PAULO JOSÉ HAUSER BRODY

***KING LEAR*: DRAMATIC LITERATURE AS A TIME MACHINE**

PORTO ALEGRE

2006

UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DO RIO GRANDE DO SUL
INSTITUTO DE LETRAS
PROGRAMA DE PÓS-GRADUAÇÃO EM LETRAS
ÁREA DE ESTUDOS DE LITERATURA
ESPECIALIDADE: LITERATURAS ESTRANGEIRAS MODERNAS
ÊNFASE: LITERATURAS DE LÍNGUA INGLESA
LINHA DE PESQUISA: LITERATURA, IMAGINÁRIO E HISTÓRIA

KING LEAR: DRAMATIC LITERATURE AS A TIME MACHINE

Dissertação submetida à Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul
como requisito parcial para obtenção do grau de Mestre em Letras
na ênfase Literaturas de Língua Inglesa

MESTRANDO: PAULO JOSÉ HAUSER BRODY

ORIENTADORA: SANDRA SIRANGELO MAGGIO

PORTO ALEGRE
2006

Encontram-se disponibilizados para leitura através da Internet os seguintes trechos da dissertação: *Sumário*, *Prefácio*, *Introdução, Caps. 1*, *2* e *3*, e *Obras Consultadas*.
Os demais capítulos estão disponibilizados na forma impressa, juntamente com os acima mencionados, na biblioteca da BSCSCH da UFRGS.

The following parts of this thesis are available for reading in the Internet: *Table of Contents*, *Preface*, *Introduction*, *Chapters 1*, *2* and *3*, as well as *Works Consulted*.
The other chapters are available in the printed form (together with the above mentioned) in the BSCSCH library of UFGRS.

Para minha linda Jaqueline.

Agradecimentos

Ao meu grande amigo Vinícius Figueira, que muito me estimulou na idéia de fazer o mestrado: devo a ele o empurrão inicial, bem como uma série de idéias e informações que me encorajaram nos primeiros passos.

À CAPES, por financiar este projeto.

Ao professor Homero Vizeu Araújo, com quem tive grandes insights *ao trabalharmos Antonio Candido.*

À professora Rita Terezinha Schmidt, que me facultou o acesso às manifestações contemporâneas da teoria literária.

À professora Márcia Ivana de Lima e Silva, que possibilitou uma série de discussões proveitosas em sua classe.

Ao professor Luís Augusto Fischer, em cujas aulas nós tanto refletimos sobre o fazer artístico, e que tanto me ensinou sobre Machado – e o resultado é que eu acabei lendo Shakespeare com olhos um tanto machadianos.

Ao professor Lawrence Flores Pereira, e mais uma vez aos professores Fischer e Márcia Ivana, por aceitarem prontamente o convite para compor a banca e analisar esta dissertação.

Ao meu amigo e colega José Carlos Marques Volcato, que me ajudou de forma fundamental na minha pesquisa, me possibilitando o acesso a um precioso material bibliográfico shakespeariano, e o principal de tudo: foi graças a ele que fiquei sabendo da questão das versões Q e F de Rei Lear. *Grande colega!*

E, por fim, mas não menos importante, à minha orientadora, Sandra Sirangelo Maggio, que com seu conhecimento da Literatura Inglesa teve um papel muito importante em situar Shakespeare no contexto da literatura nacional na qual ele se insere e, com seu carinho e dedicação, me acompanhou ao longo de todo este processo: chegamos!

RESUMO

O objetivo desta dissertação é examinar os princípios composicionais empregados na peça *Rei Lear*, de William Shakespeare, de modo a relacioná-los com as mudanças observadas nos períodos elizabetano e jaimesco. Essas referem-se principalmente à longa transição do feudalismo para o capitalismo, à subseqüente coexistência de ambos os modos de produção na Inglaterra dos começos da era moderna, e, conseqüentemente, de representações ideológicas tanto medievais como modernas. Uma tradicional tendência nos estudos literários e históricos da Inglaterra é a de descrever tal coexistência como sendo pacífica e evolucionária; contudo, estudos mais recentes apresentam tal período de transição como sendo muito conflituoso. Creio que *Rei Lear* lida com esses conflitos não apenas através de seu enredo, como principalmente por meio de sua estruturação. Para atingir o objetivo proposto, utilizarei o procedimento da *close reading* para as duas cenas iniciais (I.1 e I.2), em razão de estas apresentarem os principais elementos estruturais da peça. Em seguida, apresentarei eventos históricos dos períodos Tudor e Stuart de maneira sucinta, os quais serão relacionados com os artifícios estruturadores presentes em I.1 e I.2. O próximo passo será o de examinar com menos detalhamento outras cenas relevantes, visando identificar nestas aqueles aspectos estruturais analisados nos capítulos anteriores, bem como relacioná-los com os conflitos na Inglaterra dos começos da era moderna. O último capítulo examinará a composição social do público de Shakespeare, suas preferências dramáticas e literárias, e a forma como *Rei Lear* lida com essas, com o propósito de estabelecer uma constante quebra de expectativas em termos estéticos. A base teórica para esta dissertação serão os escritos de Karl Marx, os quais considero relevantes para a elucidação de fatores sócio-econômicos nas histórias inglesa e européia. Outros pensadores marxistas, tais como Brecht e Jameson, auxiliarão a estabelecer a conexão desses com a organização estética proposta em *Rei Lear*. Ocasionalmente aplicarei outras teorias literárias como complemento, tais como o continuum formalista-estruturalista e a estética da recepção. Na conclusão, comentarei a cena final da peça. Ao término do trabalho, espero validar a tese de que a organização estética propositalmente instável de *Rei Lear* apresenta uma relação com a luta de classes na Inglaterra dos primórdios da era moderna.

Palavras-chave: Literatura inglesa – *Rei Lear* – Shakespeare – Marxismo – Períodos elizabetano e jaimesco

ABSTRACT

This thesis aims at studying the compositional principles of William Shakespeare's play *King Lear*, in order to understand the way its structuring relates to the changes observed in Elizabethan and Jacobean times. Such changes concern mainly the long transition from feudalism to capitalism, the subsequent coexistence in early modern England of both modes of production and, consequently, of both medieval and modern ideological representations. Although a traditional tendency of the English literary and historical studies describes such coexistence as peaceful and evolutionary, more recent studies depict those times of transition as very conflictive. I believe *King Lear* deals with such conflicts not only by way of its plot, but mainly in the manner it is structured. In order to pursue my goal, I will present a close reading of the two initial scenes (I.1 and I.2) , for they present the main structural features of the play. Subsequently, I will present a brief account of historical events in both Tudor and Stuart times and connect those to the structuring devices presented in I.1 and I.2. I will then examine some further relevant scenes in lesser detail, in order to identify the structural features analysed in the previous chapters as well as their connection to the conflicts in early modern England. The last chapter will examine the social composition of Shakespeare's audience, their dramatic and literary preferences, and the manner in which *King Lear* deals with those in order to provide a constant break of expectations concerning its aesthetics. The theoretical basis for this thesis will rely on the writings of Karl Marx, which I deem relevant to elucidate socio-economic factors in the English and European history. Other Marxist thinkers, such as Brecht and Jameson, will help me establish the connection with the aesthetic organization proposed in *King Lear*. I will occasionally employ other literary theories as a complementing tool, such as the formalist-structuralist continuum and the aesthetics of reception. In the conclusion, I will comment on the play's final scene. At the end of the work I hope to validate the thesis proposed, being it that the intentionally unstable aesthetic organization of *King Lear* relates to the developments of class struggle in early modern England.

Key-words: English Literature – *King Lear* – Shakespeare – Marxism – Elizabethan and Jacobean times

TABLE OF CONTENTS

The following chapters are available in printed form, but not in the Internet:

PREFACE

The following speech was delivered on the occasion of the defence of this thesis, on October 30, 2006,

Dear Professors members of the examining panel, dear people of the audience: writing a thesis is not really an easy task. The first, and possibly the main difficulty about it, is choosing the object of study. When I entered the postgraduation program, I had already decided to study Shakespeare, but my project then was about *The Merchant of Venice*, a play I didn't really feel enthusiastic about. On the other hand, the one play by Shakespeare that I loved the most was *King Lear*, but I didn't choose that one initially because I really felt intimidated by the idea of working with it. To start with, my connection to *King Lear* was purely emotional and sensitive. This means that I did not have initially any idea about the sociohistorical circumstances concerning this work; more than that, its aesthetic organization is so complex - a remarkable linguistic complexity as well as a plot full of events, which seems to defy any logic. *King Lear* seemed absolutely ungraspable to me.

This made me really wary of working with *King Lear*. However, there came a moment when I changed my mind and I thought it was worth daring. And so, I dropped my original project in order to grapple with *King Lear*, the one play that I didn't understand at all, but which I loved even though. So this was already the month of May last year, and as I said, I did not have the slightest idea how I would approach the play.

Up to that moment I had not read any criticism about it, and it also seemed impossible to apply any sort of theoretical approach. Generally speaking, I favour the Marxist approach for literary criticism, and I was then enthusiastic about adapting the notions developed by Lukács in his essay 'Narrate or Describe?' for the drama criticism. Nevertheless, I was not sure I could deal with *King Lear* that way, and so I decided to leave aside any theoretical issues for a while in order to come back to them in a later moment.

So, for some months, I dedicated myself to the task of reading the text as many times as possible at the same time that I was reading assorted literary criticism about the play. And there was a difficulty concerning these assorted commentaries about the play: such pieces of criticism differed greatly from each other; more than that, they actually contradicted each other, and, to make things worse, each of them seemed to be right in its evaluation about the play, at least concerning some aspects of it.

And there came a moment when it seemed to me that such a divergence of viewpoints about the same artistic work was possibly caused by the very structuring of *King Lear*: that is, there is something in the formal organization of this play which causes us to have so many and contradictory views about it. At that moment, I thought I finally had something to investigate.

Now, if opinions and views about this play differ greatly, there is one thing about which just all critics agree: *King Lear* is a work that breaks the expectations of the reader and the spectator regarding all characters and situations featured in it.

The consequence of putting these two factors together is that I was lead to believing that - *strange as it seems* -, the main feature of *King Lear* concerning its formal organization is that it is **structured around instability**. Now, what do I mean by this? What are the practical, concrete characteristics of this specific play that is *structured around instability*? I would say there are three main effects concerning this.

The first one: this instability makes us change opinions about the characters and situations presented in *King Lear* just *all the time*. We feel we are unable to keep any fixed opinion about those.

The second one comes as a consequence: this play provides a variety of different and conflictive perspectives, as is to be perceived from the critical fortune and the scenic history of the play.

The third one: *King Lear* is characterized by a constant break of expectations - the situations, the atmospheres and the characters themselves change constantly all along the play, and in the most unpredictable way.

At that moment, I was not able to see yet how Marxism or any other theory could deal with such aspects of the play, and, on the other hand, I felt that I really needed a theory to work with. I had already read a number of Marxist thinkers, especially Brecht, but I could not really see *how* they could explain the workings of the play. It seemed as if these were completely different things that did not bear any connection. I started then reading for the first time Marx himself, and there was a text of his in particular, called *A Contribution to the*

Critique of Political Economy, which mentions the transformations in the early Modern Age concerning the way the individual relates to his family and to society in general, as well as the changes in the relation of the ruling classes in Europe, and especially in England, to the accumulation of goods, to money, and to landed properties. And then it finally occurred to me that *King Lear* was written precisely in such times of change, the beginning of capitalism - times of tremendous changes and terrible uncertainties. It came to me that the structural instability of *King Lear* was the aesthetic expression of the terror the Englishmen must have felt in the times of the ascension of capitalism, a social order which, just like the play, is unpredictable and structured around instability.

At last I was able to somehow relate the form of the play to the historical moment in which it was written. However, this was still very general and very intuitive - I needed to do a close reading of the play, but, technically speaking, I still did not know how to proceed on a concrete analysis of the play at that moment. A little later on, I was reading Kent Cartwright's *Shakespearean Tragedy and Its Double*, which deals with the manner the Shakespearean *tragedie* regulates the response of the audience by means of a dynamics of engagement and detachment. In the Introduction, Cartwright mentions a peculiar effect that Shakespeare obtains in the composition of the character of Macbeth. This is what he says, "Our early impressions of Macbeth, for example, contradict each other; witnesses from battle report him as ferociously brave, while on entering he acts fearful and rapt."[1] Cartwright is not so much interested in contradictions as much as he is in establishing a scenic coherence which has to do with what he perceives as the openness of the Shakespearean tragic character. This does not really have to do with my understanding of *King Lear*, but that passage of his book was an inspiration for me: people say about Macbeth that he is ferocious and brave, and thus, we are prepared to see a character like this; yet, when he first enters, he seems a rather fearful character. Our expectations about Macbeth, based on what we have heard about him, are not met.

While Cartwright tries to somehow establish a coherence out of this, this passage recalled the effect that so many passages in *King Lear* had on me, where I had contradictory impressions about the characters and situations. I was not really aware of this in the previous times I had read the play, but this brief comment on another play by the same author made it clear to me that this happens many times in *King Lear*, also if I was not aware of this fact while reading. The way Cartwright writes about the aforementioned contradiction in *Macbeth* reminded me not only of things that I experienced while reading *King Lear*, but it also recalled the *V-effekt*, a technique devised by the theatre director Bertolt Brecht which

assembles contradictions side by side in order that the spectator has a critical perception of the scene and, consequently, a keener political awareness of what life is in a capitalistic society. The similarity that this formal construction in *King Lear* bears to Brecht's *V-effekt* showed a possibility of applying such notions to the analysis of the play.

This should be done very cautiously, though - Brecht's technique has got a socialistic orientation to it, while Shakespeare is an author famous, among other things, for not having a clear political agenda. Also, the effects obtained by Brecht are very clear once that you know what his working methodology is. Nevertheless, the contradictions in *King Lear* did not work upon me in the same way as they do in a Brechtian play - I would say that, instead of clearly perceiving such contradictions, I rather felt them in a sensitive way. That is, it was an unconscious operation which, in spite of this, made me critical of the characters in the play.

I finally had the key for proceeding a close reading of *King Lear*: I would look for contradictions in somewhat Brechtian lines, but, at the same time, I had to be cautious enough to perceive not only the similarities, but mainly the differences between Brecht's methodology and the compositional procedures employed for *King Lear*. Also, while a Marxist approach seemed now very feasible, I decided that, while doing the close reading, I would try to leave aside the Marxist theory and come back to it only later, when the play had already been analyzed.

And so, I did this close reading in Portuguese for a good number of scenes, as well as a more general study of other scenes, and this procedure covered all of the play, except for the final scene, V.3. By doing this, I was able to perceive that *King Lear* is built around certain formal principles which occur all along the play, such as:

a) Constant and sudden interruptions of subjects and situations by other ones;

b) Juxtaposition of actions and situations completely different from each other, with no real gradation between them;

c) A wild mixture of dramatic and literary genres. Not only we have *tragedie* but, among other things, we have got elements which are more proper to comedy, to the adventure narrative and to the fairy-tale, among others. And, if this were not enough, *King Lear* is characterized by this constant break of expectations concerning not only one genre, but several genres. We can take the *tragedie*, the comedy, the adventure narrative, the fairy-tale, and none of these genres behaves as it is expected to do.

To sum up, we can say that, in *King Lear*, the author's method of creating scene and character is one which assembles behavioural and aesthetic contradictions side by side, and thus calls our attention to them, instead of concealing them.

Many of these procedures are analogous to Brecht's *V-effekt*, and might even have inspired it. However, I identified two specific compositional procedures which make this play very different from a Brechtian work, and which I have found only in *King Lear*. I denominated those as the *false continuity* and the *'not-too-conscious' critical attitude*. Unfortunately, I will not be able to explain them right at this moment, both because they are too complex, and because it would require some concrete examples from the play to present them satisfactorily.

And, just as any reader, I always had a problem from the first time I read this play with situating it along the timeline. It is always stated that the action of *King Lear* is situated in a pre-Christian Britain, in 800 B.C. However, we have got characters, speeches and situations that seem very much like the Middle Ages, and we have also got other characters, speeches and situations that seem closer to Shakespeare's times, that is, the Renaissance. The consequence is that many critics and theatre directors refer to the setting of this play as atemporal, but this was not a satisfactory answer for me, either.

While doing the close reading, I had the feeling that *King Lear* feels like a time machine, it transports us to-and-fro through the centuries. I arrived to the conclusion that this was necessary precisely to show the class conflict between the decaying feudal nobility and the ascending bourgeoisie - that is, between the ruling class of the Middle Ages, and the social class that would be the future ruling class from a certain moment of the Modern Age on. This conflict presented different aspects along the centuries and it ended up changing completely the organization of the state in England, and more than that, it changed the English society itself in profound and irreversible ways.

What *King Lear* does in a way is synthesize a story that took centuries: the story of the class struggle between the feudal nobility and the bourgeoisie. It is a symbolic condensation of the history of England, and, because of this, Shakespeare needed to put side by side elements from different historical ages, the famous anachronisms of the Elizabethan/Jacobean theatre.

Such anachronisms present in Shakespeare's plays are an aesthetic element that either goes completely unnoticed by the post-Shakespeare readers, or then, it tends to be taken for granted - that is, we have got a large number of critics who say that Shakespeare mixes elements from different historical ages in his plays, but, more often than not, they do not

dedicate any reflection as to why he and the other dramatists contemporary to him do this. I actually believe that my main contribution in this thesis - the main novelty, let's say - is this study concerning the socio-aesthetic function of the anachronisms in *King Lear*: they are the technical instrument that allows us to travel in this time machine.

I arrived to such conclusions without a previous good knowledge of the English history. I had already read some books by English historians about the historical period in which Shakespeare lived, but things had not gotten any clearer to me because the facts of the Tudor and Stuart ages tend to be presented by traditional historiography in a very disconnected way. What I had was the close reading of the play itself, some knowledge of Marxist theory, and a knowledge of European history in general. I already knew that the history of England differed from that of France in that, in England, there was a section of the aristocracy which was more enthusiastic for capitalism and established an alliance with the bourgeoisie, while in France the nobility was monolithically opposed to the bourgeoisie. I also knew that there was a characteristic in the English history from Henry VIII up to Queen Victoria of constant changes in the alliances between different social classes, and of these with, or against, the government. And so, my analysis of the symbolic representation of class struggle in the play was based very much on a generic European model and not on a specifically English one. It was in this manner that I wrote Chapters 3 and 4, which analyze scenes I.1 and I.2 respectively. I had previously decided that I should not read any more books while writing the thesis but I always had two words pounding in the back of my mind: Christopher Hill. This is the renowned Marxist English historian who wrote so many books on the so-called Puritan Revolution. And, due to my familiarity with Marxist theory, I believe that, when one studies History for the purpose of literary analysis, one should not study only the period in which the analyzed fiction is set, or the times of the author, but also what comes afterwards so as to put things in perspective. And so, in July this year, I started examining the writings of Hill, and I perceived that I had just come across a source of rich and invaluable historical information.

I saw that I had to stop writing for a couple of weeks in order to read these books which featured a plethora of historical facts about the Tudor and Stuart ages which were completely absent from the traditional historiography and, even better than that, they were treated according to a Marxist perspective.

And my main source of joy in the discovery of the works of Christopher Hill was that, strange as it may sound, they just confirmed my intuition and the findings I arrived to by means of the close reading of the play. And I want to state this here and again: I did not

arrive to an understanding of *King Lear* because I had previously studied he history of England. No; it was just the opposite - I *did not* have a previous knowledge of the history of England, but I arrived to it by means of a careful analysis of the structuring of the play. What Hill provided me was precise historical data organized around a theory, but the main arrangement of such facts could already be inferred from the dynamics of the structure of *King Lear*. And, for this reason, I decided to present such data to the reader only in Chapter 5, after the analysis of some scenes - thus, the reader arrives to such facts exactly at the same time that I arrived to them. It is the analysis of the structure of the play which allowed me to understand the history of England, and not the opposite - and, if this was good for me, I believed it would also be good for the reader. And this is why the historical facts come after the literary analysis and not prior to it.

I also had the intuition that the several dramatic and literary genres in *King Lear* represented the aesthetic tastes of the different social classes that went to the theatre in those times, and that this probably had some relation to the stage of the class struggle in Jacobean England. And so, after having read Hill and still while writing the thesis, I had other four words pounding in the back of my mind - those were *Playgoing in Shakespeare's London*. This is the name of a book by Andrew Gurr which my good friend José Carlos Volcato had lent to me, but which I had not read until then. Gurr is a historian of the Elizabethan theatre, and I had already read two other works by him, and after this, I had decided that I could not read anything else because there was no more time for it, even though I felt that *Playgoing* . . should be the best book by Gurr. But afterwards, I finally read it. I was lucky enough to do it after I had read Hill, and so these two sources of information matched each other perfectly well.

So, I have just finished relating in brief lines my process of elaborating this thesis. The last thing I would like to say is that, concerning Shakespeare studies (and maybe literary studies in general), we have got a dissociation. In the last decades we have had a good amount of leftwing essays which provide interesting information about the society of Shakespeare's times, but do not help us in understanding the artistic process in his plays - that is, why Shakespeare is Shakespeare. I expect that, with this thesis, I might have helped to bridge this gap.

ENDNOTES

(1) See Kent Cartwright's *Shakespearean Tragedy and Its Double*, p. 35.

INTRODUCTION

King Lear: Dramatic Literature As A Time Machine is a study of the compositional principles of Shakespeare's *King Lear*. The analysis presented here relates the structuring principles of this play to the main social conflict in early modern England - the struggle between the ascending capitalist mode of production and the decaying feudal mode of production.

This is a play which, along its four centuries of critical fortune, has motivated a wide array of opinions about all imaginable aspects: its characters, its artistic value, its philosophical and political standpoint, even its feasibility of being staged or not - and if we come to think of the scenic history of the play along the twentieth century, with the different perspectives provided by different theatre directors, we are going to add some more diverging points of view about *King Lear*. In fact, I am a theatre director myself, and this is my favourite play - and such a divergence of viewpoints upon the same artistic work has been certainly puzzling for me, but more than that, it has always been very stimulating. It is precisely the difficulty of offering an exhaustive interpretation and position about it that shows us the vitality of *King Lear*. Moreover, by reading a considerable amount of the critical fortune as well as appraisal about different stagings of this play along the twentieth century, I could not help wondering that many of those seemed to offer consistent assessments of *King Lear*, at the same time that they contradicted each other.

This peculiarity made me wonder that the reason for this must be found in the very structuring of *King Lear* - and so, I decided to do a survey on the formal aspects of the play in order to see if I could understand better this phenomenon. This was my starting point: I never intended to arrive to "the definitive opinion" about this work, but I believed that such a study would illuminate some aspects of how *King Lear* works on us - either spectators or readers - and how it is able to go through centuries having both readers and spectators relate to it in the most varied ways. (One could argue that what I am saying is true for just all

classics of literature. I agree with this, but the vast number of contradictory views in the span of four centuries is seldom obtained by other plays, or even by literary works in general.)

However, there is one single aspect of *King Lear* upon which all critics agree, whatever their philosophical standpoint is, and whether they like the play or not: this is a work that breaks the expectations of the spectator and the reader regarding all characters featured in it. This also seemed to me an important matter of investigation: one thing is to say, "The end of the play absolutely surprised me and shocked me" - we all agree about that; we also agree that the play provides us a constant sensation of instability which makes us change opinions all the time, and never know what is going to happen next. We can take this for granted, or we can give up and attribute this to some wild inspirational factor that will never be properly grasped by us. Another, quite different thing is to investigate how the author manages to do this in technical terms. I concluded that such a break of expectations was not only an important factor - it was the *structural axis* of the play, and it was worth investigating.

Strange as it seems, my belief was that *King Lear* is structured around instability. On the one hand, this instability makes us change opinions about the characters and situations all the time, and provides a variety of different and conflictive perspectives, as is to be perceived from the critical fortune and the scenic history of the play. On the other hand, it generates a constant break of expectations. My focus, then, was set to the analysis of how Shakespeare generates this instability and constant break of expectations in a technical manner.

However, I believe this cannot be done satisfactorily if one does not investigate the social conditions and the historical movement that is connected to this specific work. If I am to do a satisfying technical analysis on *King Lear*, this has necessarily to go *pari passu* with the study of Shakespeare's times and the specific sociohistorical conditions in which *King Lear* was created. And there is one aspect about that moment of History which is fundamental for this study: the coexistence in early modern England of concrete aspects of life that belonged either to the Middle Ages or to the Renaissance, as well as the coexistence of ideological representations which are proper to these two different historical periods. Such a coexistence was a conflictive one: a clash was taking place between the long-existing feudal mode of production and the arising capitalist mode of production - or, to put it in simpler terms, that was a moment of bitter class struggle between the decaying feudal nobility and the ascending bourgeoisie.

By studying Shakespeare's historical moment, I also had to study the theatre of early modern England, and an aspect that called my attention was that, contrary to the prevailing

image we have of the theatre of those times - the Elizabethan theatre as a venue where all social classes in England gathered and shared their hopes, wishes and fears (i.e., the artistic expression of an organic community) -, the theatrical tastes of that audience were also divided along lines of class struggle, and that meant different varieties of drama, different kinds of performances, and different theatre venues for conflicting social classes (Shakespeare's Globe was more like the exception that confirmed the rule).

Different social classes favoured different dramatic and literary genres, and here enters the peculiarity of the Globe being a theatre venue that intended to appeal to all social classes. Shakespeare was certainly familiar with all these genres, and I examined the possibility that one of the formal factors that provides a break of expectations in *King Lear* is precisely a wild mixture of assorted dramatic and even literary genres (among other technical factors, of course). In other words, I thought it was profitable to consider *King Lear* a hybrid work instead of a homogeneous tragedy. And the socio-historical aspect to consider was that such a mixture of genres was an elaboration on a symbolic level of the class struggle in early modern England.

In order to do a work like this, it was certainly profitable to get in touch with the latest developments in literary criticism and theory, which examine literary works as inscribed in the wider contexts of culture or language. And still, I have a very specific concern with Shakespeare's *King Lear*, which is examining it as a *work of art*. I completely agree with R. A. Foakes when he states that "literature demands not merely to be understood, but to be appreciated as an experience, and as art".[1] When he said that, he was specifically concerned with recovering a sense of the artistry in works such as *King Lear* or *Hamlet*.

I will be dealing then with *King Lear* as art, not as culture or language. By this, I am not denying the contexts of language and culture - these must be taken into account (and will be). Also the manner in which we, readers, deal with literary works as an instance of reception inscribed in specific historical and geographical contexts must be taken into account - and, of course, whichever elements that constitute our identity. Taking these elements into consideration was a conquest of the contemporary literary criticism, but we will not go very far if we do not regard a work of art as a work of art, and an artist as an artist. If we deny or circumvent the artistic experience, we will be denying Shakespeare (or any other author) his agency, his own capability of having performed a transforming action in his own circumstances of space and time. And this would be profoundly undialectic - besides the pole of reception (readers and spectators), we must also consider the pole of production (the author), if we want to have a global comprehension of the literary work that is being

examined. This does not mean that I will be using the words “art”, or “artist”, very often - in fact, they will seldom appear, and I use the usual term “author” a lot more often. Still, the word “art” will be present now and then, as something that includes literature - that is, where common usage would prefer the term “literature and art”, I often say just “art”, for I understand literature as a branch of the arts, and this is where my interest resides.

When I say “art” or “artist”, I am referring to somebody who, even if deceased four centuries ago (in the case of Shakespeare), developed specific skills for his work and, more than this, needed to make specific choices at every moment in order to shape *King Lear* in the manner he did. Had Shakespeare made different choices, we would have another work (and maybe we would not be interested about it). And I must take this as a dialogue - as a reader, I produce meaning, but I do it within specific circumstances, and these include the compositional choices the author made. In the specific case of Shakespeare, this is a dialogue with a different historical age.

This dialogue will proceed in the following manner: I will examine scenes I.1 and I.2 by means of close reading; these two scenes present technical devices which will be present in the rest of the play (even if in a transformed manner) - such technical devices provide the structuring principles of *King Lear*. Afterwards, I will relate the structure of I.1 and I.2 to the historical movement of the English society, from the Tudor era up to the event which came to be usually called ‘the Puritan Revolution’. I will also examine a structuring factor in this play which has been overlooked: the anachronisms. I will examine how the structuring principles above mentioned operate in other scenes of the play (and this time it will not be a close reading, but a brief examination). Finally, I am going to present information about the theatrical (and also reading) preferences of the different social classes in Shakespeare’s London, and relate such data to the historical information and the aesthetic survey which was previously done.

Precisely because we will engage in a dialogue with another historical age, I need to explain some terminology which I employ in this thesis concerning the dramatic genres of Shakespeare’s times. In Chapter 1 (1.4) we will see in more detail the issue of the first editions of Shakespeare’s plays - meanwhile, I will remind you that, until the eighteenth century, these were published individually in a small format called Quarto, and, seven years after Shakespeare’s death, they were all published together in a very large format called Folio. In the specific case of *King Lear*, this play was named differently in each format, and I will present these titles with their original spelling: the Quarto presented it as the *True Chronicle Historie of the life and death of King Lear and his three Daughters. With the unfortunate life*

of Edgar, sonne and heire to the Earle of Gloster, and his sullen and assumed humor of Tom of Bedlam. In the Folio, it was published as *The Tragedie of King Lear*. So, we have *King Lear* characterized as belonging to two different dramatic genres of early modern England in these two different formats: in the Folio, it is called a *tragedie*, and in the Quarto, a *historie*.

And here I must explain that you will come across this ancient spelling whenever I refer to such genres in this thesis. I chose to write *tragedie* instead of "tragedy" in order to historicize this Renaissance English genre. The reason for this is that the dramatic genre known as 'tragedy' properly speaking was a form of art that came into being in Greece in the fifth century B.C. Not only it had different formal characteristics from the Elizabethan *tragedie*, but it was a manner of elaborating in a symbolic form conflicts proper to that specific society. It was an art form developed in a very specific society, in very specific circumstances of space and time, just in the same manner that the kabuki theatre originated in a specific historical moment of Japan, and the kathakali theatre, in India. And, just as it would not make sense to talk of an Argentinean or a Swedish kabuki, there is no such a thing as an "English tragedy". Also, the study of drama in general will not profit if we assign a common denomination such as 'tragedy' to the works of dramatists who are so different from each other, as Sophocles, Shakespeare and Racine. Nevertheless, we need some definition for what constitutes an Elizabethan *tragedie*, and I think the Brazilian critic Bárbara Heliodora provides a satisfying one: *tragedies* are plays whose protagonists belong to the aristocracy, and, in the course of action, move from a state of happiness to one of unhappiness, until they die in the end.[2]

As for the Elizabethan dramatic genre known as *historie*, it has got peculiarities which make it different, for instance, from whatever sort of historical drama that was written in the nineteenth or in the twentieth century. As Lena Cowen Orlin says, this was an "Elizabethan invention, used with reference to a dramatic subject matter rather than a dramatic mode *per se*".[3] She goes on to inform that prose writing about the history of England (in the form called "chronicles") constituted a popular reading which helped shape a national identity. This appreciated subject matter was then transposed to the stage - the *historie* plays told the lives of the kings of England, or of other historic figures and historic events. In the specific case of Shakespeare, his *histories* presented to the audience examples of what were to be considered good and bad monarchs. Generally speaking, one can say that the dramatic form of such plays was fluid: it could resemble that of a *tragedie*, or emphasize the comic elements, or still, and more often, alternate between, and present a mixture of both (and still other elements) -

of course, this mixture would vary according to the specific needs of the play, and the point that it was trying to make about a specific event or figure in the history of England.

Both *tragedie* and *historie* present protagonists from the ruling class - in order to make clearer the main differences between these two dramatic genres, I will quote from Linda Woodbridge, who presents a list of relevant differences. Among other things, this is what she says about the differences between the two genres, ". . . it is common to find in history plays no clear-cut set of heroes and villains, but ambiguous collections of partly good, partly bad characters drawn in shades of grey . . . history plays paint on a broader, less focused canvas crowded with characters vying for attention; [while] tragedies focus on one or two prominent central protagonists."[4]

It is not my purpose in this thesis to discuss the *historie* plays. I reproduced the passage above, however, due to some aspects that bear similarity to *King Lear*: in spite of presenting two distinct groups which could be, roughly speaking, called 'heroes and villains', we certainly can see 'shades of grey' in most of the characters. And a production of this play would also have the stage "crowded with characters vying for attention", differently from other Shakespearean *tragedies*. This is to say that there are indeed elements in *King Lear* which could cause it to be called a *historie* in Shakespeare's times, even if I prefer its usual designation as a *tragedie*. Also, there are other cases of plays by Shakespeare which were given different generic identifications when published as a Quarto, or in the Folio.

The last thing I have to say about the manner I spell the dramatic genres Shakespeare wrote, is that, whenever I refer to 'comedy', this will be spelled in the usual, contemporary manner, otherwise from the other genres. This does not mean that I would get ahistorical about it and disregard the differences in the manner that Aristophanes, Molière, Jerry Lewis and Jerry Seinfeld provoke laughter. I think, however, that the situation here is very different from the problem with 'tragedy', and it allows me doing so.

There is another aspect which I think is worth clarifying. Whenever I refer to a specific passage in the play, I will do it according to the manner established in the English-speaking countries. Since most readers of this thesis will possibly be Brazilian, I believe it is worth explaining how this is done. Let us take as an example a speech of Lear which is in Act 2, scene 4, starting in line 118 and ending in line 126. Following the common usage, I will refer first to the number of the act, then to the number of the scene, and finally, the lines - it will look like this: II.4.118-26.

And here I must provide another explanation which has to do with the Quarto and Folio editions of *King Lear* (which will be called Q and F from now on, following common

usage). There are many and important differences in the text featured in both, being the best-known one the fact that Q features something like three hundred lines not present in F, and F, for its turn, presents approximately a hundred lines not to be found in Q. And so, the vast majority of editors and critics believed that the reason for this was that both Q and F were imperfect transmissions of a complete original text that featured all lines present in both, and which was lost. The solution for this: for approximately three centuries there has been an editorial tradition of combining (or, as is usually said, 'conflating') the two texts into a single one that presented all lines from both. As for the differences from one text to the other, each editor would make his own decisions about the best solution to take regarding certain problems (and, of course, there were solutions which became traditional and were commonly adopted by most editors of the assorted *King Lear* editions).

Notwithstanding, there was a group of scholars who presented a different view about this question in the early eighties. According to them, the traditional editorial solution of conflating the Q and F texts into a single one was not a solution - instead, it generated problems concerning the aesthetics and the comprehension of *King Lear*.[5] These critics understand that the pattern of changes from Q to F shows that each of these texts is aesthetically coherent in itself, that they are in fact different versions of *King Lear* produced in different moments, and, for this reason, they are not 'imperfect' - each of them was meant to be like it was in the respective moment that it was written (or rewritten) - Gary Taylor believes that Q was written around 1605-6 and F dates from 1609-10.[6] More than that, these structural differences from Q to F are so deep that they affect the action itself - and, consequently, they affect content. Some of the most important differences: Q presents many moralizing commentaries, which were excised in the F version; there are many cases in which speeches are transferred from one character to another; the roles of Kent and Albany are significantly diminished from Q to F, and the structural consequence is that this enhances the role of Edgar.[7]

Although this thesis is not about the question of Q and F, I found it relevant to mention the topic here. We will later see some properly editorial aspects of it in Chapter 1 (1.4) - because the working version for this thesis is F, and not a conflation.

I decided to use the F version instead of a conflation only after doing a long, detailed and careful study of the Q version, the F version, and the conflated editions by G. K. Hunter and Kenneth Muir. My choice was established after I did a thorough survey of Q and F before reading the arguments of the 'divisionist' critics, because I did not want to be previously influenced by those. After this long study, which included reading the divisionist

critics and comparing F to the conflated editions above mentioned, I was convinced that, indeed, conflating Q and F was not the best solution concerning either aesthetics or content, and that we will appreciate *King Lear* better if we take one of these two versions in separate. And, in this, I also agree with the majority of the divisionists, who say that F is the version that achieved the best artistic results. This is the reason why this thesis examines the F version. The specific edition that was used for this study is *King Lear: A Parallel Text Edition*, edited by René Weis and published by Longman. This edition presents both Q and F versions side by side, in a very neat and didactic way that allows the reader to perceive easily the differences between the two versions.[8]

Although I agree with the divisionist critics in many and important aspects, I do not go to the point of considering Q and F as two different plays, as some of them seem to do - in this, I agree with R. A. Foakes that Q and F are two versions of the *same* play to be read in separate, but not *two* plays.[9] (And Foakes also prefers the F version.) Also, this is no reason for anybody to dismiss with the conflated edition he has got at home (and my conflated Penguin *King Lear*, edited by G. K. Hunter, is one of those few objects that I treasure) - reading *King Lear* as a conflation is still a wonderful experience. And I want to stress that this thesis can also be followed by a reader who makes use of a conflated *King Lear* edition.

Now and then you will find endnotes that mention differences between Q and F (especially in Chapter 3). This matter is not central for the purposes of this thesis, and this is why it is in an endnote, and not in the main text. On the other hand, I agree with the divisionists that, by blending Q and F, the conflations tend to blur some aspects which might not be perceived or understood in a clear way - such cases of contradictions between Q and F are the main reason for these endnotes.

From all these differences, there is one which I take to be the most important, and which affects profoundly the political and philosophical outlook of the two versions: in Q, the final speech is uttered by Albany; in F, this speech is Edgar's (and this is how the conflated editions present it in most of the cases). We have to take into consideration that, when *King Lear* was first written and performed, England was ruled by James I, a Scottish king who intended to join the two countries in the island of Britain - England and Scotland - in one single kingdom (the third British country, Wales, was already part of England by that time). Many characters in the play are not called by their proper names, but by the names of the territories they control. I am saying this because Albany is an ancient name by which the English would call the northern part of the British isle (including Scotland) - and thus, Albany would be perceived by Shakespeare's audience as representing Scotland. In the Q

version, it is not Edgar, but Albany, who utters the last speech. The effect, as Gary Taylor says, would be that of presenting the Scot as the one with the last word, the one that unifies the split kingdom. It would be easy to establish a connection between the Q Albany and King James (as Gary Taylor says) - thus, James I would be perceived as a healthy unifying factor: the anti-Lear.[10]

This happens in the Q version (and this is the version which was presented in King James' court in 1606). Now even if the factor above mentioned could please the then-king of England, we should avoid a mechanicist thinking that would strive to attribute to this play a fixed political label, such as "pro-government", or "oppositionist". I believe that a political literary criticism can do better than ask if a literary work is 'rightwing' or 'leftwing'. There are many other factors, both aesthetic and social at the same time, which were probably not noticed by James I, and that must be taken into consideration. It is these factors which I consider fundamental for the impact that this work exerts on us.

We also have to take into account that this play underwent a profound revision later on. In this revision, many lines were excised and, as a consequence, Albany, who was a moralizer in Q (and also close to being a hero), became a collateral and more dubious character. And, more important than this, it is not he who has the final say in F (and in the conflations), but Edgar. And, by means of the analysis that will be proceeded in the following chapters, we will see that this change bears a special significance, both political and philosophical.

Since I mentioned Edgar, I would like to say that I will pay considerable attention to this character in the last chapters of this thesis. The reason for this is that I believe the structural weight that Edgar has in the play, has been overlooked, generally speaking. On the other hand, I will not be dealing with the Fool - that is, I will have to talk about him whenever he appears in a scene that is studied here, but the Fool himself will not be studied. The main reason for this is that the Fool does not appear in scenes I.1 and I.2 - these are precisely the two scenes that will be deeply and thoroughly examined, since they lay the structural basis of *King Lear* (as I said, I will also talk about other scenes, but this will be in a briefer manner). This means that a study of this character would be disconnected from the other matters that will be examined here. The second reason is that I do not perceive the Fool as a character properly speaking, but rather as a poetic function - he is not involved in the dramatic action of the play, he does not have any function concerning the development of the plot.

About the working methods employed in this thesis, I would like to explain four things. The first one is about my choice of scenes to be examined, either by means of close reading, or in a briefer manner - there is a tendency in the criticism of *King Lear* to focus upon these scenes which bear a stronger emotional impact: the initial scene, the Dover Cliff "leap" followed by the encounter of the blinded Gloucester with Lear dressed with wild flowers, and the final scene. Of these, I will only examine the initial scene. The reason for this is that I am examining the structure of the play instead of focusing on its mere effects. However beautiful the Dover Cliff and the final scenes might be, they cause us an impact because they are set within a specific structure. They would not be so powerful, emotionally speaking, if they were not preceded by elements which lead us to appreciate them the way we do; they would not mean much for somebody who read or saw these scenes on their own, disconnected from a specific structural basis. Even if I chose to examine other scenes instead of Dover Cliff and V.3, I believe that these last two ones might also be better understood if we get to know about *King Lear*'s structuring principles as they operate in other moments of the play.

The second relevant thing to clarify is that, although Chapter 1 is dedicated to historical and critical contextualization, and Chapter 2 is dedicated to explaining the theory that is used here, there is a large quantity of historical facts and theory that I purposely left out of these initial chapters, and which I present along with the analysis of the play. In Chapter 2 I will provide a theoretical explanation for that, but I am going to provide now a practical reason for doing this. As a writer, I am always careful of writing in a manner that I know I would like to read (if I were in the reception pole). The acid test for me are two questions that I always pose myself after writing a text: Can I easily understand what is written there? Is this text boring or interesting for myself?

And one thing that displeases me very much as a reader, is being fed with tons of information (whether historical, theoretical, or another) which I am not able to connect to anything else. I believe that, in a work of literary criticism, the right moment to introduce theory or historical information, is when the analysis of the *corpus* requires so, and not before. If the information is presented in this exact moment, the reader will be interested in it, and thus, understand it. Otherwise, it might be counterproductive. So, historical information and theory will go intertwined with the literary analysis. I only left for the initial chapters information which I could not see how to fit properly into the literary analysis of *King Lear*.

The third aspect regards how I introduce new information for the reader in the literary analysis (basically, new ideas or new concepts). One manner of doing this is by starting from

perceptions and ideas that are commonly shared, and from this, proceed to new concepts. I prefer to do otherwise, and not take anything for granted. That is, I prefer to suddenly introduce a different perception, provoke a sensation of estrangement, and only after the "shock", explain how I arrived to that concept or perception. This second manner of presenting new content is less common than the first one, but I believe that, in many cases, it will be more effective.

The fourth thing to say is that, instead of doing a synchronic analysis of the first two scenes (which would be more usual), I will work with scenes I.1 and I.2 by means of a diachronic, sequential analysis. The main reason is that, due to our being separated by centuries from Shakespeare's circumstances, we possibly have lost some of the aesthetic objectives Shakespeare might have had when composing *King Lear*. My approach will be presenting excerpts from the text, and then analyzing the formal organization of the scene, so as to highlight the manner in which social content is expressed there. This will be done step by step - the further we go into the text, the more able we will be to make use of a theoretical approach (in this case, Marxism and, in certain moments, its best variation to analyze dramatic literature: Brecht's concept of the *V-effekt*).

It is important to show the development of the situations and characters step by step (and consequently, the ideological circumstances of Shakespeare's aesthetic choices for this work). Doing this was the manner that I found for not forcing my conclusions upon the reader. Instead, I hope to make you understand my point of view by breathing along with the play - that is, I believe the aesthetic movement of the play will lead the reader to the political conclusions I arrived to. To sum up, we should better get the interpretive key from the literary work itself, and not as some sort of *a priori*.

However, there is a peculiarity about the structuring of *King Lear*: this is a play in which characters and situations interrupt each other constantly, generating thus completely unexpected shifts. And so, *King Lear* is a play characterized by constant interruption; another characteristic is that the elements of this interrupted situation or scene will come back in some further moment, but in a very transformed way. And since I will proceed a diachronic analysis, such interruptions will bear the following consequence: our analysis will be interrupted in certain moments (especially in Chapter 3), and we will stop what we are doing and start with the new event, so as to follow in an organic manner the shift provided by Shakespeare.

There are two reasons for this, and the first one is that the drama is a sequential art which is written not to be read, but to be watched on the stage. (It can be read afterwards,

when published, but this is not the circumstance of reception which the author was thinking of when writing.) The original circumstances of reception of such a work are different, for example, from the circumstances of reception of a novel. Whenever I am reading a novel, and I am puzzled by a passage which I do not quite understand, I can always come back to it and compare it to another passage (or keep in that page, and read it, say, three times). Not so with the drama. If I did not understand what I have just seen performed on the stage, I cannot come back - I will have to proceed along with the play, and maybe in a further moment I will be able to connect what I see fifteen minutes later with that other moment.

It was for such circumstances that Shakespeare wrote *King Lear*. And I believe that, if we are to understand some procedures of the author, it will not help us to explain a puzzling passage by mentioning some further moment; this is not how it works in the theatre. Of course we will try to obtain as many answers as that scene can provide us in that moment - but not more than that. Whenever a puzzling interruption comes, we will stop, keep our questions in mind, and try to obtain an answer in another moment.

The second reason for this procedure is an epistemological one. It is precisely these "disagreeable" interruptions that will provide us knowledge. Whatever conclusions we arrive to, they will not seem gratuitous and forced upon us - they will come "from the play itself".

Understanding a specific literary work can also be a manner of understanding a certain society, or a certain historical period, in a manner other than studying its empiric social facts. And, of course, the most important thing about studying the way in which Shakespeare dealt with the social conflicts of his times is not staying in early modern England, but trying to see what insights it can give us when we compare that other society to our own, including not only the similarities, but mainly, the differences.

Finally, I will inform you of the contents of this thesis. Chapter 1 explains the historical terminology that will be applied in this work, and provides information about the sources Shakespeare used for composing *King Lear*; some technical points about the editorial tradition of conflating Q and F as well as about the point of view of the divisionist critics; and, finally, some facts about the critical fortune of *King Lear*, as well as the developments of its scenic history which I consider most relevant for our study (and also, some brief information about the remarkable auditory quality of Shakespeare's audience).

Chapter 2 will explain some of the theoretical principles employed in the making of this thesis. It deals mainly with Marxism, which is the theoretical basis for this work, and it also presents information about other theories and critical approaches which I employed as a

complementary tool: Brecht's *V-effekt*, the formalist-structuralist continuum, the aesthetics of reception, and performance criticism.

Chapter 3 analyzes scene I.1, and examines the way in which it relates to non-dramatic narrative genres such as the fairy-tale and the adventure narrative; it also establishes a relation of this play to the aesthetic principles of the German dramatist and theatre director Bertolt Brecht. Chapter 4 analyzes scene I.2 and relates it to the structure of comedy; it also introduces some structuring devices which Shakespeare devised specifically for *King Lear*.

As for Chapter 5, it compares I.1 to I.2 and, afterwards, it compares the structuring principles present in both scenes to the historical movement in Tudor and Stuart England which led to the Revolution of 1640. It also analyzes the structural role that a device from the Elizabethan theatre - the anachronisms - plays in generating the aesthetic impact which *King Lear* exerts on us, and also in allowing Shakespeare's audience a critical perception about its own historical moment.

Chapter 6 sums up the structuring principles that were introduced in Chapters 3 and 4 (the principles that bear analogy to Brecht's theatre, but mainly, the ones that were especially devised by Shakespeare for this play), and examines how these apply to other scenes of *King Lear*. It also elaborates on the question of the mixture of genres in *King Lear*, especially the manner in which this causes a break of expectations for the spectator and the reader.

Chapter 7 provides historical information about the theatre venues in early modern London, the dramatic genres in Shakespeare's times, and the manner in which the opposing social classes in England related to the theatre, and to the dramatic and literary genres in Shakespeare's times. It connects such facts to the developments in the English history and, in the end, a relation is established between this information and the notion of *King Lear* as a play that presents in a symbolic manner the developments of class struggle in early modern England, by means of incorporating into *tragedie* different genres that were favoured by the opposing classes.

You must have noticed that I opted to start by the analysis of the play, and only present the main historical facts in the later chapters 5 and 7. This is done for didactic purposes, but there is also a theoretical basis for this procedure which will be explained in Chapter 2 (2.1 and 2.2).

Finally, in the *Conclusion*, I will, of course, elaborate on the content of the previous chapters, at the same time that I analyze some aspects of the final scene. I know that this is not an orthodox procedure, but I believe it is an organic one. By breathing along with *King Lear*, an unorthodox play, this thesis needed to present an unorthodox format. Thus, the

thesis finishes when the play finishes - and so, the conclusion needed to go together with scene V.3.

I expect that, with this thesis, we get to be more able to understand the compositional procedures that Shakespeare used in *King Lear*, by relating his aesthetic choices to the main conflicts in his own society. I would also feel very glad if this work stimulates other students from post-graduation courses to analyze literary works in a manner that combines delving into the work's structure to understand its aesthetics (that is, "breathing" along with it, and knowing what makes a specific literary work different from other works), and try to understand the society of the author, and its conflicts, by means of this artistic work.

ENDNOTES

(1) In R. A. Foakes' *Hamlet Versus Lear*, p. 7.
(2) See Bárbara Heliodora's 'Introdução a *Macbeth*', p. 183, in the Brazilian 1995 Nova Fronteira edition of *Hamlet* and *Macbeth*. As with any generalization, one will find many exceptions among the Elizabethan and Jacobean *tragedies*, which differ from this definition to some degree - however, I still think this was the best explanation. Also, Bárbara Heliodora refers to "important protagonists",and I changed this to "protagonists [who] belong to the aristocracy", because this is actually what 'important' means in the text.
(3) See Lena Cowen Orlin's essay 'Introduction [to Shakespearian Genres]', p. 169, in *Shakespeare: An Oxford Guide*, edited by Stanley Wells and Lena Cowen Orlin.
(4) In Linda Woodbridge's essay 'Tragedies', p. 217, in *Shakespeare: An Oxford Guide*, edited by Stanley Wells and Lena Cowen Orlin.
(5) On this matter, see the volume *The Division of the Kingdoms*, edited by Gary Taylor and Michael Warren.
(6) The dates of the two versions are not a consensual matter among these critics, but Gary Taylor presents consistent evidence about Q dating from 1605-6, and F from 1609-10. For this reason, I go along with him in this matter. (See Gary Taylor's essay '*King Lear*: The Date and Authorship of the Folio Version' in *The Division of the Kingdoms*.)
(7) On this specific matter, see Michael Warren's essay 'The Diminution of Kent' in the volume *The Division of the Kingdoms*.
(8) René Weis, the editor of the volume used for this study - *King Lear: A Parallel Text Edition* -, prefers the Q version, and he presents the cause for this in his 'Introduction'. This offers an interesting counterpoint to the prevailing view (as in *The Division of the Kingdoms*) which favours F as a superior artistic achievement.
(9) See R. A. Foakes' *Hamlet Versus Lear*, pp. 96-7.
(10) See Michael Warren's essay 'The Diminution of Kent' as well as Gary Taylor's essay 'Monopolies, Show Trials, Disaster, and Invasion: *King Lear* and Censorship', in *The Division of the Kingdoms*. Concerning the relation of the characters to historical questions of Britain, this is interesting information, ". . to [Shakespeare's] audience, the names of the two Dukes [Albany and Cornwall] would have strongly suggested two British 'kingdomes' with which

they were thoroughly familiar. Albany, the old name for all of Britain north of the Humber, was eventually identified, more loosely, with Scotland; it was one of the three territories into which the legendary Brutus had divided the island. Cornwall was a separate kingdom until the tenth century; from the fourteenth century the Duke of Cornwall was also always the Prince of Wales, thereby uniting the two western territories under one nobleman. (This in turn would have immediately suggested that the 'third, more opulent' which Lear intended for Cordelia was England)." (In Gary Taylor and Michael Warren's 'Preface', p. vi, I in *The Division of the Kingdoms*.) For some conjectures on the reasons for the last speech having been assigned to Albany in Q, see p. 451, endnote 162, in the above-mentioned essay by Taylor.

1 CONTEXTUALIZATIONS

In this chapter, I will provide some historical background which I think will be useful when analyzing *King Lear* in the following chapters. As I explained in the Introduction, not all historical data relevant for our study will be presented here: whenever I feel that some specific historical information will be more useful and better understood if placed together with the aesthetic analysis of the play, I will do so. Thus, what follows here is strictly information that does not fit into the following chapters and, for this reason, is presented aprioristically. We will start by some facts of the history of early modern England, especially concerning the historical terminology employed along this thesis - and, by 'historical terminology', I mean not only explicitly sociopolitical history, but also the history of the theatre, either as drama or as performance. We will proceed then to brief and specific information on the theatre of Shakespeare's times – more specifically, its remarkably auditory quality. From this, I will proceed to some information on the sources Shakespeare employed for writing *King Lear*. After that, we will see some technical information concerning the Quarto and Folio editions of *King Lear*. And, since this thesis studies the F version of the play for the reasons presented in the Introduction, we will see briefly the centuries-long tradition of conflating the two *King Lear* texts, and from there we will go to the questions raised by the divisionist critics. Finally, we will see very briefly the reception of *King Lear* from the Restoration on - I will focus mainly on the critical fortune, but I will also provide information about moments in the scenic history of the play when I consider these relevant to our study.

1.1 HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

If we try to recall the historical information that we already have about England in the Renaissance, all of us have the general notion that the theatre was an important, popular social

event in England in the last decades of the sixteenth century as well as in the first decades of the seventeenth century, and that Shakespeare's works were created in those times. We know that, even if this author was *primus inter pares*, there were many other talented dramatists - both the social importance of the theatrical event and the artistic quality of the drama written then provide us a notion that the English theatre of those times was a vibrant one. We know that, by then, England was ruled by absolutist monarchs, and we associate Shakespeare's artistic production to the most well-known of those, which is Elizabeth I - and the phrase that comes up to our minds to sum up the data above is *the Elizabethan theatre*. However, many of us know that a significant part of Shakespeare's drama was written not in the times of Elizabeth, the last monarch of the Tudor dynasty, but in those of James I, the Scottish king who succeeded her in 1603, and who planted the seeds for what would be known, one century later, as the United Kingdom - and who inaugurated the rule of the Stuart dynasty in England. Fewer of us remember that James I died in 1625, and so the next Stuart monarch was his son Charles I - but we all know that the first bourgeois revolution in Europe started in England in 1640, that it lasted for twenty years and that, exactly amid the process, in 1649, King Charles I was decapitated. We recall that this political movement displayed a strong association with religion, and so, the long revolutionary period is usually known as the Puritan Revolution. We are also aware that these pious men were not fond of the theatre, and so, all theatre venues in England were closed in 1642, and by this deed an artistic era came to an end. We have some general knowledge that the revolutionary process finished in 1660, when the Stuarts were reempowered in the event known as the Restoration - and, finally, we know that with the Stuarts also the theatre came back to England, but it did so in the manner of a mediocre copy of the French theatre, and not as it was prior to the Revolution - the drama of Shakespeare remained on page and on stage, but the theatre of his times was lost forever, either in its social importance or in its specific scenic qualities.

When we think either of Shakespeare or of the theatre of his times, or still of the history of England in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, those are the elements that first come to the mind of most of us - some very general knowledge whose assorted elements are somewhat difficult to interrelate in order to make up a comprehensible narrative. Especially for somebody with no background in the history of England, the facts above mentioned might give the impression of not being much more than a pile of disconnected information.

This is a problem for the literary critic who tries to understand the aesthetic composition of a specific work by situating it historically: engaging in such a task requires much more than assembling empirical data from the times the fictional work came into being;

it demands from the critic that he somehow relates the aesthetic organization provided by the author of the fictional work to the conflicts of the society this author lived in. And in the specific case of *King Lear*, this requires some knowledge not only of the times of James I (when both its Q and F versions were composed), but also of the previous centuries. More than that, in the specific case of *King Lear* it is important to know what happened in England centuries after the play was first performed. This is not only because the story of Lear can be associated to the real-life dethronement and beheading of Charles I four decades later, but mainly because the play seems to bear a connection to certain tendencies in the life of the English society which, even if not conspicuous in the times of James I, were already there to be perceived by a keen observer such as Shakespeare was.

The biggest challenge when one intends to study such historical events is to associate them in a manner that makes sense, and, as I said in the paragraph above, this is a rather difficult task concerning the history of England. One factor which makes it difficult for a foreigner to understand the English history is that its evolution is very peculiar. Like the other European countries, it progressively left the feudal mode of production behind in order to adopt the capitalistic one; also like so many European countries, England went through absolutism during the Renaissance, and centuries later it adopted a form of government more consonant to the paradigm of liberal democracy. But, as I just said, the English historical process is very peculiar in spite of sharing important similarities with the continental countries, and this might confound a foreign observer. And thinking especially of the manner History is studied in Latin America, it is important to observe that, when we think of the European historical processes which I have just mentioned, our tendency is to take the history of France as an explanatory model. And the biggest difference of the English process to the French one is that France had an aristocracy monolithically opposed to the bourgeoisie, while in England there was a sort of split in the ranks of the nobility. There was indeed one part of the English aristocracy which was as staunchly opposed to the bourgeoisie as their French counterparts; on the other hand, there were significant parts of the English nobility which were able to adopt the capitalistic ways and establish an alliance with the bourgeoisie. This is the main difference of the English transition from feudalism to capitalism to the continental ones, especially in France, and one has to keep this in mind to understand many events in the history of that country.

There are two other factors which can make it difficult for a foreign observer to understand the English history, and both have to do with the idiosyncrasies of what used to be the dominant trend in the English historiography until quite recently. The first peculiarity of

the old English history books is that they tend to present the facts in a rather disconnected way (somewhat like I did in the second paragraph of this chapter). Facts are effectively presented in a sequential order, but it seems there is a lack of some element which could bind them together. I do not have an explanation for this, but I tend to believe this has to do with the famous English qualities of empiricism and pragmatism - a very healthy distrust of whatever form of dogmatism as well as a wariness concerning aprioristical assumptions which cannot be satisfactorily proved, have enabled that country to achieve progress in so many different areas of life. Nevertheless, there are still areas of knowledge in which such an attitude constitutes more of a drawback than of an advantage, and historical research is one of them. By not presenting a clear theory which is able to tie the historical facts together at the same time that it tries to make sense out of them, the traditional English historiography ended up being instrumental for an ideology that strived to present the history of England as one of ever-lasting social consensus, when in fact it presents episodes of brutal class struggle just like the history of any other country. (On the other hand, the continental historiography is built around a variety of theoretical models - whether it be positivist historiography, Marxist, or another one yet - which allows a better understanding for the foreign observer.)

The other element in the traditional English historiography which makes the comprehension of English history somewhat difficult for foreigners is the use of very peculiar socio-historical terminology which applies only to England, instead of using another terminology which has got better international currency. This goes hand in hand with the above mentioned empiricism and the subsequent fragmentation of perception that it causes.[1] The consequence is that, instead of using terminology which was widely accepted in Europe (and consequently around the globe), both English historiography and literary criticism would use designations which had no equivalent in other countries. For instance, the historical periods were named after the English kings who ruled in those times and, as a consequence, those labels were also used for the artistic production in the same period - thus, an English author which would be labeled ‘Romantic’ in the continent was called ‘Victorian’ in England, and the one which in the continent would be labeled ‘modernist’ was called ‘Edwardian’ in Britain. This tendency is presently waning, and the terminology which is more employed internationally is finding more and more currency in England. All this is to explain that, in order to allow an easier comprehension of the facts which connect *King Lear* to situations of class struggle in England, I will use the generalizing and widely-understood terminology of ‘aristocracy’ and ‘bourgeoisie’, and thus, I will not use the very specific English class

terminology of ‘gentlemen’, ‘gentry’, ‘yeomen’, or ‘citizenry’ (in fact, I will open an exception and use the term ‘citizen’ in Chapter 7 in a way that is self-explanatory).

The consulted works of the English historian Christopher Hill were of great help in allowing me to work in this manner. Being a Marxist, Hill fulfills several prerequisites which I deem are important for this thesis: he makes use of a theory which connects the facts of the English history in a way that is easily understandable, at the same time that it is not subservient to the ideology of the ruling class. Especially in Chapter 5, but also in Chapter 7 for some extent, I will rely mainly on this bibliography to understand the facts in both Tudor and Stuart times which bear a connection to the aesthetic structuring of *King Lear*. According to Hill, such facts converge to the Revolution of 1640 - and here I must explain that I will not deal with this revolution in detail, since it happened many decades after Shakespeare had written *King Lear*, but I will be obliged to mention it because I agree with Hill that this is the focal point for a more accurate perception of the historical facts presented.

And here I am going to call your attention to the fact that, when referring to this revolution, Hill does not employ the widely current terminology of ‘Puritan Revolution’, but instead, he calls it the ‘Revolution of 1640’, and I will follow him in this choice. Whenever we attribute names to things, this shows both our perception of them and what we want them to be. The expression ‘Puritan Revolution’ is not neutral: it came into being long after that historical event, and it emphasizes the religious aspect in it to the detriment of the element of class struggle. By saying this, I am not denying at all the Puritan predominance in that revolution. It happens that I go along with Hill when he says that religion went along with politics in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and especially during the preceding years of the Revolution (and during the Revolution itself, of course). That is, Christian religion was a code understood by everybody in the English society, and so, divergent political currents and ideas found a way of expression in the religious discourse. (In theoretical terms, Hill’s option of not employing the phrase *Puritan Revolution*, but instead, the *Revolution of 1640*, has got its roots in Marx’s views on this same historical phenomenon.)[2]

As I said in the Introduction, I will present in Chapter 7 some historical facts concerning the theatre of Shakespeare’s times which bear relation to the situation of class struggle and the transformation the English society was going through in those same times, and my main source there will be the works of Andrew Gurr mentioned in Works Consulted. Gurr himself is not a Marxist but his account of the social facts concerning the theatre of Shakespeare’s times matches very well Hill’s presentation of the more general movement the English society was going through. And so, I believe it is time to explain some historical

terminology which will be employed along this thesis, a terminology that is also used by the literary criticism that studies Shakespeare.

Such terms - *Elizabethan*, *Jacobean*, *Tudor*, *Stuart*, *Renaissance*, *early modern England* - frequently overlap each other, and it is the context in which they are employed that determines the choice of one or the other. So, just as 'Elizabethan' refers to things that happened during the rule of Elizabeth I, 'Jacobean' refers to things proper to the times of James I. By rule of thumb, one generally associates the term 'Elizabethan' to some vibrant, optimistic patriotism, while 'Jacobean' is associated to an atmosphere of decadence and oppressive disenchantment. Of course the exam of historical facts presents much more nuance than the widespread perception I have just mentioned, but it is important to be acquainted with such perceptions since they have informed literary criticism for quite a long time. The formal conventions of both drama and scenic performance kept just the same during the two periods, but literary criticism attributes differences to the drama produced under the two monarchs with reference to the subjects examined by the plays as well as to their mood - and concerning this, again speaking in a general way, 'Elizabethan drama' was associated to a cheerful patriotism, while 'Jacobean drama' would be one of a bitter, mordant quality. (Again, there are the exceptions just as for any rule, but this is the association that the phrases 'Elizabethan drama' and 'Jacobean drama' would usually bring to mind.)

Sometimes I will be using other terms, such as 'Tudor' and "Stuart'. I use the term 'Tudor' when I refer to something that was characteristic not only of Elizabeth, but of the Tudor dynasty as a whole (especially Henry VIII and his daughter Elizabeth). Now, of course, I will use the term 'Stuart' when I refer to something that was characteristic of the subsequent dynasty, and not only of James I. And here I must make it clear that, when I use the term 'Stuart', I am referring only to the absolutist monarchs that preceded the Revolution, which are James I and his son Charles I. The Stuarts came back with the Restoration, but then England was becoming more and more of a constitutional monarchy, and, just as the country was never more to be the same as it was prior to the Revolution, the same thing happened with the Stuarts.

Also, we have historical aspects concerning the society as a whole - as well as the drama, the theatre venues and the theatrical performances -, which are common to the periods of both Elizabeth I and James I (and sometimes these aspects extend even further in time). In these cases the terminology I employ will vary according to the context: you will see that I use very frequently the term 'Elizabethan/Jacobean'; also, there are cases in which I deal with facts which - although common to the times of both Elizabeth and James - always bear

the adjective ‘Elizabethan’, and I will follow this convention (for example, the open amphitheatres of early modern England are usually called “the Elizabethan theatre”, and their stages, “the Elizabethan stage” - even if they were equally used in the times of James I and Charles I); there are other cases in which I use the more comprehensive term ‘Renaissance’; and very often I will employ the phrase ‘early modern’ (as in ‘early modern England’, for instance), since Shakespeare wrote in the beginnings of the Modern Age. Nevertheless, I employ the phrase ‘early modern’ in a more restrictive manner than the usual: generally speaking, ‘early modern’ includes the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, while I use it to refer to a shorter span of time - from 1510 to 1660, when aspects of the medieval life were still very present in England.

Finally, there is the matter of the two types of theatre venues in early modern England, which are the “public” and “private” theatres (this will be examined in Chapter 7). As Andrew Gurr points out, traditional books on the history of the theatre kept (and keep) using this terminology which dates from the Elizabethan/Jacobean times. The problem is that such terms are not only inaccurate, but they also reflect the class prejudice of those times. Instead of those, Gurr uses the terms “open amphitheatres” and “hall playhouses”, which I think are more accurate and, for this reason, I will also employ those.

1.2 A THEATRE FOR AUDITORY PLAYGOERS

There are many good books which provide plenty of information about the theatre in Shakespeare’s times, and so, there is no need that we see again these aspects. Nevertheless, I want to call your attention to one single feature which bears a significant weight in my analysis of the compositional procedures of *King Lear*, and this is the aural quality of both the Elizabethan/Jacobean public and the theatrical performances devised for them.

We have to recall that, even if literacy had been making fast and steady progress in early modern England - thus generating more and more avid readers -, this was still a relatively new phenomenon. As a whole, the early modern Englishmen were firmly engaged in auditory activities, which played a constant and very important part in their lives. Let us keep in mind that, while reading is an individual activity, auditory activities have got an intrinsic collective quality to them. These Englishmen were raised with rhymes; being religious people, they went to the local church where they would listen to sermons; singing was a frequent collective activity; when walking on the street, they would stop in order to

listen to preachers that would deliver long sermons. That is, they were people who were used to listening for a long time, and for this reason they developed sophisticated auditory strategies.

The theatre of the Elizabethan and Jacobean times, for its part, did not have the luxury of visual resources which was to be achieved centuries later. This does not mean that the theatre companies of those times were careless concerning elements of visual interest, but those had very little weight in the whole of the performance and did not go much beyond the physical action of the actors.[3] What really counted and made a difference was the auditory part - the audience of those times had a trained ear which was able to pick up immediately the emotional effects provided by the rhythms of the speech; the narrative effect which derived from the alternation between blank verse and prose; the double and triple meanings which Shakespeare loved to provide to his words. Such playgoers were able to pick up everything; more than that, they were eager to pick up everything; and, among all talented dramatists of those times, it was Shakespeare who strived to take the best advantage he could from the auditory capabilities of those audiences - for a talented dramatist will have his writing capabilities enhanced to the best, if there is a talented audience to engage with him.

1.3 THE SOURCES OF *KING LEAR*

It was for such an audience that Shakespeare conceived *King Lear*. When writing his plays, Shakespeare could make use of more than one source, and this is particularly true for *King Lear*, where Shakespeare made use of at least nine different sources. Let us start by saying that Shakespeare's spelling of the name of the old monarch with an "a" (Lear) is peculiar to him, for the name of the legendary king is spelled with an "i" (Leir) in all of the author's sources. For this reason, it will be 'Leir' whenever I write about the legend, and not about the protagonist of the play.

For obtaining the elements of the story of Leir and his daughters, Shakespeare made use of four sources. The first one, Holinshed's *Chronicles of England, Scotland and Ireland* (written in prose, published circa 1577) was a very highly-esteemed history book in Shakespeare's times, and Shakespeare used it as a source for a large number of his plays (all *histories*, plus *King Lear*, *Macbeth* and *Cymbeline*). It must be said that the boundaries between fictional and historical narrative were not really clear-cut in those times: what people really wanted was a good story, whether it really happened or not; and, if a fictional

story were considered edifying or suitable for any extranarrative purpose, it would be "real" enough. (And, of course, history books were excellent for propaganda purposes - and so, for instance, the Tudor propaganda demonized King Richard III, and the history books and Shakespeare went along. Nevertheless, more recent research on the concrete facts about Richard III tells us that, in fact, he was a really good king - but then, he was on the other side.) Thus, history books would embellish the stories of the lives of really-existing kings with events that never happened but were worth telling and reading, and they would present alongside with real history also that which was pure legend, and this is the case of Leir - there has never been any King Leir, but it was worth telling the story of this monarch who would have lived around 800 B.C.

The second source for the story of Leir was John Higgins' *Mirror for Magistrates* (published circa 1559), written in verse, which provided stories concerning good and bad examples from the lives of several rulers. The *Mirror* was a good example of a medieval vestige in the Modern Age: all its narratives had to do with the medieval concept of the *Wheel of Fortune*. According to a purely medieval view, the positioning of this Wheel concerning one's life would seal one's fate, or provide him good fortune instead. Nevertheless, Higgins did not write in the Middle Ages: in early modern England, the concept of the Wheel of Fortune was adapted so that it would also comprehend the notion of an adequate moral behaviour to it. This change allowed men to be more responsible for their own lives, even if not in a contemporary sense - a proper moral conduct had a chance of avoiding a terrible fate.

The third source was a more properly artistic one: Edmund Spenser's renowned romance *The Faerie Queene* (published circa 1590), whose several episodes - Leir's included - are written in verse. As for the fourth source, more than artistic, it is dramatic: the play of anonymous authorship called *The True Chronicle Historie of King Leir, and His Three Daughters, Gonorill, Ragan, and Cordella*, which might have been written in 1590 or even earlier, and was published as a Quarto in 1605 (probably shortly before Shakespeare started writing his Q version of *King Lear*). All these four sources feature or at least mention, besides Leir and Cordelia, Goneril, Regan, Albany, Cornwall and the King of France.[4] (Just like Leir, the three daughters have their names spelled otherwise. As for the feudal lords of the territories named Albany and Cornwall, their names change according to the designation that the authors of each version assign to the respective territories they control). To these characters, *The True Chronicle Historie of King Leir* adds Perillus, which is structurally equivalent to *King Lear*'s Kent.

In all these four versions, King Leir informs his plans of dividing the country in three parts, and sets a "contest of filial love" for his three daughters, in order to see which one gets the best part; Cordelia, for noble reasons, does not accept to flatter her father; Leir then divides the country in two parts that are to be governed by Goneril and Regan, and her respective husbands; Cordelia is sent to exile, to live with her now-husband King of France; Leir, by losing his powers, gets oppressed by Goneril and Regan; seeing no alternative, he goes to France, where Cordelia listens to his grieves and soothes him (this is an aspect in which the sources differ from Shakespeare's play: there, Lear does not go to France – it is Cordelia who goes to England, where she meets Lear and comforts him); the armies of France, commanded by Cordelia, attack the forces of Goneril and Regan (in Holinshed's *Chronicles*, the King of France commands the armies together with Cordelia) .

As for the end of the story, all four sources go the same as well, but in this part, Shakespeare's play differs greatly from them, for they provide a happy ending: the armies of France defeat the English forces; Leir is restored to the throne; Leir dies a good death after having lived happily in his final years; Cordelia is now the Queen of England. The not-too-happy part is that Cordelia dies an ugly death also in the legend, but this goes as an epilogue that comes long after the whole story happened: sometime while she was ruling England, the now-adult sons of the defeated Goneril and Regan dethroned Cordelia and put her to prison. Depressed with this situation, she commits suicide and hangs herself in jail. (According to Holinshed, this happened five years after Leir died.)

I would like to stress that, in all these narratives, Leir's disgrace is that of being a dethroned king and a father who suffers from filial ingratitude. In none of the narratives above mentioned is there any mention to his becoming either a madman or a vagrant, both of which are innovations by Shakespeare.

As for the subplot of Gloucester, Edmund and Edgar, Shakespeare took his inspiration from a fifth source, and this was Sir Philip Sidney's *Arcadia* (written around 1580, and published between 1590-93), a pastoral romance written in prose, which was a much-esteemed reading in those times. *Arcadia* presents as one of its episodes the story of the king of Paphlagonia who had two sons, Leonatus, who was legitimate and good-natured, and Plexirtus, an illegitimate son who was evil, cunning and deceiving. The narrative starts with two princes from the kingdom of Galacia, Pyrocles and Mucedorus, who seek cover from a storm, and then they hear a conversation near there. They see that it is a blind aged man who is being guided by his young son. The blind old man asks his son to leave him to die: he wants to leap to death (exactly as Gloucester does in Shakespeare's play), but the son,

Leonatus, does not want to leave him, and tries to convince him not to commit suicide. The two princes who were listening to the conversation come to talk to father and son, and so they listen to their stories about the reason for the present situation: Plexirtus, the bastard son, was greedy and envious about his half-brother, and so he deceived his father, the king of Paphlagonia, into sending Leonatus to death. The king ordered some servants of his to take Leonatus to the forest and kill him, but the servants spared the life of the legitimate son and let him go. Leonatus then became a "private soldier" for somebody else's.

Because the king of Paphlagonia loved so much his illegitimate son Plexirtus, he would do just everything for him, and that is exactly what he did: not only he did all favours and punishments Plexirtus asked for, but he also distributed all offices and places of importance to his sons's favourites - and by so doing, he had left himself nothing but the name of a King. He ended up being stripped of all power, and shortly after he was literally thrown out of his seat by Plexirtus, who put out his father's eyes. After that, Plexirtus opted to let his father wander in misery, because the old man would suffer more like that than if he were just killed. Plexirtus then became a tyrant - he murdered liberty by filling his country of foreign soldiers and disarming his own countrymen so that nobody would stand for the ex-king. Nobody dared show the ex-king the slightest charity, such as offering to guide him around. In this, Leonatus came back and offered to be his fathers' guide, for he had forgiven everything due to the love he felt for the old man.

At this point the ex-king finishes telling his story to the two princes, and asks them to help him leap to death, for this is the only thing in which Leonatus will oppose him. Right at this moment arrives the now-king of Paphlagonia Plexirtus, followed by a party of forty horsemen, only to murder his half-brother. Plexirtus, however, did not count with the bravery, prowess and fighting skills of Leonatus, Mucedorus and Pyrocles, who, just the three of them, kill an enormous number of Plexirtus' men. Notwithstanding, the three fighting men are still in danger. In this, comes to the help of the two good princes an army of a hundred horsemen led by the king of the neighbouring country of Pontus. Meanwhile, another army of fifty horsemen comes to the help of the evil Plexirtus. This last group is composed of men, not just of great bravery, but who are very good-hearted; nevertheless, or even because of this, all of these fifty newly-arrived fighters were deceived by the cunning Plexirtus.

In the end, the forces led by Leonatus, Mucedorus and Pyrocles win the battle. Justice is made, and the ex-King of Paphlagonia makes Leonatus the new King. In the ceremony of coronation of Leonatus, the old father himself sets the crown upon the legitimate son's head, and, "with many tears (both of joy and sorrow)", sets forth "to the whole people his own fault

and his son's virtue". After kissing Leonatus, the ex-king dies, "his heart broken with unkindness and affliction, stretched so far beyond his limits with the excess of comfort". As an epilogue, the now defeated Plexirtus devises a new trick in order to raise his now-bad living standards: in a surprising move, he appears in front of his brother the King, "with a rope about his neck, barefooted", to offer himself to his half-brother's judgment. What Leonatus first sees is the murderer of his father, and he wants revenge. Plexirtus is cunning, though. He does not justify what he does; instead, he bemoans and bemoans how evil and lowly he is, and by doing this, he obtains precisely what he was looking for - his brother's pity; and then, his pardon; and finally, his favours. Life now smiles again for Plexirtus. As for those men who, deceived by Plexirtus, fought for him, they are not so lucky: all of them are tortured and die horrible deaths. [5]

As it is proper to the romance literature, this narrative, which is full of events, is presented in a detached manner. This means that we do not have emotional climaxes, and the terrible epilogue is presented in a rather casual way. And, needless to say, the names are all changed, but we have plenty of elements which are used in the subplot of Gloucester, Edgar and Edmund: the father of a good-natured legitimate son and an evil and ever-intriguing bastard, as well as the fooling of the old man by his own son; the blinding of the father who gave everything (here, by his own son, while in *King Lear*, the illegitimate son is responsible, but is not actively engaged in the torture of the father); the old man being conducted by his good son and expressing his wish to die (and here the son is not in disguise, and, of course, we do not have the grotesque situation of Shakespeare's Dover Cliff scene); the father dying of grief and joy at the same time.

From all the characters mentioned in the sources up to now, Plexirtus is the one who more fully resembles the features of a character from Shakespeare's play (in this case, Edmund), instead of being just equivalent in structural terms, as all the other mentioned ones are. I took much longer (and went to much more detail) to deal with this last source, because, in my opinion, this is the one among all these five narratives which offers more elements that seem to have been used in the shaping of the Bard's play. Shakespeare extracted phrases and sentences from all the sources he used in *King Lear*, but, concerning the narrative itself, I have the impression that the Leir sources are rather poor in comparison to Sidney's *Arcadia*. And by this, I do not mean the profusion of events in this last one - I am actually speaking of the motives of justice and pardon, which are just hinted in the Leir sources (with the exception of the *King Leir* play, which develops the motive of pardon more fully than the other Leir sources – even if in a stiff, awkward manner) but are more present in the story of the

Paphlagonian king. However, the profusion of events is also an element to be taken into account, for it informs all of Shakespeare's play, and not only the subplot of the "Gloucester family" (as we can see in Chapters 3, 6 and 7).

Actually, even if Sidney's *Arcadia* is the source for the "Gloucester family" subplot concerning its main events, it is worth noticing that we have other elements in there which are actually used, not in Gloucester's subplot, but in Lear's main plot. One of them is the above-mentioned profusion of events, which is more proper to an adventure narrative in the manner of the romances - it is the main plot of Lear that resembles an adventure narrative and is crowded with characters, and not that of Edgar, Edmund and Gloucester which, in this sense, is rather simple in comparison As for the misery and poverty the Paphlagonian king endures after being stripped of his powers, Shakespeare's representation of Lear is also more akin to Sidney's *Arcadia* than to the Leir narratives (again in this aspect, it is the *King Leir* play that comes closer to Shakespeare's work). Another aspect to notice is that Gloucester dies of joy and grief, just as the Paphlagonian king, but this also happens to Lear - in this last case, this is not just mentioned (as with Gloucester), but concretely represented in the dramatic action.

Up to here, I have mentioned elements in the narrative of the Paphlagonian king which were transferred to Lear's main plot. However, Shakespeare also performs the opposite operation of borrowing an element from the Leir narratives to the subplot of the "Gloucester family": in scene XXIV of the *King Leir* play, Cordella and the Gallian King (i.e., the King of France) go disguised as 'country folk' so as to see very closely how their subjects live. In this, they come across Leir and Perillus. Leir does not recognize his daughter in disguise, and so he tells the "country woman" what he did to Cordella and how he repents of having done that. This scene is presented in a detached manner - more epic than properly dramatic, as befits a *chronicle historie* -, for *King Leir* does not aim at generating any pathos (and even Sidney's narrative of the Paphlagonian king comes closer to doing that). In this detached manner, we see not only Leir regretting what he did, but also Cordella in disguise saying in apart, *"Alack, that ever I should live to see / My noble father in this misery."* And these are elements that Shakespeare borrows not for the Lear main plot, but for the Gloucester and Edgar subplot.

I have mentioned before the profusion of characters and events which is present in Lear's main plot - this generates a specific atmosphere, and I would like you to keep this in mind when we examine scene I.1 in Chapter 3, and also when we discuss the dramatic and literary genres that formed the horizon of expectations of Shakespeare's audience in Chapter 7.

I also want to stress an important structural choice of Shakespeare's concerning his use of Sidney as a source: the subplot of Gloucester, Edgar and Edmund gets its basic events from Sidney's *Arcadia*, but the "Gloucester family" is stripped of the royal status present in the source's equivalents, and this will have very important consequences, as we are going to see in Chapters 4 and 5.

As for the other sources Shakespeare used for *King Lear*, there is also Samuel Harsnett's *A Declaration of Egregious Popish Impostures*. Harsnett was the Anglican Bishop of London around the time the Q version was written. His *Declaration* is an attack against the practice of exorcism, and, in fact, the purpose of this pamphlet is more political than theological: Harsnett aims at the Catholic Church, by associating Catholicism to ignorance and superstition. Shakespeare borrowed from this text not for political-theological reasons, but because of its colourful language. Wording based on the *Declaration*'s peculiarly sounding phrases is used most especially in Poor Tom naming the devils, and in Lear's imprecations against women. Another source Shakespeare used for borrowing vocabulary is Florio's translation of Montaigne. The seven sources I have mentioned up to now are examined by Kenneth Muir in his 2nd Arden edition of *King Lear*.[6] In addition to these, G. K. Hunter mentions two other sources in his 1972 New Penguin edition of the play, and these are the *Homily Against Disobedience and Wilful Rebellion* as well as the *Gospel of St. Mark*[7], both of which provide vocabulary and images for Gloucester's apocalyptical speech in I.2.95-108. (There will be more comment on the use of the *Homily*, in Chapter 4.)

I.4 THE Q AND F VERSIONS OF *KING LEAR*: TECHNICAL INFORMATION

After examining the sources, we will go now to another question concerning Shakespeare on page, and that is more specifically some technical information about what is a Quarto and what is a Folio edition. The English plays from the period 1574-1642 were not written to be read, let alone to be published as books - such texts were aimed solely for the purpose of theatrical performance. However, a good number of these plays would be published individually in the format known as *Quarto*, which was a cheap one to acquire. This does not mean that drama had literary prestige at that time, for it did not. In spite of this, there were playgoers who were willing to acquire the text of a play they particularly enjoyed, and so, it was common that the theatre venues in London offered such cheap editions of plays.

The costly *Folio* format was destined for publications of high prestige, i.e., considered serious (the *Bible* on top of the list; history books such as Holinshed's *Chronicles*, or works of heraldry like Ralph Brooke's *Catalogue and Succession of Nobility* followed). By contrasting physically Quarto and Folio, one can have a more concrete idea. Folios were called like that because the format would result from a sheet folded in half once. The size of the book depended on the size of the initial sheet, but even with one folding, the resulting volumes were very large books, from 11 to 16 inches tall, and from 8 to 11 inches in width. The stationer who printed it would very often sell it just as a collection of loose sheets - i.e., unbound and with no cover - in order to make it a "cheaper" sale (even like that it would cost around 15 shillings, which was a small fortune for that time). If the customer wanted to buy it already bound, it could cost up to one pound. Customers would usually buy the Folios as loose sheets and try to do a cheaper binding at some other place.[8]

This format was not for drama, which would be sold in the cheaper Quarto editions. To make a Quarto, a sheet of paper would be folded twice, forming four leaves (and thus, its name). They were usually 7 inches wide and 9 inches long, and were usually sold for sixpence.[9] Generally speaking, this would not affect the dramatists in London, for they took their plays as mere entertainment. Those playwrights who wished to obtain literary prestige would look for another vehicle - poetry -, and then try to get this published (and Shakespeare was one of those). In 1616 (the year Shakespeare died), another London dramatist, Ben Jonson - who was the most prestigious playwright of his times together with the Bard - did the unthinkable: he published some plays of his, along with poems and masques, in the Folio format. (And in this, one should add that Jonson was very talented at promoting himself, and that he was the one and only dramatist of the period who had the project of acquiring literary prestige with his plays, and leaving those for posterity.)

It is possible that the Jonson Folio inspired Shakespeare's fellow actors in his company, the King's Men, to pay a tribute for the memory of their deceased colleague. Whatever the motivation was, two actors from the King's Men, John Heminges and Henry Condell, undertook the task of editing the First Folio, which came to light in 1623, containing all of Shakespeare's plays but two.[10]

Some of the plays in the Folio were in print for the first time. Most of them, however, had previous Quarto editions, and we can group these in three categories: plays that are just the same in the Quarto and Folio editions; plays that present alterations which are not really significant; and, finally, the plays that, according to Stanley Wells, present important differences in the 'good' Quarto and Folio texts, and these are *Hamlet, Othello, Troilus and*

Cressida, and, most of them, *King Lear*.[11] (According to T. W. Craik, 'good' Quartos were published from a manuscript copy supplied by the author himself or by the company who owned the text, and 'bad' Quartos were published from manuscript copies "compiled by some process involving memorization of the text as performed in the playhouse".[12] Some of Shakespeare's plays were first published as a 'bad' Quarto before being published as a 'good' Quarto, being *Hamlet* the best known example of these. For the reason I mentioned, 'bad' Quartos are considered inaccurate versions, and so, they are not considered when editing a play by Shakespeare.)

T. W. Craik says that the texts from which the 'good Quartos' were published were either manuscript copies supplied by the author - and so, rough drafts of the text were called 'foul papers' -, or then, the source was what has been termed 'promptbooks'. Laurie Maguire defines those as "an annotated version of the author's original manuscript (prepared by the company's scrivener and bookholder)".[13] Concerning the specific case of *King Lear*'s Quarto edition, Gary Taylor believes that the characteristics of the *King Lear* 1608 Quarto make it less likely that it was published from a promptbook, and so, he believes it was published from the 'foul papers'. As for the 1623 Folio edition of the play, Taylor believes that it comes from the promptbook of a revised version of the play.[14]

As we saw in the Introduction, *King Lear* is a very specific case concerning the variations of Q and F - its situation is very different from that of *Hamlet* or *Othello*. Here, it is not only a matter of a big number of textual differences between Quarto and Folio (and *King Lear* is the text which features the biggest number of differences of them all), and it goes even beyond the aesthetic level - as the divisionist critics point out, such differences promote important alterations in the structural weight of the characters; and consequently, in the action itself. What we have here, then, are two authoritative texts - *King Lear*'s Quarto and Folio versions must be seen as independent texts which have their artistic value for themselves, and not as parts of a lost whole, which need to be completed - as they were perceived to be, up to the mid-eighties.

There were no editing problems concerning the Q and F versions in the seventeenth century, because in those times Shakespeare's plays were only published in the Quarto and Folio formats. Thus, a reader that bought a Quarto edition of *King Lear* would read one version, while another one that bought Shakespeare's Folio would read the other version. Nevertheless, problems started in the eighteenth century, when the publishing houses and editors started publishing the Bard's plays in other formats: when publishing *King Lear* in a new format, which version should be chosen for the new edition, the Quarto or the Folio?

This was no easy question for two reasons: the differences between the Q and F versions of *King Lear* were enormous and posed difficult questions; and also, these editors knew an awful lot about literature and books, but not about the reality and practices of the theatre life. For instance, they could not fancy that a playwright wrote a play for his company and, when they wanted to revive it five years later, he had second thoughts about it and decided to change a lot of things. The consequence was that there was no such a thing as the "true" *King Lear* out of two choices, because both versions had been indeed staged - and the reality of the theatre is what is actually staged, and what the audience actually sees. And if we come to think of a specific spectator who had watched a staging of *King Lear* by the King's Men around 1606, and who enjoyed it so much that he went to watch another staging by the same company around 1610, he would actually have watched two different versions. If he remembered somehow that there were important differences, he would prefer either the first version he had watched, or the second one - both versions were authoritative; it would be up to the spectator to decide if, by promoting so many changes, Shakespeare had improved the play or made it worse.

As I said, the reality of the theatre was unknown to these eighteenth-century editors. They could perceive that the writing style of the F version seemed an improvement over that of Q, especially concerning the choice of vocabulary and the use of the blank verse: this would lead them to believe that F was indeed the best version, the one that the author approved of. However, F lacked something like three hundred lines which were to be found only in Q. And when these editors came back to these lines in Q to see what the problem could be, they could see no problem at all - the writing was indeed fine, it was actually beautiful. They could not conceive that, what seemed beautiful for reading, would perhaps not work so well on the stage, and that a man of the theatre (as Shakespeare was) has got no qualms about eliminating those passages which, however pleasant for reading, constitute bad spectacle when on stage; or that might constitute good spectacle if considered in separate, but do not work on the whole - if such 'good' passages are kept, they will make the theatrical performance of the whole play more dragging, more boring, or less comprehensible. They could also see that Q, for its turn, lacked something like a hundred lines which were only to be found in F.

Let alone the troubling question of speeches that were assigned to a certain character in one version, and to another character in the other version. There were many cases like that - and they thought somebody must have committed a mistake when printing one of the versions. It did not occur to the editors that such changes could have happened due to

practical considerations concerning the acting capabilities of one actor of the company or the other. What more, they could not fancy that maybe Shakespeare had changed his mind in the space of four or five years concerning the artistic value of certain aesthetic choices; or that, there could be political and philosophical considerations which made him change his mind about certain parts of the play - that is, even if a certain change did not have important aesthetic consequences, it could be very significant concerning the political and philosophical outlook of the play (and the transfer of the last lines in the final scene from Albany to Edgar is the most striking example - it certainly confers very different meanings to Q and F respectively).

Also, such editors were removed at least one century from Shakespeare's times, or 150 years, or even two centuries, depending on which editor we are talking about. This means that they could have a general idea about what Jacobean England must have been like, but they were not aware of important social and political peculiarities which, just like now, can change very much within the space of four or five years. In 1605, James I had been ruling for two years; in 1610, he had already been ruling for seven years. Significant changes can happen in five years, either in governmental practices, or in the practice of censorship, or on the outlook the people could have about the country – their hopes and fears. And so, Shakespeare could indeed have changed his mind about certain aspects of the play within such a space of time.

(As I said in the Introduction, the focus of this thesis is not on the difference between Q and F; whenever I consider a certain aspect about such differences worth mentioning, I will do it in the endnotes.[15])

In face of so many and important differences between the two texts, and unaware of practical questions concerning the theatre, the eighteenth-century editors, generally speaking, faced the following situation: due to stylistic considerations, they understood that the F version was the best one. So the majority of them presumed that F would constitute a better basis for a new edition. Nevertheless, F missed hundreds of lines of fine literary quality present in Q. Also, there were a couple of moments when the choices in Q seemed artistically better than the ones in F. That is, F seemed better in most aspects, but it still missed many things present in Q which they thought were worth reading. What to do? The conclusion most of them arrived to was that, even if F seemed the best version, both versions lacked good things that were present in the other one; thus, both versions were "imperfect": they must have derived from a lost original which has been imperfectly transmitted in two different manners. And since they did not have this ideal third, "perfect" version in front of them, they

believed that the ideal solution would be to conflate the Q and F versions into a single one which would feature all existing lines in both. And whenever there were differences such as stylistic ones, or speeches which were attributed to different characters, they would usually opt for the F solution, but occasionally they could choose Q for a more specific matter.

The consequence: an editorial tradition started in the eighteenth century of conflating Q and F, so as to obtain a "perfect whole". From then on, editors strived to combine the two versions in order to be as close as possible to the lost *Ur*-text they believed was the matrix of both Q and F. This belief became so firmly established for the centuries to come that, with a possible couple of exceptions, no one even thought of this question: it was taken for granted that the conflated edition which was read at school, or which one bought in the bookshop, was *the King Lear*.[16]

In the mid- and late seventies, however, different scholars in the United States and England were doing research on the distinction of the Q and F texts, and all of them arrived to the conclusion that both were independent and authoritative texts - and even though they did not know of each other's work at the time, their research pointed to the same direction. In 1983, this group of scholars published a collection of essays about the theme entitled 'The Division of the Kingdoms: Shakespeare's Two Versions of *King Lear*', which proved to be groundbreaking. This collection, together with other important publications that were happening at the same time about this theme (either by the same authors who took part in that collection, or others), were responsible for changing the perception about *King Lear*'s editorial tradition, bringing it under a critical light, at the same time that they promoted the interest in reading the Q and F versions separately, for their own sake. In 1986, another very important step in this direction was taken when the Oxford Shakespeare series, edited by Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor (one of the most important and authoritative Shakespeare series), published *King Lear*'s Q and F versions in separate volumes, i.e., as independent editions of different works. From then on, and as I said in the Introduction, the predominant position among scholars and critics has been one of evaluating Q and F as independent authoritative texts that must be read for their own sake (and in most cases, F is favoured as the best of the two versions, although we also have critics and theatre directors who stand for the superiority of Q).[17] In spite of this having become a predominant position in Shakespearean scholarship, I believe it will not be hegemonic as conflationism was for almost three centuries, due to three reasons. The first one is that, in spite of what academia regards as the best, it is unlikely that an editorial tradition that has lasted for three centuries (up to the moment) will simply disappear; the second reason is that we still have scholars who defend

the cause of conflation, even if this is a minority position in the present days. Finally, the logic inherent to divisionist criticism does not allow for a clear hegemony: if there is more than one authoritative text for *King Lear*, one might prefer Q even if most in academia stand for F; also, one could find reasons to defend that a certain conflation constitutes a third valid variety of the text.

1.5 THE POST-SHAKESPEARE *KING LEAR*

After this brief information concerning the question of editing *King Lear*'s Q and F versions separately or as a conflation, we can proceed in order to have some idea about the "career" of *King Lear* after Shakespeare's times. Following the Restoration in 1660, theatres reopened in England, and they did so in lines that differed greatly from the theatre of Shakespeare's times. There were positive aspects in this change, for actresses were introduced on stage (this was a new feature, since women's roles were played by boys in the pre-Revolution theatre), but, on the whole, such changes came for the worse. Scenic devices were installed so as to illustrate visually the playwright's ideas - and with this, the audience was not required anymore to make use of its imagination in order to create together with the actors ambiences which, in the Elizabethan theatre, were only verbally suggested (and due to this development, the life of the Restoration dramatists was made easier in the creative sense, and they did not have to strive so much in their playwriting as their forerunners did). Much more important than this, this new theatre was destined only to a wealthy public. This was in fact the final development of a tendency which had already been strong in the last years of the pre-Revolution Stuarts (as Andrew Gurr points out and we are going to see in Chapter 7).[18] As for the architecture of the new theatres, it resembled in nothing what was termed the 'Elizabethan stage': from the Restoration on, the theatre venues adopted the theatrical architecture of Italy (which was the model of the theatres in France, where the future king Charles II spent his exile years) with its proscenium arches that separated the audience from the scene.[19]

Shakespeare's plays were, thus, revived in new social and scenic conditions, which meant that, also when the new companies kept true to the original texts, those stagings and the reception they got from their respective audiences differed greatly from the pre-Revolution times. Very often, the texts of Shakespeare suffered profound adaptations in order to suit the

aesthetic tastes of the Restoration audiences. *King Lear* is perhaps the most famous case of those. There were even attempts to present it with no adaptations, but those did not succeed.

In 1681, however, the actor Nahum Tate wrote a famous heavy-handed adaptation that made the play more suitable for the tastes of the new times. In doing this, he rewrote entire scenes and promoted many profound alterations. Among those changes, we have Cordelia and Edgar as a romantic pair, Lear killing the soldiers of Edmund who were trying to murder Cordelia and thus saving her, Lear being restored to power and promptly handing it over to Edgar and Cordelia, and the perspective of good old Lear living with the now-royal couple Edgar and Cordelia happily ever after.[20]

This adaptation of Tate is very important in the history of the theatrical reception of *King Lear*, for this was the *King Lear* that the English audiences saw in the theatre from 1681 up to 1838 (of course this was not the case on page – what the reading public was being offered was Shakespeare's text, even if in a conflated mode). The reason why Shakespeare's text was "restored" to the stage in the 1830s was possibly the fact that Romantic criticism held this work in very high regard, esteeming it in a way that was not previously done.[21]

Generally speaking, the Romantic critics place *King Lear* as a grandiose, ungraspable, sublime work. While such criticism is one of the most important developments in the critical fortune of the play, one could also complain that it is too vague and too based on adjectives. But then again, we must recall that, before the advent of the Russian formalism, literary criticism was more impressionistic than technical. Of these critics (many of them outstanding poets, such as Coleridge, Shelley and Keats), one that deserves special attention is Charles Lamb, who wrote circa 1810 that "the Lear of Shakespeare [as opposed to Tate's adaptation, which he despised] cannot be acted", and that it is "essentially impossible to be represented on a stage". According to him, this was a work to read, for "while we read it, we see not Lear, but we are Lear".[22] Lamb was commenting the feeble results of the stagings of the Tate version he had seen. The situation somewhat changed when the Romantics elevated the status of *King Lear* and, as a consequence, the English companies started restaging Shakespeare's own text.

The later development of science and technology, however, allowed the stage machinery to provide plenty of stage effects for the Victorian audiences, which enjoyed *King Lear* very much as a thunderous melodrama full of horrors and which provided plenty of opportunities for Romantic-style acting, full of "sweeping gestures, terrifying scenes, and violent soliloquies, loudly delivered", as Jan Kott so vividly puts it.[23]

In 1904, A.C. Bradley published his famous lectures on Shakespeare's *tragedies*, and his comments on *King Lear* are possibly the most famous piece of criticism about the play, together with the later critique of Jan Kott.[24] This is considered the apex of Romantic/Victorian criticism about the play, and, as Foakes says, it synthesizes the main lines of the nineteenth-century criticism.[25] In spite of being a clearly Romantic critique, in which he presents *King Lear* as an immense, stupefying work of art which is to be compared to the *Divine Comedy*, to the statues in the Medici Chapel and to the greatest symphonies of Beethoven,[26] Bradley also presents some classical-minded restrictions, saying that the play presents many failures in its dramatic structure, and he also poses realistic-minded restrictions, by saying that many events in the play lack verisimilitude. According to Bradley, what the play lacks in dramatic structuring and verisimilitude, it compensates in its poetic qualities. In his very peculiar style, he says,

> It is therefore Shakespeare's greatest work, but it is not what Hazlitt called it, the best of his plays; and its comparative unpopularity [in relation to plays such as *Hamlet* or *Othello*] is due, not only to the extreme painfulness of the catastrophe, but in part to its dramatic defects . . . a failure which is natural because the appeal is made not so much to dramatic perception as to a rarer and more strictly poetic kind of imagination. For this reason, too, even the best attempts at exposition of *King Lear* are disappointing; they remind us of attempts to reduce to prose the impalpable spirit of *The Tempest*.[27]

I said "in his peculiar style", because, at the same time that he talks of the play's poetic qualities, Bradley is somewhat repeating the same thing Lamb said one century earlier: *King Lear* is wonderful, but absolutely impossible on stage (which is not exactly a high appraisal for a play).

Bradley sees the play as a story of redemption, and by saying this, we can consider that his lectures on *King Lear* are not only the climax of Romantic criticism, but also the beginning of the second (in chronological order) important tendency of the critique of *King Lear*, and this is the one that got to be called 'Christian criticism'. The critics who are considered to make part of this tendency see *King Lear* exactly as Bradley termed it, a 'story of redemption' – and I must add that, when one says 'Christian (or redemptionist) criticism', this covers a wide range of works which go from a more discrete philosophical standpoint such as Bradley's to essays which present somewhat more explicit religious views. (One of the best-known pieces of criticism in this trend is Kenneth Muir's 'Introduction' to the 2nd Arden edition of *King Lear*.)

One thing that both Romantic and Christian criticism share is that they interpret the play as one that deals with individual and essentialist themes. R. A. Foakes puts it very well when he says, "Most of such accounts of the play treat it as one of cosmic scope, concerned with universals, with Man abstracted from the petty concerns of ordinary life – as if the play could only be understood by analogies with Christian or Greek myths . . ." [28]

So, critics would usually see the play in redemptionist terms, or then, as a study of parental relationship. Times changed very much, however, and the end of the fifties saw a new perception of the world. This, of course, would affect the criticism of the play. Maynard Mack, who is possibly the most talented of the 'Christian critics', was able to perceive that *King Lear* now had to be viewed in a different way, and so he wrote in 1965,

> After two world wars and Auschwitz, our sensibility is significantly more in touch than our grandparents' was with the play's jagged violence, its sadism, madness, and processional of deaths, its wild blends of levity and horror, selfishness and selflessness, and the anguish of its closing scene. We have not the Victorians' difficulty, today, in discerning behind its foreground story of a family quarrel intimations of mortality on a far greater scale . . .[29]

The world changed very much, and the optimism as well as the sensation of stability enjoyed by nineteenth-century bourgeois Europe was by then only a distant memory. This changed political ambience provided that the criticism of *King Lear* suffered a radical change. The most famous piece of criticism in this new mode was to come not from the English-speaking countries, but from Poland. Professor Jan Kott of Warsaw had seen his country destroyed by the Nazis; also, his country was the one of the Auschwitz and Treblinka death camps. Professor Jan Kott wanted something different for Poland; he had even been a member of the Polish Communist Party. The problem is, after the Communist Party came to power, it also persecuted innocents. People would betray each other, allies became mortal enemies overnight, and if someone knocked on your door in the middle of the night, you were afraid: it could mean a death sentence. Professor Kott did not see the change he hoped for.

This 'new' Poland was a country of the unexpected: the prime-minister could be sent to jail overnight, and at the same time somebody could be released from jail and become the new prime-minister. Professor Kott taught Drama at the University, and he enjoyed very much Shakespeare. By reading Shakespeare's plays, and also by reading about the history of early modern England, he got to the conclusion that the Bard was very familiar with a world where a knock on the door in the middle of the night could mean death. He understood that

there were striking similarities between Shakespeare's world and his own, and in the most part not for the good. Kott developed a view of History as a nightmare, an ever-repeating absurd. This is how he puts it,

> We began our considerations with a metaphor of the grand staircase of history . . . There are no good and bad kings; there are only kings on different steps of the same stairs. The names of the kings may change, but it is always a Henry who pushed a Richard down, or the other way around. Shakespeare's Histories are *dramatis personae* of the Grand Mechanism. But what is this Grand Mechanism which starts operating at the foot of the throne and to which the whole kingdom is subjected? A mechanism whose cog-wheels are both great lords and hired assassins; a mechanism which forces people to violence, cruelty and treason; which constantly claims new victims? A mechanism according to whose laws the road to power is at the same time the way to death? This Grand Mechanism is for Shakespeare the order of history, in which the King is God's Anointed.[30]

Around 1960, Kott wrote an essay called '*King Lear*, or Endgame', in which he associates Shakespeare's play to the works of Samuel Beckett. In his view, modern post-War dramatists such as Dürrenmatt, Ionesco, but most especially Beckett, write plays built around a poetics of the grotesque. These works, according to him, deal with the same basic questions the Greek tragedy dealt with (human fate, the meaning of existence, freedom and inevitability). This non-comic grotesque shares with the Greek tragedy the dramatic situation in which the protagonist has to make a choice between two opposing values - and, still according to Kott, both varieties of drama share in common the fact that this choice is imposed on the protagonist; he finds himself in such a situation against his will. The difference between the tragic and the grotesque is that, in the grotesque, "both alternatives of the choice imposed are absurd, irrelevant or compromising . . . Every move is bad, but [the hero] cannot throw down his cards. To throw down the cards would also be a bad move."[31] While tragedy is a game whose rules are established by the gods, the grotesque is the aesthetic expression of the Grand Mechanism as formulated by Kott: an absurd, men-eating machine which was not devised by the gods, but by men themselves. It is an inescapable mechanism, even if created by fellow men, and the best the grotesque protagonist can do, is ridicule both this Grand Mechanism and men's tragicomic belief that the Mechanism might somehow be fair and wise. No hope is left, only an unfunny clowning.

Kott sees *King Lear* as a play that shares with Beckett's works this same view about the human condition. And here it is important to state that his critique has got important aesthetic implications. Kott says that the reason why so many productions of *King Lear*

failed, is that they relied on illusionist tricks which made the scene all the more ridiculous. In order to achieve its proper aesthetic impact on stage, a staging of *King Lear* must be explicitly theatrical, i.e., non-illusionist, in the manner of Beckett's plays, and, of course, of the Elizabethan/Jacobean theatre.[32] Kott's formulation of the grotesque acting on a stripped stage for *King Lear*, as well as the theatre of Samuel Beckett, influenced the English theatre director Peter Brook in his staging of *King Lear* in 1962, which is certainly the most famous staging of the play (and is by far one of the most famous and influential stagings of any Shakespeare play in the twentieth-century).

Early sixties. Exit Auschwitz and Hiroshima, enter Vietnam and the Cuban missile crisis. *King Lear* started being perceived as a clearly political play. Peter Brook says that he wanted to relate Lear more specifically to the rule of Stalin, but, in a more general way, he also wanted the audience to establish a connection to all aging rulers who, in his belief, were leading to world to a war. The violence and fear of such times increased the importance of *King Lear* - R. A. Foakes says that due to the political and social climate of such times, *King Lear* displaced *Hamlet* as the centre of the Shakespearean canon from 1960 on.[33] Also the tastes concerning the theatre were changing around those times. It is not that the light entertainment theatre has stopped existing, but there was a growing demand for aesthetics that provided either emotional shock or political awareness, or both at the same time - and many dramatists, theatre directors and theatre groups were striving to do exactly that. This means that Brook and Kott were not isolated - at the same time, other critics and directors in England and the United States were exposing a perception of *King Lear* as a work of despair. But it was Brook and Kott who were clearly the spearheads of what is considered the third (in chronological order) important tendency in the criticism of *King Lear*: that which has been termed the 'absurdist (or existentialist) criticism'. To sum up, one can say that, also if there is important criticism that does not fall into any of these categories, one can divide the twentieth-century criticism of *King Lear* into two main groups: the Christian (or redemptionist) criticism, which sees *King Lear* as a work about the ultimate redemption, and the absurdist (or existentialist) criticism, which sees it as a work about the ultimate senselessness and despair. We can also say that this last tendency has been the most well-known and influential one in the last decades.[34] (Being a theatre director, I believe that the most efficient way to test the influence of drama criticism is by examining the degree and durability of its influence upon theatrical productions. And, concerning this, one can recall that, decades after Kott wrote his text on *King Lear*, England kept seeing productions that strived to be the-one-effectively-Beckettian-*King Lear*-in-Kott's-lines. Among the best-

known ones are the staging by David Hare, featuring Anthony Hopkins as Lear in 1986, and Peter Hall's staging in 1997.)

By identifying three successive main trends in the criticism of *King Lear*, it does not mean that discussion about the play has stopped at the absurdist critics. Important criticism keeps being written, but, as it is very characteristic of the last decades, there is no such a thing as a clearly discernible current of criticism, a number of critics and artists which we can clearly identify as a body that holds a certain perception of the play as something common to all its members. The nearest that we have got to something like this are the divisionist critics, which have been shortly discussed above - their situation, nevertheless, is clearly different from the three previous cases. Those were aesthetic-philosophical tendencies in many cases held by people who did not know each other, while the divisionist critics are more like a group who, in most cases, collaborates and works together. The 'divisionists' have also got to them two important aspects which make them different from the three mentioned tendencies: on the one hand, they work upon a solid technical basis of textual analysis, while the Romantics, the 'redemptionists' and the 'absurdists' are basically impressionistic critics;[35] the other difference is that these three tendencies present a clear philosophical orientation, while this is not the case with the 'divisionists' (this does not mean that they have not one, but rather, that it is neither clearly discernible nor necessarily shared by all its members).

We still have important critics of *King Lear* who are either impressionistic or that do not present a clear theoretical basis. Predominately, however, the critics in the last decades examine the play under the light of a specific theory, whether it be feminism, Lacanian psychoanalysis, deconstructionism, new historicism or cultural materialism (and it is important to state that, concerning the last two theoretical tendencies, *King Lear* has been discussed by critics who are among the main representatives of each of them: Stephen Greenblatt for the new historicism, and Jonathan Dollimore for cultural materialism). As I said above, we cannot find a properly unifying element in such theoretically-oriented criticism, but there are main tendencies and concerns which can be perceived, however big the differences in such works are. One of these frequent concerns is what Foakes calls "the notion of ambivalence or absence of closure" in *King Lear*, an instability in our evaluations of the play.[36] Such criticism ranges from a perception that the play is so rich that it allows us to reach different conclusions about it, to a notion of aporia in the manner of deconstructionist criticism.

The other frequent concern is a rescue of the play's historicity, so that the critic tries to elaborate on the historical context in which *King Lear* was created, something which

consequently leads to an elaboration of the play's content - and this historical context is the decline of the feudal aristocracy and the ascension of the bourgeoisie.[37] Such an elaboration of the content of *King Lear* tries to establish its roots not only in the times of the critic, but also - and perhaps mainly - in the times of the author. That is, instead of understanding Shakespeare by making him our contemporary, as Kott does, we study the reasons why he is *not* our contemporary (and, precisely because of the difference between his times and ours, we might understand ours a little better).

A further development is what I would call, roughly speaking, a combination of the two concerns above mentioned - rescuing the historicity of the transitional period in which Shakespeare created his work, and the ambivalence of closure which prevents establishing a coherent 'meaning' to the play. Such combination of these two concerns examines the tensions in *King Lear* under the light of this text being a site of conflicting ideologies.[38] As with the other developments in the paragraphs above, Foakes points to the fact that such critical works reach different conclusions.[39] In fact, this thesis will be working along these lines, with the specific characteristic of applying close reading as a working methodology, and Marxism as its theoretical basis. Thus, we can proceed to the next chapter in order to clarify some aspects concerning the theory applied.

ENDNOTES

(1) I believe this might also be a vestige of the nationalistic feeling of previous ages when there was a concrete concern about not being invaded by the Continent.

(2) Marx starts his *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Napoleon* by discussing the need of the bourgeoisie of borrowing symbols and discourses from the past in order to employ them for their own revolutions. He starts by mentioning the French Revolution, "But unheroic though bourgeois society is, it nevertheless needed heroism, sacrifice, terror, civil war, and national wars to bring it into being. And in the austere classical traditions of the Roman Republic the bourgeois gladiators found the ideals and the art forms, the self-deceptions, that they needed to conceal from themselves the bourgeois-limited content of their struggles and to keep their passion on the high plane of great historic tragedy." After that, Marx goes to the English bourgeois Revolution of 1640, "Similarly, at another stage of development a century earlier, Cromwell and the

English people had borrowed from the Old Testament the speech, emotions, and illusions for their bourgeois revolution. When the real goal had been achieved and the bourgeois transformation of English society had been accomplished, Locke supplanted Habakkuk." (Quotations are from Karl Marx's *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Napoleon*, Chapter 1, available in the Internet; see Works Consulted.)

(3) Alexander Leggatt writes on this matter, "Our knowledge of the visual taste of the time suggests that it was not a bare stage in the sense of being austere and undecorated, though we can only speculate about the nature and extent of the decoration; but it was neutral in that it was the same stage not only for every scene but for every production, occasionally augmented by scenic elements (a bed, a tree, a throne) but making no statement in itself." (See Alexander Leggatt's *Shakespeare in Performance: King Lear*, p. 5).

(4) Spenser, in *The Faerie Queene*, calls the King of France 'Aganip of Celtica'. However, this is the same King of France, and not some other character. (Holinshed calls him Aganippus as well, but he lets it very clear from the beginning that he is the monarch of France, so that a twenty-first century reader does not get in doubt that he is writing about the same man Shakespeare is.)

(5) Philip Sidney's narrative about the king of Paphlagonia can be found in the 'Appendices', pp. 229-35, of the 2nd Arden edition of *King Lear*, edited by Kenneth Muir.

(6) Besides Muir's commentaries about these in the 'Introduction', the 2nd Arden edition of *King Lear* reproduces these seven sources in the 'Appendices', either in excerpts or in their entirety.

(7) See G. K. Hunter's 'Introduction', pp. 39-40 in the 1972 New Penguin edition of *King Lear*.

(8) The information in this paragraph was obtained from the combination of two sources: Laurie Maguire's essay 'Shakespeare Published', p. 585 (in *Shakespeare: An Oxford Guide*, edited by Stanley Wells and Lena Cowen Orlin), and the official site of the Royal Shakespeare Company (see Works Consulted for it.)

(9) I am thankful to José Carlos Volcato for providing me information about the measures of the Quarto and Folio formats.

(10) The two plays which were not included are *Pericles* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen* (both of which were integrated into the Shakespearean canon later). Of course, if one is to count *Sir Thomas More*, a collaborative work in which

he wrote three pages, or the lost *Cardenio*, or still *Edward III*, about which strong evidence has been presented recently that Shakespeare had a hand in its making, it will be five plays not included. (As for *Edward III*, there has been discussion whether Shakespeare wrote only a few scenes or a significant part of it. However, there has been growing academic acceptance that the Bard took part in this collaborative work and, due to this, it is making its way into the Shakespearean canon, having already been included in the Cambridge and Riverside Shakespeare series).

(11) See Stanley Wells' 'Introduction', p.2, in *The Division of the Kingdoms*.

(12) See T. W. Craik's 'Introduction', pp. 20-1, to the 3rd Arden edition of *King Henry V*.

(13) The most precious assets belonging to the Elizabethan/Jacobean theatre companies were the costumes and, more than those, the texts which they bought from the playwrights, and which constituted their stable repertoire - and so, these should never be lost or stolen. (See Gabriel Egan's essay 'Theatre in London', p. 21, in *Shakespeare: An Oxford Guide*.) Thus, it was necessary for such companies to have bookholders for these manuscript copies.

(14) The information in this paragraph was collected from: T. W. Craik's 'Introduction', p. 20, to the 3rd Arden edition of Shakespeare's *King Henry V*; Laurie Maguire's essay 'Shakespeare Published', p. 584 (in *Shakespeare: An Oxford Guide*, edited by Stanley Wells and Lena Cowen Orlin); and Gary Taylor's essay 'Monopolies, Show Trials, Disaster, and Invasion: *King Lear* and Censorship', pp. 105-6, in *The Division of the Kingdoms*.

(15) To those interested, such study is developed extensively in the volume *The Division of the Kingdoms*, edited by Gary Taylor and Michael Warren.

(16) Actually, there was a couple of voices claiming for the independence of the Q and F texts, but they were isolated. The most notable of them is Harley Granville Barker, the English theatre director who revolutionized the staging of Shakespeare in the first decades of the twentieth century. Not only he believed that Q and F should be seen as two different texts, but he also claimed for the superiority of the F version (this was in 1927). The critic E. A. J. Honigmann also pointed to the direction of an independence of the two texts in 1965. However, such movements did not bring any repercussion. (See Stanley Wells' 'Introduction', pp. 3, 14, in *The Division of the Kingdoms*. See also R. A. Foakes *Hamlet Versus Lear*, p. 71-2.) To this, one could add the fact that, when Peter Brook directed his staging of *King Lear* in 1962, some of the cuts

he did in the conflated text were precisely in the Q parts.

(17) In the present situation, besides the Oxford series publishing *King Lear*'s Q and F versions in separate editions, we also have the case of the Cambridge Shakespeare series, which, instead of publishing a conflated *King Lear*, has opted for publishing the pure F version; also, the Pelican series has published both Q and F versions in one single volume. Of course we have very important series, such as the Arden and Penguin ones, which, even if referring to the discoveries of the divisionist criticism, still opt for publishing a conflated edition due to editorial tradition and to the expectation of the majority of the reading public in this sense (and, of course, most Shakespeare series publish conflations regardless of how they see the question of 'divisionism').

(18) See Andrew Gurr's *Playgoing in Shakespeare's London*, pp. 182-8. See also McGowan and Melnitz's *The Living Stage*, p. 219.

(19) See MacGowan and Melnitz, pp. 219-20.

(20) See R. A. Foakes' *Hamlet Versus Lear*, p. 45. For a very detailed list of those changes, see Maynard Mack's 'Actors and Redactors', pp. 56-8, in *Shakespeare: King Lear: Macmillan Casebook Series*, edited by Frank Kermode.

(21) According to R. A. Foakes, it was the Romantic critics "who first claimed for the play the special status it now has" (in *Hamlet Versus Lear*, p. 45).

(22) It is worth reading Charles Lamb's comments, which can be found in *Shakespeare: King Lear: Macmillan Casebook Series*, edited by Frank Kermode, pp. 44-5.

(23) See Jan Kott's *Shakespeare Our Contemporary*, p. 101.

(24) Although I make use of several sources for my account of the critical fortune of *King Lear*, R. A. Foakes' *Hamlet Versus Lear* (especially Chapter 3) is the main basis for it, since it provides a clear and concise organization of such assorted information. This does not mean that I share all Foakes' conclusions concerning the matters presented, or that my own account is a paraphrase of his work (there are differences in certain aspects of organization and conclusions, although I follow his presentation in the main lines).

(25) See Foakes' *Hamlet Versus Lear*, p. 49.

(26) See Bradley's *Shakespearean Tragedy*, p. 244.

(27) Idem, p. 248.

(28) Foakes' *Hamlet Versus Lear*, p. 50.

(29) See Maynard Mack's 'Actors and Redactors', p. 67, in *Shakespeare: King Lear: Macmillan Casebook Series*, edited by Frank Kermode.

(30) In Jan Kott's *Shakespeare Our Contemporary*, pp. 31-2.

(31) Idem, p. 107.

(32) Kott says about this, "Producers have found it virtually impossible to cope with the plot of *King Lear*. When realistically treated, Lear and Gloster were too ridiculous to appear tragic heroes. If the exposition was treated as a fairy tale or legend, the cruelty of Shakespeare's text, too, became unreal. Yet the cruelty of Lear was to the Elizabethans a contemporary reality, and has remained real since. But it is a philosophical cruelty. Neither the romantic, nor the naturalistic theatre was able to show that sort of cruelty; only the new theatre can. In this new theatre there are no new characters, and the tragic element has been superseded by the grotesque. The grotesque is more cruel than tragedy." (Ibid., pp. 102-3.)

(33) This is actually the main subject of Foakes' *Hamlet Versus Lear*, but one can see it in a very summarized way already in its page 1.

(34) G. K. Hunter writes about this, "The modern popularity of the play among readers has its obvious counterpart in the theatrical movement which stresses the theatre's social role to shock and distress. If the later nineteenth century stressed the pathetic side of the play and highlighted the healing role of Cordelia, the twentieth century's special contribution has been to stress the inhumanity and impersonality of the processes which crush Lear." (See G.K. Hunter's 'Introduction' to the 1972 New Penguin edition of King Lear, p. 52.)

(35) There are exceptions to the rule: for instance, redemptionist critics who apply the methods of the New Criticism, such as Robert Heilman. However, most of the criticism on *King Lear* up to the seventies was not theoretically or methodically oriented.

(36) In Foakes' *Hamlet Versus Lear*, pp. 63-5.

(37) Idem, pp. 65-7.

(38) Ibid, pp. 67-8.

(39) Ibid., p. 68.

2 THEORY

2.1 WHICH MARXISM?

By following a very usual division for the contents of a thesis along its different chapters, I provided a historical and critical contextualization of *King Lear* in Chapter 1. So, following the same usual division, this Chapter 2 is the one destined to explain the theoretical basis for my work. Thus, somebody who is reading this chapter could expect that, among the several theories (literary as well as other ones) which are in currency, I will pick from the shelf the one theory that suits my work better, explain it thoroughly here in this chapter, and, in the following ones, demonstrate the rightness of my theoretical choice by applying it to the literary work I decided to examine. And so, all the further analysis of Shakespeare's *King Lear* will come as a consequence of both the historical facts in Chapter 1 as well as from the theory explained here. In fact, I will meet some of these possible expectations, but this will not really be the case with most of the other ones.

Let us start then by the one expectation to be thoroughly fulfilled: I will now say the name of the theory which I apply in this thesis - and this theory is called *Marxism*. One can then have the expectation of coming across with such terminology as 'modes of production', 'the development of class struggle along History', 'ideology', and other such familiar wording - and this will indeed happen. The other expectation to be raised when I mention the word 'Marxism' is that I will first explain the socio-economic functioning of the English society in Shakespeare's times, and then I will present the aesthetic options of Shakespeare in *King Lear* as a consequence of the first one.

In fact, this will not happen. It is true that there is a variety of Marxism which, unfortunately, has been widely predominant along the twentieth century, and which splits the life of men in society into two halves - one of which determines what happens in the other -, and those are the *infrastructure* and the *superstructure*. The first one is the socio-economic organization of a given society, and the second one includes all developments of society

which are not strictly economic: art, religion, philosophy, the legal system, political structures and the State itself. When one thinks of Marxism, he will probably associate it to this kind of dual thinking which, splitting the life of men into two halves, will have as a necessary consequence the attribution of more importance to one of these two 'halves of life' to the detriment of the other - and, as the terminology implies, this thinking believes that the really important goings happen in the socio-economic sphere (i.e., the infrastructure), and the super-structure is just an evidence, a cover for the concrete facts that determine it.

Such thinking is frequently to be found in Engels' writings[1], and it is characteristic of the later Soviet-style Marxism. Such institutional Marxism caused terrible consequences in the twentieth century - and even in countries that were not ruled according to such thinking, it succeeded so well in obtaining the hegemony in Marxist thinking, that it came to be perceived as '*the* Marxism', even if there have been many other readings of Marx which just do not go in this way. This has also had consequences in the area of literary criticism, with certain critics examining literary works as a mere consequence and confirmation of the so-called 'socio-economic infrastructure'.

What happens is that such thinking is not present at all in the works of Marx, who has even written, "The difficulty we are confronted with is not, however, that of understanding how Greek art and epic poetry are associated with certain forms of social development. The difficulty is that they still give us aesthetic pleasure . . ." [2]

And Marx is right in that. Even prior to the establishment of Marxism as an institutional philosophy, and also before the emergence of the first literary theory (which was the Russian formalism), nineteenth-century literary criticism would frequently study literature as a consequence of the concrete life in certain periods of History (of course, such empiric criticism was not associated to a thinking of nefarious consequences such as Soviet-style Marxism). Certainly, the difficulty in literary criticism is not in understanding that literary works have to do with the society in which they were conceived, and their times - this is self-evident. The difficulty is in understanding the effect that these literary works exert on us, and this is all the more difficult when they are so detached in time as Shakespeare's plays are.

Speaking about myself, I was troubled of how I could understand the workings of *King Lear*, and relate this play to the conflicts of the times in which it was written, without doing it in a mechanical way. And the truth is, we have got in Latin America a tradition of lively Marxist thinking which points to this direction. When we come to think more specifically of Brazil, we have, for instance, the works of Roberto Schwarz - and this is a critic who, when studying the works of authors such as Machado de Assis, does not go into

the most obvious direction of understanding the aesthetic organization of such literature merely as a "consequence of the infrastructure". Instead, Schwarz understands such fictional works as a manifestation of the reality, which is as valid as an object of study as the historical facts which happened in the same times; a literary work is a manifestation in another level of the social circumstances of its times. This fictional work is not subordinate to the empiric, concrete social facts that happen previously or simultaneously to its making; it is actually in the same level of these ones as a manner of understanding a given society. The consequence is that, instead of doing the usual, which is first understand society in order to understand the literary work in a later moment, one might just go the opposite way - by first understanding the formal organization of a certain fictional work, one can have a better insight about the circumstances of a given society than if he went directly to the History books. And the best example of such Marxist criticism that comes to my mind is Antonio Candido's essay 'Dialética da Malandragem', in which he first analyzes the aesthetic procedures employed by the Brazilian author Manuel Antônio de Almeida in his novel *Memórias de um Sargento de Milícias*, and in a second moment examines what information such formal procedures provide about the Brazilian society in the early nineteenth century. This essay helped me set as a goal that I would first try to understand the aesthetic procedures in *King Lear*, and from these findings I would try to understand the English society of Shakespeare's times.[3]

As of this, we have the notion that the school of thought which has been called 'vulgar Marxism' divides matters into those which concern the socio-economic infrastructure (i.e., those which are deemed "really important" by this kind of Marxism) and the others which concern the super-structure (that is, "all the rest" - including literature), and that this will not benefit the study of literature. I also said that such a notion is not really present in Marx (which is what many of us erroneously think).

We can translate the terms 'infrastructure' and 'superstructure' into more general concepts, and so we can see more clearly the polarization between them. Instead of 'infrastructure' and 'superstructure', we could say, for instance, 'matter' and 'ideas', or 'material' and 'ideal'. In fact, we have examples of schools of thought which are based upon an opposition of these two poles as well as upon a belief that one of these must prevail, so that we can have the truth. Following this reasoning, we could say that we have those who believe that the truth, the comprehension of the facts of human life lies in the realm of ideas, and that the ideas are the one factor which determines our lives - this school of thinking is called 'idealism'; we also have those who think that the key for a comprehension of the human life is in the concrete facts, it is the concrete matter that determines human life - and this second

school of thinking is called ‘materialism’. Both forms of thinking are based upon an opposition between subject and object, in which one of these poles must prevail upon the other. Whether one is a materialist or an idealist, he will view subjectivity and objectivity, spirituality and materiality as poles of an epistemic relation of subordination in which one of these must necessarily have the precedence over the other. We could then say that ‘vulgar Marxism’ is clearly situated in the materialistic thinking: it believes that ideas are a consequence of the concrete matter.

What Marx says about the opposition between materialism and idealism is quite different, though. Let us hear a famous statement of his about this topic,

> The question whether objective truth can be attributed to human thinking is not a question of theory but is a practical question. Man must prove the truth — i.e. the reality and power, the this-sidedness of his thinking in practice. The dispute over the reality or non-reality of thinking that is isolated from practice is a purely *scholastic* question.[4]

By saying this, Marx means that a perception of reality that is based upon a precedence of one of these two elements - matter and ideas - upon the other will be necessarily warped. The building of knowledge is an *active,* practical task which requires the presence of both factors - otherwise, it will not be possible. A perception that is based upon the precedence of idea over matter, or vice-versa, is a distortion - it is a *‘false consciousness’* of reality, and it will not lead much farther. (Whenever I make use of the term ‘false consciousness’ in this thesis, I do not mean the more widespread notion which connects this term to the situation of the exploited classes who are not aware of their own needs due to the phenomenon of ideology. Instead, I employ this term to refer to the distorted perception which opposes idea to matter, or vice-versa.)

Such a distortion was widespread in the times of Marx, and it still is in ours. Man develops an instrumental knowledge which enables him to achieve increasing control upon nature, and yet, life seems to be getting worse in many aspects. A common perception in the recent centuries (that is, the era of capitalism) is that the environment is completely alien to us, at its best, and hostile, at its worst. We tend to feel that matter and idea, subjectivity and objectivity, are opposed - indeed, we live in the age of ‘false consciousness’.

Either materialism or idealism will not be satisfactory; the answers they provide for our questions are incomplete, for they are just symptoms of this ‘false consciousness’. Thus, according to Marx, it is only the concrete action - which consists of an interaction between idea and matter, or vice-versa - which creates actual knowledge. This joining of matter and

idea is not static, it must be in constant movement - man is the only species that, when confronted with problems in his environment, tries to change it in a manner that suits better his needs. Man is the one being that transforms his environment and, by doing this, he transforms himself. This concrete action that unifies matter and idea into a transforming whole has been given different names by Marx and the Marxists: action, labour, praxis - they all refer to the same thing.

I said in the beginning of this chapter that a very common way of organizing a thesis on Literature is starting it with a chapter that provides historical background about the times of the author and the text, and then, in the next chapter, explain the theory which will be employed, and only after that, analyze the literary work that constitutes the corpus of the thesis. If I could, I would avoid completely such a procedure, for I agree when Marx postulates that real knowledge is active, it is transforming, and thus, it unifies all the constituent parts of knowledge into a single whole - the elements (both idea and material circumstances) that existed before the transforming action, the result of the action, the action itself in process, and the agent of the transformation, which ends up transformed himself.

This means that the historical circumstances of Shakespeare and of *King Lear*, the theory I make use of, the analysis of *King Lear*, all go hand in hand - if I pick up and try to isolate one of these elements from the others, I will see that it becomes meaningless; and thus, none of these elements precedes in fact the other ones. Whatever attempt in terms of a strict separation of these would be equivalent to the dissection of a living organism; it would generate nothing but a *'false consciousness'*. If I explained all theory in Chapter 2 in an attempt to dedicate the following chapters to sheer application of it, I would incur into the practice of idealism: that is, I would attribute the Marxist theory (an idea) a generating power, it would be the matrix of the subsequent analysis - and in fact, it cannot be so. I can only discover things about *King Lear* and about Shakespeare by dealing with *King Lear*, and not with Marx or the Marxists. Whatever theory that I apply will prove its worth only in the concrete task of coming to grips with the literary work. More than that, it is not only the theory that will put *King Lear* to the test; it is also *King Lear* that will test the given theory. And a theory that does not resist *King Lear* (or any other text of choice) must be dismissed with.

As a consequence of this thinking, I did my best to present the employed theory - not only Marx himself, but also other Marxist thinkers such as Brecht and Fredric Jameson - alongside with the literary analysis; I believe that a separation of these would be meaningless. Nevertheless, there is some applied theory whose explanation does not fit organically the

following chapters; it would slow down their pace in a considerable manner, and for this reason I am presenting some of the theory in this chapter. The same applies to the historical facts - if I put all of them in Chapter 1, it would be a manner of saying that such "infrastructure" determines what goes in the chapters dedicated to the analysis. Most of such historical facts will be presented together with the analysis - however, not all of them would fit organically there, and so, these ones were presented in the previous chapter. In fact, I arrived to the vast majority of such historical knowledge by means of careful analysis of the play, and not the other way around. It was this almost-word-by-word close reading that gave me plenty of insights concerning the possibility of certain sociohistorical facts, which were later confirmed by the reading of the theory of Marx himself and, later on, of historiography concerning early modern England.

2.2 WHICH HISTORY?

I started this chapter talking about the problematic notion of infrastructure and superstructure, and now I am talking about History. History is a central element in Marxist theory, but there is not something such as a single consensual perception about it, which satisfies all Marxists. And thus, I would like to introduce now the one conception of History that is employed in this thesis - this one is present in the works of Fredric Jameson, one of the Marxist theorists I recur to in this work. In fact, the conception of History I am going to write about is not Jameson's, but actually Althusser's - nevertheless, it is Jameson who adapted this concept for the purpose of applying it to literary analysis.

Jameson employs the traditional terminology of 'mode of production', but he follows Althusser in doing it in a manner different from the traditional: while we have a predominant kind of Marxism that understands the phrase 'mode of production' as a synonym for the socio-economic basis (the 'infrastructure') which causes all the rest to happen (including art in general), Jameson employs it in a structural manner. According to this view, 'mode of production' does not designate the so-called 'underlying infrastructure', but instead, it designates a whole structure. The characteristics of this structure called 'mode of production' are to be perceived in its different branches: the cultural, the ideological, the juridical, the political and the economic branch. None of these branches precedes the other: the cultural branch is just as important for understanding a given society as the economic and the political branches - all of them are a manner of 'reading' this society organized around a predominant

mode of production. And so, this structure called ‘mode of production’ is a synchronic system of social relations which are expressed in different “languages” or “texts” (the above-mentioned branches).[5] And by this way we arrive to a notion of History as an “absent cause”: we cannot perceive History directly, we can only do it by means of the *effects* it exerts in the different branches of the above-mentioned structure. Nevertheless, Jameson is careful to explain that, when Althusser somewhat says that History cannot be perceived directly, and thus, we can only have access to it by reading it as a text, he is not formulating a reasoning that History is a fiction - he is not saying that History is a “non-existing referent”, as it could be understood.

On the contrary: History *does* exist. History is the movement along time in which different modes of production succeed each other by means of the dynamics of class struggle. We cannot perceive or apprehend such a thing directly. This is impossible, not because History is some pre-existing immaterial essence, for it is not. History includes both matter and idea, since there cannot be transformation in human life without each of these elements. We cannot apprehend History, not because it does not exist or because it is immaterial, but because it is *enormous*.

History is impossible to be grasped by itself, and so, we need texts that can express it in a narrative manner. These can be fictional texts produced in a given society, for instance; or instead, we can have a non-fictional narrative about the succession of events in the economy of a certain society in a given period; or still, we can have another non-fictional narrative about the succession of laws in this same given society in the same period. All of these are fine ways of trying to understand History by its remaining effects, and the fictional narrative will be as important and concrete as the non-fictional ones: it is impossible for a fiction to be outside of History. The author of this fictional work might not be concerned about registering the historical moment, but he still will be part of that moment in History, and this will be felt as a remaining effect in the fiction he produces - such a fiction could only be generated in the circumstances of time and space in which it was conceived.

However, such narratives are formulated in very different “languages”. It is true that Marxism is transdisciplinary from its birth, but there still is the need to establish a relation between such different instances in order to have the possibility of adapting the discoveries concerning one branch to the other one. We need a *mediation* between these different “languages”, and so, I will present Jameson’s definition for mediation: *mediation* is a specific code or language that is established with the purpose of analyzing at the same time two completely different structural branches of reality - this code will be able to articulate two

completely different kinds of objects, or “texts”. This does not mean that such different branches of reality, or “texts”, will be unified into one and the same thing. This is just a methodological procedure that allows a specific analysis - by means of this procedure, such different levels of human life will establish a relation while at the same time they keep their peculiarities, their different identities.[6]

Mediation is necessary in order to establish a connection between different areas of life, and yet, according to Jameson, such a need is typical of the historical stage of late capitalism. Our knowledge is split, not just between different theoretical areas, but mainly between theory and practice, between idea and experience due to the above-mentioned phenomenon of false consciousness. Such a contradiction can only be overcome in a practical way, by means of the praxis which integrates idea, matter and activity with the purpose of transforming a given situation. And this has to do with our discussion about History because, all in all, according to Marx, philosophers will not be able to solve such a contradiction between matter and idea if they stay outside of History and try to reach a better comprehension just in a purely theoretical manner. It is only by taking an active part in History that man can expect to achieve this feeling of wholeness.[7]

Now, of course, this does not mean that we are outside of History if we do not wish to take an active part in it - this is something that just cannot happen. We will take part in History also if in a passive way, but this does not seem to be a really good situation for self-fulfillment. What connects us to History is action, praxis, or still, a third synonym for it: labour.

2.3 ENGAGED LABOUR vs. ALIENATED LABOUR: SHAKESPEARE

Labour. It seems such a common word, that one could think this cannot be the solution for such a complicated epistemic conflict as the one we have been dealing with. Nevertheless, labour is really the key for achieving an integrated perception that does not separate the existence into subjectivity and objectivity, at the same time that it puts one in connection with History. Let me make this clearer. Many of us might have a devalued perception of labour, and yet, this should not be so. We admire the works of art of Rembrandt and Michelangelo, we admire scientists like Einstein, Marie Curie or Alexander Fleming; we admire educators such as Emília Ferreiro and Paulo Freire; and this list could go on for a long time. We are talking of labour. Now one could argue that what we admire are the

outstanding deeds and results of these people. I will say that this is not so: present-day computers and machinery can do amazing things, and still, we do not admire them. But we admire at least some of the people I have just mentioned. And we do it for one reason: those were concrete men and women who faced certain concrete, historical circumstances, and all of them had ideas which were not really easy to achieve. And yet, they strived, they worked hard, they confronted at the same time the matter they dealt with and their own ideas. Things were not easy for them, they had to adapt to certain situations, they had to drop some ideas that seemed ineffective in order to try new ones. In the end, they achieved results - the matter they dealt with was transformed in the end, their own ideas were transformed in the end. These people also transformed themselves along the process, at the same time that they transformed the world. This happened not because of luck, or of isolated ideas - it happened because of their *labour*. We admire them because, by reading their stories of life or by coming across the results of their work, we become aware of the things man and woman are capable of doing to change their world for better.

One might argue that he indeed admires the labour of such people, but he does not admire his own labour, nor his wife's, nor his cousin's, nor his neighbour's - in fact, if one is to look around, he might not find too many people whose work he admires. One might say that some people are geniuses, or that they have an enormous sum of money to deal with, and maybe these ones can do admirable things. And again, some of the people I mentioned in the paragraph above might have had very favourable working conditions, but others did not.

Somehow we know that there is an element in the labour of these people that makes their work different from that of most of us, but in most cases this is not sponsorship or a good bank account. The big difference is that they were involved right from the beginning with what they were doing, they wished to achieve certain objective results as well, and they were ready to face the difficulties and frustrations inherent to their tasks. To sum up, they were very *engaged* in their labour. And if we think a little more, we are going to see that it is not only famous workers as the ones I mentioned above that might get our admiration. Let us think of a more everyday situation: whenever we watch somebody who is involved with his work - whether it is a carpenter, a mechanic, a nurse or a teacher - we derive pleasure from seeing this person at work. This is because such people, for one reason or another, are engaged in their labour - and, also if they will not become famous like the other ones, they also change the world and change themselves in their everyday activities. When we see such people working or when we think of the famous examples, we perceive that man is his labour.

The human being is always in the making, and the popular saying that “life is what we make of it” acquires a fresh meaning.

Nevertheless, this engaged work is an uncommon situation - unfortunately. The most common for workers in general is being involved in *alienated labour*. This is an expression that Marx coined, and it means a situation in which someone cannot establish an identity with the activity he is performing or with the results of his work. Every worker - whether working for himself or for someone else, whether he likes his work or not - puts literally much of himself in his labour: the product that results from his labour is at the same time the embodiment of his labour - if he has made a vase, the vase embodies the hours of work necessary to generate it. Now we have to remember that, in a capitalist economy, the worker will neither keep the vase he has made nor give it to someone he likes. The vase - the very embodiment of his hours of labour - belongs to the capitalist. The object is separate from the subject.

Moreover, the worker’s own labour is a commodity itself to be sold in the market. This situation does not get so clear for the worker due to the high degree of abstraction in the capitalistic economy - it is not just a couple of workers that go through this situation, but the biggest part of society. In the end, our lives are determined in most situations not by workers who know what they do, but by this alienated labour which was once part of ourselves, but is not anymore. What is more, our own labour does not belong to us, and, by becoming an object separate of us, it can in fact become our own enemy. We feel that the objects around us have come alive and, on the other hand, we believe that we are helpless, incapable of doing significant things. This is the root of the antithesis of subject and object - the epistemic conflict we have been dealing with in the last paragraphs is a symptom of our times.

I do not mean at all that the exploitation of the labour of others is an invention of capitalism. On the contrary, this has existed ever since human societies started dividing into classes. What is proper to capitalism, though, is the high degree of abstraction that such a situation has reached. In the times of feudalism, for instance, the tenant who was obliged to give his produce to the landlord knew very well that the product of his work was being transferred to the hands of someone else’s - such an exploitive relation was clearly personified. In the times of capitalism, abstraction has progressively increased to such a level in which the worker might not have the clear picture that he is being exploited, or who is exploiting him - economic relations within the capitalistic society are not clearly personified, but they are instead fetishized, not into the statues of figural idols, but into the numerical

abstraction called money. And so, one has the sensation that the objects have come to life and are suffocating him, when, in fact, objects are just objects with no will of their own.

In fact, there is a category of workers who usually does not experience this epistemic conflict - I am thinking of the artists. Ideas, working material, the process of work: all these elements are indissoluble parts of a work that is an outstanding example of engaged labour. Artists do what they do because they have to; when they are at work, they feel they are working for themselves, and there is nothing more important in the world than their labour. Artists usually endure difficult material conditions, they might even starve - but they will not stop working. And this is the reason for the admiration and envy that the artists cause in so many people, also when their material difficulties are a well known fact: in a world of alienated labour, these specific workers remind us that things can be different.

Think of Shakespeare for a while. Not everybody has read his works, but he is a household word all around the world that stands as a synonym for excellence, and there are all the time discussions about why, and how, and in which conditions he worked - this happens with him more often than with anybody else (even Leonardo da Vinci). Fewer of us know about the concrete working conditions of Shakespeare, but those of us who do, know that he wrote his drama in a time when the theatre was an activity destined to big audiences - the bigger the audience of the King's Men, the more money they made. It is true that they would also make Court presentations (and that certainly meant a gorgeous sum of money), but this happened only a couple of times a year, and so, they still had the whole year to earn their living. Thus, they needed big audiences. And yet, whenever Shakespeare wrote for the public, he strived to provide his drama the highest artistic standard possible. This means that he was in the double condition of writing to supply his material needs, and at the same time, in order to achieve a high artistic quality, he did a lot of things that were completely unnecessary for the purpose of earning his living. Nevertheless, it is precisely these "unnecessary things" that make us admire his work.

Now and then there are discussions about "who really wrote the works of Shakespeare", because some people believe that such works could not have been written by a man who needed to deliver a significant number of plays in order to put the bread on the table - a nobleman with more spare time must have done it! Of course the plays were written by him, but this is not the point - what I want to call your attention to, is to the fact that there is always discussion about how such a common man, who faced the concrete circumstance, already present in early capitalism, of having to sell a product in the market (his plays) in order to make a living, could write such outstanding plays which provide characters known by

almost everyone at the same time that they set the gold standard for writing in the English literature. (And if it seems as if I am having a fit of Bardolatry, I am sorry, but what I said is just true.)

We do not have such discussions about the ancient Greek artists, for instance, because we know that the society they lived in was structured around a completely different mode of production - we do not dedicate much thinking to the material circumstances in which such artists produced their works, exactly because the concrete conditions of their lives seem so remote to us. This is not the case with Shakespeare - the capitalism of his age was radically different from ours, but even though, there are many areas of contact, and this allows us to compare ourselves to him - that is, our working conditions to his - in a way that we would not do with Aeschylus, for instance. Or, we could even think of dramatists who came later, such as Racine. There is no such a discussion about him, and this is due to a social factor that makes all the difference. The Elizabethan/Jacobean theatre companies were dependent on the power of the State (which was controlled by the nobility) and whatever opportunity there was of working directly for the Court was seen as a source of great profit; still, the main income of such companies came from the market: they needed a great number of spectators who paid tickets, and this was for the whole year. This was not the case with Racine - one might even prefer his drama to Shakespeare's, but we know that his was a courtly art, and so, his working conditions were very different from the English dramatist's. Racine worked in a later moment of History as that of Shakespeare's, but his concrete working conditions are more alien to us than the Bard's. And so, what we discuss is how Shakespeare could write his plays, or if it was not someone else's - but we do not do this with Aeschylus or Racine.

Much of our present fascination with Shakespeare owes to our perception that there was a man who worked in circumstances which bear some similarity to our working conditions - the circumstances of selling the product of one's labour in the market - and still achieving the results he did.

2.4 IDEOLOGY IN CLASSICAL MARXISM

Man is a being that symbolizes. Representation is an important capability that allows our perception to raise from a concrete level to a more abstract one. The problem is that we live in a historical situation where our labour - which is the core of our being - becomes separate from us in such a manner that we do not even get aware of what is happening. And

this is so because almost all the facts in our existence are mediated by money, and money is an abstract representation of human labour. Nevertheless, we are not aware of this, and we provide money (which, according to Marx, is nothing more than human labour represented in numbers) an autonomy, a personality, and intentions of its own.

And so I will resort to the concept of *ideology*. This term can mean many different things to thinkers of different philosophical orientations, but I will make use of the definition of this word by classical Marxism. David Hawkes provides a good definition for ideology in the lines I am working with, "Ideology consists in an inability to recognize the mediating function of representation, in assuming that it is an autonomous sphere, and thus mistaking the appearance for the thing-in-itself." [8] This situation of taking representation as being reality itself is not a development proper to capitalism - it is probably as old as man's capability of symbolizing and establishing representations.

We can also make use of the psychological notion that an individual tends to project himself onto the world, and thus, see the world as a reflection of himself - if one does not develop a deeper and wider awareness of reality, he tends to see the world as merely reflecting his own needs and tendencies. For the purpose of elaborating on what ideology is, we can transfer this notion to the collective sphere of the social classes. Somewhat in the manner of individuals, social classes also tend to represent reality according to their own needs and tendencies, that is, they project their worldview onto the world. They end up believing that their perception of the world corresponds to reality. And, by seeing a correspondence between their beliefs and "the world" (which is not the concrete world, but the world as they represent it), the members of this social class understand that their worldview is "universal", "neutral", "objective", when in fact it is not more than the reflection of their own class's wishes and fears. When analyzing Marx's classic study on ideology, *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Napoleon*, Hawkes says that "the petty bourgeoisie has formed a false concept of itself as a universal class". [9] Let us see what else Hawkes has to say,

> . . . when the particular is falsely subsumed within the general, representation is forced to assume a determining role which does not naturally belong to it . . . Because of this concept's falsity [i.e., the petty bourgeoisie as a universal class], the normal relationship of representation to reality is distorted, and people can only see the representation, which they therefore mistake for reality. We find ourselves once more in Plato's cave . . . *Marx regards the delusion that representation is material and substantive as ideological.* [Italics mine.] A representation is a product of the human brain, and humanity is under a constant temptation to idolize these representations, and treat them as though they were real.[10]

As Hawkes reminds us, ideological representation is much more than a mere distorted reflection of the world, for it generates very material consequences,

> Although these 'imaginary' representations are not 'real', *and in fact conceal 'real', material interests and motives* [Italics mine], they nevertheless really exert a determining influence on the way people think and behave. This is an example of how representation can actively determine material conditions, rather than emerging out of them as a mere 'reflection'. [11]

We will not really understand the concept of ideology in classical Marxism, if we think only in terms of an isolated social class. It is true that a social class will devise self-justifying representations also in a situation where it does not have to convince the members of any other social class. This is not the most important use of ideology, though. Let us recall that a social class exists only because there are other classes in the same society. (Otherwise, we would have a society with no division into classes. I know this sounds tautological, but we cannot analyze a social class *per se*; we can only understand its doings by confronting it with the other classes in the same society.)

However strong a ruling class is, it cannot exert control over the other classes only by means of sheer force. It must convince the other ones that its manner of doing things is *the right one*, and no other way is better than this one. This ruling class will do even better if it convinces the others that its ways are the "only" ones, or, at least, the "natural" ones. In order to do this, the beneficiaries of such ideology must act accordingly to such representations - first of all, they must convince themselves of the "reality" of this representation, if they are to convince the others.

Life in society is not determined by the gods, it is determined by concrete men, especially the members of the ruling class. Nevertheless, they must make the others believe that the organization in their society is "natural". They must conceal from the other classes the following fact: that things happen the way they do because the ruling class is to benefit from such an order of things. As I said, the others must believe that such an organization cannot be changed because it is "natural". This is the main function of ideological representation: to make the other classes 'naturalize' the perception of that which is not natural at all.

Such representations will not convince the members of the other classes forever. We might have factors of several orders - cultural, economic, political - that make life in a given society change so much that a certain ideological representation, which was powerful

some years ago because it was widely believed, ceases being believed, and thus, loses its function of social control. I am going to give an example that will be easily understood by Brazilian readers, and probably, by Latin American and Western ones in general. Let us think of an ideological figure that has lasted for long millennia, since the establishment of the first patriarchal societies. I am talking of equating father to God: according to such a representation, God is like a father to all of us, and a father is a small god within his household. Such an ideological figure is not typical of one single mode of production, but of several (if we think of Engels' scheme of the succession of modes of production along History) - it certainly was not present in the ancient matriarchal societies, but we have seen variations of it throughout History, until very recently. When political organization of society required it so, the equation became something wider than only father-God; it became father-God-chief-of-government: the king was both a father and a god to his subjects, God was the King of all men, and, sure, the *pater familias* was a little king at home.

The father-God-chief-of-government is a figure that managed to survive the establishment of capitalistic societies - until quite recently, this figure became even expanded: boss-father-chief-of-government-God. Nevertheless, recent developments in the Western societies in general, and in the Latin American ones in particular, have challenged the survival of this figure. Changes in many aspects of societal life, mainly in the economy, have demanded that women make part of the workforce in wider and wider numbers. This does not mean a situation of equality - remnants of the ancient patriarchal society are strong: women are paid lower wages, and are still submitted to social and familial situations of submission men do not have to go through. Even though, if we think of the specific case of the developed regions of Brazil, we cannot deny that women enjoy a different status as that of forty years ago, and that, because of this, the figure of boss-father-chief-of-government-God is shrinking and tends to disappear. And this is something very concrete: if a boss wants to impose his ways, he will have to look for a way other than that of saying he is like a father to his employees (which is something that would have been effective some years ago). This is due to profound changes in society; we have possibly reached a point of no return concerning the use of this ideological figure for purposes of persuasion and control, and I would not rule out the possibility of it disappearing altogether in the Western societies in the future.

It is not only because of the change of the role of women that the ideological figure of the father-God is disappearing. This has also got to do with the fact that capitalism is a mode of production that heads to higher and higher abstraction. As we are going to see in Chapter 5, there is no such a thing in History as one mode of production substituting for the previous

one at once. Both modes of production will coexist in a conflictive way for some time, until one of them prevails. For this reason, capitalism had to coexist with feudalism for a long time. In the times of feudalism, life was much more concrete, and so, ideological representation needed to be more concrete, i.e., figural. Since the organization of life under capitalism is getting ever more abstract, there is a tendency that, at least concerning certain levels and needs, representation will also be increasingly more abstract. Such a degree of abstraction does not leave much room for the figure of the father-God.

Let us connect this topic to *King Lear* and early modern England. We have to recall that Shakespeare lived in a time of enormous changes, and this connects directly to the question of the use of ideological representation for the purposes of the ruling class. The ruling class of Shakespeare's England was still the nobility, but, within the time span of a few decades, this class would have to change ways and rule England together with the bourgeoisie. Actually, within just half a century of the writing of the F version of *King Lear*, England had changed completely. And that was just the beginning; after the revolutionary process that started in 1640 and ended in 1660, the English bourgeoisie would increase both its economic power and its political grip in more "evolutionary" ways. (I am saying this only concerning institutional politics. If we think of the Industrial Revolution that came later on, we must regard it as an even more radical revolution, also if it did not have direct institutional effects.)

And the point is this: in Shakespeare's times we had the coexistence of the feudal mode of production and the capitalist mode of production. I believe this was a more radical situation than the changes we are facing now. (I believe that, at this moment, we are facing a big change in capitalism, and not yet, the beginning of a change of one mode of production for another.)

We have to bear in mind that the feudal nobility had one representational system for its ideology, while the bourgeoisie was still looking for one. Certainly, the ideological representation of the feudal nobility was still hegemonic in Shakespeare's times. Nevertheless, the bourgeoisie was getting strong enough to start looking for new codes of representation that would suit better its own purposes. While such representational codes were not formed, the bourgeoisie could at least try to get hold of the then-existing codes for its own purposes. In one level of life in society, this is very clear: religion. In such times, when there was not a notion of a civil society organized around lay institutions such as political parties, religion provided a common code by means of which the assorted social groups could hope to articulate their wishes, hopes and fears. Different from the present

Western societies, religion was not a matter of private concern - it was public matter. And so, these different social groups would articulate their discourse in religious terminology, but there was also a strong sociopolitical aspect to it.[12] This is why Christopher Hill, when referring to the future Revolution of 1640, does not adopt the more common terminology of 'Puritan Revolution'. In those times, but also before, in Shakespeare's times, religious denominations also expressed the political concerns of specific social groups. All along the sixteenth and seventeenth century, religious denominations would imply specific political views, and this was so not only for the Puritans, but also for the Anglicans and the Catholics, for instance.

This is easier to grasp in religion, but art, and more specifically the theatre, would also constitute a field where ideological representations could be reinforced, tested or confronted. It was in such a context that Shakespeare wrote *King Lear*.

2.5 BRECHT'S *V-EFFEKT*: SMASHING IDEOLOGY INTO PIECES

Since ideology is representation, and not concrete matter, it can (and will) also be present in art. Nevertheless, as we have just seen, being 'fictional' does not mean that the ideological constructs are harmless and exert no effects in the concrete life of the human beings. As Hawkes says, such constructs, by influencing the thinking and behaviour of people, will end up determining material conditions - and they do so by 'naturalizing' our perception of the social facts: we take as 'natural' situations that are in fact *historical*, i.e., situations that came into existence in a specific historical moment with the purpose of protecting the material interests of the ruling class of a given society against the action of the opposing classes.

In the twentieth century, there was an artist who was concerned with the problem of art transmitting the ideology of the ruling class (sometimes willingly, but in most cases, not) and inducing the public to a passive attitude in relation to the conditions of life in society. I am talking of the German theatre director and dramatist Bertolt Brecht. When analyzing *King Lear*, I will now and then refer to Brecht's practice and theory, due to the fact that I will investigate some compositional techniques that Shakespeare makes use of, which make us not take for granted some ideological constructs presented in the play (and which could possibly have had, in many cases, analogous effects on the audience of his times). After having said this, I want to make clear that Brecht is a useful theoretical reference concerning this matter,

but I am not equating Shakespeare to the German dramatist. Brecht had a clear political agenda for the plays he wrote, and this was certainly not the case with Shakespeare. Also, there are some compositional devices employed by Shakespeare which might remind us of Brecht's techniques, but I will also examine in detail other artifices which precisely make Shakespeare very different from Brecht. To sum up, Brecht is a useful theoretical reference for the purposes of this thesis, but he is not a parameter to measure the Bard.

Brecht devised a theatre whose purpose was precisely to 'denaturalize' our perception of social facts in the capitalistic societies, which are presented as "natural", when in fact they are historical. (And, of course, Brecht's theatre wished to entertain while doing this, and not lecturing the audience on socialist doctrine, as some bad leftwing theatre does.) He believed that our perception of the social reality around us is conditioned by ever-repeating representations which make us used to think and behave in a certain way, and that such representations are also present in art and, more specifically, in the theatre. He also believed that, when theatrical performances repeated such representations, they were not doing this in a conscious manner in most cases - such representations were being repeated because these artists were themselves used to present things in a certain way, when these could be presented in another way (and by doing this, they were conditioning the audience to accept the reality around them, and in many cases these artists were doing this unwillingly, unconsciously). Brecht instead wanted a theatre that developed a critical perception about reality, instead of an art that lead the public to accept life "as it is". He also perceived that it was not a matter of replacing one representation by another, "more progressive" one. What was needed was a change in the manner that the audience perceived the theatrical representation; and consequently, the ideological representation it was used to; and finally, the surrounding reality. Brecht's aim was not a critical perception in a purely intellectual manner - as a good Marxist, he believed in praxis, and he wanted to change reality itself. This change in the perception of the audience implied technical changes in the aesthetic organization of both the theatrical performance and the written drama, and so, Brecht studied the non-empathic construction of comedy, the oriental theatre, and certain manifestations of popular art.[13] He also studied the non-illusionist techniques of the Elizabethan drama and staging for this purpose, and he was so influenced by those, that he adapted two plays of the period: in the twenties he adapted Christopher Marlowe's *Edward II*, and circa 1949 he adapted Shakespeare's *Coriolanus*.

Brecht also studied theory that could help him for his purposes. In the 1910s and 1920s there was a specific literary theory which dealt with the manner that art (or, more

specifically, literature) offered a different perception of reality. This theory was the Russian formalism, and the author that influenced Brecht more specifically in this sense was Viktor Shklovsky. One of Shklovsky's most important concepts is that of 'defamiliarization' or 'estrangement' (in Russian, *ostranenie*). Shklovsky believes that the routine, the demands of our everyday existence require that we 'automatize' our perception of reality. And against this, we have the purpose of art, which is precisely to provide a different perception of things that we take for granted in our everyday life - with art, our perception shifts from an automatic perception to an 'artistic', i.e., unusual one, and by this, we acquire a more 'real' perception of the object than the one we were used to. (And here we can recall the saying of the expressionist painter Paul Klee, according to which, art does not reproduce what we see - it makes us see.)[14] Shklovsky studied more specifically the technical devices which made the effect of 'estrangement' possible in literature, and he developed a concept that was very dear to the twentieth-century modernist art in general, and to Brecht, more specifically: according to Shklovsky, art must 'lay bare' its own structuring, so that the public perceives it as the artistic construction it actually is, and not merely as the illusionist reproduction of something else.

Another concept of the Russian formalists which was widely used by Brecht is that of the difference between 'story' and 'plot'. This difference had already been established by Aristotle, but the Russian formalists put a strong and specific emphasis on the 'plot'. We can say that the 'story' are the events present in it, while the 'plot' is the specific arrangement of these events for narrative purposes: according to the manner such events are disposed, the narrative will generate different effects upon the reader - and so, two different fictional works might present exactly the same events, but the aesthetic effect generated by one will be quite different from the other, precisely because of the differences in the 'plot', the organization of the events. A narrative is not just what it tells, but also, and mainly, *how* it tells - and so, we get to the famous formalist saying that "form is content". For instance, if the author who is writing a fictional work changes the usual arrangement of the events, so that the plot deviates from what a reader would normally expect, he will be calling the attention of the reader to the structure of the work itself, and not only to the story.[15]

This is a principle which Brecht applied for his theatre (concerning both the drama he wrote and the theatrical performances he directed). However, there is a very important difference between Brecht's 'dialectic theatre' and the theories of the Russian formalists: when these theorists say that 'form is content', they are being very literal about it, which is not the case of the German director. For the Russian formalists, there is no such a thing as

'content': the 'story', the ideas, the theme, the historical context of the writer are not relevant elements - the only thing that really counts is the formal arrangement of the fiction, the technical devices that the author makes use of in order to compose his fictional work; the rest is deemed irrelevant.

Brecht, for his turn, has a different understanding of "form is content". He differs from the Russian theorists in that he believes that what the author has to say is really important, it is not a mere excuse to show his dexterity in the formal organization of a fictional work. Nevertheless, the formal organization of such fiction will strongly influence the effect that it exerts on the public, and the content itself will be affected by the manner in which the author makes use of the technical devices he is dealing with. Brecht also wrote non-dramatic literature, but his life and focus was the theatre, and when he thought of content, this meant mainly political content. In Brecht's dialectic theatre, the concepts of the Russian formalists are applied to call the attention of the spectator to the artificiality of the theatrical scene, but this is not a goal in itself - in the dialectic theatre, the director's main purpose is to denaturalize the perception of the spectator, as well as the expectations that he has for the scene, in order to also denaturalize his perception of life under capitalism. An aesthetic shock must be generated, but this is not a goal in itself: the frustration of the audience's expectations concerning the narrative, for instance, must generate an awareness in the spectator that the situations presented on stage are not 'natural'; the events represented could have had a different outcome, if the characters had chosen other possibilities of action.

To do this, the performance in the dialectic theatre must generate contradictions between the assorted scenic elements, so that the structure of the theatrical scene is 'laid bare', and the spectator does not identify with what he sees on stage. (A famous Brecht saying is, "I laugh of those who cry, I cry because of those who laugh.") Let us see some examples of scenic contradictions in Brecht's lines: *a)* Just like the Russian formalists propose, the 'plot' (the formal arrangement of the events) is more important than the story; thus, the dramatic action can - even *must* - be interrupted precisely in the climactic moments, so that the staging can introduce critical comments concerning the action that was being presented; *b)* The physical action of the actor can often go precisely in the opposite way of the speech that he is saying; *c)* The soundtrack must not enhance the emotional content of the scene, as is usual; instead, it must provoke emotional detachment (for instance, a sentimental scene should have some cheerful music as its soundtrack); *d)* The scenes must be preceded by titles that are ironical about the content to be presented, or that generate an expectation which is to be broken soon.

An important aspect concerning Brecht's conception of a political theatre is that it does not exclude the possibility of spectatorial empathy with a character (up to a certain degree). By 'empathy', I mean the emotional identification between spectator and character - let us recall that a more traditional theatrical approach will precisely establish as many points of contact between spectator and character as possible, and this will happen during the whole spectacle. This is certainly not Brecht's goal - he wants the spectator precisely to criticize the actions of the character. However, the spectator cannot keep critical distance all the time, otherwise he will not be interested in the spectacle. Thus, there must be a balance between empathy and critical distance. The scene provides enough empathy for the spectator to be interested in what will happen to the character - or what he will do -, but it will also feature breaks that generate aesthetic shocks, in order that the audience does not get overwhelmed by the character's emotions, and is able to "laugh at those who cry", as Brecht would say - and by this, Brecht did not mean that he wanted his audience to be sadistic; they should perceive that, if the character had chosen another course of action instead of the one he did, he would not end up crying.

In order that the estrangement generated by the theatrical scene carries a political content, the action presented must be necessarily *historicized* - that is, the spectator perceives that the course of action chosen by the character on stage is not 'natural' and 'inevitable'; it is not 'essential' or 'typical of all men'. It happens this way due to certain circumstances; if the historical circumstances were different, the character would have chosen a different course of action. More important than that, the spectator must perceive that the character could have chosen a different course of action in the precise situation that he is facing, if he had a better awareness of the historical moment.[16] There are basically two manners by which the dramatist or the theatre director can historicize a situation:

a) When presenting past events, the theatrical scene situates them within the context of the society in which they happened, relating those to the main conflicts of those times - at the same time, the scene will relate such historical facts to the spectator's present, so that he reflects either on the similarity or on the difference of the present moment in relation to the past;
b) When showing present events, the scene must make it clear that the present moment is not the culmination of the historical process (as positivist historiography would put it). Our present moment will also be regarded in a critical manner in the future. The theatrical scene must allow the spectator, thus, to put in historical perspective the present moment in which he lives.

I would like now to talk about the terminology that I employ in this thesis when I refer to Brecht's concepts. Since the Russian formalists were an important inspiration for him, Brecht took Shklovsky's term *ostranenie* (the Russian word for 'estrangement') and translated it into German (*Verfremdung*). Thus, he called the effect that he wanted to provoke on the spectator *Verfremdungseffekt*, or, to shorten, *V-effekt*, as it ended up being usually called. As I said, Brecht's term means precisely 'estrangement', but it differs from the Russian *ostranenie* because of its explicitly political aspect. In English, it is called either *V-effekt* (as in German) or 'alienation effect'. Being a Brazilian, I do not feel at ease with the word 'alienation' - as a false cognate, it might recall for Latin Americans precisely the opposite of what Brecht intended. For this reason, I will call it *V-effekt*, as it is to be sometimes found also in English.[17]

So, I will make use of the term *V-effekt* when examining certain formal devices in *King Lear* which remind me of Brecht's theatre (regarding the aspect of a politically critical perception of the events presented in the scene). As I said, though, Shakespeare might have been an important source of inspiration for Brecht, but the English dramatist does not have a political agenda for his drama. Very frequently, the effect Shakespeare provokes on the spectator or the reader is one of a critical perception, but not necessarily a political one. In such situations, I will make use of the term 'estrangement', which is devoid of political connotation.

Sometimes, I will also make use of the term 'detachment', as used by Kent Cartwright. In his book *Shakespearean Tragedy and Its Double: The Rhythms of Audience Response*,[18] Cartwright analyzes the relation of the audience to Shakespeare's *tragedies* as one in which the spectator of these plays is not just emotionally engaged, but he will also have moments of aesthetic distance. Cartwright employs the word 'detachment' in a relation of dichotomy to the term 'engagement', and he explains the dynamics of the alternation between these two poles in the theatrical performance of a Shakespearean *tragedie* as it follows,

> I view "engagement" as the audience's surrender of self-awareness through empathy, sympathy, or identification; detachment as the audience's sense of its autonomy, experienced as doubt, evaluation, mediated emotion . . . A tragedy's overall movement in spectatorial distance - generally, from engagement through detachment to a heightened balancing of the two - confers upon spectators an empowering sense of openness and possibility (wonder) in the tragic moment.[19]

It is possible to make an analogy between the terminology employed by Cartwright of 'engagement/detachment', and Brecht's 'empathy/critical distance'. In spite of this, they do not mean exactly the same thing. In the case of Cartwright's 'detachment', this term means a cooling of the emotional temperature of the spectator so that he can evaluate what is happening in the scene, but not necessarily criticize it, or put in a political perspective, as Brecht's *V-effekt*. (I do not mean that Cartwright's 'detachment' cannot overlap with those functions, but this is not the focus of his study.) And so, I will add a third term to *V-effekt* and 'estrangement', and this is 'detachment', meaning a moment in the scene when our empathy with a character cedes to doubt and evaluation about what this character is up to in that moment - but with no political resonance to it.

2.6 OTHER THEORETICAL SOURCES

2.6.1 THE FORMALIST-STRUCTURALIST CONTINUUM

The theoretical approach employed for analyzing the F version of *King Lear* is basically a Marxist one, but I decided to make use of other approaches used for literary criticism, whenever I felt that these would complement and enrich the analysis of the play. (Let us recall that Marxism itself is not a "pure" theory. In fact, Marx formulated his theory based on a very eclectic blend: the philosophy of Hegel, the nascent economic studies, the writings of what he called 'Utopian socialists', and the materialistic thinking of Feuerbach - and it is possible that I have forgotten other sources.) The study of a literary work, concerning the effects that it causes (or might cause) on its readers, has to take into account the technical devices employed by the author, so that the critic tries to grasp the aesthetic effect that the author tried to achieve when writing the play. Nevertheless, trying to understand the aesthetic procedures of the author is not enough; one must also take into account the public that gets in touch with the play. Now, *King Lear* is a work that was written four centuries ago - and so, I believe that the critic should not think only of the present-day public, but, whenever it is possible, he should try to know about the public for *King Lear* in Shakespeare's times; the reception was certainly very different from now, and the comprehension of such circumstances would help us understand some of the procedures the author made use of at the time of writing the play. Another factor to be taken into consideration when one thinks of the public (past or present) for *King Lear* is that

Shakespeare did not write his plays to be published as a book, i.e., to be read. Plays are written to be performed (but, of course, they can also be read). This means that, when writing about *King Lear*, I cannot think of *one* abstract public, but of three instances of reception: the audience of Shakespeare's times; the audiences of the present times; the readers of the present times. In terms of social environment, this means both Jacobean England and the contemporary, globalized world. In terms of analyzing the possibilities of reception, this means that Shakespeare on page must go hand in hand with Shakespeare on stage.[20]

Two poles: production and reception. As for the production, i.e., the aesthetic effects that stem from specific procedures in the making of the play, I will make use, whenever it is necessary, of general notions from the formalist-structuralist continuum. I say 'formalist-structuralist continuum' instead of splitting it into two different groups of literary theory, because I perceive structuralism more as a development of the Russian formalism than as a departure from it. I will not resort to a specific theorist of either of these two schools, but there are some general notions that helped me in elaborating my analysis of *King Lear*. Shklovsky's notions of 'estrangement' and 'laying bare the structure' are there, either through the mediation of Brecht, or in a somewhat more direct manner: because Shakespeare's plays do not have a clear political orientation, not every moment of 'estrangement' in *King Lear* can be analyzed as if it were analogous to Brecht's *V-effekt* (although several moments are).

The notion developed by Tynianov of an evolution in the literary genres and forms, by understanding that literary texts are products of the entire literary system, was also helpful for me when I was trying to relate *King Lear* to the dramaturgic production in Elizabethan and Jacobean England (as in Chapter 7) as well as to non-dramatic literary genres that were read by many in Shakespeare's audience (as in Chapters 3 and 7). In this case, however, its usefulness for my study was much more general than the concepts of Shklovsky.

From structuralism I took some very general notions provided by narratology concerning narrative rules which, for their turn, generate specific expectations both for the audience and the readers. When an author such as Shakespeare provides unexpected turns to his scenes, he is breaking specific narrative rules that the readers and the audience share in common. If such rules did not mean anything, *King Lear* would not result so surprising for us. I also owe to structuralism the idea of opposing the narrative structure of *King Lear* in a synchronic relation to the history of early modern England (more specifically, concerning the development of the class struggle in such times) as I do in Chapter 5.[21] In both of these cases, I am not resorting to any specific theorist, but instead, I am influenced by general notions. The only case in which I could really mention a theorist of structuralism in relation to my

thesis happens in a very mediated form, and is that of Claude Lévi-Strauss. The notion that he presents in his *Structural Anthropology* of the use of aesthetic structuring to solve in a symbolic manner a conflict that is present in a given society (and which cannot be solved by practical means in that moment) was appropriated by the aesthetic theories of Marxist thinkers so different form each other as Ernst Fischer and Fredric Jameson, both of whom have influenced this thesis.

2.6.2 THE AESTHETICS OF RECEPTION

The author of a literary work has certain intentions about it, and he will make use of specific formal procedures in order to achieve the aesthetic effects that he wishes, but this work will not be complete without the reader - it is he, after all, that will provide meaning to the literary work. And, of course, the meaning that the reader will provide will depend on the social environment in which he lives, his historical conditions, his life experience, and the information he has had access to prior to his contact with the fictional work - and by information I mean very much the fiction that he has got in touch with, and which will make him used to certain narrative conventions and, consequently, will generate certain expectations concerning the future fiction that he will read.

The literary theory that deals specifically with such concerns is called ‘aesthetics of reception’, and was proposed by Hans Robert Jauss. Jauss coined the term ‘horizon of expectations’, and by this he meant two things that intertwine. The first meaning for ‘horizon of expectations’ is the set of expectations that the reader presents when he picks a book from the shelf and starts reading. (Of course we can transfer this concept to other, non-literary possibilities of receiving fictional narratives. One has got a set of expectations also when he buys a ticket in the cinema or the theatre venue, and starts watching the movie or the play, or when he sits on the couch to watch a detective series on the TV.) As I said, there are personal, individual factors that stem from one’s life experience, which will influence one’s expectations about such a fiction; there are also social factors, such as the social class, or the nationality, or the religion of the reader/viewer; and there are, of course, historical factors: one will probably not receive a work of fiction in the same way if he reads it now, or within twenty years.

‘Horizon of expectations’ also carries another meaning to it. When someone picks a book from the shelf and starts reading it, we can be sure that this will not be the first time that he gets in touch with a fictional work. He has read other fictional works before, he has

watched films or plays, and so on. Now, it does not matter how much the author of a fiction strives, there is no such a thing as an absolutely original fictional work. In one way or another, it will always present some degree of similarity to fictional works that were previously produced. This does not mean that originality is impossible - it certainly is feasible; but originality starts from elements that are already known from the reader, and then, when the reader thinks he is reading something he is somewhat acquainted with, the author of the original work will subvert the expectation of the reader, and introduce the unknown. Let us forget for a moment the 'culinary' fiction - that is, the fiction that presents no aesthetic surprises at all. Let us think of the works that present original traces in comparison to what has been previously done. Some of them will present originality to a lesser extent, others will be original in so many aspects that they might provoke a shock. Nevertheless, even these will have to present 'non-original' elements, for the reader must recognize what he is reading if he is to be shocked. (Susan Bennett puts this in a nice way, "Avant-garde texts are thus never completely 'new' - if they were they would be incomprehensible . .")[22] Such a reader will have expectations, for instance, about the course of events in a certain moment of a novel. He has read works that presented similarities to this one he is presently reading. And so, in all moments, regarding whatever situation presented, there are two possibilities: either the outcome will be the same as in other fictional works the reader has been exposed to, or it will not. (These last sentences in this paragraph will probably remind you of things we have already discussed when we were examining some aspects of the Russian formalism. And this is not by chance - we have these two poles of production and reception, and one depends completely on the other.)

As a consequence of all this, our reader has already established a criterion for acknowledging if a fictional work has got quality or not. When he is reading this new novel (for instance), he will be comparing it to other novels that he has read - some readers like to be surprised, while others not, and so, it is unlikely that a fictional work will be unanimously liked or disliked.

Up to now, I was talking of the horizon of expectations on a very individual level, which is that of the aesthetic taste of each reader. We also have to take into consideration that there are established social criteria for judging a literary work, and these change according to the changes in society. Some works will be considered shocking or tasteless in a moment, and decades later they will be very appreciated, while other works which are appreciated now will be considered bad or irrelevant within some years.

And here we get to what I consider the most important aspect of Jauss's theory, which is its concern with historicity. Literary works do not have fixed meanings, and also concerning their aesthetic value they will be regarded differently, according to the peculiarities of the historical moment. The importance of recovering the horizon of expectations concerning a certain work in a certain period does not imply (in case we are successful in knowing what such horizon was) that we get in touch with the "right opinion", and that we will have to adhere to such a view. What it means is that past and present will put each other into perspective.

At this moment, I want to recall what I said a few pages before: the basal theory for this thesis is Marxism, but other theories (the ones I am referring to in this part of the chapter) are necessary to complement it. I am saying this because, right now, I will do the reverse operation, and examine two aspects of the aesthetics of reception under the light of Marxism: the first one is the concern that the aesthetics of reception has in regard to historicity. From a Marxist perspective, I believe that, more than a dialogue between the past and the present, what is necessary is to enhance the differences between the past and the present. When I say this, I do not mean either that the past must "win" (and thus, we end up mourning the "glorious" past), or that the present must "win" (and so, we arrive to a positivist interpretation of History in which the present is the apex of progress). We need to establish the differences in a critical manner, precisely to understand History as a process. By understanding the peculiarities of the past, we might understand the peculiarities of the present. I believe that, when this happens, it is always an active and positive factor in our concrete lives.

The second aspect concerning the aesthetics of reception *vis-à-vis* Marxism is that, if we want to somehow recover aspects of the reception of *King Lear* in Jacobean England, we must have in mind that this play was presented in the Globe (among other venues), a playhouse that strived to appeal to all social classes in London (or almost). The consequence is that, concerning such theatrical events, there will not be such a thing as "*the* (consensual) Jacobean horizon of expectations" - different social classes would view *King Lear* (for example) with different eyes, and we must take this into account.[23]

2.6.3 THE THEATRE AND PERFORMANCE CRITICISM

Jauss's aesthetics of reception deals with the reading public - and at this moment we have to take into consideration that *King Lear* is a play, that is, a text that *can* be read, but was produced strictly for performance purposes. And so, one must also, and very much, think of

the theatre audiences when examining the possibilities concerning the reception pole. (You must have noticed that I wrote "*also* think of the audience", and not "*only* think of the audience". After all, the historical conditions of transmission for the plays of the Shakespearean canon on a global scale have generated a situation in which the plays of the English dramatist have probably been more read than watched - and this also if we add to the theatrical performance other possibilities of production, such as the cinema and the television.)

When thinking of the theatrical performance of *King Lear* or any other Shakespeare play, we must also bear in mind the peculiar situation of the director and the actor. Both are situated at the same time in the poles of production and reception. Just like the non-specialized reader and the literary critic, both director and actor read the text of Shakespeare and interpret it - that is, they provide meaning to it, since the text does not "speak" or "mean" on its own. And, at the same time, they produce meaning also by producing a 'new text' - for the theatrical performance is a new text itself, an unprinted one, which stems from the written drama, but at the same time, as W. B. Worthen states, it is necessarily another text.[24] (Even if a staging of a play by Shakespeare is intent on being orthodox and performing the play "as it is", it still will be the interpretation of the director and the actors, which reflects their own situation and concerns, and which is historically situated: if the same ensemble produces *King Lear* in 1996 and again in 2006, it will be two different *King Lears* - also if the text is rigorously the same, and if they are intent on doing in 2006 "the same thing" they did in 1996. In ten years, the world will have changed, the audience will have changed, the theatrical ensemble will have changed, and thus, their *King Lear* will have changed too, also if against their own will.)

As a consequence, the work of a literary critic who is analyzing a play by Shakespeare will profit more if he also has in mind the reality of the work on the stage. Since drama is written for the concrete purpose of being performed, there are aspects in a play which will be illuminated if we think of the concrete circumstances of the work on stage - the aesthetic choices that the theatrical ensemble makes when rehearsing and staging a play, and the reaction of the audience to such a performance. If the empiric element of the theatrical labour is in the mind of the literary critic, it will probably add to his analysis. Let us think of the writings of theatre directors such as Stanislavski and Peter Brook, and we will recall the fresh insights they were able to have working with their actors on specific written drama, insights which could not be reached by a literary criticism that approached drama as if it were only to be properly understood in its printed form.[25] This does not mean that the literary critic who is

analyzing drama must be a man of the theatre. What he must do anyway, whether he is more familiar with the labour of the theatre and the circumstances of the audience or not, is keep in mind the following notion: the aim of the written drama is to be enacted on the stage, not to be read in printed form - the literary criticism that does not take this extraliterary reality into account is an analysis that has failed in recognizing the reality of its object.

After saying this, I want to explain some terminology that might be found in one moment or the other in this thesis. When analyzing the action of a specific character, we might talk about his 'aim' or 'goal'; when analyzing a certain speech, we might wonder what the 'intention' of such utterance is. I will seldom employ such terminology - instead, I will use a term coined by the Russian theatre director Constantin Stanislavski. This term is 'objective', and it can mean both the aim and the intention of a specific character.

The last thing to say is that, since the 1970s, the literary criticism of Shakespeare's plays has seen the growth of what has been termed 'performance criticism'. This is an area of literary criticism that bridges the gap between that literary criticism which does not take into account the reality of the stage, and the theatre studies (whose object, as the name says, is non-literary). One could say that performance criticism about Shakespeare's drama deals mainly with two topics: the analysis of a written text regarding its possibilities of performance on the stage; or, establishing a relation between a specific staging of a Shakespeare play to the text itself (or still, comparing different stagings of the same play) - all in all, this is literary criticism that features an interface in relation to the theatre studies.[26]

It is time then to start a new chapter and go to another phase. From the next page on, we are going to analyze the F version of *King Lear*.

ENDNOTES

(1) Even if this economicist reasoning is to be found in the works of Engels, this does not happen in such a consistent manner as in the institutional Marxism of the twentieth century - there are moments in which the thinking of Engels is truly dialectic.

(2) This can be found in Marx's *Introduction to: A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, which is available in the Internet. (See Works Consulted for website.)

(3) Antonio Candido's essay 'Dialética da Malandragem' can be found in the volume *O Discurso e a Cidade*. It is very well complemented by an essay which Roberto Schwarz has written about it, called 'Pressupostos, Salvo Engano, de *Dialética da Malandragem*', which is to be found in the volume *Que Horas São?*.

(4) In Karl Marx's *Theses on Feuerbach*, which is available in the Internet. (See Works Consulted for website.)

(5) Such notions about History and mediation are to be found in the Chapter 1 of Fredric Jameson's *The Political Unconscious*.

(6) Idem, Chapter 1.

(7) In my opinion, the best Marxist thinkers are those ones which cannot be described satisfactorily as 'thinkers' or 'theorists' because they are in fact *doers*, men of praxis. Let us think of Brecht: many think that he developed a theory, and afterwards he applied it to his works – in fact, it was just the opposite. Being a man of the theatre, he dealt with the practical reality of his profession: he would come to grips with practical and concrete problems, and, at the same time, he reflected on theoretical questions. In his praxis, he arrived to practical solutions, and, only after that, he would theorize and write about his notions of the epic drama, and, later on, of the dialectic theatre. And, because his labour in the theatre lasted for decades, new problems would always arrive, and with them new solutions, as well as reformulating what he theorized before - and changes would be many times very radical. For this reason, what Brecht thought in the thirties, for instance, was not the same thing that he thought in the fifties. By this, I do not mean that he was not concerned with theory - he was, and very much, but, as he was involved in effective praxis, he theorized *in* and *with* his practice. I could also mention the example of the educator Paulo Freire, which can be compared to Brecht in this sense of praxis. And I want to mention another outstanding Latin American example of the praxis which integrates practice and Marxist theory: I am thinking of the Argentinean theatre director and acting teacher Raúl Serrano. His book *Tesis Sobre Stanislavski* is the best account that I have ever read on the 'method of physical actions' devised by the Russian theatre director Constantin Stanislavski in his last years. In this book, Raúl Serrano develops his own elaboration about Stanislavski's method of physical actions at the same time that he elaborates on Marx's concern about integrating theory and practice. Reading this book helped me understand better, not "only" Stanislavski's last work as well as the epistemic problems related to acting, but it also helped me understand Marx better.

(8) In David Hawkes' *Ideology*, p. 98.

(9) Idem, p. 95.

(10) Ibid., pp. 94-5.

(11) Ibid., p. 94.

(12) See Fredric Jameson's *The Political Unconscious*, pp. 88-9.

(13) For brief information on this, see my essay '*Pai Contra Mãe*: O Dia Em Que Machado Encontrou-se Com Brecht'. For more detailed information, see the chapter 'O Efeito de Distanciamento: O Conceito' in Gerd Bornheim's *Brecht: A Estética do Teatro*. Bornheim's book is a precious, thorough source of information and reflection on Brecht's work.

(14) See Viktor Shklovsky's essay 'A Arte Como Procedimento' in *Teoria da Literatura: Formalistas Russos* (edited by Dionísio de Oliveira Toledo) . See also Raman Selder's *A Reader's Guide to Contemporary Literary Theory*, p. 33, as well as my essay above mentioned.

(15) See Selder, pp. 35-6.

(16) In order to make this point clear for the reader, Brecht picks examples precisely from *King Lear* in his essay 'O Teatro Experimental', pp. 135-6, in *Teatro Dialético: Ensaios* (edited by Luís Carlos Maciel).

(17) In a reverse manner, this is the reason why I chose to employ in 2.3 the term 'alienated labour' for the phenomenon studied by Marx, instead of 'estranged labour', which is how this is usually called in English..

(18) Kent Cartwright's approach in his *Shakespearean Tragedy and Its Double* is not political (even though he provides many important data about historical circumstances regarding *King Lear*), and his study on spectatorial distance

regarding Shakespeare's *tragedies* is not focused on a Brechtian concern for the spectator's political awareness, but, as Cartwright puts it on p. ix, on "an Artaudian concern for the effect of performance upon an audience". This is a book whose reading I recommend very much, especially its Chapter 4 about *King Lear*. Although Cartwright's close reading deals with the Q version (which bears many important differences in relation to the F version which is the *corpus* of this thesis) and his conclusions differ many times from mine, his approach provided many insights which were important for the close reading I did of F.

(19) In Cartwright's *Shakespearean Tragedy and Its Double*, pp. ix-x.

(20) It will probably be noticed that, when talking of the possibilities of reception of *King Lear* in the present times, I am referring to a very general, "globalized" public, instead of mentioning something more specific, such as a Latin American - or, even more specific, Brazilian - public. This happens because, when thinking of the specific reception of *King Lear* in Brazil, one does not have a very long story to tell. There were very few stagings of this play in the history of the Brazilian theatre, and *King Lear* does not get to be a household name, either among the cultured public of Brazil that reads drama or goes to the theatre, or among the artists of the theatre (I can think of at least eight plays by Shakespeare which are better known in Brazil than *King Lear*.)

(21) And, as I said before in this chapter, I also owe this idea very much to the synchronic relation that Antonio Candido establishes in his essay 'Dialética da Malandragem' between the structure of the novel *Memórias de Um Sargento de Milícias* and the class dynamics of the Rio de Janeiro society in the early nineteenth century - that work combines Marxism and structuralism.

(22) In Susan Bennett's *Theatre Audiences: A Theory of Production and Reception*, p. 49.

(23) The King's Men performed *King Lear* for the Court of James I in the Christmas of 1606. (Due to the year, we can be sure that it was the Q version.) What I want to call your attention to, is that, in the theatre, the audience effectively makes the spectacle. This has to do not only with the behaviour of the audience (for instance, if it receives the performance in a more enthusiastic way or not), but also with the manner they view the performance due to their *social* horizon of expectations. In the Court of James I, *King Lear* was certainly received in a situation of a monolithic class view, with no dissonances amid the spectators in this regard. This was certainly not the situation in the Globe: in the open amphitheatres such as the Globe, different classes would have different reactions to the scenes presented (as we are going to see in Chapter 7), and it was probably not different with *King Lear*. It comes to my mind that Brecht, for his turn, did not look for an approving consensus in his spectacles - on the opposite, he wished precisely that spectators of different classes reacted in different ways to his plays, and he saw such a conflict approvingly. It is very probable that, when he thought of this, he took the open amphitheatres of the Elizabethan Age as a model.

(24) I agree with W. B. Worthen when he says that the theatrical performance is a text in itself (in *Shakespeare and the Authority of Performance*, especially in Chapter 1). Another notion developed by him in this work, and which is inspired by the post-structuralist Barthes, is that of equating the theatrical performance, the literary critic and the reader, in that each of them, by interpreting a written play, are all creating new texts. This is a very interesting idea that gives food for thought, but one that I do not agree with. In this, I agree with Fredric Jameson, who says he believes that a text has got a finite number of interpretive possibilities. (See Jameson's *The Political*

Unconscious, pp. 31-2.) I am a firm believer in our possibility of appropriating and making the old texts new by means of an act of interpretation inscribed into the historical moment, but I still consider the intentions of the author an essential element, otherwise we would be denying this author any possibility of agency. In most cases, we cannot know for sure what the intention of the author was, and this is especially true for Shakespeare. However, I go with Brecht and the Russian formalists in that the form speaks for the author. The consequence is that understanding the form is a means of "communicating with this dead author" – if we want to be truly dialectical, we must be aware not only of the present moment, but also of the past, and this means that, regardless of how wide the interpretive possibilities of a text are, we still do not have infinite possibilities of interpretation. And this is not an attitude of respect for the dead, this is respect for ourselves.

(25) W. B. Worthen says about this, "The sense that performance is merely a reiteration of writing is a commonly held understanding of stage drama." (See his *Shakespeare and the Force of Modern Performance*, p. 15).

(26) W.B. Worthen, in his *Shakespeare and the Authority of Performance*, discusses the question of a performance of a Shakespeare text having an independent authority of its own which is not subordinate to the written text, as opposed to the prevailing view in performance criticism, according to which, theatrical performances illuminate the text by discovering concrete possibilities in it which have not been experimented yet. In Chapter 4 he presents a discussion about several points of view concerning performance criticism, and his own view of the subject is informed by post-structuralist theory, especially the writings of Barthes from 1970 on.

3 I.1: A FORCE DISPELS

Let us start the analysis of the play by examining the very beginning of Act I, Scene 1, where we find two noblemen enjoying a conversation,

> [Enter Kent, Gloucester and Edmund]
>
> **Kent** - *I thought the King had more affected the Duke of Albany than Cornwall.*
> **Gloucester** - *It did always seem so to us, but now in the division of the kingdom, it appears not which of the dukes he values most, for qualities are so weighed that curiosity in neither can make choice of either's moiety.*

At once, in a quite simple exchange we have the presentation of the scene's situation - the kingdom is to be divided but no one is sure about the criteria used for doing so, or the outcome of the King's decision. It is a curious fact that, when talking about the coming division of the kingdom, Gloucester mentions indirectly Lear's two eldest daughters, Goneril and Regan (by referring to their respective husbands, Albany and Cornwall), but leaves aside the youngest one, Cordelia. Rather than being a case of bad memory or disdain, one should remember that Cordelia is not exactly the best candidate for Lear's succession. According to the rules of the English medieval nobility concerning this matter (which have gone on through the Renaissance),[1] sons had the precedence over daughters, and when there were not male heirs, the eldest daughter would precede the younger one. Another obstacle for any royal aspirations which somebody in Cordelia's situation might have is that she is not married, and thus, will generate no successors. Probably for those reasons Gloucester does not refer to her when talking about the division of the kingdom.

Let us proceed to I.1.7-32,

> **Kent** - *Is not this your son, my lord?*
> **Gloucester** - *His breeding, sir, hath been at my charge. I have so often blushed to acknowledge him that now I am brazed to't.*
> **Kent** - *I cannot conceive you.*

> **Gloucester** - *Sir, this young fellow's mother could, whereupon she grew round-wombed and had indeed, sir, a son for her cradle ere she had a husband for her bed. Do you smell a fault?*
> **Kent** - *I cannot wish the fault undone, the issue of it being so proper.*
> **Gloucester** - *But I have a son, sir, by order of law, some year elder than this, who yet is no dearer in my account. Though this knave came something saucily to the world before he was sent for, yet was his mother fair; there was good sport at his making, and the whoreson must be acknowledged. Do you know this noble gentleman, Edmund?*
> **Edmund** - *No, my lord.*
> **Gloucester** - *My lord of Kent. Remember him hereafter as my honourable friend.*
> **Edmund** - *My services to your lordship.*
> **Kent** - *I must love you, and sue to know you better.*
> **Edmund** - *Sir, I shall study deserving.*
> **Gloucester** - *He hath been out nine years, and away he shall again. The King is coming.*

Spicy dialogues are not the exclusive province of Shakespeare. They were a common feature in the Elizabethan and Jacobean drama, but the excerpt above shows a number of aspects which are worth noticing. The first of them is that, even though Gloucester says he loves his two sons - the legitimate and the bastard one - just the same way (*"But I have a son, sir, by order of law, some year elder than this, who yet is no dearer in my account."*), he refers to Edmund and his mother in such a scornful manner that it gets to be shocking. In the same spirit, he describes the young man's conception in sordid details. So we have Gloucester declaring his equal love for his two children at the same time that he is cracking disdainful jokes about the younger one. It is worth asking how such a dialogue would affect a contemporary theatre audience (that is, middle-class people who enjoy going to the theatre). This is not so difficult to answer: we tend to be politically correct about the matter of having and raising children. Whether they are conceived within the bonds of marriage or not, we all agree children must be raised with love, and we do not treat such matters jokingly - this is too serious a subject! Thus, when we watch or read Gloucester's jokes about Edmund, it is not a sure bet that we will laugh along with him. And even if we laugh, this will probably cause us a feeling of uneasiness. Let us now think of Shakespeare's original audience: how would they have reacted to this? We do not know for sure, although there are good studies about this subject which could provide a hint about it. It is not the case to try an answer right now; however, I believe it would be useful to keep this question in mind, for it might help us in a later moment.

At this moment, I believe I owe an explanation to those readers who do not work with the theatre, and this is about a working principle for theatre directors and actors: the

indications in the stage directions of who enters and who exits the scene are fundamental information - if there is no stage direction such as [*Exit (or 'Exeunt') Edmund*], this means that he remains in the scene. We see that, right at the beginning of the scene, Edmund enters together with Gloucester and Kent. Since there is no indication that Edmund leaves the scene, we assume this is an indication of the author that this character will be present during the whole I.1, even if silent.[2]

Let us go back to the dialogue above. However short, this initial exchange raises other questions: although Edmund is present in the scene all the time, his father talks about him as if he were not there at all, until the moment he introduces one to the other. And not just that: we have here an inversion of the rules of etiquette. According to those, the less important person should be introduced to the more important one. So we have on one side this young man who also happens to be a bastard (and his father is not really neutral about the fact), and on the other a nobleman, an earl who also happens to be older than Edmund. Thus, the usual thing to happen would be presenting Edmund to Kent. Nevertheless, it happens just the opposite way.

The last aspect I would like to call your attention to, are the last lines of Kent and Edmund in this excerpt,

> **Edmund** - *My services to your lordship.*
> **Kent** - *I must love you, and sue to know you better.*
> **Edmund** - *Sir, I shall study deserving.*

As we know, none of this is going to happen in the play. In our specific case, we have already read or watched *King Lear*, but if we come to think of people who are not familiar with the play yet, and are getting in touch with it for the first time, this exchange may cause expectations which will not be fulfilled.

Those very first lines of the play feature three aspects which generate a feeling of estrangement either on the spectator or the reader. Besides, if one is to take Edmund and Kent's last lines too seriously, there will be a break of expectations. It is not by chance that the beginning of the play features so many aspects of estrangement as well as a break of expectations both for the spectator and the reader. Up to this moment, Shakespeare has not touched the central subject of the play, but he has already presented structural elements which will be present throughout *King Lear*.

Since I am talking of structural elements, I should better start dealing with this aspect in a more explicit way. In a very curious manner, the characters start the scene by referring to

the division of the kingdom in six brief lines, and then the conversation suddenly shifts to Edmund and his bastardy for a quite longer time (twenty-four lines). As a consequence, the matter of the division of the kingdom is resumed only in line 31, with Lear's entrance. What is peculiar to the structure of this scene is the fact that, right after introducing the situation, there is a change to a quite more mundane topic, and this keeps so for a rather long time, until the scene gets back to its main subject. This is quite uncommon. Why should the beginning be built this way?

The first reason to occur is a quite obvious one: *King Lear* is a play built around a double plot - one concerning Lear's family, and the other concerning Gloucester's. The conversation around Lear's succession is interrupted for about twenty-four lines which deal with the conception of Edmund, and only after that we have the situation which was just mentioned in the conversation. This could be perceived as an artifice which links the two storylines from the very beginning, for the story of Gloucester's family actually starts in the next scene, I.2, and will intertwine with Lear's story only in II.1.

The problem with this reasoning is, I do not think either the reader or the spectator will be able to establish such connections the first time he reads or watches the play. From the very moment the play starts, events succeed each other vertiginously. The focus in this part of the play changes so quickly - from the succession to Edmund, and then back to the division of the kingdom - that the reader and the spectator will hardly have a chance to establish any connections between them. Actually, Gloucester and Kent's first exchange about the succession is so brief that, by the time the King enters, it is very likely that a 21st-century audience will have Edmund's bastardy more present than the matter of the succession - in other words, from the point of view of the reader or the spectator who gets in touch with this work for the first time, it is Lear's entrance that actually sets this theme, and not the initial dialogue of the two noblemen.

This is a quite unusual way to convene these two different themes. What would a more conventional manner be like, then? If this play presented a more usual plot structure, we would probably have first one scene wholly dedicated to the division of the kingdom, and then a second scene dedicated to the conflict between the brothers Edgar and Edmund; this second scene would be introduced by a character that took part in I.1 - possibly Gloucester. Since a more usual construction would not present the intertwining of the Edmund theme into I.1, the first scene would be totally dedicated to the division of the kingdom, and so, the dialogue on the younger son's bastardy would be either excised or transferred to the next scene, since it doesn't bear any clear relationship to Lear's succession. According to this

more conventional construction, Gloucester's speech in line 6 (" . . .*curiosity in neither can make choice of either's moiety"*) would be immediately followed by the one in line 32 (*"The King is coming."*), and the rest of the scene would follow as it was originally proposed. However, this is not what happens with this scene. Why do we have this peculiar construction?

I believe Shakespeare wished to interrupt the dialogue on the division of the kingdom for reasons other than establishing a double plot, since this could be done in many other ways which would be easier to follow, ways which could provide clearer hints to the spectator or the reader (and he does this in other plays). What the author possibly wished by this interruption, was not to give any hints, but instead to provide a feeling of puzzlement and uncertainty. In a word, the reader and the spectator who are not familiar with the play will not be quite sure about what comes next - and this from the very beginning. However, even the spectator or the reader who already knows the play will feel some sort of displacement due to this "strange intermission". Subjects and situations interrupt each other continuously, and this is to be seen in the rest of the play. In stranger and more aggressive ways, the play is built in such a way that the audience's expectations will be continuously frustrated in an ever-evolving spiral of estrangement. This will happen not just by interruptions such as the one above, but also by the absolutely unexpected outcome of situations all throughout the play.

Let us then analyze the following moment, which is the division of the kingdom, properly speaking. This starts around l.1.32 with the entrance of Lear and his entourage (Cornwall, Albany, Goneril, Regan, Cordelia, and attendants),

> **Lear** - *Attend the lords of France and Burgundy, Gloucester.*
> **Gloucester** - *I shall, my lord.* [Exit]
> **Lear** - *Meantime we shall express our darker purpose. / Give me the map there. Know that we have divided / In three our kingdom, and 'tis our fast intent / To shake all cares and business from our age, / Conferring them on younger strengths, while we / Unburdened crawl toward death. Our son of Cornwall, / And you, our no less loving son of Albany, / We have this hour a constant will to publish / Our daughters' several dowers, that future strife / May be presented now . . .*

Before going on with Lear's first speech, let us examine for a brief while the central situation that goes exposed in these lines. For a long time it was commonplace in the ranks of Shakespearean criticism to ascribe Lear's decision concerning the division of the kingdom to some degenerate, feeble state of mind, due to such causes as old age, folly, etc. (Indeed, Lear will become a madman later on, but this has not happened yet.) I believe it is not really

productive to psychologize Lear's decision in such a way, since historical studies have demonstrated that, in the feudal times, when there was no such a thing as the nation-state, it was a quite common practice for aged kings to divide their kingdom while they were still alive in order to avoid internecine wars. Thus, Lear's action is orientated by a rationale, even if it is a feudal one: the kingdom as some sort of private property to be inherited according to the laws of succession - a rationale that certainly could not be defended anymore in the beginning of the seventeenth century, when Shakespeare wrote *King Lear*.[3]

At this moment, it might be appropriate to recall Brecht's notions of historicity and estrangement, according to which historical facts and situations might cause us a sensation of estrangement, due to the manner they differ from their present equivalents. At the same time, it is exactly this difference from our present or other times which makes a certain situation *historical*, and not eternal or essential. So, the estrangement we experience as readers or spectators in front of the situation above is not caused by Lear's senility, but, just the opposite, by the *normalcy* of such a deed in the feudal times. Of course, this effect (which reminds me so much of Brecht's *V-effekt*) will be more powerful if this situation shown in the theatrical scene, while keeping a clear difference to the audience's situation, also bears some sort of relationship to the present times – the audience's reality – in any sense.[4]

One more brief observation concerns a stylistic aspect of Shakespeare's writing, which occurs in *King Lear* as well as in other plays: I am talking about the alternation of prose and verse in the author's plays. I would like to call your attention to the fact that the first dialogue of I.1, featuring Gloucester, Kent and Edmund, is in prose, and Lear's entrance provides a shift in the writing style which turns then to verse. A current explanation for this – which I believe is quite accurate – is that in the Elizabethan and Jacobean drama the noblemen and other people of higher rank speak in blank verse, which confers them an elevate tone, while the servants and other people from lower rank speak in prose. This would have to do with the fact that, until quite recently, literature would present people from the subaltern classes only in comedies and other literary genres which blended humour and earthier subjects. It is quite clear that, being a king, Lear speaks in verse; Gloucester and Kent are noblemen, though. Why should they start the play speaking in prose?

I believe this happens due to an ingenious device of Shakespeare's, which guides the expectations of the spectator and the reader. Even if the two mentioned characters are noblemen, the fact that the play starts in prose is an auditory clue meant to prepare the Jacobean audience for a down-to-earth subject, that is, a less important one (at least, according to the ruling class's point of view). And this is really what happens, since they start

saying something about the division of the kingdom but shift immediately, and for a reasonably long time, to Edmund's bastardy. Now, when Lear enters and speaks in verse, the Jacobean audience had another auditory clue that the subject would turn to something elevate, that is, decorous and considered important by the ruling class.

One last thing to add about it: I started talking about estrangement and the break of the audience's expectations, and then, in these last paragraphs, I switched to something which is not just different from these concepts, but even seems to go against them. Now I am talking about a convention, i.e., about working according to the audience's expectations, and not against them. What actually happens is that there will be no break of expectations if these are not first raised. If one perceives right from the beginning that the scene does not have anything to do with the aesthetic rules he is used to, he will not engage with the play's action. Thus, the author first presents the expected conventions, and only after the audience is engaged, he will start breaking expectations. In *King Lear*, this game reaches a sophisticated level, and this right from the beginning, as we have seen in the artifice of the scene starting with a subject and then immediately interrupting it, only to resume it some twenty-four lines later.

Let us see the rest of Lear's initial speech, and then what goes on between the King and the people he is addressing at this moment, i.e., his three daughters (in I.1.44-81),

> **Lear** - . . . *The princes France and / Burgundy, / Great rivals in our youngest daughter's love, / Long in our court have made their amorous sojourn, / And here are to be answered. 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? Goneril, / Our eldest born, speak first.*
> **Goneril** - *Sir, I love you more than words can wield the matter, / Dearer than eyesight, space, and liberty, / Beyond what can be valued rich or rare; / No less than life, with grace, health, beauty, honour; / As much as child e'er loved, or father found; / A love that makes breath poor and speech unable. / Beyond all manner of so much I love you.*
> **Cordelia** - (Aside.) *What shall Cordelia speak? Love and be silent.*
> **Lear** - *Of all these bounds, even from this line to this, / With shadowy forests and with champaigns riched, / With plenteous rivers and wide-skirted meads, / We make thee lady. To thine and Albany's issues / Be this perpetual. What says our second daughter, / Our dearest Regan, wife of Cornwall?*
> **Regan** - *I am made of that same mettle as my sister, / And prize me at her worth. In my true heart / I find she names my very deed of love; / Only she comes too short: that I profess / Myself an enemy to all other joys / Which the most precious square of sense professes, / And find I am alone felicitate / In your dear highness' love.*

> **Cordelia** - (Aside.) *Then poor Cordelia. / And yet not so, since I am sure my love's / More ponderous than my tongue.*
> **Lear** - *To thee and thine hereditary ever / Remain this ample third of our fair kingdom; / No less in space, validity, and pleasure / Than that conferred on Goneril. . .*

There are many aspects worth being noticed in this passage. The first one has to do with style: also when he addresses his daughters, Lear never does it in a personal way. He is always rhetorical, for he is the King, and he does not address just one person - when he speaks, he is to be listened by all his subjects. As for the rich and flowery manner his daughters Goneril and Regan speak, it was very usual for the literary critics of the last two centuries or so to take it as a sign of their adorned hypocrisy, since they speak in a quite different way in the other scenes that follow. It could actually be so, but this is just one among many other possibilities of interpreting the style they are using in their speeches to the King. It is natural that the reader will attribute one or another motivation to a character's actions and speeches - especially when he is reading drama - , but one would find it useful to remember Walter Benjamin's lesson about the fictional narrative: the storyteller will do well enough if he does not define the intention behind a character's action, but instead, leaves its motivational possibilities quite open, so that different readers in different times and societies will have the possibility of ascribing different motivations. Benjamin believes that narratives which do not attribute *one* definite psychological motivation to an action performed by a character stand a better chance of survival along the time, and I agree with him.[5] [6] I believe *King Lear* is one of such cases, and so, hypocrisy is just one possibility among others for Regan and Goneril's stylish speeches (and, in fact, a rather poor one). This play allows us not to close the possibilities for the characters and situations in it, and one of the keys for achieving this quality is its constant changes of style.

I believe the reason their speeches are built this way lies not in any psychological motivation, but instead, in the situation and atmosphere in that part of the scene. (This does not mean at all that the characters act devoid of any psychological motivation. However, we would better focus on the form, since it allows many interpretational possibilities for the characters' actions, which is one of the reasons this text has been captivating the public's attention both on page and on stage, and intriguing it for such a long time.)

This scene of Lear and his children, with all its grandiose promises and language, and presenting the situation of a father-king who establishes a competition between the three daughters-princesses, reminds us of the fairy-tales. As I said in Chapter 1 (1.2), in the early modern times the English public was still predominately illiterate, and thus raised in an aural

popular culture, which caused them to be completely familiar to those folk narratives.[7] Goneril and Regan find themselves in such a situation where, in a quite literal way, "form is content". Thus, they could not formulate their utterances in a different manner - at least not without contradicting the spectator or reader's horizon of expectations. And, as I just said above and will demonstrate in the following pages, Shakespeare's method in the construction of this play is one of first raising the audience's expectations according to their familiarity with the theatrical and narrative genres the play dialogues with, and after this is done, contradicting these same expectations.

The last formal observation about the passage above concerns Cordelia. Even if we do not take into consideration her situation, her actions and her objectives, there is a formal device in her initial lines which differentiates her from her sisters right at the first moment: she speaks in the third person. This little artifice practically denotes that, despite the fact that she is the youngest daughter - and the only single one - , she attributes herself a good amount of importance, possibly because she somehow knows she is her father's favourite. (In her second speech she shifts to the first person in order to obtain the audience's empathy; however, these lines also start in the third person.) The form already guides the audience's horizon of expectations; a spectator or reader who is not familiar with the play - and, for this reason, does not know that Goneril and Regan are the villains - will know that Cordelia is supposed to be the heroine due to these two facts: she talks about inner content as opposed to mundane outwardly demonstrations (in a rather Christian way), and, mainly, she talks like a very important person, maybe a would-be queen. (And, of course, there is the aspect of Cordelia being the third, i.e., the last one to speak. Thus, accordingly to the narrative conventions, the audience will expect that the last daughter to speak will differentiate from the two former ones.)

Such a formal device allows Shakespeare to be more subtle in the construction of this scene - and of the play as a whole - than a less talented author would be. We have a construction which unfolds little by little who is the hero and who is the villain, and so, a staging of the play does not need to present Goneril and Regan right away as scolds. Their evil aspect might evolve in a gradation, and thus, it will probably provide a more interesting spectacle if these two characters are introduced in the beginning as quite normal women who might even have a cause of theirs. Such subtlety also applies to Cordelia. It is quite usual in the history of *King Lear*'s stagings to present the youngest daughter in a very idealized light, as some all-pathos, Christ-like silent sufferer.[8] What one usually forgets is that Cordelia is actually a strong and determined character: she even dares to confront Lear in this scene and,

later in the play, she becomes the commander of the French invasion. If this is taken into account when composing the actress's interpretation, another possibility for the asides is to utter them in a more confident, King's-favourite-daughter way. In Cordelia's asides it is also possible to perceive the arrogance and conceit of someone who believes herself to be superior to Goneril and Regan - someone who is so sure her father values her better than her sisters, that she does not need to make the slightest effort in order to please him, as Goneril and Regan strive so hard to.

So, Cordelia is a person of elevate feelings, and at the same time she is arrogant. As for Goneril and Regan, there are hints of their insincerity, while at the same time they can be shown as people who have a real problem - they are daughters who have a hard time trying to get from their father at least some of the attention he dedicates to their insolent younger sister.

This information can do a lot more than only provide subtlety and nuance. Due to the way he disposes such information in the scene, Shakespeare allows the spectator the possibility of evaluating the characters in a more critical light. Thus, a staging could provide that Cordelia's asides are presented in such a way as to show the older sisters' vileness and, at the same time, how conceited Cordelia is. Actually, this more detached examining of the situation around the characters can go much farther: it might enable us to have a glimpse on the social conditions which generate the conflict presented before us. Of course we, either as readers or as spectators, do not formulate a sociological discourse to explain what is happening there - one of the main characteristics of art is that its articulation of symbols operate on a sensitive-intuitive level. Still, also on this level we are able to grasp some aspects which are more political, and will try one way or another to articulate them with our knowledge of the world. I am stating this in relation to Cordelia, since her blending of arrogance and dignified acts definitely conveys social information. We feel she is indeed *noble* - and let us keep this word in mind.

As Poulantzas has elaborated on Engels' scheme of the development of societies along History, each society bears some remnant focuses of the preceding ones, that is, these ones leave traces.[9] I am saying this because of the word above: *noble*. Let us open the Penguin/Longman pocket English dictionary and take a look at two of the more common definitions that come to our mind:

- *having or showing a magnanimous character or high ideals;*

- *a person of noble rank or birth*.

The critical methodology employed in this thesis absolutely does not rely on philological or etymological studies. Nevertheless, a dictionary is an excellent resource not only to know the current meanings a certain word can have, but also - and this has to do with the Marxist approach I am employing - to examine the ideological aspects it might convey. These two current definitions for the word *noble* point to the fact that, in spite of the clear hegemony the bourgeoisie has established in the capitalistic Western societies, the nobility was somehow still able to hold its grip on the way it wanted to be represented: *magnanimous, dignified, imposing, showing high ideals* (all of them are dictionary definitions).

For this reason, Cordelia's blending of arrogance and dignity is not really an accident. Just like Lear and Kent - who are still going to be more closely studied -, she is behaving exactly like a noble is expected to do, if she is to be found deserving of her rank. As for Goneril and Regan, they are not typical members of the nobility, but we will come back to this subject in a later moment.

Let us return to the scene in the exact moment where it was interrupted. Lear has just finished addressing Goneril and Regan, and now comes what the King expected to be the apex of his show, when he addresses Cordelia (I.1.81-118),

> **Lear** - *. . . Now our joy, / Although our last and least, to whose young love / The vines of France and milk of Burgundy / Strive to be interested: what can you say to draw / A third more opulent than your sisters? Speak.*
> **Cordelia** - *Nothing, my lord.*
> **Lear** - *Nothing?*
> **Cordelia** - *Nothing.*
> **Lear** - *Nothing will come of nothing; speak again.*
> **Cordelia** - *Unhappy that I am, I cannot heave / My heart into my mouth. I love your Majesty / According to my bond, no more nor less.*
> **Lear** - *How, how, Cordelia? Mend your speech a little / Lest you may mar your fortunes.*
> **Cordelia** - *Good my lord, / You have begot me, bred me, loved me. I / Return those duties back as are right fit; / Obey you, love you, and most honour you. / Why have my sisters husbands, if they say / They love you all? Happily when I shall wed / That lord whose hand must take my plight shall carry / Half my love with him, half my care and duty. / Sure I shall never marry like my sisters.*
> **Lear** - *But goes thy heart with this?*
> **Cordelia** - *Aye, 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, / For by the sacred radiance of the sun, / The mysteries of Hecat, and the night, / By all the operation of the orbs, / From whom we do exist and cease to be, / 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. The barbarous Scythian, / Or he that makes his generation messes / To gorge*

> *his appetite, shall to my bosom / Be as well neighboured, pitied and relieved / As thou, my sometime daughter.*

We can easily observe that, when talking to Cordelia, Lear switches the usual rhetorical tone to a more personal one. Let us now try to understand what is going on in a more technical way, by examining the way Lear uses the pronouns 'thou' and 'you' when dealing with his daughters. David Crystal has presented this matter in a very clear way, and so I am going to quote him,

> Social and attitudinal differences between people are so important that they affect some of the language's most frequently used forms, notably the pronouns *thou* and *you*. In Old English, *thou* was singular and *you* was plural. But during the thirteenth century, *you* began to be used as a polite form of the singular - probably because people copied the French manner of talking, where *vous* was used in that way. English then became like French, which has *tu* and *vous* both possible for singulars. The usual thing was for *you* to be used by inferiors to superiors - such as children to parents, or servants to masters; and *thou* to be used in return. But people would also use *thou* when they wanted special intimacy, such as when addressing God; and *thou* was also normal when the lower classes talked to each other. The upper classes used *you* to each other, as a rule, even when they were closely related.
>
> So when someone changes from *thou* to *you* (or vice versa) in a conversation, it must mean something. The change will convey a different emotion or mood. The new meaning could be virtually anything - affection, anger, distance, sarcasm, playfulness. To say *thou* to someone could be an insult . . . The way characters switch from one pronoun to the other therefore acts as a barometer of their evolving attitudes and relationships.
>
> We find an important illustration in the opening scene of *King Lear*, where the king sets about dividing his kingdom among his daughters. We would expect Lear to use *thou* to them, and they to use *you* in return, which is how the interaction begins . . . But when Lear turns to his favourite daughter, he uses *you* . . . Plainly, if *thou* is for 'ordinary' daughters, *you* is being used here as a special marker of affection. But when Cordelia does not reply in the way he was expecting, Lear abruptly changes back (to *thou*) . . . Now the *thou* forms are not being used as a marker of fatherly affection, but of anger.[10]

This explanation about the use of the 'thou' and 'you' forms in this part of the scene explains the first change in the way Lear treats Cordelia. According to this thinking, when Lear says, "*But goes thy heart with this?*", we have a change. However, we are still operating on an individual level, and the scene actually goes far beyond that. To understand what I mean, let us examine Lear's last speech in the excerpt above. For clarity's sake, I am going to quote it again, this time separately,

> **Lear** - *Let it be so. Thy truth then be thy dower, / For by the sacred radiance of the sun, / The mysteries of Hecat, and the night, / By all the operation of the orbs, / From whom we do exist and cease to be, / 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. The barbarous Scythian, / Or he that makes his generation messes / To gorge his appetite, shall to my bosom / Be as well neighboured, pitied and relieved / As thou, my sometime daughter.*

This speech of Lear is crucial to the scene. In the preceding moments he demonstrated for quite a long time the great affection he has for Cordelia. Now, this thunderous expletive comes just too unexpectedly. As a consequence, one cannot help feeling shocked.

Let us see what effect the construction of this scene might operate on the spectator or the reader. It is true that Lear seems tyrannical right from the beginning, but even though, when one is reading the dialogue he has with Cordelia, one cannot help feeling some sort of compassion for that all-loving father who is mistreated by his conceited, apparently spoiled youngest daughter. And all of a sudden, the situation changes completely, and Lear becomes an unjust, fear-inspiring Titan, reminding us of the cannibalistic Saturn in Goya's series of Black Paintings. And we, who three seconds ago were criticizing Cordelia's attitude, suddenly feel all too sorry for her, and are now criticizing Lear's "exaggerated" reaction.

Here we have the first example of the effect Shakespeare achieves in this play, of changing from one moment to the other - and just all the time -, our judgment and feelings towards the characters and situations. As a good number of critics has put it for such a long time, we are dragged into a maelstrom of strong, violent emotions, and we never know what is going to happen next. The consequence is that our evaluation of the situations presented is unstable, and this causes us, as R. A. Foakes has so well and importantly expressed it, to live in an eternal present when reading the play.[11]

The juxtaposition of so contradictory actions and situations, with no real gradation between them, causes yet another effect: we get critical of the characters and, in this case, especially of Lear. We end up not believing a hundred percent in what he says, either in one situation or the other, since they contradict each other. This does not mean that we are not emotionally engaged - we never get neutral towards the characters and situations. Nevertheless, these abrupt changes are so strange that we tend to evaluate what happens in the play in a more critical light - we are aware that all through the play we are treading some quite unstable soil, and must take the characters' lines with a grain of salt. According to Kent Cartwright's fine terminology for this dynamics (the alternation of *engagement* and *detachment*), we *engage* in the action, and thus experience the pathos. At the same time, we

are *detached*, that is, we, from outside the scene, observe and evaluate - just like scientists before a puzzling phenomenon.

Thus, Lear's sudden change in the excerpt above should not be treated as some mere capriciousness of the King. Instead, this shows a structuring principle for this work, which Shakespeare keeps throughout the whole play, even if it changes so much that we happen to think there is no structuring at all. Consequently, we will do better if we leave the easy realm of psychologization, and instead, observe that this compositional resource is not psychologizing at all. In many of Shakespeare's plays, and in this one in particular, characters who go from one state to the other do not have to undergo a many-phase gradation. They are allowed to - even must - change all of a sudden. Such shading - which came to be a requirement of later psychological realism - is not useful here. The aesthetics of *King Lear* asks for abrupt changes, which actually enable the story to proceed more speedily, without stopping at moments of lesser interest. Like a fairy-tale or any other narrative of popular origin, the F version of *King Lear* features only the essential elements of a story. So, the spectator or the reader does not have to deal with irrelevant details. He will also not be bugged with explanatory accretions - and this will allow him to arrive by himself to whatever conclusions.[12] [13] [14] As a consequence, he will be more capable of concentrating on the story's most important elements. This does not have to do only with his aesthetic fruition, and I will have to explain this in better detail.

The most remarkable achievement of this compositional device is its capability of widening the audience's scope in such a way that one will also have a political perception about the story being told. It generates an effect of detachment in such a way that we move from the personal-familial and mythical scopes to a wider one which concerns the questions of state. It reminds us that what we are watching is a collective drama, precisely because the scene presents in a sequence a familial situation, and then a situation concerning the state. The familial-mythical scope catches our attention and causes our empathy in a way that would probably not be possible, had the author presented the matters of state in a purer way (as in so many of the *histories*). This more collective scope is the real focus of *King Lear*. As flies attracted to sugar, we get interested in the play due to these melodramatic stories that taste of familial-mythical matter. However - and in a masterful way -, after our attention is caught, Shakespeare is able to direct our attention to the societal drama. (I must make it clear that this last paragraph refers to the manner I believe the contemporary public relates to the play. In the Elizabethan and Jacobean times there was not a separation of family and state matters. Thus, Shakespeare's audience actually experienced those as being parts of a whole, just as the

author did when he composed his works. The strict separation of private and public matters is a much later development in the western societies - it is a feature of our lives, and since we act and think according to such a frame, which is different from the one of Shakespeare's times, our perception of the author's works will also be different.)

We are now moving closer to Brecht's *V-effekt*. As we saw in Chapter 2 (2.5), the *V-effekt* is a concept similar to that of estrangement - that is, presenting an unfamiliar look upon the situations and characters -, and it also bears some analogy to Cartwright's detachment, but there is a political slant to it: by detaching ourselves from what happens in the scene, we also have the possibility of perceiving that the facts presented necessarily happen within definite historical circumstances, and consequently, we can apply this perception to *our* own life in *our* present society. Strangely enough, Shakespeare's anachronisms, especially in *King Lear* - a play set in the eighth century B.C., featuring a clash between medieval-feudal forces and Renaissance-bourgeois ones - are of great help in providing this political critical perception.

What this *V-effekt* does is, it takes us from the personal-familial confine to a wider political surrounding - in *King Lear*, that one concerning the matters of state and societal organization, and more specifically, concerning the basis upon which the power of the king rests. Let us see more specifically how this happens in this scene.

First, we need to look at Lear's first lines, and see in which way their content differs from what is uttered by his daughters. We will perceive that all three daughters' lines sound absolutely fairy-tale-like. (This is no put-down at all. There is a magic to the three women's lines which is rarely to be seen, and takes us back to the long-forgotten times when we were nannied by such stories.) The content of Lear's initial lines, however, is a blend of such fairy-tale stuff with a more evidently political one. He also talks about matters of state: his coming retirement, a division that intends to prevent future strife, and defining who will marry his youngest daughter.[15] Being Cordelia unmarried and the youngest daughter, she is not really a great candidate for inheriting even a third part of the King's power - Goneril and Regan, for their turn, are already and respectively married to the dukes of Albany and Cornwall, and, for this reason, are indeed more powerful at the moment of the imminent division. Nevertheless, Cordelia has as candidates for her hand, not only the duke of Burgundy, but also a king - and the King of France himself, at that! This shows not only Lear's favouritism even before he addresses Cordelia (needless to say, an unarranged marriage would be inconceivable in that context); it also shows that she is bound for becoming the most powerful heir. And, of course, this might later on bring her sisters some quite disagreeable - and very political -

consequences. So, there is a cause to Goneril and Regan that goes beyond the already-mentioned family problems.

As readers or spectators, we are not likely to get immediately aware that we are witnessing a political confrontation. One of the reasons for this is that Lear's initial speech, even being explicitly political, has got many of the magical fairy-tale elements to it. And the daughters' lines which follow it, as well as Lear's next lines, are sheer "fairy-tale-ical". The consequence is that the social content does not get outright explicit - it will reach the spectator in a less direct way, and I believe this is to the play's advantage. The way it is built, *King Lear* makes it possible for the spectator and the reader to elaborate it first on the intuitive-sensitive level, and later on, on the rational level.

Since a lot of not-explicitly-political dialogue follows Lear's initial lines, we might first have the feeling that this scene is not political, and instead, it rather concerns the familial or mythical scope. But we are brought back to politics, and this time in a very explicit way, when we read or listen to Lear's imprecation by the end of this short passage (in I.1.106-11). Of course that is not just the harangue of an angry father. In fact, it is some plain matter of state: the favourite heir of the King, the daughter who the King possibly wanted to become the most powerful one, is being expelled from the kingdom, and thus, power will concentrate on the hands of the two other daughters. This is sheer politics and is inescapable to the audience.

To sum up: the contradictory actions and situations, as well as the constant changes of style (an element that will be further studied), make our empathy with any of the characters problematic. It is not that we do not feel empathy. We do, and sometimes in a very plaintive way, but this empathy is not able to last - the same character towards which this feeling is directed, will act in the next moment in such a way that demands our critical judgment. This prevents us from establishing a permanent alignment to any character (or, at least, to most of them). In a way or another, we are always criticizing them.

In the last two paragraphs, I tried to show in a technical way the most important artistic achievement of the estrangement *King Lear* achieves, which is in certain moments analogous to Brecht's *V-effekt*: by making us detach from the characters - instead of being always connected to them -, this structuring of the scene establishes the possibility of passing from the familial-mythical realm to the political one. *King Lear* reminds us all the time that we are witnessing the drama of an entire society, and not just of a group of persons.

The passage we have just examined concentrates in a very clear way a movement which is to be seen throughout all the play; a movement that takes us from the familial-

mythical scope to the sociopolitical one, which, in my point of view, is the main focus in *King Lear*. (As a Brazilian reader, I feel this seems to be the problem with Shakespeare's *histories*: they lack such a movement. Since they concern in a very explicit way the lives of the kings of England - that is, medieval politics in a pure way -, and usually do not offer other elements of interest besides that, they tend to seem pretty unattractive and dull to a non-English public, especially the Brazilian one. On the other hand, the *tragedies*, even if they also deal with politics, offer plenty of personal-mythical elements which catch our attention. It is probably for this reason that outside of England they are far more popular than the *histories*.)

One last word about this passage before going further into I.1: we have just seen that, according to the structure of the excerpt we have analyzed, all three daughters' speeches sound fairy-tale like. It is actually Lear who provides the spectator the historical-political overtones. In spite of this, there is more to their speeches and behaviour than just individual content. We should not limit ourselves to easy psychological-moralizing conclusions (for instance, Goneril and Regan's falseness *versus* Cordelia's pureness; or, the oppression of Goneril and Regan due to Lear's favouritism). Instead, we will do better if we study the political implications in the three daughters' difference of behaviour. This will be done later on, for now we must abandon the three sisters for a while, and look at other characters - Kent, for instance.

We are now going to delve with the scene's next moment, when Kent tries to intercede for Cordelia (I.1.119-85). For purposes both of methodology and aesthetic fruition, I will first reproduce the whole passage, and right after we will analyze the bits of dialogue that are more relevant for this study. So, first, the passage (I.1.138-85),

> **Kent** - *Good, my liege.*
> **Lear** - *Peace, Kent! / Come not between the dragon and his wrath. / I loved her most, and thought to set my rest / On her kind nursery.* (To Cordelia.) *Hence, and avoid my / sight! / So be my grave my peace as here I give / Her father's heart from her. Call France. Who stirs? / Call Burgundy. Cornwall and Albany, / With my two daughters' dowers digest the third. / Let pride, which she calls plainness, marry her. / I do invest you jointly with my power, / Pre-eminence, and all the large effects / That troop with majesty. Ourself by monthly course, / With reservation of an hundred knights / By you to be sustained, shall our abode / Make with you by due turn. Only we shall retain / The name and all th'addition to a king: / The sway, revenue, execution of the rest, / Beloved sons, be yours; which to confirm, / This coronet part between you.*
> **Kent** - *Royal Lear, / Whom I have ever honoured as my king, / Loved as my father, as my master followed, / As my great patron thought on in my prayers.*

> **Lear** - *The bow is bent and drawn; make from the shaft.*
> **Kent** - *Let it fall rather, though the fork invade / The region of my heart. Be Kent unmannerly / When Lear is mad. What would'st thou do, old man? / Think'st thou that duty shall have dread to speak / When power to flattery bows? To plainness honour's bound / When majesty falls to folly. Reserve thy state, / And in thy best consideration check / This hideous rashness. Answer my life my judgment: / Thy youngest daughter does not love thee least, / Nor are those empty-hearted whose low sounds / Reverb no hollowness.*
> **Lear** - *Kent, on thy life, no more!*
> **Kent** - *My life I never held but as a pawn / To wage against thine enemies; ne're fear to lose it, / Thy safety being motive.*
> **Lear** - *Out of my sight!*
> **Kent** - *See better, Lear, and let me still remain / The true blank of thine eye.*
> **Lear** - *Now by Apollo -*
> **Kent** - *Now by Apollo, King, thou swear'st thy gods in vain.*
> **Lear** - *O vassal! Miscreant!*
> **Albany and Cornwall** - *Dear sir, forbear.*
> **Kent** - *Kill thy physician, and thy fee bestow / Upon the foul disease. Revoke thy gift / Or whilst I can vent clamour from my throat, / I'll tell thee thou dost evil.*
> **Lear** - *Hear me, recreant; on thine allegiance hear me! / That thou hast sought to make us break our vows, / Which we durst never yet, and with strained pride / To come betwixt our sentences and our power, / Which nor our nature nor our place can bear, / Our potency made good, take thy reward: / Five days we do allot thee for provision / To shield thee from disasters of the world, / And on the sixth to turn thy hated back / Upon our kingdom. If on the tenth day following / Thy banished trunk be found in our dominions, / The moment is thy death. Away! By Jupiter, / This shall not be revoked.*
> **Kent** - *Fare thee well, King. Sith thus thou wilt appear, / Freedom lives hence, and banishment is here. /* (To Cordelia) *The gods to their dear shelter take thee, maid, / That justly think'st, and hast most rightly said. /* (To Goneril and Regan) *And your large speeches may your deeds approve, / That good effects may spring from words of love. / Thus Kent, O princes, bids you all adieu; / He'll shape his old course in a country new.* (Exit.)

And now, for the details. Enter Kent,

> **Kent** - *Good, my liege.*

Kent's very first line is an example of Shakespeare's talent for conveying information right within the action in a precise and agile way. When the earl pleads on Cordelia's behalf, we already get to know from these three words his relationship to Lear, who reacts,

> **Lear** - *Peace, Kent! / Come not between the dragon and his wrath. / I loved her most, and thought to set my rest / On her kind nursery.* (To Cordelia.) *Hence, and avoid my / sight! / So be my grave my peace as*

> *here I give / Her father's heart from her. Call France. Who stirs? / Call Burgundy. Cornwall and Albany, / With my two daughters' dowers digest the third. / Let pride, which she calls plainness, marry her. / I do invest you jointly with my power, / Pre-eminence, and all the large effects / That troop with majesty. Ourself by monthly course, / With reservation of an hundred knights / By you to be sustained, shall our abode / Make with you by due turn. Only we shall retain / The name and all th'addition to a king: / The sway, revenue, execution of the rest, / Beloved sons, be yours; which to confirm, / This coronet part between you.*

Lots of action in those few lines! Lear switches from his usual rhetorical royal style to a very personal tone (in a couple of sentences), and back: he retorts Kent; then bemoans, as if for himself (that is, not in royal style); shouts at Cordelia (it even looks she is being expelled like some stray dog); one more time bemoans, but this time invested of his King persona (i.e., in a rhetorical way); demands from whoever (this means, the public, everybody) to get France and Burgundy to the room; and finally, details his intentions to Cornwall and Albany, who are his real heirs (Goneril and Regan being women, they are not supposed to hold any power other than symbolical). Now that is some dizzying dynamics: within a few seconds, we leap from one moment to another completely different. We are never allowed whatever little time to get used to a new piece of information; it is useless trying to guess where an action will lead to, because it will be immediately substituted by something new.

This constant interruption of the action (even if it will be resumed in a further moment) is another device that generates detachment. I am not talking here of such a detachment that enables the spectator to have a politically critical perception of the facts - such as in Brecht's *V-effekt* -, but one of a more restricted scope. This is an emotional detachment (such as the one described by Kent Cartwright) which operates according to the following dynamics: whenever we think we are getting used to a situation and believe we can make predictions about what is going to happen next; whenever we are taken by a certain emotion, which we believe is going to last, something comes which interrupts the action and gives the scene an unexpected turn - and we as spectators or readers are then obliged to start wholly anew.

Such constant interruptions lead in some moments to an extreme fragmentation of the action which, alongside with the multiplicity of points of view existing in the play, is probably responsible for the perception that the Romantic criticism had of *King Lear,*: that of an ungraspable work of art, immersed in such a fantasticality which would oblige us only to admire the play, for we would never be able to properly analyze it.

We have seen that Lear has directed a speech towards Albany and Cornwall (in fact, towards the world, according to his characteristic imperial style) in which he says that, in spite of his abdication from the throne, he "*shall retain / The name and all th'addition to a king*". And, at this moment, Kent again interposes,

> **Kent** - *Royal Lear, / Whom I have ever honoured as my king, / Loved as my father, as my master followed, / As my great patron thought on in my prayers.*

The first thing to notice is that, as opposed to his first exchange with Gloucester, Kent now speaks in blank verse. This has to do with the exigencies of the scene. Even if a nobleman is always supposed to be a nobleman, Kent's first dialogue (on Edmund's bastardy) did not follow the aristocratic rules of decorum, let alone talking about an 'elevate' subject. According to these same rules, lowly matters require a lowly form - that is, plain and common prose in the beginning of the scene. This is not the case here - we have important, indeed, *noble* matters going on!

This fact makes it opportune to state here a compositional quality, not only of Shakespeare, but of the Elizabethan and Jacobean drama as a whole. As I said earlier, psychological realism was not a preoccupation of such playwrights, and thus, there was not an exigency that a character be coherent throughout the whole play. The formal unit considered was the scene - each scene was to be treated as a whole play; not as just some part of a bigger mechanism, and thus, limited to generating a specific effect on the whole. If each scene was to have a life of its own, that is, if it was to be treated as an independent small play, considerations of style (for instance) would constantly change, according to the exigencies of the scene.[16] (And this was one element of the Elizabethan theatre which inspired Brecht's work.) The peculiarity of *King Lear* is that these changes of style happen not just from scene to scene, but within the same scene, and at a sometimes dizzying speed.

As for another stylistic consideration about Kent's lines, let us keep in mind the little excerpt above, and add to it the next lines that we are going to see (I.1.141-152),

> **Lear** - *The bow is bent and drawn; make from the shaft.*
> **Kent** - *Let it fall rather, though the fork invade / The region of my heart. Be Kent unmannerly / When Lear is mad. What would'st thou do, old man? / Think'st thou that duty shall have dread to speak / When power to flattery bows? To plainness honour's bound / When majesty falls to folly. Reserve thy state, / And in thy best consideration check / This hideous rashness. Answer my life my judgment: / Thy youngest daughter does not*

> *love thee least, / Nor are those empty-hearted whose low sounds / Reverb no hollowness.*

Let us see, then, *"Royal Lear, / Whom I have ever honoured as my king, / Loved as my father, as my master followed, / As my great patron thought on in my prayers"*. If we try to identify the style that pervades Kent's lines, we are getting to that heroic one of the chivalric romances, and this is not accidental. In these first lines, we have more than Kent's allegiance to Lear. We are dealing with something else than just the personal trait of a vassal who loves his King - we have an outright assumed spokesman for the values of feudalism, maybe the most accomplished one in this play. As I will try to show, Kent is actually more of a function than of a character properly speaking.

I am not denying one might find a personal aspect to these lines, such as a man who is brave, good-hearted, sincere, disinterested - *noble*, indeed. Especially when *King Lear* gets a theatrical production, both actor and director must work on these personal aspects of the character, in order that he has an organic life in the scene. Nevertheless, I still maintain that Kent - however likable he might be due to his goodness - bears more of a discursive-ideological function in this work than that of a character properly speaking.

I will pick three more sentences of Kent's speech above in order to base this idea: *"Let it fall rather, though the fork invade / The region of my heart. Be Kent unmannerly / When Lear is mad*", plus, *"To plainness honour's bound / When majesty falls to folly"*, plus, *"Answer my life my judgment: / Thy youngest daughter does not love thee least, / Nor are those empty-hearted whose low sounds / Reverb no hollowness"*. One could feel tempted to say there is some irreverence in these lines. A vassal dares to face his King, and tell him the error he is incurring into. To make matters worse, Kent even applies the 'thou' treatment to his Lord and King! And not just that, he calls him – plainly and bluntly – 'old man', *"What would'st thou do, old man? / Think'st thou that duty shall have dread to speak / When power to flattery bows?"*

What is actually happening, though, is something quite other, but we will need to see the rest of this dialogue in order to understand this (I.1.152-85),

> **Lear** - *Kent, on thy life, no more!*
> **Kent** - *My life I never held but as a pawn / To wage against thine enemies; ne're fear to lose it, / Thy safety being motive.*
> **Lear** - *Out of my sight!*
> **Kent** - *See better, Lear, and let me still remain / The true blank of thine eye.*
> **Lear** - *Now by Apollo* -

> **Kent** - *Now by Apollo, King, thou swear'st thy gods in vain.*
> **Lear** - *O vassal! Miscreant!*
> **Albany and Cornwall** - *Dear sir, forbear.* [17]
> **Kent** - *Kill thy physician, and thy fee bestow / Upon the foul disease. Revoke thy gift / Or whilst I can vent clamour from my throat, / I'll tell thee thou dost evil.*
> **Lear** - *Hear me, recreant; on thine allegiance hear me! / That thou hast sought to make us break our vows, / Which we durst never yet, and with strained pride / To come betwixt our sentences and our power, / Which nor our nature nor our place can bear, / Our potency made good, take thy reward: / Five days we do allot thee for provision / To shield thee from disasters of the world, / And on the sixth to turn thy hated back / Upon our kingdom. If on the tenth day following / Thy banished trunk be found in our dominions, / The moment is thy death. Away! By Jupiter, / This shall not be revoked.*
> **Kent** - *Fare thee well, King. Sith thus thou wilt appear, / Freedom lives hence, and banishment is here. /* (To Cordelia) *The gods to their dear shelter take thee, maid, / That justly think'st, and hast most rightly said. /* (To Goneril and Regan) *And your large speeches may your deeds approve, / That good effects may spring from words of love. / Thus Kent, O princes, bids you all adieu; / He'll shape his old course in a country new.* (Exit.)

We see that irreverence is not really the case if we take into account lines I.1.152-4, *"My life I never held but as a pawn / To wage against thine enemies; ne're fear to lose it, / Thy safety being motive."* Thus, lack of respect for Lear does not seem to be an attribute of Kent. And here we arrive at the conclusion that his function in the play is that of a staunch defender of the ideological principles of feudalism against any deviations that might be proposed by anybody - Lear included. Kent is loyal to Lear not only due to personal bonds, but mainly because this character is a true believer of the feudal values, *"See better, Lear, and let me still remain / The true blank of thine eye."*

If the King himself will deviate from such values, Kent – as the ideological guardian he actually is – will restate them at any rate. Such values precede the King, whoever he is and however beloved he is, *"Be Kent unmannerly / When Lear is mad*"; *"To plainness honour's bound / When majesty falls to folly"*. In the case of a conflict between Lear and medieval ideology, Kent will definitely stick to the last one.

The easiest way to perceive this defence of the feudal nobility's values is the way Kent expresses his adherence to this class's code of honour. Also to be noticed is this remnant trace of the ancient Heroic Age: a man's conduct should be given literal expression through his actions. That is, there should be a thorough continuity between what is said and what is done, with no space allowed for whatever dissonances or ulterior motives. As for some utterances where Kent expresses this value (for instance: *"Thy youngest daughter does not love thee least, / Nor are those empty-hearted whose low sounds / Reverb no hollowness"* ;

"What would'st thou do, old man? / Think'st thou that duty shall have dread to speak / When power to flattery bows?" ; or when he addresses Goneril and Regan: *"And your large speeches may your deeds approve . . ."* , and others), the best we should do is not just moralize and ascribe it to Kent's seemingly goody-goody nature. Instead, we should try to understand the social and political movement associated with it.

By this, I do not mean Kent is not good-hearted. He is, and this is what usually causes us some sort of relief every moment he enters - until he starts getting boring, for that never-changing goodness ends up being incredibly predictable, and thus, monotonous. The point is: if our feelings towards Kent move from some initial admiration up to a sense that his repetitiveness gets to be somewhat ridiculous, this does not occur due to some shoddy characterization work that so happened, because perhaps the Bard was not really inspired the day he conceived this specific character. By this movement which gets more and more predictable, we - the theatre audience, or the readers - have a glimpse of the English feudal nobility's lack of capability for changing according to the new social circumstances that were entering the scene in the transition from the Middle Ages to the Renaissance. These feudal lords would always present the same stock responses to the new facts which were happening around them. For this reason, they would end up being obsolete.

So many unpredictable things happen to so many characters along the play (and especially in the end), but good ol' Kent keeps always the same. Even the lines he utters along the play show this characteristic: they are lively and interesting in the first two scenes he appears but, exactly as the character himself never changes, also his lines sound "trite and wooden", as a theatre critic once has so nicely put it. It is as if we were witnessing the effect of a 'time machine': Kent sounds as if he were brought into the scene from an earlier age as that of the other characters, and this impression is quite accurate. His speech sounds indeed more archaic and less spontaneous than that of so many other characters, and this has to be so.

His "chivalry dialect" is the verbal expression of a part of the English nobility that could not adapt to the new times of the emergent capitalism, as opposed to another faction of the same class which - at least in England - was able to forge alliances with the thriving bourgeoisie. (In a few moments we are going to see in more detail who could be the aesthetic equivalent in *King Lear* for this more modern and flexible group within the English nobility.)

So Kent is doomed to disappear into obsolescence, which is actually the way he ends in the play. He prepares all along the play for a glorious comeback, but can do nothing better in the last scene than be the pathos-soaked remainder of some glorious times (at least for a definite social class) which are never to be back. He will not even be allowed to die in the

scene. Due to his class's lack of importance in the play's final moments, when the world has all changed, he will have to pass away quietly and out of the stage.

So, after Kent exits, we have Lear facing the two suitors for Cordelia's hand, France and Burgundy. I am going to present their introductory moments in two bits, for I think this should favour a contrastive approach for the two characters. Let us then first see the dialogue between Lear and the duke of Burgundy (I.1.187-206),

> **Lear** - *My lord of Burgundy. . . What in the least / Will you require in present dower with her, / Or cease your quest of love?*
> **Burgundy** - *Most royal Majesty, / I crave no more than hath your highness offered, / Nor will you tender less.*
> **Lear** - *Right noble Burgundy, / When she was dear to us we did hold her so; / But now her price is fallen. Sir, there she stands. / If aught within that little seeming substance, / Or all of it, with our displeasure pieced / And nothing more, may fitly like your grace, / She's there, and she is yours.*
> **Burgundy** - *I know no answer.*
> **Lear** - *Will you with those infirmities she owes, / Unfriended, new-adopted to our hate, / Dowered with our curse, and strangered with our oath, / Take her or leave her?*
> **Burgundy** - *Pardon me, royal sir; / Election makes not up in such conditions.*
> **Lear** - *Then leave her, sir; for, by the power that made me, / I tell you all her wealth . . .*

Now for the dialogue with the King of France (I.1.206-21),

> **Lear** - . . . (To France) *For you, great King, / I would not from your love make such a stray / To match you where I hate; therefore beseech you / T'avert your liking a more worthier way / Than on a wretch whom nature is ashamed / Almost t'acknowledge hers.*
> **France** - *This is most strange / That she whom even but now was your object / The argument of your praise, balm of your age, / The best, the dearest, should in this trice of time / Commit a thing so monstrous to dismantle / So many folds of favour. Sure her offence / Must be of such unnatural degree / That monsters it, or your fore-vouched affection / Fall into taint; which to believe of her / Must be a faith that reason without miracle / Should never plant in me.*

When Lear deals with these two suitors, he is not looking for the best offer he can get for Cordelia. Instead, he is doing what a fellow living in post-industrial capitalism like me would call an "anti-advertisement" of his youngest daughter, devaluating Cordelia the most he can. Starting the study of this moment by the most obvious aspect seems a good procedure. Let us then go to the obvious: the difference of tone between France and Burgundy can be grasped immediately. The King of France speaks in a most idealized manner, which would be

quite proper either to the folk fairy-tale or to the medieval romance. He is all concerned about *inherent merit and worth*. Whatever he has to say, whatever his previously conceived ideas are, they will not change due to "minor" considerations such as richness, territory or political power.

Burgundy, by contrast, is carefully evaluating, he is analyzing the situation in its concrete aspects. He has established concrete goals in relation to marrying Cordelia and is determined to obtain them - otherwise, he will not marry her. That is, *he is negotiating*. Of course this fact does not turn Burgundy into a representative of the bourgeoisie. After all, properties were definitely the main interest of the feudal lords. Those, as well as money, were not invented by capitalism, and existed long before this socio-economic system came into being - the accumulation of goods has been the focus of practically all ruling classes in the different phases of History. What is new to the capitalistic organization of society is its focus on the multiplication and mainly circulation of these same goods - that is, an ever-growing productivity and exchange.

This means that Burgundy's behaviour of carefully analyzing and evaluating the suitability of marrying Cordelia to his economic goals is not something impossible to happen to a nobleman. Just as Kent, Cordelia and France represent the ideological discourse of the feudal nobility in its purest form, it might be appropriate to state again the obvious: ideology does not represent the ruling class as it is, but as it perceives itself - as it would like to be seen and represented. Thus, these last three characters are represented according to the prescription of medieval literary rules for depicting the ruling class, while Burgundy is not, even if he also is a feudal lord.

The consequence is that, while Burgundy's negotiations need not be necessarily called capitalistic, he still is shown in a different light as that of his class counterparts. He is not embellished through the lenses of medieval ideology, and thus is shown as behaving in a very pragmatic way. And since he is not shown in the same idealized manner as, for instance, the King of France is, we will miss the grandeur of this later character. Amid the likes of Kent, Cordelia and France, Burgundy will seem meager in comparison.

At this point it is important to state one more time that *King Lear* was first presented for a Jacobean audience. What they would see on stage during this scene was two types of nobility: one that was more similar to what they were used to, and another which was presented as it "should be". And here I must talk a little bit about this "should-be nobility" in connection to the phenomenon of ideology. First of all, when relating the evolution of representation and of aesthetic forms to the changes in the organization of a given society, we

should better avoid getting too mechanical about it. Many of these forms and representations subsist a long time after the disappearance of the socio-economic manner of organization they were connected to (let us recall the example of the father-God-king figure mentioned in Chapter 2 [2.4]).

The case of the Elizabethan and Jacobean periods is not merely one of a long-lasting remnant of a previous age. Regardless of how strong its effects might have been felt at that time, capitalism in England was still being built - the Modern Age might have formally started more than one century before *King Lear* was written, but life in England still presented many aspects of the late Middle Ages - what we had then was a long-time cohabitation of both medieval and Renaissance aspects concerning the people's concrete life. Such a situation was not restricted to the concrete factors of everyday life - there was also a cohabitation of representations, and this in the theatre as well.

An important tendency in the English literary and historical studies talks about a peaceful coexistence in those times of both the Renaissance and the Middle Ages,[18] of capitalism and feudalism - nevertheless, what happened there was actually a bitter clash between two incompatible systems of economic organization and of thinking. In the later history of England, such a situation was misunderstood, due to a tradition in that country of de-emphasizing all manifestations of class struggle that occurred along the English history, so as to present it in a rather consensual manner - which, of course, is fictional. Even if the English have shown along their history a remarkable capability of accommodating such conflicts, this "consensual" England remains fictive and is a relatively recent construction. In early modern England there was an increasing awareness of the fact that different social classes and groups had necessarily conflicting interests, and thus, politics was still perceived as a battlefield. This perception is to be seen in the works of the Elizabethan and Jacobean playwrights, Shakespeare among them - and *King Lear* is an excellent example of that.

A feudal lord concerned about merit and worth, and another one focused on concrete interests - that is, a nobleman "as it should be", and another one who goes about his business. The King of France is not ready to yield an inch in his beliefs, while Burgundy is very explicit about his quest for material benefits. Burgundy, in other words, seems a little bit more like "real life". Of course, this is not an artistic advantage in itself. Since art approaches life in a symbolic language, it should not be concerned with providing a naturalistic mimesis of what the public sees and lives - sometimes a symbolic or formal organization can represent the conflicts of a given society in such a powerful way, which a more realistic one would just not be able to do. Still, mimesis is an important resource of art,

one which Shakespeare mastered very well, and which is used here to the advantage of showing two approaches to power in a contrastive way. Burgundy's one is clearer to an audience of our times. I said above that his actions and speeches would not be impossible in the medieval times; nevertheless, they seem more contemporary, since we live in an age where everybody negotiates all the time, and not just the politicians. It just seems so . . . "capitalistic", indeed.

There is no doubt that the juxtaposition of these two characters places Burgundy in an unfavourable light. Besides France's beautiful speeches; besides the fact that we, either as spectators or as readers, will probably side up with the one character that seems to act out of a good heart, and not with the other one that is moved by some petty self-interest; besides the fact that we all crave for unconditional love (France: *"Love's not love / When it is mingled with regards that stands / Aloof from th'entire point"* ; or still, *"Gods, gods! 'Tis strange that from their cold'st neglect / My love should kindle to inflamed respect. / Thy dowerless daughter, King, thrown to my chance, / Is queen of us, of ours, and our fair France"*); besides the fact that France is an accomplished ladies' man who knows exactly what to say when he wants to get a girl (*"Will you have her*? / *She is herself a dowry"*); besides all these factors, there is a very simple formal device that indicates to us, the audience, which is the side we should cheer for (France's, of course). This almost banal device is having the audience first hear the duke of Burgundy, and only after that, the King of France. Even if this is not a law, the last one to speak usually leaves us the strongest impression. If this is true also for a banal exchange of points of view, it will be much truer when, after hearing some business considerations which do not take Cordelia herself in the least regard, we listen to some fine poetry that reminds us of the conventions of *amour courtois*.

Thus, we - the spectators and readers - will not stand for Burgundy. Even if this seems normal according to a modern audience's horizon of expectations, there is something curious to be noticed about it. Shakespeare was bourgeois himself, he was a talented businessman (not just in the theatre, but in several fields of activity), and still, in this excerpt he leads us not to identify with the one character that is actually closer to him (and us).

The structure of the scene makes us favour characters like France and Cordelia, who present the discourse of a ruling class to which neither Shakespeare nor the majority of his audience belonged to. And, unlike the Romantics who were nostalgic of something they never experienced and just fantasized about, this feudal past was not remote for the playwright and his contemporaries. It was quite recent, it left many traces still to be perceived in the years to come, and mainly - and this is what I would like to call your attention to -,

the social class to which Shakespeare belonged to was to collide frontally with the feudal nobility within three decades. And in spite of this, the scene makes us closer to characters that belong to a social class which did not share the same interests with the author (and the majority of the Globe's audience). Let us keep this question in mind, let us not come to easy answers at this moment, let us observe some further aspects of the play before coming to grips with this matter.

Let us see now a point that concerns not only this play, but drama in general: there is no such a thing as a character in itself; we can only analyze a character in his relationship to the other ones in the play. It is the character's sum of actions and reactions in relation to the other ones - what he tries to achieve from the other characters, and what these ones try to achieve from him -, which gives us the whole picture about him. Thus, each and every scene must be analyzed in relational terms, considering the interaction of the characters. So it is not only what France and Burgundy say and do that establishes the difference between them, but also the way Lear relates to each one. The manner he addresses one and other helps setting a clear distinction between the two characters, even if we, spectators and readers, are not aware of this technical aspect. More than that, it also provides elements for a political evaluation of Lear and the play in general.

It is worth noticing that Lear addresses each of the suitors, France and Burgundy, in the manner peculiar to each character. If we come back to the two bits of dialogue above, we see that Lear also makes use of the negotial tone so characteristic of Burgundy: he talks of his daughter's fallen price, he tells Burgundy all her wealth (that is, none) - in fact, he talks like an honest merchant who makes it clear for his customer that all he has got to offer for the moment, is a devalued commodity. In contrast, when he addresses France, Lear is all-emotional. He does not talk about price, but about merit and worth.

Up to this moment, one could say that this fact I am talking about shows nothing more than the author's good dramatic skills. Good playwrights know that a character needs to adapt the strategies he uses to achieve his objectives according to the way circumstances change around him. Lear probably knows who he is dealing with, either because he has already been with the two suitors beforehand, or because he has got good information about them. Thus, if he wants to punish Cordelia all the way, he needs to dishearten each of the suitors in their own terms - he is looking for the best reasoning he could use for each one to give up Cordelia.

However, there is more to it. If we keep the whole scene I.1 in mind, we know that Lear does not have to make an effort to reach France's tone - he is at home with that, he is

being authentic (we know this from the rest of the scene and the play, where he acts in accordance to the feudal tenets). They are both medieval kings who share the same mindset. Still, however unyielding Lear might be, he shows that he can somewhat adapt to Burgundy's way, which is definitely not his own. And this is important - Lear at least tries to mimetize Burgundy's negotial manners, something that neither France nor Cordelia could even think of doing (let alone Kent).

Lear is making an effort to do things in another way, a negotial one. In that, he differentiates from his counterparts who cannot conceive at all of another manner of managing the kingdom's interests. Thus, Lear sends shockwaves all around not just because he is an egotist tyrant who is blind to his daughter's suffering (and he is), but also because he is trying a mixed approach in his final days as a monarch. As we are going to see, though, this new approach is not useful for Lear. It would require some ability for longtime planning and a strategic view of the kingdom's matters - and none of those is for him, for they were not regarded as qualities in his times. (Of course, if we go for the historical record, we will see that, in fact, the more talented medieval kings developed some sophisticated planning and dealt with politics, even if politics was something completely different in the Middle Ages. However, I am talking here of a more generalized, popular perception of kings which prevailed not only in Shakespeare's times, but in our own. And according to it, Renaissance kings would be more like politicians - gossipy and cunning -, while feudal kings would be more authentic. These last ones did not lose much time with empty talk: according to such a representation, they lived by the sword, and acted according to their hearts.)

Lear is a feudal king at heart: attending his kingdom's matters in a modern, Renaissance style is beyond his scope. We are going to see the consequences of this in a while. Let us proceed with the scene (I.1.222-60),

> **Cordelia** - *I yet beseech your Majesty, / If for I want that glib and oily art / To speak and purpose not, since what I well intend / I'll do't before I speak - that you make known / It is no vicious blot, murder, or foulness, / No unchaste action or dishonoured step / That hath deprived me of your grace and favour, / But even for want of that for which I am richer: / A still-soliciting eye, and such a tongue / That I am glad I have not, though not to have it / Hath lost me in your liking.*
> **Lear** - *Better thou / Hadst not been born than not t'have pleased me better.*
> **France** - . . . *My lord of Burgundy, / What say you to the lady? Love's not love / When it is mingled with regards that stands / Aloof from th'entire point. Will you have her? / She is herself a dowry.*
> **Burgundy** - *Royal King, / Give but that portion which yourself proposed, / And here I take Cordelia by the hand, / Duchess of Burgundy.*

> **Lear** - *Nothing; I have sworn, I am firm.*
> **Burgundy** - *I am sorry, then, you have so lost a father / That you must lose a husband.*
> **Cordelia** - *Peace be with Burgundy. / Since that respect and fortunes are his love, / I shall not be his wife.*
> **France** - *Fairest Cordelia, that art most rich being poor, / Most choice forsaken, and most loved despised, / Thee and thy virtues here I seize upon. / Be it lawful I take up what's cast away. / Gods, gods! 'Tis strange that from their cold'st neglect / My love should kindle to inflamed respect. / Thy dowerless daughter, King, thrown to my chance, / Is queen of us, of ours, and our fair France. / Not all the dukes of wat'rish Burgundy / Can buy this unprized precious maid of me. / Bid them farewell, Cordelia, though unkind; / Thou losest here, a better where to find.*

Cordelia's speech being placed right after France's is another element which helps the audience have France in better regard than Burgundy. It also enables us to see that justice is on her side. This observation might seem redundant, but it is not. We have already seen that, despite her outstanding qualities, the King's youngest daughter should not be seen as an angel or as a suffering Christ-like character. She is actually arrogant, due to her awareness that she not only belongs to England's ruling class, but also that she is the King's favourite daughter. Let us recall Cartwright's observation about the way Shakespeare makes use of an alternation between engagement and detachment in this play, so that we empathize with some of the characters, but at the same time are not overpowered by sheer emotion and can have a critical appreciation of what is going on.

In Cordelia's speech we have this aristocratic class despise for that portion of the English nobility which foresaw a better future in forging alliances with the emerging bourgeoisie - that is, a nobility which tried to acquire new habits and approaches in order to tackle with the challenges of the future. (One could oppose that neither Burgundy nor France are English. However, Shakespeare is not concerned with the precision of geographical or historical details, but with the symbolic representation of the conflicts in his times' England. Consequently, he uses the characters mentioned in sources such as Holinshed and Spenser to represent his own society.) We have another demonstration that Cordelia is *noble* in the fullest sense of the word: she does not believe in pretending things in order to achieve her objectives. Instead, she wants to be appreciated by her inherent (*noble*) value, which just ought to be perceived by everybody - and if somebody does not perceive those inherent qualities of hers, it is just because he is unworthy.

Coupled with this, though, we have a very humanizing feature: we see that Cordelia understands she has fallen in disgrace - she is trying to plead in behalf of herself, while at the same time she is struggling not to lose her dignity. This causes our empathy towards her, and,

if she did not have such a beautiful speech right after France's, we would probably perceive her as just some stuck-up little princess. This humanizing feature is exactly what differentiates her from a character like Kent. Unlike Cordelia, the earl does not show any traces of frailty, nor whatever contradictory aspect that would make him seem more tridimensional. (Even though, as I said, this more unilateral composition of Kent works to the benefit of the play as a whole.)

(Here we have one of the elements that make scene I.1 such an outstanding example of concision of the dramatic action. A few lines ago Cordelia was the King's favourite, now she has fallen in disgrace - *"a wretch whom nature is ashamed"*, in Lear's words. Within the space of one hundred and thirty lines - and, in the theatre, within a few minutes -, we are able to grasp the whole trajectory of this character, and understand her disgrace.)

This is followed by Lear's speech (*"Better thou / Hadst not been born than not t'have pleased me better"*), which makes it very clear we are not facing some grieved poor old father, but a tyrant who knows very well how to display his power. And here Shakespeare's construction one more time reminds us very much of a feature of Brecht's *V-effekt* I have mentioned before, according to which we have a character changing all the time within the same scene, in a very contradictory way which does not leave room for any sort of lineal development. A couple of minutes ago we witnessed Lear's genuine suffering as a father, but we cannot get empathic with him because we see the next minute that he is wont to use his power in the most ruthless way - if Lear is to show his subjects who calls the shots in there, he will do it even at the expenses of his favourite daughter. On the other hand, even if we know he is a tyrant, we will not align with the 'anti-Lear' party, because we have previously seen his suffering due to Cordelia's behaviour, because of what we are going to see further in the play (when we get to scene III.2, we cannot help empathizing with the poor old man who faces the storm), and mainly, because we cannot empathize with his opponents' methods.

And still, we are not likely to wish his restoration to power, since we have already seen what sort of monarch he was. By sharply enhancing such contradictions of this character as well as of the other ones, the author does not allow us to "buy" their view of things. We do not align to any of them, and this allows us to have a wider view of the whole situation. Our focus is directed to the condition of being a king at such times of brutal class struggle and violent change, with all the social implications related to it (including being ruled by such monarchs).

Shakespeare's audience possibly did not have a clear picture of their own historical moment, but in one way or another they must have perceived theirs was an age of transition.

Being historically and geographically detached from that context, we know such transition was characterized by a clash between the remaining forces of the feudal nobility - where the monarchy rooted -, and the Renaissance ones (both the emerging bourgeoisie and the section of the English nobility allied to it, which were paving the way for a full-fledged capitalism). Thus, Shakespeare's times are not clear-cut ones: like any other age, they have both features of the past and of the future. The difference is that in those times the contradictions abounded and did not point up to a clear future.

I would like to call your attention to another short utterance by Lear which also shows the contradictions of this character. Such contradictions do not have only an individual dimension - being Lear the fictional representation of a king, both the author and his Jacobean audience would in one way or another relate this king to the institution of the English monarchy and the contradictions it was facing. This utterance happens after Burgundy suggests to Lear to give Cordelia her third part of the realm, so that he can marry her,

Lear - *Nothing; I have sworn, I am firm.*

Here we have Lear as a truly medieval king. He might have tried before to address Burgundy in the duke's own terms, but that was still an effort to deal with somebody who is different from him. However, even if Lear is more like Cordelia, France and Kent, there is a feature which differentiates him from these other characters. When he previously tried to reach out to Burgundy, he was actually trying to incorporate other elements, other manners of action, to his last days of governing. He is a feudalist at heart, he is thoroughly convinced of that ideology, but he perceives it might be useful to incorporate this 'something' which people like Burgundy have got, and which Lear probably cannot define. This 'something' which Lear feels around but cannot explain is the emerging bourgeois way of life and proceeding. The aristocratic way of thinking in its purest form - feudalistic ideology - is not able to provide any answers and solutions for the new problems that are arising, problems whose solution require a very practical approach to things and an almost economic evaluation of the relation cost-benefit inherent to each course of action. This new way of thinking and acting is so alien to France, Cordelia and Kent that they cannot even notice its presence around. Lear can, but he is not willing to change his stripes, and even if he did, he does not understand very well what this new thing is. Even if he sincerely tried to be a Renaissance-like king, he

would be prone to failure, since he does not understand the rules of the new game as well as Goneril and Regan do, for instance.

Now, when Burgundy tries one more time to bargain, Lear will stick to a strict code of conduct, according to which one's honour must be regarded above other considerations - Lear is now back to playing in his own turf. The problem is, his own turf is not the best one in such an age of changes - he will probably not see things very clearly. Thus, the disasters that follow are not due to some supernatural connection of terrible facts; they happen because Lear is not able to fully understand this moment of transition, and consequently, of making the right choices for the times that are coming ahead.

Cordelia's departure is an indication for us to examine the next moment (I.1.266-81),

> **France** - (To Cordelia.) *Bid farewell to your sisters.*
> **Cordelia** - *The jewels of our father, with washed eyes / Cordelia leaves you. I know what you are, / And, like a sister, am most loath to call / Your faults as they are named. Love well our father. / To your professed bosoms I commit him; / But yet, alas, stood I within his grace, / I would prefer him to a better place. . . .*
> **Regan** - *Prescribe not us our duty.*
> **Goneril** - *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.*
> **Cordelia** - *Time shall unfold what plighted cunning hides; / Who covers faults at last with shame derides. / Well may you prosper.*
> **France** - *Come, my fair Cordelia.*
>
> [Exeunt France and Cordelia.]

There is a considerable dose of self-assuredness and even aggressiveness in Cordelia's farewell speech, which shows us that we cannot regard her as a frail, helpless victim. The structure of this speech is interesting, because she alternates contents which are apparently more delicate, with others that are more aggressive. She starts her utterance in a rather gentle way, *"The jewels of our father, with washed eyes / Cordelia leaves you."* (However, there seems to be some quite ironic tone to this *"jewels of our father"*.) Then comes Cordelia's first blow, *"I know what you are, / And, like a sister, am most loath to call / Your faults as they are named."* She starts playing 'nicey-nice' again, *"Love well our father. / To your professed bosoms I commit him"*. (We must keep in mind, however, that this "nice girl" is behaving like a "little queenie", and whatever she utters sounds like an imperial command. This attitude is so natural for her, that, even after being rejected, she has not given up issuing

orders to her sisters.) Then comes the next utterance, *"But yet, alas, stood I within his grace, / I would prefer him to a better place."* Now this is some really aggressive line!

If we place Regan's first line (*"Prescribe not us our duty"*) in a positional context, we are going to notice that what she says is not necessarily evil or disproportionate. The consequence is that Goneril and Regan will not end up looking like predecessors to Cinderella's evil sisters, as they have so often been depicted. Even if their course of action is despicable, there is a certain logic and reason to it, as we are going to see. It is true that the structure of this storyline reminds us very much of the fairy-tales, and this is one of the reasons for *King Lear* being so attractive. It is also true that, even if there are nuances to the characters, Shakespeare clearly presents two opposing groups that, yes, could be roughly called "good" and "evil". Nevertheless, *King Lear* does not have to be viewed as melodrama: the plot is dangerously close to this genre, but the Folio treatment for characters like Goneril and Regan is one of the elements which prevent this play from being characterized as such.

The manner the two excerpts above deal with our horizon of expectations is worth being noticed. The passage with Lear and Burgundy ends with the exit of these two, and just before that, with France saying, *"Fairest Cordelia, that art most rich being poor, / . . . / Thou losest here, a better where to find."* And in the last time she talks to her sisters, Cordelia says just before her exit, *"Time shall unfold what plighted cunning hides; / Who covers faults at last with shame derides. / Well may you prosper"*. After that, she exits, and we are left with her two sisters. The effect of these is that, while we watch Goneril and Regan plotting immediately after Cordelia departed with those words, we strongly expect the following things to happen:

a) The older sisters will do more evil *(and our expectation is really met)*;

b) The wronged princess will come back, this time with a strong help from France, and a terrible struggle will take place *(one more time our expectation is met)*;

c) This time, around the end of the play, Cordelia will have the upper hand. With the help of the good King of France, she will defeat the forces of evil and reestablish order, this time in a more justly way *(and in this case our expectation is not met at all)*.

Our familiarity with the conventions of such genres as the fairy-tale and the adventure narrative - genres the play deals with - will generate the expectations above mentioned. I have said before that the play generates such expectations all the time - and all the time we are surprised when things do not happen as we believed they were going to. Sometimes these expectations are broken immediately, as in the beginning of the play, when, after a couple of lines about the division of the kingdom, Gloucester and Kent suddenly start talking about a

base subject such as Edmund's bastardy - and this is once again interrupted by Lear's too sudden entrance. Other times, it takes very long for an expectation to break, as in here. In this last case, Shakespeare plants the seeds based on narrative conventions, and we will go all through the play waiting for something to happen - and feel very surprised when this does not occur. (The conventions of genre are more important in order to build expectations than knowing the legend of Leir. Being so detached in time and space, we are not likely to know this story; and yet, we build all the three expectations above mentioned, because of our familiarity with the narrative schemes of the fairy-tales and the adventure narratives.) And even when we are familiar with the play, and are reading it for the umpteenth time, we always feel awed and awkward at such breaks. This happens because the author is able to make us engage due to his mastery of such narrative conventions. So, either one way or the other, the break of expectations is the play's most distinctive structural feature. Other plays by Shakespeare might also feature such breaks, but they are not central to the structure as here. I would even say that such break of expectations is *the* central structuring element of *King Lear*.

Now that Cordelia has exited, let us see what her two sisters are up to (I.1.282-304),

> **Goneril** - *Sister, it is not little I have to say of what most nearly appertains to us both. I think our father will hence tonight.*
> **Regan** - *That's most certain, and with you; next month with us.*
> **Goneril** - *You see how full of changes his age is. The observation we have made of it hath not been little. He always loved our sister most, and with what poor judgment he hath now cast her off appears too grossly.*
> **Regan** - *'Tis the infirmity of his age; yet he hath ever but slenderly known himself.*
> **Goneril** - *The best and soundest of his time hath been but rash; then must we look from his age to receive not alone the imperfections of long-engraffed 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.*
> **Goneril** - *There is further compliment of leave-taking between France and him. Pray you, let us sit together. If our father carry authority with such disposition as he bears, this last surrender of his will but offend us.*
> **Regan** - *We shall further think of it.*
> **Goneril** - *We must do something, and i'th'heat.* [Exeunt]

Characters like Goneril and Regan have got nuances to their respective lines of action, which do not justify what they do, but prevent us from seeing two "monsters of the deep".[19] I said in the Introduction that this study does not deal with the differences between the Quarto and Folio versions, but I must open an exception here and bring to you a difference from Q to

F that is relevant to the study of the two older sisters. In fact, in Q Goneril and Regan (there called Gonoril and Ragan) are more Cinderella's-sisters-like, while their characterization in F is more tridimensional.[20] In the latter, we have real women (and not mere scolds) which have got reasonably concrete fears concerning their father's actions. They have got believable worries, and consequently, they have got a cause, even if their acts are indeed evil. Besides, there is a new feature to Goneril, not really present in Q, which is going to show up latter in the play: here we have got a woman whose sexual needs are not being met. (Goneril's husband - Albany - is also a cuckold in Q, but there her adulterous behaviour seems to be just another facet of her evilness, while here we might have a relatively 'normal' woman - as normal as a murderous villainess can be - who is unhappy in her marriage.) This nuancing of the older sisters is one of the aspects which make me go along with the majority of the contemporary Shakespearean criticism, and prefer F to Q.

There are other elements which confer dramatic weight to Goneril and Regan and prevent them from looking like cartoon characters. The older sisters perceive that, even if Lear has just favoured them in the division of the kingdom, they might have "such unconstant starts" from him - as Regan puts it. She seems to be right in assuming that, if he behaved like that with such favourites as Cordelia and Kent, they might also have got it coming to them in the near future. What calls our attention when they refer to such whimsical acts by Lear is the fact that, despite the clear display of their rivalry towards Cordelia, they are absolutely conscious that what their father did to her was unjustified (*"He always loved our sister most, and with what poor judgment he hath now cast her off appears too grossly"*). This is a very important detail. On the one hand, like some other before-mentioned aspects, it humanizes the depiction of the two older sisters. On the other hand, this is what best characterizes Goneril and Regan as evil people, and not "plain normal women", as other aspects from the passage above could lead us to think. They are absolutely conscious that Lear behaved in an unjustified way towards Cordelia and Kent, and has thus assigned them a terrible future. And this nuance which makes them so human - and not "monsters of the deep" -, is also what shows us their wickedness: they saw injustice taking place; they clearly perceived it could have happened to them; they could have tried to prevent it; and yet, they decided to let the opponents of their material interests be expelled from the kingdom.

We could say that the older sisters show aspects of normalcy and of justifiable behaviour before a situation of possible oppression, and at the same time they display an absolute lack of compassion and a premeditate attitude. Both aspects, positive and negative, illuminate each other, and, more importantly, *contradict* each other.

Contradiction. I believe it is accurate to say Shakespeare preceded the aesthetic conquests of psychological realism by creating characters as tridimensional as possible (N.B.: I am not saying that the author practiced any sort of psychological realism, or that his works should be examined according to such parameters. He was absolutely not realistic in the stricter sense of the word. In spite of that, we can hardly name any other writer who has created so many multifaceted characters.) These several facets of the characters in *King Lear*, however, are not harmoniously or complementarily combined. The compositional strategy for creating both scene and character in this play is one of assembling behavioural and aesthetic contradictions side by side, and, instead of concealing them, actually calling our attention to them. What goes on with Goneril and Regan is somewhat equivalent to what we have experienced with Lear and Cordelia in the previous passages. This happens all throughout the play, and is one of the reasons why one feels uneasy with this work, at least in the first time he gets in touch with it: either we adore it in a Romantic manner, as an expression of the ungraspable, or we think that, however creative it might be, there are several - and serious - compositional problems to it (or we do both, in the manner of Bradley).

Goneril and Regan have definitely got another attitude as that of Lear, Kent, Cordelia and France - and it is important to stress that this is not necessarily a matter of being good or bad. They might belong to the ruling class of their fictional society, but we also feel that, like Burgundy, in some way they do not belong exactly to that group. That is, they do not seem as *noble.* Rather than being unbending as the other ones, they are extremely flexible - they can walk the walk and especially talk the talk when they are required to, even if it is not what they feel. Also, in the appropriate conditions they will be explicit about their material interests, and not conceal them behind an idealized-ideological façade, as the members of the previous group do. (This does not mean they are sincere - they are not. I am calling your attention here to a compositional device. We have got this scene where they confess their material interests, even if not too directly. Such a thing never happens to the characters of the other group - even when they are left alone, they will never talk about such petty matters.) Third, we see from the dialogue that they do not take it as a virtue to burst into rash action. They *observe* almost *methodically* the object of their interest (in this case, Lear), they *evaluate* it, and, that being done, they *plan* their course of action. Fourth, and as a consequence of the first three, they have got a wider repertoire of action and strategies to achieve their objectives than the other group does.[21]

If all this sounds rather *bourgeois* or *Renaissance-like*, or, even better, *capitalistic*, as opposed to the other group (*noble* or *medieval* or *feudalistic*), this is meant to be so. Now of

course neither of the older sisters is bourgeois, but I believe Shakespeare is little by little introducing in the play a way of acting, thinking, and representing the world which is opposed to that one of the outright medieval group of Lear, Kent and the like. That other group set the initial tone of the scene, and we, as spectators or readers, take that tone to be the *status quo* of the play's fictional society. The opposing new way of thinking is first introduced in *King Lear* by Burgundy, in a very slight way. We do not feel it as a disruption, but we see for the first time a way of thinking and acting that differs from the other characters. It is important to stress that the kind of conflict between France and Burgundy has got a different nature to it than the conflicts between Lear and Cordelia, or Lear and Kent. These last two ones do not oppose two different worldviews. Instead, when Kent or Cordelia argue with Lear, they are actually disputing who best represents a worldview they all share in common. As for Burgundy's worldview, we can see it is really alien to that environment - France does not even seem to understand what Burgundy is talking about.

So, after Burgundy, we have this short moment when Goneril and Regan are left alone, and this other way of thinking makes itself somewhat more present in the play, but it is still on the fringes. As the play proceeds, this worldview makes itself progressively more present.

An impressive feature of *King Lear*'s structure is its accuracy in presenting the movement of History in an aesthetic manner: the succession of different social systems does not happen through a mere substitution of one for the other. Instead, we have the collapse of a social system due to its own internal contradictions. Certainly the social classes that oppose this system will do their best to accelerate this process, and thus, we need two conditions to be present so that a new social order succeeds a preceding one: *a)* The existing system must have been corroded by its own inner contradictions, so that it does not have enough stamina to last much longer; *b)* The social classes that oppose this system must be very strong and organized - that is, prepared to take over when the moment happens. The action and attitude of the bourgeoisie in the early Modern Age is a good example of that. Even if they were not completely content with the governing power, they were certainly not willing to counter it, and be jailed or killed for that. They had to play the game of the ruling class, and try their best to win that game by subverting its rules to their own benefit, which is what was happening with the absolutist monarchies throughout Europe. In doing that, the bourgeoisie showed more flexibility and better capability of changing their course of action than the feudal nobility, with its rigid sticking to obsolete codes that would not provide a feasible answer for the present moment.

How is this presented in the play? We do not have there, right from the beginning, an outright conflict between these two different social groups (that is, *"medieval nobility"* x *"Renaissance nobility plus bourgeoisie"*). Actually, the conflict starts between Lear and his two most cherished people, Cordelia and Kent. Goneril, Regan and their respective husbands (as well as Edmund, whom we are going to study in the next chapter) are on the sidelines, just watching and not actively taking part in it. And this organization of the plot is very similar to the historical process: in History there was never such a thing as the bourgeoisie declaring an open war to feudalism from the very beginning. Instead, this system collapsed due to its own contradictions. Just like in the play, the bourgeoisie started waiting on the sides, until there came the moment when it seized the opportunity to give the feudal nobility its final blow.

The last thing to say about this dialogue of Goneril and Regan refers to its form - it is written in prose. There are countless switches in *King Lear* from blank verse to prose, and vice-versa. I am not going to deal with all of them, since there is no space in this thesis for that, and also because not all these changes are to be explained sociologically. However, this is the exception to confirm the rule (like the initial dialogue), and I would like to risk a sociological hypothesis for that. One could feel tempted to attribute this change to Goneril and Regan's deceiving strategies: they speak verse in front of Lear because this is required to please him and be favoured by him; afterwards, they speak in prose because nobody is watching them, and so they can show their true colours. This is not altogether wrong, but I believe there is a lot more to it. I take the switch from blank verse to prose to be a more consciously political indication. Prose is rather plebeian language; of course, the two sisters did not cease being noble, but this would be an aesthetic way of quickly indicating to a Jacobean audience - an audience pretty much used to theatrical aural conventions - that their acting and thinking in this moment do not belong to a properly courtly world. In other words, it would indicate in an aural and subtle way the intermission of something that is not proper to that order.[22]

I said previously that Shakespeare presents Burgundy in a clearly unfavourable light, and we definitely cannot cheer for Goneril and Regan, even if we understand their reasons. Let us keep in mind that it is puzzling how the author, a member of the bourgeoisie, leads the spectator to develop more empathy for the 'feudal' characters (even if the estrangement and detachment devices make us critical also of these characters). It is not the case of trying to get an answer right now, just of keeping this question in mind, and going along with the play. By understanding better its structure, we might then arrive to a conclusion later on.

Speaking of structure, along this chapter I tried to point out that many of the most important compositional features of *King Lear* are concentrated in scene I.1. Now that we have finished analyzing the different moments of this scene, it is the proper time to discuss one more aspect of the play that is strongly present in I.1, and which is especially responsible for the impression we get from *King Lear*: in those few pages there is a tremendous profusion of data which makes it difficult to understand immediately what is going on. It is not that we are not able to understand - we do, but we are left with the impression that, whenever we are getting acquainted with some information or a character, the situation changes into something completely different from what we were seeing or reading some minutes ago. Another factor that contributes to this difficulty is that the play - and particularly this scene - abounds with important and weighty characters.

It is true that Shakespeare's plays always present several characters, and that the author generally cares enough about all of them, so as to raise our interest also to the lesser ones. Nevertheless, his plays usually present two well-defined groups: the central characters, and the others which gravitate around them. The plethora of important characters in *King Lear* is an exception to this rule. Coupled with the enormous quantity of ever-changing events, this characteristic is responsible for our perception - even if only on a subconscious level - that we are not witnessing the story of a single character. *Instead, what we witness is the story of a whole collectivity*. The political and aesthetic implications of this collective dimension are to be seen in the next chapters. In order to do that, we must now deal with another group of characters.

ENDNOTES

(1) This matter was regulated by the Salic Law, a body of traditional law which governed the Salian Franks and was codified in the early sixth century. It underwent several changes, and was brought into use in England by the Norman conquerors from 1066 on. An interesting detail about the Salic Law is that it made clear that an individual had no right to protection if he was not part of a family.

(2) On this subject, it is worth reading Miriam Gilbert's essay 'Performance Criticism' (in *Shakespeare: An Oxford Guide*). Among other things, she examines Deborah Warner's 1990 staging of the Q version of *King Lear* with the National Theatre (pp. 550-3), and especially an aspect of Q's IV.7, which is Kent being in scene even if silent, and the importance that this detail has in Warner's construction of meaning in this scene and on the play as a whole (especially on p. 551).

(3) On this specific matter, see Brecht's essay 'Uma Nova Técnica de Representação' (translated by Klaus Schell), p. 172, in the volume *Teatro*

Dialético: Ensaios.

(4) Actually, the Q and F versions differ about that. Q presents this in a way which seems more like sheer voluntarism, since Lear does not explain the reasons for his action. In the F version Lear explains his decision, thus providing his action a clearer political content, and this is consequently kept in all the conflated editions.

(5) See Walter Benjamin's essay 'O Narrador: Observações Sobre a Obra de Nikolai Leskow.' In: *Textos Escolhidos: Walter Benjamin, Max Horkheimer, Theodor W. Adorno, Jürgen Habermas.*

(6) The Polish critic Andrzej Zurowski puts this in a very nice way, "In Shakespeare, everything is told, but nothing is told to the end. Shakespeare is always asking us to give him birth." (See *Is Shakespeare Still Our Contemporary?*, p. 171, edited by John Elsom.)

(7) A quite recurrent situation in such fairy-tales is that of a father who has got three daughters which undergo a challenge common to all of them, and, of course, achieve different results. The customary practice of the times these fairy-tales were generated - which was probably still prevailing in Shakespeare's time -, was that of attributing the precedence in any such competitions to the eldest child. The fairy-tales usually subvert this practice and present the youngest daughter as the worthiest, and thus, the winner.

(8) It must be said that the Q version enhances this impression of Cordelia as a sufferer due to the presence in there of idealized accounts of her exile. These were excised in the F version, which presents a more determined and warrior-like Cordelia - a facet which is not absent in Q, but is not so clear, either. Since the conflated editions keep all of both texts (and thus, the above-mentioned excised passages), a reader might have a more Christ-like impression of Cordelia. This might explain why Cordelia-the-sufferer is such a frequent sight on stage.

(9) See Jameson's *The Political Unconscious*, Chapter 1, p. 95.

(10) See David Crystal's essay 'The Language of Shakespeare', pp. 73-4, in *Shakespeare: An Oxford Guide*.

(11) See Chapter 7 in Foakes' *Hamlet Versus Lear*, especially pp. 182-3 and 203.

(12) The German critic Peter von Becker puts it this way, "[The French director Arianne Mnouchkine] wanted to make Shakespeare less comfortable and more strange again, and so bring out the fundamental fury, terror and emotion, which proceed from Shakespeare's dramatic use of 'suddenness'. Suddenly, somebody changes tack and suddenly somebody decides to throw aside his wife, because of a sudden jealousy or something like that; and the whole world turns suddenly into a tragedy or a comedy. This is one reason why Shakespeare is the greatest dramatist, the abrupt changes of direction in his dramaturgy." (See *Is Shakespeare Still Our Contemporary?*, p. 90, edited by John Elsom.)

(13) This observation applies only to the F version which is being used as the basis for this thesis. As we saw in the Introduction, explanatory and moralizing accretions abound in Q, and are consequently kept in the several conflated editions, which, for this reason among others, constitute a more blurred material for the reader.

(14) Brecht makes use of this same moment in I.1 - Lear's rage - to explain his concepts of historicity and the *V-effekt* (in his essay 'O Teatro Experimental', translated by Roberto Franco de Almeida, in *Teatro Dialético: Ensaios*, pp. 135-8). The conclusions he draws from the scene are different from the ones I present here - even if mine are also in Brecht's lines -, and I believe one complements the other. He says that there is no such a thing as an eternal essence of "Man", and thus, of "Choler". By this, Brecht means that the scene

should be represented in a way so as to enable the spectator to perceive that Lear's choler is not a mandatory reaction – it is connected to a specific man who lives in specific historical circumstances. Thus, the representation should allow the spectator to perceive in a critical manner that Lear's choleric reaction is not "natural" and "essential", and thus, other reactions would also be possible.

(15) The intention of preventing future strife, which is present in the F version (in I.1.43-4), is absent in Q. This is an aspect which confers more historical concreteness to F.

(16) See Peter Thomson's essay, 'Conventions of Playwriting', p. 47, in *Shakespeare: An Oxford Guide*.

(17) This single line of Albany and Cornwall is a Folio accretion which achieves a brilliant effect in terms of both nuance and trajectory of the characters. The spectator cannot tell Albany from Cornwall, for the villainous Cornwall shows himself performing a good deed right at this moment. Since there is no contradiction between the dukes, it will be up to the audience to make out much further in the play what this character is really into. (The equivalent opposite to this would be the development of Albany. He seems a villain - or, at least, a despicable upstart - in the play's first scenes, and reveals himself to be a "good" character only in the last moments. As for my opinion about him, I happen to agree with those critics who understand that Albany in the F version is a dubious character, not much more than a turncoat. For a commentary on different perceptions about Albany among the divisionist critics - none of them too flattering, anyway - see Gary Taylor's essay '*King Lear*: The Date and Authorship of the Folio Version', p. 425, in *The Division of the Kingdoms*.)

(18) One well-known example of a work written according to such a tendency is G. M. Trevelyan's *English Social History*, mentioned in Works Consulted.

(19) This is a phrase present in a speech of Albany in Q (IV.2.48), which was excised in the F version. It does not refer directly to Goneril and Regan, but to a state of final chaos in which men would prey on each other. Nevertheless, one can find this expression and other equivalents as adjectives commonly used for Goneril and Regan. Coleridge, for instance, refers to "the monster Goneril". (See his comment on p. 40, in *Shakespeare: King Lear: Macmillan Casebook Series*, edited by Frank Kermode.)

(20) It is worth reminding that divisionist critics, such as Randall McLeod, believe that the conflations give birth to a shapeless creature - for example, due to the mixture of Q and F, we cannot really differentiate Goneril from Regan. (See Randall McLeod's essay '*Gon.* No more, the text is foolish' in *The Division of the Kingdoms*.)

(21) There is no significant change in this passage concerning both Q and F versions. The only exception, and an important one, is Goneril's second line in her penultimate utterance, *"Pray you, let us sit together"*. This is how it reads in F, which provides the basis for this thesis, and so was it kept here. In Q, however, it reads, *"Pray, let's hit together"*. This is not just a stylistic alteration, for the content changes completely. Randall McLeod, for instance, favours F concerning this change. He says that, by having *"sit together"*, F provides more nuance for Goneril – at this moment she is a woman "off balance, thinking on her feet in an attempt to grasp an unprecedented situation . .". (See Randall McLeod's essay '*Gon.* No More, The Text is Foolish', pp. 169-70, in *The Division of the Kingdoms*.) Although I go along with McLeod in his preference for F over either Q or the conflation, I have a couple of moments in which I prefer the Q solutions, and this is one of them. McLeod says that *"sit together"* is more coherent with the F treatment for Goneril and Regan, where they cease being shrews, and become somewhat closer to normal women - they are going to discuss the subject and get to a solution. As for me, I believe

we should not look for a realistic coherence in *King Lear*, since behavioural and aesthetic contradictions abound in such a manner that I take this to be the play's specific compositional method. According to this spirit, I think it is not the best solution to depict Goneril and Regan as two ladies who are going to sit over a cup of tea and discuss. Thus, *"hit together"* reads better. If the play's structure is based on contradictions, it goes better with its aesthetic procedure to have the two women commenting the rash actions of their father in a horrified way, and right after that, deciding to attack.

I also agree with divisionist critics such as McLeod and Gary Taylor that F is superior to the conflations, since the latter's mixture of both versions renders the text too long, less straight to the point and somewhat dragging. In spite of this, I believe that both G.K. Hunter's and Kenneth Muir's conflated editions arrived to the best solution for this problem. These editions also adopt F as the stylistic basis for their work (as conflations generally do), but in this case they understood it was better to adopt Q's *"hit together"*. So, they combined the aggressiveness of Q's *"Pray, let's hit together"* and the musicality of F's *"Pray you, let us sit together"*, and arrived then to *"Pray you, let us hit together"*.

(22) See Peter Thomson's 'Conventions of Playwriting', p. 47, in *Shakespeare: An Oxford Guide.*

WORKS CONSULTED

ARISTÓTELES. *Arte Poética.* In: *A Poética Clássica: Aristóteles, Horácio, Longino.* Translated by Eudoro de Souza. São Paulo: Cultrix, 1985.

ARMSTRONG, Alan. 'Unfamiliar Shakespeare'. In: WELLS, Stanley; ORLIN, Lena Cowen. (Eds.) *Shakespeare: An Oxford Guide.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

ARNAUT, Cezar; BERNARDO, Leandro Ferreira. '*Virtú* e *Fortuna* no Pensamento Político de Maquiavel.' In: *Acta Scientiarum. Ciências Humanas e Sociais.*, v. 24, n. 1. February 2002. Available in PDF format at:

<http://www.ppg.uem.br/Docs/ctf/Humanas/2002/11_260_01_Cezar%20Arnaut_Virtu%20e%20Fortuna.pdf >. Access on: 23.03.2006

AUERBACH, Erich. *Mimesis: A Representação da Realidade na Literatura Ocidental.* Translated by Suzi Frankl Sperber. São Paulo: Perspectiva, 1994.

BARBA, Eugenio. *Além das Ilhas Flutuantes.* Translated by Luís Otávio Burnier. São Paulo: Hucitec-Unicamp, 1991.

BARTELS, Emily. 'Shakespeare's View of the World'. In: WELLS, Stanley; ORLIN, Lena Cowen. (Eds.) *Shakespeare: An Oxford Guide.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

BARTHES, Roland. 'Introdução à Análise Estrutural da Narrativa.' Translated by Maria Zélia Barbosa Pinto. In: *Análise Estrutural da Narrativa: Pesquisas Semiológicas.* Petrópolis: Vozes, 1976.

BEAUMONT, Francis; FLETCHER, John.. *The Knight of the Burning Pestle.* (Ed. by J. W. Lever.) London: Longman, 1962.

BENJAMIN, Walter. 'O Narrador: Observações Sobre a Obra de Nikolai Leskow.' In: *Textos Escolhidos: Walter Benjamin, Max Horkheimer, Theodor W. Adorno, Jürgen Habermas.* Translated by Modesto Carone. São Paulo: Abril Cultural, 1983.

BENJAMIN, Walter. 'The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction.' In: *Illuminations.* (Ed. by Hannah Arendt.) Translated by Harry Zohn. New York: Schocken, 1968.

BENNETT, Susan. *Performing Nostalgia: Shifting Shakespeare and the Contemporary Past.* London: Routledge, 1996.

BENNETT, Susan. *Theatre Audiences: A Theory of Production and Reception.* London: Routledge, 1997.

BENTLEY, Eric. *The Life of the Drama.* s.l.: Atheneum, 1967.

BERGSON, Henri. *Laughter: An Essay on the Meaning of Comic.* Translated by Cloudesley Brereton and Fred Rothwell. Available at:

< http://www.authorama.com/laughter-1.html >. Access on: 15.03.2006

BERRY, Cicely. *The Actor and the Text.* New York: Applause, 1997 (1987, 1992).

BEST, Michael. 'Internet and CD ROM Resources'. In: WELLS, Stanley; ORLIN, Lena Cowen. (Eds.) *Shakespeare: An Oxford Guide.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

BETTELHEIM, Bruno. *The Uses of Enchantment: The Meaning and Importance of Fairy Tales.* Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1976.

BILLINGTON, Michael. 'Shakespeare and the Modern British Theatre'. In: WELLS, Stanley; ORLIN, Lena Cowen. (Eds.) *Shakespeare: An Oxford Guide.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

BLOOM, Harold. *Shakespeare: The Invention of the Human.* New York: Riverhead, 1998.

BLOOM, Harold. *The Western Canon: The Books and the School of Ages.* New York: Riverhead, 1995.

BOAL, Augusto. *Jogos para Atores e Não-Atores.* Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 1998.

BOAL, Augusto. *Teatro do Oprimido: E Outras Poéticas Políticas.* Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 1983.

BOND, Edward. *Lear.* London: Methuen, 1991 (1972).

BORNHEIM, Gerd. *Brecht: A Estética do Teatro.* São Paulo: Graal, 1992.

BRADLEY, A.C. 'Hegel's Theory of Tragedy.' In: *Hegel on Tragedy.* (Ed. Anne and Henry Paolucci) New York: Doubleday, 1962.

BRADLEY, A.C. *Shakespearean Tragedy: Lectures on Hamlet, Othello, King Lear, Macbeth.* Houndmills: Macmillan, 1956 (1904).

BRADLEY, Harriett. *The Enclosures in England: An Economic Reconstruction.* Kitchener: Batoche, 2001 (1918). Available in PDF format at:

< http://www.ecn.bris.ac.uk/het/bradley/Enclosure.pdf >. Access on: 20.05.2006

BRAUNMULLER, A. R. 'Shakespeare's Fellow Dramatists'. In: WELLS, Stanley; ORLIN, Lena Cowen. (Eds.) *Shakespeare: An Oxford Guide.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

BRECHT, Bertolt. *Estudos Sobre Teatro.* Translated by Fiama Pais Brandão. Rio de Janeiro: Nova Fronteira, 1978.

BRECHT, Bertolt. *Teatro Dialético.* (Ed. by Luís Carlos Maciel.) Translated by Luís Carlos Maciel et al. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 1967.

BRODY, Paulo. '*Pai Contra Mãe*: O Dia Em Que Machado Encontrou-se Com Brecht.' Soon to be published.

BROOK, Peter. *O Ponto de Mudança: Quarenta Anos de Experiências Teatrais - 1946-1987.* Translated by Antônio Mercado and Elena Gaidano. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 1994.

BROOK, Peter. *The Empty Space.* New York: Macmillan, s.d.

BÜRGER, Peter. *Theory of the Avant-Garde.* Translated by Michael Shaw. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, s.d.

BURGESS, Anthony. *English Literature.* London: Longman, 1977.

CANDIDO, Antonio. *O Discurso e a Cidade.* São Paulo: Duas Cidades, 1993.

CARROLL, William C. 'Romantic Comedies'. In: WELLS, Stanley; ORLIN, Lena Cowen. (Eds.) *Shakespeare: An Oxford Guide.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

CARTWRIGHT, Kent. *Shakespearean Tragedy and Its Double: The Rhythms of Audience Response.* Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1987.

CHAUÍ, Marilena de Souza. *O Que É Ideologia.* São Paulo: Brasiliense, 1994.

CHURCHILL, Winston S. *A History of the English-Speaking Peoples, vol.2: The New World.* New York: Barnes & Noble, 1993. (1956).

CLAYTON, Thomas. '*Is This the Promis'd End?* Revision in the Role of the King' In: TAYLOR, Gary; WARREN, Michael (Eds.) *The Division of the Kingdoms: Shakespeare's Two Versions of King Lear.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000 (1983)

COLERIDGE, Samuel Taylor. 'Excerpt from his second lecture in the series *Shakespeare and Milton*'. (1811-12) In: KERMODE, Frank (Ed.). *Shakespeare: King Lear: Macmillan Casebook Series.* London: Macmillan, 1974 (1969).

Commedia dell Carte Homepage, The. Available at:
< http://www.shane-arts.com/commedia-archives.htm >. Access on: 03.04.2006.

CRAIK, T. W. 'Introduction.' In: SHAKESPEARE, William. *King Henry V (3rd Arden Shakespeare).* London: Routledge, 1995.

CRYSTAL, David. 'The Language of Shakespeare'. In: WELLS, Stanley; ORLIN, Lena Cowen. (Eds.) *Shakespeare: An Oxford Guide.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

DELGADO, Maria M.; HERITAGE, Paul. (Eds.) *In Contact With The Gods: Directors Talk Theatre.* Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996.

Dictionary.com. Available at: < http://dictionary.reference.com/ >.
Access on a daily basis.

DYNES, William R. 'The Trickster Figure in Jacobean City Comedy'. In: *Studies in English Literature: 1500-1900.* 33/2, 1993.
Available in PDF format at: < http://english.uindy.edu/dynes/trickster.pdf >.

EAGLETON, Terry. *Literary Theory: An Introduction.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987.

EAGLETON, Terry. *William Shakespeare.* Oxford: Blackwell, 1995.

EDMONDSON, Paul. 'Comical and Tragical'. In: WELLS, Stanley; ORLIN, Lena Cowen. (eds.) *Shakespeare: An Oxford Guide.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

EGAN, Gabriel. 'Theatre in London'. In: WELLS, Stanley; ORLIN, Lena Cowen. (Eds.) *Shakespeare: An Oxford Guide.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

EISENSTEIN, Serguei. *Anotaciones de un Director de Cine.* Translated by Vicente E. Pertegaz. Moscow: Progreso, s.d.

EISENSTEIN, Serguei. *El Montaje Escenico.* Translated by Margherita Pavia. Ciudad del México: Gaceta, 1994.

Elizabethan Bear- and Bull-Baiting. Available at:

< http://www.elizabethan-era.org.uk/elizabethan-bear-bull-baiting.htm >.

Access on: 24.07.2006

ELSOM, John (Ed.). *Is Shakespeare Still our Contemporary?* London: Routledge, 1989.

ELTON, W. R. 'Double Plot in *King Lear*'. (1966) In: KERMODE, Frank (Ed.). *Shakespeare: King Lear: Macmillan Casebook Series.* London: Macmillan, 1974 (1969).

ENGELS, Friedrich. 'A Origem da Família, da Propriedade Privada e do Estado.' In: *K. Marx/F.Engels: Obras Escolhidas, Volume 3.* Translated by Leandro Konder. Rio de Janeiro: Vitória, 1961.

ENGELS, Friedrich. 'Sobre o Papel do Trabalho na Transformação do Macaco em Homem.' In: *K. Marx/F.Engels: Obras Escolhidas, Volume 2.* Translated by Almir Matos. Rio de Janeiro: Vitória, 1961.

ENRIGHT, D. J. 'Elizabethan and Jacobean Comedy'. In: FORD, Boris. (Ed.) *The Pelican Guide to English Literature, vol. 2: The Age of Shakespeare.* Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1973 (1955).

ESSLIN, Martin. *An Anatomy of Drama.* New York*:* Hill & Wang, 1977.

EVERETT, Barbara. 'The New *King Lear*'. (1960) In: KERMODE, Frank (Ed.). *Shakespeare: King Lear: Macmillan Casebook Series.* London: Macmillan, 1974 (1969).

FERGUSSON, Francis. *The Idea of a Theater: A Study of Ten Plays.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968.

FISCHER, Ernst. *A Necessidade da Arte.* Translated by Leandro Konder. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 1981.

FOAKES, R. A. *Hamlet Versus Lear: Cultural Politics and Shakespeare's Art.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

FOAKES, R. A. 'Romances'. In: WELLS, Stanley; ORLIN, Lena Cowen. (Eds.) *Shakespeare: An Oxford Guide.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

FREIRE, Paulo. *A Importância do Ato de Ler: Três Artigos Que Se Completam.* São Paulo: Cortez, 1994.

FRYE, Northrop. *Fools of Time: Studies in Shakespearean Tragedy.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1986.

FRYE, Northrop. *Northrop Frye on Shakespeare.* Ontario: Fichenry & Whiteside, 1986.

GILBERT, Miriam. 'Performance Criticism'. In: WELLS, Stanley; ORLIN, Lena Cowen. (Eds.) *Shakespeare: An Oxford Guide.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

GOLDRING, Beth. '*Cor.*'s Rescue of Kent' In: TAYLOR, Gary; WARREN, Michael (Eds.). *The Division of the Kingdoms: Shakespeare's Two Versions of King Lear.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000 (1983).

GRANVILLE BARKER, Harley. 'From *Prefaces to Shakespeare*.' In: SHAKESPEARE, William. *King Lear.* (Ed. Russell Fraser.) New York: Signet, 1986 (1963).

GROTOWSKI, Jerzy. *Em Busca de um Teatro Pobre.* Translated by Aldomar Conrado. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 1971.

GURR, Andrew. *Playgoing in Shakespeare's London.* Second Edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997 (1987).

GURR, Andrew; ICHIKAWA, Mariko. *Staging in Shakespeare's Theatres.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

GURR, Andrew. *The Shakespearean Stage: 1574-1642.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004 (1992).

HARBAGE, Alfred (Ed.). *Shakespeare: The Tragedies – A Collection of Critical Essays.* New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1964.

HAUSER, Arnold. *História Social da Arte e da Literatura.* Translated by Álvaro Cabral. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2000.

HAWKES, David. *Ideology.* London: Routledge, 1996.

HAWKES, Terence. 'Introduction [Shakespeare's Afterlife]'. In: WELLS, Stanley; ORLIN, Lena Cowen. (Eds.) *Shakespeare: An Oxford Guide.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

HAWKES, Terence. 'Love' in *King Lear*'. (1959) In: KERMODE, Frank (Ed.). *Shakespeare: King Lear: Macmillan Casebook Series.* London: Macmillan, 1974 (1969).

HEGEL, G.W.F. *Hegel on Tragedy.* (Ed. Anne and Henry Paolucci) Translated by J.B. Baillie, F.P.B. Osmaston, E.B. Speirs, J. Burdon Sanderson & E. S. Haldane. New York: Doubleday, 1962.

HEILMAN, Robert B. 'The Unity of *King Lear*'. (1948) In: KERMODE, Frank (Ed.). *Shakespeare: King Lear: Macmillan Casebook Series.* London: Macmillan, 1974 (1969).

HELIODORA, Bárbara. *Falando de Shakespeare.* São Paulo: Perspectiva, 1997.

HIGGINS, John. 'Passage from *The Mirror for Magistrates.*' In: King *Lear (2nd Arden Shakespeare).* (Ed. Kenneth Muir.) London: Routledge, 1994 (1952, revised in 1972).

HILL, Christopher. *Intellectual Origins of the English Revolution Revisited.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, Revised edition 1997 (1965).

HILL, Christopher. *Reformation to Industrial Revolution: A Social and Economic History of Britain 1530-1780.* London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1969 (1967).

HILL, Christopher. *The English Revolution 1640.* Available at:

< http://marxists.org/archive/hill-christopher/english-revolution/index.htm >.

Access on: 15.07.2006

HILL, Christopher. 'Uma Revolução Burguesa?'. In: *Revista Brasileira de História, n. 7, pp. 7-32.* Translated by Luiz Antônio de Almeida. São Paulo: Marco Zero-ANPUH (Associação Nacional dos Professores Universitários de História), 1984.

HOLINSHED, Raphael. 'Extracts from *Chronicles.*' In: King *Lear (2nd Arden Shakespeare).* (Ed. Kenneth Muir.) London: Routledge, 1994 (1952, revised in 1972).

HOLLOWAY, John. '*King Lear*'. (1961) In: KERMODE, Frank (Ed.). *Shakespeare: King Lear: Macmillan Casebook Series.* London: Macmillan, 1974 (1969).

Homily Against Disobedience and Wilful Rebellion. Available at: <http://www.anglicanlibrary.org/homilies/bk2hom21.htm >. Access on: 21.04.2006

HOWARD, Jean. 'Civic Institutions and Precarious Masculinity in Dekker's *The Honest Whore*' [draft version]. In: *Early Modern Culture: An Electronic Seminar.* Issue 1, 2000. Available at:

< http://emc.eserver.org/1-1/howard.html >. Access on: 13.07.2006

HOWARD, Jean; SHEERSHOW, Scott Cutler (Eds.). *Marxist Shakespeares.* London: Routledge, 2001.

HOWARD, Jean (Ed.) *Shakespeare Reproduced: The Text in History and Ideology.* s.l.: Methuen, 1987.

INGRAM, Martin. 'Love, Sex and Marriage'. In: WELLS, Stanley; ORLIN, Lena Cowen. (Eds.) *Shakespeare: An Oxford Guide.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

ISER, Wolfgang. 'A Interação do Texto com o Leitor.' In: *A Literatura e o Leitor: Textos de Estética da Recepção*. (Ed. Luiz Costa Lima) Translated by Luiz Costa Lima. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1979.

JACKSON, MacD. P. 'Fluctuating Variation: Author, Annotator, or Actor?' In:

TAYLOR, Gary; WARREN, Michael (Eds.). *The Division of the Kingdoms: Shakespeare's Two Versions of* King Lear. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000 (1983).

JAMES, C. L. R. 'Ancestors of the Proletariat: Tercentenary of the English Revolution: 1649-1949' In: *Fourth International.* Vol.10 No. 8, September 1949, pp. 252-55. Available at:

http://www.marxists.org/archive/james-clr/works/1949/09/english-revolution.htm.

Access on: 09.09.2006

JAMESON, Fredric. *Postmodernism, or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism.* Durham: Duke University Press. 1992.

JAMESON, Fredric. *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1986.

JAUSS, Hans Robert. 'A Estética da Recepção: Colocações Gerais.' In: *A Literatura e o Leitor: Textos de Estética da Recepção.* (Ed.: Luiz Costa Lima) Translated by Luiz Costa Lima. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1979.

JAUSS, Hans Robert. *A História da Literatura como Provocação à Teoria Literária.* Translated by Sérgio Tellaroli. São Paulo: Ática, 1994.

JAUSS, Hans Robert. 'O Prazer Estético e as Experiências Fundamentais da Poiesis, Aisthesis e Katharsis.' In: *A Literatura e o Leitor: Textos de Estética da Recepção.* (Ed.: Luiz Costa Lima) Translated by Luiz Costa Lima. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1979.

JOHNSON, Samuel. 'Excerpt from the *Preface* and *Notes* to Johnson's edition of *King Lear*'. (1765) In: KERMODE, Frank (Ed.). *Shakespeare: King Lear: Macmillan Casebook Series.* London: Macmillan, 1974 (1969)

JONSON, Ben. *Three Comedies: Volpone, The Alchemist, Bartholomew Fair.* (Ed. Michael Jamieson.) Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1981 (1966).

JOSEPH, Bertram. 'The Elizabethan Stage and Acting'. In: FORD, Boris. (Ed.) *The Pelican Guide to English Literature, vol. 2: The Age of Shakespeare.* Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1973 (1955).

JUMP, John. 'Middleton's Tragedies'. In: FORD, Boris. (Ed.) *The Pelican Guide to English Literature, vol. 2: The Age of Shakespeare.* Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1973 (1955).

KEATS, John. ‘On Sitting Down to Read *King Lear* Once Again’ (1818) In: KERMODE, Frank (Ed.). *Shakespeare: King Lear: Macmillan Casebook Series.* London: Macmillan, 1974 (1969).

KERMODE, Frank. ‘Writing About Shakespeare’. In: *London Review of Books, Vol. 21, no. 24, dated 9 December 1999.*

In: < http://www.lrb.co.uk/v21/n24/kerm01_.html >. Access on 12.05.2004:

KERRIGAN, John. ‘Revision, Adaptation, and the Fool in *King Lear*’ In: TAYLOR, Gary; WARREN, Michael (Eds.). *The Division of the Kingdoms: Shakespeare’s Two Versions of* King Lear. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000 (1983).

KIDNIE, Margaret Jane. ‘Shakespeare’s Audiences’. In: WELLS, Stanley; ORLIN, Lena Cowen. (Eds.) *Shakespeare: An Oxford Guide.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

KNIGHT, G. Wilson. *The Wheel of Fire: Interpretations of Shakespearian Tragedy*. London: Methuen, 1983 (1930, 1949).

KNIGHTS, L. C. ‘Ben Jonson, Dramatist’. In: FORD, Boris. (Ed.) *The Pelican Guide to English Literature, vol. 2: The Age of Shakespeare.* Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1973 (1955).

KNIGHTS, L. C. ‘Shakespeare: *King Lear* and the Great Tragedies’. In: FORD, Boris. (Ed.) *The Pelican Guide to English Literature, vol. 2: The Age of Shakespeare.* Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1973 (1955).

KOTT, Jan. *Shakespeare Our Contemporary.* London: Methuen, 1986.

KOTT, Jan. *The Gender of Rosalind.* s.l.: Northwestern University Press, 1992.

KUSNET, Eugênio. *Ator e Método.* São Paulo: Hucitec, 1992.

LAKE, Peter. ‘Changing Attitudes Towards Religion’. In: WELLS, Stanley; ORLIN, Lena Cowen. (Eds.) *Shakespeare: An Oxford Guide.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

LAMB, Charles. ‘Excerpt from his *On the Tragedies of Shakespeare*’. (1810-11) In: KERMODE, Frank (Ed.). *Shakespeare: King Lear: Macmillan Casebook Series.* London: Macmillan, 1974 (1969)

LEGGATT, Alexander. ‘Roman Plays’. In: WELLS, Stanley; ORLIN, Lena Cowen. (Eds.) *Shakespeare: An Oxford Guide.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

LEGGATT, Alexander. *Shakespeare in Performance: King Lear*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1991.

LESKY, Albin. *A Tragédia Grega.* Translated by J. Guinsburg, Geraldo Gerson de Souza and Alberto Guzik. São Paulo: Perspectiva, 1990.

LÉVI-STRAUSS, Claude. *Structural Anthropology*. Translated by Claire Jacobson and Brooke Grundfest Schoepf. Harmondsworth.: Penguin, 1977.

LEVIN, Carole. ‘The Society of Shakespeare’s England’. In: WELLS, Stanley; ORLIN, Lena Cowen. (Eds.) *Shakespeare: An Oxford Guide.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

LEVIN, Harry. ‘Science without Conscience’. In: JUMP, John. (Ed.). *Marlowe: Doctor Faustus: Casebook Series.* Nashville: Aurora, 1970 (1969).

LUKÁCS, Georg. *A Teoria do Romance: Um Ensaio Histórico-Filosófico Sobre as Formas da Grande Épica*. Translated by José Marcos Mariani de Macedo. São Paulo: Editora 34, 2000.

LUKÁCS, Georg. ‘Narrar ou Descrever.’ In: *Ensaios Sobre Literatura.* (Ed.: Leandro Konder) Translated by Giseh Vianna Konder. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 1968.

MACGOWAN, Kenneth; MELNITZ, William. *The Living Stage: A History of the World Theater*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1955.

MACHIAVELLI, Niccolo. *The Prince.* Translated by W. K. Marriott.

In: < http://www.ilt.columbia.edu/publications/machiavelli.html >.

Access on: 08.11.2005

MACK, Maynard. ‘Actors and Redactors’. (1965) In: KERMODE, Frank (Ed.) *Shakespeare: King Lear: Macmillan Casebook Series.* London: Macmillan, 1974 (1969).

MAGNUSSON, Lynne. 'Non-Dramatic Poetry'. In: WELLS, Stanley; ORLIN, Lena Cowen. (Eds.) *Shakespeare: An Oxford Guide.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

MAGUIRE, Laurie. 'Shakespeare Published'. In: WELLS, Stanley; ORLIN, Lena Cowen. (Eds.) *Shakespeare: An Oxford Guide.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

MAQUIAVEL, Nicolau. *A Mandrágora.* Translated and edited by Mário da Silva. São Paulo: Abril Cultural, 1976.

MAROWITZ, Charles. *Directing the Action: Acting and Directing in the Contemporary Theatre.* New York: Applause, 1991. (1986)

MARX, Karl. *Introduction to: A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy.* Translated by S. W. Ryazanskaia. Available at:

< http://members.tripod.com/Lonego/Traduzioni/Marx/quattro.htm >.

Access on: 22.08.2006

MARX, Karl. *Economic & Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844: First Manuscript: Estranged Labour.* Translated by Martin Mulligan. Available at:

< http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1844/manuscripts/labour.htm >.

Access on 22.08.2006

MARX, Karl. 'Manuscritos Econômico-Filosóficos: Terceiro Manuscrito.' In: *Manuscritos Econômico-Filosóficos e Outros Textos Escolhidos / Karl Marx. 2nd Ed.* (Ed.: José Arthur Giannotti.) Translated by José Carlos Bruni. São Paulo: Abril Cultural, 1978.

MARX, Karl. 'O 18 Brumário de Luís Bonaparte.' In: *Manuscritos Econômico-Filosóficos e Outros Textos Escolhidos / Karl Marx. 2nd Ed.* (Ed.: José Arthur Giannotti.) Translated by Leandro Konder. São Paulo: Abril Cultural, 1978.

MARX, Karl. 'O Rendimento e Suas Fontes: A Economia Vulgar.' In: *Manuscritos Econômico-Filosóficos e Outros Textos Escolhidos / Karl Marx. 2nd Ed.* (Ed.: José Arthur Giannotti.) Translated by José Arthur Giannotti and Walter Rehfeld. São Paulo: Abril Cultural, 1978.

MARX, Karl. 'Para a Crítica da Economia Política.' In: *Manuscritos Econômico-Filosóficos e Outros Textos Escolhidos / Karl Marx. 2nd Ed.* (Ed.: José Arthur Giannotti.) Translated by José Arthur Giannotti and Edgar Malagodi. São Paulo: Abril Cultural, 1978.

MARX, Karl. 'Salário, Preço e Lucro.' In: *Manuscritos Econômico-Filosóficos e Outros Textos Escolhidos / Karl Marx. 2nd Ed.* (Ed.: José Arthur Giannotti.) Translated by Leandro Konder. São Paulo: Abril Cultural, 1978.

MARX, Karl. 'Teses Contra Feuerbach.' In: *Manuscritos Econômico-Filosóficos e Outros Textos Escolhidos / Karl Marx. 2nd Ed.* (Ed.: José Arthur Giannotti.) Translated by José Arthur Giannotti. São Paulo: Abril Cultural, 1978.

MARX, Karl. *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Napoleon. Karl Marx 1852. Chapter 1*. Translated by Saul K. Padover. Available at:

< http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1852/18th-brumaire/ch01.htm >.

Access on 22.08.2006

MARX, Karl. *Theses on Feuerbach.* Translated by W. Lough. Available at:

< http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1845/theses/theses.htm >.

Access on 22.08.2006

MAXWELL, J. C. 'Shakespeare: The Middle Plays'. In: FORD, Boris. (Ed.) *The Pelican Guide to English Literature, vol. 2: The Age of Shakespeare.* Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1973 (1955).

MAXWELL, J. C. 'The Plays of Christopher Marlowe'. In: FORD, Boris. (Ed.) *The Pelican Guide to English Literature, vol. 2: The Age of Shakespeare.* Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1973 (1955).

McCRADY, Matthew. 'Breaking the Norman Yoke: Milton's History of Britain and the Construction of the Anglo-Saxon Past'. In: *Shakespeare and Renaissance Association of West Virginia Selected Papers (SRASP).* Vol. 22, 1999. Available at: < http://www.marshall.edu/engsr/SR1999.html#A3 >.

Access on: 30.08.2006

McDONALD, Russ. 'Shakespeare's Verse'. In: WELLS, Stanley; ORLIN, Lena Cowen. (eds.) *Shakespeare: An Oxford Guide.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

McLEOD, Randall. '*Gon.* No More, The Text is Foolish' In: TAYLOR, Gary; WARREN, Michael (Eds.). *The Division of the Kingdoms: Shakespeare's Two Versions of* King Lear. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000 (1983).

MELLERS, Wilfrid. ‘Words and Music in Elizabethan England’. In: FORD, Boris. (Ed.) *The Pelican Guide to English Literature, vol. 2: The Age of Shakespeare.* Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1973 (1955).

MITTER, Shomit. *Systems of Rehearsal: Stanislavsky, Brecht, Grotowski and Brook.* London: Routledge, 1998. (1992)

MOLIÈRE. *Tartufo, o Doente Imaginário.* Translated by Guilherme Figueiredo. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 1975.

MOORE, Sonia. *Stanislavski Revealed: The Actor’s Guide to Spontaneity on Stage.* New York: Penguin, 1991. (1979)

MOORE, Sonia. *The Stanislavski System: The Professional Training of an Actor.* New York: Penguin, 1984. (1965)

MUIR, Kenneth. ‘Changing Interpretations of Shakespeare’. In: FORD, Boris. (Ed.) *The Pelican Guide to English Literature, vol. 2: The Age of Shakespeare.* Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1973 (1955).

NOSWORTHY, J. M. ‘Introduction.’ In: SHAKESPEARE, William. *Cymbeline (2nd Arden Shakespeare).* London: Routledge, 1994 (1955, revised in 1960).

ORLIN, Lena Cowen. ‘Ideas of Order’. In: WELLS, Stanley; ORLIN, Lena Cowen. (Eds.) *Shakespeare: An Oxford Guide.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

ORLIN, Lena Cowen. ‘Introduction [Shakesperean Genres]’. In: WELLS, Stanley; ORLIN, Lena Cowen. (Eds.) *Shakespeare: An Oxford Guide.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

ORWELL, George. ‘Lear, Tolstoy and the Fool’. (1950) In: KERMODE, Frank (Ed.). *Shakespeare: King Lear: Macmillan Casebook Series.* London: Macmillan, 1974 (1969).

PALLOTTINI, Renata. *Dramaturgia: A Construção do Personagem.* São Paulo: Ática, 1989.

PALLOTTINI, Renata. *Introdução à Dramaturgia.* São Paulo: Brasiliense, s/d.

PLAUTO; TERÊNCIO. *A Comédia Latina (Anfitrião, Aululária, Os Cativos, O Gorgulho, Os Adelfos, O Eunuco).* Edited and translated by Agostinho da Silva. Porto Alegre: Globo, 1952.

Pocket English Dictionary. (Based on the *Longman New Universal Dictionary*.) Harmondsworth: Penguin, 2000.

POTTER, Lois. 'Shakespeare's Life and Career'. In: WELLS, Stanley; ORLIN, Lena Cowen. (eds.) *Shakespeare: An Oxford Guide.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

RACKIN, Phyllis. 'English History Plays'. In: WELLS, Stanley; ORLIN, Lena Cowen. (eds.) *Shakespeare: An Oxford Guide.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

REDPATH, Theodore. 'Bacon and the Advancement of Learning'. In: FORD, Boris. (Ed.) *The Pelican Guide to English Literature, vol. 2: The Age of Shakespeare.* Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1973 (1955).

RICHARDS, Thomas. *At Work with Grotowski on Physical Actions.* London: Routledge, 1995.

ROSENFELD, Anatol. *O Teatro Épico.* São Paulo: Perspectiva, 1985.

ROWE, John Carlos. 'Modern Art and the Invention of Postmodern Capital.' In: *American Quarterly*. V. 39, n. 1 (spring 1987), p. 155-173. Baltimore. 1987.

Royal Shakespeare Company: King Lear: Enclosures. Available at: < http://www.rsc.org.uk/lear/teachers/enclosures.html >. Access on: 17.08.2006

Royal Shakespeare Company: King Lear: Teachers. Available at: < http://www.rsc.org.uk/lear/teachers/ >. Access on: 17.08.2006

RYAN, Kiernan. 'Introduction.' In: SHAKESPEARE, William. *King Lear.* (Ed. by G. K. Hunter.) Harmondsworth: Penguin, 2005 (1972).

SALINGAR, L. G. 'The Decline of Tragedy'. In: FORD, Boris. (Ed.) *The Pelican Guide to English Literature, vol. 2: The Age of Shakespeare.* Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1973 (1955).

SALINGAR, L. G. 'The Elizabethan Literary Renaissance'. In: FORD, Boris. (Ed.) *The Pelican Guide to English Literature, vol. 2: The Age of Shakespeare.* Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1973 (1955).

SALINGAR, L. G. ‘The Social Setting’. In: FORD, Boris. (Ed.) *The Pelican Guide to English Literature, vol. 2: The Age of Shakespeare.* Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1973 (1955).

SALINGAR, L. G. ‘Tourneur and the Tragedy of Revenge’. In: FORD, Boris. (Ed.) *The Pelican Guide to English Literature, vol. 2: The Age of Shakespeare.* Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1973 (1955).

SCHEUNEMANN, Dietrich. ‘On Photography and Painting: Prolegomena to a New Theory of the Avant-Garde.’ In: *European Avant-Garde: New Perspectives.* (Ed. by Dietrich Scheunemann.) Amsterdam: Editions Rodopi, s.d.

SCHLEGEL, A. W. ‘Excerpt from his *Lectures on Dramatic Art and Literature*’. (1811) In: KERMODE, Frank (Ed.). *Shakespeare: King Lear: Macmillan Casebook Series.* London: Macmillan, 1974 (1969)

SCHWARZ, Roberto. *Ao Vencedor as Batatas: Forma Literária e Processo Social nos Inícios do Romance Brasileiro.* São Paulo: Duas Cidades, 1977.

SCHWARZ, Roberto. *Que Horas São?* São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 1989.

SELDER, Raman, WIDDOWSON, Peter & BROOKER, Peter. *A Reader’s Guide to Contemporary Literary Theory.* London: Prentice Hall, 1997.

SERRANO, Raúl. *Tesis sobre Stanislavski: En la Educación del Actor.* Ciudad del México: Gaceta, 1996.

SHAKESPEARE, William. *A Midsummer Night’s Dream.* (Ed. by Stanley Wells.) Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1986 (1967).

SHAKESPEARE, William. *Hamlet.* (Ed. by Anne Barton.) Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1992 (1980).

SHAKESPEARE, William. *Hamlet, Macbeth.* Translated by Anna Amélia Carneiro de Mendonça and Bárbara Heliodora. (Ed. by Bárbara Heliodora.) Rio de Janeiro: Nova Fronteira, 1995.

SHAKESPEARE, William. *King Lear: A Parallel Text Edition.* (Ed. by René Weis.) Essex: Longman, 1993.

SHAKESPEARE, William. *King Lear.* (Ed. by G.K. Hunter.) Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1992 (1972).

SHAKESPEARE, William. *King Lear (2nd Arden Shakespeare).* (Ed. by Kenneth Muir.) London: Routledge, 1994 (1952, revised in 1972).

SHAKESPEARE, William. *Macbeth.* (Ed. by Nicholas Brooke.) New York: Oxford University Press, 1994 (1990).

SHAKESPEARE, William. *O Mercador de Veneza.* Translated by Bárbara Heliodora. Rio de Janeiro: Lacerda, 1999.

SHAKESPEARE, William. *Othello.* (Ed. by Alice Walker; John Dover Wilson.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1957.

SHAKESPEARE, William. *Rei Lear.* Translated by Bárbara Heliodora. Rio de Janeiro: Lacerda Editores, 1998.

SHAKESPEARE, William. *Richard III.* (Ed. by John Dover Wilson.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1954.

SHAKESPEARE, William. *Romeo and Juliet.* (Ed. by T. J. B. Spencer..) Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1967.

SHAKESPEARE, William. *The Comedy of Errors.* In: *The Comedies of Shakespeare*, vol. 2 (Ed. by Fritz Kredel.) New York: Random House, 1944.

SHAKESPEARE, William. *The Merchant of Venice.* (Ed. by Jay L. Halio) New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.

SHAKESPEARE, William. *The Tempest.* (Ed. by Anne Barton.) Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1992 (1968).

SHAKESPEARE, William. *Titus Andronicus (3rd Arden Shakespeare).* (Ed. by Jonathan Bate.) London: Routledge, 1995.

SHELLEY, Percy Bysshe. 'Excerpt from his *A Defence of Poetry*'. (1821) In: KERMODE, Frank (Ed.). *Shakespeare: King Lear: Macmillan Casebook Series.* London: Macmillan, 1974 (1969)

SHKLOVSKY, Victor. 'A Arte Como Procedimento.' Translated by Ana Mariza Ribeiro Filipouski, Maria Aparecida Pereira, Regina L. Zilberman and Antônio Carlos Hohlfeldt. In: *Teoria da Literatura: Formalistas Russos.* (Ed. by Dionísio de Oliveira Toledo.) Porto Alegre: Globo, 1973.

SHKLOVSKY, Victor. 'A Construção da Novela e do Romance.' Translated by Ana Mariza Ribeiro Filipouski, Maria Aparecida Pereira, Regina L. Zilberman and Antônio Carlos Hohlfeldt. In: *Teoria da Literatura: Formalistas Russos.* (Ed. by Dionísio de Oliveira Toledo.) Porto Alegre: Globo, 1973.

SIDNEY, Philip. 'Extract from *Arcadia.*' In: King *Lear (2nd Arden Shakespeare).* (Ed. by Kenneth Muir.) London: Routledge, 1994 (1952, revised in 1972).

SISSON, C.J. 'Justice in *King Lear*'. (1962) In: KERMODE, Frank (Ed.). *Shakespeare: King Lear: Macmillan Casebook Series.* London: Macmillan, 1974 (1969).

SPENCER, Theodore. *Shakespeare and the Nature of Man.* New York: Collier, 1974 (1942).

SPENSER, Edmund. 'Passage from *The Faerie Queene.*' In: King *Lear (2nd Arden Shakespeare).* (Ed. by Kenneth Muir.) London: Routledge, 1994 (1952, revised in 1972).

STANISLAVSKI, Constantin. *El Trabajo del Actor Sobre Su Papel.* (Translated by Salomón Merener.) Buenos Aires: Quetzal, 1993.

TATE, Nahum. 'Excerpt from Tate's *Dedication* and *Prologue* to his *King Lear*'. (1681) In: KERMODE, Frank (Ed.). *Shakespeare: King Lear: Macmillan Casebook Series.* London: Macmillan, 1974 (1969)

TATSPAUGH, Patricia. 'Performance History: Shakespeare on the Stage, 1660-2001'. In: WELLS, Stanley; ORLIN, Lena Cowen. (Eds.) *Shakespeare: An Oxford Guide.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

TAYLOR, Gary. '*King Lear*: The Date and Authorship of the Folio Version' In: TAYLOR, Gary; WARREN, Michael (Eds.). *The Division of the Kingdoms: Shakespeare's Two Versions of* King Lear. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000 (1983).

TAYLOR, Gary. 'Monopolies, Show Trials, Disaster, and Invasion: *King Lear* and Censorship'. In: TAYLOR, Gary; WARREN, Michael (Eds.). *The Division of*

the Kingdoms: Shakespeare's Two Versions of King Lear. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000 (1983).

The True Chronicle Hisatory of King Leir (Three Scenes). In: King *Lear (2nd Arden Shakespeare).* (Ed. by Kenneth Muir.) London: Routledge, 1994 (1952, revised in 1972).

THIRSK, Joan. 'Daily Life in Town and Country'. In: WELLS, Stanley; ORLIN, Lena Cowen. (Eds.) *Shakespeare: An Oxford Guide.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

THOMSON, Peter. 'Conventions of Playwriting'. In: WELLS, Stanley; ORLIN, Lena Cowen. (Eds.) *Shakespeare: An Oxford Guide.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

TILLYARD, E. M. W. *The Elizabethan World Picture: A Study of the Idea of Order in the Age of Shakespeare, Donne, and Milton*. New York: Vintage, 1959 (1944).

TODOROV, Tzvetan. *As Estruturas Narrativas.* Translated by Leyla Perrone-Moisés. São Paulo: Perspectiva, 1970.

TODOROV, Tzvetan. *Introdução à Literatura Fantástica.* Translated by Maria Clara Correa Castello. São Paulo: Perspectiva, 1975.

TOPORKOV, Vasily Osipovich. *Stanislavski in Rehearsal: The Final Years.* Translated by Christine Edwards. New York: Routledge, 1998 (1979).

TOVSTONOGOV, Gueorgui. *La Profesión de Director de Escena.* La Habana: Arte y Literatura, 1980.

TRAVERSI, Derek. 'Shakespeare: The Last Plays'. In: FORD, Boris. (Ed.) *The Pelican Guide to English Literature, vol. 2: The Age of Shakespeare.* Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1973 (1955).

TRAVERSI, Derek. 'Shakespeare: The Young Dramatist'. In: FORD, Boris. (Ed.) *The Pelican Guide to English Literature, vol. 2: The Age of Shakespeare.* Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1973 (1955).

TREVELYAN, George Macaulay. *English Social History: A Survey of Six Centuries from Chaucer to Queen Victoria.* Essex: Longman, 1978 (1944).

TYNIANOV, Iuri. ‘A Noção de Construção.’ Translated by Ana Mariza Ribeiro Filipouski, Maria Aparecida Pereira, Regina L. Zilberman and Antônio Carlos Hohlfeldt. In: *Teoria da Literatura: Formalistas Russos.* (Ed. by Dionísio de Oliveira Toledo.) Porto Alegre: Globo, 1973.

TYNIANOV, Iuri. ‘Da Evolução Literária.’ Translated by Ana Mariza Ribeiro Filipouski, Maria Aparecida Pereira, Regina L. Zilberman and Antônio Carlos Hohlfeldt. In: *Teoria da Literatura: Formalistas Russos.* (Ed. by Dionísio de Oliveira Toledo.) Porto Alegre: Globo, 1973.

URE, Peter. ‘Chapman as Translator and Tragic Playwright’. In: FORD, Boris. (Ed.) *The Pelican Guide to English Literature, vol. 2: The Age of Shakespeare.* Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1973 (1955).

URE, Peter. *Elizabethan and Jacobean Drama: Critical Essays.* Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1974.

URE, Peter. ‘Two Elizabethan Poets: Daniel and Ralegh’. In: FORD, Boris. (Ed.) *The Pelican Guide to English Literature, vol. 2: The Age of Shakespeare.* Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1973 (1955).

URKOWITZ, Steven. ‘The Base Shall to th’Legitimate: The Growth of an Editorial Tradition’. In: TAYLOR, Gary; WARREN, Michael (Eds.) *The Division of the Kingdoms: Shakespeare’s Two Versions of* King Lear. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000 (1983).

VAJTÁNGOV, Evgueni. *E. Vajtángov: Teoria y Práctica Teatral.* Translated and Edited by Jorge Saura. Madrid: Asociación de Directores de Escena de España, 1997.

VERNANT, Jean-Pierre; VIDAL-NAQUET, Pierre. *Mito e Tragédia na Grécia Antiga.* Translated by Anna Lia A. de Almeida Prado, Filomena Yoshie Hirata Garcia, Maria da Conceição M. Cavalcante, Bertha Halpem Gurovitz and Hélio Gurovitz. São Paulo: Perspectiva, 1999.

WARREN, Michael. ‘The Diminution of Kent’ In: TAYLOR, Gary; WARREN, Michael (Eds.) *The Division of the Kingdoms: Shakespeare’s Two Versions of* King Lear. Oxford:Oxford University Press, 2000 (1983).

WARREN, Roger. ‘The Folio Omission of the Mock Trial: Motives and Consequences.’ In: TAYLOR, Gary; WARREN, Michael (Eds.) *The Division of the Kingdoms: Shakespeare’s Two Versions of* King Lear. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000 (1983).

WATT, Ian. 'Elizabethan Light Reading'. In: FORD, Boris. (Ed.) *The Pelican Guide to English Literature, vol. 2: The Age of Shakespeare.* Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1973 (1955).

WATT, Ian. *The Rise of the Novel*. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1964.

WEKWERTH, Manfred. *Diálogo sobre a Encenação: Um Manual de Direção Teatral.* (2nd edition) Translated by Reinaldo Mestrinel. São Paulo: Hucitec, 1986.

WELLS, Stanley. 'Introduction: The Once and Future *King Lear*' In: TAYLOR, Gary; WARREN, Michael (Eds.) *The Division of the Kingdoms: Shakespeare's Two Versions of* King Lear. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000 (1983).

WELLS, Stanley. 'Why Study Shakespeare?' In: WELLS, Stanley; ORLIN, Lena Cowen. (Eds.) *Shakespeare: An Oxford Guide.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

WELSFORD, Enid. 'The Fool in *King Lear*'. (1935) In: KERMODE, Frank (Ed.) *Shakespeare: King Lear: Macmillan Casebook Series.* London: Macmillan, 1974 (1969).

WERSTINE, Paul. 'Folio Editors, Folio Compositors, and the Folio Text of *King Lear*' In: TAYLOR, Gary; WARREN, Michael (Eds.) *The Division of the Kingdoms: Shakespeare's Two Versions of* King Lear. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000 (1983).

WOODBRIDGE, Linda. 'Tragedies'. In: WELLS, Stanley; ORLIN, Lena Cowen. (Eds.) *Shakespeare: An Oxford Guide.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

WORTHEN, W. B. *Shakespeare and the Authority of Performance.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

WORTHEN, W. B. *Shakespeare and the Force of Modern Performance.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Livros Grátis

(http://www.livrosgratis.com.br)

Milhares de Livros para Download:

Baixar livros de Literatura
Baixar livros de Literatura de Cordel
Baixar livros de Literatura Infantil
Baixar livros de Matemática
Baixar livros de Medicina
Baixar livros de Medicina Veterinária
Baixar livros de Meio Ambiente
Baixar livros de Meteorologia
Baixar Monografias e TCC
Baixar livros Multidisciplinar
Baixar livros de Música
Baixar livros de Psicologia
Baixar livros de Química
Baixar livros de Saúde Coletiva
Baixar livros de Serviço Social
Baixar livros de Sociologia
Baixar livros de Teologia
Baixar livros de Trabalho
Baixar livros de Turismo