Universiteit Leiden

Signifying Wounds

Metaphoric Wounds and the Concept of bodily Trauma in Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus* and *Coriolanus*

Thesis

Annemieke Windig

Annemieke Windig
S1057375
Master Thesis English Literature
First reader: Dr. J. F. van Dijkhuizen
Second Reader: Dr. A.G. Dorst

June 2014

Index

I

INTRODUCTION

1. Introduction

In Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*, Antony paints a gruesome picture of a bodily interaction when he says that he "will put a tongue into every wound of Caesar" (3.2.236). When, moments later, he calls these same wounds "dumb mouths" (3.2.268), it is as if the wounds have become entities that can present meaning. I studied the use of the word 'wound' *in Julius Caesar* for the master class 'Shakespeare's Language' at Leiden University in 2011, and concluded that, "Antony intimates, but never discloses meaning. The assumptions of deeper meanings of wounds are void" (Windig 12). However, a reference to the wounded body does seem to trigger a concept that encompasses more than mere physicality, and that links wounds to the concept of meaning. If our thinking is indeed metaphorical, this could be what lies behind Antony's clever rhetoric: he appeals to an underlying metaphorical concept that seems to imply that Caesar's wounds are, after all, meaningful. My aim is to discover if such metaphorical concepts exist for the expressions of woundedness in the plays analysed in this thesis.

2. Thesis statement

My premise is that there is a connection between wounds and words, or between bodily trauma and meaning, which is reflected in the metaphorical usage of the word 'wound' in Shakespeare's plays *Titus Andronicus* and *Coriolanus*. In order to test this premise, I intend to study the concept of wounds and woundedness in these plays. Since I suspect that there is an underlying metaphorical concept triggered by the use of the word 'wound', I will focus on metaphoric use of this word. For the linguistic analysis I will use the

Metaphor Identification Procedure (MIP), and its extended version (MIPVU), as described by the Pragglejaz group. I will determine conceptual domains and mappings as outlined in the conceptual metaphor theory by Lakoff and Johnson. A subsequent literary analysis will demonstrate if the metaphorical concept that is explicated in terms of woundedness is also demonstrated within the characters, plot and setting of the play.

I use Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT) as a theoretical backdrop to this thesis because CMT asserts that our thinking is conceptual in nature, and that the evidence we find for this lies in the metaphoric expressions of our language. Metaphors are seen as mappings between conceptual domains. This means that the metaphoric expressions found in Shakespeare's plays will reveal the thought processes underlying the metaphorical concepts of these plays. My assumption is that Shakespeare uses the image of the wounded body, or the representation of a wound, to explicate abstract concepts. Woundedness and pain are never purely physical sensations, and emotion and a perceived meaning, or lack of meaning for suffering can influence the perception of pain. This implies that a representation of the wounded body not only implies perceived pain, but also a connection to the concept of signification.

My main aim, therefore, is to discover if the individual metaphors that are governed by the word 'wound' constitute a shared conceptual mapping which is consistent for both plays in this study. If all, or most, metaphoric uses of the word 'wound' in the plays show coherence in their conceptual domains, then it is to be expected that such a mapping can be disclosed.

3. Evidence in the structure of the play as a whole.

In his article 'Catch[ing] the nearest way: *Macbeth* and cognitive metaphor', Donald Freeman uses a cognitive metaphor approach to show "that the CONTAINER and PATH schemata dominate the salient metaphors of the play" (689). Freeman has found two

mappings or image-schemata that are part of the "skeletal structure of the play"(689). According to him, these mapping show:

> A nearly obsessive unity of vision that depends on the cognitive operations arising at all levels of the play from these two very simple image-schemata of PATH and CONTAINER, [and] constitute the terms in which we understand not only *Macbeth's* language, [but] its central characters, crucial aspects of its various settings, and the . . . structure of its unitary plot. (691)

I am interested in finding out if there are image-schemata or mappings for the plays in this thesis that show a similar unity of vision as the PATH and CONTAINER mappings of Freeman's study.

My approach differs from Freeman's deductive method. Freeman starts with the conceptual metaphor and then presents a profusion of linguistic evidence for the existence of CONTAINER and PATH mappings. However, he does not explain how he arrived at the conclusion that these schemata were indeed the most salient metaphors for this play. I have no preconceived notions about the content of the cross-domain mappings. These, I suspect, will become clear from studying the linguistic expressions. Therefore, my method for determining metaphoricity is inductive. I "move from the available set of linguistic structures towards a set of reconstructed conceptual structures that constitute cross-domain mappings" (Steen 767). By choosing this —less interpretative— method, I hope it will become clear how the relevant metaphorical concepts have been designated.

4. Outline

Several issues need to be addressed in order to ascertain whether there is a connection between wounds and words, or between wounds and meaning, and if this connection is reflected in the metaphorical use of the word 'wound' in the plays *Titus Andronicus* and *Coriolanus*. The theoretical background to conceptual metaphor is found in chapter II, as is the theoretical and historical background to the metaphor of the body politic, which

features so prominently in both plays. Chapter III covers the method I used for defining metaphorical concepts. It explains in more detail what the metaphor identification procedure entails, and gives directions for using MIP and MIPVU. It comments on the choice of plays to be studied, and the reason for using the *Oxford English Dictionary*. Finally the process of determining conceptual domains and MAPPINGS is addressed in chapter III. Chapter IV consists of the literary analyses, for both plays, based on the results of the MIP/MIPVU analyses. In these literary analyses I will determine whether the results of the MIP/MIPVU are concurrent with the rest of the play, and I will discuss how the theme of bodily trauma is elucidated within these plays. The conclusion can be found in chapter V. Chapter VI contains the actual MIP/MIPVU analyses, as well as the context for metaphorically used words. This chapter also contains the reference tables mentioned in the main text.

II

Theoretical framework

1. Conceptual Metaphor Theory

Our ordinary conceptual system, by which we think and act, is metaphorical in structure. This is what Lakoff and Johnson declared in 1980 when they published their seminal work *Metaphors we live by*. George Lakoff and Mark Johnson state: "metaphors as linguistic expressions are possible because our conceptual system is metaphorical in nature" (6). Lakoff and Johnson "shared a sense that the dominant views on meaning in Western philosophy and linguistics [were] inadequate" (ix). Philosopher Mark had noted that metaphor hardly played a role in traditional philosophical views. The linguist George had found "linguistic evidence showing that metaphor [was] pervasive in everyday language and thought" (ix). An interest in the explanation of meaning, coupled with the pervasiveness of metaphor in our day-to-day communication, formed the starting point of their Conceptual Metaphor Theory, which is also referred to as Cognitive Metaphor Theory. Lakoff and Johnson found that the concepts that govern our thoughts are far more than mere thought processes. They explain that although we are not aware of them, our conceptual systems are metaphoric in nature, and moreover, these conceptual systems structure our perceptions and our understanding.

Thus, for Lakoff and Johnson, metaphors as linguistic expressions exist as a result of the metaphors in our conceptual system. The fact that we find metaphor in language is, therefore, not accidental but inevitable. Their (now famous) example of a conceptual metaphor derives from the concept ARGUMENT, which is structured in terms of winning or losing a war. (When Lakoff and Johnson refer to conceptual meaning they use capitals. I have adopted their practice.) They cite numerous expressions for the conceptual metaphor ARGUMENT IS WAR. These expressions are reflected in everyday

language such as: winning an argument, attacking weak points, defending your claims, using a strategy to wipe out someone's arguments etc. Lakoff and Johnson claim that we not only use the terminology associated with war, but we also think in terms of winning or losing an argument. The structure of the physical battle —attack, defence, and counterattack— is reflected in the verbal battle. Because we conceptualise arguments in terms of a battle, this influences how arguments are shaped. We might think and act very differently if, for instance, we conceptualised the notion of ARGUMENT in terms of a dance.

The metaphors we use to talk about concepts such as ARGUMENT, TIME or LOVE, follow systematic patterns. This systematicity in our thought processes is reflected in the language we use. The metaphorical concepts we use, such as ARGUMENT IS WAR, TIME IS MONEY or LOVE IS A JOURNEY, are not isolated or singular metaphors, but they form cohesive patterns. However, the systematicity of metaphoric frameworks is always partial. It "allows us to focus on one aspect of a concept . . . and hide other aspects that are inconsistent with that system" (10). Because we choose, unconsciously, to focus on one aspect, namely that time is valuable, this inevitably excludes another aspect: time is infinite.

The examples above also indicate that concepts can be determined culturally. The concept TIME IS MONEY is influenced by the way the concept of work has developed in the western world. We experience TIME as a valuable commodity, something that "can be spent, wasted, budgeted, invested wisely or poorly, saved or squandered" (8). It is quite possible to imagine another conceptual metaphor: TIME IS INFINITE, in which time would be seen as a given, like the air we breath. Consequently, the metaphorical concepts in this particular cultural setting would be reflected in its linguistic expressions; one might gasp for time, or take a huge breath of time to prepare for an arduous job.

According to Lakoff and Johnson, most of our fundamental concepts are organized in spatialization metaphors. They distinguish structural metaphors, in which one concept is metaphorically structured in terms of another, and orientational metaphors, in which a

whole system of concepts is organized in terms of another. Most orientational metaphors relate to spatial orientation; they derive from the way our bodies function in a physical environment. Thus, HAPPY IS UP and SAD IS DOWN reflect our body postures when we are feeling up or down. This would mean that at least a part of our understanding is directly linked to our physicality, and expressions like, ‘things are looking up’ or ‘I am feeling down’ are, therefore, not isolated utterances, but belong to systematized concepts. As Zoltan Kövecses states, “the experiential basis of conceptual metaphors and the notion of embodiment [of meaning] is perhaps the central idea of the cognitive linguistic view of metaphor” (32). Thus, the way our minds work, can be seen as structured in terms of our bodies.

2. Bodies Politic and Bodies Wounded.

The metaphor of the body politic compares the characteristics of a governed state to those of the human body. We use the metaphor in the expression 'heads of state'. This metaphor, which is often an analogy as well, was used prolifically in early modern England. It came down to the Elizabethans and Jacobeans bearing with it a whole weight of history. As warnings and complaints about real or perceived defects of the state of the realm increased, this was reflected in the changing language of the metaphor. The notion of disorder or sickness that had always been present within the metaphor received a greater emphasis in this era, to the extent that the metaphor of the body politic was changing into the metaphor for the *wounded* (my emphasis) body politic.

This greater emphasis on disorder within the body came as result of an increased hierarchical distance between ruler and ruled. In its earlier history the body politic metaphor had emphasised interdependency and mutual responsibility between the members of the body. Now, lower ranking members became increasingly responsible for the well-being and protection of those whose position was pre-eminent. However, as this need for protection presupposed vulnerability, not only the king, as head of the political body, could be considered in need of protection, and thus vulnerable. Those who failed to protect him were vulnerable as well. As lower members failed to protect the head of the political body, they themselves risked being injured or, indeed, cut off because they were considered detrimental to the body as a whole. Subsequently, a failure to protect the ruler would, almost as a matter of course, lead to repression and punishment. This increase in hierarchical distance meant that the concept of woundedness became inherent to the body politic metaphor. The language of the body politic both reflects and contributes to these changes. Thus, during the course of the Midland revolt (which I discuss later in this chapter), James I stated:

> We are bound (as the head of the politike body of our Realme) to follow the course which the best Phisitians use in dangerous diseases, which is, by a sharp remedy applied to a small and infected part, to save the whole from dissolution and destruction" (Larkin and Hughes 156),

However, the language of the injured body was not the sole prerogative of the king, it was used by pamphleteers, parliamentarians, playwrights and poets alike in the Elizabethan and Jacobean ages. Thus, we find James I' statement, as well as the event of a revolt, reflected in Shakespeare's play *Coriolanus*. Coriolanus "is a disease that must be cut away" (3.1.378).

The following historical perspective will clarify the prolific use of this metaphor in early modern England. The origins of the body politic metaphor in western society can be traced to the formation of the Greek city-states, while its use in Eastern societies dates back even further[1]. The various renderings of these metaphors in ancient Greece stress the relationship between those who govern and those who are governed, although the burden of responsibility always rests with those in power. As early as 355 BCE Isocratus writes *Areopagitus*, and asserts that a city's soul is nothing but its political principles. The participation of citizens in the political life of their state is necessary and just, "for the soul of a state is nothing else than its polity, having as much power over it as does the mind over the body" (qtd. in Hale 19). Although, in the Greek city-states it is only the citizens —the free males— who participate in governing, the welfare of the whole of the state depends on the health of its politics, and "all the members of the state must fare well or ill according to the kind of polity under which they live" (qtd. in Hale 19).

In the first century BCE, Cicero outlined the necessity of putting the welfare of the state above the welfare of the individual. When Cicero, as a Roman Stoic, emphasized the interdependence between separate parts in *Of Offices,* he emulated Greek representations of the state as a body:

---

[1] It appears around 1500 BCE in the Rig Veda, a sacred Indo Aryan collection of Vedic Sanskrit hymns, and one of the oldest existing texts. Priests are compared to the mouth, and warriors are the arms of the body in this text.

> As supposing each member of the body was so disposed as to think it could be well if it should draw to itself the health of the adjacent member, it is inevitable that the whole body would be debilitated and would perish; so if each of us should seize for himself the interests of another, and wrest whatever he could from each for the sake of his own emolument, the necessary consequence is, that human society and community would be overturned (122).

Cicero warns that not one member of the body should misuse the other parts for its own gain. Thus, the government of a state and its people are mutually dependent. From this beginning onwards, the analogy has not only focused on portraying the ideal state, but the possibility of bodily disorders, and hence of a disordered or corrupt state, have been incorporated into it[2]. Plato, for instance, writes about: "a healthy state" and "a fevered state" in book III of *The Republic* (qtd in Hale 20).

It is does not require a great leap of the imagination to see the similarity between the writings of the Stoic Cicero and those of the Apostle Paul. The analogy between the body and a community of its members is part of the Christian tradition, and appears in the Bible in various places. In St Paul's first Epistle to the Corinthians, for example, the end of the passage reads:

> That there should be no schism in the body; but that the members should have the same care for one another. And whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it; or one member be honoured, al members rejoice with it (1. Cor. 12. 25-26).

In this text Paul, like Cicero, focuses on how parts of the (Christian) community depend on each other.

---

[2] Hale cites Sophocles and Aristophanes who uses a sick body as the target domain for the metaphor. Both explicate the problems in society in terms of bodily illness. In *Antigone* we find the line, "and 'tis thy council that hath brought this sickness on our state" (22). Whereas in the *Wasps* Aristophanes concludes that "hard were the task . . . To attempt to heal an inveterate, old disease engrained in the heart of the state" (22).

The Renaissance revival of classical texts meant that Elizabethans encountered, in text like those of Cicero's, an analogy that was already familiar to them, not only from the scriptures but also from diverse forms of medieval Christian writing. "More than any saint on earth or in heaven, Christ was above all, at least in the late middle ages, unthinkable without his injuries. Each welt, puncture wound, bruise or gash received singular devotional attention, especially in meditations on the passion" (Covington, 13). In emulation of Christ's suffering, saints and martyrs suffered[3], and their wounds accrued a symbolic meaning, which, like Christ's wounds, became highly sacralised. Thus, the concept of woundedness received ample attention in medieval texts, as it was so intrinsically linked to finding (religious) meaning.

However, the body metaphor did not have a solely religious focus in the middle ages. One of the first attempts to write on political philosophy during the middle Ages was John of Salisbury's *Policratus*. As early as 1159, he wrote an analogy about a centralized authority, in which a prince —who is subject only to God— filled the place of the head of state[4]. Where Cicero had stressed the mutual dependency of the various 'organs' within a state, John of Salisbury accentuated the hierarchy between those in power and their subjects. Salisbury emphasized the need for protection of the head of state as follows:

> For his sake every subject will expose his own head to imminent dangers in the same manner that by the promptings of nature the members of the body are wont to expose themselves for the protection of the head (17).

This rendering of the body politic metaphor already contained the concept of a diseased state, as the need for the ruler to be protected accentuated the possibility of

---

[3] For instance, Gertrude Helfta (a thirteenth century Benedictine saint) wrote: "Most merciful Lord write your wounds in my heart with your precious blood" (qtd in Covington 9), thus transplanting Christ's wounds to the heart of the worshipper herself.

[4] Various officials in this analogy are represented by the senses, and by members of the body; the judges are the eyes, soldiers are the hands, while farmers and peasants are the feet. The intestines however, are reserved for tax gatherers who ought not to retain their accumulations too long.

injury to the head of state. Moreover, “to liken a political event or situation to an illness is to impute guilt, to prescribe punishment” (Sontag 82). Therefore, when subjects subsequently failed in their duty to protect their ruler, questions about responsibility and punishment seemed unavoidable. Thus, the seeds of political repression lie scattered in the writings of John of Salisbury, who forewarned that if one unsound member endangered the state, it would be the duty of the prince to eliminate or amputate that member. Not one member would be spared if it “revolts against the soul” and those who rebel against the state must be: “rooted out, broken off, and thrown away” (qtd in Musolff 241).

The fifteenth-century ideas of John Fortesque resonated as far as seventeenth-century England as well[5]. Where Salisbury focused on the head of state, Fortesque’s emphasis was on the will of the people who, represented as they were by the bloodstream, were an empowering force. Fortesque rejected the notion of regal dominion —which was in essence absolute monarchy— as sole form of government, and advocated the use of political dominion[6]. In his explication of political dominion he employed the body politic metaphor: “In the body politic the will of the people is the source of life, having in it the blood, namely, political forethought for the interest of the people, which it transmits to the head and all the members of the body” (*38; Ch. 13).* Because of this emphasis on the will of the people, Fortesque’s work can be seen as a first instigation towards a parliamentary democracy.

So far, the language of the body had referred to either the spiritual body of the church and its community of believers or to the more worldly body of a state. This practice of referring to two distinct bodies: physical and spiritual[7] existed already in the early medieval period. However, in early modern England these two notions —

---

[5] Fortesque writes his De Laudibus Legum Anglie in the late 15th century, as a dialogue between the young prince Edward and the chancellor to Henry VI in exile.

[6] Fortesque relegates regal dominion to emergency measures, for instance to meet foreign invasions.

[7] See also Ernst Kantorowicz. *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1957.

state and religion— became more and more intertwined. When Henry VIII became head of the Church of England as well as head of the realm, he fused two distinct bodies into one. Consequently the whole body politic, as well as the religious body of that time, had to rethink their positions, and each incorporated the ancient language of the body politic metaphor into their own arguments[8], as for example Thomas More did, when he, asserted, "a kingdom is in all parts like a man" (49). Henry VIII used the religious terms that were familiar to him to further his own cause, but he incorporated the legal discourse of the time in defence of his own position as well. Most notably, he included a legal point that lawyer Edmund Plowden had made in an earlier case[9] when Plowden stated that the king has two bodies, and that the royal, legal and infallible body of the king was separated from his mortal and fallible body[10].

The statement that proclaimed the king head of the religious institute as well as head of the realm brought with it a heightened awareness of his supremacy, and henceforth, the need to protect the king as supreme head of the body politic. The 1535 act of Supremacy accentuated this hierarchy, and consequently focused on the repression of those who failed to protect the monarch. The act not only states that the king and his successors are "the only supreme Head on earth of the Church of England", but the same act indeed proclaims that it is treasonous to disagree with the king, for the monarch may: "henceforth repress, redress, reform, order, correct, restrain and amend all such errors, heresies, abuses, offenses, contempts and enormities" (qtd in McEachern 185). Thus the act of supremacy expands the

---

[8] For example: Bishop Gardiner, who defends the king, defines the church as "that only multitude of people which being unified in the profession of Christ is growne in to one body" (Gardiner, Oration of true Obedience/ De vera obedienca, Qtd. in Hale, 53)

[9] This case concerned the Duchy of Lancaster, which was owned privately by the Lancastrian kings and therefore not a property of the crown.

[10] Plowden reports on the infallibility of the king as follows:

> The King has in him two bodies, viz., a body natural, and a body politic. His body natural (if it be considered in itself) is a body moral, subject to all infirmities that come by nature or accident, to the imbecility of infancy or old age, and to the like defects that happen to the bodies of other people. But his body politic is a body that cannot be seen or handled, consisting of policy and government, and constituted for the direction of the people, and the management of the public weal, and this body is utterly void of infancy, and old age, and other natural defects and imbecilities, which the body natural is subject to, and for this cause, what the king does in his body politic cannot be invalidated or frustrated by any disability in his natural body (qtd in Kantorowicz 7)

groundwork laid by Salisbury, who expressly stated the duty of the members to protect their head.

In fact, all the Tudor monarchs, as well as the Stuarts that followed them, made use of the analogy that maps the characteristics of a body onto a state, and each consecutive monarch added his or her own exegesis to suit their own purposes. When Henry VIII was succeeded by boy king Edward Seymour, the consequences of disobedience were defined more clearly, and the focus of the body politic metaphor came to rest firmly on the doctrine of passive obedience. According to this doctrine, the king, as head of the spiritual as well as the political community, is supreme, and his commands must be obeyed no matter how just or unjust. It was no longer taken for granted that the king would always have the welfare of the state at heart, and the possibility of an unjust ruler was expressly stated. Since it was unthinkable to remove a God given ruler, the solution was to remove those who rebel. Thus, in Homily[11] VI: 'of Christian Love and Charity', Archbishop Cranmer used the body politic metaphor when he stated that a seditious person was like a "putrified and festered member".

The suggestion that disorder could be found within the body of the monarch represented yet another shift in thinking. Mary Tudor, in this case, was seen as the cause of illness within the body politic, and thus held responsible for disorder within the realm. Thomas Betteridge finds this notion in Foxe's book of Martyrs, which is the common name for *The Actes and Monuments* by John Foxe, published in 1563. Betteridge indicates how Foxe used "Mary Tudor's dismal empty cradle and her mysterious unfruitful pregnancy to symbolize the sterility of her reign, the Catholic revival, and the false doctrines of the mass" (Waduba 1).

Whereas Elizabeth's cradle remained as empty as Mary's, there was nothing dismal about Elizabeth I herself, who made good use of the body politic metaphor

[11] The Homilies were official sermons written during Edward's reign, and as such they reflect the official position of the church, which at this stage, is indistinguishable from the position of the state.

when she cleverly incorporated her own body into it, and styled herself as Virgin Queen. Even though Elizabeth I faced many of the same issues as her predecessors, her reign brought a period of relative stability to the realm in which the arts thrived. As a result the metaphor of the body politic was put to play in the lines of sonneteers like Sydney and Donne, and in the theatrical works of Dekker and Shakespeare, amongst many others. Nevertheless, the comparison between a state and a body was also, and increasingly, used to describe the ills of society. As such it found its way into political tracts and speeches in parliament. It was used as social criticism in sermons, as well as in pamphlets either inciting to, or exhorting against or rebellion, to mention but a few of the numerous examples of this "analogy between society and the human body [which was] used with more frequency, variety, and seriousness than any other of the correspondences which compose the 'Elizabethan world picture'" (Hale 7).

It was the first Stuart king James I, who took the idea of absolute monarchy to yet another extreme. James I, who had written extensively on the doctrine of the divine rights of kings,[12] quoted from his own work when he declared to parliament in 1609 that "Kings are justly called Gods, for that they exercise a manner or resemblance of divine power upon earth" (Wooten 107). As James I placed himself level with the gods, the hierarchical distance between him and his subjects increased. The emphasis on the duty of subjects towards their king increased accordingly, up to a point that it was considered blasphemy to rise up against the sovereign. James the first concluded: "on this point touching the power of kings, with this axiom of divinity, that as to dispute what God may do, is blasphemy … so is it sedition in subjects, to dispute what a king may do in the height of his power" (Wooten 107). In the execution of the divine right of kings it was the king's right to dispose of his seditious subjects. Thus, the metaphor was now used to describe a situation in which it might be deemed

12 He set out his ideas in: *The true Law of Free Monarchies* and repeats them later at the behest of his son in *Basilikon Doron*.

necessary, as John of Salisbury indeed forewarned[13], to cut off members of the body in order to preserve it.

Since the maxim of mutual responsibility seemed so out of tilt, this, almost as a matter of course, generated the inclusion of rebellion and repression in the wording of the body politic metaphor. For each side the focus was on injury: whether from the point of view of the king who, as head of the realm, was protected from injury by the removal of unwanted members from the body politic, or from the point of view of rebels, who were physically injured as punishment. As the metaphor was increasingly used to look at the ills of society, it became the *wounded* (my italics) body politic metaphor. Sue Covington asserts in her book *Wounds, Flesh and Metaphor* that "descriptions of a wounded body politic were thus prevalent even in the pre-civil war period, when writers sought to encapsulate the conflicts between and within the parliament, the church, and the court" (21). It is these descriptions of the body politic, but more emphatically of the *wounded* body politic, that Shakespeare's audience would have been familiar with and would have recognized in *Coriolanus* and *Titus Andronicus.*

In fact, as Ann Kaegi states, Shakespeare's *Coriolanus* is inundated with the metaphor of the body politic:

> There is much about the civic structure of Shakespeare's Rome in Coriolanus that would have seemed very familiar to seventeenth century Londoners. One feature that would have lessened the temporal and political gulf separating Jacobean London from the Roman republic as it is represented in Coriolanus is the frequent resort to analogues of the 'body politic'. (363)

She refers to Menenius Agrippa's exposition of the ancient[14] fable of the belly, when she adds, "few examples of the use of oratory to forestall anarchy [were] more famous

---

[13]See page 16 of this thesis and Mussolf 241, not one member will be spared if it "revolts against the soul" and those who rebel against the state must be: "rooted out, broken off, and thrown away".

in early modern times than the one with which *Coriolanus* begins" (363). This fable is an extended form of the body politic metaphor, and in Shakespeare's version the belly exemplifies the senators, who are accused by the citizens of Rome that they, "still cupboard the viand" and that "our sufferance is a gain to them" (1.1.102–105). Shakespeare deviates from his original source when he describes the political events surrounding the Midland revolt in 1607. He adds these current events, such as a revolt due to a lack of corn and the concomitant fear of famine, to the play. Both were a direct result of the land enclosure acts: land that had traditionally been used by the poor for their livelihood was now enclosed within the estates of the landlords, to be used for their economic gain. The poor were evicted and lost their means to a livelihood. This depopulation made peasants depend on buying grain from the landlords, whom they accused of artificially driving up the price of corn under the pretext of shortage. It is the same grievance that the citizens in Coriolanus hold against Caius Martius, who they perceive as "chief enemy to the people"(1.1.6). With the death of Caius Martius, the citizens believe, they will have "corn at our own price". Shakespeare's citizens, who are "resolved to die rather than famish" (1.1.3-4), echo the statement of the Warwickshire diggers,[15] who contemplated "dying manfully rather than starving slowly" (qtd in Hindle 42). Thus, the play is a good example of how social disorder is reflected in the language of the body politic. In fact, Steve Hindle mentions *Coriolanus* as the fifth commentary of this revolt, which he describes in four discourses that "demonstrate the extraordinary resonances between the text of Coriolanus 1.1 and the social and political discourses circulating in London and Northampton in 1607" (42). All four discourses used the language of the wounded body politic. Francis Bacon for instance "was convinced that the rebellions of the Belly are the worst" (qtd in Hindle 37).

[14] The fable already appears in Aesop's fables around 600 BC.
[15] One of the factions in the Midland revolt

So, *Coriolanus* and to a lesser extent *Titus Andronicus,* demonstrate the culmination in the use of the body politic metaphor during the Elizabethan and Jacobean age. Both plays make heavy use of a metaphor that is increasingly used to describe the ills of society, and is, therefore, in the process of becoming the metaphor of the *wounded* (my emphasis) body politic.

III

METHOD

1. Approach

I have looked at the word count for the word 'wound' in all of Shakespeare's plays. Since tragedies yield the highest overall count for the word 'wound', this has led me to the choice of the Roman tragedies. See table 1, page 70.

Of the tragedies, I have chosen to study *Titus Andronicus* and *Coriolanus* because their subject matter seems to imply a connection between woundedness and meaning. Since these Roman plays (as well as *Julius Caesar*, which I studied earlier) frequently describe the conception of good governance as an analogy with the human body, I will also take the body politic metaphor into consideration, especially where it shows a connection to woundedness.

2. Analysis

2.1. Identifying metaphor

I have used the Metaphor Identification Procedure (MIP) to analyse each occurrence of the word 'wound' in *Titus Andronicus* and in *Coriolanus* in order to determine whether these words were used metaphorically. Since the MIP takes the context in which a word appears into account, I have examined these occurrences of 'wound' within the context of the scenes they appeared in. I have also looked at words in close proximity to the word 'wound'. Firstly to determine if 'wound' appears in a sentence of high metaphorical density, and secondly, to discover if there are any other words, either in that sentence or in the immediate context, that reflect on the concept of woundedness.

2.2. MIP

The recent focus on employing authentic data for determining metaphor in natural discourse raises the question of a reliable and workable definition of what counts as metaphor. A group of scholars whose combined initials read PRAGGLEJAZ addressed this issue when they formed the Metaphor Identification Procedure. In *Metaphor and symbol* the Pragglejaz group comment on the "isolated [and] constructed examples seen in linguistic research" (1), and they postulate the need for a reliable method for metaphor identification. So far, they claim, decisions on what constitutes metaphor are intuitive. Because there is no consensus on what comprises metaphor, it is difficult to compare research:

> The lack of agreed criteria . . . complicates any evaluation of theoretical claims about the frequency of metaphor, its organization in discourse, and possible relations between metaphoric language and metaphoric thought. [What is needed is] an explicit, reliable, and flexible method for identifying metaphorically used words in written or in spoken language. (2)

The Metaphor Identification Procedure aims to establish whether a lexical unit can be described as metaphorical within its context. The MIP defines indirect metaphors. This means the MIP identifies those words that carry two connotations within that one word. For example, if we say: "He is a real pig", the word pig carries the connotations of both the animal and of an unpleasant person. MIP distinguishes a basic meaning: that of 'an animal' and a contextual meaning: 'being unpleasant'. However, MIP does not make claims about metaphorical intention; it seeks to identify whether metaphorical meaning is conveyed, regardless of whether this was intended by the writer or reader who used the expression.

MIP is not concerned with finding linguistic metaphors that derive from already established conceptual metaphor. In this regard, its method is opposed to that of the Conceptual Metaphor Theory. CMT starts at a conceptual level and finds evidence in

linguistic use. MIP starts from a stretch of text, or discourse, and identifies linguistic metaphor within this given context. It does not, at this point, define conceptual metaphor.

2.3. MIP Procedure

The procedure of the MIP is as follows:

1. Read the entire text–discourse to establish a general understanding of the meaning.
2. Determine the lexical units in the text–discourse.
3. (a) For each lexical unit in the text, establish its meaning in context, that is, how it applies to an entity, relation, or attribute in the situation evoked by the text (contextual meaning). Take into account what comes before and after the lexical unit.

   (b) For each lexical unit in the text, determine if it has a more basic contemporary meaning in other contexts than the one in the given context. For our purposes, basic meanings tend to be

   - More concrete [what they evoke is easier to imagine, see, hear, feel, smell and taste];
   - Related to bodily action;
   - More precise (as opposed to vague);
   - Historically older;

   Basic meanings are not necessarily the most frequent meanings of the lexical unit.

   If the lexical unit has a more basic current–contemporary meaning in other contexts than the given context, decide whether the contextual meaning contrasts with the basic meaning but can be understood in comparison with it.

4. If yes, mark the lexical unit as metaphorical.

2.4. MIPVU

The fact that the MIP can only detect indirect metaphors, but not similes or metonymies is a disadvantage. This is why "the MIP has since been refined and extended to MIPVU" (Steen et al 5). MIPVU was developed at the Vrije Universiteit in Amsterdam, hence the extension VU, and it can handle such forms as analogies and similes: linguistic forms that directly express the source domain of a metaphorical mapping. While MIP only determines indirect linguistic metaphor, MIPVU can help find those metaphors in which both source and target are used directly. In these cases cross-domain mapping is often signalled by words such as 'like' and 'as'. For example, in the phrase 'wounds like graves' the use of both 'wound' and 'graves' is direct; the meaning refers to actual wounds and actual graves. However, the characteristics of 'wounds' can be explained as related to the characteristics of 'graves'. The basic meaning for 'wounds' refers to the bodily injury, and the contextual meaning is found directly in the text: 'graves'.

In order to determine basic and contemporary meanings for the analyses in this thesis I have used the *Oxford English Dictionary*. A dictionary is often necessary to determine the historically older meaning of a word, and in most publications that explicate the use of MIP and MIPVU the *Macmillan English Dictionary for Advanced Learners* (Rundell & Fox, 2002) is recommended, in combination with its online tool. However, in this instance, the *OED* is indispensable because it has an extensive etymological section for each entry. This is useful in finding suspected metaphoric use in sixteenth-century texts, as Shakespeare might well have referred to a meaning that was current in his time but that is now lost to us.

3 Identifying metaphoric concepts

One extra step is needed to determine a conceptual MAPPING for the metaphors that were analysed. “Since MIP and MIPVU are primarily concerned with the linguistic level of metaphor analysis, not the conceptual level, . . . the exact nature of the mapping [will] have to be determined during subsequent conceptual analysis” (Dorst, 132-133). Metaphoric expressions can be classified into structured patterns or groups. These conceptual meanings form systematized sets of correspondences, which are termed MAPPINGS. Ekaterina Shutova and Simone Teufel report on the consensus between views on metaphor[16] that “an interconceptual mapping . . . underlies the production of metaphorical expressions. In other words, metaphor always involves two concepts or conceptual domains: the target and the source . . . The phenomenon of metaphor is not restricted to similarity-based extensions of meanings of isolated words, but rather involves reconceptualization of a whole area of experience (target domain) in terms of another (source domain). (Shutova and Teufel, 3255).

Thus, target domains are often complex or abstract concepts. Source domains are: “more concrete, simple familiar, and grounded in our bodily and perceptual experience” (Dorst, 34). TIME, LIFE, EMOTIONS are examples of concepts in the target domain. MONEY, and BITCH are examples of concepts in source domains, at least in the expressions: ‘time is money’, or ‘life is a bitch’. Consequently, the source domain is the image that we use in order to understand the more abstract concept of the target domain.

In order to arrive at a conceptual MAPPING that transfers knowledge from one conceptual domain to another, it is necessary to determine the conceptual domains. By looking at the basic and contextual senses of the metaphors for ‘wound’, their conceptual domains can be inferred. By pinpointing these target and source domains conceptual MAPPINGS can be construed.

---

[16] Shutova and Teufel report on several discussions in linguistics and philosophy: Gentner, 1983; Black, 1962; Hesse, 1966; Wilks, 1978; Lakoff and Johnson, 1980.

4. Literary analysis

Since I want to establish if there is an underlying metaphorical concept for each separate play, I will write a literary analysis of each play in which I test if the metaphorical concepts that were found during MIP and MIPVU analyses are consistent with the rest of the play. This is necessary because MIP and MIPVU are linguistic tools, and so they will give me important, but not complete, information about the underlying thought processes that determine metaphor. If, as Conceptual Metaphor Theory claims, our thinking is structured metaphorically, then the concepts that govern metaphor will also become apparent in the structure of the play. It should, therefore, be possible to find evidence in characters, setting and plot of the play for the existence of those underlying metaphorical concepts that were determined during MIP/MIPVU analyses.

5. Summary

Based on the precepts of Conceptual Metaphor Theory, and with the help of the MIP/MIPVU tools I will first determine if there is one metaphoric concept that governs the use of the word ‘wound’ in each play. I will then decide whether an overall metaphorical concept can be established for each individual play, if the outcome of the literary analyses concurs with the MIP/MIPVU analyses. The outcome of the MIP/ MIPVU analyses will be discussed within the literary analyses for *Titus Andronicus* and *Coriolanus* in the following chapters. If I can designate a conceptual mapping for the use of ‘wounds’ for both plays, these mappings will be compared.

IV Literary analysis

1. Titus Andronicus and the Alphabet of Pain

The human body is painfully present In *Titus Andronicus*, a play in which the sacrificially lopped off limbs of Alarbus are but the first introduction to an abundance of mutilated body parts. In this play, in which violence, revenge and rape take grotesque forms, and which has a body count of 23 at the end of the first act, physical pain is used to explore the depths of emotional pain. *Titus Andronicus*, therefore, is not a play about physical violence but a play that explores the depth of grief using a somatic frame of reference. Emotional pain is understood in terms of bodily trauma. There are several arguments that support the conclusion that this play, which abounds in images of excruciating corporeal discomfort is, at least in part, a study on how to express grief.

For this thesis, I have chosen a single word as a starting point. The MIP and MIPVU analyses for the metaphor of the word 'wound' demonstrate a unity in presenting emotional pain as physical trauma. This unity carries over into the images, text, structure and concepts of the play as a whole. I will, therefore, move from single words and images to text, and then move on to the structure and concepts of this play when discussing how the concept of grief or suffering is explored, and emotional pain is explicated in terms of physical trauma. The bodily orientation of conceptual metaphors, which serves as groundwork for the MIP/MIPVU analyses, illustrates Titus' decline from power. The emotional loss of honour and the suffering of Titus' children highlight the need to express suffering, as well as the difficulty of communicating physical and emotional trauma. This breakdown of communication is illustrated by the recurring image of a stone, which, since no one will listen to or sympathize with Titus, symbolizes a lack of compassion.

.

Marcus' speech is yet another textual effort, in which Marcus, turning to the literary conventions of the time, tries to comprehend his own emotional trauma in terms of his niece's wounded body. Marcus' second-hand rendering of events, events that he has not witnessed but that he can infer from seeing his niece, detaches the narrative from Lavinia, to whom the horrors of this tale really belong, as Marcus places the events in the realm of fantastical stories, metaphysical poetry and classical myth. After having looked at metaphors for the single word 'wound', and at the metaphorical density that supports this use, which is followed by the plethora of rhetorical devices, and even the intertextuality of Marcus speech, I consider how grief is explored conceptually. Shakespeare is shown to be at least as unique as Montaigne in his secular reflection on compassion. A similar reflection, on the connection between language and creation, provides a link to the debate on transubstantiation, and hence to the power of words to create meaning. Thus words and wounds are found to be analogous to meaning and suffering.

As the MIP/MIPVU analyses of the word 'wound' in the Appendix demonstrate, the abstract concept of emotional pain is explicated in terms of somatic injury. The word 'wound' occurs ten times in *Titus Andronicus*. Seven out of these ten times 'wound' or 'wounds' are part of a linguistic metaphor; the contextual meaning of this word differs from the most basic meaning of the word, which, refers to a bodily injury or a cut. At a conceptual level, 'wounds' form part of the source domain of an indirect metaphor. The source domain for 'wounds' is the —more concrete, easier to imagine, corporeal— image that explicates a more abstract concept. In six out of the seven times that 'wound' is used metaphorically in *Titus Andronicus*, the abstract concept signifies a feeling of emotional pain. The mapping that can be made for this thought process is the same for all these instances: EMOTIONAL PAIN IS PHYSICAL PAIN. If we look at the results of the MIP/MIPVU analyses the conclusion must be that the underlying concept for the

metaphors on wounds in this play refers to emotional pain that is explained in terms of physical pain, and *Titus Andronicus* is an exploration of grief.

The word 'grief' in this thesis is mostly used in the modern (twenty-first century) sense of: "mental pain, distress or sorrow" *(OED 7a.),* or even in the "limited sense in modern use: Deep or violent sorrow, caused by loss" (OED 7a). It must be noted, however, that this distinction between physical and emotional components of the word grief was far less pronounced in early modern English than it is nowadays. Michael Schoenfeldt comments on th[is], "lack of distinction between physical and emotional pain" within the word grief when he states: "The vocabularies of suffering continue to migrate between these two realms that for us designate quite separate phenomena" ("Aesthetics and Anesthetics" 29). There are numerous references in the *OED*[17] that show how 'grief', in early modern English, could refer to physical as well as mental injury, and thus the meaning of 'grief' as emotional pain nearly always had an inherent physical component to it, at that time.

The first time in this play that the word 'wound' is used metaphorically, a connection between words and wounds is immediately established. When Titus calls out, "these words are razors to my wounded heart" (1.1.320), this is the first of many instances that explicate emotional pain in terms of a bodily injury. The words of emperor Saturninus are the cause of Titus' emotional distress. Saturninus calls Titus' sons, who valiantly fought for Rome, "lawless and fit to ruffle in the commonwealth of Rome" (1.1.319). Titus, who has just killed one of his own sons for acting against the emperor, is cut to the quick by these comments, and compares the emperor's sharp words to razors. In doing so, he refers to a shared characteristic of both words and razors: their capacity to wound and to cause pain. The mental distress that Titus feels -as result of the emperor's cutting remarks- is just as painful as razors cutting his heart. When Titus uses

17 Numerous, now obsolete, references in the *OED* were valid interpretations of the word grief in Shakespeare's time, and these can be seen as valid interpretations for the concept of grief that is studied in Titus Andronicus. Grief can refer to: "Hardship or suffering. Obs." (*OED* 1), or "hurt, harm, mischief or injury. Obs." (*OED* 2a). It is also a " feeling of offense; displeasure, anger. Obs." (*OED* 4a) as well as "a bodily injury or ailment; . . . a sore, wound, a blemish of the skin. Obs."(*OED* 5).

the phrase: “these words are razors to my wounded heart” (1.1.320), he relates this emotional distress to a bodily injury, and immediately establishes a relationship between words and wounds.

Titus expresses emotional distress in terms of a wound once more in the first act. The cause for this distress is the violation of his concept of honour. When Titus cries out: “Marcus, even thou hast struck upon my crest, / And, with these boys, mine honour thou hast wounded” (1.1.371-372), the abstract concept of honour is injured “in a manner comparable to the infliction of a wound” (OED meaning 2a for a figurative wound). The word honour is a personification; this means that honour, like a human body, can be desecrated or damaged. The violation of an abstract concept is set up in comparison to the violation of a human body. The concept of wounded honour might allude to the sexual violation of Lavinia’s honour later in the play, but in this paragraph it is Titus’ “personal title to high esteem” (*OED* sense 1 for honour) as well as his “sense of strict allegiance to what is due or right (to some conventional standard of conduct)” (*OED* sense 2) that have been violated. This violation of an abstract concept is made explicit by referring to a physical wound.

When, in the second act, in a passage dense with metaphors, emperor Saturninus exclaims: “Now to the bottom doest thou search my wound” (2.3.253), this is the third time the word wound is used metaphorically, and once more emotional pain is explicated in terms of physical pain. However, the word ‘wound’ in *Titus Andronicus* never acts in a single isolated metaphor; it always occurs in the proximity of other words that either enhance or add new layers of meaning to the already existing metaphor. There is a detailed explanation of the metaphorical density of this and other instances in the analyses in chapter VI. The bottom of the wound that Saturninus probes is a reference to the entrapment of Titus’ sons and the rape of Titus’ daughter as well as a reference to the emotional pain that Saturninus professes to feel. For Titus, however, it is the cause of real distress. The Andronici have indeed fallen a long way; they now find themselves beneath the earth, at the bottom of a pit.

Shakespeare uses the orientation of Titus' body to illustrate the extent of Titus' emotional distress. Titus starts from one of the highest positions; at the height of his career he finds himself near the senate building on the top of Capitol hill[18]. Titus, surnamed Pius, has just declined an offer to become emperor of Rome, and is at this moment a celebrated Roman general "laden with honor's spoils" (1.1.35). High and mighty Titus is the epitome of righteousness, convinced as he is of his own and his family's sense of honour. When, in the first act, Titus accuses Marcus of striking him on the crest (1.1.371), the crest serves as a symbol of honour, and Marcus' remark is perceived as an unexpected slight: even Marcus strikes him when he is up.

It is the blow to Titus' concept of honour that literally brings Titus down. As a result of this downfall, Titus subsequently loses his own sense of decorum. And then, Titus, who "for two-and-twenty sons . . . never wept / Because they died in honor's lofty bed" (3.1.10-11), cries bitter tears, as he pleads in vain for the lives of his sons, who will be executed on false charges. In his emotional distress he mimics a body in physical pain. Having descended from Capitol hill, Titus exposes his tears to the judges, and lies down on the floor where the position of his body mirrors his feelings.

In this sense, conceptual metaphor theory, which I have discussed in chapter II, is applicable to Shakespeare: Titus uses the position of his body to act out what Lakoff and Johnson call orientational metaphors. Orientational metaphors "have a spatial orientation that arises from the fact that we have bodies" (Lakoff and Johnson, 14). Thus the language that describes the spatial orientation of Titus' body posture moves downward with his decline from power, and Titus becomes the embodiment of his own metaphors. The move is from the top of Capitol hill where Titus stands tall: his head "bound with laurel boughs" (1.1.74). He is then struck at the crest (1.1.371), and thereafter bends down when "on feeble knee/ [he] beg[s]" Saturninus (2.3.289-290), until he lies down in despair, wondering: "When will this fearful slumber have an end" (3.1.257). Finally, his

[18]The senate building is put mistakenly at the top of the hill instead of at the bottom, according to the Folger Shakespeare edition for *Titus Andronicus* (Mowat 6).

kin end up in a dark pit whose bottom is a jumble of allusions to the fiery pit of hell, a symbol for Lavinia's rape and also a wound that needs to be probed in order to find the truth.

To Titus, the loss of his sons' honour does not only change the orientation of his body; it accentuates the necessity to articulate his sorrow, and thus it warrants crying. For a second time in this play, we hear that Titus is not given to weeping. This underlines his transformation from the staunch stoic he was at the start of the play -for whom weeping would be weakness- to the weeping and broken-down man he has now become. Titus is faced with the kind of distress that he cannot find words for. Even as he himself so very eloquently phrases why his tears must speak for him: "and let me say, that never wept before / My tears are now prevailing orators" (3.1.25,26). Consequently, Titus' tears fall like rain, and he writes: "in the dust I write / My heart's deep languor and my soul's sad tears" (3.1.12-13).

His son Lucius recognizes the futility of what Titus is doing: "O noble father, you lament in vain. / The Tribunes hear you not and no man is by, / And you recount your sorrows to a stone" (3.1.27-29). Nevertheless, Titus knows his plea needs to be expressed, regardless of who hears it. He knows the tribunes, whom he addresses in absentia, would not take heed of him anyway. Ultimately, it is the image of inanimate stones that conveys, even more forcefully than the absent tribunes do, that Titus will not receive any response. Titus is aware of this, but unlike his own son, he understands the need to express his anguish, and the necessity to plead for his children, without regard to the outcome.

> Why, tis no matter, man; if they did hear,
> They would not mark me, or if they did mark,
> They would not pity me, yet plead I must;
> And bootless unto them. (3.1.33-36)

So, Titus is not mad or incoherent with grief, but he recognizes the need for articulation that is inherent to moments of torment or despair.

Titus does not only recognize his own need for expression, but he also realizes the impossibility of truly communicating what his suffering feels like to another human being**.** His son thinks he is mad, and the tribunes will not and cannot understand him: Titus stands isolated in his grief. Then Titus twists Lucius' phrase, so that, besides the necessity of uttering futile words of pain, it now highlights Titus' feeling of separation: "and therefore I recount my sorrows to the stones" (3.1.37). Obviously, Titus does not expect any answer from insentient and inanimate stones. In their 'stoniness' they expose the extent of Titus' isolation, and his lack of connection, as they reflect the impossibility of truly sharing pain with another being. In *The Body in Pain*, Elizabeth Scarry writes on the nature of pain: "thus pain comes unsharably into our midst" (5). The magnitude and impact of pain, differs enormously, depending on the perspective of the person who encounters pain. Titus recognizes the impossibility of partaking in another's pain: his pain cannot mean the same thing to him and to the tribunes simultaneously. This very private quality of pain is what makes it so difficult to share. As Scarry states: "When one speaks about "one's own physical pain" and about "another person's physical pain," one might almost appear to be speaking about two wholly distinct orders of events" (4). What Scarry writes about physical pain is, in *Titus Andronicus,* true for emotional pain as well. As Scarry states "So, for the person in pain, so incontestably and unnegotiably present is it that "having pain" may come to be thought of as the most vibrant example of what it is to 'have certainty,' while for the other person it is so elusive that 'hearing about pain' may exist as the primary model of what it is 'to have doubt'" (5). Titus recognizes the certainty of his own pain, it is acute enough to make a stoic cry, but he also recognizes the elusive quality of pain. It is the futility of sharing his pain with the tribunes, or any other person for that matter, that makes him talk to the stones instead.

As contrast to the permeable nature of a wound, Titus utilizes the image of stones to expose the tribunes' lack of response, to affirm his own need to articulate sorrow, and to disclose his own isolation. Now, Titus turns the image of a stone around once more; this time he uses it to illustrate the concept of compassion. Initially, the description of a

stone hearkens back to Tamora's lack of compassion for Lavinia's tears. Like Titus, Tamora's son Demetrius uses the characteristics of a rock to describe a state of mind: "Listen, fair madam: let it be your glory / To see her tears; but be your heart to them / As unrelenting flint to drops of rain" (2.3.141). The image of a particularly sharp and jagged stone, such as flint, is used to illustrate how unyielding and hard-hearted Tamora is. Titus, in contrast to Demetrius, uses the representation of stones as a demonstration of how to show empathy and how to provide comfort. Hard and impenetrable, with an inside that, even if it breaks, differs not that much from their outside, stones are set against wounds as exact opposites. Wounds operate in the area of soft permeable skin and show characteristics of the inside as well as the outside of the body; the blood that issues forth from them is a visible reminder of that inside world. Yet, it is left to the unyielding stones to provide comfort. The stones can neither help nor hear Titus, but the fact that Titus can tell his story, and they seem to suffer with him, makes them seem soft, compared to the hardness of Tamora's heart, and they certainly are: "better than the Tribunes, / For that they will not intercept my tale. / When I do weep, they humbly at my feet / Receive my tears and seem to weep with me" (3.1.40-43). Titus shows a keen understanding of the nature of compassion, in this succinct and wonderful description of it. The stones know how to be still and listen: they do not interrupt with their own stories, and so they let Titus tell his own tale; there is comfort in that. However, the stones do more: they do not stem Titus' tears, but they seem to receive these tears into themselves. The stones as receptacles for tears seem to cry, not for, but with Titus. Therefore, it is left to the stones to show empathy, and in doing so, they highlight the lack of it in those surrounding Titus.

If *Titus Andronicus* is a study on how to express grief, then Marcus' speech can be seen as yet another way of making perceptions of pain and suffering manifest. So far, I have looked at one metaphor and at single images (the bottom of a pit, rocks and stones) which, either as illustration or as direct opposite of the word wound, collaborate in explicating the concept of inner pain. This concept is also examined at a textual level. Marcus' lengthy speech is an example. The speech of Lavinia's uncle seems incongruous

when faced with the reality of his mutilated and wounded niece. One wonders why Marcus does not rush to Lavinia's help. He does not do so, because, in a play that explores several angles to the concept of grief, Marcus is not giving first aid, but a point of view.

Marcus explores suffering with a viewpoint taken from early modern literature. He uses literature to find an interpretation for something that he cannot quite grasp. This is a common enough stance, according to Michael Schoenfeldt who, in his talk "Something for the Pain" ponders, "why writers, particularly early modern writers, bother to record their protracted agonies in the difficult, resistant media of genre, rhyme, and meter". Shakespeare, for example, does not differ that much from another early modern writer, Edmund Spenser, in this treatment of the subject of suffering and pain. In "Reading Bleeding Trees: The Legend of Other People's Pain in 'the Legend of Holiness'", Joseph Campana discusses part of Spenser's poem *The Faerie Queene*, and states that

> Spenser invokes a literary history of bleeding trees in order to think through the relationships governing pain and the imagination, on the one hand, and beauty and violence on the other. These literary marvels enable Spenser to consider the ethics of witnessing, experiencing, appropriating, or responding to pain and to consider the extent to which it is that [in] suffering (not violence) . . . both a sense of lived embodiment and the possibility of subjectivity might be rooted. (349)

Marcus also uses his speech in order to "think through the relationships governing pain and the imagination" (Campana 349) that underlie a response to suffering, and his speech is similar to Spenser's in this respect. Thus, both Spenser and Shakespeare are seen to explore the subject of suffering in a similar vein. Schoenfeldt asserts that "literature focused on suffering can paradoxically work to relieve suffering in a variety of ways". Much of what Schoenfeldt argues is particularly apt to Marcus' speech in *Titus Andronicus*. First of all, Schoenfeldt contends that literature on suffering can serve "as a temporary distraction from our own suffering". It is certainly possible to see Marcus' catalogue of Lavinia's agonies as a distraction from his own suffering. Marcus is

distracted in two possible ways. First, Marcus is focused more on the form, the technicalities of the metaphoric devices he uses, for instance, than on content. The audience, perforce, will be temporarily distracted with him, as they recognize the various literary forms in his speech. Secondly, since Marcus describes the suffering of another, he is distracted from his own anguish. Moreover, when Marcus says: “Shall I speak for thee, / shall I say tis so?” (2.4.33), he speaks for his niece and, in doing so, attempts to offer what Schoenfeldt calls “a kind of community of suffering”. Yet, even Marcus is aware that, because he does not know her thoughts, he can never fully be Lavinia’s voice: “Oh that I knew thy heart” (2.4.34). Marcus’ speech, first and foremost, aims to “place suffering in a literary form that orders the unruly nature of deep grief” (Schoenfeldt “Something for the Pain”). Marcus’ speech must be read in this sense; even more than forming a community of suffering with his own niece, Marcus speech is an attempt to make sense of what has happened to his niece by reverting to well known patterns of literature.

Marcus first reshapes Lavinia’s plight into poetry, employing a lyrical style familiar to his Elizabethan audience. He then partitions her body, and focuses on the separate parts, using the form of the blazon. Thereafter, he meticulously describes her mutilated body as a form of art. Finally, he transforms her tragedy into a myth, turning to classical stories for content.

When Marcus describes the raped and mutilated Lavinia, his early modern audience would already be familiar with a style that emphasises corporeality, since “evidence of the body’s attraction as a source of meditation and instruction [was] everywhere apparent in the literature of the period (Sawday 86). Marcus’ lyrical style incorporates characteristics of metaphysical writing. Yet, where metaphysical poets attempt to transcend the physical sphere by explaining abstract concepts in concrete terms, Marcus fails to transcend the horrendous physicality of Lavinia’s mutilated body. Even though Marcus tries to use logic to explain the inexplicable, an abstract concept that explains Lavinia’s plight eludes him. Marcus position is the reverse of

the metaphysical poets; they turn to the physical and the concrete to explicate an abstract concept, he tries to explain Lavinia's broken body.

The form of the blazon that Marcus uses derives from heraldry. As "a description of a woman's beauty in the form of a list of her excellent features" it is a "common device for Elizabethan lyricists" *(Gray*, 46). One can see the conceit in using a catalogue of a woman's beauty as a means of describing Lavinia's maimed and disabled body. What makes Marcus' use of this technique so gruesome is that the corporeal references do not remain lyrical metaphors; they refer to actual cut-off body parts. The literalised form of the blazon in this play highlights the inherent cruelty that Sawday refers to when he states that "the human body may . . . have been emblazoned, or embellished through art or poetry. But to 'blazon' a body is also to hack it to pieces in order to flourish fragments of men and women as trophies" (ix).

In order to illustrate Lavinia's suffering Marcus resorts to Ekphrasis. This is a rhetorical device, in which a person or thing is described as a work of art**,** is "a way of bringing the experience of an object to a listener or reader through highly detailed descriptive writing" (Welsh, n. pag.), and as such, it is used by Marcus. In order to share the experience of her rape with his audience, he details Lavinia's abuse in phrases that mirror the ornate and elegant language of Elizabethan poetry. As a result, Lavinia's misery is turned into art: her pain is transformed into poetry, and this makes Lavinia an interpretation of reality. However, ekphrasis also means to induce a form of heightened reality. "The challenge is . . . to share the emotional experience and content with someone who had never encountered the work in question" (Welsh n.pag.). This is precisely what Marcus is doing; he is first and foremost trying to share his emotional pain upon seeing Lavinia. Yet, even though Marcus uses a rhetorical device geared to give the audience a heightened perception of reality, the illusion that art can give an accurate rendering of reality is immediately shattered, because his niece stands maimed and bleeding next to him on stage.

As if being portrayed as a work of art is not enough, Lavinia herself is also regarded as literature. In order to make sense of what has happened to his niece, Marcus falls back on the Mythological tales from classical antiquity that he knows. The line, “But sure some Tereus has deflowered thee” (2.4.26) refers to the story of Tereus and Procne. In this story, Tereus has forced himself on his wife’s sister Philomena, and to stop Philomena from telling what has happened he cuts out her tongue. Philomena then uses her hands to sew a sampler, and so reveals the names of her attackers. Lavinia’s attackers, Chiron and Demetrius, have apparently also read Ovid, but they misuse their education, and Tamora’s surviving sons cut off Lavinia’s hands, to stop her from following Philomena’s example. Marcus interprets what has happened by taking Ovid’s tale as a blueprint for what he sees when he cries out: “Fair Philomena, why she but lost her tongue” (2.4.38). Thus, In *Titus Andronicus,* myth pre-exists reality. As Nancy Christiansen states: “Because [Shakespeare] divorces stories from authors, his precedents, whether historical or mythical, become to him, facts, not representations of reality. By showing how pre-existing patterns and stories dictate what . . . [Marcus] sees, Shakespeare emphasizes the reversal, of art being reality and life imitation” (n. pag.). By representing Lavinia’s misery as an Ovidian tale, Marcus tries to dispel the disruptive quality of Lavinia’s wounds. He does this by placing her pain and wounds in a larger context: the context of literature. This detaches the tale from the reality of the events, and in doing so, helps Marcus cope with Lavinia’s suffering.

However, as soon as detachment is created, it is immediately destroyed, and the physicality of the actual event is fore-grounded in lurid and explicit images. The accuracy of the literary images simultaneously distances and highlights the horror of what has happened. The graphic imagery of what is described, coupled with the fact that the real Lavinia is right there, on stage, together with Marcus, highlights the actuality of what has happened. If we picture what Lavinia looks like, however eloquent the description, the image that is painted is a horrible one:

Alas, a crimson river of warm blood

Like to a bubbling fountain stirred with wind

Doth rise and fall between thy roséd lips

Coming and going with thy honeyed breath (2.4.21-25).

Marcus' efforts, then, finally falter in the face of an actual Lavinia whose broken body demonstrates that the ghastly content of his speech finally overrides the elegant form of it.

Titus, Marcus and, as we will see, Lucius also, use Lavinia as a means to describe their own pain. Marcus' poetic description of his niece is an antidote to his own pain. Lavinia's brother, Lucius, is painfully aware of his niece, and he too describes his emotions, upon seeing her misery, in terms of a wound: "Ah, that this sight should make so deep a wound" (3.1. 251). The word 'wound' acts, once again, as metaphor, and focuses on the emotional pain that Lucius undergoes. Even though Lavinia has been subjected to intense physical and emotional suffering —she is raped and mutilated— others use her broken body in order to speak of their own suffering. Lavinia has become the canvas that others write their distress on. Titus addresses her as: "Thou map of woe" (3.2.12), as she is the map that he uses to chart his pain on. Despite the moment in which Titus and Lavinia seem to form one shared universe of suffering: "she is the weeping welkin, I the earth" (3.1.231), it is still Titus' pain that is described. Even though Titus seems to weep with Lavinia, she is also the cause of the grief that overwhelms him: "Then must my earth with her continual tears. / Become a deluge" (3.1.233-234). Therefore, for all his anguish about Lavinia's plight, it is Titus who seems to drown in sorrow, not Lavinia. Therefore, it is not only the action of the plot -the actual cutting off of her tongue- that removes Lavinia's voice, but she is rendered silent by the structure of the play as well. Her pain is never vocalized, and as a consequence her feelings are muted. Not only is her pain not voiced; it is not even subject of discussion. When Scarry asserts that "pain defies description", she claims, "physical pain

—unlike any other state of consciousness— has no referential content. It is not of or for anything. It is precisely because it takes no object that it, more than any other phenomenon, resists objectification in language" (5). This is why Lavinia's pain is not voiced; it has no object. Lavinia cannot say what the "referential content" of her rape is, because she has no tongue anymore; to form words. More important than the physical removal of her tongue, is the fact that she has no voice, because she herself is objectified. She has become the object of others' suffering, as is evident in the way Lucius refers to his sister when he cries out: "Ay me, this object kills me" (3.1.66).

In her silence as "speechless complainer" (3.2.39) Lavinia embodies, expresses, if you will, the absence of reason. Titus and his family do not know, yet, why Lavinia was attacked. Lavinia herself cannot describe or explain what has happened. Moreover, the crime itself is so horrendous that it seems impossible to produce a plausible reason for it. This absence of reason is linked to the absence of her voice. Yet, in the absence of a physical voice, it is her body that becomes her language. Her body, in its mutilated form, expresses her suffering without the use of words. It also becomes the tool that she uses to convey messages with. Lavinia, like her father before her, writes in the dust. Taking a staff in her mouth and guiding it with her stumps she writes -and mimics- the name of the crime against her: 'stuprum' (rape) (4.1.7).

All the examples of suffering mentioned so far are governed by a lack of meaning. The emotional distress that metaphoric wounds explicate throughout the play is painful, precisely because there seems to be no reason for the pain inflicted. Apparently, and very fittingly for a Roman play, Titus sees the honourable deaths of his sons on the battlefield as acceptable. Yet, he cries for the sons who had no cause to die, and whose deaths are therefore deemed meaningless. Marcus, despite his lengthy monologue, cannot perceive of meaning for Lavinia's suffering. Though he deduces what has happened, he still does not know why Lavinia was assaulted, and who the perpetrator of this crime was. This deprives Marcus of an

enemy to “rail at . . .and . . . ease [his] mind” (2.4.35). Not knowing who maimed Lavinia, or for what reason she has been raped, is agonizing to Marcus; it burns his heart, because: “sorrow concealéd, like an oven stopped / Doth burn the heart to cinders where it is” (4.2.36-37). For Titus, it is the very absence of reason that contributes to the enormity of his suffering. Consequently his suffering is also limitless: “If there were reason for these miseries, / Then into limits could I bind my woes” (3.1.224, 225). In all the instances the crux of suffering is in the question: Why?

Since it is the absence of meaning that causes anguish, then this implies that a perception of meaning can be instrumental in relieving, or at the least, alleviating suffering. In Elizabethan England this meaning was first and foremost found within Christianity. Based on sacrifice and suffering, Christianity permeated all aspects of early modern society, and emphatically found meaning in wounds and in being wounded. The term: “the universal grammar of sacred wounds”, which Stephen Greenblatt coins in “Mutilation and Meaning” describes how in sixteenth-century England, “for Christians God’s flesh was itself a text written upon with universal characters, inscribed with a language that all men could understand since it was a language in and of the body itself” (224). In this discourse, wounds, as emblems of Christ’s suffering, are instrumental in salvation. “The root perception”, according to Greenblatt, “is that there is a link between mutilation, as a universal symbol of corporeal vulnerability, abjection, and holiness” (223). Yet, although the notion of meaningful suffering that underlies Shakespeare’s use of bodily trauma in *Titus Andronicus* derives from Christianity, Shakespeare does not resolve the quandaries that arise from this notion by referring to Christian theology in any way.

In fact, Shakespeare’s exploration of the profession of pain and grief in *Titus Andronicus* reflects the “rethinking of the meaning of pain during the modern era” (6), which Jan Frans van Dijkhuizen posits as the central theme of his study *Pain and Compassion in Early Modern English Literature and Culture*. One of the contentions of this study is that “the origins of modern Western notions of pain . . . can [also] be

attributed to the Reformation era when Protestant theologians attempted to redefine and circumscribe the spiritual meaning of pain, and came to reject late medieval religious assumptions about bodily suffering" (6).

This same notion, that significance can be located in bodily trauma, and thus in wounds, is what underlies Titus' pain. Because he cannot conceive of meaning for his suffering, his wounds have no redeeming power. The agony of unexpressed pain and the urgency to find meaning are notions that van Dijkhuizen culls from the writings of Montaigne, but which, as I have reasoned above, are also very much present in *Titus Andronicus.* Van Dijkhuizen writes about Montaigne: "it is revealing, finally, that he should think of unexpressed or inexpressible pain as particularly agonizing or horrifying" . . . Indeed, it is precisely because pain has such intense physical reality that the need to attach meaning to it is also urgent" (233).

In connection with this "shift in early modern pain attitudes, and the wider cultural transformations of which they were a part" (6), van Dijkhuizen considers the unique position that Montaigne takes, when writing on the subject of compassion and states: "Montaigne's conception of the relation between pain and compassion is exceptional in early modern culture: "in their sustained meditation on -and even celebration of- an inclusive, secular compassion and responsiveness to bodily suffering, the *Essais* seem to have no parallel in other works of the period" (238). Having said that, van Dijkhuizen does find "an intriguing parallel in Shakespeare's *The Tempest (1610*), "a play demonstrably informed by Shakespeare's reading of Montaigne" (238-239). He claims that "Shakespeare's *last* (my italics) singly authored play stands out as a uniquely Montaignian moment in early modern English history of pain" (242). However, it would seem that also in *Titus Andronicus*, Shakespeare's *first* (my italics) play to appear in print in 1594, there are several moments that allude to the concept of compassion without directly "taking recourse to Christological conceptions of suffering" (242).

The subject of compassion certainly plays a part, as one of the many expressions of grief, in *Titus Andronicus*. Marcus' commiseration with Lavinia has already been noted.

When Marcus speaks the words: “we’ll mourn with thee” (2.4.56), he shows compassion towards Lavinia, in the final lines of his long speech. Even though, these words estheticize and aenesthesize his own pain; they cannot help Lavinia: “Oh that our mourning could ease thy misery” (2.4.57). The stones, although they give cold comfort, do provide an example of compassion nevertheless. Titus shows pity, and wants to help his daughter: “Gentle Lavinia, let me kiss thy lips, / Or make some sign how I may do thee ease” (3.1.122,123). Titus is willing to cry with her: “Shall . . . thou and I / sit round some fountain . . . Till the fresh taste be taken from that clearness / And made a brine pit with our bitter tears?” (3.1.125,130-131). And, he is, predictably and dangerously, willing to suffer with her, reflecting the now obsolete use of compassion as he wants to “participate in [Lavinia’s] suffering” (*OED*): “ Or shall we cut away our hands like thine? “(3.1.132).

However, *Titus Andronicus* can hardly be called a play on compassion. In fact, it is Titus’ lack of compassion for Tamora that initiates the cycle of revenge that will, eventually, return full scale to Tamora. *Titus Andronicus* is a revenge play, and Shakespeare’s focus in this play, certainly in the first three acts, is on the concept of suffering. While studying modes of making suffering manifest, Shakespeare illustrates the concept of compassion as one of the ways in which grief finds expression or even, alleviation. In his manifestation of compassion as a response to bodily suffering, Shakespeare, without making overt references to the biblical rendering of this subject, reflects the notions of compassion that van Dijkhuizen finds in the *Essais* of Montaigne, long before the 1603 translation of these *Essais* became available in the English language.

As a study on the significance of grief, *Titus Andronicus* explores the limits of what language can achieve**.** Shakespeare explores and speculates about the nature of language in a variety of ways. First of all, he stretches the distinction between concept and reality to the limit. Secondly, as a result of this lack of distinction, language itself is shown to be involved in acts of creation and violation. Finally, when metaphors are no

longer distinct from reality, words receive power in a manner that links them to the debate on transubstantiation.

When Albert Tricomi states, “the play continuously investigates the chasm between the spoken word and the actual fact” (228), he refers to the aforementioned obfuscation between concept and reality. According to Tricomi, the “figurative language imitates gruesome circumstances of the plot” (226). However, the figurative language *prefigures* the plot rather than imitate it. For example: Lavinia’s rape is literalised into a dark hole that first her husband and then her brothers enter. Yet, it is only after Lavinia asks to be tumbled into “a dark and loathsome pit” that she is raped. And Titus only actually cuts off his hands long after he has made the suggestion to Lavinia. So the figurative language does not imitate the gruesome circumstances of the plot. Rather, the figurative language of its metaphors dictates the plot.

Metaphors are involved in an act of creation when, in order to keep the focus of the audience on the gruesomeness of the metaphors, Shakespeare turns figurative perceptions of the body into a physical realities. How best to explain the shock of what it is like to have a state without a leader? It is one thing to use a metaphor for this, which implores Titus: “And help to set a head on headless Rome” (1.1.186). The headless body still remains part of a simile that explicates an abstract concept. It is quite another thing, in order to emphasize the metaphor, to have the severed heads of Titus’s sons, who could have been future heads of Rome, on stage. When the heads of Titus’ sons are returned to Titus, together with his own severed hand, the fact that Titus no longer has a hand in what happens in Rome is, disturbingly literally, brought home to him. In order to shock, to make it physically real, to bring home the message: metaphors themselves become reality. The examples above make clear that the actualization of metaphors always ensues in the wake of violence in this play.

Not only do metaphors capture the violence in the plot, but in doing so, they alter the concept of metaphor itself. Metaphors can only be literalised into physical realities when the concept of metaphor itself is violated, thus involving language in an act of

creation -turning metaphor into reality, and in a double act of violation and destruction as well. The violence that ensues from literalised metaphors can only occur when the concept of metaphor itself is simultaneously deconstructed. To decide whether a word counts as a metaphor, the basic meaning of a word has to be both distinct from and similar to its contextual meaning. When metaphors no longer compare or explain one thing in terms of another, and one thing *becomes* (my italics) the other, then distinction that is necessary for the formation of a metaphor is lost. “Lend me your hand, and I will give you mine” (3.1.190), says Titus to Aaron, speaking metaphorically of course. Then the metaphorical entity -the hand in this case- becomes a physical reality, and Titus proceeds to cut off his own hand, which he lends -it is returned to him later- to Aaron. Thus, the distinction between signifier and signified in *Titus Andronicus*, collapses, and metaphor itself is violated.

If, as the proponents of Conceptual Metaphor Theory say, our thinking is conceptual, and it finds expression in metaphors, then this explains why this collapse between signifier and signified is partly responsible for the unease that has always accompanied the play. When the nature of a concept changes, and it becomes reality instead, then there is, de facto, no longer a concept. Since, as a concept, it no longer explicates the reality it stands for, it has lost its force. As a result we are momentarily confused. Our minds still searches for the right concept to explicate reality, but the two have become one and the same. Physical violence seems to be the subject of the play because concept and target domains —or vehicles and tenors,— merge, and metaphors for mental suffering morph into real physical violence.

When Albert Tricomi, reflecting on this tendency of metaphors to become reality, states in his article that “the most profound impulse in *Titus* is to make the word become flesh” (230) he seems to imply a connection to what Maria Franziska Fahhey aptly terms, “the transubstantiating power” (53) of words. Fahey concurs that it cannot be coincidental that “amid these theological debates about transubstantiation and trope Shakespeare stages . . . a play that showcases the potentially transformative, sometimes lethal, power

of figures of speech" (50). The subject of transubstantiation, which was current in the early modern era, hinges on this possibility; of words becoming flesh. Thus, Catholics would take part in a sacrificial meal during Holy Mass, in which the host becomes the actual and physical body of Christ. Whereas Protestants would celebrate a ritual in which the host remains a symbol that signifies Christ. Shakespeare's metaphors follow a pattern that is discernible in and similar to the Catholic proposition on Holy Communion. When the wording of the mass is perceived not as merely symbolic, but if the signifier -the host- can turn into the signified -the body of Jesus Christ- then this gives divine power to words, namely the power to change meaning into matter. The metaphors in *Titus Andronicus* show a similar loss of distinction between signifier and signified, and consequently have a similar tendency to become real. As Fahey states: "the play reveals that it is this potential collapse of figurative and literal that gives a metaphor its transubstantiating power —its power to do, not just to tell" (53).
Shakespeare, similar to what he did with the subject of compassion, removes God from this equation as well, and endows words with the power to create reality.

Yet, the words in this play have no healing power, and the reality they create is a destructive and violent one. The notion that significance can be located in wounds is what underlies Titus' pain. Because he cannot conceive of meaning for his suffering his wounds have no redeeming power. Ironically, arch villain Aaron recognizes, even more clearly than Titus does, the power of words to wound, and he calls out, "Here's no sound jest! the old man hath found their guilt; / And sends them weapons wrapped about with lines /That wound, beyond their feeling, to the quick" (4.2.26-29). Whether words induce physical violence, and become reality, or whether they cause emotional stress that can only be rendered comprehensible by a reference to physical pain, it is the power of words to wound that make them more dangerous than weapons in this play. Like Titus in the beginning of the play, Aaron establishes this connection between words and wounds. It is a connection that we can now see as a link between suffering and meaning.

In exploring expressions of pain, *Titus Andronicus* explores expression, that is, language itself. In this, *Titus Andronicus,* finally, becomes a quest for the meaning of suffering. Since not even Shakespeare, who dares to take God out of compassion and communion, and replace Him with the power of words[19], can have found an answer to that question, it will have to remain a quest. Shakespeare does, however, place signposts that direct our thinking along the way. These signposts are: that wounds, and the suffering they imply, desperately warrant expression; that our bodies are inextricably bound up with the expression of emotions; and finally, that the true meaning of suffering is inexpressible and private. Yet the play also implies that the feelings of dissociation and even dislocation of someone in pain -which result from this impossibility of truly sharing grief- are universal and can be communicated, as they are in *Titus Andronicus*. The actor who plays a desolate Titus, utterly alone in his ocean of grief, "stand[s] as one upon a rock / Environed with a wilderness of sea (3.1.95,96), and at that moment shares Titus's feelings of isolation, with the sea of people that surrounds him.

In this chapter I have argued that *Titus Andronicus* is a play about emotional pain rather than about physical violence. Emotional pain is described with reference to the human body, as the MIP/MIPVU analyses that focus on the metaphoric use of the word 'wound' show. I have shown several ways in which the play explores the expression of grief. It is explored through the body itself as Titus moves downward in his sorrow. In Marcus' long speech, agony is surveyed through art. Because of Lavinia's enforced silence, her body becomes a canvas for others to write upon and a writing tool for herself. Her very silence is a telling expression of the inexpressibility of suffering. Language itself is explored to the limits of what language can do. By investigating the limits of the communication of emotional pain, whether it can be adequately communicated to others, or whether pain can even be shared with others, ontological questions are asked. This play of broken bodies and broken language explores the depths of emotional pain. In

19 Which, incidentally, is a biblical concept as well. Compare John1:1. In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.

doing so Shakespeare asks questions about the nature of language and the relationship between reality and fiction. In the link he forges between wounds and meaning he touches on the connection between language and our bodies, a topic that is still current today. Finally, Shakespeare is like Titus, who, in his quest for the meaning of suffering, is prepared to reinvent language all over again:

> Thou shalt not sigh, nor hold thy stumps to heaven,
> Nor wink, nor nod, nor kneel, nor make a sign,
> But I of these will wrest an alphabet
> And by still practice learn to know thy meaning (3.2.42-45).

2. Harmless Wounds and Harmful Words in Shakespeare's Coriolanus

The enigmatic titular hero of the play *Coriolanus* is defined by his ability to bleed for his country, but he refuses to share a view of his vulnerable body in exchange for a political vote. Because Coriolanus is incapable of making the connection between wounds and words: between the somatic and the metaphysical, he cannot relate to the citizens of Rome at a humane level either. Because Coriolanus honours his own truth, and nothing but his own truth, his own words lead to his downfall, making him a truly tragic hero.

Since of all Shakespeare's plays, *Coriolanus* has the highest word count for the word 'wound', I will start my exploration of this play with a focus on the single word 'wound'. I will also use the Metaphor Identification Procedure (MIP), to establish if the word 'wound' is, indeed, used metaphorically in *Coriolanus.* Based on this same procedure, I have declared *Titus Andronicus* a play about emotional pain rather than about physical violence. However, the outcome of the MIP for *Coriolanus* reveals that not one of the 22 occurrences of the word 'wound' is in fact an indirect metaphor. Since it is not possible to establish a distinction between the basic and the contextual meaning for any of the occurrences of 'wound', this means that in all these instances the word 'wound' is just that; a reference to a physical wound. There are, nevertheless, a few instances when the word wound is used as direct metaphor. In these cases, even though the word itself still refers to a physical injury, the contextual meaning is found directly within the phrase itself. These instances can be determined by using the extended version of the MIP, the MIPVU. They will be discussed when applicable because they do, in fact, shed some light on Coriolanus' attitude towards wounds and their meaning.

The fact that there is so little metaphoric use for the word 'wound' might account for some of the unease that one experiences when reading Coriolanus. The play repeatedly links the act of speaking to woundedness, and refers to exchanging wounds

for voices, or for words: “Your voices! For your voices I have fought; / Watched for your voices; for your voices bear / Of wounds two dozen odd” (2.3 136-137). Since the exchange of one word or concept for something else implies metaphoric content, this leads one to expect, and even to search for, another meaning than physical woundedness, where in fact there might be none. ‘Voices’ is used metonymically for votes, but ‘wound’ itself is not metaphoric. Even though there is hardly any metaphorical concept governing the word ‘wound’ in *Coriolanus,* the content of the play seems to imply the opposite.

In fact, as Eve Rachele Sanders so rightly states, “Coriolanus’ refusal to show his wounds *is* (my emphasis) the pivotal event in Shakespeare’s Roman history play” (387). Coriolanus’ crucial refusal to show his wounds in exchange for words or votes warrants closer attention, precisely because this refusal does imply a connection between the two. It is my contention that because Coriolanus himself does not attach any metaphoric meaning to his own woundedness that none, or hardly any, metaphors for ‘wounds’ are to be found within the play.

This lack of metaphoric content for the word ‘wound’ is connected to Coriolanus’ inability to accept his own woundedness. Coriolanus categorically refuses to be praised for his wounds. Yet, even this negation of his wounds’ worth is telling, as in each of these denials there is a connection to the spoken word. When he says “I had rather have my wounds to heal again / Than hear say how I got them” (2.2.79-80), he links his wounds to the words that are spoken about them, and for Coriolanus at least, words prove to be the most painful of the two. It is not wounds that frighten him, but words: “Yet oft, / When blows had made me stay, I fled from words” (2.2.83-84). In fact, the only time that he admits to his wounds as being painful is when they are talked about; by others, “my mother, / Who has a charter to extol her blood, / When she does praise me grieves me” (1.9.16-17).

Coriolanus does not want: “to hear [his] nothings monstered”[20] (2.2.91). Because to accept praise for receiving “unaching scars” (2.3.176) in honour of his country not only means that Coriolanus has to accept that he has done a worthy deed in honour of his country, but more importantly, that he has, in fact, bled for it. Moreover, if Coriolanus accepts the reality of his wounds, he has to accept their pain as well. When he appears “mantled in blood” (1.6.38), he comments, “my work has not yet warmed me . . . The blood I drop is rather physical / than dangerous to me.” (1.5.19-20). The Folger Shakespeare edition for this play refers to the practice of barber surgeons of letting blood in order to improve health, and it glosses the word ‘physical’ as medicinal (Mowat 46). Coriolanus, therefore, feels invigorated rather than hurt by the fight. As a warrior, Coriolanus can neither acknowledge the pain of his wounds nor, as we will see, the necessity to keep them from festering.

By rejecting praise, Coriolanus not only personifies his wounds, but also directly links his wounds to the act of speaking. When Coriolanus states, “I have some wounds upon me and they smart to hear themselves remembered” (1.9.32-33), it is as if his wounds cringe when they are talked about, and so become persons who are ashamed to hear the little they have done praised as something tremendous. The word ‘wound’ in this short phrase is not a metaphor, but it is involved in two other words that are: ‘smart’ and ‘hear’. ‘Smart’ is an indirect metaphor that compares the emotional pain of being talked about with the physical pain of receiving a wound. The resulting personification turns Coriolanus’ wounds into separate entities that almost seem to exist apart from Coriolanus; placed as they are, on the periphery of his skin. His wounds become active agencies that can hear, remember, and even feel pain. This first occurrence of the word ‘wound’ in the play immediately makes clear that to have others talk and give meaning to wounds is far worse to Coriolanus than actual physical pain.

[20] Coriolanus refers to his wounds in this sentence. He uses the word monstered because he compares the crowd that talks about these wounds with a multi headed beast: to Hydra and, thus to a monster.

When Coriolanus speaks so disdainfully of his wounds, his comrades warn him of the dangers of false pride. In fact, Coriolanus' achievements are far from little; he has just conquered a whole town singlehandedly. Nevertheless, his comrades say, it is just as well that his wounds smart when they are remembered in praise, "should they not, / well might they fester 'gainst ingratitude / and tent themselves with death" (1.9.34-36). Coriolanus' comrades tell him that it is crucial to acknowledge his own wounds, and it is paramount that he acknowledges the validity of the praise he receives for them. Not only is this necessary in order for wounds to heal, but it is vital in order to prevent death. The acknowledgment of woundedness is compared to 'tenting', that is: probing wounds with "a roll, usually of soft absorbent material, often medicated, . . . formerly much used to search and cleanse a wound, or to keep open or distend a wound, sore, or natural orifice"(*OED*). The verb 'to tent' derives from the even older meaning for the noun: that of a probe. In Coriolanus' refusal to tent his wounds, we recognize his objection to probe his wounds for other meanings than the merely physical. Coriolanus' brothers in arms are speaking metaphorically, of course, but Coriolanus, refuses to attach metaphoric meaning to his own woundedness. Since he is incapable of seeing his wounds as belonging to a non-physical domain, he, therefore, fails to heed the warning of his friends "not to become the grave of [his own] deserving" (1.9.24).

In fact, to probe his wounds for meanings other than those he himself attaches to his woundedness would mean a change of identity for Coriolanus. To perceive of wounds as points of entry of an enemy's sword, as signs of disfigurement or as breaches to the territory of his skin, would mean that Coriolanus has to perceive himself as someone who can be entered, disfigured or even breached. Coriolanus is incapable of doing this; wounds would literally become breaches in his identity of invincible warrior if he could.

It is possible that Coriolanus does not admit to being susceptible to pain because he endorses the (neo)-Stoic notion that pain "exists only insofar as the mind assents to it and allows itself to be affected by pain" (van Dijkhuizen, 222). When Coriolanus talks lightly, and even derogatively, of his wounds and his pain, by calling them "scratches with

briars, / Scars to move laughter only" (3.3.68-69), he seems to agree with Seneca's adage that "it is our Stoic fashion to speak of all those things, which provoke cries and groans, as unimportant and beneath notice" (XIII). Yet, Coriolanus lacks an important characteristic to be truly considered the stoic for whom, "ultimately, pain is only a bodily matter, and therefore distracts from the mental constancy to which the Stoic aspires [and for whom] physical sensations . . . ultimately possess no reality since genuine experience takes place in an exclusively mental realm" (van Dijkhuizen 221). Coriolanus seems to personify rather the opposite; when at war, he operates in an almost exclusively physical realm, and he seems singularly lacking in the element of rational thought. Coriolanus is no stoic, and he knows it. It is why he tells his mother, "tell me not / wherein I seem unnatural; desire not / t'allay my rages and revenges with/ Your colder reasons" (5.3.96-99).

Actually, Coriolanus shows far more affinity to a warrior who requires rage as an element of his war make up. Kristine Steenbergh in 'Green Wounds: Pain, Anger and Revenge in early modern Culture', refers to a "martial kind of anger [that] is not represented as a painful experience, but as a force that leads the warrior to ignore his pain to reach the higher goal of glory" (185). She cites a passage from Sydney's *Arcadia* as example:

> They bleeding so abundantly, that everybody that saw them fainted for them; and yet they fainted not in themselves: their smart being more sensible to other's eyes than to their own feeling" (Qtd in Steenbergh 185).

There are several scenes in *Coriolanus* that show an uncanny resemblance to the scene described above. General Cominius alludes to Coriolanus when he wonders, "who's yonder, / that does appear as if he were flayed? O gods, / He has the stamp of Martius" (1.6.28-30). Coriolanus, who might look as if he has been skinned alive, is not bothered in the least, and his only worry is whether he is too late to fight on; "come I too late?" (1.6.36). Coriolanus is "a thing of blood, whose every motion / as timed with dying

cries" (2.2.125-126). Time and again, Coriolanus, whose first name Martius links him to Mars, is depicted as an inviolable and invincible God of war.

My focus on woundedness in this very political Jacobean play brings one immediate comparison to the fore: James I and Coriolanus both have bodies in which imperfections are of no consequence. Coriolanus, who does not recognize his own fallible body, and who considers himself part or the ruling body of Rome, emulates James I who believed that "this Body politic wipes away every imperfection of the other Body" (Kantorowicz, 11). As a matter of fact, "in the first years of his reign, James I made the body politic analogy his almost excusive property" (Garganio, 335), as he described himself as the kingly head of a body which "is utterly void of . . . natural Defects and Imbecilities, which the Body natural is subject to" (Plowden qtd. in Kantorowicz, 9). Thus, in this reading, the play might even constitute a hint of criticism towards the king James' infallible body politic. Yet, while there are numerous parallels between the play's body politic and those bodies surrounding James I, tend to agree with Alex Gargiano that there is no "thoroughgoing parallel that construct[s] an allegorical narrative" (349) between James and Coriolanus.

Steenbergh relates the type of anger that Coriolanus asserts, in which "choler is conducive to courage"(169), to the aristocratic tradition in early modern England, and specifically mentions its "significant role in the political discourse of the Sydney-Essex faction" (181). Gail Kern Paster describes these martial noblemen or courtiers as the "socially intolerable nobleman" (191), of whom Thomas Wight wrote in 1604: "how vngratefull must his company seeme, whose passions ouer-rule him?" (qtd. in Paster 191). According to Paster, "aggressivity was always latent in the relations of men of honour". It is this "catastrophic explosiveness [that] magnify[s] the destructive power of the nobleman" (192). Coriolanus seems to bear not a little resemblance to the choleric nobleman who was, apparently, to be found among the courtiers of the king, or possibly among the aristocratic landowners who were not averse to taking the land of the poor, as I have discussed in the chapter on the body politic metaphor. King James as Scot might

have appreciated watching a play that ridicules notoriously bad-tempered Englishmen. However, if Coriolanus' role as aristocratic and heroic warrior can be seen as a pastiche of James the first's courtiers, it also serves as warning of what can happen if this code of conduct —in which anger serves as a conduit to courage in war— is taken to extremes. This is what happens to Coriolanus, whose 'catastrophic explosiveness wins him wars, but costs him votes, and ultimately his life.

Coriolanus' inability to accept his own wounds as painful is, therefore, inherent to the martial code that he represents. It is a code ingrained into Coriolanus by his mother Volumnia and by his mentor Menenius, who count off[21] all the wounds that they already know of: "He had before this last expedition twenty-five wounds upon him, now it is twenty-seven" (2.1.158-159). They perceive wounds as marks of valour that, almost like war medals[22], define Coriolanus as a warrior, and a strong hero[23]. Thus, wounds are something to be proud of, something to look forward to. "Oh is he wounded, I thank the gods for't" (2.1.25), cries Volumnia, who sees wounds as adornment to her son. Menenius and Volumnia between them are responsible for a third of the instances in the play, when the word 'wound' — or words similar to it: 'cicatrices' (2.1.153), 'hurts' (2.2.155), 'gash' (2.1.160) — are mentioned, and so represent a major view in the play that portrays Coriolanus' wounds as "marks of merit" (2.3.180).

Coriolanus, who does not accept his own woundedness, who cannot conceive of metaphoric meaning for his injuries, and who flees from rhetoric when it concerns his battle scars, is now asked to employ his woundedness as a tool in the political arena. In order to gain the votes necessary to become consul, Coriolanus needs to show his

---

[21] And, get their arithmetic slightly wrong. VOLUMNIA: "He received in the repulse / of Tarquin seven hurt's in the body. / MENENIUS: One i' th neck and two I'th' thigh —there's / nine that I know" (2.1.154-157).

[22] Not unlike the medals German soldiers in WW II received as marks of honour when they were wounded. The Wound Badge or 'Verwundetenabzeichen' came in various gradations depending on the severity of the wounds, and could also be awarded posthumously.

[23] Another intriguing parallel between Coriolanus' and Nazi Germany lies in the fact that the play was taught in schools in Nazi Germany, " with Coriolanus praised as an exemplary heroic leader . . . and a forerunner to Adolf Hitler". The play was blacklisted by the American authorities immediately after the Second World War. (Jane Armstrong. *The Arden Shakespeare Miscelany*. Londen: Methuen Drama. 2011.)

wounded body to the citizens[24] of Rome. From the beginning of the play, it is clear that for Coriolanus the citizens exist at an entirely different level of humanity. Throughout the play, he consistently refers to the common citizens in terms of animals: "He that trusts to you / Where he should find you lions finds you hares; / Where foxes, geese." (1.1,181-182), he calls them: "rats" (1.1.283). He questions the people's tribunes, "are these your herd?" (3.1.43), and refers to the citizens as the "mutable rank-scented meiny" (3.1.88), that is "calved i' the porch o' the Capitol" (3.1.304). Even though Menenius, in his exposition of the fable of the belly, calls the citizens the "lowest, basest, poorest, . . . the great toe" (1.1.164), he does incorporate them into the body politic, nevertheless. Coriolanus, on the contrary, calls the citizens 'scabs', and places them —as signs of imperfection— outside the body politic altogether. Therefore, to share his vulnerable body with these citizens would place Coriolanus on the same ground —or should I say the same foot— as the citizens. To share a violable body, is to belong to the same body after all. The next step, to connect at the level of the body politic should not be such a large one. This, Coriolanus refuses to do. One of the tribunes of the people accuses Coriolanus: "You speak o' th' people / As if you were a god to punish, not / A man of their infirmity" (3.1.107-108). However, because Coriolanus accepts neither the import of his own woundedness nor his shared humanity with the citizens he cannot engage with the citizens, and accept them as members of the body politic.

The citizens, do take their political obligation to Coriolanus very seriously, and two servants of the senate, like Coriolanus' comrades earlier, link ingratitude to injury, as they comment on this political responsibility: "But he hath so planted his honors in their eyes and / his actions in their hearts that for their tongues to / be silent and not confess so much were a kind of ingrateful injury" (2.2.29-32). Once again, as a failure to speak out results in further injury, words and wounds are linked. The citizens are well aware of their need for gratitude, and of their own power, as they talk, ironically, about how monstrous

[24] In discussing the reactions of commoners of Rome I will throughout refer to citizens, as this is the prefix that the Folger edition uses to denote the plebeians of Rome. These citizens should not be confused with the citizens of the ancient Greek city-states who did have far more advanced political rights.

it would be for the multitude to be ungrateful. Since as a crowd they naturally are many, and thus have many heads, their comparison to a multi-headed monster is not only metaphorically, but quite literally true as well. Coriolanus will later echo their epithet, when he calls the multitude, “the beast with many heads” (4.1.1-2). Meanwhile, the citizens ponder their power to either grant or withhold their votes:

> We have power in ourselves to do it, but it is a
> power that we have no power to do; for if he show us
> his wounds and tell us his deeds, we are to put our
> tongues into those wounds and speak for them; so, if
> he tell us his noble deeds, we must also tell him
> our noble acceptance of them. Ingratitude is
> monstrous, and for the multitude to be ingrateful,
> were to make a monster of the multitude: of the
> which we being members, should bring ourselves to be
> monstrous members (2.3.4-13).

The phrase “To put our tongues into his wounds and speak for them” is obviously non-literal. Nevertheless, it is more than a simple metonymy for the act of speaking, and the image that is conveyed —a crowd that puts their tongues into Coriolanus’ wounds— is gruesome. To put a tongue into something means to taste something, but to put a tongue into a wound also means to lick a wound. The sentence then also carries the meaning of a crowd that wants to have a taste of Coriolanus’ wounds, and even more incongruously, of a crowd that is licking Coriolanus’ wounds. This implies that by licking his wounds the crowd is suffering with Coriolanus. This intimacy with a crowd that sees and licks his wounds, and thus speaks for him is abhorrent to Coriolanus.

When Coriolanus is expected to appear in the marketplace without a tunic underneath his toga, in order to display his scars as evidence of his valour for Rome, he

states that he is incapable of asking the populace for their votes, and like the crowd did before him, he refers to the moving of his tongue as a bodily action: “What must I say? ‘I pray sir?’ —plague upon’t ! I cannot bring / My tongue to such a place” (2.3.53-55). “For Coriolanus, assigning a political significance to his scars is an unacceptable distortion of their true meaning” (Sanders 399). For Corolanus, the true meaning of his scars lies in their representation of valour. They are literal marks inscribed in his flesh that identify him as warrior. They are not suited as materials to barter with the citizens in an exchange in the market place, “as if I had received them for the hire / Of their breath only” (2.2.147-150). To have to show his wounds thus would change Coriolanus into a salesman; his wounds would become “marketing symbols”. “The charge Coriolanus makes here is that showing the scars would be an act of falsification” (399) because this act forces Coriolanus to abandon his warrior identity, in favour of that of a “politician working a crowd” (401). However, Coriolanus is persuaded to go to the marketplace after all, where he, ungraciously and very unwillingly, performs his duty.

The tribunes, who know Coriolanus is far more prone to rage than to reason, goad him on by, “putting him to rage, . . . [and] ta’en th’ advantage of his choler” (2.3.218-219). Provoked by the people’s tribunes Coriolanus lashes out against the citizens, who become aware of the extent of Coriolanus’ disdain. Moreover, when they realize that Coriolanus never did show his wounds, as “no man saw em” (2.3.181), they retract their vote. Coriolanus echoes the crowd’s earlier phrase, as he exclaims that they should be plucked out as a “multitudinous tongue [that should not] lick / the sweet that is their poison” (3.1.118-119). The crowd, portrayed as the voice of Rome, are not allowed not have a say in its ruling body, according to Coriolanus. Therefore, this same crowd, prodded on by their tribunes, screams treason, as Coriolanus fails to honour the little power that is legitimately theirs. As a result, Coriolanus is banished from Rome, and forms an alliance with his erstwhile opponent Aufidius. Together they march on Rome in revenge.

Various officials and friends plead with Coriolanus to renege on his revenge. They plead in vain, as Coriolanus, who lost his consulship by “lack of stooping” (5.6.34), will not budge here either. When Coriolanus contemplates surrendering, by bowing to the political power of the citizens, he envisages this in terms of bodily action. First of all he imagines changing his voice, and then he visualises the orientation of his body. In doing so, Coriolanus accredits an inseparable connection between body and mind.

> Well, I must do't: Away, my disposition, and possess me
> Some harlot's spirit! my throat of war be turn'd,
> Which quired with my drum, into a pipe
> Small as an eunuch, or the virgin voice
> That babies lulls asleep! the smiles of knaves
> Tent in my cheeks, and schoolboys' tears take up
> The glasses of my sight! a beggar's tongue
> Make motion through my lips, and my arm'd knees,
> Who bow'd but in my stirrup, bend like his
> That hath received an alms! I will not do't,

When he visualises the physical action of bending a knee, he realizes that he will not and cannot bend emotionally and intellectually, and states: “I will not do’t / Lest I surcease to honour mine own truth / And by my body’s action, teach my mind an inherent baseness”(3.2.148-150). Coriolanus appears to follow the same line of thinking —that the way our mind works is structured by our bodies— that Lakoff and Johnson use to explicate orientational metaphors. Coriolanus cannot disconnect the words he speaks from his bodily orientation.

Coriolanus is a man with only one identity, that of the heroic warrior, and he can only act according to that nature. “Would you have me / false to my nature?” (3.2.16,17), he had asked his mother earlier. However, his mother tells him, “now it lies you on to

speak . . . not by your own instruction" (3.2.68-69), and she seems to pun on the word 'lie' as she tells him to speak, "such words that are but roted in / Your tongue, though but bastards and syllables / Of no allowance to your bosom's truth" (3.2.70-73). Volumnia disconnects the words Coriolanus speaks from his body. The truth is found within his body, in his bosom. The lies, the words that he does not really mean, are like bastards that do not really belong to Coriolanus. These lie, as mere syllables learned by rote, on Coriolanus' tongue, which he could so easily move outside of his body. When Coriolanus states that he refuses to lie to the citizens because this would diminish him as a person, he makes it very clear that there is an inextricable link between his body and his mind. In fact, this link is the reason that he cannot cease to "honour [his] own truth" (3.2.148), and can only act according to his one true identity.

His mother addresses Coriolanus as, "Thou art my warrior", and refers to her own role in making him so: "I holp[25] frame thee" (5.3.72-73). Nevertheless, when she asks Coriolanus to agree to her proposal[26] for a treaty between Rome and the Volcsian army, she effectually asks Coriolanus, to lay down his role as warrior and become a politician. In doing so she asks Coriolanus to violate his own code of honour. Not only does he have to lie, but if he admits that the citizens share "his infirmity" (3.1.108), he also admits to his own vulnerable body. Since for the warrior Coriolanus his body and mind are inextricably linked, it is impossible to have an invincible state of mind and a vulnerable body simultaneously. Ultimately, this means that he has to cease to exist as warrior, and violate his own identity.

Coriolanus does give in to his mother, and agrees he will not march on Rome, and so Coriolanus, who hated Aufidius "more than a promise breaker"(1.8.8-9), breaks his own promise to his former archenemy and now possibly his lover. Aufidius is the first to recognize that this means a fatal breach in Coriolanus' identity: "He bowed his

---

[25] Helped to

[26] In doing so, she uses the language of a wounded body politic to accuse Coriolanus of "tearing / His country's bowels out" (5.3. 120-121). In doing so she echoes Menenius, who compared the senators of Rome to the belly, in the first act of the play.

nature, never known before / But to be rough, unswayable and free" (5.6.30-31). Coriolanus, who up till this point had heeded the maxim found in *Hamlet* "to thine own self be true" (3.1.), has violated his own code of honour. Since he can no longer exist as invincible warrior, and it is not in his nature to be a politician who agrees to treaties, he will have to cease to exist altogether, and so, violent death is the only natural outcome for him:

> Oh mother, mother!
> What have you done? Behold, the heavens do ope,
> The gods look down, and this unnatural scene
> They laugh at. O my mother, mother! O!
> You have won a happy victory to Rome;
> But, for your son, —believe it, O, believe it,
> Most dangerously you have with him prevail'd,
> If not most mortal to him. (5.3.205-213).

Coriolanus has not been able to link his words to his wounds, and when Aufidius murders him, he finally becomes "the grave of his own deserving"(1.9.24). . Even as the play provides a stark reminder of the power of reasoning, it also questions the power of politics, as the wheeling and dealing of the tribunes of the people seems to have carried the day. These lying tribunes only speak derogatively about the populace behind their backs, never in their faces. In doing so they are as much part of the wounded body of Roman politics a Coriolanus is. *Coriolanus* therefore can be construed as a warning; *Coriolanus* is what happens if those who rule cease to be aware of their own fallibility and vulnerability, and indeed of a shared humanity with those less noble them themselves. Because Coriolanus as a warrior cannot attach metaphoric meaning to his own wounds, he refuses to speak about them, and so cannot use them as a tool in the political arena. As a result, the wounded and wounding warrior becomes the victim of his own inability to adapt to a political view that gives a voice to the common people of Rome. Coriolanus'

tragedy is that he can only serve his country by ceasing to exist. It makes him a tragic hero, in this play in which time and again a failure to speak is seen as an injury.

V Conclusion

My aim in this thesis has been to discover if an underlying metaphorical concept that implies that wounds are connected to the concept of meaning, exists for the expressions of woundedness in the plays analysed in this thesis. Such a concept has been established for the play *Titus Andronicus.* For both plays a connection between words and wounds has also been established.

With the aid of the Metaphor Identification Procedure (MIP) the conceptual MAPPING: EMOTIONAL PAIN IS PHYSICAL PAIN could be construed for most metaphors for 'wound' in *Titus Andronicus*. Thus, the concept of 'woundedness' has been employed in explicating and giving meaning to emotional pain. This conclusion has been supported by subsequent literary analysis, which shows *Titus Andronicus* to be a study on grief.

It was not possible to construe a similar MAPPING for *Coriolanus*, since hardly any metaphoricity for the twenty-two occurrences of he word 'wound' could be determined by using the MIP. Based solely on the MIP or MIPVU analyses the conclusion would be that the concept of woundedness does not underlie the thought-processes for this play. However, subsequent literary analysis proves that this is not true and, in fact, this play hinges on the expression of the concept of woundedness.

I have first employed the MIP and MIPVU tools to determine metaphoricity. Following this, I have designated those source and target domains that were needed construe conceptual MAPPINGS based on the tenets of Conceptual Metaphor Theory. This has been followed by a literary analysis that explored whether the metaphoric concepts that were found did indeed govern the use of each individual play. I will discuss my conclusions for these analyses in this order. Finally I will expound my conclusion that

there is a connection between wounds and words, or between bodily trauma and meaning, which is reflected in the use, metaphorical or otherwise, of the word 'wound' for the plays discussed in this thesis.

My use of the MIP has alerted me to the metaphoric use of many of the instances of the word 'wound' in *Titus Andronicus,* and it has thus proved to be a helpful tool in determining metaphoricity. MIP defines indirectly used metaphors, which are metaphors that find the basic and contextual referents within one word. As these basic and contextual meanings are used to designate conceptual domains, MIP has also been helpful in determining the conceptual MAPPINGS for the plays. It is essential, nevertheless, to be aware that MIP does exactly, and only, what it professes to do. First of all, MIP only defines metaphor and nothing else. MIP does not establish other non-literal uses of a word. As the scholars who developed this tool concede, "we emphasize that any decision not to mark a word as metaphorical in context does not imply the word is being used literally (i.e., the word may express metonymic, hyperbolic or some other type of figurative meaning) (PRAGGLEJAZ 23). Secondly, MIP is a linguistic tool that works at sentence level. Since MIP, "[i]s applied to the lexical units of a single sentence of written text", this also means that MIP does not look at a complete text, or work of literature as a whole[27].

However, since MIP emphasizes the importance of establishing the meaning of a suspected metaphor within its context, this contextual focus has alerted me to the fact that those passages that contain metaphors for 'wound' in *Titus Andronicus* are highly dense with metaphors for other words as well. Shakespeare obviously uses more than a single metaphor to elucidate meaning, and often the various metaphors as well as the synecdochical, metonymic and analogical meanings interact with each other.

MIPVU, the extended version of the MIP, was helpful in establishing those metaphors for which the contextual meaning was found directly within the text. It has,

[27]MIP defines metaphoricity at sentence level, but does not mark a symbolic or allegorical text as metaphoric, because in these texts, "their lexical units relate directly and literally to situations that themselves have further metaphorical significance" (PRAGLEJAZZ 24).

therefore, been useful in establishing some of the similes and personifications in *Coriolanus* that would not have come to light had I only used the MIP.

I have established conceptual target and source domains with reference to the basic and contextual meanings of the MIP and MIPVU procedures. This has been necessary because my main interest in this thesis lies with the conceptual meaning of metaphors, and "MIP and MIPVU are primarily concerned with the linguistic level of metaphor analysis, not the conceptual level" (Dorst 132). The assignment of target domains and source domains has made clear that in *Titus Andronicus* 'wounds' occur as source domain, and in Coriolanus as target domain (See tables 2 and 3). This means that my assumption that Shakespeare uses the image of the wounded body to explicate more abstract concepts is true for *Titus Andronicus,* but not for *Coriolanus*. While in *Titus Andronicus* the concept of woundedness or bodily trauma is used to explicate an emotional state, the opposite is true for *Coriolanus*. In this play, as the designation of source and target domains shows, it is the concept of woundedness itself that is explicated.

One thing must be noted with regard to source and target domains. The terminology of using the target domain as that which we try to understand, and the source domain as that which is understood, does not do justice to the amount of cross-domain mapping that always occurs between domains. The phrase, "his wounds, his marks of merit" (2.3.180) is a case in point, as for this phrase it is not entirely clear whether wounds are explicated in terms of marks of merit, as I argue, or the other way round.

The theory behind the MIP, Lakoff and Johnson's Conceptual Metaphor Theory, forms the backbone for this thesis. The underlying metaphorical concepts for *Titus Andronicus* —the MAPPINGS— are based on this theory. A theory that suggests our thinking is conceptual in nature, and that these concepts are reflected in the metaphors we use. We draw a blank, however, if we look for the metaphors that Coriolanus uses in connection to 'wounds', and thus the observation that Coriolanus does not impute any metaphorical meaning to his own woundedness is a direct result of the application of this

theory. The citizens, as well as Coriolanus' mother and his friend Menenius, do want to impute political meaning to Coriolanus' wounds, and they even name a source domain for him: 'marks of valour'. Coriolanus, however, fails to recognize that ARGUMENT is indeed just as much WAR as the wars he fought, and he refuses to use his words as weapons in the political arena.

Both *Coriolanus* and *Titus Andronicus* follow a downward slope in their orientational metaphors. Titus' body moves downwards with his decline in power, and at his lowest point emotionally, he also lies down physically. Coriolanus also gives credit to the connection between body and mind, which forms the basis of orientational metaphors. When he contemplates surrendering his ideas of invulnerability, by bowing to the political power of the citizens, he envisages this in terms of bodily action (3.2.139-150). His statement that he will not bend and: "by my body's action, teach my mind an inherent baseness" (3.2.150), reflects Lakoff and Johnson's position on the spatial orientation of metaphors: "The system of conceptual metaphors is not arbitrary, . . . it is shaped to a significant extent by the common nature of our bodies" (245).

It has been imperative to conduct a literary analysis, in order to determine whether the metaphorical concept found for *Titus Andronicus* was reflected in the structure of the play as a whole as well. Literary analysis has, indeed, shown that, like Donald Freeman's CONTAINER and PATH schemata, the MAPPING: EMOTIONAL PAIN IS PHYSICAL PAIN is one of the underlying metaphors for *Titus Andronicus*. Moreover, evidence for this is found in the plot, the characters, the structure and in the language of the play. Literary analysis has also been necessary in order to explain why there is so little metaphoric content for woundedness in *Coriolanus.* In this play, Shakespeare demonstrates that the position of the play's titular hero who refuses to attach rhetorical meaning to his own woundedness is not tenable. Thus, this focus on woundedness, which had already been demonstrated in the few metaphors that had wounds or bodily trauma as their target domain, is found throughout the play. Therefore, literary analysis, does, indeed, show that the concept of woundedness is the target under investigation. It

is, in fact, one of the underlying thought processes for a play that constantly juxtaposes wounds to the act of speaking.

The metaphorical concept that explicates a state as analogous with a human body also plays a major role in *Coriolanus.* The fable of the belly is the most extended explication of this body politic metaphor, which is a structural metaphor that could be mapped as A STATE IS A BODY. Both plays therefore, make similar explicit or implicit statements about the nature of wounds and pain, the body and language.

Each play also conflates statements about the nature of language and the nature of suffering. In *Titus Andronicus* I have argued that the power that words have to wound makes them more dangerous than the weapons in this play. A similar truth is expressed by Coriolanus, who flees from words where blows would have made him stay (2.2.84). In both plays Shakespeare explores the concept of woundedness in relation to the human body, and in relation to language and meaning. In the person of Titus Andronicus the imminent sack of Rome is explored through wounded and mutilated bodies. As metaphoric concepts turn into reality, and signifiers into signified and vice versa, this stretches language to the limits of what it can achieve. In *Coriolanus,* the concept of an infallible body, which Coriolanus shares with James I, is taken to extremes. Coriolanus first of all demonstrates the absolute imperativeness of accepting a vulnerable body as a connection to humanity, and secondly, he demonstrates what happens when a failure to import meaning to bodily trauma results in a lack of political action. This lack of implied meaning is also reflected in the lack of metaphoric content for woundedness in the language of the play.

Thus the concepts in *Titus Andronicus* that typified Titus' 'quest for the meaning of suffering' can be found in Coriolanus as well. These concepts are: wounds and their implied suffering desperately warrant expression, our bodies are inextricably bound up with the expression of emotions, and finally: the true meaning of suffering is inexpressible and private. The preconception that significance can be located in wounds is what underlies Titus' pain, and its negative counterpart; that no significance can be found in

wounds, is what kills Coriolanus. However, this means that the underlying preconception for each play is the same: WOUNDS CARRY MEANING.

Both these very political plays also use the very common body politic metaphor of that time. Thus, both plays reflect on the precepts of good governance. *Titus Andronicus* does so in a setting of a fictional Rome that quickly runs out of successors after Titus refuses be the "head of headless Rome"(1.1.184). It is an apt theme during the reign of Virgin Queen Elizabethan the first. *Coriolanus* is a highly topical play as well. Whether it comments on the infallible body of King James I, or on notoriously bad tempered English aristocrats, or whether it discusses the current affairs of the Midland revolt, it does so in analogy to the metaphor of the wounded body politic. By employing the metaphor of a the body politic in its changed form of the wounded body politic both plays reflect the language of their times, and express concern for the state of affairs in early modern England.

Thus, the concept of woundedness has proven to be rich in metaphorical meaning. In fact, this is precisely what Shakespeare seems to express in each of these plays: the wounded body speaks. As wounds turn into mouths in *Coriolanus*, just like they did in *Julius Caesar*[28], they beg to be heard for other works of Shakespeare as well. It would be immensely rewarding to study the concept of woundedness in the history plays, for instance, or to investigate if the theme of the poem "The rape of Lucrece" concords with the story as it is presented in *Titus Andronicus.* The concept of woundedness coupled to the concept of meaning will prove, I suspect, a fountain that is rich in meaning indeed.

[28] "Show you sweet Caesar's wounds, poor poor dumb mouths. / And bid them speak for me" (3.2 237-238). "Put a tongue / In every wound of Caesar that should move / The stones of Rome to rise and mutiny" (3.2.240-242).

VI

Works cited

Alexander, Catherine M.S., ed. *Shakespeare and Language.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004. Print.

Betteridge, Thomas. *Tudor Histories of the English Reformations. 1530-83*, Ashgate: Vermont and Aldershot, 1999. Print

Covington, Sarah. *Wounds, Flesh, and Metaphor in Seventeenth-Century England.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009. Print.

Cicero, Marcus Tullius. *Cicero's Three Books Of Offices* or *Moral Duties*. Trans. Cyrus Edmonds. London: H. G. Bohn, 1856. http://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=hvd.32044051725422;view=1up;seq=23 Web. June 2014.

Christiansen, Nancy L. "Synecdoche, Tropic Violence, and Shakespeare's Imitatio in *Titus Andronicus.*" *Style 34.3 (2000): 350-379.* Web. Oct 2013.

Deignan, Alice. *Metaphor and Corpus Linguistics.* Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2005. Print.

Dijkhuizen, Jan Frans van., and Karl Enenkel, ed. *The Sense of Suffering: Constructions of Physical Pain in Early Modern Culture.* Leiden: Brill, 2009. Print.

Dijkhuizen, Jan Frans van. *Pain and Compassion in Early Modern English Literature and Culture.* Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2012. Print

Dorst, Aletta G. *Metaphor in Fiction: Language, thought and Communication.* Diss. VU Amsterdam, 2011. Oistewijk: BOX press uitgeverij, 2011. Print

Fahey, Maria F. *Metaphor and Shakespearean Drama: Unchaste Signification.* Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2011. Print.

Fortesque, John. *De Laudibus Legum Anglie.* Ed.,and Trans. Amos Andrew, and Gregor Francis. Cambridge: Printed by J. smith for J. Butterworth. 1825. *Internet Archive.* <delaudibusleguma00fortuoft> Web. June 2014.

Freeman, Donald C. "'Catch[ing] the nearest way': *Macbeth* and cognitive metaphor." *Journal of Pragmatics 24.* (1995): 689-708. Print.

Gray, Martin. *A Dictionary of Literary Terms.* London: Longman York Press, 2008. Print.

Hale, David, G. *The Body Politic: A Political Metaphor in Renaissance English Literature.* The Hague: Mouton, 1971. Print.

The Holy Bible, King James Version. Cambridge Edition: 1769; King James Bible Online, 2014. <http://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org/.> Web. June 2014.

Hindle, Stephen. "Imagining Insurrection in Seventeenth-Century England: Representations of the Midland Rising of 1607." *History Workshop Journal 66 (*Autumn 2008) : 21-61. Web. April, 2014.

Hillman, David, and Carla Mazzio, eds. *The Body in Parts: Fantasies of Corporeality in Early Modern Europe.* New York: Routledge, 1997. Print.

Kaegi, Ann. "'How apply you this?' Conflict and consensus in Coriolanus." *Shakespeare.* (Feb. 2008): 362-378. Web. April 2014.

Kövecses, Zoltan. *Metaphor: a Practical Introduction.* Oxford: Oxford UP, 2002. Print.

Kantorowicz, Ernst. T*he King's Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1957. Print.

Laughlin Fawcett, Mary L. *"*Arms/Words/Tears: Language and the Body in *Titus Andronicus.*" *ELH* 50:2 (Summer 1983) 261-277. Web Nov. 2013.

Lakoff, George., and Mark Johnson. *Metaphors we Live by.* Chicago: Chicago UP, 1980. Print.

Larkin, James F., and Paul Hughes L., ed. *Stuart Royal Proclamations, vol. 1: Royal Proclamations of King James I 1603-1625,* Oxford: UP, 1973. Print.

Mc Donald. Russ *Shakespeare and the Arts of Language*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2001. Print

McEachern, Claire. "Shakespeare, religion and politics." *The New Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare*. Ed. Grazia, Margreta, Stanley Wells. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001. 185-300. Print.

More, Thomas. *The Latin Epigrams of Thomas More*, Ed. Leicester Bradner and Charles

A.Lynch Chigago: Chigago UP, 1953. Print.

Mowat, Barbara A., and Paul Werstine, Ed. *Folger Shakespeare Library: Coriolanus.* By William Shakespeare. New York: Simon & Schuster paperback, 2006. Print.

Mowat, Barbara A., and Paul Werstine, Ed. *Folger Shakespeare Library: Titus Andronicus.* By William Shakespeare. New York: Simon & Schuster paperback, 2010. Print.

Murphy, George L. "On Metaphoric Representation." *Cognition,* 60 (1996): 173-204. Print.

Musolff, Andreas., "Metaphor in the History of Ideas and in the History of Discourse: How can we interpret a medieval version of the body-state analogy?" *Metaphor and Discourse.* Ed. Andreas Musolff and Jorg Zinken. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 231-247. 2009 Print.

Oxford English Dictionary Online. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1989. Web.

Paster, Gail Kern. *Humoring the body: Emotions and the Shakespearean Stage.* Chicago: Chicago UP, 2004. Print.

Pettet, E, C. "Coriolanus and the Midlands Insurrection in 1607", *The Shakespeare Survey* 3 (1950): 34-42. Print

Pragglejazz group. "MIP: A Method for Identifying Metaphorically Used Words in Discourse." *Metaphor and Symbol,* 22.1 (2007):1-39. Print.

Salisbury, John. *Policratus.* Trans., and Ed. Cary J Nederman. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1990. Print.

Sanders, Eve Rachele. "The Body of the Actor in *Coriolanus.*" *Shakespeare Quarterly* 57:4 (2006): 387-412. Web. Aug 2013.

Sawday, Jonathan. *The Body emblazoned: Dissection and the Human Body in Renaissance Culture.* London: Routledge, 1995. Print

Schoenfeldt, Michael. " Aesthetics and Anesthetics: The Art of Pain Management in Early Modern England." *The Sense of Suffering: Constructions of Physical Pain in Early Modern Culture.* Ed. Jan-Frans Van Dijkhuizen and Karl Enenkel. Leiden: Brill, 2009. 19-38. Print.

- - -. “Something for the pain.” Suffering, the Body, and the Senses in the Religious Culture of Early Modern Europe. Sixteenth Century Society Conference. Puerto Rico, 25 Oct. 2013. Reading.

Sellars, John. *The Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy.* Neo-Stoicism, n.d. <http://www.iep.utm.edu/>, Web. 6 May 2014.

Shakespeare, William. *Coriolanus.* Eds. Barbara Mowat and Paul Werstine. New York: Simon & Schuster paperback, 2006. Print.

Shakespeare, William. *Coriolanus.* Eds. Barbara Mowat and Paul Werstine. New York: Simon & Schuster paperback, 2006. Print

Sontag, Susan. *Illness as Metaphor.* New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1978. Print

Shutova, Ekaterina., and Simone Teufel. “Metaphor Corpus Annotated for Source - Target Domain Mappings.” *Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation.* Ed.Nicoletta Calzolari et al. Malta: European Language Resources Association (ELRA) May 2010. Web Dec. 2013.

Steen, Gerard J., et al. “Metaphor in usage.” *Cognitive Linguistics* 21.4 (2010): 765-796. Print.

Steenbergh, Kristine. “Green Wounds: Pain Anger and Revenge in Early Modern Culture.” *The Sense of Suffering: Constructions of Physical Pain in Early Modern Culture.* Ed. Jan-Frans Van Dijkhuizen and Karl Enenkel. Leiden: Brill, 2009. 165-187. Print.

Wabuda, Susan. “Of Martyrs and History.” Rev. of *Tudor Histories of the English Reformations* by Thomas Betteridge. Vermont and Aldershot, 1999. Print.

Welsh, Ryan. “Theories of Media: Keywords glossary” *University of chicago.* Winter 2007:

Windig, Annemieke “ Wounds Wielding Words The Language of Wounds in Antony’s forum speeches of Shakespeare’s *Julius Caesar* ” 2011. Essay, < http://csmt.uchicago.edu/glossary2004/ekphrasis.htm>. Web. Dec. 2013.

Wooten, David. James I. "'Kings Are Justly Called Gods'. Divine Right and Democracy": *An Anthology of Political Writings in Stuart England*. London: Penguin Books, 1986. Modern World History Online. Facts On File, Inc. < http://www.fofweb.com/activelink2.asp?

ItemID=WE53&iPin=SIWH0049&SingleRecord=True> Web. 8 June 2014.

VII Appendix

1. Word count

Searched database at www.opensourceshakespeare.org for the keyword wound

Table 1 Word count

Comedy	All forms of *wound* *(wound, wounds, wounded)*	**33**	instances
	All's well	2	
	As you like it	8	
	Love's labour lost	4	
	Measure for measure	2	
	Merchant of Venice	3	
	Midsummer Night's Dream	3	
	Much Ado about Nothing	2	
	Taming of the Shrew	2	
	Tempest	2	
	Two Gentlemen of Verona	4	
	Winter's Tale	1	

Tragedy	All forms of *wound*	**91**	
	Antony and Cleopatra	11	
	Coriolanus	22	

	Hamlet	7	
	Julius Caesar	10	
	King Lear	1	
	Macbeth	5	
	Othello (3 x = stage directions)	5	
	Romeo and Juliet	7	
	Timon of Athens	4	
	Titus Andronicus	10	
	Troilus and Cressida	10	

History	All forms of *wound*	**83**	
	Cymbeline	7	
	Henry IV Part 1	11	
	Henry IV Part 2	8	
	Henry V	5	
	Henry VI Part 1	6	
	Henry VI Part 2	7	
	Henry VI Part 3	11	
	Henry VIII	2	
	King John	9	
	Pericles	1	
	Richard II	10	
	Richard III	6	

Sonnets	All forms of *wound*	**5**	
	34	1	
	120	1	
	133	1	
	139	2	
Poems	All forms of *wound*	**19**	
	Lover's Complaint	1	
	Passionate Pilgrim	3	
	Rape of Lucrece	18	15
	Venis and Adonis	9	
	total in all works	**231**	**217**

Word count

I have used the Open Source Shakespeare Website (OSS) to determine the word-count for wound (http://www.opensourceshakespeare.org/). Words derived from the word wound are included. This means wounds, wounded, wounding wounded are not counted separately but as a form of wound. I have also used the OSS to check for terms related to the word 'wound' for example: cut, laceration, grief, injury, blood etc, as the number of times these words are used, and their place within the play might shed some light on their connection to the them of bodily trauma.

The word wound, and words deriving thereof, appears 217 times in Shakespeare's works in plays, poems and sonnets. If we compare histories, comedies and tragedies we

see, not surprisingly, that comedies score lowest: 33 times, followed by histories 83 times and tragedies 91 times. Of the tragedies, the play *Coriolanus* yields the highest number for the keyword wound (22) followed by the other Roman plays; *Antony and Cleopatra* (11), *Julius Caesar* (10), *Titus Andronicus* (10) and by *Troilus and Cressida* (10). In terms of relative numbers the poem *the Rape of Lucrece* (18) follows *Coriolanus*. However, in this thesis I will look at plays only.

2. Table 2 MIP / MIPVU for Titus Andronicus

Numbers correspond with MIP/MIPVU analyses Numbers in parenthesis refer to place within text

wound	MIP	MIPVU	source	target
1 (1.1.320)	+		bodily hurt	emotional pain
2 (1.1.372)	+		bodily hurt	wounded honour = emotional pain
3 (2.3.263)	+		bodily hurt	emotional wound wounded feeling
4 (3.1.94)				
5 (3.1.97)				
6 (3.1.251)	+		bodily hurt	emotional pain
7 (3.2.15)	+		bodily hurt	emotional wound
8 (4.2.29)	+		bodily hurt	emotional wound
9 (4.4.95)				

10 (5.3.88)	+		bodily hurt	damaged city

3. Table 3 MIP / MIPVU for Coriolanus

Coriolanus. Numbers correspond with MIP/MIPVU analyses Numbers in parenthesis refer to place within text					
metaphoric use for 'wound'	not 'wound',	MIP	MIP VU	source	target
1 (3.1.32)		-	-		
2 (2.1.123)		-	-		
3 (2.1.123)		-	-		
4 (2.1.125)		-	-		
5 (2.1.127)		-	-		
5a	become	+		ornamentation	wounds
6 (2.1.251)		-	-		
7 (2.1.253)		-			
8 (2.1.258)		-	-		
9 (2.1.261)		-	-		
10 (2.2.78)		-	-		
11 (2.2.163)		-	-		
personification	for my wounds sake		-	person	wounds
12 (2.3.6)		-	-		
13 (2.3.7)		-	-		

	put tongues into these wounds	+	-	bodily movement	speaking about wounds
14 (2.3.55)		-	-		
15 (2.3.85)		-	-		
16 (2.3.116)		-	-		
17 (2.3.138)		-	-		
18 (2.3.180)		-			
	marks	+		damaged surface	sign of quality
His marks of merit, his wounds			+	sign of quality	wounds
19 (2.3.183)		-	-		
20 (3.3.65)		-			
(3.3.66)	graves	-			
	wounds like graves		+	graves	wounds
21 (4.1.8)		-			
22 (4.2.39)					

4. MIP / MIPVU Analyses

Analysis per occurrence of '*wound*'

When using the MIP it is important to take the context in which a metaphor occurs into consideration, this is why each analysis starts with those lines of the play that disclose the context of the scene.

(a) The first part of the actual analysis clarifies the context by giving, if necessary, an outline of that part of the plot, and/or an explanation of what came before.

(b) The MIP starts by looking at the contextual meaning, and then tries to find a more basic referent for this word. I have deviated from this. Since I am not determining the metaphoricity of several words, but of one and the same word only, the basic meaning for this word has been given first. It reflects what I have been doing; I have been checking to see if the contextual meanings differ from this known basic referent.

The headings (b)3 and (b)4 reflect step 3 of the MIP procedure: "Decide whether the contextual meaning contrasts with the basic meaning, but can be understood in comparison wit it. Under the '(b)3 Distinct' heading I reflect on the contrast between basic and contextual meaning. Under the '(b)4 Similar' heading I reflect on the similarity that is necessary in order to form a comparison.

The final decision on whether 'wound' (and words derived thereof: wounds, wounded) acts as metaphor is found under heading (b)5.

(c) The MAPPINGS reflect conceptual domains. In order to determine a mapping, I have looked at those source and target domains that reflect the basic and contextual meanings of the analysed words.

(d) Since I am interested in the conceptual domain for the whole of each play, I also give relevant for that particular scene, act or for the play as a whole.

(e) In the comments section I remark on those words within the passage that are used the theme I am investigating.

Analysis for occurrences of the word '*wound',* or words derived thereof, in *Titus Andronicus* and *Coriolanus*

When using the MIP it is important to take the context in which a metaphor occurs into consideration, this is why each analysis starts with those lines of the play that disclose the context of the scene.

(a) The first part of the actual analysis clarifies the context by giving, if necessary, an outline of that part of the plot, and/or an explanation of what came before.

(b) The MIP starts by looking at the contextual meaning, and then tries to find a more basic referent for this word. I have deviated from this. Since I am not determining the metaphoricity of several words, but of one and the same word only, the basic meaning for this word has been given first. It reflects what I have been doing: I have been checking to see if the contextual meanings differ from this known basic referent.

The headings (b)3 and (b)4 reflect step 3 of the MIP procedure: "Decide whether the contextual meaning contrasts with the basic meaning, but can be understood in comparison wit it. Under the '(b)3 Distinct' heading I reflect on the contrast between basic and contextual meaning. Under the '(b)4 Similar' heading I reflect on the similarity that is necessary in order to form a comparison.

The final decision on whether 'wound' (and words derived thereof: wounds, wounded) acts as metaphor is found under heading (b)5.

(c) The MAPPINGS reflect conceptual domains. In order to determine a mapping, I have looked at those source and target domains that reflect the basic and contextual meanings of the analysed words.

(d) Since I am interested in the conceptual domain for the whole of each play, I also give a literary analysis that shows how the conceptual domains, found at sentence level, are relevant for that particular scene, act or for the play as a whole.

(e) In the comments section I remark on those words within the passage that are used non-literally, or that have metaphoric meaning, when and if these words have a bearing on the theme I am investigating.

TITUS ANDRONICUS

(1.) TITUS ANDRONICUS (1.1.305-321)

SATURNINUS. Full well, Andronicus,

Agree these deeds with that proud brag of thine,

That said'st I begg'd the empire at thy hands.

TITUS ANDRONICUS. O monstrous! what reproachful words are these?

SATURNINUS. But go thy ways; go, give that changing piece

To him that flourish'd for her with his sword

A valiant son-in-law thou shalt enjoy;

One fit to bandy with thy lawless sons,

To ruffle in the commonwealth of Rome.

TITUS ANDRONICUS. These words are razors to my **wounded** heart**.**

(a) Context within the play

These words are razors to my **wounded** heart **(1.1.320).**

Titus has come home victorious in battle, bringing with him 21 dead sons who need to be buried. He refuses to spare the son of Tamora, the conquered queen of the Goths, and Tamora's son is hacked to pieces and burnt as a religious sacrifice. The people of Rome have named Titus a candidate to be elected Emperor. However, Titus refuses this candidacy, and names Saturninus, who thanks him by taking Titus' daughter Lavinia as wife. Lavinia is not happy, and wants to stay betrothed to Saturninus' brother Bassianus. When Lavinia's brothers try to take her with them, Titus calls his sons traitors and kills one of them, for bringing dishonor on him. Saturninus now no longer wants Lavinia, and calls Titus' sons lawless "fit to ruffle in the commonwealth of Rome" (1.1.319). These words of Saturninus are like razors to Titus' heart.

(b) MIP and MIPVU analysis

1) ***Basic:*** The basic meaning of the adjective 'wound' refers to the physical injury as in *OED* sense 1b: "wounded, *adj.* Subjected to, injured or impaired by, wounding; suffering from a wound or wounds. b. Of parts of the body".
2) ***Contextual:*** The contextual meaning refers to an emotion. It reflects *OED* meaning 3, which refers to figurative use: "*3.fig.* Deeply pained or grieved".
3) ***Distinct: Yes,*** the basic meaning is human-oriented; it refers to a pain that is located in the human body. The contextual meaning refers to a feeling of

discomfort in an abstract psychological domain. Although emotional pain is often given a physical location, as is the case here for 'wounded heart', it is not actually possible to pinpoint a location for emotional pain. Therefore, bodily and emotional pain are distinct.

4) ***Similar: Yes,*** the emotion that is felt as a result of spoken words is compared to pain that is felt after receiving a physical injury. Thus, the concept of pain is compared.

5) ***Yes***, '***wound' is an indirect metaphor***.

***(c) MAPPING*:** The basic meaning of 'wounds' is connected to the source domain. The contextual meaning: the emotional pain that Titus feels, is connected to the target. Thus emotional pain is explained in terms of physical pain. The emotional pain that Titus feels derives from treasonous words. There are two suggestions for mappings.

1. EMOTIONAL PAIN IS PHYSICAL PAIN
2. TREASON IS AN AGENT THAT WOUNDS

(d) Literary analysis: The emotional pain that Titus feels comes from words that are sharp. The sharpness of words is compared to the sharpness of razors. Saturninus' words are treasonous because they bear no relation to the truth, and therefore are a betrayal of what Titus is, and what Titus stands for. Saturninus called Titus "proud and ambitious" (1.1.203), just one line after Titus has declined becoming the emperor, proclaiming he would rather have, "a staff of honor for mine age / But not a scepter to control the world (1.1.200). So, Saturninus, rather than Titus, is the ambitious one. Saturninus curses Titus: "Andronicus, would thou wert shipp'd to hell, / Rather than rob me of the people's hearts!" (1.1.208-209). Since the people of Rome have "by common voice" (1.1.20) chosen Titus as their emperor, it is clear from the context the opposite is true: it is Titus, and not Saturninus, who has conquered the Romans' hearts. Saturninus is established early on in the play as an antagonist who antagonizes. Saturninus accuses Titus of character traits that are, in fact, his own. He accuses Titus being false. Yet, it is Titus who is the true patrician, since he is the one who remains loyal to Rome.

(e) Comments:

The word 'wounded' does not occur as an isolated metaphor. In the short sentence "these words are razors to my wounded heart" three: (razors, wounded and heart) of the four nouns are used metaphorically.

(2.) TITUS ANDRONICUS (1.1. 362-364 and 371-374)

MARCUS ANTONICUS. My lord, this is impiety in you:

My nephew Mutius' deeds do plead for him

He must be buried with his brethren. . . .

TITUS ANDRONICUS. Marcus, even thou hast struck upon my crest,

And, with these boys, mine honour thou hast wounded:

My foes I do repute you every one;

So, trouble me no more, but get you gone.

(a) Context within the play

And with these boys mine honour hast **wounded (1.1. 372).**

There is a dispute between Titus, his sons and their uncle Marcus Andronicus. Titus calls his family traitors. They want to bury Mutius, the son who Titus has just killed for opposing the emperor, in the family grave. Titus refuses this, since to be buried there would mean Mutius died an honourable death, whereas his son was "basely slain in a brawl" (1.1.360).

(b) MIP and MIPVU Analysis

1) ***Basic:*** The basic meaning of the word 'wound' refers to the physical injury as in *OED* sense 1: "wound, v. To inflict a wound on (a person, the body, etc.) by means of a weapon; to injure intentionally in such a way as to cut or tear flesh".
2) ***Contextual:*** It is the abstract concept honour that is seen as something that can be injured. This relates to *OED* sense: "2a *fig*. To injure, inflict pain or hurt upon, in a manner comparable to the infliction of a wound; in later use *esp*. to pain or grieve deeply".
3) ***Distinct: Yes,*** the basic meaning refers to a distinct physical injury. The contextual meaning refers to injury of the abstract concept of honour. An abstract concept and a physical injury are distinct.
4) ***Similar:*** Yes, the violation of an abstract concept is injured "in a manner comparable to the infliction of a wound" (*OED* meaning 2a for wound).
5) ***Yes*, 'Wound' is an indirect metaphor.**

***(c) M*APPING** The basic meaning: physical injury refers to the source domain: the wounded body. The contextual meaning refers to the target domain: wounded honour. Thus honour is comparable to a body (part) that can receive an injury.

1. WOUNDED HONOUR IS LIKE A WOUNDED BODY PART
2. EMOTIONAL PAIN IS PHYSICAL PAIN
3. HONOUR CAN FEEL PAIN

4. HONOUR CAN BE WOUNDED

5. HONOUR IS A PERSON

6. ABSTRACT CONCEPTS ARE LIKE BODY PARTS

(d) Literary analysis: The concept of honour is important here. It is both Titus' "personal title to high esteem" (*OED* sense 1 for honour) and his "sense of strict allegiance to what is due or right (to some conventional standard of conduct)" (*OED* sense 2) that have been violated. Titus adheres to honourable conduct, which he places above the life of his own son. He considers his anger, and therefore the outcome of his anger, as justified. He cannot see any other course of action, and therefore he is hurt by Marcus' suggestion that he do otherwise. In his retort to Marcus he refers to another symbol of honour: the crest. Marcus' remark is perceived as an unexpected slight. Even Marcus strikes him when he is up.

(e) Comments:

The word 'wounded' is not the only word in this passage that carries metaphoric meaning. The word 'crest' carries several connotations, "the head, summit or top of anything" (*OED 5),* derives from the tuft of hair or feathers on an animal's head (*OED 1,a*), and was later used for the feathers on military helmets (*OED* 2). Besides that, it is "a symbol of pride, self-confidence, or high spirits" (*OED 1b)*. Here Titus means literally: 'when I was struck at the height of my success'. Yet the overtones of the other meanings are there, since his success is military and Saturninus accuses him of being proud.

When Titus speaks of wounded honour he personifies honour, since honour like a person can be wounded. The concept of honour has several connotations, all of which can be applied to Titus. First of all there are those meanings that report respect or esteem: "High respect, esteem, or reverence, accorded to exalted worth or rank;" (*OED 1a).* Secondly honour signifies: "Glory, renown, fame; credit, reputation, good name" (*OED 1c).* Then there are those meanings that report an elevation of character: "Personal title to high respect or esteem; honourableness; elevation of character; 'nobleness of mind, scorn of meanness, a fine sense of and strict allegiance to what is due or right (also, to what is due according to some conventional or fashionable standard of conduct)" (*OED* 2). If we look at the latter part of *OED* definition 2 we can see how this reflects on Titus, who adheres very closely to his understanding of what is due and right according to the standard of Rome. It is Saturninus' denial of this type of honour that rankles. Thus, the words 'crest' and 'honour' in this passage enhance the metaphoric concept of 'wounds'.

In this play there are often several layers of meaning at work in one word or sentence, new ones appearing on close scrutiny, for example, when Titus says "with these boys mine honour thou hast wounded" the meaning of 'with' is ambiguous. It can refer to either or both of the following. 'With' can refer to Marcus who with Titus' sons tries to talk sense into Titus. It can also refer to Titus' sons as the cause for wounding Titus' honour. Their actions: defying Rome and defying their father's command are the cause of Titus' wounded honour.

(3.) TITUS ANDRONICUS (2.3. 238- 241, 255- 264)

[Enter SATURNINUS with AARON]

SATURNINUS Along with me: I'll see what hole is here,
And what he is that now is leap'd into it.
Say who art thou that lately didst descend
Into this gaping hollow of the earth?

MARTIUS The unhappy son of old Andronicus:
Brought hither in a most unlucky hour,
To find thy brother Bassianus dead.

SATURNINUS My brother dead! I know thou dost but jest:
He and his lady both are at the lodge
TAMORA. Where is my lord the king?

SATURNINUS. Here, Tamora, though grieved with killing grief.

TAMORA. Where is thy brother Bassianus?

SATURNINUS. Now to the bottom dost thou search my **wound**:
Poor Bassianus here lies murdered.

(a) Context within the play

Now to the bottom doest thou search my **wound (2.3. 263 - 264).**

Tamora's lover Aaron has set a trap for Bassianus, who is Saturninus' brother and husband to Lavinia. Bassianus and Lavinia are lured into the woods. Tamora's sons, Chiron and Demetrius, kill Bassianus. His body is put in a hole or a pit. Aaron then lures Titus' sons Martius and Quintus, to this pit. When Martius falls into the pit he discovers Bassianus, when Quintus tries to rescue Martius he too falls in.

(b) MIP and MIPVU analysis

1) ***Basic***: The basic meaning of the word 'wound' refers to the bodily injury as in *OED* 1.a. wound, *n.* A hurt caused by the laceration or separation of the tissues of the body by a hard or sharp instrument, a bullet, etc.; an external injury".

2. ***Contextual:*** The contextual meaning refers to an abstract concept such as psychological pain. It relates to *OED* sense: "2a *fig*. To injure, inflict pain or hurt upon, in a manner comparable to the infliction of a wound; in later use *esp*. to pain or grieve deeply".
3. ***Distinct: Yes,*** bodily and emotional pain are distinct.
4. ***Similar: Yes,*** feelings of emotional pain are compared to the infliction of a wound. See also *OED* meaning 2a.

5. Yes, 'wound' is an indirect metaphor

(c) **MAPPING**

EMOTIONAL PAIN IS PHYSICAL PAIN

(d) Literary analysis:

The 'wound' that is searched to the bottom refers to the emotional pain that Saturninus feels, or professes to feel, when he sees his own brother murdered —at his own instigation— at the bottom of a pit. A wound is compared to a container that can be searched. This emphasizes the allusion to the pit that was searched, and which was found to hold dead bodies. The allusion to a pit also refers to the rape of Lavinia, who pleads to be killed and to be kept from the "worse than killing lust" of Chiron and Demetrius. "Tumble me into some loathsome pit she pleads" (2.3.176). The thinly veiled reference to the pit as allusion for rape appears again when Quintus asks: "What subtle hole is this / Whose mouth is covered with rude-growing briers"(2.3.199-200). When, in the following lines, he speaks of, "drops of new shed blood/ As fresh as morning dew distilled on flowers" (2.3.201-202), the reference to Lavinia's deflowering is inescapable.

When Saturninus pronounces the word 'wound', he refers to the emotional pain that he professes to feel when he sees his dead brother. His wound can be probed or searched like a physical wound. Of course it is Saturninus himself who is the cause of the injuries of the Andronici. The phrase "to the bottom dost thou search my wound" foregrounds the loathsome pit as grave for Bassianus, Marius and Quintus, and is a symbol for the rape of Lavinia. The phrase also questions the legitimacy of Saturninus' remark. When his wound is probed to the bottom, Saturninus' sorrow will prove to be false.

(e) Comments: Strangely enough, the word 'wound' could also refer to a literal wound in the layers of the earth, in the sense that a pit is a actual separation of the tissues or layers of earth. This ties in with the, now obsolete, meaning that the *OED* gives for search: "To probe (a wound) Obs.1400-1687" (*OED* 8). In fact Saturninus'

sentence, as discussed above, is given as sole example for this use by the *OED*. This means that 'search', in the phrase' search to the bottom' carries several meanings. The basic meaning, "to explore, examine thoroughly" (*OED*) applies, but there is an added contextual meaning of probing a wound, which is fore-grounded by the occurrence of the word 'wound' in the same sentence.

Thus, the word 'bottom' in this sentence adds several layers of meaning. There are dead bodies lying at the bottom of the pit. There is the depth of the emotional wound that Saturninus allegedly feels. This highlights with the spatial orientation of the *OED's* definition for bottom: "the lowest part of anything considered as a place or position in space" (*OED*). The above-mentioned probing of a wound is captured in our modern phrase 'getting to the bottom of a problem' and thus alludes to understanding the meaning of something. The *OED* gives examples of similar meanings used between 1577 till 1877: "The fundamental character, essence, reality". It refers to the use of 'searching for meaning' in phrases such as: "to search, etc., to the bottom: to examine thoroughly, to find out the real character of, . . . to underlie, to be the real author or source of (*OED:II*. 12). The indication of "to be the real author of" is significant, as in this passage Saturninus *is* (my emphasis) the real author of the event that causes the fall into the pit of several bodies.

There is yet another, now obsolete, meaning that could be into play here: *OED* 10:a. "That upon which anything is built or rests; the foundation. Obs". Part of Saturninus' deceit rests, quite literally, on the bodies in the bottom pit. Saturninus' deceit is that he grieves for his brother Bassianus whom he has put into the pit. The foundation of his deceit, the dead Bassianus lies on the bottom of that pit. Finally, there is the reference to the body part 'bottom'. This word, and the pit itself are both allusions to Lavinia's rape.

Once again, this is a passage in which rhetorical devices are used in profusion. 'Wound' is certainly not an isolated metaphor. All nouns and the main verb in this short sentence are metaphoric. There are so many meanings of the word 'bottom' that are vying for attention that it is difficult to see which one is fore-grounded.

(4.) TITUS ANDRONICUS (3.1. 84 - 94)

MARCUS ANDRONICUS O, that delightful engine of her thoughts
That blabb'd them with such pleasing eloquence,
Is torn from forth that pretty hollow cage,

Where, like a sweet melodious bird, it sung
Sweet varied notes, enchanting every ear!

LUCIUS O, say thou for her, who hath done this deed?
,thus I found her, straying in the park,
Seeking to hide herself, as doth the deer
That hath received some unrecuring **wound**.

(a) Context of sentence within play

Seeking to hide herself, as doth the deer/ That hath received some unrecurring **wound (3.1.94).**

Marcus, Titus' brother, has found Lavinia in the park with her hands cut off, her tongue cut out and "ravished"(stage directions scene 4). The previous scene and act were almost entirely taken up by his long and extremely eloquent monologue, in which his highly stylized language contrasts incongruously with the graphic facts of Lavinia's rape. His monologue continuously refers to the classical story of Philomena, whose tongue had been cut out in a similar fashion by her rapist. Philomena embroidered a sampler to reveal the identity of the person who had violated her. Not only is the horror of Lavinia's rape anesthetized by esthetic language, the rape itself is turned into a classical tale. This story places a —literary— screen between the horrendous violence of the rape, and so makes the telling of it bearable. Thus, literature and eloquent language are used to alleviate pain. Notwithstanding this, Lucius is aware of the gruesome impact his news will have on Titus, and he uses a much simpler metaphor: Lavinia is like a wounded deer, he says.

(b) MIP and MIPVU analysis

1) **Basic:** The basic meaning of the word 'wound' refers to the bodily injury as in *OED* "1.a. wound, *n.* A hurt caused by the laceration or separation of the tissues of the body by a hard or sharp instrument, a bullet, etc.; an external injury".
2) ***Contextual:*** The contextual meaning also refers to the bodily injury and therefore is the same as the basic meaning.
3) **Distinct*: No,*** there is no distinction between basic and contextual meaning. Since they are the same they cannot be contrasted.
4) ***Similar: No,*** the meanings are identical, and therefore no comparison can be made between them.
5) Since both meanings are identical there is ***no metaphoric use.***

(c) MAPPING: No mapping can be obtained since there is no metaphoric use.

(d) Literary analysis: The 'wounds' that Lucius referred to are physical wounds that a deer would receive when injured. So, there is no metaphoric use for the word 'wound'. Lavinia is compared to a wounded animal that is hiding in the woods. If Lavinia is a wounded animal, 'wound' could possibly be a reference to her rape. However, in this case it is more likely a reference to the physical injuries she has sustained during her rape, as in the lines preceding this one Marcus referred to the cutting out of her tongue.

***(e) Comment*s:** The word *unrecurring* is interesting in this sentence. The only mention of this word in the *OED* is for this very sentence. There is also only one meaning: "not admitting of recovery". (*OED*). This substantiates the use of 'wound' as a reference to physical injuries. Lavinia has physical injuries –her hands that are cut off and her tongue is cut out– that cannot recover or be regained. The word 'unrecurring' is a good example of how Shakespeare invents new word by adding suffixes or, as in this case, prefixes derived from Latin. Since there is only one mention of the word in the *OED*, this clearly was not a word that saw much continued use.

(5.) TITUS ANDRONICUS (3.1.94 - 97)

TITUS ANDRONICUS. It was my dear; and he that **wounded** her
Hath hurt me more than had he killed me dead:
For now I stand as one upon a rock
Environed with a wilderness of sea

(a) Context within the play

It was my dear; and he that **wounded** her **(3.1.97)**

Titus expresses his grief when he hears what has happened to his daughter.

(b) MIP and MIPVU analysis

1. ***Basic:*** The basic meaning of the word 'wound' refers to the bodily injury as in *OED* "1.a. wound, *n.* A hurt caused by the laceration or separation of the tissues of the body by a hard or sharp instrument, a bullet, etc.; an external injury".
2. ***Contextual:*** The contextual meaning is identical to the basic meaning. The wounds that are referred to are the actual wounds that Lavinia sustained when she was physically attacked, and subsequently raped. This sentence is a continuance from the one above. Marcus is still speaking about the physical wounds of Lavinia.

3. Distinct: No, there is no distinction between basic and contextual meaning.

4. Similar: No, meanings cannot be contrasted since they are identical.

5. 'Wound' is not used metaphorically

(c) MAPPING: No mapping can be obtained since there is no metaphoric use.

(d) Literary analysis:

In this sentence, which immediately follows Lucius' words, Titus, in what seems an inappropriate moment for punning, takes up Lucius' theme of a deer, when he says: "She was my dear" (3.1.97).

(e) ***Comments:*** No comments.

(6.) TITUS ANDRONICUS (3.1.246 -254)

MARCUS ANDRONICUS. Now let hot AEtna cool in Sicily,
And be my heart an ever-burning hell!
These miseries are more than may be borne.
To weep with them that weep doth ease some deal;
But sorrow flouted at is double death.

LUCIUS. Ah, that this sight should make so deep a **wound**,
And yet detested life not shrink thereat!
That ever death should let life bear his name,
Where life hath no more interest but to breathe!

(a) Context within the play

Ah, that this sight should make so deep a **wound (3.1. 251).**

The sight that causes grief in this passage is the sight of the two severed heads of Titus' sons together with his own cut off hand. They are returned to Titus, adding insult to injury, quite literally , since Titus had cut off his own hand in order to save his two sons.

(b) MIP and MIPVU analysis

1. ***Basic*:** The basic meaning of the word wound refers to the definition of bodily injury as mentioned in the *OED*: "1.a. wound, *n.* A hurt caused by the laceration or separation of the tissues of the body by a hard or sharp instrument, a bullet, etc.; an external injury".
2. ***Contextual:*** The contextual meaning refers to emotional pain as a result from seeing. This refers to the figurative use mentioned in the OED sense 2: "To injure, inflict pain or hurt upon, in a manner comparable to the infliction of a wound; in later use *esp*. to pain or grieve deeply".

3. ***Distinct: Yes,*** the contextual meaning refers to emotional trauma that results from witnessing a terrible event. The basic meaning relates to physical pain as a result from a bodily injury.
4. ***Similar: Yes,*** inflicting emotional trauma is comparable to inflicting bodily trauma. Emotional pain can be experienced as a sensation Similar: to bodily pain. See above: *OED* sense 2.
5. ***'Wound' is metaphorically used***

(c) ***MAPPING:*** The target, emotional pain, as result from seeing a terrible sight, is explained in terms of the source domain; a physical injury. Thus:

EMOTIONAL PAIN IS PHYSICAL PAIN

(d) Literary analysis: The passage preceding this finds Titus extolling his grief: "Is not my sorrow deep, having no bottom? Then be my passions bottomless with them" (3.1.221-222). If Titus seems to become the voice of grief, Marcus, as ever in this play, is the voice of reason: "But yet let reason govern thy lament" (223). For Titus it is the absence of reason that contributes to the enormity of his suffering. The very fact that there is no reason means that his suffering is also limitless: "If there were reason for these miseries, / Then into limits could I bind my woes" (3.1.224-225). When Titus' grief is at its height, a messenger returns, bringing Titus the heads of his two sons as well as Titus' own hand which he had hewn off in order to save those two sons. Whereas before shared grief gave some solace, "to weep with them that weep doth ease some deal" (3.1.249), now this sight, which makes a mockery of grief, wounds so much it is small wonder it does not kill as well, twice. For: "sorrow flouted at is double death" (3.1.250)

(e) ***Comments:*** No comments.

(7.) TITUS ANDRONICUS (3.2.12 - 20)

TITUS ANDRONICUS. Thou map of woe, that thus dost talk in signs!
When thy poor heart beats with outrageous beating,
Thou canst not strike it thus to make it still.
Wound it with sighing, girl, kill it with groans;
Or get some little knife between thy teeth,
And just against thy heart make thou a hole;
That all the tears that thy poor eyes let fall
May run into that sink, and soaking in
Drown the lamenting fool in sea-salt tears.

(a) Context within the play

Wound it with sighing girl **(3.2.15)**

(b) MIP and MIPVU analysis

1. ***Basic:*** The basic meaning of the verb 'wound' refers to causing bodily injury as in *OED* "1.a. wound, *v.* To inflict a wound on (a person, the body, etc.) by means of a weapon; to injure intentionally is such a way as to cut or tear flesh".
2. ***Contextual:*** The contextual meaning refers to causing emotional pain. This relates to *OED* sense: "2a *fig*. To injure, inflict pain or hurt upon, in a manner comparable to the infliction of a wound; in later use *esp*. to pain or grieve deeply".
3. ***Distinct: Yes,*** the basic meaning refers to inflicting physical pain and the contextual meaning refers to causing emotional suffering.
4. ***Similar: Yes,*** the concept of pain is compared. We can understand emotional pain in terms of physical pain.
5. **'Wound' is an indirect metaphor.**

(c.) MAPPING: EMOTIONAL PAIN IS PHYSICAL PAIN

(d) Literary analysis: Titus calls Lavinia "a map of woe" (3.2.12). Lavinia herself is not only a map of misery she is also the map that charts Titus' grief. He is no longer the detached stoic, but seems lost in an ocean of grief. Lavinia, who has been forced into silence, forces words to his grief from Titus' mouth.

(e) Comments: When Titus talks to his daughter he tells her to wound her heart with sighing. It could be argued that he refers to physically wounding or damaging of Lavinia's heart. In that case both basic and contextual meaning would be the same, and wound would not be used metaphorically. However, since the complete passage explicates emotional pain in terms of physical pain, and a heart cannot be physically wounded with sighing, I regard this instance as metaphoric.

(8.) TITUS ANDRONICUS (4.2.18-29)

DEMETRIUS What's here? A scroll; and written round about?
Let's see;
[Reads]
'Integer vitae, scelerisque purus,
Non eget Mauri jaculis, nec arcu.'

CHIRON O, 'tis a verse in Horace; I know it well:
I read it in the grammar long ago.

AARON Ay, just; a verse in Horace; right, you have it.
[Aside]
Now, what a thing it is to be an ass!

Here's no sound jest! the old man hath found their guilt;
And sends them weapons wrapped about with lines,
That **wound**, beyond their feeling, to the quick.

(a) Context within the play

Weapons wrapped in lines that **wound** beyond their feeling to the quick **(4.2.28-29).** Titus has his grandson Lucius deliver "a bundle of weapons and verses writ upon them" (4.2.1, stage direction). The text is a verse of Horace which translates: "He who is of upright life and free of crime does not need the javelins or bow of the Moor" (Horace's *Odes* 1.22.1-2).

(b) MIP and MIPVU analysis

1. ***Basic:*** The basic meaning of the verb 'wound' refers to causing bodily injury as in *OED* "1.a. wound, *v.* To inflict a wound on (a person, the body, etc.) by means of a weapon; to injure intentionally is such a way as to cut or tear flesh".
2. ***Contextual:*** The contextual meaning refers to painful feelings. This relates to *OED* sense: "2a *fig*. To injure, inflict pain or hurt upon, in a manner comparable to the infliction of a wound; in later use *esp*. to pain or grieve deeply".
3. ***Distinct: Yes,*** the basic meaning refers to pain as a result from an injury. There is no literal wound. The contextual meaning refers to painful emotions, caused by words. These meanings are sufficiently distinct.
4. ***Similar: Yes,*** emotional pain that is felt upon reading certain lines is understood as the pain that is felt when receiving a physical injury.
5. ***Yes, wound is an indirectly used metaphor.***

(c) MAPPING: EMOTIONAL PAIN IS PHYSICAL PAIN

(d) Literary analysis

In this passage it is Aaron who is the most astute. Not only does he recognize the Latin passage, he immediately recognizes why Titus uses these specific lines. The references to an upright life free of crime, coupled with the mention of a Moor, might refer to Aaron himself, or to Tamora's sons. This text seems to pierce Aaron's calm momentarily, and he recognizes that it is the *meaning* of these lines that "wound[s] beyond their feeling to the quick". The words cut to the bone, and this is more hurtful than physical pain. Aaron is hurt by lines from a story from a classical text. Moreover, Aaron is also hurt by lines that appeared in a schoolboy's grammar.

Young Lucius has, in an aside, already mentioned that Chiron and Demetrius have been: "deciphered" (4.2.8), thus preparing the listener for a passage that is full

of references to 'words' and 'wit' and to the meaning of words. Aaron speaks of: "no sound jest" (4.2.26), as the lines in question are written, and not spoken out loud, so they make no sound. The text is dangerous to Aaron, and therefore not wholesome: not sound, to Aaron. The weapons are wrapped, possibly[1] in the paper that bears lines of words. Yet, the actual weapons can, ironically, be considered as carrying a more dangerous threat than implied by the –physical– danger of the weapons themselves. The weapons are, thus, the wrapping for dangerous words. The boys only recognize that the words come from a schoolbook, a grammar. They do not grasp their implied meaning. This makes them "asses" (4.2.25) in Aarons' eyes. The boys remain dumbly ignorant. They cannot see further than the immediate, while Aarons sees cause and effect; he knows why, and sarcastically refers to the reason behind Titus' words: Lavinia's rape. "Had he not reason Lord Demetrius? / Did you not use his daughter very friendly?" (4.2.41).

(e) Comments

Again, the word 'wound' appears in a passage of high rhetorical and metaphorical density. Even in this one sentence there are several metaphors and allusions at play simultaneously. There are weapons that wound, literally and generally. However, the reference to a specific classical text is also a reference to a specific crime within the play.

(9.) TITUS ANDRONICUS (4.4.91-98)

TAMORA. Then cheer thy spirit: for know, thou emperor,
I will enchant the old Andronicus
With words more sweet, and yet more dangerous,
Than baits to fish, or honey-stalks to sheep,
When as the one is **wounded** with the bait,
The other rotted with delicious feed.

SATURNINUS But he will not entreat his son for us.

TAMORA. If Tamora entreat him, then he will:

(a) Context within the play

When as the one is **wounded** with the bait **(4.4.95).**

When Saturninus hears that Lucius has joined the Goths and is marching against him he is disheartened: "These tidings nip me and I hang the head/ As flowers with frost or grass beat down with storms" (4.4.73-74). To cheer his spirits, Tamora holds a

[1] In the stage direction we read about a bundle of weapons and verses writ upon them. A few lines later Demetrius refers to: A scroll and written round about (4.2.18) while Aaron speaks of weapons wrapped in lines.

rousing speech, “King, be thy thoughts imperious like thy name” (4.4.84). She mistakenly believes that she can fool Andronicus, and she uses a metaphor of bait that wounds a fish and believes her own words far more dangerous than this poisonous bait.

(b) MIP and MIPVU analysis

1. ***Basic*:** The basic meaning of the word ‘wound’ refers to the bodily injury, as in *OED* “1.a. wound, *n.* A hurt caused by the laceration or separation of the tissues of the body by a hard or sharp instrument, a bullet, etc.; an external injury”.
2. ***Contextual:*** The contextual meaning is the same as the basic meaning, they both refer to being physically injured in this case the e'xternal injury that is referred to is the injury that a fish receives when he takes to the bait and finds that it is hooked; the fishhook causing the injury.
3. ***Distinct: No,*** there is no distinction between basic and contextual meaning.
4. ***Similar: No,*** since contextual and basic meaning are identical, they cannot be compared.
5. ***No metaphor***

(c) MAPPING: No mapping

(d) Literary analysis:

In the end, it is not Titus, but Tamora, who will take the bait that Titus has prepared for her. The “delicious feed” (4.1.96) that Tamora talks of prefigures the pie Titus has prepared for her as revenge.

(e) Comments: No comments.

(10.) TITUS ANDRONICUS (5.3. 81 - 96)

MARCUS ANDRONICUS. Speak, Rome's dear friend, as erst our ancestor,
When with his solemn tongue he did discourse
To love-sick Dido's sad attending ear
The story of that baleful burning night
When subtle Greeks surprised King Priam's Troy,
Tell us what Sinon hath bewitch'd our ears,
Or who hath brought the fatal engine in
That gives our Troy, our Rome, the civil **wound**.
My heart is not compact of flint nor steel;
Nor can I utter all our bitter grief,
But floods of tears will drown my oratory,

And break my utterance, even in the time
When it should move you to attend me most,
Lending your kind commiseration.
Here is a captain, let him tell the tale;
Your hearts will throb and weep to hear him speak.

(a) Context within the play

That gives our Troy, our Rome, the civil **wound (5.3.88).**

Marcus speaks after the final frenzy of killing in the last act. He wants to teach the Romans to: "knit . . . the broken limbs again into one body" (5.3.73), and refers to the city or state of Rome as a body. In this last instance of the use of 'wound' the relationship between a wounded city and a wounded body is introduced. Rome has indeed suffered terribly from bad politics, and Shakespeare employs the body politic metaphor to explicate this.

(b) MIP and MIPVU analysis

1. ***Basic*:** The basic meaning of the word 'wound' refers to the bodily injury, as in *OED* "1.a. wound, *n.* A hurt caused by the laceration or separation of the tissues of the body by a hard or sharp instrument, a bullet, etc.; an external injury".
2. ***Contextual:*** The contextual meaning indicates a damaged city. This relates to *OED* sense: "2a *fig*. To injure, inflict pain or hurt upon, in a manner comparable to the infliction of a wound; in later use *esp*. to pain or grieve deeply".
3. ***Distinct: Yes,*** a city is distinct from a human body.
4. ***Similar: Yes,*** it is possible to understand a damaged city in terms of a damaged or injured body. The fact that a city is often (metaphorically) referred to as a body underlines this.
5. ***Yes, 'wound' is an indirect metaphor.***

(c) MAPPING

A CITY IS A BODY

A CIVIL WOUND IS A PHYSICAL WOUND

(d) Literary analysis

There have been many allusions to classical texts in this play. Now, Rome is compared to Troy. Both cities had boundaries that were breeched, and enemies from without that attacked the city from within. Unlike the Trojan soldiers, Tamora does not enter by stealth, but becomes part of Rome by her marriage to Saturninus. She remains Rome's enemy and contributes to its downfall by plotting the downfall of the one true noble Roman of the play: Titus Andronicus. Characteristics of skin and flesh are placed on cities. Both have boundaries that can be broken, pierced, and cut, and

thus, a city is like a body. This metaphor, as part of the body politic metaphor, will play a much larger role in the next play: *Coriolanus*.

(e) Comments:

Titus Andronicus can be said to be about who has a hand in what in Rome. Titus, who certainly at the beginning of the play, stood for what was true and noble about Rome, has become handicapped (quite literally). His loss of his hands betokens his loss of power, and Titus can be seen as a symbol for Rome itself.

CORIOLANUS

There are several instances when analyses have been grouped together. This has been done when occurrences of the word 'wound' are found in close proximity of each other, and are all subject to the same analysis. When an entry warrants a more elaborate comment or further literary analysis, it has been treated separately.

(1.) *Coriolanus* (1.9.24-40)

COMINIUS You shall not be
The grave of your deserving; Rome must know
The value of her own: 'twere a concealment
Worse than a theft, no less than a traducement,
To hide your doings; and to silence that,
Which, to the spire and top of praises vouch'd,
Would seem but modest: therefore, I beseech you
In sign of what you are, not to reward
What you have done—before our army hear me.
CORIOLANUS I have some **wounds** upon me, and they smart
To hear themselves remember'd.
COMINIUS Should they not,
Well might they fester 'gainst ingratitude,
And tent themselves with death. Of all the horses,
Whereof we have ta'en good and good store, of all
The treasure in this field achieved and city,
We render you the tenth, to be ta'en forth,
Before the common distribution, at
Your only choice

(a) Context within the play

I have some **wounds** upon me, and they smart / To hear themselves remember'd (3.1.32-33).

The Romans are at war wit the Volsces. Caius Martius has just taken their town Corioles singlehandedly. Caius Martius, who will hereafter be named Coriolanus, tells his comrade Cominius that he does not want to be praised for this deed.

(b) MIP and MIPVU analysis

1. ***Basic:*** The basic meaning of the word 'wound' refers to the bodily injury, as in *OED* "1.a. wound, *n.* A hurt caused by the laceration or separation of the tissues of the body by a hard or sharp instrument, a bullet, etc.; an external injury".
2. ***Contextual:*** The contextual meaning is the same as the basic meaning; it also refers to a bodily injury.
3. ***Distinct: No,*** basic and contextual meaning are identical.
4. ***Similar: No,*** since basic meaning and contextual meaning are identical, there is no ground for comparison on the basis of similarity.
5. ***No, There is no indirect metaphoric use for 'wound' in this sentence.***

(c) MAPPING for 'wound': No, Wound is not an indirect metaphor. However, smart is used metaphorically. Therefore, a mapping can be made that incorporates 'wounds' as part of the source domain in the phrase 'wounds that smart'.

MAPPING for smart: EMOTIONAL PAIN IS PHYSICAL PAIN.

The basic meaning of to smart refers to: "a sharp, often intense, physical pain, esp. such as is caused by an external agency (a blow, sting, etc.), or by *a wound* (my italics) (*OED*). The source domain refers to physical pain and is connected to 'wound'. The contextual meaning is distinct, since it refers to an emotional pain that is felt upon hearing oneself remembered. Thus, physical pain and emotional pain are compared.

The word 'hear' is also used metaphorically. The basic meaning: "To perceive, or have the sensation of sound" (*OED*) contrasts with the contextual meaning in which an inanimate object is endowed with a sense that perceives sound. Cross-domain mapping does occur at a conceptual level between the concept 'WOUNDS', and the concepts SMART, HEAR and REMEMBER. Mappings could be:

WOUNDS FEEL PAIN,

WOUNDS CAN HEAR/REMEMBER and thus,

WOUNDS ARE PERSONS.

(d) Literary analysis:

Cominius recognizes the importance of receiving praise; to him, receiving praise is a right, and therefore when due praise is withheld this is like theft. He anticipates what will finally happen if Coriolanus persists in his unwillingness to receive admiration. If the wounds, as symbols of Coriolanus' war effort, are not given due praise, they might fester, and ultimately lead to death. Indeed, they foreshadow Coriolanus' death, who, "become[s] the grave of [his own] deserving"(1.9.24).

(e) Comments:

The word 'wound' itself is not metaphoric, because it refers only to physical wounds. However, its use is ambiguous for the wounds themselves feel pain; they smart when they are remembered. Wounds are personified. Besides being active agents that cause pain, wounds simultaneously become passive receivers of pain, and thus they signify both cause and effect.

Several of the following analyses have been grouped together.

(2., 3.) *Coriolanus* (2.1.118-123)

MENENIUS AGRIPPA. A letter for me! it gives me an estate of seven
years' health; in which time I will make a lip at
the physician: the most sovereign prescription in
Galen is but empiricutic, and, to this preservative,
of no better report than a horse-drench. Is he
not **wounded**? He was wont to come home **wounded**

(4.) *Coriolanus* (2.1.125)

VOLUMNIA O, he is **wounded**; I thank the gods for't.

The analysis for the following three instances, which occur in close proximity to each other, is identical and is therefore given only once.

(a) Context within the play

Is he not **wounded**? He was wont to come home **wounded** (2.1.122-123)

O, he is **wounded**; I thank the gods for't. (2.1.125)

Menenius Agrippa, Coriolanus' friend and mentor, and Volumnia his mother, look forward to Coriolanus' return from the war with the Volsces. Both of them recognize the importance of war wounds that can be shown in order to gain the necessary votes from the citizens of Rome. Therefore, both are first hopeful, and finally glad when Coriolanus comes home wounded.

(b) MIP and MIPVU analysis

1. ***Basic:*** In each of the three instances the basic meaning of the word 'wound' refers to the bodily injury as in *OED:* "1.a. wound, *n.* A hurt caused by the laceration or separation of the tissues of the body by a hard or sharp instrument, a bullet, etc.; an external injury".

2. ***Contextual:*** The contextual meaning refers to the wounds that Coriolanus has sustained during his war efforts. It denotes the same bodily injury that we see as basic meaning.
3. ***Distinct: No,*** the basic and contextual meanings are identical for all instances of 'wound' that are used here.
4. ***Similar: No,*** since both meanings are identical they cannot be compared on the basis of similarity.
5. ***No, 'wound' is not used metaphorically***

(c) MAPPING: No mapping can be obtained.

(d) Literary analysis: The wounds that Coriolanus has sustained in the war are literal wounds. Although, in this instance there is no metaphoric meaning for the word 'wound', within the context of this play wounds are far from meaningless. This is a recurring theme in this play; wounds are something to be looked forward to, something to be proud of.

(e) ***Comments:*** No comments.

(5.) *Coriolanus* (2.1.126- 129)

MENENIUS AGRIPPA. So do I too, if it be not too much: brings a'
victory in his pocket? The **wounds** become him.
VOLUMNIA. On's brows: Menenius, he comes the third time home
with the oaken garland.

(a) Context within the play

The **wounds** become him (2.1.127).

Menenius and Volumnia continue their theme of extolling Coriolanus' virtues. These virtues are directly linked to the wounds he has received while fighting.

(b) MIP and MIPVU analysis

1. ***Basic:*** The basic meaning of the word 'wound' refers to the bodily injury as in *OED* "1.a. wound, *n.* A hurt caused by the laceration or separation of the tissues of the body by a hard or sharp instrument, a bullet, etc.; an external injury".
2. ***Contextual:*** The contextual meaning is also the basic meaning.
3. ***Distinct: No,*** basic and contextual meanings are identical
4. ***Similar: No,*** since both meanings are identical they cannot be compared on the basis of similarity.
5. ***'Wound' is not used metaphorically***

There is no case to be made for wound as a linguistic metaphor. At a conceptual level wounds are personified, and cross-domain mapping does occur between wounds and persons. These mappings hinge on the metaphoric use of the word 'become'

5 'Become' is used metaphorically

(c) ***MAPPING:*** There are two mappings to be made for the phrase 'the wounds become him'. One is for Coriolanus who is personified into a wound. He is not wounded but, quite absurdly, becomes a wound himself. The mapping for this metaphor, which operates at sentence level, would be:

WOUNDS ARE CORIOLANUS, or

WOUNDS ARE A PERSON.

And even: CORIOLANUS IS A WOUND.

A second mapping for 'become' as linguistic metaphor focuses on the meaning of 'become' as a form of ornamentation; something that is becoming to a person. The basic meaning, then, is defined by *OED* sense III, which describes suitability and ornamentation: "To agree or accord with; suit, befit, grace" (*OED III)*. The contextual meaning is distinct from the basic meaning, as the contextual meaning refers, incongruously, to wounds that are becoming to, or that adorn a soldier. Wounds are compared to ornaments. Thus the target domain ornamentation is understood in terms of the source domain, wounds. Thus, a mapping could be:

WOUNDS ARE ORNAMENTATION

(d) Literary analysis:

When Menenius speaks of wounds that are becoming to Coriolanus, Volumnia echoes this, when, in the next sentence, she speaks about the oaken garland that sits well on Coriolanus' brow. The Oak crown was a form of decoration and could only be worn by Roman citizens who had saved the lives of their fellow citizens by slaying an enemy. This underlines the meaning of wounds as a form of decoration, like war medals. To Menenius and Volumnia, wounds are something positive. They both link wounds to badges of honor. Coriolanus' wounds personify him, and he personified by his wounds. He is presented as a violent soldier who has the capacity to wound and be wounded in the course of fighting. However, when he has to present his wounds in order to gain admission into the senate he fails. His inability to show himself as wounded turns the Roman citizens against him. Coriolanus in response to them will turn against Rome and becomes the instrument that wounds Rome.

(e) Comments:

Besides those connotations mentioned above, there are several even older descriptions for *become* in the OED. Each of these connotations piles up an extra layer of meaning. The first, now obsolete, meaning that the *OED* gives is: “To come, to come about” This implies that the wounds happen to Coriolanus, almost outside his own volition.

The *OED* gives two refinements for the meaning, “to agree with or to suit” (*OED III)*. The first of these, now extinct, meanings refers to something that is: “congruous, appropriate, fitting” (III, a). This is what Volumnia and Menenius feel about Coriolanus’ wounds: they are fitting for a war hero. The second addition to this meaning is: “To agree or accord with; suit, befit, grace. Said esp. of an accessory, property, attribute, quality or action, suiting or gracing it owner”. If we look at these characteristics in detail we see that all of them fit the description of Coriolanus’ wounds as well. First, ‘accessory’, wounds are befitting accessories for Coriolanus, like the oaken garland that will grace his brow in the next sentence. Second, ‘property’, wounds are not only an accessory, but to Coriolanus his wounds are his sole property, he cannot share them with the base citizens. Finally, ‘Attribute or quality’: Coriolanus’ wounds are an attribute to his warlike actions, and for his mother and his friend wounds are seen as Coriolanus’ best quality.

(6., 7., 8.) *Coriolanus* (2.1.142-159)

VALERIA. In troth, there's wondrous things spoke of him.
Menenius Agrippa. Wondrous! ay, I warrant you, and not without his
true purchasing.
VIRGILIA. The gods grant them true!
VOLUMNIA.True! pow, wow.
MENENIUS AGRIPPA. True! I'll be sworn they are true.
Where is he **wounded**?
[To the Tribunes]
God save your good worships! CORIOLANUS is coming
home: he has more cause to be proud. Where is he **wounded**?
VOLUMNIA. I' the shoulder and i' the left arm there will be
large **cicatrices** to show the people, when he shall
stand for his place. He received in the repulse of
Tarquin seven **hurts** i' the body.
MENENIUS AGRIPPA. One i' the neck, and two i' the thigh,—there's
nine that I know.

VOLUMNIA. He had, before this last expedition, twenty-five

wounds upon him.

MENENIUS AGRIPPA. Now it's twenty-seven: every gash was an enemy's grave.

(a) Context within the play

(6,7,8.) *Coriolanus* (2.1.251, 253, 258)

As before, Volumnia and Menenius continue their theme of drawing attention to the virtue of receiving wounds. The fact that wounds are something to be proud of is mentioned yet again.

(b) MIP and MIPVU analysis

1. ***Basic:*** The basic meaning of the word 'wound' refers to the bodily injury as in *OED* "1.a. wound, *n.* A hurt caused by the laceration or separation of the tissues of the body by a hard or sharp instrument, a bullet, etc.; an external injury".
2. ***Contextual:*** In all three occurrences of 'wound' that are mentioned here, the basic meaning is identical to the contextual meaning.
3. ***Distinct: No.***
4. ***Similar: No,*** since both meanings are identical it is not possible to compare them, and therefore there is no ground for metaphoric use.
5. ***No, 'wound' is not used metaphorically.***

(c) MAPPING: No mapping can be obtained since there is no metaphoric use.

(d) Literary analysis:

Other words are used to describe bodily injuries; gashes cicatrices and hurts. The theme of extolling the virtue of being wounded continues unabated. Menenius and Volumnia now boast about the number of the hurts that Coriolanus has.

(e) Comments: No comments.

(9.) Coriolanus (2.1.257-262)

JUNIUS BRUTUS I heard him swear,
Were he to stand for consul, never would he
Appear i' the market-place nor on him put
The napless vesture of humility;
Nor showing, as the manner is, his wounds
To the people, beg their stinking breaths.

(a) Context within the play

Nor showing, as the manner is, his **wounds** (2.1.261).

Junius Brutus refers here to what appears to be the custom of showing the scars of war wounds in order to obtain votes to be elected consul.

(b) MIP and MIPVU analysis

1. ***Basic:*** The basic meaning of the word 'wound' refers to the bodily injury as in *OED* "1.a. wound, *n.* A hurt caused by the laceration or separation of the tissues of the body by a hard or sharp instrument, a bullet, etc.; an external injury".
2. ***Contextual:*** The contextual meaning is identical to the basic meaning. Junius Brutus refers to the actual wounds of Coriolanus.
3. ***Distinct: No*****,** the basic and the contextual meaning are identical.
4. ***Similar: No,*** since both meanings are identical it is not possible to compare them.
5. ***No, 'wound' is not used metaphorically.***

(c) MAPPING: No mapping can be obtained since there is no metaphoric use.

(d) Literary analysis:

A new theme is introduced. In order to become consul Coriolanus will have to show his wounds to the common people. This goes against his grain, as he only feels disdain for the citizens. Coriolanus feels he is one of the elect already, and he should not need votes of low-classed citizens to become elected. Yet, the people will only speak for him, meaning they will give him the necessary votes to become consul, if he shows them that he has actually been wounded.

(e) Comments: No comments.

(10.) Coriolanus (2.2.77-79)

Your honor's pardon:
I had rather have my **wounds** to heal again
Than hear say how I got them.
I do beseech you,

(a) Context within the play

I had rather have my **wounds** to heal again (2.2.78).

Coriolanus is fulminating against the custom of having to show his wounds, that is: having to prove that he has fought for his country.

(b) MIP and MIPVU analysis

1. ***Basic:*** The basic meaning of the word 'wound' refers to the bodily injury as in *OED* "1.a. wound, *n.* A hurt caused by the laceration or separation of the tissues of the body by a hard or sharp instrument, a bullet, etc.; an external injury".

2. ***Contextual:*** The word 'wound' that is mentioned here is identical to the basic meaning.
3. ***Distinct: No*****,** the basic and the contextual meaning are identical.
4. ***Similar: No,*** similar meanings cannot be compared in terms of one and the other, therefore, there is no ground for metaphoric use.
5. ***No, 'wound' is not used metaphorically.***

(c) MAPPING: No mapping can be obtained since there is no metaphoric use.

(d) Literary analysis:

Coriolanus has come home victorious from battle, so for him it is self-evident that he is more than loyal to his country, and he finds it degrading that he has to prove his worth to the citizens whom he despises.

Comments: No comments.

(11.) Coriolanus (2.2.152-164)

MENENIUS AGRIPPA. The senate, Coriolanus, are well pleased
To make thee consul.
CORIOLANUS. I do owe them still
My life and services.
MENENIUS AGRIPPA. It then remains
That you do speak to the people.
CORIOLANUS. I do beseech you,
Let me o'erleap that custom, for I cannot
Put on the gown, stand naked and entreat them,
For my **wounds**' sake, to give their suffrage: please you
That I may pass this doing.

(a) Context within the play

For my **wounds**' sake, to give their suffrage (2.2.163).

Coriolanus is still arguing against having to show his wounds.

(b) MIP and MIPVU analysis

1. ***Basic:*** The basic meaning of the word 'wound' refers to the bodily injury as in *OED* "1.a. wound, *n.* A hurt caused by the laceration or separation of the tissues of the body by a hard or sharp instrument, a bullet, etc.; an external injury".
2. ***Contextual:*** The contextual meaning also refers to bodily injuries therefore it is not distinct.
3. ***Distinct: No*****,** the basic and the contextual meaning are identical.

4. *Similar: No,* since both meanings are identical they cannot be compared on the basis of similarity.

5. *No, 'wound' is not used metaphorically.*

5a. In the phrase: ***'For my wounds sake', the word 'wounds' is a personification***

(c) MAPPING: The mapping that can be made for this personification is:
WOUNDS ARE PERSONS, and possibly
WOUNDS NEED CONSIDERATION.

(d) Literary analysis: -

(e) Comments:

The word 'wound' is not a linguistic metaphor, 'sake', however, could be considered as one. The *OED* gives the following definition for 'sake': "Out of consideration for . . . or on (a person's) account". This basic meaning is the historically older one. The contextual meaning refers to "Out of regard for a thing, because of something" The distinction then, lies in the difference between a person and thing. So sake is metaphoric. The phrase "For my wounds sake" can be construed as a personification. The context supports this, as Coriolanus uses the phrase that follows, "to give them suffrage" (2.2.163) to refer to the meaning of giving votes for the word suffrage. The *OED* gives the following meaning for suffrage: "3.a orig. a vote given by a member or a body, state, society in . . . favour of the election of a person". Later suffrage becomes to mean "consent: the collective opinion of a body of persons" (*OED 8).* Both meanings apply here. Moreover, 'Wounds' become persons who receive votes. The target domain, 'sake' or 'consideration' is understood in terms of bodily wounds. The mapping in this case would be:
WOUNDS ARE PERSONS and possibly
WOUNDS NEED CONSIDERATION.

(12,13.) Coriolanus (2.3.4-13)

THIRD CITIZEN. We have power in ourselves to do it, but it is a
power that we have no power to do; for if he show us
his **wounds** and tell us his deeds, we are to put our
tongues into those **wounds** and speak for them; so, if
he tell us his noble deeds, we must also tell him
our noble acceptance of them. Ingratitude is
monstrous, and for the multitude to be ingrateful,
were to make a monster of the multitude: of the

which we being members, should bring ourselves to be
monstrous members.

(a) Context within the play

Coriolanus needs the formal consent of the citizens in order to become consul. They will only give their consent if he shows them his wounds.

(b) MIP and MIPVU analysis

1. ***Basic:*** The basic meaning of the word 'wound' refers to the bodily injury as in *OED* "1.a. wound, *n.* A hurt caused by the laceration or separation of the tissues of the body by a hard or sharp instrument, a bullet, etc.; an external injury".
2. ***Contextual:*** The contextual meaning is identical to the basic meaning of the word wound.
3. ***Distinct: No,*** since there is no difference between basic and contextual meaning there is no distinction.
4. ***Similar: No,*** it is not possible to compare basic and contextual meaning on the basis of Similarity since they are not similar, but identical.

5. No, 'wound' is not used metaphorically

The phrase "To put our tongues into his wounds and speak for them" is obviously non-literal. It is a synecdoche; in as far as a part stands for the whole, tongues stand for the complete act of speaking. It is a metonymy because the organ of the tongue represents the act of speaking. Nevertheless, there is more to the phrase than simple metonymy. The wounds do not literally speak. The image of putting multiple tongues into wounds adds a sense of gruesomeness. To put a tongue into something means to taste something, to put a tongue into a wound means to lick a wound. The sentence then also carries over the meaning that the crowd wants to have a taste of Coriolanus' wounds, and even more incongruous, that the crowd is licking Coriolanus' wounds. The crowd also speaks for the wounds: "to put our tongues into his wounds and speak for them" (3.2.7.), not only implies that they talk about Coriolanus' actions of receiving wounds in war time, but that they will or will not speak out in favour of Coriolanus' consulship on the grounds of these actions during the war.

The phrase "To put tongues into wounds" is metaphoric.

(c) MAPPING: The source domain is a bodily movement, the target domain the act of speaking on behalf of Coriolanus. It is difficult to formulate a clear mapping since there are several meanings that interact at play here. Possible mappings could be:
WOUNDS HAVE MEANING,
WOUNDS ARE MEANINGFUL/FILLED WITH MEANING.

Putting into implies:

WOUNDS ARE CONTAINERS

WOUNDS CAN BE FILLED WITH WORDS/MEANING

(d) Literary analysis:

The citizens refer to the connection between Coriolanus' actions and their words. Coriolanus needs the approval of the common citizens to be elected consul; he needs their word. The citizens do not willingly give their consent, since it has been clear from the beginning that Coriolanus looks at them with disdain and they question his motives: "though soft-conscienced men can be content to say it was for his country, he did it to please his mother and to be partly proud" (1.1. 36-39).

Comments:

As before, 'wounds' act as symbols for Coriolanus actions during war.

The passage in which the word 'wound' occurs has a high metaphoric and rhetoric density. There is wordplay on power, and two meanings of power are implied: physical and political power. The words 'power', 'deed', 'member' and 'monster' are used metaphorically.

The word 'deeds' can refer to literal deeds done: "an act"(*OED* 1), or to deeds as documents of law: "An instrument in writing (which for this purpose includes printing or other legible representation of words on parchment or paper), purporting to effect some legal disposition" (*OED* 4). This means that 'deeds' is metaphoric. The basic meaning is an act, and the contextual meaning refers to the legal deed or law. So the citizens not only ask Coriolanus to show them his wounds, but also the deed, or law that states that Coriolanus is required by Roman law to ask the citizens for their votes.

In the phrase "ingratitude is a monster" ingratitude is presented as a separate entity instead as an attribute of the crowd. There is a comparison between ingratitude and an imaginary and frightening creature. The crowd call themselves members of a multitude. 'Members' is metaphoric. The distinction between members of a physical body and members of a political body has been firmly established at the beginning of the play in Menenius speech on the body politic.

(14,15,16,17,19.) Coriolanus

(14.) Coriolanus (2.3.53-58)

CORIOLANUS. What must I say?
'I Pray, sir'—Plague upon't! I cannot bring
My tongue to such a pace: —'Look, sir, my **wounds**!
I got them in my country's service, when
Some certain of your brethren roar'd and ran
From the noise of our own drums.'

(15.) Coriolanus (2.3.84-87)

FIRST CITIZEN. The price is to ask it kindly.
Coriolanus. Kindly! Sir, I pray, let me ha't: I have **wounds** to
show you, which shall be yours in private. Your
good voice, sir; what say you?

(16.) Coriolanus (2.3.116)

You have received many **wounds** for your country.

(17.) Coriolanus (2.3.122-142)

Most sweet voices!
Better it is to die, better to starve,
Than crave the hire which first we do deserve.
Why in this woolvish toge should I stand here,
To beg of Hob and Dick, that do appear,
Their needless vouches? Custom calls me to't:
What custom wills, in all things should we do't,
The dust on antique time would lie unswept,
And mountainous error be too highly heapt
For truth to o'er-peer. Rather than fool it so,
Let the high office and the honour go
To one that would do thus. I am half through;
The one part suffer'd, the other will I do.
[Re-enter three Citizens more]
Here come more voices.
Your voices: for your voices I have fought;
Watch'd for your voices; for Your voices bear
Of **wounds** two dozen odd; battles thrice six
I have seen and heard of; for your voices have
Done many things, some less, some more your voices:
Indeed I would be consul.

(19.) Coriolanus (2.3.183-192)

THIRD CITIZEN. He said he had **wounds**, which he could show
in private;
And with his hat, thus waving it in scorn,
'I would be consul,' says he: 'aged custom,
But by your voices, will not so permit me;
Your voices therefore.' When we granted that,
Here was 'I thank you for your voices: thank you:
Your most sweet voices: now you have left
your voices,
I have no further with you.' Was not this mockery?

(a) Context within the play

All of these instances of the word 'wound' refer to physical wounds. They are all subject to the same MIP/MIPVU analysis. Moreover they all refer to the wounds that Coriolanus has to show in order to gain formal approval of the citizens for his consulship.

(b) MIP and MIPVU analysis

1. ***Basic:*** The basic meaning of the word 'wound' refers to the bodily injury as in *OED* "1.a. wound, *n.* A hurt caused by the laceration or separation of the tissues of the body by a hard or sharp instrument, a bullet, etc.; an external injury".
2. ***Contextual:*** The contextual meaning is identical to the basic meaning of the word wound.
3. ***Distinct: No,*** since there is no difference between basic and contextual meaning, there is no distinction.
4. ***Similar: No,*** it is not possible to compare basic and contextual meaning on the basis of similarity, since they are not similar but identical.

No, wound is not used metaphorically

(c) MAPPING: No mapping can be obtained since there is no metaphoric use for *wounds.*

(d) Literary analysis:

In these passages Coriolanus shows his wounds to the crowd. He needs their voices, meaning: their votes, in order to become consul. To say that Coriolanus does this willingly is an understatement. He feels he is already entitled to the title of consul. In fact he would sooner die then ask for the votes of the common crowd: "Better it is to die, better to starve, / Than crave the hire which first we do deserve" (3.2.123-124). Since he cannot avoid this custom or law, he very grudgingly talks to the citizens, who are equally distrustful of Coriolanus. The citizens feel that Coriolanus has no

further use for them, now that he has got their votes: " . . . 'Now you have left / your voices, / I have no further with you.' Was not this mockery?" (3.2.139-142).

(e) Comments:

'Voices' is metonymic for votes. It is also a synecdoche for citizens: "Here come more voices", meaning here come more citizens who can cast their votes.

(18.) Coriolanus (2.3.178-180)

Not one amongst us, save yourself, but says
He used us scornfully: he should have show'd us
His marks of merit, **wounds** received for's country.

(a) Context within the play

The citizens continue their complaint that Coriolanus has used them for his own gain. They also continue the theme that wounds show what a man is worth.

(b) MIP and MIPVU analysis

1. ***Basic:*** The basic meaning of the word 'wound' refers to the bodily injury as in *OED* "1.a. wound, *n.* A hurt caused by the laceration or separation of the tissues of the body by a hard or sharp instrument, a bullet, etc.; an external injury".
2. ***Contextual:*** The contextual meaning refers to the basic meaning. They both refer to actual wounds.
3. ***Distinct: No,*** there is no distinction between basic and contextual meaning.
4. ***Similar: No,*** basic and contextual meaning are identical therefore they cannot be compared on a basis of similarity.
5. ***No,' wound' is not used metaphorically***

5a. 'Mark' is metaphoric

The basic meaning for 'mark' is: "distinctive or distinguishing feature" (*OED* III). The contextual meaning refers to wounds as this distinguishing feature. Wounds are distinct from the usual signs that mark quality. Therefore, a physical sign of quality is compared. Wounds and marks of merit are both considered physical signs that typify quality. As the basic meaning differs from the contextual meaning and these meanings are distinct as well as comparable on the basis of similarity, this makes the phrase 'his marks of merit, his wounds' metaphoric.

The phrase: 'his marks of merit, his wounds' is an asyndetic A is B Metaphor.

(c) *MAPPING:*

Here cross-domain mapping occurs which can be rendered thus:

WOUNDS ARE MARKS OF MERIT.

WOUNDS MARK MERIT

(d) *Literary analysis:*

The use of the word mark is significant, because not only are 'wounds' seen as signs of distinction; marks of merit, they are also literally marks on Coriolanus' skin. The connotation of 'marks' as a boundary that is connected to 'marks' on the human skin makes the wounds signs of breeching a boundary.

There is another relevant meaning that was current in Shakespeare's time. A mark can be, "a monetary unit used in accounts, and for determining the value of gold and silver coins"(*OED* ??). There seems to be a link with the way Coriolanus is bartering, or feels he has to barter, his wounds in exchange for words. It is as if his wounds are the currency he uses in exchange for votes. Thus, to have the citizens debating what the value is of his wounds concurs with this interpretation.

Yet another, now obsolete, meaning for mark that was in use during Shakespeare's time underlines the meaning of 'mark' as a sign of territories that are breeched. 'Mark' can also refer to a boundary *(OED I, 1)* or, an object that marks a boundary (*OED* II, 7). Thus, wounds have become features that mark the boundary of the skin. The many connotations of 'marks of merit, wounds' interact. Thus this short phrase incorporates many of the viewpoints on the concept of wounds that are dealt with in the play. 'Wounds' can be badges of honour, as they are for Volumnia and Menenius. They can be marks on Coriolanus' skin that define his personality of invincible warrior. Because Coriolanus refuses to barter his 'wounds' for the 'words' of the citizens, they become the 'currency' that Coriolanus refuses to pay, in order to gain a political position. Ultimately this makes his wounds, indeed, marks of merit, because Coriolanus stays true to his own identity and refuses to present himself as something he is not.

(e) *Comments:* No comments.

(20.) Coriolanus (3.3.63-66)

MENENIUS AGRIPPA. Lo, citizens, he says he is content:

The warlike service he has done, consider; think

Upon the **wounds** his body bears, which show
Like graves i' the holy churchyard

(a) Context within the play

A new motif is introduced; wounds are now seen as graves, they foreshadow death.

(b) MIP and MIPVU analysis

1. ***Basic:*** The basic meaning of the word 'wound' refers to the bodily injury as in *OED* "1.a. wound, *n.* A hurt caused by the laceration or separation of the tissues of the body by a hard or sharp instrument, a bullet, etc.; an external injury".
2. ***Contextual:*** The contextual meaning refers to the basic meaning. They both refer to actual wounds.
3. ***Distinct: No,*** there is no distinction between basic and contextual meaning.
4. ***Similar: No,*** basic and contextual meaning cannot be compared since they are identical. The same analysis as the word 'wound' above can be made for the word 'grave'. Here too the basic meaning is identical to the contextual meaning. However, the word 'like' signals a comparison and alerts us to a form of cross-domain mapping. In the phrase 'wounds like graves' both the source domain 'graves', and the target domain 'wounds' are found directly in the text.
5. ***Yes, "wounds are like graves" is a direct metaphor.***

(c) MAPPING: The wounds that Coriolanus' body bears, and the graves in the churchyard are each used literally. The mapping occurs directly between the target 'wounds' and the source domain 'graves'. The mapping is as follows:
WOUNDS ARE GRAVES

(d) Literary analysis:

The comparison between wounds and graves comes at the end of the play and serves to foreshadow Coriolanus' death.

(e) Comments: No Comments.

(21.) Coriolanus (4^2.1.1-12)

Come, leave your tears: a brief farewell: the beast
With many heads butts me away. Nay, mother,
Where is your ancient courage? you were used
To say extremity was the trier of spirits;
That common chances common men could bear;
That when the sea was calm all boats alike

[2] Open Source Shakespeare website gives this as scene 3.

Show'd mastership in floating; fortune's blows,
When most struck home, being gentle **wounded**, craves
A noble cunning: you were used to load me
With precepts that would make invincible
The heart that conn'd them.

(a) Context within the play

Two tribunes Brutus and Scinius goad the people into revoking their vote, and, thus, their support for Coriolanus. Coriolanus lashes out against the office of the tribunes, who officially represents the plebeians. This is construed as treason, and Coriolanus is banished from Rome. He says goodbye to his friends and his mother. When his mother rails against Rome, he comforts her with her own words.

(b) MIP and MIPVU analysis

1. ***Basic:*** The basic meaning of the word 'wound' refers to the bodily injury as in *OED* "1.a. wound, *n.* A hurt caused by the laceration or separation of the tissues of the body by a hard or sharp instrument, a bullet, etc.; an external injury".
2. ***Contextual:*** The contextual meaning alludes to the basic meaning
3. ***Distinct: No,*** there is no distinction between basic and contextual meaning.
4. ***Similar: No,*** basic and contextual meaning cannot be compared since they are identical.
5. ***No, 'wound' is not used metaphorically***

(c) MAPPING: No mapping can be obtained since there is no metaphoric use

(d) Literary analysis:

In an earlier passage the crowd compare themselves to an ungrateful monster. Here Coriolanus refers to them as a mythical monster. Throughout the play, he has refused to see the crowd as equals, and often referred to them as animals. In order to comfort his mother he quotes her own words back at her. The word 'extremity' is significant in this passage. Volumnia used to tell her son that hardships would make his spirit strong: "Extremity was the trier of spirits" (4.1.4). There are many now obsolete meanings for this word, but their connotations would still have carried meaning when Shakespeare was writing. The basic meaning of 'extremity' is, "the extreme or terminal point or portion of anything, the end" (*OED 1a).* This is meaning is reflected by Coriolanus who, as he is banished from Rome, has reached the terminal point of being a Roman patrician. The *OED* also gives the following meaning, "the utmost penalty" (*OED 3b Obs.)*. Since Coriolanus had initially been condemned to death, this could very well be the contextual meaning that is applicable here. The ultimate

penalty in Rome was to be thrown off the Tarpeian rock, this is the penalty given to Coriolanus, although it is later revoked and he is banished. The following two meanings also apply equally well to Coriolanus. “Extreme or inordinate intensity or violence” (*OED* 4a Obs.), and “extravagance in opinion, behaviour, or expenditure” (*OED 5 Obs.).* These two last descriptions seem to typify Coriolanus. His extreme and intensely violent behaviour has brought him renown as well as shame, and throughout the play his friend Menenius is constantly trying to temper Coriolanus’ extravagant opinion. Coriolanus acts and speaks violently, and even though this stands him in good stead as a soldier during the war, it brings him nothing during peacetime. Coriolanus is an extreme character; he does not seem capable of nuances.

(e) Comments:

In the first two lines of this passage the words come, leave, beast, heads, and butts are all used metaphorically. The expression ‘the beast with many heads’ is a metaphor for the people. It is also a metonym because the beast stands for the people who, incidentally, are many and thus have heads. The beast with many heads also refers to Cerberus or Hydra: mythical beasts with many heads.

(22.) Coriolanus (4.2.30-40)

VOLUMNIA. More noble blows than ever thou wise words;
And for Rome's good. I'll tell thee what; yet go:
Nay, but thou shalt stay too: I would my son
Were in Arabia, and thy tribe before him,
His good sword in his hand.
SICINIUS VELUTUS. What then?
VIRGILIA. What then!
He'ld make an end of thy posterity.
VOLUMNIA. Bastards and all.
Good man, the **wounds** that he does bear for Rome.
MENENIUS AGRIPPA. Come, come, peace.
SICINIUS VELUTUS. would he had continued to his country
As he began, and not unknit himself
The noble knot he made.

(a) context of sentence within play

Volumnia continues to rail against those that want to banish her son.

(b) MIP and MIPVU analysis

1. ***Basic:*** The basic meaning of the word 'wound' refers to the bodily injury as in *OED* "1.a. wound, *n.* A hurt caused by the laceration or separation of the tissues of the body by a hard or sharp instrument, a bullet, etc.; an external injury".
2. ***Contextual:*** Basic and contextual meaning are the same.
3. ***Distinct: No,*** there is no distinction between basic and contextual meaning.
4. ***Similar: No,*** basic and contextual meaning cannot be compared since they are identical.
5. ***No, 'wound' is not used metaphorically.***

(c) MAPPING: No mapping can be obtained since there is no metaphoric use.

(d) Literary analysis:

When Velutus remarks on the "noble knot" (4.2.40) that Coriolanus has tied himself into, it seems an apt and succinct comment on Coriolanus plight. His nobility puts certain obligations on him, not in the least the obligation of being a warrior who makes good use of his anger in the course of war. By taking his own ideal to extremes, Coriolanus fails to see the relevance of others less noble than himself. This is his undoing. Since, because of his noble upbringing, he cannot be any other than he is, it is also his fate. He has tied himself into a noble knot indeed, by adhering to, and by taking to extremes, his own code of nobility.

(e) Comments: No Comments.