Self-Naming in Shakespeare's Early Plays

Deborah T. Curren-Aquino

> As if that name
> Shot from the deadly level of a gun
> Did murther her, as that name's cursed hand
> Murder'd her kinsman. O tell me, friar, tell me,
> In what vile part of this anatomy
> Doth my name lodge? Tell me, that I may sack
> The hateful mansion.
>   (*Romeo and Juliet*, 3.3.102-8)[1]

As Romeo illustrates, a person's name and his sense of identity are very important concerns in a Shakespearean play, concerns that have received considerable attention in recent years.[2] Since 1979, the annual *Shakespeare Bibliography* published by *Shakespeare Quarterly* has listed a category of "names and naming" in its index. One particular pattern of naming that has received tangential commentary by several critics,[3] and focal attention by at least one,[4] is the habit of referring to oneself in the third person by means of one's proper name while speaking in the first person. Hamlet provides a good example:

> Was't Hamlet wrong'd Laertes? Never Hamlet!
> If Hamlet from himself be ta'en away,
> And when he's not himself does wrong Laertes,
> Then Hamlet does it not, Hamlet denies it.
> Who does it, then? His madness. If't be so,
> Hamlet is of the faction that is wronged,
> His madness is poor Hamlet's enemy.
>   (*Hamlet*, 5.2.233-39)

S.K. Viswanathan has labeled this technique "illeism with a difference," since illeism proper occurs when a character speaks of himself in the third person as "he" or "she." M.W. MacCallum, R.A. Foakes, and Madeleine Doran, in their commentaries on the device, limit themselves to one play,

Julius Caesar; Viswanathan, while restricting his study to plays belonging to the middle phase, widens the focus from *Julius Caesar* to include *Troilus and Cressida, Hamlet,* and *Othello.* Illeism by proper name, however, is not limited to the middle plays, as Viswanathan suggests; nor is its occurrence elsewhere in the canon sparse and solely for purposes of "theatrical expedience," that is, for identification and disguise.[5] On the contrary, it occurs frequently in the early plays, especially the histories, and often with a significance that goes beyond "theatrical expedience."

The special feature of self-naming in a third person context, what Doran has described as the most striking and distinctive form of naming,[6] appears 240 times in the early plays: thirty-five uses in *I Henry VI,* forty-six in *2 Henry VI,* forty in *3 Henry VI,* twenty in *Richard III,* four in *The Comedy of Errors,* twenty in *Titus Andronicus,* sixteen in *The Taming of the Shrew,* ten in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona,* nine in *Love's Labor's Lost,* five in *King John,* fifteen in *Richard II,* seven in *Romeo and Juliet,* and thirteen in *A Midsummer Night's Dream.* Of these 240 examples, thirty-five have an identification/disguise function, e.g.:

> Gloucester: Open the gates, 'tis Gloucester that calls. (*I HVI,* 1.3.4)

Only six, however, operate solely on this most simplistic level;[7] the remaining twenty-nine assume varying degrees of additional significance and complexity. In *Love's Labor's Lost,* for instance, when Costard, playing Pompey, is asked to take away the Conqueror Alisander, he answers, "Your servant, and Costard" (5.2.571). By giving his real name, he breaks away from the make-believe of the play-within-a-play and confirms his own identity. The ghost sequence in *Richard III* obviously employs the device so that Richard, Richmond, and the audience will know who each speaker is. But when the devices accumulate - one self-naming after another in the third person - an hypnotic, incantatory effect bordering on ritual develops. The stylistic iteration of name by each ghost is in keeping with the relentless repetitiveness and formal symmetries of the play's compositional temper. The utterance of family names, coupled with such third person references as Edward's "King Henry's issue" (5.3.123), Clarence's "wronged heirs of York" (137), and the children's "Edward's unhappy sons" (153), reminds the audience of the factionalism and family genealogies at the heart of the play's mythos. It is as though the outrages perpetrated by Richard in his rise to power - all of which are replayed in microcosm in the sequence - go beyond the characters as individuals to embrace whole families in their dynastic lineage, the sum total of which suggests that the entire country is being consumed.

Curren-Aquino

Other uses of illeism by proper name evidence a complexity and purpose having nothing to do with identification. In the following passage, it becomes a device by which the character steps outside herself and so views her situation as though she were an observer:

> Juliet: "Romeo is banished," to speak that word,
>   Is father, mother, Tybalt, Romeo, Juliet,
>   All slain, all dead ...
>
> $$(Rom, 3.2.122-24)$$

In some cases a character uses the device to assert his own self-worth, even implying an awareness of something legendary about his name:

> Talbot: And there will we be too, ere it be long,
>   Or else reproach be Talbot's greatest fame!
>
> $$(I\ HVI, 3.2.75-76)$$

In the histories especially, characters frequently use the technique to point up a tension between the public role and the private self:

> Richard: ... Will his Majesty
>   Give Richard leave to live till Richard die?
>
> $$(RII, 3.3.173-74)$$

Illeism by proper name demonstrates Shakespeare's time-saving method of concisely yet effectively revealing character, for the dramatic figure offers a perception of self in a moment, often using his name to further what might be called rhetorically his ethical appeal. Let us now look at Shakespeare's use of this technique in more detail, examples of which, for the purpose of classification, may be assigned to the following categories: detachment; tension between inner and outer self, or the public/private dilemma; awareness of self-worth, power, legendary image; sense of family identity and genealogy; and rhetorical balance and emphasis.

Detachment

By using his name in the third person, a speaker can distance himself from the immediate situation to achieve a semblance of objectivity. Sometimes the distancing helps to structure the pathos inherent in an intensely emotional moment. The poignant simplicity and eloquence of the dying Mortimer come to mind:

> Let dying Mortimer here rest himself.
> Even like a man new haled from the rack,
> So fare my limbs ...
> And these grey locks ...

Self-Naming

                    Argue the end of Edmund Mortimer.

                                    (*I HVI*, 2.5.2-7)

When joined with such affective epithets as "poor," "helpless," and "hope-less," the proper name yields a detachment that offsets the self-pity, whether the context is comic:

Katherine: Now must the world point at poor Katherine,
                And say, "Lo, there is mad Petruchio's wife ... "
                               (*Shr*, 3.2.18-19)

or more serious:

Egeon: Hopeless and helpless doth Egeon wend,
          But to procrastinate his liveless end.
                         (*Err*, 1.1.157-58)

In other cases, the detachment lends authoritative weight to what passes as choric commentary:

Exeter: And now I fear that fatal prophecy ...
          That Henry born at Monmouth should win all,
          And Henry born at Windsor lose all:
          Which is so plain that Exeter doth wish
          His days may finish ere that hapless time.
                 (*I HVI*, 3.1.194; 197-200)

Perhaps the most interesting kind of detachment or depersonalization is that associated with a character's sense of playing a part or scripting a scenario. Like the Dickensian Scrooge, the hapless King Henry VI watches in his mind a scene at which, though not present, he is mentioned by name; in fact, he sees his name reduced to a bartering chip in a negotiation:

Henry: Ay, but she's come to beg; Warwick, to give:
         She, on the left side, craving aid for Henry;
         He, on his right, asking a wife for Edward.
         She weeps, and says her Henry is depos'd;
         He smiles, and says his Edward is install'd ...
                 (*3 HVI*, 3.1.42-46)

In a way that anticipates Richard III's histrionic self-praise following the courtship scene with Lady Anne, Suffolk imaginatively watches himself in the role of a legendary lover:

Suffolk: Thus Suffolk hath prevail'd, and thus he goes,
         As did the youthful Paris once to Greece,

With hope to find the like event in love ...

(*I HVI*,5.5.103-105)

Tension between Inner and Outer Self: Public/Private Dilemma

In a number of instances, illeism by proper name, while illustrating objectification and detachment, goes on to emphasize a bifurcation of self. Romeo's "Tut, I have lost myself, I am not here:/This is not Romeo, he's some other where" (*Rom*, 1.1.197-98) can be seen as an embryonic antici-pation of what is to come in Othello: "That's he that was Othello; here I am" (*Othello*, 5.2.284). For both tragic protagonists, the proper name has more than mere sign value in simply designating one person as opposed to another; instead, it both denotes and connotes the essence or substance of the character, capturing an inner core that seems to have been lost. Quite the contrary occurs in Walter Whitmore's usage; for him the proper name seems to function solely as sign with no significance at all. As he says to Suffolk, who is most eager to rationalize his way out of fulfilling the pro-phecy that has doomed him to die by water (the pronunciation of Whitmore's first name): "Gualtier or Walter, which it is, I care not" (*2 HVI*, 4.1.38). For Whitmore, unlike Romeo and Othello, there is no correlation between the name and the man bearing it; no correspondence whatsoever between the external sign and the internal ethical core.

In the only soliloquy belonging to Richard III that even approaches intros-pection,[8] Richard refers to himself by name in the third person, thus establishing a tension between the external and the internal man, and marking for the first time his questioning of self. Nowhere is the juxtapo-sition of third and first person sharper or the emerging identity crisis more pronounced than in the following lines: "Richard loves Richard, that is, I am I./ Is there a murtherer here? No, Yes, I am: (5.3.183-84). This passage captures in small Richard's egotism, insecurity, and paranoia, as well as the reflexive action of the play whereby words and curses come back to haunt the characters who utter them,[9] and actions rebound on their agents in ways they never anticipated. In a soliloquy that is so self-oriented (with eleven references to "myself"), it is appropriate that the final word should be the speaker's own name, Richard (1.206).

Tension between the external and the internal can be related to the public/private dilemma: the awareness of a difference between the public role and the private man who must fill that position. As might be expected, this usage of illeism by proper name occurs primarily in the his-tories. In Henry VI's line, "Peace thou! and give King Henry leave to speak" (*3 HVI*, 1.1.120), the power invoked by the illeistic use of name

Self-Naming

yoked to public title is poignantly undercut by the passive voice and plea
for permission to speak surrounding the proper name. One line thus
manages succinctly to capture the ethos of Henry, and the topical con-
trast of public and private which informs so much of the trilogy's plot
and thought. In *2 HVI*, the king says to the soldiers, following the com-
moners' desertion of Cade:

> Soldiers, this day have you redeem'd your lives,
> And show'd how well you love your prince and country:
> Continue still in this so good a mind,
> And Henry, though he be infortunate,
> Assure yourselves, will never be unkind.
>
> (4.9.15-19)

While the state of the public Henry may be "infortunate," virtues such as
kindness, associated with the private Henry, will still be in evidence.
Additional examples of such public/private tension include Richard II's:

> Long mayst thou live in Richard's seat to sit,
> And soon lie Richard in an earthy pit!
> God save King Henry, unking'd Richard says ...
>
> (*RII*, 4,1.218-20)

and Edward's:

> Nay then I see that Edward needs must down.
> Yet, Warwick, in despite of all mischance,
> Of thee thyself and all thy complices,
> Edward will always bear himself as king.
> Though Fortune's malice overthrow my state,
> My mind exceeds the compass of her wheel.
>
> (*3 HVI*,4.3.42-47)

A good example of the public/private contrast in a play that is not a his-
tory comes from *The Taming of the Shrew*. Early in the play, when Kate
first meets Petruchio, she haughtily reproaches him for his lack of
decorum in addressing her as "Kate" (2.1.182). Almost as if she is think-
ing of herself as subject matter rather than as direct addressee (i.e. as
third person rather than second person), she continues: "They call me
Katherine that do talk *of* me" (2.1.184). Standing on formality, not fami-
liarity, the young woman proclaims a self-respect and importance that
she does not receive from others. The use of *Katherine* connotes dignity,
assertive feistiness, and public formality. Near the end of the play, she
once again speaks of herself as *Katherine,* and again to Petruchio:

Curren-Aquino

> Then God be blest, it is the blessed sun,
> But sun it is not, when you say it is not;
> And the moon changes even as your mind.
> What you will have it nam'd, even that it is,
> And so it shall be so for Katherine.
>
> (4.5.18-22)

While the self-naming here still connotes personal worth and dignity, it may also assume another layer of meaning, one indicative of the relationship that will prevail between husband and wife in public, formal situations. Perhaps Katherine is giving both Petruchio and the outside audience a clue as to how to interpret her famous homily on wifely duty delivered in the final scene, a public celebration of several recent nuptials. Thus, in the passage quoted above, Kate may be telling us that whatever Petruchio says in public will be agreed to by her when she is Katherine; when, that is, she finds herself in a public situation that might demand deference. But who is to say what will prevail in the intimacy of a private, domestic context when she is presumably more Kate than Katherine?

Awareness of Self-Worth, Power, Legendary Image

When used in this fashion, the technique of illeism by proper name reinforces the speaker's credibility or ethical appeal by investing the name with a sense of importance, dignity, and authority:

Joan: Thus Joan de Pucelle hath perform'd her word.
          (*I HVI*, 1.6.3)

Suffolk: Stay, Whitmore, for thy prisoner is a prince,
          The Duke of Suffolk, William de la Pole.
          (*2 HVI*, 4.1.44-45)

Eleanor: Though in this place most masters wear no breeches,
          She shall not strike Dame Eleanor unreveng'd.
          (*2 HVI*, 1.3.146-47)

Tamora: If Tamora entreat him [Titus], then he will,
          For I can smooth and fill his aged ears
          With golden promises ... .
          (*Tit*, 4.4.95-97)

Sometimes in statements by Suffolk and Warwick, and almost always in declamations by Talbot, use of the proper name implies consciousness of a legendary image of self:

Self-Naming

Suffolk: Great men oft die by vild besonians:
                A Roman sworder and bandetto slave
                Murder'd sweet Tully; Brutus' bastard hand
                Stabb'd Julius Caesar; savage islanders
                Pompey the Great; and Suffolk dies by pirates.
                            (2 HVI, 4.1.134-38)

Warwick: Neither the King, nor he that loves him best,
                The proudest he that holds up Lancaster,
                Dares stir a wing if Warwick shakes his bells.[10]
                            (3 HVI, 1.1.45-47)

Talbot: Here is the Talbot. Who would speak with him?[11]
                            (I HVI, 2.2.37)

In Suffolk's case, irony runs through his self-inclusion among a number of "worthies" of the past, for, unlike the names of Tully, Caesar, and Pompey, Suffolk's name seems not to have evoked mythic lore at the time nor was it to do so in the future. Talbot's name, on the other hand - to judge from *I HVI* - seems to have been on the tongue of all Englishmen and a good number of Frenchmen as well.[12] The name, in fact, seems to assume the illocutionary force of a battle cry, for moments after Talbot refers to himself by name ("And here will Talbot mount, or make his grave," *I HVI*, 2.1.34), the stage directions (ll. 37 and 77) indicate the contagious spread of the cry "A Talbot."

Sense of Family Identity and Genealogy

This usage, an extension of the preceding one, can be found when a character names himself in such a way as to encourage a perception of family ties and roots, a sense of ancestry and posterity, a keen appreciation of family heritage and honor. The fact that the majority of examples belonging to this category come from the histories would seem to reinforce the dynastic theme that informs the history play as a genre. More than other kinds of drama, it is concerned with the importance of blood lines, family names, and lineage; hence, the type of proper name that proliferates is not the first name but the surname designating either territorial domain or blood ties. The emphasis on surname, moreover, suggests that family lineage is more important than the individual bearer of the name, that the individual, in fact, may have little significance apart from his family identity, a feature that generically distinguishes history from tragedy. York, in particular, and Warwick illustrate this usage nicely:

Curren-Aquino

York: Doth any one accuse York for a traitor?
                    (*2 HVI*, 1.3.179)

             By this I shall perceive the commons' mind,
             How they affect the house and claim of York.
                    (*2 HVI*, 3.1.374-75)

             Now York and Lancaster are reconcil'd.
                    (*3 HVI*, 1.1.204)

Warwick: Ah, who is nigh? Come to me, friend or foe,
             And tell me who is victor, York or Warwick?
                    (*3 HVI*, 5.2.5-6)

The last example, along with those that follow, registers a corporate identity that fits the ritual of battle when the name indicates not only him who bears it but all those who march under the banner or crest of Warwick, Oxford, Montague, or Somerset:

Oxford: Oxford, Oxford, for Lancaster!
Montague: Montague, Montague, for Lancaster!
Somerset: Somerset, Somerset, for Lancaster!
                    (*3 HVI*, 5.1.59,67,72)

In an extended sequence in *Richard II*, Bullingbrook employs the dynastic family name and all that it implies in an effort to repossess what has been taken from him. When Berkeley addresses him as "My lord of Herford" (2.3.69), Bullingbrook tartly answers:

My lord, my answer is to Lancaster,
And I am come to seek that name in England,
And I must find that title in your tongue,
Before I make reply to aught you say.
                    (2.3.70-73)

Several moments later, he continues: "As I was banish'd, I was banish'd Herford/But as I come, I come for Lancaster" (113-14). The sequence concludes with Bullingbrook's linkage of first and third person: "If that my cousin king be King in England,/ It must be granted I am Duke of Lancaster" (123-24). In *King John*, Salisbury who has joined forces with Lewis of France against his native England and his king, laments the dishonor his defection has brought to the family name:

                    O, and there
Where honorable rescue and defense
Cries out upon the name of Salisbury!

Self-Naming

> But such is the infection of the time ...
>
> (5.2.17-20)

Richmond's self-naming in the grand peroration of *Richard III*, entering as it does into a chiasmic structure linking Lancaster to Richmond and York to Elizabeth, provides a nice bridge between the present category and the final one to be discussed, rhetorical balance and emphasis:

> All this divided York and Lancaster,
> Divided in their dire division,
> O now let Richmond and Elizabeth,
> The true succeeders of each royal house,
> By God's fair ordinance conjoin together!
>
> (5.5.27-31)

Rhetorical Balance and Emphasis

Sometimes the placement of the name is equal to, if not more important than, the actual usage. In such cases, the self-naming contributes to the formal balance and emphasis inherent in specific rhetorical schemes. One finds, for example, anadiplosis in the following exchange between Buckingham and Warwick:

> Buckingham: All in this presence are thy betters, *Warwick,*
> Warwick: *Warwick* may live to be the best of all.
>
> (*2 HVI*, 1.3.111-12)

anaphora in that between Valentine and Proteus:

> Valentine: Is Silvia dead?
> Proteus: *No, Valentine.*
> Valentine: *No Valentine* indeed, for sacred Silvia.
>   Hath she forsworn me?
> Proteus: *No, Valentine.*
> Valentine: *No Valentine,* if Silvia have forsworn me.
>   What is your news?
>
> (*TGV* 3.1.210-16)

and epistrophe in that between Warwick and York:

> Warwick: My heart assures me that the *Earl of Warwick*
>   Shall one day make the Duke of York *a king.*
> York: And, Nevil, this I do assure myself,
>   Richard shall live to make the *Earl of Warwick*

> The greatest man in England but *the King*.
>   (*2 HVI*, 2.2.78-82)

In the above example, the visual and/or aural association of "the Earl of Warwick" with "King" is particularly effective when one recalls that, according to his legendary reputation, Warwick was considered a king-maker. In another passage involving Warwick, only this time with the Yorkist Edward, the placement of Warwick's name emphasizes his position as a distributed middle term between the polarized factions of Lancaster (Henry VI) and York (Edward IV):

Warwick:	Thou art no Atlas for so great a weight;
	And, weakling, Warwick takes his gift again,
	And *Henry* is my king, *Warwick* his subject.
Edward:	But *Warwick's* king is *Edward's* prisoner.

>   (*3 HVI*, 5.1.36-39)

In the final examples to be cited, Richard II's self-naming, along with that of Richard III, rhetorically sharpens the opposition between two central antagonistic forces:

Richard II:	Discharge my followers, let them hence away,
	From *Richard's* night to *Bullingbrook's* fair day.
	(*RII*, 3.2.217-18)
Richard III:	By the apostle Paul, shadows to-night
	Have shook more terror to the soul of *Richard*
	Than can the substance of ten thousand soldiers
	Armed in proof and led by shallow *Richmond*.
	(*RIII*, 5.3.216-19)

Conclusion

For purposes of analysis I have deliberately treated the preceding categories as entities separate unto themselves. But just as plot, character, and thought (usually examined as separate components) must, by necessity, interrelate if a play is going to work as a well-constructed artistic whole, so a number of examples of illeism by proper name embrace several categories. Talbot's use of his own name in the countess of Auvergene scene in *I HVI*, for instance, demonstrates an awareness of self-worth and legendary image, along with a bifurcation of self, and an awareness of the difference between the public man and the private individual. When the Countess boasts that she has successfully taken the famous John Talbot prisoner, he points out that she has only captured the private man,

Self-Naming

the shadow of Talbot, not the public man, which he regards as the substance of Talbot:

> I laugh to see your ladyship so fond
> To think that you have aught but Talbot's shadow
> Whereon to practice your severity.
>
> (2.3.45-57)

After his troops come in, he says to the amazed Countess:

> How say you, madam? Are you now persuaded
> That Talbot is but shadow of himself?
> These are his substance, sinews, and strength ...
>
> (2.3.61-63)

He concludes the encounter graciously but pointedly, reminding her of the difference between the external, physical man and the internal metaphysical core - the difference between name as sign versus name as essence:

> Be not dismay'd, fair lady, nor misconster
> The mind of Talbot, as you did mistake
> The outward composition of his body.
>
> (2.3.73-75)

To take another example, in the wooing scene of *Richard III*, Richard's use of the family name *Plantagenet* is part of his rhetorical strategy to disarm Lady Anne. It also serves to reinforce his ethical coloring as the consummate schemer and rhetorician, since he is deliberately misleading her. The name *Plantagenet*, furthermore, resonates with a sense of self-importance and power as well as with corporate/family identity and lineage:

> Richard: He lives, that loves thee better than he could.
> Anne: Name him.
> Richard: Plantagenet.
> Anne: Why, that was his.
> Richard: The self-same name, but one of better nature.
> Anne: Where is he?
> Richard: Here. (She spits at him.)
>
> (1.2.141-44)

No matter which category is involved, the technique often sheds light on the speaker's character. The triple reiteration of Romeo's proper name in the scene with Friar Lawrence and the Nurse plays up his histrionic, self-pitying, even melodramatic tendencies:

Curren-Aquino

> ... and every cat and dog
> And little mouse, every unworthy thing,
> Live here in heaven and may look on her,
> But *Romeo* may not. More validity,
> More honorable state, more courtship lives
> In carrion flies than *Romeo*; they may seize
> On the white wonder of dear Juliet's hand,
> And steal immortal blessings from her lips ...
> But *Romeo* may not, he is banished.
>
> (*Rom.* 3.3.30-40)

It is Romeo, for all intents and purposes, who is the main practitioner of the technique in the play; five of the seven examples come from his discourse. Interestingly enough, he ceases to use the feature after the wedding night, perhaps one small yet stylistically significant sign of the transformation he undergoes from love-sick boy to defiant tragic protagonist.

In what may be the most famous self-naming in all of Shakespeare, John of Gaunt detaches himself from the anxiety and grief of his last encounter with Richard II through an elaborately extended punning on his own name:

> O how that name befits my composition!
> Old Gaunt, indeed. and gaunt in being old;
> Within me grief hath kept a tedious fast;
> And who abstains from meat, that is not gaunt?
> For sleeping England long time have I watch'd,
> Watching breeds leanness, leanness is all gaunt.
> The pleasure that some fathers feed upon
> Is my strict fast - I mean, by children's looks;
> And therein fasting, hast thou made me gaunt.
> Gaunt am I for the grave, gaunt as a grave,
> Whose hollow womb inherits nought but bones.
>
> (*RII*, 2.1.73-83)

As Gaunt indicates in response to Richard's question, "Can sick men play so nicely with their names?" (2.1.84), his mockery of name emphasizes not only a major susceptibility in the King but a central topic as well - flattery: "Since thou dost seek to kill my name in me,/ I mock my name, great King, to flatter thee" (2.1.86-87). And, of course, the constant harping on "Gaunt/gaunt" allows the dynastic lineage of that name to reverberate throughout the confrontation in a hauntingly effective manner.[13]

Self-Naming

While still important in a number of middle plays, most noticeably *Julius Caesar* (thirty times) and *Troilus and Cressida* (fifteen times), illeism by proper name seems equally, if not more, prevalent in the early plays.[14] And contrary to what Viswanathan suggests about the device's appearance outside the middle phase, the majority of examples have significance beyond the levels of identification and disguise. The special feature of self-naming is in keeping with the extreme formality and stylized patterns of the early works. As Shakespeare's blank verse loosened in his final phase, and as his use of rhetorical schemes became more naturally embedded in the dialogue,[15] so it seems that his need for such formal techniques as illeistic self-naming subsided.[16] The technique, after all, lends itself to formality, artifice, patterning, and distancing; it allows a character to stand momentarily outside himself while commenting on his role, behavior, or situation in a detached fashion; in fact, it is compatible with the tendency of characters in the early plays to state feelings rather than express them, to articulate or declaim a dilemma rather than struggle with it.[17] What might on one level be a device to impart rhetorical and/or prosodic balance to the verse line, more often than not, takes on several levels of meaning. Shakespeare does not tend, even in the early plays, to settle for the easy, the expedient, or the one-dimensional. The feature that has been the focus of the present essay is not only stylistic but dramatic in revealing aspects of character and in serving as part of a speaker's rhetorical strategy. It may also have generic implications for the history plays where it occurs most frequently, and where proper names are so important for family genealogy and the delineation of factions.[18] One stylistic device with so many implications! From the beginning of his career, Shakespeare appears to have anticipated and practiced Keats's advice to Shelley: " ... 'load every rift' of your subject with ore."[19]

The Catholic University of America

Notes

[1]All references to the plays are taken from *The Riverside Shakespeare*, ed. G.B. Evans et al. (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1974). All italics in quotations have been added by the author for emphasis.

[2]See, for example, W. MacIsaac, "A Commodity of Good Names in *Henry IV* Plays," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 29 (1978), 417-19; Howard Jacobson, "Nomen Omen: Lear's Three Daughters," *Révue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire*, 58 (1980), 595-603; Murray Levith,

Curren-Aquino

What's in Shakespeare's Names (Hamden, CT: Archon, 1978); William Wray, "You Claudius, An Anatomy of a Name," *Publications of the Arkansas Philological Association* 6 (1980), 78-94; Thomas Stroup, "Bottom's Name and His Epiphany," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 29 (1978), 79-82; Robert Fleissner, "The Moor's Nomenclature," *Notes and Queries* 25 (1978), 143; William Woodson, "Iago's Name in Holinshed and a Lost English Source of Othello," *Notes and Queries* 25 (1978), 146-47; Samuel Macey, "The Naming of the Protagonist in Shakespeare's *Othello*," *Notes and Queries* 25 (1978), 143-45.

[3]Madeleine Doran, "What Should Be in That Caesar? Proper Names in *Julius Caesar*," in *Shakespeare's Dramatic Language* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1976), 126, 132-48; R.A. Foakes, "An Approach to *Julius Caesar*," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 5 (1954), 259-70, see particularly 264-66; M.W. MacCallum, *Shakespeare's Roman Plays* (1910: repr. New York: Russell and Russell, 1964), 230-32.

[4]S.K. Viswanathan, "'Illeism With a Difference' in Certain Middle Plays of Shakespeare," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 20 (1970), 407-15.

[5]Ibid., 408 and 414.

[6]Doran, 126 and 132.

[7]In addition to the Gloucester example, see also Tranio *(Shr,* 1.1.243-44); Lucentio *(Shr,* 3.1.34 and 5.1.114); Proteus *(TGV,* 4.2.90-91); and Navarre *(LLL,* 2.1.90).

[8]I say approaches because, although it is clearly more than the blueprint for a plan of action, as is the case with the rest of his soliloquies, this one is not completely internalized. Richard runs the whole spectrum from first person through second person to third person. While the self-naming functions illeistically in lines 183 and 206, the use of "thyself" and "fool" in line 192 introduces the second person. When taken together, the second and third person formation suggest a directing outward rather than a moving inward on the part of the speaker. The soliloquy is thus not as introspective as, let us say, Hamlet's "O that this too too sallied flesh" soliloquy is or Macbeth's "If it were done" speech.

[9]See Anne's curse on Richard's future wife (1.2.26-28) and Buckingham's promise of loyalty to Queen Elizabeth in the presence of the dying Edward IV (2.1.32-35).

[10]Warwick provides another example in the lines "For who lived king, but I could dig his grave?/ And who durst smile when Warwick bent his brow" *(3 HVI,* 5.2.21-22).

[11]Talbot, in fact, refers to himself by name more than any other character in the play (twenty-one times). For further illustration of his own legendary usage of his name, see the following:

> And there will be too, ere it be long,
> Or else reproach be Talbot's greatest fame,
>   *(I HVI,* 3.2.75-76)

> O young John Talbot, I did send for thee
> To tutor thee in stratagem of war,

> That Talbot's name might be in thee reviv'd ...
>   (4.5.1-3)

> Damsel, I'll have a bout with you again,
> Or else let Talbot perish with this shame.
>   (3.2.56-57)

> God and Saint George, Talbot and England's right,
> Prosper our colors in this dangerous fight!
>   (4.2.55-56)

> The Regent hath with Talbot broke his word ...
>   (4.6.2)

> Coupled in bonds of perpetuity,
> Two Talbots, winged through the lither sky,
> In thy despite shall scape mortality.
>   (4.7.20-22)

[12] According to Marvin Spevack's *A Complete and Systematic Concordance to the Works of Shakespeare* (Hildensheim: Olms, 1968-70), the name *Talbot* occurs a total of eighty-eight times. This fact, when taken in conjunction with footnote 22, might counter Andrew Cairncross' view as expressed in *The Arden Edition of I HVI* (London: Methuen, 1962) that the play is not a "Talbot play" (pp. xl-xli).

[13] The Gaunt example suggests others where the self-naming underlies key patterns informing respective plays. For instance, Puck's facile shift from *Puck* to Robin in the epilogue to *A Midsummer Night's Dream* not only indicates something legendary about him - he is one of a line of Pucks - but captures the motif of transformation so prevalent in the play from beginning to end:

> And, as I am an honest Puck,
> If we have unearned luck
> Now to scape the serpent's tongue,
> We will make amends ere long;
> Else the Puck a liar call.
> So, good night unto you all.
> Give me your hands, if we be friends,
> And Robin shall restore amends.
>   (5.1.431-38)

Likewise, Lucentio's use of his proper name when speaking with Tranio goes beyond merely clarifying the disguise venture that is about to start; it neatly captures the pattern of inversion at the heart of the play's structure: "And not a jot of Tranio in your mouth,/ Tranio is chang'd into Lucentio" (*Shr.* 1,1.236-37).

Curren-Aquino

[14]It is noteworthy that the technique is common in Shakespeare's immediate predecessors
   and early contemporaries on the stage. A cursory survey of Lyly, Peele, Kyd, and par-
   ticularly Greene and Marlowe shows a high frequency of the device: Lyly's *Endimion*
   (29), Peele's *The Old Wive's Tale* (13), Kyd's *The Spanish Tragedy* (38), Greene's *Friar
   Bacon and Friar Bungay* (71), Marlowe's *1 Tamburlaine* (36), *Doctor Faustus* (54), and
   Edward II (62).

[15]"Shakespeare's Use of Rhetoric," in *A New Companion to Shakespeare Studies*, ed. Kenneth
   Muir and S. Schoenbaum (1971; repr. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979),
   91-92.

[16]The sum total for Shakespeare's final plays is thirty-three: *Pericles* (7), *Cymbeline* (4), *The
   Winter's Tale* (3), *The Tempest* (12), and *Henry VIII* (7).

[17]Robert Turner, *Shakespeare's Apprenticeship* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974),
   27-30.

[18]In the first tetralogy alone, the device occurs a total of 141 times.

[19]"To Percy Shelley," August 16, 1820, as found in *The Letters of John Keats 1814-1821*, ed.
   Hyder Rollins, Vol. II (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1958), 323.

$$$ $$$ $$$ $$$ $$$

" ... the industrialist Armand Hammer has always had to hang his head a
bit when people asked if he was in the baking-soda business. No more.
Last week the 88-year-old Mr. Hammer announced that his company,
Occidental Petroleum, would acquire a 5 percent interest in and a seat on
the board of the Church & Dwight Company, the New Jersey concern
that manufactures Arm & Hammer Baking Soda. Mr. Hammer said last
year that he was often asked whether he owned Arm & Hammer and had
once offered to buy it 'so I could say yes.'"

-New York *Times*, September 28, 1986

Self-Naming