『영어영문학연구』 제47권 제3호
(2021) 가을 39－54

Studies in English Language & Literature
http://dx.doi.org/10.21559/aellk.2021.47.3.003

A Choleric Lear : Humoralism and Malleable Identity in *King Lear**[1]

Eonjoo Park
(Jeonbuk National University)

Park, Eonjoo. "A Choleric Lear: Humoralism and Malleable Identity in *King Lear*." *Studies in English Language & Literature* 47.3 (2021): 39-54. This article examines the character of Lear with the early modern medical scheme of Galenic humoralism. I argue that the dual emphasis on health and temperament in humoral theory allows us insight into Lear's rashness, wrath, and madness not only as illness but also as different phases of his choleric identity. Humoralism also posits physical connections between the body and nature, which enable a malleable concept of identity. This belief helps us to understand how Lear's identity is constantly formed and reformed in response to his immediate environment and social conditions. The tempest scenes, then, not only metaphorically represent Lear's inner turmoil, but literally stage Lear's recognition and acceptance of the state of flux that defines his choleric identity. (Jeonbuk National University)

Key Words: humoralism, identity, *King Lear*, early modern medicine, choler

I. Introduction

A medical approach to the character of Lear has strived to diagnose his physical

* This paper was supported by research funds for newly appointed professors of Jeonbuk National University in 2020.

[1] Unless otherwise stated, this article will refer to the First Quarto (Q1), *The History of King Lear*, which was published in 1608.

and mental conditions. Alexander M. Truskinovsky notes that medical literature has understood Lear's illness as "senile dementia, mania, delirium, brief reactive psychosis, involutional melancholia" (343). He adds another diagnosis, bipolar I disorder, through which he makes sense of Lear's symptoms such as his irrational decision-making, sudden changes of mood, grandiloquent cursing, short attention span, and hallucinations (348-50). While the discussion in medically influenced criticism employs modern clinical criteria, this paper calls forth the early modern medical framework of Galenic humoralism to analyze the character of Lear. The early modern medical discourse of humoralism captures the historically specific understanding that psychology is an entirely embodied process. The strength of humoralism, then, lies in its facility with pre-Cartesian concepts of personality, emotion, and psychology that do not rely upon the mind-body dualism as with modern medical approaches. Humoralism also has the potentiality to examine a character's changing identity formation. While previous medical studies engaged in diagnosing Lear's condition, this article argues that early modern Galenic humoralism enables us to read Lear's state not in terms of abnormality but in terms of a specific phase of identity change. The interconnections between embodiment and identity further gesture toward an increasing interest in neuroscience in literary studies, specifically, the mental and physical connections mediated by hormonal or chemical change sometimes aided by medication. These issues parallel the questions of early modern humoralism, in which bodily change and psychology are intertwined.

Galenic humoralism gained renewed attention in the early modern period through the humanistic revival of the ancient Greek tradition. The word 'humor' refers to "liquid or fluid" in Latin, and humoral theory associates one's health and disposition with the circulation of the four bodily fluids: black bile, phlegm, blood, and yellow bile (Bhikha and Glynn 15030). While a healthy and sound body was believed to stem from the balance of these four humors, their imbalance was thought to deteriorate one's physical as well as mental stability (Marie & Roos 375; Jackson 487). The humoral liquids were further believed to contribute to determining one's

personality and physical make-up, and such a view provides us with a ground for connecting medical knowledge to the formation of identity. Indeed, by ascribing the origins of the four temperaments—melancholy, phlegmatic, sanguine, and choleric—to an abundance of one of these four humors, the Elizabethans tried to understand how one's distinctive identity is established, reinforced, and even transformed by the works of the humors.

Early modern medicine based on humoral theory tends to blur the division between normalcy and abnormalcy. In *The Passions of the Minde in Generall* (1620), the English Jesuit Thomas Wright states, "why some men are always, almost merry; others, for the most part, melancholy; others, euer angry: this diuersitie must come from the natural constitution of the body, wherein, one or other humour doth predominate" (65). The excessiveness of a particular humor is not just a sign of unhealthiness but physiologically conditions dispositions and personality. According to the humoral scheme, Lear's temperament can be defined as choleric due to a dominance of yellow bile. His proneness to anger and rashness demonstrates both his distinctive personality and physical condition that may develop into disease. In other words, Lear's body is a choleric entity, in which both normality and abnormality reside as his humoral body embraces not only his original disposition but also a seed of disease. Humoralism, thus, allows us to depart from the medical attempts to interrogate Lear's abnormal states and speculate on what illness he suffers from. Rather, the humoral model suggests a more comprehensive ground, through which we can observe how Lear's biological state constantly communicates with various natural as well as social elements.

II. Humoral Selfhood

Lear is presented as a choleric character type throughout the play. According to humoralism, an excessive amount of yellow bile leads one to be choleric, or more

"energetic and quickly prone to anger" (Marie & Roos 375). In *The Humors & Shakespeare's Characters*, John W. Draper notes that the choleric type is distinctively associated with "active and dynamic" characteristics (44). Indeed, despite his "four-score and upward" age, Lear maintains a strong physical condition (Scene 21, Line 59). Herbert S. Donow has categorized Lear as an anomalous ager because of "his exceptional stamina" (735). During a stay at Gonoril's castle, Lear enjoys hunting and dominates his daughter's household. Even when he is shocked and mentally weakened by the ingratitude of Gonoril and Regan, Lear appears to be exceptionally agile and vigorous as he endures the wild storm on the heath and even murders Cordelia's hangman (Truskinovsky 351; Donow 736).

In the opening scene, several characters verbally attest to Lear's choleric temperament. After Lear's whimsical love test, which results in the banishment of Cordelia and Kent, Gonoril and Regan try to grasp the chaotic results from their father's choleric temperament. Gonoril tells us, "The best and soundest of his time hath been but rash; then must we look to receive from his age not along the imperfection of long-engrafted condition, but therewithal unruly waywardness that infirm and choleric years bring with them" (Scene 1, Lines 280-83). From her statement, we can picture how Lear was "rash" in his prime, and how his choleric disposition worsened with age. Lear's temperament is an enduring, or as Gonoril puts it, a "long-engrafted" trait that both constitutes and preserves his core identity. Yet this disposition can also fluctuate when affected by old age and infirmity. If Gonoril and Regan criticize Lear's temperament behind his back, the loyal servant, Kent, openly admonishes his king: "in thy best consideration check / This hideous rashness" (Scene 1, Lines 139-40). Similar to Gonoril, Kent acknowledges the king's rash temperament as the source of his irrational decision to disown Cordelia. He also believes that rashness can be moderated, and thus the king's reckless decision can be reverted.

As we can see from Kent's admonition, it was believed that the overgrowth of a certain humoral disposition should be properly managed. This idea indicates how the

circulation of humoral liquids not only determines one's personality but also is held to be responsible for both maintaining and disrupting health. An overlap between temperament and disease can also be found in Kent's metaphoric assertion toward the unrelenting Lear: "kill thy physician, / And the fee bestow upon the foul disease" (Scene 1, Lines 150-51). Kent initially asks Lear to exert his controlling power to keep his anger at bay. By denying Kent's recommendation, however, Lear ends up surrendering himself to his choleric identity that is further developed into "the foul disease". Kent here figuratively associates his own endeavor to persuade Lear to revoke his rash decision with medical treatment. Lear's stubbornness, then, is likened to be the dismissal of the physician and the waste of the medical fee. Despite being metaphoric, Kent's claim allows us to see how the division between temperament and illness was flimsy in the Elizabethan medical understanding.

While the framework of humoralism helps us to grasp the intricate relationship between health and natural disposition in the early modern period, Gonoril's and Kent's quotes from above further push us to think about what exactly this humoral understanding does to the formation of identity. If Gonoril's comment hints at how Lear's disposition can be both long-standing and alterable, Kent's assertion similarly shows how Lear's natural choler can be not only worsened but also alleviated. Indeed, *King Lear* brings in the humoral scheme and invites us to see how the notion of individuality and personhood is both fixed and adjustable, both biologically hard-wired and socially fluctuating, as well as both universal across humoral bodies and particular within the world that they belong. This malleable concept of subjectivity in humoral theory is crucial in tracing the constant mutation of Lear's identity.

Early modern belief in the humoral system represents a crucial ontological turn that enables this constant renegotiation of identity. In *Humoring the Body*, Gail Kern Paster has termed this historical ontological understanding as "psychophysiology" (12). As a pre-Cartesian concept, psychophysiology does not rest upon the mind-body dualism in a way that modern diagnoses do. It pushes forward the

understanding of psychology as embodied and material. Thus, the humoral body itself contains actively circulated humoral liquids and determines one's predispositions, emotional states, psychology, and identity. In this framework, the distinction between humor and passion, or between humor and disposition becomes nebulous. As Wright notes, "Passions ingender Humors, and Humors bred Passions" (64). Charles Taylor also writes that "black bile doesn't just cause melancholy; melancholy somehow resides in it. The substance embodies this significance" (qtd. in Paster 5). In a similar vein, Nancy G. Siraisi provides a psychophysiological reading of the relationship between the humors and natural temperament, which was commonly called as complexion in the early modern era: "the humors were in a special way the vehicle of complexion. Like all bodily parts, they were themselves complexionate. But in addition, the four humors collectively were the means whereby an individual's overall complexional balance was maintained or altered" (106). Siraisi affirms the materialist sense of early modern humoralism by claiming that one's character traits are decided completely by works of humoral liquids rather than spiritual functioning or rational cognition. More importantly, by using the adjective form of complexion, "complexionate," Siraisi implies that a particular humor itself can be analogous to a certain temperament. Reminiscent of Taylor's assertion, the statement that the humors are inherently complexionate signals that a messy and complicated exchange and identification, rather than a clear-cut cause-and-effect, can better describe the relationship between the humors and complexions.

The focus on the body in humoralism helps us to see historical conceptions of biology and identity. However, early modern psychophysiology also presupposes reciprocal relations between humoral bodies and their immediate environment, which allows the social dimension of identity to be developed. While the four humors were material substances coursing through the body, it was also believed that their counterparts existed as forms of natural substances outside the human body. In *The Little World of Man*, one of the earliest attempts to theorize humoralism as a basis

for early modern psychology, J.B. Bamborough argues that "The concept of Man as Microcosm was… fundamental to Elizabethan psychology" (20). Indeed, in humoral theory, the four humors correspond, not metaphorically but literally, to four natural elements—earth, water, air, and fire. Earth is associated with black bile, water with phlegm, air with blood, and fire with yellow bile. Moreover, as these four elements of the world possess two of the four attributes—heat, cold, dryness, and moisture, the four humors are also believed to show the combination of these qualities. Similar to earth, black bile, which is related to the melancholic temperament, is cold and dry; phlegm is cold and moist like water; blood, which resembles the element of air, possesses hot and moist attributes; and yellow bile or choler shows both hot and dry qualities like fire.

The connections between the humors and the natural elements are rooted in the early modern belief that all areas of life and living entities share identical substances with either earth, water, air, or fire. In *The Optick Glasse of Humors* (1607), English vicar Thomas Walkington asserts that "all naturall bodies haue their composition of the mixture of the elemntes, fire, ayre, water, earth" (39). He expands this idea and argues that the four humors can also be found in the four planets, the four winds, the four seasons of the year, the twelve Zodiac signs, and the four ages of men (39-40). Rashid Bhikha and John Glynn elaborate that the four natural elements can explain "most areas of personal experience—the heavenly bodies, seasons of the year, climatic influences, daily time period, properties of food and drink, herbal medicines, tissues and organs in the body, physiological activity in the body, symptoms of disease, and any other objects and phenomena" (15030). The humor of yellow bile, therefore, shares hot and dry qualities not only with fire but also with the emotion of anger, the period of youth, and the season of summer. In this sense, the ubiquity in the concepts of the natural elements enable the humoral body to be porous and mutable or hard and stable depending on its immediate world and environment.

Gloucester's concern with the eclipses captures well how the natural elements can

be intimately related to human relations and society:

> These late eclipses in the sun and moon portend no good to us. Though the wisdom of nature can reason thus and thus, yet nature finds itself scourged by the sequent effects. Love cools, friendship falls off, brothers divide; in cities mutinies; in countries discord; in palaces treason; the bond cracked between son and father. (Scene 2, Lines 96-101)

The word choice of "portend" indicates foreboding that a strange weather can be an ominous sign. Gloucester's next line, however, points toward the idea that bad events in human society such as betrayal, treason, and ingratitude are not just anticipated by natural disaster, but rather are similar to the unusual natural event of the eclipse. The material characteristics between the eclipse and the destruction of human relations are literally the same, and this identification leads personified nature to realize that disturbing events in human society "punish, chastise," "torment" or "devastate" itself (*OED*, "scourge," v.2). In Kent's understanding, nature does not occupy a superior position to human society. The natural event, furthermore, does not necessarily cause or predict the human event. The two realms of natural and human worlds share the identical qualities and thus interconnect with each other without hierarchical orders.

Due to these physical correlations between the universe as macrocosm and human beings as microcosm, it is fundamental to consider "conditions of life and external circumstances" in fully understanding one's natural temperament and identity (Siraisi 102). While the Elizabethan bodies were universal in the sense that they were governed by the circulation of humoral fluids, their living conditions as well as social phases of lives particularized their bodies and identities. For Walkington, diet is one of the pivotal factors that can diversify humoral bodies. He claims, "Of all complections, the meane of wine is soueraigne for the Phlegmaticke, and helpes the Melancholicke; for the other two hoter, it little rather serues for inflamation then conseruation" (25-26). As both liquids of wine and the humor have their own

attributes, the contact between them can either reinforce or debilitate a certain temperament. The consumption of wine, thus, can affect one's conversion of mood and personality. Siraisi concludes that the Elizabethans recognized that the complexion was influenced and even drastically transformed by "the passage of time," "sex," and "geographical regions" (102).

III. The Formation and Alteration of Lear's Choleric Identity

How does the psychophysiological notion of humoralism help us to understand the development of Lear's identity from a rash and choleric ruler to a still passionate but introspective authority? It is vital to note that at the beginning of the play, Lear resists the possibility that his identity can change. Criticizing Lear's foolhardiness, Gonoril asks him to "put away / These dispositions that of late transform you / From what you rightly are" (Scene 4, Lines 199-201). The transformation that Gonoril points out is reminiscent of the "unruly waywardness that infirm and choleric years bring with them" in the opening scene. Lear's engagement with active sports such as hunting, his creation of noise and disturbance with his knights, and his abuse of Gonoril's servants contradict not only what Gonoril believes to be Lear's past self but also the socially acceptable image of old age replete with wisdom and moderation. Furthermore, a choleric temperament overlaps with youth and summer in humoralism, while Lear's age seems to fit better melancholy. Against Gonoril's request, Lear questions:

> Doth any here know me? Why, this is not Lear.
> Doth Lear walk thus, speak thus? Where are his eyes?
> Either his notion weakens, or his discernings
> Are lethargied. Sleeping or walking, ha?
> Sure, 'tis not so.
> Who is it that can tell me who I am? (Scene 4, Lines 204-09)

Lear's own perception of who he is concerns the image of powerful and energetic king. This image is far from the traits of melancholy but rather closer to his long-time disposition of choler. Draper has introduced two types of choleric character types: one Sun-governed and the other Mars-governed. If the former shows sanguine characteristics and positive attitudes as we can see from Juliet, Henry V, and Cassius, the latter is governed by typical images of choler—passionate, angry, and violent. Draper also states that a desire for authority is one of the key traits of the Mars-governed choler, and thus this type is "appropriate to soldiers and ambitious schemers" (45). While Draper only suggests Othello, Hotspur, and Macbeth as examples of a Mars-governed choleric personality, it is safe to add Lear to the list due to his vigorous actions as well as willingness to retain his monarchical power even after he divides his kingdom. What Lear strongly believes to be his true self—a powerful authorial figure, however, is shattered once he accepts his own aging and Gonoril's views. By repeatedly asking who he actually is, Lear strives not only to comprehend the conflicts that his multiple identities generate, but also to defend the identity that he has held as authentic.

Lear also attempts to assign an independent agency to passions so that what he perceives as the essence of his identity cannot be tainted by the invasion of passion into the body: "O, how this mother swells up toward my heart! / Histerica passio, down, thou climbing sorrow; / Thy element's below" (Scene 7, Lines 221-24). Humoral theory tends to conflate core identity and the balance or imbalance of the four bodily liquids. This also means that the passion originated from the imbalance of the four humors should be understood as part of one's humoral identity. Yet Lear resists this conflation by consciously treating passions as having a separate agency from his own identity. The personification of "Histerica passio" and "sorrow" allows him to view passions as unwelcomed guests that constantly try to intrude and alter his identity. A similar intention to separate the essence of one's identity from passion can be found when he comments on Cornwall's supposedly "unremovable and fixed" quality (Scene 7, Line 254): "Maybe he is not well. / Infirmity doth still

neglect all office / Whereto our health is bound. We are not ourselves / When nature, being oppressed, commands the mind / To suffer with the body" (Scene 7, Lines 262-66). If Gonoril assumes the influences of infirmity and aging as constitutive of a newly developed identity, Lear holds that such elements lead us to the point where "[w]e are not ourselves".

While Lear appears to deny Galenic humoralism, the storm brings about a fundamental change in his perception of identity formation. Alluding to the reciprocity between the body and nature, Lily B. Campbell argues that the storm is a conventional trope in the Renaissance period that reflects "the mind of the man, for the tempestuous winds enter into the spirits of the man who breathes the air thus tempest-tossed, and he too becomes mad" (199-200). Shigehisa Kuriyama also points out the ambiguity between the wind, air, spirits, and human breath in early modern culture: the wind entered the human body and then "sculpted the shape and possibilities of the body, molded desires and dispositions, infused a person's entire being" (235). The natural substances, then, literally and physically affect and determine the human's "fortune and misfortune, health and sickness" (Kuriyama 243). At first glance, Lear's choleric body, which is dominated by the hot and dry qualities, makes a cacophony with the cold and wet properties of storm. Yet, the first gentleman's observation demonstrates the process of assimilation between the humoral body and the natural substances as Lear "[s]trives in his little world of man to outstorm / The to-and-from-conflicting wind and rain" (Scene 8, Lines 9-10). Fighting against the tempest and storm is futile, but his attempt to "outstorm" these forces signifies that "his little world of man" is also filled with the same materials such as water, wind, thunder, and lighting so that his body can compete with and outdo the external storm. Thus, while Lear was preoccupied with blocking outer forces before the storm scene, he now willingly confronts and accepts the natural materials even despite the danger to his identity.

Without any further resistance, Lear now willingly summons and rely on the violent effects of nature's apocalyptic change:

Blow, wind, and crack your cheeks! Rage, blow,
You cataracts and hurricanoes, spout
Till you have drenched the steeples, drowned the cocks!
You sulphurous and thought-executing fires,
Vaunt-couriers to oak-cleaving thunderbolts,
Singe my white head; and thou all-shaking thunder,
Smite flate the thick rotundity of the world,
Crack nature's mould, all germens spill at once
That make ingrateful man. (Scene 9, Lines 1-9)

Behind Lear's decision to expose his infirm and old body to a raging storm lies his understanding that his desire to punish Gonoril and Regan can be actualized vicariously through cataclysm. In other words, the crux of calling forth natural disaster is Lear's acceptance of the assimilation between his core self and nature. As E. Catherine Dunn correctly points out, the storm scenes show how "Lear and the macrocosm are one; the storm in his heart and the clash of the elements are fused into one gigantic cataclysm. The terms of the storm metaphor are therefore interchangeable, and both Lear and the cosmos become simultaneously avenger and victim of ingratitude" (332). This reciprocity further shows that his identity is not set in stone and permanent, but constantly developing along with its immediate environment.

Before entering the hovel to avoid the harsh weather, Lear even corrects his previous attempt to separate what he perceives as his core self from any other external influences such as passion:

Thou think'st 'tis much that this contentious storm
Invades us to the skin. So 'tis to thee;
But where the greater malady is fixed,
The lesser is scarce felt…
When the mind's free,
The body's delicate. This tempest in my mind

Doth from my senses take all feeling else
Save what beats there: filial gratitude. (Scene 11, Lines 6-14)

He previously assigned independent agency to the passion of wrath in attempts to keep his identity intact. He now understands that what makes up his inner turmoil is analogous to the material substances of the storm and tempest. By accepting the new qualities of coldness and moisture, his choleric temperament, which has been composed with hot and dry attributes, also changes. The physical affinities between Lear's humoral body and the tempest not only allow his anger and shock to be externalized as a form of natural disaster, but also posit the storm to represent his wrath and despair. With the fusion of his wrath with the tempest, Lear lessens his own psychological burden and agony.

The acknowledgement of his inner tempest as part of his new identity further allows Lear to reassess his past identity as a king. For the first time, Lear admits and reassesses his ineffectual kingship, during which he did not pay attention to "Poor naked wretches" (Scene 11, Line 25): "O, I have ta'en / Too little care of this" (Scene 11, Lines 29-30). If the image of formidable monarch represented Lear's identity in his own perception before encountering the storm, he now gains the capacity to reread the past so that he can redefine his identity. Here we can find an ironic exchange between anger and sympathy. In *The Unrepentant Renaissance*, Richard Strier suggests this moment as an important early modern example that rebels against Stoic criticism of the destructive results of emotion: "the passion that animates Lear's rage at how he has been treated is also seen as enabling his newfound sympathy for all the victims of injustice" (51). Strier reads constructiveness in Lear's madness for a certain kind of wisdom, that is, humbling himself and paying attention to socially underprivileged groups. More fundamentally, this transformation is possible because Lear embraces the openness of his humoral body to external conditions and circumstances as well as the possibility that his porous humoral body can any time reconstruct his personality and identity.

IV. Conclusion

This article has traced Lear's identity change through the lens of Galenic humoralism. The early modern medical scheme of humoralism promotes a character analysis not in terms of diagnosing sickness but in terms of understanding how one's natural temperament is determined and transformed in relation to humoral fluids and the external environment. This approach allows us to understand how the early modern notion of individuality and identity is constructed not only through the humoral body but also through the immediate environment and social conditions that this body makes contact with. This further implies that the division between normalcy and abnormalcy or between health and illness is messier and can be understood as the process of identity change.

Concluding this article, I would like to point out a specific moment in the First Quarto that is slightly modified in the First Folio (1623) and what this modification tells us about the two editions' different approaches to the humoral understanding of Lear. In the scene where Lear is cared for by Cordelia, the Doctor announces that "The great rage… is cured in him, and yet it is danger / To make him even o'er the time he has lost" (First Quarto, Scene 21, 76-78). In the Folio version, however, the Doctor is replaced with the first gentleman who says "The great rage… is killed in him" (4.6.72-73). The word "cured" informs us that Lear regains his agency, which allows him to exercise governing and controlling power over his rebellious choleric temper. Moreover, the Doctor's next lines imply that his lost time, or the time when he confronted the storm and adopted a new identity, can function as a latent disruption that can creep into his current self. Yet this danger also signals that his current identity unconsciously recalls and incorporates his predicament in the storm, and that his identity is still open to change by new stimulus or old memory. The word "killed" in the First Folio, however, gives a stronger sense of getting rid of insanity, which was a hostile intruder to his identity. The omission of the lines that warn about the danger of remembering his lost time further tells us that the

edited version is less concerned with the malleable nature of identity.

Works Cited

Bamborough, J. B. *The Little World of Man*. London: Longmans, 1952. Print.

Bhikha Rashid, and John Glynn. "The Theory of Humous Revisited." *IJDR* (*International Journal of Development Research*) 7.9 (2017 Sep): 15029-34. Print.

Campbell, Lily Bess. *Shakespeare's Tragic Heroes: Slaves of Passion*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1930. Print.

Donow, Herbert S. "'To Everything There is a Season': Some Shakespearean Models of Normal and Anomalous Aging." *Gerontologist* 32.6 (1992 Dec): 733-38. Print.

Draper, John W. *The Humors & Shakespeare's Characters*. Durham: Duke UP. 1945. Print.

Dunn, E. Catherine. "The Storm in King Lear." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 3.4 (1952 Oct): 329-33. Print.

Jackson, William A. "A Short Guide to Humoral Medicine." *TRENDS in Pharmacological Sciences* 22.9 (2001 Sep): 487-89. Print.

Kuriyama, Shigehisa. *The Expressiveness of the Body and the Divergence of Greek and Chinese Medicine*. New York: Zone Books, 1999. Print.

Marie, Anna and Eleanor Roos. "Biomedicine and Health: Galen and Humoral Theory." *Scientific Thought: In Context.* Ed. K. Lee Lerner and Brenda Wilmoth Lerner, Farmington Hills: Gale, 2009. Print.

Paster, Gail Kern. *Humoring the Body: Emotions and the Shakespearean Stage.* Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2004. Print.

"scourge, v." *OED Online*. Oxford UP, June 2021. www.oed.com/view/Entry/173206. Accessed 3 July 2021. Web.

Shakespeare, William. *King Lear*. *The Norton Shakespeare.* Ed. Stephen Greenblatt, Walter Cohen, Jean E. Howard, and Katharine Eisaman Maus. New York: Norton, 2008. Print.

Siraisi, Nancy G. *Medieval & Early Renaissance Medicine: An Introduction to Knowledge and Practice*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1990. Print.

Strier, Richard. *The Unrepentant Renaissance: From Petrarch to Shakespeare to Milton*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2011. Print.

Truskinovsky, Alexander M. "Literary Psychiatric Observation and Diagnosis Through the Ages: King Lear Revisited." *Southern Medical Journal* 95.3 (2002 Mar): 343-52. Print.

Walkington, Thomas. *The Optick Glasse of Hvmors, or The touchstone of a golden temerature, or the Philosophers Stone to make a golden temper*. London, 1607. *Early English Books Online*. Accessed 1 July 2021. Web.

Wright, Thomas. *The Passions of the Minde in Generall*. Ed. William Webster Newbold. New York: Garland Publishing, 1986. Print.

Park, Eonjoo (Jeonbuk National University/Assistant Professor)

Address: Jeonbuk National University, 567, Baekje-daero, Deokjin-gu, Jeonju-si, Jeollabuk-do, 54896, Korea

Email: eonjoop@jbnu.ac.kr

Received: June 30, 2021 / Revised: August 4, 2021 / Accepted: August 11, 2021