


4-1979

"Fair Terms & A Villain's Mind:" Shylock in Perspective

Montreva Calhoun
Western Kentucky University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.wku.edu/theses>

 Part of the [Jewish Studies Commons](#), [Literature in English, British Isles Commons](#), [Playwriting Commons](#), and the [Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Calhoun, Montreva, "'Fair Terms & A Villain's Mind:" Shylock in Perspective" (1979). *Masters Theses & Specialist Projects*. Paper 2204. <https://digitalcommons.wku.edu/theses/2204>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by TopSCHOLAR®. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses & Specialist Projects by an authorized administrator of TopSCHOLAR®. For more information, please contact topscholar@wku.edu.

Calhoun,

Montreva Wilkins

1979

"Fair Terms and A Villain's Mind:"
Shylock in Perspective

A Thesis Presented to
the Faculty of the Department of English
Western Kentucky University
Bowling Green, Kentucky

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts in English

Montreva Wilkins Calhoun

April, 1979

AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF THESIS

Permission is hereby

granted to the Western Kentucky University Library to make, or allow to be made photocopies, microfilm or other copies of this thesis for appropriate research or scholarly purposes.

reserved to the author for the making of any copies of this thesis except for brief sections for research or scholarly purposes.

Signed

Richard Cebon

Date

5-31-79

Please place an "X" in the appropriate box.

This form will be filed with the original of the thesis and will control future use of the thesis.

"FAIR TERMS AND A VILLAIN'S MIND:"
SHYLOCK IN PERSPECTIVE

Recommended 19 April 1979
(Date)

Ray E. Berman
Director of Thesis

Roy W. Miller

Will Tricky

Approved May 31, 1979
(Date)

Edmund Gray
Dean of the Graduate College

"Fair Terms and a Villain's Mind:"

Shylock in Perspective

Montreva Wilkins Calhoun April, 1979 109 pages

Directed by: Dr. Hoyt Bowen, Dr. Will Fridy, Dr. Roy Miller

Department of English Western Kentucky University

While The Merchant of Venice has long been one of Shakespeare's most popular plays, it has also been one of the most controversial with Shylock being the hub of the conflict. Critics have long been arguing whether this great character is a tragic hero or a larger-than-life villain. Those opting for the first often believe the playwright guilty of anti-semitism, and those following the latter consider Shylock the embodiment of evil. Very few critics have viewed this character as three dimensional, possessing human dignity as well as a capacity for evil.

The first chapter reveals the many sources for both the plot of the play and for Shylock's character. Chapter II deals with the subject of usury historically and in relationship to Shylock's character. The third chapter reveals the humanness of Shylock, his supposedly fierce dedication to his values and his relationship with the Christians. Included also in this chapter is Shakespeare's

use of imagery, particularly animal imagery in the revelation of Shylock's character, and the Jew's diabolic nature. Shylock as a scapegoat in the traditionally Jewish sense is the topic of Chapter IV.

The discussion of these pertinent areas of the play show that Shakespeare did not have to be anti-semitic to write about an evil man who happened to be a Jew. It is shown that Shylock may be viewed consistently on three levels: the historic, the archetypal, and the literal. The point being made here is that the modern reader, particularly due to the fact that twentieth century man has perpetrated more atrocities on the Jewish people than all past centuries combined, is perhaps incapable of total objectivity where this play is concerned. We tend to view the play either offensively or defensively on an emotional level rather than intellectually and literally. This reaction is explored in the Conclusion using the philosophy of Jung and his studies of the collective unconscious.

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Chapter	
I. Plot and Character Sources for <u>The Merchant of Venice</u>	3
II. Shylock and Usury.....	16
III. "Humanity in Inhumanity".....	26
IV. Scapegoat Psychology and <u>The Merchant of Venice</u>	54
Conclusion.....	77
Notes.....	83
Bibliography.....	100

Introduction

The Merchant of Venice has long been one of Shakespeare's most popular plays. It is filled with love and hate and some of the most exquisitely beautiful poetry that Shakespeare wrote. In addition to its wide popularity, it has also engendered large quantities of diverse criticism, spawning charges of anti-semitism against its author, along with judgments that the play's basic structure is weakened; Shylock, to many critics, appears too tragic to be a comic villain.

If we permit ourselves total objectivity, it is obvious that the structure of this play is one of comedy. The difficult thing is that Shylock, while his character contains some aspects of humor, is most memorable in his pain.

It is also apparent that the real antagonism between Antonio and Shylock is caused by money and not by either Christianity or Judaism. The terms of the bond, which are understood by the merchant, his young friend and the Jew, cause Bassanio to change his mind about borrowing the money: "You shall not seal to such a bond for me" (I.iii.155).¹ Antonio is not concerned about forfeiting, however, as his ships are expected in a month before the bond is due. He seals to the bond much to the conster-

nation of Bassanio, whose feeling is still one of distrust: "I like not fair terms and a villain's mind" (I.iii.180).

An aspect of the play which causes the confusion and the discomfort is Shylock's Jewishness. He is cruel, unattractive and cold, but the reader feels guilty for responding to him with these feelings because of two-thousand years of world history. Shylock explains the problem himself: "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" (III.i.58-63).

One of Shakespeare's most famous and complex villains, "Shylock is a man of no mediocre qualities. He has dignity, strength, purposefulness, tenacity, courage, an excellent mind, a cuttingly wry sense of humor...."² In creating him, Shakespeare drew on many sources that had been used several times before; in fact, it would perhaps be safe to say that nothing about Shylock is original except Shakespeare's treatment of him.

Chapter I.
Plot and Character Sources
for The Merchant of Venice

Many possibilities are open when discussing the source of The Merchant of Venice. It is often thought that the success of Marlowe's The Jew of Malta influenced Shakespeare. In fact, Boas notes that Marlowe's play was, according to Henslowe's diary, presented at least twenty times during the year 1594.¹ The exact time Shakespeare's play was written is not known, though it is generally assumed to have been sometime between 1594 and 1598 as Francis Meres in 1598 "mentions Shakespeare as a leading contemporary dramatist" and included in his listed productions is The Merchant of Venice.²

Another source is thought to be Il Peccerone, a collection of tales written in 1378 by Giovanni Fiorentino. While there are many similarities between the tale and the play, there are also many contrasts, the most striking perhaps being the expansion of the characters in Shakespeare's version. The prototypes of Bassanio and Antonio have much more dimension in the play with the greatest changes apparent in Portia, who is much more wise and noble than the widow in the tale.³ Grebanier not only believes Il Peccerone to be Shakespeare's source

for this play, he also sees many similarities in the language of the two, convincing him that Shakespeare read the collection of tales in the original Italian.⁴

An interesting similarity is also seen in an old English ballad, reprinted by Percy in Reliques of Ancient English Poetry. Grebanier notes that it was known by the title "A new song, shewing the crueltie of Gernutus, a Jewe, who lending to a merchant an hundred crownes, would have a pound of his fleshe, because he could not pay him at the time appointed."⁵ The words Shylock speaks to Antonio when they settle on the terms of the loan are often used as a claim by supporters of Shylock that he is not serious about taking a pound of Antonio's flesh because he refers to their deal as "this merry bond" (I.iii.174). In the ballad Gernutus calls his terms a "merry jeast." Grebanier says, "This is the sole case in which we find a parallel to Shylock's description of the bond as being made 'in a merry sport' ... a point of cardinal dramatic importance to Shakespeare's play."⁶

Shakespeare also borrowed the tale of the three caskets, found in many places, but translated again in 1595 in Gesta Romanorum. The plot differs from Shakespeare's version in that it is a princess who must choose among three vessels to win the emperor's son.⁷

Further evidence that Shakespeare was familiar with Italian literature and comedy is found in the obvious

similarities between Shylock and the Pantaloon character of the "Commedia dell' Arte." Pantaloon is avaricious, "an abject slave" to his money and excessively miserly."⁸ Shylock possesses these characteristics to the extent that his love for his ducats seems at times to exceed that of his love for his daughter. At the same time his miserliness seems to extend to the depths of his soul; he locks up the casements against the masques and appears to let no beauty enter his "sober" house in any way.

Another characteristic which Pantaloon possesses is that he is always duped.⁹ Shylock, too, is considered bested by Portia and is a dupe of the only thing he believes in--the law. He is also a victim of Antonio to a degree, when Portia asks the merchant, "What mercy can you render him, Antonio?" (IV.i.379).

Pantaloon usually has a servant, as well, who is "starved by his master until he hardly casts a shadow."¹⁰ Lancelot Gobbo, before he goes to work for Bassanio, says to his father, "I am famished in his service: you may tell every / finger I have with my ribs" (II.ii.116-117).

On stage Pantaloon was usually portrayed with a beard and a large hooked nose.¹¹ Stoll says that the earliest portrayal of Shylock very likely also included the red beard [One of the traditional characteristics of the Jews was red hair; a particular group with which

the Jews mixed were the Amorites who were "supposed to have been distinguished by a high frequency of red hair."¹² and the hooked nose.¹³ Grebanier quotes a ballad published in 1664 by Thomas Jordan which described Shylock:

His beard was red; his face was made
 Not much unlike a witches
 His habit was a Jewish gown
 That would defend all weather;
 His chin turn'd up, his nose¹⁴ hung down,
 And both ends met together.

In addition, Ducharte says of the Pantaloon figure, "When his vanity suffers he forgets his habitual meekness and flourishes his dagger."¹⁵ One could hardly call Shylock "meek" nor does his vanity seem in any danger at the moment we see him whet his knife in the courtroom (IV.i.121). The knife-wielding villain is also a characteristic of the Vice of the morality plays who often flashed his dagger or pared his nails in an obvious manner. That Shakespeare was familiar with this character is apparent as he used it many times. In Twelfth Night the clown sings to Malvolio:

I am gone, sir,
 And anon, sir,
 I'll be with you again,
 In a trice,
 Like to the old Vice,
 Your need to sustain
 Who with dagger of lath,
 In his rage and his wrath,
 Cries 'Ah, ha,' to the divel. (IV.ii.123-131)

The playwright also puts these words into the mouth of Falstaff:

A king's son! If I do not beat these out of thy kingdom with a dagger of lath, and drive all thy subjects afore thee like a flock of wild geese, I'll never wear hair on my face more....
(1H4.I.Iiv.137-140)

Margeson says of the Vice that he was often an "accuser and sometimes satiric moralist."¹⁶ One obvious example of such moralizing is when Shylock accuses the Christians of keeping slaves and treating them like dogs (V.i.89-97). He is a man of wit and cunning, always ready with an answer which will justify his beliefs. "Usually the course of events provides an opportunity the villain is quick to seize upon."¹⁷ While Shylock considers Antonio "good" or "sufficient" to loan money to, he also prepares the way with the bond perchance something happens that Antonio cannot pay.

Ducharte says that Pantaloon is "always old and as a rule, retired from business."¹⁸ Shylock, on the other hand, seems very vigorous and active in his profession. He is referred to as "old" one time during the play when the Duke says, at the arrival of Bellario's assistant, "Antonio and old Shylock both stand forth" (V.i.175). Another quality Shylock does not have which is evident in the Pantaloon is the problems with "unfortunate amours."¹⁹

Shylock is not made a fool of by a young wife nor does he lust after a young maiden only to have her call him upon his leaving, a "scurvy, gouty, catarrhous old beast."²⁰ Whatever opinion the reader may have of Shylock's business dealings or of his relationship with his daughter, he maintains his dignity throughout.

Though Marlowe's Barabas is often considered Shylock's prototype there is really very little similarity; Barabas is much more the villain of the typical Senecan revenge tragedy as he goes about committing murder and wreaking chaos from one end of Malta to the other. There are traces of Seneca in Shylock, though Titus Andronicus, Macbeth and Hamlet are generally considered more obvious examples of Shakespeare's use of the revenge tragedy.²¹ Shylock on the other hand is a comic villain, as Stoll says, and he is contained within the comic structure.²²

The devious nature of the Machiavellian villain is also evident in this play. Watson says that, "Machiavelli recommends that malcontents who are still too weak to oppose the ruler openly should 'sedulously court his favour' and 'adapt themselves to his pleasure' as their plans mature."²³ In feigning friendship with Antonio and in the eventual outcome, Shylock follows the pattern of the Machiavellian character. "To return a murderous game back on the guilty is pardonable, even admirable, in this world of drama," says Watson, "and to be hoist on

one's own petard is justice, if rough justice."²⁴

The debate between Mercy and Justice was a popular theme in medieval drama. The Castle of Perseverance which Hunter says is the "earliest of the surviving English moralities" has Mankind repenting on his death-bed. His soul "calls repeatedly upon Mercy but there is no reply, and his bad angel is carrying him off to Hell when the Four Daughters of God enter to consider his case."²⁵ There is much conflicting opinion of whether Mankind deserves to be saved. "Mercy appeals to Christ's sacrifice, which is sufficient to atone for any and all of the sins of humanity,"²⁶ and "Justice and Truth are won over by the arguments of their sisters and God decrees that ... he [Mankind] shall be judged with mercy rather than according to his deserts."²⁷

When Portia enters the trial as Bellario's assistant, she appears to be the personification of the Four Daughters of God: Justice, Truth, Mercy and Peace. She recognizes the reality of the situation, that Shylock does have the letter of the law on his side; however, to maintain the order of society, she knows that Shylock must be merciful, because revenge is the antithesis of order and can only result in destruction. Trying every way she can to get him to recognize the necessity of mercy, she finally echoes the words of the New Testament: "Judge not, that ye be not judged. For with what judgment

ye judge, ye shall be judged: and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again" (Matt.7.1-2).²⁸

Further evidence of Portia as God's representative is seen in her superiority to all of the other characters. She is very wise and manipulates the characters when necessary, particularly Bassanio. Hapgood says, "When poor Bassanio is with Portia, he submits to her will, and when he is with Antonio, he submits to his."²⁹ Bassanio is perhaps the embodiment of Mankind, knowing right from wrong, but constantly wavering in the face of this temptation or that. Portia realizes Bassanio's possible inability to handle the situation, because she does not leave the problem to him to solve alone. She tells Nerissa, "I have within my mind / A thousand raw tricks ... / Which I will practice" (III.iv.76-78).

There is much mention in the morality plays, particularly in "Everyman," of God's having "bought" man: "As thou me boughtest, so me defend."³⁰ Portia, in telling Bassanio to go pay the bond even if it costs twenty times the original amount, says to him, "Since you are dear bought, I will love you dear" (III.ii.314). Also in her conversation with Lorenzo as she is readying to leave Venice, she reiterates the idea of the redemption of man:

..... this Antonio

Being the bosom lover of my lord,
 Must needs be like my lord. If it be so,
 How little is the cost I have bestow'd
 In purchasing the semblance of my soul
 From out of the state of hellish cruelty!
 (III.iv.16-21)

History is another possible source for The Merchant of Venice. Siegel believes that Shakespeare intended his audience to associate Shylock with the Puritans who tried and eventually succeeded in getting the theatres closed, who supposedly hated music and who were closely associated with usury. He says, "These early Puritans were a radical minority, outsiders who were so sharply attacked and derided that one would have thought them scarcely human."³¹ In fact, Portia makes a very interesting distinction between Shylock and the Christian Venetians when she tells Shylock, "if thou dost shed / One drop of Christian blood, thy lands and goods / Are by the laws of Venice confiscate / Unto the state of Venice" (IV.i.310-313).

There is also the case of Queen Elizabeth's physician, Dr. Roderigo Lopez who was, through the efforts of Essex, arrested, tried and convicted of aiding in a plot against the queen's life. "Put on the rack, Lopez confessed to having received and concealed an offer of fifty thousand ducats to poison the queen; but he claimed that his intention had been merely to mulct the Spanish King."³² The queen was fond of Lopez; however, she was

fonder still of Essex and, furthermore, there had been many assassination attempts made on her life which perhaps forced her to make the final decision.

That Essex pursued the charges vigorously against Lopez is obvious; Durant suggests that the reason for Essex' hatred of the doctor was that Lopez had attended him and had then told of his ailments to others.³³ Lopez was drawn, quartered and hanged before the public; thus it may be assumed that there were probably few people in Shakespeare's audience who did not at least have an opinion about the incident, whether or not they attended the execution.

Boas further links this incident with the play, as others have done, suggesting that Shakespeare's use of the name "Antonio" for his hero-merchant was deliberate. A Portuguese name rather than Italian, Antonio was also the name of the pretender to the Portuguese throne whom Lopez was supposed to have conspired against and who became a hero after the execution.³⁴

Antonio is often considered to be somewhat of a flat character within the play. If he is viewed as the typical Renaissance gentleman, however, he has more depth. The qualities of a Renaissance gentleman, according to Shalvi, were in England "counterbalanced" by "humanism ... strongly infused with the spirit of Christianity."³⁵ These virtues originated with Aristotle and were well

known in Shakespeare's time as well as characteristics which he often used in his plays. They are as follows:

courage; temperance; which consists of the observance of due measure in bodily pleasures; liberality, which is "the means with regard to wealth, both in the gaining and giving of it;" magnificence, which is only possible to rich men; pride, or, as it has been variously termed, magnanimity ... which is the crown of virtues ... proper ambition; gentleness or good temper; modesty; moderation in leisure (i.e. correct social behavior--saying or listening to what one should): shame ("a kind of fear of dishonour, which is properly fitting only to youth"); justice; and friendship....³⁶

Antonio, like Shylock, must be viewed within the comic structure and not only as an entity unto himself.

It seems that no discussion of the source of The Merchant of Venice is complete without including a few comments about the debate of where Shakespeare stood with respect to Shylock. Critics seem to be somewhat divided upon the question of the playwright's possible anti-semitism. Charlton believes that Shylock is the result of a combination of "Shakespeare the Jew-Hater and of Shakespeare the dramatist."³⁷ Phialas, on the other hand, takes a much more objective view, suggesting that Shylock is a Jew for the same reason that Richard III has a malformed body--it is the symbol of his evil nature. Shakespeare wanted his usurer to create the same kind of "predictable impression."³⁸ Smith concurs saying, "Thus

on two historical condemnations, as both unbeliever and usurer, Shylock is branded a villain upon his first appearance in the play."³⁹ To Bronstein, the "image of the villain-Jew was absolutely necessary to the central theme of the play: the ideal of unconditional love."⁴⁰

Along these same lines of thought Berman says:

An unbelievable amount of time has been wasted in the attempt to prove that this play has its real origins in Shakespeare's anti-semitism. I reject this theory not because it would be painful to contemplate but because this form of prejudice was meaningless for the Elizabethans in general and appears in no conceivable form in other Shakespearian plays. The Old Testament itself is harder on most of⁴¹ its Jewish figures than Sh is on Shylock....

"Shakespearian commentary and scholarship," says Grebanier, "have tended to be as accurate as were the blind men about the elephant."⁴² He cites the tale of a wise man who called all of the blind men of the city together to touch the body of an elephant so that each would know exactly what an elephant was like. To each man, however, the elephant was something different, depending on what part of the body he touched.⁴³

Much of the criticism of The Merchant of Venice--and particularly Shylock--is based on just such a search for truth. The Jew is an enigma in many ways. He is not good or kind or noble in the manner of the Renaissance gentleman, nor is he totally evil. At times he is so

cryptic as to be nearly overwhelming.

Throughout the study and reading of this play, it is necessary to remember that it is first of all a comedy and therefore of a particular structure which Shakespeare used many times.

Though Shylock at times appears tragic, he is not a tragic hero in the traditional sense. The ambiguities of his character which provide unending interest also encourage tangents of runaway criticism.

Shylock may be viewed consistently on three levels: the historic, the archetypal and the literal. He is powerful, exciting and one of the most complex characters Shakespeare created.

Chapter II
Shylock and Usury

"That the word 'Jew' was associated with usury is a result not of Shakespeare's deliberate imposition," says Grebanier, "but of long precedence...."¹ In fact, according to Poliakov, the "Jewish usurer ... has been promoted to the dignity of an archetype because behind him stood the silhouette of another archetype: that of Judas Iscariot, the man with the thirty pieces of silver."² Certainly to the Elizabethans the two words Jew and usurer were synonymous, largely because of legend and literature, though historical influence of this idea cannot be discounted, as the Jews had an unusually important role in English economic history:

From the start they managed to associate closely with kings in their operations, turning over to the royalty the notes of defaulting debtors in return for a share of the sums due.... During a period of rapid national expansion in the twelfth century the Jews became rich by advancing money to the barons and to the clergy, whose needs for legal tender and appetites for luxury were considerable.... They were subject not to regular taxes but to special contributions that the kings demanded in case of need--especially for the Crusades.³

Nowhere in Europe did the Jews enjoy such an important position in financial dealings but their fall like their

rise was meteoric. When they were extorted to the place that no more money could be "contributed" they were forced out. Thus they were expelled from England in 1290 by Edward I and were not permitted back until Cromwell readmitted them in 1655.

The vocation of usury was thrust upon the Jews primarily as a result of their lack of rights. They were not permitted citizenship in most of the places in which they lived, nor were they able to bear arms. They were usually forbidden to own land; they were often refused membership in the trades and guilds; and because of high agricultural taxes, they were usually not farmers.⁴ They often lived simply, keeping everything possible about their lives portable.⁵ As Morais indicates, "People living an insecure life, liable at any moment to be attacked or expelled, tended to become attached to money because this was one of the few means of wealth they could own and it was always easy to carry."⁶

Because they were considered "vassals of a special kind"⁷ or chatels of the aristocracy,⁸ they were not subject to Christian laws in regard to usury. As a result, they were "the one group of people who could engage in the necessary and lucrative trade.... The result was naturally a despised minority made rich and powerful by the religious decisions of Christian Europe."⁹

Usury had been considered an evil for centuries.

In Aristotle's words:

The most hated sort of money-making, and with greatest reason, is usury, which makes gain out of money itself, and not from the natural use of it. For money was intended to be used in exchange, but not to increase at interest. And this term usury, which means the birth of money from money, is applied to the breeding of money from money because the offspring resembles the parent. Wherefore of all modes of making money this is the most unnatural.¹⁰

The age of Elizabeth, however, because of increased trade and business interests had a need of capital which created a paradox. Usury was hated; it was wrong legally and morally and it was necessary.

Shylock's role as usurer is compared to that of a prostitute by Auden; the usurer is one who "has a special function in society but is an outcast from the community."¹¹ Hudson reiterates this idea of Shylock's alienation saying that "he can have no life among them but money; no hold on them but interest; no feeling towards them but hate; no indemnity out of them but revenge."¹²

Usurers were hated by the populace perhaps because they were so necessary and at the same time they were parasites. There was rarely a family that this despicable process did not touch in some way, either directly or indirectly. Because most people had strong feelings about it, usury as a topic for a play would have had

popular appeal. Mendilow expands this view of an approved playwright giving his public what it wanted by saying that in addition to usury, the motifs of the three caskets and the pound of flesh story with the stock character of the wicked Jew were stories that the people were familiar with and liked. "For them," he says, "the Jew was the unknown but traditional enemy, the devil masquerading in human guise to ruin the noble Christians."¹³ The execution of Lopez was also appealing as Boaz relates:

The popular excitement was kept alive by the publication of five official accounts of his treason.... The 'groundlings' with the execution of Lopez fresh in their minds would appreciate with more than usual zest plays which introduced members of his race in an odious light....¹⁴

The more educated element of the audience, according to Mendilow, would have, in addition to the melodrama, perhaps responded to the "problematics suggested by the plot, to the deeper contrasts of the two worlds, each with its own standards, its own morality, its own world outlook."¹⁵ Sinsheimer suggests that, "It was no easy task for the Elizabethan stage to fulfill the demands both of the courtier and the man on the street. But both--and all the others between as well--had a claim on it."¹⁶

Because there were few Jews in England, it becomes questionable how many Jews--particularly any who were

usurers--Shakespeare might have known. Chute among others considers this irrelevant saying that Shylock's character is not drawn from real life, that it is a "folk portrait" in a "folk play."¹⁷ Stoll substantiates this view: "In the Elizabethan drama and character-writing, then, the Jew is both money-lender and miser, a villain who hankers after the Christian's blood...."¹⁸ The stock character previously portrayed is transformed by Shakespeare into a human being. Ralli quotes Hugo as saying, "No single usurer is like Shylock: but from the mass of usurers steps forth one complete who is like Shylock."¹⁹ He is more than a stereotype--one who forces us to look at the world through his eyes if only for awhile.

Usury was a "sixteenth century issue" in the words of Auden, with the Church on one hand declaring it a mortal sin and the government on the other, agreeing but limiting the rate to ten percent.²⁰ The Church based its dictums upon the Bible in which there is much written against usury. It is considered wrong (Ezek. 18.8); it is forbidden to lend money at interest to the poor (Exod. 23.25); and it is sinful to practice usury with one's own brother (Deut. 23.19). White says, "It would be safe to say that usury is the burden of more sermons and passages in sermons on social wrong of the time than any other single factor in contemporary life."²¹ Stoll

agrees: "No doctrine of the Church was ever less disputed or less obeyed."²²

The government on the other hand was influenced by the populace as is confirmed by Durant:

Men and women loved money as passionately then as now. Interest on loans had been forbidden by Parliament as late as 1552 as a "vice most odious," but the growing strength of business forces in the Commons led to the Usury Bill of 1571, which distinguished interest from usury....²³

This practice had far-reaching effects on English society and the two branches of society most adversely affected were the "very poor, and the young gentlemen, prodigals easily gulled by unprincipled money-mongers."²⁴
Draper explains further:

Lodge exposed the whole system by which a "Solicitour" would frequent taverns, allure "Novices" to borrow at ruinous rates, help them riot the money away, demand the indorsement of friends and relations at each extension of the loan, and so in the final forfeiture impoverish whole families.²⁵

Mendilow and Siegel both have made somewhat extensive comparisons of Shylock to the Puritans. Mendilow says, "The great merchants and experts in money matters in England were not Jews but Christians, and especially Puritans."²⁶ And if Thomas Wilson's "Discourse Upon Usury" is accurate, the usurer with whom most Elizabethans dealt was a deceptive character to say the least. In

Siegel's words:

The contemporary usurer, Wilson repeats several times, is worse than the Jewish money-lender, who no longer existed in England since Judaism was outlawed. The Jewish money-lender ... had at least followed his own creed and did not pretend to be a member of the Christian commonwealth. And the typical contemporary usurer is the Puritan.²⁷

There is much historical evidence of the harsh demands of the Christian usurers. Grebanier cites records of Florentine bankers charging as much as two-hundred and sixty-six percent interest.²⁸ The Jews were often recalled to a city or country from which they had been expelled, says Poliakov, by a "common outcry of the people."²⁹

We have no word from Shakespeare that Shylock's rates were excessive except in comparison to Antonio who charged none. Bloom says, "So he is a moneylender; he does not cheat men, he only takes advantage of their need.... What he does is neither noble nor generous, but it is not unjust."³⁰

One of the reasons that usury was resented perhaps was that the money-lender took little risk in comparison to the merchant he did business with. "Men in love with the sea or money ventured across oceans to find new trade routes.... A fury of shipbuilding was engendered by the quest for markets and colonies...."³¹ Therefore,

while men like Antonio risked life, limb and fortune-- who did indeed "hazard" all they had--societal vultures like Shylock sat back and waited for their interest to accrue or the right to confiscate property, real or otherwise.

Shakespeare was not immune to the usurer either, for according to Mendilow, the Globe Theatre "was built with money borrowed at a high rate of interest."³²

Draper adds to this by saying:

The players themselves sometimes had reason to be bitter at the demands of Henslowe and others who supplied them with buildings and furnishings; and thus both audience and actors had personal motives for hating the usurer.³³

Many critics have suggested that one of the themes of The Merchant of Venice is the opposing roles of love and money. The history of Elizabeth's reign gives credence to this theory. In White's words:

At home they saw the countryside passing from the hands of the old nobility and gentry into the hands of the commercial middle classes with their habits of speculation and efficient exploitation of the means of profit. And as they looked still further abroad, they were face to face with the mysteries of international finance which baffled their governments' best efforts to understand, let alone control.³⁴

Durant reiterates this idea:

The commercial spirit grew as London became

one of the thriving marts and centers of the world. The unlit streets were brightened with goods; a traveler to many countries judged the London goldsmiths' establishments as the most sumptuous anywhere. Business men were cramped for quarters, and some used the nave of St. Paul's Cathedral as temporary offices, confident that Christ had changed His mind since Calvin; lawyers dealt with clients there, men counted out money on the tombs, and in the courtyard hucksters sold bread and meat, fish and fruit, ale and beer.³⁵

If Shakespeare witnessed this scene, it perhaps inspired him to write a play reminiscent of Christ throwing the money-changers out of the temple. "His aim was not to attack Jews but to attack the greed and materialism of the Christians all about him," says Bronstein.³⁶ "It was the 'Jew' who could best be used to bring the contrast with 'Christian' and to ask 'which is which?'"³⁷

In Auden's opinion, Shakespeare could have made Shylock a greater villain by placing him in a "medieval agricultural society," a place where a man might become bankrupt overnight by a stroke of nature, "but he places him in a mercantile society where the role played by money is a very different one."³⁸ It is interesting that Shakespeare sets the play in Venice; the historian Roth notes that the Jews were better off in Italy during the Renaissance than anywhere in the world. The Italian Jew thought, spoke, acted and lived like any other Italian. He was "profoundly Italian."³⁹ In addition, Durant

says that "Jewish youths attended the University and an increasing number of Christians studied Hebrew."⁴⁰

"Venice was a republic; one of the few successful examples of such a political organization in its time...."⁴¹ Perhaps even more important than that, however, was the fact that

Venice was above all a commercial city and had indeed succeeded in bringing together in one place more different types of men than any other city. The condition of Shylock's living in Venice was its need of venture capital for its enterprises.⁴²

There is much similarity between the Venice of the Renaissance and the London during Elizabeth. The Elizabethan age was one that was coming into its own. In education, religion, art and business, it was comprised of a people who were expanding their wings to the four corners of the world, embracing new ideas, engaging in exciting business ventures and adopting new life styles. It is certainly a stroke of human fortune that Shakespeare would live in this most exhilarating period of English history. In Durant's words:

These are the three epochal gifts of the world's drama, and we must, despite our limitations, welcome them all to our deepening, thanking our heritage for Greek wisdom, French beauty, and Elizabethan life.
(But, of course, Shakespeare is supreme.)⁴³

Chapter III.

Shylock: "Humanity in Inhumanity"

Hugo said of Shakespeare: "The whole human race is contained within his brain."¹ None of his characters exemplifies the diversity and capacity of his human empathy any more than Shylock and certainly none has attracted any more attention. Zesmer expresses the controversy rather well:

Comic Shylocks, malevolent Shylocks, heroic Shylocks, allegorized Shylocks, and even a few Shylocks dwindled by critics to near insignificance--there is no end to the discussion.²

Matchett suggests that the contradictions upon which the play is built are what enabled Shakespeare "to achieve fullness of character."³ "Shylock is both the embodiment of an irrational hatred," says Murray, "and a credible human being. He is neither of these things to the exclusion of the other."⁴

There are many times in the play when Shylock is either directly or indirectly called a devil. Bronstein more specifically notes that "Shylock is referred to as 'the Jew' over sixty times and as a Jew he is repeatedly associated in one form or another with the devil."⁵ Such an idea is as old as that of the Jew as usurer.

It was assumed in the early days of Christianity that since the Jews did not acknowledge Christ as the Son of God they surely must be in league with the devil. To the Christian world, says Sinsheimer, they were "suffering witnesses" being punished "for their lack of true faith," a crime against Jesus Christ.⁶ To the Jews, the devil was little more than a symbol, perhaps because they believed that they had more to fear from Yahweh; but to the Christians, Satan was the "arch enemy of mankind, seeking to destroy it, as Jesus had come to save it."⁷ In league with the devil from the beginning, then, they were his agents on earth and must be treated accordingly. Trachtenberg quotes Chrysostom of Antioch:

[They] Jews sacrificed their sons and daughters to devils.... They are become worse than the wild beasts, and for no reason at all, with their own hands they murder their own offspring to worship the avenging devils who are the foes of our life.⁸

Though Shylock is often called a devil, we do not see him practicing magic or sorcery. All we know about him really is that he is a usurer. He agrees to loan the money to Antonio for the principle or a pound of flesh, but Antonio apparently does not have the remotest idea that he may not be able to repay the debt on time. He says to Bassanio, "Why, fear not, man; I will not forfeit it:/ Within these two months, that's a month before / This

bond expires, I do expect return / Of thrice three times
the value of this bond" (I.iii.157-160).

Shylock hates Antonio--he tells us as much (I.iii.43)--
and he later claims to Bassanio that he probably would
kill that which he hates, but there is no indication that
he has ever killed before.

In addition to being called a devil, he is also
referred to several times as a dog, or having currish
qualities. Spurgeon says of this image that it was used
so many times by the playwright to evoke a certain feel-
ing that it represents one of the things that "rouses
Shakespeare's bitterest and deepest indignation"--"feigned
love and affection."⁹ An example from the play in which
critics see this quality in Shylock is his meeting with
Antonio to discuss the loan. He greets the merchant
with fawning pretense after having expressed in an aside
that he hates Antonio because "he is a Christian" (I.iii.43).
With "obsequious courtesy"¹⁰ Shylock says, "Rest you, fair,
good signior; / Your worship was the last man in our
mouths" (I.iii.59-60). Continuing a few lines later, he
says:

I would be friends with you, and have your love,
Forget the shames that you have stain'd me with,
Supply your wants, and take no doit
Of usance for my moneys, and you'll not hear me:
This is kind I offer. (I.iii.139-142)

Antonio does not mistake his true feelings as indicated by his words to Bassanio:

The devil can cite Scripture for his purpose.
 An evil soul, producing holy witness,
 Is like a villain with a smiling cheek,
 A goodly apple rotten at the heart.
 O, what a goodly outside falsehood hath!
 (I.iii.98-103)

Another possible example of Shylock's falseness is that moment when he reminds the Christians:

You have among you many a purchas'd slave,
 Which like your asses and your dogs and mules,
 You use in abject and slavish parts,
 Because you bought them: shall I say to you,
 Let them be free, marry them to your heirs?
 Why sweat they under burdens? let their beds
 Be as soft as yours, and let their palates
 Be season'd with such viands? you will answer:
 'The slaves are ours:' so do I answer you:
 The pound of flesh which I demand of him,
 Is dearly bought; tis mine and I will have it:
 (IV.i.90-100)

This speech is often used by critics as ammunition against the Christians; however, if read carefully, it is obvious that Shylock is not interested in slavery as an issue. He is using what he ascertains to be the Christian morality--or the lack of it--to justify his own demand for Antonio's blood. Compare his speech to the following:

Then took Mary a pound of ointment of Spike-
 nard, very costly, and annointed the feet of
 Jesus, and wiped his feet with her hair: and

the house was filled with the odour of the ointment. Then saith one of his disciples, Judas Iscariot, Simon's son, which should betray him, Why was not this ointment sold for three hundred pence, and given to the poor? Thus he said, not that he cared for the poor; but because he was a thief, and had the bag, and bare what was put therein. Then said Jesus, Let her alone: against the day of my burying hath she kept this.

(John 12.3-7)

Spurgeon suggests, then, that the dog as an image was linked to two things in Shakespeare's mind which he hated: the Elizabethan habit of keeping dogs at the table, "licking the hands of the guests, fawning and begging for sweetmeats" and the "fawning of insincere friends, bowing and flattering for what they hope to get, and turning their backs when they think no more is coming to them."¹¹ She also notes that this image is central in Timon of Athens, where in addition to their "fawning" and "licking" there are "hounds feasting on the blood of the animal they have killed."¹²

This thirsting for blood is associated with Shylock throughout the play, but especially when he emulates the Vice and whets his knife on his shoe during the trial, in anticipation of collecting his "due" (IV.i.121).

The Christians never say that they hate Shylock, but much of their behavior says it for them. Every time Shylock is called dog or when he relates a conversation in which he has been called dog, there is always a feeling of the utmost contempt attached to it.

When discussing the rate of the loan with Antonio, the merchant reminds Shylock that he does not charge interest and they argue. Shylock says to Antonio, "You call me misbeliever, cut-throat dog, / And spit upon my Jewish gaberdine, / And all for use of that which is my own" (I.iii.110-113). And a few lines later, Shylock repeats the charge, "And foot me as you spurn a strange cur / Over your threshold ... (I.iii.119-120).

After Jessica has fled, Salarino and Salanio are discussing Shylock's reaction and Salanio calls him dog: "I never heard a passion more confused, / So strange, outrageous, and so variable, / As the dog Jew did utter in the streets ... " (II.viii.12-14). Also, when the note is due, Antonio and Salanio meet Shylock with the jailer on the street when Antonio tries to talk to Shylock, but he refuses. Salanio says of the Jew, "It is the most impenetrable cur / That ever kept with man" (III.iii.17-18).

Gratiano, too, among his taunts at the trial says to Shylock, "O, be thou damn'd, execrable dog!" (IV.i.128).

Noble points out, "In the Bible 'dog' is frequent as a term of abstract contempt; the Gentiles were 'dogs' as were those who hired themselves out for purposes of unnatural vice."¹³ This term could have a double-edged meaning of contempt, then, since it was used by the Jews as a method of abuse for non-Jews. Perhaps being called "dog" is the most degrading name Shylock could be called--

a Gentile--in addition to its unpleasant connotation with his questioned humanity.

Frazer also tells of dogs being used as scapegoats in primitive societies, first tempted with sweetmeats then sacrificed for the benefit of the community as a vehicle for removing evil.¹⁴ In addition, Stoll says that "in France ... until the fourteenth century, when a Jew was hanged it was head downwards between two dogs."¹⁵

Gratiano brings up the idea of hanging numerous times during the trial when he compares Shylock to a wolf saying that

..... thy currish spirit
 Govern'd a wolf, who, hang'd for human slaughter,
 Even from the gallows did his fell soul fleet,
 And whilst thou lay'st in thy unhallow'd dam
 Infus'd itself in thee; for thy desires
 Are wolfish, bloody, starv'd and ravenous.
 (IV.i.133-138)

Animals were often hanged, particularly sows, as Sitwell relates:

In the dark centuries, blind punishments were wreaked by mankind upon poor beasts who sinned because they had only their instincts to guide them--or who were sinless but had been used for sport by Nature. Such punishments were meted out to a sow who, convicted in France in 1457 of 'murder flagrantly committed on the person of Johann Martin, aged five,' was sentenced to be hanged by the hind feet from a tree or gibbet.... Her six sucklings were reprieved since there was no evidence against them.¹⁶

Later, in the same scene, Gratiano makes more suggestions that Shylock should be hanged, saying that he will not have left the money to buy a rope, and when Antonio is asked if he will show mercy to Shylock, Gratiano tells him to give Shylock a rope! (IV.i.380).

These references are often thought inspired by the Lopez incident, because of the similarity of Lopez and lupus which is the Latin word for wolf.

Antonio also compares Shylock to a wolf, saying: "You may as well use question with the wolf, / Why he hath made the ewe bleat for the lamb" (IV.i.73-74). The symbol gathers additional import here perhaps when it is recalled that lambs were used for sacrifices by the Jews and also Christians were considered lambs of Christ. This is an appropriate comparison, as Antonio looks upon himself both as a sacrifice and as a favored child of God. In fact, he refers to himself as a "tainted wether of the flock, / Meetest for death" (IV.i.114-115).

Nash considers the lines devoted to comparing Shylock to a wolf pertinent, because "Shylock is beset by four of the Seven Deadly Sins, and three of them (Avarice, Envy and Wrath) can be symbolized in Renaissance literature by the wolf."¹⁷ [It is assumed, though the author does not specify, that he considers the fourth to be pride as Shylock was not guilty of gluttony, lust or sloth.]

Another aspect of Shylock's devilish nature is

evident in his revenge. Some critics believe that he did not seek Antonio's life until after Jessica fled, while others believe that he never wanted anything else.

Jessica substantiates the latter idea in conversation with Bassanio, Portia and Salanio:

When I was with him, I have heard him swear
To Tubal and to Chus, his countrymen,
That he would rather have Antonio's flesh
Than twenty times the value of the sum
That he did owe him ... (III.ii.285-289)

Of Shylock's great speech asserting his similarity to all mankind, Fripp says that it "contains nothing of religion, not a word to suggest common ground between Christianity and Judaism."¹⁸ Bloom, in spite of this, finds this speech very revealing of Shylock's character:

But, sadly, if one looks at the list of similar characteristics on which Shylock bases his claim to equality with his Christian tormentors, one sees that it includes only things which belong to the body; what he finds in common between Christian and Jew is essentially what all animals have in common. The only¹⁹ spiritual element in the list is revenge.

Palmer comments on this animalistic imagery as well, though he does not limit its effect to Shylock:

This is not merely ideological bigotry: they respond to each other through their bodies, in a savage, primitive way, and the essence of such a response is that, neither regards the other as a fellow man.²⁰

While this speech of Shylock's is often considered noble in its pleas for equality, Echeruo says, "He is justifying his determination for revenge."²¹ Hazlitt agrees, saying that his "desire for revenge is inseparable from the sense of wrong."²²

Whatever sense of purpose he may have had is obliterated by the pain of his daughter's disappearance in Bloom's opinion, for "now his life is carried on only in response to the Christians whom he hates; it has no solid content of its own."²³ In Hazlitt's words, Shylock is a "good hater," though perhaps not without some reason as Van Doren suggests:

His [Shakespeare's] gentlemen within the code are as harsh to Shylock as Shylock is to them, however much love they have, they cannot love him.... Yet Shylock is not a monster. He is a man, thrust into a world bound not to endure him.²⁴

Such insight into his humanity does not, however, lessen his guilt. Moody suggests that Shylock is "fully responsible for the inhuman act he proposes."²⁵ That he deserves what he gets at the hands of the Christians is Zeeveld's opinion, not because of his preoccupation with money or his perhaps righteous anger, but because of his terrible "vindictiveness."²⁶ Brandes agrees, saying, "Avaricious though he may be, money is nothing to him in comparison to revenge."²⁷

Shylock's vengeful nature shows, not only in his seeking the bond, but also in small ways. He is reminiscent of the usurers mentioned in the previous chapter who not only sought possible victims for their business, but then tried to help them spend it in foolish ways, hoping to hasten them into bankruptcy. Shylock seems to do this with Lancelot when the clown goes to work for Bassanio: "Therefore I part with him, and part with him / To one that I would have him help to waste / His borrow'd purse ..." (II.v.49-51).

His attitude is similar when he goes to dine with Antonio and Bassanio. "But yet I'll go in hate, to feed upon / The prodigal Christian" (II.v.14-15). His desire for the pound of flesh has become palpable; he is already savoring it, though the bond has just been made.

Siegel indicates that, "The cannibalistic images which are associated with Shylock throughout the play are suggestive of the medieval legends, continuing through the Renaissance, that Jews delighted in secretly feasting on the flesh of murdered Christians...."²⁸

Shylock's revenge is illustrative, not only of his devilish side, but also of his humanness. He is powerful in his pain. Burkhardt says:

In his mouth the common language assumes a force which puts all genteel speech to shame and reduces gentle speech to impotence. It mocks and makes a mockery of all sentimental claims.

to a 'higher truth,' clothed in elevated and elevating rhetoric....²⁹

Richmond adds:

Shylock's conduct also demonstrates that one becomes what one hates. Ostensibly Shylock favors the maintenance of social decorum ... at any cost to the individual, rightly esteeming that the broad sweep of human interrelationships in a society as complex as Venice cannot be regulated simply by private feelings, whatever Antonio thinks.³⁰

Interpretation of Shylock's apparent lack of devotion to his daughter is fuel for the fire of the critics who call him inhuman. It is the concensus of their opinion that she is justified in running away, that she was not stealing when she took the ducats; she was only taking what would have belonged to her anyway in the form of a dowery. Bloom has a more empathetic opinion of Shylock's feeling, saying that he cared for her because she was his blood relation, and had she remained, she would be loved still;³¹ however, she broke the law not once, says Golden, but three times: when she deserted her father, when she robbed him, and when she disguised herself as a boy.³² To Shylock "she is no more," says Bloom, "and he must forget her for she existed for him as a human only so long as she was faithful."³³ This is rather a harsh indictment, and in spite of the fact that to Shylock the law is of supreme importance, Sinsheimer considers this "mutual lack of love ...

the most un-Jewish feature of their characters."³⁴

Another un-Jewish quality of Shylock is his decision to eat with Antonio. The Jews were very strict about their eating habits, as Shylock suggests (I.iii.34f). First he says he will not go, but then we find him going, though he complains that he was not asked out of love (II.v.11-14).

Perhaps the most uncharacteristically Jewish quality Shylock possesses is his sense of revenge. Reik says, "There is somewhere in the Talmud, the collection of Jewish civil and canonical law, the prescription that not the offender but the person who has been affronted has first to give the sign that he wishes to be friends again."³⁵

It cannot be put into a paragraph the terrible sufferings the Jews have endured throughout the centuries. Durant notes that their "ability to recover from misfortune is one of the most impressive wonders of history...."³⁶ Poliakov refers to the continual massacres not as a "struggle between two camps" but as "an upheaval of nature."³⁷ They did not survive unbelievable brutality by fighting back. They were not permitted to carry arms and they were terribly outnumbered. But more than the impossibility of revenge was their devotion to the law. God gave the law to Moses and it was precise: "To me belongeth vengeance and recompence; their foot shall

slide in due time: for the day of their calamity is at hand, and the things that shall come upon them make haste" (Deut.32.35).

Through all their pain, down deep the Jews have always believed "that the sins of the chosen people have not been sufficiently expiated."³⁸ Their plea, says Poliakov, is thus:

May the blood of the reverent be our merit and our expiation for us, our children, and our grandchildren, for all eternity, even as the sacrifice of Abraham, who bound his son Isaac on the altar in order to sacrifice him. Let these just, these pure, these perfect men become our advocates before the Lord, and may He soon deliver us from our exile. Amen!³⁹

Poliakov further comments:

While each Jewish victim was regarded as a warrior fallen on the field of honor, the battle waged by the Jews was not like other battles. Making a virtue out of necessity, the Jews of Europe resolutely took the path of a purely passive resistance to evil (evil is equated with Christian society) and revealed a tenacity of which history offers no other examples....⁴⁰

Shylock appears insensitive to the history of his ancestors as he says, "The curse never fell upon our nation til now" (III.i.92). The interesting thing is that he makes this comment, not as a result of Jessica's running away, but because she took a diamond which had cost Shylock "two-thousand ducats in Frankfurt!" (III.i.91).

Smith denies that Shylock's apparent devotion to the letter of the law is indication that he is likewise faithful to his religion; he considers it a pretense, a hypocritical mask Shylock wears to disguise his evil:

What Shakespeare is really trying to do through Shylock is to depict a character who rationalizes his villainy ... by projecting his own ethnic group prejudice on to the shoulders of his innocent opponents.⁴¹

"Ironically," says Siegel, "Shylock, the typical Jew for the anti-Semites, is like the hate filled racist."⁴² Myrick also sees the inflexibility of Shylock's character not noble, but racist: "The modern parallel to Shylock is not the Jews. It is the Nazi persecutors of the Jews."⁴³

Golden believes that Jessica's running off with a Christian is reason enough for Shylock's vengefulness and that his reaction to the news that she had traded her mother's ring for a monkey lends a special poignancy to his words:⁴⁴ "Out upon her! Thou torturest me, / Tubal: it was my turquoise; I had it of Leah / When I was a bachelor: I would not have given / it for a wilderness of monkeys" (III.i.128-131). Of his painful response, Bloom says:

This is the expression of a man practiced to a parsimony of sentiment but whose sentiments

for that reason are deep and unutterable. It is different from the effusiveness of Antonio's expressions of love; but is it not equal?⁴⁵

It is obvious from Shylock's words that the ring belonged to him, that it was not part of the dowery. One could perhaps understand Jessica's taking a keepsake of her mother, but to trade it for a monkey? It is not too difficult to agree with Weiss when he says, "All may be adjudged contaminated by money, interested in each other mainly as useable or profitable objects."⁴⁶ Holland believes there is an explanation for Jessica's behavior:

Venice is hard-boiled, commercial, realistic, and predominantly masculine; in fact, three times women have to disguise themselves as men in Venice. Presiding over this world as a kind of malignant deity is the father, Shylock. It is he who established this atmosphere of competition, aggression, of having to pay a price for a favor, for everything. It is he who makes Venice a place of risk and chance in which love must mask itself and hide and hoard and steal. Only when you get out from under his spell can you throw money away (as Jessica does).⁴⁷

Bronstein suggests that Shakespeare might have foreseen

that day when the urgent new commercial values would so suffuse human relationships that nothing would be done for love or friendship or the sake of giving alone, but only for the sake of gain; ... and even the most important human relationships such as those between husband and wife,

parent and child, would be judged in terms
of commercial analogy....⁴⁸

"For Shylock the only things that have meaning or value
are those which are visible, explicit and calculable...."⁴⁹

When his daughter flees, we have an image of him created
by Salanio who repeats his jagged sentences:

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, stol'n from me by my daughter!
And jewels! two stones, two rich and precious
stones,
Stol'n by my daughter! Justice! find the girl!
She hath the stones upon her, and the ducats.
(II.viii.15-22)

Shylock's "bags of ducats" calls to mind Judas and his
bag containing the thirty pieces of silver which is
often mentioned in the New Testament. One such example
of this was cited earlier in the passage about Mary and
the expensive ointment with which she annointed the feet
of Jesus (John 12.3-7). In another, Jesus told his disci-
ples that one among them would betray Him, but they mis-
understood when He said to Judas, "That thou doest, do
quickly" (John 13.27).

Now no man at the table knew for what intent
he spake this unto him. For some of them
thought, because Judas had the bag, that Jesus
had said unto him, Buy those things that we
have need of against the feast; or, that he
should give something to the poor.
(John 13.28-29)

Jews were often portrayed in art wearing yellow cloaks, conical hats, the dreaded badge, and carrying a bag and skulking. Not until Rembrandt, who lived among them and who "was fascinated by their old men, their beards dripping wisdom, their eyes remembering grief," were they painted with empathy.⁵⁰

As evidenced in Shylock's words at his discovery that Jessica is gone, he cannot decide which is more important, the missing ducats or the missing daughter. Shylock devotes his time to making money and hoarding it and at the same time maintaining his rigid standards. The Christians, on the other hand, mix their fondness for wealth with friendship, humor and love; money gives them the freedom to do what they want. Jesus said:

Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt, and where thieves break through and steal.... For where your treasure is, there will your heart be also.

(Matt. 6.19,21)

Shylock's treasure (heart) is locked in his cold, multiplying but unfruitful ducats.

Shylock has his side, however; he is not always treated with love and Christian charity. Shakespeare is the first writer "in seven hundred years of 'Jew literature' in Europe," says Golden, who "had given the Jew a motive. Then he put the cloak of a 'human being' around

him."⁵¹

Antonio has allegedly spit on Shylock and tells him he might do it again. Grebanier holds the opinion that Antonio did not really spit on the Jew. "[N]othing in his behaviour ... could possibly be consonant with such conduct."⁵² He says further:

But if we were asked to believe that this is the truth, it would be Shakespeare's practice to show us Antonio conducting himself elsewhere in the play in a manner consistent with such an act.⁵³

Shylock accuses him of spitting to his face, however, and Antonio does not deny it, but rather suggests it will happen again. There are a few times in the play when Shylock is not consistent with what he says and what he does, the most prominent being when he says he will not dine with Antonio and then does in spite of his own protestations; so perhaps this incident is a moot point.

Spurgeon considers this speech (I.iii.107-130) of great import:

[I]t is clear from the way the Jew dwells on it (5 times in 17 lines) that it is the outcome of his deepest feeling, and sums up symbolically in itself the real and sole reason for his whole action--bitter rancour of the contemptuous treatment he has received, and desire for revenge.⁵⁴

"It is none the less astounding," says Brandes aptly,

"how much humanity in inhumanity, Shakespeare has succeeded in imparting to Shylock."⁵⁵

In spite of his being "an unimpressive and morally ambiguous figure,"⁵⁶ the following words of Lorenzo have attracted much attention:

The man that hath no music in himself,
Nor is not mov'd with concord of sweet sounds,
Is fit for treasons, strategems, and spoils;
The motions of his spirit are dull as night,
And his affections dark as Erebus:
Let no such man be trusted....(V.i.83-88)

Not unlike other critics, Aronson believes that Shylock's inhuman nature is a result of his dislike of music; in fact his way of saying it is not much different than Lorenzo's, though infinitely less poetic:

For the absence of music in a man's spiritual make-up would indicate an unhealthy predominance of conscious ego-centered forces, and therefore a strong, possibly irresistible inclination to do evil for evil's sake.⁵⁷

Spurgeon notes that in The Merchant of Venice the "distribution of images is unusual; it is very uneven, varying with the tone and subject, and in no other play I believe, is the unevenness so marked...."⁵⁸ She does attest, however, to the importance of Shakespeare's use of music: "He associates the purest emotion and the most spiritual condition known to man with music and harmony...."⁵⁹

Moreover, Long comments on the use of music in the background of two of the most important scenes in the play:

In the casket scene, the song contains the key which resolves the emotional tension created by Bassanio's predicament; in the garden scene the instrumental music and poetry resolve the emotional tension with which we are left at the end of the preceding act.⁶⁰

Rabkin says about the play, "At every point at which we want simplicity we get complexity."⁶¹ This is true of Antonio who appears upon the first reading perhaps to be the simplest of characters. Of the relationship between the merchant and the Jew, Palmer comments that "it is clear that the antagonism between them runs far deeper than a business rivalry or a theological dispute."⁶² There seems to exist between the two an instinctive hatred so deep that they "can never mix socially however much they deal together commercially."⁶³

"To do away with their hostility," says Bloom, "the beliefs of each would have to be done away with, those beliefs which go from the very depths to the heights of their souls."⁶⁴ Because they have no "common ground," one must be right and the other wrong and to universalize one way of life or the other would cause one to be destroyed.⁶⁵ For Antonio to survive, then, "the Jew must cease to be."⁶⁶

The relationship between Antonio and Bassanio is no less complex. A lot of critics appear to misunderstand Antonio's friendship with Bassanio conceiving it to be more--or less--than it is. The homosexual explanation of Antonio's sadness, because of Bassanio's approaching involvement with Portia, is perhaps not illogical if viewed in a totally subjective manner; however, within the framework of the comedy it is cumbersome and unnecessary, the kind of criticism perhaps that Rabkin compares to that which describes "the girlhood of his [Shakespeare's] heroines."⁶⁷

The idea of platonic love was one that Shakespeare often used. Knight cites many examples in different plays where Shakespeare had his characters show love to each other on a totally spiritual level, indicating that "[e]xpressions of such friendships were common enough, and fashionable in Elizabethan society...."⁶⁸ Within the realm of the Renaissance gentleman, friendship is of supreme importance. Morgan says, "Platonic love is a disciplined, passionate commitment to all that is good and true and beautiful."⁶⁹ Continuing, he explains further:

But this man is far from the soul-sick lover we refer to in the phrase "Platonic lover." The real Platonic lover is a well-balanced, vigorously active man. He does not spend most of his time devising new physical-erotic

delights, but neither does any healthy man. He takes truth more seriously than do his myopic fellow-citizens. He is not ashamed of doing political work to improve the human community, for he remembers that polis is the same root word as civis, meaning city-society, and he knows that a truly civilized man is a political man. Most important of all, his loving work is intelligently passionate precisely because it is consciously directed toward intelligibility itself: the beauty we as humans, and with us all creation, inherently and naturally seek.⁷⁰

Morgan was not writing about Antonio and Bassanio, but he might have been. We know Antonio cares for his fellow man, that he loans money without interest, that he is generous to his friends and that he has aided some of Shylock's victims. Salanio and Salarino, indistinguishable though they are in character, reveal much in their conversation. Salarino tells Salanio of the parting of Antonio and Bassanio when the latter left for Belmont:

A kinder gentleman treads not the earth.
 I saw Bassanio and Antonio part:
 Bassanio told him he would make some speed
 Of his return: he answer'd 'Do not so;
 Slubber not business for my sake, Bassanio,
 But stay the very riping of the time;
 And for the Jew's bond which he hath of me,
 Let it not enter in your mind of love:
 Be merry, and employ your chiefest thoughts
 To courtship and such fair ostents of love
 As shall conveniently become you there:'
 And even there, his eye being big with tears,
 Turning his face, he put his hand behind him,
 And with affection wondrous sensible
 He wrung Bassanio's hand; and so they parted.
 (II.viii.35-49)

Afterwards the two leave to go to Antonio's house to see

if they can cheer him, for not only has he lost his friend, there is also rumor that the merchant's ships have run into trouble.

Salanio also calls the merchant "the good Antonio, the honest Antonio-- / O, that I had a title good enough to keep his name company!--" (III.i.14-16).

We never hear Antonio say of Shylock, "I hate him because he is a Jew." It is this apparent nearness to perfection perhaps that magnifies the devilish quality of Shylock's character. In the beginning Antonio says in answer to Gratiano's question of why he is sad, "I hold the world but as the world, Gratiano: / A stage where every man must play a part, / And mine a sad one" (I.i.77-79). Whatever he suffers from, or whatever he is serious about, seems inevitable. There is a marked difference between the carefree manner of the other Christian Venetians and Antonio, who seems very pre-occupied with his own life.

He does not seem at all surprised that Bassanio needs money, nor does it appear unusual for Bassanio to be borrowing from him. The younger man explains his desire for another loan, comparing his financial condition to his boyhood games of shooting one arrow after another which was lost in hopes of recovering both (I.i.140-145).

Antonio is almost a father figure, very patient

and forgiving, acting as though his whole purpose in life is to provide some kind of sustenance to Bassanio. In fact, Salanio says in discussing Bassanio's leave-taking that he thinks Antonio "only loves the world for him [Bassanio]" (II.viii.50).

"Antonio's charity," says Hassell, "is also at least doubly flawed: it is selfish and directed towards only one man, not all man."⁷¹ Viewed subjectively, there is a certain amount of truth in this, though Lewalski finds defense for Antonio in the Scriptures: "Greater love than this hath no man, then any man bestoweth his life for his friends (John xv.13)."⁷² In addition she reminds the reader that Antonio shows his love for other members of his community by loaning money without interest and also by coming to the aid of Shylock's victims.⁷³ In everything but the "willingness to forgive injuries and to love enemies, ... Antonio is presented throughout the play as the very embodiment of Christian love...."⁷⁴

Ludowyk suggests that "Antonio, in the use of his wealth, comes near to the prescription given to the rich young ruler whom Christ advised to sell everything he had."⁷⁵

From the very beginning Antonio seems willing to play the martyr, an attitude he maintains throughout. He very nobly tells Bassanio not to argue with Shylock

but to let justice take its course, that after his death, Bassanio can do nothing more commendable than write his epitaph.

"He is, in short," Reik says, "pure caritas, pure Christ. And as a figure to be mutilated ... he resembles the mythical figures of Osiris, Attis, Adonis (and Christ)--the dying Gods."⁷⁶

Palmer says of Antonio's sadness that it "sets in motion the forces of division and disharmony which will take the play to the brink of tragedy before it is retrieved as a comedy."⁷⁷ As a Christ figure his sadness is relevant and perhaps easily explained. The night Christ was to be crucified he went to Gethsemane to pray:

And he took with him Peter and the two sons of Zebedee, and began to be sorrowful and very heavy. Then saith he unto them, My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death.... And he went a little farther, and fell on his face, and prayed, saying, O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me: nevertheless not as I will, but as thou wilt.

(Matt.26.37-39)

This turmoil of Christ prior to his crucifixion is told by all of the apostles and in practically the same way.

Levitsky compares Antonio to Christ in the merchant's desire to "supply the ripe wants of my friend" (I.iii.64).

In her words:

There is a striking analogy here with Matthew xii. 1-12, wherein Jesus defends the plucking of corn for the hungry and the healing of the sick on the sabbath. If his accusers (the Pharisees) had known the meaning of God's words, "I will have mercy, and not sacrifice," they would not, says Jesus, have condemned him.⁷⁸

In addition Bloom feels that the situation of the trial before Portia arrives parallels Pilate's tribunal at the trial of Christ. The Duke obviously believes Shylock unfair, but he refuses to make judgment, leaving that task up to Bellario's assistant without whom "the conclusion would also have been similar."⁷⁹

One aspect of Antonio's behavior which seems out of character with the Christ figure is the accusation Shylock makes of the merchant spitting on him. Reik takes the passage literally though he remembers an angry Christ in a similar situation:

Did He not go up to Jeruselem when Passover was at hand and abuse and whip the money-changers and drive them all out of the temple? Did he not pour out their money and overthrow their tables?⁸⁰

Previously it was mentioned about the expanding economy in Elizabethan England where business men were so desperate for places to meet that they used the nave of St. Paul's Cathedral to buy and sell. The similarity of Antonio's reaction to Shylock and the biblical passage Reik refers to is obvious:

And Jesus went into the temple of God, and cast out all them that sold and bought in the temple, and overthrew the tables of the moneychangers, and the seats of them that sold doves, And said unto them, It is written, My house shall be called the house of prayer; but ye have made it a den of thieves.
(Matt.21.12-13)

What then of Shylock? Is he a devil or a man, human or inhuman? Mézierès comments:

We see the miseries of riches, and the uncertainty of fortune; also the antagonism of races and oppression of the weak, and the bitterness left by persecution. Shylock's love of money has not stifled his feeling for man's dignity; riches do not console him for insult. He is impartially presented, neither attractive nor odious....⁸¹

Chapter IV.
Scapegoat Psychology
and
The Merchant of Venice

Frye says that the usual structure of Shakespeare's comedy is based on that of Plautus and Terence.¹ It is related to the "ritual forms preceding drama" of which there are three parts: the "gloomy period" of the scapegoat ritual, the "period of license and confusion of values" and the "period of festivity itself, the revel or komes which is said to have given its name to comedy."² Further, he says that The Merchant of Venice is an example of this comic structure: "the law that confirms Shylock's bond and justifies his action" is an example of the scapegoat ritual;³ the period of "license and confusion of values" is evidenced in Portia and Nerissa dressing up as men during the trial, as well as Jessica disguising herself during her escape from Shylock's house;⁴ and the period of festivity would, of course, be the reunion at Belmont in Act V.

Critics who believe Shylock to be totally evil from the beginning would perhaps recoil at the idea of him as a scapegoat figure; however, the fact that he fits the role does not preclude his own guilt. Barber says,

"Shylock is the opposite of what the Venetians are; but at the same time he is an embodied irony, troublingly like them. So his role is like that of the scapegoat...."⁵

Frazer suggests that the scapegoat ritual is as old as man himself, the result of believing that one's sins could be transferred as easily from one person to another as a load of "wood, stones, or what not" could be shifted from one's own back to that of another.⁶

"Upon this idea he acts, and the result is an endless number of very unamiable devices for palming off upon some one else the trouble which a man shrinks from bearing himself."⁷

Both Jung and Neumann have done in-depth studies with regard to the "shadow," the projection of which is the method man uses to eliminate his evil or sense of sin.⁸ The shadow is that side of man, that part of his unconsciousness which he cannot bear or refuses to face, the alien part which he must project on to an alien outside himself.⁹ Neumann believes that this side of man which he finds hard to acknowledge is the result of his consciousness not being strongly developed to the point that he can accept "his own evil." Continuing, he says, "It is for this reason that evil is invariably experienced by mass man as something alien, and the victims of shadow projection are therefore, always and

everywhere, the aliens."¹⁰

The Jews have been cast in the role of scapegoat continuously for centuries. This is ironic as the Jews were the first of the ancient peoples, who while understanding the need for the scapegoat ritual, were willing to use an animal rather than a human being.¹¹

Sartre refers to the Jews as being "perpetually aged."¹² This archaic quality they possess is also suggested by Fenichel to be connected to their role as scapegoats. The Jews have always been the foreigners. This is perhaps mostly due to the fact that they were never, from the time of the Roman Empire until the French Revolution, permitted full citizenship in most if not all of the countries in which they lived. In addition, they always looked foreign, the result of their restricted dress and cultural habits. Because they were usually forced to live in ghettos, they have perhaps tended to be clannish; and this, along with their strange religious habits, has caused them to be misunderstood.

One such practice which has always been controversial is that of circumcision which Freud believed to be connected to the harsh attitudes against the Jews.¹³

Fenichel says, "Psychoanalysts are of the opinion, therefore, that circumcision--which is strange yet familiar in unconscious depths--operates in the same way as the other customs which make the Jew appropriate as a

devil-projection."¹⁴

At the unconscious depth, circumcision, according to Reik is a symbol of castration. Further, he says, "If Shylock insists upon cutting out a pound of flesh from Antonio's breast, it is as if he demanded that the Gentile be made a Jew if he cannot pay back the three thousand ducats at the fixed time."¹⁵

Circumcision was a topic that Luther felt strongly about, particularly when he discovered that some Christians were adopting Judaism and its ways. He said, "I hope I shall never be so stupid as to be circumcised! ... I would rather cut off the left breast of my Catherine...."¹⁶ [Portia's answer for that might be, "Your wife would give you little thanks for that, / If she were by to hear you make the offer" (IV.i.289-90).]

Though the initial reason for using the Jews as scapegoats was that they killed Christ, Poliakov suggests that

this antagonism seems to feed on itself, irrespective of whether or not Jews inhabited a given territory. If the Jew no longer dwelt there, he was invented; and if the Christian population came into less and less conflict with Jews in daily life, it was increasingly obsessed by their image, which it found in reading, saw on monuments, and contemplated at plays and spectacles.¹⁷

And behind every mythical Jew, as was mentioned earlier, was the man with the thirty pieces of silver.

Some of the most gross representations of this image were perpetrated by the Church. St. Ambrose said with regard to Jews and Mohammedans, that it was not a sin to take usury "from him ... whom it would be no crime to kill."¹⁸ And Luther encouraged the Germans to "burn down the homes of Jews, to close the synagogues and schools, to confiscate their wealth, to conscript their men and women to forced labor, and to give all Jews a choice between Christianity and having their tongues torn out."¹⁹

The great firebrand of the Reformation also describes an example of the popular symbolization of the "delineation of Judaism in the form of a sow."²⁰ While this motif appeared on many churches, the most famous was on the one at Wittenberg:

Here in Wittenberg a sow is chiselled in stone at the church and under her lie suckling pigs and Jews sucking from her teats; behind the sow stands a rabbi who raises her tail and bends down and looks attentively beneath it into the Talmud, as if he wanted to read something special and ingenious....²¹

The portrayal of Jews in literature was similar. Some critics in defending Shakespeare against accusations of anti-semitism cite as their primary reason the expulsion of the Jews from England more than two-hundred and fifty years before Shakespeare was born. Because of this, it is believed that anti-semitism was not an issue during

Elizabeth's reign. The image, however, could survive without their presence. Nearly one hundred years after Edward I had expelled the Jews, Chaucer cited the story of Hugh of Lincoln in The Canterbury Tales. The Prioress tells the story of the alleged murder of the child and the aftermath of persecution which ensued.

Fenichel believes that the scapegoat theory provides the

means of satisfying these two contradictory tendencies at the same time: the rebellious tendency through destructive actions against defenseless people, and the respectful tendency through obedient action in response to the command of the ruling powers.... [T]he people believed that their enemies were likewise the enemies of the ruling powers.²²

Shylock plays the role of scapegoat as well as that of villain. His Jewishness and his personification of the guilt that afflicts all of Venice, in addition to the conflict he causes in the ordered society, make him a suitable victim.

In studying the scapegoat psychology of this play, it will be necessary to be subjective, pulling some of the lines out of context temporarily. The scapegoat idea, like that of Shylock's Jewishness, is inextricably threaded into the total pattern of The Merchant of Venice. Both may be individually examined, but in the final analysis they are only part--though a very

important part--of the total picture.

Viewing the Christians subjectively, then we may see them as Quiller-Couch says, as "cold-hearted wasters."²³ Bassanio takes advantage of Antonio's love for him so that he may borrow more money to woo the "lady richly left" (I.i.162). This is Bassanio's first description of Portia, not that she is beautiful and so desirable that, as Morocco says, "From the four corners of the earth they come, / To kiss the shrine, this mortal breathing saint:" (II.vii.39-40). Nor does he say that she has honor and character as Jessica suggests:

Why if two gods should play some heavenly match,
And on the wager lay two earthly women,
And Portia one, there must be something else
Pawn'd with the other, for the poor rude world
Hath not her fellow. (III.v.85-89)

Portia recognizes Bassanio for what he is, and for what he is not, but she loves him anyway. She tells him that she wishes she were "a thousand times more fair, ten thousand times / More rich;" (III.ii.154-155). She makes it very clear that she understands Bassanio's appreciation of money; for she says to him, "Since you are dear bought, I will love you dear" (III.ii.314).

She realizes when Bassanio receives the message from Antonio that this situation if not properly resolved will ruin her forthcoming marriage. She says, "For never

shall you lie by Portia's side / With an unquiet soul" (III.ii.306-307). Therefore, go and pay whatever you must to save your friend.

Money and love are no less intertwined in the relationship of Jessica and Lorenzo. Burkhardt is not gentle in his description of them:

They are spendthrift rather than liberal, thoughtless squanderers of stolen substance; they are aimless, drifting by chance from Venice to Genoa to Belmont. They are attended by a low-grade clown, who fathers illegitimate children.... Wherever we look, the Jessica and Lorenzo affair appears as an inversion of true, bonded love.²⁴

Felheim, as well, comments on the clown's "progress" which takes him from the ordered house of the Jew to the "loose morality" of the Christians.²⁵

With regard to Jessica, Gratiano who, in Bassanio's words, "speaks an infinite deal of nothing, more than any man in all Venice" (I.i.114-115), provides some interesting insight when he responds to Jessica's returning for more ducats to "gild myself" (II.vi.49) as she is preparing to flee her father's house: "Now, by my hood, a Gentile, and no Jew" (II.vi.51). This is questionable flattery of her transformation from a "lost" Jew into a "saved" Christian.

Antonio, noble gentleman that he is, has a few ironic qualities as well. Hyman says, "The bond legally

and literally binds Antonio to Shylock, but on a deeper level, it binds Antonio to Bassanio."²⁶ The following passage illustrates the critic's point:

Give me your hand, Bassanio: fare you well!
 Grieve not that I am fallen to this for you:
 For herein Fortune shows herself more kind
 Than is her custom: it is still her use
 To let the wretched man outlive his wealth,
 To view with hollow eye and wrinkled brow
 An age of poverty: from which lingering penance
 Of such a misery doth she cut me off.
 Commend me to your honourable wife:
 Tell her the process of Antonio's end;
 Say how I lov'd you, speak to me fair in death;
 And, when the tale is told, bid her be judge
 Whether Bassanio had not once a love.
 Repent but you that you shall lose a friend,
 And he repents not that he pays your debt;
 For if the Jew do cut but deep enough,
 I'll pay it instantly with all my heart.
 (IV.i.266-282)

Antonio mentions Bassanio's responsibility in his imminent death no less than six times in this passage. These lines are interesting for two other reasons as well. First it is obvious that Shakespeare was familiar with the scapegoat idea. In a primitive society, a man who was approaching old age would sometimes be selected as a scapegoat. We do not know Antonio's age, of course, but his prototype in Il Peccerone is the younger man's godfather.²⁷ It may be assumed, therefore, that he is at least middle-aged. The justification for choosing such a scapegoat was that he would be spared the "degeneracy" of old age.²⁸

Secondly, Antonio seems to consider Portia his rival in Bassanio's affections, or perhaps he realizes that his love for Bassanio will be supplanted by Portia's. In Hyman's words, "Antonio's action is no less brave or sympathetic, but simply more understandable and more interesting, when it is seen as a desperate attempt to equal Portia's love for Bassanio."²⁹ Further, he says, "To break this bond, . . . we need not only a clever judge, but Portia herself."³⁰

At the point when Shylock turns down the triple amount of the bond (IV.i.234), he sets himself up as a scapegoat. Whereas Antonio was originally the one to have suffered, a substitute has been found in Shylock. This is one of the ways he fits the role. Bronowski says, "When once the city can pay for the hubris of civilization, not with the true king's life, but the false king, it becomes natural to crown for this sad office a sad creature whom no one will mourn."³¹ Who would mourn Shylock? He is the object of hate and contempt, the devil-dog-Jew. The degeneration is complete, then, when "everything which symbolized that those who were once powerful are now spat upon."³² Gratiano provides this abuse all during the trial with his continual jibes at Shylock, calling him dog and wolf, and verbally hoping he will be hanged.

Dogs were one of the animals used as scapegoats and

Shylock, it has been noted, is referred to as a dog many times. Spurgeon says, "The irony and force of this symbol are heightened by Shylock's description of the ways Christians use their dogs...."³³ He tells them that they use their dogs in the same way that they use their slaves, simply because they are bought and paid for (IV.i.90-93).

Frazer indicates that another characteristic of the scapegoat was that it must be a person "chosen because of some mark or bodily defect, which the gods had noted and by which the victims were to be recognized."³⁴ It is an ancient belief that a Jew is recognizable anywhere. Montagu comments on these so-called characteristics which Jews are thought to possess:

From the standpoint of scientific classification, from the standpoint of physical anthropology, and from the standpoint of zoology there is no such thing as a Jewish physical type, and there is not, nor was there ever, anything even remotely resembling a Jewish 'race' or ethnic group..... The quality of looking Jewish is not due so much to any inherited characteristics of the persons in question as to certain culturally acquired habits of expression, facial, vocal, muscular, and mental....³⁵

Shylock is obviously the alien. His gabardine and the apparent characteristics of the Pantaloon and the stage Jew are enough to set him apart.

Shylock's scorn of the seemingly hypocritical Christ-

ians from whom he demands his bond, is "positivism triumphant ... and when the ornament is stripped away, they too have been relying on the positive laws of the social order."³⁶ Bronowski says, "In this fight against natural chaos, the guilt of society is that it is a society. The guilt is order and the guilty are those whose authority imposes order."³⁷ Shylock adopts this sin of order when he demands justice and the letter of the law: "If you deny it, let the danger light / Upon your charter and your city's freedom" (IV.i.38-39).

Reik sees in Shylock the personification of the whole Jewish people who rejected Christ as the Son of God and as a result unconsciously refused "to accept a poor gesture of reconciliation from His side." They are the Chosen People and they want to be treated as they were promised.³⁸ The psychologist says that the Old Testament is full of examples or "proofs ... that Jahveh has to redeem his sinful and rebellious people." Further he says:

Beneath their prayers, their demonstrations, and their display of remorse and guilt feelings is sometimes heard the appeal to Him-- not a cry for help or mercy, but a reminder of His obligation to turn His face to His children, to acknowledge them and to love them as He had promised.³⁹

Shylock becomes the eternal Jew in his pursuit of his bond. Reik continues:

No mercy--justice! One can imagine Shylock as representative of his people in a wrangle not with Antonio, but with God, standing on his right and demanding that the law He had given should be administered to the letter of the Book.⁴⁰

It is difficult to ascertain whether the Christians realize their own contribution of guilt. Murray believes them to be "unconscious." He says, "They do not realize ... that their morality is essentially no finer than Shylock's or rather that Shylock's is the logical consequence of their own."⁴¹ In addition, suggests Moody, we are disturbed

about the essential likeness of Shylock and his judges, whose triumph is even more a matter of mercenary justice than his would have been. In this view, the play does not celebrate the Christian virtues, so much as expose their absence.⁴²

Neumann suggests that in the scapegoat psychology guilt might not be recognized as one's own, but it "is nevertheless recognized as evil."⁴³

Antonio, in his "cold, austere morality," says Holaday, "is particularly cruel to Shylock." Further, he feels that Antonio "fails completely to understand that arrogance of this sort is the direct enemy of Christian charity."⁴⁴ Continuing, he says that "because of his spiritual blind spot, Christian Antonio rivals the Jew in his lack of Christian charity."⁴⁵

Several critics have noticed distinct similarities between Shylock and Antonio. Richmond says, "Neither Antonio's overt love nor Shylock's repressed hate is compatible with sustained social relationships, however virtuous both ways of life may seem."⁴⁶ Both characters are inevitably tied together: Shylock's defeat is Antonio's defeat because of Bassanio.⁴⁷ Auden points out that Shylock and Antonio are the two characters who did each "hazard all he hath:" and they are the ones who are still alienated from the harmony at the end.⁴⁸ Shylock is not at Belmont, and Antonio, though present is the only one without a marriage partner.

Because the Christians are unwilling or unable to recognize their guilt they, through the able Portia, "turn the tables" on Shylock and make him the victim. Portia's plea for mercy, one of the most beautiful speeches in all of Shakespeare, does appear to "fall on deaf ears."⁴⁹ The Christians seem to have the opinion that Shylock is the only one present who is not perfect, that they, as followers of the philosophy of Christianity, are "saved." There are critics who believe Portia's words dramatically ineffective because of the lack of response, but perhaps her words are misunderstood. Could it not be that their effect lies in their very impotence?

When Portia says, "That in the course of justice

none of us / Should see salvation ..." (IV.i.199-200), she assumes the role of the early Christian who because he had admitted his part in the murder of Christ, is forgiven his sin; the Jew on the other hand, never admitted his supposed guilt and thus is not pardoned.⁵⁰ At this point the trial becomes the ageless battle between Christian and Jew, the necessity of one or the other proving superiority. Parkes puts the philosophical battle this way:

In its apologetic to the pagan world around it, the Church was not concerned to argue that Jesus of Nazareth was the Jewish Messiah, an argument which would have left the Hellenistic world completely indifferent. It was arguing that Christianity was the true, original, universal religion of humanity, that it predated and outshone all that the poets, philosophers and lawgivers of Greece and the East could offer.... Neither Christian nor Jew would have been willing to admit that they shared the great collection of Scriptures.... To either side, possession of it by themselves was a denial of it to the other.⁵¹

Because of the commitment "to the Old Testament as a prophetic basis for New Testament fulfillment" says Glock and Stark, it was necessary that Christianity be accepted as the "final resolution of an established religious tradition."⁵² A connection would need to be devised which would reconcile the "Christian condition as non-Jews ... with the doctrine of the Chosen People."⁵³ It was because "Christ fulfilled the prophecies of the

Old Testament" ... that there was now a "new set of conditions for man's relation to God. Because Christ's death was an atonement for human sins, now only through Christ could man qualify for God's kingdom."⁵⁴ Shylock, just as his ancestors, does not react favorably to this philosophy. "When he says, 'My deeds upon my head!' and prefers the seed of Barabas to Christians," says Frye, "he is echoing the Jews at the trial of Christ."⁵⁵

When Portia realizes that the plea of mercy has not affected Shylock, Leggett believes that she sees a comparison to Morocco and Arragon who "took the casket mottoes logically and literally."⁵⁶

Morocco's apparent reason for having selected the golden casket was that the inscription was too obvious: "Who chooseth me shall gain what many men desire. Why, that's the lady: all the world desires her;" (II.vii.37-38). Arragon, on the other hand, prideful and pompous did not wish to be "ranked... with the barbarous multitude" (II.ix.33). "Who chooseth me shall get as much as he deserves. I will assume desert" (II.ix.50-51). Morocco looked at the choice as too simple and Arragon had excessive pride. Shylock views Portia's apparent recognition of his rights in the same manner. Because she says the bond is legal (IV.i.178-179), he jumps to the conclusion that she takes his side.

In order that the community may be purified, Shylock

is convicted of business and social evils for which he is only partly to blame, damned for the persecution of a pact, however horrible, to which his victim agreed without delusions and the court approved and expelled in a symbolic ridding of a vengeful justice, hatred, hypocrisy and other imperfections.⁵⁷

It is more acceptable to the Christian Venetians that the alien among them pay the price than the prince-like Antonio do so. Shylock's philosophy is counter to their values in every way. He stands in opposition to their business practices and he is the block in the way of harmony and happiness in the relationships of Jessica and Lorenzo, and Portia and Bassanio. In Hunter's words, "He is the personified barrier in a play whose structure is basically that of New Comedy, where boy and girl are kept apart by a force external to themselves."⁵⁸

Malefijt, in her studies of the Navajo says, "By projecting his anger onto witches rather than on to relatives, the hostile impulses are directed into oblique channels where they are less disruptive socially."⁵⁹ In other words, the loss of the devil-dog-usurer-Jew would be more easily borne than that of one of the most prominent citizens of Venice.

"It is not by cowardice that Shylock is reduced,

but by respect for the law."⁶⁰ The scapegoat is the "vehicle" by which the sins of the community are dispensed,⁶¹ and the law is the vehicle by which Shylock fills the role. "For the doctrinal point of the play," according to Levitsky, "has been that the Old Man must die in order that the New Man may live...."⁶² In Reik's restatement of the theme is perhaps the perfect confluence of the historical, archetypal and literal:

I do not doubt any more that behind Antonio and Shylock are hidden the great figures of their gods. Here are two small people in Venice, but the shadows they cast are gigantic and their conflict shakes the world. There is the vengeful and zealous God of the Old Testament and the milder Son-God of the Gospels who rebelled against His father, suffered death for His revolt and became God himself afterwards. The two Gods are presented and represented in this play by two of their typical worshipers of the playwright's time.⁶³

To "quiet" the conscience, as Parkes defines the rationalization of the scapegoating process,⁶⁴ Antonio suggests as his offer of mercy that Shylock become a Christian. In Frazer's words:

It would add pathetic significance to the crowning act of the ceremony, when on a lofty platform in the public square, with the eyes of a great and silent multitude turned upon him, the condemned malefactor received from the Church the absolution and remission of his sins; for if the rite is to be interpreted in the way here suggested, the sins which were thus forgiven were those not of one man only but of the whole people.⁶⁵

Neumann comments on this element of the scapegoat process by saying that those who are involved "take part in the execution of judgment on the unfortunate victims of the scapegoat psychology in the fullest pride of a 'good conscience;' and the relief felt ... is palpable in every case."⁶⁶

Echeruo notes that Shylock's "recognizing the weight of Christian authority and submitting to it" is hardly 'reception into the Christian community.'⁶⁷

History substantiates this. Jews who were converted to Christianity either forcibly or otherwise, though usually it was a choice of conversion or death, were called "marranos" which Roth says originally was defined as "swine."⁶⁸ They were never really accepted. Lopez is a good example. With his last breath he exclaimed that his love for Queen Elizabeth was equal to that of his love for Jesus Christ, bringing many derisive hoots and howls from the spectators.⁶⁹

The Jews have always been known to be passionately devoted to their religion so much so that, throughout history, they have willingly mounted the gallows rather than compromise their faith. One of the reasons for Luther's virulent anti-semitism was that he tried to convert the Jews only to find later that they practiced Judaism secretly. He noted that "it is as easy to convert a Jew as to convert the Devil."⁷⁰ Further he said,

"Know, O adored Christ, and make no mistake, that aside from the Devil, you have no enemy more venomous, more desperate, more bitter, than a true Jew who truly seeks to be a Jew."⁷¹

The period of festivity which Frye says "corresponds to pity in tragedy is always present at the end of a romantic comedy."⁷² The "festive conclusions with their multiple marriages are not concessions: they are conventions built into the structure of the play from the beginning."⁷³

The last word or groan of the scapegoat would be a sign to all the people for rejoicing--the wrath of the god is appeased and society is saved.⁷⁴ This is like the comic cycle, "moving from death to rebirth, decadence to renewal, winter to spring, darkness to a new dawn."⁷⁵ The final act of The Merchant of Venice, according to Siemon, serves as a ritual return to the world which "enables men to triumph over the absurd restrictions which threaten the health of society...."⁷⁶ It forms a "complete ritual restatement of the body of the play...."⁷⁷

Frye has said that the second part of the ritual form of Shakespeare's comedic structure was the confusion of values. Not only do we see this in Nerissa, Portia and Jessica when they disguise themselves as males, it is also evident in the jumble caused by the rings when Nerissa and Portia tease Gratiano and Bas-

sanio about how they got the rings.

Through Gratiano, the "shallow but good-natured hedonist ... Shakespeare remarks the possibility of a fuller realization of the oneness of flesh and spirit."⁷⁸ While Nerissa and Gratiano lean toward the bawdy with their sexual comments, Portia's witty remarks suggest that "not every sex joke is merely coarse."⁷⁹ It is interesting that Portia hands the ring to Antonio to give to Bassanio, asking the merchant to "bid him keep it better than the other" (V.i.255). Perhaps this also symbolizes that Portia has supplanted Antonio in Bassanio's emotions. The rings represent love, marriage and harmony which Lorenzo also speaks of in describing the music of the spheres.

Moody finds that the world of Belmont contains a "disturbing quality ... that we are left to rejoice there if we will." It is a green world, an ideal world which "is attuned to our dreams rather than our necessities, and satisfies no more than our illusions...."⁸⁰ Frye says that this feeling is not unusual:

In Shakespeare the new society is remarkably catholic in its tolerance; but there is always a part of us that remains a spectator, detached and observant, aware of other nuances and values.... Part of us is at the wedding feast applauding the loud bassoon; part of us is still out in the street hypnotized by some graybeard loon and listening to a wild tale of guilt and loneliness and injustice and mysterious revenge.⁸¹

"Shylock is never mentioned again--a silence that reverberates through the remaining scenes."⁸²

Corresponding to the primitive nature of the scapegoat ritual, Bloom views the Belmont scene as containing many pagan qualities:

Belmont is beautiful and there we enter the realm of the senses; it is Pagan; everyone there speaks in the terms of classical antiquity; religion is only used there; and there is a temple as well as a church; the theme of conversation and ideas current in Belmont have an ancient source. Portia has the tastes of a Roman and is compared to one whose name she shares.⁸³

The world of Venice seems far away as Lorenzo expresses the world of harmony and music and beauty which is possible to the soul which will permit it to enter:

How sweet the moonlight sleeps upon this bank!
Here will we sit and let the sound of music
Creep in our ears; soft stillness and the night
Become the touches of sweet harmony.
Sit, Jessica. Look how the floor of heaven
Is thick inlaid with patens of bright gold.
There's not the smallest orb which thou behold'st
But in his motion like an angel sings,
Still quiring to the young-eyed cherubims;
Such harmony is in immortal souls,
But whilst this muddy vesture of decay
Doth grossly close it in, we cannot hear it.
Come ho, and wake Diana with a hymn!
With sweetest touches pierce your mistress' ear
And draw her home with music. (V.i.54-68)

Auden reminds us, however:

Belmont would like to believe that men and women are either good or bad by nature, but

Shylock and Antonio remind us that this is an illusion: in the real world, no hatred is totally without justification, no love totally innocent.⁸⁴

Conclusion

Granville-Barker calls The Merchant of Venice a "fairy tale" with "no more reality ... than in Jack and the Beanstalk."¹ To a very large extent he is right; for what we are dealing with in this play is emotional reaction, the response to archetypes. Echeruo suggests that, "When we fail to take this folk or archetypal conditioning into account, we become liable to possibly sentimental readings of The Merchant of Venice."²

Jung did not originate the idea of the archetype, but he did perhaps do more than anyone else to conceptualize it. Whereas Freud believed that the unconscious is personal, Jung was more expansive, saying that the personal unconscious is just the "superficial layer" and beneath this personal unconscious is a deeper layer which is the "collective unconscious" having "contents and modes of behavior that are more or less the same everywhere and in all individuals."³

The collective memory of man is comprised of archetypes which have constellated and as a result cause mass neuroses in human behavior. In his words:

The archetype corresponding to the situation is activated, and as a result these explosive and dangerous forces hidden in the archetype

come into action, frequently with unpredictable consequences. There is no lunacy people under the domination of an archetype will not fall prey to. If thirty years ago [this work was revised by Jung in 1954] anyone had dared to predict that psychological development was tending towards a revival of the medieval persecutions of the Jews, that Europe would again tremble before the Roman fasces and the tramp of legions, that people would once more give the Roman Salute, as two thousand years ago, and that instead of the Christian Cross an archaic swastika would lure onward millions of warriors ready for death -- why that man⁴ would have been hooted at as a mystical fool.

The point being made here is that it is impossible for any sensitive person--Jew or Christian--in the light of world history, to read this play without a certain amount of discomfort. It is for this reason that one must understand the necessity of viewing it within the comedic structure and keeping Shylock in perspective within that structure.

Perhaps the reader practices a little shadow projection himself with regard to Shylock's powerful character; general critical explanation of the discomfort experienced by The Merchant of Venice is identified as Shakespeare's mistakes rather than personal response on the part of the reader or members of the audience. Certainly a look at the historical background gives an explanation for making the playwright the scapegoat.

Persecution of the Jews began not long after the murder of Christ; however, the first large-scale massacre

of the Jews did not happen until 1096 during the First Crusade. Of these Crusaders, Poliakov says: "On their clothing they sewed the sign of the Cross. Whatever they did, eternal felicity had been promised them; they were God's avengers, appointed to punish all infidels, whoever they might be."⁵ Various crusades under different names sanctioned by the papal authority continued into the subsequent centuries, all with the same bloody results.

The next great period of indiscriminate murder of the Jews happened in the fourteenth century when they were punished for allegedly causing the Black Death, which resulted in the death of one third of the population of Europe. They were accused of having poisoned the wells with the intent of killing all of the Christians. The charges were substantiated for the accusers when it appeared that fewer Jews died from the Plague than did their supposedly intended victims. The populace decided once again to purge itself of the devils among them. Durant says, "All in all, some 510 Jewish communities were exterminated in Christian Europe as a result of these pogroms;" in some areas "only one Jew out of five survived the Black Death persecutions."⁶

Another terrible period in Jewish history was the decade of 1648 to 1658 known as the Deluge when so many Jews were murdered that "the number of victims exceeded that of all the catastrophies of the Crusades and of the

Black Plague in Western Europe."⁷ These persecutions are documented in minute and bloody detail, and "a conservative estimate has reckoned 34,719 Jewish lives lost and 531 communities wiped out."⁸

During the twentieth century we have managed to surpass the total horror of these past centuries. During the reign of the Third Reich, it is estimated that the numbers of Jewish victims were somewhere between 4,200,000 and 6,000,000.⁹ It should be recognized here that the two eras of greatest Jewish persecution occurred after Shakespeare's death. Myrick has suggested that it is impossible to view The Merchant of Venice "in terms of modern realism"¹⁰ and it appears that he is right. The fact that we refuse to recognize in viewing the play, the importance of the period in which Shakespeare wrote, is evident in modern attempts to have the play banned. Like Huckleberry Finn and many other masterpieces of literature, Shakespeare's play has served its time in being removed from the curriculums of large numbers of public schools in the United States to the approval of some notable scholars. In fact, as late as 1974 when the Olivier version of this play was produced for television, there were strong efforts made to keep it from being aired.¹¹

If the horrors of history do reside in the collective memory, it is not hard to understand the openness to victimization that the Jews feel. In Sartre's words:

He [the Jew] carefully watches the progress of anti-semitism; he tries to foresee crises and gauge trends in the same way that the peasant keeps watch on the weather and predicts storms. He ceaselessly calculates the effects that external events will have on his own position. He may accumulate legal guarantees, riches, honors; he is only the more vulnerable on that account and he knows it. Thus it seems to him at one and the same time that his efforts are always crowned with success--for he knows the astonishing successes of his race--and that a curse has made them empty, for he will never acquire the security enjoyed by the most humble Christian.¹²

Shylock must be viewed as both a Jew and as a human being. To reiterate Murray's words, "He is neither of these things to the exclusion of the other."¹³ To become overly involved in the religious implications of the theme without facing the truth of that implication, is to be led astray, and also, it is inconsistent with Shakespeare's intent. Wilson says, "Shylock is a terrible old man. But he is the inevitable product of centuries of racial persecution. Shakespeare does not draw this moral. He merely exposes the situation. He is neither for nor against Shylock."¹⁴

It has been shown here that the sources of this play were widely used previously, that every aspect of the plot and all of the major characters were parts of earlier plays. In Shakespeare's play the role of Shylock has far more scope than any of the other characterizations of the stereotyped Jew which appeared before or after.

Rather than being an unnecessary appendage, Shylock's Jewishness is shown to be such an intricate part of all facets of his character--his profession as a usurer, his adherence to the law, his role of the scapegoat--that it is foolish to pretend it is not important. The similarity of the Puritans and the Jews, in both philosophy and in public attitude toward them, and the importance of both the Puritans and usury in Elizabethan society must also be regarded as helpful in understanding the play. His Jewishness is that thread woven through the entire play which makes it meaningful. It cannot be otherwise.

Notes: Introduction

¹ Shakespeare, William. The Merchant of Venice, ed. William Lyon Phelps, The Yale Shakespeare, 40 vols. (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1957), I.iii.155 (p. 18). All further reference to Shakespeare's plays are from The Yale Shakespeare.

² Bernard Grebanier, The Truth about Shylock (New York: Random House, 1962), p. 134.

Notes: Chapter I

- ¹ Frederick S. Boas, Shakspeare and His Predecessors (New York: Greenwood Press, 1969), pp. 217-218.
- ² Shakespeare, p. 111.
- ³ Grebanier, p. 134.
- ⁴ Grebanier, p. 136.
- ⁵ Grebanier, p. 121.
- ⁶ Grebanier, p. 127.
- ⁷ Grebanier, p. 227.
- ⁸ Pierre Louis Ducharte, The Italian Comedy, trans. Randolph T. Weaver (New York: Dover, 1966), p. 181.
- ⁹ Ducharte, p. 184.
- ¹⁰ Ducharte, p. 184.
- ¹¹ Ducharte, p. 185.
- ¹² Ashley Montagu, Man's Most Dangerous Myth: The Fallacy of Race (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1974), p. 355.
- ¹³ Elmer Edgar Stoll, Shakespeare Studies: Historical and Comparative in Method (New York: Frederick Ungar, 1960), p. 271.
- ¹⁴ Grebanier, p. 162.
- ¹⁵ Ducharte, p. 185.
- ¹⁶ J. M. R. Margeson, The Origins of English Tragedy (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967), p. 130.
- ¹⁷ Margeson, p. 140.
- ¹⁸ Ducharte, p. 180.

- 19 Ducharte, p. 182.
- 20 Ducharte, p. 182.
- 21 F. L. Lucas, Seneca and Elizabethan Tragedy (New York: Haskell House, 1966), p. 117.
- 22 Stoll, p. 328.
- 23 George Watson, "Machiavel and Machiavelli," Sewanee Review, 84 (1976), 646.
- 24 Watson, p. 645.
- 25 Robert Grams Hunter, Shakespeare and the Comedy of Forgiveness (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1965), p. 17.
- 26 Hunter, p. 18.
- 27 Hunter, p. 19.
- 28 All references to the Bible are from the King James Version.
- 29 Robert Hapgood, "Portia and The Merchant of Venice: the Gentle Bond," Modern Language Quarterly, 28 (March, 1967), 28.
- 30 Everyman and Medieval Miracle Plays, ed. A. C. Cawley (New York: Dutton, 1959), l. 882 (p. 232).
- 31 Paul N. Siegel, "Shylock the Puritan," Columbia University Forum, 5, No. 4 (Fall, 1962), 14.
- 32 Will and Ariel Durant, The Age of Louis XIV, Vol. VIII of The Story of Civilization (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1963), p. 460.
- 33 Durant, Louis XIV, p. 460.
- 34 Boas, p. 218.
- 35 Alice Shalvi, The Relationship of Renaissance Concepts of Honour to Shakespeare's Problem Plays, Jacobean Drama Studies 7 (Salzburg, Austria: Institut fur Englische Sprache and Literatur Universitat Salzburg, 1972), p. 22.
- 36 Shalvi, Renaissance Concepts, pp. 22-23.

37 H. B. Charlton, Shakespearian Comedy (London: Methuen, 1949, p. 132.

38 Peter G. Phialas, Shakespeare's Romantic Comedies: The Development of Their Form and Meaning (Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 1966), p. 155.

39 Warren Smith, "Shakespeare's Shylock," Shakespeare Quarterly, 15 (1964), 196.

40 Herbert Bronstein, "Shakespeare, the Jews and The Merchant of Venice," Shakespeare Quarterly, 20 (1964), 4-5.

41 Ronald Berman, A Reader's Guide to Shakespeare's Plays (Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman, 1973), p. 57.

42 Grebanier, p. 4.

43 Grebanier, p. 4.

Notes: Chapter II

- 1 Grebanier, p. 154.
- 2 Leon Poliakov, From the Time of Christ to the Court Jews, Vol. I of The History of Anti-Semitism, trans. Richard Howard (New York: Vanguard Press, 1965), p. 77.
- 3 Poliakov, p. 78.
- 4 Will Durant, The Reformation: A History of European Civilization from Wyclif to Calvin 1300-1564, Vol. VI of The Story of Civilization (Simon and Schuster, 1957), p. 738.
- 5 Hermann Sinsheimer, Shylock: The History of a Character (New York: Benjamin Blom, 1947), p. 33.
- 6 Vamberto Morais, A Short History of Anti-Semitism (New York: W. W. Norton, 1976), p. 110.
- 7 Poliakov, p. 78.
- 8 James Parkes, Antisemitism (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1963), p. 67.
- 9 Michael J. C. Echeruo, "Shylock and the 'Conditioned Imagination:' A Reinterpretation," Shakespeare Quarterly, 22 (1971), 8.
- 10 Grebanier, p. 79.
- 11 W. H. Auden, "Love and Usury in The Merchant of Venice" in Four Centuries of Shakespearian Criticism, ed. John Frank Kermode (New York: Avon Books, 1965), p. 244.
- 12 Henry Norman Hudson, Shakespeare: His Life, Art and Characters, Vol. I (Boston: Ginn, 1900), p. 291.
- 13 A. A. Mendilow, "The Ambiguity of The Merchant of Venice," in The World and Art of Shakespeare (Jerusalem: Israel Universities Press, 1967), p. 140.
- 14 Boas, pp. 217-218.
- 15 Mendilow, p. 140.

- 16 Sinsheimer, p. 24.
- 17 Marchette Chute, Shakespeare of London (New York: Dutton, 1949), p. 176.
- 18 Stoll, pp. 274-275.
- 19 Augustus Ralli, A History of Shakespearian Criticism, Vol. I. (New York: Humanities Press, 1965), p. 461.
- 20 Auden, "Love and Usury," p. 240.
- 21 Helen C. White, Social Criticisms in Popular Religious Literature of the Sixteenth Century (New York: Macmillan, 1944), p. 199.
- 22 Stoll, p. 240.
- 23 Will and Ariel Durant, The Age of Reason Begins, Vol. VII of The Story of Civilization (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1961), p. 50.
- 24 Phialas, p. 152.
- 25 John Draper, "Usury in The Merchant of Venice," Modern Philology, 33 (1935-36), 42.
- 26 Mendilow, p. 138.
- 27 Paul N. Siegel, Shakespeare in His Time and Ours (Notre Dame: Univ. of Notre Dame Press, 1968), pp. 239-40.
- 28 Grebanier, p. 82.
- 29 Poliakov, pp. 80-81.
- 30 Allan Bloom, "Shakespeare on Jew and Christian: An Interpretation of The Merchant of Venice," Social Research, 30 (1963), 7.
- 31 Durant, Age of Reason, p. 49.
- 32 Mendilow, p. 317.
- 33 Draper, p. 41.
- 34 White, p. 199.
- 35 Durant, Age of Reason, p. 50.

- 36 Bronstein, p. 8.
- 37 Bronstein, p. 8.
- 38 Auden, "Love and Usury," p. 242.
- 39 Cecil Roth, "The Jews of Western Europe to 1648,"
in The Jews: Their History, Culture, and Religion, Vol. I
ed. Louis Finkelstein (New York: Jewish Publication
Society of America, 1960), pp. 242-243.
- 40 Durant, The Reformation, p. 721.
- 41 Bloom, p. 2.
- 42 Bloom, p. 4.
- 43 Durant, Age of Reason, p. 109.

Notes: Chapter III

- ¹ Ralli, I, p. 461.
- ² David M. Zesmer, Guide to Shakespeare (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1976), p. 117.
- ³ William H. Matchett, "Shylock, Iago and Sir Thomas More: With Some Further Discussion of Shakespeare's Imagination," PMLA, 92 (March, 1977), 221.
- ⁴ J. Middleton Murray, "Shakespeare's Method: The Merchant of Venice," in Shakespeare the Comedies: A Collection of Critical Essays, ed. Kenneth Muir (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1965), p. 59.
- ⁵ Bronstein, p. 4.
- ⁶ Sinsheimer, p. 29.
- ⁷ Joshua Trachtenberg, The Devil and the Jews: The Medieval Conception of the Jew and Its Relation to Modern Anti-Semitism (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1943), p. 198.
- ⁸ Trachtenberg, p. 21.
- ⁹ Caroline Spurgeon, Shakespeare's Imagery and What It Tells Us (Cambridge: University Press, 1971).
- ¹⁰ Siegel, "Shylock the Puritan," p. 16.
- ¹¹ Spurgeon, p. 197.
- ¹² Spurgeon, p. 198.
- ¹³ Richmond Noble, Shakespeare's Biblical Knowledge and Use of the Book of Common Prayer As Exemplified in the Plays of the First Folio (New York: Octagon Books, 1970), p. 97.
- ¹⁴ Sir James Frazer, "The Scapegoat," in The Scapegoat: Ritual and Literature, ed. John B. Vickery and J'nan M. Sellery (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1972), p. 8.
- ¹⁵ Stoll, p. 285.

- 16 Edith Sitwell, A Notebook on William Shakespeare (Boston: Beacon Press, 1948), p. 195.
- 17 Ralph Nash, "Shylock's Wolvish Spirit," Shakespeare Quarterly, 10 (1959), 126.
- 18 Edgar Innes Fripp, Shakespeare: Man and Artist, Vol. I (London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1938), p. 417.
- 19 Bloom, pp. 12-13.
- 20 D. J. Palmer, "The Merchant of Venice or the Importance of Being Earnest," in Shakespearian Comedy, Stratford-Upon-Avon Studies 14 (New York: Crane, Russak, 1972), p. 105.
- 21 Echeruo p. 10.
- 22 Augustus Ralli, A History of Shakespearian Criticism, Vol. II (New York: Humanities Press, 1965), p. 53.
- 23 Bloom, p. 11.
- 24 Mark Van Doren, Shakespeare (New York: Doubleday-Anchor, 1953), p. 87.
- 25 A. D. Moody, "An Ironic Comedy," in Twentieth Century Interpretations of The Merchant of Venice, ed. Sylvan Barnet (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1970), p. 104.
- 26 William Gordon Zeeveld, The Temper of Shakespeare's Thought (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1974), p. 149.
- 27 George Brandes, William Shakespeare: A Critical Study, Vol. I (New York: Frederick Ungar, 1963), p. 198.
- 28 Siegel, "Shylock the Puritan," p. 18.
- 29 Sigurd Burkhardt, Shakespearian Meanings (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1968), p. 230.
- 30 Hugh M. Richmond, Shakespeare's Sexual Comedy: A Mirror for Lovers (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1971), p. 127.
- 31 Bloom, p. 12.
- 32 Harry Golden, "Shylock and William Shakespeare," in his Only in America (Cleveland: World Pub., 1959), p. 174.

- 33 Bloom, p. 12.
- 34 Sinsheimer, p. 102.
- 35 Theodor Reik, Myth and Guilt: The Crime and Punishment of Mankind (New York: Braziller, 1957), p. 388.
- 36 Durant, The Reformation, p. 737.
- 37 Poliakov, p. 85.
- 38 Poliakov, p. 85.
- 39 Poliakov, p. 85.
- 40 Poliakov, p. 87.
- 41 Smith, p. 196.
- 42 Siegel, "Shylock the Puritan," p. 18.
- 43 Kenneth Myrick, "The Merchant of Venice," in The Complete Signet Classic Shakespeare (New York: Harcourt, 1963), p. 603.
- 44 Golden, p. 172.
- 45 Bloom, p. 12.
- 46 Theodore Weiss, The Breath of Clowns and Kings: Shakespeare's Early Comedies and Histories (New York: Atheneum, 1971), p. 113.
- 47 Norman N. Holland, Psychoanalysis and Shakespeare (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966), p. 235.
- 48 Bronstein, p. 7.
- 49 Albert Wertheim, "The Treatment of Shylock and Thematic Integrity in The Merchant of Venice," in Shakespeare Studies, VI (Dubuque, Iowa: Brown, 1972), p. 77.
- 50 Durant, Age of Reason, p. 490.
- 51 Golden, p. 172.
- 52 Grebanier, p. 193.
- 53 Grebanier, p. 194.
- 54 Spurgeon, p. 285.

- 55 Brandes, p. 196.
- 56 Alex Aronson, Psyche and Symbol in Shakespeare (Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1972), p. 281.
- 57 Aronson, p. 281.
- 58 Spurgeon, p. 284.
- 59 Spurgeon, p. 74.
- 60 John H. Long, Shakespeare's Use of Music: A Study of the Music and Its Performances in the Original Production of Seven Comedies (Gainesville, Florida: Univ. of Florida Press, 1961), p. 118.
- 61 Norman Rabkin, "Meaning and Shakespeare," in Shakespeare 1971: Proceedings of the World Shakespeare Congress, Vancouver, August, 1971 (Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1972), p. 103.
- 62 Palmer, p. 99.
- 63 Alice Shalvi, "Intention and Outcome: The Merchant of Venice," in The World and Art of Shakespeare (Jerusalem: Israel Universities Press, 1967), p. 129.
- 64 Bloom, p. 6.
- 65 Bloom, p. 6.
- 66 Israel S. Wechsler, "Some Remarks on the Psychology of Antisemitism," in Essays on Antisemitism, ed. Koppel S. Pinson (New York: Conference on Jewish Relations, 1946), p. 39.
- 67 Rabkin, p. 89.
- 68 G. Wilson Knight, Shakespeare and Religion: Essays of Forty Years (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1967), p. 53.
- 69 Douglas N. Morgan, Love: Plato, the Bible and Freud (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1964), p. 5.
- 70 Morgan, p. 37.

71 R. Chris Hassel, Jr., "Antonio and the Ironic Festivity of The Merchant of Venice," in Shakespeare Studies, VI (Dubuque, Iowa: Brown, 1972), p. 73.

72 Barbara K. Lewalski, "Biblical Allusion and Allegory in The Merchant of Venice," Shakespeare Quarterly, 13 (1962), 330.

73 Lewalski, p. 300.

74 Lewalski, p. 329.

75 E. F. C. Ludowyk, Understanding Shakespeare (Cambridge: Univ. Press, 1962), p. 122.

76 Holland, p. 233.

77 Palmer, p. 104.

78 Ruth M. Levitsky, "Shylock As Unregenerate Man," Shakespeare Quarterly, 21 (1970), p. 59.

79 Bloom, p. 17n.

80 Theodore Reik, "Jessica, My Child," in The Design Within: Psychoanalytic Approaches to Shakespeare, ed. M. D. Faber (New York: Science House, 1970), p. 453.

81 Ralli, I, p. 373.

Notes: Chapter IV

¹ Northrop Frye, A Natural Perspective: the Development of Shakespearian Comedy and Romance (New York: Columbia University Press, 1965), p. 72.

² Frye, p. 73.

³ Frye, p. 74.

⁴ Frye, p. 76.

⁵ C. L. Barber, "The Merchant and the Jew of Venice: Wealth's Communion and the Intruder," in Twentieth Century Interpretations of The Merchant of Venice (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1970), p. 13.

⁶ Frazer, p. 3.

⁷ Frazer, p. 3.

⁸ Erich Neumann, "The Scapegoat Psychology," in The Scapegoat: Ritual and Literature, ed. John B. Vickery and J'n'an M. Sellery (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1972), p. 43.

⁹ Neumann, p. 45.

¹⁰ Neumann, p. 45.

¹¹ Jacob Bronowski, "The Scapegoat King," in The Scapegoat: Ritual and Literature, ed. John B. Vickery and J'n'an M. Sellery (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1972), p. 36.

¹² Jean-Paul Sartre, Anti-Semite and Jew (New York: Schocken Books, 1970), p. 84.

¹³ Otto Fenichel, "A Psychoanalytic Approach to Anti-Semitism: the Unconscious Factors at the Root of Mass Aggression," Commentary, 7, No. 1 (July, 1946), 42.

¹⁴ Fenichel, p. 42.

¹⁵ Reik, "Jessica, My Child," p. 450.

¹⁶ Poliakov, p. 223.

- 17 Poliakov, p. 123.
- 18 Echeruo, p. 7.
- 19 Durant, The Reformation, p. 727.
- 20 Joseph Reider, "Jews in Medieval Art," in Essays on Antisemitism, ed. Koppel S. Pinson, Jewish Social Studies Publications, No. 2 (New York: Conference on Jewish Relations, 1946), p. 96.
- 21 Reider, p. 97.
- 22 Fenichel, p. 37.
- 23 Ralli, II, p. 376.
- 24 Burkhardt, p. 224.
- 25 Marvin Felheim, "The Merchant of Venice" in Shakespeare Studies, IV (Dubuque, Iowa: Brown, 1969), p. 99.
- 26 Lawrence W. Hyman, "The Rival Lovers in The Merchant of Venice," Shakespeare Quarterly, 21 (1970), p. 111.
- 27 Grebanier, p. 128.
- 28 Frazer, p. 22.
- 29 Hyman, p. 112.
- 30 Hyman, p. 111.
- 31 Bronowski, p. 39.
- 32 Bronowski, p. 41.
- 33 Spurgeon, p. 286.
- 34 Frazer, p. 6.
- 35 Montagu, pp. 364-367.
- 36 Burkhardt, p. 230.
- 37 Bronowski, p. 37.
- 38 Reik, Myth and Guilt, p. 394.

- 39 Reik, Myth and Guilt, pp. 389-90.
- 40 Reik, Myth and Guilt, p. 394.
- 41 Murray, p. 40.
- 42 Moody, p. 101.
- 43 Neumann, p. 44.
- 44 Allan Holaday, "Antonio and the Allegory of Salvation," in Shakespeare Studies, IV (Dubuque, Iowa: Brown, 1969), p. 111.
- 45 Holaday, p. 112.
- 46 Richmond, p. 128.
- 47 Alexander Leggett, Shakespeare's Comedy of Love (London: Methuen, 1973), p. 119.
- 48 W. H. Auden, "Belmont and Venice," in Twentieth Century Interpretations of The Merchant of Venice, ed. Sylvan Barnet (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1970), p. 115.
- 49 Burkhardt, p. 232.
- 50 Reik, Myth and Guilt, p. 378.
- 51 Parkes, p. 62-63.
- 52 Charles Y. Glock and Rodney Stark, Christian Beliefs and Anti-Semitism (New York: Harper, 1966), p. 44.
- 53 Glock and Stark, p. 44.
- 54 Glock and Stark, p. 45.
- 55 Frye, p. 134.
- 56 Leggett, p. 138.
- 57 Hassell, p. 68.
- 58 Hunter, pp. 87-88.
- 59 Annemarie DeWaal Malefijt, Religion and Culture: An Introduction to Anthropology of Religion (London: Collier-Macmillan, 1968), p. 280.

- 60 Bloom, p. 59.
- 61 Frazer, p. 60.
- 62 Levitsky, pp. 63-64.
- 63 Reik, "Jessica, My Child," p. 455.
- 64 Parkes, p. 12.
- 65 Frazer, p. 14.
- 66 Neumann, p. 46.
- 67 Echeruo, p. 5.
- 68 Roth, p. 236.
- 69 Durant, Age of Louis XIV, p. 460.
- 70 Poliakov, p. 219.
- 71 Poliakov, p. 218.
- 72 Frye, p. 103.
- 73 Frye, p. 119.
- 74 Frazer, p. 11.
- 75 Frye, p. 74.
- 76 James E. Siemon, "The Merchant of Venice: Act V As Ritual Reiteration," Studies in Philology, 67 (1970), 207.
- 77 Siemon, p. 209.
- 78 Alan Hobson, Full Circle: Shakespeare and Moral Development (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1972), p. 206.
- 79 Hobson, p. 205.
- 80 Moody, p. 107
- 81 Frye, pp. 103-104.
- 82 Palmer, p. 116.
- 83 Bloom, p. 14.
- 84 Auden, "Belmont and Venice," p. 115.

Notes: Conclusion

¹ Harley Granville-Barker, Prefaces to Shakespeare, Vol. IV (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1963), p. 88.

² Echeruo, p. 2.

³ C. G. Jung, The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious, Vol. 9 of The Collected Works of C. G. Jung, Bollingen Series XX (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1969), p. 3.

⁴ Jung, pp. 47-48.

⁵ Poliakov, p. 41.

⁶ Durant, The Reformation, p. 730.

⁷ Poliakov, p. 258.

⁸ Durant, The Age of Louis XIV, p. 467.

⁹ Morais, p. 209.

¹⁰ Myrick, p. 599.

¹¹ Fred M. Hechinger, "Why Shylock Should Not Be Censored," New York Times, Sunday Ed., 31 March, 1974, Sec. D, pp. 23, 47.

¹² Sartre, pp. 87-88.

¹³ Murray, p. 59.

¹⁴ John Dover Wilson, Shakespeare's Happy Comedies (Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern Univ. Press, 1962), p. 114.

Works Consulted

- Aldus, Paul J. "Analogical Probability in Shakespeare's Plays." Shakespeare Quarterly, 6 (1955), 397-414.
- Aronson, Alex. Psyche and Symbol in Shakespeare.
Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana Univ. Press, 1972.
- Auden, W. H. "Belmont and Venice." In Twentieth Century Interpretations of The Merchant of Venice: A Collection of Critical Essays. Ed. Sylvan Barnet. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1970, pp. 113-115.
- Auden, W. H. "Love and Usury in The Merchant of Venice." In Four Centuries of Shakespearian Criticism. Ed. John Frank Kermode. New York: Avon Books, 1965. pp. 242-245.
- Barber, C. L. "The Merchants and the Jew of Venice: Wealth's Communion and the Intruder." In Twentieth Century Interpretations of The Merchant of Venice: A Collection of Critical Essays. Ed. Sylvan Barnet. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1970, pp. 11-32.
- Berman, Ronald. A Reader's Guide to Shakespeare's Plays: A Discursive Bibliography. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman, 1973.
- Bevington, David. "Shakespeare the Elizabethan Dramatist." In A New Companion to Shakespeare Studies. Ed. Kenneth Muir and S. Schoenbaum. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1971, pp. 127-140.
- Bloom, Allan. "Shakespeare on Jew and Christian: An Interpretation of The Merchant of Venice." Social Research, 30 (1963), 1-22.
- Boas, Frederick S. Shakspeare and His Predecessors. New York: Greenwood Press, 1969.
- Boswell, Jackson Campbell. "Shylock's Turquoise Ring." Shakespeare Quarterly, 14 (1963), 481-483.
- Brandes, George. William Shakespeare: A Critical Study. Vol. I. New York: Frederick Ungar, 1963.

- Bronowski, Jacob. "The Scapegoat King." In The Scapegoat: Ritual and Literature. Ed. John B. Vickery and J'nan M. Sellery. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1972, pp. 36-42.
- Bronstein, Herbert. "Shakespeare, the Jews and The Merchant of Venice." Shakespeare Quarterly, 20 (1969), 3-10.
- Brown, John Russell. "Love's Wealth and the Judgement ^[sic] of The Merchant of Venice." In Twentieth Century Interpretations of The Merchant of Venice: A Collection of Critical Essays. Ed. Sylvan Barnet. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1970, pp. 81-90.
- Brown, John Russell. Shakespeare and His Comedies. London: Methuen, 1957.
- Burkhardt, Sigurd. Shakespearian Meanings. Princeton New Jersey: Princeton Univ. Press, 1968.
- Campbell, Oscar James, ed. The Reader's Encyclopedia of Shakespeare. New York: Crowell, 1966.
- Charlton, H. B. Shakespearian Comedy. London: Methuen, 1949.
- Chute, Marchette. Shakespeare of London. New York: Dutton, 1949.
- Coe, Charles Norton. Demi-devils: The Character of Shakespeare's Villains. New York: Bookman's Associates, 1963.
- Coghill, Nevill. "The Theme of The Merchant of Venice." In Twentieth Century Interpretations of The Merchant of Venice: A Collection of Critical Essays. Ed. Sylvan Barnet. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1970, pp. 108-113.
- Conolly, L. W. "The MERCHANT OF VENICE and the Jew Bill of 1753." Shakespeare Quarterly, 25 (1974), 125-128.
- Cooper, John R. "Shylock's Humanity." Shakespeare Quarterly, 21 (1970), 117-124.
- Dessen, Alan C. "The Elizabethan Stage Jew and Christian Example: Gerontus, Barabas, and Shylock." Modern Language Quarterly, 35 (1974), 231-245.

- Diesendruck, Zevi. "Antisemitism and Ourselves." In Essays in Antisemitism. Ed. Koppel S. Pinson. Jewish Social Studies Publications, No. 2. New York: Conference on Jewish Relations, 1946, pp. 41-48.
- Draper, John. "Usury in The Merchant of Venice." Modern Philology, 33 (1935-36), 37-47.
- Ducharte, Pierre Louis. The Italian Comedy: The Improvisation, Scenarios, Lives, Attributes, Portraits, and Masks of the Illustrious Characters of the Commedia dell' Arte. Trans Randolph T. Weaver. New York: Dover, 1966.
- Durant, Will and Ariel Durant. The Age of Louis XIV. Vol. VIII of The Story of Civilization. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1961.
- Durant, Will and Ariel Durant. The Age of Reason Begins. Vol. VII of The Story of Civilization. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1961.
- Durant, Will. The Reformation: A History of European Civilization from Wyclif to Calvin, 1300-1564. Vol. VI of The Story of Civilization. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1957.
- Echeruo, Michael J. C. "Shylock and the 'Conditioned Imagination:' A Reinterpretation." Shakespeare Quarterly, 22 (1971), 3-15.
- Everyman and Medieval Miracle Plays. Ed. A. C. Cawley. New York: Dutton, 1959.
- Felheim, Marvin. "The Merchant of Venice." In Shakespeare Studies: An Annual Gathering of Research, Criticism and Reviews. Vol. IV. Dubuque, Iowa: Brown, 1969, pp. 94-108.
- Fenichel, Otto. "A Psychoanalytic Approach to Anti-Semitism: The Unconscious Factors at the Root of Mass Aggression." Commentary, 7 (1946), 36-44.
- Frazer, Sir James. "The Scapegoat." In The Scapegoat: Ritual and Literature. Ed. John B. Vickery and J'nan M. Sellery. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1972, pp. 3-31.
- Frazer, Sir James George. The Golden Bough: A Study in Magic and Religion. New York: Macmillan, 1940.

- Freud, Sigmund. "The Theme of the Three Caskets." In The Design Within: Psychoanalytic Approaches to Shakespeare. Ed. M. D. Faber. New York: Science House, 1970, pp. 193-206.
- Fripp, Edgar Innes. Shakespeare: Man and Artist. Vol. I. London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1938.
- Frye, Northrop. A Natural Perspective: The Development of Shakespearian Comedy and Romance. New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1965.
- Fujimura, T. H. "Mode and Structure in The Merchant of Venice." PMLA, 81 (1966), 499-511.
- Glock, Charles Y. and Rodney Stark. Christian Beliefs and Anti-Semitism. New York: Harper, 1966.
- Goddard, Harold C. The Meaning of Shakespeare. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1951.
- Golden, Harry. "Shylock and William Shakespeare." In his Only in America. Cleveland: World, 1958, pp. 170-77.
- Granville-Barker, Harley. Prefaces to Shakespeare. Vol. IV. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1963.
- Grebanier, Bernard. The Truth about Shylock. New York: Random House, 1962.
- Hapgood, Robert. "Portia and The Merchant of Venice: The Gentle Bond." Modern Language Quarterly, 28 (1967), 19-32.
- Harbage, Alfred. As They Liked It: A Study of Shakespeare's Moral Artistry. Gloucester, Massachusetts: Peter Smith, 1971.
- Hassel, R. Chris, Jr. "Antonio and the Ironic Festivity of The Merchant of Venice." In Shakespeare Studies: An Annual Gathering of Research, Criticism, and Reviews. Vol. VI. Dubuque, Iowa: Brown, 1972, pp. 67-74.
- Hobson, Alan. Full Circle: Shakespeare and Moral Development. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1972.
- Holaday, Allan. "Antonio and the Allegory of Salvation." In Shakespeare Studies: An Annual Gathering of Research, Criticism, and Reviews. Vol. IV. Dubuque, Iowa: Brown, 1969, pp. 109-118.

- Holland, Norman N. Psychoanalysis and Shakespeare. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.
- The Holy Bible. King James Version. London: Oxford University Press, 1948.
- Howarth, Herbert. The Tiger's Heart: Eight Essays on Shakespeare. New York: Oxford University Press, 1970.
- Hudson, Henry Norman. Shakespeare: His Life, Art and Characters. Vol. I. Boston: Ginn, 1900.
- Hunter, Robert Grams. Shakespeare and the Comedy of Forgiveness. New York: Columbia University Press, 1965.
- Hyman, Lawrence W. "The Rival Lovers in The Merchant of Venice." Shakespeare Quarterly, 21 (1970), 109-116.
- James, E. O. "The Day of Atonement." In The Scapegoat: Ritual and Literature. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1972, pp. 32-35.
- Jung, C. G. The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious. Vol. IX of The Collected Works of C. G. Jung. Bollingen Series XX. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1969.
- Jung, C. G. The Symbolic Life. Vol. XVIII of The Collected Works of C. G. Jung. Bollingen Series XX. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1976.
- Klein, David. The Living Shakespeare. New York: Twayne, 1970.
- Knight, G. Wilson. Shakespeare and Religion: Essays of Forty Years. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1967.
- Leggett, Alexander. Shakespeare's Comedy of Love. London: Methuen, 1973.
- Lendvai, Paul. Anti Semitism Without Jews: Communist Eastern Europe. New York: Doubleday, 1971.
- Levitsky, Ruth M. "Shylock As Unregenerate Man." Shakespeare Quarterly, 21 (1970), 58-64.
- Lewalski, Barbara K. "Biblical Allusion and Allegory in The Merchant of Venice." Shakespeare Quarterly, 13 (1962), 327-343.

- Lindzey, Gardner. "An Experimental Examination of the Scapegoat Theory of Prejudice." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 45 (1950), 296-309.
- Long, John H. Shakespeare's Use of Music: A Study of the Music and Its Performances in the Original Production of Seven Comedies. Gainesville, Florida: Univ. of Florida Press, 1961.
- Lucas, F. L. Seneca and Elizabethan Tragedy. New York: Haskell House, 1966.
- Ludowyk, E. F. C. Understanding Shakespeare. Cambridge: University Press, 1962.
- McDonnell, Robert. "Shylock's Wry-Necked Fife." Shakespeare Quarterly, 15 (1964), 115-117.
- McKay, Maxine. "The Merchant of Venice: A Reflection of the Early Conflict Between Courts of Law and Courts of Equity." Shakespeare Quarterly, 15 (1964), 371-375.
- Malefijt, Annemarie DeWaal. Religion and Culture: An Introduction to Anthropology of Religion. London: Collier-Macmillan, 1968.
- Margeson, J. M. R. The Origins of English Tragedy. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967.
- Matchett, William H. "Shylock, Iago, and Sir Thomas More: With Some Further Discussion of Shakespeare's Imagination." PMLA, 92 (1977), 217-230.
- Mendilow, A. A. "The Ambiguity of The Merchant of Venice." In The World and Art of Shakespeare. Jerusalem: Israel Universities Press, 1967, pp. 137-143.
- Montagu, Ashley, Man's Most Dangerous Myth: The Fallacy of Race. New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1974.
- Montagu, M. F. Ashley. Anthropology and Human Nature. Boston: Porter Sargent, 1957.
- Moody, A. D. "An Ironic Comedy." In Twentieth Century Interpretations of The Merchant of Venice: A Collection of Critical Essays. Ed. Sylvan Barnet. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1970, pp. 100-108.

- Morais, Vamberto. A Short History of Anti-Semitism. New York: W. W. Norton, 1976.
- Morevski, Abraham. Shylock and Shakespeare. Trans. Mirra Ginsburg. St. Louis: Fireside Books, 1967.
- Morgan, Douglas N. Love: Plato, the Bible and Freud. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1964.
- Murray, J. Middleton. "Shakespeare's Method: The Merchant of Venice." In Shakespeare the Comedies: A Collection of Critical Essays. Ed. Kenneth Muir. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1965. pp. 32-46.
- Myrick, Kenneth. "The Merchant of Venice." In The Complete Signet Classic Shakespeare. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1963, pp. 599-606.
- Nash, Ralph. "Shylock's Wolvish Spirit." Shakespeare Quarterly, 10 (1959), 125-128.
- Neumann, Erich. "The Scapegoat Psychology." In The Scapegoat Ritual and Literature. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1972, pp. 43-51.
- Noble, Richmond. Shakespeare's Biblical Knowledge and Use of the Book of Common Prayer As Exemplified in the Plays of the First Folio. New York: Octagon Books, 1970.
- Palmer, D. J. "The Merchant of Venice, or the Importance of Being Earnest." In Shakespearean Comedy. Stratford-Upon-Avon Studies, 14. New York: Crane, Russak, 1972, pp. 97-120.
- Parkes, James. Antisemitism. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1963.
- Phialas, Peter G. Shakespeare's Romantic Comedies: The Development of Their Form and Meaning. Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 1966.
- Poliakov, Leon. From the Time of Christ to the Court Jews. Vol. I of The History of Anti-Semitism. Trans. Richard Howard. New York: Vanguard Press, 1965.
- Rabkin, Norman. "Meaning and Shakespeare." In Shakespeare 1971: Proceedings of the World Shakespeare Congress, Vancouver, August, 1971. Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1972, pp. 89-106.

- Ralli, Augustus. A History of Shakespearian Criticism. 2 vols. New York: Humanities Press, 1965.
- Reider, Joseph. "Jews in Medieval Art." In Essays in Antisemitism. Ed. Koppel S. Pinson. Jewish Social Studies Publications, No. 2. New York: Conference on Jewish Relations, 1946, pp. 93-102.
- Reik, Theodore. "Jessica, My Child." In The Design Within: Psychoanalytic Approaches to Shakespeare. Ed. M. D. Faber. New York: Science House, 1970, pp. 441-464.
- Reik, Theodor. Myth and Guilt: The Crime and Punishment of Mankind. New York: Braziller, 1957.
- Richmond, Hugh M. Shakespeare's Sexual Comedy: A Mirror for Lovers. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1971.
- Rockas, Leo. "'A Dish of Doves:' The Merchant of Venice." ELH, 40 (1973), 339-351.
- Roth, Cecil. "The Jews of Western Europe to 1678." In Vol. I of The Jews: Their History, Culture and Religion. 3rd ed. Ed. Louis Finkelstein. New York: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1960 pp. 216-49.
- Saccio, Peter. The Court Comedies of John Lyly: A Study in Allegorical Dramaturgy. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1969.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. Anti-Semite and Jew. New York: Schocken Books, 1970.
- Sen Gupta, Subodh Chandra. Shakespearian Comedy. London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1967.
- Shakespeare, William. The Merchant of Venice. Ed. William Lyon Phelps. The Yale Shakespeare. 40 vols. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1957.
- Shalvi, Alice. "Intention and Outcome: The Merchant of Venice." In The World and Art of Shakespeare. Jerusalem: Israel Universities Press, 1967, pp. 127-136.
- Shalvi, Alice. The Relationship of Renaissance Concepts of Honour to Shakespeare's Problem Plays. Jacobean Drama Studies 7. Salzburg, Austria: Institut fur Englische Sprache and Literatur Universitat Salzburg, 1972.

- Siegel, Paul N. Shakespeare in His Time and Ours. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1968.
- Siegel, Paul N. "Shylock the Puritan." Columbia University Forum, 5, No. 4 (1962), 14-19.
- Siemon, James E. "The Merchant of Venice: Act V As Ritual Reiteration." Studies in Philology, 67 (1970), 201-209.
- Sinsheimer, Hermann. Shylock: The History of a Character. New York: Benjamin Blom, 1947.
- Sisk, John P. "Bondage and Release in The Merchant of Venice." Shakespeare Quarterly, 20 (1969), 217-223.
- Sitwell, Edith. A Notebook on William Shakespeare. Boston: Beacon Press, 1948.
- Smith, Warren. "Shakespeare's Shylock." Shakespeare Quarterly, 15 (1964), 193-199.
- Spivak, Bernard. "Falstaff and the Psychomachia." Shakespeare Quarterly, 8 (1957), 449-459.
- Spurgeon, Caroline F. Shakespeare's Imagery and What It Tells Us. Cambridge: University Press, 1971.
- Stoll, Elmer Edgar. Shakespeare Studies: Historical and Comparative in Method. New York: Frederick Ungar, 1960.
- Strathman, Ernest A. "The Devil Can Cite Scripture." In Shakespeare 400: Essays by American Scholars on the Anniversary of the Poet's Birth. Ed. James G. McManaway. New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston, 1964, pp. 17-23.
- Swinden, Patrick. An Introduction to Shakespeare's Comedies. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1973.
- Tillyard, E. M. W. The Elizabethan World Picture. New York: Vintage Books-Random House, n.d.
- Tillyard, E. M. W. Shakespeare's Early Comedies. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1965.

- Trachtenberg, Joshua. The Devil and the Jews: The Medieval Conception of the Jew and Its Relation to Modern Anti-Semitism. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1943.
- Van Doren, Mark. Shakespeare. New York: Doubleday-Anchor Books, 1953.
- Ward, A. W. and A. R. Waller, ed. The Cambridge History of English Literature. Vol. V New York: Macmillan, 1933.
- Watson, George. "Machiavel and Machiavelli." Sewanee Review, 84 (1976), 630-648.
- Wechsler, Israel S. "Some Remarks on the Psychology of Antisemitism." In Essays on Antisemitism. Ed. Koppel S. Pinson. New York: Conference on Jewish Relations, 1946, pp. 35-40.
- Weiss, Theodore. The Breath of Clowns and Kings: Shakespeare's Early Comedies and Histories. New York: Atheneum, 1971.
- Wertheim, Albert. "The Treatment of Shylock and Thematic Integrity in The Merchant of Venice." In Shakespeare Studies: An Annual Gathering of Research, Criticism and Reviews. Vol. VI. Dubuque, Iowa: Brown, 1972, pp. 75-87.
- White, Helen C. Social Criticisms in Popular Religious Literature of the Sixteenth Century. New York: Macmillan, 1944.
- Wilson, John Dover. Shakespeare's Happy Comedies. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern Univ. Press, 1962.
- Zeeveld, William Gordon. The Temper of Shakespeare's Thought. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974.
- Zesmer, David M. Guide to Shakespeare. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1976.