Order in Disorder- Hospitality, Language and Madness in *King Lear* and *Macbeth*

A dissertation submitted to the University of Hyderabad in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the award of the degree of

Master of Philosophy

In

English

By

S. Sayujya

Department of English

School of Humanities

University of Hyderabad

Hyderabad, India

December, 2013

Department of English

University of Hyderabad

Declaration

I, S. Sayujya, hereby declare that the dissertation entitled **“Order in Disorder-Hospitality, Language and Madness in *King Lear* and *Macbeth*”** has been submitted to the University of Hyderabad in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the award of the Degree of Master of Philosophy in English, and that it is a record of the work done by me under the guidance of Dr. Anna Kurian, Department of English, School of Humanities, University of Hyderabad, Hyderabad.

I also declare that the dissertation, in part or in full, has not been submitted for any degree or diploma in this or any other university to the best of my knowledge.

Place: University of Hyderabad

Date:

S. Sayujya

Department of English

University of Hyderabad

Department of English

University of Hyderabad

Certificate

This is to certify that the dissertation entitled **"Order in Disorder- Hospitality, Language and Madness in *King Lear* and *Macbeth*"** is a bona fide record of the research work done by S. Sayujya, Research Scholar, Department of English, University of Hyderabad, India. This is her original work and does not constitute part of any material submitted for a degree or diploma in either this or any other university or institute to the best of my knowledge.

Dr. Murali Manohar

Head of the Department

Department of English

University of Hyderabad

Dr. Anna Kurian

Supervisor

Department of English

University of Hyderabad

Professor Amitabha Das Gupta

Dean, School of Humanities

University of Hyderabad

To my thatha,

R. Nagarajan-

the person who told me stories,

who got me interested in Shakespeare

and who always inspired me

to follow my love for literature…

Acknowledgements

This is to say thanks:

To the people who taught me that "we are such stuff as dreams are made on"- the big ones and the little ones; the people who taught me to dream, and almost always made sure that those dreams came true: amma, appa- I wouldn't have made it here without your love and unconditional support.

To the people who taught me to understand Shakespeare the text, and not the man, and how to read a text carefully and with scrutiny: Dr. Anna Kurian and Dr. Pramod K. Nayar. A special thanks to Prof. Tutun Mukherjee for the valuable suggestions and constructive criticism that only helped make my dissertation better and more complete.

To the roommate who was there through it all- the highs and lows, the moments of nervousness, the heights of elation, the days of ordering food from outside, and even the whining and the sulking. Thank you, Aparna Jith, for putting up with it all.

To Gitanjali Joshua, who came a little late, but made a massive difference- not just the random walks on campus, but also the very many interesting discussions about everything under the sun… thank you for adding that little bit of flavour to life (of cinnamon, coffee, garlic flakes, pancakes and chocolate).

At the moments of discontent when I knew that I could get by with a little help from my friends… these were the people who were there, even when they weren't: Rashmi, Meenakshi Sankar, Shreela Manohar, Aadityan Mohan K.

Those people whose discussions were invaluable, the people with whom my thesis was most discussed, and those people who helped sort out the thoughts in my head by just listening: Kaveri Murthy, Aparna Vincent and Vennela Rayavarapu.

The walks-and-talks, the poetry reading sessions and the million other conversations that somehow helped think a thesis through: Mohan K Pillai, Anirudh Karnick, R. Hari Krishnan, John Betten, Shalini Srinivasan, Gankhu Sumyan, Devaki, Anu Philipose, Anu K Antony, Sinjini.

To the people who meant music and dance and all sorts of fun: Abhishek K, Varsha Pai, Kirti Varma, Parvathy Rajendran, Vaikhari, Pragya, Nivea, Durga, Radhika, Thomas Herzmark, Trudy, Sasha Bayan, Mia and Camilla.

To those teachers who were there on the various steps of life that led here: Dr. K. Narayan Chandran, Nirmal Selvamony, K. Ganesh, Sumitra M. Gautama, Prema Sekhar and many others.

But it was not only the people, I feel obliged to say, but also the place. To a campus that provided the spaces to think, the roads to walk and wander through while thought slowly chugged into the brain's synapses.

Contents

Sl. No.	Title	Page No.
1.	Introduction: Critical Overview and Theoretical Frameworks	1
	a. Critical Overview	2
	b. Theoretical Frameworks	15
	c. Order in Disorder	22
2.	Hostile Host, Hospitable Host or Strangers in Their Own Home	28
	a. The Interchangeable Host/Guest	30
	b. The Sovereign Host	37
	c. Property, Violence and Alienability	43
	d. The Gift	47
3.	Spaces of Language	57
	a. The Space of the Messenger and the Message	58
	b. Spaces Seen Through the Title	67
	c. Battle as Art	74
	d. The Façade: Hiding Behind a False Show	80
4.	Curing the Madnesses of Mind, Body, State and Nature	87
	a. Immersion: Water as a Cure	89
	b. Purification: Blood-Letting as a Cure	96
	c. Regulating Movement: A Breach in Auto-Immunity	102
	d. Consolidation: Controlling the Heath	107
5.	Conclusion	116
6.	Bibliography	119

Chapter I

Introduction: Critical Overview and Theoretical Frameworks

This dissertation examines two key Shakespeare texts- *King Lear* (written in 1605) and *Macbeth* (written in 1606)[1]- analysing the order in disorder within the plays through the theoretical frameworks of hospitality, spaces of language and madness. While disorder is prominent in the madness, or the overthrow of authority seen in the plays, this dissertation studies the order present even in the disorder[2]. As Gloucester notes in *King Lear*, "machinations, hollowness, treachery, and all ruinous disorders follow us disquietly to our graves" (I.ii.110) and in *Macbeth*, Macbeth tells Lady Macbeth to "let the frame of things disjoint" (III.ii.16). Both plays therefore can be read via these issues of disorder- whether it is in nature, the body politic, or the family. Yet, these disorders remain within the framework of certain hierarchies, which, therefore, fall within an ordered system. It is this order in the disorder of the nature and state rather than the chaos itself that will be studied in this dissertation.

In the first section, this introductory chapter will study the contemporary criticism on these two Shakespeare texts, specifically focussing on those aspects relevant to the dissertation- authority, nature and gender- while the second section will focus on the theoretical frameworks used in the three subsequent chapters.

---

[1] These texts were chosen owing to their proximity of composition as well as the elements of similarity and comparison found between them.

[2] This dissertation evolved from readings on Greg Garrard's *Ecocriticism*, which provided a comprehensive idea about the studies related to literature and ecology up to current criticism; Gabriel Egan's *Green Shakespeare: From Ecopolitics to Ecocriticism*, where Shakespeare's theatrical world is compared to today's world; and Simon Estok's *Ecocriticism and Shakespeare: Reading Ecophobia*, where he speaks of the fear of nature evolving from an inability to control it. This lack of control led to the notions of order in disorder within the two texts.

A. Critical Overview

Shakespeare was "not of an age but for all time!" – Ben Jonson

While Shakespearean criticism spans over centuries, this section will focus only on Shakespearean criticism today, observing the different aspects of contemporary 20th and 21st century criticism. This section does not cover a wide range of criticism that is available to the reader today- including the traditional criticism available up to the 20th century, with accounts by critics like Nicholas Rowe, Charles Lamb, Samuel Taylor Coleridge, Dr. Johnson, William Hazlitt and others who focus on the effect of the text, the characterisation, the importance of the imagery etc. on the reader/audience. Nor does it focus on A.C. Bradley's analysis of the structure, characteristics as well as characterisation in Shakespeare's works, only exploring contemporary criticism.

Even within the vast amount of information available in relation to *Macbeth* and *King Lear*, this section does not analyse historical backgrounds, religious metaphors, metatheatrical references or even Marxian perspectives on the text. Instead, it primarily focuses on questions of authority, and nature in *King Lear* and *Macbeth*. Criticism about gender is also reviewed, though it forms only a minor portion of the chapters, yet it is significant in understanding authority as well as disorder.

Since there are different versions of the 'original' text of Shakespeare, such as the Quarto and Folio versions, these versions will also be discussed in this section.

a. Authority:

In *Succeeding King Lear: Literature, Exposure, and the Possibility of Politics,* Emily Sun speaks about a "crisis of sovereignty" (2), connecting freedom and the political life. She states that Lear seeks freedom outside the political realm, while Cordelia attempts to bring freedom into the political realm when her answer to King Lear is 'nothing'. Sun notes that Cordelia "does not simply say that she will participate in more than one sovereign totality and be subject to more than one lord… The "nothing" that she speaks insists on something radically in excess of *any* political realm defined as such… [Cordelia's] 'Nothing' exposes the limit of sovereignty" (21). Sun also connects the political sphere to the theatrical space of the stage. She states that Lear desires a script that he has written to be played out in I.i. that Cordelia refuses to follow and that when he is in his eldest daughter's house, he himself becomes a player along with his men.

Arguing against essential humanism (comparing it to religious, Christian criticism) in *King Lear*, Jonathan Dollimore, in *Radical Tragedy: Religion, Ideology and Power in the Drama of Shakespeare and his Contemporaries*, analyses the political dimensions in the text. He argues that decentring man in a text should "make visible social process and its forms of ideological misrecognition" (191). Dollimore notes that man usually empathises only when he can experience the suffering of the poor (as seen in Lear's empathy for Tom o' Bedlam). Yet, because of this lack of empathy or understanding, the majority of the people remain poor and unacknowledged. The gap between the rich and the poor is never bridged. Instead of focussing on concepts of pity and kindness, as essential humanists do, Dollimore notes that the focus should be about power, property and inheritance. Redistributing power and property leads to the laws of kindness being ignored. Even Gloucester and

Lear show their need for power, and relate to it in the same manner that Goneril, Regan and Cornwall do. Dollimore notes that both Gloucester and Cornwall offer to reward Edmund in the same manner- by increasing his land/title. Thus, Dollimore focuses on power, property and inheritance, and through this he overthrows the essential humanist arguments of pity and kindness in the play.

Annabel Patterson, in *Shakespeare and the Popular Voice*, connects *King Lear* to the Jacobean political situation, drawing parallels between the text and King James's rule. For instance, she sees the rival sons-in-law, Cornwall and Albany, in the play as comparisons with James's distinction between his rule over both England and Scotland (which he calls the two brothers). She notes that "the central scenes on the heath… situate gibes at monopolies… [as] the building blocks of an emergent structural analysis of power and class relations" (112). She quotes the Fool's speech about Albion (III. ii. 81-92), and states that he speaks about these power relations through the church, crown, law, economy and also the human body.

Gary Taylor studies the possible interpretations of the portrayal of war between France and England in "The War in *King Lear*", noting that the events significantly differ in both the Quarto and Folio versions of the play. Though he believes that the war in the text does not have a proper climax (ending in Armageddon and the establishment of a new order) but culminates in an "aggressive disappointment", he also notes that there needn't be any "moral logic in the catastrophe" of the play (31). He states that the need to find a moral logic is only a desire for poetic justice. About the distinction between the quarto and the folio versions regarding the war, he states that the former emphasises the presence of the French army on the stage, while the latter does not.

Alan Sinfield speaks about the violence that is legitimated by the state and that which is not in "'Macbeth': History, Ideology and Intellectuals", where the former is considered good and the latter evil. Quoting King James's notions of the lawfulness of the Absolutist State in *Basilikon Doron*, Sinfield says that King James sought a polarisation between the lawful ruler and the tyrant, and refused to acknowledge the possibility of a ruler who was not a usurper but was nonetheless tyrannical. Sinfield notes that James I doesn't speak about the behaviour of the king, but rather at his motives. He also points out the oppositional view held by others during the time, which did not agree with King James's ideas. For instance, George Buchanan stated that "sovereignty derives from and remains with the people" (127). Sinfield notes, "Certainly Macbeth is a murderer and an oppressive ruler, but he is one version of the Absolutist ruler, not the polar opposite" (128).

Rebecca Lemon, too, speaks of state violence as opposed to violence that is considered deviant. In "Sovereignty and Treason in *Macbeth*", she challenges the notion of Duncan as an ideal ruler by stating that he is not connected to his surroundings and is dependent upon his soldiers. While Duncan ruled through love, she notes, Macbeth's rule is through fear and hatred. She, too, like Stallybrass, states that Macbeth ought to be considered the successor to Duncan and therefore Malcolm is also a rebel, since he attempts to overthrow a crowned king: "Since Macbeth is the reigning sovereign, his deposition, while arguably necessary, is nevertheless treasonous" (83). Thus, she states that *Macbeth* actually supports treason, albeit Malcolm's more orthodox, patriarchal and Christian version of it.

Peter Stallybrass in "'Macbeth' and Witchcraft" analyses the witches in relation to the state. He recognises that there are two ways of looking at witchcraft within *Macbeth*- the Renaissance concept and witchcraft as a form of psychological

symbolism, though he dismisses the latter. The Renaissance beliefs of witchcraft function by defining roles within the state and family where “Witchcraft accusations are a way of reaffirming a particular order against outsiders, or of attacking an internal rival, or of attacking 'deviance'” (26). He connects witchcraft to the monarchy, where witches imply a disruption of the order of the king. The godly rule of the king is overturned by the devil and the rule of the man in the house is overturned by the woman. Connecting Shakespeare’s *Macbeth* to Holinshed’s version, Stallybrass notes that in the latter’s version, Macbeth was a legal heir to the throne, and the only way in which Shakespeare could emphasise the godly rule of king James (whose ancestor was Banquo), was by opposing the godly rule with that of the demonic forces of the witches. He connects the witches with disorder in nature, reversing moral values, and examines their physical ambiguity. He notes that they enabled a “double perspective on evil” (30) because they were not just countryside ‘hags’, but also the creatures who lead Macbeth to be dependent on them. He recognises the difference between the witches and Lady Macbeth where the former are difficult to physically categorise, and the latter “is shown in the very attempt of overthrowing a norm inscribed in her own body” (31). She speaks out against the feminine. Yet, she is connected to the witches in her sterility and her ‘unnatural’ motherly qualities. Stallybrass sees the female figures related to ‘evil’ alternate with the public scenes (which are exclusively male). Through witchcraft Stallybrass sees that the state and family are the primary concepts seen in *Macbeth* and that “If state and family were founded together, witchcraft founded the antistate together with the antifamily” (36).

Stephen Greenblatt connects Shakespeare’s stage with his political world, speaking about the power of the stage in representing political spaces, and the stage

itself as breaking boundaries, if only subtly, established by society. He compares the Renaissance artist to the Renaissance monarch in *Shakespearean Negotiations: The Circulation of Social Energy in Renaissance England*, stating that "the power of the prince is largely a collective invention, the symbolic embodiment of the desire, pleasure, and violence of thousands of subjects, the instrumental expression of complex networks of dependency and fear, the agent rather than the maker of the social will. Yet we can scarcely write of prince or poet without accepting the fiction that power directly emanates from him and that society draws upon this power" (4). He notes that the stage could be subversive giving the example of usage of the language of the church or crown- a language that cannot be used by anybody else- that makes its way onto the stage. This was also true of the clothes- of crown and church- that actors wore (19). Though this connection between the stage and the politics of the age is not explored in this dissertation, these comparisons are nevertheless significant in highlighting a supposed disruption of order (or state and church) that the stage itself provides.

b. Nature:

Richard Kerridge in "An Ecocritic's *Macbeth*" explores the natural history in Shakespeare's *Macbeth*- i.e. references to anything related to nature- weather, flora, fauna, etc. (201). He speaks of Nick Moschovakis's reference to the text as dualistic, and disagrees with those notions. He notes that Moschovakis mentions the binary oppositions of good and evil (a binary that he connects to nature- e.g. light/dark, sight/blindness, day/night, good/bad creatures etc.). When Macbeth visits the witches a second time, Kerridge states that the protagonist seeks global devastation (when he uses phrases such as "swallow navigation up", "trees blown down", "castles topple" etc.) as a consequence for his desires (208). Kerridge also analyses the dialectic

between civilised (clearings, gardens etc.) and wild nature (forests, heath etc.), stating that the forests move against Macbeth, though he does not refer to the human manipulation of the forest. He quotes Robert Pogue Harrison, noting that Birnam wood symbolises natural law against the "moral wasteland of Macbeth's nature" (209). He sees economic value in the wood, but not in the heath of the witches.

Gabriel Egan in *Green Shakespeare: From Ecopolitics to Ecocriticism* attempts to connect nature to modern perceptions (he quotes Arthur C. Clarke: "Any sufficiently advanced technology is indistinguishable from magic" (132)). He notes that the earth sympathises with human affairs in *Macbeth* through the various horticultural images as well as the response of the natural world to human actions. He also speaks of the loss of magic in the play when the supposedly supernatural aspects in the witches' predictions- i.e. Birnam wood and Macduff's birth- are eventually shown to be natural events.

In *King Lear*, Egan studies how the weather is treated as 'supernature' through the use of various deceptions. For instance, when agency is perceived in the storm, the audience (and Lear too) is deceived into seeing a supernatural element in nature. Egan uses Tillyard's notions of the microcosm and the macrocosm, noting that the human body, family, society, nature, and the cosmos are interconnected: "Society *is* like a body, like a family, and like the Earth" (143). He mentions that Lear sees the earth as diseased and in need of cure when he addresses the tempest, and that the tempest is a means of connecting the microcosmic and macrocosmic worlds. He sees the thunder of the storm through the perspective of the stage, where it is caused by human agency instead of being seen as a natural phenomenon.

Simon Estok's *Ecocriticism and Shakespeare: Reading Ecophobia* examines ecophobic notions of nature, where the uncontrollability of nature becomes a cause for fearing it. He notes about *King Lear* that "here is Lear powerless within his own kingdom, victimized by the weather, unhoused, and alienated" (Estok, 19). He sees Lear's inability to control spaces around him as leading to a loss of both power as well as his own identity. With regard to the women in the play, he notes: "women are for Lear a potently dangerous material, a space of poison and pollution that, like the natural environment, lacks reason, is morally inconsiderable, and must be kept silent" (27).

Laurie Shannon focuses on the animals in *King Lear* and the distinctions drawn between humans and animals. Instead of seeing man as the centre of everything, her article "Poor, Bare, Forked: Animal Sovereignty, Human Negative Exceptionalism, and the Natural History of *King Lear*" observes the current notions of the human-animal binary. She states that these binaries did not exist to such a large extent during Shakespeare's time. She states that *King Lear* perceives the human not positively, but through a "negative exceptionality" (175), where man is not situated amongst the best of beasts, but rather amongst the worst of them. She speaks of an "animal sovereignty" which implied a hierarchy created by humans within the animal kingdom where "animals play a requisite role in the production of human political sovereignty" (182). She also refers to concepts of nakedness that are not perceived in animals where even their naked bodies are said to be covered by coats of wool, hide, fur etc., while humans bereft of clothing are considered to be 'poor, bare, forked' creatures.

c. Gender:

Kathleen McLuskie, in her essay on "The Patriarchal Bard: Feminist Criticism and Shakespeare: *King Lear* and *Measure for Measure*", speaks against traditional feminist criticism, which tends to present "feminism as a set of social attitudes rather than as a project for fundamental social change" (90), and leaves the categories of male and female unaltered. She sees a connection between the insubordination of the woman and anarchy in *King Lear*, stating that human nature is defined in relation to the man and male power. What is considered to be unnatural therefore goes against a masculine norm. In the play, when fixed family relations are disrupted, there is a reversal of order. According to McLuskie, the breakdown in social control is identified through a woman's desire, which Lear perceives at the source of corruption. Therefore, chaos is seen through a disruption of gendered roles. The woman becomes a link between family peace and economic justice. McLuskie studies Cordelia as a positive figure who becomes framed by male narratives. She believes that Cordelia's love is more personal in nature, not affected by economic gain.

Marilyn French in "'Macbeth' and Masculine Values" connects the ambiguity in the gender of the witches to a moral ambiguity within *Macbeth*. She divides the world into the inner world of the family, home and neighbourhood where violence is not the primary action and the outer world of military prowess. She sees the former as bound by the principles of nature, and therefore as connected to the feminine principle (portrayed through images of nourishing milk, children, procreation etc.) as opposed to the latter which is associated with the masculine principle (seen through images of blood, royal robes, authority etc.). The inner world should be dissuaded from seeking worldly power, but Lady Macbeth fails to do this (as does Goneril). French notes that "Both [Macbeth and Lady Macbeth] agree that manliness is the highest standard of

behaviour: what they argue about is what the term comprehends" (18). French notes that the battlefield is brought into the home, thereby bringing the outer world (the masculine one) into the inner world (the feminine category), when the 'feminine' values of pity and compassion are removed. She speaks about the domination of the masculine principle but also the fear of the feminine principle, because it is the "pole of nature and feeling" (20) and is therefore uncontrollable and unpredictable. She connects the images of children in the play to the organic or natural line of succession. She notes that the play ends in a masculine world and that "Shakespeare sets the feminine principle… firmly within the mortal span, within everyday experience. We may not repudiate the qualities associated with pleasure and procreation, with nature and giving up of control, without injuring ourselves" (23-24).

In "The witches are the heroines of the piece…", Terry Eagleton believes that the witches are the primary characters within *Macbeth*, where they "strike at the stable social, sexual and linguistic forms which the society of the play needs in order to survive" (47). He notes that societies always look for order, and therefore see chaos as the "radical 'other'" (48). As opposed to the linear time followed by the Macbeths, Eagleton notes that the witches follow a cyclical pattern of time, and their double talk opposes single narratives. He recognises that "Nature harbours the unnatural within its bosom, and does so as one of its conditions of being" (50), and the so called unnaturalness in the witches is seen primarily through their physical/gender fluidity, as well as their disruption of the state system.

Janet Adelman, in her article "'Born of Woman': Fantasies of Maternal Power in 'Macbeth'" notes that Duncan could be perceived as both the maternal (as a source of nurturing his men who are also his 'children') and paternal figure (centre of authority etc.) in *Macbeth*, but that "In his absence male and female break apart" (53).

The “female chaos” (55) seen in *King Lear* (implicit in the storm scene and more explicit in Goneril and Regan), Adelman notes, is pursued in *Macbeth* (in the witches), where the men are more vulnerable to the female power seen in the witches and Lady Macbeth. She says that the witches contain a “cosmic” force while Lady Macbeth brings this power into the family using “psychic force” (58). Referring to masculinities in *Macbeth* Adelman says that unseaming Macdonwald makes his body ‘female’ since there are connections that could be made to Caesarean section operations as well as castration. She believes that while the play enforces maternal power, it ends in a purely male realm, which only establishes masculinity and masculine authority and power.

““Let grief convert to anger”: Authority and Affect in *Macbeth*” observes the various ways in which grief is perceived within the play, where Lynne Bruckner states that in *Macbeth*, violence replaces grief and “blood supplants tears” (193). She studies the notions of manhood related to grief. Grief, she says, was also a means of purging the body. While Holinshed provided vivid descriptions of masculine weeping, Bruckner notes that Shakespeare does not do so. Though there is sorrow in *Macbeth*, Bruckner says that the tears turn into violence, as seen in Malcolm. She also notes that sometimes sorrow can be performed while at other moments, when grief is needed, there is no time for it to be felt (which she says is the case when Macbeth speaks of his wife’s death in V.v). She also notes that expressing emotions is also a privilege of people in authority, and that emotion “becomes a commodity that the state can exploit to great effect” (204).

d. A Note on the Texts:

A.R. Braunmuller notes, “If Macbeth contains allusions to the Gunpowder Plot, some of its text must have been composed after 5 November, 1605; if the play alludes to the conspirators’ trials, convictions, and executions, some of its text must have been composed about the first quarter of 1606” (6). Yet, he does not provide any conclusive argument for either year, quoting E.K. Chambers’s *William Shakespeare: A Study of Facts and Problems*, where Chambers does not see Macbeth, King Lear and Antony and Cleopatra as having any precise order in the chronology (7). Thus, Braunmuller uses primarily the Folio version of 1623 in editing *Macbeth*, which is considered to be the authoritative text.

Apart from the Folio text, however, A.R. Braunmuller notes that there was also a Quarto version printed in 1673 as well as William Davenant’s edition of 1674. He notes that all three texts most probably include sections written by Thomas Middleton, sections that are therefore also included in his own edition of the play (Braunmuller, 95).

In the Arden edition of *King Lear* (1972), Kenneth Muir speculates the date of composition of the play, stating that “there is good reason to believe that *King Lear* was partly written by 6 August 1605… If *King Lear* was written in the winter of 1604-5 the date would fit in with the political situation, for between 1604 and 1607 King James was trying to get Parliament to approve of the union of England and Scotland and referring in speech after speech to the misfortunes that division brought to Britain” (xxi-xxii).

Though the date of composition is attributed to 1604-5, different versions of the text are available today. The Quarto version of 1608 (Q1), called *The History of*

King Lear, is probably the earliest available text followed later by the First Folio version of 1623, called *The Tragedy of King Lear*, each of which differs significantly from the other. While the former was only divided into scenes, the latter was divided into both acts and scenes.

Jeffrey Kahan notes the differences spotted by Alexander Pope between the two texts:

> "Moreover, the Folio lacked some of the Quarto's passages, among them, a political dialogue between Lear and the Fool (Scene 4.135–51), a description of the French invasion (Scene 8.21–33), Lear's mock trial of his two eldest daughters (Scene 13.16–51), a dialogue in which Gloucester's servants discuss Gloucester's blinding (Scene 14.96–105), much of Albany's complaints concerning the treatment of the king (found throughout Scene 16), a discussion of Cordelia's grief upon seeing the condition of her father (all of Scene 17), Lear awaking to music (Scene 21.1–26), and Edgar's account of his meeting with Kent (Scene 24.201–18). Pope also found about 100 lines in the Folio that were not in the Quarto, among them, Kent's statement that the French had spies within both Albany's and Cornwall's households (3.1.14–20), and the Fool's recitation of Merlin's prophecy (3.2.79–96). Lastly, he found that a variety of lines were shifted from one character in the Quarto to another in the Folio." (Kahan, 32)

Kenneth Muir in the preface to the 1972 Arden edition of *King Lear* notes that he assimilates both the First Quarto as well as the Folio editions of the play. Muir notes that, "There is now fairly general agreement that the F text is not only more accurately printed, but also much nearer to what Shakespeare wrote" (ed. Muir, xiv)

Thus, while Muir incorporates the Folio text in his edition, he provides extensive footnotes about the Quarto edition as well.

I shall be using A.R. Braunmuller's The New Cambridge Shakespeare edition of *Macbeth* (1997) and Kenneth Muir's The Arden Edition of *King Lear* (1972).

B. Theoretical Frameworks

In this dissertation, *King Lear* and *Macbeth* are analysed through the aspects of hospitality, spaces of language and madness. This section provides an introduction to the theoretical bases used in the following chapters:

a. Hospitality:

Jacques Derrida in *Of Hospitality* analyses the question of the foreigner or *xenos* and the hospitality provided towards the foreigner. Observing the foreigner as standing at the threshold of the house, Jacques Derrida notes, "this right to hospitality offered to a foreigner "as a family," represented and protected by his or her family name, is at once what makes hospitality possible, or the hospitable relationship to the foreigner possible, but by the same token what limits and prohibits it. Because hospitality, in this situation, is not offered to an anonymous new arrival and someone who has neither name, nor patronym, nor family, nor social status, and who is therefore treated not as a foreigner but as another barbarian." (23-25)

Thus, Derrida distinguishes between the barbarian (who has not name or social status) and the foreigner (who is not the absolute other). He also refers to conditional and unconditional hospitality (or "the law of absolute hospitality") where "one of the subtle and sometimes ungraspable differences between the foreigner and the absolute other is that the latter cannot have a name or a family name; the absolute or

unconditional hospitality I would like to offer him or her presupposes a break with hospitality in the ordinary sense, with conditional hospitality, with the right to or pact of hospitality" (25).

Having defined the foreigner, the barbarian as well as conditional and unconditional hospitality, Derrida also examines the host-responsibility towards the foreigner where, the host who is supposed to invite the foreigner can also treat him as an enemy, where "the foreigner *(hostis)* welcomed as guest or as enemy. Hospitality, hostility, *hostpitality*"(45). With the play on the word 'host', the guest can be seen not only as the one to whom hospitality should be given, but also as the person who can become hostile. Similarly, he recognises that the host should act as a sovereign in his own home, when he says that there is a "necessity, for the host, for the one who receives, of choosing, electing, filtering, selecting their invitees, visitors, or guests, those to whom they decide to grant asylum, the right of visiting, or hospitality. No hospitality, in the classic sense, without sovereignty of oneself over one's home, but since there is also no hospitality without finitude, sovereignty can only be exercised by filtering, choosing, and thus by excluding and doing violence" (55). Without this filtering and choosing, one loses one's ipseity (the characteristic of being 'at home' in the host) and therefore also loses control over the home.

Related to the question of hospitality and the home is also the 'homely' and 'unhomely'. Freud in "The 'Uncanny'" speaks about 'heimlich' (the familiar/homely) and 'unheimlich' (the uncanny/unhomely). He studies the displacement from the homely atmosphere. He notes,

> "The German word *unheimlich* is obviously the opposite of *heimlich, heimisch,* meaning "familiar," "native," "belonging to the home"; and we are tempted to conclude that what is "uncanny" is frightening precisely because it

> is *not* known and familiar. Naturally not everything which is new and unfamiliar is frightening, however; the relation cannot be inverted. We can only say that what is novel can easily become frightening and uncanny; some new things are frightening but not by any means all. Something has to be added to what is novel and unfamiliar to make it uncanny." (2).

Freud, here, attempts to invert the order of *heimlich* and *unheinmlich*. He states that the former word is used both to mean that which is familiar as well as that which is concealed or hidden (3). He therefore states that "the "uncanny" is that class of the terrifying which leads back to something long known to us, once very familiar" (1-2).

Chapter 2 examines these questions of hospitality[3], sovereignty of the host, property of the host and the quality of gift-giving and gift-receiving in *King Lear* and *Macbeth* through Derrida's *Of Hospitality*.

b. Spaces:

"(Social) space is a (social) product" (Lefebvre, 26)

In *The Production of Space*, Henri Lefebvre studies three different kinds of space: physical nature or the cosmos, mental spaces and social spaces (11). Comparing social space to commodities, money and capital, he says that it has a reality of its own. He sees social spaces as both abstract as well as concrete- i.e. though it is a product, it is not tangible as a regular product (like commodities) would be, yet it is a "concrete abstraction" (27). It is instrumental in creating or producing thoughts and actions.

Lefebvre claims that while social space is a product, it also becomes a tool for thought as well as action. Within a given social space, certain thoughts and actions

[3] Though the homely and unhomely as well as the uncanny are related to the question of hospitality, it is not explored in this dissertation, owing to the magnitude of its scope.

can be enacted. This means that it is not only a product but also a means of production which provides it with both control and power. Therefore, "The social and political (state) forces which engendered this space now seek, but fail, to master it completely; the very agency that has forced spatial reality towards a sort of uncontrollable autonomy now strives to run it into the ground, then shackle and enslave it." (26) Social spaces, therefore, while initially formed within social and political state forces, can also work outside their limitations.

Social spaces are not passive products, but are actively instrumental in both production of thought, as well as in subverting social and political forces. Just as "knowledge objectified in a product is no longer coextensive with knowledge in its theoretical state" (27), social spaces, too, cannot be objectified in what they produce alone. Thus, Lefebvre connects the production of social spaces with knowledge production. Simultaneously, he also sees the differences between the production of social spaces and knowledge production, where the latter which involves a development of concepts, can occur only within the "discourse of social beings or 'subjects'" (72).

Thus, within the social space, there is a "'subject' with a body" or a "collective subject" (132) where the subject participates within not just the space, but also its forms and structures, inclusive of its language. Lefebvre notes the connection between social spaces and language (inclusive of both verbal and non-verbal systems): "parts of space, like parts of discourse, are articulated in terms of reciprocal inclusions and exclusions. In language as in space, there is a before and an after, while the present dominates both past and future… an understanding of language and of verbal and non-verbal systems of signs will be of great utility in any attempt to understand space… Every language is located in a space. Every discourse says

something about a space (places or sets of places); and every discourse is emitted from a space. Distinctions must be drawn between discourse *in* space, discourse *about* space and the discourse *of* space." (131-132)

Doreen Massey, like Lefebvre, believes that discourses are situated within a particular space and the essays in *Human Geography Today* analyse these relations between discourse and space and at the power relations that are enacted based on social spaces. The essays examine the "reciprocity between 'the social' and 'the spatial'- while we in a spatial discipline accepted that the spatial was always socially constructed, so too, we argued, it had to be recognized that the social was necessarily also spatially constructed" (6). Within these social spaces, the relations of power are also analysed within the text, where "rethinking spatiality… necessitates rethinking also concepts of power" (9).

The essays selected in the text also study the implications or the consequences that result from spatializing the social. Gillian Rose in "Performing Space" analyses spaces as performance, where the body becomes a space. This aspect of the body as a performance is seen in the battles in *Macbeth*, where the body becomes a piece of art to be displayed (after killing in war) as well as in Edmund in *King Lear* who uses his body for deceit and artifice.

Nigel Thrift in "Steps to an Ecology of Place" studies spaces through what he calls a "non-representational theory" where the world cannot be represented in any one manner, but only through constructions that depend on social interactions (296-297). These multiple constructions can be seen in Chapter 3, where the messenger who ought to communicate also has the power to mis-communicate. So also, through the façade, where individuals portray a face, but hide multiple sides to them behind a mask.

John Allen observes the spatial languages of power in "Spatial Assemblages of Power: From Domination to Empowerment", where power which is said to be 'held' by a few implies a certain vocabulary of power. This vocabulary is seen through the titles inherited by the characters in *Macbeth* and *King Lear*, who contain power only because of their position, losing the power when the title is lost.

Doreen Massey refers to Geraldine Pratt who analyses the consequences of "the metaphorical spatializing of the social" which could lead to "erasing (or potentially erasing) the difference between the social in a general sense and the more explicitly spatial (her example is 'the home' as on the one hand an identity and on the other a place)" (11).

These metaphorical spaces are also seen through stories and in story-telling, where there is a multiplicity of spaces in the many narratives presented. Speaking of David Slater's essay "Situating Geopolitical Representations: Inside/Outside and the Power of Imperial Interventions", Doreen Massey in the introduction to *Human Geography Today* notes: "Slater insists also on the importance of recognising the *theories* of 'the others'; that is, not only are there multiple stories to be told, but there are multiple tellers of stories, reverse discourses and multiple sources of theoretical knowledge" (15).

Thus, chapter 3 analyses the spaces of language (both verbal and non-verbal languages) as well as the multiplicity of meanings seen through these spaces in *King Lear* and *Macbeth*, with regard to the theories in *The Production of Space* and *Human Geography Today*.

c. <u>Madness:</u>

In *Madness and Civilization*, Michel Foucault traces the evolution of madness from a form of unreason to the point where it becomes institutionalised through the asylum and the use of corrective measures to cure such madness. He sees madness and reason as two sides of the same coin: “We must try to return, in history, to that zero point in the course of madness at which madness is an undifferentiated experience, a not yet divided experience of division itself. We must describe… that “other form” which relegates Reason and Madness to one side or the other of its action as things henceforth external, deaf to all exchange, and as though dead to one another” (xi). The chaos that is associated with madness is opposed to the order seen in reason, where the latter seems to be promoted through the institutionalising of madness and disease.

David Cooper in his introduction to the book notes that Foucault sees madness as an “invention” which doesn’t allow us to analyse “a certain moment of our own existence” (viii). Instead of recognising this self-analysis or the order within the chaos of madness, there is a constant necessity to search for cures for madness- something that provides order and a sense of control. In the chapter “Doctors and Patients”, Foucault speaks of this attempt at control seen during the 18th century prior to the establishment of asylums and the institutionalising of madness. Through processes that Foucault divides into four aspects- immersion, purification, consolidation, and movement regulation- there was an attempt to subdue or cure madness. Immersion involved ‘cleansing’ madness through water; purification involved creating sores or wounds in the body to remove the ‘unhealthy’ blood; movement regulation looked at restricting the terrains available to the mad; consolidation believed that only certain surroundings or certain climes were good for the mind, while wild nature was not

considered as helpful. Foucault notes that the "therapeutics of madness did not function in the hospital, whose chief concern was to sever or to "correct". And yet in the non-hospital domain, treatment continued to develop throughout the classical period" (159).

Chapter 4 examines these four methods of attempting to cure madness in relation to the madness of body, state, mind and nature in *King Lear* and *Macbeth*, and the ineffectiveness of the same.

C. Order in Disorder

> "The madness of desire, insane murders, the most unreasonable passions- all are wisdom and reason, since they are a part of the order of nature" (Foucault, 282)

> "Nature harbours the unnatural within its bosom, and does so as one of its conditions of being" (Eagleton, 50)

Disorder is a prevalent theme that can be seen in both *King Lear* and *Macbeth*. The state is disrupted in the former when Lear gives away his crown, and in the latter when Macbeth uses violence to obtain the crown. The families are disrupted, where daughters and sons do not pay obeisance to their parents in *King Lear*, and through questions of feminine ambiguity, the loss of female sexuality (seen in Lady Macbeth's "unsex me here" (I.v.41)) as well as through the death of families (Duncan, as well as Macduff's wife and children) in *Macbeth*. Nature is also considered to be disorderly, wild and 'unnatural'.

Analysing disorder through questions of hospitality, multiplicity of textual meanings and images of madness, this dissertation highlights the order or naturalness

of disorder. Sinfield's recognition in "'Macbeth': History, Ideology and Intellectuals" that both the violence of the state as well as violence against it are one and the same, except for the way in which they are perceived, shows that disorder is prevalent not only in acts against the state, but within the body politic as well. Though violence might be used in an attempt to bring about order, it does not necessarily do so.

Chapter 2 studies the questions of hospitality where the host's and the guest's roles are inverted. Even through this inversion of hospitality into hostility we see orders of hierarchy attempting to be broken. This hostility of the host is seen in Goneril who turns against her father, in Regan and Cornwall who usurp Gloucester's home, in Macbeth who overthrows the ultimate-host of his land (Duncan), and even in Malcolm who takes over Macbeth, who becomes the reigning host of Scotland. Yet, even this disruption of the state or family has an order unto itself.

Chapter 3 examines spaces of language, where there is always a multiplicity of meanings available, as is seen when Macbeth speaks about the witches: "And be these juggling fiends no more believed/ That palter with us in a double sense" (V.viii.19-20). But this is also true of *King Lear*, where as Kent says, "Report is changeable" (IV.vii. 92). This multiplicity of meanings, which seems to create disorder- where the equivocation of the witches in *Macbeth* and Edmund in *King Lear* only leads to destruction- actually has an order of its own. For instance, the witches' prophecies, though seemingly supernatural, turn out to be 'natural' events that can occur in day-to-day existence. Similarly, Edmund's actions of deception are spurred only by 'natural' desires for land and power.

Chapter 4 observes the different kinds of madnesses seen in the texts and possible cures for madness. Foucault quotes Pascal in *Madness and Civilization*:

"Men are so necessarily mad, that not to be mad would amount to another form of madness" (xi). Thus, he considers both reason and unreason to be natural and sees that attempts at cure needn't necessarily create order. Metaphors of water, blood-letting, confinement and controlling wild spaces do not lead to an ordered world. Instead, even through attempted cures, disorder becomes prominent. Yet, here, madness is of the mind, body, state and nature. If nature is seen as wild, chaotic and mad, there is an attempt to control it that doesn't necessarily work. In *King Lear*, when Lear tries to keep his lands under his control, he faces the storm. In *Macbeth*, when Macbeth usurps the crown, and therefore the land of Scotland, he attempts to control the land, but is met with a forest rising up against him. Yet, even the storm and the rise of Birnam wood fall within a natural order.

Thus, this dissertation will examine these expressions of order within the seeming disorders within *King Lear* and *Macbeth*.

Works Cited

Adelman, Janet "'Born of Woman': Fantasies of Maternal Power in 'Macbeth'." *Macbeth.* Ed. Alan Sinfield. London: Macmillan, 1992. 53-68. Print

Allen, John "Spatial Assemblages of Power: From Domination to Empowerment." Ed. Massey, Doreen, John Allen and Philip Sarre. *Human Geography Today.* Cambridge: Polity Press, 1999. 194-218. Print.

Bruckner, Lynne Dickson "'Let grief convert to anger'- Authority and affect in *Macbeth.*" *Macbeth: New Critical Essays.* Ed. Nick Moschovakis. New York: Routledge, 2008. 192-207. Print.

Derrida, Jacques *Of Hospitality.* Trans. Rachel Bowlby. California: Stanford University Press, 2000. Web.

Dollimore, Jonathan *Radical Tragedy: Religion, Ideology and Power in the Drama of Shakespeare and his Contemporaries.* Sussex: The Harvester Press, 1984. Print.

Egan, Gabriel *Green Shakespeare: From Ecopolitics to Ecocriticism.* Oxon: Routledge, 2006. Print.

Eagleton, Terry "The witches are the heroines of the piece…" *Macbeth* Ed. Alan Sinfield. London: Macmillan, 1992. 46-52. Print.

Estok, Simon C. *Ecocriticism and Shakespeare: Reading Ecophobia.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011. PDF file.

Foucault, Michel *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason.* Trans. Richard Howard. Cambridge: Routledge, 1961. Print.

French, Marilyn "'Macbeth' and Masculine Values." *Macbeth.* Ed. Alan Sinfield. London: Macmillan, 1992. 14-24. Print.

Freud, Sigmund "The 'Uncanny'" Trans. Alix Strachey. MIT. Web. 12 June 2013. web.mit.edu/allanmc/www/freud1.pdf.

Garrard, Greg. *Ecocriticism*. London: Routledge, 2004. Web.

Greenblatt, Stephen *Shakespearean Negotiations: The Circulation of Social Energy in Renaissance England* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988. Print.

Kahan, Jeffrey "Introduction: Shakespeare's *King Lear.*" Introduction. *King Lear: New Critical Essays.* Ed. Kahan. New York: Routledge, 2008. 1-103. Print.

Kerridge, Richard "An Ecocritic's Macbeth." *Ecocritical Shakespeare.* Ed. Lynne Bruckner, and Daniel Brayton. Surrey: Ashgate Publishing Ltd., 2011. Web.

Lefebvre, Henri *The Production of Space.* Trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith. Maiden: Blackwell Publishing, 1991. PDF file.

Lemon, Rebecca "Sovereignty and Treason in *Macbeth.*" *Macbeth: New Critical Essays.* Ed. Nick Moschovakis. New York: Routledge, 2008. 73-87. Print.

Massey, Doreen "Issues and Debates." Introduction. *Human Geography Today.Ed. Doreen* Massey, John Allen and Philip Sarre. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1999. 3-21. Print.

McLuskie, Kathleen "The Patriarchal Bard: Feminist Criticism and Shakespeare: King Lear and Measure for Measure." *Political Shakespeare: New Essays in Cultural Materialism.* Ed. Jonathan Dollimore, Alan Sinfield. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1985. Print.

Moschovakis, Nick "Introduction: Dualistic *Macbeth*? Problematic *Macbeth*?" Introduction. Ed. Moschovakis. New York: Routledge, 2008. 1-72. Print.

Patterson, Annabel M. *Shakespeare and the Popular Voice*. Cambridge, MA, USA: B. Blackwell, 1989. Print.

Rose, Gillian "Performing Space." Ed. Doreen Massey, John Allen and Philip Sarre. *Human Geography Today.* Cambridge: Polity Press, 1999. 247-259. Print.

Shakespeare, William *King Lear.* Ed. Muir, Kenneth. London: Methuen, 1972. Print.

---. *Macbeth.* Ed. Braunmuller, A. R. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997. Print.

Shannon, Laurie "Poor, Bare, Forked: Animal Sovereignty, Human Negative Exceptionalism, and the Natural History of *King Lear.*" *Shakespeare Quarterly*, Johns Hopkins University Press, 60.2 (2009): 168-196. Web. 31 Oct. 2013.

Sinfield, Alan "'Macbeth': History, Ideology and Intellectuals." *Macbeth.* Ed. Alan Sinfield London: Macmillan, 1992. 121-135. Print.

Stallybrass, Peter "'Macbeth' and Witchcraft." *Macbeth.* Ed. Alan Sinfield. London: Macmillan, 1992. 25-38. Print.

Sun, Emily *Succeeding King Lear: Literature, Exposure, and the Possibility of Politics.*

New York: Fordham University Press, 2010. Print.

Taylor, Gary "The War in *King Lear.*" *Shakespeare Survey 33: King Lear.* Ed. Kenneth Muir, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980. Print.

Thrift, Nigel "Steps to an Ecology of Place." Ed. Doreen Massey, John Allen and Philip Sarre. *Human Geography Today.* Cambridge: Polity Press, 1999. 295-322. Print.

Chapter II

Hostile Host, Hospitable Host or Strangers in Their Own Home

> "*Hospitalität*, a word of Latin origin, of a troubled and troubling origin, a word which carries its own contradiction incorporated into it, a Latin word which allows itself to be parasitized by its opposite, "hostility," the undesirable guest [*hôte*] which it harbors as the self-contradiction in its own body" (Hostipitality, 3)
>
> "…hospitality [*Hospitalität* (*Wirtbarkeit*)] means the right of a stranger [*bedeutet das Recht eines Fremdlings*] not to be treated with hostility [*en ennemi*] when he arrives on someone else's territory" (Hostipitality, 4)

Jacques Derrida plays on the meanings of the word 'host', which can mean: a. the host towards one's guests; b. "the lord of strangers"; c. the enemy/ army; d. lord or master (of nation as well as house). Using these four different aspects of the host this chapter will study the hospitality provided by the host towards his/her guests, the host as a stranger (seen in the phrase "lord of strangers") within his own home, the questions of hostility that arises when faced with a host army, the element of authority that is usually vested in the master/lord (the host) of the house as well as the gift that is usually given by the stranger to his host in recognition of the hospitality provided to him. The gift does not only have the positive connotation of a present, but also the constraining one that demands reciprocity, and in that sense becomes chain-like.

In *Macbeth*, the Macbeths play the role of the host when they welcome Duncan, but Macbeth also plays the role of the lord or master of the country once he obtains the throne, thereby becoming the host and hostess towards all their subjects. Macbeth also plays host to the noblemen once he is crowned king. This host-quality

vested in kingship, therefore, is also seen in Duncan at the beginning of the play and Malcolm towards the end. While Malcolm himself is a guest of King Edward, he acts as a host to Macduff by inviting him into his presence. In the absence of the host, it is the hostess who welcomes the guest, and this is seen in both Lady Macduff as well as Lady Macbeth. The witches, too, act as hosts to Macbeth when they say, "A drum, a drum;/ Macbeth doth come." (I. iii. 28-29).

In *King Lear*, Lear acts as a host in the first scene to Albany, Cornwall, Burgundy and France. But he is also the host to all his subjects. Though Gloucester plays the host to Cornwall and Regan, he can also be seen as the lord or the master of the house (in relation to his sons). Yet, he also simultaneously acts as a guest to Cornwall. Goneril acts as hostess to Lear and his men, and Regan and Cornwall, though guests in Gloucester's home use their authority over him and take over the host-quality from him when Oswald and Kent go to meet them. The play ends in doubt when the question of the ultimate host is not resolved (owing to the various versions in the quarto and folio that attribute the last speech to either Albany or Edgar).

In both texts there are also host armies that march against the kingdom: the Norwegian army against Duncan's Scottish army, but also Malcolm against Macbeth in *Macbeth*, and Cordelia with the French army against England in *King Lear*. Though Cordelia arrives with an army, she becomes a hostess towards Lear, by providing him with care and shelter in the French camp. This chapter will analyse these instances of the host in relation to Derrida's concept of hospitality, the enemy and the foreigner.

Alan Sinfield notes in "*Macbeth*: History, Ideology and Intellectuals", that in *Macbeth* there seems to be a distinction "between the violence which the State

considers legitimate and that which it does not… most citizens learn to regard State violence as qualitatively different from other violence and perhaps they don't think of State violence as violence at all" (121). Sinfield observes the similarity between the violence of the state as well as that against it. This is also true of all orders and hierarchies within the state, where an alteration in the hierarchy is perceived as creating disorder or confusion. However, the same order or hierarchies remain even when the people within them change. When the host becomes guest-like and vice versa, though the positions have changed, the hierarchies are still in place. Only the power structures alter (i.e. Malcolm takes over Scotland, and England in *King Lear* is taken over by either Albany or Edgar, depending on the edition), while the system remains more or less the same. This chapter will examine the interchangeability of the host and guest, questions of sovereignty and property as well as the gift-giver and gift-receiver in terms of this so-called disorder that is created, and portrays this disorder as something that is 'natural'.

A. The Interchangeable Host/Guest

The words 'host', 'hospital' and 'hospitality' derive from the same root word as 'guest'- i.e. "hospes", which literally means "the lord of strangers". The concept of the 'host' and 'guest' are blurred in *Macbeth* and *King Lear*. The Greek word *xenos* (which also means guest) and the French word *étranger* mean "stranger" and "foreigner" simultaneously. Rachel Bowlby, in her translator's note to Jacque Derrida's *Of Hospitality* says, "As well as meaning 'the stranger' or 'the foreigner,' *l'etranger* is also equivalent to the English word 'abroad'," (*Of Hospitality* ix). Thus, in the very definition of the terms, the host/guest and the stranger/foreigner are interchangeable. This section studies various concepts and ideas associated with hosts, hospitality and guests. While the host is obliged to provide shelter to the foreigner,

which Derrida refers to as "unconditional hospitality" (25), this section will also study the host himself as a foreigner.

In a monarchic reign the king becomes the ultimate host, while the subjects are his guests. On the other hand, these guests are also required to play the role of the host to their king. Thus, the distinction between the host and the guest is already unstable. In *Macbeth*, Macbeth is Duncan's subject, and therefore a guest to the ultimate host. This is seen when he speaks of the "service and the loyalty I owe" (I. iv. 22). However, as the ultimate host to his subjects' needs, Duncan also has the power to make demands of his men and the condition he lays upon Macbeth is that the latter will act as a temporary host to the king: "From hence to Inverness/ And bind us further to you" (I. iv. 42-43).

While Duncan is aware that "There's no art/ To find the mind's construction in the face," (1.iv. 12-15) he welcomes both Macbeth and Banquo by stating that, "I have begun to plant thee, and will labour/ To make thee full of growing" (1.iv. 29-30). With the use of the word "labour", Duncan assures his subjects that he will endeavour to take care of them, in the role of king, or the master of his nation, as Malcolm does ("What's more to do/ Which would be planted newly with the time" (V. ix. 31-32)).

If *Macbeth* is about acquiring the quality of host, and the inability of maintaining it, *King Lear* is about renouncing the host-quality. The introduction of Lear portrays him, first, as the ultimate host. He not only acts as the master of the house (in relation to family) and the master of the nation (in relation to his subjects) but also as a host to two foreigners ("Attend the Lords of France and Burgundy" (1.i. 33)), who hail from a different land, and therefore do not necessarily acknowledge all the laws of his nation. While Albany and Cornwall are Lear's 'sons' because of their marriage to Lear's elder two daughters (Lear even calls them his son in I.i. 40-41),

they, too, affect the quality of guest in Lear's palace. Thus, the initial scene shows the host-necessity to mediate a multitude of guests under one roof. He is pressurised by the laws of hospitality (as king) to his guests (as his subjects first, and family later), for he realises that when he divides the land equally, "future strife/ May be prevented now" (1.i. 43-44).

However, Lear who desires the title of host at the beginning of the play but not the responsibility ("we shall retain/ The name and all th' addition to a king" (I. i. 134-135)), changes through the course of the play as he renounces the quality of hospitality. While attempting to keep his sovereignty over his home, he becomes a guest in his daughter's home, still believing that he is the ultimate host. When he goes to Goneril's palace he sees himself as knocking on his own door, where he is still the master, and not the guest. Later, when he tells Gloucester, "Go tell the Duke and's wife I'd speak with them" (II. iv. 113), he still believes that he is the ultimate host.

Macbeth starts becoming dissociated from the State when he is 'all hailed' by the witches, who introduce to him the idea of killing the king. He exclaims, "why do I yield to that suggestion/ Whose horrid image doth unfix my hair/ And make my seated heart knock at my ribs/ Against the use of nature?" (1.iv.134-137) Here, the metaphor of knocking, where the master of the house knocks at his own door, is used to describe Macbeth's thoughts and feelings. The "seated heart" could be compared to Macbeth's seat at Inverness. Yet, it knocks against his own ribs, indicating instability not only of the heart, but also predicting the instability of Macbeth's hold over his 'seat' once he becomes king.

The witches themselves become hosts to Macbeth. In I.i, they decide to meet upon the heath "There to meet with Macbeth" (I. i. 8) and they wait for Macbeth's arrival in I.iii. A. R. Braunmuller provides a note to the setting of IV.i, where he states

that "The location of this scene is as doubtful as its narrative connection with 3.6. Hecate says it will be the 'pit of Acheron' (3. 5. 15), and it is an outdoor scene (horses gallop up at 139) and a place where the cauldron and apparitions may exist, but also an interior ('come in without there' (134)), where a lock and knock may be imagined (46), a place where Lennox and presumably other courtiers are within earshot… The witches' 'cooking' inverts and contrasts with the banquet of 3.4." (*Macbeth*, 189).

When the second witch notes, "Something wicked this way comes;/ Open locks, whoever knocks" (IV. i. 45-46), it shows that the witches are awaiting Macbeth's entry, and that their 'doors' (whether symbolical or real, as Braunmuller explicates) are unlocked for him. However, because the witches are "Posters of the sea and land" (I. iii. 31) they do not have a stable home to invite Macbeth into, though it could be argued that the heath can be seen as the witches' home.

Braunmuller's comparison (citing G. Wilson Knight and Michael Hawkins) between the witches' cooking and the banquet that Macbeth hosts, also serves to highlight their host-quality, even though they lack a permanent home (as constructed by humans). While the lords who eat at Macbeth's banquet in III. iv leave their tables in a hurry, without completing the meal, the witches seem to feed Macbeth with deep desires from the cauldron. Before Macbeth's arrival in IV.i, the witches are stirring a cauldron, and when he asks them to show him the apparitions, the first witch responds: "Pour in sow's blood, that hath eaten/ Her nine farrow; grease that's sweaten/ From the murderer's gibbet throw/ Into the flame" (IV. i. 64-66). Only after all three apparitions disappear does the cauldron descend (IV. i. 105).

When Macbeth "yield(s) to that suggestion" by listening to the witches he becomes a foreigner to his State. Derrida, in *Of Hospitality*, defines the foreigner as somebody who cannot speak the local language, or is alien to it: "the foreigner is first

of all foreign to the legal language in which the duty of hospitality is formulated, the right to asylum, its limits, norms, policing, etc. He has to ask for hospitality in a language which by definition is not his own, the one imposed on him by the master of the house, the host, the king, the lord, the authorities, the nation, the State, the father, etc." (15) Thus, the foreigner or the stranger (*l'éstranger*) is subject to the hospitality and the laws of the host. Derrida emphasizes that the foreigner is not the absolute other (the nameless barbarian who does not possess any status). The foreigner has a name and a status which the host recognises when providing hospitality (21).

Lear does not seem to recognise the limits or norms of hospitality, since he repeatedly asks for hospitality- first to Goneril and then to Regan- attempting to assert his authority over that of his host. When he tells his knight, "I have perceived a most faint neglect of late" (I. iv. 66), he sees himself as a host, while depending on his daughter for shelter and food. Goneril calls him "Idle old man,/ That still would manage those authorities/ That he hath given away." (I. iii. 17-19).

While Lear doesn't understand the language of hospitality of the house, Macbeth refutes the language of the state. Macbeth becomes a foreigner that by nationality he is not. He is not the 'absolute other'- he is not the Jew, Tartar, Moor or barbarian. He is a Scottish soldier. Yet, his language is not that of the state. Here, language is not just the spoken or written language, but all the signs and symbols that establish a difference between the host and the foreigner. Though he acknowledges the language of the state, he does not follow it: "First, as I am his kinsman and his subject,/ Strong both against the deed; then, as his host,/ Who should against his murderer shut the door,/ Not bear the knife myself… I have no spur/ To prick the sides of my intent, but only/ Vaulting ambition" (I. vii. 13-27). Here, Macbeth is seen

as *hostis* or hostile, Duncan's host, yet simultaneously his guest, and yet, also, a stranger to the throne since he goes against the authority of his ultimate host.

If Macbeth does not follow the orders of his king- i.e. if he does not provide the required hospitality (which he subsequently does not, since he kills his guest and his host) - he loses the position of distinguished guest in the state of Scotland. Derrida notes that "… the Foreigner had to begin by contesting the authority of the chief, the father, the master of the family, the "master of the house", of the power of hospitality…" (4) Macbeth's murder of Duncan, therefore, leads to the alienation of Macbeth. On the other hand, though Duncan is the ultimate host, he has to follow the rules of Macbeth's house while he stays at Inverness and stays therefore in "double trust" as Macbeth notes. In comparison to Macbeth's "seated heart", Duncan calls Inverness a "pleasant seat" (1.vi. 1). While Macbeth has already unseated himself as both host and guest, Duncan recognises only the pleasance of his abode. Similarly, in *King Lear*, Gloucester contests the authority of the ultimate host who comes to reside in his house when he tries to hide the information of France's arrival in England (III. iii. 7-14) from Cornwall and Regan and later when he provides shelter for Lear in his farmhouse (III.vi).

In *Macbeth*, after the deed of murder, the lack of hospitality and the strong hostility in Macbeth degrades his host quality and is contrasted only later by Malcolm's reappearance. It must be remembered that while Macduff, Lennox and the lord (as seen in III.vi) consider Macbeth as hostile and Malcolm as the rightful host, the latter is a guest in Edward's kingdom. Rebecca Lemon refers to David Norbrook, who states that "the Scottish practice of succession, tanistry, would place Macbeth as Duncan's successor, not Malcolm" (76). She goes on to argue that Malcolm's attempt to regain the throne is an act of treachery, though one that is portrayed as positive

("Since Macbeth is the reigning sovereign, his deposition, while arguably necessary, is nevertheless treasonous" (83)). Thus, Malcolm's host-authority itself is subject to scrutiny.

Malcolm's description of himself to Macduff is an attempt to portray himself as a benevolent host:

> …here abjure
> The taints and blames I laid upon myself
> For strangers to my nature. I am yet
> Unknown to woman, never was forsworn,
> Scarcely have coveted what was mine own,
> At no time broke my faith, would not betray
> The devil to his fellow, and delight
> No less in truth than in life. My first false speaking
> Was this upon myself. What I am truly
> Is thine and my poor country's to command (4.iii. 123-132)

As mentioned at the beginning of this section, Rachel Bowlby in her translator's note to Of Hospitality connects the word *l'etranger* with the meaning 'abroad' (*Of Hospitality* ix). Thus, though Malcolm is 'abroad' (i.e. in England), he is still considered by many of the Scottish citizens to be Scotland's host, and indeed also has a host (army) at his disposal, to reclaim the same. While Duncan and Macbeth do not seem able to maintain a hold over the throne, Malcolm attempts to do so.

This interchangeable quality of the host and guest in *Macbeth* and *King Lear* undermines the authority or the sovereignty of the host, even as authority is restored towards the end of the plays. This undermining of the existing authority presents the disorders within the text. Yet, they work within the framework of the host and guest,

and the positions of authority remain- i.e. while the hosts and guest interchange roles, the hierarchy of the host and guest still remain.

B. The Sovereign Host

"…(T)he sovereignty of power, the host's *potestas* and possession, remain those of the *paterfamilias,* the head of the house," (*Of Hospitality*, 41) Derrida states that to ensure hospitality, there has to be a sense of sovereignty, of mastery at home. Macbeth, in his home at Inverness is not seen as a master over his house. To be authoritative requires an attitude of command that is seen more in Lady Macbeth than in her husband. When Macbeth reaches Inverness, his wife tells him "you shall put/ This night's great business into my dispatch,/ Which shall to all our nights and days to come/ Give solely sovereign sway and masterdom", to which Macbeth only responds "We will speak further-" (I. v. 65-69). Macbeth constantly hesitates in making a decision. When he states that Duncan "is here in double trust" (I. vii. 12) he is giving in to self-doubt which causes Lady Macbeth to question his manhood.

If assumptions of manhood and manliness are seen through authoritativeness, when Lady Macbeth speaks of him as filled with the "milk of human kindness" (I. v. 15) and when she asks if he would "live a coward in thine own esteem,/ Letting I dare not wait upon I would" (I. vii. 43-44), she questions this authority. She even says, "When you durst do it, then you were a man./ And to be more than what you were, you would/ Be so much more the man" (I. vii. 49-51). This constant reiteration by Lady Macbeth emphasises Macbeth's lack of decisiveness, and therefore also an unstable sense of mastery. This lack of authority is also seen in the crown when Macbeth becomes king.

Malcolm's sovereignty, as noted earlier, is also a deceptive and treacherous one. While both the deception by Macbeth and Malcolm are to appropriate the crown, the former does not possess a sense of authority which the latter assumes. Though Malcolm is a guest in Edward's kingdom, he has already assimilated an army and is ready to deceive once again (through Birnam wood) in order to claim the throne.

In *King Lear*, Lear's authority is seen through his relationship with Cordelia. If Goneril and Regan are considered guests on the basis of their marriage to Albany and Cornwall respectively, Cordelia is still Lear's possession, and therefore still the host's property. Derrida speaks about the 'daughter' as host-property in relation to Lot and his daughters, where the guest is preferred over the daughter who is 'given' for sexual satisfaction (151). Even Kent, whose dialogue begins the play, speaks only of the division of land between Cornwall and Albany and not of Cordelia.

Lear says of Cordelia that, "I lov'd her most, and thought to set my rest/ On her kind nursery" (I. i. 122-123), and acknowledges to Burgundy that "When she was dear to us we did hold her so,/ But now her price is fallen" (I. i. 195-196), treating Cordelia as a commodity to be bargained for. She becomes his possession and therefore, someone he has authority over. Thus, he asks for a reassurance of host-sovereignty in Cordelia and her statement, "Nothing, my lord" (1.i. 86), is equal to a disruption of his mastery over the house (which extends to his land). By losing Cordelia (the centrality of his authority), he has lost the authority of the host.

It is because Cordelia threatens Lear's hospitality that he is forced to banish the one who supports her- Kent, since by extension, he too, threatens Lear's sense of host. However, in losing his own daughter to France and in the provision to his guests (Albany and Cornwall) of "all my living" (1.iv. 106) as the Fool says, he has lost his

hold over his own home (both his palace and his land). Thus, when he visits Goneril, he visits as a guest to Albany's palace, thereby leading to the question of the sovereignty of the host.

In Goneril's household, as in the case of Macbeth's household, it is the woman who takes charge of hospitality. By the laws of hospitality, she provides a roof, sport ("when he returns from hunting" (1.iii. 8)), and food. Derrida notes that "Anyone who encroaches on my "at home," on my ipseity, on my power of hospitality, on my sovereignty as host, I start to regard as an undesirable foreigner, and virtually as an enemy." (*Of Hospitality*, 53-55) Thus, when Goneril attempts to establish sovereignty it is not with kindness, but with an authoritative rule (as the Fool says, "thou mad'st thy daughters thy mothers… thou gav'st them the rod, and put'st down thine own breeches" (1.iv. 170)), treating Lear not as family, but as the "undesirable foreigner". Goneril accuses Lear of not following the etiquette of a guest: "You strike my people; and your disorder'd rabble/ Make servants of their betters" (1.iv. 254-255). She also recognises her father as a threat when she says, "He may enguard his dotage with their pow'rs,/ And hold our lives in mercy" (1.iv. 327-328) thereby stressing on the conditional nature of hospitality.

Derrida states that hospitality "is always about answering for a dwelling place, for one's identity, one's space, one's limits, for the ethos as abode, habitation, house, hearth, family, home." (149-151). The main instances of hospitality in *Macbeth* include Duncan's self-invitation to Inverness, the banquet scene, and Malcolm's stay in England. However, Macbeth does not seem to be able to answer for his own space and limit. Instead, both he and his wife attempt to mask their true identities, just as the Thane of Cawdor did. They appear to be the "innocent flower" but are the "serpent under't" (1.vi. 62-63). They "mock the time with fairest show;/ False face must hide

what the false heart doth know" (1.vii. 81-82). Macbeth, here, has also defined the limit of his hospitality as murder. Thus, he says, "Wake Duncan with thy knocking! I would thou couldst!" (2.ii.74) His identity has become embedded in that of the murder he commits.

Just as Macbeth acts as a host to Duncan, Gloucester also hosts Regan and Cornwall's stay in his castle. They become the ultimate host or the master while Gloucester is their guest. He notes that "The noble Duke my master,/ My worthy arch and patron, comes to-night" (II. i. 57-58). The sovereignty, therefore, no longer lies with Gloucester, but rather with Regan and Cornwall. While Duncan acknowledges that he is a guest in I.vi (he calls Lady Macbeth hostess thrice within twenty lines) and even states that "We are your guest tonight" (I. vi. 26), Regan and Cornwall only provide a vague reason to Gloucester for their presence there: "we must have use of your advice… bestow/ Your needful counsel to our businesses,/ Which craves the instant use" (II. ii. 120-127).

They choose to punish Kent rather drastically by putting him in the stocks. The punishment offered to Kent is also a question of authority, where a minor offence is given a bigger punishment than necessary by the guest/host, but has to be accepted because of their authoritative status. Yet, Regan, whose authority which has to be accepted by Gloucester, also attempts to supersede Lear's authority. When Gloucester tells Cornwall "His fault is much, and the good King his master/ Will check him for't" (II.ii. 136-137), Regan replies that "My sister may receive it much more worse/ To have her gentleman abus'd" (II.ii. 145-146). When Regan finally does meet Lear, though she calls him "your Highness" (II.iv. 125), she also tells him that "Nature in you stands on the verge/ Of her confine: you should be rul'd and led/ By some discretion that discerns your state/ Better than you yourself" (II.iv. 144-147). Kent

gives a complete description to Lear about the manner in which he is treated both at Cornwall's palace as well as Gloucester's castle. Cornwall and Regan do not provide equal hospitality to their guests, preferring Goneril's messenger and Oswald over Kent.

Indeed, Regan even invites Goneril without the consent of Gloucester and on her father's appearance at Gloucester's door, says "I look'd not for you yet, nor am I provided/ For your fit welcome" (2.iv. 231-232). By now, Regan and Cornwall have appropriated the authority of Gloucester's castle completely considering it theirs. While talking about the unnecessary housing of Lear's men, Regan asks, "How in one house/ Should many people under two commands/ Hold amity?" (2.iv. 240-241) She refers here to her authority clashing with that of Lear's. Yet, she disregards Gloucester's authority entirely and imposes hers when in his castle. It is this that leads the latter to lament his loss of a home: "they took from me the use of mine own house" (3.iii. 1). Only with the rise of Cornwall's servant against him and in favour of Gloucester does their authority get questioned. This situation is reported to Albany thus: "A servant that he bred, thrill'd with remorse,/ Oppos'd against the act, bending his sword/ To his great master" (4.ii. 73-75).

Macbeth also plays host when he holds the feast for his men, where he says he will "play the humble host" (3.iv. 4). Even in this instance, he does not maintain his authority as king. Indeed, it is his wife who has to eventually play his role. Initially, Macbeth says, "Our hostess keeps her state; but in best time/ We will require her welcome" (3.iv. 5) In the end however, even she cannot keep her state, and neither does she want the party to. The hospitality that the Macbeths provide to their guests is negligent. When they act as host to Duncan and his men (I.vii), Macbeth leaves the feast and Lady Macbeth asks him, "Why have you left the chamber?" and when

Macbeth asks, "Hath he asked for me?" she responds, "Know you not, he has?" (I.vii.28-30). This is also true of the banquet scene in III.iv. Lady Macbeth chides her husband when she notes, "My royal lord,/ You do not give the cheer; the feast is sold/ That is not often vouch'd, while 'tis a-making,/ 'Tis given with welcome. To feed were best at home:/ From thence the sauce to meat is ceremony;/ Meeting were bare without it." (1.iv. 32-37) The porter also plays an important role in this disruption of the sovereign authority of his lord. Residing within Macbeth's castle (which is basically "a large fortified residential building" used for protection against attacks), the porter allows entry to a farmer, an equivocator and a foreign tailor. Though this invitation is fictive, he has disrupted the host's authority by allowing the lower classes into a thane's home without his permission.

Finally, one must also consider Cordelia as a host. As was earlier stated, at the beginning of the play Cordelia is treated as Lear's possession and her response to Lear questions his host-sovereignty. France, however, accepts this quality in Cordelia and takes her as his wife. While kingship is problematic in the play, the text offers us only one queen. The word occurs five times and always in reference to Cordelia. It is France who first sees her as a regal heir, calling Lear's "dow'rless daughter" as "queen to us, ours, and our fair France" (1.i. 256). The next two references are made by Kent and the gentleman in conversation with each other:

> Kent: Did your letters pierce the queen to any
> demonstration of grief?
>
> Gentleman: Ay, sir; she took them, read them in my presence;
> And now and then an ample tear trill'd down
> Her delicate cheek: it seem'd she was a queen

Over her passion; who, most rebel-like,

Sought to be king o'er her. (4.iii. 10-14)

This conversation establishes the queen-like quality of Cordelia- though she leads an army (with the help of Marshall La Far) she is also regal in her passion and controls it in a queen-like manner. Her passion is compared to a rebel and a king simultaneously therefore highlighting the problems of kingly rule in the play. This expression of sorrow also shows an authority over one's own emotions and is also seen in Malcolm and Donalbain's passion at their father's death- a passion that is withheld with a greater vision in mind.

Both *King Lear* and *Macbeth* observe the loss of one's sovereignty as well as one's mastery over the home. This loss only leaves the control of both the sovereignty and mastery in the hands of others, but does not upset the existing systems. This shift in authority or mastery can also be seen through the (need for) possession of property.

C. Property, Violence and Alienability

Derrida says that the foreigner is "in some places linked to the land and in others to blood" (*Of Hospitality* 21). When both King Lear and Macbeth sit on the throne, they are also connected to the land that they own. Macbeth claims the land through usurpation while Lear, who already possesses the land under his control, seems to deny it by giving it away. Macbeth's unwarranted claim of the land and Lear's denying of it cause them to lose their status of the host. Once Lear divides his land and gives up the position of king in all but title, he becomes alienated from both his land and people whom he considers to still be his subjects, just as Prospero in *The Tempest* becomes alien to his land and people once he gives authority to his brother, Antonio. The Fool's lines establish this alienation of Lear: "I can tell why a snail has

a house… Why, to put's head in; not to give it away to his daughters" (I. v. 27-29). In this section, the alienability of the individual shall be seen through property.

Nicholas Blomley, in "Law, Property, and the Geography of Violence: The Frontier, the Survey, and the Grid" connects law, property and violence. Quoting C. F. Adams, he connects the power in society to land and property ownership. He also states that, "property is not a static, pre-given entity, but depends on a continual, active 'doing'." (122) Lear does not initially see property as active, but rather as something that is his to control, even when he gives it away. Even when he says, "I tax you not" (III. ii. 16) to the winds, he sees himself as in control of, or possessing even nature, but only later realises that "they told me I was every thing; 'tis a lie, I am not ague-proof" (IV. vi. 105).

Lear asks Regan: "Do you but mark how this becomes the house," soon referring to "The offices of nature, bond of childhood,/ Effects of courtesy, dues of gratitude;/ Thy half of the kingdom hast thou not forgot,/ Wherein I thee endow'd." (II. iv. 150, 176-179), but does not realise that the kingdom that he gave away was no longer considered to be his, but was appropriated by Goneril and Regan. Therefore, with the shift in possession of property, there is also a shift of power.

While Goneril and Regan, as mentioned earlier, are more guest-like in Lear's home (I.i.), it is Cordelia who is considered to be host-property, just as the land is also considered to be Lear's. The parting of Lear with his land and his only unmarried daughter leaves him without a "kind nursery" to go to. When he decides to "disclaim all my paternal care,/ Propinquity and property of blood" (1.i. 112-113), he has not only become alienated from his land, but from his guests as well.

Nicholas Blomley connects property and violence when he states that property can be a means of "nonviolent meaning", or a persuasive violence. But in property,

space and corporeal violence are intertwined (123). This seems to be the opening line in *King Lear*, where Kent states, “I thought the King had more affected the Duke of Albany than Cornwall” (1.i. 1). Thus, there is already a movement towards violence seen in the possible partiality of Lear towards his sons-in-law. Violence is also inherent in the letter that Edgar supposedly wrote that Gloucester “keeps our fortunes from us till our oldness cannot relish them” (1.i. 46) It is property that spurs Goneril and Regan as well as Edmund. Edmund’s desire is clearly seen in the lines, “Wherefore should I/ Stand in the plague of custom, and permit/ The curiosity of nations to deprive me” (1.ii. 2-4). Though the two sisters do not overtly state so, their actions (professing love initially, and later denying Lear a roof to rest under and the eagerness with which Goneril takes charge of her husband’s army) shows their desire for Lear’s land. While facing the storm, Lear acknowledges this desire of theirs when he states, “I never gave you kingdom, call’d you children;/ You owe me no subscription” (III. ii. 17-18) Lear soon becomes aware that there is an economic aspect to both hospitality and parenthood.

The final question of property, however, is raised after the battle against France, in the last act, where Lear, who has already surrendered the name of king, Gloucester, who seemingly loses his title, Goneril and Regan who are already beginning to turn against each other in the name of Edmund’s love, and Cordelia, who is the sole representative of France are all present. Lear and Gloucester are alienated from their names and lands and Cordelia has been alienated from England. Yet, there is strife amongst the two duchesses who do retain the title and property of England, thus leaving the land in a state of disorder.

Macbeth begins with war- a primary manifestation of violence for property possession. Rebellion broke out from Macdonwald, Sweno, and even the Thane of

Cawdor and is eventually quelled. Sweno's request for "composition" is met with Ross's statement: "Nor would we deign him burial of his men/ Till he disbursed, at Saint Colme's Inch,/ Ten thousand dollars to our general use." Thus, Sweno's over-reaching desire for possession results in violence as well as a loss of his own state's capital. This is akin to Macbeth's "vaulting ambition".

Alan Sinfield in "'Macbeth': History, Ideology and Intellectuals" notes, "Violence is good, in this view, when it is in the service of the prevailing dispositions of power; when it disrupts them it is evil." (121). Macbeth and Banquo's violence that gives the former the name "Bellona's bridegroom" is a state-sanctioned violence against a foreigner (in this case the Norwegian army) and the one that alienates the traitor (the Thane of Cawdor). The second act of violence goes against the law of state and individual hospitality, therefore alienating the doer despite giving him property.

The third kind of violence is slightly more unsettling, as Rebecca Lemon states, "Macbeth and Malcolm both practice a form of treasonous sovereignty, coming to the throne through violent murder rather than through simple succession" (83). Thus, Malcolm's usurpation though not legitimated, is justified through, Lemon says, deception (and not outright violence) (83). She states: "Dwelling in 'shadow' and error as a means of deceiving his enemies, Malcolm relates to the natural landscape, which supplies the images of fertility characteristic of Duncan, through a destructive impulse: he hews down the wood to fuel his cause. Furthermore, he evinces a comfortable familiarity with precisely the types of deceitful practices that neither Duncan nor Macbeth could anticipate or understand." (83)

Malcolm does not just relate to Duncan with the use of the natural landscape; he appropriates it. Birnam wood, through his act of cutting down, becomes his and

that of his men. While still enacted in the name of Scotland, the violence towards property (the woods) alienates not Malcolm, but Macbeth. When Macbeth hears of the "moving grove" from the messenger, he is filled with amazement: "I pull in resolution, and begin/ To doubt th' equivocation of the fiend/ That lies like truth" (5.v. 42-44). The moving wood provides a sense of the uncanny, a combination of fear and fascination, but primarily it dethrones him ("Blow wind, come wrack;/ At least we'll die with harness on our back." (5.v. 51-52)) And thus, Macbeth's attempt at appropriating Duncan's land and reign leaves him alienated and dethroned.

This section, therefore, observes the possession of property and the power that comes with it, and also at the loss of authority and control over the land because of an act against the state. While in *King Lear* the loss of property alienates the owner, in *Macbeth* its destruction by Malcolm alienates Macbeth. This section analyses the disorders in relation to the ownership of the land, where the sense of possession or ownership only shifts from one individual to the other.

D. The Gift

> "The word "gift," in fact, in various languages, contains puns or figures which reform the logic or alogic of the relation of parasite and host I am exploring here. *Gift* in German means poison. To receive or give a gift is a profoundly dangerous or equivocal act. One of the French words for gift, *cadeau*, comes from the Latin *catena*, little chain, rings bound together in a series. Every gift is a ring or a chain, and the gift-giver or gift-receiver enters into the endless ring or chain of reciprocal obligation" (Miller 445)

While the section on the 'Sovereign Host' examines the power vested in the host, this section studies the power in the provision of a gift and the expected

responses to the same. Power is not seen only in the one who owns property, but also with the gift-giver, who is usually the guest. The obligation of the person who receives a gift towards the giver usually gives a certain amount of power to the guest. Thus, to a certain degree the guest has some agency against the sovereignty of the host. The gift binds two people- the host and the guest. This section will focus on the reciprocity of gift-giving and taking as altering the ordered structures.

Lear's division of the land in I.i. could be seen as a gift that Lear gives his two sons-in-law and refuses to his third: "Our son of Cornwall,/ And you, our no less loving son of Albany,/ We have this hour a constant will to publish/ Our daughters' several dowers" (I. i. 40-43). Yet, he refuses this to his third son-in-law: "I would not from your love make such a stray/ To match you where I hate" (I. i. 208-209). However, it is unclear whether the land is gifted to them or to his daughters, since the division is based on them professing their love to Lear ("thy truth then be thy dower" (107)).

This gift of land hints at the "reciprocal obligation" that Miller talks about. Thus, land is not only property that is disposed, but it leads to the question of "the economy of the gift" (Ruiter 171). Ruiter states that a gift or an act of generosity in a society of hospitality has to be repaid, referring to the lavish entertainment that Leontes throws for Polixenes which the latter might not be able to return in *The Winter's Tale*. Yet, even if "gifts are never free" (171), they are stated to be so. When Lear, as a host, gifts his land to his daughters, he expects to be "unburden'd" (1.i.40) However, as Ruiter and Miller have pointed out there is also a burden of being repaid for a gift that is given, which is made clear by Lear himself who confidently expected the daughters to reciprocate by taking care of him and indulging him.

While Goneril and Regan indulge Lear's ego in the first scene by saying what was expected of them, Cordelia refuses to do so, and so is bereft of her gift. In that sense, his elder daughters gift him with what he wants to hear and in return get their gift of the land, while Cordelia does not. On the other hand, when Lear visits his daughters, both Goneril and Regan consider the dispersal of Lear's men as an obligation on his part in return for their hospitality towards him. While Lear sees this as them not repaying him for the years of fathering ("bonds of childhood" (2.iv. 177)), the two sisters perceive it as a guest who has arrived without a gift of reciprocity in return for their hospitality.

Thus, Lear gets caught in the "economy of the gift". When speaking of the relation between the father and the daughter, Lynda E. Boose quotes Georges Bataille: "The gift itself is a renunciation. . . . Marriage is a matter less for the partners than for the man who gives the woman away, the man whether father or brother who might have freely enjoyed the woman, daughter or sister, yet who bestows her on someone else" (327). Though Lear seeks "kind nursery" (1.i.123) only from Cordelia he, as the host, initially intends to give her away as a 'free' gift to either France or Burgundy requiring in return an allegiance with France.

But after Cordelia's speech, Lear perceives her as 'tainted' (a word used by France in I.i. 220). The word 'taint' means 'to corrupt, contaminate', 'to convict, prove guilty', 'to colour, dye' but also 'to seize'. Lear tells Cordelia "Here I disclaim all my paternal care,/ Propinquity and property of blood" (I.i. 112-113), calling her a "stranger" (114) and "my sometime daughter" (118). Kent disputes his king, stating: "Revoke thy gift" (I. i. 162). Here, the gift that the father bestows upon his daughter is not a positive gift, but a negative one of disowning his own daughter.

Yet, eventually, Cordelia becomes a chain that links France and England. Though France wages war on England, it is seen that the prince himself leaves the battlefield and when the battle is won, Edgar states "King Lear hath lost, he and his daughter ta'en" (5.ii. 6) thus siding Lear not with England, but with France. The notions of what France is, what England is and what England is not get blurred. Despite France being an 'enemy' country, it is France- in the name of its queen, Cordelia- that comes to Lear's aid. On the other hand, despite England belonging to Lear's two elder daughters, there is disharmony in the country once Lear gives away his title.

The word 'gift' occurs twice in *Macbeth*: once when Macbeth speaks to the murderers, and once when Malcolm refers to King Edward's governance. In the first instance Macbeth notes that "The valued file/ Distinguishes the swift, the slow, the subtle… According to the gift which bounteous nature/ Hath in him closed" (III. i. 95-98). Macbeth, here, desires order, and sees that order as a gift. Both Lear's and Macbeth's decision taints their country. But, here, Macbeth recognises order and hierarchy as a gift given by nature, even as he disrupts it further when he sends the murderers to kill Banquo.

Even when Macbeth addresses Duncan, he highlights the importance of the reciprocity of gifts. Macbeth says, "The service and the loyalty I owe,/ In doing it, pays itself. Your highness' part/ Is to receive our duties, and our duties/ Are to your throne and state, children and servants" (I. iv. 22-25). Yet, here, the gift is that of a service, rather than a physical object. In return for this, Duncan provides them with "late dignities heaped up to them" (I. vi. 19).

Marcel Mauss, in *The Gift*, talks about the pledge or token as a symbolic gift. "First the pledge not only creates obligations and acts as a binding force but it also engages the honour, authority and *mana* of the man who hands it over. He remains in an inferior position so long as he is not freed from his 'engagement-wager'… It is the price of an agreement and the recognition of a challenge, even more than a means of constraining the debtor… it is not only the person who gives it that is bound, but also the one who receives it." (61) He states that to throw a pledge at one's feet is a symbol of distrust or danger in receiving the pledge as is seen before duels.

The duels in *King Lear* are abundant- when Kent trips Oswald in Goneril's house, the fight between them in front of Gloucester's house, the staged fight between Edgar and Edmund, the duel between Cornwall and his servant who disobeys him and finally the duel between Edgar and Edmund. But it is only in this last duel that the pledge (the glove) is exchanged and therefore, it is only here that a formal 'gift', as Mauss perceives it, is seen.

When Edgar challenges Edmund, he does not do so in his own name, but as a nameless soldier. Edmund is not obliged to answer his challenge, but says, "In wisdom I should ask thy name… What safe and nicely I might well delay/ By rule of knighthood, I disdain and spurn." (5.iii. 141-145) Edmund, thus, is blinded by the power and affectations that comes with honour. Even Goneril sees Edmund as an honourable man when she says, "O, the difference of man and man!" (4.ii. 26) Here, she gives him a favour as well. This favour, completely different from the pledge, is also a gift albeit a positive one and is complemented by the letter Goneril writes to Edmund in IV.vi: "Let our reciprocal vows be rememb'red. You have many opportunities to cut him off; if your will want not, time and place will be fruitfully offer'd. There is nothing done if he return the conqueror: then I am the prisoner, and

his bed my gaol; from the loathed warmth whereof deliver me, and supply the place for your labour./ Your (wife, so I would say) affectionate servant, Goneril." (IV.vi. 264-269)

This letter highlights the promise that is entrenched in the favour itself. However, Goneril seems to already be 'imprisoned' by Albany. She already loathes him and finds herself shackled by the bonds of marriage. In that sense, one could say that their wedding rings and vows become a restrictive bond. However, Goneril signs the letter as an "affectionate servant", thereby enslaving herself to Edmund in the process of freeing herself from Albany.

On the other hand, towards the end of the play, Lear sees imprisonment as a gift. When he tells Cordelia, "Come, let's away to prison./ We two alone will sing like birds I'th' cage… so we'll live,/ And pray, and sing, and tell old tales, and laugh" (V.iii. 8-12) he is happy that prison brings back a 'possession' he unwittingly gave away as a gift.

While Hillis Miller talks about the gift as poisonous, we also see how poison in *Macbeth* works through words. The gift of prophecy given by the witches seems to poison Macbeth's mind. The witches are uncanny and terrifying in their predictions. In *The Gift of Death*, Derrida defines *mysterium tremendum*:

"*Mysterium temendum.* A frightful mystery, a secret to make you tremble.

Tremble. What does one do when one trembles? What is it that makes you tremble?

A secret always *makes* you tremble. Not simply quiver or shiver, which also happens sometimes, but tremble." (*The Gift of Death* 53)

The witches depict this "*mysterium tremendum*". Not the sight of them, but their prophecy "Shakes so my single state of man" (IV .iii. 139). The prophecy is mysterious and has to be maintained as a secret. The gift of such a prophecy makes Macbeth tremble. Banquo (both alive and as a ghost) threatens to expose this secret, and therefore, the word tremble occurs twice in a row when Macbeth states: "Approach thou like the rugged Russian bear,/ The arm'd rhinoceros, or th' Hyrcan tiger,/ Take any shape but that, and my firm nerves/ Shall never tremble. Or be alive again,/ And dare me to the desert with thy sword;/ If trembling I inhabit, then protest me/ The baby of a girl" (III.iv. 100-106).

When Birnam wood rises, in Macbeth's mind, to Dunsinane hill and when Macduff reveals that he is not born of woman, Macbeth no longer 'trembles' because the secrecy of death can no longer be maintained. Macbeth says, "I have almost forgot the taste of fears… I have supp'd full with horrors;/ Direness, familiar to my slaughterous thoughts,/ Cannot once start me." (V.v. 9-14)

Derrida points out that the "gift of death" could be either a death given to the other, as is usually the case in a war, where the enemy is killed, or the death of oneself, which is a sacrifice. There are instances of the former in the play. There is also the death given to the other for one's own benefit. Secrecy is involved only in the death given to Duncan and Banquo- the deaths that were caused by the prophecy.

The death due to war as well as the willing death of one's own self are a part of what Derrida calls the "economy of a sacrifice" (*The Gift of Death* 8). In the first battle, there is a sacrifice of one's own soldiers in the name of treachery. When the thane of Cawdor is killed, it is done in the name of the country. Thus, his sacrifice becomes a gift to the country (and inadvertently a gift to Macbeth as well). Thus, the

deaths of Macdonwald and Sweno are also a part of the sacrifice as a gift for the country itself.

Thus, the “economy of the gift” and the “economy of a sacrifice” are used to portray the host-guest ambiguity in *King Lear* and *Macbeth*. This section studies the concept of the gift as something that is not necessarily an act with positive consequences. Instead of a gift binding two people in an equal relationship, it binds the receiver in an obligation that is not necessarily always met. In fact, the gift constantly places somebody in a position of power- as is seen through services owed to the king, the pledges used to signal a duel etc. Just as there is power that comes with property, there is also power in the possession of the gift.

Conclusion

Through the play on the meanings of the host/guest, the question of sovereignty, property, violence, and the reciprocal obligations of the guest/host or stranger/host are seen. The ordered worlds of the host and guest, the host’s sovereignty and possession of property, as well as the negligible power vested in the guest (or the gift-giver) seem to be overturned. However, even the disorder functions within the norms of ‘natural’ orders.

While this chapter focuses on the spaces of power seen through the host-guest relationships, the next chapter focuses on spaces of language, where meaning itself can be expressed and perceived through many different ways.

Works Cited

Blomley, Nicholas "Law, Property, and the Geography of Violence: The Frontier, the Survey, and the Grid" *Association of American Geographers* 93.1 (2003): 121-141. *JSTOR*. Web. 26 Mar. 2013.

Boose, Lynda E. "The Father and the Bride in Shakespeare" *PMLA* 97.3 (1982): 325-347. *JSTOR*. Web. 19 Sep 2013.

Bruckner, Lynne Dickson "'Let grief convert to anger'- Authority and affect in *Macbeth.*" *Macbeth: New Critical Essays.* Ed. Nick Moschovakis. New York: Routledge, 2008. 192-207. Print.

Derrida, Jacques *Of Hospitality.* Trans. Rachel Bowlby. California: Stanford University Press, 2000. PDF file.

---. "Hostipitality." Trans. Barry Stocker, Forbes Morlock. *Angelaki: Journal of the Theoretical Humanities* 5.3 (2000): 3-18. Taylor & Francis Ltd. Web.

---. *The Gift of Death.* Trans. David Wills. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1995. PDF file.

Lemon, Rebecca "Sovereignty and Treason in *Macbeth.*" *Macbeth: New Critical Essays.* Ed. Nick Moschovakis. New York: Routledge, 2008. 73-87. Print.

Mauss, Marcel, *The Gift: Forms and Functions of Exchange in Archaic Societies.* Trans. Ian Cunnison. Paris: Presses Universitaires De France, 1950. PDF file.

Miller, J. Hillis "The Critic as Host" *Critical Inquiry* 3.3 (1977): 439-447. JSTOR. Web. 16 Jan. 2013.

Ruiter, David “Shakespeare and Hospitality: Opening "The Winter's Tale"” *Mediterranean Studies* 16 (2007): 157-177. JSTOR. Web. 16 Jan. 2013.

Shakespeare, William *King Lear.* Ed. Kenneth Muir. London: Methuen, 1972. Print.

---. *Macbeth* Ed. A. R. Braunmuller. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997. Print.

Sinfield, Alan “‘Macbeth’: History, Ideology and Intellectuals.” *Macbeth.* Ed. Sinfield, Alan London: Macmillan, 1992. 121-135. Print.

Chapter III

Spaces of Language

> *"Representational spaces:* space as directly *lived* through its associated images and symbols, and hence the space of 'inhabitants' and 'users', but also of some artists… who *describe* and aspire to do no more than describe. This is the dominated — and hence passively experienced — space which the imagination seeks to change and appropriate. It overlays physical space, making symbolic use of its objects. Thus representational spaces may be said, though again with certain exceptions, to tend towards more or less coherent systems of nonverbal symbols and signs." (Lefebvre, 39)

Using Lefebvre's concept of representational spaces, where symbols (of art or any non-verbal language) define the physical, but also social spaces around us, this chapter shall analyse the various ways in which these languages are seen in *King Lear* and *Macbeth*: the message, titles of people, art, as well as the façade. The message mediates between various spaces of power. Yet, the messenger, too, occupies a certain space where he can express a minimal agency. Titles represent spaces of hierarchy in relation to the landscape, where the physical space is directly connected to social spaces. The language of art, with its multiplicity of meanings, represents spaces of war, treachery and cunning, where the landscape of the battlefield gains significance. Finally, the façade portrays the walls (both social and physical) behind which people can hide.

Thus, this chapter shall analyse representational spaces and how they symbolise both physical and social spaces in the two texts where the various spaces of language and the multiplicity of meanings inherent in them will also be studied.

Messengers who work for a certain master, and who could possess a certain level of allegiance to their masters can convey their messages in variant ways which could then be interpreted differently by the people who receive the message. Titles that usually provide a level of order in society, because they keep the required people within their orders, can also be broken or altered. Art- which is both talent and artifice- can also be perceived as that which is normal or natural where the usual state of being itself can be seen as artificial. Finally, both positive and negative façades, connected to shadows and darkness, work within a system which establishes authority in the hands of certain people, but simultaneously also functions in destabilizing them.

A. The Space of the Messenger and the Message

> "…not only are there multiple stories to be told, but there are multiple tellers of stories, reverse discourses and multiple sources of theoretical knowledge" (Massey, 15)

In *King Lear* and *Macbeth*, some messages that are delivered are ambiguous and can be interpreted differently. At the beginning of *Macbeth*, Macbeth receives the news that "The King hath happily receiv'd, Macbeth,/ The news of thy success; and when he reads/ Thy personal venture in the rebels' fight,/ His wonders and his praises do contend/ Which should be thine or his," (I. iii. 89-93). Macbeth, however, reads this in the light of the message portending his ascension to the throne which he hears from the witches. Interestingly, Ross uses the word "reads" in relation to Duncan's praise of Macbeth, already highlighting the interpretive quality of messages, something that is pointed out in *King Lear* by Kent to the gentleman, when he says "Report is changeable" (IV.vii. 92). Since Duncan does not witness the battle first hand, but only hears a verbal account of it through the sergeant, this word expresses

the “multiple stories” that are available within a single message. The sergeant is first introduced by Malcolm who vouches for his honour by stating that the sergeant prevented him from being captured. Only then does Duncan listen to him, and eventually states, “So well thy words become thee as thy wounds;/ They smack of honour both” (I.i.44-45).

In *King Lear*, when Edmund shows Gloucester the letter that he says Edgar wrote, he answers his father’s question about who the messenger was: “It was not brought me, my lord; there’s the cunning of it; I found it thrown in at the casement of my closet.” (I.ii.58) The absence of the messenger, here, lends credibility to the message itself. Lefebvre notes that there is an “illusion of transparency” which holds that writing and speaking create a ‘transparent’ space without darknesses or shadows, but that this is a myth (28-29). While the letter seems to expose Edgar’s ‘true’ nature, it actually hides Edmund’s desires. The letter, which is seemingly transparent in Gloucester’s eyes, is not.

Indeed, just as Gloucester asks him to, Edmund does “frame the business after [his] own wisdom” (I.ii. 95-96, my parenthesis), creating an illusion of transparency with his father, while working within shadows. When Gloucester asks Edmund if “You know the character to be your brother’s?” (I.ii. 60) the word character refers both to Edgar’s handwriting as well as his nature. The letter contains within it a portrayal of Edgar, but also of Edmund’s deception. Thus, in Edmund’s instance, the multiplicity is not only in the meanings seen in the message, but also in the perception of the one who gives the message.

Edmund pretends to work for Gloucester, but serves Regan and Cornwall. When Gloucester’s plan to secretly convey Lear to Dover is revealed, Gloucester looks

towards Edmund. Regan then says, “Thou call’st on him that hates thee; it was he/ That made the overture of thy treason to us” (III.vii.87-88). Sarah Whatmore, in her article “Hybrid Geographies: Rethinking the ‘Human’ in Human Geography” notes that “The privileging of language as a precondition and hallmark of social agency rests on and reproduces a worn-out distinction between language and the world, in which the world is treated as an external referent and language as a medium which represents ‘it’ in a more or less transparent manner.” (*Human Geography Today*, 30) The world though, comprises both the physical surroundings as well as the world of actions. Though the messenger only conveys existing news, (s)he also has a certain amount of “social agency” about the actions conveyed, and does not necessarily communicate in a “transparent manner”. The apparent transparency that Gloucester and Edgar see in Edmund’s words actually works against them and the peripheral space that Edmund feels he has in his house gets altered to the central space he occupies in Regan and Goneril’s service.

The texts do not only study the multiplicity of meanings within a message but also the messenger, who can be seen as the mediating space between the sender and receiver of a message. They represent the stories of their masters, but, at times there is a small space within which their own voice is also conveyed. There is also a hierarchy of power between the giver and the receiver that is inherent in the messages delivered. The multiplicity of narratives shows the agency of the characters and the importance of the spaces that their voices occupy.

In *Macbeth*, the witches depict the agency of the messenger through their cryptic information. Macbeth and Banquo are curious about where the witches come from, and whose message they bear. Macbeth asks them, “Say from whence/ You owe this strange intelligence, or why/ Upon this blasted heath you stop our way/ With such

prophetic greeting” (I. iii. 73-76). But in response they vanish, not providing the receivers of the message the answer as to who the sender is, leaving Banquo to conclude that they are of nature: “The earth hath bubbles, as the water has,/ And these are of them” (I. iii. 77-78). While Hecate considers herself as superior to the witches (III. v. 6), she, too, is called away with music and song by a ‘spirit’ who “Sits in a foggy cloud” (I. v. 34-35).

The three witches also call the apparitions their masters (IV. i. 62), even as they conjure them up, asking Macbeth to “Listen, but speak not to’t” (IV. i. 88). Thus, the apparitions, themselves, can also be seen as messengers of the witches (because they conjure them by pouring the blood of a sow that eats its young ones (IV. i. 64)). The witches never show who they bring messages from. Yet, they have the ability to control the winds and seas to a certain extent, showing that they are of nature. But primarily, they are of that part of nature that is both fair and foul- a combination of heath, thunder, and darkness. In *Post-Modern Wetlands: Culture, History, Ecology*, Rodney Giblett speaks about how the wetland is a region where meanings “slip and slide” (Giblett, 21). It is precisely this that the witches do- they equivocate, they “[lie] like truth” (V.v. 43). As Banquo notes, they “Win us with honest trifles, to betray’s/ In deepest consequence” (I.iii. 124-125). The witches, then, can be seen as messengers of nature- a nature that has not been tamed or controlled by the activities of humans.

Despite knowing that the witches are “secret, black and midnight hags” (IV.i.47) Macbeth desires to know more about his own life from them. Their language that is seemingly transparent eventually creates spaces of falsity and desire. Hecate points this out when she says, “To trade and traffic with Macbeth/ In riddles and affairs of death;/ And I, the mistress of your charms,/ The close contriver of all harms,/ Was

never called to bear my part,/ Or show the glory of our art?" (III.v.2-9). These messengers are providers of riddles rather than absolute knowledge. Even as they impart information, they withdraw information as well. This is seen when they say, "Seek to know no more" (IV.i.103). The messenger's language, here, is obscure. Describing the metaphor of the messenger, Nigel Thrift, in "Steps to an Ecology of Place", says, "The messenger brings light to texts or signs that are obscure. But she also induces a certain foreignness, even strangeness, because the message comes from afar." (*Human Geography Today*, 308). The foreignness introduced by the witches is in the multiplicity of the meanings of what they say, but also in the obscurity of who they bring their message from.

Lennox's messages are obscure as well. He describes the events occurring in Scotland to the lord: "My former speeches have but hit your thoughts,/ Which can interpret farther" (III.vi.1-2). Lennox cannot and will not overtly speak against the king, but speaks to be interpreted and makes it clear to the lord that he is against the king despite, seemingly, speaking in his favour. Yet, it is Lennox who provides Macbeth with the information that Macduff has escaped to England. Lennox, then, is working within the space provided by Macbeth to subtly speak out against him, until he openly joins Malcolm's forces.

In *King Lear* the multiplicity of meanings is not only perceived in the news provided by a single messenger, but also in an opposition between two messengers, Oswald and Kent (as Caius) who attempt to deliver messages outside Gloucester's castle. Kent first goes to Regan's palace, where he meets Goneril's "reeking post" (II.iv. 29) and soon after he follows Regan to Gloucester's castle, where he sees Oswald. As soon as Goneril, towards the end of I.iv sends Oswald to Regan (though she does not specify where Oswald should go, Kent notes that he is spotted only at

Gloucester's castle (II.iv. 37-40)) with criticism of her father, Lear (in the next scene) sends Kent to Gloucester with a letter that is probably meant for Regan (even though, the audience is not yet informed that she is headed to Gloucester's castle). The two messengers, both outside Regan's palace (the messenger and Kent) and Gloucester's castle (Oswald and Kent) are a physical representation of two opposing narratives contending for the same verbal space.

By placing one messenger in the stocks out in the open, and inviting the other into the house, they establish a hierarchy of power seen through the messenger. Indeed, even Lear can mediate with Regan only through a messenger- he has to repeatedly ask Gloucester to call forth Regan and Cornwall: "Deny to speak with me!… Fetch me a better answer"; "I'd speak with the Duke of Cornwall and his wife"; "Are they inform'd of this?"; "Now, presently: bid them come forth and hear me" (II. iv. 84-114).

John Allen speaks of the use of power: "power is clearly not some preformed entity with latent abilities. Rather, distanciated forms of power may be considered to manifest their abilities through a series of often routinized and repetitive practices 'stretched' over space." Here, power "is produced through networks of social action" (199). Without the ability to constantly be wherever required, the person who gives the message to be delivered asserts his/her power over distances through the messenger. The delivery of a message is this stretching over space that defines the power of the person whose message is being given.

The obedience of the messenger, who stands in the space of their master, becomes a symbol of their power. Unlike Lennox in *Macbeth*, Oswald is a "trusty servant" as Goneril tells Edmund. He reports to her about her own husband, "When I inform'd

him, then he called me sot,/ And told me I had turn'd the wrong side out" (IV.ii.8-9) and he even refuses to reveal Goneril's letter to Regan. Richard Madelaine speaks of the agency of the messenger: "despite their apparent passivity, messengers' agency is important in at least the catalytic sense, in connection with broader issues of identity and authority." (169). Oswald's defiance of Regan, then, shows a certain amount of authority on Goneril's part. Similarly, Lennox's subtle defiance of Macbeth shows his slipping authority.

It is not just the messenger's obedience, but also his/her allegiance that highlights the master's power. Madelaine notes that "professional messengers often function as whipping-boys, bruised agents in a learning process more immediately beneficial to the well-born than to the lowly." (154). Thus, the respect paid to the conveyor of news directly relates to the person he comes from. When Oswald is called a "sot", it is a direct insult to Goneril as well. Gloucester points this out to Regan and Cornwall when they place Kent in the stocks- "the king must take it ill,/ That he's so slightly valued in his messenger" (II.ii. 141). The full extent of this insult towards Lear through Kent is seen in the latter's lament to his king:

"My lord, when at their home

I did commend your highness' letters to them.
Ere I was risen from the place that showed
My duty kneeling, came there a reeking post,
Stewed in his haste, half breathless, panting forth
From Goneril his mistress salutations,
Delivered letters spite of intermission,
Which presently they read, on whose contents

They summoned up their meiny, straight took horse,

Commanded me to follow and attend

The leisure of their answer, gave me cold looks.

And meeting here the other messenger,

Whose welcome I perceived had poisoned mine—

Being the very fellow which of late

Displayed so saucily against your highness—

Having more man than wit about me, drew.

He raised the house with loud and coward cries.

Your son and daughter found this trespass worth

The shame which here it suffers." (II.iv.27-45)

Yet, even in that instance when he says he serves as Lear's messenger, he also receives messages from Cordelia (II.ii.161-163). While pledging his allegiance to Lear, he is still in contact with the daughter that Lear had initially banished. Kent's agency lies in this in-between zone that obeys two masters. He, thus, occupies a dual space.

In *Macbeth*, when Macduff visits Malcolm in England, he goes on behalf of a country, and not a person. He represents the growing discontent amongst the lords of Scotland, as is seen in the lord's lament to Lennox: "Macduff/ Is gone to pray the holy king… That by the help of these… we may again/ Give to our tables meat, sleep to our nights,/ Free from our feasts and banquets bloody knives/ Do faithful homage and receive free honours,/ All which we pine for now." (III. vi. 29-37). In IV.iii., Macduff constantly reverts to speaking about Scotland, attempting to defend her against Macbeth and highlight the various problems to Malcolm ("like good men/ Bestride our downfall birthdom" (IV. iii. 3-4)). Thus, he has to prove his loyalty towards

Scotland to Malcolm, who tries and tests him thoroughly, accepting Macduff's story only after a lengthy verbal duel. Malcolm's trial of the messenger questions the allegiance of latter towards his country. The messenger could be read as either a supporter or a traitor, in this instance, of his country, rather than of any single individual.

In his conversation with the lord, Lennox comes to know of Macduff's plans to visit the English court which houses Malcolm. The lord speaks of Macduff as the messenger of bad tidings about a tyrannous rule, but also of Macbeth's messenger who attempts to convince Macduff to return to Scotland: "with an absolute "Sir, not I,"/ The cloudy messenger turns me his back,/ And hums, as who should say "You'll rue the time/ That clogs me with this answer." (III.vi. 40-43). In opposition to this messenger of Macbeth's, there is the supposed "holy angel" that Lennox wishes would "Fly to the court of England and unfold/ His message ere he come, that a swift blessing/ May soon return to this our suffering country/ Under a hand accurs'd" (III.vi. 45-49). Macbeth has already stated to his wife that he has bribed most of the servants in Macduff's home (III.iv. 128-132). He is also aware that Macduff had refused to attend the banquet. Thus, when the lord speaks of Macduff's opposition of Macbeth's messenger, the altercation between a messenger of the crown and that of the land can be seen, where the crown and land are no longer the same.

Messages themselves are ambiguous in nature and can be interpreted differently by various people. Similarly, the messenger can also perform the role of providing messages with diverse meanings, but also messages that are obscure. Despite the messenger being a peripheral character, the words of a message occupy a central space: the messenger mediates between the giver and the receiver of the message. This act of mediation gives them a certain degree of social agency when they provide

multiple meanings, creating an "illusion of transparency". Yet, there still exists a hierarchy of power, where the messenger obeys or owes allegiance to their master, representing the space of the master. The messenger, then, can either openly negate this space or can attempt to disrupt it, but only in a subtle manner.

B. Spaces Seen Through the Title

"… many items in addition to places were named on a landscape. People had names, and titled people had genealogies to account for their names. The rich preserved their names… while men of action created names for themselves as they lived. This variety of names… were associated [with place names] at the same level of description in sixteenth-century geographies…" (Robinson, 323)

Brian S. Robinson, in "Elizabethan Society and Its Named Places", speaks of the connection between the names of a physical landscape in association with the names of the upper-classes of the sixteenth century, and when he says that "people created names for themselves", he is talking about their status and the titles that they obtain. Doreen Massey notes that in the "reciprocity between 'the social' and 'the spatial'… it had to be recognized that the social was necessarily also spatially constructed." (6). Thus, the physical spaces in *King Lear* and *Macbeth* can also be seen as determining the social hierarchy of titles in the plays.

King Lear begins with a map that represents charted terrains, when Lear takes his title for granted. These mapped terrains are linked to his own position as the king. When Lear still believed that "Only we shall retain/ The name, and all th' addition to a king:/ The sway, revenue, execution of the rest,/ Beloved sons, be yours" (I. i. 134-137) it is his Fool who points out that Lear was, himself, a fool, because "All thy other titles thou hast given away; that thou wast born with" (I. iv. 146) and in the next

scene points out that the snail keeps its house "to put's head in; not to give it away to his daughters, and leave his horns without a case" (I. v. 30). The Fool recognises this connection between the house and the title. Just as Lear gave away his land, he also gave away his title, thereby not even retaining the 'name' of king. However, Lear eventually questions his title as 'king', referring to himself as only "old and foolish" (IV. vii. 84) and simultaneously losing all sense of place as well: "for I am mainly ignorant/ What place this is… nor I know not/ Where I did lodge last night." (IV. vii. 65-68).

It is interesting to note that in *King Lear*, the lands given to Lear's daughters have names, while the name of the location of Lear's palace is not mentioned- i.e. Albany's palace and Gloucester's castle and even the unmentioned home of Cornwall are situated in the respective places of Albany, Gloucester and Cornwall. Yet, Lear in I.i., is not situated in any one place. If, as Robinson states, the variety of names are usually associated with place names, the absence of a name for Lear's palace could refer to the king's rule over the entire kingdom of England, but it also paradoxically hints at the eventual lack of place which Lear can call his own.

While Lear loses both his title and his land, Macbeth loses the land of Scotland as he gains a title. Macbeth's coronation is reported to be a subdued affair by Macduff who says, "He is already named, and gone to Scone/ To be invested" (II. iv. 31-32). His coronation, therefore, has not been acknowledged by many of his subjects, like Ross and the old man. It is also mentioned at a time when the 'unnatural' aspect of nature is spoken about by Ross and the old man in II.iv and by III.vi., the lord, while talking to Lennox, alienates Macbeth's kingship from Scotland- i.e. his title and his land are seen separately (III.vi. 30-39). It is in this scene that Lennox first calls Macbeth a tyrant. Once he has been named a tyrant and a traitor, the title of king no

longer holds power, and Macbeth's title of king is converted into that of a tyrant. Eventually faced by Malcolm along with the English army marching towards him, Macbeth notes that "this push/ Will cheer me ever or disseat me now" (V. iii. 20-21). Thus, he only recognises open revolt as the 'push' that will overthrow him, but doesn't accept that he has already been overthrown when Macduff entreats Malcolm to help him overthrow the "untitled tyrant" (IV.iii. 104).

Malcolm is approached by Macduff, who claims that he is "the truest issue of [the] throne" (IV.iii. 106, my parenthesis), and he directly connects this title to Scotland. He first asks Malcolm to defend Scotland (IV.iii. 2-4). When Malcolm questions his loyalty towards his family, his first response is "Bleed, bleed, poor country" (IV.iii. 32), and when Malcolm slanders his own name, Macduff's responses are "We have willing dames enough" (where "we" refers to Scotland) (73) and "Scotland hath foisons to fill up your will" (88), and finally when he gives up hope, he mourns, "O Scotland! O Scotland!" (100). Therefore, Macduff directly connects the title of the king with the possession of the land. When Malcolm is finally proclaimed as a king, it is in front of an entire army, where Macduff says, "Hail, king! for so thou art: behold, where stands/ The usurper's cursed head. The time is free./ I see thee compassed with thy kingdom's pearl,/ That speak my salutation in their minds;/ Whose voices I desire aloud with mine./ Hail, King of Scotland." (V. viii. 21-26). While Malcolm is hailed as a king by his subjects, the only people who do so for Macbeth are the witches. Thus, the subjects vocally recognise Malcolm's title as the "King of Scotland" and not Macbeth.

When Macduff vividly describes the folly of Scotland to Malcolm at England: "Bleed, bleed, poor country./ Great tyranny, lay thou thy basis sure,/ For goodness dare not check thee; wear thou thy wrongs,/ The title is affeered" (IV. iii. 32-34), the

title is not that of any individual, but about the landscape of Scotland itself- inclusive of its geography as well as its citizens. This landscape comprises the various ‘unnamed’ citizens who are also a part of the terrain.

David Rollison notes, in “Exploding England: The Dialectics of Mobility and Settlement in Early Modern England”, that “A minor gentleman's affective world was a region centred on a 'seat', a substantial household and immediate family; his affections rippled out in concentric circles to embrace friends, neighbours, village, district, region, kingdom. As he moved from the centre his affections waned, and gradually became active dislike or even contempt. The firmly centred, settled life was the ideal.” (13) This ‘seat’ or ‘centre’ was not something the yeoman had. Thus, the title and the land go hand in hand when the Fool tells Lear that the mad man is “a yeoman that has a gentleman to his son; for he’s a mad yeoman that sees his son a gentleman before him” (III. vi. 12-14), highlighting the aspiration towards a settled life. The yeoman, who is either an “attendant in a noble household”, a “commoner who cultivates his land” or “the third order of fighting men” does not aspire towards this centre, and according to Rollison, some of them had to keep moving during the late 1500s due to industrial crisis (11). When Lear disseats himself, he has moved away from the settled, ideal life that Rollison mentions. Similarly, when Macbeth gains the name of ‘tyrant’, he too has disseated himself through his act of murder and he loses control over his state.

Physical spaces and the spaces of possession (available through the title) are also seen in Edgar and Kent, where they have to leave their land and change their names and identities, becoming more impoverished than their previous, highly positioned selves. Lear sees Edgar as a poor, naked, homeless man, stating that “unaccommodated man is no more but such a poor, bare, forked animal as thou art”

(III. iv. 105-106)). Edgar and Kent give up their titles and the spaces of power that came with the name. On the other hand, though Edmund is provided a shelter, he does not have possession of land. He does not have a title either. In the introduction by Gloucester to Kent, he is scoffed at, leading him to desire Edgar's land- "Why bastard? Wherefore base?... Legitimate Edgar, I must have your land" (I. ii. 6, 16)). Under the service of Regan and Cornwall, however, he gains both. Cornwall strips Gloucester of his title giving it to Edmund, thereby also providing him with the lands under his father's name.

By bestowing a title on someone, the spaces that they occupy alter. After Edmund is seen as loyal in Regan and Cornwall's eyes when he reveals his father's treachery, he is named by Cornwall as the Earl of Gloucester. It is this that enables him to lead the soldiers in the war at the end of the play. Regan and Cornwall seem aware of the allegiance they will obtain from Edmund by increasing his rank, providing him the land that belonged to his father. It is this that allows him to state at the end of the play, "Sir, I thought it fit/ To send the old and miserable King/ To some retention and appointed guard… With him I sent the Queen" (V. iii. 47-52). When Albany questions this move by stating that Edmund is not his equal (or "brother"), Regan says, "That's as we list to grace him" (V. iii. 63). Edmund moves from being seen as an illegitimate son without property, to the sole owner of Gloucester's lands, and eventually almost reaches the status of a duke (which is foiled by the duel).

In *Macbeth*, Duncan and Malcolm recognise the importance of the titles of their men. Duncan notes, "Sons, kinsmen, thanes,/ And you whose places are the nearest, know:/ We will establish our estate upon/ Our eldest, Malcolm, whom we name hereafter/ The Prince of Cumberland" (I. iv. 35-39) while Malcolm says, "My thanes

and kinsmen,/ Henceforth be earls, the first that ever Scotland/ In such an honour named" (V. viii. 29-31).

In *King Lear*, Cordelia gains a title only when she is no longer granted a space within both her home and her country. The woman who is termed "untender" (I. i. 105), "little seeming substance" (197), "infirmities she owes" (201), "wretch whom nature is ashamed/ Almost t'acknowledge hers" (211-12) etc. gains the title of queen with France's words- "Thy dowerless daughter, king, thrown to my chance,/ Is queen of us, of ours, and our fair France" (I.i. 255-256).

Doreen Massey notes that power can be perceived as that which is "wielded over the less powerful. Power is either held or it is not. Space is present in this conception of power, but in the background." (172) When Macbeth denies the titles of his citizens, he loses his power and it leads to the landscape itself turning against him. The murderers, who are also citizens of the state, are not even acknowledged as men by Macbeth. A. R. Braunmuller in a footnote on the murderers, says that they are considered to be ex-soldiers, or masterless men belonging to the vagrant class (ed. Braunmuller 165). By dismissing them as unimportant, he doesn't even give them the title of men. He tells them, "Ay, in the catalogue ye go for men,/ As hounds, and greyhounds, mongrels, spaniels, curs… All by the name of dogs. The valued file/ Distinguishes the swift, the slow, the subtle,/ The housekeeper, the hunter, every one/ According to the gift which bounteous nature/ Hath in him closed," (III. i. 91-98).

He also hunts down Banquo and Macduff, who are within the bounds of the citizenship. Angus notes of Macbeth's capacity to govern- "Those he commands, move only in command,/ Nothing in love. Now does he feel his title/ Hang loose about him, like a giant's robe/ Upon a dwarfish thief' (V. ii. 19-22). So also, when he

calls his guests for dinner, his wife asks them to leave without any regard to their status and the order of leave-taking that they ought to follow- “Stand not upon the order of your going” (III. iv. 119). This inability to recognise the titles and positions of the others causes Macbeth’s title itself to fall. It is because he refuses to recognise these titles, and aspires to a title that is not his, that the landscape (inclusive of its people) rises against him.

Duncan never usurps a title or undermines it. He is aware of Macbeth’s position in the space of the battlefield, and also in the spaces of hierarchy. He assigns Macbeth’s new title based only on prowess, not on personal aspirations. Yet, for Macbeth the title of ‘Prince of Cumberland’ that Duncan bestows upon his elder son is a title that he ought to have obtained (“The Prince of Cumberland: that is a step/ On which I must fall down, or else o’erleap,/ For in my way it lies” (I. iv. 48-50))

The title bestowed upon Edmund by Cornwall provides him with small spaces of power, where he can command the captain to cause Cordelia’s hanging and only he could revoke his order eventually (“Who hath the office?” Edgar asks). This is the only instance where Edmund takes charge and initiates a command, otherwise possessing only little power. Even though he is both a knight and a nobleman (though not royalty), he also acts as a messenger under Regan and Goneril’s reign. Yet, when Regan offers to raise his status- “Witness the world, that I create thee here/ My lord and master… Let the drum strike, and prove my title thine” (V. iii. 77-78) his title is denied by Albany when he says, “I hold you but a subject of this war,/ Not as a brother.” (V. iii. 61-62).

Thus, the relation between social and physical spaces can be seen through the titles held by various individuals. Lefebvre notes that, “Nature presents itself as it is,

now cruel, now generous. It does not seek to deceive; it may reserve many an unpleasant surprise for us, but it never lies. So-called social reality is dual, multiple, plural. To what extent, then, does it furnish a reality at all?" (81). The landscape can only be seen through this 'social reality' which comprises of multiple meanings. With a transformation in the title, the reality of the landscape, too, changes. However, while the titles may change, the system within which they function still remains the same.

C. Battle as Art

'Art' is defined by the *Oxford English Dictionary* as follows: "Skill; its display or application", "Anything wherein skill may be attained or displayed", as an adjective "in precise senses, but particularized- magic art, military art, healing art, useful arts etc." where the body is used in art, and also as "skilful, crafty, or artificial conduct". Thus, art can also be opposed to 'nature' or what is considered to be 'natural' actions or events. The term originates in the Latin *artem*, from root '*ar-'* or "to fit" from the 13th century. It was also used as a verb (a term now obsolete) during the 14th century, meaning "to confine, cramp, restrict, limit, in local position or in action". This is derived from the Latin *artā-re* meaning "to draw close, contract", and thus can also be seen in connection with battle or war.

The word 'war' is defined as follows: "Hostile contention by means of armed forces, carried on between nations, states, or rulers or between parties in the same nation or state", "A contest, struggle", "… fighting as a department of activity, as a profession, or as an art", "a manner of fighting" (a term now obsolete, but used from the mid 15th century in relation to instruments of war like artillery etc., arrays and formations, and tournaments of war) (*OED*). From the 18th century it was also used in connection with words denoting cries, songs, musical instruments etc. The phrase

"military art" was a term that became popular around the 1700s with Charles Rollin's *Roman History*, where he speaks about a treatise on "art military", but was also used in Sir J Smyth's *Disc. Weapons* of 1590 as "Arte Militarie" (*OED*). In relation to art, therefore, war refers to the various formations and tactics used in warfare, the music and fanfare provided for battles, the weaponry used as well as the skill of the soldiers in battle.

This section studies the spaces of the battlefield as a 'real' space that is represented in art. If 'art' is seen as a "skill as a result of learning or practice", the skill or talent can be seen in the first battle in *Macbeth*, which is described as "two spent swimmers, that do cling together/ And choke their art" (I. ii. 8). Here, both armies are associated with swimmers who have tired themselves out, and attempt to destroy each others' talent with their exhaustion. Thus, the battle itself becomes a depiction of skill and practice (or the art of war).

When the messenger describes Macbeth and Banquo's conquests in war to Duncan, he says, "Disdaining Fortune, with his brandished steel,/ Which smoked with bloody execution,/ Like Valour's minion carved out his passage/ Till he faced the slave… Yes, as sparrows, eagles, or the hare, the lion…/ As cannons over-charged with double cracks;/ So they doubly redoubled strokes upon the foe" (I. ii. 17-20, 35, 37-38). This is the Scottish "swimmers'" art. Macbeth and Banquo represent the valour and skill with which they fought their enemy. The tactics of war are also seen in the use of Birnam wood as a means of hiding the army by Malcolm and his men.

Gillian Rose in "Performing Space" notes that spaces are constantly "articulating, giving form to, the conquests, alliances, raids, inscriptions, investments, revolts and refusals among the discursive, the fantasized and the embodied." (247). When Edgar

asks the gentleman whether he knows about the battle, he replies, “Most sure and vulgar; everyone hears that,/ Which can distinguish sound” (IV. vi. 207-208). He also provides the news that Cordelia’s “army is mov’d on” (IV. vi. 212) and that the British army marches towards Dover within the hour. This repetitive talk of a battle to come culminates rapidly in the ten lines in V.ii. The descriptions offered by the gentleman and even the description of the battle itself are provided in the mediating space of the country near Dover and a field between the two camps respectively. If the spaces define the battles, this battle becomes anti-climatic. As Gary Taylor notes in “The War in *King Lear*”, especially the Folio version “encourages the audience to forget [the war]” (31, my parenthesis) which culminates, as he states, in an “aggressive disappointment” (28). Thus, the war in the play cannot be seen in relation to the skill of the soldiers, but it can be seen in the fanfare that surrounds the two camps- i.e. the flourishes, the drums, the colours etc.

In *King Lear*, the anticipation of war begins when Kent tells the gentleman, “from France there comes a power/ Into this scatter’d kingdom; who already,/ Wise in our negligence, have secret feet/ In some of our best ports, and are at point/ To show their open banner.” (III. i. 30-34). This information is repeated by Gloucester to Edmund in III.iii. The French camp is first mentioned in IV.iii, but Cordelia arrives with soldiers only in the next scene where the pomp of war preparations is seen through the drum and colours that accompany her. Similar pomp is seen in the English camp only in V.i. when Edmund and Regan arrive with officers and soldiers. The “drums and colours” which relate to the war music can, therefore, be seen as a part of the pomp and splendour of the camps which are a part of the “military art” mentioned earlier.

In *Macbeth*, when Macduff announces Duncan’s death, he notes that, “Confusion now hath made his masterpiece” (II. iii. 59), where murder is the creation, and

confusion is personified as the artist. The masterpiece of confusion becomes visible through the lifeless body of the erstwhile king. Though, here, the death is not in battle, the murder itself is perceived as artistic and skilful (i.e. deceitful). Confusion also works its art in the physical space where "The night has been unruly" (II. iii. 46). Here, the body becomes the space of art.

The body as a work of art is also seen when Gloucester describes Lear as a "ruin'd piece of Nature" (IV. vi. 133). Lear's body is seen as a creation of Nature, which can here be equated to an artist whose work of art is the human body. Yet, Lear's body is ruined or disfigured in his battle against his daughters as well as the storm. Macbeth's beheading by Macduff can also be considered as a work of art, since it is shown for all to see: "Behold where stands/ Th' usurper's cursed head" (V.ix. 21-22). Macbeth's ambition in attempting to ascend the social order leads to his severed head being displayed- "And live to be the show and gaze o'th' time./ We'll have thee, as our rarer monsters are,/ Painted upon a pole and underwrit,/ 'Here may you see the tyrant.'" (V. viii. 24-27). Though the display of traitors' heads was a reminder of the treachery and the punishment ensuing from that, this display can also be seen as an illustration of the victory in war. This can be associated to the first image of Macbeth, who valiantly painted death in the initial scene of battle.

Gillian Rose in "Performing Space" speaks about how the body is identified by certain notions (of race, colour, class, gender etc.), and how the body of their work (art/criticism) is defined by their physical body. The body becomes a performance (249). While Duncan, Lear and Macbeth's bodies can be seen as sites of art, the body can also be seen as a means of deception. Here, art is seen in opposition to 'nature' or 'natural actions', where the body is no longer a passive site (or sight, where it is only viewed), but becomes a space to mislead. For instance, when Edmund frames Edgar,

painting him as the black sheep of the family, he stages a duel between himself and his brother, cutting himself to prove that Edgar had attacked him. His cunning and trickery lies in his artful use of his own body as a means of deceit. Gloucester uses the word “frame” after hearing about Edgar’s supposed letter and asks Edmund to “frame the business after your own wisdom” (I. ii. 95). Originating from the Old Norse word *frami* or “advancement”, frame also meant ‘profit’ or ‘benefit’, ‘established order or plan’, ‘human body’ and a ‘border or case for a picture or pane of glass’. Thus, by marring himself Edmund uses his own body as a work of art when he frames Edgar.

Kent, too, attempts to frame Oswald before Cornwall and Regan, but fails to do so. He says of Oswald, “a tailor made thee… a stone-cutter or a painter could not have made him so ill, though he had been but two years o’th’ trade” (II. ii. 52, 55-56). Though Kent picks a fight with Oswald, he attempts to be ‘simple’ or ‘natural’ when addressing Cornwall and Regan, saying “I am no flatterer” (II. ii. 107).

bell hooks notes that “Spaces can be real and imagined. Spaces can tell stories and unfold histories. Spaces can be interrupted, appropriated, and transformed through artistic and literary practice.” (qtd. Massey, 271) In *King Lear*, Cordelia appropriates the space of the battlefield to profess love. She believes that her army marched for love, not war: “My mourning and importun’d tears hath pitied./ No blown ambition doth our arms incite,/ But love, dear love, and our ag’d father’s right” (IV. iv. 26-28). She shows a belief that love, in its simplicity will triumph over the artistry of war, where love is more natural while war is more deceitful and crafty. While the body and battle represent the artistic comparisons in warfare, Cordelia’s professing of love over war is a statement of ‘nature’ (where love is natural) over ‘art’ (the deceit seen in warfare).

The origin of the word ‘war’ comes from the German *verwierren* or “to confuse, perplex” and art, too, has the meaning of “cunning and trickery” that is in usage from 1600 onwards (*OED*). When the French army leaves (as is noted when the gentleman meets Edgar and tells him that “Though that the Queen on special cause is here,/ Her army is mov’d on” (IV.vi. 211-212)), the pomp of the British army is seen in opposition to the lack of men in the French camp. Cordelia adheres to the idea that, as Lefebvre’s notes, “Nature’s space is not staged” (70). Though Lefebvre is speaking of the physical space of nature, Cordelia sees what is natural amongst humans, and the artistry of war is superseded by the so-called ‘naturalness’ of love.

This act of deception is also central to *Macbeth*, where Duncan notes, “There’s no art/ To find the mind’s construction in the face.” (I. iv. 12-13). Another meaning of ‘art’ is “human workmanship” as opposed to nature. The act of murder in *Macbeth* can be seen as an act of human workmanship as opposed to the natural quality of sleep. Lady Macbeth tells her husband: “when in swinish sleep/ Their drenched natures lie as in a death,/ What cannot you and I perform upon/ The unguarded Duncan?” (I. vii. 67-70) Death and sleep are natural, but murder is, as Lady Macbeth states, a performance. Macbeth believes that he has murdered sleep- he has altered that which was natural, thereby disrupting it. He says,

“Macbeth does murder sleep', the innocent sleep,
Sleep that knits up the ravell'd sleeve of care,
The death of each day's life, sore labour's bath,
Balm of hurt minds, great nature's second course,
Chief nourisher in life's feast,” (II. ii. 39-42)

In response to this, Lady Macbeth asks him to perform his art with precision when she tells him, “go carry them and smear/ The sleepy grooms with blood.” (II. ii.

51-52). Macbeth creates the “air-drawn dagger” which Lady Macbeth names as “the very painting of your fear” (III. iv. 61-62). The painting becomes a false narrative, just as “these flaws and starts,/ Impostors to true fear, would well become/ A woman’s story at a winter’s fire,/ Authorized by her grandam” (III. iv. 63-66).

Thus, art can be seen in battle as well as opposed to ‘nature’ or what is considered ‘natural’, or not deceitful and crafty. The battlefield becomes a form or representation of art and the body, too, becomes a site of performance. Art itself is opposed to nature/natural, where the latter is considered to be the state of order, while the former leads to chaos due to its deceptive quality. Yet, both the texts work within the frameworks of art, artistry and artifice, as though they were the norm, thereby considering it as ‘natural’.

D. The Façade: Hiding Behind a False Show

Lefebvre compares spaces to a façade saying that some acts are on the façade (like a balcony or window) some from them (like processions), and some are behind them (where something obscene is always behind the scenes) (99). The word “façade” which means ‘the front of a building’ or ‘outward, esp. deceptive appearance’, originates from the Latin word *facia* or ‘face’. The deception could either be a positive one, but could also be seen as negative. This section examines these positive and negative façades seen through the two plays.

In *Macbeth*, Birnam wood can be seen as a façade, behind which Malcolm’s army marches in order to appropriate the crown. Here, the physical space is literally uprooted in order to maintain a front. Edgar, in *King Lear*, on the other hand, hides behind the façade of the heath, but also his disguise- i.e. he uses the heath as his front- “The country gives me proof and precedent/ Of Bedlam beggars” (II. iii. 13-14) –

against the ports that are out to seek him. His disguise is rooted in the simplicity of the 'natural' madman.

Lefebvre states that "façades were harmonized to create perspectives; entrances and exits, doors and windows, were subordinated to façades- and hence also to perspectives; streets and squares were arranged in concord with the public buildings and palaces of political leaders and institutions (with municipal authorities still predominating). At all levels, from family dwellings to monumental edifices, from 'private' areas to the territory as a whole, the elements of this space were disposed and composed…" (47) Thus, Lefebvre speaks of the deceptive nature of a space that is seemingly harmonising. In the heath in *King Lear*, when King Lear faces the storm, despite him recognising that "man is no more but such a poor, bare forked animal" (III. iv. 105), the heath does not make equals of the king, the fool, the madman and the servant. Similarly, the first battlefield in *Macbeth*, which seemingly harmonises all men in the collective goal towards victory, simultaneously divides the "kerns" from "Valour's minion". Thus, the façades worn by Lear before the storm scene, as well as the façades of valour seen in Macbeth are not "harmonising".

Kent and Edgar hide behind a façade, and are keen not to be revealed until the end of the play. While Macbeth's façade is the show of a 'fair' face that hides a 'foul' heart, for Kent and Edgar, it is a means of remaining in their own country. With the help of his cover, Kent shows his loyalty toward his master and Edgar helps Gloucester and eventually Albany through his disguise. This disguise by Kent and Edgar as people of a lower class and rank than their prior selves is a physical mask. The mask is something which both conceals and protects. In a land that is searching for them, their masquerade or "false show" helps protect them.

Malcolm, on the other hand, is initially represented as someone who does not wear a mask, where “To show an unfelt sorrow is an office/ Which the false man does easy” (II. iii. 129-130). However, he deceives Macduff as to his ‘true’ nature, when he pretends to be lustful and unperturbed about the state of his kingdom, retracting these statements later: “my first false speaking/ Was this upon myself” (IV.iii. 130-131). Malcolm wears a personal mask when he speaks to Macduff about his supposed vices (IV. iii). This personal mask leads to a collective façade when he marches against Macbeth, requesting his men to uproot the trees of Birnam wood. Both while talking to Macduff and while preparing the tactics for war, it is only after he has gained a significant advantage that he sheds the façade: “your leavy screens throw down,/ And show like those you are.” (V. vi. 1-2). Thus, Malcolm, too, hides behind a façade.

However, façades are not necessarily used for positive ends, but can also cause negative results. The witches’ famous first lines “Fair is foul, and foul is fair:/ Hover through the fog and filthy air” (I.i.10-11) is an apt description not only of the natural and political climate of the time, but also of the way language is used through the play- where foul deeds are hidden behind a “false face [which] must hide what the false heart doth know” (I. vii. 82, my parenthesis).

The mask can be perceived in many ways. Based on the French word *masque* which means “covering to hide or guard the face", the mask is an external cover that hides a ‘true’ character. In *The Country House Discourse*, Kari B MacBride speaks of legitimacy that is achieved through agency (here, she speaks about how nobility is ‘done’ just as one ‘does’ gender), performance (where the country house is the stage), costumes (that were established through the sumptuary laws) and actors (farmers, chaste wives etc.) (McBride, 3). The spaces of legitimacy in both *King Lear* and *Macbeth* are forcefully obtained through deception- i.e. Macbeth deceives Duncan in

his own home; Edmund deceives his father to act against his brother; and Goneril and Regan deceive their father into believing that they ‘love’ him.

Lefebvre states that “walls, enclosures and façades serve to define both a *scene* (where something takes place) and an *obscene* area to which everything that cannot or may not happen on the scene is relegated: whatever is inadmissible, be it malefic or forbidden, thus has its own hidden space” (36). Macbeth’s thought of murder, which occurs within his own castle, is aided by the illusions created by his castle as well. Duncan notes, “This castle hath a pleasant seat; the air/ Nimbly and sweetly recommends itself/ Unto our gentle senses” and Banquo responds by referring to the “temple-haunting martlet” (I. vi. 1-4). The castle, instead, hides these deeds and thoughts harboured by Macbeth.

Macbeth’s deception is voluntary and visible. He has a constant battle between what he feels or thinks and how he expresses it. Though he says, “make our faces vizards to our hearts/ Disguising what they are” (III. ii. 33) after he decides to kill Banquo, he has to constantly be reminded by his wife that he should “look like the innocent flower,/ But be the serpent under’t” (I. v. 63-64). In *King Lear*, Goneril and Regan’s façade is in order to obtain a space within their father’s kingdom. Though Goneril says that she loves Lear more than “space and liberty” (I. i. 55), she only professes love in order to gain her own space or agency. This is also true of Edmund, whose false pretence is only in order to obtain his own freedom.

Rodney Giblett in *Post-Modern Wetlands: Culture, History, Ecology* speaks about the marshlands which comprise of surfaces of water that reflect the surface of consciousness, where “The surface of the water reflects and ‘heightens’ the depths of gloom.” (6) The landscape constantly reflects the darkness of the action. The façades

also possess an inherent darkness within them. *Macbeth*'s theme that "There's no art/ To find the mind's construction in the face" (I.iv. 12-13) and Edgar's final statement in *King Lear* that we should "Speak what we feel, not what we ought to say" (V.iii. 323) connects with the "depths of gloom" that Giblett mentions. Since Giblett is talking about the heath as a reflection of individual consciousness, the heath in *Macbeth* and *King Lear* become important in comparing the murkiness of the façade to the landscape.

Macbeth's "black and deep desires" (I. iv. 51) are constantly mirrored in the witches, who visit him only in the open spaces of the heath. Yet, just as Macbeth puts up a façade in front of the others, the witches, too, put up a façade. Giblett's comparison to the surfaces of marshy water is apt here, since, water never reflects precisely- it always deceives and misleads, just as the witches do.

The façade is a space of deception. Some façades and masks seem to be harmonising, but are usually not, and they define what Lefebvre calls the 'scene' and 'obscene'. The façade always has an element of darkness or shadow, something that is hidden from everyone else. These façades are present within a system that observes open domination and control, but subtly undermine these notions.

Conclusion

This chapter examines the various spaces of language and how they seemingly work in destabilizing an existing order, but actually only function within it. The spaces occupied by the message and messenger, titles, art and façades provide a multiplicity of narratives (where something is stated while something else is implied) which question the existing norms of authority and order. Yet, even this questioning exists only within the structures that are already established.

This chapter focuses on the questioning of structures through a play of meanings. The next chapter, on the other hand, studies madness as a form of questioning, where insanity and unreason are considered to be negative and seemingly require a cure. Yet, madnesses are inherent in systems and even an attempt at curing them does not completely work.

Works Cited

Allen, John "Spatial Assemblages of Power: From Domination to Empowerment." Ed. Massey, Doreen, John Allen and Philip Sarre. *Human Geography Today.* Cambridge: Polity Press, 1999. 194-218. Print.

Giblett, Rodney James *Post-Modern Wetlands: Culture, History, Ecology.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1996. Print.

Lefebvre, Henri, *The Production of Space.* Trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith. Maiden: Blackwell Publishing, 1991. PDF file.

Madelaine, Richard "'What Are You?': The Staging of Messenger-Function in Antony and Cleopatra." *Parergon* 25.1, (2008): 149-170. *Project Muse*. Web.

Massey, Doreen "Issues and Debates." Introduction. *Human Geography Today.Ed. Doreen* Massey, John Allen and Philip Sarre. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1999. Print.

McBride, Kari B. *The Country House Discourse.* Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001. Print.

Robinson, Brian S. "Elizabethan Society and Its Named Places." *Geographical Review* 63.3 (1973): 322-333. *JSTOR*. Web. 19 Sep 2012.

Rose, Gillian "Performing Space." Ed. Doreen Massey, John Allen and Philip Sarre. *Human Geography Today.* Cambridge: Polity Press, 1999. 247-259. Print.

Rollison, David "Exploding England: The Dialectics of Mobility and Settlement in Early Modern England." *Social History* 24.1 (1999): 1-16. *JSTOR*. Web. 19 Sep 2012.

Shakespeare, William *King Lear.* Ed. Kenneth Muir. London: Methuen, 1972. Print.

---. *Macbeth.* Ed. A. R. Braunmuller. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997. Print.

Simpson, J. A. and E. S. C. Weiner eds. *The Oxford English Dictionary*. 2nd ed. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989. Print.

Taylor, Gary "The War in *King Lear.*" *Shakespeare Survey 33: King Lear.* Ed. Kenneth Muir. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980. Print.

Thrift, Nigel "Steps to an Ecology of Place." Ed. Doreen Massey, John Allen and Philip Sarre. *Human Geography Today.* Cambridge: Polity Press, 1999. 295-322. Print.

Whatmore, Sarah "Hybrid Geographies: Rethinking the 'Human' in Human Geography." Ed. Doreen Massey, John Allen and Philip Sarre. *Human Geography Today.* Cambridge: Polity Press, 1999. 22-39. Print.

Chapter IV

Curing the Madness of Mind, Body, State and Nature

The *Oxford English Dictionary* states the origins of the word 'mad' as follows: "OE. g*emaed(e)d*… to render insane… corresponding to OS. *gimêd* foolish, OHG. gameit, kimeit, foolish, vain, boastful (MHG. Gimeit merry, stately, handsome), Goth. *gamaips* crippled… the corresponding ON. *meiða* means to cripple". The various meanings it ascribes to this word include: a. "Suffering from mental disease; beside oneself, out of one's mind; insane, lunatic"; b. "Foolish, unwise… Extravagantly or wildly foolish; ruinously impudent"; c. "Stupefied with astonishment, fear or suffering: dazed. *Obs.*"; d. "Carried away by enthusiasm or desire; wildly excited; infatuated"; e. "'Beside oneself' with anger; moved to uncontrollable rage; furious"; f. "Of an animal: Abnormally furious, rabid"; g. "Uncontrolled by reason; passing all rational bounds in demeanour or conduct; extravagant in gaiety; wild". (*OED*)

Using these various meanings of the word 'mad', this chapter will observe the connections between the mind, body, state and the natural world. With roots in the Old Norse 'to cripple', madness need not only refer to a state of mind, but can also be connected to the body. While it is not directly connected to the state, this chapter shall observe the state as a body that cripples itself. Madness is also intrinsically connected to the word "wood". As an adjective, 'wood' derived from the Old English 'wod' which meant "Out of one's mind; insane, lunatic" (*OED*). If all four aspects- mind, body, state and nature- have connections to madness, then Foucault's descriptions of cure can be used for all four aspects as well.

While elements of madness have been explored in *King Lear* and *Macbeth* (especially about the protagonists, and in the latter play about Lady Macbeth as well),

this chapter will focus not only on madness as a state of the mind, but also of the body, state and nature and of attempts at curing these states of madness.

Foucault speaks about four different types of cure for madness: consolidation, where "A force must be found within nature to reinforce nature itself" (159); purification where through deflection and detersion "physical methods that seek to create wounds or sores on the surface of the body, both centres of infection that relieve the organism, and centres of evacuation into the outside world" (163); immersion into water (166) and movement regulation (172). While Foucault speaks about the discourse of madness and the cures in relation to it during the classical period where the above four methods are used to treat madness, this can also be used in relation to the various types of madness of mind, body, state and nature in *King Lear* and *Macbeth*.

If madness is only a state of unreason (or not being controlled by reason) or wildness (and therefore something we perceive as chaos), Lear's State is constantly uncontrolled and wild- seen through the alteration of the power structure when Goneril and Regan inherit Lear's land and the final battle that ends the play with two possible leaders. Nature is also uncontrolled, as is seen in Lear's helplessness when he faces the storm. In *Macbeth*, too, the state undergoes a period of chaos under Macbeth's rule, and nature's 'unnaturalness' is also seen through the eclipses, cannibalism amongst animals etc.

There is an attempt at controlling these forms of madness and chaos. Yet, these forms of madness manage to surface even when they are tried to be subdued. This chapter will study these various types of madness that are seen in the two texts and how even the attempt at 'curing' them cannot completely suppress them.

A. Immersion: Water as a Cure

> "…madness then was likely viewed as discrete, widely varied (and potentially transient) behaviors rather than as a permanent condition of an individual. Unlike insanity… madness is not defined as the opposite of sane and is not exclusively a medical condition. It is seen as an extension of, a kind of excess of, the normal: people run mad, fall mad, are beside themselves, and then recover themselves." (Neely, 778)

Rather than focussing on the kinds of madness or diseases in *Macbeth* and *King Lear*, this section will analyse madness through Foucault's connection to immersion and purification through contact with water. The connection between the physical body in relation to the mind will also be noted. The madness of the mind, Foucault notes, is intrinsically connected to the wildness of the body (88). Thus, this section shall observe the relation between water (and effects of contact with water) in madness and the moral economy where the purification of the soul is attained by cleansing the body.

According to Foucault, water, which was considered to be a purifying element, was used, during the 17th and early 18th century, to immerse the madman in order to affect a cure (166). The purifying qualities of water, however, could be seen even during the 16th century. This section will examine the purifying aspect of water as both a physical as well as a moral purification. Foucault notes: "The madman's body was regarded as the visible and solid presence of his disease: whence those physical cures whose meaning was borrowed from a moral perception and a moral therapeutics of the body". Immersion as a method of cleansing, then, affects the physical body in order to cleanse the soul.

The most prominent image of immersion in *King Lear* is when Lear attempts "in his little world of man to out-storm/ The to-and-fro-conflicting wind and rain" (III. i. 10-11). From commanding the winds (III. ii. 1-7), Lear realises that "You owe me no subscription" (III. ii. 18). He speaks of the criminal who will be exposed and punished by the rains- "Let the great Gods,/ That keep this dreadful pudder o'er our heads,/ Find out their enemies now" (III. ii. 49-51). Yet, it is Lear's madness that is exposed to the rain. This is also seen in Edgar's sudden cry when the Fool enters the hovel- "Fathom and half" (III. iv. 37) - where he pretends to be a shipwrecked seaman exposed to the sea. Even after the effects of the storm, however, Lear's madness does not subside- he is dressed in wild flowers when he meets Edgar and Gloucester in IV.vi, and Edgar acknowledges this madness when he says, "O! matter and impertinency mix'd;/ Reason in madness" (IV. vi. 172-173).

Similarly, Macbeth is unable to cleanse the blood off his hands: "Will all great Neptune's ocean wash this blood/ Clean from my hand? No: this my hand will rather/ The multitudinous seas incarnadine,/ Making the green one red." (II.ii. 63-66), an image repeated with Lady Macbeth attempting to wash the blood off her hands in V.i. This unsuccessful physical attempt at cleansing represents the disease of the 'soul'. In the captain's introduction of the war scene, he compares the two armies to "two spent swimmers that do cling together/ And choke their art" (I.ii. 8-9) providing an image of drowning in water. The nation, then, is also incapable of emerging from the waters cleansed. Indeed, Macbeth and Banquo "bathe in reeking wounds" (I.ii.39) instead of the clarity of water.

When Lady Macbeth mentions the plot to get Duncan's chamberlains drunk, she speaks of their "drenched natures". Though she implies their drunken state, they are innocent of the crime, and they are a direct contrast to the Macbeths being

drenched in Duncan's blood. Macbeth's worries about not being able to speak a prayer (II.ii. 31) connect the physical act of being drenched in blood to its moral value. Indeed, he "does murder sleep" that is "sore labour's bath" (II.ii. 39,41).

Macbeth mentions when contemplating the murder of Duncan, that "here, upon this bank and shoal of time,/ We'd jump the life to come" (I.vii.6-7). Macbeth presents time as a river of which life is only a part. He is willing to 'jump' over his afterlife. In an extended image, Macbeth evades the consequences of the afterlife through the metaphor of the evasion of the waters of life. Yet, during the banquet scene, after he is visited by Banquo's ghost, he realises that he cannot evade it. He feels that he is caught in a river of blood and he realises that there is no turning back from the murders he committed: "I am in blood/ Stepped in so far that should I wade no more,/ Returning were as tedious as go o'er" (III.iv. 136-138).

The stream of life is also mentioned at Duncan's death, when Macbeth laments to Malcolm and Donaldbain that "The spring, the head, the fountain of your blood/ Is stopped, the very source of it is stopped" (II.iii. 91-92). Both the 'spring' and the 'fountain' are considered to be sources of clear river water (since rivers usually comprise of fresh water). By comparing Duncan to these sources of fresh water, the physical death of the monarch and the father as the head of a spring symbolises the end of a moral economy leading towards madness.

Tears can also be seen as a curative. When the doctor tells Cordelia in IV.iv that Lear needs certain herbs, she responds by saying, "All you unpublish'd virtues of the earth,/ Spring with my tears" (IV.iv. 16-17). Since Cordelia wills her tears to raise plants from the earth, her tears, too, become 'springs of life' that seek to cure Lear's

madness. This grief, and sorrow, represented through tears becomes a curative for the madness of the state.

Speaking about *Macbeth*, Lynne D. Bruckner notes, “Macbeth initially recognizes that there is another mode of masculine being, a mode more complicated than vengeful physical power. This mode entails honor, poetry, courage, and the capacity to mourn.” (196) Malcolm and Donalbain, however, respond with the least emotion. When Malcolm asks, “Why do we hold our tongues,/ That most may claim this argument for ours?” Donalbain responds by saying that, “Our tears are not yet brew’d” (II.iii.112-116). Malcolm says that everybody else’s sorrow is “an unfelt sorrow” (129) which they express, but do not intend. However, when Ross arrives at England with word about the death of Macduff’s family, it is Malcolm who notes, “Give sorrow words: the grief that does not speak/ Whispers the o'er-fraught heart and bids it break” (IV.iii.211-212) The same man who flees Scotland, implores Macduff to “Dispute it like a man,” and “let grief/ Convert to anger; blunt not the heart, enrage it” (IV.iii. 222, 231-232).

As Foucault notes, the madman “is a prisoner in the midst of what is the freest, the openest of routes… the prisoner of the passage” (11). Speaking about the sea, Foucault sees the madman as homeless and as a vagabond. While Cordelia and Kent are initially rendered homeless, the former finds another home in France almost immediately. Kent, too, seeks a second home under Lear’s care, though in disguise, two scenes after his banishment. On the other hand, when Edgar is rendered homeless he is desperately in search of a home. He says that “No port is free” (II. iii. 3), echoing Gloucester’s command- “All ports I’ll bar; the villain shall not ‘scape” (II. i. 79). Edgar recognises the difficulty in escaping, especially via the route of passage- the sea. He wonders about the “unusual vigilance” (II. iii. 4) that has been placed for

his capture, yet he desires to remain in England- "Whiles I may 'scape,/ I will preserve myself" (II. iii. 5). Instead of leaving the country and maintaining his name, Edgar chooses to 'preserve' himself by acting mad and instead becomes "Edgar I nothing am" (II. iii. 20).

Lear, too, becomes a "prisoner of the passage", though not at sea, but on land when he is faced by the storm in Act III. As Foucault notes that water "carries off, but it does more: it purifies. Navigation delivers man to the uncertainty of fate; on water, each of us is in the hands of his own destiny" (11). It is this individual destiny that Lear recognises during the storm when he says, "here I stand, your slave,/ A poor, infirm, weak, and despis'd old man" (III.ii. 19-20).

When there is an element of treachery, the 'king' is left in the chaotic madness of moral and political disorder. This is seen not only in Duncan, but Macbeth as well. Rebecca Lemon, in "Sovereignty and Treason in *Macbeth*" says that, "Since Macbeth is the reigning sovereign, his deposition, while arguably necessary, is nevertheless treasonous" (83). When Ross notes that, "cruel are the times when we are traitors/ And do not know ourselves" (IV. ii. 18-19), the reader finds a connection with Macbeth's "To know my deed, 'twere best not know my self" (II. ii.76). In both instances there is a loss of identity that comes with being treacherous. This loss of identity is similar to being out of one's mind, or beyond the control of reason and rationale. The support of a traitor against his king is an act of unreason within the state- i.e. it becomes the cause for chaos and disorder, attempting to overthrow the existing order. Braunmuller describes IV.ii.22 as follows: "(move) in many directions yet settle on no one direction. Circumstances ('the times' (18)) and fears ('what we fear' (20)) urge us to act, but we dart this way and that without finding a satisfactory course of action" (200). Ross realises that the citizens of Scotland "float upon a wild

and violent sea,/ Each way and none" (IV. ii. 21-22), riddled with fear and anxieties, desiring to act against the king, cannot bring themselves to pursue any fixed course of action.

Lear's Fool's counsel on the storm also defines a certain form of treachery:

"That sir which serves and seeks for gain,
And follows but for form,
Will pack when it begins to rain,
And leave thee in the storm.
But I will tarry; the Fool will stay,
And let the wise man fly" (II. iv. 75-80)

Here, however, the state of confusion is not in the mind of the subject. Unlike *Macbeth*, the loyalties are more clearly defined. Edmund depicts this treachery, but turns it around when he says that Gloucester was the true traitor: "How malicious is my fortune, that I must repent to be just!... that this treason were not, or not I the detector!" (III. v. 6-11). Just as Ross sees that working against Macbeth is treachery, Edmund sees that working against the people amongst whom the coronet was divided is also a kind of treachery. This concept of treason is perceived differently by Ross and Edmund, but is to be noted nevertheless.

Purification comes from outside- i.e. England (in *Macbeth*), where King Edward acts as a curative, and France (in *King Lear*), where Cordelia is the medicine. Therefore, Caithness marches to meet "the med'cine of the sickly weal,/ And with him pour we in our country's purge,/ Each drop of us" (V. ii. 27-28). Lennox highlights the difference in the use of purgative waters, where the dew is the symbol of freshness, while the weed has to be drowned out (V. ii. 29).

In *King Lear*, Kent mentions to the gentleman that "from France there comes a power/ Into this scatter'd kingdom" (III. i. 30-31). The French army would have to cross the seas to enter Dover in order to save the 'scatter'd kingdom' that Kent speaks of. The coasts of Dover are mentioned within the play, when Edgar describes to Gloucester the hardworking fishermen upon the beach, with the "anchoring bark" nearby (IV. vi. 15-20). Quoting Edgar's description of Dover (IV. vi. 17-24), Steve Mentz notes, "Edgar's description of Dover Beach, far below the imaginary verge to which he tempts his father, gives the ocean provisional order. Acting pits itself against the sea, and momentarily the waters shrink and seem less terrifying" (16). It is across this ordered ocean that Cordelia arrives into an England that has just suffered the storm of madness.

This act of entry via the coast can be read as a metaphor of the calming and cleansing waters that can purify the land, and Cordelia's presence in English territory becomes purifying in nature since she acts as a balm to Lear, providing him with clothes, medicine and rest, attempting to do what King Edward does in *Macbeth*. It is France who points out to Lear that his daughter is the "balm of your age" (I. i. 214). However, while in *Macbeth*, King Edward's forces aid Malcolm's men and they end victorious, in *King Lear* the French army loses in both instances and it causes the defeat of the protagonist.

Thus, the metaphor of water can be seen as an attempt at rectifying states of madness through the purification of both body and soul. Through the images of cleansing- storms, rivers, tears, seas- the texts attempt to treat the madness of individuals as well as of the state. Yet, at the end of *King Lear*, we see that this madness has not been solved. While *Macbeth* seems to portray the disorder of the state as coming to an end, Malcolm's treachery and his deceit of Macduff show that

this need not necessarily be true. There is a form of madness that still exists in both plays, therefore, and the various forms of immersion cannot subdue it.

B. Purification: Blood-Letting as a Cure

One of the root words for the term 'mad', as noted above, is the Old Norse word *meiða* ('to cripple'). If madness is crippling, and therefore physical in nature, physical methods can also be used in an attempt to cure this madness. According to Foucault, total purification occurred with processes like blood transfusion (which began in 1662 with Moritz Hoffman), but also through "techniques of deflection… physical methods that seek to create wounds or sores on the surface of the body, both centres of infection that relieve the organism, and centres of evacuation into the outside world" (163). These processes during the mid-17th century were based on the notion that wounds and sores can be seen as an attempt at curing the madness of an individual through the physical body. Similarly, the madness within the body of the state can be compared to the physical body, where the wounds and sores occur through battles (owing to the large-scale blood-letting).

Madness, as earlier noted, is also "uncontrolled by reason… wild". When the witches in *Macbeth* meet in I.i., they predict that "the battle's lost, and won" and they note that "Fair is foul, and foul is fair" (I. i. 4, 12). This ambiguity reflects the chaos of the state that is already in war. The state of Scotland is both crippling as well as crippled in I.ii. It is crippled because it is fraught with internal strife "from the Western Isles/ Of kerns and gallowglasses" (I.ii.12-13) as well as opposition from outside (Norway). It is crippling because of the valour and the triumph over the enemy mentioned in the reports of the battle given by the captain (the "brandished steel,/ Which smoked with bloody execution", "Valour's minion" (I.ii. 17-19) etc.) as

well as Ross ("Bellona's bridegroom, lapped in proof… Curbing his lavish spirit" (I.ii. 54-57)). The wounds (seen in the battle), therefore, become both a representation of madness (as uncontrollable and irrational rage) as well as a method to cure it.

While there is only a single battle towards the end of *King Lear*, the madness in the state starts when Lear says, "Cornwall and Albany,/ With my two daughters' dowers digest the third… I do invest you jointly with my power" (I.i. 126-129). Despite Cordelia's banishment by Lear being a personal issue, the first speech by Gloucester in I.ii refers to the problems in the body politic rather than in Lear's family: "Kent banish'd thus! And France in choler parted!/ And the King gone to-night! prescribe'd his power!/ Confin'd to exhibition!" (I.ii. 23-25), and he speaks of the various disorders faced by England when he tells Edmund "We have seen the best of our time: machinations, hollowness, treachery, and all ruinous disorders follow us disquietly to our graves" (I.ii. 110-111). This chaotic disorder shows the madness of the state in *King Lear*.

Foucault notes that "In Shakespeare, madness is allied to death and murder" (31). While he speaks of madness in relation to the individual, it can also be applied to the state, where the chaos during the battle in Scotland, in I.ii of *Macbeth*, is a ('wild') madness, and that the madness of the state in *King Lear* results in the many duels and the eventual battle, between France and England. In *Macbeth*, Macdonwald's gruesome and dishonourable death, which is described by the captain who says that Macbeth "unseam'd him from the nave to th' chaps,/ And fix'd his head upon our battlements", mirrors Macbeth's death at the end of the play. Macbeth who is initially called "valour arm'd" the justice (represents the madness that means to be 'beside oneself' with anger) that killed Macdonwald, becomes a "dead butcher" (V.ix. 36).

In *King Lear* the battle that occurs at the end of the play is, like the first battle in *Macbeth*, "lost and won" (as the witches in *Macbeth* state), since England wins, but Lear loses the battle. The play also contains three duels that result in a wounding of the opponent: Cornwall vs. his servant, Edgar vs. Oswald and Edgar vs. Edmund. When Cornwall fights his servant, the latter dies on stage, while Cornwall does not. Though the servant's body is ordered to be thrown onto a dunghill (III. vii. 94-95), the visibility of his death gives him more prominence. His lack of a burial denies him any honour, but the presence of his body on the stage shows his significance. As Duncan Salkeld notes:

> "The body was openly displayed as the object of political, juridical, and medical knowledges; a site of power represented in the body of the king, and a site of spectacular violence, of torture and execution in the bodies of deviant 'subjects'… The individual was allocated a position within the social order by pre-existent hierarchical codes, guaranteed by the king's body, which articulated the social reality in which the subject lived. The subject was located, 'by an essential fit, by necessary bonds of nature articulating the political anatomy of the king's body.' So in a literal, material sense, the body, as object of contemporary political, juridical, and medical discourses, set the condition for what could be known and represented on the stage as madness." (56-57)

In the case of the first servant, his 'deviance' is seen when he acts against his master, Cornwall, and when his body is, therefore, ordered to be thrown on a dunghill. Yet, in his duel with his master, his body becomes a site of victory, and therefore power.

When Macbeth refers to Duncan as "the spring, the head, the fountain of your blood", speaking of his "silver skin laced with his golden blood/ And his gashed stabs looked like a breach in nature,/ For ruin's wasteful entrance" (II.iii.91, 105), we can also see a comparison to Salkeld's reference to the "political anatomy of the king's body". The gashes on Duncan are not just wounds on his body, but also on the body politic. But once Macbeth takes over the crown, the madness of Macbeth's mind (that begins when Lady Macbeth points out to him that, "These deeds must not be thought/ After these ways; so, it will make us mad" (II.ii.37-38)) parallels the madness of the body politic (When Ross asks, "How goes the world, sir, now?' Macduff's reply is "Why, see you not?" (II.iv.21-22)).

Similarly, Lear's madness, too, can be compared to the madness of his state. Yet, in Lear's instance, it is slightly more complicated, since his state has been divided amongst his daughters, and the power also rests in their rule, not just Lear's. Thus, when he calls Goneril "a disease that's in my flesh,/ Which I must needs call mine: thou art a boil,/ A plague-sore, or embossed carbuncle,/ In my corrupted blood" (II. Iv. 220-223), and when he seeks to "anatomize Regan" (III.vi.74), parallels can be drawn between the body and the state that ought to be governed by her and Goneril.

Lear acknowledges the deterioration in his body (V. iii. 275-278) that shows the decay in his nobility as well. When Lear sees Edgar in the hovel, he says, "Thou wert better in a grave than to answer with thy uncover'd body this extremity of the skies" (III. iv. 100). Here, he sees death as better than living the life of the "unaccommodated man" (III. iv. 105), where Lear still places his nobility over the nothingness of the poor and the mad. Lear's desire for death is a representation of the deterioration of his noble body. Danielle Westerhof says, "The focus was cast more sharply on the physical and moral qualities true knights were supposed to possess:

strength, prowess, loyalty, valour, grace, generosity and honour – qualities which came to be underwritten by an impressive noble lineage" (44). Though she is talking about the medieval knight, this quality of physical strength is necessary in a king as well, and when the king lacks this physical strength, he is, to a certain degree, emasculated: "thou hast the power to shake my manhood thus" (I.iv.295).

If, as Robert Bossler argues, Macbeth is a victim of battle fatigue, he too, gives up on his nobility, and is also emasculated towards the end of the play, when he no longer desires to fight. Bossler notes, "In the medieval and Renaissance world, fighting was a major part of all thought. One of the human reactions to it, and one that Shakespeare must have known well, was the inevitable letdown following a surfeit" (436). The crown that Macbeth fervently pursues becomes something he treats with disdain towards the end. He eventually accepts, in his famous monologue, that: "all our yesterdays have lighted fools/ The way to dusty death. Out, out, brief candle!/ Life's but a walking shadow, a poor player/ That struts and frets his hour upon the stage/ And then is heard no more: it is a tale/ Told by an idiot, full of sound and fury,/ Signifying nothing." (V. v. 19-27). Foucault says, "What death unmasks was never more than a mask; to discover the grin of the skeleton, one need only lift off something that was neither beauty nor truth, but only a plaster and tinsel face… But when the madman laughs, he already laughs with the laugh of death." (16) He says that the anxiety of the nothingness of the world transfers from the representations of death to madness in life itself. Macbeth sees this quality of nothingness in the world and in life through this monologue.

This is his battle fatigue- no longer desiring the valour and blood-shed that comes with war. Macbeth's 'battle fatigue' could also be seen as signs of emasculation, since he lacks the will to use his physical prowess and valour in the

battlefield: "Accursed be that tongue that tells me so,/ For it hath cowed my better part of man… I'll not fight with thee" (V.viii.17-22).

Macbeth's death is preceded by Macduff's comment, "I have no words:/ My voice is in my sword," and only Macduff and Malcolm refer to his death in passing: Macduff speaks of the "usurper's cursed head" and Malcolm mentions the "dead butcher". Yet, in killing Macbeth, Macduff, too, becomes the one who sheds the blood for his state ("My voice is in my sword" (V.viii.8)). By doing so, he attempts to purge his land of the madness of Macbeth's realm. However, *King Lear* does not resolve with a purging of blood, and Kent speaks of allowing Lear a peaceful death. Without this purging, the state still does not belong to any one ruler (since both Edgar and Albany could take over the throne).

This section notes that madness also has a physical form- the crippling effect on the body (but also the body politic)- and, therefore, physical methods of crippling through wounds is also used as a method of curing madness. Yet, these wounds on the state and the body do not completely purify them. *Macbeth* begins, but also ends in blood-letting, where in the beginning it is by Macbeth against Sweno and Macdonwald, and in the end by Macduff against Macbeth. Thus, the process of 'purification' can never be complete, since there is always a necessity to wound (through battle). In *King Lear*, there is an attempt by Lear to purify the body politic only in the enacting of the trial of Goneril and Regan. Yet, at the end of the play, even though both his daughters as well as Edmund die, the land is not 'purified' because the deaths do not occur in the battle but after it. Thus, in this instance, the purging of the body politic is incomplete, leaving the State in its former state of ordered disorder.

C. Regulating Movement: A Breach in Autoimmunity

> "Autoimmune disorder: any of a number of disorders caused by a reaction of the *immune system* against the body's own cells and tissues. Bacteria, viruses, and drugs may play a role in initiating an autoimmune disorder, but in most cases the trigger is unknown." (BMA Illustrated Medical Dictionary, 60)

> "When foreign and hence potentially dangerous material enters the body- classically as an invading micro-organism- it requires to be recognized as foreign… Any defence force must know how to distinguish friend from enemy." (Burnet 645)

Macfarlane Burnet's comparison of warfare and the body can be applied to the castle where the act of war and a breach of security in the castle is equated to a breach in the body. The immune system of the state is its own army, just as a body's anti-bodies protect it from pathogens. Thus, a castle, which is either a large fortified building or a fortified village, is supposed to be a place of protection against enemies.

The castle restricts movement not only for those who are outside, attempting to get in (i.e. the enemy), but also for those who reside within the castle, and thus, in both *Macbeth* and *King Lear*, even the citizens become restricted by the castle walls. As noted at the beginning of the section, Foucault speaks of regulating movement as a cure for madness. Lear understands his madness, and recognises who he really is (in terms of position, status and power) only after his imprisonment, when he says "I am old now… Mine eyes are not o'th'best." (V.iii. 276-278). Similarly, in *Macbeth*, only after Macbeth constrains himself when he fortifies Dunsinane hill does he realise, "Blow wind, come wrack;/ At least we'll die with harness on our back." (V.v.50-51) and that life is a tale "Signifying nothing" (V.v. 27).

The first reference to Macbeth's castle is given by Banquo, who speaks of the occupation of the castle walls by martlets. He mentions the "jutty", "frieze", "buttress" and "coign of vantage" (I. vi. 6-7), all of which have been taken over by the "pendent bed and procreant cradle" (I. vi. 8) of the martlets. Apart from the metaphorical significance attributed by Banquo to these birds (Braunmuller notes that martlets were considered to be "emblems of 'prudent trust' and 'harmony in the realm'" (ed. Braunmuller, 128) therefore symbolising the castle as a safe place), their settlement on the walls could also imply a lack of care for the outposts that keep an eye out for the enemy. Macbeth is unable to maintain the security of his castle, and ends up confined within its walls: "They have tied me to a stake; I cannot fly,/ But bear-like I must fight the course" (V.vii.1-2). Yet, he is constrained physically only after a psychological constraint as well: "But now I am cabined, cribbed, confined, bound in/ To saucy doubts and fears" (III. iv. 24-25).

When Caithness says, "Great Dunsinane he strongly fortifies./ Some say he's mad; others that lesser hate him/ Do call it valiant fury, but for certain/ He cannot buckle his distempered cause/ Within the belt of rule" (V. ii. 12-16), he acknowledges that Macbeth has been walled in, caged and his tactic to fortify Dunsinane is seen as a senseless manoeuvre against the enemy (who are his own citizens) and as a breach in Macbeth's sanity. Angus goes on to speak of the "faith-breach" (V. ii. 18), that will eventually cause the breach of the castle walls. Clara Claiborne Park says, "All four of Shakespeare's major tragedies present abnormal psychological states, and madness- actual mental illness- is an issue in three of them." (222-223) In a society that is built upon social, legal and moral/ethical order, disease would be moral or social misbehaviour where even human emotions can be incorporated into the narrative of sickness. Both the social order and human behaviour and emotions that are embedded

in social discourses allow only certain norms to be followed which get corrupted by disease or even ‘dis-ease’/unrest.

Both Macbeth and Lear provoke their own citizens to march against them. They work against the social order- of the subject and king (in *Macbeth*), and also a gendered, filial hierarchy (in *King Lear*) - by usurping the throne and giving it away, respectively. While it is acceptable for a king to destroy *other* communities/nations or individuals, they ought to protect their own land. Thus, Duncan’s war against Norway in *Macbeth* and England’s war against France in *King Lear* are considered ‘natural’. But, Macbeth and Lear do not destroy an *other* (outside/foreign) community or individual, but their own. Macbeth kills his own king, and his fellow citizens, while Lear breaks down his own country and state. This action by the protagonists against one’s own state becomes an act of madness that can be controlled only by regulating movement.

While the king seems to stand for society, a ‘negative’ deed is a breakdown of the contract (“bond”) between king and state. By giving away his territory and therefore his own ‘home’, Lear breaches his contract. He becomes displaced from his own home because he has given it away. Lear’s actions are considered unnatural by both Kent and Gloucester. In the First Folio version of *King Lear*, Kent says, “Reserve thy state” (I.i.148). Here, he could mean that Lear ought to control his emotions, but also that he has to maintain possession of his own state, rather than to split it amongst flattering daughters. He believes that the disease of the mind of Lear as well as the state has been triggered by the king’s action. Gloucester, too, says “…the bond crack’d ‘twixt son and father. This villain of mine comes under the prediction: there’s son against father. The King falls from bias of nature: there’s father against child… all ruinous disorders follow us disquietly t’our graves” (I.ii. 108-111).

On the other hand, Macbeth becomes displaced as a member of his state because of his self-aggrandisement, which is also a breach in the bond between the liegeman and his king: “I am his kinsman and his subject,/ Strong both against the deed” (I. vii. 13-14).

Pointing out the liminality of the madman, Foucault notes that he is either in the interior of the exterior or vice-versa where “what was formerly a visible fortress of order has now become the castle of our conscience” (11). The castle that was perceived as perfect by Duncan and Banquo, that which was considered a fortress, becomes something confining when Macbeth becomes a bear that is baited (V.vii.1-2). Macbeth’s castle, though within the state of Scotland, becomes an outsider, just as the anti-bodies become external to the body though belonging to it. Similarly, with Cordelia’s entrance onto the scene of England, her camp becomes a territory that is neither purely British nor French. It lies in a space that is occupied by both. Lear’s affiliation towards Cordelia’s French army also highlights this inside-outside quality of Lear.

The reaction of the body against its own immune system could be due to a trigger, and this is also true of the body politic: due to a trigger, certain elements of the body politic (a subject/citizen/member of the society) can rise up against its self causing the social equivalent of an autoimmune disorder. Macbeth’s ambition acts as a dormant disease within the state that is triggered by the witches’ apparition. This, and Cordelia’s “nothing” in *King Lear* lead to the destruction of the state (the “horrid image” (I. iii. 134) in *Macbeth* and the breaking of the coronet in *King Lear*).

While Macbeth, after I.v, is mostly seen within the castle, and Lear is seen shuffling from Goneril’s palace to Gloucester’s castle to the hovel, to the farmhouse

adjoining Gloucester's castle, eventually to the prison, wandering homeless under the storm (and even then mentally confined in his own curses of his daughters), the triggers (i.e. the witches and Cordelia) are seen in open spaces: the witches are always seen in the heath, and Cordelia (after Act I, scene i) is seen only in the camp. Both the witches and Cordelia become the outsider/insider, where they belong to the landscape of the country, but are simultaneously also outside it. I.e. the witches remain on the heath, but vanish into thin air. Cordelia is the daughter of the English king, but does not possess any land there. Instead, she becomes a part of France, and visits England as an outsider. The trigger, too, like the disease (i.e. Macbeth and Lear) becomes liminal.

Thus, the madness of Macbeth and Lear can be seen as breaching the autoimmunity of their state, leading to social turmoil within their own state due to their actions. In order to restrain this madness, the movement of the protagonists becomes restricted. Yet, even towards the end of the plays, the immunity in neither play is safe and protected, opening itself to an attack from within the system itself. Though there doesn't seem to be any regulating of movement towards the end of either play (since *King Lear* ends in the open space of the British camp, and *Macbeth* ends in the battlefield at Dunsinane) the deceptive quality of Malcolm in *Macbeth* and in the question of kingship at the end of *King Lear*, there is a question of possible disorder in the auto-immunity of the State in both plays.

D. Consolidation: Controlling the Heath

> "Broadly speaking, we may define ecophobia as an irrational and groundless fear or hatred of the natural world, as present and subtle in our daily lives" (Estok, 4)

Estok's *Ecocriticism and Shakespeare* defines the fear of nature which leads humans to attempt to control it. It also studies the displacement from the home in *King Lear*, where "Lear, controlled by rather than in control of everything, especially (and most dramatically) the natural environment, loses his identity when he loses his ability to control spatial worth." (21). While Estok's focus is on the control of the space of the home, this section will study ecophobia through the heath, which does not comply with the norms of social requirement, as uncontrollable, and the attempt to control it.

Foucault speaks of 'consolidation' as a means of curing madness, where "What is wanted, then, is a cure that will give the spirits or the fibers a vigor, but a calm vigor, a strength no disorder can mobilize… More than the image of vivacity and vigor, it is one of robustness that prevails, enveloping the theme in a new resistance, a young elasticity, but subjugated and already domesticated. A force must be found within nature to reinforce nature itself" (160). Foucault, here, speaks of domesticating 'mad' or 'uncontrolled' human nature. The heath, in both *Macbeth* and *King Lear*, is this space of the uncontrolled. While Foucault speaks of consolidation to occur through various weeds, or iron provided to the mad, this section will examine the madness in nature ('wood' as an adjective for 'mad') and the attempt to control it.

Giblett speaks, regarding the wetlands, of how "The colonial process of writing doesn't master a compliant and passive object but tries to master an active

agent" (69). The wetland can be written over (by gridding and mapping or drainage plans), and yet, within that space, there are marsh languages that are spoken out through the gaps. The maps that are used to grid and control a terrain can only see the surfaces of the spaces mapped, and not the depths (66). In *King Lear*, Lear, who initially maps out his lands and its divisions, loses control of both the land and his people. Similarly, Duncan's belief that "I have begun to plant thee and will labour/ To make thee full of growing," (I. iv. 28-29) which uses agricultural metaphors, attempts to control the wilderness of Macbeth's thoughts of murder (that begins with the witches in the heath, who 'All hail' him).

The wetlands, which always comprise a duality of elements (water and earth) are considered to be a threat to both health and sanity. The natural wilderness of the heath[4], can be compared to the 'wild' madness in human nature, where there is a desperate attempt to control both. Therefore, the inability to control this wildness of human nature can be compared to the inability to control the wilderness. Estok, himself, recognises this connection, quoting Danby who, speaking of *King Lear*, "proposes that the play offers a binary vision of nature with a third position in the middle. He locates Lear, Gloucester, Albany, and Kent on one side… On the other side are Edmund, Cornwall, Goneril, and Regan" and Cordelia "whom Danby sees as "standing for Nature herself"" (19-20). Estok, however, focuses on the natural world and the attempt to control it.

The comfort of the home (whether it is a house or a country) which later becomes alien can be compared to a garden over-ridden with weeds. Cordelia says this of Lear: "Crown'd with rank fumiter and furrow-weeds,/ With hardocks, hemlock, nettles, cuckoo-flowers,/ Darnel, and all the idle weeds that grow/ In our

---

[4] I shall henceforth refer to the natural world as 'Nature', and human nature as 'nature'.

sustaining corn" (IV. iv. 3-6). Lear's body, then, is the corn that is engulfed by weeds. The weed, which is "a plant not valued for use or beauty", is something that is considered to destroy the harvest. It goes against the economic order of what is cultivated by humans. Similarly, Goneril and Regan take away everything that could be considered an economic and social order for Lear. Just as Prospero speaks of Antonio in *The Tempest*, Goneril and Regan become for Lear "The ivy which had hid my princely trunk,/ And suck'd my verdure out on't." (I.ii. 87-88). Significantly, the other meaning of the word 'weed' is 'garment' from the Old Saxon 'wadi'. When Cordelia requests of Kent, "Be better suited:/ These weeds are memories of those worser hours:/ I prithee, put them off" (IV. vii. 7-9), he refuses. Though, she refers to the rags he is dressed in, he, too, like Lear, has been consumed by the weeds that are Lear's elder two daughters.

Macbeth, too, is constantly represented as a product of the heath- i.e. he is both fair and foul, he is both man and beast, he is both blood (since sword "smoked with bloody execution" (I.ii.18)) and milk ("milk of human kindness" (I.v.15)). Just like the heath, then, he too, is never just one element. In the understanding of the multiple aspects of the heath, the wildness of Macbeth is located, thereby placing him within the space of the heath, which is both 'fair' and 'foul'. Speaking about 'Mudfog', Rodney J. Giblett refers to the combination of mud (earth and water), and fog (air and water), calling the wetland an "aqua terra nullis" (16). This inability to place the wetland or heath in a single category (of elements), is also true of Macbeth.

Macbeth, too, is seen as a weed that is eating away at the productive harvest of Scotland. This is noted by Lennox: "Or so much as it needs/ To dew the sovereign flower and drown the weeds." (V.ii. 29-30). The "sovereign flower", Malcolm, that is opposed to Macbeth, the weed, represents this destruction of the heath. Significantly,

Malcolm uproots a forest (also a wild space) to attack the wildness of Macbeth's actions, and as soon as he gains the crown on Macbeth's death, he states that, "What's more to do/ Which would be planted newly with the time" (V. ix. 31-32). He is already thinking of weeding out and replanting his kingdom.

This weed-like quality of disruption in Macbeth is similar to the qualities of the heath that are present in the witches, who trigger his murderous thoughts. Terry Eagleton, in his essay "The Witches are the Heroines of the Piece", notes about the witches in *Macbeth*: "the witches figure as the 'unconscious' of the drama, that which must be exiled and repressed as dangerous but which is always likely to return with a vengeance. That unconscious is a discourse in which meaning falters and slides, in which firm definitions are dissolved and binary oppositions eroded" (ed. Sinfield, 47)

Giblett calls the "wetlands of the world, or what's left of them- living or dead, living and dying" (xii). The witches are this combination of both dead and the living: "what seemed corporal,/ Melted, as breath into the wind" (I.iii.79-80)They are devious and can manipulate Macbeth's thoughts and feelings (in that sense they are both living and are the harbingers of death). They are not of the land, sea or air. Yet, they manipulate the winds and the seas and are capable of vanishing and appearing.

Just as metaphors of agriculture and growth are connected to Duncan and Malcolm, images of the marsh and creatures belonging to these marshlands are associated with the witches, as seen in IV.i, where they stir the cauldron filled with toads, snakes, frogs, newts, dogs, worms, and lizards (IV.i. 5-16). The witches can be seen as a reflection of Macbeth's consciousness, where the surface of water of the marshlands reflects the surface of human consciousness: "The surface of the water reflects and 'heightens' the depths of gloom…" (Giblett, 6). However, the reflection

of water is always distorted or discoloured. This is also true of the surface of consciousness. When the witches call forth the eight kings (stage direction- “[Enter] a show of eight kings, and [the] last with a glass in his hand; Banquo’s ghost following” (IV.i)), Macbeth believes in Banquo’s succession. However, this is only a portrayal of a distorted future that he convinces himself to believe in, and which heightens the depths of his gloom.

In “An Introduction to Shakespeare and Ecocriticism: The Special Cluster”, Estok defines ecophobia as follows: “anything that amputates or seeks to amputate the agency of Nature and to assert a human order on a system that follows different orders is, in essence, ecophobic. Ecophobia is a subtle thing that takes many forms… [It is] all about fear of a loss of agency and control to Nature” (Estok, 112). He speaks of the personal hygiene industry that uses perfumes over natural body odours, the cosmetic industry that masks natural faces, sanitary demands for cut and tended lawns to prevent pests and landscaped gardens that prevent outgrowths. Having already seen Lear and Macbeth through the metaphor of the landscaped garden as opposed to weeds and the heath, we can also examine the texts through the other images that Estok brings forth.

When Lady Macbeth says, “Here's the smell of the blood still: all the perfumes of Arabia will not sweeten this little hand” (V. i. 42), she says that her natural odour will not be hidden by scents. Though abetting murder is a social crime, she, like Macbeth works as a weed against social order, disrupting the cultivated perfection of Duncan’s Scotland. Lear, too, refers to perfumes and the extra fittings that man cultivates: “Thou wert better in a grave than to answer with thy uncover’d body this extremity of the skies. Is man no more than this? Consider him well. Thou ow’st the worm no silk, the beast no hide, the sheep no wool, the cat no perfume. Ha! here's

three on's are sophisticated; thou art the thing itself; unaccommodated man is no more but such a poor, bare, forked animal as thou art." (III. iv. 99- 106). Yet, Lear is unable to stand the wrath of the storm without clothes and shelter. He recognises the trappings of human desires, but is unable to withstand the removal from those trappings.

Thus, if ecophobia, or the fear of nature owing to the inability to control it, can be seen in relation to nature, it can also be seen with the human. In the attempt to curtail freedom from characters like Edmund, Goneril, Regan, Cornwall, Macbeth, Lady Macbeth and the witches, the result is inevitably chaos and death. In *Macbeth*, the out-growths are successfully weeded out where a new England-like garden is planted with the naming of the thanes as earls. *King Lear*, however, allows the possibility for weeds to reappear on the field, since the question of authority could rest in either Edgar or Albany.

Just as there is chaos or wildness in the body, state and mind, there is an element of wildness in Nature as well. This wildness is usually envisaged as disorder and there is an attempt to control it using maps and chartered terrains. Yet, even the wildness of nature exists within its own order, and therefore what humans believe is disorderly in nature also has a structure that humans cannot see. It is this disordered order that is seen in the heaths of both the plays.

Conclusion

Madness and unreason are other forms of chaos and disorder. What we do not understand or cannot categorise becomes madness and seems to deserve a cure. Yet, the disorders that work within the plays as madness have their own sense of order and structure. These forms of madness only attempt at subverting existing authorities and norms, and in doing so, fall in the category of ordered disorder- a disorder that works

within a system of order. Thus, madness, as Foucault notes, is only "reason's subjugation of non-reason, wresting from it its truth as madness, crime, or disease" (xi-xii).

Works Cited

Bossler, Robert "Was Macbeth a Victim of Battle Fatigue?" *College English* 8.8 (1947): 436-438. *JSTOR*. Web. 6 Oct. 2012.

Bruckner, Lynne Dickson "'Let grief convert to anger'- Authority and affect in *Macbeth.*" *Macbeth: New Critical Essays.* Ed. Nick Moschovakis. New York: Routledge, 2008. 192-207. Print.

Burnet, Macfarlane "Auto-Immune Disease: I. Modern Immunological Concepts." *The British Medical Journal* 2: 5153 (1959): 645-650. *JSTOR*. Web. 11 Oct. 2012.

Eagleton, Terry "The Witches are the Heroines of the Piece." Ed. Alan Sinfield. *Macbeth.* London: Macmillan, 1992. 46-52. Print.

Estok, Simon "An Introduction to Shakespeare and Ecocriticism: The Special Cluster." *Interdisciplinary Studies in Literatim' and Environment* 12.2 (2005): 109-117. isle.oxfordjournals.org. Web. 9 Jan 2011.

---. *Ecocriticism and Shakespeare: Reading Ecophobia.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011. PDF file.

Foucault, Michel *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason.* Trans. Richard Howard. Cambridge: Routledge, 1961. Print.

Giblett, Rodney James *Post-Modern Wetlands: Culture, History, Ecology.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1996. Print.

Lemon, Rebecca "Sovereignty and Treason in *Macbeth.*" *Macbeth: New Critical Essays.* Ed. Nick Moschovakis New York: Routledge, 2008. 73-87. Print.

Mentz, Steve *At the Bottom of Shakespeare's Ocean.* London: Continuum, 2009. PDF file.

Neely, Carol T. "Recent Work in Renaissance Studies: Psychology Did Madness Have a Renaissance?" *Renaissance Quarterly* 44. 4 (1991): 776-791. *JSTOR*. Web. 7 Oct. 2012.

Page, Martyn ed. *The British BMA Medical Association Illustrated Medical Dictionary.* London: Dorling Kindersley, 2002. PDF file.

Park, C. Clara "Canst Thou Not Minister to a Mind Diseas'd?" *The American Scholar* 56: 2 (1987): 219-234. *JSTOR*. Web. 7 Oct. 2012.

Salkeld, Duncan *Madness and Drama in the Age of Shakespeare.* Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1993. PDF file.

Shakespeare, William *King Lear.* Ed. Kenneth Muir. London: Methuen, 1972. Print.

---. *Macbeth.* Ed. A. R. Braunmuller. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997. Print.

Simpson, J. A. and E. S. C. Weiner eds. *The Oxford English Dictionary*. 2nd ed. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989. Print.

Van der Slice, Austin "Elizabethan Houses of Correction." *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* 27.1 (1936): 45-67. *JSTOR*. Web. 18 Aug 2013.

Westerhof, Danielle *Death and the Noble Body in Medieval England.* Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2008. PDF file.

Chapter V

Conclusion

> “There is nothing that the madness of men invents which is not either nature made manifest or nature restored.” (Foucault, 283)

The disorder of existing systems perceived in *King Lear* and *Macbeth* are disorders that only overturn the norm, but do not destroy it completely. Structures of authority, power, spaces etc. still remain, even if the people who possess these change. If the host and guest change roles, the presumed structure of language provides more than just one meaning, and the endeavour of trying to control madnesses does not completely work, it is not because the system has fallen into chaos and disorder, but that there is only an alteration of what is already there.

Hospitality- seen through sovereignty, property and the acceptance of gifts provided by the guest- is modified when the guest no longer acts as the one who possesses less power, and instead tries to take over the role of the host, while the host loses his power to his guests. Yet, despite an alteration of roles they still function within the concepts of the host-guest.

Languages of messages, titles, art and façades which seem to have one meaning or represent one person, actually have more than one aspect of what is seen. There is a multiplicity of meanings that seems to imply disorder. However, even these meanings and actions exist within what is ‘natural’ or the norm of meaning production. The spaces of language, explored in chapter 3, are not only seen within the texts, but also in their performances. Stephen Greenblatt compares the political spaces of Shakespeare’s time to the space of the stage. He notes that the stage and

theatre are neither completely orthodox nor wholly subversive. He notes that the theatre represents "within limits, the sacred as well as the profane, contemporary as well as ancient times, stories set in England as well as those set in distant lands… the language of the theatre was astonishingly open: the most solemn formulas of the church and state could find their way onto the stage and mingle with the language of the marketplace" (18-19). Thus, Greenblatt refers to the language of politics and the spaces they occupy on the stage.

Madnesses of the mind, body, state and nature, too, are not just chaotic, but possess an order in their madness. As Edgar succinctly states in IV.vi of *King Lear*, there is "Reason in madness" (173). What is considered to be a form of madness can also be seen as a pattern of order which is not comprehended. The attempt at controlling the chaos of nature and state is only an attempt to subdue a different form of reason or the natural.

In all the disruption of the state, home and nature, there is an inherent order in both *King Lear* and *Macbeth*. Here, the state, nature and the home are not distinct or separate from each other, but are connected. Uncanny Nature which is uncontrollable and chaotic is mentioned by James Rodney Giblett in *Postmodern Wetlands: Culture, History, Ecology*. He notes that the wetlands and marshes are uncanny, constantly challenging human agency, and act as a source of both fear and awe. They are neither land nor water nor air alone, but all three combined. He says that "the wetland was not proper ground on which [humans] could leave a mark." (17) This uncanny Nature is also the *unheimlich* or 'unhomely' that Freud speaks about. This is also, therefore, connected to the lack of home, and the lack of control over the home.

Simon Estok notes, "…not that nature is good or bad or edenic but that it is unpredictable. The fear of nature's perceived or imagined unpredictability (a fear which is constitutive of ecophobia)… dramatizes an imagined natural world whose patterning of power relationships, identity, and the notion of home present that natural world as an antagonist" (13). This unpredictability is not just true of physical nature, but also of human nature, and the nature of the body politic. This unpredictability lies in what is comprehended by the characters as chaos, even though it is only a different form of order. It is this order in the disorders of *King Lear* and *Macbeth* that has been analysed.

Bibliography

Blomley, Nicholas "Law, Property, and the Geography of Violence: The Frontier, the Survey, and the Grid" *Association of American Geographers* 93.1 (2003): 121-141. *JSTOR*. Web. 26 Mar. 2013.

Boose, Lynda E. "The Father and the Bride in Shakespeare" *PMLA* 97.3 (1982): 325-347. *JSTOR*. Web. 19 Sep 2013.

Bossler, Robert "Was Macbeth a Victim of Battle Fatigue?" *College English* 8.8 (1947): 436-438. *JSTOR*. Web. 6 Oct. 2012.

Bradley, A.C. *Shakespearean Tragedy.* Hampshire: Macmillan, 1985. Print.

Bruckner, Lynne and Daniel Brayton, eds. *Ecocritical Shakespeare.* Surrey: Ashgate Publishing Ltd., 2011. Web.

Burnet, Macfarlane "Auto-Immune Disease: I. Modern Immunological Concepts." *The British Medical Journal* 2: 5153 (1959): 645-650. *JSTOR*. Web. 11 Oct. 2012.

Derrida, Jacques *Of Hospitality.* Trans. Rachel Bowlby. California: Stanford University Press, 2000. PDF file.

---. "Hostipitality." Trans. Barry Stocker, Forbes Morlock. *Angelaki: Journal of the Theoretical Humanities* 5.3 (2000): 3-18. Taylor & Francis Ltd. Web.

---. *The Gift of Death.* Trans. David Wills. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1995. PDF file.

Dollimore, Jonathan *Radical Tragedy: Religion, Ideology and Power in the Drama of Shakespeare and his Contemporaries.* Sussex: The Harvester Press, 1984. Print.

Dollimore, Jonathan and Alan Sinfield eds. *Political Shakespeare: New Essays in Cultural Materialism* Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1985. Print.

Egan, Gabriel *Green Shakespeare: From Ecopolitics to Ecocriticism.* Oxon: Routledge, 2006. Print.

Estok, Simon "An Introduction to Shakespeare and Ecocriticism: The Special Cluster." *Interdisciplinary Studies in Literatim' and Environment* 12.2 (2005): 109-117. isle.oxfordjournals.org. Web. 9 Jan 2011.

---. *Ecocriticism and Shakespeare: Reading Ecophobia.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011. PDF file.

Foucault, Michel *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason.* Trans. Richard Howard. Cambridge: Routledge, 1961. Print.

Freud, Sigmund "The 'Uncanny'" Trans. Alix Strachey. MIT. Web. 12 June 2013. web.mit.edu/allanmc/www/freud1.pdf.

Garrard, Greg. *Ecocriticism*. London: Routledge, 2004. Web.

Giblett, Rodney James *Post-Modern Wetlands: Culture, History, Ecology.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1996. Print.

Greenblatt, Stephen *Shakespearean Negotiations: The Circulation of Social Energy in Renaissance England* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988. Print.

Kahan, Jeffrey ed. *King Lear: New Critical Essays.* New York: Routledge, 2008. Print.

Knight, G. Wilson *The Imperial Theme.* London: Methuen and Co. Ltd., 1972. Print.

---. *The Wheel of Fire.* London: Methuen and Co. Ltd., 1949. Print.

Knights, L. C. *Some Shakespearean Themes.* London: Chatto and Windus, 1966. Print.

Lefebvre, Henri *The Production of Space.* Trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith. Maiden: Blackwell Publishing, 1991. PDF file.

Madelaine, Richard "'What Are You?': The Staging of Messenger-Function in Antony and Cleopatra." *Parergon* 25.1, (2008): 149-170. *Project Muse*. Web.

Massey, Doreen, John Allen and Philip Sarre eds. *Human Geography Today.* Cambridge: Polity Press, 1999. Print.

Mauss, Marcel, *The Gift: Forms and Functions of Exchange in Archaic Societies.* Trans. Ian Cunnison. Paris: Presses Universitaires De France, 1950. PDF file.

McBride, Kari B. *The Country House Discourse.* Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001. Print.

Mentz, Steve *At the Bottom of Shakespeare's Ocean.* London: Continuum, 2009. PDF file.

Miller, J. Hillis "The Critic as Host" *Critical Inquiry* 3.3 (1977): 439-447. JSTOR. Web. 16 Jan. 2013.

Moschovakis, Nick ed. *Macbeth: New Critical Essays.* New York: Routledge, 2008. Print.

Muir, Kenneth ed. *Shakespeare Survey 33: King Lear.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980. Print.

Neely, Carol T. "Recent Work in Renaissance Studies: Psychology Did Madness Have a Renaissance?" *Renaissance Quarterly* 44. 4 (1991): 776-791. *JSTOR*. Web. 7 Oct. 2012.

Page, Martyn ed. *The British BMA Medical Association Illustrated Medical Dictionary.* London: Dorling Kindersley, 2002. PDF file.

Park, C. Clara "Canst Thou Not Minister to a Mind Diseas'd?" *The American Scholar* 56: 2 (1987): 219-234. *JSTOR*. Web. 7 Oct. 2012.

Patterson, Annabel M. *Shakespeare and the Popular Voice*. Cambridge, MA, USA: B. Blackwell, 1989. Print.

Robinson, Brian S. "Elizabethan Society and Its Named Places." *Geographical Review* 63.3 (1973): 322-333. *JSTOR*. Web. 19 Sep 2012.

Rollison, David "Exploding England: The Dialectics of Mobility and Settlement in Early Modern England." *Social History* 24.1 (1999): 1-16. *JSTOR*. Web. 19 Sep 2012.

Ruiter, David "Shakespeare and Hospitality: Opening "The Winter's Tale"" *Mediterranean Studies* 16 (2007): 157-177. JSTOR. Web. 16 Jan. 2013.

Salkeld, Duncan *Madness and Drama in the Age of Shakespeare.* Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1993. PDF file.

Shakespeare, William *King Lear.* Ed. Kenneth Muir. London: Methuen, 1972. Print.

---. *Macbeth.* Ed. A. R. Braunmuller. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997. Print.

Shannon, Laurie "Poor, Bare, Forked: Animal Sovereignty, Human Negative Exceptionalism, and the Natural History of *King Lear.*" *Shakespeare Quarterly* 60.2 (2009): 168-196. *Project Muse*. Web. 31 Oct. 2013.

Simpson, J. A. and E. S. C. Weiner eds. *The Oxford English Dictionary*. 2nd ed. 4 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989. Print.

Sinfield, Alan ed. *Macbeth.* London: Macmillan, 1992. Print

---. Ed. *Macbeth: New Casebooks.* Hampshire: Macmillan, 1992. Print.

Smith, D. Nichol ed. *Shakespearean Criticism: A Selection (1623-1840).* London: OUP, 1963. Print.

Sun, Emily *Succeeding King Lear: Literature, Exposure, and the Possibility of Politics.* New York: Fordham University Press, 2010. Print.

Thompson, Ann *King Lear: An Introduction to the Variety of Criticism (The Critics Debate).* Hampshire: Macmillan, 1988. Print.

Tillyard, E.M.W. *The Elizabethan World Picture*. New York: Vintage Books, 1960. Print.

Van der Slice, Austin "Elizabethan Houses of Correction." *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* 27.1 (1936): 45-67. *JSTOR*. Web. 18 Aug 2013.

Vickers, Brian ed. *Shakespeare: The Critical Heritage Volume II (1693-1733)* London: Routledge, 1974. Print.

Westerhof, Danielle *Death and the Noble Body in Medieval England.* Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2008. PDF file.