

## *Molière's Imitation of Shakespeare*

陳 庸 宇

It is not a rare opinion that English dramatic literature is dominated by Shakespeare as well as that the French one is enriched by Molière along with Racine, much obliged with the benefit of Corneille's groundings. It is thus that an English reader should measure the value of other poetic dramas by the standards which Shakespeare has already implanted in his mind; in French comedy Molière has been the object of almost universal admiration as the most consummate master among all the writers of his race, and yet so beyond time and space.

This dissertation presents a comparative study between Shakespeare and Molière; not in the full sense of the sum total of both playwrights, but as an area of interest observed in perspective from the point of view of the influence ascertained between these two eminent authors I have planned to analyze to a certain extent. Such area as I am indebted to treat with exactness should be subjected to the treatment of what the resemblance between the former and the latter, however correct or otherwise it may be in its genuine or real shape, represents to the object of it.

This resemblance in regard to the comparative study, however, even supposing it to control, would not seriously affect the whole and genuine comparison between both playwrights. The principal comparative study of them lies elsewhere. It is felt to some extent in act or process of contrasting what literary orientation the English poet supplied to the Frenchman, but still more in swaggering what the latter achieved wining the former as a playwright. It is, in a word, no less than the communication between Shakespeare and Molière, that is to know how much the former reflected the literary tendency of the latter and what merits of the master the discipliner took advantage of in aping him with competition or difficulties, and where and how the son of New-classicism stood more intellectually and more imaginatively than the English giant, while enjoying his consummate talent grounded from the deserved mantle of that alien, by virtue of which he in earlier time resembled him in some parts of displaying his endowed ability but in time refused all the comparisons other than the supreme examples, such as applying the sources to the literary works. As a playwright, the English man guided and in part reflected and at last consummated his follower. His field is unique and particular as a playwright, the French stage being for him more than only a stage for performance.

This is the reason he had hardly retreated on the 17th of February, 1673, from the stage of *Le Malade imaginaire* being performed than he disappeared suddenly with

whatever comically or cynically goes, with his gesture as well as declamation, of the public enriching its relaxation with it. What seems comic or cynical, if we turn to English literature, will be found of course in Shakespeare, but there is such a great difference between these two writers that much remains controversial as will be shown elsewhere as a later series of this thesis. No doubt the more such controversy so invulnerable as to argue seems true, the more it seems essential and significant for us to intend to grapple with its immediate hub.

The method which is to accommodate the procedures necessary for scrutinizing this projected obligation needs to be clarified. Before challenging my descriptive analysis of it, it will be necessary for me to propose a hypothesis that some controversial material is, even if it were actually not, under the influence of what *le transmetteur* should tyrannize to *le récepteur* through what we call *le passage*, which is the process of transmitting what once belonged to the former or indirectly, even in defiance of the communicating method, to the latter. For such an assumption is to the study of comparative criticism what a sewing needle is to thread. This notwithstanding, the unity of literature serves with its peculiar characteristic whose traditional tendency centers on similar and general situations; even though one has his own personality, he has all the woe with the loss of Eden, the mortal taste intermingled first with disobedience. And as P. Van Tieghem has already manifested in his *La Littérature comparée*, such terminologies as contact, accueil, diffusion, imitation and influence are all not extravagant but rather common to fully exercise its critical proceeding in which *le transmetteur* emitted the echoes of his possession in *le récepteur*. The thoroughness with which those literary nomenclatures respectively deal with the appreciation exposed to the aesthetic subtlety of critics is admirable beyond time and space, but this is not rare and easy in ordinary critical exercises, still less in the case of this one. Even if this is too usual and common for us to disapprove, it does insinuate much fear into me lest I should direct my course wrongly, no matter if only within the approval of the formerly designed purport to theorize it as a dissertation. Thus it is in my course of discussion in this dissertation that I will make it a point to look upon the terminologies as a compass so real and genuine as to correctly direct north.

Here and now, for the sake of this article at issue, nowhere is the excellence of Van Tieghem's nomenclatures once designated more appropriate than in the fourth one, 'imitation,' which forms so large and important a portion of his apprenticeship with a view to learning that conspicuous and profound skill from the English master. What I examine here is, of course, of *la nature de l'emprunt littéraire*, most of which consist of literary genre, style or expression, *sujet* or *thème*, type, tradition, *idée* and sentiment. Out of these, it is fatuous to say that each head should be confined at a corresponding, in equal shares, prototypical pattern and that it should be supplied with some definite prototypes. Thus it is itself's for the supplying or not. On the other hand, in saying that the last two heads, *idée* and sentiment, have the value of depth more profound than the others I here am about to examine, it is out of the question which direction my treating will

bound. Of these two kinds of treatments to expound how l'emprunt littéraire goes between le transmetteur and le récepteur, the first category is likely to be so superficial and cursory we realize better how different or similar are the literary works of the former for the latter's, while in the second argument in my prospective series of this one there will be much and even more profound than the controversy at hand and thus extend to inquire from which play of Shakespeare Molière apes in writing his own dramatic work whose taste and technique stand higher than the original ones. All his superlatives are the main subjects which put him above his master, and this will be the vital part of this sort of dissertation; its essential point is to discern how much he was affected by his master. It was in 1655 that *L'Étourdi*, his first comedy was written, letting the public prick its wonder of what other comic theatricality which could surpass that of the master would appear later on. More important than the authorship of his books is, it seems to me, the chronological order of them, which will count much for processing further to the would-be-cardinal point to be discussed.

In fact, as to Molière's technical debts to the master of English renaissance, which are not prevailing literary arguments at present, there is not much of controversy enchanting the public who are willing to participate in the same field. This is one of the phenomena among us, for the voluminous erudition of the French language stands as a rudiment at the outset before making up one's mind to carry on the debate.

On the other hand, many of the arguing objects are mostly conjecture; for in advance I proclaimed a premise in which the interrelationship between Shakespeare and Molière consists; thus a considerable body of arguing probabilities are consequently conjectures whose possibilities are as certain and sure as the answers immediate and appropriate to the premise. Of course, I know that such conjecture hardly provides sufficient illustration for identifying that interrelationship, even though they are essential; and yet the fruits of much effort, however short of vigor or in lack of activity, expended to the definite end to clarify the particular connection between both dramatic masters.

## 1

There are obviously matters of resemblance or similarity between *Le Tartuffe* and *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, notwithstanding that dramatic effect and structure are not interrelated; the former being that all the characters are vivid and subtle stupidities, dominated by the central figure of the vulgar adventurer disguising his passion for money and his sensual lust under the cover of religion, and nearly bringing to ruin a whole family,<sup>1)</sup> and the latter the realization of mutual recognition of two lovers and in some respects the most perfect of his comic devisings as much as if there were nothing to challenge that work in its own special kind.

In this respect Mariane, the daughter of Organ who is the central figure labeled as

---

1) Germaine Mason(1959), *A Concise Survey of French Literature*, London: Arthur Barker, p.87.

extortionate usurer and Hermia, daughter of Egeus whose trouble as a father is to decide whom he should choose as a son-in-law from two adults who are in love with her and whose final decision settled at last on Demetrius. Such situations are so different from each other as to note the similarities between both paternal cares; 'every play has a "source" in that the plot must have come from somewhere'; and nowadays originality is regarded as a merit more than previously, even in the days of Shakespeare.<sup>2)</sup> The devices for presenting those cares for daughters are originated from sources respectively; the plot of the English play came fragmentarily from various stories, whereas the character of *Le Tartuffe*, as the author explained himself, came from Italian comedy.<sup>3)</sup>

In comparing the major significant respect, we should remember that no sooner had Doriane, maid to Mariane, had the dutiful and even submissive compliance to her father than she so violently blamed her hostess as follows:

Lui dire qu'un cœur n'aime point par autrui,  
 Que vous vous mariez pour vous, non pas pour lui,  
 Qu'étant celle pour qui se fait toute l'affaire,  
 C'est à vous, non à lui, que le mari doit plaire,  
 Et que si son Tartuffe est pour lui si charmant,  
 Il le peut épouser sans nul empêchement.<sup>4)</sup>

Such blame is in point of fact that when Doriane spoke of the love of Mariane, she was so sternly referring to its freedom pertaining to the free will or self-decision and self-determination rather than to the unwilling judgement of paternal choice or verdict that even the house-maid, too, disposed in the action of blaming her master in defiance of her estate not to do so. The fact that such a situation as shown in this associates the name of Lysander with the comedy of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* encourages us in further deliberation. So, in searching for any comparable and corresponding expression, there is an oration appropriate for it whose emphasis converges on A I S i of that play as emphatically as if his thought or idea of what is desirable or what ought to be in such a situation on the account of love affairs were Doriane's own, so that the relative effect of it might provide the same results and consequences to both plays alike. This is the dialogue Lysander told to Demetrius, her rival to compete with getting betrothed:

You have her father's love, Demetrius:  
 Let me have Hermia's; do you marry him.<sup>5)</sup>

- 
- 2) Majorie Boulton(1960), *The Anatomy of Drama*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, p. 64.  
 3) a. *Tartuffe* par René Vaubourdolle, Hachette, p. 6. *Le Tartuffe*, dit Molière lui-même au début de sa préface, est 'une comédie dont on a fait beaucoup de bruit et qui a été longtemps persécuté.'  
 b. Molière: *Sa Vie dans ses Oeuvres* par Pierre Brisson, Gallimard, p. 29.  
 4) Georges Couton (ed.), Molière: *Oeuvres complètes*, Gallimard, p. 922. (A II s iii, 592-6).  
 5) Peter Alexander (ed.), (1960) *The Complete Works of William Shakespeare*, London: Collins, p. 199(A I s i 93-4).

Now, to compare that with Doriane's blame translated into English, our surprise is immediately checked, for the protest of Lysander looks so much like Doriane's that we can not show any disapproval therein, nor disavow the conjecture that both playwrights have some exact and tight connection so close as to easily discern even at a glance that nothing is so good in itself as that connection between both and that this hold cannot be reversed beyond question, even if it were not defended stoutly in the company of the ablest critics.<sup>6)</sup>

## 2

It is said that when once Louis XIV asked Boileau which of his contemporary writers would give lasting fame to his reign, the then famous critic answered unhesitatingly: 'Molière, Sire.' That answer was so correct and true that it derived from his brilliant intelligence the ablest capacity codified the then existing artistic theories in his most famous work, *L'Art poétique*, which seems to catch up many diverse elements of French criticism, and to give a rounded statement of humanistic ideas, and of whom Mr. Ferdinand Brunetière has written as being representative of French literary genius. And still it seems so. Boileau's anticipative eulogy praises Molière's greatness and judges his potential to please the public audience, and yet to make it laugh. No doubt the last laughter he gave to the audience was to be found all in *Le Malade imaginaire*: for he died after the fourth performance of that play during which he tumbled, as if stricken with the strong blow of laughter and ovation so tremendous as to measure his length, down on the stage.

In the play (A II S viii) Argan, imagining himself to be ill, submits himself to the endless medicaments prescribed by doctors Purgon and Diafoirus, whose son is the suitor to his daughter, Angélique; her father is no other than the imaginary invalid. Wishing to let his daughter get married with the son of Diafoirus, a young student studying medical science, by virtue of which he would cure his disease, he is so encouraged by the arguments of his sensible brother that he comes not to be faithful to fact as well as to fantasy what they were earlier than that argument. He is what every one who has been under suffering from illness so severe as to remain disappointed afterwards understands something about what his own image is now; for it is very likely that it is in his own way that he perceives everything surrounding him or quite otherwise thoroughly apart from him. Between the thralldom of self-satisfaction and that of self-abandon, there is the boundary, so narrow that it seems as if 'as, whence the sun 'gins his reflection, shipwrecking storms and direful thunders; so from that spring whence comfort seemed to come, discomfort swells.'<sup>7)</sup> Nevertheless, Angélique's affection is set on Cléante who for the sake of their dating to easily become engaged would deign to be her music tutor, and who

6) The following is the quotation from Molière translated by John Wood, Penguin Classics in 1960.  
And that, if he had such a fancy for his precious Tartuffe, he can marry himself and there's nothing to stop him.

7) Peter Alexander, *op. cit.*, *Macbeth* A I si 25-28.

never came across Argon to make it easy for that pretender to present a hypocritical show as a feigned musician; this is the most eloquent stage action which Molière used to show the dramatic process such as a son tricking his father or a valet beating his master or a wife making show of devotion to her husband; nevertheless, in each case, the punishment is well deserved, as in this play where Beline reveals her false heart in time to Argan.

So much his pioneer works to know that what he is about is not to be wasted, as might so easily have happened. Getting aid from his younger daughter, Louison, he realized the heartless self-interest of his wife so deceptive as to defraud his property and the devotion of his elder daughter for Cléante. Before such realization of what her real affection is realized, he suffered from the dramatic conflict so antagonistic in him as having been induced to feign death to prove his wife's affection. Although not easy for him to understand her falsehood, either to hide himself or to cheat him, before he comes to know such proof as it turns out wholly and altogether, there is a dilemma nothing could so easily hear as so often happens. By this explicit explanation mentioned until now, it is clear that it is for his daughter whose marriage, if taken according to his opinion, makes him have a doctor as a member of his family, that he says,

Ma raison est que, me voyant infirme et malade comme je suis, je veux me faire un gendre et des alliés médecins, afin de m'appuyer de bons secours contre ma maladie, d'avoir dans ma famille les sources des remèdes qui me sont nécessaires, et d'être à même des consultations et des ordonnances.<sup>8)</sup>

This is the reason why his daughter's match with Thomas is so indispensable in his view of the feeble and poorly state that it should be realized under his eyes, no matter what impediment may stand in his planning. Contrary to this, Toinette constantly insists on the inadequacy of his persistence, at last letting him continue steadfastly his first opinion, 'On dira ce qu'on voudra; mais je vous dis que je veux qu'elle exécute la parole que j'ai donnée.' Next in the remonstrance that execution of order is unfair for Angélique, and so he bursts out into fury and rails at it in brawling:

Elle le fera, ou je la mettrai dans un couvent.<sup>9)</sup>

The commonest form in which Molière presents the remonstrance against a disobedient daughter who challenges her parents' order or direction to her marriage is the notification of 'un couvent' where she must endure all the ordeals so lonely renounced that such lady as 'the more deceived' should be 'given this plaque for her dowry: be thou as chaste as ice, as pure as snow, thou shalt not escape calumny.' In this play the word 'un couvent' being to, even citing Shakespeare, is represented thrice more with the same meaning as in the first reference to the representation of a disobedient young lady.

Il nous a dit qu'il voulait donner sa fille en mariage au fils de Monsieur Diafoirus; je lui ai

8) Georges Couton, *op. cit.*, *Le Malade imaginaire*, A I s v.

9) *Ibid.* A I s v.

répondu que je trouvais parti avantageux pour elle; mais que je croyais qu'il ferait mieux de la mettre dans un couvent.<sup>10)</sup>

Écoute, il m'y a point de milieu à celà: choisis d'épouser dans quatre jours, ou Monsieur, ou un couvent. Ne vous mettez pas en paine, je la rangerai bien.<sup>11)</sup>

Argan, parlant avec emportement, et se levant de sa chaise: Mon frère, ne parlez point de cette coquine-la. C'est une friponne, une impertinente, une effrontée, que je mettrai dan un couvent avant qu'il soit deux jours.<sup>12)</sup>

Judging from the examples shown in *Le Malade imagininaire*, we might expect 'un couvent' to be only the way to handle or rather declare the disinheritance to the girl who, disregarding her paternal intention, falls in love with her clandestine lover, and who makes all the suitors ridiculous because of their vulgar and inelegant attitude to love so vain and worthless as to ascertain the old saying 'Mother only bore the child, not its mind.' This is also one of the interpretation through which the same case as shown in Molière can be compared with the following.

Either to die the death, or to abjure  
 For ever the society of men.  
 Therefore, for Hermia, question your desires,  
 Know of your youth, examine well your blood,  
 Whether, if you yield not to your father's choice,  
 You can endure the livery of a nun,  
 For age to be in shady cloister mew'd,  
 To live a barren sister all your life,  
 Chanting faint hymns to the cold fruitless moon.  
 Thrice-blessed they that master so their blood  
 To undergo such maiden pilgrimage;  
 But either happy is the rose distill'd  
 Than that which withering on the virgin thorn  
 Crowns, lives, and dies, in single blessedness.<sup>13)</sup>

This same purport in its tendency shows itself in Shakespeare by a different expression. It, if nothing else, may show us how different it is between them to express their ideas respectively in the same terminology; while it should be noted that Theseus, duke of Athens, makes such proclamation about 'the livery of a nun' to his people as if a king were in all his glory of the sovereign power to execute its sovereignty, in other words, a public announcement of the national prestige to exercise an authority as severe and serious as any national law to reign the nation; whereas in Molière the word 'un couvent' being the ultimate measure in such a case, paternal affection is obliged to take as an admissible

10) Georges Couton, *op. cit.*, *Le Malade imaginnaire*, A I s vi.

11) *Ibid.* A II s vi.

12) *Ibid.* A II s ix.

13) Peter Alexander, *op. cit.*, *Midsummer Night's Dream*, A I s i.

policy to counter whatever happens in the terms of its necessity according to the first convenience to pacify it under conciliating situations.

What is the meaning of such opposite facts as is shown in contrast? Is Thesus, in practising his authoritative control, better prepared to meet the affair of love than Argan who as a normal father to his daughter suggests only the livery of a nun in alternative acts? As for the dialogue, it is no other than the presentation of a character's opinion, especially the inner circle of his actions, which is now and then exaggerated or dissimulated under a false semblance for the sake of its convenience in which the more sincere he is, the more falsehood he will pretend—a equivocator one could not easily discern in what attitude and on what he is about—the real is not always natural.

This is another case in which 'un couvent' becomes the ultimate goal for a member of the fair sex to escape her trouble and settle herself down in order to avoid it completely from the area within which it exerts influences upon her. In *Le Tartuffe*, Mariane tries to avoid the present situation under which she is suffering from 'du tourment d'être à ce que j'abhorre,' making such a claim as follows:

Vos tendresses pour lui ne me font point de peine;  
Faites-les éclater, donnez-lui votre bien,  
Et, si ce n'est assez joignez-y tout le mien:  
J'y consens de bon cœur, et je vous l'abandonne;  
Mais au mains n'allez pas jusques à ma personne,  
Et souffrez qu'un couvent dans les austérités  
Use les tristes jours que le Ciel m'a comptés.<sup>14)</sup>

Driven to this desperation by pushing her father's authority to its extreme, he is rather more definite than pitiful in insisting that girls be all for going into convents as soon as their father's wishes conflict with their wanton designs (lorsqu'un père combat leur flammes amoureuses). The difference between this assurance and Shakespeare's sternly declamatory severity is the question of how much the former is more positive in insisting his declaration than the latter is filled with fatherly affection; this is, in both cases, up to as compassionate a feeling as the scowl to check the liberation of instincts against fatherly wishes. The paternal dignity that both playwrights have confirmed upon the plays of each other still crowns the nuance both moral and psychological, so that this may guarantee us that the feature of marriage of the day practised by a parent's permission without much dissimilarity of rites is one of the distinguished particularities to be noted in order to compare both playwrights by means of much opposite or contrasting interpretation on literary gestures and expressions alike.

### 3

As the first appearance of Baquo's ghost in *Macbeth* takes place at the time of supper

14) Georges Couton, *op. cit.*, *Le Tartuffe*, A IV s iii.



in the third act of the play, so that of Commandeur's statue does at the same hour in the same act of *Don Juan*. Such coincidence, though disconnected by the intervening barrier of several decades and the handicap owing to different languages existing between them, seems accidental so that we may pass by without any concern over it. We cannot help calling it not merely such and such a accident, but an exact and precise imitation of thinking and feeling, rather an pattern so cunningly remodelled or so adapted as to avoid the real intention intrinsic in the writer imitating whatever is, it seems to him, indispensable for his composition.

*Don Juan*, produced in 1655, 'is a more open attack on the dévots whose criticisms had exasperated Molière; the arguments in favour of religion, which he put in the mouth of the corrupt, vulgar and stupid valet Sganarelle, are, ridiculous and grotesque.' In that *Don Juan*, an insolent and unscrupulous libertine, had carried off Elvire from a convent and married her, and being soon tired of her has deserted her to pursue other amorous intrigues. As he sits at supper, the statue of the Commandeur he has killed arrives, and he receives it with unshaken effrontery.

What holds a curiosity to me is that the statue of Molière juxtaposes two characteristics of the ghosts Shakespeare embodied in *Macbeth* as well as in *Hamlet*; in the case of the former, Banquo's ghost appeared silently and secretly, as explained just before, at supper time, whereas Hamlet's speaks, and even portends an omen and the accounts of the past which are as factual and vivid a matter as a character to converge all the attention of the whole audience in a theatre. In his first appearance (Le tombeau s'ouvre, ou l'on voit un superbe mausolée et la statue de commandeur), the statue in *Don Juan* 'baisse la tête' in answering the question that 'Seigneur Commandeur, mon maître Don Juan vous demande si vous voulez lui faire l'honneur de venir souper avec lui' and signs again in the same gesture with a nod as before to his assassinator's impudence that 'Viens, maraud, viens je te veux bien faire toucher au doigt ta poltronnerie. Prends garde. Le Seigneur Commandeur voudriat-il venir souper avec moi?'<sup>15)</sup> It is of primary importance to realize such nods and their significance as the representing means of Molière's dramatic development. In reality it easily reminds us of the silent appearance of Banquo's ghost which sat in *Macbeth's* place before he pretends to indicate to Banquo his repentance that

Here had we now our country's honour roofed,  
Were the graced person of our Banquo present;  
Who may I rather challenge for unkindness  
Than pity for mischance.<sup>16)</sup>

This insincere compunction on Banquo soon follows the false regret of his absence. This repentance propels him to his being 'not well' right after becoming as wandering a stray as to say 'The table's full' and 'which of you have done this' and soon, making Lady

15) Georges Couton, *op. cit.*, *Dom Juan*. A III s v.

16) Peter Alexander, *op. cit.*, *Macbeth*, A III s iv.

Macbeth, audacious as she is, blame his 'infirm of purpose,' humbly excusing the fit as momentary and upon a thought that 'He will again be well. If much you note him, you shall offend him and extend his passion. Feed, and regard him not.' In spite of his unfaithful intrigues and his wife's as well, his real conscience of an honest mind moves chiefly among the consideration of active justice and of conscious thoughts whose real sincerity discourages him from crime and complies with righteousness to follow as 'a subject' as loyal and allegiant as possible. It is with the help of A. C. Bradley that we could see what his reality in essence is through his erudite commentary on *Macbeth*:

This bold ambitious man of action, has, within certain limits, the imagination of a poet,—an imagination on the one hand extremely sensitive to impression of a certain kind, and, on the other, productive of violent disturbance both of mind and body. Through it he is kept in contact with supernatural impressions and is liable to supernatural fears. And through it, especially, come to him the intimations of conscience and honour. Macbeth's better nature—to put the matter for clearness' sake too broadly—instead of speaking to him, in the overt language of moral ideas, commands, and prohibition, incorporates itself in images which alarm and horrify. His imagination is thus the best of him, something usually deeper and higher than his conscious thoughts; and if he had obeyed it he would have been safe. But his wife quite misunderstands it, and he himself understands it only in part.<sup>17)</sup>

Such good fiber of his nature shakes violently according to the incentives, or rather persuasion as strong or stimulating as to deprave such a kind king as Duncan who 'hath borne his faculties so meek, hath been/ So clear in his great office, that his virtues/ Will lead like an angel, trumpet-tongued against/ The deep damnation of his taking-off;/ And pity, like a naked new-born babe/ Striding the blast, or heaven's cherubin, horsed/ Upon the sightless carriers of the air,/ Shall blow the horried deed in every eye/ That tears shall drown the wind.'<sup>18)</sup> It has been proved that however violent this tremor be that persuasion does its real role in time to persuade Macbeth to carry out the fuel intrigue, while his inner being is convulsed by conscience. From such real fiber of Macbeth as has been so far characterized, it should be noted that his audacity, although at last leading to success in seizing the royal crown, riddled with images as sacrilegious and bloody as a lordly temple, after being strayed with solely sovereign sway and masterdom, 'fate and metaphysical aid does seem to have you crowned,' refers by insinuation to the failure of losing that and as well because of that his inner being was always checked by conscience. This is why there is a good deal of proof that Banquo's ghost will not emerge taciturnly as much as motionless, unless that check is guaranteed as much by conscience as fate and metaphysical aid. Nevertheless, the appearance of the ghost is so terrifying that Macheth sobers from the abrupt intoxication of sovereign elevation, and his wayward fancy of impulse loses completely the equilibrium of mind and so 'spoil the pleasure of the time' by crying out as if to engage into severe arguments along with more 'horrible shadow'

17) A. C. Bradley, (1964) *Shakespearean Tragedy*, London: Macmillan, p. 295.

18) Pater Alexander, *op. cit.*, *Macbeth*, A I s vii.

than 'the rugged Russian bear, the armed rhinoceros, or the Hyrcan tiger which makes his firm nerves tremble. Such is the scene that shadow has created only by its shape so taciturn and motionless that it rather implies something which hides somehow in one's heart, and thus that something pierces in time into his maw, and at last the scene of crying out bursts into a climax as if he were surrounded by the monstrosity more horrible and terrifying than those names subsequently given forth in the mouth of Macbeth. This is understandable: of all horrors, taciturnity is the most fundamentally imperative of any condition of horrible emotion; thus in the very act of hoping to get by the proverb 'Silence is the best eloquence' there are few cases except this whose name is worthier than them. This is one of the aspects due to the different nationalities between the French and the English about which we may speculate endlessly the extent to which the former praises the latter's being taciturn; the latter does become the object of envy when keeping a loquacious atmosphere to make its running oilier and better in consequence. Indeed, what I might call here nationality is one of the characteristics traditionally intrinsic in one nation itself which we might as well be capable of feeling as a characteristic of literary tradition based on the peculiar national quality.

Up until now, I have digressed somewhat so as to return to the major point of what should be successively keeping on its genuine direction, the conventional deferences to the belief of each nation. Why does Molière have Don Juan invite the statue of Commandeur to supper (*Demande-lui s'il veut venir souper avec moi*)? Does he wish to placate or assuage his enemy to come out of le tombeau revealing his fundamental characteristic, his being loquacious not from his temper but from the nationality in which he was born and grew up? One wonders. I can define that this is not from whimsical temper at all nor from eccentricity nor even from curiosity, but rather from a part of his belief, as much tradition conceived in it as such nationalities as postulated part to them at exposure.

Beside this, it may be said that Molière here is thinking of the ghost of Hamlet, thoroughly and completely personified by the virtue of both motion and tongue quite apart from that deficiency of these two essentials in acting. Others will insinuate in favour of their elucidation of that play being evolved in sequence of the developing plot. This is why in Act IV, viii, Don Juan appears with 'la statue du Commandeur, qui vient se mettre á table,' so equally and evenly as to treat it nonetheless as a usual character, such as Sagnarelle or Don Juan himself or any other character. In Act V Scene v, the very words uttered by le spectre,

Don Juan n'a puls qu'un moment à pouvoir profiter de la miséricorde du Ciel; et s'il ne se repent ici, sa perte est résolue.<sup>19)</sup>

suggest to the readers dual meanings. On one hand, un spectre voices here a true decision as a symptom of relative revenge for its mortification too deplorable to picture slightly in mind; on the other hand, it has for that decision its fully scaled plan that in spite of the

---

19) Georges Couton, *op. cit.*, *Don Juan*, A V s v.

vindictive fury to blow up its enemy at once, there is a strong presumption that the real mind of un spectre seeks Don Juan's inner being to be found as thoroughly and clearly as possible before taking retaliation. Thus it exacts, in anticipation of its execution, what and how to carry out appropriately in proportion to its righteousness what any one can approve without any hesitation. This is all the spectre as the supernatural being has in itself, which impression I believe differs little among readers except in degree. Its understanding can hardly avoid those two effects the spectre has given any more than it, either through motion or through tongue, can be described. To me the statue's last words.

Don Juan, l'endrucissement au péché traîne une mort funeste, et les grâces du Ciel que l'on revoie ouvrent un chemin à sa foudre,<sup>20)</sup>

summon up the picture of the scene of Hamlet, A I s v, where the ghost uses a device which contributes to excite the 'prophetic seoul' of hidden secret or doubt operating on the mind of Prince Hamlet, and which reaches the apex along with the following:

I find thee apt,  
And duller shouldst thou be than the fat weed  
That roots itself in ease on Lethe wharf,  
Wouldst thou not stir in this, Now, Hamlet, hear.  
'Tis given out that, sleeping in my orchard,  
A serpent stung me. So the whole ear of Denmark  
Is by a forged process of my death  
Rankly abused. But know, thou noble youth,  
The serpent that did sting thy father's life  
Now wears his crown.<sup>21)</sup>

Thus, given more detail than this, the ghost of Molière can guarantee the juxtaposition of those both of Macbeth and of Hamlet, but not the opposition which seems to have driven against each other between both playwrights; the French is, therefore, enhanced twice as much as the English. As if to deepen the scenes of the ghost, he has concentrated attention on the two facts of the invitation to supper and of condemnation of 'une morte funeste'—motionlessness and the tongue. And that enhancement has been already achieved by taking advantage of literary contrivance, which I dared to explain beforehand specifying such kinds of resemblances to Macbeth that are likely to be misunderstood as an informed controversy, at the worst. This as well as the other respects already beforehand by the force of Shakespeare himself makes it seem that he is so fascinated under the influence of the predecessor as to take after him on the scene of the knocking at the gate as well as the attendance at the supper table. Contrasting the two, nobody can deny that this is nothing but imitation and copy or counterfeit. The French imitator follows his English master with his own ornament or adornment so peculiar and characteristic as to believe

20) *Ibid.* A V s Δi.

21) Peter Alexander, *op. cit.*, *Hamlet*, A I s v.

that he contrived it by his own effort.

Don Juan: Qui peut frapper de cette sorte?

Sganarelle: Qui diable nous vient troubler dans notre repas?

Don Juan: Je veux souper en repas au moins, et qu'on ne laisse enter personne.

Sganarell: Laissez-moi faire, je m'y en vais moi-même.

Don Juan: Qu'est-ce donc? Qu'y a-t-il?

Sganarelle, baissant la tête comme a fait le Statue:

Le...qui est là!

Don Juan: Allons voir, et montrons que rien ne me saurait ébranler.

Sganarelle: Ah! Pauvre Sganarelle, où te cacheras-tu?<sup>22)</sup>

When Lady Macbeth, losing her nerves at the shrill crying of 'avant, and quit my sight,' tries to appease him in imperturbablity, Macbeth loses his balance of mind and bursts into fury, uttering;

What man dare, I dare.

Approach thou like the rugged Russian bear,

The armed rhinoceros, or the Hyrcan tigers,

Take any shape but that, and my firm nerves

Shall never tremble. Or be alive again,

And dare me to the desert with thy sword:

If trembling I inhabit them, protest me

The baby of a girl. Hence, horrible shadow

Unreal mockery, hence!<sup>23)</sup>

Next, while the influence of the knocking at the gate(Qui peut frapper de cette sorte?) on Don Juan is very great, it is quite doubtful whether he has the same influence of fear that Macbeth and his wife, after the assassination of Duncan, had. It is referred in detail on behalf of its effect, which is praised as the apex among the techniques of delineating the painful emotions such as abhorrence, terror, panic, insecurity, unrest and so on. That is because they, with the daggers bloody in their hands, heard the knocking as soon as they barely stole from 'another Colgotha'; whereas Don Juan has an intervening time space, although it is not long. It is nonetheless longer than in *Macbeth*, because the invitation to supper about to be made between la statue and himself is subservient to diminish the elevated painful emotion to bring him up to a reasonable state in which to keep one's sound judgement. Thus, by the time when their confrontation at supper in Act V, s i took place in tranquility, their painful emotion would have turned to a more reasonable direction than the first strong determination solidated in heart and mind, looking forward to take the chance of revenge. In spite of that, diminshing as is the effect of it owing to such a time sequence to last some certain term, it is not agreeable to be reticent of what horror Don Juan has at the moment when he is aware of that 'Sganarelle,

22) Georges Couton, *op. cit.*, *Don Juan*, A IV s vii.

23) Peter Alexander, *op. cit.*, *Macbeth*, A III s iv.

baissant la tête comme a fait la state: Le...que est la!' Before characterizing Don Juan's horror which might remain invulnerable rather than arguable, it may as well confer on the opinion of De Quincey the vital point, which is as follows, as if to attribute to its element whatever belongs really to the genuine situation of that scene.

Hence, it is, that when the deed is done, when the work of darkness is perfect then the world of darkness passes away like a pageantry in the clouds: the knocking at the gate is heard; and it makes known audibly that the reaction has commenced; the human has made its reflux upon the fiendish: the pulses of life are beginning to beat again; and the re-establishment of the goings-on of the world in which we live, first makes us profoundly sensible of the awful parenthesis that had suspended them.<sup>24)</sup>

#### 4

Indeed, comparing Shakespeare's comedy with Molière's, we cannot help regarding the character of Shylock without being reminded of that of Harpagon, and further on becoming rather so skeptical of whether or not the former did affect a good deal of influence on the latter that the resemblance or similarity of both characters is enough to make us believe so. Nevertheless, nobody would give in to this and yet be penitent of himself in case he came across the lines to reverse him, 'Quant à la source de *L'Avare*, l'un est essentielle et indiscutable, *L'Aululaire de Plaute*. L'abbé de Marelles a imprimé assez peu de temps auparavant (1658) la première traduction française de Plaute, avec le texte latin en regard. *L'Aululaire* y figure sous le titre *L'Avaricieux*, mais avec le supplément par lequel un humaniste, Urceus Cordus, a complété la pièce antique qui, comme on sait, nous est parvenue mutilée. Molière nous paraît avoir utilisé cette édition-là, qui lui fournissait le nom de son héros, Harpagon.<sup>25)</sup> Besides that, in the same page there are noted two more existing literary works, *La Belle Paideuse* de Boisrobert and *L'Avare dupé ou L'Homme de Paille*, which played their role as the source to *L'Avare*. Those notwithstanding, at the risk of identifying them with the influence of Shakespeare on being avaricious are readers, contrasting their dispositions of the covetous nature of both Shylock and of Harpagon, whose dialogues are so similar as to make us nod in so doing. What has all this to do with that identification which strays between the resemblance and the influence? It is of an imagination so productive and creative that readers are unable to reconstruct into what was comprehended its new sort of recognition, rather active and constantly engaged in making images and associating with what was once known in order to let the mind be active enough to procure some or other complete idea, that is the normal work of a mind in daily life. It is plain that the mind of a human is of a reciprocal relationship between the operation of imagination on one side and that of memory on the other, and that such creative and productive ability of the former is so overwhelmingly

24) Thomas de Quincey(1961), 'On the Knocking at the Gate in "Macbeth"', *Shakespeare Criticism*, D. Nichol Smith (ed.), London: Oxford University Press, p. 336.

25) Georges Couton, *op. cit.*, p. 508.

surpassing as to render the latter useless. That is just the reason why it is in the imagination that the order of preference to choose which of these abilities prevails. Thus the aforesaid identification has more authority than what it should have in arguing those problems of resemblance and similarity. The likeliest misinterpretation which would happen on comparing Shylock with Harpagon, of which readers are likely not to be so generally conscious as usual, is in fact no more common in this than in other cases; for such comparison is so rare that the two characters are not only separated a century or so from each other in their discrepancy of age, but so much more than this are the nationalities as alien as that age. More than a little has been written on the dim borderland, where it seems to me at a glance that the influence of Plautus and that of Shakespeare dissemble completely so as not to discern which is which at all.

Once such dissembling reaches its apex along with La Fliche's condemnation so severe as to say 'Le prêteur, pour ne charger sa conscience d'aucun scrupules, prétend ne donner son argent qu'au denier dix-huit.' Cléante at once decries so stingy, niggardly and avaricious an attitude toward men and society, and toward Harpagon, his father whom he abuses and even rebels as if he were an offender and not his own father, emitting the insolent words,

Comment diable! quel Juif, quel Arabe est-ce là?  
C'est plus qu'au denier quatre.<sup>26)</sup>

With the words, 'Quel Juif!' in this language, readers would like to associate him with Shylock, whose stinginess is too widely disseminated for us to add any explanation. Why else, for example, do we take him lest the play, *The Merchant of Venice*, should be misunderstood apart from its genuine meaning? Without such character as that stinginess, in the whole conventional critical tradition of long standing, Portia, the ideal young lady, is not so bright nor explicit in her judgement and manners, any more than the contrast that Harpagon and Cléante could afford the contribution to expedient deference to public tastes. As that language in French can be in parallel, only arising antipathy as execrative and loathsome, rather hateful as the words, 'certainly the Jew is the very devil incarnation,' so in both plays that word 'Jew' empowers its pregnant significance in which all the good characters in them are elevated to live virtuously under integral order and as docile observers, echoing such social and religious law that it seems to be observed usually as much as ever. Not only Harpagon but also Shylock is not so happy to be rescued from the suffering, originated from excessive avarice out of due bounds, in which Shylock is a cruel Harpagon. So they are as avaricious as stingy to their daughters, only with the contrast that this is more cunning but that is more cruel.

As to this avarice, the correspondance or parallelism is much more apparent in consequence of such advancement of the play as from Act I Scene II to Act II Scene I, to Act II Scene V, to Act III Scene I and to Act IV Scene I, throughout which the Jew is

26) *Ibid.* *L'Avare*, A II s i.

characterized as he is. Perhaps Cléante's abhorrence of his father coincides fortuitously with those passages of Shakespeare in the play; but those five coincidences at hand in this article are so fortuitous, as incidental events, that I cannot entirely ignore the correspondence, contrast or parallelism that I have examined so far in its aspects of passages of which both playwrights take possession. Of course, this is one of the suggestions not only I but also readers or critics can conceive, when we look over the two masters with comparing critical taste, in the course of reading and watching the situations progress in proportion as the stinginess and avarice along with aversion severe enough to utter 'The pound of flesh which I demand of him is dearly bought, 'tis mine, and I will have it'<sup>27)</sup> make such an amalgam as the dim borderland where such dissembles does not relinquish its preceding. But, it is not a declaration that such is the real truth that nobody can ever commend enough as a principle or the like as to the controversy at issue.

## 5

I mentioned beforehand what I should like to call the importance of the literary influence, the transformation of what the predecessor used into what is profitable for the follower's sake such literary influence of Shakespeare on Molière's comedies as the literary sources, beliefs, situation and the passages. I need not recount these here, but I should like to draw attention to what in literature is called the theme, more fundamental components than those, even more immediately influential on the play whose plot is woven out of the fortunes of the characters, not to say the hero and the heroine alike.

Not only do they take Valère for the robber, and enhance the panic situation to arrest him accordingly, but they are as fascinated with the unforeseen confrontation to denote its happiness as Anselme is so as to say:

L'audace est merveilleuse. Apprenez, pour vous confondre, qu'il y a seize ans pour le moins que l'homme dont vous nous parlez périt sur mer avec ces enfants et sa femme, en voulant dérober leur vie aux cruelles persécutions qui ont accompagné les désordres de Naples, et qui en firent exiler plusieurs nobles familles.<sup>28)</sup>

'Les désordres de Naples' which were probably a source rather than a cause of the production of the play, even with the similarity of the shipwreck and the same period of separation for the sake of this as we can recognize in *The Comedy of Errors* and *Pericles*, are explained as follow:

S'agit-il de la révolte de Masianello(1647)? Mais après cette révolte, un Français, quelque peu héros de roman, le duc de Guise, avait de façon éphémère régné sur Naples d'où l'avait chassé Don Juan d'Autriche. Les Français, sans regarder de plus près aux dates, devaient avoir gardé l'impression que Naples était un pays à révolutions.<sup>29)</sup>

27) Peter Alexander, *op. cit.*, *The Merchant of Venice*, A IV s i, i, 98-100.

28) Georges Couton, *op. cit.*, *L'Avare*, A V s v.

29) *Ibid.* vol. II, p. 1397.



Seen in this quotation, it is highly debatable that the incident of 'Les désordres Naples', as the direct cause of cutting off the blood bond between father and son, took sixteen years to let them confront by availing of an unexpected opportunity by which the play suddenly turns to something leading to a ridiculous but romantic happy ending in brightness and laughter. The story being as explained, to be sure, Molière has introduced into it certain elements which are quite similar, in a certain sense, to some of Shakespeare's the conception of whose age seems to have been prototyped as proposed for or deserving of imitation to theirs, particularly to the French playwright. As to Anselme's surprise sooner than any of the others' it can hardly be neglected that those missing years of 'Ily a seize ans pour le moins que l'homme dont vous nous parlez périt sur mer avec ses enfants et sa femme' are a long term of separation from one's wife and children. The term of sixteen years is sharply differentiated from other terms by the fact that in it the concern about an extraordinary likeness to separation scenes in Shakespeare is wholly replaced by a concern about the imitation of or profound influence from him. The conception of the imitation in this sense may be supposed as haphazard conjecture; it is almost credible that however similar, however equal, it can by being fortuitous and incidental be as worthy of truth as in assuming a principle in reasoning. Thus, when we suppose that creative elements are obviously and constantly mistaken for imitations not themselves, the solution to the puzzle ought to let us be hung on that in question, the key point of which is imitation or otherwise, or of what is originative, whatever economies to the play it may supply. This being so, some themes of the play, however popular the episodes they may include, remain, and have remained insolvable subjects for critics; something about Shakespeare's learning is one of the controversial subjects shown by Kenneth Muir in his *Shakespeare's Sources*.

The extent of Shakespeare's classical learning is nevertheless still a matter of dispute. Some believe that Jonson's 'small Latin and no Greek.' Others think that though Shakespeare had little or no Greek, he understood Latin pretty well, and that his knowledge of the language was small only in comparison with Jonson's. Those who adhere to the former view point out that many of the parallels with Latin Literature, which have been collected by numerous critics, may well be fortuitous; that Golding's translation of Ovid is so bad—in spite of Ezra Pound's belief that it is superior to *Paradise Lost*—that a good Latin scholar would not have tolerated it; that Shakespeare's actual quotations from Latin authors are mostly in early plays—*Henry VI* and *Titus Andronicus*—of which he may not have been the sole author, or of passages so familiar that he could have acquired them as general knowledge; that he makes a number of blunders about classical mythology; that his spelling 'triumpherate' suggests that he was ignorant of the derivation of 'triumvir', and that he is guilty of shocking anachronisms. None of these arguments has much substance. It is perfectly true that many of the alleged parallels between Shakespeare's works and classical literature are unconvincing.<sup>30)</sup>

Such method of comparison as aforesaid is so agreeable with that of contrasting Molière

---

30) Kenneth Muir(1957), *Shakespeare's Sources*, London: Methuen, pp. 1-2.

with Shakespeare that it is as if the former method were the right guidance whose pursuit is nothing less than the proper device for the latter case, particularly promising well in its brightness onward on behalf of this, in which originals as well as imitations can echo their disdain of alluding the results. That does casually deserve to remind us that the literary earmark of the 17th century derived from the literary principles once prevailing, and yet long standing in Greece and Rome alike. This reached its apex on which new-classicism fully flourished in its marvelous significance and thus brought revolutionary innovation to the passing literary activities which on the public as well as on the literary authorities have imposed an arbitrary authenticity to model themselves and dissipate it as a literary commonplace. Not only in the whole substance of but also in the formula of this literary movement can not the world of the century relinquish itself; amoured of this, the Renaissance is entitled to bring forth its accelerating pace of human progress from that time on.

Yet it was during this period that the most decisive political and social changes came about in the development from feudalism to bureaucracy, from the medieval to the modern way of life, not so decisively in the literary aspects either, rather returning to the ancient ages. In a sense of truth the concept of that return has two meanings which have to be distinguished from each other. One is an exclusively literary virtue by which the literary tradition of neoclassicism took shape and grew to maturity in a brief half century or so, and consolidated more and more as time passed by; the other to pay to that original deference as much esteem as to be replaced by that glory won for the sake of man's own development, no merely spiritual but also material because of his own discovery of himself to discharge whatever is owing to his conventional conception of God. The first of two results is more dependent upon this discussion at hand than the other, even though that is less useful in the highly upheaving development of civilization than this to which we owe so much in enjoying modern utilities in our daily lives. Before preceding further on the major topic, it is rather helpful for us to divert from it to pay a brief survey to French literature at the beginning of the 17th century; this provides one of the principal references of that topic which it is desirable for us to demand.

The literature of this age forms in this respect a complete contrast with a tryingly European movement such as Romanticism: it was hardly fed at all by other contemporary cultures, and while it did depend heavily on links with the literature of antiquity, this influence was so blended with other local and contemporary stimuli as to make of French 'classicism' something unique in modern literature. That this creative achievement should so soon be followed in certain genres by a falling-off into imitative mediocrity was no doubt due as much to the continued stability of social conditions, and to reluctance on the part of overcautions writers to question the basic structure of society, as it was to a complacent refusal to vary the formulae which had produced the masterpieces of the 1660s and 1670s.<sup>31)</sup>

---

31) Henri M. Peyre and John Cruckshank (1974), *French Literature from 1600 to the Present*, London: Methuen, pp. 1-2.

And yet, influential as is the literature of antiquity on Shakespeare, as is shown beforehand, there is an even greater part of it in the 'masterpieces of the 1660s and 1670s' in France; and not to mention that, Molière is by all means well deserved of committing himself to producing some of those masterpieces. Such is the relation between that literature of antiquity and those two literary masters whose works owe so much to it respectively; the elder's being beholden to it is handled in general at the beginning of this essay, but the other's is nowhere other than in this line. This notwithstanding, the suggestion that I have so far proposed concerning the relationship between both masters is emphatically grounded in the period after the Renaissance. In other words, Shakespeare's immediate influence on Molière through or in straight and direct communication, utterly neglecting the possibility with which some criterion or other with the comparison of this present influence is judged, is not included for the reason that this is out of my capability, as already explained.

At the beginning of this essay, I noted Anselme's surprise that the sixteen-year separation of the family members is really such a concrete swerve that nobody dared to imagine, even more any of them even at the moment of frolicsome strain, however prankish it may grow at the worst of it. That figure of sixteen rather calls something of being significant for theorizing on in this article, which claims nonetheless a kind of such separation as in usual for life of that period. In Shakespeare as in Molière it is presented, and to a more marked degree in the former than the latter, that figure of 'seize ans pour le moins,' might hardly be understood as revealing the lighthearted lapse of time. It rather sums up in no simple form a considerable body of troublesome events, intermingled boundlessly at the mercy of that troublesomeness, of which the plot consisted more directly than other happenings. In fact, many such separations as in Molière's play are easily found in Shakespeare so that it is probable that suitable elements are used by him as sources, or else that these were derived from the work of previous dramtists or such kind of the masters as these. This is true partly because the first alternative is put beyond doubt manifested enough, with examples contrasting with each other, from this article to the prospective series of it, and partly because of the other case, the same method as demonstrated in explaining the influence between Shakespeare and the literature of antiquity. It must therefore be conjectured that Molière borrowed 'that sixteen year of separation' from other sources than Shakespeare in which I can present similarities below which it seems most likely to have been adapted from a variety of sources. It is a hope too great for us to trace down more than a small fraction of the passages which Molière made use of, for there is no reason to doubt that he was influenced by conversations dissipated down and over as well as by the written words. More often than not he must have composed lines and statements which resemble those of Shakespeare to whom he was, if possible, not even indirectly indebted. Nevertheless, the elements of that sixteen years are truer in the lines.

Impute it not a crime

To me or my swift passage that I slide  
 O'er sixteen years, and leave the growth untired  
 Of that wide gap, since it is in my pow'r  
 To o'erthrow law, and in one self-born hour  
 To plant and o'erwhelm custom.<sup>32)</sup>

Beside such as quoted from Shakespeare, there are other elucidations parallel to it. It is worth observing the care with which he has arranged his plays so as to make use of those separations as they are; in matters of great importance those enable Shakespeare to have mutations realize and so depict vicissitudes so genuine as to make us be impressed in the loom of world affairs. Thus they intensify the substance of comic interests to an extent to which a total compliment of fortune comes unaware upon a man who is under conflict, suffering and calamity. Those elucidations were apparently invented by Shakespeare himself, who used them appropriately in proportion to the necessary situations such as in *Tempest*(A I), *The Comedy of Errors*(A I), *Pericles*(A I) and *Twelfth Night*(A I), both as a means of providing each play with a total inversion of fortune and as expecting a happy ending due to that means.

Whatever comparison we make of Molière's play with Shakespeare's, we cannot help being struck by his genius for picking out the most suitable incident and characters, and inventing the situations where 'He provides the dramatic conflict between love and his ruling passion or weakness, avarice, ambition, misanthropy.'<sup>33)</sup> On the other hand, my suggestions so far asserted are different from a selection picked from *Neuf siècles de Littérature française*, which details the influential powers upon him:

Il s'épanouit. Prenant ses sujet partout, chez Térence et chez Plaute, plus rarement chez les Espagnoles et les Italiens, chez ses compatriotes, romanciers ou dramaturges, empruntant à Cyrano et à Rotrou, ici une scène, là un trait, parodiant Corneille, dont sa mémoire d'acteur lui rend les pièces familières, il se préoccupe fort peu de cette matière, qui est à ses yeux un trésor commun: il la met en forme, il l'enrichit de son observation, il en dégage la valeur comique, il en fait sortir le rire.<sup>34)</sup>

As two more projected chapters as part of this series still remain to be discussed, it is agreeable at this stage to offer only provisional conclusions to bring this article to somewhat of an end. It would be daredevil to make any large generalizations about the imitation of Molière. It can not be said, for example, that Molière never invented a plot, because the creation of that may account for as much of his information and readings as his capacity so intellectual and creative as to orderly compose such complexities as the consecutive happenings of our daily affairs in which it is plausible that even these are used as materials for the literary works. No one disputes that for the preceding suggestions

32) Peter Alexander, *op. cit.*, *The Winter's Tale*, A IV s i 4-9.

33) Germaine Mason, *op. cit.*, p. 87.

34) Emile Henriot(1958), *Neuf Siècles de Littérature française*, Librairie Delagrave, p. 223.

as well as conjectures so far specified, Molière made some use of such earlier plays as Plautus' and other's, not to mention Shakespeare's. At last it is deserved not to linger on him, so that the main arguments have lain on his influence upon Molière whose imitation in respect of theme, versification, characterisation, passages and ideas, shows itself immediately and by no inference.

It may be noticed—and objected to—that the extension of the interrelationship between Shakespeare and Molière has been even wider and ought to be so than it here appears, either by imitation or mimicry, no matter what it may be. Not, in fact, till we appreciate the history and extent of the phenomena of Shakespeare's influence to the Frenchman can we hope quite fruitfully to approach what his mastership really is and how great its contribution is to the follower, so much so that his influence will timeslessly continue with Molière for good and all. It seems to me undeniable, that imitation, taken as a first step to maturity, is the most obstinate and worst camouflaged of all apprenticeships Molière enjoyed for his full development, just because its adaptations are so apparently reconcilable and accommodating to be left unattended to enthusiastic tyros. When it is in all practice, is there anything simpler and more facile than that stage of imitation of what one does owe to his superior in ability, particularly in literary apprenticeship? This step of 'imitation' is the one of the processes through which the French novice has accomplished outstanding merit which no playwright can ever surpass in dramatic composition. Only with this has he from the seventeenth century onwards been called the master of French dramatic literature, much more as an eminent comedian without whom the vast areas of world literature would be limited as if they impeded the progress of theatrical prestige.

Beside the simple step of imitation, on extending his other ones to a considerable extent of further interpretation, the relationship between Shakespeare and Molière holds a time somewhat as much as to liken the old Korean proverb, 'Green is darker than blue, though that came out of this.' Such is, in some sense, true, rather so ingenuous as to prove certainties of the golden saying instead of conjectures of it. Expressed in brief beforehand, the latter enjoyed apprenticeship from the former and derived from him what he needed for writing plays, and not only the dramatic technique as necessary as his substantial materials, but also pure dramatic dialogue beside which many are packed theatrical, descriptive and lyrical passages. Nevertheless, this is not enough for him to carry on his literary tastes to match the gifted talent. Thereupon he disfigured as much as possible what seems essential for writing—he changed so presumptuously the dramatic technique or development and expression media that he can easily obscure or faint what he is about to write, his real attitude and intention of expressing genuine manner; in other words, he furnishes it with a seemly appearance of or an assumed situation of the play, so that it seems as if it were another one quite different. Compared with Shakespeare, Molière should have variety in presenting such comedies as the illustrations near at hand will show. So peculiar and so versatile in delineating what he means is the medium of presentation over this work that his disguising in process reaches the apex where he can dictate and even

recreate what is already known to lead to excessive self-indulgence, that in truth the literary resources of English tragedy becomes the presence too comic to utterly forget that they served once for tragic literature. That medium can be divided into two categories such as 'Plagiarism' and 'Transcendance' which it is fully ready for me to communicate elsewhere, as series of this article with as much exertion or effort as I employed for it so far.

#### REFERENCES

- Alexander, Peter ed. (1960). *The Complete Works of William Shakespeare*. London: Collins.
- Boulton, Majorie (1960). *The Anatomy of Drama*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Bradley, Andrew Cecil(1957), *Shakespearean Tragedy*. London: Macmillan.
- Brison, Pierre(1942). *Molière: Sa Vie dans ses Oeuvres*. Gallimard.
- Brown, John Russell(1957). *Shakespeare and His Comedies*. London: Methuen.
- Couton, Georges (ed.) (1971). *Molière: Oeuvres complètes*. Gallimard.
- Henriot, Emile(1958). *Neuf Siècles de Littérature française*. Librairie Delagrave.
- Peyre, Henri M. and others(1974). *French Literature from 1699 to the Present*. London: Methuen.
- Mason, Germaine(1959). *A Concise Survey of French Literature*. London: Arthur Barker.
- Muir, Kenneth(1957). *Shakespeare's Sources*. London: Methuen.
- Smith, D. Nichol(1961). *Shakespeare Criticism*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Wood, John tr. (1969). *Molière*. London: Penguin.

경희대학교  
문리과대학 영문학과