

ЛІТЕРАТУРОЗНАВСТВО

UDC 821.111.

DOI <https://doi.org/10.32782/2710-4656/2025.4.2/02>

Gorenko O. P.

Ferenc Rákóczi II Transcarpathian Hungarian Institute

NAMES AS ALLEGORIES AND SYMBOLS IN WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE'S PLAY "CYMBELINE"

This paper studies W. Shakespeare's play "Cymbeline" and offers a new perspective for its interpretation. It focuses on the names of four main characters: Posthumus, Imogen, Cymbeline, and the Queen which relate closely to the peculiarities of the narrative lines and messages. The anthroponymical paradigm is intentionally restricted, yet, its efficiency is well illustrated. As a result, on the one hand, the logic of Shakespeare's drama in the first decade of the seventeenth century is re-created. On the other, the names of the main dramatis personae in the semiotic space of the performance are analysed and their transparency as allegories, well understood by Shakespeare's contemporaries, is surveyed. From this perspective, it can be stated that the names are well thought out. They embody fundamental psychological characteristics and internal drives of their bearers. At the same time, certain consistent pattern in Shakespeare's naming strategy is specified and the so-called 'unevenness,' 'incongruity,' and 'absurdity' of the main narrative lines are clarified. The constructive role of anthroponyms, charged with powerful allegoric and symbolic messages, is outlined against the background of Apocalyptic Tragicomedy. It is noted that this fact is important as genres set up a definite interpretative background, introducing special semiotic parameters. Simultaneously, historical, cultural, aesthetic, and religious atmosphere in England at the outset of the seventeenth century is outlined. It helped to study the names in "Cymbeline" as integral components which have preserved without distortion the content created by the author himself. Such devices of Literary onomastics as etymological, associative, and mimetic are applied in the article. Besides, the investigation is carried out through the prism of historical, comparative, and hermeneutic techniques. It is concluded that this multidisciplinary approach accentuated modernity and topicality of the play which, after centuries of oblivion, found its target audience in our turbulent times.

Key words: literary onomastics, William Shakespeare, Cymbeline, anthroponym, allegory, symbol.

Statement of the Problem. William Shakespeare's "Cymbeline" has often been criticized by different men of letters, ranging from S. Johnson and D. Hume to B. Shaw and H. Bloom. Meanwhile, attentive reading of this dramatic text may give a clue to ideas which still require interpretation. Any playwright, to a greater degree than writers in general, creates texts not for the generations to come, but for the people belonging to the same cultural background, facing the same problems, and sharing the same aspirations. There is no doubt that Shakespeare's literary heritage has radically exceeded the borders of his historical epoch, and each new generation of fans, admirers and critics regard him as a contemporary, reflecting the complexities and contradictions of their time. Shakespeare's works, notwithstanding their universal

humanistic content, are inseparable from the epoch of Renaissance, that specific milieu which became fertile soil for his artistic imagination. The playwright was "intimately bound up with his age" and "knew by experience the manners of country, court, and town" [19, p. 205]. In his plays Shakespeare "recorded the world of Renaissance England, a society that fastidiously investigated and questioned its surrounding universe" [24, p. 2]. Maybe, that is why 'Cymbeline' was staged and "well-liked by the King (Charles I) in 1634 and has been frequently revived for performance" [16, p. 2978]. It is also a well-known fact that "in the second half of the eighteenth century its frequent performances placed it among the top ten of Shakespeare's plays, and it contributed to the construction of Shakespeare as a national poet"

[22, p. 2]. Despite the play's lack of popularity in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, nowadays it is staged more often as it is charged with powerful content which finds its target audience in our stormy times. The main goal of this paper is to connect this content with the names of the main characters.

Theoretical framework and literature review.

Modern perception of Shakespeare's works may differ radically from those messages, which were addressed to his historical audience. The sense of theatre, taken for granted today, differs from the logic of presentation in the age of Shakespeare. T. J. C. Bulman states that "in any criticism of performance [...] we are bound by the perspectives of our own time and place" [4, p. 3]. That is why the ideas, thoughts, and points of view, expressed by the playwright, may seem obsolete, out of date, and even archaic for modern audience. Yet, such outdatedness may reveal new horizons for its interpretation. The outlines of historical (W. Churchill, D. Hume), cultural (H. Taine, D. Bergeron), aesthetic (J. Le Goff, G. Gadamer), and religious (W. Knight, D. Vernon) atmosphere at the outset of the seventeenth century help to study the anthroponyms in *Cymbeline* as integral components which have preserved without distortion the content created by the author himself.

M. Sfeir claims that proper names in plays have been "the subject of analysis from different perspectives." However, "their exploration in dramatic texts has remained fragmented, and a systematic approach is yet to be developed for their analysis. The connection between proper names and key dramatic elements, namely characterization, plot progression, and stage directions, remains underexplored" [14, p. 15]. It is possible to encapsulate one more factor into this system of interconnections – the genre of the dramatic text. In the world of dramatic performance, the names of the characters are intricately connected with the peculiarities of genres which differ, among other things, in dynamics of emotional states. In this sense, the same name may have different connotations depending on the context of its usage: historical drama, tragedy, comedy, or farce. This fact is salient as genres set up a definite interpretative background, introducing special semiotic parameters. The works by H. Bloom, G. Minton, G. Wickham, J. Schavrien focus on the play *Cymbeline*, examining its genre from different points of view. Thus, defining *Cymbeline* as Shakespeare's late romance, H. Bloom admits that "principal figures in Shakespeare's romances tend to be baroquely wrought in ways we do not yet wholly understand" [3, p. 614]. G. Minton puts forward his own approach to the genre of this play. Though, according to him, the apocalyptic elements in Shakespeare's Jacobean

plays, including *Cymbeline*, seem far "removed from the religious context of the previous century's interest in the apocalypse," they "have long been noticed." The researcher points out that W. Shakespeare "found use for apocalyptic elements that fit naturally with the tragicomic structure and enhanced the imaginative landscapes of the plays" [12, p. 130]. Surveying the main components and characteristics of apocalyptic tragicomedy, G. Minton highlights the mixing of genres, "the mixing of character types," involving "allegorical figures, superhuman spirits, good and bad, and historical personages" [12, p. 138]. All of them "freely converse together and interact with no sense of incongruity" with the purpose "to open up all history into a *totalizing discourse*" [12, p. 133]. In this respect, *Cymbeline*, "unabashedly" combining "the allegorical and the historical with no respect to consistency" [12, p. 142] may be also included into this domain of 'apocalyptic tragicomic structure'.

To our mind, it is a bent for apocalyptic tragicomedy that helps to reveal in full the constructive role of the proper names in this play, deepening its analytical perception. Anthroponyms in *Cymbeline*, like other instruments of tragicomic genre, help us to probe deep into this '*totalizing discourse*' and understand a definite logical scheme within its space, otherwise chaotic and eclectic. Consequently, the names may be regarded as medieval allegories which uncover dominant features of the protagonists and shape them as transparent, lucid characters. Besides, the comparison of *Cymbeline* with apocalyptic tragicomedy actualizes its key ideological message in periods of mass cataclysms, as this genre is "focusing upon moments of crisis" [12, p. 136]. In the same vein Katrin Bauer, for example, emphasizes the grows of interest in this "lesser-known and rarely performed" play in 2016, just before the Referendum concerning Brexit, when three major theatre companies in London and Stratford were "putting on stage their productions of William Shakespeare's late romance *Cymbeline*" [1, p. 20]. Attentive reading of this play may give a clue to some ideas which still require interpretation.

At the same time, some other observations by different researchers concerning character names in Shakespeare's dramatic heritage seem rather valuable. In this sense, we share G. W. Smith's point of view, expressed in his book *Names as Metaphors in Shakespeare's Comedies* that "Shakespeare's names and references show his descriptive imagination, his indebtedness to previous literature, and his immersion in the culture of his time" [18, p. 24]. In the same vein, J. Tanner's article "The Power of Names in Shakespeare's Antony and Cleopatra" evokes

interesting ideas, as the author enlarges on the functions of names, emphasizing that Shakespeare “uses names to characterize, to reveal cultural attitudes, prejudices, and superstitions, to show conflict or concord, to enhance themes, and to add humorous and serious dimensions to his dramatic narrative” [20, p. 164]. Tanner notes that “even though some devices of onomastics may not be immediately apparent to the modern reader or spectator, the use of names remains one of Shakespeare’s more effective devices and one of the literary critic’s most legitimate targets of concern” [20, p. 173]. Yet, one cannot but agree with F. Burelbach that “name study is one way of gaining increased access to the overtones and undertones, those elusive levels of meaning and emotional effect that help to enrich our understanding of literature in general and Shakespeare in particular [5, p. 137].

Task statement. Important work by Harold Bloom examining “*Cymbeline*” became the starting point for this article. The scholar’s productive idea that the name *Cymbeline* is a “cipher” [3, p. 617] predetermined our intention to study the names in this perspective and to define their role in the semiotic space of the performance. Thus, the semiotic approach to the analysis of anthroponyms in this tragicomedy seems quite relevant. We restricted our research to four names: *Cymbeline*, *Posthumous*, *Imogen*, and the *Queen* which relate closely to the peculiarities of narrative lines and messages in this play. Such devices of Literary onomastics, as etymological, associative, and mimetic, complemented by historical, comparative, and hermeneutic techniques seem productive for the exploration of these names. Given all the considerations, the methodological approach implemented by this article interprets the names of the main dramatis personae in the play as allegoric or symbolic formulae [25] fertile in social, political, and religious messages.

Outline of the main material of the study. Semiotic paradigm of the play: intellectual standards and ‘downsizing’. Harold Bloom regards *Cymbeline* as “a very uneven play, with much in it that can seem hasty or even perfunctory” [3, p. 614]. Bloom cites Samuel Johnson, one of the first critics of Shakespeare’s legacy, who states that “the play has many just sentiments” but “they are obtained at the expense of much incongruity”, “the absurdity of the conduct” and “the confusion of the names” [3, p. 615]. Interestingly, D. Hume characterizes Shakespeare’s dramatic texts nearly in the same words, regretting that “many irregularities, and even absurdities, should so frequently disfigure the animated and passionate scenes, intermixed with them” [9, p. 99]. Johnson’s critical approach to the choice of the names

probably ignites Bloom’s interest in this question, and he creates a semiotic paradigm of this dramatic text, interpreting the meanings of the names and correlating them with the deeds of the characters. For example, the scholar points out that the name of Cloten, “the wicked Queen-stepmother’s nasty son,” “admirably suggests his clottish nature” and introduces him “as a noisome braggart” [3, p. 617]. While analysing the name of *Posthumus*, the critic states that it “refers both to having been ripped from a dying mother’s womb and to being the only survivor of a family” [3, p. 621].

It is possible to enlarge on Bloom’s interpretation, stating that *Posthumus* may be regarded as twice born. The second birth occurs in the final act, the scene in prison, when the deceased parents visit him in his dream, and Jupiter himself is descending from the sky, carried by a huge eagle. Bloom thinks that this scene is redundant, and that is why he cannot agree with Wilson Knight who was convinced that “not to appreciate the ghosts and Jupiter was not to understand Shakespeare.” The scholar, while praising Wilson Knight as “a great critic, and a religious Shakespearean,” does not share his attitude to this scene which he defines as a “doggerel,” written “as bad as possible” [3, p. 633]. Bloom’s critical attitude to this episode resonates with Bernard Shaw’s claim that this play “judged in point of thought by modern intellectual standards,” is “vulgar, foolish, offensive, indecent, and exasperating beyond all tolerance” [17, p. 51].

Obviously, neither Bloom nor Shaw paid attention to something what was evidently accentuated by Wilson Knight. This play really cannot be judged in ‘point of thought by modern intellectual standards’ because these standards have changed and are in the process of change ever since. According to D. Vernon, “in Shakespeare’s day, religion was part of the wider communications of people’s everyday lives, a measurement of their involvement in structures beyond both them and their lifetime.” The researcher claims that “in this period religious concerns, power politics, communal and individual life continually intersected and overlapped, as Shakespeare observed whether directly or not in his plays” [21, p. 11]. That is why in case with the scene in prison we would rather share W. Knight’s “religious” approach to *Cymbeline*, since the events delineated here with the inclusion of the device “*deus ex machina*”, used in Ancient Greek dramas, may be compared with epiphany, revelation, the second birth after spiritual darkness and blindness. Here Shakespeare comes close to a scenic reflection of redemption. As it is formulated by J. Schavrien, “*Cymbeline* reflected Shakespeare’s late-in-life

aspirations for a world redeemed" [13, p. 122]. The episode in prison, criticized by H. Bloom and rewritten by B. Shaw, turns out to be rather significant not only for understanding the character's behaviour, but the idea of the whole play in general. The playwright, to our mind, wants to reveal to his audience that overcoming hardships and sufferings may help to overcome one's own depravity. The presence of the protagonist's parents at the time of his greatest spiritual discord, when he is on the threshold of death, gives him the chance to redeem his mistakes and to start a new lease of life. Thus, this name becomes a code, carrying an important message: the search for one's real identity.

H. Bloom's attitude to this personage is evident when he states: "What Imogen finds in Posthumus we are not shown, but if Cloten (rhyming with «rotten») is the alternative that tells us enough" [3, p. 621]. By writing this, the scholar expresses his dissatisfaction with this character, who is not good enough to be called the protagonist. Obviously, his quite grounded observation can be explained by "downsizing," what was "Shakespeare's new way of viewing the characters" who "are not just epistemologically, but in all ways, considerably downsized from those huge creatures who dominate the tragedies" [13, p. 126]. In other words, Shakespeare's late period is a sort of a farewell to the epoch of tragic heroes. As Northrop Frye comments it, "the scaling down of characters brings these plays (*The Winter's Tale* and *Cymbeline*) closer to the puppet shows" [7, p. 155]. There is no doubt that the spirit of puppet shows, addressed to common public, permeates this play. Beginning with the first decade of the seventeenth century one could observe gradual democratization of theatre performances in England, inseparable from substantial democratization of the theatre audience. These two factors were closely intertwined and reflected the rapid change in tastes, aesthetic perceptions, and semiotic techniques. New performance canons were being established and implicitly the old ideas of power were desacralized. Shakespeare's last plays, including *Cymbeline*, mirrored all these transformations: mixings in genre, characters, and style. On the one hand, it was really a simplification, a scaling down of protagonists, their reduction to allegoric figures as it happens with Posthumus. On the other hand, it was the act of narrowing the distance between the dramatis personae and the audience and endowing them with a full set of characteristic features, well recognised and understood.

The enchanting Imogen. Defining the play as a self-parody, H. Bloom points out that "Imogen ought to be in a play worthier of her aesthetic dignity, but Shakespeare seems too troubled to give her the context she deserves, at least in the first two acts." At the same

time, the scholar accentuates an important aspect of the heroine: "Grotesquery swirls about her, and yet Imogen remains always the sublime, antithetical to the grotesque" [3, p. 618]. In the same context Bloom stresses that "the enchanting Imogen, with whom Hazlitt and Tennyson fell in love, is not possible upon our stages" [3, p. 618].

This observation is especially interesting for our understanding of this name. Though in most editions it is spelled as Imogen, in Modern Critical edition of Shakespeare's complete works it is Innogen [16]. Imogen is believed to be either accidental or deliberate misspelling of "Innogen," which comes from the word "inghean" meaning "virgin" or "girl." In this sense, this name bears a powerful mythic/archetypal potential of eternal Virgin, Kore/Cora who is searched by her mother. In Shakespearean text she is searched by her father, though not quite actively. As Carl Kerenyi emphasizes in the Eleusinian Mysteries "the yearning of Demeter for her own girl-child, the Kore, must be characteristic of undivided human existence, of men as well as women ... because men's imitation of the questing Goddess led to the same goal and fulfillment" [10, p. 146]. Nobody abducts Imogen, but a whole chain of events makes her leave her home. First, her ardent love is overshadowed by the necessity of parting with Posthumus; then, in his absence, she is persecuted by Cloten; and, at last, she is betrayed by her easily manipulated husband, ordering his servant to kill her. That is why this princess, disguised as a page, is fleeing away and begins her quest. She chooses for herself a man's name Fidel which only enhances the image of eternal virginity, underlying her faithfulness. Fidelity, her new name and essence, shapes her as a full-fledged allegoric figure, and all her deeds are motivated within this scheme. Feeling deceived and forgotten, she undergoes the most tragic period in her life which culminates in her death, though not real, but evidently such not only for Belarius and his adopted sons, but also for the spectators, kept in suspense. She poignantly suffers the loss of her lover when she sees the beheaded corpse of Cloten in Leonatus' attire. Notwithstanding all these calamities, she possesses enough stamina to continue her quest and finishes it successfully. Features of archetypal Maiden do not prevent Imogen to be a representative of her epoch. Nicole Williams is convinced that "the fictional world of *Cymbeline* reflects the world of Renaissance England and, as a result, the heroine of the play is placed not only in the centre of the plot, but also in the centre of the contemporary debate on the nature of womankind" [24, p. 2]. The critic highlights Imogen as a product of Renaissance society. She is

“constructed in the context of this ideal woman, and, through her characterization, Shakespeare stages the ‘reality’ of female experience” [24, p. 2–3]. Thus, we may conclude that Imogen, a Renaissance woman in archetypal decorations, by predestination of her name demonstrates independence of her character and overcomes all the misfortunes to confirm her status of eternal Virgin on a new spiral of her existential quest.

What concerns Posthumus, he in his often primitive, thoughtless, and even cruel behaviour is given a chance of a new life, more motivated, mature, and well deserved. In this respect, the names of the above personages as ciphers fully justify the incongruities and excessive twists of the plot. Notwithstanding the initial moral differences between these two protagonists, there is no doubt that moral and psychological development of Posthumus relates to that of Imogen. As it is pointed out by D. Bergeron, they “move in different directions, she busily cutting herself off from her royal family and he in search of his family” [2, p. 32]. But however ironic it may seem, this movement in opposite directions leads to their final unification.

Cymbeline as a symbol: dichotomy of the name and character. One cannot but agree with H. Bloom when he calls Cymbeline “a cipher throughout the drama” [3, p. 617]. This character really becomes a code to be decoded. This name, to our mind, may be interpreted in two perspectives. The first is a historical background, as it is a well-known fact that a real king Cunobeline lived in Britain from about AD 9 to about AD 42. Many coins featuring his image were discovered, and he held authority over a significant part of South-Eastern Britain. Cunobeline had good relations and developed lucrative trade with the Roman Empire. He always tried to expand his lands, and his name may be translated as a “Strong dog.” Other version of this name Cunobeline in translation from Brythonic Celtic means “hound of Belenus,” Belenus being the name of the god.

We may assume that despite existing variations in spelling and translation, for Shakespeare this name primarily related to historical content transferred from Geoffrey of Monmouth’s work to Raphael Holinshed’s Chronicles in 1577. This content, though substantially transformed, fills the contours of this name, amplifying its solidity and authority. The second perspective of the name belongs to Shakespeare’s contemporaneity when “modernized” meaning of this name became widely known. And this altered spelling “Cymbeline” is a homophone of the Greek word – *σύμβολον*, which means symbol.

In Ancient-Greek mysteries symbol defined both a secret word, which meant a password, and an object,

like a coin or a plate, divided into two parts. Hans-Georg Gadamer writes that this word is “a technical term in Greek for a token of remembrance. The host presented his guest with the so-called *tessera hospitalis* by breaking some object in two. He kept one half for himself and gave the other half to his guest. [...] In its original technical sense, the symbol represented something like a sort of pass used in the ancient world: something in and through which we recognize someone already known to us” [8, p. 31].

According to Jacques Le Goff, “the Greek word *σύμβολον* meant the sign of gratitude” which consolidated an agreement or a commercial act and thus acquired some general notion, was endowed with abstract content which was already constantly present in this symbol, “reminded about and appealed to higher and hidden reality” [11, p. 330]. In this sense, the name Cymbeline refers to a sign of respect and agreement, which must be kept.

In Shakespeare’s play Cymbeline embodies two personalities, two images, each of them playing significant role. The first explains the fact of growing national consciousness, shows the source of energy of resistance and disobedience. The second reflects a legal aspect, an attempt to fulfill Cymbeline’s agreement with the Roman Empire. Shakespeare’s nominative strategy is well thought out. The King’s behaviour is motivated by the tension between the two poles of his name: aggression and readiness to fight at any moment (“Strong dog”) and allegiance to the agreement (symbol). Such dichotomy, complexity of this name completely justifies the collisions of plot line, its “idiocy” and “incongruity,” which were marked out by H. Bloom: “Shakespeare, seemingly unable to cease from travesty [...] confounds us by Cymbeline’s further gesture, which reduces much of the play to sheer idiocy, confirming Dr Johnson’s irritation. After bloodily defeating the Roman Empire, in a war prompted by his refusal to continue paying tribute, Cymbeline suddenly declares that he will pay the tribute anyway!” [3, pp. 637–38].

As it is evident from this passage, it is ‘idiocy’ of the king what is meant. In such a case it seems relevant to refer to Hippolyte Taine’s vision of Shakespeare’s dramatis personae. French philosopher regards “man”, conceived by the playwright, as “naturally unreasonable and deceived”. The parts of his inner mechanism are “like the wheels of clockwork, which go of themselves, blindly, carried away by impulse and weight.” The real life of this man is “the life of a lunatic, who now and then simulates reason, but who is in reality such stuff as dreams are made on” [19, pp. 203–5]. Human propensity to

unreasonableness and splashes of emotions is only one half of the King's 'unmotivated' behaviour. His second half, adherence to agreement, is revealed in his law-abiding principles. Throughout the play Shakespeare depicts him as if torn between opposing impulses and drives but in the finale, he demonstrates Cymbeline's ability to act from the positions of political and practical logic, the laws of real life, where trade and lucrative business may be regarded more desirable object than victorious war. Shakespeare, an eyewitness of glorious victories over Spanish Armada, could not but see that the struggle with Spain had long absorbed the energies of Englishmen. It is a well-known fact that in the last years of Queen Elizabeth there were troubles in England. As it is stated by a famous British historian W. Churchill, "people reduced to beggary and vagabondage were many, and new outlets were wanted for the nation's energies and resources. The steady rise in prices had caused much hardship to wage earners. Industry was oppressed by excessive Government regulation". The scholar emphasizes that "the march of enclosures drove many English peasants off the land. The whole scheme of life seemed to have contracted, and the framework of social organization had hardened. There were many without advantage, hope, or livelihood under the new conditions" [6, pp. 164–5]. The tragic character of this situation predetermined undisguised disappointment and pessimism. That is why the reign of James I, his policy of peace, unification and colonization was perceived for a definite period, though not too long, as a sort of panacea for the population of England. That is why Shakespeare regards the first decade of the seventeenth century from the vantage point of historical events ascribed to king Cunobeline, however improbably they were delineated. The fact that the King after the victory over the Romans decides to continue paying the tribute really seems irrational. Nevertheless, there may be quite reasonable explanations. For David Bergeron, for example, "the essential political problem in Cymbeline is how to guarantee future stability of the kingdom through orderly familial succession and how to deal with the immediate threat of the Roman invasion" [2, p. 34]. The critic claims that this play "captures the images of rule that were the ruling images of James's reign" [2, p. 31] and completely justifies this illogical deed: "As peacemaker, Cymbeline submits to Rome from his position of strength and magnanimity: Cymbeline as King now embodies the 'peaceable reign and good government' of King Simonides in *Pericles*" [2, p. 36]. The confirmation of the same idea, but in terms of genre approach, may be found in

G. Wickham's article, stating that the transition from revenge tragedy to "regenerative tragic comedy in the first decades of James's reign" can be explained by "political consciousness of the British peoples saved from foreign invasion and civil war by the peaceful accession of James I in 1603" [23, p. 36]. One more aspect of the same point of view is accentuated by G. Minton who underlines the fact that "in the first instance, the play seeks to support a view of foreign policy that combines Britain with the rest of the world rather than isolating it" [12, p. 143].

Nameless Queen. Special contribution to the names of the play is the Queen, who is deprived of a name, and this fact seems significant from the point of view of its anthroponymical interpretation. It immediately reduces this character to the level of allegory. She is an embodiment of numerous characteristic features pertinent to royal persons. At the same time, B. Shaw claims that "the Queen is nothing after Lady Macbeth" [17, p. 52]. In this respect, the comparison with Lady Macbeth deserves special attention. To our mind, Cymbeline's wife is much more authentic than villainous Lady Macbeth, depicted only in black colours. Besides being evil, Queen in "Cymbeline" possesses the entire range of positive features: she has a sense of humour, can look quite benevolent, and has patriotic aspirations. In the scene with the Roman Ambassador, for example, she pronounces the slogans of national resistance to aggressors:

... A kind of conquest Caesar made here,
But made not here his brag
Of 'Came, and saw, and overcame'. With shame –
The first that ever touched him – he was carried
From off our coast, twice beaten; and his shipping,
Poor ignorant baubles, on our terrible seas
Like eggshells moved upon their surges, cracked
As easily against our rocks (III. i, 21–28)

Being ardent defender of British national identity, the Queen, nevertheless, fails to conquer the hearts of readers and spectators because her innate hypocrisy, revealed in numerous asides, undermines her credibility. This context accentuates paradoxical phenomenon: important societal problems are heralded by persons with low moral background, like the Queen and her son. In such a way the playwright finds opportunity to pronounce topical historic ideas, deliberately diminishing their pathos at the expense of being declared by real scoundrels. No doubt that this personage is reminiscent of other women characters from history and literature. That is why Shakespeare left her nameless – just to show that she is the embodiment of other royal persons. Nevertheless, she fails to fulfill

her evil plans, maybe, because, she lacks intensity of feelings. At the same time, when she intuitively feels that her connection with her son is broken, she dies in sufferings and torments, admitting her evil actions without the least remorse. The dichotomy of this character seems more realistic than all-embracing wickedness of Lady Macbeth. Her death revokes one of the obstacles for happy denouement.

Conclusions. *Cymbeline* reflected gradual democratization of theatre performances, inseparable from substantial democratization of theatre audience. These two factors were closely intertwined and mirrored the rapid change in tastes, aesthetic perceptions, and semiotic technique. New performance canons were being established and implicitly the old ideas of power were desacralized. The study of the names of the main dramatis personae within the semiotic space of Apocalyptic tragicomedy reveals their transparency as allegories, well understood by Shakespeare's contemporaries. They are well thought out and embody fundamental psychological characteristics and internal drives of their bearers. The name Posthumus, for example, manifests the idea of a new lease of life, and this idea is realized as one of the directions in the general plot line; Imogen, as a personification of eternal Virgin, is predestined by her name to search her love despite all the misfortunes and predicaments; Cymbeline,

notwithstanding his victory, is going to stick to the agreement, as it is presupposed by his name. That is why these anthroponyms are logically embedded into each twist of the plot and effectively support its development and outcome. Thus, they turned into a cross point of ontological and epistemological.

Yet, there exists one more important aspect – that of phonetic perception. When pronounced from the stage in conditions of meagre decorations and absence of musical accompaniment, these three-syllable anthroponyms In-no-gen, Post-hu-mus, Cym-be-line imparted special sonority and melodiousness to the performance, enhancing its emotional impact on the audience and extending its aesthetic awareness. In this sense, we may agree with F. Burelbach who claims, “that reading Shakespeare is like hearing a symphony in a good concert hall.” [5, p. 137].

We should admit that the names can only partly explain definite incongruity and absurdity in certain deeds of the characters, since the absence of general logical scheme in collective and individual behaviour is often a lamentable reality of human existence. Its logic is hidden in the depths of human nature. The interaction of psychological and physical, rational, and irrational unpredictably manipulates the flow of human emotions. Shakespeare's unique talent lies in a specific reproduction of their dynamics. It is the magic of artistic truth, the insight of a genius into paradox of being.

Bibliography:

1. Bauer, Katrin “Shakespeare's Cymbeline, Brexit, and British national identity.” *Shakespeare Seminar* 18:20-32. 2021. URL: <https://surli.cc/beosfn>
2. Bergeron, David 1987 “Images of Rule in *Cymbeline*.” *Journal of Dramatic Theory and Criticism*, spring: 31–37. 1987 doi: 10.2307/2869367
3. Bloom, Harold.1998. “Cymbeline.” In *Shakespeare: The invention of the human*, 614–638. New York : Riverhead books.
4. Bulman, James.2005. “Introduction, Shakespeare and performance theory” in *Shakespeare, Theory, and Performance*, edited by J. C. Bulman, 1–12. Taylor & Francis e-Library.
5. Burelbach, Frederick. 1987. “Names of Supporting Characters in Hamlet, King Lear, and Macbeth”. *Names* 35, no. 3–4: 127–138.
6. Churchill, Winston 1956. “The new world” in *A history of English-speaking peoples in 4 volumes*. Vol. 2. New York: Dodd, Mead, and Company.
7. Frye, Northrop. 1995. *A Natural perspective: The development of Shakespearean Comedy and Romance*. Columbia University Press.
8. Gadamer, Hans-Georg. 1986. *The relevance of the beautiful and other essays*, translated by N. Walker, edited by R. Bernasconi, 3–53. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press. URL: <http://timothyquigley.net/ipa/gadamer-rb.pdf>
9. Hume, David. 1983. *The History of England from the Invasion of Julius Caesar to the Revolution in 1688*. Vol. 5. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund.
10. Kerenyi, Carl. 1967. *Eleusis. Archetypal Image of Mother and Daughter*, translated by R. Manheim. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
11. Le Goff, Jacques. 1992. *Medieval civilization. 400–1500*, translated by J. Barrow. Oxford : Blackwell Publishers.
12. Minton, Gretchen. 2013. “Apocalyptic Tragicomedy for a Jacobean Audience: Dekker's Whore of Babylon and Shakespeare's Cymbeline”. In *Renaissance and Reformation* 36: 129–152. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33137/rr.v36i1.20022>

13. Schavrien, Judy. 2013. "Shakespeare's Cymbeline and the mystical particular: Redemption, then and now, for a disassembled world" in *International Journal of Transpersonal Studies*, 32(2), 122–140. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.24972/ijts.2013.32.2.122>
14. Sfeir, Maya. 2024. A Corpus Linguistic Approach for Onomastics in Drama: Proper Names and Naming in Edward Childs Carpenter's *The Cinderella-Man*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5195/names.2024.2615> Vol. 72. No. 3 (2024)/Names: A journal of onomastics.
15. Shakespeare, William. 2015. *Cymbeline*, edited by M. Butler. 11th edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
16. Shakespeare, William "Cymbeline, King of Britain", edited by R. Loughnane. In *The complete works. Modern Critical Edition*, general editors G. Taylor, J. Jowett: 2970–3068. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2016
17. Shaw, Bernard. 1922. "Blaming the Bard." In *Dramatic Opinions and Essays with an Apology*, edited by James Huneker. Vol.2: 51–59. New York: Brentano's. URL: <https://ia902608.us.archive.org/3/items/BlamingTheBard>
18. Smith, Grant W. 2021. Names as Metaphors in Shakespeare's Comedies. Delaware: Vernon Press. Series in Literary Studies. 371 p.
19. Taine, Hippolyte. 1873. *History of English literature*, translated by H. V. Laun. New York: John Wurtele Lovell. (Digitized in 2007).
20. Tanner, Jeri. 1987. "The Power of Names in Shakespeare's Antony and Cleopatra". *Names* 35, no. 34: 164–174.
21. Vernon, David Charles. 2018. "Shakespeare and Religion: Capricious and Concealed Faith in Three Tragicomic Plays" 177p. URL: <https://refubium.fuberlin.de/handle/fub188/24293>
22. Wayne, Valerie. 2017. "Cymbeline. Introduction." *Bloomsbury Arden Shakespeare*, edited by V. Wayne, 1-3. Third Series. URL: <https://www.perlego.com/de/book/395325/cymbeline-third-series-pdf>
23. Wickham, Glynne. 1973. "From Tragedy to Tragicomedy: 'King Lear' as Prologue," *Shakespeare Studies* 26: 33–48.
24. Williams, Nicole. 1988. "Who isn't can read a woman?" In *Shakespeare's Cymbeline and the Renaissance Woman*. Illinois: Wesleyan University. 4–48. URL: https://digitalcommons.iwu.edu/eng_honproj/9
25. Горенко О. П. Антропонімічний вимір американського романтизму. Монографія. Інститут філології Київського національного університету імені Тараса Шевченка. – К. : В.Д. «Корпорація», 2006. – 312 с.

Горенко О. П. ІМЕНА ЯК АЛЕГОРІЇ І СИМВОЛИ У П'ЄСІ ВІЛЬЯМА ШЕКСПІРА «ЦИМБЕЛІН»

Дану розвідку присвячено малодослідженому твору Вільяма Шекспіра. Впродовж декількох століть п'єса «Цимбелін» викликала як захоплення публіки, так і гостру критику з боку літературознавців, письменників та науковців. У статті розглянуто імена чотирьох головних діючих осіб: Постумуса, Імогени, Цимбеліна та Королеви, які тісно пов'язані з базовими наративними лініями та проблематикою цього драматичного твору. Хоча антропонімічна парадигма дослідження свідомо обмежена, тим не менш, вона виявилась цілком продуктивною. З одного боку, відтворено логіку шекспірівської драми на початку першого десятиліття сімнадцятого століття. З іншого, визначено роль імен персонажів у семіотичному просторі театралізованого дійства й доведено їхню транспарентність як алегоричних/символічних фігур, добре зрозумілих для сучасників геніального драматурга. Зазначено, що ці імена були ретельно продумані автором, і саме тому вони втілювали фундаментальні психологічні характеристики та внутрішні мотиваційні настанови своїх носіїв. Простежено певні закономірності шекспірівської номінативної стратегії. Це дозволило пояснити так звану «нерівність», «невідповідність» та «абсурдність» наративу п'єси. Проаналізовано конструктивну роль антропонімів, заряджених потужним алегоричним або символічним змістом, на тлі Апокаліптичної трагікомедії. Підкреслено важливість цього факту, оскільки саме жанрова специфіка визначає інтерпретативну парадигму, вводячи спеціальні семіотичні параметри. Водночас, окреслено історичну, культурну, естетичну та релігійну атмосферу Англії на початку сімнадцятого сторіччя, що дозволило досягнути антропоніми п'єси як стабілізуючі компоненти, які зберегли без спотворення зміст, вкладений у них самим В. Шекспіром. У процесі дослідження імен визначено ефективність таких засобів літературної ономастики як етимологічний, асоціативний та міметичний. Доведено плідність застосування історичного, компаративістського та герменевтичного підходів для вирішення поставленої мети. У висновках наголошено, що залучення такої мультидисциплінарної стратегії дозволило зацентрувати сучасність та актуальність п'єси, яка після століть перебування на маргінесі суспільної уваги, знову віднайшла свою читачку й глядацьку аудиторію.

Ключові слова: літературна ономастика, В. Шекспір, Цимбелін, антропонім, алегорія, символ.