

# Shylock at the Crossroads of Commerce, Christianity, and Culture

**SWAPNIL SHASHWAT**

*Undergrad Student*

*Department of English*

*Sri Aurobindo College, University of Delhi, Delhi*

**HEMCHANDRA NAMEIRAKPAM**

*Professor*

*Department of English*

*Sri Aurobindo College, University of Delhi, Delhi*

## Abstract

*Out of a myriad of creations by William Shakespeare, the character of Shylock remains one of his most memorable and enigmatic characters, representing thematic nuances and human complexities. Shylock, the Jewish moneylender in *The Merchant of Venice*, embodies a dramatic intersection of mercy, justice, revenge, and the harsh realities of being an outsider in a prejudiced society. This paper is a critical evaluation of the character Shylock from Shakespeare's play *The Merchant of Venice*. Written during the era of Elizabethan England, specifically amidst religious instability and widespread antisemitism, this study aims to dissect the historical and cultural influences shaping the character of Shylock. The character of Shylock, as a Jewish moneylender is entwined with the religious biases and prejudices of his time while simultaneously emerging as a complex individual navigating issues of justice, revenge, mercy and human dignity on a larger scale. Shylock perpetually swings to and fro between an antagonistic archetype to a sympathetic character thus representing the broader themes of the economic and the religious undertones of the character that Shakespeare addresses in the text. By examining the various interpretations of Shylock by several critics, and the constantly shifting perspectives towards this iconic Machiavellian figure, this paper attempts to highlight the importance of representing marginalised groups and the need for contextual understanding and re-evaluation of seminal literary works, further problematising the contemporary reception of the same.*

**Keywords:** *jewish identity, elizabethan england, otherness, antisemitism, machiavellian.*

## Introduction

In the tapestry of Shakespearean drama, few characters have provoked as much continuous debate and analysis as Shylock, the Jewish moneylender at the heart of *The Merchant of Venice*. The play, penned in the times of Elizabethan England—considered an epoch of religious turmoil and after the expulsion of the Jewish people, in 1290—draws a problematic picture of probably its most contentious character. Shylock embodies a confluence of the era's stereotypes, fears, and fascinations regarding Jewishness, wrapped within a narrative that challenges and engages with themes of mercy, justice, and revenge. So, through Shylock, Shakespeare draws a character that will serve to capture the representation of this ambivalent societal attitude of the Elizabethan era toward the Jewish community. This paper seeks to unravel the intricacies of Shylock's character and the representation of Jewish

identity in Elizabethan drama, exploring how historical context, textual construction, and subsequent interpretation determine the continuing depth of Shakespeare's work.

In Elizabethan England, amidst religious turmoil, literature was one of the main ways through which Elizabethans engaged with and tried to understand Jewish identity. The era's Jewish representation was often entangled with stereotypes and societal biases. Some readings tend to understand Shylock as a sort of caricature mirroring the feelings of hostility against Jews prevalent at the time, while a more nuanced reading comes forth upon deeper reflections of the text and its historical context. Shakespeare, with his deep insight into the human psyche and social dynamics, seems to have used Shylock not just as a method of challenging or critiquing a particular ethnicity or religion but actually as a tool to provide a discourse on otherness, humanity, and the nuanced ways

in which justice and mercy interact. In this manner, Shylock serves to become one of his most memorable and controversial characters.

### Materials and Methods

Jewish people in the Elizabethan period experienced religious discrimination, economic stereotyping, scapegoating for societal ills, and legal and social exclusion, all compounded by historical prejudice. At the base was religious discord, as the Christian belief was that Jews were liable for the killing of Jesus Christ through crucifixion which sowed seeds for long-term hostility. This was, however, compounded by economic factors, for with a great number of restrictions in other areas of enterprise, Jews were often only allowed roles in moneylending and finance by Christian usury laws, which created stereotypes of greed, jealousy and resentment from the Christian majority. Further, Jews were a conveniently placed scapegoat during periods of unrest. They were blamed for everything from blood libel to the creation of economic hardships, or indeed for such depopulating events as the Black Death, thus uniting the Christian majority against a common 'enemy'. Legal and social structures of the time, from expulsions to the implementation of ghettos, institutionalised discrimination served to keep Jews at arm's length. This status was only reinforced through literature and drama by often portraying them as mysterious and morally corrupt.

Initially, Shylock is introduced as the Jewish moneylender, encapsulating the era's anti-Semitic stereotypes with his profession and demeanour. This is evident when he speaks of the bond with Antonio, stating, "If you repay me not on such a day, / In such a place, such sum or sums as are / Expressed in the condition, let the forfeit / Be nominated for an equal pound / Of your fair flesh" (Act 1, Scene 3). This demand for a pound of flesh as collateral is chilling, presenting Shylock as vindictive and merciless, a man seemingly obsessed with exacting revenge upon those who have wronged him. Yet, this very insistence on the bond unveils Shylock's vulnerability and the depth of indignities he has suffered, framing his quest for vengeance within his self constructed concept of justice. Shakespeare does not confine Shylock to the role of a simple antagonist. The pivotal moment of

transformation is highlighted in Shylock's impassioned plea for recognition of common humanity, which transcends his initial portrayal and urges the audience to see beyond the entrenched prejudices of the time:

Hath not a Jew 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 villainy you teach me, I will execute, and it shall go hard but I will better the instruction. (Act 3, Scene 1) As Herbert Bronstein mentions in his work "Shakespeare, the Jews, and *The Merchant of Venice*", this speech is a clarion call to recognize the arbitrary nature of the divisions that segregate Jews from Christians, highlighting the shared vulnerabilities of all humans, irrespective of their religion or ethnicity.

In this trial scene, Shylock's character is further complicated. Even when given the chance to show mercy, he chooses to stick to the bond resulting in his own downfall. This unflinching insistence of his, even when offered many times the worth of the debt in place, underlines the deep rancour and thirst for revenge that underlies his nature. Nonetheless, this same stubbornness lends a tragic air to Shylock's figure which portrays him as a victim of endless prejudice and personal tragedy which includes the betrayal by his daughter, Jessica. His claim for justice through flesh stands at a broader criticism against moral decay within Venice society. Against the idea that Shylock was simply created in response to Marlowe's Jew, or to take advantage of anti-Semitism following the conviction of Elizabeth I's Jewish physician, Roderigo Lopez, this character is a complex one that cannot be easily pigeonholed as only a villain or a victim just because he is Jewish. This analysis posits Shakespeare's attempt to explore broader themes through Shylock regarding humanity, usury and societal prejudice.

While John R. Cooper in his work "Shylock's Humanity", has a slightly different view on the sympathy we feel for Shylock and our perception of his motives and Shakespeare's aim in penning him, his interpretation of "I am a Jew" is not an invitation for jocularly but an acknowledgement of moral dilemma. Modern renditions of *The Merchant of Venice* have reassessed the role Shylock plays transforming it from being mostly wicked with no substance beneath into a more complicated figure. To solve this problem which lies at play in these particular performances, it is important for the contemporary productions to emphasize the play's antisemitic undertones. It is a deep, complicated depiction that forces people to be more sympathetic towards Shylock and challenges them to reconsider the preconceived notions they have about him and ponder over the historical significance of the play.

Adding another layer to this discussion, Gary Rosenshield in his work "Deconstructing the Christian Merchant: Antonio and *The Merchant of Venice*", offers another perspective by examining some ambiguities in Antonio's character and the play's treatment of Christian values as related to economic transactions which are intertwined with societal transformation. Usually, Shylock embodies greediness as well as vengefulness; however, this picture still appears in Shakespeare's critique of certain attributes inherent within Christianity itself. According to Rosenshield, it depicts how a Christian self-identity became problematic for the merchant class in Venice revealing the moral compromises and ethical blindness plaguing their economic practices. This means that Shakespeare's critique is not only about Shylock but also encompasses the wider Venetian society, thereby including its Christian viewership. In a way similar to Smith and Cooper but extending beyond the narrow confines of the former critic, Rosenshield's examination provides us with a deeper analysis of societal ethics which contextualises Shylocks' struggles within a changing moral economy.

### Findings and Results

The difference between Smith and Rosenshield lies in what their works focus on and the consequences that follow from them. Smith's exponentiation undermines the

importance of religious identity by seeking to develop a universal criticism of human morality; while Rosenshield argues that the play is a critique of Christian morality in the context of an emerging capitalist society, which means that he suggests a more concentrated examination of Christian ethics over human universalism.

These scholarly insights reveal Shylock as a character beyond just being villainous or victimised by analysing various societal structures at play and considering the historical setting. For example, Shylock as depicted by Shakespeare continues to be relevant and complex even today, and therefore, serves as a basis for further discussions about human nature. In fact, rather than creating a one-sided evil personage, Shakespeare develops an individual who mirrors economic and social contradictions during Elizabethan England.

In terms of the play and character of Shylock, Herbert Bronstein adds an exclusive standpoint to the critical analysis of *The Merchant of Venice* by saying that it criticises the emerging capitalist ethos. Though Smith and Cooper mainly concentrate on the idea that 'Shylock' is a multifaceted character—Smith discusses the societal and religious influences moulding persons while Cooper stresses empathy for Shylock—Bronstein brings in wider socio-economic criticism into the review.

Bronstein's interpretation locates this play within early capitalism, arguing that Shakespeare not only debunked antisemitic stereotypes but also criticised broader societal trends towards consumerism, materialism, and alienation from other people or moral values. This approach presents a fine-grained reading that considers economic and social changes in Elizabethan England and shows how greed, justice and loss of communal ties for individualistic gains are matters that pre-occupied Shakespeare.

In so doing, he adds to what Smith and Cooper have already said and shows that in addition to being a character shaped by his age's negative stereotypes, he is also a way for Shakespeare to question the morality of society and individuals in the era of the new financial system.

On the other hand, D.M. Cohen critically examines this play in his essay "The Jew and Shylock", which he refers to as "profoundly and crudely anti-Semitic." The author also highlights how Shylock's representation itself

along with the derogatory use of the word 'Jew' creates a portrayal that makes hostility against Jews unavoidable. He challenges some apologists who absolve Shakespeare from anti-Semitism by arguing that when it comes to his portrayals of Jewish characters, perhaps this playwright did not consider their far-reaching implications. In Cohen's estimation, such arguments call for an analysis of the play's contents while recognising its potential to perpetuate damaging stereotypes.

### Conclusion

The current views represent the ongoing discussion concerning *The Merchant of Venice* and how it deals with Jewish themes and characters. Bronstein's work on Shylock, in contrast to Cohen's criticism of this play, offers another way for a more sympathetic response to it. At the same time, Cohen's critical analysis reveals the problematic nature of the text as well as its everlasting influence on the perception of Jews by others. These two positions show that such interpretations are intricate because they insist on equal attention to historical implications and activist re-readings that foreground empathy and self-awareness. In the face of this exploration, Shylock's character emerges simultaneously as a point of focus for academic deliberation and a cultural lamp that lights up the changing patterns of collective bonding with marginalised people in Western literature. This conversation goes beyond the academic arena into a public space where theatrical interpretations and educational curricula struggle to create a Shylock that speaks to diversity and inclusivity as modern notions. As

such, Shylock's journey from the European production of *The Merchant of Venice* to its appearance on contemporary stages and the academic sphere, embodies the ongoing endeavour to reconcile historical artworks with present-day ethical standards. By doing so, we collectively strive towards a more empathic literary experience which still acknowledges the multi-layered nature of characters while at the same time promoting critical thinking about whose voices are amplified and what stories merit celebration. In this light, Shylock transcends his role within Shakespeare's work, catalysing conversations about the power of storytelling to bridge divides, heal historical wounds, and inspire a more equitable and compassionate understanding of the other, thereby affirming the vital role of literature in the continual quest for social justice and human connection.

### References

- Bronstein, Herbert. "Shakespeare, the Jews, and the Merchant of Venice." *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 20, no. 1, 1 Jan. 1969, pp. 3–10.
- Cohen, D.M. "The Jew and Shylock." *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 31, no. 1, 1980, pp. 53–63.
- Cooper, John R. "Shylock's Humanity." *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 21, no. 2, 1970, pp. 117–124.
- Rosenshield, Gary. "Deconstructing the Christian Merchant: Antonio and 'the Merchant of Venice.'" *Shofar*, vol. 20, no. 2, 2002, pp. 28–51.
- Gilbert, Miriam. *The Merchant of Venice*. London, Arden Shakespeare, 2002.