

Changing Multitudes in Societal and Intra-Societal Alchemy in Shakespeare's *King Lear*

Arvind Manikrao Tatte, Assistant Professor, Department of English, Late P.P. Arts & Commerce MahilaMahavidyalaya, Warud, District -Amravati.

ABSTRACT:

Societal and intra-societal alchemy is the triumphant expression of a new attitude towards condemned infatuation of essential orientalism that emerges from inextricable association of irrational culture and misguided derived tendencies. Authentic cultural bondage is necessary for the societal development; but, thinking of modeled aesthetic and political projection undermines the departure of adapted universal history. Shakespearean assertion substantially acknowledges considered strangeness of placing this alchemy beneath the articulated and manifested paradoxical tradition. Thus, through the present piece of research it is observed that changing multitudes of societal and intra-societal alchemy have transposed the fertilized moral instruction as occurred in Shakespeare's *King Lear*.

KEY-WORDS:

Changing multitudes, alchemy, paradoxical tradition. etc.

INTRODUCTION:

Dissonance of enormous vistas have steadily enabled innovative cultural vistas. This opening of such vistas is largely scalable to measure societal and intra-societal alchemy over the years. Essential beginning of culmination is proactively obsessed by the changing multitudes of social status, classical education, and difference in social class. Thus, the characteristic application of natural history and its protean inclusiveness within the spheres of human lives collectively embraces the rime of typical human institutions.

Apparently, this kind of razor spontaneity is observed in Shakespeare's *King Lear*. Basically, it is a drama with the plot and subplot of blindness, perhaps to mention, blindness to others motivation, nature, emptiness, power, privilege, and importance. Lear's shaping his relationship with his daughters, its shortcomings, getting blind all these happenings symbolize virtuosity and a quest for hopelessly polite world that is no more a part of such blindfolded materialism. In fact, it is seen in the glimpses of the opening plot of the play as Gloucester explains that he has two sons, one legitimate and the other is illegitimate but still he loves both of them equally. He wanted to suggest the King to divide his kingdom equally among his three daughters. Lear then announces his intention to divide his kingdom by admitting that Cordelia is his favourite. He clearly expects all three daughters to outdo each other with declarations of their love for which he will reward them with portion of land. Here, Cordelia refuses to flatter and disobeys him publicly. After Cordelia's stubbornness, Lear disowns her and divides his kingdom between the remaining two daughters, a deceitful Goneril and Regan. But, all in all, the real gist of the story lies here in Cordelia's reluctance as she does not want to pretend her love for her father but it is observed as Lear's failure and inability to understand his notions is his biggest tragic mistake.

This rigid form factorial scenic representation has advent misery of Albany who is the husband of Goneril but never speaks a word though presents everywhere and it is the biggest mistake of this character. As author portrays the

complete tragic scenery of Lear's life, presence of Albany is marked somewhat pathetic when Goneril and Oswald see him as pathetic and regard him dull, negative, and offensive as below –

*“Welcome my lord, I marvel our mild husband
Not met us on the way...
...what most he should dislike seems pleasant to him;
What like, offensive?”¹*

(Act IV, Scene – ii)

Lear's only wish was to take his own care after dividing kingdom and he was expecting that his daughters should take his care. But, his daughters – Goneril and Regan started to treat him like a powerless old man. He was deprived by this. Meanwhile, the same treatment is observed in between Edmund and Edgar. Edmund wishes to banish Edgar and take his place as Gloucester's heir. Herewith, it is observed through such episodic representations that the play has two simultaneous climaxes where a protagonist comes in direct conflict with an antagonist. In another incident, Edgar in a disguise of a beggar called poor Tom shows King Lear that as a King he failed to take care of poor and downtrodden when he was in power. Precisely, Shakespeare has projected that power is a greater force than even the love of families. To admit this, Gloucester was blinded for helping King Lear when he was not in power. Secondly, Edmund has achieved his goal after learning this brutal truth.

This palpable randomness is seen in the words of Kent who is the loyal and trusted servant of King Lear when he risks his life to tell the truth to the King inspite the death sentence passed on him, he mentions –

*“...Now, banished Kent,
If thou canst serve where thou dost stands condemn'd,
So may it come, thy master, whom thou lovest,
Shall find thee full of labours.”²*

(Act I, Scene – iv)

Unfathomable origin of violence is observed in Lear's representation from the Play. The fatalism of the play echoes when the reader comes to know the destruction of all two families for the quest of power. Edgar kills Edmund and also unintentionally to his father and restored to power as the new Duke of Gloucester. Lear's family is also destroyed. Regan, Goneril, Cordelia, and finally Lear himself all die. In fact, it is observed that dividing kingdom among wrong daughters brings fatality and curse. The final scene of the play is marked with more fatal outcomes as Lear walks onstage carrying Cordelia's body howling with grief. All this happened with him because he just wanted to be loved just as the same he does to all his daughters. But, love fails before political power. His all suffering has been for nothing.

The brutality of Regan is observed when she insults her father and leaves home. She goes to Gloucester's castle and when King Lear approaches to meet her she clearly denies. With the help of her servant Kent she refuses to allow her father to meet her. Lear allows her every wish but finally she takes Goneril's hand and unites with her against Lear. The following crushing blow by Regan baffles Lear which represents her ingratitude towards her father – Lear as mentioned –

“And in Good time you gave it.”³ (Act II, Scene – iv)

Moreover, the insignificant application of the literary devices is the core juncture of the whole plot development and this construction assembles the sensitive approach of changing multitudes societal and intra-societal alchemy as depicted in the life of Lear King. The cultural production including macabre of nothingness against power ought to have flirtation with transitional distinctiveness in Lear and Cordelia along with Gloucester. This tragic amalgamation has nothing to do but to survive through the whole plot as observed; but, the climax has opened the Shakespearean tragic magic with the utmost degree of imperialistic salvation. Distinct interest in morality of the transitional nature, particularly in soldering apparition of King Lear, and modernity in otherness with nothingness has admittance of determination. Hence, this coining materiality automates modern sophisticated social-political criticality and its subsequent efforts are to evaluate and accumulate authenticity of the fatal lateral judgements. H. Cartner observes this in his book *Struggling for Ethnic Identity: Ethnic Hungarians in Post-CeausescuRomania* as given below –

To sum up briefly, then. The concept of the security dilemma is usually defined by a combination of most, if not all, the above elements: the indistinguishability between offence and defence; uncertainty; the advantage of offence over defence; an action–reaction dynamic; a preemptive strike; and unintended consequences. From this general formulation, my argument now moves to distinguish between three different types of security dilemma: a ‘tight’, a ‘regular’ and a ‘loose’ security dilemma.⁴ (Pg. No. 20 - *Struggling for Ethnic Identity: Ethnic Hungarians in Post-CeausescuRomania*)

Submissively, it is recognized as the rationalist ideas appears insisted reasons convert into fatal makeover. In fact, unaccounted chasms of the congenial thinking super-flows with the materialistic intellectual fairings. This is why the visions and superstitions have a collaborative correspondence as observed in the play. This intra-societal jumbled alchemy imitates human impulses of transcendence. Rightfully, the measured sensual impressions and actual outcomes have simultaneously considered as spiritually empiricist moment where benevolent universal inheritance contemplates personal treasures of dissenting groups. Hereon with, the new kind of societal alchemy has emerged confronting the social status of human history.

Underpinning the segregation of cultural environment that occurs within the adequate preceding undergoes the fermented liberalism as expected in the behavior of King Lear and his daughter Cordelia; but, the amount of aesthetic necessity and thirst for power is discovered in Regan and Goneril. This is the most tragic contingency of the Lear’s life. Here, with this amalgamation, author’s sediments are found to be more cumulative rather pursuing character’s profoundness. Also, he intends to represent the skeptical hazard of power instead of family love. Essential mediations between King Lear’s thinking and the acts of his two daughters, except Cordelia, brings denouement for him and his kingdom simultaneously. Authoritarian landmark of the complex nature and its increasing ubiquitous shadows are the major susceptible hindrances for the societal and intra-societal endurences.

CONCLUSION:

Therefore, the liquid nature and hostile cultural environment both have been subverted to separate popping of roaring dominion and the hustling encounters of the works of the author. The visual cultural productivity and post landscape painting of mindful mistakes are misunderstood both in terms of societal and intra societal alchemies. Thus, the unprecedented exactness was especially opened to volatility of the intellectual and aesthetic spiraling.

REFERENCES:

1. Shakespeare, William. 2004. King Lear. New York: Oxford University Press.
2. Shakespeare, William. 2004. King Lear. New York: Oxford University Press.
3. Shakespeare, William. 2004. King Lear. New York: Oxford University Press.
4. H. Cartner. 1993. *Struggling for Ethnic Identity: Ethnic Hungarians in Post-CeausescuRomania*.New York: Helsinki Watch.