

MIMESIS OF SHYLOCK'S INWARDNESS

Carlos Roberto Ludwig*

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6846-5774>

To cite this paper: LUDWIG, C. R. Mimesis of Shylock's inwardness. *Todas as Letras – Revista de Língua e Literatura*, São Paulo, v. 23, n. 1, p. 1-18, jan./abr. 2021. DOI 10.5935/1980-6914/eLETLT2113100

Submissão: janeiro de 2020. **Aceite:** julho de 2020.

Abstract: This essay analyses Shylock's inwardness in Shakespeare's play *The Merchant of Venice*. Shylock's speech *I am a Jew* is filled with alliterations, breaks in language and syntactic turns, enhancing his inward floatation and feelings. Moreover, he uses the passive voice as a rhetoric device, whose main effect is to efface the agent of the action. It demonstrates more general and universal ideas of his human condition as well as his similarity to the Christians. The breaks in the grammatical rule suggest his inward confusion and despair. He simply repeats structures with parallelism to demonstrate that he is confused. The grammatical devices depict his inward confused state, signalling his inner rupture and suffering.

Keywords: Mimesis of inwardness. *The Merchant of Venice*. Shylock's speech. Language in the play. English Renaissance.

• Universidade Federal do Tocantins (UFT), Palmas, TO, Brasil. E-mail: carlosletras@uft.edu.br

SHYLOCK'S AND ANTONIO'S LOSSES AND THE MIMESIS OF SHYLOCK'S INWARDNESS

■ Shylock's speech *I am a Jew* is filled with alliterations, breaks in language and syntactic turns enhancing his inward floatation and feelings. Moreover, he uses the passive voice as a rhetoric device, whose main effect is to efface the agent of the action. It demonstrates more general and universal ideas of his human condition as well as his similarity to the Christians. The breaks in the grammatical rule suggest his inward confusion and despair. He simply repeats structures with parallelism to demonstrate that he is confused. The grammatical devices depict his inward confused state, signalling his inner rupture, suffering and inwardness.

Inwardness is an inward space of the self, which is constituted by feelings, thoughts, and ideas which appear in ever so subtle and sometimes puzzling details of the text. In fact, inwardness is the resulting perceptiveness of an inner space of the individual (LUDWIG, 2018, 2020). The notion of this inward space and inwardness is perceived, on the first and most obvious level, in acts and attitudes; secondly, in poetical constellations which permit to make inferences about the characters' conscience and their ethical decisions; in moments of indecisions and crises; or, more subtly and often overlooked, in the enigmas of bodily gestures, conscience, verbal slips, silences, implicit meaning in words and language, and *pathos*. They are determined by some *mysterious forces*¹ of the self's unconscious, which cannot be controlled, and pop up in bodily feelings and paradoxical ideas. Inwardness is, therefore, the inward dispositions of the self wherein thoughts, feelings, ideas, and anxieties are floating and are incruited in the individual's unconscious (LUDWIG, 2018, 2020; MAUS, 1995).

Shakespeare presents Shylock's inward traits in a rather complex way. For example, that it is more evident when Salerio and Salanio describe Shylock's and Antonio's losses. Salanio states that "The villain Jew with outcries raised the duke, / Who went with him to search Bassanio's ship" (SHAKESPEARE, 2010, p. 269). He refers here to Jessica, whom he attempts to rescue. Both Lorenzo and "his amorous Jessica" had already gone to Belmont. Then Salanio enhances Shylock's feelings, despair, and hatred:

*I never heard a passion so confused,
So strange, outrageous, and so variable,
As the dog Jew did utter in the streets:
'My daughter! O my ducats! O my daughter!
Fled with a Christian! O my Christian ducats!
Justice! the law! my ducats, and my daughter!
A sealed bag, two sealed bags of ducats,
Of double ducats, stolen from me by my daughter!
And jewels, two stones, two rich and precious stones,
Stolen by my daughter! Justice! find the girl;
She hath the stones upon her, and the ducats.*
(SHAKESPEARE, 2010, p. 269-270).

¹ For the idea of the mysterious forces in inwardness, see later on the discussion of McGinn's ideas on his work *Shakespeare's philosophy* (2007).

Salanio particularly remarks Shylock's passion: "So strange, outrageous, and so variable". His inwardness is not enhanced by stereotypical traits, but by passionate and strange dimensions. The words he chooses to describe – strange, outrageous, variable – suggest again that Shylock is not merely a stereotype and reveal something unknown by the Christians so far. The word "strange" does not refer here to Shylock as an alien as elsewhere in the play, but it suggests that his feelings and grieving are astonishing for the Christians. The intension of his feelings is described in this speech, in a way that such description unleashes Salanio's astonishment. Shylock is outraged because he was wronged and his honour for his family, gains, and nation were dishonoured. When he uses "variable" he refers to the inward floatation of the self, the floatation of feelings, emotions and thoughts. Shakespeare represents Shylock's inward feelings in other characters' discourse in order to enhance the intensity and tension of his inner state of the mind.

However, Salanio tells that Shylock confuses what he mourns and complains. His feelings are confused, for example, when he complains about his "Christian ducats". He wants his money, jewels and his daughter back, just as he claims for justice and law. According to Drakakis (2010, p. 270), one of the words "sealed" in the verse "A sealed bag, two sealed bags of ducats" must be pronounced as dissyllable in the iambic pentameter. Thus, Salanio is imitating Shylock's loss of control which is enhanced in the oscillation of pronouncing such a meaningful word: what was seemingly well sealed is lost and no longer guarded. Moreover, like Antonio, Shylock also confuses money and affection. The juxtaposition of his money and his daughter, just as the intensity with which he expresses his losses indict the confusion between wealth and feelings. Shakespeare represents inwardness in the play as the confusion between money and feelings, doubling Antonio's confusion in Shylock.

Therefore, Shakespeare builds Shylock's inward feelings and anxieties in such a confused way that one can perceive that he experiences something deeper in his heart: the feeling of deep loss, loss of honour, loss of respect, loss of his daughter. More than that, it is an *ontological loss*. It is an ontological loss, because something changes in Shylock's inner-self as he realises that he was blind. He was secured of his honour of his nation and religion, respect of his daughter, pride of his possessions, and such assurance kept his self-confidence and pride. Consequently, in his ontological loss he reveals through his claiming that he is human and such claiming reveals his awareness of his inner dimensions. One can see in his crying out that his complex inward feelings come out through bewilderment, confusion and hopelessness. Such change makes him try desperately to recuperate his losses, appealing to the duke for his rights. According to Gross (2006), Shylock experiences something new in his loss, and consequently Shakespeare experiences new feelings in building Shylock's character. What he discovered and experienced were some anxieties which were important to the great characters of the great tragedies: the fear of loss, the anxiety of losing respect, honour, the threatening and despair feeling of being alone. Thus, he represents such dimensions of human inwardness in Shylock's and Antonio's relationship, pervaded by hatred, resentment, anxiety, despair and fear of loss.

In this speech, Janet Adelman (2008) suggests that there is a potential feminisation of the Jew. According to her, it is when Salanio tells that "double ducats, stolen from me by my daughter! / And jewels, two stones, two rich and precious

stones, / Stolen by my daughter! Justice! find the girl; / She hath the stones upon her, and the ducats” (SHAKESPEARE, 2010, p. 270). The word *stone* was the common slang for testicles in Shakespeare’s Renaissance. There are many traces of sexual meaning implicit in the play. For Marjorie Garber (2004, p. 306), Shylock’s phrase inadvertently makes Jessica into a phallic woman – “She hath the stones upon her – a joke that is very clear to the Venetians who ridicule him”. Thus, Jessica takes his lineage and family away (GARBER, 2004, p. 307). For Adelman (2008, p. 101, 177), once Jessica has two stones upon her, she phantasmatically feminises and castrates Shylock. The idea of castration is implicit in this slang and it is doubled in Antonio’s fear and unconscious desire of castration. Imaginatively, Shylock loses his strength as a father and a male figure when he realises that he has lost his jewels and money, which gave him a certain confidence and strength. Symbolically the stones epitomise his self-confidence and his strength. And his daughter and his money were what gave him self-confidence.

Furthermore, Antonio’s misfortunes enhance his similarity to Shylock in this scene. Shakespeare presents Shylock’s and Antonio’s misfortunes one after another:

Salerio. *I reasoned with a Frenchman yesterday,
Who told me, in the narrow seas that part
The French and English, there miscarried
A vessel of our country richly fraught:
I thought upon Antonio when he told me;
And wished in silence that it were not his.*

Salanio. *You were best to tell Antonio what you hear;
Yet do not suddenly, for it may grieve him.*
(SHAKESPEARE, 2010, p. 271).

Here Salanio observes once again Antonio’s sadness and now Salerio suspects of his losses. He alludes to Antonio’s sadness, for he seems very susceptible to any fact which can be disturbing. His inward feelings float and change with any unexpected and unpleasant news. To some extent, Antonio’s susceptibility and confusion are doubled in Shylock’s “passion” which is “so confused, / So strange, outrageous, and so variable” (SHAKESPEARE, 2010, p. 269). Therefore, Shakespeare depicts the merchant’s inwardness mirroring of Shylock’s inward floatation, confusion, susceptibility, and resentment in this scene.

I AM A JEW: SHYLOCK’S INWARDNESS AND PATHOS

In act III, scene i, Salerio and Salanio present news of Antonio’s ships. Salanio confirms that Antonio lost his ships.

Salanio. *Now, what news on the Rialto?*

Salerio. *Why, yet it lives there unchecked that Antonio hath a ship of rich lading wrecked on the narrow seas; the Goodwins, I think they call the place; a very dangerous flat and fatal, where the carcasses of many a tall ship lie buried, as they say, if my gossip report be an honest woman of her word.*

Salanio. *I would she were as lying a gossip in that as ever knapped ginger or made her neighbours believe she wept for the death of a third husband. But it*

is true, without any slips of prolixity or crossing the plain highway of talk, that the good Antonio, the honest Antonio, – O that I had a title good enough to keep his name company! –

Salerio. *Come, the full stop.*

Salanio. *Ha! what sayest thou? Why, the end is, he hath lost a ship.*

Salerio. *I would it might prove the end of his losses.* (SHAKESPEARE, 2010, p. 280-281)

Salanio and Salerio reveal their anxieties in the depiction of Antonio's misfortune and losses. In fact, they know the threatening of losing ships in the ocean. Salerio's suspicion of Antonio's misfortune reveals he is concerned about his friend's situation. His eagerness to know the truth – "Come, the full stop" – alludes to his anxiety and fears. Alternatively, Salanio's delay in telling that Antonio has lost a ship suggests his concern and pity for him. Their evasive sentences unveil their gloomy feelings, concern and suspicion of mere hear-saying news, because they do not wish to acknowledge what really happened to Antonio's ships. Shakespeare juxtaposes once again Shylock's and Antonio's misfortunes to enhance Antonio's and the Christians' similarities with Shylock.

When Salanio and Salerio perceive that Shylock is coming, they describe him as the figure of a devil. Salanio notices that Shylock is coming and says "Let me say 'amen' betimes, lest the devil cross my prayer, for here he comes in the likeness of a Jew" (SHAKESPEARE, 2010, p. 281). Once again, Shylock is presented in the figure of a devil, which, according to Shapiro (1996), was a commonplace in the Elizabethan England. Such myths and stories were very much present in the audiences' minds. Shakespeare's *The Merchant of Venice* is not a mythmaking play, even though he reinforces the common stories regarding the Jews. He just took myths and stories from popular tradition, ballads, songs, and playlets. Thus, the characters projected onto Shylock's figure their inward negative dimensions, such as faithlessness, suspicion, and hatred. Therefore, Shylock plays the role of a mirror which reflects their feelings and works as a repository of their darker inward dimensions.

Then, Salanio asks: "How now, Shylock, what news among the merchants?" (SHAKESPEARE, 2010, p. 281). Salanio addresses Shylock as if he were commonly present among the merchants and informed about the merchants' deeds. After that, Shylock states resentfully: "You know, none so well, none so well as you, of my daughter's flight" (SHAKESPEARE, 2010, p. 281-282). Then they mock his grief and pain. Salerio says that "That's certain: I, for my part, knew the tailor that made the wings she flew withal" (SHAKESPEARE, 2010, p. 282). Also, Salanio says that "And Shylock, for his own part, knew the bird was fledged; and then it is the complexion of them all to leave the dam" (SHAKESPEARE, 2010, p. 282). Salerio and Salanio employ the imagery of ornithology to represent Jessica as a bird that flew away from Shylock, as well as the imagery of tailoring to suggest that she was entrapped by the tailor's net. Nevertheless, it also means that the tailor entangled Shylock in a sort of net, entrapping his feelings and unleashing his bitterness. In fact, Shylock's anger to Antonio is increased because of Lorenzo's running away with Jessica. Shylock is entrapped by his feelings and now he cannot control his hatred and his desire for revenge. He wants to take his revenge against Antonio as a way to release his anger against Lorenzo, who raped Jessica.

Moreover, according to Kaplan and Bevington (2002), in this speech, *dam* means mother, in this case, Leah. Salanio means that the little bird flew away from her nest. Nonetheless, in the Elizabethan age, there was a proverbial that said “the devil and his dam”, which, according to Drakakis (2010, p. 282), associated “the Jew and his absent wife with Satan”, which reproduced the myth that represented the Jews as devils. Besides that, Shylock uses damned which echoes *dam*: “She is damned for it” (SHAKESPEARE, 2010, p. 282). Damnation is a New Testament concept, which sounds ironic in Shylock’s speech, because his daughter has just been converted into Christianity, as well as Shylock himself is going to be forcibly converted in the trial scene. Therefore, damnation is an imaginary attempt to satisfy his revenge in Christian assumptions.

Shylock’s despair of his losses denotes his fear of loss and abandonment. Shylock reveals his grief and dishonour:

Salanio. *That’s certain, if the devil may be her judge.*

Shylock. *My own flesh and blood to rebel!*

Salanio. *Out upon it, old carrion! rebels it at these years?*

Shylock. *I say, my daughter is my flesh and blood.*

Salerio. *There is more difference between thy flesh and hers than between jet and ivory; more between your bloods than there is between red wine and rhenish* (SHAKESPEARE, 2010, p. 282-283).

In this dialogue, as Shylock insists on his loss – “I say, my daughter is my flesh and blood” (SHAKESPEARE, 2010, p. 282), we see in-betweens that his inward feelings demonstrate his values: his honour to his daughter, because although she ran away he still considers her his “own blood”. He is mourning his loss and, in his confused sentences, he confesses his pain, his anger and even his fear of being disrespected and left alone. He also mourns because he lost his Jewish lineage as soon as Jessica eloped (GARBER, 2004, p. 307). Moreover, Salerio and Salanio are opposing the devil to the Christian God, who, according to Drakakis (2010, p. 282), would not damn Jessica for her elopement. In Drakakis’s opinion (2010, p. 282) Salanio establishes a relation between flesh, blood and carrion in order to imply “morbid sexual desire” and “scandalously promiscuous”. Besides that, such suggestion mirrors Christian sexual desires projected on Shylock, as their sexual desire is mentioned elsewhere in the play. Salanio’s inward feelings come out and are revealed in the judgement² he makes of the Jew and reveals imaginatively Christian desires which are erotically charged in the play. Therefore, Shylock is a mirror that reflects the Christians’ sinister feelings. The mirroring device is a mimetic device introduced in Shakespeare’s drama to represent inwardness and create tension and collision between the characters of the play.

Then, Salerio marks the difference between Jessica’s blood and flesh and Shylock’s blood and flesh. Imaginatively, he uses the whiteness of ivory to define Jessica’s flesh and blood and jet to define Shylock’s; he also compares the Rhenish wine to Jessica’s blood and the red wine to Shylock’s blood, meaning that his blood is darker than hers. Salerio’s claim of Jessica’s similarity to the Christians is enhanced by the use of quite opposing similitude. They are therefore very sarcastic and ironic to Shylock.

2 It is worth pointing out that judgement, conscience and inwardness are rather connected, once judgement is usually pervaded by conscience and subjective dimensions. See Ludwig (2018, 2020) and Ludwig and Ferreira (2019) for more details.

In that sense, in Hegelian terms, their use of irony signals implicit and subtle aggression that disrespects what Shylock honours and loves. For Hegel, irony is on the edge of sarcasm and even destruction. It has an egotistical dimension, because the individual lives concentrated on the fruition of the self. According to Hegel's *Aesthetics* (2005, p. 85), irony is the affirmation of negativity and such ironic negativity "dwells in the *vacuity* of concreteness, of moral, of everything which is rich in content, in the affirmation of the nullity of everything which is objective and possesses an immanent value". Thus, this immanent capability of destruction embodied in irony is due to the potential tendency that irony possesses to destroy what is pure. Irony causes the "auto-destruction of everything which is noble, grand and perfect" (HEGEL, 2005, p. 86). Hegel strongly criticises the irony created by the romantics, avoiding what was superior in the human being. Alternatively, the ironic tends to "repudiate and disown all concrete values, all substantial content inside the individual" (HEGEL, 2005, p. 87). Although Hegel criticises those who deny such values in themselves, denying those values in the others is a similar destructive gesture. For Hegel (2005, p. 87), such individual is "a mean and despicable character and that his negation only reveals weakness and moral inferiority". In an artistic sense, Hegel (2005, p. 87) points out something which can be thought of the Christians in the play, and which is the reverse of Shylock:

For true character implies, on the one hand, essentially worthy aims, and, on the other hand, a firm grip of such aims, so that the whole being of his individuality would be lost if the aims had to be given up and abandoned. This fixity and substantiality constitutes the keynote of character.

Thus, a human being who denies such values is denying his own individuality and his inward feelings. Thus, Salanio's, Salerio's, and the other Christians' irony destroy what is valuable in the play.

Although he seems to be very pathetic for some, he is mourning his loss: he is showing his deeper feelings when he complains about his daughter and his money. According to Gross (2006, p. 4), Shylock's dimensions demonstrate that:

The power of the character also lies in what he reveals in more general terms about the human enigma, its jointure of freedom and dependence, secrecy and histrionics, alienness and complicity, its capacity for terror, for aggression, resentment, forgiving itself over to the inhuman. The play explores what it means to inhabit this enigma, this divisive jointure, to expand it from within and force it into new combinations.

His feelings and mourning represent the human condition of suffering, anxieties and fear that are quite uncontrolled. The human enigma of feeling fear, anxiety, and sense of loss is embodied in Shylock's character, signalling such enigma in any circumstance, whether losing a dear person, losing possessions and money, as well as his Jewish lineage. Shylock's inwardness is pervaded by this strength, by his feelings, his energy, his anxieties and his hopelessness facing his loss. Human enigma is portrayed in Shylock's contradictorily feelings and inward dimensions.

Then Salerio asks whether Shylock heard anything about Antonio's loss in the Rialto: "But tell us, do you hear whether Antonio have had any loss at sea or no?" (SHAKESPEARE, 2010, p. 283). Shylock answers and warns that Antonio must take care and fulfil his bond:

There I have another bad match: a bankrupt, a prodigal, who dare scarce show his head on the Rialto, a beggar, that was used to come so smug upon the mart. Let him look to his bond. He was wont to call me usurer; let him look to his bond. He was wont to lend money for a Christian courtesy; let him look to his bond (SHAKESPEARE, 2010, p. 283).

“Match” in this speech means “bargain” or “marital alliance” (DRAKAKIS, 2010, p. 283). Then, Shylock considers Antonio as a prodigal, a bankrupt and a beggar who borrowed money without interest. Shylock attacks Antonio for his attitudes in the same way the Christians attack his Jewish customs. Shylock remarks Antonio’s fear to appear in public, probably because of his fear of his creditors³. In one of the sources of the play, *Three ladies of London*, Gerontus (the Jewish prototype of Shylock) says to the merchant Mercadorus (likely to be Antonio’s prototype): “You were not to be found but was fled out of the country” (WILSON, 2002, p. 154), meaning that the merchant avoided the creditors by running away. Shylock also remarks that Antonio “dare scarce show his head on the Rialto”, meaning that he is coward, fearful and frightened of his creditors. Then he warns that Antonio must take care of his bond and its deadline. Likewise, Gerontus remarks to Mercadorus the same thing: “well look you do keep your promise” (WILSON, 2002, p. 156). Shakespeare probably got Gerontus and Mercadorus as prototypes for both characters, but he changed their feelings and intentions: both carry opposing characteristics which were separated in the play *Three ladies of London*: Gerontus was the good Jew and Mercadorus was the malicious and evil Venetian Merchant. Shakespeare used these prototypes to enhance Shylock’s complexity and ambiguity, building his villainous, dramatic and confusing dimensions. His inwardness is depicted in his desire for revenge and his resentment against Antonio. In a certain sense, Shylock embodies Richard III’s traits, as already pointed out by Ludwig (2017).

In Shylock’s most famous speech we can see his complex humanised dimensions. Salerio asks Shylock what is the use of a pound of flesh: “Why, I am sure, if he forfeit, thou wilt not take his flesh: what’s that good for?”. Then Shylock answers such question in his most astonishing and touching speech:

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 (SHAKESPEARE, 2010, p. 284-285).

3 In the same John Shakespeare also was afraid of appearing in public due to his debts. He was charge of going to church and to the city council. Shakespeare perhaps had these details in mind when he created Antonio. His fear of his creditors may be Shakespeare’s father’s fear of his creditors. For more detail, see Honan (2001).

First of all, he presents his reasons for his bond. The desire of revenge and his reasons for it are clearer now, though he had already mentioned them beforehand in the play. All his losses were caused by the Christians, as well as by his daughter, who is now a *converso*. He unveils that Antonio was bound to disdain his way of earning money and his customs, such as religion, faith, and nation. The only reason for Antonio's ill-treatment to him is because Shylock is a Jew. Then he claims that a Jew has the same feelings, affections, desires, organs and dimensions as any Christian has. Jews are subject to the same vicissitudes of life as a Christian is, such as poisoning, hurting, and dying. However, he uses such comparisons to justify that if a Christian can take revenge, so the Jews will take the same revenge. Although the Christians highly praise the value of "mercy", they are as merciless to Shylock as he is to them.

Shylock finally reveals that Antonio and the Christians' deeds have taught him to be merciless, revengeful, perfidious, and villain: "The villainy you teach me, I will execute, and it shall go hard but I will better the instruction"⁴. The Christians think that he cannot claim for justice and no one can come back to revenge their deeds. Shylock is the avenger of himself and of his nation; he is the incarnation of the avatar "of the terrifying patriarch with the knife" as states Adelman (2008, p. 131). The point is that Shylock's villainy and mercilessness are due to Antonio's mistreatment and violence. He mirrors what all the Christians have done against him. He justifies his claims with the *lex talionis* which claims an eye for an eye, a hand for a hand. However, the Christians are hypocritical when they claim that Shylock is a villain and they are merciful and generous. They do not acknowledge that Shylock can, by his own means, claim for the *lex talionis*.

His energy in this speech is quite enigmatic. He makes the audience feel the pain of his loss, his anger, anxiety, desire for revenge, and his resoluteness for it. His *pathos* is vibrating and deep, because he is simultaneously mourning the loss of his daughter⁵ and money and roaring his inward rage against Antonio. His inwardness is represented in its deepest dimensions and we see that his humanity is enhanced by this energy, strength and vigour of such inward feelings coming out so violently. As Cohen (2003 p. 59) points out: "He is a suffering human being". In fact, many critics analyse his speech as a claim for his humanity, such as Charlton (1984), Hinely (1980), Sherman (2004), and Cooper (1970). His humanity is enhanced by his suffering and his claim for equality.

In his *Mimesis*, Erich Auerbach points out Shylock's complexity and human side. For Auerbach (2007b, p. 280), though, Barabbas in *The Jew of Malta* possesses more greatness than Shylock:

Shakespeare acknowledged and understood with more depth the human problematicity of his Jew. For him, Shylock is, regarding his social position and considering the aesthetic view, a lower figure, unworthy of the tragic, whose tragicity is invoked during one moment, but it is not more than a flavor of a triumph of a higher humanity, nobler and freer, and also more aristocratic.

His inward dimensions and human feelings are not determined simply by his actions. According to Auerbach, there is a notion of destine, not in the

4 In the same way, Shakespeare puts a similar speech in Macbeth's mouth, as he fears his conscience: "But in these cases / We still have judgment here; that we but teach / Bloody instructions, which, being taught, return / To plague the inventor: this even-handed justice / Commends the ingredients of our poisoned chalice / To our own lips" (SHAKESPEARE, 1997, I, vii, 7-12).

5 In love poetry, *pathos* is common place, which enhances the lover suffering and pain. For an example, see Aguiar and Ferreira (2018).

ancient sense, but in the sense of life experience, which precedes the action itself. Auerbach (2007b, p. 284-285) focuses his analysis on the idea of *destine*, not in the Greek sense, but as the configuration of the character's pre-history and on-stage actions.

Due to a multiplicity of themes and to the remarkable liberty of movements of the Elizabethan theatre, there are clearly shown, in each case, a special atmosphere, life conditions, a pre-history of the characters; [...] we can observe thus many other things on the main characters; one makes a big picture of his normal life and of his peculiar character, independently of the plot wherein he is involved now. Thus, destine means here something more than the current conflict. In ancient tragedy, it is almost possible to distinguish clearly between the natural character of the personage and destine he is doomed to. In Elizabethan tragedy, we are faced in many cases, not only to the purely natural character, but to a character already pre-determined by birth, vital circumstances, by his own pre-history (that means, by destine); a character in which destine already partakes in a great measure, before it is accomplished in the form of the tragic classic determined conflict; this is often only the motif through which a tragicity long ago in process is realised. This is seen with special clarity in Shylock's and Lear's cases. What happens to each one is especially destined to them, for the special character of Shylock and Lear, and such character is not only natural, but pre-formed by birth, situation, pre-history, that is to say, by destine, when it reaches an unmistakable peculiarity and the tragedy destine to him.

Pre-historical seems to refer here to a set of life experiences which one can imaginatively build from the character's behaviour, feelings, thoughts, ideas and gestures. His condition as an outcast, his problematic relation to both Antonio and Jessica makes his own deeds to go against him. He is a sort of victim of his own actions and of his circumstantial situation as a usurer and a Jew. Such situation is enhanced by his being despised by the Christians in the play, overcharging his anger and bitterness towards him. In a similar way, Antonio's *destine* or pre-history determines his actions and attitudes. For example, his sacrificing attitude for Bassanio's sake and his sadness and discontent determines his relationship to the other. The pre-history of the characters and of the play suggests and represents the characters' attitudes, actions and inwardness.

Furthermore, in this speech there are some syntactical details which enhance his *pathos* and the effects of Shylock's speech. In the beginning of the speech, he uses the present perfect (hath + past participle), a tense which suggests that an action which happened in the past still has its effects in the present. Thus, one could imagine he still feels their effects inside him: Antonio's mistreatments make Shylock feel resentment, bitterness, and anger: "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". Shylock complains revealing Antonio's disrespect. He starts the speech using the formula "he + hath + past participle". He parallels many action verbs in the past participle in order to enhance Antonio's mistreatment to him. The use of this syntactic parallelism enhances the acts done by Antonio against Shylock. They are, altogether, eight different actions which aimed at affronting Shylock: disgraced, hindered, laughed, mocked, scorned, thwarted, cooled, and heated. All of them have negative meaning in his

speech. Such despising attitudes signal that the Jews are not respected by the Christians in the play.

When he stops the speech at the sentence “I am a Jew”, which achieves its heights of tension and passion, he inverts the grammatical structure of his prose. Shylock asks rhetoric questions, which refer to obvious truths about humanity: “Hath not a Jew eyes? hath not a Jew hands, organs, dimensions, senses, affections, passions?” (SHAKESPEARE, 2010, p. 284). Here he changes from the present perfect to the use of the simple present. Simple present is normally used to express habitual actions or universal truths. It is evident here that Shylock is using just rhetorical questions to enhance his human condition and to remember the Christians and the audience that he is as human being as any Christian on stage. Shylock’s employment of parallelism dovetails with J. M. Coetzee’s analysis about parallelism in his essay *The rhetoric of the passive in English*. For Coetzee (1992, p. 163),

Parallelism, periodicity, and balance and/or antithesis are structures that in fact lend themselves rather readily to interpretation. Balance and antithesis are above all principles of ordering: parallelism (a more fundamental operation, and more widespread in language) creates what we can call temporary semantic equivalents between parallel elements, and periodicity is a syntactic image of closure (no addition to the structure is possible).

Thus, such parallelisms and repetitions in Shylock’s speech enhance the rhythm and *pathos* of the speech. Shylock balances his feelings, positive and negative, which unveil the ambiguities of his character. The rhythm of his speech is quite intense and quick, jumping from word to word. Such intense, energetic and quick rhythm is also intensified by alliterations, mainly the fricative ones such as /th/, /s/ and /f/, and the nasal ones, such as /an/, /en/ and /ions/, as well as the plosive ones such as /p/, /t/, /k/. In that sense, Emil Staiger (1997, p. 123)⁶ analyses the main aspects of the drama. He highlights that the goal of such intense and “complex” rhythm in the *pathos* “is not to contaminate us with the ‘mood’, but to purify the atmosphere with rude strikes as those of a tempest”. Such mood is produced and represented by alliterations, which reveal and intensify his disturbed and confused suffering and inward feelings.

Then he twists the structure of the sentences to reassert a rather general view of his human condition: “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?”. Once again it is a sentence filled up with alliterations enhancing his inward floatation and feelings. Moreover, he uses past participle in the passive voice as a rhetoric device. Its main effect is to efface the agent of the action. It demonstrates more general and universal ideas of the human condition as well as his similarity to the Christians. He breaks the grammatical rule, not introducing the passive verb with the verb “to be”, but he simply repeats the structure with parallelism. The grammatical devices depict his inward confused state, signalling his inner rupture and suffering.

In that sense, J. M. Coetzee (1992) makes a ground-breaking analysis of the use of the passive in literature. He states that it is a device used by many classical

6 The following discussion is based on the Brazilian edition of Staiger’s book *Conceitos fundamentais da poética* (1997). He defines the drama as the “dramatic style”, whose main trait is “tension”. For more details, see specially p. 119-159. The translations of the quotations in English are my own.

authors to twist the meaning of the sentence and reverse the proposition of the sentence against those who criticise or practice the actions in the propositions. He focuses his analysis on passivisation, a rhetoric operation which deals with and intends hidden meaning in the text. Rhetoricians argue that the use of the passive can affect “the focus of a sentence, the active form can consolidate the superficial subject as ‘hero’, whereas the passive would consolidate the subject as ‘sufferer’” (COETZEE, 1992, p. 150). Thus, the focus on the passive answers rather to a “preference for objectivity and distance, which seeks for avoiding personal attachment, commitment, and responsibility to one’s speech” (COETZEE, 1992, p. 150). In classical terms, passivisation was named *hyperbaton*. Rhetoricians always tried to analyse the infringement of the natural order of the sentence, whose order is disturbed and whose meaning are changed (COETZEE, 1992, p. 150). Thus, Coetzee (1992, p. 151) presents some important aspects of classical passivisation or hyperbaton:

In the interest of aesthetic appeal, or for the sake of emphasis, or (in Longinus) for the sake of representing dramatically states of inner passion, transgressions of the natural, logical order may take place. [...] Hyperbaton must be used sparingly, since it depends for its effectiveness on the maintenance of the norm of natural word order.

Coetzee argues that, in classical English writers, such as Defoe, Swift, Gibbon and Henry James there is a rather intense use of the passive and of the agentless sentence as a rhetorical device. Such device tends to abstractness, generality, and irony, i. e. “the aristocratic mode of irony” (COETZEE, 1992, p. 159). Such authors also employ twists in language, which reverse the expected idea proposed by the passive. In Coetzee’s opinion (1992, p. 173), the analysis of the implicit meaning of the passive, specifically the short passive, in which “the agent is never there” can be sustained by “comparative, historical, and psychological” evidences. For him, a way of thinking the passive is to consider them as

[...] sentences whose agent is not merely veiled (but still there behind the veil) or deleted (but once present) or unexpressed (but thought), but is actually null, void. The short passive is the principal means language provides to enable us to talk about acts as though they occurred without agents (COETZEE, 1992, p. 173).

Thus, meaning and form are twisted together in order to create multiple and ambivalent meanings. The meaning is enhanced in the twist of the form (COETZEE, 1992, p. 174). Thus, Shakespeare also uses the passive ironically, because in this speech Shylock does not mention anything directly about the Christians; however, one can infer that he is attacking the Christians when he utters verbs in the passive. By omitting the agent in some of the sentences of Shylock’s speech, Shakespeare creates a vague but known and foretold idea of what is behind the faces in the play: the Christians are represented as a mirror of Shylock and they are hypocritical by criticising him, yet they try to hide that they injured Shylock. Shylock is trying to enhance his condition as a sufferer and as a victim, revealing that the causes of his anger and anxiety are Christian actions and mistreatment. In that sense, Coetzee (1992, p. 174) enhances that the passive,

[...] despite its convenience, leaves an uneasy feeling: it opens up an area of vagueness that can simply be skated over (as most of us do in everyday usage), but that can be explored and exploited for their own ends by writers who take seriously the question of whether language is a good map of reality.

Such “uneasy feeling” is enhanced throughout the play, but it gets at its top in this speech. Even though Shylock uses prose when he speaks, its tension is emphasised by the use of passive. To a certain extent one can say that “God” may be the agent of some actions, being thus more of a God’s job who gives and takes away a man’s blessings. Nonetheless, “hurt with the same weapons” are, in fact, Christians’ deeds in the play. By paralleling human actions with the inexorable fate that any human being must endure, Shylock confesses his fate and points to the Christians attitudes in the play. He is also ironic, stating that he was “hurt with the same weapons”, which suggests that as he is hurt by Antonio, he can take the same weapon against Antonio.

After that, Shylock swerves the syntactic construction of his speech: he introduces the conditional as a way of enhancing his humanity through hypotheses which work as merely rhetorical questions:

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 (SHAKESPEARE, 2010, p. 285).

More precisely, he uses here the Zero Conditional with “if”. It expresses “certainty rather than possibility”, according to *Oxford Dictionary of English* (2010, p. R33)⁷. Such usage implies a rather informal, loose and familiar language, which syntactically is not so well-structured as the First, Second or Third Conditionals⁸. This form of the verb conveys something that is universally accepted as true. Thus, it reveals his *pathos* and inward confusion, hatred, and resentment. After that, in the final part of the speech, he becomes more rational; his feelings are not so confused, because he thinks more rationally and organises his speech structurally. Such rational tone is enhanced syntactically by the elaborated use of the “First Conditional with if” and the will-future (OXFORD, 2010, p. R33)⁹. Now he is coming back to what he was, initially, in the play: thinking, pondering and counterbalancing the pros and cons of his revenge. Thus, Shylock cries out his resentment, anger and his deep suffering through some breaks in the grammatical norm.

According to Staiger (1997, p. 120), *pathos* normally breaks the grammatical rules and “goes directly from a high point to another one in the speech”. Therefore, when Shylock expresses his inward feelings through the *pathos*, he violates grammatical normativity to represent the inward disruption and laceration in his feelings, thoughts, and mysterious dimensions. Such twisted uses of language enhance strength, depth and laceration in Shylock’s *pathos*. Shakespeare mingles different syntactic forms in order to modulate the rhythm of Shylock’s speech, which creates ambiguous dimensions whose meaning is pervaded by tension and ambiguity. His feelings make him confused, so that language is

7 The Zero Conditional requires the employment of verbs only in the present or in the past tense.

8 The first conditional is constructed with an if clause in the present tense and the main clause in the future tense, as in *If I have money I will buy the book*; the second conditional is built with an if clause in the past tense and the main clause in the conditional tense, as in *If I had money, I would buy the book*; and the Third conditional is built with an if clause in the past perfect and the main clause in the conditional perfect tense, as in *If I had had money, I would have bought the book*. For more details, see Oxford (2010, p. R. 33).

9 The first conditional is built with a verb in the present and another in the will-future. See Oxford (2010, p. R33).

disrupted, intensifying such confusion. Shakespeare introduced the mimesis of inwardness by breaks and twists of language, *pathos* and modulated rhythm in Shylock's speeches.

Thus, in Shylock's *pathos*, his inwardness comes out. It is enhanced in such speech by his anger, desire of revenge, resentment, and sceptical thought. According to Staiger (1997, p. 121), in his analysis of the drama, originally *pathos* meant "living, experience, misfortune, suffering, passion, and many other expressions". Shylock's experience and endurance of the Christian mistreatments against him and his people are enhanced and revealed by his *pathos* in this scene. "Man is moved by passions", states Staiger (1997, p. 121). Shylock's energy and perturbation are an extreme revelation of his inward feelings. Thus, the speech of the dramatic character is quite appropriated to his feelings, which act on his passions, overwhelming him (STAIGER, 1997, p. 121). His *pathos* may be felt as exaggerated and even histrionic. Nevertheless, Staiger points out that whereas in the lyrical poetry feelings are quite inwardly kept, in the action of the *pathos*, feelings are not much discreet. As Staiger (1997, p. 122) defines, the action of the *pathos* implies

[...] resistance – a rude clash or mere apathy – which tries to shatter with impetus. Thus, stylistic peculiarities are explained in this new situation. The pathos is not spread out in our inner self; it must be engraved many times by force in our inner self. The context of the sentence does not dissolve itself oneirically as in the lyric work, but the whole strength of the speech is cored on loose words.

For Staiger (1997, p. 124), such twists are intentionally made by the dramatist, who proves that he violates the verse and its language spontaneously. With such intentional twists and breaks, Shylock tries to persuade the Christians and the audience of his human condition. What moves him is his desire and will to recover his daughter, money, honour, and respect. In this sense, "the pathetic man is moved by what must be and his passions invest against the *status quo*" (STAIGER, 1997, p. 125). Shylock does not accept his loss of respect, lineage, and gains; he fights in fact against his entourage.

Furthermore, there is something noble in Shylock's *pathos*. According to Staiger (1997, p. 126), such noble dimension in the *pathos* is because the *status quo* is always beyond of that what moves the *pathos*. Shylock's *pathos* is moved by his honour and respect. *Pathos* is then elevated, noble, and deep. Hence, it is a way in which dramatist can elevate the characters, because even though they are lower personages, they are able to express their feelings and inwardness through their *pathos*. The grandeur or nobility of the *pathos* dwells on the factuality of "being ahead" of his *status quo* (STAIGER, 1997, p. 126). And in many senses, Shylock is ahead of his entourage, because he perceives that the Christians are hypocritical and cynical and do not see him as a human being. In a subtler level, he represents a rhetorical device to point the Christians' contradictions, who are no longer able to smooth over them.

Furthermore, Staiger sums up very well the intentions of the use of the *pathos* in the dramatic work and its effects. Thus, everything may lead to

[...] the impetuous rhythm is due to the tension between present and future, the strikes which affect us as an unquestionable exigency, and the pauses show the vacuity of the inexistent as the vacuity in which the status quo is absorbed, the situation to be changed (STAIGER, 1997, p. 126).

What Shylock foresees is the vacuity of his loss. He tries to revenge himself and to cry out against the Christians as a retaliatory act, as a reaction to satisfy his anger and resentment. It is his way of recovering his control. But as soon as he claims for justice in the trial scene, he will be obliged to face his fate and accept his ruin imposed by Portia and the Christians. Thus, the bend of such devices aims at representing the floatation of Shylock's inwardness.

Shylock feels and expresses his *pathos*, whose meaning and feelings have received deep Christian dimensions. In that sense, Erich Auerbach (2007a) analyses the historical development of the meaning of the *pathos/passio* in Western tradition in his essay *Gloria passionis*. Originally, for Aristotle, *pathos* meant a spasm. It maintained the meaning of "suffering" and "passivity", "as well as its ethical neutrality. No one could be praised or reproved because of his *pathos*" (AUERBACH, 2007a, p. 77). Later on, with the stoical moral, *pathos* (*passio* in Latin) assumed negative connotations of "inquietude" and "compulsive movement, which destroy the wise man's peace" (p. 77). For the stoics, it was something to be avoided, "it was a wise man's duty to be *impassibilis*, to keep him, at least inwardly, imperturbable by the world" (p. 77). Then, there came images of tempest and the agitation of passions to represent *pathos*, as well as sometimes *pathos* was substituted by perturbation. In this second moment of the semantic development of the *pathos/passio* the word was associated to violence and activity, due to the stoical interference in the meaning of *passio/pathos* (p. 77).

However, Saint Augustine deeply changed the meaning of *pathos/passion* in his work *De Civitate Dei*. The stoical idea of *pathos/passio* as something to be avoided, negative and disgusting was substituted by the idea of *pathos* as something good – *bonae passionis* (2007a, p. 79). For Auerbach (2007a, p. 79),

[...] the Christian authors did not oppose passions to the tranquillity of the wise man, but the submission to injustice – its intention was not that one of escaping from the world in order to avoid the suffering and passions, but to transcend it through suffering.

Moreover, it was Ambrose of Milan who enlarged the idea of good sentiments of *passio/pathos* to something sublime, meaning that *pathos/passio* was something glorious: the *gloria passionis*, the glorious passion. Then, the Christian forlorn of the Church Fathers associated *pathos/passio* to Christ's passion and later on it was associated with ideas of love, both sensual and charitable love. Such erotic reading came from the reading of the *Song of Songs* by Bernardo, who associated *pathos/passio* to love, both sensual and divine love. Thus, passion became something sweet and bitter, "bitter and salutary" (AUERBACH, 2007a, p. 85), and it also meant "sufferance" and the "ecstatic creative amorous passion" (p. 86). As a result, *pathos* was associated with other love motives in later poetry and drama, such as "ardour", "love", "fervour", and "inebriety" (p. 89). Therefore, in comparison to all previous ideas of *pathos/passio*, it turned out to be something praised and sought for in the late Middle Ages and in the Renaissance. Despite that, its ambiguity is embodied in its modern concept: *pathos/passio* is seen as something good and terrible simultaneously. In the end, Auerbach (2007a, p. 93) makes clear that *pathos/passio* "always comes from super-human powers – from the depths as well as from the heights – it is always received and endured as a magnificent and terrible gift".

Therefore, Shylock's *pathos* is expressed not to avoid the world or to avoid his fate, but to face injustice. He is not submissive, since he wants revenge and justice; thereby, he lets his own passions overwhelm him and his action. He wants to have his daughter and his money back, as well as he wants to revenge himself from Antonio. That is why his sufferance and feelings make him act. One feels quite disquieted when one sees Shylock's rage, anger, and desire for revenge. That is the dramatic device that Shakespeare created and employed in the play to represent Shylock's inwardness and to make him a more complex and deeper character. Shakespeare built, with impressive ability, the mimesis of inwardness in Shylock's character, representing his inwardness by repetitions, floating, confused, and disrupted feelings and *pathos*.

FINAL REMARKS

Shylock's speech *I am a Jew* is pervaded with breaks in language and syntactic turns, depicting his inward floatation and feelings. Furthermore, the use of the passive voice as a rhetoric device effaces the agent of the action, making his speech more elusive. It demonstrates rather human ideas and feelings of his condition, as well as portrays his similarity to the Christians. The breaks in language signals his inward confusion and despair. He simply repeats structures with parallelism to demonstrate confusion and despair. The grammatical twists depict his inward confused state, signalling his inner rupture and suffering.

Additionally, Shylock's speeches are full of *pathos* and breaks in language. As Shylock expresses his inward feelings through *pathos*, he violates grammatical normativity to represent the inward disruption and laceration in his feelings, thoughts, and mysterious dimensions. Such twisted uses of language emphasise strength, depth and laceration in Shylock's *pathos*. Shakespeare mingles different syntactic forms in order to modulate the rhythm of Shylock's speech, creating ambiguous dimensions pervaded by tension and ambiguity. His feelings make him confused, so that language is disrupted, intensifying such confusion. Shakespeare introduced the mimesis of inwardness through breaks in language, *pathos* and modulated rhythm in Shylock's speeches in order to suggest his inner debate.

The play also depicts Shylock's maternal relationship to Jessica and Leah. Shylock's projects his inward feeling onto Jessica's body, as well as onto Leah's ring is a driving mechanism as a compensation for his loss and frustration. The awareness Shylock experiences is the awakening feeling of loss of his beloved objects, both Jessica and Leah's ring, which symbolises the fusional imaginary state with the maternal body. His relation to his daughter re-presented the love for his wife re-imagined in his daughter. It configures an incestuous-like relationship. Shakespeare intuitively felt that human relationship to others was pervaded by obscure and mysterious forces which determined and configured their affection to them. He represented the mysteriousness of inward human life by perceiving such human traits. In creating Shylock, Shakespeare represented inward dynamic forces which were essential for creating Brutus, Hamlet, Macbeth, and Lear.

MIMESIS DA INTERIORIDADE DE SHYLOCK

Resumo: Este ensaio analisa a interioridade de Shylock na peça de Shakespeare *O mercador de Veneza*. O discurso de Shylock, *I am a Jew*, apresenta inúmeras aliterações, rupturas de linguagem e torneios sintáticos, melhorando sua fluência e sentimentos interiores. Além disso, ele usa a voz passiva como um dispositivo retórico, cujo principal efeito é apagar o agente da ação. Demonstra ideias mais gerais e universais de sua condição humana, bem como sua semelhança com os cristãos. As rupturas na regra gramatical sugerem sua confusão e desespero interior. Ele simplesmente repete estruturas com paralelismo para demonstrar sua confusão. Os dispositivos gramaticais retratam seu estado interior conturbado, sinalizando sua ruptura e sofrimento internos.

Palavras-chave: Mimesis da interioridade. *O mercador de Veneza*. Discurso de Shylock. Linguagem na peça. Renascença Inglesa.

REFERENCES

- ADELMAN, J. *Blood relations: Christian and Jew in The Merchant of Venice*. Chicago; London: The University of Chicago Press, 2008.
- AGUIAR, E. C. R.; FERREIRA, R. S. Amor e sofrimento em segunda Tróia, de William Butler Yeats. *Porto das Letras*, v. 4, n. 2, p. 110-119, jul./dez. 2018.
- AUERBACH, E. *Ensaio de Literatura Ocidental*. Tradução Samuel Titan Jr. e José Marcos Mariani de Macedo. São Paulo: Editora 34, 2007a.
- AUERBACH, E. *Mimesis: a representação da realidade na literatura ocidental*. São Paulo: Perspectiva, 2007b.
- CHARLTON, H. B. *Shakespearian comedy*. London; New York: Mathuen, 1984.
- COETZEE, J. M. The rhetoric of the passive in English. In: COETZEE, J. M. *Doubling the point: essays and interviews*. Edited by David Attwell. Harvard: Harvard University Press, 1992.
- COHEN, D. *Searching Shakespeare: studies in culture and authority*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2003.
- COOPER, J. R. Shylock's humanity. *Shakespeare Quarterly*, v. 21, n. 2, p. 117-124, Spring 1970.
- DRAKAKIS, J. Introduction. In: SHAKESPEARE, W. *The Merchant of Venice*. Edited by John Drakakis. London: Arden, 2010.
- GARBER, M. *Shakespeare after all*. New York: Anchor Books, 2004.
- GROSS, K. *Shylock is Shakespeare*. Chicago; London: The University of Chicago Press, 2006.
- HEGEL, G. W. *Estética*. Tradução Álvaro Ribeiro e Orlando Vitorino. Lisboa: Guimarães Editores, 2005. (Coleção Filosofia & Ensaios).
- HINELY, J. L. Bond priorities in *The Merchant of Venice*. *Studies in English Literature*, v. 20, n. 2, p. 217-239, Spring 1980.
- KAPLAN, M. L.; BEVINGTON, D. (ed.). *The Merchant of Venice: texts and contexts*. New York: Palgrave, 2002

- LUDWIG, C. R. Adaptação e Re-Criação de Ricardo III, de Al Pacino. *Porto das Letras*, v. 3, n. 2, p. 202-217, jul./dez. 2017.
- LUDWIG, C. R. Inwardness and subjectivity in early Renaissance. *Porto das Letras*, v. 4, n. 2, p. 134-157, jul./dez. 2018.
- LUDWIG, C. R. Judgment, conscience and Shylock's bond. *Porto das Letras*, v. 6, n. 1, p. 110-139, jan./jun. 2020.
- LUDWIG, C. R.; FERREIRA, R. de S. Life and fiction: imagination and literary creation in atonement. *Porto das Letras*, v. 5, n. 2, p. 58-77, 2019.
- MAUS, K. E. *Inwardness and theater in the English Renaissance*. Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press, 1995.
- McGINN, C. *Shakespeare's philosophy: discovering the meaning behind the plays*. New York: Harper, 2007.
- OXFORD DICTIONARY OF ENGLISH. 7. ed. London: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- SHAKESPEARE, W. *King Lear*. Essex: Longman, 1987.
- SHAKESPEARE, W. *Hamlet*. London: Arden, 1997.
- SHAKESPEARE, W. *Macbeth*. London: Arden, 1997.
- SHAKESPEARE, W. *Richard III*. New York: Matheun, 1997.
- SHAKESPEARE, W. *The Merchant of Venice*. London: Arden, 2010.
- SHAPIRO, J. *Shakespeare and the Jews*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1996.
- SHERMAN, A. G. Disowning knowledge of Jessica, or Shylock's scepticism. *Studies in English Literature*, v. 44, n. 2, p. 277-295, Spring 2004.
- STAIGER, E. *Conceitos fundamentais da poética*. 3. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Tempo Brasileiro, 1997.
- WILSON, R. *Three ladies of London*. Printed by Roger Warde. London, 2002.