

*Imogen or Innogen – Concerning One Conjecture of  
Shakespeare’s Cymbeline’s Oxford Publication*

**Elguja Khintibidze**

*Professor of Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University. Head of the  
Institute of the History of Georgian Literature at TSU. Head of the Fund  
for Kartvelian Studies.*

**Abstract:** The principal novelty of the last decade in Rustaveli Studies, revealing the fact that the love story of the main characters in *the MPS* – Nestan and Tariel was used as a plot source in early 17<sup>th</sup> century English dramaturgy, has become a frequent topic of *The Kartvelologist’s* publications (*The Kartvelologist*, #14, 15, 16, 19, 20). One theme, pointed out in these publications, a parallel study of the main literary characters of *the MPS* and *Cymbeline*, has prompted me to realize the significance of those symbolic meanings, which, in certain cases, were used by the great playwright when selecting the names of his characters. From this point, the name of the king’s only daughter *Imogen*, being the protagonist of *Cymbeline*, is also worth noting.

The present study is dedicated to the interpretation of the symbolic meaning of the name *Imogen* as well as the acceptability of its modified version – *Innogen* in some publications of the play.

**Key words:** *The Man in the Panther Skin, Cymbeline, Imogen, Innogen.*

***Towards Posing the Problem***

My scholarly interest of the last decade includes discovering and reasoning the fact that *MPS* plot was adopted as a plot story in 17<sup>th</sup> century English Dramaturgy. At the present stage of my studies, contemplating the fact that the love story of Nestan and

Tariel in the *MPS* was used as a thematic plot source in *Cymbeline*, has prompted me to focus my attention on the similarity between literary characters - Imogen<sup>1</sup>, being a protagonist of the English play, and her prototype Nestan, a Rustaveli character. The English literary criticism, focusing on *Cymbeline*, emphasized the issue regarding the name of the character.

English literary criticism discussed the issue in the previous century[18], pointing out the fact that according to Shakespearean documents from the first complete publication of Shakespeare's plays (First Folio, 1623) the established name Imogen previously was spelt differently as Innogen.

This problem has gripped my attention in terms of parallel exploration of the literary characters Nestan and Imogen.

### ***The essence of the issue***

It is believed that the name *Imogen*, which is expressed in several ways in English Onomastics like *Imogen*, *Imogene*, *Imogine*, *Imogenia*, *Imojean*, *Imojeen*, *Emogen*, *Emogene*, is of Irish and Celtic origin and comes from the Celtic name Innogen which must have stemmed from a Gaelic name Inghean, meaning a girl, a daughter. It is also considered that this name has acquired a particular meaning in both Shakespeare's *Cymbeline* and Walter Scot's novel *The Heart of Midlothian*, dating back to the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century.

The fact that the name of *Cymbeline's* character, Imogen, has its initial source coming from historical chronicles, upon which the story relies, was indicated in the 18<sup>th</sup> century (*Malone, Variorum, vol. I, 1778*). Indeed, it is believed that Shakespeare was well acquainted with the story related to the King of Britain – Cymbeline from *Chronicles* by Rafael Holinshed, published

---

<sup>1</sup> The modern pronunciation of the name Imogen is 'imə, dʒin or 'imə, dʒen [9].

several times in the 16<sup>th</sup> century (1577, 1587). Based on the same source the wife of the British king Brute, a historical queen of Britain, was called Innogen. One of the first commentator and editor of *Cymbeline's* text, Horace Howard Furness, agrees with Malone's idea that Shakespeare must have taken the name Innogen from Holinshed's *Chronicles*, due to the fact that it, in the same form (Innogen), also appears in another play by Shakespeare, namely *Much Ado about Nothing*. The main evidence is based on the surviving records, proving that the earliest viewer of *Cymbeline's* performance (1611), Simon Forman, refers to the name of the main character as Innogen. The editor-commentator believes that there is a mistake in the first printed publication of *Cymbeline*, in the so called *First Folio*, which must have been made by the person who prepared the text for printing. It was also indicated that the name Innogen alludes to the word *innocence* (meaning immaculate, innocent), and fully corresponds to the adventures of the main character. However, the commentator (Furness) does not find it reasonable to change the name of the famous character Imogen, established by tradition into Innogen, encountered in subsequent publications of the play[18, p. 5-6].

The change of Imogen into Innogen in *Cymbeline* occurred in the 80's of the previous century. Along with the modification of some other names of Shakespeare's characters it was first testified in the 1986 Oxford publications by Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor[19]. The alterations took place under the pretext that modernised texts should include names in their modernised forms. This modernised publication was also followed by other publications of the story. In particular, special attention should be paid to the text of *Cymbeline*, included in the Oxford publication of Shakespeare's 3 volume complete set of works, compiled by the same scholars and editors[4] as well as to the another Oxford publication by Roger Warren[5].

It should be noted that, relying upon the prestige of Oxford publications, some of *Cymbeline's* researchers made altering

corrections to the name *Innogen* in recent publications of their earlier studies [1, p. 7]. However, the idea of modernising the text was not shared by other editors and commentators, amongst them the publication by John Pitcher's [20].

Varying attitudes of editors towards altering the name of the main character of *Cymbeline* are motivated by relevant facts. The reasons for supporting their conjuncture, provided by the editors of the publication are as follows:

According to Holinshed *Chronicles* the existence of the name Innogen was testified prior to the creation of *Cymbeline*, whereas the name *Imogen* was not referred to by any old sources. Another evidence: the character's name as Innogen was mentioned by the person having watched the performance in Shakespeare's lifetime (Symon Froman's records of 1611). The name Innogen was also confirmed in another play (*Much Ado About Nothing*) [26, p. 604; see 16, p. 3]. In order to prove the acceptability of the conjuncture – Innogen/Imogene, Roger Warren emphasizes the possibility of the mistake that might have been made by a person who prepared the first text of *Cymbeline* for the *First Folio* (double *n* in the name of Innogen might have been confused with *m*). Another emphasis also falls on the resemblance of the name *Innogene* with the word *innocence*, meaning free of guilt.<sup>1</sup>

The supporter of maintaining traditional reading of names given in *Cymlberline* is John Pitcher [16]. He considers the reasons for supporting the reading of the name as Innogen, unreliable. Specifically, Pitcher points out that even prior to Shakespeare's *Cymbeline*, the name of the British queen was read as *Yomogen*.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> "with its overtones of innocence, 'Innogen' gives the character a significance name..."[25].

<sup>2</sup> In the *World History*, in *Polychronicon*, made by Ralph Higden in Latin, the name of the king of Britain's wife is referred to as Innogen whereas in the English translation of this *History* by Jhone Trevisa (14<sup>th</sup> century) the name is used as *Innogen*. However in an English translation of the 15<sup>th</sup> century, made by an unknown writer, the name is referred to as *Yomogen*.

As for Symon Forman, the scholar also highlights that he made some other mistakes when relating to other plots of Shakespeare plays. The fact that Simon refers to the name as Innogen might be explained by the influence of Holinshed *Chronicles*. The researcher defines the names of the characters in *Cymbeline* on the basis of the Italian Language, more precisely, by merging English and Italian name stems (Iachimo, Philario, Pisanio, Belarius). Accordingly, he considers Imogen to be based on an English version (image, resemblance, depiction)<sup>1</sup> of an Italian word *immagine* (image, appearance, imagine, imagery - allegorical depiction). Based on this, Pitcher concludes that the name *Imogen* in Shakespeare's *Cymbeline* belongs to Shakespeare nevertheless the fact that the playwright might either have invented the name based on the stem of the name Innogen or preferred an already existing English form *Ymogen*.

According to John Pitcher, "in *Cymbeline*, the Princess is imagined or pictured in various ways – some good, others bad – by the men around her, and her name tells us this" [16, p. 8]. To be more clear, the researcher concentrates upon the story related by Iachimo about how Posthumus described his wife in the so called wager scene, during the meeting with her companions in Rome: "he began his mistress' picture, which by his tongue being made, and then a mind put in't"(V.5.175-16)[20, p. 117]. According to the researcher "The significance of *immagine* in *Imogen* is of course the same as how the name functions in the play" [16, p. 8].

### ***Unacceptability of the Conjecture***

In my opinion, changing the name Imogen in the surviving texts of *Cymbeline* belonging to the early 17<sup>th</sup> century into Innogen and including it in the Shakespearean text publication is

---

<sup>1</sup> "...that name...gives every indication of having been anglicised from the Italian noun 'likeness' or 'image', that is, 'imagine'[16, p. 8].

unreasonable. My position is not only based on the supposition that the main character of *Cymbeline*, named Imogen, has become one of the most attractive and popular characters of the theatrical art and literature of the latest centuries, and it is not desirable to disregard this disposition. In my opinion, the more significant fact is that from philological and textual points of view, such an interference with the text (i. e. such a significant alteration, changing the name of the main character) should be considered unjustifiable.

The fact that Shakespeare's characters are bearers of certain significant symbolic meanings is undeniable and Imogen should not be considered an exception in this respect. The editors with such conjecturers alter symbolic meaning of the name of the Shakespearean character. However, even if it was not characterized by any symbolic significance, the editors would add their own symbolic features or meaning to it. This should not only be considered to be the modernization of Shakespeare's text, but also remodeling his way of thinking [see 14, p. 23].

I am certainly far from supposing that the texts of *Cymbeline* which have reached us should be regarded as entirely pure and original and the possibility of making any accidental or deliberate changes should not be totally excluded.

To my way of thinking, the case for the modification of the name Innogen/Imogen also requires some interpretation. This issue should definitely become a subject of discussion for a number of reasons: the name of the main character was innovative for that time, the author's historical source indicates the probable prototype of the name otherwise, and as the modified form of the name is already attested as this particular character's name in old sources.

Although the fact that a number of different options emerge while revealing Shakespearian original ideas is a positive development, the new findings and suppositions of the commentators should also be included either in their *comments* or in specific articles. I strongly believe that it is absolutely

unreasonable to make any principal changes to Shakespeare's survived texts, unless the changes have been supported by reliable publications.

However, these words do not mean that I strongly oppose any conjecture, no matter what the case. If the conjuncture is argumentative and does not alter the ideological, artistic and thematic structure of the work, it can be considered acceptable. However, in the case of *Cymbeline*, argumentation of the transformation of Imogen into Innogen should not be considered justifiable.

There are many arguments against the replacement of the name *Imogen* with the name *Innogen*. However, the fact should not lead us to the conclusion that further discussions of the subject should be terminated. I suggest that the name Imogen, in the publications of Shakespeare's *Cymbeline*, shouldn't be changed into Innogen. Naturally, having said this, I mean only those publications which claim to be editions of the plays by the great playwright, at the same time; I cannot ignore the fact that *Cymbeline*, as a scenario for theatrical performances, can undergo multiple changes and corrections following the interests of a director or a screenwriter of the play.

Getting acquainted with scholarly literature about Imogen /Innogen, led me to reveal several viewpoints regarding the unacceptability of this replacement. At the same time I do not exclude the fact that such a viewpoint might have already been expressed in any studies, presently unknown to me. Argumentation of the fact that in Shakespeare's original version, the name of the British royal court princess was referred to as Innogen is mainly based on assumptions and possibilities. For instance, as assumed, changing the name Imogen into Innogen took place in Shakespeare's *First Folio*, due to a mistake that might have been made by a scribe or the person responsible for preparing the texts for printing: when reading the manuscript they confused double n with m. As assumed the scribes were two people, one of them (conventionally B) was experienced enough,

while the other one (E) lacked experience. The mistake made by the scribes is defined as the following: regarding the fact that the first one was fully experienced, and the half of the folio was composed by him, it is assumed that at some point he might have read the text carelessly. The other scribe, being the least experienced among the scribes of the *Folio*, might have made the mistake due to this reason.<sup>1</sup>

This discussion suggests only possibilities, they are based on mere assumptions, and however a contradictory possibility is also quite acceptable, for example: the first scribe was experienced and would not have made any mistakes, while the other one, being less experienced, might have done the work more carefully.

According to the scholars' assumptions, the mistake must have been made by the person having prepared the text for publishing. Ralph Crane, the expert scribe of the royal court was considered to have prepared this text for publication ("Crane was a professional scribe known to have worked for the King's Men" [24]). The professional activity of this person has already been explored and it is known that he was prone to making various types of deliberate changes in texts but the fact that he might have misinterpreted any letters in a text (in particular confusing double *n* with *m*) has not been noted anywhere. Of course we cannot exclude the possibility of Crane having read Innogen, in Shakespeare's manuscript, as Imogen. However, to my way of thinking it would be much more logical to think that Crane, being a professional scribe of the royal court, must have read letters, given in Shakespeare's manuscript, correctly. We should also take into consideration the fact that the name Imogen is repeated several times in the play and the name Innogen had already been known both from the other play by Shakespeare (*Much Ado*

---

<sup>1</sup> "Although Compositor B was experienced, and responsible for setting about half pages of the First Folio, he could be careless. Composer E was the least experienced of the Folio compositors, and was probably an apprentice"[24, p. 68]

*About Nothing*), and, primarily, from historical sources (Holinshed). It is less likely that the professional scribe would have replaced the familiar name with an unknown one.

According to scholars, Simon Forman referred to the name of the princess as Innogen under the influence of Holinshed *Chronicles*. (More precisely, from my point of view, he was influenced by historical memories, since the queen of Britain was also called Innogen.) It is also worth noting that Symon Formen, when writing these memoirs, did not have the printed version of the text at hand. Due to this, his memoirs are mostly based on the impressions he got from the stage [see 3, p. 377-339], and it is much less likely that the name sounded several times on the stage, as the name in question is rarely heard in the conversation of the main characters.

Therefore, it seems unacceptable to include this conjecture in the text as it is based on dubious arguments.

While discussing this issue, the main emphasis falls on the fact that in *Cymbeline*, Shakespeare mostly borrowed the names for his characters from other stories. More specifically, the name Innogen was already known from historical sources whereas the name Imogen was not. However, nowadays some amendments have already been made to this viewpoint, as it was discovered that the name Imogen, in the form of Yomogen, existed in English literature as early as in the 15<sup>th</sup> century. As it was mentioned above, the name of the British King Brute's wife, Innogen was transformed into Ymogen in an English translation of the Latin text of *World History (Polychronicon)*, performed by an unknown translator [16, p. 4].

When studying this issue concerning Innogen/Imogen, it is worth exploring the author's tendency, revealed in *Cymbeline*, regarding selecting the names for his characters, which reveals particular nuances. Shakespeare mainly adopts (precisely or approximately) only the names of historical characters (Cymbeline, Guiderius, Arviragus...) taken from historical sources. However, Princess Imogen is not a historical character.

The British Chronicles neither mention that the king *Cymbeline* (Kymbeline//Cimbeline) had a daughter nor tell a story described in the play. Thus, the story of Imogen is a pseudo-story written by Shakespeare. In *Cymbeline*, the names of non-historical characters, such as the name of the princess, adopted from other stories by the author, are mainly represented in an altered form.

Studying one banal anonymous play from the Shakespearean times, called *Rare Triumphs of Love and Fortune*, is significant in this respect. Shakespeare was familiar with the play, and according to some scholars, such as J.M. Nosworthy, it served as one of the main sources of Shakespeare's *Cymbeline* [15, p. XXV-XXVI]. It is believed that the name Fidele, selected for Imogen, disguised as a man, must be the modification of the name of one of the main characters of the play - Fidelia. There must also be a similar connection between Bomelio from *Rare Triumphs of Love and Fortune* who was banished from the palace and lived in a cave and Belarius from *Cymbeline* who sneaked out from palaces and also found a shelter in a cave. Hermione – the name of the princess's beloved man is also used by Shakespeare in another play, *The Winter's Tale* although transformed into the name of a beautiful lady [2, p. 21]. It is also considered that Shakespeare created Posthumus's epithet or rank name – *Leonatus* by modification of the name of the main character Leonato from his earlier play *Much Ado About Nothing*. Thus the assumption that Shakespeare, contrary to his tendency, would have used the already established name Innogen and, without modifying it, would have given it to his imaginary character seems less reliable. Moreover, if Shakespeare changed one name (Leonato) of the above mentioned couple (Leonato and Innogen), we should suppose that he would have changed the other one (Innogen) too.

Therefore, we should consider that Shakespeare named his favourite woman character under the influence of the name of the British queen Innogen, but, at the same time, he either modified it into Imogen, or activated the less known version of the name - Ymogen.

When discussing the name of the princess from *Cymbeline*, the commentators consider that it should convey a specific symbolic meaning and it should also have a trace of a pun, distinctly characteristic to Shakespeare. Indeed, there are some hints in the names of the significant number of non-historical characters from the works belonging to Shakespeare's last period. *Cymbeline* is not an exception either: Posthumus means *post mortem*, or born after his father's death. The biography of Posthumus, the main character of *Cymbeline*, also reveals the above mentioned symbolic meaning as he was born after his parents' death [17, p. 164]<sup>1</sup>. The stem of Posthumus's rival character's name - Cloten denotes fool, stupid and corresponds to the character's personality [17, p. LIX].

Scholarly literature also considers this tendency to provide sufficient grounds for the establishment of the name Innogen. As already mentioned above, Innogen reveals a similarity to the word innocence (free of guilt) which characterizes precisely the princess's personality in this play.

From my point of view, this interpretation of the issue also requires some corrections. Pun or quibble speech was used in Shakespeare's plays mostly for passing some hint to the audience and is mostly homographic and homophonic: a written word is indicative of something when uttered. As the audience of the theatre perceives the text by hearing it, it is less likely that a written version of one word resembling another word in writing should necessarily hint at something. According to scholars, proper names in Shakespeare's late plays are represented by words or word combinations indicating the connection between the name and the characters' personalities as well as their adventures. For example: Marina (in *Pericles*) means born in the sea, Perdita (*The Winter's Tale*) means lost; Miranda (in *Tempest*) indicates ardor [25]. The same can be said about the above mentioned

---

<sup>1</sup> Posthumus's father passed away when his mother was pregnant with him, and his mother also died post giving a birth.

names given in *Cymbeline* (Posthumus, Cloten). According to some scholars, other names like Philharmonus, Leonatus, Belarius, Philario [16] also show the same link between the names and the character's personalities.

Thus, we should conclude that, when hearing the name Innogen, the audience would not be able to notice any similarity between the name pronounced as 'in.ə.dʒen,' and a word *innocence* – 'inəsəns' [9, p. 257].

At the same time I agree with the opinion in English literary criticism that the name of the princess in *Cymbeline* should carry some specific indication to something<sup>1</sup>. The fact is that a significant number of the names of the non-historic characters of the play are selected on the bases of a pun, quibble speech. In addition, the fact that even the name of the husband and beloved of Imogen, Posthumus, was chosen deliberately (meaning *post mortem*). All this might lead us to the conclusion that the latter's wife's name, being the main character of the play, should also be bearer of some kind of symbolic indication.

I would also like to add my viewpoint about the function of the pun name Posthumus, thus clarifying the symbolic meaning it carries in the play<sup>2</sup>. In my opinion, the name does not refer only to the fact that he was born after his parents' death, but also, Shakespeare must have had much more profound thoughts when creating the name. Imogen finds her husband Posthumus beheaded, lying next to her in the cave. However, in the final scene he resurrects for her, or, in other words, he is born again. Following his wish, for Posthumus, Imogen is already murdered, and again in the final scene, she also rises from death for him. I

---

<sup>1</sup> Some hypothetical assumptions have been expressed about the meaning of the name Imogen. There are some references to the Latin words: *imitate*, *image*, *primogenitor*. There are assumptions even about the possibility of an anagram (specific combination of a word) – primogeniture [see 14, p. 22].

<sup>2</sup> None of the scholarly literature I am familiar with has considered the observation of the name the way I do, but if there is a scholar, having already expressed the same kind of opinion, I want to express my apology to him/her.

think that this nuance was also considered by Shakespeare, when creating the name Posthumus.

### ***Artistic Image of Shakespeare's Imogen***

*Cymbeline* is not usually classed as one of the best plays by Shakespeare. It is considered as one of the late period plays of the great playwright. Although it is thought to be the first chronologically of a series of plays of this period (*Cymbeline*, *The Winter's Tale*, *The Tempest*), it is not considered to be the best one. However along with *Pericles*, it is believed to have started the new style in Shakespeare's creative work whose sources and innovative issues have become the most significant subject of Shakespearean studies. The interest of English criticism towards *Cymbeline* is strengthened by the fact that Imogen is claimed to be the best (or one of the best) portrayed heroines among Shakespeare's other perfect woman characters. *Cymbeline* has provoked much controversial evaluation throughout a four-century discussion in English literary criticism. In the scholarship of the Shakespearian century, on the one hand, *Cymbeline* was labeled a disorderly chaotic play while, on the other hand, according to a number of Romantics, it was named among the best plays of Shakespeare. However the attitude that this play is either weak or not well worked on has always prevailed.

The main reason, provoking the above mentioned evaluation, was due to the fact that the 17<sup>th</sup> century literary criticism was not able to tolerate either a breach of the classical dramaturgy style or genre instability, unreality, even incredibility of certain episodes and behaviours of certain participants. Sometimes this play was referred to as absurd, less realistic than a fairy tale and disorderly arranged [see 2, p. 25; 1, p. 6]. On the other hand, the same criticism reveals several reasons for the *Cymbeline* plot being so unrealistic and unfeasible. *Cymbeline*, *Pericles* as well as *The Winter's Tale* were created based on an idealised formality [see 2, p. 36] and the same features characterise *Cymbeline*'s characters, unrealistic features of the characters have

been emphasised. Even Imogen is considered to be a boring image of a woman's chastity [see 1, p. 17]. From the psychological point of view the whole gallery of characters is discussed on the basis of imagination and fantasy, Imogene being the central idealised character with her chastity [see 21]. It has also been noted that the idealised disorder of the play, though attractive in its way, creates golden unreality [see 15, p. XXXIII]. This attractiveness is primarily revealed in the artistic image of Imogen. When evaluating the character, Shakespearean literature is almost unanimous. It has been acknowledged that Shakespeare created brilliant facets of female characters, particularly in his last period plays, such as Imogen and Hermione [7. p. XII]. It should be claimed that Imogen is among Shakespeare's brilliant woman characters who, as the plot of the plays unfolds, always prevail on their husbands to such an extent that the latter do not deserve to be their husbands – Helena (*A Midsummer Night's Dream*), Portia (*The Merchant of Venice*), Imogen [13]. Moreover, it has been noted that the author bestows his woman character, the only daughter of the king Cymbeline, with all the supreme positive features - initially a modest, and a naive princess is transformed into an ardent, determined, wise, loyal and even a joyful character [6].

Among the best woman characters, created by Shakespeare's artistic imagination Imogen was already considered to be the best as early as in the 19th century. Anna Jameson: "Portia and Juliet are pictures of fancy with more force of contrast, more depth of light and shade; Viola and Miranda, with more aerial delicacy of outline, but there is no female portrait that can be compared to Imogen as a woman....In her we have the fervor of youth, tenderness, all the romance of youthful fancy, all the enchantment of ideal grace" [8, p. 50; see 18, p. 492]. However, the 20th century criticism specifies "that Shakespeare has equalled Imogen is certainly true; but he has never surpassed her, and he has never repeated or anticipated her" [22, #17]. Imogen was loved by the English theatrical society. It is known that a popular actress of the

19th century, Helena Faucet, having created a brilliant stage image of Imogen, insisted on changing the name of the play to *Imogen - the British Princess* [1, p. 7].

Therefore, Shakespeare scholarship obviously believes that Imogen, as an artistic image, depicts a completely unreal woman, not even a hyperbolically real one. In her whole essence this character is imaginary, ideal, absolutely contrary to reality. Imogen is a product of creative fantasy. English Criticism realises that the latest plays of Shakespeare follow a tragic plot, but the style is changed into an imaginary environment [11, p. 144]; mostly in *Cymbeline* characters are likely directly from Shakespeare's imagination" [13]. It was noted in the early 20th century that as an artistic image of Imogen is not realistic, and it represents an idealised image of a character. Imogen "is not real, she is idealized... In comparison with the women in the early sentimental comedies, Rosalind, Beatrice, Portia and Viola, she lacks the details of characterisation, the mannerisms which remind us of real persons and suggest the possibility of portraiture" [22, p. 139].

Imogen is Shakespeare's dream-like character. She is an ideal wife, created by the imagination and fantasy of the author. This is clearly noticed and verified by the English Literary criticism. We should be sure that what was perceived by English Literary criticism was primarily felt and observed by Shakespeare himself. From my perspective this was the main reason he called the character Imogen. The pronunciation of the name Imogen at present sounds as the following: 'im,ə.dʒin // 'im,ə.dʒen [9, p. 248] and the name clearly resembles the word *imagine* (i'm,ə.dʒ.in) [9, p. 247], meaning fancy, imagination, creation. The fact that a connotation of the name Imogen, related to the meaning of the word imagine was already noticed during Shakespeare's life is clearly indicated in Shakespeare Studies [16, p. 8].

I strongly believe that the name Imogen, given to the Princess of *Cymbeline*, as an imaginary wife, has a symbolic

meaning and indicates fantasized unreality and dreamlike idealisation.

The indication of the artistic image on behalf of the name of the character was more significant for Shakespearean audiences and readers than contemporaries can imagine. The value of the artistic method was much more significant than can be perceived by modern esthetic attitude. As one of the commentators of *Cymbeline* puts it "Puns and playing on names may strike us as a bit strange now, but these were serious things to the Jacobean" [17, p. LX]. That is why pun speech, quibble has such an important symbolic function in Shakespeare's works. This is the reason *Cymbeline's* characters have the names created according to these principles. That is why the artistic characters from the late period of Shakespeare's plays reveal a certain indication to their personality and among them, the most profound indication is contained in the name Imogen.

The fact that quibble, pun speech and playing with words, had an immense meaning in Shakespeare's works, has been indicated several times in Shakespearean Studies and has become the subject of several researches. It has been noted that occasionally some editors fail to pay an adequate attention to this artistic style of Shakespeare's speech and change the passages in the text, obscure to them. This kind of pun, quibble speech in Shakespeare's plays is mostly acquired to show resemblance of the pronounced word to the other one, thus, the meaning of the second word expresses Shakespeare's main point [see.10]<sup>1</sup>.

---

9. Passages of this kind are even revealed in *Cymbeline* [10, p. 313]: When Imogen finds out that her husband is in the harbor of Wales (Milford Haven in Wales), she implores Pisanio to help her get to Milford as soon as possible. While imploring she mentions blessed Milford, but after one line she replaces Milford with a word Haven (Harbor) (*as a haven*) (*Cymbeline*, III, 2, 58-63). It has been noted that Haven is pronounced like heaven' and thus it is thought [10, p.313] that Imogen's imploring reveals indication to the prayer for the people being persecuted for righteousness: "Blessed are they that are persecuted for righteousness' sake: for theirs is the Kingdom of heaven" (Matthew V, 10).

And finally, Shakespeare reveals and explains the significance of symbolic meanings of pun speech in *Cymbeline*, where the soothsayer explains to Posthumus the meaning of one phrase including prediction – “be embraced by a piece of tender air”, defining “*piece of tender air*”-s Latin equivalent *molis aer*, the same as *mulier*, in English meaning wife. By telling this, the soothsayer tells him that the word *mulier* indicates his committed wife (*Cymbeline*, V. 5: 444-447).

### ***Main conclusions***

1. Changing the name of the king’s daughter, Imogen, coming from *Cymbeline*’s first Folio (1623), into Innogen, is unacceptable.

2. The great playwright, following his manner of naming his characters, might be modifying the name of the British Queen Innogen into Imogen or might be using already modified less known version of the queens name (Ymogen).

3. Following the style of pun, quibble speech, in the name Imogen the author puts a symbolic meaning into the name (Imogen – imagine); indicating not real, but imaginary artistic image – an ideal, dream-like wife.

4. The name of Posthumus – Imogen’s husband, defined as born post - parents’ death, must be a bearer of much more profound meaning. In my opinion it must also be indicating to Posthumus’s wife’s appearance in the final scene, already deceased in his mind; and also appearance of alive Posthumus in front of his wife, also thought to be dead.

### ***Distant parallels***

Choosing the character’s name, indicating the character’s personality generally was an established style in the World’s literature, and was not only peculiar to Shakespeare or his epoch style. This time I will focus on Rustaveli’s *The Man in The*

---

*Panther Skin*, as the similarity of the plot of the romance to *Cymbeline* [30] has made me concentrate upon the problem discussed in the given article. At this point, I am not speaking about Rustaveli's *The Man in the Panther Skin* in order to point to its serving the plot source of *Cymbeline*. I am simply emphasizing the parallel itself.

As it has been noted, the main character's name Nestan-Darejan from *The Man in the Panther Skin* reveals connection with some Arabic and Persian names, conveying specific connotation. Nicholas Marr identified the name as having the meaning of a "unique beauty". He noted parallels between the Arabic word *Hussān-αθ* (a woman of outstanding beauty) and Persian – *nēst-andare-dahān* (not existing on the earth) [12, p. 429]<sup>1</sup>

According to my research regarding the world-view of *The Man in the Panther Skin* [29], Rustaveli creates the imaginary world, different from the real one, with its ideal characters, emphasizing the eminence of human beings, their strength and emotions. It is not excluded that taking into account Rustaveli's multi-plane style of artistic thinking, the name of the ideal

---

<sup>1</sup> Naming the main character, by indicating his/her artistic image, as the way of emphasizing the main characteristics of the literature character, is not alien to Rustaveli. Like the name - Nestan-Darejan, the name Avtandil also reveals the same trend. Arabian-Persian lexical base shows different versions of the name, amongst them, in my opinion, being the most reliable explanation of the name based on the Arabian lexical combination - '*afd, al ad-din* (perfect, primary faith) [28, p.110]. Rustaveli apparently is familiar with this specific loan translation (calque) word of Arabic onomastics (Nuradin, Shermadin) but in my view, in case of the name Avtandil, the second part of the composite (*din* - faith, religion) is replaced by Iranian *dil* - meaning *heart* [27, p. 254; see 28, p.109]. In such a way, the author is emphasizing Avtandil's perfect heart. This interpretation of the name directly indicates Avtandil's artistic image - philanthropy, devotion, the love of mankind. It should also be noted that in *The Man in the Panther Skin*, in the dialogue with Avtandil, it has been mentioned twice that the primary dignity of a man is having a compassionate heart and it is also worth mentioning that the author characterizes Avtandil with the epithet, indicating the compassionate of heart of a man. [see 29, p. 598-603].

heroine, Nestan-Darejan, points not only to the unique beauty, not existent in the world but to the unreal, artistic image of the creature created by fantasy as well.

### **Bibliography:**

1. Brown, Richard Danson and Johnson, David, *Shakespeare 1609: 'Cymbeline' and the 'Sonnets'*. The Open University (USA), 2000.
2. Bullough, G., "Cymbeline, Introduction": *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare*. Edited by Geoffrey Bullough. Vol. VIII, New York, London 1975.
3. Chambers, E.K., *William Shakespeare. A Study of Facts and Problems*. vol. II, Clarendon Press, Oxford 1966.
4. "Cymbeline King of Britain": *The Complete Oxford Shakespeare, vol. II*. General Editors Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor. Oxford University Press, 1987.
5. *Cymbeline*. Edited by Roger Warren. Clarendon Press, Oxford 1998.
6. Forsyth, Jennifer, "Introduction. The Queen and Imogen": *"Cymbeline" by William Shakespeare*. Edited by Jennifer Forsyth <http://internetshakespeare.uvic.ca/Library/Texts/Cym/>)
7. Ingleby, C.M., "Prefatory Notes": *Shakespeare's Cymbeline*. (The Text Revised and Annotated by C.M. Ingleby). London 1886.
8. Jameson, *Characteristics of Women. Moral, Political, and Historical*. V. 2, Saunders and Otley, London 1832.
9. Jones, Daniel, *Cambridge English Pronouncing Dictionary*, Cambridge 2011.
10. Kökeritz, H., "Five Shakespeare Notes": *The Review of English Studies*, Vol.23. #92, Oxford University Press, 1947.
11. Lyne, Raphael, *Shakespeare's Late Work*. Oxford University Press, 2007.
12. Марр, Н.Я., «Грузинская поэма 'Витязь в барсовой шкуре' Шоты из Рустава и новая культурно-историческая проблема»: *Известия Академии Наук, №8*, 1917.

13. Milner, C., "Shakespeare's Tragic Comedies. Cymbeline": <http://www.netplaces.com/shakespeare/shakespeares-tragic-comedies/cymbeline.htm>
14. Myklebost, Sverre-Arve, "By Whatever Name": *Early Modern Culture Online. Vol. 1, No 1*, 2010 (see [journal.uia.no/index.php/Emco/article/view/4](http://journal.uia.no/index.php/Emco/article/view/4)).
15. Nosworthy, J.M., "Introduction": *Cymbeline*. The Arden Edition, 1966.
16. Pitcher J., "Names in Cymbeline": *Essays in Criticism, vol. 43*, 1993, pp. 1-16.
17. Pitcher J., "Introduction". "Commentary": William Shakespeare, *Cymbeline*. Edited by J. Pitcher. Penguin Books, 2005.
18. Shakespeare, *The Tragedie of Cymbeline*. Edited by Horace Howard Furness, Philadelphia 1913.
19. Shakespeare, William, *The Complete Works*. Modern spelling edition, editors Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor, Oxford 1986.
20. Shakespeare, William, *Cymbeline*, Edited By John Pitcher, Penguin Books, 2005.
21. Shwartz, Murray M., "Between Fantasy and Imagination: A Psychological Exploration of Cymbeline": *Psychoanalysis and Literary Process* (Ed. F.C. Crews), 1970. See also: *Psy Art - an Online Journal*, August, 2005.
22. "The Drama to 1642, Part One": *the Cambridge History of English and American Literature* (In 18 Volumes); *Vol. 5*, 1907-1921.
23. Thorndike, Ashley H., *The Influence of Beaumont and Fletcher on Shakespeare*. Press of Oliver B. Wood, Worcester, Massachusetts 1901.
24. Warren, R., "Introduction": *Cymbeline*. Edited by R. Warren. Oxford 1998.
25. Warren, R., "The Characters' Names" (Appendix A): *Cymbeline*. Edited by R. Warren. Oxford 1998.

26. Wells, Stanley and Taylor Gary, with John Jowett and William Montgomery, *William Shakespeare: A Textual Companion*. Clarendon, Oxford 1987.
27. აბულაძე, ი., *რუსთველოლოგიური ნაშრომები*, თბილისის უნივერსიტეტის გამომცემლობა, თბ. 1967. /Abuladze, I., *Studies of Rustaveli*. Tbilisi University Press, Tb. 1967
28. ჩიქოვანი, გ., „ავთანდილის ეტიმოლოგიისათვის“: *ახლო აღმოსავლეთი და საქართველო, VIII*, ილიას სახელმწიფო უნივერსიტეტი, თბ., 2014. /Chiqovani, G., “Towards the Etymology of Avtandil”: *Near East and Georgia, VIII*, Ilia State University, Tb. 2014.
29. ხინთიბიძე, ე., *ვეფხისტყაოსნის იდეურ-მსოფლმხედველობითი სამყარო*. „ქართველოლოგი“, თბ., 2009 / *The World View of Rustaveli's Vepkhistaosani (The Man in the Panther Skin)*, “Kartvelologi”, Tbilisi 2009.
30. ხინთიბიძე, ე., „ვეფხისტყაოსანი - შექსპირის ლიტერატურული წყარო“: ჟურნ. *ქართველოლოგი* #19, თბ., 2013. /“*The Man in the Panther Skin – Shakespeare's Literary Source*”: *The Kartvelologist* №19 , Tbilisi 2013.