

## INTRODUCTION

C.E.M. Joad, in the chapter 'The invasion of Literature by Psychology' of his Guide to Modern Thought, has shown how literature has been gradually converging on psychology in the modern world. (I). "Acknowledgement of psychology are so conventional in modern literature that Joyce's 'They were young and easily frightened' is almost straightforward, and Auden's 'One rational voice is dumb; over a grave/ The household of impulse mourns one dearly loved' (In Memory of Sigismund Freud) were appropriate from a writer than Nabokov's 'huge mustard-colored balloon... inflated by Sigismund Lejoyeux, a local aeronaut (Speak Memory)". (II). "One cognitive value in the drama and novels would seem to be psychological. 'The novelists can teach you more about human nature than the psychologists' is a familiar kind of assertion. Horney recommends Dostoevsky, Shakespeare, Ibsen, and Balzac as inexhaustible sources". (III). "There remains the question of 'psychology' in the works themselves. Characters in plays and novels are judged by us to be psychologically true. situations are praised and plots accepted because of this same quality. Sometimes a psychological theory, held either consciously or dimly by an author, seems to fit a figure or situation. Thus Lily Campbell has argued that Hamlet fits the type of 'sanguine man's suffering from

melancholy adjust' known to the Elizabethans from their psychological theories. In like fashion Oscar Campbell has tried to show that Jaques, in As You Like It, is a case of 'unnatural melancholy produced by adjustment of phlegm'. Walter Shandy could be shown to suffer from the disease of linguistic associationism described in Locke. Stendhal's hero Julien Sorel is described in terms of the psychology of Destutt de Tracy, and the different kinds of love relationship are obviously classified according to Stendhal's own book De l'amour. Rodin Raskalnikov's motives and feelings are analysed in a way which suggests some knowledge of clinical psychology. Proust certainly has a whole psychological theory of memory, important even for the organization of his work. Freudian psychoanalysis is used quite consciously by novelists such as Conrad Aiken or Waldo Frank." (IV).

It is interesting to note here how psychology has been growing more and more interesting to writers in general and to playwrights in particular. Alexander Ostrovsky, who died "as he was revising his translation of Shakespeare's Antony and Cleopatra (V), "began writing a treatise on the art of acting based on a study of physiologist Sechenov's Brain Reflexes, thus anticipating Stanislavsky's interest in Pavlov's conditioned reflexes and in current theories of the subconscious". (VI). The influences of the new current

of "depth psychology" is irresistible even in the sphere of literature. Dieter Wyss, in his highly appreciated work Depth Psychology: A Critical History, wrote: "Depth psychology has become a widespread movement which has influenced both medicine and the mental sciences, the political and social sciences and even literature and fine art. To attempt to deny this influence would be an anachronism". (italics mine) (VII). Jung truly said: "Considered in this light, art, like any other human activity deriving from psychic motives, is a proper subject for psychology". (VIII).

Psychology of literature is, therefore, a highly stimulating and ambient study. "By 'psychology of literature' we mean the psychological study of the writer, as type and as individual, or the study of the creative process, or the study of the psychological types and laws present within works of literature, or, finally, the effects of literature upon its reader (audience psychology)". (IX). Within the category "psychological study of the writer, as type and as individual" we may include the evaluation of the writer's knowledge of human nature, because a psychological study of the writer is not complete without the study of his knowledge of human nature [his cognitive aspect]. The scope of this dissertation, therefore, falls within the new-fangled Psychology of Literature. The aim of this present work is to ascertain the breadth of Shakespeare's knowledge of human nature and to evaluate it from the psychological view-point.

It is certainly a daring feat to go righter on Shakespeare, because "Shakespeare's words, images, rhymes and rhythms have been counted; all his allusions have been investigated, his sources probed, his subcurities explained, his incoherences justified; all Shakespeare's legendary or historical figures have been compared with their originals; his text has been taken to pieces, the prose analysed, the poetry scanned --- in short, Shakespeare has been tortured, torn asunder in every direction and ground down, so much paraphrased, scrutinised, "sifted, measured by x-ray and seismograph, that there is not a syllable or particle, not a subtlety of style or thought that has not been detected and reported. Under this mass of commentaries and glosses, learned or childish, Shakespeare would have been buried had there not been more life in him than in all those who have haunted him like a pack of hounds". (X). But, nevertheless, Shakespeare remains a mystery even to-day. Thus sang Matthew Arnold : "Others abide our question. Thou art free./ We ask and ask: Thou smilest and art still,/ Out-topping knowledge". Really, the inexhaustible Shakespeare is not done up. And, G.W. Knight does not surprise us when he says in his essay 'Telstoy's Attack On Shakespeare' (1934) that "The proper study of Shakespeare's work is only beginning". (XI).

However, without losing ourselves in the controversy over the beginning of the proper study of Shakespeare, we can

certainly vouch that at least the proper psychological study of Shakespeare is only beginning. Shakespeare is not merely an artist, he is more than that. Comparing the poet with Racine, Sri Aurobindo wrote : "It might be said of Shakespeare that he was not predominantly an artist but rather a great creator, even though he has an art of his own, especially an art of dramatic architecture and copious ornament; but his work is far from being always perfect. In Racine, on the other hand, there is an unflinching perfection; Racine is the complete poetic artist. But if comparisons are to be made, Shakespeare's must surely be pronounced to be the greater poetry, greater in the vastness of its range, in its abundant creativeness, in its dramatic height and power, in the richness of his inspiration, in his world-view, in the peaks to which he rises and the depths which he plumbs — even though he sinks to flatness which Racine would have abhorred". (XII). In his 'world-view' — his Weltanschauung — Shakespeare includes, and rightly so, the home sapiens and perceives them with the eyes of a psychologist. His observation is extensive as well as intensive. It is almost perfect. Johnson, in his Preface to Shakespeare, wrote: Shakespeare is above all writers, at least above all modern writers, the poet of nature; the poet that holds up to his readers a faithful mirror of manners and of life. His characters are not modified by the customs

of particular places, unpractised by the rest of the world; by the peculiarities of studies or professions, which can operate but upon small numbers; or by the accidents of transient fashions or temporary opinions: they are the genuine progeny of common humanity, such as the world will always supply, and observation will always find. His persons act and speak by the influence of those general passions and principles by which all are agitated, and the whole system of life is continued in motion. In the writings of other poets a character is too often an individual; in those of Shakespeare it is commonly a species". But how much and then how correctly Shakespeare knows of "those general passions and principles by which all minds are agitated, and the whole system of life is continued in motion", only a few writers have yet set to gather and weigh, and they, too, imperfectly. Again, in his 'Notes on Don Jonson', Coleridge wrote: "But combine all, — wit, subtlety, and fancy, with profundity, imagination, and moral and physical susceptibility of the pleasurable, — and let the object of the action be an universal; and we shall have — O, rash prophecy! say, rather, we have — a Shakespeare!" (XIII). (italics mine).

Now, should we be contented with "Tennyson's thanks giving that we know so little of Shakespeare"? (XIV). and so unabashedly cry out with Charles Dickens "Thank God"? (XV).

Or should we be dissuaded from our endeavour to know Shakespeare's mind by the sinister attitude of Sir Politick of Ben Jonson's Volpone (II, 1) and say:

"That idle, antique, stale, grey-headed project  
Of knowing men's minds and manners, ..." ?

no. "And though we may be content to die without knowing his [Shakespeare's] income or even the surname of Mr. W.H., we cannot so easily resign the wish to find the man in his writings, and to form some idea of the disposition, the likes and dislikes, the character and the attitude towards life, of the human being who seems to us to have understood best our common human nature (italics mine) (XVI).

" 'His characters', said Pope, 'are so much Nature herself that 'tis a sort of injury to call them by so distant a name as copies of her'; and 'every single character in Shakespeare is as much an individual as those in life itself; it is as impossible to find any two alike' (XVII). Again, Smirnov says about Shakespeare's knowledge of human nature: "A great realist, he reveals the essence of human characters and relationships, the causes and effects of man's actions, and leaves his audience to draw their own conclusions". (XVIII). And again, " 'The characters created by Shakespeare are not, as in Moliere, the types of this or that passion, this or that vice, but living beings, filled

to overflowing with many passions and many voices; circumstances mould their varied and many sided characters before the eyes of the audience', wrote Pushkin, pointing for the first time the way in which Shakespeare's characters develop in the course of action". (XIX). In fact Pushkin was so much influenced by Shakespeare that he called him "our father Shakespeare" (XX). Gorky also frequently urged upon young writers to follow Shakespeare, for his art and understanding. To him Shakespeare was "the world's great playwright". (XXI). Indeed, so much of nature is there in Shakespeare that "Shakespeare's earliest critics noted with regret that, in his works, there was more of nature than of art". (XXII). Even the caustic Nietzsche praised Shakespeare for his characterization of Brutus as of some other characters : "... it is against this background that we must understand Nietzsche's great admiration for Shakespeare's portrait of Brutus : 'Independence of the soul — that is at stake here ! No sacrifice can then be too great : even one's dearest friend one must be willing to sacrifice for it, though he be the most glorious human being, embellishment of the world, genius without peer...' (XXIII). William Hazlitt, in his essay 'On Posthumous Fame — Whether Shakespeare was Influenced By a Love of It?', said not for nothing that "... he [Shakespeare] revelled in the world of observation and fancy". And, again, in his Preface to

Characters of Shakespeare's Plays, he wrote : "The poetry of Shakespeare was inspiration indeed : he is not so much an imitator as an instrument of nature; and it is not so just to say that he speaks from her, as that she speaks through him". In the opinion of Allardyce Nicoll "Shakespeare in depicting this central figure has seized upon human qualities of wide diffusion". (XXIV). Carlyle, in his On Hero and Hero-worship, wrote : "Goethe alone, since the days of Shakespeare reminds me of it. Of him too you say that he gives the object; you may say what he himself says of Shakespeare : 'His characters are like watches with dial-plates of transparent crystal; they show you the hour like others, and the inward mechanism also is all visible". (XXV). And currently, E.P. Papanoutsos in his article 'The Universe of Literary Creation' in The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism, has written very aptly: "Consider, for instance, how Shakespeare, Balzac, Dostoevsky, and Proust overwhelm us with the fertility, scope and creative force of their imagination. They bring to light a whole human universe, another world we know". (XXVI). But, contrarily, in the opinion of Henri Fluchere Shakespeare's characterization is merely traditional : "But it is equally undeniable that, allowing for his own peculiar genius, he conforms with the accepted conventions of character-drawing as with other conventions. In this matter the Elizabethans obeyed the

strict, traditional rules which often make the characters unsuited to the test that modern psychology would apply to them". (XXVII). Which opinion should we cling to?

However, a very few scholars have so far attempted to ascertain Shakespeare's knowledge of human nature. "Writing towards the close of the eighteenth century, the editor George Steevens observed that : All that we know of Shakespeare is that he was born at Stratford-on-Avon; married and had children there; went to London, where he commenced as actor, and wrote plays and poems; returned to Stratford, made his will and died". (XXVIII). And since then we have done almost nothing to ascertain Shakespeare's knowledge of human nature. Scholars, as yet, have only assessed the poet's dramaturgy, analysed his characters, and tried to understand the poet's knowledge of human beings from the general impression that his works create upon the mind. These are praiseworthy endeavours, no doubt, and, surely, we have received much Shakespeare education from these learned researches. But, I am constrained to say that none of these scholarly works revealed a scientific approach to the understanding of Shakespeare's knowledge of human nature. It is because of this that no two scholars exactly agree with each other respecting the extent and exactitude of the poet's knowledge of human nature. Thus, as against the praise showered by Johnson and Coleridge upon

Shakespeare for his knowledge of human nature, that we have observed above, J.W. Knight wrote : "The Shakespearean world does not exactly reflect the appearances of human or natural life. The events in his world are often strange to the point of impossibility. Who ever knew the sun go out? What man has ever acted as did King Lear, what woman as Hermione? Shakespeare has been praised to excess for 'characterisation'. The term is vague. If however we take it in its most usual and popular sense, as photographic verisimilitude to life, depending on clear differentiation of each person in the play or novel, we find 'characterization' not only not the Shakespearean essence, but actually the most penetrable spot to adverse criticism that may be discovered in his technique". (XXIX)

Again, different scholars observed different aspects of the human being perceived by Shakespeare. Thus, B. Partridge, for example, in his Shakespeare's Naudey (XXX), saw only sex in the poet's works. Following the instance of Partridge, one might count fourteen kisses within some thirty three lines of Titilus and Cressida (IV,v), and say that Shakespeare had an atavistic tendency of his oral stage of sexuality ! It would be unwise to magnify the sex in Shakespeare. No one can be absolutely alienated from the go of his age. The confluence of sex and histrionics can be seen even in the Greek drama. It ran through the Middle Ages

following an undulating path and persists even to-day : "Sex and the theater came together for the first time in ancient Greece where, if the script called for it, actors actually copulated on stage --- on occasion they were also known to kill slaves to add realism to murder scenes. The Roman circuses added brutality to theatrical sex by staging scenes of bestiality in which condemned women, daubed with the menstrual fluid of cows, were ravaged and killed by bulls.

"By the early Middle Ages, religion, in the form of morality plays which depicted scenes from the Bible, had hit the boards, although, in the "stews" or brothels of Bankside on the south bank of the Thames in London, there never seems to have been a shortage of sex shows for those who wanted and could afford them. It was at Bankside that the Globe Theatre, immortalized as the scene of young William Shakespeare's greatest triumphs, was built during the Tudor period. But despite royal patronage for such men as Shakespeare and Ben Jonson, the old aura of theatrical permissiveness still clung, and "wandering players" --- forerunners of the more modern repertory companies --- were classed with hawkers and prostitutes and subject to the same petty restrictions" (XXXI). So, Shakespeare can be exonerated of the charge of excess of sex as witnessed by Partridge.

Sigmund Freud found Oedipus complex, at least in Hamlet, if not in all his works. But we are not interested

in isolated aspects of the man. We want to know him and know him wholly — his sex, his Oedipus complex, his love, his instinct, his friendship, his jealousy, his madness, his grief and joy and even his sleep and dream. In other words, we are interested in the three-dimensional flesh-and-blood human being. And, for the identical reason, our assessment of Shakespeare's knowledge of human nature will not be complete until we gather his views of the man in all his aspects. Unfortunately, this has not been done as yet.

Of what profit will this study be to us? It will give us a clear picture of the Elizabethan people. It will also contribute to the modern's knowledge of man, however much ignorant the Elizabethans might have been of the modern psychology. S.O. Dana, in his Introduction to the Eight Elizabethan Plays, rightly said that "The Elizabethans were spiritual geographers. They charted the countries of the mind as well as remapped the earth". (XXKII). Introspection and observation are no less important for the understanding of the human being than experimentation. And in this sense the moderns are no superiors to the Elizabethans. However, our greatest profit will be that we shall be able to have a look at Shakespeare's knowledge of human nature.

A battery of studies, so far, has been directed towards Shakespeare's psychological acumen. But these studies are mainly based on his technique, association of ideas,

imagery, etc. A few scholars only have attempted to ascertain the poet's knowledge of man. But they had not the gestalt view of man. Isolated aspects of the whole man, only, were selected as the terms of reference. And so, their failure to ascertain and evaluate Shakespeare's knowledge of human psychology, as a whole, was merely consequential. To have even a very brief account of these scholars' endeavour will require volumes. I am constrained, therefore, to mention only a few of these scholars and what they attempted. A rather elaborate discussion may be found in the two volumes of Augustus M. N. A History of Shakespearean Criticism.

Let us take Johnson first. In his Preface to Shakespeare he showered praises upon Shakespeare for the dramatists' unflinching power of understanding human psychology. In his Preface to Shakespeare, he adjudged the poet the best observer of human behaviour. In the same work Johnson wrote : "This, therefore, is the praise of Shakespeare, that his drama is the mirror of life; that he who has raised his imagination, in following the phantoms which other writers raise up before him, may here be cured of his delirious ecstasies, by reading human sentiments in human language, by scenes from which a hermit may estimate the transactions of the world, and a confessor predict the progress of the passions". Johnson continues : "His adherence

to general nature has exposed him to the censure of critics, who form their judgments upon narrower principles. Danish and Rhymers think his Romans not sufficiently Roman; and Voltaire censures his kings as not completely royal. Danish is offended, that Messingus, a senator of Rome, should play the buffoon; and Voltaire perhaps thinks decency violated when the Danish Usurper is represented as a drunkard. But Shakespeare always makes nature predominate over accident; and if he preserves the essential character, is not very careful of distinctions superinduced and adventitious. His story requires Romans or kings but he thinks only on man (italics mine)". But like Coleridge, whom we shall meet soon, Johnson did not deal with Shakespeare's understanding of specific human traits or passions. Johnson evaluated Shakespeare's psychology from a broad impressional perspective.

Next Coleridge. He too highly applauded Shakespeare's knowledge of human psychology. But, nowhere did he show us Shakespeare's understanding of diverse human traits and his evaluation of these. Coleridge's approach was also broad-based. The conclusion was deduced from general impressions that Shakespeare's works produced upon him. Thus he wrote about Shakespeare: "... he shows us the life and principle of each being with organic regularity". (XXXIII).

91311  
14 JAN 1986

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY  
300A S. MOUNTAIN

Only here and there, Coleridge gives us evidences of Shakespeare's understanding of man. Thus, for example, he wrote : "Here I cannot help noticing a fine touch of Shakespeare's knowledge of human nature (italics mine), and generally of the great laws of the human mind: I mean Miranda's infant remembrance. Prospero asks her ---

"Canst thou remember

A time before we came unto this cell?

I do not think thou canst, for then thou wast not  
Out three years old.

Miranda answers,

"Certainly, sir, I can".

Prospero inquires,

"By what? by any other house or person?  
Of any thing the image tell me, that  
Hath kept with thy remembrance".

To which Miranda returns,

" 'Tis far off;

And rather like a dream than an assurance  
That my remembrance warrants.

Had I not

Four or five women once, that tended me?

Act I, scene 2.

This is exquisite ! " (XXXIV)

Sigmund Freud, in his youth, avidly read Shakespeare. In consonance with his theory of libido, he interpreted Hamlet as an example of Oedipus complex. Freud wrote : "Another of the great creations of tragic poetry, Shakespeare's Hamlet, has its roots in the same soil as Oedipus Rex ..... In the Oedipus the child's wishful phantasy that underlies it is brought into the open and realised as it would be in a dream. In Hamlet it remains repressed; and — just as in the case of a neurosis — we only learn of its existence from its inhibiting consequences .... According to the view which was originated by Goethe and is still the prevailing one to-day, Hamlet represents the type of man whose power of direct action is paralysed by an excessive development of his intellect. (He is 'sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought'). According to another view, the dramatist has tried to portray a pathologically irresolute character which might be classed as neurathenic. The plot of the drama shows us, however, that Hamlet is far from being represented as a person incapable of taking any action ..... Hamlet is able to do anything — except take vengeance on the man who did away with his father and took that father's place with his mother, the man who shows him the repressed wishes of his own childhood realised". (XXXV). We, again, encounter Freud's comment on Shakespeare in his psychology of unconscious 'slips' : "A still more

impressive example was found by O. Rank in Shakespeare. It occurs in the (sic) Merchant of Venice, in the famous scene in which the fortunate suitor makes his choice among the three caskets; .....

" '... Having at last found in Bassanio the suitor to whom she is inclined, she fears that he too will choose the wrong casket. She would like to tell him that even so he may rest assured of her love, but she is prevented by her oath. In this inner conflict the poet makes her say to her chosen suitor :

'... Beshrew your eyes,  
They have o'erlooked me, and divided me;  
One half of me is yours, the other half yours, \_\_\_\_\_  
mine own, I would say; but if mine than yours,  
And so all yours'. " (XXXVI).

Besides at these two places, we find only occasional references of minor worth to Shakespeare in Freud's writings. But, the point is that Freud has not at all thoroughly explained to us the dramatist's knowledge of human behaviour. Regarding the Oedipus complex in Hamlet, Freud only showed that Shakespeare unconsciously produced an Oedipal theme. To justify his point of unconscious production of Oedipal theme he wrote : "For it can of course only be the poet's own mind which confronts us in Hamlet. I observe in a book

on Shakespeare by Georg Brandes (1896) a statement that Hamlet was written immediately after the death of Shakespeare's father (in 1601), that is, under the immediate impact of his bereavement and, as we may well assume, while his childhood feelings about his father had been freshly revived". (XXXVII). And respecting the unconscious 'slip' in The Merchant of Venice, Freud did not say if Shakespeare had the knowledge of human being's unconscious 'slips' or the dramatist produced this famous scene [trick] unconsciously.

Ernest Jones was a disciple of Freud. What he did in his Oedipus-complex as an explanation of Hamlet's mystery (1910) was nothing other than an application, as an illustration of psychoanalytic theory in the interpretation of Shakespeare. What Freud said briefly, Jones merely elaborated in his book. According to Jones "Claudius succeeds in doing the two things that Hamlet had unconsciously wished to do : killed his father and married his mother, yet his power to act against his hated rival is paralysed by his own sense of guilt". (XXXVIII).

Bernard Shaw railed at Shakespeare for nothing. Shakespeare did not discuss stage direction in his plays and so Shaw had prepared this libel against Shakespeare in the Preface to Plays Pleasant and Unpleasant : "It is for want of this elaboration that Shakespeare, unsurpassed as

poet, story-teller, character-draughtsman, humorist, and rhetorician, has left no coherent drama, and could not afford to pursue a genuinely scientific method in his studies of character and society". Shaw had a fallacious illation.

M.M. Reese, in his Shakespeare (Chapter XII, 'The Nature of Man'), discussed Shakespeare's knowledge of psychology. But the information is scanty regarding the dramatist's knowledge of human nature. The chapter mainly deals with the Elizabethans' knowledge of mythological psychology. Thus, Reese, for example, wrote about the Elizabethan denizen : "He had at his disposal a considerable body of psychological thinking, and if each individual could successfully analyse the blend of the four elements and the four humours in his personal composition, he was the better able to guard against his weaknesses and take up the correct ethical attitudes". (XXXIX). Nevertheless, here and there, in this chapter, Reese touched upon the dramatist's knowledge of psychology. But, it must be emphasized at the same time, that Reese's observation on Shakespeare's knowledge of psychology was also never analytic --- it was of a broad and impressional character. His observations can be illustrated with an example : "In order and the due observance of function he found the necessary laws for man's conduct of himself and his relations with his

temporal sovereign and the gods above; and in the conventional Elizabethan psychology he, along with other poets, found an artistically adequate explanation of the causes which bring men to ruin. However faulty it may be when submitted to scientific analysis, this psychology was sufficient for the uses of tragedy, and it produced much more convincing drama than the simplified, colourless parables in which medieval poetry had accounted for men's fall from greatness". (XL). And, as it is clear from the very appearance, such observations are not an estimation of Shakespeare's understanding of man.

A.C. Bradley, in his lecture on 'Shakespeare the Man' dwelt at some length on the psychological knowledge of Shakespeare, but he can be bracketed with Reese in his method and observations. Bradley's essay, as its title indicates, dwelt mainly with the personal characteristics of Shakespeare the man. We can, take into account the whole essay of Bradley's in a short single sentence of his regarding Shakespeare : "After all, he was human". (XLI). Bradley, however, read Bagshot's essay on 'Shakespeare the Man'. (XLII). and Harris' book The Man Shakespeare (XLIII), but neither of the two works could enrich Bradley's understanding of Shakespeare's knowledge of human nature.

Wolfgang Clemen's psychological work The Development of Shakespeare's Imagery is certainly a laudatory work like Caroline Spurgeon's Shakespeare's Imagery and What It

Tells us and Una Ellis-Fermor's some recent research in Shakespeare's Imagery. All these authors had taken the dramatist's imagery as their object of study. They analysed the imagery — its nature, its development, its associations, etc. Again, H.A. Armstrong's Shakespeare's Imagination: A Study of the Psychological Association and Inspiration dwelt merely with how different ideas naturally flocked together in the dramatist's mind. E. Dowden's Shakespeare: A Critical Study of his Mind and Art is not a psychological study of the dramatist's knowledge of man. And, though the title of his book Shakespeare and the Nature of Man indicates that T. Spencer has something to say about Shakespeare's knowledge of psychology, he has, rather, something else to say. All these are psychological studies. But none of these authors attempted to assess the dramatist's knowledge of human behaviour. The object of Clemen's book The Development of Shakespeare's Imagery, for example, is very clear (in the concluding chapter): "The aim of this study has been to trace the development of Shakespeare's imagery throughout his work and to consider it as an integral part of the more complex evolution of his dramatic art". (C IV).

Names of authors could be multiplied — authors who worked on the borderline of Shakespeare's understanding of man. But, unfortunately, this all important virgin ground

still remains to be broken. The present research is a humble attempt to open a new vista to Shakespeare study. Very few critics, as we have partially seen above, have attempted to explore the subject, from different angles, and yet the present work may claim to have made a significant departure. The aim of the present study is to ascertain how far Shakespeare knows of human psychology, of human nature. The proposed study is a pioneering work in as much as it is from an altogether unconventional angle.

The aim of this present project are two-fold: collection of Shakespeare's "psychological expressions" and an attempt to evaluate these from the psychological point of view. In this it is not merely an anthology like George Ryland's The Ages of Man (XLV). The method of this research is objective and almost scientific. I say "almost scientific" because certainly Shakespeare's "psychological expressions" cannot be taken to the laboratory and then experimentally verified. We can only look over these from a broad psychological view-point. But, nonetheless, my method here must be distinguished from Sainte-Beuve's philosophical method of "direct reading of an author's personal life into his works". (XVI).

The data are strewn throughout Shakespeare's whole works. The method of study is as follows. In his 37 plays, 154 Sonnets, and 5 poetical works ("His accepted output,....

is thirty seven plays, two long poems, 154 Sonnets and various shorter poems" (XLVII)), Shakespeare has at least 434 "psychological expressions", which collectively suggest how very remarkable a psychologist (although not in the academic sense of the word) — how acute an observer of human nature — the dramatist is; how correctly, barring his naive't and contradictions, at some places, he knows of human nature — of man's basic instincts, of human motives, and human responses in particular psychological situations. The number 434 is misleading here. None can definitely say how many "psychological expressions" are there in Shakespeare. The difficulty of such an assertion is that between two interpretations of a spoonful of Shakespeare's work there may be a gulf. Therefore, I have confined myself to only the least controversial ones.

By a "psychological expression" I mean sentences, a sentence, or even a part of a sentence, which have any bearing on any psychological characteristic of man, sika love, hate, sleep, dream, grief, joy, fear, jealousy, response to beauty and music, friendship, madness, etc.

Out of these 434 "psychological expressions", in this work, I have taken only 205 which will be distributed under different heads, each one of these heads being a psychological characteristic of man. All the "psychological

expressions" coming under a particular head, then, will be taken as a whole, which will certainly indicate how accurately Shakespeare knows about that particular characteristic or trait of man. In this way, when we shall know of Shakespeare's knowledge of diverse human characteristics, we shall be able to assess his knowledge of human nature as a whole.

A note of caution should be added here for several reasons. For one thing, some "psychological expressions" are very much vague. As when Brabantio says:

"Strike on the tinder, ho !  
Give me a taper; call up all my people.  
This accident is not unlike my dream".

(Othello, I.1,141-143.)

We are at a loss here: Does Shakespeare believe that some dreams come to be true [in the Jungian sense] due to the unconscious working of the mind on 'conscious' problems during sleep? Or, does he say here that there is a mere coincidence between Brabantio's dream and Othello's elopement of Desdemona? I have taken such "expressions" into my account only when I have found that there are more than one such "expressions" of the same kind, because the plurality of the same "expressions" may indicate the author's silent belief in the phenomenon. Besides, we should not be too much peevish in this matter because such "expressions" are a rarity.

Secondly, sometimes a character may read a piece or sing a song, which piece or song may contain a "psychological expression". What are we to do here? Objections may be raised that the song or the piece may contain a prevalent idea of Elizabethan England having nothing to do with Shakespeare's own belief or knowledge. But, in this case also I have taken the "psychological expression" into account on the ground that these are very rare "expressions" having a very little chance of vitiating the veracity of my conclusion. Moreover, we cannot vouch that Shakespeare does not believe in that too.

However, even a greater caution should rather be attached to my forth coming conclusion. Drama is the most objective of literary genres and Shakespeare, by common consent, is one of the most objective dramatists. The question, so, naturally arises : Is it proper to pronounce a verdict on Shakespeare's knowledge of human nature judging from his works alone? Is it not possible that Shakespeare merely incorporated the prevalent psychological knowledge of the Elizabethan world in his works, without making himself a party to it? If the charge against my conclusion be such, I can only seek the support of Bradley: "Is it really conceivable that a man can write some five and thirty dramas, and portray in them an enormous amount and variety of human nature, without betraying anything whatever

of his own disposition and preferences? I do not believe that he could do this, even if he deliberately set himself to the task. The only question is how much of himself he would betray". (XVIII) (italics mine). But, why only 'disposition' and 'preferences'? Why not knowledge too? However, had Shakespeare been merely influenced by the environmental factors and had he been merely instrumental in the production of his dramas, how is it, for example, that while Phillip Messinger's A New Way To Pay Old Debts begins with a conversation on tobacco which was much in vogue then, there is almost nowhere a mention of this omnipresent commodity in Shakespeare?

But Bradley's question is very much pertinent: "how much of himself" the dramatist would betray in his works? How much can we know of Shakespeare's knowledge of human nature from his works? We should not be over sceptical here. For one thing, Shakespeare's works are distributed throughout a long period of about 29 years [ circa 1564 to 1613 ]. Can any writer, even of the stature of Shakespeare, so long sustain within his mind any determined effort to hide himself behind his objectivity? Certainly not. Secondly, the area of investigation being a vast one — 37 plays, 154 Sonnets, and 5 poetical works — we are doubly sure of our success in assessing Shakespeare's knowledge of human nature, for it is next to impossible to cultivate so vast an area keeping

oneself away from it. Thirdly, the Sonnets being the intimate compositions, there is a store-house of our credible informations there.

Another objection may be raised here. The knowledge of human nature that may be gathered from Shakespeare's works, may not be anything else than Elizabethan people's prevalent knowledge of humans. Granting that this is so, we may say that even then it is Shakespeare's knowledge, in so far as he believed in that knowledge, for knowledge involves both knowing and believing. And, Shakespeare could not written all that he has written without believing in what he wanted to write. Nevertheless, adventitious ideas may be there, ideas which Shakespeare did not believe, but yet had incorporated in the works only because people for whom the plays were written believed these. But, we have no other way out than to treat these as what in statistics is called standard errors or in experiment is known as experimental errors, errors which do not deter one to draw conclusions. As the present study is not a mediumistic exercise in line with, say, that of Alfred Dodd (ALIX), such errors we can well ignore. Still another objection may be raised here as well. As we have said before that there are, probably, more than 434 "psychological expressions" and those beyond 434 items are excluded on the ground that they permit diverse interpretations as they are of nebulous

characters. Could the conclusion be any wise affected had those left-out "psychological expressions" been taken into account? Certainly not. Because the "psychological expressions" which are left-out certainly are not different from those which have been taken into account, at least as a whole, in so far as they are Shakespeare's too. And, moreover, because they are very very few in number.

When we shall use the word 'psychology' about the Elizabethan people, we must keep in mind what M.C. Bradbrook said in this respect: "The professional psychology of the Elizabethans — though psychology itself was of course a word they did not know and might not have approved of — has often been taken as a guide to the dramatic characters of Shakespeare, who are explained as studies in melancholy, anger, or fear . . . . . the Elizabethan 'psychologists' such as Bright, La Primaudaye, and Coeffeteau were not concerned to erect a body of consistent, articulated science, for science in the modern sense had not yet been born. It was the creation of the seventeenth century. Therefore in deducing some theory of what the Elizabethans agreed upon, and what Shakespeare might accordingly take for granted, a false perspective of order is imposed upon the diversified material". (1). Yet, at the same time we shall not forget that "... Shakespeare, like other artists of his age, was capable of presenting as art something infinitely

were complex than his age could know in any other terms. It is said that Leonardo da Vinci's sketches show a knowledge of human anatomy which did not receive scientific expression till the nineteenth century. In the same way, the drawings of Durer and some of the illustrators of early herbals show a botanical knowledge far in advance of the scientific botanists of their time". (LI). "Another fact : Honoré de Balzac, the French novelist and one of the greatest of writers, said in one of his works that he thought that certain potent secretions then unknown to science probably operate in the human organism and account for various of its psycho-physical features. Several decades later the discovery was made in the human organism of several previously unknown glands that produce hormones, thus leading to the creation of the highly important science of endocrine glands. Such blending of the creative activities of scientists and leading writers is by no means rare. Lomonosov and Goethe were poets and scientists at one and the same time, as was the novelist Strindberg whose Captain Koel was one of the first to foresee nitrogen extraction from the atmosphere". (LII). Therefore, without being recognised as a psychologist in the academic sense, Shakespeare may have knowledge of psychology — knowledge of human nature.

After we have done everything, if we do not know with how much confidence we shall be able to say that Shakespeare stands where we have reached at our conclusion, we may pay heed to what Henri Fluchère says in the 'Foreword' to the English edition of his Shakespeare: "About as good as Shakespeare, it is probable that we can never be right; and if we can never be right, it is better that we should from time to time change our way of being wrong". (italics mine) (LIII). Because what Defoe says about the common Englishman must not be applied to Shakespeare: "In close intrigue, their faculty's but weak, / For generally what'er they know, they speak". (LIV).

Lastly, editions of Shakespeare's works are as puzzling as he himself is. In the plethora of the editions no one, probably, can claim exactitude. Variations are there among editions. For example, the Nurse's speech in Romeo and Juliet were in prose in the bad quarto (1597), the good quarto (1599) and the First Folio (1623), edited by John Heminge and Henry Condell, but in the modern editions these are in verse. Fortunately, however, there are very few and very minor substantial differences among the editions, at least regarding my enquiry. However, I have used the Tudor edition of Shakespeare.

**B A R B E R E M C E E**

- I. Joad, C.B.M. Guide to Modern Thought. Faber and Faber Ltd, 1948.
- II. Ayscock, H.J., et al. encyclopaedia of psychology. Dentans/ Collins, Great Britain, 1975, vol. II, p. 602-03.
- III. Welleck, René' and Warren, Austin. Theory of Literature. Penguin, 1978, p. 33.
- IV. ibid, p. 91.
- V. Wettlin, Margaret. Playg. Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1974, p. 79.
- VI. ibid, p. 77.
- VII. Wyea, Dieter. Depth Psychology: A Critical History. translated by Gerald Oan, George Allen and Unwin Ltd, London, 1966, p. 559.
- VIII. Joseph Campbell (ed.). Portable Jung, translated by R.F.O. Hull, Penguin Books, 1977, p. 301.
- IX. ibid, p. 81.
- X. Fluchere, Henri. Shakespeare, translated by Guy Hamilton, Longmans, Green and Co., 1963, p. 11.
- XI. Knight, G.W. The Wheel of Fire. Methuen and Co., Ltd, London, 1965, p. 270.

- XII. Aurobindo, Sri. Letters of Sri Aurobindo, Sri Aurobindo Circle, Bombay, 1949, Third Series (On Poetry and Literature), p. 139.
- XIII. Coleridge, S.T. Lectures on Shakespeare, Sigs, Everyman's Library, 1951, p. 177.
- XIV. Bradley, A.C. Oxford Lectures on Poetry, Macmillan and Co., London, Ltd, 1965, p. 311.
- XV. Harbage, Alfred. Conceptions of Shakespeare. Harvard Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1966, p. 3.
- XVI. Bradley, A.C., op.cit., p. 311.
- XVII. Fluchere, Henri, op.cit., p. 131.
- XVIII. Sainov, A. 'Shakespeare, the Renaissance and the Age of Barocco' in Shakespeare in the Soviet Union, translated by Avril Fyman, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1966, p. 58.
- XIX. Ibid., p. 58.
- XX. Brown, C.S. The Reader's Companion to World Literature. Mentor Books, U.S.A., 1964, p. 372.
- XXI. Saurin, Roman. 'Preface' to Shakespeare in the Soviet Union, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1966, p. 11.
- XXII. Ibid., p. 139.
- XXIII. Kaufmann, Walter. Nietzsche, Princeton Paperbacks, Fourth edition, p. 392.

- XXIV. Nicoll, Allardyce. World Drama, George Harrap and Co. Ltd, Great Britain, 1952, p. 274.
- XXV. Temyson, G.B. (Ed.). A Carlyle Reader, Modern Library, New York, 1964, p. 398.
- XXVI. Papanoutsos, E.P., 'The Universe of Literary Creation', The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism, Temple Univ., U.S.A., vol. XXIV, no. 3, 1976.
- XXVII. Fluchere, Henri. op.cit., p. 136.
- XXVIII. Reese, M.M. Shakespeare, His World And His work, Edward Arnold Ltd, 1958, p. 345.
- XXIX. Knight, G.W., op.cit., p. 270.
- XXX. Partridge, Eric. Shakespeare's Bardy: A Literary and Psychological Essay and A Comprehensive Glossary, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1947.
- XXXI. Purnell Reference Books, Understanding Human Behavior, 24 vols. 1977, vol. XII, p. 1369.
- XXXII. Random House (Publisher). Eight Famous Elizabethan Plays, New York, 1932.
- XXXIII. Coleridge, S.T., op.cit., p. 455.
- XXXIV. ibid., pp. 457-58.
- XXXV. Freud, Sigmund. The Interpretation of Dreams, translated by James Strachey, George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., London, 1954, pp. 264-65.

- XXXVI. \_\_\_\_\_, A General Introduction to  
Psychoanalysis, translated by Joan  
Riviere, Garden City Publishing Co. Inc.,  
New York, 1943, pp. 35-36.
- XXXVII. \_\_\_\_\_, The Interpretations of Dreams,  
p. 265.
- XXXVIII. Halliday, F.B. A Shakespeare Companion, Penguin  
Books, 1964, p. 265.
- XXXIX. Reese, M.M., op.cit., p. 461.
- XI. ibid., p. 464.
- XII. Bradley, A.G., op.cit., p. 314.
- XIII. ibid., p. 315.
- XIV. ibid., footnote.
- XV. Clomen, wolfgang. The Development of shakespeare's  
Imagery, Cambridge Univ. Paperback,  
2nd edn., p. 217.
- XVI. Rylands, George. The Age of Man, Mercury Books,  
London, 1962.
- XVII. Matthiessen, F.O. American Renaissance, Oxford Univ.  
Press, India, 1973, p. xii.
- XVIII. Reese, M.M. op.cit., p. 377.
- XIX. Bradley, A.G., op.cit., p. 314.
- XX. Dodd, Alfred. The Immortal Master, Rider and Co.,  
London, New York, Melbourne, no date.

- I. Bradbrook, M.C. Shakespeare and Elizabethan Poetry,  
Penguin Books, p. 79.
- LI. Ibid., p. 79.
- LII. Gorky, Maxim. On Literature, Progress Publishers,  
Moscow, p. 29.
- LIII. Fluchere, Henri, op.cit., 'Foreword'.
- LIV. Emerson, R.W. Essays and Poems, Collins, London  
and Glasgow, 1954, p. 484.