

11 Bellies, wounds, infections, animals, territories

The political bodies of Shakespeare's *Coriolanus*

Stuart Elden

Introduction

This chapter examines Shakespeare's late tragedy *Coriolanus* in terms of the various political bodies that structure the narrative and its language.¹ The reading moves through a number of registers. First, and most obviously, the question of the body politic, which is recounted in a fable told to hungry citizens. It moves from this to discuss actual physical bodies and wounds, and then turns to the recurrent language of infection and infected bodies. This relates to the bodies of non-human animals, frequently mentioned as approbation or condemnation, particularly as this is played out in terms of the clash between the elite and the multitude, the singular and plural, and the understanding of the city as being both the people and the place. There are a number of examples of animals as the hunter and hunted, consumer and consumed. Finally, the chapter addresses the theme of banishment and the conquest of territories, in terms of bodily aspects in other political senses. In *Coriolanus* territory as the body of the state is only one aspect of its corporeal nature.

This chapter is part of a much wider project that reads a number of Shakespeare's plays to shed light on different aspects of the question of territory.² Territory, in my argument, is something that cannot be simply understood as a bounded space, but encompasses a variety of different, multiple and contested processes. I have suggested elsewhere that territory cannot be reduced to mere political and geographical questions, and that a range of economic, strategic, legal and technical issues are tangled up in the concept and practice.³ To those different registers we might add the affective, emotional, physical and bio-physical aspects of territory, of bodies in places and places embodied. It is to those aspects that this reading most directly speaks.

Coriolanus has been described as Shakespeare's 'most political play',⁴ and as 'hugely, indeed grotesquely, political'.⁵ While set in ancient Rome, and based upon the life of the title character written by Plutarch, the resonances with Shakespeare's own time have often been remarked upon, especially in terms of the corn riots and resultant popular uprisings in the English Midlands around the time he wrote the play, in 1607. The play has often been

The political bodies of Shakespeare's Coriolanus 183

mined for its political leanings, particularly because it gives voice both to the common people and their rulers. It has polarized opinion in part because it presents different perspectives with such passion, leading William Hazlitt to suggest in the early nineteenth century that if it is studied it obviates the need to read Burke or Paine or listen to debates in the House of Commons.⁶ Both T.S. Eliot and Bertolt Brecht, with very different political motives, attempted to adapt the play in the twentieth century.⁷ Robin Headlam Wells suggests that the allusion to the corn riots in the opening scene would have had a strong contemporary resonance.⁸ Yet Shakespeare took the corn riots from Plutarch's account of Coriolanus's life, which means it was not a gratuitous addition but part of the story itself.⁹ However, as Philip Brockbank suggests, 'he could not have been unaware of their closeness to his own time',¹⁰ and it is of course plausible that the parallels inspired Shakespeare to take up this story as the basis for his play. Brockbank notes that this is a recurrent theme in Shakespeare, as his 'theatrical engagement with popular risings began with the Cade scenes of 2 Henry VI, to be extended in Julius Caesar and Sir Thomas More and consummated in Coriolanus'.¹¹ Frank Kermode argues that while this link was certainly the immediate context, the political aspects of the play operate 'more abstractly' as:

a study in the relationships between citizens within a body politic; the relationship of crowds to leaders and leaders to led, of rich to power. The polis has its troubles: dearth, external enemies, enmity between classes. The patricians have a ruthless but narrow and selfish code of honour. The people are represented by tribunes who are in their own way equally ruthless, scheming politicians. The monarchic phase of Roman history has recently ended, the kings replaced by an oligarchy tending to be oppressive, committed to warfare as the ultimate proof of valour and worth, and largely indifferent to social obligation.¹²

A brief plot summary may be in order. Caius Martius is a victorious Roman general, yet he is intensely disliked by the people as a whole because he is seen as one of the reasons behind their hunger while the grain stores are full. An encounter between the people and Caius goes badly, with Caius scornful of their claims. Caius leads a victorious army, defeating the Volscians at Corioli and fighting the Volscian commander Tullus Aufidius, who is dragged away by his soldiers. Caius returns to Rome as a conquering hero, taking the honorific *cognomen* (more properly an *agnomen*) of Coriolanus. He is persuaded by his mother to run for consul, and he is elected with the backing of the people. However, two tribunes, Junius Brutus and Sicinius Velutus, conspire against him, leading to a popular revolt. Coriolanus condemns the people, which means Brutus and Sicinius have him convicted of treason. He is condemned to execution by being thrown off a cliff, but banished as an alternative. Coriolanus goes to the Volscian city of Antium, initially to allow his enemy Aufidius to kill him to spite Rome. Instead they together plot the city's

downfall. On hearing the two men are leading an army against them, Rome attempts to persuade Coriolanus against this course. While the soldier Cominius and the patrician Menenius fail, a delegation including Coriolanus's son, wife and mother Volumnia, succeeds. A pact is sealed with Rome, but Coriolanus is denounced as a traitor by the Volscians and killed by Aufidius and others.

The political questions in the play are thus not merely secondary aspects, but the very heart of the drama. Kermode has suggested that its plot is 'probably the most fiercely and ingeniously planned and expressed of all the tragedies'.¹³ As Heller notes, 'Coriolanus is in my mind such a thoroughly political play that the politically uninteresting scenes (such as the introductory part of 2.1) also seem dramatically redundant'.¹⁴ Among these many themes, I will focus on bodies.¹⁵

First, and most obviously, there is the question of the body politic. I move from this to discuss actual physical bodies and wounds, and then move to the recurrent language of infection and infected bodies. This leads to the bodies of non-human animals, particularly as this is played out in terms of the clash between the elite and the multitude and the understanding of the city, as being the people and the place, in its physical form. Finally, I examine the theme of banishment and the conquest of territories, in terms of the bodily aspects in another political sense. The aim here is to avoid the narrow, uninteresting political reading of the play that Stanley Cavell suggests 'is apt to become fairly predictable once you know whose side the reader is taking, that of the patricians or that of the plebeians'.¹⁶

The theme of bodies has, naturally, been discussed before. As Bristol notes:

The image of the body is, of course, a familiar topic in the critical discussion of *Coriolanus*. The play is saturated with concrete situations in which the fate and condition of bodies is of paramount importance. Both literal and symbolic implications of the analogy between the private individual body and the body politic are elaborated in nearly every scene.¹⁷

Some of what I say here will, then, be familiar to students of the play. The discussion of bodies in a literal sense, particularly the fable of the belly in the opening scene, and the ideas of infection and contagion that run throughout the play, are relatively well known and examined. However, even here I think there are issues less commonly remarked upon, and I hope in terms of wounds, animals and territories that my reading goes beyond this. More broadly, this reading is an engagement with, and development of, some of the themes of literary geography.¹⁸ It attempts to avoid some of the problem Nigel Thrift outlined in a letter to a journal he would later go on and edit.¹⁹ It is informed, but not bound, by the kind of political approach to literary analysis for which Silk provided something of a manifesto.²⁰

The political bodies of Shakespeare's Coriolanus 185

The most recent adaptation is Ralph Fiennes's film version.²¹ This is undoubtedly a powerful piece of cinema, with a stellar cast, big-budget production and striking cinematography. In this film version, the action is set in the contemporary moment. It was shot in Serbia and Montenegro, but the largely urban scenes of decay and despair could have been anywhere. The setting in the film is said to be 'a place calling itself Rome', having a 'border-dispute' with the Volscians.

Bellies

The initial complaint of the people is hunger in the face of dearth. They feel that the state has sufficient resources and does not release it to them. The patrician Menenius Agrippa tries to suggest that it is the gods that have created this situation, and that rather than carry arms against the Roman state, they should get on their knees to pray. He tries to explain the situation to the people by means of a corporeal parable that reverses this idea of grumbling bellies, something that is unfortunately cut from the recent Fiennes film version.

MENENIUS: There was a time when all the body's members

Rebell'd against the belly; thus accus'd it:

That only like a gulf it did remain

I'th'midst o'th'body, idle and unactive,

Still cupboarding the viand, never bearing

Like labour with the rest; where th'other instruments

Did see, and hear, devise, instruct, walk, feel,

And, mutually participate, did minister

Unto the appetite and affection common

Of the whole body. The belly answer'd—

FIRST CITIZEN: Well, sir, what answer made the belly?

MENENIUS: Sir, I shall tell you. With a kind of smile,

Which ne'er came from the lungs, but even thus—

For look you, I may make the belly smile

As well as speak—it tauntingly replied

To th'discontented members, the mutinous parts

That envied his receipt; even so most fitly

As you malign our senators for that

They are not such as you.

FIRST CITIZEN: Your belly's answer—What?

The kingly crowned head, the vigilant eye,

The counsellor heart, the arm our soldier,

Our steed the leg, the tongue our trumpeter,

With other muniments and petty helps

Is this our fabric ...²²

The sheer number of bodily parts is overwhelming. Menenius sets the other members of the body against the belly. It cupboards the viand, storing the food, but not distributing it to the other parts. Basic instincts—seeing, hearing, devising, instructing, walking, feeling, participating—are not served by the belly; the appetites and affections are not provided for. Menenius describes the complainants as ‘discontented members, the mutinous parts’, and notes that the belly is the root of this, not the lungs. One of the citizens replies by listing the parts of the entire body politic: the head, the eye, the heart, the arm, the leg, the tongue. The body politic is a recurrent theme in political theory. Perhaps the most important medieval example is found in John of Salisbury’s twelfth-century *Policraticus*,²³ but the most striking early seventeenth-century example is Edward Forset’s *Comparative Discourse of the Bodies Natural and Politique*.²⁴ Forset’s work was published in 1606, shortly after his involvement in the prosecution of Guy Fawkes and his fellow conspirators. This play is Shakespeare’s most thorough treatment of the idea.²⁵

One of the things that is unusual is that he does not allow the fable of the belly (which has its root in Aesop before Plutarch) simply to stand as a metaphor of politics: the people to whom the story are told are actually hungry in Shakespeare’s *Coriolanus*, while in Plutarch they are told the fable outside of the city walls where they are complaining about usury. Usury is mentioned only briefly in Shakespeare; in Plutarch the grain riots come later in the narrative. The exchange on the fable continues for some time, with the first citizen describing it as ‘the cormorant belly’,²⁶ trading on the idea that this is a voracious bird.²⁷ Menenius counters that ‘your most grave belly was deliberate,/Not rash like his accusers’, and that it acts as ‘the storehouse and the shop/Of the whole body’.²⁸ What is stored there is distributed appropriately:

I send it through the rivers of your blood,
Even to the court, the heart, to th’seat o’t’h’brain;
And, through the cranks and offices of man,
The strongest nerves and small inferior veins
From me receive that natural competency
Whereby they live.²⁹

It is clear what he intends, with the people getting the flour and only the bran being taken, though the crowd seem confused, so he makes it explicit:

The senators of Rome are this good belly,
And you the mutinous members; for, examine
Their counsels and their cares, digest things rightly
Touching the weal o’t’h’common, you shall find
No public benefit which you receive
But it proceeds or comes from them to you,
And no way from yourselves. What do you think,

You, the great toe of this assembly?³⁰

The use of body parts to discuss the polity continues at other times in the play: 'the navel of the state' and 'the fundamental part of state';³¹ 'lords and heads o'th'state'.³² Even the last, the well-known idea of a 'head' of state, follows from this basic idea. The bodily sustenance can be to disadvantage too, with Coriolanus claiming that whoever gave our stored corn freely 'nourish'd disobedience, fed/the ruin of the state'.³³

Wounds

As Stanley Cavell has shown, ideas of hunger and cannibalism run through the narrative.³⁴ Yet the play is not concerned simply with the workings of the body, and the distribution of nourishment throughout it. As Zvi Jagendorf notes, 'the physical is inescapable in this most unerotic of plays; everywhere we encounter legs, arms, tongues, scabs, scratches, wounds, mouths, teeth, voices, bellies, and toes, together with such actions as eating, vomiting, starving, beating, scratching, wrestling, piercing, and undressing'.³⁵ It is worth dwelling a little on the wounds born by soldiers on behalf of the city.³⁶ Martius notes that 'I have some wounds upon me, and they smart/To hear themselves remember'd'.³⁷ Menenius and Volumnia wish him to come home from Corioli with wounds upon him. Menenius is pleased to receive a letter from Martius:

A letter for me! it gives me an estate of seven
years' health; in which time I will make a lip at
the physician: the most sovereign prescription in
Galen is but empiricuteic, and, to this preservative,
of no better report than a horse-drench. Is he
not wounded? he was wont to come home wounded.³⁸

Galen is of course a medical writer from antiquity who came after the action of the play, but the point is well made. ('Empiricuteic' appears to be a combination of 'empiric' and 'pharmaceutic'.³⁹) Volumnia learns news with which she is pleased: 'O, he is wounded; I thank the gods for't'; Menenius concurs: 'So do I too, if it be not too much: brings a'victory in his pocket? the wounds become him.'⁴⁰ They then have the following exchange:

MENENIUS: ... Where is he
wounded? [*To the Tribunes*] God save your good
worships! Martius is coming home: he has more
cause to be proud. [*To Volumnia*] Where is he
wounded?
VOLUMNIA: I'the shoulder and i'the left arm there will be
large cicatrices to show the people, when he shall

188 *Stuart Elden*

stand for his place. He received in the repulse of
Tarquin seven hurts i'the body.

MENENIUS: One i'the neck, and two i'the thigh,—there's
nine that I know.

VOLUMNIA: He had, before this last expedition, twenty-five
wounds upon him.

MENENIUS: Now it's twenty-seven: every gash was an enemy's
grave.⁴¹

This passage enumerates the wounds, a calculus of pain from the battlefields
that can be expended in the political marketplace.⁴² However, breaking with
custom, the newly named Coriolanus is unwilling to show his wounds to the
crowd. Brutus is critical of this decision:

I heard him swear,
Were he to stand for consul, never would he
Appear i'th'market-place, nor on him put
The napless vesture of humility;
Nor showing (as the manner is) his wounds
To th'people, beg their stinking breaths.⁴³

Coriolanus confirms this reluctance himself: 'Your honour's pardon:/I had
rather have my wounds to heal again/Than hear say how I got them'.⁴⁴ And
again:

I do beseech you,
Let me o'erleap that custom, for I cannot
Put on the gown, stand naked and entreat them
For my wounds'sake, to give their suffrage: please you
That I may pass this doing.⁴⁵

Siculus and Brutus see this failure to display the heroic body as an affront, as
do the citizens.

We have power in ourselves to do it, but it is a power that we have no
power to do; for if he show us his wounds and tell us his deeds, we are to
put our tongues into those wounds and speak for them; so, if he tell us
his noble deeds, we must also tell him our noble acceptance of them.
Ingratitude is monstrous, and for the multitude to be ingrateful were to
make a monster of the multitude; of the which we being members should
bring ourselves to be monstrous members.⁴⁶

Coriolanus is reluctant simply to stand and tell the crowd of the wound he
received, and outlines how he imagines it is desired he do:

What must I say?
'I Pray, sir'—Plague upon't! I cannot bring
My tongue to such a place:—'Look, sir, my wounds!
I got them in my country's service, when
Some certain of your brethren roar'd and ran
From the noise of our own drums.'⁴⁷

This is the contradiction: he does not wish his wounds to speak of his actions.⁴⁸ He later concedes that 'I have wounds to/show you, which shall be yours in private' to one citizen,⁴⁹ but refuses to confirm another's claim that 'You have received many wounds for your country' by replying that 'I will not seal your knowledge with showing them',⁵⁰ though he later boasts of 'wound two dozen odd; battles thrice six'.⁵¹ Again there is the calculus, but he does not wish them visible, only known. The citizens later interpret this as disdain: 'He used us scornfully: he should have show'd us/His marks of merit, wounds received for's country'.⁵² Instead of being part of a collective body, Martius/Coriolanus wishes to remain private, separate, his body to himself. He is later described as 'a carbuncle entire'.⁵³ This idea is returned to in Act III, when Menenius tells the crowd:

The warlike service he has done, consider, think
Upon the wounds his body bears, which show
Like graves i'th'holy churchyard.
Coriolanus: Scratches with briers,
Scars to move laughter only.⁵⁴

Infections

As well as the actual damage to a physical body, the play uses the recurrent theme of corruption, pollution and disease to the political body.⁵⁵ Something is rotten in the state, but the trope is also used to refer to different elements or characters. Following his earlier description of the crowd as making themselves scabs by 'rubbing the poor itch of your opinion',⁵⁶ Martius condemns the soldiers who are on the verge of defeat at Corioli in the following way:

All the contagion of the south light on you,
You shames of Rome! you herd of—boils and plagues
Plaster you o'er, that you may be abhorr'd
Farther than seen, and one infect another
Against the wind a mile! You souls of geese
That bear the shapes of men, how have you run
From slaves that apes would beat! Pluto and hell!⁵⁷

Later, after being denied by the crowd, despite his sacrifices, he returns to taunt them.

As for my country I have shed my blood,
Not fearing outward force, so shall my lungs
Coin words till their decay, against those measles
Which we disdain should tetter us, yet sought
The very way to catch them.⁵⁸

Measles could be the modern disease, but could also be leprosy—the words have confused etymologies; while tetter is skin eruptions.⁵⁹ Later in the same scene he suggests that there is a need ‘to jump a body with a dangerous physic/That’s sure of death without it—at once pluck out/The multitudinous tongue: let them not lick/The sweet which is their poison’.⁶⁰ Yet how he describes them also is applied to him. He has already been labelled a ‘poison’;⁶¹ now it is his turn to be described as a contagion:

SICINIUS: He’s a disease that must be cut away.
MENENIUS: O, he’s a limb that has but a disease:
Mortal, to cut it off: to cure it, easy.
What has he done to Rome that’s worthy death?
SICINIUS: The service of the foot,
Being once gangren’d, is not then respected
For what before it was.
BRUTUS: We’ll hear no more.
Pursue him to his house and pluck him thence,
Lest his infection, being of catching nature,
Spread further.⁶²

Sicinius and Brutus argue that his past deeds need to be forgotten, like a gangrenous foot is no use for its previous purpose, and that in order to prevent further infection he needs to be cut away. Menenius suggests that the loss of his blood in the service of Rome outweighs his current situation. Yet both use the same mode of language in their opposed views.

Animals

Throughout the play the people as a whole and particular characters are described as animals.⁶³ There are many beastly bodies. Coriolanus describes the people as a herd;⁶⁴ and Menenius talks of ‘being the herdsmen of the beastly plebeians’.⁶⁵ The people are described as ‘multiplying spawn’ by Menenius,⁶⁶ and Coriolanus accuses Siculus of being the ‘Triton of the minnows’.⁶⁷ There are other insults used of the crowd, such as Martius’s evocative ‘Go get you home, you fragments!’⁶⁸ which makes clear the collective nature of the crowd, sometimes described as the ‘rabble’—often in stage directions as well as dialogue, which may indicate Shakespeare’s own views.⁶⁹

However, there is a veritable bestiary beyond this. Curs, lions and hares, foxes and geese all appear in Martius’s first speech,⁷⁰ shortly after a contrast

The political bodies of Shakespeare's Coriolanus 191

was drawn by Menenius between 'Rome and her rats'.⁷¹ Coriolanus mocks the crowd's hunger and their use of proverbs such 'dogs must eat',⁷² and links this to their unwillingness to fight with the lines 'The Volsces have much corn; take these rats hither/To gnaw their garner'.⁷³ Later exchanges bring in a 'fawning greyhound in the leash',⁷⁴ a cat and mouse,⁷⁵ mules, camels, dogs and sheep,⁷⁶ moths,⁷⁷ conies,⁷⁸ an 'old goat!'⁷⁹ and a hen.⁸⁰ The herd, 'souls of geese', and 'slaves that apes would beat' all appear in the condemnation of his soldiers.⁸¹ He later claims he will 'never/Be such a gosling as to obey instinct'.⁸² However the use of animals is sometimes rather lazy, with them simply listed and the auditor (or reader) having to do the work of embellishing the image. As Maxwell notes, a comparison with *Macbeth* is telling. In that play we find the evocative claim that 'A falcon, towering in her pride of place,/Was by mousing owl hawked at and killed'.⁸³

One of the most striking things is how often the animals function as pairs, one the hunter and the other the hunted, one consumer and one consumed. The animals are frequently their bodies, meat.⁸⁴ When Menenius says that the people do not love Martius, Sicinius declares that 'nature teaches beasts to know their friends',⁸⁵ which generates an exchange where the crowd is compared to a wolf looking to devour a lamb, but Brutus notes that Martius sounds like a bear, to which Menenius replies that he's a bear who lives like a lamb.⁸⁶ The implication appears to be that in politics he is a lamb, ready to be devoured, while his true strength is in battle. This is confirmed by Coriolanus later referring to a 'wolvish toge': civilian dress covering his martial instincts.⁸⁷ He had earlier welcomed war as a 'means to vent/Our musty superfluity'.⁸⁸ What these contrasts mean is that while many of the terms are pejorative, there are also animals that evoke strength or nobility ('noble' is itself a recurrent theme throughout the play). It is very much not the case that no human should be like an animal.⁸⁹ Martius is described as a bear,⁹⁰ and he declares Aufidius 'a lion/That I am proud to hunt'.⁹¹ That said, in their first encounter, Aufidius vows 'If I fly, Martius/Holloa me like a hare',⁹² where the hare stands as a figure of timidity.⁹³ Later in the play, as he is sent into exile, Coriolanus complains that 'the beast with many heads butts me away',⁹⁴ and compares his fate 'to a lonely dragon that his fen/Makes fear'd and talk'd of more than seen'.⁹⁵ The multitude expels the individual. The dragon is echoed in Menenius's later description: 'There is differency between a grub and a butterfly; yet your butterfly was a grub. This Martius is grown from man to dragon; he has wings, he's more than a creeping thing'.⁹⁶ Menenius twice describes Coriolanus as a tiger, speaking of him having 'tiger-footed rage',⁹⁷ and saying there is 'no more mercy in him than there is milk in a male tiger'.⁹⁸

Aufidius declares Coriolanus is ruled by animal instincts: 'I think he'll be to Rome/As is the osprey to the fish, who takes it/By sovereignty of nature'.⁹⁹ This relation of the osprey to the fish, a noble animal to prey, is found in other places in the play. It comes through in the idea that the people might have upset the natural balance of things, a reversal of power Coriolanus

suggests would allow 'the crows to peck the eagles',¹⁰⁰ with the eagle a somewhat anachronistic imperial emblem. He later describes Rome as a 'city of kites and crows',¹⁰¹ the kite being at Shakespeare's time a common sight scavenging in London. There are other times, however, where the power of the strong is clear, with the suggestion that the Volscian assault on Rome will be of soldiers following Coriolanus 'with no less confidence/Than boys pursuing summer butterflies,/Or butchers killing flies'.¹⁰²

The animal imagery also is important in considering the relation of the people and the patricians to the city. In the opening scene Martius suggests that 'the rabble should have first unroof'd the city',¹⁰³ a claim that makes more sense in a later context.

FIRST SENATOR: To unbuild the city, and to lay all flat.

SICINIUS: What is the city but the people?

PLEBEIANS: True,
The people are the city ...

COMINIUS: That is the way to lay the city flat,
To bring the roof to the foundation,
And bury all which yet distinctly ranges
In heaps and piles of ruin.¹⁰⁴

In distinction, Coriolanus sees them as in Rome but not Roman:

I would they were barbarians—as they are
Though in Rome litter'd; not Romans—as they are not,
Though calved i'th'porch o'th'Capitol!¹⁰⁵

He wishes they were barbarians, so he could dispense with them as in a war: 'On fair ground/I could beat forty of them.'¹⁰⁶ There is an interesting structure to these lines with the wish followed by the 'as they are', and the negative description reinforced by the 'as they are not', with the two instances of 'though' used to qualify still further. There is also a use of terms that refer to their mere bodies. As Cantor notes, 'Coriolanus' use of terms for animal procreation, *litter'd* and *calved*, reveals his point: the plebians no more deserve to be called Romans than do the tame beasts who happen to be born every year within the city's walls'.¹⁰⁷

However, the contrasts go deeper than this. The people believe they are the city, whereas the patricians clearly see a physicality to the city itself which is in danger of being destroyed.¹⁰⁸ The people care more about their own health, but Coriolanus, the Senator and Cominius talk of the destruction of the buildings, literally an 'unbuilding'; the city laid flat; a 'falling fabric'.¹⁰⁹ Sicinius re-enters, looking for Coriolanus in order to pass sentence:

Where is this viper

That would depopulate the city and
Be every man himself?¹¹⁰

One of the citizens sees the enacting of the sentence as setting both the politics and the bodies in balance again. Thrown from the rock, 'he shall well know/The noble tribunes are the people's mouths/And we their hands'.¹¹¹

When he goes into exile and seeks out Aufidius, Coriolanus addresses the city itself:

A goodly city is this Antium. City,
'Tis I that made thy widows: many an heir
Of these fair edifices 'fore my wars
Have I heard grown, and drop. Then know me not;
Lest that thy wives with spits, and boys with stones,
In puny battle slay me.¹¹²

In the final scene, discovering his Coriolanus has been persuaded against the assault on Rome, Aufidius slurs him with the accusation of being a 'boy of tears', to which Coriolanus replies with the terrible lines that lead to his death:

Cut me to pieces, Volscies; men and lads,
Stain all your edges on me. Boy! False hound!
If you have writ your annals true, 'tis there,
That, like an eagle in a dove-cote, I
Flutter'd your Volscians in Corioles.
Alone I did it. Boy!¹¹³

The description of himself as the eagle, the return to the scene of his greatest victory at Corioli, and the use of the animal descriptions of 'hound' and fluttering those in the 'dove-cote' returns to a number of key themes of the play. Coriolanus thus ends as he began, setting himself up alone against a crowd, with the people as a whole crying 'tear him to pieces' as a reply to his own 'cut me to pieces', before many blows rain down.¹¹⁴ Recall the condemnation of the crowd as 'fragments' and a 'herd' in the first scene. The individual people only make sense as part of a whole; Coriolanus can himself be reduced to pieces. For Jagendorf, the manner of his death 'represents the number over singularity, of the limbs over the belly, of the spread of power over its concentration'.¹¹⁵

Territories

These bodies relate in a number of ways to the question of territory in a narrower, more specific sense. The key here is the expulsion of Coriolanus from the civil body, and the attack he then leads against it. When the tribunes

194 *Stuart Elden*

rule him guilty of treason Sicinius notes that there are three options—'For death, for fine, or banishment'—and asks the Aedile to instruct the crowd to follow his lead.¹¹⁶ Coriolanus is unrepentant:

Let them pronounce the steep Tarpeian death,
Vagabond exile, flaying, pent to linger
But with a grain a day, I would not buy
Their mercy at the price of one fair word,
Nor check my courage for what they can give,
To have't with saying 'Good morrow.'¹¹⁷

A few lines later Sicinius picks up the theme:

That do distribute it—in the name o'th'people,
And in the power of us the tribunes, we,
Ev'n from this instant, banish him our city,
In peril of precipitation
From off the rock Tarpeian, never more
To enter our Rome gates. I'th'people's name,
I say it shall be so.¹¹⁸

The people reply enthusiastically 'It shall be so, it shall be so! Let him away! He's banish'd, and it shall be so'.¹¹⁹ There is then the important exchange and reversal:

BRUTUS: There's no more to be said, but he is banish'd,
As enemy to the people and his country.
It shall be so!

PLEBEIANS: It shall be so, it shall be so!

CORIOLANUS: You common cry of curs, whose breath I hate
As reek o'th'rotten fens, whose loves I prize
As the dead carcasses of unburied men
That do corrupt my air: I banish you!
... Despising
For you the city, thus I turn my back.
There is a world elsewhere!¹²⁰

The curs here, as they did in the first scene, invokes the dogs baiting the bear.¹²¹ The Aedile claims 'the people's enemy is gone', to which the crowd replies that 'our enemy is banish'd, he is gone!'¹²²

When he does leave, it is to the Volscian city of Antium. In the compressed dramatic action of the play, his journey is short and his arrival, disguised, follows quickly after. However, the recent film version captures this effectively in showing a lengthy journey the passage of time of which is tracked by the transformation in Fiennes's appearance. Shaven head and face become ever-

lengthening hair and a thick beard. By the time he arrives in Antium, the transformation is such that stage devices such as a hooded cloak are unnecessary, but the geographical complications are shown in this version. The play is set by Shakespeare in early republican Rome, not long after the uprising against and expulsion of the Tarquin kings. The play is written in early seventeenth-century England. The film is set in a near-contemporary pseudo-Balkans, shot in Serbia and Montenegro. The film, making effective use of newsreel and TV, shows that the Volscians are in close proximity to the 'place calling itself Rome'. The initial war footage, of the siege of the Volscian city of Corioli that gives Coriolanus his name, talks of a 'border dispute'. That implied a more proximate location, or at least, a contested front between the sides that appeared largely absent when he is making his way to Antium. The means used to mark the transition at other points in the film, where a motorway is punctuated by roadblocks, with a kind of no-man's land between them, was more effective. However, if this is so, and the two neighbours share a narrow, effectively modern border, a boundary, where does Coriolanus go when he moves into exile? Why does it take him so long to move between these places?

Yet, in republican Rome, it is indeed the case that there would have been areas outside of Rome that were not yet part of its neighbours: places that were not yet spaces; lands that were not yet cultivated, not yet territory. In the early seventeenth century, Shakespeare could effectively play this spatial politics. Exile was still a potential punishment, and features importantly in his history plays. The transportation of convicts to the new world or slavery were merely modern examples of an age-old practice. In the later seventeenth century John Locke would discuss the 'Indian who knows no Inclosure, and is still a Tenant in common', and yet still laid claim to private property and thus a nascent form of civil society¹²³—Locke declaring that 'in the beginning, all the World was America'.¹²⁴ Not all places within Shakespeare's England were yet enclosed, much less if Scotland and Ireland were included.

However, in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries, and especially in the Balkan setting which is otherwise so effective in Fiennes's adaptation, the idea of a place *outside* territory is harder to grasp. Where *is* Coriolanus as he moves through that sequence of locations, sleeping rough and his hair growing ever longer? He could be in isolated locations. He is undoubtedly making his way through war-ravaged landscapes, contested places in the present or recent past, but given the modes of modern warfare and territorial settlements, he is either still within the 'place calling itself Rome', or behind enemy lines. It's hard to conceive of a no-man's land of such extent that the time could have passed in such a way. He is effectively either in one territory or another. It is hard to imagine him outside of territory, but for early Rome, or even in Shakespeare's England, it is not so difficult.

When Coriolanus arrives in Antium to talk to Aufidius he speaks of how the people were allowed by nobles to be cheered into exile, with the 'voice of

slaves to be/Whoop'd out of Rome'.¹²⁵ (Whooped is a hunting term.¹²⁶) Aufidius clearly sympathizes, recalling later how 'Being banish'd for't, he came unto my hearth,/Presented to my knife his throat; I took him,/Made him joint-servant with me'.¹²⁷ Back in Rome, Menenius condemns the crowd—the clusters'¹²⁸—for being those 'that made the air unwholesome when you case/Your stinking greasy caps in hooting at Coriolanus' exile'.¹²⁹ The citizens quickly claim that they said to banish him reluctantly: 'we willingly consented to his banishment, yet it was against our will'.¹³⁰ Later Menenius suggests that those who sent him into exile should beg forgiveness: 'Go you that banish'd him;/A mile before his tent fall down, and knee/The way into his mercy'.¹³¹ In his attempt to mediate, Menenius is criticized by the Antium guard:

Can you, when you have pushed out your gates the very defender of them, and in a violent popular ignorance given your enemy your shield, think to front his revenges with the easy groans of old women, the virginal palms of your daughters, or with the palsied intercession of such a decayed dotant as you seem to be? Can you think to blow out the intended fire your city is ready to flame in with such weak breath as this? No, you are deceived; therefore back to Rome and prepare for your execution. You are condemned; our general has sworn you out of reprieve and pardon.¹³²

Towards the end of the play, a Roman senator expresses a wish to 'Unshout the noise that banish'd Martius,/Repeal him with the welcome of his mother'.¹³³

The play is also one of the few in the Shakespearean corpus to use the actual word 'territories'—still a rather rare word at the turn of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.¹³⁴ Only two plays by Shakespeare actually use the singular 'territory'.¹³⁵ Three passages are at stake in this play:

AUFIDIUS: Worthy Martius,
Had we no other quarrel else to Rome, but that
Thou art thence banish'd, we would muster all
From twelve to seventy, and, pouring war
Into the bowels of ungrateful Rome,
Like a bold flood o'erbear't. O come, go in,
And take our friendly senators by'th'hands,
Who now are here, taking their leaves of me
Who am prepar'd against your territories,
Though not for Rome itself.¹³⁶

AEDILE: There is a slave, whom we have put in prison,
Reports the Volsces with several powers
Are enter'd in the Roman territories,
And with the deepest malice of the war

Destroy what lies before 'em.¹³⁷

Second Messenger: You are sent for to the senate.

A fearful army, led by Caius Martius,

Associated with Aufidius, rages

Upon our territories, and have already

O'erborne their way, consum'd with fire and took

What lay before them.¹³⁸

All of these are in a single Act, when Coriolanus is mustering Volscian forces to attack Rome. It is Rome that has territories, and seemingly not its neighbours; Rome that has lands at risk. This only hints at the geographical complexities of Rome's rule, especially in the later Empire—there were lands currently part of its *imperium*, and those that could be at some point in the future. Rome did not see the political geographical status of its neighbours in the same terms.¹³⁹ Aufidius talks of the territories to attack; the functionaries of the threat at home. Yet these places are also related to bodies, and not simply Aufidius's description of 'the bowels of ungrateful Rome'.¹⁴⁰ Coriolanus is content to 'Let the Volsces/Plough Rome and harrow Italy'¹⁴¹—that is, to reduce it to a colony or *territorium*. An important moment in the founding of a new colony was the ploughing of the sacred boundary of the city walls, the *pomerium*. We hear about this from Cicero, Varro and Tacitus, for example, and in the early Middle Ages Isidore of Seville derives the etymology of the term territory from this practice: 'a *territorium* is so called as if it were a *tauritorium*, that is "broken by a plow" [*tritum aratro*] and by a team of oxen (c.f. *taurus*, "bull")—for the ancients used to designate the borders of their possessions and *territoria* by cutting a furrow'.¹⁴² In this sense, even the 'geopolitics' of the play is figured as a body politics, if not always a bio-politics.

Finally, having been expelled and taken refuge in Antium, Coriolanus then returns to this language. He talks to Aufidius of his 'canker'd country with the spleen/Of all the under fiends'.¹⁴³ Aufidius continues the polluted body trope in the passage quoted above, suggesting that they 'muster all/From twelve to seventy, and pouring war/Into the bowels of ungrateful Rome,/Like a bold flood o'erbear't'.¹⁴⁴ Returning to this theme of cannibalism, the most powerful figure in the play, the most sufficient, the one who bore Coriolanus in her body and prevents his turning against the body of Rome, is Volumnia. It is she who utters the horrific line that 'Anger's my meat; I sup upon myself/And so shall starve with feeding'.¹⁴⁵ Finally she pleads with Coriolanus not to make 'the mother, wife and child to see/The son, the husband and the father, tearing/His country's bowels out'.¹⁴⁶ She then shifts the body to her own, suggesting that 'thou shalt no sooner/March to assault thy country than to tread—/Trust to't, thou shalt not—on thy mother's womb,/That brought thee to this world'.¹⁴⁷ Coriolanus has become Rome's other, its outside; his mother

tells him not to tread on her womb, which gave him birth, but also on Rome itself, the site that made him possible.

Shakespeare was writing at a time when the modern conception of sovereign territory was emerging and so he helps us understand its variant aspects, tensions, ambiguities and limits. In *The Tempest* he explores what this might mean when Europe came into contact with its outside. In his own England the dominant form of political power was conducted in a space that was, by his time, relatively ordered and bordered, but its recent past—explored in the history plays—was anything but. We can see that, for example, in *Richard II*, which is a crucial play about the political economies of land and the politics of banishment. The earlier setting of *King Lear* shows a place that is historically distant and spatially disrupted. In that it is more similar to the Europe in which he set most of his tragedies and comedies. This was a space that was contested and fractured, both politically and spatially. We see that, especially, in *Coriolanus*. In *Coriolanus* territory as the body of the state is only one aspect of its corporeal nature. It is a play about the political body of the polity itself, its inside and outside, the aggressive wars to keep it safe externally, and its internal health and well-being. It also raises a range of questions about what it is to contribute to a political community, and who should rule. However, literally and figuratively these are often the physical bodies of its characters, with language invoking wounds, contagion, animals and a variety of body parts. Shakespeare helps us to understand what it means to be part of territory or outside territory, conceptually, historically and politically.

Notes

- 1 I have used the text in the Arden Shakespeare: *Coriolanus*, ed. Philip Brockbank, London: Routledge, 1976, though compared this to the RSC Shakespeare: *Coriolanus*, ed. Jonathan Bate and Eric Rasmussen, Houndmills: Macmillan, 2011. The edition of the text in the Third Series of the Arden edition (ed. Peter Holland, London: Bloomsbury, 2013) arrived too late to make use of its readings and apparatus. On the play generally, Adrian Poole, *Coriolanus*, New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1988; and Jan H. Blits, *Spirit, Soul and City: Shakespeare's Coriolanus*, Lanham: Lexington Books, 2006, are useful.
- 2 See also Stuart Elden, 'The Geopolitics of *King Lear*: Territory, Land, Earth', *Law and Literature* 25, no. 2 (2013).
- 3 Stuart Elden, *Terror and Territory: The Spatial Extent of Sovereignty*, Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, 2009; 'Land, Terrain, Territory', *Progress in Human Geography* 34, no. 6 (2010): 799–817; *The Birth of Territory*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2013.
- 4 Robin Headlam Wells, *Shakespeare's Politics: A Contextual Introduction*, London: Continuum, 2009: 58; Frank Kermode, *Shakespeare's Language*, London: Penguin, 2000: 243.
- 5 Zvi Jagendorf, 'Coriolanus: Body Politic and Private Parts', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 41, no. 4 (1990): 455–69: 457.
- 6 William Hazlitt, from *Characters of Shakespeare's Plays*, excerpted in B.A. Brockman, ed., *Shakespeare: Coriolanus—A Casebook*, Houndmills: Macmillan, 1977: 26.

The political bodies of Shakespeare's Coriolanus 199

- 7 T.S. Eliot, 'Coriolan', in *Collected Poems 1909–1962*, London: Faber & Faber: 137–43; Bertolt Brecht, 'Coriolan', in *Collected Plays: Nine*, ed. and trans. Ralph Manheim and John Willett, New York: Vintage, 1972. See also Brecht's 'Study of the First Scene of Shakespeare's *Coriolanus*', in *Brecht on Theatre*, ed. and trans. John Willett, London: Methuen, 1964: 252–65.
- 8 Headlam Wells, *Shakespeare's Politics*: 58. On this see E.C. Pettet, 'Coriolanus and the Midlands Insurrection of 1607', *Shakespeare Survey* 3 (1950): 34–42.
- 9 Plutarch's text, in the North translation, appears in the Arden edition. On the relation, see Kwang-Ho Kim, 'Shakespeare's Treatment of the Source in *Coriolanus*', *English Studies* 7 (1983): 49–62; and David George, 'Plutarch, Insurrection and Dearth in *Coriolanus*', in *Shakespeare and Politics*, ed. Catherine M.S. Alexander, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004: 110–29; more generally see Kenneth Muir, 'The Background of *Coriolanus*', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 10, no. 2 (1959): 137–45; and Anne Barton, 'Livy, Machiavelli and Shakespeare's *Coriolanus*', in *Shakespeare and Politics*, ed. Catherine M.S. Alexander, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004: 67–90.
- 10 Brockbank, 'Introduction', in *Coriolanus*: 26.
- 11 Brockbank, 'Introduction': 36.
- 12 Kermode, *Shakespeare's Language*: 243.
- 13 Kermode, *Shakespeare's Language*: 254.
- 14 Agnes Heller, *The Time is Out of Joint: Shakespeare as a Philosopher of History*, Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2002: 291. There is actually, *pace* Heller, quite a bit going on in the opening part of this scene that has political connotations. Nonetheless, chapter 12 of her study is helpful on *Coriolanus* generally.
- 15 On others, see G. Thomas Tanselle and Florence W. Dunbar, 'Legal Language in *Coriolanus*', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 13, no. 2 (1962): 231–38; Paul A. Cantor, *Shakespeare's Rome: Republic and Empire*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1976: part I; W. Hutchings, 'Beast or God: The *Coriolanus* Controversy', *Critical Quarterly* 24, no. 2 (1982): 35–50; Charles Mitchell, 'Coriolanus: Power as Honor', *Shakespeare Studies* 1 (1965): 199–226; Alexander Leggatt, *Shakespeare's Political Drama: The History Plays and the Roman Plays*, London: Routledge, 1989: chapter 3; Alan Hager, *Shakespeare's Political Animal: Schema and Schemata in the Canon*, Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1990: chapter 4; Cathy Shrank, 'Civility and the City in *Coriolanus*', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 54, no. 1 (2003): 406–23; Brayton Polka, 'Coriolanus and the Roman World of Contradiction: A Paradoxical World Elsewhere', *The European Legacy* 15, no. 2 (2010): 171–94.
- 16 Stanley Cavell, 'Who Does the Wolf Love? Reading *Coriolanus*', *Representations* 3 (1983): 1–20, at 2.
- 17 Michael D. Bristol, 'Lenten Butchery: Legitimation Crisis in *Coriolanus*', in *Shakespeare Reproduced: The Text in History and Ideology*, ed. Jean E. Howard and Marion F. O'Connor, New York: Methuen, 1987: 207–24, at 213.
- 18 For a helpful survey, see Sheila Hones, 'Text as it Happens: Literary Geography', *Geography Compass* 2, no. 5 (2008): 1301–17; and Angharad Saunders, 'Literary Geography: Reforging the Connections', *Progress in Human Geography* 34, no. 4 (2010): 436–52.
- 19 Nigel Thrift, 'Landscape and Literature', *Environment and Planning A* 10, no. 3 (1978): 347–49. See also his later 'Literature, the Production of Culture and the Politics of Place', *Antipode* 15, no. 1 (1983): 12–24.
- 20 J. Silk, 'Beyond Geography and Literature', *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 2, no. 2 (1984): 151–78.
- 21 For a discussion, see Slavoj Žižek, *The Year of Dreaming Dangerously*, London: Verso, 2012: 118–25.
- 22 *Coriolanus*, Act I, scene i: 95–118.

200 *Stuart Elden*

- 23 There is no complete English translation, but the best single edition is John of Salisbury, *Policraticus: On the Frivolities of Courtiers and the Footprints of Philosophers*, ed. and trans. by Cary J. Nederman, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990. The body politic is discussed in book V, chapter 2.
- 24 Edward Forset, *Comparative Discourse of the Bodies Natural and Politique*, London: John Bill, 1606. On this, see Arthur Riss, 'The Belly Politic: Coriolanus and the Revolt of Language', *ELH: English Literary History* 59, no. 1 (1992): 53–75, 64–67; and Muir, 'The Background of Coriolanus', who notes that there is no direct evidence that Shakespeare knew Forset's work (page 141).
- 25 The literature on this is quite extensive. See, for example David G. Hale, 'Coriolanus: The Death of a Political Metaphor', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 22, no. 3 (1971): 197–202; Andrew Gurr, "'Coriolanus" and the Body Politic', *Shakespeare Survey* 28 (1975): 63–69; James Holstun, 'Tragic Superfluity in *Coriolanus*', *ELH: English Literary History* 50, no. 3 (1983): 485–507; Jagendorf, 'Coriolanus'; and Riss, 'The Belly Politic'. For a contextual reading that puts it in conversation with other works from and the situation in the first years of James I's reign, see Alex Garganigo, *Studies in English Literature 1500–1900* 42, no. 2 (2002): 335–59. The classic work on the idea is Ernst H. Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Mediaeval Political Theology*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957. See Claire Rasmussen and Michael Brown, 'The Body Politic as Spatial Metaphor', *Citizenship Studies* 9, no. 5 (2005): 469–84.
- 26 *Coriolanus*, Act I, scene i: 120.
- 27 Brockbank, note to *Coriolanus*: 104.
- 28 *Coriolanus*, Act I, scene i: 127–28, 132–33.
- 29 *Coriolanus*, Act I, scene i: 134–39.
- 30 *Coriolanus*, Act I, scene i: 147–54.
- 31 *Coriolanus*, Act III, scene i: 150.
- 32 *Coriolanus*, Act V, scene vi: 91.
- 33 *Coriolanus*, Act III, scene i: 116–17.
- 34 Cavell, 'Who Does the Wolf Love?'
- 35 Jagendorf, 'Coriolanus': 457–58.
- 36 See also Coppélia Kahn, *Roman Shakespeare: Warriors, Wounds, and Women*, London: Routledge, 1997: 152–54.
- 37 *Coriolanus*, Act I, scene ix: 28–29.
- 38 *Coriolanus*, Act II, scene i: 113–18.
- 39 Brockbank, note to *Coriolanus*: 158.
- 40 *Coriolanus*, Act II, scene i: 120, 121–22.
- 41 *Coriolanus*, Act II, scene i: 141–55.
- 42 See Jagendorf, 'Coriolanus': 464.
- 43 *Coriolanus*, Act II, scene i: 229–34.
- 44 *Coriolanus*, Act II, scene ii: 68–70.
- 45 *Coriolanus*, Act II, scene ii: 135–39.
- 46 *Coriolanus*, Act II, scene iii: 4–13. The First Citizen's reply invokes 'the many-headed multitude' (16–17).
- 47 *Coriolanus*, Act II, scene iii: 51–56.
- 48 Jarrett Walker, 'Voiceless Bodies and Bodiless Voices: The Drama of Human Perception in *Coriolanus*', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 43, no. 2 (1992): 170–85, at 177.
- 49 *Coriolanus*, Act II, scene iii: 76–77.
- 50 *Coriolanus*, Act II, scene iii: 105, 106.
- 51 *Coriolanus*, Act II, scene iii: 127.
- 52 *Coriolanus*, Act II, scene iii: 160–62.
- 53 *Coriolanus*, Act I, scene iv: 55. This point is indebted to Rebecca Lemon, 'Arms and the Law in *Coriolanus*', in *The Law and Shakespeare*, ed. Constance Jordan and Karen Cunningham, Houndmills: Palgrave, 2010: 233–48, at 239. See also

The political bodies of Shakespeare's Coriolanus 201

- Riss, 'The Belly Politic': 55–56, although this overstretches the spatial resonances of Coriolanus's separation from the people.
- 54 *Coriolanus*, Act III, scene iii: 49–52.
- 55 More generally, see R.R. Simpson, *Shakespeare and Medicine*, Edinburgh: E. & S. Livingstone, 1959.
- 56 *Coriolanus*, Act I, scene i: 164–65.
- 57 *Coriolanus*, Act I, scene iv: 30–36.
- 58 *Coriolanus*, Act III, scene i: 75–79.
- 59 Brockbank, note in *Coriolanus*: 199.
- 60 *Coriolanus*, Act III, scene i: 153–56.
- 61 *Coriolanus*, Act III, scene i: 86.
- 62 *Coriolanus*, Act III, scene i: 292–308. There are parallels with *2 Henry IV*, Act III, scene i: 38–43 here. See Hale, 'Coriolanus': 201.
- 63 On this theme see J.C. Maxwell, 'Animal Imagery in *Coriolanus*', *The Modern Language Review* 42, no. 4 (1947): 417–21; and Ineke Murakami, 'The "Bond and Privilege of Nature" in *Coriolanus*', *Religion & Literature* 38, no. 3 (2006): 121–36. There are some useful thoughts in the latter, but the application of Agamben seems a stretch. On animals in Shakespeare generally, though with no reference to *Coriolanus*, see Bruce Boehrer, *Shakespeare Among the Animals: Nature and Society in the Drama of Early Modern England*, New York: Palgrave, 2002.
- 64 *Coriolanus*, Act III, scene i: 32.
- 65 *Coriolanus*, Act II, scene i: 94–95; see also Act III, scene ii: 32.
- 66 *Coriolanus*, Act II, scene ii: 78.
- 67 *Coriolanus*, Act III, scene i: 88.
- 68 *Coriolanus*, Act I, scene i: 221. See also 'shreds' (Act I, scene i: 207).
- 69 See Annabel Patterson, *Shakespeare and the Popular Voice*, Basil Blackwell, 1989: chapter 6.
- 70 *Coriolanus*, Act I, scene i: 167–71.
- 71 *Coriolanus*, Act I, scene i: 161.
- 72 *Coriolanus*, Act I, scene i: 205.
- 73 *Coriolanus*, Act I, scene i: 248–49.
- 74 *Coriolanus*, Act I, scene vi: 38.
- 75 *Coriolanus*, Act I, scene vi: 44.
- 76 *Coriolanus*, Act II, scene i: 245, 249, 255.
- 77 *Coriolanus*, Act I, scene iii: 84.
- 78 *Coriolanus*, Act IV, scene v: 218.
- 79 *Coriolanus*, Act III, scene i: 175.
- 80 *Coriolanus*, Act V, scene iii: 162. For a near-complete list, see Maxwell, 'Animal Imagery in *Coriolanus*': 420.
- 81 *Coriolanus*, Act I, scene iv: 30–36.
- 82 *Coriolanus*, Act V, scene iii: 35.
- 83 *Macbeth*, Act II, scene iv: 12. See Maxwell, 'Animal Imagery in *Coriolanus*': 420.
- 84 See Gail Kern Pastor, 'To Starve with Feeding: the City in *Coriolanus*', *Shakespeare Studies* XI (1978): 123–44, at 135–36.
- 85 *Coriolanus*, Act II, scene i: 5.
- 86 *Coriolanus*, Act II, scene i: 6–11.
- 87 *Coriolanus*, Act II, scene iii: 114. Brockbank refuses to correct 'wolvish' to 'wool-ish', which other editors have suggested 'because the garb should be the sheep's; but it is the wolf's property and symbolizes his treacherous nature'. See also Andreas Höfele, *Stage, Stake and Scaffold: Humans and Animals in Shakespeare's Theatre*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011: 111, who agrees with 'wolvish' and notes that 'toge' is itself an emendation of 'tongue' from the Folio, but claims this 'seems to me irrefutable' (page 111, n. 52).

202 *Stuart Elden*

- 88 Act I, scene i: 224–25. Holstun, ‘Tragic Superfluity in *Coriolanus*’: 488–89, notes that this evokes both the ‘medical venting of excess humours and the commercial vending of excess stock’.
- 89 On this point more generally, see Höfele, *Stage, Stake and Scaffold*.
- 90 *Coriolanus*, Act I, scene iii: 31.
- 91 *Coriolanus*, Act I, scene i: 234–35.
- 92 *Coriolanus*, Act I, scene viii: 6–7.
- 93 Brockbank, note to *Coriolanus*: 141.
- 94 *Coriolanus*, Act IV, scene i: 1–2. He had earlier (Act III, scene i: 92) referred to a ‘Hydra’ but here the use of ‘butts’ seems to imply a rather more herd-like animal.
- 95 *Coriolanus*, Act IV, scene i: 30–31.
- 96 *Coriolanus*, Act V, scene iv: 11–14.
- 97 *Coriolanus*, Act III, scene i: 309.
- 98 *Coriolanus*, Act V, scene iv: 28–29.
- 99 *Coriolanus*, Act IV, scene vii: 33–35.
- 100 *Coriolanus*, Act III, scene i: 138.
- 101 *Coriolanus*, Act IV, scene v: 43.
- 102 *Coriolanus*, Act IV, scene vi: 94–96.
- 103 *Coriolanus*, Act I, scene i: 4–5.
- 104 *Coriolanus*, Act III, scene i: 196–205.
- 105 *Coriolanus*, Act III, scene i: 237–39.
- 106 *Coriolanus*, Act III, scene i: 240–41.
- 107 Cantor, *Shakespeare’s Rome*: 82.
- 108 Pastor, ‘To Starve with Feeding’: 131. See, for example, the claim that ‘if we lose the field,/We cannot keep the town’ (Act I, scene vii: 4–5); and Robert S. Miola, *Shakespeare’s Rome*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983: 164: ‘the constricted and constrictive city ... sharply defined by outlying battlefields, rival towns, and its own vividly realized topography—its walls, gates, Capitol, Tiber, Tarpeian rock, forum, private houses, and streets.’
- 109 *Coriolanus*, Act III, scene i: 245.
- 110 *Coriolanus*, Act III, scene i: 261–63. At 284 he describes him as a ‘viperous traitor’.
- 111 *Coriolanus*, Act III, scene i: 268–70.
- 112 *Coriolanus*, Act IV, scene iv: 1–6.
- 113 *Coriolanus*, Act V, scene vi: 111–16.
- 114 *Coriolanus*, Act V, scene vi: 120.
- 115 Jagendorf, ‘*Coriolanus*’: 467.
- 116 *Coriolanus*, Act III, scene iii: 15.
- 117 *Coriolanus*, Act III, scene iii: 88–92.
- 118 *Coriolanus*, Act III, scene iii: 99–105.
- 119 *Coriolanus*, Act III, scene iii: 105–6.
- 120 *Coriolanus*, Act III, scene iii: 117–35.
- 121 Höfele, *Stage, Stake and Scaffold*: 100.
- 122 *Coriolanus*, Act III, scene iii: 137–38.
- 123 John Locke, *Second Treatise*, in *Two Treatises of Government*, ed. Peter Laslett, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988 [1960]: V, 26.
- 124 Locke, *Second Treatise*: V, 49.
- 125 *Coriolanus*, Act IV, scene v: 78–79.
- 126 Brockbank, note to *Coriolanus*: 254.
- 127 *Coriolanus*, Act V, scene vi: 30–32.
- 128 *Coriolanus*, Act IV, scene vi: 129.
- 129 *Coriolanus*, Act IV, scene vi: 131–33.
- 130 *Coriolanus*, Act IV, scene vi: 145–46.
- 131 *Coriolanus*, Act V, scene i: 4–6.
- 132 *Coriolanus*, Act V, scene ii: 38–49.

The political bodies of Shakespeare's Coriolanus 203

- 133 *Coriolanus*, Act V, scene v: 4–5.
134 For a longer discussion, see Elden, *The Birth of Territory*, especially chapters 8 and 9.
135 See Elden, ‘The Geopolitics of *King Lear*’.
136 *Coriolanus*, Act IV, scene v: 127–36.
137 *Coriolanus*, Act IV, scene vi: 38–42.
138 *Coriolanus*, Act IV, scene vi: 75–80.
139 See Elden, *The Birth of Territory*: chapter 2.
140 *Coriolanus*, Act IV, scene v: 131.
141 *Coriolanus*, Act V, scene iii: 33–34.
142 Isidore of Seville, *The Etymologies of Isidore of Seville*, trans. Steven A. Barney, W. J. Lewis, J.A. Beach and Oliver Berghof, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006: XVI, v, 22.
143 *Coriolanus*, Act IV, scene v: 92–93.
144 *Coriolanus*, Act IV, scene v: 129–32.
145 *Coriolanus*, Act IV, scene ii: 50–51. For a discussion, see Janet Adelman, ‘“Anger’s my Meat”: Feeding, Dependency, and Aggression in *Coriolanus*’, in *Representing Shakespeare: New Psychoanalytic Essays*, ed. Murray M. Schwartz and Coppélia Kahn, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1980: 129–49.
146 *Coriolanus*, Act V, scene iii: 101–3.
147 *Coriolanus*, Act V, scene iii: 122–25.

Taylor & Francis
Not for distribution