

SHAKESPEARE’S APPROACH TO HUMAN LOVE AS A PRIME PASSION

Srinivasappa. G
Asst. Prof. of English
B,M.S. Govt, First Grade College
Huliyar- C.N. Halli Tq.
Tumkur- Dist. Karnataka
Pin-572218.

“Love... Will creep in service where it cannot go....”

-Shakespeare

“Love” is an abstract term and many have attempted to define it. It is universally acknowledged that being in love and being loved makes life worth living. But does love just happen? Is it always a fairy tale? Is it merely based on appearances or there other forms of attraction? Is it an art that can be cultivated or just a happy accident?

As the very term ‘love’ is an abstract one it is quite difficult to define and not to fix any particular meaning to it. It is a multi-dimensional passion. It generally depends on the mind that attempts to love and being loved. There is purely an emotional tight fight till the end of life. It is not merely physical attraction of each other. *It is an emotional bond between two true minds.* It does not just happen as a miracle. It is usually begins with likeness that leads to mutual understanding. It is certainly based on understanding the limitations of each other and that in turn gradually and naturally respecting one’s feelings. Thus it creates a sort of emotional attachment and the concern for each other. They are pleasant even in unpleasant atmosphere in any situation. The sense of proper understanding between them is the channel where love may spring as a stream. Today some can say that it is an art. Then it requires knowledge and effort. If it is an art he/she goes on loving many then it loses its sanctity and it is not pure or true love at all. If it is an art, art should be a creative one. It never stops for one but moves for many. “*Then it is not the ever fixed mark... Love is not love which alters when it alteration finds*” as in the sonnet no-116 of Shakespeare. It is not the fairytale even. As love is more complex and complicated one, it is not always fair enough. Hence, one can remind of the words of Shakespeare “*The path of true love never did run smooth*” in the play “*Midsummer’ Nights Dream*”.

It is an eternal bliss of man which man strives to get it in many ways in all walks of life. It can be found and understood in different ways like *Love as an object* (thy) and *a subject* (man). It is desirable always. Loving an object or a person is an attachment but if it goes beyond its limits, it becomes greed and lust. This ambition over an object leads to inhuman and it is a

sign of downfall of man then he becomes corrupt and criminal and autocrat and it curtails one's liberty and there starts crisis in human relations (Macbeth's Ambition for power and love for Lady Macbeth). Today in the civilized and globalised life modern man *prefers* to love only an object and an object of love is for material success. Human love and human relationship have become objective but there is no co-relation between mind and heart in it. When the prime passion of 'love' loses its holiness, rest of the passions occupy its place and there is an imbalance of human passions. There shall not be equilibrium in human passions. As a result absolutely human love is degenerating today due to over modernization and globalization. Modern man has become a machine but *not a being*.

In a way Shakespeare's approach to human love as a prime passion is to be studied and analyzed and understood in a proper way. "Love" is a prime passion. It is prime because it plays a significant role in the world today. There is no room for harmony in any kind of human relations without 'Love'.

Today man haunts and longs and even struggles for his material existence and success but *not human love and its existence*. There a spirit of love in the existence itself. No doubt, one should understand the essence of human love to get the eternal bliss. In this context one should go for *Shakespeare's approach for human love and understand his interpretation and its scope*.

There is a multi-faced and multi-staged love in the Shakespeare's ideology of love. They are:- Political set of Love, Religions Act of Love and Instinctive Act of Love' Spiritual Act of Love, Ideal Love, Angel Love, Adolescent Act of Love, Mature Act of Love, Physical Act of Love and Worldly love. Etc. There is a Political Act of love in Macbeth. There was love between husband and wife to get power. It is the political Act which instigates Macbeth to kill Duncan the king.

They loved each other for political success. The ambition for power leads to Macbeth's downfall. Certainly there starts His tragedy. Out of political Love, Macbeth suffered a lot and met tragic end. Finally there is a wonderful transformation from worldly love to spiritual and philosophical love in Macbeth. It is what Shakespeare has done and which is essential. There is an adolescent love between *Romeo and Juliet*. It is not matured love like that of Macbeth and Lady Macbeth but later it becomes an ideal and spiritual one. There is also a transformation of love from adolescent to matured pure-ideal love in the world. It has become a land mark in the world. There is a sacrifice in everything for love which is marked by *Romeo and Juliet* of Shakespeare. In the play '*Hamlet*' one can see the mild and ideal love of Ophelia but there is no cordial match between prince Hamlet and Ophelia. There is a gap between intellectual and innocent love in Hamlet and Ophelia.*¹ It is not polished and matured love. Their path was not clear but it was complicated. The love of Cordelia is an Angel's love. She expressed her natural and angelic love when her sisters Goneril and Regan expressed their love in words in order to please their father to get kingdom and power but Cordelia alone expressed her true love. It was the fact that she said but 'Lear' was shocked and threw her out of kingdom with bare hands. As an Angel she never did expect anything from her father. But she loved her father as she said. When Lear was insane and was thrown out of kingdom by his own loved daughters and became mad, Cordelia as an honest and beloved daughter nursed him with great care and love. She was the right care taker at the right time and became an Angel in loving her father. Her love is an angelic and ideal.

Love between Ophelia and Hamlet is unique and it is highly philosophical and intellectual. It is purely hidden and potential one. Ophelia's love is Angelic and ideal. She was more emotive and kind hearted. She, having lost her mother and being under the care of her father Polonius, she could not taste the love of his mother. Polonius, the minister who controlled his daughter as a puritan. Hence she could not express her humble love to Hamlet, the prince of Denmark. They could not meet frequently to exchange their feelings. Ophelia is more avoided than Hamlet. On the contrary Hamlet too had lost his father's love who was murdered by his own uncle and he had lost his motherly love though she was living but dead as a loving mother. Luckily he got love in Ophelia but they were not socially acknowledged.

Till the grave digger scene, the instinctive and intense love could not be expressed. When Hamlet expressed his pure love for Ophelia after her death as; -

“I loved Ophelia: Forty thousand brothers
Could not, with all their quantity of love
Make up by sum. What thou do for her?”*2
(Act-5, Scene-1 Line-62-64 pp 95)

Here in the context it is brought out that the intensity of Love of Hamlet is more powerful and stronger than her brother. Shakespeare as a mouth piece of Hamlet boldly declared that the love of forty thousand brothers could not equal to Hamlet's love. One can notice how Shakespeare understood the nature of love between a brother and a sister and lover and his beloved. There was a more grief in Hamlet than Lear at the death of Ophelia. Human love is like a web that scattered and spread in all kinds of human relations. So, man should have shared all kinds of love with all kinds of relations but it should be cordial and congenial to keep harmony in any shelter under the globe. Shakespeare was bound to create and to establish human bondage with unifying force of 'love'. The intrinsic value of love brings together the divisive force of hate redness which causes fragmentation of human relations and segregation of families today. Passion of anger in *Lear* sorrow of *Cordelia*, hatred in *Iago*, Jealous of *Leantes*, cunningness of *Cassius* and villainy in *Claudius* and love of *Romeo and Juliet*, are finally transformed with unifying force of Shakespeare's love.

There is surprise how Shakespeare deals with this aspect of love as a basic human character. Love can be experienced at two levels as-Feminine Experience of Ophelia, Cordelia, Portia, Lady Macbeth, Juliet, Rosalind is brought out by Shakespeare and Masculine Experience of love of Hamlet, Romeo, Caesar, Brutus, Macbeth, Orsino, Othello, is effectively expressed by Shakespeare. It is a multifacet character of love as a passion. It exists between both sex Male and Female. It is well blend and balanced by Shakespeare in his plays. Sometimes love turns into hatred and finally the same hatred feelings get transformed into human love. Hence, *Shakespeare's approach to human love as prime passion is important and most essential today.*

Human character and personality is well built with the prime passion of love. The spring of love tends to grow from man to human. Human relations are sprung up in a family. With the family human relations are setup and there is an organic unity of love. This is how Shakespeare's approach to Human Love has become prime passions of human being is a harmonizing force. In Shakespeare's complex vision of life nothing is contrary but everything is shown relatively with bond of love.

The force of love is a unifying force in nature. The unity in the family bond is segregated by love and integrated by love too. The love between Romeo and Juliet in the two feudal families causes quarrel between them. The rivalry in the families ends with the same love bringing about

their tragic death. The two young star-crossed lovers are who ultimately die and ultimately unite their feudal families.

The contradiction of love is hate. When there is no room for love, jealous and hatred occupy its place and the same passions are overturned and transformed into love. Hence 'Love' is more powerful and it controls all human passions and rules them. Here in this juncture, it is better to cite words of Geoffrey Chaucer, "*Amor Vincit Ominia*" to justify the power of love *³ it means "*Love conquers all*".

It is true in the sense of Shakespeare that it can certainly win everyone's heart and everything is possible with it. It can transform any wicked nature of man into human nature. The Jealous of Leontes out of misunderstanding with his wife Hermeone is changed and removed at the end with true love of his wife and his daughter with the love marriage of *Perdita* and *Florizel*. The love of his daughter removed jealous for his wife. Thus love ultimately conquers all hearts of men and makes them human.

Shakespeare is loved and admired by everyone because he loved all kinds of human nature and brought it as if it is flesh and blood of global village '*Live and let Live*' is a slogan approved by the words of Shakespeare to establish human bond in human relations.

Shakespeare is immortal and his words are universal because he loves every word of everyman and gives them life in his lines with great love. Hence Dr. Samuel Johnson said "*I love Shakespeare but I admire Johnson.*"

The place and role of love is changing in different aspects and in different relationships. Today in the modern family system *joint-family* is *out of sight and out of joint*. But there is only nuclear family in order of the place. There is no a small amount of harmony, love and peace in such corporate families today. Because the sanctity of love is lost. There is only lust for material comfort and money in the name of progress. There is a tragedy in the first unit of society. When there is no love and respect for every member of the family, the entire family structure utterly collapses. There is a divorce attempt everywhere in most of the families. The extreme sense of individuality and selfishness is the root cause for this dividing force in modern families. Even the love marriages are rapidly embracing divorce. The small unit of society is certainly degenerating as there is no faith and love in the modern life. However the modern man does not understand the value of 'love'. *Today the word 'love' is immensely used in words but not indeed.* It has lost its strength and *Esemplastic Power* *⁴ power to build and sustain the human bond in the world today.

Love and marriage are complementary and contributory to each other. Marriage without love is meaningless, for love is regarded as a basic ingredient (instinct) for marital bliss. Marriage is an institution that is popularly believed to build on a relationship based on love. Marriage can be seen as a contract between the man and woman. It can also be seen as a sacrament or a destiny. It is treated as a bond, or a life long relationship. Love within marriage can provide an amicable atmosphere that eventually becomes instrumental in extending support to each other through life as journey. It is generally believed that marriage involves a high degree of trust, interdependence, intimacy, sacrifice and commitment-with bond of love.

The shift in attitudes and values in the new global world is also reflected in the institution of marriage and there shifts are changing and redefining its scope and relevance. Individualistic life styles distort the basic function of marriage. Emancipated, empowered and liberated youth confronted with many trends and choices often rethink on the relevance of this institution and its traditional aspects.

“A successful marriage is an edifice that must be rebuilt everyday” says the *French writer Andre Maurois* ^{*5}. Marriage can also be reworked in such a way that each person gets her or his space and the feelings of both are respected. This is the most significant aspect of togetherness. Sustaining a good relationship calls for diligence, skill and patience. Relationships can be revived with love, trust and faith.

There is a need to generate discussions exploring the problems faced by today’s youth. They need to evolve values in keeping with the concerns and the contexts of modern life.

In the present situation, everyone should think of prominence of human relationships and human bond which is rapidly destroyed by the modern *human activities* ^{*6} today. To find the apt and right remedy to make up and restore the same *primitive bond* ^{*7}, One should seek the vulnerable thoughts on bond of love by William Shakespeare.

Love, Sex and Marriage:-are inter-related and interdependent. In the institution of marriage both love and sex are integral parts of it. If the sex is dominant over love, the institution of marriage disturbs. But love can really balance all the emotions and passions in one’s life and marriage becomes fruitful and successful one.

Love, sex and marriage have been among the mainsprings of drama and literature in many cultures but there were particular reasons why these themes should feature so strongly in the works of Shakespeare. In Elizabethan England the term ‘*family*’ was most commonly used to devote a *house hold* ^{*8}, Including servants as well as those united by ties of blood and marriage was an institution of exceptional social importance. Not only was it the matrix of procreation and the education of the young, it was also at all social levels an important focus of economic activity of production as well as consumption and above all was the side for the exercise of patriarchal authority and the reproduction of age and gender hierarchies at a time when the law regarded woman as ‘either married or to be married’^{*9}. Sex, power and money were thus intimately connected. The family house hold was also seen as the nursery of religion, while it was imagined by statesmen as a vital political institution. Referring to ‘*private families*’ an official document around 1600 stated as simple fact that on their good government the common wealth depends ^{*10}.

It followed that courtship and marriage formation was not only of emotional and personal significance nor were they simply a family matter of great moment. They were also of prime public importance. By the same token, personal relationships within the household, above all between husband and wife, were seen as the key not only to personal happiness but also to good citizenship. Necessary it is, wrote the moralist William Gonge shortly after Shakespeare’s death, ‘that good order be first set in families good members of a family are like to make good members of church and common wealth’^{*11}.

The relationship between these pious principles and the follies and frailties of human nature was inevitably problematic. There was scope for tension and conflict between the generations and between the genders. Moreover, although in general the importance of family and household was universally accepted on particular issues there were debates and disagreement. Problems were most acute and the responses most elaborate in towns and cities, above all in the rapidly growing metropolis. Moreover, the additional freedom and wider circle of acquaintance that London society offered wives and husbands, daughters and sons, created temptations that tested sexual and social mores to their limits. Shakespeare’s London audiences must have been particularly attuned to the problems and controversies surrounding family, sex

and marriage and were observed by them even though, in practice the married state was not for everyone.

Probably the most important factor that made youngsters themselves blind to material interests or family concerns was the power of love.

Admittedly the contemporary of this term were different from those of today. Certainly emotion was only one element in a complex calculus. Thus men and women were asked later that whether they could *'find in their heart to love'* the other person. Being in love was not always accepted. Nonetheless the rich vocabulary of emotion that is found in contemporary sources—Love, fantasy, fancy, delight, dalliance, gestures of lovely liking—indicates that love could be a powerful, active force in real life as well as poetry and drama. If a union was in other respects satisfactory, love could be accepted as a positive sentiment that parents were willing to accommodate. In 1586, for example, a Wiltshire gentleman gave approval to his daughters' choice of spouse to secure her well bestowing to live in the world as also the satisfaction of her own fantasy, seeing the same so Firmid *¹². On the other hand, such sentiments could be regarded as destructive or diseased if they were seen to override prudential considerations. Some contemporaries believed that an unrequited lover might sicken or die of love. Rosalind's statement in *'As you like it,' that men have died from time to time and worms have eaten them, but not for love.* [4.1.91-2] was more controversial than it sounds.

In the union of minds there should be sex in marital relations. Satisfying sex is not offence but there should be love behind it. Even in the love of any kind, there is a point of partake of sex. Things do not always stop at words and large numbers of actual sexual transgressions come before the courts. They are not treated with equal severity because the complexity of marriage law has blunt edge of moral disapproval in certain cases. Some people believe to do so, that is a binding marriage contract gets license for sexual relations because the couple is *'man and wife before God'*. Thus in *"Measure for Measure"*, the Duke can plausibly if tendentiously assure Mariana that Angelo-

--- is your husband on a pre-contract.

To bring you thus together it's [4.1.68-9.]

Others seem to have felt that, at most, such circumstances that extenuate the forehand sin as, Claudio puts it in *"Much Ado about Nothing"* [4.1.48]. In any case, it is clear that for many couples, whether contracted or not, restraints on sexuality crumble when marriage is in sight.

In 16th century, there was a thin line between sex in-anticipation of marriage and simple fornication that is sexual relations between people who did not intend nor had no realistic hope of marriage in a society in which contraceptive and abortion techniques were not universally known and haphazardly employed, illegitimate births were the inevitable result of *marital relations and now marriages are broke.*

'Divorce' in the modern sense, with the right to remarry did not exist in Shakespearean England, though the matter was controversial. The fact was that union could be broken only by death which gave added weight to the importance of marital relations. While such relations were a less central theme of Shakespeare's plays than courtship and the marriage quest, they were important nevertheless and there were also some poignant evocations of the ties between parents and small children, as in *'Macbeth'* [4.2.30-85] and *'The winter's tale'* [1.2.121-211, 2.1, 1-34]. The long cherished notion that family relations were for the most part cold and severely authoritarian has now been discarded by historians, letters, diaries, wills and legal records

provide abundant evidence of warm and loving sentiments both between husband and wife and parents and children. They indicate that wives expect to be treated fairly and kindly. They testify to the often powerful feelings that were experienced when their relationships were prematurely ruptured by death.

Yet things could easily go wrong in part as a corollary of some of the characteristics of contemporary courtship and match making. The emphasis on marriage as an economic union cut both ways. While it could blast the relationship, troubles could ensue if material expectations are disappointed. Prevailing patriarchal prescriptions moreover imposed strains on both sides.

On the other hand men feared but were also fascinated by the sharpness of women's tongues. It was proverbial that 'Even man may tame a shrew but he who hath her. There was an extensive literature on the theme of scolding women, of which Shakespeare's *The Taming of the shrew*, was a sophisticated example.

More than in any other play it seems *The Tempest* offers a greater diversity of different forms of marriage. Rather than to illustrate through actual marriages taking place in the play's world, Shakespeare throws up different, complex and contrary views of marriage through references and reveries by different characters in the play.

One of the aspects of marriage in Shakespeare or the Elizabethan age which one must not forget, is the emphasis on female chastity. This emphasis has something to do with the social and economic considerations of age. As Clinton Latham Powell, 'The first of the wife was to protect the sanctity of the marriage bed and thus guarantee to her that his children were actually his own issue' *¹³. No wonder then that Prospero tells Miranda:-

"Thou mother was a piece of virtue".

and She said then,

"thou wast my daughter and thy father
was Duke of Milan: and his only heir
And princess, no worse issued"*¹⁴.

So, it is the wife who has to prove her fidelity to the husband by testifying that her children are his. In an enormously popular poem of the time, around which *The Tempest* was written Thomous Oerbury's *A wife* [1614], it is emphatically stated that "*Chastity alone makes a good wife*." *¹⁵

Here in this poem, marriage is not described as a highest form of friendship but as a medicine for lust for within marriage 'the very act is chastity. Lust rather than a solitary life, is the opposite of marriage.

Thus with marriage equated to chastity and predicted as the opposite of lust, the qualities demanded in a good wife are consequently much narrowed. Chastity therefore became the *Sine Qua non* in a wife, beside other qualities. This is why Prospero has to guard strictly the chastity of his daughter, even though he arranges privacy for *Miranda* and *Ferdinand* to make love. There is a note how zealous is he about the protection of his daughters' virginity:-

"Then, as my gift and thine own acquisition
Worthily purchased. Take my daughter but
If thou dost break invirgin-knot before
All sanctimonius ceremonies may
with fully and holy rite be ministered
No sweet aspersion shall the heavens let fall
To make this contract grow, but barren hate,

sour eyed disdain and discord shall bestrew
 The union of your bed with weds so loathing
 that shall hate it both -----“. (IV.i.13-22)

Although the use of words like ‘*gift*’ and ‘*acquisition*’ for the daughter being given in marriage makes the affair sound quite conventional, almost a chanting of the puritan manual for marriage, the fact that *Prospero* allows pre-marital free love not sex between his daughter and Ferdinand which shows that Shakespeare preferred marriage to be preceded by mutual liking between the opposite sex and approval, marriage of life where mutual consent leads to marriage. Of course the social aspect of ceremonies and the economic aspect of gift and acquisition still remain essential components of the marriage contract but the form as it was practiced at the time stands significantly modified from within. One can see here a sort of reconciliation between the humanist emphasis on individual choice and the puritan emphasis on sacred union.

The dominant Elizabethan view of marriage as a necessity for a stable and happy life was hinged on the feminine ‘honor’ and ‘honesty’ which came to be considered as C.B. Watson observes, almost exclusively as *sexual purity*.^{*16} In order to glorify chastity, the sixteenth century also verified lust. This intense vilification had the authority of the church.^{*17}

Ferdinand in reply to Prospero’s warning, swears, in almost a copy book style of the marriage manuals:-

“As I hope,
 For quiet days, fair issue and long life,
 With such love as its now, the murkirst den
 The most opportune place, the strongest suggestion
 Our worse genius can, shall never melt
 Mine honour into lust, to take away
 The edge of that day’s celebration....
 (From *Tempest*-Act-IV, Scene-1, Line-25-31, PP-92)

Thus, although preferring to love, Shakespeare maintains the conventional form of the marriage manuals to reassure his orthodox audience.

Shakespeare also portrays in *Prospero* and *Miranda*, a model of father-daughter relationship, demanding love and care and protection from guardian father and regards obedience from the daughter. As Anderson Thom concludes, Shakespeare’s magnificent comic heroines thrive in facilitating marriages, good marriages, the plays promise but ones that restore the natural sex roles. This is a fair bargain and balanced as Shakespeare’s liberal sympathies but conservative world view will take him.^{*18} If Ferdinand-Miranda marriage constitutes the centre of *The Tempest*, other marriages like Alonso’s daughter Caliban’s mother’s and the mythical and legendary, hypothetical and imaginary one’s also surround that centre, creating a spectrum. Shakespeare’s effort always is to dramatize this gap between the ideal and the real, the general and the specific, the abstract and the concrete prescriptions come to naught where human passions are involved.

In the natural order of Gonzalo’s ‘*common wealth*’ man-woman union will also follow the natural course, where there are no ceremonies to sanctify relationship. The comical voice here is none but ingrained orthodoxy. What Shakespeare assigns to Gonzalo here is the role of a window that opens out into a world other than Elizabethan-the kind of *Window Plato* and *More* offer in their treatises. Thus, Shakespeare keeps showing seriously as well as casually, new forms that the man-woman relationship can assume, depending on the political, social, economic

or ethical structure of society, unlike historians or the sociologist, Shakespeare the artist relies more on possibility and probability than fact and reason.

Whatever theme Shakespeare chooses to take up in a play, his exploration has no bounds, with his imagination moving from earth to heaven and heaven to earth, producing a picture of numerous hues hard to reduce into a simple figure in black or white. Why Shakespeare chooses to bring in the examples of God and Kings, of the privileged and powerful, showing how they forced their powerful will on the 'fair' or 'weaker' or second sex? In his commitment he shows a subject in all its variety and wholeness, Shakespeare appropriately places side by side the real and the possible, the mythical and the mundane the legendary and licentious. No doubt, *The Tempest* moves towards marriage but the relations it postulates are characteristically uneasy even potentially tragic. As Stephen Orgel rightly observes, "There is a familiar Shakespearean paradigm here, relationships between men and women interest Shakespeare intensely, but not, on the whole as husbands and wives". The wooing process tends to be what it is here, not so much a prelude to marriage and a family as a process of self definition-an increasingly unsatisfactory process, if we look at the progression of the play from, 'As you like it' to *Cymbeline*.^{*19} The fact that Prospero's wife remains unmentioned all through the play except once that too only as evidence to Miranda being as issue of the deposed Duke, shows how the mother disappears as a figure of no consequence. Surprisingly, even her own daughter, Miranda does not remember to have known her. Sycorax as mother also remains as invisible presence. Once married, women seem to have significance in the scheme of Elizabethan family. It is known that how Calphurnia and Portia in 'Julius Caesar' live a shadowy life, appearing only in the twilight world of disturbed sleeps. One can recognize the "greater power" as Fate in 'Romeo and Juliet'. Strangely enough, it is given to the prince, the secular head of the state, to make the enemies see Fate's exercise in wrath and retribution:-

"Capulet, Monague?

See what a scourage is laid upon your hate

That heaven finds means to kill your Joys with love!

(Act-2, Scene-6 Line 25-27)

From the above explanation of the Fate-motif it becomes evident that it is not much Romeo who directs the course of his own life as it is Fate. It is one of the paradoxes in the play that *Love* and *marriage* lead to the lovers' separation, instead of uniting them. Their separation is the work of Fate. Fate gives a rough twist to the course of Romeo's life, once he kills Tybalt. From then on it dogs his footsteps and brings him to his inescapable doom. He is thus a 'prisoner' of Fate even as he is a prisoner of love.^{*20} His tragedy is a tragedy of innocence and pity rather than a tragedy of experience and fear.

Love can be analyzed and understood in different ways in different contexts. The very term love is an abstract one which can't see and touch as an object. But it is only subjective. It is an emotional factor. One can't fix any limitation to it. It is very powerful and emotionally strong enough. Man has this passion and man cannot go away with this. It is in every one and every one is with it. But the nature of love is not the same to all. Human feelings are raised out of love. The growth of man certainly depends on it. There is a down fall of man and his character with love. Hence love is the most important aspect in man's life. It has become a prime passion in the life of a human being.

There are different kinds of love. True love, Erotic love, physical love, honest love and love in words not in deeds. Fashionable love, artificial love, tragic love, love for pity, ideal love

and Angelic love etc. of all love, love for humanity and human love is the most important today. Modern man loves and likes comfortable and luxurious life. It is purely physical love. He does not love his fellow beings but he loves material objects. It is self love. His humble feeling turns into thoughts for physical progress by means of power and money. His thoughts are neither ideal nor valuable. Because he has lost his natural feelings for natural love. As modern man is running after material success, he in turn running out of love towards his fellow beings and his human relationships of different kind in the society are lost. Modern world has become 'Waste Land' of T.S. Eliot. Because there is no room for human love and affection. There is only self-love or super ego which is ever haunting him. This is how today man is killing himself and his personality becomes unworthy.

In this context, thoughts of Shakespeare are relevant. His approach to human love is significant. He loves all kinds and all phases of life of all sections of people. As he loved life the most, he created a God's plenty in his works which are most important and inevitable to fill the loss of human love today.

In the creation of Cordelia, Kent, Edgar, Tom, Romeo and Juliet, Ophelia, Hermeone, Antonio and Cleopatra, Rosalind, Macbeth, Lady Macbeth, Desdemona, Olivia, Miranda, Ferdinand, Portia and Viola, Orsino, like many Shakespeare brings out multi-facet love which is vulnerable one to the entire mankind who is happy with only love. It is possible with human love. Love each other for humanity. Love for humanity and humanity for love. There is solidarity in human love that can be seen in Shakespeare. Hence his approach to love and human love is a prime passion. It plays an important role in the world today.

Shakespeare is known for tragedies. There is tragedy for one's weakness i.e., *Amartia*. When there is an imbalance in the equilibrium of passions. Though there shall be a scope for disorder of emotions there conflict arises in his mind what to do and what not to do. As it is raised in Hamlet "To be or not to be.....that is a question?" Human soliloquy is brought about to shock man. If he does not maintain and balance the emotions positively, he certainly undergoes suffering and after long suffering he exposes it by means of soliloquies. Hatred is the next opposite passions of man. It is caused when the prime passion of love is disturbed. Even Jealousy is the other passion of man. Even that itself springs out of loss of love.

Shakespeare's treatment of 'Love'- It has been an eternal theme for the poets and writers all over the world. How can the greatest playwright like Shakespeare disregard it? What is important is that he has used love in its variety. It is interesting to note that treatment of love theme by Shakespeare keeps us within the limit of the prescribed texts for studies in many universities as far as possible.

Love to Shakespeare was a sacred emotion. He displayed it in various aspects such as the sentimental love of *Orsino* for *Olivia* in *Twelfth Night*, the deep sincere but unequal love of *Hamlet* for *Ophelia*, the youthful exuberant love of *Perdita* and *Florizel* in '*The Winter's Tale*', the romantic love of *Viola* and *Rosalind*, in the play *As you Like It* the one side love of *Malvolio*, in the play *Twelfth Night* the genuine love of *Ferdinand* and *Miranda* in the *Tempest*, the tragic-love of *Romeo* and *Juliet*, the filial love of *Cordelia* in *King Lear* and so on. But what he excelled the most is the romantic love between a young man and a young woman.

According to Shakespeare true love is unshakable like the pole star. In *Venus and Adonis* he compares *lust* with *true love*. He says,

"Love Comforteth like sunshine after rain
But lust's effect is tempest after sun:

Love's gentle spring doth always fresh remain:
Lust's Winter comes are summer half be done.
Love surfeits not: Lust like a glutton dies.
Love is all truth: Lust full of forged lies." (Lines from Venus and Adonis No.799-804, Page-1278-Complete works of Shakespeare)

He sings highly of this kind of love in his romantic comedies and even in tragedies. Venus' lustful love for Adonis, mere physical passion was what he aimed at. Adonis was a hunter hunted down first by the love arrows of Venus and then a wild bore. He died twice. The moment he forsook his first love he perished and hunting was his first love. This was not Shakespeare's ideal love. His ideal love was patient, selfless, sacrificing. It stood the testing times like those of *Ferdinand* and *Miranda* in '*The Tempest*', when *Prospero* puts them to severe tests. It was patient like those of *Romeo* and *Juliet*. It was faithful like *Rosalind* and *Orlando* in '*As you like it*'; it was selfless like *Viola's* love for *Orsino*. It was not lusty like *Cressida*, who forsook *Troilus*.

Love at first sight dominates the comedy of Shakespeare. In *Love's Labor's Lost* *Ferdinand* and his three lieutenants, who had taken a vow to pursue knowledge and not to look at the face of any woman which succumb to the arrows of the God of love and fall in love at first sight with the princess of France and her three maids. In *Twelfth Night* we see *Viola* falling in love with *Orsino* at first sight and *Olivia* falling in love with *Casario* at first sight again.

Similarly *Rosalind* and *Orlando*, *Celia* and *Oliver* and even *Phebe* in '*As you like it*' are victims of love at first sight and so are *Romeo* and *Juliet* and *Antony* and *Cleopatra*, *Even Florizel- Perdita* in *Winter's Tale* go through it. Some of these relationships succeed quickly and culminate into marriage. It is natural outcome of love [Oliver and Celia]. Some are tested and rewarded like *Oliver* and *Rosalind*, *Viola* and *Orsino*. Some end in tragedy as in *Romeo* and *Juliet*. But in each case the love remains constant, the lovers remain faithful, they sacrifice willingly.

Shakespeare thus insists on the purity of love. It is a sacred feeling for him. He loves to portray pure love but it is never puritanical. Love is the basis mainly in a Shakespearean comedy. Love and romance go hand in hand in them.

Shakespeare's greatness as a singer of love is beyond doubt from the most divine passion to the shallowest lust he has painted love in varied colours, bright, faint, mild and gaudy. To him love and sex are not two separate identities. They are one and the same things.

Profound Relationship of human beings is with the prime passion Love. Human relationships have become strong with springs of Love from man's heart. It is a benevolent and tender human emotion. It is deep rooted and embedded in ones heart not mind. It is like roots of a tree with which the tree grows and gives shadow and fruit for many. It is inevitable and indispensable to everyone to bind good human relationships. The bond is created in a small unit of society which is known as Family. In such a family there are different kinds of relationship like husband and wife, Grand father and Grand mother, brothers and sisters and cousins and aunts and uncles and his fellow beings. Each one of them is inter related and integrated and there is a harmony in a family, with love only. All kinds of relationships are strong then and the sense of human hood would become much stronger with love.

Thinking about Shakespeare's '*King-Lear*' as a narrative of ordinary domestic life requires some careful thinking about the exact nature of family obligations. What are the kinds of things we owe to loved ones? In *Reciprocity*, Lawrence Becker begins with the suggestion

that *'families are potent'* and then goes on to consider what he calls profound-relationship'. Here the idea of *profound* refers both to depth and to obscurity. The sense is that interactions within families are so frequent and so dense that it is not possible to achieve any kind of balance in the give and take of everyday life. Our obligations are incalculable—so much is going on that we can never know everything that we have given and everything we have received. Ordinary reciprocity that says, "I did the laundry so now you must vacuum the rugs" is simply inadequate as a way to express love. According to Becker, 'Love stands as an implicit rebuke to the business of reciprocating. That business is cross by comparison—simplistic, superficial and single-minded concerned with obligations and with getting even.'²¹ Most people sense something like this about Lear's determination to measure the amount of his daughters' *'Love'*. There is something false and dishonest in the assumption that love can be expressed in terms of real estate.

Cordelia risks everything by saying nothing because she wants to put an end to the practice of family bargaining and to replace it with more genuine forms of reciprocal acknowledgement. What Cordelia actually says when she says "*I love your majesty according to my bond*". The word 'bond' comes from the verb 'to bind' and the past participle of 'bind' is 'bound', a word that refers both to obligation—what I am bound to do and to boundary—where I stand as a separately embodied self in the sense of a limit or bourne. A bond is also a pledge or a promise. In the sense that a bond represents some kind of material value the idea is related to the notion of a 'boon' or a 'bounty' which is Lear's word for his gift to his daughters. This constellation of words captures much of the complexity of the family dynamic and why Cordelia evidently feels she must decline to participate in the bidding for her father's bounty. 'Bid' is a condensation of two old English words—*beodan* to stretch out, reach out, offer, present, hence to communicate inform, announce, proclaim, command and *'biddan'* to ask pressingly, beg, pray, require, demand, command. This is exactly what Cordelia wants to avoid when she says she lacks a 'still soliciting eye', an eye that watches the other person's face and calculates the effects of every word. For Cordelia, there is no shame in speaking, *according to my bond*'. Shame is attached only to speech that begs or bids or solicits approval.

One way to see what Cordelia might have in mind when she says; 'according to my bond' is to think about Immanuel Kant's maxim of 'the end in itself.' So act as to treat humanity whether in their own person or in that of any other in every case as an end withal, never as *means only*.²²

Cordelia who thinks well enough of her own personhood insists on maintaining her own dignity. She won't 'sellout' to her father or to her sisters by making some kind of bid for her love and property. In other words she is committed to maintaining her own bounds or psychological boundaries, her own separateness as a person from the emotionally needy and exploiting parent. What we see in Cordelia looks something like Aristotle's *'Philontia'*, which means 'self-love' or more precisely self respect. It is precisely this aspect of her character that makes her naughty Cordelia. Women have traditionally been expected to function according to the ethics based on self-sacrifice taking responsibility only for the need of others. Cordelia will not be bound in a life of self deception. Her bond with Lear is a covenant, undertaken in the freedom and dignity of full personhood.

There is no unity and integrity in modern human-bond. There is full of lust and greed in the place of *'Love'*. Hence it is the need of the hour to look into the approach of Shakespeare's love as prime passion of human beings. The loss can be restored when love becomes prime

passion of man. In the study of Shakespeare one can certainly have comprehensive soul to love the mankind as a whole.

There are Passions for man and man for Passions. There is no man without passions. They are inseparable and contributory and complimentary to each other. But if the man does not balance his emotions and passions, becomes inhuman. Even the human love is lost and has no sanctity of its own today. True and honest love has no room today. The star-crossed lovers “Romeo and Juliet” should become a role model to the modern man.

Today we have different notions of deterministic forces outside the persons control the class system Global-Capitalism, oppressive Governments even a capricious stock-market that can make or break an individual but we can still appreciate the sense of helplessness and lack of personal control over events that the Renaissance called Fate.

The word ‘family’ in his works is most commonly used to be focused to denote household including servants as well as those united by ties of blood. Marriage was an institution of exceptional social importance. The family household was also seen as the nursery of religion.

The courtship and marriage formation were not only of emotional and personal significance, nor were they simply a family matter of great moment. They were also of “Prime Public Importance”. By the same token, personal relationships with in the household, above all between husband and wife, were seen as the key not only to personal happiness but also to good citizenship.

The relationship between these pious principles and the foibles and frailties of human nature was inevitably problematic and there was much scope for tension and conflict between the generations and between genders. The controversies were managed and controlled by the social ethics in his works. But it is out of central and mismanagement by the modern man. There is a mark of ‘Adultery on Hermione by her own husband Leontes in *Winters Tale*’. But it has a great message at the end of the play for the audience and readers:-

Thus human passions and human love have a great role in the life of modern man that flashes out of the thoughts and feelings of Shakespeare.

If this be error and upon me proved, I never write nor no man ever loved’. (Couplet in *Sonnet No-116*)

Cosmic-Love of Shakespeare and Love in the global-Context:- Shakespeare’s view of Love is holy and true. It is not mortal but immortal. It is beyond the boundary of time. Even time never kills it. Time actually kills everyone and spoils everything in the world. But the ‘True-Love’ is like a guiding-star it never takes death but lives for ever. There is a sacrifice of one’s life for the honest and true love.

Twelfth Night-‘True Love’ (Act-2 Se-4) Viola-speaks:-

Come hither, boy; If ever those shalt love

In the sweet pangs of it remember me;

For such as I am all true lovers are; unstead

And skittish in all motions else save in the constant image of the creature that is beloved.

Love in *As you like it* (Act 5-se-2)

God Shepherd, tell this youth what it’s to love.

It is to be all made of sighs and tears-

It is to be all made of faith and service-

It is to be all made of fantasy.

All made of passion and all made of wishes
All adoration, duty, and observance,
All humbles, all patience and impatience
All purity, all trail, all obeisance; And so am I for phebe, “*The path of true-love never did run smooth*” as ‘Puck’ says in “Mid-Summer’s Nights Dream”.

The Star-Crossed Lovers “Romeo and Juliet” are model for honest and true love. Their love is most powerful and faithful.

Shakespeare answers for “What is love”? In the famous play ‘Romeo and Juliet’. Begins as- (Act-I Se-I)

“Love is a smoke rais’d with the fume of sighs;
Begging purged, a fire sparkling in loves’ eyes;
Being vexed, a sea nourished with lovers’ tears:
What is it else? A madness most discreet,
A choking gall and a preserving sweet”.

In his *Sonnet No. 116* he emphasizes the nature and strength of honest and true-love. He tells “*LOVE IS NOT LOVE WHICH ALTER*”

Let me not to the marriage of true-minds,
Admit impediments, Love is not love,
Which alters when it alteration finds,
Or bends with the remover to remove:-
O’ No! It is an ever-fixed mark
That looks on tempest, and is never shaken;
It is the star to every wandering bark,
Whose worth’s unknown, although his height be taken.
Love’s not Time’s fool, though rosy lips and cheeks
With in his bending sickle’s compass come:
Love alters not with his brief hours and weeks,
But bears it out even to the edge of doom
If this be error, and upon me proved
I never write and no man ever love’d.

His *Sonnet No: 116* is enough to understand the Elizabethan nature of true-love and its timelessness. But today physical and erotic-love is in practice. It is a negative sign of human downfall, of human relations and faithlessness. Erotic-sex is dominant and occupies the place of true and honest-love. It is not natural but purely artificial and mortal. Faithless love is a sign of failure and futile of life. To day’s love has crossed the path of true love. There is a misconception of love and turned into physical love. It spoils the human culture and family system.

The present article tries to justify the importance of love in the life of man as Shakespeare understands human nature as a whole which is blend of love.

REFERENCE

1. Una Ellis Fermer-1909-'Hamlet-The Prince of Denmark'-Even though Hamlet expressed his love to Ophelia at the grave digger scene, it was not fruitful and successful one. Thousand brother quantity of love I loved Ophelia: Forty-could not, with all their make up my sum. Shat will thou do for her?-Act V-S-1, P-95, line-261-263.
2. Ibid-1768-Prince of Denmark-Act-V, Scene-I, P-95, line-261-263.
3. Dr. Raghukul Tilak-1992-'Chaucer's to prologue to Canterbury tales'-Words of prioress, one of the pilgrims from Canterbury- line 160-P.76. Meerut Rajhans Prakashan Mandir, Dharma Alock.
4. S.T.Coleridge-1989-'Biographia Literaria'-Chapter-13 XIII-on imagination or esemplastic power-P-17-1989. It is an unifying and creative power- London Oxford University.
5. Green Andre-1916-'Is Love an Art?'-From the text for the year 2009-Foot Prints -Iby Frich Fromm, 9.5- Bangalore: Bangalore University Press
6. Rapid changes out of science and technology in inventions and discoveries to lead comfortable and civilized life.1991- Mysore Subhash Pvt. Ltd.,
7. Ibid: Nature of kinship in ancient period without the touch of modernity. Congenial relationship in the members. From the article Soligas line 28. Hindu Daily-1996.
8. Ibid: Terminally of letarature-1896-All the people living together in house harmonically. It is domestic bond where households all of them in its cloches with bond of Love. There is a homely atmosphere for love, happiness and togetherness. P.606.
9. Winni Cott D.W.- 1971-'The Lawes Resolutions of womens Rights'. New York International University Press P.6.
10. Mary Anne Everett Green-1869-'Calendar of state papers'-Domestic-1598-1601.London: Cambridge University Press - p.519.
11. William Gouge-1622-'Of Domesticall Duties'-London: Oxford University Press Epistle.Sig.2v.
12. Ibid.p.142.
13. 'English Domestic Relations'-1917, New York Press, PP.148.9.
14. William Shakespeare-1964-'The Tempest from the complete works of Shakespeare'- London and Glasgow: English Language Book Society.
15. Thomas Overbury-1844-'A wife'-Peter Cunningham, London Percy Society Reprints, II.
16. C.B.Waston-1960-'Shakespeare and The Renaissance concept of Honour'- New York Princeton -P.159.
17. Ibid-159.
18. Martha Anderson Thom-1951-'Critique Quaterely'-PP.259-76.
19. Stephen Orgel-1920-'Prospero's wife'- in Norton critical Edition of the Tempest, PP.206-7- London Blackie and Sons.
20. John Dover Willson-1969-'Princes of prison'-P.17, WWW. books google. Com.in/books.
21. Becker Lawrence-1986-'Reciprocity'- New York Chicago Press-JP.186.
22. Robert Paul Wolff trans Lewis White Beek-1969-'Kant Immanuel Foundations of the Metaphysics of morals'- New Delhi Indian Polis Bobbs-JP.58.