

## Filial Evil in Shakespeare's King Lear

Lectr. Kamal Walee

Lectr. Asmaa Mukaram

College of Education and Humanistic Sciences (Ibn-Rushd)

University of Baghdad

### المستخلص

أن احد المقومات الاساسية للمسرحية هو اعطاء صورة عن الحياة والتجربة الانسانية التي لايمكن ان نتفحصها بعيدا عن العلاقات الانسانية بكل ما تتضمنه من عناصر الخير والشر. يدور هذا البحث بشكل رئيس حول العلاقات الاجتماعية بين افراد العائلة الواحدة، لاسيما تلك العلاقات التي نشهدها بين الابن والبنت من طرف والاب من الطرف الآخر، وهي مايسمى بالعلاقات الابنوية. ويسلط البحث الضوء على كيفية تعامل الابناء مع آباءهم في مسرحية أملك لير لوليم شكسبير، ويبين البحث ان هنالك نوعان من الابناء، أولئك الابناء المخلصون وأولئك الابناء العاقون، وهذا الامر يوضح دراية شكسبير التامة بالطبيعة الانسانية التي تبين ان كل من عناصر الخير والشر متجذرة في جسم الانسان والتي من الممكن توجيهها نحو الطريق الصحيح او الخاطيء من قبل الابناء الذين يتعاملون مع آباءهم.

الكلمات المفتاحية: المسرح الانكليزي، شكسبير، الدراسات الثيمية

### Abstract

It is one of the essential ingredients that drama portrays human life and experience, which cannot be looked at apart from human relationships with all their good and nefarious elements. This research paper mainly revolves around the social relationships among family members, especially the son-daughter-father ones—filial relationships. It sheds light on how children treat their fathers in William Shakespeare's tragedy *King Lear*, and shows there are two kinds of children, those who are faithful and those who are not. This illustrates that Shakespeare is quite aware of human nature which shows that both evil and goodness are inherent in the body of

man which can be got headed in the right or wrong directions by children when treating their fathers.

**Keywords:** English Drama, Shakespeare, Thematic Studies

Societies in all ages endeavour to castigate whatsoever is considered bad and harmful to human life, and at the same time they support and advocate whatsoever is regarded as being good and beneficial to human life, from the moral point of view. In this respect, it must be mentioned that there is an everlasting struggle between what is considered to be bad and what is considered to be good. Human societies have inherited that abhorred struggle between Abel and Cane who once represented good and evil respectively. Thus, the struggle is said to have been very old, and at the same time it is regarded as part and parcel of human life and experience.

Since drama is mainly concerned with human life and experience, which shows many and various conflicts that can by no means be overlooked by all dramatists whose main concern is to present a realistic representation of human life. Therefore, dramatists always concern themselves to create good and bad characters that conflict with one another, so that complications figure out in their drama and lead to the solution that may be suggested by the dramatist according to what kind of ending the dramatist wants to portray. This kind of conflict is found in Shakespeare's dramas which may appear to be either an external one—a physical conflict between the protagonist and his/her

enemies, or an inner conflict that occurs within the mind of the character. The latter is definitely related to the psychological behaviour of a character, which requires profound knowledge about the human psych on the part of the dramatist who may approach realistic aspects of human experience.

Medieval morality plays have widely represented the struggle between good and evil as part of the moral lesson to be inferred from that struggle between them both. It is worth mentioning that the vicious characters that figure in Shakespeare's plays are the descendants of the vicious ones projected in medieval morality plays. Many examples from Shakespeare's plays may be mentioned in this respect. For instance, the vicious character of Iago in *Othello*, who has destroyed Othello, and the vicious character of Shylock in *The Merchant of Venice*, who tries to destroy one of the prominent characters in the play, Antonio, can be considered the epitome of those vicious characters, the Vices, projected in medieval morality plays. Besides, Lady Macbeth and Macbeth can be taken as good examples of the vicious characters and of the inner conflict within their minds, which is called in Latin *psychomachia*. Both Macbeth and Lady Macbeth have suffered from an inner conflict, after killing their relative King Duncan, which in the final result of the play contributes to their downfall as tragic hero and heroine. Moreover, it may be of certain significance that the character of Iago in *Othello* can be considered the incarnation of an evil spirit trying to destroy the protagonist, using many intrigues and foul methods in

this regard. Though Macbeth, his wife and Iago have managed to fulfill their ambitions and aspirations, they are finally to pay a very expensive price for their wicked deeds, metaphorically speaking. If one makes a comparison between a Medieval morality-play character and Shakespeare's, one is absolutely to conclude that the former should assume a typical character—that is to say, a character that possesses the same qualities right from the beginning of the play up to its end, and the latter assumes the kind of character that is both a type and an individual, the kind of character that has got individualistic qualities besides its typicality.

The representation of evil characters in Shakespeare's plays can be considered an endeavour to represent life as it is really lived by real people, for evil characters and evil practices are regarded as being realistic aspects of actual life. That is to say, good and evil are two contrastive features of real life that go side by side. Briefly speaking, life comprises both good and bad people. As far as evil is concerned, it must be noted that it figures out in Shakespeare's plays as it does in actual life as a force that is either inherent in or acquired by the human character by means of powers outside the domain of human capacities. Thus, the powers of evil pervade all Shakespeare's tragedies, whose degree varies from one tragedy to another according to the dramatic effect and atmosphere which the dramatist wants to approach. According to Kenneth Muir, for instance, both the Duke in *Measure for Measure* and King Lear neglect their duties and lead the action of the dramas to its ending.

Thus, the negligence of the Duke "may be compared with Lear's abdication from responsibility; the debate on justice and authority which runs all through *Measure for Measure* reappears in the mad scenes of *King Lear*."<sup>1</sup>

There is one point which may point to Shakespeare's pessimistic point of view concerning human life and human nature in *King Lear* which may be called the theme of filial ingratitude. It must be pointed out that Shakespeare cannot be considered wholly pessimistic, for in most of his plays the good is represented to be victorious over the evil, and thus in most of his plays poetic justice is achieved by many ways. Nevertheless, pessimism should not always be attributed to evil powers which the dramatist wants to represent, for evil is supposed to be a human trait like any other traits associated with human nature, and at the same time, as it is always found in actual life, good and evil go side by side, and they are regarded as signs of reality. R. B. Heilman gives his opinion in this respect and says that one cannot realize pessimism when one sees that good is harmed by evil:

Pessimism does not consist in seeing evil injure good...it is rather the inability to see good, or to discover total depravity, but no grace. It is not pessimism but realism to recognize that without Edmunds there could be no Cordelias. <sup>2</sup>

Furthermore, it must be noted that Kent and Edgar have shown their faithfulness to their masters, not to mention Cordelia's good heart and kind treatment to her father, and at the same time one should not forget the self-composure of Edgar when disguised as a Bedlam-beggar and when he has helped his father. It must be added that the servants of Cornwall appear to be very faithful to their master, and therefore it must be concluded that the entire situation in *King Lear* cannot wholly be regarded as being pessimistic. In the play, the pursuit for power is followed up by illegal ways and evil deeds, and one can realize that the powers of evil destroy themselves by the same means employed by them to destroy goodness. As shown in the play, the power of evil leads the evil characters to their own doom. Kenneth Muir comments on the same situation, implying that evil destroys evil itself, for the three evil children in the play

are all destroyed by their superficially sane pursuit of self-interest. They all believe in looking after themselves; they all implicitly deny that we are members one of another; they all assume that man is a competitive rather than a co-operative animal.<sup>3</sup>

Both Goneril and Regan exhibit their evil traits and animal nature for they are just looking for their self-interest and animalistic desire in that they both show their love for the evil Edmund who appears in the play to be similar to the evil Iago in *Othello*.

However, Edmund at the end of the play shows some good qualities and this indicates a change in his personality and at the same time, it can be said that evil deeds can be conducive to repentance.

According to George Orwell, *King Lear* may be considered a play of renunciation, for Lear has renounced his power and wants everyone to obey him and "continue to treat him as King."<sup>4</sup> It does not come to Lear's mind that in case that he leaves power he will be in a very weak position, and at the same time other rivals may take advantage of this situation; that is to say, those people, especially his two daughters, Goneril and Regan who flatter him tremendously, are to turn against him. As Lear realizes that no one will fulfill his orders he becomes very enraged. Orwell recognizes that Lear in his madness and despair has gone through two kinds of mood which are regarded as a natural outcome to be expected from a king in his situation:

One is the mood of disgust in which Lear repents, as it were, for having been a king, and grasps for the first time the rottenness of formal justice and vulgar morality. The other is a mood of impotent fury in which he wreaks imaginary revenges upon those who have wronged him.<sup>5</sup>

Lear declares:

It were a delicate stratagem to shoe

A troop of horse with felt; I'll put't in proof;  
And when I have stol'n upon these son-in-laws,  
Then kill, kill, kill, kill, kill, kill! (6)  
(IV. vi. 185)

As to the moral lesson to be obtained from the behaviour of Lear, concerning his renunciation of power and his allowing other people to govern the state instead of him, it must be noted that if one makes himself powerless, one may let some people benefit from one's position, but not all people behave in the same manner, for it is indicated in the play that there are many characters who have sided with Lear and tried to help him, like Kent, the Fool, Edgar, and Cordelia. Orwell says that Shakespeare may try to assume that "to make yourself powerless is to invite an attack."<sup>7</sup> Orwell proceeds to say that it may happen in reality that a weaponless person may be prone to an attack by somebody, and this does not always happen, and as he puts it in the following excerpt:

If you throw away your weapons, some less scrupulous person will pick them up, if you turn the other cheek, you will get a harder blow on it than you got on the first one. This does not always happen, but it is to be expected, and you ought not to complain if it does happen. The second blow is, so to speak, part of the act of turning the other cheek.<sup>8</sup>

It is worthwhile that the character of the Fool points to the same moral when he declares "Don't relinquish power, don't give away your lands." Orwell proceeds to say that if one gives up one's power one should not expect that one will lead a happy life.<sup>9</sup>

The projection of good and evil in all Shakespeare's plays are always seen to be two contrastive powers conflicting with each other until the power of good is made triumphant over the other. These two powers enhance the action and contribute to both the theme of the play and its structure. The conflict in the play is represented to be of two kinds—physical among the warring camps, and inner within the mind of the characters, and as indicated in the following passage:

The conflict between good and evil is not only physically expressed between two conflicting characters, but it is also shown in the inner self of man; there is a moral conflict within the minds of some characters that have in the beginning committed certain evil practices, but then changed their minds and achieved some good steps towards the attainment of virtue.

<sup>10</sup>

Both the physical and inner conflicts, together with the subsequent complications and events, may lead the characters to undergo some changes in their own personalities. As indicated by Muir:

We see Lear and Gloucester painfully learning wisdom; we see Albany increase in moral stature as he frees himself from his infatuation; and we see Edgar change from a credulous fool to a brave and sanity champion.<sup>11</sup>

It must be noted that the tragedy of Lear has its beginning in the foolish misjudgment which he makes concerning the renunciation of his power and the distribution of his kingdom among his children that later on show to him filial ingratitude. The kind of fault which he has committed is considered, according to G. Wilson Knight, "is a fault of the mind, a mind unwarrantably, because selfishly, foolish."<sup>12</sup> Lear himself admits his foolishness as he gets nervous, saying:

....O Lear, Lear, Lear!  
Beat at this gate that let thy folly in,  
And thy dear judgement out

(I. iv. 270)

Thus Knight declares that the purgatory in the tragedy of *King Lear* is not one of the soul but of the mind or of madness, for Lear can by no means think that he will ever be wrong; that is to say, he thinks that all his actions and thoughts should be right and none can oppose him at any rate; but then he discovers the fault which he has committed and the false love his two evil daughters have shown to him, and thus the "theme of the play is embodied continually into a fantastic incongruity, which is implicit in the beginning—in the very

act of Lear's renunciation, retaining “‘the title and addition’ of King, yet giving over a king's authority to his children.”<sup>13</sup>

Lear is made gradually aware of the fact that he has committed a grave mistake which has driven him to madness. He has been tortured by that fact and his mind becomes chaotic and disharmonious which bears resemblance to the universe in which he figures out. This universal incongruity is hinted at by Gloucester's words:

Gloucester: These late eclipses in the sun  
and moon portend no good to us. Though  
the wisdom of nature can reason it thus and  
thus, yet nature finds itself scourg'd by the  
sequent effects. Love cools, friendship falls  
off, brothers divide; in the cities, munities;  
in countries, discord; in palaces, treason;  
and the bond crack'd 'twixt son and father.  
This villain of mine comes under the  
prediction, there's son against father. The  
King falls from bias of nature, there's father  
against child. We have seen the best of our  
time. Machinations, hollowness, treachery  
and all ruinous disorders follow us  
disquietly to our graves.

(I. ii.

100)

Lear seems to assume the central character whose death cannot be considered wholly tragic in so far as the audience does not sympathize with his character, which indicates that he is "mentally a

child; in passion a titan." <sup>14</sup> On the other hand, Edmund who is regarded as the most villainous character in the play dies tragically. As Goneril and Regan represent the Lear-theme of filial ingratitude, Edmund represents the Gloucester-theme of filial ingratitude as he has treated his father in a very bad manner. Nevertheless, he is given, according to Knight, a noble end because he shows some sort of kindness towards his enemy though too late when he gives his orders that Cordelia would be forgiven, which points to a change in his personal attitude. Both Goneril and Regan die because of their love and evil practices. Goneril dies by a knife, Regan by the poison of her sister Goneril:

And Edmund is the most villainous of all...Edmund is given a noble, an essentially tragic, end, and Goneril and Regan, too, meet their end with something of tragic fitness in pursuit of their evil desires. Regan dies by her sister's poison; Goneril with a knife. They die, at least, in the cause of love—love of Edmund. Compared with these deaths, the end of Cordelia is horrible, cruel, unnecessarily cruel—the final grotesque horror in the play. Her villainous sisters are already dead. Edmund is nearly dead, repentant. It is a matter of seconds—and rescue come too late. She is hanged by a common soldier.<sup>15</sup>

Shakespeare's presentation of round characters in the play—characters that undergo certain changes throughout the play—points to his quite awareness and understanding of human nature and human experience. The change in character is well expressed in many characters like Lear's and Gloucester's. Besides, When dying, Edmund expresses his wish that Cordelia and Lear would not be killed: "Shakespeare presents two contrasting views of nature—the traditional view...which assumes that nature is benignant, rational and divinely ordered; and the view of the rationalists that man is governed by appetite and self-interest." <sup>16</sup>

Lear is presented to be governed by the kind of passion that is destructive, which is manifested in his anger, rashness, and foolishness. To make matters worse, a sense of evil enters into his mind and determines that his kindest daughter should be deprived of his kindness and properties and that all his properties are to be bestowed upon his two other evil characters, Goneril and Regan. This may point to some moral and philosophical implications, for Lear at a moment of weakness appears to be unable to see the right course which he should follow as father and King simultaneously:

The moral and philosophical implications of exposing evil in this play show that at a moment of high pride and arrogance which culminates into a state of foolish behaviour, Lear fails to fully understand and comprehend the genuine and true

expressions of Cordelia, which have sprung from the heart. The moral significance to be obtained from this situation is that at these moments failure to comprehend a certain situation means failure to distinguish the right from the wrong, which leads Lear to commit a grave mistake which inevitably drives him to his tragic end.<sup>17</sup>

Thus, the kind of passion and the kind of anger Lear tries to show in particular situations, not to mention his rashness, are destructive and lead nowhere but to his inevitable end. He does not only appear the cause of his own destiny but also the destiny of his innocent daughter Cordelia. For evil powers manages to control his mind and makes him deprive the innocent Cordelia of her legal inheritance which has been instead been bestowed upon his two evil daughters Goneril and Regan. The latters have already shown their false affection towards him, which indicates that Lear can be easily deceived because of his foolish thinking and intentions towards not only his daughters but also towards the entire Kingdom.

When considering Lear's anger and foolish attitudes towards his dearest daughter Cordelia, it must be noted that the moral lesson Shakespeare intends to convey is that anger breeds bad results as shown in Lear's wrong decision to dismiss her from his presence; that is to say, anger may be considered a source of evil powers on the part of foolish characters like King Lear. This may also happen

in actual life, which points to Shakespeare's full understanding of human nature:

Bad decisions, reasoning, actions, and resolutions, during moments of anger and wrath, are always decided...Goneril herself says something in this regard. She declares that her father has always been hasty and the victim of freakish and sudden impulses. From the psychological point of view, it is true that anger when uncontrolled is more powerful and more dangerous than the circumstances arousing it. Lear's passion reaches its highest point when the storm beats the heath, which can be considered a manifestation of all the forces of evil which occupy his mind and which heightens his fury and anger, and thus he begins to think of inflicting destruction upon all human creatures including his two evil daughters.

18

On the heath, the storm hits Lear and makes him suffer from many dangers. The storm, as it is generally thought, is regarded as analogous to a psychological storm that hits his inner mind when he feels alone and betrayed by his daughters, not to mention the fact that he discovers, though too late, about the foolishness of his behaviour and attitudes. At this moment, it may be indicated that Lear's passionate thinking reaches its highest point, for he starts to think of inflicting destruction upon all his enemies, including his two evil daughters. It is worth mentioning that Shakespeare does

not only concentrate on evil in general but he also concentrates on a particular kind of evil—the kind of evil practiced by children against their fathers:

It seems that Shakespeare does not only display the tragedy of a king whose foolishness leads him to his destruction, but he also gives a projection of what social evils represented by some evil children that give rise to serious crimes which they commit against their fathers. Lear and Gloucester are presented as two victims of the ingratitude of their children.<sup>19</sup>

Oscar James Campbell believes that the tempest can be regarded as a destructive power and is symbolic of the evil powers that have already controlled Lear's mind, and the storm may be an indication of some natural bad omens, and as he puts it in the following:

The destructive power of the tempest is a Manifestation of the forces of evil that have invaded Lear's mind. The storm is thus more than an adjunct to the old man's fury; it elevates his passion to the awesome dignity of natural portent.<sup>20</sup>

Thus, during the storm, Lear tries to call for the natural powers to cause all kinds of destruction to his enemies, which points to his inner conflict and inner mind thinking of his two evil daughters who have already injured him. He is therefore thinking of revenge:

Singe my white head! And thou all shaking  
thunder,  
Smite flat the thick rotundity o' the world!  
Crack Nature's moulds, all germens spill at  
once,  
That make ungrateful man!

(III. ii. 6-9)

Because of the so many deaths in *King Lear*, critics may think that the play points to Shakespeare's pessimism concerning human life and social relationships. For in the play, Lear, his daughters Goneril, Regan, and Cordelia, together with Gloucester and Kent have suffered so much and died in the end. It must be noted that Shakespeare, before writing this play, witnessed all kinds of horror and killing from the chaotic political situation in his time, and thus it may be noted that the play can be representative of that kind of pessimism that had affected and influenced Shakespeare's mind to the point that he presented a play full of horror, torture, grievances, bloodshed, and deaths. Gloucester's words can be taken as a faithful representation of Shakespeare's pessimism in this respect: "As flies to wanton boys are we to the gods: /They kill us for their sport," (IV. i. 38-39) and at the same time it may be suggested that Shakespeare, throughout his experience in life, has witnessed how the power of evil may creep into the human mind and destroy whatsoever is connected with the powers of goodness. Thus G. B. Harrison presents his comment in line with what has already been said in this respect:

Indeed, *Lear* was written by a man who had seen a vision of absolute evil such as was given to those who sat through the Nuremberg trials...in which good, however pure and refined, is futile and overwhelmed by evil, in which man, the paragon of animals, has become a savage, vicious beast. Moreover, the pessimism is in Shakespeare himself and in the story of *Lear*.<sup>21</sup>

Gloucester's pessimistic attitude does not only represent his own personality and the sufferings which he has undergone throughout the play from the grievances caused to him by his illegal son Edmund, but they also represent the attitude of any pagan person, and otherwise, placed in his situation (for the play's setting is a pagan one). This reflects Shakespeare's representation of human life and attitudes. For Gloucester's sufferings can be representative of any kind of sufferings inflicted in actual life. Furthermore, the play can be regarded as a representative of that kind of drama which presents a didactic and moral lesson. The moral lesson, it must be admitted, is not only to be addressed to Kings and politicians as well, but also to any other ordinary human being. The lesson indicates that the giving up of wealth and power means the giving up of health, comfort life, and prosperity, not to mention the giving up and loss of humanity. For *Lear* does not only cause the loss of his own power, but also the loss of the kingdom, his daughters, and some dearest members of his own entourage:

Symbolically speaking, Lear's renunciation of the throne results in his renunciation of Cordelia as his dearest daughter and heiress, the world, his two other daughters, and his faithful servant Kent. It is therefore a renunciation of prosperity, which has been made only to invite sterility and death in. In this sense, Lear's renunciation proves to be something of evil tincture in so far as it leads to a great human loss and the destruction of man's spirit. Furthermore, Lear, at the end of the play, especially when in prison with Cordelia, announces his renunciation of the entire world and all worldly interests:<sup>22</sup>

...Come, let's away to prison:  
We two alone will sing like birds i' the cage:  
When thou dost ask me blessing, I'll kneel down,  
And ask for thy forgiveness: so we'll live,  
And pray, and sing, and tell old tales, and laugh  
At gilded butterflies, and hear poor rogues  
Talk of court news: and we'll talk with them too,  
Who loses and who wins; who's in who's out;  
And take upon's the mystery of things,  
As if we were god's spies.

(V. iii. 8-17)

At the end of the play, Lear himself declares that he is going to leave the world and all worldly things, which is indicated in his speech. He says that he and Cordelia are going to leave the world by means of their sacrifice: "Upon such sacrifices, my Cordelia, / the

gods themselves throw incense" (v. iii. 20-21). In this regard, according to Ramji Lall, Lear and his daughter Cordelia have become observers of life in their departure from the world and they are quietly aware of what has happened to them and the general and particular consequences their character and action have determined and led to:

this speech shows an attitude of complete detachment from the world. Lear and Cordelia will merely become observers of life, interested observers no doubt, but just observers and spectators, no longer partakers and sharers. This is the renunciation, more or less of a recluse, a renunciation approved by the gods because Lear goes on to say that upon such 'sacrifice' the gods themselves throw incense." <sup>23</sup>

According to historians, *King Lear* is regarded as a chronicle play which may be related to the ancient past of Britain. Thus, history can be considered a very good source for moral lessons. The moral and political implications in the play can best be made use of by any great rulers and politicians. Therefore, Shakespeare has not overlooked history and has resorted to it to take moral and political lessons from it which can be of great help for humanity and subsequent generations. Furthermore, the play can be taken as a case study in social relationships, especially filial ingratitude, a theme which is very prominent in the play and is also a significant aspect

of the structure of the play as a whole. M. M. Reese implies that the historical and political aspects of the play have addressed the moral and political implications. He says that the

morality structure was ideal for the history play. It was already didactic, as history was required to be, and it dealt with allegory, which enabled the dramatist to preach his contemporary lessons under the cover of abstractions. For the historian, the abstractions would be the kings and statesmen of another age, whose remoteness so offered him protection from the displeasure of the authorities: It is dangerous to be too openly contemporary. The form was easily adapted to new purposes, the state, *Republica*, replacing man as the battlefield upon which good and evil counselors waged their unending struggle.<sup>24</sup>

As one of the social evils, bastardy has been referred to by Shakespeare when creating the character of Edmund the villain of the play. He is the illegitimate son of Gloucester. He declares that he has been the product of nature, alluding to his illegitimacy as a son. The powers of evil in the play come together in that the illegitimate rulers of the kingdom, Goneril and Regan, come to good terms with Edmund. King Lear himself alludes to the same idea that Edmund is the product of nature in so far as the setting of the play is pagan. Edmund has badly treated his father and at the same time he tries to

kill his brother Edgar. Thus, his fiendish qualities are best expressed in his fiendish behaviour. Like the fiendish Goneril and Regan, Edmund has made a conspiracy against his brother, so that he (Edmund) can inherit his father's title and estates. But all their attempts are a failure as shown at the end of the play, and the tragedy ends with the death of the good and bad characters simultaneously, due to the filial ingratitude on the part of the ungrateful characters. Thus, the theme of ungratefulness has been incarnated in them all.

#### Notes

<sup>1</sup> Kenneth Muir, ed., "Introduction" to *William Shakespeare: King Lear* (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1972), pp. xxii-xxiii.

<sup>2</sup> R. B. Heilman, as quoted in Muir, p. lii.

<sup>3</sup> Muir, p. Li.

<sup>4</sup> George Orwell, "The Moral of *King Lear*," in Laurence Lerner ed., *Shakespeare's Tragedies: An Anthology of Modern Criticism* (London: Penguin Books Ltd., 1968), p. 128.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid.

<sup>6</sup> William Shakespeare, *King Lear*, in *Shakespeare: The Complete Works*, ed. G. B. Harrison (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Inc., 1968). All subsequent references to the text of *King Lear* are taken from this reference book.

<sup>7</sup> Orwell, p. 129.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid.

<sup>10</sup> Abdul Sattar Awad Ibrahim and Aseel Qais Ismael, "The Axis of Evil in William Shakespeare's *King Lear*" Al-Ustath, a Scientific Periodical Published at The College of Education and Humanistic studies (Ibn-Rushd), No. 77, 2008. p. 994.

<sup>11</sup> Muir, p. Li.

<sup>12</sup> G. Wilson Knight, "King Lear and *the Comedy of Grotesque*," in Laurence Lerner ed., *Shakespeare's Tragedies: An Anthology of Modern Criticism* (London: Penguin Books Ltd., 1968), p. 132.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid. p. 133.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid. p. 144.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid. p. lvi

<sup>17</sup> Abdul Sattar Awad Ibrahim, and Aseel Qais Ismael, "The Axis of Evil in William Shakespeare's *King Lear*," pp. 995-996.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid. p. 996.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid. pp. 996-97.

<sup>20</sup> Oscar James Campbell, ed., *A Shakespeare Encyclopaedia* (London: Methuen and Co., ltd., 1974), p. 403.

<sup>21</sup> G. B. Harrison, *Shakespeare's Tragedy* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1966), p. 159.

<sup>22</sup> Abdul Sattar Awad Ibrahim, and Aseel Qais Ismael, "The Axis of Evil in William Shakespeare's *King Lear*," pp. 1001-1002.

<sup>23</sup> Ramji Lall, *William Shakespeare: King Lear* (New Delhi: Rama Brothers educational Publishers, 1998), p. 100.

<sup>24</sup> M. M. Reese, "The Origin of the history Play," in *Shakespeare: The Histories, A Collection of Critical Essays*, ed., Eugene Waith (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1965), p. 49.

### Bibliography

Campbell, Oscar James. ed., *A Shakespeare Encyclopaedia* (London: Methuen and Co., ltd., 1974).

Harrison, G. B. *Shakespeare's Tragedy* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1966).

Ibrahim, Abdul Sattar Awad, and Aseel Qais Ismael, "The Axis of Evil in William Shakespeare's *King Lear*" *Al-Ustath, a Scientific Periodical Published at The College of Education and Humanistic studies (Ibn-Rushd)*.

Knight, G. Wilson. "King Lear and *the Comedy of Grotesque*," in Laurence Lerner ed., *Shakespeare's Tragedies: An*

*Anthology of Modern Criticism* (London: Penguin Books Ltd., 1968).

Lall, Ramji. *William Shakespeare: King Lear* (New Delhi: Rama Brothers educational Publishers, 1998).

Muir, Kenneth. ed., "Introduction" to *William Shakespeare: King Lear* (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1972).

Orwell, George. "The Moral of *King Lear*," in Laurence Lerner ed., *Shakespeare's Tragedies: An Anthology of Modern Criticism* (London: Penguin Books Ltd., 1968).

Reese, M. M. "The Origin of the history Play," in *Shakespeare: The Histories, A Collection of Critical Essays*, ed., Eugene Waith (Englewood Cliffs, N. J. : Prentice Hall, Inc., 1965).

Shakespeare, William. *King Lear*, in *Shakespeare: The Complete Works*, ed. G. B. Harrison (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Inc., 1968). All subsequent references to the text of *King Lear* are taken from this reference book.