CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The Aristotelian definition of tragedy itself underlines the importance of
the ending. It is in the ending that both the conclusion of action and the ends of katharsis
are realized. The word “end” is ambiguous so that both the meaning of the tragic action
and its conclusion are thereby signified. Even such technical features as peripety and
recognition are closely connected with the tragic nature of the play.

The tragedies of Shakespeare also have characteristic endings. And not only is
the tragic reversal of fortune evident in it but very often the hero is shown as acutely
conscious of such significant reversal. Further, there is also some kind of choric
comment on the nature of the action like, say, Horatio’s:

So shall you hear

Of carnal, bloody, and unnatural act,

Of accidental judgements, casual slaughters

Of deaths put on by cunning and forced cause,

And, in this upshot purposes mistook

Fall’n on the inventors’ heads.

(Hamlet V.ii. 362 - 67)

or Edgar’s,

The weight of this sad time we must obey;

Speak what we feel, not what we ought to say.
The oldest hath borne most; we that are young

Shall never see so much nor live so long.

(King Lear V.iii,323 - 26)

There is, therefore, something strikingly significant about the ending of the Shakespearean tragedy. But critics in our time are not so confident as their nineteenth century predecessors that there is such a thing as Shakespearean tragedy. With Kenneth Muir they would rather believe that each tragedy has a unique world of its own. For referring to the grouping of the tragedies of Shakespeare by Bradley into “Shakespearean Tragedy”, Kenneth Muir remarks,

Bradley’s assumption that the four tragedies with which he dealt were ‘pure’ tragedies, while the others were not, he was in danger of exaggerating both the resemblances between the chosen four and the differences between those four and the rest. It is misleading to regard even Bradley’s great four as belonging to a single category. There is no such thing as Shakespearean Tragedy: there are only Shakespearian tragedies.¹

Indeed, the differences between the tragedies appear to us as quite striking. All the same, the suspicion remains that Shakespeare’s tragedies though dealing with different types of people and action do form a family with close similarities among members. It is not for nothing that even before the publication of Bradley’s monumental Shakespearean tragedy, a scholarly consensus was emerging to the effect that Shakespeare had created:

¹Kenneth Muir, Shakespeare’s Tragic Sequence. (London: Hutchinson University Library, 1972) pp. 11-12
rich and novel literary form which rivalled in power and depth the best tragic expressions of other ages and climes. We hope that a study of the ending, therefore, will certainly help to throw some light on certain general features of Shakespeare's tragedies. But before we talk any further of the tragedies of Shakespeare we should like to inquire into the tradition of critical thought involving the influential theories of tragedy right from Chaucer to the more recent ones to corroborate the study and understanding of the tragic ending vis-a-vis the tragedies of Shakespeare.

To begin with, the criticism of tragedy represented in the Middle Ages by Chaucer puts the focus on the dark conclusion of tragedy. For instance, the kind of gory destruction and the inevitable carnage that mark the end of tragic drama apparently underline for Chaucer a sense of irreplaceable loss. For all tragedies in his opinion end disastrously. In other words, tragedy for him is the story

Of hym that stood in great prosperitee,

And is yfallen out of high degree

Into myserie, and endeth wrecchedly.

(From 'Prologue to the Monk's Tale')

Similarly, after Chaucer, Sidney's description of "high and excellent Tragedy" as that which

... openeth the greatest wounds, and sheweth forth the Ulcers that are covered with Tissue; that maketh Kings fear to be Tyrants, and Tyrants manifest their tirannical humours; that with sturring the affects

of admiration and commiseration, teacheth the uncertainie of this world, and upon how weake foundations guilden roofes are builded;\(^3\)

only serve to reinforce his notion of the bleak and inexorable reality of the tragic ending. It is significant that the views thus expressed by Chaucer and Sidney with regard to the tragic ending find an echo in the modern critics of tragedy. George Steiner, for instance, contends that any realistic notion concerning tragic drama

... must begin from the fact of Catastrophe. Tragedies end badly. 

... Tragedy is irreparable. It cannot lead to just and material compensation for past suffering... Call it what you will: a hidden or malevolent God, blind fate, the solicitations of hell, or the brute fury of an animal blood. It waits for us in ambush at the crossroads. It mocks us and destroys us.\(^4\)

Clifford Leech too sees the tragic suffering as an inescapable condition of man's existence. And even when the tragic ending is marked by a sense of calm and stable repose after the forces of evil have been apparently destroyed, he finds:

There is nothing reassuring in the new situation, no promise that a new chain of evil will not quickly ensue, no lesson that men or the Gods have learned. No message for the future has been brought. The tragic situation, it is implied, is recurrent in human life.\(^5\)

\(^3\)ibid pp. 69-70
\(^4\)George Steiner, *The Death of Tragedy*, (Faber and Faber, 1961) pp. 8-9
Similarly, Frank Kermode referring to the ending of *King Lear* argues:

In *King Lear* everything turns toward a conclusion that does not occur; even personal death for Lear is delayed. Beyond the apparent worst there is worse suffering, and when the end comes it is not only more appalling than anybody expected, but a mere image of that horror. The end is now a matter of immanence; ...  

Kermode goes on to make the claim that

All plots have something in common with prophecy, for they must appear to educe from the prime matter of the situation the form of a future. The best of them thought Aristotle, include a *peripeteia* no less dependent than the other parts upon 'our rule of probability or necessity' but arising from that in that original situation to which we have given less attention; *peripeteia* is equivocating plot, and it has been compared with some justice, to irony. 

Commenting on the terminal effect of tragedy consequent upon the hero's plan of action in the context of his image of the future, Edward G. Ballard contends:

... The consequence of a decision can be foreseen only with probability, but once enacted the decision takes its place in the necessary order and exercises compelling power upon its present. This necessity in its action upon the protagonist acquires the terrifying force of fate. 

---

7 ibid., pp. 83-84  
All these speculations concerning the tragic ending, then, centres round the mystery of the dark and inscrutable powers that infest the world of man mocking all his noble efforts, and threatening to make life itself for him a meaningless process. What emerges transparent from these readings, in other words, is that the tragic end envisages an inescapable involvement of man in a desperate struggle with evil. The peculiarly ironic nature of the struggle with its characteristic demand for an end of action places the tragic hero in a perilous present that force: upon him the necessity to formulate his scheme of action conjuring up in the process an image of futurity itself. But the end when it eventually comes with the might and fury of fate, is totally discordant with the expectations of the past. It is thus seen as an immanent principle perennially turning anticipated currents awry.

While a reading of this sort may serve to define the tragic vision embodied in a typical tragic novel by Hardy where the individual -- regardless of the kind of personality he or she happens to represent -- is ultimately seen as a mere sport in the hands of a blind and relentless fate or as Hardy himself would call it the “President of the Immortals”; such a reading of the Elizabethan tragedies, especially Shakespearean tragedy would steal away much from the vitality and richness of the tragic experience by totally ignoring the manifold possibilities of and the insights into the nature of life presented by the complex world of the plays.

As against this dark view of tragedy initiated by such pre-Renaissance critics like Chaucer we have the Italian Renaissance scholars who insist on a sense of pleasurable calm at the end of tragedy. J.E.Spingarn for instance, holding the cryptic nature of the
definition of "Katharsis" as solely responsible for the unending debate on the tragic ending insofar as this particular school is concerned feels that the plethora of explanations available on the subject of the nature and function of the tragic ending vis-à-vis Aristotle's 'Katharsis' can ultimately be reduced to two kinds of attitudes, viz., the ethical and the emotional. According to Spingarn, then:

No passage in Aristotle's Poetics has been subjected to more discussion, and certainly no passage has been more misunderstood, than that in which, at the close of his definition of tragedy, it states its peculiar function to be that of effecting through pity and fear the proper purgation of these emotions. The more probable of the explanations of these passages are, as Twining says, reducible to two. The first of these gives to Aristotle's Katharsis an ethical meaning, attributing the effect of the tragedy to its moral lesson and example. This interpretation was a literary tradition of centuries, and may be found in such diverse writers as Corneille and Lessing, Racine and Dryden, Dacier and Rapin. According to the second interpretation, the purgation of the emotions produced by tragedy is an emotional relief gained by the excitement of these emotions. While the ethical conception, of course, predominates in Italian criticism, as it does throughout Europe up to the very end of the Eighteenth century, a number of Renaissance critics, among them Minturno and Speroni, even if they failed to elaborate the further aesthetic
One of the earliest of the Italian Renaissance critics to have commented on the end of tragedy happens to be Giraldi Cinthio. Cinthio perceives the end of both comedy and tragedy as identical in that both the genres conduce to virtue despite the absolutely distinctive means adopted for attaining the desired end. For while comedy according to him resorts to pleasure and comic jests for producing the effect intended, tragedy, on the other hand, aims at purging the minds of "the hearers from their vices" by exciting pity and fear. Cinthio thus states:

>Tragedy and comedy have their end in common because both endeavour to introduce good morals, but in their agreement there is the difference that comedy is without terror and without commiseration (because in it there are no deaths or other terrible chances, but pleasure and with some pleasing saying), and tragedy, whether it has a happy conclusion or an unhappy one, by means of the pitiable and the terrible, purges the minds of the hearers from their vices and influences them to adopt good morals.\(^9\)

Cinthio affirms then, Spingarn would have us believe:

>... that the tragic poet condemns vicious actions, and by combining them


\(^{10}\)Quoted in Allan H. Gilbert, *Literary Criticism: Plato to Dryden* (Detroit: Wayne U. p.1962) p.252
with the terrible and the miserable makes us fear and hate them ... and it
is not a purgation of pity and fear, as Aristotle says, but an eradication of
all vice and vicious desire that is effected by the tragic Katharsis. 11

As against Giraldi Cinthio, Spingarn takes care to point out that Robortelli, another
important critic of the period sees the effect of tragedy as aesthetic rather than ethical.
Consequently, the terror and commisseration elicited by the tragic action according to
him purges the mind of the same emotions thereby acclimatising the spectator with the
identical situations of life thus assuaging the effect of the said passions.12 However, the
critic whose views were to exercise a significant influence on the critical thought of the
times was Lodovico Castelvetro. Castelvetro for whom the chief end of tragedy is
pleasure considers the utilitarian notion of purgation only as incidental to real end of
pleasure. Weinberg, quotes Castelvetro thus:

Those who insist that poetry was invented mainly to profit, or to profit and
delight together, let them beware lest they oppose the authority of
Aristotle who here [Poetics 1459 a 21] and elsewhere seems to assign
nothing but pleasure to it; and if, indeed, he concedes some utility to it,
he concedes it accidentally, as is the case with purgation of fear and of
pity by means of tragedy.13

Castelvetro further goes on to state as to how purgation itself could be a source of

11Op. Cit

12Spingarn, ibid., p. 77

13B. Weinberg, A History of Criticism in Italian Renaissance (University of
Chicago. 1961) p.506
pleasure. Once again, therefore, as Weinberg quotes him as stating that pleasure from purgation comes about

... when feeling displeasure at the unhappiness of another unjustly suffered, we recognize that we ourselves are good, since unjust things displease us, which recognition -- because of the natural love that we have for ourselves -- is a source of great pleasure to us. 14

Scaliger, happens to be another of the Italian Renaissance critics to consider the end of tragedy as purely ethical. For the function of the poet, according to him is not only to evoke admiration and dismay but also to teach, to move and to delight. As Spingarn, speaking of Scaliger's way of looking at the end of tragedy, therefore, states that the poet, according to Scaliger believes:

... teaches character through actions in order that we should embrace and imitate the good, and abstain from the bad. The joy of evil men is turned in tragedy to bitterness, and the sorrow of good men to joy. Scaliger is here following the extreme view of poetic justice which we have found expressed in so many of the Renaissance writers.15

No less a person than Dr. Johnson himself, according to Spingarn was influenced by Scaliger in censuring Shakespeare for the kind of tragic treatment meted out to Cordelia and other innocent characters in King Lear. For Scaliger, then, "the moral aim of drama is attained both indirectly, by the representation of wickedness ultimately punished and

14 Ibid.

15 Op cit., pp 78-79
virtue ultimately rewarded, and more directly by the enunciation of moral precepts throughout the play”. Finally, it is Minturno among these Italian Renaissance critics who holds in accordance with Scaliger that the ultimate end of tragedy is to teach, to delight and to move. Minturno, however, lends a kind of novelty to his approach by comparing the process of purgation to the method adopted by a physician to heal diseases. Thus he states:

> As a physician eradicates, by means of poisonous medicine, the perfervid poison of disease which affects the body, so tragedy purges the mind of its impetuous perturbations by the force of these emotions beautifully expressed in verse.

Our discussion of the Neo-classical critics’ views on tragedy, however, is confined mainly to one aspect of the ending -- the aspect of pity and terror including what Aristotle calls the “Katharsis”. But these conflicting views on this aspect alone bring to light divergent views on tragedy itself. It follows, therefore, that our conceptions of the ending will be dependent on a certain concept of tragedy.

We should, therefore, like to turn to another body of critics which seeks to locate in the tragic ending a sense of an integrated moral order and a final reconciliation. Tracing the origin and development of this school of criticism a recent critic William L. Tarvin points out:

> German writers like Hegel, Schelling and Schlegel found in tragedy an assertion of the ultimate moral order which transcends tragedy’s closing

16 ibid., p.79

17 Quoted by Spingarn., ibid., p.80
carnage. The final emphasis of a tragedy, rather than suffering and misfortune, is for Schelling and Hegel "the resolution" of "the interaction (or 'dialectic') of subjective and objective, ideal and real ... in a transcending unity"; at the end comes "eventual 'reconciliation'." As might be expected, Coleridge's criticism also stressed reconciliation. For him, tragedy is the clearest illustration of the synthetic power of imagination, with its "balance or reconciliation of opposite or discordant qualities." He felt that tragedy reveals the condition where "those struggles of inward free will with outward necessity, which form the true subject of the tragedian, shall be reconciled and solved."\(^{18}\)

This critical notions about the tragic ending, as Tarvin goes on to argue, "stemming from the Romantics, frequently have been taken over wholesale by modern critics of tragedy."\(^{19}\) One of the earliest of the twentieth century critics S.I. Butcher, for instance, argues that at the end of tragedy:

... the individual perishes, but through his ruin the disturbed order of the world is restored and moral forces re-assert their sway. The death of the martyr presents to us not the defeat, but the victory of the individual; the issue of a conflict in which the individual is ranged on the same side as the higher powers, and the sense of suffering consequently lost in that

\(^{18}\)William L. Tarvin, "Tragic Closure and tragic Calm," in MLQ 51.1 (March 1990), pp. 5-24 (p. 8)

\(^{19}\)ibid.
of moral triumph.\textsuperscript{20}

Similarly, even Bradley while refusing to describe the ultimate power in the tragic universe in terms of Christian providentialism insists on the assertion of an ultimate moral order in the world of tragedy and goes on to state that the fact that the tragic spectacle does not leave us rebellious:

... is due to a more or less distinct perception that the tragic suffering and death arise from collision, not with a fate or blank power, but with a moral power akin to all that we admire and revere in the characters themselves.\textsuperscript{21}

H.A. Myers too maintains that the ultimate impression left by tragedy is a sense of reconciliation as it "reveals a just relation between good and evil."\textsuperscript{22} In the same way, Dorothea Krook asserting the presence of an ultimate order in tragedy argues:

The final "affirmation" of tragedy springs from our reconciliation to, or acceptance of the suffering rendered intelligible by the knowledge: by illuminating the necessity of suffering the knowledge reconciles us to it; by being reconciled to ('accepting') the suffering as necessary, we affirm the supremacy of the universal moral order; and by the act of recognition of and submission to the universal moral order ... we express and affirm the dignity of man.\textsuperscript{23}


\textsuperscript{21}A.C. Bradley, Shakespearean Tragedy. (Macmillan, 1984 edition) p.26

\textsuperscript{22}H.A. Myers, Tragedy: A view of Life (Ithaca : New York: Cornell University Press, 1956) p.53

\textsuperscript{23}Dorothea Krook, Elements of Tragedy. (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1969) p.17
Willard Farnham too has referred to the moral-theological relic of medieval attitude in Shakespearean tragedy.\textsuperscript{24} The central focus of all these assumptions, despite the complexities and differences of interpretation lies on the ethical substance of tragedy. Shakespeare's intuition into the ethical substance of tragedy and his notion of a moral order in society and nature are however tampered by his sensitiveness to powerful contemporary currents of scepticism. Classical fatalism has once again raised its head among the scholars of Renaissance and Montaigne had after all exposed the hollowness of all man's consoling interpretations of the world. The ending of Shakespeare's tragedies not only draws vital moral lessons from the experience of disaster and suffering but also suggests the provisional and precarious nature of such lessons. Following the Romantics referred to by Tarvin is his essay, however, we have Nietzsche, for whom ...

"... the essence of tragedy is not simple disillusion, but alternate illusion and disillusion. The vision of Apollo builds up before us a heroic world, sublime, magnificent, rejoicing in its splendid individuality,...But with the Apolline vision is, combined the wild, self-annihilating rapture of the music of Dionysus. From that tragedy sprang, and in that tragedy dies away, while the power and the glamour and the glory of this heroic world dissolve in the end ecstatically back to airy nothing. ... Nietzsche's view has indeed this merit that it sees the effect of tragedy not as a simple thing, but as a struggle of opposing feelings -- our sense both of the splendour and of the despair of human life.\textsuperscript{25}

\textsuperscript{24}Willard Farnham, \textit{The Medieval Heritage of Elizabethan Tragedy} (Oxford: Blackwell, 1936)

This is the place to consider at some length a theory that came to be considered as crucial to the critical understanding of the Elizabethan tragic drama -- the theory, in other words, based on the Elizabethan notion of the world order as a system of gradation and degrees with each created being occupying an appointed place -- in conformity with the said hierarchical order -- in the great chain of being.

G.I. Duthie points out that ever since the publication of A.O. Lovejoy’s *The Great Chain of Being*, it has been a critical commonplace to trace the importance of the “order - background” presenting a picture of a hierarchically arranged universe in which every created thing has its duly appointed place.26 Most notable among these critical works, according to Duthie are E.M.W. Tillyard’s *The Elizabethan World Picture* and Theodore Spencer’s *Shakespeare and the Nature of Man*. It is evident from these works that in accordance with their concept of reality as based on a system of gradation and degrees, the Elizabethans also believed in a set of corresponding planes with each plane having its own corresponding hierarchy. Based on this Elizabethan notion of corresponding order Duthie goes on to interpret the tragedies of Shakespeare as an apt illustration of the principle at work. In the process, he discovers in the tragedies of Shakespeare a coherent and paradigmatic vision as the plays move through a phase of commotion and chaos to an eventual restoration of order and stability.

The ideology of the world picture however comes under the sharp attack of subsequent critics who tend to interpret the said picture as nothing but the manifestation of unquestioned orthodoxy.27

26 G.I. Duthie, *Shakespeare* (London: Hutchinson’s University Library, 1951)

More importantly, what the advocates of the Elizabethan world order did not seem to take cognizance of was the fact that the selfsame universe of stability and order was most significantly informed by an immanent principle of polarity operating within the parameters of the acknowledged hierarchical design. Consequently, the cosmological principles of correspondence and polarity confounded the Renaissance drama in a significant way. And the notion of contrariety, especially, exerted a telling influence on the tragic genre for the simple reason that tragedy by its very insistence on holding the mirror unto nature undermines the possibility of any concordant pattern of existence amid the vagaries and exigencies of life. Yet notwithstanding our awareness of the element of contrariety in the tragic drama of the period we should like to see whether a study of the endings of the tragedies of Shakespeare would enable us to discover any pattern of meaning in the plays we intend to discuss. Perhaps Shakespeare’s tragedy is located in a space between a desire for stable order and a profound sense of impending chaos.

A striking feature of Renaissance tragedy quite intelligibly, is the portrayal of the hero as the case of the beleaguered individual locked in a perennial struggle with the conflicting forces ubiquitously operative in a universe that is reduced for him to nothing but “a foul and pestilent congregation of vapours”. Although, there exists no single formula that can define the nature and scope of the struggle which varies with each individual depending upon the degree and intensity of the force he is called upon to encounter, the conflict, in each case, however, succeeds in giving a symbiotic expression to the universal frustration of man in general and to the turmoils of the thoroughly
perplexed victim of the kind of dizzy ambition triggered by the uncertain messages of the Renaissance culture. Consequently, whether it is Dr. Faustus braving the conventional barriers of morality within the sacrosanct precincts of the Christian religion in his bid to become more than “Faustus and a man” ; the passionate Bel-imperia in Kyd’s The Spanish Tragedy daring to respond to the truthful beckonings of the heart in making a marriage choice contrary to the relentless demand and expectations of those in the corridors of power or a Hamlet trying to set right a time that is “out of joint” much at the cost of his private natural inclinations -- all but bear witness to the Renaissance man’s eternal preoccupation with the conflict originating from the situation of the individual will in collision with the unfeeling and ruthless “machinery of power”. Robert N. Watson in a recent study argues in this regard with eloquent concision:

Though no single paradigm can accurately describe the range of Elizabethan and Jacobean tragedies, a remarkable number of the memorable heroes are destroyed by some version of this confrontation between the desiring personal imagination and the relentless machinery of power, whether social, natural or divine. The revenger is denied the satisfactions of true justice by civil law, political privilege, and Christian principles; the malcontent is denied respect and advancement by the perceived stupidity of his society and his heirarchies.28

The Renaissance tragedy thus emerged as a potential medium for exploring the manifold possibilities -- human, elemental or otherwise -- that seemed to reduce the

status of the human being to that of an essentially lonesome creature struggling against the eternal onslaughts of the powerful external machinery manifesting itself in numerous ways. The death of the heroes at the end of the road suggests the overwhelming force of the external machinery of power to which reference has been made. But it is also noticeable that the heroes go to their death not so much as victims but as agents and subjects in partial control over their own fate and the purposes of their own life. Tragedy is usually not the product of an age which is filled with defeat, despair and pessimism. The best tragedies have usually been written in societies and times where human energy and intelligence had expressed themselves most vigorously. Therefore, the tragic experience is not so much an exploration of death as the expression of the limits of life. But the tragic experience again as Leavis asserts is:

... constructive or creative, and involves a recognizing positive value as in some way defined and vindicated by death. It is as if we were challenged at the profoundest level with the question, 'In what does the significance of life reside?' and found ourselves contemplating, for answer, a view of life, and of the things giving it value, that makes the valued appear unquestionably more important than the valuer, so that significance lies, clearly and inescapably, in the willing adhesion of the individual self to something other than itself.²⁹

However in spite of the wide variety and richness of Renaissance tragedy, it is in the tragedies of Shakespeare that the tragic truth is best realized. For tragedy in

Shakespeare's hands became a rich amalgam of divergent experiences and perspectives eventually bringing about a coherent vision.

It is, therefore, by a close and intensive study of the tragedies of Shakespeare that we intend to unravel the peculiar inclusive pattern of Shakespearean tragedy and its various ramifications. For not only does the ending of the tragedies serve to contribute in a significant way to rounding off the action, bringing to a height, in the process, implicit contradictions and tensions; but, also unfolds the significance of the story in such a way that the tragic import is underlined.

We propose to consider in the present thesis the four major tragedies of Shakespeare, Hamlet, King Lear, Othello and Macbeth from different angles like structure and vision and from the point of view of character. While it is not our intention to propose any theory of tragedy as such, it is hoped that the results of our investigation will make clear not only the distinctive pattern of Shakespearean tragedy but also the significance of events which may be identified as tragic.

It is a very important and a pertinent point that not only does the ending of the tragedies of Shakespeare bring a chain of events to a close but there is also a pervasive awareness that something is indeed coming to a close and that this conclusion is vital to an understanding of the pattern underlying those events. The mechanical termination of events is accompanied by a realization often voiced by certain characters that a hidden truth about life was being unravelled.

Though the ending of the tragedies has been commented upon and explained by host of scholars and critics there has been no attempt to synthesize their numerous
findings into a coherent concept and this is what our thesis proposes to undertake. Accordingly, in addition to the present chapter which incidentally forms the first chapter of the thesis, we propose for the purpose of our study to divide the thesis into the following chapters:

II. The structure of Shakespearean Tragedy and the Denouement.

III. The Idea of the Tragic Hero and the Ending of the Shakespearean Tragedies.

IV. The Tragic Vision and the Ending of Shakespeare's Tragedies.

V. Conclusion.

As we propose to take up the same set of plays for discussion in all the chapters -- obviously excluding the "conclusion", which would be but a summing up of the thesis -- it is most likely that there would be some repetitions of certain statements in spite of our best efforts to avoid the same. But even when such repetition should take place, the focus of the statements will be always on the aspect under discussion. Moreover, as no isolated discussion of any individual section is possible without considering the plays in their totality, we should like to discuss the ending of the plays in each of the chapters through a discussion of the plays in their total context. We now proceed to discuss the plays in accordance with our cherished designs.