on the morning before the play, the fog has again blurred his brain. And the “To-be-or-not-to-be” soliloquy shows him in the darkest despair. The performance of the play rouses him, but insufficiently. A dozen distractions press on him. He feels very uncertain of his course. He vents irresponsibly on Polonius the energy that he meant to direct against Claudius in the second soliloquy. “Bestial oblivion” and fatalistic indifference follow. Then, as if to enhance the point of the second soliloquy, Shakespeare shows in the last soliloquy how like causes produce like results in Hamlet’s mind, when the cheap melodramatic expedition of Fortinbras’s again dispels the clouds that have lingered about his brain and effects another brief moment of clear vision.

P. S. I cannot agree at all with Sir Lawrence Olivier who purposely omitted the second and fourth soliloquies in his cinematised version of Hamlet; for these are, I believe, the surest clues to solve the so-called “Hamlet problems.”
vapours. Man, indeed, delights not him; no, nor woman neither. But no sooner have the actors been announced, he brightens up and become gayer and more normal in their presence. He cries: "We'll e'en to 't like French falconers, fly at any thing we see: we'll have a speech straight: come give us a taste of your quality; come, a passionate speech."
1 He listens eagerly to the declamation and snubs Polonius savagely for finding it too long. When the entertainment is over, Hamlet is left alone. He, as some Aristotelian might say, has gone through with the tragic catalysis. He has been in a position of a mountain climber who has long been kept inactive by confusing mists. But the mists are suddenly dispelled. And he discerns his course clearly before him.

This great soliloquy has two parts, each being quite logically connected. In the first place, as the mists are dispelled, Hamlet feels a natural wonder and disgust that he has so long been inactive. The cause of delay is quite conceivable when it is momentarily removed. He contrasts himself with the actor and proposes three reasons for his failure to perform the duty of vengeance: (1) he is "a dull and muddy-mettled rascal"; 2 (2) He is a coward; (3) he is "an ass . . . that unpack his heart with words." 3 At this point he contemptuously drops the vain search for causes, and turns his attention to the issue before him:

Fie upon't! Foh! About, my brain!

In the second part of the soliloquy, Hamlet looks to the future, and fears difficulties before him no more. He sees nothing to stop him. However, weeks and weeks have passed — perhaps two months — since he heard the Ghost's words. So the impression of the interview is inevitably less vivid than it was. The facts of the revelation are perfectly clear. But it is quite natural that he should no longer trust his supernatural visitant. Hamlet thinks, as the people of Shakespeare's time generally do, that there are two kinds of ghosts — honest and dishonest. The spirit that he has seen may be the devil; and the devil hath power to assume a pleasing shape. He had no doubts in the actual presence of the spirit. But could he conscientiously trust that feeling now? He does not make efforts to evade his responsibility. He only wants to "have grounds more relative than this."

Hamlet is normal at the end of this long second soliloquy. But the natural reaction follows. He sleeps the next night well, and when he awakes

1. *Hamlet* I. ii. 449.
4. *ibid.* I. ii. 616.
5. *ibid.* I. ii. 633f.
various insincerities mutually confute and explain one another and are explained by his diverse actions.

But Hamlet does not comment or interpret his words by his actions. Hemlet's words must be taken at their face value. So I cannot at all agree with Professor Bracley's assumption that the doubt about the King's guilt, "instead of being the natural conclusion of the preceding thoughts, is totally inconsistent with them."

The second soliloquy is Hamlet's reaction upon the Player's declamation concerning the death of Priam. There are three motives, as Professor Brooke points out, which have actuated Shakespeare to introduce this declamation. Professor Brooke puts the case thus:

1. The dramatic purposes of the "rugged Pyrrhus" declamation appear to be:

   1. It continues the rather good-natured protest concerning the little eyases of the Queen's chapel by an obvious though not very uncomplimentary parody of the turgid lines on the death of Priam in their play of Dido (by Marlowe and Nashe).

   2. The Pyrrhus-Priam-Hecuba story furnishes a kind of parallel to the Hamlet-Claudius-Gertrude story. Around the slaying of a King all Hamlet's thoughts ever revolve; so in this half-dramatized epic the most attractive passage of all is that about the death of Priam.

   3. There is an aspect in which the declamation has very decided relevance to Hamlet's case. Let us assume with Mr. Bradley that Shakespeare understands Hamlet to be suffering from melancholic depression, and then ask what effect upon his hero the dramatist would look for from such an exciting bit of dramatic entertainment. Clearly, a salutary effect. We all know how wonderfully fits of "blues" caused by disappointment or excessive introspection are alleviated by a play, particularly a wild farce or lurid melodrama. The mists of self-absorption are cleared from our brains; we see our own troubles in proper focus and perspective.

So it is with Hamlet.

Before the announcement of the player's coming, we find Hamlet in the lowest spirits. He complains of his "bad dreams." He confesses that "Denmark's a prison." He has lost all his mirth. This goodly frame, the earth, seems to him a sterile promontory. This most excellent canopy, the air, appears no other thing to him than a foul and pestilent congregation of

3. ibid. I. ii. 249.
personal power, the sympathetic appreciation of Fortinbras's spirit, and the discriminating realization of what is "rightly to be great". — these are the very clear evidences of that "slight thinning of the dark cloud of melancholy" which Professor Bradley thinks he observes in the fifth act.

Now this last soliloquy is a close and intentional counterpart of the second, which I wish to discuss here in this paper. Both speeches show a psychological progress from self-dissatisfaction and self-abuse ("O, what a rogue and peasant slave am I!" — "How all occasions do inform against me!") to self-confidence through elaborate self-analysis. Each ends with an almost triumphant declaration of Hamlet's practical resolution;

The play's the thing,
Wherein I'll catch the conscience of the king.

O, from this time forth
My thoughts be bloody, or be nothing worth!"

Professor Bradley writes thus on the conclusion of the second soliloquy, where Hamlet resolves to test the King's guilt by means of the "mousetrap."

"Nothing, surely, can be clearer than the meaning of this famous soliloquy. The doubt which appears at its close, instead of being the natural conclusion of the preceding thoughts, is totally inconsistent with them. For Hamlet's self-reproaches, his curses on his enemy, and his perplexity about his own inaction, one and all imply his faith in the identity and truthfulness of the Ghost. Evidently this sudden doubt, of which there has not been the slightest trace before, is no genuine doubt; it is an unconscious fiction, an excuse for his delay — and for its continuance."

I am of the same opinion with Professor Bradley concerning his theory of Hamlet's melancholy. But at this point I think this most careful critic-scholar has missed the mark.

Now, Hamlet is a unique character. He is different not only from the characters of other dramatists, but also from the other characters that Shakespeare himself created. Iago, for instance, utters a lot of soliloquies. But we must discount the probability of his conscious or unconscious insincerity. His
quality. His figure is imposing chiefly because of the bulk of the design. It is not without reason that Richard is often compared to the Barabas of Marlowe. Richard and Barabas are, in essential respects, the same kind of character. But whereas Marlowe has merely taken over the old tradition, Shakespeare has deepened it a step farther and created a figure of human significance. While Barabas is no more than a caricature, a parody of a human being, Richard is something at least of a living person. He captures our attention, if not our sympathy. Richard II is an experiment of Shakespeare's characterization which will later be developed into such maturer and culminating characters as Iago, Edmund or Macbeth.

II A Note on the Second Soliloquy of Hamlet

The four great soliloquies of Hamlet may be divided into two groups. Two of them — the first ("O, that this too solid flesh would melt etc."), and the third ("To be or not to be"), — show the hero inert and over-reflec¬tive, haunted by the idea of suicide, inclined to overlook his responsibilities, and to speculate in an unhealthy way on "the undiscover'd country from whose bourn no traveller returns." Indeed, the third soliloquy — the famous "To be or not to be" — marks, as Professor Tucker Brooks points out, the lowest intellectual level reached by Hamlet. The complete selfishness of the argument, the refusal to recognize any duty whatsoever, and the astonishing "bestial oblivion" — these are the shocks to any attentive reader, and show the speaker's intelligence at the lowest. And such was clearly, I think, Shakespeare's intention. It is perhaps the perversity of fate that this speech should be enshrined in the memory of the general public as the particular gem of Shakespeare's genius.

These two soliloquies are the products of a relatively quiet frame of mind. The first is uttered before Hamlet has learned of his father's murder; the third is spoken in the quiet of the morning before the play. But in the other two soliloquies we see Hamlet in far more normal and admirable moods. Both of them are produced by a state of special excitement. The second is inspired by the Player's moving declamation. The fourth is evoked by the impressive sight of Fortinbras and his army. The fourth soliloquy is perhaps the finest in the play. I get an inkling from this last soliloquy that Hamlet's tragedy arises not from the excessive postponement but from the too early development of the crisis. "That capability and god-like reason", the clear sense of

---

1. _Hamlet_ I. ii. 129ff.
2. _ibid._ I. i. 56ff.
3. _ibid._ II. i. 79.
4. _ibid._ IV. iv. 40.
5. _ibid._ IV. iv. 38.
For if unto my duety I had taken regarde,
I might have lived still in honour with the best,
And had I not attempt the thing that I ought least.
But desire to rule alas dyd me so blinde,
Which caused me to do against nature and kynde.
Ah cursed caytive why did I clymbe so hye,
Which was the cause of this my baleful thrall.
For styll I thyrstred for the regal dignitie,
But hasty rising threatneth sodayne fall,
Content yourselves with your estates all,
And secke not right by wrong to suppresse,
For God hath promist eche wrong to redresse.

In *Richard the Third*, we cannot hear this kind of moralization. Shakespeare does not present us a moral in its bare form. He only insinuates it to us. It runs through the play as its undertone. The main theme is, first and last, the character of the hero. Richard acts, as it were, as the scourge of God. He is insistent on his aims and character. No chastening of experience can modify the superhuman passion for self-aggrandisement at any price. Relying on his force of will, he removes his enemies one by one. He uses his adherents as his tools, and accomplishes such feats as the wooing of Anne and the persuasion of Elizabeth to further his plans. But the wheel comes full circle. No sooner has he done all that he possibly can do, than *Nemesis* falls on him. And Richard himself was most worthely deprived of life and kingdome.

We must not, however, forget the fact that *Richard the Third* was an experimentation of Shakespeare. Shakespeare, at that time, has not completely got rid of Marlowe's influence. The conception of the hero is still mechanical. Indeed some scholars have believed that some of the scenes of *Richard the Third* were written by Marlowe. The character is made to order, to fulfill an ideal plan. As a study of character, it is far behind such a study as that of Iago. Exceptional though he is, Iago compels our belief by virtue of the complexity of his motives, and of the mind that dwells in him and admits us to its secrets. But Richard's motive is simple. He has no individual mind. Selfish ambition, physical courage, and the lack of moral scruple and human kindness — these are the fundamental qualities on which the character of Richard is built up.

I was born so high:
Our aery buildeth in the cedar's top,
And dallies with the wind, and scorns the sun.
Richard is an artistic conception of a gigantic villain with no redeeming
But Shakespeare is generally very free in his treatment of the historical sources. In Richard the Third, he is faithful only in minor details. To form a connected action, he brings together the events of several years into a space of time. The imprisonment and death of Clarence (I. i. and iv.) took place in 1478. The events of I. ii., if historically possible, would belong to 1471. From I. i. to IV. iv., the events of 1483 follow one another in rapid succession. At the end of IV. iv., the interval between Richmond's separate expedition of 1483 and 1485 is annihilated, and the drama moves onto its climax at Bosworth. The dramatic device of these alterations is obvious: accuracy of date is impossible, in the space of two hours, with the striking presentation of character. The main object of the play is to give a clear-cut dramatic relief to the central figure of Richard III. This is the object of the liberty which is taken with history is the famous scene between Richard and Lady Anne. The scene has no foundation in fact. But it is a most powerful demonstration of the personal influence of the hero on those around him. "It would do for Titian to paint." The interview with Elizabeth in IV. iv., where Richard again exercises his faculty of persuasion, is a free deduction from history for the same purpose. Richard's connivance at the death of Clarence, which the historical authorities merely insinuate, becomes in the play a positive fact. The impression of subtlety and wickedness is repeated and emphasized by Shakespeare. This is the dramatic requisite imposed upon Shakespeare. Now and then, Shakespeare's characters depart slightly from their prototypes. Hastings of the play is a little more foolish than the Hastings of history. Buckingham of the play is represented less cautiously then he actually was. His bragging, melodramatic words in I. v. 5-11 amount to a confession of his impotence. Both Hastings and Buckingham are merely dramatic foils to the central figure of Richard; and, as such, the depreciation of their character is unavoidable. Every actor in the play receives his degree of life from association with Richard and contact with his influence.

The treatment of history in Richard the Third is guided everywhere by fidelity to the traditional principles of tragedy. The irresistible power of Nemesis overrules the actions of the dramatis personae. It would be inaccurate to say that Shakespeare was profoundly moved by the spectacle of sin and its punishment in history. But the doctrine itself was generally accepted as a conventional foundation by all the authors at that time. In the dawn of Renaissance, the "blood-will-have-blood" was a favourite theme of prose and poetry. The Mirror represents Richard as saying:

Loe here you may beholde the due and just rewarde
Of tiranny and treason which God doth most detest,
relationships between Richard and Atreus. The two characters resemble each other only in the superficial sense. The Senecan villain is a crude blood-thirsty fellow. He is purely a character in the melodrama: a villain who revels in the blackest crimes. But the crimes by themselves are essentially unconvincing.

Richard, on the other hand, is a subtle and intellectual guy. Sheer brutality may perhaps be alien to his character. We cannot accept without reserve the conventional picture of him as a "thick skinned" brute. Hazlitt referred to Richard as "towering and lofty; equably impetuous and commanding; haughty, violent, and subtle; bold and treacherous; confident in his strength as well as in his cunning; raised high by his birth, and higher by his talents and his crimes; a royal usurper, a princely hypocrite, a tyrant and a murderer of the house of Plantagenet." And, speaking of the famous courtship scene with Lady Anne, he declares:

Richard should woo less as a lover than as an actor — to show his mental superiority, and power of making others the playthings of his purposes.

Even the most superficial study of Richard the Third will demonstrate the correctness of Hazlitt's criticism. Richard is, above all, the conscious actor who delights in his wit and skill. His gaiety of spirits is real and constant.

The main source of the story of Richard the Third is, as with other historical plays, Raphael Holinshed's Chronicles. Some details seem to have been gathered from such narratives as those in The Mirror for Magistrates. The relevant entries in the Mirror as follows:

How George Plantagenet thyrd sonne of the Duke of Yorke, was by his brother King Edward wrongfully imprysoned, and by his brother Richard miserably murdered, the 11. of January. Anno 1478.

How King Edwarde the fouth, through his surfeting and untemperate life, sodaynly died in the middest of his prosperity. The 9. of Apriell, anno 1483.

How Sir Anthony Wodvill Lorde Rivers and Scales, governour of Prince Edward, was with his nephue Loid Richard Gray, and others, cansles imprisoned, and cruelly murdered. Anno 1483.

How the Lord Hastings was betrayed, by trusting too much to his evill Counceelour Catesby, and villainously murdered in the Towre of London, by Richard Duke of Glocester, the 13. of June. Anno 1483.

The Complaynt of Henry Stafford, Duke of Buckingham.

How Richard Plantagenet Duke of Glocester, murdered his brothers children, usurping the Crowne: and in the 3. yeare of his raigne, was most worthely deprived of life and Kingdome, in Basworth plaine, by Henry Earle of Richmond, after called King Henry the seventh: the
There is general agreement on the type to which Richard belongs. Richard has long been classified as a conventional *Machiavellian villain*. Professor Stoll says:

Richard I is charged to the muzzle with Machiavellian principles of egoism, promptitude and resolution, violence and fraud. Like other Machiavels he boasts and gloats, fawns upon and fondles the minions of his villainy, and he plays the hypocrite as egregiously as Barabas. All this is certainly true. Richard himself reveals, in a famous soliloquy, all the qualities listed by Professor Stoll:

Why, I can smile, and murder while I smile,  
And cry, ‘Content,’ to that which grieves my heart,  
And wet my cheeks with artificial tears,  
And frame my face to all occasions.  
I’ll drown more sailors than the mermaid shall;  
I’ll slay more gazers than the basilisk;  
I’ll play the orator as well as Nestor,  
Deceive more slyly than Ulysses could,  
And, like a Sinon, take another Troy.  
I can add colours to the chameleon,  
Change shapes with Proteus for advantages,  
And set the murd’rous Machiavel to school.

The last line is Richard’s only reference to Machiavelli. It is significant that the name of “the murd’rous Machiavel” should be coupled with symbols of deceit, such as Ulysses, Sion, the chameleon, and Proteus. In this context, Machiavelli, I think, represents hypocrisy.

But to call Richard a *Machiavellian villain* may not be to solve the problem of his character. We have only named the type he represents. We have not yet been in a position to understand him adequately. Before we can do that, we must know the reaction on the part of the audience which Shakespeare expected Richard to provoke. We must discover the traditional signification of the *Machiavellian villain* for the Elizabethan playgoer. Let us again turn to Professor Stoll:

The Machiavellian villain is but old wine in a new bottle; for out of Seneca, along with much else, came into Elizabethan tragedy a character such as Atreus who likewise practises villainy wholesale, lies and ensembles, gloats, blasphemes, and pays homage to the powers infernal. Undoubtedly the identification of the Senecan tyrant and the Machiavellian villain is very plausible. The general characteristics of Richard I appear to match with those of Atreus. Certain of Richard’s utterances have unquestionably Senecan ring. But it is impossible, I think, to prove precisely a distinct
TWO ESSAYS ON SHAKESPEARE

Ishitaro Tamaki

In my first essay, "Is Richard the Third a character play?" I tried to demonstrate that this play was the experimentation of Shakespeare on character, and that a happy one compared with the Barabas of Marlowe in the Jew of Malta. Richard II., a character of wonderful vitality, is indeed the first fruit of Shakespeare's experiments on character which will later be ripened into such superb ones as Hamlet, Iago, and Macbeth. I also tried to analyze, in this essay, how far the maxim, "Blood will have blood," was fitted in with the dramatic development of the plot of the play.

In the second essay, "A Note on the Second Soliloquy of Hamlet," I attempted to elucidate that the soliloquy was significant not only for the development of the play, but as a sure clue to solve the so-called Hamlet "riddles."

I "Is Richard the Third a character Play?"

"Richard the Third may be considered," says Hazlitt, "as properly a stage-play: it belongs to the theatre, rather than to the closet." Shakespeare's plays were calculated by the romantics in general less for performance on the stage than for reading in the study-room. They do not come, they thought, under the province of acting. "Eye, and tone, and gesture have nothing to do with them." Shakespeare's characters are not primarily the beings on the stage, but in the world of imagination. And Hazlitt's words above cited may reveal, I think, that he, though a connoisseur of plays, stands in the same position towards Shakespeare with other romantics, that he thought Richard the Third was an exceptional play belonging to the theatre rather than to the closet. This attitude of romantics towards Shakespere is, of course, nonsense to the modern reader who knows that Shakespeare was an actor-playwright, a chief entertainer in the time of Elizabeth, whose plays were primarily intended to be acted on the stage. But Hazlitt's words have something, I think, which cannot be rejected as nonsense. "It is the character," he adds, "in which Garrick came out; it was the second character in which Mr. Kean appeared, and in which he acquired his fame." It was indeed the character acted on the stage that Hazlitt was attracted most in Richard the Third. And he gives us minute analyses of "characters."

It goes without saying that Richard the Third is one of Shakespeare's experiments in "Histories." But it is, at the same time, Shakespeare's experimentation in character — a study of a character of amazing vitality, Richard II.