UNIVERSITETI I EJL

JIE UNIVERZITET

SEE UNIVERSITY

Fakulteti i Gjuhëve, Kulturave dhe Komunikimit

Факултетот за јазици, култури и комуникација

The Faculty of Languages, Cultures, and Communication

Third Cycle of Academic Studies — Doctoral Studies

Doctoral Dissertation Topic:

The Concept of the Seven Deadly Sins in Selected Characters from Shakespeare's Plays

Candidate

Krste Iliev, M.A.

Mentor

Dr. Andrew Goodspeed

2022

The Concept of the Seven Deadly Sins in Selected Characters from Shakespeare's Plays

Koncepti i shtatë mëkateve vdekjeprurëse në personazhe të zgjedhura nga dramat e Shekspirit

Концептот на Седумте смртни гревови кај избрани ликови од драмите на Шекспир

Declaration

No material from this thesis has been previously submitted for a degree at this or any other University. The work is solely that of the author, Krste Iliev, under the supervision pf Professor Andrew Goodspeed. Parts of this thesis have been published in one paper and one presentation. The paper “Falstaff`s Gluttony, Lust, Avarice, Sloth and Pride in *Henry IV Part I*” at the Journal Sciendo, Volume 16 Issue 2, pp. 69-79. The presentation “On the Deadly Sin of Avarice and Other Accompanying Sins in Selected Shakespearean Plays” was part of at the Sixth International Scientific Conference “FILKO”- Philology, culture and education -2021.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my profound gratitude to my supervisor Professor Andrew Goodspeed for his unconditional support and patience in the course of the writing of this thesis and for the inspiration for literature he instills during his lectures. It was a real pleasure to have a supervisor and a mentor with such an impeccable knowledge. It is also hard to imagine that this thesis would have been finished without his constructive advices.
Besides my advisor, I would like to thank my thesis committee:

I would also like to acknowledge the support of my family, my parents Vasil and Ilinka, my sister Natalija and my niece Andrea for providing me with books and articles as a student of University College London.

Abstract

This thesis explores Shakespeare's implicit usage of the Seven Deadly Sins and their characteristics in order to portray the discussed characters in a predominantly negative light. Namely, according to R. Newhauser the phrase "seven deadly sins" in the Early Modern Period became a byword for an "encapsulated evil". The thesis builds on previous works that link Shakespeare with the medieval world, most notably Helen Cooper`s works as well as works that link Shakespeare with this medieval concept of the Seven Deadly Sins, most notably the work of Richard Horton. It is worth noting that critics have previously depicted some of these characters as being proud, envious, angry, slothful, avaricious, gluttonous and/or lustful. This thesis expands on this view by providing an in-depth analysis of the characters through the lens of how the patristic authors, medieval books, as well as philosophers and writers influential in, but not limited to, the Renaissance have described the characteristics of these Sins or emotions. The existence of pride in the discussed characters is another point that this thesis makes. Namely, it attempts to prove that the analyzed characters are also proud, which serves as a potential cause for their downfall or misfortune. The conclusion again links Shakespeare to the medieval world, namely Dante Alighieri`s Divine Comedy. Specifically, Dante`s depiction of the Sins as a result of imperfect/ perverted/ misdirected love, subdivided into excessive love (lust, gluttony and avarice), deficient love (sloth) and malicious love (wrath, envy, pride) is applied to the characters` actions or inactions, as a concluding proof of their sinful nature.

Parathënie

Kjo tezë eksploron përdorimin e nënkuptuar të shtatë mëkateve vdekjeprurëse nga ana e Shekspirit (epshi, pangopësia, lakmia, përtacia, zilia, zemërimi dhe krenaria) dhe karakteristikat e tyre në mënyrë që të paraqesë personazhet e diskutuar nga disa nga dramat e Shekspirit dhe nga poema "Përdhunimi i Lucrece-s" si mëkatar. Teza bazohet dhe u frymëzua pjesërisht nga veprat e mëparshme që hedhin dritë shtesë mbi mëkatet, siç janë veprat e R. Newhauser dhe autorëve tjerë si Helen Cooper, të cilët ofrojnë këndvështrime të reja mbi lidhjen midis Shekspirit dhe botës mesjetare. Vlen të përmendet se kritikët më parë i kanë përshkruar disa nga këta personazhe si krenarë, ziliqarë, të zemëruar, përtacë, lakmitarë, të pangopur dhe/ose epshorë. Kjo tezë e zgjeron këtë këndvështrim duke ofruar një analizë të thellë të personazheve përmes përdorimit të këndvështrimeve të ndryshme të autorëve patristikë (teologë krishterë të kishës së hershme), librave mesjetarë, si dhe filozofëve dhe shkrimtarëve me ndikim, por pa u kufizuar vetëm tek këta, Rilindasve, për mënyrën e përshkrimit të karakteristikave të këtyre mëkateve apo emocioneve. Ekzistenca e krenarisë në personazhet e diskutuar është një çështje tjetër që trajton kjo tezë. Teza përpiqet të provojë se personazhet e analizuar janë gjithashtu krenarë, gjë që shërben si një shkak potencial për rënien apo fatkeqësinë e tyre. Përfundimi përsëri e lidh Shekspirin me botën mesjetare, përkatësisht me Komedinë Hyjnore të Dante Alighierit. Në mënyrë të veçantë, përshkrimi i mëkateve nga ana e Dantes, si rezultat i dashurisë së papërsosur/të çoroditur/të keqdrejtuar, e ndarë në dashuri të tepruar (epsh, pangopësi dhe lakmi), dashuri të mangët (përtaci) si dhe dashuri keqdashëse (zemërim, zili, krenari), shërben si një pikë referimi me të cilin krahasohen veprimet e këtyre personazheve për të vërtetuar natyrën e tyre mëkatare.

Table of Contents

Introduction

This thesis endeavors to look at some of Shakespeare's plays through the prism of the seven deadly sins. At first glance this may appear unfeasible as the notion of the seven deadly sins is primarily a Catholic notion and a concept that belongs to the period predating the Renaissance, namely the Middle Ages. This notion may also seem unfeasible due to earlier expressed views such as "For Shakespeare (1564-1616) the sins had no dramatic value" (Rogers, 1907, p.88) and that Shakespeare "has one direct reference to them" (Rogers, 1907, p.88) in Measure for Measure "and an indirect reference in *Henry VIII*" (Rogers, 1907, p.88). However, if one delves deeper, it soon becomes apparent that these concepts aren`t entirely divorced of interference. First of all, the concept of the seven deadly sins was not entirely abandoned during the Renaissance. Shakespeare`s contemporaries: Edmund Spenser (1552/1553 – 13 January 1599) and Cristopher Marlowe (baptised 26 February 1564 – 30 May 1593), employed the concept in *The Faerie Queene* and in *The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus*. With regard to *The Faerie Queene*, according to Horton, R., (2008) A. Kent Hieatt "has summarized the evidence that Shakespeare knew intimately the 1590 edition of *The Faerie Queene* in 'Shakespeare'".

To summarize Newhauser (2012), Catholicism in Shakespeare`s time was not fully abandoned, and we should not regard Catholicism as associated only with a problematic portion of English society, but as a "one of the 'alien' elements against which early modern English identity was defined". Referring to this period, Newhauser cites Eamon Duffy who views this period as religiously complex and even as religious pluralism, and talks about "the continuing and pervasive influence of Catholicism as a political, religious and cultural force in the England of Elizabeth and James" (2012, p.166). One area where the presence of Seven Deadly Sins could be strongly felt, was in the area of religious controversy, as the Sins were used by the Protestants or Catholics to "characterize the moral failings of the opposing faction while they also maintain the claim of purity of one's own group" (Newhauser, 2012, p.171). The persistence of the Seven Deadly Sins in Protestant religious life can be seen in a sermon preached by the Protestant martyr Hugh Lattimer in 1552. Wishing to excuse himself for too often reiterating his stance that "not onely the naughty curate shall goe to the deuyll, but also all those that folowe his naughty doctrine" (Newhauser, 2012, p.168), he turns to an *examplum to* showcase the importance of repetition.

> I will tell you now a prety story of a Fryer to refresh you withall: A limitour of the gray fryers in the tyme of his limitation preached many tymes, and had but one Sermon at all tymes: Which sermon was of the tenne commaundementes. And because this fryer had preached thys sermon so often: one that hearde it before, tolde the fryars seruaunt that his master

> was called, fryar John ten commandments: wherefore the seruaunt shewed the frier hys Master thereof, and aduised him to preach of some other matters: for it grueued the seruaunt to here his master derided. Now the fryer made aunswer, sayng: Belike then thou canst the x. commaundementes well, seeing thou hast heard them so many a time. Yea sayd the seruaunt, I warraunt you, let me heare them sayth the master: then he began, pride, couetuousnesse, lechery, and so numbred the deadly sinnes, for the ten commaundementes. (Newhauser, 2012, p.168)

While the example shows the importance of the Decalogue, it also shows the longevity of the concept of the Seven Deadly Sins. However, in the words of R. Newhauser, in the early modern period "the very phrase 'seven deadly sins' itself becomes shorthand for an encapsulated evil, an evocation of the ability of the heptad to classify, number and thereby control iniquity" (Newhauser, 2012, p.172). This is can be seen in Thomas Dekker`s work *The Seuen deadly Sinnes of London, Drawne in seuen seuerall Coaches, Through the seuen seuerall Gates of the Citie Bringing the Plague with them: Opus septem Dierum* (London, 1606). The practice was not abandoned after Shakespeare died, and, it can also be seen in *Romes wickednes or, wicked Rome with her seuen deadly sinnes of lying, pride, whoring, drunkennes, swearing, couetousnes, blaspheming, now raging and raigning amongst them, layd open to the view of the world,* published in 1624.

In the words of R. Newhauser, Carpenter used his publication of *The Last and Highest Appeal in 1656* to attack the members of the Church of England for persecuting him and for being sinners. Chapter nine uses the concept of the seven deadly sins to emphasize the immoral nature of his persecutors:

> I object, That the seven great Heads of Sin recounted by the Ancients, are wondrously apparent in the preaching Leaders of these Factions, which have risen since the first beginning of our unhappy Differences. We see, but let God judge. The seven great Heads, are Pride, Anger, Envy, Lust or Luxury, Covetousness, Gluttony, and Sloth, when the dangerous and painfull Works of sound Religion are to be strongly and valiantly performed.
>
> (Carpenter as cited in Newhauser, 2012, p. 173)

In that way, the seven deadly sins were profusely used to settle religious confrontation ranging from "intra-Catholic to Catholic-Protestant to intra-Protestant rivalries" (Newhauser, 2012, p.173).

Although Shakespeare never literally and explicitly associates a character with a given sin like Spencer, nevertheless he frequently implicitly portrays the characters in a way that it seems obvious that the character commits one or several sins. For example, Shakespeare mentions the notion of "sin" in 33 out of his 37 plays. Although Shakespeare mentions the seven deadly sins only

once calling lust the least of “deadly seven” (*Measure for Measure*, Act III, Scene 1, line 1346) Shakespeare mentions the notions/sins of pride, wrath /anger, lust /lechery, covetousness/ voluptuousness, sloth (idleness), greed /avarice/covetousness, envy, and gluttony. In the case of Shakespeare, sin doesn`t necessarily refer to the deadly sins, as in his time the Decalogue has taken precedence over the deadly sins, although this doesn`t mean that the deadly sins are entirely forgotten, as we see in *Macbeth*. Namely, Malcolm mentions among other sins, the sins of lust and avarice, when he speaks about Macbeth: “I grant him bloody, Luxurious, avaricious, false, deceitful, Sudden, malicious, smacking of every sin/That has a name” (Act IV, Scene 3, lines 1910-1914).

In addition, current academic research is not dismissive of the subject but rather encouraging when it comes to medieval elements in Shakespeare. Helen Cooper, the chair of the Cambridge Medieval and Renaissance English Literature, urges greater consideration of medieval elements in Shakespeare. For Cooper, Shakespeare in the 1590`s was “opening himself increasingly to the Middle Ages” (2006, p.29) and at the end of the career turned “more and more back to total theatre, to dramaturgy of the home-grown medieval variety” (Cooper, 2006, p.29). She goes on to say that “Although we think of Shakespeare as quintessentially belonging to the English Renaissance, his world was still largely a medieval one” (Cooper, 2010). She further states that “Many of the great cycles of Biblical mystery plays, which we think of as medieval, continued to be performed until half-way through Queen Elizabeth’s reign, a couple of them (both now lost) into the reign of King James I” (Cooper, 2010). Cooper states that the “Medieval principles of theatre,”(Cooper,2010) including a play that is all-embracing mixing humour and grief and performing rather than reporting what has happened off the stage, “gave Shakespeare and his fellow playwrights the freedom that the neo-Classicists wanted to forbid”(Cooper,2010). As a conclusion, Cooper states that “Around half of Shakespeare’s plays have direct or indirect medieval sources, and they are a minor presence in many more” (Cooper, 2010).

Although Morton Bloomfield states that by the end of the sixteenth century “The tradition of the Sins was dead; they no longer evolved; they no longer inspired great writing” (1952, p. 242), there are academic texts that analyze the seven deadly sins and Shakespeare with Ronald Horton mentioning Spenser`s account of the sins in the *Faerie Queen* as a natural source for Shakespeare in the chapter “The Seven Deadly Sins and Shakespeare`s Jacobean Tragedies” (Horton, 2008).

In addition to pinpointing a given sin in a given character, in the last chapter I will try to prove that the analyzed characters are guilty of the most serious sin, the sin of pride as a natural outcome since the deadly sins proceed from the sin of pride. To be more specific, this thesis argues that the characters possess hubristic pride, a pride that causes their downfall, rather than authentic pride. Wherever pride is mentioned, if not stated otherwise, this thesis refers to hubristic pride.

In the paragraphs that follow I will try to trace the criticism and studies of Shakespearean characters and the sins through the centuries. This thesis does neither claim that this review covers all of the criticism on the analyzed characters and the sins, nor that these are the only sins that are inherent to the characters.

In Chapter I, the analyzed characters, Cleopatra in *Antony and Cleopatra*, Angelo in *Measure for Measure* and Tarquin in the poem "The Rape of Lucrece" were also seen as lustful by a number of critics or poets. For example, Dante places Cleopatra in the second circle of Hell in his *Divine Comedy*, the first being reserved for the virtuous pagans. In the tragedy Antony and Cleopatra, both characters were viewed by some critics as such, although there are critics who view Antony`s love as true love rather than lust. With regard to Cleopatra, critics that have acknowledged her lustful behavior include: William Hazlitt who states "Cleopatra's whole character is the triumph of the voluptuous, of the love of pleasure and the power of giving it, over every other consideration" (2008, p.63). Anna Murphy Brownell Jameson in *Shakespeare's Heroines: Characteristics of Women, Moral, Poetical, & Historical* writes about Cleopatra's "oriental voluptuousness*" (Jameson, 2008, p.68).* A.C. Bradley states "the exercise of sexual attraction is the element of her life" (2008, p.105). Rosalie L. Colie in "The Significance of Style," from *Shakespeare's Living Art* points out the Roman view on the relationship between Antony and Cleopatra, and states that both protagonists might be lustful if we view them through Roman lenses*:* "There is more than the suggestion, then, that love is no more than appetite or a drive; if that were all there was to love, the Roman view of this affair would be correct, Cleopatra simply a whore and Antony besotted, 'ne'er lust-wearied'"(2008, p.214). There is a debate among the critics with regard to whether Antony is in love with Cleopatra or simply lusts after Cleopatra. Sara Munson Deats cites A.C. Bradley who views Antony simultaneously as "'strumpet`s fool' and Cleopatra`s 'peerless lover'" (Bradley, 2004, p.29), A.C. Bradley however seems to settle on Antony`s love for Cleopatra as he writes "How pathetic and even sublime the completeness of his love for Cleopatra!" (as cited in Sara Munson Deats, 2004. p.103). The number of critics who suggest that Antony`s feeling towards Cleopatra is one of love seems to outnumber the critics who claim the opposite. G. Wilson Knight also argues for love on the part of Antony "The strongest thing in Antony is his love for Cleopatra" (Knight, 2008, p.121). Northrop Frye is of the same opinion "The great romantic heroes are normally great lovers too, and Antony's love for Cleopatra gives him again a dimension that puts him beyond the usual human categories" (2008, p.239).

Augustus William Schlegel states that among other characteristics, Cleopatra is also proud and lustful. He states:

> The seductive arts of Cleopatra are in no respect veiled over; she is an ambiguous being made up of royal pride, female vanity, luxury, inconstancy, and true attachment. Although the mutual passion of herself and Antony is without moral dignity, it still excites our sympathy as an insurmountable fascination—they seem formed for each other, and Cleopatra is as remarkable for her seductive charms as Antony for the splendour of his deeds. As they die for each other, we forgive them for having lived for each other.
>
> (Schlegel, 2008, p.61)

The character of Angelo in *Measure for Measure* is also viewed by critics as lustful. Coleridge states: “the pardon and marriage of Angelo . . . baffles the strong indignant claim of justice' - 'for cruelty, with lust and damnable baseness, cannot be forgiven, because we cannot conceive them as being morally repented of” (2001, p.80).

Robert Bridges in *Measure for Measure: Shakespeare: The Critical Tradition,* writes about the lack of passion in Angelo`s lust: “there is no passion in his calculating lust” (2001, p.272).

According to Rosalind Miles in *The Problem of 'Measure for Measure': A Historical Investigation,* Angelo possesses “repressed and sadistic lust” (as cited in “An Introduction to the Variety of Criticism”, 1989, p.43). She also states “In fact, in her [Isabella`s] combined purity and defenceless sexuality, she is precisely the one type of woman who would arouse Angelo's repressed and sadistic lust” (1989, p.43).

The main character in the poem “The Rape of Lucrece”, Tarquin has also been viewed as lustful by critics. T. H. Wharton, for example, states “One of these paragons was the figure of Lucrece. A woman whose entire emotional life depended on her husband, her distress at his absence inflamed the lust of the Roman king Tarquin, who raped her” (1989, p.28).

The second Chapter deals with Falstaff and the main sin that defines him, the carnal sin of gluttony but also other sins pertaining to Falstaff such as lust, sloth, avarice and pride. E.E. Stoll in addition to emphasizing Falstaff`s gluttony and lechery states “He has the increasing belly and decreasing leg, the diminutive page for a foil, the weapon (his pistol) that is no weapon, but a fraud, as well as most of the inner qualities of this ancient stage-figure— cowardice and outlandish bragging, gluttony and lechery, sycophancy and pride” (2008, p.129). H. N. Hudson points to Falstaff’s greed and lust: “His thoughts dwell not at all on the Prince’s act of magnanimity, which would shame his egotism and soften his heart, but only on his own ingenuity and success in the stratagem that led to that act. So that the effect is just to puff him up more than ever with vanity and conceit of wit, and thus to give a looser rein and a sharper stimulus to his greed and lust” (Hudson,2008, p.104). Maurice Morgann *in An Essay on The Dramatic Character of Falstaff* also acknowledges Falstaff`s gluttony and whoring (2008, p.63) . His gluttony is also acknowledged by the

critic Henry Giles who in "Falstaff: A Type of Epicurean Life" in *Lectures and Essays* describes Falstaff as an Epicurean. According to Giles, "Falstaff is of those who value each moment by what it confers of palpable enjoyment; of those who say, 'Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die; and he acted out his philosophy consistently and completely'" (Giles, 2008, p. 97). Again according to Giles, Falstaff is indolent or in other word slothful *"*Indolence, therefore, and self-indulgence, sets limits to energies which would scarcely be used aright, and the love of ease becomes a safeguard against talents which the love of power would make a curse" (Giles, 2008, p.97).

The third Chapter deals with the presence of the sins of greed and, by extension pride, in three Shakespearean characters, Shylock in *The Merchant of Venice*, Cassius in *Julius Caesar* and Timon in *Timon of Athens*. Shylock`s avarice has been acknowledged by H. N. Hudson, who in *Merchant Shakespeare: His Life, Art, and Characters*, names avarice among the things that stimulate his enmity. A Pietscher, in *Jurist und Dichter*, talks about the notion that Shylock regards the law only as a means to get his hatred and above all his avarice. Elmer Edgar Stoll in "Shylock" from *Shakespeare Studies: Historical and Comparative in Method* , stresses the fact that Shylock is a "sordid miser"(2008, p.136), or in other word a greedy person. Harold Bloom in his Introduction of Shylock, talks about "the collapse of Shylock`s pride in his Jewishness" in Act V of the play (Bloom, 2008, p.202). Other critics who view Shylock as avaricious include: W. H. Auden, Charles Gildon, August Wilhelm Schlegel, Anna Jameson, Hermann Ulrici and Georg Gottfried Gervinus.

The characters of Cassius in *Julius Caesar* and Timon in *Timon of Athens* don`t seem to be as present in criticism with regard to the greediness of the characters. One of the reasons might be that, in the case of Timon and to lesser extent to Cassius, the Aristotelian golden mean, of wastefulness and stinginess were overlooked as a form of greediness. J.I. Simmons, in *Julius Caesar: New critical essays,* however, acknowledges Cassius`s greed*: "*After Brutus comes to dominate the conspiracy, in a series of countermands to Cassius's sound if brutal political instincts, Cassius might at least assume that his private greed can flourish" (Simmons, 2004, p.162). In depicting Cassius as greedy, Shakespeare seems to have been truthful, as Cassius`s historical contemporary Sallust in his *The Conspiracy of Cataline* stresses the insidious nature of avarice as a cause for the rise of pride and the fall of the Roman Republic. In Chapter 10, Sallust writes:

> But, when hard work and just action had increased the Republic, when great kings were defeated in war, uncivilized nations and vast peoples subdued by force, when Carthage, the rival to Roman power, had been eradicated, when all the sea and all the lands were accessible, Fortune began to grow cruel and confuse everything. Men who had easily endured hard work, dangers, uncertainty and adversity found that leisure and wealth, things desirable at other times, were a burden and the cause of misery. And so, at first, greed for

> money grew, then greed for power. These things were the root, so to speak, of all evils. For avarice undermined trust, goodness, and other noble qualities, and in their place taught pride and cruelty, taught men to neglect the gods and to put a price on everything.
>
> (Sallust, 2010, p.15)

With regard to Timon, Samuel Johnson (as cited in Timon of Athens. The Oxford Shakespeare) in the introduction to the play, stated "The catastrophe affords a very powerful warning against that ostentatious liberality, which scatters bounty, but confers no benefits, and buys flattery, but not friendship" (2004, p.107). Now liberality is the golden mean in Aristotle, but Johnson terms it ostentatious adding that it is of no avail and useless. It can be deduced that Johnson has a negative opinion of this term, which in my opinion is closer to wastefulness, the excess of the virtue, and by extension greediness. William Richardson in his essay of 1783, as cited by A.D. Nuttall, also regards Timon's ostentatious generosity with suspicion stating: "Real goodness is not ostentatious" (XX,1989, Twayne`s New Critical Introductions to Shakespeare).

The fourth Chapter analyzes Prince Hal, Richard II and Henry VI, through the prism of sloth as a result of dereliction of duty. Till the fourteenth century, the sin of sloth in addition to neglect of religious office, has acquired a second association, namely a "neglect in the obligation of one`s status or profession" as Siegfried Wenzel (1967, p. 91) points out. For example, A.D. Nuttal talks about Hal`s idleness as a preparation for his reformation and surprise: "He must appear to neglect his royal responsibilities, must fritter his time away in vicious idleness, with criminals and drunks, until the moment comes" (2008, p.215). John W. Blanpied, also discusses Hal`s idleness: "When Poins asks him the 'issue' of the jest, Hal answers in the nervously explosive style of a man whose wit is all that keeps him from being swamped by a desperate sense of his own idleness" (2008, p.225). With regard to Shakespeare`s portrayal of Henry V in the eponymous play, critics are sharply divided on whether, according to James D. Mardock, Henry should be regarded as "the mirror of all Christian kings" (2019) or as a "general who threatens rape and infanticide and orders the cutting of prisoner`s throats" (2019). Critics who regard him generally without serious flaws include, John Stuart MacKenzie, A.C. Bradley, Thomas Carlyle, Edward Dowden, G.G. Gervinus. Some of the critics who view Henry V in a negative light include, William Hazlitt, John McCloskey and William Watkiss Lloyd. Lloyd, for example, writes "Even the apparent humility of the post battle-prayer is 'at best refinement of pride whether audaciously claiming to be representative and arm of the divinity, or mounting to the fantastic trick of partnership with or even generosity to God'" (as cited in Mardock,2019). According to Gerald Gould, the play is a complex one and is both: "about his [Henry`s] rightful inheritance 'and to 'busy giddy minds'" (as cited in Mardock ,2019). A.P. Rossiter views the plays as "a propaganda-play on national Unity" (as cited in Mardock ,2019), a view similar

to Wilson Knight`s view that is about "refueling[the] national confidence" (as cited in Mardock ,2019). John Dover Wilson also agrees the play is a complex one. According to Wilson, Henry "is a successful king in a flawed world" (as cited in Mardock ,2019) thus exculpating Henry from the attacks of the critics who view him in a negative light. One of the best readings that emphasizes the complexity of the play *Henry V* is Norman Rabkin`s essay "Rabbits Ducks, and Henry V". Rabkin views Henry`s duality as the play`s *raison d`etre*. According to Rabkin "the play resists any attempt to find a compromise position between the binary interpretations, forcing its audiences and readers to make a choice: 'In *Henry V* Shakespeare creates a work whose ultimate power is precisely the fact that it points in two opposite directions, virtually daring us to choose one of the opposed interpretations it requires of us'" (as cited in Mardock ,2019). Stephen Greenblatt, through the lenses of "new historicism" views Prince Hal as a "conniving hypocrite" (as cited in Mardock ,2019) fostering the power that he will use in the future as king Henry V, a power which amounts to "glorified, usurpation and theft" (as cited in Mardock ,2019).

Critics have also depicted Richard II as a king who neglected his duty. Francois P. G. Guizot writes about Richard`s neglect of duties to his citizens and indolent confidence. Guizot writes:

> Richard never imagined that he ever was, or could be, anything but a king; his royalty was, in his eyes, a part of his nature,one of the constituent elements of his being, which he brought into the world withhim at his birth, subject to no conditions but his life; as he had nothing to do to retain it, it was no more in his power to cease to be worthy of it than to cease to be invested with it; and hence arose his ignorance of his duties to his subjects, and to his own safety, and his indolent confidence in the midst of danger. (Guizot, 2001, p.189)

E.K. Chambers in *The Tragedy of Richard II*, writes about Richard`s "idle confidence in a supposed God-given commission to reign" (2001, p.320). A number of critics stressed Richard`s defections of duty and obligations including Masefield in *William Shakespeare* (1911) and R.J. Dorius in Dorius, "A Little More than a Little", *Shakespeare Quarterly,* 11(1960), 13-26 and Robert Ornstein's *A Kingdom for a Stage* (1972). In addition, several authors have detected Richard`s pride and arrogance.

Henry VI is also depicted as slothful as result of negligence or dereliction of duty. Lawrence V. Ryan in his introduction to Signet Classics' *Henry VI part I, II and III* summarizes the tetralogy, consisting of these plays together with the play *Richard III*.

> The theme that runs throughout the tetralogy composed on the reigns of Henry VI and Richard III, and in fact throughout all of his dramatizations of English history, is the individual`s, and people`s response to the continuing alternations of order and disorder allowed by divine providence in the political life of a nation. A strong and heroic king whose

> regime brings glory and harmony to the commonwealth is succeeded by a monarch lacking, through extreme youth or defect of character, in the virtues constituents of society. The ineptitude or negligence of the sovereign looses the restraints on ambitious and unscrupulous subjects whose schemes and counterschemes for self-aggrandizement promote faction, public disorder and eventually civil war. (Ryan, 2005, p.4-5)

Arthur Freeman in his introduction to *Henry VI Part II*, contrasts "York`s rise to action and Henry`s degeneration into helpless passivity" (Freeman, 2005, p.238). It seems that Shakespeare followed Edward`s Hall account on Henry VI, who in his *Chronicle* described him as a man "of meek spirit, and a simple wit, preferring peace before war, rest before business, honesty before profit and quietness before labor" (Freeman, 2005, p.241).

The fourth Chapter provides an analysis on the characters of Othello, King Lear, Coriolanus and Titus Andronicus through the prism of anger. In the final Chapter these characters are analyzed as possessing hubristic pride. Over the centuries critics have acknowledged patterns of anger and pride in these characters. For example, William Hazlitt in "Othello," from *Characters of Shakespear's Plays* (1817) talks about Othello`s rage: "The nature of the Moor is noble, confiding, tender, and generous; but his blood is of the most inflammable kind; and being once roused by a sense of his wrongs, he is stopped by no considerations of remorse or pity till he has given a loose to all the dictates of his rage and his despair" (2008, p.104). Hazlitt continues:

> The progressive preparation for the catastrophe is wonderfully managed from the Moor's first gallant recital of the story of his love, of 'the spells and witchcraft he had used', from his unlooked-for and romantic success, the fond satisfaction with which he dotes on his own happiness, the unreserved tenderness of Desdemona and her innocent importunities in favour of Cassio, irritating the suspicions instilled into her husband's mind by the perfidy of Iago, and rankling there to poison, till he loses all command of himself, and his rage can only be appeased by blood. (Hazlitt, 2008, p.105)

Frank Kermode, in "Othello," also stresses Othello`s anger or rage "This kind of writing, by quasi-musical, quasi-magical means, achieves a rawness of passion, a conflict between innocently suicidal enquiry and a rage almost beyond words. Rage beyond words was not something the early Shakespeare would have even thought of aiming at" (Kermode, 2008, p.308).

A number of critics also acknowledge Lear`s anger and pride. For example, G. Wilson Knight in "The Lear Universe" from *The Wheel of Fire* points to Lear`s anger and pride. He states: "His purgatory has been this: cruelly every defense of anger and pride that barriers his consciousness from his deepest and truest emotion—his love for Cordelia, whom he loved most, on whom he had thought to set his rest (I. i. 125)—has been broken down" (2007, p.189). Harold Goddard in "King

Lear" from *The Meaning of Shakespeare* also acknowledges Lear`s pride and anger: "He is a victim, to the point of incipient madness, of his arrogance, his anger, his vanity, and his pride" (Goddard, 2007, p.223). On another occasion, Alexander Blok stresses Lear`s pride and anger: "The balance is upset, he has been hurt in his pride as king and father, and he falls into wrathful confusion" (2007, p.168).

Coriolanus, the third character analyzed in this chapter is also viewed as angry by a number of critics. Janet Adelman in "Anger is My Meat: Feeding, Dependency, and Aggression in *Coriolanus"* (Adelman, 1980, pp. 129-49 in *Representing Shakespeare,* Murray M. S., and Coppelia K.(Eds.), writes about Coriolanus feeding himself on his own anger. Bradley as cited by Bruce King is of the opinion that Coriolanus is proud, but that he is "unaware of his pride" (1989, p.19). Bruce King cites G. Wilson Knight, who in "The Royal Occupation. An Essay on Coriolanus*"* in *The Imperial Theme* (Oxford, 1931; 3rd edn, London, 1951) regards Coriolanus as a "blind mechanic, metallic thing of pride and pride`s destiny" (King, 1989, p. 27). Kenneth Burke in *Language as Symbolic Action* (1966) sees Coriolanus as being "excessively proud" (1989, p.35), not considering "any middle way" (1989, p.35). Finally, Bruce King in Coriolanus (1989) talks about the self-destructive effects of anger, stressing the notion that although pride and anger have ruined him in Rome, he resorts again to these emotions among the Volsces. According to Bruce King, Coriolanus is "prisoner of [his] wrath" (1989, p.74).

The characters of Tutus Andronicus, Tamora and Aaron have also been viewed as angry and proud by a number of critics. For example, J.C. Maxwell writes that "the errors and crimes into which Titus`s anger and inflexibility betray him in Act 1 have the same function in the play as those in Lear" (1995, as cited in Phillip C. Kolin *Titus Andronicus Critical Essays,* Introduction xxxvi, p.16). Tamora is also presented as an angry person. Jane Hiles in "A Margin for Error: Rhetorical Context in Titus Andronicus" acknowledges Tamora`s anger. She writes "Had she [Lavinia] been privy to Tamora`s hidden agenda, Lavinia might have tried to escape; instead, she not only aggravates Tamora`s anger, but she also participates rhetorically in shaping the mode of her own destruction" (Hiles, 1995, p.239).

Robert S. Miola in his *Shakespeare`s Rome* points out that Titus embodies the *Romanitas*, a military code of honour characterized among other notions by pride. Again according to Miola, "The gestalt of Roman virtues including justice, continence and nobility (1.1.15), so essential to Titus`s success in battle, appears inside the city walls as an intractable combination of pride, self-righteousness and self-aggrandizement" (Miola, 2004 p.49.) Caroline Asp in her "'Upon her wit doth earthly honour wait' Female agency in Titus Andronicus" in *Titus Andronicus Critical Essays* (2005, p.341), acknowledges Tamora`s pride in her rhetorical skills citing Tamora`s phrase that she will

"Gloze with all" (IV. 4. 35) i.e. use affable words. Aaron is also viewed by some critics as a proud character, namely by H(ereward) T. Price who writes about Aaron`s devotion as a father being proud of his race (1943, p.76).

Chapter six, which deals with the sin of envy, offers an analysis on the characters of Richard III and Iago. As with all of the characters, in the final chapter these characters are analyzed through the prism of pride. Critics over the centuries have acknowledged the notion of envy and pride in both Richard III and Iago. William Richardson in "On the dramatic character of King Richard III" from *Essays on Shakespeare`s Dramatic Characters of "Richard III", "King Lear" and "Timon of Athens"* (1784) points out about Richard III that "He is moved with the love of power and of wealth. He is susceptible, perhaps, of envy against those who arise to such pre-eminence as he thinks might have suited his own talents and condition"(2010, p.101). Thomas Whately in From *Remarks on Some of the Characters of Shakespere (1785)* has described Richard as having *"*a rancorous envy ofthose who have greater advantages of figure" (2010, p.114). August Wilhelm Schlegel in *Lectures on Dramatic Art and Literature(1809*) has described Richard as envying his brother`s "enjoyment of love" (2010,p.127). The same trait of this kind of envy in Richard was also detected by W.H. Auden in *Lectures on Shakespeare* (1946). Thomas Whately in *Remarks on Some of the Characters of Shakespere has* acknowledged the presence of pride in Richard*. He states "*Richard is filled with pride in his relentless pursuit of power" (2010, p.67). Samuel Taylor Coleridge is another critic who acknowledges Richard`s pride. In "Richard III," from *Shakspeare, with Introductory Remarks on Poetry, the Drama, and the Stage he states:* "Pride of intellect is the characteristic of Richard, carried to the extent of even boasting to his own mind of his villany, whilst others are present to feed his pride of superiority" *(2010, 141).* The critic Harold Bloom, summarizing Stopford A. Brooke`s essay "Richard III," in *On Ten Plays of Shakespeare*, depicts Richard III as *"*As a personification of chaos, Richard III is the embodiment of pride and the attendant dangers of one who believes he is above divine law*"* (2010, p.187).

The second analyzed character Iago is also described as envious and proud by a number of critics. For example, Samuel Taylor Coleridge in *"*Notes on Othello", from *Lectures and notes on Shakespeare and Other English Poets,* writes that two passions act on Iago, "vanity and envy" (Coleridge, 2008, p.114). The poet W.H. Auden also stresses Iago`s envy although from a different perspective, namely that Iago doesn`t have identity and out of envy subverts the identity of others. The critic A.C. Bradley in "Othello" from *Shakespearean Tragedy* has stressed Iago` s wounded pride. Bradley writes*: "*But he, a man ten times as able as Cassio or even Othello, does not greatly prosper. Somehow, for all the stupidity of these open and generous people, they get on better than the 'fellow of some soul'. And this, though he is not particularly eager to get on, wounds his pride"

(Bradley, 2008, p.146). He continues on the theme of Iago`s superiority, a term often synonymous to pride, and his very pride:

> Still, desire of advancement and resentment about the lieutenancy, though factors and indispensable factors in the cause of Iago's action, are neither the principal nor the most characteristic factors. To find these, let us return to ourhalf-completed analysis of the character. Let us remember especially the keen sense of superiority, the contempt of others, the sensitiveness to everything which wounds these feelings, the spite against goodness in men as a thing not only stupid but, both in its nature and by its success, contrary to Iago's nature and irritating to his pride. (Bradley, 2008, p.150)

In the last chapter, this thesis argues that all of the analyzed characters, in addition to sinning in some of the sins, are also proud. This emotion/Christian sin, as seen in the literature review above, was also noted by a number of critics.

In the conclusion, I will try affirm once again that the characters are sinful, this time by applying Dante`s view that imperfect love, (be it perverted, deficient or excessive) is the cause for the sins.

Although the number of critics that have detected these emotions/Christian sins in the analyzed plays is numerous, initial research has shown no close textual analyses of these Shakespearean characters based on an eclectic perspective including, but not being limited to 1) The Bible and patristic authors such as St. Augustine, Pope Gregory and Thomas Aquinas 2) Classical interpretation of these emotions/ later Christian Sins, in particular Aristotle , Plutarch and Seneca, 3) Influential medieval books on the sins: *Ancrene Wisse (Riwle)* and Peraldus`s *Summa de vitiis et virtutibus.* 3) Medieval authors such as the father of English literature Geoffrey Chaucer, William Langland and the father of Italian language Dante Alighieri 4) Renaissance authors/ philosophers/ theologians such as Shakespeare's contemporaries Edmund Spenser, Francis Bacon, Thomas Nashe, Pierre de la Primaudaye, Niccolò Machiavelli, and Jeremy Taylor 5) Philosophers with influential writing on the emotions such as David Hume 5)Modern theological and psychological interpretations of the emotions/Christian sins. As such, this thesis will fill that gap and provide a foundation on which further study may be build. This thesis doesn`t claim that the analysis it provides covers all of the sins in every analyzed character.

I will outline some of the reasons why this thesis takes as reference these authors/ works. Shakespeare was a Renaissance writer, and as such he was influenced by the trends of his age. Aristotle`s works, or Corpus Aristotelian, was very influential during the Renaissance. In fact, no other period provided more comments on the Corpus Aristotelian compared to the Renaissance. For example, Paul Richard Blum, a Renaissance researcher, by analyzing *Lohrs` Catalogue of Renaissance*

Latin Aristotle Commentaries, concluded that there were 6653 commentaries on the works of Aristotle in the period 1500-1650 (2018, Kuhn). As a contrast, in the preceding century (1400-1500), there are only 750 commentaries in the same catalogue of Aristotle during the medieval age. Seneca was also highly influential during the Renaissance. In the words of Watling E.F., during the Renaissance, Seneca was a "a sage admired and venerated as an oracle of moral, even of Christian edification; a master of literary style and a model [for] dramatic art" (1966, p.9).

According to Alain Billault (2002, p.226), Plutarch influenced Montaigne, who according to Billault used more than five hundred quotations in his essays from Plutarch (2002, p.226). Montaigne's Essays, translated into English language by John Florio, influenced Shakespeare (1980, 54: 43–59). Some of the critics who support the idea that Montaigne influenced some of Shakespeare`s plays, particularly *King Lear*, *Measure for Measure*, *Hamlet*, *All`s Well That Ends Well*, *The Tempest* and general worldview include, Nietzsche, Jonathan Bate, Steven Greenblatt and Peter G. Platt. For example, Jonathan Bate has stated "it was this [Montaigne's] book, perhaps above all others, that shaped the mind of Shakespeare in the second half of his career" (2014). However, a possible explanation for the similarities between the two authors can be ascribed to commonplaces, or reading the same Latin philosophical authors (Olivier, 1980). Shakespeare also used Plutarch *Parallel Lives* as an inspiration for some of his plays (Ackroyd, 2006, p.353-58; Shapiro, 2005, p.151-153). Niccolo Machiavelli was a Renaissance man. According to Allesandra Petrina, Lord Morley, "urged Thomas Cromwell to read both this book and the Principe, adding a short description of both, and noting how the Principe in particular was 'surely a good thing for your Lordship and for our Sovereign Lord in Council" (2009, p.14). Petrina cites L. Arnold Weissberger who had noted that "thanks to the efforts of Gabriel Harvey, Machiavelli's works were first introduced to English writers at the University of Cambridge in 1573" (2000, p.14).K.R. Bartlett states "Morley's recommendation of Machiavelli to Cromwell … offered, in an oblique way, a confirmation of the need for princes occasionally to break their words, as Henry had done with the rebels [of the Pilgrimage of Grace], and a pledge of loyalty to Cromwell's policies and the Henrician reform, despite Morley's own conservative position in matters of religion" (2000, p.77). Just like Shakespeare, Pierre de la Primaudaye (1546–1619) was a man of the Renaissance. Stuart Gillespie in his book *Shakespeare`s Books* (2001, p. 277) mentions that Primadauye`s *The French Academie* might have been used by Shakespeare as a source. Francis Bacon was three years senior to Shakespeare. Both Bacon and Shakespeare are some of the most prominent examples of English Renaissance literature and products of the same English educational system.

Chapter 1: The Carnal Sin of Lust in Cleopatra, Angelo and Tarquin

The reason why this thesis starts with the sin of Lust is due to the fact that it is the least hateful of the deadly sins. Dorothy L. Sayers interprets why Dante made the same choice in his Divine Comedy:

> Lust is type of shared a type of shared sin; at its best, and so long as it remains a sin of incontinence only, there is mutuality in it and exchange: although, in fact, mutual indulgence only serves to push both parties along the road to Hell, it is not, in intention, wholly selfish. For this reason, Dante, with perfect orthodoxy, rates it as the least hateful of the deadly sins. sin; at its best, and so long as it remains a sin of incontinence only, there is mutuality in it and exchange: although, in fact, mutual indulgence only serves to push both parties along the road to Hell, it is not, in intention, wholly selfish. For this reason, Dante, with perfect orthodoxy, rates it as the least hateful of the deadly sins. (1949, p.103)

In addition, the sin of lust and gluttony were regarded as sins of the flash and as least harmful, followed by the sins of the world, avarice usually accompanied by the sin of sloth, and finally the most pernicious ones the sins of the devil: anger, envy and pride.

1.1Cleopatra in *Antony and Cleopatra*

In order to better understand the sins explored in the play, specifically the sin of lust in the Antony-Cleopatra relationship, I will look at it through the prism of love-lust dichotomy. In brief, "Love is patient; lust requires immediate satisfaction. Love is kind; lust is harsh. Love does not demand its own way; lust does" (New King James Version, 1996, Corinthians 13: 4-8). Although this definition mainly refers to the Christian notion of love (charity) or *agape*, there is striking similarity to current psychological views on love and lust. Although lust can lead to love, these are different emotions and the major difference seems to be whether you care about the person or you just need instant gratification. According to Janet Brito, a psychologist at the *Center for Sexual and Reproductive Health*, the major difference between these two emotions is that: lust is impulsive and love takes time or as she is writes "Love is rooted in delayed gratification, while lust is rooted in instant pleasure. Lust feels like sprinting; love feels like a marathon. Love means acceptance; lust means indulgence" *(*Brito, 2018*).* Iris Krasnow`s stance, author of *Sex After: Women Share How Intimacy Changes As Life Changes*, is summarized as : lust is short and sudden whereas, love is slow and steady or as she says:

> Love means hanging on for the long-distance ride. When lust is the primary driver, partners can literally be in and out in one night. Love is rooted in a deep commitment and endurance. Lust is rooted in a longing of the loins and often results in unsatisfying hook-ups. Love is a comforting pilot light that, if fed properly, can fuel a couple for a lifetime. Lust can lead to a roaring bonfire of sex, but sex without a real relationship quickly turns to ashes.
>
> (Krasnow, 2018)

Shannon Chavez, who is a psychologist and sex therapist, makes the difference between love and lust which is summed up as*:* love increases with time, whereas lust decreases with time or in her words:

> Love is rooted in attachment and bonding that grows over time. Lust is rooted in intense desire and fades over time. Lust feels like a rollercoaster of emotions driven by biological forces and activated by our reward center, driven by desire for pleasure and connection. Love feels like the desire and need for attachment with biological sociocultural, and psychological factors that determine its development. (Chavez, 2018)

Perhaps the most relevant difference between these two emotions comes from Ryan Howes, which can be summed up as "lust is about you, whereas love is about them" or in his words:

> When you lust for someone, you must have them. You need their body or presence in your life as if your life depends on it. Love is not possessive, though. You'll certainly want someone you love in your life, but if their best life is found apart from you, then you want that for them. When you find that their well-being is a higher priority than your cravings, you're in love. *(Howes*, 2018)

Being too selfish and not taking into consideration the needs of the others can be very harsh and harmful as humans are social beings. Love on the other hand, can be described as patient and kind, as it is not selfish it takes time, it is steady and it is about the care of the others.

Although modern psychological and Biblical interpretation of love and lust are similar I will compare the relationship between Cleopatra and Antony using the New Testament passage. However, Antony is Roman and Cleopatra is Egyptian, so the question that arises is whether we can judge them using Christian standards. I will try to point out the similarities between the Christian view and how the notion of lust was regarded in Egypt`s and Rome`s societies. For example, it is assumed that one story from Egyptian literature was the inspiration for the Biblical story of Joseph and Potiphar`s wife in *Genesis 39:7*. The Egyptian story is called *Tale of Two Brothers* or *The Fate of an Unfaithful Wife*. In short, the story is about the detrimental and harsh consequences of unchecked lust caused specifically by the wife of Anpu. Anpu has a brother called Bata. Anpu`s wife, while Anpu is away, comes to the house where he lives with his brother and his brother`s wife and

the latter tries to entice him into sexual intercourse. Bata rejects her advances and returns to the fields. His brother Anpu returns from the field and finds his wife “lying there and it seemed as if she had suffered violence from an evildoer” (Mark, 2016). Since Anpu`s wife`s sexual lust is not accepted, she falsely claims that Bata tried to rape her. As a consequence of her lust and accusation, Anpu and his brother fall out and Anpu`s wife is killed. Another story from Egyptian mythology that points out the detrimental and harsh effects of lust is found in the story of Osiris, his wife Isis, Set and Set`s wife Nephtys. In short, Nepthys assumes the likeness of Isis and tries to seduce Osiris. The result of Nepthys`s lust and scheming is that Osiris is killed.

Romans also viewed lust as detrimental and harsh. For example, for Seneca libido or sexual desire is "destructive force *(exitium)* insidiously fixed in the innards” (2017, p.111). According to Seneca, unchecked sexual desire develops into lust. Gaca, paraphrases Seneca`s view stating that: “the only way to stop this calamity is to act on one`s sexual desires only for reproduction within marriage” (2017, p.111).

The actions of Antony throughout the play show that his love for Cleopatra is unconditional. Antony simply accepts Cleopatra for the person she is. Almost throughout the play Cleopatra fails to understand the notion of Roman honour and duty, the so called concept of *Romanitas* (including *pietas* or dutifulness) that urge him to return to Rome. She is obsessed with Anthony: “See where he is, who’s with him, what he does. I did not send you. If you find him sad, Say I am dancing. If in mirth, report That I am sudden sick. Quick, and return” (Act I, Scene 3, 297-300).

Cleopatra is immodest, urges her attendant Alexas to lie on her behalf and wants to seduce Antony. Being immodest with the intent to seduce is one way of describing the notion of lust. One may say that she is very vulnerable queen who only needs a powerful ally and that her main goal is to remain queen of Egypt. However, one may argue that she needs power, because, as H. Kissinger has stated in *The New York Times* (28 October 1973), power is the ultimate aphrodisiac. Thus, on one hand she uses her lust to remain in power, and on the other hand she needs power to goad and satisfy her lustful nature.

Cleopatra is inconstant and she expressly says so: “But, sir, forgive me, since my becomings kill me when they do not Eye well to you” (Act I, Scene 3, 410-412). Her changes in behavior are sign of inconstancy and inconstancy is one of the daughters of the sin of lust according to Thomas Aquinas. The reason for her inconstancy is that she can`t stand the fact that Antony is leaving for Rome and provokes him, saying that he is the greatest liar and unfaithful lover. Although the following passage describes Biblical love or selfless love *(agape),* it is also valid for romantic love *(eros)* as Pope Benedict XVI in his encyclical *Deus Caritas est (Benedict XVI, 2005)* argues that *agape*

and *eros* are not different types of love, but distinct halves of complete love representing giving and receiving.

If we paraphrase the previously mentioned passage of *Corinthians 13: 4-5*: 'Love suffers long and is kind; love does not envy; love does not parade itself, is not puffed up; does not behave rudely, does not seek its own" (New King James Version, 1996) and apply it to Cleopatra, one can see that she does not suffer all and is not kind, but provoking. Furthermore, she parades her love pretending that she would faint out of love for Antony. In addition, Cleopatra unconditionally seeks her own way, namely that Antony stays in Egypt, although he is a Roman general and is required elsewhere.

Another argument in support that she is lustful is present in Act I, Scene 5. She asks for mandragora, so that she can fall asleep. Mandragora has a long tradition of being associated with provoking lust. With regard to castrated men, or more particularly the eunuch Mardian, she states: "I take no pleasure in aught an eunuch has. 'Tis well for thee That, being unseminared, thy freer thoughts May not fly forth of Egypt" (533-536). In other words, she is interested only in sex as personal gratification, which is another way to describe lust.

In the next lines from the same Scene she openly envies, contrary to the Bible`s description of love, the horse that Antony rides, an apparent allusion to sexual intercourse: "O Charmian, where think'st thou he is now? Stands he or sits he? Or does he walk? Or is he on his horse? O happy horse, to bear the weight of Antony!" (543-546)

Enobarbus, describes her as having infinite variety, which simply means mood swings, another term for inconstancy or another trait of the sin of lust. He further describes her as riggish, which means lustful or sexually unrestrained. For Cleopatra, the relationship between herself and Antony boils down to the relationship between an angler and a fish. She would imagine that every fish is: "an Antony And say, "Aha! You're caught." (1065-1066) True love doesn't boil down to a hunter-prey relationship. Love is kind, the hunter-prey relationship is a harsh relationship, and is closer to lust than to love. Furthermore, Cleopatra exhibits patterns of self-love, the latter being one of the daughters of lust according to Thomas Aquinas. Upon learning that Antony has married the sister of Octavian, Octavia, she immediately wants to know the traits of the latter. When the messenger comes, she immediately starts to compare Octavia`s features to her own, as if she is the epitome for beauty and intelligence. Cleopatra starts asking the Messenger questions such as: "Is she as tall as me?" (Act III, Scene 3, line, 1700), "Didst hear her speak? (Act III, Scene 3, line, 1702), "Is she shrill-tongued or low?" (Act III, Scene 3, line, 1702), "What majesty is in her gait? Remember, If e'er thou looked'st on majesty" (Act III, Scene 3, line 1707-08), "Bear'st thou her face in mind? is't long or round?" (Act III, Scene 3, line, 1726), "Her hair, what colour?" (Act III, Scene 3, line, 1726). In the middle of the battle between Antony and Octavian Caesar, Cleopatra abandons Antony.

Enobarbus provides the information: “Naught, naught, all naught! I can behold no longer. Th’ Antoniad, the Egyptian admiral, With all their sixty, fly and turn the rudder” (Act 3, Scene 10, 2062-2064). Her flight from the battle is even more aggravating due to the fact that in the particular moment of her flight, the odds were leaning in favour of Antony and it seemed that they had the advantage. On this occasion it is Scarus who provides the information: “Yon ribaudred nag of Egypt— Whom leprosy o’ertake! —i’ th’ midst o’ th’ fight, When vantage like a pair of twins appeared Both as the same, or rather ours the elder, The breeze upon her, like a cow in June, Hoists sails and flies” (Act 3, Scene 10, 2075-2080).

If Cleopatra had really loved Antony, she wouldn’t have abandoned him when he had the upper hand. Love endures all and this is not Cleopatra reasoning. On the other hand, lust demands its own way and that is what Cleopatra did. In addition, after their defeat a messenger from Caesar arrives asking for Antony`s head. He informs Cleopatra that Caesar is ready to pardon Cleopatra since Caesar knows that: “you embrace not Antony/As you did love, but as you feared him.” Cleopatra full heartedly agrees: “He is a god and knows /What is most right. Mine honour was not yielded, But conquered merely” (Act 3, Scene 12, 2320-2322). Cleopatra goes even further and shows favour to the messenger and Caesar by stating: “Most kind messenger, /Say to great Caesar this in deputation: /I kiss his conqu’ring hand. Tell him I am prompt /To lay my crown at ’s feet, and there to kneel” (Act 3, Scene 12, 2338-2341).

Again, Cleopatra is inconstant in her actions and in her “love”. After Antony orders that the messenger is whipped, he states with regard to Cleopatra: “Were’t twenty of the greatest tributaries /That do acknowledge Caesar, should I find them /So saucy with the hand of she here—what’s her name /Since she was Cleopatra?” (Act III, Scene 13, 2371-2374)

Antony is implying that due to the fact that her behavior has changed so drastically, her name must have also changed. Antony states that she has always been fickle and inconstant: “You have been a boggler ever” (Act 3, Scene 12, 2388). Antony further states that she went wantonly after and had been used in lustful moments by Julius Caesar, Gnaius Pompey and other men: “I found you as a morsel cold upon Dead Caesar’s trencher. Nay, you were a fragment Of Gneius Pompey’s, besides what hotter hours, Unregistered in vulgar fame, you have Luxuriously picked out” (Act 3, Scene 12, 2395-2399).

Antony loses the next battle also. For his defeat he holds Cleopatra accountable probably due to the fact that she had previously betrayed him and the fact that Caesar promised to leave her to be queen of Egypt if she banished or killed him. He exclaims: “All is lost! /This foul Egyptian hath betrayèd me. / My fleet hath yielded to the foe, and yonder /They cast their caps up and carouse together /Like friends long lost. Triple-turned whore!” (Act IV, Scene 12, 2914-2917)

Antony calls Cleopatra triple-turned whore, because he knows that she had previously betrayed Julius Caesar, Gnaius Pompey and now it was his turn.

He further exclaims:

Betray'd I am:

Oh, this false soul of Egypt! This grave charm,

Whose eye becked forth my wars and called them home,

Whose bosom was my crownet, my chief end,

Like a right gypsy hath at fast and loose

Beguiled me to the very heart of loss. (Act IV, Scene 12, lines 2930-35)

He believes that she is a seductress and that she doesn`t love him, calling her deadly enchantress and that he was beguiled by a true Gypsy. Cleopatra continues to manipulate Antony seeking immediate satisfaction and exhibiting patterns of self-love. She orders Mardian to report to Antony that she had committed suicide, and that her last word was "Antony" with the disastrous result that Antony utters: "Since Cleopatra died/ I have lived in such dishonour that the gods/ Detest my baseness" (Act IV, Scene 14, 3048-3050). He urges one of his attendants Eros, that "when the exigent should come which now Is come indeed, when I should see behind me Th' inevitable prosecution of Disgrace and horror, that on my command, Thou then wouldst kill me. Do 't. The time is come" (Act IV, Scene 12, 3056-3060). Eros commits suicide rather that killing Antony, and the latter attempts to kill himself by falling on his sword but fails and hurts himself deadly. On seeing Antony, Cleopatra proclaims: "If knife, drugs, serpents, have Edge, sting, or operation, I am safe." (Act IV, Scene 15, 3195-3197) In other words as long as she has the possibility to commit suicide she will be safe from Octavian. After Antony has died, Cleopatra promised to make the "briefest end." (Act IV, Scene 15,3274)

We'll bury him, and then, what's brave, what's noble,

Let's do 't after the high Roman fashion

And make death proud to take us. Come, away.

This case of that huge spirit now is cold.

Ah, women, women! Come. We have no friend

But resolution, and the briefest end. (Act IV, Scene 15, 3268-74)

However, in Act V, the impression we get is that she is not opting for "the briefest end", but for obtaining favourable conditions from Caesar. She doesn't intend to commit suicide, but dreams of placing her son on the throne of Egypt. She states: "If he please /To give me conquered Egypt for my son, / He gives me so much of mine own as / I Will kneel to him with thanks" (Act V, Scene 2,3398-3401).

She had forgotten about Antony and her pledge to die. Instead, with regard to Caesar, she describes himself as "his fortune`s vassal" (Act V, Scene 2, 3411), constantly learning "a doctrine of obedience" (Act V, Scene 2, 3413) and that she would be happy to meet him or in the original text "would gladly/Look him i' th' face." (Act V, Scene 2, 3413-14) Apparently, Cleoptara tries to stab herself, or more precisely feigns to kill herself, but in her encounter with Caesar her mood changes and she lies that she gave over the entire treasure to the latter. In fact, Cleopatra has kept, in the words of Seleucos, "Enough to purchase what you have made known" (Act V, Scene 2, 3517). She intends to use that treasure and give it to Livia and Octavia and obtain intervention for her life. The fact that she oscillates between suicide and future life shows her inconstancy, and the fact that she intentionally keeps treasure so that she can buy her freedom, points to the fact that she has love for this world and abhorrence or despair of a future world. "Love of this world" refers to the pleasure which "a man desires to enjoy" and abhorrence or "despair of a future world" means that one is "held back by carnal pleasures" (*Summa Theologica*, p.2573) and as a consequence cannot obtain spiritual pleasures. This characteristic, alongside with inconstancy are two of the daughters of the sin of Lust according to Thomas Aquinas.

1.2 Angelo`s Tyrannous Lust in *Measure for Measure*

In *Measure for Measure*, Izabella describes Angelo as possessing "concupiscible intemperate lust" (Act V, Scene 1, line 2500). This thesis argues that it is Angelo`s lust that is at the core of the development of the play. The Duke Vincentio, abandons Vienna and delegates all the organs of his power to his deputy Angelo. In the words of the Duke he is to choose between mortality and mercy in Vienna, while the Duke is on diplomatic mission abroad. Immediately, Angelo orders the imprisonment and decapitation of Claudio for lechery, or more specifically fornication. Claudio is imprisoned for "getting Madam Julietta with child" (Act I, Scene 2, lines 162-163). They have exchanged vows, which in Shakespeare`s lifetime meant that it was legitimate to have sex, but they were not married still. Escalus tries to make Angelo lenient towards Claudio, asking him whether he hadn`t ever done the same mistake like the one for which he is now punishing Claudio. Angelo, however is adamant, stating that "Tis one thing to be tempted, Escalus, Another thing to fall" (Act II, Scene I, line 17), and finishing his speech with his sentence "Sir, he must die" (Act II, Scene I, line

484). In Act II, Scene 2, Angelo reiterates on several occasions his determination for Claudio`s death. When the provost asks him if he wants to see Claudio dead, Angelo states: “Did not I tell thee yea?” (Act II, Scene 2, line 745). When Claudio`s sister Izabella entreats Angelo to release her brother, the deputy states: “No remedy” (Act II, Scene 2, line 803), “I will not do’t” (Act II, Scene 2, line 806), “He's sentenced; 'tis too late.” (Act II, Scene 2, line 812), “Your brother is a forfeit of the law, And you but waste your words” (Act II, Scene 2, line 831-832) “he must die tomorrow.” (Act II, Scene 2, line 844), “Your brother dies to-morrow” (Act II, Scene 2, line 869). However, Izabella’s words, youth, beauty and goodness change his mood, and suddenly he says: “She speaks, and 'tis Such sense, that my sense breeds with it” (Act II, Scene 2, line 909-10) or in other words, when she speaks she makes so much sense that he wants to sleep with her. Subsequently, he tells her to come tomorrow. After the meeting, Angelo is so perplexed that he starts do doubt his own personality and emotions:

What's this, what's this? Is this her fault or mine?

The tempter or the tempted, who sins most?

Ha! Not she: nor doth she tempt: but it is I

That, lying by the violet in the sun,

Do as the carrion does, not as the flower,

Corrupt with virtuous season. Can it be

That modesty may more betray our sense

Than woman's lightness? Having waste ground enough,

Shall we desire to raze the sanctuary

And pitch our evils there? O, fie, fie, fie!

What dost thou, or what art thou, Angelo?

Dost thou desire her foully for those things

That make her good?

(Act II, Scene 2, lines 936-949)

Not only does Izabella make Angelo question his own personality, but her beauty and his lust makes him oblivious of his former firm stance that Claudio must die. Angelo utters:

O, let her brother live!

Thieves for their robbery have authority

When judges steal themselves. What, do I love her,

That I desire to hear her speak again,
And feast upon her eyes? What is't I dream on?
O cunning enemy, that, to catch a saint,
With saints dost bait thy hook! Most dangerous
Is that temptation that doth goad us on
To sin in loving virtue.

(Act II, Scene 2, lines 949-57)

The reversal of his former decision is goaded by his lust for Izabella, and the fact that Angelo thinks that now Claudio should live, is an obvious sign of inconstancy, one of the daughters of the sin of lust according to Thomas Aquinas. Angelo is completely overwhelmed by his lust for Izabella and justifies the change in his behavior towards Claudio, by comparing himself to a judge who steals and exculpates Claudio since his act is a lesser crime, namely a thief who steals.

In Act II, Scene 2, after Angelo reverts his decision telling Izabella that Claudio “cannot live” (Act II, Scene 2, line 1055) and Izabella serenely accepts his decision. However, immediately Angelo hints that there is a way that Claudio might live and questions Izabella:

“Which had you rather, that the most just law /Now took your brother's life; or, to redeem him, Give up your body to such sweet uncleanness /As she that he hath stain'd?” (Act II, Scene 4, lines 1074-1077).

With his offer, Angelo`s sin is twofold. Firstly, Angelo and Izabella are not married and haven`t exchanged vows, so his offer represents fornication. Secondly, due to the fact she is a nun and is a virgin, Angelo is aiming at deflowering a virgin. We get an additional prove of Izabella`s virginity in Act in Act III, Scene 1 when she says to her brother “If I would yield him my virginity, /Thou mightst be freed” (1329-30) and Act V, Scene 1, where she calls Angelo “a virgin-violator” (2431). Fornication and deflowering a virgin are named in Peraldus`s list of sins that go hand in hand with the sin of lust. In order to take advantage of Izabella and make her submit to his lust and “lay down the treasures of your body” (Act II, Scene 4, line 1122), Angelo continues with blackmails and threats: “Your brother is to die.” (Act II, Scene 4, line 1109), “Then must your brother die” (Act II, Scene 4, line 1131) and: “redeem thy brother /By yielding up thy body to my will; /Or else he must not only die the death, But thy unkindness shall his death draw out /To lingering sufferance” (Act II, Scene 4, lines 1194-1198).

Angelo pretends that he loves her whereas he only lusts after her. But, as stated earlier, love is patient and lust requires immediate satisfaction and misuses sex for personal gratification, exactly what Angelo does. Love is kind and lust is harsh. If Angelo loves Izabella he wouldn`t blackmail her,

thus being not only harsh but tyrannous. To Angelo`s advances, Izabella swiftly replies that her brother “did love Juliet, And you tell me that he shall die for it” (Act II, Scene 4, lines 1171-1172).

Angelo continues with blackmails “He shall not, Isabel, if you give me love” (Act II, Scene 4, line 1172). Everything that Angelo has to offer is blackmail and lust and in return he demands love. In addition to fornication and deflowering a virgin, Angelo is on the verge of becoming guilty of yet another sin that may result from the sin lust according to Peraldus. That is the sin of adultery. Namely, Angelo wants to sleep with Izabella, although he has exchanged oaths and was engaged with a girl called Mariana, but retracted from the contract after the ship which carried her dowry sank:

> She should this Angelo have married; was affianced
> to her by oath, and the nuptial appointed: between
> which time of the contract and limit of the
> solemnity, her brother Frederick was wrecked at sea,
> having in that perished vessel the dowry of his
> sister. But mark how heavily this befell to the
> poor gentlewoman: there she lost a noble and
> renowned brother, in his love toward her ever most
> kind and natural; with him, the portion and sinew of
> her fortune, her marriage-dowry; with both, her
> combinate husband, this well-seeming Angelo.
>
> (Act III, Scene 1, lines 1455-65)

The fact that he abandons her for lack of material things or dowry, also points to the fact that he hadn`t loved Mariana either but only craved for her dowry and that he rather loves material/carnal pleasures as opposed to spiritual pleasures. In other words, Angelo has” love of this world and abhorrence or despair of a future world” (*Summa Theologica*, p.2572), which is one of the daughters of the sin of lust according to Thomas Aquinas.

In Act II, Scene 4, when Angelo hears that Izabella has arrived he says: “O heavens! /Why does my blood thus muster to my heart, /Making both it unable for itself, /And dispossessing all my other parts /Of necessary fitness?” (1039-43).

In my opinion this can be read as prelude to his lust leading to dispossessing his judgment of fitness, or in other words a sign of his blindness of mind which is one of the daughters of the sin of lust, as the dialogue that follows with Izabella points out. In Act II, Scene after Angelo blackmails Izabella to sleep with him, and after Izabella says that she will tell everyone about his blackmail, Angelo states:

Who will believe thee, Isabel?

My unsoil'd name, the austereness of my life,

My vouch against you, and my place i' the state,

Will so your accusation overweigh,

That you shall stifle in your own report

And smell of calumny.

(Act II, Scene 4, 1185- 1190)

Angelo is saying that truth will remain hidden and that it will never be revealed due to his reputation and due to the position that he holds in the state. However, if he wasn`t subject to his blindness of mind infirmity caused by his lust, he would have been able to recognize that "truth will out" (*The Merchant of Venice*, Act II, Scene 2, line 645) and that we can`t hide even our evil thoughts let alone our evil deeds. For example, when Thales was asked can we hide our evil deeds from the Gods, he replied "No, nor yet an evil thought" (Laertius, 1938, p.93).

He would have also known that "dishonest people who twist the facts to support their claims are likely to be trapped by their own lies" (1996, p.1099). In addition, "for someone who always tells the truth, the facts – plain and unvarnished- give an unshakable defense" (1996, p.1099). All the assertions are true for Angelo, as truth was revealed, he wasn`t able to hide anything and in the end, he is trapped and hasn`t got any defense whatsoever. The Bible explicitly states the eternal truth that: "The truthful lip shall be established forever, / But a lying tongue is but for a moment" (New King James Version, 1996, Prov. 12:19).

In Act V, Scene 1 of the play, Angelo`s lying tongue is exposed. After Lucio takes off the friar`s hood revealing that the friar has been all along the Duke who has overseen and arranged everything, Escalus comments on Angelo`s character: "I am sorry, one so learned and so wise /As you, Lord Angelo, have still appear'd, /Should slip so grossly, both in the heat of blood. /And lack of temper'd judgment afterward." (Act 1, Scene 1, 2911-2914)

This passage can be interpreted as the" heat of blood" (Act 1, Scene 1, 2913) representing his desires or in other words his lust, whereas his "lack of tempered judgment "(Act 1, Scene 1,

2911-2914) is his poor judgment or blindness of mind as a result of the fact that he is overwhelmed by the deadly sin of lust.

1.3 Tarquin`s Tyrannous Lust in "The Rape of Lucrece"

In "Sonnet 129", "Th`expense of spirit in a waste of shame", Shakespeare portrays lust as being:

> … perjured, murd'rous, bloody, full of blame,
> Savage, extreme, rude, cruel, not to trust,
> Enjoyed no sooner but despisèd straight,
> Past reason hunted; and, no sooner had
> Past reason hated as a swallowed bait
> On purpose laid to make the taker mad.
>
> (Shakespeare, 1994, p.1241, 3-8)

In other words, lust is described as: "unfaithful (perjured), murderous (murd'rous), bloody, deserving of blame (full of blame), savage, violent (extreme), crude (rude), cruel, untrustworthy (not to trust)" after one takes advantage of lust he becomes hated, rendering mad those that enjoy in it leading them to the inferno.

It seems obvious that Tarquin is a lustful man. Not only does he blackmail and rape Lucrece, but throughout the poem Tarquin is described as: "Lust-breathed Tarquin" (line 54), "Pawning his honour to obtain his lust" (line 207), "lustful lord" (line 220), "possessing a "lustful eye" (line 230), his "heedful fear/Is almost choked by unresisted lust" (lines 332-333), "His rage of lust by gazing qualified" (line 475). Lucrece refers to Tarquin in the following terms: "And wilt thou be the school where Lust shall learn?" (line 668), "To thee, to thee, my heaved-up hands appeal, /Not to seducing lust, thy rash relier" (lines 689-690), "black lust" (line 705), "His scarlet lust" (line 1701). Tarquin`s rape and lust is further described as: "For light and lust are deadly enemies" (line 725), "O, that prone lust should stain so pure a bed!" (line 735), "Pure Chastity is rifled of her store, /And Lust, the thief, far poorer than before" (lines 743-744), "While Lust is in his pride, no exclamation/Can curb his heat or rein his rash desire" (lines 756-757), "She bears the load of lust he left behind" (line 785), "She thought he blush'd, as knowing Tarquin's lust" (line 1406).

Tarquin says that he loves Lucrece: "Yield to my love; if not, enforced hate,
Instead of love's coy touch, shall rudely tear thee"(lines 735-736). In other word he is saying: Either succumb to my love or brace yourself, because instead of embracing you affectionately, I'll vehemently rip you apart (line 177). He threatens Lucrece to sleep with him, otherwise he will kill

both a servant and Lucrece and place their bodies as if embraced, claiming that he had killed them because they were lovers. Tarquin states:

this night I must enjoy thee:

If thou deny, then force must work my way,

For in thy bed I purpose to destroy thee:

That done, some worthless slave of thine I'll slay,

To kill thine honour with thy life's decay;

And in thy dead arms do I mean to place him,

Swearing I slew him, seeing thee embrace him. (lines 580-586)

These words and threats of Tarquin dovetail perfectly with the definition that Shakespeare provides in Sonnet 129. Tarquin is crude, cruel, violent and murderous. Tarquin willingly or on a subconscious level misinterprets his lust for love. One could argue that this is an example of his blindness of mind, one of the daughters of the sin of lust. Supportive examples for this claim are found throughout the poem. He is going crazy, “Is madly toss'd between desire and dread” (line 237), his wits are confounded by Lucrece, “That eye which looks on her confounds his wits” (line 356), he is puffed up, “By reprobate desire thus madly led” (line 366). Tarquin is described as possessing “vulture folly” (line 623). Again this description of Tarquin fits perfectly with the description of lust in Sonnet 129. Namely lust has rendered Tarquin mad, as the sonnet suggests is the fate for those overwhelmed by lust. As a result of his blindness of mind he is overwhelmed by evil thoughts: “thoughts unjust” (line 250) and “unhallow'd thoughts” (line 258). His blindness of mind and his actions inevitably lead later to remorse and feeling of a guilty conscience, “She bears the load of lust he left behind, And he the burden of a guilty mind” (lines 802-803). Tarquin`s “burden of guilty mind” (line 786) is in fact his guilty conscience and after he had done the deed he feels blame, which again fits Shakespeare definition that lust is deserving of blame. Before Tarquin has done the deed he feels that Lucrece`s husband, Colatinus will blame him for the deed:

If Collatinus dream of my intent,

Will he not wake, and in a desperate rage

Post hither, this vile purpose to prevent?

This siege that hath engirt his marriage,

This blur to youth, this sorrow to the sage,

This dying virtue, this surviving shame,

Whose crime will bear an ever-during blame? (lines 285-291)

After Tarquin has raped Lucrece, the victim asks him whether he wants to be the mirror where criminals look to find excuses for their sin and blame:

“Wilt thou be glass wherein it shall discern Authority for sin, warrant for blame”. (lines 686-87).

He knows that he is deserving of blame or as sonnet 129 puts it “full of blame” (line 3), that is why he ruminates that he feels like a poor, feeble and bankrupt beggar feeling guilty and praying for repentance:

And then with lank and lean discolour'd cheek,

With heavy eye, knit brow, and strengthless pace,

Feeble Desire, all recreant, poor, and meek,

Like to a bankrupt beggar wails his case:

The flesh being proud, Desire doth fight with Grace,

For there it revels; and when that decays,

The guilty rebel for remission prays. (lines 776-782)

In addition, lust leads the involved parties to hate as Sonnet 129 description of the consequences of lust as “past reason hated as a swallowed bait” (line 7). Both Tarquin and Lucrece are being moved to hate. Tarquin is described as regretting and hating his pleasure “chides his vanish'd, loathed delight” (line 793), and Lucrece is described as someone “Whose deed hath made herself herself detest “(line 1617).

The final couplet of sonnet 129 is: “All this the world well knows, yet none knows well//To shun the heaven that leads men to this hell” (lines 13-14).

Hell is the exact denouement of the actions in the *Rape of Lucrece* for all the parties involved. After her rape, Lucrece describes the night when the rape took place as:

O comfort-killing Night, image of hell!

Dim register and notary of shame!

Black stage for tragedies and murders fell!

Vast sin-concealing chaos! nurse of blame!

Blind muffled bawd! dark harbour for defame!

Grim cave of death! whispering conspirator

With close-tongued treason and the ravisher! (lines 815-21)

In her words, the beautiful night was transformed into ugly hell: And solemn night with slow sad gait descended/ To ugly hell. (lines 1132-33)

She depicts her rape as “deep torture may be call'd a hell” (line 1339) and Tarquin`s action as “hell-born sin” (line 1570). Tarquin`s lust lead to his act of rape and his rape leads to her suicide. Her suicide, in turn leads to her father and her husband feeling that their lives are a living hell. Her father ruminates on Lucrece`s death and questions: “That life was mine which thou hast here deprived. /If in the child the father's image lies, /Where shall I live now Lucrece is unlived?” (line 1803-5).

Her husband Collatinus also feels terrible, for a moment wants to die with her, but recovers and is bent on revenge:

And then in key-cold Lucrece' bleeding stream

He falls, and bathes the pale fear in his face

And counterfeits to die with her a space;

Till manly shame bids him possess his breath

And live to be revenged on her death. (lines 1845-49)

Furthermore, there is enough evidence that as a result of his lust, Tarquin has been too rash. Rashness is one of the daughters of the sin of lust according to Thomas Aquinas. Tarquin`s lust is described as a “rash false heat”- “O rash false heat, wrapp'd in repentant cold, / Thy hasty spring still blasts, and ne'er grows old!” (lines 114-115), as “rash alarm” (525) or impulsive thing - “Who o'er the white sheet peers her whiter chin,/ The reason of this rash alarm to know,/ Which he by dumb demeanor seeks to show” (lines 539-541) and as “rash relier” - “To thee, to thee, my heaved-up hands appeal, Not to seducing lust, thy rash relier:” lines (705-706) and finally as “rash desire”- “While Lust is in his pride, no exclamation Can curb his heat or rein his rash desire, Till like a jade Self-will himself doth tire” (lines 756-758). In addition to blindness of mind and rashness, Tarquin exhibits other examples of the sin of lust, such as: misusing sex for personal gratification, as he isn`t married to Lucrece, doesn`t really love her and rapes her. In addition, by raping her, Tarquin is deliberately inflicting mental and emotional pain, with the tragic result that Lucrece decides to commit suicide.

Although an objection can be raised with regard to whether rape is really a result of lust and thus a sexual crime or a crime of violence this thesis regards as a reference the current classification of the World Health Organisation (WHO). The WHO regards rape as a sexual violence or assault. According to the WHO rape is a category of sexual violence "Sexual violence includes rape, defined as physically forced or otherwise coerced penetration." (World report on violence and health p.149) In addition, *The Textbook of Adult Emergency Medicine e-book* explains rape in the following matter "as the word rape is surrounded by legal and emotional issues the term sexual assault is more preferable. Sexual assault is a physical assault of a sexual nature directed towards another person without their consent. The assault may range from unwanted touching to sexual penetration without consent." (p.658) According to *The Trauma of Sexual Assault Treatment, Prevention and Practice*, the terms "sexual assault and rape are often used interchangeably in the literature." (p.2)

It is noteworthy to mention that the definition and classification of rape differed in the course of history. According to *Encyclopedia of Rape* "Opinion has varied according to time and place as to what sort of crime rape is. Should it be considered primarily a crime of violence? Perhaps its sexual nature should be emphasized?" (2004, p. 170) For example, in the 1960 and 1970 according to the *Encyclopedia of Rape*, the feminist movement put forward the idea that "that rape is a crime of violence that threatens all women." (p. X). According to the *Encyclopedia of Rape,* the debate over rape and its definition continues even today "The increasing popularity of the term sexual assault reflects an international trend toward seeing rape as a crime of violence, as gender neutral, and as the perpetrator's responsibility. However, in both practical and symbolic terms, the value of using sexual assault rather than rape remains contested, and the debate looks set to continue for some time" (2004, p. 225).

Chapter 2: Falstaff`s Carnal Sin of Gluttony in *Henry IV Part I, Henry IV Part II* and *The Merry Wives of Windsor* and the Concatenation of Sins Suitable to an Heir of the Vice Character

The sin that defines Sir John Falstaff in these three plays is the carnal sin of Gluttony. Falstaff is presented as either eating, drinking or talking about eating and drinking. However, this is not his only sin. Another carnal sin, that of lust also haunts Falstaff. This is no surprise as the sins of gluttony and lust are carnal sins and go hand in hand. The connection between gluttony (drunkenness) and lust is encountered in the Bible. In the *Genesis*, on two subsequent occasions Lot`s two daughters get Lot drunk, have sex with him and become pregnant. In the medieval times, gluttony and lust were regarded as a sin called Security. Thomas Nashe, describes this notion in the 16th century: "forgetting mortalitie; it is a kind of Alchymical quintessensing of a heaven out of earth" (1593, p.78). In other word guilty carelessness in the ordering of one`s moral system. One of the first connections between gluttony and lust in English literature comes from Chaucer`s "The Wife of Bath`s Tale". In that play we encounter the phrase "a lickerous mouth must have a lickerous tail" (p.188, 2011). The same word, *lickerous* has different meaning when referring to the mouth and to the tail. When it refers to the mouth, it has the meaning of gluttonous, but when referring to the tail, it means lecherous. Another example about this connection comes from Humphrey Sydenham, a 17th century sermonizer, in his Sermons Upon Solemn Occasions, calls gluttony the "forechamber" of lust. Jeremy Taylor, a cleric of the Church of England, also pointed to the connection between gluttony and lust. In the *Rule and Exercise of Holy Living*, Taylor writes: "1. It [drunkenness] causes woes and mischief, [78] wounds and sorrow, sin and shame; [79] it makes bitterness of spirit, brawling and quarrelling; it increases rage and lessens strength; it makes red eyes, and a loose and babbling tongue. 2. It particularly ministers to lust, and yet disables the body; so that in effect it makes man wanton as a satyr, and impotent as age." **(**1847**,** p.51) Last but not least, Shakespeare himself, in the play Macbeth almost half a century earlier that Taylor, made almost the exact point of the link between gluttony, lust, and impotency due to being drunk.

Macduff. What three things does drink especially provoke?

Porter. Marry, sir, nose-painting, sleep, and

urine. Lechery, sir, it provokes, and unprovokes;

it provokes the desire, but it takes

away the performance: therefore, much drink

may be said to be an equivocator with lechery:

> it makes him, and it mars him; it sets
>
> him on, and it takes him off; it persuades him,
>
> and disheartens him; makes him stand to, and
>
> not stand to; in conclusion, equivocates him
>
> in a sleep, and, giving him the lie, leaves him. (Act II, Scene 3, lines 787-797)

In addition, Taylor states that; it [drunkenness] multiplies sins and discovers them;(1847, p.52)" In the case of Falstaff, one of the sins that gluttony provokes is the sin of avarice. The connection between the sin of gluttony and avarice is attested in the Bible, in the Parable about Dives and Lazarus. Dives is a rich man and Lazarus is a poor and sickly beggar who begs at Dives` gate for food. Dives dined sumptuously every day. The issue is not so much that Dives ate sumptuously, but in not sharing his good fortune with the less fortunate and in hoarding food when the poor ones need it. In that case, Dives' action and inaction become respectively gluttony and avarice.

The connection between gluttony and sloth is best seen in W. Langland`s *Pierce Plowman*. The Glutton is presented as vomiting, passing out due to being drunk and after being brought home to his bed, "he had an accidie" (1969, p.2), *accidie* being the archaic, Greek word for sloth, or in other words an attack of sloth.

Harold Bloom in his *Falstaff: Give Me Life*, describes Falstaff as "intelligent as Hamlet" (Bloom, 2017, p.10) and "the embassy of life" (Bloom, 2017, p.10). However, in my opinion, Falstaff doesn`t have any lofty ideals that he would live or die for, and his intelligence serves only his basic, short-term instincts. For example, Falstaff doesn`t care about honour, and as a consequence live a life deprived of virtue. In my opinion, Falstaff only cares for his basic and brutish instincts, such as eating, drinking, having sex, and of course the necessary evil to achieve these things, money. In addition, although most critics describe Falstaff as charming and witty, he is also described as the Vice figure from the morality plays seeking to gain control of a man`s soul and serving as a messenger of the devil and tempter to man. R. Scott Fraser summarizes the opinion of the two foremost critics Bernard Spivack and David Wiles, who see Falstaff as an embodiment of the Vice figure:

> While secularized, the Vice never fully lost its symbolic function in the early modern period. Such a view is influenced by the work of Bernard Spivack, who argues that the Vice's role, "much older than his histrionic title, came into its key position as soon as the martial allegory for the Psychomachia was transformed by the stage into a plot of intrigue."
>
> (1958, p.140-41)

Wiles continues and expands this critical tradition, noting that "'vice' is often used as a synonym for fool in the sixteenth century […] Just as the fool in the Morris dance broke formation and danced where he pleased, so the Vice swept aside the confines of the script" (1987, p.4-5). In terms of the relationship between Falstaff and the prince, Wiles points out how Hal refers to him with language drawn from the morality tradition (such as 'devil', 'vice', 'iniquity', 'ruffian' and 'Satan'), and that Falstaff wields a wooden (as opposed to actual) dagger (1987, p.122)." Bernard Spivack adds: "It is hard for us, if not impossible to regard Falstaff as a villain in any sense, Shakespeare having marvelously exploited his affinity with the comic aspects of the Vice. But Falstaffs` high comedy is still sufficiently close to its origins in the double nature of his allegorical forbear to prevent him from being a comic figure merely. In him the direct accent of the Vice`s wit is not quite free from the faint ego of the Vice`s evil" (1958, p.204).

This thesis also argues that Falstaff's charm is a devilish charm and that he acts as a tempter to Prince Hal. Some of the charms that Falstaff uses are the charm of sex, the charm of money, the charm of power and the charm of escape.

One learns from Prince Hal in *Henry IV Part I*, that Falstaff thinks only on drinking wine, eating chickens, whores and sleeping. In a few lines, we are introduced to several sins that Falstaff possesses, namely gluttony (eating and drinking), lust (whores) and sloth (sleeping all afternoon).

> Thou art so fat-witted, with drinking of old sack
>
> and unbuttoning thee after supper and sleeping upon
>
> benches after noon, that thou hast forgotten to
>
> demand that truly which thou wouldst truly know.
>
> What a devil hast thou to do with the time of the
>
> day? Unless hours were cups of sack and minutes
>
> capons and clocks the tongues of bawds and dials the
>
> signs of leaping-houses and the blessed sun himself
>
> a fair hot wench in flame-coloured taffeta, I see no
>
> reason why thou shouldst be so superfluous to demand
>
> the time of the day.
>
> (Act I, Scene 2, lines 113-23)

It doesn`t take a long time for Shakespeare to expose another sin of Falstaff, namely avarice the desire for money, which, being a sloth, would ensure that he would enjoy his zest for life: eating, drinking, whores and sleeping. Falstaff himself admits that he is a thief: “Indeed, you come near me now, Hal; for we that take/purses go by the moon and the seven stars, and not/by Phoebus, he, 'that wandering knight so fair” (Act I, Scene 2, lines 124-126). Falstaff is even proud to be a thief. He says to Hal: “Why, Hal, 'tis my vocation, Hal; 'tis no sin for a/man to labour in his vocation” (Act I, Scene 2, lines 210-11).

Shakespeare describes a robbery perpetrated by Falstaff and his friends. Robbery is a manifestation of avarice. To make things even more sinful, the gang are attacking a group of pilgrims on their way to Canterbury with “rich offerings”. (Act I, Scene 2, lines 231) Out of desire for money, Falstaff ruthlessly gives the orders: “Strike; down with them; cut the villains' throats:/ah! whoreson caterpillars! bacon-fed knaves! They/hate us youth: down with them: fleece them” (Act II, Scene 2, lines 823-25). However, once the robbery is over, the gang is attacked by a disguised Hal and Poins. The gang, led by Falstaff, quickly escapes. Falstaff here shows moral cowardice, a manifestation of sloth.

As soon as Falstaff gets to the tavern, described in *Jacob`s Well* as the “well of gluttony, the Devil`s schoolhouse and chapel” (2006, p.8) he instantly demands a drink: “Give me a cup of sack, boy. Ere I/lead this life long, I'll sew nether stocks and mend/them and foot them too. A plague of all cowards! / Give me a cup of sack, rogue” (Act II, Scene 4, lines 1106-1109). However, Falstaff is not satisfied with any kind of wine, and he notices that there is a lime in his wine, a marker of poor quality wine. According to Thomas Aquinas, *studiose*, or eating or drinking too daintily is a marker of the sin of gluttony. In addition, wine is always in the back of Falstaff`s mind, so he compares cowards with wine with lime:

> You rogue, here's lime in this sack too: there is
>
> nothing but roguery to be found in villanous man:
>
> yet a coward is worse than a cup of sack with lime
>
> in it. A villanous coward! Go thy ways, old Jack;
>
> die when thou wilt, if manhood, good manhood, be
>
> not forgot upon the face of the earth, then am I a
>
> shotten herring.
>
> (Act II, Scene 4, lines 1114-20)

Again, with food in the back of his mind, he makes the allusion that if there is any good man in England left, other than him, that the he, the fat Falstaff is as skinny as a herring. Still nervous about the outcome of the robbery and angry at Hal, Falstaff addresses the Prince again demanding wine:

You are straight

enough in the shoulders, you care not who sees your

back: call you that backing of your friends? A

plague upon such backing! give me them that will

face me. Give me a cup of sack: I am a rogue, if I

drunk to-day.

(Act II, Scene 4, lines 1136-41)

Hal reminds Falstaff that his lips are still moist from the drink, but Falstaff would not have any of that: ”Henry V: O villain! thy lips are scarce wiped since thou/ drunkest last./ Falstaff. All's one for that. / [He drinks] A plague of all cowards, still say I” (Act II, Scene 4, lines 1142-46).

Falstaff continues with lying about the robbery, stating that they were attacked by a hundred men. Again Falstaff swears and compares himself with food and says that he is a bunch of radishes if he had not fought him: “All! I know not what you call all; but if I fought/not with fifty of them, I am a bunch of radish”. (Act II, Scene 4, lines 1173-74) When Hal catches Falstaff lying, Falstaff again defends himself using food vocabulary:

Zounds, an I were at the

strappado, or all the racks in the world, I would

not tell you on compulsion. Give you a reason on

compulsion! If reasons were as plentiful as

blackberries, I would give no man a reason upon

compulsion, I.

(Act II, Scene 4, lines 1220-25)

Falstaff shows that he is a coward once again, which is a sign of sloth, in his conversation with Hal. When they learn that Hal would have to confront on the battlefield Douglas, Percy and Glendower, Falstaff asks Hal if he wasn’t afraid:

But tell me, Hal,

art not thou horrible afeard? thou being

heir-apparent, could the world pick thee out three

such enemies again as that fiend Douglas, that

spirit Percy, and that devil Glendower? Art thou

not horribly afraid? doth not thy blood thrill at it?

(Act II, Scene 4, lines 1349-55)

When the sheriff comes to the tavern to investigate Falstaff`s robbery, Hal tells Falstaff to hide behind the arras. The conversation between the sheriff and Hal is short, and as soon as the sheriff departs, Peto pulls back the arras finding Falstaff asleep. Falling asleep on such a short notice, when your life is endangered can be viewed as a manifestation of sloth. When Hal and Peto search Falstaff`s pockets, they find papers i.e. bill for purchased food and drink:

Peto. [Reads] Item, A capon, . . .2s. 2d.

Item, Sauce,. . . 4d.

Item, Sack, two gallons, 5s. 8d.

Item, Anchovies and sack after supper, 2s. 6d.

Item, Bread, ob.

Henry V. O monstrous! but one half-penny-worth of bread to

this intolerable deal of sack!

(Act II, Scene 4, lines 1525-31)

In act III, Scene 3, Falstaff again confesses that he is slothful, avaricious and lustful. Falstaff knows and admits that he should repent: “Well, / I'll repent, and that suddenly, while I am in some liking;/ I shall be out of heart shortly, and then I/shall have no strength to repent” (lines 2011-14). Sloth is sin of omission and out of negligence, which is a close translation of acedia (without care) Falstaff never repents. In addition, Falstaff reveals several characteristics about himself that point to his greed (dicing, borrowing money and rarely returning them) and lust (visiting whore houses):

I was as virtuously given as a gentleman

need to be; virtuous enough; swore little; diced not

above seven times a week; went to a bawdy-house once

in a quarter—of an hour; paid money that I

borrowed, three of four times.

(Act III, Scene 3, lines 2021-25)

Falstaff continues with his revelations about gluttony and wastefulness (avarice) in his conversation to Bardolph, another member of his gang:

Thou hast saved me a thousand marks in links and

torches, walking with thee in the night betwixt

tavern and tavern: but the sack that thou hast

drunk me would have bought me lights as good cheap

at the dearest chandler's in Europe.

(Act III, Scene 3, lines 2050-2054)

Falstaff is so wasteful that he owes Mistress Quickly money and has to be reminded several times about it. However, either because he is slothful and doesn`t work and simply doesn`t have, or because he is mean and niggard, or a combination of these two reasons, he doesn`t have the slightest intention of returning the money: *Mistress Quickly*: "You owe money here besides, Sir John, for your diet and by- drinkings, and money lent you, four and twenty pound" (Act III, Scene 3, lines 2081-83). Falstaff`s response, due to his claim that apparently his pocket has been picked, is that he would not pay anything: "I'll not pay a denier" (Act III, Scene 3, line 2088). As soon as Hal says to Falstaff that he has been reconciled with his father, Falstaff immediate reaction is one of extreme avarice: "Rob me the exchequer the first thing thou doest, and/do it with unwashed hands too." (Act III, Scene 3, lines 2191-92) As soon as Hal gives orders to Falstaff, Peto and Bardolph about the incoming battle, and departs, Falstaff demands breakfast from the hostess of the tavern and laments the fact that he should go to war and leave it: "Rare words! brave world! Hostess, my breakfast, come! /O, I could wish this tavern were my drum!" (Act III, Scene 3, lines 2215-16). Even when he is marching to battle, Falstaff does not quit drinking. More to the point, he is a niggard and demands from Bardolph to buy him a bottle of wine:

Falstaff. Bardolph, get thee before to Coventry; fill me a

bottle of sack: our soldiers shall march through;

we'll to Sutton Co'fil' tonight.

Lord Bardolph. Will you give me money, captain?

Falstaff. Lay out, lay out.

(Act IV, Scene 2, lines 2 2367-71)

Falstaff shows his avaricious nature time and again. Even, when it comes to recruiting soldiers he resorts to bribery in order to turn a blind eye on the suitability of the wealthy to be soldiers. As a result, he describes his army as composed of ragged crooks, dishonest servants, and unemployed boys:

I pressed me none but such

toasts-and-butter, with hearts in their bellies no

bigger than pins' heads, and they have bought out

their services; and now my whole charge consists of

ancients, corporals, lieutenants, gentlemen of

companies, slaves as ragged as Lazarus in the

painted cloth, where the glutton's dogs licked his

sores; and such as indeed were never soldiers, but

discarded unjust serving-men, younger sons to

younger brothers, revolted tapsters and ostlers

trade-fallen, the cankers of a calm world and a

long peace, ten times more dishonourable ragged than

an old faced ancient: and such have I, to fill up

the rooms of them that have bought out their

services, that you would think that I had a hundred

and fifty tattered prodigals lately come from

swine-keeping, from eating draff and husks.

(Act IV, Scene 3, lines 2381- 2403)

When the Earl of Westmoreland reminds Falstaff, that the King is waiting for him, Falstaff again responses using a metaphor used about eating and stealing: “I am as vigilant as a cat to steal cream” (Act IV, Scene 2, lines 2427-28). As mentioned earlier, Falstaff cares only about the basic instincts without any regard whatsoever to some lofty ideals, like honour for example. When Hal

reminds Falstaff that he cannot guarantee for Falstaff`s safety and life on the battlefield and that he owes God his life, Falstaff expresses his view on honour, which in his opinion is reduced to a mere gravestone:

'Tis not due yet; I would be loath to pay him before
his day. What need I be so forward with him that
calls not on me? Well, 'tis no matter; honour pricks
me on. Yea, but how if honour prick me off when I
come on? how then? Can honour set to a leg? no: or
an arm? no: or take away the grief of a wound? no.
Honour hath no skill in surgery, then? no. What is
honour? a word. What is in that word honour? what
is that honour? air. A trim reckoning! Who hath it?
he that died o' Wednesday. Doth he feel it? no.
Doth he hear it? no. 'Tis insensible, then. Yea,
to the dead. But will it not live with the living?
no. Why? detraction will not suffer it. Therefore
I'll none of it. Honour is a mere scutcheon.

(Act V, Scene 1, lines 2753-66)

In the middle of the battle, Hal, seeing Falstaff`s standing idly, a manifestation of sloth, demands his sword, only to find that Falstaff has a bottle of wine in his holster:“Henry V. Give it to me: what, is it in the case?/Falstaff. Ay, Hal; 'tis hot, 'tis hot; there's that will sack a city. / [PRINCE HENRY draws it out, and finds it to be a bottle of sack]” (Act V, Scene 3, lines 2937-39)

Falstaff openly says that he doesn`t like to have the honour of the heroic sir Walter Blunt, but rather life. A life, of course that consists of robberies, drinking, eating, whoring, sleeping during daytime, cowardice, idleness, lying, taking bribes and, as a consequence, being afraid to die for any cause or anytime:

Falstaff. Well, if Percy be alive, I'll pierce him. If he do
come in my way, so: if he do not, if I come in his
willingly, let him make a carbonado of me. I like

not such grinning honour as Sir Walter hath: give me

life: which if I can save, so; if not, honour comes

unlooked for, and there's an end.

(Act V, Scene 3, lines 2942-47)

The highest form of cowardice and fear, both of them manifestations of sloth, with regard to Falstaff happens in Act V, Scene 4, when Falstaff pretends that he is dead on the battlefield in order to stay alive, while Hal fights Hotspur and eventually kills him. When Hal sees him, he thinks that Falstaff is dead, however Falstaff rises and out of immense fear stabs the dead body of Hotspur in case he is not dead.

2.1 Falstaff in *Henry IV Part II*

In *Henry IV Part II*, Falstaff`s lechery comes to the fore. In a conversation with his page, talking about Bardolph, Falstaff hopes that Bardolph would find him a wife in the whorehouse: “I bought him in Paul's, and he'll buy me a horse in/Smithfield. An I could get me but a wife in the stews, I were/mann'd, hors'd, and wiv'd” (Act I, Scene 2, lines 346-348). In the same Scene, one learns that Falstaff has gout and syphilis: “A pox of this gout! or, a/this pox! for the one or the other plays the rogue with my/toe” (Act I, Scene 2, lines 591-93). In addition, Falstaff again shows that he is slothful and a glutton. One learns from the Chief Justice that Falstaff will go with John of Lancaster to fight Northumberland and the Archbishop. However, Falstaff doesn`t intend to fight and responds: “for, by the Lord, I take but two/out with me, and I mean not to sweat extraordinarily. If it/hot day, and I brandish anything but a bottle, I would I/never spit white again” (Act I, Scene 2, lines 544-47). Furthermore, Falstaff again demands to borrow money, this time from the Chief Justice: “ Falstaff. Will your lordship lend me a thousand pound to furnish me forth?/Lord Chief Justice. Not a penny, not a penny; you are too impatient/ bear crosses. Fare you well. Commend me to my cousin/ Westmoreland” (Act I, Scene 2, lines 568-572).

As soon as Falstaff`s demand is turned down, he accuses the Chief Justice of avarice, although he is the man that is without work, almost penniless and often indebted: “A man can/more separate age and covetousness than 'a can part young/and lechery; but the gout galls the one, and the pox pinches/other; and so both the degrees prevent my curses. Boy!” (Act I, Scene 2, lines 575-78) In fact, Falstaff is so indebted that, Mistress Quickly files a lawsuit for owing her money. When the Lord Chief Justice asks for the sum, Mistress Quickly replies: “It is more than for some, my lord; it is for all—all/have. He hath eaten me out of house and home; he hath put all/substance into that fat

belly of his" (Act II, Scene 1, lines 797-99). However, as Falstaff is without money, and addicted to binge eating and drinking he doesn`t have the slightest intention of returning the money. Falstaff starts with an *ad hominem* attack questioning her sanity "My lord, this is a poor mad soul, and she says up and/down the town that her eldest son is like you. She hath been good case, and, the truth is, poverty hath distracted her" (Act II, Scene 1, lines 839-841). In the end Falstaff succeeds in making Mistress Quickly revoke the lawsuit and even gets an additional loan from her. With regard to the other girl from the Boar`s Head Tavern, Doll Tearsheat, Falstaff doesn`t want money but wants to seduce her. First, Falstaff asks her to sit on his knee and then he proceeds with the seduction:

Falstaff. Kiss me, Doll.

Henry V. Saturn and Venus this year in conjunction! What says

almanac to that?

Edward Poins. And look whether the fiery Trigon, his man, be not

to his master's old tables, his note-book, his

Falstaff. Thou dost give me flattering busses.

Doll Tearsheet. By my troth, I kiss thee with a most constant heart.

Falstaff. I am old, I am old.

Doll Tearsheet. I love thee better than I love e'er a scurvy young boy of

them all.

Falstaff. What stuff wilt have a kirtle of? I shall receive

Thursday. Shalt have a cap to-morrow. A merry song, come. 'A

grows late; we'll to bed. Thou't forget me when I am gone.

(Act II, Scene 4, lines 1551-67)

Falstaff wouldn`t go even to bed without wine as he demands from Francis sack "Some sack, Francis" (line 1572). In Act III, Scene 2, Falstaff continues with getting bribery from soldiers so that they are exempt from military service. After he decides that they should be recruited and is alone, they approach one by one offering money. Needless to say, with Bardolph as a mediator, Falstaff accepts the money and frees the most fit from service:

Bardolph. Sir, a word with you. I have three pound to free Mouldy

and Bullcalf.

Falstaff. Go to; well.

Robert Shallow. Come, Sir John, which four will you have?

Falstaff. Do you choose for me.

Robert Shallow. Marry, then—Mouldy, Bullcalf, Feeble, and Shadow.

Falstaff. Mouldy and Bullcalf: for you, Mouldy, stay at home
you are past service; and for your part, Bullcalf, grow you
unto it. I will none of you.

Robert Shallow. Sir John, Sir John, do not yourself wrong. They are
likeliest men, and I would have you serv'd with the best. (lines 2106- 17)

Falstaff`s avarice has no limits, as he also wants to befriend Judge Shallow and use his wealth:

And now has he land and beeves. Well, I'll be acquainted
with him if I return; and 't shall go hard but I'll make him a
philosopher's two stones to me. If the young dace be a bait for
the old pike, I see no reason in the law of nature but I may snap
at him.

(Act III, Scene 2, lines 2195-99)

Although throughout the plays Falstaff is fainthearted, a coward and supposedly witty, he assigns the drinking of wine to one`s courage and wittiness:

A good sherris-sack hath a two-fold
operation in it. It ascends me into the brain; dries me there
the foolish and dull and crudy vapours which environ it;
apprehensive, quick, forgetive, full of nimble, fiery, and
delectable shapes; which delivered o'er to the voice, the
which is the birth, becomes excellent wit. The second
your excellent sherris is the warming of the blood; which
cold and settled, left the liver white and pale, which is the
badge of pusillanimity and cowardice; but the sherris warms

and makes it course from the inwards to the parts extremes.

illumineth the face, which, as a beacon, gives warning to all

rest of this little kingdom, man, to arm; and then the vital

commoners and inland petty spirits muster me all to their

captain, the heart, who, great and puff'd up with this

doth any deed of courage—and this valour comes of sherris.

that skill in the weapon is nothing without sack, for that

it a-work; and learning, a mere hoard of gold kept by a devil

till sack commences it and sets it in act and use.

(Act IV, Scene 3, lines 2691-708)

However, in the end of the play Hal, now the newly crowned Henry V, decides to cut all ties with Falstaff's witticisms and debauchery, calling him a fool and a clown and urging him to pray, i.e. repent: "I know thee not, old man. Fall to thy prayers. /How ill white hairs become a fool and jester!" (Act V, Scene 5, lines 3640-41). Henry also calls on Falstaff to renounce gluttony, i.e. sinning as this has led to Falstaff being regarded by Henry as someone who is much closer to be punished with death penalty than any other in the kingdom of England: "Make less thy body hence, and more thy grace;/Leave gormandizing; know the grave doth gape/For thee thrice wider than for other men". (Act V, Scene 5, lines 3645-47)

2.2 Falstaff in the *The Merry Wives of Windsor*

Shakespeare makes Falstaff die in *Henry V*, but as tradition has it, on insistence of Queen Elizabeth I, he is revived in The Merry Wives of Windsor. In this play Falstaff is back to his old tricks. In Act I, Scene 1 Falstaff is described as a poacher. In Act II, Scene 3, Falstaff is portrayed as being broke, and subsequently, has to fire Bardolph. Falstaff is constantly broke, so he must resort to tricks: "I must cony-catch, I must shift" (Act I, Scene 3, line 335). Since Falstaff in the previous plays is shown as being able to dupe Mistress Quickly using his wit and charm in order to get her money, and due to the fact that he is avaricious and lustful, but slothful, in this play Falstaff would try something similar. He will try to seduce two middle-class, married women in order to get their money. Despite the fact that Falstaff is an old, fat man, he is so vain that he believes the two woman, Mistress Ford

and Mistress Page, have actually checked him out and apparently want to have an affair with him. With regard to Ford`s wife Falstaff says:

Briefly, I do mean to make

love to Ford's wife. I spy entertainment in her. She

discourses; she carves; she gives the leer of invitation.

I can construe the action of her familiar style;

and the hardest voice of her behavior, to be Englished

rightly, is "I am Sir John Falstaff's.

(Act I, Scene 3, lines 343-348)

In order to seduce them, Falstaff has written two identical letters to both of them, and only change the names. His logic with regard to Page`s wife is similar:

I have writ me here a

letter to her; and here another to Page's wife, who

even now gave me good eyes too, examined my

parts with most judicious oeillades. Sometimes

the beam of her view gilded my foot, sometimes

my portly belly.

(Act I, Scene 3, lines 356-360)

Since Falstaff is lustful, and due to the fact that according to Thomas Aquinas blindness of mind is one of the manifestations of the sin of lust, Falstaff cannot be more wrong in his assessment of the characters of Mistress Ford and Mistress Page. Namely as soon as they receive the love letters they become outraged at his insolence and vow revenge. Mistress Page exclaims:

What a Herod of Jewry is this! O wicked, wicked

world! One that is well-nigh worn to pieces with

age, to show himself a young gallant! What an

unweighed behavior hath this Flemish drunkard

picked—with the devil's name!—out of my conversation,

that he dares in this manner assay me?

Why, he hath not been thrice in my company!

What should I say to him? I was then frugal of my

mirth. Heaven forgive me! Why, I'll exhibit a bill

in the Parliament for the putting down of men.

How shall I be revenged on him? For revenged I

will be, as sure as his guts are made of puddings.

(Act II, Scene 1, lines 587-98)

Their plan for revenge is to pretend that they like him so that they can humiliate him in public. Mistress Ford proposes the plan: "How shall I be revenged on him? I/think the best way were to entertain him with hope/till the wicked fire of lust have melted him in his/own grease. Did you ever hear the like?" (Act II, Scene 1, lines 628-31)

In order to get Falstaff humiliated Mistress Ford and Mistress Page employ the services of Mistress Quickly. Mistress Quickly delivers the messages to Falstaff, where both married women express their willingness to have a rendezvous with Falstaff. Falstaff`s lust and greediness leads to his blindness of mind which inflates his ego and so he believes the story. Falstaff`s first choice for delivering the letters to Mistress Page and Mistress Ford were his friends Pistol and Nym. However, they declined and instead disclosed Falstaff`s intentions to Mr. Ford and Mr. Page. Contrary to Mr. Page, Mr. Ford became extremely jealous on hearing the news. In order to check whether his wife is cheating on him, he decides to resort to a trick. He will disguise himself as Mr. Brook, who is unsuccessful in seducing Mr. Ford and will offer Falstaff money in order to try to seduce Mistress Ford, i.e. his wife. Mr. Ford`s/ Brook`s explanation to Falstaff is that once Mr. Ford is seduced it will be easier for Mr. Ford/Brook to do the same. As Falstaff is always yearning for money, he accepts the deal: "Falstaff**.** Master Brook, I will first make bold with your/ money; next, give me your hand; and, last, as I am a gentleman, / you shall, if you will, enjoy Ford's wife" (Act II, Scene 2, lines 1039-41).

In Act III, Scene 3, Falstaff`s lust and blindness of mind have completely overwhelmed him. As arranged, he arrives at Mistress Ford`s house for the rendezvous. After showering Mistress Ford with compliments, Mistress Page arrives as it was agreed between her and Mistress Ford. In order not to be seen, and since he faint-hearted and a coward, Falstaff hides behind the arras. In the meantime, Mr. Ford arrives convinced that Falstaff is having an affair with his wife in his own house. In order to avoid the capture of Falstaff, Mistress Ford tells Falstaff to hide into a stinking laundry-basket, the contents of which are thrown into the Thames.

In Act III, Scene 5, Falstaff laments the fact that he has been thrown into the Thames, and as usual, to cheer himself up, he orders a large amount of wine with toast: “Falstaff. Go fetch me a quart of sack; put a toast in't. / [Exit BARDOLPH] Have I lived to be carried in a basket, like a/barrow of butcher's offal, and to be thrown in the/ Thames?” (lines 1748-52). After he has finished his first dose, he orders another: Falstaff. Take away these chalices. Go brew me a pottle of/sack finely. (Act III, Scene 5, lines 1772-74)

However, Mistress Ford and Mistress Page have not finished with the revenge, send Mistress Quickly to apologize for the mix-up and invite Falstaff once again to Mistress Ford`s house. Falstaff is so desperate for money and lustful that he accepts the offer. His inability to understand the situation and his blindness of mind lead, on hearing that Mr. Ford is returning home, to him being disguised as an old woman, Page`s aunt the “fat woman of Brentford" (Act IV, Scene 2, line 2033) in order to evade securely. However, Mr. Ford has forbidden Page`s aunt from entering his house. As Falstaff descends the stairs, the angry Mr. Ford starts to hit him: “Ford**.**I’ll pratt her. *He beats Falstaff.* Out of my/ door, you witch, you rag, you baggage, you/ polecat, you runnion! Out, out! I’ll conjure you,/ I’ll fortune-tell you!/ Falstaff exits” (Act IV, Scene 2, lines 2138-2143).

Despite Falstaff`s second humiliation, Mistress Ford and Mistress Page have not finished with the fat, old knight. The two of them plan a third and final humiliation. Mistress Page relates a folktale about Herne the hunter, a ghost that haunts the Windsor forest. They intend to make Falstaff put a set of horns on his head, just like the ghost in order to meet them at the Herne`s oak. Mistress Page concludes the plan with her idea to have her children and a bunch of other kids to get disguised as fairies and pinch him until he admits that he has been trying to seduce Mistress Ford and Mistress Page. Again, Mistress Quickly serves as the mediator delivering him a letter and Falstaff`s lust and avarice are once again exposed. Falstaff, dressed as a Herne the hunter, appears at the oak, encouraging himself with lustful stories from the Greco-Roman mythology comparing himself to Jupiter:

> The Windsor bell hath struck twelve. The
>
> minute draws on. Now, the hot-blooded gods assist
>
> me! Remember, Jove, thou wast a bull for thy
>
> Europa; love set on thy horns. O powerful love,
>
> that in some respects makes a beast a man, in
>
> some other a man a beast! You were also, Jupiter,
>
> a swan for the love of Leda. O omnipotent love,

how near the god drew to the complexion of a

goose! A fault done first in the form of a beast; O

Jove, a beastly fault! And then another fault in the

semblance of a fowl; think on ’t, Jove, a foul fault.

When gods have hot backs, what shall poor men

do? For me, I am here a Windsor stag, and the fattest,

I think, i’ th’ forest. Send me a cool rut-time,

Jove, or who can blame me to piss my tallow?

(Act V, Scene 5, lines 2560-74)

Mistress Ford shows up and Falstaff grabs her, but his “partner” tells him that Mistress Page is also there and that she also wants to join the party. Falstaff is overjoyed: “Mistress Ford.Mistress Page is come with me, sweetheart. / Falstaff.Divide me like a bribed buck, each a haunch.” (Act V, Scene 5, lines 2582-83).

Than the disguised Mistress Quickly the kids and other characters from the play start to chant and dance. Out of fear Falstaff falls to the ground and the kids start to burn him with their candles and pinch him. Falstaff tries to run away, but the Fords and the Pages confront him. Mr. Ford tells Falstaff that he is Brook and demands Falstaff`s horses until the horny knight pays back his debt. In the end it took Falstaff three humiliations to come to terms with his blindness. He confesses: **“**I do begin to perceive that I am made an ass” (Act V, Scene 5, line 2694).

Chapter 3: The Aristotelian Mean with Regard to Generosity and its Deficiency in Shylock and Cassius, and Excess and Deficiency in Timon

Although Pope Gregory Ist and Thomas Aquinas have named pride as the sin from which all other sins emerge, some authors have named the sin of avarice, otherwise known as greed or covetousness as the chief sin. For example, Pirminiuses`s (d.753) book *Scarapsus*, using Cassian`s octad and version puts cupiditas as the first vice. In this chapter I am citing St. Augustine and Thomas Aquinas` views on the sins and particularly on the sin of avarice, a sin that was often regarded as the principal sin, because Augustine is one of the thirty–six doctors of the church, which means that his writings have special authority and Thomas Aquinas is the foremost theologian who influenced

Catholic doctrine to a degree that in 1567, just three years after Shakespeare`s birth he was also declared doctor of the church, i.e., a saint whose writings are of special importance and in 1917 with the Code of Canon his doctrine was proclaimed the official doctrine of the Catholic church. Although Shakespeare lived in Protestant England, Catholic influence did not disappear immediately. For example, R. Newhauser states that there are some lines of continuity between these two branches of the Christian faith. He states "Nevertheless, it is clear that the waning of the seven deadly sins in Catholic sacramental and penitential theology does not signal the end of the history of a conceptual category that has manifestly remained productive up to the present day" (2012, p.164).

Another example is Ambrosius Autpertus (d.784), who in in one of his books, *Libellus de conflictu vitiorum atque virtutum*, intended for the monastic readers, names pride as the root of all evil and in another sermon on *cupiditas* intended for the laity names greed as the root of all evil:

> For although the vice of gluttony is one thing, that of lust another, envy another, sadness another, vainglory another, and pride another, and although they bring forth from themselves a great and innumerable brood, nevertheless . . . they grow from the one root of cupidity, as the Apostle testifies who says, 'The root of all evils is cupiditas' (2000, p.114).

In the previous passage and elsewhere, Ambrosius cites 1 Timothy 6:10, to justify his selection of cupiditas as the root of all evil. Augustine distinguishes two forms of avarice, general and specific. In his words:

> We understand here a general avarice through which someone eagerly desires more than is fitting, out of his own grandeur and out of a certain love for his own affairs. . . There is also an avarice in the specific sense, which is very commonly called 'the love of money' (amor pecuniae). By using the word as he did when he said that 'the root of all evils is avaritia,' Paul meant the genus (that is, the broad sense of avaritia) to be understood for the species.
>
> (Newhauser, 2000, p.93)

Thus, according to Augustine, "in effect avaritia generalis was almost equivalent to the idea of pride" (2000, p.93). In that way, Augustine argues, the passages Sir 10:15 (about pride being the root of all evil) and Tim 6:10 (on avarice being the root of all evil) are not contradictory but in harmony.

Julianus Pomerius, who lived in the fifth century, by drawing on Augustine's works dealing with *Ecclesiasticus 10:15* and 1 Timothy 6:10 also puts forward the notion that greed and pride are actually the same vice:

> To be sure, cupiditas and superbia are one evil insofar as one cannot find a proud person without cupidity, nor a greedy one without pride. Indeed, the devil, too, in whom pride holds the mastery, was greedy for his own power and for humankind's fall; and humanity

> itself demonstrated the passion of morbid greed by a desire for the forbidden tree and by striving to be similar to the divinity.
>
> (as cited in Newhauser, 2000, p.100)

Due to the fact that avarice ranked so highly among the sins it attracted the attention of other Christian interpreters such as Alcuin. Alcuin writes:

> Avarice is the excessive greed for acquiring, possessing, or retaining wealth and is an insatiable plague. Just like the dropsical person, who, the more he drinks, the more incessant his thirst grows, so it is with avarice: the more it has, the more it desires. And as long as it exhibits no moderation in possessing, it will not show itself otherwise in desiring. Its progeny are acts of envy, thefts, robberies, murders, lies, perjury, acts of rapine, acts of violence, restlessness, unjust judgments, contempt for the truth, forgetfulness of future bliss, and hardheartedness. It exists contrary to mercy and alms for the poor and all pity for those who suffer. It is defeated by the fear of God and by brotherly love and by deeds of mercy and by alms for the poor and by the hope of future bliss, since indeed the false riches of this world are defeated by the true riches of future bliss.
>
> (as cited in Newhauser, 2000, p.118-19)

In addition Thomas Aquinas in his *Summa Theologica*, describes covetousness as all evil, since " a gloss on Rom. 7:7, "For I had not known concupiscence," says: "The law is good, since by forbidding concupiscence, it forbids all evil." Now the law seems to forbid especially the concupiscence of covetousness: hence it is written (Ex. 20:17): "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's goods" (1981, p.1375). In other words, Aquinas is saying that all evil springs from greed.

The twelfth and the thirtieth centuries were a time of great changes. With the crusades, new ideas such as Islamic sciences and the classics started to enter Western Europe. In the same period towns became more important and the national wealth of the countries increased. The shift from agrarian society to mercantile led to an increasing rise of cupidity. In addition to Roger Bacon, St. Antoninus of Florence also gave precedence to avarice in his writings and on the whole avarice gained more attention from the twelfth century onwards. However, the leading position of pride in the heptad remained.

Since Avarice in the broad sense and pride are virtually the same sin, and since all evil spring from covetousness, I will try to demonstrate that Shylock possesses not only some of the manifestations of the sin of avarice, but also some of the progeny of the sin of pride, such as envy and anger, but also the outcome of anger, revenge.

3.1 Shylock`s Stinginess and Avarice in *The Merchant of Venice*

We get an insight into the avaricious nature of the Jewish usurer, Shylock, from his talk with Antonio, his borrower. Shylock is extremely angry and envious at the fact that Antonio lends money without interest. In that way, Antonio hurts the avaricious nature of Shylock, because the latter due to pure economic reasons, would have likewise to lower his interest rates if he would like to have clients and be competitive on the market. This means that he would make lower profits. For Shylock, this is an anathema and so he expresses his anger and hatred towards Antonio:

I hate him for he is a Christian,

But more for that in low simplicity

He lends out money gratis and brings down

The rate of usance here with us in Venice.

If I can catch him once upon the hip,

I will feed fat the ancient grudge I bear him.

He hates our sacred nation, and he rails,

Even there where merchants most do congregate,

On me, my bargains and my well-won thrift,

Which he calls interest. Cursed be my tribe,

If I forgive him!

(Act I, Scene 3, lines 363-73)

Shylock hatred is so huge that he would lend the money, three thousand ducats to Antonio without interest, albeit on one condition sealed as a bond at a notary. The bond stipulates that if Antonio doesn`t return the money in three months, that Shylock would cut a piece of a pound of flesh from “what part of your body pleaseth me” (Act I, Scene 3, 479). It seems that Shylock`s intention is to punish or even murder Antonio, to exact revenge and to teach him a lesson, in case Antonio remains alive. If Antonio forfeits his bond, in the future, out of fear he would stay clear of Shylock occupation. If Antonio dies, Shylock would get rid of his direct competition.

Shylock`s God is not God from the New Testament as he is a Jew, but rather money. In the Bible it is written “No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon” (New King James Version, 1996, Matthew 6:24). Shylock serves only mammon, i.e. money, and by demanding a

pound of flesh he is abiding to the Old Testament/ Tanakh saying: “Breach for breach, eye for eye, tooth for tooth: as he hath caused a blemish in a man, so shall it be done to him *again*” (New King James Version, 1996, *Lev.* 24:40). One possible reason for this is that Shylock feels that his flow of money and by extension his survival and above all well-being and the survival and well-being of his daughter, his flash and body, is threatened by Antonio. In Act IV, Scene 1, Shylock says: “You take my life/When you do take the means whereby I live” (lines 2325-26).

Shylock`s apparent reasoning is that, since Antonio with his actions is endangering his flesh and body, i.e. himself and Jessica his daughter, then by abiding to the Old Testament rule, he would also demand flesh for flesh.

As Pierre de la Primadaye has explained, the order of occurrence is pride, and by extension general avarice, anger and revenge “Now as pride breedeth arrogancie, so en|uy, ill will, anger, rancour, and desire of reuenge, doe follow and accompany it” (1618, p.510). Shylock is among the characters in Shakespeare that also follows this pattern. After he has fallen into the trap of pride/avarice and anger it is expected that he will continue with revenge: “Salarino. Why, I am sure, if he forfeit, thou wilt not take/his flesh: what's that good for?/ Shylock. To bait fish withal: if it will feed nothing else, /it will feed my revenge. (Act III, Scene 1, line 1285-88)

Again, Shylock justifies his urge for revenge relying on the Old Testament. His reasoning is that if a Christian wronged by a Jew seeks revenge, why that shouldn`t be the case when the roles are reversed:

> I am a Jew. Hath
>
> not a Jew eyes? hath not a Jew hands, organs,
>
> dimensions, senses, affections, passions? fed with
>
> the same food, hurt with the same weapons, subject
>
> to the same diseases, healed by the same means,
>
> warmed and cooled by the same winter and summer, as
>
> a Christian is? If you prick us, do we not bleed?
>
> if you tickle us, do we not laugh? if you poison
>
> us, do we not die? and if you wrong us, shall we not
>
> revenge? If we are like you in the rest, we will
>
> resemble you in that. If a Jew wrong a Christian,
>
> what is his humility? Revenge. If a Christian

wrong a Jew, what should his sufferance be by

Christian example? Why, revenge. The villany you

teach me, I will execute, and it shall go hard but I

will better the instruction.

(Act III, Scene 1, lines 1292-307)

In addition to being proud/avaricious, angry and revengeful, Shylock is a miser. Dante Alighieri in his Divine Comedy places those who have committed the sin of greed in the Fourth circle of Hell. Among them are misers, hoarders and spendthrifts. Shylock is a miser, because although he is described as a rich person, he is starving his poor servant Launcelot to the effect that his ribs could be counted, so that the latter wants to run away from him and find himself a new master:

Well, well: but, for mine own part, as I have set

up my rest to run away, so I will not rest till I

have run some ground. My master's a very Jew: give

him a present! give him a halter: I am famished in

his service; you may tell every finger I have with

my ribs. Father, I am glad you are come: give me

your present to one Master Bassanio, who, indeed,

gives rare new liveries: if I serve not him, I

will run as far as God has any ground. O rare

fortune! here comes the man: to him, father; for I

am a Jew, if I serve the Jew any longer.

(Act II, Scene 2, lines 667- 77)

That usurers and men of miserly nature would let the whole world perish of hunger and thirst is attested by Martin Luther as cited by Marx:

> Therefore, is there, on this earth, no greater enemy of man (after the devil) than a gripe-money, and usurer, for he wants to be God over all men. Turks, soldiers, and tyrants are also bad men, yet must they let the people live, and Confess that they are bad, and enemies, and do, nay, must, now and then show pity to some. But a usurer and money-glutton, such a one would have the whole world perish of hunger and thirst, misery and want, so far as in him

> lies, so that he may have all to himself, and every one may receive from him as from a God, and be his serf for ever. To wear fine cloaks, golden chains, rings, to wipe his mouth, to be deemed and taken for a worthy, pious man .... Usury is a great huge monster, like a werewolf, who lays waste all, more than any Cacus, Gerion or Antus. And yet decks himself out, and would be thought pious, so that people may not see where the oxen have gone, that he drags backwards into his den.
>
> (Marx, 1887, p.428-29)

One can see form Luther`s passage that usurers and greedy people want to present themselves as pious men. Shylock also wants to be seen as a pious man. In his conversation with Antonio, in order to justify his practice of usury, he cites a story from the Old Testament about Laban and Jacob`s cunning action in order to get profit:

> Shylock. When Jacob grazed his uncle Laban's sheep—
>
> This Jacob from our holy Abram was,
>
> As his wise mother wrought in his behalf,
>
> The third possessor; ay, he was the third—
>
> Antonio. And what of him? did he take interest?
>
> Shylock. No, not take interest, not, as you would say,
>
> Directly interest: mark what Jacob did.
>
> When Laban and himself were compromised
>
> That all the eanlings which were streak'd and pied
>
> Should fall as Jacob's hire, the ewes, being rank,
>
> In the end of autumn turned to the rams,
>
> And, when the work of generation was
>
> Between these woolly breeders in the act,
>
> The skilful shepherd peel'd me certain wands,
>
> And, in the doing of the deed of kind,
>
> He stuck them up before the fulsome ewes,
>
> Who then conceiving did in eaning time
>
> Fall parti-colour'd lambs, and those were Jacob's.

This was a way to thrive, and he was blest:

And thrift is blessing, if men steal it not.

(Act I, Scene 3, lines 397-416)

Antonio, however, doesn`t agree dismissing Shylock`s Biblical story by stating that “The devil can cite Scripture for his purpose” (Act I, Scene 3, line 425).

Shylock`s daughter, like Lancelot, also doesn’t like her father`s avaricious and miserly nature. Jessica lives with her father, but in her opinion their home represents “hell” (Act II, Scene 3, line 777). She says to their servant Launcelot: “I am sorry thou wilt leave my father so: Our house is hell, and thou, a merry devil, Didst rob it of some taste of tediousness” (Act II, Scene 3, line 776-79). Since Jessica`s house is hell for her, as a result of lack of love, she decides to elope with a Christian and a friend of Antonio, Lorenzo. Jessica says: “Farewell; and if my fortune be not crost, /I have a father, you a daughter, lost” (Act II, Scene 5, lines 905-6).

That Shylock cares more about his ducats that about his daughter is attested in Act II, Scene 8. Although the passage, Solanio`s account on what Shylock uttered, contains the phrase “My daughter! O my ducats! O my daughter” (line 1086), which gives the false impression that he cares more about his daughter than about his ducats, they pale when compared to the phrases that follow. Here, Shylock puts the entire emphasis on his ducats and on devising ways how to get them back. That is by finding his thief, his daughter.

My daughter! O my ducats! O my daughter!

Fled with a Christian! O my Christian ducats!

Justice! the law! my ducats, and my daughter!

A sealed bag, two sealed bags of ducats,

Of double ducats, stolen from me by my daughter!

And jewels, two stones, two rich and precious stones,

Stolen by my daughter! Justice! find the girl;

She hath the stones upon her, and the ducats.

(Act II, Scene 8, lines 1086-93)

In her escape, Jessica also takes a casket from her home, a considerable sum of ducats as well as a turquoise ring, a present to Shylock from his late wife Leah. When Shylock hears about his

daughter`s flight he expresses his opinion that he loves more his riches than his daughter and that he prefers his riches even at the cost of seeing his daughter dead in a coffin:

> Why, there, there, there, there! a diamond gone,
> cost me two thousand ducats in Frankfort! The curse
> never fell upon our nation till now; I never felt it
> till now: two thousand ducats in that; and other
> precious, precious jewels. I would my daughter
> were dead at my foot, and the jewels in her ear!
> would she were hearsed at my foot, and the ducats in
> her coffin! No news of them? Why, so: and I know
> not what's spent in the search: why, thou loss upon
> loss! the thief gone with so much, and so much to
> find the thief; and no satisfaction, no revenge:
> nor no in luck stirring but what lights on my
> shoulders; no sighs but of my breathing; no tears
> but of my shedding.
>
> (Act III, Scene 1, lines 1319-32)

This act of Shylock, according to Dante`s definition of sin with regard to love, is both an act of perverted love (in this case love of money placed above of love of his daughter) or pride and an act of excessive love (too much emphasis on money as contrasted to care about his daughter) or avarice.

With regard to the tense relationship between an avaricious men and misers and their offspring and food, Newhauser cites Gregory of Nissa, who in his *Contra Usararius Oratio*, states the example of a usurer`s behavior: “Constrained by the passion, he was also miserly with his own expenditures [..] not setting the table with enough, never changing his clothes except out of necessity, not granting his children the bare minimum for carrying on life” (Newhauser 2000, p.31).

The relationship between a wealthy and a miserly man, in this case Shylock and a son, or in our case his daughter Jessica, squandering his money is vividly depicted by Plutarch in his essay *On the Love of Wealth*. It is apposite to mention that squandering money, or being spendthrift is also a characteristic of avarice. Plutarch writes:

> For by the very means whereby they suppose that they are training their children, misers ruin them instead and warp their characters all the more, implanting in them their own avarice and meanness as though constructing in their heirs a fort to guard the inheritance. For their admonition and instruction comes to this: "Get profit and be sparing, and count

> yourself as worth exactly what you have." This is not to educate a son, but to compress him and sew him shut, like a money bag, that he may hold tight and keep safe what you have put in. But whereas the bag gets dirty and foul-smelling only after the coin has been stored in it, the children of misers, before touching the money, catch the taint of avarice directly from their fathers. Note, however, that the young pay them for this instruction in the right coin, not loving their fathers because they are to inherit a fortune, but hating them because they have not got it already. For having been taught to look up to nothing but wealth and to live for nothing but great possessions, they consider that their fathers' lives stand in the way of their own, and conceive that time steals from them whatever it adds to their fathers; years. Hence even when the father is still alive the son behind his back finds one way or another to steal some pleasure from the money and spends it as if he had no interest in it, giving it to friends and lavishing it on his appetites. (2013, p. 2593)

Dante Alighieri, in his Divine Comedy, also talks about a conflict between a miser like Shylock and a spendthrift like Jessika. Dante describes what happens in the Fourth Circle of Hell:

> Here, too, I saw a nation of lost souls,
>
> far more than were above: they strained their chests
>
> against enormous weights, and with mad howls
>
> rolled them at one another. Then in haste
>
> they rolled them back, one party shouting out:
>
> "Why do you hoard?" and the other: "Why do you waste?
>
> (*Inferno*, Canto VII, lines 25-30)

Shylock`s love of money and the estrangement it caused to his daughter with regard to her flight and subsequent loss, can be compared to the Myth of Midas as written by Nathaniel Hawthorne in *A Wonder-Book for Girls and Boys* (1852) . Namely after Midas saves Silenus, god Bacchus, out of gratitude, tells Midas that he will fulfill one wish for his service. Midas chooses that whatever he touches would be turned into gold. Bacchus grants Midas his wish. However, Midas`s daughter comes to see him in order to seek comfort because the roses that Midas has touched have turned into gold. In order to comfort his daughter, Midas touched her and turned her also into gold. Both in the cases of Shylock and in the case of Midas, avarice and obsession with money leads to the loss of one`s child.

Another parallel between the sin of avarice on one hand and childlessness, usury and miserliness on the other, comes from Edmund Spenser`s Faerie Queen. In book I, Canto IV, a personified Avarice is depicted as childless:

And greedy *Avarice* by him did ride,

Uppon a Camell4 loaden all with gold;

Two iron coffers hong on either side,

With precious metall full, as they might hold,

And in his lap an heap of coine he told;

For of his wicked pelfe6 his God he made,

And unto hell him selfe for money sold;

Accursed usury was all his trade,

And right and wrong ylike in equall ballaunce waide.

His life was nigh unto deaths dore yplaste,

And thred-bare cote, and cobled shoes hee ware,

Ne scarse good morsell all his life did taste,

But both from backe and belly still did spare,

To fill his bags, and richesse to compare;

Yet childe ne kinsman living had he none

To leave them to; but thorough daily care

To get, and nightly feare to lose his owne,

He led a wretched life unto him selfe unknowne.

Most wretched wight, whom nothing might suffise,

Whose greedy lust did lacke in greatest store,

Whose need had end, but no end covetise,

Whose welth was want, whose plenty made him pore,

Who had enough, yett wished ever more,

A vile disease, and eke in foote and hand

A grievous gout tormented him full sore,

That well he could not touch, nor goe, nor stand:

Such one was *Avarice,* the forth of this faire band.

(2006, Stanzas 27-29, p.61-2)

As previously stated, Shylock also envies Antonio, and rejoices at his misfortunes. When he learns that one of Antonio`s ships is wrecked, he rejoices, supposedly because he will get his revenge:

Tubal. Yes, other men have ill luck too: Antonio, as I

heard in Genoa,—

Shylock. What, what, what? ill luck, ill luck?

Tubal. Hath an argosy cast away, coming from Tripolis.

Shylock. I thank God, I thank God. Is't true, is't true?

Tubal. I spoke with some of the sailors that escaped the wreck.

Shylock. I thank thee, good Tubal: good news, good news!

ha, ha! where? in Genoa?

(Act III, Scene I, lines 1333- 40)

Murder is one of the characteristics of avarice according to *Ancrene Wisse*. Shylock`s rejoices at the fact that he will get revenge, and his intention is not to cut pound of flash that one can live without, but the very spring of Antonio`s essence, his heart, an act of murder: “Go, Tubal, fee/me an officer; bespeak him a fortnight before. I/will have the heart of him, if he forfeit; for, were/he out of Venice, I can make what merchandise I/will” (Act III, Scene 1, lines 1356-1360).

Shylock is resolved to exact his revenge even though he is offered double, and later even triple the sum, by Bassanio and consequently Portia:“Bassanio. For thy three thousand ducats here is six. /Shylock. What judgment shall I dread, doing/Were in six parts and every part a ducat, / I would not draw them; I would have my bond “(Act IV, Scene 1, lines 2016-2019).

Shylock is insensible to mercy, which is one of the characteristics of the sin of avarice. Mercy is regarded as the contrary virtue of avarice and the quality that heals it. Chaucer, in the Parson Tale, names mercy as the remedial virtue:

Now shul ye understonde that the relevinge of avarice is misericorde and pitee, largely taken. And men mighten axe why that misericorde and pitee is relevinge of avarice. Certes,

> the avaricious man sheweth no pitee ne misericode to the nedeful man, for he deliteth him in the kepinge of his tresor, and nat in the rescowinge ne relevinge of his evene Cristene.
>
> (Mann, 2005, 757, 804-805)

The Duke openly asks Shylock: “How shalt thou hope for mercy, rendering none?” (Act IV, Scene 1, line 2020) Shylock`s insensibility to mercy, forces Portia disguised as a lawyer named Balthazar, to deliver her speech on the quality of mercy. However, despite the speech, Shylock is adamant to fulfill his contract:

> The quality of mercy is not strain'd,
>
> It droppeth as the gentle rain from heaven
>
> Upon the place beneath: it is twice blest;
>
> It blesseth him that gives and him that takes:
>
> 'Tis mightiest in the mightiest: it becomes
>
> The throned monarch better than his crown;
>
> His sceptre shows the force of temporal power,
>
> The attribute to awe and majesty,
>
> Wherein doth sit the dread and fear of kings;
>
> But mercy is above this sceptred sway;
>
> It is enthroned in the hearts of kings,
>
> It is an attribute to God himself;
>
> And earthly power doth then show likest God's
>
> When mercy seasons justice. Therefore, Jew,
>
> Though justice be thy plea, consider this,
>
> That, in the course of justice, none of us
>
> Should see salvation: we do pray for mercy;
>
> And that same prayer doth teach us all to render
>
> The deeds of mercy. I have spoke thus much
>
> To mitigate the justice of thy plea;

Which if thou follow, this strict court of Venice

Must needs give sentence 'gainst the merchant there.

Shylock. My deeds upon my head! I crave the law,

The penalty and forfeit of my bond.

(Act IV, Scene 1, lines 2125-48)

According to the Peraldus image, stubbornness is another characteristic of the sin of avarice. Similar to stubbornness, Alcuin talks about hardheartedness, also a characteristic of avarice and a trait of Shylock. Although the Duke has tried everything to make Shylock`s abandon his intention to cut a pound of flash from Antonio, he is unsuccessful. These traits, stubbornness, hardheartedness and insensibility to mercy together with anger and envy, are seen in the dialogue between Antonio and the Duke:

Duke. I am sorry for thee: thou art come to answer

A stony adversary, an inhuman wretch

uncapable of pity, void and empty

From any dram of mercy.

Antonio. I have heard

Your grace hath ta'en great pains to qualify

His rigorous course; but since he stands obdurate

And that no lawful means can carry me

Out of his envy's reach, I do oppose

My patience to his fury, and am arm'd

To suffer, with a quietness of spirit,

The very tyranny and rage of his.

(Act IV, Scene 1, lines 1934-44)

The perilous relationship between Shylock, the money-lender and Antonio, the debtor fits the description that Plutarch provides in essay from *Moralia, That we Ought Not to Borrow*. Plutarch writes:

> For debtors are slaves to all the men who ruin them, or rather not to them either (for what would be so terrible in that?), but to outrageous, barbarous, and savage slaves, like those who Plato says stand in Hades as fiery avengers and executioners over those who have been impious in life. For these money-lenders make the market-place a place of the damned for the wretched debtors; like vultures they devour and flay them, "entering into their entrails."
>
> (2013, p. 3081-82)

Although Plutarch used a metaphor to depict the actions of money-lenders toward debtors, i.e. "entering into their entrails,", Thomas Wilson in his *A Discourse Upon Usury* (1572) depicts a situation that is more realistic and similar to the one described in *The Merchant of Venice*:

> Septimus Florens reporteth if one man were a debtour to many, hys body was geeven unto them, to bee equally cut in peces, and whereas hee had not to paye in his purse, hys quartered body should paye for all. (1925, p. 340)

In Act IV, Scene 1, as Shylock is about to cut his pound of flash and exact his revenge, Shakespeare introduces a reversal in the action. Namely Portia, disguised as Balthasar, finds a fault in the bond:

> This bond doth give thee here no jot of blood;
>
> The words expressly are 'a pound of flesh:'
>
> Take then thy bond, take thou thy pound of flesh;
>
> But, in the cutting it, if thou dost shed
>
> One drop of Christian blood, thy lands and goods
>
> Are, by the laws of Venice, confiscate
>
> Unto the state of Venice. (lines 2252-58)

Unable to abide to the bond, Shylock, as he as an alien, has attempted murder and has previously refused triple the sum, is stripped of his property and converted to Christianity in order to avoid being sentenced to death by the Duke. Shylock ends the play as a saddened and despondent man. In Act IV, Scene 1, Shylock says: “Nay, take my life and all;” (line 2323) and in his last speech “I pray you, give me leave to go from hence;/I am not well: send the deed after me, /And I will sign it” (Act IV, Scene 1, 2345-46).

The link between avarice, wrath and sadness is attested by Evagrius, as cited by Newhauser: “The houses of the avaricious will be filled with the beasts of wrath, and the birds of sadness will rest in them.” (2000, p.55)

On the other hand, Francis Bacon in his essay “On revenge”, establishes the link between revenge and sadness. Bacon states:

> Public revenges are for the most part fortunate; as that for the death of Caesar; for the death of Pertinax (1); for the death of Henry the Third of France (2); and many more. But in private revenges it is not so. Nay rather, vindictive persons live the life of witches; who as they are mischievous, so end they unfortunate. (1994, p.11-12)

Shylock`s end is also unfortunate and is accordance with Bacon`s view on revenge.

3.2. Cassius`s Greed for Wealth and Power in *Julius Caesar*

“Greed signals an obsession with material accumulation such as wealth, status, and power”
(*Dante's Deadly Sins: Moral Philosophy*, as cited in Hell, 2011, p.138)

According to the Oxford Learners` Dictionary, greed is “a strong desire for more wealth, possessions, power, etc. than a person needs“. The moving force behind the assassination of Julius Caesar in the play is Cassius. Cassius is also the character that embodies the sin or notion of greed, both greed for power and greed for money. Cassius is also envious of Caesar. Due to the fact that greed, according to Aquinas is the source of all evil, it is no surprise that Cassius has other sinful characteristics, such as envy. In the play, is doesn`t take long for Cassius to show his real face and intentions. In Act I, Scene 2, on several occasions Cassius starts to flatter Brutus as one of the most honourable men in Rome. Cassius needs Brutus, in order to disguise the murder of Caesar as perpetrated by honourable republicans, democrats and *liberatores* against a tyrant. Flattery to win support or affection is often regarded as one of the manifestations of the sin of greed. On one occasion, Cassius says to Brutus: “You bear too stubborn and too strange a hand/Over your friend that loves you.” (Act I, Scene 2, lines 122-23) Cassius continues with his flattery. He asks Brutus, whether he can see his face. When Brutus says that in order to see his face he needs a mirror, Cassius retorts:

> Tis just:
>
> And it is very much lamented, Brutus,
>
> That you have no such mirrors as will turn
>
> Your hidden worthiness into your eye,
>
> That you might see your shadow. I have heard,
>
> Where many of the best respect in Rome,

Except immortal Caesar, speaking of Brutus

And groaning underneath this age's yoke,

Have wish'd that noble Brutus had his eyes.

(Act I, Scene 2, lines 142-50)

On seeing Cassius, Caesar comments on the latter greedy nature relying on physiognomy and previous knowledge: “Let me have men about me that are fat;/Sleek-headed men and such as sleep o' nights:/Yond Cassius has a lean and hungry look;/He thinks too much: such men are dangerous” (Act I, Scene 2, lines 284-287).

Here the adjective *hungry* doesn`t refer to appetite about food, but rather about ambition (a manifestation of the sin of avarice according to the Peraldus image) and greediness for power and gold. One of the meanings of the adjective *hungry*, according to the Oxford Learners dictionary, besides being related to eating is: having or showing a strong desire for something.

The source for Shakespeare play is Plutarch’s Parallel lives. In the section, The Life of Brutus, Cassius is also described as a greedy and envious man. Plutarch comments on his avaricious nature and his disregard for justice:

> And now it was thought that Cassius, vehement and passionate man that he was, and often swept from the path of justice by his passion for gain, was incurring the perils of wars and wanderings principally to establish some great power for himself, and not liberty for his countrymen. (Plutarch, 2013, p. 1574)

St. Augustine in the fifth century comments that the desire for greed in itself is not a defect, but rather the preference of greed over justice. Whereas Brutus fights for justice, Cassius seems to have lucrative interests.

> In one passage from The life of Brutus, Cassius`s ways of acquiring gold are compared to those of Brutus. Cassius is described as being a lot more eager to amass fortune than Brutus: For whereas Cassius, about the same time, compelled the Rhodians individually to pay in to him all the gold and silver they possessed (thus accumulating about eight hundred talents), and fined the city as a whole five hundred talents more, Brutus exacted only a hundred and fifty talents from the Lycians, and, without doing them any other injury, set out with his army for Ionia. (Plutarch, 2013, p.1576)

We get an additional insight into Cassius`s preference of avarice in general, and embezzlement in particular as a manifestation of the former, over justice in another passage from the same section of *Parallel Lives*:

> But on the following day Lucius Pella, a Roman who had been praetor and had enjoyed the confidence of Brutus, being denounced by the Sardians as an embezzler of the public moneys, was condemned by Brutus and disgraced; and the matter vexed Cassius beyond measure. For a few days before, when two friends of his had been convicted of the same misdeeds, he had privately admonished them but publicly acquitted them, and continued to employ them. He therefore found fault with Brutus on the ground that he was too observant of law and justice at a time which demanded a policy of kindness. But Brutus bade him remember the Ides of March, on which they had slain Caesar, not because he was himself plundering everybody, but because he enabled others to do this; since, if there is any good excuse for neglecting justice, it had been better for us to endure the friends of Caesar than to suffer our own to do wrong. "For in the one case," said he, "we should have had the reputation of cowardice merely; but now, in addition to our toils and perils, we are deemed unjust." Such were the principles of Brutus.
>
> (Plutarch, 2013, p.1578)

Cassius starts to simultaneously envy Caesar, flatter Brutus and end with a hint of long range plan to destroy Caesar, a manifestation of envy and greed for power:

> Why, man, he doth bestride the narrow world
>
> Like a Colossus, and we petty men
>
> Walk under his huge legs and peep about
>
> To find ourselves dishonourable graves.
>
> Men at some time are masters of their fates:
>
> The fault, dear Brutus, is not in our stars,
>
> But in ourselves, that we are underlings.
>
> Brutus and Caesar: what should be in that 'Caesar'?
>
> Why should that name be sounded more than yours?
>
> Write them together, yours is as fair a name;
>
> Sound them, it doth become the mouth as well;
>
> Weigh them, it is as heavy; conjure with 'em,
>
> Brutus will start a spirit as soon as Caesar.
>
> Now, in the names of all the gods at once,

Upon what meat doth this our Caesar feed,

That he is grown so great? (Act I, Scene 2, lines 224-41)

. . . .

O, you and I have heard our fathers say,

There was a Brutus once that would have brook'd

The eternal devil to keep his state in Rome

As easily as a king. (Act I, Scene 2, lines 249-52)

In the play, Cassius is very quick in revealing his true nature. As an old friend of Caesar, Cassius knows all of Caesar`s faults such as: crying for help when he was about to drown in the Tiber and being saved by Cassius, his coward lips when he had fever in Spain and his sick girlish cry for water. Now Cassius cannot stand the fact that Caesar has become a God to whom Cassius should bow down on Caesar`s nod and that Caesar would alone carry the trophy of victory: “Ye gods, it doth amaze me/A man of such a feeble temper should/So get the start of the majestic world/And bear the palm alone” (Act I, Scene 2, lines 2018-2021).

As an avaricious and envious man, Cassius uses treachery and guile in order to convince Brutus to join his conspiracy. Thomas Aquinas regards treachery as a daughter of the sin of avarice, and conspiracy is often regarded as a manifestation of envy. Cassius`s treachery consists of him throwing letters with different handwritings supposedly written by Roman citizens stating the respect they have for Brutus and objections regarding Caesar`s inappropriate ambition.

As an envious man, talking to Casca, Cassius continues with his thoughts on conspiracy and murder, both manifestations of envy. Cassius says:

There's a bargain made.

Now know you, Casca, I have moved already

Some certain of the noblest-minded Romans

To undergo with me an enterprise

Of honourable-dangerous consequence;

And I do know, by this, they stay for me

In Pompey's porch: for now, this fearful night,

There is no stir or walking in the streets;

And the complexion of the element

In favour's like the work we have in hand,

Most bloody, fiery, and most terrible.

(Act I, Scene 3, lines 549-59)

In Act IV, Scene 3, Cassius berates Brutus for condemning one of his friends for bribery. Brutus defends himself by attacking Cassius that the latter is also guilty of selling offices in return for money. This is bribery on the part of Cassius, a usual manifestation of the sin of avarice. Brutus accuses Cassius: “Let me tell you, Cassius, you yourself/Are much condemn'd to have an itching palm;/To sell and mart your offices for gold/To undeservers” (lines 1988-1991). Brutus continues with his contrast of the reasons for the murder, which is justice, with the results that Cassius is promoting, namely bribery, which is contrary to justice:

Remember March, the ides of March remember:

Did not great Julius bleed for justice' sake?

What villain touch'd his body, that did stab,

And not for justice? What, shall one of us

That struck the foremost man of all this world

But for supporting robbers, shall we now

Contaminate our fingers with base bribes,

And sell the mighty space of our large honours

For so much trash as may be grasped thus?

I had rather be a dog, and bay the moon,

Than such a Roman.

(Act IV, Scene 3, lines 1997-2007)

After an exchange of insults between the two of them, Brutus accuses Cassius of two additional sins, being proud and angry: “All this! ay, more: fret till your proud heart break;/Go show your slaves how choleric you are, /And make your bondmen tremble” (Act IV, Scene 3, lines 2024-26).

Brutus also implies that Cassius is stingy, i.e. a miser, because he didn`t send him gold, which Cassius acquired using dubious methods. *Ancrene Wisse* names unwillingness to give or lend and

extortion and compulsion as a manifestation of the sin of avarice. In addition, unjust taxation and extortion are manifestation of the sin of avarice according to Peraldus`s *Summa de vitiis et virtutibus.* Contrary to Cassius who would rather hoard, Brutus concludes by saying that if he becomes as greedy as Cassius as to hoard money, that he is ready to be killed by the Gods with thunderbolts.

I did send to you

For certain sums of gold, which you denied me:

For I can raise no money by vile means:

By heaven, I had rather coin my heart,

And drop my blood for drachmas, than to wring

From the hard hands of peasants their vile trash

By any indirection: I did send

To you for gold to pay my legions,

Which you denied me: was that done like Cassius?

Should I have answer'd Caius Cassius so?

When Marcus Brutus grows so covetous,

To lock such rascal counters from his friends,

Be ready, gods, with all your thunderbolts;

Dash him to pieces!

(Act IV, Scene 3, lines 2054-67)

In the play, Brutus due to his love for justice, honesty and honour, serves as a foil to Cassius as the latter is described as corrupted and conspiring against Caesar out of selfish, self-aggrandizement including avarice, narrow-minded and envious reasons. Cassius doesn`t admit he is a miser and to confirm his generosity he offers his heart instead of his gold. One explanation is that Cassius values his gold more than his life: There is my dagger, /And here my naked breast; within, a heart/Dearer than Plutus' mine, richer than gold:/If that thou be'st a Roman, take it forth;/ I, that denied thee gold, will give my heart (Act IV, Scene 3, lines 2087-91)

3.3. Avarice in *Timon of Athens* – From Extreme Wastefulness to Extreme Stinginess

According to Aristotle:

> Therefore, virtue is an active condition that makes one apt at choosing, consisting in a mean condition in relation to us, which is determined by a proportion and by the means by which a person with practical judgment would determine it. And it is a mean condition between two vices, one resulting from excess and the other from deficiency, and is also a mean in the sense that the vices of the one sort fall short and those of the other sort go beyond what is appropriate both in feelings and in actions, while virtue both discovers and chooses the mean. (2002, p.61)

Again, Aristotle with his emphasis on the mean, i.e. golden mean and describes spending and hoarding with the following definition:

> Concerning giving and taking money, the mean condition is generosity, the excess and deficiency being wastefulness and stinginess. In the latter, people exceed and fall short in contrary ways, for the wasteful person exceeds in letting go of things but falls short in getting them, while the stingy person exceeds in getting and falls short in letting go.
>
> (Aristotle, 2002, p.62-63)

With regard to large amounts of money and the notion of the mean, Aristotle explains:

> There are also other dispositions concerned with money, the mean condition being magnificence (for a magnificent person is different from generous one, since the former is concerned with great things and the latter with small ones), the excess being gaudiness or vulgarity, and the deficiency being chintziness. (2002, p.63)

Drawing largely on Aristotle and his virtues and vices and the notion of the mean, Dante Alighieri as previously mentioned, developed the notion of the sin of greed. In the fourth circle of the Inferno, Dante placed those who have strayed from the mean, the greedy ones, that is the squanders and the hoarders. Relying on Dante`s portrayal of the greedy, this chapter analyzes Timon through the prism of a squanderer, and later in the play as a miser, and as such greedy, and his fair-weather friends and flatterers through the prism of the hoarders and misers and argue that they are likewise greedy.

One learns that Act I, Scene 1 takes place at Timon's house and one also learns from the character of the Poet that Lord Timon has a large fortune. Timon has prepared a feast, for the senators, lords, a poet, a painter, a merchant, a jeweler even a cynic philosopher and the Athenian nobleman Alcibiades with his retinue. Almost everyone has brought something as a gift for Timon. We also learn that Timon regards his fellows as friends. When a messenger asks Timon to pay the

debt of his lord Vintidius so that the latter can be freed from prison, Timon accepts:
Timon. Commend me to him: I will send his ransom;/ And being enfranchised, bid him come to me. / 'Tis not enough to help the feeble up, /But to support him after. Fare you well" (Act I, Scene 1, lines 132-35).

Timon also accepts to give money to his servant Lucilius so that he can marry his girlfriend:

Timon. This gentleman of mine hath served me long:

To build his fortune I will strain a little,

For 'tis a bond in men. Give him thy daughter:

What you bestow, in him I'll counterpoise,

And make him weigh with her.

Old Athenian. Most noble lord,

Pawn me to this your honour, she is his.

(Act I, Scene 1, lines 177-83)

The cynic philosopher, Apemantus, however doesn`t fit in, senses that something is rotten and portrays a different picture of what is going on in Timon`s house. When the poet presents his poem to Timon, Apemantus accuses the poet of having distorted Timon`s character and as having presented him as a worthy man, thus flattering him. Flattery is one of the manifestations of the sin of avarice. He dislikes Timon`s guests and calls them flatterers: "Yes, he is worthy of thee, and to pay thee for thy/labour: he that loves to be flattered is worthy o'/ the flatterer. Heavens, that I were a lord!" (Act I, Scene 1, lines 264-66).

The Lords however are very satisfied with Timon`s generosity or as Aristotle terms it wastefulness or vulgarity. As they dismiss Apemantus, one of the Lords comments:

Second Lord. He pours it out; Plutus, the god of gold,

Is but his steward: no meed, but he repays

Sevenfold above itself; no gift to him,

But breeds the giver a return exceeding

All use of quittance.

(Act I, Scene 1, lines 322-326)

After an additional exchange of presents between Timon and his guests, his honest servant Flavius, like Apemantus, sees that Timon is overstretching himself and that Timon is indebted and bankrupt due to his gifts, his feasts and his vulgarity:

Flavius. [Aside] What will this come to?

He commands us to provide, and give great gifts,

And all out of an empty coffer:

Nor will he know his purse, or yield me this,

To show him what a beggar his heart is,

Being of no power to make his wishes good:

His promises fly so beyond his state

That what he speaks is all in debt; he owes

For every word: he is so kind that he now

Pays interest for 't; his land's put to their books.

Well, would I were gently put out of office

Before I were forced out!

Happier is he that has no friend to feed

Than such that do e'en enemies exceed.

I bleed inwardly for my lord.

(Act I, Scene 2, lines 554-68)

In Act II, Scene 1, one learns that Timon has borrowed money for his feasts and gifts. Timon owes to The money-lenders, a senator, Varro and Isidore twenty-five talents. The servants of the money-lenders are sent to Timon to demand the borrowed money from Timon. Timon has concentrated so much on earthly pleasures that he is surprised by their demands, although he has previously been warned by Flavius about his wasteful spending. When asked why he wasn`t warned, Flavius responds:

Flavius. O my good lord,

At many times I brought in my accounts,

Laid them before you; you would throw them off,

And say, you found them in mine honesty.

When, for some trifling present, you have bid me

Return so much, I have shook my head and wept;

Yea, 'gainst the authority of manners, pray'd you

To hold your hand more close: I did endure

Not seldom, nor no slight cheques, when I have

Prompted you in the ebb of your estate

And your great flow of debts. My loved lord,

Though you hear now, too late—yet now's a time—

The greatest of your having lacks a half

To pay your present debts.

(Act II, Scene 2, lines 820-33)

As a solution to the problem, Timon proposes that they sell his land. However, as with the case regarding his debts, he isn`t aware that his land has already been sold and that even if it wasn`t that he is of such disposition that he would give it away quickly.

Timon. Let all my land be sold.

Flavius. 'Tis all engaged, some forfeited and gone;

And what remains will hardly stop the mouth

Of present dues: the future comes apace:

What shall defend the interim? and at length

How goes our reckoning?

Timon. To Lacedaemon did my land extend.

Flavius. O my good lord, the world is but a word:

Were it all yours to give it in a breath,

How quickly were it gone!

(Act II, Scene 2, lines 834-43)

Timon`s servant Flavius reveals that not only his master`s friends are greedy, but they are also gluttonous:

Flavius. Heavens, have I said, the bounty of this lord!

How many prodigal bits have slaves and peasants

This night englutted! Who is not Timon's?

What heart, head, sword, force, means, but is

Lord Timon's?

Great Timon, noble, worthy, royal Timon!

Ah, when the means are gone that buy this praise,

The breath is gone whereof this praise is made:

Feast-won, fast-lost; one cloud of winter showers,

These flies are couch'd.

(Act II, Scene 2, lines 855-64)

However, Timon would have none of that. He proudly says that he is wealthy in his friends and sends his servants to borrow money from his friends: Lucilius, Lucullus, Sempronius and the Senators. One by one his fair-weather friends deny him money, citing various excuses. First, the Senators refuse to give Timon money. Timon has so often given gifts to his friends that he had turned them into greedy persons with an attachment to gifts. When Timon`s servant visits Lucullus with an empty box, Lucullus thinks that, as usual, there is a gift in the box from Timon. Lucullus even bribes, a manifestation of avarice, Timon`s servant in order to say that he hasn`t seen him:

Thy lord's a

bountiful gentleman: but thou art wise; and thou

knowest well enough, although thou comest to me,

that this is no time to lend money, especially upon

bare friendship, without security. Here's three

solidares for thee: good boy, wink at me, and say

thou sawest me not.

(Act III, Scene 1, lines 984-90)

After Luciulius also refuses to give Timon money, another servant goes to Sempronius. Relying on illogical excuse, Sempronius also denies Timon money. Sempronius`s reasoning is that since he was the first to receive a gift from Timon, he should have been the first that Timon has asked for money and not the last.

Must I be his last refuge! His friends, like

physicians,

Thrive, give him over: must I take the cure upon me?

Has much disgraced me in't; I'm angry at him,

That might have known my place: I see no sense for't,

But his occasion might have woo'd me first;

For, in my conscience, I was the first man

That e'er received gift from him:

And does he think so backwardly of me now,

That I'll requite its last? No:

So it may prove an argument of laughter

To the rest, and 'mongst lords I be thought a fool.

(Act III, Scene 3, lines 1120-31)

After more creditors arrive at Timon`s house to demand money, Flavius, Timon`s servant, reiterates that the creditors are avaricious and gluttonous:

Ay,

If money were as certain as your waiting,

'Twere sure enough.

Why then preferr'd you not your sums and bills,

When your false masters eat of my lord's meat?

Then they could smile and fawn upon his debts

And take down the interest into their

gluttonous maws.

You do yourselves but wrong to stir me up;

Let me pass quietly:

Believe 't, my lord and I have made an end;

I have no more to reckon, he to spend.

(Act III, Scene 4, lines 1119-30)

After Timon doesn`t get the money he becomes angry. The pattern of concatenation of sins is repeated in this play also, from avarice/pride, to anger and in the end revenge. Timon is disappointed and exclaims in anger:

[Enter TIMON, in a rage, FLAMINIUS following]

Timon. What, are my doors opposed against my passage?

Have I been ever free, and must my house

Be my retentive enemy, my gaol?

The place which I have feasted, does it now,

Like all mankind, show me an iron heart?

(Act III, Scene 4, lines 1256-61)

In addition, he berates the creditors in anger: “They have e'en put my breath from me, the slaves. /Creditors? devils!” (Act III, Scene 4, lines 1288-1289)

Timon is so disappointed with his so-called friends that he goes from philanthropy to misanthropy. As previously stated the last recourse for the avaricious/prideful man is revenge. In fact, Timon prepares two revenges out of anger. His first and lesser revenge is intended for his so-called friends. He invites them to a feast. No one of the guest suspects anything, despite the fact that they didn’t give him the required money. It is no wonder, that Dante depicted the avaricious with their heads turned towards the earth, for concentrating too much on earthly pleasures. Neither the squanderer Timon, nor his so-called friends and hoarders are able to see the consequences of their misdeeds. When everybody has arrived, Timon uncovers the dishes. To everyone`s surprise instead of the usual wine and meat, Timon has placed warm water and stones. Timon teems with rage and throws the water and the dishes at them:

May you a better feast never behold,

You knot of mouth-friends I smoke and lukewarm water

Is your perfection. This is Timon's last;

Who, stuck and spangled with your flatteries,

Washes it off, and sprinkles in your faces

Your reeking villany.

[Throwing the water in their faces]

Live loathed and long,

Most smiling, smooth, detested parasites,

Courteous destroyers, affable wolves, meek bears,

You fools of fortune, trencher-friends, time's flies,

Cap and knee slaves, vapours, and minute-jacks!

Of man and beast the infinite malady

Crust you quite o'er! What, dost thou go?

Soft! take thy physic first—thou too—and thou;—

Stay, I will lend thee money, borrow none.

[Throws the dishes at them, and drives them out]

What, all in motion? Henceforth be no feast,

Whereat a villain's not a welcome guest.

Burn, house! sink, Athens! henceforth hated be

Of Timon man and all humanity!

(Act III, Scene 6, lines 1526-46)

One learns from this passage that Timon wants to hurt the whole of Athens. He curses Athens and goes to live naked in the woods. Outside of the wall he shouts that wives should become whores, children should become disobedient, slaves should steal from their masters, plague, leprosy and lust should overrun Athens. In the wood, Timon digs for roots but finds gold. Since gold, wealth and wastefulness/vulgarity has brought about his downfall, Timon decides to leave it in the ground, keeping only a small amount. Timon is visited by Alcibiades and learns that the latter wants to attack Athens. On hearing that, Timon agrees to give him some gold to successfully complete his attack and simultaneously fulfil Timon`s revenge on the city of Athens. Another part of his revenge is to urge

the two prostitutes that are accompanying Alcibiades to use their lust to spread deceases in Athens:

Be a whore still: they love thee not that use thee;

Give them diseases, leaving with thee their lust.

Make use of thy salt hours: season the slaves

For tubs and baths; bring down rose-cheeked youth

To the tub-fast and the diet.

(Act IV, Scene 3, lines 1758-62)

The prostitutes are also described as avaricious, willing to do anything about money:

Phrynia. [with Timandra] Well, more gold: what then? /Believe't, that we'll do any thing for gold (Act IV, Scene 3, lines 1831-32).

Timon and Alciabides interests for revenge collude and, the former urges the latter not to spare anyone in Athens:

Put up thy gold: go on,—here's gold,—go on;

Be as a planetary plague, when Jove

Will o'er some high-viced city hang his poison

In the sick air: let not thy sword skip one:

Pity not honour'd age for his white beard;

He is an usurer: strike me the counterfeit matron;

It is her habit only that is honest,

Herself's a bawd: let not the virgin's cheek

Make soft thy trenchant sword; for those milk-paps,

That through the window-bars bore at men's eyes,

Are not within the leaf of pity writ,

But set them down horrible traitors: spare not the babe,

Whose dimpled smiles from fools exhaust their mercy;

Think it a bastard, whom the oracle

Hath doubtfully pronounced thy throat shall cut,

And mince it sans remorse: swear against objects;

Put armour on thine ears and on thine eyes;

Whose proof, nor yells of mothers, maids, nor babes,

Nor sight of priests in holy vestments bleeding,

Shall pierce a jot. There's gold to pay soldiers:

Make large confusion;

(Act IV, Scene 3, lines 1787-1807)

Several bandits have heard about Timon`s gold and pretend that they are soldiers, because they are greedy and also want his gold. Although Timon sees that the bandits` behavior is a bluff, he gives them gold urging them to destroy Athens.

The laws, your curb and whip, in their rough power

Have uncheque'd theft. Love not yourselves: away,

Rob one another. There's more gold. Cut throats:

All that you meet are thieves: to Athens go,

Break open shops; nothing can you steal,

But thieves do lose it: steal no less for this

I give you; and gold confound you howsoe'er!

(Act IV, Scene 3, lines 2156-62)

Even the poet and the painter have heard about Timon`s gold. Both of them are presented as flatterers and as being avaricious. In their conversation they reveal that they have come after Timon`s gold:

Poet. What's to be thought of him? does the rumour hold

for true, that he's so full of gold?

Painter. Certain: Alcibiades reports it; Phrynia and

Timandra had gold of him: he likewise enriched poor

straggling soldiers with great quantity: 'tis said

he gave unto his steward a mighty sum.

Poet. Then this breaking of his has been but a try for his friends.

Painter. Nothing else: you shall see him a palm in Athens

again, and flourish with the highest. Therefore

'tis not amiss we tender our loves to him, in this

supposed distress of his: it will show honestly in

us; and is very likely to load our purposes with

what they travail for, if it be a just true report

that goes of his having.

(Act V, Scene 1, lines 2262-75)

When Timon finally offers them gold, both of them reveal their true nature, expressing their readiness to kill for gold whoever Timon names:

Timon. Look you, I love you well; I'll give you gold,

Rid me these villains from your companies:

Hang them or stab them, drown them in a draught,

Confound them by some course, and come to me,

I'll give you gold enough.

Both. Name them, my lord, let's know them.

Timon. You that way and you this, but two in company;

Each man apart, all single and alone,

Yet an arch-villain keeps him company.

If where thou art two villains shall not be,

Come not near him. If thou wouldst not reside

But where one villain is, then him abandon.2380

Hence, pack! there's gold; you came for gold, ye slaves:

[To Painter]

> You have work'd for me; there's payment for you: hence!
>
> [To Poet]
>
> You are an alchemist; make gold of that.
>
> Out, rascal dogs! [Beats them out, and then retires to his cave]
>
> (Act V, Scene 1, lines 2369-87)

One can see that in *Timon of Athens*, Shakespeare has painted a very sinful picture of Athenians, and has included most of the sins when describing Athens. For example, Timon is presented as avaricious and wrathful; his flatterers, the poet, the painter, the Senators are presented as avaricious, gluttonous and lustful as the presence of prostitutes in Athens indicates, and due to the fact that lust as a carnal sin, proceeds from gluttony, another carnal sin.

In the subplot that deals with Alcibiades and his court defense of a murderer, one can see that other sins are present in Alcibiades, namely, the latter`s pride and anger and the envy and anger towards him by the Athenian senators. The murderer that Alcibiades defends has killed a man in self-defense. The senators demand death for the murderer. Alcibiades demands pity, but indirectly he is accused of being a sophist: “Striving to make an ugly deed look fair” (Act III, Scene 5, line 1332). Eventually, the senators become angry with Alcibiades’s impertinence and pride and banish him: FIRST SENATOR “Do you dare our anger? /’Tis in few words, but spacious in effect:/We banish thee forever” (Act III, Scene 5, lines 1409-1411). In Plutarch`s *Life of Alcibiades*, one of the major sources for Shakespeare`s *Timon of Athens*, Alcibiades is also portrayed as a vain and foolishly prideful person.

> And so it was that Alcibiades, although he was pampered from the very first, and was prevented by the companions who sought only to please him from giving ear to one who would instruct and train him, nevertheless, through the goodness of his parts, at last saw all that was in Socrates, and clave to him, putting away his rich and famous lovers. And speedily, from choosing such an associate, and giving ear to the words of a lover who was in the chase for no unmanly pleasures, and begged no kisses and embraces, but sought to expose the weakness of his soul and rebuke his vain and foolish pride.
>
> (Plutarch, 2013, p.322)

In the same work by Plutarch, the Athenians in general, and the senators in particular are described as envious towards anyone who wants to raise above the others and towards someone whose actions were deemed inappropriate. The penalty was banishment by ostracism:

> Accordingly, at the time of which I speak, persuaded by this man, they were about to exercise the vote of ostracism, by which they cripple and banish whatever man from time to

> time may have too much reputation and influence in the city to please them, assuaging thus their envy rather than their fear.
>
> (Plutarch, 2013, p.328)

The concatenation of sins, in the case of Alcibiades is similar to Timon`s. Alcibiades moves from pride, to anger and finally to revenge. Once banished, Alcibiades's next move is anger and insults: "Banish your dotage, banish usury/That makes the Senate ugly!" (Act III, Scene 5, lines 1413-14). His final move revenge is again preceded by anger:

> I hate not to be banish'd;
> It is a cause worthy my spleen and fury,
> That I may strike at Athens. I'll cheer up
> My discontented troops, and lay for hearts.
> 'Tis honour with most lands to be at odds;
> Soldiers should brook as little wrongs as gods.
>
> (Act III, Scene 5, lines 1428-33)

Chapter 4: The Sin of Sloth in *Henry IV Part I* and *II*, *Henry V* and *Richard II*

According to Pope Gregory, pride is the sin from which all other capital sins arise. Thus, in his book *Commentary on Job* also known as *Magna Moralia, Moralia on Job or Morals on the Book of Job*, Saint Gregory states that:

> For when pride, the queen of sins, has fully possessed a conquered heart, she surrenders it immediately to seven principal sins, as if to some of her generals, to lay it waste. And an army in truth follows these generals, because, doubtless, there spring up from them importunate hosts of sins. Which we set forth the better, if we specially bring forward in enumeration, as we are able, the leaders themselves and their army. For pride is the root of all evil, of which it is said, as Scripture bears witness; Pride is the beginning of all sin. [Ecclus. 10, 1] But seven principal vices, as its first progeny, spring doubtless from this poisonous root, namely, vain glory, envy, anger, melancholy, avarice, gluttony, lust.
>
> (*The Book of the Morals of St. Gregory the Pope*, 1844, p. 1013)

Various authors translate melancholy as *accedia* or sloth. Catholic scholars like St, Augustine and Thomas Aquinas made a distinction between pride and vainglory, as the latter was described as being a daughter of pride. However, Catholic catechism manuals conflated the two notions and preached only about pride as one of the seven deadly sins. This thesis will follow the Catholic

catechism way of conflating the two notions. The sins or vices of sloth and pride can be detected with relative ease in the conduct of a person who holds high office such as that of a king, particularly in a king that is depicted in various shades, as is the case with Prince Hal and later King Henry V. In the first place, a prince was expected to behave in an appropriate manner and to fulfill his obligations, and due to the fact that he was near the top of the Elizabethan Chain of Being, his actions or inactions would be reflected on the whole country and nation. In the case of a prince, sloth is closely related to dereliction of one`s duty, and in the medieval chivalric code, dereliction of duty by a king or a prince was regarded as one of the most shameful social sins. In the beginning sloth was associated with neglect of religious office. However, till the fourteenth century it has acquired a second association, namely a "neglect in the obligation of one`s status or profession" as Siegfried Wenzel (1967, p. 91) explains. This is even more emphasized if the status in question, is appointed by God, like the king. In addition, Bossy calls these sins social, and cites Luther whose social doctrine of confession adds to the furtive sins of the heart "those sins which upset the community". These "social" sins, when looked in a historical framework, become related to government. When analyzing the morality of political history, the sin of sloth is associated with instability, dereliction of duty, inaction, indecisiveness, and cowardliness. It is also viewed as withdrawal, mental distraction, despair and dreaming.

Pride, being associated to honour, has been equally reinterpreted with regard to its secular existence. Both in the medieval notion, and in the remodeled chivalry of the Renaissance, pride and ambition are closely associated with the notion of honour. The sin can be seen as a misplaced moderation in search of reputation and gain, in other words private objectives above public objectives.

Sloth and pride are in fact sins that are diametrically opposed: to be prideful means to be highly ambitious, to assume responsibility that is not yours, whereas to be slothful means to assume a negligent stance and absence of ambition. Another similarity between the sins of pride and sloth, besides the fact that both are seen by Aquinas (Summa Theologica, 1981) as manifestations of disordered self-love and daughters of pride is that they represent sins with regard to oneself and thus can be regarded as two sides of the same coin.

4.1. Prince Hal, Later Henry V in *Henry IV Part 1*, *Henry IV Part II* and *Henry V*

Henry IV Part 1 starts with an obvious sign of sloth on the part of Prince Hal. His Father, King Henry IV and his country England are in a dangerous situation. His father`s armies are engaged in two wars. The situation is so serious that they are forced to cancel their crusade to the Holy Land. And yet Prince Hal, is not helping his father and leading armies like his foil Harry Percy called

Hotspur. Instead he visits his old friend Sir John Falstaff in a tavern, although he is aware of the notion that he is a glutton and a womanizer. For example, when Falstaff asks Hal what time of the day is it, Hal rhetorically asks what does Falstaff have to do with the time of the day, unless hours were cups of sack and minutes capons, and clocks the tongues of bawds. Sir Walter Blunt and Hotspur defeat the Scots and take prisoners. His father is instantly aware that this is the right thing for a prince to do. So he utters "It is a conquest for a prince to boast of" (Act I, Scene 1, line 78) and calls Sir Walter Blunt "a true industrious friend," (Act I, Scene 1, lines 63) and Hotspur "A son who is the theme of honour's tongue" (Act I, Scene 1, line 82). He is dissatisfied with Hal`s attitude, uttering "riot and dishonour stain the brow of my young Harry," (Act I, Scene 1, lines 86-87) and wishing that some night-tripping fairy had exchanged the clothes of his son and Hotspur in cradle and called his child Percy, the other Plantagenet. The person that exhibits a sign of disobedience and therefore pride is clearly Hotspur as he refuses to deliver the prisoners that he took, asking in return that his captured brother-in-law Mortimer is ransomed. Henry IV refuses and asks his cousin what is his opinion on "Percy`s pride" (Act I, Scene 1, line 93). Prince Hal is the opposite of Hotspur who fights not only for the king but also excessively cares for his relative, the captured Mortimer. Without the slightest concern about his father and his kingdom, Hal asks Falstaff: "Where shall we take a purse tomorrow, Jack?" (Act I, Scene 2, line 205). Hal is amusing himself. Several lines later he desists from purse taking saying: "Who, I rob? I a thief? not I, by my faith," (Act I, Scene 2, line 243) and change his mind later uttering "once in my days I'll be a madcap" (Act I, Scene 2, line 247). This is changeability of purpose or instability, one of the characteristics of sloth put forward by Isidore of Seville. Another characteristic of sloth, outlined by Isidore of Seville is curiosity, and Prince Hal also exhibits signs of this characteristic as he assents to Edward Poins` proposition that they execute a jest on Falstaff and his friends Peto, Bardolph and Gadshill while they rob purses and listen to and be amused by their story later. The jest consists of surprising Falstaff, Peto, Bardolph and Gadshill during their robbery, robbing them and later listening to their "incomprehensible lies" (Act I, Scene 2, line 288). The money Hal and his band rob, belongs in fact to his father the King, and in a time of war and demands for ransom, money is certainly more than necessary. This shows that Hal is amusing himself and that he exhibits signs of dereliction of duty. However, in the following lines Shakespeare subverts Hal`s behavior, portraying him as a savvy temporary actor who is aware of the dangerous behavior of his friends: "I know you all, and will awhile uphold /The unyoked humour of your idleness" (Act I, Scene 2, lines 298-99).

Hal has an agenda, which consists of the fact that when his reformation is completed he would be more wondered at, since he would be compared to his previous attitude: "And like bright

metal on a sullen ground, / My reformation, glittering o'er my fault, Shall show more goodly and attract more eyes/ Than that which hath no foil to set it off" (Act I, Scene 2, lines 315-18).

We can see that Hal is a complex character or as Bloom would term it Machiavellian. In my opinion this refers to the so-called Machiavellian *virtù,* actually meaning possessing a "flexible disposition" which according to Nederman and Bogiaris means being "capable of varying her/his conduct from good to evil and back again as fortune and circumstances dictate" (Nederman, 2019). On one hand due to his dereliction of duty and instability, he can be described as a slothful person. In addition, the fact that he trades and traffics with gluttons, womanizers and idlers also points to the fact that he might be also guilty of these sins as Aesop`s moral from The Charcoal –burner and the fuller, namely that like will draw like implies. Although he has expressly stated that his behavior is only part of his agenda, in Act II, Scene IV Hal continues his inappropriate behavior visiting wine-cellars, bragging that in fifteen minutes he drank so much wine that he can be friend with any lad from any social class: "I am so good a proficient in one quarter of an hour that I can drink with any tinker in his own language during my life" (Act II, Scene 4, lines 1001-4). According to Thomas Aquinas, bragging or boastfulness is a daughter of the sin of pride. This is a sign that Prince Hal may in the future change his behavior and move from sloth to pride. Prince Hal is acquainted with Hotspur`s character, but apparently disdains it, because of his diligence, the virtue that in fact cures the sin of sloth:

I am not yet of Percy's mind, the Hotspur of the north, he that kills me some six or seven dozenof Scots at a breakfast, washes his hands, and says to his wife "Fie upon this quiet life! I want work" (Act II, Scene 4, lines 1092-96).

Hal and Falstaff know that Hal will be reprimanded when he goes to the court. And they are right. His father asks him whether "such inordinate and low desires, /Such poor, such bare, such lewd, such mean attempts, / Such barren pleasures, rude society" (Act III, Scene 2, lines 1835-37) are appropriate for a prince. These low desires and barren pleasures are of course, his drinking habits, his jesting and his idleness. His drinking habits and jesting can be understood as, what Aquinas has described as, recourse to eternal object of pleasure. In fact, this is one of Aquinas` daughters of sloth, namely "wandering of the mind after unlawful things" (*Summa Theologica*, 1981, p. 1797). Henry IV compares prince Hal to Richard II who like Hal shared the company of:

Shallow jesters and rash bavin wits,

Soon kindled and soon burnt; carded his state,

Mingled his royalty with capering fools,

Had his great name profaned with their scorns

And gave his countenance, against his name,

To laugh at gibing boys and stand the push

Of every beardless vain comparative,

Grew a companion to the common streets,

Enfeoff'd himself to popularity;

That, being daily swallow'd by men's eyes,

They surfeited with honey and began

To loathe the taste of sweetness, whereof a little

More than a little is by much too much.

So when he had occasion to be seen,

He was but as the cuckoo is in June,

Heard, not regarded.

(Act III, Scene 2, lines 1884-99)

He can also be regarded as partaking in the same sin of sloth, namely recourse to eternal object of pleasure and "wandering of the mind after unlawful things" (*Summa Theologica*, p. 1797). As a result, Hal has lost his "princely privilege, with vile participation" (3. 2. 1909-10) and he has lost his place in the council to his younger brother and no one but his father wants to see him. Henry continues to compare the action of Hotspur to the actions or rather inaction of his son stating that Percy has more worthy interest to the state than Hal. In addition, for Henry IV, Hotspur is full of ambition, pride and duty, as opposed to Hal dissolute life: "Leads ancient lords and reverend bishops on/ To bloody battles and to bruising arms. /What never-dying honour hath he got/ Against renowned Douglas!" (Act III, Scene 2, lines 1928-31)

For Henry IV, the main reasons for Hal`s behavior are three: vassal fear, base inclination and the start of spleen, or in other words: lowly fear, base behavior and bad temper. According to Thomas Aquinas (*Summa Theologica*, 1981) faint-heartedness, or by extension fear, is one of the daughters of the sin of sloth. Furthermore, Henry IV portrays Hal`s behavior actions/inactions and sloth as being inferior to Percy actions, pride and ambition stating that he wouldn`t be surprised if he followed Percy like a dog which shows "how much thou art degenerate" (Act III, scne 2, line 1952). Prince Hal replies that will redeem himself and confesses that he has been indignant: "For the

time will come, / That I shall make this northern youth exchange / His glorious deeds for my indignities“ (Act III, Scene 2, lines 1968-69).

According to Thomas Aquinas, spite is one of the daughters of sloth. However, it shouldn`t be “taken as synonymous with hatred, but for a kind of indignation” (*Summa Theologica*, 1981, p. 1978). Another cue that hints Hals move from sloth to action and honour happens in Act 3 Scene 3, when Hal hears about Percy`s revolt and sends letters to John of Lancaster, his brother John and the Lord of Westmorelend saying “The land is burning; Percy stands on high; /And either we or they must lower lie” (Act III, Scene 3, lines 2213-14).

Prince Hal has travelled a long way from his dissolute life filled with sloth to a life filled with honour. Prior to the battle, Hal acknowledges that he “has been truant to chivalry” (Act V, Scene 1, line 2717) and in order to save blood, Hal challenges Hotspur to a single fight. Due to Hal`s previous life, Hotspur is suspicious and asks whether he has proposed that out of hate, but Vernon replied that he praised Percy and that he spoke modestly of himself, adding that Hal has been misunderstood by his previous wild behavior or as he puts it “wantonness” (Act V, Scene 2, line 2843). Percy is unconvinced and states that he has never seen a prince who has used his liberty so irresponsibly or in his words “Never did I hear/ Of any Prince so wild a libertine” (Act IV, Scene 2. Lines 2844-45).

In *Henry IV Part II*, King Henry IV is sick and Prince Hal laments the fact that although he is sad about that, nobody including his friends would believe him if he cried since again he shares the company of his old fellows from the tavern. Poins tell him that he would consider him a hypocrite if he wept for his father. Prince Hal replies to Poins:

It would be every man's thought; and thou art a blessed

fellow to think as every man thinks. Never a man's thought in

world keeps the road-way better than thine. Every man would

me an hypocrite indeed. (Act II, Scene II, lines 1010-14)

The trait of hypocrisy is indeed closely related to the sin of pride as Thomas Aquinas (1981) reckons hypocrisy to be a daughter of vainglory.

Falstaff, reminiscent of Hal`s former behavior, compares Prince Hal to Poins, saying that they both have strong bodies and weak minds, and enumerates their proclivities such as: playing game of quoits, eating and drinking a lot, playing see-saws and swearing. These activities can be summed up as Aquinas` “wandering of the mind after unlawful things,” (*Summa Theologica*, 1981, p. 1797) one of the daughters of the sin of sloth. As previously stated pride is linked to ambition.

Thomas Aquinas in *Summa Theologica* (1981), expressly states: “The pride of life refers to ambition for renown and honour” (p. 1496).

In Act IV, Scene 1, Prince Hal is back to his tricks, fooling Falstaff to slander him and Poins to Doll Tearsheet. In the meantime, his younger brother, Prince John together with Westmoreland also fools somebody, but this time it is a bit more serious matter, because the person in question is the leader of the rebels, The Archbishop of York, together with Lord Mowbray and the Lord Hastings. Prince John achieves this by convincing them to disband their armies, because the King`s party considers the rebels’ complaints as suitable and by swearing on his honour that his father`s intentions were good and that some of his men have done things that he would never have agreed to. After the rebels` armies are disbanded they are persecuted and killed. These two situations of deceit are in stark contrast. Whereas the older brother and heir designate, Prince Hal is amusing himself in taverns and showcasing signs of dereliction of worldly duty and “neglect in the obligation of one’s status or profession” as Siegfried Wenzel (1967, p. 91) defines sloth. His younger brother has successfully defeated the rebels, helped his father and country by manifesting great dexterity. Prince John seems that has also followed another Machiavellian precept, explained and quoted by Lerner: “Cunning and deceit will every time serve a man better than force to rise from a base condition to great fortune” (*The Prince and the Discourses*, 1950, p.526). Despite following precepts from the same person, short Prince Hal`s behavior can be described as slothful and Prince John`s as one of statesmanship and *Realpolitik*.

When Henry IV falls on the ground in Act IV, Scene 4, the Earl of Warwick remarks that the prince should be patient because “these fits /Are with his Highness very ordinary. /Stand from him, give him air; he'll straight be well” (lines 2867-70).

Prince Hal however, thinking that his father is dead, is impatient for honour and his ambition leads him to seize the crown and to put it on his head. On account of his ambition and due to the fact that this is an act of disobedience, one of the daughters of the sin of vainglory, Prince Hal can be described as overwhelmed by the sin of pride. King Henry IV recovers, and referring to Prince Hal and his fellows says that with Prince Hal as a king the English court would be filled with “apes of idleness” (Act IV, Scene 5, line 3018), rhetorically asks whether the neighboring countries have any ruffian that “swear, drink, dance, / Revel the night, rob, murder, and commit/ The oldest sins the newest kind of ways” (Act IV, scene 4, lines 3020-22). According to Henry IV, if his son becomes a king: “England shall double gild his treble guilt” (Act IV, Scene 5, line 3024). By describing the Boar`s tavern company`s behavior as “apes of idleness” (Act IV, Scene 5, line 3018) King Henry IV acknowledges their slothful behavior, and also acknowledges the fact that they are gluttons and criminals. The fact, that they “commit the oldest sins in the newest ways” (Act IV, scene 4., line

3022) points to the fact that they are also very creative but also shows that they are overwhelmed by love of novelties, one of the daughters of the sin of vainglory and thus are filled by the sin of vainglory or pride.

In Henry V, the French ambassador tells Prince Hal, now king Henry V, that he savours too much of his youth and to mock his demand for his precedence over the current king of France for the French throne; sends him tennis-balls as a telling reminder for his dedication to pleasure when he was still a prince. This action also serves to remind Henry V of his slothful days since the tennis-balls can be regarded as a symbol of recourse to "objects of pleasure" (Aquinas, 1981, p. 1798), and as a result the daughter of the sin of sloth "wandering after unlawful things" can be ascribed to his behavior.

By Act IV, Scene 6 in *Henry V*, Henry V is a completely changed man. The former idler, now is full of pride and has no mercy. For example, he threatens virgins with rape and infants with murder:

> The gates of mercy shall be all shut up,
> And the flesh'd soldier, rough and hard of heart,
> In liberty of bloody hand shall range
> With conscience wide as hell, mowing like grass
> Your fresh-fair virgins and your flowering infants
>
> (Act II, Scene 3, lines 1282-1286)

During the battle of Agincourt, he orders that every soldier kill his prisoners. In the following Scene 7, he says: "Besides, we'll cut the throats of those we have, / And not a man of them that we shall take/ Shall taste our mercy" (Act IV., scene 7, lines 2580-83). This is a sign of vainglory or pride as Thomas Aquinas, quoting Chrysostom states "vainglory is always evil, but especially in philanthropy, i.e. mercy". (*Summa Theologica*, 1981, p. 2328).

4.2. Henry VI in *Henry VI part I, II and III*

In Act III, Scene I Henry VI tries to be the peacemaker and settle the dispute between his uncles: Humphry Duke of Gloucester and Henry Beaufort, Bishop of Winchester. Again in act IV Scene I, Henry VI wants to be the peacemaker and to settle the dispute between Vernon (a member of the White Rose or York group and Besset a member of the Red rose or the Lancaster group. The leaders of both factions the Duke of Somerset (Lancaster faction) and Richard Plantagenet, later 3rd Duke of York, are also present. However, as later events would show, he is not up to the job. This is due to the fact that he is negligent (Chaucer in the Canterbury tales, in the Parson`s Tale expressly states that sloth "breed negligence or recklessness", and that it "cares for nothing, and is the nurse

of all mischief". Henry VI lives in a dream world, yet another phrase from the sin of sloth wordbook. He is negligent because he putts on the red rose, thus incurring the suspicion of Richard Plantagenet, which later will have disastrous consequences with regard to the battle of Bordeaux, where neither Richard`s nor Somerset`s troops would take part in the battle:

HENRY VI: O, think upon the conquest of my father,

My tender years, and let us not forego

That for a trifle that was bought with blood

Let me be umpire in this doubtful strife.

I see no reason, if I wear this rose,

[Putting on a red rose]

That any one should therefore be suspicious

I more incline to Somerset than York:

Both are my kinsmen, and I love them both.

(Act IV, Scene 1, lines 1913-21)

However, Richard Plantagenet is openly suspicious of the act, although he has been put in charge of the armies in France: "But yet I like it not, / In that he wears the badge of Somerset" (Act IV, Scene 1, 1944-45).

Henry VI lives is a dream world, unaware of the severity of the situation and the ambition that governs the actions of Somerset and York and of the symbolism of choosing a rose. Henry VI isn`t aware or is negligent of the fact that previously in Act II Scene IV, in London`s Temple-garden, the conflict between Somerset and York boiled down to choosing sides, by plucking white or red rose from a briar and a thorn. The situation is so serious that during the dispute, the Earl of Warwick says: "This brawl to-day, / Grown to this faction in the Temple-garden, / Shall send between the red rose and the white /A thousand souls to death and deadly night" (Act II. Scene 4, lines 1061-64).

By putting a red rose, Henry VI has symbolically aligned himself with Somerset and alienated the Duke of York. Although he speaks about peace on three occasions with regard to Somerset and York`s conflict, instead of resolving it, due to his negligent approach, he has just fanned the flames of it. Henry VI continues to live in a dream world not only with regard to resolving conflict, but also with regard to his choice of a wife. The earl of Suffolk has captured a French noblewoman Margaret, daughter of the Duke of Anjou. He intends to marry her to the young Henry VI and "bereave him of his wits with wonder" (Act V, Scene 3, lines 2667) so that he can dominate him later: "Margaret shall

now be queen, and rule the king; /But I will rule both her, the king and realm“ (Act V, scene 5, Lines 2931-32).

Against the opinion of The Lord Protector, the Duke of Gloucester, Henry VI acquiesces to the proposal, which shows his over-hastiness and instability as he had been previously in the words of the Duke of Gloucester been “betroth'd / Unto another lady of esteem: / How shall we then dispense with that contract, / And not deface your honour with reproach?” (Act V, scene 5, lines 2879-82).

Namely, Henry VI was betrothed to the daughter of the Earl of Armagnac who is near kinsman to Charles, the king of France and who offers a liberal dower. In addition, the Earl of Armagnac has sent letters, together with the Pope and Emperor suing for peace. However, Henry VI has dismissed their offer for a marriage, saying to Gloucester: “Marriage, uncle! alas, my years are young! / And fitter is my study and my books / Than wanton dalliance with a paramour” (Act V, scene 1, lines 2376-78). However, he quickly changes his mind when it comes to Suffolk entreaties:

Your wondrous rare description, noble earl,

Of beauteous Margaret hath astonish'd me:

Her virtues graced with external gifts

Do breed love's settled passions in my heart:

And like as rigor of tempestuous gusts

Provokes the mightiest hulk against the tide,

So am I driven by breath of her renown

Either to suffer shipwreck or arrive

Where I may have fruition of her love.

(Act V, Scene 5, lines 2854-62)

Henry VI also doesn`t care about the fact that Margaret`s father Reignier, in the words of the Duke of Exeter “sooner will receive than give” (Act V, scene 5, line 2900) a dowry. He is so taken by her beauty that he urges the Earl of Suffolk:

Take, therefore, shipping; post, my lord, to France;

Agree to any covenants, and procure

That Lady Margaret do vouchsafe to come

To cross the seas to England and be crown'd

King Henry's faithful and anointed queen.

(Act V, Scene 5, lines 2940-45)

In Henry VI Part 2, Act I, Scene 1, we see the results of this over-hastiness on the part of Henry VI, in that it is agreed:

That the duchies of Anjou and Maine shall be

released and delivered over to the king her father,

and she sent over of the King of England's own

proper cost and charges, without having any dowry. (lines 65-8)

Due to his over-hastiness, negligent approach, instability and following the notion of putting pleasure above all or what in his opinion represents love, Henry VI not only evaded the possibility of peaceful resolution to the conflict, but also lost the duchies of Anjou and Maine. In the same play, Richard Plantagenet reports that not only are Anjou and Maine given to the French, but "Paris is lost; the state of Normandy/ Stands on a tickle point" (Act I, Scene 1, lines 227-28).

Henry`s passive nature and the proactive and ambitious nature of his wife and her allies can be seen in the fact that his wife can no longer stand being subordinate to the Lord Protector: "What shall King Henry be a pupil still/ Under the surly Gloucester's governance?" (Act I, Scene 3., lines 437-38) His passivity and Margaret`s proactive role can also be seen in the contrast between the approach of Henry VI and Margaret in the regency dispute between Somerset and York in Act I Scene 3. In the beginning Henry is indifferent as to who will be awarded the regency: "For my part, noble lords, I care not which; / Or Somerset or York, all's one to me" (Act I, Scene 3, lines 495-96).

When the Earl of Salisbury rhetorically asks "Why Somerset should be preferred in this" (Act I, Scene 3, lines 508), Queen Margaret fills in the indecision gap left by Henry`s silence, indecisiveness and passivity, steps in and answers: "Because the king, forsooth, will have it so." (Act I, Scene 3, line 509)

Margaret and Suffolk first orchestrate the fall of Eleanor, the wife of the Duke of Gloucester as a prelude to the latter`s fall. The Duke of Gloucester is accused of high treason. Although Henry VI believes that The Duke of Gloucester is innocent as "is the sucking lamb or harmless dove" (Act III, Scene 1, line 1349) he doesn`t gainsay Queen Margaret for disagreeing with him and accusing Gloucester. In addition, he does not do anything when the Earl of Suffolk arrests him, instead choosing to stay silent in the discussion on Gloucester`s culpability that follows and where Richard Plantagenet, Queen Margaret, the Duke of Buckingham and the Bishop of Winchester take part. On

seeing Gloucester taken prisoner, Henry VI only has the will to utter: “My lords, what to your wisdoms seemeth best, / Do or undo, as if ourself were here” (Act III, Scene 1, lines 1476-77). His indeterminacy and indifference are further emphasized by the fact that, when he decides to leave the parliament in grief, knowing that in the Duke of Gloucester he sees “the map of honour, truth and loyalty” (3. 1. 1485) he rhetorically asks: “What louring star now envies thy estate, / That these great lords and Margaret our queen/ Do seek subversion of thy harmless life?” (Act III, Scene 1, lines 1488-90) He further says that he will weep. Grief and weeping are signs of despair, and the latter is one of the daughters of the sin of Sloth.

In the beginning of Henry VI Part 3, the York party enters the Parliament-house wondering how King Henry VI has escaped in the previous battle. The Earl of Warwick explains that, the same day Queen Margaret holds parliament there, saying that it will be called bloody parliament unless: “Plantagenet, Duke of York, be king, / And bashful Henry deposed, whose cowardice/ Hath made us by-words to our enemies” (Act I, Scene 1, lines 44-6). The Earl of Warwick describes Henry VI as a coward, moral cowardice being associated with sloth. His faint-heartedness, one of the daughters of the sin of Sloth according to Aquinas, and moral cowardice is again displayed in the Scene that follows. King Henry VI and his party also enter the Parliament house. A dispute erupts between the King and Richard Plantagenet as to who has the right to be the king. After Exeter, one Henry VI`s man, says that Richard II`s decision to abandon his throne is void, due to the fact that it wasn`t done voluntarily, and therefore concludes that Richard of York is the lawful king. Henry VI becomes fearful and utters: “[Aside] All will revolt from me, and turn to him” (Act I. Scene 1, line 158). And whereas Lord Clifford vows that despite everything he will fight in his defense, Henry VI is still scared and utters: “O Clifford, how thy words revive my heart!“ (Act I, Scene 1, line 170). This fear is further emphasized in the lines that follow, namely when the Earl of Warwick threatens to fill in the Parliament house with soldiers and write with his blood his title on the throne where he sits. Henry`s faintheartedness comes to the fore and upon the entry of the soldiers he resigns his title after his death, thus disinheriting his only son Edward. His party is dissatisfied by his words, the Earl of Westmoreland exclaiming: “Base, fearful and despairing Henry!” (Act I, Scene 1, line 187) and “Farewell, faint-hearted and degenerate king, /In whose cold blood no spark of honour bides.” (Act I. Scene 1, lines 192-93). Fearfulness, faintheartedness and despair are words that are often associated to the sin of Sloth.

We get a further glimpse into Henry`s lack of courage in Act 2 Scene 2, after Margaret armies have defeated Richard and have put his head on the gates of the city of York. Namely Henry VI laments the fact that as an inheritor to his father’s crown he has inherited more troubles than pleasures and the fact that Richard is killed. Margaret tries to lift him out of his despair:

My lord, cheer up your spirits: our foes are nigh,

And this soft courage makes your followers faint.

You promised knighthood to our forward son:

Unsheathe your sword, and dub him presently.

Edward, kneel down.

(Act 2, Scene 2, lines 898-902)

Henry VI lives in a dream-world, a manifestation of sloth. During the battle instead of taking active participation he shows sign of utter dereliction of duty as he would rather exchange his station (and food) with that of a shepherd.

And to conclude, the shepherd's homely curds,

His cold thin drink out of his leather bottle.

His wonted sleep under a fresh tree's shade,

All which secure and sweetly he enjoys,

Is far beyond a prince's delicates,

His viands sparkling in a golden cup,

His body couched in a curious bed,

When care, mistrust, and treason waits on him.

(Act II, Scene V, lines 1149-56)

Prior to the battle Lord Clifford tells Henry that he should depart the field of battle since: "The queen hath best success when you are absent" (Act II, Scene 2, line 917). This leads Henry to go on a molehill and ruminating that once one party wins another time the other. He, however will sit on a molehill and "To whom God will, there be the victory! / For Margaret my queen, and Clifford too, / H ave chid me from the battle; swearing both/ They prosper best of all when I am thence. Would I were dead!" (Act II, Scene 5, lines 1117-21)

Henry is a desperate man and is having suicidal thoughts. Suicidal despair is one of the characteristics of slothful men, due to the fact that despair is one of the daughters of the sin of sloth according to Thomas Aquinas (Summa Theologica, 1981) and due to the fact that sloth is a kind of sorrow (Summa Theologica, 1981). According to the Bible "The sorrow of the world worketh death" (*2 Corinthians* 7:10). To conclude, sloth leads to despair and sorrow and finally to death, or in his

case suicide. In addition, according to Aquinas, since sorrow is a daughter of the sin of sloth and since spiritual goods are the object of the sin of sloth, an avoidance of goods which are means to an end in matters of common righteousness according to Aquinas represent the effect of “sluggishness about the commandments” (*Summa Theologica*, 1981, p.1797). This is how Aquinas traces the movement from sloth to sorrow to sluggishness about the commandments. The fifth commandment in the Bible is “Thou shalt not kill”. According to St. Augustine this command is to be taken as not only killing another person but also forbidding self-destruction, in other words suicide and a natural extension of the fifth commandment (City of God, 1888). In that way, sloth often leads to sorrow, which in turn leads to sluggishness about the commandments, and finally to suicide.

4.3. Richard II in *Richard II*

After Richard II has banished the son of his uncle John of Gaunt, Henry Bolingbroke in order to evade a trial by combat between Bolingbroke and Mowbray, he is notified that his uncle John of Gaunt is grievous sick and that he wants to see him. Upon hearing that, Richard utters:

> Now put it, God, in the physician's mind
>
> To help him to his grave immediately!
>
> The lining of his coffers shall make coats
>
> To deck our soldiers for these Irish wars.
>
> Come, gentlemen, let's all go visit him:
>
> Pray God we may make haste, and come too late!
>
> (Act I, scene 4, lines 673-78)

Neither John of Gaunt nor his son Henry Bolingbroke has wronged the Richard II in any way. And yet the king wants to see his uncle dead and is happy to confiscate his lands and belongings for funding the Irish Wars. This represents a clear sign of malice on the part of Richard II, malice being one of the daughters of the sin of sloth according to Thomas Aquinas. This action is also a sign of a lack of foresight, as by doing so, Richard II will sow the seed for the Wars of the Roses, but it also represents negligence as John of Gaunt`s speech in Act II Scene 2 points out. John of Gaunt calls Richard II “unstaid youth” (Act II, Scene 1, line 684) in other words reckless youth and points out that England now is rented “leased out” (Act II, Scene 2, line 741) calling Richard II a “careless patient” (Act II, Scene 1, line 781). Richard`s confiscation of Gaunt`s land is also a sign of shortcut to solutions,

yet another term from the sin lexicon, since the easiest but not the safest way to amass money is to simply confiscate the land of some noble after his death.

Another sign of Richard II`s slothfulness is his trait of living in a dream world. In Act III Scene 2, after Richard II compares himself to the sun and compares Bolingbroke to a traitor stating that in the end Bolingbroke will tremble at his sin, he utters: “Not all the water in the rough rude sea/ Can wash the balm off from an anointed king;/ The breath of worldly men cannot depose/ The deputy elected by the Lord “(lines 1462-65).

However, the situation changes very quickly, as in the next lines he is told that the Welsh have abandoned him, and have joined Bolingbroke. Richard II says that he has the right to look pale and dead, since he has lost twenty thousand men and that time has ruined him. After the Duke of Aumerle urges him to bear in mind who he is, Richard II confesses that he is a coward and asleep, two additional terms from the sin lexicon: “I had forgot myself; am I not king? / Awake, thou coward majesty! thou sleepest” (Act III, Scene 2, lines 1491-92).

In the lines that follow he shows signs of despair, yet another trait of the slothful man, as he urges his company in the following manner:

Let's talk of graves, of worms, and epitaphs;

Make dust our paper and with rainy eyes

Write sorrow on the bosom of the earth,

Let's choose executors and talk of wills:

And yet not so, for what can we bequeath

Save our deposed bodies to the ground?

Our lands, our lives and all are Bolingbroke's,

And nothing can we call our own but death

And that small model of the barren earth

Which serves as paste and cover to our bones.

(Act III, Scene 2, lines 1555-64)

Talking about graves, worms, epitaphs, executors, deposed bodies is the ultimate show of despair and despondency as Richard II seems deprived of all hope and all he sees is dead bodies. In such a state the only thing that he possesses in his opinion is death and the earth covering their imagined coffins. After the Bishop of Carlisle (with an advice) and the Duke of Aumerle (with hint about his father`s power) attempt to lift him out of his despair, Richard II confesses that his previous

fit of fear was overblown. However, when Sir Stephen Scroop informs them that the Duke of York, Aumerle`s father, has allied himself with Bolongbroke, Richard II utters:

Beshrew thee, cousin, which didst lead me forth

[To DUKE OF AUMERLE]

Of that sweet way I was in to despair!

What say you now? what comfort have we now?

By heaven, I'll hate him everlastingly

That bids me be of comfort any more.

Go to Flint castle: there I'll pine away;

A king, woe's slave, shall kingly woe obey.

(Act III, Scene 2, lines 1615-22)

In just a few lines we have seen several terms from the Sloth lexicon confessed personally by Richard II, namely: fear, or in other words faint-heartedness, and woe and sorrow or despair.

In Act III Scene 4 in the Garden-State allegory, the Gardener says to his Servant that it is a pity that Richard hadn`t looked after his state as they have looked after their garden. Namely, if he had cut the unnecessary branches, so that the necessary can live, he might have still “borne the crown, / Which waste of idle hours hath quite thrown down” (lines 1931-32). In other words, he would have worn the crown if it wasn`t for his laziness and negligence in fulfilling his duties. When the servant asks the Gardener whether he would be deposed, the Gardener replies: “Depress'd he is already, and deposed / 'Tis doubt he will be” (Act III, Scene 4, lines 1931-32).

In Act IV, Scene 1, Edmund of Langley announces that Richard with willing soul adopts Henry Bolingbroke as his heir. Bolingbroke orders that Richard is brought over so that he himself surrenders the crown in front of everyone to avoid any suspicions. Richard suddenly starts to have second-thoughts about surrendering the crown:

Give me the crown. Here, cousin, seize the crown;

Here cousin:

On this side my hand, and on that side yours.

Now is this golden crown like a deep well

That owes two buckets, filling one another,

The emptier ever dancing in the air,

The other down, unseen and full of water:

That bucket down and full of tears am I,

Drinking my griefs, whilst you mount up on high.

(Act IV, scene 1, lines 169-77)

When Bolingbroke hears and sees this, he asks Richard: “Are you contented to resign the crown?” (Act IV, Scene 1, line 2188). Again Richard is not certain, saying: “Ay, no; no, ay; for I must nothing be” (Act IV, scene 1, line 2189). These words and reactions namely changeability in his intention to accept and refuse dethronement represent instability on the part of Richard. Instability, according to Isidore of Seville is one of the seven things that arise from the sin of sloth.

After Richard II has resigned his crown, he falls further in his state of despair, wishing that he is dead. Suicidal despair is one of the terms of the Sloth lexicon. Richard, addressing Bolingbroke, states: “Long mayst thou live in Richard's seat to sit, / And soon lie Richard in an earthly pit!” (Act IV. Scene 1, lines 2206-07). His suicidal despair continues in the lines that follow: “O that I were a mockery king of snow, /Standing before the sun of Bolingbroke, /To melt myself away in water-drops!” (Act IV, Scene 1, lines 2249-51).

Chapter 5: The Sin of Anger in *Othello*, *Titus Andronicus*, *King Lear* and *Coriolanus*

This chapter analyses Shakespearean characters in four plays through the prism of anger. In order to better understand the sin or emotion of anger, I will use several authorities that have elucidated this notion. I will be quoting Aristotle and his *The Art of Rhetoric*, Seneca and his treatise *On Anger*, Niccolo Machiavelli and his work *The Prince,* Pierre de la Primaudaye and his work *The French Academie* and Francis Bacon and his *Essays*.

In the course of history, as far as the Western tradition symbolized by the Greco-Roman civilization and later European civilization as well as the Judeo-Christian tradition is concerned, anger is regarded from two perspectives. The first view is that anger can be justified and that it can be a positive emotion in certain cases. The main proponents of this idea are Aristotle, Catholic theology in general represented by moralists such as Thomas Aquinas, Shakespeare`s compatriot Jeremy Taylor, as well as the Jewish mystic Rabbi Elijah de Vidas. The view that anger is always a negative emotion is held by Plutarch, Galen the stoic Seneca, Horace, Judaism in general and the Catholic bishop St. Francis de Sales. The view that anger can sometimes be a good emotion, in my opinion, is best summed up by Aristotle. In *The Nichomachean Ethics*, Aristotle states: “Now someone who is angered at things and at people one ought to be angered at, and also as and when and for as long as

one ought to be, is praised, so this would be a gentle person, if in fact gentleness is praised. . . For holding back when one is being foully insulted, and overlooking it when it happens to those close to one, is slavish" (2002, p.110). The view that anger is always a negative emotion is summed up by Seneca`s and Horace`s apothegm "Anger is a brief madness". By summarizing the writings of the major representatives from both groups- Aristotle, Seneca and Plutarch- Solomon Schimmel establishes the link between anger and vengeance. His summary is as follows:

> Anger is aroused when a person suffers a real or perceived injury. Usually the angered person directs his actions towards punishing the real or perceived offender. The feelings of anger are an intermingling of pain and pleasure – pain at the injury and pleasure at the expectation of vengeance and the overt expression of anger".
>
> (*The Seven Deadly Sins, Jewish, Christian, and Classical Reflections on Human Nature*, 1992, p. 87)

In the plays that follow, my main concern would be to analyze the link between anger and revenge or vengeance.

5.1. Othello - Honour, Credulity, Anger and Revenge

In the *play The Tragedy of Othello, the Moor of Venice*, Othello is jealous since Iago has convinced him that Othello`s wife Desdemona has spent the night with Cassio. Othello is particularly sensitive about his honour. Close to the end of the play, after he kills Desdemona and wounds Iago, Othello reveals his worldview explicitly saying to Lodovico: "An honourable murderer, if you will; /For nought I did in hate, but all in honour" (Act V, Scene 2, lines 3656-67). Othello is a Moor, and as such, he shares some of the characteristics of the populations in the Maghreb countries, most notably honour killings or shame killings. The term Moor is an exonym initially used by Christian Europeans to describe the Muslim populations living in the Maghreb countries, the Iberian Peninsula, and the islands of Sicily and Malta during the Middle Ages. According to Leo Africanus the "Moors-- were the Berbers" in other words the Maghrebine Berbers (*1526, pp. 20 & 108*). Later, the term Moors was applied to Arabs. According to the UN in 2002, *The report of the Special Rapporteur (E/CN.4/2002/83)* states that in addition to Pakistan and Turkey, honour killings "had been reported in Jordan, Syria, Egypt, Lebanon, Iran, Yemen, Morocco and other Mediterranean and Gulf countries. It also takes place in countries such as: Germany, France and the United Kingdom within the migrant communities" (p.12).

In addition to being sensitive about honour, Othello regards Desdemona as his property. When he is accused that he has used magic to marry Desdemona, he sardonically reiterates the accusation:

Yet, by your gracious patience,
I will a round unvarnish'd tale deliver
Of my whole course of love; what drugs, what charms,
What conjuration and what mighty magic,
For such proceeding I am charged withal,
I won his daughter.

(Act I, Scene 1, lines 429-34)

Othello, a general, speaks about Desdemona in terms of wining, as it is a battle and as if she is only a possession similar to Homeric *geras* or prize. In Achilles` case, his lost *geras,* that leads to his anger (Anger of Achilles), is Briseis, whereas in Othello`s case it is Desdemona. Furthermore, Machiavelli expounding on how a prince can avoid being hated writes about the subjects that "As I have mentioned, what makes him particularly hated is being predatory and pre-emptory toward the property and the women of his subjects: he must keep himself away from these whenever they are not deprived of their property or their honor, most men remain satisfied" (2008, p.287). Since both Othello's honour and property is touched, not only he is not content, but he is jealous of Cassio and in the course of the play becomes extremely angry.

Pierre de la Primadaye explains the connection between jealousy and anger, or as he says choler which is an archaic word for anger, in his work *The French Academie*: "And that this is true, we see that women are commonly soo|ner ▪ driuen into choler then men▪ the sicke then the sound: the old than the yoong: all vici|ous, gluttonous, iealous, vaine-glorious, and ambitious men, than those that vnfainedly hate vice." (1618, Chapter 29, p. 129)

On first glance, Othello is in love with Desdemona, as Desdemona is in love with Othello. Othello says: "She loved me for the dangers I had pass'd, /And I loved her that she did pity them " (Act I, Scene 3, lines 512-13). For Othello, Desdemona is a "fair warrior" (Act II, Scene 1, 972) and his "soul`s joy" (Act II, Scene 1, 975). When Desdemona says that she wishes that their "loves and comforts should increase" (Act II, Scene 1, 975) as the days pass, Othello's reply is one of a speechless lover who kisses his beloved:

Amen to that, sweet powers!
I cannot speak enough of this content;
It stops me here; it is too much of joy:

And this, and this, the greatest discords be

[Kissing her]

That e'er our hearts shall make!

(Act II, Scene 1, lines 988-93)

Aristotle in his Rhetoric says that “a lover is angered by disregard of his love” (2012, p.84) just like Othello feels with regard to his love and Desdemona`s presumed disregard. One of the causes for Othello`s anger is the fact that he lives in a world where reputation is very important. Even Cassio, who holds a lower rank than Othello, after getting drunk and getting embroiled in fight, says: “Reputation, reputation, reputation! O, I have lost/ my reputation! I have lost the immortal part of/ myself, and what remains is bestial. My reputation, / Iago, my reputation!” (Act II, Scene 3, lines 1414-19)

According to Francis Bacon, people who are sensitive about their reputation are prone to becoming angry: “Lastly, opinion of the touch of a man`s reputation doth multiply and sharpen anger” (Bacon, 1994, p. 145).

In addition, Iago senses that Othello`s is too credulous: “The Moor is of a free and open nature, /That thinks men honest that but seem to be so, /And will as tenderly be led by the nose/As asses are” (Act I, Scene 3, lines 756-59).

Iago takes advantage of Othello`s sensitivity with regard to reputation and his credulous nature:

Good name in man and woman, dear my lord,

Is the immediate jewel of their souls:

Who steals my purse steals trash; 'tis something, nothing;

'Twas mine, 'tis his, and has been slave to thousands:

But he that filches from me my good name

Robs me of that which not enriches him

And makes me poor indeed.

(Act III, Scene 3, lines 1805-11)

Othello is not an exception, as after he starts to suspect Desdemona`s “infidelity” due to Iago`s machinations he proclaims:

I had been happy, if the general camp,

Pioners and all, had tasted her sweet body,

So I had nothing known.O, now, for ever

Farewell the tranquil mind! farewell content!

Farewell the plumed troop, and the big wars,
That make ambition virtue! O, farewell!
Farewell the neighing steed, and the shrill trump,
The spirit-stirring drum, the ear-piercing fife,
The royal banner, and all quality,
Pride, pomp and circumstance of glorious war!
And, O you mortal engines, whose rude throats
The immortal Jove's dead clamours counterfeit,
Farewell! Othello's occupation's gone!

(Act III, Scene 3, lines 2022-34)

Othello exhibits all the signs of an angry person. Some of his character traits are: rage, cursing, striking, which according to *Ancrene Wisse* are manifestations of the sin of anger. Additional character traits that Othello possesses are: fury, homicide, hatred and insult, which according to the Peraldus image are some of the manifestations of the sin of anger. Othello is an enraged man. After Iago tells Othello that he had heard Cassio in his sleep saying that he and Desdemona should be wary and hide their love, Othello goes homicidal screaming “O, blood, blood, blood!”. Iago`s supposedly comforting words instead of dulling the edge of anger only reinforce and enrage him even more:

Never, Iago: Like to the Pontic sea,
Whose icy current and compulsive course
Ne'er feels retiring ebb, but keeps due on
To the Propontic and the Hellespont,
Even so my bloody thoughts, with violent pace,
Shall ne'er look back, ne'er ebb to humble love,
Till that a capable and wide revenge
Swallow them up. Now, by yond marble heaven,
[Kneels]
In the due reverence of a sacred vow
I here engage my words.

(Act III, Scene 3, lines 2139-49)

Othello is so homicidal that on several occasions his murderous thoughts are so angry that they represent rage. This is the case, when for example he says: “I'll tear her all to pieces” (Act I, Scene I, 2115), “I will chop her into messes: cuckold me!” (Act IV, Scene 1,2631). His homicidal remark that he wants to poison her, ends with several other characteristics of anger, namely, striking

and insult, calling her a devil: ”Get me some poison, Iago; this night: I'll not/ expostulate with her, lest her body and beauty/ unprovide my mind again: this night, Iago. / [Striking her] Devil!” (Act IV, Scene 1, 2635-37). Another example of his homicidal thoughts is the remark: “Yet she must die, else she'll betray more men” (Act V, Scene 2, line 3307).

On several occasions Othello insults Desdemona. He calls her a whore five times, a strumpet five times and once a bawd. Moreover, when Othello is about to appoint Iago as his lieutenant instead of Cassio, he curses Desdemona and is homicidal: ”Damn her, lewd minx! O, damn her! / Come, go with me apart; I will withdraw, /To furnish me with some swift means of death /For the fair devil. Now art thou my lieutenant” (Act III, Scene 3, lines 2167-70).

In addition to homicide, rage, striking, insult and cursing, Othello is transformed from a lover into someone who hates. He states:

She's gone. I am abused; and my relief
Must be to loathe her. O curse of marriage,
That we can call these delicate creatures ours,
And not their appetites! I had rather be a toad,
And live upon the vapour of a dungeon,
Than keep a corner in the thing I love
For others' uses.

(Act III, Scene 3, 1928-34)

His next speech on hate is interwoven with rage and its outcome revenge: “Arise, black vengeance, from thy hollow cell! /Yield up, O love, thy crown and hearted throne /To tyrannous hate! Swell, bosom, with thy fraught, / For 'tis of aspics' tongues!” (Act III, Scene 3, lines 2132-35)

5.2. Titus Andronicus, Tamora and Aaron in *Titus Andronicus* – Anger and the Vicious Circle of Revenge

Titus Andronicus is a revenge tragedy and one of its main themes is the theme of revenge. However, revenge or vengeance, according to the Catholic Encyclopedia is the main manifestation of anger. In the *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Joseph F. Delany defines anger as:

The desire of vengeance. Its ethical rating depends upon the quality of the vengeance and the quantity of the passion. When these are in conformity with the prescriptions of balanced reason, anger is not a sin. It is rather a praiseworthy thing and justifiable with a proper zeal. It becomes sinful when it is sought to wreak vengeance upon one who has not deserved it, or to a greater extent

than it has been deserved, or in conflict with the dispositions of law, or from an improper motive. The sin is then in a general sense mortal as being opposed to justice and charity (Delany, 1907).

We have another link between anger and revenge in Homer`s Illiad. After Achilles pride is hurt and he is angered by Agamemnon, he refuses to participate in the siege of Troy. Subsequently, his friend Patroclus wearing his armour, is killed by Hector. This leads to Achilles wanting to revenge his friend and the murder of Hector at the hands of Achilles.

In addition, Geoffrey Chaucer in his “The Parson`s Tale” from Canterbury tales also names revenge or vengeance among the fruits of anger. Furthermore, as fruits of anger, among others Chaucer also mentions: manslaughter, falsehood, flattery, treachery, sowing of strife, doubleness of tongue etc.

Most of the aforementioned manifestations are present in the play Titus Andronicus, which means that the principal characters Titus, Tamora, Tamora`s sons and Aaron all exhibit this pattern of anger.

Titus is a revengeful and thus an angry person. Due to the fact that he had lost twenty-one sons in the war against the Goths, and despite the pleadings of Tamora, in an act of anger and revenge, he orders the murder of the firstborn son of Tamora, queen of the Goths: “To this your son is mark'd, and die he must, /To appease their groaning shadows that are gone” (Act I, Scene 1, lines 142-43). In addition to his desire for revenge, Titus in a fit of anger also kills his son Mutius, when the latter, alongside with his brothers, take the side of Lavinia and her fiancé Bassianus, rather than the side of the king Saturninus who also wants to marry her. Titus utters: What, villain boy! / Barr'st me my way in Rome? *Stabbing MUTIUS* (Act I, Scene 1, lines 321-22) Bassianus explains that in a fit of anger, Titus has killed his son: “That in the rescue of Lavinia /With his own hand did slay his youngest son, /In zeal to you and highly moved to wrath /To be controll'd in that he frankly gave” (Act I, Scene 1, lines 466-69).

After Lavinia`s husband is killed and she is raped and her hands and tongue are cut off, as a revenge orchestrated by Tamora, Titus in a cycle of revenge decides to cut the throats of the culprits, Tamora`s sons Chiron and Demetrius:

O villains, Chiron and Demetrius!
Here stands the spring whom you have stain'd with mud,
This goodly summer with your winter mix'd.
You kill'd her husband, and for that vile fault
Two of her brothers were condemn'd to death,
My hand cut off and made a merry jest;
Both her sweet hands, her tongue, and that more dear

Than hands or tongue, her spotless chastity,
Inhuman traitors, you constrain'd and forced.
What would you say, if I should let you speak?
Villains, for shame you could not beg for grace.
Hark, wretches! how I mean to martyr you.
This one hand yet is left to cut your throats,
Whilst that Lavinia 'tween her stumps doth hold
The basin that receives your guilty blood.

(Act V, Scene 2, lines 2486-500)

After he has prepared and served the dinner to Tamora, that included the grinded bones of her sons, Titus in a fit of Anger kills his daughter Lavinia because he agrees with Saturninus` statement that “the girl should not survive her shame, /And by her presence still renew his sorrows” (Act V, Scene 3, 2573-74).

Tamora is also prone to some manifestations of anger such as: revenge, falsehood, doubleness of tongue and flattery. Her doubleness of tongue falsehood and flattery is seen in the lines where she promises to be faithful to the newly elected king Saturninus. “And here, in sight of heaven, to Rome I swear, / If Saturnine advance the Queen of Goths, /She will a handmaid be to his desires, /A loving nurse, a mother to his youth” (Act I, Scene 1, lines 369-73).

However, in the course of the play one becomes aware that she is not faithful to the king, has her own agenda which consists of taking revenge on the Andronici, in a plot hatched with her lover Aaron. In addition, she gives birth to a child fathered by Aaron, rather than to a child from her husband, the king Saturninus.

Her revengeful nature is best seen in the speech where she urges the king Saturninus to pardon Titus, advising him that pardon is the best course of action since he is new to the throne, lest the people take him for ungrateful. Immediately after she reveals her plan to Saturninus:

and then let me alone:
I'll find a day to massacre them all
And raze their faction and their family,
The cruel father and his traitorous sons,
To whom I sued for my dear son's life,
And make them know what 'tis to let a queen
Kneel in the streets and beg for grace in vain.

(Act I, Scene 1, lines 499-505)

Her revengeful nature is again seen when she lies to her sons Chiron and Demetrius and urges them to take revenge on Bassianus and Lavinia, since in her words, they told her:

But straight they told me they would bind me here
Unto the body of a dismal yew,
And leave me to this miserable death:
And then they call'd me foul adulteress,
Lascivious Goth, and all the bitterest terms
That ever ear did hear to such effect:
And, had you not by wondrous fortune come,
This vengeance on me had they executed.
Revenge it, as you love your mother's life,
Or be ye not henceforth call'd my children.

(Act II, Scene III, lines 842-51)

In Act IV, Scene 4, Tamora continues with a speech where again she speaks about revenge, this time however her speech is coupled with flattery, doubleness of tongue or falsehood, since on the surface she pleads to Saturninus not to take action against Titus due to the fact that she together with Aaron has a more sinister agenda “To scatter and disperse the giddy Goths” (Act V, Scene 2, 2385) led by Titus` son Lucius against Rome:

My gracious lord, my lovely Saturnine,
Lord of my life, commander of my thoughts,
Calm thee, and bear the faults of Titus' age,
The effects of sorrow for his valiant sons,
Whose loss hath pierced him deep and scarr'd his heart;
And rather comfort his distressed plight
Than prosecute the meanest or the best
For these contempts.
[Aside]
Why, thus it shall become
High-witted Tamora to gloze with all:
But, Titus, I have touched thee to the quick,
Thy life-blood out: if Aaron now be wise,
Then is all safe, the anchor's in the port.

(Act IV, Scene 4, 2036-2049)

Tamora will use flattery and doubleness of tongue to convince Titus, that he, his son Lucius, brother Marcus, king Saturninus, Tamora, Lavinia, and Goths should assemble at a banquet:

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:
For I can smooth and fill his aged ear
With golden promises; that, were his heart
Almost impregnable, his old ears deaf,
Yet should both ear and heart obey my tongue.
[To AEmilius]
Go thou before, be our ambassador:
Say that the emperor requests a parley
Of warlike Lucius, and appoint the meeting
Even at his father's house, the old Andronicus.

(Act IV, Scene 4, 2103-18)

Again Tamora reiterates that she would use “art” in her goal is to separate Lucius from the “warlike Goths” (Act IV, Scene 4, l 2126): “Now will I to that old Andronicus; And temper him with all the art I have, /To pluck proud Lucius from the warlike Goths” (Act IV, Scene 4,2124-2126). Tamora`s sons also exhibit patterns of anger such as revenge and manslaughter or murder. Namely, to revenge the murder of their brother Alarbus, Aaron counsels them that they should rape Lavinia. They readily agree:

Chiron. “Thy counsel, lad, smells of no cowardice,/ Demetrius. Sit fas aut nefas, till I find the stream /To cool this heat, a charm to calm these fits. /Per Styga, per manes vehor” (Act II, Scene 1, 690-93). Not only do Chiron and Demetrius rape Lavinia but they also cut off her hands and tongue and kill her husband Bassianus.

Aaron is another angry person, musing continually on revenge. As stated earlier, he goads Chiron and Demetrius into raping Lavinia in the forest:

The forest walks are wide and spacious;
And many unfrequented plots there are
Fitted by kind for rape and villany:

Single you thither then this dainty doe,
And strike her home by force, if not by words:
This way, or not at all, stand you in hope.
Come, come, our empress, with her sacred wit
To villany and vengeance consecrate,
Will we acquaint with all that we intend.

(Act II, Scene 11, lines 671-679)

In Scene II, Act 3, after Tamora reprimands him for being sad, Aaron reiterates his desire for vengeance:

Vengeance is in my heart, death in my hand,
Blood and revenge are hammering in my head.
Hark Tamora, the empress of my soul,
Which never hopes more heaven than rests in thee,
This is the day of doom for Bassianus:
His Philomel must lose her tongue to-day,
Thy sons make pillage of her chastity
And wash their hands in Bassianus' blood. (lines 771-778)

In Act V, Scene I, after the Goths bring the captured Aaron and his child in front of Lucius, and after the latter gives an order that the child should be hanged, Aaron urges Lucius to save the child, otherwise he curses him with vengeance:

Lucius, save the child,
And bear it from me to the empress.
If thou do this, I'll show thee wondrous things,
That highly may advantage thee to hear:
If thou wilt not, befall what may befall,
I'll speak no more but 'Vengeance rot you all! (lines 2188-2194)

5.3. King Lear and the Earl of Gloucester in *King Lear* – Vain Glory Leading to Anger, Madness and Revenge

As in the case of Titus Andronicus, in King Lear anger leads to revenge. The cause for anger, as usual and as Aristotle has explained it in *The Rhetoric* is a slight. In his essay *On anger*, Seneca discusses several kings who were prone to anger. He states the example of Alexander the Great, who stabbed his dearest friend Clitus for refusing to flatter him and was reluctant the change from a free man into a Persian slave. The desire to be flattered proved also to be one of the causes for the

downfall of King Lear. After asking for and receiving exaggerated and false praises from his two daughters Goneril and Regan on the question which one loves him most, his youngest daughter Cordelia is laconic and shortly answers: “Nothing, my lord” (Act I, Scene 1, line 89) and “I love your Majesty /According to my bond; no more nor less ” (Act I, Scene 1, lines 94-95). Her father receives these answers as a slight or an injury which shows that he is vainglorious, prone to anger and retorts wrathfully and revengefully:

> Let it be so! thy truth then be thy dower!
> For, by the sacred radiance of the sun,
> The mysteries of Hecate and the night;
> By all the operation of the orbs
> From whom we do exist and cease to be;
> Here I disclaim all my paternal care,
> Propinquity and property of blood,
> And as a stranger to my heart and me
> Hold thee from this for ever. The barbarous Scythian,
> Or he that makes his generation messes
> To gorge his appetite, shall to my bosom
> Be as well neighbour'd, pitied, and reliev'd,
> As thou my sometime daughter.
>
> (Act I, Scene 1, lines 112-24)

Lear`s reaction is understandable if we take into account Seneca`s explanation that anger becomes more violent as we raise in station and enjoy good fortune and that it shows itself in “rich men and notables and magistrates: anything frivolous and vacant in their mental makeup takes wing when the breeze is at its back” (*Anger, Mercy, Revenge*, p.49, 2010). As a king, Lear is rich, noble and becomes angry about trivial matters such as a refusal to be flattered. When the Earl of Kent intervenes about the injustice regarding Cordelia, King Lear shows again how angry he is: “Peace, Kent! /Come not between the dragon and his wrath” (Act I, Scene 1, lines 126-7). The fact that Lear has renounced his daughter, is deaf to reason and advice and is excited by trifling causes such as flattery and is unable to distinguish between true and false, shows that Lear is prone to anger. This is corroborated by Seneca`s stance that anger “[is] a brief madness: for it’s no less lacking in self-control, forgetful of decency, unmindful of personal ties, unrelentingly intent on its goal, shut off from rational deliberation, stirred for no substantial reason, unsuited to discerning what’s fair and true, just like a collapsing building that’s reduced to rubble even as it crushes what it falls upon” (*Anger, Mercy, Revenge*, p.14).

Kent notices that Lear`s anger has led him to acting madly and says: “Be Kent unmannerly/When Lear is mad” (Act I, Scene 1, lines 151- 2). Just because Kent is telling him that he making a mistake and he is pointing to what is true and just, Lear utters “Out of my sight!” (Act I, Scene 1, line 165), lays his hands on his sword and banishes Kent on pain of death.

As a result of his old age and conceit, Lear in both cases is exaggerating trifles. Seneca explicitly says that conceit leads to anger: “Many people manufacture their own causes for complaint through false suspicion and by exaggerating things that are trivial. Anger often comes to us, but we more often go to it” (2010, p.72).

One of the manifestations of the sin of anger, according to *Ancrene Wisse* is cursing. Lear admits that he has cursed Cordelia when he offers her to the Duke of Burgundy: “Will you, with those infirmities she owes, /Unfriended, new adopted to our hate, /Dow'r'd with our curse, and stranger'd with our oath, /Take her, or leave her?” (Act I, Scene I, lines 219-22)

Goneril, his eldest daughter, specifically states that Lear, due to his age, is an angry or choleric man: “The best and soundest of his time hath been but rash; then /must we look to receive from his age, not alone the /imperfections of long-ingraffed condition, but therewithal /the unruly waywardness that infirm and choleric years bring with /them” (Act I, Scene I, lines 319-23).

With regard to old age, Francis Bacon in his essay Of Anger, mentions that anger is found in “children, women, old folks, sick folks” (*Essays*, Of Anger, p 145). Lear has more than eighty years and can be regarded as an old man.

In addition to cursing, we learn that Lear exhibits another characteristic of anger, namely striking. In Act I, Scene 3, Oswald informs us that Lear has stricken one of Goneril`s servants for chiding his fool.

Lear also strikes Oswald for trivial causes. On Lear`s question “Who am I, sir?” (Act I, Scene 4, line 607), Oswald replies “My lady's father” (Act I, Scene 4, 608). For Lear this is an insult and he utters “You whoreson dog! You / slave! you cur!” striking him (Act I, Scene 4, lines 609-10).

When Goneril, halves his retinue of hundred knights, Lear unleashes an outburst of curses:

Hear, Nature, hear! dear goddess, hear!
Suspend thy purpose, if thou didst intend
To make this creature fruitful.
Into her womb convey sterility;
Dry up in her the organs of increase;
And from her derogate body never spring
A babe to honour her! If she must teem,
Create her child of spleen, that it may live

And be a thwart disnatur'd torment to her.
Let it stamp wrinkles in her brow of youth,
With cadent tears fret channels in her cheeks,
Turn all her mother's pains and benefits
To laughter and contempt, that she may feel
How sharper than a serpent's tooth it is
To have a thankless child!

(Act I, Scene 4, lines 802-16)

After the Duke of Albany, asks what the matter is, Lear continues with cursing:

Life and death! I am asham'd
That thou hast power to shake my manhood thus;
That these hot tears, which break from me perforce,
Should make thee worth them. Blasts and fogs upon thee!
Th' untented woundings of a father's curse
Pierce every sense about thee!

(Act I, Scene 4, lines 825-30)

Angered Lear leaves Goneril`s castle and goes to his other daughter Regan. Reagan starts to defend and search reasons to exculpate Goneril, but Lear is adamant: "My curses on her!" (Act II, Scene 4, line 1427). When Reagan tells him that he should ask forgiveness from Goneril, Lear again starts to curse Goneril: "All the stor'd vengeances of heaven fall / On her ingrateful top! Strike her young bones, /You taking airs, with lameness!" (Act II, Scene 4, lines 1446-48)

When the Duke of Cornwall interrupts, Lear continues with curses: "You nimble lightnings, dart your blinding flames /Into her scornful eyes! Infect her beauty, / You fen-suck'd fogs, drawn by the pow'rful sun, /To fall and blast her pride!" (Act II, Scene 4, lines 1450-53)

Regan however is even less willing to accommodate Lear`s fifty attendants. She reduces the number of his retinue to twenty-five. Lear promises revenge on both of his daughters: "I will have such revenges on you both/That all the world shall- I will do such things- /What they are yet, I know not; but they shall be /The terrors of the earth!" (Act II, Scene 4, lines 1580-83)

Lear is so angered at the behavior of his daughter that he is on the verge of going mad. As previously stated, Seneca describes anger as a short madness. "You think I'll weep. /No, I'll not weep. /I have full cause of weeping, but this heart /Shall break into a hundred thousand flaws /Or ere I'll weep. O fool, I shall go mad!" (Act II, Scene 4, lines 1583-87).

Lear specifically mentions the ingratitude of his daughters for his dire situation and madness:

Filial ingratitude!
Is it not as this mouth should tear this hand
For lifting food to't? But I will punish home!
No, I will weep no more. In such a night
To shut me out! Pour on; I will endure.
In such a night as this! O Regan, Goneril!
Your old kind father, whose frank heart gave all!
O, that way madness lies; let me shun that!
No more of that.

(Act III, Scene 4, lines 1816-24)

When he meets Cornelia in a tent in the French camp, Lear admits that he is not a completely sane person:

And, to deal plainly,
I fear I am not in my perfect mind.
Methinks I should know you, and know this man;
Yet I am doubtful; for I am mainly ignorant
What place this is; and all the skill I have
Remembers not these garments; nor I know not
Where I did lodge last night. Do not laugh at me;
For (as I am a man) I think this lady /To be my child Cordelia.

(Act IV, Scene 7, lines 2981-89)

As stated in the book *The French Academie*, the usual order sequence with regard to anger is: pride, anger, vengeance and finally shame.

> But when he doth it, he is not mooued with any euill affection, but onely with the loue he beareth to iustice and vertue, to his children, and with pittie and compassion towards them in regarde of the iniuries done vnto them. And as himselfe commeth in iudgement to take vengeance, so he would haue them that supply his place among men, vnto whom he hath committed the sword for the defence of the good and punishment of euill doe•s, to follow his example. But whether they doe so or no, there is no sinne that can auoide punishment, and that findeth not a Iudge euen in him that committed it, to take vengeance thereof, by meanes of the affecti|ons, which God hath placed in man to that end. Among which Shame occupieth a place, which we ought well to consider. (1618, p.506)

This play is no different as in the end Lear feels ashamed from his unjust action towards Cordelia urging her not to weep: “I pray weep not. If you have poison for me, I will drink it./

I know you do not love me; for your sisters /Have, as I do remember, done me wrong. /You have some cause, they have not" (Act IV, Scene 7, lines 2991-95).

In addition, Lear is again so ashamed that he asks for forgiveness from Cordelia: "No, no, no, no! Come, let's away to prison. / We two alone will sing like birds i' th' cage. /When thou dost ask me blessing, I'll kneel down/ And ask of thee forgiveness" (Act V, Scene 3, 3131-34).

Gloucester shares in many ways the fate and approach to life, such as credulousness, to Lear`s fate. Gloucester`s illegitimate son Edmund, forges a letter inculpating Gloucester`s legitimate son Edgar in conspiracy to overthrow their father`s so-called tyranny. When Gloucester reads "Edgar`s" letter, like Lear, he goes into rage: "O villain, villain! His very opinion in the letter! Abhorred /villain! Unnatural, detested, brutish villain! worse than /brutish! Go, sirrah, seek him. I'll apprehend him. Abominable /villain! Where is he?" (Act I, Scene 2, lines 404-407).

In order to reassure Lear of Edgar`s involvement, Edmund convinces Lear that the latter will obtain "auricular assurance" (Act I, Scene 2, line 418). In addition to rage, Gloucester starts to swear: "To his father, that so tenderly and entirely loves him. /Heaven and earth! Edmund, seek him out; wind me into him, I pray /you; frame the business after your own wisdom. I would unstate /myself to be in a due resolution" (Act I, Scene 2, line 423-26).

As a revenge for Edgar`s supposed conspiracy, Gloucester wants his son Edgar dead, promising rewards to the one who apprehends him:

Not in this land shall he remain uncaught;
And found- dispatch. The noble Duke my master,
My worthy arch and patron, comes to-night.
By his authority I will proclaim it
That he which find, him shall deserve our thanks,
Bringing the murderous caitiff to the stake;
He that conceals him, death.

(Act II, Scene I, lines 991-97)

Like Lear`s anger, Gloucester anger, love and grief for his outlawed son, leads him to madness. During the storm at the heath he states:

Thou say'st the King grows mad: I'll tell thee, friend,
I am almost mad myself. I had a son,
Now outlaw'd from my blood. He sought my life
But lately, very late. I lov'd him, friend-
No father his son dearer. True to tell thee,

The grief hath craz'd my wits. What a night 's this!

I do beseech your Grace.

(Act III, Scene 4, lines 1958-64)

As in the case of Lear, Gloucester in the end understand that he has been wrong in disinheriting and outlawing his son Edgar. As Lear, he goes from anger to revenge to shame: “O my follies! Then Edgar was abus'd. /Kind gods, forgive me that, and prosper him!” (Act III, Scene 7, 2225-26).

The blind Gloucester recognizes that Edgar has not deserved to be the object of his anger: “Ah dear son Edgar, /The food of thy abused father's wrath! Might I but live to see thee in my touch, /I'ld say I had eyes again!” (Act IV, Scene 1, lines 2271-74).

Gloucester is so ashamed of his actions that he asks Edgar, who is disguised as a peasant to lead him to a cliff near Dover so that he can commit suicide. Prior to jumping from the “cliff”, Gloucester renounces this world, leaves behind his troubles and problems and blesses Edgar:

O you mighty gods! He kneels.

This world I do renounce, and, in your sights,

Shake patiently my great affliction off.

If I could bear it longer and not fall

To quarrel with your great opposeless wills,

My snuff and loathed part of nature should

Burn itself out. If Edgar live, O, bless him!

Now, fellow, fare thee well.

He falls [forward and swoons].

(Act IV, Scene 6, lines 2638-46)

5.4. Coriolanus- Pride, Anger and Revenge

The first impression that we get about Caius Martius, later called Coriolanus, when we read or watch the play is that Coriolanus is a very proud man. The instances when he is called proud are numerous. In Act I, Scene I the First Citizen depicts Coriolanus as honouring himself “with being proud” (Act I, Scene 1, line 27). A few lines later the First Citizen also ascribes Coriolanus` valorous deeds for his country in part as a result of his pride: “he did it to/please his mother and to be partly proud; which he/is, even till the altitude of his virtue” (Act I, Scene 1, lines 31-33). One can see in the previous passage that his courage is equated to his pride. In addition, Coriolanus himself compares his Volscian general and enemy to a lion “That I am proud to hunt” (Act I, Scene 1, line 250). After

Coriolanus is made deputy to Cominius in the war against the Volsces and after he call the citizens of Rome rats, Sicinius who is one of the tribunes asks: “Was ever man so proud as is this CORIOLANUS?” (Act I, Scene 1, lines 275) His fellow tribune Brutus answers: “He has no equal” (Act I, Scene 1, line 76). The tribunes Sicinius and Brutus continue their conversation, commenting on Coriolanus`s reaction when they were chosen as tribunes. According to them he mocked their election. In addition, they comment that his courage has made him too proud.

Sicinius Velutus. When we were chosen tribunes for the people, —

Junius Brutus. Mark'd you his lip and eyes?

Sicinius Velutus. Nay. but his taunts.

Junius Brutus. Being moved, he will not spare to gird the gods.

Sicinius Velutus. Be-mock the modest moon.

Junius Brutus. The present wars devour him: he is grown

Too proud to be so valiant.

(Act I, Scene 1, lines 277-283)

In act II, Scene I, when Menenius asks Sicinius and Brutus what quality “is Martius poor in, that you two/have not in abundance” (lines 931-32), Brutus answers that he has many faults and Sicinius adds “Especially in pride” (Act II, Scene 1, line 934). When Menenius asks Sicinius and Brutus whether they blame Coriolanus “for being proud” (Act II, Scene 1, line 947), Brutus answers: “We do it not alone, sir” (Act II, Scene 1, line 948). Menenius attacks the tribunes and defends Coriolanus by stating that: “CORIOLANUS is proud;/who in a cheap estimation, is worth predecessors/since Deucalion, though peradventure some of the/ best of ’em were hereditary hangmen” (Act II, Scene 1, lines 1005-8). After Coriolanus defeats the army of the Volscian leader Aufidus, wounded he returns to Rome and receives in honour of his victory the agnomen Coriolanus. Menenius confirms the fact and again points to the fact that Coriolanus is a proud person: “CORIOLANUS is coming/home: he has more cause to be proud. Where is he wounded?” (Act II, Scene 1, lines 1063-63). On his arrival in Rome, the tribunes who represent the people, namely Sicinius and Brutus are afraid that he may become a consul and they hope that given the hatred the people feel for him and considering his prideful nature he will provoke them so that they will forget these honours.

Doubt not

The commoners, for whom we stand, but they

Upon their ancient malice will forget

With the least cause these his new honours, which/

That he will give them make I as little question/

As he is proud to do't.

(Act II, Scene 1, lines 1168-73)

In Act II, Scene II, we learn from the Second Officer in the Capitol that there are three candidates for the consulship, and the First Officer also comments that Coriolanus is “a brave fellow; but he's vengeance proud, and loves not the common people” (lines 1229-30). A usual custom for being elected a consul is appearing before the people wearing the gown of humility and to showing them your wounds from the battles. Coriolanus does this, albeit begrudgingly, the people give him their voices, but the tribune seems to have seen something that the commoners haven`t. Junius Brutus states: “With a proud heart he wore his humble weeds. /will you dismiss the people?” (Act II, Scene 3, lines 1594-95). After he is elected, the commoners start to argue whether he mocked them when he appeared before them. The tribunes seize the opportunity and again emphasize his pride and his hatred for them:

Let them assemble,
And on a safer judgment all revoke
Your ignorant election; enforce his pride,
And his old hate unto you; besides, forget not
With what contempt he wore the humble weed,
How in his suit he scorn'd you; but your loves,
Thinking upon his services, took from you
The apprehension of his present portance,
Which most gibingly, ungravely, he did fashion
After the inveterate hate he bears you.

(Act II, Scene 3, lines 1668-77)

The tribunes are successful in instigating a rebellion, and after Coriolanus insults the commoners and the notion of popular rule arguing putatively in favor of tyrannical rule he is accused of treason and the tribunes even demand his death. Coriolanus escapes in his house, and even his mother Volumnia, after she urges him to go to the people and repent, admits that his is proud:

At thy choice, then:
To beg of thee, it is my more dishonour
Than thou of them. Come all to ruin; let
Thy mother rather feel thy pride than fear
Thy dangerous stoutness, for I mock at death
With as big heart as thou. Do as thou list
Thy valiantness was mine, thou suck'dst it from me,
But owe thy pride thyself.

(Act III, Scene 2, lines 2312-19)

After Coriolanus is banished from Rome, Junius Brutus states: “Caius CORIOLANUS was/A worthy officer i' the war; but insolent,/O'ercome with pride, ambitious past all thinking, Self-loving” (Act IV, Scene 6,lines 3045-48). Sicimius joins the conversation and adds that he was in favour of one governing body, without a counterbalance: “And affecting one sole throne, /Without assistance” (Act IV, Scene 6, lines 3049-50).

Banished, Coriolanus goes to Aufidus and they sign a treaty to attack Rome. When the Volscian army is at the gates of Rome and Romans are about to be defeated, the Romans send Cominius and Menenius to change Coriolanus` mind. However, they fail in their task. Menenius stresses the fact the Coriolanus is wrathful and wants revenge:

Menenius Agrippa: O my son, my son!
thou art preparing fire for us; look thee, here's
water to quench it. I was hardly moved to come to
thee; but being assured none but myself could move
thee, I have been blown out of your gates with
sighs; and conjure thee to pardon Rome, and thy
petitionary countrymen. The good gods assuage thy
wrath, and turn the dregs of it upon this varlet
here, —this, who, like a block, hath denied my
access to thee.

(Act V, Scene 2, lines 3444-53)

After Coriolanus dismisses Menenius`s plea, Coriolanus stresses his desire for revenge:

Coriolanus. Wife, mother, child, I know not. My affairs
Are servanted to others: though I owe
My revenge properly, my remission lies
In Volscian breasts. That we have been familiar,
Ingrate forgetfulness shall poison, rather
Than pity note how much.

(Act V, Scene 2, lines 3456-61)

Later, the Romans send Corilonanus` smother Volumnia, his wife Virgilia and a noblewoman Valeria in order to deter Coriolanus from his intention to revenge himself. His mother, seeing that her son is adamant and too proud, pleads:

Say my request's unjust,
And spurn me back: but if it be not so,

Thou art not honest; and the gods will plague thee,
That thou restrain'st from me the duty which
To a mother's part belongs. He turns away:
Down, ladies; let us shame him with our knees.
To his surname Coriolanus 'longs more pride
Than pity to our prayers.

(Act V, Scene 3, lines 3675-82)

In the four analyzed plays, there is a striking resemblance between the notions of anger and vengeance. Othello, Titus Andronucus, Tamora, Tamora`s sons, Lear and Gloucester, move from anger to vengeance. Their motives however are different. Othello`s motive is "offended" honour, Titus` motive is quite different. He wants to avenge his sons killed in war. This is also problematic, because as a Roman, he should be acquainted with Herodotus view of war in general from his *Histories* that "in which [war], instead of sons burying their fathers, fathers bury their sons "(1996, p.43) meaning that the outcome of being a soldier and going to war means that you should expect the worst things that war delivers. His sons, are soldiers and are killed. He decides to kill Tamora`s son Alarbus, in order to avenge his sons. However, as Macbeth says "It will have blood; they say, blood will have blood" (Act III, Scene IV, line 1425), one murder can lead to another and to finally to a vicious circle. This is exactly what happens, as Tamora and her remaining sons plot to avenge the murder of Alarbus. For this reason, her sons kill Bassianus and rape Titus`s daughter Lavinia. Titus learns the names of the rapists and murderers and cuts the throats of the perpetrators Chiron and Demetrius. Titus also kills Tamora in the presence of the king, Saturninus. In turn, Saturninus kills Titus. The bloody vicious cycle ends with Saturninus being killed by Lucius, Titus`s eldest son, to avenge the murder of his father. To some extent, Lear and Gloucester have similar characteristics as Othello, as they are all credulous. Othello believes Iago instead of Desdemona, Lear believes Regan and Goneril and can not grasp the true nature of Cordelia, Gloucester immediately believes Edmund`s machinations, which means that he, as a father, hasn't grasped the true nature of the character of his son Edgar. Othello, Titus Andronucus, Tamora, Tamora`s sons, Lear and Gloucester also do not fit Aristotle`s description of a justified anger, as neither of them fulfill the criteria of being angry "for the right reasons, with the right people, and also in the right way, at the right time and for the right length of time" (2002, p.68). Othello`s reasons are totally wrong as he is misled by Iago, Titus`s reasons are also wrong as Tamora has not personally wronged him. In addition, he is not angered in the right way as he recourses to revenge, which is a kind of wild justice according to Francis Bacon. Tamora and her sons are angry for the right reasons and with the right people, Titus, but not in the right way as they also turn to revenge. Lear is angry at Cordelia, but not for the right

reasons and he is wrong for being angry at her. Gloucester`s reasons for being angry are also wrong, as he is deceived by Edmund. In the case of Coriolanus, his pride leads to anger and finally to revenge.

Another thread that is common for these angry characters, particularly the main protagonists, is that anger can lead to madness. Seneca in his treatise "On Anger" writes: "Some wise men have said that anger is a brief madness: for it's no less lacking in self-control, forgetful of decency, unmindful of personal ties, unrelentingly intent on its goal, shut off from rational deliberation, stirred for no substantial reason, unsuited to discerning what's fair and true, just like a collapsing building that's reduced to rubble even as it crushes what it falls upon" (2010, p.14). For example, the critic Bruce King writes about Coriolanus`s mad anger which "brings down his world, ruins what he has or destroys what he loves" (1979, p.74). Iago perplexes Othello in the extreme by making him an ass "and practicing upon his peace and quiet even to madness". In a fit of mad jealousy, Othello kills his innocent wife. King Lear also goes mad due to anger. Titus, as befitting for a hero of a revenge tragedy also goes mad.

Chapter 6: The Spiritual Sin of Envy in Richard III and Iago

Envy is the first spiritual sin, that this thesis traces in Shakespearean characters, as the previous five sins were all carnal. According to Dorothy L. Sayers, alongside with anger and pride it represents perverted love towards harming others (1955, p. 65-67). According to Aristotle, envy is "a disturbing pain caused by the prosperity of others. But it is not excited by the prosperity of the undeserving but by that of people who are like us or equal with us" (2012 p.106). According to Solomon Schimmel, "the ubiquity and danger of envy made it a central sin in all of the moral and religious traditions" (1992, p.61). Envy is one the first sins mentioned in the Bible with regard to human interactions. Cain committed fratricide, killing Abel because he envied God`s acceptance of Abel`s gift instead of his. Another example from the Bible is the woman who lost her child envied the new born child of another woman claiming that the child was hers. When King Solomon proposed that the child is cut in two and divided, the real mother assented to losing the child as long as it unharmed, even though the false mother receives it. The envious woman, who falsely claimed that the child was hers did nothing, which shows how cruel envy can be, preferring the child dead rather than seeing it with another woman. Jewish legends ascribe to Satan, in addition to the sin of pride, the sin of envy. Namely, Satan was envious of God and started a rebellion. After Satan was thrown out of Paradise, he expressed his envy and anger towards Adam and Eve, as representatives of all Mankind. John Milton in his *Paradise Lost* Book I, has reiterated this view stressing Satan`s pride and envy as a cause for his rebellion.

6.1. Richard III in *Henry VI Part III* and *Richard III* - Lying, Slander and Murders

In Henry VI Part 3, on ascending to the throne, Edward IV gives the title of Duke of Gloucester to his brother Richard Plantagenet. Instead of being thankful, Richard gossips with his brother George, Duke of Clarence while Edward woos Lady Gray. As opposed to George`s gossiping and jesting which is benevolent, Richard`s gossiping is malevolent and serves as a prelude to his next speech where his true nature is revealed. On Edward`s avowal that he will use women honourably, Richard, left all alone, ponders:

> Would he were wasted, marrow, bones and all,
> That from his loins no hopeful branch may spring,
> To cross me from the golden time I look for!
> And yet, between my soul's desire and me—
> The lustful Edward's title buried—
> Is Clarence, Henry, and his son young Edward,
> And all the unlook'd for issue of their bodies,
> To take their rooms, ere I can place myself:
> A cold premeditation for my purpose! (lines 1614-22)

This monologue is an example of Richard`s hatred, ingratitude and his grief at the prosperity of his brother. Instead of being grateful and showing brotherly love and support, Richard wants his brother consumed with decease and he wants him dead. According to Thomas Aquinas, hatred and grief for the prosperity of our neighbor are two of the five daughters of the sin of envy, and ingratitude is stated as a manifestation of the sin of envy in Peraldus`s image in his book *Summa de vitiis et virtutibus (*Diekstra, 1998), as well as in the 13th century anonymous monastic manual *Ancrene Wisse* (Tolkien, 1662). There are several explanations for Richard`s envy in Francis Bacon`s essay “Of Envy” (1994). Bacon states:

> Near kinsfolks, and fellows in office, and those that have been bred together, are more apt to envy their equals when they are raised. For it doth upbraid unto them their own fortunes, and pointeth at them, and cometh oftener into their remembrance, and incurreth likewise more into the note of others; and envy ever redoubleth from speech and fame. (1994, p. 22)

As brothers, Richard and Edward are near kinsfolk. They fought together with their father against King Henry VI and Margaret, that is, they shared a common office and goal and they were raised together. Bacon, also mentions that envy redoubles from speech and fame. Not only has Edward become King of England, but he might also gain a queen and his fame will thus be redoubled. Richard is neither king nor has a wife or a queen. This is probably Richard`s reasoning and

the cause for his envy. Some critics may explain the previous lines as Richard`s ambition. Ambition is defined as “aspiration to achieve a particular goal, good or bad” (*Life Application Study Bible*, 1996). In Richard`s case his goal is a bad one since he desires the murder of his brother. According to the Bible, envy and ambition to achieve a bad goal are near synonyms. The Bible states: “Some indeed preach Christ even from envy and strife, and some also from goodwill: The former preach Christ from selfish ambition, not sincerely, supposing to add affliction to my chains; but the latter out of love, knowing that I am appointed for the defense of the gospel” (New King James Version, 1996, Phillipians, 1:15-17). In other words, if the motive that drives the action is a good one, then ambition is close to goodwill. In Richard`s case the motive that drives his actions is a bad one and therefore, his selfish, murderous ambition, according to the Bible is close to envy.

Another passage from the Bible also links envy and ambition: “But if you have bitter envy and self-seeking in your hearts, do not boast and lie against the truth. This wisdom does not descend from above, but is earthly, sensual, demonic. For where envy and self-seeking exist, confusion and every evil thing are there” (New King James Version, 1996, James 3:14-16). According to passage envy and self-seeking are inspired by the devil. The devil, according to biblical scripture namely John 8:44, is known as a liar and the father of lies.

With regard to Richard, we can say that his envy and selfish ambition resembles the selfish ambition and envy of Herod the Great. Both royal titles, that of Richard III and of Herod the Great were not genuine and as a result both feared about losing their position. Both were filled with envy and as a result killed near relatives. Richard III killed or is responsible for the murder of Henry VI, his son Edward of Westminster, his brother George, Duke of Clarence, Lord Hastings, Earl Rivers, Lord Grey, Sir Thomas Vaughan, King Edward V, and Richard, Duke of York, Lady Anne Neville and the Duke of Buckingham. Herod the Great killed several of his own children and at least one wife. In addition, out of envy, selfish ambition and suspicion, Herod had ordered the murder of innocent children in Judea.

Francis Bacon also thinks that envy and selfish ambition are very similar. In his essay “Of ambition” he states:

> Ambition is like choler; which is an humor that maketh men active, earnest, full of alacrity, and stirring, if it be not stopped. But if it be stopped, and cannot have his way, it becometh adust, and thereby malign and venomous. So ambitious men, if they find the way open for their rising, and still get forward, they are rather busy than dangerous; but if they be checked in their desires, they become secretly discontent, and look upon men and matters with an evil eye, and are best pleased, when things go backward; which is the worst property in a servant of a prince, or state. (*Essays,* 1994*, p. 97)*

According to Bacon, envy “is also the vilest affection, and the most depraved; for which cause it is the proper attribute of the devil, who is called, the envious man” (1994, p.24) . Dante Alighieri in *his Divine Comedy*, equates envy with eyes. Thus, the eyes of the envious are sewn shut with wire to prevent them from seeing and envying the good fortune of others. Edmund Spenser in his Faerie Queen and John Milton in Paradise Lost also both link envy to eyes and in *The Faerie Queen*, Envy is described as being embroidered with eyes *“*All in a Kirtle of discolour'd Say/He clothed was, ypainted full of Eyes.” (1.4.31). In *Paradise Lost*, when the devil sees Adam and Eve kissing, “Aside the devil turn`d/ For envy, yet with jealous leer malign/ `d them askance (4. 502-504).

We see that women are partially responsible for Richard`s envy and represent a problem in the lines that follow:

Well, say there is no kingdom then for Richard;
What other pleasure can the world afford?
I'll make my heaven in a lady's lap,
And deck my body in gay ornaments,
And witch sweet ladies with my words and looks.
O miserable thought! And more unlikely
Than to accomplish twenty golden crowns!
Why, love forswore me in my mother's womb:
And, for I should not deal in her soft laws,
She did corrupt frail nature with some bribe,
To shrink mine arm up like a wither'd shrub
To make an envious mountain on my back,
Where sits deformity to mock my body;
To shape my legs of an unequal size;
To disproportion me in every part,
Like to a chaos, or an unlick'd bear-whelp
That carries no impression like the dam.
And am I then a man to be beloved?

(*Henry VI Part 3*, Act III, Scene 2, lines 1635-51)

Due to the fact that nature has made him disproportionate in every part, he reasons that he cannot be loved and as a consequence cannot love. Richard reasons that seducing and loving a lady is, given his shortcomings, more difficult than conquering twenty kingdoms. He envies his brother because he is in love and woos Lady Gray and in Richard`s eyes he is again more successful than him, calling him “lustful Edward” (*Henry V Part 3*, 3. 2.1618). Bacon in his *Essays*, states that “A man that

hath no virtue in himself, ever envieth virtue in others" (*1994*, p. 21). In Richard`s case, he may see Edward`s wooing of Lady Grey as a sign of virtue, and due to the fact that he doesn`t possess such virtue or ability he envies Edward. In addition, Bacon states that "Deformed persons, and eunuchs, and old men, and bastards, are envious" (*1884*, p. 22). Richard is a deformed person; his arm is like a withered shrub, his legs are of an unequal size and he has an envious mountain on his back.

Richard is not only envious towards his brother King Edward IV, but he is also envious towards his brother George, Duke of Clarence. After he participates in the murder of Prince Edward, he goes to the tower of London and kills his father, the deposed King Henry VI. In the Tower he comes up with a long range plan to destroy his brother George.

I have no brother, I am like no brother;
And this word 'love,' which graybeards call divine,
Be resident in men like one another And not in me:
I am myself alone. Clarence, beware; thou keep'st me from the light:
But I will sort a pitchy day for thee;
For I will buz abroad such prophecies
That Edward shall be fearful of his life,
And then, to purge his fear, I'll be thy death.

(*Henry VI*, Part 3, 5. 4.3078-86)

In addition to devising a way to destroy someone, which is one of the manifestations of the sin of envy, in these lines Richard confesses that he will spread rumors, or as he says "Buz abroad such prophecies" (*Henry VI*, Part 3, 5. 6. 3084), or in other words malicious stories or gossip for his brother George, so that King Edward IV will be fearful for his life. In a nutshell, Richard is tale-bearing, which is one of the daughters of the sin of envy according to Thomas Aquinas.

In the play Richard III, Richard Duke of Gloucester continues to lament his deformity. He says:

But I, that am not shaped for sportive tricks,
Nor made to court an amorous looking glass;
I, that am rudely stamped and want love's majesty
To strut before a wanton ambling nymph;
I, that am curtailed of this fair proportion,
Cheated of feature by dissembling nature,
Deformed, unfinished, sent before my time
Into this breathing world, scarce half made up,
And that so lamely and unfashionable

That dogs bark at me as I halt by them—
Why, I, in this weak piping time of peace,
Have no delight to pass away the time,
Unless to see my shadow in the sun
And descant on mine own deformity.

(*Richard III*, 1.1. 15-28)

Richard is dissatisfied with his physical appearance, which is one of the manifestations of the sin of envy. He continues his soliloquy with other manifestations of the sin of envy, such as maliciousness which is a manifestation of the sin of envy according to Peraldus. His maliciousness is summed up in his determination to become a villain:

And therefore, since I cannot prove a lover
To entertain these fair well-spoken days,
I am determinèd to prove a villain
And hate the idle pleasures of these days.
In the lines that follow he continues with other manifestations of the sin of envy.
Plots have I laid, inductions dangerous,
By drunken prophecies, libels and dreams,
To set my brother Clarence and the king
In deadly hate, the one against the other.

(*Richard III*, 1.1. 29-36)

The last four lines further reveal the envious nature of Richard and are an example of detraction and tale bearing. Detraction and tale bearing according to Thomas Aquinas are two daughters of the sin of envy. Similar manifestation to these are slander, which is manifestation of the sin of envy according to Peraldus and backbiting, a manifestation of the sin of envy according to *Ancrene Wisse*. These four lines are also an example of another manifestation of the sin of envy, namely, devising a way to destroy someone usually with a long range plan, which is exactly what Richard is doing.

When his plot has succeeded and he has set King Edward IV set against his brother George so that on the orders of the king George is to be imprisoned to the Tower, Richard goes from one fault to another. He utters:" Why, this it is, when men are ruled by women:/ 'Tis not the king that sends you to the Tower:/ My Lady Grey his wife, Clarence, 'tis she/ That tempers him to this extremity" (*Richard III*, 1.1. 67-70).

In that way, Richard shifts the blame to Lady Grey. Furthermore, by saying that he is ruled by his queen, he criticizes Edward IV through sarcasm, which is one of the manifestations of the sin of

envy. In the same time, he is slandering, exposing faults, backbiting, detracting and tale bearing. In addition, his envy leads to lying. The story of Joseph and his brothers from the Bible is an example of the pernicious effects of envy. Joseph`s brothers envied the fact that his father Jacob loved Joseph the most and due to fact that he had dreams that foreshadowed his reign over them. They plot to kill him, and only through the intervention of Reuben is he spared and is instead thrown into a pit and later sold to some Ishmaelites. Afterwards they took Joseph`s coat, dipped it in a goat`s blood and lied to their father that they have found the coat. Another story from the Bible that corroborates the notion that envy is related to lying comes from Samuel. According to Samuel, Saul was envious of David "And Saul eyed David from that day and forward" (New King James Version, 1996, 1 Samuel 18-9) for his successes on the battlefield and for that reason wanted him dead. As previously discussed eyes are associated to envy. He attempted to kill him on two occasions, but failed. Saul proceeded with intrigues, because he wanted to ensnare David to marry his daughters so that the Philistines could kill him. Since David refused the offers, Saul attempted to ensnare David with lies. Thus he told his servants to tell David that he, Saul, loves him. Saul in fact lied, as he just wanted to see David dead.

In a similar fashion, as the envy of Joseph`s brothers and Saul leads to lying so in the case of Richard envy leads to lying. He lies that Lady Grey is responsible for George`s incarceration. Richard lies throughout the play, a trait that is in line with the previous episode from the Bible. He lies when he says to Sir Robert Brackenbury: "we speak no treason", (Richard III,1. 1. 95) and to his brother George that he will try to release him:

> Brother, farewell I will unto the king,
> And whatsoe'er you will employ me in,
> Were it to call King Edward's widow "sister,"
> I will perform it to enfranchise you
> Meantime, this deep disgrace in brotherhood
> Touches me deeper than you can imagine.
>
> (*Richard III*,1. 1. 112-117)

Again, even though he is the chief architect of the downfall of his brother, he comforts him blatantly lying that: "your imprisonment shall not be long; /Meantime, have patience" (*Richard III*,1. 1. 119-120). As George is led to the Tower, Richard maliciously enjoys the sight which represents a joy at another`s misfortune, a manifestation of the sin of envy: "Go tread the path that thou shalt ne'er return. /Simple, plain Clarence, I do love thee so /That I will shortly send thy soul to heaven, /If heaven will take the present at our hands" (*Richard III*,1. 1. 123-126).

Richard`s duplicitous and envious nature is again emphasized with constant lying. On receiving the news that king Edward IV is sick, weak and melancholically disposed, he utters: “Now, by Saint Paul, this news is bad indeed” (Richard III,1. 1. 145). When Hastings exits and Richard is left alone he says: “He cannot live, I hope; and must not die/ Till George be pack'd with post-horse up to heaven. /I'll in, to urge his hatred more to Clarence, / With lies well steel'd with weighty arguments” (*Richard III*, 1. 1. 153-156).

In Act I, Scene 2, Richard tries to woo Lady Anne, the wife of the heir to the throne Edward of Westminster, killed by Richard. Anne accuses Richard that he has killed Henry VI and his son Edward of Westminster. Richard blatantly lies: “I did not kill your husband” (*Richard III*, 1. 2. 153-67) and puts the blame on Edward “slain by Edward's hand” (Richard III,1. 2.269). However, Anne will not have any of his lies and tells him that Queen Margaret has seen him. Richard confesses, but only as a way to proceed again with lying by stating that her beauty was the cause for the murders. “Your beauty was the cause of that effect— / Your beauty, that did haunt me in my sleep / To undertake the death of all the world, / So I might live one hour in your sweet bosom” (*Richard III*, 1.2. 301-4).

Richard continues to woo Lady Anne by exploiting her weaknesses using bluffing, which is a form of lying. Referring to his eyes, he states:

> These eyes, which never shed remorseful tear—
> No, when my father York and Edward wept
> To hear the piteous moan that Rutland made
> When black-faced Clifford shook his sword at him;
> Nor when thy warlike father, like a child,
> Told the sad story of my father’s death
> And twenty times made pause to sob and weep,
> That all the standers-by had wet their cheeks
> Like trees bedashed with rain—in that sad time,
> My manly eyes did scorn an humble tear;
> And what these sorrows could not thence exhale
> Thy beauty hath, and made them blind with weeping.
>
> (*Richard III*, 1.2. lines 340-51)

Richard continues to bluff and lie offering his chest to Anne to stab him with his sword:

> If thy revengeful heart cannot forgive,
> Lo, here I lend thee this sharp-pointed sword,
> Which if thou please to hide in this true breast
> And let the soul forth that adoreth thee,

I lay it naked to the deadly stroke

And humbly beg the death upon my knee. (Richard III, 1.2. 359-364)

When Anne drops the sword and accuses him of being a liar: “Arise dissembler” (Richard III, 1.2.372), Richard continues to bluff, saying that he will kill himself on her command: “Then bid me kill myself, and I will do it” (*Richard III*, 1.2.374).

In the next Scene, when Lady Grey, Queen Elizabeth accuses him of envying hers and her friends` advancement, Richard falsely accuses her of lying, saying that she has orchestrated his brother`s imprisonment: “Your brother is imprisoned by your means” (Richard III, 1.3.540).

In the lines that follow, Richard uses another tool closely associated with the sin of envy, criticism with sarcasm. Namely he criticizes the fact that she had married his brother, not out of love but due to the fact that he is a king: “What, marry, may she? Marry with a king, A bachelor, a handsome stripling too” (*Richard III*, 1.3.562-563). Richard continues with lying and bluffing. In his conversation with Queen Margaret he states: “I would to God my heart were flint, like Edward's; /Or Edward's soft and pitiful, like mine /I am too childish-foolish for this world” (*Richard III*, 1.3.605).

However, neither Edward`s heart is flint or stony, nor Richard`s is soft and pitiful. It is true that Edward participated in the murder of Prince Edward in the civil war along with his brothers Richard and George, but, unlike Richard, he didn`t participate in the murder of Henry VI, nor does he harbor any evil disposition towards his brothers Richard or George, at least not until Richard with his tale bearing turned Edward against George and even than he didn`t issue any command for George`s murder, and the latter`s death occurred as a result of Richard`s scheming. There isn`t any sign in the play that Edward harbors any evil thoughts towards his wife, whereas Richard`s behavior towards Lady Anne Neville is duplicitous at best as the latter becomes certain that Richard will kill her. In addition, Edward IV is a peacemaker and wants to reconcile the Woodville family: Elizabeth, Dorset and Rivers with the Duke of Buckingham and Hastings. Richard is the opposite of a peacemaker. With his machinations he pitches the Yorkist nobles against the relatives of Queen Elizabeth, the Woodwille`s. On Rivers` comment that they would follow him if he was the king, Richard ironically replies: “If I should be? I had rather be a pedlar. /Far be it from my heart, the thought of it” (Richard III,1.3.612-613). The audience is aware of the fact that Richard is lying and bluffing, since he has made clear his intention to win the crown using all necessary means.

Also, when the news of the murder of Clarence is brought to the court, Richard insinuates and lies that the responsible ones are the Queen and her relatives:

Mark'd you not

How that the guilty kindred of the queen

Look'd pale when they did hear of Clarence' death?

O, they did urge it still unto the king!

God will revenge it. But come, let us in,

To comfort Edward with our company. (*Richard III*, 2.1.1262-1267)

Even Richard`s mother admits know that he is the killer and tells Clarence`s children that he has lied them that the queen Elizabeth was behind the murder. Richard lies when he says that, everyone has a cause to lament the death of King Edward IV: "All of us have cause / To wail the dimming of our shining star" (*Richard III*, 2.2.1374-1376).

Richard is happy and pretends that he is wailing since one obstacle on his road to gain the crown has disappeared. However as previously described, his actions are not stirred by mere ambition, but rather by a bad ambition, a course of action which is similar to envy with all the negative consequences that it engenders.

After he orders the murder of Clarence, King Edward IV dies and makes Richard Lord Protector. Richard proceeds with his devising ways to destroy someone else using a long range plan. Now whoever, instead of acting like a regent and protector, it is the turn of Edward`s son Edward V and his relatives. Firstly, Richard tries to portray the uncles of the Princes as dangerous, using tale-bearing: "Those uncles which you want were dangerous. / Your Grace attended to their sugared words/ But looked not on the poison of their hearts. / God keep you from them, and from such false friends" (*Richard III*,3.1.1578-1581).

Then he orders the imprisonment of the aforementioned relatives: Lord Rivers, Lord Grey and Sir Thomas Vaughn. Instead of crowning his nephew Edward, he says to him and his younger brother that they should stay for a few days at the Tower of London, promising that after that they will go wherever pleases them: "If I may counsel you, some day or two/ Your Highness shall repose you at the Tower; / Then where you please and shall be thought most fit/ For your best health and recreation" (*Richard III*, 3.1.1578-1581). In addition to devising ways to destroy them, Richard is again lying. As later events would show, Richard just like Joseph`s brothers, has murderous thoughts and orders the execution of the Princes and their aforementioned relatives. When Lord Hastings objects to Richard`s plotting to ascend to the throne, Richard again has murderous thoughts and orders his decapitation: "Chop off his head, man" (*Richard III*, 3.1.1767). He finally orders Hastings` execution when the latter questions the veracity of his story that Queen Elizabeth is a witch:

Thou protector of this damnèd strumpet,

Talk'st thou to me of "ifs?"

Thou art a traitor— Off with his head.

Now by Saint Paul I swear I will not dine until I see the same

Lovell and Ratcliffe, look that it be done.

The rest that love me, rise and follow me.

(*Richard III*, 3.4.2031-36)

Richard also lies to the Mayor of London about the true causes for Hasting`s execution. He says to him that it was the peace of England and their safety that forced him to order the execution:

What, think You we are Turks or infidels?
Or that we would, against the form of law,
Proceed thus rashly to the villain's death,
But that the extreme peril of the case,
The peace of England and our persons' safety,
Enforced us to this execution?

(*Richard III*, 3.5.2111-2116)

Richard uses tale-bearing to bring the downfall of George, Duke of Clarence, to undermine Queen Elizabeth and to execute her relatives: Lord Rivers, Lord Grey and Sir Thomas Vaughn. His next move is it to use tale-bearing to undermine the reputation of the princes, implying that they are illegitimate by slandering their father`s lust and cruelty and the fact that his real father wasn`t Richard, 3rd Duke of York since he was away fighting in France when he was conceived. He says to the Duke of Buckingham:

The mayor towards Guildhall hies him in all post:
There, at your meet'st advantage of the time,
Infer the bastardy of Edward's children:
Tell them how Edward put to death a citizen,
Only for saying he would make his son
Heir to the crown; meaning indeed his house,
Which, by the sign thereof was termed so.
Moreover, urge his hateful luxury
And bestial appetite in change of lust;
Which stretched to their servants, daughters, wives,
Even where his lustful eye or savage heart,
Without control, listed to make his prey.
Nay, for a need, thus far come near my person:
Tell them, when that my mother went with child
Of that unsatiate Edward, noble York
My princely father then had wars in France
And, by just computation of the time,

Found that the issue was not his begot;
Which well appeared in his lineaments,
Being nothing like the noble duke my father.

(*Richard III*, 3.5.2144-2163)

The Lord Mayor and the citizens are captivated by this story, and come to Richard to demand that he is crowned. He pretends that he doesn`t desire the crown, since there is already a rightful heir to Edward IV, which means that he manipulates and lies:

Your love deserves my thanks; but my desert
Unmeritable shuns your high request.
First if all obstacles were cut away,
And that my path were even to the crown,
As my ripe revenue and due by birth
Yet so much is my poverty of spirit,
So mighty and so many my defects,
As I had rather hide me from my greatness,
Being a bark to brook no mighty sea,
Than in my greatness covet to be hid,
And in the vapour of my glory smother'd.
But, God be thank'd, there's no need of me,
And much I need to help you, if need were;
The royal tree hath left us royal fruit,
Which, mellow'd by the stealing hours of time,
Will well become the seat of majesty,
And make, no doubt, us happy by his reign.
On him I lay what you would lay on me,
The right and fortune of his happy stars;
Which God defend that I should wring from him!

(*Richard III*, 3.7.2365-2384)

When the Lord Mayor insists and says that the citizens entreat him to take the crown, Richard again manipulates and lies: “I am unfit for state and majesty; /I do beseech you, take it not amiss; /I cannot nor I will not yield to you” (*Richard III*, 3.7.2416-2419). When he is told by Buckingham that his brother`s son shall never be their king and that they will place someone else on the throne, thus bringing disgrace and downfall to his family, Richard agrees but with the caveat that he shouldn`t be counted responsible for any misdeeds, since he was forced and shouldn`t be blamed

because as he states: “For God he knows, and you may partly see, / How far I am from the desire thereof” (*Richard III*, 3.7.2448-2449).

Richard gains and ascends the throne and his immediate reaction is to kill the princes. He says to the Duke of Buckingham:” I wish the bastards dead, And I would have it suddenly performed” (Richard III, 4.2.2599-2600). Next he spreads rumors that his wife Anne is sick and likely to die: “I say again, give out / That Anne my queen is sick and like to die. /About it, for it stands me much upon/ To stop all hopes whose growth may damage me” (*Richard III*, 4.2.2647-2650).

In order to solidify his grip on the throne, he has additional murderous thoughts:

I must be married to my brother’s daughter,
Or else my kingdom stands on brittle glass.
Murder her brothers, and then marry her!
Uncertain way of gain! But I am in
So far in blood that sin will pluck on sin:
Tear-falling pity dwells not in this eye.

(*Richard III*, 4.2.2652-2657)

The Duke of Buckingham demands land, the earldom of Hereford. However, instead of giving the land, Richard orders his capture and his execution.

6.2. Iago and the Sin of Envy- Lying, Conspiracy and Murderous Thoughts

Iago`s envy is directed towards General Othello, the main character, but also towards Cassio. Iago serves as Othello`s ensign, or flagbearer but doesn’t get the promotion by Othello. Instead Cassio, a younger man, is promoted to a lieutenant. David Hume explains the causes of the relationship and envy in this kind of situation:

> ’Tis worthy of observation concerning that envy, which arises from a superiority in others, that ’tis not the great disproportion betwixt ourself and another, which produces it; but on the contrary, our proximity. A common soldier bears no such envy to his general as to his sergeant or corporal; nor does an eminent writer meet with so great jealousy in common hackney scriblers, as in authors, that more nearly approach him.
>
> (*A Treatise on Human Nature,* 1960, p.377)

Iago and Cassio vie for the same position, they are located in proximity on the social ladder and hence the envy. Iago as an envious man might envy Othello, but his main emotion towards Othello is hatred. Although Coleridge speaks about Iago`s “motiveless malignity” (2008, p.116), it seems that Iago is motivated by his belief that Othello has made him a cuckold: “I hate the Moor:

/And it is thought abroad, that 'twixt my sheets /He has done my office: I know not if't be true;" (Act I, Scene 3, 743-45)

Since hatred is the first mentioned daughter of the sin of envy, according to Thomas Aquinas and since Iago is prone to envy, we might deduce that he might feel envy towards Othello as well. Like the envy of Joseph`s brothers, Iago`s envy is characterized by conspiracy, lying and murderous thoughts. Iago is prone to conspiracy and scheming. In Act I Scene 1, he conspires with Roderigo to compromise Othello by hinting to Desdemona`s father that by marrying her, Othello has robbed her father Brabantio.

Iago starts with slander, one of the manifestations of the sin of envy, directed towards Othello: "Call up her father. Rouse him. Make after him, Poison his delight, Proclaim him in the streets" (Act I, Scene 1, 70-72). In the lines that follow, Iago proceeds with hints that Desdemona`s elopement and marriage is actually a theft perpetrated by Othello: "Awake! What, ho, Brabantio! Thieves! Thieves! Look to your house, your daughter, and your bags! Thieves! thieves!" (Act I, Scene 1, 82-84). In the end Iago literally says that Branbantio, Desdemona`s father is robbed, which is a lie: "Zounds, sir, you're robbed! For shame, put on your gown" (Act I, Scene 1, 91-92)/

After Iago `s unsuccessful conspiracy to compromise Othello, Iago turns his attention to Cassio. Iago again conspires with Roderigo, but this time around his goal is to get Cassio stripped of his position as lieutenant. In order to have Roderigo on board, he lies to him that Desdemona is in love with Cassio:

> Sir, he's rash and very sudden in choler, and haply
> may strike at you. Provoke him that he may. For
> even out of that will I cause these of Cyprus to mutiny,
> whose qualification shall come into no true
> taste again but by the displanting of Cassio.
>
> (Act II, Scene 1, 1072-76)

Furthermore, Iago frames Othello to believe that Desdemona is in love with Cassio, and thus making him a party of the conspiracy to have Desdemona and Cassio murdered. He uses the handkerchief that Othello gave to Desdemona which she subsequently lost, and was later found by Iago`s wife as a proof that Desdemona and Cassio are in love: "I know not that, but such a handkerchief—/I am sure it was your wife's—did I today/See Cassio wipe his beard with" (Act 3, Scene 3, 2121-23).

Othello believes that story and unwittingly becomes part of the conspiracy. With regard to Desdemona, Othello`s reaction is that he will tear her to pieces: "I'll tear her all to pieces!" (Act 3, Scene 3, 2115). Othello also wants to kill Cassio: "Oh, that the slave had forty thousand lives! / One is

too poor, too weak for my revenge. / Now do I see 'tis true" (Act 3, Scene 3, 2127-29). He commands Iago to find a way to have Cassio dead: "Within these three days let me hear thee say That Cassio's not alive" (Act 3, Scene 3, 2163-64).

In Act IV, Scene 2, Iago again conspires with Roderigo who is in love with Desdemona. Iago tells Roderigo that Othello and his beloved Desdemona are going to Mauritania, and that only an accident would keep them in Cyprus. An accident, in Iago`s words, such as "the removing of Cassio" (2998). Iago explains to Roderigo that this means "making him incapable of Othello's place: knocking out his brains" (Act 4, Scene 2, 3000-3001). Iago lies profusely throughout the play. I will point out only his most notable lies. In Act I, Scene 3, Iago comes up with a plan to lie that Cassio and Desdemona are lovers:

Cassio's a proper man: let me see now:
To get his place and to plume up my will
In double knavery—How, how? Let's see: —
After some time, to abuse Othello's ear
That he is too familiar with his wife. (749-753)

He puts his plan in action and lies in Act II, Scene 1 when he says to Cassio:

"The /lieutenant tonight watches on the court of /guard: —first, I must tell thee this—Desdemona is /directly in love with him" (1014-1017). Iago also lies with regard to his feelings towards Cassio. He says that he loves him, whereas he is devising plans for his downfall by making him drunk and compromising his integrity: "I do love Cassio well; and would do much /To cure him of this evil" (Act 2, Scene 3, 1278-79). Iago pretends that he loves Cassio so much that he would: "rather have this tongue cut from my mouth /Than it should do offence to Michael Cassio" (Act 2, Scene 3, 1370-71).

After planting the seeds of doubt about the supposed relationship between Cassio and Desdemona, Iago also pretends and lies that he loves Othello: "for now I shall have reason /To show the love and duty that I bear you /With franker spirit: therefore, as I am bound, /Receive it from me" (Act 3, Scene 3, 1845-480). In the same act and Scene, he continues to flatter Othello: "I humbly do beseech you of your pardon /For too much loving you" (1866-67) and again 1872-73 "I hope you will consider what is spoke /Comes from my love" (1872-73).

In act III, Scene 3, Iago continues to invent things that never happened. He invents that he had heard Cassio saying that the latter and Desdemona should hide their love:

I lay with Cassio lately;
And, being troubled with a raging tooth,
I could not sleep.

There are a kind of men so loose of soul,
That in their sleeps will mutter their affairs:
One of this kind is Cassio:
In sleep I heard him say 'Sweet Desdemona,
Let us be wary, let us hide our loves;'
And then, sir, would he gripe and wring my hand,
Cry 'O sweet creature!' and then kiss me hard,
As if he pluck'd up kisses by the roots
That grew upon my lips: then laid his leg
Over my thigh, and sigh'd, and kiss'd; and then
Cried 'Cursed fate that gave thee to the Moor! (lines 2101-08)

When Othello exclaims that he would kill Desdemona, Iago offers his mental, physical and emotional "support": "Witness that here Iago doth give up/ The execution of his wit, hands, heart, / To wronged Othello's service. / Let him command, And to obey shall be in me remorse,/ What bloody business ever" (Act 3, Scene 3, 215-58).

In Act III, Scene 3, Othello makes Iago lieutenant. Iago again manipulates Othello and lies saying to him that "I am your own forever" (2170).

In Act IV, Scene 1, Iago again lies to Othello that Cassio has told him that the latter had slept with Desdemona:

Othello. What hath he said?
Iago. 'Faith, that he did—I know not what he did.
Othello. What? what?
Iago. Lie—
Othello. With her?
Iago. With her, on her; what you will.
Othello. Lie with her! lie on her! We say lie on her, when
they belie her. Lie with her! that's fulsome.
—Handkerchief—confessions—handkerchief! —To
confess, and be hanged for his labour; —first, to be
hanged, and then to confess. —I tremble at it.
Nature would not invest herself in such shadowing
passion without some instruction. It is not words
that shake me thus. Pish! Noses, ears, and lips.
—Is't possible? —Confess—handkerchief!—O devil!— (*lines* 2446- 2460)

Again in Act IV, Scene I, Iago tells Othello that he will meet with Cassio and question him: “Where, how, how oft, how long ago, and when He hath, and is again to cope your wife” (2510-11). However, unbeknownst to Othello the object of the conversation will not be Desdemona but Bianca, a prostitute. This represents another lie by Iago. Othello`s reaction is that he will poison her. Iago reiterates his lie again: “Do it not with poison. Strangle her in her bed, even the bed she hath contaminated” (Act 4, Scene 1, 2638-39).

After Othello calls Desdemona a whore, the latter asks Iago: “Alas Iago, what shall I do to win my lord again?” (Act IV, Scene 2, 2918-19) Iago`s reply is a lie: “I pray you, be content, ’tis but his humor. /The business of the state does him offence, /And he does chide with you” (Act IV, Scene 2, 2934-35).

In Act V, Scene1, after Iago has told Roderigo, that in order to sleep with Desdemona he must kill Cassio who got Othello`s position, Roderigo stabs Cassio. Iago stabs both Roderigo and Cassio. Iago than pretends that he doesn`t know who has done it: “Oh, me, lieutenant! What villains have done this?” (3205). Iago continues with lying as he asks Bianca: “He that lies slain/here, Cassio, /Was my dear friend: what malice was between you?” (Act V, Scene 1, lines 3262-3264). Iago, lies and indirectly accuses Bianca for the murder:

Stay you, good gentlemen. —Look you pale, mistress?
Do you perceive the gastness of her eye?
Nay, if you stare, we shall hear more anon.
Behold her well. I pray you, look upon her.
Do you see, gentlemen? Nay, guiltiness Will speak,
though tongues were out of use.

(Act V, Scene 1, 3269-74)

Iago lies to Emilia when he says that Cassio was attacked by Roderigo and “fellows that are scaped.” (Act V, Scene 1, 3278) In fact, the fellows that are escaped is Iago himself.

After Othello kills Desdemona, Emilia, Iago`s wife, confronts Iago and tells him that Othello said that it was Iago who told him that his wife was false. Iago again lies:

Iago: I told him what I thought, and told no more
Than what he found himself was apt and true.
Emilia: But did you ever tell him she was false?
Othello: I did
Emilia: You told a lie, an odious, damnèd lie.
Upon my soul, a lie, a wicked lie.

(Act 5, Scene 3,3513-17)

When Emilia reveals the fact that she gave the handkerchief, which Desdemona dropped to Iago, and that Desdemona didn`t give it to Cassio, Iago again lies: “Filth, thou liest!” (Act 5, Scene 3, 3578)

Another trait of envy, according to Peraldus, is maliciousness. Iago is so malicious that he devises the downfall of Othello. Iago says: “Oh, you are well tuned now, /But I’ll set down the pegs that make this music, /As honest as I am” (Act 2, Scene 1, 994-96). In addition to Othello, Iago also wants the downfall of Desdemona:

I'll pour this pestilence into his ear,
That she repeals him for her body's lust;
And by how much she strives to do him good,
She shall undo her credit with the Moor.
So will I turn her virtue into pitch,
And out of her own goodness make the net
That shall enmesh them all.

(Act 2, Scene 3, 1508-14)

In addition to conspiracy lies and maliciousness, Iago has murderous thoughts with regard to Desdemona, Cassio, Roderigo and his wife Emilia. With regard to Desdemona, as previously stated, Iago says to Othello that instead of poisoning her, Othello should strangle her. He goads Roderigo into killing Cassio, He stabs twice Roderigo killing him. Iago also stabs Cassio. When Emilia, his wife, exposes his machinations Iago kills her. Solzhentsyn`s maxim that “Violence can only be concealed by a lie, and the lie can only be maintained by violence. Any man who has once proclaimed violence as his method is inevitably forced to take the lie as his principle” fits perfectly Iago`s violence murders and lies.

The moral from Aesop`s fable about the envious (in some translations the jealous) and the covetous (the greedy man) and its outcome applies both to Richard and Iago. In the story, Phoebus Apollo visits the earth and witnesses two men asking the gods to fulfill their opposite prayers. Apollo agrees under the condition that the other man will receive twice the amount the of the wish of the first one. The covetous man waited because he didn`t wanted the envious to get twice his amount, but the envious demanded that one of his eyed is gauged out, so the covetous man is blinded and left without eyes. The moral of this fable, that vices are their own punishment, applies both to Richard and Iago. They are responsible for the downfall of so many people, but they are also responsible for their own misfortunes.

Chapter 7: The Characters Revisited and Analyzed as Being Proud

"'Pride' is thinking too highly of one's self from self-love" (Spinoza,2000, p.57)

This last chapter argues that not only some of the discussed characters are lustful, gluttonous, slothful, angry and envious, but that they are also proud and that this trait is in accordance with the connection that the patristic and later authors have made between pride and the other deadly sins. Namely it seems logical to assume that, since pride is the cause and the seven deadly sins its effects, that it is logical to try to prove that these characters are also proud. This conclusion won`t analyze the character of Coriolanus, as he was analyzed as a proud person in the chapter dealing with anger, neither the avaricious Shylock, Cassius and Timon, as they were analyzed from the standpoint of general avarice being equated to pride. As a consequence, the claim of this thesis makes is that they are also proud.

The first analyzed characters here are the lustful Cleopatra, Angelo and Tarquin. One of the critics that has detected pride in the Cleopatra-Antony relationship is Harold Bloom. In his book *Cleopatra I am fire and air*, Bloom states "Pride in their mutual prowess—political, military, lovemaking—is a principal constituent of their glory" (2017, p.24). I will also argue that Cleopatra in Anthony and Cleopatra is a proud character, as she is vain and too competitive, two characteristics of being proud. Cambridge dictionary describes vain, among other meanings, as "too interested in your own appearance or achievements". After Mark Anthony, Cleopatra`s lover, marries Octavius`s sister Octavia, Cleopatra becomes increasingly jealous. She starts to focus on comparing herself to Octavia`s appearance. When the messenger from Rome arrives, Cleopatra starts to question him about Octavia:

Cleopatra. Is she as tall as me?

Messenger. She is not, madam.

Cleopatra. Didst hear her speak? is she shrill-tongued or low?

Messenger. Madam, I heard her speak; she is low-voiced.

Cleopatra. That's not so good: he cannot like her long.

Charmian. Like her! O Isis! 'tis impossible.

Cleopatra. I think so, Charmian: dull of tongue, and dwarfish!

What majesty is in her gait? Remember,

If e'er thou look'dst on majesty.

Messenger. She creeps:

Her motion and her station are as one;

She shows a body rather than a life,

A statue than a breather.

Cleopatra. Is this certain?

Messenger. Or I have no observance.

Charmian. Three in Egypt

Cannot make better note.

Cleopatra. He's very knowing;

I do perceive't: there's nothing in her yet:

The fellow has good judgment.

Charmian. Excellent.

Cleopatra. Guess at her years, I prithee.

Messenger. Madam,

She was a widow,—

Cleopatra. Widow! Charmian, hark.

Messenger. And I do think she's thirty.

Cleopatra. Bear'st thou her face in mind? is't long or round?

Messenger. Round even to faultiness.

Cleopatra. For the most part, too, they are foolish that are so.

Her hair, what colour?

Messenger. Brown, madam: and her forehead

As low as she would wish it.

(Act III, Scene 3, lines 1700-31)

In Act III, Scene 10 during the battle of Actium, although the Egyptian navy has the upper hand, Cleopatra decides to abandon the battle with her ships. This is an act of cowardice, and as a consequence, a sign of pride. Soren Kierkegaard, who was greatly influenced by Shakespeare "on his personal life, his psychology and his aesthetics" (1968, Ruoff, p.343) has made the connection between these two human emotions. In *The Concept of Anxiety* Kierkegaard writes "Pride begins through an activity, cowardice through a passivity; in all other respects they are identical, because in cowardice there is just enough activity to maintain anxiety about the good. Pride is a profound cowardice … Cowardice is a profound pride" (1980, p.145).

In Act IV, Scene 13, after Anthony has lost naval fight in his third and final battle against Octavius, he assumes that Cleopatra has again betrayed him. Anthony berates Cleopatra and threatens to kill her expelling her. In order to endear her to Anthony once again, guided by her hurt ego, Cleopatra resorts to an opportunistic, but ill-advised act. She tells Mardian to go to Anthony and impart to Anthony that she has died with the name Anthony on her lips. This action, caring only for yourself without considering the impact of your actions on the others, is a sign of egoism, a manifestation of the sin of pride. That egoism, individualism and solipsism and are a sign of pride is attested for example by, Morton Bloomfield who says "[pride] the sin of exaggerated individualism" (1952, p.75) and Henry Fairlie who states "Solipsism has the same characteristic as Pride: The self becomes 'the center about which the w ill and desire revolve" (1979, p.49). However, as her act of lying is a risky affair and a presumption of wisdom boiling down to Cleopatra`s assurance in the aptness of her decisions, the strategy backfires. Anthony, like Brutus at Phillipi, assumes that everything is lost and decides to kill himself. However, he only manages to wound himself. Bleeding he learns that Cleopatra is still alive and demands to be taken to her monument, where he dies in her arms.

The second analyzed character Angelo in *Measure for Measure*, perhaps doesn`t have the vanity of Cleopatra but he is as egoistic as the Egyptian queen. Other characteristics that mark him as proud are being hypocritical, inconsiderate, aggressive and patronizing.

H.N. Hudson in *The Works of Shakespeare: The Text Carefully Restored According to the First Editions; with Introductions, Notes Original and Selected, and a Life of the Poet; by the Rev. H. N. Hudson, A. M. In Eleven Volumes* depicts Angelo as a proud man. He states "As a natural consequence, his 'darling sin is pride that apes humility, and his pride of virtue, his conceit of purity, 'my gravity wherein (let no man hear me) I take pride', while it keeps him from certain vices, is itself a far greater vice than any it keeps him from; insomuch that Isabella's presence may almost be said to *elevate* him into lust" (2001, p.117).

This thesis also argues that Angelo in *Measure for Measure* is another proud character. Before the Duke of Venice goes on an apparent diplomatic mission, he names Angelo as his deputy. Angelo`s request to obtain the virginity of Isabella in order to release her brother for a lesser crime, shows his strict justice code for others and lax moral code for himself. These are double standards, which is hypocrisy, a sign of pride. His behavior also represents ingratitude, as instead of being grateful to Duke Vincentio for his appointment, he abuses the decision by demanding Isabella`s virginity. Angelo is so selfish that he doesn`t care that if Isabella yields, she would lose the thing that she most cherishes. Namely, nuns like Isabella take vows, known as vows of poverty, chastity and obedience. Henry Fairlie in his book *The Seven Deadly Sins Today* describes Pride as "a sin of neglect: it causes us to ignore others. It is a sin of aggression: it provokes us to hurt others. It is a sin of condescension: it makes us patronize others" (1978, p. 45). These are some of the things that Angelo also does to Isabella. Angelo ignores Isabella`s vow of chastity, he wants to hurt her by blackmailing her and by destroying what she values most and he patronizes Izabella by pretending as if he is nice and telling her to come tomorrow for his judgment. In fact, Angelo is struck by her beauty and wants to see her again in order to show his superiority by demanding her to give him her body.

Sextus Tarquinus also shares some of the traits of pride found in other discussed characters. Namely, like Angelo, he does what he wants, both being placed high on the social ladder. He is selfish, solitary, inconsiderate, self-conceited and like Angelo uses others in a violent way, namely rapes Lucrece.

Thus, we can say that Sextus Tarquinus in the "Rape of Lucrece", in addition to being lustful is also proud. Tarquinus is proud because he does what he wants, namely he rapes Lucrece. Bernard of Clairvaux has named freedom to sin as one of the ladders up the mountain of pride. Here pride rejoices in the freedom to do what it pleases, without any limits. Daniel A. Biddle *in Knights of Christ: Living Today with the Virtues of Ancient Knighthood* sheds additional light on this notion: "Proud people act and live *the way they want*. A line in a popular song says, 'I did it my way.' If you are doing it your way and not God's way, you are more likely to get tied up in the other deadly sins" (2012, p.159). In addition, the act of rape is a violent act, but it is also a very selfish act without any consideration for the wishes of the raped person. Tarquinus doesn`t respect Lucrece`s personality, which is insolence, also a manifestation of pride. As Solomon Schimmel notes: "In our society the most desirable assets are wealth, power, social status, physical attractiveness, and intelligence. . . As Aquinas said, a person who possesses more of these than do other people may believe this entitles him to special privilege, or that he is exempt from behaving with respect and empathy toward others. It may make him contemptuous of human weakness and indifferent to the needs of others (Schimmel, 1992, p. 36) Sextus is the son of the king of Rome, hence he is powerful and Lucrece is a

woman who lived in a time when women didn`t have rights that would put them on par with men. As a powerful man, Sextus does what Schimmel has described, he pretends as if he has the special privilege to sleep with his friend`s wife without her consent. In Cleopatra, Angelo, and Sextus their position of powerful leaders inflames their lust and pride.

In the chapter on Falstaff, in addition to other sins, the sin of gluttony was analyzed. According to William Ian Miller, gluttony can also lead to pride. He states "Food and feasts were the central props in competitive displays, as in a slightly different way people who care about their reputations for discernment in matters of food and wine compete each other today" (1999, p.24). Like Cleopatra, Falstaff is a coward, he is a thief, which means that he does what he wants like Angelo and Sextus. He is also a braggart and a vain person, trait that he again shares with Cleopatra. Dr. Samuel Johnson considers Fallstaff a proud person. In his preface to Henry IV he states that Falstaff is proud of the fact that he is a friend of Prince Hal and as a result he is haughty in his behavior with other people. In addition, Falstaff frequently brags, a manifestation of pride. Dr. Johnson states

> [Falstaff] is a thief, and a glutton, a coward, and a boaster, always ready to cheat the weak, and prey upon the poor; to terrify the timorous and insult the defenseless. At once obsequious and malignant, he satirises in their absence those whom he lives by flattering. He is familiar with the prince only as an agent of vice, but of this familiarity he is so proud as not only to be supercilious and haughty with common men, but to think his interest of importance to the duke of Lancaster. (2008, p.59)

E.E. Stoll, also describes Falstaff as being proud. In *Modern Philology*`s "Falstaff", Stoll states:

> I have suggested that many of the 'secret impressions of courage' are contradictions inherent in the type of the braggart captain. For to this type Falstaff unquestionably belongs. He has the increasing belly and decreasing leg, the diminutive page for a foil, the weapon (his pistol) that is no weapon, but a fraud, as well as most of the inner qualities of this ancient stage-figure— cowardice and outlandish bragging, gluttony and lechery, sycophancy and pride. . . All these traits are manifest, except his sycophancy, which appears in his dependence on the Prince and his cajoling ways with him; and except his pride, which appears in his insistence on his title on every occasion [as in Part II, II, ii, 109-16], and in his reputation for a proud jack among the drawers.
>
> (2008, p.129-130)

A.C. Bradley is another critic who point to Falstaff`s pride: "His freedom is limited in two main ways. For one thing he cannot rid himself entirely of respect for all that he professes to

ridicule. He shows a certain pride in his rank: unlike the Prince, he is haughty to the drawers, who call him a proud Jack" (2008, p.125).

Furthermore, the Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms states Falstaff as an example of the stock character of braggadocio, a notion put forward by E.E. Stoll (Modern Philology`s "Falstaff" 1914, 2011). In addition to being a braggart, this stock character is also vainglorious. This Dictionary describes braggadocio in the following manner:

> A cowardly but boastful man who appears as a stock character in many comedies; or the empty boasting typical of such a braggart. This sort of character was known in Greek comedy as the *alazon*. When he is a soldier, he is often referred to as the *miles gloriosus* ('vainglorious soldier') after the title of a comedy by the Roman dramatist Plautus. The most famous example in English drama is Shakespeare's Falstaff.
>
> (The Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms)

Even Prince Hal admits that his friendship and dealings with Falstaff is marked by vanity, a notion closely associated with pride. In Henry IV part I, during the play-within a play, Falstaff and Hal switch parts impersonating King Henry IV, Hal is aware of the of Falstaff`s character, namely his vanity and pride, and foreshadows the fate of the fat knight. Hal, as the king, berates himself stating:

> Why
>
> dost thou converse with that trunk of humours, that
>
> bolting-hutch of beastliness, that swollen parcel
>
> of dropsies, that huge bombard of sack, that stuffed
>
> cloak-bag of guts, that roasted Manning tree ox with
>
> the pudding in his belly, that reverend vice, that
>
> grey iniquity, that father ruffian, that vanity in
>
> years?
>
> (Act II, Scene IV, lines 1431-38)

In *Henry IV Part II*, Act V, Scene 3 when Hal decides to banish Falstaff, the prince renounces his proud past filled with vanity which he has experienced by following Falstaff. Hal declares: "The tide of blood in me/ Hath proudly flow'd in vanity till now. /Now doth it turn and ebb back to the sea, /Where it shall mingle with the state of floods,/And flow henceforth in formal majesty" (lines 3377-81).

In addition to being described as a boaster and as a vainglorious soldier, in *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, Shakespeare describes Falstaff as extremely vain in the sense of being too proud of one`s appearance. This is pride on the part of Falstaff, as he falsely believes that he is so attractive that he can send two identical love letters to two ladies, Mistress Alice Ford and Mistress Margarete Page that are friends and win their love. Falstaff is so vain, that he falsely believes that Mistress Page has sympathies for him:

> I have writ me here a letter to her: and here
>
> another to Page's wife, who even now gave me good
>
> eyes too, examined my parts with most judicious
>
> oeillades; sometimes the beam of her view gilded my
>
> foot, sometimes my portly belly.
>
> (Act I, Scene 3, lines 356-60)

In the lines that follow in the same Scene, Falstaff continues to be vain: “O, she did so course o'er my exteriors with such a/greedy intention, that the appetite of her eye did/seem to scorch me up like a burning-glass!” (363-365).

However, Falstaff`s vanity and pride are so prevalent that he is wrong in his judgment, as Mistress Page and mistress Ford are not interested in the old, fat knight and only respond to him to amuse themselves and get their revenge on him.

The next three characters that this conclusion analyses are kings who in the chapter on sloth have been analyzed as negligent kings, the major difference being that Henry V assumes his duty after his participation in the battle of Shrewsbury and the rejection of Falstaff. As previously mentioned pride and sloth are opposite vices and can be regarded as the two sides of the same coin. This is why in the lines that follow, this thesis will try to showcase their proud nature, which was also noted by a number of scholars.

For example, John Dover Wilson in his Introduction to *Richard II* writes about the similarity between the historical Richard, as described by Sir Charles Oman`s Political History of England 1377-1485 and Shakespeare`s Richard stressing his arrogance and vain boasting (Wilson, 2015, p.18-19). William Hazlitt in his *Characters of Shakespeare's Plays (London 1817)* also points out Richard`s proud nature as the cause, among other vices, of his ruin (Hazlitt, 2001, p.117). Henry Reed is another critic who talks about Richard pride that ruined his reign, referring to it as “tyrannic pride” (Reed, 2001, p.196). Edward Dowden in “The immaturity of Richard II and the realism of Bolingbroke” also writes about the notion that Richard is proud (Dowden, 2001, p.251). The

previously mentioned R.J. Dorious also writes about Richard`s “haughtiness and arrogance” (Dorious, 2001, p.177).

Richard II`s proud nature and Henry VI`s indifference is stressed by William Hazlitt. He writes:

> We shall attempt one example more in the characters of Richard II and Henry VI. The characters and situations of both these persons were so nearly alike, that they would have been completely confounded by a common-place poet. Yet they are kept quite distinct in Shakespeare. Both were kings, and both unfortunate. Both lost their crowns owing to their mismanagement and imbecility [i.e. weakness]; the one from a thoughtless, wilful abuse of power, the other from an indifference to it. The manner in which they bear their misfortunes corresponds exactly to the causes which led to them. The one is always lamenting the loss of his power which he has not the spirit to regain. (2001, p.117)

This passage refers to Richard`s lack of courage and will.

> The other [Henry VI] seems only to regret that he had ever been king, and is glad to be rid of the power, with the trouble; the effeminacy of the one is that of a voluptuary, proud, revengeful, impatient of contradiction, and inconsolable in his misfortunes; the effeminacy of the other is that of an indolent, good-natured mind, naturally averse to the turmoils of ambition and the cares of greatness, and who wishes to pass his time in monkish indolence and contemplation. — Richard bewails the loss of the kingly power only as it was the means of gratifying his pride and luxury; Henry regards it only as a means of doing right, and is less desirous of the advantages to be derived from possessing it than afraid of exercising it wrong. (2001.p.117)

Henry`s fear of governance, like Richard`s lack of will is a sign of cowardice, which is a characteristic of indolence and sloth. To quote Kierkegaard once again: “Pride is a profound cowardice … Cowardice is a profound pride” (1980, p.145).

After the participation in the victory on the battlefield and the rejection of Falstaff, it seems as if Shakespeare wanted to present Henry V as the national pride of England, particularly in the play *Henry V*. However as shown in the chapter on Sloth, Henry V shows no mercy to the French prisoners. The fact that the French leaders are presented as arrogant does not diminish his sin and fault. In addition, not every critic agrees with the view that he represents English national pride. For example, William Hazlitt observes that his Gadshill robbery was just a prelude to the Agincourt and “to rob and murder in circles of latitude and longitude abroad” (2010, Hazlitt, p.95). Hazlitt further states another negative trait if Henry V, namely his resolution to “to destroy all that he cannot enslave; and what adds to the joke, he lays all the blame of the consquences of his ambition on

those who will not submit tamely to his tyranny" (Hazlitt, 2010, p.95-96). H. C. Goddard in *The Meaning of Shakespeare,* Vol. 1, 1951, p.267) calls Henry V "the perfect Machiavellian prince" (1951, p.267). Norman Rabkin also acknowledges the alternate views on Henry V`s:

> For some of them, a recent writer remarks, the play presents the story of an ideal monarch and glorifies his achievements; for them, the tone approaches that of an epic lauding the military virtues. For others, the protagonist is a Machiavellian militarist who professes Christianity but whose deeds reveal both hypocrisy and ruthlessness; for them, the tone is predominantly one of mordant satire. (2010, p.195)

Harold Bloom also presents Henry V in a negative light, calling him Machiavellian:

> Another aspect of Henry's character, however—his manipulative, self-interested nature—seems to undermine his idealized status. This dimension is most evident in his apparent self-serving reasons for going to war. His father, Henry IV, had told him, in *Henry IV, Part2,* 'to busy giddy minds / With foreign quarrels.' No one ascribes that motiveto Henry V, but the idea is presented that alternative, Machiavellian motives are behind the war.
>
> (Bloom, 2010, p.29)

The fact that Hal is described as Machiavellian by a number of critics attaches a tag to him that goes with Machiavelli. Namely Machiavelli in England and elsewhere was associated with Satan, whose primordial sin was the sin of pride. For example, Reginald Pole (1500-1558) the last Roman Archbishop of Canterbury, in his *Apologia ad Carolum Quintum*, (1539), refers to Machiavelli`s book *The Prince* as a book 'scriptum ab hoste humani generis … Satanae digito scriptum', or in other words "Written by an enemy of mankind … written by the finger of Satan" (2009, p.15 Machiavelli in the British Isles Alessandra Petrina Two Early Modern Translations of *The Prince*). According to Jewish scriptures and Christian scriptures, Satan`s first sin is the sin of pride.

With regard to the angry characters, and particularly Othello, his pride like Angelo`s and Henry VI`s is manifested through solitariness. Othello has only one true friend, his wife Desdemona. To make matters worse he suspects her fidelity. Othello is also presumptive and entertains a false feeling of superiority due to his military achievements, probably stemming from his inferiority complex, which results with wrong decisions and subsequent self-pity.

Othello is also often viewed as proud by a number of critics. G. Wilson Knight in "The Othello Music" from The Wheel of Fire (1930) states "Othello is a compoundof highly-coloured, romantic adventure—he is himself 'coloured'—and war;together with a great pride and a great faith in those realities."(Knight, 2008, p.167) Kenneth Burke in "Othello: an Essay to illustrate a Method", lists the values that Othello identifies Desdemona with, namely "Ambition, virtue, quality, pride, pomp, circumstance, glory, and zest in his dangerous occupation"(Burke, 2008, p.247). Robert B. Heilman in

"Othello The Unheroic Tragic Hero" points out Othello`s pride as a cause for his downfall "Among the analysts of character, the older traditionis that Othello is the victim of Iago and remains pretty much the "noble Moor" throughout; he is guilty only of being too innocent or foolish or simple or trusting or of losing his usual self-control. According to the other main approach, Othello is not the "noble Moor" at all but has serious defects of character which cause his downfall—defects such as habitual flight from reality and as pride."(Heilman, 2008, p. 253) This view is also shared by F.R. Leavis who in his essay "Diabolic Intellect and the Noble Moor" states "his self pride becomes stupidity, ferocious stupidity and insane self-deceiving passion" (Leavis, 1952, p.151) and that this is the root of the problem.

Critic G. Wilson Knight in "The Othello Music" from the *Wheel of Fire*, has described Othello as being proud. Knight states: "Othello radiates a world of romantic, heroic, and picturesque adventure. All about him is highly coloured. He is a Moor; he is noble and generally respected; he is proud in the riches of his achievement. Now his prowess as a soldier is emphasized. His arms have spent 'their dearest action in the tented field" (2008, p.165).

There are additional clues that point to Othello's pride. Iago describes Othello as "loving his own pride and purposes" (Act I, Scene 1, line 12). In addition, after Iago plants the seeds of doubt about the supposed illicit affair between Desdemona and Cassio, Othello exclaims: "O, farewell!/ Farewell the neighing steed, and the shrill trump,/The spirit-stirring drum, the ear-piercing fife,/The royal banner, and all quality,/ Pride, pomp and circumstance of glorious war!" (Act III, Scene 3, lines 2027-31)

Othello`s emphasis on pride can stem from his feelings of inferiority and low self-esteem. Solomon Schimmel in *The Seven Deadly Sins* explains the link between pride and feelings of inferiority and low self-esteem. He writes:

> Overt manifestations of pride and arrogance can often reflect covert feelings of inferiority. This insight into the relationship between manifest pride and latent low-self-esteem, although noted by some of the medieval religious writers on pride, plays a much more prominent role in contemporary psychological analysis as a result of the influence of Freud and Adler. (Schimmel, 1992, p.38-39).

Paul Sands in "The deadly sin of pride" further elucidates on the relationship between pride and low self-esteem. He writes:

> As noted earlier, pride is part of a strategy for coping with low self-esteem. People who think poorly of themselves will often compensate by creating an imaginary self—an "ideal self" thought to possess prized attributes like brilliance, beauty, skill, virtue, or the like. Individuals naturally seek to create an ideal self that they themselves find believable.

(The deadly sin of pride, 2010, p.41)

One interpretation is that as an outsider in Venice and due to the fact that he is a Moor from Africa, Othello is insecure in the relationship with Desdemona. When Iago hints at Desdemona`s supposed infidelity and the infidelity of Venetian women in general: “I know our country disposition well;/In Venice they do let heaven see the pranks/They dare not show their husbands; their best conscience/Is not to leave't undone, but keep't unknown” (Act III, Scene 3, lines 1853-56). Othello, although his pride doesn`t allow him to confess at first, he is distressed:

Othello. And yet, how nature erring from itself,—
Iago. Ay, there's the point: as—to be bold with you
Not to affect many proposed matches
Of her own clime, complexion, and degree,
Whereto we see in all things nature tends—
Foh! one may smell in such a will most rank,1890
Foul disproportion thoughts unnatural.

(Act III, Scene 3, lines 1585-91)

Another characteristic of pride is self-pity. According to Paul Sands “Although pride is a self-expansive vice, it sometimes plunges people into periods of self-contempt and self-pity” (2010, p.45). Sands further elucidates on this notion:

> Failure to measure up to the idealized self can sometimes cause a person’s psychological defenses to collapse. She will then swing from grandiosity to self-loathing and self-pity. To recover her self-esteem, the proud person will likely employ two strategies. She will minimize her failure by insisting that it is inconsequential: to fail in a matter of so little importance was not really a failure at all. She will also attempt to excuse her failure by claiming that success was impossible because of some circumstance beyond her control: the failure did not really “count.” Both strategies allow the proud person to save face. The punctured ego reinflates itself with rationalizations. Pride thus completes the cycle from grandiosity to self-contempt and back again to grandiosity. When face-saving excuses portray the self as a victim, pride expresses itself as self-pity. (2010, p.45).

Furthermore, Sands quotes May:

> Beneath the most unheroic expressions of self-pity can lurk no less stubborn a claim to one’s own divinity. The high estimate of the self in this case is based on a pretension to divine virtue rather than divine power. The man who drenches himself with self pity is convinced that underneath it all he is a splendid fellow, a rather precious innocent, much abused or neglected by a harsh environment in which he is trapped. (A catalogue of sins: a

contemporary examination of Christian conscience, 1967, p. 185).

As a proud person, Othello also pities himself and tries to find rationalization for his murder “An honourable murderer, if you will; For nought I did in hate, but all in honour” (Act V, Scene 2, lines 3656-67) and “demand that demi-devil why he hath thus ensnared my soul and body” (Act V, Scene 2, lines 3663-64). Furthermore, Othello rationalizes and searches for excuse in Iago`s manipulations or in other words the “harsh environment in which he is trapped”, although he could have discovered everything if he had asked Desdemona. When Othello sees what he has done, he starts to pity himself:

I pray you, in your letters,
When you shall these unlucky deeds relate,
Speak of me as I am; nothing extenuate,
Nor set down aught in malice: then must you speak
Of one that loved not wisely but too well;
Of one not easily jealous, but being wrought
Perplex'd in the extreme; of one whose hand,
Like the base Indian, threw a pearl away
Richer than all his tribe;

(Act V, Scene 2, lines 3707-15)

In the previously discussed characters, the sin of pride is mainly manifested through solitariness, presumption, self-conceit, low self -esteem, whereas in the case of Titus Andronicus it is mainly manifested through self-righteousness, but also obstinacy, discord and contention. H. Fairlie cites Dorothy Sayers "the devilish strategy of Pride is that it attacks us, not in our weakest points, but in our strongest. It is preeminently the sin of the noble mind” (1978, p.43). According to Henry Fairlie, pride is the sin “not only of the noble, but also of the righteous “(1978, p.43). Self-righteousness s is a common and peculiarly loathsome form of Pride.

Titus`s nature seems to be noble in state affairs because he had served Rome for forty years, he has been victorious in a campaign lasting ten years and he declines the offer to be new emperor because he is not fit showing modesty:

A better head her glorious body fits
Than his that shakes for age and feebleness:
What should I don this robe, and trouble you?
Be chosen with proclamations to-day,
To-morrow yield up rule, resign my life,
And set abroad new business for you all?

> Rome, I have been thy soldier forty years,
> And led my country's strength successfully,
> And buried one and twenty valiant sons,
> Knighted in field, slain manfully in arms,
> In right and service of their noble country
> Give me a staff of honour for mine age,
> But not a sceptre to control the world:
> Upright he held it, lords, that held it last.
>
> (Act I, Scene 1, lines 211-24)

However, when it comes to interpersonal matters Titus`s ground, like Othello, is not so firm as with state and war affairs. He shows signs of self-righteousness and he takes center stage attempting to claim wisdom that he doesn`t possess, a manifestation of pride. According to Cambridge dictionary self-righteousness is "believing that your ideas and behaviour are morally better than those of other people". In addition, Titus also displays self-conceit or an exaggerated opinion of one`s own qualities or abilities. Namely, although Titus is warned by his sons that his daughter Lavinia is betrothed to Bassanius and that under Roman Law the matter is already settled, Titus agrees with the decision of Bassiunus`s brother and in the same time Emperor Saturninus that as first act he should marry Lavinia. Titus`s sons are adamant that Bassianus is right and Saturninus wrong: "Marcus Andronicus. 'Suum cuique' is our Roman justice:/This prince in justice seizeth but his own. Lucius. And that he will, and shall, if Lucius live" (Act I, Scene 1, lines 309-11).

In the family scuffle that ensues, Titus kills one of his sons, Mutius. However, this is not the only ramification of Titus`s self-conceit and wrong decision making. For their impudence, Saturninus denounces the Andronici and decides to marry Tamora, whose child Alarbus has previously been sacrificed by Titus. In that way, due to the insidious nature of pride, Titus loses one child and has an enemy elevated to a position from where she can carry out her revenge plan.

Although pride is one thing and vainglory another, most of the authors that discuss the seven deadly sins have conflated the "queen" and its daughter. I will use some of the characteristics of vainglory as presented by T. Aquinas as a way to establish whether Titus can be regarded as a proud man. In *Summa Theologica*, Aquinas claims that "Now the end of vainglory is the manifestation of one's own excellence, as stated above" (1981, p.2328) and:

> On another way a man strives to make known his excellence by showing that he is not inferior to another, and this in four ways. First, as regards the intellect, and thus we have 'obstinacy,'by which a man is too much attached to his own opinion, being unwilling to believe one that is better. Secondly, as regards the will, and then we have

> ‘discord,’whereby a man is unwilling to give up his own will, and agree with others. Thirdly, as regards ‘speech,’and then we have ‘contention,’whereby a man quarrels noisily with another. Fourthly as regards deeds, and this is ‘disobedience,’ whereby a man refuses to carry out the command of his superiors.
>
> (*Summa Theologica*, 1981, p.2328-29)

With regard to the intellect and obstinacy, Titus possesses this trait as in the quarrel with his sons he is obstinate and doesn`t obey the custom of Rome, although he is reminded by his brother and tribune of the people that the Roman law is to give to each his own and Bassianus is already bethrothed to Lavinia.This law is written in Justinian`s *Institutiones* as *iuris praecepta sunt haec: honeste vivere, alterum non laedere*, *suum cuique tribuere* (Inst. 1,1,3-4*)* or in English “the precepts of law are these: to live honestly, to injure no one, to give to each his own" (1911, p.4). Titus also possesses the second trait, the one with regard to will. This is the trait of discord and is best seen in his failure to agree with his sons and brother over the future of Lavinia. With regard to the third trait, speech and contention, Titus displays this trait as he quarrels noisily with his son Mutius prior to stabbing him: “What, villain boy! /Barr'st me my way in Rome? (Act I, Scene 1, lines 323-234). With regard to the fourth point, as regards deeds and disobedience, Titus disobeys one law in favor of another. Namely, in obeying Saturninus as king and disobeying Marcus Andronicus as tribune of the people, Titus favors the law of lex animata of Justianian at the expense of the suum cuique law again by Justinian. I. Kant quotes the *lex animate* “The Emperor, however, is not subject to the rules which We have just formulated, for God has made the laws themselves subject to his control by giving him to men as an incarnate law (2001, p.20). Probably Titus`s reasoning is that the king is above the law and he can do whatever he wishes and marry Lavinia. On yet another occasion, Tutus shows his reverence for the king. That happens in Act V.2, when Titus asks Saturninus whether a father should kill his raped daughter. The precepts state clearly that no one should be injured and Titus seeks justification by looking for permission from the king, and when he gets it, he kills Lavinia.

Tamora, Titus`s nemesis, also displays patterns of pride. Namely although she has a secret lover, she marries the emperor Saturninus in order to revenge the murder of her eldest son. According to Stuart Scott using others (2002, p.195) is a form of pride. Tamora uses her position as Saturninus`s wife and empress to take revenge on the Andronici. In order for Tamora`s sons to rape Lavinia first they kill her husband Bassianus, at Tamora`s instigation:

> And then they call'd me foul adulteress,
> Lascivious Goth, and all the bitterest terms
> That ever ear did hear to such effect:
> And, had you not by wondrous fortune come,

This vengeance on me had they executed.
Revenge it, as you love your mother's life,
Or be ye not henceforth call'd my children.

(Act II, Scene 3, lines 845-51)

In addition, Tamora uses her position as Saturninus` s wife to frame Titus`s sons for the murder of Bassianus. Namely, although on her urging her sons kill Bassianus, in front of the king she pretends that she doesn`t know who killed him framing Titus`s sons for the murder by giving Saturninus a letter written by Aaron, inculpating them indirectly.

In this enterprise, Tamora is aided by Aaron. Aaron, Tamora`s lover and conspirator, also uses the fact that he knows Saturninus and tries to take advantage of this. In Act II, Scene 3, Aaron prior to giving Tamora the letter, hides gold under a nearby tree. Martius falls into a pit. Prior to the fall of Quintus, Aaron hatches a plan to frame Titus sons for the murder of Bassianus.
Aaron. [Aside] "Now will I fetch the king to find them here, /That he thereby may give a likely guess/How these were they that made away his brother" (Act II, Scene 3, lines 952-54).

The plan succeeds when Saturninus reads the letter which describes a plan to kill Saturninus in return for gold and when Aaron discovers the gold. As Martius and Quintus have fallen into the pit where Chiron and Demetrius threw Bassianus, in the eyes of Saturninus, the guilt falls on them as the conspirators.

In Act III, Scene 1, Aaron tells Titus that he carries a message from Saturninus. In fact, Aaron is lying. The alleged message is that Saturninus will pardon Tutus` sons if, either Titus, Marcus or Lucius cut off one hand. Since the Andronici have seen in Act II, Scene 3 that Aaron is on good terms with the Emperor, they believe him and even argue who will be the one that will cut off his hand. By using others, namely the king Saturninus, Aaron can also be regarded as a proud person.

Like Tutus Andronicus, Lear is also self-righteous and, as a consequence, proud. A number of critics has noticed his Lear`s trait of pride. For example, Garold C. Goddard depicts Lear as proud: "Lear, at the beginning of the play, possesses physical eyesight, so far as we know, as perfect as Gloucester's. But morally he is even blinder. He is a victim, to the point of incipient madness, of his arrogance, his anger, his vanity, and his pride" (2008, p.223). Another critic, Harold Bloom also stresses Lear`s pride when he compares Cordelia to her father: "She is flesh of the flesh of old Lear; she has inherited her father's stubbornness, his limitless pride, his terrible inability to compromise" (Bloom, 2008, p.165). In the tragedy King Lear, Lear wishes to have his vanity and ego flattered by his daughters by asking them to tell him which one loves him the most so that he will allot the biggest portion of the kingdom to, de facto, the biggest flatterer. This action shows that Lear `s a concept synonymous pride, as you can`t judge your children`s love towards you by their eloquence and

words, but rather by their deeds. Lear is also presumptive, because he tries to achieve something, namely dividing his kingdom in a righteous way, which is beyond his capacities, a sign of presumption and as a result he makes a fatal mistake. Namely, after Goneril and Ragan`s flatteries they receive the land from their father and are supposed to take care of him when he visits them, but instead they treat him disparagingly and reduce his retinue. Goneril is first to show her true and ungrateful nature, something that Lear has failed to recognize due to his vanity and pride by reducing his retinue in return for inheriting half of his kingdom:

This admiration, sir, is much o' th' savour
Of other your new pranks. I do beseech you
To understand my purposes aright.
As you are old and reverend, you should be wise.
Here do you keep a hundred knights and squires;
Men so disorder'd, so debosh'd, and bold
That this our court, infected with their manners,
Shows like a riotous inn. Epicurism and lust
Make it more like a tavern or a brothel
Than a grac'd palace. The shame itself doth speak
For instant remedy. Be then desir'd
By her that else will take the thing she begs
A little to disquantity your train,
And the remainder that shall still depend
To be such men as may besort your age,
Which know themselves, and you.

(Act I, Scene 4, lines 759-74)

After Goneril orders his retinue halved, Lear realizes his mistake in giving everything to Goneril and nothing to Cordelia.

[to Goneril] Detested kite, thou liest!
My train are men of choice and rarest parts,
That all particulars of duty know
And in the most exact regard support
The worships of their name.- O most small fault,
How ugly didst thou in Cordelia show!
Which, like an engine, wrench'd my frame of nature
From the fix'd place; drew from my heart all love

And added to the gall. O Lear, Lear, Lear!

Beat at this gate that let thy folly in [Strikes his head.]

And thy dear judgment out!

(Act I, Scene 4, lines 788-98)

Despite his disparagement by Goneril, Lear still hopes that Regan will treat him differently. However, she proves to be even more disparaging, exculpating Goneril and urging him to return to her and to apologize. In addition, Regan is even more cruel than Goneril towards her father and asks that Lear`s retinue be reduced to twenty-five knights.

Why not, my lord? If then they chanc'd to slack ye,

We could control them. If you will come to me

(For now I spy a danger), I entreat you

To bring but five-and-twenty. To no more

Will I give place or notice.

(Act II, Scene 4, lines 1543-47)

Regan`s cruel mistreatment of her father further emphasizes Lear`s bad judgement as a result of his arrogance, self –righteousness, vanity and desire to be flattered:

Lear`s self –righteousness an also be seen clearly in his relationship with the Earl of Kent. When Kent tries to protest, Lear warns him to stay away or face the consequences: “The bow is bent and drawn; make from the shaft” (Act I, Scene 1, line 149). When Kent tries to explain that only because Cordelia is quiet doesn`t mean that she doesn`t love him, Lear again warms him to stop talking if he wants to stay alive: “Kent, on thy life, no more!” (Act I, Scene 1, line 163). When Kent tells Lear that he doesn`t mind losing his life if that means protecting the king, Lear utters “Out of my sight” (Act I, Scene 1, line 165). By displaying the notion of self –righteousness, Lear alienates the people who most loved him, Cordelia and Kent. Pride is associated with setting oneself apart from other people, namely Cordelia and Kent, and although Kent disguises himself as Caius to protect Lear and Cordelia fights till the very end for Lear, Lear has made irreparable mistakes that would cost the life of Cordelia, and his own life.

The Earl of Gloucester, like Lear also shows signs of self –righteousness and presumption. When Gloucester introduces his son to Kent, he jokes about the fun he had while he conceived his illegitimate son. In addition, his illegitimate son knows something that Gloucester shouldn’t have told him, namely that Gloucester`s legitimate son Edgar will inherit his father`s title and wealth. This is a mistake as a result of presumption and lack of wisdom due to pride and perceived invulnerability. However, Gloucester is completely in the dark with regard to Edmund`s intention.

Due to the fact that he will not inherit anything from his father, Edmund pledges and plots to take the land of his half-brother Edgar:

Wherefore should
Stand in the plague of custom, and permit
The curiosity of nations to deprive me,
For that I am some twelve or fourteen moonshines
Lag of a brother? Why bastard? wherefore base?
When my dimensions are as well compact,
My mind as generous, and my shape as true,
As honest madam's issue? Why brand they us
With base? with baseness? bastardy? base, base?
Who, in the lusty stealth of nature, take
More composition and fierce quality
Than doth, within a dull, stale, tired bed,
Go to th' creating a whole tribe of fops
Got 'tween asleep and wake? Well then,
Legitimate Edgar, I must have your land.
Our father's love is to the bastard Edmund
As to th' legitimate. Fine word- 'legitimate'!
Well, my legitimate, if this letter speed,
And my invention thrive, Edmund the base
Shall top th' legitimate. I grow; I prosper.
Now, gods, stand up for bastards!

(Act I, Scene 2, lines 335-55)

In addition, Gloucester is completely taken by Edmund`s plot and letter, putatively written by Edgar, that states that Edgar invites Edmund in a conspiracy to kill their father and divide his wealth in two shares, one for each of them. This is a another sign of self-righteousness on the part of Gloucester, as it doesn`t make much sense for Edgar to lose half of his wealth in exchange for a hasty, but vastly reduced gain. However, Gloucester is completely taken in by Edmunds action and exclaims: “O villain, villain! His very opinion in the letter! Abhorred/villain! Unnatural, detested, brutish villain! worse than/ brutish! Go, sirrah, seek him. I'll apprehend him. Abominable/ villain! Where is he?” (Act I, Scene 2, lines 404-7)

After Edmund has inculpated Edgar with a conspiracy in front of his father, the illegitimate son tells Edgar that the latter might have offended his father in their last discussion and he ought to stay

away and hide for a while. Edmund again puts his scheme in motion knowing Gloucester`s credulousness and utters: “A credulous father! and a brother noble, /Whose nature is so far from doing harms/That he suspects none; on whose foolish honesty’ My practices ride easy! (Act I, Scene 3, lines 498-501)

Edmund tells Edgar that Gloucester has discovered his hiding place and that he should escape right away while it is still dark outside as their father is approaching. Edgar believes the story and flees, while Edgar excuses himself before Edgar for the fact that he will pretend that they are fighting, drawing a sword and stabbing his arm. When Gloucester enters he immediately asks where the villain is. Edmund tells him that Edgar has fled, but that prior to that, Edgar attacked him and cut his arm. Again the unsuspecting Gloucester believes the story:

Let him fly far.
Not in this land shall he remain uncaught;
And found- dispatch. The noble Duke my master,
My worthy arch and patron, comes to-night.
By his authority I will proclaim it
That he which find, him shall deserve our thanks,
Bringing the murderous caitiff to the stake;
He that conceals him, death.

(Act II, Scene 1, lines 990-97)

Like Lear, the Earl of Gloucester has alienated the person who loves him sincerely and thus, due to his pride and self-righteousness has set himself apart. As a result of the scheming of his son Edmund, who has informed Cornwall, Regan and Goneril about Gloucester`s knowledge of an invading army led by Cordelia, his eyes are gouged out by Regan and Cornwall. As previously mentioned, Lear and Gloucester make a number of silly mistakes. This is also a sign of pride. For example, W.H. Willimon in his book *Sinning like a Christian*, *a new look at the seven deadly sins*, states that “people convinced of their own brilliance are sure to make stupid mistakes “(2005, p.36).

As anger can lead to pride so can envy. This view as shared by Shakespeare`s contemporary Thomas Nashe. In *Crist`s Tears over Jerusalem, he states* “Envy breeds pride, and pride breeds envy; there is none can uphold envy but he must uphold pride, nor can true pride live if it hath nothing to envy at; if it have nothing so great as itself to aim at, there is no man under it hath any pride or prosperity but it envies and aims at” (1593, p.19). That these sins often go hand in hand is also attested by John Milton in his epic poem *Paradise Lost* in his description of Lucifer`s temptation of Eve and rebellion against God. Milton states:

Th’ infernal Serpent; he it was, whose guile

Stird up with Envy and Revenge, deceiv'd
The Mother of Mankinde, what time his Pride
Had cast him out from Heav'n, with all his Host
Of Rebel Angels, by whose aid aspiring
To set himself in Glory above his Peers,
He trusted to have equal'd the most High,
If he oppos'd; and with ambitious aim
Against the Throne and Monarchy of God
Rais'd impious War in Heav'n and Battel proud
With vain attempt.

(Book I, lines 34-44, 2013, p.2)

Just as Milton`s Lucifer, the two characters depicted as envious in the chapter on envy Richard III and Iago vie for higher position. Critics view these two characters, alongside with Falstaff, as heirs to the Vice figure from the Morality plays. Bernard Spivack for example, when referring to the wooing of Lady Anne by Richard compares the latter with the figure of the Vice. Spivack states:" at such a moment the Vice displays the full extent of his virtuosity. Step by step, with every device at his command, he dissolves his victim`s allegiance to virtue and binds him to the Evil which he, The Vice, personifies" (1958, p.170). Richard`s pride has been noticed by several critics. One of the first critics to associate Richard and pride is Thomas Whately. Comparing Macbeth and Richard III, Whately states: "While Macbeth is vulnerable to vanity and flattery, Richard is filled with pride in his relentless pursuit of power" (2010, p.67). Samuel Taylor Coleridge also stresses Richard`s pride, or to be more exact his pride of intellect and his vanity in "Richard III," from *Shakespeare, with Introductory Remarks on Poetry, the Drama, and the Stage. Coleridge writes "*Pride of intellect is the characteristic of Richard, carried to the extent of even boasting to his own mind of his villainy, whilst others are present to feed his pride of superiority; as in his first speech, act II. sc. 1" (2010, p.141). Edward Dowden in "The English Historical Plays," from *Shakespeare: A Critical Study of His Mind and Art*, also points out Richard`s pride, but links it to his demonic spirit, rather than his intellect. Dowden also point out Richard`s solitariness, a characteristic of pride. He states "It is true that Richard, like Edmund, like Iago, is solitary; he has no friend, no brother" (2010, p.145). Stopford Brooke`s 1905 essay, also stresses Richard `s pride. Harold Bloom, summarizes Brooke`s essay with regard to Richard`s pride "As a personification of chaos, Richard III is the embodiment of pride and the attendant dangers of one who believes he is above divine law". Brooke also emphasizes Richard`s solitariness: "Richard is loveless intellect, ambitious of unchallenged power—absolute self with cunning—an awful solitary" (2010, p.195).

In the play *Henry VI Part 3*, Richard in my opinion is not only envious but is also proud. Richard exhibits some of the characteristics of the sin of pride such as: selfishness, solitariness and solipsism. According to Henry Fairlie the self-love of pride is justified as long as the man is good. If the man that exhibits self-love is bad man, and as previously shown Richard is an envious man and a murderer and thus a bad man, than according to Fairlie "he will injure himself and his neighbors by giving way to base feelings"(1978, p.41). Again, according to Fairlie: "Few of our prescriptions for self-love today are concerned with the moral quality of our actions or use it as any measure at all; certainly they do not ask us to consider any more than a selfish purpose to our lives, for always its affirmations begin with "I - I - I" (1978, p.41).Sands quotes William May who calls pride "the sin of the first person singular" (*The seven deadly sins today*, 1978,p.42).

This solipsism and self-centeredness is best seen in Richard`s soliloquy in the play Henry VI part III. There are many instances of Richard being focused on himself in these plays. I have chosen two passages from this play to demonstrate his selfishness and egoism.

In Henry VI part III, Richard is obsessed with himself and in 65 lines starting from line 1619 till line 1684 in Act III, Scene 2, mentions the word "I" 21 one times, the word "my" 13 times, "myself" twice, the word "mine" once and the illeism "Richard" once. That amounts to a total of 38 references where Richard is obsessed with himself.

Is Clarence, Henry, and his son young Edward,
And all the unlook'd for issue of their bodies,
To take their rooms, ere I can place myself:
A cold premeditation for my purpose!
Why, then, I do but dream on sovereignty;
Like one that stands upon a promontory,
And spies a far-off shore where he would tread,
Wishing his foot were equal with his eye,
And chides the sea that sunders him from thence,
Saying, he'll lade it dry to have his way:
So do I wish the crown, being so far off;
And so I chide the means that keeps me from it;
And so I say, I'll cut the causes off,
Flattering me with impossibilities.
My eye's too quick, my heart o'erweens too much,
Unless my hand and strength could equal them.
Well, say there is no kingdom then for Richard;

What other pleasure can the world afford?
I'll make my heaven in a lady's lap,
And deck my body in gay ornaments,
And witch sweet ladies with my words and looks.
O miserable thought! and more unlikely
Than to accomplish twenty golden crowns!
Why, love forswore me in my mother's womb:
And, for I should not deal in her soft laws,
She did corrupt frail nature with some bribe,
To shrink mine arm up like a wither'd shrub;
To make an envious mountain on my back,
Where sits deformity to mock my body;
To shape my legs of an unequal size;
To disproportion me in every part,
Like to a chaos, or an unlick'd bear-whelp
That carries no impression like the dam.
And am I then a man to be beloved?
O monstrous fault, to harbour such a thought!
Then, since this earth affords no joy to me,
But to command, to cheque, to o'erbear such
As are of better person than myself,
I'll make my heaven to dream upon the crown,
And, whiles I live, to account this world but hell,
Until my mis-shaped trunk that bears this head
Be round impaled with a glorious crown.
And yet I know not how to get the crown,
For many lives stand between me and home:
And I,—like one lost in a thorny wood,
That rends the thorns and is rent with the thorns,
Seeking a way and straying from the way;
Not knowing how to find the open air,
But toiling desperately to find it out,—
Torment myself to catch the English crown:
And from that torment I will free myself,

Or hew my way out with a bloody axe.
Why, I can smile, and murder whiles I smile,
And cry 'Content' to that which grieves my heart,
And wet my cheeks with artificial tears,
And frame my face to all occasions.
I'll drown more sailors than the mermaid shall;
I'll slay more gazers than the basilisk;
I'll play the orator as well as Nestor,
Deceive more slily than Ulysses could,
And, like a Sinon, take another Troy.
I can add colours to the chameleon,
Change shapes with Proteus for advantages,
And set the murderous Machiavel to school.
Can I do this, and cannot get a crown?
Tut, were it farther off, I'll pluck it down.

(Act III, Scene 2, lines 1619-84)

Again in Henry VI part III, after Richard kills king Henry he is obsessed with his ego. In eighteen lines Richard mentions ten time the pronoun "*I*", four times "*my*", three time "me" and once "myself". This amounts to 18 references to himself in the same number of lines.

I, that have neither pity, love, nor fear.
Indeed, 'tis true that Henry told me of;
For I have often heard my mother say
I came into the world with my legs forward:
Had I not reason, think ye, to make haste,
And seek their ruin that usurp'd our right?
The midwife wonder'd and the women cried
'O, Jesus bless us, he is born with teeth!'
And so I was; which plainly signified
That I should snarl and bite and play the dog.
Then, since the heavens have shaped my body so,
Let hell make crook'd my mind to answer it.
I have no brother, I am like no brother;
And this word 'love,' which graybeards call divine,
Be resident in men like one another

And not in me: I am myself alone.

Clarence, beware; thou keep'st me from the light:

But I will sort a pitchy day for thee.

(Act V, Scene 6, lines 3066-83)

Besides Richard`s obsession with himself and egoism, in the end of the *Richard III* play, due to his machinations, he is left all alone. He has nobody to talk to and nobody by his side, because either he has killed them or he has alienated everyone: “I shall despair. There is no creature loves me;/And if I die, no soul shall pity me:/Nay, wherefore should they, since that I myself/Find in myself no pity to myself? (Act V, Scene 3, lines 3072-75) In the final battle against the Earl of Richmond he is abandoned even by Lord Stanley.

In addition to egoism and solitariness, Richard exhibits other traits of pride, namely self-conceit and presumption. According to Merriam Webster, self-conceit is “an exaggerated opinion of one's own qualities or abilities”. According to the *Catholic encyclopedia*, presumption is “the desire to essay what exceeds one's capacity” (Delany, 1911). Throughout the play Richard believes that he can get away with all his machinations and murders unscathed. Although in one moment his guilty conscience awakes and torments him, he quickly recovers and with the power of his will liberates himself from this affliction. Richard says that conscience is: “but a word that cowards use, /Devised at first to keep the strong in awe: /Our strong arms be our conscience, swords our law” (Act V, Scene 3, lines 3824-26).

However, his machinations have proved so atrocious that a rebellion was the obvious outcome, coupled with desertions in his army in the decisive moment. As a result, in a hand to hand combat Richard is killed by the Earl of Richmond, future Henry VII.

As a conclusion one could say that Richard`s pride is manifested through pride of his intellect, solitariness, presumption, competiveness and diabolical ambition.

Iago is another character that can be described as being proud. Bernard Spivack presents Iago as an heir to the medieval Vice. Spivack states: “like his ancestor, the Vice he is putting himself on display and what he displays has villainy for its subject and deceit for a method” (1958, p.432) A.C. Bradley describes Iago as being proud with a feeling of superiority and being highly competitive, characteristic of pride. Bradley states “But what is clear is that Iago is keenly sensitive to anything that touches his pride or self-esteem. It would be most unjust to call him vain, but he has a high opinion of himself and a great contempt for others. He is quite aware of his superiority to them in certain respects; and he either disbelieves in or despises the qualities in which they are superior to him. Whatever disturbs or wounds his sense of superiority irritates him at once; and in *that* sense he is highly competitive” (2008, p.146).

Like Richard III, Iago displays the traits of solitariness and presumption and competitiveness, characteristics of pride. In his plot to set up Othello against Desdemona, Iago doesn't tell his plan to anyone and acts on his own. Even his wife Emilia doesn`t know about Iago`s intentions with Desdemona`s lost handkerchief. When in the final act, Emilia realizes what Iago has done and exposes him, she is killed by Iago. Iago acts all alone and keeps in the dark even Roderigo, although in the final act we learn that Roderigo complains about Iago ordering him to kill Cassio. However, Roderigo doesn`t know why exactly Iago wants Cassio dead and also doesn`t know about Iago`s envy towards Othello and his plan to destroy him for apparently sleeping with his Emilia, his wife: "And nothing can or shall content my soul/Till I am even'd with him, wife for wife, /Or failing so, yet that I put the Moor/At least into a jealousy so strong/That judgment cannot cure" (Act II, Scene 1, lines 1099-03).

In addition to solitariness, Iago is also presumptive. Just as Richard III he thinks that he can manipulate everyone without being harmed. However, in Act V he is wounded and taken captive with Cassio in charge of delivering the sentence for all of his machinations and the murders of Roderigo and Emilia. Iago is also diabolically competitive, another trait of pride. He perceives Cassio`s promotion by Othello as being unrightfully granted and wrong:

> One Michael Cassio, a Florentine,
> A fellow almost damn'd in a fair wife;
> That never set a squadron in the field,
> Nor the division of a battle knows
> More than a spinster; unless the bookish theoric,
> Wherein the toged consuls can propose
> As masterly as he: mere prattle, without practise,
> Is all his soldiership. But he, sir, had the election:
> And I, of whom his eyes had seen the proof
> At Rhodes, at Cyprus and on other grounds
> Christian and heathen, must be be-lee'd and calm'd
> By debitor and creditor.
>
> (Act I, Scene 1, lines 20-31)

In addition, Iago regards Cassio`s promotion as an injury and vows to get his place and destroy Othello in the process:

> Cassio's a proper man: let me see now:
> To get his place and to plume up my will
> In double knavery—How, how? Let's see:—

After some time, to abuse Othello's ear
That he is too familiar with his wife.
He hath a person and a smooth dispose
To be suspected, framed to make women false.
The Moor is of a free and open nature,
That thinks men honest that but seem to be so,
And will as tenderly be led by the nose
As asses are.

(Act I, Scene 3, lines 749-759)

To summarize, that analyzed characters in this chapter display most of the characteristics that modern critics ascribe to Pride. All of them share some, the majority or all of the following characteristics of Pride: being solitary (including the putatively pious Henry VI and the gregarious Falstaff and Timon), egoistic, self-righteous, self-conceited, the fact that they use others, being competitive (excluding Henry VI), doing what they want and not what is morally right, being cowards(Henry VI, Cleopatra and Falstaff).

In addition, in accordance with Proverbs 16:18 from the Bible: “Pride goeth before destruction, and an haughty spirit before a fall” (New King James Version, 1996) almost all of these characters end their lives in a misfortunate way. For example, Cleopatra. Othello and Cassio commit suicide, Angelo marries a woman whom he doesn`t love, Tarquin is banished, Falstaff dies as a result of living unhealthy life, Shylock is forced to bestow his property to his daughter Jessica and her husband and is forced to convert to Christianity, , Timon dies unhappy in the wilderness, Henry VI is killed as are Richard II, Richard III, Coriolanus and Titus, Both Lear and the Earl of Gloucester die as a result of their sufferings, and Iago is arrested. The only character to whom Shakespeare doesn`t ascribe a misfortunate end is Henry V. However, one can argue that the result of his sins is transferred and is visible in the tragic fate of his son Henry VI.

Conclusion: Dante`s Imperfect Love Applied to the Analyzed Characters as a Cause and Concluding Proof of their Sinfulness

The goal of this thesis would probably be incomplete if it does not apply the views on Dante Alighieri on the sins in his *Divine Comedy,* specifically those *in Purgatory,* due to the importance of this medieval work with regard to the Sins. The importance of Shakespeare and Dante to world literature is so strong that T. S. Eliot stated that: “Dante and Shakespeare divide the modern world between them; there is no third “(1975, p.237). According to a number of Dante`s critics including Dorothy Sayers, Harry Eis and Raymond Angelo Belliotti, Dante divided the sins in his *Purgatory*

according to love that is imperfect/perverted/misdirected, as opposed to God`s perfect love. According to Eis: “The core seven sins within Purgatory correspond to a moral scheme of love perverted, subdivided into three groups corresponding to excessive love (lust, gluttony, greed), deficient love (sloth), and malicious love (wrath, envy, pride)” (2017, p.8).

According to Raymond Angelo Belliotti, the First Three Terraces (anger, envy and pride) in Dante represent misdirected Love or “Love of Wrongful Objects and Harming Others”. The Fourth Terrace (Sloth) represents “Deficient Love of the Good”. The last three terraces (lust, gluttony and avarice) represent Excessive Love of Secondary Goods.

The first three analyzed sins in both Dante`s Purgatory and in this thesis, namely lust, gluttony and avarice, are concerned with excessive love. In the cases of the lustful, namely, the characters of Cleopatra, Angelo and Tarquin sin in excessive love for carnal pleasures. As in the previous chapter they are portrayed as being proud, this means that they also sin in malicious love. Cleopatra`s lust harms Anthony, as he is misled and commits suicide. That is also the case with Angelo`s lust who harms Izabella by tormenting her and Tarquin who harms Lucrece, by raping her.

With regard to the sin of gluttony, Falstaff is shown to possess excessive love for food and alcohol, but also excessive love for carnal pleasure and money. Due to the fact that in this thesis he is also portrayed as proud, his malicious love consists in at least two actions: trying to rob money that is intended for the Exchequer and taking bribes from conscripts, thus harming his kingdom in a time of civil war. In the chapter on gluttony, Falstaff was also presented as being slothful which means that he is experiencing deficient love. With regard to deficient love or sloth, Falstaff doesn`t love his country and what is the *good*. In order to clarify what is Bellotti`s and Dante`s *good*, this thesis will refer to Aristotle as according to the *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Dante was greatly influenced by Aristotle. The *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* states: “Dante cites a dozen works of Aristotle, apparently at first hand, and displays a particularly intimate knowledge of the Ethics, largely derived, no doubt, from Thomas Aquinas. But his Aristotelianism was nourished by other sources as well (Wetherbee, 2018)”. According to Aristotle, as summarized by *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* “Aristotle insists, the highest good, virtuous activity, is not something that comes to us by chance (Kraut, 2018)”. According to Aristotle, “the forms of virtue are justice, courage, liberality, temperance, magnificence, magnanimity, liberality, gentleness, prudence, wisdom” (2012, p.42). If we follow Falstaff activities and compare them to the virtuous activity that represents the good, one can deduce that Falstaff is deficient in all of the virtues : justice (enjoys the possessions of others), courage (refuses to fight), temperance(he is a glutton), liberality (doesn`t spend his money for the benefit of others), magnanimity (doesn’t do good to others on a large scale), magnificence (instead of his money, his spends borrowed money and money obtained using

criminal practices), prudence (Henry V banishes him, and his addiction to overeating and overdrinking damages his health). Since he lacks virtuous activity which is the highest good, Falstaff has deficient love of the good, which is a characteristic of the slothful person.

With regard to the avaricious characters, In the case of Shylock his excessive love is the love of money and profit and his malicious love lies in the fact that his desire to harm Antonio exceeds even his love for money. In the case of Cassius, his excessive love is the love of money and power and his malicious love lies in the fact that he is the moving force behind the murder of Julius Caesar and the downfall of Brutus. With regard to Timon, his excessive love, lies not in amassing money and vying for power, but excessive love of squandering money and excessive love of doing too much good. Timon`s servant Flavius famously says: “Strange, unusual blood, /When man's worst sin is, he does too much good” (Act IV, Scene 2, lines 1649-50). His malicious love or pride lies in the fact that he wants to destroy Athens by funding the rebel Alcibiades and the prostitutes.

With regard to the slothful characters, Hal, Richard II and Henry VI, their deficient love is shown in the fact they evade duty and the good, that is virtuous activity and the love of their country and by extension the welfare of their subjects. Eventually Hal assumes his duty, but showcases malicious love by showing no mercy to the French prisoners. Richard also shows deficient love in his duty as a king by concentrating on luxury and his malicious love is seen in the fact that he tyrannically seizes the land of John of Gaunt after his death and banishes his cousin Henry Bolingbroke thus initiating The Wars of the Roses. Henry VI also shows signs of evading his duty, and although the impression that we get is one of a profoundly pious man, he embodies a characteristic of pride “love of wrongful objects”. His love and eventual marriage to Margaret is wrong as she cares only for her own interests. In addition, this marriage causes the loss of Paris, Anjou and Maine and a number of English soldiers are killed as a result.

Anger and Envy are described as love perverted transformed into malicious love or love of wrongful objects. Some of the examples that show that the angry and proud characters display malicious love are the fact that Othello kills the innocent Desdemona, Titus kills his son for the simple reason that his son objects to his decision. Tamora and Aaron are responsible for the death of Bassianus and the rape and mutilation of Lavinia. King Lear by banishing the virtuous Cordelia in effect causes her death. In Gloucester`s case, as in Henry VI`s, his pride is seen in the love of wrongful objects. Namely he initially he believes the scheming Edmund and thus loves a wrong person, rather than the innocent Edgar. In the case of Coriolanus, due to the fact that he isn`t elected as consul, he offends the plebeians and is banned from Rome. His malicious love consists of siding with Rome`s bitterest enemy with the intent of destroying Rome. Richard`s malicious love is the love of power at all cause including harming others. As previously mentioned he is responsible

for the deaths of a dozen of persons including his brother George. With regard to Iago, his malicious love or harming others includes him murdering his wife Emilia and Roderigo. In addition, Iago is also the main reason for the deaths of Othello and Desdemona.

References

Ackroyd, P. (2006). Shakespeare: The Biography. London: Vintage.

Adelman, J. (1980). “Anger is My Meat: Feeding, Dependency, and Aggression in Coriolanus”. In Murray M. Schartz and Coppelia Kahn (eds) *Representing Shakespeare* (pp. 129-49). Baltimore.

Aquinas, T. (1981). *Summa Theologica*. Christian Classics.

Aristotle (2002). *Nicomachean Ethics*. Focus Publishing Pullins Company.

Aristotle. (2012). *The Art of the Rhetoric*. London: Harper Press.

Augustine (1888). *City of God*, 1888, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

Bacon, F. (1994). *Essays*. London: Orion Publishing Group.

Barnet, S. (2005). *Henry VI, Part I, Part II, Part III*. New York: Signet Classics.

Bartlett, K. (2000). ‘Morley, Machiavelli, and the Pilgrimage of Grace’, in ‘Triumphs of English’: Henry Parker, Lord M. (2000). “Translator to the Stuart Court”, *New Essays in Interpretation*, ed. Marie Axton and James P. Carley. London: The British Library.

Bate, J., (2014, July 16). Montaigne and Shakespeare: two great writers of one mind https://www.newstatesman.com/culture/2014/07/montaigne-and-shakespeare-two-great-writers-one-mind

Belliotti, R., A. (2011). *Dante's Deadly Sins: Moral Philosophy In Hell*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Benedict XVI (2005, December 25). Deus Caritas est. https://www.vatican.va/content/benedict-xvi/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_ben-xvi_enc_20051225_deus-caritas-est.html

Biddle, D. (2012). *Knights of Christ: Living Today with the Virtues of Ancient Knighthood*. WestBow Press.

Billault, A., (2002). "Plutarch's Lives". In Gerald N. Sandy (ed.). The Classical Heritage in France.

Blanpied, J.W. (2008). “Rebellion and Design in Henry IV, Part One”. In Bloom, H., Heims. N. (eds*) Bloom`s Shakespeare through the Ages: Henry IV, Part I* (217-246). New York: Infobase Publishing.

Blok, A. (2007). “Shakespeare’s King Lear: An Address to the Actors”. In Bloom, H., Heims. N. Bloom`s *Shakespeare through the Ages: King Lear* (164-169). New York: Infobase Publishing.

Bloom, H. (2007). *Falstaff: Give me life*. New York: Scribner.

Bloom, H. (2010). *Bloom`s Shakespeare through the Ages: Richard III*. New York: Infobase Publishing.

Bloom, H. (2017). *Cleopatra I am fire and air*. New York: Scribner.

Bloom, H., Heims. N. (2007). *Bloom`s Shakespeare through the Ages: King Lear*. New York: Infobase Publishing.

Bloom, H., Heims. N. (2008). *Bloom`s Shakespeare through the Ages: The Merchant of Venice*. New York: Infobase Publishing.

Bloom, H., Rolls, A. (2010). *Bloom`s Shakespeare through the Ages: Henry V*. New York: Infobase publishing.

Bloomfield, M. (1952). *The Seven Deadly Sins: An Introduction to the History of a Religious Concept*. Michigan State College Press.

Bottrall, M., Botrall, R. (1969). Collected English Verse: An Anthology. Books for Libraries Press

Bradley, A.C, (2008). "Othello". In Bloom, H., Heims. N. *Bloom`s Shakespeare through the Ages: Othello* (138-156). New York: Infobase Publishing.

Bradley, A. C. (2008). "Shakespeare's Antony and Cleopatra". In Bloom, H., Heims. (Eds), *Bloom's Shakespeare Through the Ages: Antony and Cleopatra* (92-110). New York: Infobase Publishing.

Bridges, R. (2001). "Inconsistency in the character of Angelo". G. L. (ed). *Measure for Measure: Shakespeare, the Critical Tradition*. (271-273). London: The Athlone Press.

Brito, J. (2018, June 21). "The difference between love and lust according to experts". https://www.huffpost.com/entry/difference-between-love-lust_n_5b2a965ee4b0321a01cd46ba

Burke, K. (1989). "Language as a symbolic Action". In King, B. (ed) Coriolanus. The Critics debate.

Cameron, P., Jelinek, G., Kelly, Brown, A., Little, M. (2011). *Textbook of Adult Emergency Medicine* E-Book. Elsevier Health Sciences. p. 658.

Carpenter R., (16[5]6). The Last, and Highest Appeal: Or, An appeal to God, Against the NewReligion-Makers, Dresters, Menders, or Venders amongst us: Wherein is evidenced, amongst other things, That they have not true Faith, true Repentance, or true Charity: Likewise, that The seven Heads of Sin, commonly called, The seven deadly Sins, are manifestly apparent in the Lifes of their Preachers. London, 27.

Chambers, E.K. (2001). "The Artistry of Richard II". In Forker, C.R. (ed.) in *Richard II. Shakespeare*. The Critical Tradition (317-323). The Athlone Press: London.

Chaucer, G. (2011). *The Canterbury Tales*. London: Harper Press.

Chavez, S. (2018, June 21). The difference between love and lust according to experts. https://www.huffpost.com/entry/difference-between-love-lust_n_5b2a965ee4b0321a01cd46ba

Clark, William George; Glover, John, eds. (2009). [first published 1863]. *The Works of William Shakespeare. The Cambridge Shakespeare*. Vol. 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clark, William George; Wright, William Aldis, eds. (2009) [first published 1866]. *The Works of William Shakespeare. The Cambridge Shakespeare*. Vol. 9. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clark, William George; Wright, William Aldis, eds. (2009). [first published 1863]. *The Works of William Shakespeare. The Cambridge Shakespeare*. Vol. 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clark, William George; Wright, William Aldis, eds. (2009). [first published 1864]. *The Works of William Shakespeare. The Cambridge Shakespeare*. Vol. 4. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clark, William George; Wright, William Aldis, eds. (2009). [first published 1864]. *The Works of William Shakespeare. The Cambridge Shakespeare*. Vol. 5. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clark, William George; Wright, William Aldis, eds. (2009). [first published 1865]. *The Works of William Shakespeare. The Cambridge Shakespeare*. Vol. 6. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clark, William George; Wright, William Aldis, eds. (2009). [first published 1865]. *The Works of William Shakespeare. The Cambridge Shakespeare*. Vol. 7. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clark, William George; Wright, William Aldis, eds. (2009). [first published 1866]. *The Works of William Shakespeare*. The Cambridge Shakespeare. Vol. 8. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Coleridge, S.T. (2008). "Notes on Othello". In Bloom, H., Heims. N. Bloom`s Shakespeare through the Ages: Othello (113-117). New York: Infobase Publishing.

Coleridge, S.T. (2010). Shakespeare, with Introductory Remarks on Poetry, the Drama, and the Stage. In Bloom, H. (ed.) *Bloom`s Shakespeare through the Ages: Richard III*. (p.140). New York: Infobase Publishing.

Coleridge, S.T. (2001*). "*A hateful and painful play". In Geckle, G. L. (ed). *Measure for Measure. Shakespeare, the Critical Tradition*. (80-81). London: The Athlone Press.

Colie, R.L. (2008). The Significance of Style. In Bloom, H., Heims. (Eds), *Bloom's Shakespeare Through the Ages: Antony and Cleopatra (205-229)*. New York: Infobase Publishing

Cooper, H. (2006). "Shakespeare and the Middle Ages". An inaugural lecture delivered at the University of Cambridge 29 April. Cambridge University Press.

Cooper, H. (2010, May 05). *Shakespeare`s medieval world*. https://www.cam.ac.uk/research/news/shakespeares-medieval-world

Deats, S.M. (2004). *Antony and Cleopatra: New Critical Essays. Shakespeare Criticism*. London: Routledge.

Delany, J. (1907). "Anger". In *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. New York: Robert Appleton Company. Retrieved March 28, 2022 from New Advent: http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/01489a.htm

Diekstra, F. N. M., (ed). (1998). *Book for a simple and devout woman: a late Middle English adaptation of Peraldus`s Summa de vitiis et virtutibus and Friar Laurent`s Somme le roi: edited from British Library Mss Harley 6571 and additional* 30944. Groningen: Egbert Forsten.

Duffy, E. (2005). *Stripping of Altars - Traditional Religion in England*, 1400-1580. Yale University Press.

Eiss, H., (2017). *Seeking God in the Works of T. S. Eliot and Michelangelo*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Fairlie, H. (1978). *The Seven Deadly Sins Today*. Washington: New Republic Books.

Forker, R.C. (2001). *Richard II*. London: The Athlone Press.

Fraser, R., (2010). "The king has killed his heart: The Death of Falstaff in Henry V". SEDERI Yearbook, núm. 20 (paper)

Frye, N. (2008). Antony and Cleopatra. In Bloom, H., Heims. (Eds), *Bloom's Shakespeare Through the Ages: Antony and Cleopatra (229-243)*. New York: Infobase Publishing

Gaca, K.L. (2017). *The Making of Fornication: Eros, Ethics, and Political Reform in Greek Philospohy and Early Christianity*. University of California Press.

Giles, H. (2008). "Falstaff: A Type of Epicurean Life". In Bloom, H., Heims. N. (eds) *Bloom`s Shakespeare through the Ages: Henry IV, Part I.* (96-103). New York: Infobase Publishing.

Gillespie.S., (2001). *Shakespeare`s Books*. Bloomsbury Publishing.

Goddard, H. (2007). "King Lear". In Bloom, H., Heims. N. *Bloom`s Shakespeare through the Ages: King Lear* (213-245). New York: Infobase Publishing.

Gregory (1884). *The Book of the Morals of St. Gregory the Pope*. Rivington: London.

Guizot, F.P.G. (2001). "History, character, and divine right in Richard II". In Forker, C.R. (ed.) in *Richard II. Shakespeare*. *The Critical Tradition.* (187-190). The Athlone Press: London

Hazlitt, W. (2008). "Characters of Shakespear's Plays". In Bloom, H., Heims. (Eds), *Bloom's Shakespeare Through the Ages: Antony and Cleopatra (62-66).* New York: Infobase Publishing.

Hazllitt, W. (2008). "Othello". In Bloom, H., Heims. N.(eds.) *Bloom`s Shakespeare through the Ages: Othello* (102-112). New York: Infobase Publishing.

Herodotus. (1996). *Histories*. Wordsworth editions limited.

Hieatt, A. K. (1990). *Spenser Encyclopedia*. Ed. Hamilton, A. C. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Hiles, J. (1995). A Margin for error, Rhetorical context in Titus Andronicus. In King, B. (ed) *Coriolanus. The Critics debate.*

Horton, R. (2008). The seven deadly sins and Shakespeare`s Jacobean tragedies in Lethbridge.J.B. *Shakespeare and Spenser (pp. 242-258).* Manchester University Press.

Howes, R. (2018, June 21). The difference between love and lust according to experts. https://www.huffpost.com/entry/difference-between-love-lust_n_5b2a965ee4b0321a01cd46ba https://www.refworld.org/docid/3d6ce3cc0.html [accessed 1 March 2022] https://www.worldhistory.org/article/934/love-sex-and-marriage-in-ancient-egypt/

Hudson, H.N. (2008). Shakespeare: His Life, Art, and Characters. In Bloom, H., Heims. N. (eds) *Bloom`s Shakespeare through the Ages: Henry IV, Part I* (132-149). New York: Infobase Publishing.

Hume, D. (1960). A Treatise on Human Nature. Oxford at the Clarendon Press.

Jameson, A.M.B. (2008). "Shakespeare's Heroines: Characteristics of Women, Moral, Poetical, & Historical". In Bloom, H., Heims. (Eds), *Bloom's Shakespeare Through the Ages: Antony and Cleopatra (67-69)*. New York: Infobase Publishing

Jowett, J.(ed) (2004). *Timon of Athens*. The Oxford Shakespeare.

Kermode, F. (2008). “Othello”. In Bloom, H., Heims. N.(eds.) Bloom`s Shakespeare through the Ages: Othello (297-312). New York: Infobase Publishing.

Kermode, T., (1975). *Selected Prose of T. S. Eliot*. Harcourt Brace.

Kierkegaard, K., (1980). *The Concept of Anxiety*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

King, B. (1989). *Coriolanus*. UK: Macmillan Education.

Knight, G. W. (2008). “The Diadem of Love: An Essay on Antony and Cleopatra”. In Bloom, H., Heims. (Eds), *Bloom's Shakespeare Through the Ages: Antony and Cleopatra* (110-163). New York: Infobase Publishing

Knight, G.W. (2007). “The Lear Universe”. In Bloom, H., Heims. N. Bloom`s *Shakespeare Through the Ages: King Lear* (169-194). New York: Infobase Publishing.

Knight, J. W. (1989). “The Royal Occupation. An Essay on Coriolanus”. In King, B. (ed) *Coriolanus. The Critics debate*.

Kolin, P. C. (1995). *Titus Andronicus Critical Essays*. Garland Publishing: New York and London.

Krasnow, I. (2018, June 21). The difference between love and lust according to experts https://www.huffpost.com/entry/difference-between-love-lust_n_5b2a965ee4b0321a01cd46ba

Kraut, R., (2018, June, 15). *Aristotle`s Ethics*. https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/dante/

Krug, E., Dahlberg, L., Mercy, J., Zwi, A. and Lozano, R. (Eds). (2002). *World report on violence and health.* World Health Organization.

Kuhn, H. (2018). *Aristotelianism in the Renaissance. Metaphysics Research Lab*. Stanford University.

La Primaudaye, P. de (1618) The French academie London: Printed [by John Legat] for Thomas Adams, Retrieved from http://name.umdl.umich.edu/A05105.0001.001

Laertius, D. (1938). *Lives of the most eminent philosophers*. Cambridge, M. A: Harvard University Press

Leavis, F.R. (2011). *The common Pursuit*. Faber and Faber.

Leo Africanus (1986). *The History and Description of Africa*. Hakluyt Society.

Lerner, M. (1950). Intro. The Prince and The Discourses. The Modern Library.

Life application Study Bible. (1996). New King James Version. Tyndale House Publishers.

Machiavelli, N. (2008). *The Prince*. Hacket Publishing Company.

Mardock J. D. (2019, November 1). Edition: Henry V Critical Reception https://internetshakespeare.uvic.ca/doc/H5_CriticalSurvey/index.html#about

Mark, J. J. (2016, September 26). Love, Sex, and Marriage in Ancient Egypt. *World History Encyclopedia*. Retrieved from https://www.worldhistory.org/article/934/love-sex-and-marriage-in-ancient-egypt/.

Marx, K. (1887). *Capita*l, Volume 1, Chapter 24, Footnote 20. Translated by Samuel Moore and Edward Aveling. Edited by Frederick Engels. Marxists Internet Archive. 1887, p. 428-29.

May, W. F. (1967). A catalogue of sins: a contemporary examination of Christian conscience. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Milton, J., (2013). *Paradise Lost*. Harper Press.

Miola. R., (2004). Shakespeare's Rome. Cambridge University Press.

Morgan, M. (2008). An Essay on the Dramatic Character of Sir John Falstaff. In Bloom, H., Heims. N. (eds) *Bloom`s Shakespeare through the Ages: Henry IV, Part I* (61-77). New York: Infobase Publishing.

Moyle, J. (1911). Justinian Institutes. https://amesfoundation.law.harvard.edu/digital/CJCiv/JInst.pdf

Nashe, T. (1593). *Christ's Tears Over Jerusalem*. London: James Roberts.

Nederman, C. (2019). Niccolò Machiavelli. https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2019/entries/machiavelli/

Newhauser, R. (2000). *The Early History of Greed: The Sin of Avarice in Early Medieval Thought and Literature*. Cambridge University Press.

Newhauser, R. G. Ridyard S. J. (2012). - Sin in Medieval and Early Modern Culture: The Tradition of the Seven Deadly Sins-Boydell and Brewer.

Newlin, J. T. (2015). *Richard II: Critical essays*. New York: Routledge.

Nuttal, A. D. (1989). *Timon of Athens. Twayne`s new critical introductions to Shakespeare*.

Nuttal, A.D. (2008). Henry IV: Prince Hal and Falstaff. In Bloom, H., Heims. N. (eds) *Bloom`s Shakespeare through the Ages: Henry IV, Part I* (200-2017). New York: Infobase Publishing.

Olivier, T., (1980)."Shakespeare and Montaigne: A Tendency of Thought". Theoria.

Petrak, J., Hedge, B. eds. (2003). *The Trauma of Sexual Assault Treatment, Prevention and Practice*. John Wiley & Sons Limited.

Petrina, A., (2009). Machiavelli in the British Isles Two Early Modern Translations of *The Prince. Routledge*

Phillip, C. Kolin (1995). *Titus Andronicus Critical Essays*. Garland Publishing. New York and London.

Plutarch (2013). *The complete works of Plutarch*. Delphi Classics.

Price, H.T. (1943). The Journal of English and Germanic Philology, Vol. 42, (pp. 55-81). University of Illinois Press.

Richardson, W. (2010). On the Dramatic Character of King Richard the Third. In Bloom, H. (ed.) *Bloom`s Shakespeare through the Ages: Richard III* (pp.92-108). New York: Infobase Publishing.

Rogers, F., (1907). *The seven deadly sins*. London: A.H. Bullen.

Ruoff, J. (1968). "Kierkegaard and Shakespeare". *Comparative Philology*, Vol. 20, No.4.

Sachs, J. (2002). *Nicomachean Ethics*. Newburyport, MA: Focus Publishing/R. Pullins Company.

Sallust. Batstone, W. W. (2010). *Catiline's Conspiracy, The Jugurthine War, Histories* (Oxford World's Classics). USA: Oxford University Press.

Sands, Paul F. (2010). “Deadly Sin of Pride,” Family and Community Ministries 23, no. 4(Winter-Spring2010): 40-49.

Sayers, D., (1949). *The Comedy Of Dante Alighieri*. Penguin Classics.

Schimmel, S. (1992). *The seven Deadly Sins: Jewish, Christian and classical reelections on human nature*. New York: The Free Press.

Schlegel, A.W. (2010). On the Dramatic Character of King Richard the Third. In Bloom, H. (ed.) Bloom`s Shakespeare through the Ages: Richard III(pp.126-129). New York: Infobase Publishing.

Schlegel, A.W. (2008). Lectures on Dramatic Art and Literature. In Bloom, H., Heims. (Eds), Bloom's Shakespeare Through the Ages: Antony and Cleopatra (61). New York: Infobase Publishing

Scott, S., (2002). The exemplary husband. Focus Publishing.

Scott, S.P. (2001). The Civil Law. The Lawbook Exchange.

Seneca, L., (2010). Anger, Mercy, Revenge. The University of Chicago Press.

Shakespeare, W. (1994). The Complete Works of William Shakespeare. Barnes & Noble, Inc.

Shapiro, J., (2005). 1599: A Year in the Life of William Shakespeare. London: Faber and Faber.

Simmons J.I. (2004). From theatre to globe. The construction of character in Julius Caesar.In Zander H.(ed) Julius Caesar. New Critical Essays (155-164). Routhledge: New York

Smith, M., (2004). *Encyclopedia of Rape.* Greenwood.

Solomon, R. C. (1999). Wicked Pleasures: meditations on the seven ”deadly” sins. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers Inc.

Spenser, E. (2006). The Faerie Queen. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company.

Spinoza, B., (2000). *The Ethics. Part III on the Origin and Nature of Emotions*. The Pennsylvania State University.

Spivack, B., (1958). *Shakespeare and the Allegory of Evil*. Columbia University Press.

Stoll. E.E. (2008). Falstaff. In Bloom, H., Heims. N. (eds) *Bloom`s Shakespeare through the Ages: Henry IV, Part I (132-149)*. New York: Infobase Publishing.

Stoll. E.E. (2008). Shylock. In Bloom, H., Heims. N. (eds) *Bloom`s Shakespeare through the Ages: The Merchant of Venice* (132-149). New York: Infobase Publishing.

Taylor, J., Heber, R. (1847). The Whole Works of the Right Rev. Jeremy Taylor: The rule and exercises of holy living and dying. Longman, Brown, Green and Longmans.

Tolkien, J. R. R., (ed.). (1962). *The English Text of the Ancrene Riwle*, *Ancrene Wisse, edited from MS Corpus Christi College Cambridge* 402 EETS, o.s. 246. London: Oxford University Press.

UN Commission on Human Rights (2002, January 31). *Report of the Special Rapporteur on violence against women, its causes and consequences, Ms. Radhika Coomaraswamy, submitted in accordance with*

Commission on Human Rights resolution 2001/49: Cultural practices in the family that are violent towards women, E/CN.4/2002/83

Watling, E. F. (1966). "Introduction". *Four Tragedies and Octavia. Penguin Books.*

Wenzel, S. (1967). *The sin of sloth: Accedia in medieval thought and literature*. University of North Carolina Press

Wetherbee, W., (2018, July, 13). Dante Alighieri. https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/dante/

Wharton, T. F. (1989). *The Critics Debate. Measure for Measure*. London: Macmillan Education UK

Whately, T. (2010). Remarks on Some of the Characters of Shakespeare. In Bloom, H. (ed.) Bloom`s Shakespeare through the Ages: Richard III (pp.108-120). New York: Infobase Publishing.

Wiles, D., (1987). Shakespeare's Clown. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Willimon, W.H. (2005). Sinning like a Christian, a new look at the seven deadly sins. Nashville: Abingdon Press.

Wilson, T (1925). *A discourse upon Usury*. Harcourt, Brace & Company.

Woolgar, C., M. (2006). *The Senses in Late Medieval England*. Yale University Press.