

Shakespeare's Theory of International Relations

Shakespeare's Theory of International Relations

*Diplomacy, Romance,
and Aesthetics*

By

William M. Hawley

**Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing**



Shakespeare's Theory of International Relations:
Diplomacy, Romance, and Aesthetics

By William M. Hawley

This book first published 2022

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2022 by William M. Hawley

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-5275-8586-7

ISBN (13): 978-1-5275-8586-7

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments	vi
Introduction	vii
Chapter 1	1
<i>Cymbeline: An Unexpected Song of Peace</i>	
Chapter 2	24
<i>Pericles: Ethical and Metaphysical Dances</i>	
Chapter 3	45
The Moral Architecture of IR Theory: <i>The Tempest</i>	
Chapter 4	67
The Ephemeral Art of IR Theory: <i>The Winter's Tale</i>	
Chapter 5	91
<i>The Two Noble Kinsmen: The Art of an Unethical Global System</i>	
Chapter 6	113
IR Theory in Shakespearean and Renaissance Drama	
Chapter 7	136
Coda: Shakespeare's IR Debt to Christopher Marlowe	
Conclusion.....	148
Appendix A	154
Notes.....	156
Bibliography.....	168
Index.....	178

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Malta University Press kindly allowed me to revise completely “Peace, Prestige, and Prediction: *Cymbeline* as Hermeneutics and IR Theory,” published in *The European Mind: Narratives and Identity*, vol. 2 of 2, edited by Henry Frendo, Msida, Malta, 2010, which appears in its present form as Chapter 1: *Cymbeline*, An Unexpected Song of Peace. Philosopher Brayton Polka and the other panelists offered especially keen insights at the ISSEI *The European Legacy* conference hosted expertly by the University of Malta.

Thanks are due as well to the 2011 Comparative Drama Conference in Playa Vista (Los Angeles), California, for permitting me to present my essay, “Anti-Orientalism in *Antony and Cleopatra* and *The Blind Beggar of Alexandria*.” My remarks at the event hosted by Loyola Marymount University marked the beginning of my thinking about Chapter 6 in its present form.

Cover Image:

Giovanni Bellini’s *Allegoria Sacra* shows an East-West diplomatic encounter resembling those depicted in Shakespeare’s romances. Although the painting is replete with symbolism, it presents the first realistic landscape in Renaissance art. Bellini’s scene thus corresponds on a natural level to the realist diplomacy in the playwright’s romances. The chessboard pattern on the terrace at center suggests as well the abstract and analytical components underpinning Shakespeare’s theory of international relations. *Image courtesy of the Uffizi Gallery.*

INTRODUCTION

This is the first book to treat William Shakespeare's romances as international relations (IR) theory plays of the highest artistic merit. In presenting the peaceful foreign policy aspirations of diverse states, the romances stage variations on IR theory that necessarily entail the values of philosophical aesthetics. For Shakespeare develops not only the prevailing Renaissance notion of IR classical realism, but he arranges the dramatic action into coherent aesthetic patterns validating some modern concepts about the nature of interstate relations. Shakespeare regards states as being autonomous actors in a relatively anarchic global system, an insight that prevails for good or ill over Renaissance utopian visions of peaceful coexistence abroad.

Shakespeare's IR theory is founded upon "commonsense realism," to cite Hilary Putnam's overarching pragmatic philosophy in order to describe standard operating procedure in Tudor-Stuart diplomacy.¹ No effective legate inhabits a semiotic world so detached from reality that he or she cannot address the interests of foreign counterparts. Yet the influence of cultural materialism appears in literary critic Timothy Hampton's antirealist holding that Renaissance diplomacy involves an "exchange of signs" producing a "symbolic political act par excellence."² Hampton's belief in the dominance of cultural signs assumes that proper diplomacy consists in the enactment of rituals reflecting a virtual reality, thereby negating the useful negotiable value of things in the outside world. By contrast, Shakespeare's romances show characters making painful concessions to reality in order to resolve personal and global conflicts. The playwright enlists aesthetics in the cause of rectifying conceptual international injustices without losing sight of basic IR realist premises. Put in aesthetic terms, Octavius Caesar (in *Antony and Cleopatra*) poses a marginally greater threat to Egypt than Augustus Caesar (in *Cymbeline*) does to Britain in part because the latter makes no actual appearance on stage.

IR theory and Shakespearean aesthetics overlap in their analysis of the benefits of restraint in global political relations. IR realists treat world affairs with an abundance of caution, shown in U.S. diplomat Charles Hill's interpretation of Hans Holbein's *The Ambassadors*: "Every reference tells of a world out of order, with no means available to set it right."³ Hill carefully considers the anamorphic skull (i.e., Time)

emblazoned diagonally across the lower center of the double-portrait, but Holbein's ironic image of political actors in the aftermath of a temporary diplomatic impasse does not rule out prudent, long-term accommodations between states that Shakespeare's IR theories pursue as aesthetic imperatives. To his credit, Hill never discounts Carl von Clausewitz's insight into successful power politics and war as the timely application of decisive force, in the absence of which some international disputes may never finally be resolved. Still, U.S. diplomat George F. Kennan famously cautioned against relying too heavily upon the foreign policy option of military adventurism, although the sound advice of this artistically sensitive architect of American Cold War realism (who published under his true name as well as his nom de plume "X") was sometimes ignored amid fears of international communist aggression from 1945-1991.

In explaining the design of the global system, IR theory seeks to place a limit on any violent ideological overcorrection, or "recoil," that might produce unanticipated conflicts overseas (to use Hilary Putnam's term for my own purposes).⁴ If Prospero and Ariel reject the theory of governance espoused by Antonio and Sebastian, who conspire to use assassination as a tool to gain political power, *The Tempest* lends even less credence to Gonzalo's brand of experimental communalism. Shakespeare would no doubt have concurred with Elizabeth I that an elite class already exists to preserve the status quo and the peace abroad—namely, European monarchies, "Princes can discuss matters together, as private persons cannot do."⁵ The playwright nevertheless shows aristocratic diplomacy to be rudderless in the absence of an aesthetically sophisticated ruler cognizant of moral and realist principles of international relations.

For the most part, Shakespeare addresses foreign policy above the transactional level of diplomacy. Most British Renaissance diplomats stationed overseas sold their influence locally in order to improve their living conditions and thus their odds of survival even while promoting their rulers' policies; however, the plays reveal that the international political system operates as well according to a logic of its own. Caius Lucius seems quite incorruptible as Rome's special envoy to Cymbeline's court, but his safety is guaranteed by ancient interstate traditions; therefore, he feels empowered to advise that Britain fulfill the terms of the Anglo-Roman bilateral agreement without his buckling to the taunts of the IR theory neophytes surrounding Britain's king. On the other hand, Pericles's search for a suitable political and marital alliance abroad seems to constitute the entirety of Tyre's initial foreign policy.

Tudor-Stuart rulers entrusted sensitive foreign missions to loyalists and coreligionists whenever possible because they lacked the objective intelligence analysis forthcoming from a well-staffed bureaucracy

like the one serving the Venetian empire. Elizabeth regarded askance two types of diplomatic candidates: holdovers from Mary's reign for being insufficiently attuned to her interests, and youthful diplomat-adventurers. Young Anthony Sherley parlayed his nomination as Persia's ambassador into a self-aggrandizing European tour. His assignment to unite Persia and the Continent in an alliance arrayed against the Ottoman Empire yielded him monetary rewards in Spain, although he suffered the consequences of his indecorous behavior by receiving only a polite hearing from James I after being jailed in Venice as a mercenary. In view of the financial hardships incurred in foreign service, Renaissance diplomats accrued wealth by methods that would seem treasonous today, yet they earned the trust of their masters by advocating strenuously (if duplicitously) on behalf of their rulers' interests abroad.

The contingent agreements struck between Renaissance European powers scarcely seem compatible with the notion of enduring cooperation implicit in today's IR neoliberal theory. The romances generally support Garrett Mattingly's assertion that the Renaissance state "could only think of itself," which is in effect a restatement of IR classical realism, although Shakespeare allows for loose temporary alliances within a self-help global system.⁶ Mattingly sees Renaissance diplomacy through the bipolar lens of the Cold War, when (perceived) dashing diplomatic elites served a knowledgeable bureaucracy in order to pilot fractious states into safe Western harbors. Yet his epitome of diplomatic savoir-faire produced inadequate results for Spain: "Gondomar's success as a diplomat meant the ruin of his aims as a statesman."⁷ Despite Gondomar's considerable skills, he gained little from James apart from attending endless royal soirées in return for involving Spain in decades of ruinous Continental wars. Not surprisingly, Mattingly regards *The Prince* as an "embittered pamphlet" facilitating the moral decay and rampant "cynicism and treachery" in Renaissance politics, which, even if true, is rather beside the point of the Florentine political scientist's analysis.⁸ Machiavelli shows interstate and feudal systems operating on at least two levels: the players' personal mores, and the reasonable principles guiding autonomous actors through a crowded anarchic field.

James appeared with foreign dignitaries in lavish masques for the entertainment of policy elites, events that showcased not merely the elegance of his court but as well his precepts on morals and pacifism. Legates sparred over perceived slights on these prestigious occasions, although personal disputes exerted little influence over systemic politics, "Jealousy between the Spanish and French ambassadors; insolence of the latter."⁹ Recent scholarship on Renaissance foreign relations explores the "sociocultural codes" comprising "another important prerequisite for

successful diplomacy”; however, the courtesies (and insults) exchanged between diplomats in global capitals bear no necessary relationship to the true state of affairs in the world.¹⁰ Untutored British popular opinion often held the international system in its proper regard despite being at times inaccurate as to certain details. In fearing Spain, the public viewed her wrongly out of all proportion to the actual danger she posed after the defeat of the Armada: “They (the English) are in great fear of the [Spanish] galleys and . . . say the galleys will utterly destroy them.”¹¹ Spain deserved respect as the greatest power on the Continent, but she was no longer the constant existential threat to Britain that she once was. France too was in decline, although she continued to use Scotland as a proxy to attempt to influence English politics. Only skillful Dutch merchant seamanship placed Britain increasingly at a disadvantage along vital trade routes. James had to reach the best possible accommodations with foreign partners regardless of the atmospherics surrounding the culture and semiotics of his court; thus, Venetian diplomats were right to take his moral claims with a grain of salt: “The King of England is very prudent, able in negotiation, capable of dissimulating his feelings.”¹²

Even leaders well versed in IR realism were never above expressing outrage at perceived slights to their dignity. Philip shows his disgust at France’s refusal to grant safe harbor to Armada vessels damaged en route to Britain, “If the [French] King desired to be neutral in this war, it was nevertheless a matter of honour with him and his fortresses, that anyone seeking shelter under his guns should, according to the law of nations, be allowed to do so.”¹³ Yet the rules of fair play finished a distant last to those based upon the prevailing standards of international law, the laws of war, and the political competition between secure and weaker states and principalities alike. Spanish ambassador Bernardino de Mendoza once complained that Elizabeth received him in “an insolent and outrageous manner,” which struck him as an affront to Spanish dignity, but major offenses like Drake’s seizure of a “million and a half” in gold from Spanish vessels returning from South America posed a far greater risk to global peace.¹⁴ Mendoza’s sensitivity to English misbehavior seemed to spike relative to the feelings of serenity he enjoyed only a few years earlier in Mary’s subservient attitude toward Spain.

Alone among the romances, *Cymbeline* examines in some depth the duties of the office of the diplomat per se; however, Spanish ambassador Don Diego Sarmiento de Acuña (Conde de Gondomar) is roundly satirized in Thomas Middleton’s *A Game at Chess* for attempting to destabilize Britain in order to advance the cause of Jesuit and Spanish expansionism. Gondomar used his relationship with James to scuttle the careers of a few prominent British rivals, but, in the final analysis, his sole

major foreign policy accomplishment was to act as a lightning rod for the British public's distaste for Spain and her representatives. Although envoys played a vital role in conveying state secrets, including news of the location of the Armada, most British legates accepted their appointments ambivalently, chafed at delays prolonging their service abroad, and suffered under the physical toll exacted by travel overseas.

Britain posted her least experienced quasi-consular attachés half a world away. Merchants like Richard Cocks were expected to acquire the necessary diplomatic skills on the job in their service to the East India Company. Cocks recalls a "Comoedie (or Play)" on Japanese historical figures showing "the valiant deeds of their Ancestors, from the beginning of their Kingdome or Common-Wealth until this present," which comprised part of a popular theatrical event hosted by the King of Firando (in contemporary Nagasaki prefecture).¹⁵ Because Cocks was unable to form effective ties to the host country, he became depressed by periods of inadequate commerce, lack of support from the EIC and Britain, and unending expenses incurred in his maintaining the trappings of an economic envoy. Lacking the expertise to decipher Japanese domestic politics, he was unable to fulfill adroitly the minimal consular functions expected of him. We learn little of the true state of global affairs from the perspective of such low-level economic and para-diplomatic functionaries; furthermore, New Diplomatic History cannot adequately describe the privileged or relevant socio-cultural facets of Renaissance diplomacy, much less those immured within (alleged) Orientalist discursive formations designed to dominate the East. In their "analysis of social practices," exponents of New Diplomatic History calculate financial arrangements at a merely symbolic level of importance relative to the robust economies created through the offices of public diplomacy, which alone achieve a scale sufficient to modify the rules of the interstate system.¹⁶

Renaissance English and Japanese elites exchanged art and other commodities as a means to improve diplomatic ties. Japan's Edo ruler asked for "pictures, paynted, som lascivious, others of stories of warrs by sea and land, the larger the better . . ."; however, EIC captain John Saris's translation apparently mistakes Japan's request for Western mythological scenes for portraits of a prurient interest.¹⁷ Indeed, on Saris's definition, it was James who expressed a desire to obtain Edo representations of fleshy subjects. Shakespeare's depiction and analysis of IR theory soar above the procedural level of diplomacy, although systematic practices are vital to the successful implementation of foreign policy. IR theory and philosophical aesthetics offer the most incisive analytical tools for understanding these late plays because Shakespeare's global viewpoint is

far too cosmopolitan to be left to narrow socio-cultural critical devices. This book seeks to engage literary and dramatic critics along with political scientists and art theorists, although the scholarship herein draws most heavily upon the illumination cast by IR theory and philosophical aesthetics. The Shakespearean romance receives moral sustenance for its peaceful interstate resolutions from aesthetics and IR theory.

CHAPTER ONE

CYMBELINE: AN UNEXPECTED SONG OF PEACE

Abstract

Cymbeline shows a peaceful resolution to a sanguinary conflict between imperial Rome and her British vassal state. This outcome results less from brilliant diplomacy than it does from a conceptual deficiency King Cymbeline detected in international relations (IR) theory. Rome, the greatest sovereign power in an anarchic world system, proves feeble in comparison to the ultimate hegemon, Jupiter, which convinces Cymbeline to observe Jovian rules of respectful diplomacy. Far from staging a political fantasia, the play treats artistic estimations of global affairs as a value added to diplomatic thinking. By pressing IR realist assets into the service of peace, Shakespeare imaginatively modifies foreign affairs by aesthetic means.

King Cymbeline adopts belatedly the aristocratic style of prudent diplomacy that modified international relations (IR) realism in Shakespeare's Britain. His impolitic demeanor had proven to be a liability in an anarchic global system sensitive to the slightest disruption. Having refused to pay tribute to the Roman Empire, he accedes at last to *status quo ante bellum* arrangements based upon his perception of a hidden Jovian order. Britain profits politically from Cymbeline's financial reengagement with Augustus Caesar's Rome. If Jupiter's position atop the diplomatic hierarchy would seem to make a virtue of idealism in foreign affairs, aesthetic values combined with fears of divine reprisals prevail in Cymbeline's decision to take the *viam pacis* (path of peace).¹

Cymbeline tacitly accepts a subordinate role in the top-down global hierarchy ruled by Jupiter. Under the duress of Roman hostility, Cymbeline endorses the god's implicit command to forgive his devotee (Posthumus), to honor the wayward son-in-law's lineage, and, in so doing,

to respect Jovian supremacy. He risks the estrangement of his loyal daughter and the forfeiture of his crown by ignoring the god's missive, which is rendered spectacularly in metaphysical and musical terms. Rather than offend Jupiter, the repentant monarch conforms to a vertical foreign policy structure distinct from that of the institutional IR bureaus evolving horizontally in Rome and (later) in Venice. For Jupiter, not Augustus Caesar, is the true universal prime mover working his will through Britain's ruler. Ennobled by his service to Roman divinity, Cymbeline holds his policy cards close to the vest by extending an olive branch to his foes. The aesthetic vision producing his peripeteia differentiates the play from the tragedies (as well as from *Troilus and Cressida*, with which it appeared in the First Folio of 1623). Shakespeare's addition of a heavenly power to rule over all earthly authorities revises IR realist theory to the degree that the play distinguishes between normal and heightened levels of aesthetic and diplomatic value governing serious calculations about foreign affairs.

I. Comparative IR Realism in British Diplomacy

King Cymbeline sets the standard for British diplomatic relations, although Tudor-Stuart monarchs managed a far more diversified global portfolio. English Renaissance political moguls determined overseas strategy to the extent that diplomacy had become choreographed, shown in Nicholas Throckmorton's May 10, 1559, letter to Secretary William Cecil, in which he asks for guidance on the subliminal tone he should set for his upcoming meeting with French and Scottish officials, "Requests to be furnished with instructions how to behave himself."² Similarly, most Shakespearean envoys behave like dutiful factors, not political operatives (Wolsey in *Henry VIII* being a cautionary example of the latter), which reduces in due proportion their dramatic significance. But only the crown's most trusted advisors were allowed to improvise in policy discussions abroad. Professional exclusivity is required because elite amateurs like Cloten and Posthumus display no aptitude for diplomacy. In contrast to Cloten, Posthumus is deemed a paragon of virtue, yet even he is gulled by Iachimo, an obvious confidence man. If Cymbeline's passivity throughout the Roman parley sets British affairs adrift, his *volte-face* produces such a victory that he can declare magnanimously a holy day of celebration while preempting calls for reprisals against the enemy.

Cymbeline's peace plan assumes the existence of a higher authority possessing strength greater than that wielded by Augustus Caesar, a belief that compensates him perforce for his inability to nullify Rome's suzerainty over Britain. The king's discovery places Britain in a stronger (because wiser) position vis-à-vis Rome. He could never behold the new

era without resuming payments to Rome, which remains the sole unconquerable land power; however, the benefits of Roman colonialism far outweigh their costs to Britain's ruling class. Cymbeline derives his authority via Roman fiat, but he owes true fealty to Jupiter, whose somewhat obscure logic conjoins the aspirations of IR idealists and the constraints of IR realism. Yet Cymbeline commits blunders as a fledgling IR theoretician commensurate with Elizabeth I's errors in her maiden foreign policy initiative over Calais at the Peace of Cateau-Cambrésis (1559). Both monarchs face stinging rebukes from Continental foes for claiming sovereignty over justly disputed holdings (Britain and Calais, respectively). The play accords all due honor to Cymbeline for his statecraft, whereas the historical record puts Elizabeth at a disadvantage. Her retreat from the negotiations over Calais ensured that her participation in the talks would remain an embarrassing footnote to Spain's successful enlargement of Italian territory; however, in each case, Britain profits in the long run by preferring peace to the risks of war waged according to an IR structuralist's notion of correct global protocol, which rejects as an idle dream any aesthetically nuanced conception of peace and national security.

Caius Lucius discharges perfectly his mission to convey to Britain the seemingly incontrovertible political necessity of her obedience to Rome. His embassy fails only because British leadership and interests are divided, an impairment that would have undermined any similar ministerial initiative. For even ideal speech situations are in themselves no guarantee of an envoy's success. Ironically, Elizabeth's rigid control over her legates in France handed the negotiating advantage to Spain, her primary threat. British "liegers" *in situ* could not exploit propitious bargaining opportunities for fear of contradicting the crown's standing policy.³ As a consequence, Spain humiliated the British envoys by sweetening the terms of the peace proposal at regular intervals, secure in the knowledge that Elizabeth's emissaries would suffer extreme mental anguish in having to decline all of Philip's increasingly tempting offers. Elizabeth avoided a potential foreign policy disaster by restricting her legation's options, but she ensured thereby an unsatisfactory and needlessly delayed result. If Spanish jocularly over British bargaining inequalities reached the heights of hubris, Caius Lucius maintains a taciturn demeanor in dismissing equally impertinent counteroffers from Cloten and the Queen, who pursue Cymbeline's interests only insofar as they might profit by them.

The Roman Empire remains the nominal world hegemonic power despite making unexpected concessions to Britain. Augustus's half-measures dilute his invasion force, thereby increasing the cost to Rome of a final settlement. He discounts the natural obstacles impeding his reconquest of the distant island, including high seas and rocky shores, that allow a

weaker but highly motivated defender to outlast the stronger foe. British audiences would have understood too the rationale behind Spain's failure to seize the advantage in Calais, a perfectly viable if somewhat *déclassé* Channel port. Philip had eyes only for his forthcoming Italian prizes, whose value exceeded by far the price of a French saltwater gateway that could have been won merely by betraying his Cateau-Cambrésis treaty partner (France). Spain may have been slightly deterred by the very nautical barriers complicating Elizabeth's evaluation of the port's susceptibility to a successful invasion. Above all, Rome and Spain miscalculate the depth of Britain's fighting spirit, which produces hard-won victories for Cymbeline and Elizabeth (in 1589). Not even Jupiter attempts to outlaw the natural right of self-preservation governing IR theory.

IR theory has only rarely been so ambitious as to formulate grand theories of historical change rising to the level of Hegelian excellence, yet historian John Watkins traces the birth of Continental transnationalism back to the "tangled dynastic lines of the late Middle Ages," wherein he detects "the emergence of the modern state from its medieval antecedents" in Elizabeth's reticence to sign the retrogressive Peace of Cateau-Cambrésis.⁴ This treaty conflicted with her independent outlook, besides having consecrated but a few politically ineffectual French marriages. Under the aegis of neoliberal modernity preferred by Watkins, states are meant to pursue noble ideas, such as the promotion of regional peace, not to endure servitude in the prison-house of arranged matrimony. The Westphalian Peace (1648) interrupted Watkins' neoliberal conception of history whereby decrepit dynasties become transformed into vital cooperative states, but the Peace of Cateau-Cambrésis was not finalized on the basis of a proto-Westphalian rejection of neoliberal institutionalism. Such ideological conflicts ripen only under the illusions of old and new historicism. As Shakespeare proves, British rulers forever pursue British interests. Elizabeth never abandoned her search for means to recover Calais, albeit at a gradually reduced level of urgency. Notwithstanding his occasional breach of social decorum, Cymbeline honors a pact with Rome that seems to foretell of universal political forbearance upon the Incarnation of the Prince of Peace.

The continuity in Augustus's receipt of British tribute survives an accident of history in the form of Rome's embarrassing military defeat, yet Cymbeline's victory cannot be attributed solely to self-help foreign affairs (given timely assistance from Wales), nor to the interdependence of neoliberalism (given persistent Continental hostility toward Britain). Cymbeline prospers due to the heroism of his subjects, while Elizabeth earned a reputation for defensive prowess in presiding skillfully over the rout of the Spanish Armada. In each case, diplomatic success demands

more than public recitations of British rights as recorded in ancient treaties. Even the chaos descending upon Paris after Henri II's death in a jousting match celebrating the signing of the Peace failed to provide Elizabeth sufficient justification to absorb Calais. Elizabeth's credibility in foreign affairs depended upon her reasonable avoidance of a military debacle overseas. Yet her policy conservatism was laced with a strain of combativeness characterizing not only *Cymbeline* but James I, who burnished assiduously his credentials as a peacemaker on the Continent despite approving the use of force against erstwhile European partners in the Far East.

Shakespeare's conceptual diplomatic innovation lies in his discovery of the value of a new regime of global relations transcending mere territorial acquisition. The benefits of peaceful alliances to Britain more than compensate her for her subventions to Rome. By the same token, renouncing IR realist practices altogether would have seemed a flight of fancy to all of the diplomats charged with disposing of Calais, each of whom understood Machiavelli's precepts at least as well as Iachimo: "Mine Italian brain / 'Gan in your duller Britain operate" (5.4.197-198). Quite self-servingly, Philip regarded Elizabeth's loss of Calais as being her "own fault" due to "carelessness"; however, more so than Augustus Caesar, Spain rather consistently sought to appease the British public, estimates of whose opinion the ambassador, the Duke de Feria, secretly transmits in cipher, "*They say that it is through your Majesty that the country is in such want and that Calais was lost.*"⁵ Remarkably, both Renaissance Spain and classical Rome (on Shakespeare's view) weighed adverse British sentiments in their strategic calculations, if only at the margins.

Shakespeare takes the long view of British foreign policy by holding that global aggression counts for nothing against the virtue of a people destined to be blessed by the Savior. For the first time, English IR theory considers mere popular resistance to great power belligerence to be a minor foreign policy deterrent; moreover, Jupiter's intervention raises normal ethical standards to the level of moral imperatives in the global system. Not only does the untamed Welsh countryside nurture the aspirations of characters uncorrupted by ambition, but Jupiter reciprocates the devotion of his followers with a limited guarantee of security and safety. Rome accepts *Cymbeline's* terms for the restoration of British relations (by all outward appearances); indeed, diplomatic sociality attains such a high level of ontological appeal that even Iachimo feels obliged to repent of his sins. Britain's financial concession to Rome scarcely registers in the grand scheme of wealth creation because the costs (and carry) of tribute will be dwarfed by future returns.

The peace pact makes Cymbeline, not Augustus Caesar, the clear protagonist. In dramatic terms, the Roman emperor is a distracted antagonist lodged at a great remove; therefore, Cymbeline alone consecrates “peace and plenty” in obedience to Jupiter (5.4.459). Britain undermines (paradoxically) the IR realist axiom that weaker states must submit to the threats of hegemons. Cymbeline’s glimpse into a previously unseen celestial order, one revealed solely by art, justifies his unique resolution of a crisis in IR realism, for, as IR theorist Kenneth N. Waltz holds, “A structural change is a revolution, whether or not violently produced.”⁶ Unable to decipher the Queen’s motives, therefore incapable of unmasking the plotters (due partly to the effect of poisons administered by implacable foes), Cymbeline nevertheless realizes that he diminishes Rome’s relative standing in the world by upholding the metaphysics of Roman divinity. Shakespeare pens no florid encomiums for Cymbeline, but he endows proper diplomacy with a theatrical grandeur appropriate to its revolutionary conceptual influence upon IR theory.

II. Putting IR Realism in its (High) Place

Cymbeline upends received IR realist hierarchies by lifting the curtain on British resistance to Roman colonialism. Jupiter’s supremacy diminishes Rome’s status by negating the concept of thoroughgoing global anarchy that is foundational to IR realism; however, Cymbeline’s moral revival restores an equally vital ethical pillar supporting IR classical realism. The crown perseveres despite the misguided attempts of dilettantes (Posthumus, Cloten, etc.) to join the so-called great game of diplomacy. True, Cymbeline flouts IR decorum, but the Roman parley is negotiated in bad faith based upon Britain’s presumed inferiority. Caius Lucius merely adds wise counsel to his restatement of Augustus’s inviolable terms, principles that had been espoused long before by Thucydides in the Melian Dialogue. The envoy claims the traditional right of the strong (Rome) to do as it wishes to the weak (Britain), with each side proposing optimistic scenarios for victory that disallow reasonable concessions. Yet Cymbeline’s peace pact relegates IR realism to a position of dependence within Rome’s polytheistic order.

IR realist theory endures because states receive mortal threats from abroad, although IR social constructivist Alexander Wendt discounts the problem, “Thus, in contrast to Classical Realists who would posit fear, insecurity, or aggression as essential parts of human nature, I am suggesting these feelings are effects of unmet needs and therefore contingent.”⁷ Wendt’s influential book appeared in the relatively idyllic decade following the collapse of Soviet communism but before the absolute terrorism of 9/11.

He assumes confidently that “it would be crazy today for Norway and Sweden . . . to represent each other as enemies,” even though, in the not-too-distant past, Axis Germany’s occupation of Norway changed Sweden’s perception of her Nordic neighbor.⁸ Wendt sees no obstacle to cultural activity shaping global relations all the way down, to invoke his oft-repeated expression, in an argument proceeding almost point-by-point in opposition to Waltz’s IR realist views. For Waltz had the temerity (on Wendt’s view) to believe that states exist ontologically prior to the system of states, due to which conceptual failing Wendt exiles him to the IR nether world, presumably for exhibiting neorealist tendencies. Wendt treats Waltz’s moral substance as a false front for materialism; however, he concedes that Waltz is “defensive and cautious,” which would make Waltz a defensive realist with the moral outlook of an IR classical realist—hardly an IR neorealist.⁹

Shakespeare and Waltz paint a complete picture of IR realism. Even at his lowest ebb, *Cymbeline* protects Caius Lucius so long as the envoy acts in his official capacity. For her part, Rome is required to smooth over her differences with Britain, having failed to decapitate the tributary state. Paradoxically, Britain defends both her national security and her identity by making accommodations in order to reaffirm the unequal alliance, whereas a constructivist resolution on Wendt’s terms would turn Britain’s gains into losses by misestimating the aesthetic values accruing to *Cymbeline*’s advantage. Neither Shakespeare nor Waltz is a status quo IR theorist. Without having studied *Cymbeline* professionally, Waltz as much as sounds the bottom of Shakespeare’s metaphysical discovery: “Self-help systems are transformed if their organizing principle shifts from anarchy to hierarchy.”¹⁰ The revolts of Pannonia and Dalmatia in the East and of Britain in the West vindicate Jupiter’s interest in reforming the anarchy in the system. Waltz is a mid-twentieth-century IR classical realist who understands perfectly that global anarchy encourages acts of revisionism, which was Germany’s profoundly immoral, hyper-aggressive *modus operandi* throughout World War II. Waltz would likely have regarded as foolhardy *Cymbeline*’s attempt to apotheosize Britain’s global profile in the absence of effective security planning against the Roman threat; nevertheless, Shakespeare sees the value in granting interested actors within or without government unlimited scope to contribute to the moral development of foreign policy.

British art, spirituality, and autochthonous fecundity draw from the fountainhead of Roman inspiration without connoting a cultural deficiency. The isle’s investment in Roman art alone makes her an affiliate of the empire. The Italianate art in Innogen’s chamber confirms Britain’s affinity with the Continental hegemon. On the fateful night of Iachimo’s visit,

Innogen falls asleep reading (ominously) Ovid's narrative on Philomena's ravishment by Tereus. Caius Lucius takes into the account the states' prior cordial relationship in conducting himself as if British misbehavior might moderate. Wartime refrains of *sauve-qui-peut* seem misplaced given the parties' previous amity, yet peace emerges finally not due to shared values but rather to Jupiter's intervention, which stuns the system; therefore, Wendt's analysis is based on a category error: "The problem with Realism is its individualist and materialist ontology of structure. . . ." ¹¹ Far from hewing to materialism and atomism, IR realists like Waltz and Shakespeare view the world in diachronic and partly metaphysical terms. Shakespeare's use of "Statist"—alone in the canon—situates diplomats historically in the sovereign entities they represent (2.4.16). The imperial ties between Rome and "Lud's Town" (London) relax but never dissolve in the pre-Christian era, a consideration Wendt discounts (5.4.479). Wendt assumes mistakenly that a perceived sequence in the much-disputed history of ideas (Hobbes—Locke—Kant) validates by not ruling out the very intellectual progression underwriting his constructivist IR theory: realism—liberalism—constructivism.

Wendt dallies with the concept of border nullification notwithstanding his remonstrations, "No territory, no state."¹² He downplays as a necessary but insufficient condition the socio-psychological effect of national boundaries on Canadian identity since 1867, "which, despite a 100 percent turnover in membership, helps to explain aggregate continuities in its citizens' behavior—obeying Canadian laws, fighting Canadian wars, honoring the Canadian flag. . . ." ¹³ A further diminution appears in his holding that IR realism itself is a free-rider on cultural constructivism to such a degree that aggressors "*let*" weak microstates like Singapore and Monaco live in peace.¹⁴ But these city-states were invaded and liberated at a terrible cost in the post-Westphalian era, suggesting that bad actors are deterred by reinvigorated international alliances; indeed, Wendt unintentionally affirms the validity of Waltz's axiomatic holding that IR realist principles tend to restrain, not exacerbate, global violence.

Wendt depreciates IR theories with the slightest toehold in political realism by proclaiming that culture forms "the central battleground" of global interests.¹⁵ *Cymbeline* however brings to bear upon IR theory more levels of foreign policy analysis than Wendt imagines. Cloten and the Queen contemplate the defeat of the Roman interloper by dismissing fancifully all obstacles to their attempted coup d'état, yet the properties of materialism work both for and against them. Rome must alight her forces in distant Milford Haven due to geographical restrictions, but British heroics in the "narrow lane" (another geographical impediment) allow *Cymbeline* in victory to split the difference between IR sociality and IR realism

(5.3.52). No competent British regent could afford to reject out of hand a *modus vivendi* with Rome, whose ties to the island cannot be reduced to mutually constructed values. As well, the play forestalls Wendt's argument by lodging Jupiter's metaphysical objections to Rome's attempted pacification of Britain. Wendt renders unto Waltz only what he claims is Waltz's—anarchy as an empty IR vessel—while rendering unto constructivism all of the vessel's priceless contents, including, in the play's terms, the refined qualities of Innogen herself.

One artistically inclined prime minister discerns a pattern in Tudor-Stuart diplomacy: “. . . the foreign policy of England has been to oppose the strongest . . . Power on the Continent, and particularly to prevent the Low Countries falling into the hands of such a Power.”¹⁶ Winston Churchill observes that Britain aligned with lesser states in addition to the Low Countries in order to restrain the reigning Continental hegemon, yet distinct IR realist tactics (Philip's mediation, Churchill's balancing, Cymbeline's sociality) are not necessarily mutually exclusive. Axis Germany balked at invading England due in part to Churchill's engagement with prospective allies. Cymbeline successfully proposes bilateral peace backed by a higher authority (Jupiter) surpassing by far the combined might of all terrestrial actors. Although the historical record reveals no partner with whom Cymbeline might have bonded in order to neutralize Roman militarism, he attracts champions from abroad to defeat the invader. Small wonder that *Cymbeline* treats IR offensive realism as a paean to boundless ambition. Just as no sensible ruler forgets the beneficial codicils of old treaties, few self-respecting leaders dare to vitiate fruitful IR partnerships, which Cymbeline must acknowledge exists vis-à-vis Rome. Not only does Cymbeline's respect for the Roman emperor (and his fond recollection of Julius Caesar) make a distasteful rapprochement seem somewhat more palatable, but the play's showing of a new Anglo-Roman era of reasonably good feelings repudiates IR dynastic triumphalism of the kind celebrated brilliantly in *Henry V*.

Crucially, Cymbeline's internal conflict remains the decisive unknown quantity in British diplomacy, just as it had been in Elizabeth's case. Elizabeth could have accepted Spain's eleventh-hour gift of Calais at the greatly reduced price of allowing a panel of Continental arbiters to assess the legality of her rule, yet she spurned the glory of a certain diplomatic coup in order to conceal her sensitivity about her legitimacy, a problem of IR identity so seemingly ephemeral as to be insubstantial. Cymbeline nullifies his embargo of Roman tribute in order to promote peace, but his quest for autonomy had always been as quixotic as Elizabeth's wish to be deemed universally as legitimate given Britain's insuperable sectarian divisions. He finds overriding value in returning to

the diplomatic fold, she in suffering the loss of Calais. Each sacrifices a modicum of international prestige in order to retain the crown, but neither pays in full the penalty some IR theorists insist upon levying against rulers who shrink from using force. Yet many IR neorealists would bar foreign accords due to their risk-aversion to the slightest paper loss, which they calculate according to the distribution of relative capabilities inhering in rather clichéd self-help aggressors and anxiety-ridden pacifists; however, the policy effect of *Cymbeline*'s temporarily impaired mind defies explanation solely on the basis of microeconomic analysis. For Jupiter's intervention in world affairs entails relatively more art than social science in his bending of IR realism to his will.

III. Relative Aesthetic Values in *Cymbeline*

One would expect the play's artistic devices to show objective evidence of the dawning of Jovian supremacy (if true) short of a literal explication of Shakespeare's IR theory; furthermore, an inquiry into *Cymbeline*'s artistic and IR unity (or disunity) might disclose the broad outlines of Shakespeare's overall aesthetic conception, assuming as a given that the high artistic standards of English Renaissance theatre were neither static nor consistent. Such an analysis (notably on the element of music) might reveal the degree to which aesthetics contribute to Shakespeare's foreign policy calculations.

Some of the play's artistic adornments provoke little aesthetic controversy. Although their physical presence is not required, the decorative works in Innogen's chamber (e.g., the arras, the andirons, etc.) are related aesthetically by virtue of Iachimo's art-critical description; moreover, his curation unwittingly affirms Innogen's artistic sophistication. In attempting to cash in her maximum aesthetic value, Iachimo rhapsodizes over his own countrywomen in order to raise the stakes of a bet that he believes he will win, unfairly if necessary. The false image he plants in Posthumus's mind of an immoral act consecrated with Innogen's blessing is no different in referential terms than Hamlet's observation on the sky as a polluted canopy hanging over the theater, which the Danish prince cites in order to declaim against the vicissitudes of the world. Yet no moral philosopher would allow Iachimo's duplicity to escape scrutiny, although the self-same heavens in *Cymbeline* sparkle like a "palace crystalline" in a "radiant roof" (5.3.177, 185). Shakespearean metaphors are abstract types involving ontological tokens, whether apprehended in the theatre or in one's private study.

Similarly uncontroversial is Posthumus's epistolary art, which suffers from an abusively officious style. In a letter adopting the tone of a

diplomatic memorandum, Posthumus invites Innogen to join him in Milford Haven in order that he might exact his private revenge. His command that she “take notice” of his presence in Cambria shows all the sensitivity of a royal *démarche* (3.2.47). In his eyes, she magnifies her presumed iniquity by remaining at court, whereas her escape to Milford Haven would constitute but one more cynical attempt to conceal her lechery. Far from expressing joy at the prospective conjugal encounter, he portrays her as the paradigmatically fickle mistress of the sonnet cycle (seen in the Renaissance as the highest literary form), who intentionally wounds her faithful lover by withdrawing from view. His wager is predicated foolishly upon a calculation of risk and reward so unpropitious that he all but invites Iachimo to assault her, which presages metaphorically Rome’s attack on Britain. We see the irony in Innogen unburdening her (defensive) stomacher of his letters as a consequence of his accusations of infidelity. His violation of the civility of the epistolary form confirms his reckless disregard of their marital bonds; nevertheless, his devious writings fit seamlessly within the normal aesthetic boundaries of Shakespearean theatre.

Jupiter’s tablet displays a rather more elevated level of craftsmanship in the epistolary arts, although cries of malfeasance prompt the god to descend from the theatrical heavens “*in thunder and lightning, sitting upon an eagle*” (5.3.157). Theatrical shows, including pyrotechnic displays of sound and light, signal the appearance of the divine onstage. Cymbeline accepts as dispositive the Soothsayer’s interpretation of Jove’s tententious, if curiously wrought, text; however, respect for written precedent, diligent research, voluminous records, and professional staffing was deeply ingrained as a best Renaissance diplomatic practice. So loath were Tudor-Stuart-era envoys to violate precedent that even Philip’s representatives at Cateau-Cambrésis rejected cutthroat French entreaties to seize upon Queen Mary’s demise as an excuse to ignore British treaty claims, “Even if the Queen were dead yet is the treaty not expired.”¹⁷ Augustus Caesar appears only through his communiqués, yet he behaves as if he too were constrained by normal Renaissance IR protocols.

Posthumus declines to judge the tablet solely by its “rare” cover, but his reformation is far from complete: in striking the Page, he unwittingly batters Innogen (5.3.197). He is morally the wiser but politically the loser under the restored line of succession. Cymbeline’s peace plan secures the common good (*commune bonum*), the Catholic doctrine by which Cardinal Wolsey tacitly directed foreign policy; however, Jupiter betrays a deficit of compassion for nonbelievers, making divine rule but a partial blessing. IR policy professionalism reduces further the role of popular participation in global politics even allowing for the tablet’s elaborate edict. Still, Britain’s survival depends upon a credible

interpretation of the prophecy; therefore, the Roman Soothsayer offers for domestic British consumption a plausible—even inspired—benediction attesting to the validity of England’s reformed royal lineage by conceiving of Jove’s work of art as a transcendental vision of peace fit for the gods.

On roughly the same aesthetic level, Arviragus and Guiderius resolve simply to “speak” their *chant funèbre*: “Fear no more the heat o’th’sun, / Nor the furious winter’s rage” (4.2.241, 257-258). If the musicians’ aubade for Innogen tells of fecundity under the orbit of the earth’s diurnal star, the young men find consolation in “common-kissing Titan” no longer exposing Fidele to the oppressive rays of divine tyranny (3.4.162). Having decided to “word” the song rather than render it in a musical theater or actor’s voice, they pronounce the threnody forthrightly, if not altogether convincingly on the purest musical level, before soldiering on to achieve greatness in the narrow lane, armed only with their customary acting talents (4.2.239). In view of the musicians’ special skills, the funeral elegy proceeds at a pace and pitch consonant with their abilities *qua* professional actors. If the sons demonstrate such pure musical (e.g., proto-operatic) *savoir-faire* in singing the coronach that they seem to unbalance the aesthetic dynamics of the performance, a new artistic complexity would be introduced, albeit one that could (no doubt) be easily rationalized by the audience. In none of these cases does the performance rise above the already high Shakespearean aesthetic levels of musicality and artistry, but the play breaks new artistic ground in the aubade and in important aspects of the ghostly Jacobean masque choreographed to rally Posthumus’s flagging spirits.

IV. Aesthetic Absolutism in *Cymbeline*: The Aubade and the Masque

The King’s Men traverse the very highest aesthetic peaks by featuring virtuosos in their production—“*Enter Musicians*”—an artistic addition designed to increase the audience’s enjoyment (2.3.12). The aubade surpasses by far the play’s prevailing musical standards: “Hark, hark, the lark at heaven’s gate sings, / And Phoebus ‘gins arise” (2.3.17-18). The leading musician, possibly the Lord Chamberlain’s lutenist and composer, Robert Johnson, fills the role of Shakespeare’s guest star by performing the song with a consort.¹⁸ The musicians draw inspiration from Italian-derived monodies and airs, which are lyrical vocal parts accompanied by the rhythms of stringed instruments. Monodies treat a range of topics and occasions, including the somber themes in funeral songs. Although it is doubtful that Robert Johnson and his peers possessed the acting talent of the company’s sharers, the musicians’ reactions to Cloten’s maladroit

instructions would have been noted by the audience. Nor would the troubadours have aggrandized the Globe stage in the manner of Shakespeare's *bêtes noires*: those comedians who could not abide speaking the playwright's speeches as written. In an acknowledgement of their special status, Shakespeare creates a narrative cover story for his luminaries by casting them as innocent for-hire champions commissioned by Cloten in furtherance of his scheme to charm Innogen away from the path of righteousness.

Philosopher Roger Scruton differentiates "programme music" from "absolute music" with respect to the possible referential value of melodic airs.¹⁹ The former category involves (narrowly) a lyrical representation of things in the world, as well as (broadly) any musical association with things or events in the outside world, such as the "*Solemn music*" introducing Posthumus's masque (5.3.124), or (in a different context) "The Star Spangled Banner." By contrast, absolute music appears on the level of self-referential artistry by eschewing exogenous denotations, including for example the unworldly sound from Belarius's "ingenious instrument" (4.2.185), or (in another setting) a free jazz saxophone solo. Absolute music ranges solely throughout an esoteric sonic universe, although related concepts and abstractions (e.g., mathematical progressions) might also qualify. The performance of "Hark, hark" fits Scruton's definition of programme music because of the song's referential lyrics, yet I would suggest additionally that the very sonority of the instruments and of the singers' trained voices might well transport the audience into the realm of absolute music; however, Scruton does not make this claim.

The nuances of philosophical aesthetics have not graced recent Shakespearean scholarship on music, although the literature has benefitted from developments in music theory as well as from in-depth studies of the Tudor-Stuart theatrical repertory. On the level of theatre history, but without recourse to aesthetics, Katherine Hunt considers the intrusive effect on British Renaissance performances of the ambient sound of London's church bells, whose tones were interpreted either as a sign of moral fidelity or of ethical "Jangling."²⁰ The bells pealed in furtherance of a normally mild sectarian competition to determine which faith might prevail based upon the intensity and quality of the sound. Tudor-Stuart theatre practitioners had no ready means to prevent extraneous tones from marring open-air or other public performances. By contrast, a 1952 avant-garde art experiment celebrated the very absence of performed music. Composer John Cage highlights ambient noise in "4:33," a pianistic nonperformance in which an artist sits attentively at the instrument, hands poised forever at the ready, but to no musical avail, unless we are said to hear the music of the spheres internally, like Pericles.

Cymbeline includes songs intended to be “regarded-as-art” on their own merits, to borrow the terminology of philosopher Jerrold Levinson, “An artwork is a thing (item, etc.) that has been seriously intended for regard-as-a-work-of-art, i.e., regard (treatment, etc.) in any way preexisting artworks are or were correctly regarded, *so that an experience of some value be thereby obtained.*”²¹ He attaches historical and institutional (but not necessarily moral) categories to Scruton’s precise analytical definition. Like Scruton, Levinson situates aural art on points along a scale ranging from music-for-music’s-sake art, to music indicating even if metaphorically a reality beyond the theatrical apron. Levinson’s overriding requirement is that the work reflect the artist’s intentional relationship to the relevant aesthetic legacy. Given the widely acknowledged excellence of “Hark, Hark,” the musicians add a purely artistic dimension to *Cymbeline* in performance distinct from normal theatrical standards, albeit without threatening to turn the event into a recital, entr’acte, or variety show.²²

V. Beyond Materialist Aesthetics

Philosophers doubt neither the materiality nor the ethereality of music; however, modern aestheticians see scant returns flowing from a major reinvestment in artistic materialism. Yet, as always in aesthetics, all writers tread Calliope’s path with humility by recalling Tolstoy’s (humorously overstated) *bon mot* that, where music is concerned, “Critics are the stupid discussing the clever.”²³ *Cymbeline* is far from alone in Tudor-Stuart dramatic art in employing musical shows to reflect alternate levels of reality or beauty in keeping with the playwright’s aim, but few Renaissance artworks are created according to the specifications of the “magical epistemologies” noted by Gary Tomlinson in cataloguing Caliban’s and (by inference) Shakespeare’s musicology in *The Tempest*, a viewpoint disproven in *Cymbeline*, as I see it.²⁴ Tomlinson performs a valuable service in advocating on behalf of the restoration of instrumental music to a position of equality with lyrics, yet the thaumaturgical properties in his Foucauldian thesis on Caliban’s mores seem to accrue to the benefit of cultural materialism. If he discounts effectively the pertinence of Cartesian dualism to Renaissance theories of art, he succeeds mainly because Descartes’s *œuvre* all but postdated Shakespeare’s life in the theatre.

Aestheticians would have noted out of fairness that Cartesian musical aesthetics are pluralistic in nature, whatever their obvious defects. Descartes evolved aesthetically in part because of his youthful immersion in musical expression, including its emotional and mathematical dimensions. Tomlinson overlooks Descartes’s observations on musical aesthetics, “Hence comes it, (for instance) that the noise of Thunder, and the report of

Guns are not convenient to Musick: because they offend the Ear, as the too great splendor of the Sun doth destroy the sight.”²⁵ Far from having revolutionized aesthetics by declaring in rather pedestrian fashion that too many notes jar the hearer, or that slow music renders the listener lethargic, Descartes shows an advanced understanding of musical structure and arithmetic logic in notation. Some of Descartes’s holdings have been roundly and justly disproven, including his famous theory on the role of the pineal gland in our understanding of mind/body dualism, but Tomlinson presents Ficino not merely to oppose Descartes but to allow materialist epistemologies to bask in the spotlight while relegating musical aesthetics to the backdrop. His estimation of Caliban’s flights of musical fancy in *The Tempest* is predetermined because, in treating the helot’s pursuit of “riches / Ready to drop upon me,” he preemptively accuses the disgruntled servant of thirsting only after ready money rather than of questing high-mindedly after the delicate fruit of rarified beauty (3.2.140-141). In an apparent rejection of Ficino’s sense of equipoise in aesthetic transubstantiation, Tomlinson rules musical idealism and abstraction out of court by attempting to stamp them eternally with the ineradicable imprint of cultural materialism in his concessions to the thought of Michel Foucault.

Tomlinson instead asks epistemology to do the critical work properly assigned to aesthetics, although didactic treatises on music theory have always had limited appeal in art, apart from a few notable exceptions (including the drama of Bertholt Brecht). Rather than proposing that Prospero and Ariel unite worldly and spiritual things comprehensively despite Neoplatonic musical theory, Tomlinson privileges the materialism of the occult powers by attributing Caliban’s addiction to the island’s sounds to his scurrilous intent to transmute the noble coin of idealism into the base metal of the realm. Tolstoy’s famous distinction between counterfeit and true music thereby applies perfectly to the internal divisions marking Caliban’s aesthetics given that Prospero’s drudge is so deeply infected (to use the Russian writer’s favorite art-critical term) by pious attitudes toward actual ditties, catches, and aural fragments. Far from denying materialism’s role in music, aestheticians are notably reluctant to oversimplify songs through a heavy-handed approach to the history of philosophy.

The vast range of Shakespearean musical values alone contradicts Tomlinson’s unitary holding on artistic criteria: “There is no epistemological distinction, if one exists at all, between the meaningfulness of words, of songs, of images.”²⁶ He ignores certain subtleties in philosophical aesthetics by assuming that distinct media formats convey identical referential values, which not coincidentally accommodates a strict Foucauldian theory of order and discipline and, consequently, of new

historicist theory in the bargain. On a philosophical level, the music in *The Tempest* is rather less aesthetically disruptive than are the songs in *Cymbeline*, which is by no means to rank qualitatively one play over another. The difference arises necessarily because *The Tempest* assumes the synthesis of art and sound under Prospero's administration of the island, where clear but not always intertwined and determinative lines of aesthetic and political authority negate any possibility of Caliban's attending raptly to free musical beauties of pre-Kantian derivation; nevertheless, artistic value obtains just as profoundly if the island's aesthetics are seen to have been stage-managed under a less superficially politicized regime than the one imagined by new historicists. For *Cymbeline* proves that Shakespeare uses music to introduce complications in extant IR realist theory and foreign relations.

Tomlinson sees music's very materiality as having been widely suppressed (which few aestheticians believe); therefore, he feels obliged as a cultural materialist to mortgage the idealistic equity in Ficino's worldview in order to inflate the hard currency of musical materialism. Yet Jerrold Levinson has long held that musical works may possess a certain degree of "nonphysicality . . . without undermining their objectivity."²⁷ Indeed, aestheticians have always defended the material presence in music (pitch, phrasing, instrumentation, composition, acoustics, dynamics, notation, referential sounds, the sonic gifts of the singer, etc.) while accounting for creative expression and other more ephemeral products of musical labor throughout history.

Most disconcertingly, Tomlinson misconstrues the consequences of privileging the materiality in songs possessing ethereal qualities as well. He emphasizes Ficino's concatenation of "music, musical effect, words, magic and demons" in the spiritual domain (which is situated below the level of the soul) in holding that the spirit retains its capacity to ensnare the soul by virtue of its more powerful aural rather than visual spells.²⁸ But Tomlinson defends music's debt to materialism (presumably to recognize marginalized theories and customs) by citing the arguments of an Idealist straw man in decrying the "narrow, exclusionary currency of its modern Western usage."²⁹ On this holding, Tomlinson simply tilts at windmills on behalf of magic and cultural materialism. Hilary Putnam reflects upon the consequences for materialists of this kind of outcome, albeit in a different context, "I think Diderot and Descartes were both wrong in assuming that if we are matter, or our souls are material, then there is a physical explanation for our behavior."³⁰ For Tomlinson imagines a circular, apolitical process involving "*metatechnology*" yoking materiality to immateriality *pace* Ficino.³¹ But Tomlinson sees Caliban associating magic with the values of the age of reason; therefore, (on his view) Shakespeare's rude villein must

forever be chastened according to the dictates of an impoverished Cartesian (not British Renaissance) worldview. Consequently, as a (perceived) ineducable theatrical fool, Caliban might never so much as hope to let slip the iron shackles of Prospero's (presumed) Western brutality. Tomlinson reasons from one level of materiality to another, which misses the epistemological mark, as Putnam might have declared (relative to a different problem): "*What makes you call this deduction an explanation?*"³² Tomlinson would diminish musical idealism via Foucauldian fiat.

Tomlinson thus makes an interpretive error in requiring that all musical meaning fit a narrow materialist epistemological category. For philosophical aestheticians are perfectly willing to allow great abstract music like "Étude Op. 10, No. 3" (which its composer viewed as an unalloyed triumph) to be pulled into the material realm of programme music solely on the basis of the commendatory title by which Chopin's work of art became known as a result of its overwhelmingly positive critical reception: "*Tristesse*." Similarly, far from seeking to preserve Western cultural hegemony under Cartesian domination, philosophical aestheticians view with reasonable serenity any justifiable recalibration of a work's status to include both objectively real and immaterial components that the composer could neither reasonably have foreseen nor necessarily have desired. Philosophers do not preemptively discount artworks on the basis of mind-body or similar disputes, but they would regard Tomlinson's emphasis on musical materialism to be excessively downbeat. After all, his commentary relies partly upon the diverse benchmarks established by philosophical aestheticians.

VI. The Philosophical Value of *Cymbeline*'s Aesthetics

While Tomlinson treats Shakespeare's music on the basis of somewhat extraneous neoclassical principles, philosophical aestheticians mine artistic gold in their ontological and metaphysical inquiries. As a testament to the vitality of philosophical aesthetics, even seemingly elementary artistic issues have never been put to rest, including whether music should be defined by the notation on paper or the sound in performance. A standard philosophical method of proof in the form of a hypothetical may help us see more clearly how musical values are ranked in *Cymbeline*. The play creates episodes of pure musicality (facilitated by lutenist Robert Johnson or his artistic equal) in order to highlight by aesthetic analogy the disparity between Jovian heights in IR theory and Rome's politics of brutal domination; moreover, the sons' dirge is to the professionals' aubade as a fine popular song is to a classical work of exquisite beauty, although

Shakespeare requires that the element of music fulfill its proper dramatic function.

Shakespeare presents quite nuanced views of IR classical realism in part by setting forth the range of differences between pure musical aesthetics (reflected in the consort's performance) and Cloten's debased artistic values (notwithstanding his employment of professional musicians to perform the aubade). The playwright suggests a hierarchy of musical levels so that we are better able to comprehend by analogy Jove's new order in terms of its qualitative aesthetic superiority relative even to the old Roman order, which depends for its global supremacy upon its military dominance.

Aestheticians today mainly find the legitimacy of music residing in the beauty of its sounds rather than in the validity of the score on paper. Philosopher Nelson Goodman holds that no valid instance of music exists by virtue of the notation alone, "In music, only performances, not inscriptions, count as instances of the work."³³ Even so, he finds that allographic notations establish an identity between autographic interpretations: ". . . two musical performances that differ drastically are nevertheless performances of the same work, if they conform to the same score."³⁴ Goodman mainly affirms Shakespeare's essential point (with suitable academic polish) concerning the validity of musical forms as properly performed. Yet Jerrold Levinson conditions musical authenticity upon the composer's intentional relationship to the relevant historical legacy, although he agrees with Goodman on the primacy of sounds over scoring: "Sound structures per se are not created by being scored—they exist before any compositional activity."³⁵ Levinson means that (e.g.) B-flat existed immaterially before a composer first inscribed the sound in his or her score. Shakespeare's view of musical transcendence is taken up coincidentally in Levinson's axiomatic holding that composers must acknowledge the song's place within the musical tradition on the occasion of its composition, or, in other words, of seeing "*art now* in terms of *art until now*."³⁶

Cymbeline's very casting of established musical professionals settles the question of Shakespeare's overriding interest in elevating our aesthetic perceptions within a given musical tradition. The play's stage direction for a professional musical interlude is a concession to the reality of the need to augment the already considerable sonic talents embodied in a theatrical company in Tudor-Stuart London. As well, the musicians' presence signifies the playwright's intent to treat aesthetics as a means to define the play's overarching theory of global politics. If the aubade and the dirge occupy slightly different points on the aesthetic scale, their sounds are undoubtedly meant to please (notwithstanding Cloten's ignoble intent);