

INFORMATION TO USERS

The most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

U·M·I

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road Ann Arbor MI 48106-1346 USA
313 761-4700 800 521-0600

Order Number 9020780

**The changing face of Fortune in six English versions of the
tragedy of Antony and Cleopatra**

Mallery, Mary Aileen, Ph.D.

City University of New York, 1990

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106



A

THE CHANGING FACE OF FORTUNE
in Six English Versions of
The Tragedy of Antony and Cleopatra

by
Mary Aileen Mallery

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in
English in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, The City
University of New York.

1990

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in English in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

12/14/89
Date

Angus Fletcher
Chair of Examining Committee

12/14/89
Date

Martin Stevens
Executive Officer

Angus Fletcher
W. R. Egan

Lillian Feder
Supervisory Committee

The City University of New York

Acknowledgements

I am grateful for the assistance of the librarians and staff of the British Library, London; the Warburg Institute, London; the Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington, DC; the Butler Library at Columbia University; and the Firestone Library at Princeton University. Special thanks to Professor Helga Feder of the City University Graduate Center Library. In addition, discussion at the Provost's Colloquium on "The Journey of the Self" was indispensable to the shaping of this work. Thanks also are due to friends and family who made it all possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	1
PART I: MAN'S BATTLE AGAINST FORTUNE	
1. Fortune in English Literature from Chaucer through Shakespeare.....	14
2. The Countess of Pembroke's "Antonie:" The Prison-House of Fortune.....	35
3. Samuel Daniel's "Tragedy of Cleopatra:" Fortune and the Mind.....	60
4. William Shakespeare's "Antony and Cleopatra:" The Measure of Man.....	80
PART II: THE TRIUMPH OF FORTUNE	
5. Fortune in English Literature from Jonson through Dryden.....	111
6. Thomas May's "Tragoedy of Cleopatra:" Fortune in Satire.....	128
7. Sir Charles Sedley's "Antony and Cleopatra:" Fortune in the Later Heroic Drama.....	146
8. John Dryden's "All for Love:" Fortune in the "New" Tragedy.....	163
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	180

INTRODUCTION

This study traces the development and changes in the depiction of the goddess Fortune in a selected group of dramas written between 1592 and 1678: the six English versions of the tragedy of Antony and Cleopatra. The concepts surrounding the goddess Fortune and her place in any culture change with the idea of the individual's ability to shape his own destiny. In the seventeenth century in particular Fortune becomes increasingly connected to questions of personal identity and what Stephen Greenblatt has called "self-fashioning,"¹ so that by 1678 the subject of John Dryden's All for Love is not the quest for the Fortune of Love as its title indicates, but instead the characters are concerned with answering the question "Who am I?" The main change in the depiction of Fortune occurs after the reign of James, when Fortune becomes a ruling force in man's life, and the individual seems to have no redress against the order she imposes on his life. This tyranny of Fortune is perceived as good, however, because it imposes order on man's life, whereas if left to himself the individual regresses to animalistic violence and the chaos of nature, best described by Thomas Hobbes in his influential Leviathan (1651).

Until recently, the traditions of the goddess Fortune were considered a part of medieval allegory exclusively. In

the forties and fifties Willard Farnham and H.B. Charlton noted the importance of Fortune in the early English drama, but both concluded that it was a remnant from morality plays and Senecan tragedy, forms which lost their explicit influence as English drama became more sophisticated. In this decade, Frederick Kiefer challenged this view. He begins his book-length study of Fortune and Elizabethan Tragedy (1983) with the remarks:

To trace the development of English drama in the sixteenth century is to recognize that Fortune gradually assumed not less but more importance.... It is toward the end of the Elizabethan era, rather than at the beginning, that we find the most dramatically compelling treatment of Fortune. Similarly, it is in the latter part of Shakespeare's career that Fortune engages his imagination most fully (xvii).

In fact, Fortune is a key theme in European drama, both tragic and comic, of the seventeenth century. The idea of Fortune was especially important to the English Protestants, as is evident in their doctrine of election,² so much so that one of the first boats to Plymouth which the Puritans took to escape religious persecution in 1621 was named the "Fortune."

The seventeenth century and its political, religious and linguistic revolutions have been the focus of much discussion in recent years. Michel Foucault argued in The Order of Things (1972) that the seventeenth century is the watershed of modern civilization; it marks the transition in the Western episteme of man's relationship to the world

through language, from which emerged the current crisis of man's alienation from the world and his own humanity. Francis Barker examines Foucault's ideas further in The Tremulous Private Body: Essays on Subjection (1984) by focussing on the literary evidence of this crisis particularly in seventeenth century England. Barker analyzes the diaries of John Evelyn as well as Jacobean tragedy and Milton's prose works to support his conclusion that the main transition in linguistic discontinuity at this time can be traced through changing representations of the human body. Barker claims that a "new" body, the human physique as an instrument, emerged through the influence of Puritan antisexuality and also because of the mechanical "decorporalization" of the scientific revolution: the body becomes an object rather than a subject.

Foucault's and Barker's work are especially important to the analysis of the changes in the depiction of Fortune because she is the goddess of worldly goods. Man's concept of himself in terms of his physical attributes, his possessions and the range of his power, are all defined by his relation to Fortune. In fact, as Machiavelli showed in his political writing, the concept of the hero in the Renaissance is a question of the individual's ability to woo and win lady Fortune.

There have been many answers and amplifications of the "Foucault hypothesis" of radical change in Western thought.

The main thrust of the criticism is that this idea of change is contrary to our experience of historic process.³ Thomas M. Greene gives the best answer to theorists of "radical discontinuity" in language in his book The Light in Troy: Imitation and Discovery in Renaissance Poetry (1982), where he notes that, "Time may be the element in which words are eroded but it is also the element in which, for each of us, they acquire accumulatively their being and their wealth.... The word carries with it a story of its development, its evolution,... [its] 'etiology'" (15-6).

In his article on "Fortune and Fate" in The Dictionary of the History of Ideas, Vincenzo Ciofari notes many different versions of the goddess as she appears in early Renaissance literature, beginning with Saint Augustine, who sees Fortune as the antithesis of the Christian church because of her focus on worldly goods; he also repudiates her divinity because she has no substance: if one could isolate her long enough to define her, she would cease to be Fortune because she is by nature "inconstant." Dante placed Fortune in hell⁴ where her role is one of Divine Justice in God's scheme. Petrarch and Boccaccio also feature Fortune as a powerful force in human affairs, though Petrarch takes the more Christian view that man should learn from the tragedies of Fortune that he should not trust in the things of this world and should instead contemplate the goods of the spirit. All of these religious views are contrasted to

Machiavelli, who "views Fortune as the compendium of all circumstances regarding the good outside of oneself, or the sum total of all mobility in human affairs" (235).

The goddess Fortune is a central figure in any culture because she is a force outside of human control (of politics, history, or religion) against which an individual of heroic stature must contend in order to establish his merit and his own destiny; Fortune is the force of society that works against "self-fashioning," and she is recognized as such from earliest times.

Fortune is a major theme in each of the six English versions of the tragedy of Antony and Cleopatra. As Marilyn Williamson notes in her book-length study Infinite Variety: Antony and Cleopatra in Renaissance Drama and Earlier Tradition (1974), all earlier versions of the tragedy of Antony and Cleopatra, including the original, Plutarch's Life of Antony, have a similar emphasis on Fortune and Love as the deities reigning over this couple's tragedy.

Also, in each version of the tragedy of Antony and Cleopatra, Fortune changes her attributes. Sometimes she is the lady with her wheel who randomly rules men's lives; or she is a tyrant who holds man prisoner; sometimes she is a woman who can be wooed and won by the man of virtu; and in later works, she becomes a part of man's psychology, the part most concerned with the appearances of this world, the restraining power of empirical reasoning, as opposed to

imagination and passion.

Recent critics have noticed how widespread the Fortune theme is, and Shakespeare's play has received the most critical comment. Fortune appears frequently in key scenes throughout Antony and Cleopatra: when Antony finds that his fleet has betrayed him at Alexandria and he has lost to Caesar, he cries out, "O sun, thy uprise shall I see no more./Fortune and Antony part here; even here/Do we shake hands" (IV, xii, 18-20), and after Antony has died in her arms and she has decided on suicide, Cleopatra has an insight, "My desolation does begin to make/A better life./'Tis paltry to be Caesar./Not being Fortune, he's but Fortune's knave, A minister of her will" (V, ii, 1-5). In fact, Marilyn Williamson examined the frequency of the word "fortune" in all of Shakespeare's plays, and she found that

In Antony and Cleopatra forms of the word fortune appear forty-one times, or almost twice as often as in other high frequency plays like Lear and Timon ("Fortune in Antony and Cleopatra" 423).

Williamson's article focuses on the difference between Shakespeare's use of the concept and Plutarch's. William D. Wolf also wrote an excellent article "'New Heaven, New Earth:' The Escape from Mutability in Antony and Cleopatra" (1982) where he notes the imagery of ebb and flow and perpetual change in Shakespeare's play, and he argues that the crux of opposition in the play is not the Rome/Alexandria split, but the difference between the world

of change and the imagined world of constancy which Antony and Cleopatra believe will come after death. Also, Frederick Kiefer devotes the final chapter of his Fortune and Elizabethan Tragedy (1983) to an examination of the related themes of Friendship and Fortune in Timon and Antony and Cleopatra. More recently, Jonathan Dollimore's Radical Tragedy (1984) examines the motif of sexuality and power with the Machiavellian concept of virtu as opposed to Fortune in comparing Shakespeare's heroic characterizations of Antony and Coriolanus, heroes worthy of ruling an empire because of their greatness of heart but defeated by men with a better sense of political strategy.

Dryden's play, like Shakespeare's, has received much critical comment, and in "The Jewel of Great Price: Mutability and Constancy in Dryden's All for Love" (1975) J. Douglas Canfield wrote the most informed article to date on the long tradition of Fortune as Mutability which Dryden was following in his play. Since its production in 1678, Dryden's play has consistently been singled out by critics for its successful rendering of the tragedy of Antony and Cleopatra. In fact, in the eighteenth century All for Love received many more performances than Shakespeare's version,⁵ and it is still acted on the stage today, though in the twentieth century it cannot approach the popularity of Shakespeare's play. Unlike the other English playwrights besides Shakespeare who undertook the story, Dryden managed

to create a meaningful tragedy. One might attribute his success to many factors, but it is important to note here that, like Shakespeare, Dryden's entire canon of poetry, both dramatic and non-dramatic, uses the theme of Fortune and Fate as key concepts.⁶

During the seventeenth century, Fortune became a part of the human sense of self and was central to the Renaissance idea of man's control over the image of self. The six English versions of the tragedy of Antony and Cleopatra present a unique opportunity to study the changes of this key concept during a pivotal time in English history which spans the reign of Elizabeth and the beginning of the established Church of England through the bloody revolution of Cromwell and the Restoration.

In Part I of this study, "Man's Battle Against Fortune," I examine earlier ideas of Fortune and analyze them in poetry and drama before Shakespeare, then I focus on the three versions of the tragedy of Antony and Cleopatra written during the reigns of Elizabeth I and James I: The Countess of Pembroke's The Tragedy of Antonie (1592, a translation of Robert Garnier's Marc Antoine, which was first performed in France in 1578), Samuel Daniel's Tragedy of Cleopatra (1594), and William Shakespeare's Tragedy of Antony and Cleopatra (1606-7). Part II, "The Triumph of Fortune," begins with an overview of the depiction of Fortune in the works of Ben Jonson through John Dryden, a

different tradition than the former, which takes a darker view of the individual than the Renaissance humanism of the earlier works and posits that Fortune should rule as a postlapsarian figure of Justice. In order to contextualize this change in the depiction of Fortune and the role of the individual in society, I examine the three versions of Antony and Cleopatra written during the reign of Charles I and after the restoration of Charles II: Thomas May's Tragedie of Cleopatra (1626; reprinted 1639), Sir Charles Sedley's Antony and Cleopatra (1677) and John Dryden's All for Love (1678).

Notes on the Texts

All quotes for the Countess of Pembroke's Antonie are taken from Geoffrey Bullough, ed. Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare, Volume V, The Roman Plays (1964), where he reprints the 1595 edition of the text, but my interpretation is informed by a reading of Alice Luce's earlier edition (Weimar 1897) of the text, dated 1592 and entitled Antonius: a tragedie. Differences in the text are mostly those of expansion in the later edition and a slight improvement of the sense in Pembroke's cumbersome blank verse.

The text for Samuel Daniel's The Tragedy of Cleopatra is also Bullough's edition; he reprints the 1599 version of this closet drama, which he believes would have been the

edition that Shakespeare read (235). There are several editions of the play because of Daniel's practice of issuing "newly corrected and augmented" editions of his works. In particular, there is some critical debate about whether he saw Shakespeare's play before revising his last edition of the play, printed in his Certaine Small Workes (1607).

The Shakespeare text is from the "Arden Shakespeare;" M.R. Ridley, ed., Antony and Cleopatra, where he notes that his apparatus for editing has been governed by the dictum that "The only authoritative text of the play is that of the First Folio [1623]" (vii). Ridley assigns the date of composition of Antony and Cleopatra to 1606-7 (xxiv).

Denzell S. Smith edited the authoritative edition (1979) of Thomas May's The Tragoedy of Cleopatra, the text of which he made as "a conflation of the author's autograph manuscript and the first printed edition of 1639" (iii). Smith's edition is the source for all quotes here. However, I was able to see the 1654 edition of the play in the North Library of the British Library; it was printed posthumously "for Humphrey Moseley... in Saint Pauls Church-yard" as an anti-Royalist play. The differences in the texts are minor.

Sir Charles Sedley's version of the play also went through different editions. It was quite popular when it first appeared on the stage, and Thomas Shadwell wrote in the dedication to A True Widow that it is "the only tragedy, except two of Jonson's and one of Shakespeare's, wherein

Romans are made to speak and do like Romans." However, Dryden's All for Love appeared a year later and stole its thunder. Sedley rewrote his play as a long poem in heroic verse, and it was published posthumously in 1702 under the title "Beauty the Conqueror, or the Death of Marc Antony." All quotes from the play are from a facsimile published by Cornmarket Press (1969) from the copy in the Birmingham Shakespeare Library, London, dated 1677. Also, I consulted the version edited by Vivien de Sola Pinto (1928), whose notes are still quite cogent.

The University of California edition of All for Love, edited by George R. Guffey with commentary by Maximillian E. Novak (1984), is the source for all quotes for John Dryden's play in this dissertation. The copy text for the California editors was the first edition of 1678 with a listing of variants from the play's long history of publication.

* * * * *

1. Greenblatt begins his Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare (1980) with the definition: "Self-fashioning is in effect... the cultural system of meanings that creates specific individuals by governing the passage from abstract potential to concrete historical embodiment" (3).
2. See Martha Tuck Rozett's The Doctrine of Election and the Emergence of Elizabethan Tragedy (1984).
3. See in particular Douglas Lane Patey's answer to Foucault in Probability and Form: Philosophic Theory and Literary Practice in the Augustan Age (Cambridge University Press, 1984). Patey argues against the idea of a sudden emergence of the concept of probability (a concept related to the Fortune of gambling and the random nature of the goddess).

Patey answers both Foucault and Ian Hacking's The Emergence of Probability: A Philosophical Study of Early Ideas About Probability, Induction and Statistical Inference (1975). Patey writes: "Foucault and Hacking argue not merely that in only about 1660 did the term 'probability' take on its modern meanings, but that previously our very concept of probability did not exist; its coming at once marked the end of the Renaissance and made possible the mathematical doctrines of chance" (x), but Patey doubts "this radical intellectual discontinuity" and goes on to trace the history of the concept of probability from Aristotle's ideas of probable action in drama through the Latin idea of probabilis or "that which is worthy of approbation or approval in an evaluative, even a moral sense" (3).

4. In Circle Four, the place of the Hoarders and the Wasters, Virgil notes to Dante,

Now may you see the fleeting vanity
of the goods of Fortune for which men tear down
all that they are, to build a mockery.

Not all the gold that is or ever was
under the sky could buy for one of these
exhausted souls the fraction of a pause.

(Canto VII, 61-6)

When Dante asks Virgil to describe Dame Fortune, he equates her with "error," as will Chaucer and Spenser in later works, but he also calls her the "Lady of Permutations," and he notes that "Man's mortal reason cannot encompass her" and Virgil devotes a lovely two lines to her continual legendary inconstancy: "Season by season//her changes change her changes endlessly" (87-8) [translation by John Ciardi].

5. See M.E. Novak's "Commentary" to the University of California edition of All for Love (1984) for an account of the play's stage history.
6. In "Dryden's Philosophy of Fortune" (1985), Paul Hammond analyzes Dryden's use of the concept in the non-dramatic works, including the "Heroique Stanzas to Cromwell," "Astraea Redux," "Annus Mirabilis," and "Absalom and Achitophel," as well as Dryden's Latin translations. Hammond notes: "Dryden continued to make Fortune an active element in his vocabulary, so that his apparently disconnected references to Fortune actually form a series of linked thoughts" (777).

PART I:

MAN'S BATTLE
AGAINST
FORTUNE

Chapter 1

THE CHANGING FACE OF FORTUNE IN ENGLISH LITERATURE
FROM CHAUCER THROUGH SHAKESPEARE

Geoffrey Chaucer's vision of Fortuna in his poem "Balades de Visage sanz Peinture" (1390) gives the clearest picture of the medieval version of this deity. He presents a debate between "Le Pleintif countre Fortune" and the goddess herself, beginning with the speaker's complaint:

This wrecced worldes transmutacioun,
As wele or wo, now povre and now honour,
Withouten ordre or wys discrecioun
Governed is by Fortunes errour (1-4).

Chaucer sets up a series of opposites in his evocation of the "worldes transmutacioun," and the swing from "wele" to "wo" is the up and down of Fortune's wheel, just as "povre" followed by "honour" defines the top and bottom of man's possible career in this world; the next set of nouns describes two qualities which Fortune lacks: "ordre" and "wys discrecioun." Most medieval complaints against Fortune contain this description by negatives;¹ in fact, one could say that Fortune is usually characterized not by what she is but by what we are missing. The ubi sunt lament and the quantum mutatus speeches of elegy and epic are both variant addresses to Fortune.

Chaucer's poem stands out in the early literature of Fortune because, as in Boethius's Consolation of Philosophy

(which Chaucer translated into English between 1370-80), the goddess answers in her own defense, disclaiming responsibility for human misery. She says, "No man is wreeched, but himself it wene." Much like the God in his answer to Job, Fortune argues that the goods of the world are not man's to possess in the first place. Fortune can give and take them back again as she pleases; she counsels her plaintiff to rely on his own virtue.

In fact, of the many definitions of "Fortune" in the Oxford English Dictionary, half of the citations of "fortune" as a verb and one third those for the noun use quotations from Chaucer's work. In the Canterbury Tales (c 1380), such as "The Monk's Tale," Chaucer draws on the de casibus tradition of Fortune, depicting her as an arbitrary and dangerous ruler of man's affairs and cautioning that man should not rely on her favors because they are ephemeral. But Chaucer's Troilus and Criseide (1385) gives another portrait of Fortune, based on the nautical version of the deity as Martin Stevens shows in his article on "The Winds of Fortune in the Troilus" (1977). Here, "the poem is dramatically and poetically supported by adaptations of the favorite medieval metaphor in which a capricious Fortune blows her winds against the sails of a boat traversing the sea of life" (286).

By contrast, Spenser limits his mention of Fortune the goddess by name in the Faerie Queene (1596), even though she

is the traditional deity reigning over the affairs of knights errant in romance literature. When his knights begin "accusing fortune, and too cruell fate" (as each of them does in every book from I-VI), it is a sure bet that they are headed down the wrong path, to the Woods of Error or the Cave of Mammon or the House of Busirane. The knights must realize that Fortune, like Duessa and Archimago, is false, and only God should be their guide.

Spenser also uses the word "fortune" as a verb, "It fortunéd...", when introducing a new adventure for his knights. Chance is their method of advance and also the main source of impetus for the action in all of the stories, so Fortune rules their lives on the temporal level.

In a key passage in Book I, canto viii, Una mentions the goddess by name: Prince Arthur has defeated both Duessa and the giant Orgoglio, and when he releases the weakened Red Cross Knight from his dungeon, Una, the personification of the one right Church, cries out,

But welcome now my Lord, in wele or woe,
Whose presence I have lackt too long a day;
And fie on Fortune mine avowed foe,
Whose wrathfull wreakes them selves do now alay. (43)

Although like Chaucer Spenser uses the same formula of "wele" to "woe" for the range of Fortune's wheel, he sees the goddess as the force behind worldly success or failure and the "avowed foe" of the true Church.

In his Christian poem, Spenser uses many aspects of Fortune under different names: There is Mammon in Book II, canto vii, the "God of the world and worldlings" (8) who tries to tempt Sir Guyon into his service with an argument taken straight from Boethius's *Fortuna*:

Do not I kings create, and throw the crowne
Sometimes to him, that low in dust doth ly?
And him that raignd, into his rowme thrust downe,
And whom I lust, do heape with glory and renowe? (11)

In addition, Spenser's two Mutability Cantos contain a vivid depiction of Fortune in the person of Mutability, a goddess who addresses Nature, her judge in an assembly of the gods. Mutability in Spenser is the force of change and decay in the world, associated with Time and Death. As such, the goddess claims sovereignty over all the universe, and her argument for omnipotence is as carefully reasoned as any lawyer's defense. She demonstrates that the four elements and the creatures in them, even the gods themselves, change and are subject to birth and decay over time.

Like Chaucer's Fortune, Spenser's Mutability complains that she is not appreciated by men for the good she accomplishes: change is the basis of life itself, after all. She concludes:

Then since within this wide great Universe
Nothing doth firme and permanent appeare,
But all things tost and turned by transverse:
What then should let, but I aloft should reare
My Trophee, and from all, the triumph beare? (vii,
456).

Nature does not agree. She claims a wider time frame for

her judgment and points out that from an eternal perspective things change to remain the same: Mutability is subject to Nature and must be content to be ruled until the Day of Judgment when all changes will cease.

Mutability in Spenser encompasses the Christian idea that evil came into the world with the Fall of Adam and will leave with the Day of Judgment.² Death and decay are a judgment on man that he must endure; but, as Spenser's speaker notes in the final Mutability Canto viii, these changes in life encourage man to look beyond the things of this world to the divine and unchanging world of God. Though the poet cannot often invoke Fortune by name, he can, through the guise of characters from the Old Testament, such as Mammon, and the Book of Revelations, such as Mutability, introduce Fortune's attributes. Spenser's allegories show the many faces of Fortune and the extent to which the Renaissance assimilated the concept into its religious, political and social mythologies.

One might expect that the tradition of Fortune in English literature ended here, and that Mutability became the new face of the goddess, but in fact the drama continued the tradition of Fortune through the translation and adaptation of Senecan tragedy. Thus, early English drama inherited both the de casibus tradition of Chaucer as well as the Christian view that the fall on the wheel of Fortune is a type of the fall of man. In addition, the idea of

Fortune as the goddess of romantic tragedy (e.g., Robert Wilmot's Gismond of Salerne, 1566-8)³ comes forward in works based on the continental novelle.⁴

While many early dramatic works in English literature invoke Fortune as a principal theme, in a number of plays, she appears incarnate as an allegorical character. In the Index of Characters in English Printed Drama to the Restoration (1975) Berger and Bradford list twenty-one dramatic works in which Fortune appears as a character. Most of the works are masques and entertainments, such as George Peele's Descensus Astraea (1591), which celebrates the return of the Golden Age and the end of the reign of Fortune with the accession of Elizabeth I. Also, in 1604 Thomas Dekker's Entertainment through London marks the entry of the new king, James I, into London with an elaborate triumphal arch,⁵ in which Fortune is represented as one of the minions of the new king, who can control her because of his great strength of character.

Clearly, many different traditions are woven together in the literary works that use the theme of Fortune, and the English drama of the Renaissance is the best example of this Turkish carpet of literary traditions. Don Cameron Allen notes in his article "Renaissance Remedies for Fortune" (1941): "Among the humanists and literary men of the Renaissance there appears to be no unanimity in regards to either the nature of fortune or her remedies" (189). For

example, because of the de casibus association with Fortune one might think that she appears only in tragedy, but in fact of the two full-length dramas of note in the early works where Fortune appears as a character, one is a tragedy, the Jocasta (1566) of George Gascoigne and Francis Kimwelmarsch, but the other is one of the most popular of Elizabethan comedies, Thomas Dekker's Old Fortunatus (1599).⁶

Like the figure of the theater, Fortune can bring a laughing or a weeping face to man;⁷ indeed, one of the first theaters in Elizabethan times was named the Fortune, built in Cripplegate in 1600 by Peter Street, who also built the Globe.⁸

Christopher Marlowe's tragic heroes, such as Tamburlaine and Barabas, illustrate the re-emergence of Fortune in Renaissance drama; they are Fortune's favorites.⁹ These men are driven by their will to power, and as such they are examples of the gradual internalizing of Fortune in Renaissance literature. Stephen Greenblatt analyzed Marlowe's plays in Chapter Five of Renaissance Self-Fashioning (1980), and he concluded that "Marlowe's heroes struggle to invent themselves; they stand, in Coriolanus's phrase, 'As if a man were author of himself/And knew no other kin' (5.3.36-7) " (212). Indeed, the process of "self-fashioning" which Greenblatt traces in Renaissance literature, and the drama in particular, is part of the

internalization of Fortune, a process where Fortune becomes an aspect of the personal psychology more than a force extraneous to the individual.

There are many other uses of the tradition of Fortune in the tragedies of the period, both romantic, as when Webster's *Duchess of Malfi* calls herself "fortune" in her makeshift marriage ceremony, and political, where Ben Jonson divides his characters in *Sejanus* (1603) into two groups: those who follow the whims of the fickle goddess Fortune and those who have a Stoic sense of virtue.¹⁰

The goddess Fortuna is central to the tragedies of Seneca (ca. 4 B.C. - A.D. 65) and his Renaissance imitators, who include Christopher Marlowe, George Chapman, Thomas Kyd, Ben Jonson, and William Shakespeare, as well as the Countess of Pembroke and her circle. Fortune is the named tormentor of the protagonists in these dramas. Elizabethan heroes such as Bussy D'Ambois and Hamlet pace the stage and review their pasts while complaining to Fortune. They sing the ubi sunt lament, consider revenge, and analyze their past actions in an attempt to discover the path which Fortune has cut out for them. Recognizing Fortune and her limits is one of the key moments of anagnorisis in these plays.

Ten of Seneca's plays survived to be translated into English in 1581 by Thomas Newton.¹¹ In his study of "King Lear" and the Gods (1968), W.R. Elton notes that "Seneca, transmitting the idea of fortune and the truth of existence

as uncertain, bequeathed also to Renaissance drama a Stoic sense of fatalism which ran counter to the conception of providence" (12). But between Seneca's original plays and his Renaissance imitators there lies a large body of philosophical and theological writing that had its own effect on the literary tradition of Fortune.

The most important single work to define the iconography of Fortune for the Middle Ages is Boethius's Consolation of Philosophy (524 A.D.). H.R. Patch notes in his study The Tradition of Boethius (1935), "It is hardly an exaggeration to say that in the Consolatio all the details of the conventional portrait of Fortune in medieval literature found a beginning. One cannot hope to stop her wheel; if the goddess cease to be fickle, she ceases to be Fortune; she puts one up, another down; ideas like these in great number were first expressed for the Middle Ages by Boethius, and then passed round in common currency" (96).

In Renaissance Senecan imitation, we have two discernible kinds of Fortune: both the original Stoic philosopher's concern with human destiny and Boethius's later work describing the goddess in anthropomorphic detail pictured as "blind" and "unpredictable" in opposition to the goddess Philosophy who is far-sighted and constant and who will help man overcome despair in the face of Fortune's sudden disasters. As Patch points out in his study, the Machiavellian concept of Fortune as a force in political

affairs that men must counter with their virtu or will-power and reason is a distortion of Boethian ideas of man's struggle against the goddess. Philosophy's final answer to the black aspect of Fortune is the power of cosmic love and a renunciation of the desires of the individual, hardly the Machiavellian ideal. Here, Patch notes the affiliation of Boethius with Dante in the Paradiso and the Vita Nuova:

"With Dante as with Boethius the love that is common to all is the love which turns the sun and the other stars" (121).

Boethius in his prison cell questions Fortune in much the same manner as his Senecan counterparts, but with a difference. While the Stoicism of Seneca shares its themes of exile and rational answers to suffering with Boethius's battle against the despair over bad Fortune, by contrast it centers on the ability of the individual, or his inability, to cope especially when faced with the irrational injustices of the world.

Many of Seneca's dramas center on families cursed by the gods; these men and women have done nothing more terrible than to be born under an unlucky name. Violent and sensational situations from Greek tragedy and mythology are the stock-in-trade of the Senecan drama, where Fortune is indeed "outrageous" in her score of bloody, awful deeds against the innocent.¹² As noted above, examples of Senecan imitation outside the blue-stocking school of the Countess of Pembroke include Shakespeare's Titus Andronicus (1594) as

well as Hamlet (1600-1) and the chronicle plays, Ben Jonson's Sejanus (1603), George Chapman's Bussy D'Ambois (1604), Cyril Tourneur's The Revengers Tragoedy (1607), and John Webster's The Duchess of Malfi (1613-4), all works in which the final scene presents a stage littered with dead bodies. But before the grand finales, the heroes examine in detail the choices left to them by their miserable fates.

Many critics of Seneca and his imitators have noted that the definition of self is the main purpose of his protagonists' many soliloquies against Fortune. In order to discover the core of the ego, Seneca requires total isolation. Descartes' stripping of all external appurtenances in his solitary meditations in the Discourse on Method (1637) to come to his cogito is a direct descendant of French Senecanism.¹³

In "Shakespeare and the Stoicism of Seneca" (1942), T.S. Eliot persuasively notes that the most striking Senecan element in Shakespeare's plays is a "new attitude" in his great tragedies: "It is the attitude of self-dramatization assumed by some of Shakespeare's heroes at moments of tragic intensity" (38). Eliot gives the famous example of Othello "cheering himself up" after he discovers his mistake in killing Desdemona for adultery: Othello recalls that he has done some service for the Venetian government and tells the story of a "turban'd Turk" who "beat a Venetian and slander'd the state" (V, ii, 353-4). Othello makes the

story real by performing his "service" of killing the "traitorous dog" right in front of his audience. By stabbing himself with the word "thus," he performs a double act of theater, transforming himself into both the traitorous dog and the avenger Othello. This drama is Othello's interpretation of his own just end.

Eliot also notes that one can find many instances of Senecan self-definition in Elizabethan tragedy. For example, he writes, "Antony says, 'I am Antony still,' and the Duchess, 'I am Duchess of Malfi still;' would either of them have said that unless Medea had said, 'Medea superest?'" (42-3). This tradition of the self-definition of characters at war with Fortune, as it descends through its Senecan imitators, shows that Dryden's concern with identity in All for Love (1678) is not as unprecedented as it first appeared.

Much has been written about the reading and translating of Seneca by the public school pupils who later became Marlowe, Kyd, Chapman, and Shakespeare.¹⁴ The past ten years of literary criticism have shown a renewed interest in Seneca and, as Coburn Freer notes, one should not consider Seneca's plays obscure and stuffy because of their description as "closet" dramas. Historically, the name "closet" drama refers to the private place where one goes to read and contemplate these dramas, as opposed to the public glare of the theater where one would go to see the plays of

Shakespeare and his fellow playwrights. As such it is an appropriate name for Senecan drama and its strict imitators, such as the Countess of Pembroke's Antonie and Samuel Daniel's Tragedy of Cleopatra: the scene of their plays is that vast hortus conclusus of the Elizabethan mind with its exotic flowerbeds of hybrid philosophy and home-grown theology. The human mind is also the subject of Senecan tragedy.¹⁵

The French Senecan drama, which the Countess of Pembroke translated, was stylized and seems stilted to our modern sensibility, but it followed what she considered to be the "authentic" style of the ancients. However, as Marlowe demonstrated in his characterizations of Fortune's favorites in his plays, the chief glory of Senecan drama is its exploration of extreme states of human emotion; he showed that the Senecan rant could become a dramatic tool of psychological insight. But whatever their differences and their strengths, both the French and the English schools of Senecan adaptation agree that the power working against man is Fortune, and she is a hard tyrant against which to rebel.

In Shakespeare's works in particular Fortune is a key concept. Beginning with the sonnets, there are many references to Fortune as the goddess of material success and the world's evaluation of a man's worth, as in the opening of Sonnet 29, "When in disgrace with fortune and men's

eyes/I all alone beweepe my outcast state...".¹⁶ In the plays, The Merchant of Venice (1596-8) includes many references to Fortune, both as a goddess and as an abundance of worldly possessions, and multiple references also appear in the Roman plays, notably Julius Caesar (1599), where Brutus counsels Cassius to do battle against Marc Antony and Octavius with the famous image reminiscent of the winds of Fortune in Chaucer,

There is a tide in the affairs of men
Which, if taken at the flood leads on to fortune;
Omitted, all the voyage of their life
Is bound in shallows and in miseries (IV, iii, 217-9).

Again, in Antony and Cleopatra (1606-7) Fortune is named by most of the characters as the arbitress of battles in love and war. Fortune is a Roman goddess, so you might expect mention of her in the Roman plays, but she also appears in Hamlet (1600-1), where the "slings and arrows of outrageous Fortune" are precisely the facts of life which Hamlet would like to avoid.¹⁷

In fact, Shakespeare's tragedies are the richest source for a study of the theme of Fortune in English literature. When Shakespeare's audience heard a reference to Fortune, they could expect a number of quite different images and associations: first, astrology and fortune-telling by the stars is an immediate association, and one that was debated heatedly by theologians of the seventeenth century. In Lear, Edmund, a fine example of Renaissance self-fashioning,

comments on his father's astrological superstitions:

This is the excellent foppery of the world, that, when we are sick in fortune, often the surfeit of our own behaviour, we make guilty of our disasters the sun, the moon, and the stars; as if we were villains on necessity;... Fut! I should have been that I am, had the maidenliest star in the firmament twinkled on my bastardizing (I, ii, 112-126).

Also, Fortune is the deity of kings, and she rules the rights of inheritance.

As Machiavelli asserted in his Discourses on Livy's History of Rome and the more well-known Il Principe, if you are Fortune's favorite, you can count on political power as well as wealth. Machiavelli's work is also associated with man's fight against Fortune for the Elizabethans. Although his Il Principe was written in 1513 and printed in Rome in 1531, it was not translated into English until the seventeenth century. However, responses to Machiavelli's purported secular view of man in history, especially those condemning Machiavelli as a monster and practical diabolist, were translated into English as early as 1576. In the history plays, such as Henry VI (1593), the Machiavellian is the pragmatist who unseats kings; he puts his trust in his own virtu or strength of character as opposed to the more idealistic noblemen.¹⁸ For example, King Edward vows before he is deposed, "Though Fortune's malice overthrow my state,/My mind exceeds the compass of her wheel" and he is answered cynically by Warwick, "Then, for his mind, be Edward England's King;/[Takes off his crown] But Henry now

shall wear the English crown/And be true king indeed, thou but the shadow" (3. Henry VI, IV, iii, 47-50).

The de casibus tradition of Fortune also appears throughout Shakespeare's drama as late as Timon of Athens (never performed, though Irving Ribner suggests that "it was written close in time to King Lear 1606"), where the play begins with a poet describing his latest work inspired by rich and generous Timon, in which "I have upon a high and pleasant hill/Feign'd Fortune to be thron'd" (I, i, 63-7). This portrait of a favorite of Fortune foreshadows the quick and terrible bankruptcy of Timon and his friends' abandonment of him. Also, the poet's vision is echoed in the banquet-of-water scene, where Timon taunts his false friends for their insubstantiality. He calls them, among other epithets, "you fools of fortune, trencher friends, time's flies" (III, vi, 89).

Finally, Fortune appears frequently in Shakespeare's comedies. Most notably, As You Like It (1599-1600) is structured around the duality of Fortune and Nature, where Fortune rules the court and city life while Nature is the equally potent force of the "green world" of Arden.

From Chaucer through Shakespeare, Fortune holds sway over the imagination of the best writers in many guises. Shakespeare's Fortune is not Chaucer's goddess, though both authors use the same word, and both work in the same language and literary traditions. One reason for this

difference is historical: the medieval version of Fortune does not include the Senecan sense of Fortune as a doom that man must nobly endure, a tragic vision the Elizabethans incorporated into their drama.

But is the different treatment of Fortune in Chaucer and Shakespeare more a question of their difference in historical context, or is it more a question of the interpretation of Fortune by the author himself? Or, is the author responding to the aesthetic set of the text? For example, both Chaucer and Shakespeare wrote versions of the legend of Troilus and Cressida, where the Fortune of Love is a reasonable deity to blame for Cressida's betrayal, as is the case in both Chaucer and Boccaccio and most any other source that Shakespeare could have encountered. But Shakespeare omits Fortune from the couple's tragedy; the goddess is mentioned in association with Achilles, who notes that "Fortune and I are friends" (III, iii, 88).

It is essential to recognize the dramatic function of Fortune within its particular context. Often Shakespeare uses a reference to Fortune to characterize a certain situation or an individual speaker, as with Achilles's boast mentioned above; also, his villains, such as Edmund in King Lear and Iago in Othello, often declare themselves against Fortune and as authors of their own destiny.

In the later works of Shakespeare, the darker side of the individual is emerging. We see it in Macbeth (1605-6),

where the question of Fate or man's choice becomes much more problematical than any other play: do the witches see the future or does Macbeth make that future happen through his decision to kill Duncan?¹⁹ In the later romances, Shakespeare shows the hell of mind that Leontes suffers when he trusts only himself and does not regard the good of society and his kingdom. Fortune becomes a symbol of Justice in these later plays.

But these lists do not answer the question why is it that when Shakespeare's characters invoke Fortune they sound so much less wooden than their predecessors in drama? I think part of the answer lies in seeing Shakespeare as a transitional writer in the tradition of Fortune. In early Renaissance drama, Fortune is a power that limits the freedom of the individual, and though Shakespeare celebrates that freedom in his comedies and shows the heroic side of the solitary in his tragedies, he is ambivalent about the limits of the man-as-God heroes, such as Marlowe's Tamburlaine. In Shakespeare's plays it is questionable whether man can win his battle against Fortune.

* * * * *

1. See Barbara Bartholomew's Fortuna and Natura: A Reading of Three Chaucer Narratives (1966) for an analysis of these allegorical figures in the "Physician's Tale," the "Clerk's Tale" and the "Knight's Tale." Also, John Dryden "translated" Chaucer's "Knight's Tale" into heroic couplets in his Fables, Ancient and Modern (1700); see Paul Hammond's article "Dryden's Philosophy of Fortune" (1985) for a study of Dryden's version of Fortune in Chaucer.

2. See Willard Farnham's The Medieval Heritage of Elizabethan Tragedy (1936), 85ff: "The power of Fortune came into being because of Adam's and Eve's disobedience to God.... This first Fall of Man made possible the later falls of princes. Through that first Fall all miseries entered this world of ours, all misfortunes."
3. In Chapter 5 of Fortune and Elizabethan Tragedy (1983) Frederick Kiefer analyzes the tradition of Fortune and Love in romantic tragedies such as Robert Wilmot's Gismond of Salerne and Soliman and Perseda, wherein is laid open, Love's constancy, Fortune's inconstancy, and Death's triumphs (c. 1588-92) ascribed to Thomas Kyd.
4. Fortune is allied with the allegorical figures of Love and Time again and again in the early English drama. Nature is sometimes her adversary, but as with Time and Death, Fortune is always a goddess to be overcome by the higher virtues in man, especially Honour. In particular, romantic tragedy is defined by a conjunction of three allegorical forces joined together against man: Love, Death and Fortune. In Studies in Iconology: Humanistic Themes in the Art of the Renaissance (1962), Erwin Panofsky notes that the iconography of Love, Death and Fortune is often the same: "These three were blind not only as personifications of an unenlightened state of mind, or of a lightless form of existence, but also as personifications of an active force behaving like an eyeless person: they would hit or miss at random, utterly regardless of age, social position and individual merit" (112).
5. D.J. Gordon describes both Dekker's and Jonson's Entertainments through London for James I and the iconography of their respective triumphal arches in the essay "Roles and Mysteries" in The Renaissance Imagination (1975).
6. The comic plot of Old Fortunatus reveals yet another face of Fortune. Here, she is a bestower of magic gifts that test the imagination and judgment of the recipient, a motif common in picaresque romance. Fortune's legacy here is most clearly traceable in the modern novel. H.R. Patch notes an early connection with the picaresque in The Goddess Fortuna in Medieval Literature: "Ventura or Aventure [the French word for 'chance' or 'the chances'] is a name that at one time threatened to replace the name Fortuna" (39).
7. Leo Salinger's study of Shakespeare and the Traditions of Comedy (1974) devotes two chapters to the historical development of Fortune in classical through Renaissance drama, and he notes: "Not only does the working out of the plot take primacy among the factors Aristotle examines in a tragedy, but the idea of the wheel of Fortune is crucial to his analysis of the complex plot, the type he most approves.... [Indeed,]

- 'changes of fortune' remained at the center of definitions of drama down to Dryden's time" (148-9).
8. Frances Yates's Theatre of the World (1969) contains a description of the Fortune Theatre (93ff).
 9. Don Cameron Allen places Marlowe's heroes in the tradition of the fortunati of Italian Renaissance literature because Marlowe's heroes are "men fortunate by Nature.... They violate all the dictates of reason and prudence, and yet they never fail" ("Renaissance Remedies" 192).
 10. See Gary D. Hamilton's "Irony and Fortune in Sejanus" (1971), where he argues that "The presence of Fortune [in Sejanus] becomes, in effect, a device used for exposing the evils in a society whose actions are based upon expediency" (268).
 11. Seneca's plays are: Agamemnon, Hercules Furens, Hercules Oetaeus, Medea, Oedipus, Phaedra, Phoenissae, Thyestes, and Troas. Many of Seneca's plays were further adaptations of Euripides' tragedies, which had another tradition of Fortune as ruler over men's affairs. See Malcolm Heath The Poetics of Greek Tragedy (1987), 157ff on "Tragic Wisdom."
 12. See Gordon Braden's Renaissance Tragedy and the Senecan Tradition (1985), Chapter I "Stoicism and Empire" and Chapter II "Senecan Tragedy."
 13. In The Tremulous Private Body (1984) Francis Barker notes the similarities between Hamlet's "desire to refine away the insistent materiality of the body" (40) and Descartes' newfound "self-consciousness" (59) in the Discourse, but Barker argues that this seventeenth-century preoccupation with the duality of mind/body introduces a new kind of subjectivity, where the idea is "for the subject to apprehend itself as Other" (56).
 14. See H. B. Charlton The Senecan Tradition in Renaissance Tragedy (1921), Eugene M. Waith The Herculean Hero in Marlowe, Chapman, Shakespeare and Dryden (1962), Marilyn Williamson Infinite Variety: Antony and Cleopatra in Renaissance Drama and Earlier Tradition (1974), Timothy J. Reiss Tragedy and Truth: Stories in the Development of Renaissance and Neoclassical Discourse (1980) and Gordon Braden's Renaissance Tragedy and the Senecan Tradition: Anger's Privilege (1985).
 15. In a recent study of Renaissance Tragedy and the Senecan Tradition: Anger's Privilege (1985), Gordon Braden finds two separate lines of descent of Senecan tragedy through the Renaissance drama of France and England: "Along one line, culminating in Descartes and Corneille, the Senecan self bids for a triumphant harmony with its surroundings; along another,

culminating in Montaigne and Shakespeare, the self's ambitions are compromised in a new sense of distant inwardness" (2-3). Braden's hypothesis is clearly based on the idea that Senecan tragedy is the tragedy of self-definition, and the two lines of Renaissance adaptations are both defined by the subject/object relations of mind/world that the protagonists come to before their deaths.

A.M. Witherspoon had earlier made a different distinction between the English and French Senecan imitators of the Renaissance. He writes in The Influence of Robert Garnier on Elizabethan Drama (1924): "It is noteworthy that whereas the dramas of Seneca had influenced the blood-and-thunder playwrights of England, and had made their chief appeal to the groundlings in the pit, the plays of Garnier appealed to the tastes of the bluestockings, and became a criterion of elegance in dramatic composition" (71).

16. In Maynard Mack's "Antony and Cleopatra: The Stillness and the Dance" (1973), he notes Shakespeare's use of themes of Fortune and Love in his sonnets.
17. Raymond Chapman has an article on "The Wheel of Fortune in Shakespeare's History Plays" (RES, I 1950, 1-7). In The Living Monument: Shakespeare and the Theatre of his Time (1976), M.C. Bradbrook notes the theme of Fortune in Othello, Coriolanus and Antony and Cleopatra. Leo Salingar notes the Fortune as trickster motif in Shakespeare's comedies in his Shakespeare and the Traditions of Comedy. Stanley J. Kozilowsky has an article on "The Allegory of Love and Fortune: The Lottery in the Merchant of Venice" (Renascence: Essays on Values in Literature, 1980, V32 N2: 105-115). In Fortune and Elizabethan Tragedy, Frederick Kiefer devotes Chapter 7 to a study of Fortune in Richard II, Julius Caesar and Hamlet, Chapter 8 to a comparison of Fortune in Jonson's Sejanus and Shakespeare's Lear, and Chapter 9 to Fortune in Timon and Antony and Cleopatra.
18. See Hanna F. Pitkin's Fortune is a Woman (1986), where Chapter 6 is devoted entirely to a historical examination of how Machiavelli's idea of Fortune changed the concept for Renaissance man.
19. See G.R. Elliott Dramatic Providence in "Macbeth" (1958).

Chapter 2

THE COUNTESS OF PEMBROKE'S "ANTONIE:"
The Prison-House of Fortune

In the early traditions of Fortune, the goddess is a tyrant, the ruler of all earthly things, and she holds man as a prisoner to her will. This willfulness is symbolized by a wheel, and sometimes the iconography of Fortune shows man in chains, held in the dungeon beneath her turning wheel, or enthroned at the top.

Besides this tradition of the prison-house of Fortune, Renaissance literature is steeped in the literature of man as prisoner and slave, as is evident in much of the poetry and prose of the period. One reason for this continued tradition is the common practice of imprisonment and execution of political enemies to the state in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries: Queen Elizabeth herself spent many years of her adolescence in prison, and many of the most influential statesmen ended their lives in the Tower.

The Renaissance dramatist's inquiry into Fortune and her hold on man's life centers around the question, "Is man free, or is he a puppet?" This is why the prison motif is so often employed by the playwrights; as Hamlet recognizes, all men are prisoners of their own bodies, their ethereal spirits are trapped in the corruptible, earthly materials of flesh and blood. Fortune is the ruler of all earthly

things, especially the body, in Renaissance philosophy as can be seen in the descriptions of her in the emblem books, the masques and the plays, where she describes her own domain.¹ If man becomes a slave to ambition or a pursuer of pleasure for pleasure's sake, he has become a slave to Fortune, but paradoxically the definition of greatness in this world also depends on the favors of Fortune.

As with the English kings and their masques proclaiming their respective triumphs over Fortune, each hero must define the boundaries of Fortune and take control over his own life. However, this liberation from Fortune is not merely a personal achievement. Ernst Cassirer notes in his chapter on "Freedom and Necessity in the Philosophy of the Renaissance" in The Individual and the Cosmos in Renaissance Philosophy (1927) that the necessity of astrological causality is questioned in the Renaissance and denied by such philosophers as Marsilio Ficino and Pico della Mirandola because of their belief in man's power over Fortune: "The astrological vision of the world was overcome, essentially, neither by empirical and scientific reasons, nor by new methods of observation and of mathematical calculation.... The agent of liberation was not the new view of nature but the new view of the value of humanity. The power of Fortuna is confronted with the power of Virtus" (120).

Fortune, the lady tyrant, and especially the Fortune of

Senecan tragedy, had a particular appeal for the Elizabethans; its depiction of violent and irrational forces ruling the world mirrored the English world of conflict and bloodshed. At the same time, Seneca's Stoic emphasis on the powers of the individual offered some hope for freedom from the prison-house of Fortune.

In the Countess of Pembroke's translation of Garnier's Marc Antoine, Antony's first soliloquy of lament, "Since cruel Heaven's against me obstinate...", begins the ubiquitous theme of captivity and man as prisoner and enemy of Fortune.² Antony is like Prometheus chained to the stones and tormented by the gods, but Antony is quick to acknowledge that the "fire" he let loose is not the creative fire of the gods but the destructive fire of his passion for Cleopatra.

Because the action of Garnier's play opens after the battle of Actium and the final betrayal of the Egyptian fleet in the harbor of Alexandria, both Antony and Cleopatra are threatened with actual imprisonment by the approach of Octavius Caesar's soldiers, but they are still physically free. Nevertheless, their language is replete with references to "chains" and "bonds" and images of captivity and ensnarement. Lack of liberty and the question "is man free?" is central to Garnier's tragedy. Compared to images of freedom and captivity, images of love are less frequent throughout the play, even in Antony's and Cleopatra's

complaints against one another.

One question that both Antony and Cleopatra persist in asking in their long, solitary meditations on imprisonment is who or what has captured them and holds them prisoner? Both of them are sure it is not Octavius Caesar. In his first soliloquy, Antony exclaims in contempt,

Have Caesar fortune and the Gods his friends,
To him have love and the fatal sisters given
The Scepter of the earth: he never shall
Subject my life to his obedience (39-43).

And later he complains, "Yet if to bring my glory to the ground,/Fortune had made me overthrown by one/Of greater force, of better skill than I,... The less her wrong, the less should be my woe" (1079-1092). Antony goes so far as to describe Caesar as "A man... Who fears the field, and hides him cowardly/Dead at the very noise the soldiers make... His arms the arts that false Ulysses used" (1097-1105). Cleopatra also sees Caesar as the puppet of larger forces working against herself and Antony. She tells her maids,

My face too lovely caused my wretched case.
My face hath so entrapped, to cast us down,
That for his conquest Caesar may it thank (431-3).

Like Antony, Cleopatra believes Fortune is her captor and tormentor. After her lover's death, she cries out, "Was there ever one/By fortune's hate into more dolours thrown?" (1887-8).

Only Octavius believes that he is the captor of Antony and Cleopatra and the ruler of Fortune. In Act IV, Octavius claims, "Yet at this day this proud exalted Rome/Despoil'd, captiv'd, at one man's will doth bend:/Her Empire mine" (1358-60). But Octavius is in a frenzy of power, and he continues his rant of victory with the wild claim, "As Monarch I both world and Rome commaund;/Do all, can all... bestowing by my word/Happs and mishappes, as Fortunes King and Lord" (1361-5). Immediately Octavius's claims of omnipotence are undercut by his general Agrippa, who shows throughout the scene that he is in fact Octavius's lord: every time Octavius mentions his own ideas about how Antony and Cleopatra should be handled as rebel leaders Agrippa has a more practical idea that Octavius finally agrees to follow. For example, Octavius swears that he "must" kill both Antony and Cleopatra, but Agrippa counsels moderation, and again when Octavius wants to indulge in his grief for Antony on learning of his death, Agrippa reminds him that Cleopatra should be his main concern now because she is alive and capable of destroying both her palace and herself. Octavius responds by drying his tears and running to stop Cleopatra. So much for "Fortunes king and lord." In the play, Octavius's dependence on his messengers and generals for all his information about the world outside his tent shows how much of a captive he himself is.

The idea of Fortune as captor of man's earthly self,

and the world as a prison which man cannot escape except through death is a commonplace of the Renaissance both in French and English literature (and of classical drama, especially the tragedies of Euripides, Seneca's models).³ Boethius also uses these images of captivity in his Consolatio (Book II, Prose I), where Philosophy counsels, "Finally, once you have submitted yourself to [Fortune's] chains, you ought to take calmly whatever she can do to you" (22). Paradoxically, Philosophy argues that it is only when man is in actual prison that he is free from the chains of Fortune because then he sees the true nature of the goddess. In Act III of Pembroke's play, Lucilius, a friend of Antony's, uses the same imagery of chains and bondage to describe how Fortune uses the battleground as her playground: In battle, Fortune is accustomed to "Rule all, do all, have all things fast enchained/Unto the circle of her turning wheel" (1125-6). Lucilius also gives Antony advice right out of Boethius's Consolatio, though the translation is somewhat confused in syntax by Pembroke's desire to compress as much philosophical profundity as she can into poetic language, a medium which resists her sententiousness:

Men in their friendship ever should be one,
 And never ought with fickle Fortune shake,
 Which still removes, nor will, nor knowes the way,
 Her rowling bowle in one sure state to staie.
 Wherefore we ought as borrow'd things receive
 The goods light she lends us to pay againe:
 Not hold them sure, nor on them build our hopes
 As one such goods as cannot faile, and fall:

But thinke againe, nothing is dureable,
Vertue except, our never failing host (980-9).

This verse combines a number of Boethius's arguments into one tumultuous paragraph. The actual passages from the Consolatio are much more coherent than the Countess's blank verse medley. Lucilius's idea that "friendship" is man's best remedy against the inconstancy of Fortune is better stated in Boethius as Philosophy presents the good side of misfortune,

Fortune has separated your true friends from two-faced ones; when she left you, she took her followers with her and left you your own. Think how much you would have given for this knowledge when you were still on top and thought yourself fortunate. Now you complain of lost riches; but you have found your friends, and that is the most precious kind of wealth (41).

Also, Pembroke's "rowing bowle" of Fortune is her version of Fortune's wheel conflated with the idea of man as sport of the gods. In a parallel passage, Boethius's Philosophy argues in the guise of Fortune:

Here is the source of my power, the game I always play:
I spin my wheel and find pleasure in raising the low to
a high place and lowering those who were on top. Go
up, if you like, but only on condition that you will
not feel abused when my sport requires your fall (24).

Corresponding to the Countess's idea of the things of this world as "borrow'd" and lent to man by Fortune, in the Consolatio Philosophy presents Fortune's argument that "if you can prove that riches and honors really belong to any mortal man, I will freely concede your ownership of the things you ask for" (23). Then, in Lucilius's final idea of

"Vertue" as man's most important asset against Fortune's changeability, he is echoing Philosophy's later argument, "Why then do men look outside themselves for happiness which is within?.... If you possess yourself, you have something you will never want to give up and something which Fortune cannot take from you" (29). Clearly, the Countess's theme of man as captive on the wheel of Fortune is based on Boethius's philosophical vision.

However, Pembroke's translation uses other ideas of man's enslavement to Fortune and the things of this world. Another topos she employs is the Christian ideal of contemptus mundi, or the idea that real happiness comes from total renunciation of the things of this world. As noted above, another version of life as captivity uses the image of man's free spirit pent up in a prison of flesh, best described in Hamlet's words, "O that this too too solid flesh would melt, /Thaw, and resolve itself into a dew!" (I, ii, 129-130). Frederick Kiefer notes in Fortune and Elizabethan Tragedy (1983) the importance of Fortune as the goddess who controls the world of the flesh, and Hamlet describes her vividly in his "To be or not to be..." soliloquy, where he says that the alternative to suicide, continuing to exist, would entail subjecting oneself to "the slings and arrows of outrageous Fortune" (III, i, 58).

The most striking image of imprisonment in Elizabethan tragedy is Bajazeth in a cage in Part I of Marlowe's

Tamburlaine. The play was first printed in 1590, two years before the Countess published her Antonie, and, as mentioned above, Pembroke chose Garnier's style as a correction to the vulgar, indecorous drama of the time. She saw the fine symmetries and philosophic questioning of Garnier's Senecan drama as a better way of expressing Seneca's tragic passion than the blood-soaked stages of such unwieldy tragedies as Marlowe's Tamburlaine or Thomas Kyd's Spanish Tragedy (1585).

The problem of presenting Bajazeth's situation is one of dramatic decorum; like Hieronymo's mad raving and killings in earnest before an audience, Bajazeth's suicide is hard to depict on-stage without approaching the ridiculous. Bajazeth was the emperor of the Turks, but after his army lost to Tamburlaine Bajazeth and his queen were too proud to bow down before their captor. Tamburlaine put them in a cage and displayed them at feasts as symbols of his great power. To intensify the parallel between Bajazeth's plight and the common man, Tamburlaine seriously believes he "turns Fortunes wheel in his hands," and nothing in Part I of the play contradicts this conceit. As Fortune incarnate and captor of Bajazeth, Tamburlaine throws bones to Bajazeth and his queen at feasts as if they were his pet lions. The captive king rages against this inhuman treatment and finally concludes that the only escape is death, and he literally dashes his brains out against the

bars of his cage, and his wife, seeing what he has done, immediately follows suit. Tamburlaine finds his favorite toys broken in a heap when he returns.

As Marlowe presents it, the story of Bajazeth in a cage represents the extreme version of the Elizabethan sceptic's idea of man's lot in the world as the play-thing of the gods. In Shakespeare's King Lear, Gloucester's speech, "As flies to wanton boys, are we to th' Gods;/They kill us for their sport" (IV, i, 36-7) sums up this attitude most succinctly. Sir Philip Sidney, the Countess of Pembroke's brother, used another image in his Arcadia: men are "fortune's tennis balls."⁴ In "King Lear and the Gods" W.R. Elton notes the force and frequency in Renaissance literature of this "topos of man, viewed from the perspective of the gods, sub specie ludi, as variously a trivial, ephemeral creature used for the amusement of higher powers (e.g., as fly, gilded butterfly, or caged bird); as a ball tossed in a tennis game; or as a mere player or entertainer on a stage ('this great stage of fools'), whose audience may be those higher powers" (164).

In Pembroke's play, Antony's description of himself in his opening soliloquy distinctly recalls Bajazeth: "Caged in thy hold, scarce master of thyself,/Late master of so many nations" (129-30). His complaint is followed immediately by a Chorus of Egyptians, who continue the theme of captivity, now applying it to all mankind: "Nature made

us not free/When first she made us live" (174-5). In imitation of Seneca, Garnier closes four of his five acts with a Chorus; Acts I, II and III are Choruses of Egyptians, countered in Act IV by a Chorus of Roman Soldiers, who hope for peace and a return home from this scene of violence, but they see Rome as so great in her glory that she is in danger of competing with Jove, "who angry at one blowe/may her quite overthrowe" (1791-2). The Egyptians, by contrast, voice the opinion that Death is the only freedom from this prison of life, and they blame this state of affairs on Prometheus, who stole the sacred fire and provoked the gods, so that death and especially "warre and warrs bitter cheare" became the natural state of man.⁵ Later in the play, the Chorus following Antony's final lament and decision for suicide in Act III repeats this image of Death as the only liberator of man from the prison-house of life. It should be noted here that the topos of Death as one who "all mishappes relieves" (1257) will appear again in later versions of the tragedy in Cleopatra's address to the asp.

Yet another literary tradition which Garnier's Marc Antoine employs is Love as the conqueror and cruel tyrant over man. Sonnet sequences are the richest source of this vision of Love, beginning with Petrarch and continuing through Wyatt and Surrey and Shakespeare's poetry. In Garnier's play, Philostratus, the Egyptian priest, opens Act II with an address to Egypt, and he questions how his great

country came to be under Roman captivity and to be so marked as the enemy of the gods when it was once the greatest and most pious nation. He names the instigator of this vengeance of the gods against Egypt, as Love, who "hath lost this Realme inflamed with his fire" (280).⁶ Philostratus then draws a parallel between the public fortune of Egypt and the private fortune of Antony: both have been blighted by the gods because they have allowed the passions of Love to rule them instead of law and order. Later, after Cleopatra's debate with her maids, Diomedes also compares the fire of love for Cleopatra to the lightning of Jove:

Alas! if Jove in midst of all his ire,
With thunderbolt in hand some land to plague,
Had cast his eies on my Queene, out of hand
His plaguing bolte had falne out of his hand:
Fire out of his wrath into vaine smoke should turne,
And other fire within his breast should burne. (703-8)

Besides Fortune, Love is the other goddess whom Antony and Cleopatra blame for their imprisonment.⁷ Cleopatra is most identified with Love and its attractions. In the beginning of the play, Antony's images of entrapment all refer to Cleopatra: He sees her as a witch who has cast a spell on him, a spider who has caught him in her web, a harpy who holds him in chains; later in Act III, he compares his enchantment with Cleopatra to Hercules' enchantment by Omphale, where he has hung up his lionskin and his club, lost his strength and become almost a woman.⁸ Antony accuses Cleopatra, "Thou only hast my freedom servile made"

(32). And Cleopatra initially also blames herself for Antony's failure to secure the empire. "My face too lovely caused my wretched case./My face hath so entrapped, to cast us down" (431-2).

Antony discusses with his friend Lucilius throughout Act III the true cause of his downfall. Though at first Antony agrees with Lucilius that "Fortune engulfs me in extreme distress... Casting on me mishaps upon mishap" (969-71), he amends this as they progress in their debate to "Pleasure, nought else,... Alone hath me this strange disaster spun... So I me lost" (1150-7). It is important that Antony says "Pleasure" was his conqueror, not "Love," because Pleasure is an aspect of worldly love, which Fortune rules. In his first soliloquy, Antony denied that his feelings for Cleopatra had anything to do with love, "The fire thee burnt was never Cupid's fire" (55), but in Act III, he admits, "I love, nay burn in fire of her love" (910), and when Diomede tells Antony that Cleopatra has killed herself, the messenger reports that Antony cried out,

Ah Antony! why doest thou death deferre,
 Since Fortune thy professed enimie,
 Hath made to die, who only made thee live? (1588-90).

Similarly, Cleopatra spends all of Act II debating with her maids what she should do and how she has come to such an impasse. Her maids counsel self-interest and moderation, but the maids are unsuccessful in their homely wisdom.

Cleopatra refuses to renounce her love for Antony, and retorts, "Without this love I should be inhumaine" (552). Charmian notes in exasperation, "With so strong charms doth love bewitch our wits:/So fast in us this fire once kindled flames" (593-4)

As well as the imagery of destructive fire, the imagery of "chains" and "bonds" occurs again and again in Antony and Cleopatra's discussions of love. Antony describes himself as "For love of her, in her allurements caught" (11) and Cleopatra describes Antony's sudden retreat at the battle of Actium "as if his soul/Unto his lady's soul had been enchained" (439-40). In the mythology of Love, there are many images of bondage and ensnarement, as a quick glance at Ovid's Metamorphoses shows. The most famous example is Vulcan's net in which he catches Venus and Mars in adultery, which might apply here since Antony and Cleopatra often compare themselves to the gods of Love and War.

But there are larger implications as well: All this talk of the "chains" of Love leads to the question, what makes man establish these bonds, such as marriage, but also what makes contracts of power such as the triumvirate worth maintaining? Charmian brings up this relationship between the bonds of state and the bonds of Love in her counsel to Cleopatra "T'abandon him 'gainst whom the frowning world/Banded with Caesar makes conspiring war" (563-4). In addition, Antony and Cleopatra are searching for the causal

chain that has led so inexorably to their state of isolation and their loss of power.

While Antony and Cleopatra follow their chains of causes and effects both alone and with their servants, it is noteworthy that they never speak to each other, and their isolation is the cause of their final tragedy. Cleopatra sends Diomede to Antony with the false news that she is dead, and Antony does not ask to see the bloodied sword (as Caesar would) or for any proof; he immediately believes the lie and acts upon it. Throughout the play, Antony and Cleopatra and Caesar rely on verbal reports for knowledge of what is happening in the world that is beyond their prison of self, a world in which they are unable to participate actively.

This line of inquiry brings up another group of words related to the theme of lack of liberty and captivity, that is, the repetition of the word "part," with its many cognates, both in Antony and Cleopatra's wish to "depart" from this world of sorrow and in the triumvirate's "parting" the world into three, or as Lucilius notes to Antony, "[Caesar and] You into portions parted have the world" (1006). Agrippa, Caesar's general, also speaks of the unnaturalness of the triumvirate in splitting up rulership of the world; he tells Caesar:

Mete it was
The Romain Empire so should ruled be,
As heav'n is rul'd: which turning over us,
All under things by his example turnes.

Now as of heav'n one onely Lord we know:
 One onely Lord should rule this earth below (1485-90).

The "part" cognates also include the "apartness" of the lovers and their inability to "participate" in the world. Such use of the resonance of words, or what William Empson calls "the dictionary interest in words that was so strong in the Elizabethans" (94), is an important aspect of poetry in the Renaissance.⁹

The Countess of Pembroke is invoking a set of fundamental Renaissance notions of man's relation to the universe in her constant repetition and play with the word "part." Of course, there are the obvious sexual implications of a man's "parts," a pun which proves a "fatal Cleopatra" to Shakespeare in many of his plays, but one which the Countess of Pembroke does not make explicit.

For the Countess, "part" carries more the idea of man as part of a larger whole. This philosophy is fundamental to many Renaissance concepts of man's relation to the cosmos. Ernst Cassirer points out an example in Ficino's De vita triplici, "There can be in [the world] no mere 'parts' that possess an independent existence next to and outside the whole" (110). Man is a cog in that great machine of the concordia mundi, in which all people and things have their proper place, though perhaps they don't perceive what their function might be. So again, because of the sin of Adam man knows only a part of the truth; he is not privy to God's

mysteries.¹⁰

In Pembroke's play, Charmian encourages this last reading of the whole/part dichotomy in her advice to Cleopatra:

The Gods have will'd it so...
 For us disastered men
 Which subject are in all things to their will,
 Their will is hid: nor while we live, we know
 How, or how long we must in life remaine (509-18).

Further, the pun on fragmentation in the Countess's play could refer to Antony and Cleopatra specifically: One interpretation of their hamartia is that they allow their passions, or only a part of their tripartite souls, to rule their actions instead of keeping a balance as good rulers should. Both Antony and Cleopatra come to realize that they have lost their kingdoms through their own faults. Also, both refer to themselves as "remnants" or pieces of their former selves, flotsam washed up on the beach after the storm of Fortune has passed. Antony cries out after his fleet betrays him at Alexandria, "What waite I for that have no refuge left,/But am sole remnant of my fortune left?" (III, 868-9) and Cleopatra laments after Antony's death in somewhat disjointed syntax:

O cruell fortune! o accursed lot!...
 Unhappie Queene! o would I in this world
 The wandring light of day had never seene?
 Alas!of mine the plague and poison I
 The crowne have lost my ancestors me left,
 This Realme I have to strangers subject made,
 And robd my children of their heritage (V, 1793-1806).

Further, those critics who see the action of the play

as culminating in the cosmic marriage of Antony and Cleopatra will see them as two "parts" of one whole, coming together at last in death. Pembroke's Cleopatra seems to encourage this reading when she vows to her maids that she will never leave Antony on her own,

I am with thee [Antony], be it thy worthy soul
Lodge in my breast, or from that lodging part
Crossing the joyless lake to take her place
In place prepared for men demigods....
Dead and alive, Antony, thou shalt see
Thy princess follow thee, follow, and lament (538-43).

In another variation of the theme, every man has his "part" to play in the theatrum mundi, and Cleopatra uses this analogy when she says of Antony at Actium,

He left his men, who so couragiously
Did leave their lives to gaine him victorie,
And carelesse both of fame and armies losse
My oared Gallies follow'd with his ships,
Companion of my flight, by this base part
Blasting his former flourishing renown (441-6).

In this sense, "part" is also an allusion to the tradition of Fortune in the Greek idea of "Moiras," or literally man's portion in life.¹¹

Besides continuing the theme of captivity with different notions of fragmentation and man's alienation from the world and the gods, Pembroke also uses imagery of following and leading. This imagery prefigures the threat of Caesar's triumphal march through Rome, where Cleopatra will be forcibly led through the marketplace as a trophy of war, but it also has larger implications. In Antony's long opening soliloquy, he compares himself in defeat to Orestes

pursued by Furies: "he fled his fault which followed as he fled" (60), and he repeats the image of following when he describes his state of longing for Cleopatra when he has gone to war. He says, "And day and night/In watch, in sleep, her image followed thee" (107), and when he complains about Cleopatra's false love, he concludes, "In wanton love a woman thee misleads" (120). At the battle of Actium, Antony lost because he blindly followed Cleopatra when she turned her ship to retreat, and Cleopatra mentions this to her maids. She says Antony followed her "as if his soul/Unto his lady's soul had been enchained" (439-40). As a result, Cleopatra sees herself forsworn to never leave Antony, and she warns her maids, "Good friends I pray you seek not to revoke/My fixed intent of following Antony " (649-50).

Following and leading are the rhetoric of the dance, an important art-form in the Renaissance court, but it was also an integral part of the original Greek choric drama that Seneca imitated and preserved in his Latin plays. In addition, the dance is an image that characterizes the drama of Antony and Cleopatra best because of the play's two strong protagonists, both equally capable of tragic recognition, both legendary examples of their sex, and both personifying two separate empires and vastly different cultures, the West (Rome) and the East (Egypt/Byzantium). In the play, we follow a dance of opposite, and in some ways

complementary, forces.

Maynard Mack analyzes this dance motif in his essay, "Antony and Cleopatra: The Stillness and the Dance" (1973), where he states that Shakespeare's play shows us a world in motion with his many entrances and exits and changes of scenes. Mack notes, "Most striking of all, perhaps, is Shakespeare's use of the grammatical mood that, of all moods, best expresses mobility and mutability, the optative" (91).

Although dance imagery also appears in Garnier's play, his drama is driven by less dynamic concepts than Shakespeare's, as Witherspoon noted. The scenes in Antonie are static, their setting is unimportant, and the characters are always clear and rational in their speeches, as Antony shows in his first speech, which is entirely a set of conclusions based on observations:

Since cruell Heav'ns against me obstinate,
 Since all mishapps of the round engin doo
 Conspire my harme: since men, since powers divine
 Aire, earth, and Sea are all injurious:
 And that my Queene her self, in whome I liv'd,
 The Idoll of my harte, doth me pursue;
 It's meete I dye. (1-7)

In Garnier, the mood of verb most often is one of compulsion and necessity, using the auxiliary verb "must." Antony repeats, "Die, die I must" (1239) at the conclusion of his final scene, and Cleopatra tells her maids, "I will die. I will die; must not his life,/His life and death by mine be followed?" (651-2). Octavius also echoes this mood of

compulsion in his justification of his persecution of Antony and Cleopatra. "Murther we must," he tells Agrippa, "until not one we leave,/Which may hereafter us of rest bereave" (1499-1500). Finally, the Egyptian Chorus uses this language in their address to conquered Egypt: "Now thou must begin to send/Tribute of thy watry store.... We at surly face must quake/Of some Romaine madly bent, etc." (776-814). In its second lament, the Chorus calls this force of necessity "Destiny," and they conclude that Rome is also subject to this same force of fate, and "One day there will come a day/Which shall quaille thy fortunes flower [O, Rome]" (831-2).

This repeated sententia that all things must come to an end combined with Antony's and Cleopatra's insistence that they must hasten their deaths to escape the prison of life indicates that the dance that Garnier's characters are stepping through is the Dance of Death, a popular medieval image of the senselessness of life, but paradoxically also an image of the hidden patterns of life and the fortunes of all men.¹²

One moral of the danse macabre is that all men are subject to death, that we are all captives in life, not knowing how long we are sentenced to this prison of flesh, as Kathi Meyer-Baer notes in The Music of the Spheres and the Dance of Death (1970). On the continent especially, Meyer-Baer notes, "From the fourteenth century on, it is

possible to find evidence that the form of the Dance of Death was widely known and was, indeed, such a familiar phenomenon that the terms 'to perform' or 'take part in' the danse macabre were used colloquially to mean 'to die'" (298).

Most important for the study of Fortune, the image of the Dance of Death corresponds also with the image of the goddess Fortuna, who is often conflated with Death in iconography, as Patch notes: "Fortune succeeds in sometimes usurping the place of Death in the thought of the Middle Ages" (120). This conflation is not surprising since both are irrational forces of destiny. In addition their symbols, the dance and the wheel, are defined by repetition and measure: a common musical form of the Dance of Death is the rondeau, its circular form echoing the wheel of Fortune. Also, both deities have their own sense of necessity, a momentum all their own that carries their victims to an inevitable end.

Thus Garnier uses the romance trilogy of Fortune/Love/Death in his tragedy. Because of the compulsive mood of the language and the character's inability to act, the Senecan moment of self-definition is somewhat muted in this play: when Antony and Cleopatra come to their respective moments of recognition that they, not Fortune, are the instruments of their own destruction, they immediately go on to other problems, and the moment is lost.

A.M. Witherspoon suggests that Garnier did not formally finish his play because of a need for haste in its production. The play concludes abruptly and lacks a final Chorus: it ends with Cleopatra wishing to "melt" and "flow" into death with Antony. Pembroke did not furnish an ending because she saw her function as translator, not imitator, of Garnier's work.

The theme of man as captive of Fortune, and earthly Love (Pleasure) and Death as modes of the captivity of Fortune, is thus established in the first English version of the tragedy of Antony and Cleopatra. In the next chapter, we shall see how much this view of Fortune changes in the British Senecan drama of Samuel Daniel, The Tragedy of Cleopatra, which continues the story where Garnier left it at the end of his play.

* * * * *

1. See Howard R. Patch The Goddess Fortuna in Mediaeval Literature (1927), especially Chapter 1 "The Philosophy of Fortune" and Chapter 2 "Traditional Themes of Fortune in Mediaeval Literature."
2. See Francis Barker The Tremulous Private Body: Essays on Subjection (1984) for some modern reflections on the theme of captivity in Jacobean tragedy and seventeenth century philosophy.
3. See Theodore Spencer Death and Elizabethan Tragedy (1936) as well as Frederick Kiefer's Fortune and Elizabethan Tragedy (1983).
4. Also see in Webster's Duchess of Malfi: "We are merely the stars' tennis-balls, struck and bandied/Which way please them" (V, iv, 52-3).
5. See Eugene F. Rice, Jr. "The Wisdom of Prometheus" in The Renaissance Idea of Wisdom (1958), 93-123.

6. In his section on "The Don Juan Convention" in "King Lear" and the Gods (1968), W.R. Elton notes the connection between Don Juan and the myth of Prometheus in English and continental literature before Shakespeare; Elton's notes show one connection between Promethean "fire" and the "fire" of lust in Renaissance literature.
7. See Frederick Kiefer's Fortune and Elizabethan Tragedy (1983), Chapter 5 for a history of "The Tragedy of Love" and its relation to the rule of Fortune in men's lives in the Renaissance.
8. Eugene Waith notes in The Herculean Hero in Marlowe, Chapman, Shakespeare and Dryden (1962) that the new element in the Herculean tragedy is "the emphasis on the theme of love.... As we have seen, a romantic concept of love does not occur at all in the Hercules plays of Sophocles, Euripides and Seneca" (154-5).
9. Earlier in Seven Types of Ambiguity, Empson noted, "the Elizabethans minded very little about spelling and punctuation; that this must have given them an attitude to the written page entirely different from ours (the reader must continually have been left to grope for the right word); that from the comparative slowness, of reading as of speaking, that this entailed, he was prepared to assimilate words with a completeness which is now lost; that only our snobbish oddity of spelling imposes on us the notion that one mechanical word, to be snapped up by the eye, must have been intended; and that it is Shakespeare's normal method to use a newish, apparently irrelevant word, which spreads the attention thus attracted over a wide map of the ways in which it must be justified" (83-4).
10. See Stanley Cavell's Disowning Knowledge in Six Plays of Shakespeare (1987) and his meditation on The Winter's Tale, in which he notes that "The play punctuates its language with literal 'part' words" (200ff); also see W.R. Elton's section on "Take Upon's the Mystery of Things" in "King Lear" and the Gods (249-53) for sources of the Renaissance idea of man's limitations of knowledge.
11. See E.R. Dodds The Greeks and the Irrational (1964), where he notes that in Homer, "moira is still quite concretely used for, e.g., a 'helping' of meat (Od. 20.260)" (20 Note 30).
12. See Kathi Meyer-Baer's Music of the Spheres and the Dance of Death: Studies in Musical Iconology (1970), where she notes that there are "three major types of the Dance of Death: 1) Vado mori, or 'you shall die,' 2) Ubi sunt lament, and 3) the Debat with death, but she adds "Perhaps the best-known topic for this type of discussion [debat] is the dialogue between

the soul and body;" Meyer-Baer also finds that the most common form of the dance is a "ring of figures" (307). For a comment on the circle motif, see Rolf Soellner's "King Lear and the Magic of the Wheel" (1984), where he notes the paradox that "The circle has always been regarded as the most perfect figure, representing all that God made -- the universe, the earth, and man, -- as well as the eternity of the divine nature.... But in its configuration as the Wheel of Fortune, the circle was for the hermeticists and for iconographers in general also the symbol of earthly change, representing 'vicissitude,' the reversals of life and nature" (274).

Chapter 3

SAMUEL DANIEL'S "TRAGEDY OF CLEOPATRA:"
Fortune and the Mind

In his Tragedy of Cleopatra (1594), Samuel Daniel continues the theme of man as captive and enemy of Fortune. As Theodore Spencer notes in his portrait of "Two Classic Elizabethans: Samuel Daniel and Sir John Davies" (1966), "Throughout his poetic career Daniel remained what under the Countess of Pembroke's patronage he had originally become: the disciple, in versification, of Sir Philip Sidney; in narrative poetry, of Ovid and Sackville; in drama, of the Countess herself" (102). Many critics agree that Daniel is following the Countess in her dramatic style of classicizing Senecan tragedy because he persists in using a Chorus to separate his acts into the regular five, and his play concentrates on the philosophical and moral issues of Cleopatra's situation more than the development of a suspense-laden plot.¹

However, Daniel's concept of Fortune throughout his play is much more complex and has more force than Garnier's Boethian lady with her wheel, or his triumvirate of Fortune, Love and Death as the gods' agents against man. The references to captivity and "chains" are as prevalent in Daniel's play as in Garnier's, yet Daniel uses them to argue that man is "free" because the "chains" of the gods and

especially Fortune are weak in comparison to the powers of the human "mind." Consequently, Daniel's idea of Fortune owes much more to Machiavelli's writings than to Boethius.²

Cleopatra's first soliloquy in Daniel's play contains a summary of Garnier's Cleopatra and her position as captive queen, but the Senecan hero's definition of self is the major point of Cleopatra's questioning of her fate, and it is through this self-fashioning that she recognizes her one chance for liberty from Fortune's prison. Like Pembroke's Antony, she sees herself as "a captive kept to honour others spoiles" (48), and she sings the quantum mutatus lament of medieval tragedy:

Now who would think that I were she who late
 With all the ornaments on earth inrich'd...
 Should thus distrest [be], cast downe from off that
height
 Am I the woman whose inventive pride,
 Adorn'd like Isis, scorn'd mortalitie? (25-34)].

Daniel's Cleopatra bears hard on the question of "Who am I?" in this opening soliloquy. Like Pembroke's protagonists, she also repeats Boethius's Philosophy in her lesson learned from Fortune when she proclaims:

Well, now I see, they but delude that praise us,
 Greatnesse is mockt, prosperitie betrayes us.
 And we are but our selves, although this cloude
 Of interposed smoakes makes us seeme more:
 These spreading parts of pomp whereof w'are prowd,
 Are not our parts, but parts of others store:
 Witnesse these gallant fortune-following traines,
 These Summer Swallowes of felicitie
 Gone with the heate. Of all, see what remaines,
 This monument, two maides, and wretched I (37-46).

Although Daniel continues to invoke many of the ideas of Pembroke's Senecan tragedy, he is a better poet and thinker than the Countess, and he develops his images with much more skill and with a better feeling for the English language than his predecessor. Daniel does not distort his verse to conform to a philosophy as much as Pembroke did: he uses the debate of actual philosophers to explain the problems of disgrace in Fortune and men's eyes, as opposed to the excesses of Lucilius's sententia in Pembroke's translation. Cleopatra sees "my scepter-bearing hands/Behind me bound" (66-7), but later in the play she vows at Antony's tomb:

These hands must breake the prison of my soule,
To come to thee, there to enjoy like state,
As doth the long-pent solitarie Foule,
That hath escapt her cage, and found her mate (1150-3).

Daniel's Octavius is likewise aware of man's freedom even in chains. When he surveys his new conquest of Egypt he is not blinded by victory as Garnier's Caesar had been, but he is disappointed. He complains to his general Proculeius,

Kingdoms I see we winne, we conquere Climates,
Yet cannot vanquish hearts, nor force obedience....
Free is the heart, the temple of the minde,
The Sanctuarie sacred from above
Where nature keeps the keies that loose and bind (256-64). In Daniel's play, man is no longer bound to the wheel as a victim of Fortune; now he is a participant in his fate.

This radical departure from Garnier's idea of man as helpless victim to Fortune is evident from the first lines of Daniel's play. Unlike Garnier's queen, Daniel's Cleopatra is a fighter, a questioner and a skeptic. She enters questioning herself -- a most unorthodox beginning for a Senecan tragedy, where the first act traditionally opens with an address to the gods or a particular tutelary deity. Cleopatra does not believe in the gods; she speaks to herself when she asks,

Yet do I live, and yet doth breath extend
My life beyond my life? nor can my grave
Shut up my griefes, To make my end my end? (1-3).

This style of repetition with a difference³ is striking. A dualism is at work here: what is the difference between "my life" in the first and the second instance? Cleopatra speaks figuratively: her emotional "life" was with Antony, and since he is dead her life is over, but her physical life continues, as she has breath to speak. Again, with the repetition of "my end," Cleopatra sees herself as split into two parts. Her physical and emotional realities are at odds: her life with Antony has ended and lies buried in his grave while she is only beginning her tragedy and has yet to accomplish her "end," both her death and her purpose in life. The repetition of "yet" also points to an important theme in the play of time split into pieces: Cleopatra's life is divided between her

past and her present; this is also true for Egypt. All has changed since Octavius conquered Alexandria. The question becomes one of identity: with such a difference between what was and what is, can there be continuity? Is Cleopatra herself any more? And where is the source of this self? "Yet" implies the relentless continuity of time outside of and indifferent to human desires, and it also gives an idea of the world as repetition, as one breath added to another out of weary necessity.

These opening lines are quite forceful in their evocation of Cleopatra's quandary, but the force exists in the language and the rhetoric. The idea that "my life" can end before my death is a nightmare vision of death-in-life, but more importantly the way that Cleopatra expresses her plight makes her situation seem more unhappy: words are losing their meaning for her. Daniel's rhetoric evokes a picture of the world-upside-down. Cleopatra's soliloquy is a dazzle of regal rhetoric, but words are useless, and she complains that her questions only lead to more questions. She ends by denying the validity of language altogether; she sees that as a queen she has one course to follow, after which death will put a period to all her words.⁴

To support his idea of the mind of man as liberator from Fortune, Daniel gives two overt meditations on language in separate debates between servants. These are men who do

not have the noble care for their dignity that Cleopatra must have as a queen; they are happy to breathe and speak whether they are free or suffering servitude. They are Machiavellian opportunists, and the Elizabethan reader would have recognized them as such. In Act II, scene i, two philosophers (servants who care for the minds of men) lament that "all this ayre of sweet-contrived wordes" (493) of philosophy is empty of meaning because when faced with death even a philosopher would rather live as a beast, a servile wretch, than die. They complain that, "when this ship of life pale Terror boords,/Where are our precepts then, where is our art?" (495-6).

In Act IV, scene i, a parallel debate occurs between two servants of the queen, men who have been entrusted with the treasures of Cleopatra [Seleucus her treasurer and Rodon the tutor to whom she entrusted her son Caesarion, "this precious Gem, the chiefest that I have" (865)]. Both men are in disgrace because they have betrayed the trust of their queen, and yet they are happy to speak with one another because "'tis some ease our sorrowes to reveale,/If they to whom we shall impart our woes/Seeme but to feele a part of what we feele" (810-11). As Cleopatra notes in her speech at Antony's tomb: "Words are for them that can complaine and live" (1142).

In addition to the power of speech, Daniel also uses the word "power" to convey the notion that the gods may be the "powers" that govern the universe, but man also is endowed with "powers" and "means" by which he can control his life and live free from the dictates of Fortune. Cleopatra begins by bemoaning "my constrained case/Drawn down with powre" (130-1), but she knows that she and Antony are bound together by a love that cannot be broken by Caesar or Fortune, and she wonders, "What powre should be of powre to reunfold/The armes of our affection lockt so fast?" (141-2). Octavius also realizes that Cleopatra's nobility of spirit makes her capable of suicide: when his general Proculeius asks, "Can Princes powre dispence with nature than?" Caesar answers, "To be a prince is more then be a man" (385-6).⁵

The finest example of this war of powers between man and Fortune comes in the Nuntius's description of Cleopatra's final hour. He tells the Chorus of Egyptians how Cleopatra hesitated before she bared her arm to the asp, and how she was disgusted with herself for hesitating:

And sharpely blaming of her rebel powres,
False flesh (saith she) and what dost thou conspire
With Caesar too, as thou wert none of ours,
To worke my shame, and hinder my desire?...
No, know there is a greater powre constraines
Then can be countercheckt with fearfull blood.
For to the minde that's great, nothing seemes great

(1579-86).

The power of Fortune is directly opposed to the power of the mind, both here, where the "false flesh" and "fearfull blood" are the earthly sphere of that goddess, counterpoised against the stronger force of "the minde that's great," and previously in Cleopatra's opening soliloquy, where she notes that she must show Caesar a servile face "seeming to sute my minde unto my fortune" (190). From this first speech, Cleopatra shows that she is free from Fortune's guile, now she has seen "Desolations darke and ougly face," when before she had been "wont but on Fortunes fairest side to looke,/Where nought was but applause, but smiles, and grace" (11-12)

Not surprisingly, the characters who name Fortune the most in this play are those who are not noble: the Chorus of Egyptians and the servants of the Queen who celebrate the power of language. The Chorus sees the force that governs Egypt as "fearefull frowning Nemesis" (745) and they take comfort in the idea that "As we, so they that treat us thus,/Must one day perish like to us" (803-4). The Chorus is also directly opposed to Cleopatra and Caesar in their attitude toward the mind. The Chorus complain in their sing-song trimeter,

No meanes at all to hide
 Man from himselfe can finde:
 No way to start aside
 Out from the hell of minde. (208-11).

The common man is content to be governed by forces larger

than himself. He would rather not have to think; the mind to him is a "hell." This opposition between Cleopatra's belief in the "minde that's great" and the Chorus's comfort in the regular yet external force of Fortune where "the course of things requireth/change and alteration ever" (1202-3) shows most clearly when the Chorus sings their final song. Here, as in Cleopatra's opening soliloquy, repetition is rampant, but the Chorus does not vary their meanings. They are repeating the same words for dramatic emphasis. They address a god, "O thou all-seeing light,/High President of heaven..." (1740-1), and their questions are rhetorical. They conclude,

Is greatnesse of this sort,
That greatnesse greatnesse marres,
And wrackes it self, selfe driven
On Rockes of her owne might?
Doth Order order so
Disorders overthrow? (1749-1753)

Here, "greatness" is both subject and object of "marres," but there is no contradiction in meaning between them, and the final "Order" "order"ing is a return to a world where language does what it says.

The final "overthrow" shows that the Chorus's idea of order and justice in life is the turn of Fortune's wheel. The philosopher Arius also invokes Fortune's wheel in defense of man's changing state:

For this decree a law from high is given...
Entred the booke of unavaoided Fate;
That no state can in height of happinesse,
In th'exaltation of their glory stand....

Thus doth the ever-changing course of things
Run a perpetuall circle, ever turning (541-50).

Finally, Seleucus defends his betrayal of Cleopatra by saying he was "following the fortune of the present time" (830). Daniel's play is not divided into Romans and Egyptians, as Shakespeare's play is. Caesar is not Cleopatra's enemy philosophically. He believes in the same overweening power of the mind that's great that she does. Daniel's Egypt is stratified into the men and women who are Fortune's followers and those who eschew Fortune and claim their own paths because of their noble minds (or Machiavellian virtu).

In Daniel's play, the theme of "parts" and "parting" is best dramatized in an allegorical battle, which the Nuntius who announces Cleopatra's death narrates in the last scene. He tells how Cleopatra hesitates before taking up the asp, and he tells the Chorus he sees "presented in her brow,/The doubtfull combate tride twixt Life and Honor" (1556-7). The forces of the first, he explains, are "her inward foes/False flesh and bloud, joyning with life and hope," and these together would "mutinie against her resolution" (1573-5). But here Cleopatra answers that question which Philostratus the philosopher meant to be rhetorical in his debate with Arius: "Oh who is he that from himselfe can turne,/That beares about the body of a man?" (497-8). Cleopatra exclaims,

False flesh (saith she) and what doest thou conspire
 With Caesar too, as thou wert none of ours?...
 No, know there is a greater powre constraines
 Then can be countercheckt with fearfulle bloud
 For to the minde that's great nothing seems great
 (1579-86).

When Cleopatra has discovered that "To the minde that's great, nothing seems great," the Nuntius sees the battle of body and mind, or "Life and Honor," as decided, and Cleopatra finally is no longer divided but unified in one dreadful resolve. He sees her as "strength'ned in her owne hart,/And union of herselfe, sences in one/Charging together, she performes that part/That hath so great a part of glorie wonne" (1590-3).

Daniel's Cleopatra generally does not make many mythical references; she is mostly concerned with what her "hands" can accomplish. When she considers the gods, it is with a shrug: either they cannot or will not help her, both ways she is left to her own devices. In her first speech, she notes, "But what know I if th'heavens have decreed,/And that the sinnes of Egypt have deserv'd/The Ptolomies should faile and none succeed,.... If it be so, then what neede these delaies?" (99-107) And again when she sends her son Caesarion away from Egypt to escape Octavius, she hesitates between her desire to keep him at her side and the need to send him out of Egypt, and she wonders,

But yet I doubt the Genius of our race
 By some malignant spirite comes overthrowne:
 Our bloud must be extinct, in my disgrace,
 Egypt must have no more Kings of their owne.

Then let him stay, and let us fall together,
 Sith it is fore-decreed that we must fall.
 Yet who knowes what may come? let him go thither,
 What Merchaunt in one vessell venters all? (913-20).

Finally, Daniel's Cleopatra doubts even the existence of Antony's spirit after death when she goes to his tomb and prays to him. She stops herself, and wonders if the spirit world is only a comfort men have invented with their deceitful imaginations. "If it be so," she says, "why speake I then to th'ayre?" (1114). But immediately she checks her doubt, "But tis not so, my Anthonie doth heare" (1115). Ten lines later, she again stops herself as she tries to conjure up the "powres" beyond the grave: "If any powres be there whereas thou art,/(Sith our country gods betray our case,)/O worke they may their gracious helpe impart,/To save thy wofull wife from such disgrace" (1130-3) and she doubts,

"But what, do I spend breath and ydle winde,/In vaine invoking a conceived ayde?/Why do I not my self occasion finde/To breake the bounds wherein my self am staide?" (1138-41). Daniel's Cleopatra knows that there are many powers in the world, the Egyptians have their "country gods," and the Romans have theirs, and then there are the gods of the dead, which perhaps might be able to help her, but she ends by convincing herself that the gods are too unpredictable and so they cannot help her.

Fortune and Nature are the two goddesses which Daniel's

Cleopatra names most, and she names them as her enemies. I have discussed her associations with Fortune and her queenship above. Daniel's Cleopatra identifies Nature first with her private role as mother as opposed to her public self as queen, which Fortune defines. In her first soliloquy, Cleopatra laments that though it would seem nobler if she died immediately instead of waiting, "Nature brings to contradict my soule/The argument of mine unhappy wombe" (82-3).

The same characters in Daniel's play who invoke Fortune also speak of Nature as a goddess of order. Philostratus the philosopher argues that the reason his many meditations on the uselessness of life do not affect his wish to live is because "So deepe we feele impressed in our blood,/That touch which Nature with our breath did give" (483-4), and his friend Arius agrees, "Nature doth us [philosophers] no more then others give:/Though we speake more then men, we are but men" (507-8). The law of Nature precedes the law of Fortune and Nemesis in the myth of the Golden Age which the Chorus invokes. In the present Age of Brass, man has perverted the order of Nature into the laws of Fortune. The Chorus of Egyptians sings that "the proudly great... [who] Reversing th'order nature set" are set to rights by the "heavenly" justice of Nemesis (761). In the eyes of the Chorus, Fortune redresses the errors that man has introduced

through his pride to the good world of Nature.

The idea of Nature's rule as a Golden Age that man has spoiled is repeated by Caesarion in his lament when he is captured by Octavius's soldiers. He has a pastoral vision of a better life than the tragic life of greatness, and he ends like Shakespeare's Richard II and Henry IV, who also had a pastoral vision of a happy life of quiet contemplation compared to the unhappy, tumultuous life of kingship:

O how much better had it beene for me,
 From low descent, deriv'd of humble birth,
 T'have eat the sweete-sowre bread of povertie,
 And drunke of Nylus streames in Nylus earth:
 Under the cov'ring of some quiet Cottage,
 Free from the wrath of heaven, secure in minde....
 Neere death he stands, that stands too neere a Crowne.

(996-

1011)

In Caesarion's speech, the Nile River is the personification of Nature. This connection between the Egyptian goddess of fertility and Nature is continued in the Chorus's speeches, where they see the downfall of Egypt and later of Rome as a natural process of dissolution. All of their imagery of ruin is water imagery. The philosopher Arius gives the best example when he talks of Egypt's troubles as "this inundation of disorders" (534).

Finally, Cleopatra brings out the most striking associations with Nature in her address to the asp, which she sees as her key to freedom, her only means to cheat Caesar and Fortune of their victory. The Nuntius narrates

to the Chorus her entire speech, which begins,

O rarest beast (saith she) that Affrick breeds,
 How deerly welcome art thou unto me!
 The fairest creature that faire Nylus feedes
 Methinks I see, in now beholding thee.
 What though the ever-erring world doth deeme
 That angred Nature fram'd thee but in spight? (1492-7)

The asp is Cleopatra's signature. There are other legendary lovers who have committed suicide, but none in such an ingenious manner. Usually, the woman takes up the dagger or the cup of poison left behind, but only Cleopatra has researched well the various ways to Death and chosen her weapon so carefully.

As Daniel notes in this speech, the asp as a poisonous snake embodies one of the problems of Christian doctrine, how could any god but an "angred" one create the asp, which kills on contact without distinction of age or morality. According to Christian doctrine, the poisonous snake is a sign of our expulsion from paradise and God's decision to turn Nature against man. For Cleopatra to take the asp as a symbol of Nature and what is good is indeed a case of what Daniel's Chorus calls "reversing th'order Nature set." Also, the asp is a distinctly Egyptian snake, a symbol of the potency of the Nile and its animosity to man as destroyer of Nature. Cleopatra notes, "Well did our Priests discern something divine/Shadow'd in thee" (1520-1). The asp thus becomes the only divinity which Daniel's Cleopatra recognizes, and she calls her death a "sacrifice" (1534).

But Cleopatra's life does not end here. She continues her meditation on the asp, characterizing it as Nature's child, and comparing it to Death, Fortune's minion:

If Nature err'd, O then how happy error,
Thinking to make thee worst, she made thee best:
Sith thou best freest us from our lives worst terror,
In sweetly bringing soules to quiet rest,
When that inexorable Monster Death
That follows Fortune, flies the poore distressed,
Tortures our bodyes ere he takes our breath,
And loads with paines th'already weak oppressed (1504-11).

Death is the minister of Fortune in this world alienated from Nature, and as such it is a torture to our bodies and minds. But the asp brings release from the body for the spirit and liberty for the mind.

By contrast to Daniel's Cleopatra, in Shakespeare's play Cleopatra's death is presented with a luxurious pace of preparation, and the sensuality of swooning into death without feeling its bite is a poignant contrast to Antony's slow, tortuous death on stage, as he begs his soldiers to put an end to his misery, ending with the gruesome sight of Cleopatra and her maids pulling his bleeding body pulled up the side of her monument. Antony's death is bloody and hastily executed in contrast to Cleopatra's elaborate, bloodless pageant. Cleopatra dresses herself for death and makes a point of her histrionics, saying she is repeating her grand entrance on the Cydnos into Antony's life. Antony undresses for death, calling on his servant Eros to disarm

him, to take off all the trappings of this world now that he believes Cleopatra, his only reason for living, is dead.

Daniel's Cleopatra lacks all of these dramatic complexities: she talks about the "Monster Death" and its bodily tortures, but these are feeble abstractions. In Daniel's play, Cleopatra's choice of the asp becomes a ritual death; it is the only religious rite she will believe in after her prolonged doubt in the gods. Daniel makes it explicit that Cleopatra is being perverse, that she has confused the identities of things, when she proclaims that this perversion of Nature, the poisonous snake, will help her overcome the power of the flesh and the desire for life which is part of human nature.

To emphasize the perversity of Cleopatra's vision, Daniel has her entreat the snake like a woman offering an invitation to her lover,

Therefore come thou, of wonders wonder chiefe
That open canst with such an easie key
The doore of life, come gentle cunning thiefe,
That from our selves so steal'st our selves away (1516-19).

The asp is one of the ugliest creatures on earth, and its plain ugliness contrasts painfully with the grandeur of Cleopatra's diadem and her beauty. But despite the snake's odious form, she calls him "the fairest creature" and "of wonders wonder chiefe." The contrast is as pathetic as when Titania proclaims her love for the transformed Bottom in

Shakespeare's A Midsummer Night's Dream (1595) (III, i).

And in both instances, it is clear that the woman is mistaken.

But Daniel does not let Cleopatra die with these illusions intact; the address to the asp is not Cleopatra's final word. She hesitates still to die and struggles against the natural impulse to live. Ironically, it is Octavius who held the answer to Cleopatra's quandary; the keeper of the keys of life is not the asp, as Cleopatra claims, but the human heart, as Octavius notes: "Free is the heart, the temple of the minde,/The Sanctuaries sacred from above,/Where nature keeps the keies that loose and bind" (262-4). It is only when Cleopatra has achieved the recognition that "to the minde that's great, nothing seemes great" (1586) that the Nuntius announces she has found "union of herselfe" (1591); then she has the key that unlocks the door of life, then she reaches for the asp and receives its poisonous bite. The asp is not her source of liberation, as she had first believed, but her own will is what frees her from Octavius.

Thus, Cleopatra's final words are not the invocation of the asp, like a priestess in a religious rite. She has dismissed that conceit as a deception. The Nuntius sums up Cleopatra's final concern the best with the words "her honour did her dying thoughts retaine" (1601). Then he

gives her final speech verbatim:

Well, now this worke is done (saith she) heere ends
 This act of Life, that part the Fates assign'd:
 What glory or disgrace heere this world lends,
 Both have I had, and both I leave behind.
 And now O earth, the Theater where I
 Have acted this, witnes I die unforst.
 Witnessse my soule partes free to Antony,
 And now prowde Tyrant Caesar do thy worst (1602-9).

If Cleopatra had continued in her illusion that the asp would free her from the world easily, her death would have been the vain delusion of an unhappy madwoman, but by the fact that she does not accept her own myth and that she must struggle against her own desire to live, she gives her death the tragic glory of a hero like Milton's later Adam in Paradise Lost (1667), who "scrupled not to eat [the forbidden fruit]/Against his better knowledge, not deceived" (IX, 997-8).

* * * * *

1. Geoffrey Bullough notes in Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare, vol. v: The Roman Plays (1964): "Daniel's drama differs from the Antonie of Garnier and Mary Sidney in the narrower scope of its plot, its more detailed following of Plutarch's Life, and the attempts intermittently made to set it in a wider frame of reference" (235).
2. See Cecil Seronsy's "The Doctrine of Cyclical Recurrence and Some related Ideas in the Works of Samuel Daniel" (1957) and Russell Leavenworth's book-length study Daniel's "Cleopatra": A Critical Study (1974) for two analyses of the impact of Daniel's reading of Machiavelli's work on his philosophy of history.
3. Ben Jonson parodied Daniel's repetitious style of poetry in Every Man in his Humour (1598). For a more sympathetic view of Daniel's style, see Antony LaBranche "Samuel Daniel: A Voice of Thoughtfulness" (1974), who characterizes Daniel's

style as "the rhetoric of a mind in associative action rather than... [in] argument" (128).

4. Recently, Timothy Reiss noticed a similar preoccupation with language in one of Daniel's sources for his story, Etienne Jodelle's Cleopatre Captive (1552). Reiss argues that the predominant image in Jodelle's play is the circle: the circle of the stage, the circle of Fortune's wheel, and the circle of isolation that encloses the protagonists, as well as the circle of the crown which marks Cleopatra as a queen, who must die nobly free; also, there is the circle of the globe, which defines the earthly region, where Fortune is queen. Man strives to break out of this circle of the earth, his mortal casing, and to reach heaven. He is a hybrid monster, part beast/part divine, who lives between the two realms of human and divine, trapped. Reiss notes, "As man is caught between the gods and the world, so language is trapped between the expression and the expressed" (201). Further, Reiss believes that the debates between Octavius and Cleopatra and Cleopatra's debates with herself over the worth of life evoke "the essentially circular nature of scholastic logic or rhetoric" (201). Cleopatra's struggles with language are inevitable "for within the circle the only possible action is in words" (203). Language is a function of the earthly realm of Fortune, even while it is an expression of our most divine aspect, the mind.

5. See Ernst Kantorowicz The King's Two Bodies (1957) for further Renaissance developments of this paradox of king as human and divine. Also, Maynard Mack's Killing the King (1973) contains an analysis of this theme in Shakespeare's tragedies, particularly Richard II, Hamlet, and Macbeth.

Chapter 4

SHAKESPEARE'S "ANTONY AND CLEOPATRA:"
The Measure of Man

Philo, a Roman soldier, begins Shakespeare's Antony and Cleopatra (1607-8) with a summary of the plot as succinct as any Prologue's. He announces to Demetrius, a Roman ambassador to Egypt:

Nay, but this dotage of our general's
O'erflows the measure: those his goodly eyes,
That o'er the files and musters of the war
Have glow'd like plated Mars, now bend, now turn
The office and devotion of their view
Upon a tawny front: his captain's heart,
Which in the scuffles of great fights hath burst
The buckles on his breast, reneges all temper,
And is become the bellows and the fan
To cool a gipsy's lust. Look, where they come:
Take but good note, and you shall see in him
The triple pillar of the world transform'd
Into a strumpet's fool: behold and see (I, i, 1-13).

Thus Philo invites his audience to a rare spectacle while he has also named the main themes of Shakespeare's play: he introduces the concept of "measure", a Roman standard of temperance and good soldiership¹, which Antony has violated in his love for Cleopatra; then with two swift strokes Philo paints a full portrait of his fallen captain: the greatness of Antony and his shame are shown through his eyes and his heart, respectively. Indeed, there are only two methods of perceiving the world in this play: through the eyes (which see external reality and what can be measured in quantity) and through the heart (internal reality, where Antony and Cleopatra find their true domain, the infinite reaches of the imagination, "past the size of dreaming").²

As with other key words in Shakespeare's plays (such as "nothing" in Lear), the different meanings of the word "measure"³ resonate with and complicate the other themes in the play. In Shakespeare's work, "measure" appears most prominently in Measure for Measure (1604-5). Here, the title echoes the biblical Matthew in his rejection of the Old Testament's lex talionis in favor of a more Christian attitude of toleration, "Judge not, that ye be not judged. For with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again" (7:2). The question of "measure" as an idea of law which reflects man's sense of justice is central to Measure for Measure. Significantly, only Pompey mentions Justice by name in Antony and Cleopatra (the production of which followed Measure for Measure by three years). Of course, in a Roman play the Christian sense of justice would be out of place, but in fact, the frequency of the word "measure" in the text is much greater in Antony and Cleopatra than in Measure for Measure. As Antony, Cleopatra and Octavius note, their world is governed by Fortune, and there is no justice in Fortune's favors; man must trust to his own idea of what is good to steer his course in the world. "Measure" then becomes a question of comparison between men;⁴ there are no objective standards.

For the purposes of this study, I will note the importance of "measure" in relation to Fortune and Time, two

key concepts in the play which Shakespeare weighs against each other in his constant balance of opposites. As Charles Hallett notes in his article "Change, Fortune and Time: Aspects of the Sublunar World in Antony and Cleopatra" (1976), Shakespeare "has linked with the Roman Empire other conventional iconographical attributes of the secular world -- Time, which brings each individual into conflict with an endless process of present but fleeting moments, and Fortune, that area of change which is concerned with the material happiness of the individual" (81).

"Measure" has an immediate relation to Fortune and Time in classical Greek and Roman mythology, where the Fates allot a certain length to the thread of man's life at his birth. And Shakespeare constantly connects the goddess Fortune with the concept of measure throughout the play. The first encounter with Fortune as a goddess of measure comes when Cleopatra's maids argue with the soothsayer. Charmian and Iras complain when they are told they have "equal" fortunes (an irony which the audience understands as meaning that they will both die in the same way and at the same time). Charmian quips, "Am I not an inch of fortune better than she?" (I, ii, 55). Iras immediately takes up the sexual innuendo with her retort, "Well, if you were but an inch of fortune better than I, where would you choose it?" The measure of a man in sexual terms is also mentioned

by Cleopatra when she bristles against Antony's news that he is leaving her to return to Rome. She cries out, "I would I had thy inches, thou shouldst know/There were a heart in Egypt" (I, iii, 40-1). But Enobarbus comes up with the best mingling of measure as physical inches and the ancient idea of the measure of man as god's allotted justice when he replies comically to Antony's news that Fulvia is dead:

Why, sir, give the gods a thankful sacrifice. When it pleaseth their deities to take the wife of a man from him, it shows to man the tailors of the earth; comforting therein, that when old robes are worn out, there are members to make new. If there were no more women but Fulvia, then had you indeed a cut, and the case to be lamented: this grief is crown'd with consolation, your old smock brings forth a new petticoat, and indeed the tears live in an onion, that should water this sorrow (I, ii, 159-78).

To describe the gods as "the tailors of the earth"⁵ is a low rendering of the Greek idea of Atropos et al., but it also describes a comfortable relationship for man with the gods; Fortune is not a cruel tyrant, but a "housewife" who spins her wheel, as Cleopatra describes her to the dying Antony: "let me rail so high,/That the false huswife Fortune break her wheel,/Provok'd by my offence"(IV, xv, 43-5).⁶

Antony and Cleopatra (1607) is a late work of Shakespeare, and its concern with Fortune as a complex entity is shown by the frequency and variety of Shakespeare's uses of the word throughout the play⁷. Both Antony and Cleopatra name Fortune as the goddess that rules men's lives, as do Pompey, Octavius Caesar, various Roman

soldiers, and members of the Egyptian court. Fortune is in everyone's mouths as they look toward the future and plan their strategies of love and war.

The Egyptian courtier and the Roman soldier are distinguished by their respective interests in the Fortune of Love and the Fortune of War. Charmian, Iras and Alexas ask the soothsayer at court to tell their amatory fortunes, inquiring about who will they marry or cuckold, but Caesar and the Roman soldiers look to Fortune to show them success in battle and in state affairs. Enobarbus scoffs at talk of the Fortune of love as he says to Cleopatra's maids and the soothsayer: "Mine, and most of our fortunes to-night shall be -- drunk to bed" (I, ii, 45). He is more concerned with what Iras calls a "worky-day fortune," or the question of where his next meal will come from than with the distant future. When love and war are in conflict, Enobarbus jocosely argues, "Under a compelling occasion let women die: it were pity to cast them away for nothing, though between them and a great cause, they should be esteemed nothing" (I, ii, 134-7). Antony also does not indulge in questions of love or appetite when questioning the soothsayer; he asks not about his marriage to Octavia or his liaison with Cleopatra but how will he fare against Caesar, man to man, though, ironically, the Fortune of Love could be considered the cause of Antony's loss at the Actium and his later

suicide, not Caesar and the Fortune of War.

This split of the world between Love and War⁸ echoes Philo's initial profile of Antony: he is a man who has perverted both his "goodly eyes/That o'er the files and musters of the war/Have glow'd like plated Mars" and his "captain's heart,/Which in the scuffles of great fights hath burst/The buckles on his breast". There is an immediate contradiction here in images: Philo's original complaint was that Antony's "dotage" was excessive, breaking the bonds of decorum or measure, but in the next lines Philo characterizes this dotage by its smallness, not excess: Antony's eyes are settled on one object, Cleopatra, where once they had ranged with mighty effect over the ranks of soldiers, and his "captain's heart" which overflowed the measure to the point of bursting his armor, has become trivialized when he contents himself with the empty air of lover's praises and sighs, his lungs pump air "to cool a gypsy's lust." This is a strange reversal. "Dotage" means loss in Shakespeare; a man in his dotage is like the idiot in Macbeth whose words are "full of sound and fury signifying nothing" (V, v, 27-8). Thus, Antony who had once been so full of substance is now full of nothing to overflowing. The image is one of metamorphosis: what is light is made heavy and the heavy made light by the magic of a gypsy. Now Antony uses his eyes and heart to serve his

Venus, Cleopatra.⁹

This imbalance of extremes, accompanied by the constant shifting of meaning from the abstract to the physical and back again, the exchange of "light" talk for "heavy" serious words which will decide kingdoms, is characteristic of Shakespeare's play. "Measure" is a questionable quality in this world of change and transformation.

When Cleopatra first enters, she taunts Antony with exactly the question of measure that Philo broached, but she wants to know the measure of Antony's love. "If it be love indeed/Tell me how much," she asks, as if love were coins Antony could take out of his pocket and count over into her hand. Her use of the verb "tell" instead of "show" brings together the ideas of measurement in words or in numbers (one can "tell" in either coinage). But Antony will not stoop to answer in such worldly terms because "There's beggary in the love that can be reckon'd."¹⁰ Then, Cleopatra tries again to quantify love but in terms of physical distance: "I'll set a bourn how far to be belov'd." Antony counters with another denial: if she would measure his love, or put bounds around it, she would have to discover "new heaven, new earth."

Finally, Antony responds to Cleopatra's goading with an eight-line tribute to love, in which he renounces all worldly goods, and he claims that the passion of one embrace

defines "the nobleness of life:"

Let Rome in Tiber melt, and the wide arch
Of the rang'd empire fall! Here is my space,
Kingdoms are clay: our dungy earth alike
Feeds beast as man; the nobleness of life
Is to do thus: when such a mutual pair,
And such a twain can do't, in which I bind,
On pain of punishment, the world to weet
We stand up peerless (I, i, 33-9).

The high-flown language of Antony's disclaimer is common to Renaissance love poetry and could be seen as a gallant's cliches,¹¹ but Antony repeats these extravagances after his loss at Actium when he forgives Cleopatra for misleading him:

Fall not a tear, I say, one of them rates
All that is won and lost: give me a kiss,
Even this repays me (III, xi, 69-71).

Antony speaks in terms of worlds and universes, and his rhetoric has been called "Brobdingnagian" by Bethell and "cosmological" by Markels. Cleopatra also speaks in terms of world cataclysm and the deaths of thousands when she is offended. The "infinite" as opposed to the "finite" or the measurable in the world is the key to their idea of greatness. Both Antony and Cleopatra are complimented with descriptions of incommensurability: she is "infinite variety," and he is "infinite virtue." They would be "peerless." They defy not only Octavius Caesar but the gods themselves. Such overweening pride is characteristic of the couple's tragedy: they want to ignore the material world (that which can be measured), and yet they are disheartened

when they lose battles, or territories are not granted to them. Like Lear in Shakespeare's earlier play, they want both to renounce the world's baser elements and yet keep their sovereignty over it, and they cannot. When Antony believes "All is lost" after his final defeat at Alexandria, and he vows "Fortune and Antony part here, even here/Do we shake hands" (IV, xii, 8-21), he does not know what final stroke Fortune has in store for him through Cleopatra. The irony is that one cannot "shake hands" with Fortune; she will have her final say in life because that is the definition of Fortune's domain. In Lear, Edgar sees this irony when he recognizes his blinded father on the heath and remarks, "O gods! Who is't can say 'I am at the worst'?/I am worse than e'er I was" (IV, i, 25-6).

In comparing man to man, "measure" is also a duelling term, where it marks the boundary between men based on the length of their swords. Shakespeare's Two Gentlemen of Verona (1594) is one the first citations in the Oxford English Dictionary for this definition of "measure", where Valentine threatens Thurio with his sword, "Thurio, give back, or else embrace thy death!/Come not within the measure of my wrath." (V, iv, 126-7). In the seventeenth century, "measure" denotes the line where fencers can and cannot step. Again, this is a question of decorum through external measures, but duelling is very important to Shakespeare's

Antony and Cleopatra (both as a concept of the meeting of opposites -- the very word "foil" comes from fencing -- and as a real subject)¹². Twice Antony challenges Octavius to single combat, and twice he is rejected. In the second instance, Enobarbus comments that Antony must be mad to send such a challenge after his losses to Caesar:

I see men's judgments are
A parcel of their fortunes, and things outward
Do draw the inward quality after them,
To suffer all alike, that he should dream,
Knowing all measures, the full Caesar will
Answer his emptiness (III, xiii, 30-6).

Not only does Enobarbus here make the important distinction between the fortune of man (or what is outward and visible about a man) and the judgment (or "inward quality" of a man), but he uses Antony's challenge to a duel against Octavius as an example of the corruption of man's judgment by the changes in his fortunes.

Enobarbus also makes a connection between the idea of judgment or rationality and "measure." What does "knowing all measures" mean? Clearly, for Enobarbus, who is no dreamer, it is a question of seeing plainly and in the most physical terms, as he proves on many occasions. Even in his most poetic description of Cleopatra to Agrippa, Enobarbus gives an exact accounting of what he has seen, in colors and sensual details. "Knowing all measures" to Enobarbus means being able to judge by external facts. But the way that Enobarbus expresses the external difference between Antony

and Octavius is through a metaphor of weights and balances: "the full Caesar" as opposed to Antony's "emptiness."¹³

However, though Enobarbus puts so much stake in the proof of his eyes that he decides to leave Antony, he is finally overwhelmed by his heart. Enobarbus resolves to desert Antony because "I see still,/A diminution in our captain's brain/Restores his heart" (III, xiii, 197-9). But once in Caesar's camp, Enobarbus receives the news that his captain has sent his spoils of war after him, and Enobarbus realizes that he has left a great man (a "Jove" on earth). His immediate reaction is: "This blows my heart:/If swift thought break it not, a swifter mean/ Shall outstrike thought, but thought will do't, I feel" (IV, vi, 34-6).

The mistaken notion of ocular proof as most important to an evaluation of a man's worth is not confined to Enobarbus in Antony and Cleopatra. Octavius Caesar also has "eyes" on Antony's every move in the war. But it is not only in the Fortunes of War that Octavius depends on eyes. Also, his idea of love is measured by shows and ocular proof. When his beloved sister comes to Rome from Athens, Octavius admonishes her,

You are come
A market-maid to Rome, and have prevented
The ostentation of our love; which, left unshown,
Is often left unlov'd (III, vi, 50-3).

Clearly to Caesar a love that cannot be reckoned is in danger of extinction. But what is perhaps most ironic about

this definition of love as a thing for show is that when Octavius describes the proper pomp and circumstance for Octavia's entry into Rome, his speech has explicit echoes of Enobarbus's description of Cleopatra on the Cydnos (though Caesar never heard Enobarbus, the contrast is for the audience to discern). Caesar says:

You come not
 Like Caesar's sister: the wife of Antony
 Should have an army for an usher, and
 The neighs of horses to tell of her approach,
 Long ere she did appear. The trees by the way
 Should have borne men, and expectation fainted,
 Longing for what it had not. Nay, the dust
 Should have ascended to the roof of heaven,
 Rais'd by your populous troops (III, vi, 42-50).

Antony, by contrast, knows that appearances can deceive, and his most poignant speech concerns the illusory nature of sight, as he tries to describe the evanescence of clouds to Eros after the Egyptian fleet has betrayed him in the port of Alexandria:

Sometimes we see a cloud that's dragonish,
 A vapour sometime, like a bear, or lion,
 A tower'd citadel, a pendent rock,
 A forked mountain, or blue promontory
 With trees upon't, that nod unto the world,
 And mock our eyes with air (IV, xiv, 1-7).

Caesar's belief in the truth of appearances and the necessary correspondence of Nature to man's idea of himself is put to the test when he protests in disbelief at the news of Antony's death. Octavius expects a world cataclysm to match his inner sense of loss when he says,

The breaking of so great a thing should make
 A greater crack. The round world

Should have shook lions into civil streets,
 And citizens to their dens. The death of Antony
 Is not a single doom, in the name lay
 A moiety of the world (V, i, 14-9).

This is the judgment of the heart. Caesar sees that the world goes on and does not acknowledge even an emperor's estimate of himself. Antony was a soldier, and he leaves behind a bloody sword, no more, as far as external events can show. But Act V of the play goes beyond Antony's death to show the complex effects of loss through the final farewells of Octavius and Cleopatra.¹⁴

Unlike Fortune in Antony and Cleopatra, which is measured by men's eyes, Time is a quality known by the heart. Shakespeare's characters do not, like Eliot's Prufrock measure out their lives "in coffee spoons," but each character's unit of measurement is quite distinctly his or her own.

Cleopatra thinks time is only worth noting when Antony is present; when he is absent, she calls for mandragora "that I might sleep out this great gap of time/My Antony is away" (i, v, 5-6). In effect, Cleopatra lives in the past. In the first act, she describes their loving time together in the past tense:

Nay, pray you, seek no colour for your going,
 But bid farewell, and go: when you sued staying,
 Then was the time for words; no going then;
 Eternity was in our lips, and eyes,
 Bliss in our brows' bent; none our parts so poor,
 But was a race of heaven. (I, ii, 32-7).

By the end of the play, when Antony leaves her through death, never to return, she again seeks to build a heavenly part for both of them through her imagination, as she describes her "dream" of the "Emperor Antony" to Dolabella:

His face was as the heavens, and therein stuck
A sun and moon, which kept their course, and lighted
The little O, the earth....
His legs bestrid the ocean, his rear'd arm
Crested the world: his voice was propertyed
As all the tuned spheres, and that to friends(V, ii,
79-84).

But again she speaks entirely in the past tense, and her one wish is to sleep through the time of Antony's absence so that she "might see but such another man" (V, ii, 78). When she resolves on suicide, Cleopatra looks forward to immortality, but it is the immortality of legend, a preservation of the past.

By contrast, Octavius Caesar has a vision of the future, and he lives his life entirely in terms of what can be done to bring on "the time of universal peace" (IV, vi, 5), a time that can only be achieved through the unity of the Roman Empire and his own ascendancy to ruler over all the world. Thus Octavius also links himself to a myth of immortality, the return of Astraea. He does not see himself as "Fortune's knave," but rather as the rightful heir of Julius Caesar and the man to return Rome to peaceful unity.

Caesar's worst criticism of Antony's excesses in Egypt is that he "wastes/The lamps of night in revel" (I, iii, 4-

5), and when Antony does not recognize ambassadors from Rome, Caesar complains to Lepidus, "to confound such time,/That drums him from his sport, and speaks as loud/As his own state, and ours,--'tis to be chid" (I, iv, 28-30).

The idea of confounding time is first expressed by Antony with a very different meaning in the first 50 lines of the play. Antony invites Cleopatra to a banquet of love and a night of what Caesar would call "waste:"

Now for the love of Love, and her soft hours,
Let's not confound the time with conference harsh:
There's not a minute of our lives should stretch
Without some pleasure now. What sport to-night?(I, i,
44-7)

Notice Antony's emphasis on "now." He is a man of the present, and he does not like to look backwards to the past or forwards to the future. He reacts to present contingencies, as critics, such as J. Leeds Barroll and Eugene Waith, have noted when trying to explain Antony's rapid reversals in plan and strategy, especially Antony's seeming hypocrisy in marrying Octavia when he loves Cleopatra.

Antony responds to "the strong necessity of time" (I, iii, 42) as he tells Cleopatra; and he advises Octavius when he objects to so much drinking on Pompey's galley, "Be a child o' the time" (II, vii, 98). But perhaps the most telling remark of all comes when a messenger hesitates to tell Antony of his losses in the Parthian war, and he

reassures him, "Things that are past are done, with me. 'Tis thus,/Who tells me true, though in his tale lie death,/I hear him as he flatter'd" (I, ii, 94-6). Here, Antony states his basic philosophy and his weakness: he recognizes no time but the present, with all of its contradictions.

But Antony is not blind to the problems of living so fully in the present. When he feels the full portent of his wife Fulvia's death, he notes his conflicting emotions:

There's a great spirit gone! Thus did I desire it:
 What our contempt doth often hurl from us,
 We wish it ours again. The present pleasure,
 By revolution lowering, does become
 The opposite of itself: she's good, being gone,
 The hand could pluck her back that shov'd her on
(I, ii, 119-2).

Once again, opposites change places, and there are no boundaries or distinctions that cannot be reversed in Shakespeare's play.

To underscore his living in the present, many of Antony's speeches begin with "now," and he often uses the word "thus" to emphasize his actions, even when he commits suicide: "Eros,/Thy master dies thy scholar; to do thus/I learnt of thee" (IV, xiv, 102-3). But Antony recognizes the importance of time most fully when he lies bleeding with his death wound and Diomedes comes to him with the news, "My mistress Cleopatra sent me to thee" (IV, xiv, 118). Antony does not accuse or argue that Cleopatra is supposed to be

dead by her own hand; instead he asks one important question, "When did she send thee?" and the answer "Now, my lord" tells all.

Another characteristic mark of Antony's living in the present is the strange fact that Antony is constantly in the process of saying good-bye throughout the play. He begins with his formal farewell to Cleopatra, who is at first at a loss for words with which to say good-bye ["Sir, you and I must part, but that's not it;/Sir, you and I have lov'd, but there's not it;/That you know well, something it is I would,--" (I, iii, 87ff)]. He leaves her with famous last words:

Our separation so abides and flies,
That thou, residing here, goes yet with me;
And I, hence fleeting, here remain with thee(I, iii,
102-4).

In the Arden edition, M.R. Ridley notes echoes of Donne's "A Valediction Forbidding Mourning" in Antony's farewell as well as other contemporary "parting lines," such as Sidney's Arcadia (Book I, 169-70) [It also echoes Jesus's words to his Apostles in the Gospel of St. John: "I will come again, and receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also" (14:3)]. Antony says good-bye to Pompey after the banquet on his galley, but Pompey also finds it hard to say good-bye and follows Antony to shore (II, vii, 123ff). In Act III, Antony wrestles hand-to-hand with Octavius Caesar, who will not say good-bye to his sister, Antony's new bride,

but insists on a world of no goodbyes: "You shall hear from me still; the time shall not/Out-go my thinking on you" (III, ii, 60-1). Almost immediately after this (III, iv), Antony is bidding good-bye to Octavia as he sends her off to Caesar as "go-between" in their rivalry.

After the loss at Actium, Antony tells his followers to leave him because "I am so lated in the world that I/Have lost my way for ever" (III, xi, 3ff). Many of them take his advice, but many remain, and before his land battle with Caesar in Alexandria, Antony says a formal goodbye to all his "sad captains" in a scene reminiscent of the Christ's Last Supper (IV, ii).

In fact, Act IV contains nothing but a series of entrances and exits for Antony, culminating in his final, long and agonizing death scene, where he takes leave of the world forever. During this time, he says good-bye to Cleopatra first as a gallant soldier:

Fare thee well, dame, whate'er becomes of me:
This is a soldier's kiss: rebukeable,
And worthy shameful check it were, to stand
On more mechanic compliment; I'll leave thee
Now like a man of steel (IV, iv, 29-33).

Then, when he learns that Enobarbus has left him, he sends his spoils of war after him with "gentle adieus, and greetings" and he asks his soldier to "Say, that I wish he never find more cause/To change a master" (IV, v, 15-6). Antony's success in Alexandria is the cause of a formal

march of entrance into the city with Cleopatra at the lead (IV, viii), but this is a short-lived victory. When the Egyptian fleet surrenders to Caesar without a fight on the next day, Antony immediately blames Cleopatra for the treachery of her fleet and he vows revenge as he says good-bye to "all:"

All is lost:
This foul Egyptian hath betrayed me....
Bid them all fly:
For when I am reveng'd upon my charm,
I have done all. Bid them all fly, be gone (IV, xii, 9-17).

Immediately afterward, he bids goodbye to Fortune with the lines: "Fortune and Antony part here, even here/Do we shake hands" (IV, xii, 19-20). To underscore the irony that Antony will not be quit of the Fortune of Love, "heart" imagery is most prevalent in this scene, where Antony vows against Cleopatra: "My heart/Makes only wars on thee" (14-5), and he complains she has "beguil'd me, to the very heart of loss" (IV, xii, 28-9). When Cleopatra appears before him, he tells her to be gone and threatens her with "Caesar's triumph" through Rome.

After the battle of Actium there begins a long procession of friends and allies who bid their own good-byes to Antony. First, Canidius confides to Enobarbus, "To Caesar will I render/My legions and horse, six kings already/Show me the way of yielding" (III, x, 33-4), and when Enobarbus believes he sees Cleopatra betray Antony to

Caesar's ambassador Thidias and Antony forgives her for it, Enobarbus also decides, "I will seek/Some way to leave him" (III, xiii, 200-1). But the strangest leave-taking of all occurs later that same night when the guards in Antony's camp hear music that comes from nowhere in particular, and one interprets it as an ill omen: "'Tis the god Hercules, whom Antony lov'd,/Now leaves him" (IV, iii, 15-6).¹⁵ The audience feels the power of this scene as the final desertion of Antony's "genius" from him.

It is when Antony believes that Cleopatra is dead that his good-byes to the world become more and more frequent, and the audience begins to realize that this is indeed the end. But still there is some reluctance: he is thwarted in most of his attempts to have the final word. First, Antony says good-bye to his armor with a touching speech, much like his address to his "sad captains:" "No more a soldier: bruised pieces, go,/You have been nobly borne. From me awhile" (IV, xiv, 42-3). Then, when he and Eros shake hands, Eros cannot kill him, and so makes the farewell good on his own part by killing himself. Again, Antony tries to say good-bye to life as a follower of Eros in suicide, but finds only that he has wounded himself, and he is "not dead." His servants will not put an end to his misery, and again he must ask them for "the last service what I shall command you" (IV, xiv, 132): to carry him to Cleopatra for a

quick farewell. With Cleopatra at the monument, Antony asks for a farewell kiss, which she at first refuses him; then she refuses to allow him to speak because she wants to vent her own anger against Fortune. Finally, Antony gets in his last words, though Cleopatra wants to refuse him. His last words are: "I can no more," as if to show that he has finally lost all indeed.¹⁶ Piece by piece, the world falls from him, but it is agonizingly slow in the process.

When Antony is not on-stage saying "farewell", people are asking where he is; indeed, "looking for Antony" seems to be the major pass-time of Caesar and Cleopatra in the play. He is the focus of all their messengers and spies. As T.B. Stroup notes in "The Structure of Antony and Cleopatra" (1964) that

at least fifty-two entrances and exits of the play are formalized. That is, they are processional, with soldiers marching on and off in formation, or diplomats with attendants, or rulers with entourage, or the court with 'train,' or others making ceremonious entry and exit, all observing protocol (293).

Stroup adds that in keeping with this Chinese fire drill quality of the action, the actual space of the play becomes smaller and smaller. "The geography of the play narrows as the action moves forward. After Actium it is restricted to Alexandria and environs. Thus as the fortunes of the protagonists become more circumscribed, so does the area of their action, until it is confined to the monument" (297). Thus we see that the actual space of the play is shrinking,

even as Antony loses "all" before our eyes.

By contrast with Act IV, in which Antony takes leave of so much and so many and finally dies, Act V concentrates on Cleopatra and Caesar in their long farewell to this great man. In some ways, the entire play has been building up to this elegiac ending.

The first words of the play are a kind of eulogy for the Great Marc Antony of Julius Caesar who is no longer with us; Philo speaks of what Antony has been and how much he has lost since he has taken up residence with the Egyptian queen. In particular, Philo's use of the word "measure" echoes Marc Antony's first heart-felt response to the sight of Julius Caesar's murdered corpse in that earlier play:

O mighty Caesar! dost thou lie so low?
Are all thy conquests, glories, triumphs, spoils,
Shrunk to this little measure? (III, i, 148-50).

From the first moments of Antony and Cleopatra, Antony is losing ground, and the "measure" of his greatness is shrinking. But it is not the loss itself that concerns the audience but rather how does the heroic Antony recognize and sustain the loss? In some ways, Antony and Cleopatra is not rightly a tragedy at all, as A.C. Bradley suggested in his early study of the play, where he noted that its tragic effect is muted from beginning to end (284).

Antony and Cleopatra begins with an elegy for a "lost" general, and proceeds to the news that Marc Antony is a

widower. The idea of insufficient mourning for a death, which touches off Hamlet's melancholy in the former play,¹⁷ is mentioned in Cleopatra's comment, "Now I see, I see,/In Fulvia's death, how mine receiv'd shall be" (I, iii, 64-5). To balance this beginning with death and insufficient bereavement, the entire last act of the play is concerned with the actual loss of Antony, the "great spirit" of the play, whom everyone acknowledges. When Antony dies no one "gives the gods a thankful sacrifice" as Enobarbus had suggested that Marc Antony do in response to the news of Fulvia's death, because everyone recognizes the magnitude of the loss of such a great man. As noted before, Caesar sees his own mortality in Antony's sudden and inauspicious death, while Cleopatra grieves inconsolably and, like a true melancholic, she believes that without her beloved "there is nothing left remarkable/ Beneath the visiting moon" (IV, xv, 67-8).

As if to echo Antony, Cleopatra gives formal and informal farewells in abundance throughout Act V, and the good-byes increase until the scene with the fig-bearing clown, whom she waves off the stage with "farewell" four times before he actually leaves her to "the worm".¹⁸ Finally, Cleopatra renounces "leave-taking" itself when she sees Iras fall dead before her, "If thus thou vanishes, thou tell'st the world/It is not worth leave-taking" (V, ii, 296-

7).

In this play of loss and mourning, the last lines of the play balance the first; the lost general is finally buried. Caesar instructs Dolabella that there will be no staging of Alexandrian revels or triumphs while they grieve.

Our army shall
In solemn show attend this funeral,
And then to Rome. Come, Dolabella, see
High order, in this great solemnity (V, ii 361-4).

In his study of The English Elegy (1985), Peter Sacks notes the similarities between Jacobean tragedy and the elegy, and one of the typical continuities that he notes is the breakdown in language and the mourner's complaints of the insufficiency of words to express the loss of the beloved:

Towards the end of the sixteenth century, the question of 'what should be said' in the face of suffering and death had become particularly vexing. Since supposedly immutable principles of divine, human and natural order were increasingly suspected of being no more than man's figural impositions on an essentially intractable reality, the traditional means of consolation were robbed of their protective charms (64).

From the first line of Antony and Cleopatra, Shakespeare shows the contradictions between man's high idea of himself with his names of "emperor" and "infinite virtue" (especially his poetic sense of self) and the low, physical truth of his existence. Indeed, there is a sense in which Shakespeare deliberately undercuts man's use of language in this play. As Cleopatra warns her maids of Caesar, "He

words me, girls, he words me, that I should not/Be noble to myself" (V, ii, 190-1). Words are disguises and not to be trusted; they are as illusory as Antony's clouds.

Ultimately, the measure of the heart's grief, as with its love, is too large for words or gestures to express. Dolabella comes closest to recognizing this truth when he tries to understand Cleopatra's babble about dreams and gods named Antony, and he can only respond with:

Hear me, good madam:
 Your loss is as yourself, great; and you bear it
 As answering to the weight: would I might never
 O'ertake pursued success, but I do feel,
 By the rebound of yours, a grief that smites
 My very heart at root (V, ii 100-5).

Throughout Antony and Cleopatra, Shakespeare is asking the question, how can we measure man? By his own illusions of grandeur? By the vagaries of Fortune? By the report of others? Shakespeare is questioning the very foundations of the concept of "measure" and Fortune. Though some critics would propose that Shakespeare answers these questions with Antony and Cleopatra's assertions that there is no such thing as a measure of loss because man's imagination is too great to be encompassed or quantified, the questions remain unanswered by the end of the play.

* * * * *

1. See Janet Adelman The Common Liar (1973) p. 122ff, where she notes: "Implicit in the word 'measure' are two significantly related concepts: moderation and measurement." She follows this with a discussion of various concepts of measure in the play, both Roman and Egyptian, and opposes the language of measure and decorum to the language of hyperbole and excess

in Shakespeare's Antony and Cleopatra. Adelman concludes that "in its very form the play insists that we acknowledge the limitations of measurement" (142).

2. Although the play resists reduction to dualities, as many critics have noted who see the Rome vs. Egypt school of interpretation of the play as misleading, Shakespeare does establish polarities of extremes, both in theme and character, that are central to the meaning of the play as tragedy. [See Maynard Mack's "Antony and Cleopatra: The Stillness and the Dance" (1973) for a discussion of the paradoxes in the play and William D. Wolf "'New Heaven, New Earth': The Escape from Mutability in Antony and Cleopatra" (1982), where he argues that "the pace of the dialogue reinforces the opposing values of Rome and Egypt.... But these differences obscure a subtle yet important similarity between Rome and Egypt which can give new insight into the play" (328).]
3. In the Oxford English Dictionary there are 23 citations under the noun "measure" and 13 for the verb. The variety of meanings for "measure" is remarkable: it begins as a term of geometry, distinguishing between "lengthe, bredthe or depthe", then is used in the tailor's trade (for suits and grave shrouds); it is also an important term in poetry, music, law, and fencing. In its early uses (ca. 1400), "measure" indicated something "in excess of the stated amount", but by the seventeenth century it suggests moderation, or measure as a means of controlling man's tendency toward excess. Perhaps most interesting of the OED notes is: "Many of the senses below were developed in French, and adopted." Is "measure" an idea foreign to the English temperament, imported from the mechanical, calculating French?
4. The idea of man as the measure of all things is ancient, attributed to Protagoras in a famous essay called "Truth", which begins, "Of all things the measure is man: both of things that are that they are, and of things that are not that they are not." Many seventeenth-century theologians and philosophers debated this idea of man as central to the universe. Jonathan Dollimore notes in Radical Tragedy (1984), "The decentring of man in Jacobean tragedy was contemporaneous with, and influenced by, the revolution whereby 'man' and 'his' planet were displaced both from the real and the metaphysical centre of the universe" (154-5).
5. What is "fitting" in life then becomes a question of garments, another physical mark of distinction (and Fortune's favor) between persons, and one that becomes important to both Antony and Cleopatra in their final moments, when Antony requires that Eros disarm him before he commits suicide, and Cleopatra

conversely commands that she be attired as a queen of queens for her exit from this world. Finally, the idea of "fit" and decorum are bound together when Charmian replies to the guard's question of Cleopatra's death: "It is well done, and fitting for a princess/Descended of so many royal kings" (V, ii, 324-6). This is contrasted to Enobarbus's despair when he finds that he should not have deserted Antony: "I will go seek/Some ditch, wherein to die: the foul'st best fits/My latter part of life" (IV, vi, 37-9).

6. In The Origins of European Thought about the Body, the Mind, the Soul, the World, Time, and Fate (1951), R.B. Onians demonstrates through careful citations and historical analysis of texts that such classical expressions as "man's fate is in the 'lap of the gods'" refers to "the early Hellenic idea of fate as spun" (308); the Greeks did see the gods literally as "tailors of the earth." In addition, Onians notes in a key passage: "The 'binding' [and 'spinning'] of the gods is no mere trick of language but a literal description of an actual process, their mode of imposing fate upon mortals, a religious belief not a metaphor.... Thus all these varieties of expression may be referred to the same image or belief: fortune in its different forms is a cord or bond fastened upon a man by the powers above" (331).

While I am not suggesting that Shakespeare was trying to revive this Greek notion of Fate, it is noteworthy that the major references in Onians's study, such as Homer's Iliad and Odyssey and Ovid's Metamorphoses, as well as Plutarch's Lives, are Shakespeare's sources for his Roman plays and his guides for representing pre-Christian mores to his Renaissance audience [cf., J.L. Simmons Shakespeare's Pagan World: The Roman Tragedies (1973)].

7. Marilyn Williamson begins "Fortune in Antony and Cleopatra" (1968) with the observation: "The fickle goddess Fortune is the most neglected person of importance in Antony and Cleopatra.... In [the play] forms of the word fortune appear 41 times, or almost twice as often as in other high frequency plays like Lear and Timon" (423).
8. Shakespeare's Troilus and Cressida (1601-2) provides a good contrast to the uses of the Fortunes of Love and War in the later play, Antony and Cleopatra.
9. Julian Markels sees this as Shakespeare's division between Antony as public and private man in The Pillar of the World (1968). This interpretation would also fit in with the eyes/heart dualism of imagery I have explored, where the public man is determined entirely through his outward

appearances, what is seen, and the private man is measured by the responses of the heart.

10. L.T. Fitz and other critics have recognized that Antony's disclaimer is tantamount to Cordelia's "Nothing" in response to her father's demand for a similar accounting of love in Lear.
11. See Philip J. Traci The Love Play of "Antony and Cleopatra" (1970), especially Chapter IV "The Nature of Love as a Dramatized Theme in the Play," where he discusses interpretations of Antony's love speeches in the context of Ovid's Art of Love, Shakespeare's sonnets, and the love poetry of John Donne and Andrew Marvell.
12. Duels also play an important part in Romeo and Juliet and Hamlet, but the theme of duelling brothers, which is appropriate to Antony and Octavius, is most strongly emphasized in King Lear, where Edmund believes finally that Fortune is the goddess who decides the outcome of his fight to the death with Edgar.
13. Enobarbus's conceit of "the full Caesar" as opposed to Antony's "emptiness" repeats Philo's idea of measure as a scale or a cup and his first idea of Antony's emptiness in dotage. The imagery in connection with fortunes suggests the scales of Zeus and an allusion to the frequent duelling scenes in Homer's Iliad, where Greek faces Trojan, and Zeus decides the outcome by taking his silver scale and deciding the outcome by the balance.
14. The idea of Fortune as based on men's judgment of externals and especially his "eyes" versus the judgment of his heart appears in Shakespeare's work as early as Sonnet 29:

When, in disgrace with Fortune and men's eyes,
I all alone bewep my outcast state,
And trouble deaf heaven with my bootless cries,
And look upon myself and curse my fate,
Wishing me like to one more rich in hope,
Featur'd like him, like him with friends possess'd,
Desiring this man's art, and that man's scope,
With what I most enjoy contented least;
Yet in these thoughts myself almost despising,
Haply I think on thee, and then my state,
Like to the lark at break of day arising
From sullen earth, sings hymns at heaven's gate;
For thy sweet love rememb'red such wealth brings
That then I scorn to change my state with kings.

The speaker begins with acceptance of the judgment of men's eyes, that he is in "disgrace" and "outcast"; this is a judgment of worth based on an evaluation of the goods of Fortune, which he enumerates (hope, features, friends, art, and scope, but most importantly these are all values of the external world as opposed to "what I most enjoy"). In this world of show and seeming, heaven is "deaf" to the cries of despair. Note also that comparisons of man to man end in nothing but melancholy desire and self-hatred.

But when the speaker turns from the judgment of eyes and "false compare" to "sweet love" (the heart) as judge, he finds there is a heaven and a heard voice of song. Also, he discovers a different kind of "wealth" than the "sullen earth" knows. The sonnet's closing couplet with its exaltation and concluding "then I scorn to change my state with kings" echoes in Cleopatra's words in the final act when she realizes, "'tis paltry to be Caesar:/Not being Fortune, he's but Fortune's knave,/A minister of her will" (V, ii, 2-4). In addition, the heaven/earth dichotomy echoes in Antony's initial conceit that Cleopatra must "needs find out new heaven, new earth" (I, i, 17) if she would measure the boundaries of love, and again in his disclaimer of empire for love in "Let Rome in Tiber melt.... Kingdoms are clay: our dungy earth alike/Feeds beast as man; the nobleness of life/Is to do thus" (I, i, 33ff).

15. Richard Hillman points out the contradictory impact of this scene in "Antony, Hercules and Cleopatra: 'the bidding of the gods' and 'the subtlest maze of all'" (1987). Hillman notes that Shakespeare changed the god from Bacchus in Plutarch's account to Hercules, and that he also changed its position in the action: in Plutarch, Bacchus's withdrawal with music and noise of revelry occurs on the eve of the defeat at Alexandria, but Shakespeare places it paradoxically before Antony's last victory over Caesar. Hillman writes, "In moving the departure scene forward to make it unexpectedly herald not defeat, but victory, Shakespeare is clearly subverting tragic form and thus calling into question the meaning implied by the structural momentum" (449).
16. "No more" becomes a refrain for Cleopatra for the rest of the play, as with Poe's raven's lament: She cries to her maids that she is not an "empress" but since Antony's death she is "No more but e'en a woman, and commanded/By such poor passion as the maid that milks,/And does the meanest chares" (IV, xv, 73-5); and "Give me my robe, put on my crown, I have/Immortal longings in me. Now no more/The juice of Egypt's grape shall moist this lip" (V, ii, 279-81).

17. See Jacques Lacan's study of "Desire and the Interpretation of Desire in Hamlet" (1982), where he asserts that "From one end of Hamlet to the other, all anyone talks about is mourning" (39). Lacan believes that one can look at "the drama of Hamlet as the man who has lost the way of his desire" (12).
18. M.C. Bradbrook notes in The Living Monument (1976) that in the scene with the fig-bearer, "Four times Tragedy must tell Comedy to leave the stage" (179). This interpretation of Cleopatra's sudden spate of farewells is in keeping with Bradbrook's thesis that Antony and Cleopatra is a "festive tragedy; it presents an open situation, which has many elements of comedy; it is moving toward the romances" (176).

PART II:

THE TRIUMPH
OF
FORTUNE

Chapter 5

FORTUNE IN ENGLISH LITERATURE
FROM JONSON THROUGH DRYDEN

After the Restoration of Charles in 1660, an entire generation had passed between the "last age" of the English theater and the "new age," and theater-owners had a hard time filling their playbills when the English dramatic tradition had been so utterly interrupted.¹ As W. Jackson Bate points out in The Burden of the Past and the English Poet (1970), in the age of Dryden the greatest burden of literary influence came from the Jacobean and Elizabethan drama more than the literature of classical Greece and Rome. John Dryden's Essay of Dramatic Poesie (1668) is one of the first and greatest literary manifestos of the new age of drama, and in it Dryden names Beaumont and Fletcher and ultimately Ben Jonson as the great examples for the poet/dramatist of Charles's court to follow.²

Lady Fortune appears as a character most conspicuously in Jonson's tragedies, especially Sejanus (1603). However, the comedies also have a tradition of Fortune attached to them, a tradition that is more related to the Juvenalian idea of Fortune than the tradition which Shakespeare drew on.³ Jonson's view of the world in his comedies and tragedies is fundamentally more pessimistic than Shakespeare's. More specifically, he holds out no hope for

the individual to triumph over the corruptions of society. The virtuous characters in his comedies, such as Celia in Volpone (1606), are powerless to protect themselves against the vicious designs of the villains; they are saved only by chance, and tragedy is averted through a deus ex machina not through any action of the individual.

In Jonson's idea of the tradition of classical drama, his work is not concerned with individuals. His comedy does not have any great ladies or gentlemen, like Shakespeare's Rosalind of As You Like It (1599-1600) or Helena of A Midsummer Night's Dream (1595-6). Instead, he has comic characters, types of grotesque. Similarly, though both of his tragedies are named after their protagonists, the actual tragic action does not concern a person at all but the state; the agagnorisis occurs on the level of the republic coming to know its limits. Jonson achieved his greatest masterpieces in his masques because they are the best showcases for his abstract approach to art. In the masques, Jonson can at last use actual allegorical figures instead of characters, such as Morose or Volpone, to explore the forces of good and evil at work in the world.

To some extent, Jonson looks at a much larger picture than Shakespeare. In his dramas, he portrays social forces more than men. His tendency toward abstraction could be the reason why the Restoration audience found Jonson's conversation so much more attractive. In addition, Jonson's

litigious bent looks forward to the flowering of British barristers later in the century. The back and forth of legal debate, especially its administration in Parliament, became a focus of entertainment for the wits of the Restoration. Wycherley's *Widow Blackacre* is a type straight out of Jonson, a female Volpone who twists the letter of the law to her own designs.

By contrast to Jonson who makes his characters slaves to their humours, John Milton believed in the individual's ability to transcend this fallen world. Because of this philosophical bent, Douglas Bush characterizes Milton as "the last great exponent of Christian humanism" (English Literature in the Early Seventeenth Century, 378).

A constant motif throughout Milton's work that stems from the Renaissance conceit of man's battle against Fortune is the question: what is virtue and how can it help a man overcome the corruptions of this fallen world? As early as his masque, Comus (1634) Milton gives us a Fortune figure in the eponymous villain.⁴ The Lady whom Comus captures and tries to seduce finds that "virtue" alone cannot save her.⁵ Thus, the individual is powerless against Fortune, but must be assisted by society (her brothers) and the powers of nature (the Spirit of the Wood and Sabrina) to conquer the force of appetite and animal desire.⁶

Throughout his work, Milton recognized the conflict of the Christian traditions which he espoused and the pagan

traditions of the epic and tragedy, which he tried to adapt to his subject. To be consistent with his religious themes, he avoids the mention of Fortune more conscientiously than any other poet of the seventeenth century. In fact, when Edward Phillips reprinted some of Milton's sonnets on public figures in his Letters of State (1694), he deleted the most pagan mention of Fortune in Milton's work, a line in an early sonnet to Cromwell (Sonnet 16: "Cromwell, our cheif of men," dated May 1652).

But the deletion was misinformed, as can be seen if the reference to Fortune is viewed in its context in the body of Milton's work, not condemned as a youthful apostrophe to a pagan god. The line describes Cromwell triumphant over the Scots: "[Cromwell, thou] on the neck of crowned Fortune proud/Hast reard Gods Trophies and his work pursu'd" (5-6). The sonnet ends with a prayer to Cromwell to "Help us to save free Conscience from the paw/Of hireling wolves whose Gospell is their maw."

In the propaganda of the Commonwealth, Fortune was often associated with Cromwell, as in Andrew Marvell's "An Horatian Ode upon Cromwell's Return from Ireland" (written between May and July 1650), which ends with a less devout address to the "chief:" But thou, the war's and fortune's
son

March indefatigably on!
And for the last effect,
Still keep thy sword erect;
Besides the force it has to fright
The spirits of shady night,
The same arts that did gain

A power must it maintain (113-21).

Milton's poem could be a corrective to Marvell's martial idea of Cromwell's place as "Lord Protector." After all, the religious poet reminds his lord that it is "Gods Trophies" that he must concern himself with and that "proud Fortune" must be subdued and humbled before the duties to "save free Conscience" that Cromwell is bound to fulfill. The following sonnet in Milton's sequence, "When I consider how my light is spent" (Sonnet XVII) also uses this idea of God's will as more important than the outward opinion of the world, as in the lines "who best/Bear his mild yoke, they serve him best; his state/Is kingly" (10-2) and the final resolution, "They also serve who only stand and wait."

In Milton's Paradise Lost (1667, revised 1674) one might expect Satan to rail against Fortune in true epic style, but it is the Satan of Paradise Regained who boasts like a proud Machiavellian from the Jacobean stage, "Fortune is in my hand" (II. 429). Christ answers him in exactly the style of Sonnet XVII, as he runs through the false doctrines of humanity and especially the Stoics, who believe they know what "virtue" is, yet

Alas what can they teach, and not mislead,
Ignorant of themselves, of God much more....
Much of the soul they talk, but all awry,
And in themselves seek virtue, and to themselves
All glory arrogate, to God give none;
Rather accuse him under usual names,
Fortune and fate, as one regardless quite
Of mortal things. Who therefore seeks in these
True wisdom, finds her not (309-19).

This view of the fallen world also repeats the history of man that the Archangel Michael gives to Adam when he expels him from Paradise in the second, lengthened version of Paradise Lost:

Wolves shall succeed for teachers, grievous wolves,
Who all the sacred mysteries of heaven
To their own vile advantages shall turn
Of lucre and ambition (508-11).

Adam answers with the lesson of Sonnet XVII:

Henceforth I learn that to obey is best,
And love with fear the only god, to walk
As in his presence,...and by small
Accomplishing great things, by things deemed weak
Subverting worldly strong, and worldly wise
By simply meek (561-9).

Michael assures Adam that with his new knowledge of his place in the world, "then wilt thou not be loth/To leave this Paradise, but shalt possess/A paradise within thee, happier far" (585-8).

In fact, in all of Milton's work, Fortune appears most frequently in Samson Agonistes (1674). The idea of classical tragedy and the de casibus motif seems to be the tradition behind this usage. But, like Jesus in Paradise Regained Samson is tempted to doubt his special status as God's chosen one on earth. He looks at the outward rewards of Fortune (he is blind and in chains) and he is tempted to despair, but he discovers that God has not abandoned him when he begins to feel the "inward motions" of God working through him. Prompted by this inner voice, he performs his last great feat and frees the Jews from the Philistines. In

this way for Milton, Satan and Fortune are defeated by the man of true wisdom who bows to the will of God, but Milton did not convince his compatriots, and his Jesus argues sophistically but he does not really answer Satan; this is why Blake can later claim that "Milton was of the Devil's party without knowing it."

Other poets of the later seventeenth century use Fortune in their works especially when complaining about the changes in the world around them and the corruption and decay of the once beautiful world. As seen above, Andrew Marvell and other poets of the Commonwealth tried to construct a myth of Cromwell as the rising star of Fortune, a Davidic king and chosen one of God, but his early death destroyed the Commonwealth.⁷

Although, Thomas Carew claimed in his elegy for John Donne that he avoided reference to pagan myths in his poetry,⁸ in fact, Donne refers to the goddess Fortune many times in his works, and specifically his Elegy XII addresses the question of Fortune's parting of two lovers: Can they be parted or will they triumph over Fortune? The poem begins with despair at parting, "Since she must go, and I must mourn, come Night,/Environ me with darkness, whilst I write" (1-2), but it reaches a climax where the poet realizes it is Fortune, not Love, which is causing their separation, and he bravely scolds:

Oh Fortune, thou'rt not worth my least exclaim
And plague enough thou hast in thine owne shame.

Do thy great worst, my friend and I have armes,⁹
 Though not against thy strokes, against thy harmes.
 Rend us in sunder, thou canst not divide
 Our bodies so, but still our souls are ty'd,
 And we can love by letters still and gifts,
 And thoughts and dreams; Love never wanteth shifts
 (65-72).

But this brave talk is empty if his love is not constant, and the speaker of this elegy ends with a prayer to his mistress that is as tender and as open to the possibility of betrayal as Matthew Arnold's closing "Ah, love let us be true to one another..." in his own great love elegy, "Dover Beach" (1867). Donne's speaker asks: "And dearest Friend, since we must part... so/Declare yourself base fortunes Enemy,/No less by your contempt then constancy:/That I may grow enamour'd on your mind" (83-93). The reader has little certainty that the speaker's prayer is answered, and Donne is ambivalent about man's ability to be "true" to God or himself.

In fact, Dame Fortune appears most frequently in Donne's little-known verse epistles, which he called "documents of my second religion, friendship."¹⁰ In these epistles, he advises his friends on the ways of court and discusses the definition of true "virtue."

Donne's verse epistles are patterned after Horace's Epistles, and as such they are mostly epideictic in nature, some of them extravagant in their praise. For example, in the first epistle to Lucy, Countess of Bedford (1633), who was later one of Donne's most powerful patrons, Donne begins

by declaring,

Madame,
 You have refin'd me, and to worthyest things
 (Vertue, Art, Beauty, Fortune,) now I see
 Rarenesse, or use, not nature value brings;
 And such, as they are circumstanc'd, they bee" (1-4).

He concludes his first paragraph with the conceit: "at Court, which is not vertues clime... there some must bee/To usher vertue, and say, This is shee" (7-12).

The uses of Fortune in the poetry of praise of the seventeenth century has not been well documented, but reference to Fortune seems to be a commonplace both in the poetry of praise and blame (satire). Since these are usually occasional poems, it is fitting that Fortune as occasio should appear in them.

Donne questions as much as he asserts in his epistles. For example, in the epistle "To Sir Henry Wotton, at his going Ambassador to Venice," Donne warns his fellow poet against the crooked ways of Italy and gives the heroic code as the best morality: "Honour alone will to your fortune fit." Conversely, in one of his most popular poems of the time "The Storm," a verse epistle describing the disastrous Islands Voyage of 1597, Donne begins with this echo of Achilles's questioning of the heroic code:

For, Fates, or Fortunes drifts none can soothsay,
 Honour and misery have one face and way (11-12).

Or, as Gray wrote in the next century, "The paths of glory lead but to the grave" ["Elegy Written in a Country

Churchyard" (1746)].

Later poets of the seventeenth century are more consistently pessimistic about man's battle against Fortune. Andrew Marvell in particular emphasizes the corruption of the world and the impossibility of virtue being triumphant or man achieving meaningful love in a postlapsarian world governed by Fortune.

In answer to this climate of doubt and pessimism, Thomas Hobbes's Leviathan (1651) provides a new myth for the world of the court and Fortune's provenance.¹¹ His materialism is the only certainty among the ambiguities of later seventeenth century life. In addition, Hobbes was influential in literature, and his description of the "laws" of Nature helped to establish an entirely new idea of man as a rational animal, ready to return to his animal state if society does not curb his bestial appetite.¹²

John Dryden followed Hobbes's philosophy of the laws of Nature and Fortune throughout his work.¹³ And, like Shakespeare, Dryden's entire canon of poetry, both dramatic and non-dramatic, uses the theme of Fortune and Fate as key concepts.¹⁴

Dryden's first respected work of poetry is his "Heroic Stanzas to Cromwell" (1658), which he wrote as a posthumous elegy to the fallen chief. The first few quatrains establish the epideictic tone, but Dryden makes an important distinction in relation to Cromwell as Fortune's favorite.

He notes in Stanza 6: "His grandeur he derived from Heav'n alone,/For he was great ere Fortune made him so" (21-2). Dryden took up where Donne left off with his verse epistles, as Barbara Lewalski notes in Donne's Anniversaries: The Poetry of Praise (1972), and he also continues to ask the question of the place of virtue in this fallen world and the possibility of the conquest of Fortune by the individual. However, he gives a different perspective to his idea of virtue and vice, as can be seen in a close study of his occasional poems.

Fortune appears again in Dryden's poems Astraea Redux, a Poem on the Return of Charles the Second (1665) and the Annus Mirabilis (1667) both epideictic poems, this time hailing the dawn of the new age of Charles. Paul Hammond notes in his essay "Dryden's Philosophy of Fortune" (1985) that the Annus Mirabilis is "the poem which sees the introduction into Dryden's philosophical vocabulary of the word 'auspicious,' which he uses to denote people or periods of time which are in the care of Providence rather than Fortune" (772).

Thus, Dryden begins his career in letters on an optimistic note. He believes in Providence and Fortune, and both are working together for the improvement of mankind. Unlike Donne, Dryden is pleased that he lives in a "new" age. In his defense of the modern playwrights against the ancients in the Essay of Dramatic Poesie (1668) his

spokesmen Eugenius and Neander (the "new" man of the "new" age) insist that the English theater and English poetry in general have improved since the days of Shakespeare and Ben Jonson, especially in the realm of "wit" or imagination.¹⁵ Another spokesman in the Essay, Crites, begins the first debate with the statement that "almost a new nature" has been discovered in the past few years in philosophy and science. He tries to use this modern superiority in science to argue that the modern age is not an age of poetry, that its genius is limited to science, but Eugenius points out that because the moderns have studied nature, they imitate her better than the ancients could have.

Fortune is an integral part of the definition of drama that Dryden's disputants agree on in the Essay before they begin their debates:

Lisideius.... conceived a play ought to be a just and lively Image of Human Nature, representing its Passions and Humours, and the Changes of Fortune to which it is subject; for the Delight and Instruction of Mankind (15).

Fortune is the goddess of change, and as such she governs the peripety of tragedy.

In fact, Dryden began his career as a playwright with heroic drama where the protagonist claims himself the favorite of Fortune. However, as the sunny court of Charles began to darken with intrigues and plots against the king, Dryden's plays became more and more pessimistic. In Aureng-Zebe, the protagonist is weary of the world and the changes

of Fortune; he begins to see the destructive side of the goddess. In Absalom and Achitophel (1682), Dryden's satire on the Popish Plot and the crisis when the Earl of Shaftesbury and other Whigs tried to exclude James, Charles's Roman Catholic brother, from inheriting the throne. Dryden's narrator proclaims against change with such ringing statements as "All other errors but disturb a state,/But innovation is the blow of Fate" (799-800). Also, the villain Achitophel (Dryden's name for the Earl of Shaftesbury) speaks of Fortune in his temptation of the good young Absalom (the Duke of Monmouth, Charles's illegitimate son), which begins,¹⁶

Auspicious Prince! at whose Nativity
Some Royal Planet rul'd the Southern sky...
Believe me, Royal Youth, thy Fruit must be,
Or gather'd Ripe, or rot upon the Tree.
Heav'n, has to all allotted, soon or late,
Some lucky Revolution of their Fate:
Whose Motions, if we watch and guide with Skill,
(For humane Good depends on humane Will,)
Our Fortune rolls, as from a smooth Descent,
And, from the first Impression, takes the Bent:
But, if unseiz'd, she glides away like wind:
And leaves repenting Folly far behind (230-59).

Achitophel goes so far as to surmise that the Davidic king owes his kingship to Fortune, not Providence ["Had thus old David, from whose loins you spring,/Not dared, when fortune called him, to be king,/At Gath an exile he might still remain,/And Heaven's anointing oil had been in vain" (263-4)].

After many changes in his own life, such as his conversion to Catholicism, which Samuel Johnson saw as evidence of gross hypocrisy and outright "prostitution" to the time, and especially after his loss of the Poet Laureateship in 1688 when William and Mary took the throne, Dryden gained a darker vision of the world, and Fortune is not his friend. By the end of his long life, Dryden gives a satiric retrospective of "what changes in this age have been" (24) in his Secular Masque (1700), which ends with a pithy summary of the age of the Tudors, addressed first to Diana (representing the courts of James I and Charles I), then Mars (the wars of Charles I), and Venus (the amorous days of the courts of Charles II and James II):

All, all of a piece throughout:
 Thy chase had a beast in view:
 Thy wars brought nothing about;
 Thy lovers were all untrue.
 'Tis well an old age is out,
 And time to begin a new (95-100).

* * * * *

1. At this time there were only two licensed theaters, the Duke's and the King's, but both encouraged free adaptations of Shakespeare's plays, which were quite popular. As Allardyce Nicoll notes in his studies Dryden as an Adapter of Shakespeare (1922) and the later A History of English Drama, Volume I (1952), the many adaptations of Shakespeare's plays included the following: Romeo and Juliet was made into a tragicomedy by Howard and "classicised" by Otway, Macbeth was transformed into an opera by D'Avenant, Lear was given a happy ending by Tate, Antony and Cleopatra was "rendered heroic" by Sedley and Dryden, Troilus was "heroicised" by Dryden, Coriolanus was "made political" by Tate, Titus Andronicus included more bloodshed (if one can imagine it) in Ravenscroft's version, Timon was "turned into a play" by Shadwell, Julius Caesar was rewritten by an anonymous

dramatist, Cymbeline was "made pathetic" by D'Urfey, and Pericles received an updating by an anonymous writer. Nicoll notes that the playwrights were not happy with Shakespeare's rude style and homey language; in fact, of all Shakespeare's plays, "Hamlet and Othello alone they permitted to be seen unadapted" (174).

Restoration dramatists felt they were improving Shakespeare's art because they believed they had a better understanding of literary theory due to their exposure to the French drama and its "rules" during the King's retreat on the continent. Also, Dryden and other seventeenth century dramatists claimed that their level of conversation was more noble and elegant than the poets of the "last age" because of the great King Charles and his court's devotion to the art of repartee. Nicoll states: "This infinite self-confidence is, I think, the first and primal characteristic of the age of Charles" (8).

2. According to Dryden's Crites [a name taken from Jonson's Cynthia's Revels (1601), where he is a character identified with the author and is described as "a creature of a more perfect and divine temper... in whom all the humours and elements are peaceably met" like Truewit in Epiccoene, a character Dryden praises later in his Essay], Jonson is "the greatest man of the last age" (21), and Neander (the "new man" of the new age, a character most critics identify with Dryden himself) later compares Jonson and Shakespeare, and concludes that while Shakespeare writes the most "lively" plays and comes closest to the passions of his audience ["when he describes anything you more than see it, you feel it too"], Jonson is the better poet because "I think him the most learned and judicious writer" (41).
3. See Leo Salingar's Shakespeare and the Traditions of Comedy (1974).
4. In fact, Comus shares many characteristics with Mammon in Spenser's Faerie Queene, Book II, who is one of the originals for Milton's Satan in the later Paradise Regained.
5. Note the similarity between Celia in Jonson's Volpone (especially in the seduction/rape scene of Act III) and the Lady in Milton's Comus.
6. See Angus Fletcher's Transcendental Masque (1971) Chapter 6 "The Bound Man" for an interpretation of the Sabrina myth in relation to the salvation of the Lady. Also, Fletcher notes, "Had Milton omitted the Spirit's tableau, or relocated it in the manner of the Bridgewater Manuscript, his masque would have ended on a much more didactic plane, like Pleasure Reconciled to Virtue, whose fourth song the Spirit's last

lines recall, with their image of Heaven stooping to aid earth-bound Virtue" (227).

7. See Joseph A. Mazzeo's essays "Cromwell as Machiavellian Prince in Marvell's An Horatian Ode" and "Cromwell as Davidic King" both in Renaissance and Seventeenth Century Studies (1964).

8. Thomas Carew writes in "An Elegie upon the Death of Dr. John Donne:"

But thou art gone, and thy strict lawes will be
Too hard for Libertines in Poetrie.
They will repeal the goodly exil'd traine
Of gods and goddesses, which in thy just raigne
Were banish'd nobler Poems, now, with these
The silenc'd tales o'th'Metamorphoses
Shall stufte their lines, and swell the windy Page,
Till Verse refin'd by thee, in this last Age
Turne ballad rime, Or those old Idolls bee
Ador'd againe, with new apostasie (61-70).

9. Dryden has Cleopatra repeat this retort in All For Love (1678) with her dying words, "Caesar, thy worst:/Now part us, if thou canst" (V, 500-1). In fact, much of Donne's "Elegy" is parallel with the problem of Fortune and Love in the tragedies of Antony and Cleopatra.
10. See the Introduction to W. Milgate, ed. John Donne: The Satires, Epigrams and Verse Letters (1967), especially the section "Donne as Moralist" (xxxiiiff).
11. See especially Part I "Of Man," Chapter 10, "Of Power, Worth, Dignity, Honour, and Worthinesse," of Hobbes's Leviathan, where he makes this distinction between the inner and the outer man in terms of Nature vs. Fortune, a dichotomy that will be repeated in philosophy and literature through the eighteenth century in England: "Naturall Power, is the eminence of the Faculties of Body, or mind: as extraordinary Strength, Forme, Prudence, Arts, Eloquence, Liberality, Nobility. Instrumentall are those Powers, which acquired by these, or by fortune, are means and Instruments to acquire more: as Riches, Reputation, Friends, and the secret working of God, which men call Good Luck" (150).
12. See the famous Chapter 13 of Part I of Leviathan (1651), "Of the Natural Condition of Mankind as Concerning Their Felicity and Misery" and the following chapters on the laws of Nature, where he states that "the condition of man is a condition of war of every one against every one."

13. Josephine Miles notes in Eras and Modes in English Poetry (1964) that Dryden's vocabulary is characterized by "key value terms like good, day, eye, God, heaven, man, and... their emphasis is upon four special interests: emotion... abstraction... descriptive physical detail... and especially heroic combat (35).....Others in Dryden's time were devoted to this same complex of materials for poetry [e.g., Marvell, Addison, Parnell and Pope].... nature and fate are pervasive" (37).
14. In "Dryden's Philosophy of Fortune" (1985), Paul Hammond analyzes Dryden's use of the concept in the non-dramatic works, including the "Heroique Stanzas to Cromwell," "Astraea Redux," "Annus Mirabilis," and "Absalom and Achitophel," as well as Dryden's Latin translations. Hammond notes: "Dryden continued to make Fortune an active element in his vocabulary, so that his apparently disconnected references to Fortune actually form a series of linked thoughts" (777).
15. Samuel H. Monk points out in his notes to the California edition of the Essay of Dramatick Poesie that "It is not always realized that Neander's answer to Lisideius and his answer to Crites are alike founded on the capacity of the imagination.... The essential unity of Dryden's Essay can be seen in his advocacy of a dramatic art which gives 'more latitude to the Rules' and rising 'as high as the imagination of the Poet can carry them [the elements of a play], with proportion to verisimilty'" (347).
16. See Anne D. Ferry's Milton and the Miltonic Dryden for a comparison of Achitophel's temptation speech to Milton's Satan to Eve in Paradise Lost and Satan to Christ in Paradise Regained.

Chapter 6

THOMAS MAY'S "TRAGOEDY OF CLEOPATRA:"
FORTUNE IN SATIRE

Thomas May's use of the figure of Fortune in The Tragoedy of Cleopatra (1626) is informed by the classical, especially Roman, tradition of the goddess. At the same time, she is the Fortune of the Caroline court, a highly political deity recognized in the masques, poetry and plays of the period as the regent of a world corrupted and tending toward ruin, which man must battle against to keep himself from total destruction.¹ Thus, Donne's "new philosophy" that "calls all in doubt" is as important a background to May's Fortune as Plutarch's.² While May seeks to re-establish or historically purify the tradition of Fortune, his vision of Fortune is not strictly Roman, however, nor is his idea of the tragedy of Fortune shaped by either the de casibus tradition nor the Machiavellian, but rather by classical satire and its idea of Fortune's rule as the product of man's folly.

In his preface to his adaptation of the classical tragedy Antigone (1631) May suggests that his style of tragedy is founded on Ben Jonson's idea of "truth of Argument" in the ancient classics.³ Jonson defined this style in his short but pithy "Preface to Sejanus, His Fall (1605)," where he asserts that the task of the tragic writer

is to preserve "truth of Argument, dignity of Persons, gravity and height of Elocution, fulness and frequencie of Sentence" (10). It is clear from the text of May's Cleopatra with its citations of sources and its verbatim use of North's Plutarch that with Jonson May regards history as "truth" and more worthy of verse drama than the fevered imaginings of contemporary poets.⁴

Like Jonson's vision of Fortune in his tragedies, May's goddess is the patron of Roman emperors. Although Jonson's Sejanus shows that Fortune can be seen as the cause of a man's ruin, as Gary D. Hamilton points out in his study of "Irony and Fortune in Sejanus" (1971), "to understand the play solely in terms of the medieval tragic formula is to miss much that Jonson wanted us to see" (267). One of Jonson's original sources for the tale of Sejanus is Juvenal's "Tenth Satire, or On the Vanity of Human Wishes," which Lepidus paraphrases in the last act of the play:

Fortune, thou hadst no deity, if men
Had wisdom; we have placed thee so high
By fond belief in thy felicity (V, vi).

Thus in Jonson's tragedy Fortune is a human foible, not a goddess at all but an artificial deity, and man's belief in her shows him to be a fool.

In effect, Jonson uses the motif of Fortune for social criticism, to show in his own mordant way that there are no heroes, only knaves and fools in this world.⁵ In just this

same way, Jonson's comedy of humours uses the classical concept of satire as a purge for the excessive "humours" that make men less than rational animals. In the seventeenth century, with the gradual internalization of Fortune, it is apt that the Fortune of Juvenalian satire is so influential since it recognizes the goddess as a product of man not Parnassus.

Fortune is alluded to frequently in May's tragedy, especially after the sea battle of Actium, which both Octavius, Antony and Cleopatra declare was decided by Fortune. In fact, May gives no other explanation than the tipping of Fortune's scales for Cleopatra's sudden retreat and Antony's ill-considered decision to follow her. As Caesar's general Pinnarius sums up to his troops after Actium, "Before we knew not/To whome the Godds and Fortune had assigne'd/Pure service; soldiers, now they have declar'd" (III, i, 13-5). In addition, because May's work is a mosaic of quotations and anecdotes from Plutarch and Dio Cassius, his plot is predetermined from the first, and the characters seem to have no choice but to fulfill their well-known destinies. As Denzell Smith notes in his "Introduction" to the authoritative edition of The Tragoedy of Cleopatra (1979), May "shows that the general scheme of action in the play is governed by a fate that men cannot control" (xcvii).

But does May use the same images of Fortune that Plutarch used? Marilyn Williamson notes in her study of "Fortune in Antony and Cleopatra" (1968) that Fortune occurs in Plutarch's narrative as a kind of Roman folk-goddess (426); this objective historian reports without comment what legends were attached to the battle of Actium, as for example when Caesar meets a shepherd named "Eutyclus" (good Tyche or Fortune) while overseeing his ships in the harbor the morning of the battle (300). Plutarch does not confuse Fortune with History, as May does; she is not the driving force behind men's actions.

May's Fortune has much more in common with that of political satirist's, and more particularly she is the goddess the seventeenth century playwright calls on to show what fools these mortals be. In the volatile intrigues of the Caroline court, May's tragedy yields many parallels to contemporary political figures. For example, the parallel between Antony and Charles is clear from the first; they are both great but misguided leaders who betray their countrymen into a civil war because of personal rivalries and bad policies.

Also, Cleopatra and her band of revellers, who give banquets and shows of Olympian conceits, reflect on Henrietta Maria and her coterie who enjoyed celebrating any occasion with banquets and elaborate masques. The masque of

love that Antony and Cleopatra propose in their witty conversation in the first banquet in May's play is intended to be reminiscent of many of Jonson's and other poets' royal masques of the period.

In fact, Charles I and Henrietta Maria, had their new rule declared in two lavish works which feature Fortune as a character. First, in Love's Welcome at Bolsover (1634),⁶ in addition to the famous caricature of Inigo Jones in the person of Master Vitruvius, Ben Jonson celebrates the transcendent love of Charles and Henrietta Maria, a love so strong that it can defeat Fortune and Time (who are shown as an aged woman and man in contrast to the young Eros and Anteros, who personify the mutual love of the regents). The second work is Thomas Carew's Coelum Britannicum (1634), with its enormous stage designs by Inigo Jones. Stephen Orgel called it "the greatest theatrical expression of the Caroline autocracy" (Illusion 83). In Carew's allegory, Jove banishes all bad or questionable influences, including Fortune, from his heavenly court in an attempt to imitate the great Charles in his orderly rule.

In May's play, Cleopatra like Henrietta Maria is also called the "Queen of Fortune," and in the first act, Antony compares Cleopatra to "bright Cynthia/In her full orbe" (I, ii, 33-4), then he goes on to describe an elaborate tableau that would rival the apotheosis of James on the ceiling at

the Whitehall Banquet House:

Meethinkes
 Jove should descend, while Cleopatra's here,
 Disguis'd for love, as once for feare hee was
 When bold Typhoeus scal'd the starry sky,
 And all the Godds disguis'd in Aegypt lurk'd.
 Love were a nobler cause then feare to bring him,
 And such a love as thine.

This speech is followed by a song, where the Egyptians argue in carpe diem style that men should enjoy life while they can because "Whilest you doo, you aequallize/The Godds in happiness" (I, ii, 68-9).

When Antony presents Cleopatra with the crowns of three provinces he has captured, it is also performed in typical masque style with Cleopatra declared the queen of Cypress, Venus's isle.⁷ Finally Antony tells the story of Cleopatra's pageant down the river Cidnus, when she first played Venus to his Mars

But long agoe was I enforc'd to know
 That Cleopatra was the Queene of Love,
 When first I mett her in Cilicia,
 And downe the silver streame of Cidnus, thou
 In Venus shape cam'st sailing, while the aire
 Was ravish'd with thy Musicke, and the windes
 In amorous gales did kisse thy silken sailes.
 Thy maides in Graces habitts did attend,
 And boys, like Cupids, painted quivers bore,
 While thousand Cupids in those starry eyes
 Stood ready drawne to wound the stoutest hearts
 (I, ii, 131-40).

The entire speech compares well to Enobarbus's description of this same event in Shakespeare's play, the imagery of which is taken almost verbatim from North's translation of Plutarch, the major source of both authors. In Shakespeare,

Cleopatra's "person" is so gorgeous that she o'erpictures "that Venus where we see/The fancy outwork nature" (II, ii, 200-1). By contrast, in May's version, Cleopatra is consciously imitating Venus and she dresses up her maids and boys in costumes to fit her pageant. Thus, May changes his source more than Shakespeare, and he intentionally presents his Cleopatra as a seventeenth century masque-giving queen like Henrietta Maria.

It is also significant that, like Cleopatra to the Romans, Charles's consort was a foreigner to the British, a Catholic from the decadent French court. In May's play, Titius and Plancus (the same Roman magistrates who begin the play) decide to leave Antony and join Octavius because they think Antony loves Cleopatra more than his allies. They see the outcome of the wars in this dim light:

But shall our valour toils in sweat and blood
Only to gaine a Roman Monarchy
For Cleopatra and th'effeminate rout
Of base Canopus? Shall her timbrells fright
Romes Capitoll, and her advanced pride
Tread on the necks of captive Senatours? (I, ii, 212-20).

Many critics have pointed out that May is the only playwright who presents Cleopatra as a traitor to Antony. Denzell Smith argues that this skeptical portrait of Cleopatra shows that Dio Cassius is May's source (lxxxv). However, the reason for this portrayal could also be that May means to show by extension that Henrietta Maria was

decadent and a bad influence on Charles, whereas the Elizabethan writers were more inclined to show the noble, proud but whimsical greatness of their own monarch in their *Cleopatra*.

May further suggests the parallel between the Roman civil war and the one brewing in London by repeatedly mentioning that the real cause of the conflict is the wounded rule of the Senate at Rome (read Parliament in England) as it tries to survive under the capricious whims of private tyrants. Like Shakespeare's Antony and Cleopatra, May's play opens with a discussion of Antony's love-crazed behavior by a group of Romans, but May's Romans are "magistrates" not soldiers and they believe that the Senate should rule Rome, not Caesar or Antony. As Canidius describes it, the world is rotten with corruption because Romans have "endur'd our Consuls state and power/To bee subjected by the lawless armes/Of private men" (I, i, 100-2).

May's satirical intentions were quite clear to the British literati of his day. His play was never presented on the stage, but it went through two printings, one in 1639, when the power of the king was in great jeopardy and the Parliamentary disputes were a cause celebre, and in 1654 the play enjoyed a second printing, after May had been dead for four years and buried in Westminster Abbey (though his

body was removed to nearby St. Margaret's churchyard after the Restoration of the King), the play enjoyed a second printing. Indeed, in his mock elegy, Marvell accused May of "transferring old Rome" (49) to England in his poetry, and he has Ben Jonson's shade scold May in Hades in a scene that gives precedent to such great satires against bad poets as Dryden's Mac Flecknoe and Pope's Dunciad: "Foul Architect that hadst not Eye to see/How ill the measures of these States agree" (51-2).

It is also possible that in the tragedy a clef that May presents, readers during the Protectorate also saw a kind of prophecy. Octavius Caesar, "whom Fortune now has made/Sole lord of all" (III, i, 39-40), corresponds to Cromwell, whose reign was celebrated and justified by many writers and poets as a consequence of Fate more than ambition.⁸

But however much it increased the posthumous printings of the play, the choice of satire over tragedy takes its toll on the dramatic effect of May's play. Like Thersites in Shakespeare's Troilus and Cressida, May has but one theme: "wars and lechery, all wars and lechery." There are no heroes in May's play. Cleopatra is downright treacherous, making pacts with Caesar behind Antony's back after his defeat at Actium. Similarly, the interlude in Act III where Antony takes on the name and lifestyle of Timon the Misanthrope in his madness shows him as a railer and a

fool. He jokes bitterly with his philosopher friend that he will keep a bawdy-house to assure himself of the destruction of all men. The lack of a hero extends to Octavius Caesar, who by the end of the play is little more than Cleopatra's gull. He thinks he knows how to deceive Cleopatra, but in the end he recognizes that he cannot stop her from joining Antony in death. As in the Roman sources, Octavius consults with Cleopatra's physician and employs Egyptian "psylls," men skilled in reviving snakebite victims, but he is too late. He finally gives up. "Wee will no longer strive 'gainst Destiny" (V, v, 98), he says.

The interlude of Antony as Timon in May's play also shows an important kind of Fortune which corresponds to satire, that Fortune which shows us our true friends. As Robert C. Elliot notes in his chapter on "The Great Misanthropes" in The Power of Satire (1960) throughout the history of literature on Timon it is understood that he is not a tragic figure; in fact Lucian makes it clear that "Timon was a fool in his failure to discriminate between the worthy and the unworthy, between true friends and jackals" (146). Before his bankruptcy, Timon also used Fortune and enjoyed her gifts, and he accepts the poets' tribute to him as one of the favorites of Fortune. His reaction to bad Fortune is a rejection of man and a kind of madness borne of bitterness, but his madness does not make him less of a

fool.

The theme of friendship is important to May's version of Antony's fall from greatness. Antony loses his allies because, as his generals note, "Alas, hee knows not what true frendshipp meanes,/But makes his frends his slaves, and which is worse/Slaves to his lusts and vices" (I, ii, 174-5).

At first, May tries to establish a conflict between Friendship and Love in his play, so that Antony's downfall is seen as a misplacing of affection. Canidius, Antony's most trusted general, admits from the first that he is also in love with Cleopatra, and later he accepts a bribe from Cleopatra to convince Antony to allow her to join him at the battle of Actium. Antony foolishly places the decision of whether or not to bring Cleopatra along in his allies' hands with the words, "Now noble frends, on whose oraculous counsells/And matchlesse valour my whole fate depends" (II, iii, 85-6). Again, after his mad scene as Timon, Antony recovers himself with the news that his army has dispersed and gone over to Caesar. He recognizes Canidius and his other captains with the words,

Dearest frends,
I will bee prooffe 'gainst any fortune now.
Come lett's together to the Court...
And laugh at Fortunes malice; for youre sight
More cheeres my spirits then her frownes can dull them
(III, iii, 149-54).

Later, Antony tells Cleopatra, "I have lost no frends./All that are gone from mee to Caesar's side.../Were fortunes frends not mine" (III, iii, 194-8). But he returns to the court of Cleopatra, where she is in the process of making pacts with Caesar against him through the flattering embassy of Thyreus.

Shakespeare also uses the theme of true friendship as the test of Fortune in his Antony and Cleopatra;⁹ in particular, Antony's largesse to Enobarbus after he has deserted to Caesar's camp shows Antony's magnanimity and true friendship, as Enobarbus realizes too late. But in satire, the world is corrupt and there are no true friends; there are only two types of man: knave and fool. Consequently, in May's play, friendship between men is an illusion; Fortune rules men's actions and their hearts.¹⁰

Antony's madness and his foolish railing against Fortune instead of recognizing the folly of his own policies in war show him as a type in the tradition of the Herculean hero, a character both tragic and satiric. As Eugene Waith describes him in his study of The Herculean Hero in Marlowe, Chapman, Shakespeare and Dryden (1962), he is "a warrior of great stature who is guilty of striking departures from the morality of the society in which he lives" (11). Indeed, Antony considered himself a descendant of Hercules, as

Plutarch notes in his character of Antony:

Now, it had bene a speeche of old time, that the familie of the Antonii were discended from one Anton, the sonne of Hercules, whereof the familie tooke name. This opinion did Antonius seeke to confirme in all his doings: not onely resembling him in the likenes of his bodye... but also in the wearing of his garments (257).

Hercules is not only a tragic figure of heroic stature, as Waith shows, but a comic figure as well. Ben Jonson gives the best portrait of the comic Hercules in his masque "Pleasure Reconciled to Virtue" (1618), where it is Daedalus, the figure of the poet and the Magister Ludi, not Hercules, who contrives the final harmony and the Dance of Contraries with which the entertainment ends.¹¹

But of the examples of Herculean heroes in the drama of the seventeenth century which Waith examines, it is particularly Chapman's hero of Bussy D'Ambois (1604) who shares a fatalistic attitude and blindness to the consequences of his actions with May's raging fool Marc Antony. Significantly, Chapman begins Bussy D'Ambois with the protagonist in an isolated world of pastoral retreat (like Timon in the desert), where he laments that all the world is controlled by Fortune and that a good man is an outcast in the corrupt world of the French court. To a certain extent, Bussy also shows himself to be something of a fool, especially in his love for Tamyra.

But May's Antony has none of the idealistic charisma of Chapman's protagonist. Antony is the Hercules of the

comedies; he is a big idiot, buffeted about from one extreme to another, a pawn in Fortune's game of chess.

As Waith notes, the tradition of the Herculean hero has its place in the history of drama, especially in the development of heroic drama after the Restoration, where the world is a lapsed paradise of lost men concerned only with material gain. The idealistic hero is too good for this world, and though he strives to make things right he is doomed to be cast out as an alien. At the same time however, he is always recognized as better than the cynical weaklings that rule in these latter days.

Thus, May's world is characterized by "ruin;" the Roman magistrates that begin the play declare that "this Aegyptian Queene was made/To bee the ruine of Antonius" (I, i, 4-5). Similarly, the Egyptian governors Seleucus and Glaucus, who begin Act II, lament the corruption of the world. For them, there is "no other justice then ambition" (13) to justify the civil war that is tearing the world apart between Antony and Octavius.

Thomas May follows Shakespeare in pairing Fortune and Time, but the Time of his play is historical, an external force impinging on man's freedom. May's historical bent is not surprising since he was the first historian of Parliament, and his verse translation and continuation of Lucan's Pharsalia (1627) were famous in his time. Though

accused of being a "most servile wit and mercenary pen" by Marvell, May wrote the History of Parliament (1640-47), which is often compared favorably with the Earl of Clarendon's more famous History of the Rebellion (written 1646-74, published 1702-4). Thus, May was familiar with, or perhaps obsessed by, both classical historical models and the new ideas of history in the Renaissance. Tom Driver explores the difference between these two ideas of history in The Sense of History in Greek and Shakespearean Drama (1960), where he notes that the Shakespearean playwright "believes in an ordering purpose above the temporal process, indistinguishable in form from the Christian idea of Providence, which imposes the burden of choice upon man without abandoning history to chaos..... The Shakespearean tragic hero is guilty of sin, rather than hybris" (104-5).

May tells a historical tale of the fall of a great empire. His emphasis on the ultimate decay of all things in nature is evident in the scene where Antony imitates Timon in the desert and philosophizes on the corruptness of man which is discussed above. Also, fleshly corruption is the theme when Octavius Caesar searches for the remains of Alexander the Great in Egypt to see what Time makes of heroes. Finally, Cleopatra's monologue, where she considers suicide, is a morbid meditation on this theme:

Corruption now, and rottenness must seize
This once admired fabrick, and dissolve
This flesh to common elements again.

When skillfull nature, were she strictly bound
 To search through all her storehouse would be pos'd
 To tell which piece was Cleopatra once. (V, i)

Fortune and Time are inexorable forces in May's cosmology, and man is a puppet to both. There is no moment of final liberation for his hero and heroine, who merely fulfill their historical roles in a drama which casts Octavius as the new man of Fortune.

Although May's experiment in satiric tragedy is a failure, his sojourn into the field marks an important step away from the Renaissance idea of Fortune as a power outside of man and toward the later seventeenth century concept of Fortune as a part of man's psychology.

* * * * *

1. See Christopher Hill Intellectual Origins of the English Revolution (1965) and Herschel Baker The Wars of Truth (1952).
2. See above Chapter 6, "Fortune in English Literature from Jonson through Dryden." Donne's satires are as influential as Jonson's during the period, but "An Anatomy of the World. The First Anniversary" (1611) deserves a full citation here:

And new philosophy calls all in doubt,
 The element of fire is quite put out;
 The sun is lost, and the earth, and no man's wit
 Can well direct him where to look for it.
 And freely men confess that this world's spent,
 When in the planets, and the firmament
 They seek so many new; then see that this
 Is crumbled out again to his atomies.
 'Tis all in pieces, all coherence gone;
 All just supply, and all relation:
 Prince, subject, Father, Son, are things forgot
 (205-15).

3. Despite Marvell's poetic vision of Jonson damning May in the other world, May and Jonson were friends. In fact, Jonson respected the younger poet's efforts enough to offer verses (the equivalent of our modern-day dust-jacket blurb) to prefix May's first translation of Lucan's Pharsalia (1627). May was a self-confessed member of the Tribe of Ben, that merry group of Renaissance literati who met at the Mermaid Tavern, which included Richard Bromer and Thomas Carew and Sir John Suckling.
 4. The critical rejection of both Jonson's and May's play speaks for the aesthetic failure of their "truth of Argument" or fidelity to the sources. As Henry James notes in a different context but much to the point, "The historian, essentially, wants more documents than he can really use; the dramatist only wants more liberties than he can really take" (The Aspern Papers).
- One might also extend this argument about the proper style of tragedy to Jonson's argument with Inigo Jones as to the source of greatness in the masque. Jones held that his spectacular sets and machinery were responsible for the masque's popularity, while Jonson believed that without his verses it was all a second-rate magic show.
5. Most important for the history of drama, Beaumont and Fletcher were also followers of Jonson's dramatic principles, as Eugene Waith notes in The Pattern of Tragicomedy in Beaumont and Fletcher (1952). The heroic drama of Sedley and Dryden are direct descendants of Beaumont and Fletcher's style of drama as Dryden notes in his Essay of Dramatic Poesie (1668) and his prefaces to his heroic plays.
 6. Jonson's Love's Welcome at Bolsover is described in detail with an analysis of its allegorical imagery by D.J. Gordon in "The Quarrel between Ben Jonson and Inigo Jones" in The Renaissance Imagination.
 7. Sarah P. Sutherland notes in her study of Masques in Jacobean Tragedy (1983) that "Far from disappearing from the stage when James died, the masque virtually invaded tragedy under Charles. The plays of Ford, Massinger and Shirley, for example, are studded with masques and masque-like elements" (112).
 8. Andrew Marvell called Cromwell "thou, the war's and fortune's son" in his famous Horatian ode. See Chapter 5 above for more on Marvell's Horatian Ode to Cromwell.

9. See Frederick Kiefer's chapter on Fortune and the theme of friendship in Shakespeare's Antony and Cleopatra in Fortune and Elizabethan Tragedy (1983).

10. At the start of the play, May's Roman magistrate Glaucus also notes that there are no friends in such a world:

Se: Well, gentlemen, I'll to Pelusium
And fortify the towne, to keepe oure foes,
If foes bee conquerours, from entring there.

Gla: Yes, and oure frends, if they bee vanquished.
Keepe out oure frends, Seleucus, if their presence
May plucke a warre, and ruine on oure heads (94-9).

11. See Richard Hillman's article "Antony, Hercules and Cleopatra: 'the bidding of the gods' and 'the subtlest maze of all'" (1987) for a discussion of why Shakespeare conflates Bacchus and Hercules in the scene where Antony's genius takes leave of him (an elegiac and magical moment noticeably missing from May's play though related in Plutarch). Hillman also notes the correspondence between Jonson's depiction of Hercules in "Pleasure Reconciled to Virtue" to the depiction of Antony as a questioning fool; further Hillman suggests that Shakespeare had a subversive meaning behind his use of Hercules as the figure taking leave of Antony: i.e., Shakespeare's Antony now enters a stage in his personal development where the comic Hercules has no place and Antony transcends his family genius to become a full tragic figure, more akin to Aeneas.

Chapter 7

SIR CHARLES SEDLEY'S "ANTONY AND CLEOPATRA:"
FORTUNE IN LATER HEROIC DRAMA

Sir Charles Sedley's version of the tragedy of Antony and Cleopatra is perhaps the most innovative of all the English versions.¹ He introduces characters and motives from his own imagination and plays havoc with Plutarch's historical record. Largely, he adapts the story freely to the pattern of the heroic drama, so that his characters speak in the sing-song apothegms of rhymed heroic couplets and his heroes rant and rave with the Alamanzors and Almahides about love and honor. Yet it is a play written after the vogue of the heroic drama has died. Dryden wrote the epitaph to the use of heroic verse in drama in the prologue to Aureng-Zebe (1676): "Our author... Grows weary of his long-loved mistress, Rhyme/Passion's too fierce to be in fetters bound" (275). Indeed, as Michael B. Hudnall argues in his unpublished dissertation Moral Design in the Plays of Sir Charles Sedley (1984), "Viewed as conventional heroic drama, even as tragedy, [Sedley's Antony and Cleopatra] has consistently disappointed expectations because, although it employs a number of conventional heroic devices, in reality it challenges much of the conventional wisdom associated with the drama" (140).

Heroic drama is a genre particular to the Restoration. It was born and died within a twenty year span (1660-80), and John Dryden's plays are perhaps the most successful examples of this poetic genre. The quintessential heroic protagonist is Almanzor of Dryden's Conquest of Granada (1670). Although he is clearly patterned after the favorites of Fortune in Jacobean tragedy, particularly Marlowe's Tamburlaine, with whom the admiring ladies of the Spanish court compare him, Almanzor and his like have their own peculiarities. Almanzor is "author" of himself and at the same time a kind of natural man, a "noble savage" who does not recognize the rule of Fortune, as he claims when he roars out with grand rage to his king,

No man has more contempt than I of breath
 But whence hast thou the right to give me death?
 Obeyed as sovereign by thy subjects be,
 But know, that I alone am king of me.
 I am as free as nature first made man,
 Ere the base laws of servitude began,
 When wild in woods the noble savage ran (I, i, 25).

In the heroic drama of the seventeenth century, Fortune represents the order of society, especially the court, which the hero opposes because of his intense individuality. Surprise turns of plot, or the wild swings of Fortune's wheel, move the plot of heroic drama. In just this manner Lisideius, Dryden's caricature of Sedley the Francophile, defines the drama in The Essay of Dramatic Poesie (1668):

he conceived a play ought to be, a just and lively image of human nature, representing its passions and humours, and the changes of fortune to which it is

subject, for the delight and instruction of mankind (10).

Dryden not only wrote the best examples of heroic drama, but he also argued the best defenses of this kind of drama in the prefaces to his plays. As Arthur Kirsch points out in his study of Dryden's Heroic Drama (1965), "The basis of Dryden's criticism of heroic drama seems to be his belief that 'an Heroick Play ought to be an imitation, in little of an Heroick Poem'" (8), a remark Dryden made in his "Preface to the Conquest of Granada" (1672).

Dryden notes in this preface that the pattern of his heroic protagonist is Homer's Achilles, an individual of great passions especially rage (or unviv, the root for our modern "maniac"), but one whose destiny is already decided. The choice of Achilles for a short but glorious life is the paradigm of the death of a warrior. In fact, Achilles is a strange hero, because he does nothing for most of The Iliad, and while he sits beside the Greek ships he broods and talks with his friend Patroclus. While he broods he thinks and questions, and as early as Book 9, Achilles questions the heroic code of honor in war. He has discovered that "Fate is the same for the man who holds back, the same if he fights hard" (318). Love and honor have no effect on a man's ultimate meeting with death.

Thus, the heroic ideal is not the same as the tragic. Man cannot change Fate; he can only do his part to prolong

the heroic ideal and keep society together. In The Aeneid, there is a poignant scene that illustrates this contradiction between the tragic and heroic: Jupiter tells Hercules who wants to intercede in the battle for Pallas, "For each man his day stands fixed. For all mankind the days of life are few, and not to be restored. But to prolong fame by death, that is valour's task" (X, 440-73).

Eventually, Dryden recognized that the heroic play had its limits, and its hero was a possible danger to society. Indeed, Absalom in Absalom and Achitophel is a spirited youth, like Almanzor, but he becomes the tool of a plot against the king and the established order. Then, later in 1690, Dryden admits in the preface to Don Sebastian that love and honor are not the proper subjects of tragedy, and that the true hero must have stronger ties to reality in order to hold any tragic interest for the audience.

As in the classical epic which contrasts the present age of mortal imperfection with a Golden Age of mighty heroes, Sedley's play starts in a postlapsarian Age of Iron. Agrippa notes that "once" there was a Golden Age when Romans were heroes and had "souls" that would not live in "conquer'd Bodies" and would rather commit suicide than face the shame of conquest,

Yet now by hopes we're flatter'd to live on,
 And with the Common Herd of Mankind run,
 Crouching to Fate, which we by death might shun
 (I, i, p. 1).

In Sedley's play, Antony resembles Aureng-Zebe, the sceptical hero of the later heroic drama. Aureng-Zebe's most famous lines are a lament of world-weariness rather than a challenge to all comers:

When I consider life, 'tis all a cheat;
 Yet fooled with hope, men favour the deceit;
 Trust on, and think to-morrow will repay:
 To-morrow's falser than the former day;
 Lies worse, and, while it says, we shall be blest
 With some new joys, cuts off what we possess....
 I'm tired with waiting for this chemic gold,
 Which fools us young, and beggars us when old (IV, i,
 320).

In addition, like Aureng-Zebe, Sedley's Antony is an outcast from society who has declared war on all laws that do not conform to his interior idea of what is right. Caesar notes in the beginning of the play that Antony is a man "in love and pleasure drown'd" (I, i, 1), but Antony is more than that, as he shows from his first appearance on the stage, where he broods philosophically on the theme of the wheel of Fortune: "How slippery is the Top of humane state,/And on exalted Heads what tempests beat?" (I, ii, p. 4). He also has a vision of a pastoral world which his victory over Caesar will initiate, as he vows to Cleopatra:

This Storm once past; in Peace and Love we'll Raign,
 Like the Immortal Gods, the Giants slain (I, ii, p.
 10).

The noble but asocial hero of the heroic drama also has a pastoral vision of how the world should be,² but he is eventually tamed and either welcomed into the society

through marriage or overcome by Fortune and destroyed for the good of society. The best characterization of the protagonist of heroic drama comes in The Rehearsal (1671), a parody of heroic drama which a number of wits including the infamous Duke of Buckingham wrote and rewrote. Their best shots hit Mr. Bayes, a caricature of Dryden the Poet Laureate, as when Mr. Bayes presents in Act IV of his crazy quilt of a drama the ultimate superhero, Drawcansir, "a fierce hero that frights his mistress, snubs up kings, baffles armies, and does what he will, without regard to numbers, good manners, or justice."

As Sedley shows in a number of allusions, Virgil's Aeneas is his example of the heroic ideal.³ Though a more active hero than Achilles, Aeneas is also a man driven by fate, and he sees his destiny as a burden. The story of Dido and Aeneas is perhaps the best example of Aeneas's conflict as a private man of passionate nature with desires which do not cohere with his destined path in life. He must leave Dido, though he would rather stay and live with her in Carthage, as Virgil states, when Dido asks Aeneas to stay, "Aeneas the True longed to allay her grief and dispel her sufferings with kind words. Yet he remained obedient to the divine command, and with many a sigh, for he was shaken to the depths by the strength of his love, returned to his ships'" (IV, 378-409). In Book IX of the Aeneid, Nisus asks

the central question of this conflict between human desire and destiny: "Is it the gods who have put this ardour... into our hearts? Or do we all attribute to a god what is really an overmastering impulse of our own?"

By beginning the action after the battle of Actium Sedley, like the Countess of Pembroke, shows his characters already slipping down to the bottom of Fortune's wheel. Maecenas remarks to Caesar in the first act, "Fate already has declar'd for you" (I, i, 2) and the Egyptians also recognize that "We in Neutrality secure might wait,/And calmly expect an Emp'ror from Fate" (I, ii, 5). Again, at each turn in the plot, the characters name Fortune as the arbiter of the outcome of the war with Caesar. When Antony begins to rally his troops and drives Caesar from the gates, Cleopatra notes, "Fortune's afresh fond of Antonius grown,/And has this Minute her old Love put on" (V, i, 48). And after the betrayal of the fleet at Alexandria, Antony growls, "Fortune hath seiz'd my Empire and Renown" (V, i, 50). Finally, when Photinus reveals his treachery in pretending that Cleopatra had killed herself, Antony responds philosophically, "Death soon will place me out of Fortunes reach" (V, ii, 53). Of the noble characters, not Antony, not Cleopatra, not even Caesar declare that they are authors of their own destiny. Caesar ends the play with the gloomy motto of the de casibus plot:

Let no man with his present Fortune swell

The Fate of growing Empire who can tell?
 We stand but on that Greatness whence these fell
 (V, ii, 60).

Sedley's pessimism would seem a throwback to the morality play if one did not notice that his is a new kind of Fortune. Sedley follows Hobbes in his description of the ambitions and frenzied emotional life of the individual who is isolated from society. In traditional comedy, Fortune, as the ruler of court and society, opposes Nature, the goddess who controls the green world (such as Arden or Arcadia). However, in Hobbes's Leviathan (1651) and especially in the famous Chapter XIII, "Of the Natural Condition of Mankind as Concerning Their Felicity and Misery", man in Nature, outside the protection of society, is in a state of continual warfare, and consequently his life is "solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short" (100). Hobbes asserts that peaceful coexistence can be attained by man only if he gives up his individual freedom and enters into a social contract with other man, where they name a sovereign, to whom they vow strict obedience.⁴

In fact, Sedley's Roman characters compare this social contract to the bond of marriage (III, i), and Octavia puts it most succinctly in her argument against war,

Wives (like good Subjects, who to Tyrants bow)
 To Husbands though unjust, long patience owe
 They were for Freedom made, Obedience We,
 Courage their vertue, ours is Chastity (IV, i, 33-4).

There are many other signs of the influence of Hobbes's

philosophy in Sedley's Antony and Cleopatra. For example, in what seems to be a Hobbesian footnote, all battles in Sedley's play take place outside the city in a natural setting, the "woods," a strange stage direction since geographically there would not be any woods outside of Alexandria, Egypt.

Also, Hobbes's central question of rule by law is brought to the forefront in Sedley's tragedy, where Caesar and his counsellors constantly debate whether Rome should be ruled by the law of the Senate or by Caesar's needs. Even Antony's generals see the problems of civil war as brought on by the rule of private men.⁵ After being chastised by his counsellors with the warning, "Empire is safest moderately great,/And death unseen does on Ambition wait" (III, i, 22), Caesar vows, like a good Hobbesian monarch, "Ile see the Common-wealth no mischief take,/And do and suffer all things for her sake." By contrast, Antony pursues only his appetite for love and honor, as he shows in his definition of Empire:

True Empire only those great Souls enjoy,
Who can in what, and whom they please employ,
And without leave from Rome a Crown bestow,
Exalt a Friend, and trample on a Foe (III, ii, 23).

The image of the crowd as a blind and terrible force of brute Nature is a commonplace in Sedley's play, and there are multiple references to rebellions, sedition and plots against both Antony and Cleopatra. When Octavia rails

against the corruption of government in Rome she begins with the Senate and ends with a jibe at the British court: "Men learn at Court what they must there repeat,/And for Concurrence, not for Council meet" (IV, i, 34). Most important, however, the crowd is less wild and contemptible than Antony and Cleopatra's whims, as Antony notes after the crowd stops him from his unprecedented and somewhat capricious decision to have Thyreus, Caesar's ambassador, beaten. Antony relents once the Romans and Egyptians rise up against him, but he grumbles to himself, "What am I,/Whom the rude People, teach Humanity?" (III, ii, p. 31). This response of a bewildered tyrant is directly contrasted to the old lion in Shakespeare's play, who responds to Thyreus's impertinence with the famous retort, "I am Antony yet".

According to Hobbes, a man's fortune defines where he fits within the society, and society is more important than the individual. Ambition is the greatest vice for man in Hobbes's view because it places private desires before the public good.

In Sedley's drama, Caesar is fighting Antony to restore social order, ostensibly to force him to observe the laws of matrimony and return to his wife, Octavia, Caesar's sister. But Caesar also admits that the other half of his motive is ambition to become sole emperor of the world.

Love is a "disease" in this view of life. Antony and Cleopatra are not able to save themselves from destruction. The process of their defeat is slow but inexorable, and, as discussed above, at all times Sedley makes it clear that Fortune is the force behind their destruction, but it is Fortune as the power of society, the laws of social cohesion, which work against the natural man, who would destroy with war and violence the fabric of civilization if left to himself.

In The Moral Design in the Plays of Sir Charles Sedley, Michael B. Hudnall Jr. describes Photinus as a "Hobbesian villain." He is marked as a Hobbesian rather than a Machiavellian villain because not only does blind ambition drive Photinus but he has the terrible will to power of a sociopath. Hudnall notes that the structure of Sedley's play can be seen as a series of conflicts between two philosophical parties, the "self-centered Hobbesian characters," like Photinus, as opposed to the idealists, such as Antony and Cleopatra, who see nothing important in the world but their love for one another. The character of Caesar is a good mixture of the Hobbesian villain and the idealist as he vacillates between his motive of ambition for total control over the Empire and his love for a brother and friend.

Sedley employs a double plot structure by introducing the perverse courtship of Photinus and Iras into his tragedy. Both are servants, "low" characters, in direct opposition to the great and noble Antony and Cleopatra, and both follow the promptings of ambition and think Love and Honor are idle fancies of the rich. Iras sings out, "I would do any thing to be a queen/I would could love one whom I had never seen" (II, i, 15). By contrast, Sedley's Antony and Cleopatra are completely faithful to one another. In fact, Neville Davies and other critics have noted that of all the versions of Antony and Cleopatra, Sedley has his queen most unambiguously true to her love. Antony is also a perfect trusting lover in Sedley's version. At one point Canidius marvels that Antony is so single-minded in his love of Cleopatra that he is blind to his desperate position:

'Tis very fine, here's all the Sense he has!
 His Legions, Empire, all are in that face!
 I do not think he knows he is besieg'd,
 But quite undone, talks how he is oblig'd!
 Pray, Sir, do you consider where we are,
 If we stay long we shall have Caesar here (IV, iv, 42).

In the tradition of the heroic tragedy, from first to last both Antony and Cleopatra eschew their roles as rulers in favor of their great love.

Sedley also introduced a villain into the tragedy of Antony and Cleopatra (a tale that has no villains in the original), but the genre of heroic tragedy demands a villain since its heroes are so pure and uncorrupted. As a genre,

heroic drama added a Christian note to the classical epic with its evil, usually lustful as well as avaricious, villain pitted against the good, pure hero. Thus, the battle becomes spiritual as well as physical. In addition, the hero is usually tempted by a Satan-figure whose sole motive is Ambition (also personified to show its undiluted strength as a ruling passion for the villain). Milton's Satan in Paradise Lost is perhaps the greatest epic source of the villain figure in heroic drama.

At first glance, it might seem that Sedley meant a parallel between his Antony and Milton's Satan when after the betrayal of the fleet at Alexandria, he exclaims, "Gape Hell, and to thy dismal Bottom take/The lost Antonius" (V, i, 50), but as Anne Ferry notes in Milton and the Mil tonic Dryden (1968) Milton's Satan is a reversal of the classical hero. Though Satan uses the rhetoric of Achilles and epic warriors, he has declared "Evil be thou my good." Sedley's villain, Photinus pursues Empire out of ambition and out of lust for Iras, and in relation to Iras he sees himself like Satan tempting Eve in Paradise Lost, and he makes the comparison between himself and Adam in his first declaration of villainy as he announces Iras's entrance: "But see she comes, and charming as new light,/Appear'd to the first Mans amazed sight" (II, i 13).

Iras is not a comic character, though she is clearly affiliated with Dryden's Lyndaraxa,⁶ a character from The Conquest of Granada, who vows almost comically,

O, could I read the dark decrees of fate,
That I might once know whom to love, or hate....
I will be constant yet, if Fortune can;
I love the king,--let her but name the man (IV, ii,
54). Iras, however, unlike the Moorish princess Lyndaraxa,

is a maid and Photinus a slave who has been given some administrative duties by Cleopatra. Their "love" is hardly love at all, but sexual appetite for Photinus and the lust for political power in Iras, a power that she does not understand. She envies Cleopatra her finery and the appearance of a queen, but Iras has no real desire to rule Egypt.

The double plot with a parallel between "low" and "high" characters was a common practice in Jacobean tragedy, and Dryden compliments the tragicomedy, or double plot, as typically English and more "lively" than the regular French plays, in his Essay of Dramatic Poesie. But double plots also fulfill a function of Fortune, as William Empson notes in Some Versions of Pastoral (1938). He notes that "the interaction of the two plots gives a particularly clear setting for, or machine for imposing, the social and metaphysical ideas on which pastoral depends" (31), and he explains later that the "power of suggestion is the strength of the double plot" (34). The double plot of Jacobean

tragedy works out a pastoral alternative to a heroic main plot. The servants or low characters suffer from the same love problems as the heroic characters and usually the contrast is also one of diction and genre, where the low characters have comic parallels, such as the madhouse scenes in The Changeling (1622), one of the tragicomedies which Empson refers to in his study.

The "magic" of the double plot helps to ensure the feeling of determinism in Sedley's play and to undercut any sense of tragic suspense. Antony and Cleopatra are doomed to die for their love, and Photinus ensures this outcome, as he tells Iras, "You must trust my love to urge his Fate" (II, i, 15). In the later heroic drama, Fortune rules against the individual, and she is a kind of figure of justice, or "poetic justice," as Thomas Rymer called it in his criticism of the serious drama of the Restoration.

* * * * *

1. See Ruth Wallerstein's "Dryden and the Analysis of Shakespeare's Techniques" (1943). She notes, "Sedley's Antony and Cleopatra was not an imitation of Shakespeare. Nor is it even substantially an historical play, but a play on current Platonic themes" (555).
2. Sedley's Cleopatra ends her life with this pastoral vision of the afterlife:

Men say that we to th'other World shall bear
 The same Desires and Thoughts, imploy'd as here.
 The Hero shall in shining Arms delight,
 In neighing Steeds, shrill sounds and empty fight:
 Poets shall sing, and in soft Dances move,
 And Lovers in Eternal Roses Love.

If so, Antonius, we but change the Scene,
And there pursue what we did here begin (V, ii, 60).

3. Also, in Sedley's play, Caesar's counsellor, Maecenas flatters him with the correspondence between his virtue and the founding of the Roman state:

Rome on your vertue leans her aged head,
As old Anchises on Aeneas did,
And thinks she may with ease when propt by you
Factions at Home, and Foes abroad subdue (III, i, 22).

4. Hobbes defines this social contract in his Leviathan (1651) as: "This is more than consent or concord; it is a real unity of them all, on one and the same person, made by covenant of every man with every other man.... This done, the multitude so united in one person is called a commonwealth, in latin civitas. This is the generation of that great Leviathan, or rather (to speak more reverently) of that mortal god to which we owe under the immortal God our peace and defense" (134).

5. There are many parallels between Sedley's play and Dryden's later "Absalom and Achitophel" (1679). The latter was written in response to the Exclusion Crisis, which was just beginning to form when Sedley wrote his play. Most notable are the the beginning contrast between a Golden Age ["In pious times ere Priest-craft did begin,/Before polygamy was made a sin" (1-20); the opposition of Nature and Law: "When Nature prompted and no law deny'd" (5); the problem of a "murmuring" crowd which doesn't agree with its ruler in his decisions of government:

Those very Jews, who, at their very best,
Their humour more than loyalty expressed,
Now wondered why so long they had obeyed
An idol monarch which their hands had made (61-4);

the plotting and hyupocrisy of rebels; and especially the Hobbesian villain of Ambition, Achitophel, who tempts a heroic but moody young man, "warlike Absalon" (221), through the language of Fortune, as in his great speech (256ff) which Anne Ferry has compared to Satan's speech to Christ in Paradise Regained (in Milton and the Miltonic Dryden).

6. Perhaps the reason that Sedley chose to copy Lyndaraxa in his heroic drama is that Dryden went out of his way to compare her to Cleopatra in his play. Ironically, Lyndaraxa and Abdalla, only one of the many pairs of lovers in The Conquest of Granada, see themselves as types of Antony and Cleopatra. Abdalla must murder his brother in order to become king, and

Lyndaraxa will not admit his love unless he can make her a queen. Abdalla tries to stir up a revolt against his brother, and when he retreats from the battle he runs to Lyndaraxa with the words,

While she is mine, I have not yet lost all,
But in her arms shall have a gentle fall:
Blest in my love, although in war o'ercome.
I fly, like Antony from Actium,
To meet a better Cleopatra here (V, i, 67).

There ensues a copy of the scene at Cleopatra's monument from Shakespeare's play, where the wounded Antony asks to come to die with his queen and she tells him that she cannot open the gate for him, but instead she hauls him bleeding up the side of the monument, a scene which we have already mentioned in the chapter on Shakespeare as incredible in performance and a visual emblem of Fortune with her wheel. Lyndaraxa is no Cleopatra, as she proves in her verbal banter with Abdalla. She won't open the gate to him or even acknowledge that she knows him. She concludes, "You're but a single person, not a king.... I love a king, but a poor rebel hate" (V, i, 68-9).

Chapter 8:

DRYDEN'S "ALL FOR LOVE:"
 FORTUNE AND THE "NEW" TRAGEDY

John Dryden tried to redefine the genre of tragedy in All for Love (1678). He had been considering the form since the beginning of his career when in his Essay of Dramatic Poesie (1668) we see the buddings of his theoretical thinking on the subject, and he continued his exploration of the form in many of the prefaces to his heroic dramas. He outlined but never wrote out an answer to Thomas Rymer's attack on Jacobean tragedy and Shakespeare in defense of the "new way" of writing serious drama as opposed to following Greek and Roman traditions. But it isn't until he abandoned the rhyming heroic couplet for blank verse in All for Love [perhaps after reading Milton's Samson Agonistes (1674)] that he finds a "mighty line" of his own and a mode of tragedy suited to his taste for repartee and ratiocination and his theory fully flowers.

Sedley's bad verse could explain Dryden's renunciation of the heroic couplet in his preface to All for Love (1678).¹ Ten years previously, Dryden had endorsed the use of rhyme in "serious" drama; in his Essay of Dramatic Poesie, Dryden's spokesman Neander says that rhyme defines the tragic genre because it is the highest form of expression, and tragedy is a genre that contains only the

superlative in man.² However, Dryden seems to contradict this conclusion with his later play; the blank verse in All for Love is magnificent. For example, Dryden is able to take Sedley's bad lines of Antony's expostulation to Cleopatra ["How well I lov'd, you did at Actium see,/When to be near you I left Victory" (I, ii, 257-8)] and turn them into a memorable tribute to passion:

How I loved
 Witness, ye days and nights, and all ye hours,
 That danced away with down upon your feet,
 As all your bus'ness were to count my passion!
 One day passed by, and nothing saw but love;
 Another came, and still 'twas only love:
 The suns were wearied out with looking on,
 And I untired with loving.
 I saw you every day, and all the day;
 And every day was still but as the first,
 So eager was I still to see you more (II, 282-291).

But Dryden is not solely concerned with rewriting Sedley's play. Indeed, in the preface to All for Love, Dryden does not even mention Sedley by name as one of his competitors to bend "this bow of Ulysses." Dryden claims to be reworking Shakespeare's play. As he notes, his major innovation is to conform to the three unities of French drama: he has decreased Shakespeare's cast of characters to a bare minimum, and he limits the time and action of the play to the space of one day and the confines of the courtyard of the Temple of Isis in Alexandria. But he also introduces into the plot a villain, Alexas, a Hobbesian villain like Sedley's Photinus, and in some ways more sinister. However,

Dryden does not follow Sedley in much else; his mode of tragedy is formal and austere after the excesses of the antiquarian May and the romantic Sedley.

A comparison of the blank verse form will show the wide diversities between the works of Dryden and his predecessors. Both Bonamy Dobree ("Cleopatra and 'That Criticall War'" 1928) and Kenneth Muir ("The Imagery of All for Love" 1940) have compared Shakespeare's and Dryden's styles of blank verse, and they concluded that Dryden's imagery is much less natural, and his diction more argumentative and rational. Dryden's Cleopatra is absolutely lucid as she commands her maids to dress her for death; when Charmion asks her why, she answers:

Dull that thou art! why 'tis to meet my love;
As when I saw him first, on Cydnus' bank,
All sparkling, like a goddess; so adorned,
I'll find him once again; my second spousals
Shall match my first in glory. Haste, haste, both
And dress the bride of Antony. (V, 458-463)

The entire scene is carried out through questions and answers between Cleopatra and her maids.

Though Dryden goes out of his way to criticize Jean Racine's Phedre (1678) in his preface to All for Love, his work is modelled on Racinian tragedy. Not only are the ratiocinative dialogues and stichomythic exchanges signs that Dryden was imitating Racine, but also the insular setting and the complete paralysis of the characters recall the Racinian mode. In many ways, Dryden has come full

circle back to the French Senecan imitation of the Countess of Pembroke.

In All for Love, Dryden internalizes Fortune more than any playwright besides Shakespeare. Perhaps the reason a modern audience responds better to Dryden's and Shakespeare's versions of the tragedy is that the vision of Fortune as a sublimation of the gods agrees more with our post-Freudian interpretation of the relations of divine to human events. In Dryden's play, the most-asked question by the protagonists is: "Who am I?" While this theme of Fortune as identity is apparent in Shakespeare's version from the start and has its roots in Senecan tragedy, there is a clear difference between Enobarbus's complaints that Fortune is making a fool of his captain, and Dryden's Antony telling his friend Ventidius,

Fortune came smiling to my youth, and wooed it,
And purple greatness met my ripened years....
I was so great, so happy, so beloved,
Fate could not ruin me; till I took pains,
And worked against my fortune, chid her from me,...
At length have wearied her, and now she's gone,
Gone, gone, divorced forever (I, 297-309).

This speech contains more abstract language than Shakespeare allows any of his characters except Thidias, the silver-tongued ambassador whom Antony despises. Dryden's Antony speaks in allegories.

However, Dryden's return to the abstract language of allegory does not invoke the same Lady Fortune as the

Countess of Pembroke. While Pembroke's Fortune characterized a mysterious force in the affairs of the world beyond man's control or understanding, Dryden's Fortune is a woman, one who woos and weds a man and he spurns her, as in Sedley's version, but Dryden's Fortune is also a characteristic of man and his sense of personal identity. It is an epistemological entity, something the Countess would never have dreamed of.

Cleopatra in All for Love makes this distinction more clear in her famous disclaimer

Nature meant me
 A wife, a silly, harmless, household dove,
 Fond without art, and kind without deceit;
 But Fortune, that has made a mistress of me
 Has thrust me out to the wide world, unfurnished
 Of falsehood to be happy (IV, 91-6).

Most critics interpret Dryden's parallel of Nature and Fortune as divided between appearance and reality;³ they believe Cleopatra is a "silly, harmless, household dove," and they complain that Dryden has cheapened the greatest seductress of all history into a woman of pathetic domesticity. However, by the careful antithetical structure of her logic, Dryden's Cleopatra shows that she knows she is a "mistress" and not a "household dove;" she blames Fortune for this distortion of her personality. While she voices the same complaint against Fortune as all her predecessors in the quantum mutatus tradition (the world of Fortune is one of "falsehood" or "error" as Chaucer's speaker declared

in his indictment of Fortune) Cleopatra is proposing a new duality between potential and possibility.

Dryden's distinction between Nature and Fortune as forces which mould the character of an individual is quite different from that meant in the confrontation between the two goddesses in Spenser's "Mutability Cantos," written less than a hundred years previously.⁴ In Spenser, Nature controls Fortune, but by the time of the Restoration they are equally powerful deities: Fortune provides the external events that shape a man's life, while Nature rules the internal, inherent virtues that a man is born with.

Dryden's Antony uses this same distinction when describing Octavius, who is an emperor in fact, yet he

knows no honor
Divided from his int'rest. Fate mistook him
For nature meant him for an usurer;
He's fit indeed to buy, not conquer kingdoms (III, 214-6).

The description is a psychological one that we retain to this day in the debate as to whether nature or nurture have a stronger role in the development of personality.

However, modern audiences hardly notice that Fortune and Nature are determiners of man's destiny in Dryden's play *Man has few choices, if any in history, according to the Hobbesian epistemology, and if he tries to strike out on his own, he will tend toward crime, not greatness, because of his inherently evil nature.*⁵

The mood of Dryden's All for Love is elegiac; the good days are gone, and the present is a time of desolation and mourning, as in Shakespeare's play, but in contrast to Shakespeare's Antony and Cleopatra Dryden's characters do not transcend their loss to understand how much they have within to compensate for the imperfections of the world governed by Fortune.

Dryden's play begins and ends on the day of Antony's final defeat at Alexandria, and the subject of the play in keeping with this one day that shook the world and began the "peace" of Augustus is change that cannot be reversed, or metamorphosis.⁶ The single scene of the action is under the shadow of the temple of Isis, a fact that would probably be shown through a statue of the goddess on stage. Isis is the goddess of the moon, the queen of change, and a figure that is often conflated with Fortune in later mythography.

As Derek W. Hughes and J. Douglas Canfield note in their complementary studies of mutability in All for Love [Hughes' "The Significance of All for Love" (1970), modified by Canfield's "The Jewel of Great Price..." (1975), which is in turn answered in Hughes' "Art and Life in All for Love" (1980)], the prevailing water imagery (beginning with the flood and ending with the "dissolution" of Antony and Cleopatra in suicide) in Dryden's play suggests that the main theme is mutability and the uncertainty of all things

in this world. Canfield believes that the "constancy" of love is Dryden's answer to the ups and downs of Fortune; he writes, "Cleopatra... is the play's jewel of great price, representative of transcendent values which 'secure' humans from mutability and for which the world is well lost" (38-9), but Hughes shows that this reading is somewhat more optimistic than Dryden intended: in All for Love there is certainty only in stasis and death.

The Egyptian priest Serapion begins with an image of loss, in fact a loss of language: "Portents and prodigies are grown so frequent,/That they have lost their name." Dryden's play centers around rhetoric, and this fact is underscored by the character Dryden chooses to begin and end the play, Serapion, the high priest of Egypt, who describes a flood in the "poetic" circumlocutions that Pope later satirized in his "Peri Bathous;" as when he says a sudden ebbing of the Nile "slipped underneath the scaly herd" (10). In fact, Serapion is so florid in his language that when he announces the end of the war with his Shakespearean "Egypt has been; our latest hour has come" (V, 71-2), Cleopatra scolds him impatiently, "Be more plain" (75). Serapion also pronounces the final benediction over the dead pair. In true tragic form, Serapion comes at the final hour to restore order to Egypt, and he puts the villain Alexas in chains "as our pledge/To grace th'imperial triumph, then he

gives the epitaph for the tomb: Antony and Cleopatra in death are for him finally "secure from human chance" and "storms of fate" (thus concluding the play with the same image of storms and winds that he began it). But there is no sense that Antony and Cleopatra have triumphed. Serapion is a character of satire; he is a man of words not action, and his final words are a sigh of relief that the storms of Fate have passed.

What is more important to our inquiry is the question why does Dryden introduce the character of a priest into the story, and why does the entire play take place in the temple of Isis, thus centering around Serapion's realm, not Antony and Cleopatra's empire? How could Dryden eschew the brilliant image of Cleopatra's "monument" that so fascinated his predecessors as a poetic device because she could use it as her castle or her "tomb?" It seems out of character for Mr. Bayes to lose this chance for a "clench," but in some ways the temple of Isis suits Dryden's devices best because as a house/temple, it is a place of both Fortune and Nature. Here, the priests look into the book of Fate and prognosticate, but here also Antony can lie in the garden, the pastoral "hortus conclusus" and entertain notions of himself as a man outside the strictures of Rome or Egypt:

I fancy
 I'm now turned wild, a commoner of nature;
 Or all forsaken, and forsaking all;
 Live in a shady forest's sylvan scene,
 Stretched at my length beneath some blasted oak,

I lean my head upon the mossy bark,
And look just of a piece as I grew from it (231-7).

We have no Timon here; Antony does not spit fire but dreams of sheep. He wants to be a wild man in the forest, or even better to be so close to nature that he's mistaken for a tree. Most important, he wants to lose his identity as a man, especially a man subject to society and Fortune.⁷

The question of loss of personal identity with the loss of "names" comes up again when Antony meets Ventidius, whom he questions, "Art thou Ventidius?" only to be answered with the ironic, "Are you Antony?/I'm liker what I was than you to him/I left you last" (I, 246-8). The question of identity arises again when Octavia confronts Antony with their children, she asks, "Who am I?" and Antony answers cuttingly, "Caesar's sister" (III, 255).

At first it appears that this theme of self-definition has its roots in Senecan tragedy, like Pembroke's play, but Dryden writes of loss of definition, while Seneca's characters almost idealize themselves. Though there are echoes of such Senecan plays as the Phaedrus in All for Love, the questions of identity have no certain answers in Dryden's play.

The moment of recognition or anagnorisis that defines tragedy for Aristotle is missing in Dryden's play. When Antony complains to Dolabella, "Fortune is Caesar's now; and what am I?" (III, 150), Ventidius jumps in with a jab of

conscience, "What you have made yourself; I will not flatter" (III, 151). Antony does not deny that he is the instrument of his own destiny, but he does not seem to think it is an important point either. The moment of anagnorisis for the three early plays of Pembroke, Daniel and Shakespeare came when Antony and Cleopatra saw that they were the authors of their own fates, that, as Shakespeare's Cleopatra says of Caesar, "Not being Fortune, he's but Fortune's knave" (V, ii, 2-4).

In Dryden's play, the idea of self-determination comes and goes in a rapid-fire exchange of "causes" between Antony and Cleopatra, when she arranges one last farewell before he goes to battle:

Ant.	Well, madam, we are met.
Cleo.	Is this a meeting?
	Then we must part?
Ant.	We must.
Cleo.	Who says we must?
Ant.	Our own hard fates.
Cleo.	We make those fates ourselves.
Ant.	Yes, we have made 'em; we have loved each
other	Into our mutual ruin (II, 240-5).

We hear the distant thunder of Millamant and Mirabell sparring in these lines; a proviso scene is in the making, but is this conversation? Are the characters thinking? To a certain extent, Dryden's Antony and Cleopatra don't care what they say, as long as they can keep the rally going. It is a kind of lovemaking, this bickering. Though Antony "proves" that Cleopatra has ruined him, his proof is

disregarded in the end, and he throws himself at her feet when she shows him one token of her faithfulness to him (a letter from Octavius offering her terms of peace on condition that she abandon Antony).

Strangely it is the servants who drive the plot in Dryden's play. If left to themselves, Antony and Cleopatra would drag out their days in melancholy and Octavius would win out through sheer tenacity. Both protagonists see themselves as "lost" and "past recovery" until they are persuaded through lengthy debates that perhaps they can change their fate or, as Ventidius argues, at least they might try to make a brave end of it instead of languishing. Ventidius⁸ urges Antony to "Try your fortune" (I, 321) against Caesar, just as Alexas, Cleopatra's eunuch and counsellor, tells her, "You must urge your fortune" (I, 99) when she complains that Antony "has taught my mind the fortune of a slave" (95).

In keeping with Dryden's use of antitheses and parallels, Alexas, the Egyptain eunuch, is the soul of vice⁹ as opposed to Ventidius, who is always described as having "virtue" in him. In fact the first mention of Ventidius in the play comes from his rival Alexas, who owns that he "hates" him, but he will do him justice. "Let me witness to the worth I hate" (100), he begins in true Iago fashion¹⁰ and ends, "In short the plainness, fierceness, rugged

virtue,/Of an old true-stampt Roman lives in him" (I, 102-3), while everyone in the play refers to Alexas as a "villain," and he identifies himself as the malcontent and sceptic with his first words as he challenges the high priest in the temple of Isis:

And dreamed you this? or did invent the story,
To frighten our Egyptian boys withal,
And train 'em up betimes in fear of priesthood? (32-4)

Dryden has Alexas invent the story of Cleopatra's suicide out of his own head. He is trying to save himself, to live while all of Egypt dies around him, even if he lives like a dog. He is not ambitious like Sedley's Photinus; he is simply pragmatic. He does not care for the past or the future, so long as he saves his skin now he is happy, but he recognizes nobility, as he sees that Ventidius is his opposite in being virtuous and true, and he is the person who comments in the last act that Charmian and Iras did the proper thing in killing themselves rather than suffer as Roman slaves.

Alexas is also called "Antony's other fate" because he is a eunuch, not a man. He is a creature (Cleopatra's "creature" as Antony rightly names him) that a decadent society has made. He is not a natural man at all, as he notes in his soliloquy of complaint, where he calls himself, "Cast out from nature, disinherited/Of what her meanest children claim by kind" (III, 386-7). Antony, by contrast,

is described as "bounteous as nature; next to nature's god" (180-2) and "framed in the very pride and boast of nature" (405), but love of Cleopatra has weakened him, and now he is as low as Alexas in the hierarchy of nature.

Dryden's plot moves through the changing identity of Antony as each character names his or her relationship to him.¹¹ No man is complete in himself. Antony is not Antony when he is alone; he would be a tree or a rock. But when Ventidius goads him, he is a brave soldier; and Cleopatra can make him the king of lovers; while Octavia brings out the harassed husband in him; and Dolabella strikes the softer notes of friendship and possible peace with the world. As Judith Milhous and Robert D. Hume note in their chapter on All for Love in Producible Interpretation (1985), there is no progress in these changes from identity to identity: "Unlike Shakespeare Dryden gives Antony no genuine choices. We watch Antony gradually comprehend that fact and try to deal with it" (114).

What kind of tragedy gives a man no choice in life? In some ways, the emphasis on Fortune and man's helplessness before her is more true to classic Greek tragedy than anything that Shakespeare or Marlowe wrote. In fact, Milton also makes this claim in his preface to Samson Agonistes (1671). Milton's play also shares many similarities of plot structure with Dryden's All for Love: for example, the

temptation to dishonor especially through the emotions of love, family and friendship are noted in Anne D. Ferry's study Milton and the Miltonic Dryden (1968). At the same time, as Samuel Johnson complained of Milton's play, it is hardly a tragedy at all because it has no action (most important to Aristotle's definition; he wrote that man's action is what makes him happy or unhappy): Samson has "a beginning and an end which Aristotle himself could not have disapproved, but it must be allowed to want a middle, since nothing passes between the first act and the last that either hastens or delays the death of Samson" [Rambler #139 (July 16, 1751)].

The new tragedy of the late seventeenth century proved to be the death of tragedy in English drama. What happened to tragedy during this hundred-year period when this dramatic genre had its generation, reached its greatest height and then went into decline? As Cleanth Brooks notes in his essay "A Note on the Death of Elizabethan Tragedy" (1939), "A satisfactory interpretation of the decline of Elizabethan tragedy will have to deal with something which happened to the conception of tragedy itself" (204). As we have seen, the depiction of the goddess Fortune is intrinsic to the definition of tragedy, and it is apparent that a society where the individual is a victim of the tyranny of Fortune cannot sustain the heroic view of man

required for great tragedy.

The tradition of Fortune in English literature does not end with the death of tragedy, however. Because of the internalization of Fortune and its new bonds with psychology, narrative prose became the new medium for the vicissitudes of Fortune in man's life. In particular, the novel takes Fortune as its goddess in such works as Defoe's Robinson Crusoe (1719) and Swift's Gulliver's Travels (1726) as well as Henry Fielding's Tom Jones (1749). These and other authors brought new life to the goddess and yet another change to her constellation, but that is another story.

* * * * *

1. See Peter Caracciolo's "Dryden and the Antony and Cleopatra of Sir Charles Sedley" (1969), which begins, "The tradition that it was Sedley's tragedy of 1676 which quickened Dryden's interest in a re-working of the Antony and Cleopatra story is preserved in a poem of Laurence Eusden published by Richard Steele in his Poetical Miscellanies (1714)" (1), and he concludes, "the totally inexpressive couplets of Sedley must have been a forcible reminder to Dryden.. [that] the heroic couplet was inadequate for the depth of emotion he aspired to convey" (lv).
2. For a good discussion of Dryden's definition of tragedy in the "Essay of Dramatic Poesie" as well as his "Heads of an Answer to Rymer" and their relation to the structure of All for Love, see Chapter 4 of Judith Milhous and Robert D. Hume Producible Interpretation: Eight English Plays, 1675-1707 (1985).
3. See especially Derek Hughes "Aphrodite katadyomene: Dryden's Cleopatra on the Cydnos" (1980), where he notes that Dryden has his 'own unique conception of Cleopatra-- as a passive victim, misrepresented and finally destroyed by the visions of superhuman evil or superhuman eroticism that she incongruously inspires in those who surround her" (35).

4. In Dryden's dedication to his translation of the Aeneid, he claims to be a follower of Spenser in "numbers" (as his dependence on the authority of a closing alexandrine shows), and he notes, "Virgil in Latin, and Spenser in English, have been my masters" (22).
5. Like his "wrangling queens," Cleopatra and Octavia, Fortune and Nature are each pulling on one arm of Antony and pulling in different directions. Ventidius describes the dilemma the best with the lines, "Virtue's his path, but sometimes tis too narrow/For his vast soul; and then he starts out wide/And bounds into a vice" (I, 123-6).
6. Compare Serapion's opening description of the flood with the incipit of Ovid's Metamorphoses, parts of which Dryden translated for Tonson's Miscellany; ironically, Serapion's source is a creation myth, though he is narrating how "Egypt shall be no more."
7. As Waith notes in The Herculean Hero, there are echoes of the opening of Chapman's Bussy D'Ambois here, where Bussy enters to a "green retreat" and complains, "Fortune, not Reason, rules the state of things,/Reward goes backwards, Honour on his head" (I, i, 1-2).
8. Ventidius wants to save Antony and bring him back to the path of "virtue." He is the plain-spoken Roman soldier, but he derives his dramatic heritage more from Wycherley's humorless Manly in The Plain Dealer than from Shakespeare's clever companion Enobarbus.
9. See Howard D. Weinbrot "Alexas in All for Love: His Genealogy and Function" (1967) for a good analysis of the character and tradition of the eunuch.
10. Note that even A.C. Bradley finds that Iago is a character of Fortune in some ways. He writes that "the skill of Iago was extraordinary, but so was his good fortune" (180).
11. See the section on "Character configuration in All for Love" In Judith Milhous and Robert D. Hume Producible Interpretation (1985), where the authors object that, "Critics have tended to see the character configuration of All for Love as a tug-of-war with Antony in the middle" (136). Also see John A. Vance "Antony Bound: Fragmentation and Insecurity in All for Love" (1986).

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adelman, Janet. The Common Liar: An Essay on "Antony and Cleopatra". New Haven: Yale University Press, 1973.
- Allen, Don Cameron. "The Degeneration of Man and Renaissance Pessimism." Studies in Philology, xxxv (1938): 202-227.
- . "Renaissance Remedies for Fortune: Marlowe and the Fortunati." Studies in Philology, xxxviii (1941): 188-197.
- . Mysteriously Meant: The Rediscovery of Pagan Symbolism and Allegorical Interpretation. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1970.
- Auerbach, Erich. Scenes from the Drama of European Literature. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984.
- Barker, Francis. The Tremulous Private Body: Essays on Subjection. London and New York: Methuen, 1984.
- Barnet, Sylvan. "Recognition and Reversal in Antony and Cleopatra." Shakespeare Quarterly, 18 (1957).
- Barroll, J. Leeds. Shakespearean Tragedy: Genre, Tradition and Change in "Antony and Cleopatra". Washington, DC: The Folger Shakespeare Library, 1984.
- Barthes, Roland. On Racine (translated by Richard Howard). New York: Performing Arts Journal Publications, 1983.
- Bartholomew, Barbara. Fortune and Nature: A Reading of Three Chaucer Narratives. The Hague: Mouton, 1966.
- Bayley, John. "Determined Things: The Case of Antony and Cleopatra" in Harold Bloom, ed. Modern Critical Interpretations of Shakespeare's "Antony and Cleopatra". New York: Chelsea House Publications, 1988: 93-107.
- Beauchamp, Virginia W. "Sidney's Sister as Translator of Garnier." Renaissance Notes, 10 (1957): 8-13.
- Beckerman, Bernard. "Past the Size of Dreaming" in Mark Rose, ed. Twentieth Century Interpretations of "Antony and Cleopatra". Englewood, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1977: 99-112.

- Berger, Thomas L. and William C. Bradford, Jr. An Index to Characters in English Printed Drama to the Restoration. Englewood, CO: Microcard Editions Books, 1975.
- Besterman, Theodore. "A Bibliography of Cleopatra." Notes & Queries, February 6 & February 13, 1926.
- Bethell, Samuel L. Shakespeare and the Popular Dramatic Tradition. New York: Octagon Books, 1970 (Reprint from 1944).
- Bevington, David. From Mankind to Marlowe: Growth of Structure in the Popular Drama of Tudor England. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1962.
- . Tudor Drama and Politics. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1968.
- Bono, Barbara J. Literary Transvaluation: From Vergilian Epic to Shakespearean Tragicomedie. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.
- Bradbrook, M.C. The Living Monument: Shakespeare and the Theatre of his Time. Cambridge University Press, 1976.
- Braden, Gordon. Renaissance Tragedy and the Senecan Tradition: Anger's Privilege. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985.
- Bradley, A.C. "Shakespeare's Antony and Cleopatra" from Oxford Lectures on Poetry. London: Macmillan, 1909: 279-310.
- Brooks, Cleanth. "A Note on the Death of Elizabethan Tragedy" from Modern Poetry and the Tradition. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1939.
- Brower, Reuben A. Hero and Saint: Shakespeare and the Graeco-Roman Heroic Tradition. Oxford University Press, 1971.
- Bullough, Geoffrey. Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare, vol. 5, The Roman Plays: "Julius Caesar," "Antony and Cleopatra," "Coriolanus". New York: Columbia University Press, 1964.
- Bulman, James C. The Heroic Idiom of Shakespearean Tragedy. Newark, NJ: University of Delaware Press, 1985.

- Bush, Douglas. Mythology and the Renaissance Tradition in English Poetry. New York: Pageant Book Company, 1957.
- Canfield, J. Douglas. "The Jewel of Great Price: Mutability and Constancy in Dryden's All for Love." Journal of English Literary History, xlii (Spring, 1975): 38-61.
- Cantor, Paul A. Shakespeare's Rome: Republic and Empire. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1976.
- Caracciolo, Peter. "Dryden and the Antony and Cleopatra of Sir Charles Sedley." English Studies (Anglo-American Supplement), L (1969): 1-lv.
- Cassirer, Ernst. The Individual and the Cosmos in Renaissance Philosophy (translated by Mario Domandi). New York: Harper & Row, 1964 (Orig. pub. 1927).
- Cavell, Stanley. Disowning Knowledge in Six Plays of Shakespeare. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Chambers, E.K. The Elizabethan Stage, vol. 1. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923.
- Charlton, H.B. The Senecan Tradition in Renaissance Tragedy. Folcroft, PA: Folcroft Press, 1969 (Orig. pub. 1921).
- Chew, Samuel C. "Time and Fortune." Journal of English Literary History, vi (1939).
- Chester, Allan Griffith. Thomas May: Man of Letters 1595-1650. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1932.
- Cope, Jackson I. The Theater and the Dream: From Metaphor to Form in Renaissance Drama. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973.
- Couliano, Ioan P. Eros and Magic in the Renaissance (translated by Margaret Cook). University of Chicago Press, 1987.
- Craig, Hardin. "The Shackling of Accidents: A Study of Elizabethan Tragedy." Philological Quarterly, xix (1940): 1-19.

- Curtius, Ernst Robert. European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages (translated by Willard R. Trask). Princeton University Press, 1973 (Orig. pub. 1948).
- Danby, John F. Poets on Fortune's Hill: Studies in Sidney, Shakespeare, Beaumont and Fletcher. Port Washington, NY: Kennikat Press, 1966 (Orig. pub. 1952).
- Davies, H. Neville. "Dryden's All for Love and Sedley's Antony and Cleopatra." Notes & Queries, ccxii (1967): 221-7.
- . "Dryden's All for Love and Thomas May's The Tragedie of Cleopatra, Queen of Egypt." Notes & Queries, (April 1964): 139-44.
- de Man, Paul. "Pascal's Allegory of Persuasion" in Stephen J. Greenblatt, ed. Allegory and Representation. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1981.
- Dobree, Bonamy. "Cleopatra and 'The Criticall Warr.'" Times Literary Supplement, 1393 (October 11, 1928): 717-8.
- . Restoration Tragedy 1660-1720. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1927.
- Dollimore, Jonathan. Radical Tragedy: Religion, Ideology and Power in the Drama of Shakespeare and his Contemporaries. University of Chicago Press, 1984.
- Donno, Elizabeth. "Cleopatra Again." Shakespeare Quarterly, 7 (1956): 227-33.
- Driver, Tom F. The Sense of History in Greek and Shakespearean Drama. New York: Columbia University Press, 1960.
- Eliot. T.S. "Shakespeare and the Stoicism of Seneca" in Elizabethan Essays. London: Faber & Faber, 1934: 33-54.
- . Selected Essays, 1917-1932. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1932.

- Elton, W.R. "King Lear" and the Gods. San Marino, CA: Huntington Library, 1968.
- . "Shakespeare and the Thought of his Age" in Stanley Wells, ed. The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare Studies. Cambridge University Press, 1986: 17-34.
- Farnham, Willard. The Medieval Heritage of Elizabethan Tragedy. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1963.
- Feder, Lillian. "John Dryden's Use of Classical Rhetoric." Publications of the Modern Language Assn., 69 (1954): 258-78.
- Fisch, Harold. "Antony and Cleopatra: The Limits of Mythology." Shakespeare Survey, 23 (1970): 59-67.
- Fisher, Alan S. "Necessity and the Winter: The Tragedy of All for Love." Philological Quarterly, 56 (Spring 1977): 188-203.
- Fitz, L.T. "Egyptian Queens and Male Reviewers: Sexist Attitudes in Antony and Cleopatra Criticism." Shakespeare Quarterly, 28 (1977): 297-316.
- Fletcher, Angus. Allegory: The Theory of a Symbolic Mode. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1964.
- . The Transcendental Masque: An Essay on Milton's "Comus." Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1971.
- Freer, Coburn. "Mary Sidney, Countess of Pembroke" in Katherina M. Wilson, ed. Women Writers of the Renaissance and Reformation. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1987.
- Frye, Northrop. Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays. Princeton University Press, 1971.
- . Fools of Time: Studies in Shakespearean Tragedy. University of Toronto Press, 1967.
- Furness, H.H., ed. A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare's "The Tragedie of Anthonie and Cleopatra". Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott, 1907.
- Goldberg, Jonathan. James I and the Politics of Literature: Jonson, Shakespeare, Donne and their Contemporaries. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1983.

- Gordon, D.J. The Renaissance Imagination (collected and edited by Stephen Orgel). Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1975.
- Greenblatt, Stephen J. Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare. University of Chicago Press, 1980.
- Greene, Thomas M. The Light in Troy: Imitation and Discovery in Renaissance Poetry. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982.
- Hacking, Ian. The Emergence of Probability: A Philosophical Study of Early Ideas About Probability, Induction and Statistical Inference. Cambridge University Press, 1975.
- Hagstrum, Jean H. "Dryden's Grotesque: An Aspect of the Baroque in his Art and Criticism" in Earl Miner, ed. John Dryden: Writers and their Backgrounds. London: Bell and Sons, 1972.
- . The Sister Arts: The Tradition of Literary Pictorialism in English Poetry from Dryden to Gray. University of Chicago Press, 1958.
- Hallett, Charles. "Change, Fortune and Time: Aspects of the Sublunar World in Antony and Cleopatra." Journal of English and Germanic Philology, 75 (1976): 75-89.
- Hamilton, Gary D. "Irony and Fortune in Sejanus." Studies in English Literature, xi (1971): 265-81.
- Hammond, Paul. "Dryden's Philosophy of Fortune." Modern Language Review, 80 (October 1985): 768-85.
- Hillman, Richard. "Antony, Hercules and Cleopatra: 'the bidding of the gods' and 'the subtlest maze of all.'" Shakespeare Quarterly, 38 (Winter 1987): 442-51.
- Hinnant, Charles H. "All for Love and the Heroic Ideal." Genre, 16 (1983).
- Hosley, Richard. "The Staging of the Monument Scene in Antony and Cleopatra." Library Chronicles, 30 (1964): 62-71.

- Hughes, Derek. "Aphrodite katadyomene: Dryden's Cleopatra on the Cydnos." Comparative Drama, 14 (1980): 35-45.
- . "Art and Life in All for Love." Studies in Philology, 80 (1983): 84-107.
- . "The Significance of All for Love." Journal of English Literary History, xxxvii (1970): 540-63.
- Hume, Robert D. The Development of English Drama in the Late Seventeenth Century. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976.
- . Dryden's Criticism. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1970.
- . "Individuation and Development of Character through Language in Antony and Cleopatra." Shakespeare Quarterly, 24 (1973): 280-300.
- Jondorf, Gillian. Robert Garnier and the Themes of Political Tragedy in the Sixteenth Century. Cambridge University Press, 1969.
- Kantorowicz, Ernst. The King's Two Bodies. Princeton University Press, 1957.
- Kaula, David. "The Time Sense of Antony and Cleopatra." Shakespeare Quarterly, 15 (1964).
- Kearful, Frank J. "'Tis Past Recovery': Tragic Consciousness in All for Love." Modern Language Quarterly, 34 (1973): 227-46.
- Kiefer, Frederick. Fortune and Elizabethan Tragedy. The Huntington Library, 1983.
- Kirsch, A.C. Dryden's Heroic Drama. New York: Gordian Press, 1972 (Orig. pub. 1965).
- Knight, G. Wilson. The Imperial Theme: Further Interpretations of Shakespeare's Tragedies Including the Roman Plays. London: Methuen, 1951 (Orig. pub. 1931).
- Kozilowsky, Stanley J. "Homo Fortunatus: A Study of the Humanized Image of Fortune in Tudor Dramatic Literature." Unpublished dissertation for Ph.D., University of Massachusetts, 1971.

- Kristeller, Paul Oskar. The Classics and Renaissance Thought. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1955.
- LaBranche, Antony. "Samuel Daniel: A Voice of Thoughtfulness" in Thomas O. Sloan and Raymond B. Woddington, eds. The Rhetoric of Renaissance Poetry. University of California Press, 1974: 123-139.
- Lacan, Jacques. "Desire and the Interpretation of Desire in Hamlet" in Shoshona Felman, ed. Literature & Psychoanalysis, the Question of Reading Otherwise. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1982: 11-52.
- Lamb, Margaret. "Antony and Cleopatra" on the English Stage. London: Associated University Presses, 1980.
- Leavenworth, Russell. Daniel's "Cleopatra": A Critical Study. Salzburg Studies in English Literature, 1974.
- Lloyd, Michael. "Antony and the Game of Chance." Journal of English and Germanic Philology, 61 (1962): 548-54.
- . "Cleopatra as Isis." Shakespeare Survey, 12 (1959): 88-94.
- MacMullan, Katherine Vance. "Death Imagery in Antony and Cleopatra." Shakespeare Quarterly, 14 (1963): 399-410.
- Mack, Maynard. "Antony and Cleopatra: The Stillness and the Dance" in Milton Crane, ed. Shakespeare's Art: Seven Essays. University of Chicago Press, 1973: 79-114.
- Markels, Julian. The Pillar of the World: "Antony and Cleopatra" in Shakespeare's Development. Athens, OH: Ohio State University Press, 1968.
- Meyer-Baer, Kathi. Music of the Spheres and the Dance of Death: Studies in Musical Iconology. Princeton University Press, 1970.
- Milhous, Judith and Robert D. Hume. Producible Interpretation: Eight English Plays, 1675-1707. Carbondale & Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press, 1985.

Morrison, Mary. "Some Aspects of the Treatment of the Theme of Antony and Cleopatra in Tragedies of the Sixteenth Century." Journal of European Studies, 4 (June 1974): 113-125.

Muir, Kenneth. "Elizabeth I, Jodelle and Cleopatra" in S. Schoenbaum, ed. Renaissance Drama New Series II: Essays Principally on Dramatic Theory and Form. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1969: 197-206.

----- . "The Imagery of All for Love." Proceedings of the Leeds Philosophical and Literary Society, V (1940): 140-7.

Nicoll, Allardyce. Dryden as an Adapter of Shakespeare. London: Oxford University Press, 1922.

----- . A History of English Drama, vol. 1: Restoration Drama 1660-1700. Cambridge University Press, 1952.

Norman, A.M.Z. "Daniel's Tragedie of Cleopatra and Antony and Cleopatra." Shakespeare Quarterly, 9 (1958): 11-18.

----- . "The Traagedie of Cleopatra and the Date of Antony and Cleopatra." Modern Language Review, 54 (1959): 1-9.

Novak, M.E. "Criticism, Adaptation, Politics and the Shakespearean Model of Dryden's All for Love" in Roseann Runte, ed. Studies in Eighteenth Century Culture. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1978.

Onians, Richard Broxton. The Origins of European Thought about the Body, the Mind, the Soul, the World, Time, and Fate. New York: Arno Press, 1973 (Orig. pub. 1951).

Orgel, Stephen. The Illusion of Power: Political Theater in the English Renaissance. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975.

Panofsky, Erwin. Studies in Iconology: Humanistic Themes in the Art of the Renaissance. New York: Harper & Row, 1962 (Orig. pub. 1939).

- Parry, Graham. The Golden Age Restor'd: The Culture of the Stuart Court, 1603-42. Manchester University Press, 1981.
- Patch, Howard Rollin. The Tradition of Boethius: A Study of His Importance in Medieval Culture. New York: Oxford University Press, 1935.
- . The Goddess Fortuna in Medieval Literature. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1927.
- Patrick, J. Max. "The Cleopatra Theme in World Literature up to 1700" in James Russell Conway Perkin, ed. The Undoing of Babel: Watson Kirkconnell, the Man and His Work. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1975: 64-76.
- Pechter, Edward. Dryden's Classical Theory of Literature. Cambridge University Press, 1975.
- Pitkin, Hanna F. Fortune is a Woman: Gender and Politics in the Thought of Niccolo Machiavelli. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.
- Quinney, Laura. "Enter a Messenger" in Harold Bloom, ed. Modern Critical Interpretations of William Shakespeare's "Antony and Cleopatra". New York: Chelsea House Publishers, 1988: 151-68.
- Rabkin, Norman. Shakespeare and the Problem of Meaning. University of Chicago Press, 1981.
- Ramsay, Paul. The Art of John Dryden. Lexington, KY: University of Kentucky Press, 1969.
- Rees, Joan. "Samuel Daniel's Cleopatra and Two French Plays." Modern Language Review, xlvii (1952).
- . "Shakespeare's Use of Daniel." Modern Language Review, 55 (1960): 79-82.
- Reiss, Timothy J. "Jodelle's Cleopatre and the Enchanted Circle." in Yale French Studies, 47 (1972): 199-210.
- . Tragedy and Truth: Stories in the Development of a Renaissance and Neoclassical Discourse. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980.
- Rice Eugene F., Jr. The Renaissance Idea of Wisdom. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1958.

- Rinehart, Keith. "Shakespeare's Cleopatra and England's Elizabeth." Shakespeare Quarterly, 23 (1972): 81-6.
- Rothstein, Eric. Restoration Tragedy: Form and the Process of Change. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1967.
- Rozett, Martha Tuck. "The Comic Structure of Tragic Endings: The Suicide Scenes in Romeo & Juliet and Antony and Cleopatra." Shakespeare Quarterly, 36 (Summer 1985): 152-164.
- . The Doctrine of Election and the Emergence of Elizabethan Tragedy. Princeton University Press, 1984.
- Salingar, Leo. Shakespeare and the Traditions of Comedy. Cambridge University Press, 1974.
- Schiebinger, Londa. "Feminine Icons: The Face of Early Modern Science." Critical Inquiry, 14 (Summer 1988): 661-91.
- Seronsy, Cecil. "The Doctrine of Cyclical Recurrence and Some Related Ideas in the Works of Samuel Daniel." Studies in Philology, liv (1957): 387-407.
- . Samuel Daniel. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1967.
- Seznec, Jean. The Survival of the Pagan Gods: The Mythological Tradition and its Place in Renaissance Humanism and Art (translated by B.F. Sessions). New York: Harper & Row, 1953.
- Shapiro, Barbara J. Probability and Certainty in Natural Science, Religion, History, Law and Literature. Princeton University Press, 1983.
- Simmons, J.L. Shakespeare's Pagan World: The Roman Tragedies. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press, 1973.
- Smith, Sheila M. "This Great Solemnity: A Study of the Presentation of Death in Antony and Cleopatra." ES, xlv (1964): 163-76.
- Soellner, Rolf. "King Lear and the Magic of the Wheel." Shakespeare Quarterly, 35 (1984): 274-89.

- Solomon, Harry M. "Tragic Reconciliation: A Hegelian Analysis of All for Love." Studies in Philology, 80 (Spring 1984): 185-211.
- Spencer, Benjamin T. "Antony and Cleopatra and the Paradoxical Metaphor." Shakespeare Quarterly, 9 (1958): 373-8.
- Spencer, Theodore. "Two Classic Elizabethans: Samuel Daniel and Sir John Davies" in Alan C. Purves, ed. Theodore Spencer: Selected Essays. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1966: 100-22.
- Spitzer, Leo. "Review of Stephen Gilman's The Art of 'La Celestina'." Hispanic Review, 25 (1957): 1-25 (With Gilman's reply on pp. 112-121).
- Starnes, D.T. "Imitation of Shakespeare in Dryden's All for Love." Texas Studies in Literature and Language, 6 (1964): 39-46.
- Stirling, Brents. "Cleopatra's Scene with Seleucus: Plutarch, Daniel and Shakespeare." Shakespeare Quarterly, 15 (1964): 299-311.
- Strong, Roy. The Cult of Elizabeth. London: Thames & Hudson, 1977.
- Stroup, T.B. "The Structure of Antony and Cleopatra." Shakespeare Quarterly, xv (1964): 289-98.
- Stull, Joseph S. "Cleopatra's Magnanimity: The Dismissal of the Messenger." Shakespeare Quarterly, 7 (1956): 73-8.
- Traci, Philip J. The Love Play of "Antony and Cleopatra": A Critical Study of Shakespeare's Play. The Hague: Mouton, 1970.
- Trinkaus, Charles. "The Problem of Free Will in the Renaissance and the Reformation" in The Scope of Renaissance Humanism. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1983 [Orig. pub. in Journal of the History of Ideas, x (1949)].
- Tuve, Rosemond. Allegorical Imagery: Some Medieval Books and their Posterity. Princeton University Press, 1966.
- Van Doren, Mark. John Dryden: A Study of his Poetry. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1920.

- Vance, John A. "Antony Bound: Fragmentation and Insecurity in All for Love." Studies in English Literature (Summer 1986).
- Waith, Eugene M. The Herculean Hero in Marlowe, Chapman, Shakespeare and Dryden. New York: Columbia University Press, 1962.
- Wallerstein, Ruth. "Dryden and the Analysis of Shakespeare's Techniques" in H.T. Swedenberg, ed. Essential Articles for the Study of John Dryden. Hamden, CT: Archon Books, 1966: 551-75.
- Willey, Basil. The Seventeenth Century Background: Studies in the Thought of the Age in Relation to Poetry and Religion. New York: Doubleday & Company, 1953.
- Williamson, Marilyn L. Infinite Variety: Antony and Cleopatra in Renaissance Drama and Earlier Tradition. Mystic, CT: L. Verry, 1974.
- . "Fortune in Antony and Cleopatra." Journal of English and Germanic Philology, 67 (1968): 423-9.
- Wind, Edgar. Pagan Mysteries in the Renaissance. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1968 (Orig. pub. 1958).
- Witherspoon, A.M. The Influence of Robert Garnier on Elizabethan Drama. New York: Archon Books, 1968 (Orig. pub. 1924).
- Wolf, William D. "'New Heaven, New Earth': The Escape from Mutability in Antony and Cleopatra." Shakespeare Quarterly, 33 (1982): 328-335.
- Yates, Frances. Theatre of the World. University of Chicago Press, 1969.