Process of Social Development and Meaning-use in Shakespearean Tragedies

Dr. Aakanksha

Abstract
Shakespeare portrays all aspects of society. The use of social accuracy is mainly presented in Shakespearean tragedies. The norm inherent in social actuality is also indicated. The norm of Shakespeare is not projected and fictitious but related to actual behavior of the community. The playwright has expressed the personal psychology and social psychology through different meaning-uses. The different meaning-use indicates separate community forms and social standard varieties.

Keywords: Meaning, Social diversity, Tragedies, Community, Society, Synonymous, Antonymous, Linguistics

Language and society are interrelated to each other, as Sociolinguistics is the study of language in relation to society. Hence, Meaning-use in relation to social development is a major part of Sociolinguistics. The process of social status and social development may be expressed by the semantic-process used in Shakespearean Tragedies-Hamlet, Othello, King Lear and Macbeth. The meaning is related to the word which is presented in different dictionaries and lexicon-books. Shakespeare has been a play-Wright of social-concerns. He knows very well that the decision and fixation of the meaning depends upon the social-dealings. The accurate-form of the current meaning is employed in Shakespearean Tragedies. Besides it, he presents the contextual meaning. The use of common meaning is pertaining to simple (ordinary) society and the contextual meaning to upper class community. Shakespeare portrays all aspects of society the use of social accuracy is mainly presented in Shakespeare's Tragedies. The norm inherent in social actuality is also indicated-pointed. The norm of Shakespeare is not projected and fictitious but related to actual behaviour of the community.

In Shakespeare's Tragedies, the aspects of the community, rule, administration, law, system, manner, destiny, justice, etc., are presented.

The temperament and function of the above-mentioned parts of the society are expressed in their original form. Due to their original-form, mainly, the denotation word-force is used in all Tragedies. In some social references, the implied and suggestion word-forces are also employed through the proverbs and idioms. Hence, the implied and suggested meanings along with chief meaning are also presented. Due to such meaning-uses, Shakespearean Tragedies have become multilateral and multi-referential. The main meaning-uses presented in Shakespeare's Tragedies, may be divided as follows:

1. DENOTATION

A great majority of denotation uses are presented in Shakespeare's Tragedies. Only the sense of a word is called a denotation. The sense of a word is expressed only through the denotation. Shakespeare is a Playwright of earth-born, hi all his Tragedies, the action of this earth and universe are expressed, rule-administration, medication, etc., are such regulations, which are reflected in visible social actions. In life and universe, whichever occurs, the straight and direct connection of that occurrence remains with human society. The writer attached' with social life becomes all-touching only through the denotation. Shakespeare has accepted the fundamental meaning to be the basic point of all social functions. Only being added to fundamental meaning, he has become a universal writer. The family, neighbourhood, community, rule, administration, justice, system, manner, destiny, ambition, philosophy, religion and culture employed in Tragedies are presented in their real forms. All these regulations of society tie each social group into the thread of unity.

All, the king, general, Lord, noble, sister-brother, husband-wife, son-mother, son-father, servant-master, nurse-doctor, air, sky, earth, storm, hero-heroine, villain, villainous, sergeant, porter, soldier, murderer, judge, judgement, etc., have their common meanings. Such words are employed in abundance in Shakespeare's Tragedies. In Linguistics, there is only one common meaning of a word. This very meaning unites the entire community with its function.

The confirmation of this expression may be exemplified by the following lines:
Ber.: Who's there?
Fran.: Nay, answer me. Stand and un-fold yourself.
Ber.: Long live the King!
Fran.: You come most carefully upon your hour.
Des.: Alas, she has no speech!
Iago: I know too much
I find it aye when I have list to sleep,
Marry, before your ladyship. I grant,
She puts her tongue a little in her heart

And chides with thinking.
Kent: I cannot conceive you.
Glo.: Sir, this young fellow's mother could; whereupon she
grew round-womb'd, and had indeed, sir, a son for her
Cradle ere she had a husband for
her bed. Do you smell a fault?
Macb.: We will speak further.
Lady M.: Only look up clear. To alter favour ever is to
fear. Leave all the rest to me.

2. POLYSEMY

It (multiple meaning) is a property of single lexeme. It is a principle of Linguistics that a single word has it's a single lexical meaning. A single word has never several meanings. A single word is Polysemous when it is presented in more than one context. Hence, polysemousness is related to contextual variety. Shakespeare has employed numerous words in separate contexts. Due to this contextual variety, there is a Polysemous use in Shakespeare's Tragedies. There has been a multi-contextual use of various words in Shakespeare's Tragedies, as: sleep, walk, spirit, lord, give, do, etc. Shakespeare has portrayed the word 'sleep' in separate references. Being used the word 'sleep' has become Polysemous. For example:
Lady M.: When Duncan is asleep.

When in Swinish sleep.
Macb.: Those sleepy two of his own chamber.
Macb.: There's one did laugh in's sleep
— Again to sleep.
Macb.: Sleep no more;
Macbeth does murder sleep -the innocent sleep, Sleep that Knits up
Macb.: Still it cried 'sleep no more to all the house;
'Glamis hath murder'd sleep and therefore Cawdor. Shall sleep no more - Macbeth shall sleep no more.
Lady M.: —The sleepy grooms with blood.
—The sleeping and the dead.
Port.: —in a sleep.
Macd.: Shake off this downy sleep.
Lady M.: You lack the season of all natures, sleep.
Macb.: Come, we'll to sleep.
Doct: Yet I have known those which have walk'd in their sleep who have died holily in their beds.

3. ANTONYMY

The term Antonymy is used for 'oppositeness of meaning; words that are opposites are Antonyms. To begin with, English abounds in pairs of words such as wide-narrow, old-young, big-small, etc. These, all of them adjectives, have in common the fact that they may be seen in terms of degrees of the quality involved. Thus, a road may be wide or very wide and one road may be wider than another. We have, that is to say, gradation of width, age, size, etc., all indicated by such adjectives as these. Shakespeare has portrayed several antonymous in his Tragedies. By antonymousness, the Play¬wright has

expressed the personal psychology and social psychology. The expression of anonymousness is presented in the following forms:

• By basic word-uses
• By basic and derived word-uses and
• By derived word-uses.

By basic word-uses: The above-mentioned anonymousness indicates the three separate community-forms and social standard varieties. In Shakespearean Tragedies, the expression of anonymousness of various basic word-uses, as: good-bad, day-night, to-morrow-yesterday, angel-devil, etc., are presented as follows:
Heaven - hell, day-night, good-bad, hate-love, friends-foes/enemies, husband-wife, father-mother, Fair is foul, and foul is fair, open-shut, rich-poor, son-daughter, wise-fool, true-false, old-young, white-black, enter-exit, joy-sorrow, best-worst, more-less, here-there etc.

By basic and derived word-uses: Such antonymous words are expressed by the uses of basic and derived words. They are different from number one community, i.e.. Basic word-uses. Such words are:
Loyal-dis-loyal, perfect-im-perfect, welcome-un-welcome, kind -un-kind, tie-un-tie, honour-dis-honour, grace-dis¬grace, courage-discourage, usual-un¬usual, fortune-mis-fortune, natural-un¬natural, visible-un-visible, etc. Social Psychology is expressed through such Antonymous-ness.

By derived word-uses: On the basis of form-level, such type of Antonymous-ness is different from number one and two, as: Cheerful-cheerless, faithful-un¬faithful, falling-un-falling, familiar-un¬familiar, graceful-un-graceful, courageous -dis-courageous, comfortable-dis-comfortable, loyalty-disloyalty, timely-un-timely, careful-care-less, etc. such word-uses of Antonymousness express the different class-community.

4. SYNONYMY

A word with the same meaning as another in the same language but often with different implications, and associations 1, is called synonym. In fact, synonymous-ness is not an indication of one-word but all indicative words of synonymity express the several qualities and separate functions of one and same person, thing or substance. Several Linguists have accepted the synonymity to be separate beauties and reflections of one and the same meaning. The numerous synonym-forms likely, fire, air, earth, water, sea, mankind, etc., are portrayed in Shakespeare's Tragedies. For example: grief-woe, joy-mirth, joy-delight, sorrow-grief, lord-liege, strange-odd, King-monarch, devil-damn, fair-beauty, ecstasy-madness, Heaven-God, gain-profit, envenomed - poison'd, coxcomb-cap, dog-cur, oyster-snail, bad-ill, weapons-arms, yes-yea, mock-laugh, foolish-ignorant, conjuration-magic, adieu-farewell, napkin-handkerchief, strumpet-whore, good-well,

_____

brave-valiant, Lord-Thane, Iand-earth2, look-seem, help-aid, pleasant-sweet, service-business, twice-double, dignities-graces, etc.

REFERENCES

Chambers, J. and Trudgill, P. (1980): Dialectlogy, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 63-68.

Hudson, R.A. (2001): Sociolinguistics, Second Edition, Cambridge University Press, pp. 1-4.

Labov, W. (1972): Sociolinguistics Patterns, Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 183-185.

Lucy, J. (1992): Language Diversity and T hought, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 15.

Lyons, J. (1977): Semantic, 2 Volumes, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, (1981): Language, Meaning and Context, London: Fontana, McCormick, K. (1994a): Code-Switching and Mixing, ELL: 581-7.

Milroy, L. (1980): Language and Social Networks, Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 54-58.

Montgomery, M. (1986): An Introduction to Language and Society, 1st edition, Methuen & Co. Ltd., II New Fetter Lane, London, pp. 71-73.

Owens, Jr., R.E. (1996): Language Development, Fourth edition, Allyn and Bacon, London, pp. 95-98.

Palmer, F.R. (1996): Semantics, second edition, Cambridge University Press, U.K., pp. 62-65.

Pride, J. and Holmes, J. (1972): Sociolinguistics, Harmonds-worth: Penguin, pp. 112-115.

Schiffrin, D. (1994): Approaches to Discourse, Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 18-20.

Trudgill, P. (1974/1983): Sociolinguistics, 2nd edition, Harmonds-worth: Penguin, pp. 125.

Wardhaugh, R. (1986): An Introduction to Sociolinguistics, Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 65-66.

William Shakespeare The Complete works, Oxford Edition 1980, Oxford & IBH Publishing Co. Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, pp. 1035-1098.

Hornby, A.S. (1982): Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English, Revised and Updated, Oxford University Press, pp. 877.