

Revisiting William J. Shakespeare's *The Merchant of Venice*'s Shylock from a Critical Discourse Analysis

Saif Al-Deen Lutfi Ali Al-Ghammaz 

English Language and Literature Department, Al-Zaytoonah University of Jordan, Amman, Jordan.

Received: 20/10/2022
Revised: 10/2/2023
Accepted: 18/4/2023
Published: 30/3/2024

* Corresponding author:
S.alghammaz@zu.edu.jo

Citation: Al-Ghammaz, S. A.-D. L. A. . (2024). Revisiting William J. Shakespeare's *The Merchant of Venice*'s Shylock from a Critical Discourse Analysis. *Dirasat: Human and Social Sciences*, 51(2), 267–280. <https://doi.org/10.35516/hum.v51i2.2834>

Abstract

Objectives: This study uses the speech of Shakespeare's well-known character Shylock as a case study to examine how language manipulation impacts power, establishes a connection between language and societal structure, and considers the effect of blending different ideologies.

Methods: This study adopts critical discourse analysis to demonstrate the societal marginalization of the Jewish character Shylock by correlating his speech with the trilogy "identity, ideology, and Venetian society" related to his Jewish identity.

Results: The study shows that once Shylock decides and works to achieve the trilogy of "identity, ideology and power", he fails miserably due to his inhumane traits and personality. Furthermore, Shylock's insistence on the literal interpretation of the bond paves the way to damage his reputation and status, neglecting the power of other influential figures to properly manage the language of his "deed," thereby destroying Shylock's "Power" in Venetian society

Conclusions: The study demonstrates that language is a significant factor in shaping how societies exercise "power" over others, harm undesirable "identities," and adopt the "ideologies" of others.

Keywords: Jew, Shylock, speech, *The Merchant of Venice*, William Shakespeare.

إعادة النظر في بطل مسرحية ويليام جيه شكسبير تاجر البندقية (شايлок) من خلال تحليل الخطاب النقدي

سيف الدين لطفي الغماز*

قسم اللغة الإنجليزية وآدابها، كلية الآداب، جامعة الزيتونة الأردنية، عمان، الأردن

ملخص

الأهداف: تبحث هذه الدراسة في خطاب شخصية شكسبير المعروفة "شايлок". وتكمن الأهداف الأخرى في النظر إلى تأثير التلاعب اللغوي على السلطة، وربط اللغة بهيكل المجتمع، ومعرفة تأثير خلط الأيديولوجيات المختلفة مع بعضها بعضاً. **المنهجية:** منهج البحث المستخدم يستوجب توظيف تحليل الخطاب النقدي من أجل تقديم دليلاً على أن اليهودي شايлок قد هُيئ من قبل المجتمع من خلال ربط ألفاظ شايлок بثلاثية "الهوية، الإيديولوجيا والسلطة البُنْدُقِيّ" بسبب هويته اليهودية.

النتائج: توضح الدراسة أنه بمجرد أن يقرر شايлок ويتصرف لتحقيق ثلاثية "الهوية، الإيديولوجيا والسلطة"، يفشل فشلاً ذريعاً. فتتقف سمات وشخصية شايлок اللاإنسانية وراء فشله في تحقيق "الهوية والإيديولوجيا الخاصة به" من جهة أخرى، إن تأكيد شايлок على تنفيذ العقد حرفياً يفتح الطريق أمام تدمير شخصيته وموقفه، متجاهلاً قوة الشخصيات الأخرى المؤثرة في إدارة لغة "عقده" على النحو المناسب، وهكذا تدمير "سلطة" شايлок في المجتمع البُنْدُقِيّ. **الخلاصة:** تبين الدراسة أن اللغة تعمل كعامل مؤثر لفرض "السلطة" على الآخرين، وإلحاق الضرر "بالهويات" غير المرغوب فيها، وتبني "أيديولوجيات" الآخرين في مجتمع معين. **الكلمات الدالة:** يهودي، شايлок، خطاب، تاجر البندقية، ولیم شکسپیر.



© 2024 DSR Publishers/ The University of Jordan.

This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY-NC) license <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

1. Introduction

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is an interdisciplinary approach examining discourse that demonstrates language as a social practice form. Critical discourse analysis as an approach is based on critiquing discourse and explaining how it figures within and adds to the current social reality so that the existing reality can be changed in specific aspects. Structured as an application theory, CDA focuses on collective social problems, highlighting the practices and behaviors of those individuals in power.

Critical discourse analysis is “a framework used to analyze discourse, is basically concerned with analyzing opaque as well as transparent structural relationships of dominance, discrimination, power and control as manifested in language” (Wodak, 2001, p. 1). According to Billing (2008), “Implementing CDA as a literary criticism methodology may assist researchers in seeing literary works from a fresh perspective, providing chances for analyzing the hidden units of the language in terms of social and political dimensions”. Like traditional stylistics do, discourse analysis can be utilized to comment on texts and understand the functioning of literary discourse, as part of the discursive practices of a given society. Among the patterns of those individuals in power are the Christians in *The Merchant of Venice* authored by William J. Shakespeare as they illustrate the Christians’ ideologies, interacting and working together with the Jews.

According to Hodge (2012), ideologies signify the morals and values that manage a society, reflecting the norms, assumptions, and interests of a certain group. Ideologies can be negative and positive in any society and among the negative ideologies is discrimination, while the positive ideology is exemplified by anti-discrimination. Practicing power is a basis to establish one’s identity, and once someone has power, he can have a particular identity in any society. In Shakespeare’s *The Merchant of Venice*, for example, what distinguishes the Christian identity is authority, particularly in the play’s court scene in Venice Italy. Words’ meanings sometimes are out of sight which the recipients and addressees may overlook. Therefore, it is assumed that words include two meanings; the first meaning rests in themselves, while the second meaning lies in a particular context. Thus, analyzing a certain speech necessitates looking at the setting; when, where, and why producing such an utterance.

Toward the end of Shakespeare’s drama, it is shown that Christians have power and domination over Jews, leading to the downfall of Shylock, a Venetian Jewish merchant. To draw a clearer picture, Shylock attempts to defeat Antonio, the Venetian Christian merchant in the courtroom scene, but Shylock is defeated out of the blue. Therefore, what would be fresh and innovative is that this paper, as such, investigates the social interaction between Christians and Jews in Shakespeare’s *The Merchant of Venice*. In addition, the significance of the research rests in adopting CDA to look at the various traits of the Jew, Shylock. Moreover, this study serves as a marker of motivation and contribution for readers to make continual efforts to look at *The Merchant of Venice* by William Shakespeare from various perception levels (Al-Ghammaz et al., 2022). Precisely, there will be a critical analysis of the character of Shylock in line with his linguistic and social interactions with Christians. This paper is, however, divided into three main sections apart from the introductory section and structured as follows. Section Two explores the Literature Review. Section Three presents the Textual Analysis, and in Section Four, the Conclusion is presented.

2. Literature Review

This study bridges the gap left by the modern scholarship by focusing on analyzing Shakespeare’s *The Merchant of Venice* from stylistics perspectives’, using the CDA approach to show the marginalization of the character, Shylock. In a CDA-based study, Davoodi (2013, p. 1) analyzes the novel by Stephen King, Rita Heyworth and the Shawshank Redemption. The findings reveal that the more manipulation is practiced by characters in the stories, the better CDA can be applied to literary texts. In a study conducted by Aviva (2016), *The Merchant of Venice* is reread from a Jewish point of view demonstrating that *The Merchant of Venice* is labeled as a comedy, for marriage is the ending instead of death. Towards the end of the drama, several good triumphs over evil are shown, i.e., mercy and devotion are represented by the Christian Portia for her goodness, and usury is represented by the Jewish usurer Shylock for his evilness, alongside one and all who care to live happily ever after (Qutami, 2022).

At the level of racial environments, Ganyi (2013, p. 1) analyzes the drama’s Shylock, Barabbas, and Iago as victims of

their society. Ganyi states that it is a complex task to analyze the said characters from contemporary perspectives, for their actions cannot be properly understood, and thus they are simply viewed as social circumstances victims. He adds that Shylock is seen as a victim of his surroundings and an intelligible felon instead of a villain at one go, saying “In an active social and moral universe, the Jew is still a peripheral character” (Ganyi, 2013, p. 130).

From another angle, the depiction and characterization of Shylock as a scapegoat by Deng and Wu (2013) shows that Shylock defends and protects the ideologies of the ruling class, making them feel that greedy people experience hard times and prejudicial treatment, speaking of Shylock is racial prejudices’ first victim. Thus, it is obvious that Deng and Wu (2013) believe that Shylock’s description by Shakespeare merely represents a picture of his time. However, it is still difficult to agree or disagree with this idea as Shylock’s actions demonstrate that he is a victim and a villain altogether. Shylock’s act of villainy, for example, is obviously seen in his insistence on implementing the bond word by word.

Viewing the play as a bi-theme play addressing themes of romance and money usury, Harp (2010) discusses the drama’s main characters; the Christian, Antonio, and the Jew, Shylock. Antonio’s obsession with risks trade business and love affairs makes him the play’s hero. However, Harp does not view Shylock as an example of villainy as gleaned from the words of Shylock, saying “Hath not a Jew eyes? Hath not a Jew hands, passions”. Harp justifies Shylock’s anger as a response to the hatred and contempt experienced by Shylock in the Christian community.

From other critics’ annotations, Blanchard (2009) argues the distinctions among romance, mercy, indifference, law, and justice, seeing that Shylock goes through inconstancy. In other words, Shylock is viewed as uncomfortable with romance, humanity, or justice. The adoption of Shylock to compare Hebrew inflexibility with Christian flexibility enables Shakespeare to convey that every person in the drama corroborates inconstant in the long run, and thus all are required to learn to side with effort over effect, mercy over manner, and love over law.

From a literary criticism viewpoint of *The Merchant of Venice*, Weinstein (2007) analyses Shylock’s usury acts and the four violations of biblical and Talmudic laws related to money lending. Among the Talmudic laws committed by Shylock is to take interest from poor people. Murder is the second Talmudic law Shylock commits, for Shylock’s inhuman demand for the flesh of Antonio entails Antonio’s death. Shylock’s third Talmudic law violation rests in his insistence on being merciless at the court. To give details, Shylock is required to show mercy so that he does not violate Prophet Micah’s instructions. Likewise, Jeerer indicates “He who does show mercy to people, God will show mercy to him. The word ‘people’ refers to those who deserve mercy, such as Muslims and non-Muslims. And so, the Jewish, Christian, and Islamic rituals, laws, and culture are distorted by Shylock.

Given the previous literature review of the different analyses and interpretations of Shakespeare’s *The Merchant of Venice* and the very few studies on using CDA in analyzing the literary works, it is evident that research work on the use of CDA in interpreting the literary texts is very few with few impact, and the gap filling in this study is that Shylock’s character is revisited from critical discourse analysis. Thus, the current work purports to identify how Shylock’s character relies on his personal, social, and linguistic interaction and dealings with the Christians. In a few words, the study is limited to Shylock’s trio of “Identity, Power, & Ideology” concerning other Christian characters in Venice Italy, the land of Christianity.

Moreover, with the advent of William J. Shakespeare’s *The Merchant of Venice*, studies examining the themes, structure, stylistics, and other linguistic and literary subject matters are on the rise. The nature of critically analyzing and describing *The Merchant of Venice*’s Shylock’s character necessitates conducting a CDA-based study. Many theories relating to critical discourse analysis are adopted to detail the verbal and social interaction between Christians and Jews, as they give insight into the relationship between power and language, analyzing language and its structure under the power’s effect. Social psychologists are inclined to integrate power and the authorized utterances’ resultant structures. More importantly, investigating Shakespeare’s famous character, Shylock requires analyzing Shylock’s various utterances, depending on the context’s use and the articulation method.

Significantly, the incorporation of critical discourse analysis (CDA) in Shakespeare’s *The Merchant of Venice* is unavoidable as it greatly contributes to the analysis of the Jew’s character and speech’s Shylock. The next section of the textual analysis is structured to include the Shylock-Antonio Bond Language and the “Identity, Power, & Ideology Trio”.

3. Textual Analysis

3.1 Shylock-Antonio Bond

Investigating and analyzing the speech of Shakespeare's well-known character Shylock using the Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) requires analyzing the Shylock-Antonio bond language. The analysis of Shylock's language demonstrates his obvious intention of cutting off a pound of Antonio's flesh, requesting a condition that the bond shall be signed by Antonio so that the bond's validity and legality are guaranteed. Shylock says:

Go with me to a notary, seal me there Your single bond; and, in a merry sport, If you repay me not on such a day, In such a place, such sum or sums as are Express'd in the condition, let the forfeit Be nominated for an equal pound Of your fair flesh, to be cut off and taken In what part of your body pleaseth me (Shakespeare, I, III, 139-147).

As shown in the previous excerpt, Shylock has the right to take a pound of flesh due to Antonio failure's to pay in the due time and place agreed on in the two-party bond. With that being said, Shylock is intended to make the actual taking of Antonio's flesh. These conditions are written in black and white in the bond's actual words. In reciting the bond's conditions in the courtroom before the judge, Bassanio's beloved Portia says "Why, this bond is forfeit; and lawfully by this the Jew may claim a pound of flesh, to be by him cut off nearest the merchant's heart. Be merciful: Take thrice thy money. Bid me tear the bond" (Shakespeare, IV, I, 228-233).

On the other hand, concerning Antonio's body's part to be taken, Shylock is to decide it clearly demanding the flesh part through using the related language, saying a flesh is "A merry sport". However, with an intense look at the bond's structure and language, Shylock is determinedly taking flesh, so no joke of any kind is seen in Shylock's language and words adopted in the bond. To explain, if Shylock intends to make a joke, Shylock shall be merciful in granting Antonio himself the opportunity to select his body's part and not Shylock's. By way of explanation, Shylock shall avoid deciding the "fair flesh" that "pleaseth" him in order not to control or possess Antonio's body.

As a consequence, Antonio enthusiastically surrenders to the bond by which he shall give his life to Shylock because the laws protect the property's interests (Tiffany, 2006). Another important thing is that if there is a joke on the go, needless to go to a notary to officialize the contract. However, Shylock is eager to gain Antonio-misstep to practice his deep hostility and hatred against Christians. In the same vein, being fully aware of the dangerous nature of the seas, Shylock assumes that Antonio may not defray the agreed-on amount on time. This idea - full of malicious intentions and deception - is easily gleaned from Shylock's words to Bassanio, "Ships are boards, sailors but men: there be land-rats and water-rats, water-thieves and landthieves—I mean pirates—and then there is peril of waters, winds and rocks. The man is, notwithstanding, sufficient. Three thousand ducats; I may take this bond" (Shakespeare, I, III, 20-25). The utterances made by Shylock relating to the seas' hazards and risks demonstrate his evil mind or ill intention for killing Antonio for "He is a Christian" (Shakespeare, I, II, 38).

3.2 Identity, Power, & Ideology Trio

Explicating the trio of "Identity, Power, & Ideology" necessitates investigating Shakespeare's famous character, Shylock by giving a detailed insight into Shylock's various utterances voiced in the drama structure of the acts and scenes.

3.2.1 Identity, Power, & Ideology Trio of Act 1

The initial appearance of *The Merchant of Venice*'s Shylock is introduced in Act I, where the Shakespearean drama's readers are aware of the fact that some Christians are in need of money from Venice's Jew, Shylock. Owing to the daily-life burdens and the Christians' financial needs for Shylock's money, readers can directly observe the Christians' adoption of polite language to provoke sympathy for Shylock. Shylock agrees to lend the Christians around his, as his approval is guaranteed by Antonio's pledge to settle up the due amount lent from Shylock. This is gleaned from Shylock's description of Antonio, saying "Antonio is a good man" (Shakespeare, I, III, 12). However, Shylock ironically uses the adjective "Good" because he explains that the meaning of "Good" entails that Antonio is sufficiently capable of defraying the debt (Shakespeare, I, III, 14-25). In the same mood, although Christians dislike interest-based business dealings, Antonio is impelled to deal with interests in the interest of his friend.

Besides, Shylock has already decided neither to unite with the Christian community nor share his identity as a Jew with

Christians, for Shylock "Will not eat with Christians nor pray with them". As put by Schuman (2012), Shylock believes that not now and not in the future that he can ever mingle with the Christian community, in particular Antonio's tribe. Yet, Shylock tries by observing any act of misbehavior from Antonio. This demonstrates that the Christian community and identity are both unwelcome and vilify the Jewish identity in the drama. The first aside voiced by Shylock encompasses ambiguous and misleading utterances, i.e. due to his hatred and grudge toward Antonio, Shylock seems like an anti-Christian Jew, saying "For he is a Christian" (Shakespeare, I, III, 37). Likewise, if Antonio is caught by Shylock's "Once upon the hip", Shylock "Will feed fat the ancient grudge", and if Shylock excuses Antonio, "Cursed be my tribe, if I forgive him!" (Shakespeare, I, III, 37-48). Within that context, Harp (2010) maintains that Shylock feels much upset and disappointed as he shall reveal his deep hatred to Antonio in an aside. And so, of the obvious thoughts and attitudes of Shylock related to his stance from Christians is that he cannot openly show his villainy for Antonio in the presence of Antonio himself. Schuman (2012) asserts that Shylock's words "I hate him for he is a Christian" (Shakespeare, I, III, 38) purport to uncover the true attitudes and thoughts of a character thanks to their appearance in an aside by Shylock.

What is more, labeling Antonio as "A fawning publican" (Shakespeare, I, III, 37) by Shylock signposts that Shylock, a Jew with a tax evasion record, hates Antonio for loaning others money with zero interests. Thus, Shylock considers Antonio as an obstacle as Antonio stands behind Shylock's trading losses. Shylock pays attention to Antonio's actions with eagerness to get a false step to "Catch him" "Once upon the hip" (Shakespeare, I, III, 42). Shylock's inhumanity in attempting to gain extra powers to avenge Antonio is articulated in Shylock's utterance "Cursed be my tribe if I forgive him!" (Shakespeare, I, III, 47-48). Among the reasons fuelling Shylock's revenge is that Antonio hates the Jews' sacred race and nation.

In another utterance, Shylock is viewed as a lost person in the Shylock-Antonio bond. The use of the word "Lost" shows that Shylock attempts to produce a Jewish identity by borrowing money from Tubal, his Jewish friend so that he can loan Antonio and make him submissive. As said (Beauchamp, 2016), Shylock's intentional use of "Hebrew" (Shakespeare, I, III, 49-56) is merely a glimpse of race, and it has nothing to do with religion to show Antonio as a powerless Christian. On the other hand, Shylock does not have to loan money to Antonio for not having a sufficient amount. Rather, Shylock may be eager to see Antonio's false step so that he can hit and win in his unethical and racial war. On the subject of the unethical war waged by Shylock, Weinstein (2007) maintains that although various careers are unavailable to Jews, it is still unethical for Shylock to request cutting off a pound of Antonio's flesh as a condition to process the bond and as an interest.

As well, Shylock is a double-talking and deceitful Jew in speech, being unable to openly express and show his long-term hostility to Antonio. To put it simply, Shylock's description of Antonio with good personality traits and qualities such as "Your worship" is inundated with lies, demonstrating Shylock's inability and powerlessness to competently express his character. With that, Shylock is a powerless Jew with a distorted and deformed identity and ideology among Christians. Thus, Shylock strives for establishing a strong identity and ideologies, saying "When Jacob graz'd his uncle Laban's sheep. This Jacob from our holy Abram was (As his wise mother wrought in his behalf) the third possessor; ay, he was the third" (Shakespeare, I, III, 67-86). The pretext behind Shylock's mention of the Jacob-Abraham story is that Shylock works hard to establish Jewish identity, ideology, and sense of power in the presence of the Christian, Antonio by speaking of Jewish and religious tales. By way of explanation, Antonio is given grounding in the Jewish ethics and values by Shylock so that Antonio is familiarized with the Jewish identity. In detail, the interest is justified by Shylock's beliefs, saying "No, not take interest; not, as you would say, directly interest: mark what Jacob did.... And thrift is blessing, if men steal it not" (Shakespeare, I, III, 72-91).

Beyond the shadow of a doubt, Shylock's opening up about stories and tales relating to Jacob and the sheep is an unethical attempt to strengthen his Jewish ideologies, beliefs, and values. Religion-based tales and stories are always incorporated into discourses to reflect the powerful identity and history of the speaker, and so Shylock incorporates these allegoric and historical tales and stories so that his Jewish ideologies, beliefs, and identity are deeply established among the Christians. To explain, even though Jacob used to take interests from borrowers, Christians don't have to be aware of Jacob's method of taking interests from debtors. What is gleaned from the mention of Jacob's story with interest is that a Jew-Jew

interest-taking process is not applied based on the Jewish traditions as the Jew, Tubal loans the Jew, Shylock the required amount without, and the readers are still unaware if Shylock pays interests or the due amount itself to Tubal. In this context, Mcavan (2011) confirms that interests shall be written in black and white in the Jewish-Christian bonds and that the explicit reason for Shylock's deep grudge and hatred toward Antonio is that Antonio takes no interest when loaning others. Conversely, A Jew only takes interest in non-Jew transactions as Shylock religiously justifies why he takes interests from borrowers, demonstrating that he shall follow suit Jacob's work to make the sheep bread so that he can establish himself, his reputation, and his stance in this life, saying "This was a way to thrive" and "Thrift is blessing" (Shakespeare, I, III, 90). It is believed that "Thrift" represents power, and once "Men steal it", power is damaged.

With that being said, Shylock makes every effort to arrogantly triumph over the Christians in general and Antonio in particular by boasting about his economic and financial powers, saying "Hath a dog money? Is it possible, a cur can lend three thousand ducats?" Or Shall I bend low, and in a bondman's key, with bated breath, and whispering humbleness" (Shakespeare, I, III, 102-125). Though Antonio curses, humiliates and spits on Shylock, Shylock adopts a language with a higher structure and style as a trial so that Shylock's will is imposed on Antonio; this is in line with a 2003 study by Hunt piecing together that concerning Shylock being abused by Antonio, Shylock replies by asking Antonio sarcastically and rhetorically, saying "And for these courtesies/I'll lend you thus much moneys?" Likewise, Turner (2006) confirms that Shylock can bear Antonio's insults as the entire Jews do so, adding that Shylock is a deceiving Jew attempting to make Antonio submissive to him. Shylock is not forgetful of Antonio's aggressions, reminding Antonio of these insults; spitting on his Jewish gabardine and calling Shylock unbeliever and dog, saying "You call me misbeliever, cutthroat dog, And spet upon my Jewish gabardine" (Shakespeare, I, III, 121-122). At that point, Shylock simply asks if you need Shylock's help and the dog's help, considering that I have bad personal traits, so why requesting my moneys, saying "Well then, it now appears you need my help. Go to, then. You come to me and you say "Shylock, we would have moneys"—you say so" (Shakespeare, I, III, 124-125). In contrast, Shylock simply answers these spiritual questions; Shylock has not had enough money to loan Antonio and thus can make an apology to lending him, but since Shylock is a Jew known as a ruthless and blood-thirsty moneylender, he is eager to triumph over Antonio. To put it in another way, Shylock keeps convincing himself that he has high appreciation and values among Christians who disrespect them.

Furthermore, Shylock uses various symbols serving to attain power and find the Jewish identity. Of these symbols, for example, is the expression uttered by Shylock, saying "My Jewish gabardine" (Shakespeare, I, III, 108) symbolizing Shylock's high status in the community. Another example is the word "Beard" signifying Shylock's glory, splendor, and dignity tarnished by Antonio. Consequently, Shylock shall not "Bend low" because he thinks that he attains certain powers thanks to his economic status among Christians (Shakespeare, I, III, 102-125).

In reality, Shylock is unsuccessful in gaining power and establishing identity as Antonio says "A breed for barren metal of his friend? But lend it rather to thine enemy, who, if he break, thou mayst with better face exact the penalty. Shylock replies Why, look you, how you storm! I would be friends with you and have your love" (Shakespeare, I, III, 134-138). As gleaned from this excerpt, Shylock is malicious since although he is badly abused and treated, he decides to be generous and kind, and loan money to Antonio, forgetting the verbal abuses and offenses. At the start of the play, readers of Shakespeare's *The Merchant of Venice* are unaware of the reasons behind Antonio's repeated act of spitting on Shylock, but later facts are uncovered and reasons are identified as the readers know that Antonio distastes the Jews and their race because they loan money with interests.

However, Schuman (2002) asserts that being spitted on twice as mentioned in the play is a gesture of Antonio's disgust toward Shylock and his race. Shylock's personality is also deformed for being weak-minded and hesitant although he has determined to get Antonio lowered in his social rank among the Christians and Jews. Although Shylock is a hesitant and weak-minded character, he is still bloodthirsty and ruthless, saying "This kindness will I show in what part of your body pleaseth me" (Shakespeare, I, III, 139-147). In Shylock's terms, it is an act of joke and fun "Merry Sport" to take a pound of a Christian's flesh "fair flesh", which is Antonio's flesh. Thus, Shylock uses the Shylock-Antonio bond to tie Antonio's freedom and choices; Antonio's fate is now in the power of the bond and Shylock. To put it simply, cutting off a

pound of flesh from a man means he is under the control of/ at the mercy of someone else.

Yet, Antonio must “Seal” the bond to legalize the Christian-Jewish bond. The evil thoughts whirling in Shylock’s mind anticipate the failure of Antonio to defray the debt as Shylock speaks of not taking the due interest proposing cutting off a pound of flesh from Antonio. Assuming that Antonio’s pound of flesh is cut off by Shylock and that Antonio is still alive and does not die, Christians will regard it shameful for becoming a stain of disgrace by an “Insulted Jew”.

All over again, appearing passionate, emotive and, humane requires Shylock to use religious allusions as he says “O father Abram, what these Christians are, and, for my love, I pray you wrong me not” (Shakespeare, I, III, 156-166), and this signposts Shylock’s animosity. Yet again, Shylock’s words “A pound of man’s flesh is not so estimable, profitable neither” (Shakespeare, I, III, 172-173) show Shylock as a bloodthirsty character. In this mood, Shylock looks for power to establish his ideologies, saying “The thoughts of others” (Shakespeare, I, III, 170), as others’ thoughts represent the Jews’ values. In the same vein, Shylock refers to religious mentions and references, namely: “O father Abram” (Shakespeare, I, III, 168) to legalize his actions, convincing himself that his behaviors are true. Nickel (2001) maintains that to defend himself from the accusations of Antonio, Shylock cites the verses of the Torah to say that he practices “Thrift” and never “steals”. Also, a Christian’s pound of a flesh is of no value, but the “Flesh of muttons, beefs, or goats” (Shakespeare, I, III, 175) is more valuable, as flesh is a sign of a man’s personality, and Shylock strives for distorting it.

3.2.2 Identity, Power, & Ideology Trio of Act 2

Shakespeare’s romantic comedy play Act II furnishes a frame on two Jewish-Jewish relationships; a Jewish master-servant relationship and a Jewish father-daughter relationship. To clarify, making up his mind to serve a new master Bassanio who is Christian, Shylock’s servant Launcelot Gobbo is the first person to relinquish his service with the Jewish master in Venice. With that, Shylock regards himself as an irreplaceable master, persuading Launcelot that Bassanio is of no use as a master. Shylock says “Hagar’s offspring” (Shakespeare, II, V, 44), adding “Well, thou shalt see, thy eyes shall be thy judge... Why, Jessica, I say!” (Shakespeare, II, V, 1-6).

In the same mood in this act, Shylock acts as a father, who is careful and unwilling to leave his lone daughter to dine with Christians, saying “I am bid forth to supper, Jessica. There are my keys.—But wherefore should I go? I am not bid for love. They flatter me. But yet I’ll go in hate, to feed upon the prodigal Christian.—Jessica, my girl, Look to my house.—I am right loath to go. There is some ill a-brewing towards my rest, for I did dream of money bags tonight” (Shakespeare, II, V, 11-18). Shylock’s daughter Jessica is granted the authority to pay attention to her father’s wealth because he is still unwilling to eat dinner with “The prodigal Christian” (Shakespeare, II, V, 15). As proved in this excerpt, Shylock is a Jew with a confused and eccentric character, making it difficult to make decisions.

As a father’s role, Shylock makes orders to his daughter, saying “What are there masques? Hear you me, Jessica..... Say I will come” (Shakespeare, II, V, 28-39). As detailed by these lines, Shylock is authoritative and masterful to his lone daughter, Jessica. Shylock, for example, avoids general discourse with his daughter and keeps individualizing or specifying his pieces of wealth, calling his daughter Jessica to “lock up my doors” (Shakespeare, II, V, 29). The possessive adjective pronoun “My” is adopted to make his Jewish character dictatorial and oppressive. Furthermore, Shylock tells Jessica that she is not allowed to open “His” windows so that Jessica neither sees the Christians nor listens to their music. Accordingly, it is asserted that Shylock has economic capacities and power, attempting to save it by identifying his wealth.

In the same context, Jessica is cautioned to lock the doors to safeguard her father’s wealth since “Fast bind, fast find” (Shakespeare, II, V, 54). The irony in this situation rests in the fact that Shylock is fearful of losing his wealth and money, but he is not afraid of losing his daughter. Shylock shall also tell Jessica to be careful for herself; however, due to his materialistic character, he has not paid attention to his daughter. Scene I of act III has a confirmation related to the previous claim; when Jessica flees with her lover, Shylock desires Jessica, his daughter, saying “Were dead at” his “Foot” (Shakespeare, III, I, 83-84). Still, Heller (2000) maintains that it is well-established that no single person is fond of Shylock’s character as a human being, even temporarily. In other words, Shylock’s character as a man never exists.

3.2.3 Identity, Power, & Ideology Trio of Act 3

Shylock’s adoption of a materialistic stance in his daily-life dealings, things, and outings are as clear as crystal in Act

III. The minute Shylock knows about his daughter's elopement with Lorenzo, a Christian young man, he speaks of the stolen things by his daughter, Jessica instead of wishing her good health and luck, although Shylock describes Jessica as his "Flesh and blood" (Shakespeare, III, I, 32). However, "She is damned for it" (Shakespeare, III, I, 30). Making a connection between the two asides relating to Jessica; "Flesh and blood" and "She is damned for it" demonstrate Shylock's curses to himself. Furthermore, in *The Merchant of Venice*, the noun "Flesh" has been used several times. It is first used when Shylock requests a pound of flesh from Antonio if he is late to pay the due amount. Secondly, the word "Flesh" is used by Shylock to describe Jessica being as his flesh. And so, the body's outside form is symbolized by "Flesh", while the body's inside form is symbolized by religious perceptions. To put it simply, it is true that the flesh of Jews and Christians are alike, but their souls are unlike, and Shylock's request for the Christian flesh is a clear clue that Shylock wants to end Antonio's soul and life.

In the same vein, though Shylock as a father has power over Jessica, her elopement with Christian Lorenzo topples Shylock's power, becoming unstable or unsteady and falling over. Most likely, Shylock's feelings of temporal happiness fueled by the news of the damage to Antonio's ships are simultaneously mixed with feelings of money hunger, cruelty, greed, and fretfulness that Shylock's stolen money is used by Jessica to take great delight in life with Lorenzo. The indecency of the Jewish lost ideology and identity is illustrated in Act III, as Salerio says, "There is more difference between thy flesh and hers than between jet and ivory; more between your bloods than there is between red wine and rhenish. But tell us, do you hear whether Antonio have had any loss at sea or no? And Shylock replies "There I have another bad match: a bankrupt, a prodigal, who dare scarce show his head on the Rialto; a beggar that was used to come so smug upon the mart" (Shakespeare, III, I, 40-46).

The high morale of Shylock is on the up thanks to the news of the damage to Antonio's ships, and thus that he gets ready to revenge and hit back at Antonio. Additionally, Shylock repeats the bond-based sentence thrice "Let him look to his bond" (Shakespeare, III, I, 43 & 46) to point to his feelings of triumph and winning over the bond. Thus, Shylock's three repetitions of the sentence are adopted to remind Antonio of the fact that he will be shortly finished by Shylock. At that point, Shylock explains the bond's literal implementation, saying "To bait fish withal: if it will feed nothing else, it will feed my revenge" (Shakespeare, III, I, 49). At this juncture, the Jew's revenge matches Antonio's assaults.

With the Christians' question about the pound of the flesh and what to do with it, Shylock adopts a language inundated with sympathy to convince readers of his valid revenge, saying

"To bait fish withal: if it will feed nothing else, it will feed my revenge. He hath disgraced me, and hindered me half a million; laughed at my losses, mocked at my gains, scorned my nation, thwarted my bargains, cooled my friends, heated mine enemies; and what's his reason? I am a Jew. Hath not a Jew's eyes? hath not a Jew hands, organs, dimensions, senses, affections, passions? fed with the same food, hurt with the same weapons, subject to the same diseases, healed by the same means, warmed and cooled by the same winter and summer, as a Christian is? If you prick us, do we not bleed? If you tickle us, do we not laugh? If you poison us, do we not die? And if you wrong us, shall we not revenge? If we are like you in the rest, we will resemble you in that. If a Jew wrong a Christian, what is his humility? Revenge. If a Christian wrong a Jew, what should his sufferance be by Christian example? Why, revenge. The villany you teach me, I will execute, and it shall go hard but I will better the instruction" (Shakespeare, III, I, 49-69).

As gleaned from the above excerpt, Shylock's speech creates confusion among the readers about whether he is a money merchant or a decent Jew. Both Jews and Christians have eyes, ears, and flesh, eyes, and die if diseased. However, the distinctive feature between them rests in their religions, as Antonio is Christian and Shylock is a Jew. Since Shylock tries to find a Jewish identity, he relies on a technique based on questioning to make the readers sympathize with his cause. Similarly, Antonio and Shylock both have different ideologies, and Shylock is keen on showing his modest ideologies.

With his knowledge about the worthlessness of the flesh, Shylock still demands it to satisfy his thirst for vengeance. However, Shylock's plan to process the terms of the bond is exaggerated. To explain, if the Christian affronts a Jew, the Jew shall exactly do the same, not to demand the double; cutting off his flesh, saying "It shall go hard" (Shakespeare, III, I, 72). Therefore, the ideologies considered by Shylock are tarnished with blood since his vengeance is completely bloody.

What is more, Shylock clearly states that he has an unknown Jewish identity to others, as he is capable of being and acting as a real Jew. Heller (2000) asserts that Shylock acts like a Venetian merchant; dressing the Venetian upper-class clothes. Neither Shylock's physique nor his shapes confirm his Jewishness.

In the same mood, the financial powers of Shylock are also on the decrease, worsening more and more, saying "Why there, there, there, there! A diamond gone...no tears but o' my shedding" (Shakespeare, III, I, 79-92). This excerpt demonstrates that the news of Shylock's daughter's elopement with Lorenzo quickens the decline of the financial powers Shylock, wishing the death of his daughter with stolen money. Shylock's wishes assert that he no longer has power over his daughter, Jessica, and what sustains his power once again is having her dead, alongside the stolen money and diamonds.

On the other hand, despite his daughter's elopement, the intuition of Shylock is to attain power against Christians, as he learns about the collapse of Antonio's trading ships. In detail, the news of the damage to the ships strengthens Shylock, thanking God and describing this news as "Good news" (Shakespeare, III, I, 100-101). Despite the "Good news", the repetition of Shylock's daughter's elopement weakens Shylock, but Shylock's identity and stance are once more strengthened by the repetition of Antonio's ships' destruction, as he is about to hit back and revenge against the Christian, Antonio. With hitting back at Antonio; Shylock rebuilds authority and power so that his Jewish identity and ideologies are created and circulated at the Venetian society level. In this context, Shylock is happy and can now tort Antonio, saying I am very glad of it: I'll plague him; I'll torture him: I am glad of it" (Shakespeare, III, I, 110).

The revenge pursued by Shylock is brought into being and put on the table, as Shylock says "Nay, that's true, that's very true. Go, Tubal, fee me an officer; Tubal at our synagogue, Tubal" (Shakespeare, III, I, 119-124). Shylock's words confirm the Jewish Shylock's continuous pursuit of the identity, power, & ideology trio. For the benefit of obtaining power, Shylock wishes to have Antonio arrested two weeks before the bond, and as stated by Mcavan (2011), Shylock has a complete relationship with the legal bond or contract. To achieve a Jewish ideology, Shylock makes transactions of any kind when loaning money to Christians. For the reason of making a Jewish identity, Shylock shall get rid of the bad Christian, Antonio so that Shylock can be recognized as the Jew who has beaten a Christian, and thus he can manage the trading business as he likes. With that being said, Shylock feels powerful thanks to the bond signed by Antonio but still feels powerless due to the news of Jessica's elopement with Lorenzo, the Christian lover.

Now, Shylock threatens Antonio with no mercy for his financial problems; Antonio is a Christian fool who loans money with zero interest, saying "Jailer, look to him. Tell not me of mercy and this is the fool that lent out money gratis" (Shakespeare, III, III, 1-3). Weinstein (2007) maintains that Jews in the Shakespearean era have the right to take interest. Therefore, Shylock is predetermined to defeat Antonio based on the rights given to Jews in the Shakespearean time. Also, Shylock never shows any mercy to Antonio for failing to pay the due amount though he is in need of mercy, as he says "Tell not me of mercy", confirming Shylock's inner brutality (Shakespeare, III, III, 1). At the start, Antonio used to curse and insult Shylock for being powerful more than Shylock, but now Shylock is more powerful than Antonio, preparing to avenge Antonio's curses, spits, and insults. Their conflict is now governed by the concept of "An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth", where Shylock attacks tit for tat a similar attack by Antonio. To put it simply, Antonio and Shylock's values, ideologies, and objectives are almost alike. Afterward, Shylock is now convinced that the Duke shall grant him justice, saying "The Duke shall grant me justice" (Shakespeare, III, 18), as he wins the two-party bond, and trusts the Duke's justice. In this instance, Shylock firmly believes that the highest powers of the court, represented by the Duke, will align with him to enforce the terms of the bond, thus enabling him to cut off Antonio's pound of flesh.

However, Shylock considers the justice's judicial and executive powers to grant him the right to cut off a flesh pound from Antonio for having his bond. Blanchard (2009) asserts that Shylock adamantly demands implementing the bond's exact terms, nothing more nothing less. To Shylock, the bond is the sign of the religious and high authority, saying "I'll have my bond; speak not against my bond... to come abroad with him at his request" (Shakespeare, III, III, 12-17). This quotation shows that Shylock reminds Antonio of the offenses and insults previously borne by Shylock. As Shylock will be given justice in court against Antonio, he says "But since I am a dog, beware my fangs" (Shakespeare, III, III, 8), as he can now strike Antonio and take his flesh.

3.2.4 Identity, Power, & Ideology Trio of Act 4

The courtroom scenes, alongside their unexpected events, are introduced in Act IV inundated with, speeches, language tools, and satires strongly adopted to criticize both Christians and Jews. The significance of the courtroom scenes lies in reflecting the power of Christians over Jews at that point. During the court proceedings, Shylock's insistence to literally implement the terms of the bond makes him believe that Christians are no longer powerful and that he has power and control over the Christians. And so, Shylock has been viewed as very self-confident among readers thanks to his belief in winning the case against Antonio. The first words uttered by Shylock in the courtroom expose Shylock's intuition of winning the case and rude behavior of being merciless with Antonio because of Shylock's hunger to avenge his identity and ideology. Shylock addresses the Duke, the highest power of the court, saying "I have possess'd your grace of what I purpose; And by our holy Sabbath have I sworn... A losing suit against him and are you answer'd?" (Shakespeare, IV, I, 35-62). Christians' immediate decision at the courtroom to pay Shylock three thousand ducats moves neither Shylock's intuition nor Shylock's heart, saying "A weight of carrion flesh" is better than "to receive three thousand ducats" (Shakespeare, IV, I, 41-42). The "Carrion flesh" uttered by Shylock is a sign signifying the superiority and arrogance of Shylock that despite Antonio's flesh's inedibility, Shylock badly requests it. In another sign, the use of the word "Carrion flesh" is with intent not to refer to Antonio's body only, but to demonstrate the rottenness of the entire Christians. Furthermore, the now powerful Shylock ridicules the Christians, comparing his case with "A rat" and saying the "Rat" is Antonio who disturbs the house and life of Shylock.

In this context, the Duke makes efforts, begging the merciless Shylock to pour mercy on Antonio. However, Shylock asserts the terms of the bond to be literally implemented. To Shylock, the bond is a symbol of a weapon used to fight the Christian foes. In case the bonds' terms are not executed as required by the Duke, Shylock believes that freedom is invalid in the bylaws adopted by the City of Venice. Shylock's pretexts furnished to the Duke relating to cutting off Antonio's flesh are questionable and inconclusive, as he adds that I like to end Antonio's life with no need to present justifications, saying "Can I give no reason, nor I will not, more than a lodged hate and a certain loathing I bear Antonio, that I follow thus a losing suit against him. Are you answer'd? I am not bound to please thee with my answers" (Shakespeare, IV, I, 35-65).

Using the pronoun "Our", the Jew, Shylock, an essential element of the courtroom scene, symbolizes the entire Jewish society. Adopting religious oaths, speeches, and words, i.e. Holy Sabbath, Shylock aims to damage the Christians' high powers on their ground. It is Shylock's trial, victory, and day to reestablish his torn ideology and identity before the Duke and other Christian court attendees by taking Jewish oaths in a Christian courtroom and city. After signing the bond with Antonio, Shylock determinedly believes he has power over all Christians. The hatred and grudge of Shylock against Antonio is the driving power behind killing Antonio with no mercy, as Shylock says "Hates any man the thing he would not kill?What! Wouldst thou have a serpent sting thee twice?" (Shakespeare, IV, I, 35-69),

Among the words metaphorically used by Shylock is "Serpent", indicating that the Christian, Antonio can be symbolized by the serpent. To Shylock, showing any act of mercy may enable Antonio, the serpent to "Sting" Shylock again. Being hungry for money, Shylock is offered double the sum; however, Shylock rejects it, replying "If every ducat in six thousand ducats, were in six parts, and every part a ducat, I would not draw them. I would have my bond" (Shakespeare, IV, I, 35-85). Accordingly, the bond's terms shall be exactly and literally implemented. Shylock is eager to get his bond's terms achieved, and once Shylock wins his bond, he can strike and topple the Christians' power to retake his power in the community. Shylock's regaining power is a confirmation of the Jewish identity and ideologies among the Christians accustomed to having the Jews declassified among other ethnicities. As put by Picker (2012), Shylock thinks of usury as a source of power to defeat and control his Christian foes, and what functions as usury is the flesh pound previously coded in the bond.

For example, Shylock looks like a man abiding by law when requested to pour mercy on Antonio; he replies "What judgment shall I dread, doing no wrong? I stand for judgment. Answer— shall I have it?" (Shakespeare, IV, I, 89-101). As gleaned from the previous excerpt, Shylock looks as if a Jew who is a Venetian law-abiding citizen, admiring the Christians' laws. In this context, Beauchamp (2016) maintains that a similarity between the flesh pound and slaves is made by the Jew,

Shylock. Shylock does not intrude on the method adopted by Christians in dealing with their slaves or animals as these are solely their affairs, and not the Jews, and thus is Antonio's flesh pound. The flesh pound is Shylock's property, saying "Tis mine and I will have it" (Shakespeare, IV, I, 100), and there is no right stipulating that Christians can request Shylock not to claim it. Describing Antonio as a "Serpent" that bites encompass the mission's seriousness at the court. Shylock claims that once upon a time, he has been stung by Antonio; however, Antonio no longer can sting Shylock again since Antonio is submitted to the bond's will. Therefore, the pound of flesh requires Shylock to be his possession and under his control. Accordingly, Shylock is optimistic about the Duke's right and fair judgment. Shylock is self-assured that the law sides with him, but if it is denied, "Fie upon your law" (Shakespeare, IV, I, 101). Importantly, as indicated by (Weinstein, 2012), a simile is also used to convince the Duke about Antonio's pound of flesh, as Shylock takes revenge for the various losses related to his daughter and the insult and humiliation and years of insult and humiliation (Weinstein, 2013).

Long (2012) states that Shylock's evilness is once again reflected in carrying a knife sharpened with feelings of hatred and grudge against Christians. The scene of a knife in Shylock's hands in the courtroom is a representation of Shylock's high rank and stand of defeating Antonio and other Christians. The knife is sharpened by Shylock "To cut the forfeiture from that bankrupt there" (Shakespeare, IV, I, 122). Hence, the court represented by the Duke is cautioned by Shylock who says, "If you deny me, fie upon your law!" (Shakespeare, IV, I, 101). In this context, "Bankrupt" a word uttered by Shylock entails two meanings; life and money. What is more, Hartman (2011) shows that the knife is a confirmation of Shylock's power as Antonio is incapable of equivocating to deny his oath before the duke and others in the courtroom, and the contract to give his body suggests a redemptive theme of Christianity.

The Jew's power is continuously on the increase as all Christians are unhelpful help although the court is full of Christian officers, and thus Shylock is close to winning over them. Accordingly, Shylock is full of pride for Antonio and other Christians, saying "Canst rail the seal from off [his] bond"; till thou canst rail the seal from off my bond. Thou but offend'st thy lungs to speak so loud: Repair thy wit, good youth, or it will fall to cureless ruin, and I stand here for law" (Shakespeare, IV, I, 139-142). As stated (Dutta, 2013), Shakespeare reveals Shylock's muted struggle against the structures of the social power that select the assimilation patterns. As confirmed by Abd-Rabbo (2019), social power, distinction, and freedom can only be attainable under the prevailing social standards that may lead to the excellence and achievement of a person, and thus the characters respond differently to the prevalent social norms and traditions. Conversely, disguised as a young man, Portia strives for defending Antonio who is a friend of her lover, Bassanio. Portia immediately attempts to convince the merciless Shylock to be merciful with the Christian, Antonio; however, Shylock rejects her efforts. As the events and discussions progress in the courtroom, Portia, a Christian lawyer, is described as noble, excellent, wise, and knowledgeable by Shylock who says "O noble judge! O excellent young man! Excellent young man and wise: 'Tis very true! O wise and upright judge! How much more elder art thou than thy looks! Upright, Daniel, "A Daniel comes to judgment! Yea, a Daniel! O wise young judge, how I do honour thee! Most rightful judge! Most learned judge! A sentence! Come, prepare!" (Shakespeare, IV, I, 244-302). The irony as a literary device is now reflected in the court as Shylock feels confident and proudly responds that Shylock is my name. However, this noble and knowledgeable judge is unsupportive of Shylock, making him astonishingly scream, saying "Is that the law?" (Shakespeare, IV, I, 312).

At the start of the drama, Shylock pursues mercy, pity, and love with others in the Venetian Christian community. However, once Shylock attains the opportunity and is requested to yield some mercy, he yields nothing at all, saying "On what compulsion must I? Tell me that" (Shakespeare, IV, I, 181). The name of Daniel stands for the virtuous and decent judge, as Portia, firstly regarded as a knowledgeable and decent lawyer, is no longer good thanks to her efforts in Antonio's victory at the end of the trial. Toward the end of the drama, the defeated Shylock not deliberately speaks out that Portia is solely good for Christians in the city. Shylock appears as a law-abiding person respecting the laws with full responsibilities to literally implement the bond, and thus, he is a lawman who says "My deeds upon my head! I crave the law, the penalty, and forfeit of my bond" (Shakespeare, IV, I, 204-205). Moreover, Shylock vows to have the terms of the agreed-on bond completed. After taking the oath, Shylock, a man of law, cannot break or violate its terms due to his baseless discipline to respect the law. Shylock's ideology rests in respecting the oath, not breaking it, as he says "An oath, an oath, I have an oath

in heaven. Shall I lay perjury upon my soul? No, not for Venice" (Shakespeare, IV, I, 226-228).

Likewise, it is evident that Shylock's act of revenge is unstoppable, saying "There is no power in the tongue of man to alter me I stay here on my bond" (Shakespeare, IV, I, 239-240). Another piece of evidence is that Shylock's heart and mind are full of revenge and its scent is once requested to bring a surgeon, he claims "Tis not in the bond", confirming Shylock's utilitarianism on one hand. On the other hand, Shylock's behavior demonstrates his predating work, saying "When it is paid according to the tenour... to alter me. I stay here on my bond" (Shakespeare, IV, I, 233-240). In other words, it is the code of Shylock's power and stance; it is the one thing where Shylock's profit and property are guaranteed by the law, and it is far away from being usurious, as he says "Ay, 'his breast': So says the bond: —doth it not, noble judge?-'Nearest his heart'-those are the very words" (Shakespeare, IV, I, 251-252).

Within Shylock's plans and beliefs, he is completely sure of his ability to win the pound of flesh, and thus he is fully ready to weigh the meat, making the required balance, as Shylock says "I have them ready" (Shakespeare, IV, I, 254). This act of pre-preparation is another confirmation of Shylock's intention to end Antonio's life, making the triumph, since he is on the point of taking a pound of flesh near to his heart. To the callous Jew, the law is exemplified in written tools, i.e. his bond, saying "Here 'tis, most reverend doctor, here it is" (Shakespeare, IV, I, 224). Shylock is incapable of doing anything unsupportive of his power in the bond with Antonio, as he says "I cannot find it: 'tis not in the bond" and "Is it so nominated in the bond?" (Shakespeare, IV, I, 257-260).

The bond's translation based on word-for-word and letter-for-letter approach creates the merciless Shylock merciless because of his rejection to secure a surgeon to heal Antonio's wound. Shylock sees that needless to heal Antonio's flesh as it is rotten and deserves no cure. Above and beyond, Shylock thinks of Jessica's marriage to the Jewish thief, Barabbas as a better choice than the Christian, Lorenzo, verifying Shylock's deep hatred for the Christians. Precisely, Shylock's thought relating to marriage is dyed-in-the-wool when Shylock warns Jessica to avoid listening to the Christian melody, saying "These be the Christian husbands! I have a daughter; would any of the stock of Barabbas, had been her husband rather than a Christian!" (Shakespeare, IV, I, 293-295). On the subject of a Jew's nature, it is unmistakable that Shylock has the Jew's blood-sucking nature due to his rejection of "Thrice thy money offered thee" (Shakespeare, IV, I, 316). Afterward, Shylock, with the failure to cut off Antonio's flesh pound, comes to an understanding of taking thrice the money, saying "I take this offer then: pay the bond thrice, and let the Christian go" (Shakespeare, IV, I, 316-317). Shylock's torn identity contributes to easily changing his mind as his decisions are indecisive. Thus, Shylock differently speaks of decisions, refusing to literally implement the bond by setting the Christian free once getting thrice of the due amount.

Shylock misses the mark to get hold of the physical power required to kill Antonio, so he thinks of another source of power represented in the economic power by accepting to take the simple amount of money, despite being unstated in the bond. It seems that Shylock's Jewish identity is at the lowest level, saying "Give me my principal, and let me go" (Shakespeare, IV, I, 334). Being a loser now, language is used by Shylock for manipulation to attain the sympathy of the Christians because he wants "barely [his] principal". It is evident that the Jewish ideology is bent on killing and harming others, and in case it fails, the only way out is to take the money "Shall I not have barely my principal?" (Shakespeare, IV, I, 340). This result is in line with (Barnet, 2000), demonstrating that Shylock's plans are guaranteed with no risks since he will unavoidably reclaim either his principal or Antonio's pound of flesh. In detail, Shylock wants to kill Antonio, but he is fearful of being killed due to the unsure success of his scale. Shylock simultaneously hopes to kill Antonio and stay alive so that his Jewish identity is proven, leading to Shylock's refusal to end the Christian foe's life, Antonio. As an alternative, once making sure that tactics are in vain and fruitless, Shylock only requests the money.

Another important subject matter is the Jews' collective hatred and detestation of Christians. For example, the ducats given to Antonio belong to Tubal, not to Shylock. The reaction of the Jew, Tubal to Shylock's defeat is also still anonymous. Readers, however, do not make out that Tubal requests Shylock to return the three thousand ducats, underlining the mere fact that entire Jews together with Tubal aspire to destroy Antonio and his Christian society by hook or by crook. Thus, Shylock is a mirror of the lion's share of the Jews who has an aggressive standpoint against Christianity and its followers. With the failure to return the three thousand ducats, Shylock wishes Antonio the whole bad luck in life, saying "Why, then

the devil give him good of it!" (Shakespeare, IV, I, 343), alongside managing to escape due to the losses of beating Antonio and getting power, saying "I'll stay no longer question" (Shakespeare, IV, I, 344). Importantly, as put by (Masugi, 2002), despite being committed to the terms of the agreement, Shylock naïvely violates Venice city's high laws, for he is regarded as an alien forbidden from intimidating the life of a Venetian citizen. With that, Jackson (2007) maintains that Shylock is all of a sudden on the hook with the crime of intimidating the life of a Venetian citizen, and thus shall convert to Christianity.

More importantly, the inscrutability of the Jew, Shylock causes the loss of self-definition as stated by Sherman (2013). Barnet (2000) indicates that given the loss of Shylock, he demands for being killed since he cannot engage in unethical activity. As Shylock has lost the trio of "Identity, Power, & Ideology", he cannot be stung by the serpent once again. Antonio stands behind the distortion of Jewish rituals, laws, and traditions (Weinstein, 2013). Picker (1994) asserts that Shylock's lone source of power, i.e. money no longer exists. Consequently, Shylock feels unwell, surrenders to the victors, and now is content to the Venetian Christian laws, saying "I pray you to give me leave to go from hence, I am not well, and send the deed after me" (Shakespeare, IV, I, 393-395).

4. Conclusion

In summary, CDA, a literary criticism methodology, enables scholars to view literary works and key characters from a fresh perspective, providing chances for analyzing the hidden units of the language in terms of social and political dimensions of any context. The trio of Identity, Power and Ideology reflected in Shylock's final surrender to the Christian will to be forced to adopt a new religion, Christianity due to his villain character. With the change in Shylock's religion, identity and ideology are spontaneously changed. Shylock's adoption of the Christian identity is a must-do to avoid making interest-based transactions and threatening any person sooner or later. Like other Christians, Shylock shall also follow the rules of Venice city as required by the Christians. Therefore, the confiscation of Shylock's properties means his losses of various powers, and with the death of Shylock, the Jew, half of Shylock's properties shall be willed to his Christian daughter, Jessica, and her Christian lover, Lorenzo.

REFERENCES

- Abd-Rabbo, M. M. (2019). Overlapping character variations in Chinua Achebe's *Things Fall Apart*. *JNT-Journal of Narrative Theory*, 49(1), 55-81. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jnt.2019.0002>
- Al-Ghammaz, S., Al-Khatib, W., & AbuRas, F. (2022). Emotional Abuse in Kate Chopin's "The Story of an Hour". *Al-Zaytoonah University of Jordan Journal for Human and Social Studies*, 3(3), 213-223.
- Barnet, S. (2000). Prodigality and time in *The Merchant of Venice*. *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, 1(1), 26-30.
- Beauchamp, G. (2016). Shylock's conversion. *Humanities*, 24(1), 55-92.
- Blanchard, J. (2009). Contesting constancy in *The Merchant of Venice*. *Renascence*, 61(4), 209-220.
- Billing, M. (2008). The language of critical discourse analysis: The case of nominalization. *Discourse & Society*, 19(6), 783-800.
- Davoodi, A. (2013). The application of critical discourse analysis in literary criticism: Challenges and solutions. *Criticism and Metacriticism*, 20(1), 100-114.
- Deng, W., & Wu, Y. (2013). The new exploration to *The Merchant of Venice*. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 3(9), 1624-1629.
- Dutta, U. (2013). Representation of race in four Shakespearean plays: *Titus Andronicus*, *Othello*, *Antony and Cleopatra*, and *The Merchant of Venice*. *European Academic Research*, 1(6), 922-948.
- Ganyi, F. (2013). The Jew as racial villain: A historico-generic interpretation of Shylock, Iago and Barabbas as victims of racial circumstances in Elizabethan drama. *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences*, 3(6), 122-131.
- Harp, R. (2010). Love and money in *The Merchant of Venice*. *Modern Age*, 52(1), 37-44.

- Hartman, G. (2011). The Tricky word: Richard Weisberg on *The Merchant of Venice*. *Law & Literature*, 23(1), 71-79.
- Heller, A. (2000). The absolute stranger: Shakespeare and the drama of failed assimilation. *Critical Horizons: A Journal of Philosophy & Social Theory*, 1(1), 147-167.
- Hodge, B. (2012). Ideology, identity, interaction: Contradictions and challenges for critical discourse analysis. *Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis across Disciplines*, 5(2), 1-18.
- Hunt, M. (2003). Shakespeare's Venetian paradigm: Stereotyping and sadism in *The Merchant of Venice* and *Othello*. *Papers on Language & Literature*, 39(2), 162.
- Jackson, K. (2007). Shylock: The knight of faith. *Journal for Cultural and Religious Theory*, 8(2), 67-82.
- Long, M. (2012). Merchantry, usury, villainy: Capitalism and the threat to community integrity in *The Merchant of Venice*. *Anthropoetics*, 17(2), 1-16.
- Masugi, K. (1997). Race, the rule of law, and *The Merchant of Venice*: From slavery to citizenship. *Notre Dame Journal of Law, Ethics & Public Policy*, 11(2), 197- 223.
- Mcavan, E. (2011). Economies of sacrifice in *The Merchant of Venice*: God, the gift and Shakespeare. *The Bible and Critical Theory*, 6(1), 201-211.
- Nickel, J. (2001). Shylock in Washington: the Clinton crisis, *The Merchant of Venice*, and Enjoyment of the Law. *Textual Practice*, 15(2), 317-335.
- Qutami, M. (2022). Countering normalized violence in Aboulela's "The Museum" and El Guindi's "Trading in my Arab". *Al-Zaytoonah University of Jordan Journal for Human and Social Studies*, 3(3), 224-235.
- Picker, J. (1994). Shylock and the struggle for closure. *Judaism*, 43(2), 173-189.
- Schuman, S. (2002). Authorizing meaning in *The Merchant of Venice*. *Text & Performance Quarterly*, 22(1), 47-62.
- Shakespeare, W. (1992). *The Merchant of Venice*. Roma Gill (Ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Sherman, D. (2013). Governing the wolf: Soul and space in *The Merchant of Venice*. *Journal of Medieval & Early Modern Studies*, 43(1), 99-120.
- Tiffany, G. (2006). Law and self-interest in *The Merchant of Venice*. *Papers on Language & Literature*, 42(4), 384-400.
- Turner, H. S. (2006). The problem of the more than-one: Friendship, calculation, and political association in *The Merchant of Venice*. *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 57(4), 413- 442.
- Weinstein, B. (2007). Shakespeare's forgivable portrayal of Shylock. *Jewish Bible Quarterly*, 35(3), 187-192.
- Wodak, R. (2001). What is CDA about? A summary of its history, important concepts and its developments. *Discourse and Society*, 1(1), 1-16.