

UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DO PAMPA
GRADUAÇÃO EM LICENCIATURA EM LETRAS PORTUGUÊS/INGLÊS

***CORIOLANUS* – WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE: THE CONSTRUCTION OF A
HERO.**

Por
Alex Barcellos Pinto

Monografia submetida à Universidade Federal do Pampa em cumprimento parcial dos
requisitos para a obtenção da graduação em Letras

**BAGÉ,
MAIO, 2013**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the supervision of my advisor Prof. Dr. Gelson Peres da Silva who believed in this project and for the dedicated and patient orientation in the making of this work. His suggestions and guidance provided me not only inspiration to write, but also made me reflect about the theme that is the object of my studies in this monograph. I also want to thank my parents Vivaldino e Sonia and my sister, Carine, for their love, help and for having always been by my side, providing me support whenever I needed it. I want to thank my teacher Lúcia Maria de Brito Correa and Mirian Denise Kelm – my unforgettable teachers – for showing me a new world through literature, and for their friendship. I would like to thank specially the teacher Taiane Basgalupp for showing me that even in academic work poetry is also required. I would also like to thank the following friends, colleagues and teachers whose support helped me in my trajectory in this Academy: Paula da Costa, Emanuel Herbstrith, Mr. Luis Alberto Macedo, José Ricardo da Costa, Priscila Fonseca, Anderson Martins, Professor Kátia Morais, Aline Bazerque, Mariana Mello, Luciano Peres, Paola Antunes Lopes, Diogo Raldi Morrudo, Junior Jobim, Silvio Pedro Corrêa and Daiane Bier. I also thank all my classmates and professors who were part of the Languages course, as well as the staff of the University.

ABSTRACT

***CORIOLANUS* – WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE: THE CONSTRUCTION OF A HERO**

Alex Barcellos Pinto

UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DO PAMPA

2013

Supervising Professor: Dr. Gelson Peres da Silva

This monograph aims at analyzing the character “Caio Martius Coriolanus” of the play *Coriolanus* by William Shakespeare in a hero construction perspective. I take as objects of this research the characteristics of the protagonist of this Shakespeare’s work *Coriolanus* and the characters that have influence in his personality during the play. According to my analysis, I expose that those characteristics are divided as Classical Hero characteristics and Renaissance Hero characteristics making Coriolanus being a conversion of the two species of the hero. During the play, it is possible to see that the character, Coriolanus, is not a common hero from the Renaissance era but is also a Classical hero seen both in the medieval and Hellenistic eras.

In addition, according to my analysis, I highlight that those characteristics can be observed in other famous heroes who are acclaimed as Classical hero or Renaissance hero for theoretical studies. Hence, little changes occur in the representation of the different heroes in comparison to Coriolanus, being possible to prove that Coriolanus is a conversion of the two species of hero.

ABSTRACT

***CORIOLANUS* – WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE: THE CONSTRUCTION OF A HERO**

Alex Barcellos Pinto

UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DO PAMPA

2013

Professor Orientador: Dr. Gelson Peres da Silva

Esta monografia tem por objetivo analisar o personagem Caio Martius Coriolanus da obra *Coriolano* peça de William Shakespeare em uma perspectiva de construção de heróis. Eu tomo como objetos de pesquisa as características do protagonista de *Coriolano* de Shakespeare e os personagens que têm influência em sua personalidade durante a obra. De acordo com a minha análise, eu exponho que essas características são divididas como características de heróis clássicos e características de herói renascentistas fazendo de Coriolano sendo uma convergência das duas espécies do herói. Durante a peça, é possível ver que o personagem, Coriolano, não é um herói comum a partir do Renascimento, mas também é um herói clássico da eras medieval e helenística.

Além disso, de acordo com a minha análise, destaco que essas características podem ser observadas em outros heróis famosos que são aclamados como heróis clássicos ou heróis renascentista por estudos teóricos. Assim, poucas alterações de comportamento ocorrem na representação dos heróis diferentes em comparação com Coriolano, é possível comprovar que Coriolano é, de fato, uma convergência das duas espécies de heróis.

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION.....	7
-------------------	---

CHAPTER 2

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REVIEW.....	10
-----------------------------	----

CHAPTER 3

ANALYSIS	18
----------------	----

3.1 The myth, the classical hero	18
--	----

3.2 The man, the Renaissance hero	20
---	----

3.3 The shining, dark and shining star: Coriolanus, the Roman hero	22
--	----

3.4 The heroes' lion heart, the braveness and honor.....	25
--	----

3.5 “The fault is not in the stars, it is in my mind”, the birth of a Renaissance hero	28
--	----

3.6 “His mouth is his heart” – Menenius	31
---	----

3.7 “Only Spartans women can rise real Spartans men”	
--	--

The woman's role in the creation of the hero35

CHAPTER 4

CONCLUSION.....38

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCE.....40

Chapter 1
Introduction

This work is a part of the result of my studies in English Literature and classical literature during the course of Letras Português/Inglês at Universidade Federal do Pampa in the year of 2012. During the course, I did researches concerning the construction of characters in comparison to other works and on power relations focused in the Renaissance. I studied authors such as Michel Foucault, Niccolò Machiavelli, Bárbara Heliodora, Massaud Moisés, Antônio Candido for instance, and I encountered important observations that reinforce the fact that the classes of the two principal heroes, classical and renaissance, can converge in one character, and that Coriolanus' social structure and relation to his context of life is the responsible for this conversion. That is so, on the one hand, because in Coriolanus' attitudes and characteristics, it is possible to see Renaissance attitudes full of human unexpected acts and, mainly, he is a man's son and not a demigod as classical heroes. On the other hand, Coriolanus has been brought up by the society and his attitudes and personality are similar to many demigods we know. His pride, braveness and the people's necessity of him make him a classical hero in his attitudes and personality, as well as a Renaissance one since he keeps being a man whose attitudes can never be predicted as social move is considered.

Taking into account this theme, this monograph can be directly associated to other heroes' stories along History. During my analyses I will use the characteristics of other Classical and Renaissance heroes in order to show that the ones present in Coriolanus are also present in other heroes of both classifications. To this analyses, I used Achilles of *The Iliad* by Homer, Galahad of *Sir Galahad* the poem by Alfred Lord Tennyson, Don Quixote of *Don Quixote de la Mancha* by Miguel de Cervantes and Beowulf of *Beowulf*. The analyses will be done considering all the remarkable characteristics of the hero from his rise to the title he receives. Hence, those characteristics are signals which show the convergence of the two kinds of heroes in Coriolanus after the comparison of them to the attitudes and characteristic of other literary heroes as Achilles, Galahad and Beowulf, classical heroes, and Don Quixote, who is considered, according to Michel Foucault, a renaissance hero. Taking these comparisons into account, my objective in this monograph is to show that when those characteristics are present in a character, he cannot be classified as a renaissance hero or a classical hero, he is more than a classification, he is a complex character who deserves being treated as it is.

Although *Coriolanus* is a Shakespeare's rereading of the Plutarch story present in *Parallel Lives*, this is not going to be taken into account as the analysis is focused on Shakespeare's view and creation of the hero. As the literary works show, immersed in a meritocratic society Shakespeare's character, Coriolanus, represents the typical man of Rome who was loyal to the Empire and was looking for honor and glory with the direct influence of his family, especially his mother, and the society over him. Hence, those characteristics are signals which show the convergence of the two kinds of heroes in Coriolanus since we compare them to the attitudes and characteristic of other literary heroes. Shakespeare, in his work, recreates the ancient Rome and the political situation of the period. The society and the power relations among the character are important characteristics in his creation as a hero, and they will be part of this analysis.

The comparisons and the analyses of the society and family influences over the hero, I will make in this essay using those characters' attitudes, justify the statements I present. Besides, this analysis highlights that those heroes represent in each work a kind of hero.

In Chapter 02, I present the theoretical review of this work where are exposed concepts related to the theme and definitions of heroes by Michel Foucault, Massaud Moisés and Antônio Cândido. I use these authors to explain the differences established between the classical hero and the renaissance hero. In the sequence, Bárbara Heliodora's and John Jeffries Martin's comments are used to point out the Renaissance era and the influences Shakespeare received. The social roles man and woman need to play are also emphasized in this work, and to expose these characteristics I used the texts by Michel Foucault and by Niccolò Machiavelli. Still concerning to the study of heroes, more specifically about heroes in general, I also cite the conception of Baltasar Gracian.

In Chapter 03 of this monograph I analyze Shakespeare's character construction as a hero. First, I use authors as Bárbara Heliodora, Michel Foucault and John Jeffries Martin to define the different periods of eras (Renaissance and Medieval) to highlight some historical information related to Shakespeare. Next, in the part named "The classical hero" I present some characteristics of Coriolanus which are the same or totally different of the classical heroes shown by a comparison between his attitudes and other heroes' attitudes. At this point, I chose some heroes to compare Coriolanus, Achilles and Beowulf. Secondly, I also chose the main character of the Renaissance era to be the base of my statements, so, I decided to use

Don Quixote de la Mancha of *Don Quixote* by Miguel de Cervantes and I also used a classical hero, Galahad.

To continue my analyses, I highlight information concerning to the contemporary society on Coriolanus. From this point, I analyze the power relation present in the play around his mother, Volumnia, and his opponents, Sicinius, Brutus and Aufidius. The power relation present in the play is an important part of the construction of Coriolanus' personality since it is seen in his attitudes. In Chapter 04 I present my conclusion of this work.

Chapter 2

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REVIEW

Shakespeare's character, Caius Martius Coriolanus, in *Coriolanus* can be considered a Renaissance hero. Besides, it is possible to see the union of the classical hero and the Renaissance one in Coriolanus through the analysis of his behavior and social context, and making a comparison between him and the classical heroes, the Renaissance ones and their contexts of life.

As a complex character, Coriolanus has different characteristics: on the one side the classical, and on the other side the Renaissance. The character has the values and virtues of the classical as he is brave, fearless, and a Renaissance one as he is a mortal with flaws, imperfections and worried about his own desires instead of the determinations of the gods. Michel Foucault says in his book *The Order of Things* that it is really hard to line a change of thinking or an era in History in general (50). Thus, Coriolanus turns out as a convergence of both sorts of hero.

As to a definition for classical hero we can see "Demigod" as the first word that appears on Massaud Moisés' *Dicionário de Termos Literários* (219). The word "hero" comes from the Greek "hèros". The most part of the classical heroes were the product of the alliance between gods and humans. Over time, the image of a demigod has changed. Christianity influences changed the idea of a demigod into the idea of being "sons of God". Moisés defines "hero" as "todo o ser fora do comum, destinado a obrar façanhas sobre-humanas que se aproximassem com a dos deuses" (219). He presents Sir Galahad from *A Demanda do Santo Graal* as an example of this classical definition of "hero". Sir Galahad is a protagonist of a medieval chivalry story of the King Arthur's saga for whom he was in the service to bring a holy artifact used by Jesus, attitude that makes Galahad a "protected by God." So, Moisés' definition of a hero is also applied in the Medieval Age and in the chivalry stories as a redefinition of the classical hero as Christian context is taken for granted. The chivalry stories were present in the culture of the sixteenth century more than the new thought brought by the Renaissance, which influenced Shakespeare. The movement around the Renaissance must be restricted into Italy because the other countries just suffered the effects of the Italian movement (Martin, 2003).

In addition, Baltasar Gracian's definition for a hero is described by Clément Rosset in *A Antinatureza*. To Gracian, hero is a myth, he is courageous and without flaws. Gracian does not consider Don Quixote as a hero because he lives in a reality different than his present. Don Quixote is not courageous enough to face the real world where he lives: "Para tornar-se o herói de Gracian, falta a Don Quixote de Cervantes um pouco mais de coragem: renunciar, não a suas extravagâncias, mas à ideia de real que o mantém no solo como os cascos de seu cavalo "que nunca deixam a terra""(188).

Gracian also claims about the way heroes use to react to the situations presented. He claims that heroes do not predict their actions and they enjoy the opportunity when they are provided. "O herói possui a arte de aproveitar as ocasiões, mediante uma técnica que não é a da previsão, mas da intuição da oportunidade no momento em que esta se apresenta." (189). This is an important characteristic present in Coriolanus as I claim in chapter three.

One of the characteristics presented by Gracian for a hero is not present in Coriolanus, that is, the manner he uses his discourse. According to the author, heroes have the ability to convince and to be beloved for their discourses: "... um dos supremos artifícios do herói consiste em auferir proveito de sua linguagem, a suprema riqueza artificial, que satisfaz a outrem com algumas vibrações sonoras – "palavras de seda"" (193). Coriolanus does not satisfy this description of a hero because his words turn against him. Coriolanus' discourse is what makes him be exiled, and that shows us his personality. He does not convince his enemies, but those who love him know that he is a real man and hero. Coriolanus talks with his feelings, as I analyze in chapter three of this monograph.

The opposite, in terms of beliefs the classical heroes were theocentric, whereas Renaissance hero were created in an anthropocentric era; the chivalry romances hero is the Renaissance hero, imperfect and reasonable. The Renaissance hero is the kind of hero that represents a real man carrying all the characteristics which every man can have. So, Coriolanus presents himself as a Renaissance hero because in his behavior no supernatural acts can be seen but a man after the realization of his desires. Although Shakespeare received influences from the chivalry romances, it happens because the author is recreating the ancient Rome society as Bárbara Heliodora points out in *Expressão Dramática do Homem Político em Shakespeare* (169).

However, this analyses is made by the perspective of the Renaissance era, there are some author who fit Coriolanus in the Mannerist literary period. In my studies, I analyze

Coriolanus as a rational which leads me to the Renaissance era. Lígia Cademartory claims that Shakespeare is part of the Mannerist canon because he uses characteristics from the Medieval Age and Renaissance age:

A palavra maneirismo deriva de maneira, que significa estilo, no sentido mais amplo da palavra. O maneirismo é a primeira orientação estilística que considera a relação entre o tradicional e o novo como um problema cultural que desafia a inteligência e dela demanda solução. Estilo com característica específicas, dista tanto do Renascimento quanto do Barroco, constituindo-se numa tentativa de pôr em acordo a espiritualidade da Idade Média e o realismo do Renascimento.(22)

Although, there are conflicts about the real era of Shakespeare, authors as Terry Eagleton and Harold Bloom claim that it is very difficult to fit Shakespeare in just one era saying that he surrounds for many of them in different plays. Thus, in my analyses, I agree with the idea of this author defining only the play Coriolanus in the Renaissance era as I see Coriolanus as a rational man.

In addition, the important feature that remains in Renaissance is the duality between good and bad or light and darkness. The manner of thinking is changing from God (the good and morally acceptable) as the center of the Universe to the human centered (the bad and innovative and unpredictable thought). On the same line, Foucault claims about the History of thoughts saying that to transform a thought is not an instantaneous action but a process:

Establishing discontinuities is not an easy task even for history in general. And it is certainly even less so for the history of thought. We may wish to draw a dividing-line; but any limit we set may use perhaps be no more than an arbitrary division made in a constantly mobile whole. We may wish to mark off a period; but have we the right symmetrical breaks to two points in time in order to give an appearance of continuing a unity to the system we place between them? (50)

Foucault is stating that we cannot reduce thoughts present in History to simple concepts or delimited frontiers because this is not possible, since we receive influences from other eras. Furthermore, Renaissance was marked by the passage from beliefs to reason. During the Medieval Age people were guided by the Church knowledge and commandment, the Catholic

Church God was in the center of the Universe. However, Renaissance was different because men began to refuse mystical influences. Renaissance was the period people fought against “God’s wishes”, Church beliefs and commandments but searching for explanations through reason. Foucault says that the seventeenth century was the age that received from the sixteenth century a “distorted memory of a muddled and distorted body of learning which all things in the world could be linked indiscriminately to men’s experiences, traditions and, or credulities”(51) .

Moreover, Bárbara Heliadora in her thesis *Expressão Dramática do Homem Político em Shakespeare* explores Shakespeare’s influences from ancient and medieval eras. She says that Renaissance in Italy can have this name because it brought out the forgotten ideals and culture from the old Rome. In England that was not possible because it was totally new, there was nothing to resurrect¹ (167). She uses it as bases for her claim about the inheritances that Shakespeare presents in his plays.

... do mesmo modo que ele herdou junto com seus contemporâneos ideias vindas do mundo feudal do qual a Inglaterra emergia no século XVI – mesmo que alteradas e enriquecidas pelo fenômeno renascentista – assim também o teatro profissional para o qual Shakespeare escreveu, preservava inúmeros aspectos medievais, indissociavelmente mesclados a outros, mais recentes, passando todo o conjunto, inclusive, passando por várias transformações em plena época da carreira do poeta.[...](169)

The Medieval Age was characterized by the novels of chivalry which were filled with classical heroes’ characteristics, besides, those aspects in the medieval era they used to travel long distances to save the princess or to defeat the evil, being as courageous as they could, risking their lives if necessary. Those characteristics were influences over Shakespeare’s character as he describes some classical characteristics on Coriolanus which came from the chivalry stories.

Furthermore, Foucault emphasizes rationality as effect of the period of Renaissance. During Renaissance, thought was transformed and what was credulity changed to rationality:

¹ Translation mine

It's no longer sixteenth century thought becoming troubled as it contemplates itself and beginning to jettison its more familiar forms; it is Classical thought excluding resemblance as the fundamental experience and primary form of knowledge, denouncing it as a confused mixture that must be analysed in terms of identity, difference, measurement, and other.(52)

Considering Foucault's words we can see that Europe was the stage of Christianity and man was seen as a product of God whose thought was the perfect and the only acceptable. Caius Martius Coriolanus is a representation of a hero from this period, because he has the duality of the period in his personality "the good (being a man with the values of Christianity and being a son of God) and evil (being a man full of sins and reasonable, living by his own reason)".

In Foucault's exposition in *The Order of Things*, he claims the comparison of the two periods of thought, and explains how to do it in adequate manner to obtain better results:

The comparison of two sizes or two multiplicities requires, in any case, that they both be analysed according to a common unit; so that comparison effected according to measurement is reducible, in every case, to the arithmetical relations of equality and inequality.[...] I can recognize, in effect, what the order is that exists between A and B without considering anything apart from outer two terms'; one cannot know the order of things 'in their isolate nature', but by discovering that which is the simplest, then that which is the next simplest, one can progress inevitably to the most complex things of all. (53)

The comparison between these two eras of different thought can be done analyzing Coriolanus as a hero. Coriolanus' characteristics make him a classical hero and can make him Renaissance one at the same moment. When we talk about knowledge and characteristics, arithmetical proportions are impossible to be used, since, we can analyze facts that occurred during the play in order to show that he is a Renaissance hero with Classical characteristics.

One of these characteristics which Shakespeare received from the sixteenth century is the preoccupation with the popular preferences. During the Medieval Age, dramaturgy was conditioned to the popular preferences built on the bases of the classical drama from the *Mystery and miracles plays*, which were popularized in the medieval England. The *Mystery*

plays were biblical stories played in small stages over wells called “pageants”. Heliadora argues that this kind of drama influences all the modern theater that Shakespeare wrote (169). Analyzing the *Mystery plays* characters we can see that the bible characters are, in general, men with God’s protection because they follow God’s instructions, what can be connected to the classical period when fate determined men’s and women’s lives. A good example of it is David king who was a murderer, but because of his lovable actions was characterized as “The man with god’s heart”². To obey God is the best perfection that men could have in the biblical view, making King David a classical hero in Moisés’ description. This model of character had a good acceptance from the popular realm during the Medieval age and so, as we can see, Shakespeare was influenced by the personality of these characters as he builds his characters. Coriolanus has a strong personality during all the play. His focus and ideal are incorruptible. This characteristic can lead us to the medieval mystery plays characters as Bárbara Heliadora points out (169).

Heliadora also claims that the rhetorical education that Shakespeare had during his life was a very important influence on his plays (178). Furthermore, the education of rhetoric and textual production are traditions on medieval England and later in the sixteenth England. Thus, Shakespeare uses it to construct his character. In my point of view, that is the most relevant aspect of Coriolanus, the way he uses his discourse, as a man thinking about his own ideals and not using leadership skills, just his heart in his mouth. As Heliadora claims about the quality in her work:

A razão e a capacidade de falar eram as qualidades que colocavam o homem acima dos animais (porém abaixo dos anjos) no encadeamento dos seres; a razão e a fala eram ligados aos elementos divinos do homem e, portanto, o treinamento no bom uso desses dons era parte do treinamento adequado para que o indivíduo bem servisse a Deus, que continuava ser a explicativa altamente dominante para a justificativa da presença do homem na terra.

² Bible text extract from the book of Acts 13:22

Shakespeare shows the influences of his rhetoric classes in the thinking of Coriolanus present in his discourse. It is possible to see the Renaissance hero in Coriolanus through the rhetoric Shakespeare provides him, which is used against him during the play configuring an important aspect of his personality.

In addition, honesty is a strong characteristic in Coriolanus present in his discourse too. Foucault, in “A Microfísica do Poder”, claims about this human characteristic and how it is present in humanity.

A noção de ideologia me parece dificilmente utilizável por três razões. A primeira é que, queira-se ou não, ela está sempre em oposição virtual a alguma coisa que seria a verdade. Ora, creio que o problema não é o de fazer a partilha entre o que num discurso revela da cientificidade e da verdade o que revelaria outra coisa; mas de ver historicamente como se reproduzem efeitos de verdade no interior do inconveniente: refere-se necessariamente a alguma coisa como o sujeito. Enfim, a ideologia está em oposição secundária com relação a alguma coisa que deve funcionar para ela como infraestrutura ou determinação econômica, material, etc. (07)

When we analyze this extract of Foucault’s text, it is possible to see the relation among truth, ideology and personality. The ideology of a person would be something related to the subject he/she is and grounded on the other one’s ideology, which is being considered something true. This relation, claimed by Foucault is made by thinking about a human analyzing humanity. Shakespeare brings up this human relation to his character. That is, the ideology of Shakespeare’s character leads the latter to death, because it goes against the truth presented at the time by his executioners.

Nevertheless, the leadership skills of Coriolanus can be analyzed in his acts, the truth presented in his discourse, and the way he presents it to the local people. Niccolò Machiavelli in *The Prince*, claims about politics, advising a prince how to keep power, which can be interpreted how to control people using discourse and a strong hand. Analyzing Coriolanus’ discourse, we can see that his words state for his personality rather than controlling or conquering people. On the cover of Shakespeare’s play, the quotation of Ian McKellen refers directly to his leadership “Coriolanus is a loner, a star: a great warrior, not a great leader.” The leadership of Coriolanus is one of his human characteristics. Coriolanus is a leader as

Achilles is in the Troy War. Both of them are leaders who lead the people and the army with the truth of their hearts in their discourses and actions.

Chapter 3

Analysis

3.1. The myth, the classical Hero

“Classical” or “Epic Hero” is a common expression as studies about literature and many other culture expressions to describe a kind of hero which has the ability to do things that no other man could do. The common definition says that “heroes” are those who save people from death or the devil. This definition is not incorrect at all, it is normally true because normally heroes are known because of their brave acts which have saved or brought happiness to someone. The acts of braveness are done by the classical heroes for their own desire, because they are good and inherent in their perspective. The classical or epic hero has something different: they are demigods or have magical powers flowing in their bloods. They are incorruptible in their values (honesty, loyalty, love, hating bad action, and everything which is not lawful and righteous). In this chapter, some famous classical heroes will be cited as bases for the arguments which show the thesis on Coriolanus, Shakespeare’s hero, as a Renaissance hero with classical characteristics in his personality, as seen in his actions.

As seen above, the word “hero” is related to “demigod”, or son of god. The epic heroes were normally the alliance between gods and humans. In literature, many characters with this characteristic have appeared in time. The first ones we know appeared in the ancient Greece Homer³ with Odysseus and Achilles⁴, or even in the Greek mythology with Heracles the son of Zeus and a mortal woman. Along the eras, this definition changed in some points. Classical heroes are not more only “demigods” but they also have magical powers or their faith in God who assumes the role as their leader. For instance, Beowulf is considered a classical hero but he is not a son of god, but according to the epic poem, he is equipped with a magical sword called *Hrunting* as the sword “Excalibur” of king Arthur’s legend. In the Medieval age, we had another definition related to Gods, at that age the classical hero had the direct protection of the Christian God and Jesus Christ as we can see in the saga of Galahad, one classical hero of “The Chronicles of Arthur” ,who were carried to heaven like the bible tells

³ The author of the poems *The Iliad* and *The Odyssey* in which, both, have classical heroes as protagonists, Achilles and Odysseus (or Ulysses in the Roman myth).

⁴ Heroes present in the poems by Homer *The Odyssey* and *The Iliad*.

about the prophets Elijah and Enoch who existed in the ancient time. Moreover, all the classical heroes have the same characteristic when we talk about values, they are incorruptible. The classical heroes were focused on their beliefs and fate, fighting until death (if necessary) to conquer their honorable objectives. They served the gods, they served love, they served the fatherland, or even the honor of the family⁵, in other words, acts which must be done for law and justice. The character of the classical hero is perfect, no flaws, no corruption, no imperfections, no tendencies to evil, they are the perfect character of honesty and loyalty; men who were examples to be followed by other men.

⁵ We can remember Achilles here, his proudness and the vengeance desire against Hector for killing Patroclus, considered by some as the former's companion.

3.2 The man, the Renaissance hero

The other kind of hero we analyze in this monograph is the Renaissance hero. The Renaissance hero is different than the classical one in terms of origin. Renaissance heroes are humans and they have all the characteristics of a human being, not a demigod as the classical kind. According to Michel Foucault., they are the deconstruction of the perfection character present in the classical heroes. They have the same characteristics a man would have, weakness, fear, desires, mistakes in their actions and tendency to do dishonorable and “bad” actions. Coriolanus is one example of this kind of hero because he is not a demigod and has no magic powers, he is a common man with some characteristics of the classical heroes as presented above.

During *Coriolanus*, it is possible to see that the problems Caius Martius has are caused by his imprudence, proudness and for his love for the fatherland and its government. As Foucault claims in *The Order of the Things*, during Renaissance people became reasonable and started giving value to their intelligence, feelings and ideals (52). Foucault uses as example Don Quixote de la Mancha, which is the character of his example to the fears of this era, a man considered insane, although he was just a man following his ideals. Don Quixote is a character who wanted to follow his ideals and ideas as an individual that he was in a period in which it was not considered something “normal”; however, he was free to be the unpredictable man he was. He lived his adventures searching for values such as honor and glory, copying the chivalry stories he used to read but in an unreal world created in his mind. So, Don Quixote and Coriolanus are Renaissance heroes because they are not demigods but men under the conditions of human limitations.

Moreover, Foucault’s arguments are a complement for Gracian’s arguments when he claims about Renaissance heroes. However, in Gracian’s conception there are no Renaissance heroes, rather, he claims about the classical hero as the only kind of hero. He discusses about the lack of braveness of Don Quixote as a human characteristic which makes him not be a hero.

...falta ao Don Quixote um pouco mais de coragem: renunciar não só a suas extravagâncias, mas a ideia de real que o mantém no solo como os cascos de seu cavalo “que nunca deixaram a terra”, e que, dentro de outras coisas, causaram-lhe a loucura, uma vez que Don Quixote aplica a sua concepção de real aos objetos de preferência escolhidos em sua imaginação solitária. (188)

According to Gracian, Don Quixote is not a hero because he is not brave enough to face the real world he is in. He prefers to escape from reality to live in the “perfect” world he created to be what he himself desired. Although Don Quixote is classified as a Renaissance hero by Foucault, he is brave enough to do what is necessary, but insane as much as a normal man could be considered by his contemporaries. Cervantes’ character is the example of the reconstruction of the epic perfect hero, he has the qualities of a hero and the imprecations of a man.

To sum up, the difference between the classical hero and the Renaissance one is the magical origin of the epic hero and the natural human acts and reason of the Renaissance one. Achilles was emerged from the Styx River to be invulnerable as gods, whereas Don Quixote is a man who had read very much and decided to become a hero according to his reason and ideals. Renaissance heroes are as Don Quixote, they have problems during their journey because of their own mistakes and imperfections as we are going to see in Coriolanus’ journey.

3.3.1. The Rise:

Dark and shining star: Coriolanus, the Roman hero

Caius Martius is the hero of Shakespeare's play *Coriolanus*. He is a Renaissance hero according to the definitions presented by Massaud Moisés in *Dicionário de Termos Literários* and Baltazar Gracian as exposed by Clément Rosset in *A Antinatureza*. The character is located in the ancient Rome recreated by Shakespeare in the sixteenth century. Caius Martius' behaviors are presented in the definition for Renaissance heroes and, also, classical in some acts at the same moment. During the play, he is unpredictable in his acts. This fact makes him wander between the Renaissance and classical heroes definitions. Caius Martius' participation in the play can be divided in three moments: The rise, the fall, and the new rise.

The personality of Martius is very strong and strict, as we analyze his acts and beliefs. Martius is a man whose ideals are straight and severe. He believes and exposes that the Roman plebeians are the "worms" of Roman society, as they do not fight for Rome and as they are always complaining about the decision the senators make about the management of the Empire. He is not an enemy of the plebeians but he defends the Senate because he is a patriotic man who wants the best for Rome. Coriolanus is an aristocratic which can be considered a Mannerist characteristic. He believes in the management of the Senate. He also believes that his own people do not think about Rome, they are worried just about their personal necessities. This is a very strong characteristic of Martius'. Being severe in his beliefs makes him an honest man who defends all his thoughts clearly. Thus, he is not worried about the way they talk about him, and he defends his ideals without worrying about the manner the plebeians receive it. Martius has a lack of "silk words", as Gracian claims about the way heroes use their discourse, and makes him a man that does not take people's admiration. He is a man that follows his heart, and "his heart is his mouth"(71).

Although Caius does not please people, he becomes a hero for Rome when he defeats the Volcians' Army, one of the enemies of Rome. This is the first important moment in the play, when Martius wins the battle against the Volcians in their territory. Caius Martius defeats the Volcians in a battle in front of the Corioli (the Volcians capital) gates. Defending his mother land bravely provides him a characteristic of a classical hero. He is brave enough and he is not afraid of dying to protect his land. Martius fights bravely in this battle entering the city alone and defeating the Volcians' commander, Tullius Aufidius. At this moment in the

play, he is similar to Achilles when he goes to Troy gates to face Hector to defend his honor. Both go alone guided by their courage and pride.

COMINIUS

Too modest are you;
More cruel to your good report than grateful
To us that give you truly: by your patience,
If 'gainst yourself you be incensed, we'll put you,
Like one that means his proper harm, in manacles,
Then reason safely with you. Therefore, be it known,
As to us, to all the world, that Caius Marcius
Wears this war's garland: in token of the which,
My noble steed, known to the camp, I give him,
With all his trim belonging; and from this time,
For what he did before Corioli, call him,
With all the applause and clamour of the host,
CAIUS MARCIUS CORIOLANUS! Bear
The addition nobly ever!

Flourish. Trumpets sound, and drums (32)

Thus, because of this brave act, Cominius, a Roman general, gives him the cognomen Coriolanus for his deeds in the battle, and he gains the gratitude of the plebeians (however they keep distrusting him) and of the Senate. Thus, Caius Martius becomes Caius Martius Coriolanus and he rises as the Roman hero. Although he receives another title, he keeps the same personality, defending the same ideals as strong as he had defended before it.

3.3.2. The Fall

Moreover, to defend his ideals Caius Martius Coriolanus is inconsequent. He keeps his thoughts and expresses them offending and being disrespected by his people. This characteristic of his personality leads him to be a target for those who wanted his place. In consequence of his brave deeds in Corioli, he is indicated to be a Roman consul but he needs to convince the plebeians to vote for him. Coriolanus is convinced by Volumnia (his mother) to use “silk words” (GRACIAN, 1973) and apologize the plebeians in his discourse. At this moment it is possible to see how unpredictable he is, he forces himself and talks to people conquering their vote. But, he is more unpredictable in the following moments. Brutus and Sicinius, two tribunes plot against Coriolanus to get the position of Consul in his place. They

use the severity and the pride of Coriolanus against him. They claim that Coriolanus does not like the people and despises them all and because of it he is traitor of Rome. At the moment Coriolanus listen to that, he burns out and brings up his hidden beliefs. Again, his unpredictability comes up, and he is treated as a betrayal to Rome and exiled as punishment.

SICINIUS

For that he has,
As much as in him lies, from time to time
Envied against the people, seeking means
To pluck away their power, as now at last
Given hostile strokes, and that not in the presence
Of dreaded justice, but on the ministers
That do distribute it; in the name o' the people
And in the power of us the tribunes, we,
Even from this instant, banish him our city,
In peril of precipitation
From off the rock Tarpeian never more
To enter our Rome gates: i' the people's name,
I say it shall be so. (85)

This is the moment his star gets dark. To follow his ideals, the Roman hero is reduced to a Roman traitor. At this moment, Coriolanus becomes a Renaissance hero because he could not control rationalize and because of it he falls from his position.

3.3.3. The new Rise

Although, in the third Coriolanus' modification, the hero comes up again as a phoenix from the ashes, and saves Rome from destruction by the price of his life. Looking for vengeance, Coriolanus goes to the Volcians Army and turns himself into their allied against Rome. He was well accepted by Tullius Aufidius, the army general, because of his honor and manhood. Aufidius provides Coriolanus a commanding position, thus starts his vengeance by destroying Rome in each battle. Coriolanus has an imminent victory on his hands when his mother, Volumnia, convinces him not to destroy his own people for a personal vengeance.

CORIOLANUS

O mother, mother!
What have you done? Behold, the heavens do ope,
The gods look down, and this unnatural scene
They laugh at. O my mother, mother! O!
You have won a happy victory to Rome;
But, for your son,--believe it, O, believe it,

Most dangerously you have with him prevail'd,
If not most mortal to him. But, let it come.
Aufidius, though I cannot make true wars,
I'll frame convenient peace. Now, good Aufidius,
Were you in my stead, would you have heard
A mother less? or granted less, Aufidius?

AUFIDIUS

I was moved withal. (125)

Caius Martius is unpredictable and meets the application of his mother. He stops his strikes and signs for peace agreement with Rome. For saving Rome, he is considered a hero, although for the Volcians he is a traitor and he is murdered when he goes back to the Volcians' Army. It is possible to see that the reason in Coriolanus is the most outstanding characteristic he has. He was blind for vengeance, although he was reasonable enough to see that the destruction of his own people was not the solution for a personal problem. Saving Rome is the important view about his personality which was worthy for a hero, dying for his people and not only for his ideals and desires as classical heroes would do.

Thus, it is possible to divide the hero life in the play in three distinct moments, the rise the fall and the new rise. During these three moments it is also possible to see characteristics of a Renaissance hero and classical one. By the analyzes of Coriolanus' attitudes during these moments it is possible to affirm that Coriolanus is a Renaissance hero because of his unpredictability and his reason full of classical characteristics of a classical hero as I present in the next chapters.

3.4 The heroes' lion heart, the braveness and honor hunt

Braveness is the first word that comes to our minds when we think about the word "hero". That is not a surprise when we take the simplest definition of "hero" which says that "hero" is a man whose deeds over performs the capacity of a human being. To complete the quests, heroes must equip themselves with an unshaken courage and delete from their minds the fear of death. This braveness is seen in Coriolanus during the play all the time, however, to this analyzes I chose just one to represent it. I chose the passage responsible for this last name, the title of Coriolanus, the moment he faces an entire army inside the walls of the enemy city. That deed was very similar to Beowulf's when he faces the monster Grendel. This comparison is one of the arguments that builds the conversion of Coriolanus into Classical hero and Renaissance Hero.

In *Coriolanus*, Act 1, Rome discovers that the Volcians are in arms to attack Rome led by Tullius Aufidius, the Volcians' commander. Coriolanus, who is still only Caius Martius, is the biggest enemy of Aufidius, however, there is a mutual admiration between the two because of their courage and honor. So, Caius Martius prepare the army to attack the Volcians first and goes to the gates of Coriolis, the capital of the Volcians. At this moment we have the most outstanding feature of Caius Martius in the whole play. Alone he invades the city and faces Aufidius and defeats him one more time (he had already done it before the play). The gates of the city were closed when he was entering and, after the fight against Aufidius, Caius Martius fights against a whole army and escapes from Coriolis using the front door. In order to congratulate Caius Martius, he receives the name of Coriolanus from Rome for the deed in Coriolis.

Coriolanus' great braveness and his lack of fear makes him does acts like the one he did in Coriolis. Acts considered beyond the capacity of other normal man, an act clapped by the Gods makes Coriolanus a hero for Rome. But, the most impressive act is that he offered himself to go because his enemy would be there. He looked for the fight even though it could cost his life, because he knew the power of his opponent, and admired him. The courage of Caius Martius is proved in his name, now, Caius Martius Coriolanus. Because of his courage he was able to save Rome against the Volcians' strike, and gains honor for his name and in the title of consul.

It is important to mention that the courage can be considered a common characteristic when we talk about Classical or Renaissance heroes. However, the braveness present in Coriolanus can lead us to consider it a classical characteristic when we compare his actions to Beowulf. When Beowulf knew that there was a monster attacking and terrifying the kingdom of Scandinavia, equipped with his braveness, he traveled towards it to offer himself to battle against the monster Grendel and save the land. The characteristic of the two heroes are the same, both of them were able to face death and survive to receive the desirable honor. Nevertheless, Coriolanus kept the consul title for a short period he got it, as Beowulf in some years became the king of Scandinavia. That is a characteristic that Baltazar Gracian claims when he says that “o herói possui a arte de aproveitar ocasiões mediante uma técnica que não da previsão, mas da intuição da oportunidade no momento em que esta se apresenta” (189). Both heroes enjoyed the opportunities they had and used it in the best way they could.

In summary, the acts present in Coriolanus and Beowulf proves the hero definition by Gracian as we can see in the following passage:

... o herói é aquele que não tem medo, não só dos espectros, mas sobre tudo de um imaginário “real” – real que poderia destruir a construção artificial das aparências; o herói é o cavaleiro sem medo e sem censuras que aprecia a aparência ilimitadamente (188).

The acts of the heroes happened due to the fact that they did have enough braveness to execute the acts they needed, and conquer the honor they chased. So, those are the characteristics which move the great part of heroes to conquer and battle what is necessary for their love, fatherland, or honor. This braveness without fear is a feeling of the classical heroes, the feeling which makes them put the honor, the fatherland, the love in first place above their life.

3.5 “The fault is not in the stars, it is in my mind”, the birth of a Renaissance hero

Caius Martius is also a Renaissance hero. During the play, Coriolanus changes his mind and he is not able to control his feelings, and he changes his actions to move against his primary ideal, that was to defend Rome against all its enemies. He used to believe in Rome and in its governing crew, but when he feels betrayed he changes it and looks for vengeance against his own people. The classical heroes follow their ideal to the last consequences, but Coriolanus' behavior is deviant from the linearity of the classical hero, making him a Renaissance hero.

Coriolanus focused in protecting Rome during the first part of the play. He is ready to defend Rome with all the forces he has. His courage and his braveness are result of his belief and love for Rome, he is ready to die protecting his country.

Those are they
That most are willing. If any such be here--
As it were sin to doubt--that love this painting
Wherein you see me smear'd; if any fear
Lesser his person than an ill report;
If any think brave death outweighs bad life
And that his country's dearer than himself;
Let him alone, or so many so minded,
Wave thus, to express his disposition,
And follow Marcius.[...] (Act 1, Part.6, 28)

In Caius Martius' discourse, it is possible to see that he is moved by the love he maintains for Rome, he is ready and able to put the country over him and destroy all who try to put the country in a submissive position. This feeling leads him to face the Volcians alone, inside the Corioli city walls and he becomes the hero of Rome.

Although he is the Rome hero, he is betrayed by his people after he saved them from destruction that would come from the hands of the Volcians. He is exiled by Rome accused of betrayal. After he becomes a consul, he cannot control his words against the plebeians he believed were not thankful with Rome and were the ruin of the City. Brutus and Sicinius, two tribunes elected by the plebeians, use his words against him and accused him of being a betrayal:

The fires I' th' lowest hell fold-in the people!
Call me their traitor! Thou injurious tribune!

Within thine eyes sat twenty thousand deaths,
In thy hands clutched as many millions, in
Thy lying tongue both numbers, I would say
'Thou liest' unto thee with a voice as free
As I do pray the gods.

The furious soldier takes his heart after being called traitor by the tribunes and then by the plebeians. He is exiled for that, and hurt by his people, he searches and claims for vengeance against the country he loves.

In order to execute his vengeance, Coriolanus meets his enemy Tullius Aufidius, the commandant of the Volscian army, and joins them to destroy Rome. At this moment we have the deviation of the classical hero in Coriolanus. The character is clearly hurt for being called “traitor” after having risked his life many times fighting for Rome and defending it. His resentment is a human reaction, he feels betrayed by his country. His love and his worship for Rome are broken and his ideal does not exist anymore, he wants, now, to destroy the ones he loved. The normal linearity of the classical hero is unexpectedly corrupted, turning his classical characteristic into a Renaissance one.

Moreover, the deviation of the linearity of a classical hero can be seen when we compare Coriolanus to Galahad⁶ presented in Alfred Lord Tennyson's poem *Sir Galahad*. Galahad is a hero involved in Arthur's chronicles. He is one of the knights of the Round Table. Galahad, in Tennyson's poem, is a pure man, the only one who was capable to see the Holy Grail. To find the holy artifact he sacrificed all his life, becoming a pure man:

How sweet are looks that ladies bend
On whom their favours fall!
For them I battle till the end,
To save from shame and thrall:
But all my heart is drawn above,
My knees are bow'd in crypt and shrine:
I never felt the kiss of love,
Nor maiden's hand in mine.
More bounteous aspects on me beam,
Me mightier transports move and thrill;
So keep I fair thro' faith and prayer
A virgin heart in work and will. (13–24)

⁶ There are many stories with Galahad as a main character, however I have chosen Tennyson's approach because he can simple represent the focus for my analyzes.

Galahad was ready to face everything necessary for his ideal, be the one who would feel the Holy Grail in his hands. After being hurt Coriolanus turned his heart against his first ideal, something that nothing or nobody could do with Galahad.

In conclusion, Coriolanus can be characterized as a Renaissance hero because he is not linear in his goals during the play. That is, he does not follow the model that would go against himself for the cause. This characteristic can be emphasized in his last act that is to save Rome against the Volcians, as he changes his objectives once more. As a human creature, a man, he claims vengeance for being hurt by those he loves.

3.6 “His mouth is his heart” – Menenius

Coriolanus is an honest and honorable man who follows his values. His discourse is one of the most outstanding characteristic as a hero under the condition of a man. During the play, it is noticeable the way his uncontrolled arrogance speaks instead of his mind and mouth. Because of this, Coriolanus is not appreciated when speaking to the plebeians, although he is honest and straight in his discourse. As a matter of fact, Caius Martius' lack of care and control made him a betrayal for those who had the ability of using discourse as a tool to control people, Brutus and Sicinius.

The discourse and the ways to use it is an important ability to control people. At this point, it is possible to mediate about *The Prince* by Nicolò Machiavelli. In this work, Machiavelli accepts and advises princes to gain (or keep) such as glory and survive. The author of the work says that princes can use immoral means to achieve some objectives such as glory and survival.

The character is not able to use Machiavelli's advice in his discourse because as Volumnia said “His mouth is his heart”. He is focused in his belief; he does not care for any consequence that can come against him. In the apex of the play, the hero must lie and be polite so the people vote for him to be a consul and he can do it:

CORIOLANUS

Most sweet voices!
Better it is to die, better to starve,
Than crave the hire which first we do deserve.
Why in this woolvish toge should I stand here,
To beg of Hob and Dick, that do appear,
Their needless vouches? Custom calls me to't:
What custom wills, in all things should we do't,
The dust on antique time would lie unswept,
And mountainous error be too highly heapt
For truth to o'er-peer. Rather than fool it so,
Let the high office and the honour go
To one that would do thus. I am half through;
The one part suffer'd, the other will I do.

Re-enter three Citizens more

Here come more voices.
Your voices: for your voices I have fought;

Watch'd for your voices; for Your voices bear
Of wounds two dozen odd; battles thrice six
I have seen and heard of; for your voices have
Done many things, some less, some more your voices:
Indeed I would be consul. (54)

Doing a big effort he can tell the people he needs them and he wants to be their “friend”. This act is well accepted by the people and he became a consul conquering the glory as Machiavelli said, however it had to be.

However, the plebeians were instigated by Brutus and Sicinius, the tribunes of the plebeians. They intended to change the vote so that the plebeians voted against Coriolanus. After that, Coriolanus could not control himself and spoke against the plebeians:

SICINIUS

Where is this viper
That would depopulate the city and
Be every man himself?

MENENIUS

You worthy tribunes,--

SICINIUS

He shall be thrown down the Tarpeian rock
With rigorous hands: he hath resisted law,
And therefore law shall scorn him further trial
Than the severity of the public power
Which he so sets at nought.

First Citizen

He shall well know
The noble tribunes are the people's mouths,
And we their hands. (71)

In this scene, it is possible to see the power relation which involved the Rome society, directly linked to the way influential people used their discourses. Using them, Sicinius and Brutus convinced people to change their minds to vote against Coriolanus. The relationship between the tribunes and Coriolanus is a matter of power. The three characters desired honor and glory in becoming a consul, since that position could bring them. They fought using discourse as a gun to reach people and conquer the desirable position. As opponents, their discourses are

characterized by differences. The tribunes lie and dissimulate if necessary, while Coriolanus cannot hide his heart in his mouth.

In addition, Coriolanus is exiled because of his lack of “silk words”. Gracian points out the ability to use the discourse as an indispensable characteristic of a hero. However Coriolanus does not have it, and it characterizes a flaw in the hero, exposing his human side. In addition, this flaw is the responsible for Coriolanus’ ruin. He cannot control his heart and speaks to the plebeians his real thoughts about them.

CORIOLANUS

The fires i' the lowest hell fold-in the people!
Call me their traitor! Thou injurious tribune!
Within thine eyes sat twenty thousand deaths,
In thy hand clutch'd as many millions, in
Thy lying tongue both numbers, I would say
'Thou liest' unto thee with a voice as free
As I do pray the gods. (84)

[...]

I know no further:
Let them pronounce the steep Tarpeian death,
Vagabond exile, raving, pent to linger
But with a grain a day, I would not buy
Their mercy at the price of one fair word;
Nor cheque my courage for what they can give,
To have't with saying 'Good morrow.'

Coriolanus’ thoughts are not pleasant to people whom he judges as vagabonds and dishonorable because they are not like him, they do not fight for Rome. After Coriolanus burst out, he is exiled as a consequence for his lack of a pleasant discourse, lack of control, however, he did nothing against people or Rome, just targeted against them the words from his heart.

To sum up, Coriolanus’ discourse is an outstanding mark of his personality. He talks with his arrogance, instead of using reason before the people. This characteristic cannot be related to only one kind of hero, since Achilles, Beowulf and Galahad speak according to their beliefs and their society accepts them as honorable for that. Thus, the discourse used is a characteristic that depends on the social context. In Rome, to express arrogance is not

acceptable if it is not pleasant to others. So, this is one of Coriolanus' flaws and, in his social context, makes him a Renaissance hero.

3.7 “Only Spartan women can rise real Spartan men”:

The woman’s role in the creation of the hero

Women’s upbringing is one of the most important factors in the creation of a mighty man of value in the ancient time. Besides, the education of the children was normally a responsibility of the mother in the age of ancient Rome. This education used to give the woman the obligation, by the society, of creating a strong and honored man, a man who must have an idealism, virtues and incorruptible values. Coriolanus’ mother was the responsible for a great part of his formation as a hero. During the process of Coriolanus’ upbringing, Volumnia had the opportunity to pass him much of her ambition and pride which are visible in his attitudes when adult.

Volumnia’s upbringing makes Coriolanus a proud man who is ready to die defending his ideals. Coriolanus got the ideals passed by his mother as the pride of being a Roman. His commitment of defending his republic is one of the effects of his upbringing process. Coriolanus’ ideal is based on the defending of the Roman Republic. As a matter of fact, during the play, he defends the Roman patricians as the responsible for the greatness of Rome. This ideal was passed by his mother during his raise as we can see in the words he says when he is asked to apologize his action for the plebeians who he had offended while he was defending the patricians:

CORIOLANUS.

I muse my mother

Does not approve me further, who was wont

To call them woolen vassals, things created

To buy and sell with grouts; to show bare heads

In congregations, to yawn, be still, and wonder,

When one but of my ordinance stood up

To speak of peace or war.

[Enter VOLUMNIA.]

I talk of you: [To Volumnia.]

Why did you wish me milder? Would you have me

False to my nature? Rather say, I play

The man I am. (Act 1, Part.3, 12)

During his discourse, he can remember his mother's exact words that can show how strong she was, when he listened to her during his youth. In addition, how impressed he is that she does not agree with his attitude because she had taught it to him.

Moreover, his words were very strong when he speaks about his nature. He expresses the knowledge he received from his mother. In contrast to Coriolanus's discourse, we can see Volumnia speaking about the pride of defending Rome and her preference for the dead's honorable death for his country in a battle than out of action:

VOLUMNIA.

Then his good report should have been my son; I therein would have found issue. Hear me profess sincerely, if had I a dozen sons, each in my love alike, and none less dear than thine and my good Martius, I had rather had eleven die nobly for their country than one voluptuously surfeit out of action. (Act I.3, 12)

Coriolanus' mother is very straight in her ideals and Coriolanus is similar her at this point. He has the same focus on his point of view that his mother has, thus, he cannot apologize to the plebeians because he would do something incorrect in his opinion. The ideal and the focus on it are an intrinsic characteristic of a hero and point to Coriolanus as something that comes from his mother.

The influence of Volumnia is explicit during all the play but it has his apex when she asks him for an accord with the Volces and he forgets his vengeance because of her demand:

VOLUMNIA.

Nay, go not from us thus.
If it were so that our request did tend
To save the Romans, thereby to destroy
The Volsces whom you serve, you might condemn us,
As poisonous of your honors: no; our suit
Is that you reconcile them: while the Volsces
May say 'This mercy we have show'd,' the Romans
'This we receiv'd,' and each in either side
Give the all-hail to thee, and cry, 'Be bless'd
For making up this peace!' Thou know'st, great son,
The end of war's uncertain; but this certain,
That, if thou conquer Rome, the benefit
Which thou shalt thereby reap is such a name
Whose repetition will be dogg'd with curses;
Whose chronicle thus writ: The man was noble,...
(SHAKESPEARE, 2011, V.3, pg. 105)

He accepts her begging and shows that he knows the risks of his action when he talks to Aufidius. Because of his action he dies, and he knew that it could happen because he is a warrior and knows that he was not abdicating not only his vengeance but also the spoils of war, and more meaningful than all, the possibility of the Volces defeat Rome forever.

Furthermore, the influence of the family, specifically the mother, is a classical characteristic present in Achilles also seen in Coriolanus' upbringing. Achilles is a demigod (classical hero) son of Thetis, a nymph, and Peleus, a mortal man. According to the myth told by Publius Papinius Statius, Thetis did not accept the idea of having a mortal son, so she emerged him in the Stige River giving him invulnerability, but in the heel where she held him. There is a second version told by Apollonius of Rhodes⁷, which says that the nymph blessed Achilles with ambrosia and held him over the fire to burn his mortal parts, but she was stopped by Peleus. Hence, she was the responsible for Achilles invulnerability, she was the responsible for the creation of a classical hero, because it was the first action of a sequence linked directly with it. Achilles is proud, brave and a great warrior because she made him invulnerable like Volumnia did with Coriolanus, giving him the characteristics of a classical hero in his upbringing.

Summing up, Volumnia was the most responsible for the formation of Coriolanus as a hero as Thetis was the most responsible for Achilles'. Volumnia had the power over his upbringing during his youth. She led him to have the ideal of defending Rome against everyone who represented damage to his nation. Because of her great praise for the honor and the warrior's glory she could improve his warrior abilities. In the last scene she appears, she confesses her participation in his creation and that she really wanted to make him an honorable warrior who would have his name forever in history "VOLUMNIA: Thou art my warrior; I help to frame thee..." (V.3,115). She clearly says that she wanted to do what she did. She really wanted to make him a hero.

⁷ **Apollonius or Apollonius of Rhodes** (Alexandria, c. 295 BC. - Alexandria, 230 BC.) was a poet of the ancient Greece, author of *The Argonauts*, it was told for the first time in Rhodes, that's the reason of his last name.

Chapter 4

Conclusion

As it was shown previously in Chapter 3, the hero of Shakespeare's play analyzed here is presented as being someone who converges kinds of characteristics presented in literature due to his actions and personality he assumes in the play. Coriolanus has in himself characteristics of the classical heroes and those associated to the Renaissance heroes. Such analysis gives the reader the view of a specific kind of hero. Coriolanus is a hero who is reasonable as a man, although he is led by his arrogance, and, for his courage and fearlessness, a myth among the human beings as classical heroes. Those characteristics shaped his personality and his attitudes, differing him from other heroes of past in culture.

Regarding this point, and considering the change of attitudes Coriolanus assumes during the play, we perceive that in the situations which are presented to us in this specific play, a particular definition of the hero is only possible by the time the play was written by the author and not by the characteristics or attitudes Coriolanus performs. This occurs as we can notice that he has three different moments in the play. In the first, he is the hero of Rome after he had defeated the Volcians alone, the second moment is when he is treated as a hero by the people, and the last moment he turns back to the hero position at his sacrifice. Living these three different moments, Coriolanus acts adequately to each one of them.

Moreover, he passes by transformation according to the moment he is living. This adaptation makes Coriolanus unpredictable, which is a strong characteristic of the Renaissance period marked by the liberty of thinking people assumed searching for explanations on the Universe. Thus, rationality is a characteristic present in Shakespeare's hero. Coriolanus does not act based only on his arrogance but also on his reason. As any other man, he changes opinions, as well as the way he acts and, when necessary, takes on the exile and consequently a new nation to fight for. Thus, Coriolanus is a Renaissance hero because he is a man of Renaissance, capable to think, act and react the way he wishes, in the same way Don Quixote does after his journey for his ideals. Both characters act by their own reason and do not care for God's point of view or any other supernatural influence.

Furthermore, this hero is considered a Renaissance hero because of the lack of linearity of the play, the acts, and characteristics of Coriolanus can be compared to other classical heroes' attitudes as examples in literature of his classical characteristics are

concerned. Coriolanus acquired his lack of fear and his pride of being a warrior from his mother in the same way Achilles did his invulnerability by the hands of his mother. He also has the determination and loyalty Galahad had to conquer his objectives. In addition, he has the courage and braveness to apply himself to fight for glory and honor as Beowulf did in his story. Such characteristics expose him not as a simple Renaissance hero, but also a classical one at the same moment.

To confirm this perspective, the perspective of the influence that Shakespeare lived in the writing of the play is crucial. As pointed, Shakespeare received influence from the chivalry stories from Medieval age. The chivalry characters were Christian, incorporating aspects of the classical heroes. They were led and had their destinies defined by the Christian God's purposes. We can also see that he also located his play in the ancient Rome which was polytheistic and people believed to have their lives controlled by the gods' will. Although, Shakespeare received these influences, he also was a man of his age. The thought of Renaissance age was being spread throughout Europe.

After the analyses of Coriolanus' personal characteristics and the attitudes he assumes in the play shown in the comparison with other heroes' attitudes and characteristics of both kinds of heroes' definitions, classical and Renaissance, it is possible to conclude that Coriolanus cannot be defined as only one kind of hero, but he can be defined as a convergence of the two kinds, Renaissance and classical ones.

BIBIOPGRAPHICAL REFERENCE

CANDIDO, Antonio et al. *A Personagem de Ficção*. Editora Perspectiva. 11^a, São Paulo Edição. Pp 53-80.

FOUCAULT, Michel. *The Order of Things*. Vintage books, New York. 1994.

_____. *A microfísica do poder*. Edições Graal, Rio de Janeiro. 1979.

HEANEY, Seamus. *Beowulf*. USA: Norton, 2000.

HELIODORA, Bárbara. *Expressão do Homem Político em Shakespeare*. Paz e Terra, Rio de Janeiro 1978.

MAQUIAVEL, Nicolau. *O Príncipe*. UnB, Brasília. 1992.

MARTIN, John Jeffries. *The Renaissance: between myth and history*. In Martin, John Jeffries (ed). *The Renaissance: Italy and abroad. Rewriting Histories*. Routledge, 2003. pp. 1-25

MOISÉS, Massaud. *Dicionário de Termos Literários*. Cultrix, São Paulo, 1974.

CADEMARTORI, Ligia. *Períodos literários*. 2 ed. São Paulo: Ática, 1986.

HAUSER, Arnold. *História social da literatura e da arte*. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2000.

BLOOM, Harold. *Shakespeare: a invenção do humano*. Rio de Janeiro: Objetiva, 2000.

NAGLE, Betty Rose. *The Silvae of Statius*. Indiana University Press, 2004, pp. 1-31

SHAKESPEARE, William. *Coriolanus*. Penguin Group, Penguin. London, 2005.

ROSSET, Clément. *A Antinatureza*. Ed. Espaço e Tempo, Rio de Janeiro, 1973.

TENNYSON, Alfred Lord: Wordsworth Poetry Library, 1994. *The Works of Alfred Lord Tennyson*. Present in: <http://www.lib.rochester.edu/camelot/Galahad.htm>