



RESEARCH PAPER

Liquid Modernity in Shakespeare's Works: A Critical Reading

Farkhanda Shahid Khan*¹ Dr. Asma Iqbal Qazi²

1. Lecturer, Department of English Literature, Government College University Faisalabad, Punjab, Pakistan
2. Assistant Professor, Department of English Graduate Studies, National University of Modern Languages Islamabad Pakistan

***Corresponding Author**

farkhandashahidkhan@gcuf.edu.pk

ABSTRACT

This work while arguing that Shakespeare has the genius to mingle up words, phrases, and concepts in such a manner that they aptly fit globally- in different regions and countries, scrutinizes Shakespeare's sublimity through a vast critical scholarship. Not of an age but for all times, was critically remarked by Johnson, who was a contemporary of Shakespeare. His works are sentimental, pithy, and sometimes hilarious. He was the master to develop a connection between the narrative and his characters and that is why we notice, Hamlet's anger, everlasting love for Romeo and Juliet, Ophelia's agony, and King Lear's turning from foolishness to a modest and caring father. Theorists of the postcolonial era offer a variety of reasons for Shakespeare's recurrent presence around the globe- which are multi-folds, starting from worldwide recognized themes, his genius to transcend class, color or ethnicity, and linguistic barriers. Some others consider him as a symbol of what the Polish sociologist Zygmunt Bauman recalls as 'liquid modernity, part of the fluid, ideas-based economy of the global web, while he has been taken as a rhizomatic figure (person having self-replicating, multiple, and innovative ideas) based on touching the horizons of globalization. In the end, it concludes that Shakespeare's genius to intersperse notions to make them fit globally is at the heart of his works to designate him as a sublime figure.

KEYWORDS

Bard, Drama, Elizabethan Period, Fashion, Imagination, Jacobian Period, Sublime

Introduction

William Shakespeare is well known for his canonical writing in the field of drama, and sonnets, and his works leave him with a sublime personality following his genius to entwine ideas. George Dowson, as Charles Kingsley remarks, "the greatest talker in England", (1911) and a friend of Emerson and Carlyle, was famous for his lecturing from Shakespeare to German poetry. This person along with his friends built a striking, small public library, with the greatest collection of Shakespeare's works in Birmingham to mark and celebrate the 300th birthday of the bard. This library was named "Birmingham Shakespeare Memorial Library". George Dawson outlined the idea in a letter to Aris's Birmingham Gazette in 1861:

I wished to have in Birmingham a library to commemorate Shakespeare with the availability of every work, edition, translation, and criticism-good, bad or indifferent; in this way, every work connected to the writings or life of our great master. enlarge the project with the addition of portraits of Shakespeare

and pictures which give illustrations of his works. This collection needs a room and some trustees devoted to this conservation. (Chisholm, 2012, p. 874)

Shakespeare's close friends, John Heminge and Henry Condell compiled the accurate version of his plays to bring them into print form after his death. As plays were performed in Shakespeare's own company, the shareholders and actors edited the plays' handwritten scripts. They edited all his works and divided them into three categories used even today, i.e., tragedies, comedies, and histories. It can be made another classification from another point of view, as the period developed and he wrote special plays hence, his works can be distributed into four major periods. The first period, before (1595) shows the energy of youthful love, and the world of imagination and comedies got common in this period. The second phase, from 1595 to 1601 shows his mastery and dramatic perfection, and well-developed characterization. In his third phase of writing, he came towards tragedies and he recalls his life as "a fitful fever". The fierceness of this phase was left behind in the fourth phase (1608-1613), and the period was marvelous with sweetness and exuberant strength again in writing. There was a kinder look on life due to his mother's death in 1608 (Halleck, 1913, p. 64).

Literature Review

A vast scholarship is available on bard's works discussing different dimensions ranging from racism, postcolonialism, gender bifurcation, and appearance vs reality, yet the present work seeks to analyze his available works critically on the basis of his unique yet global perspectives entwined as a substantial aspect of his works. There is prestige and honor for those who quote his works and relate them with present-day happenings. Shakespeare has become part of every culture and community. It is a multiplicity of characteristics that wonders the reader and they praise him. Stage Illusion is another quality that puts him under praise by most critics. A dominant example can be taken from Antony and Cleopatra, where it is considered impossible of passing the first hour at Alexandria and the very next hour at Rome. It happens that the spectator, on opening the play imagines Alexandria, and again thinks that his walk-through theatre is a voyage to Egypt, and finally that he lives in the age of Antony and Cleopatra.

Over this description, Dr. Johnson remarks that if the audience was so deluded, it struck him as so implausible that he rejects completely the concept and possibility of stage illusion. (D. Nichol Smith, 1963, p. 34)

The fact is that the viewers are always with their senses intact, so they know each detail from the first act to the last that it was stage and actors are only acting there. But William Kenrick found contradiction with Johnson's argument that Shakespeare's drama is implausible, yet he is best considered a poet, a nature poet. He tried to differentiate between two types of delusions; delusion which affects our beliefs and the other which affects our emotions. He claimed after that 'the deception goes no farther than the passions, it affects our sensibility, but not our understanding', which ultimately proved to the audience as passive and that the paroxysms of grief or laughter are abrupt and involuntary. It also includes our consciousness towards likeness or differences.

Material and Methods

This work gathers various works of William Shakespeare to find out how similar angles become applicable to different nations, countries, regions, classes, and societies marking the bard's writings with universal appeal and, therefore, leaving him a sublime

universal figure with a genius to intermix ideas and notions in such a manner that they become diversified united. This approach also becomes similar to what Zygmunt Bauman calls liquid modernity in Shakespeare's works or how the concept of modernity changes to different nations while reading bard's works. A number of texts have been visited to accomplish the purpose of my newly generated argument which through multiple examples and critical stances proves a substantial addition to the present literary scholarship on Shakespeare. For this purpose, a close reading of the selected data has been carried out along with critical support to find out the chunks/ examples similar to my stance, which are multiple in numbers making the argument valid in the wake of this research.

Results and Discussion

A number of secondary works have been gathered for critical analysis to scrutinize the aspects of entwining ideas, themes, and subject matter in Shakespeare's works in such a manner that makes him ultimately fit in conveying the ideas globally. The works enviably convey the idea of the writer as an epic game changer who aptly fits into different classes, nations, sects, and regions and hence becomes an awe-inspiring persona. For example, the ritual of ring exchange during the wedding ceremony is taken by two religious' sects of Christian theology differently. Protestant service considers it compulsory, and a matter of internalization, after which one thinks it compulsory and an inevitable happening. So, in the beginning, the simple sign as a ritual was sufficient. There was no shame in simply doing this ritual. On the other hand, the Catholic sect receives this ritual in an inflated manner, though joining hands by the couple is considered more important in this sect as compared to the ring ceremony. At the beginning of the seventeenth century, this ritual was not taken more than magic by Protestants and there was a conscious effort to bade goodbye to this ritual from English marriage contracts, but after the mid-seventeenth century, they also assimilated to perform the ritual in the same manner. (Cumming, 2012, p. 56)

This ritual of ring exchange is important because it is done while kneeling. The physical act of kneeling blurs the boundary between secular and religious. For example, Iago, in Othello, in the very first act, while talking with Roderigo mocks the kneeling process, and calls it an act of hypocrisy and service of the master, in which one is subservient to the other. Then Cassio, with a group of Cyprus, kneels before Desdemona and compares her with Madonna, whereas Iago, ironically joins the ritual and vows vengeance on his wife. Further, kneeling is a process not dropped even in the Puritan religion. It is also taken as authentic evidence during prayers and a testimony of one's bowing according to one's faith (Cumming, 2012, p. 43). In this way, Shakespeare wisely incorporates religion and rituals to remain fit in every society, and over the ages. That's why he is praised more than the objections or criticism for the same reason.

Coleridge, who has read Kames and Darwin as well, while rejecting Dr. Johnson's views, thought that stage acting and presentations bring a kind of 'Half Faith' for the time being. Shakespeare's exploitation of the audience that they are ready to accept themselves in a position of transitory half faith, with their prior knowledge that they are watching a play in a theatre, where actors are acting gives a deeper sense to the life of acting or drama. As it is commonly said that we all play roles for our spectators; Shakespeare's writings play with the imagination of the viewers and make them active to play their roles and participate in his dramatic world of acting to make him ultimately a successful writer (Foakes, 1980, p. 56).

A remarkable element that puts this great writer, Shakespeare under praise is his religious turn and the representation of their tradition in the wider public sphere. Though the idea of secularization was everywhere, he seems to keep his traditions intact through his writings and readers see a balance between religion and secularity or the amalgamation of ritual and representation, that's why critics like A.D Nuttall called him a great thinker. His writings need praise and are universally accepted because he touches the apex or heart of the issues, though political, social, economic, and moral. In *All is Well that Ends Well*, the exchange of the ring in the final scene of the play is deeply rooted in post-reformation wedding rituals, what Brook calls a true ritual in the sixteenth century- a ritual embedded in social, religious as well as sentimental practice; a practice which Thomas Whythorn puts as:

'The eye doth find, the heart doth chose

And love doth bind till death doth loose' (04).

Shakespeare is the greatest re-maker with remarkable genius, especially when stories are deducted from some novel or history. As it happens in the present period that a film is made, and it gets successful; some years later a rival group or a competitor with a completely different cast, director, and improved technical devices gives another version of the same story. This was what happened in the Elizabethan and Jacobean periods as well, and Shakespeare was the figure as the greatest re-maker of the King's men. He was perfect at this skill from the very early years of his career. It can be called intelligent strategies or luck that his versions are considered the most satisfactory versions though they were the re-making of already available literature or data. It can also be observed that the idea is taken from the existing material and he develops the storyline independently. For example, an old version of the play *Henry IV* is with the character Oldcastle, but the text produced by Shakespeare that we have now is with the character of Falstaff, and he uses the name Bardolph instead of Rossill. In this way, Shakespeare has the quality to use tact to grab public attention. In Harold Jenkin's view, in rewriting Shakespeare's *Henry IV*, "there was no room to add details about Falstaff and the prince, such as the death of the prince and rejection of the Falstaff. These details were set aside for future writings, and Shakespeare used these details in the form of transformation of the prince into a successful *Henry V*", (Melchiori, 1986, p. 43) which shows the victory of policy and the last meeting of the prince with Falstaff, the rejection comes here and Henry is shown as the personification of perfection and kingship. Shakespeare gives true life to the play by turning deception (history is taken as deception by Eliot and Joyce after experiencing WWI) into dramatic ambiguity. It is a lesson from history that Shakespeare as a virtuoso has conveyed through these two historical plays.

Shakespeare's sense of place is also superb and real, it is for what he is compared with Defoe. He describes the beauty of England and the goodness of its people. In the same way, about the truths of Shakespeare's historical plays, it is said, that it is deeply rooted in his imagination. As far as Shakespeare knew the truth, they are based on factual and local truths as well. It is said, that as Trevelyan did, Shakespeare gathered/ devised the facts grounded in the mystery of life, death, and time. The locality was also added in the description and it was taken right because historical drama can be successful only when extended beyond the horizons of the facts, allowing the world of imagination to add into, where the past and present of society both are seen and taken under consideration. Here lie the comments of Dr. Johnson about Shakespeare as a historical dramatist:

History must be loaded with the fundamentals of narration, which can be improved and made subtle with the help of principled and righteous art, filled with dramatic energy, and with diverse references from past and present. Morality should provide the writer difference between the categories of immorality and virtue, and this is the quality that tells about the character's good or evil nature and to put this information in poetical terms a strong imagination and quality of realizing fiction is required which Shakespeare demonstrates clearly. Johnson is in favor of Shakespeare just as a dramatist and purely a historical dramatist, but as a poet, he rejects Shakespeare by commenting that he is unaware of the fragilities of phrases and multiple uses of words and to put all this in metrical composition. (Johnson, 1917, p. 134)

Shakespeare deals with localities. It is a fact that historical events must occur at some distinct locality, but most of the plays of the Elizabethan era does little about the domestic reality of England. Edward II deals with some destinations specific or unspecific, the same happens in Richard II that which readers are in a different world. For example, Woodstock's sense of place is quite evident in scene I of act IV, when he talks about the wealthy mines of America and talks about the exaltations of Tamburlaine which conveys the landscapes of fantasy as well. The opening section of Henry VI in a continuous flow tells through messengers about the power of English in France in minute details of places under the cascade of destiny. And when there is a civil war there comes further mentioning of the boundaries which are atrophied, and navigated. It is a phenomenon embedded in the subconscious to talk about territorial tycoons like Gloucester, York, Warwick, Buckingham, and Suffolk. It is also an involuntary process to identify oneself with the particular place, especially native place, as my lord of Hereford and as Bolingbroke replies, To Lancaster or when Humphrey of Gloucester recalls that

Somerset, Buckingham,

Brave York, Salisbury, and victorious Warwick

Received deep scars in France and Normandy;

So, it is common to say that spectators should perform the whole play in their imagination to enjoy this sense of surrounding that Shakespeare provides. When Duke of Humphrey is told dead, the commoners are angry and they come out just like bees and want their leader back without knowing who will be injured in revenge. It shows spectators' interest, working of imagination, and engagement with the screen or simply with Shakespeare whom they trust and praise. (Whitehead, 1904, p. 24)

Sometimes, Shakespeare is criticized for using black characters as stereotypical niggers, but praise goes parallel when the reader does an in-depth study. It is equally obvious from studies he never wished the audience to terminate Othello as a black or nigger character. Some European intellectuals read the story from a white girl, Desdemona's perspective that 'color does not matter' - they consider them as above these biases, away from racial segregation and ethnic dichotomy. While some theatergoers as they say imagine Othello as a white man and color difference is not important rather it matters too much to be tolerable. This colored character has been received differently in different ages, and sometimes viewpoints of different periods are relative and we can differentiate between diverse racial groups. Elizabethan also received economic threats put by neighboring countries like France; they have daily contact otherwise. While they do not have any connection with Moor's land and these foreigners, for these Europeans are inferior, insane, and curious, and 'as much curious, as much inferior' is the concept

used for these moors. These masters also consider this color a symbol of sin, death, and destruction. This supposition as Shakespeare himself says is found from ancient periods to modern times and it is present around the globe. (*Love's Labor's Lost*, 1598, p. 254). This concept in the West is present with documentary proof as well. As, in European countries like Rome and Greece, black color is considered death, ill luck, denunciation, and wickedness. On the South porch of the Cathedral, the executioner of St. Denis is represented as Negro, and sometimes they are painted black. There were Moors in Lord Mayor's pageants in London from 1519-1624 who acted as bogey-man to clear the path before the Lord when the main procession came.

The Moors of Elizabethan settings are quite different. The knowledge of Moors, Elizabethan society received from real geography was wretched and tragic. The same happens in the world of Shakespeare's plays. His treatment of the Moors does not match the treatment they received in the harsh world. Aaron in *Titus Andronicus* represents a world of general barbarism, which is Gothic when belongs to Tamora and Moorish when we talk about Aaron, and for both these characters, it is a general, unimportant and unfocused world. This relationship between a Moor and a Queen interrupts readers' sensibility and their black baby represents disorder. These interruptions may be present in viewers' minds as well while entering the theater to watch the play *The Moor of the Venice*. (Hunter, 1967, p. 67)

While highlighting the qualities of the two characters Iago and Othello, it is said that Othello's character is embedded in real action, while Iago's is in appearance. Iago is a self-centered man, thus isolated from everyone even from his wife as well, while, Othello is occupied with several duties. He is submissive to his father-in-law and as a lieutenant, a kind man to his juniors. So, it is said that Iago is a man of white skin but a black soul while Othello is a man of black skin and a fair soul. Hence, it is the guilty consciousness of Europe that has been represented through Iago.

While establishing a triangular matrix on equal terms, between *The Tempest*, *Othello*, and *Titus Andronicus* it is said that *The Tempest* shows the concern to apprehend the point of unity instead of demarcation between uncivilized and civilized, ignorance and knowledge. And *Titus Andronicus* is taken on similar grounds as *The Tempest*. While in *Othello*, Shakespeare goes polar apart as he does not take Othello's treatment by Iago as an exploitation of innocent black by the clever white master or what he says, corrupt European. So, there is a kind of morality in this play, but giving too much weightage to it will make Iago and Othello, what society wants them to see. Study shows that much of the criticism goes against this character of Othello, as Schlegel paints that 'Othello's veneration for Christianity and civilization cracks when the play starts and thus his basic savagery reveals' (Schlegel, 1815, p. 189). Since he is taken as a black Indian savage and a man of pagan appearance who casts away Desdemona, a white pearl, a European; so through poetic justice Christian authority reasserts its mastery over the pagan that can be understood (Hunter, 1967, p. 76).

Criticism on thematic grounds is another concern of Shakespearean plays. Though he is inspired by previous works and takes the past works as source material for his writings, he brings new aspects and for this, he is praised much at all times. Secondly, along with the innovations he is stuck with his Christian traditions as much that no one can call him non-conformist. Maxwell discusses *Measure for Measure: The Play and the Themes* (Maxwell, 1998, p. 74) in Christian interpretation by considering the grounds/bases provided by Chambers as a pessimistic Shakespeare of the Jacobean era, who claims that Shakespeare is struggling for strengthening his belief in this play. Maxwell, while discussing the play on different thematic grounds justifies as well as

refutes different claims about the themes of this play. First of all, the play has been emphasized due to its theatrical qualities, as a comedy, a play of ideas, and a play discussing the concepts of justice and mercy, etc. The word permissive has been used here by Shakespeare for the first time, and it is also said that the setting of the play Vienna was not decided by Shakespeare rather Jonathan Miller did this. Arden Shakespeare, a Bloomsbury publishing series on Shakespeare's works (1965) also puts it as the play of ideas, while A.P. Rossiter claims that justice is on trial. There are some other aspects as well like the enforcement of law and the relation between law and mercy that are of much concern in the play under discussion.

Though Shakespeare was familiar with several earlier versions of this play, he gave central importance to innovation in this work. The so-called bed trick is used to yield to the unjust judge which already betrothed Angelo, and Marianna is replaced by Isabella. This introduces questions of law unfamiliar to the modern reader. Claudio and Juliet have co-habited, they are now a couple, but it is of less importance and it can be brought under revived law after technical correctness. Angelo, on the other hand, is not questioned because it is not needed, and secondly, it is not the duty of the duke. The idea to put Isabella as a novice in religious order has been discussed by Geoffrey Bullough, Isabella was made novice to make that his heroine was stubborn against Angelo's proposal because in this sense play was a tragedy. In Whetstone's version, she was shown as an angel of mercy. She must disagree to meet the moral teachings as Shakespeare puts it. The writer is of the view that if this act was turned into a marriage ceremony, she would have become a dutiful wife, but it seems obvious that Shakespeare wanted to convey a profound Christian message in the play. Isabella wanted to forgive Angelo because Duke was not going to condemn his death for this sin of fornication. So, pardon here is just of theoretical interest, as Angelo would die in another charge, the second charge of promise breaching for which Isabella cannot plea because it would change the duke's decision and secondly, it will become deadly for Shakespeare. (Maxwell, 1998, p. 79)

The theme of mercy and equity is equally important here. It is hard to differentiate between the two terms. Equity, he has used once in the whole of his writings but mercy has been used many times. Mercy technically is called equity for reflection of heavenly mercy. If we see the nature of the offense, it is taken as a moral offense, and cannot be taken as a capital offense. Paying attention to the exact dramatic situation makes one thing clearer, Shakespeare wanted to convey the Christian message overwhelmingly. Some critics like Rossiter put it as a low comedy because it shows a visibly corrupt society- where no wholesome thing can grow and hence, condemns Vienna. (Rossiter, 1961, p. 357) Play can be taken as a superb inquiry into man's nature- justice, truth, sex, and love or simply in terms of faith- Christianity, and due to such non-conformist qualities, critics put an enthusiastic admiration in favor of this writer.

The stage setting is another remarkable achievement for which Shakespeare is praised even in the modern period by modern directors. So, it is not a recent phenomenon, though technological advancements set the scene. His insight and enlightenment in stage directions meet modern technicalities. It was less obvious but part of Shakespeare's services as well. Use of technical terms like *at one doore* and *another doore* is used by Shakespeare. There are some manuscripts with minor alterations or additions; otherwise, his works show a sense of completeness. An action that requires a large cast is executed with care and the availability of every resource material. Two doors were used on the stage for entries, and the word above was used for the invitation. Sound effects are also profound. Playwrights like him have a higher card to play to be

successful and honored like him. He is a man of continuing reputation. Thomas Heywood writes:

“he chose to exemplify the power of historical drama to ‘new mold the hearts of the spectators and fashion them to the shape of any noble and notable attempt’ (in Arthur, 1922, p. 14).

History, especially when it was taken as objective and factual, just as a scientific phenomenon, was dramatized by this writer. Modern readers, in this period, when history is taken as a subjective, fictional, and ever-changing phenomenon, can be compared to see the authenticity of times, both past and present in a diachronic and synchronic manner. It also serves the purpose of the account of that particular society, king, and heroism in which it is compiled.

Shakespeare provides an account of Edward’s lifetime; a brief detail can be put here as a period of much advancement like it happened in the time of Queen Elizabeth and she developed an image of Royal Excellence. Edward’s reign saw ‘Hundred Years’ war’ and two visits of the plague. The early years of his kingship were reflected by Roger Mortimer, the lover of his mother. He relied much on the mistress of his age Alice Perrers, who stained his heroic image as well. A further low blow was the death of his eldest son. Account of the same king was also tried by Ben Johnson, but he never advanced from a synopsis and a scrap of conversation between Mortimer and the Queen. It was in Greek form with much reliability on choric narratives. One of the narratives was to provide the detail of the murder of Edward II. (Proudfoot, 1998, p. 19) There was young Edward’s arrest and murder of Mortimer and it was concluded as a healthy celebration of the king’s justice. It can be extracted that it was Shakespeare who dealt with every aspect of history with limited education in a way, no one could meet the completion as Ben Johnson also failed in providing a satisfactory account.

Three nations, four theatres of war, and twenty years of history with a wide range of major and minor figures are accomplished with skill and can avoid the monotony of treatment. There will be a perfect shape and coherence in his plays. It can be noted that the romantic myth about the countess of Salisbury due to Edward’s infatuation has less to do with this account. Shakespeare adds his victories. He provides the detail of a man of twenty-six years with a brilliant mindset, a freshman in the school of honor, who shows his skills by winning Crecy. His handling of characters and dealing with nations and their histories, showing English unity by the presence of three lords, victory over the French crown, and mastery at restatements, which he puts in the mouths of French characters exalt him to the level of extreme admiration. Shakespeare made careful use of Lord Berner’s English version of the chronicles of Froissart’s work which is very close to le Bel’s stance in providing a similar account. Shakespeare also uses Holinshed who taught him how to use the names misprinted in the 1596 quarto. He takes allusions from Stow’s chronicles as well who mention Edward as lieutenant-general of the empire as well, while on other points he is mentioned as vicar-general. His account of the black prince is closer to the sanctimonious jingoism of Holinshed. It is through the provision of such an account that he wins the admiration of foe and friend alike through the humanity and humility with which he treats royal characters (Foakes & Rickert, 1980, p. 241).

He shares past chronicles to inform his reader about the national happenings, like he assimilates memories of the Armada narrative in the battles of Sluys and Poitiers,

which, is interesting to quote he took from his audience. More it is an account of detailed history with successive battles of Edward in France, but overall, it can be taken like *Othello*, and *Troilus and Cressida*, a narrative about love and fighting, relating with each other through cross-references of themes, and other literary devices. The same is the case with his authorship, as we find much criticism that most of the plays have not been written by him, rather they are co-authored or copied from earlier literature. It is said due to flamboyant language, subtle vocabulary, and imagery, especially associated with large image clusters. But the same can be found in most of his plays which pave the way towards authenticity about Shakespeare as an original author of his works (Schanzer, 2004). He cannot be stigmatized on authorship when one does not have done a systematic study of other writers.

Shakespeare is one of the writers who thought about improvisation, or the art of rhetoric, or speaking at the spur of the moment because he was of the view things can be done easily with this art. Rhetoric, Aristotle defines as the “faculty of recognizing the available means of persuasion in a given moment or situation.” it is a perception that enables the person to figure out things accordingly. Viola is one of the greatest masters of rhetoric. She is washed up at the shore after the shipwreck because she knew about her lost brother. The Sea captain helps her know about the address and also that Olivia is there, a countess whose father died recently and who is living in mourning as a recluse in the play, *Twelfth Night*.

O that I served that lady

And might not be delivered to the world

Till I had made mine occasion mellow

What my estate is? (1.2, lines 43-46)

When she has been considered a man, and is an object of Olivia’s advances and says, ‘How will this fadge?’ words like occasion and fadge were taken as new and embedded in great art. (Witmore, 2017, p. 34)

Depicting society of his time he talks in favor and against women. Some of his plays show the character of women as powerful ladies, like Tamora in *Titus Andronicus* seems to have shifted her natural femininity to fit into a masculine game of politics. Be ruled by me, she tells Saturnius, and he is ruled by her. It is in most of the play, Tamora is the powerful character in Rome. On the other hand, Lavinia is an antithesis of women’s virtue, treated as property, and excluded from the women’s world. She is the woman who belonged to a powerful father but is treated as a phenomenon that ceases to exist. As a master of linguistic tricks, he devises his characters’ speeches embedded in powerful rhetoric, as we have examples of Antony, Macbeth, Lear, Othello, Olivia, and Iago.

Conclusion

It has been concluded after reading several of his texts through primary and secondary data that Shakespeare’s genius lies in combining words and phrases which makes him aptly fit into different nations, countries, and regions, hence leaving him a sublime figure globally. It is also said that great works of art are the expressions of great

human minds. Shakespeare read great minds like Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, and Seneca and their influence reflects in his writings as well. As a representative writer of the Elizabethan era, he was writing for Queen Elizabeth and James VI of Scotland who becomes James I of England. On one side he was following their ideology and was serving their interests, for which his writings are socio-political compacts, and on the other hand, he was following/using the literary elements of Intertextuality, allusions, and past references which we can also call follow the traditions with following Aristotelian unities to make drama credible. The same goes for a realistic depiction of his characters and their tragedies/happenings that spectators immediately associate with their personal stories. All this craft at painting stories and characters shows him as a God-gifted, mastermind, and well-read person, who has not left any stone unturned in developing his writings fit around the globe.

References

- Arthur Melville C. (1922). *Thomas Heywood as a critic*. Modern Language Notes 37, 223. Project Muse: Jhon Hopkin University Press.
- Chisholm, H. (1911). Dawson, George". *Encyclopedia Britannica*. 7 (11th ed.). :Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. p. 874
- Cummings, B. (2012). *Shakespeare, and Reformation: Lecture series*, <https://www.thebritishacademy.ac.uk/events/lectures/listings/shakespeare-lectures/>.
- D. Nichol S. (1963). *Eighteenth-Century Essays on Shakespeare*. Revised edition. P. 118. The Project Gutenberg. E-book.
- Foakes, R.A. (1980). *Forms to His Conceit: Shakespeare and the uses of Stage Illusion*. UK: Oxford University Press.
- Foakes, R.A and Ricket R.T (1961). *Henslowe's Diary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press Pp. 241
- Johnson, S. (1917). *The Preface to Shakespeare*. USA: The Harvard Classics. P.F. Collier & Son.
- Halleck, Reuben P. (1913). *Halleck's New English Literature*. New York: American Book Company. Shakespeare Online. 20 Feb. 2011. (23 November 2019) < <http://www.shakespeare-online.com/biography/fourperiods.html> >.
- Hunter, K.G. (1967). *Othello and Color Prejudice: Shakespeare Lecture*. Online. <Http://Harvardenglish129.com>.
- Melchiori, G. (1986). *The Corridors of History: Shakespeare the Re-Maker*. *Shakespeare Lecture: online*. Accessed: <https://philpapers.org/rec/MELTCO-10>.
- Maxwell. E.F. (1998). *The Play behind the Play*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Proudfoot, R. (1998). *King Edward III*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rositer, A.P. (1961). *Angel with Horns and other Shakespeare Lectures*. Edi. Graham Storey. New York: Theatre Art Books. Pp. 357.
- Schlegel. (1815). *Lectures on Dramatic Art of Shakespeare*. Online. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Lectures-on-Dramatic-Art-and-Literature>.
- Schanzer, E. (2004). *The Problem Plays of Shakespeare*. UK: Routledge.
- The Arden Shakespeare: Measure for Measure*. (1965) Bloomsbury Shakespeare series, 3rd edition.
- Witmore, M. (2017) *Shakespeare, improvisation, and the art of rhetoric, Shakespeare's Birthday Lecture*.
- Whitehead, W. (1904) *His Appreciation of Shakespeare*. <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/57863/57863-h/57863-h.htm>.