

ATILIM UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE
ENGLISH CULTURE AND LITERATURE Ph. D. PROGRAM

**THE STATE OF NATURE AND MIMETIC DESIRE AS
CONDUCTIVE TO THE STATE OF RIVALRY IN SHAKESPEARE'S
TRAGEDIES: *TITUS ANDRONICUS, MACBETH, AND KING LEAR***

Ph. D. Dissertation

Mehmet Akif Balkaya

Ankara -2019

ATILIM UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE
ENGLISH CULTURE AND LITERATURE

**THE STATE OF NATURE AND MIMETIC DESIRE AS
CONDUCTIVE TO THE STATE OF RIVALRY IN
SHAKESPEARE'S TRAGEDIES:
*TITUS ANDRONICUS, MACBETH, AND KING LEAR***

Ph. D. Dissertation

Mehmet Akif Balkaya

Supervisor

Prof. Dr. Gülsen Canlı

Ankara – 2019

ACCEPTION AND APPROVAL

This is to certify that this dissertation titled “The State of Nature and Mimetic Desire as Conducive to the State of Rivalry in Shakespeare’s Tragedies: *Titus Andronicus*, *Macbeth* and *King Lear*” and prepared by Mehmet Akif Balkaya meets with the committee’s approval unanimously as a Ph. D. Dissertation in the field of English Language and Literature following the successful defense of the dissertation conducted on 31/01/2019.

Signature of the Director

Prof. Dr. Dilaver TENGİLİMOĞLU

Signature of the Supervisor

Prof. Dr. Gülsen CANLI

Signature of the Committee Member

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Şebnem KAYA

Signature of the Committee Member

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Aslı Özlem TARAĞÇIOĞLU

Signature of the Committee Member

Asst. Prof. Dr. Sibel İZMİR

Signature of the Committee Member

Asst. Prof. Dr. Kuğu TEKİN

ETHICS DECLARATION

I hereby declare that;

- I prepared this dissertation in accordance with Atılım University Graduate School of Social Sciences Thesis Writing Directive,
- I prepared this dissertation within the framework of academic and ethics rules,
- I presented all information, documents, evaluations and findings in accordance with scientific, ethical and moral principles,
- I cited all sources to which I made reference in my dissertation,
- The work of art in this dissertation is original,

I hereby acknowledge all possible loss of rights in case of a contrary circumstance.

(in case of any circumstance contradicting my declaration)

31/01/2019

Mehmet Akif Balkaya

ÖZ

BALKAYA, Mehmet Akif. Shakespeare'in Trajedilerinde Rekabet Durumuna Sebep Olan Doğa Durumu ve Mimetik Arzu: *Titus Andronicus*, *Macbeth* ve *King Lear*, Doktora Tezi, Ankara, 2019.

Bu tezin amacı William Shakespeare'in *Titus Andronicus* (1594), *Macbeth* (1606), ve *King Lear* (1608) isimli trajedilerini rekabet durumu örnekleri olarak incelemektir. Çalışma, rekabet durumunun, Thomas Hobbes'un doğa durumu teorisi ile René Girard'ın mimetik arzu teorisinin arasındaki ilişkiyle açığa çıktığını iddia eder. Bu amaçla, doğa durumu, mimetik arzu ve rekabet durumu bunların kökenleri, tanımları, türleri ve özellikleriyle birlikte çalışılır. Doğa durumu, bu durumdaki kişi doğuştan eşitliğe inandığından dolayı, kişinin bencil ve kendini koruyan durumda olmasına işaret eder. Bu durumda, kişi diğerleriyle savaşım halindedir çünkü herkesi güven altında tutacak bir otorite ya yoktur ya da bu otorite zayıftır. Öte yandan, bir otoritenin egemenliği altında, medeni bir toplumda dahi, kişisel kazanımları için gizlice çıkarıcı planlar yapan bireyler olabilir. Böyle bir otorite, herhangi bir iç kargaşa ve başkaldırıcıyı önlemek için medeni hukukla düzen sağlar. Ancak buna rağmen, medeni hukuka aykırı davranan, doğa durumu ve mimetik arzu ile ilişkili olan rekabet durumundan dolayı bir çatışma durumu ortaya çıkabilir. Bu durum salgın bir hastalık gibi etrafa yayılabilir. Hobbes'a göre çatışma durumunu ortaya çıkaran sebepler çekişme, (kendine) güvensizlik ve şan, şereftir. Bu kavramlar mimetik arzu ile paralellik göstermektedir. Mimetik arzu, kişinin bir nesneye karşı bir model yani dolayımlayıcı vasıtasıyla dolayımlanmış olan arzudur. Bir dolayımlayıcıyı taklit etmek rekabeti öne çıkarır, çünkü arzulanan nesne çekişmeye sebep olur. Bu sebepten, mimetik arzu üçgen bir yapıya sahiptir: model alınan dolayımlayıcı, arzulayan kişi ve arzulanan nesne. Çalışma doğa durumu ve mimetik arzunun özelliklerini ve bunların ilişkisinin rekabet durumuna sebep olduğu sonucuna varacaktır. Bu ilişki ile Shakespeare'in seçilen üç trajedisi incelenecektir.

Anahtar Sözcükler: William Shakespeare, Doğa durumu, Rekabet durumu, Mimetik Arzu, Thomas Hobbes.

ABSTRACT

BALKAYA, Mehmet Akif. The State of Nature and Mimetic Desire as Conducive to the State of Rivalry in Shakespeare's Tragedies: *Titus Andronicus*, *Macbeth* and *King Lear*, Ph. D. Dissertation, Ankara, 2019.

The aim of this dissertation is to study William Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus* (1594), *Macbeth* (1606), and *King Lear* (1608) as examples of the state of rivalry which, as the study asserts, is related to Thomas Hobbes' theory of the state of nature and René Girard's theory of mimetic desire. To this end, the state of nature, mimetic desire, and the state of rivalry are studied along with their origins, definitions, types, and characteristics. The state of nature refers to the state of a man¹ who is egotistic and self-preserving. A man in this state believes in equality by birth. In this state, man is at war against another, as there is no (or lack of) authority to keep everyone secure. However, even in a civil society under the dominion of authority, there may be human beings who are in that state. They may secretly put manipulative plans into action for personal gains. Such an authority constructs order with the help of civil laws to prevent any disobedience and civil strife. During a time of disobedience, this condition may spread like a contagious disease. Among the reasons that lead to such a conflict in the state of nature, for Hobbes, are competition, diffidence, and glory. These notions are parallel with mimetic desire. Mimetic desire refers to man's mediated desire for an object. Imitating a mediator brings forth rivalry, as the desired object ascertains competition. Therefore, mimetic desire has a triangular structure: mediator as the model, the desirer, and the desired object. The study concludes that the characteristics of and the relationship between the state of nature and mimetic desire are conducive to the state of rivalry, as will be analyzed in Shakespeare's selected three tragedies.

Keywords: William Shakespeare, the State of Nature, the State of Rivalry, Mimetic Desire, Thomas Hobbes.

¹ The use of "man," "he," "himself" follows Hobbes' usage in gender-neutral meaning throughout the dissertation.

For
Meriç & Fatma

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am indebted to everyone who assisted with my dissertation, especially my supervisor Prof. Dr. Gülsen Canlı, who provided exhaustive editorial and intellectual support. I thank her for her endless patience, her constructive criticism, and her invaluable guidance. Prof. Dr. Canlı has a significant contribution in each part of this dissertation. It has been an honour for me to be her Ph. D. student. This dissertation is the result of her prompt responses to my endless emails, confidence in my research and careful editing.

I would also like to thank the members of my committee: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Şebnem Kaya, Asst. Prof. Dr. Sibel İzmir, Asst. Prof. Dr. Kuğu Tekin, Asst. Prof. Dr. Gökşen Aras, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Aslı Özlem Tarakçıođlu, and Asst. Prof. Dr. Dürrin Alpakın Martinez Caro. Your helpful comments and gracious encouragement were much needed and much appreciated.

Last but not the least; I would also like to extend my gratitude to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Lerzan Gültekin, and Asst. Prof. Dr. Evrim Dođan Adanur for their considerable support.

CONTENTS

ÖZ.....	i
ABSTRACT.....	ii
DEDICATION.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
CONTENTS.....	v
INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER ONE:	
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK of the RESEARCH.....	9
1. Thomas Hobbes’ Concepts of the State of Nature, the Laws of Nature, the Social Contract and the Sovereign Power.....	9
1.1. The State of Nature.....	10
1.2. The Laws of Nature.....	12
1.3. The Social Contract and the Sovereign Power.....	14
2. René Girard’s Concepts of Mimetic Desire, Mimetic Rivalry, Mimetic Crisis, and the Scapegoat Mechanism.....	16
2.1. Mimetic Desire and Mimetic Rivalry.....	16
2.2. Mimetic Crisis and the Scapegoat Mechanism.....	19
3. The State of Rivalry.....	24
CHAPTER TWO:	
THE SIBLING RIVALRY and GLORY in <i>TITUS ANDRONICUS</i>.....	27
CHAPTER THREE:	
THE SEEDS OF RIVALRY and DIFFIDENCE in <i>MACBETH</i>.....	55
CHAPTER FOUR:	
THE (FE)MALE RIVALRY and COMPETITION in <i>KING LEAR</i>.....	89
CONCLUSION.....	117
ENDNOTES.....	122
WORKS CITED.....	123
CURRICULUM VITAE	133

“The devil knew not what he did when he made man politic”

(*Timon of Athens*, 5.1.36)

INTRODUCTION

What is the place of rivalry in Shakespeare’s *Titus Andronicus* (1594), *Macbeth* (1606), and *King Lear* (1608)? What is the source of the state of rivalry and of one’s desire to have power over other people? Titus, Tamora, Bassianus, and Saturninus in *Titus Andronicus*, Macbeth and Lady Macbeth in *Macbeth*, and Regan, Goneril, and Edmund in *King Lear* think, decide, and act in line with the state of rivalry to attain power and prestige. However, in these tragedies, the state of rivalry leads authority to weaken and order to be subverted by the actions of the aforementioned characters. This study considers the state of rivalry and associates it with Thomas Hobbes’ (1588–1679) theory of the state of nature and René Girard’s (1923–2015) theory of mimetic desire in Chapter 1, forming the theoretical framework of the research. For the purpose of analysis, Chapter 2, Chapter 3, and Chapter 4 respectively examine Titus’, Bassianus’, and Saturninus’, Macbeth’s and Lady Macbeth’s, and Goneril’s, Regan’s, and Edmund’s selfish decisions and actions for personal welfare.

In the light of these, this study correlates these two theories and asserts that the relationship between the state of nature and mimetic desire is the source of the state of rivalry as well as the source of one’s desire to have power over others. The reason for this is that authority, in three of the plays, faces problems and falls into chaos because of sibling rivalry, antagonistic rivalry, and (fe)male rivalry, as the aforementioned characters reveal their repressed state of nature as a result of “three principal causes of quarrel”: “glory,” “diffidence,” and “competition” as will be examined in *Titus Andronicus*, *Macbeth*, and *King Lear*, respectively (Hobbes, *Leviathan* 83). Within this study, Titus’ showing an excessively high opinion of his honour is related to “glory”. Macbeth’s lack of self-confidence, and his fear of men who are in the civil state are related to “diffidence”. Goneril’s, and Regan’s conditions of striving to gain authority are related to “competition”. In these tragedies, political stability is threatened by disorder and chaos because of the problem of authority. Disorder prevails in such conditions as men who are in the state of nature may not keep pace with the social contract. Thereupon, mimetic desire, mimetic rivalry, and mimetic

crisis transpire, as disorder and chaos subvert the social hierarchy because of the actions of those who ignore the dynamics of a social contract, transcending into the state of nature.

The state of nature is a term used in political theory by philosophers such as Thomas Hobbes. Hobbes remarks that in this state, man has a natural right to everything, as everybody is equal to one another by birth. In this state, the law of nature is a principle that inclines man to seek peace. This law is reason, which demands self-protection for every man, urging them to keep away from “war of every man against every man” (Hobbes, *Leviathan* 85). In this state, “nothing is unjust,” as there is no ruler, no law-maker (85). To pull a man out from the condition of war, a social contract needs to establish the authority of a ruler. Without such a contract, the passions of man, namely desire, envy, anger, jealousy, among others, lead man to live in continual fear. In other words, a social contract leads man to enter the civil society. Yet, as will be analyzed in the aforementioned tragedies, as authority weakens, some may reveal their repressed state of nature for personal interests.

The other source of the state of rivalry may be mimetic desire. Girard believes that human desire is a mediated one, and it has a triangular structure, comprising a desirer (subject), mediator (model), and object (desired object). With respect to the nature of imitation, one thinks about mannerism, dress, speech, and so forth, but no one thinks about desire. That is, one’s desire may be imitated by another as well. In this case, “[i]mitation does not merely draw people together, it pulls them apart” (Girard, *A Theatre of Envy* 3). Within this context, imitating other’s desires leads man to rivalry. Girard mainly restricts his theory to Shakespeare’s comedies. With respect to the tragedies, he analyzes *Oedipus the King* (429 BCE) in *Violence and the Sacred*. Moreover, in *A Theatre of Envy*, he applies mimetic theory to *Hamlet*, *Julius Caesar*, and *Othello*. Girard’s mimetic theory resembles Hobbes’ theory of the state of nature in that both theories examine human nature and human passions. The common factor in these theories is that man desires to have what another man desires or already has. Such a desire makes men rivals. As such, this study sets out with a fairly new approach to literary analysis, in general, and to Shakespeare studies, in particular.

The reason for choosing these three tragedies is that they share a common theme: the state of rivalry that leads to order-disorder opposition related to the relationship

between the state of nature and mimetic desire. Order is subverted by actions of those who are in the state of nature, namely, Tamora, Titus, Bassianus, and Saturninus in *Titus Andronicus*, Macbeth and Lady Macbeth in *Macbeth*, Edmund, Regan, and Goneril in *King Lear*. These characters are in the state of nature, as they think and act in line with passions such as glory, desire, envy, and emulation by disrespecting civil laws. For personal gain, each follows his/her own way that is constructed by the norms of the state of nature. This is a state that subverts the social, political, and hierarchical order. However, Marcus Andronicus in *Titus Andronicus*, King Duncan, Malcolm, Donalbain, Macduff, and Banquo in *Macbeth*, King Lear, Cordelia, Gloucester, and Edgar in *King Lear* are following reason, the law of nature. Therefore, they are in the civil state, as they accommodate themselves to the social contract. Moreover, they follow the principles of the social contract, as they wish for communal life in peace. The reason is that social contract establishes social order, which puts people “in their places” (Berry 137). By their actions, it is realized that men who are in the civil state favor public gain that brings forth each man’s felicity.

Contrary to the felicity of the public, rivalry stems from disobedience of the requirements of the social contract. Similar to René Girard’s and Thomas Hobbes’ viewpoints on the notion of desire, Shakespeare’s aforementioned characters who are in the state of nature struggle and fight for what is desired, thereby becoming rivals. There are various reasons that explain the state of rivalry, one of which is the socio-political function (Greenblatt, *Shakespeare’s Freedom* 105). Socio-political function refers to any action that poses a direct threat to social and political order, such as the rivalry between Titus and Tamora for revenge, the fight for the throne between two brothers, Saturninus and Bassianus, in *Titus Andronicus*, Macbeth’s desire to become the king in *Macbeth*, and Goneril’s and Regan’s rivalry, and Edmund’s plots against Edgar for more land and authority in *King Lear*.

In the database of dissertations found at the Council of Higher Education (YÖK), no Ph. D. dissertation associates Shakespeare’s works with Hobbes’ and/or Girard’s. As for the website of international dissertations, “ProQuest”, although there are a few dissertations relating Shakespeare’s tragedies to Hobbes’ political ideas, no dissertation analyzes the relationship between mimetic desire and the state of nature. To this end, this study will be the first dissertation to study the relationship between

mimetic desire and the state of nature to analyze the order-breaking actions of the state of rivalry. Concordantly, the study may be directive for Shakespearean studies; that said, this study is limited to the analyses of *Titus Andronicus*, *Macbeth*, and *King Lear*. Furthermore, the plot-line of these plays may be beneficial, first, to understand the choice of plays and, second, to discuss the aim of the dissertation.

Titus Andronicus begins with the conflict between two brothers, Saturninus and Bassianus, the sons of the dead Roman emperor. Meanwhile, Titus victoriously enters Rome with prisoners of war: the Goth queen Tamora, her sons Alarbus, Demetrius and Chiron, and her lover, a moor, Aaron. This gives Marcus Andronicus, the Tribune and brother to Titus, the chance to announce Titus as the choice of emperor for Romans. However, Titus honours Saturninus by letting him become the emperor and, in turn, Saturninus takes Lavinia as the queen to honour Titus. Moreover, Titus lets his sons kill Alarbus, Tamora's oldest son, as a sacrifice for his sons who passed away during the war. Therefore, Tamora vows revenge. Meanwhile, Bassianus elopes with Lavinia. Upon this, Titus kills his son Mutius, accusing him of treachery, and Saturninus declares Tamora as his new wife, the empress. In the hunting scene, Bassianus is killed and Lavinia is raped by Demetrius and Chiron who later cut off her tongue and hands. However, Titus' sons Quintus and Martius are accused of Bassianus' murder. In accordance with the judgment of the tribunes, they are executed. All of this was planned by Aaron to dignify Tamora's place. When Titus learns the truth, he kills Tamora's sons and cooks them as a pie to serve to Tamora. Titus kills Lavinia as well after Saturninus says that Virginius was right to kill her daughter. When Tamora learns that the pie was made out of her sons, Saturninus kills Titus. Lucius, in turn, kills Saturninus. Lucius, who raises an army among the Goths, attacks Rome. He wins the war and becomes the new emperor.

This play represents a disordered society, disturbed by the fight for the throne between the Roman brothers, Saturninus and Bassianus. Moreover, Roman order further weakens because of a war with the Goths who are a threat to Roman authority and the social contract. Following the arrival of the Goths, there is a series of cruel and violent actions. The subplot, the arrival of the Goths, representing the barbarous, uncivilized man, strengthens the main theme: the release of the repressed state of nature because of actions stemming from "glory" and rivalry by ignoring public gain.

In this tragedy, the state of rivalry leads the way from the general to the specific; that is, the rival countries and the cultures of the Romans and the Goths reveal the differences between the civil state and the state of nature. The reason is that “[i]n Renaissance humanism... ‘Gothic’ had usually... meant non-Roman,” as “the Goths are indeed thoroughgoing pillagers, ravagers, looters, and spoilers” (Sowerby 26–27). However, although the commander Titus holds Tamora captive, the rival Goth queen becomes the Roman Empress. As the captive becomes the empress, Titus hides his true feelings toward Tamora, his rival.

In *Macbeth*, Scotland is at war in which two Scottish soldiers, Macbeth and Banquo, fight against enemies. Three “weird” witches prophesize that Macbeth will become Thane of Cawdor and the king in near future. At the same time, they predict that the future kings will descend from Banquo. After his conversation with the witches and Lady Macbeth, Macbeth murders King Duncan. Soon after Macbeth becomes the king, he plans to kill Banquo and his son, Fleance. The reason is that Macbeth considers them his rivals who will depose him from the throne. Banquo’s son, Fleance, escapes while Banquo is murdered. Meanwhile, along with Macduff, Malcolm makes arrangements in England to prepare for war. At the same time, Lady Macbeth goes mad and commits suicide. Following this, Macduff defeats and kills Macbeth, and Prince Malcolm restores order.

In this chapter, Macbeth’s relation to King Duncan, Banquo, the witches, and Lady Macbeth will be analyzed. Macbeth’s relationship with Lady Macbeth and the witches uncovers his ambitious side that struggles for self-interest. However, due to his relationship with the king and Banquo, Macbeth stays close to culturally accepted notions of loyalty, courage, and generosity that benefit the public. At the beginning of the play, Macbeth seems to care for public power as a soldier who fights for the survival of his state. However, his relation to the aforementioned female characters leads him to follow his repressed passions. It is the temptations of the weird sisters and Lady Macbeth’s encouragement to put his plan of killing the king into practice that lead Macbeth to do so. Soon after he kills the king, Macbeth, who acts in line with the state of rivalry, starts fearing Banquo and Malcolm. He considers them as his rivals. Macbeth feels he is inferior to Banquo, and this inferiority makes him diffident. As a

consequence of this rivalry and “diffidence,” Macbeth considers Banquo as his rival who is to be killed.

King Lear, the third play, begins with the division of the kingdom by Lear who aims to preclude further possible inheritance disputes among his daughters. King Lear’s two daughters, Regan and Goneril, exaggerate their love for their father, whereas Cordelia, the youngest daughter, says “nothing” in the love competition that Lear sets. Although Cordelia is banished, the King of France offers to marry her because of her honesty. Meanwhile, Goneril and Regan break their promises and begin behaving badly against their father. At the same time, the subplot reveals another father-child relationship. Edmund, the illegitimate son of Gloucester, plots against his brother Edgar. Like Edgar, Cordelia is the loyal child who helps her father fight against Edmund, Regan, and Goneril with the help of the French army. Later, Regan and Goneril become mimetic rivals for Edmund, and Goneril poisons Regan and commits suicide. In the end, Edmund dies after he is fatally wounded by Edgar, and King Lear dies of grief after Cordelia’s death, leaving Edgar, Kent, and Albany to restore order.

As far as the research method is concerned, this dissertation is divided into four chapters. Chapter 1 consists of the theoretical framework that defines and clarifies the concept of the state of rivalry, Thomas Hobbes’ concepts of the state of nature, the laws and nature, and René Girard’s concepts of mimetic desire and scapegoat to examine the plays through the relationship between the state of nature and mimetic desire. The following three chapters comprise of analyses to illustrate the theory put forth in the first chapter.

In Chapter 2, representations of the state of rivalry in *Titus Andronicus* will be examined to analyze what lies behind rivalry. The fight between the two rival Roman brothers reveals the state of nature, as the emperor is dead, and the Roman authority loses power. Disorder stems from the actions of rivals who focus on attaining power. Therefore, the power of the authority weakens. In the light of these, the acts of rivalry stem from the relationship between the state of nature and mimetic desire for personal interests. Another important issue is the theme of honour that initiates Titus’ state of nature, as “glory” is among the “three principal causes of quarrel” and rivalry (Hobbes, *Leviathan* 83; Blunt 260). The urge to save his honour transforms Titus into a man who is in the state of nature. Soon after the captive barbarous Goth queen Tamora

becomes the Roman empress, Titus abandons his belief and trust in Roman laws. He follows his passions and disregards the laws of nature, and he orders his son Lucius to form an alliance with the Goths to attack Rome.

Chapter 3 analyzes *Macbeth* and asserts that the state of war leads the state of nature to be revealed for Macbeth and Lady Macbeth. They are focused on their self-interests as, according to Hobbes' analysis of the state of nature, "force and fraud are in war two cardinal virtues" (*Leviathan* 85). No contract works properly during and/or after a war, and any action may be fair. Therefore, the self-seeking Macbeth cares for his personal interests. However, Macbeth's friend Banquo is different from Macbeth. Banquo is after public gain and the survival of the state, whereas Macbeth's state of nature becomes prominent to the extent that he commits regicide. However, Macbeth regards Banquo as his rival, believing that he may desire to attain his power and authority. Moreover, Banquo becomes superior for Macbeth, as the future kings would descend from Banquo's breed. This incident, within this study, makes Banquo the rival, as Macbeth's state of nature will not allow anyone to pose any threat to his kingdom. Therefore, he plans to kill Banquo and Fleance. In the end, the desire for more power to gain personal gain brings forth Macbeth's downfall.

Chapter 4 examines how the state of nature is revealed within the family of a king in *King Lear*. Goneril and Regan return to the state of nature, soon after King Lear prioritizes a personal matter: love competition. The competition of love reveals the ones who are in the state of nature. However, Cordelia, Kent, and the King of France realize the danger of dividing the kingdom, as they are in the civil state. This chapter also asserts that Edmund is in the state of nature and desires to have what Edgar may have in the future. Therefore, within the state of rivalry, Edmund plots against his father and Edgar. Moreover, Edmund leads Goneril and Regan to become mimetic rivals. Edgar, Regan, and Goneril's "competition" for personal gain leads to chaos at the end of the play (Hobbes, *Leviathan* 83).

CHAPTER ONE

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK OF THE RESEARCH

René Girard examines mimetic desire and mimetic rivalry in Shakespearean comedies such as *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, *Much Ado About Nothing*, *As You Like It*, and *Twelfth Night*. With respect to tragedies, he analyzes the mimetic seduction of Brutus in *Julius Caesar* and *Othello* and the theme of vengeance in *Hamlet*. However, he does not analyze other tragedies. Girard acknowledges that “Shakespeare often defines mimetic desire in his comedies; he calls it ‘love that stood upon the choice of friends,’ ‘love by another’s eye,’ ‘love by hearsay’” (*A Theatre of Envy* 5). For the tragedies, however, neither love nor envy but the state of nature is crucial to better understand the desires of Titus, Tamora, Macbeth, Lady Macbeth, Regan, Goneril, and Edmund. Hobbes’ theory of the state of nature is parallel with Girard’s theory of mimetic desire. Mimetic desire and the state of nature are conducive to the state of rivalry in *Titus Andronicus*, *Macbeth*, and *King Lear*. For the theoretical framework of this study, René Girard’s *Violence and the Sacred* (1972), *The Scapegoat* (1982), and *A Theatre of Envy* (1991) as well as Thomas Hobbes’ (1588–1679) *De Cive* (1642) and *Leviathan* (1651) are examined. Following the establishment of the theoretical framework, each play is examined in accordance with the works of Girard and Hobbes.

1. Thomas Hobbes’ Concepts of the State of Nature, the Laws of Nature, the Social Contract and the Sovereign Power

Thomas Hobbes (1588–1679), the English philosopher, is well known for his political theory. In his works, he is interested in political order/disorder and its problems. His works include *De Cive* (concerning the Citizen 1642), *De Corpore* (concerning Body 1655), *De Homine* (concerning Man 1658), and *Leviathan* (1651), which rank among the first sourcebooks of political philosophy. Hobbes is “the thinker, who, more than any other, broke with traditional Christian political theology and laid the foundations of the more secular form of political philosophy that has shaped the outlook on religion and politics at the heart of the modern West” (Stauffer

868). Hobbes aims to understand the existence and limits of political authority, the laws of nature, and the state of nature through his works.

The state of nature, the laws of nature, the social contract, and the sovereign power are notions that have been discussed within the studies of political philosophy. Political philosophy examines the relationship between the citizens as ruled and the authority as ruler (Wolin 5). For the welfare of society, politics aims to use power for public gain (Thiele xi). The ruled expects to live in peace under the power of authority, as collective humanity prioritizes proper and rational association of human beings for public gain as a requirement of the law of nature against the state of nature that looks for ways for personal gain (Evren 26).

1.1. The State of Nature

The state of nature is the state of man before the establishment of political authority. Within the state of nature, man remains in a violent state and in conflict, as he attempts to fulfil his desire to attain power over others for self-preservation. This is a state in which man is equal to one another by birth, as there is no law-maker who decides who and/or what is right or wrong. Such equality leads one to desire anything that someone else has. If one thing is desired by more than one man, then they may become enemies and rivals. In this context, passions such as envy, jealousy, anger, and desire may incline man toward rivalry. One's desire to attain power is related to rivalry, which demands, in Hobbes' words, a "war of every man against every man" (*Leviathan* 79). In other words, without a sovereign power, man is at war against another; therefore, the authority is expected to bring peace and order against war and conflict, which are the dangers and threats of the state of rivalry. However, some human beings, under an authority, may also be in the state of nature. They secretly desire to gain power through their egotistical plans which may cause civil strife and conflict.

The time of Shakespeare and Thomas Hobbes witnessed a period "when fundamentally opposed conceptions of civil society contended for dominance" (Alvis 4). There had been civil strife and wars on account of the conflicts of opposed conceptions, that is, the rival groups in early modern England from the 15th to the 17th century: Wars of Roses (1455–85), the Dutch Revolt (80 Years War) (1568–1648), the

Gunpowder Plot (1605). Such may be among the reasons why Thomas Hobbes studied the state of nature, the laws of nature, and the sovereign power to refer to the threats of rivalry and conflict that may lead to disorder within a state. Similarly, Shakespeare's plays are thematically concerned with conflicts, stemming from the actions of rivals who are after personal gains.

At the beginning of his definition of the state of nature, Hobbes states his belief in the equality of human beings: "NATURE hath made men so equal, in the faculties of the body, and mind; as that though there be found one man sometimes manifestly stronger in body, or of quicker mind than another; yet when all is reckoned together, the difference between man, and man, is not so considerable" (*Leviathan* 82, capitals by Hobbes). Due to such equality, any human being may claim the right to have anything in the absence of an authority. Hobbes continues to describe the state of nature as, "Whatsoever therefore is consequent to a time of war, where every man is enemy to every man; the same is consequent to the time, wherein men live without other security, than what their own strength and their own invention shall furnish them withal" (*Leviathan* 84). In other words, as man is at war against others, no safety is guaranteed. Therefore, everyone depends on his own power and strength.

A human being in the state of nature may consider other(s) as his enemies and/or rivals. Depending on his strength, he tries to do his best to preserve his body. Therefore, such a condition may demand "a time of war" for his safety (Hobbes, *Leviathan* 83-84). Yet, such a condition limits the intellectual capacity of the human being because in the state of nature, the outcome of any industry is uncertain. Therefore, no culture advances, as any rival may wipe out one's achievement in any field of science. All this ensues because of "continual fear and danger of violent death" (*Leviathan* 84). As each man becomes a rival to one another out of the fear of death, a man in the state of nature considers art and letters worthless. In such a condition, as Hobbes suggests, life would be "solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short" (*Leviathan* 84). To keep himself away from the fearful condition of the state of nature, man seeks peace. The first law of nature—reason—leads man to live in peace and harmony.

1.2. The Laws of Nature

In the state of nature, due to passions, some may try to subvert the authority and order of society. Hobbes says that passions may lead man away from peace because of the fear of death; however, “reason suggesteth convenient articles of peace, upon which men may be drawn to agreement. These articles ... are called the Laws of Nature” (*Leviathan* 86). Reason suggests men live in peace. Human beings need to keep away from the condition of war to do so. Once order is established by the law of nature, peace prevails. The laws of nature are the “articles of peace” that bring human beings into a peaceful state, by which they may unite to live under the sovereign. Its power is expected to enact laws to be obeyed. The law of nature, for Hobbes, “is a precept, or general rule, found out by reason, by which a man is forbidden to do, that, which is destructive of his life, or taketh away the means of preserving the same; and to omit, that, by which he thinketh it may be best preserved” (*Leviathan* 86). Any destructive action is forbidden by reason, which prioritizes self-preservation, that is, human beings pursue their self-interests through their egotistical psychology within the state of nature unless a social setting is constructed.

As human nature differs from one to another, there may be those who disobey the rules of the sovereign power. Passions like “pride and revenge” are contrary to the concepts of “equity and mercy”, and as Hobbes clarifies: “For the laws of nature (as justice, equity, modesty, mercy, and (in sum) doing to others, as we would be done to) of themselves, without the terror of some power to cause them to be observed, are contrary to our natural passions that carry us to partiality, pride, revenge, and the like” (*Leviathan* 111). Concerning man, John Locke (1632–1704), an English philosopher, says, God “made Man such a Creature that ... it was not good for him to be alone” (133). The reason, for Locke, is that man was born “with a title to perfect Freedom and an uncontrolled enjoyment of all the rights and privileges of the law of nature, equally with any other man, or number of men in the world, hath by nature a power;” however, within society, “every one of the Members hath quitted this natural power” at the hands of the authority (136–37). In other words, by nature, man has equal power as another. Yet, for public gain, a man decides to make an agreement with others to transfer his power to an authority. The authority, in a way, guarantees the right of living “equally” in peace. This is the idealized construction of public power. Yet, this may not necessarily mean that every human being gives up his personal power in favor of

public power, and for the survival of sovereign power. For those who ignore the power of the authority despite living under it, the condition of war dominates human existence because “[n]ature,” for Hobbes, “dissociate[s], and render[s] men apt to invade and destroy one another” (Hobbes, *Leviathan* 84). To keep away from destruction and invasion, men need a communal life, which may be sustained by a social contract.

For Hobbes, the first law of nature is reason, which leads people to live in peace. Reason leads man to abandon the idea that others may be his enemies. This is the second law of nature (*Leviathan* 87). This law implies that a human being, looking for peace and security, is expected to abandon the state of nature that demands waging a war against all others to stay alive and, in most cases, to be more powerful than others. This may be achieved by a mutual agreement, which is also known as the social contract. Men need the social contract to “preserve themselves against mutual violence” (Hobbes, *De Cive* 41). Within the context of the laws of nature, agreeing on the social contract “is a voluntary act” of men (*Leviathan* 88). That is, peace is the final end of every man who would otherwise live under the pressure of enmity and rivalry. Therefore, in *De Cive*, Hobbes states, “the Second Law of Nature is to perform Contracts” (61). Harmony and peace are attained by ordering the rules of contracts. According to the third law of nature, man needs to be just and adhere to the contract (Hobbes, *Leviathan* 95). Justice of manners and actions should be reasonable and consistent for everyone; in this case, a commonwealth is constituted by justice (*Leviathan* 95–99). The fourth law of nature is as such: if justice is consistent with the social contract, man receives benefits one another under the authority (*Leviathan* 100). This law implies that man needs to be thankful and kind to one another in accordance with the social contract. Following this comes the fifth law of nature: man wishes to “*accommodate himself to the rest*” (*Leviathan* 100, emphasis by Hobbes). This implies that man fits in with the wishes and needs of mutual peace. These are among the crucial laws of nature for Hobbes who believes that “the laws of nature are immutable and eternal” as long as man obeys the requirements of the social contract (*Leviathan* 105).

1.3. The Social Contract and the Sovereign Power

The social contract establishes authority for the well-being of man. It is a contract against possible dangers of the state of nature in which man is at war with all others to defend himself, survive, and invade for personal gain. Therefore, the idea of

social contract is established on the contradiction between civil society and pre-civil society. Civilized society demands a ruler to let everyone live in peace by establishing civil laws. However, as no one may trust another, each person transfers his right to a ruler to let him rule the society by social consent through the social contract (Hobbes, *Leviathan* 89). In the state of nature, the fear of death and insecurity are two threatening factors that lead man to search for a peaceful ground. A reasonable man may look for ways of getting rid of them; therefore, “reason suggesteth convenient articles of peace upon which men may be drawn to agreement. These articles are they which otherwise are called the laws of nature”, (Hobbes, *Leviathan* 86). The authority is expected to protect human life against any threat of violence and death, stemming from the rivalrous acts of those who are in the state of nature. In other words, as the fear of death remains in the forefront in the state of nature, the state of rivalry dominates the actions of men in this state. However, man desires “to covenant with others to create a civil state” because of “the fear of death” (Martinich 198).

For Hobbes, “the beginning of Civil Society is from mutual fear” (*De Cive* 41). Therefore, the authority is required to make laws to preclude disorderly behavior within civil society. An all-ruler authority is demanded to keep everyone in peace. In this respect, reciprocal fear is replaced by a common fear of people under the authority of one sovereign: a king, a queen or a head of the state. With respect to common power, Hobbes argues, “[h]ereby it is manifest, that during the time men live without a common power ... they are in that condition which is called war” (*Leviathan* 84). Common power may be regarded as a warrantor of peace, as “it is a precept, or general rule of reason, that every man, ought to endeavor peace, as far as he has hope of obtaining it” (*Leviathan* 87). To obtain peace, common action is exercised by the authority against those who may subvert order. Otherwise, “*as long as this natural right of every man to every thing endureth, there can be no security to any man*” (*Leviathan* 87, emphasis by Hobbes). The society becomes (or is expected to become) one so that each individual may get rid of the condition of insecurity and rivalry. Regarding this, Locke writes, “[t]hose who are united into one body and have a common established law and judicature to appeal to, with authority to decide controversies between them, and punish offenders, are in civil society...: but those who have no such common appeal ... are still in the state of nature” (137). In other

words, a civil state may be instituted under civil laws, as it “is a power set up to constrain those that would otherwise violate their faith” (*Leviathan* 91).

By the time all men act voluntarily under an authority, a mutual agreement rules over every member of that community, that is, “[t]he mutual transferring of right is that which men call CONTRACT” (*Leviathan* 89). Authority is the embodiment of common power, which is “with right and force sufficient to compel performance;” therefore, the contract “is not void” (*Leviathan* 91). Therefore, every man needs to “obtain Peace” to validate the contract (Hobbes, *De Cive* 62). Men, by the social contract, establish a commonwealth for their own preservation to get “themselves out from that miserable condition of war” by the “visible power” that “keep[s] them in awe and tie[s] them by fear of punishment to the performance of their covenants and observation of those laws of nature” (Hobbes, *Leviathan* 111). This “visible power” is indeed the sovereign power that needs to be strong enough to guarantee peace by the obedient citizens, and soldiers. Otherwise, man may return to the state of nature and of war because of any disobedient citizen and/or soldier (or any other individual/group). Therefore, a commonwealth has the authority when all men “confer all their power and strength upon one man” (Hobbes, *Leviathan* 114). That one man attained by the social contract is the embodiment of authority. The authority has power and strength, and “this done, the multitude so united in one person, is called a COMMONWEALTH, in Latin CIVITAS ... the great LEVIATHAN” (*Leviathan* 114). Therefore, subverting the political and social order by revolting against the state is a direct threat to the “Commonwealth.” It is the responsibility of the sovereign to secure the public authority, as the social contract demands him to do so.

2. René Girard's Concepts of Mimetic Desire, Mimetic Rivalry, Mimetic Crisis, and the Scapegoat Mechanism

Born in Avignon, France, in 1923, René Girard was an anthropologist, theorist, and literary critic who gave lectures at New York State University and Stanford University, among others. Among his well-known works are *Violence and the Sacred* (1972), *The Scapegoat* (1982), and *A Theatre of Envy* (1991). Girard's concepts of "mimetic desire" and "scapegoat mechanism" are related to the state of rivalry, and applicable to literary studies. Girard emerged with his theory of "mimetic desire" in *Deceit, Desire and the Novel* (1961) through an analysis of the works of Stendhal, Cervantes, Flaubert, Proust, and Dostoyevsky.

2.1. Mimetic Desire and Mimetic Rivalry

For Girard, human behaviour is motivated by mimetic desire. Girard asserts that one's desire is generated by imitating the desire of another. In other words, one desires an object that is desired by another. The word mimetic calls to mind imitation, so it is an imitative desire. Since desire has an imitative structure, mimetic desire produces rivalry. Rivalry is related to envy, desire, and anger among passions of man. Both envy and mimetic desire subordinate a desired object to someone who has a concessional relationship with that object. One's envy emulates not only that particular object but also that particular someone; that is, envy desires to attain both of them (Girard, *A Theatre of Envy* 4). Since envy is a hidden emotion, its repressed position may bring forth conflicts, hatred, and anger. As the desires of others become a focal point among men, a kind of rivalry may be initiated, it progresses, and ultimately overwhelms. Regarding that, Girard says, "[e]nvy involuntarily testifies to a lack of being that puts the envious to shame... that is why envy is the hardest sin to acknowledge" (*A Theatre of Envy* 4). Envy generates a rivalry in an attempt to obtain what is desired. As the object (or status/person) is the desired one, stemming from the imitation of another's desire, it is not unique. Regarding the imitative structure of desire, Richard Golsan explains: "those objects which are designated transformed in the eyes of the desiring individual such that they assume a magical aura that they do not really possess" (6). The object is designated by a mediator who forms "a magical aura" for another desiring

man (Golsan 6). Therefore, the mediator and the desirer attribute a value to the object. However, the object becomes unique for the desirer.

There are two kinds of mimetic desire: external and internal mediations. External mediation takes place when there is a sufficient distance that eliminates contact between the model and the desirer; therefore, almost no conflict is generated between them. However, when this distance is reduced enough to let the mediator and the subject to contact, then a conflict, and rivalry may be generated (Girard, *Deceit, Desire* 9). In other words, in external mediation, the mediator does not realize that he becomes a model for a desirer. Therefore, this kind of mediation may not spark a conflict. For the external one, “mimetic desire” does not cause any psychological and/or physical effect because the desirer publicly proposes that he will take the mediator as a model for him; therefore, no envy between them develops. That Don Quixote imitates Amadis de Gaule is an example of external mediation because they do not meet and may never become rivals. However, for the internal mediation, a reverse situation is at work. The mediator is close to the desirer, and the desiring individual does not admit his influence, but hides and represses it. In the case of internal mediation “the impulse toward the object is ultimately an impulse toward the mediator; in internal mediation, this impulse is checked by the mediator himself since he desires, or perhaps possesses, the object” (Girard, *Deceit, Desire* 10). Once the desirer realizes that the mediator is an obstacle in his way to the desired object, he gets envious and turns his desire towards the mediator. As Girard claims, “[f]ascinated by his model, the disciple inevitably sees, in the mechanical obstacle which he puts in his way, proof of the ill will borne him. Far from declaring himself a faithful vassal, he thinks only of repudiating the bonds of mediation” (*Deceit, Desire* 10). “The disciple” may refer to a follower of the mediator; that is, the disciple is like a learner. Yet, he rejects that the mediator is superior to him. As such, this case resembles to the relationship between man who is in the state of nature (the disciple), and the civilized man (superior one). However, the man who is in the state of nature does not accept the superiority of the civilized man. The reason is that the man who is in the state of nature believes in equality by birth. Therefore, he does not care for a difference in rank. In that way, the desirer (the disciple) supposes that the mediator is his rival, so the desirer fights to obtain the desired object. Inevitably, acts of violence stem from such a competition by which “[t]he subject is

torn between two opposite feelings toward his model — the most submissive reverence and the most intense malice. This is the passion we call *hatred*” (Girard, *Deceit, Desire* 10).

In this context, hatred and adoration go hand in hand, as the hatred of the desirer results from his admiration for the mediator. As to the co-existence of hatred and admiration in human nature, one that hates the mediator indeed begins to hate himself because the passion of hatred conceals a secret admiration in itself (Girard, *Deceit, Desire* 11; Spinoza 83; Hobbes, *Leviathan* 113). Such hatred becomes an internal conflict between the rival (mediator) and the desiring individual. Girard explains: “[i]n an effort to hide this desperate admiration from others, and from himself, he no longer wants to see in his mediator anything but an obstacle. The secondary role of the mediator thus becomes primary, concealing his original function of a model scrupulously imitated” (*Deceit, Desire* 11). In other words, the role of the mediator gains importance, as the desiring individual regards the mediator as a hated obstacle. The hated rival – mediator – is imitated; yet, the mimetic desire lurks deep within the desiring individual’s nature: “[h]e asserts that his own desire is prior to that of his rival; according to him, it is the mediator who is responsible for the rivalry. Everything that originates with this mediator is systematically belittled although still secretly desired” (Girard, *Deceit, Desire* 11). For the desiring individual, the act of rivalry is reversed; that is, the rival is the one who imitates the desiring individual. Therefore, internal mediation takes root in the mind of the desiring individual as a consequence of the mediated structure of desire. Such a desire affects everyone in contact with both the mediator and the desiring individual. Thus, desire has an imitative structure which leads to rivalry and whose result is envy and jealousy, or as Girard has put it “[j]ealousy and envy imply a third presence: object, subject, and a third person toward whom the jealousy or envy is directed” (*Deceit, Desire* 12). That is why desire has a triangular structure. However, “we never recognize a model in the person who arouses jealousy because we always take a jealous person's attitude toward the problem of jealousy” (*Deceit, Desire* 12). The subject becomes jealous of the model, as he is close to or has the object. Therefore, the subject supposes that he has nothing to do with the model. In this context, Girard states, “[l]ike all victims of internal mediation, the jealous

person easily convinces himself that his desire is spontaneous, in other words, that it is deeply rooted in the object and in this object alone” (*Deceit, Desire* 12).

According to Girard, one reason for such a characteristic of desire is that “imitative desire is always a desire to be Another” (*Deceit, Desire* 83). In this respect, feelings of inadequacy and impotence surround the desiring individual. The subject, that is, the desirer credits himself with an inadequacy, and the desirer supposes that he lacks something (the desired object) that the model has. The desirer identifies the model with the object, as the model keeps the object just for himself. Therefore, it becomes a dream of the desirer to acquire that object. As a result, the desirer-subject may desire the object more than ever. For the subject, the model is self-sufficient whereas the imitator lacks sufficiency (Girard, *Things Hidden* 296). In such a case, mimetic desire becomes an obsession, as the desiring individual feels emptiness and inadequacy. Therefore, he is apt to commit violence in order to stifle such incompetency. Mimetic desire may affect the individual and the society. Disorder in society is a result of violence, stemming from mimetic desire/rivalry. Regarding such societal disorder, Girard insists that “an analysis of significant texts reveals definitive analogies between the plague, or rather all great epidemics, and the social phenomena, real or imagined, that are assimilated to them” (*To Double Business Bound* 138). The plague stands as a metaphor for “... reciprocal violence that spreads, literally, like the plague” (139). Similar to a plague that spreads everywhere, mimetic crisis arises because of the actions of rivals.

2.2. Mimetic Crisis, and the Scapegoat Mechanism

A desirer may begin to lose his personal differences as he imitates the actions of his model. In other words, social differences between a desirer and a mediator begin to dissipate because of the imitative actions of the desirer. This process is called “undifferentiation” that leads to mimetic crisis, and “a crisis of degree” (Girard, *A Theatre of Envy* 174, 182, 228). Rivalry tends to spread because of its imitative and contagious structure. Therefore, it leads to a mimetic crisis due to the reciprocal acts of rivalry and counter-rivalry, that is, revenge. In this case, rivalry may end up in violence. As people witness violence, they tend to imitate it. Thus, it has a mimetic structure, as more people turn violent to attain what is desired and/or hated. Such

contagious desire/hatred brings destabilization to societies. For that reason, societies have turned to sacrifice in an effort to reduce acts of violence because of the latter's destructive force. That is, sacrifice is aimed at the disposal of the urge to commit violence. On the spread of violence, Girard states: "if left unappeased, violence will accumulate until it overflows its confines and floods the surrounding area. The role of sacrifice is to stem this rising tide of indiscriminate substitutions and redirect violence into 'proper channels'" (*Violence and the Sacred* 10). Sacrifice, as a scapegoat mechanism in this context, becomes the proper channel through which the desire for violence is settled and a resolution attained.

Cultures, arising from mythic religions, turn to animal sacrifice to purify themselves from sins and/or keep them away from any evil deeds. Sacrifice is defined as "an instrument of prevention in the struggle against violence" (Girard, *Violence and the Sacred* 17). Although sacrifice relieves the mimetic crisis between the rivals, it may lead to an increase in the act of violence, which is then contaminated by the sacrifice itself and scapegoat. For Girard, the sacrificers become persecutors, and the "[n]aïve persecutors are unaware of what they are doing" (*The Scapegoat* 8; emphasis by Girard). The reason is that "[t]heir conscience is too good to deceive their readers systematically, and they present things as they see them" (*The Scapegoat* 8). For Girard, as soon as the sacrificial ritual is done, a mimetic crisis — caused by envy and rivalry that stem from desiring the same object — comes to an end. For Girard, "the purpose of the scapegoat is to restore harmony to the community, to reinforce the social fabric" (*Violence and the Sacred* 8). As such the scapegoat may discharge hatred and violence.

Girard points out thus: "Shakespeare identifies the force that periodically destroys the differential system of culture and brings it back into being, namely, the mimetic crisis... He sees its resolution in the collective violence of scapegoating" (*A Theatre of Envy* 6). However, the scapegoating mechanism may not establish a peaceful society in the long term because of the repetitive structure of violence. As Girard writes, "by putting an end to the vicious and destructive cycle of violence, it simultaneously initiates another constructive cycle, that of the sacrificial rite that protects the community from the same violence and allows culture to flourish"

(*Violence and the Sacred* 93). Collective violence, therefore, underlies the origins of cultural forms, as it goes on in circles.

In this regard, Girard argues: “[c]ounter violence turns out to be the same as violence. In cases of massive contamination, the victims are helpless, not necessarily because they remain passive but because whatever they do proves ineffective or makes the situation worse” (*Violence and the Sacred* 139). The desperate condition of the victim encourages the mass, while violence swirls, expands and floods. As regards the contamination of violence, Girard states, “[t]he tendency of violence to hurl itself on a surrogate if deprived of its original object can surely be described as a contaminating process. Violence too long held in check will overflow its bounds-and woe to those who happen to be nearby” (*Violence and the Sacred* 30). Similar to Girard’s view on the contaminated structure of violence, an act of violence creates another in Shakespearean tragedies in which “the floodtide” enlarges to an extent that everyone involved in violence becomes identical to one another. Regarding violence, and its contaminating effect, Girard remarks “[r]itual precautions are intended both to prevent this flooding and to offer protection, insofar as it is possible, to those who find themselves in the path of ritual impurity-that is, caught in the floodtide of violence” (*Violence and the Sacred* 30). Everyone, involved in the ritual, supposes that he prevents further violence through the protection of the ritual.

For Girard, the ritual of sacrifice enables human beings to relieve their anger. Therefore, violence may be directed at another object (Girard, *Violence and the Sacred* 4). The scapegoat may be an animal, a divine entity, and/or even a human being. In any case, it is a victimized surrogate to alleviate someone’s anger. To exemplify his view, Girard puts forth *Oedipus the King* which is “nothing more and nothing less than a search for a scapegoat” (*to Double Business Bound* 145). In that sense, Thebes is “in the throes of a plague epidemic; the solution of the crisis becomes a test of power and prestige for the protagonists, Oedipus, Creon, and Tiresias” (*to Double Business Bound* 144). At the end of the test of power, the death or banishment of the scapegoat – Oedipus in this case – purges violence. Girard writes: “[r]itual tries to reproduce a process that has proved effective against one kind of ‘plague,’ the most terrible kind, the epidemic of reciprocal violence that never becomes explicit as such” (*to Double Business Bound* 148). Girard believes that rituals are the channels through which the

rivals may be freed from acts of violence. Mimetic crisis arises out of rivalry; yet, in time the rivals become “doubles”, as they forget about the desired object. The “double” rivals are too alike that they cannot anymore be separated. Although they assert their being alien to each other, they are alike indeed. The desired object represents victory for the two; that is, it is no longer a target but a vehicle to show off. Therefore, the state of rivalry becomes a way to show off power and prestige in a disordered society.

Regarding the cultural order, Girard says that the difference between what is pure and impure generates a sacrificial distinction. Otherwise “the same process of violent reciprocity engulfs the whole. The sacrificial crisis may be defined, therefore, as a crisis of distinctions—that is, a crisis affecting the cultural order” (Girard, *Violence and the Sacred* 49). At the end of a sacrificial ritual, the difference between the pure and impure dissipates. However, the individual differences decrease. In this case, they may become “doubles”, as “the differences among individuals are used to establish their “identity” and their mutual relationships” (Girard, *Violence and the Sacred* 49). Therefore, rivalry may decrease distinction between the individuals, and the violent actions of rivals generate doubles. The reason is that violence is connected to loss of distinctions, as each rival deploys violence to the other by disregarding individual differences. Therefore, reciprocal violence of mimetic doubles stems from loss of distinctions (Girard, *Violence and the Sacred* 56). From a Girardian perspective, rivals become the mimetic doubles who spark conflicts. Thus, violence arises as soon as individual differences become indistinct.

The urge to exercise violence may be imitated by men who are in the state of nature, and rivalry. Therefore, violence escalates, and brings a reciprocal violence. In the case of reciprocal violence, the scapegoat mechanism brings a resolution to the mimetic crisis: “[i]t is unanimous victimage that transforms the disruptive force of mimetic rivalry into the constructive force of a sacrificial mimesis periodically re-enacting the original violence in order to prevent a return of the crisis” (*A Theatre of Envy* 6). Therefore, sacrificing seems to be an antidote to the spread of violence which would otherwise spread more, or as Girard has put it, “all the dissensions, rivalries, jealousies, and quarrels within the community...are designed to [be] suppress[ed]” by sacrifice (*A Theatre of Envy* 8). That is to say, the community is in need of a scapegoat

in times of collective violence so that rivalries, jealousies and conflicts within the community may be brought to an end.

For Girard, “the sacrificial crisis” refers to “the disappearance of the sacrificial rites” which “coincides with the disappearance of the difference between impure violence and purifying violence. When this difference has been effaced, purification is no longer possible and impure, contagious, reciprocal violence spreads throughout the community” (*Violence and the Sacred* 49). In this context, reciprocal violence is “nothing more than a regulated system of distinctions in which the differences among individuals are used to establish their identity and their mutual relationships” (*Violence and the Sacred* 49). Differences among individuals in any society constitute culture; therefore, “[o]rder, peace, and fecundity depend on cultural distinctions; it is not these distinctions but the loss of them that gives birth to fierce rivalries and sets members of the same family or social group at one another’s throats” (49). In short, the loss of distinctions among the members of a society can lead to rivalry and envy whose ultimate end is violence.

The members of society “are transformed into twins, matching images of violence” and they may become “the sole object of universal obsession and hatred” (Girard, *Violence and the Sacred* 79). The scapegoat mechanism is born out of this universal obsession and hatred, as it spreads and becomes contagious. Girard, in the context of scapegoat, states “... any community that has fallen prey to violence or has been stricken by some overwhelming catastrophe hurls itself blindly into the search for a scapegoat” (*Violence and the Sacred* 79). The death of the scapegoat may be “generative” as it “protects the community from the same violence and allows culture to flourish” (Girard, *Violence and the Sacred* 93). Therefore, it may bring order, and culture is recreated since the acts of violence have come to an end. The mimetic crisis is controlled by the murder of the scapegoat, called *pharmakos*¹ by Girard, that is, the representative of society’s contamination and disease. To purge violence and cleanse society, the scapegoat (*pharmakos*) is to be punished in public so that the community may unite against it (Girard, *Violence and the Sacred* 102). The reason why it cleanses the ills of society is that “sacrifice...as a deliberate act of collective substitution [is] performed at the expense of the victim and absorbing all the internal tensions, feuds, and rivalries pent up within the community” (Girard, *Violence and the Sacred* 7).

Whether the scapegoat is pure or impure does not cause any alteration to the act of violence because the sacrificer who offers up a sacrifice to restore the social and cultural order actually sacrifices a member of the group/society for the sake of power and authority. However, although the scapegoating mechanism is supposed to end act(s) of violence, peace is not established in *Titus Andronicus*, *Macbeth*, and *King Lear*. It is because of the contagious effects of mediated desire at the hands of rivals who are in the state of nature within a disordered society.

3. The State of Rivalry

This section of the study explores the theoretical relevance of the relationship between mimetic desire and the state of nature as conducive to the state of rivalry. In the light of the definitions of mimetic desire, and the state of nature, the meaning of the state of rivalry will be clarified. *Cambridge International Dictionary of English* defines rival as “a person, group etc. competing with others for the same thing or in the same area” (Procter 1227). Similarly, *Longman Dictionary of Language and Culture* defines the terms as “a person group or organization with whom one competes” (1162). In this regard, rivalry is related to competition between two or more people, group etc. so as to attain anything for which rivals compete. The second definition of *Longman* is “to equal; be as good as or reach the same standard as” (1162). Rivalry leads the weaker one to compete the superior one so as to equal his power with the other. In such a competition, a rival may exercise violence to the other. Rollo May is right in saying, “deeds of violence ... are performed largely by those trying to establish their self-esteem, to defend their self-image, and to demonstrate that they, too, are significant... Violence arises not out of superfluity of power but out of powerlessness” (23). Either for being more powerful than the rival or for being equal to the other rival, the state of rivalry brings forth the notion of competition. The notions of equality and competition refer to the state of nature, and mimetic desire, respectively. The state of nature is based on the idea of man’s equality, and claiming possession on an object that another man has, and self-preservation against other(s). In this case, the other is a rival who aims to attain whatever object the other has. However, in the theory of mimetic desire, a desirer competes with the mediator so as

to attain the desired object. In each case, either secretly or openly, rivals may create conflict, and disorder.

Girard says “Shakespeare discovered the truth” as rivalry is a “fundamental source of human conflict” (*A Theatre of Envy* 3). As Girard suggests, rivalry lies at the base of civilization and culture. He gives the example of the story of Cain and Abel. In other words, society and culture are shaped by the effects of mimetic desire and rivalry. As for Hobbes, in the nature of conflict, there are three causes “[f]irst, competition; secondly, diffidence; thirdly, glory” which make man rival to other(s) so that “[t]he first, make[s] men invade for gain; the second, for safety; and the third, for reputation” (*Leviathan* 83). Thus, desire, personal gain, and reputation are key notions that are related to the state of rivalry.

Rivalry is the beginning of attaining a desired object. It becomes a contentious object, as rivalry becomes heated by attributing value to the object (Girard, *Things Hidden* 294). In other words, rivalry for the object discloses envy between the rivals. Therefore, the relationship between rivals becomes a key to understanding the origin of conflict. However, the desiring individual hides his envious feelings toward the model, the rival. In this case, desire arouses rivalry that results from envy, and hatred, two passions that are concealed by the desiring individual so as to suppress his feeling of inferiority against his rival. Therefore, concealment is another factor in the state of rivalry. It leads to growth of hatred, as the desiring individual aims to conceal his desire that makes the other superior. As one hides his rivalry, and hatred against another, the former feels that he lacks the power and/or the prestige the latter has. The former overlaps, and hides his deficiency. However, such a feeling of lack leads the desiring individual to hate his rival. Therefore, the inferior man may regard the superior man as a threat. The inferior one is the man who is in the state of nature and/or the desirer in mimetic theory. However, the superior is either the mediator or the one in the civil state in each theory, respectively. The mediator, or the one in the civil state becomes the object of envy, as the former envies the superior rival.

In the state of rivalry, emulation is another factor that is close to envy. Emulation refers to a process during which one tries to surpass an achievement or a person by imitation. As the level of imitation increases, so do the levels of emulation and rivalry. Emulation is a key notion in mimetic theory, in which the desirer and the mediator

come up against each other. The desirer begins to act in rivalrous manners toward the model. Therefore, personal differences between the mediator and the desirer begin to eliminate. This is what is called undifferentiation. However, undifferentiation makes the rival act, speak, and decide like the mediator. Therefore, the rival who is in the state of nature becomes a double of his mediator. As the process of double heightens, so does the crisis between them. From a Girardian view, the crisis at the end of such rivalry is mimetic crisis. As a result of mimetic crisis, social differences, and hierarchy begin to lose power. Therefore, power in the hands of rivals shifts.

In the state of rivalry, the possibility of future conflicts may condition, and form the manners and behaviours of the rivals. The reason is that rivalry may be affected “by the outcome or processes of previous disputes” (Goertz 148). Both future crisis and past conflicts form the behaviour of opponents in line with the state of nature and mimetic desire. The reason is that a man supposes himself to be equal to his rival. This assumption subverts the social order, and once order, and social differences are disregarded, mimetic desire is generated. Therefore, the state of nature and mimetic desire, in this study, are conducive to the state of rivalry.

“Th’ abuse of greatness is when is disjoins / remorse from power”
 (*Julius Caesar*, 2.1.19-20)

CHAPTER TWO

THE SIBLING RIVALRY and GLORY in *TITUS ANDRONICUS*

The known earliest edition of *Titus Andronicus* dates back to 1594 as printed in the *First Quarto*, in which the full title of the play is “*The most lamentable Romaine Tragedie of Titus Andronicus*” (Metz 154 italics by Metz; Gray 295). The *First Quarto* writes that the play was acted “by two ... companies, Derby's and Pembroke's” (Metz 155).

Titus Andronicus is dominated by quarrels between Saturninus and Bassianus, the children of the dead Roman emperor; by revenge and rivalry between Titus, the Roman commander, and Tamora, the captive Goth queen who later becomes the Roman empress. Shakespeare presents “a state of conflict ...between two sections of the community”, a conflict led by the Roman brothers, the sibling rivals (Mcalindon 6). Titus comes back from war with the prisoners of war: Tamora, the Goth queen, Alarbus, Demetrius and Chiron, her children, and Aaron the moor, her lover. Upon his arrival, Titus finds Rome disordered by a fight over the throne between rival brothers Saturninus and Bassianus. Tamora vows to revenge after Titus sacrifices Alarbus. Although Titus is asked to be the emperor by Marcus, the tribune, Titus rejects, and announces Saturninus’ emperorship. To honour Titus, Saturninus marries Lavinia, his daughter who is in love with Bassianus. However, Lavinia is seized by Bassianus; thereupon, Saturninus marries Tamora. Tamora, plotting with Aaron, asks Demetrius and Chiron to rape Lavinia and kill Bassianus. Titus’s sons Quintus and Martius are held responsible by this crime, and they are executed. Lucius is banished, as he revolts against the judges. These incidents lead Titus to pursue “glory” to such a point that he disregards the survival of Rome, an act that makes him act in line with the state of nature, and the state of rivalry. Titus orders Lucius to attack Rome by the help of Goths, as he desires to avenge Tamora and her sons. Therefore, the play is full of rivalrous actions within a chaotic, and disordered society in which conflict, and rivalry never end till the end of the play.

In this chapter, three groups of rivals are examined. The first group is an example to sibling rivalry: Saturninus and Bassianus. The second rivals are Titus and Tamora. Titus has fought for the glory of his nation. Yet, as the captive Goth queen becomes a Roman empress, Titus becomes a rival to Tamora to save his glory, honour and reputation. Similar to the Roman brothers, the Goth brothers Demetrius and Chiron also act in accordance with the state of rivalry. This chapter examines to what extent mimetic desire and the state of nature are conducive to the state of rivalry.

Among Shakespeare's early-tragedies, *Titus Andronicus* contains many rivalrous actions that take place one after another (Yüksel 48-49). This makes the analysis of the play difficult because the incidents are closely intertwined (Warren 69). For example, Bassianus' elopement with Lavinia leads Titus to kill Mutius, whereas the same action leads Saturninus to marry Tamora. One reason for such a difficulty may be because, in David Bevington's words, "Shakespeare apprenticed himself to neo-classical Senecan tragedy in *Titus Andronicus*" (53; Özmen 29). Because of the formula of the revenge play, a tragic hero may receive a different reaction from that of an avenger's. The reason for this is that one may have a "sympathetic identification" with the avenger (Bevington 53). That is, "as a pattern for tragedy, Senecan revenge tragedy "has its limitations" that make Titus "the cunning avenger more than the fallen hero struggling to understand his destiny" (Bevington 53). However, "[a]fter the two initial efforts in the early and mid-1590s, *Titus Andronicus* and *Romeo and Juliet*" Shakespeare attains a "poetic maturity, with his having mastered and developed the technical practices and formal innovations" (McDonald 24). In *Hamlet*, for example, Shakespeare transforms the revenge motif of *Titus Andronicus* into a great tragedy (Bevington 58). As compared to his late plays, Shakespeare presents more rivalrous actions than those of his early plays in which disorder, and chaos reign over harmony, peace and order. In the state of nature, man desires in accordance with his natural instincts, that is, with passions. The reason is that there is no limitation that forbids man what to do or not to do. Therefore, the state of nature is related to chaos and conflict.

Among the sources of conflict, and continuity between order and disorder are "mimetic rivalry", and the state of nature (Girard, *A Theatre of Envy* 3). For Hobbes, the main causes of conflict, and rivalry within the state of nature are "competition,

diffidence, and glory” which lead men “to invade for profit, safety and reputation” (*Leviathan* 83). These are direct threats to order of an authority. Regarding the authority of a state, Hobbes writes, “[f]or by this authority, given him by every particular man in the Commonwealth, he hath the use of so much power and strength conferred on him that, by terror thereof, he is enabled to form the wills of them all, to peace at home, and mutual aid against their enemies ... for their peace and common defence” (Hobbes, *Leviathan* 114). In this regard, Saturninus and Bassianus are expected to act together against the enemy, the Goths. Yet, they care for personal gain, as they are after “glory”. Moreover, Titus’ pursuing “glory” affects the Roman authority (Abizadeh 313). In other words, along with Titus, Bassianus, Saturninus are chasing “glory” in their pursuit for personal power and “reputation” as they “think themselves wiser and abler to govern the public better than the [other], and these strive to reform and innovate, one this way, another that way; and thereby bring it into distraction and civil war” (Hobbes, *Leviathan* 113). Titus disregards Roman laws, and takes his revenge himself. The actions of the above-mentioned characters bring chaos and disorder that help the state of nature to be revealed (Hobbes, *Leviathan* 83- 84). The reason is that a crisis of the state of rivalry requires a continuous conflicting behaviour (Goertz 156).

Act 1 begins with the fight of Saturninus and Bassianus to become the emperor. Saturninus says,

Noble patricians, patrons of my right,
 Defend the justice of my cause with arms.
 And, countrymen, my loving followers,
 Plead my successive title with your swords.
 I am his first-born son, ... / ... /
 Then let my father's honours live in me, (1.1.1-7)

According to the Roman laws, the “first-born-son” Saturninus has the right to sovereignty (1.1.5). In his speech, Saturninus refers to the primogeniture, a divine belief of the 16th century England. It is a political idea that the eldest son of a sovereign receives the father’s authority, estate, and title (Montrose 36). This is a law that aims to protect and preserve the power of a state. As Lawrence Stone remarks, “the prime factor affecting all families which owned property was ... the principle and practice of primogeniture, for the preservation and protection of which the entail was designed” (87). Similar to this, regarding the primogeniture as one of the legitimate claims to

authority, J. P. Sommerville says that these claims “included original election by the people, victory in a just war, and gift from a sovereign ruler. It was widely agreed that the best form of government was a monarchy in which succession proceeded by primogeniture in the male line...” (*Royalists* 28). Therefore, Saturninus’ reference to primogeniture presents his belief in his legitimate claim to the throne. Yet, Bassianus announces his rivalry in this competition, as he claims himself to be “a poor competitor” (1.1.66). Although the laws close the issue to debate, Bassianus disregards the civil laws, and acts in line with the state of nature. The reason is that Bassianus desires to get benefit of the loss of power in Rome for personal gain. The state of nature triggers the state of rivalry, as Bassianus supposes himself to be equal to Saturninus. The reason is that such are the ones who believe in equality in terms of the right to everything without a sovereign. Thus, Bassianus’s state of rivalry, at this point, is formed by the state of nature. Bassianus’ reference to himself as a “competitor” shows that it is Saturninus’ right to become the new emperor because Bassianus deflects a public issue into a personal competition.

Competition for the throne leads the fractions to be gathered (Hobbes, *Leviathan* 83-84). That Bassianus announces himself as a “competitor” is a challenge to the Roman power relations and to authority because its power has been politically and culturally established for years (Mcalindon 6). In such a state, an emperor embodies the power of sovereignty which is protected by “swords” (1.1.4). However, a competition for the throne may lead to internal conflicts within the state. Regarding this, Hobbes writes, “if men had the use of reason they pretend to, their commonwealths might be secured, at least from perishing by internal diseases” (*Leviathan* 212). In this context, Bassianus acts against reason, the law of nature because the son of an emperor is expected to care for public gain. It is the law of nature, “right reason” which is concerned with “what should be done or avoided continually to preserve life” and the survival of the state (Sommerville, *Thomas Hobbes* 46). The rivalrous competition generates an “internal disease” within Rome. Yet, each brother calls Romans to support him. The “competition” is so fierce that it may end in civil war, which may subvert the authority. But none of the brothers thinks about the possible results of their egotistical actions.

Saturninus and Bassianus are, in Michael Hathaway's words, "obviously evil" princes (109). Saturninus, for example, takes his sword and calls countrymen to "[d]efend the justice" to such an extent that he may kill his brother (1.1.2). The reason is that the death of the emperor brings forth the idea that the state is powerless. Therefore, as Thomas Hobbes remarks, social contract without the protection of a sovereign power becomes meaningless (*Leviathan* 111). Similar to Saturninus, Bassianus also asks his followers to defend his right to the throne with swords. This situation represents that each rival fears the other. As a result, insecure men are ready to fight with others (Hobbes, *Leviathan* 83-85). Therefore, such a beginning presents the rivalry between brothers who subvert the Roman power relations. Both are ready to exercise violence; so, the ones who need to sustain order disrupt it. Thus, their quarrel is a symptom of the state of nature that ignores the power of authority.

Bassianus and Saturninus disrespect power relations. This is a relation that stems from hierarchy. However, following Saturninus, Bassianus' way of addressing the Romans is similar to that of his brother: "[t]o justice, continence, and nobility: / But let desert in pure election shine, / And, Romans, fight for freedom in your choice" (1.1.15-17). The Roman brothers establish "rivalries between factions" that may start a civil war (Sommerville, *Royalists* 2). Civil war may be "consequent ... to the natural passions of men when there is no visible power to keep them in awe, and tie them by fear of punishment to the performance of their covenants, and observation of those laws of nature" (Hobbes, *Leviathan* 111). Since Bassianus and Saturninus assert that each has the right to power, "no visible power" maintains laws of nature (Hobbes, *Leviathan* 111). Therefore, fight is against the social contract, and it may lead to a political crisis.

Crisis escalates under such conditions, as it is related to rivalry and competition (Goertz 156). However, Marcus Andronicus, the tribune of the people, interrupts the fight of the Roman brothers to announce the arrival of Titus Andronicus, the noble Roman general fighting against the Goths, a rival enemy state to Rome. Marcus is aware of the attractiveness of emperorship. Marcus realises the threat of hostility, escalated by the rival brothers. He aims to catch attention, and to emphasize the attraction of power and authority which are desired "ambitiously". He says: "Princes, that strive by factions and by friends / Ambitiously for rule and empery" (1.1.18-19).

The factions dissent on the application of the use of their power. Therefore, each rival faction reduces its power by opposing the other; yet, none gains anything (*Leviathan* 112). Such an opposition leads power relations to weaken. The weakening, inevitably, softens the power of Roman authority.

Bassianus and Saturninus put emphasis on the supremacy of honour to take the authority (Hattaway 110). The political uncertainty leads the brothers to act through the urges of the state of nature. The state of nature, and rivalry are revealed by the pursuit of glory (Hobbes, *Leviathan* 82-84). For example, by the time Saturninus says “let my father’s honours live in me,” Bassianus remarks, “suffer not dishonour to approach / the imperial seat” (1.1.7; 1.1.13-14). Within the power relations of a state, and army affairs, honour is used as a concept reinforcing the power of the king (or emperor), noblemen, and soldiers. However, in the above-mentioned dialogue of Saturninus and Bassianus, personal honour is emphasized instead of the public image of an emperor. Honour, as a leading factor of authority, is praised, and desired by many characters from a personal point of view. For instance, following the fight of the rival brothers, Marcus says, “Renowned Titus, flourishing in arms. / Let us entreat, by honour of his name / ... / ... / Whom you pretend to honour and adore” (1.1.41-45). Desire of being honourable and maintaining honour may shape the actions of soldiers, and emperors who, in this case, may act against what is for the good of his county.

Each rival claims that his fight is for the good of Rome, although each brother calls citizens for his personal career. Therefore, no universal rule decides what is good and/or evil. Some men may present what is good as evil and vice versa, and/or may decrease the superiority of evil and good through their ways of speech. For this reason, it depends on the person who regards what is good or bad (Hobbes, *Leviathan* 35). That is, what is good and bad for the Roman Empire is not crucial, as the Roman brothers are after personal gains. As regards considering what is good and evil, Warrender states, “men differ as compared one with another in what they regard as good and evil for themselves” (210). Each imperial candidate, Saturninus and Bassianus, calls the other evil (Belsey 125). If the authority is turbulent, what is good or evil for the state may be decided by a judge (Hobbes, *Leviathan* 35). The Tribune Marcus Andronicus is the “judge” who suggests that Titus Andronicus is required to be the new ruler. Marcus says that the Romans would like to see Titus at “the head of

the headless Rome” so as to end the conflict and any rivalry between groupings. Marcus brings the reason why Titus is to be the ruler: “A nobler man, a braver warrior, / ... / ... / From weary wars against the barbarous Goths, / That with his sons, a terror to our foes, / Hath yoked a nation strong, trained up in arms” (1.1.25-30). For Marcus, and the people of Rome, Titus is the “brave warrior” who has saved Rome several times. Parallel to Somerville’s idea on one’s claim to authority, Titus may be elected as the new emperor because of his victory (28). The reason is that, he saves his country from the Goths. War is one of the supreme indicators of acts of collective violence. Yet, Titus praises war, although he has lost twenty-one sons for Rome during wars:

...five times he hath returned
 Bleeding to Rome, bearing his valiant sons
 In coffins from the field, {and at this day
 To the monument of the Andronici
 Done sacrifice of expiation,
 And slain the noblest prisoner of the Goths}. (1.1.33-38)

“The monument of Andronici” family is regarded to be a sacred place for the ones who died in wars. Therefore, death is praised by building a monument for those who have died at wars. In other words, like many cultures, Romans regard dying in a battle as a glorious death. War as collective violence becomes an arena in which the honoured ones, as Titus thinks so, would either fight or die for their state.

As a good Roman soldier, Titus saves his country from many wars. Similar to what Titus does for the good of Rome, a ruler is expected to preserve his people from any threat and/or danger. However, the envious Roman brothers fight publicly. Therefore, they neglect the requirements of the social contract, although human beings need to get rid of condition of war so that they may follow peace to live in harmony together (Hobbes, *Leviathan* 83; 111). In other words, without a sovereign power, everyone may get into the state of rivalry, and may fight against other(s), as there is no rule-maker that “keep[s] them in awe” (Hobbes, *Leviathan* 111). Therefore, communal security and peace are threatened by the collapsing of hierarchy. As Hobbes remarks, if a state weakens “not by external violence, but intestine disorder, the fault is not in men, as they are the matter; but as they are the makers, and orderers of them” (Hobbes, *Leviathan* 212). That is, not the subjects, the citizens, but Bassianus and Saturninus are responsible in the weakening of the Roman authority. The weakening of authority gives way to their relation with the rival country, the Goths (Paster 156).

Within this context, political disorder, and the results of the previous war with Goths lead Saturninus, and Bassianus to act in accordance with the state of nature, and rivalry. Each decides and acts for his self-interest. The death of the emperor brings a political vacuum, which leads Bassianus and Saturninus to depend on their strength to get the throne (Hobbes, *Leviathan* 111; Mcalindon 7). In other words, there is no power for the security of people because the authority of “[o]ne man” ends (*Leviathan* 114).

Meanwhile, rivalry between the Roman brothers escalates to such a point that the two become double. In other words, their actions and speeches become similar to each other’s. That is, each loses his personal differences, and becomes, in a way, the “double” of the other. This is what Girard calls “mimetic double”. As Girard has put it, “brotherhood is almost invariably associated with the reciprocity of revenge” in tragedies that are drawn from myths, and legends (*A Theatre of Envy* 274). Although they are brothers, the idea of killing one another does not seem to be an unusual act for the desire of power over the other. Power, however, works by means of relationships. The authority of a monarchy establishes socially, culturally, and politically shaped subjects, discourses, and practises. Power and authority shape and construct a hierarchical and organized structure. (Foucault, *Power, Knowledge* 198). Power may affect everyone, as it subsists within cultures through man-made hierarchies, rituals and systems (Foucault, *Power, Knowledge* 198). To be aware of, and to act in line with power relations is an indicator of following the social contract whereas the opposite indicates the state of nature, as has been exemplified by the opening scene of the play. If the judgments of a group of people regulate their actions, no protection may be guaranteed against an enemy (Hobbes, *Leviathan* 112). To illustrate, by the quarrel scene of Saturninus and Bassianus, Roman power relations are overbalanced because of factions of a collective mind.

The collective mind puts all the members of factions into the same pot. That is to say, each member of the faction loses his independent thinking. In such a case, the individuals think and act in accordance with the group/faction. Their ideas are directed toward one object: unconditional acceptance of what Saturninus or Bassianus says. This unconditional acceptance presents mob mentality that stems from the crowd psychology. Regarding the mob mentality, Gustave Le Bon remarks, “a crowd [has] a

sort of collective mind which makes them feel, think, and act in a manner quite different from that in which each individual... would feel, think, and act were he in a state of isolation” (4). In other words, as everyone accepts the idea of a collective mind, personal differences of individuals begin to diminish. Such a mind, in principle, works in a similar way that mimetic desire works. The reason is that, an individual may lead one person or a group to desire the same object or to attack the same target. Therefore, as Bassianus and Saturninus return to the state of nature, they want their followers to imitate their manners. The reason is that, similar to rivalry, desire is contagious. That is, as one desires an object, so do the others. This works the same way for the notion of rivalry that stems from the state of nature and mimetic desire. Each of the Roman brothers aims to show off his power by factions. Belonging to a group is equated with being powerful because an individual out of a group becomes powerless; that is, the group brings power to each individual by solidarity (Arendt 44). That is why Saturninus and Bassianus address the commoners. They desire to rally supporters so as to seem more powerful by having more supporters than the other rival. In this case, hatred prevails all the members of the factions. Mutual relationships, and identity are based on individual differences, which in turn, establish the cultural order (Girard, *Violence and the Sacred* 49). However, as for the Romans, Roman culture and authority may collapse any time because the factions of Bassianus and Saturninus bring forth a threat to communal identity by eliminating individual identities, and differences.

The ambitious Roman brothers “are displeased with one another's attaining” the power of authority (Hobbes, *Leviathan* 37). The rivalry gets worse once individual rivalry turns into collective rivalry (Girard, *A Theatre of Envy* 191). However, Marcus knows that grouping may end up in a civil war. Although the Roman state has political problems, only Marcus Andronicus acts in accordance with the social contract, as he does not follow the groupings. That is, he is a man of reason who acts in line with the law of nature. The quarrel of the Roman brothers Saturninus and Bassianus is suppressed by the tribune Marcus, Titus Andronicus’ brother, who says: “Princes... / ... / Know that the people of Rome, for whom we stand / ... / ... / Chosen Andronicus, surnamed Pius / For many good and great deserts to Rome” (1.1.18-24). As a tribune, Marcus aims to establish the sovereign to avoid the devastating results of the state of

nature, and rivalry. The tribune realizes that the social contract is disregarded. Therefore, order is disrupted in such a way that no one discusses the devastating effects of acts of rivalry.

However, Alarbus is sacrificed to show the Goths that they are at the lowest degree in terms of hierarchy, as they are prisoners of war. Titus lets his sons sacrifice Tamora's eldest son upon Lucius's request: "Give us the proudest prisoner of the Goths, / That we may hew his limbs, and on a pile / *Ad manes fratrum* sacrifice his flesh" (1.1.99-101). Although the war is over, Titus accepts this demand, as he is aware of his prestige and power for the Romans. However, because of his interactions with the Goths, Titus becomes barbarous because Alarbus' sacrifice seems to be a show off power, as Titus acts like a "ritual butcher" (Moschovakis 466). Although the ritual of sacrifice is a part of Roman culture, Titus' passions of anger, and hatred contaminate it. As Moschovakis remarks, "this pagan obligation inaugurates a cycle of revenge" (463). However, a ritual is performed so as to hamper mimetic crisis, and rivalry by supplying a surrogate victim to preclude collective violence (Goldman 15).

To control acts of violence, to promote, and to preserve social order, lawful violence seems to be required within the cultural order (Girard, *Violence and the Sacred* 36-38). Communal rituals function as a safety net in establishing order in the society. To re-establish order, rituals and sacrifices are used in case disorder prevails. A rite functions as a violence-diminishing event which "is nothing more than the regular exercise of 'good' violence" (Girard, *Violence and the Sacred* 37). However, since the sacrifice of Alarbus is done for the sake of revenge, the sacrifice of Alarbus "turn[s] into bad" violence (Girard, *Violence and the Sacred* 42). Such a rite "has lost all its ritual characteristics; it has reverted to its violent origins. Instead of holding violence in check, the ceremonies inaugurate a new cycle of revenge" (Girard, *Violence and the Sacred* 125). Violence escalates toward a mimetic crisis because the ritual "lends its support to the forces of destruction" (Girard, *Violence and the Sacred* 125).

The sacrificial ritual turns into a cycle of revenge, a notion related to Hobbes' state of nature. Regarding the ritual, Liebler has put it, "the rite itself is problematic in so far as it is intended as a rite of completion, to answer a killing and to avoid further reprisal; that effect is only possible in the case of communal agreement about its

function and operation” (143). A communal agreement, as a premise of social contract, is required in case of a ritual. However, this sacrifice is demanded by Titus and his sons by personal decisions. Titus is indifferent to Tamora’s cry, although she begs for mercy, “gracious conqueror, / Victorious Titus, rue the tears I shed, / A mother’s tears in passion for her son! / And if thy sons were ever dear to thee, / O, think my son to be as dear to me” (1.1.107-11). Tamora’s begging shows that she is ready to end acts of violence, and she accepts Titus’ victory. As Titus rejects Tamora’s desire of forgiveness, he breaks the sixth law of nature: “*that upon caution of the future time, a man ought to pardon the offences past of them that repenting, desire it*” (*Leviathan* 101, emphasis by Hobbes). Hobbes means that one needs to forgive man who repents, otherwise it may lead to another crisis in “the future time”. However, Titus leads acts of rivalry to turn into a swirl of blood, and a cycle of revenge. Therefore, rivalry escalates, and Tamora swears to revenge. She calls Titus “cruel, irreligious piety” (1.1.133). Therefore, the ritual “ceases to function as a preventive measure” of further violence because of rivalry (Girard, *Violence and the Sacred* 125). The ritual does not prevent violence; on the contrary, it leads more violence to be exercised because of the relationship between the state of nature and mimetic desire. Tamora supposes that Titus would pity her, as he himself has children. Yet, Titus is not such a man, as he places personal honour and fame above all. The most silent and obedient one, Alarbus, becomes the scapegoat. The other two sons Chiron and Demetrius are not like Alarbus. They are cunning and full of evil.

Similar to Lucius, who asks for Alarbus’ sacrifice for “the shadows” of his dead brothers, Titus says, “[r]eligiously they ask a sacrifice. / To this [Tamora’s] son is marked, and die he must, / T’appease their groaning shadows that are gone” (1.1.103; 1.1.127-9). Titus, by doing such an act, becomes a model of mimetic desire for Tamora as, in Act 2, she will let his sons rape Lavinia so as to avenge Titus. Therefore, the two become double in terms of exercising violence. Each rival becomes more barbarous than the other in the rivalry for revenge. Lucius heralds that the sacrifice is done: “See, lord and father, how we have performed / Our Roman rites: Alarbus’ limbs are lopped / And entrails feed the sacrificing fire, / Whose smoke like incense doth perfume the sky” (1.1.145-48). It is supposed that the smoke of Alarbus’ dead body would make the dead sons of Andronicus satisfied. Titus says, “In peace and honour rest you here,

my sons; / Rome's readiest champions, repose you here in rest, / Secure from worldly chances and mishaps. / Here lurks no treason, here no envy swells" (1.1.153-56). One reason for such a bloody ritual is that Titus and his sons cannot get over the effects of "ten years" war (1.1.31). For Titus, and his sons, "a special sort of impurity clings to the warrior returning to his homeland" (Girard, *Violence and the Sacred* 41). Canonizing the enemy at home, that is, making Tamora the Roman empress, and making Alarbus' sacrifice public contaminate Roman culture. Bringing the enemy home becomes a risk because the city may meet new rivalries, and violence (Girard, *Violence and the Sacred* 41). Within this context, Titus makes a mistake when he brings the enemy to the city. His mistake upsets the balances of power relations, although he is not aware of his error.

As a commander, Titus is supposed to be "the first ruling class [who] introduce[s] the first principle of hierarchy into the city" (Plato 348-49). By following passions, however, Titus neglects the requirements of laws of nature. The reason is that the laws of nature "are contrary to our natural passions, that carry us to partiality, pride, revenge, and the like" (Hobbes, *Leviathan* 111). Parallel to what Hobbes argues on passions, Titus is after pride, and revenge; that is, he is following passions instead of laws of nature that prioritizes "social division and hierarch[y]" (Berry, *Laughing* 137). Thus, Titus has a leading role in the downfall of Roman hierarchy, as he returns to the state of nature, and acts in line with the state of rivalry.

The Roman hierarchy is under question because of the interactions with the Goths. Therefore, rivalry, and violence dominate the actions of the characters. Regarding violence, as Girard says, "[o]nce violence has penetrated a community it engages in an orgy of self-propagation. There appears to be no way of bringing the reprisals to a halt before the community has been annihilated" (*Violence and the Sacred* 67). That is what happens after the sacrifice of Alarbus. Many violent events take place because of the contagious feature of violence that contaminates anyone around it. Thus, Titus' rivalrous actions against the Goths destroy the Roman hierarchy.

Titus stands as the ideal Roman general within the Roman hierarchy. He respects manhood, honour, and reputation to the extent that his family comes after his fame, and honour. This is accepted by Lavinia, as she is shaped in a culture replete with

patriarchal codes. “In peace and honour live Lord Titus long; / My noble lord and father, live in fame!” says Lavinia, who demonstrates the prestige of the father (1.1.160-61; Cohen 3). Titus’ power is magnified as such: “O bless me here with thy victorious hand, / Whose fortunes Rome's best citizens applaud” (1.1.166-67; Rowe 286). The concepts of honour and fame are the representations of Romanness and manhood both for Titus, his family, and the Roman brothers (Belsey 124). However, following honour, glory, and fame strengthens self-centredness of Titus, who, as a result, does not care for public gain. As Hobbes assumes, putting forward “glory” leads many to quarrel, and to think of personal gains, and it leads the repressed rivalrous state of nature to be revealed.

Among the socially and culturally attributed characteristics of manhood are nobility, greatness, honour, courage, pride, and wisdom. Titus has been victorious in battlefields many times, and he goes on fighting, as he seems to know no other way of living. Titus is not greedy in political titles because to be powerful is equal to be an honourable soldier for him. That is, war has become a lifestyle for Titus. Titus, who believes in the power of army, praises dying gloriously. Therefore, the concepts of honour, nobility, and pride which are attributed to manhood make Titus self-centred. His selfishness, an indicator of the state of nature, begins to corrupt the social order.

As regards violence that stems from rivalry, Girard says: “[e]ach sees in the other the usurper of a legitimacy that he thinks he is defending but that he is in fact undermining” (*Violence and the Sacred* 71). In other words, each rival supposes that the other takes a position of power and/or the desired object by force and/or illegally. For this reason, “[a]nything one may affirm or deny about either of the adversaries seems instantly applicable to the other. Reciprocity is busy aiding each party in his own destruction” (71). That is to say, each rival assumes that the other deploys unjust violence to the other; therefore, violence becomes reciprocal. The reciprocal violence of Andronicus and the Goths is justifiable from their points of view. Yet, each party brings forth its “own destruction”. In other words, each rival feels justified in his/her acts of violence. Likewise, Saturninus and Bassianus, the sibling rivals, suppose that each is right in being ready for committing violence (Reese 79). However, the tense atmosphere is moderated by the time Titus declares Saturninus as the new emperor. Titus rejects to become the emperor, by saying, “[g]ive me a staff of honour for mine

age, / But not a sceptre to control the world” (1.1.201-2). However, “transfer[ring]” the right of sovereignty “to another” would be, in Hobbes’ word, “the greatest evil that can happen” within authority (*Leviathan* 222). It may lead to the dissolution of the authority. In such a case, man may return into the state of nature (Hobbes, *Leviathan* 222-23). The power of authority keeps the society together in peace whereas a weakening of authority leads to a loss of power. Thus, the rival brother Saturninus and Bassianus, and the rival revengers Titus and Tamora subvert power relations.

Power creates its subjects, as anyone around the sovereign power becomes a subject for the authority (Hobbes, *Leviathan* 114). For example, Titus is shaped, and constructed by the army, a leading factor of the authority. The practices of army make Titus subject to the extent that he has no roles out of the army. Titus is not good at rhetoric, and has no interest in politics. For Titus, “the sword [is] translated into politics...by the concept of honour” (James 308). In other words, personal honour is above becoming the head of the empire for Titus because “... a long-established military and chivalric tradition ... assumes a state of affairs in which resort to violence is natural and justifiable; the recurrence of personal and political situations in which conflict cannot be otherwise resolved than violently” (James 309). That is, the disciplinary techniques of the army restrict Titus in politics. To resolve any conflict, and rivalry, he resorts to violence. However, conflicts, and rivalry lead to “a crisis of authority”, as the survival of state is less important than personal gains (Foessel 308).

Titus does not grasp the importance of ruling the state for the benefit of public. Titus places Saturninus as the new emperor. Saturninus, in return, praises Titus by saying “...for an onset, Titus, to advance / Thy name and honourable family, / Lavinia will I make my empress” (1.1.242-44). That is, after Titus declares Saturninus as the new emperor, Saturninus announces that he would marry Lavinia to show gratitude. However, such an action is against family bonds, as Saturninus already knows that Lavinia and Bassianus love each other (Belsey 125). This time, mimetic desire dominates Saturninus’ actions. The “escalation of rivalry” between the Roman brothers becomes “an entangled web of mimetic interaction” (Girard, *A Theatre of Envy* 30). Therefore, mimetic desire is revealed once these characters are in the state of nature. Lavinia, within this context, becomes the desired object for the Roman brothers, who are in the web of mimetic desire (Barkan 46). As Leonard Tennenhouse

remarks, “Shakespeare uses [Lavinia’s] body as the site for political rivalry among various families with competing claims to power over Rome. For one of them to possess Lavinia is for that family to display power over the rest...” (108). That is why Lavinia is “Rome’s rich ornament” (1.1.55), as Bassianus calls her. During the political conflict, Saturninus codes Lavinia as a mediated object, whose value is heightened by Bassianus, the mediator. Mimetic desire leads the Roman brothers to turn their attention to Lavinia, who “personifies the state, which implies that her consent ought to go to the man chosen as Rome’s emperor” (Ray 31).

Rivalry for Lavinia stems from mimetic desire and Saturninus speaks like Bassianus’ double. Saturninus calls Lavinia as “Rome’s royal mistress” whereas she is “Rome’s rich ornament”, for Bassianus (1.1.245; 1.1.55). Saturninus’ statement illustrates the case of mimetic doubling. Therefore, Girard is right in saying: “[w]hen mimetic rivalry escalates beyond a certain point, the rivals are engaged in endless conflicts that undifferentiate them more and more; they all become doubles of one another” (*A Theatre of Envy* 185). That is, the individual differences between Bassianus and Saturninus dissipate as soon as they mimetically desire the same object. However, before mimetic desire actualizes, the Roman brothers have already left out the requirements of the social contract. Each becomes a rival, and enemy to the other in the web of the state of rivalry. Therefore, there is a symmetry of events that presents the relationship between the state of nature and mimetic desire. A relationship that brings forth the state of rivalry.

Rivalry between the “double” brothers escalates to the point that “Lavinia is surprised” by Bassianus (1.1.288). The word “surprised” means that Lavinia is captured un expectedly. Mutius helps Bassianus “and with [his] sword ... keep[s] th[e] door safe” (1.1.292). Upon the incident, Titus says “My sons would never so dishonour me” and Titus kills his own son, Mutius (1.1.300). By killing his son, Titus supposes that he maintains his power, and authority, as he is “half crazed with grief” (Belsey 135). On his part, Titus sustains his personal honour, and he says, “[t]raitor, restore Lavinia to the emperor” (1.1.301). In both cases, Titus decides by his own free will as the sovereign of the family because of the Roman belief of “*patria potestas*”², the rule that the father has the right to let live or take life. Therefore, killing of Mutius is a sacrifice to save the honour of the family, but more importantly for Titus, who pays

great attention to the power of honour above all (Kahn, *Shakespeare's Classical Tragedies* 212). Therefore, one apparent characteristic of the kingly/authorial power³ is to take or give life.

Titus and Tamora, the representatives of different cultures, regard each other “the usurper of a legitimacy that [s/]he thinks [s/]he is defending but that [s/]he is in fact undermining” (Girard, *Violence and the Sacred* 71). Each rival assumes that the other tries to take power and prestige by force. In other words, both Titus and Tamora destroy the social order by equal measure as they “are drawn unwittingly into the structure of violent reciprocity”³ (Girard, *Violence and the Sacred* 69). However, concealment of violence from the society through projecting the violence on a scapegoat becomes a sacrificial ritual as is the case of the sacrificing of Alarbus or the killing of Mutius. However, the projection of violence renews itself as it becomes an act of revenge in the case of rivalry. Such acts of violence, stemming from the state of rivalry, turn into cycle of revenges, resulting in sacrifices. In this case, because of the revenge cycle, no one admits that s/he is responsible of his/her evil response; yet, s/he wants to find a guilty one (Girard, *The Scapegoat* 86).

Marcus Andronicus realizes that Mutius was not guilty, as he says “[t]hou art a Roman, be not barbarous” (1.1.383). His is an act similar to what he does in the case of sacrificing Alarbus. Similar to Tamora, Marcus says, “this is impiety in you” (1.1.360). As Liebler remarks, “[t]he violation of Roman burial rites by a Roman immediately establishes the pattern of ritual perversion”; therefore, killing Mutius and not letting him be buried in the Andronici tomb is against Roman burial culture (144). Titus, therefore, acts against the norms of the social contract by putting the concept of honour above all. Titus comes up with the concept of honour any time he commits violence because as James has put it, “[h]onour could both legitimize and provide moral reinforcement for a politics of violence” (309). However, the sacrificial rituals do not always terminate acts of violence, as “[a] community may pass from good to evil reciprocity for petty reasons, but the reasons may be so powerful and convincing that it amounts to the same thing” (Girard, *The Scapegoat* 86). Violence exercised through warfare, capital punishment, rituals, religious rites, and warfare by a state so as to provide the security is authorized. However, if such acts are done for personal gains, it may be called unauthorized violence. To sustain peace and order in any

society, such acts of authorized and lawful violence may be required. Otherwise, anarchy, and enmity may prowl around.

Saturninus takes the hand of the enemy, as he gets angry with the Andronici family. The effect of the relationship between mimetic desire and the state of rivalry comes to such a point that Saturninus gets Tamora, the barbarous Goth queen, as Roman empress. The political identity of Rome is threatened because of Saturninus' sudden personal decision that may affect the whole society. Saturninus' anger is an act in line with the state of nature because an emperor may not do so for the benefit of his country, as he is expected to rule the country without bringing in personal matters. Saturninus and Tamora's marriage may disrupt the social and political harmony in Rome. As Hobbes argues, "when either they have no common enemy, or he that by one part is held for an enemy is by another part held for a friend, they must needs by the difference of their interests dissolve, and fall again into a war amongst themselves" (*Leviathan* 112). Tamora was the "common enemy" for both Titus and Saturninus; yet, she becomes more than "a friend" for Saturninus.

After she becomes the Roman empress, Tamora hides her intention: to revenge the Roman commander Titus. Both Tamora and Titus hide their feelings of revenge, and rivalry, as "there is some contentious problem that remains unresolved" (Goertz 153). Each rival becomes a mediator to the other, for two reasons. The first reason is that Tamora, the captive Goth queen, now becomes a Roman empress. Therefore, the inferior Tamora becomes a superior rival because of her new title. The second reason is that Tamora hides her feelings toward Titus. She hides them because in case of any conflict in Rome, she realizes that Saturninus' emperorship may get into danger, as the Romans, in Tamora's words, "take Titus' part" (1.1.451). Thus, each realizes the potential power of the other, and each aims to destroy the other secretly. Therefore, such kind of desire is reciprocal desire. As soon as the model realizes that he is imitated by an imitator, the model imitates the imitator so as to set aside the obstacle that the other places on his way. Therefore, each becomes a model to, and an imitator of the other rival. On the surface, both Titus and Tamora accommodate themselves to the requirements of the social contract. Yet, their true feelings, and intentions are hidden. For example, as soon as Tamora becomes the Queen of Romans, she says,

Titus, I am incorporate in Rome,
A Roman now adopted happily,

And must advise the emperor for his good.
 This day all quarrels die, Andronicus;
 And let it be mine honour, good my lord,
 That I have reconciled your friends and you. (1.1.467-72)

Her addressing seems to be convincing enough; yet, Marcus Andronicus, who is after the welfare of Roman state, is aware of Tamora's hypocrisy, as he says, "That on mine honour here do I protest" (1.1.482). Marcus tries to warn Saturninus and Titus; yet, Saturninus silences Marcus by saying "Away, and talk not; trouble us no more" (1.1.483). The rival states Rome and Goths are combined one by this marriage. However, Titus becomes silent, as he supposes that he is already ashamed of his daughter's elopement with Bassianus. Although Saturninus is the emperor, he has no ability to sustain the authority, as he cares for what Tamora tells him to do. Therefore, he does not care about the possible dangers of a marriage with an enemy queen. Tamora acts as if there was no rivalry between her and Titus. She hides her intention, and in an aside to Saturninus, she says,

My lord, be ruled by me, be won at last,
 Dissemble all your griefs and discontents.
 You are but newly planted in your throne;
 Lest then the people, and patricians too,
 Upon a just survey, take Titus' part,
 And so supplant you for ingratitude (1.1.447-52)

Tamora realizes that Saturninus acts personally; therefore, she takes advantage of this situation. Although Tamora has also power by becoming the Roman empress, her rivalry with Titus continues. Therefore, "a rivalry does not end merely because one side has dramatically increased its strength" (Goertz 155). Power relations, and power distribution do not remain fixed in the state of rivalry, but it is rivalry that remains constant between the two sides (Goertz 155). She is conscious of the fact that Saturninus thinks not in the way an emperor would do. Tamora makes her point clear:

I'll find a day to massacre them all,
 And raze their faction and their family,
 The cruel father and his traitorous sons
 To whom I sued for my dear son's life,
 And make them know what 'tis to let a queen
 Kneel in the streets and beg for grace in vain. (1.1.455-60)

She is jealous of, and angry with Titus's power. As she is aware of Titus' power, Tamora warns Saturninus not to fight with him, as Titus has the power of a reliable leader in the eyes of the Romans. There, as Girard says, "Shakespeare turns into evidence of mimetic envy... Envy loves to hide, but it also loves company because it

wants to make converts and, in order to contaminate them, it must go on display” (*A Theatre of Envy* 187). Tamora’s envy strengthens her state of rivalry. As for Titus, personal matters take precedence over public issues. Titus’ actions are “motivated by the pursuit of glory or, more often, vainglory: the restless seeking after power and reputation at the expense of self-interest, even the interest of self-preservation” (Kahn, *Hobbes, Romance* 5). The good soldier who has fought for the good of Rome now returns to the state of nature, and state of rivalry.

Within the state of rivalry, Tamora is a barbarous Goth Queen whereas Titus is a respected Roman general. However, through their plans of revenge, both lose their differences, and they become equal by subverting the hierarchy. Equality leads human beings to feel insecure, as every man becomes a threat to another (*Leviathan* 84). Both become double rivals by losing individual differences; therefore, the rivals become indistinguishable (Girard, *A Theatre of Envy* 274). Roman hierarchy collapses step by step as a result of a crisis of authority.

Titus and Tamora, as rivalrous doubles, compete for gaining power and seek ways to overwhelm one another. Tamora receives help from Aaron (Cowdell et al 5). As the representatives of the state of nature, Tamora and Aaron think of their self-interests; therefore, their status is associated with barbarism (Liebler 142-43; Turgut 80). The two cause the Roman political identity and culture to devastate through their plans. Following his interaction with Tamora, Saturninus becomes silent to Tamora’s idea of killing a Roman commander, as she declares her revengeful plans “to massacre ...[the Andronici family] all” (1.1.455). Saturninus’ error is to let a prisoner of war “rule” Rome (1.1.447). A reasonable Roman empire may not let an enemy do such a violent act, stemming from the state of rivalry. Tamora’s state of nature violates the Roman social contract, as the empire is hybridized by her marriage to Saturninus. Their marriage leads to disorder, mimetic crisis, and chaos. The reason is that the Goths are the opposite of what the Romans are. Romans represent the civilization while Goths represent barbarism. The Goths are in the state of nature because they do not have a communal life, whereas the Romans act through the rules of the social contract. However, the arrival of Goths, the rivalrous quarrel of Roman brothers, their mimetic desire for Lavinia, and the effects of the war lead the Romans to leave the civilized life, and to offend the social contract.

Act 2 brings the subplot of the fight of the two Goth brothers. The rivalry of Demetrius and Chiron is similar to that of Bassianus and Saturninus (Dickson 389).

Chiron says,

Tis not the difference of a year or two
 Makes me less gracious, or thee more fortunate:
 I am as able and as fit as thou
 To serve, and to deserve my mistress' grace,
 And that my sword upon thee shall approve,
 And plead my passions for Lavinia's love. (1.1.530-5)

Like Bassianus, Chiron ignores age factor which is crucial in patriarchal order. Chiron becomes a rival to his brother Demetrius. Theirs is an example to mimetic desire. At first, each considers himself equal to one another. Yet, as the mimetic desire escalates, the Goth brothers experience a crisis because of mimetic doubling. They present almost no individual differences, as they speak like mimetic doubles. Similar to Bassianus and Saturninus, Demetrius and Chiron desire Lavinia. However, Aaron advises them to be reasonable, as he uses reason for cunning (Belsey 123). Aaron is aware of the danger of such mimetic rivalry, as he says, "Why, are ye mad? Or know ye not in Rome / How furious and impatient they be, / And cannot brook competitors in love?" (1.1.574-6). Aaron is aware of the condition that Demetrius and Chiron are "competitors" who are in the state of sibling rivalry (Ray 35). Aaron says, "The forest walks are wide and spacious, / And many unfrequented plots there are / Fitted by kind rape and villainy" (1.1.614-6). As a man in the state of nature, Aaron knows the rules of the forest, an uncivilized place.

Aaron mediates Tamora's decisions and actions as well. Titus' shining power, in a way, fascinates Tamora's decisions. The moor Aaron plots Lavinia's rape and Bassianus' murder. He supposes that Tamora is now far from the reach of the fatal results of envy, as he says, "Now climbeth Tamora Olympus' top, / Safe out of fortune's shot, and sits aloft, / Secure of thunder's crack or lightning flash, / Advanced above pale envy's threatening reach" (1.1.500-3). Aaron aims to make Tamora more powerful than Titus. Aaron tells Demetrius and Chiron to rape Lavinia together, as Aaron knows that the two brothers desire her. Aaron is also aware how honour is crucial for Titus. For Aaron, Lavinia's rape may lead to a social unrest, and the social

contract may be destroyed more easily by the results of rape. As Robert S. Miola remarks, because of Lavinia's rape "the destruction of her familial bonds have disastrous implications for the order in the city and the hierarchical order in nature itself" (*Titus Andronicus* 87). Aaron aims to subvert the patriarchal order through his plan that leads the Goths to act in line with mimetic desire. A web of mimetic desire materializes among the Goths, who are directed and mediated by each other. Tamora is the mediator of her sons, and Aaron is the mediator of Tamora as Aaron says, "Madam, though Venus govern your desires, / Saturn is dominator over mine" (2.2.30-31). For Aaron, Roman goddess of desire, prosperity, and victory is Tamora's guide whereas Aaron follows "Saturn", the god of dissolution and wealth. Aaron declares his villainous plan, "[t]his is the day of doom for Bassianus, / His Philomel must lose her tongue today" (2.2.42-43). Aaron's plan may subvert the Roman order and hierarchy.

Regarding cultural and social order, Girard remarks, degree, and rank are the principles of social and cultural order, as the individuals have their places depending on their ranks within the society (*Violence and the Sacred* 50). The balance within the Roman state breaks down because of the barbarous outsiders, Goths, who destroy the social degree in Rome. Rome stands as the embodiment of civilization that is secured by a defensive wall that stands as a barrier between the dangers of barbarism and the advantages of civilization (Velz 11). The protective wall is demolished by the actions and plans of the barbarous Goths. Such a break down through the barbarous Goths is a result of the state of nature, and rivalry because the Goths are not adapted to civil life. Therefore, the state of nature and civil state are embodied by the rival cultures: the Goths and the Romans (Moschovakis 479). Such concepts of communal life, mutual agreement, law and order, and power relations are far from the Goths' lifestyles, as hierarchy and rank are not established within their society.

The Goths, however, are aware how crucial and honourable hierarchy is for the Romans. Therefore, Tamora does not kill Titus, as he is powerful in the Roman hierarchy. Instead of him, Tamora chooses Lavinia as the surrogate victim. After Lavinia is raped on the dead body of Bassianus, Lavinia's tongue and hands are cut. Demetrius and Chiron become doubles and mediators of hatred, as "mimetic effects ... affect the choice of the only entities left inside the system, the doubles themselves.

Mimetic contamination will now determine more and more the choice of antagonists” (Girard, *A Theatre of Envy* 186). Demetrius and Chiron have Alarbus’s revenge, as they obey what Tamora orders them to do (Belsey 140). Similar to Alarbus, Lavinia is hewed.

Aaron’s plan leads Lavinia to be raped, Bassianus to be killed, Quintus and Martius to be accused of Bassianus’ murder. Therefore, these violent results of Aaron’s plan weaken Titus’ power whereas Titus’ mimetic rival and double Tamora gains power. Mimetic hatred prowls around, as the state of nature prevails over the social contract. Tamora, in a way, clarifies how Titus becomes her mediator of hatred, as she says,

Remember, boys, I poured forth tears in vain
To save your brother from the sacrifice,
But fierce Andronicus would not relent.
Therefore away with her, and use her as you will:
The worse to her, the better loved of me. (2.2.163-67)

There, the tables are turned, the captive Tamora is now the Roman empress. Therefore, Tamora is the “pitiless” one who desires her sons to be cruel to show off power, as her “empowerment enables her to avenge her son’s death” (Liebler 146). Tamora and Titus become doubles of mimetic hatred in the cycle of rivalry. Titus vows to revenge as his daughter Lavinia is silenced literally. Violence becomes an “evil reciprocity” as in the case of Lavinia's rape and dismemberment (Girard, *The Scapegoat* 86). Titus becomes lonely, as his authority fades now that his sons are accused of murdering the emperor’s brother. However, for Hobbes, revenge is against the seventh laws of nature because this law states that “in revenges ... men look not at the greatness of the evil past, but the greatness of the good to follow” (*Leviathan* 101). Titus’ plan of revenge is not for the “good” of Rome; therefore, it has nothing to do with the “security of the future time” (101).

In Act 3, soon after his sons are arrested for killing Bassianus, Titus gives a speech similar to that of Tamora’s when she begged for her son Alarbus, “Hear me, grave fathers; noble tribunes, stay! / For pity of mine age, whose youth was spent / In dangerous wars whilst you securely slept; / For all my blood in Rome's great quarrel shed” (3.1.1-4). The begging scene of Titus looks similar to that of Tamora’s. Yet, for Titus, honour is still a steady truth that represents his self-centredness, as he says “For two-and-twenty sons I never wept, / Because they died in honour’s lofty bed” (3.1.10-

11; Watson 166). Honour, here, is a human passion that inactivates reason, law of nature. Therefore, Titus does not think about Roman judicial system, which may release Martius and Quintus, if they are found innocent by the Judges and Senators. That is to say, Titus does not trust the Roman judges; therefore, he challenges the reliability of Roman authority, as he says, “were they but attired in grave weeds / Rome could afford no tribunes like to these” (3.1.43-44). There, Titus discusses the formal authorized dresses of the judges and senators, but he regards them as damned, as he says, “tribunes with their tongues doom men to death” (3.1.47). Titus disrespects the Roman Authority, as he does not trust their objectivity. Although Titus is aware of the cruelty, and illegality of killing the brother of an emperor, he does not want to believe that his children have committed such a crime. As Titus says, “If they did kill thy husband, then be joyful, / Because *the law hath ta'en revenge* on them. / No, no, they would not do so foul a deed”, it is seen that Titus is not sure about the innocence of his sons (3.1.117-9, italics mine). However, as soon as he finds out that Lucius is banished, he turns his back on the Roman authority forever. The similitude of Tamora and Titus’ begging for their children, and the rivalry between each of the Roman and Goth brothers reinforces the representation of mimetic desire that stems from barbarism and ignoring the authority and the requirements of the social contract. Thus, the state of nature, and mimetic desire work together to establish the state of rivalry.

Although Titus does not have any clue or proof as evidence for the innocence of his children, Titus makes up his mind through thinking for his personal gain. It is the feeling of grief, and shame that makes Titus desperate. As Hobbes argues, “Grief, for the discovery of some defect of ability, is SHAME, or the passion that discovereth itself in BLUSHING; and consisteth in the apprehension of some thing dishonourable; and in young men, is a sign of the love of good reputation, and commendable: in old men it is a sign of the same...” (*Leviathan* 39). Titus feels ashamed, as he is unable to prove that his children are innocent. Also, Titus feels shame for the possibility of such a “dishonourable” act. As aforementioned, Titus follows “good reputation”, as he repeats “honour” several times. By the time Titus says, “My sons’ sweet blood will make it shame and blush”, he refers to “shame” on his honour and on his “good reputation” because of the charge of treason of his children (3.1.15).

Titus, in this sense, loses all his distinctions in terms of individuality, and he becomes a “double” of the Goths. That is, he becomes almost the same in terms of mediation by the mediator Tamora. As Girard has put it, “[o]rder, peace, and fecundity depend on cultural distinctions; it is not these distinctions but the loss of them that gives birth to fierce rivalries” (*Violence and the Sacred* 49). As the “cultural distinctions” between the civilized Romans, and the barbarous Goths dissipate, rivalry escalates. Not only the citizens but also the patricians are in the web of mimetic hatred. The civilized Rome turns into “a wilderness of tigers”, as Titus says (3.1.54). There, his statement is close to Hobbes’ argument that regards “every man [as] enemy to everyman” (Hobbes, *Leviathan* 84). As René Girard has put it, “it is not the differences but the loss of them that gives rise [to] violence and chaos” (*Violence and the Sacred* 51). Since individual differences between Titus and Tamora decrease, mimetic desire and its chaotic results prevail. Becoming violent barbarians stems from mimetic desire, scapegoating of Alarbus, and state of nature as the Roman authority is disordered (Watson 167). For the Goths, following passions is crucial whereas Romans are expected to follow reason.

Thomas Hobbes argues on human passions which may inactivate reason. Similarly, as Titus speaks on passions, he says, “Is not my sorrows deep, having no bottom? / Then be my passions bottomless with them” (3.1.217-8). After Lavinia is raped, her tongue and hands cut off, Lucius is banished, and Titus’ sons are accused of killing Bassianus, Titus feels helpless, and he cuts off his hand as ransom so as to set his sons free, as Aaron tells him to do. Marcus, who believes in the supremacy of law and public order, says, “yet let reason govern thy laments” (3.1.219). However, Titus is far from grasping the importance of reason, the law of nature, which is proposed by Marcus. Following that, “the heads of [Titus’] two noble sons” are brought to Titus, who vows to revenge (3.1.237). Titus rejects to obey the rules of reason, law of nature, as his sorrow is too “deep” that the state of “fierce rivalry” surrounds him (Girard, *Violence and the Sacred* 49). Similar to Tamora, once his mimetic rival and now his rivalrous double, Titus returns to the enemy for help, as he tells Lucius to “Hie to the Goths, and raise an army there” (3.1.286). Therefore, once again the state of nature reigns over the social contract and civilization. Regarding the weakening of the social contract, Charvet remarks, “the state of war is the product of

the inherent tendency of men's natures, which underlies all social life, and which would break out in unrestrained form were it not held in check by the devices of a commonwealth" (41). The devices of Roman authority that controls any civil disobedience have weakened since Saturninus' marriage with Tamora.

The relationship between the state of nature and mimetic desire weakens the foundation of Roman order. This relationship leads social and individual differences to be lost. Loss of individual differences is represented by the representation of the rivals: Demetrius – Chiron, Saturninus – Bassianus, Titus – Tamora. Because of the mimetic doubles in the state of nature, and rivalry, "the maintenance of peace and order" gets difficult (Girard, *A Theatre of Envy* 274). Loss of social and cultural diversity is represented by the hybridization of the Goths and Romans. As Girard remarks, "[t]his loss forces men into a perpetual confrontation, one that strips them of all their distinctive characteristics—in short, of their 'identities'" (*Violence and the Sacred* 51). The hybridization of cultures leads the individuals to grow away from the necessities of the social contract, communal living, and to become doubles, and to lose their individual differences that establish social order.

As thus far analysed, Titus is in the state of nature for some reasons. First, because he rejects to become the emperor, which may have enabled him to establish authority. Then, he could avert possible factions and conflicts because of the sibling rivals Saturninus and Bassianus who desire to have power, and to become the emperor. Second, Titus sacrifices Alarbus in a barbarous way, which besmirches Roman ritual and sacrifice culture. This sacrifice may have established an environment that is based on actions related to state of nature because of the contagious effect of violence (Kahn, *Shakespeare's Classical Tragedies* 211). Titus becomes double of Tamora as his encounter with the barbarian Goths keeps him out of the Roman culture. Third, Titus does not respect the Roman senators for their judgments of Martius and Quintus. Maintaining honour and glory is vital for Titus. Yet, this makes him a man who is in the state of nature, as he is after his personal gain. As Foakes points out, "virtue and honour are drained of meaning in a play that relishes cruelty" (*Shakespeare and Violence* 54). Therefore, the Roman authority is in question after the hybridization of Rome with the Goths, the two rival states. As Girard has put it, "[t]he more nearly 'perfect' the doubles are as doubles, the easier it becomes to confuse them, and ... to

[e]xchange or substitute one for another or for many others” (Girard, *A Theatre of Envy* 186). At the end of the play, the Goths and the Romans become mimetic doubles because the cultural differences that establish each society disappear.

In Act 5, Titus gives a feast which is announced by Marcus as such: “[t]he feast is ready which the careful Titus / Hath ordained to an honourable end, / For peace, for love, for league, and *good to Rome*” (5.3.21-23, italics mine). Honour is emphasized for announcing Titus’ feast which may be for the good of Rome, as feasts serve to unity, and peace within a society. However, by this feast, Titus has a plan of revenge, as he cooks “a human pastry” (Greenblatt, *Shakespeare’s Freedom* 57). Therefore, Titus treats a personal problem publicly. Titus and Saturninus debate on the issue of honour of family with the example of Virginius (Law 145). Saturninus says, “the girl should not survive her shame, / And by her presence still renew his sorrows” (5.3.40-41). Following that, Titus kills Lavinia to defend his honour, and to let Lavinia’s “shame” die with her (5.3.46). Lavinia becomes the scapegoat for the Andronicis and the Goths to purge violence on. Titus kills Lavinia because “... dual conflicts give way to associations of several people against a single one...” (Girard, *A Theatre of Envy* 186). Lavinia becomes the scapegoat as “mimetic rivalry ... produces ... the breeding of violence and collective victimage...” (Girard, *A Theatre of Envy* 187). Lavinia, in the end, becomes a victim of the state of rivalry, as both Goths and Romans breed violence on her. A general fight takes place: Titus stabs Tamora, in turn, Saturninus stabs Titus, then, Lucius stabs Saturninus.

Within all of these acts of violence, the scapegoat is one: Lavinia. Lavinia becomes the scapegoat; first, as a result of the conflict between Saturninus and Bassianus, second, as a result of the conflict between Demetrius and Chiron and Aaron’s plan; third, as a result of Saturninus’ confirmation of Virginius’ killing of his daughter, an event that leads to external mediation for Titus who kills Lavinia. Therefore, Lavinia’s “silent presence onstage in so many scenes [the ones reminded above] shows Shakespeare making the most of the violence done to her” (Foakes, *Shakespeare and Violence* 55). Titus becomes a subject of patriarchal history, as he follows what Virginius⁴ did. Through this story, an external mediation occurs. The mediator is Virginius who becomes a model to Titus who prefers honour above everything. However, although Lucius returns with an army of Goths, the order he

restores is “half Roman-Goth, [that] will eventually destroy what is left of Rome” as represented through Aaron’s burial till the head (Liebler 147). In a way, Rome is still headless now that “Rome has lost all vestiges of its political identity” (Liebler 147). The end of the play is similar to what Saturninus did when he married the Goth Queen. That is, Rome becomes hybridized at the end of the play, as Lucius associates with the Goths.

In conclusion, the state of nature reveals itself by the death of the Roman emperor whose sons act in accordance with the state of rivalry. Conflicts for power distribution form the manners of rival siblings. Also, following glory, and honour is the key factor that generates both the state of nature and the state of rivalry. As Hobbes says, in the state of nature, “men are continually in competition for honour and dignity ... and consequently amongst men there ariseth on that ground, envy, and hatred, and finally war” (*Leviathan* 113). Titus’ following “honour, dignity” and glory leads his passions of “envy and hatred” to be revealed. These are among the passions that may end up in the state of rivalry. However, as Titus becomes a rival to Tamora, he loses his individual differences, and becomes a barbarous murderer. As Titus, Tamora, and Saturninus lose individual differences, acts of violence escalate. Moreover, the hybridization of Roman and Goth culture; first, through Tamora and Saturninus’ marriage; and second, through Lucius’ alliance with Goths to attack Rome, ruin Roman social, cultural and political order. As for the sibling rivalry for emperorship between Saturninus and Bassianus, future crisis occurs because of mimetic desire. The reason is that Saturninus marries Lavinia, the desired object, to surpass Bassianus’s mediation. However, strategies in the state of rivalry depend on past experiences of conflict between rivals. Therefore, as a strategy because of the state of rivalry, Titus asks Lucius to attack Rome with the Goths, as he plots to avenge Tamora and the Romans (Goertz 149). Therefore, in the state of rivalry future disputes between rivals form their behaviours in line with the outcomes of both the state of nature and mimetic desire. For Titus, as civil laws are not sufficient to demand justice, the state of nature and mimetic desire conduce him to the state of rivalry so as to look for ways of revenge. “[G]lorying in the hurt of another” tends “to no end” as in the case of Titus’ and Tamora’s rivalrous revenge (Hobbes, *Leviathan* 101). Such an act is “vain-glory”

which is “contrary to reason” (101). Thus, out of the civil state, glory leads one’s self-destruction, as rivalry aggravates disorder, the crisis of degree, and mimetic desire.

Blood hath been shed ere now, i' th' olden time,
 Ere humane statute purged the gentle weal;
 Ay, and since too, murders have been performed
 Too terrible for the ear. (*Macbeth* 3.4.74-77)

CHAPTER THREE

THE SEEDS of RIVALRY and DIFFIDENCE in *MACBETH*

Macbeth is supposed to be written in 1606, published in the *First Folio* in 1623, and it was performed by the King's Men before James I of England (VI of Scotland). Shakespeare takes the material of the play from Raphael Holinshed's (1525-1580) *Chronicles* (1577) and Scottish history (Clark and Mason 26). *Macbeth* also has similarities with *Titus Andronicus*. For example, the protagonists of both plays are commanders who are all related to kingship/emperorship. However, one key difference is that Titus refuses to become emperor, as "glory" for him is above emperorship and is associated with making a name, whereas Macbeth kills the king to take over his throne, and ensures that his rivals are taken care of (James 153). Macbeth considers Malcolm, Donalbain, and Banquo as rivals to his throne; so, he fears them. His fear is related to "diffidence" which is a lack of self-confidence. Along with "glory" and "competition", "diffidence" is one of the three causes of conflict related to the state of nature and the state of rivalry (*Leviathan* 83). In other words, Titus and Macbeth differ in that the former privileges having an honourable name, while the latter's ambition is to have a crown, an endless desire that leads Macbeth to act out of a sense of rivalry so as to secure his title. Within this context, the state of rivalry becomes the focal point for attaining his desire for personal gain, having been pressured by the state of rivalry that stems from the state of nature.

This chapter is based on the analysis of Macbeth's state of rivalry, his relationship with other characters, and his decisions and actions to examine the relationship between the state of nature and mimetic desire. Macbeth remains in between the struggle of reason and passion, two notions that are examined by Thomas Hobbes who relates them to the law of nature and the state of nature, respectively. In

between these notions, Macbeth establishes his Authority on lawless acts, such as regicide, accusing innocent watchmen of regicide, leading prince Malcolm and Donalbain to look guilty of regicide, and hiring murderers to kill Banquo and Fleance. Within the context of Hobbesian political theory, as has been analysed in the previous chapter, of the three causes of conflict, “glory” leads Titus to act like a man who is in the state of nature. However, “diffidence”, as the second reason of conflict “in the nature of man”, is the focal point that leads Macbeth to act in line with the state of rivalry (*Leviathan* 83). In this respect, this chapter asserts that “diffidence” leads Macbeth to kill his rivals in order to safeguard his reign over his unauthorized kingdom.

Act I introduces the bleak setting outside of civilization, and the three witches without any social rank. The isolated and bleak land, which is the setting of the opening scene, evokes the idea of being far from civilization and society. The three witches, known as the weird sisters, promise each other “to meet with Macbeth” (1.1.7) as soon as “the battle’ lost, and won” (1.1.4). In 1597, James VI and I published *Daemonologie*, an examination of witchcraft. The Kings’ book is about magic, trial and punishments of witches. The King excludes the witches and/or women with magical power from the social hierarchy (McDonald 47). Similarly, the witches in the play are represented as being outside of society without a place within the social contract. That is to say, they are not interested in what is just and/or unjust. Although the witches meet Banquo as well, they are not very interested in him, as they specifically decide to meet Macbeth. However, their interest in Macbeth leads the audience/reader to wonder as to what extent Macbeth may act out of the law of nature, and whether or not he may subvert the social hierarchy for his private objectives. The ambiguous statement of the witches, “Fair is foul and foul is fair”, further arouses curiosity as to why and how anyone or anything fair would become foul (1.1. 9). This statement may refer to the theme of appearance versus reality. It means that anything, any event and/or anyone that seems to be good may be bad indeed (Ekmekçioğlu 197; Belsey 135). This is significant in the sense that although Macbeth seems to be a good soldier, he begins to think of his personal interests soon after he starts a relationship with the witches, as they enable Macbeth's repressed passions to be revealed.

Therefore, Macbeth's fair actions during the war may be contaminated by his foul plans.

In the second scene of Act I, "a captain" informs King Duncan regarding the state of war, and considers the warriors "as two spent swimmers that do cling together" (1.2.9). "Together[ness]" of the enemy and the Scottish army may represent a defect within the army hierarchy. The army stands for the power of King. Moreover, authority sustains order via hierarchy under civil laws (Doğan Adanur 1052; Berry, *Laughing* 137). Any crack because of war or economic problem may lead to an outbreak of rebellion, as King Duncan is informed of the revolts. In this sense, the civil rebellion of Thane of Cawdor in addition to the ongoing war with Norway are direct threats to King Duncan's authority which is the warrantor of peace in the state. As Hobbes remarks, "to stand to our Covenants, or to keep faith, is a thing necessary for the obtaining of peace" (Hobbes, *De Cive* 62). In other words, disrespecting the requirements of a state, as by the Thane of Cawdor's revolt in this case, ends in breaking the peace. The Thane of Cawdor looked to gain more power by his disobedience, an act against peace. The sovereign power, by the help of the law of nature, sustains peace. On this, Hobbes remarks that a state is secure "at least from perishing by internal diseases" so long as "man had the use of reason" (*Leviathan* 212). Therefore, the treason of Thane of Cawdor, from a Hobbesian view, may show that there are "subjects" of the King who act against the norms of reason.

The political conflict, in this context, results from "the revolt" (1.2.2). It is strengthened by the rebellion of "merciless Macdonald", who has "the multiplying villainies of nature" (1.2.9; 1.2.11). As rebellion denotes a resistance to authority and order, it brings forth the idea of rivalry because a rival, in politics, competes for superiority by his actions. Moreover, "multiplying" is the key word that may foreshadow further treason by Macbeth. The reason is that "villainy" stands for criminal behaviour that may include the rivalry of a man who disobeys law and order during and/or after a war. This is because "a number of rivalries may be coded as beginning with a war" (Goertz 157). It is not that easy to control law and order under the conditions of war because a war may pave the way for the state of nature. The reason is that any unjust action may be regarded as just during a war, as exemplified by the Thane of Cawdor who revolts against his king. As another example, Macbeth

finds the opportunity to put into practice his plan of regicide right after the war. This is because Macbeth realises that the authority has weakened, as he assumes that a revolt shows something is lacking in the authority. Therefore, such a mind reveals the selfish and competitive side of man in the state of rivalry. Thus, such “mankind” as the Thane of Cawdor, and later Macbeth, may lead the state “to be dissolved”, as they do not follow the rules of the law of nature that stands for sustaining justice (Hobbes, *Leviathan* 212). As put forth in the theoretical framework of this study, the state of rivalry, as a threat to the justice of the sovereign, escalates because of its contagious characteristic. It may be contagious because Macdonald’s and the Thane of Cawdor’s revolts foreshadow Macbeth’s treason and regicide.

The captain states that Macdonald supplies men “from the Western Isles / Of kerns and gallowglasses” (1.2.12-13). Macdonald’s collaboration with disordered and lawless men may represent the state of nature because it is outside the law of nature for a soldier to attack his country for self-interest. Treason is among the reasons that disregard the social contract. Moreover, Macdonald’s men are lawless and disordered because “Kerns” stand for “Irish foot-soldiers who fought in guerrilla style ... the Macdonalds were the first great galloglass family” (Clark and Mason 131). Therefore, his revolt is supported by an unofficial military group that is a direct threat to King Duncan’s authority and power. Such a military group disrespects laws and order that establish and sustain civilization. Thus, the “Kerns” indicate the existence of a state of nature that becomes a threat to Scottish order.

The captain’s statement — “whence comfort seemed to come / Discomfort swells” — may refer to the contrast between order and disorder (1.2.27-28). However, the revolt is suppressed by Macbeth and Banquo who are regarded “as cannons over-charged with double cracks / So they doubly rebounded strokes upon the foe” (1.2.37-38). They fight against the enemy with great effort and bring victory to Scotland. They exercise violence authorized by the king against the lawless “kerns” and rebels. The king praises Macbeth, the “valiant cousin! Worthy gentleman!” (1.2.24). King Duncan orders his men to “pronounce [Thane of Cawdor’s] death, / and with his former title [to] greet Macbeth” (1.2.65-66). That is, King Duncan awards Macbeth with the title of Thane of Cawdor. When King Duncan says, “What he hath lost, noble Macbeth hath won”, the King is referring to the title of Thane that passes to Macbeth (1.2.67).

Yet, it may foreshadow Macbeth's taking over kingship by regicide, as the previous Thane of Cawdor "hath lost" that chance (1.2. 67).

Meanwhile, unaware that he is awarded the title of Thane of Cawdor, Macbeth arises triumphant with Banquo. Regarding the effect of the war that he was returning from, Macbeth says, "So foul and fair a day I have not seen", a statement very similar to what the witches say at the beginning of this act (1.3.39). Upon his statement, Macbeth and Banquo come across the witches who hail Macbeth in the order: "Hail to thee, thane of Glamis! / Hail to thee, thane of Cawdor! / All hail, Macbeth, that shalt be king hereafter!" (1.3.49-51). The witches dignify Macbeth by attributing to him the supreme status in hierarchy (Watson 178). However, Banquo's question, "Good sir, why do you start and seem to fear / Things that do sound so fair?", may suggest his doubt regarding Macbeth's nature (1.3.51-52). Banquo asks the witches, "Speak, then, to me, who neither beg nor fear / Your favors nor your hate" (1.3. 60-61). There, Banquo regards them as insignificant beings with no title in the hierarchy and/or social life. Although Macbeth calls the witches "imperfect speakers" (1.3.70), he desires to know more, as he says "tell me more" (1.3.70). Macbeth's statement is different from that of Banquo. The difference is that Macbeth, unlike Banquo, supposes that what the witches tell him is remarkable. However, Macbeth becomes anxious, as the witches give Banquo the good news regarding the future king, "Thou shalt get kings, though thou be none" (1.3.67). Macbeth's statement, "Your children shall be kings" (1.3.87), denotes his jealousy and fear of Banquo, as Macbeth in an aside says, "Glamis, and thane of Cawdor! The greatest is behind" (1.3.116). Macbeth repeats to himself the ranking of the titles, keeping in mind the prophecies of the witches. His ambition, among passions related to the state of nature and rivalry, is revealed, as he seems to desire kingship by saying "the greatest is behind" (1.3.116). However, when the witches tell Banquo that his children will also become kings, "the witches sow the seeds of rivalry between Macbeth and Banquo by hailing them both as 'Treasurer'" (Townshend 44).

Macbeth's belief in the prophecies of the witches underlines his potential of acting in accordance with the state of rivalry and the state of nature, and he seems ready to disobey the requirements of the social contract (Hobbes, *De Cive* 62-63). Macbeth begins to interiorise his fantastical eminence. Hence, Macbeth begins to

ignore the necessities of hierarchy, social order, and authority. His ignorance resulting from the statements of the witches makes him return to the state of nature. The reason is that political disorder and the prophecies of the witches allow Macbeth's deep repressed ambitious desires to be revealed. The contrast of good versus bad is strengthened by Macbeth's statement, "This supernatural soliciting / Cannot be ill, cannot be good" (1.3.131-32). The contrast of good versus evil brings to mind the contrast of civilization versus the state of nature. In an aside, Macbeth says,

If good, why do I yield to that suggestion
Whose horrid image doth unfix my hair,
And make my seated heart knock at my ribs,
Against the use of nature? Present fears
Are less than horrible imaginings.
My thought, whose murder yet is but fantastical,
Shakes so my single state of man. (1.3.136-42)

The statement "[Duncan's] murder yet is but fantastical" shows that Macbeth has already thought about regicide (1.3.141). As part of his plot, Macbeth acts as if he were a good soldier; so, he hides his intention to kill the king, an idea that makes him uneasy, as his statement "horrid image doth unfix my hair" suggests (1.3.137). His idea of subverting the authority is against the law of nature. This is a law that leads "every man...to obtain peace" (Hobbes, *De Cive* 62). The shaking of the "state of man", in Macbeth's words, may refer to the civil state of man that goes along with the requirements of the social contract.

Macbeth, seemingly a good soldier, looks for personal gain through his plan of regicide. Within this context, the king is not aware that "love of soldiers, (if caution be not given of the commander's fidelity,) is a dangerous thing to sovereign power" (Hobbes, *Leviathan* 234). The reason is that King Duncan believes in an unreliable man. The sovereign may err but the outcomes of his erring may be disastrous. Regarding belief in an unreliable man, the king says, "There's no art / To find the mind's construction in the face. / He was a gentleman on whom I built / An absolute trust. / (to MACBETH) O worthiest cousin" (1.4.11-15). In a way, the king admits that he has trusted an unreliable Thane, who was honoured by the king himself. Similarly, Macbeth is considered a reliable soldier, like Iago of *Othello* and Brutus of *Julius Caesar*. Macbeth flatters the King so as to maintain his reliability in the eyes of the king, "Your highness' part / Is to receive our duties, and our duties / Are to your throne and state children and servants, / Which do but what they should,

by doing everything / Safe toward your love and honour” (1.4.24-28). As part of his plan of murdering the king, Macbeth hides his true intentions and controls his egotistic side. He seems to be obeying the requirements of civilization. On the surface, he is a man of the king, and of the state. However, Macbeth’s plan is a direct threat to the social contract (Hobbes, *Leviathan* 234). Thus, Macbeth is neither a “faithful subject” nor a “good conductor” for “the safety of the people” (Hobbes, *Leviathan* 234).

Since the state of nature refers to the condition of man without laws and order, Macbeth’s idea of murdering the king shows that Macbeth is ready to act against the laws and social contract. To this end, he acts in line with the state of rivalry for personal gains (Scott 167; Willbern 523; Kirsch 278). However, his self-interested nature looks for a possibility to subvert authority. As regards self-interest, Gregory S. Kavka rightly remarks, “self-interested concerns play ... a large role in motivating human actions” (*Hobbesian Moral* 53). Public gain becomes insignificant when compared to personal gain, as “self-interested motives tend to take precedence over non-self-interested motives in determining human actions. That is, non-self-interested motives usually give way to self-interested motives when there is a conflict” (Kavka, *Hobbesian Moral* 64). The conflict within the Scottish state leads Macbeth to his self-interested plans that have earlier been repressed.

Macbeth's plan of regicide is clearly hostile, and it may be related to both rivalry and enmity. Moreover, enmity is one of the codes of the state of rivalry since “competitors” who pose a threat in rivalry may be qualified “as enemies” (Thompson 557). Treason in this way becomes not just a political act but “a form of possession, an action contrary to and destructive of the very order of nature itself” (Kernan 87). In a national or civil war, in Hobbes’ words, if “the forces of the commonwealth keep[s] the field no longer[,] there is no further protection of subjects in their loyalty; then is the commonwealth DISSOLVED” (*Leviathan* 221). Macbeth becomes disloyal to the authority of the king since he begins to think like a man who is in the state of nature, as Macbeth is encouraged by the prophecies of the witches. Macbeth’s idea indicates the existence of the state of nature, as the political relation and hierarchy become questionable after the war (Barker 25). Therefore, security and peace are under threat within Scottish authority. Because of the rebellions and conflict, as it is wartime, Macbeth finds a gap in political stability. During a war, “men no longer

live in harmony with one another” (Girard, *Violence and the Sacred* 8). Those who are after personal gains are revealed, as they challenge the social contract by their repressed state of nature and rivalry. “All dissensions, rivalries, jealousies, and quarrels within the entire community” lead to the plotting of rebellions (Girard, *Violence and the Sacred* 8).

Soon after King Duncan awards Macbeth, Duncan announces Malcolm as the prince and heir to his throne: “We will establish our estate upon / Our eldest, Malcolm, whom we name hereafter / The prince of Cumberland” (1.4.37-39). In reaction, Macbeth, in an aside, says, “The prince of Cumberland! That is a step / On which I must fall down, or else o'erleap, / For in my way it lies. Stars, hide your fires; / Let not light see my black and deep desires” (1.4.50-53). Macbeth’s “way” is contrary to that of a commander, a loyal subject. His repressed hatred toward King Duncan becomes clear, as he calls the “stars” to “hide [their] fires” on his way to killing the king (1.4.53). There and then, Macbeth envies Malcolm while he hates King Duncan. Malcolm becomes a rival for Macbeth, as the latter needs to compete with him given his desires to attain kingship (Cheung 433). Passions of envy and hatred go together in human nature, and as to the state of rivalry as in his *Ethics*, the Dutch philosopher Benedict de Spinoza (1632-1677) is right in saying that “similar affects of hate are related to envy which, therefore, is nothing but hate, insofar as it is considered so to dispose a man that he is glad at another’s ill fortune and saddened by his good fortune” (83). In other words, hatred and envy are among the passions that relate to one another in that each rival feels happy on account of the ill fortune of the other rival. Macbeth’s envy toward Malcolm becomes hatred toward Duncan, the mimetic model. Duncan is unaware of the mimetic aura of what he does; so, he makes himself a rival to Macbeth. It is mimetic since the model, i.e. the king, canonizes the power of kingship, i.e. the object. And the mediator says that he would transfer the desired object to another one, his son. As a necessity of order, primogeniture is a requirement of the hierarchy which indicates that the eldest son accedes to the throne after his father (Clark and Mason 35). Macbeth’ invoking the stars to hide their fires suggests that he disrespects the hierarchical structure of the state, although hierarchy is an essential requirement of any lawful authority. Yet, in the state of rivalry, Macbeth aims to remove any possible rivals on his way to the desired object.

Just as the state of nature and mimetic desire are related to conflict, the passions of love, envy, and hatred are not just related to one another but also to conflict (Spinoza 83; Girard, *Deceit, Desire* 119). Macbeth seems to respect King Duncan, his model, but according to Macbeth, he becomes his rival. Moreover, “Macbeth does not want to have rivals in his peers” (Veszy-Wagner 251). That is, Macbeth’s state of rivalry allows him to overcome his peers and thus attain power forever. In “mimetic terms”, Macbeth’s obedience leads him to hate his model, the king. (Girard, “Collective Violence” 400). Macbeth is envious and full of hatred because King Duncan has power, authority, and Macbeth wants to have them all. The king, who is the mediator in this case, uses the “common power” and “law” required by the social contract, as he is the legal power-holder. In other words, against the ones who are in the state of nature and/or rivalry or who may disrespect civil laws, the king uses lawful authority to eliminate any possible rival to his throne. Such rivals bring crisis. The desirer, Macbeth, brings forth the mimetic crisis due to his rivalry with the mediator. It is mimetic because the crisis is generated as a result of mimetic desire, as Macbeth aims to destroy the model who, for Macbeth, becomes a rival.

Macbeth cannot accept the idea that Malcolm, Duncan’s son who is now announced as the “prince”, will accede to the throne after Duncan. In Girard’s own words, Macbeth becomes “like a lover who sees the woman he loves in the arms of another man” (“Collective Violence” 400). Here, the woman may stand for authority that would end up in the hands of Malcolm. Regarding the relationship between rivalry and enmity, Girard has this to say: “[r]ival ambitions can become so intense, however, that they no longer tolerate one another. Instead of competing within the limits of the law, the rival leaders turn violent and treat each other as enemies” (“Collective Violence” 401). Macbeth’s plan oversteps “the limits of the law” because Macbeth regards himself as equal to a prince whilst ignoring hierarchy. In this competition for kingship, Macbeth's ambitions lead him to regard men of authority as enemies.

King Duncan aims to honour Macbeth in saying, “From hence to Inverness, / And bind us further to you” (1.4.42-43). Upon this, Macbeth sends a letter to Lady Macbeth to inform her about the prophecies of the witches and his own ambition. For instance, regarding his ambitious desire, Macbeth writes, “when I burned in / desire to question them further ...” (1.5.3-4). On his own, Macbeth remains between reason and

passions, namely envy, rivalrous ambition and hatred. Reason demands that Macbeth ought to obey the rules of authority and the necessities of hierarchy. However, his passions incline him to be ambitious and rivalrous in order to attain the power that he so desires. Alone with the letter, Lady Macbeth says, “Yet do I fear thy nature; / It is too full o' th' milk of human kindness / To catch the nearest way: thou wouldst be great, / Art not without ambition, but without / The illness should attend it” (1.5.16-20). “Th[e] milk of human kindness” may be taken as a metaphor that refers to the binder of the individual to the social and cultural order. Macbeth’s plan of murder distances him from that “milk of human kindness”, and he becomes a man trapped between the desires of self-interested passions and the restrictions of prescriptive reason. Similar to the witches, Lady Macbeth urges Macbeth to pursue the easiest way to kingship, as may be suggested by “the nearest way” in Lady Macbeth’s statement. Since Lady Macbeth is aware of Macbeth’s plan, she says, “I may pour my spirits in thine ear / And chastise with the valor of my tongue / All that impedes thee from the golden round, / Which fate and metaphysical aid doth seem / To have thee crowned withal” (1.5.26-30). “Fate and metaphysical aid” may stand for the witches who are the sisters of “fate, destiny” (1.5.29; Partridge 3674). In other words, Lady Macbeth urges Macbeth to examine the way the witches show him, which Macbeth “fear[s] to do” (1.5. 24). Lady Macbeth invokes the “spirits” for “metaphysical aid”:

Come, you spirits
That tend on mortal thoughts, unsex me here,
And fill me from the crown to the toe, top-full
Of direst cruelty. Make thick my blood.
Stop up the access and passage to remorse,
That no compunctious visitings of nature
Shake my fell purpose, nor keep peace between
Th’ effect and it. (1.5.40-47)

Like the witches, Lady Macbeth decides to act so as to bring out Macbeth's repressed ambition. Her utterance “unsex me” may show that Lady Macbeth is ready to get out of the patriarchal order that makes her act in accordance with the cultural codes of womanhood; that is, to be merciful and gentle by obeying the norms of social order (Watson 179). Her “purpose” is to keep away from “nature” that may stand for the social contract which prioritizes “peace”. That is why she calls for “murd’ring ministers” that “wait on nature’s mischief” so that her “keen knife see not the wound it makes, / Nor heaven peep through the blanket of the dark / To cry ‘Hold,

hold' ” (1.5.48; 1.5.50; 1.5.52-54). “Knife” and “wound” refer to their plan to murder the king. Lady Macbeth uses the words “night”, “hell”, and “dark”, as she and Macbeth hide their true intentions. She wants Macbeth to act against the normative order of the social contract, as she cautions Macbeth: “O never / Shall sun that morrow see. / Your face, my thane, is as a book where men / May read strange matters. To beguile the time, / Look like the time. Bear welcome in your eye, / Your hand, your tongue; look like th' innocent flower, / But be the serpent under 't” (1.5.60-66; Belsey 134). That is, the king “shall” not “see that morrow”; he should be murdered, and Macbeth’s “face” needs to hide the “strange matters”. As part of the plan, Macbeth is to seem “like [an] innocent flower” so as to hide his ambition and rivalry. There, “serpent” may stand for treason, which is the way Macbeth follows to the throne. The contrast used by Lady Macbeth recalls “fair and foul” used by the witches. Therefore, they overlap on common points; that is, to seem obedient to authority, yet acting against its norms. Lady Macbeth advises Macbeth to conceal his two-faced side as “men / may read strange matter” on his “face”.

Similar to Macbeth, Lady Macbeth welcomes King Duncan with flattering words: “All our service, / In every point twice done and then done double, / Were poor and single business to contend / Against those honours deep and broad wherewith / Your majesty loads our house” (1.6.14-18). The words “twice” and “double” strengthen the idea that Macbeth and Lady Macbeth are both hypocrites, as the word “double” is even repeated by Macbeth: “He’s here in double trust: / First, as I am his kinsman and his subject, / Strong both against the deed; then, as his host, / Who should against his murderer shut the door, / Not bear the knife myself” (1.7.12-16; McDonald 47). “The door” represents the protective barrier that keeps danger outside, as it stands between the insider and the outsider. The insider may be the civilized one whereas the outsider may represent the state of nature and insecurity. Macbeth is supposed to protect the sovereign since he is in their “house”. Yet, he discusses with Lady Macbeth how to kill Duncan. However, Macbeth thinks about what he is planning to do over and over in his mind. He is aware that regicide is not as easy as Lady Macbeth supposes because he says, “If it were done, when ‘tis done then ‘twere well / It were done quickly” (1.7.1-2). Macbeth means that if the murder of the king was done without any fatal consequence, then he could kill the king without any delay.

However, he is aware that normally regicide does not go without judgement that ends in (capital) punishment. When he is alone, Macbeth expresses his opinion on judgement as such:

We still have judgement here, that we but teach
 Bloody instructions, which being taught, return
 To plague th'inventor. This even-handed justice
 Commends th'ingredience of our poisoned chalice
 To our own lips. (1.7.8-12)

Macbeth is aware of the point that doing evil to anyone could be returned to the “bloody instruct[or]” as “even-handed”; that is, the impartial “justice” punishes the evil-doer. Macbeth is aware of the power of the law, and at this point, he is close to reasonable thinking. Therefore, for Macbeth, as represented in this scene, reason seems to dominate passions. However, Macbeth cannot stabilize his conscience between reason and passion, as he knows that acting in accordance with the social contract is a requirement of the law of nature. Yet, in Macbeth’s case, the “bloody instructions” of the state of nature are against the social contract. Macbeth “seek[s] power, success, and wealth for [himself] and admire[s] them in others” (1.8.9; Freud 12). Yet, seeking power for personal gain, as in the case of Macbeth, may lead to catastrophe. That is why, Macbeth remains within the struggle between reason and passions. Lady Macbeth realises Macbeth’s dilemma, for she says, “Letting ‘I dare not’, wait upon ‘I would’, / Like the poor cat i'th’adage?” (1.7.44-45). Lady Macbeth’s statement reminds a proverb, “[t]he cat wanted to eat fish but dared not get her feet wet” (Dent 71) to imply that Macbeth is afraid of carrying out the action needed to attain what he desires (McDonald 46). Macbeth’s reply, “I dare do all that may become a man, / Who dares do more, is none”, may imply that man is limited in his actions due to decisions by the laws of a state (1.7.46-47).

At this point, conscience overweighs Macbeth's passions, especially his ambition of which he is already aware, as he confesses, “I have no spur / To prick the sides of my intent, but only / Vaulting ambition, which o’er-leaps itself, / And falls on th’other” (1.7.25-28). “The sides of [his] intent” may stand for staying between reason and passion under the pressure of his plan to murder the king. His intent stems from his “vaulting ambition”. However, “spur” refers to encouragement. His internal conflict because of his conscience increases, for he says, “Besides, this Duncan / Hath borne his faculties so meek, hath been / So clear in his great office” (1.7.16-18). Regarding

the relation between conscience and reason, Hobbes writes, “Whatsoever any man doth against his conscience is a sinne, for he who doth so, contemns the Law” (*De Cive* 147). In this context, Macbeth underestimates the laws of nature. Parallel to Hobbes’ idea, Macbeth seems to be aware of the dangers lurking beneath his plan of regicide which runs counter to the laws of nature. His passions dominate reason because of his conversation with Lady Macbeth, who urges Macbeth to instigate his plan of regicide. Macbeth is aware of the fact that killing the king for self-interest is politically disastrous (Greenblatt, *Shakespeare’s Freedom* 74).

However, Macbeth is finally “settled, and bend up” to accomplish his plan; therefore, “[f]alse face must hide what the false heart doth know” (1.7.79-82) so as to attain kingship. Thus, “the passions contrary to peace” dominate his further actions which may lead him to leave the civil state (*De Cive* 146). The civil state refers to the civilized state of man who obeys the civil laws and the norms of social contract. He goes after the “false heart”, that is, his passions and ambition, as he calls it already (1.7.82; Greenblatt, *Shakespeare’s Freedom* 74). Macbeth’s decision to kill the king disorients him because he prioritizes personal gain over public gain, as this is an act against the civil state. Therefore, his state of nature dominates his reason at the end of Act 1.

Act 2 begins with a dialogue between Banquo and Fleance. As Banquo asks for the time, Fleance replies that “the moon is down; I have not heard the clock” (2.1.2). “The moon”, the sun, and their positions would tell the time in those days; however, “the clock” is an invention of civilization. In this regard, a contrast between wildlife and civilization is provided. This is crucial in the sense that before civilization, night was supposed to hold evil that lurks in darkness. Hence Banquo says, “There’s husbandry in heaven, / Their candles are all out”, which refers to the power of nature reacting against any disorder on earth (2.1.4-5). The word “candles” may refer to stars; therefore, it may be taken as a metaphor which reminds of Macbeth’s words: “stars, hide your fire”. What Banquo means is that it is very dark outside, as there are no stars that night. The darkness of the night foreshadows Macbeth’s killing of the king which is at hand. Banquo says, “Merciful powers, / Restrain in me the cursed thoughts that nature / Gives way to in repose” (2.1.7-9). “The cursed thoughts” may be considered as a metaphor referring to lawless actions that may disturb the order. Moreover, that

the witches appear in thunder, in storm, or in rain strengthens the belief that darkness brings danger. That is why, the contrast between light and darkness, fair and foul, is used throughout the play.

Similar to Macbeth, Banquo keeps in mind the prophecies of the witches. Banquo says, “I dreamt last night of the three weird sisters: / To you they have showed some truth” (2.1.20-21). There, Banquo suggests that the prophecies of the witches for Macbeth have come true; hence, their prophecies regarding the future of kingship may become true for Banquo as well. As a consequence of Macbeth’s state of nature, his actions end in the state of rivalry. Because of the belief of equality in the state of nature, Macbeth thinks that Banquo may become a rival for kingship. That is, Banquo becomes Macbeth’s rival because Macbeth regards Banquo as a potential obstacle on his way to the throne. Macbeth’s rivalrous state strengthens Macbeth’s idea that Banquo’s children may attain the throne. The reason is that in “mimetic desire, passion is never spontaneous but always a matter of imitation; the rival ... is only apparently an obstacle but actually the precondition of the hero's desire. In fact, what the hero desires is to be like his rival, to take his place, which of course means to kill him” (Kahn, *Hobbes, Romance* 6).

Upon this, Macbeth speaks ambiguously, “If you shall cleave to my consent when ‘tis, / It shall make honour for you” (2.1.25-26). Macbeth, in a way, means for Banquo to go along with his ideas, as a time of Macbeth’s kingship may come. However, Banquo’s reply is ambiguous as well, “So I lose none / In seeking to augment it, but still keep / My bosom franchised and allegiance clear, / I shall be counselled” (2.1.26-29). Macbeth’s vague threat does not go unreturned, as Banquo implies that one may “lose” what is at hand in search of asking for more covetously. Banquo, unlike Macbeth, does not let his reason be controlled by passions that may seduce him. In other words, Banquo thinks of the prophecies of witches as well; yet, he does not let reason be overcome by his emotions. Thus, for Banquo, who is heralded by the witches as the father of future kings, the state of nature has not materialized. The reason is that he controls his ego by following reason, law of nature, so as not to act against the norms of the social contract. However, Banquo’s reference to the prophecies of the witches leads Macbeth to think that Banquo may be making plans to take over the throne. That is why Macbeth supposes Banquo as a rival, and he fears Banquo.

Macbeth's hallucination about "a dagger...before [him]" represents a loss of clear-thinking (2.1.34). As a result, Macbeth feels uneasy because he remains within the contradiction of crime and law. He knows that he has no lawful right and authority to kill the king. However, he seems to feel under pressure because of the prophecies of the witches and Lady Macbeth's words. Macbeth asks himself whether the illusion of the dagger is "a false creation, / Proceeding from the heat-oppressed brain?" under such a pressure (2.1.38-40). The illusion of the dagger, along with the prophecies and his conversation with Lady Macbeth, indicate that Macbeth has already thought of killing the king. Although Macbeth feels "oppressed", and thinks that "it is [a] bloody business" that he intends, he still kills the king. Following that, Macbeth's guilty conscience makes him say, "Methought I heard a voice cry, 'Sleep no more! / Macbeth does murder sleep' " (2.2.35-36). Knowing that the king is at the top of the hierarchy, Macbeth is also aware that he may not find peace any more. He does not speak and act like a victorious man. He reproaches himself: "Will all great Neptune's ocean wash this blood / Clean from my hand? No, this my hand will rather / The multitudinous seas incarnadine, / Making the green one red" (2.2.60-63). Lady Macbeth, however, does not take this action seriously because she replies to Macbeth, "A little water clears us of this deed" (2.2.67). Similar to the reaction of nature to the assassination of Julius Caesar, natural events react to the death of the king, as he is the man at the top of the great chain of being. Lennox, a noble Scot, reports:

The night has been unruly. Where we lay,
Our chimneys were blown down and, as they say,
Lamentings heard i' th' air, strange screams of death,
And prophesying with accents terrible
Of dire combustion and confused events
New hatched to the woeful time. The obscure bird
Clamored the livelong night. Some say the Earth
Was feverous and did shake. (2.3.53-59)

"Night screams" to the death of the king, whereas Macbeth becomes silent as in his "most need of blessing, ... 'Amen' / Stuck in [his] throat" (2.2.33-34). As Macbeth becomes tongue-tied, he decides to "go no more" as he is "afraid to think [of] what" he has "done" (2.2.51-52). Lady Macbeth, however, puts blood on "the faces" of the guards of the king so that it "seem[s] their guilt" (2.2.57-58). Unlike Macbeth, Lady Macbeth is represented as constructing a world in which her rules are valid, as in the example of "unsex me", a statement that subverts the patriarchal authority of the

Elizabethan culture (1.5.41). For Lady Macbeth, personal gain is dominant over public gain, as she tries to convince Macbeth to live in her lawless world which lacks civil order. Although King Duncan rewards Macbeth for his achievements and contributions to the country, Lady Macbeth is not contented with Macbeth's title of Thane of Cawdor. Although the law-maker Sovereign, King Duncan, does what is expected of him, the previous Thane of Cawdor, Macbeth and Lady Macbeth do not go along with what the king grants. Regarding the duty of the sovereign under such circumstances, Hobbes mentions, "their duty (I say) it is to cherish obedient subjects, and to depresse the factious all they can; nor can the publique power be otherwise preserved, nor the subjects quiet without it" (*De Cive* 163). King Duncan fulfils his duty, as his army suppresses all factions in the first Act.

Macbeth, on the other hand, does not act like an "obedient subject" (*De Cive* 163). He deploys violence to attain and sustain his desires and other passions by ignoring the public gain (Hobbes, *Leviathan* 85; Moore 45). Concerning man's condition of war, parallel to the state of nature, Hobbes states the following: "to this war of every man against every man, this also is consequent; that nothing can be unjust. The notions of right and wrong, justice and injustice, have there no place. Where there is no common power, there is no law; where no law, no injustice" (*Leviathan* 85). Taking advantage of the weakening of the authority's power because of the national and civil war, Macbeth acts like a man who is in the state of nature because of his egotistic self which supposes that "[f]orce and fraud are in war the two cardinal virtues. Justice and injustice are none of the faculties neither of the body nor mind" (Hobbes, *Leviathan* 79). In other words, Macbeth deploys violence by using everyone for his self-interest so as to attain what he desires (Girard, *Violence and the Sacred* 144). Thus, violence exercised for self-interested purposes may not be stopped, as such purposes are outside the communal life that is constructed by cultural codes of social contract.

"All values, spiritual or material, perish" because of the regicide of King Duncan (Girard, *Violence and the Sacred* 15). The cultural value of kingship vanishes as kingly distinctions such as the prestige and power of the king are destroyed because of the effects of rivalry and desire. Therefore, "end of distinctions means ... end of all human justice", as justice falls into ruin by Macbeth's takeover of kingship because of the fact

that Macbeth does not respect hierarchy which is based on distinctions of degree in a state (Girard, *Violence and the Sacred* 15-16). Hobbes explains the relationship between desire and rivalry: “But the most frequent reason why men desire to hurt each other, ariseth hence, that many men at the same time have an Appetite to the same thing; which yet very often they can neither enjoy in common, nor yet divide it; whence it followes that the strongest must have it, and who is strongest must be decided by the Sword” (*De Cive* 46). Both for Hobbes and Girard, one of the main reasons of the state of rivalry is desire which requires competition in the case that the desired object is desired by two or more. Therefore, rivalry is a means of power because as one seeks to have power over other(s), he eliminates his rival(s). Any one or group that has more power than others may frighten the other(s) who, in this case, may not be rivalrous, as the one with more power would be the winner.

Regarding desire and rivalry, Hobbes asserts that “if any two men desire the same thing, which nevertheless they cannot both enjoy, they become enemies; and in the way to their end... endeavour to destroy or subdue one another” (*Leviathan* 76). The violent man who is in the state of nature engulfs his rival in enmity by the mimetic crisis that demands a sacrifice, a weak scapegoat. The desirer hides his/her envy of the mediator until they become rivals. The secret envy of the rival leads him to exercise violence against the mediator out of hatred by repressing the idea that the mediator is superior to the desirer. Although Macbeth kills the king, he also looks forward to killing Banquo and his son Fleance, the first of whom is his rival and the second is the scapegoat. Macbeth faces Banquo on his way to a permanent kingship. In this regard, Jules Henry is right in this saying: “[w]ith a single murder, the murderer enters a locked system. He must kill and kill again, he must plan whole massacres lest a single survivor remain to avenge his kin” (quoted in Girard, *Violence and the Sacred* 54). Thus, the state of nature positions Macbeth to commit further violence, as he arrives in the web of the state of rivalry.

The state of rivalry begins to work as soon as the hierarchy of social order is subverted by Macbeth. The prophecy that Banquo’s children will acquire the kingship leads to Banquo becoming a rival and a threatening competitor for Macbeth. Macbeth grieves and suffers as his rival Banquo may well exceed him. Regarding grief, Hobbes states this: “Grief, for the success of a competitor in wealth, honour, or other good, if

it be joined with endeavour to enforce [exert] our own abilities to equal or exceed him, is called EMULATION: but joined with endeavour to supplant, or hinder a competitor, ENVY” (*Leviathan* 39). Macbeth’s grief arises out of “emulation” because of the assumed “success of” Banquo, his “competitor”. However, after King Duncan’s murder, his sons Donalbain and Malcolm, two possible rivals of Macbeth, realize the uncanny order as Donalbain, in an aside to Malcolm, says, “What should be spoken / here, where our fate, Hid in an auger-hole, / may rush and seize us? Let’s away” (2.3.119-121). Macbeth focuses his plans on Banquo, as Malcolm and Donalbain flee from Scotland “to England” and “to Ireland”, respectively (2.3.135-6).

The dialogue in Act 2, scene 4 between Ross, a noble Scottish man, and an old man reveals the amalgam of good and evil by metaphors, for Ross says, “Is’t night’s predominance or the day’s shame / That darkness does the face of Earth entomb / When living light should kiss it?” (2.4.7-9). Although Ross, Macduff and the old man do not enunciate Macbeth’s name concerning the regicide, “Night’s predominance” stands for Macbeth’s superiority, established by killing the king, an act which is like “the day’s shame”. Therefore, that “darkness” entombs “the face of Earth” may represent Macbeth’s kingship which is gained by means of plotting in the dark, emanating from a rivalrous mind. Macbeth’s action is “unnatural” as the old man says, because it subverts the hierarchical order, thereby disturbing not only the political but also the natural order (2.4.10; Harris 475). Similar to the murder of the king, “a falcon ... / Was by a mousing owl hawked at and killed” (2.4.12-13). That the falcon towers “in her pride of place” represents the hierarchical order in which the king is at the top. Therefore, the murder of the king by a Thane is “unnatural” as it is against the power structure of authority and hierarchy (2.4.12).

Macbeth achieves his goal just as Malcolm and Donalbain “are stol’n away and fled”, an incident which “puts upon them / Suspicion of the deed” (2.4.25-27). Therefore, as Ross puts it, “The sovereignty ... fall[s] upon Macbeth” (2.4.27-30). Sovereignty has such a tempting power “that would make good of bad and friends of foes” (2.4.40-41). It means that friends return to the state of rivalry when they become enemies in search of power. Macbeth loses his sense of the difference between what is good and bad, once his reason is overwhelmed by his passion of rivalry and desire. As to the loss of balance between reason and emotion, Hobbes says, “When in the mind

of m[e]n, appetites, and aversions, hopes, and fears, concerning one and the same thing, arise alternately; and divers good and evil consequences of the doing, or omitting the thing propounded, come successively into our thoughts” (*Leviathan* 39). Similarly, Macbeth straddles the line between “fair and foul”; therefore, he “sometimes ... [has] an appetite to it; sometimes an aversion from it; sometimes hope to be able to do it; sometimes despair, or fear to attempt it” (Hobbes, *Leviathan* 39). His calculations whether or not to kill the king make him dwell among his “desires, aversions, hopes and fears” (Hobbes, *Leviathan* 39). This process, as Hobbes remarks, “continue[s] till the thing be either done, or thought impossible, is ... call[ed] DELIBERATION” (Hobbes, *Leviathan* 39). Following that, Macbeth directs his focus onto his second rival, Banquo, for Macbeth wants to ensure that his kingship is safe. The reason is that Banquo’s children may take away the throne. Therefore, Macbeth fears because deep in his mind, he is aware of the fact that what he did is contrary to the law of nature. It is unlawful because “qualities of mankind ... concern their living together in peace, and unity” (Hobbes, *Leviathan* 65). However, having lost the quality of reason, the law of nature urges him to destroy peace and unity as Macbeth is after his everlasting desire of keeping power in his own hands.

The state of nature stirs up the state of rivalry for Macbeth, who is envious of Banquo. Macbeth finds himself in the middle of “a continual progress of the desire, from one object to another; the attaining of the former, being still but the way to the latter” (Hobbes, *Leviathan* 65). Macbeth’s rivalry may be related to a progress of desire. The reason is that his desire to attain power never ends because each time he acquires more power, Macbeth fears that his lawless kingship may be subverted (Yüksel 211). Fear is one of the main motives of the state of nature, and “man’s thoughts and feelings are concentrated to a single point by pervasiveness of fear” (Minoque 75). Fear is present throughout Macbeth’s actions. Therefore, Macbeth’s fear brings forth diffidence and a never-ending rivalry for him. He lacks self-confidence, as he may lose power at any time to his rivals. That is, Macbeth is aware that King Duncan, Malcolm, and Banquo are in the civil state and are thus representatives of law and order. His fear and lack of self-confidence may stem from the fact that “in the civil state, the accusation [of treason] is followed with punishment” (Hobbes, *Leviathan* 93).

Banquo, however, is aware of the fact that Macbeth killed the king to attain the throne, as, in an aside, Banquo says, “Thou hath it now, King, Cawdor, Glamis all, / As the weird women promised, and I fear / Thou playe’st most foully for’t” (3.1.1-3). Yet, Banquo does not speak out frankly to Macbeth as regards his “fear”. Therefore, neither Macbeth nor Banquo speaks of their true feelings and intentions because each fears the other. By the way, Banquo’s words “fear” and “foully” sound similar to the witches’ “fair is foul”, and Macbeth’s “fair and foul”; therefore, this repetition represents Banquo’s awareness of Macbeth’s state of rivalry, and his potential for committing crime to attain power (1.1.9; 1.1.38). However, Banquo is deluded by the aura of kingship, and so he says, “Yet it was said / It should not stand in thy posterity, / But that myself should be the root and father / Of many kings” (3.1.3-6). Although Banquo does not act in defiance of the civil law, he realizes that Macbeth considers him as his rival because of the prophecies of the witches:

if there come truth from them
As upon thee, Macbeth, their speeches shine
Why, by the verities on thee made good,
May they not be my oracles as well,
And set me up in hope? But hush, no more. (3.1.6-10)

Banquo’s soliloquy reveals that the two may become rivals, since hope of becoming more powerful than Macbeth excites Banquo. However, Banquo does not act in any unlawful manner, as he is a man who follows reason. Banquo realizes that Macbeth may kill him and his son Fleance; therefore, both aim to flee although Macbeth asks him to attend the “solemn supper” (3.1.14). Similar to Macbeth’s answer to King Duncan’s request of attending Macbeth’s house, Banquo hides his feelings and says, “Let your highness / Command upon me, to the which my duties / Are with a most indissoluble tie / For ever knit” (3.1.15-18). However, the difference is that Macbeth hides his true intention of killing the king to satisfy his passions, whereas Banquo makes a reasonable decision to flee from Macbeth. Banquo realizes that Macbeth regards him as a rival to be wiped out. The reason is that Macbeth supposes that Banquo desires attaining his throne. That is why Macbeth considers Banquo as a rival to the throne. The desired object of maintaining the kingship, is “something [Macbeth] himself lacks and ... [Banquo] seems to possess” (Girard, *Violence and the Sacred* 146). Macbeth lacks the desired object because he has no son, whereas Banquo has two. Therefore, ‘Banquo the rival’ seems to be superior to ‘Macbeth the desirer’.

However, for Macbeth, Banquo's dream of the witches indicates that Banquo secretly supposes that the prophecies of the witches regarding his children becoming kings will come true. As Girard remarks, "in desiring an object the rival alerts the subject to the desirability of the object. The rival, then, serves as a model for the subject" (Girard, *Violence and the Sacred* 145). For Macbeth, Banquo heightens the brightness of the image of kingship. In other words, 'Banquo the rival' renders the desirability of the throne more appealing than it is for Macbeth. That is why, Macbeth fears for the future of his kingship.

Fear and diffidence lead Macbeth to harm his rivals so as to "proceed... from security of ... [his] own fortune" (Hobbes, *Leviathan* 39). To establish a durable authority of his own, Macbeth aims to remove obstacles on his way to a powerful kingship. Fearing Banquo, Macbeth hires two murderers to kill his possible rivals to the kingship, Banquo and Fleance. This idea may be reinforced, for as Macbeth says, "To be thus is nothing, but to be safely thus" (3.1.47). The problem of the safety of his kingship becomes an issue on Macbeth's mind. Macbeth supposes that Banquo holds a loyal standing by the time he says, "Our fears in Banquo stick deep, / And in his royalty of nature reigns that / Which would be feared" (3.1.47-50). For Macbeth, Banquo has a "royalty of nature". Macbeth pursues his passions, whereas Banquo is loyal to the civil laws. For Macbeth, Banquo "hath a wisdom that doth guide his valour / To act in safety" (3.1.52-53). As Hobbes argues within his theory of the state of nature, "men live without other security, than what their own strength" (*Leviathan* 84). This is valid for Macbeth, who believes in his "own strength" which is key to his understanding of "security". As Macbeth "acquires some *Right* in the natural state of men, he only procures himself security" (Hobbes, *De Cive* 53). Macbeth's "Right" to the throne is an illegitimate one; therefore, he cannot feel enjoyment in the power he attains since he supposes that his rival, Banquo, is superior to him.

In the soliloquy in Act 3, Scene 1, Macbeth acknowledges Banquo's superiority: "There is none but he, / Whose being I do fear; and under him / My genius is rebuked, as it is said / Mark Antony's was by Caesar" (3.1.53-56). There, Macbeth refers to *Antony and Cleopatra* (1606) in which a soothsayer warns Mark Antony to keep away from Caesar, as Caesar's star of spirit makes Antony worthless. Similar to their relationship, Macbeth feels inferior to Banquo. For Macbeth, Banquo, the rival model,

“is apparently already endowed with superior being” (Girard, *Violence and the Sacred* 146). Therefore, a triangular structure of the state of rivalry is constructed between Macbeth, Banquo and kingship (Palaver 35). And as Girard puts it, as soon as Macbeth cannot “share whatever ... [he] desire[s]”, friends may “become the worst of enemies” (*A Theatre of Envy* 3). That is, friends turn into rivals. Macbeth supposes that Banquo acts behind his back to attain kingship, since he says,

He chid the sisters
 When first they put the name of king upon me,
 And bade them speak to him. Then, prophet-like,
 They hailed him father to a line of kings.
 Upon my head they placed a fruitless crown
 And put a barren sceptre in my gripe,
 Thence to be wrenched with an unlineal hand,
 No son of mine succeeding. (3.1.56-63)

Macbeth is envious of Banquo, as Macbeth has “a fruitless crown”, that is, he has no children that could become his heir to the throne. The “crown” is the desired object, as conveyed by the actions and dialogues between Macbeth and Banquo. Therefore, the conflict between Macbeth and Banquo arises from rivalry on Macbeth’s side (Kirsch 278; Veszy-Wagner 250). It is on Macbeth’s side because Banquo does not step into any action to attain kingship although he mentions the witches a few times. However, Macbeth would like to “enjoy a privileged relationship with” the power of kingship (*A Theatre of Envy* 4). Once Macbeth has kingly power, he wants to hold on to that power for ever. Therefore, Macbeth does not want to lose it to a rival. That is why he says:

For Banquo’s issue have I filed my mind;
 For them, the gracious Duncan have I murdered;
 Put rancours in the vessel of my peace
 Only for them; and mine eternal jewel
 Given to the common enemy of man,
 To make them kings, the seed of Banquo kings. (3.1.56-69)

Macbeth fears that his killing of the king may allow Banquo to take over the kingship. His fear and doubt correspond to “rancours in the vessel of [Macbeth’s] peace” (3.1.58). Hatred (rancour) disturbs Macbeth’s peace of mind. As Girard says, “all these crimes” that break one’s peace of mind “attack the very foundation of cultural order, the family and the hierarchical differences without which there would be no social order” (*the Scapegoat* 15). Therefore, Macbeth, the one who is in the state of nature and rivalry, attacks the very foundation of social order and the hierarchical system.

Following this, Macbeth talks to the murderers who are hired to kill Banquo and Fleance. Macbeth says, “Know / That it was he, in the times past, which held you / So under fortune, which you thought had been / Our innocent self” (3.1.78-81). Macbeth tries to incite the murderers by asserting that he is an “innocent” man. Similar to Iago of *Othello*, Macbeth is acting in a way that is inconsistent with his personality by showing the opposite of what kind of a man he indeed is. Macbeth pretends as if he were a trustworthy man whereas he secretly undermines his rivals. The reason why he hides his real plans from others is that he seems to be following the norms of authority and social contract so as not to draw attention. Yet, at the same time, he tries to do his best so as not to move away from his desires. Therefore, Macbeth is a man who pays attention to his self-interest although he seems to take notice of the hierarchical order which stands for public benefits.

Although Macbeth is far-removed from the idea of hierarchical order in state affairs, he speaks about hierarchy as if he were lecturing so as to seduce the two murderers: “Ay, in the catalogue ye go for men: / As hounds and greyhounds, mongrels, spaniels, curs, / Shoughs, water-rugs, and demi-wolves are clept / All by the name of dogs” (3.1.93-96). As Macbeth relates it, hierarchy constructs a categorical organisation of people, based on their level of importance. He goes on:

The valued file
Distinguishes the swift, the slow, the subtle,
The housekeeper, the hunter, every one
According to the gift which bounteous nature
Hath in him closed, whereby he does receive
Particular addition, from the bill
That writes them all alike: and so of men.
Now, if you have a station in the file,
Not i'th' worst rank of manhood, say't (3.1.96-104)

Macbeth tries to highlight the importance of hierarchy by comparing dogs and people as it maintains order in the state (Plato 348-49). However, Macbeth actually reverses the hierarchy of authority by asking the murderers to kill the commander. His aim is to seduce the murderers, as Macbeth takes up “the role of [a] mediator” (Girard, *the Scapegoat* 15). Macbeth’s aim is to transfer his hatred toward Banquo to the murderers. That is why Macbeth acts, in his speech to the murderers, in line with mimetic desire and the state of nature. Macbeth supposes that his rival “wear[s] [his] health but sickly in his life” as Macbeth’s authority “in [Banquo’s] death [will become]

perfect” (3.1.108-109). Macbeth is aware of the necessity of overthrowing hierarchy so as to make everyone equal, and thus aims to make the murderers suppose themselves as Banquo’s equals so that they may easily kill Banquo and Fleance. The plan of murdering Banquo is related to the state of rivalry, as Macbeth aims to get rid of his rivals. Therefore, as Girard puts it, “at the very height of the crisis violence becomes simultaneously the instrument, object, and all-inclusive subject of desire” (*Violence and the Sacred* 144).

Similarly, Hobbes is right in saying the following: “The cause whereof is, that the object of man's desire, is not to enjoy once only, and for one instant of time; but to assure for ever, the way of his future desire” (*Leviathan* 65). Each time Macbeth procures his desire, he looks for another desire. Soon after he becomes king, the desire to maintain kingship for himself forever triggers his state of rivalry. Lady Macbeth, as if she were aware of this view, says, “Naught’s had, all’s spent, / Where our desire is got without content. / 'Tis safer to be that which we destroy / Than by destruction dwell in doubtful joy” (3.2.5-8). Lady Macbeth’s statement recalls what Girard and Hobbes have been saying regarding the relationship between desire and joy. Macbeth is floundering because he faces uncanny events each time he tries to safeguard his power. Therefore, Macbeth procures a “doubtful joy” as he cannot be content with achieving his desire. The “doubtful joy” Lady Macbeth refers to is a kind of joy that is fearful since, as Macbeth says, they “have scorched the snake, not killed it” (3.2.14). Macbeth is aware that Malcolm and Donalbain may come back for revenge. However, there lies a foreshadowing as Fleance runs away while Banquo is murdered. That is, although Macbeth refers to Duncan by the metaphor of “snake”, he unknowingly refers to Banquo whose child will be the “former tooth” of the snake, a threat to his authority (3.2.16). Although his main target is ‘Banquo the rival’, Macbeth makes Fleance the scapegoat, just as he made Malcolm and Donalbain scapegoats, but this time the scapegoats have managed to run away. As Girard has put it, “the weakest and most defenseless, especially young children” are chosen as scapegoats. Similarly, the “children” of Duncan and Banquo are chosen as scapegoats by Macbeth (Girard, *The Scapegoat* 15). Macbeth, however, has his “meal in fear”, and he “sleep[s] / In the affliction of these terrible dreams / That shake [him] nightly” (3.2.18-20). The reason for his fear is that the first scapegoats have run to Ireland and England, and Fleance

has run away as well. After the scapegoats have run away, violence escalates. Macbeth is “convinced that [his] violence is justified” (Girard, *The Scapegoat* 6). As Macbeth is now king, he has the authority to expose who is guilty, as in the example of convincing the two murderers and others who suppose that Malcolm and Donalbain are complicit in Duncan’s murder.

Macbeth, however, needs to conceal his true feelings, as he says, “unsafe the while that we / Must ...[wash] our honours in these flattering streams, / And make our faces vizards to our hearts, / Disguising what they are” (3.2.33-36). Macbeth means that he and Lady Macbeth need to flatter those around them so that they may further their own interests (Clark and Mason 212). Macbeth warns Lady Macbeth to act reasonably in accordance with their plans to maintain his unlawful hold on power. Macbeth says,

...Come, seeling night,
 Scarf up the tender eye of pitiful day;
 And with thy bloody and invisible hand
 Cancel and tear to pieces that great bond
 Which keeps me pale... / ...
 Good things of day begin to droop and drowse,
 While night's black agents to their preys do rouse. / ...
 Things bad begun make strong themselves by ill. (3.2.47-56)

“Seeling night” may refer to the state of nature which “scarf[s] up the tender eye of pitiful day”; that is, which blinds the merciful and peaceful civil state. Therefore, the contrast of “night” and “day” stands for the contrast between the state of nature and the civil state. Macbeth refers to the “night’s black agents”; that is, the passions that may lead man to go to “war against every man”. By their help, Macbeth desires to be “strong” over his rivals Malcolm and Banquo, who may be at the top of hierarchy if Macbeth’s plans fail.

Macbeth is far-removed from the realities and necessities of hierarchy and civilized social life that sustains peace by laws and reason. Macbeth “goes to sit down at his own table and finds that there is no place for him. The moment marks what for the newly crowned Macbeth should be the resumption of the social role in which he has cast himself” (Greenblatt, *Hamlet in Purgatory* 188). He has violated the hierarchical order, for as he says, “You know your own degrees; sit down. At first / And last, the hearty welcome” (3.4.1-2). Macbeth undermines the hierarchy which ensures the social order and thus lets everyone live in peace. As Fleance escapes while

Banquo is killed “with twenty trenched gashes on his head” (3.4.25), Macbeth is “cabined, cribbed, confined, bound in / To saucy doubts and fears” (3.4.22-23). He fears for the future of his kingship because he does not know where his other rival Fleance is. Macbeth feels diffidence, as he is full of “doubts and fears” about the capabilities of his runaway rival Fleance (3.4.23). Doubtful Macbeth, by the way, is not interested in the guests at his supper, as he neglects hierarchy of which he is reminded by Lady Macbeth, “To feed were best at home, / From thence, the sauce to meat is ceremony, / Meeting were bare without it” (3.4.33-35). The King is expected to accompany his guests, as it is a requirement of hosting. However, Macbeth is distant from such social conventions, just as before in his killing of King Duncan, his guest and kinsman. Feeling guilty, Macbeth “is not well” as the ghost of Banquo enters and sits on the “place reserved” for Macbeth (3.4.49; 3.4.44). The ghost may represent Macbeth’s fear of his other rival Fleance, who has escaped (3.4.18). Therefore, the ghost “is the very painting of [Macbeth’s] fear: / This is the air-drawn dagger which [Macbeth] said / Led [him] to Duncan” (3.4.58-60; Greenblatt, *Hamlet in Purgatory* 188-189). Although the law of nature demands peace, and forbids anyone to kill another man for one’s personal gain, Macbeth, under such pressure, feels uneasy, which reveals itself as fear.

Macbeth realizes that his violent actions ensure that the civil state returns to the state of nature, for he says, “Blood hath been shed ere now, i’ th’ olden time, / Ere humane statute purged the gentle weal; / Ay, and since too, murders have been performed / Too terrible for the ear” (3.4.74-77). “Th’ olden time” may refer to a lawless time in which the state of nature prevails over order. Also, “human statute” may refer to the civil laws that were absent at such a time. The “gentle weal” may refer to the common weal, the public benefit, and is related to the civilized state. Therefore, a lack of laws allows “murders” to be “performed / Too terrible for the ear”. Apart from the civil state, the state of rivalry leads to “blood ...[being] shed”, as in the example of *Macbeth*. There, Macbeth, in a way, confesses that he violated the civil laws by killing King Duncan, and a commander, Banquo, who was high up in the hierarchy. Hierarchy is subverted in times of the state of rivalry; therefore, a kind of equality similar to the state of nature prevails. Thus, disrespecting the hierarchical order by bringing in the idea of everyone being equal brings “a crisis of [d]egree”

because of the state of rivalry (Girard, *A Theatre of Envy* 174, 182, 228; Golsan 46, 51; Osborne 337).

Following his speech on civil laws and violence, Macbeth says, “It will have blood, they say: blood will have blood. / Stones have been known to move, and trees to speak” (3.4.120-121). Macbeth’s state of rivalry mingles violence with the state of nature for the reason that “at the height of the sacrificial crisis man’s desires are focused on one thing only: violence” (Girard, *Violence and the Sacred* 145). Yet, apart from “the sacrificial crisis” and/or “man’s desires”, subverting the social contract also leads one to deploy unauthorized violence. That is, Macbeth’s interaction with the witches allows him to be decisive in exercising violence, as Macbeth returns to the state of nature by the effects of “the penetration of the ordinary world by demonic spirits” (Greenblatt, *Hamlet in Purgatory* 191). Macbeth’s violence against his rivals is now hurled on the victims; therefore, Macbeth’s violence has a contaminating effect, as he turns his attention to Macduff who “denies his person / at [Macbeth’s] great bidding” (3.4.126-27). Although Macbeth summons Macduff, the latter is deaf to Macbeth’s summons. Hence, Macbeth feels diffidence on account of Macduff’s action. Macbeth’s fear of others around him is a sign of diffidence, an indicator of the state of nature, as Hobbes argues in *Leviathan* (83). Therefore, as Hobbes says, “from this diffidence of one another, there is no way for any man to secure himself, so reasonable, as anticipation; that is, by force, or wiles, to master the persons of all men he can, so long, till he see no other power great enough to endanger him” (*Leviathan* 83). Macbeth desires to become the greatest power in Scotland. To secure his power, Macbeth “keep[s] a servant fee’d” in the houses of men of whom Macbeth does not trust (3.5.130). Lennox seems to be one of the spies of Macbeth, as during a dialogue to a Lord at Forres, Lennox praises Macbeth by putting the blame on Donalbain and Malcolm for killing “their gracious father” Duncan (3.6.10); and on Fleance for the murder of “the right-valiant Banquo” (3.6.5). However, Lennox contradicts himself, for he says that “a swift blessing / May soon return to this our suffering country, / Under a hand accursed”, referring to Macbeth under whose accursed hand Scotland suffers (3.6.48-50). Soon after the Lord calls Macbeth a “tyrant” who “holds the due of birth” (3.6.25) of Malcolm, Lennox refers to Macbeth with an “accursed” “hand” although a few lines earlier, he calls Malcolm the murderer of King Duncan. That is

why Lennox is a spy of Macbeth. Lennox is informed that King Edward “prepares for some attempt of war” (3.6. 39).

Act 4 displays Macbeth’s craving for more power, as he fears that Malcolm may be at a battle readiness. Therefore, Macbeth meets the witches with whose aid he desires to strengthen his power to sustain security “for his own ends” (3.5.13; Moore 44). The prophecies have violent images. The second apparition of a bloody child says, “for none of woman born / Shall harm Macbeth” (4.1.79-80). Following this, a third apparition of a child crowned with a tree in his hands says, “Macbeth shall never vanquished be until / Great Birnam Wood to high Dunsinane Hill / Shall come against him” (4.1. 91-93). Finally, there appears “a show of eight kings, the last with a glass in his hand, followed by BANQUO” to which Macbeth says “Thou art too like the spirit of Banquo” (4.1.111). The “glass” stands for the future vision of kingship, as it reflects the descendants of Banquo since the similarities with kinship may be realized as Macbeth says, “thy hair / ... is like the first” (4.1.112-113).

Macbeth’s last meeting with the witches becomes the beginning of the end. Macbeth gets out of control, as he loses the ability of rational thought once he is informed that “Macduff is fled to England” (4.1.141). Macbeth vows to deploy more violence as he says, “The very firstlings of my heart shall be / The firstlings of my hand. And even now, / To crown my thoughts with acts, be it thought and done” (4.1.146-48). Macbeth is intent on acting fast as he follows his passions. Ross suspects that Macbeth may exercise violent actions; therefore, Ross warns Lady Macduff and her son against Macbeth. Lady Macduff replies, “When our actions do not / Our fears do make us traitor” (4.2.3-4). Her statement may be regarded as a comparison of the civil state and the state of nature, just as the relationship between fear and treason that has been analysed before. Macbeth’s fear of Malcolm attaining kingship with Macduff’s help prompts Macbeth on a sudden impulse to exercise violence. As Lady Macduff says, the “traitor” Macbeth gains power; therefore, Scotland has become “a wild and violent sea” (4.2.21). To her son’s question “What is a traitor?”, Lady Macduff says, “Why, one that swears and lies. / ... / Every one that does so is a traitor and must be / hanged” (4.2.48-52). A citizen is expected to be loyal to his country by respecting law and order. Macbeth breaks his oath of loyalty to the service of the king. Therefore, disrespecting the norms of communal life and breaking peace makes him a

“traitor”, proving him to be a man who is in the state of nature. However, it is Macduff’s son who realizes that “there are / liars and swearers enow [enough] to beat the honest men, and / hang them up” (4.2.63-65). Macduff’s son implies that Macbeth, as a “liar and swearer” who ignores the requirements of the social contract, murders “the honest men”, King Duncan and Banquo. Soon after, murderers kill Macduff’s son.

Macbeth, till this point, represents an unlawful king by his unjust actions and control over his people. However, Malcolm discusses the nature of tyranny with Macduff in Act 4, scene 3, in which Macduff is put on stage as an opposite to what Macbeth is. By the time Macduff’s son is killed, Macduff is with Malcolm at the English court of King Edward. Regarding the tyrannical rule of Macbeth, Macduff says, “Hold fast the mortal sword and, like good men / Bestride our downfall birthdom. Each new morn / New widows howl, new orphans cry, new sorrows / Strike heaven on the face” (4.3.3-6). As the setting moves to England, civil life in Scotland is still being established, as Macduff tries to encourage Malcolm to attack the enemy Macbeth in Scotland. Unaware that his family is slaughtered, Macduff opposes the idea of living under tyranny (Palfrey 293).

The dialogue between Malcolm and Macduff compares the tyrant ruler Macbeth with the benevolent monarch, King Edward. Like political philosophers, Macduff and Malcolm comment on a tyrannical rule that favours personal gain against the rule of a monarch who works for the public gain. Malcolm speaks ill of himself while Macduff tries to encourage Malcolm to revolt against Macbeth. Malcolm denigrates himself, “were I king, / I should cut off the nobles for their lands, / Desire his jewels and this other’s house” (4.3.78-80). There, Malcolm indicates that in the hands of a greedy man, both the poor and the rich suffer because of a sovereign’s avarice. Macbeth has no kingly “graces” and features such “[a]s justice, verity, temperance, stableness, / Bounty, perseverance, mercy, lowliness, / Devotion, patience, courage, fortitude” (4.3.91-94). Although Malcolm defames himself, he actually means that the tyrant is Macbeth. For as he says, “had I power, I should / Pour the sweet milk of concord into hell” (4.3.97-98), Malcolm refers to the social agreement and harmony within a civil society through “the sweet milk of concord”, a metaphor which is similar to Lady Macbeth’s “I fear [Macbeth’s] nature, / It is too full o’th’ milk of human kindness”

(1.5.16-17). Kindness and harmony are among the features of a civil society without which “the universal peace” may be “confound[ed],” as an “uproar” may destroy “[a]ll unity on earth” (4.3.98-99). Therefore, as Hobbes has put it, “[t]ake away in any kind of state, the obedience, (and consequently the concord of the people,) and they shall not only not flourish, but in short time be dissolved” (*Leviathan* 224-25). Similar to Malcolm’s concern of the obedience of subjects to the king, Hobbes remarks that disobedience to a ruler would stir up trouble. Malcolm concludes that “such a one [is not] fit to govern” (4.3.101), as such a ruler is outside the social contract. Therefore, Macbeth is an illegitimate ruler, as he is not a legal monarch. Malcolm refers to Macbeth as “evil” because of whom Macduff is “banished ... from Scotland” (4.3.112-13). On that, Malcolm reveals the truth that he is not such a malignant man, as aforementioned misdeeds are “strangers to [his] nature” (4.3.125; Hattaway 115). Malcolm says that he spoke in such a way to test Macduff’s “truth and honour” (4.3.117).

Following that, a doctor enters, and tells Macduff and Malcolm that the King of England cures “a crew of wretched souls” (4.3.141). The play not only denigrates tyranny by Macbeth, but also eulogizes the English monarch Edward, who is believed to have “miraculous” healing power (4.3.147). In medieval times, the kings hanged “a golden stamp about their necks / put on with holy prayers” (4.3.153-54). A medal was hung around the necks of the cured ones (Clark and Mason 262-63) by the king whose power of healing would pass “to the succeeding royalty” (4.3.155). Edward is praised for representing his sacred authority so as to expose Macbeth’s wicked qualities. Therefore, a polar opposite of the “tyrant” Macbeth is constructed by means of the benevolent King Edward. Macbeth’s kingdom is like “the Kingdom of darkness”, as Macbeth talks to witches who are but “phantasms that appear in the air” (Hobbes, *Leviathan* 403). As Macbeth is regarded as “devilish” (4.3.117), King Edward is regarded as having “a heavenly gift of prophecy, / And sundry blessings hang about his throne, / That speak him full of grace” (4.3.157-59; Hattaway 116). From a Hobbesian perspective, Macbeth is “under [the] dominion” of evil and “darkness” as he is far-removed from “God’s grace” which is only valid for ones such as King Edward, Macduff, and Malcolm, “the faithful [ones] (who are the children of the light)” (*Leviathan* 403). Parallel to this, the contrast of day and night is repeated one

more time by Malcolm, for he says, “The night is long that never finds the day” (4.3.243). “Night” refers to Macbeth’s reign over Scotland which, in Ross’ words, “cannot be called our mother, but our grave”, for it is far from “light”, that is, the lawful heir of King Duncan, Malcolm (4.3.165-66). However, this lawful authority is then ready to attack Scotland with the help of King Edward and “good Siward, and ten thousand men” (4.3.191). Meanwhile, Macbeth goes on slaughtering, for as Ross breaks the news to Macduff, “Your castle is surprised, your wife and babes / Savagely slaughtered” (4.3.205-206). Ross requests Macduff to “[d]ispute it like a man” (4.3.223) so that they be strong to attack Macbeth. As to “the office of the sovereign representative” (*Leviathan* 222), Hobbes remarks that “people are to be taught, to abstain from violence to one another's person, by private revenges; from violation of conjugal honour...” (*Leviathan* 226-27). However, let alone teaching such a duty to his subjects, Macbeth as the king deploys violence on Macduff’s family for “private revenge”; therefore, this duty of a lawful king is violated by Macbeth, who is not fit to govern the state, for his violation, one more time, shows that he acts in accordance with the state of rivalry.

Act 5, similar to the beginning of the first act of the play, is full of violent acts and blood. An English invading army attacks Macbeth in Dunsinane. However, Lady Macbeth goes mad, for she cannot cope with her guilty conscience. Guilt causes “a great perturbation in nature”, as the doctor tells her (5.1.9). For Lady Macbeth, Duncan is “the old man ... / had so much blood in him” (5.1.39-40) that “[a]ll the / perfumes of Arabia will not sweeten this little hand” (5.1.50-51), although in Act 2 she claimed just the opposite, as she said, “a little water clears us of this deed” (2.2.68). “Unnatural deeds”, in the doctor’s words, refer to what Macbeth and Lady Macbeth have done, as they “breed unnatural troubles” (5.1.68-69). In other words, Macbeth and Lady Macbeth’s “deeds” are “unnatural” as they have no legitimate right to the throne; therefore, maintaining the throne by violence, and, in Malcolm’s word, “devilish” plans, brings “unnatural troubles” to the Macbeths. Lady Macbeth becomes aware of their “devilish” deeds as soon as she goes mad. Before this scene, Lady Macbeth has associated whatever they did with “darkness”; however, this time, “She has light by her continually,” as she cannot endure the heavy burden which brings her to a disturbed state of mind (5.1.16).

Macbeth's state of mind, as analysed thus far, is disturbed to such an extent that there is no way back for him. Macbeth's life seems to have lost its meaning, as even the death of Lady Macbeth means nothing to him. He says, "She should have died hereafter" (5.5.16), as he "forget[s] the taste of fears" (5.5.9). Violence once exercised by Macbeth now attacks him, as "[t]he English power is near, led on by Malcolm, / His uncle Siward and the good Macduff" as "[r]evenges burn in them" (5.2.1-3). "Open violence in battle" emerges against Macbeth's "secret murders sticking on his hands" (5.2.17). Macbeth's unlawful authority is shaken as "[t]hose he commands move only in command, / Nothing in love (5.2.19-20; Appelbaum 32). The prophecies of the witches come true. By the time the noblemen Menteith, Malcolm, and Siward arrive at Birnam wood, "every soldier hew[s] him down a bough / And bear't before him" to camouflage themselves (5.4.4-5). Macbeth's end is close, and "the very weapons used to combat violence ... are turned against their users" (Girard, *Violence and the Sacred* 31). In a way, the play represents what happens when a tyrant attains authority. The reason is that Macbeth misemploys the power of the state for his personal gains, as he ravages the civil order of Scotland. Macbeth cannot maintain the unlawful authority he usurped, so he "finds himself obliged to continue [killing] in order to hold on to the power he has gained" (Clark and Mason 2). Macduff enters with Macbeth's head, and all hail Malcolm as the new King of Scotland. Just as the traitor Macdonald's head was exhibited in Act 1, scene 2, Macbeth's head is now exhibited. However, the end of the play in which Malcolm establishes order is similar to the beginning of the play in which King Duncan rewards Macbeth with titles after Macbeth and Banquo defeated the enemy. Similar to his father, Malcolm rewards those around him with new titles. Therefore, although order is re-established, ambiguity regarding the future of the kingdom remains.

To conclude this chapter, it is worth recalling that Macbeth acts in accordance with the state of rivalry so as to "defend" his sovereignty on "other men" (*Leviathan* 83). The state of rivalry goes parallel with the state of nature because both states may subvert an authority and its civil laws. In the state of nature and rivalry, fear and diffidence lead man to protect what he has or what he has attained from others. The reason is that equality of the state of nature may render man egotistic who thereby regards others around him as rivals. Although one may attain the power of authority

by actions parallel to the state of nature, a feeling of diffidence – one of three reasons for conflict in the state of nature – pushes such a usurper (Macbeth in this case) towards war against other(s). In this context, diffidence stems from the assumption that equality in the state of nature leads one to attack other(s) so as to possess what the other(s) have (*Leviathan* 83-85). Moreover, it also leads to disrespecting the necessities of the social contract by means of regicide and actions of the state of rivalry in which one — Macbeth in this case — considers anyone around him (Malcolm, Banquo, Fleance) to be his potential rivals. Therefore, the state of nature lurks deep inside Macbeth's rivalrous actions. It is not only mimetic desire but also the state of nature that lead to the emergence of the state of rivalry. By following his passions in the state of nature, man acts for personal gain, such that in the state of rivalry, the self-interested side of man may be revealed.

Turning and turning in the widening gyre
 The falcon cannot hear the falconer;
 Things fall apart; the centre cannot hold;
 Mere anarchy is loosed upon the world,
 The blood-dimmed tide is loosed, and everywhere
 The ceremony of innocence is drowned;
 The best lack all conviction, while the worst
 Are full of passionate intensity.

(William Butler Yeats, *the Second Coming*, 1-8)

CHAPTER FOUR

THE (FE)MALE RIVALRY and COMPETITION in *KING LEAR*

William Shakespeare's *King Lear* is among "the greatest tragedies" (Bradley 209). Raphael Holinshed's tale *King Leir in the Chronicles* and the English poet Edmund Spenser's (1552–1599) Book Two, Canto Ten in *The Faerie Queen* (1590) are among the sources of the main plot of *King Lear*. The subplot of the conflict between Gloucester and his sons resembles the English statesman and poet Sir Philip Sidney's (1554–1586) epic romance *Arcadia* (1593) (Dolven and Keilen 23). This subplot is taken from an account of the blind King of Paphlagonia and his two sons. In Book One, chapter 10, Sidney writes, "Paphlagonia, by the hard-harted [u]ngratefulnes of a son ... of his, depri[v]ed, not onely of his kingdome ... but of his sight ... I was caried by a bastarde sonne of mine ... first to mislike, then to hate, lastly to destroy" ("the Countess"). Paphlagonia is blinded and exiled by his bastard son, whereas his other son aids him.

King Lear differs from *Titus Andronicus* and *Macbeth* in that the latter two plays begin with the outcomes of war. Furthermore, in *Titus Andronicus*, the "emperor" is dead, whereas in *Macbeth*, the "king" is murdered. As analyzed thus far in these two plays, "glory" in *Titus Andronicus* and "diffidence" in *Macbeth* lead to conflicts in the state of nature, as well as rivalry. These notions and incidents in these two plays result in crises. However, in *King Lear*, it is neither the death or murder of a sovereign nor a war that leads to political crisis, but it is the king's action that leads to "civil laws" to

be disobeyed. Although Lear aims to eliminate any possible conflict that may arise due to inheritance, the sibling rivals Goneril and Regan bring crisis, as they act in line with the state of nature, rivalry, and mimetic desire. To this end, “competition” as the third and last reason among the reasons of conflict in the state of nature has parallel effects with mimetic desire. This parallel relationship between them results in a state of rivalry that brings forth disorder.

Regan and Goneril are two rival siblings among King Lear’s three daughters. Among them, Cordelia is the youngest. On the other hand, within the subplot, Edmund is the Earl of Gloucester’s illegitimate son. His elder brother is Edgar, Gloucester’s legitimate son. An earl reserves a high level of importance in the hierarchy, as an earl “is the third most powerful among the nobility ranks” (“What is an Earl?”). His rank is lower than that of a duke and a marquess. Therefore, the plot and the subplot relate to one another in that the state of rivalry leads to a weakening of authority, as will be analysed in this part.

By critically analyzing *King Lear*, this chapter argues that King Lear’s dividing the kingdom is a violation of the civil laws, as this is an act that leads to the weakening of the state, as those in the state of nature, namely Regan, Goneril, and Edmund, take advantage of this division “to make themselves masters” (*Leviathan* 83). Moreover, these three characters wait for the right time to act in line with the state of rivalry to gain more power than the other(s). Therefore, the state of nature is revealed, as Edmund, Regan, and Goneril think and act against the civil state and as they take advantage of the loss of authority following the division of the kingdom. The conflict is between men in the state of nature and men in the civil state, namely, between Goneril, Regan, and Edmund on one hand and Lear, Kent, Edgar, Gloucester, and Cordelia on the other. Therefore, Shakespeare presents a “variety of people” in *King Lear* (Hoenselaars 140).

Act 1, within this context, begins with a dialogue between two earls, Kent and Gloucester. The Earl of Kent and the Earl of Gloucester are seen discussing King Lear’s “division of the kingdom” (1.1.4). The two earls already know that the king will divide the kingdom. However, both seem to be surprised, as Kent says, “I thought the king had more ... [favored] the Duke of Albany than Cornwall” (1.1.1–2). The earls seem to suppose that the King, by his actions and manners, favors the Duke of Albany,

husband to Lear's eldest daughter Goneril, more than the Duke of Cornwall, Lear's second daughter Regan's husband. Similarly, Gloucester says, "It did always seem so to us: but now, in the/division of the kingdom, it appears not which of the dukes he values most, for qualities are so weighed that/curiosity in neither can make choice of either's moiety" (1.1.3–6). Although they suppose that the king favors one over the other, King Lear aims to divide the kingdom equally.

Gloucester, despite joking, belittles his younger "bastard" son, Edmund, as he says, "I have so often blushed to acknowledge him that now I/am brazed to't", although Edmund is present with them (1.1.9). In terms of inheritance, Edmund does not have equal rights with and advantages over his brother Edgar. The legitimate son, Edgar, in Gloucester's words, is "by order of law, some/year elder than" Edmund (1.1.18–19). The words "brazed" for Edmund and "by order of law" for Edgar may indicate that Gloucester is aware of the inheritance laws that protect the rights of the legitimate son. However, Gloucester actually means that he does not favor either of his sons by saying that they are "no dearer in ... [his] account" (1.1.19).

Soon after their dialogue, King Lear, his three daughters, the lords of France and Burgundy, one of whom will be betrothed to Cordelia, enter the scene. At once, the king announces his "darker purpose", as he says, "we have divided/In three our kingdom" (1.1.35–37). This implies that he has planned to distribute three equal parts of the country to his daughters, Regan, Goneril, and Cordelia. With respect to the distribution of a country by a sovereign, Hobbes remarks, "dividing of the sovereign power ... is directly against the essence of a commonwealth" (*Leviathan* 216). Although Lear aims to prevent possible "future stri[ves]," rivalries and jealousy that may stem from property sharing among his daughters after his possible death, he disregards the duty of a sovereign from a Hobbesian perspective (Elliott 262). A king shall not intermingle public affairs with personal affairs because, by doing the opposite, he may "experience a tragic" end (Miola, *Roman Comedy* 31). The reason why this is a personal affair is clear when Lear says,

Tell me, my daughters—
 Since now we will divest us both of rule,
 Interest of territory, cares of state—
 Which of you shall we say doth love us most,
 That we our largest bounty may extend
 Where nature doth with merit challenge. (1.1.48–53)

“Cares of state” interest all subjects, soldiers, noblemen in a country; therefore, distributing them by a personal question, “which of you shall we say doth love us most”, may weaken “civil laws” (1.1.50–51; Hobbes, *Leviathan* 175–177; Greenblatt, *Shakespeare’s Freedom* 105). The civil laws contain the law of nature, and they are of equal importance in the sustainability of authority and order. Honesty, justice, objectivity, and reason above all are included in the law of nature, and these are “qualities that dispose men to peace and obedience” (Hobbes, *Leviathan* 177). The civil laws and law of nature are so related to one another that “obedience to the civil law is part also of the law of nature. Civil and natural law are not different kinds [of] ... law... without ... which there cannot possibly be any peace” (Hobbes, *Leviathan* 178). To this end, the peace-maker, the King, needs to be careful with his decisions and actions, especially while discussing personal matters publicly. Moreover, a king is expected to be experienced enough to know that in such matters, human nature may be deceptive. This implies that all or any of his daughters may exaggerate their show of love to take a bigger share than the other(s). It is not easy to be objective and reasonable to share land and the cares of state—an action “above the law” by competition for love (Greenblatt, *Shakespeare’s Freedom* 105).

The King lets “Goneril, [the] eldest born, speak first” (1.1.53–54). Lear follows a hierarchical order in terms of his daughters’ age. This incident and his aim to distribute the kingdom equally among his daughters present the idea that Lear wants to be objective. However, as aforementioned, he does not consider the misleading aspect of human nature. First, Goneril replies,

Sir, I do love you more than word can wield the
matter,
Dearer than eyesight, space, and liberty,
Beyond what can be valued, rich or rare,
No less than life, with grace, health, beauty, honour.
.../...

Beyond all manner of so much I love you. (1.1. 54–61)

Goneril flatters with words of fancy to attain a good share. However, it is the king who leads his daughter to flatter him. Upon her answer, Lear says, “Of all these bounds, even from this line to this,/.../.../We make thee lady. To thine and Albany’s issues/Be this perpetual” (1.1.63–67). His second daughter Regan, Cornwall’s wife, replies in a similar fashion:

Sir I am made of that self mettle as my sister

And prize me at her worth. In my true heart
 I find she names my very deed of love;
 Only she comes too short ... /
 And find I am alone felicitate
 In your dear highness' love. (1.1.69–76)

By saying “she comes too short,” Regan praises the king more than Goneril does, implying that Goneril, the rival in this competition, is “short” in praising Lear; therefore, it is evident that Regan and Goneril are sibling rivals (Berry, *Lear's System* 424). This is the point when their rivalry begins. However, King Lear is not “cognizant of the potential disaster that such rivalry might cause”, as the words “self” and “felicitate” bring to mind the state of nature (Cahn 298). Moreover, these words may refer to the happiness of a person; therefore, her words resemble the definition of the state of nature, as the title of this notion in *Leviathan* is as such: “the Natural Condition of Mankind as Concerning their Felicity and Misery” (82). One who is in the state of nature considers his felicity by a subjective view based on personal feelings and passions (McEachern 192). To rid themselves from “misery,” the rivals Regan and Goneril enter a competition (Berry, *Lear's System* 422). Each desires to get a better portion of the territory than the other. Thus, their state of rivalry is simply a consequence of competition, a reason for the state of nature (Mann 91).

The relationship among Lear's authority, Regan, and Goneril may not be explained *yet* by mimetic desire (italics by the writer of the dissertation). Although Lawrence R. Schehr, in his essay, *King Lear: Monstrous Mimesis*, asserts that theirs is mimetic desire, Regan and Goneril are not yet in “mimetic rivalry” (54). Particularly, in this scene, the two daughters are represented in a manner that depicts them to be in a “competition” (Hobbes, *Leviathan* 83). Although in his Girardian analysis, Schehr asserts that “mimetic rivalry ... transforms both Goneril and Regan into monsters” (54), his argument may not be true because what makes them “monsters,” in Schehr's words, is not “mimetic rivalry” at this point, but the state of nature (53–55). In other words, neither Goneril nor Regan takes one another as a mediator because they are competing with each other, and Lear asks them to tell him how much they love him to get a good portion of the territories. Although Regan and Goneril later become mimetic rivals, as Edmund will affect their desires, as will be analysed, *in this scene*, theirs is not mimetic rivalry (italics by the writer of the dissertation). Unknowingly, Schehr revolves around the notion of the state of nature, as he says, “[t]he composite being of

the monster is precisely *the animal nature* within or attached to *the human (civilized) nature*" (54; italics by the writer of the dissertation). Indeed, "the animal nature" that is linked to "the human (civilized) nature" by Schehr reflects the state of nature in which man is "out of civil state" like an animal. Out of the civil state, "there is always war of every one against everyone" (Hobbes, *Leviathan* 84). Similarly, animals fight against each other, as there is no hierarchy or a ruler among them because they are equal by birth, as is the case in the state of nature (Hobbes, *Leviathan* 84). Therefore, in this scene, contrary to a Girardian reading, Regan and Goneril are in a competition to attain Lear's land and authority.

Regan and Goneril seem to be hypocritical, as "Lear has invited flattery" (Foakes, *King Lear* 161). Although a king holds the greatest power in his country, he may be in need of being flattered to feel better and stronger. With respect to this need of flattery, Hobbes writes that "kings, whose power is greatest, turn their endeavors to the assuring it at home by laws, or abroad by wars: and when that is done, there succeedeth a new desire; ... of *admiration, or being flattered for excellence*" (*Leviathan* 66; italics by the writer of the dissertation). No war threatens the existence of Lear's state, and his citizens seem to obey the laws. Thus, Lear, in a way, asks his daughters to praise him. Therefore, "a restless desire of power after power" shapes Lear's manners (Hobbes, *Leviathan* 66).

Then, it is Cordelia's turn to partake in the competition, as Lear says, "[a]lthough our last and least, to whose young love/The vines of France and milk of Burgundy/Strive to be interes[t]ed, what can you say to draw/A third more opulent than your sisters'? Speak." (1.1.83–86). It is now crystal clear that Lear is, indeed, holding a competition, as he enunciates, "a third *more opulent than your sisters*" (1.1.86; italics by the writer of the dissertation). It seems that Lear has "reserved the richest" share for Cordelia; yet, she is to "speak" with more flattering words than her sisters (Foakes, *King Lear* 163). However, she says "nothing" (1.1.87). Cordelia's choice to say "nothing" is asked to be mended by Lear. Thus, Cordelia says,

You have begot me, bred me, loved me.
I return those duties back as are right fit,
Obey you, love you, and most honour you.
Why have my sisters husbands if they say
They love you all? Haply, when I shall wed,
That lord whose hand must take my plight shall carry

Half my love with him, half my care and duty. (1.1.96–102)

The relation between father and child is established on “duties,” “obe[dience],” and “honour” (1.1.97–98). These are similar notions that are expected from subjects to sustain the sovereign’s power. To this extent, Cordelia does not disregard the power of the authority. However, Lear senses disobedience and denigration, as she does not utter flattering words like the sibling rivals Goneril and Regan. Although Cordelia says that she is speaking the truth, Lear takes it as denigration, and he says, “thy truth then be thy dower” (1.1.109). Lear gets so angry that he says,

By all the operation of the orbs
From whom we do exist and cease to be,
Here I disclaim all my paternal care,
Propinquity, and property of blood,
And as a stranger to my heart and me
Hold thee from this forever. (1.1.112–17)

The King announces that he has disinherited Cordelia by vowing on “Hecate and the night ... and the orbs” (1.1.111–12). Apart from the civil laws and the power of authority, Lear refers to the orbs that affect “human fate” (Foakes, *King Lear* 165). Hecate, as in *Macbeth*, is the goddess associated with magic, night, and witchcraft. Along with Hecate, Lear refers to another name that is considered to be out of civilization, as he says,

The barbarous Scythian,
Or he that makes his generation messes
To gorge his appetite, shall to my bosom
Be as well neighbored, pitied, and relieved,
As thou my sometime daughter. (1.1.117–121)

Scythia is an ancient region that extends over “Europe and Asiatic Russia, inhabited by a nomadic people viewed as barbaric” (Bate, *Titus Andronicus* 136). With respect to the Scythians, two things are crucial. The first is that they are nomadic; therefore, they do not have a permanent settlement, and they move periodically. The second is that they are known to be “barbarous,” as put forth in *Titus Andronicus* as well (1.1.134). As Lear says, “he that makes his generation messes” (1.1.118); he compares Cordelia to “cannibals” who eat their babies (Foakes, *King Lear* 166). Thus, the three references to Hecate, the Scythians, and cannibals imply a problem of weakening of the social contract, civil laws, and civil life. King Lear attributes the problem to Cordelia who has, for Lear, disobeyed her father and the King. This implies that, for

Lear, Cordelia speaks against the power of authority as a barbarous, uncivilized person who is in the state of nature.

In this context, Lear is aware of the requirements of civil laws and the social contract, as his references indicate. By remarking, “Why have my sisters husbands, if they say/They love you all?,” Cordelia seems to be telling the truth, as she has already indicated (1.1.99–100). This indicates that she does not want to participate in the love-competition by flattering her father, as she says, “I cannot heave/My heart into my mouth. I love your majesty/According to my bond, no more nor less” (1.1.91–93). It seems that Cordelia means that she loves her father, but proclaiming this publicly would imply flattery. As her father is the king who has decided to share the kingdom, Cordelia seems to suppose that by speaking with flattering words in the eyes of the others around them, she would come across as speaking in such a way to gain lands. Yet, Lear does not grasp what Cordelia means. Therefore, Cordelia, unlike Goneril and Regan, does not decide and act in line with the state of nature. Thus, Cordelia does not compete with her rival siblings, as she is not in the state of rivalry (Reid 230–35; Moore 71).

Lear, upon this incident, gives the third share to Regan, Goneril, and their husbands. He says, “the sway,/Revenue, execution of the rest,/Beloved sons, be yours; which to confirm,/This coronet part between you” (1.1.136–39). A king wears a crown, whereas princes wear a coronet. However, the king hands over the control of the government, the money received in the kingdom, and the “coronet” “intended for Cordelia” to his sons-in-law and the rival siblings (Foakes, *King Lear* 167). Although “it is the sovereign power that obliges men to obey” civil laws, the king “appears to have been illegal” with respect to his distribution of his lands and power (Hobbes, *Leviathan* 177; Foakes, *King Lear* 17). It is illegal and a violation of the civil laws because “any property ... [is] not ... owned by the monarch as an individual;” therefore, “the king ... could not give away lands to a subject in his own person” (Foakes, *King Lear* 17).

Meanwhile, the Earl of Kent interrupts Lear: “be Kent unmannerly/When Lear is mad. What wouldst thou do, old man?/Think’st thou that duty shall have dread to speak,/When power to flattery bows? To plainness honour’s bound” (1.1. 146–49). Here, Kent implies that Lear respects Goneril and Regan’s “flattery” words by

ignoring Cordelia's "plain honour". This is why he assumes that Lear "is mad." Kent realizes that the king acts against the norms of the law of nature and the civil laws because, for Kent, Lear is not reasonable in his decisions. To this end, Kent says, "Reserve thy state" (1.1.150), a political utterance that is meant to say that the king needs to keep power and authority. "The state," as Kent says, may refer to the state of nature in which the power of authority is weakened. Yet, Lear cannot grasp what Kent means, and he banishes Kent by ordering him "to turn back [his] hated back/upon [his] kingdom" (1.1. 176–7). With respect to Kent's warnings, Lear says, "nor our nature, nor our place can bear" (1.1.172). Here, Lear is referring to his authority that rules Britain by "sentences [laws] and ... power" (1.1.171). By nature, Lear refers to the Great Chain of Being, the hierarchy of nature, which "stretched from the foot of God's throne to the meanest of inanimate objects" (Tillyard 23).

Like Kent, the King of France realizes that Cordelia has done nothing to disrespect Lear's authority. Cordelia says that she is not good at flattering and that she has no "soliciting eye," by which she means that she does not beg for wealth (1.1.225–35). To her, the King of France says, "Fairest Cordelia, that art most rich being poor,/ ... /Thee and thy virtues here I seize upon,/Be it lawful I take up what's cast away" (1.1.252–55). Therefore, Cordelia goes to France as queen although she is not glad to leave her father with her sisters. To her sisters, Cordelia says, "I know you what you are;" yet, she does not name their "faults" (1.1.271–73). Her statement, "I would prefer him to a better place", foreshadows a bad condition that Goneril and Regan will create for Lear (1.1.276). Cordelia implies that she is not pleased with her father's relinquishment of sovereign power. She insinuates that "Time shall unfold what plighted cunning hides,/Who covers faults at last with shame derides" (1.1.282–83). By this statement, Cordelia means that it remains to be seen how her sisters' words of love are deceptive, that is, their egotistical and self-centered personalities will be revealed.

With respect to their father, Goneril and Regan discuss the effects of old age, which is "full of changes" (1.1.290; Greenblatt, *Hamlet in Purgatory* 3). Regan and Goneril realize Cordelia's honesty in the love-competition, as Goneril says, "with what poor/judgments he hath now cast [Cordelia] off" (1.1.292–93). Although Goneril and Regan suppose that Lear's judgment regarding Cordelia was wrong, they do nothing

to justify Cordelia. They refer to King Lear's age as "choleric years," suggesting that he is prone to anger while making decisions, as evidenced by "Kent's banishment" (1.1. 300–302). Goneril says that they "must do something" to render Lear ineffective (1.1.309). Therefore, it is now clear that Goneril and Regan seem to have acted for their personal gains during the love-competition in accordance with the state of rivalry. Goneril says that they need to "hit together" to plot against their father (1.1.304). They aim to restrain Lear from "carry[ing] authority;" otherwise, their plans of subverting his authority may be disturbed (1.1.305). Therefore, as their dialogue reveals, these two sisters plan to act against the requirements of the civil laws that stand for "the procuration of the safety of the people" (Hobbes, *Leviathan* 222). However, as they are in the state of rivalry (not yet mimetic rivalry) for personal gain, neither Goneril nor Regan uses the power of authority for public benefit. Goneril realizes that "Lear has so identified himself with power that he may not be able to relinquish it" (Foakes, *King Lear* 178–79), which is why the two rival siblings decide to "further think of" their plan to subvert Lear's authority (1.1.308; Foakes, *King Lear* 179). The two rivals disregard the social contract and the power of the king, as their dialogue reveals. Thus, it seems that Lear's manner of dividing the kingdom is inconsistent with his office to the kingdom, as his decision may lead "to the dissolution of a commonwealth" (Hobbes, *Leviathan* 215).

Among "things that weaken" a commonwealth is that a sovereign "is sometimes content with less power" (Hobbes, *Leviathan* 213). Yet, in such a case, "defense of the commonwealth is necessarily required," as Goneril and Regan desire to attain Lear's authority, taking advantage of the authority's loss of power. This is what happens when King Lear transfers his right to rule the kingdom to his sons-in-law and two daughters because they begin to plot against him to subvert the power that is left to him. Therefore, Hobbes is right in saying that it is "against the duty of a sovereign to relinquish any essential right of sovereignty" (Hobbes, *Leviathan* 222).

The second scene of Act 1 introduces the subplot. The Earl of Gloucester has two sons, Edmund, a "bastard" (1.2.6), and Edgar, the elder "legitimate" son (1.2.16). Edmund plots against his father Gloucester and Edgar "to have [Edgar's] land" (1.2.16). He hides a "letter," which denigrates Gloucester, with the intention of showing that it was written by Edgar (1.2.19). Edmund says,

Thou, Nature, art my goddess. To thy law
 My services are bound. Wherefore should I
 Stand in the plague of custom, and permit
 The curiosity of nations to deprive me
 For that I am some twelve or fourteen moonshines
 Lag of a brother? Why bastard? (1.2.1–6)

For Edmund, “nature” is a law-maker to whom his “services are.” Yet, he may refer to the state of nature in which there is no rule. Therefore, Edmund refers to the lawless state of nature in which he may become a rival to his brother. Therefore, by nature, he means neither the authority nor its laws. Edmund reproaches in exasperation why he should submit to the civil laws that lead him to have no rights of inheritance, as he is “twelve of fourteen” months younger than the “legitimate” Edgar. Edmund cannot endure “custom;” therefore, he does not want to “remain subject to ... laws, which denied a bastard any share by inheritance” in Gloucester’s property (Foakes, *King Lear* 179). Edmund takes a stand against the orderly and hierarchical arrangement of the social contract. Thus, his statement, “nature ... to thy law/my services are” may stand for the state of nature, as he disdains civil laws (1.2.1–2). These are the laws that procure the safety of the subjects in a society. Civil laws exist to restrain any disobedience, civil strife, fight, and war that threaten the security of people. Therefore, disdaining the civil laws suggests that Edmund, Regan, and Goneril are in the state of nature. In other words, Edmund, similar to Goneril and Regan, does not acknowledge the validity of civil laws. However, each seems to obey the rules and laws as obedient subjects and children who love and care about their fathers. Yet, this incident is revealed when each is alone, suggesting that they conceal their true identities otherwise. Within this context, the conditions of the two fathers resemble one another in that Gloucester is unaware of his son Edmund’s secret plot and, likewise, Lear is ignorant of his daughters Regan and Goneril’ plans. This is why these characters are in the state of nature (Danby 46–47).

Edmund supposes that he is not different from Edgar although the laws leave no legacy to him. He is envious of his brother; therefore, he decides to compete with him without Edgar being aware of this situation. With his plan pertaining to the “letter,” Edmund aims to bequeath his “father’s love to” himself and denigrate Edgar (1.2.17; 1.2.19). The “letter” is Edmund’s “invention,” which shows he has a “quicker mind

than” Edgar (Hobbes, *Leviathan* 82). Yet, by “quicker mind,” Hobbes means to imply someone who plays a trick on someone for one’s personal gain.

To spark a conflict between Edgar and Gloucester, Edmund slyly “pockets the letter” (1.2.27), and Gloucester, noticing the letter, says, “The quality of nothing/hath not such need to hide itself” (1.2.34–35). Gloucester’s statement brings to mind Lear’s words, “Nothing will come of nothing” (1.1.90). Gloucester, in a way, echoes Lear’s response to his youngest daughter, Cordelia. This seems like a reiteration of the theme of conflict between father and child. However, Edmund increases the tension by saying, “It is a letter from/my brother that I have not all o’er-read; and for so much/as I have perused, I find it not fit for your o’er-looking” (1.2.37–39). Gloucester reads the letter:

This policy and reverence of age
makes the world bitter to the best of our times, keeps
our fortunes from us till our oldness cannot relish
them. I begin to find an idle and fond bondage in the
oppression of aged tyranny, who sways not as it hath
power but as it is suffered. Come to me, that of this I
may speak more. If our father would sleep till I waked
him, you should enjoy half his revenue forever and live
the beloved of your brother. Edgar. (1.2. 46–54)

The letter portrays Edgar as plotting against his father to “enjoy half his revenue”, as the other half is promised to Edmund, in case he helps him (1.2.53). Edmund’s plot is similar to that of Regan and Goneril’s. In a similar manner, Edmund writes about “oldness” and “the oppression of the aged tyranny” that make “power” ungovernable (1.2. 48–51). Therefore, the letter implies Gloucester is to be dead so that his sons may “enjoy his revenue” (1.2.53). As Gloucester believes in the letter, he gets angry like Lear. In the eyes of both fathers, each situation—Cordelia’s “nothing” (1.1.87) and Edgar’s “conspiracy” (1.2.54)—signifies a revolt against the father’s authority.

Noticing that his plan is working, Edmund says, “I have heard him oft/maintain it to be fit that, sons at perfect age and fathers/declined, the father should be as ward to the son and/the son manage his revenue” (1.2.71–74). Edmund leads Gloucester to call Edgar a “villain” who, for Gloucester, is plotting against his father by taking advantage of his old age that leads authority to weaken (1.2.75). Gloucester takes Edgar as a “danger” to his authority (1.2.88).

These late eclipses in the sun and moon
portend no good to us. Though the wisdom of Nature

can reason it thus and thus, yet nature finds itself
 scourged by the sequent effects. Love cools, friendship
 falls off, brothers divide: in cities, mutinies; in
 countries, discord; in palaces, treason; and the bond
 cracked 'twixt son and father. This villain of mine
 comes under the prediction – there's son against father. (1.2. 103–110)

As mentioned before, Edmund's reference to "nature" evokes the notion of the state of nature. However, Gloucester's reference to "Nature" has a completely different implication compared to Edmund's. When Gloucester says, "the wisdom of Nature," he is referring to the law of nature, as evidenced by when he says, the state of nature "portend[s] no good to" public, whereas "the wisdom of Nature/can reason" the punitive "effects" (1.2.104–106). Therefore, similar to King Lear, by nature, Gloucester refers to the power of authority. Due to the effects of the state of nature, "brothers divide," as has been analyzed in the relationship between Saturninus and Bassianus in *Titus Andronicus*, and "mutinies" occur because of "treason," as in the example of *Macbeth*.

With respect to the results of the weakening of authority, Gloucester further explains, "The king falls from bias of nature—there's father/against child. We have seen the best of our time./Machinations, hollowness, treachery, and all ruinous/disorders follow us disquietly to our graves" (1.2.111–114). Due to the state of nature, "treachery" prowls around, and it generates disorder, as "the king falls" from power. Therefore, by "the best of our time," Gloucester refers to the strength of authority that keeps society and order at its best. Once the state of nature is revealed, the honest man who obeys the norms of civil laws is banished, just as "the noble and true-hearted Kent [is] banished" (1.2.117). Gloucester, therefore, notices that Lear has made a wrong judgment by banishing Kent; yet, similar to Lear, Gloucester takes a sudden decision against Edgar.

As soon as Edmund meets with Edgar, Edmund says that Gloucester is angry with him, and Edgar says, "[s]ome villain hath done [him] wrong" (1.2.163). Edmund tells Edgar to "go armed" (1.2.170). Edgar believes him and exits. Following this, Edmund soliloquizes his intention: "on [Edgar and Gloucester's] foolish honesty/My practices ride easy. I see the business./Let me, if not by birth, have lands by wit" (1.2.179–81). This implies that the state of nature pushes Edmund to the state of rivalry to gain land. Moreover, Edmund wants to be like Edgar, that is, he desires to take his

rival brother's place (Kahn, *Hobbes, Romance* 6). Edmund's statement, "Legitimate Edgar, I must have your land" (1.2.16) refers to "a craving for the patrimony in which the rival brother and the rival father become almost indistinguishable" (Cooley 342). Edmund regards Lear's dividing the kingdom as his loss of power in Britain. Taking advantage of this condition, Edmund decides to act for his personal gain through wit, that is, by scheming. In Hobbes' words, "Where there is no common power, there is no law: where no law, no injustice" (Hobbes, *Leviathan* 85). This implies that if there is no law, then any action may be deemed just. This is realized when Edmund says, "All with me's meet hat I can fashion fit" (1.2.182), by which he means that any way to achieve his final aim is acceptable because Britain begins to lose power.

Goneril, in the next scene, plots against Lear. Goneril tells Oswald, her steward, "If you come slack of former services/You shall do well; the fault of it I'll answer" (1.3. 10–11). She is aware of the fact that by making her steward serve Lear in a disrespectful way, Lear may realize that his authority is not being respected as it used to be. When she says, Regan's "mind and mine I know in that are one,/Not to be overruled" (1.3.16–17), Goneril means that both Regan and she reject and disallow Lear's authority to be superior to theirs. Goneril says,

Idle old man
That still would manage those authorities
That he hath given away. Now by my life
Old fools are babes again and must be used
With checks as flatteries, when they are seen abused. (1.3.17–21)

Goneril supposes that Lear is too old to manage the authority. This idea is similar to that of Edmund's in the previous scene. Goneril desires to attain more power, as she is not content with what she has. This is because "there is no way for any man to secure himself" or his property in the state of nature (Hobbes, *Leviathan* 83). Although she has the authority and land, she is not glad that Lear wants to "manage his authorities" (1.3.18). The desire to attain more power than one deserves is among "the passions" that lead one to make "a war ... against every man" (*Leviathan* 84).

Such are the decisions and actions of man who is in the state of nature. However, although he is banished, Kent remains in the civil state. His loyalty is revealed by his disguise: "If but as well I other accents borrow/That can my speech diffuse, my good intent/May carry through itself to that full issue" (1.4.1–3). He disguises and speaks with an accent to be a server to King Lear. Kent's plan is intended for the good of the

public and authority, as he realizes that Lear and his authority are under threat. His plan “allows him to give full expression to his true nature as a faithful follower of Lear” (Foakes, *King Lear* 192). Kent presents himself as “a very honest-hearted fellow” (1.4. 19). The disguised Kent says that he would like to “call [Lear] master” as he seems to have “authority” (1.4.28; 1.4.30). Kent aims to prove his loyalty and protect Lear’s authority against any threat that may come from those who do not obey the requirements of the civil state. Similar to Kent, one of the 100 knights of Lear in Goneril’s palace, “3 Knight,” says,

... your highness is not entertained with
that ceremonious affection as you ... [used to be]. There’s a
great abatement of kindness appears as well in the
general dependents as in the Duke himself also, and
your daughter. (1.4.56–60)

The knight means that the king’s authority is not treated well. Oswald and Goneril’s manners are not appropriate in terms of respecting a king. For this reason, the knight says, “for my duty cannot be silent when I think/your Highness wronged” (1.4.63–64), by which the knight implies that he is ready to exercise violence to sustain the King’s authority. Similarly, Kent is aware of the civil laws that establish order. In this regard, he says, “I’ll teach you differences” (1.4.88) when Oswald acts disrespectfully towards Lear. Kent means that Goneril and her steward disregard Lear’s authority, as Oswald says that Lear is “[his] lady’s father” (1.4.77). For Kent, who acts in line with the civil state, Lear is more than a “lady’s father” to Oswald, as Lear is the king. Therefore, by “differences,” Kent refers to the distinctions of rank. As a sign of his loyalty to Lear, Kent “trips” and “pushes [Oswald] out” (1.4.84; 1.4.90).

Meanwhile, the fool appears and jokes with Lear by saying, “Why, this/fellow has banished two on’s daughters and did the/third a blessing against his will—if thou follow him,/thou must needs wear my coxcomb” (1.4.100–103). The fool implies that Lear has inverted order and banished Kent and Cordelia. Yet, as the fool suggests, Lear’s banishment of Cordelia conduces her to become Queen of France. Furthermore, the fool says, “If I gave them all my living, I’d keep my coxcombs/myself. There’s mine; beg another of thy daughters” (1.4.106–107). His statement may refer to a proverb: “he that gives ALL before he dies provides to suffer (is a fool)” (Dent 48, emphasis in original). The proverb, to which the fool refers, foreshadows that Lear will both “suffer” and “beg ... of [his] daughters” (1.4.107). In other words, the fool realizes

that as the king has decided to give “all” his property and land and transfer his power to “another,” he may suffer. Moreover, the fool catches Lear’s attention with his song, “fools had ne’er les grace in a year,/for wise men are grown foppish, and know not how their wits to wear, their manners are so apish” (1.4.158–61). The fool may imply that experienced and reasonable men in the civil state “have become foolish” because they do not know how to display their wit and reason to men who are in the state of nature (Foakes, *King Lear* 201). The reason for this is that civilized men act in an apish way. Here, “apish” refers to the opposite of reason; therefore, it refers to the manners of men who disregard the law of nature. The fool even comes to the point of saying that Lear has become a man that has made his “daughters [his] mothers” (1.4.163–64). Shakespeare, in a way, on one hand, presents man in the state of nature—Goneril, Regan, and Edmund—and, on the other hand, men in the civil state—Cordelia, Kent, the fool, and Edgar. Kent, the King of France, and the fool try to show that Goneril and Regan are acting against the norms of authority and civil laws. For example, the fool says, “thou/clovest thy crown i’t the middle and gav’st away both/ parts, thou bor’st thine ass on thy back o’er the dirt” (1.4.152–54; Stern 46). Through this, he means that the crown is a symbol of authority that cannot be divided because, in the end, such an action may subvert order.

As Kent and the fool imply, Lear is acting against the law of nature. Even Goneril implies to Lear that he is out of reason in his manner: “make use of your good wisdom,” “as you are old and reverend, should be wise” (1.4.211; 1.4.231). She tells Lear that his “hundred knights, and squires,/Men so disordered” (1.4.232–33). Therefore, as Goneril says, Lear’s knights break peace in her palace, so Lear needs to “disquantity [his] train” (1.4.240), which means that Lear has to decrease the number of his knights and followers. Even the fool recognizes “the inversion of order in Goneril’s” manners in front of her father (Foakes, *King Lear* 204). The fool says that it is “Lear’s shadow,” as he becomes a king, that lacks authority (1.4.222). Soon after, Goneril dismisses “fifty of [Lear’s] followers” (1.4.286), and Lear curses Goneril. Meanwhile, Goneril’s husband, the Duke of Albany, does not justify her actions, as evidenced by when he says, “My lord, I am guiltless as I am ignorant/of what hath moved you” (1.4.265–66). Albany realizes that making Lear powerless is unjust, and he tries to warn Goneril: “I cannot be so partial Goneril,/to the great love I bear you”

(1.4.304–305). He realizes that Goneril’s actions are out of the civil state. Like Lady Macbeth who says that Macbeth’s nature “is too full o’the milk of human kindness” that cannot revolt against authority (1.5.17), Goneril refers to Albany’s loyalty to Lear’s power as “this milky gentleness and course of yours” (1.4.337). Goneril means that she and Albany have different views on the respectability of authority, as Goneril is ready to subvert authority for her self-interest. However, at the end of Act 1, Lear realizes that he “did [Cordelia] wrong” (*Macbeth* 1.5.24) and in view of his favors to Goneril and Regan, he says, “I will forget my nature: so kind a father!” and “keep me in temper, I would not be mad” (1.5.45).

Act 2 continues with the other father and child relationship. Edmund sets his plot into action as soon as he is informed that the Duke of Cornwall is visiting their castle. Curan, a courtier in Gloucester’s castle, talks about a likelihood of a war between “the two dukes of Cornwall and Albany” (2.1.12). That is, a state of rivalry between the dukes is implied by the courtier. Moreover, Edmund acts as an opportunist, and he asks Edgar, “Have you not spoken ‘gainst the Duke of Cornwall.../He’s coming hither, now, i’the night, i’the haste,/and Regan with him. Have you nothing said/upon his party ‘gainst the Duke of Albany?” (2.1.24–27; Bartlett 9). Edmund aims to make Edgar anxious and uneasy like an accusing interrogator to restrain him from thinking rationally so that he does not consider and analyze the information Edmund has and make judgments because of the situation Edgar is in. Moreover, Edmund implies a possible civil conflict and division of power in Britain, arising out of Albany and Cornwall’s state of rivalry (Foakes, *King Lear* 217).

Edmund aims to portray Edgar as an enemy to his father: “In cunning I must draw my sword upon you. / Draw, seem to defend yourself” (2.1.30–31). For Gloucester, when Edgar draws his sword, he becomes, beyond any doubt, a villain—a rival. Edmund tries to reinforce Edgar’s seemingly state of nature by saying, “Here stood he in the dark, his sharp sword out, / Mumbling of wicked charms, conjuring the moon/To stand’s auspicious mistress” (2.1.38–40). Yet, as has been analyzed in Act 1, Edmund himself refers to the state of nature. Within this context, Edmund shows Edgar as the opposite of civilized man as a son who desires to “murder” his father, Gloucester (2.1.44). Edmund imitates Cordelia’s way of addressing Lear in the previous act, and he talks to his father in an obedient way, as he talks about the

relationship between a father and a child: “a bond/The child was bound to the father” (2.1.47–48). Following this, Gloucester says, “[t]hat he which finds him shall deserve our thanks,/Bringing the murderous coward to the stake,” by which he means that Edgar will be executed because of his “villain[y]” (2.1.41). However, to Edmund, Gloucester says, “[a]nd of my land,/Loyal and natural boy, I’ll work the means/To make thee capable” (2.1.83–85). With respect to the reason why Gloucester calls Edmund a “natural boy,” Foakes remarks that “the ambiguities here are very rich” in terms of whether “natural” could mean “legitimate [or] ... illegitimate” (*King Lear* 222). However, in terms of the state of nature and by considering that Gloucester calls Edmund a “bastard,” Edmund is a son out-of-wedlock, that is, Edmund was born out of the law of marriage and law of patrimony. Therefore, he is a man who is in the state of nature, having almost no place in the civil laws. Thus, Gloucester says that he would do his best to make Edmund “qualified to inherit” (Foakes, *King Lear* 222). Edmund is aware what dangerous effects the state of rivalry may have. Therefore, Edmund does his “best” to bring Edgar and Gloucester into the state of rivalry, so they may both kill one another (2.1.15). Then, the father’s title and land may go to Edmund. Gloucester believes in his son Edmund, who is in the state of nature, and curses Edgar, the son who is in the civil state. Therefore, as thus far analyzed, “[t]he rivalry between good and evil siblings is found in both the Lear and the Gloucester plots...” (Rudnytsky 303).

Meanwhile, Regan and Goneril come to Gloucester’s castle. Regan, as Edmund did before, talks about Edgar in an accusatory tone; she says, “was he not companion with the riotous knights/that tended upon my father?” (2.1.94–95). Cornwall dissembles his true nature, and like Regan, he seems to be proud of Edmund who has “shown [his] father/a child-like office” (2.1.105–106). Soon after, Regan and Cornwall realize that Edmund secretly disregards laws through his manipulative plans. Cornwall says, “[f]or you, Edmund,/Whose virtue and obedience doth this instant/So much commend itself, you shall be ours./Natures of such deep trust we shall much need./You we first seize on” (2.1.113–17). This award is an action that may prevent Gloucester from discovering their true nature of state and rivalry because Gloucester respects the duke and his authority.

In Act 2, scene 2, Oswald arrives at Gloucester’s castle. Upon seeing Oswald, Kent gets angry at him: “Draw, you rascal! You come with letters against the/King,

and take Vanity the puppet's part against the/royalty of her father" (2.2.34–36). As Oswald behaved badly with Lear in the previous act, Kent calls Oswald Goneril's puppet who disrespects the civil state and authority and who "come[s] with letters against the" authority and the king (2.2.34). However, Cornwall and Regan order the servants to put Kent in the stocks⁵. Kent says that it would be disrespectful to Lear's authority, as he "serve[s] the king, on whose employment [he] was sent to" them (2.2.126–27). This punishment would be "too bold malice/against" the dignity and authority of the king. Lear is disrespected because he has deprived himself of power by transferring his power of authority to Goneril and Regan in the hope that he may take it back any time he wishes (Hobbes, *Leviathan* 213). This is "ignorance of what is necessary to the office [the king] undertake[s]" (*Leviathan* 213). Among the actions that weaken a state or tend to dissolve it is "want of absolute power" by those who are in the state of nature, as sometimes a sovereign may be "content with less power, than to the peace, and defen[s]e of the commonwealth is necessarily required" (Hobbes, *Leviathan* 213). Therefore, being content with less power is an unfair act against the civil laws, as this action may cause "great numbers of men ... to rebel" (Hobbes, *Leviathan* 213). Regan asserts her authority by ordering Kent to be held in the stocks all night. However, being aware of the unjust actions taking place in Britain, Cordelia writes a letter to Kent, in which she states, "and shall find time/From this enormous state, seeking to give/Losses their remedies" (2.2.166–68). By this, Cordelia means that she knows about the bad and serious state of affairs in Britain, so she would like to make good of what is lost after Lear's division of the kingdom. Unlike Goneril and Regan, Cordelia is still interested in public gain although she has been banished. As Lear realizes that Kent has been confined in the stocks, he cannot believe how disrespectful Regan and Cornwall are, as "'tis worse than murder" to confine a king's man in the stocks (2.2.213). When Regan and Cornwall deny speaking to Lear, Lear says, "They have traveled all the night? -mere fetches,/The images of revolt and flying off" (2.2.278–79). Here, Lear speaks as if he still holds power and authority. Although Lear curses Regan, after a while, he says,

Thou better know'st
 The offices of nature, bond of childhood,
 Effects of courtesy, dues of gratitude.
 Thy half o' the kingdom hast thou not forgot,
 Wherein I thee endowed. (2.2.366–70)

Lear refers to proper behavior, obedience to father, and authority. However, Regan openly tells him that he has no authority; she says, “I pray you father, being weak, seem so” (2.2.390). Regan tells Lear that he needs no man with him. She says, “how in one house/should many people, under two commands,/Hold amity? ‘tis hard, almost impossible” (2.2.429–31). Regan means that two authorities in one state conduce to revolt and cause a civil war; therefore, one power is better than two, that is, Lear’s power has come to an end. Lear explodes with anger: “Allow not nature more than nature needs,/man’s life is cheap as beast’s” (2.2.455–56). By these words, he means that human nature is to need more than an animal; therefore, this reference compares civilized nature with the state of nature. If there are civil laws and an authority to rule men, “then man’s life is worthless as that of a beast” (Foakes, *King Lear* 255). Lear wanders from Gloucester’s castle to the storm outside.

Act 3 takes place on a heath near Gloucester’s castle. One of Lear’s knights introduces himself to Kent: “one minded like the weather, most unquietly” (3.1.2). He means that Britain is in a state of disorder and is disturbed like the storm. Thus, as can be seen, the storm scenes are used to portray the disturbed mind of men in Britain. Kent says, “[t]here is division,/Although as yet the face of it is covered/With mutual cunning, ’twixt Albany and Cornwall” (3.1.19–21). With respect to a possible war between the dukes, further rumors are disclosed. After Lear’s division of the kingdom, Britain is about to be divided now due to a possibility of a civil war because of the dukes who, as Kent says, cover their true intentions for selfish gains (Girard, *A Theatre of Envy* 151).

Meanwhile, Kent and the fool wander in the storm. Lear continues cursing his daughters: “Crack nature’s molds, all ... [seeds] spill at once/That makes ingrateful man” (3.2.8–9). Lear wants the storm to destroy the world. As Goneril and Regan show no gratitude for what Lear has given them, Lear realizes that they are out of the civil state, implying that they are shaped by the state of nature and rivalry that disrupt the peace of civilized society. This explains why Lear prefers to stay in the storm, as the society is occupied by men who are in the state of nature. As Lear suffers, he comes to realize the true nature of his rival daughters. Thus, Lear says that they owe him no support (3.2.18). Regan and Goneril’s state of nature and rivalry bring Lear nothing but misery, as Kent says, “Man’s nature cannot carry/Th’affliction, nor the fear”

(3.2.48–49). Also, out of fear, Kent refers to the storm as a punishment for the enemies of the power of authority. The storm will cause the guilty ones in the state of nature and rivalry to “reveal themselves” (Foakes, *King Lear* 266). Lear appeals to the gods:

Let the great gods / ...
Find out their enemies now. Tremble, thou wretch,
That hast within thee undivulged crimes,
Unwhipped of justice. Hide thee, thou bloody hand,
Thou perjured, and thou simular of virtue. (3.2.49–54)

The crimes of Lear’s rival daughters are not disclosed; their “bloody hand” makes them murderers of peace who pretend to be honourable and virtuous. As the great chain of being is parallel with the social hierarchical structure of the civil state of Elizabethan England, Lear appeals to the gods. They are, for Lear, the divine law-makers of the universe that are more powerful than him. Lear admits that the chaos in Britain stems from his own fault: “I am a man/more sinned against than sinning” (3.2.59–60). His words imply that not only his rival daughters but also he is a sinner because he has divided and handed the kingdom over to men who are in the state of nature and rivalry. Even the fool comments on the hierarchical structure that has been turned upside down by the actions of rival daughters and sons-in-law:

When priests are more in word than matter,
When brewers mar their malt with water,
When nobles are their tailors’ tutors, /...
And bawds and whores do churches build,
Then shall the realm of [Britain]
Come to great confusion (3.2.81–83; 90–92)

The fool speaks like a satirical commentator “on selfishness and greed” (Foakes, *King Lear* 135). The fool illustrates selfishness of those who disobey the civil order of society—the priests are hypocritical, brewers dilute beer with water, and the nobles do not believe in public gain, as they are interested in fashion. Therefore, in Britain, almost everyone disregards public gain, as they devote themselves to personal gain under the rule of Goneril and Regan. Thus, the civil state in Britain “come[s] to great confusion” (3.2.92).

In Act 3, scene 3, the “division/between the dukes” is repeated again by Gloucester: “These injuries/the King now bears will be revenged home. There is/part of a power already footed; we must incline to the/King” (3.3.11–14). Gloucester refers to the French army that could help Lear to restore order in Britain. As soon as Gloucester goes to look for Lear, Edmund goes to the duke to let him know about

Gloucester's intentions, as the duke had forbidden everyone from helping Lear. Edmund says that he is close to gaining earlship and lands, as "this seems a fair deserving and must draw me/that which my father loses, no less than all./The younger rises when the old doth fall" (3.3.23–24). Edmund's comparison of the old and younger generation may be associated with the comparison of the civil state and the state of nature. The younger generation—Goneril, Regan, and Edmund—is now in power, whereas the old generation—Lear and Gloucester who have fallen from power due to the actions of men who are in the state of nature—is in the civil state. Soon after, Cornwall rewards Edmund by naming him the Earl of Gloucester (3.5.17–18). Cornwall plucks out Gloucester's eyes, declaring him to be a traitor. As Gloucester asks Edmund for help, Regan tells him the truth about Edmund: "Thou call'st on him that hates thee. It was he/That made the overture of thy treasons to us,/Who is too good to pity thee" (3.7.87–89). Thus, Gloucester sees the truth that "Edgar was abused" when he has been blinded (3.7.90). Due to the decisions and actions of men who are in the state of nature, Kent has been confined in the stocks, Lear has been cast out by his daughters, and Gloucester's eyes have been plucked out. Although individuals expect a ruler to protect themselves from violence, Regan and Goneril's rule becomes a threat to Lear, Kent, Cordelia, and Gloucester (Schulman 98).

Such scenes may indicate that unjust punishments are considered to be just when men who are in the state of nature and rivalry take the power of the sovereign. Therefore, with respect to the laws and sovereign, Hobbes is right in saying, "[t]he sovereign is legislator" whose "laws are the rules of just, and unjust" (*Leviathan* 176). This implies that as power changes hands, so do the notions of what is just and unjust. Both once-powerful fathers become powerless in the hands of their children who are in the state of nature and rivalry. As Maud Bodkin puts it, "the child may be both loving support of age and ruthless usurper and rival, and these two aspects find expression in separate figures, such as the tender and the wicked daughters of Lear" (Bodkin 16). The rival daughters Regan and Goneril fight for more power, whereas Cordelia, outside of Britain, tries to help her father and her country. Similarly, Edmund attains earlship by plotting against Edgar and Gloucester.

In Act 4, an old man helps Gloucester to find his way while Edgar disguised as poor Tom observes them from a distance. When Gloucester says, "I stumbled when I

saw” (4.1.21), he acknowledges his fault in trusting Edmund and accusing Edgar without listening to him. Both Lear and Gloucester realize the true nature of their children. Gloucester’s statement may be considered in this context: “[t]is the time’s plague when madmen lead the blind” (4.1.49). Here, madman may refer to a man who acts without caring for the first law of nature, implying Goneril and Regan who are ruling over Britain and Edmund, who is ruling over Gloucester’s territory. Lear almost goes mad in the storm, as he is cast out by his daughters.

In scene 2, Act 4 mimetic desire, the other source of the state of rivalry, takes place. Manipulative Edmund desires to be more powerful soon after becoming the Earl of Gloucester. Albany has not appeared on stage since scene 4, Act 1. Meanwhile, Goneril and Edmund have had a secret love affair, as Goneril says, “Our wishes on the way/may prove effects .../... This kiss, if it durst speak,/Would stretch thy spirits up into the air” (4.2.14–15; 22–23). They may be wishing about killing Albany to further their secret love. However, Albany does not get along with either Goneril, Cornwall or Regan. He has been indecisive about taking part with Cornwall in their schemes against Lear’s authority. His disapproval of their actions is revealed when he says, “Tigers, not daughters, what have you performed?/A father, and a gracious aged man” (4.2.41–42). The metaphor “tiger” may stand for the cruel, self-seeking characteristic of the rival siblings Regan and Goneril, whereas Goneril’s reply “[m]ilk-livered man” may indicate Albany’s kindness, which contrasts the war condition of men in the state of nature (4.2.51). Albany aims to keep his distance from Regan, Goneril, and Cornwall’s underhand secret plans. Meanwhile, a messenger informs them that Cornwall is dead. Hearing the news, Albany is glad: “you justicers, that these are nether crimes/so speedily can venge” (4.2.80–81). Through “justicers,” Albany is referring judges who can take revenge on Cornwall for plucking out Gloucester’s eyes and plotting against Lear.

Regan and Goneril are now in a web of mimetic rivalry. The sibling rivals in the state of nature now turn their attention to another object, Edmund. Both Goneril and Regan desire to attain Edmund. However, making the two sisters desire him is a part of Edmund’s plot so that he can gain more authority than that of an earl’s. In the web of mimetic desire, Regan becomes so jealous that she cannot cope with the idea of sharing the desired object with her mimetic rival: “Why should she write to Edmund?”

(4.5.21). She tries to get Goneril's letter from Oswald. Mimetic rivalry brings "the source of ... disintegration" between the rival siblings (Girard, *A Theatre of Envy* 30). Regan tries to persuade Oswald to get the letter: "Let me unseal the letter;" "My lord is dead; Edmund and I have talked,/And more convenient is he for my hand/Than for your lady's" (4.5.24; 32–34). She tries to sound reasonable, as her husband has passed away. Yet, knowing that Oswald is a self-interested man, she says that by giving her the letter, he "may gather more" (4.5.34). However, in the next scene, on his way to Edmund, Oswald notices Gloucester. In a quarrel, Edgar kills Oswald. As Edgar reads Goneril's letter, he considers Albany to be a "virtuous" man (4.6.267; Neill 134).

In scene 6, Act 4, Lear and Gloucester meet again. Lear speaks desperately:

What, art mad? A man may see how this world goes
with no eyes. Look with thine ears. See how yon justice
rails upon yon simple thief. Hark in thine ear. Change
places and handy-dandy, which is the justice, which is
the thief? (4.6.146–150)

Under the authority of Regan and Goneril, men are sentenced and punished by unjust laws. Lear himself is an example of the inversion of the notions of justice and injustice. Once the image of authority, he now wanders through a wasteland with disheveled clothes. With respect to authority, Lear says, "behold the great image of authority: a dog's/obeyed in office" (4.6.154–55). Lear's authority has been disregarded by men who are in the state of nature and rivalry. When Cordelia comes for help, Lear is embarrassed by what he had done to her. Lear draws an analogy between them: "Thou art a soul in bliss, but I am bound/upon a wheel of fire" (4.7.46–47). "Bliss" may refer to peace in the civil state, as one regards civil laws; however, "fire" may stand for man's condition of war in the state of nature. In other words, Lear implies that Cordelia's decisions and manners all comply with the civil state, whereas Lear acts against the law of nature, believing in those in the state of nature and rivalry.

Act 5 continues with "the mimetic desire that governs ... relations" among Goneril, Regan, and Edmund (Girard, *A Theatre of Envy* 30). The dialogues below reveal the mimetic desire:

REGAN: Do you not love my sister?

EDMUND: In honoured love.

REGAN: But have you never found ... [Albany's] way
To the for[bidden] place?/...

Be not familiar with her” (5.1.9–11; 16).

Regan is jealous and suspicious of Edmund, as she supposes him to have shared forbidden love with Goneril. Each becomes a mimetic model for the other. Therefore, the desired object becomes so important that they forget about their war with France. Aside, Goneril says, “I had rather lose the battle than that sister/Should loosen him and me” (5.1.18–19). Their state of rivalry turns into reciprocal rivalry because of their desire to attain Edmund who is “an attractive, wily, charismatic villain” (Stern 47). Their rivalry triggers violent actions that aim to destroy the mimetic rival (Farneti 546; Girard, *A Theatre of Envy* 150). However, in his soliloquy, Edmund reveals his hypocritical actions: “To both these sisters have I sworn my love,/Each jealous of the other as the stung/Are of the adder. Which of them shall I take?/Both? One? Or neither?” (5.1.56–59). Edmund tries to ascertain from which of the sisters he may gain more advantages.

In scene 3, Act 5, however, Edmund triumphs over France and takes Lear and Cordelia as captives. To Cordelia, Lear says, “upon such sacrifices, my Cordelia/the gods themselves throw incense” (5.3.20–21). Lear’s statement on sacrifice foreshadows Cordelia’s death at the end of the play when she sacrifices herself to save Lear. Meanwhile, to a “Captain,” Edmund says, “Know thou this: that men/Are as the time is; to be tender-minded/Does not become a sword” (5.3.31–33). By these words, he means that to be powerful, one has to change his manners in accordance with the political order of the time. In other words, personal expedience may guide one to look after his interests (Schulman 102). Moreover, his address reminds us of King Henry V’s statement in Shakespeare’s *Henry V*: “In peace there’s nothing so becomes a man/As modest stillness and humility:/But when the blast of war blows in our ears,/Then imitate the action of the tiger” (*Henry V* 3.1. 3–6). In other words, humility and stillness prevail in the time of peace, an outcome of the law of nature and the civil state, whereas during a war, man needs to fight with others, disregarding the law of nature.

As Albany is now sure of Edmund’s secret affair with Goneril and as he cannot endure his actions, he says, “I hold you but a subject of this war/Not as a brother” (5.3.61–62). For Albany, Edmund is not so powerful in terms of hierarchical importance as, according to the structure of power, he is below a duke. Yet, mimetic

rivals Goneril and Regan fight for Edmund's love. Regan says that Edmund is more powerful than Albany, as she gives him the authority. She says, "He led our powers,/Bore the commission of my place and person,/The which immediacy may well stand up/And call itself your brother" (5.3.64–67). Regan means that Edmund acts on behalf of Regan's authority. However, as Regan and Goneril dispute, Albany interrupts them and says that he is arresting Edmund because of "capital treason; and, in thine attaint/This gilded serpent" (5.3.83–85). The "serpent" is Goneril who is ordered to be arrested as well. Albany breaks his silence in the final act, and he resorts to "reason," the first law of nature, so that order may be reestablished. He then calls on anyone who may talk about Edmund's treason. Edgar pays attention to Albany's call and fights with Edmund. Albany wounds Edmund.

Each mimetic model, however, is "transformed into a rival" because of the "jealous and conflictual nature of the mimetic convergence on the same object" (Girard, *A Theatre of Envy* 36). Goneril poisons and kills Regan, as "the spirit of interminable vengeance is aroused" (Girard, *A Theatre of Envy* 150). Then, Goneril kills herself. Following this, the fatally wounded Edmund dies. As the state of rivalry becomes mimetic rivalry, the rival siblings destroy themselves, as Hobbes has put, "plainly and directly against the essence of a commonwealth; and 'tis this, that the sovereign power may be divided. For what is it to divide the power of a commonwealth, but to dissolve it? for powers divided mutually destroy each other" (*Leviathan* 216). Order is subverted, and the divided powers destroy one another in the end. Albany aims to restore order by giving Lear his "absolute power" (5.3.298). Yet, Cordelia dies, and Lear dies of grief. Kent's statement. "All's cheerless, dark and deadly" (5.3.288) is parallel with Hobbes' idea regarding the state of nature in which life is described as unpleasant, isolated, and short (Hobbes, *Leviathan* 84). To Edgar and Kent, Albany says "Friends of my/soul, you tw[o], / Rule in this realm, and the gored state sustain" (5.3.318–19). Order is to be restored to sustain peace and discipline of hierarchy, as Edgar says, "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" (5.3.322–25; Girard, *A Theatre of Envy* 141).

In conclusion, the hierarchical order begins to break soon after the idea of “competition” when the king decides to divide the kingdom. As Hobbes puts it, competition leads to conflict that subverts political order. Private pleasure of the king becomes a threat to the public. King Lear is a character that makes any reader question the power of a ruler who has god-like authority in the Elizabethan period. The reason is that such a ruler may be so powerless to the extent that his children may betray him (McEachern 192). A ruler may become powerless if his actions lead the ones who repress their state of nature/rivalry to act for personal gain. Furthermore, the decision to divide the kingdom separates people, as evidenced by Cordelia and Kent’s banishment, and then reunites them, as is the case at the end. The state of rivalry and the state of nature occupy a central position in this play, as both the plot and the subplot serve this by representing the father-child relationship in terms of rival siblings and competition. In other words, both the state of rivalry and mimetic rivalry are among the reasons for loss of authority and order (Girard, *A Theatre of Envy* 141). Hierarchy breaks down because of the influence of the relationship between the state of nature and mimetic desire. The self-centered passions govern lawless actions against the authority to make it powerless, whereas those in the state of nature, namely, Regan, Goneril, Cornwall, and Edmund, transfer that power to themselves.

CONCLUSION

The social existence of human beings searching for authority is thematically found in many of Shakespeare's plays through the representation of the contradiction of order and disorder within the political and social spheres. Collective human life does not exist without conflicts. In this case, disorder stems because of the thoughts and actions of those who are in the state of nature—interested in their own benefits—and this seems to be prevalent in *Titus Andronicus*, *Macbeth*, and *King Lear*. This dissertation examined the state of rivalry in these three tragedies by evaluating the relationship between the state of nature and mimetic desire. For this purpose, Thomas Hobbes' political theory and René Girard's theory of mimetic desire were chosen to elucidate the state of rivalry. In the state of nature, without the civil laws and authority, man lives in continual fear of each other because everyone is equal to one another. Although a ruler governs his country through the civil laws and protects his country with an army, which is a representative of lawful power, there may be men who act in accordance with the state of nature for their self-interests. Therefore, the repressed state of nature under an authority may bring forth disorder and chaos of violence. Similarly, just the opposite may be valid as well. That is, disorder and conflict may reveal the state of nature in a civilized country. From a Hobbesian perspective, among the causes of conflict that lead a civilized state to return to the state of nature are glory, diffidence, and competition.

With respect to mimetic desire, passions such as emulation, envy, and hatred may lead man to imitate another's desires. As one desired object may not be shared between two or more men, rivalry begins to dominate their actions. Therefore, the state of nature and mimetic desire are similar in that the desirer and man who is in the state of nature supposes himself equal to his rival. Another similarity among the state of nature, rivalry, and mimetic desire is self-interest. Within the context of the relationship between the state of nature and mimetic desire that brings forth the state of rivalry, *Titus Andronicus*, *Macbeth*, and *King Lear* have been respectively examined through the notions of glory, diffidence, and competition.

This study has demonstrated that rivalrous actions are related to the repressed state of nature and mimetic desire. Such actions lead to the subversion of authority in each play. Rivals attain unauthorized power, which disturbs power relations and order.

The state of nature underlies mimetic desire because, in the state of nature, human beings desire to have power. Power has the capacity to influence those on whom it is used. Power is also related to political authority. Parallel to this, authority establishes a system in which members of a society are classified according to status. However, due to mimetic desire and the state of nature, rivalry may lead man to subvert hierarchy to attain whatever the desired object is. Subversion of hierarchy, however, brings forth a crisis of degree in which commanders, brothers, sisters, and friends may become enemies to their countries, as they may plot against lawful authority for their self-interests.

Titus, Saturninus, Bassianus, Macbeth, Lady Macbeth, Edmund, Regan, and Goneril are such self-interested ones who think and act by following their passions. Due to an interaction between desire and the state of nature, their desires work mimetically by following the ones who are superior to them, such as King Duncan, Banquo, and Edgar. One desires to have power because he feels something lacking in himself. Yet, such a desire may end in chaos because of the actions of those who are in the state of nature. The latter characters are the mediators, and they are not in the state of nature because, in the civil state, a soldier, a prince, the son of an earl and such others are expected to know the importance and validity of civil laws. The civil laws lead man to respect one another. However, human nature differs because reason and passions do not work in the same way, as the social and political functions of the state of rivalry may change. On the socio-political function of rivalry, Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus*, *Macbeth*, and *King Lear* represent lawless and self-interested men who may use others as means for their personal gains. That is, the self-serving and egotistical man tends to be lawless to attain whatever he desires. Therefore, the state of rivalry conduces one to act out of the laws of nature. Thus, such ones become rivals to others. Private objectives of personal gains motivate the characters who are in the state of nature. They represent manipulative and selfish men. The state of nature and mimetic desire present similarities as, with respect to human nature, they are parallel. The reason for this is that among the passions of any selfish man who is in the state of nature are envy, anger, and rivalry, which also establish the center of mimetic desire.

The state of rivalry, in this context, is related to the will to power since one needs to legitimate his authority through the use of power. Therefore, the state of rivalry

contains violence, and power. Rivals may become violent to gain more power and/or to be more prestigious than others, as the state of nature is a phase in which equality dominates over hierarchy. Hierarchy establishes social order and sustains the power of authority through ranks and degree. Following disorder in a hierarchy, equality gives rise to mimetic desire and rivalry. A man who is in the state of nature may take advantage of equality in case authority loses power. Therefore, the crisis of degree prevails as a result of the subversion of hierarchy. In other words, such characters take advantage of the authority gap. However, in case of a weakening of authority, mutual aid is a necessity of communal life to live in peace. Yet, peace may not be possible once order is threatened by disrespecting the requirements of the social contract, as the analyses of the three tragedies have presented.

In *Titus Andronicus*, for example, the lack of authority, resulting from the death of the emperor, leads his two sons, Saturninus and Bassianus, to divide the society into two opposing factions. The fight is so fierce that it could have been ended in a civil war if it had not been stopped by Marcus, the tribune. Their search of personal power leads to a crisis of degree. As the Roman hierarchy is subverted by rivalrous actions, the enemy, Tamora, becomes the Roman Empress. However, due to his notable achievements, honour has been a leading guide for Titus who puts “glory” above all. The notion of glory becomes so crucial that the commander Titus breaks Roman laws soon after he proclaims Tamora, who is honoured by the Roman emperor, to be his rival. His military power and honour are overthrown, first, after Lavinia is seized, second, after Tamora the enemy becomes the empress and, third, after his sons, Martius and Quintus, are executed. As the head of the Roman authority, Saturninus acts under Tamora’s guidance, Titus begins to lose his power and his glorious title. However, Titus still supposes himself to be glorious although he is not as glorious as he used to be before. In this context, Titus’ “vain-glory” leads to uncontrollable anger, and he begins to act out of reason by disrespecting the civil laws. He decides to sustain his honour and glorious title by taking revenge. Revenge, in this case, is an action that is related to the state of rivalry. In other words, his rivalry and passions incline him to the desire of revenge. In the state of rivalry, Titus’ opinion of his own self brings forth disorder to Rome, as Roman authority is dethroned by the Roman-Goth ally because of Titus’ rivalrous decision. From a Hobbesian perspective, the competition of honour

tilts toward rivalry and war, and the end is a disaster, as almost all characters die at the end of the play.

As for *Macbeth*, passions prompt Macbeth to compete with the ones who are envied and/or hated to surpass his achievement and/or something superior in his personality. Within the structure of both the state of nature and mimetic desire, passion is not spontaneous; rather it is a matter of imitation and rivalry. In the state of rivalry, the desirer imitates the rival's manners and status. Macbeth's desire for kingly power leads him to enmity with King Duncan, Malcolm, and Banquo. Rivalry for power leads him to act in line with the state of rivalry. To attain his desire, Macbeth kills his rivals, as he is in continual fear of losing his unlawful authority. Macbeth's authority is unlawful because he attained it through regicide. Macbeth's desire to have power leads him to make sneaky plans. Therefore, Macbeth's passionate rivalry with King Duncan, Malcolm, and Banquo brings forth a social and political crisis. Macbeth cannot accommodate himself in the structure of power relations because of the interaction between the state of nature and the state of rivalry. Macbeth, who is a man in the state of nature, is fearful and anxious about the outcome of regicide and the safety of his unlawful authority. Macbeth lacks self-confidence, as he knows that his lawless actions may be punished by the lawful authority of Malcolm or Banquo in the future; therefore, his rivalry is also associated with diffidence.

Regarding *King Lear*, many studies label the villains Regan, Goneril, and Edmund as stock characters; therefore, much attention is paid to the analysis of Lear's, Cordelia's, Kent's, and Gloucester's actions (Bartlett 5–11; Cooley 327–348; Jaffa 405–410; Jayne 277–281; Maclean 49–54; Rozett 237–240; Storozynsky 163–165). However, ignoring and/or partly studying the reasons behind the actions of Regan, Goneril, and Edmund may not sufficiently explain the contrast between order and disorder in *King Lear*. As the related chapter examined, within the state of nature, Regan, Goneril, and Edmund render themselves equal to the power holder, and following this, the state of rivalry begins to trigger their actions, which bring the crisis of degree, as they undifferentiate to pass their rivals. Thus, rivalry and imitation may create dangerous struggles between man who is in the state of nature and in the civil state.

The dissertation has presented that rivalry is a state of competition that occurs because of the relationship between two rivals who engage in conflicts with one another. Rivalry refers to a process that begins and ends for various reasons such as desire and the state of nature. The process of rivalry may generate threatening competitors. In this context, the threatening competitors may be enemies, as enmity is close to the notion of rivalry. However, as is the case in the state of nature and mimetic desire, passions may direct one to the state of rivalry. For example, due to envy, a friend, a sibling or a good soldier may become a rival to his friend, sibling or another soldier. Among the causes of such conflict, Hobbes puts forward the place of “[t]he desires and other passions of man” (*Leviathan* 85). If an object is desired by two men, neither of them may enjoy it. Therefore, “they become enemies; and in the way to their end... endeavor to destroy or subdue one another (*Leviathan* 83). Similar to Hobbes’ ideas of desire, Girard states, “[i]ndividuals who desire the same thing are united by something so powerful that, as long as they can share whatever they desire, they remain the best of friends; as soon as they cannot, they become the worst of enemies” (Girard, *A Theatre of Envy* 3). Therefore, rivalry may generate enmity from friendship as effects of mimetic desire and the state of nature.

ENDNOTES

¹ Violence as victimage and sacrifice through stoning to death or throwing the victim from a cliff, as pharmakos, in ancient religious sacrificial rituals stands as “a kind of sacrificial immolation that is distinct from the later practice of beheading... In the Greek universe the ritual Pharmakos was periodically put to death in the same way” (Girard, *The Scapegoat* 176).

² This is derived “from the ancient patria potestas that granted the father of the Roman family the right to “dispose” of the life of his children and his slaves; just as he had given them life, so he could take it away” (*HOS* 135).

³ Similar yet superior to that is the sovereign power of the king whose decisions are beyond dispute. As Foucault has put it, “If someone dared to rise up against him and transgress his laws, then he could exercise a direct power over the offender's life: ... put to death ... the power of life and death was not an absolute privilege: it was conditioned by the defence of the sovereign, and his own survival” (*HOS* 135). Yet, the concept of “defence” is controversial as it is not clear when and why to kill someone, as the sovereign has the supreme power. This is the case in killing Mutius, who “rises up against” Titus for guarding his sister; an act which is regarded an uprising by Titus. However, Mutius is weaker in terms of hierarchy when compared to Lavinia who is then married Saturninus, the emperor.

⁴ Virginius was a Roman commander who killed his daughter to prevent her rape.

⁵ Stocks were used to imprison the disobedient men.

WORKS CITED

Primary Sources

- Girard, René. *The Scapegoat*. Translated by Yvonne Freccero. Johns Hopkins UP, 1986.
- . *Things Hidden Since the Foundation of the World*. Trans. Stephen Bann and Michael Metteer. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1987.
- . *Violence and the Sacred*. 1972. Trans. Patrick Gregory. Johns Hopkins University Press. 1989.
- Hobbes, Thomas. *De Cive*. 1642, edited by Howard Warrender. Oxford UP, 1987.
- . *Leviathan*. 1651, edited by J.C.A. Gaskin. Oxford UP, 1998.
- Shakespeare, William. *Julius Caesar*. Edited by David Daniell, 3rd Edition, Bloomsbury Arden Shakespeare, 1995.
- . *King Lear*. Edited by R. A. Foakes, 3rd Edition, Bloomsbury Arden Shakespeare, 1997.
- . *Macbeth*. Edited by Sandra Clark and Pamela Mason, 3rd Edition, Bloomsbury Arden Shakespeare, 1995.
- . *Titus Andronicus*. Edited by Jonathan Bate, 3rd Edition, Bloomsbury Arden Shakespeare, 1995.
- Sidney, Sir Philip. *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia*. 1693, edited by Maurice Evans. Penguin Books, 1987. *Google Books*,
https://play.google.com/store/books/details/Philip_Sidney_The_Countess_of_Pembroke_s_Arcadia?id=unlvhylSzeEC

Secondary Sources

- Abizadeh, Arash. "Hobbes on the Causes of War: A Disagreement Theory." *The American Political Science Review*, vol. 105, no.2, 2011, pp. 298-315. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/41495067
- Alvis, John E. and Thomas G. West. *Shakespeare as Political Thinker*. ISI Books, 2000.
- Appelbaum, Robert. "Shakespeare and Terrorism." *Criticism*, vol. 57, no. 1, 2015, pp. 23-45. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/10.13110/criticism.57.1.0023
- Arendt, Hannah. *On Violence*. Harcourt, Brace, and World, Inc., 1969.
- Barker, Simon. *War and Nation in the Theatre of Shakespeare and His Contemporaries*. Edinburgh UP, 2007.
- Bartlett, Bruce R. "'Go You Before to Gloucester with These Letters': 'King Lear' 1.5 Reconsidered." *Shakespeare Bulletin*, vol. 15, no.4, 1997, pp. 5-11. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/26352911
- Belsey, Catherine. "Gender and Family." *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespearean Tragedy*, edited by Claire McEachern. Cambridge University Press, 2002, pp. 123-141.
- Berry, Edward. "Laughing at 'others':" *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespearean Comedy*, edited by Alexander Leggatt. Cambridge UP, 2004, pp. 123-138.
- Berry, Ralph. "Lear's System." *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 35, no. 4, 1984, pp. 422-429. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/2870161
- Bevington, David. "Tragedy in Shakespeare's Career." *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespearean Tragedy*, edited by Claire McEachern. Cambridge University Press, 2002, pp. 50-68.
- Blunt, Anthony. "An Echo of the 'Paragone' in Shakespeare." *Journal of the Warburg Institute*, vol. 2, no. 3, 1939, pp. 260-262. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/750102
- Bodkin, Maud. *Archetypal Patterns in Poetry: Psychological Studies of Imagination*. Oxford UP, 1963.
- Bradley, A. C. *Shakespearean Tragedy*. 3rd Edition. St. Martin's Press, 1992.
- Cahn, Victor L. *Shakespeare the Playwright: A Companion to the Complete Tragedies, Histories, Comedies, and Romances*. Greenwood Publishing, 1996.

- Cheung, King-Kok. "Shakespeare and Kierkegaard: "Dread" in Macbeth." *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 35, no.4, 1984, pp. 430-439. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/2870162
- Clark, Sandra and Pamela Mason. Eds. *Macbeth*. William Shakespeare. Bloomsbury Arden Shakespeare, 2015.
- Cohen, Derek. *Shakespeare's Culture of Violence*. MacMillan, 1993.
- Cooley, Ronald W. "Kent and Primogeniture in "King Lear"." *Journal of Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, vol. 48, no. 2, 2008, pp. 327-348. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/40071337.
- Cowdell, Scott. "René Girard, Modernity, and Apocalypse." *Violence, Desire, and the Sacred: Girard's Mimetic Theory Across the Disciplines*, edited by Scott Cowdell, Chris Fleming, and Joel Hodge, Continuum IP, 2012, pp. 3-18.
- Danby, John F. *Shakespeare's Doctrine of Nature: A Study of King Lear*. Faber and Faber, 1949.
- Dent, R. W. *Shakespeare's Proverbial Language: An Index*. University of California Press, 1981.
- Dickson, Vernon Guy. "'A pattern, precedent, and lively warrant": Emulation, Rhetoric, and Cruel Propriety in Titus Andronicus." *Renaissance Quarterly*, vol. 62, no.2, 2009, pp. 376-409. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/599865
- Doğan Adanur, Evrim. "The Uses of Anachronism in Troilus and Cressida." *Gaziantep Journal of Social Sciences*, vol. 16, no. 4, 2017, pp. 1048-1056. Dergipark, <http://dergipark.gov.tr/jss/issue/31209/341889>.
- Dolven, Jeff and Sean Keilen. "Shakespeare's Reading." *The New Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare*, edited by Margreta de Grazia and Stanley Wells. 2nd edition. Cambridge UP, 2015, pp. 15-30.
- Ekmekçioğlu, Neslihan. *The Theme of Ambition and Implied Counterpoints to this Theme as Revealed by some of Shakespeare's Characters in his Plays*. 1993. Hacettepe University, PhD dissertation. *YÖK Tez Merkezi*, <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/>.

- Elliott, G. R. "The Initial Contrast in "Lear"." *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, vol. 58, no. 2, 1959, pp. 251-263. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/27707269
- Evren, Mehmet. *John Locke ve John Rawls Liberalizminin Karşılaştırılması*. 2015. Ataturk University, PhD dissertation. *YÖK Tez Merkezi*, <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/>.
- Farneti, Roberto. "A Mimetic Perspective on Conflict Resolution." *Polity*, vol. 41, no.4, 2009, pp. 536-558. *JSTOR*. www.jstor.org/stable/40587510
- Foakes, R. A. "Introduction." *King Lear. Bloomsbury Arden Shakespeare*, 2005.
---. *Shakespeare and Violence*. Cambridge UP, 2003.
- Foessel, Michael. "Legitimations of the State: the Weakening of the Authority and the Restoration of Power." *Constellations: An International Journal of Critical and Democratic Theory*, vol. 13, no. 3, 2006, pp. 308-319. *Wiley Online Library*. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/j.1467-8675.2006.00403.x>
- Foucault, Michel. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews & Other Writings 1972-1977*. Ed. Colin Gordon. Pantheon Books. 1980.
---. *The History of Sexuality Volume I: An Introduction*, translated by Robert Hurley. Pantheon Books. 1978.
- Freud, Sigmund. *Civilization and Its Discontents*. 1930. Trans. And Ed. James Strachey. W. W. Norton Company, 1962.
- Girard, René. "Collective Violence and Sacrifice in Julius Caesar." *Julius Caesar: Contemporary Critical Essay*, edited by Richard Wilson. Palgrave, 2002, pp. 108-127.
---. *Deceit, Desire, and the Novel*. Translated by Yvonne Freccero. Johns Hopkins University Press, 1961.
---. *To Double Business Bound: Essays in Literature, Mimesis, and Anthropology*. Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986.
---. *A Theatre of Envy*. Oxford UP. 1991.
- Golsan, Richard. *René Girard and Myth: An Introduction*. Routledge, 2002.
- Gray, Austin K. "Shakespeare and "Titus Andronicus"." *Studies in Philology*, vol. 25, no. 3, 1928, pp. 295-311. *JSTOR*. www.jstor.org/stable/4172002

- Greenblatt, Stephen. *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare*. University of Chicago Press, 1984.
- . *Hamlet in Purgatory*. Princeton University Press, 2013.
- . *Shakespeare's Freedom*. The University of Chicago Press, 2010.
- Harris, Jonathan Gil. "The Smell of "Macbeth"." *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 58, no. 4, 2007, pp. 465-486. *JSTOR*. www.jstor.org/stable/4625011
- Hattaway, Michael. "Tragedy and Political Authority." *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespearean Tragedy*, edited by Claire McEachern. Cambridge University Press, 2002, pp. 103-122.
- Hoenselaars, Ton. "Shakespeare's English History Plays." *The New Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare*, edited by Margreta de Grazia and Stanley Wells. 2nd edition. Cambridge UP, 2015, pp. 137-152.
- Jaffa, Harry V. "The Limits of Politics: An Interpretation of King Lear, Act 1, Scene 1." *The American Political Science Review*, vol. 51, no. 2, 1957, pp. 405-427. *JSTOR*. www.jstor.org/stable/1952200
- James, Mervyn *Society, Politics and Culture: Studies in Early Modern England*. Cambridge UP, 1986.
- Jayne, Sears. "Charity in King Lear." *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 15, no. 2, 1964, pp. 277-288. *JSTOR*. www.jstor.org/stable/2867900
- Kaeuper, Richard W. *Chivalry and Violence in Medieval Europe*. Oxford UP, 1999.
- Kahn, Coppelia. "Shakespeare's Classical Tragedies." *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespearean Tragedy*, edited by Claire McEachern, Cambridge University Press, 2002, pp. 204-223.
- Kahn, Victoria. "Hobbes, Romance, and the Contract of Mimesis." *Political Theory*, vol. 29, no.1, 2001, pp. 4-29. *JSTOR*. www.jstor.org/stable/3072541.
- Kavka, Gregory S. *Hobbesian Moral and Political Theory*. Princeton University Press, 1986.
- Kirsch, Arthur. "Macbeth's Suicide." *ELH*, vol. 51, no. 2, 1984, pp. 269-296. *JSTOR*. www.jstor.org/stable/2872946
- Law, Robert Adger. "The Roman background of "Titus Andronicus"." *Studies in Philology*, vol. 40, no.2, 1943, pp. 145-153. *JSTOR*. www.jstor.org/stable/4172611

- Liebler, Naomi Conn. *Shakespeare's Festive Tragedy: The Ritual Foundations of Genre*. Routledge, 1995.
- Locke, John. *Second Treatise of Government*. Edited by C. B. Macpherson. Hackett Publishing, 1980.
- Maclean, Hugh. "Disguise in King Lear: Kent and Edgar." *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 11, no. 1, 1960, pp. 49-54. *JSTOR*. www.jstor.org/stable/2867430.
- Mann, Mary Anneeta. *The Construction of Tragedy: Hubris*. Bloomington, 2004.
- Martinich, A. P. *A Hobbes Dictionary*. Blackwell, 1998.
- May, Rollo. *Power and Innocence: A Search for the Sources of Violence*. W. W. Norton Company, 1972.
- Mcalindon, Tom. "What is a Shakespearean Tragedy?" *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespearean Tragedy*, edited by Claire McEachern, Cambridge University Press, 2002, pp. 1-22.
- McDonald, Russ. "The Language of Tragedy." *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespearean Tragedy*, edited by Claire McEachern, Cambridge University Press, 2002, pp. 23-49.
- McEachern, Claire. "Shakespeare, Religion, and Politics." *The New Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare*, edited by Margreta de Grazia and Stanley Wells, 2nd edition, Cambridge University Press, 2015, pp. 185-200.
- McLuskie, Kathleen. "Humane Statute and the Gentle Weal: Historical Reading and Historical Allegory." in *Shakespeare Survey 57: Macbeth and Its Afterlife*. Ed. Peter Holland. Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Metz, G. Harold. "Stage History of Titus Andronicus." *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 28, no.2, 1977, pp. 154-169. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/2869397
- Minoque, K. R. "Hobbes and the Just Man." *Hobbes and Rousseau: A Collection of Critical Essay*, edited by Maurice Cranston and Rihard S. Peters, Anchor Books, 1972.
- Miola, Robert S. "Roman Comedy." *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespearean Comedy*, edited by Alexander Leggatt, Cambridge University Press, 2004, pp. 18-31.

- "Titus Andronicus and the Mythos of Shakespeare's Rome," *Shakespeare Studies*, vol. 14, 1981, pp.85–98. *EBSCOHOST*. connection.ebscohost.com/c/literary-criticism/7167335
- Montrose, Louis Adrian. "'The Place of a Brother' in 'As You Like It': Social Process and Comic Form." *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 32, no.1, 1981, 28-54. *JSTOR*. www.jstor.org/stable/2870285
- Moore, Andrew. *Shakespeare between Machiavelli and Hobbes: Dead Body Politics*. Lexington Books, 2016.
- Moschovakis, Nicholas R. "'Irreligious Piety' and Christian History: Persecution as Pagan Anachronism in 'Titus Andronicus'." *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 53, no.4, 2002, pp. 460-486. *JSTOR*. www.jstor.org/stable/3844237
- Neill, Michael. "Shakespeare's Tragedies." *The New Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare*, edited by Margreta de Grazia and Stanley Wells, 2nd edition, Cambridge University Press, 2015, pp. 121-136.
- Osborne, Laurie E. "Crisis of Degree in Shakespeare's Henriad." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, vol. 25, no. 2, 1985, pp. 337-359. *JSTOR*. www.jstor.org/stable/450726.
- Özmen, Özlem. *Re-writing Shakespeare in the Twentieth Century: Edward Bond's Lear, Arnold Wesker's The Merchant and Howard Barker's Gertrude-the Cry in Socio-Historical Context*. 2018. Hacettepe University, PhD dissertation. *YÖK Tez Merkezi*, <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/>.
- Palaver, Wolfgang. *René Girard's Mimetic Theory*. Translated by Gabriel Borrud. Michigan State University Press, 2001.
- Palfrey, Simon. *Doing Shakespeare*. The Arden Shakespeare, 2011.
- Partridge, Eric. *Origins: A Short Etymological Dictionary of Modern English*. London: Routledge. 2006.
- Paster, Gail Kern. "The tragic subject and its passions." *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespearean Tragedy*, edited by Claire McEachern, Cambridge University Press, 2002, pp. 142-159.
- Plato. *The Republic*. 380 BC. Trans. Allan Bloom. Basic Books, 1961.
- Procter, Paul. "Rival." *Cambridge International Dictionary of English*. Cambridge UP, 1995.

- Ray, Sid. "Rape, I Fear, Was Root of Thy Annoy": The Politics of Consent in Titus Andronicus." *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 49, no. 1, 1998, pp. 22-39. *JSTOR*. www.jstor.org/stable/2902206.
- Reid, Stephen. "In Defense of Goneril and Regan." *American Imago*, vol. 27, no.3, 1970, pp. 226-244. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/26302628
- Reese, Jack E. "The Formalization of Horror in Titus Andronicus." *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol.21, no.1, 1970, pp. 77-84. *JSTOR*. www.jstor.org/stable/2868405
- "Rival." *Longman Dictionary of English Language and Culture*, 3rd Edition. Pearson, 2000.
- Rowe, Katherine A. "Dismembering and Forgetting in *Titus Andronicus*." *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 45, no. 3, 1994, pp. 279 - 303. *JSTOR*. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2871232>
- Rozett, Martha Tuck. "Tragedies within Tragedies: Kent's Unmasking in "King Lear"." *Renaissance Drama, New Series*, vol. 18, 1987, pp. 237-258. *JSTOR*. www.jstor.org/stable/41917230
- Rudnytsky, Peter L. " "The Darke and Vicious Place": the Dread of the Vagina in "King Lear" ." *Modern Philology*, vol. 96, no.3, 1999, pp. 291-311. *JSTOR*. www.jstor.org/stable/439219.
- Scott, William O. "Macbeth's and Our Equivocations." *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 37, no.2, 1986, pp. 160-174. *JSTOR*. www.jstor.org/stable/2869955
- Sommerville, J. P. *Royalists and Patriots: Politics and Ideology in England 1603-1640*. 2nd Edition. Routledge, 1999.
- . *Thomas Hobbes: Political Ideas in Historical Context*. Macmillan, 1992.
- Spinoza, Benedict de. *Ethics*. 1677. Edited and Translated by Edwin Curley. Penguin Books, 1996.
- Stauffer, Devin. "Of Religion in Hobbes' Leviathan." *The Journal of Politics*, vol. 72, no.3, 2010, pp. 868-879. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/10.1017/s0022381610000228
- Stern, Tiffany. "The Theatre of Shakespeare's London." *The New Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare*, edited by Margreta de Grazia and Stanley Wells, 2nd edition, Cambridge University Press, 2015, pp. 45-60.

- Stone, Lawrence. *The Family, Sex, and Marriage in England, 1500-1800*. Harper and Row, 1977.
- Storoznysky, L. M. "'King Lear' and Chaos." *Critical Survey*, vol. 3, no.2, 1991, pp. 163-169. *JSTOR*. www.jstor.org/stable/41555577
- Tennenhouse, Leonard. *Power on Display: The Politics of Shakespeare's Genres*. Methuen, 1986.
- Thiele, Leslie Paul. *Thinking Politics: Perspectives in Ancient, Modern, and Postmodern Political Theory*. Seven Bridges Press, 2002.
- Thompson, William R. "Identifying Rivals and Rivalries in World Politics." *International Studies Quarterly*, vol. 45, no. 4 ,2001, pp. 557-586. *JSTOR*. www.jstor.org/stable/3096060.
- Tillyard, Eustace M. W. *The Elizabethan World Picture*. Vintage, 1960.
- Townshend, Dale. "Gothic Shakespeare." *A New Companion to the Gothic*, edited by David Punter, Blackwell P, 2012, pp. 38-63.
- Turgut, Fehmi. *Power Struggle in Shakespeare's Roman Tragedies: Coriolanus, Antony and Cleopatra and Julius Caesar*. 2015. Karadeniz Technical University, PhD dissertation. *YÖK Tez Merkezi*, <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/>.
- Yüksel, Ayşegül. *William Shakespeare: Yüzyılların Sahne Büyücüsü*. Habitus, 2017.
- Velz, J.W. "The Ancient World in Shakespeare: Authenticity or Anachronism? A Retrospect," Ed. Kenneth Muir. *Shakespeare Survey*. 31 (1978): 1–12.
- Veszy-Wagner, L. "Mcbeth: "Fair is Foul and Foul is Fair"." *American Imago*, vol. 25, no.3, 1968, pp. 242-257. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/26302345.
- Warren, Michael. "Shakespearean tragedy printed and performed." *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespearean Tragedy*, edited by Claire McEachern, Cambridge University Press, 2002, pp. 69-85.
- Warrender, Howard. *The Political Philosophy of Hobbes*, Oxford UP, 1957.
- "What is an Earl?" *The Victorian Era England: Facts about Queen Victoria, Society & Literature*, <http://www.victorian-era.org/what-is-an-earl.html>. Accessed 11 November 2018.
- Willbern, David. "Phantasmagoric "Macbeth"." *English Literary Renaissance*, vol. 16, no.3, 1986, pp. 520-549. *JSTOR*. www.jstor.org/stable/43447200.

Wolin, Sheldon S. *Politics and Vision: Continuity and Change in Western Political Thought*. Princeton University Press, 2004.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Name and Surname: Mehmet Akif BALKAYA

Place and Date of Birth: Sivas, 20.11.1986

Education:

Degree	Field	University	Year
Undergraduate	English Language and Literature	Cumhuriyet University	2006-2011
Graduate	English Language and Literature	Atılım University	2012-2014
Ph. D.	English Language and Literature	Atılım University	2014-2019

Work Experience:

Work Place	Position	Year
Aksaray University	Research Assistant	2012-2014
Aksaray University	Lecturer	2014-Present

Foreign Language: English

Publications (selected):

Balkaya, Mehmet Akif. *The Industrial Novels: Shirley, Hard Times, and North and South*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2015.

---. "Voices in James Joyce's the Dead: A Bakhtinian Reading." *Journal of International Social Research*, vol. 10, no. 52, 2017, pp. 69-74. Doi: 10.17719/jisr.2017.1872

---. "In Search of the Truth: The Modernist Poems of Thomas Hardy." *International Journal of Language Academy*, vol. 4, no: 13, 2016, pp. 318-325. Doi: 10.18033/ijla.451

---. "A Dialogic Reading of Tom Stoppard's Postcolonial Discourse in Indian Ink." *The Journal of European Academic Research*, vol. 3, no. 5, 2015, pp. 5723-5738.

Email: makif.balkaya@hotmail.co.uk

Date: 31.01.2019

Mehmet Akif Balkaya

ORIJINALLIK RAPORU

%**4**

BENZERLIK ENDEKSI

%**3**

İNTERNET
KAYNAKLARI

%**2**

YAYINLAR

%**1**

ÖĞRENCİ ÖDEVLERİ

BIRINCIL KAYNAKLAR

1

arizona.openrepository.com

İnternet Kaynağı

<%**1**

2

George Shelton. "Morality and Sovereignty in the Philosophy of Hobbes", Springer Nature America, Inc, 1992

Yayın

<%**1**

3

media.proquest.com

İnternet Kaynağı

<%**1**

4

www.colorado.edu

İnternet Kaynağı

<%**1**

5

www.arts.uwaterloo.ca

İnternet Kaynağı

<%**1**

6

www.buscalegis.ufsc.br

İnternet Kaynağı

<%**1**

7

www.nlnrac.org

İnternet Kaynağı

<%**1**

8

Submitted to University College London

Öğrenci Ödevi

<%**1**