Shakespeare as a Universal Writer with a Postmodern Touch: A Comparative Analysis of '*The Merchant of Venice*', '*Romeo and Juliet*', '*King Lear*', and '*Hamlet*'

Mr. Khandavalli Ashok

Assistant Professor, Department of English

VNR Vignana Jyothi Institute of Engineering and Technology

Hyderabad, India

ashokkf2028@gmail.com

Abstract

William Shakespeare is often hailed as the universal dramatist of the human condition. His works transcend time and culture, continuing to resonate in academic, theatrical, and popular contexts. Traditionally framed within Renaissance and Enlightenment humanism, Shakespeare's plays are now increasingly examined through contemporary theoretical paradigms, including postmodernism. This paper explores four major plays—*The Merchant of Venice*, *Romeo and Juliet*, *King Lear*, and *Hamlet*—from a postmodern perspective. It examines how Shakespeare's dramaturgy interrogates notions of identity, justice, language, truth, and authority, not by providing clear resolutions, but by dramatizing contradictions and indeterminacies. Drawing on the theories of Jean-François Lyotard, Jacques Derrida, Judith Butler, Linda Hutcheon, and Catherine Belsey, the paper argues that Shakespeare's "universality" is not grounded in timeless truths but in his anticipatory alignment with postmodern concerns such as performativity, fragmented subjectivity, and epistemological skepticism. The paper further examines how contemporary reinterpretations and adaptations reflect Shakespeare's dialogic openness and capacity for reinvention. Ultimately, this study

asserts that Shakespeare's relevance is sustained not by moral certainties, but by his dramatization of the instability of truth and meaning—a core tenet of the postmodern condition.

Keywords: Shakespearean Drama, Postmodernism, Universality, Performativity, Linguistic Instability, Fragmented Identity, Meta-theatre, Deconstruction.

Introduction

William Shakespeare's plays have withstood centuries of critical scrutiny, cultural shifts, and ideological transformation, and still maintain a dominant presence in literary studies and global performance. While his texts have traditionally been valorized for articulating the human condition in ways that appear timeless, such a universalist reading has been contested in the light of postmodern theory. What emerges when we read Shakespeare not as a sage offering eternal wisdom, but as a dramatist who reveled in ambiguity, contradiction, and theatrical self-reflexivity?

Postmodernism, as described by Jean-François Lyotard (1984), is a movement characterized by an "incredulity toward metanarratives"—the grand, totalizing explanations that seek to define human history, progress, or morality. Shakespeare, far from reinforcing such narratives, frequently dismantles them. His plays expose the fragility of power, the artificiality of gender roles, and the elusiveness of truth. Lyotard's critique finds echoes in Shakespeare's open-ended plotlines, morally ambiguous characters, and use of theatrical illusion to question reality itself.

Jacques Derrida's (1976) concept of *différance*—which asserts that meaning is always deferred and unstable—is especially useful for understanding the linguistic ambiguity in Shakespeare's plays. In tragedies such as *Hamlet* and *King Lear*, meaning constantly slips away from the characters, often with fatal consequences. Linda Hutcheon (1988) describes postmodernism as "a contradictory mode of discourse," one that critiques while simultaneously

invoking the very traditions it questions. Shakespeare's plays perform this dual function: they work within classical genres and forms while simultaneously subverting them.

Catherine Belsey (2001) emphasizes that Shakespearean characters are not fixed identities but subjects in flux, grappling with forces—social, political, linguistic—that are beyond their control. Judith Butler's (1990) theory of gender performativity further enhances our understanding of Shakespeare's frequent use of disguise and mistaken identity. Characters such as Portia in *The Merchant of Venice* or Viola in *Twelfth Night* enact gender as performance, thereby destabilizing essentialist notions of identity long before postmodern feminism articulated them.

This paper will explore how four of Shakespeare's most studied works—*The Merchant of Venice*, *Romeo and Juliet*, *King Lear*, and *Hamlet*—reflect postmodern preoccupations. Each section will focus on a central theme: justice and otherness in *The Merchant of Venice*; love and linguistic failure in *Romeo and Juliet*; authority and epistemological collapse in *King Lear*; and selfhood and metafiction in *Hamlet*. The final section will offer a comparative analysis that draws connections between these plays and the broader theoretical framework.

In examining Shakespeare's texts through a postmodern lens, this paper does not seek to impose an anachronistic framework upon early modern drama. Rather, it argues that Shakespeare's dramatic strategies—his embrace of contradiction, openness to multiple interpretations, and skepticism toward absolutes—render his work particularly resonant in the postmodern age. He is not universal because he speaks eternal truths, but because he stages the endless contestation of meaning itself.

The Merchant of Venice: Language, Justice, and Performativity

In *The Merchant of Venice*, Shakespeare offers a striking critique of legal and moral frameworks through the character of Shylock, the Jewish moneylender marginalized by a Christian society. Traditionally dismissed as a villain, Shylock has increasingly been

reinterpreted as a tragic figure, a product of structural injustice and cultural othering. His powerful speech, “Hath not a Jew eyes?” (Shakespeare, 1600/2004, 3.1.59), remains one of the most compelling pleas for shared humanity in literature. However, the same speech turns toward vengeance, complicating any straightforward moral reading.

Jean-François Lyotard’s (1984) concept of incredulity toward metanarratives is key here. The dominant Christian framework in the play functions as a metanarrative that claims moral authority but fails to uphold justice for those outside its bounds. Portia’s legal triumph in the courtroom scene, delivered while she is disguised as a male lawyer, seems to uphold justice. Yet it does so through rhetorical manipulation and linguistic literalism—"The pound of flesh...but not one drop of blood"—rather than ethical reasoning. This outcome undermines the very structure it seems to protect, highlighting the fragility of supposedly universal principles.

Jacques Derrida’s (1976) *différance*—his assertion that meaning is always deferred and never fully present—helps us interpret the play’s complex use of legal language. Portia’s argument works because it twists semantics to her advantage, exposing the ways in which legal discourse, like all language, is slippery and manipulable. The courtroom becomes a theater where justice is not discovered but performed.

Gender performativity is also dramatized through Portia’s cross-dressing. Butler (1990) argues that gender is not a fixed essence but an ongoing performance, shaped by cultural norms and repetition. In the courtroom, Portia gains power precisely because she performs maleness convincingly. The fact that justice is delivered only when a woman impersonates a man speaks volumes about the gendered construction of authority.

The play’s resolution—or lack thereof—further aligns it with postmodern narrative strategies. Shylock is not reconciled; he is punished and silenced. His forced conversion to Christianity may satisfy the plot’s surface requirements but leaves a moral residue that has

troubled audiences for centuries. Peter (2020) points out that this unresolved tension reveals Shakespeare's discomfort with closure, anticipating postmodernism's preference for open-endedness and interpretive instability.

Moreover, contemporary productions such as Trevor Nunn's 1999 RSC staging or Michael Radford's 2004 film adaptation with Al Pacino have emphasized Shylock's humanity and tragedy. These reinterpretations foreground the play's capacity to evolve with socio-cultural contexts—a postmodern trait Linda Hutcheon (1988) identifies as "historiographic metafiction": texts that reflect on their own historicity and invite re-reading across time.

In sum, *The Merchant of Venice* resists categorization as either a comedy or a tragedy, reflecting postmodernism's disruption of genre conventions. Its exploration of justice, language, and identity suggests that Shakespeare, intentionally or not, destabilized the very systems he dramatized.

Romeo and Juliet: Love, Language, and Structural Constraint

At first glance, *Romeo and Juliet* appears to be a quintessential romantic tragedy, a celebration of youthful passion thwarted by fate. However, when examined through a postmodern lens, the play reveals itself to be a sophisticated critique of the language of love and the social structures that constrain it. The lovers' tragedy is not merely the result of bad timing or poor communication—it is embedded in a cultural system that resists individual agency.

Derrida's theory of *différance* finds clear application here. The lovers' language, though poetic and elevated, fails to secure their future. Romeo's misunderstanding of Juliet's feigned death and the botched delivery of Friar Laurence's letter underscore the limitations of linguistic communication. Language in *Romeo and Juliet* is beautiful but unreliable; it can enchant but not save. This disjunction between signifier and reality is a central concern in postmodern thought (Derrida, 1976).

Juliet's rhetorical question, "What's in a name?" (Shakespeare, 1597/2003, 2.2.43), critiques the arbitrary nature of linguistic signifiers. Her willingness to abandon her name and family illustrates an attempt to escape the linguistic and cultural structures that define identity. However, as Lyotard (1984) would argue, these structures are metanarratives—overarching systems like family, religion, and patriarchy—that shape subjectivity. The tragedy of *Romeo and Juliet* is that the individual cannot simply opt out of these narratives.

Judith Butler's (1990) theory of performativity also enhances our understanding of the lovers' identities. Their relationship is constructed through a shared language of courtly love—a performance learned from literary and cultural scripts. Romeo's early love for Rosaline mimics Petrarchan sonnet conventions, and his sudden switch to Juliet indicates that love, too, is performative and rehearsed. Juliet's expressions, though deeply felt, are likewise framed by the same poetic conventions.

The role of fate—a frequent point of critical debate—is also reinterpretable through a postmodern lens. Fate in *Romeo and Juliet* is not a divine force but a social construct: the result of entrenched familial hatred, institutional authority, and linguistic determinism. In this reading, fate is not transcendent but immanent—a product of human systems rather than cosmic design.

Baz Luhrmann's (1996) adaptation of *Romeo + Juliet* exemplifies the play's postmodern potential. By retaining Shakespeare's original dialogue while setting the story in a hyper-modern, MTV-style urban landscape, the film becomes a pastiche—a layering of cultural codes that deconstructs traditional readings. Hutcheon (1988) argues that such adaptations expose the constructedness of narratives, allowing viewers to see the play not as sacred text, but as a flexible cultural artifact.

Stallybrass (1986) also points out that *Romeo and Juliet* undermines binary thinking. The lovers are both subject and object of desire; they are both autonomous and manipulated.

The play blurs the lines between public and private, life and death, love and violence—creating a dialectical space where contradictions coexist. This complexity aligns with postmodernism's challenge to totalizing narratives and binary logic.

In conclusion, *Romeo and Juliet* can be read not as a tragic affirmation of romantic destiny, but as a postmodern meditation on the limitations of language, the performativity of love, and the violence of social structures. Shakespeare dramatizes not the inevitability of fate but the constructedness of identity and the fragility of human connection.

King Lear: Madness, Monarchy, and the Postmodern Void

King Lear is arguably Shakespeare's most radical tragedy, interrogating not only the fallibility of political structures but the very foundation of human identity and reason. The central question Lear poses—"Who is it that can tell me who I am?" (Shakespeare, 1608/2005, 1.4.222) — captures the postmodern destabilization of the subject. Identity, once tethered to authority, is here exposed as unstable and fragmented.

Lear's division of the kingdom is initially framed as rational and political. Yet it is immediately revealed to be driven by insecurity and a desire for performative affirmation. When Cordelia refuses to participate in the hollow ritual of flattery, she is cast out. This act launches the narrative into chaos and signals the beginning of epistemological collapse. As Belsey (2001) observes, Shakespeare presents characters not as autonomous agents but as subjects formed by and vulnerable to language, ideology, and social positioning.

In Lyotardian terms, the collapse of Lear's authority reflects the postmodern critique of metanarratives—here, the divine right of kings, filial piety, and patriarchal power. These structures are revealed to be culturally contingent rather than inherently just. The storm on the heath becomes a metaphor for Lear's internal disintegration and the broader unraveling of inherited meaning systems. He is "more sinned against than sinning" (Shakespeare, 1608/2005,

3.2.59), but the nature and scale of sin in the world of *King Lear* are left ambiguous and unresolved.

Terry Eagleton (2003) asserts that *King Lear* is unmatched in its "refusal of consolation." It offers no clear moral trajectory or ethical resolution. Even when villains such as Edmund express remorse, the redemption is muted by the deaths of Cordelia and Lear. The conclusion resists catharsis; rather than order being restored, the audience is left with silence and ambiguity. This reflects postmodernism's refusal to accept closure as a form of narrative comfort.

Judith Butler's (1990) theory of performativity is relevant not only in the literal sense of disguise and deception—Edgar as Poor Tom, Kent's false identity—but also in the broader notion that authority is not inherent but enacted. Lear is only king insofar as others recognize him as such. Once he abdicates power, he becomes invisible and incoherent, a figure of madness rather than majesty. His journey is not toward enlightenment, but toward fragmentation.

The Fool, often overlooked, functions as a meta-commentator, exposing the performativity of truth and governance. His riddles and songs blur the lines between sanity and madness, jest and wisdom. In many ways, the Fool is the play's most postmodern figure—a destabilizing voice who refuses consistency and defies interpretation.

Akira Kurosawa's *Ran* (1985), a cinematic reimagining of *King Lear*, amplifies the play's themes through visuals of war, betrayal, and cosmic indifference. In *Ran*, the king's folly leads not to spiritual growth but to existential despair. This interpretation aligns with postmodern readings of *Lear* as a drama of disintegration, where meaning is elusive and language inadequate.

Thus, *King Lear* represents Shakespeare's deepest engagement with the limits of knowledge, power, and identity. It dismantles the scaffolding of political and familial

structures, leaving behind a world where justice is absent and truth is fractured. Its postmodern resonance lies in its refusal to stabilize the very concepts it dramatizes.

Hamlet: Metatheatre, Identity, and the Failure of Knowing

Of all Shakespeare's works, *Hamlet* most fully embodies the postmodern condition—a world in which knowledge is suspect, identity is constructed, and truth is ultimately inaccessible. The protagonist's iconic soliloquy, "To be or not to be" (Shakespeare, 1603/2006, 3.1.56), is not a declaration but a question, unresolvable and recursive. In it, Hamlet performs contemplation, embodying Derrida's (1976) assertion that meaning is always deferred and that language cannot capture the fullness of thought or intention.

Stephen Greenblatt (2004) describes *Hamlet* as the emergence of modern selfhood, marked by reflection, alienation, and theatricality. Hamlet's indecision is not a flaw but a condition—a sign of a fractured self, uncertain of its moral and ontological bearings. He oscillates between avenger and philosopher, between performance and paralysis. This internal multiplicity aligns with postmodern conceptions of subjectivity as dispersed and contingent.

The play-within-a-play (*The Mousetrap*) is a paradigmatic postmodern device, functioning as a mirror within a mirror. Hamlet stages a fictional performance to reveal a hidden truth, but the very act of staging complicates the distinction between reality and fiction. Linda Hutcheon (1988) defines postmodernism in part by its use of metafiction—texts that self-consciously reflect on their own status as constructs. In *Hamlet*, the boundary between performance and authenticity is always blurred.

The language of the play is self-reflexive and destabilizing. Hamlet's use of puns, rhetorical questions, and paradoxes undermines the authority of straightforward meaning. Words are traps, not tools. When Polonius asks, "What do you read, my lord?" Hamlet replies, "Words, words, words" (Shakespeare, 1603/2006, 2.2.192), emphasizing the emptiness and redundancy of language.

Judith Butler (1990) extends the notion of performativity beyond gender to encompass all forms of identity. Hamlet performs grief, madness, affection, and vengeance, but none of these performances settle into stable subjectivity. He is always "acting"—even when he claims to be authentic. His madness may be "feigned," but it reveals truths that sober reason cannot articulate.

The ending of the play offers no moral resolution. Claudius dies, but so do Hamlet, Gertrude, and Laertes. Fortinbras arrives as a cold, political afterthought. The bodies are cleared, but the questions remain. Who was right? What was accomplished? These ambiguities mirror the postmodern suspicion of closure and progress.

Tom Stoppard's *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead* (1966) takes this uncertainty to its extreme. By retelling *Hamlet* from the perspective of two minor characters, Stoppard foregrounds the randomness and arbitrariness of narrative authority. The protagonists are trapped in a world they cannot control or understand—a quintessential postmodern scenario. Their witty, existential banter exposes the absurdity of seeking stable meaning in a constructed world.

Additionally, Hamlet's preoccupation with the afterlife, appearance vs. reality, and self-doubt positions him not only as a tragic figure but as a thinker caught in the whirlpool of competing epistemologies. As Lyotard (1984) notes, the postmodern subject is one who is "situated at the junction of narratives," constantly shifting among contradictory demands and discourses.

Hamlet is thus not merely a study in revenge but a study in representation. It questions not only what we know but how we know it, and whether knowing is ever truly possible. Its philosophical depth, linguistic play, and metatheatrical strategies make it Shakespeare's most postmodern text.

Comparative Reflections: Fragmented Wholes and Dialogic Texts

Examining *The Merchant of Venice*, *Romeo and Juliet*, *King Lear*, and *Hamlet* side by side reveals recurring patterns of thematic complexity, structural ambiguity, and philosophical inquiry. While each play engages distinct concerns—justice and marginality in *Merchant*, love and language in *Romeo and Juliet*, power and madness in *King Lear*, and identity and truth in *Hamlet*—they are united in their interrogation of fixed meanings and inherited structures.

In *The Merchant of Venice*, the courtroom becomes a stage where justice is performed rather than administered, and language serves as a weapon rather than a bridge. Shylock's arc underscores how social structures frame identity and justice selectively, aligning with Lyotard's (1984) postmodern critique of exclusionary metanarratives.

Romeo and Juliet, though often romanticized, reveals the destructive power of language and ideology. Juliet's challenge to naming ("What's in a name?") critiques linguistic determinism, while the lovers' deaths expose the failure of poetic language to transcend social constraints. Derrida's (1976) insight into the deferred nature of meaning resonates here: the more intense the language of love, the more it defers the possibility of resolution.

King Lear brings the consequences of epistemological collapse into focus. The erosion of Lear's authority and coherence illustrates the postmodern dismantling of grand narratives, including monarchy, patriarchy, and moral law. The storm scene dramatizes the loss of structure—both physical and mental. As Belsey (2001) suggests, Lear becomes a site of contesting discourses, none of which provide closure.

In *Hamlet*, Shakespeare elevates postmodern concerns to their most explicit level. The play's self-awareness, linguistic skepticism, and ontological questioning mark it as a drama of infinite regress. Hamlet's inability to act is not a psychological failing but a philosophical condition. Stoppard's (1966) *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead* further demonstrates the play's capacity to generate new, self-aware narratives from its margins, embodying Bakhtin's (1981) dialogism.

What emerges from this comparative lens is that Shakespeare's universality does not reside in timeless moral truths but in his capacity to render truth unstable, meaning plural, and identity performative. His plays are not repositories of certainty but arenas of ambiguity. They dramatize contradiction without resolving it, making them ideal texts for postmodern analysis.

Furthermore, these plays consistently defy genre expectations. *The Merchant of Venice*, ostensibly a comedy, ends in moral unease. *Romeo and Juliet* presents lyrical love only to destroy it through miscommunication and social constraint. *King Lear* offers no redemptive arc, and *Hamlet* is a tragedy that doubles as a philosophical treatise. This genre hybridity is itself postmodern, reflecting Linda Hutcheon's (1988) notion of parody as both homage and critique.

Intertextuality also plays a crucial role in sustaining Shakespeare's relevance. His texts are dialogic not only in their internal structure but in their external reception. Adaptations such as Kurosawa's *Ran*, Luhrmann's *Romeo + Juliet*, and Taymor's *Titus* reflect how Shakespeare's narratives can be recontextualized to reflect contemporary anxieties. These adaptations do not dilute the original texts; they amplify their postmodern potential.

Additionally, Shakespeare's characters are not fixed types but dynamic figures who resist total interpretation. Portia, Juliet, Lear, and Hamlet are all defined by contradiction. They are heroic yet flawed, rational yet emotional, active yet trapped. As Butler (1990) notes, identity is not an essence but a series of performed and performative acts. Shakespeare's dramaturgy reflects this fluidity centuries before postmodernism theorized it.

Shakespeare also problematizes the act of storytelling itself. His plays contain plays, stories within stories, and characters who narrate, misreport, or remain silent. This recursive structure forces audiences to question what is true, what is performative, and what is unknowable. In this sense, his dramaturgy aligns with postmodern metafiction, which foregrounds its own construction and invites skepticism.

Finally, Shakespeare's language—so often praised for its beauty—is also a site of instability. Puns, paradoxes, rhetorical flourishes, and double meanings fill his plays. These are not mere ornaments but tools that reveal the slipperiness of meaning. Derrida's theory of *différance*—the endless deferral of meaning—applies not only to individual lines but to the plays as wholes.

Conclusion: Shakespeare's Postmodern Universality

To call Shakespeare a "universal writer" is to acknowledge that his plays have traversed centuries and cultures, inspiring readers, audiences, and scholars from radically different perspectives. Yet this universality is not grounded in moral clarity or timeless values. Rather, it stems from Shakespeare's dramatic engagement with instability—of language, identity, truth, and power.

Postmodern theory, far from being an anachronistic overlay, reveals the ways in which Shakespeare's plays already participate in epistemological and ontological debates that would only later be named. His works embody what Lyotard (1984) calls the "postmodern condition"—an awareness of the failure of totalizing systems, a celebration of multiplicity, and an openness to contradiction.

Each of the four plays analyzed in this study reflects core postmodern concerns. *The Merchant of Venice* interrogates justice and otherness; *Romeo and Juliet* deconstructs love and language; *King Lear* dramatizes the collapse of authority and identity; and *Hamlet* exemplifies self-conscious fiction and the failure of knowledge.

Moreover, Shakespeare's plays continue to thrive in contemporary culture because they resist final interpretation. Their adaptability, their intertextual richness, and their rhetorical playfulness make them endlessly generative. Whether reimagined in feudal Japan or post-industrial America, his narratives speak not through universal truths but through universal questions.

As we continue to grapple with fragmented realities, contested identities, and the limits of language, Shakespeare remains not a relic of the past but a companion in philosophical exploration. His work offers not certainty, but the pleasure—and pain—of ambiguity. In doing so, it aligns with the very spirit of postmodernism.

Thus, Shakespeare does not transcend time because he delivers eternal answers, but because he dramatizes the complexity of asking the right questions. That is the truest measure of his universality—and his enduring relevance in the postmodern world.

Conflict of Interest: The corresponding author, on behalf of second author, confirms that there are no conflicts of interest to disclose.

Copyright: © 2025 by Mr. Khandavalli Ashok Author(s) retain the copyright of their original work while granting publication rights to the journal.

License: This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, allowing others to distribute, remix, adapt, and build upon it, even for commercial purposes, with proper attribution. Author(s) are also permitted to post their work in institutional repositories, social media, or other platforms.

References

Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays* (M. Holquist, Ed.; C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans.). University of Texas Press.

Belsey, C. (2001). *Poststructuralism: A very short introduction*. Oxford University Press.

Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. Routledge.

Derrida, J. (1976). *Of grammatology* (G. C. Spivak, Trans.). Johns Hopkins University Press.

Eagleton, T. (2003). *Sweet violence: The idea of the tragic*. Blackwell Publishing.

Greenblatt, S. (2004). *Will in the world: How Shakespeare became Shakespeare*. W. W. Norton & Company.

Hutcheon, L. (1988). *A poetics of postmodernism: History, theory, fiction*. Routledge.

Lyotard, J.-F. (1984). *The postmodern condition: A report on knowledge* (G. Bennington & B. Massumi, Trans.). Manchester University Press.

Peter, E. (2020). Shakespeare's vivid presence in the age of postmodernity. *Philologica Jassyensia, 16*(1), 45–58.

Shakespeare, W. (2003). *Romeo and Juliet* (J. Bate & E. Rasmussen, Eds.). Modern Library. (Original work published 1597)

Shakespeare, W. (2004). *The Merchant of Venice* (J. Bate & E. Rasmussen, Eds.). Modern Library. (Original work published 1600)

Shakespeare, W. (2005). *King Lear* (J. Bate & E. Rasmussen, Eds.). Modern Library. (Original work published 1608)

Shakespeare, W. (2006). *Hamlet* (J. Bate & E. Rasmussen, Eds.). Modern Library. (Original work published 1603)

Stallybrass, P. (1986). Patriarchal territories: The body enclosed. In M. Jacobus, E. Fox Keller, & S. Shuttleworth (Eds.), *Body/politics: Women and the discourses of science* (pp. 123–142). Routledge.

Stoppard, T. (1966). *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are dead*. Faber & Faber.