

University of Windsor

Scholarship at UWindor

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Theses, Dissertations, and Major Papers

1-1-1963

Convention and invention: Soliloquy in Shakespearean tragedy.

James M. Shea
University of Windsor

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/etd>

Recommended Citation

Shea, James M., "Convention and invention: Soliloquy in Shakespearean tragedy." (1963). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 6337.
<https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/etd/6337>

This online database contains the full-text of PhD dissertations and Masters' theses of University of Windsor students from 1954 forward. These documents are made available for personal study and research purposes only, in accordance with the Canadian Copyright Act and the Creative Commons license—CC BY-NC-ND (Attribution, Non-Commercial, No Derivative Works). Under this license, works must always be attributed to the copyright holder (original author), cannot be used for any commercial purposes, and may not be altered. Any other use would require the permission of the copyright holder. Students may inquire about withdrawing their dissertation and/or thesis from this database. For additional inquiries, please contact the repository administrator via email (scholarship@uwindsor.ca) or by telephone at 519-253-3000ext. 3208.

CONVENTION AND INVENTION:
SOLILOQUY IN
SHAKESPEAREAN TRAGEDY

BY
JAMES M. SHEA

A Thesis
Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies through the
Department of English in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts at Assumption
University of Windsor

Windsor, Ontario

1963

UMI Number: EC52517

INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI[®]

UMI Microform EC52517

Copyright 2008 by ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest LLC
789 E. Eisenhower Parkway
PO Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

ABL 2753

Approved:

John J. Sullivan

W. W. Walcott

Mary J. Manley.

ABSTRACT

This thesis is a study of Shakespeare's use of soliloquy, a convention common to early English tragedy. Its purpose is to determine his development of the dramatic effectiveness of the device.

The introductory chapter is a general discussion of soliloquy: its dramatic functions, the different critical views regarding the convention, and a brief consideration of the use of the device by Kyd and Marlowe. Shakespeare's use of soliloquy has been examined under the following topics: "Self-described Villains" (Richard III, Iago and Edmund), "Heightened Pathos" (Romeo and Juliet, Richard II and Lear), and "Conflicts of Mind" (Brutus, Hamlet and Macbeth). Some of the speeches of Richard II and Lear, although not soliloquies in the strict sense, have a similar "detached quality" and therefore have been included in the study.

Richard III's soliloquies, which show the influence of Kyd and Marlowe on Shakespeare's early plays, are a direct and therefore more primitive means of self-explanation and exposition of the action than those of Iago and Edmund, whose villainy and evil designs are more subtly revealed. Lear's laments and the soliloquies of Romeo and Juliet stress the tragic significance of the immediate situation

and cumulate to increase the pathos of the catastrophe. Richard II's speeches, however, have a rhetorical quality which hinders a complete identification between him and the audience. Brutus' internal debates, although they reflect the struggle between his noble nature and his patriotic ideals, lack the emotional intensity distinctive of the soliloquies of Hamlet and Macbeth.

A definite development in the use of soliloquy can be traced throughout Shakespeare's career: the extravagantly rhetorical versification gradually matures to a style more characteristic of spontaneous utterance; direct exposition becomes less prominent as Shakespeare begins to portray the state of consciousness within the characters themselves.

PREFACE

English tragedy passed through definite stages of development during the latter half of the sixteenth and early seventeenth century. Some critical work has been done on the general question of dramatic speech in the tragedies, notably Wolfgang Clemen's English Tragedy Before Shakespeare: The Development of Dramatic Speech, trans. T. S. Dorsch (London, 1961) and M. C. Bradbrook's Themes and Conventions of Elizabethan Tragedy (Cambridge, 1960). But no single study of the soliloquy, a particular form of dramatic speech, has yet been made. If, as Professor Clemen so convincingly demonstrates, the set speeches are "the main pillars, indeed the very foundations" (p. 12) of Renaissance tragedy, then a concentrated examination of the soliloquy perhaps will prove valuable for a better understanding of that period of English drama.

Because of the frequent use of soliloquy by early English playwrights and their varied achievements in handling the device, I found it necessary to limit my research to Shakespeare. This restriction, however, does not detract from the possible benefit of the investigation, for Shakespeare is a focal point in the development of Elizabethan drama: he was influenced to some extent by the dramatic technique of his predecessors and contemporaries and exerted an

even greater influence on the dramatists who immediately succeeded him.

In studying the soliloquy in Shakespearean tragedy two basic considerations are important: the dramatic purpose for which he uses this device and his maturity in technique. The plays best suited for examination are Richard III, Romeo and Juliet, Richard II, Julius Caesar, Hamlet, Othello, King Lear, and Macbeth. Owing to the uncertainty of Shakespeare's authorship of Titus Andronicus and Timon of Athens, these tragedies have been excluded from the thesis. Since there is comparatively little use of soliloquy in Anthony and Cleopatra and Coriolanus, these plays have also been omitted.

I have purposefully avoided interchanging the use of "soliloquy" and "monologue." The former term I have restricted to the set speeches made by a character when alone on the stage. There is only one actual soliloquy in Richard II, the prison speech in Pomfret Castle. Several times throughout the play, however, Richard drifts into dramatic reveries which, even though there are other characters present, have the effect of isolating him in his thoughts. King Lear does not utter a single soliloquy, but his ravings during the heath scenes and his laments over the body of Cordelia have a detached quality similar to Richard's musings. It is for these passages of Richard's self-analysis and Lear's emotional outbursts that I have reserved the use of "monologue."

I wish to thank Dr. J. F. Sullivan, my director, without whose assistance and encouragement this thesis could not have been completed. I am also grateful to Dr. M. J. Manley

and Rev. J. A. Malone, C.S.B., Ph.D., the other two members of the committee, for their suggestions on the revision of the manuscript. I owe a debt of thanks to Rev. C. P. Crowley, C.S.B., Ph.D., Dean of Graduate Studies and Head of the English Department, whose recommendation for a fellowship enabled me to pursue a Master's degree in English. Mrs. H. Haberer also deserves acknowledgement for her generosity and patience in typing the thesis.

The text of Shakespeare's plays from which I quote is The New Cambridge Edition, edited by William Allen Neilson and Charles Jarvis Hill (Cambridge, Mass., 1942).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	ii
PREFACE	iv
Chapter	
I. THE SOLILOQUY: AN INTRODUCTION	1
II. SELF-DESCRIBED VILLAINS	8
Richard III	8
Iago	15
Edmund	20
III. HEIGHTENED PATHOS	26
Romeo and Juliet	26
Richard II	31
Lear	37
IV. CONFLICTS OF MIND	41
Brutus	41
Hamlet	45
Macbeth	53
V. CONCLUSION	60
BIBLIOGRAPHY	65
VITA AUCTORIS	68

CHAPTER I

THE SOLILOQUY: AN INTRODUCTION

The soliloquy may be defined as a passage of dramatic speech delivered by a character when alone upon the stage. There is general critical agreement in specifying the various functions of soliloquy. Wolfgang Clemen describes the soliloquies in pre-Shakespearean tragedy as "the sole medium by which the characters are presented and their states of mind and motives for action revealed; by their means, moreover, the dramatic import of the play is made clear, and the course of its action revealed."¹ M. C. Bradbrook is more precise in stating the uses of the soliloquy, but her distinctions correspond to Professor Clemen's general statement. She divides the soliloquy into the "expository," the revelation of the thoughts and feelings of the characters and the dramatic action, and the "moral," a statement of the total significance of the dramatic situation.² Going one step further, R. C. Hill distinguishes between the "informative" and the "natural" expository soliloquy. "Informative" exposition is merely a talking to the audience; "natural" exposition is a talking to oneself aloud, revealing inner tensions

¹ English Tragedy Before Shakespeare: The Development of Dramatic Speech, trans. T. S. Dorsch (London, 1961), p. 13.

² See Themes and Conventions of Elizabethan Tragedy (Cambridge, 1960), p. 112.

which are in effect the causes of such soliloquizing.³

Thus far there is fairly general agreement. There are, however, many widely varying opinions about the reasons for and the effectiveness of this dramatic device. For instance, Levin L. Schücking maintains that Shakespeare uses the soliloquy because of the physical features of his stage:

Our drama is enacted under the tacit agreement that there are no spectators present. Only one wall, that in front of the audience, is wanting to the scene. In contrast to this, Shakespeare's stage is surrounded by the spectators on three sides. The actor may be said to stand in the midst of the audience; he is always mindful of this while he is acting, and in many cases directly addresses his spectators.⁴

For Professor Schücking, then, the proximity of audience and actors, the absence of the modern fourth wall convention of dramatic presentation, made the use of the soliloquy almost inevitable.

Elmer E. Stoll, who agrees with Professor Schücking on most other points, disagrees with the above interpretation:

But for the Elizabethans this is the explanation--drama not yet fully evolved, not the stage. It has been suggested, and of late years it has well-nigh become a commonplace of criticism, that the platform stage, with the resultant proximity of the audience, explains, even if it may not altogether justify, the confidential communications which the characters of the Tudor drama are in the habit of making to the spectators before and around them But the same phenomena appear in Greek drama, in the Latin, Spanish, French, and German--in all early drama as distinguished from the modern, and often

³ See "Dramatic Techniques and Interpretation in Richard II," in Early Shakespeare (Stratford-upon-Avon Studies 3), ed. John Russel Brown and Bernard Harris (London, 1961), p.116.

⁴ Character Problems in Shakespeare's Plays (New York, 1922), p. 152.

before larger audiences, and with the actors still farther away These materialistic mechanistic theories do not carry us far. Great artists, in the long run, are irresistible, and dramatists are not at the mercy of the carpenter; it is rather the actors and their art that they have to consider.⁵

Drama in embryonic form, the need for explicit presentation of character and dramatic motivation, are the reasons Professor Stoll stresses for the use of soliloquy in early English tragedy.

The question of how much information the soliloquy gives about the character of its speaker is also debated. Older criticism of Shakespeare simply accepted the soliloquies as realistic reproduction of the thought of the speaker, with the result that the personality of the character was open to consideration. Thus Coleridge sees in the soliloquy which Hamlet utters when refusing to kill the praying Claudius (III.iii.73-96) "the marks of reluctance and procrastination."⁶ Coleridge insists that "the character of Hamlet may be traced to Shakespeare's deep and accurate science in mental philosophy."⁷

In the twentieth century, however, studies of Elizabethan stagecraft and convention have suggested a different approach to the soliloquy, so that Professor Schücking, for example, can say of the same passage in Hamlet:

⁵ Shakespeare Studies (New York, 1960), p. 377.

⁶ Lectures and Notes on Shakespeare and Other English Poets, comp. T. Ashe (London, 1883), p. 364.

⁷ Lectures and Notes, p. 343.

If the reasons stated by Hamlet had been intended to be merely specious ones Shakespeare would at least have made Hamlet add, with that knowledge of himself which elsewhere distinguishes him, "But I am only deceiving myself; in reality I cannot force myself to do the deed."⁸

In like manner, Miss Bradbrook criticizes those who consider the device of soliloquy as a medium of psychological insight:

Those critics who have been interested in the plays as "realistic" or "psychological" studies have been much concerned with this self-characterization . . .; but if it [the soliloquy] is considered not in isolation but in relation to other kinds of direct speech, it appears a straightforward device, hardly worth the discussion it has provoked.⁹

A. C. Bradley, speaking in general terms of Shakespeare's characterization, indirectly takes Coleridge to task for his tendency toward deep psychological probing:

The centre of the tragedy, therefore, may be said with equal truth to be in action issuing from character, or in character issuing in action. Shakespeare's main interest lay here. To say that it lay in mere character, or was a psychological interest, would be a great mistake for Shakespeare was dramatic to the tips of his fingers.¹⁰

The question of the effectiveness of the device of soliloquy has also provoked some discussion. Tracing the development of dramatic set speech in pre-Shakespearean tragedy, Professor Clemen concludes that the soliloquy, as used by such playwrights as Kyd and Marlowe, created for the first time and "in-

⁸ Character Problems, p. 216.

⁹ Themes and Conventions, p. 126.

¹⁰ Shakespearean Tragedy, Meridian Books (Cleveland, 1961), p. 21. Author's italics.

ward drama," a drama portraying human emotion rather than merely reciting events.¹¹ On the other hand, Professor Schücking considers Shakespeare's use of soliloquy as conventional and unrealistic and relegates the device to inferior dramatic achievement:

We clearly see that the villains in Shakespeare are not allowed to appear as honest characters even in their own eyes, and that the noble characters must be noble even in the eyes of their wicked enemies. This is an astonishing example of the great contrasts between which the art of Shakespeare oscillates. The pendulum is ever swinging from the side of a highly advanced realism, unfettered by any tradition, which allows characters instinctively conceived to work out their relations in unrestricted liberty, to the side where there exists an almost childish primitiveness and a submission to traditional practice utterly regardless of the actual facts of life.¹²

Some critics have dismissed the use of soliloquy altogether. The German scholar Kilian called the device a "lame makeshift," and Brander Matthews denounced it as "false in psychology" and "primitive dramaturgy."¹³

What, then, are the reasons for and what is the effectiveness of Shakespeare's use of soliloquy? These questions can only be answered in the light of some understanding of the use of soliloquy in pre-Shakespearean tragedy. For Shakespeare developed his idiom mainly from the popular playwrights who preceded him and his drama is, therefore, partially the product of his age.

¹¹ See English Tragedy, pp. 287-92.

¹² Character Problems, p. 66. Author's italics.

¹³ As quoted by Bradbrook, Themes and Conventions, p. 3.

Of all pre-Shakespearean dramatists Kyd and Marlowe made the most frequent use of soliloquy. Kyd's The Spanish Tragedy (ca. 1586) is characterized by a balanced rhetorical structure, as is evident in the following opening line of Hieronimo's soliloquy after the murder of his son:

O eyes, no eyes, but fountains fraught with tears;
 O life, no life, but lively form of death;
 O world, no world, but mass of public wrongs;
 Confus'd and full'd with murder and misdeeds; 14
 (III,ii. 1-4)

The rhetorical quality of this and similar soliloquies in The Spanish Tragedy can be accounted for by the great interest in rhetoric in England during the second half of the sixteenth century. The favorite handbook of the time was Sir Thomas Wilson's The Art of Rhetoric (1553).¹⁵ Students were given courses in rhetoric, and university playwrights like Sackville and Norton, whose Gorboduc (ca. 1561) is the first English tragedy, modeled their plays on the balanced rhetorical style of Senecan tragedy.

The Spanish Tragedy was a popular success and at the beginning of his career Marlowe was influenced by Kyd's style of dramatic speech. The soliloquies in the two parts of Marlowe's Tamburlaine (1587-8), however, take on a new characteristic. Besides the rhetorical, there is also a bombastic quality. In so far as this bombast reveals the pride and haughtiness of Tamburlaine, the main character, Marlowe's

¹⁴ Thomas Kyd, The Spanish Tragedy, ed. Philip W. Edwards (London, 1959), p. 52.

¹⁵ See Clemen, English Tragedy, p. 23.

grandiloquence in this play represents a development in the technique of the soliloquy: self-portrayal is beginning to replace Senecan rhetoric. It is not until Marlowe's Doctor Faustus (1588-9), however, that there is any real advance so that the soliloquies are organically related to one another. Faustus, in his soliloquies, leads the audience on the path of a vital religious experience. He is not merely reporting events; he is stating the total situation, the core of the play. Professor Clemen has summed up the importance of Doctor Faustus in the development of the soliloquy:

Thus the handling of the soliloquy in such a way that for the first time in English drama it reproduces the actual inner experience of a soliloquy has led in this play to the development of a new type of speech, and one that is unmistakably different from anything that has been heard before.¹⁶

From the rhetoric of Gorboduc and The Spanish Tragedy, through the bombast of Tamburlaine and the moralizing of Doctor Faustus: these are the stages through which the soliloquy had passed by the time Shakespeare was writing his first plays. That Shakespeare was influenced by Kyd and Marlowe in the device of the soliloquy there can be no doubt. A dramatist cannot escape the conventions of his age unless he is a deliberate rebel, which Shakespeare was not:

Shakespeare's work is everywhere pervaded by conventional and stereotyped elements inherited from the past, always associated, however, with the new elements that are the product of his own remarkable creative urge.¹⁷

An examination of these "conventional" and "new elements" is the basis of this study of soliloquy in Shakespearean tragedy.

¹⁶ English Tragedy, p. 151.

¹⁷ Clemen, English Tragedy, p. 18.

CHAPTER II

SELF DESCRIBED VILLAINS

One of the functions of soliloquy in Shakespearean tragedy is to reveal the basic characteristics of the dramatis personae. When the villains use the device for this purpose, they often speak openly of their wickedness and always inform the audience of their plans for intrigue. Richard III, Iago and Edmund are Shakespeare's chief villains. The aim of this chapter is to consider their soliloquies of self-explanation and to discover any differences in the way in which these villains are characterized.

Richard III

Richard speaks an important passage of self-description in the third act of III Henry VI (1590-91), the chronicle play written two or three years before Richard III. He begins the lengthy soliloquy by denouncing the recently crowned Edward and the other hindrances to his accession to the throne:

Would he were wasted, marrow, bones, and all,
That from his loins no hopeful branch may spring,
To cross me from the golden time I look for!
And yet, between my soul's desire and me--
The lustful Edward's title buried--
Is Clarence, Henry, and his son young Edward,
And all the unlook'd for issue of their bodies
To take their rooms, ere I can place myself:
A cold premeditation for my purpose!

(III.ii.125-33)

The beginning of this speech is clearly expository: it states Richard's desire for the crown and specified those who must be murdered to attain it.

He then proceeds to describe his physical deformity: his arm shrunk "like a wither'd shrub," his body mocked by "an envious mountain" on his back, and his legs shaped "of an unequal size" (III.ii.153-62). This grotesque appearance, Richard states, is the reason for his desperate desire of the crown. The audience was to be left in no doubt about his motivation.

Aware of the difficulties in attaining his goal, he continues in words which reflect his frenzied state of mind and his diabolical intent to use any means to the end:

And yet I know not how to get the crown,
 For many lives stand between me and home;
 And I--like one lost in a thorny wood,
 That rends the thorns and is rent with the thorns,
 Seeking a way and straying from the way,
 Not knowing how to find the open air
 But toiling desperately to find it out,--
 Torment myself to catch the English crown;
 And from that torment I will free myself
 Or hew my way out with a bloody axe.
 (III.ii.172-81)

In the closing lines of the soliloquy comparison is piled upon comparison as Richard describes his ability to conceal his devilish nature and designs:

Why, I can smile, and murder whiles I smile,
 And cry "Content" to that which grieves my heart,
 And wet my cheeks with artificial tears,
 And frame my face to all occasions.
 I'll drown more sailors than the mermaid shall;
 I'll slay more gazers than the basilisk;
 I'll play the orator as well as Nestor,
 Deceive more slyly than Ulysses could,
 And, like Sinon, take another Troy.
 I can add colours to the chameleon,
 Change shapes with Proteus for advantages,
 And set the murderous Machiavel to school.
 (III.ii.182-93)

The influence of Kyd and Marlowe upon Shakespeare's early writing is conspicuous in this speech, especially in the section just quoted. The balanced rhetorical quality is Kyd's, the lofty poetic language, Marlowe's. III Henry VI was composed about three years after The Spanish Tragedy and perhaps only one or two years after Tamburlaine. No doubt the eloquent phrases of Hieronimo and the sonorous lines of Tamburlaine, as spoken by the popular actor Edward Alleyn, were still ringing in Shakespeare's ears. At this time in his career, he took over the device of soliloquy from his two successful predecessors and, as this speech of Richard demonstrates, imitated their rich and somewhat artificial form of dramatic set speech.

The soliloquies in Richard III have a lyric quality similar to that of the above passage from III Henry VI. The play begins with a highly rhetorical speech as Richard, alone on the stage, informs the audience that the Yorkists are in power:

Now is the winter of our discontent
 Made glorious summer by this sun of York;
 And all the clouds that lour'd upon our house
 In the deep bosom of the ocean buried.

(I.i.1-4)

He continues in this extravagantly lyrical form of soliloquy, speaking of "brows bound with victorious wreaths," "dreadful marches to delightful measures," and "Grim-visaged War" smoothing "his wrinkled front." Shakespeare was still a learner and imitator when writing Richard III. That the influence of Kyd and Marlowe carried over from III Henry VI into the later play is evident from a comparison of the two soliloquies.

In the latter half of this opening speech Richard gives a description of his physical deformity similar to that in the

earlier play. There is one important difference, however, in the respective passages. In Richard III he frankly tells the audience that because of this disfigurement he is "determined to prove a villain" (v.30), not merely that he desires the crown. Such a direct confession is an indication that Shakespeare had not yet developed the skill of subtle characterization.

Richard, in the concluding lines of the first soliloquy, further confides to the audience his design for the disposal of King Edward and of his own brother George, Duke of Clarence:

Plots have I laid, inductions dangerous,
By drunken prophecies, libels, and dreams,
To set my brother Clarence and the King
In deadly hate, the one against the other;
(I.i.32035)

Thus the main action of the early part of the play is plainly revealed. Richard plans to set the king against George, using the prophecy "that G / Of Edward's heirs the murderer shall be" (I.i.39-40). With the death of his brother he will be one step closer to the throne.

The first scene of Richard III contains three soliloquies, the dialogue exceeding soliloquy by only 103 lines. Most of these speeches are self-descriptive, although some preparation is made for future action by Richard's avowed hatred of Hastings and the outrageous proposal of marriage to Anne. Both Clarence and Hastings must die, but Clarence first. These obstacles removed,

. . . God take King Edward to his mercy,
And leave the world for me to bustle in!
For then I'll marry Warwick's youngest daughter
What though I killed her husband and her father?
The readiest way to make the wench amends
Is to become her husband and her father,
The which will I; not all so much for love

As for another secret close intent
 By marrying her which I must reach unto.
 (I.i.151-9)

In the three remaining scenes of Act I there are two soliloquies, one in the second, the other in the third scene. In the first, delivered just after the funeral procession of King Henry VI and the subsequent wooing of Anne, Richard rejoices in his success, emphasizing again his ability to disguise his evil intentions:

Was ever woman in this humour woo'd?
 Was ever woman in this humour won?
 I'll have her, but I will not keep her long.
 What! I, that killed her husband and his father,
 To take her in her heart's extrement hate,
 With curses in her mouth, tears in her eyes,
 The bleeding witness of my hatred by;
 Having God, her conscience, and these bars
 against me
 And I no friends to back my suit withal
 But the plain devil and dissembling looks,
 And yet to win her, all the world to nothing!
 (I.ii.228-38)

Making his villainy appear even more heinous, Richard continues, eulogizing Anne's husband, Edward, whom he had murdered:

Hath she forgot already that brave prince,
 Edward, her Lord, whom I some three months since
 Stabb'd in my angry mood at Tweksbury?
 A sweeter and a lovelier gentleman,
 Fram'd in the prodigality of nature,
 Young, valiant, wise, and, no doubt, right
 royal,
 The spacious world cannot again afford. (I.ii.240-46).

After this tribute to the Prince of Wales, Richard reveals at the end of the speech a humorous side of his personality. In the opening soliloquy of the play he had derided his malformed body:

But I, that am not shap'd for sportive tricks,
 Nor made to court an amorous looking-glass;
 I, that am rudely stamp'd and want love's
 majesty

To strut before a wanton ambling nymph;
 Why, I, in this weak piping time of peace,
 Have no delight to pass away the time,
 Unless to see my shadow in the sun
 And descant on mine own deformity.
 (I.i.14-17,24-27)

Now, after his triumph in winning the hand of Anne, he exclaims in ironic glee:

I'll be at charges for a looking-glass,
 And entertain a score or two of tailors
 To study fashions to adorn my body.
 Shine out, fair sun, till I have bought a glass,
 That I may see my shadow as I pass.
 (I.ii.256-58,263-64)

Richard is not deceiving himself here; he is speaking with tongue in cheek. Amused at Anne's gullibility, he is "at charges" for the same "looking-glass" which previously he was not "made to court."

The last soliloquy of Act I merely stresses Richard's Machiavellian role. He sets one enemy against another, thereby removing all guilt from himself. His dissembling nature, to which he has often previously referred, is epitomized in the final lines of the speech:

But then I sigh, and, with a piece of scripture,
 Tell them that God bids us do good for evil;
 And thus I clothe my naked villainy
 With odd old ends stol'n forth of holy writ,
 And seem a saint when most I play the devil.
 (I.iii.334-8)

Richard has no soliloquies in the second act. Those he utters in Acts III and IV are quite short and are important only as devices to make the dramatic action clear. He announces his preparations for the death of Clarence's two sons (III.v.106-9); he realizes the necessity of marrying his niece

Elizabeth to secure the crown he has evilly won (IV.ii.61-6); he summarizes the deaths he has accomplished and begins to fear the strength of Richmond (IV.iii.36-43).

The final soliloquy of the play is delivered just after Richard has been visited on the battle field by the ominous ghosts of those whom he has murdered. Awaking in a frenzy, he reveals at once his inner unrest:

Give me another horse! Bind up my wounds!
 Have mercy, Jesu!-Soft! I did but dream.
 O coward conscience, how dost thou afflict me!
 The lights burn blue. It is now dead midnight.
 Cold fearful drops stand on my trembling flesh.
 What! do I fear myself? There's none else by.
 Richard loves Richard; that is, I am I.
 Is there a murderer here? No. Yes, I am.
 (V.iii.177-84)

Richard continues in this jerky rhythm, trying in vain to soothe his conscience and deny his villainy:

Alack, I love myself. Wherefore? For any good
 That I myself have done unto myself?
 O, no! alas, I rather hate myself
 For hateful deeds committed by myself!
 I am a villain: yet I lie, I am not.
 Fool, of thyself speak well; fool, do not flatter.
 My conscience hath a thousand several tongues,
 And every tongue brings in a several tale,
 And every tale condemns me for a villain.
 (V.iii.187-95)

In the concluding lines of the speech Richard pitifully recognizes the loneliness to which evil has subjected him:

Perjury, perjury, in the high'st degree;
 Murder, stern murder, in the dir'st degree;
 All several sins, all us'd in each degree
 Throng to the bar, crying all, Guilty! guilty!
 I shall despair. There is no creature loves me,
 And if I die no soul shall pity me.
 Nay, wherefore should they, since that I myself
 Find in myself no pity to myself? (V.iii.196-203)

This soliloquy is not artificial self-description or the mere reporting of events. In its broken rhyme, its disasso-

ciated ideas, its repetition of pitiful pleas, it mirrors the soul of a man caught up in his own evil deeds. All Richard's other soliloquies are explanations offered to the audience.¹ In this instance, however, Shakespeare has succeeded in portraying an "inward drama." Richard, like Marlowe's Faustus, is undergoing for the audience an immediate and vital experience.

Iago

Othello (ca. 1604) was written about twelve years after Richard III and during this span of time Shakespeare had acquired a skill in more subtle characterization. It is true that both Iago and Richard announce their evil designs in soliloquy, but Iago is more a villain of impulse than of pre-conceived action. He forms his plots as the play progresses, with the result that the action of Othello is much less contrived than that of Richard III.

The play begins, not with a soliloquy frankly confessing villainy, as in Richard III, but with a conversation between Iago and Roderigo, the disappointed lover of Desdemona. Iago tells Roderigo of his jealousy of Cassio, who has been appointed lieutenant by Othello. For this appointment he hates both Cassio and the Moor. As the action progresses, Iago succeeds in pitting Roderigo against Othello, filling his ears with false hopes of winning Desdemona from her husband. But this design is too remote in Iago's eyes to repay the slight

¹ See Bradley, Shakespearean Tragedy, Meridian Books (Cleveland, 1961), p. 181.

given him by Othello: he wishes to gain the lieutenantcy or nothing.

Iago has no pre-conceived plan for his revenge; his villainous schemes spring from the situation of the moment. This habit of spontaneous plotting is evident in Iago's first soliloquy:

Cassio's a proper man: let me see now:
 To get his place and to plume up my will
 In double knavery--How, how?--Let's see:--
 After some time, to abuse Othello's ear
 That he is too familiar with his wife.
 He hath a person and a smooth dispose
 To be suspected, fram'd to make women false.
 The Moor is of a free and open nature,
 That thinks men honest that but seem to be so,
 And will as tenderly be led by th' nose
 As asses are.
 I have't. It is engend'ed. Hell and night
 Must bring this monstrous birth to the world's
 light. (I.iii.398-410)

Here is villainy not directly confessed, but indirectly portrayed. Iago is unsure of his plans: "How, how?--Let's see." The result is an initial suspense which is not present in Richard III.

The success of Iago's strategy is not merely reported; it is enacted in the presence of the audience. When Cassio shows extreme courtesy to Desdemona, Iago, contemplating the possibility of turning this show of affection to Cassio's detriment, says in an aside:

He takes her by the palm; ay, well said,
 whisper. With as little a web as this will
 I ensnare as great a fly as Cassio. Ay, smile
 upon her, do; I will gyve thee in thine own
 courtship.--You say true; 'tis so, indeed.
 --If such tricks as these strip you out of your
 lieutenantcy, it had been better you had not
 kiss'd your three fingers so oft, which now
 again you are most apt to play the sir in.
 Very good; well kiss'd! An excellent curtsy!
 (II.i.168-76)

Immediately after Cassio's affectionate embrace of Desdemona, Othello enters and kisses his wife. Again Iago comments in an aside:

O, you are well tun'd now!
But I'll set down the pegs that make this music,
As honest as I am. (II.i.202-4)

Both of these passages, directed to the audience in the device of the aside, reveal a mind spinning intrigue. They foreshadow future diabolical action, creating suspense more effectively than the artificial set speech.

All of Iago's soliloquies in Act II retain this quality of a calculating mind in action. In the soliloquy at the end of the first scene of this act he considers several possible intrigues, but concludes, " 'Tis here, but yet confus'd; / Knavery's plain face is never seen till us'd." (II.i.320-1). In scene three Iago decides to get Cassio drunk and, by creating a disturbance, to make him the object of Othello's anger, the Moor having strictly forbidden any revelry in Cyprus:

If I can fasten but one cup upon him,
With that which he hath drunk tonight already,
He'll be as full of quarrel and offence
As my young mistress' dog.

.
. . . Now, 'mongst this flock of drunkards
Am I to put our Cassio in some action
That may offend this isle. (II.iii.50-3, 61-3)

Iago's plan regarding Cassio succeeds and the latter is stripped of the lieutenantancy. He next counsels Cassio to have Desdemona appeal to her husband for a repeal. After Cassio's departure Iago muses on the possible ramifications of his strategy:

. . . How am I then a villain
To counsel Cassio to this parallel course

Directly to his good? Divinity of hell;
 When devils will the blackest sins out on,
 They do suggest at first with heavenly shows,
 As I do now; for whiles this honest fool
 Plies Desdemona to repair his fortune
 And she for him pleads strongly to the Moor,
 I'll pour this pestilence into his ear,
 That she repeals him for her body's lust;
 And by how much she strives to do him good,
 She shall undo her credit with the Moor.
 So will I turn her virtue into pitch,
 And out of her own goodness make the net
 That shall enmesh them all. (II.iii.354-68)

This soliloquy intensifies Iago's diabolical character.

Cassio has lost the lieutenantcy and, therefore, Iago has achieved his purpose. But now his villainy extends beyond Cassio to Desdemona; she is to be the means of Iago's vengeance on Othello. How this is to be accomplished is immediately related by Iago in the soliloquy which ends the scene:

. . . Two things are to be done:
 My wife must move for Cassio to her mistress
 I'll set her on;
 Myself awhile to draw the Moor apart,
 And bring him jump when he may Cassio find
 Soliciting his wife. Ay, that's the way;
 Dull not device by coldness and delay.
 (II.iii.388-94)

By the end of Act II Iago's plans are fairly well formed: Cassio's appeal to Desdemona is to appear as illicit love. From this point on, Iago's soliloquies have a definiteness which increases tension and speeds the action of the play so that the device as it is used in Othello has an entirely different function from that of the set expository type in Richard III.

The soliloquies of Iago in Acts III and IV prepare for the sudden frenzied jealousy of Othello. The Moor demands "ocular proof" of Desdemona's unfaithfulness and Iago in-

geniously sets up the handkerchief plot:

I will in Cassio's lodging lose this napkin,
 And let him find it. Trifles light as air
 Are to the jealous confirmations strong
 As proofs of holy writ; this may do something.
 The Moor already changes with my poison.
 (III.iii.321-5)

Othello sees Desdemona's handkerchief in Cassio's possession and falls into a trance, distraughtly muttering, "Is't possible?--Confess--handkerchief!--O devil" (IV.i.44). Iago, triumphant in his success, looks down at the once so even-tempered Moor and cries:

Work on,
 My medicine, work! Thus credulous fools are
 caught;
 And many worthy and chaste dames even thus,
 All guiltless, meet reproach (IV.i.45-48)

Now only one stratagem remains in Iago's ever-expanding revenge on Othello. The Moor is almost completely ensnared. To secure his victory, to increase the rage of Othello beyond all possible appeasement, Iago, at the approach of Cassio, has Othello hide himself, and announces his plan:

Now will I question Cassio of Bianca,
 A housewife that by selling her desires
 Buys herself bread and clothes. It is a creature
 That dotes on Cassio, as 'tis the strumpet's
 plague
 To beguile many and be beguil'd by one.
 He, when he hears of her, cannot refrain
 From the excess of laughter. (IV.i.94-100)

When Cassio enters, Iago urges him to speak of the sexual pleasures he has had with Bianca. Othello, thinking that Cassio is talking about Desdemona, is overcome with rage. Thus Iago has achieved his goal. In the final scenes of the play Othello unmercifully lashes out at Desdemona, repeating the words "impu-

dent strumpet" and "whore." He finally vents his anger by suffocating Desdemona in her bed.

Shakespeare's development in the use of soliloquy is evident in the contrast between Richard III and Othello. There is a subtlety of characterization in the latter play: Iago is less a self-described villain and more of a diabolical force revealed in action. His insidious plots are not pre-fabricated as are those of Richard III; he spins them as the play advances. This effect of evil in the process of formation adds a certain "plausibility" to the action.² Richard's victims seem like mere puppets on a string, whereas we follow the catastrophe of Othello with every new contrivance of Iago, the "super-villain."

Edmund

Shakespeare wrote King Lear (1605-6) shortly after Othello. That he had Iago in mind when creating Edmund is evident from the similarity of their roles. Iago's soliloquies, however, are more numerous than Edmund's because they are an important factor in understanding the main action of the play. Edmund, being a character of the sub-plot, has less chance for self-description and informative comments upon the dramatic action, although his role in the tragedy does gain importance with the fusion of the two plots. This difference taken into consideration, the roles of the two villains are

² See E. E. Stoll, Othello: An Historical and Comparative Study (Minneapolis, 1915), pp. 5-6.

identical and Edmund could be called a counterpart of Iago.

Edmund introduces the sub-plot (that of Gloucester and his two sons) in a soliloquy at the beginning of the second scene of Act I. The function of this soliloquy is purely expository, Edmund first despising his position as the bastard son:

Thou, Nature, art my goddess; to thy law
 My services are bound. Wherefore should I
 Stand in the plague of custom, and permit
 The curiosity of nations to deprive me,
 For that I am some twelve or fourteen moon-
 shines
 Lag of a brother? Why bastard? Wherefore
 base?
 When my dimensions are as well compact,
 My mind as generous, and my shape as true
 As honest madam's issue? Why brand they us
 With base? with business? bastardy? base? base?
 (I.ii.1-10)

Edmund continues, announcing the letter plot against his brother Edgar and the reasons for it:

 Well, then,
 Legitimate Edgar, I must have your land.
 Our father's love is to the bastard Edmund
 As to th' legitimate. Fine word, "legitimate!"
 Well, my legitimate, if this letter speed
 And my invention thrive, Edmund the base
 Shall top th' legitimate. I grow; I prosper.
 Now, gods, stand up for bastards. (I.ii.15-22)

Edmund's first soliloquy clearly prepares for the future secondary action of the play. Since he is a "natural" son he has made Nature his goddess. Jealous of the inheritance the "legitimate" Edgar is to receive, he has forged a letter which will turn Gloucester against his first-born son. This soliloquy parallels Iago's denouncement of Cassio's preferment and his reasons for hating Othello. Here Edmund, like Iago, imparts information absolutely necessary for an understanding of the

dramatic motivation for his villainy.

After Gloucester becomes incensed against his elder son, Edmund soliloquizes on the superstitious astrological reasons his father has offered for Edgar's reversal:

This is the excellent foppery of the world,
that, when we are sick in fortune,--often the
surfeits of our own behaviour,--we make guilty
of our disasters the sun, the moon, and stars,
as if we were villains on necessity, fools by
heavenly compulsion (I. ii.128-32)

Edmund denounces such superstitious notions with the terse rebuttal:

. . . Fut! I should have been that
I am, had the maidenliest star in the
firmament twinkled on my bastardizing.
(I.ii.143-5)

This soliloquy is very important for it is the first instance of a thematic statement in the soliloquies of Shakespeare's villains. The evil which is to ensue in both the main and the sub-plot is caused by the perverse natures of Goneril, Regan and Edmund; the stars or fates are not to blame. Edmund is the first character in the play to recognize the true source of evil--in his case, himself. Later in the play, Gloucester gives a fatalistic interpretation of his misfortunes: "As flies to wanton boys, are we to th' gods, / They kill us for their sport" (IV.i.38-39), and before his attempted suicide, he reiterates his superstitious notions about the presence of evil in the world:

O you mighty gods!
This world I do renounce, and in your sights
Shake patiently my great affliction off.
If I could bear it longer, and not fall
To quarrel with your great opposeless wills,
My snuff and loathed part of nature should
Burn itself out (IV.vi.34-40)

But Gloucester, mysteriously saved, as he thinks, from suicide, and reunited with Lear, renounces this fatalism with the phrases, "You ever-gentle gods" (IV.vi.221) and, a few lines later, "The bounty and the benison of Heaven" (l. 230). The source of evil in the play is to be found not in the firmament, as Gloucester initially thinks, but in particular persons. This fact Edmund stresses in soliloquy at the outset of the tragedy; Gloucester only comes to realize it through the progress of his suffering.

Edmund's last soliloquy in the first act gives information necessary for understanding Gloucester's quick decision against Edgar and Edgar's passive acceptance of it:

A credulous father and a brother noble,
Whose nature is so far from doing harms
That he suspects none; on whose foolish honesty
My practices ride easy (I.ii.195-200)

Iago's soliloquy about Othello's "free and open nature, that thinks men honest that but seem to be so" made the subsequent dramatic action of Othello more plausible. Similarly, Edmund's comments about his "credulous father" and "brother noble" are the clue to the success of his villainy.

In the second act Edmund has only one soliloquy, which, like those of Iago, portrays a mind formulating a plot, not merely reporting pre-conceived designs. As Edmund contrives to set the Duke of Cornwall against Edgar and thus secure the inheritance, the movement of his diabolical thoughts is reflected in the progression from the comparative to the superlative form of the adjective:

The Duke be here to-night? The better! best!
This weaves itself perforce into my business.
My father hath set guard to take my brother;

And I have one thing, of a queasy question,
Which I must act. Briefness and fortune, work!
(II.i.16-20)

The impression of spontaneous plotting which this soliloquy conveys is essential to the convincing presentation of Edmund's villainy.

There are two more soliloquies in the play; both emphasize Edmund's role as the Machiavellian villain. Gloucester tells Edmund that he has given aid to the raving Lear and received a letter regarding the arrival of Cordelia and the French army. Edmund, turning on his father as he had on his brother, foreshadows in soliloquy the cruel treatment Gloucester is to receive at the hands of Cornwall:

This courtesy, forbid thee, shall the Duke
Instantly know; and of that letter too.
This seems a fair deserving, and must draw me
That which my father loses; no less than all.
The younger rises when the old doth fall.
(III.iii.22-26)

Edmund, not satisfied with the dukedom of Gloucester and the blinding of his father, decides to play Goneril against Regan and thereby win all:

To both these sisters have I sworn my love.
Each jealous of the other as the stung
Are of the adder. Which of them shall I take?
Both? one? or neither? Neither can be enjoyed,
If both remain alive. To take the widow
Exasperates, makes mad her sister Goneril;
And hardly shall I carry out my side,
Her husband being alive. Now then we'll use
His countenance for the battle; which being done,
Let her who would be rid of him devise
His speedy taking off (V.i.55-65)

In the closing lines of this final soliloquy Edmund completes his villainy by planning to prevent Albany's decision of amnesty for Lear and Cordelia:

UNIVERSITY OF WINDSOR LIBRARY

. . . As for the mercy
 Which he extends to Lear and Cordelia,
 The battle done, and they within our power,
 Shall never see his pardon; for my state
 Stands on me to defend, not to debate.
 (V.i.65-69)

Edmund is thus the counterpart of the villainous Iago. Both are extreme Machiavellians: their insidious designs do not cease once their first objectives have been attained; obsessed with evil, they are not satisfied except with a total destruction of good. Iago gains the lieutenancy, but rejoices only in Othello's murder of Desdemona. Edmund acquires the dukedom, but is content only with the deaths of Goneril and Regan and the hanging of Cordelia.

In Othello and King Lear Shakespeare has portrayed villainy in the extreme and with greater skill than in Richard III where soliloquy is a mechanical device, the protagonist frankly declaring his wickedness in artificial set speeches. Iago and Edmund have no need to confess their villainy; each reveals through soliloquy his diabolical nature and his calculated scheming. Some ten years intervened between the composition of Richard III and Othello and King Lear. The more subtle portrayal of Iago and Edmund is evidence of Shakespeare's development in the use of soliloquy.

66372

CHAPTER III

HEIGHTENED PATHOS

Another function of soliloquy in the tragedies, different from that of self-explanation and exposition, is the creation of pathos throughout the early scenes and the intensification of that pathos in the concluding action. Romeo and Juliet, Richard II and King Lear furnish excellent examples of this particular use of the device. Romeo and Juliet's soliloquies and the reveries or monologues of Richard II and Lear stress the significance of the immediate situation and have a cumulative effect in augmenting the tragic outcome of the denouement.

Romeo and Juliet

Romeo and Juliet (1594-95), as the Prologue to Act I states, is the story of

A pair of star-cross'd lovers . . . ;
Whose misadventur'd piteous overthrows
Doth with their death bury their parents'
strife. (vv.6-8)

"Star-cross'd"--the lovers meet their death, not through a "fatal flaw" in either of them, but because of the unlucky circumstances connected with their love. They are the hapless victims of a family feud and unpredictable chance. For these reasons their story is "piteous," and the play is pathetic rather than tragic in the strict classical sense.

When Shakespeare wrote Romeo and Juliet he was, according to G. B. Harrison, "more interested in fine writing than in drama."¹ Hence, combined with the pathetic element, there is a more lyrical vitality than in the mature tragedies. This extravagant poetic quality is especially evident in the soliloquies wherein Romeo and Juliet speak about their love for each other. These passages create an emotional intensity superior to that in any of the earlier tragedies.

The exquisite poetry which Romeo utters at the first sight of Juliet has the effect of isolating him from the other characters on the stage and thus sets the scene for their first meeting. The images of light he uses in describing her are expressive of his own joy as well as the beauty of Juliet:

O, she doth teach the torches to burn bright!
 It seems she doth hang upon the cheek of night
 As a rich jewel in an Ethiop's ear;
 Beauty too rich for use, for earth too dear!
 (I.v.46-51)

The words which the pair first speak to one another are in the form of a sonnet filled with religious "conceits" (I.v.95-108). Romeo compares his lips to "two blushing pilgrims" come to a "holy shrine"; Juliet gently chides Romeo for his "mannerly devotion," telling him that pilgrims have "lips that they must use in prayer." Elaborating the conceit for the remainder of the sonnet, they finally kiss, Romeo taking his "prayer's effect," Juliet commenting that he kisses "by the book". The stilted language of this passage seems to emphasize the

¹ Introducing Shakespeare (Penguin Books, 1959), p. 121.

superficialty of this mutual attraction. Such diction disappears when their love has matured through trials and separation.

The joy of their meeting, however, is suddenly changed to dismay. When Romeo finds out that Juliet is a Capulet, he sorrowfully comments, "Is she a Capulet? - O dear account! My life is my foe's debt" (I.v.119-20). Juliet echoes Romeo's woe, using more fatalistic terms:

My only love sprung from my only hate!
 Too early seen unknown, and known too late!
 Prodigious birth of love it is to me
 That I must love a loathed enemy. (I.v.140-43)

Similar emotional shifts occur several times throughout the play, each time the lovers appearing to be bound more tightly by the fickleness of fate.

The elaborate metaphors of Romeo's soliloquy before the balcony scene express his elation at catching a second glimpse of Juliet:

But, soft! What light through yonder window
 breaks?
 It is the east, and Juliet is the sun.
 Arise, fair sun, and kill the envious moon,
 Who is already sick and pale with grief
 That thou, her maid, art far more fair than she.
 (II.i.1-5)

But immediately after his utterance of joy, Juliet begins her lament,

O Romeo, Romeo! wherefore art thou Romeo?
 Deny thy father and refuse thy name;
 Or, if thou wilt not, be but sworn my love,
 And I'll no longer be a Capulet. (II.ii.33-36)

Here, again, are happiness and sorrow contrasted side by side. The audience is reminded continually of the obstacles to the lover's happiness owing to the hostility between their families.

Juliet's anxiety about the plans for the secret marriage is reflected in her soliloquy as she awaits the tardy Nurse.

It begins:

The clock struck nine when I did send the nurse;
 In half an hour she promis'd to return.
 Perchance she cannot meet him: that's not so.
 O she's lame! (II.v.1-4)

The tense atmosphere is relaxed with the success of the marriage plans, but the contentment of the lovers is short-lived. As Juliet is watching for the arrival of Romeo on their wedding night, unaware that he has been sentenced to banishment, she soliloquizes in the form of an epithalamium, a prelude to the consummation of their love (III.ii.1-31). When she is told of Romeo's doom, her previous joy is replaced by almost utter despair:

"Romeo is banished," to speak that word,
 Is father, mother, Tybalt, Romeo, Juliet,
 All slain, all dead. "Romeo is banished!"
 There is no end, no limit, measure, bound,
 In that word's death; no words can that woe
 sound. (III.ii.122-26)

The contrast between Juliet's love prelude and the consequences of Romeo's revenge increases the pathos of the lovers' situation.

Further sympathy is directed to Juliet in the potion speech which dramatically portrays her fear of the Friar's device:

I have a faint cold fear thrills through my veins,
 That almost freezes up the heat of life.

 How if, when I am laid into the tomb,
 I wake before the time that Romeo
 Come to redeem me? There's a fearful point!
 Shall I not then be stifled in the vault,
 To whose foul mouth no healthsome air breathes in,
 And there die strangled ere my Romeo comes?
 (IV.iii.15-16,30-35)

Casting aside all doubts, however, Juliet takes the potion: "Romeo I come! This do I drink to thee" (IV.iii.58). According to John Lawlor, this soliloquy is "at once the test and vindication of her maturity."²

Romeo's soliloquy at the beginning of Act V ironically foreshadows the news of Juliet's "death." Walking the streets of Mantua, he muses about a recent favorable dream:

If I may trust the flattering truth of sleep
My dreams presage some joyous news at hand.
My bosom's lord sits lightly in his throne,
And all this day an unaccustom'd spirit
Lifts me above the ground with cheerful
thoughts. (V.i.1-5)

His joy dispelled by Balthasar's inaccurate news, Romeo is determined to join Juliet in death, "Well, Juliet, I will lie with thee tonight" (V.i.34). His decision creates a dramatic tension which is resolved only by the catastrophe.

In Act V occur the death speeches of Romeo and Juliet. The pathos of Romeo's soliloquy is extreme. Upon entering the tomb to drink the poison, he looks for the last time on the "dead" Juliet:

O my love! my wife!
Death, that hath suck'd the honey of thy breath
Hath had no power yet upon thy beauty.
Thou art not conquer'd; beauty's ensign yet
Is crimson in thy lips and in thy cheeks,
And death's pale flag is not advanced there.
(V.iii.91-96)

Juliet's soliloquy is a mournful wish to share her lover's means of death:

² "Romeo and Juliet," in Early Shakespeare (Stratford-upon-Avon Studies 3), ed. John Russel Brown and Bernard Harris (London, 1961), p. 134.

What's here? A cup, clos'd in my true love's hand?
 Poison, I see, hath been his timeless end.
 O churl! drunk all and left no friendly drop
 To help me after? I will kiss thy lips;
 Haply some poison yet doth hang on them,
 To make me die with a restorative. (V.iii.160-66)

In desperation she takes Romeo's dagger and stabs herself: "O happy dagger! / This is thy sheath; there rust and let me die" (V.iii.169-70).

The pathos of the abrupt conclusion is perhaps Shakespeare's greatest achievement in the play. Within five days Romeo and Juliet have met, fallen in love, and committed suicide. Because of a family feud and chance circumstances they were prevented from completely fulfilling their love. The soliloquies, in augmenting the intensity of their short-lived love and in stressing the hopelessness of their situation, cumulate to heighten the pathos of the swift termination of their love in death.

Richard II

Richard II (1595) depicts the fall of a king, a fall due more to Richard's own character than to the power of the usurping Bolingbroke. Richard possesses an extremely reflective and poetic nature: he is more concerned with self-analysis and the power of words than with the welfare of England. When he is wearing the crown, he glories in his opportunity to play a part; when he is afraid of losing the crown, he indulges in self-pity and embraces despair. All of Richard's speeches of self-analysis, though all but one are uttered in the presence of other characters, have a detached quality similar to the soliloquy. These "mono-

logues" effectively characterize Richard before his deposition and gain for him the sympathy of the audience in his ruin.

Richard's delight in the ritual of power is evident in his handling of the political hostility between Bolingbroke and Mowbray. When neither of the dukes can be appeased, Richard, "equating the word of authority with authority itself,"³ thus addresses them:

We were not born to sue, but to command;
Which since we cannot do to make you friends,
Be ready, as your lives shall answer it,
At Coventry, upon St. Lambert's day.
There shall your swords and lances arbitrate
The swelling difference of your settled hate.
(I.i.196-201)

During the lists at Coventry, Richard's tendency to revel in the power of words is evident in his announcement to Bolingbroke and Mowbray:

Draw near
And list with what our council we have done.
For that our kingdom's earth should not be
soil'd
With that dear blood which it hath fostered;
And for our eyes do hate the dire aspect
Of civil wounds plough'd up with neighbors'
sword;
Therefore we banish you our territories.
(I.iii.123-28.143)

It is important to note that seventeen lines intervene between the beginning of Richard's speech and its import. Here is an example of poetic verbiage rivalling even that of Richard III.

The passage which Richard speaks when landing in England reflects his propensity to languish in sorrow:

³ R. F. Hill, "Dramatic Techniques and Interpretation in Richard III," in Early Shakespeare, p. 104.

I weep for joy
 To stand upon my kingdom once again.
 Dear earth, I do salute thee with my hand,
 Though rebels wound thee with their horses'
 hoofs.

As a long-parted mother with her child
 Plays fondly with her tears and smiles in meeting,
 So, weeping, smiling, greet I thee, my earth,
 And do these favours with my royal hands.

(III.ii.4-11)

Richard continues in this hyperbolic poetic vein, denouncing Bolingbroke and his allies:

Feed not thy sovereign's foe, my gentle earth,
 Nor with thy sweets comfort his revenous senses;
 But let thy spiders, that suck up thy venom
 And heavy-gaited toads lie in their way,
 Doing annoyance to their treacherous feet
 Which with usurping steps do trample thee.

(III.ii.12-17)

Fearing Bolingbroke's usurpation of the throne, Richard stresses (more for his own comfort than to hold allegiance of his few remaining friends) his divine right to the crown. The following lines of this monologue seem aimed at winning the sympathy of the Elizabethan audience, schooled as they were in the theory of the divine right of kingship:

Not all the water in the rough rude sea
 Can wash the balm off from an anointed king;
 The breath of worldly men cannot depose
 The deputy elected by the Lord. (III.ii.54-57)

But such considerations fail to bring Richard any comfort and he soon lapses into despair:

Let's talk of graves, of worms, and epitaphs;
 Make dust our paper and with rainy eyes
 Write sorrow on the bosom of the earth.

Our lands, our lives, and all are Bolingbroke's
 And nothing can we call our own but death,
 And that small model of the barren earth
 Which serves as paste and cover to our bones.

(III.ii.145-471151-54)

A passage further on in the same scene gains a greater degree

of sympathy for Richard, for he realizes that, though he is a king, he is nevertheless essentially like other men:

Cover your heads, and mock not flesh and blood
 With solemn reverence. Throw away respect,
 Tradition, form, and ceremonious duty;
 For you have but mistook me all this while.
 I live with bread like you, feel want,
 Taste grief, need friends: subjected thus,
 How can you say to me that I am a king?
 (III.ii.171-77)

Richard's long monologue of humble submission to Bolingbroke intensifies the pathetic situation to which he is being reduced:

What must the King do now? Must he submit?
 The king shall do it. Must he be depos'd?
 The king shall be contented. Must he lose
 The name of king? O' God's name, let it go.
 (III.iii.143-46)

Richard goes on to list the exchanges he will make for his royal belongings:

I'll give my jewels for a set of beads,
 My gorgeous palace for a hermitage,
 My gay apparel for an almsman's gown,

 My large kingdom for a little grave,
 A little grave, an obscure grave;
 Or I'll be buried in the King's highway,
 Some way of common trade, where subject's
 feet
 May hourly trample on their sovereign's head;
 For on my heart they tread now whilst I live,
 And buried once, why not upon my head?
 (III.iii.147-49,154-60)

The poverty and the insignificant burial upon which he here muses ironically foreshadow his imprisonment and cruel murder in the Tower of Pomfret Castle.

The lengthy, detached speeches of Richard during the deposition scene reflect his extreme sorrow and despair. In anguish he compares himself to the betrayed Christ:

Give sorrow leave a while to tutor me
 To this submission. Yet I well remember
 The favours of these men. Were they not mine?
 Did they not sometime cry, "All hail!" to me?
 So Judas did to Christ; but He in twelve,
 Found truth in all but one; I, in twelve
 thousand, none. (IV.i.166-71)

In a highly emotional manner and in words charged with grief
 he finally forfeits the crown:

Now mark me, how I will undo myself.
 I give this heavy weight from off my head
 And this unwieldy sceptre from my hand,
 The pride of kingly sway from out my heart.
 With mine own tears I wash away my balm,
 With mine own hands I give away my crown,
 With mine own tongue deny my sacred state,
 With mine own breath release my duteous oaths.
 (IV.i.203-10)

Once Richard has been deposed he loses all control of
 his emotions and gives way to self-pity and despair. Calling
 for a mirror, he comments upon his reflection in the glass:

No deeper wrinkles yet? Hath sorrow struck
 So many blows upon this face of mine,
 And made no deeper wounds? O flatt'ring glass,
 Like to my followers in prosperity,
 Thou dost beguile me! Was this face the face
 That every day under his household roof
 Did keep ten thousand men? Was this the face
 That, like the sun, did make beholders wink?
 Is this the face which fac'd so many follies,
 That was at last out-fac'd by Bolingbroke?
 (IV.i.277-86)

When Richard is at last conducted to the prison in Pomfret
 Castle, the Abbot concludes the deposition scene with the
 terse but comprehensive comment, "A woeful pageant have we here
 beheld" (IV.i.321).

After the departure of the Queen for France, Richard is
 isolated in the Tower and, as a result of the inner pressure
 of his grief, begins to soliloquize about his prison cell. For

thirty lines he "hammers out" a comparison of the prison to the world and concludes that he has become "nothing":

Thus play I in one person many people,
 And none contented. Sometimes am I king;
 The treasons make me with myself a beggar;
 And so I am. Then crushing penury
 Persuades me I was better when a king;
 Then am I king'd again: and by and by
 Think that I am unking'd by Bolingbroke,
 And straight am nothing. (V.v.31-38)

Elaborately comparing himself to a clock, his time "running on in Bolingbroke's joy," Richard ends the soliloquy with the pathetic, self-pitying comment, ". . . and love to Richard / Is a strange brooch in this all-hating world" (V.v.65-66).

Just before he is murdered, Richard learns that Bolingbroke has ridden his favorite horse. It is a small matter, but to Richard, who has been stripped of his crown and royal dignity, it is the final phase of his downfall. The simple language and the almost childlike concern for a once prized possession make his monologue a striking contrast to the lack of restraint in his previous passages of lyric self-expression:

So proud that Bolingbroke was on his back!
 That jade hath eat bread from my royal hand;
 This hand that made him proud with clapping him.
 Would he not stumble? Would he not fall down,
 Since pride must have a fall, and break the neck
 Of that proud man that did usurp his back?
 Forgiveness, horse! Why do I rail on thee,
 Since thou, created to be aw'd by man,
 Wast born to bear? I was not made a horse;
 And yet I bear a burden like an ass,
 Spurr'd, gall'd, and tir'd by jauncing
 Bolingbroke. (V.v.84-94)

Nowhere in the play does Shakespeare disguise Richard's weakness of character. His pompous show of authority and his misrule are revealed in the early scenes; his self-indulgence in pity and despair become evident in the scene of his depo-

sition. These weaknesses, however, are not so emphasized as to deny him sympathy or to obscure his tragedy. His initial extravagant self-analyses may hinder the empathy necessary for a true tragic experience.⁴ But the grief expressed in the speeches after the deposition and during the prison scene overrides this gap, as it were, and heightens the pathos of Richard's fall.

Lear

King Lear's speeches during the storm scenes have a detached quality⁵ similar to Richard II's self-descriptive reveries. Having been turned out of doors by Goneril and Regan, Lear is forced to wander through the countryside and to seek shelter in a miserable hut. Emotionally overburdened with the thought of his daughter's ingratitude, his "wits begin to turn" and his distracted laments intensify the pathetic condition to which he has been subjected.

Lear's first monologue effectively creates the stormy atmosphere of the barren heath:

Blow, winds, and crack your cheeks! Rage!
 Blow!
 You cataracts and hurricanes, spout
 Till you have drench'd our steeples, drown'd the
 cooks!
 You sulph'rous and thought-executing fires,
 Vaunt-couriers of oak-cleaving thunderbols,
 Since my white head! (III.ii.1-6)

Continuing in the same distraught manner, he parallels the

⁴ See Hill, "Dramatic Techniques and Interpretation in Richard II," pp. 116-17.

⁵ See M. C. Bradbrook, Themes and Conventions of Elizabethan Tragedy (Cambridge, 1960), p. 133.

cruelty of the storm to that of his daughters:

Rumble thy bellyful! Spit, fire! Spout rain!
Nor rain, wind, thunder, fire are my daughters.
I tax you not, you elements, with unkindness;
I never gave you kingdom, call'd you children.

· · · · ·
But yet I call you servile ministers,
That will with two pernicious daughters join
Your high-engender'd battles 'gainst a head
So old and while as this. Oh! Oh! 'tis foul!
(III.ii.14-17,21-24)

And after calling upon the tempest to punish perverse human nature (III.ii.49-58), Lear concludes this first set of laments with a terse comment about his own undeserved misery, "I am a man / More sinn'd against than sinning" (III.ii.58-59).

Unable to regain his emotional balance, Lear frantically tears off his clothes and dresses himself in wild flowers. At this point in the tragedy (IV.vi.) his monologues, disconnected prose rather than his customary lyric expression, emphasize his abject mental condition:

That fellow handles his bow like a crow-keeper;
draw me a clothier's yard. Look, look, a
mouse! Peace, peace! This piece of toasted
cheese will do't. There's my gauntlet; I'll
prove it on a giant. Bring up the brown bills.
O, well flown, bird! I'the clout! Hewgh!
Give the word. (IV.vi.87-93)

Lear's final ravings are a frenzied comment on the kingly authority he once possessed. Claiming that he is still "every inch a king," he muses upon the previous pardons that he has granted. But now he himself is without succour and his once obedient subjects no longer "quake" when he "does stare." Rather, he is made to "quake" because of the "filial ingratitude" of his "monstrous daughters." Lear concludes his ravings on the heath by pitifully contrasting his lack of authority to the bark

of a dog:

Thou hast seen a farmer's dog bark at a
 beggar? And the creature run from the cur?
 There thou mightst behold the great image of
 authority: a dog's obey'd in office.
 (IV.vi.159-62)

The most heart-rending of Lear's monologues occur in the
 last scene of the play. Holding the body of Cordelia in his
 arms, he cries in anguish:

She's gone for ever!
 I know when one is dead, and when one lives;
 She's dead as earth. (V.iii.259-61)

In desperation, he looks twice for a sign of life in her:

Lend me a looking-glass;
 If that her breath will mist or stain the stone,
 Why, then she lives. (V.iii.261-63)

This feather stirs; she lives! If it be so
 It is a chance which does redeem all sorrows,
 That ever I have felt. (V.iii.265-67)

He thinks he hears her speak, and exclaims: "Cordelia, Cor-
 delia! stay a little. Ha! / What is't thou say'st?" (V.iii.271-
 272). Then he consoles himself with the tender comment, "Her
 voice was ever soft, / Gentle, and low: an excellent thing in
 woman" (V.iii.272-73).

Just before his death Lear completes the lament over Cor-
 delia's body, his torment being evident in the repetition of
 his woeful words:

And my poor fool⁶ is hanged! No, no, no life!
 Why should a dog, a horse, a rat, have life,
 And thou no breath at all? Thou'lt come no more,
 Never, never, never, never, never! (V.iii.305-8)

⁶ In this instance, "fool" is generally considered to
 refer to Cordelia.

He dies with the body of Cordelia in his arms, still hoping in vain that she is alive: "Do you see this? Look on her, look, her lips, / Look there, look there" (V.iii.310-11).

Although there is pathos in Romeo and Juliet, Richard II and King Lear, there is a difference in degree. Because of the rhetorical quality of some of Richard's speeches, the spectators remain somewhat detached from him and are not able to experience fully his catastrophe. This lack of identification between audience and characters is less evident in Romeo and Juliet, owing to the emotional force of their lyrical expressions of love. Lear's calamity, however, becomes most immediate because his monologues graphically portray his intense grief and almost utter despair.

CHAPTER IV

CONFLICTS OF MIND

We have considered the dramatic effect of the soliloquy when used by an extremely sensitive and reflective character like Richard II. In varying degrees, Brutus, Hamlet and Macbeth also reveal these psychological traits. Their soliloquies, however, do not so much increase the pathos of their situations as portray inner conflicts caused by excessive strain.

Brutus

Brutus' first soliloquy in Julius Caesar (1599) reflects the mental turmoil induced by Cassius' conversation about Caesar's ambition for a crown. The speech is a projection of the struggle between the "noble" Roman's gentle nature and his patriotic ideals. It begins with the resolution, "It must be by his death," which, however, is followed immediately by the reflection

and for my part,
I know no personal cause to spurn at him
But for the general. (II.i.10-12)

The internal debate continues as Brutus considers how the crown might change Caesar's nature:

Crown him? That--
And then, I grant, we put a sting in him
That at his will he may do danger with.
Th' abuse of greatness is when it disjoins
Remorse from power; (II.i.15-19)

But to these thoughts he again must add in all honesty,

and to speak truth of Caesar,
I have not known when his affections sway'd
More than his reason. (II.i.19-21)

The supposed threat to Rome, however, lessens the weight of his personal considerations and he begins to calculate the dangers of a politically ambitious man to the state:

But 'tis a common proof
That lowliness is young Ambition's ladder,
Whereto the climber-upper turns his face;
But when he once attains the upmost round,
He then unto the ladder turns his back,
Looks in the clouds, scorning the base degrees
By which he did ascend. (II.i.21-27)

Upon this reasoning Brutus bases his resolve, "So Ceasar may;
/ Then, lest he may, prevent" (II.i.27-28).

In the closing lines of the first soliloquy the patriot seems to rationalize his conflict. Realizing that "the quarrel will bear no colour" because of Caesar's present nature, he decides that he must therefore

Fashion it thus: that what he is, augmented,
Would run to these and these extremities;
And therefore think him as a serpent's egg
Which, hatch'd, would, as his kind, grow
 mischievous,
And kill in the shell. (II.i.30-34)

Brutus' great concern for the welfare of Rome becomes more evident as he soliloquizes about Cassius' message urging him to join the conspiracy:

Shall Rome stand under one man's awe? What,
 Rome?
My ancestors did from the streets of Rome
The Tarquin drive when he was call'd a king.
"Speak, strike, redress!" Am I entreated
To speak and strike? O Rome, I make thee promise
If the redress will follow, thou receivest
Thy full petition at the hand of Brutus!
 (II.i.52-58)

So Cassius has successfully baited the Roman's patriotic pride and convinced him of the necessity and integrity of their cause.

The above resolution, however, brings little peace of mind. As the conspirators are knocking at the door, Brutus reflects upon his decision, his thoughts revealing the now augmented conflict within him:

Between the acting of a dreadful thing
And the first motion, all the interim is
Like a phantasma or a hideous dream.
The Genius and the mortal instruments
Are then in council; and the state of man,
Like to a little kingdom, suffers then
The nature of an insurrection. (II.i.63-69)

It is significant that this tragically patriotic character compares the turmoil caused when the mind (Genius) deliberates over the deadly means (mortal instruments) at its disposal, to a rebellion within a kingdom. His own state of unrest foreshadows the upheaval in Rome after the assassination and the funeral oration of Antony.

Brutus has two more soliloquies in the play, one before, the other after the murder of Caesar. In the first he contrasts his uneasiness about the planned assassination to the peaceful sleep of Lucius, his servant:

Enjoy the honey-heavy dew of slumber.
Thou has no figures nor no fantasies
Which busy care draws in the brains of men;
Therefore thou sleep'st so sound. (II.i.229-33)

The second, uttered just before the appearance of Caesar's ghost, is an apostrophe to sleep which has robbed Brutus of the soothing music of Lucius' instrument:

O murd'rous slumber,
Lay'st thou thy leaden mace upon my boy,
That plays thee music? (IV.iii.267-70)

It is interesting to note that both Hamlet and Macbeth contrast their mental conflicts to the peace of sleep. In the "To be or not to be" soliloquy the Dane equates sleep with death which rids man of "The heart-ache and the thousand natural shocks / That flesh is heir to" (III.i.62-63). Macbeth, after murdering Duncan, thinks he hears a voice cry, "Sleep no more! / Macbeth does murder sleep" (II.ii.35-36) and comments:

Sleep that knits up the ravell'd sleeve of care,
The death of each day's life, sore labour's bath,
Balm of hurt minds, great nature's second course,
Chief nourisher in life's feast. (II.ii.37-40)

Such contrasts of sleep and emotional disturbance are a recurrent theme in Shakespearean tragedy. Richard III is plagued in his rest by the ghosts of those he has murdered, and Lady Macbeth's sleep-walking scene is a classic example of a mind distraught by the remorse of conscience.

Several critics have pointed out an affinity between Brutus and Hamlet.¹ Both are of a sensitive and idealistic nature and both manifest their internal conflicts. The Roman's soliloquies, however, are not as subjective as those of the Dane, and have a rhetorical quality which mitigates the effective portrayal of his turmoil. Hamlet's speeches of self-explanation,

¹ See, among others, A. C. Bradley, Shakespearean Tragedy, Meridian Books (Cleveland, 1961), p. 72; Harley Granville-Barker, "Shakespeare's Dramatic Art," in A Companion to Shakespeare Studies, ed. H. Granville-Barker and G. B. Harrison, Doubleday Anchor Books (Garden City, N.Y., 1960), p. 70; and Irving T. Richards, "Meaning of Hamlet's 'To be or not to be,'" PMLA, XLVIII (September, 1933), 742.

on the other hand, are the expression of "thought in the process of formation,"² not merely an ornate statement or report of inner tension. (A comparison of Brutus' insurrection" speech [I.i.61-69] and Hamlet's first reproach [II.ii.576-635] is an indication of this distinction.) In Hamlet (1600-1) Shakespeare achieved for the first time the dramatic presentation of a mind charged with strife and anguish.³

Hamlet

Hamlet's first soliloquy reveals the depth of misery and despair into which the hasty and "incestuous" marriage of his mother has plunged him. The speech begins with a disgust for life and a longing for death so intense that nothing stands between the Prince and suicide except religious fear:

O, that this too too solid⁴ flesh would melt,
Thaw, and resolve itself into a dew!
Or that the Everlasting had not fix'd
His canon 'gainst self-slaughter! O God! God!
(I.ii.129-32)

The death wish is followed by a loathing for the entire world which to Hamlet now seems "an unweeded garden" possessed only of "things rank and gross in nature" (I.ii.135-36). The remainder of the passage is a series of impassioned comments about his mother's shallowness of feeling for her recently

² L. C. Knights, An Approach to Hamlet (London, 1961), p. 74.

³ See Granville-Barker, "Shakespeare's Dramatic Art," p. 68.

⁴ For an excellent comparative study of the critical controversy over this word see Fredson Bower, "Hamlet's 'Sullied' of 'Solid' Flesh: A Bibliographical Case-History," in Shakespeare Survey 9, ed. Allardyce Nicoll (Cambridge, 1956), pp. 44-48.

deceased husband and about her marriage to Claudius. There is exposition here, but not merely of previous events. The shock to Hamlet's moral sensitivity is reflected in such phrases as:

That it should come to this!
But two months dead! Nay, not so much, not two.
(I.ii.137-38)

O, most wicked speed, to post
With such dexterity to incestuous sheets!
(I.ii.156-57)

So overwhelming is the change in his mother's nature that he is tortured by an intense melancholy: "But break my heart, for I must hold my tongue" (I.ii.159).

After the colloquy with the ghost, Hamlet is further stunned by the news of his father's murder and his mother's adultery. The first few lines of his soliloquy most effectively reveal the shock he has received:

O all you host of heaven! O earth! What else?
And shall I couple hell? O, fie! Hold, my heart,
And you, my sinews, grow not instant old,
But bear me stiffly up. (I.v.92-95)

Having been charged to avenge the "foul and most unnatural murder," he thrice repeats the ghost's petition to "remember" him and vows complete attention to the command. No sooner has he done this than he again vents his anger against Gertrude, "O most pernicious woman!" (I.v.105) and lashes out against Claudius, "O villain, villain, smiling, damned villain!" (I.v.106). Here, the portrayal of tension and conflict is far superior dramatically to that of Brutus. The abrupt transitions in Hamlet's thoughts, the short and emotionally charged phrases, mirror a mind burdened almost beyond endurance.⁵

⁵ Regarding the question of Hamlet's feigned or real madness, see Bradley, Shakespearean Tragedy, pp. 103-4; and J. Dover Wilson, What Happens in Hamlet (Cambridge, 1961), pp. 88-101.

Approximately two months intervene between the apparition of the ghost and the arrival of the players, but Hamlet has not yet accomplished his revenge. After one of the actors passionately delivers the "Hecuba" speech, the Prince, when alone, reproaches himself for his delay. He begins with the denunciation "O, what a rogue and peasant slave am I!" (II.ii. 576) and goes on to compare his cause for vehement action to that of the player's:

What's Hecuba to him, or he to Hecuba,
That he should weep for her? What would he do,
Had he the motive and the cue for passion
That I have? (II.ii.585-88)

The actor, Hamlet answers, "would drown the stage with tears," yet he, "unpregnant" of his cause,

. . . can say nothing; no, not for a king,
Upon whose property and most dear life
A damn'd defeat was made. (II.ii.596-98)

Concluding this self-laceration, the Dane accuses himself of being "pigeon-liver'd" and then scathingly comments:

This is most brave,
That I, the son of a dear father murder'd,
Prompted to my revenge by heaven and hell,
Must like a whore, unpack my heart with words,
And fall a-cursing, like a very drab,
A scullion! (II.ii.611-16)

In the closing lines of this reproach the Prince states his uncertainty about the ghost: "The spirit that I have seen / May be the devil" (II.ii.627-28). Fearing damnation if the ghost is not genuine, he decides to have the actors perform before his uncle a play "something like the murder of my father" (II.ii.624). If Claudius "but blench," then he will know that the command to revenge must be obeyed.

This concern over the authenticity of the spirit and the

subsequent plans for "The Mouse-trap" have been the subject of much critical discussion. Bradley considers his doubt "an unconscious fiction, an excuse for delay--and for its continuance."⁶ F. T. Bowers concludes that his fear is legitimate in view of the revenge tradition and would have been accepted as such by an Elizabethan audience.⁷ E. E. Stoll does not consider the doubt a sign of procrastination, but rather an effective device to motivate the delay necessary in a revenge tragedy. For him the entire reproach is an advancement in the use of soliloquy because of the purpose which it serves.⁸ Whatever may be the reason for Hamlet's self-rebuke, whether inner weakness or dramatic necessity, Shakespeare developed in this speech a form of spontaneous utterance reflective of inner turbulence and anxiety.

Hamlet's next soliloquy occurs shortly after the first reproach. The entire speech is a gloomy meditation, beginning with the words "To be, or not to be: that is the question" (III.i.56). The antithesis expressed in this line seems to be between activity and passivity rather than between life and death.⁹ "To be" is "to take arms against a sea of troubles" (v.59), "not to be" is "to suffer the slings and arrows of

⁶ Shakespearean Tragedy, p. 111.

⁷ See Elizabethan Revenge Tragedy 1587-1642 (Gloucester, Mass., 1959), pp. 113-14.

⁸ See Art and Artifice in Shakespeare (Cambridge, 1938), pp. 94-95.

⁹ See Richards, PMLA, XLVIII, 751.

outrageous fortune" (v.58). The initial lines of this passage give the effect of the Prince trying to bestir himself to active opposition, of attempting to enter boldly upon a struggle from which personal escape seems altogether impossible.

The soliloquy continues, as Hamlet muses about sleep, death and annihilation (vv.60-82). Here, again, is a weariness of life similar to that expressed in the first soliloquy of the play. The Dane has been charged with the dreadful responsibility of revenge, but because of his increasing melancholy he continually emphasizes at this point in the tragedy the "ills" which humanity must bear.

The concluding lines of the speech (vv.83-88) are a gradual transition to its opening theme, the contrast between action and inaction. Hamlet speaks of "the native hue of resolution" as being "sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought," and of "enterprises of great pith and moment" losing "the name of action." Suicide, the central thought of the passage, seems to be the only way that he can solve the dilemma posed by the alternatives of vigorous activity and death-shadowed passivity.

After the success of "The Mouse-trap," Hamlet gives utterance to his thoughts in a soliloquy which begins auspiciously enough:

'Tis now the very witching time of night
 When churchyards yawn and hell itself breathes out
 Contagion to this world. Now could I drink hot
 blood,
 And do such bitter business as the day
 Would quake to look on. (III.ii.406-10)

He seems on the verge of action, but continues:

Soft! now to my mother.
 O heart, lose not thy nature! Let not ever
 The soul of Nero enter this firm bosom;
 Let me be cruel, not unnatural. (III.ii.410-13)

The thirst for blood, engendered by the sight of his uncle's startled eyes and blanched face, appears to have been forgotten. It is to his mother that Hamlet first goes, not to Claudius.

J. Dover Wilson, calling this passage "the most glaring instance of 'bestial oblivion' in the play,"¹⁰ suggests that the Dane is incapable of thinking about two objects at the same time. The speech does seem to indicate a delay on Hamlet's part, especially in view of the ghost's earlier admonition:

But, however thou pursuest this act,
 Taint not thy mind, nor let thy soul contrive
 Against thy mother aught, (I.v.84-86)

Perhaps this neglect is intended as further evidence of the Prince's confusion after Claudius' obvious betrayal of guilt. Hamlet's lines concerning his mother do reflect an emotional disorder, for he promises only to "speak daggers to her," but immediately admits, "My tongue and soul in this be hypocrites" (III.ii.414-15). His impulse to castigate her is controlled only by an enforced restraint of will.

On his way to Gertrude, Hamlet encounters Claudius at prayer and begins to soliloquize about this opportunity for revenge:

Now might I do it pat, now he is praying;
 And now I'll d't--And so he goes to heaven;
 And so am I reveng'd. That would be scann'd.
 (III.iii.73-75)

¹⁰ What Happens in Hamlet, p. 245.

He decides that to kill his uncle while praying would be "hire and salary, not revenge." Since Claudius murdered his father "grossly," "With all his crimes broad blown, as flush as May," he determines to wait for his revenge, until the villain

. . . is drunk asleep, or in his rage,
Or in th' incestuous pleasure of his bed,
At gaming, swearing, or about some act
That has no relish of salvation in't--
Then trip him, that his heels may kick at heaven,
And that his soul may be damn'd and black
As hell, whereto it goes. (III.iii.89-95)

As noted in the Introduction (p. 3), Coleridge sees in this soliloquy "the marks of reluctance and procrastination." These "marks", however, are less glaring when the passage is considered in light of the traditions of the revenge play. For the vengeance to be complete, the offender not only had to be killed in a manner more cruel than his victim, but also at a time when his damnation could be reasonably assured.¹¹ Shakespeare's audience knew this and, as the soliloquy indicates, Hamlet did too. Judged by the conventions of Elizabethan revenge, the speech becomes a means of heightening tension, for then the Prince is viewed as being thwarted in his opportunity, rather than as failing to act of his own accord.

Hamlet's final soliloquy is a self-reproach similar to the one provoked by the "Hecuba" speech. This time it is the example of Fortinbras' martial valor that causes him to express his feelings. The speech begins with the rebuke,

How all occasions do inform against me,
And spur my dull revenge! What is a man,

¹¹ See Bowers, Revenge Tragedy, pp. 110-11.

If his chief good and market of his time
 Be but to sleep and feed? A beast, no more.
 (IV,iv.39-41)

The Prince then considers the possible reasons for his in-
 action,

Now, whether it be
 Bestial oblivion, or some craven scruple
 Of thinking too precisely on th' event,--
 (IV.iv.39-41)

but concludes,

I do not know
 Why yet I live to say, "This thing's to do,"
 Sith I have cause and will and strength and
 means
 To do't. (IV.iv.43-46)

Realizing that Fortinbras is daring "fortune, death, and
 danger" merely "for an egg-shell," he asks himself: "How stand
 I then, / That have a father kill'd, a mother stain'd" (IV.iv.
 56-57). The soliloquy ends with the firm determination, "O,
 from this time forth, / My thoughts be bloody, or be nothing
 worth!" (IV.iv.65-66).

This speech, absent not only from the First Quarto
 (1603), but also from the Folio (1623), is considered by both
 Wilson and Bradley as a further sign of Hamlet's procrastina-
 tion.¹² Professor Stoll, however, says that the passage was
 added to the corrected Second Quarto (1604) "not as an indict-
 ment, but to show, with the final resolution, that the neg-
 lect and delay are over and done with."¹³ The validity of
 either interpretation depends upon one's reading of Hamlet.

¹² See What Happens in Hamlet, pp. 260-64; and Shake-
 spearean Tragedy, pp. 117-18.

¹³ Art and Artifice, p. 100.

If his failure to act is considered the result of a melancholic paralysis, then the first will bear more weight; if his delay is viewed as a dramatic necessity to prolong the action, then the second will appear more feasible. Whichever interpretation is chosen, however, the soliloquy retains the quality of spontaneous utterance, of an exhortation arising naturally out of a contention with an internal rather than with an external force.

Macbeth

All of Hamlet's soliloquies are an integral part of his introspective and sensitive nature and reflect a mind exploring its own complexity. In a similar way, the device seems instinctive to the character of Macbeth as Shakespeare has sketched it. His imagination is so sensitive that the thought of dreadful action immediately becomes the terrifying picture of its performance.¹⁴ Completely distraught at times by his fearful imaginings, or overcome by the inability to act, the Scot expresses his inner turmoil in soliloquy.

Macbeth's aside after the announcement that he has been made Thane of Cawdor reflects the extent to which the witches' prophecy has disturbed this. So "rapt withal" is he in the "supernatural soliciting" that he is unable to determine its meaning or to understand the effect it has had upon him:

If ill,
Why hath it given me earnest of success,

¹⁴ See Granville-Barker, "Shakespeare's Dramatic Art," p. 79.

Commencing in a truth? I amthane of Cawdor.
 If good, why do I yield to that suggestion
 Whose horrid image doth unfix my hair
 And make my seated heart knock at my ribs,
 Against the use of nature? (I.iii.131-37)

He admits his "present fears" about the prophecy, but realizes that they "are less than horrible imaginings" to which he is prone. Finally, denying any notion of murdering Duncan, he does confess that his faculties are overwhelmed by imagination and that nothing exists for him except the unrealized crown:

My thought, whose murder yet is but fantastical,
 Shakes so my single state of man that function
 Is smother'd in surmise, and nothing is
 But what is not.¹⁵ (I.iii.139-42)

The ambivalence between Macbeth's determination not to act and his ambition for kingship is evident in two other asides in Act I. In the first he seems to refuse to give the matter any further thought:

If chance will have me king, why, chance may
 crown me
 Without my stir. (I.iii.143-44)

Again, when Duncan names Malcolm the heir apparent, his thoughts return to the crown:

The Prince of Cumberland! That is a step
 On which I must fall down, or else o'erleap,
 For it lies in my way. (I.iv.48-50)

His subsequent invocation to the stars to hide his "black and deep desires" (I.iv.50-53) is an indication that the ambition which he had previously tried to deny has now taken greater hold of him.

According to Levin L. Schücking, Lady Macbeth's first

¹⁵ Note the echo of Brutus' speech (II.i.63-69), p. 43, in the repetition of the phrase "state of man".

soliloquy "completes and confirms the impression we have already received of Macbeth."¹⁶ Having been informed of the witches' prophecy, she expresses her fears about her husband's nature:

It is too full o' th' milk of human kindness
To catch the nearest way. Thou wouldst be great,
Art not without ambition, but without
The illness should attend it. (I.v.17-21)

Thus is Macbeth's reaction to the weird sisters explained: they have aroused his ambitious nature, yet he, because of an innate aversion to evil, becomes greatly disturbed by thoughts accompanying such an enticement. By revealing her husband's temperament in this way, Lady Macbeth also prepares the audience for the internal conflicts which are to follow.

After Macbeth has welcomed Duncan to Dunsinane, he begins to soliloquize about the murder which both his wife and his ambitions have been urging him to undertake. The first section of the speech reflects his concern over the possible outcome of the deed:

If it were done when 'tis done, then 'twere well
It were done quickly. If the assassination
Could trammel up the consequence, and catch
With his surcease success; (I.vii.1-4)

If, Macbeth continues, the fatal stroke "might be the be-all and the end-all," then he would "jump the life to come." But he realizes that "bloody instructions" often return "to plague th' inventor." It is "this even-handed justice" which gives him pause and which marks a turning point in the soliloquy.

In the central portion of the passage the struggle be-

¹⁶ Character Problems in Shakespeare's Plays (New York, 1922), p. 80.

tween Macbeth's natural disposition and his treasonous ambition is most pronounced. He begins to consider the reasons which would stay his hand against Duncan:

He's here in double trust:
First, as I am his kinsman and his subject,
Strong both against the deed; then, as his host,
Who should against his murderer shut the door,
Not bear the knife myself. (I.vii.12-16)

Taking into account Duncan's competent rule,¹⁷ he realizes that

his virtues
Will plead like angels, trumpet-tongue'd, against
The deep damnation of his taking off. (I.vii.18-20)

Here Macbeth is thinking not merely of consequence, but of the horror of the deed. The imagery, moreover, reveals that he is concerned about an after-life. Earlier in the speech he said that he would "jump the life to come" (I.vii.7). Now he uses such terms as "angels" and "deep damnation" which point to the theme of everlasting punishment of evil.

Immediately after this soliloquy Lady Macbeth enters and Macbeth declares, "We will proceed no further in this business" (I.vii.30). This resolve is slowly weakened, however, as his wife torments him about his cowardice. In the next scene, as Macbeth prepares to murder Duncan, his abnormally sensitive imagination creates the image of a knife hanging before him in the air. As his dread of the illusion increases, the dagger becomes more real:

I see thee yet, in form as palpable
As this which now I draw.
.....

¹⁷ In Holinshed's Chronicles, Duncan is described as a despotic monarch. This alteration of the source makes Macbeth's crime appear even more heinous.

I see thee still,
 And on thy blade and dudgeon gouts of blood,
 Which was not so before. (II.i.40-41,45-47)

Even though Macbeth finally rejects this fearful product of his "heat-oppressed brain," his imagination continues to torment him through the remainder of the soliloquy. He envisions all of nature as plagued by the murder which he is about to commit:

Now o'er the one half-world
 Nature seems dead, and wicked dreams abuse
 The curtain'd sleep. Witchcraft celebrates
 Pale Hecate's offerings, and wither'd Murder,
 Alarum'd by his sentinel, the wolf,
 Whose howl's his watch, thus with his stealthy
 pace,
 With Tarquin's ravishing strides, towards his
 design
 Moves like a ghost. (II.i.49-56)

The uneven rhythm, the diction, and the images of wild and violent activity in this section of the speech mirror Macbeth's inner turbulence as he, jarred by the ringing of a bell, makes his way to Duncan's chamber.

After the murder Macbeth is startled by a knocking at the gate. His soliloquy is evidence of his extreme distraction at this point in the tragedy. He wonders why "every noise appalls" him and, looking down at his hands, he woefully cries,

With all great Neptune's ocean wash this blood
 Clean from my hand? No, this my hand will
 rather
 The multitudinous seas incarnadine,
 Making the green one red. (II.ii.61-63)

Lady Macbeth echoes this lament in the sleep-walking scene:

Here's the smell of blood still; all
 the perfumes of Arabia will not sweeten
 this little hand. Oh, oh, oh! (V.i.56-58)

In both cases, it is not merely their hands that have been stained, but, as Macbeth's frenzy during the banquet scene and Lady Macbeth's insanity prove, their minds as well, and with the blood of guilt.

Macbeth's trepidation increases after he has attained the crown. Remembering that the witches hailed Banquo as "father to a line of kings," he fretfully ponders:

To be thus is nothing,
But to be safely thus. Our fears in Banquo
Stick deep; and in his royalty of nature
Reigns that which would be feared. (III.i.48-51)

Dreading that the weird sisters have given him a "fruitless crown and a barren sceptre," he continues the soliloquy in a state of great agitation:

If 't be so,
For Banquo's issue have I fil'd my mind;
For them the gracious Duncan have I murder'd;
Put rancours in the vessel of my peace
Only for them; and mine eternal jewel
Given to the common enemy of man,
To make them kings, the seed of Banquo kings!
(III.i.64-70)

After his visit to the witches, Macbeth speaks an aside which reveals an important change in his disposition. Having been warned to "beware Macduff," he immediately decides to plunder his castle. Here is unqualified resolution without the usual fearful imaginings:

From this moment
The very firstlings of my heart shall be
The firstlings of my hand. And even now,
To crown my thoughts with acts, be it thought
and done. (IV.i.146-49)

Thus, as Macbeth becomes confirmed in evil, his powers of imagination are weakened. He is barely startled by the women's

loud lament over his wife's death¹⁸ and realizes that he has
 "almost forgot the taste of fears":

The time has been, my senses would have cool'd
 To hear a night-shriek, and my fell of hair
 Would at a dismal treatise rouse and stir
 As life were in 't. I have supp'd full with
 horrors;
 Direness, familiar to my slaughterous thoughts,
 Cannot once start me. (V.v.10-15)

As long as Macbeth's imagination is active, he is distracted by an internal turmoil similar to that of Hamlet. Both characters suffer conflicts because they are unable to pass from thought to critical resolution and action. The Scot's difficulty is due to his abnormal imaginative power, the Dane's, to his extremely introspective nature. Brutus, like Macbeth, wages a debate with himself about committing the crime of assassination. The Scot's struggle, however, is more dramatically effective than the Roman's, because of the greater emotional intensity involved. All three characters manifest their mental conflicts in soliloquy. Used for this dramatic purpose, the device succeeds in presenting an "inward drama," a function far superior to a direct and, therefore, more primitive exposition of the action.

¹⁸ Cf. the effect of the knocking at the gate (II.ii. 58-63), p. 58.

CONCLUSION

Can a development be traced in Shakespeare's use of soliloquy? Is there an advance from "convention" to "invention" in his employment of the device? The soliloquies of the earlier tragedies certainly reveal the influence, in both form and function, of the set speeches in pre-Shakespearean drama, especially those of Kyd and Marlowe. There is a gradual maturation, however, from a highly rhetorical form of versification to a style more characteristic of spontaneous speech, from the conventional function of direct self-explanation to a purpose more wholly integrated with character, situation and theme.

The difference of quality lies not in a contrivance itself, but in what is thereby contrived. If soliloquy is used merely to give information about the speaker's intentions or as an excuse for a sheer outburst of poetry, it must be relegated to inferior dramatic technique. If, on the other hand, the device admits the audience into the subconscious workings of the character's mind, there results an immediacy of feeling necessary for an inward experience of life itself.

Brief reference was made in the Introduction to the critical disagreement about the psychological importance of soliloquy. In the early tragedies little, if any, insight

into character can be gained from the set speeches. In the mature tragedies, however, where the emphasis is placed on an inward rather than an outward struggle, there is evidence of Shakespeare's growing interest in the complexities of human nature. It is impossible to restrict the expression of this interest to soliloquy, for Shakespeare's development included an integration of his whole dramatic art. Direct exposition gave way to a more subtle presentation of character, including not only an emphasis on the actions of the dramatis personae, but also an interpretation of the hero from the point of view of the other characters in the play.

The development of Shakespeare's dramatic technique raises the question of why soliloquy is used so infrequently in the tragedies written after Macbeth. In Coriolanus there are but two instances of the device; Antony has hardly thirty lines of soliloquy, Cleopatra not one. The heroes of these plays are by nature men of action and there is, therefore, less need of the convention. Shakespeare turned soliloquy to significant account for such introspective characters as Hamlet and Macbeth, but where characterization could be handled by other dramatic means, the device became subordinate, if not altogether eclipsed.

Parallel to Shakespeare's maturity of the form of soliloquy is his development in other types of dramatic speech. His early style is easily distinguished by a regularity of rhythm. In the early history plays, especially, there is a bombastic

quality which reveals a concern for mere words, their sound and color. As Shakespeare's proficiency in writing blank verse increased, his dialogue became more representative of normal speech. Superfluity of words and unnecessary metaphor disappear and the characters no longer all speak alike, but in a style more distinctive of their individual traits. Thus blank verse is natural to the heroic Othello, while Iago, a lower character, speaks mostly in prose.

The language of the later style is also more flexible and capable of representing different changes in a character's mood. Lear's speeches in the earlier part of the play have a certain nobility, whereas his utterances during the heath scenes reflect his misery and mental instability. In the mature tragedies, moreover, Shakespeare made use of more intensive images which enabled him to express themes incapable of direct statement. Finally, in the versification of such tragedies as Macbeth and Antony and Cleopatra there is a resonant quality which Shakespeare had previously been unable to achieve. The verbal echoes and contrasts not only have a beauty in themselves but also a perfect aptness of meaning. The language most appropriately expresses the emotions of the characters in a given situation.

Equally important to a consideration of Shakespeare's development of dramatic speech is the question of his influence on his successors. In this connection, however, there is the problem of different interpretations by various dramatists and, therefore, of various modifications in style. Webster's handling of the device of soliloquy bears a close

resemblance to mature Shakespearean tragedy. The action of The Duchess of Malfi is concentrated on the heroine by the use of set speeches similar to those in Hamlet. The Duchess' outbursts of grief and despair, moreover, have the same intensity of feeling as Othello's. For the most part, the primitive self-characterization of early Elizabethan drama disappeared, but playwrights like Beaumont and Fletcher and Ford used the convention for scenes of a relatively low emotional pitch. They did not isolate and concentrate the feeling; above all, they did not transcend the limitations of the character.

The development of an "inward drama" by the effective use of soliloquy--prominent as a stage device until the end of the nineteenth century--parallels a similar trend in the technique of the novel.¹ Novelists in the middle of the nineteenth century, like Eliot and Meredith, were writing fiction which placed more than the usual amount of emphasis on interior characterization. The tendency of novelists to concentrate on internal action increased with the influence of Hardy and Conrad whose main interest was the portrayal of interior motives and psychological effects. The works of Henry James reveal an intense concern for the inner life of his characters. His development of a technique centered in the representation of the effect produced in the self by

¹ For an interesting and concise discussion of the similarities and differences between Shakespeare's use of soliloquy and the technique of the "psychological novel", see Leon Edel, The Modern Psychological Novel (New York, 1955), pp. 17-18, 56-57.

external events may be called the beginning of the modern "psychological novel". The trend culminates in the novels of James Joyce and William Faulkner who utilize the "interior monologue" to recount the subconscious life of their characters.

Thus the possible ramifications of this study prove almost innumerable. Soliloquy, the most common convention of early English drama, is inevitably related to developments in other types of dramatic speech, both Shakespearean and post-Shakespearean. The influence of the device, moreover, can be seen even in the art forms of the present century. A detailed examination of these important connections is an undertaking that must be left to the future.

One definite conclusion, however, can be made as a result of this study: Shakespeare far surpassed his predecessors in the dramatic effectiveness of soliloquy. The objective stated at the beginning of the thesis, therefore, has been realized. By considering in detail Shakespeare's use of the convention, not only has his drama been related to the Elizabethan period as a whole, but specific reasons have been found for the greatness and permanence of his achievement.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bowers, Fredson Thayer. Elizabethan Revenge Tragedy 1587-1642. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1940.
- _____. "Hamlet's 'Sullied' or 'Solid' Flesh: A Bibliographical Case-History," in Shakespeare Survey 9, ed. Allardyce Nicoll. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956. Pp. 44-48.
- Bradbrook, M. C. Themes and Conventions of Elizabethan Tragedy. New York: Pageant Books Inc., 1960.
- Bradley, A. C. Shakespearean Tragedy. Meridian Books. Cleveland: The World Publishing Co., 1961.
- Campbell, Lily B. Shakespeare's Tragic Heroes: Slaves of Passion. New York: Barnes & Noble Inc, 1959.
- Charlton, H. B. Shakespearean Tragedy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961.
- Clemen, Wolfgang. English Tragedy Before Shakespeare: The Development of Dramatic Speech, trans. T. S. Dorsch. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd. 1961.
- Coleridge, Samuel Taylor. Lectures and Notes on Shakespeare and Other English Poets, comp. T. Ashe. London: George Bell and Sons, 1883.
- Edel, Leon. The Modern Psychological Novel. New York: Grove Press Inc., 1955.
- Fluchère, Henri. Shakespeare and the Elizabethans, trans. Guy Hamilton. New York: Hill and Wang Inc., 1956.
- Granville-Barker, Harley. "Shakespeare's Dramatic Art," in A Companion to Shakespeare Studies, ed. H. Granville-Barker and G. B. Harrison. Doubleday Anchor Books. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1960. Pp. 44-87.
- Harrison, G. B. Introducing Shakespeare. England: Penguin Books, 1959.
- Hill, R. F. "Dramatic Techniques and Interpretation in Richard II," in Early Shakespeare (Stratford-upon-Avon Studies 3), ed. John Russel Brown and Bernard Harris. London: Edward Arnold Publishers Ltd., 1961. Pp. 101-21.

- Knight, G. Wilson, The Imperial Theme. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1951
- _____. The Wheel of Fire: Interpretations of Shakespearean Tragedy. New York: Meridan Books, Inc.,
- Knights, L. C. An Approach to Hamlet. London: Chatto and Windus, 1961.
- Kyd, Thomas. The Spanish Tragedy, ed. Philip W. Edwards. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1959.
- Lawlor, John. "Romeo and Juliet," in Early Shakespeare (Stratford-upon-Avon Studies 3), ed. John Russel Brown and Bernard Harris. London: Edward Arnold Publishers Ltd., 1961. Pp. 123-43.
- Lucas, F. L. Seneca and Elizabethan Tragedy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1922.
- Richards, Irving T. "Meaning of Hamlet's 'To be or not to be,'" PMLA, XLVIII (September, 1933), 741-66.
- Rosen, William. Shakespeare and the Craft of Tragedy. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1960.
- Schücking, Levin L. Character Problems in Shakespeare's Plays. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1922.
- Shakespeare, William. The Complete Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare, ed. William Allan Neilson and Charles Jarvis Hill. The New Cambridge Edition. Cambridge, Mass.: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1942.
- Stoll, Elmer Edgar. Art and Artifice in Shakespeare. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1938
- _____. Othello: An Historical and Comparative Study. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1915.
- _____. Poets and Playwrights. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1930.
- _____. Shakespeare and Other Masters. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1940.
- _____. Shakespeare Studies. New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., 1960.
- Spenser, Theodore. Death and Elizabethan Tragedy: A Study of Convention and Opinion in Elizabethan Drama. New York Pageant Books, Inc., 1960.

Webster, Margaret. Shakespeare Without Tears. New York:
Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1959.

Wilson J. Dover. What Happens in Hamlet. Cambridge:

VITA AUCTORIS

- 1938 Born on November 30, in Detroit, Michigan.
- 1943 Commenced primary education at Precious Blood Grade School, Detroit, Michigan.
- 1952 Commenced secondary education at Catholic Central High School, Detroit, Michigan.
- 1956 Graduated from Catholic Central High School.
- 1958 Commenced the Preliminary Year at St. Michael's College, Toronto, Ontario.
- 1959 Commenced Honours Philosophy (English or History Option) at the University of Toronto.
- 1961 Transferred to Assumption University of Windsor, Honours English and Philosophy.
- 1962 Granted the Bachelor of Arts degree from Assumption University of Windsor.
- 1962 Commenced Master of Arts studies at Assumption University of Windsor.