

Shylock's Speech in The Merchant of Venice: Critical Discourse Analysis

Hamada S. A. Dawood

*Directorate of Education, Palestine
hamada_shehdeh2000@hotmail.com*

Nimer A. A. Abuzahra^{*}

*Associate Professor, Hebron University, Palestine
nabuzahran@gmail.com*

Mohammad A. A. Farrah

*Assistant Professor, Hebron University, Palestine
mfarrah06@gmail.com*

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. Hence, this descriptive qualitative study explores the literature to answer the aforementioned questions. 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. The reasons behind Shylock's failure in obtaining "the self" can be attributed to his brutal character. 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. To conclude, 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.

Keywords: *The Merchant of Venice*; Shylock's Speech, Critical Discourse Analysis

1. Introduction

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). CDA 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

* Corresponding Author

Submission date: Sep 1, 2014

Acceptance date: Dec 28, 2014

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.

Words sometimes have hidden meanings to which the receivers may not pay attention. Therefore, it is believed that words have a specific meaning in themselves, and they have another in a specific context. So, when analysing speech, one should look at where, when and why such an utterance is produced.

This study, as such, 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. As an illustration, 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.

2. Background

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).

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.

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.

Moreover, in the play, the bitter and cruel inhumanity of Shylock is depicted in opposition to friendship and romantic love (Hieatt, 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).

Additionally, the themes of money, romance 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).

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 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 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 does not 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 do not 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. 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.

3. Methods: 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. 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). Additionally, 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.

4.1. Analysis of the Bond

Before analysing the speech, it is better to analyse the language of the bond between Shylock and Antonio. One finds that 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 are 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).

4.2. Power, Identity, and Ideology Act I, Scene III

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). However, though Christians do not like dealing with interests, Antonio is forced to deal with interests for the sake of his friend.

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), purport to expose a character's "true" thoughts for they appear in Shylock's aside (Schuman, 2002). 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. 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 utterance "Cursed be my tribe, if I forgive him!" (1.3.47-48) shows 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.

In (1.3.49-56), Shylock is lost. 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. However, Shylock has not to lend money because he does not 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 not 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.

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).

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.

Shylock justifies the interest: "No, not take interest; not, as you would say, directly interest: mark what Jacob did.... 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. This leads the researcher to say that the Jews do not 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" (McAven, 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 in (1.3.102-125): "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, ith bated breath, and whispering humbleness..."(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 does not 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 do not respect it.

Additionally, these lines, (1.3.102-125), 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.

Shylock fails to obtain power and establish identity (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 do not 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: "This kindness will I show... In what part of your body pleaseth me" (1.3.139-147). 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. 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.

Nevertheless, in order to make the bond lawful, Antonio should "seal" the bond. 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 does not 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,... And, for my love, I pray you wrong me not." (1.3.156-166), which indicates the animosity of Shylock. Shylock here appears as 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, 2001, 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.

4.3. 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. To clarify, 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... 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 (2.5.11-18). He offers his daughter the authority to take care of his wealth since he is still reluctant whether to have dinner with "The prodigal Christian (2.5.15)" 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.

Shylock keeps on giving instructions to his daughter: "What, are there masques? Hear you me, Jessica:... 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 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 does not scare to lose his daughter. He has to inform Jessica too to take care of herself, but because he is materialistic, he does not care of his daughter. 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).

4.4. 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 to 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 make a connection 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-hunger when he learns that his daughter enjoys herself with the money she stole.

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...hard but I will better the instruction (3.1.49-69). These lines (3.1.49-69) 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 distinctive characteristics between them are their religions, 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! 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).

Shylock's economic power has deteriorated and declined: "Why there, there, there, there! A diamond gone,... 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 this 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).

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.

Shylock's revenge is brought into being: "Nay, that's true, that's very true. Go, Tubal, fee... 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.

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.

4.5. 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.

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:... 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 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. Hence,

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.

4.6. 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. 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... 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. 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 does not 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 are not 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).

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?... 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, 2011). 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 is 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, lets 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 does not 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 is 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 cannot 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... 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).

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 does not 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). 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 do not 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).

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".

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"? 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.

5. Conclusion

To conclude, Shylock finally surrendered to the will of the Christians in which he was forced to change his religion because he was a victim of his villainy. When the religion changed, the ideology changed and

so did the identity. Shylock had to adopt Christian identity in order not to have transactions with interests. He might not threaten anyone in the future. He would be forced to follow the rules of Venice the way Christians liked. Therefore, he lost all kinds of power for his properties were confiscated, and after his death, he had to will half of his property to his "Christian" daughter and her Christian lover.

Shylock's ideology went 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 had to 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 was described as malign and negative (Bloom, 1998). It could be the reason that made Antonio ask Shylock to embrace Christianity. He might want him to be positive regardless of the fact that Antonio could be called as negative, too. Yet, Shylock attempted to create, establish and insert his Jewish identity and ideology between Christians. We could see Shylock interacted 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).

If one does not 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 was the loser for he had no power, ideology and identity. When he tried to find all of these, he lost 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.

References

- Barnet, S. (1972). Prodigality and Time in The Merchant of Venice. *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, 26-30.
- Beauchamp, G. (2011). Shylock's Conversion. *Humanitas*, 24, 55-92.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- Gross, K. (2008). *Shylock is Shakespeare*. University of Chicago Press.
- 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.
- Hieatt, A. (2002). Shakespeare, William. In *Encarta Encyclopedia* [CD-ROM]. Redmond, WA: Microsoft Corporation.
- Hodge, B. (2012). Ideology, Identity, Interaction: Contradictions and Challenges for Critical Discourse Analysis. *Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis across Disciplines*, 5 (2), 1-18.
- 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.
- Jackson, K. (2007). 'Shylock: The Knight of Faith'. *Journal for Cultural and Religious Theory*, 8(2): 67-82.
- 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.
- 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.
- Nickel, J. (2001). Shylock in Washington: the Clinton Crisis, The Merchant of Venice, and Enjoyment of the Law. *Textual Practice*, 15(2), 317-335.
- Picker, J. (1994). Shylock and the Struggle for Closure. *Judaism*, 43(2), 173 -189.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.