

make utmost use of its tenderness. When his efforts fail, however, the deadliness of the sentence is physically represented by the distance across which the uninformed lover has to run in the dark to die. In *The Winter's Tale*, on the other hand, Leontes refrains from killing the baby on the spot and has it deserted helpless, which is practically the same thing to the angry king, who never dreams it will live. It is the tenderness of the shepherd that chances to take over what little softness Leontes had to show against his distemper. It is not an intervening divinity but men themselves that shape their end however ignorant they are about themselves.

observe it literally, allowing Shylock to materialize most cruelly his wish to spurn back, and compelling Antonio to accept his death as a consequence of the wreck of his ships. But, when Shylock, instead of Antonio, seems to be benefited by the bond, it proves more authoritative than he expects. The bond will kill Antonio through Shylock, but it will kill Shylock through Antonio, for the civil law will take vengeance. The intervention of 'mercy' invalidates the bond and saves all. It is beside the point to ask if Portia's argument is strictly legal. It is not legal if a bond is a final authority, but it is final if it convinces and persuades. The play says that every human activity, legal and merchant, is for the cause of life; the pride of law and wealth, originating in a fatal oblivion of human mortality, is self-destructive and is too empty to fulfill man's ultimate need.

4. In the opening scene of *Hamlet*, the fear of the sentinels at some invisible danger in the cold darkness is corresponded by their uncomfortable duty as liegemen to the Dane to strike at the apparition exactly like their former king. After having tried to beat the phantom in vain, a soldier quite illogically connects the impossibility to harm an insubstantial thing with the idea of the awful invulnerability of its majesty. The irony is: while the partisan of the king's body-guard is found useless to solve the ominous equivocality of the 'warlike' visitor from the land of death, his 'majesty' still holds the self-justifying effect of the armed power which guarded the powerless spirit when in life. The poor, faithful soldier is 'sick at heart' because Denmark is sick at heart with its invisible imposture, which turns out merely to be a hallucination of power politics.

5. Shakespeare's comedy is his tragedy narrowly prevented by people whose sympathetic capacity is not overshadowed by the proud faith in high status that possesses those who possess what must be jealously guarded. Not that some people of socially lower classes are specially virtuous. Just that they are much less tempted to despise their tenderness. For a possible catastrophe to be avoided, the tenderness in the evil-doer should chance to be allowed to be unconsciously sown to grow somewhere unknown. In *Romeo and Juliet*, the sentence of Romeo's banishment is both cruel and tender according to viewpoints. Friar Lawrence tries to

In the foregoing, the play *A Midsummer-Night's Dream* has by no means been "explained." At most, something has been explained about its author. The play, like all good plays, has a life of its own apart from the author's interests and end. (p. 142)

2. It is a phenomenon rather hard to understand that Hamlet's soliloquies are generally held to deserve an acceptance at their face value while Iago's are thought motiveless and causeless — in plain terms, unbelievable. The premise is that we know what these characters are before they explain themselves. If our daily-life perception of their relative morality, which is quite apparent without their unrealistic monologues, should decide our sense and sight, it would be meaningless to talk about the silly technique of telling plainly what ought to be dramatized. The unique significance of a monologue in a drama, I think, lies in the fact that it is the only way for us to hear the speaker revealing himself to himself to build his identity. It functions because the efforts sound real and can be placed somewhere in the imaginable scope of human action. Thus, Iago sounds motivelessly evil with his jealousy. But to say that Iago is motiveless is quite another thing, and is not right. His motives are explicitly there in his own words, and, if we cannot accept them, it is because we fail to grasp his identity. The case of Hamlet is quite the same; it is not enough to be impressed by his delicate moral sensibility; most essential is the dramatic relationship between his sensibility and the words he uses, that is, how he finds himself in the world. Iago's imaginary motive-hunting and Hamlet's self-forbidden death-wish both indicate their lost identity and their inability to notice their loss.

3. The dramatic possibility of the idea of 'bond' is more fully exploited in *The Merchant of Venice*. Antonio, forced to ask favour of Shylock whom he daily spurns, has to justify himself by accepting the latter's literally-vicious and therefore seemingly-playful offer that he shall pay with his life when he cannot return the money. Because he is confident that the world will go as he makes it go, he plays with his own life. Then it turns out that he cannot pay back, a situation that neither of the parties really expected. It is then that the bond claiming a pound of flesh claims its own independent authority, forcing the legal court to

Cordelia. It deserves no less admiration that Lear should still ask the suitors if they will accept his disinherited and disowned daughter. The well-meaning giver of the fertile land forgets that, because everyone inhabiting it must partake its fertility, its ruler has the power to give. And the virtuous theorizer of love's duty, Cordelia, is so confined within her faith in equity that she does not know how miserably difficult it is for a lone woman to help others partake nature's opulence of which she is part. She is the 'Heart of Lear' with his physique lost, which will be taken care of by her elder sisters.

If these daughters resemble the allegorical figures of virtue and vice, let us remember that Shakespeare knows what it is to incarnate them. Both come from a single source, the necessity of life. When men forget their mortality, their reciprocated quarrels are mere follies to a bystanding Puck. It is to us, fools of nature, that their farce has a poignantly tragic appeal.<sup>5)</sup>

## NOTES

1. In this connection, Mr. Thomas H. Jameson's work, *The Hidden Shakespeare, A Study of the Poet's Undercover Activity in the Theatre* (N. Y., Funk & Wagnells: 1967) is particularly stimulating. Although I am not to refer to real-world causes outside the artistic efforts they must have driven the dramatist to, especially relevant to my thesis is Jameson's analysis of *Henry V*, where Holinshed's image of a virtuous and gentle king is turned into its opposite. It is doubtless, I should agree, that censorship helped Shakespeare to develop his art and attitude, but I maintain that his art so developed is perfectly consistent with itself so that any attention from such political quarters, whether of the Elizabethan conformist judge or of the present sympathetic critic, must find every detail of the real-world pressure transformed into something that makes censorship blush by turning its own power against itself. He hides his criticism under the cover of the tragedy of man's misdirected aspiration. For this reason, I do not feel quite at home when, after a comment on a play in which he rightly points out a highly critical implication of its explicitly-juxtaposed social classes, Mr. Jameson says:

express the genuine oneness of love and need, although every one of them dies by overreaching his or her physical capacity in a desperate attempt to fulfill his or her need of love. They are so many mirrors to reflect one another. They are correct mirrors to reflect their own imperception because their ultimate measure of judgment is the simple and instinctive discrimination between the joy of being accepted and the pain of being rejected, the universal criterion that knows no class distinction. Their troubles are no other than a grotesque but necessary elaboration of their common imperception.

What they fail to perceive is the bare fact of humanity that behind every man's desire is the ominous shadow of his mortality; and the reason they fail to perceive this is that those that have barely succeeded in organizing their desires into a social order of duty and reward have voices. A dogma of merit and comfort solidifies the right of the few possessors of the land's opulence to disregard hungry beggars and slaughtered soldiers and allows them to forget that they are successful beggars and slaughtering soldiers. The king in the daylight is but a shadow of the beggar, unless his airy 'pomp' should take the 'physic' of his reality.

With his firm belief in his regal office, his giving all except what he thinks his nominal substance, his impartiality highlighted by his rewarding most the most virtuous, and with his cares about the future of the state, Lear has every reason to find himself virtuous. But the reality of his regime is exposed at the very outset by the disappointed expectation of his subjects that a larger portion will go to the duke the king has 'more affected,' their premise being that the land is given to his daughters' husbands according to his personal favour. The duke will prove that Lear justly likes him, but never does Lear let his sense of Albany's goodness determine who is to rule. Not that he is suspicious of his partiality. His choice of Cordelia declares otherwise; he simply divides the land as his gifts to his daughters and through them to their husbands. Happy and felicitous gifts, no seeds of evil in them! It deserves admiration that the English king should accept the possibility of a good portion of the English soil falling into the hands of France, to think of the coming bitter battles the power of France causes when it tries to help

love

As much as child e'er loved, or father found.

(1. 1. 60)

There, the need of competition almost threatens to eliminate the primary implication of 'child' and 'father' which induces their usage in this context, the implication that the father-child relationship is in itself a simple, concrete image of mutual love. Regan is not ironical when she says that her sister names her 'very deed of love,' but, because she accepts Goneril's sense of duty, she has to compete with her by using less practicable metaphors :

I profess

Myself an enemy of all other joys,  
Which the most precious square of sense possesses ;  
And find I am alone felicitate  
In your dear Highness' love.

(1. 1. 74—78)

Now, 'all other joys/ Which the most precious square of sense possesses' must be identical with Goneril's 'life with grace, health, beauty, honour.' While the eldest declares that her father is as dear as such life, the second outbids her by saying that such joys are nothing beside the joy of having his love. This is a logical development of their basic position which sharply divides love from desire, and culminates in the utter nonsense that love is the highest joy because it is perfectly joyless. And yet the use of the word 'joy' signifies Regan's natural sense of life, which no burden of life can possibly suppress. And it is this manifestation of her nature that pleases Lear, whatsoever is her conscious intention in expressing it. It is Lear's unnoticed responsibility and therefore cruel fortune that Goneril and Regan cannot sincerely mean it, but it is their misery, too. They have to hide their desire because they feel that they are not truly loved, not needed except as a virtuous machine. In spite of their opulent words, the chilling truth is apparent in their logical purport that the daughters appreciate Lear's physical fatherhood and not his concern with their need.

The king and his three daughters know no adequate code of life to

desire-laden mortal coil, what hinders men's compensating affection from bearing fruits is the jealousy of rivalry, self-righteously called honour, which readily finds quarrels and regards an opponent as vice incarnate and not as a vessel of possibility and which authorizes itself by virtuously assuming retributive justice that, in itself, is a show of its inability to judge itself. Sympathy is the ability to grasp others' truth behind their diverse expression.

Cordelia's pride of virtue is not affected by the pride of justice which motivates Lear's fatal action. The pride of justice is a disguise and product of the pride of privilege, which, undisguised, humiliates and attracts the elder sisters. The development of sheer jealousy into hierarchy, justice, and virtue testifies to man's natural aspiration. It is no wonder that Cordelia has been taken absolutely or practically to be faultless. However, Shakespeare's art springs from a profounder level of consciousness. The three parties discern evil and unreason in one another. With the father's loving heart, Lear eventually forces his daughters to love his 'Majesty,' and, since it is wrong

To offer it the show of violence,  
(*Hamlet*, 1. 1. 143)

Cordelia's rejection of its compulsion proves to be 'malicious mockery.'<sup>4</sup> And Goneril has to pretend to have more shapes of affection at her beck than she has

thoughts to put them in, imagination to give them shape,  
or time to act them in, (*Hamlet*, 3. 1. 128—129)

For it is, as the air, invulnerable.  
(*Hamlet*, 1. 1. 144)

It is with this hollowness that Cordelia is disgusted, but Goneril is doing her utmost to please the majesty according to the authoritative law of duty that will turn vindictive any time the moment she should look, as Cordelia looks, incapable of doing more than her nature permits and according to her natural knowledge of how to please. She is forced to compete with her natural gifts, and therefore with other people. She says that she will

demand for his dear ones' affection is the initial intimation of his crawling.

Lear expresses his truth by requiring his children to express their truth, without considering that the strongest expression of love can express lovelessness, and Cordelia expresses her truth by refusing to express it, by virtually saying, incidentally at the expense of her sisters, that an expression does not express any truth. But she is forced to express her truth with the ideas of duty and bond which she believes express love adequately. And Lear feels that that expression of hers expresses an untender heart. This seemingly complex drama of expression and perception is simple in principle. Each one subjectively believes in a way of expression which does not express his or her truth objectively, takes the other's protestation for a negation of what he or she has expressed, and fails to see that his or her protestation causes the other's protestation because his or her way of expression is not his or her truth itself. By honestly trying to be themselves, they turn themselves away from themselves. The basic drama of Shakespeare's plays lies invariably in the social structure of 'seem' and 'that within which passeth show' (*Hamlet*, 1. 2. 89), and, since every action of a man is an expression of his necessity of life, in that drama of expression and perception lies every evil that seems fatal and in that drama hides man's ultimate hope to discover his identity before he brings his self-deception to a catastrophe. That is, since man is not omniscient, tenderness that refuses to refuse ought to be his first and last resort to overcome his blindness, which usually causes fear and hardens his heart.

Cordelia fails to consider the inward meaning of Lear's formality, and Lear does the same to her. She protests only because she has in pure abundance what he asks for. Now, surrounded by people with so vastly different experiences it is impossible for one to look what one truly is. Misunderstandings are inevitable, and the oldest and the youngest both die ignorant of the true cause of their deaths. And yet Cordelia never ceases to love, and Lear dies lamenting over her body. If only Lear had patience enough then, just that amount of patience he shows before Goneril and Regan! If only they could freely talk! In this world of

nothing can keep the mortal warm enough except love. Especially important is the fact that, when he foresees himself crawling towards death without power, Lear for the first time desires to listen to love spontaneously overflowing to him. This is a new realm of experience to him, and accordingly Cordelia does not know what sort of answer will please him and what not. Though incorporated in the ceremony of inheritance and the test of virtue, this desire of Lear's has nothing to do with either the pride of power or the attachment to possession. But, just as he does not understand the nature of his authority and possession, so he is not aware of the nature of his need. He says he expects to

Unburden'd crawl toward death.

(1. 1. 42)

In the context of the complacent honesty characteristic of Lear's behaviour here, the down-to-earth realism of this image of age denotes the calm, resolute self-assurance with which he accepts the way of all flesh. He means it, and he can mean it because he has no fear in life. The image of crawling suggests Lear's memory of a miserable earth-bound creature, but it is clear of the sense of misery. And yet, the image tells much more than Lear means it to tell. It tells why it is an image of misery before Lear uses it to show his composure.

Nothing crawls unless burdened. A maimed fly wontonly killed does not crawl to death; it crawls under the heavy burden of life. An old man cannot just wait for death; he has to live until he cannot live any longer. Lear may get unburdened of the cares of the state, but it is impossible to shake cares from his age because now the common, unavoidable necessity to support life, which has taken the shape of his royal office up to now, will show itself in its common, less privileged form of longing, anxiety, and desperation once he has parted with the mighty shield of power which is now too heavy for him and is to turn 'Rebellious to his arm' (*Hamlet*, 2. 2. 492). Unburdened of 'all cares and business,' Lear is the more burdened. He has to 'crawl' in a sense he does not mean, because no man has the art of crawling toward death. His

death, for Cordelia and himself, and for Kent after him, and, for that matter, even for Goneril and Regan, and for Edmund who dies with love on his lips? Was it not Lear, the king, that only could have saved all of them from these deaths? Didactically, Lear's power, asserted vindictively, destroys his dearest one. Allegorically, Lear is cruelly punished by his own power that cruelly punishes. Tragically, Lear's imperception perceives the unfathomable evil of killing.

#### 5. Humanity identified : the ultimate necessity

Lear, with his unmeant malice, lets power expose its machinery which is destructive if not led by love. Now it is not Shakespeare's way to divide humanity into the dichotomous antitheses of love and desire and hurry to a fatalistic vision.

When told by his daughters to reduce the number of his attending knights, Lear cries :

O, reason not the need : Our basest beggars  
Are in the poorest things superfluous :  
Allow not nature more than nature needs,  
Man's life's as cheap as beast's. Thou art a lady ;  
If only to go warm were gorgeous,  
Why, nature needs not what thou gorgeous wear'st,  
Which scarcely keeps thee warm.

(2. 4. 267—274)

Lear is not aware of the danger of his own reasoning because 'need' as accommodation for nakedness belongs to beggars while knights and clothes are indispensable parts of princes. He wants to strike a sympathetic relationship with the daughters by pointing out their identical needs to live up to their self-images. He accepts and understands them and wants them to understand him. Since his giving over of the land is the affectionate father's spotless act of giving all without asking more than natural love, Lear is offended by Cordelia's refusal and by the elder daughters' lack of hospitality.

The pity is that the king does not know that the basest beggars learn how to desire more because nature knows what poverty is, and that

the instinctive and therefore essential truth. Yet

Is it but this, — a tardiness in nature  
Which often leaves the history unspoke  
That it intends to do?

(1. 1. 238—240)

The 'tardiness in nature' is here represented by their imperception of the 'entire point' that love is not love when it stands aloof from the cares of life. Kindly and with love, but with profound ignorance, the French king says to 'this unprized precious maid':

Bid them farewell, Cordelia, though unkind :  
Thou lovest here, a better where to find.

(1. 1. 263—264)

A farewell may be kindly bid, but where is 'a better where' to be found when unkindness threatens the very farewell? How could Cordelia fare well with her love unfulfilled, the part of her love she promised for her father?

Thy dowerless daughter, king, thrown to my chance,  
Is queen of us, of ours, and our fair France.

(1. 1. 259—260)

No one recognizes the irony of the fact that the French king's chance is a chance accident to Cordelia, too, until it ceases to interfere with her native connection to English affairs when she loses the help of the French army, the only favour that the power of her busy husband is capable of. Then, only then, Cordelia will prove as poor and wretched as her father now means to make her. Power causes strife and does not become Cordelia.

Power denies her, power does not save her, and finally power will destroy her when a petty captain's poor ambition to make his way to 'noble fortunes' (5. 3. 30) accepts his 'great employment' that 'Will not bear question' (5. 3. 33). Old Lear exhausts himself to kill her murderer. A miracle of love, to be sure. But would he still glow with that 'uneffectual fire' (*Hamlet*, 1. 5. 90) if he knew that it is time to love to

does Lear forbid Kent further benefit from his land, that is, he leaves no room for the given chance. Who would fardels bear if life were easy to sustain? It is only when it anticipates the pains it can inflict that the monopolized power seems to recognize the necessity for every man to live and the difficulty with which an unaccommodated man should meet it.

Cordelia does not recognize the threat in the king's command that she mend her words. Nor does she allow herself to be upset by her loss. Not much concerned with possession, she does not feel the pains of dispossession. The spiritual pride with which the father will rather banish himself from accommodation than suffer unreasonale humiliation is inherited by the idealist daughter who keeps herself without crying mercy. She even asks her father to notice that her virtue has caused his displeasure.

Cordelia, however, stands much calmer now than Lear later, because she does not notice that her loss has utterly disabled her in whatever her loving heart urges her to do. As Goneril says, it is a sheer fortune that the French king should be there to take her hands. But even this woman of artifice is not aware of the dramtist's art that places here a character who, unafraid and unenvious of the English king's power and wealth, can do what his heart tells him to. A twin brother to Cordelia! But their difference is great enough, too: he has everything besides love; she has nothing but love. He does what Lear would surely do if he only knew the truth. When the French king preaches on love's absolutism, however, he unconsciously wrongs Burgandy:

Love's not love

When it is mingled with regards that stands  
Aloof from th' entire point.

(1. 1. 241—243)

As man cannot feed on love, it would be a fatal disadvantage for Burgandy to marry a woman with nothing but the king's disfavour. In this sense, the French king's speach smells of the same naive complacency as motivates Lear's love-test. They certainly speak the truth,

#### 4. Lear's reaction : its double nature

When Lear disinherits Cordelia, he is not a vicious man using his great power for private causes but is mastered by the emotion of the law-keeper compelled to compel obedience to a system of morality with its art of love, the truth of which is vividly attested by the painful shock which the kind father in him feels 'To have a thankless child' (1. 4. 311).

The disinheritance is meant to be a bitter punishment. The pains it is to give is of the same nature as is shown by Lear's maddening agonies when he is prevented from living up to his image of his status :

Here I disclaim all my paternal care,  
Propinquity and property of blood,  
And as a stranger to my heart and me  
Hold thee, from this, for ever.

(1. 1. 115—118)

You see me here, you gods, a poor old man,  
As full of grief as age ; wretched in both !  
(2. 4. 275—276)

The difference is : Princess Cordelia is denied existence and driven out of her father's protection, while Lear is denied a hundred knights and will be received if he accepts the ladies' condition. Because to him his attending knights are part of himself, he disclaims the sisters, this time by banishing himself from comforts. This shows how honestly Lear is convinced of the vital importance of 'The name and all th' addition to a king' to the disregard of life's necessity. But Lear forgets that this is exactly what Cordelia does when he banishes her. If the elder daughters' lack of affection is symbolized by the misery of 'a poor old man,' then 'that little seeming-substance' 'with our displeasure pieced' is in itself a protestation against Lear's lack of affection.

Lear's treatment of Cordelia, together with his banishment of Kent, testifies to the cruel aspect of power which reacts to resistance by interfering destructively with the future life of the resistant. In nature, these punishments are death-oriented, no matter how the justice softens itself by leaving the criminal a chance to survive. On pain of death

gives to love, Lear finds his sense of the natural order argued like a need to be argued. To view from the side of one who thinks reticence to be richer than an oily tongue, Lear's compulsion is only vexatious because regardless of the law of love. She takes her sister's version of the fierce conflict between wishes and reality for a question of their personal morality. Thus, she unknowingly gives her own version of the same conflict by committing the error of criticizing the conflict from a view-angle from which love seems to rule. And it is intolerable to Lear who expects to be pleased by pleasing by means of a special favour of giving all. Because both of them believe that love must rule, their collision is inevitably fierce. The father, unconscious of the true duty of power, does not understand how successfully his cares have protected a faith in the absolute validity of affectionate honesty in Cordelia, which has actually been expressed in what has been his 'joy' and has fostered his vision of 'her kind nursery.'

Lear pictures himself as father of love and king of honour. His desire for his daughters' filial love in fact accompanies a demand of their obedience, which, combined with his sense of virtue, forms an esthetic absolutism that does not admit any refusal of its ideal image. He believes that Cordelia, his most beloved daughter, will be only too glad to show her virtuous conformity. Later, when accusing Goneril for refusing what is due to him, he refers to Cordelia's 'most small fault.' It seems 'most small' then because, now thinking in relative terms, he regards it as a merely oral fault. But it is a fault still, and Lear is unconscious that, for all his self-accusation about his disinheritance of the youngest daughter, he is repeating himself in his fury at Goneril's attitude. The fact is: Cordelia's act, if it is a fault at all in Lear's sense, is a great fault, indeed; but, if it is an inevitable reflection of Lear's erroneous self-image, he has no right whatever to call it a fault. But a fault it is in the profoundest sense, because Cordelia fails to acknowledge Lear's best part, to bring out her own best part, and to appeal to Lear's inmost heart. Love is not instruction, and Cordelia's preaching sounds heartless though true. Cordelia will show that blaming is no part of loving.

father proves when he banishes Cordelia who only speaks what is apparently true, and they also know with what a foolish pride Cordelia has courted the unnecessary misfortune. Their expression of what they are ordered to express is not entirely a wicked deception as the youngest sister understands it. They answer the authority's demand of a specified action by expressing their readiness to recognize its authority. In the presence of irresistible authority, 'readiness is all.' It is fear of loss that makes authority absolute. Now that they can expect nothing from the landless king, the landed ladies only fear his authority, a phantom of authority, the 'name and all th' addition to a king,' which will be found as good as nothing.

In brief, the elder daughters' attitude derives from their acceptance of the necessity to effect private desires under the cover of lawfulness, from their recognition of the ceremonial importance of absolute obedience, from their fear of their irascible and unruly father, and, in conclusion, from their efforts to survive and get what they think is due to them by observing the law of possession.

Attention should be paid to the difference between the power-holder and the power-seekers. With assured security and satisfaction on his side, Lear believes in the idea of love that gives and gives back freely, whereas to Goneril and Regan their father's offer is a fortunate whim which another caprice may take back. But it is hard to tell their relative morality.

ii. Cordelia is characterized as a young woman whose faith in reason and love has been fostered and protected under her father's shelter. Unconscious that the king's power and wealth let love have its aim, she believes that love is reasonably practicable.

Her 'Nothing' is an expression of her virtuous antipathy against the excessive eloquence of her dishonest sisters. The formality of the occasion compels her to distinguish her position because she understands that her king-father asks her to express *her* idea of love. Because she accepts the ritual as part of love's expression, she fails to regard love as part of the ritual. Because her spirit, untouched by the conflict between love and desire, points out correctly the distortion which desire

whose status is inferior to their native one. The taste of obeisance is bad in their mouths, and they long for royal splendour and nurse jealousy against their father whose will and power now look like unreason to them. They expect the greatest fortune long monopolized by their father to be due to them in good time. There is no shade of thankfulness in their talk :

*Goneril.* The best and soundest of his time hath been but rash ; then must we look to receive from his age, not alone the imperfections of long-engrafted condition, but therewithal the unruly waywardness that infirm and choleric years bring with them.

*Regan.* Such unconstant starts are we like to have from him as this of Kent's banishment.

(1. 1. 298—305)

They do not seem to have ever but slenderly known themselves. To use their own phrases, they reveal 'the imperfections of long-engrafted condition' in themselves by exposing the imperfections of newly-acquired condition and with them the unruly waywardness that rash youth brings with them. But this is not correct. The waywardness is unruly because long engrafted. 'Infirm and choleric years' may prove harmless if not equipped with the power that makes 'poor judgment' rash. Goneril and Regan have passed as dear daughters and known how to please before they have to guard their estates jealously.

If our father carry authority with such disposition as he bears, this last surrender of his will but offend us.

(1. 1. 308—310)

They call their own that which is 'unconstant.' Now they are resolute to prove their father's 'authority' 'unconstant.' They really fear and not without cause. They believe they are the ones that talk sense.

They obey their father because they know the strongest man's will must be done and that the servants' obedience must be acknowledged. To ask whether the ruler's demand is reasonable or not is definitely beside the point. While resistance is danger and criticism death, obedience means what matters, gain. Goneril and Regan see how foolish their

makes a dragon of a man.

iv. In conclusion, Lear's ceremony, grounded on his confusion of two contradictory values, possession and devotion, is at once motivated by the old man's ultimate need of love and by the able man's loving generosity. The former is man's basic need but Lear's ignorance about man's basic status distorts his expression of it. The latter is an essential virtue of a ruler but Lear's mistaking of his exceptional privilege for a natural right eventually renders his love rebellious to itself.

### 3. The daughters' responses : two extremes

The love-test is but a show of the daughters' unquestionable just right to inherit the king's possession. But the category of the virtue tested is private and domestic, which signifies the confine of women's existence in Lear's world. The three princesses exist as daughters and wives or a wife-to-be; that is, they exist by domestically belonging to their father and husbands. Lear gives the rule and cares of state to them only because in this way he can materially please them who belong to him, not because their competence in rulership is tested and proved. Goneril certainly knows women's art of subsistence when she contemptuously advises her youngest sister who, out of her father's favour, is no more than 'that little seeming-substance':

Let your study  
Be to content your lord, who hath received you  
At fortune's alms. you have obedience scanted,  
And well are worth the want that you have wanted.

(1. 1. 279—282)

Now we will analyze the old king's last show of his authority as it is reflected in the minds of his daughters, who, closely connected to the privilege of power, show unmistakable affinity to Lear though in extremely different ways.

i. When Lear's power to give physical felicity to his children displays itself for the last time before it ceases to exist, Goneril and Regan's future hope lies in their connection to their husbands' households

The pity is Cordelia does not know better. Loving each other, we know, because each is loving, kind, and frank, they are at the mercy of the power of possession, which, left to itself, turns love, kindness, and frankness against themselves.

iii. Now, at the end of his long rule, his desire to die wrapped in honour and love shows that this man has been seeking what his power ultimately fails to secure for him, the peace of unrejected life. Lear's belief in his reserved seat in the centre of a friendly community in the double character of king and father conceals the necessity of trading possession for affectionate cares. It signifies, on one hand, that power regards love as a rightful property and, on the other, that love is the only hope for the powerless. With all his wrong notions about the world he reigns, he is conscious that love is best. This explains why he chooses the particular form of a love-test in order to prove his daughters' merit. Precisely because he mixes up the status of the king and the life of a man who happens to be the king, Lear has absolutely no fear, no anxiety, no furtive need of private insinuation. He is confidence itself. He is enraged at Cordelia's disobedience not because it touches what he consciously or subconsciously feels to be his sore part, but because it denies his right, his love, his sense of order and virtue, in brief, his sense of harmony. With the self-assurance with which Cordelia impeaches her sisters, Lear impeaches the proud Cordelia who has deceived him :

I loved her most, and thought to set my rest  
On her kind nursery. Hence, and avoid my sight!  
So be my grave my peace, as here I give  
Her father's heart from her!

(1. 1. 125—128)

This is a frank confession from a wrathful dragon. There speaks the man, who, swayed by the dragon of false pride, believes in his 'sight' which should be avoided and takes his father's heart from himself and who will find his peace only in his grave because he finds his heart killed with the dear one mercilessly. Though a victim of the common imperception, Lear is distinguished from Cordelia by his power which

least of all anything hard to achieve. He is to learn this, when he finds himself a naked old man, honest and tormented.

ii. Lear does not notice the irrelevance of filial love in the act of what is practically a division of the kingdom, because to him this is a distribution of *his* possession among his daughters. His utter blindness to his own mixing up of public and private matters is evidenced by his frank distinction between his possession which he gives away and his royal authority which he keeps. He is not conscious that his possession is his authority. He does not know that, because he has the borrowed power of the sacred radiance of the sun,

The mysteries of Hecate, and the night;  
... all the operation of the orbs  
From whom we do exist, and cease to be,  
(1. 1. 111—114)

that is, he can disinherit and disable any one, the other sisters obey him in order to 'exist,' and that, when the time comes for them to disobey him, he will not have the power to restore, let alone revive, the wronged one. Though not a conscious seeker of self-interests, Lear is affected by his royal privilege. Dipped deep in the honour of his most celebrated status as the lord of an illusory world of celestial law, the king's eyes are closed to the miserable struggle for survival taking the form of a royalty-loyalty relationship and to the rational disinterestedness which assured security alone can foster. Inexperienced in want and need, Lear cannot fathom the temptation of power but perfectly embodies in his self-assurance what is so dangerously tempting to others. He has not a true idea of the serious war a man of true royalty must wage against his personal causes. This is the reason he so complacently takes the attitude of a benefactor appealing to and satisfying his beneficiaries' desire, when he should choose the least self-interested soul to be trusted with the sceptre. Absolutely terrible is the Shakespearean compression:

*Lear.*                    what can you say to draw  
                                 A third more opulent than your sisters? Speak.  
*Cordelia.*                Nothing, my lord.  
                                 (1. 1. 87—89)

The old king's acknowledgement of his own infirmity is honest enough and his motive to trust younger strength with the charge of state business is sensible enough. But Lear's division of the territory as well as the love-test ceremony it accompanies betrays the scandalously personal nature of his status and power. (1) Lear divides England among his children, (2) lets their filial love justify this procedure, (3) appeals to their desire to draw forth their expression of love, and (4) retains 'The name and all th' addition to a king.' But in his own view there is nowhere any fault with him.

i. Lear divides his land merely because he happens to have children. This is expediency rather than wisdom, partiality rather than rule.

We have this hour a constant will to publish  
Our daughters' several dowers, that future strife  
May be prevented now.

(1. 1. 44—46)

In spite of his professed intention, Lear hands the 'interest of territory' over in a clearly less integrated, less stable state than under his control. He admits the strength of desire, and, in order to avoid its violence, he tries to satisfy desire by changing the 'rule' and 'cares of state' into dividable shares to be possessed, instead of placing the duty of rule and cares over the desire of possession. The irony of this self-annihilating procedure is precipitated by Lear's complacent retention of the king's status. While he expects a mutual good-will among the ones satisfied with their divided authority, Lear would not admit any vision of himself less than what he has hitherto been. That is, precisely because he is every inch a king to himself, and that a good and thoughtful king, he is unconscious of the threatening self-contradiction of his intention but understands it enhances homogeneity, friendship, and thankfulness. He is ignorant of his own image of himself. His idealism is a naive assertion of spirituality by one whose life of power has spared him the taste of struggling discontent. To the old ruler, love is a premise, a secured thing, a thing he can readily secure, not anything to be longed for, and

her lack of affectionate consideration a moral vice, but it is an error all the same, and her self-assurance is grounded on her imperception of the extreme difficulty of communication, that is, the difficulty of self-definition and mutual definition. Cordelia's reasoning exposes a very simple mentality of one inexperienced in man's desperate struggle with himself. Her 'bond' is a spring of spontaneity and her 'duty' indicates the reciprocation of mutual love. But here Cordelia is oblivious of the very vice she discovers in her elder sisters. To them, bond and duty are beautiful words under which to hide their self-interests. They have found love and desire hard to reconcile, and by concealing their poignant desire under the virtuous show of love they at least acknowledge the ultimate importance of love and at the same time nurse their desire which it is impossible to renounce. But Cordelia dismisses their experience along with their rhetoric. This is not an adequate way to take their presence into consideration.

Cordelia's simple reasoning accompanies a tragic imperception about her situation. She is so young and so true: her youth is so inexperienced in the way of the world that the old father takes her for what she strives to convince him she is not. She does not recognize how powerless her spiritual simplicity is. Significantly, she has to commit her aged father to the questionable cares of her sisters, only because she does not thank him properly.

But yet, alas, stood I within his grace,  
I would prefer him to a better place.  
(1. 1. 276—277)

She has failed to do so. Rational impartiality has disappointed his 'grace.'

The above discussion is not to accuse Cordelia or ascribe the unhappy breach to her imperception alone. But at the beginning of an analysis of the scene, the problem of Cordelia is a good instance with which to make my point clear. It is not right to isolate her like a virtue incarnate.

## 2. Lear's self-expression: his truth and fallacy

she believes in the identity of heart and act.

I love your Majesty  
According to my bond ; no more nor less.  
(1. 1. 94—95)

'Bond' here signifies her social sense with which she will love people around her. If she loves someone so much, that much is the utmost within her power, for, if she overloves him, she will be failing to give others their due. She will be devoted and impartial at once. Whatever she means by it, however, the word, with its strong connotation of legal procedure, is not a happy choice. For, precisely because the bond of reality forbids men to realize their deep love more than it allows them to, they aspire for a spiritual realm where love transcends relativity. From this view-angle, 'bond' is an antithesis of love and Cordelia sounds as if she were reluctant to do more than she is compelled to.<sup>3)</sup> Lear's reasonable efforts to keep up with his belief in her tenderness is thus doubly frustrated by the presence of Goneril and Regan. Lear is forced to compare Cordelia's rejection with their compliance, and she is forced to distinguish herself from them. From her view-angle, she has done no wrong and there is no mending her words. She tries to explain herself in the same terms, but the more she resorts to the matter-of-fact authority of the reality of life, the further she alienates herself from Lear's image of spontaneous love.

*Lear.* But goes thy heart with this?  
*Cordelia.* Ay, my good lord.  
*Lear.* So young, and so untender?  
*Cordelia.* So young, my lord, and true.  
*Lear.* Let it be so ; thy truth, then, be thy dower.  
(1. 1. 107—110)

Cordelia's way to distinguish herself is ill-advised in that it disregards the mentality of the addressed and does not answer his need. Her rhetoric fails her, because it is largely motivated by her antipathy against her sisters who, she well knows, are false. A negative tone is least likely to indicate love.

Now that her asides assure us of her goodness, we should not call

she knows it is a mere rhetoric without love behind it. She knows what they are. At the same time, she is dismayed to be required to do what she is incompetent to do, while she believes that she is the only one that loves her father truly. Her asides convey her dismay :

What shall Cordelia do? Love, and be silent.  
(1. 1. 63)

Then poor Cordelia!  
And yet not so, since I am sure my love's  
More ponderous than my tongue.  
(1. 1. 78—80)

These speeches addressed to herself reveal her sincerity far better than her resolute 'Nothing' which suggests none of 'poor Cordelia.' They impress us because there she persuades herself by forcing word wield the matter, which she refuses to do to satisfy her father. Her rhetoric is the same as Goneril's ;

Beyond all manner of "so much" I love you.  
(1. 1. 62)

What prevents her from honestly expressing the poor dismay of the good heart is the necessity to speak conclusively in the public without depending upon 'a still-soliciting eye.' Her sisters have spoken and met the demand according to their law of virtuous expression, and she ought to make hers clear. If there were not Goneril and Regan present, Cordelia would still be reserved but would not think it necessary to crystalize her will of devotion in a resolute refusal of its verbal expression.

In this way, 'nothing' is her only possible method of expressing her heart. The irony is that she has to speak after all, making word wield the matter and that in the most preposterous way. Lear is surprised at what he cannot help regarding as a denial of filial affection. But he needs a hard time of cruel revelation before he convinces himself of her unkindness. He has sense enough to discriminate between the heart and the words and gives her four chances to mend the wrong impression she gave. And each time she precipitates a crisis. Because

ively assumes, a 'daughter' should love her loving and protecting father naturally, her goodness can be properly tested and judged in such terms. This is a test of nature in the public, not an assessment of private promises. Moreover, he does not allow his personal likings of their husbands to affect his distribution of his land among his daughters (a crucial point which is emphasized at the very opening of the scene but escapes the notice of Kent and Gloucester). He has decided to give 'a third more opulent' to Cordelia, without regarding who will have her love. That is, in his eyes, she alone is distinguished among the three sisters in natural merit, and the ritual of the division is so contrived as to reach its climax with Cordelia proving her excellency. In this sense, the ceremony of love-test exists for her expected triumph, while every one is required to be virtuous. Lear believes that all his daughters are good enough, the youngest being the best.

Consequently, Lear adopts the form of competition to show the justice of his judgment. And the ritual obliges every contestant to prove her merit by participating in the spiritual challenge by means of impressive images, her acceptance of her obligation of obedience being the primary intimation of her expected nature. Every one is supposed to know what is required and how to meet the challenge. Now, sincerity is the hardest thing to render in words; every body knows how difficult it is to materialize his or her sense of duty in actions; it inevitably violates the bounds of concrete images. Thus, Goneril begins:

Sir, I love you more than word can wield the matter.  
(1. 1. 56)

This is the only possible way to let word wield the matter. In this sense of rhetoric, let it be noted, we are concerned with the adequacy of expression and not with the morality of its user. When the heart matters and no ill will is anticipated, any successful use of words to show love's spontaneity is justified. Lear is satisfied because he cherishes the moral truth much more than the physical truth, because love, at its best, is an endeavour to do more than is possible.

Cordelia cannot justify her elder sisters' 'glib and oily art' because

double dealing ; by being badly shocked at the discord in Cordelia's manner, Lear reveals his inward truth, to which Cordelia's criticism of his way of expressing it does not pay express attention ; and, since their manner is affected by their common unconscious involvement in something discordant, they inevitably find the distortion in each other but, unable to look through each other's inward, cannot identify the origin of their predicament. And this is why we must clearly define the phenomenal error committed by the subjectively purest soul which can really appear to be unkind ingratitude to the very one who cherishes most dearly what she really is at heart.

When Cordelia criticizes a logical untruth in her sisters' rhetoric, she does not respect the fact that their obvious exaggeration satisfies the old man who cannot be so silly as to expect his married daughters to be his personal maids. He says to Goneril :

Of all these bounds, even from this line to this,  
We make thee lady : To thine and Albany's issue  
Be this perpetual.

(1. 1. 64—68)

And he continues and addresses Regan :

What says our second daughter,  
Our dearest Regan, wife to Cornwall?

(1. 1. 68—69)

To Lear, this ceremony implies nothing of calculation :

Tell me, my daughters,—  
Since now we will divest us, both of rule,  
Interest of territory, cares of state,—  
Which of you shall we say doth love us most?  
That we our largest bounty may extend  
Where nature doth with merit challenge.

(1. 1. 49—54)

This, he means, is a bounty offered to the heart, not a mere grant of what the receivers are entitled by birth to inherit. And since, he na-

tongued young girl may not possess the art to instruct and please at once, which is a common fact of the world known to all including the old father; although Cordelia cannot be said to be wholly faultless, yet the father's inverted judgment is extraordinary enough to convince us of his practically determinant responsibility; and her actions of love and his agonized compunction to be developed later settle the question of their relative morality as the theatre is concerned. On the apparent level of practical judgment, this is sound. But it does not explain Lear's reaction and virtually makes him unaccountably foolish. It does not do justice to the old man who will prove surprisingly honest and intelligent and affectionate. Evil should be better grounded.

We may dismiss our possible sympathy with Lear as irrelevant assuming that his characterization leading to his misjudgment is far more important. In other words, we may think that Cordelia's 'Nothing' is a technical accident to draw forth the dramatic substance of the evil in Lear's blind pride. This, however, does not do justice to Cordelia, who chooses to reply in this particular way of her own accord. Her response is more a rejection of her sisters' dishonesty than of Lear's expectation, and represents her resolute stand taken against their principle of life, while they actually please the father who is to find himself wickedly deceived. Thus, "Why does Cordelia act in the way she does?" and "Why does Lear act in the way he does?" are not separate questions but are so related as to help form a vision of the royal family whose interests in possession and love are not harmoniously integrated. Cordelia's flat refusal is a manifestation of her unconscious involvement in the disintegration. And to the same extent Lear's flat disinheritation of her is an authentic revelation of his involvement. We are concerned with the characters' situations from which their thoughts and actions spring rather than with a disinterested law of morality with which to judge their personal responsibility.

About the breach between the father and the daughter, the most crucial point is least perceptible. In expressing her honesty by refusing to comply with her father's method, Cordelia expresses a discord in the family by not perceiving Lear's utter imperception of the elder daughters'

## CHAPTER I *KING LEAR*

### 1. Cordelia's 'Nothing': her heart, motive, form, and error

Cordelia's attitude to Lear's demand for an oral expression of her love is by no means simple and definite in meaning. It causes in people concerned nearly so many different interpretations. To Lear it means unkindness to be punished with disinheritance; to Goneril and Regan foolish simplicity that happens to benefit them; to Kent just judgment and right words of one who deserves gods' loving protection; to Burgandy an unaccountable accident that causes a loss of great fortune; to the King of France richest virtues worthy of 'inflamed respect'; and to herself love that wants 'that glib and oily art' and a 'still-soliciting eye.'

And there should be mentioned the audience, the centre of the theatrical experience, to whom specially audible are Cordelia's asides which faithfully record her vexation up to the moment she utters her fateful 'Nothing.' We depend upon her asides to evaluate her action and other characters' evaluation of it. And, since there she speaks most truly to herself, we are tempted to accept her action as a wholly virtuous one.

An aside or soliloquy, however, may justify the speaker's subjective view of things but will not tell whether he is right or wrong. We accept his self-expression but we are free to decide how much of it to believe and how much not.<sup>2)</sup> The truth is that exactly because Cordelia's asides are there to assure us of the subjective honesty in her reaction, its interpretations by others to various effects suggest its objective or phenomenal significations about which she is unconscious. If, shocked by the violence of Cordelia's 'Nothing' and at the same time impressed by her reticent tenderness, we interpret the shock as a forceful revelation of her innocence which makes Lear's blindness the more impressive, we wrong Lear.

'Nothing' is a rejection of the flattest kind. It is not a happy way to sound affectionate. Even the most erroneous interpretation by Lear can snatch from us a logical degree of sympathy, which haunts us because it is part of our commonsense. And to deny it, we may apply more of commonsense with a bit of artistic twist: An honest and frank-

the foregoing comments and preoccupations concerning the 'Mona Lisa of literature.' Many of its long-discussed problems seemed to vanish. This shocking and intimidating experience caused me to wonder what the dramatist ever meant by concealing his craftiness so perfectly. Relief came when applications of the same notion to his other major works proved fruitful. It became clear that *Hamlet* has been surrounded by mutually invalidating theories only because sufficient lights have not been thrown on the dramatist's idea of drama which characterizes all his works and of which *Hamlet* is a particularly conscious presentation.

In the following chapters, we will discuss the first important actions in each of some major works of Shakespeare, because, while a full analysis of them is neither convenient for the present purpose of studying his basic method to interrelate his characters or proportionate to the incompetence of the present writer, one may expediently suppose that, with Shakespeare's method of letting every action represent and explain the whole story, the part of initial presentation in each work should be a perfect embodiment of the predicament and its nature without referring the audience to its memory of preceding actions. For the same reason, we will chiefly let the text explicate its thematic structure with as few references as possible to foregoing theories and criticisms, which, when made, are made only to point out their errors or mutual contradictions and not to do justice to each of them by acknowledging its intrinsic value which reveals itself even through its accidental errors. One hopes this is not taking too much liberty.

by calling what is not properly his his own, now finds some other one doing the same after him like a twin brother, but, instead of understanding his involvement in the prevalent evil, is tortured by the sense of being sinned against.

With such implications carefully and coherently woven into the texture of every speech, Shakespeare digs into the heart of the misery of possession, competition, jealousy, and vengeance. It might seem to be an allegorical world. But its nature is much more of psychomachia than of allegory, much more of self-analysis than of criticism. It leaves us with the final riddle, 'Whether love lead fortune or else fortune love.' Because man's identity is captured without referring to extra-natural sophistications, dramatic irony is restored to its properly artistic function of holding a mirror up to nature. The secret of Shakespeare's art lies, not in the enigma of the conflict between obligation and moral sensibility, not in a disturbed brain of an uncertain dramatist, but in a unique combination of a clear mind and a tender heart in a conscious realist who knows that, if, in order to be saved, it should be necessary for man to see better than he does, there would be no hope for him, but that, if he can correctly feel what is taking place and know his feeling to be his reason, it may not be rigorously necessary for him to know exactly in what way he has become what he is. Hamlet suffers for all his belief in his cause, though he is ignorant of the cause of his suffering. His misfortune is that he never once thinks of doubting his cause which forces his 'godlike reason' 'greatly to find quarrel in a straw,' while the grain lies forgot, untended, frozen, and dead. This is something men ought to learn from 'bad dreams' if they are to sustain themselves better. And this is the proper realm of drama. It is an 'honest method' to concentrate on what happens and not on how it should be accepted. For the slave of 'what we ought to say,' it is good to 'speak what we feel' (*King Lear*, 5. 3. 324) once in a while.<sup>1)</sup>

The above notion about this dramatist's technique and its philosophy began to take shape when an attention to the female figures in *Hamlet* compelled me to understand its plot structure and therefore the motivations of its participants in a way fundamentally different from any of

heaven to take care of her soul rather than reckons her among the number to be killed, and when the Ghost before him tells his son not to let his soul contrive against his wife against whom the dead husband is unable to become revengeful. Love denies murder even if unconscious, while the Ghost persuades love to commit what he himself says is most foul in the best. He wants death to remedy death. It escapes the consciousness of the great king now rendered powerless by death that it is his love of his life which his wife helped to make dear that makes his loss of her so painfully unbearable, that he wants to kill his murderer because he knows the other loves life as he does, and that it is just the same expression of love in the form of murder that is shown by the murder of the proud monopolizer of power able to make love go 'hand in hand even with the vow.' Behind the seeming conquest of proud death and the apparent cruelty of fortune, there is man's instinctive sense, the root of his 'motion,' 'apoplex'd' and 'cozen'd at hoodman-blind.' Man's instinctive sense is that of the need of unrejected life, which could be achieved, if ever, through his awakening to the joy and necessity of mutual sympathy.

Truly fatal is man's destiny of death, which is not either good or bad, but thinking makes it so. After all within man's reason and power is thought and done, mortality must be accepted with readiness. With readiness, that is, without expecting to have in the unknown place a fulfilment of life that is missed here. For as far as man can know, there is not 'a better where to find' (*King Lear*, l. 1. 264)\* after losing this. The final test of life's consummation is whether a man dies contented because he has tasted life and helped others taste it. One must accept his own death as the world without malice has to accept his death. A ghost who is so vexed at his own death as to think ill of the world's procedure to fill up his absence is a 'perturbed spirit' that cannot trust himself to silence both because, with his life cut short at its prime, he is surprised by death which he has thought himself able to ward off by his own strength and because he has conceived this naive self-assurance

---

\*Quotations from the plays are from W. G. Clark & W. A. Wright ed., *The Works of William Shakespeare* (London, Macmillan & C. : 1949)

world is the interaction of such individuals, no one can have rest and peace until everyone sees the portraiture of the others by the image of his cause, understanding both how oblivious he can be of their needs and grief and how his cause, as well as theirs, can be grounded upon this 'bestial oblivion' of their brotherhood. Given a situation where no one understands any one, the tragedy seems inevitable and deterministic. But the most essential point with Shakespeare's tragedies is that the merciless inevitability of the actions is invariably coupled with the actors' feeling sense of horror and loss at their own actions and at the same time with their intelligent reasoning in terms of duty and morality and fairness that compels them to act against their grief. Thus, the apparently tragic fatality turns out to be a self-frustration of a 'most miraculous organ' that speaks without tongue against the error of trying to correct a corrigible evil by resorting to a similar evil because one does not know that one's enemy stands on the same ground, and letting the evil run its course unchecked. With a truly deterministic tragedy, the inevitability with which the catastrophe is brought about plays a double function of convincing the spectator of the impossibility of correction and also giving him a sense of extraordinariness that transcends his daily expectation. This is not the case with Shakespeare. His theme is the conflict between man's native sensibility and his aquired habit of response. His morality founds itself simply on men's common wish to live. He knows that all the philosophical and religious elaborations and sophistications come from this one wish and tells their truth from their fallacy. For instance, the law against suicide proves true and adequate when it represents Hamlet's instinctive fear of 'self-slaughter,' but, when he says he refrains from suicide for fear of the unreasonable God, we know that Hamlet's religious education has not taught him that his soft flesh is the root of heaven and hell. When, again, Ophelia prays heaven to restore the mad prince, heaven adequately represents her tender sympathy with the madly invective prince but it is as helpless as Ophelia herself with Hamlet blind to his loving responsibility as the only possible guardian knight for the wronged girl. And yet, the saving element or creative factor manifests itself, though misplaced among contradictory ideas, when the prince wants

determinism as far as the dramatic persons are concerned. This is a very delicate point to make because the idea of fatalism or determinism can mean quite different things while retaining a convincing degree of inevitability. If a rash act that kills the wrong man who will not be much missed should be accepted and justified because 'There's a divinity that shapes our ends,' heaven's 'scourge and minister' crawls about without eyes until he himself is killed in an unjustifiable fashion but with a firm belief in 'a special providence' in his fall. This is a determinism of the most fatal kind that deprives 'enterprises of great pitch and moment' of 'the name of action.' If an infinitely graceful and virtuous man with 'some vicious mole of nature' in him should 'in the general censure take corruption/ From that particular fault,' it is cruel and absurd rather than revealing and tragic. Now, fatalism of these kinds practically takes away responsibility from man and renders morality meaningless, even though the moral sensibility about good and evil and beauty and ugliness held by a Hamlet continues to appeal to the sympathetic capacity of the audience. It is men's madness that develops the plot of their fate, whatever may be said to account for its unreason. The situation remains quite unchanged even if a Hieronimo, after his life of madness and murder, is admitted to the everlasting felicity of an Elysium. Any crafty dramatist will think of appeasing the spectators' uneasy concern, especially if any hint of moral disturbance may incriminate him, while securing most tyrannical clappings for the ghastly sensationalism with which the 'tragedians' delight Hamlets.

It is useless to criticize and praise unless man proves able, inclined, or likely to discover and correct his mad participation in the whole course of the disaster. With this concern about the ultimate morality of a tragedy, the creator of Hamlet is distinguished from his creation. It is Shakespeare who defies augury by analyzing how the tragic persons' ignorance about 'Why the man dies' derives from their blindness, not to some 'cause without,' but to their most vital cause within. There is an imperception to be desirably avoided if only they could watch themselves acting. No ill feelings would rise and prick one's bosom if one felt one's needs understood and reasonably satisfied by the world. Since the

in life characteristic of his status, education, and experience. It is not that a number of men with diverse mentalities happen to come in contact but that they sustain their lives by belonging to their society with its particular system and order which impels them to form their ideas of life according to their respective position and function in it. Our dramatist's myriad-minded style comes from his awareness of the diverse images of life entertained by diverse classes of men who understand the same thing quite differently. They experience pains individually and collectively owing to self-deceptions and mutual misunderstandings attributable in the first place to their respective ways of being interested and being ignorant and finally to their common share of an invisible blindness inherent in their social system.

### 3. Unity

Shakespeare does not put a special emphasis on any one character's moral responsibility. Instead of highlighting one person's fatal error, the playwright makes all his characters ply their diverse versions of the same discord. Their irretrievable loss is caused by a certain defect in their social order which professes to secure peace of mind and physical felicity for them and imposes law, decorum, and cults, although the common people often prove to be more reasonably critical than its exponents of high rank. At the same time, it is suggested that the diverse self-images have an identical significance to the inward of their holders. There is poised before us a profound question about the essential meaning of man's efforts in life, which compels us to reexamine in the light so given our accepted standard of struggle for survival. Behind each man's peculiar manner of reaction is an ultimate faith in life with an ultimate wish for safety and satisfaction in the face of threatening death. It is this everlasting desire of man that gives a subjective meaning to each and all of a man's past experiences on the testimony of which he builds his way of thinking and habit of response. Thus, the basic principle of the Shakespearean tragedy is: the man-made rule of living violates the rule of life that makes man. The consequence of the error, therefore, is not accidental or temporal but continuous, ever-present, and accumulative.

The above discussion may sound to suggest a sort of fatalism or

dramatist's view of his situation. He does not act in an unlikely way even if he does greatly different things at different times. When he appears to do what he has seemed unlikely to do or incapable of, he is just revealing prominently something innate in his characterization that has consistently influenced his choice of actions but has not been recognized as such. A great man of honour and reputation with merits enough to justify his glory commits a grievous fault not because a passion or madness blinds his reason for a few fatal moments, nor because his best possible reasoning just does not foresee an unpredictable turn of events, nor because a providence has it so according to its inscrutable plan or the blood spilt by one of his ancestors curses him, but because there is given a situation which exposes a destructive element in his mode of existence that has been the very source of his fame and honour and pride. And that element proves the more destructive because unnoticed either by the admiring or the admired. Even when a character repents with a painfully acquired new vision of himself, he repents because he fully feels the irretrievably evil effect of his own action and not because he grows truly aware of the forces that have conduced to it. Othello, for instance, kills himself because it seems to be the only honourable way to vindicate his sincere self from an imputation of some monstrosity which he cannot account for except in the irrelevant terms of loving too well. And, symbolically enough, Lear dies asking why Cordelia is dead; he does not realize that the terrible authority of the mighty with which he rendered his youngest daughter homeless and powerless now seeks its consummation in the hand of an ambitious exploiter of that authority. No matter what misery and pain his failure brings about, no matter how serious he finds his error to have been, no matter what new sets of ideas he uses to interpret his situation, the Shakespearean tragic figure remains his contradictory self at the bottom, trying with all his passionate intellect to account for his misery and reaching a conclusion characterized by his implanted turn of mind.

## 2. Diversity

Every character has a characteristic self-definition and distinctive features in psychology. Every one entertains a set of hope and purpose

irony functions somehow as a technical means to divert the audience from 'thinking too precisely on th' event' by tacitly or overtly premising an unfailing norm of judgment in the audience.

However, if one allows oneself to think too precisely, the sense of dramatic irony with which the audience leaves the theatre convinced of what he seems to have always known gives a most merciless instance of dramatic irony. There, not only the dramatic persons on the stage but the theatregoers are foils exploited by the dramatist who is resolute to let the tragedy criticize its own convention. What is the use of making the Prince of Denmark refer to 'th' imposthume' 'that inward breaks' and let his 'godlike reason' lead himself to bloody thoughts, if one is to believe that it is no matter however 'ill all's here about my heart,' accept his readiness to defy whatever death may chance by accepting it, and trust his silent soul to whatever felicity it may find in death without identifying any cause 'Why the man dies'? Is this a mere presentation of heart-rending agony and self-destructive madness to be enjoyed? Or is it a picture of hopeless absurdity that defies reason? Or can it be a logical method to reveal some unnoticed and unaccepted truth for the audience who has to be enlightened so as to get rid of certain 'motes' in his 'mind's eye'? Suppose the last is the case, what becomes of the supernatural or metaphysical sense of order that has helped to form the tragic?

In Shakespeare's plays, dramatic irony has nothing to do with any ideological sophistication about man's status in the universe but is a neverfailing norm of plot construction. The imposthume is presented as it is in the act of breaking inward unrecognized in the very person who suffers it and reacts to it. The plot is grounded on the interrelatedness of men who misconceive what they are to the world and what it is to them. The basic sensibility of the audience is depended upon but not its code of conduct. Thus, the irony reaches the realm of insight as to what is man and how he can know it so as to be himself. It functions with thoroughness, diversity, and unity at once:

1. Thoroughness

Any character in Shakespeare's tragedies is not allowed to share the

out to be a blind man whose blindness and errors do no good to him in his given situation but educate the audience against similar situations? What sort of consciousness can be worth having while limited by blindness and clearly short of the audience's knowledge of the plot? What good is it ever to invite the audience to watch an actor pretending to struggle for what is finally no more than a half-truth? In brief, these confounding questions may all be contained in the final one, What is evil? If man is of a dichotomously double nature being cursed in his physical self and blessed in his spiritual capacity, his dramatic presentation must inevitably show a twofold structure telling how the evil in him brings about a disaster and how his soul extricates itself from his 'mortal coil.' Then, tragedy is inherent in life and an inexorable determinism, whether hopefully religious or ominously cynical, ought to be brought in to assure the integrity of the critic's consciousness about man's disintegrity. Thus, a Gloucester mentions the heavenly beings that wantonly kill men like flies and a Hamlet calls miserably to the Everlasting that forbids him to escape the torture of life and has to accept His inscrutable way of killing him. If, on the other hand, man is to be his own master, either he should cease to disown his evil and assert his strength within whatever stretch of life he can live like Edmund and Iago or he should find the ultimate cause of his unbearable pains the remedy of which is possibly within his power like Prospero. But in either case we lose the scent of the tragic or the sense of losing something valuable. Again, this consideration gives rise to another perplexing question, what is this 'something valuable' that is lost in a tragedy? Is Hamlet sung to his felicity by flights of angels or is he among the 'so many princes' served on the table of proud Death in his eternal cell? Is Iago's a degraded man's insignificant failure and not an image of man's 'capability and godlike reason' misemployed? And how can one know that it is misemployed? Insoluble questions ensue, and with by far the most of the tragical pieces in history it seems that their conceptual integrity has been achieved by some or other poetic or philosophical vision that persuades the audience to swallow two logically incompatible principles in combination and remain a disinterestedly interested watcher. That is, dramatic

# “SOME NECESSARY QUESTION OF THE PLAY”

by Kei Maruta

## INTRODUCTION

A drama presents a number of interrelated characters that, by expressing themselves according to their respective characterizations, affect one another in such a way that something unexpected and consequential is caused to take place so as to reveal a certain momentous element in their relationship hitherto unnoticed. The dramatist has his objective view of the whole situation but lets each of his characters form his own conception of what he thinks he sees. Thus, the drama defines the dramatic person in a way he cannot define himself by showing where and how his sight distorts the truth. A person in a drama may be defined in terms of his function and significance in the human society he belongs to, which must involve not only his status but also his prospect. Therefore, his error in shaping his own image or defining himself discloses itself in the way he judges the world, decides his attitude on the judgment, chooses a series of actions to make the world into what he wants it to be, and finds himself confronted by unexpected results. This pattern is known, in general terms, as dramatic irony.

The idea of dramatic irony, useful as it proves as an expositive principle, is, as a process of enlightenment, hardly an easy tool to handle. How much of the reality should a person in a drama come to know at the end? Can a man possibly come to a full knowledge of the irony of his own fate? If he can and still remains a victim of his own fatal error, he must be playing the double role of a mortal thing confined within his limited intelligence and an omniscient articulator of some universal and timeless intellect. If he cannot, how much should he know and what good does his limited instruction amount to? Should he turn