all disguise themselves as men, and give counsel about love to their masters, whom they love.

There are other relationships supported by advice in *Twelfth Night*. Sebastian needs a consultation with Antonio when he is misidentified as Cesario: “His counsel now might do me golden service, / For though my soul

disputes well with my sense / That this may be some error but no madness” (4.3.8-10). Sir Andrew consults Sir Toby about his love for Olivia. Sir Toby consults Maria about the plot against Malvolio. In these relationships, consultation is not mutual. Except for the friendship between Sir Andrew and Sir Toby, these relationships are master–servant relationships. As seen in the examples of Maria as well as Viola, good counselling is not restricted to male characters.

Prejudice against female love and friendship

One difference between classical and Renaissance ideas of friendship is their application to master–servant friendships. Another difference is gender. Humanists discussing an ideal courtier, such as Castiglione and Elyot, defend female courtiers and women’s rhetoric of advice. In *Twelfth Night*, Viola counsels Orsino about his love while serving him as a male servant, Cesario. The female rhetoric of advice is idealized in the plot, where she gains his favour through her service and fulfils her own love. Nevertheless, Orsino maintains a male-centred idea of love at first.

ORSINO

There is no woman’s sides
 Can bide the beating of so strong a passion
 As love doth give my heart: no woman’s heart
 So big to hold so much—they lack retention.
 [...]

VIOLA

Too well what love women to men may owe.

In faith, they are as true of heart as we. (2.4.93-96, 105-06)

Keir Elam observes that the phrase “they lack retention” includes “two senses [...] they lack the capacity of real love and that they lack self-restraint” (“The Fertile Eunuch” 6). Orsino believes in strong male “passion” and doubts that women can hold such strong passion for as long. He distrusts women’s constancy. However, Viola disagrees with him and tries to remove his prejudice. Orsino’s distrust evokes Montaigne’s exclusion of women in his idea of friendship, and Viola’s defence evokes that of Castiglione and Elyot.⁶³ In *Twelfth Night*, the consistency of men as well as of women is controversial. This is implied in the conversation between Valentine and Viola:

VALENTINE If the duke continue these favours towards

You, Cesario, you are like to be much advanced. He hath known you but three days, and already you are no stranger.

VIOLA You either fear his humour or my negligence that

you call in question the continuance of his love. Is he inconstant, sir, in his favours? (1.4.1-7)

⁶³ For Montaigne’s disbelief in female friendship, see the Introduction of this thesis, 14-15. For a defence of women by Castiglione and Elyot, see Chapter 2 Section 2, 109-10. Elam annotates this scene about the intertextuality between *Twelfth Night* and Castiglione’s defence of women in *The Book of the Courtier*. See *Twelfth Night*, 233n.

Here they discuss Orsino's favour for his servant, but provided that he holds twofold favour for Cesario / Viola, which will make him love Viola in the final scene, "the continuance of [Orsino's] love" also implies his love for a woman.

Viola's constancy of love for Orsino is clearly depicted on stage. On the other hand, her skill for giving advice, proving her virtues in friendship, is more metaphorically suggested. The skills that make her speech and persuasion attractive, are the same as Marina's in *Pericles*: singing and storytelling.⁶⁴ As argued in the previous chapters, the skill for giving advice was supposed to be enhanced with music and attractive stories, and these accomplishments were supposed to be feminine.⁶⁵ Just after the shipwreck, Viola asks the captain, who saved her, to introduce her to Orsino:

I'll serve this duke.

Thou shalt present me as an eunuch to him.

It may be worth thy pains, for I can sing

And speak to him in many sorts of music,

That will allow me very worth his service. (1.2.53-56)

Viola shows her confidence in serving Orsino, because she "can sing / and speak to him in many sorts of music," suggesting these skills belong to "an eunuch". In his essay "The Fertile Eunuch," Elam discusses Viola's nature as

⁶⁴ See Chapter 2 Section 1, 99-102.

⁶⁵ See Chapter 1 Section 3, 81-82.

a “eunuch,” arguing from the view of post-Freudian psychoanalysis, that Viola “is loved for—or through—what she is not, as she hints in her teasing revelation / hiding of her “real” gender both to Olivia [...] to Orsino” (7). Elam maintains that rejecting femininity provides Viola with the favour of Olivia and Orsino. On the other hand, C. L. Barber suggests that Viola originally holds male virtues, arguing that “gentility shows through [Viola’s] disguise as does the fact that she is a woman” (115).

Both critics point out the intertextuality between Castiglione’s *The Book of the Courtier* (Elam, “The Fertile Eunuch” 4-7; Barber 114), but they do not mention the ideal courtiers’ advice accompanied by music and storytelling. Given that such advice is supposed to be feminine in *The Book of the Courtier*, it can be argued that Viola shows the female rhetoric of seductive persuasion, through which friendship is developed. This provides Viola with Orsino’s favour of Cesario, which is changed into his heterosexual love. Orsino sends Cesario to Olivia, believing that this boy can move and persuade her to receive his love:

Dear lad, believe it,
 For they shall yet belie thy happy years
 That say thou art a man. Diana’s lip
 Is not more smooth and rubious. Thy small pipe
 Is as the maiden’s organ, shrill and sound,
 And all is semblative a woman’s part.
 I know thy constellation is right apt
 For this affair. (1.4.29-36)

Orsino highly evaluates “the maiden’s organ” of Cesario, believing that this enables her to be “right apt” for persuading Olivia. There are no scenes where Viola actually sings. However, it is implied that her voice entertains and moves Olivia like music. When he learns that Viola is not a boy, Orsino is also persuaded that his disbelief in women’s strong love and friendship is only prejudice against women.

Deconstruction of gender difference in love and friendship

Orsino unconsciously refers to Viola’s female virtues, especially in the skills of persuasion, before her true identity is disclosed. Regardless of his distrust of women’s constancy, this proves that a woman can develop a firm friendship and a master–servant relationship. Eventually, Orsino expresses his love for Cesario / Viola before knowing her true identity. When Olivia discloses her love for Cesario in front of Orsino, he insists on his love for the boy:

Why should I not, had I the heart to do it,
 Like to th’Egyptian thief at point of death,
 Kill what I love—a savage jealousy
 That sometime savours nobly?
 [...]
 But this your minion, whom I know you love,
 And whom, by heaven I swear, I tender dearly,

Him will I tear out of that cruel eye

Where he sits crowned in his master's spite.

[to Viola] Come, boy, with me. My thoughts are ripe in mischief.

I'll sacrifice the lamb that I do love

To spite a raven's heart within a dove. (5.1.113-16, 121-27)

Orsino expresses his anger and jealousy towards Cesario: "Kill what I love." However, this is the first time that Orsino directly expresses his love for Cesario in front of the boy. The Duke also calls Cesario "the lamb that I do love".

The fact that Viola gains Orsino's favour as a boy suggests that a woman can develop a firm friendship. His high evaluation of womanly persuasion deconstructs Renaissance prejudice against women: women are no longer inferior to men in friendships; on the contrary, their seductive rhetoric is more welcome than men's. However, this is not only the case of friendship, but also with heterosexual love. Orsino admits this by proposing marriage to Viola:

Your master quits you, and for your service done him—

So much against the mettle of your sex,

So far beneath your soft and tender breeding—

And, since you called me master for so long,

Here is my hand; you shall from this time be

Your master's mistress. (5.1.315-20)

For a man, his beloved is a mistress whom he serves. In this sense, “Your master’s mistress” means that you are now your previous master. In *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, Silvia calls Valentine a “servant” (2.1.92). Carroll annotates this word with the meaning of “one dedicated to serve a lady—a term from the courtly love tradition” (169n). Silvia is a mistress before marriage. On the other hand, Viola achieves the same status not in the process of feeling love but when fulfilling love. Not only women but also men can become masters of their masters. Argued in Chapter 2 Section 1, Helicanus is highly evaluated by Pericles as a wise counsellor “[w]ho by [his] wisdom makes a prince [his] servant” (*Pericles* 1.2.62). He is a typical example of Erasmus’s ideal tutor of a king.⁶⁶

Viola’s becoming her “master’s mistress” implies that she inverts her master–servant relationship with Orsino both in love and friendship. Nevertheless, it is still ambiguous whether she succeeds in deconstructing his prejudice against women. In fact, the word “mistress” can suggest that she is his beloved and wife, so the phrase “Your master’s mistress” also implies that Viola is Orsino’s wife and he is still her master. Another ambiguity is included in the phrase “soft and tender bringing.” This suggests Viola’s nobility but also implies female vulnerability. If he means the latter, Orsino still maintains his prejudice against women, reflecting Montaigne’s disbelief in women’s constancy.

⁶⁶ See Chapter 2 Section 1, 91.

Viola fulfils her love through her service for Orsino. While she disguises herself as a male courtier, she is never loved as a woman. However, her disguise gives her an opportunity to show the Duke her education in rhetoric as a courtier and gain his favour. In this sense, Viola achieves twofold love as a woman and a man. Her rhetoric plays an important role in developing both her romantic relationship and friendship with Orsino. Shakespeare's women are sometimes subject to suppression by male-centred ideology, but they are still energetic and eloquent. Their characteristics do not only reflect the Renaissance ideas of friendship and the ideal courtier but also suggests more liberal ideas regarding in gender differences. Of course, this analysis does not exclude any readings that disclose Orsino's persistent prejudice against women. Nevertheless, it is still plausible that Shakespeare's depiction of idealised women and their rhetoric would have surprised and entertained the Renaissance audience.

Conclusion

This thesis has explored Shakespeare's engagement with the humanist philosophy of rhetoric. Humanist rhetoric comprises a comprehensive body of knowledge argued in a diverse range of topics, such as in discussions of tyrannicide and republicanism, in theories of the ideal courtier and friendship and in defences of poetry and women. Shakespeare dramatized discourses on these topics, attracting public attention and entertaining his audience in Renaissance England.

Advice-giving is a central concept in humanist rhetoric. In theories of republicanism and tyrannicide, a tyrant is defined as a monarch who ignores advice from his subjects, preferring flattery. In theories of the ideal courtier, a counsellor is expected to maintain a virtuous monarch, to keep him from becoming a tyrant. Both friendship and the master-servant relationship are developed through advice and spoiled by flattery. Just as the ideal courtier gives good counsel, so too does the ideal poet teach and delight his readers. Seductive advice is blamed for its femininity, while women's advice and friendship are sometimes defended.

Although critics have separately discussed political thought and the ideas of friendship and gender politics reflected in Shakespeare's plays, few critics have related these topics together in the terms of advice-giving. Therefore, one of the aims of this thesis has been to conduct a comprehensive analysis of the Renaissance ideas of rhetoric with which Shakespeare is engaged.

Another aim has been to prove that we should discuss flattery as well as

advice, because these two opposing terms function differently in Shakespeare's dramaturgy: he depicts flattery as a cause of a tragedy, courtiers' advice as a remedy for their ruler's tyranny, and advice in love as a method for women to fulfil their love.

Julius Caesar depicts problems with tyrants and flattery. Brutus embodies tyrannicide theories, such as *Vindiciae Contra Tyrannos* and Buchanan's *A Dialogue on the Law of Kingship among the Scots*, removing Caesar from Rome for the reason that Caesar flatters the Roman people for his private good, while ignoring their advice. Shakespeare impartially illustrates the conspirators' faults as well as Caesar's, and this provides his audience with an opportunity to discuss the ubiquity of the problems with flattery. Caesar's manipulation of flattery and his preference for flattery are ambiguously depicted, and so are the conspirators'.

Brutus is a heroic victim of flattery. His nobility is suggested through his refusal to flatter. In the ethically chaotic mood of this play, both Caesar's party and the conspirators manipulate flattery. The image of noble Brutus is invented by Cassius, and distorted by Antony. While Brutus expresses things as they are, Antony expresses more than the facts. The heart of Ciceronian oratory is "amplification," but Antony abuses this for his private benefit. From a dramatic viewpoint, both parties compete by suggesting and creating the images of Brutus as well as Caesar on stage. This actually encroaches on Brutus's nature. He becomes tyrannical, ignoring advice and taking part in flattery.

Julius Caesar reflects problems with flattery concerning a tyrant, while *Coriolanus* includes disorder caused by the commoners' preference for

flattery. In theories of a mixed government, such as in the works of Richard Beacon and Sir Thomas Elyot, preference for flattery is a characteristic both of tyrants and the corrupt people. Roman aristocrats, except for Coriolanus, manipulate rhetoric, controlling the people. However, just as in *Julius Caesar*, advice and persuasion are easily replaced by flattery: Volumnia encourages her son Coriolanus to flatter the people in order to win the consulship. However, the tribunes seduce the people to revolt against Coriolanus.

Coriolanus is often compared to Caesar, in that both generals are removed from Rome because of their tyranny; furthermore, both of their enemies are flatterers. However, as a tragic hero and a victim of flattery, Coriolanus is more similar to Brutus than Caesar. While Caesar listens to flattery and participates in it, both Brutus and Coriolanus refuse to flatter. Just as Brutus makes a plain speech in front of the people after the assassination of Caesar, Coriolanus is reluctant to flatter the people in his consul election. As a result, both are defeated by their rivals who flatter and agitate the mob.

Volumnia succeeds in dissuading her son from attacking Rome. In fact, she is the greatest rhetorician in the play. She embodies humanist rhetoric in which womanly persuasion and seduction are defended and idealised. However, her dissuasion ends up leading to Coriolanus's isolation in the Volscian camp. Shakespeare's reflection of humanist rhetoric is again moderate and impartial: it might be effective, but it is also difficult to deal with. He depicts both its advantages and disadvantages.

Compared to *Julius Caesar* and *Coriolanus*, which depict the political aspects of rhetoric with respect to theories of tyrannicide and a mixed

government, *Timon of Athens* deals with the relatively personal problem of flattery in friendship, though Timon is illustrated as an influential aristocrat surrounded by followers, like a king in Renaissance England. Timon becomes a misanthrope after his bankruptcy, but this is ultimately derived from his failure to develop an ideal friendship: he ignores all advice but listens to flattery.

Timon of Athens reflects defences of poetry as well as theories of friendship. Sidney defends poets from the attack that Plato regarded them as liars. However, the Poet in *Timon of Athens* flatters Timon, while ironically forecasting Timon's tragedy in his works. Shakespeare is also a poet and a playwright, but he does not ignore poets' potential guilt, depicting Timon's Poet as a flatterer; simultaneously, however, the works of poet exhibit true foresight of Timon's tragedy. Again, Shakespeare's reflection of humanist rhetoric is impartial.

"Femininity," or seductiveness of humanist rhetoric is much more focused in *Timon of Athens* than in the two other tragedies discussed in this thesis. In *Julius Caesar*, Caesar prefers Decius's flattery to Calphurnia's advice, and Brutus at first does not consult his wife, Portia about the assassination of Caesar. As women are excluded from the concept of classical friendship, women's advice-giving draws less attention in the play. In *Coriolanus*, Volumnia is a female rhetorician, and her persuasion is accompanied by flattery and deception, but nothing about femininity is directly emphasised.

In *Timon of Athens*, femininity is linked to tears. For Timon, the act of shedding tears belongs to women, implying deep compassion, and this is the

opposite end of flattery. Timon welcomes Flavius's tears, shedding tears of his own. Furthermore, Timon evaluates women's words more highly than men's when he hates flattery. Regardless of his preference for femininity, Timon's curse attracts the listeners more than seductive persuasion, which Renaissance humanists defend from the attack that it effeminates men. After all, Timon does not completely exclude women from his category of flatterers. Ultimately, he comes to hate all Athenian people and kills himself.

In tyrannicide theories, a tyrant is eliminated by a body politic if he ignores the advice of his subjects. This is dramatized in Shakespeare's tragedies, such as *Julius Caesar* and *Coriolanus*. On the other hand, in his romances, the tyrant is not directly removed, but instead destroys himself because of his sin. A typical example of this is Antiochus in *Pericles*. When a tyrant is too dominant, subjects cannot but escape from him. Then, all they can do is to wait until the tyranny ends. This evokes James I's ideas about tyrannicide. Facing an emergency, Pericles gains time by manipulating flattery to Antiochus.

Shakespeare's romances include another type of "tyrant": they are originally a wise monarch, but they become temporarily tyrannical because of mental disorders, keeping themselves apart from a counsellor. In theories of the ideal courtier, such as in the works of Castiglione and Elyot, a counsellor maintains a wise monarch and cures the decay of the body politic. Shakespeare's romances focus on this type of "tyrant" and the medicinal advice of healing them.

In *Pericles*, the melancholy of Pericles, a prince of Tyre, embodying decay of his land, is cured through the counsel of Helicanus at the beginning

and later through that of Marina, Pericles's daughter. *Pericles*, like other Shakespearean romances, includes a series of miraculous events, but it is in fact men's virtues and rhetorical skills that lead to a denouement where royal families are reunited, and the order of their land is repaired. This is a thematic difference between *Pericles* and one of its sources, Gower's *Confessio Amantis*, in which tyranny is uncurbable and the goddess Fortuna is more dominant than in *Pericles*.

The thematic difference is related to the characteristics of the two counsellors Helicanus and Marina whose rhetoric is compared to medicine. Helicanus is an experienced counsellor to his monarch, depicted as an ideal courtier for Renaissance humanists, while Helican in *Confessio Amantis* does not have such a status. In addition to the medicinal analogy, Marina's rhetoric also takes on divine power, which evokes Sidney's ideal poet. Like the difference between Helicanus and Helican, Thaise, a daughter of Pericles in *Confessio Amantis*, does not have rhetorical skills equal to those of Marina. When he assumes that his daughter has died, Pericles becomes tyrannical: he beats Marina and he does not listen to her. However, Marina's womanly persuasion cures him of his melancholy, and Diana's direction, embodied by Marina's sacred rhetoric, allows Pericles to be reunited with his wife.

Like *Pericles*, *The Winter's Tale* depicts an emergency in a kingdom: Leontes's jealousy makes him imprison his wife Hermione and abandon his daughter Perdita, and his son Mamillius dies from sadness. The royal family are separated and Sicilia faces the lack of a legitimate heir. Furthermore, because of his mad jealousy, Leontes becomes tyrannical and indifferent to his subjects' advice. In order to solve these troubles, the loyal counsellors

Camillo and Paulina manipulate different types of rhetoric: Camillo's advice is moderate and conciliating, while Paulina's advice is frank and fearless. These are opposite ends in theories of ideal rhetoric in Renaissance England. Although Camillo and Paulina fail to be listened to by Leontes at first, their remedies come to fruition after a long period of time. In the end, their rhetoric is compared to miracle and magic.

Like Helicanus and Marina in *Pericles*, Shakespeare remade Camillo as a courtier from the cupbearer Franion in *Pandosto* and created Paulina, a female courtier, who does not appear in his source material. His introduction of these two courtiers suggests that one theme of *The Winter's Tale* is courtiers' advice as a remedy for their ruler's tyranny; furthermore, it also suggests that, in *The Winter's Tale*, female rhetoric is not excluded from ideal counsel, though some humanists would differ in their discussions.

Rhetoric is a remedy for tyranny in Shakespeare's romances, and it is also a method for women to fulfil their love. Through their disguises as male servants and in service to their beloved ones, women gain the favour of their masters. Renaissance humanists developed their idea of the master-servant relationship, basing it on Cicero's ideas of friendship where only men are able to establish and maintain an ideal relationship through mutual advice. Through this process, mutual advice was replaced by unidirectional advice from courtiers to rulers; furthermore, womanly seductive rhetoric was idealised. Shakespeare's romances reflect this process: women's rhetoric, which at first seem to belong to a male servant, later discloses its true identity. This moves their beloved ones and allows them to fulfil their love.

The Two Gentlemen of Verona idealises women's constancy in love

through Silvia's refusal to flatter and Julia's service in her disguise as a male servant: Julia continues to love Proteus even after he changes his mind and she is sent to propose Silvia for Proteus. Silvia sympathises with Julia's genuine love, and she blames Proteus for his flattery. On the other hand, the play depicts a potential problem with friendship between men in a rivalry of love at court. Valentine and Proteus come to prioritize their romantic relationship and master-servant relationships with the Duke over their friendship. Accordingly, their advice is replaced by flattery. This decay of male-to-male friendship is removed by women's rhetoric: Silvia's harsh advice and Julia's moderate persuasion.

Like Julia in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, Viola a young aristocratic woman, disguises herself as a man named Cesario and starts to serve Orsino, after the shipwreck in *Twelfth Night*. She falls in love with the Duke, but she is sent to persuade Olivia of love by Orsino. Although it is difficult for her to fulfil her love, her service as a male servant and her womanly persuasion allows her to gain the favour of the Duke. This is supposed to be a reason for his sudden change of heart in the last scene. The Duke's high evaluation of men and contempt for women in love reflects a similar idea as that of in humanist friendship. This prejudice against women is denied by his own favour of Viola's rhetoric.

This thesis has dealt with a diverse range of political and cultural discourses in Renaissance England, and it has discussed Shakespeare's plays as closely engaged with these discourses, focusing on Greco-Roman tragedies, romances and romantic comedies. However, Shakespeare's other works are also supposed to deal with these topics to some extent and the two opposing

concepts of advice and flattery play a significant role in other genres such as the history plays. Studies on gender politics in Shakespeare are popular today, but more attention should be paid to gender politics with regard to ideas concerning rhetoric. After all, the study of the idea of rhetoric in Shakespeare is always fruitful, because his works were produced in Renaissance England, where education in rhetoric was fundamental.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Anonymous. *Timon*. Eds. J.C. Bulman and J. M. Nosworthy. Oxford: Oxford UP. 1980.

Aristotle. *The Art of Rhetoric*. Trans. J. H. Freese. Cambridge, Massachusetts, London: Harvard UP, 1926.

---. *Nicomachean Ethics*. Trans. H. Rackham. Cambridge, Massachusetts, and London: Harvard UP, 1926.

Ascham, Roger. "Of Imitation: *The Scholemaster* (Book II). 1570." *Elizabethan Critical Essays*. Ed. G. Gregory Smith. Vol.1. London: Oxford UP, 1904.

Beacon, Richard. *Solon, His Follie, or A Politique Discourse Touching the Reformation of Common-Weales Conquered, Declined or Corrupted*. Eds. Clare Carroll and Vincent Carey. Binghamton, New York: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1996.

Brutus, Stephanus Junius. *Vindiciae, Contra Tyrannos: or Concerning the Legitimate Power of a Prince over the People, and of the People over a Prince*. Ed. and Trans. George Garnett. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994.

Buchanan, George. *A Dialogue on the Law of Kingship among the Scots: A Critical Edition and Translation of George Buchanan's De Jure Regni apud Scotos Dialogus*. Eds and Trans. Roger A. Mason and Martin S. Smith. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003.

- Castiglione, Baldassare. *The Book of the Courtier*. Trans. Sir Thomas Hoby. 1561. London: David Nutt, 1900.
- Cicero. *Cicero on Oratory and Orators; with His Letters to Quintus and Brutus*. Trans. and Ed. J. S. Watson. London: George Bell and Sons, 1884.
- . *On Friendship & The Dream of Scipio*. Ed. and Trans. J.G.F. Powell. Warminster: Aris & Philips, 1990.
- Elyot, Sir Thomas. *The Boke Named the Governour*. Ed. H. H. S. Croft. 2 vols. 1531. London, 1880, 1883.
- . *The Defence of Good Women*. Ed. Edwin Johnston Howard. 1540. Oxford, Ohio: The Anchor Press, 1940.
- . *Of the Knowledge Which Maketh a Wise Man*. Ed. Edwin Johnston Howard. 1533. Oxford, Ohio: The Anchor Press, 1946.
- Erasmus, Desiderius. *The Education of a Christian Prince*. Trans. Neil. M. Cheshire and Michael. J. Heath. Ed. Lisa Jardine. New York: Cambridge UP, 1997.
- Fletcher, John, and William Shakespeare. *The Two Noble Kinsmen*. Ed. Lois Potter. London: Thomson Leaning, 1997.
- Goslicius, Laurentius Grimalius. *The Counsellor: Exactly Poutraited in Two Bookes*. Trans. anon., London, 1598.
- Greene, Robert. "Sources: *Pandosto*." *The Winter's Tale*. William Shakespeare. Ed. John Pitcher. London: Bloomsbury, 2010. 406-45.
- James I. *The True Law of Free Monarchies and Basilikon Doron*. Eds. D. Fischlin and M. Fortier. Toronto: CRRS Publications, 1996.
- Lucian. *Certain Select Dialogues of Lucian*. Trans. F. Hickes. Oxford: W.

- Turner, 1634.
- Machiavelli, Niccolò. *The Discourses*. Ed. Bernard Crick. Trans. Leslie J. Walker. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1974.
- . *The Prince*. Trans. George Bull. London: Penguin Books, 2003.
- Montaigne, Michel de. *Shakespeare's Montaigne: The Florio Translation of the Essays*. Eds. Stephen Greenblatt and Peter G. Platt. New York: New York Review Books, 1958.
- Plutarch. *Moralia*. Vol. 1. Trans. Frank Cole Babbitt. London: Harvard UP, 1927.
- . *Shakespeare's Plutarch; Being a Selection from the Lives in North's Plutarch Which Illustrate Shakespeare's Plays*. Ed. Walter William Skeat. London: Macmillan and Co., 1875.
- Quintilian. *Institutes of Oratory*. Trans. John Watson. London: Henry G. Bohn, 1856.
- Seneca. *Epistulae Morales: Letters 1-65*. Trans. Richard M. Gummer, London: Harvard UP, 1989.
- Shakespeare, William. *As You Like It*. Ed. Juliet Dusinberre. London: Thomson Learning, 2006.
- . *Cymbeline*. Ed. Valerie Wayne. London: Bloomsbury, 2017.
- . *Coriolanus*. Ed. Peter Holland. London: Bloomsbury, 2013.
- . *Hamlet*. Eds. Ann Thompson and Neil Taylor, London: Thomson, 2006.
- . *Julius Caesar*. Ed. David Daniel. London: Methuen Drama, 1998.
- . *King Lear*. Ed. R. A. Foakes. London: Thomson, 1997.
- . *Measure for Measure*. Ed. J. W. Lever. Surrey, England: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1998.

- . *The Merchant of Venice*. Ed. John Drakakis, London: Bloomsbury, 2010.
- . *Richard III*. Ed. James R. Siemon. London: Methuen Drama, 2009.
- . *The Taming of the Shrew*. Ed. Barbara Hodgdon. London: Bloomsbury, 2010.
- . *Titus Andronicus*. Ed. Jonathan Bate. London: Bloomsbury, 1995.
- . *Twelfth Night*. Ed. Keir Elam. London: Bloomsbury, 2008.
- . *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*. Ed. William C. Carroll. London: Methuen Drama, 2004.
- . *The Winter's Tale*. Ed. John Pitcher. London: Bloomsbury, 2010.
- Shakespeare, William, and George Wilkins. *Pericles*. Ed. Suzanne Gossett. London: Methuen Drama, 2004.
- Shakespeare, William, and Thomas Middleton. *Timon of Athens*. Eds. Anthony B. Dawson and Gretchen E. Minton. London: Thomson, 2008.
- Sidney, Sir Philip. *An Apology for Poetry*. Ed. Geoffrey Shepherd. 3rd ed. Rev. R. W. Maslen. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2002.
- Smith, Sir Thomas. *De Republica Anglorum*. Ed. Mary Dewar. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1982.
- Wilkins, George. *Pericles, Prince of Tyre. A Novel by George Wilkins, Printed in 1608, and Founded Upon Shakespeare's Play. Edited by Professor T. Mommsen, With a Preface by the Editor and an Introduction by J. Payne*. Collier. Oldenburg: Gerhard Stalling, 1857.
- Wilson, Thomas. *The Art of Rhetoric*. Ed. G. H. Mair. Oxford: Benediction Classics, 2009.

Secondary Sources

- Armitage, David et al. "Introduction" *Shakespeare and Early Modern Political Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2009. 1-22.
- Barber, C. L. "Testing Courtesy and Humanity in *Twelfth Night*." *Twelfth Night: Critical Essays*. Ed. Stanley Wells. London and New York: Routledge, 2015. 107-130.
- Barton, Ann. *Essays, Mainly Shakespearean*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994.
- Baumlin, James S. "Ciceronian Decorum and the Temporalities of Renaissance Rhetoric". *Rhetoric and Kairos: Essays in History, Theory, and Praxis*. Eds. Philip Sipiora and James S. Baumlin. New York: State U of New York P, 2002. 138-64.
- Benson, Pamela Joseph. *The Invention of the Renaissance Woman*. Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State UP, 1992.
- Bevington, David and David L. Smith. "James I and Timon of Athens." *Comparative Drama* 33. 1 (1999): 56-87.
- Beckwith, Sarah. *Shakespeare and the Grammar of Forgiveness*. Ithaca and London: Cornell UP, 2011.
- Behnegar, Nasser. "Who Is Shakespeare's Julius Caesar?" *Shakespeare and The Body Politic*. Eds. Bernard. J. Dobski and Dustin Gish. Lanham, Boulder, New York, Toronto, Plymouth: Lexington Books, 2013. 79-93.
- Bristol, Michael D. "Introduction: Is Shakespeare a Moral Philosopher?" *Shakespeare and Moral Agency*. Ed. Michael D. Bristol. London:

- Continuum, 2010. 1-12.
- Burckhardt, Sigurd. *Shakespearean Meanings*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1968.
- Burke, Kenneth. *Language as Symbolic Action: Essays on Life, Literature and Method*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: U of California P, 1966.
- Burke, Peter. *The Fortunes of the Courtier*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1995.
- Burns, Timothy. "Julius Caesar: The Problem of Classical Republicanism." *Shakespeare and The Body Politic*. Eds. Bernard. J. Dobski and Dustin Gish. Lanham, Boulder, New York, Toronto, Plymouth: Lexington Books, 2013. 49-77.
- Carroll, William C., ed. *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*. By William Shakespeare. Ed. William C. Carroll. London: Methuen Drama, 2004.
- . "Introduction" *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*. By William Shakespeare. Ed. William C. Carroll. London: Methuen Drama, 2004. 1-130.
- Charney, Maurice. *Shakespeare's Villains*. Madison, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 2013.
- Chernaik, Warren. *The Myth of Rome in Shakespeare and His Contemporaries*. New York: Cambridge UP, 2011.
- Colclough, David. "Talking to the Animals: Persuasion, Counsel and Their Discontents in *Julius Caesar*." *Shakespeare and Early Modern Political Thought*. Eds. David Armitage et al. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2009. 217-33.
- Cooper, Helen. *Shakespeare and the Medieval World*. London: Thomson, 2010.
- Cox, John D. "Shakespeare and the Ethics of Friendship." *Religion and Literature* 40.3 (2008): 1-29.

- Daniel, David. *Julius Caesar*. By William Shakespeare. Ed. David Daniel. London: Methuen Drama, 1998.
- Dawson, Anthony B, and Gretchen E. Minton. "Introduction." *Timon of Athens*. By William Shakespeare and Thomas Middleton. Eds. Anthony B. Dawson and Gretchen E. Minton. London: Thomson, 2008. 1-145.
- Dollimore, Jonathan, and Alan Sinfield, eds. *Political Shakespeare: Essays in Cultural Materialism*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1994.
- Eastman, Nate. "The Rumbling Belly Politic: Metaphorical Location and Metaphorical Government in *Coriolanus*." *Early Modern Literary Studies* 13. 1 (2007): 1-39.
- Elam, Keir. "The Fertile Eunuch: *Twelfth Night*, Early Modern Intercourse, and the Fruits of Castration." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 47. 1 (1996): 1-36.
- , ed. *Twelfth Night*. By William Shakespeare. London: Bloomsbury, 2008.
- Feather, Jennifer. "To "Tempt the Rheumy and Unpurged Air": Contagion and Agency in *Julius Caesar*." *Shakespeare and Moral Agency*. Ed. Michael D. Bristol. London: Continuum, 2010. 86-98.
- Garnett, George. "Editor's Introduction." *Vindiciae, Contra Tyrannos: or Concerning the Legitimate Power of a Prince over the People, and of the People over a Prince*. By Stephanus Junius. Brutus. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994. xix-lxxvi.
- George, David. "Plutarch, Insurrection, and Dearth in *Coriolanus*." *Shakespeare Survey* 53 (2000): 63-72.
- Gossett, Suzanne, ed. *Pericles*. By William Shakespeare and George Wilkins. London: Methuen Drama, 2004.
- Gower, John. *Confessio Amantis of John Gower*. Ed. Dr. Reinhold Pauli. Vol.

3. London: Bell and Daldy, 1857.
- Grady, Hugh. "Moral Agency and Its Problems in *Julius Caesar*: Political Power, Choice, and History." *Shakespeare and Moral Agency*. Ed. Michael D. Bristol. London: Continuum, 2010. 15-28.
- Graham, Kenneth J. E. *The Performance of Conviction: Plainness and Rhetoric in the Early English Renaissance*. Ithaca and London: Cornell UP, 1994.
- Green, Henry. *Shakespeare and the Emblem Writers: an Exposition of Their Similarities of Thought and Expression Preceded by a View of Emblem-Literature down to A. D. 1616*. London: Trübner, 1870.
- Green, Jeffrey Edward. *The Eyes of the People: Democracy in the Age of Spectatorship*. Oxford and New York: Oxford UP, 2010.
- Greene, Judy. "'You must eat men.'" The Sodomitic Economy of Renaissance Patronage." *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* 1. 2 (1994): 163-197.
- Hadfield, Andrew. *Shakespeare and Renaissance Politics*, London: Thomson, 2004.
- . *Shakespeare and Republicanism*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2005.
- Heal, F, and Holmes, C. *The Gentry in England and Wales 1500-1700*. New York: Palgrave, 1994.
- Hiscock, Andrew. "Pericles, Prince of Tyre: Prince of Tyre and the appetite for narrative." *Late Shakespeare, 1608-1613*. Eds. Andrew J. Power and Rory Loughnane. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2013.
- Holland, Peter. "Introduction." William Shakespeare, *Coriolanus*. Ed. Peter Holland. London: Bloomsbury, 2013. 1-141.

- . ed. *Coriolanus*. By William Shakespeare. Ed. Peter Holland. London: Bloomsbury, 2013.
- Humphreys, Arthur. "Introduction." Shakespeare, *Julius Caesar*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1984. 1-147.
- Jackson, Ken. "'One Wish' or the Possibility of the Impossible: Derrida, the gift and God in *Timon of Athens*." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 52. 1 (2001): 34-66.
- Jardine, Lisa., ed. *The Education of a Christian Prince*. By Desiderius Erasmus. Trans. Neil. M. Cheshire and Michael. J. Heath. Ed. Lisa Jardine. New York: Cambridge UP, 1997.
- Jordan, Constance. *Shakespeare's Monarchies: Ruler and Subject in the Romances*. New York: Cornell UP, 1999.
- Kahn, Coppélia. "'Magic of bounty': *Timon of Athens*, Jacobian Patronage, and Maternal Power." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 38. 1 (1987): 4-57.
- . *Roman Shakespeare: Warriors, Wounds, and Women*. London and New York: Routledge, 1997.
- Klein, Melanie. *Envy and Gratitude and Other Works*. London: Vintage, 1997.
- Knight, G. Wilson. *The Wheel of Fire: Interpretations of Shakespearian Tragedy*. 1930. London: Routledge, 2001.
- Krieger, Elliot, *A Marxist Study of Shakespeare's Comedies*. London: Macmillan, 1979.
- Kurland, Stuart M. "'We Need No More of Your Advice.'" Political Realism in *The Winter's Tale*." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 31.2 (1991): 365-86.

- Langis, Unhae Park. *Passion, Prudence, and Virtue in Shakespearean Drama*. London and New York: Continuum, 2011.
- Lindley, David. *Shakespeare and Music*. London: Bloomsbury, 2006.
- McCoy, Richard. *Faith in Shakespeare*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2013.
- MacFaul, Tom. *Male Friendship in Shakespeare and His Contemporaries*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007.
- Mack, Peter. *Elizabethan Rhetoric: Theory and Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002.
- Martin, Randall. "Paulina, Corinthian Women, and the Revisioning of Pauline and Early Modern Patriarchal Ideology in *The Winter's Tale*." *Shakespeare, the Bible, and the Form of the Book*. Eds. Travis Decook and Alan Galay. New York: Routledge, 2012. 57-76.
- Matz, Robert. *Defending Literature in Early Modern England: Renaissance Literary Theory in Social Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000.
- Nelson, Eric. "Shakespeare and the Best State of a Commonwealth." *Shakespeare and Early Modern Political Thought*. Eds. David Armitage et al. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2009. 253-70.
- Palfrey, Simon. *Late Shakespeare: A New World of Words*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.
- Palliser, D. M. *The Age of Elizabeth*. London and New York: Longman, 1983.
- Patch, Howard R. *The Goddess Fortuna in Mediaeval Literature*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1927.
- Peltonen, Markku. *Classical Humanism and Republicanism in English Political Thought 1570-1640*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995.
- . "Political rhetoric and citizenship in *Coriolanus*" *Shakespeare and Early*

- Modern Political Thought*. Eds. David Armitage et al. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2009. 234-252.
- Pennacchia, Maddalena. "Antony's Ring: Remediating Ancient Rhetoric on the Elizabethan Stage." *Identity, Otherness and Empire in Shakespeare's Rome*. Ed. Maria Del Sapio Garbero. Farnham: Ashgate, 2009.
- Pequigney, Joseph. "The Two Antonios and Same-Sex Love in *Twelfth Night* and *The Merchant of Venice*." *ELR* 22. 2 (1992): 201-21.
- Pettit, E.C. "Coriolanus and the Midlands Insurrection of 1607", *Shakespeare Survey* 3 (1950): 34-42.
- Pfister, Manfred. "Acting the Roman: *Coriolanus*." *Identity, Otherness, and Empire in Shakespeare's Rome*. Ed. Maria Del Sapio Garbero. Farnham: Ashgate, 2009. 35-47.
- Piazza, Antonella. "'What dost thou think 'tis worth?'" *Timon of Athens* and Politics as a Nonreligious Religion." *Shakespeare and European Politics*. Ed. Dick Delabastita. Newark: U of Delaware P, 2008, 246-54.
- Pincombe, Mike. *Elizabethan Humanism Literature and Learning in the Later Sixteenth Century*. Harlow: Pearson Education, 2001.
- Pitcher, John, ed. *The Winter's Tale*. By William Shakespeare. London: Bloomsbury, 2010.
- Plotz, John. "Coriolanus and the Failure of Performatives." *ELH* 63. 4 (1996): 809-832.
- Richards, Jenifer. *Rhetoric and Courtliness in Early Modern Literature*. New York: Cambridge UP, 2003.
- Sanders, Eve Rachele. "The Body of the Actor in 'Coriolanus.'" *Shakespeare Quarterly* 57.4 (2006): 387-412.

- Schalkwyk, David. *Shakespeare, Love and Service*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2008.
- Schulman, Alex. *Rethinking Shakespeare's Political Philosophy: From Lear to Leviathan*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 2014.
- Shannon, Laurie. *Sovereign Amity: Figures of Friendship in Shakespearian Contexts*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2002.
- Sharp, Buchanan. "Shakespeare's *Coriolanus* and the Crisis of the 1590s." *Law and Authority in Early Modern England*: Eds. Buchanan Sharp and Mark Charles Fissel. 2007. 27-63.
- Shrank, Cathy. "Counsel, succession and the politics of Shakespeare's Sonnets." *Shakespeare and Early Modern Political Thought*. Eds. David Armitage et al. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2009. 101-18.
- Shin, Hiewon. "Fatherly Violence, motherly absence, servants' resistance in Shakespeare and his time." *Renaissance Studies* 25.5 (2011): 666-83.
- Skinner, Quentin. "Afterward: Shakespeare and humanist culture." *Shakespeare and Early Modern Political Thought*. Eds. David Armitage et al. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2009. 271-81.
- . *Forensic Shakespeare*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2014.
- . *Visions of Politics*. Vol. 2. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002.
- Strain, Virginia Lee. "*The Winter's Tale* and the Oracle of the Law." *ELH* 78.3 (2011): 557-84.
- Walzer, Arthur E. "The Rhetoric of Counsel and Thomas Elyot's *Of the Knowledge Which Makes a Wise Man*." *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 45.1 (2012): 24-45.
- Watt, Garry. *Shakespeare's Acts of Will: Law, Testament and Properties of*

- Performance*. London: Bloomsbury, 2016.
- Welsh, Alexander. *What Is Honor?: A Question of Moral Imperatives*. New Haven and London: Yale UP, 2008.
- West, Michael and Myron Silberstein. "The Controversial Eloquence of Shakespeare's Coriolanus—an Anti-Ciceronian Orator?" *Modern Philology* 102. 3 (2005): 307-331.
- Whigham, Frank. *Ambition and Privilege: The Social Tropes of Elizabethan Courtesy Theory*. London: U of California P, 1984.
- Wiegandt, Kai. *Crowd and Rumour in Shakespeare*. Farnham, Surrey, and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2012.
- Wills, Garry. *Rome and Rhetoric: Shakespeare's Julius Caesar*. New Haven and London: Yale UP. 2011.
- Zeeveld, Gordon W. *The Temper of Shakespeare's Thought*. New Haven, CT: Yale UP, 1974.