

Aesthetics of Beauty in Dramatic Discourse of W. Shakespeare's Plays: A Reader-Response Review

Abdullah H. Kurraz

English Department, Al-Azhar University, Jamal Abdl Naser St., Gaza City, Palestine

ARTICLE INFO

Article history

RECEIVED: 21-Oct-20

REVISED: 12-Nov-20

ACCEPTED: 24-Nov-20

PUBLISHED: 07-Dec-20

*Corresponding Author

Abdullah H. Kurraz

E-mail: abdhk99@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

This research identifies and traces the concept of aesthetics of both beauty and ugliness in W. Shakespeare's plays in the light of aesthetic and critical conceptualizing the opposite binaries. The research offers a preface to identify the concept of binary oppositions in Shakespeare's plays; it thematically discusses the aspects of both ugliness and beauty of the major dynamic characters and actions. Meanwhile, *the research adopts the qualitative textual analysis method* to address the significance of the aesthetic quality of beauty for realizing the implications of the aesthetics of ugliness within a modern receptionist theatrical context and aesthetic appreciation.

Keywords: aesthetics, dramatic discourse, beauty, ugliness, Reader-response, W. Shakespeare.

Introduction

Aesthetics is a creative and flexible critical theory that explores the aesthetic values of beauty and ugliness. Critics like Huhn, Mohan, and Kant indicate that aesthetics focuses on the euphemism of dramatic discourses to enrich the artistic and theatrical creativity. In Immanuel Kant's usage, aesthetic stands for the experienced object through the senses than artistic lens; he values the viewers' reaction rather than the artistic production. In this sense, beauty doesn't necessitate looking at an object through determinate concepts (2008, 53). In addition, in its modernist sense, the theory of aesthetics "attempts to move beyond the seemingly closed dialectic of beauty and ugliness" (Huhn, 1988, p. 2). Therefore, aesthetic awareness determines the aesthetic norms in human life and art. Beauty itself involves qualities of the beautiful and the ugly in the art of the 20th century which "was not kind to the notions of beauty or the aesthetic" (Zangwill, 2014). So, modern critics such as Rosenkranz, Baker, and Eco keep addressing the aesthetic qualities of the beautiful and the ugly, the comic and the tragic and the lofty and the decadent. Also, the aesthetic codes and artistic paradigms of beauty in literature is a consistent field of modern scholars. Moreover, beauty decides on the rank of human beings; this beauty is classified as

moral and physical. The former is a source of comfort and expresses human salvation from the negative impacts of life. The beautiful aspects defend human against the self that defies ugliness, which is fused with human virtue and sincerity. According to Mohan, beauty is not dependent on physical qualities alone; "wisdom, virtue, etc. can also be beautiful, a balance of values is necessary" (2020). For Kant, beauty value is quite different from any sort of cognition. He admits that deciding on the beauty of things relies heavily on the act of "imagination to the subject, and its feeling of pleasure or pain," adding that taste does not yield a "judgment of cognition," rather it is "aesthetical." (2008, p. 27).

Again, this research adopts the qualitative textual analysis method to explore the relevant concepts of beauty and ugliness in Shakespearean plays. Critics, mentioned in the references, still argue that ugliness is an aesthetic experience that manifests the close interaction between the dramatic discourses and readers. Ella Przybylo (2010) describes ugliness as "contingent and relational" available due to binary oppositions of contingent beauty and ugliness. Moreover, ugliness is never naturally original; rather it is a deformed beauty of certain value and effect. In this sense, ugliness is explored for its qualitative content and form. While the content embodies the ethical

and moral aspects socially and behaviorally, the form implies the bodily aspects. In this regard, Karl Rosenkranz indicates that there is no beauty without ugliness and vice versa and that “beauty is an absolute” while “ugliness is a relative” (2015, p. 95). This matter generates a binary tension between the beautiful and the ugly in the characters’ soul and body.

Concepts of Beauty and Ugliness in Drama

Generally, dramatic texts include ugly characters that represent the ideological portion of implied ugliness. This ugliness appears in the social relations and behavioral tendencies of such characters. In tragic plays, reconstructing ugliness is a moral aesthetic, in which ugliness is translated into sadness to get “an aesthetical pleasure” of readers (Shiying, 2013, p. 6). Meantime, this view is not negative; it offers a positive tendency to disclose the centers of imperfection and disharmony. Yet, Walter T. Stace confutes that ugliness is against beauty for there is a visionary flaw that painful depression is aroused by ugliness. Stace also argues that beauty is,

“an all-encapsulating concept including the pathetic, the comic, the sublime ... the whimsical, the romantic, the idyllic, the realistic, the impressionistic, the symbolic, the classical, the sad, the melancholy, the graceful, the humorous, the majestic, the pretty, and so forth” (1997, p. 61)

Therefore, ugliness is hostile to beauty and what opposes beauty is its absence. So, the ugly have an exquisite value despite its conceptual psychological effect.

Culturally, beauty and ugliness are traditional binary oppositions. Umberto Eco professes that “beauty could now express itself by making opposites converge, so that ugliness was no longer the negation of beauty, but its other face” (2007, p. 321). Here, beauty may transform into ugliness and vice versa based on the artist’s creativity and viewers or readers’ taste. Any judgment of human taste or beauty is the main “target of the analysis of aesthetics and not the object of beauty” (Kant, 2008, p. 34). Obviously, Kant argues that human taste gain its claim of universality from the rule of aesthetics and beauty Kant’s aesthetic theory of aesthetics offers a judgment of beauty based on the aesthetic judgments of taste. Meanwhile, Zhang Shiying proclaims that modifying ugliness necessitates confessing that “ugliness has an aesthetic significance” for it uncovers the “true color of life” in arts (2013, p. 1). Accordingly, ugliness is esteemed in arts as it sheds positivity on portraying the ugly. For example, in

A Midsummer Night’s Dream, the clever Helena esteems the beautiful appearance of Hermia who “has beautiful eyes” that make the former look “as ugly as a bear” (2.2. p. 79).¹ Yet, this attitudinal view is changed into a positive view when Lysander depicts her as “Radiant, beautiful Helena” and he informs her that he feels “like Mother Nature” that enables him to delve into her heart (2.2, p. 80). Here, Shakespeare transfigures the negative sentiment of derision into a beautiful semblance embodied in Hermia’s face. Also, this change would suggest that the malformed features metamorphose into pleasing beautiful qualities, creating an oxymoronic image to readers.

Similarly, Rosenkranz asserts that ugliness is “the negation of beauty without being reducible to evil, materiality, or other negative terms used in its conventional condemnation” (2015, p. 25). So, in plays, the qualities of ugliness never critically appear as a contrary value to beauty. In this sense, Shiying argues that on being beautified, ugliness signifies the underlying meaning of human life, sustained by the artists’ sublime imagination that constructs beautiful implications out of ugliness by means of “color, figure, or languages” (2013, p. 2). Again, ugly objects are viewed disgusting; they are epistemologically identifiers of ugliness, base on human imagination. For Kant, aesthetics of the ugly is meaningless (2008, p. 96). Such views imply that the ugly features involve an aesthetic aspect that creates a semantic significance of ugliness. For example, the scenes of killing, burlesque, profligacy, deception, and avarice are realistically different in their ugliness but equal in their aesthetic implications.

Aesthetic Significance of Ugly-Beautiful Binary Oppositions

Widely known, the concept of binary oppositions belongs to postmodern criticism that studies the aesthetic syntactic and semantic aspects of such oppositions. The device of binary oppositions is a center in the receptionist theory that interpretively arouses readers’ suspense. For this view, Naomi Baker emphasizes that the binary oppositions of beauty and ugliness are close embodiments of goodness and/or disfigurement in a literary and cultural context, in which “physical ugliness” is connected with “evil character” (2010, p. 43). In a word, ugliness is not the peremptory antithesis of beauty. In arts, ugliness is as significant as beauty for they incentivize writers to evoke their own literary tools. In this respect, ugliness and

¹All quotations are from Shakespeare’s plays are from Hylton, Jeremy. *The Complete Works of William Shakespeare*. 1 Jan. 1994. Available from <http://shakespeare.mit.edu>. [accessed 8 March 2019].

beauty in arts classically coexist and binary oppositions explicate the relations between the idea, the aesthetic structure, and their tension. Meanwhile, *Kant* defines beauty as a feeling of pleasure; it is an "aesthetic sense" that every man has (2008, p. 107). Accordingly, Thomas Huhn (1988, p. 8) states that the tension between ugliness and beauty is "supplanted by the harmony that attempts to disown this tension by suppressing the ugly, that is, nature." In this context, Mohan also argues that "The beauty of man does not depend on the soul or the body alone; rather it depends upon the harmony of both" (2020, p. 5).

Ostensibly, several dramatic texts evoke the idea of dissonance between the dramatic features of ugliness and beauty. The fiendish tragic character with the ugly patterns is presented with a wrinkled, gloomy, and sullen face with thick lips, ruthless eyes, and unnatural laugh. In this regard, Baker argues that "ugliness is infused with moral and supernatural meaning repeatedly collides with an emergent understanding of ugliness as a purely physical phenomenon, devoid of spiritual significance" (2010, p. 55). Here, ugliness may share with other features in shaping any character's identity on moral and behavioral levels. For example, Shakespeare presents Othello with an aged black look that negatively decides on his tragic fate, implied in Iago's words, "Even now, now, very now, an old black ram. Is tupping your white ewe. Arise, arise, Awake the snorting citizens with the bell" (*Othello* 1.1. p. 91). Here, Iago asserts his stereotypical view of Othello's negritude that implies ugliness and aberration. Mohan (2020) informs readers that black people were *denigrated* by the whites, "they created a dichotomy between the black and the white, the purity and the filthiness, virginity and sin, virtue and baseness, beneficence and evil, beauty and ugliness, God and the devil." Yet, Othello evokes striking poetic metaphorical images to support his personal beauty and to conceal his hideousness. In addition, when raged, Othello uses a poetic language and transforms into an "ugly, idiotic" figure, embodying the binary oppositions of beauty and ugliness (Rocha, 2013, p. 10). Here, Othello says, "Haply for I am black, and have not those soft parts of conversation" (*Othello* 3.3. p. 265). So, Othello's color is a tool for aesthetic evaluation, and the critic Baker admits that "power dynamics of ugliness" classify people on "gender, class, and race" (2010, p.188). Such a stance asserts that ugliness reflects an ideological perception of moral malady.

Furthermore, there are two connected issues: the beautiful body that embodies the quality of the ugly and the ugly body that fails to manifest any other quality. Shiyang states that "there is neither pure beauty nor pure

ugliness" for they are fused in human realities, arguing that beauty generates a positive and optimistic value (2013, p. 3). In this sense, public readers fail to differentiate between the value of the ugly and that of the beautiful. Stace insists that beauty arouses the beholders' appreciative feelings of "an intellectual content." (1997, p. 149). Clearly, the significance of aesthetics in the study of dramas is presented in the dramatic discourses and their intellectual and aesthetic values.

Dramatic criticism searches for the basic aesthetics of both the structure and content that include the binary oppositions of ugliness and beauty and the various juxtaposed dramatic forms. Moreover, ugliness should not be regarded as a nasty value that deforms or degrades the beautiful for aesthetics is the science of perceptual cognition that values beauty and ugliness. Furthermore, social concepts of beauty vary from a culture to another. Relevantly, Rosenkranz argues that "beauty is the original divine idea, and its negation, ugliness, as it is a negation, has only a secondary existence" (2015, p. 125). This view shows that beauty is a center while ugliness is sub-center in the perceptive mentality of readers. Thus, tragic plays always try to offer their valuable forms to reflect a current reality or create a new one. Meantime, readers can find aesthetic qualities of ugliness in dramas fused with other aesthetic features, creating a significant conflict with beauty. In this sense, Stace asserts that such a conflict may arise from the belief that ugliness is against beauty and that beauty and ugliness are binary oppositions like goodness and evil or sincerity and falsehood (1997, p. 94). Hence, Stace implies that ugliness cannot be excluded from various arts, in which this ugliness constitutes an aesthetic pleasure. Therefore, the ugly arouses a beautiful aesthetic tone instead of a painful one, taking in account the disparity between ugliness as a negative value and beauty as a utilitarian aesthetic value. In this point, *Kant's* aesthetics widens the idea of "purposiveness" beyond mankind to all phenomena of nature. Kant offers this term "purposiveness" an object of nature "the supersensible realm" that causes human feeling of "disinterested interest or beauty" (2008, p. 111). Moreover, any dramatic discourse entails evoking aesthetics that can judge the discourse in terms of its absolute beauty or ugliness and break the barriers between them. Eco explains that "art has the power to portray [ugly things] in a beautiful way, and the beauty of this imitation makes ugliness" (2007, p. 133). This ambiguous complex relationship between beauty and ugliness is embodied in the ties between ugliness and offense within a philosophical context. For example, the witches' prophecies result in a murder in Shakespeare's *Macbeth*, a crime that asserts the significance of talking the value of the ugly based on

the aesthetic interconnections. Further, the conceptual mechanisms of this approach and the aesthetics of ugliness in tragic plays are tools to explicate and reconcile the ugly and the beautiful.

The aesthetic theory of beauty argues that the beautiful character is not the familiar beautiful we conceive as an anti-ugly figure, for the ugly may aesthetically be beautiful in an artistic and cognitive context. In this respect, the reality of the ugly in contrast to the beautiful displays the distance between beauty and ugliness that yields a lack of aesthetic prospect. So, natural ugliness may become a positive quality in artistic prettiness. Aestheticians avow that ugliness in arts is a principal aesthetic worry. For Eco, "ugliness can be redeemed by context and restored of its uselessness" (2007, p. 409). This applies to plays that offer aspects of ugliness that may foster readers' feelings of sarcasm, scare, sadness, and disgust to subjectively extract aesthetic embodiments. Concurrently, the contextual aesthetic experience of the reader usually impacts the estimation of beauty and ugliness, in relation to concepts of psychoanalysis, socio-aesthetics, and cultural aesthetic merits.

Dramatic Textual Analysis of Characters' Beauty and Ugliness

Thematically, fusing ugly characters, actions, places in literature entails artistic skills to create moments of suspense among readers. Textually, this view is aesthetic that enables readers to explore the artistic manifestations of ugliness in plays. For example, in *Henry IV*, ugliness is incorporated with moral corruption and ailment manifested in Harry's words: he will "imitate the sun, / . . . / By breaking through the foul and ugly mists" (1.2. p. 175–180). In this sense, "Beauty and ugliness are evaluated linguistically therefore, not only as physical opposites but as moral opposites" (Mohan 2020). Moreover, Henry's words to Kate are indicative of other implications of ugliness,

... in faith, Kate, the elder I wax, the better I shall appear: my comfort is, that old age, that ill layer-up of beauty, can do no more spoil upon my face: thou hast me, if thou hast me, at the worst; and thou shalt wear me, if thou wear me, better and better" (5.2. p. 227–230).

These lines suggest that Henry's ugliness negates the contextual "traditional beauty associated with youth" (Zangwill, 2014). Also, Henry tells Kate that his ugliness is incorporated with the conventional beauty of young characters,

... downright oaths, which I never use till urged, nor never break for urging. If thou canst love a fellow of this temper, Kate, whose face is not worth sun-burning, that never looks in his glass for love... (5.2. p. 137–40)

Here, Henry's speech is an admission of his external and internal conflicts with corporeal ugliness that turns him into a foul. Meanwhile, Richard confesses, "I can add colors to the chameleon, / Change shapes with Proteus for advantages" (3.2. 191–92). This animal code implies an ugly feeling of true prejudice. Likewise, in "Fair is foul, and foul is fair," the witches think that things that men think foul and ugly are beautiful to women for such things personify evil (*Macbeth*, 1.1. p. 12–13). This view arouses readers' ugly insight about the witches who plan against Macbeth; they hate beautiful things. In an aesthetic judgment, Kant alludes that the beautiful can integrate "the more cultured and ruder sections of the community" together (2008, p.135). Nevertheless, this rooted feeling of ugliness is not perpetual; it also shows Macbeth's spiritual prettiness that cultivates from his cleverness and charisma. Mohan (2020) states that "Physical beauty is used to symbolize inner moral or spiritual goodness or beauty, so too physical ugliness is believed to symbolize an inner evil." Meantime, human self shows a set of doubts and inconsistencies against both the ugly and the beautiful. For example, both *Hamlet* and *Macbeth* praise ugliness in nature objects like mountains, wilderness, and stormy oceans. In this view, Shakespeare uses ugliness as a source of inspiration and artistry by presenting malformed characters. In other words, Shakespeare depicts tragic ugliness as a blemish to mock human internal dark side that needs the existence of its binary opposite: beauty. Obviously, "Beauty and ugliness are evaluated linguistically therefore, not only as physical opposites but as moral opposites" (Mohan 2020).

Dramatic discourses re-establish the modern aesthetic standards that view ugliness and beauty as a binary opposite with certain thematic and aesthetic values. In this concern, tragedy is manifested by the beautiful death of the tragic character, generating a tragic sense and a lack of harmony between the ideal that the character aspires to achieve and the social and cultural milieu. Huhn affirms that ugliness is the antithesis of beauty and the ugly object turns into "an aesthetic taboo" which disapproves beauty (1988, p. 6). This tragic sense arouses feelings of sorrow and frustration that, however, result in a considerable value incarnate in tragic significant ugly images. For instance, in *Hamlet*, the mad Ophelia endures Hamlet's cruelty and climbs into the willow tree, drops into the brook, and drowns. This event signifies an ugly action of suicide and proves her insanity as she

views "violence as beauty and justice" (Foucault, 2001, p. 23). In addition, Ophelia tells Hamlet, "Could beauty have better commerce than with honesty?" and Hamlet replies that beauty weakens honesty (*Hamlet* 3.1. p. 110). Also, in *Othello*, Othello perceives that his murdered wife, Desdemona, is not guilty of disloyalty and stabs him with a dagger. Here, Ana Maria Rocha comments that Shakespeare introduces "an ugly Othello," who is haunted by massive wrath and jealousy and murders his wife (2013, p. 70).

The dramatic bad character in the plays of mysteries has a mask that presupposes human ugliness. Here, ugliness suggests provocative illusions that cultivate man's experiences of repugnant attitudes. In this manner, the carnal qualities of ugliness make the devil grow in the hybrid physical mask that fuses the human and the animal and reflects the ugly side of the former. To exemplify, in *King Lear*, the hybrid persona is evoked when King Lear exposes Goneril's behavior in terms of animal codes, "Thy sister's naught. O, Regan, she hath tied / Sharp-toothed unkindness, like a vulture, here." (2.4. p. 113–14). These ugly animalistic codes refer to an ugly quality of man's behavior and signify a hideous feeling of prejudice. Further, emergent ugliness is manifested in the characters who perpetrate unsightly crimes and bloody violence. For instance, Shakespeare shows his unique characters dramatically through phantoms, witches, storms, revenge, and conspiracies.

Analogously, *Julius Caesar* offers another case of ugliness manifested in blood and violence. This is obvious in Brutus's ugliest utterances to the conspirators,

And let us bathe our hands in Caesar's blood
Up to the elbows, and besmear our swords;
...
Let's all cry, "Peace, freedom, and liberty!" (3.1. p. 118–22)

Here, it is the ugliest time that Brutus invidiously incarnates, and Shakespeare exposes human gloomily ugly part that is never beautiful. Also, Eco argues that the incarnations of ugliness comprise "a lack of equilibrium in the organic relationship between the parts of the whole" (2007, p. 19). This idea matches the philosophy of laughter in drama with the human and social, affirming the farcical character of low consistency and ugly vanity. Here, ugliness is a drive to induce feelings of ugliness that culturally cannot defeat beauty. Besides, Shakespeare exposes the mythicized ugliness of some characters with deformed physical semblances.

Additionally, Shakespeare introduces physical and moral ugliness of certain misbehaving characters to create an

unfamiliar portrait of his artistic invention. In *Richard III*, the mad Richard indifferently perpetrates ugly crimes of murdering parents, women, and children; he seduces the widows. Meantime, Richard confesses executing ugly crimes,

Nay, do not pause; for I did kill King Henry,
But 'twas thy beauty that provoked me.
Nay, now dispatch; 'twas I that stabb'd young Edward.
(1.2. p. 183–85)

Richard's insanity, as a sign of ugliness, exposes a secret of "animality which is its own truth, and in which, in some way, it is reabsorbed" (Foucault, 2001, p. 71). Also, Richard's ugly behaviors create panic and aversion of others and are severely rebuked in the play. For instance, Richard disappointedly describes himself as

... a wither'd shrub;
To make an envious mountain on my back,
Where sits deformity to mock my body;
To shape my legs of an unequal size (3.2. p. 147–50)

Here, Richard's overdone ugliness arises from his deformed figure that adjoins mental and moral ugliness. Thence, ugliness, fused with moral ailment, embodies features of abnormality that prevailed during Renaissance (Baker, 2010, p. 11). Richard offers himself as a malformed villain, "And descant on mine own deformity ... I am determined to prove a villain" (1.1. p. 26–30). Such words prove a connection between Richard's bodily abnormality, ugliness, and vicious mood. In this sense, Nick Zangwill (2014) proclaims that the qualities of beauty and ugliness depend on "non-aesthetic properties" for beauty and ugliness are innate qualities of the human world and arts. Thus, Richard's excuses for his execrable behavior parallel his fixed despondency out of his imperfection and insanity. Nevertheless, Richard's rhetorical words are unquestionable and relieve his ugliness.

Briefly, Shakespeare's plays integrate legendary ugly codes by evoking horrifying images that denote his characters' corruption and avarice. Meantime, the conventional comic characters are liars, slanderers, queers, and wantons and embody immoralities and moral ugliness. In this respect, Shiyong pinpoints that "sarcastic comedy often makes originally humble and insignificant forms -manifested in ugliness- appear as lofty and serious faces" (2013, p. 4). True, in plays, watchers laugh as a mechanism of disrespecting the ugly. For example, Caliban, in *The Tempest*, epitomizes absurdity in his flagrant ugliness, inhumanity, and moral blindness implied by Prospero's words,

A devil, a born devil, ...
 Humanely taken, all, all lost, quite lost;
 And as with age his body uglier grows,
 So his mind cankers. (4.1. p. 188–92)

Also, Prospero characterizes Caliban as “disproportioned in his manners/As in his shape. (5.1. p. 290–91). Contextually, Prospero affirms that Caliban is thoroughly ugly “reflecting cultural anxieties, fears, and fascinations” (Przybylo, 2010). Clearly, the notion of ugliness is thematically embodied in the so-called inferior human beings.

Artistically, Shakespeare introduces burlesque characters with ugly manifestations of deformity and physical distortion, deepening the cynical aspects of his plays. In *Othello*, Othello’s beauty engenders from his rhetorical discourse that subverts his ugliness manifested by his blackness and deformity. Rocha maintains that the Negroes are “black, ugly, cruel, evil, pagan ... and barely human” (2013, p. 57). This view is incarnated in Othello’s character that The Duke depicts as “noble signior, if virtue no delighted beauty lack, your son-in-law is far more fair than black” (1.3. p. 328–331). Here, despite the negative implication, the word black denotes a positive reflection in which the Duke refers to Othello as an exception to duality of blackness and ugliness. In addition, Othello has a beautiful spirit embodied in his goodness, and “goodness and beauty cannot be incompatible” or distanced (Mohan 2020). Similarly, *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* introduces Bottom and his partners as caricatures of amateur players to carry out the roles of women. In a word, Bottom is as ugly as “an ass-head,” presented as a monstrous ugly character (3.1. p. 116). Consequently, ugliness is burlesque results in caricatures with unfamiliar physical and attitudinal features.

Furthermore, black tragicomedy, ugly in nature, is a fair manifestation of the quality of ugliness with its unique themes of death, violence, crime, insanity, and racism. Such black tragicomedies satirize human ugliness; they humorously expose such ugly realities to diagnose human shortcomings and disadvantages. Shakespeare’s artistic representation employs irony, sarcasm, and parody to depict the status quo of humanity and foreshadow its future. For example, the deformed absurd characteristics in *King Lear* advocate the ugly disarray in the king’s ailed psyche. One of the comical ugly traits is the Fool’s humor in a set of positions in the play. For instance, Gloucester imagines that the Fool jumps off the cliff at Dover and utters, “Methinks the ground is even” (4.6. p. 3), and then Edgar adds, “Horrible steep” (4.6. p. 4). Here, Edgar renders a morally ugly and mimic mural. Moreover, in the assumed courtroom, Lear absurdly pursues his daughters and ridicules them, referring to them as “The little dogs

and all...see, they bark at me,” (4.6. p. 62–63). This tragic scene implies Lear’s impaired mental health and bestows a sarcastic tone on the play. Eventually, Cordelia’s death signifies an ugly and contemptible game of fatalism and absurdity. Also, this scene presents features of an ugly comical play in which Cordelia, despite her devotion and goodness, dies in an humiliating way. This event embodies a metaphor for human ugliness of torture, offense, and moral and physical injustices.

To epitomize, presenting the ugly and the beautiful is a part of dramatic conceptual techniques, by which readers may recognize the dramatic special features that qualify the realistic and imaginative constituents of both the beautiful and the ugly. In this regard, Zangwill (2014) asserts that once the “beauty is a generic aesthetic value, then, sublimity can be understood as a kind of beauty” which implies that sublimity in arts is an original aesthetic concept. As a result, the features of ugliness address the tragic, the farcical, and the tragicomic; they might transform into aesthetic qualities that embody the skillful dramatic manifestation of costumes and harmonious audio-visual effects. For example, in *Macbeth*, the dialogue between Macbeth and Banquo depicts the witches as aged, feeble, and ugly; they are exceptions. Their dramatic value emerges from their prophecy and its influence on Macbeth based on his ugly crimes. In a sense, human ugliness and beauty are rated in the light of height, complexion, appearance, deformities, and diseases. All such elements impact the dramatic character and affect its psyche and engender its internal and external conflicts. To this end, Eco asserts that ugliness is dulcet and congenial in arts that depict “the ugliness of ugliness” in a comely way (2007, p. 133). Thus, the tragic conflict takes place between the ugly and the beautiful based on the aesthetic standards.

Conclusion

In Shakespeare’s plays, ugliness is an aesthetic quality that has a significant role in triggering readers’ aesthetic flavor based on their skills of appreciation and predilections. This view emphasizes the significant binaries of the ugly and the beautiful in their modern sense. The aesthetic moment of suspense in plays results from the significant semantic unfamiliarity of ugliness and its conflict with the familiarity of the beautiful. In addition, ugliness has a bifunctional role; it is tension-inducing and influential. Meantime, the quality of ugliness can artistically be evoked as a critical norm based on the theoretical concepts of criticism to elucidate these qualities in semantically and syntactically. Furthermore, deciding on the aesthetic aspects of ugliness in plays may determine the textual extent of creativity and

judge the possible metamorphosed and emergent aesthetic qualities and values. This depiction may attain aesthetic consistency and semantic effects. Dramatic texts present aesthetic values manifested in the binary oppositions of the beautiful and the ugly that control the dramatic discourse. Ostensibly, the didactic and attitudinal contexts shape the structures of the aesthetic qualities of physical and verbal ugliness in plays.

The human beauty of soul, mind and conscience is the most influential. For example, the beauty of expression is the highest euphemistic type of arts and controls man's practices in speech, style, and behavior. Consistently, man should achieve gravity in his or her aesthetic expressions. Human life is integrated with passions of love, goodness, lofty morals, and beauty of speech. These qualities of the aesthetic beauty are fused with human truth, in which there is no beauty in lies and turpitude. Additionally, beauty is a means to sustain truth, for moral beauty and euphemism are sustained explicitly and implicitly. Analogously, beauty is a comrade of truth and righteousness; rhetoric is ultimately integrated with beauty. So, when a character feels ugly, his psyche becomes somber, and he might turn into a deviant and apprehend the things of life ugly. Therefore, true beauty is the beauty of human soul and spirit manifested in tolerance, forgiveness, love, and purity.

Competing Interest Statement

The author has read and approved the manuscript and takes full responsibility for its contents. No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank the reviewers and editors of this manuscript.

Biographical Statements of Author(s)

Abdullah H. Kurraz is currently an associate professor of Modern criticism at the department of English Language and Literature, Al-Azhar University, Gaza.

He is an editor, proofreader, and reviewer in a number of journals in Gaza and the Arab World.



References

- Baker, Naomi (2010). *Plain Ugly: The Unattractive Body in Early Modern Culture*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Eco, Umberto (Ed.) (2007). *On Ugliness*. Translated by Alastair McEwen. London: Harvill Secker.
- Foucault, Michael (2001). *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason*. London: Routledge.
- Huhn, Thomas (1988). "Diligence and Industry: Adorno and the Ugly." *Canadian Journal of Political and Social Theory*. 12(3), pp. 1–9.
- Hylton, Jeremy (1993). The Complete Works of William Shakespeare. Available from <http://shakespeare.mit.edu>. [accessed 20 Sep. 2020]
- Kant, Immanuel (2008). *The Critique of Judgment*. Trans J.H. Bernard. New York: Dover Publications.
- Mohan, Mansi (2020). "The Beauty Mystique." September 23, 2020. Available from <https://discordiummagazine.com/?p=695>. [accessed 25 Sep. 2020]
- Przybylo, Ella (2010). "The Politics of Ugliness." eSharp. Available from https://www.gla.ac.uk/media/Media_180322_smxx.pdf. [accessed 20 August 2020]
- Rocha, Ana M (2013). "Madness in Shakespeare's Major Tragedies: A Tentative Analysis towards Laingian Interpretation." Master's Thesis, Federal University of Santa Catharina. Brazil. 13 Nov. 2013. Available from <https://repositorio.ufsc.br/handle/123456789/106138>. [accessed 5 August 2020]
- Rosenkranz, Karl (2015). *Aesthetics of Ugliness: A Critical Edition*. Translated by Andrei Pop. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Shiyang, Zhang (2013). "Converting Ugliness into Beauty ---a Way to the Realm of Freedom." *International Open Journal of Philosophy*. 1(1), pp. 1–8.
- Stace, Walter T. (1997). *The meaning of Beauty, Theory of Aesthetics*. London: Kessinger Publishing.
- Zangwill, Nick (2014). "Aesthetic Judgment." *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Available from <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/aesthetic-judgment/>. [accessed 25 Sep. 2020].
- His research focus is on modern literary texts and authors of different genres and theories. He also supervises MA students, majoring in English and acts as their advisor.
- Dr. Abdullah Hussein Kurraz**
Department of English Language and Literature
Al-Azhar University
Gaza, Palestine.
- E-mail:** abdhk99@yahoo.com
Mobile: +972 599405424.

