Σ

**Skenè Studies I • 6**

Shakespeare and the Mediterranean • 3
*Antony and Cleopatra*

Edited by Cristiano Ragni

S K E N È *Texts and Studies*. Studies I

# Shakespeare and the Mediterranean

This series collects selected contributions to the International Summer School annually organised by the Skenè Research Centre, Verona University (https://skene.dlls.univr.it/en/), as well as articles related to its activities.

**Published volumes:**

Bigliazzi, Silvia, and Emanuel Stelzer, eds. 2022. *Shakespeare and the Mediterranean • 1:* Romeo and Juliet (pp. 296)

Ciambella, Fabio, ed. 2023. *Shakespeare and the Mediterranean • 2:* The Tempest (pp. 200)

# Contents

## The Actor's Point of View

# Contributors

**Rita de Carvalho Rodrigues** has completed her undergraduate degree in General Studies, majoring in North American Studies and minoring in Performing Arts and Mathematics at the University of Lisbon. She is a recent postgraduate student at Nova University of Lisbon in the Arts of Writing. Her study interests are mainly related to Literature, Theatre, and Cinema, although she is currently focused on Creative Writing.

**Paul Edmondson** is Head of Research for the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust, an Honorary Fellow of The Shakespeare Institute, University of Birmingham, and a Visiting Professor in Human Rights, Birmingham City University. His publications include: *Shakespeare: Ideas in Profile*; *Twelfth Night: A Guide to the Text and Its Theatrical Life*; *Destination Shakespeare*; *Finding Shakespeare's New Place: an Archaeological Biography* (with Kevin Colls and William Mitchell); *New Places: Shakespeare and Civic Creativity* (with Ewan Fernie); *Shakespeare's Creative Legacies* (with Peter Holbrook); *A Year of Shakespeare: Re-living the World Shakespeare Festival* (with Paul Prescott and Erin Sullivan); and, in collaboration with Stanley Wells: *Shakespeare's Sonnets*; *Shakespeare Beyond Doubt: Evidence, Argument, Controversy*; *The Shakespeare Circle: An Alternative Biography*; and *All the Sonnets of Shakespeare.* He is a Trustee of the British Shakespeare Association, The Rose Theatre, and The Friends of Shakespeare's Church. He also turned his late friend Greg Wells's Ph.D. thesis into a book: *John Hall, Master of Physicke: A Casebook from Shakespeare's Stratford.* He is currently writing Shakespeare and Stratford-upon-Avon for the Oxford Shakespeare Topics series.

**Lisa Hopkins** is Professor Emerita of English at Sheffield Hallam University. She is a co-editor of *Journal of Marlowe Studies* and of *Shakespeare*, the journal of the British Shakespeare Association, and a series editor of Arden Critical Readers and Arden Studies in Early Modern Drama. Work resulting from her longstanding interest in Roman plays includes *The Cultural Uses of the Caesars on the English Renaissance Stage* (Ashgate, 2008), 'Beautiful Polecats: the Living and the Dead in Julius Caesar', *Shakespeare Survey* 72 (2019): 160-170, "'By Jupiter, forgot': Volscians and Scots in Shakespeare and Arbella Stuart", *SEDERI Yearbook* 31 (2021): 55-72, and "Titus Andronicus and the Wicked Streets of Rome", *Cahiers Elisabéthains* 113.1 (2024): 6-22. Her most recent publications are *The Edge of Christendom on the Early Modern English Stage* (De Gruyter, 2022) and *A Companion to the Cavendishes*, with Tom Rutter (ARC Humanities Press, 2020), and her edition of John Ford's *The Queen* is forthcoming from Manchester University Press in 2024. She also writes about detective fiction and her book *Ocular Proof and the Spectacled Detective in British Crime Fiction* was published by Palgrave in 2023.

**Jason Lawrence** is Senior Lecturer in English at the University of Hull. His primary area of research interest is the literary and cultural relationships between Italy and England in the Renaissance period and beyond. His first monograph explored the relationship between methods of learning Italian in Renaissance England and techniques of imitation in response to popular Italian literary materials. His recent monograph focuses on the reception in England of the life and work of the great 16th century Italian poet Torquato Tasso, spanning literature, opera, and the visual arts from the late 16th to the late 19th centuries.

**Pasquale Pagano** has been teaching English Language at the University of Campania "L. Vanvitelli" (Department of Architecture) since November 2023 and has been a Teaching Assistant (Department of Economics) since February 2022. He graduated in English Literature *cum laude* from the University of Naples "L'Orientale" in 2006. He also got a degree in Religious Sciences from the "San Roberto Bellarmino" Higher Institute for Religious

Sciences in Capua (CE) in 2014. He has been teaching English in upper secondary schools since 2008. His main research interests focus on Shakespeare Studies, English Renaissance literature, and the history of English Reformation, as well as the broader relations between religious discourses and literature.

**Amelia Platt** recently graduated from the University of Cambridge with a degree in English. Her undergraduate final year dissertation explored the figure of the detective in 'Golden Age' crime fiction, focusing on the works of Ngaio Marsh and Dorothy L. Sayers. It explored how the detectives featured in these texts experience a 'crisis of authority' relating to their detecting, thus compromising the justice they seek to administer. She is due to begin a Masters in English Literary Studies at the University of York in September, where she hopes to continue her analysis of crime fiction.

**Cristiano Ragni** is Assistant Professor (RtdA) of English Literature at the University of Verona. After earning his Ph.D. in Comparative Literature at the University of Perugia and carrying out part of his research at the Warburg Institute in London, he was a Post-Doctoral Research Fellow at the Universities of Turin and Genoa. His main research interests lie in the relations between political thinking, theology, and theatre in the Elizabethan age, and in the receptions of classical antiquity in modern and contemporary literature. For the project *In the Margins of Theatre* (IMT) at the University of Verona, he is studying the *marginalia* that can be found in early printed English playbooks. Among his recent publications, besides essays in edited collections and peer-reviewed journals, are the book *La Nazione e il Teatro. Alberico Gentili, Shakespeare e l'Inghilterra elisabettiana* (2020), and the Italian editions of Christopher Marlowe's *The Massacre at Paris* (2017), and *Hero and Leander* (2023). Dr Ragni is a member of the Editorial Board of *Skenè. Journal of Theatre and Drama Studies* and Managing Editor of the series *Skenè. Texts and Studies.*

**Stanley Wells** CBE, FRSL is one of the world's foremost Shakespearians, a former Life Trustee (1975-2017) and former Chairman of the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust (1991-2011), Emeritus

Professor of Shakespeare Studies of the University of Birmingham, and Honorary Emeritus Governor of the Royal Shakespeare Theatre, of which he was for many years Vice-Chairman. He holds a Ph. D. of the University of Birmingham, is an Honorary Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford and of University College, London and holds honorary doctorates from Furman University, South Carolina, and from the Universities of Munich, Hull, Durham and Warwick, Marburg and Craiova. He also received a knighthood in the 2016 Queen's Birthday Honours in recognition of his services to Shakespeare scholarship. His books include *Literature and Drama*; *Royal Shakespeare: Studies of Four Major Productions at the Royal Shakespeare Theatre*; *Modernizing Shakespeare's Spelling*; *Re-editing Shakespeare for the Modern Reader*; and *Shakespeare: the Poet and his Plays*. He edited *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, *Richard II*, and *The Comedy of Errors* for the New Penguin Shakespeare and *King Lear* for the Oxford Shakespeare. He was for nearly twenty years the editor of the annual *Shakespeare Survey*, and writes for the *New York Review of Books* and many other publications. He has edited *The New Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare Studies* and is General Editor (with Gary Taylor) of *The Complete Oxford Shakespeare*, co-author of *William Shakespeare: A Textual Companion* and General Editor of the *Penguin Shakespeare*. His most recent books are *Shakespeare in the Theatre: An Anthology of Criticism*; *The Oxford Dictionary of Shakespeare*; *The Oxford Companion to Shakespeare* (edited with Michael Dobson); *Shakespeare For All Time*; *Looking for Sex in Shakespeare*; *Shakespeare's Sonnets* and *Coffee with Shakespeare*, both co-authored with Paul Edmondson; *Shakespeare & Co.*; *Is It True What they Say About Shakespeare?*; *Shakespeare, Sex, and Love*; *Great Shakespeare Actors, and William Shakespeare: A Very Short Introduction*. Together with Paul Edmondson he has edited *Shakespeare Beyond Doubt* and *The Shakespeare Circle*, for Cambridge University Press. Stanley Wells was elected The Shakespeare Birthplace Trust's first Honorary President in June 2011.

**Sina Will** is an MA student in Comparative Literature at the University of Vienna. Enrolled in BA in Ancient Greek and Ancient History, her research interests lie mainly in the field of classical reception, specifically the translation and adaptation of Homer

and Greek tragedy. Her dissertation focuses on the phenomenon of feminist and postcolonial approaches to and rewritings of the classics in the 20th and 21st centuries while also examining the role that different translational approaches play in the contemporary reception of ancient literature in scholarship and popular discourse.

# 4

# "Name Cleopatra as she is call'd in Rome": (Un)Hiding Cleopatra's Name in *Antony and Cleopatra*

Rita De Carvalho Rodrigues

## Abstract

This essay explores the reasons behind the lack of Cleopatra's name in the Shakespearean play *Antony and Cleopatra*. In particular, the investigation attempts to uncover why Cleopatra's name appears only twenty-eight times in a text of 23,848 words. It does so by showcasing a deep literary and linguistic analysis of the play's text, specifically, character speech, to decode which expressions and terms are used to address, mention, or refer to Cleopatra and why characters choose them. Firstly, it argues that a patriarchal context combined with an 'Egyptian-enemy' perception fuels the rage that leads Cleopatra not to be called by her own name by the men in the play. This argument also analyses the ambivalence that characterises Antony's speech towards Cleopatra. Secondly, it argues that Cleopatra's name carries fearlessness and power, whether through its commanding sonority or possible associated superstition. The word 'Cleopatra' is charged with strength and intensity that arguably threatens most men in the play, which unmistakably leads to an avoidance of her name. These arguments work together in building the idea that there are relevant substantial reasons that could explain why Cleopatra's name is ultimately hidden in the play

Keywords: Shakespeare; Mediterranean; Cleopatra; Digital Humanities; Linguistics; Drama Studies

## 1. Introduction

It seems only fitting to be shocked after learning that out of the 23,848 words that constitute the text of Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra,* only twenty-eight of those words are the name 'Cleopatra'. After all, she is the protagonist of the play; her name is in the very title of the tragedy. Then why does it appear only twenty-eight times in such a lengthy play? Notably, her male co-protagonist's name, 'Antony', appears 133 times. What could explain this tremendous contrast? This essay explores the imbalance between the use of

Cleopatra's first name and the use of other characters' first names in an attempt to uncover the possible reasons behind the prevailing alternative terms and expressions used to address Cleopatra.

Firstly, it is important to clarify that "a 'form of address' may be considered as any word or phrase regularly used vocatively and formulaically which is indicative of social relationships" (Replogle 1967, 14). In this essay, different forms of address regarding Cleopatra and other characters will be considered for analysis and interpretation, such as their first names (like 'Cleopatra', 'Antony', 'Caesar'), terms of social indication or rank (like 'Queen', 'Egypt', 'Lady', 'Lord'), terms of endearment ('my love') or even insults ('gypsy', 'witch'). When looking at these terms, it becomes possible to uncover the gap in the use of first names between Cleopatra and other characters – mainly Antony and Caesar.

As Robert D. Hume claims, ". . . characters are sharply differentiated by their language," in the sense that each character has its own style of language, specific ways of constructing a sentence, and even a preference for certain words (1973, 281). Exploring why Cleopatra's name seems to be hidden in the play's text is relevant in that finding the primary alternatives for her name that characters use sheds light not only on their own language style but also on the depth of Cleopatra's character. Hume follows, ". . . the distinctively personal speech of each individual contributes to our apprehension of his character" (281). Thus, examining the terms each character attributes to her provides insight into why her name is being avoided. Those reasons, in turn, will help construct the depth and power of Cleopatra's figure and presence in the play.

## 2. Research Methodology

As a reader – especially a first-time reader of the play – it is hard to focus on the use of any specific word or even how many times one or the other appears in the text. Actually, it is more than likely that the average reader, reading solely for enjoyment purposes, will not notice how frequently a particular word is uttered in a text. Therefore, it may come as a surprise that the word 'Cleopatra' appears only twenty-eight times during the play. The idea itself is

hard to grasp when discussing a play with the word 'Cleopatra' in its title. Regardless, the fact stands that Cleopatra's name consists of only 0,12% of the play's text – no possibility of claiming against it; this is what the numbers show.

These numbers were calculated using The Folger Shakespeare API Tools to select the complete text of *Antony and Cleopatra*, followed by inserting it in the Voyant Tools, which provided graphs and tables of all the top words in the text. For further analysis, the play's text by character was also selected in The Folger Shakespeare API Tools (and later inserted in Voyant) in order to investigate the differences between Cleopatra and Antony's individual linguistic presence throughout the play.

Nonetheless, while recognising how unnatural it seems that Cleopatra's name appears only twenty-eight times in the text, it is crucial to keep in mind that that number is not an exact representation of the number of times Cleopatra is referred to and/or addressed during the play. In order to get a clear picture of the total instances in which Cleopatra is central in a dialogue or character interaction, research calculations used the different tables in Voyant to include – besides the name 'Cleopatra' – all equivalent expressions and terms, such as 'Queen', 'Egypt', 'Lady', 'Madam', 'Majesty', and so forth. Additionally, it was part of the methodology to verify if those equivalents truly referred to Cleopatra in all those instances. Arguing that the number twenty-eight is a fair representation of Cleopatra's presence in the play and concluding that she, as a character, is somehow hidden or given less importance can be easily contested, and it is not what this essay defends.

## 3. Lines of Inquiry

This essay argues that regardless of how many times Cleopatra is referred to or mentioned in dialogue, it remains an uncontested fact that she is called by her own name only twenty-eight times (and some of those times, it is Cleopatra who is referring to herself). On the contrary, 'Caesar' and 'Antony' are the two most used words in the text – 134 and 133 times, respectively, almost quintupling Cleopatra's name. But why is this relevant? What meanings could

lie behind Cleopatra's name being hidden in the text (and by contrast, Antony and Caesar being abundantly on display)?

This essay presents two distinct arguments as attempts to explain why this happens. The first one arises by questioning whether this could be a sociological issue related to gender norms. It questions how differently the 'powerful' men in the play, Caesar and Antony, are referred to *versus* how Cleopatra is mentioned. Moreover, it intertwines the avoidance of Cleopatra's name with the differences in treatment between Cleopatra, an Egyptian woman, and other female characters, especially Fulvia and Octavia, two Roman *matronae*. While focusing on the possibility of a deeper sociological reason behind this situation, or even hints of a geographical prejudice, this argument requires a thorough consideration of the literary techniques employed by Shakespeare in the writing of each character's text. Thus, the patterns in Antony's language while addressing or referring to Cleopatra as her lover are investigated.

The second argument elaborates on the power of Cleopatra's name, what it represents, and how the intensity behind its utterance could be directly related to its (maybe) conscious avoidance. It is undeniable that Cleopatra's powerfulness as a purely confident woman, a queen, a representation of the 'otherness' that was not the Roman world, threatened the men in the play in more ways than one. The argument follows that many personal, spiteful, prejudicial reasons engraved in the other characters' personalities may lead to her name's literary presence being diminished. It investigates a possible phonetic connection and even the possibility of a superstitious connotation regarding the avoidance of Cleopatra's name by certain characters. Nonetheless, the argument stays aware of its limitations, for instance, because Cleopatra's servants could not call her simply by her name, which would be unthoughtful and disrespectful. While this is one of the apparent reasons that explains some of the absence of Cleopatra's name, as a reason itself, it is irrelevant for this essay because it is a motive shared by other characters – Antony and Caesar's servants cannot also call them by their names.

As Hume explains, ". . . it should be plain that in *Antony and Cleopatra,* language is not merely the vehicle of the action; rather, it parallels and reinforces the conflicts of the play, indicates what

is going to happen and helps tell us why" (1973, 300). Therefore, it seems only fitting to focus on language – analysing linguistic traits in each character that may help us understand the underlying conflicts and issues in the play reflected in the play's text.

## 4. From "my dearest queen" to "triple turned whore"

As an attempt to get closer to the total number of times Cleopatra's character is referred to, addressed to, or mentioned in the play, research calculations led to a rough estimate by adding to the name *Cleopatra* almost every possible alternative. With every added term, the estimated number reached 146 instances – correspondingly 0,61% of the play's text.

Firstly, it needs to be pointed out that, even after adding all the alternative terms to Cleopatra's name – in this study, only 'Cleopatra', 'Queen', 'Egypt', 'Lady', 'Madam' and 'Majesty' were considered as alternatives – that still surpasses the use of Antony's name alone (all other alternatives excluded) by only thirteen instances. By accepting the number 146 as the total of instances where Cleopatra is mentioned, then the number of times the word 'Cleopatra' is chosen for reference corresponds to 19.2% of all the times she is addressed or mentioned. Thus, this calculation reinforces that Cleopatra's name does not even prevail in the handful of ways the play's characters choose to address her.

Furthermore, research calculations, in an attempt to expose contrasts, show a rough estimate calculated for Antony's case. If we add to the 133 times Antony's name appears in the text, most alternatives for his name, such as 'Sir', 'Lord' and 'Mark', a number around 260, 270 is reached as an estimated total. Adding every 'Sir', 'Lord' and 'Mark' would correspond to 286 mentions, but that number cannot be used as a reference without considering a margin of error of at least twenty 'Sir's and 'Lord's belonging to someone else, in this case, Caesar. Still, if that margin of error is taken into account, that leaves the total still as roughly 100 more mentions of Antony than Cleopatra – 1,2% of the play's text. Antony's name alone appears, as stated previously, 133 times, corresponding to 0,56% of the play's text. Surprisingly, Caesar surpasses Antony by

one appearance, making his name the top word in the play – with a total of 134 times correspondingly 0,56% of the play's text.

Another relevant strategy used to depict discrepancies in name use between characters is looking specifically at the contrasts presented in Antony's speech towards Cleopatra. Of all the twenty-eight times Cleopatra's name appears in the play, Antony is responsible for only seven of those. On the contrary, Cleopatra's top word is 'Antony', with thirty-five utterances. Even if we add, in Antony's speech, to Cleopatra's name all the other alternatives ('Egypt', 'Queen', 'Lady'), the total of times Antony addresses and mentions her becomes an estimate of thirty-two times – which is still not enough to surpass Cleopatra's use of his own name. Similarly, if we added all the alternatives for Antony's name, as 'Sir', 'Lord' and 'Mark', the number thirty-five would only go up, easily surpassing Antony's thirty-two mentions of Cleopatra. Author Teresa Fanego argues that Cleopatra and Antony, by using their first names to address each other, illustrate the "closeness of their relationship" (2005, 30). Besides, Fanego also states that even though Antony uses Cleopatra's name significantly less than Cleopatra uses Antony's, "his affection for her becomes clear from his frequent use of endearments, a form of address which became more common from the seventeenth century onwards" (31). This sustains that Antony's love for Cleopatra can hardly be measured by the number of times he says her name because he uses other "terms of endearment." But does this rightfully explain why he rarely uses her name?

Antony resorts to an endless array of terms and expressions to refer to Cleopatra. It is essential to highlight the striking difference between the terms of endearment he uses when he is satisfied with her and when everything is going according to plan and the radically opposed, insulting terms he uses when things start to go wrong – or more explicitly when Cleopatra allegedly does something with which he is not happy about. As Hume points out, ". . . after his final defeat Antony rails against Cleopatra . . . calling her 'foul Egyptian,' 'triple turned whore,' 'charm,' 'gypsy,' 'spell,' and 'witch'" (1973, 295). The way he speaks to her when he is not angry is dramatically different. He then uses terms like 'my dearest queen' (1.3.22) and 'most sweet queen' (1.3.40).

As far as discrepancies between Cleopatra's speech towards Antony and his towards her are concerned, Fanego mentions that "although in principle the relationship between husband and wife, or between two lovers of the opposite sex, was founded on mutual love and respect, it was not an equal one" (2005, 29). It is undeniable that inequality often surrounds a romantic relationship, especially a heteronormative one – and especially one set many centuries ago, even more so a non-official asymmetrical relationship like Antony and Cleopatra's. Antony is married, Cleopatra is his mistress. There is a power imbalance sustained easily by the fact that Cleopatra is the one who, unconventionally, holds all the power in the relationship, when as far as Rome is concerned, Antony should be the powerful one and should not let himself be controlled by Cleopatra. Exhibit A, Antony follows Cleopatra, leading him to lose the Battle of Actium and Exhibit B, he wishes to kill himself when he learns of her death. Traditionally and old-fashionably, Antony should have all the power; for one thing, he is the man in the relationship, an illustrious, *married* Roman general – first to Fulvia, then to Octavia. As far as Antony's men are concerned, Cleopatra is *just* his mistress, regardless of their acknowledging of her charm and appeal.

Moreover, when it comes to Cleopatra's allure, Shakespeare could not put in the play explicit descriptions of her "physical charms." Hume claims that, in order to capture Cleopatra's "magic spell" and transpose into the text what exactly made her so appealing to men, Shakespeare had to devote lengthy descriptions of her – the prime example being Enobarbus' monologue – or intricate expression as alternatives for direct identification (1973, 288):

> Enobarbus I will tell you.
>     The barge she sat in, like a burnish'd throne,
>     Burnt on the water. The poop was beaten gold,
>     Purple the sails, and so perfumed that
>     The winds were love-sick with them
>     . . .
> (2.2.216-20)

Besides, it is also important to keep in mind that part of Cleopatra's "magic spell" was also due to the fact that she was seen as a symbol of the unknown. It is known that the Mediterranean "stands as the

geographic centre of Shakespeare's imagination" (Cantor 2006, 897). Cleopatra herself, in representing Egypt, part of her "magic spell" is essentially that "otherness" characteristic of the Mediterranean site (Stelzer 2022, 26) that allows her to be fetishized by almost every man in the play, as the monologue shows. In the following argument, it will also be proved how her "otherness" worked as a double-edged sword. As quickly as it is labelled a "magic spell" in a most sensual and ethereal way, it easily transforms into harmful prejudices and stereotypes through the distorted Egyptian-enemy-like lens.

However, it is essential to remember that this is not as simple as stating that Cleopatra's name is used less simply because she is a woman. Even though it could seem that way based on the fact that her male co-protagonist's name appears 105 times more than hers, the gap cannot be merely reduced to that. Considering other female characters in the play like Fulvia and Octavia, for example – two Roman women that, despite not being of the same rank as Cleopatra, represent Antony's marital prospects, directly opposed threats to Cleopatra. As author, Manfred Weidhorn argues, ". . . though seductress of the greatest Romans, (Cleopatra) had been treated by them . . . as a gypsy, a low-class concubine, an Oriental Siren, and not with dignity accorded a Roman matron like Fulvia or Octavia" (1969, 305). Manfred's statement suggests that she is not treated with the same dignity as Fulvia or Octavia, which uncovers a more significant issue that surpasses gender and enters a deeper realm. A realm of perhaps not-so-subtle racial discrimination. This is clearly a symptom of the general geographical conflict between the Roman and Egyptian civilizations, and it is fairly evident through the fact that Cleopatra's "magic spell" is of no use to her because she will always represent the enemy. Which ultimately leads to a drastic difference in treatment between her and the other (Roman) women in the play.

Take Fulvia's case, a female character not even awarded with stage presence. Her name appears fourteen times in the play. Fulvia's name appears *half* the number of times Cleopatra's name appears. When Enobarbus learns about Fulvia's death, in a matter of 4 sentences, he and Antony manage to use her name a total of *three* times:

> Antony **Fulvia** is dead.
> Enobarbus Sir?
> Antony **Fulvia** is dead.
> Enobarbus **Fulvia**?
> Antony Dead.
> (1.2.172-6)

In Octavia's case, another female character who barely appears in the play, her name appears twenty-three times. How can it be possible that Cleopatra's name only surpasses that by five more instances? Weidhorn would argue that Cleopatra, despite her high rank, is not treated with the same respect and ceremony as Roman women (1969, 305). Overall, the aforementioned reasons help decode the disparity of how Cleopatra is addressed. The patriarchal context that fuels the rage and negative feeling that most male characters hold toward her has a clear reflection on the terms used to mention or describe her, much like the fact she is an Egyptian, not a Roman. As Hume asserts, "the Roman world is coldly rational and proper; the Egyptian is emotional, at once exalted and degraded" (1973, 282). If the Roman civilization is determined to be 'rational' and 'proper', then Cleopatra is, for them, the opposite. Cleopatra's Egyptian "otherness" is ultimately what fuels the hostility that characterises the ways in which she is addressed. Despite her being a symbol of sensuality and viewed almost as a celestial being, as far as most of them are concerned, she is the root of all evil – a true male manipulator. That sexist distorted lens through which Roman men view Cleopatra, combined with sleeping-with-the-enemy rage coming from her relationship with Antony, leads to several different expressions used to address her in lieu of her name, further explored in the following argument.

## 5. "Sink Rome, and their tongues rot / That speak against us!"

The second argument proposed in this essay sustains the fact that Cleopatra represents a threat to most of the characters in the play, especially Roman men, and Antony's own supporters. This is directly connected with the lack of the word 'Cleopatra' within all the different ways she is addressed throughout the play.

According to author Jeri Tanner, "… names reveal personal feelings, cultural attitudes, and social structure" (1987, 164). Cleopatra's name encompasses personal feelings, whether it is love, anger, contempt, or fear; it reveals cultural attitudes insofar as her name is directly tied to the word *Egypt*, to many men, equalling *enemy* – when someone uses her name, people know who and what she represents; and, finally, her name reveals social structure – she is Cleopatra, Queen of Egypt. If there is a female name in Shakespeare's plethora of female characters that evokes all of these elements, it is Cleopatra's.

Established thus far that the Mediterranean site is at the core of Shakespeare's imaginary realm, Paul Cantor also explains, "In particular, the clash of civilizations turns out to be (the author's) fundamental formula for tragedy" (2006, 902). Therefore, having also established that Cleopatra *is* Egypt and Egypt *is* Cleopatra, it follows that the conflictive dynamic between Antony and Cleopatra's relationship and the Roman men who insist on their separation mirrors that of the geographical disputes at stake. Conflicts inadvertently translate into language, as all other sociological phenomena do. Consequently, her name means something. It represents her essence; it plays a big part in constructing her identity and, therefore, is undeniably charged with all the negative energy the men in the play associate her with.

Although it is incessantly acknowledged in the character's dialogues the ethereal beauty of Cleopatra and her almost otherworldly qualities, she is equally insulted as much. Antony's men, as Linda Bamber states, ". . . do not approve of Antony's romantic sojourn in Egypt . . ." (2013, 83). Cleopatra is seen as a menace, an active impediment to Roman general Antony's pathway to glory in his 'fights' with Caesar. She is a powerful threat to the men even in war, evident in the conversation she has with Enobarbus where she states she will rightfully go to war as any man would:

> Cleopatra Sink Rome, and their tongues rot
> That speak against us! A charge we bear i'th' war,
> And as the president of my kingdom will
> Appear there for a man. Speak not against it,
> **I will not stay behind.**
> (3.7.19-23)

This line clearly illustrates just how powerful Cleopatra was. She demanded and decided her own fate; she held the power to control her own decisions.

Moreover, as Tanner cleverly points out, Shakespeare ". . . emphasized the use of names and their function to individualise, to show conflict, to provide motives, and to aid in the interpretation of his drama" (1987, 164). In *Antony and Cleopatra*, the way characters address each other plays a pivotal role in understanding where conflict lies. For example, as explained previously, Antony changes his tone toward Cleopatra when he is angry at her, which is reflected in the different terms he uses to address her. In the span of a few scenes, he can go from referring to her as 'my dearest queen' (1.3.22) and 'most sweet queen' (1.3.40) to 'gypsy' (4.12.30) and 'witch' (4.2.51). Antony avoids uttering Cleopatra's name when he is furious with her and trades it for insults. Likewise, Caesar refers to Antony as 'most noble Antony' (3.2.31) right after he pleasingly marries his sister Octavia; however, after Antony leaves Octavia for Cleopatra, he "cannot bear to speak his name" (1987, 168). This example shows us two things: one, Octavia's abandonment affects the way Caesar addresses Antony, but Cleopatra also suffers as collateral damage. Caesar knows Cleopatra is the real reason why Antony left his sister, hence his contempt and rage towards Cleopatra. Secondly, and most importantly, it exemplifies how personal feelings, whether love or anger, directly affect the words we choose to label other people and, therefore, it makes sense that Cleopatra's name is much avoided in big scenes like Antony's verbal fight with her after the Battle of Actium or after the messenger incident.

Additionally, characters choose to avoid using Cleopatra's name by recurrently using metonymy and synecdoche – two literary styling techniques used to make one thing refer to another and use a part to stand for the whole, respectively. Metonymy is probably the most frequent, with the highly repeated substitution of the name 'Cleopatra' with the word 'Egypt'. As author Virginia Vaughn carefully explains, ". . . she is Egypt insofar as she is Egypt's ruler: she is a regal part for the whole" (2016, 85). An example of the use of synecdoche is 'tawny front' (1.1.6). Here, the author of the play is choosing to have Cleopatra referred to as whole by a part – her face. There are other instances of metonymy used to address or

refer to Cleopatra, especially ones more insulting like the word 'gypsy', ". . . derived from 'Egyptian' as a term of contempt, . . . used again when Antony thinks Cleopatra has betrayed him" (86). This is relevant insofar as it shows Antony's dramatic switch of terms to refer to Cleopatra, as explored in the previous argument. This also ties in with the fact that feelings play a huge part in how characters address each other. According to Tanner, ". . . in the play, epithets and descriptions, usually hyperbolic, evoke images of falling and rising, disgust and adoration, weakness and strength, and decay and growth" (1987, 168).

In Vaughan's work on the role of language and writing in *Antony and Cleopatra*, the author explains Cleopatra's use of harsh sounds, such as 'k', to underline her scorn for a particular character (2016, 81). The example used by Vaughan is the verse "I hear him mock / the luck of Caesar", where the 'k' sound exposes her anger towards him. Following a similar line of thought, it could be argued that Cleopatra's name has a similar harsh quality – the 'p' sound. The letter 'p' and the open 'a' vowel followed by the 'tr-' sound create a commanding sonority with undeniably powerful connotations. Thus, from a certain point of view, it could be argued that Cleopatra's name is also avoided because of its sonority. The sonority of her name carries power, strength, and intensity. It symbolises her identity as a ruler, and in conversations where she is being diminished or even insulted, it would not work. Therefore, the fact that Antony and Caesar, or even other characters such as Enobarbus, avoid her name can be – besides all the reasons listed previously – also associated with her name's powerful sonority.

Moreover, as Tanner interestingly points out, ". . . characters may refrain from pronouncing a name so that they will not attract the bearer's thoughts or curses" (1987, 164). In fact, "while in Rome, Antony never uses Cleopatra's name either because he fears her curse or because he knows that she can be cursed if named" (172). Finally, this could potentially be one of the reasons Cleopatra's name is not pronounced as much as other names in the play, like *Antony* and *Caesar* –the play's language indicates that they are the most powerful (Hume 1973, 282). Certainly, one could think that, based on the fact that their names are the two most used words in the play. Everyone in the play repeatedly addresses them by their

own names, but for Cleopatra, characters use "epithets ranging from disdain to idolatry" (1987, 171). Even if some 'Caesar's are alluding to Julius Caesar, the importance it attributes to the Caesar 'dynasty' is clear. However, it is intriguing to wonder if the constant use of their names, as opposed to alternatives, directly symbolizes power. From that point of view, Cleopatra's name shows two disadvantages: not only is she a woman and they are men, but she is an Egyptian woman, and they are two respected Roman generals. Once again, it is evident that Cleopatra's "otherness" does not work in her favour. The bigger question remains if, even with all of that in mind, we can really claim their names stand through the test of time as powerful as Cleopatra's.

## 6. Conclusion

It is safe to say that there are a number of reasons that could explain the lack of Cleopatra's name throughout the play. Whether they truly are the reasons behind the avoidance of her name, we cannot know for sure. There is no way of knowing the author's true intention. Nevertheless, as Tanner reminds us, in the play, Shakespeare ". . . uses names to characterise, to reveal cultural attitudes, prejudices, and superstitions, to show conflict or concord, to enhance themes, and to add humorous and serious dimensions to his dramatic narrative" (1987, 173). Therefore, we know the author carefully and consciously chooses where and when to put each name and form of address. Whether we can find the true reasons that explain why characters choose other expressions to address Cleopatra, it must stand that Shakespeare intentionally creates and applies each character's name in each and every circumstance.

The only thing left for researchers to do, as Vaughan astutely remarks, is to ". . . study the text itself as carefully as we can and make our own judgements about its meaning" (2016, 55). By enumerating possible reasons for the lack of Cleopatra's name in *Antony and Cleopatra*, this essay uncovered different meanings behind the action of choosing to (or not to) use Cleopatra's name. First and foremost, as part of the research, numbers showed that the word 'Cleopatra' is pronounced only a striking twenty-eight times throughout a

lengthy play of 23,848 words. The first argument presented as to why this happened stood on the fact that it could be related to a deeply rooted issue of sociological nature. The immediate reaction in finding out Cleopatra's name appears twenty-eight times could be asking how many times Antony's name appears, hoping there might be an interesting contrast. The answer, 133, leads to our following line of inquiry, arguing that the inconsistency could be related to gender. Since Caesar's name also appears even more than Antony's, it is only natural to follow that, even in language, men seem to be paramount. However, research found that Fulvia and Octavia's names, the two Roman women whom Antony is at some point married to in the play and have little to no stage time, are used almost as many times as Cleopatra's. These findings show that the avoidance of Cleopatra's name cannot be solely explained by evoking gender but instead is strongly connected to the fact that she is an Egyptian woman – the enemy.

After carefully analysing the ambivalent nature of Antony's language while addressing Cleopatra, with the intention of uncovering the discrepancies in language use within an unbalanced romantic relationship, the second argument focuses on the power of Cleopatra's name. As Tanner explains in the aforementioned quote, names in Shakespearean plays reveal "cultural attitudes, prejudices, and superstitions". 'Cleopatra' is a charged word, a symbol of power. A powerful queen whose presence threatens everyone in the play, particularly the male characters. The argument employs the different connotations of Cleopatra's name, whether phonetic or superstitious, to explain the intensity of its utterance, which, in turn, exposes the complexity of meanings behind the avoidance of Cleopatra's name.

Regarding further questions, there are many that could be pertinently explored in the matter of the play's lack of Cleopatra's name. It would be relevant to conduct an in-depth analysis of every instance her name is used, followed by analysing every time an alternative is used, in order to compare which characters choose to use her name and in which contexts the same characters tend to choose alternatives, or even if the characters who choose the alternatives are different from the ones who use her name. Furthermore, it could also be relevant to conduct a similar analysis

to Antony's name, or even Caesar's, in order to truly uncover the drastic differences in the use of male and female names. Both these analyses can assist in finding the answers to questions such as is there a difference in the terms chosen to address characters when they are a part of the conversation *versus* when they are not present?

In conclusion, this essay sheds some light on the possible reasons behind the lack of Cleopatra's name in Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra* through an analysis of the play's text and different character's speeches. Hopefully, Cleopatra's name was somewhat redeemed in this essay since, according to calculations, it was used a total of 148 times.

## Works Cited

Bamber, Linda. 2013. "Cleopatra and Antony". *Harvard Review* 44 (2013): 82-116.

Blake, N. F. 1997. "Editing Shakespeare: The Role of Language Studies". *European Journal of English Studies* 1 (3): 329-353.

Cantor, Paul A. 2006. "The Shores of Hybridity: Shakespeare and the Mediterranean". Literature Compass 3-4: 896-913

Stelzer, Emanuel. 2022. "Prologue: Romeo and Juliet from a Mediterranean Perspective". In *Shakespeare and the Mediterranean: Romeo and Juliet*, edited by Silvia Bigliazzi and Emanuel Stelzer, 25-47. Verona: Skenè Theatre and Drama Studies.

Curran Jr, John E. 2020. "New Directions: Determined Things: The Historical Reconstruction of Character in *Antony and Cleopatra*". In *Antony and Cleopatra: A Critical Reader*, edited by Domenico Lovascio, 133-154. London and New York: Bloomsbury.

Fanego, Teresa. 2005. "'Fare thee well, dame': Shakespeare's forms of address and their socio-affective role". *SEDERI Yearbook* 15: 23-42.

Hume, Robert D. 1973. "Individuation and Development of Character through Language in Antony and Cleopatra". *Shakespeare Quarterly* 24 (3): 280-300.

Replogle, Carol A. H. 1967. "Shakespeare's Use of the Forms of Address". Brandeis University ProQuest Dissertations Publishing (Accessed 15 October 2023), https://www.proquest.com/docview/288232472?pq-origsite=gscholar&fromopenview=true

Tanner, Jeri. 1987. "The Power of Names in Shakespeare's Antony and Cleopatra". *Names: A Journal of Onomastics* 35 (3-4): 164-174.

Vaughan, Virginia M. 2016. *Antony and Cleopatra: Language and Writing*. London and New York: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc.

Weidhorn, Manfred. 1969. "The Relation of Title and Name to Identity in Shakespearean Tragedy". *Studies in English Literature*, 1500-1900 9 (2): 303-319.

*The Folger Shakespeare API Tools* (Last accessed 9 November 2023), https://www.folgerdigitaltexts.org/api

*Voyant Tools* (Last accessed 9 November 2023), https://voyant-tools.org