

**Hebron University  
College of Graduate Studies  
English Department**

**Critical Discourse Analysis of Shylock's Speech in Shakespeare's The Merchant of Venice in Contexts of Power, Ideology and Identity**

**By  
Hamada Shehdeh Abid Dawood**

**Supervised By  
Dr. Nimer Abuzahra**

This thesis is submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Applied Linguistics and the Teaching of English, College of Graduate Studies, Hebron University, Palestine.

**2015**

**Hebron University  
College of Graduate Studies  
English Department**

**Critical Discourse Analysis of Shylock's Speech in Shakespeare's The Merchant of Venice in Contexts of Power, Ideology and Identity**

**By  
Hamada Shehdeh Abid Dawood**

**This thesis was successfully defended on 22 January 2015 and approved by:**

**Committee members:**

**Signature**

**1. Dr. Nimer Abuzahra (Chair)**



**2. Dr. Jamal Nafi (External Examiner)**



**3. Dr. Mohammed Farrah (Internal Examiner)**



## **Dedication**

- To my parents, especially my lovely mother who has spent nights awake to support me... She is the only one who encouraged me to continue my studying...
- To the soul of martyrs who award their souls as redemption to our lovely country, Palestine...
- To the soul of my cousin: Martyr Issa Ali Abid Dawood...
- To the prisoner Rami Salim Ali Dawood...
- To my brothers, sisters, relatives, friends, colleagues, and professors...
- To my perseverant supervisor Dr. Nimer Abu Zahra whose feedback and continuous assistance are fast and marvellous...
- To all who helped me (too many to mention by name)...

I dedicate this work.

## **Acknowledgments**

Special thanks are to my supervisor Dr. Nimer Abu Zahra who helped me intensely without being fretful. I'm extremely grateful to him for his cooperation. Dr. Abu Zahra showed unparalleled and continuous edition to my work.

I would like to thank my parents who encouraged me to continue my studying, especially my kindhearted mother.

My thanks are also to be extended to all those who helped me. I would not have been able to complete my project without their help.

## Table of Contents

Dedication .....	I
Acknowledgments.....	II
Table of Contents .....	III
List of Abbreviations.....	VI
الملخص .....	VII
Abstract .....	VIII
Chapter One: Introduction.....	1
1.1. Introduction .....	1
1.2. The Merchant of Venice: Critical View .....	2
1.3. Major Characters in the Play .....	3
1.4. Theories to Critical Discourse Analysis .....	4
1.4.1. Epistemology.....	5
1.4.2. General Social Theories, Social Psychology, and Critical Linguistics .....	5
1.4.3. Middle-range and Micro-sociological Theories .....	5
1.4.4. Mainstream Linguistics .....	6
1.5. Statement of the Problem .....	6
1.6. Research Purposes .....	6
1.7. Research Questions .....	7
1.8. Significance of the Study .....	7
1.9. Limitations of the Study .....	8
1.10. Definition of Terms .....	8
1.10.1. Context .....	8
1.10.2. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA).....	8
1.10.3. Discourse .....	9
1.10.4. Text.....	9
1.10.5. Utterance .....	9
1.10.6. Pragmatic Meaning.....	9
1.10.7. Irony .....	9
1.10.8. Repetition .....	10
1.11. Summary .....	10
Chapter Two: Literature Review.....	11
2.1. Introduction .....	11

2.1.1. Discourse Analysis and Critical Discourse Analysis .....	11
2.2. Discourse and Power .....	12
2.3. Discourse and Identity .....	13
2.4. Discourse and Ideology .....	14
2.5. Discourse and Characterisation .....	15
2.6. Shakespeare's Language .....	16
2.7. Related Studies .....	17
2.8. Summary .....	22
Chapter Three: Research Methodology .....	23
3.1. Introduction .....	23
3.2. The Role of Discourse Analysis .....	23
3.3. Structure in Standard Drama .....	24
3.4. The Design of the Research.....	25
3.5. The Data .....	25
3.6. Procedures of Analysis .....	27
3.6.1. The Language of Literature .....	27
3.6.2. Literature as Discourse .....	29
3.6.3. Literary Criticism and Discourse Analysis.....	30
3.6.4. Applying CDA to the Drama.....	31
3.7. Summary .....	32
Chapter Four: Analysis and Findings.....	33
4.1. Introduction .....	33
4.2. Power, Identity and Ideology in the Play .....	33
4.3. Analysis of the Bond .....	34
4.4. Analysis of Shylock's Speech in Contexts of Power, Identity and Ideology .....	36
4.4.1 Act I, Scene III .....	37
4.4.2. Act II, Scene V .....	45
4.4.3. Act III, Scene I .....	48
4.4.4. Act III, Scene III.....	53
4.4.5. Act IV, Scene I .....	54
4.5. Findings .....	64
4.5.1. Why do those Charged with Authority, like Christians in The Merchant of Venice, Reproduce Discourse the Way Suiting their Interests?.....	65
4.5.2. How do the Ideologies of a Variety of People Living together Affect Each Other, such as the Jews and the Christians in MV? .....	65

4.5.3. What is the Impact of Christians' Identity on the Identity of the Jews, especially Shylock, in MV?.....	66
4.6. Conclusion.....	67
4.7. Summary .....	67
Chapter Five: Conclusion.....	69
5.1. Introduction .....	69
5.2. Language Manipulation, Power, Identity and Ideology .....	70
5.3. Analysis of the Settings of the Play.....	71
5.4. Shylock's Language Variation in the Scenes of the Play .....	72
5.5. Who is Shylock?.....	73
5.6. Shylock as a Christian .....	75
5.7. The End Justifies the Means.....	76
5.8. Summary .....	77
5.9. Recommendations for Further Studies .....	77
References .....	79

## **List of Abbreviations**

- DA: Discourse Analysis
- CDA: Critical Discourse Analysis
- MV: The Merchant of Venice



## الملخص

تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى دراسة وتحليل خطاب شايلوك في مسرحية شكسبير تاجر البندقية، وذلك من خلال دراسة العلاقة بين الخطاب والسلطة، والأيدولوجية، والهوية في المسرحية. وتهدف الدراسة أيضا إلى دراسة آثار التلاعب اللغوي على السلطة، وتهدف إلى إيجاد حلقة الوصل بين اللغة وبنية المجتمع، وإيجاد تأثير مزيج من الأيدولوجيات المختلفة على بعضها البعض. لذلك، هدفت الدراسة كذلك إلى الإجابة عن الأسئلة: لماذا يقوم أصحاب النفوذ، مثل المسيحيين في تاجر البندقية، على إعادة صياغة الخطاب بالطريقة التي تناسب مصالحهم؟ كيف تؤثر أيدولوجيات الناس المختلفة الذين يعيشون معا على بعضها البعض، مثل اليهود والمسيحيين في المسرحية؟ ما هو تأثير هوية المسيحيين على الهوية اليهودية، وخاصة شايلوك، في المسرحية؟ وبالتالي، فإن هذه الدراسة النوعية الوصفية بحثت في المراجع السابقة المماثلة للإجابة عن هذه الأسئلة. وبالإضافة إلى ذلك، حاول الباحث من خلال دراسته للمسرحية تحليل خطاب شايلوك. وكذلك استخدمت بعض النظريات المتعلقة بالتحليل النقدي للخطاب، دون تحديد أي منها أثناء التحليل، مثل Cultural Model التي تنص على أن من هم في السلطة يؤثرون على غيرهم. ما وصلت إليه الدراسة هو أن شايلوك اليهودي يفتقر إلى القوة و الأيدولوجية والهوية اليهودية، ولكن عندما سعى إلى العثور على هذه العناصر، فقدما كلها. ومن خلال وضعه الاقتصادي القوي حاول تثبيت نفسه وأيدولوجيته بين المسيحيين الذين يسيطرون على المجتمع كله. ويمكن أن تعزى الأسباب وراء فشل شايلوك في الحصول على "الذات" إلى شخصيته الوحشية.

على الرغم من أنه يحب المال بشدة، فضل شايلوك رطلا من اللحم المسيحي "الفاقد" بإصراره على التطبيق الحرفي للصك والذي بدوره أدى إلى دماره. لقد تناسى شايلوك قدرة الناس ذوي السلطة على تحرير وتغيير لغة الصك بالشكل الذي يروونه مناسبا لمصالحهم الخاصة. حدث ذلك عندما تنكرت بورشيا بصورة شاب. وهي فتاة مسيحية. وقامت بدور المحامي ودافعت عن أنتونيو. لقد استطاعت بورشيا أن تجد نقطة ضعف لغوية في الصك وهي أن لشايلوك رطل لحم مسيحي ولكن عليه أن لا يريق قطرة دم واحدة. لذلك، فشلت كل خطط شايلوك وبذلك تمت مصادرة ممتلكاته وخسر هويته اليهودية. ولقد أُجبر على اعتناق المسيحية وعليه أن يتصرف كمسيحي وليس كيهودي. باختصار، خسر شايلوك هويته اليهودية وأيدولوجيته وقوته لأنه "لعب مع الكبار"؛ اللغة هي إحدى العوامل المؤثرة في فرض السلطة، وتدمير الهويات "غير المرغوب فيها" وإنهاء أيدولوجية الآخرين عن طريق "الأيدي العليا" في أي مجتمع.

## Abstract

This paper aims to examine, reveal and analyse Shylock's speech in Shakespeare's The Merchant of Venice, by connecting his words to the power, identity, and ideology in the play. The purposes of this study are to examine the effects of linguistic manipulation on power, to link language with the structure of a society, and to find the impact of a combination of different ideologies on each other. Therefore, the study aims to answer the questions: Why do those charged with authority, like Christians in The Merchant of Venice, reproduce discourse the way suiting their interests? How do the ideologies of different people living together affect each other, such as the Jews and the Christians in the play? What is the impact of Christians' identity on the identity of the Jews, especially Shylock, in MV? Hence, this descriptive qualitative study explores the literature to answer those questions. In addition, the researcher tries to analyze the language of the Jew character, called Shylock, depending on his reading and analysis of Shylock's utterances. Some theories related to CDA are used, without specifying any, such as the cultural model which states that those in power affect powerless people. What is found in this paper is that Shylock, the Jew, lacks power, Jewish ideology, and Jewish identity, but when he tries to find these aspects, he fails to gain any of them. Through his economic power status, he tries to establish his Jewish identity and ideology between the Christians who control the whole society at the time of the play. The reasons behind Shylock's failure in obtaining "the self" can be attributed or ascribed to his brutal character. Though he likes money, he prefers a pound of a Christian's "rotten" flesh. His insistence on the literal implementation of the bond leads to his destruction. He neglects the fact that those charged with power are able to edit the language of "his bond" the way they like. That occurs when Portia, disguised as a lawyer, finds a defect in the bond. Literally, Shylock has the flesh, but nonliterally, he doesn't have the blood. Therefore, all his plans have failed in which his property is

confiscated and his Jewish identity is lost. He has to adopt Christianity and behave like Christians. To conclude, Shylock's power, Jewish ideology and Jewish identity are set aside since he "plays" with those who are charged in power; language is one of the most influencing factors aiding in imposing power, destroying "unwanted" identities, and appropriating others' ideology by the "upper hands" in any society.

## Chapter One: Introduction

### 1.1. Introduction

Discourse as defined by Widdowson (2007, p.7) “refers both to what a text producer meant by a text and what a text means to the receiver”. In other words, discourse means what is intended by the speaker, and how it is interpreted by the listener. Likewise, the text producer encodes a message and the receiver tries to decode it. Discourse analysis (DA) is thus “concerned with the relationship between language and the contexts of its use” (McCarthy, 2009, 10). Accordingly, discourse is a social and linguistic combination between the producer and the receiver of the text.

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) is a special approach in discourse analysis which focuses on the discursive conditions, components and consequences of power (Van Dijk, 1995, p. 24). Consequently, critical discourse analysis is an application theory concerned with common social problems which highlight the practice of those in power, such as the Christians in Shakespeare’s The Merchant of Venice; they reveal the ideology of the Christians who are interacting with the Jews in the play. Ideology represents the values running a society. In other words, it reflects the interests and assumptions of a particular group (Hodge, 2012), so there is negative ideology such as discrimination, and there is positive ideology such as anti-discrimination. Through the practice of power, one’s identity can be established, and who has power has a specific identity in the society. For example, in The Merchant of Venice, Christian identity is distinguished by authority, especially in the court scene in the play.

In order to study social issues adequately, Van Dijk (1995) notes that CDA focuses on the relations between discourse and society and on group relations of power, dominance and inequality. He adds that ideologies play a significant role in the production or resistance against dominance or inequality. Finding manipulation in texts and

examining patterns of elite dominance are ways to do CDA. Additionally, sometimes, readers or listeners expect something different from what the writers or speakers mean or intend, since “in writing there is a pressure of avoiding forms whose meaning depends on intonation factors, facial expressions or gestures” (Abbas, 2012, p. 339). That is to say, the reason is that words sometimes have hidden meanings in which the receivers may not pay attention to. Therefore, it is believed that words have a specific meaning in themselves, and they have another in a specific context. So, when analysing a speech, one should look at where, when and why such an utterance is produced.

This study, however, will examine the social interaction between Jews and Christians in Shakespeare’s The Merchant of Venice. It is known that Christians have power over Jews in the play which leads to destruction at the end of the play to a Jew merchant called Shylock. For instance, Shylock tries to defeat the Christian merchant in the court scene, but unexpectedly, he is defeated. This character will be critically analysed in accordance with his social and linguistic interactions with Christians.

## **1.2. The Merchant of Venice: Critical View**

The title of the play is named after Antonio, the merchant. We know this when the disguised Portia says in the court: "Which is the merchant here, and which the Jew?" (4.1.172), so, the difficulty of Antonio should be overcome, not the difficulty of Shylock, for Shylock causes the risks to Antonio. However, "The Merchant of Venice, one of Shakespeare’s most controversial plays, has proven particularly plastic" (Schuman, 2002, p. 47). It is 'plastic' since it can be read and interpreted depending on the reader's viewpoint. However, it deals with four events: the bond, the casket, the elopement of Jessica, Shylock’s only daughter, and the rings, but the main story in the play is the case of the bond. During the play, readers notice that both Christians and Jews lack mercy. For instance, Antonio, the Christian merchant, is in need for money

and goes to Shylock to borrow, but he insults Shylock. At the court, which represents power, Antonio asks Shylock to show some mercy, but Shylock refuses. In addition, Shylock believes that he will win against Antonio by fighting him through the literal implementation of the bond, but the truth is that Shylock is defeated because of his urgency on the literal implementation.

Shylock tries to create an identity for himself. This insulted Jew tries to establish himself between the Christians who govern and have power over Jews at the time of the play. The use of religious and poignant words by Shylock implicates the lack of power and identity. Moreover, the social interaction between Jews and Christians is through money and trade. For example, it is shameful for Shylock to get his daughter married to a Christian. From this point, one can conclude that Shylock looks at Christians as inferior members and they are unwelcomed and un-respected in his ideology or belief.

Generally, this paper deals with people, or Christians, who control minorities, Jews in this case. Through the progress of the play, it is noticed that a group of people suffer from bias by those who have power, where those who are powerless try to defeat the powerful without having a prior or planned knowledge of what is going to happen.

### **1.3. Major Characters in the Play**

Many characters interact with Shylock in the play. One of those characters is Jessica, Shylock's daughter, whose first appearance is in Act 2, Scene 3. Particularly, the major characters who affect Shylock's characterization in terms of CDA are:

- Jessica: She's the only daughter to Shylock. She leaves her father's home and religion, and adopts Christianity. When she elopes with her lover, she steals her father's money. One of the stolen money is the ring of her mother that represents the relationship between a husband and a wife.

- Tubal: He is another Jew who lends Shylock three thousand ducats that Shylock lends to Antonio. Tubal brings "good news" to Shylock that Antonio's ships are wrecked; he, additionally, informs Shylock about his daughter that she spent the money she stole.
- Antonio: He borrows money from Shylock to offer them to his friend Bassanio. He uses to declass Shylock by spitting upon him, cursing him, and the like. Shylock, then, manages to cut off a pound of his flesh because Antonio can't defray the debt,.
- Portia: She is described well by Shylock at the court. She is disguised as a boy in order to defend Antonio. Though Shylock regards her positively, she doesn't support him, for Antonio wins the case. She turns the table upon Shylock's head. "Portia's mind allows her to find loopholes in legal matters, thus rescuing her new husband's friend from his bond" (Cope, 2007, p. 8).
- Bassanio: He is considered as the suitor to Portia. He wants to appear rich in order to marry her, so he borrows three thousand ducats causing all the problems of the play with Shylock.

#### **1.4. Theories to Critical Discourse Analysis**

Meyer (2001, pp. 19-20) provides seven theories, which can be found in CDA, including epistemology, general social theories, middle range theories, micro-sociological theories, socio-psychological theories, discourse theories, and linguistic theories. Additionally, Mills (1997, pp. 8-10) explores the cultural theory, critical theory, literary theory, mainstream linguistics, social psychology, and the critical linguistics. All of these theories compromise CDA, so all of these theories are going to be taken into considerations when doing CDA to The Merchant of Venice. The following is a brief explanation to these theories:

### **1.4.1. Epistemology**

It includes theories reflecting the limitations of "human perception in general and scientific perception in particular" (Meyer, 2001, p. 19). Because epistemology addresses issues of knowledge, dualism and reality, discourse and social actions are linked. In other words, when the discourse changes, the object loses its original identity and becomes a new object (Meyer, 2001, p. 20).

### **1.4.2. General Social Theories, Social Psychology, and Critical Linguistics**

General social theories examine the relations "between social structure and social action" in order to imply some kind of circulation between them (Meyer, 2001, p. 19). So, according to him, general social theories, often called grand theories, provide bottom-up and top-down explanations to the structure or context and the actions within a society. However, for social psychologists and critical linguists, discourse is seen as power relations affecting the production of texts such as racism and sexism, so social psychologists tend to integrate concern with power relations and the resultant structures of authorized utterances (Mills, 1997, 9). "Discursive psychology is an approach to social psychology that has developed a type of discourse analysis in order to explore the ways in which people's selves, thoughts and emotions are formed and transformed through social interaction" (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002, p. 7).

### **1.4.3. Middle-range and Micro-sociological Theories**

Middle-range theories "focus either upon specific social phenomena (such as conflict, cognition, social networks), or on specific subsystems of society (such as economy, politics, religion)", where the micro-sociological theories "try to explain social interactions", for example "the reconstruction of everyday procedures which members of a society use to create their own social order" (Meyer, 2001, p. 19).



#### **1.4.4. Mainstream Linguistics**

Discourse for theorists within the mainstream linguistics is seen by linguists as a structured system of language. In this case, cohesion, coherence and internal organization of the text should be taken into consideration when doing a CDA (Mills, 1997).

#### **1.5. Statement of the Problem**

The character of Shylock in Shakespeare's The Merchant of Venice has been the focus of debate among scholars. Many notice that Shylock, the Jew, is portrayed as violent and robust, whereas others feel that Shylock is a "kind" Jew who is treated badly by Christians. Therefore, the question arises in this case is that: Is Shylock treated fairly or not? Ganyi (2013) clearly mentions the problem:

In character portrayal, therefore, Shylock in Shakespeare's The Merchant of Venice is described as the most note-worthy figure in the comedy though there is, as yet, no consensus as to whether he is a tyrannical villain or a tragic victim. Opinions vary as to his personality (p. 127).

Since the play has received many criticisms because of a Jew called Shylock, this study will discuss this controversial character from other side, i.e. discourse analysis. In the play, it is clear that the Jews are more economically prosperous, or powerful, than the Christians, who are financially in need of the Jews. Yet, they insult and declass them. For instance, Antonio, the Christian merchant, borrows ducats from Shylock, the Jew, but Antonio used to insult Shylock in spite of his need to him. So, this attitude will determine the way the Christians and the Jews treat each other.

#### **1.6. Research Purposes**

This study aims to:

1. Investigate why those charged with authority modify language the way meeting their interests. In other words, it aims at discussing the term “power” and examine its impact on the social relations between the Jews and Christians in The Merchant of Venice.
2. Identify the relations between ideology and the members of a society in the play.
3. Discover the impacts of one’s identity with people of different identities, for instance, the impact of Christian identity on Shylock.

### **1.7. Research Questions**

This study is designed to discuss Shylock, the Jew character in The Merchant of Venice. It tries to find a relationship between three terms of CDA and Shylock's speech and interaction in the play, so it aims at answering the following questions:

1. Why do those charged with authority, like Christians in The Merchant of Venice, reproduce discourse the way suiting their interests?
2. How do the ideologies of a variety of people living together affect each other, such as the Jews and the Christians in MV?
3. What is the impact of Christians’ identity on the identity of the Jews, especially Shylock, in MV?

### **1.8. Significance of the Study**

This study is significant since it contributes to the theory of CDA as it explores a serious debatable area. First, it will manifest the relationship between words and power by investigating power relations in a literary work. Second, it is significant for it is designed to demonstrate that people, sometimes, don’t follow or believe in what they say, but they expect others to follow or believe, for they have a well-known ideology and identity. Finally, the most important, it is intended to stress that language is a

powerful weapon; those who have power can use, change and edit the language the way they like.

### **1.9. Limitations of the Study**

CDA pays attention to irregularity of power, inequities in a society and "the manipulative tendency people have in discursive practice" (Taiwo, 2010, p. 106). "It draws on poststructuralist discourse theory and critical linguistics to focus on how social relations, identity, knowledge and power are constructed through written and spoken texts in different linguistic contexts" (Taiwo, 2010, p. 107). Thus, the current study attempts to investigate the terms 'power', 'identity', and 'ideology' in The Merchant of Venice. The speech analysis is limited to the previously mentioned terms, and is limited to Shylock's speech only.

### **1.10. Definition of Terms**

The following definitions, (1.10.1.-1.10.6), are directly taken from Widdowson (2007):

#### **1.10.1. Context**

Context is defined as "aspects of extra-linguistic reality that are taken to be relevant to communication" (p. 128). A context is the situation in which we find ourselves; time and place (p. 19).

#### **1.10.2. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)**

CDA is a "socio-politically motivated approach to the study of language in use that generally assigns ideologically significance to texts on the basis of their linguistic features" (pp. 128-129).

### **1.10.3. Discourse**

A) "It is the meaning that a first person intends to express in producing a text and that a second person interprets from the text" (p. 129). Simply, discourse refers to what a text producer meant by a text and what a text means to the receiver (Widdowson, 2007, p. 7). It is an interaction between the text producer and the receiver.

B) As a CDA concept, it is a mode of social practice: a set of socio-cultural conventions for conceiving of reality in certain ways and controlling it (p. 129).

### **1.10.4. Text**

A text is "the language produced by the addresser in the communication process. It is "the linguistic trace in speech or writing of the addresser's intended discourse" (p. 133). It is "the actual use of language" which can be recognized when produced for a communicative purpose (p. 4).

### **1.10.5. Utterance**

An utterance is "a communicative use of language which takes on pragmatic meaning. The term usually refers to short expressions in spoken language like turns in a conversation" (p. 133).

### **1.10.6. Pragmatic Meaning**

It refers to "what language users make of language use, i.e. what the addresser means by a text and what it means to the addressee" (p. 131).

### **1.10.7. Irony**

Generally, irony "involves the difference between what is said" by the producer "and what is meant" by the receiver (Beard, 2004, p. 88). In other words, it means how text receivers understand text producers.

### **1.10. 8. Repetition**

Repetition is defined by Reynolds (1995, p. 185) as "multiple instances of an idea or word, and the greater the number of repetition the more we notice it".

### **1.11. Summary**

In this chapter, the study background becomes clear that a CDA is going to be applied to a literary work. Some theories to CDA are discussed, such as the mainstream linguistics which look at linguistic aspects in a text. The role of discourse is also negotiated that it links between language and social behaviour. Many terms related to discourse are defined, such as the term 'utterance'. Finally, the significance of conducting such a study is provided which is that it will prove that language is a hazard weapon.

## **Chapter Two: Literature Review**

### **2.1. Introduction**

The Merchant of Venice is considered as one of Shakespeare's most complex plays (Cope, 2007). Cope adds that the play "provides myriad opportunities for deeply examining character and motivation", especially Shylock, "who surfaces only in four scenes, but whose mark is indelible" (p. 4) though he appears in five scenes.

Various terms are needed when discussing discourse analysis. For example, when examining a text, one should examine grammar, vocabulary, text, metaphor, context, shared knowledge, cohesion, coherence, meaning, connotation, denotation, collocation, situation, irony, symbol, and so on. These concepts are important to be noticed during the analysis in order to reveal how power, identity and ideology are hidden between the lines of a literary work. So, discourse analysis is not entirely separated from the study of grammar or phonology (McCarthy, 2009, p. 9).

Knowing the grammar of a language is not the same as knowing how to describe it (Widdowson, 2007, p.11). This means that a grammatical sentence might be meaningless, or a meaningful sentence might be ungrammatical. Widdowson, therefore, illustrates that any piece of language should be "pragmatically effective as an act of communication" (p. 12). Consequently, discourse analysis looks at all linguistic aspects beyond the level of the sentence. Additionally, every utterance should be interpreted in its situation. For example, when one says "I'm stuffed", s/he means that s/he ate too much.

#### **2.1.1. Discourse Analysis and Critical Discourse Analysis**

Discourse refers to language use as social practice and consequently discourse is seen to figure particularly in institutional, historical and political structures and processes

(Pietikäinen & Dufva, 2006, p. 208). Along with, McCarthy (2009, pp. 5-7) discusses the term discourse analysis; it is said to be the relationship between the language and the contexts in which it is used. He adds that discourse analysts study language in use: written texts of all kinds, and spoken data, from conversation to highly institutionalized forms of talk. Discourse analysis seeks to discover language form and function in addition to its identification of linguistic, social and cultural features aiding in understanding or interpreting a text (Demo, 2001).

As mentioned, critical discourse analysis is a special approach in discourse analysis. Therefore, it is believed by Orpin (2005, p. 37) that critical discourse analysis provides fruitful insights into the relationship between language and ideology, so when doing CDA, the focus is not within the texts, but outside. Furthermore, critical discourse analysis is concerned with the use and abuse of language for the exercise of socio-political power, so it sets itself to discover traces of ideological bias in texts (Widdowson, 2007, pp. 70-71).

Moreover, discourse analysis is one of the approaches "to the study of language that examine the conditions of possibility of particular statements and their effects" (Calhoun, 2002, p. 125). However, CDA has relations with various disciplinary fields, such as Critical Linguistics, Speech Acts theory, and Pragmatics, so CDA addresses issues on power, class, culture, gender and race (Taiwo, 2010).

## **2.2. Discourse and Power**

Discourse, power and identity are closely connected (Ainsworth & Hardy, 2004), so CDA focuses on the ways discourse structures enact, confirm, legitimate, reproduce, or challenge relations of power and dominance in society (Van Dijk, 2001, p. 353). Power has a vital impact on the interpretation of discourse and "thus the capacity to promote change as well as to maintain things as they are" (Savignon, 2006, p. 89).

CDA recognizes that those who are privileged to have access to social power, through their wealth, status, knowledge, age, gender often abuse it in discourse when they interact with people without such power (Taiwo, 2010, p. 109). Simply, power is possession, but Foucault adds complexity to the term; he believes that power is dispersed throughout social relations, that it produces possible forms of behaviour as well as restricting behaviour (Mills, 1997, pp. 19-21).

However, a language is not powerful in its own, but it gains power by its skilled and powerful users (Blackledge, 2005). For example, the universality of English stems from the historical fact that the British Empire governed the world, and now the United States of America is controlling it. One can conclude that manipulation in language affects the text so language can be used to impose power. In other words, powerful people use highly structured language to mock the weak by manipulating language through the usage of hidden symbols, satire, metaphor or the like. "It is important to expose the hidden things, since they are not evident for the individuals involved, and, because of this, they cannot be fought against" (Horváth, 2009, p. 46). In a literary text, societal power is enacted in written discourse; i.e. the writers, sometimes, tend to be implicit.

### **2.3. Discourse and Identity**

The simplest definition of identity is "self" or the "individual". However, the term "identity" in relation to discourse is said to be unclear, ambiguous, or unstable. According to Hodge (2012, p. 5), "Identity is a slippery term, posing many problems for its victims and for CDA. On one hand, it refers to a unique, individual entity. On the other hand, it refers to total loss of that individual's identity in a collective." When it refers to a unique entity, it refers to one and no other, but when it refers to a loss in a collective, it refers to the whole members in one society in which all the members are identical, according to Hodge. Nevertheless, identities are dynamic and subject to



change (Blackledge, 2005, p. 36). By defining groups and their position in the society in addition to their interaction with other groups, one's identity can be constructed (Ainsworth & Hardy, 2004).

An example in The Merchant of Venice can be traced. For example, Shylock feels that he is undesirable because he takes interests, so he supposes that if he asks a flesh instead of money, he might be accepted. "He thinks that Antonio and the other Christians may change their negative views about him and the Jewish community if he declines to take interest" (Weinstein, 2007, pp. 189-190).

#### **2.4. Discourse and Ideology**

Ideology is defined as "a set of ideas and values which are held by a group or an individual" (Beard, 2000, p. 118). The concept of ideology is closely related to power and dominance (Laakkonen, 2007, p. 33). Ideology also represents the assertions and "the collection of plans societies have for governing themselves, for administering all that goes on their midst" (Goodson, 2010, p. 35). "Ideology, for CDA, is seen as an important means of establishing and maintaining unequal power relations" (Wodak, 2002, p. 9).

Hence, ideology is connected with social, religious and economic life. Thus, discourse plays a powerful role in the reproduction of ideologies, such as intonation, syntax, meaning, coherence, presuppositions, metaphors, argumentation, and etc. (Van Dijk, 2003). Van Dijk adds that ideologies can be acquired from parents to children, and can be learnt from the media or written texts such as books or magazines. Therefore, one's ideology can go under change, or can be modified or repaired.

This discussion makes a strong notion that those who are powerful, socially and linguistically, can force others to change their ideology and adopt new ones that may

meet the ideology of the powerful or the dominant. "In critical discourse analysis, it is claimed that discursive practices contribute to the creation and reproduction of unequal power relations between social groups, for example, between social classes, women and men, ethnic minorities and the majority", which "are understood as ideological effects" (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002, p. 74). By the existence of power, this claim can be achieved.

## **2.5. Discourse and Characterisation**

As stated earlier, discourse is affected by power, identity and ideology of the speaker. In other words, the production of discourse is subject to those who have power and well-established identity and ideology. However, Characterisation "refers to the way characters are presented by an author" (Beard, 2004, p. 87). It is meant to describe the nature of somebody, or something, or to show a person's character in a particular way (Oxford Dictionary, 2008, p. 117).

"Shakespeare is famous for his creation of characters who seem like real people. We can judge their actions and we can understand their thoughts and feelings" (Gill, 1992, p. 94). Therefore, it is easy to identify the speakers, using their languages or discourses. So, to characterize the producers of a discourse, it is better to look at the speech and actions of the producers. By examining the speech of the text producers, identity and ideology become clear, if the language of the speakers is powerful, or if they are from the "elite" of society.

Characterization and critical discourse analysis have something in common. Both are concerned with revealing the semantic and linguistic meanings of an utterance in order to draw a complete picture of the addresser. In addition, both try to disclose the relationship between texts and contexts. Yet, to reveal how good or bad the character is,

one looks at the "unpredictable power of evil over good in human nature" (Ganyi, 2013, p. 123). Ganyi states that:

When one discusses the concept of villainy in Literature, one is really looking at the unpredictable power of evil over good in human nature or human society or within the individual human being. This evil force in human nature could rise to an uncontrollable level and become habitual or characteristic of an individual, hence he becomes a villain (p. 123).

## **2.6. Shakespeare's Language**

William Shakespeare is recognized as "the greatest of all dramatists" (Heatt, 2002). According to Heatt, his plays reveal a "profound knowledge" of human behaviour. He adds that Shakespeare's usage of dramatic and poetic style creates a distinguished aesthetic effect to his writing and the poetic language expresses the "deepest levels of human motivation in individual, social, and universal situation".

However, modern English differs from Shakespeare's English. Shakespeare's language is considered difficult because of the strange arrangements of words in his language (Robinson, 1989). For instance, one can find unusual sequence of words or find omission of words in Shakespearean language. This omission is called ellipsis. Additionally, Robinson (1989, p. 12) points out that readers "encounter familiar words used with unexpected meanings", so they misunderstand the meaning. These words hold meanings different from what it means in a Shakespearean drama.

Shakespeare's language in his comedies is characterized to be comic (Elam, 1984). Comic, in a comedy, refers to the language that makes the readers smile or even giggle, or that gives a sense of humour to the comedy. So, Shakespeare's use of comic language gives the comedy a sense of humour so that readers don't find themselves annoyed or upset. As a result, the sense of humour allows readers to keep on reading the dramatic

work. The sense of humour appears when readers encounter a dramatic irony, a situation opposite to what readers know.

## **2.7. Related Studies**

Many studies have been conducted to alleviate the debate in Shakespeare's The Merchant of Venice. The controversial issues in the play are countless. One of these issues is the word "mean" which is discussed by Rubinstein and Harris (2004). They examine the use of the word "mean" and find that it has multiple meanings. One of these meanings is "merit". They claim that Shakespeare is punning, and through the analysis of Jessica's speech, they discover various puns in the word "mean" that it is used for "sexual intercourse for financial gain" which causes a thread throughout the play. In addition, it is used by Shylock to discuss money deal. "The various meanings and puns in "mean"--a middle ground, moderation, finances, intent, and pandering to sexual intercourse for financial gain--run like a thread throughout the play" (p. 72). Ironic terms have also been found in the play, according to Rubinstein and Harris (2004), such as "good man" which is uttered by Shylock to describe Antonio.

Moreover, Schalkwyk (2010) inspects Shakespeare's language as a system and its relation to performative speech acts. He addresses the prevalence of oaths in Shakespeare's texts. In his investigation of Shakespeare's language, Schalkwyk comments that:

Such navigation between language and speech shows that emotion is not a state seeking expression from within, but rather something that is discovered and shaped through its articulation — between self and other, passionate utterance and illocutionary performance (p. 396).

The annotations of critics have admired Blanchard (2009). The author discusses the distinctions between justice, mercy, love and law in which she notices that Shylock suffers from inconstancy. In other words, Shylock is seen as uncomfortable for love,

mercy or justice. "In using Shylock to contrast Hebrew rigidity with Christian adaptability, Shakespeare conveys that everyone proves inconstant sooner or later, and thus all must learn to favour love over law, mercy over method, and effort over effect" (p.218).

Ganyi (2013) analysed Shylock, Iago and Barabbas as victims of racial circumstances. He suggests that if these characters are analysed from recent day perspectives, they will be complex since their actions will not be understood so that they will simply be seen as victims of social circumstances. He points out that "the Jew still remains a peripheral character in the active social and moral universe..." (p. 130). He adds that Shylock can be seen as intelligible criminal and a victim of his circumstances rather than a villain.

However, Shylock is depicted as a "scapegoat" by Deng and Wu (2013). This characterization leads Deng and Wu to hold that Shylock defends the ruling class's ideology which makes them feel that greedy people may suffer unfair treatment. They see that Shylock is a victim of the racial prejudices. So, it is clear that these two authors believe that Shakespeare's description of Shylock is merely a picture of his time. However, it is difficult to stand with or against this idea since some actions in the play prove that Shylock is not only a victim, but also is a villain. For example, Shylock's insistence on the literal implementation of the bond could be a clear support for his villainy.

To clarify the character of Shylock, Alonso (1996) takes into consideration that Shylock is a "Jew, malcontent, usurer, miser and father". As a Jew, Alonso thinks that Shylock is a victim of his society. In spite of that, Shylock knows no mercy and he is a devil, as described by the Christians. The pound of flesh is seen as a satisfaction of desire for social subversion. However, Alonso supposes that the four faceted descriptions of

Shylock are intervened with his Jewishness. Through the discussion, Alonso finds that Shakespeare is not anti-semitic:

Therefore, we must be discerning spectators and readers and avoid being misled by appearances, a theme which is precisely underlined in The Merchant of Venice, we must not think that Shylock is just the embodiment of the archetypical Jew as the expression of anti-semitism, for he is not ( p. 258).

In addition, Coonradt (2007) closely examines Shakespeare's The Merchant of Venice depending on the play's critical heritage and explores it post-structurally "as the site of a metaphoric, performative conversion"(p. 74) "to show how the play's anti-Judaism" affects "reader response" (p. 74). Coonradt points out that Shakespeare's usage of the trope of anti-Semitism, a term appears recently, is ironic in order to convey the anxieties about the identity of Christians. He adds that justice and mercy are violated "which highlight the hypocrisy in Christianity as Shakespeare saw it practiced." (p. 74). Additionally, Shylock is seen by Coonradt both right and wrong. "He is wrong in that Christ's life and teachings urge the opposite of revenge", and he is right in that he "sees how Christians do not follow these teachings; they are hypocrites of the worst kind" (p. 94).

Because of the importance of gender and economy in the play, Marzola (1997) tackles these issues. Through her interpretation, she explores many perspectives in the play such as the relationship between subjectivity and gender. For example, the happy ending of the play is seen as a result of a girl disguised as a man at the court scene. There, Portia's question "Which is the merchant here and which is the Jew?" (4.1.172) confirms the sophisticated knot of identities. Furthermore, Bassanio's language is seen as "confusion of power" and rhetorical because he wants to marry Portia in order to get sexual identity, body, flesh and money. Additionally, the language of the merchants may become a political and cultural practice which is confirmed at the court scene.

However, the personality of Shylock is considered dynamic and has reached maturity (Hirschfeld, 2005). For example, Shylock, at the court scene, greets and supports the law or the high power of Venice at the beginning of the trial, but when defeated, he accepts the verdict with adulation. Because he was confident that he would have the pound of flesh, he supported the lawyer who carried out a revolution against Shylock. This revolution makes Shylock accept the verdict with adulation.

Moreover, in the play, the bitter and cruel inhumanity of Shylock is depicted in opposition to friendship and romantic love (Heatt, 2002). "According to the usual interpretation, Shylock, the moneylender is interested in money alone whereas the youth of Venice, although not faultless, are involved in far more noble things such as love and friendship" (Heller, 2000, p. 157).

Nevertheless, Pettigrew (2010) presents a literary criticism to the play. Pettigrew examines scenes one, three, and four to determine what Bassanio thinks of Portia and the relationships between them. He notes that money would have been concerned for Bachelors when selecting a wife. Thus, Bassanio isn't totally interested in Portia's wealth, for in Bassanio's speech, there is a balance between love and wealth. Pettigrew depends on Bassanio's description to Portia as "fair".

Additionally, the themes of money, romance and usury and discussion of the main characters are negotiated by Harp (2010). Harp also discusses the main characters of the play, including Shylock and Antonio. Antonio is seen as the hero of the play for he takes risks in business and love. Shylock's speech "Hath not a Jew eyes? Hath not a Jew hands, passions...." makes Harp not to depict Shylock as a villain. Harp states that "some of Shylock's anger can be justified as a response to the contempt with which he is treated" (p. 43).

In Bryson's (2008) discussion, he does not judge Shylock as a villain or a victim. He just explains the bitterness and righteousness of Shylock. This Jew merchant has suffered from humiliation at the hands of Christians. Consequently, he wants to obtain revenge since he is looking for equal treatment. Bryson states that "Shylock is someone deeply misunderstood, most view him as cunning, treacherous, and evil, but at the core he is someone who just wants to be treated fairly. Shylock, villain or victim? You decide" (p. 100).

Horwich (1977) tackles the dilemma and the riddle in the play. He points out that the play discusses difficult choices. One of these choices is the setting of the play, Venice and Belmont. These two locales are distinguished that Venice is infested with social and economic problems, whereas Belmont is a quiet place where all the problems disappear. The settings of the play are important because one of them has no Jews. Moreover, the caskets are seen as riddles since one will win Portia's heart. The winner is seen as the one who rightly loves, not as the one who is good at solving riddle games. However, after solving the problem of the caskets, Portia disguised as a lawyer and went to the court to conduct the trial of Shylock.

Moreover, a literary criticism to the play is provided by Weinstein (2007) to The Merchant of Venice. Weinstein explains usury in addition to the provision of the four violations of "Talmudic laws concerning the lending of money" by Shylock. One of the Talmudic laws violated by Shylock is the taking of the interest. Another Talmudic law violated by Shylock is murder. Because in Shylock's demand of Antonio's flesh, Antonio may die. The third Talmudic law violated by Shylock is when he doesn't show any mercy at the court. Shylock has to show mercy in order not to violate the instruction of "prophet Micah". Also, it is stated that those who show mercy, mercy is shown to them, and those who don't show mercy, mercy is not shown to them (p. 188). Therefore, "Shylock is distorting Jewish tradition, culture and law" (p. 189).



However, the main point in this study is discourse analysis of Shylock so that his speech is going to be critically analysed before and after the bond transaction. Before the bond, Shylock appears as humble who seemingly likes Christians, but after the bond, especially at the court, his villainy against Christians is framed and clearly appeared that he refuses to take his money instead of a “Christian’s” pound of flesh. Therefore, the study purports to determine how Shylock's character is depending on his linguistic and social interaction with the Christians; in brief, the study is limited to Shylock’s identity, power and ideology in relation to those of Christians.

## **2.8. Summary**

The notion of discourse in relation to power, identity and ideology in this chapter has been discussed. When we talk about discourse, we talk about linguistic relations between people beyond the level of the sentence. Critical discourse analysis is concerned with power relation in a society. It highlights the practice of those charged with authority. Identity and ideology are also discussed. It is mentioned that one's ideology is flexible, or dynamic. However, in this chapter, some studies to The Merchant of Venice are precisely discussed. All of these studies can be supported or refuted since the play is still the debate of many scholars because of a Jew usurer. In other words, it depends on one's reading to the play. One might agree or disagree with these studies. Generally, the speech of Shylock is going to be critically analyzed in this study by applying CDA to his utterances.

## **Chapter Three: Research Methodology**

### **3.1. Introduction**

In the previous chapters, the notion of discourse analysis is discussed. It is thought that "ordinary discourse contains misleading expressions" giving "rise to philosophical problems, so the role of a philosophy is to restate them" in a logical form (Baird, 2002). Moreover, power influences not only what we can say and do, but how we can say and do interpersonal relations (Savignon, 2006, 88).

However, this chapter shows the methods of analysing the data of the current study. The researcher will explore the literature to analyse the speech of Shylock. The researcher will also use some of the approaches related to CDA to discuss the terms power, identity and ideology in the MV. One of these approaches is the Social Psychology; it is a theory for CDA that analyses language under the effect of power. Thus, social psychologists tend to integrate power and the resultant structures of authorized utterances (Mills, 1997, 9).

All in all, Shylock appears in five of twenty scenes of the play (Tanner, 1999, p. 77), and utters only 360 sentences (Bloom, 1998). He appears in act I scene III, act II scene V, act III scene I, act III scene III, and act IV scene I. The play used in the analysis is edited by (Gill, 1992).

### **3.2. The Role of Discourse Analysis**

Gee (2001, p. 13) illustrates that the role of discourse is to recognize people through their social practices and mental entities. He says:

But Discourses also exist as the work we do to get people and things recognized in certain ways and not others, and they exist as maps that constitute our understandings. They are, then, social practices and mental entities, as well as material realities (p. 13).

DA is "essential to study how people communicate on a daily basis" (Potter & Wetherell, 1987), cited in Onwuegbuzie et al. (2009, p. 6). Nevertheless, critical discourse analysis provides theories and methods for the empirical study of the relations between discourse and social and cultural developments in different social domains (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002, p. 60).

In addition, according to Taiwo (2010), conducting a CDA research differs from conducting other researches in other disciplines. Taiwo believes that the researcher's mission in a CDA research is to "unveil the ideology behind the text" (p. 108), so there is no neutrality in such research. He adds that power and resistance of power are the core point of a CDA research. For example, in The Merchant of Venice, authority is owned by Christians, where a Jew tries to resist this power to establish himself between them as a Jew. In other words, this Jew wants to set up his Jewish identity and ideology between Christians.

Nevertheless, "CDA has been the first attempt so far to formalise a methodology that seeks to articulate the relationship between a text and the context in which it is produced, received and interpreted, thus moving beyond a concern with wholly text-immanent interpretation and considering wider social and cultural issues" (Carter, 2007, p. 10).

### **3.3. Structure in Standard Drama**

Before doing a CDA to a play, one should get acquainted with the structure of drama. A standard drama has three parts: exposition, rising action, and resolution; "the action requires a drive leading to a climax, a moment of intense feeling, and a shape" (Cody & Sprinchorn, 2007, p. 365). Exposition is the initial phase of a drama which "shows the transmission of information of the events and situations determining the dramatic present" (Pfister, 1991, p. 86). Hence, the first part of a drama is usually introductory

and informational. The second phase of a drama is the rising of the actions of the events. "Once the exciting force has set the action in motion, the struggle builds dramatic tension toward a confrontation" (Myers-Shaffer, 2000, p. 97). "A drama may have several crises, in which the conflict intensifies to the point that something or someone is threatened" (Musburger & Kindem, 2009, p. 108). In consequence of that, the important decisions have to be taken by the major character to come to an end of the crisis. The last phase of a drama is the resolution. When the basic conflict that has stimulated the dramatic action has overcome, the problem of the drama is solved (Musburger, 2007). So, the rising action falls when the resolution starts to appear.

#### **3.4. The Design of the Research**

This study is a descriptive qualitative one, for it will describe and critically analyse the character of Shylock in Shakespeare's The Merchant of Venice. Various theories of critical discourse analysis will be applied to reveal the social and verbal interaction between Jews and Christians in the play. One of these theories is the Social Psychology which is concerned with the relationship between language and power. In order to achieve the aims of this study, different utterances of Shylock will be analysed depending on the context of usage and the way of articulation. Another important theory to discourse analysis that will be applied to the analysis of Shylock is the Cultural Model which shows that more powerful groups in a society can influence less powerful groups (Gee, 2001). It might be the first study applying the Social Psychology and Cultural Model to The Merchant of Venice.

#### **3.5. The Data**

Still, to meet the objectives of this study, Shakespeare's the Merchant of Venice is used. The target tragicomedy was written in 1596 and the text of the play that will be used in this study is edited by Gill (1992). According to Gill, the text of the play was first

published in 1600. Additionally, Gill notices that the play was written in the era of Queen Elizabeth I in which England was a Christian country.

The Merchant of Venice consists of five acts. The first act contains three scenes, act two contains nine scenes, act three contains five scenes, act four contains two scenes, and act five contains only one scene. The first act is an introductory and informational. In The Merchant of Venice, readers are informed about many situations. One of these situations is that Bassanio is in need to some money in which he asks some from his friend Antonio. The second and the third acts are more complicated because they lead to the climax of the action. Readers notice the crisis in act II and the climax in act III. In act two, readers notice that Jessica, Shylock's daughter, is fretful from her father so that she manages to elope with her lover, Lorenzo. "Jessica rejects her widowed father and the Jewish people; she is ashamed of him" (Weinstein, 2007, p. 190).

The most essential act in The Merchant of Venice is act three. Readers have acquainted with the climax of the whole play that Shylock is going to cut off a pound of Antonio's flesh if he cannot defray the three thousand ducats. However, in act four, in the court scene, the action falls and comes to an end that the literal implementation of the bond leads to Shylock's loss of the case. The last act, act five, is the resolution of the play. It is worth mentioning that Shylock doesn't appear in the last act of the play, where all the characters are enjoying themselves.

However, in Shakespeare's dramas, fantasy and realism can be found. For example, in The Merchant of Venice, reality takes place. Venice is a real city where readers find Jew, Christians, trade, and the like. However, Belmont is a city comes from Shakespeare's imagination, so realism and fantasy characterize the play.

To summarize, it is clear that Shakespeare allows his characters to "create themselves not just in the moments of their soliloquy, but also in their intercourse with others" (Heller, 2000, p. 157).

### **3.6. Procedures of Analysis**

The language of Shylock in the play will be examined in relation to the revelation of his identity, ideology and power, throughout the progress of the play. Every possible utterance by Shylock will be critically analysed, so symbols, irony, metaphor, and other literary terms will be revealed and framed to analyse Shylock's character. The importance of this critical analysis is to study the social interaction between Jews and Christians by examining the linguistic interaction. However, "the users of language do not function in isolation, but in a set of cultural, social and psychological frameworks" (Horváth, 2009, p. 45). According to Gill (1992, p. 94), "characters can be studied from the outside, by observing what they do, and listening sensitively to what they say". By observing the language and the actions of Shylock, the character will be critically analysed.

#### **3.6.1. The Language of Literature**

A literary text has an aesthetic value. When reading a literary text, readers carry information from it and they try to create their imaginative world through interacting with the text. In addition, a literary text has multiple interpretations that depend on one's reading to the text. It is worth mentioning that not all of the interpretations are alike. Everyone interprets the literary text the way s/he understands, so what is literary language?

Baleiro (2011) provides a full picture of the analysis of literary texts. He states that:

When reading literary texts, the reader has to be reflective, attentive and select information in order to confirm hypotheses in an ongoing interaction with the literary text. This is a type of text which is most often characterized by ambiguity, offering multiple possibilities for meaning and, as a result, imposing resistance on the process of meaning production (p. 18).

However, the language of literature is discussed by Beard's book The Language of the Literature, where he examines the structure, genre, narrative, representation of talk, and creativity of the literary texts.

Firstly, structure shows how words are built in which Beard believes that it is not adequate to discuss literary texts at the level of words only, but it is necessary to discuss the context of any text and the way it is built. In other words, when analysing a literary text, it is inescapable that what is inside and outside the text should be examined.

Moreover, according to Beard (2004, p. 23), genre gives the language its shape and purpose allowing a text to have multiple interpretations. Genre looks for how whole texts fit into genres, how texts relate to other texts by mixing, for example inappropriate content and form (p. 71).

Furthermore, narrative shows how the story (in Literature) is told either in first or third person. The author of the literary text can be considered as an observer if the story is told in the third person pronoun, and as an active if the story is narrated in the first person pronoun. Additionally, narration of the story includes either direct or indirect speech. If the same words of a literary character is seen in the narration, it is direct, but if character uses other characters' words, it is indirect. Direct and indirect speech help in characterization, according to Beard. However, sometimes, readers may face a free speech in a literary text that "gives the reader the direct or indirect speech, but not the narrative descriptions that go with it" (p. 37).

In addition, representation of talk in a dramatic text creates aspects of a character through the spoken words (Beard, 2004, p. 49). So, the words in a drama, often, don't represent real-life talk. However, drama shares some real-life functions (Badran, 2002).

Finally, in a drama we look for metaphors and comparisons and work out what they contribute to meanings searching for multiple meanings and how they are created, and for ways in which authors use language in a consciously creative way, such as by using archaic words, inventing 'new' words, breaking grammatical rules, using unusual graphology, playing with words and meanings, creating ambiguity, suggesting absence – what is not in the text but might be expected to be, and making inter-textual references (Beard, 2004, p. 71).

To conclude, "after producing several units of meaning", text receivers are able to "produce a meaning that renders the literary text coherent" (Baleiro, 2011, p. 18), so allegory can be found in a literary text in which the text can be interpreted in various meanings.

### **3.6.2. Literature as Discourse**

Discourse analysis takes care of everything significant both linguistically and extra-linguistically (Taiwo, 2010, p. 111). Accordingly, literature is seen as a piece of conversation liable to analysis since it is a product of communication (Abbas, 2012, p. 338). It is a written discourse reflecting the viewpoint of the writers, so it is a type of discourse which distinguishes a sort of written language from other types (Badran, 2002). In Badran's (2002) discussion, he points out that the language of literary texts shares some functions with real life language. He, additionally, notices that literary discourse reflects ideology, consciousness, class and role with speech and language users.



Literature “fulfils multiple functions within a society”, such as communicative functions (Johansen, 2002, p. 3). Johansen believes that a literary text is the outcome of the imagination of the writer, and literature is a source of aesthetic enjoyment to readership (p. 15). No account of literary work will be complete without an account of literary communication between fictional characters in context (Abbas, 2012, p. 339).

Since language is a vehicle for literary texts, discourse and literature are “allied disciplines” (Taiwo, 2010, p. 122). In Taiwo's view, any literary text can be seen as discourse that can be analysed using approaches to discourse analysis. Hence, every literary text functions ideologically and politically in its context (Taiwo, 2010):

Critical Linguistics, introduced by Roger Fowler, is a critical linguistically-oriented examination of literary texts. It was concerned with reading the meanings in texts as the realization of social processes, seeing texts as functioning ideologically and politically in relation to their contexts (p. 122).

### **3.6.3. Literary Criticism and Discourse Analysis**

Literary criticism is concerned with the “discussion of literature, including description, analysis, interpretation, and evaluation of literary works” (Hernadi, 2002); it is a way in which critics try to analyse and describe the ambiguity of a literary work and to explain its meaning. Hernadi adds that in order to study a literary text, special attention should be paid to the purpose, structure, effect, language and the message it conveys. Various approaches to literary criticism can be noticed, such as structuralist criticism, formalist criticism, biographical criticism, Marxist criticism, etc.

Structuralism tries to inquire about the “structure” of a culture as a whole by interpreting its signs, so it is not interested only in language, but in social behaviour; Formalism involves “detailed inquiry into plot structure, narrative perspective, symbolic imagery, and other literary techniques” (Hernadi, 2002). New criticism belongs to

formalism. Biographical criticism takes care of the conditions of the author. Marxism is concerned with class clashes and quarrels where the lower class is oppressed, therefore, the dominant class controls minorities. "Ideology has been a key term for CDA from the outset, a strong link with the Marxist tradition out of which it grew" (Hodge, 2012, p. 4).

Literary criticism and discourse analyses are intertwined. Both try to examine and analyse the linguistic and social behaviour of a society to reveal many issues related to the members of that society, for example, the struggle between the classes, religion, culture, language, etc. For instance, discourse analysis focuses on the text to arrive to the proper interpretation, and so does the new criticism. Therefore, when analysing a text, the author might be kicked out or ignored because literature is a reflection of the whole society not of the author himself, since a literary work might be imaginative, or not real. Additionally, Marxism and discourse analysis are concerned with power relation. Therefore, literary criticism and discourse analysis have a general purpose aiming at revealing social and linguistic relations in a society.

#### **3.6.4. Applying CDA to the Drama**

When examining the language of drama, one should search for linguistic devices such as (dramatic) irony, pragmatic meaning, cohesion, allegory, pun, conjunction, soliloquy, ellipsis, systematic knowledge, schematic knowledge, collocation, etc. In other words, the mainstream linguistic theories will take part in the analysis. Critical discourse analysis takes into consideration these linguistic devices in addition to factors from outside the text to reveal socio-political matters in that text. It is "concerned with exposing the often hidden ideologies that are reflected, produced and reproduced in everyday discourse" (Mayr, 2008, p. 16). To apply CDA to a dramatic text, one can discover all elements of figurative language, power relation, social relation, etc.

Moreover, various theories to CDA, such as micro-sociological theories, will be applied to the play in order to find elements of power, identity and ideology. Micro-sociological theories provide an explanation to the social interactions (Meyer, 2001). However, this study is concerned with power relation between Jews and Christians in The Merchant of Venice, so the concentration is going to be on power, identity and ideology; whenever it is possible, any linguistic device being compatible with the aims of this study will be mentioned and analyzed if it carries a hidden meaning.

### **3.7. Summary**

This chapter discusses the structure of a standard drama, the role of discourse analysis and the procedures that is going to be followed in order to analyse Shylock's language. It provides a brief picture of how literature is considered as discourse and how to apply a CDA to a dramatic work. The data of this study is The Merchant of Venice written by Shakespeare which deals with Jews and Christians in most of its terms. For example, it shows that a Jew girl converts to Christianity because of her father's tyrannical character.

## Chapter Four: Analysis and Findings

### 4.1. Introduction

This study tries to link discourse with social practice in the Merchant of Venice by revealing the exercise of power, identity and ideology. The play involves two groups, Jews and Christians. The main Jewish character in the play is Shylock. This literary character will be discussed in the following sections by analysing its language.

In addition, the settings of the play are as important as Shylock, for he appears in one of these settings, so they are going to be analysed, in addition to the language of the bond. Moreover, the scenes where Shylock appears will be examined, too. Power, identity and ideology are going to be addressed to show how they affect and are affected through the interactions of the characters.

### 4.2. Power, Identity and Ideology in the Play

The researcher classifies four types of power in The Merchant of Venice: economic, social, linguistic and religious. Both Christians and Jews exercise these types. First, Jews have more economic power than Christians. Jewish wealth represents a powerful force governing the sustenance, expansion, and protection for Christian societies (Picker, 1994, p. 174). For example, Antonio's appeal of money from Shylock suggests that Jews are more economically powerful than Christians.

Second, it is difficult to determine the dominant social power in the play, but according to the researcher, Christians are more socially powerful than Jews in the play for many reasons. One of the reasons is that Christians respond, interact, and deal with all races found in the play. For instance, readers find that Christians invite Shylock to have dinner with them, but they don't find the way around that Shylock invites the Christians

to have dinner with him. Shylock "has imposed isolation on himself by declaring that he will not eat, drink, or pray with Christians" (3.2.33-34) (Smith, 2011).

Third, both Jews and Christians play on language and word choice. Both manipulate in language, especially the Jews. Shylock tries to ask for sympathy and passion throughout his linguistic manipulation. One of Shylock's appeal for entreaty is when he says "Hath not a Jew eyes? Hath not a Jew hands..." (3.1.54-55).

Finally, the most important, religion affects, and is affected by all other "powers" in the play. To live in peace, one has to be a Christian. Two examples can be traced in The Merchant of Venice; the first example is Jessica's embracement to Christianity and the second is the Shylock's convergence to Christianity. The play ends happily when the troublemaker Jew converts to Christianity.

Two major identities can be found in the play, the Jewish identity and the Christian one. However, the Christian identity is established in which it affects all other identities. Additionally, ideology is represented in the interaction between people in the play. One can find that the ideology of Christianity is dominant since England was a Christian country in the era of the play in the 16<sup>th</sup> century. Hence, utilitarianism governs the social life of both Jews and Christians. The social interaction between them is absent, but the commercial interaction is very vital in which a Christian borrows some ducats from a Jew.

#### **4.3. Analysis of the Bond**

"In the prototype pound-of-flesh story they are straightforwardly good Christians set against bad Jew" (Jeffery, 2004, p. 37). Hence, the bad Jew, Shylock, expresses frankly his intention that he is going to cut off a pound of Antonio's flesh. He states a condition

that Antonio has to sign, or 'seal', the bond as to guarantee the legality, or validity, of the contract:

Go with me to a notary, seal me there  
Your single bond; and, in a merry sport,  
If you repay me not on such a day,  
In such a place, such sum or sums as are  
Express'd in the condition, let the forfeit  
Be nominated for an equal pound  
Of your fair flesh, to be cut off and taken  
In what part of your body pleaseth me (1.3.139-147).

Shylock will take a pound of flesh if Antonio fails to defray in the very suitable time, or in 'such a day, place, such sum or sums'.

Antonio's actual flesh is intended to be taken by Shylock. This is proven in the actual words of the bond. The following lines is Portia's reading to the bond at the court:

Why, this bond is forfeit;  
And lawfully by this the Jew may claim  
A pound of flesh, to be by him cut off  
Nearest the merchant's heart. Be merciful:  
Take thrice thy money. Bid me tear the bond (4.1.228-233).

However, Shylock will decide the part of Antonio's body. Shylock clearly states that the language, or the demand of, a flesh is "a merry sport", but if we look intensely to the language of the bond, Shylock firmly is going to take a flesh, so it is not a joke. If it is a joke, Shylock should give Antonio the chance to decide the part of his body, not Shylock. In other words, Shylock should not decide the "fair flesh" that "pleaseth" him, so he tries to control the body of Antonio, or possess it. Antonio "willingly submits to the bond by which he must yield his own life to Shylock because the law safeguarding property interests" (Tiffany, 2006, p. 392), so, if it is a joke, there is no need to go to a notary in order to make the contract official, but Shylock looks for a misstep by Antonio as to impose his hostility against Christians.

Because he knows the danger of the seas, Shylock expects that Antonio might not be able to defray the three thousand ducats. This idea is totally confirmed when Shylock says to Bassanio, "Ships are boards, sailors but men: there be land-rats and water-rats, water-thieves and land-thieves— I mean pirates— and then there is peril of waters, winds and rocks. The man is, notwithstanding, sufficient. Three thousand ducats; I may take this bond (1.3.20-25). Shylock's utterances about the hazards of the seas give emphasis to his ill-intention, or evil-mind that he wishes to kill Antonio for "he is a Christian" (1.3.38).

#### **4.4. Analysis of Shylock's Speech in Contexts of Power, Identity and Ideology**

The verb "Shylock", as stated by Merriam-Webster's online dictionary, means "to lend money at high rates of interest", or "at extortionate rates" (Green, 2010). It also means offensive, derog, and hard-hearted money-lender (Ayto & Simpson, 2008). The high rates, as appeared in the play, cost a flesh of a Christian's body. The demand of a flesh as an interest shows the cruelty of the fictional character, Shylock, who "will spill blood to own" his "pound of flesh" (Sedgman, 1998):

Every man is able to exercise some life choices about how much he invests of himself in his role as partner, parent and worker. Those who engage in violence as a way of controlling their relationships, like Shylock, will spill blood to own their pound of flesh (p.149).

Shylock is an "odd man out in the society depicted by Shakespeare" (Hartman, 2011, p. 73). He "hates only a particular class of people, and his hatred is tempered with reason and human feeling" (Davidson, 1901, p.342). All in all, the following is the acts and the scenes where Shylock appears and interacts.

#### 4.4.1 Act I, Scene III

In this section, any possible utterance of Shylock is going to be analysed. To begin with, Shylock first appears in Act I, Scene III in which readers find that Christians need money from Shylock, the Jew. Because of their need to Shylock, readers find a polite language used to ask for his sympathy. Shylock agrees because Antonio will be a guarantee to repay the loan to Shylock. Shylock describes Antonio as a “good man” (1.3.12,) and he is ironic, here, because he explains what “good” means that Antonio is sufficient and able to defray the debt, (1.3.14-25):

Oh, no, no, no, no; my meaning in saying he is  
a good man is to have you understand me that he is  
sufficient. Yet his means are in supposition: he hath  
an argosy bound to Tripolis, another to the Indies;  
I understand moreover, upon the Rialto, he hath  
a third at Mexico, a fourth for England, and other  
ventures he hath, squandered abroad. But ships are  
but boards, sailors but men: there be land-rats and  
water-rats, water-thieves and land-thieves—I mean  
pirates—and then there is the peril of waters, winds,  
and rocks. The man is, notwithstanding, sufficient.  
Three thousand ducats; I think I may take his bond (1.3.14-25).

Shylock's description of Antonio in those lines involves not only his materialist fixations and his deep hatred of Christians, but also an implicit commitment to the possibility of satisfaction, of making and feeling enough (Hirschfeld, 2010, p. 104).

However, though Christians don't like dealing with interests, Antonio is forced to deal with interests for the sake of his friend. It is obvious that the profession of Shylock is despised, but also needed (Heller, 2000, p. 151). Yet, "the agreement that Antonio signs for Shylock is not properly a loan contract itself between both parties, but rather a unilateral pledge to pay a forfeit of flesh unless Antonio releases himself from his bond by repaying the loaned money" (Scott, 2004, p. 286).

When Shylock is invited to dine with Christians, he replies:



Yes, to smell pork; to eat of the habitation which  
your prophet the Nazarite conjured the devil into.  
I will buy with you, sell with you, talk with you,  
walk with you, and so following; but I will not eat  
with you, drink with you, nor pray with you. What  
news on the Rialto? Who is he comes here? (1.3.30-35).

Shylock responds to Bassanio's invitation to dinner by using, ironically, Christian doctrine to reinforce Jewish dietary law (Fitzpatrick, 2006, p. 101). Therefore, Shylock is not going to share his Jewish identity with Christians since he "will not eat with" Christians "nor pray with" them. "Shylock knows there is no possibility that he can ever enter the community of Antonio's tribe" (Schuman, 2002, p. 56), but he will try by noticing a misbehaviour from Antonio. This means that the Jewish identity is unwelcomed by Christian identity in the play.

Shylock's first aside in Act I Scene III, Line 37-48, contains misleading and ambiguous utterances; Shylock appears as an anti-Christian Jew for he hates Antonio "for he is a Christian", and if Shylock catches Antonio "Once upon the hip", he "will feed fat the ancient grudge" he "bear[s] him", but if he forgives Antonio, "cursed be" his "tribe". "Shylock is so disturbed that he must speak in an aside, revealing his clear hatred of Antonio" (Harp, 2010, p. 39). Therefore, it is clear that Shylock cannot directly express his villainy against Antonio in front of his face, or in open.

These words, "I hate him for he is a Christian" (1.3.38), can be absorbed in an audience's centripetal interpretation of Shylock as an offensive usurer, especially since they appear as an aside, which purports to expose a character's "true" thoughts (Schuman, 2002). When Shylock catches Antonio from the "hip", all Antonio's body will be down. This means that Shylock will revenge for himself in the suitable time. Moreover, Shylock describes Antonio as "a fawning publican" (1.3.37) which indicates that Shylock is a tax evasion Jew who hates Antonio who lends money without interests. The word "publican" refers to usury (Rosenshield, 2008). These utterances

confirm two things. One, Christians used to insult Jews at Shakespeare's time. Two, the Jews used to tolerate those assaults, and in the suitable time, they will hit the Christians back.

[Aside] How like a fawning publican he looks!  
I hate him for he is a Christian,  
But more for that in low simplicity  
He lends out money gratis, and brings down  
The rate of usance here with us in Venice.  
If I can catch him once upon the hip,  
I will feed fat the ancient grudge I bear him.  
He hates our sacred nation, and he rails,  
Even there where merchants most do congregate,  
On me, my bargains and my well-won thrift,  
Which he calls interest. Cursed be my tribe,  
If I forgive him! (1.3.37-48).

So, Antonio is an obstacle for Shylock, for Antonio makes Shylock lose in his trade. Shylock keeps an eye on Antonio's actions to catch a false step so that he "can catch him" "upon the hip" (1.3.42). The last two lines "Cursed be my tribe, if I forgive him!" (1.3.47-48) show the inhumanity in Shylock who tries to gain some power to take his revenge. One of the reasons for his revenge is that Antonio "hates" the sacred nation of the Jews. This aside leads Jeffery (2004, p. 41) to describe Shylock as wicked and stereotype Jew.

The following lines demonstrate how lost is Shylock.

I am debating of my present store,  
And, by the near guess of my memory,  
I cannot instantly raise up the gross  
Of full three thousand ducats. What of that?  
Tubal, a wealthy Hebrew of my tribe,  
Will furnish me. But soft! how many months  
Do you desire? [To Antonio] Rest you fair, good signior;  
Your worship was the last man in our mouths. (1.3.49-56)

What "lost" means is that Shylock tries to create a Jewish identity, so he borrows money from his friend Tubal to lend Antonio in order to make Antonio subservient. The use of "Hebrew" may be an indication for race, not religion (Beauchamp, 2011). In this case,

Antonio appears as a weak Christian. One can ask: Why does Shylock lend borrowed-money? In other words, Shylock has not to lend money because he doesn't have the required enough sum. It could be that Shylock looks for a false step from Antonio so that he wins. Though "other professions are closed to Jews" (Weinstein, 2007, p.191), it is unethical to cut off a pound of a man's flesh as an interest.

Additionally, Shylock is a double-tongued Jew who can't express his animosity to Antonio. He lies to Antonio by describing him in good traits, such as "Your worship", so Shylock lacks the required power helping him express himself efficiently. Because of this, his identity and ideology are deformed and distorted.

In the following lines, Shylock tries to create his identity and to establish his ideology:

When Jacob graz'd his uncle Laban's sheep—  
This Jacob from our holy Abram was,  
As his wise mother wrought in his behalf,  
The third possessor: ay, he was the third—(1.3.67-86).

In his notes, Gill (1992, p.15) writes that Abram is the founder of the Jewish race. "Shylock had come fairly close to assuming for himself the authority or role of "holy Abram" (Jackson, 2007, p.80).The reason that Shylock provides this story is that Shylock tries to set his Jewish ideology and Jewish identity, as well, to Antonio, the Christian, by telling him religious Jewish stories. In other words, Shylock teaches Antonio the Jewish values so that his Jewish identity becomes familiar to him. Therefore, "his words here seem carefully crafted to serve a double purpose: to defend the practice of usury while offending Antonio" (Picker, 1994, p. 176).

In the following lines, Shylock justifies the interest:

No, not take interest; not, as you would say,  
Directly interest: mark what Jacob did.  
When Laban and himself were compromis'd  
That all the eanlings which were streak'd and pied  
Should fall as Jacob's hire, the ewes, being rank,  
In the end of autumn turned to the rams;

And, when the work of generation was  
Between these woolly breeders in the act,  
The skilful shepherd pill'd me certain wands,  
And, in the doing of the deed of kind,  
He stuck them up before the fulsome ewes,  
Who, then conceiving, did in eaning time  
Fall parti-colour'd lambs, and those were Jacob's.  
This was a way to thrive, and he was blest:  
And thrift is blessing, if men steal it not. (1.3.72-91).

There is no doubt that telling such stories about Jacob and the sheep is an ugly attempt by Shylock to set up his values, or ideology. Religious stories reflect one's powerful history and identity, so Shylock uses these historical allegoric stories to establish his Jewish identity and ideology between the Christians. Jacob takes interests, but the way how he takes interests is not necessary to be known for Christians. On the account of that, any "profitable activities must-if they are to be lawful- involve a risk, be at God's disposal" (Barnet, 1972, p.29). This leads the researcher to say that the Jews don't take interests from other Jews because Tubal is a Jew who lends Shylock the sum without showing the readers if Tubal needs interests from Shylock, or the sum itself. "Interest is for Jewish-Christian transactions, and it is this that Antonio is thwarting in lending without interest, the explicit reason that Shylock gives for hating Antonio" (McAvan, 2011, p.26). However, Jews take interest if they deal with non-Jews since Shylock is justifying religiously why he is going to take interests. He is going to follow Jacob's deeds who establishes himself by making the ewes breed because "This was a way to thrive" (1.3.90) and "thrift is blessing". The researcher believes that "thrift" is a symbol for power, and when "men steal it", it is destroyed.

Shylock seeks to create a victory over the Christians by showing his economic power:

Signior Antonio, many a time and oft  
In the Rialto you have rated me  
About my moneys and my usances:  
Still have I borne it with a patient shrug,  
For sufferance is the badge of all our tribe.  
You call me misbeliever, cut-throat dog,

And spit upon my Jewish gaberdine,  
 And all for use of that which is mine own.  
 Well then, it now appears you need my help:  
 Go to then; you come to me, and you say,  
 'Shylock, we would have moneys:' you say so;  
 You, that did void your rheum upon my beard,  
 And foot me as you spurn a stranger cur  
 Over your threshold. Moneys is your suit.  
 What should I say to you? Should I not say,  
 'Hath a dog money? is it possible  
 A cur can lend three thousand ducats?' Or  
 Shall I bend low, and in a bondman's key,  
 With bated breath, and whispering humbleness,  
 Say this;  
 'Fair sir, you spit on me on Wednesday last;  
 You spurn'd me such a day; another time  
 You call'd me dog— and for these courtesies  
 I'll lend you thus much moneys'? (1.3.102-125).

Although Antonio curses Shylock, Shylock uses highly structured language as a trial to impose his will on Antonio; "referring to this abuse, Shylock asks Antonio rhetorically and sarcastically, "and for these courtesies / I'll lend you thus much moneys?" (Hunt, 2003, p. 165). Shylock tolerates these insults because all the Jews do so. Shylock is a misguiding Jew who tries to make Antonio obedient to him since, according to Turner (2006, p. 435), friendship requires no justice. Shylock reminds Antonio of his aggressions that he spits upon his Jewish "gabardine", and calls him unbeliever and dog. Then Shylock simply inquires: You need my help? You need a dog's help? If you think I have bad characteristics, why do you need my "moneys"? The answer to all these spiritual questions is simple. Shylock himself doesn't have the money, so he can avoid lending, but because he is a blood-thirsty Jew; he wants to win over Antonio. In other words, Shylock effortlessly persuades himself that he has a high value between Christians who don't respect it.

Additionally, these lines contain many symbols which serve in finding Jewish power and identity. For example, the expression "my Jewish gabardine" (1.3.108) symbolizes the high status of Shylock. Moreover, the word "beard" symbolizes the dignity and

glory of Shylock, which is being stained by Antonio. Therefore, there is no need for Shylock to “bend low” for he thinks he gets some power because of his economic status.

When Shylock fails in obtaining power and establishing identity, he replies:

Why, look you, how you storm!  
I would be friends with you and have your love,  
Forget the shames that you have stain'd me with,  
Supply your present wants and take no doit  
Of usance for my moneys, and you'll not hear me:  
This is kind I offer. (1.3.134-138).

These lines illustrate how malicious Shylock is. Though he is treated badly and spat upon, he is going to lend money, forget the insults and be kind to Antonio. Readers don't exactly know why Antonio used to spit on Shylock at the beginning of the play, but later they know that Antonio hates the race of the Jews for they lend money with interests, and this could be a reason. However, spitting is being mentioned twice which is a gesture of disgust (Schuman, 2002, p. 55). His personality is distorted, since he is weak-minded though he has determined to declass Antonio.

Though Shylock is weak-minded, he is bloodthirsty. The following lines demonstrate this claim:

This kindness will I show.  
Go with me to a notary, seal me there  
Your single bond; and, in a merry sport,  
If you repay me not on such a day,  
In such a place, such sum or sums as are  
Express'd in the condition, let the forfeit  
Be nominated for an equal pound  
Of your fair flesh, to be cut off and taken  
In what part of your body pleaseth me (1.3.139-147).

"The bond would thus seem to grant a measure of justice to Shylock" (Turner, 2006, p. 437). In Shylock's eye, taking a pound of a Christian's “fair flesh” is a joke (merry sport), so, Shylock has tied Antonio's freedom in his bond, so to speak, or "Shylock will

earn interest in obscene enjoyment" (Nickel, 2000, p. 321). His fate is under the mercy of the bond.

When one cuts off a pound of a man's flesh, this means he controls him. Blanchard (2009, p. 216) states that:

He then transforms his bond made in "merry sport" (1.3.144) with Antonio to a bond bearing "a lodged hate and a certain loathing" (4.1.61). Even the Duke of Venice, who must uphold civic law and freedom and thus cannot "alter a decree established" (4.1.223).

Nevertheless, in order to make the bond lawful, Antonio should "seal" the bond. Shylock wants what legally belongs to him (Tiffany, 2006). It seems that Shylock expects the failure of defraying the debt because he says he will not take interest, so he suggests to cut off a pound of flesh. Supposing that Shylock cuts off a pound of Antonio's flesh, and that Antonio doesn't die, it will be shameful for Christians that they become a mark of disgrace by an "insulted" Jew.

In order to appear humanitarian and passionate, Shylock, again, uses religious allusions:

O father Abram, what these Christians are,  
Whose own hard dealings teaches them suspect  
The thoughts of others! Pray you, tell me this:  
If he should break his day, what should I gain  
By the exaction of the forfeiture?  
A pound of man's flesh taken from a man,  
Is not so estimable, profitable neither,  
As flesh of muttens, beefs, or goats. I say,  
To buy his favour, I extend this friendship:  
If he will take it, so; if not, adieu;  
And, for my love, I pray you wrong me not. (1.3.156-166).

This indicates the animosity of Shylock. Shylock here appears as a bloodthirsty for "A pound of man's flesh is not so estimable, profitable neither". Here, Shylock searches for power in order to establish his ideology as says "The thoughts of others". The thoughts of others symbolize the values of the Jews. He also uses religious references such as "O father Abram" to persuade himself that what he does is true, and "defending himself

against Antonio's accusations, Shylock cites the Torah to argue that he practises 'thrift' and does not 'steal'" (Nickel, 2000, p. 326). The pound of a Christian's flesh is worthless, but the "flesh of muttons, beefs, or goats" is much more precious. Flesh symbolizes the personality of a man, and Shylock seeks to distort it.

To summarize, readers were introduced to Shylock in this act. Shylock will not share his identity with Christians. He uses ironic terms, such as "good man", to show his fake respect to Antonio. He hates Christians because they are Christians: "I hate him for he is a Christian" (1.3.38). He uses religious stories to confirm the act of taking interests as lawful, or acceptable. Shylock appears malicious, since he is going to lend borrowed-money regardless to the insults of Christians.

#### **4.4.2. Act II, Scene V**

In act II, scene V, the relationship between a Jewish father and a daughter is framed in addition to the relationship between a Jew master and a servant. Shylock may represent the Jewish ethics for Shakespeare's audience, not for us (Hartman, 2011).

Shylock begins to lose power. His servant is the first to relinquish his service for he wants to serve Bassanio. Because of this, Shylock believes that he is a unique master and tells Launcelot, 'Hagar's offspring' (2.5.44), that Bassanio is a useless master. He tries to persuade him:

Well, thou shalt see, thy eyes shall be thy judge  
The difference of old Shylock and Bassanio—  
What, Jessica!—Thou shalt not gormandize  
As thou hast done with me—What, Jessica!—  
And sleep and snore, and rend apparel out—  
Why, Jessica, I say! (2.5.1-6).

Shylock appears in this scene as a careful father who is reluctant to go to dine with Christians and leave his daughter alone. Yet, Shylock dictates his daughter to:



I am bid forth to supper, Jessica;  
There are my keys. But wherefore should I go?  
I am not bid for love: they flatter me.  
But yet I'll go in hate, to feed upon  
The prodigal Christian. Jessica, my girl,  
Look to my house. I am right loath to go:  
There is some ill a-brewing towards my rest,  
For I did dream of money-bags tonight. (2.5.11-18).

Shylock offers his daughter the authority to take care of his wealth since he is still reluctant whether to have dinner with “The prodigal Christian” or not. This conversation proves that Shylock is an eccentric and confused Jew who, according to Horwich (1977, p. 197), finds it difficult to make decisions. Tanner (1999, p. 82) discusses the relationship between the word “prodigal” and Christianity. He indicates that the word has two dimensions: the first is the munificent prodigality of Antonio, and the second is the obsessive meanness and parsimony of Shylock.

Shylock keeps on giving instructions to his daughter:

What, are there masques? Hear you me, Jessica:  
Lock up my doors, and when you hear the drum  
And the vile squealing of the wry-neck'd fife,  
Clamber not you up to the casements then,  
Nor thrust your head into the public street  
To gaze on Christian fools with varnish'd faces,  
But stop my house's ears—I mean my casements—  
Let not the sound of shallow foppery enter  
My sober house. By Jacob's staff, I swear  
I have no mind of feasting forth tonight;  
But I will go. Go you before me, sirrah;  
Say I will come. (2.5.28-39).

These lines confirm how masterful and authoritative, to his daughter, Shylock is. Instead of addressing his daughter in general, he likes to specify or individualize what he has. For example, he calls upon his daughter to “lock up *my* doors” (2.5.29). The use of “*my*”, here, makes his character tyrannical. Additionally, Shylock warns Jessica not to open “*his*” windows in order not to see the Christians or to listen to their music.

Shylock is confirmed that he has economic power and he tries to save it by specifying what he has.

Shylock has power over his daughter and servant:

The patch is kind enough, but a huge feeder;  
Snail-slow in profit, and he sleeps by day  
More than the wild-cat: drones hive not with me;  
Therefore I part with him, and part with him  
To one that would have him help to waste  
His borrow'd purse. Well, Jessica, go in—  
Perhaps I will return immediately—  
Do as I bid you; shut doors after you:  
Fast bind, fast find;  
A proverb never stale in thrifty mind. (2.5.46-55).

Again and again, Shylock cautions his daughter to lock the doors in order to protect his wealth because “Fast bind, fast find” (2.5.54). The irony here is that Shylock is afraid that he loses his money, but he doesn't scare to lose his daughter. He has to inform Jessica too to take care of herself, but because he is materialistic, he doesn't care of his daughter. Shylock's final instructions to Jessica, "shut doors after you" (2.5.53) snaps their connection rather than preserves her inclusion (Sherman, 2013, p. 113). This claim is confirmed in act III, scene I; when she elopes with her lover, Shylock wishes his daughter “Were dead at” his "foot" (3.1.83-84). Nevertheless, "there is not a single person who is interested in Shylock as a human being, even momentarily; Shylock, as a man does not exist" (Heller, 2000, p. 152).

To summarize, Shylock appears in this scene as a materialistic father and good master. He warns his daughter to save his property, and he tells Launcelot not to quit his service because Shylock believes he is better than any other masters. However, the irony is clear that he has to inform his daughter to take care of herself in addition to his property. Irony occurs when his daughter, Jessica, steals his property and elopes with her lover.

#### 4.4.3. Act III, Scene I

Shylock treats everything from a materialistic perspective. When he learns that his daughter, Jessica, eloped with her lover, Lorenzo, he mentions what she stole rather than wish her good luck, though he describes her as his "flesh and blood" (3.1.32). However, "She is damned for it" (3.1.30). If we connect between (3.1.32) and (3.1.30), we find that Shylock curses himself! In addition, the word flesh is used many times in the play. It is used once when Shylock says that he needs a pound of Antonio's flesh, and when Shylock describes his daughter as his flesh. Therefore, "flesh" represents the outside form of the body, where the inside is represented by the religious perspectives. In other words, it is true that Christians and Jews have the same flesh, but not the same soul, and Shylock demands the Christian flesh to end its soul, in a matter of speaking.

Shylock has had power over his daughter, but when she eloped with her lover, Shylock loses all kinds of power. Probably, Shylock feels happy when he learns that Antonio's ships are damaged, but feels fretful, cruel, greedy, and money-hungry when he learns that his daughter enjoys herself with the money she stole.

Shylock's wishes are that he would his daughter "Were dead at" his "foot" (3.1. 84). Now, it is clear that Shylock is a tyrannical who only prefers money, and doesn't care of his only daughter. All in all, the elopement of his daughter, who embraced Christianity, might be an indication that Shylock is outrageous.

Lines 40-46 illustrate the offensiveness of the Jewish lost identity and ideology (3.1.40-46). Shylock's morals are high that he will defeat and take revenge from Antonio since he knows that his ships are destroyed. Additionally, Shylock's repetition of the sentence "Let him look to his bond" (3.1.43&46) indicates that Shylock feels a victor, or winner of the bond, so the repetition of the sentence by Shylock is used to convince or persuade Antonio that Shylock will finish him. Then, he states that the literal implementation of

the bond "will feed" his "revenge" (3.1.50). Here, the revenge of the Jew equals the assaults of the Christian, Antonio.

When Shylock is asked about what to do with the flesh, he uses a sympathetic language to persuade readers that his revenge is valid:

To bait fish withal: if it will feed nothing else, it will feed my revenge. He hath disgraced me, and hindered me half a million, laughed at my losses, mocked at my gains, scorned my nation, thwarted my bargains, cooled my friends, heated mine enemies; and what's his reason? I am a Jew. Hath not a Jew eyes? hath not a Jew hands, organs, dimensions, senses, affections, passions? fed with the same food, hurt with the same weapons, subject to the same diseases, healed by the same means, warmed and cooled by the same winter and summer, as a Christian is? If you prick us, do we not bleed? if you tickle us, do we not laugh? if you poison us, do we not die? and if you wrong us, shall we not revenge? If we are like you in the rest, we will resemble you in that. If a Jew wrong a Christian, what is his humility? Revenge. If a Christian wrong a Jew, what should his sufferance be by Christian example? Why, revenge! The villainy you teach me, I will execute, and it shall go hard but I will better the instruction. (3.1.49-69).

These lines cause the confusion whether Shylock is a good Jew or a money and flesh hunger merchant. Christians and Jews both have flesh, eyes, etc., and both die if poisoned, but the distinction characteristics between them are religion, where this is a Jew, and that is a Christian. The questioning technique by Shylock makes the readers feel sympathetic with Shylock, since he looks for his Jewish identity. In addition, the ideology of both is different, and Shylock tries to show how humble his ideology is. Although Shylock knows that the flesh is worthless, he is still demanding in order to quench his thirst of revenge, but he exaggerates in the process. In other words, if a Christian insults a Jew, the Jew has to do the same, not to demand the double –“it shall go hard”- by cutting off his flesh!

‘Human flesh and money in Venice are constantly exchanged for one another’ (Girard, 1978, p. 102), cited in McAvan (2011, p. 28). Therefore, Shylock’s ideology is stained with blood since his revenge is totally bloody. Moreover, it is clearly stated by Shylock that his Jewish identity is unknown. He cannot act as a true Jew. "Shylock looks like a merchant of Venice; he wears the clothes of a Venetian patrician. Neither his stature, his look, nor his face indicated that he was Jewish" (Heller, 2000, p. 152).

In the following lines, Shylock’s economic power has deteriorated and declined.

Why there, there, there, there! A diamond gone,  
cost me two thousand ducats in Frankfurt! The  
curse never fell upon our nation till now; I never  
felt it till now: two thousand ducats in that, and  
other precious, precious jewels. I would my  
daughter were dead at my foot, and the jewels in  
her ear! Would she were hearsed at my foot, and the  
ducats in her coffin! No news of them—why so?  
and I know not what’s spent in the search. Why  
thou—loss upon loss! The thief gone with so much,  
and so much to find the thief—and no satisfaction,  
no revenge: nor no ill luck stirring but what lights  
o' my shoulders; no sighs but o' my breathing;  
no tears but o' my shedding. (3.1.79-92).

These lines show the poorness of Shylock’s economic power when he learns that his daughter has eloped with her lover. His wishes are to see his daughter dead with all what she steals. These wishes confirm that Shylock’s authority over his daughter is non-existent. When he sees her dead with the stolen diamonds, his authority can be sustained.

However, despite the elopement of his daughter, Shylock’s intuition is to have power over Christians because he knows that Antonio’s ships are collapsed. When he learns that the ships are damaged, Shylock thanks God and describes these news as good (3.1.97/100-101). In spite of the “good news”, Tubal’s repetition of the elopement of Shylock’s daughter makes him feel weaker, but the repetition of the shipwreck of

Antonio's ships, makes him stronger that he will take his revenge from Antonio, the Christian, so that he scores a hit, so to speak. He tries to catch power in order to create his Jewish identity and to put his ideology in circulation. Shylock is "glad" and will "torture" Antonio, but fretful that his daughter takes the ring (3.1.110).

The following lines are a description for the ring:

Out upon her! Thou torturest me, Tubal: it was  
my turquoise; I had it of Leah when I was a  
bachelor: I would not have given it for a wilderness  
of monkeys. (3.1.114-117).

Even the turquoise ring is a gift from his wife. The ring usually represents the partnership between the husband and the wife. "The ring exemplifies the paradox of marriage; it binds two people exclusively to each other" (Leggatt, 1992, p.212).

Jessica unties the relationship between her Jewish father and mother, so he has no authority over anyone, even himself. His Jewish identity is broken up because he loses an inestimable piece, the ring that reflects his matrimony. The ring to Jessica is put on the same level of a monkey, but Shylock "would not have given it for a wilderness of monkeys" (3.1.116-117). Because of her "extravagant spending and bartering away of his late wife's jewellery", Shylock turns "into an utter monster" (Masugi, 1997, p. 205). Hence, a Christian, Lorenzo, invades Shylock's house, and Shylock looks for a "financial security for harming a Christian" Tiffany (2006, p. 388).

It is an odd behaviour when someone feels happy and sad at the same time. Truly, this is Shylock who feels happy when Tubal informs him that Antonio "is certainly undone", but loses concentration when Tubal reminds him of his daughter elopement.

Hunt (2003) connects between the happiness and sadness of Shylock and describes how Shylock looks for power:

Thou stick'st a dagger in me: I shall never see my  
gold again: Fourscore ducats at a sitting! fourscore  
ducats! (3.1.104-106).

Hearing of Jessica's profligacy with his ducats, Shylock feels as though a dagger has been stuck in him. Tubal's inexplicable introduction of Antonio into this dialogue gives Shylock, figuratively speaking, the opportunity to withdraw this dagger and plunge it into Antonio for relief of his pain (p. 168).

Shylock's revenge is brought into being:

Nay, that's true, that's very true. Go, Tubal, fee  
me an officer; bespeak him a fortnight before. I will  
have the heart of him if he forfeit, for were he out  
of Venice I can make what merchandise I will. Go,  
Tubal, and meet me at our synagogue; go, good  
Tubal; at our synagogue, Tubal. (3.1.119-124).

These lines, (3.1.119-124), clearly show the seeking of power, identity and ideology by Shylock, the Jew. For the sake of obtaining power, Shylock wants Antonio to be arrested two weeks ahead before the bond, and according to McAvan (2011, p.26), there is an absolute relationship between himself and the legal contract. For the sake of establishing a Jewish ideology, Shylock will make whatever transactions when he lends money to Christians. For the sake of making a Jewish identity, he will throw away from Antonio, the bad Christian, so he will be known as the Jew who defeated a Christian so that his trade and business will run the way Shylock likes.

To summarize, the seeking of power, establishing identity and proving Jewish identity are clear in this scene. Shylock feels that he has power coming from the bond signed by Antonio, but feels powerless when he learns that his daughter runs away with her lover. However, the bond can be a symbol for power to Shylock because he wants the implementation of the bond literally. He also wants Antonio to be arrested two weeks before the date of the bond.

#### 4.4.4. Act III, Scene III

Shylock starts to threaten Antonio in this scene. He will not show any mercy to that “fool” Christian who lends money without interests (3.3.1-3). Jews were allowed to take interests in Shakespearean era (Weinstein, 2007). For that reason, Shylock has a sign of predetermination that he will defeat Antonio. Though Shylock seeks for mercy, he doesn't show any when Antonio fails to pay the bond. "Tell not me of mercy" confirms the inner brutality of Shylock (3.3.1). At first, Antonio has the power over Shylock, and used to insult him, now, Shylock has the power, and will revenge for the insults. They treat each other according to "an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth". Shylock makes an attack in return for a similar attack. In other meaning, Shylock and Antonio's ideologies, values, assertions, and aims are alike. After that, Shylock sets in mind that "The Duke shall grant" him "justice" (3.3.8), for he has his bond, and trusts the judgment. Here, Shylock's thinking is that the high power may stand with him, so he will have his bond, and, therefore, the pound of flesh.

The condition to get the pound of flesh is, Garber (2004) argues, an attempt to convert Antonio to Judaism (Ionescu, 2009, p. 106) so that Shylock establishes the Jewish identity and ideology. If Shylock has what he seeks for, he will defeat the high power in Venice and all people in Venice will say that a Jew wins and Christians fail.

However, Shylock believes that justice will give him his right, and will be able to cut off a pound of Antonio's flesh because he has his bond. "Shylock insistently demands the precise terms of the bond, no more and no less" (Blanchard, 2009, p. 210). The bond represents high and religious authority to Shylock:

I'll have my bond; speak not against my bond:  
I have sworn an oath that I will have my bond.  
Thou call'dst me dog before thou hadst a cause,  
But, since I am a dog, beware my fangs:  
The duke shall grant me justice. I do wonder,  
Thou naughty gaoler, that thou art so fond



To come abroad with him at his request. (3.3.12-17)

In these lines, Shylock reminds Antonio of the assaults that were tolerated by Shylock. Shylock, “the dog”, has “fangs” that will bite Antonio because “The duke shall grant” him “justice”. The power dynamics have been reversed in which Shylock holds the stick (Picker, 1994). The duke represents the high power in Venice, so Shylock trusts him. It is important to notice that Antonio describes Shylock as “good” which indicates the low determination of Antonio. He changes his language to control Shylock, but Shylock has his bond. Shylock’s recommendation for the foolish jailer is to keep Antonio under his protection in order not to run away.

The bond is a symbol of power for Shylock. He will not go back on his words for he has his bond. He is unrelenting because he will not listen to Antonio’s justification. Turner (2006) describes the pound of flesh as "Christian political body": "It is Antonio’s flesh that is demanded, the whole person Antonio in his status representative of the Christian political body, and Shylock will accept nothing less" (p. 439).

#### **4.4.5. Act IV, Scene I**

The court scene, act IV, scene I, has a lot of satire, and the language and other tools of the language serve intensely to criticize both the Jews and the Christians. It is the longest scene in the play. However, the play "attacks both Shylock and Antonio as warped representatives of their faiths" (Masugi, 1997, p. 208). Hence, the court scene symbolizes the Christian power over Jews at that time. At the court, because of Shylock's insistence on the literal implementation of the bond, he thinks that he has power over the Christians. Therefore, readers find him very self-confident since he believes he will win the case because of the bond he has. The following is Shylock's first words at the court:

I have possess'd your grace of what I purpose;  
 And by our holy Sabbath have I sworn  
 To have the due and forfeit of my bond:  
 If you deny it, let the danger light  
 Upon your charter and your city's freedom.  
 You'll ask me, why I rather choose to have  
 A weight of carrion flesh than to receive  
 Three thousand ducats. I'll not answer that,  
 But say it is my humour. Is it answer'd?  
 What if my house be troubled with a rat,  
 And I be pleas'd to give ten thousand ducats  
 To have it ban'd? What, are you answer'd yet?  
 Some men there are love not a gaping pig;  
 Some, that are mad if they behold a cat;  
 And others, when the bagpipe sings i' the nose,  
 Cannot contain their urine: for affection,  
 Master of passion, sways it to the mood  
 Of what it likes, or loathes. Now, for your answer:  
 As there is no firm reason to be render'd,  
 Why he cannot abide a gaping pig;  
 Why he, a harmless necessary cat;  
 Why he, a woollen bagpipe, but of force  
 Must yield to such inevitable shame  
 As to offend, himself being offended;  
 So can I give no reason, nor I will not,  
 More than a lodg'd hate and a certain loathing  
 I bear Antonio, that I follow thus  
 A losing suit against him. Are you answer'd? (4,1,35-62).

These utterances confirm Shylock's intuitive to win the case, and confirm that Shylock is going not to show any mercy toward Antonio, for Shylock wants to revenge to himself. Here, he talks directly with the Duke, the high power. "He will have 'his bond' and invests his cause with religious respectability" (Wilson, p.16). Though Christians determine to give him his money at the court, "A weight of carrion flesh" is better than "to receive three thousand ducats". The "carrion flesh" is a symbol indicating Shylock's superiority that though Antonio's flesh is not edible, Shylock needs it. In other words, "carrion" is used not to indicate Antonio's body only, but to describe the whole Christians as rotten. In addition, Shylock mocks on the Christians for he compares between "a rat" and his case. The "rat" is Antonio who has troubled Shylock's house.

The Duke begs Shylock for mercy, but Shylock insists on the implementation of the bond literally. The bond represents a weapon for Shylock by which he uses to fight. If the Duke doesn't implement what is written in the bond, Shylock's viewpoint that there is no freedom in the law of Venice city is valid.

Shylock's justifications of cutting off Antonio's flesh to the Duke aren't conclusive, or "a lodged hate", for "it is" his "humour". He likes to end Antonio's life so as he "give[s] no reason, nor [he] will not". There is no reason, in Shylock's view, to provide to the Duke justifying the killing, so Shylock likes to kill a Christian without any reason, though he knows the killing is "a losing suit against him", and he is "not bound to please thee with [his] answers". (4,1,35-65).

Because "there is no inherent quality to distinguish the Christian from the Jew" (Dutta, 2013, p, 945), Shylock tries to find a quality distinguishing them. Shylock, in the court scene, represents the whole Jewish community for he uses the pronoun "our". He is trying to defeat the high power of Christians and uses religious words, or oaths (holy Sabbath). It is a trial by Shylock to establish his identity and ideology in front of the Duke and the Christian attendants to the court by swearing and using Jewish oaths in a Christian court. He firmly believes he has power because of the bond signed by Antonio.

For Shylock hates Antonio, he is going to kill him as says "hates any man the thing he would not kill? (4,1,35-67), and Shylock will not show any mercy: "What! wouldst thou have a serpent sting thee twice?" (4,1,69).

The word "serpent" is used metaphorically. The serpent could be a symbol for Antonio, the Christian. If Shylock shows any mercy, the serpent, Antonio, will "sting" him again. Owing to the fact that Shylock is a money-hunger, he is given twice the sum, but he

refuses and replies: "If every ducat in six thousand ducats, Were in six parts, and every part a ducat, I would not draw them. I would have my bond." (4,1,35-85).

On the account of that, the bond should be applied in precisely the same words. Shylock would have his bond and if he gets his bond, he defeats the Christians who are charged in power so that he will obtain power. When he has power, he could confirm the Jewish identity and then ideology between the Christians who used to declass the Jews. Shylock believes that usury gives him power to control his opponent (Picker, 1994). The usury here is what is coded in the bond, which is a pound of flesh.

When asked to show mercy, Shylock's reaction is:

What judgment shall I dread, doing no wrong?  
You have among you many a purchased slave,  
Which, like your asses and your dogs and mules,  
You use in abject and in slavish parts,  
Because you bought them: Shall I say to you,  
'Let them be free, Marry them to your heirs?  
Why sweat they under burdens? Let their beds  
Be made as soft as yours, and let their palates  
Be season'd with such viands?' You will answer,  
'The slaves are ours'. So do I answer you:  
The pound of flesh which I demand of him,  
Is dearly bought; 'tis mine and I will have it.  
If you deny me, fie upon your law!  
There is no force in the decrees of Venice.  
I stand for judgment. Answer— shall I have it? (4,1,89-103).

Shylock appears as a legal or lawful Jew who respects the law of Christians. He makes an analogy between the slaves and the pound of flesh (Beauchamp, 2001). He will not intrude on how Christians deal with their animals or slaves for all of these are related to them, not to the Jews, and so is the pound of flesh. The pound of flesh is a property of Shylock: 'tis mine and I will have it" (4,1,100), and Christians have no right to persuade Shylock not to have it. Shylock's description of Antonio as a "serpent" that stings implicates the seriousness of his mission at the court. Shylock argues that Antonio has

stung him in the past, but now he will not sting him again because Antonio's submission to the will of the bond.

Hence, "the pound of flesh" which Shylock requires is his possession. As a result, he wishes the right judgment, and hopes the Duke be fair. He is self-confident that the law is on his side, but if it is denied, " fie upon your law" (4,1,101). A simile is used to persuade the Duke about the pound of flesh. Shylock wants revenge for the loss of his daughter and for the years of insult and humiliation (Weinstein, 2007, p. 190).

Having a knife in the court represents the high status of Shylock that he will defeat the Christians. Shylock sharpens the knife "to cut the forfeiture from that bankrupt there"(4,1,122). For that reason, Shylock warns the court, "If you deny me, fie upon your law!" (Long, 2012), (4,1,101). So, the word "bankrupt" holds two meanings; the first is related to money, and the second is related to life. The knife confirms that Shylock has had power; Antonio "does not equivocate or seek to deny his oath", and the agreement to "offer his body may imply a Christian redemptive theme" (Hartman, 2011, p. 73).

Shylock is proud for Christians "canst rail the seal from off [his] bond";

Till thou canst rail the seal from off my bond.  
Thou but offend'st thy lungs to speak so loud:  
Repair thy wit, good youth, or it will fall  
To cureless ruin. I stand here for law. (4,1,139-142).

This utterance indicates Shylock's power that no one can help and he will surely win the case, though all of the officers of the court are Christians. It can be restated as: I am a Jew, this is Antonio's seal and this is my bond. Shakespeare "shows a muted resistance in Shylock against social power structures that decide patterns of assimilation" (Dutta, 2013, p. 945).

However, Portia, disguised as a boy, defends and protects her lover's friend. She seeks urgently that Shylock should show some mercy to the Christian, where Shylock refuses. With the progress of the court, Shylock is describing the lawyer, Portia, as noble: "O noble judge! O excellent young man! (4,1,244), excellent young man and wise: 'Tis very true! O wise and upright judge! How much more elder art thou than thy looks! (4,1,248-249), upright, Daniel, "A Daniel come to judgment! yea, a Daniel! O wise young judge, how I do honour thee! (4,1,221-222), "Most rightful judge! (4,1,299)", "Most learned judge! A sentence! Come, prepare!" (4,1,302).

The irony here is that he is confident and replies proudly that his name is Shylock (4,1,174), but this good judge turns against him which makes Shylock, later, let out a scream of astonishment: "Is that the law?" (4,1,312). Shylock, at the beginning of the play, seeks for love and mercy, but when he has the opportunity, he is asked to show some, but he doesn't show any: "On what compulsion must I? Tell me that" (4,1,181).

Daniel symbolizes the good judge, where Portia, though at the beginning good, is not a good lawyer, for Antonio wins at the end. She's good for Christians, and Shylock unintentionally declares that.

Shylock respects the law and takes responsibilities of applying the bond literally. He is the man of the law: "My deeds upon my head! I crave the law, The penalty, and forfeit of my bond." (4,1,204-205).

He swears to have his bond. It is an oath, and he can't violate or break his oath for he respects the law. His ideology is not to break his oath: "An oath, an oath, I have an oath in heaven. Shall I lay perjury upon my soul? No, not for Venice." (4,1,226-228).

Moreover, "there is no power in the tongue of man to alter "Shylock and he "stay[s] here on [his] bond" (4,1,239-240). When asked to fetch a surgeon, Shylock claims that

"'tis not in the bond", which confirms how this Jew is a utilitarian, from one hand, and on the other hand is a predator:

When it is paid according to the tenour.  
It doth appear you are a worthy judge;  
You know the law, your exposition  
Hath been most sound: I charge you by the law,  
Whereof you are a well-deserving pillar,  
Proceed to judgment: by my soul I swear  
There is no power in the tongue of man  
To alter me. I stay here on my bond. (4,1,233-240).

Gross (2008, p. 85) argues that "it is the cipher of his power and place, the one thing in which the law guarantees him property or profit that is not usurious": "Ay, 'his breast': So says the bond: —doth it not, noble judge? — 'Nearest his heart'—those are the very words." (4,1,251-252).

In his thought, Shylock is totally convinced that he will have his pound of flesh, so he is totally prepared in which he fetches a "balance" to weigh the meat: "I have them ready". (4,1,254). This prior preparation confirms Shylock's intuitive to end the life of Antonio, for he will take a pound "nearest his heart". In this case, he has a triumph.

The law to Shylock is represented in written materials, such as the bond he has: "Here 'tis, most reverend doctor, here it is" (4,1,224). He cannot do anything unwritten for his power comes from the "seal" of Antonio on the bond: "I cannot find it: 'tis not in the bond": (4,1,260), "Is it so nominated in the bond?" (4,1,257).

"Fixated on collecting a pound of flesh, Shylock epitomizes taking the law too literally. In doing so, he ignores the unwritten code that the law ultimately serves to protect the interests of the ruling Venetian elite, the Christians. Not only does Shylock use the law antithetically to the unspoken rules of Venice, but his myopic legal vision leads him to demand (in the name of the law) a punishment incommensurate with Antonio's default." (Nickel, 2001, p. 320). His word-to-word translation of the bond makes him merciless

due to his refusal to call a doctor to heal the wound of Antonio. The flesh of Antonio is "rotten", so it doesn't deserve healing!

Besides, Shylock's wishes are that if his daughter married Barabbas, the thief, it is better than a Christian, which verify how this Jew hates the Christians, and this idea is confirmed when he warned his daughter not to listen to the Christian music: "These be the Christian husbands! I have a daughter; Would any of the stock of Barabbas, Had been her husband rather than a Christian!" (4,1,293-295).

The reason that Shylock prefers "Barabbas" is that Barabbas and Shylock have some characteristics in common. Barabbas is "a confirmed criminal" who "breathes hatred against the whole world" (Davidson, 1901, p. 342), where Shylock hates the whole world of Christianity.

However, Shylock is a blood-sucker Jew for his refusal of "thrice thy money offered thee", but when he fails to collect the pound of Antonio's flesh, he lately agrees to take thrice the money: "I take this offer then: pay the bond thrice, And let the Christian go." (4,1,316-317).

He can change his mind easily that his decisions are not decisive. He changes his mind and refuses to implement the bond literally. He will "let the Christian go" if he takes "the bond thrice".

He fails to obtain "physical" power and kills Antonio, so he manages to find an economic power by agreeing on accepting the mere sum of money, though it is not stated in the bond. His Jewish identity is at its "lowest level": "Give me my principal, and let me go." (4,1,334). "Shall I not have barely my principal?" (4,1,340).

He manipulates in language to get Christians' sympathy for he wants "barely [his] principal". It can be stated that the Jewish ideology is to kill, and if it is failed, take



money instead. This idea is clearly stated by Barnet (1972, p. 29) that "Shylock has full assurance; he hazards nothing, for in time he will necessarily regain either his principal or a pound of Antonio's flesh". He can kill Antonio, but he is afraid to be killed for he is not sure of his scale. He wants to kill and stay alive to prove his Jewish identity, so he refuses to end Antonio's life. Instead, he demands the money when he knows that his plans are unsuccessful and unfruitful.

What can be noticed, here, is the use of the pronoun "my principal". The ducats are not for Shylock; it is for Tubal. Tubal's reaction to Shylock is unknown. Readers don't recognize that Tubal demands his money back from Shylock. This gives emphasis to the fact that all the Jews including Tubal want to destroy the Christian society by any means available, so Shylock represents the majority of the Jews whose viewpoint toward Christianity is aggressive.

He fails to get his original money, so he wishes bad luck to Antonio: "Why, then the devil give him good of it!" (4,1,343). He manages to run away because of his failure in obtaining power and defeating Antonio: "I'll stay no longer question" (4,1,344). Though he is committed by what is written in the contract, he, unknowingly, contradicts the high law of Venice because he is considered an alien. The alien is prohibited from threatening a citizen's life (Masugi, 1997). "Shylock is suddenly and surprisingly charged with the criminal offense of seeking the life of a citizen (4.1.350) and forced to convert to Christianity (4.1.389)" (Jackson, 2007, p. 71).

Money and properties are his life, not his daughter or tribe:

Nay, take my life and all; pardon not that:  
You take my house, when you do take the prop  
That doth sustain my house; you take my life  
When you do take the means whereby I live. (4,1,372-375).

As a result of Shylock's inscrutability, he loses his own self-definition (Sherman, 2013, p. 114), so he appeals to be killed, for "he can no longer engage in an immoral activity" (Barnet, 1972, p. 29). He loses his Jewish identity, Jewish ideology and power, so he cannot tolerate another sting by the serpent, Antonio for "Shylock is distorting Jewish tradition, culture and law" (Weinstein, 2007, p. 189). His source of power, which is money, is deprived (Picker, 1994). Therefore, he "pray[s] you, give [him] leave to go from hence". He is not well. "Send the deed after [him]. And [he] will sign it" (4,1,393-395) because he is "content" (4,1,392) to the Christian law of Venice.

The irony, here, comes from the fact that the contract, or the written language in the contract, is merely a joke. Because it is a joke, it causes Shylock all his property. Though it is a joke, it makes Shylock insist on its letter-by-letter application, so Tiffany (2006, p. 395) states that "having introduced the contract as a joke—"a merry sport" (1.3.141)—he clings in court to its cruel letter".

To summarize, Shylock demanded the lawyer to hasten the sentence against Antonio: "We trifle time; I pray thee, pursue sentence" (4,1,296), and when Antonio won the case, Shylock let out a scream of horror "Is that the law"? "Shylock is pressed to be merciful in the civil contract case before he is charged with a criminal offense" (Jackson, 2007, p. 72).

However, when Shylock's fire of revenge was extinguished, he started to feed his wealth by demanding the thrice of the bond, and later, the sum of money itself, but without getting anything, so Shylock is the loser who had been stung twice by the same serpent. A disguised Christian woman defended a Jew who described her in good characteristics, and it is a kind of mockery. The ironic situation is clear when no Christian showed any mercy to Shylock when fell, where they begged his pardon to show some, and forced him to embrace Christianity. Both Shylock and Antonio are interested in flesh,

according to Heller (2000): "Shylock becomes irrational in his confrontation with Antonio. He becomes like Antonio. In their personal showdown, their personal fight for life or death, neither of them is interested in money, but in flesh" (p. 159).

#### **4.5. Findings**

After analysing Shylock's speech, there is a shift to discuss the findings of the analysis. The discussion demonstrates that powerless people are subject to those who have power, and language is an important weapon to impose power. Additionally, in the play, it is found that Jews are members of the margin, not the society for they can't be members of different ideologies. Therefore, what is found in this study is that those charged with authority reproduce discourse the way they like, and different ideologies affect each other. Hence, Jews are affected by Christians in which they change their religion and adopt a new ideology.

This study can add to the literature that language is used to impose power, terminate identity and remove ideology. Dominant social group may exercise control over text and talk (Dijk, 1995, p. 20). Those who have power have the authority to change or edit a text the way meeting their interests. It demonstrates that language manipulation is more dangerous than the law. However, the study proved the following:

1. Jews are trouble-makers who can't be members of a mixture of ideologies.
2. Their identity is based on personal interests.
3. When Jews have power, they try to end the life of all those they hate or oppose.
4. Language gains power from the might of its speakers.

#### **4.5.1. Why do those Charged with Authority, like Christians in The Merchant of Venice, Reproduce Discourse the Way Suiting their Interests?**

Simply, to keep their authority untouchable and protect it, Christians reproduced the language of Shylock's contract by finding "leaking terms" between the lines. Because Christians in MV have power, they have ideology, and because they have ideology, they have self and identity. In contrast, Jews have neither power nor ideology, so they lack the self and the identity. It was a trial by Shylock to fight the high power of Christians by making a bond and letting a Christian sign it. The trial was damaged for the bond is reproduced by Christians the way standing up with their interests, so language is power. Every word might be explained differently in different situations.

Those who have power can change the exact meaning of a word and give it a new, according to their interests or needs. The bond, for example, simply means a pound of flesh, but in the Christian dogma, it means spilling blood. Hence, Shylock's half property should be administered by Antonio for Shylock infringes the law and tries to spill Christian blood.

#### **4.5.2. How do the Ideologies of a Variety of People Living together Affect Each Other, such as the Jews and the Christians in MV?**

In a society, a multiple of ideologies can be found. They can either affect or be affected by each other. In The Merchant of Venice, the ideology of Jews is totally affected by the ideology of Christianity. The demonizing ideology of Shylock makes Christian deaf to him, so that they call him villain (Schuman, 2002). However, it is Jessica who converts to Christianity, without being forced to do so, and it is Shylock who is forced to adopt the ideology of Christianity. He is forced to embrace Christianity, and then its ideology. To clarify, in Judaism, interests are allowed, but it is forbidden in Christianity. Interests are one of the values controlling the Jewish society, so Shylock has to stop dealing in

interests for he is a Christian now. "Antonio's stipulation that Shylock convert to Christianity stands as the greatest act of kindness and mercy that he could have possibly rendered his tormentor" for "Antonio saves Shylock from eternal damnation" (Beauchamp, 2001, p. 55).

#### **4.5.3. What is the Impact of Christians' Identity on the Identity of the Jews, especially Shylock, in MV?**

Shylock loses all kinds of power and his religion. When the religion changes, one's ideology changes for s/he has to follow the values of the new one. Consequently, Shylock's ideology goes under change leading to a change in his self and identity. "Yet, there is another aspect in which Shylock is a Jew. He looks as a Venetian, he behaves as a Venetian, he smiles as a Venetian, but he prays as a Jew" (Heller, 2000, p. 153). However, he must behave like Christians, smell pork, eat with them, drink with them, and pray with them:

Yes, to smell pork; to eat of the habitation which  
your prophet the Nazarite conjured the devil into.  
I will buy with you, sell with you, talk with you,  
walk with you, and so following; but I will not eat  
with you, drink with you, nor pray with you. What  
news on the Rialto? Who is he comes here? (1.3.30-35).

Shylock is described as malign and negative (Bloom, 1998). It could be the reason that makes Antonio asks Shylock to embrace Christianity. He may want him to be positive regardless to the fact that Antonio can be called as negative, too. Yet, Shylock attempts to create, establish and insert his Jewish identity and ideology between Christians. We usually see Shylock interacts with Christians, and rarely with Jews. According to Heller (2000, p. 150), "we do not see Shylock's behaviour in the company of Jews", but "we only see him in the company of Venetian gentiles" (Christians).

#### **4.6. Conclusion**

To conclude, Shylock finally surrendered to the will of the Christians in which he was forced to change his religion because he is a victim of his villainy. When the religion changes, the ideology changes and so does the identity. Shylock had to adopt Christian identity in order not to have transactions with interests. He may not threaten anyone in the future. He will be forced to follow the rules of Venice the way Christians like. Therefore, he lost all kinds of power for his properties were confiscated, and after his death, he has to will half of his property to his "Christian" daughter and her Christian lover.

If one doesn't have power, s/he becomes under the mercy of others' ideologies and identities. Shylock "is wicked, because he wanted Antonio's flesh, although he likes money best, and he is comic, because he loses and becomes the victim of a trick that he himself played" (Heller, 2000, p. 155).

Shylock is the loser for he has no power, ideology and identity. When he tries to find all of which, he loses everything, like his religion and money, or economic power. If one has no power, others may manipulate, control, insult, and even abuse him/ her. Therefore, those charged in power can reproduce the language suiting their interests, and can affect others' identity and ideology. Additionally, if one's religion changes, his identity and ideology may change, as well.

#### **4.7. Summary**

The speech of Shylock is critically analysed in context of power, identity and ideology in this chapter. The analysis reveals that Shylock, a Jew usurer, draws upon his economic status to obtain power in order to control the society of Christians. He depends on a contract signed by Antonio in which Shylock has all the rights to cut off a pound of his flesh if Antonio fails to defray the three thousand ducats. Because of his

literal-mind, Shylock's weapon, which is the bond, is used against him where he loses his identity and ideology. He is forced to adopt Christianity in order not to threaten the society of Christianity in the future.

In addition, some of the linguistic devices have been noticed to reveal the hidden or implied meaning of an utterance. For example, Shylock uses the imperative sentence "beware my fangs" (3.3.15) to warn Antonio that he is not poor anymore, since he has power coming from the bond which is signed by Antonio.

## Chapter Five: Conclusion

### 5.1. Introduction

This study was conducted with the aims to investigate power relation and its impact on social intercourse between the Jews and Christians in The Merchant of Venice, and to identify the impacts of one's ideology and identity between them. Accordingly, it was noticed that elements of power, identity and ideology affect social life through language manipulation. What is addressed in this research can be stated in the following:

1. The effects of language manipulation on the reproduction of discourse: Those charged with power can change and easily manipulate language.
2. The impact of a mixture of ideologies on the members of the society: It was found that one's ideology goes under change if s/he is forced to adopt a new religion or culture.
3. The influence of religion on identity: It was noticed that one adopts a new identity if s/he adopts a new religion.

This study is concerned with revealing and analysing power, identity and ideology in Shakespeare's The Merchant of Venice by analysing linguistic and social interactions between the Jews and Christians in the play. It is noticed that discourse forms a powerful impact on creating a powerful society by means of language manipulation. However, the current critical analysis of discourse and society is limited to the language of the Jew character, called Shylock.

To summarize, lawfully, Shylock wins the case, but he loses it linguistically. He might take a pound of flesh regardless to the blood that is going to be spilled. This proves that language manipulation is more powerful than the law.



## **5.2. Language Manipulation, Power, Identity and Ideology**

Language Manipulation can be seen as the source to exercise power, prove identity and establish ideology. Sometimes, a text holds many interpretations leading to either gain the previously mentioned items or losing them. For example, Shylock tried to exercise power through language against the Christian merchant, Antonio. Though Shylock had a bond bearing Antonio's signature, he neglects the fact that the bond holds several interpretations, since "discourse is a system of meanings" (Zeeman, Poggenpoel, Myburgh & Van Der Linde 2002). One of these interpretations is that Shylock is the owner of a Christian flesh, but not his blood. So, finding a 'secret' between the lines allows to interpret the text differently from its exact meaning. In Shylock's ideology, a bond is a bond that contains unchangeable elements which must literally be implemented. It cannot be altered for the "seal" of Antonio. However, the Christians at the court translated the text in the same words, but they change the meaning. This translation led Shylock to go back on his words and ask for money, not flesh since he believed that he couldn't argue with the high power of Venice. He couldn't find leaking points in the bond permitting him to take the demanded flesh, so he didn't want the literal implementation of the bond; he wanted his money only.

However, his literal determination makes his character as a stubborn who believes on what can only be seen. His ignorance in written language manipulation leads to his loss of economic power, his character as a father and husband, and his values, or ideology. He has to be under the obedience of Christians, for half of his property will be administered by them, and he has to adopt a new ideology and change his Jewish identity to a Christian one. Therefore, language is an instrument to impose power, prove identity and establish ideology by manipulating the meaning conveyed by the 'hidden' words. In this case, Christians realized Shylock's economic power, resulted from the

allowable interest in Judaism, so they intend to force him to change his religion and confiscate his property in order to keep their power, identity and ideology.

### **5.3. Analysis of the Settings of the Play**

The Merchant of Venice has two settings: Venice and Belmont. Venice is the Italian city of law, trade, business, and difficulties. It is a real city which is a "name for compulsive stereotyping, the conversion of love into hatred that this stereotyping occasions, and the place where the rectification of this conversion proves unsatisfying as a long-term solution" (Hunt, 2003, p. 164). All nationalities and beliefs can be found in Venice such as Jews, Christians, etc. It is full of problems because of the existence of the Jews.

However, Belmont is the city of peace and beauty where no Jew exists. "Belmont is a refuge from the "naughty world" (5.1.91), it is subject to the conditional negotiations of wills and vows" (Scott, 2004, p. 299).

The researcher believes that the city is quiet because there are no Jews in it. Launcelot is the only Jew who steps inside the city, but he differs from all the Jews in the play depending on how Shylock describes him; Shylock in Act II, Scene V describes him as "kind enough" (2.5.46), so he is not trouble-maker. In addition, Jessica feels sorry that he appeals to give Bassanio his servant, for he is going to leave Shylock's house. Moreover, Jessica, Shylock's only daughter, enters the city after she becomes a Christian, so one can conclude that when the Jews appear in a city, problems appear.

On the account of that, the idea that the Jews are trouble-makers can be supported by Tanner's (1999) discussion of The Merchant of Venice. He says that there are two cities of Venice; one belongs to Christians and the other for Jews in which Shylock lives in a

city that is described by Shakespeare as "public place", different from the Venice enjoyed by the Christian merchants.

#### **5.4. Shylock's Language Variation in the Scenes of the Play**

In Act I, Scene III, when Shylock first appears, we notice that Shylock uses highly polite language when he interacts with Christians, but uses very aggressive and offensive language in his asides. For instance, Shylock describes Antonio as a "good man" (1.3.12,) when he was speaking with Bassanio, but in his aside, away from Antonio and Bassanio, Shylock says, "If I can catch him once upon the hip, I will feed fat the ancient grudge I bear him" (1.3.42-43).

In act II, scene V, Shylock warns Jessica not to listen to Christians' music. He hates all their deeds, such as listening to their music, actions, etc. "To gaze on Christian fools with varnish'd faces" (2.5.33). Away from Antonio, Shylock describes him as "prodigal" (2.5.15). Usually, sons imitate their parents in their actions, deeds, favourite things and the like, but Jessica does not imitate her father in terms of hating Christianity, though she knows that her father hates Christians. Nevertheless, she becomes a Christian in spite of her father's impediments.

In act III, scene I, Shylock appears as a contradictory Jew who feels well if a Christian loses his trade, and feels fretful when his daughter spends his money. He tries to give vent to his rage against Antonio when he learns about the elopement of his daughter.

In act III, scene III, because he knows that Antonio becomes insolvent, Shylock feels victory and attains manhood to directly show his hostility to Antonio. For the first time, Shylock covertly shows to Antonio his hatred, "But, since I am a dog, beware my fangs" (3.3.15). The use of the imperative sentence "beware my fangs" attracts reader's

attention. Shylock uses figurative language to compare himself with a dog that has dangerous fangs.

Finally, in act IV, scene I, in the court scene, Shylock's language has a new style. At the beginning of the court, he thinks he wins the case, so his hostility is very clear, but when defeated, he goes back to use 'sympathetic' language by letting out a scream of horror using the rhetoric question "is that the law?" (4,1, 312). Therefore, Shylock fails in obtaining power and establishing his Jewish identity for his linguistic manipulation of language is poor; he has to learn all aspects of language manipulation in order to have his 'dark' plans.

To conclude, people, sometimes and in certain circumstances, try to control public discourse if they access power. Shylock accesses power through a bond signed by Antonio and tries to control not only a discourse, but also a society. Van Dijk (2001) summarizes "how (more) powerful groups control public discourse":

In sum, virtually all levels and structures of context, text, and talk can in principle be more or less controlled by powerful speakers, and such power may be abused at the expense of other participants. It should, however, be stressed that talk and text do not always and directly enact or embody the overall power relations between groups: it is always the context that may interfere with, reinforce, or otherwise transform such relationships (p. 357).

### **5.5. Who is Shylock?**

Depending on the analysis of Shylock's speech, one can suggest that Shylock is a valueless Jew for many reasons. First, he fails to be the desirable father. Because of his arbitrary dealing with his daughter, who preferred to adopt Christianity and elope with her lover. She told Launcelot, the Jewish servant, that their "house is hell" (2.3.2). When she ran away with her lover, she took the symbol, ring, framing the relationship between her father and dead mother. She looked for a true man's love and protection.

Additionally, Shylock is a worthless Jew for his unsuccessful seek of power. He, firstly, tried to appear as highly regarded Jew who looks for love and mercy from his enemy, Antonio, but, finally, the mask he wore was taken off that he wanted to find elements of power in order to kill Antonio. This two-faced Jew deserves double slaps for his insistence on the implementation of the bond that allows him to cut off a pound of his enemy's flesh.

He is a brutal usurer Jew who refused to take twice and thrice of the ducats at first, then when failed to collect his demanded flesh, he wanted the 'principal' itself, and finally he didn't need anything. "It is difficult to deny that the play indeed villainizes Shylock and casts him in the role of the stereotypical greedy usurer" (Long, 2012, [www.anthropoetics.ucla.edu/ap1702/1702long.htm](http://www.anthropoetics.ucla.edu/ap1702/1702long.htm)).

He wanted a Christian's flesh for he "hates" Antonio because of his faith, but Shylock has to hate himself now for he is firmly a Christian. It can be noticed that Jews try to control the world of Christianity at the time of the play by their financial power; "the negative association of Jews with money-lending seems well imbedded in the Christian mind not only in Shakespeare's time but also until the present day" (Weinstein, 2007, p. 187).

Whatever the case may be, Shylock describes Antonio well and badly. He uses some adjectives, either implicitly or explicitly, directly or indirectly, to either attack him or to act as if he likes him. Antonio is being described as good man, fawning publican, sufficient, prodigal, rat, serpent, beggar, signior, etc. These characteristics show how Shylock seeks to appear as a good Jew and how manipulative he is.

## 5.6. Shylock as a Christian

"Shylock is Shakespeare's extreme example of someone who professes and practices Hebrew rigidity as opposed to Christian adaptability" (Blanchard, 2009, p. 209). His "morality is only subject to Jewish ethical standards which permit wealth acquisition and revenge" (Ganyi, 2013, p. 127). However, Shylock is a Christian now, and the word "Jew" could be called a term of abuse (Leggatt, 1992).

Therefore, in the court, Shylock is content to convert his Jewish religion and to accept Christianity. Consequently, Shylock experiences two different identities, and his new identity is still ambiguous. The expectations of Shylock's new identity and ideology are questionable, for his last appearance is at the court scene. After then, we don't know how he behaves or interacts with both Jews and Christians. The only issue that we know about Shylock is that he is going to will half of his property to his daughter and lover. Tiffany (2006) describes Shylock as a fake Christian. He declares that "the bequest will be a fake (but legal) "gift" from a fake Christian to a fake "son" and a daughter he has emotionally disowned" (p. 398).

Nevertheless, the two identities of Shylock are contradictory. For example, when he was a Jew, he is allowed to take interests, but he has not to take interests when embracing Christianity, because in the "fifth century, popes prohibited usury" (Weinstein, 2007, p. 187). Additionally, Jews don't eat the 'pork' (Gill, 1992), but in Christianity it is allowed, so Shylock should 'smell' and eat pork.

However, "meaning can never be ultimately fixed and this opens up the way for constant social struggles about definitions of society and identity, with resulting social effects" (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002 p. 24). Yet, what is important to mention here is that how Shylock will tell his "tribe" that he changes his religion. Will Christians

protect him? Will he become a new "Antonio"? Will he stop taking interests? Will Antonio spit again upon Shylock, the Christian?

Therefore, one might suggest that Shylock may hate himself for he hates Antonio because of his religion. Such an idea is mentioned by McLean (2006); she believes that Shylock's "inability to accept mercy gratefully when it is offered bodes ill for his future forced conversion" (p. 60).

### **5.7. The End Justifies the Means**

"At the time The Merchant of Venice was written, England was the site of a major ideological conflict" (Long, 2012, [www.anthropoetics.ucla.edu/ap1702/1702long.htm](http://www.anthropoetics.ucla.edu/ap1702/1702long.htm)). That's why Jews and Christians used methods to achieve their goals. On the one side, Shylock uses his economic power status to gain respect. He offered three thousand ducats, though borrowed, to get some power. He got some power from the bond, as he thought, then this power in a moment deteriorated. On the other side, Christians insisted on Shylock to show some mercy at the court, but they didn't show any when he collapsed. Therefore, hegemony is evident in the play. Hegemony "happens when one social group's ideology dominates another group and becomes the predominant influence of this group" (Goodson, 2010, p. 35).

Shylock used the bond as a sign to obtain power in order to get his pound of flesh. The flesh can be grotesque for Shylock (Leggatt, 1992). Nevertheless, the bond was used against him in which the Christians found it as powerful as a weapon. They find a "hidden" language within the lines allowing the Jew not to fulfil the terms of the contract. It can, hence, be concluded for all the scenes of MV where Shylock appeared that language is a weapon that can be used either to obtain power or end an authority; language is power.

## **5.8. Summary**

Lending of money reflects the very relationship between Jews and Christians; Antonio used to abuse and insult Shylock, and in a moment, he borrows a sum of ducats. Though he borrows, he directly tells Shylock that he will abuse him again. On the contrary, Shylock has learned to hide his emotions, but at the court, he feels secured for he is protected by law. He becomes very self-confident, for he has a legal document to fight with. Shylock has to show some mercy at the beginning of the court, but he is never shown any when he falls down. However, Christians try to give him mercy before they look between the lines of the bond, where they offer Shylock double the sum, but he refuses because of his villainy; therefore, it is too late to show Shylock any kind of mercy. All in all, Jews are not deprived from raising a case, which shows the fair treatment offered by Christians, so Shylock comes to the court with malicious mood that he wants to gain authority in order to spill a Christian's blood. He is the loser who loses his Jewish identity and ideology. It is better if Shylock accepts the sum offered to him at the court so that he gains self-respect, dignity and honour. It was too late for Shylock to save his face!

## **5.9. Recommendations for Further Studies**

The character of Shylock is still the debate of many scholars. In this study, it was proved that Shylock is a brutal money-hunger Jew who is interested in both interests and ending the life of others. This claim can be agreed or supported by some readers. It can also be refuted by others, so the researcher recommends the following:

1. Those who are interested in psychology can study the psychological aspects of the Jew character.
2. Researchers should do a CDA for Antonio's language.



3. This study might add to the literature that those interested in interests isolate themselves from the outside, as Shylock. Hence, one may study the relationship between the materialistic father and the daughter who left his house. In other words, research can be conducted on why daughters, sometime, are voluntary forced to separate themselves from their fathers in the context of power and identity.

## References

- Abbas, N. F.** (2012). Pragmatics and the Teaching of Literature. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Education*, 2, 333-346.
- Ainsworth, S., & Hardy, C.** (2004). Critical Discourse Analysis and Identity: Why Bother? *Critical Discourse Studies*, 1(2), 225-259.
- Alonso, J. C.** (1996). Shylock's Five-Faceted Character. *SEDERI: Yearbook of the Spanish and Portuguese Society for English Renaissance Studies*, 7, 253-260.
- Ayto, J. & Simpson, J.** (Eds). (2008). *The Oxford Dictionary of Modern Slang*. Oxford University Press.
- Badran, D.** (2002). *Ideology through Modality in Discourse Analysis* (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). University of Nottingham. Retrieved April 5, 2014, from <http://etheses.nottingham.ac.uk/2216/1/275961.pdf>.
- Baird, R.** (2002). Ryle, Gilbert. In *Encarta Encyclopedia* [CD-ROM]. Redmond, WA: Microsoft Corporation.
- Baleiro, R.** (2011). A Definition of Literary Literacy: A Content Analysis of Literature Syllabuses and Interviews with Portuguese Lecturers of Literature. *TOJNED: The Online Journal of New Horizons in Education*, 1(4): 16-25. Retrieved October 3, 2014 from <http://www.tojned.net/pdf/tojnedv01i04-02.pdf>.
- Barnet, S.** (1972). Prodigality and Time in The Merchant of Venice. *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, 26-30.
- Beard, A.** (2000). *The Language of Politics*. London: Routledge.
- Beard, A.** (2004). *The Language of the Literature*. London: Routledge.
- Beauchamp, G.** (2011). Shylock's Conversion. *Humanitas*, 24, 55-92.
- Blackledge, A.** (2005). *Discourse and Power in a Multilingual World*. USA, John Benjamins Publishing Company.

- Blanchard, J.** (2009). Contesting Constancy in The Merchant of Venice. *Renascence*, 61(4), 209-220.
- Bloom, H.** (1998). *Shakespeare: The Invention of the Human*. New York: Riverhead Books.
- Bryson, D.** (2008). Villain or Victim: The Role of Shylock in Shakespeare's The Merchant of Venice. *Meeting of Minds: Journal of Undergraduate Research*, 10, 98-100.
- Calhoun, C.** (Ed.). (2002). *Dictionary of the Social Sciences*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Carter, R.** (2007). Literature and Language Teaching 1986–2006: A Review. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 17 (1), 3-13.
- Cody, G. H., & Sprinchorn, E. (Eds.).** (2007). *The Columbia Encyclopedia of Modern Drama* (Vol. 1). Columbia University Press.
- Coonradt, N.** (2007). Shakespeare's Grand Deception: The Merchant of Venice—Anti-Semitism as “Uncanny Causality” and the Catholic-Protestant Problem. *Religion and the Arts*, 11 (1), 74–97.
- Cope, W.** (2007). *A Teacher's Guide to the Signet Classics Edition of William Shakespeare's The Merchant of Venice*. New York: Penguin Group.
- Davidson, I.** (1901). Shylock and Barabas: A Study in Character. *The Sewanee Review*, 9(3), 337-348.
- Demo, D. A.** (2001). *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers*. ERIC Digest. Retrieved June, 14, 2014, from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED456672.pdf>.
- Deng, W., & Wu, Y.** (2013). The New Exploration to The Merchant of Venice. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 3(9), 1624-1629.

- Dutta, U.** (2013). Representation of Race in Four Shakespearean Plays: Titus Andronicus, Othello, Antony and Cleopatra, The Merchant of Venice. *European Academic Research*, 1(6), 922-948.
- Elam, K.** (1984). *Shakespeare's Universe of Discourse: Language-games in the Comedies*. Britain: Cambridge University Press.
- Fitzpatrick, J.** (2006). *Early Modern Dietaries and the Jews: The Merchant of Venice and the Jew of Malta*. Retrieved August 9, 2014, from <http://joanfitzpatrick.org/publications/fitzpatrick-2008a.pdf>
- Ganyi, F.** (2013). The Jew as Racial "Villain": a Historico-Generic Interpretation of Shylock, Iago and Barabbas as Victims of Racial Circumstances in Elizabethan Drama, *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences*, 3(6), 122-131.
- Garber, M.** (2004). *Shakespeare after All*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Gee, J.** (2001). *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method*. New York, USA, Routledge.
- Girard, R.** (1978). To Entrap the Wisest: A Reading of The Merchant of Venice. In E. Said (ed.). *Literature and Society*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Green, J.** (2010). *Green's Dictionary of Slang*. Chambers Harrap Publishers.
- Gross, K.** (2008). *Shylock is Shakespeare*. University of Chicago Press.
- Goodson, P.** (2010). *Theory in Health Promotion Research and Practice: Thinking Outside the Box*. Jones & Bartlett Publishers.
- Harp, R.** (2010). Love and Money in The Merchant of Venice. *Modern Age*, 52(1), 37-44.
- Harris, A., & Rubinstein, F.** (2004). Shakespeare's The Merchant of Venice. *Explicator*, 62(2), 70-74.
- Hartman, G.** (2011). The Tricky Word: Richard Weisberg on The Merchant of Venice. *Law & Literature*, 23(1), 71-79.

- Heller, A.** (2000). The Absolute Stranger: Shakespeare and the Drama of Failed Assimilation. *Critical Horizons: A Journal of Philosophy & Social Theory*, 1(1), 147-167.
- Hernadi, P.** (2002). Criticism, Literary. In *Encarta Encyclopedia* [CD-ROM]. Redmond, WA: Microsoft Corporation.
- Hieatt, A.** (2002). Shakespeare, William. In *Encarta Encyclopedia* [CD-ROM]. Redmond, WA: Microsoft Corporation.
- Hirschfeld, H.** (2005). Compulsions of the Renaissance. *Shakespeare Studies*, 33, 109-114.
- Hirschfeld, H.** (2010). "And He Hath Enough": The Penitential Economies of The Merchant of Venice. *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, 40(1), 89-117.
- Hodge, B.** (2012). Ideology, Identity, Interaction: Contradictions and Challenges for Critical Discourse Analysis. *Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis across Disciplines*, 5 (2), 1-18.
- Horváth, J.** (2009). Critical Discourse Analysis of Obama's Political Discourse. In *Language, Literature and Culture in a Changing Transatlantic World, International Conference Proceedings*. Presov: University of Presov (pp. 45-56).
- Horwich, R.** (1977). Riddle and Dilemma in The Merchant of Venice. *Studies in English Literature (Rice)*, 17(2), 191.
- Hunt, M.** (2003). Shakespeare's Venetian Paradigm: Stereotyping and Sadism in The Merchant of Venice and Othello. *Papers on Language & Literature*, 39(2), 162.
- Ionescu, A.** (2009). (De)marginalization in The Merchant of Venice. *Petroleum-Gas University of Ploiesti Bulletin, Philology Series*, 61(2).
- Jackson, K.** (2007). 'Shylock: The Knight of Faith'. *Journal for Cultural and Religious Theory*, 8(2): 67-82.

- Jeffery, C.** (2004). Is Shylock a Catholic? *Shakespeare in Southern Africa*, 1637-51.
- Johansen, J. D.** (2002). *Literary Discourse: A Semiotic-Pragmatic Approach to Literature*. University of Toronto Press.
- Jorgensen, M., & Phillips, L.** (2002). *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*. UK: London, Sage Publication.
- Laakkonen, I.** (2007). *Breadwinners, Sportsmen and Conforming Girls: Representations of Gender in Finnish EFL textbooks*. (Unpublished Pro Gradu Thesis). University of Jyväskylä, Department of Languages. Retrieved June 30 2014 from [https://jyx.jyu.fi/dspace/bitstream/handle/123456789/18295/URN\\_NBN\\_fi\\_jyu-2008131016.pdf?sequence=1](https://jyx.jyu.fi/dspace/bitstream/handle/123456789/18295/URN_NBN_fi_jyu-2008131016.pdf?sequence=1).
- Leggatt, A.** (1992). *The Merchant of Venice: A Modern Perspective*. Retrieved October 2, 2014 from [http://bracksieck.com/shakespeare/shakespeare/merchant\\_files/MoV%20Modern%20Perspective.pdf](http://bracksieck.com/shakespeare/shakespeare/merchant_files/MoV%20Modern%20Perspective.pdf).
- Long, M.** (2012). Merchantry, Usury, Villainy: Capitalism and the Threat to Community Integrity in The Merchant of Venice. *Anthropoetics*, 17(2) - Retrieved October 2, 2014 from <http://www.anthropoetics.ucla.edu/ap1702/1702long.htm>.
- Marzola, A.** (1997). Which is the Woman Here, and Which the Man? Economy and Gender in The Merchant of Venice. *European Journal of English Studies*, 1(3), 291-309.
- Mayr, A.** (2008). *Language and Power: An Introduction to Institutional Discourse*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Masugi, K.** (1997). Race, the Rule of Law, and The Merchant of Venice: From Slavery to Citizenship. *Notre Dame Journal of Law, Ethics & Public Policy*, 11, 197- 223.
- McAvan, E.** (2011). Economies of Sacrifice in The Merchant of Venice: God, the Gift and Shakespeare. *The Bible and Critical Theory*, 6(1). 2.1-2.11.

- McCarthy, M.** (2009). *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McLean, S.** (1996). Prodigal Sons and Daughters: Transgression and Forgiveness in "The Merchant of Venice". *Papers on Language & Literature*, 32(1), 45-62.
- Meyer, M.** (2001). Between Theory, Method, and Politics: Positioning of the Approaches to CDA, in R. Wodak and M. Meyer (Eds). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London and Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications LTD, 14–31.
- Mills, S.** (1997). *Discourse*. London: Routledge.
- Musburger, R. B.** (2007). *An Introduction to Writing for Electronic Media: Scriptwriting Essentials across the Genres*. Taylor & Francis.
- Musburger, R. B., & Kindem, G. A.** (2009). *Introduction to Media Production: the Path to Digital Media Production*. Taylor & Francis.
- Myers-Shaffer, C.** (2000). *How to Prepare for the SAT II. Literature*. US: Barron's Educational Series.
- Nickel, J.** (2001). Shylock in Washington: the Clinton Crisis, The Merchant of Venice, and Enjoyment of the Law. *Textual Practice*, 15(2), 317-335.
- Onwuegbuzie, A. J., Dickinson, W. B., Leech, N. L., & Zoran, A. G.** (2009). A Qualitative Framework for Collecting and Analysing Data in Focus Group Research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 8(3), 1-21.
- Orpin, D.** (2005). Corpus Linguistics and Critical Discourse Analysis: Examining the Ideology of Sleaze. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 10(1), 37-61.
- Oxford Dictionary.** (2008). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Pettigrew, T. J.** (2010). The Merchant of Venice 1.161-76: Is Bassanio a Mercenary?. *Explicator*, 68(4), 212-215.
- Pfister, M.** (1991). *The Theory and Analysis of Drama*. Cambridge University Press.

- Picker, J.** (1994). Shylock and the Struggle for Closure. *Judaism*, 43(2), 173 -189.
- Pietikäinen, S., & Dufva, H.** (2006). Voices in Discourses: Dialogism, Critical Discourse Analysis and Ethnic Identity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 10(2), 205-224.
- Potter, J., & Wetherell, M.** (1987). *Discourse and Social Psychology: Beyond Attitudes and Behaviour*. London: Sage.
- Reynolds, D.W.** (1995). Repetition in Non-native Speaker Writing. *SSLA*, 17, 185–209.
- Robinson, R.** (1989). *Unlocking Shakespeare's language: Help for the Teacher and Student*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Rosenshield, G.** (2008). Deconstructing the Christian Merchant: Antonio and The Merchant of Venice. In H. Bloom. *Bloom's Shakespeare through the Ages: The Merchant of Venice* (pp. 225- 249). New York: Infobase Publishing.
- Savignon, S. J.** (2006). Gender and Power in Applied Linguistics: An Epistemological Challenge. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 16(1), 88-92.
- Schalkwyk, D.** (2010). Shakespeare's Speech. *Journal of Medieval & Early Modern Studies*, 40(2), 373-400.
- Schuman, S.** (2002). Authorizing Meaning in The Merchant of Venice. *Text & Performance Quarterly*, 22(1), 47-62.
- Scott, W. O.** (2004). Conditional Bonds, Forfeitures, and Vows in "The Merchant of Venice". *English Literary Renaissance*, 34(3), 286-305.
- Sedgman, K.** (1998). Shylock is not Heartless: The Function of Separation in Men's Emotional Development. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Family Therapy*, 19(3), 147-150.
- Shakespeare, W.** (1992). The Merchant of Venice. Roma Gill (Ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.



- Sherman, D.** (2013). Governing the Wolf: Soul and Space in The Merchant of Venice. *Journal of Medieval & Early Modern Studies*, 43(1), 99-120.
- Shylock.** (n.d.). In *Merriam-Webster's online dictionary*. Retrieved September 5, 2014, from <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/shylock>.
- Smith, N. (2010).** *Character Analysis of Shylock in "The Merchant of Venice" by William Shakespeare*. Retrieved September 7, 2014, from <http://www.articlemyriad.com/character-analysis-shylock-merchant-venice/>.
- Taiwo, R.** (2010). *Discourse Analysis*. Lagos: National Open University of Nigeria. Retrieved June 24, 2014 from [http://www.nou.edu.ng/NOUN\\_OCL/pdf/pdf2/ENG%20352%20COURSE%20MATERIAL.pdf](http://www.nou.edu.ng/NOUN_OCL/pdf/pdf2/ENG%20352%20COURSE%20MATERIAL.pdf)
- Tanner, T.** (1999). The Merchant of Venice. *Critical Quarterly*, 41(2), 76-99.
- Tiffany, G.** (2006). Law and Self-Interest in "The Merchant of Venice". *Papers on Language & Literature*, 42(4), 384-400.
- Turner, H. S.** (2006). The Problem of the More-than-One: Friendship, Calculation, and Political Association in The Merchant of Venice. *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 57(4), 413-442.
- Van Dijk, T. A.** (1995). Aims of Critical Discourse Analysis. *Japanese discourse*, 1(1), 17-28.
- Van Dijk, T. A.** (2001). Critical Discourse Analysis. In Schifffrin, D., Tannen, D., & Hamilton, H. E. (Eds.), *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. John Wiley & Sons. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Van Dijk, T. A.** (2003). *Ideology and Discourse. A Multidisciplinary Introduction*. Retrieved June 30, 2014, from <http://www.discourses.org/UnpublishedArticles/Ideology%20and%20discourse.pdf>.
- Weinstein, B.** (2007). Shakespeare's Forgivable Portrayal of Shylock. *Jewish Bible Quarterly*, 35(3), 187-192.

- Widdowson, H.** (2007). *Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wilson, H., D.** (n.d.). *Shylock's Revenge*. Retrieved September 9, 2014, from <http://hopecorner.net/downloads/dhw15.pdf>.
- Wodak, R.** (2002). Aspects of Critical Discourse Analysis. *Zeitschrift für Angewandte Linguistik*, 36, 5-31.
- Zeeman, L., Poggenpoel, M., Myburgh, C., & Van Der Linde, N.** (2002). An Introduction to a Postmodern Approach to Educational Research: Discourse Analysis. *Education*, 123(1), 96 – 102.