

Introduction : The Employment of History on the Stage Shakespeare's Lear : The Use and Function of History

أ.د. صالح مهدي حميد الطالبة : ألق ضياء الدين

جامعة بابل / كلية التربية للعلوم الإنسانية

The firm relation between past and present incidents arises the inevitability to appreciate history. Hence, a considerable number of writers give the topic its due weight. History becomes the source of an already established material from which a writer can freely choose. According to this, history is envisaged as the speaking tongue of the writers' purposes. The writer does not have to take a firm stand in the topic. On the contrary, he has the flexibility to mould the material to what helps manifesting the writer's manipulation of the topic in accordance with the needs of his age and people. In fact, history exercises a great effect which deservingly makes it "the father of literature." The majority of writers are indebted to it to the extent that "Shakespeare has used historical material for theatrical purposes and his dramatic achievement would not have been the same without it."⁽¹⁾

Authority is licensed to the writer in the sense that he, like the therapist, knows what might help curing his patients in addition to knowing the amount of the cure."Shakespeare knows history well, but he often changes the simple facts to suit the medium of the play."⁽²⁾Not only this, but there are some historical sources which are in the scope of preference in an unnamed time,i.e., they are provoked by writers for their immediate necessity. One of such works is the historical tale of King Leir.

Much enigma envelopes the condition according to which Shakespeare has been given the inspiration of writing *King Lear*. Most of the literary genres tackling King Lear are indebted to the original story. For Shakespeare, it seems that there are many sources on which he relies much of his works. Among the ancient inspiring sources of *King Lear* is Geoffrey's *Historia Britonum* which is a Latin work first published in 1135 . Another source that might have been available for Shakespeare to read is John Higgins's *A Mirror for Magistrates* which appeared in its first edition in 1574. The title "the king of France" in *King Lear* belongs to this source,⁽³⁾ in addition to minor details that echo this work." It is possible that the original inspiration came not from the Lear story at all but from Sidney's story of the Paphlagonian king and his two sons in Arcadia"⁽⁴⁾, which was published in the late 1570s. From the aforementioned source,Shakespeare has borrowed the outline of the subplot about Gloucester and his sons.

Raphael Holinshed's *Chronicles of England,Scotland and Ireland* is considered Shakespeare's favorite source-book with regard to British history.⁽⁵⁾ From this source, Shakespeare took the titles of both Cornwall and Albany (Albania), "and perhaps a hint for Goneril's first speech:' She loued him more than toong could expresse."⁽⁶⁾Among other sources, possibly dozens more, of Shakespeare's play is Spenser's *The Faerie Queen* which is an

incomplete epic published firstly in 1590. Probably Cordials' name and her way of death in prison are derived from this epic.⁽⁷⁾

A conspicuous and provocative dramatic work that ratifies its influence upon Shakespeare's *king Lear* is a play published in the year 1594, fully entitled *The True Chronicle History of King Leir, and his Three Daughters Gonerill, Ragan and Cordella*. "On the whole it seems likely that the idea of redramatizing the Lear story came from Shakespeare's acquaintance with the old chronicle play, though he must have recognized from the first plot needed considerable modification."⁽⁸⁾ This source constitutes an interest that Shakespeare is more than obvious invested in. An immediate interpretation for this is that the dramatization of a literary work does indeed throw an upshot more than being acquainted with the work on page.

It is a kind of absurdity for a writer to present a detailed account of the life of a celebrity. So he elects a certain incident in the course of life of the figure through which the writer can deliver his message. Shakespeare's huge reliance on history accords with the immediate taste. Writers in Shakespeare's time found it a duty to appreciate history so as to pay homage to the present king or queen. Shakespeare is not exceptional in this issue. *Henry V*, *Richard II*, *Richard III*, and *King John* are only a few examples of Shakespeare's relatedness with history and kingdom.

One of the aspects which seem to be within the interest of the majority of writers including Shakespeare is the notion that the source of Lear's downfall springs from his daughters' unfaithfulness. That is, it serves to ground a warning to judge and estimate people well. This is due to the fact that any decision is taken by authority must affect in a way or another the whole state. In the situation of King Lear, familial disturbances happen in the whole country, and in a precise account two countries, France as well as Britain in the confrontation between them.

Another employment which suggests a kind of dramatic value which is excerpted from King Leir's life is the step of dividing the kingdom among three daughters. Both the authentic and the theatrical Leirs practice the outcomes of the decision which has been taken and one which makes it hard and nearly impossible to coexist with. If not all blame should be thrown upon Lear then an quintessential proof is to handle. It is sometimes at odds that Lear, though must have a considerable attachment with his daughters, exposes a sort of failure in understanding their true nature and fabrication. At other times, a shift in mood is made concerning the parameter of division followed. A basis like this does not go in line with rational thinking. A supposedly venerable figure as Lear is not expected to come up with childish ways of thinking. A man of authority and one who has spent considerable decades in ruling is expected to think deeply and sophisticatedly.

Such remarks must have encouraged modern playwrights to employ the incident afresh, focusing on more disputable ideas facing the modern man. Bond's *Lear* is one of such plays indeed where the play serves the investigation of modern themes.

ii. The Treatment of History in Modern Drama

Basing literary works on materials connected with history has not been a salient feature of the ages preceding the modern one only, but it has also proved itself worthy in the Modern Age. There is no definite date marking the beginning of the Modern Age; however, it is often claimed that its sparks illuminated in the last decade of the ninetieth century on.

Developments cover nearly all fields of knowledge, technology and science making no exception to literary advances which become tantamount to other fields and walk hand in hand with them. This period is characterized by the massive number of literary productions to the extent that it is considered "one of the most vital and exciting periods in English drama, rivaling the Elizabethan theater in thematic scope and stylistic ambition."⁽⁹⁾ These works, as in the preceding periods, are true accounts of the social, political, economic as well as educational current conditions. The great number of literary movements underscores these ideas which are either supporting, criticizing or simply describing such conditions.

It is true that there is nothing of 'complete lack' of representing the present conditions through literature; writers' hands are always indulged in picturing the present through all genres of literature, in specific drama for its actual contact with people (audience). The current conditions of the twentieth century such as world wars I and II that constitute the pivotal and raw material of the writers' works. Yet still, the historical interest has not faded away. The period following World War II has witnessed a considerable interest in historical drama. "Its[history] persistence in contemporary British drama is indicative of a continuing shared interest on the part of playwrights and playgoers."⁽¹⁰⁾

Historical plays equal in effect other plays of varied sources if the playwright could intelligibly manage to convey his message through the historical-based work. "It is important to respond to historical plays as art-works, not as selected documentary accumulations containing historic-political speculations valuable largely in terms of 'known' historical and political reality."⁽¹¹⁾ In addition, playwrights themselves have ratified the due importance of historical material. For Edward Bond, there is huge necessity of stretching back to history since it represents the guidance of the present time. As a matter of fact, Bond pays regard to history much and believes in its due importance in our Modern Age. Among his works, *Lear* evokes the tragic original story of Lear and Shakespeare's product as well, which stretches back hundreds of years.

Among the characterizing traits of the Modern Age is its advocating for new attempts in regard to literature. It supports whatever dwells the unknown. Thus, it gives room for many

thinkers to come up with divergent movements and theories. Brecht, for instance, who is a twentieth century German theater practitioner, establishes the cornerstone of 'the epic theater' through which he expresses his belief in the inadequacy of the old forms of the European theater. Similarly, Brecht rejects the Aristotelian view of the catharsis by terror and pity which most of modernists followed, for they will not be true records of social reality. However, such new theories of the theater do not ignore history in actively producing literary achievements. On the contrary, they deem history as a vent towards perfectly dealing with their audience because there is always longing for the past. In addition to this, "the less audience know about their historical period or the figure concerned, the more the dramatist is able to his or her conceptions into the creation of the character"⁽¹²⁾ in time the modernist man has not the spare time for accurately viewing his past.

There are few arenas of modern theatrical culture that have not touched the impact of Brecht's ideas and implications; dramatists and directors in whom one may trace a vivid Brechtian legacy include: Peter Brook, Peter Weiss and Caryl Churchill, to mention only few. This period, preceding 1950s, has recorded an enormous number of historical dramas: Rolf Hochhuth's *The Deputy*, Peter Shaffer's *The Royal Hunt of the Sun* as well as Robert Bolt's *A Man for all Seasons* which ratify their debt to history.

As a matter of fact, in spite of the fact that most of these post-historian attempts may suffer no weakness; however, still the sense of indebtedness is felt whenever encountering such plays because of the many tangible similarities whether in subject matter, themes with coming across considerable modifications.

Section II

King Lear : A Study in Theme(s)

For any literary work to achieve a masterpiece status, it should have certain qualities that tempt readers as well as critics to approve of that. Even if a piece of writing would win public admiration, it is unlikely to be free from well-directed onslaughts. However, this does not necessarily echo any failing touching that work, since the more controversial a literary work is, the better piece of writing it is. Such a merit undoubtedly vouches the greatness of its creator. Among those creators which literature owes a great deal is William Shakespeare.

Each literary attainment of Shakespeare, specifically his great tragedies, seem to be deservedly named a masterpiece: whether *Hamlet*, *King Lear*, *Othello* and *Macbeth*. Such works are said to have reached the zenith of Shakespeare's achievements. These famous tragedies were written about the end of the 16th century and the beginning of the 17th century. They abound in instances of poetic justice where a considerable number of moral personal with cosmic experiences are exposed. This is in itself the intrinsic outcome of literature. As an instance of a dramatic work which is fraught with such qualities is Shakespeare's *King Lear*.

"*King Lear* thus belongs to the full maturity of Shakespeare's poetic and dramatic powers engaged upon tragedy."⁽¹³⁾ Sometimes, it is assumed that Shakespeare's key to success proved in *King Lear* among other works lies in the multi-sided interpretation it accepts as well as many life-touching themes.

Once *King Lear* is read even sketchily, it is legitimized to propel the natural feeling with good account of themes. The 'political thematic' has not been estranged from the play since its very outset, for it represents an act of reduction of Lear from a domineering political and economic position to nothing as he is deprived of power and his retinue.⁽¹⁴⁾ Concerning the year 1605, for instance, England witnessed political unrest with King James I ascending the throne. Thus, *King Lear* has no other vents of interpretations than tackling the new courtly changes in that James I "would quickly have recognized that Shakespeare's play vividly dramatized the tragic consequences of dividing the kingdom as opposed to unifying it."⁽¹⁵⁾ Shakespeare's awareness of this issue may have been delivered through Gloucester's indication that "these late eclipses in the sun and moon ported no/ good to us." (I, ii, 100-1). Shakespeare's employment of this issue is needed as a means to cope with the current circumstance. By this virtue, the writer acts not only the role of an observer, but also that active member who seems to put his hand on every current change in the society. This calls the audiences' attention to what ensues being of significance, namely flattery, no matter what that significance is. Yet it holds the seeds of Lear's destruction. In other words, it hinders things going well. As an instance of such deceiving words is what is said by Gonrill :

I love you more than word can wield the matter;
 Dearer than eye-sight, space and liberty;
 Beyond what can be valued rich or rare;
 As much as child e'erlov'd, or father found;
 As love that makes breath poor and speech unable;
 Beyond all manner of so much I love you.⁽¹⁶⁾

These remarks are highly fake which are ensued by not only heart but mind blindness into judging well. Lear, thus, creates a rivalry of speeches in which the other daughter, Regan, replies:

that I profess
 Myself an enemy to all other joys
 Which the most precious square of sense possesses,
 And find I am alone felicitate
 In your dear highness' love. (I, i, 71-75)

It is at odd to hold the idea that a king, who has spent an non-ignorable couple of years in throne, being entrapped by an ephemeral sweetness of utterances. At the same time, Lear

has not even the least awareness of being perished by the flatterers." What is more, the appetite for flattery grows by what it feeds on; those who refuse to flatter are hated and banished, while the flatterers are rewarded."⁽¹⁷⁾ Lear's indifference to what is behind the lines economized his unforeseen tragic end. This act establishes the bitterness of the future scenes which grow more and more grotesque. Facing Lear's future life as an incident that incites no spot of delightfulness makes it a play which is hard to attend by audience waiting for their share of this experience which is often translated into Lear's self-purification and redemption.

The play in some respect wavers from an aspect to another; sometimes, it concerns policy, at other times it tackles social issues to the extent that it goes deep inside of every image of human life where it becomes hard detaching each on a side. The play can readily call for the redemptionist Lear. All in all, *King Lear* is a play enriched with enormous changes in states meant to all characters. Yet, Lear's change in state and mind has a different taste; his new state, though bitter, provides him with the new sight by which he can exclude former viewpoints and expose himself to the new worthy ones. Being in kingdom for many years has not been ever eligible enough to enable him to experience other kinds of life. However, this opportunity comes as he initiates his foolish love-test parameter in dividing the kingdom. What follows represents the beginning of a new Lear where a sort of 'development' towards gruesome physical spiritual approved changes. Lear's tangible change lies in the huge exchanges of roles from ruling into being ruled; the daughters brutally rule the figure who has already ruled them as Regan declares:

You should be rul'd and led
By some discretion that discerns your state
Better than you yourself. (II, iv, 145-7)

Being cast off by his daughters, Lear becomes the eye witness of every detail and one "who comes in his affliction to think of others first and to seek in tender solicitude for his poor Fool"⁽¹⁸⁾. Lear's sympathy for the welfare of the unfortunate people is aroused as he is exposed to the life out of his palace. Moreover, he turns into the sharp critic of whatever connects to people:

A man may see how this world
Goes with no eyes. Look with thine ears; see how
Yond justice rail upon yond simple thief. (IV, vi, 148-50)

By criticizing judges, Lear does not privatize it to courtly matters, but he generalizes it to all cases where there is an image of judgment.

During the course of the play, there appear to be certain issues jostling for dominance such as the duties of kingship, power, justice and authority. However, there are others implied in the events of the play rather directly expressed or explicitly treated. The idea of renunciation proves

to be adjacent in most incidents and is unequivocal in the very opening scene as Lear for casting burdens of authority by dividing the kingdom.

Lear. To shake all cares and business from our age
Conferring them on younger
strengths while we Unburthen'd crawl toward death. (I, i, 38-40)

Lear's intentions are to preclude 'future strife' where he receives the unexpected. He is intended to keep to himself the name of king in addition to a hundred knights to attend on him. His act in another version of his error in which he errs grievously in not only casting his youngest daughter but also as the Fool keeps reminding of his wicked deed by relinquishing all his authority and power leaving nothing to himself.⁽¹⁹⁾ It is only too late where he regrets his foolish act. It flusters the optimal life he is about to proceed.

Lear, only then, renounces his daughter, Cordelia. Her situation from the very beginning creates a sort of life in which she finds no enjoyment. She even does not grieve on a par with her marriage, simply acknowledging her balanced feelings as being rejected by Burgandy "peace be with Burgandy!/I shall not be his wife" (I, i, 247-8) Act Five substantiates a complete image of the spirit of stoicism and renunciation being ingrained in her very nature as she and Lear envisage the prison analogous with paradise in which Cordelia is a heavenly spirit instead of the cursed daughter.

Lear with his three daughters obviously directs the course of the explication towards parent-child theme where the parent aggressively feels the ingratitude of his daughters who become the evil-doers in his life standing against him. It is a pity in which "the child is the mother of the man"⁽²⁰⁾ in connection with Cordelia. The father in his purgatory experience feels his daughters' cruelty towards him is lesser than his cruelty towards his daughter Cordelia. Thus, in an attempt of compensation, Lear practices the ugliest humiliation in being cast off by his daughters, being blind and finally dead. Also, he tries to reconcile with the firstly cursed daughter. As Lear and Cordelia in Edmund's ruthless hands, he tries to make amends by kneeling down in front of her. "So we'll live/And pray, and sing, and tell od tales, and laugh /At gilded butterflies." (V, iii, 10-12)"

The parent-child theme is not restricted to Lear only. On the other hand, *King Lear* has another parent-child theme which is that represented by Gloucester. Lear and Gloucester have good as well as wicked children. Gloucester, too, proceeds to be blind in estimating his children's inner intentions in the same way Lear did. Gloucester's misunderstanding and foolishness suggest his tragic end. He suffers agonies as a result of the ingratitude of his son, Edmund. His son's contriving the plot leads to the temporary destruction of his brother, Edgar, and his father's downfall. Gloucester passes through identical self-redeeming journey which finalizes by new sight of the world and his reconciliation with his good son, Edgar.

Thus, at any rate, Shakespeare's play is a delicate way of presenting *King Lear* as a play where a host deliberate hypocrisies being faced by banishing evil-doer. However, Shakespeare does not make it that narrow; for his play evokes a character as Lear for reaching an ultimate aim which he hopes his audience to achieve. Lear can be anyone of us. Everyone has a kingdom of a special kind. Everyone is Gloucester in some respect since Shakespeare is invested in presenting a vicious deed and the consequences of that deed. As an example, Gloucester's adultery imposes the tragic consequences that stretches to more than the persons meant. On the opposite of such readings which ratify the invalidity of Lear's universality as a global representative, there appear many versions in an attempt of re-writir re-presenting *King Lear* to suit the present taste. Among such attempts is Edward Bond's *Lear*.

Section III

Bond's Lear : History Re-presented

In spite of the fact that Shakespeare's works have been vouched with their perfection as representatives of each age by a vast number of critics, there are many who have their views which do not correspond with the former one. Such a non-agreed-upon fact has given birth to similar opinions about plot and technique, though Shakespeare's plays are believed to be great achievements in the history of world drama. Interestingly, there are attempts to 're-shape' Shakespeare's plays in such a way as to serve contemporary issues. Bond's *Lear* is, in fact, one such play where Shakespeare's play stands to picture modern man in action and address modern audience, as well.

Bond's career as a dramatist can be as stemming from the first realization of the power of the theater and its potential capacity for enlarging our sensibilities.⁽²¹⁾ Bond is among those who strongly believe in the theater as an effective means of addressing people's mentalities and by then achieving the sense of 'change' sought after. His attempt of re-shaping *King Lear* seems to spring from his belief in Lear's inadequacy for the present time and, thus, a new reformed Lear is urgently needed. As a character, the Shakespearean Lear's invalidity in our society comes in accordance with radical continual changes which occur through ages in mood, means and above all in mentalities. The presence of aggression, both social and political, in societies has the remarkable role of producing the kind of people that Bond in his preface depicts "as if an animal was locked in a cage and then fed with the key. It shakes the bars but can never get out."⁽²²⁾

Bond's interest in investing a topic that concerns a king is not arbitrary. He could have elected any topic of any sort; however, dragging Shakespeare's is meant where he has a malleable ground of assaulting the *kings* of his time. The king is the spokesman of authority. This actualizes the very end of Bond's goals since his "theater is political, and his focus of investigation is nothing less than the survival of all the human, the humane qualities of the political animal, the dweller in a contemporary polis."⁽²³⁾ Thus, through his attempt of reaching

different goals from Shakespeare's, Bond employs the very verity of authoritarians; one ensues the other adhering the same goal. A goal might be as destructive to people as it is planned to be beneficial to them. According to this, the main plot serves to get the playwright's purposes achieved in relatedness with the political mainstream: "The play's theme is essentially political. It deals with the evolution of society and has compromises that are made in forging a new state."⁽²⁴⁾ This political reading of the play has been founded on the nexus between the interpretation of the play and Bond's belief in policy. Bond is greatly indebted in his political ideas to Brecht in that "Bond admires the artist Brecht, and his [Bond's] *Lear* follows Brecht in its subject matter as well as dramatic technique."⁽²⁵⁾ Hence, Bond presents a recurrent image of building the wall or synonymously having controlling people. However, Lear blindly grounds his thesis on shadowy foundations. "Warrington, if I am killed or fall into their hands, you must take my place and build the wall." (I, ii, 9) Lear seems to be invested in the notion of protecting people through surrounding them by a wall:

Lear. I started this wall when I was young. I stopped my enemies in the fields, but there were always more of them. How could we ever be free? So I built this wall to keep our enemies out. My people will live behind this wall when I'm dead. You may be governed by fools but you'll always live in peace. (I, i, 3-4)

Yet, he ignores the fact that protecting people is not by caging them, but by supporting them to bear the responsibility of defending themselves. Otherwise, their lives will be rendered under the mercy of this wall; if it is destroyed, they will be over. People's in-course conditions are not bound to be changed unless they change themselves. Once they are approvingly changed, then nothing can affect them. This is the essence of Bond's revolutionary thinking, because as he says "we do not need a plan of the future, we need a *method* of change."⁽²⁶⁾ Lear's plan of having the wall as a means of security is cast off by Bond's theories conveyed through Lear's final resignation, that is the spirit of change: "there is an animal in the cage. I must let it out or the earth will be destroyed". (II, ii, 37)

For Bond, *Lear* is a readjustment of *King Lear* though overtly it comes in terms of re-telling Shakespeare's play. Without Shakespeare's play, there will be no existence of Bond's *Lear*, as a king, experiences a purgatorial pilgrimage which he acquires by his daughters' tormenting deceit that finalizes his death. Yet, this pilgrimage has also brought the seeds of Lear's true insight. He could not see until he has got blind. Physical sight is not crucial in the face of reality. There are also Regan and Gonrill in the identity of Bodice and Fontanelle. In the place of the Fool there is the Gravedigger's Boy, instead of the irrational foolish love-test, there is the wall-building project. Thus, nearly each aspect in Bond's play seems to have its counterpart in Shakespeare's. By this account, Bond shows the pivotal indebtedness to history and Shakespeare as well. However, this is examined on the surface of it because *Lear* rings

with certain dramatic touches that have no resemblance with Shakespeare's, but which unquestioningly testify their significance. Among the contingent modifications is the wall placement. The wall for Bond is an economized form of representing the modern authority that lasts in building even after Lear's death.

When compared with that in *King Lear*, violence in *Lear* has so much weight that it recalls Bond's inclinations of violence. A conspicuous instance is the opening scene in which a dead worker is presented on stage and a sort of tumult ensues. Yet Lear immediately orders perishing the doer and recuperating the situation by making workers complete building the wall. Warrington being tortured by Bodice and Fontanelle, grievously repudiates any sting of mercy; they have his tongue cut, have his eyes taken away, and poke his ears with a needle where they experience joy in doing so (I, v). Another step that Bond takes in constructing the play is the omission of Cordelia's as Lear's good and kind daughter since he is establishing an image of the society that is extremely violent because "there is no other way of our society, an unjust society must be violent."⁽²⁷⁾ In time, Lear rhetorically inquires "where does their vileness come from?", investigating his daughters' spring of viciousness forgetting the verity that he has participated in having them cruel. This is, indeed, Shakespearean. Lear from the very beginning appears to cultivate the sense of self-prejudice in his daughters :

O my poor children you are too good for this world.[to the others]. You see how well they'll govern when I'm dead. Bodice, you're right to be kind and merciful and when I'm dead you can be—because you will have my wall. You'll live inside a fortress. Only I'm no free to be kind or merciful. (I, i, 4).

Thus, Lear has made no awareness of the fact that his daughters will not be free to be merciful or kind even earlier than being in authority. Such instances prove Edward Bond's success in presenting a piece of work that is copious with violent scenes that sometimes make it unbearable to be seen. As a result, constructing *Lear* in this way has wavered the acceptability of each play according to how and when it is perceived. Hence, each play is good enough in certain settings.

Section IV

Conclusion

Bond's paramount stimuli of coming out with 'modified' Lear lies in his belief of the fact that Lear belongs to the past yet "he does not belong to it in terms of solutions but in terms of problems: he is in many ways a contemporary figure: Bond deals with difficulties that human beings have in the society"⁽²⁸⁾. The two plays are oriented in the same ;direction however, they both display Lear's experience towards the true insight. Bond's attempt at having *King Lear* re-shaped is accomplished by tracing Shakespeare's original plantation. This is quite obvious in respect to the equivalence between the two plays: madness is, for instance, proved in the

pseudo-trial as in the case of Shakespeare's mad king in Act III, scene vi. Similarly, Bond's Lear shows much wisdom as he is to be tried like a madman.

Shakespeare and Bond consider nature as the world of required liberty in which the mad Lear finds shelter. The shelter that his siblings have not given when it becomes much bitter to bear. Instead of Shakespeare's Edgar (Poor Tom), there is the Gravedigger's Boy to give Lear refuge. Thus, intimacy springs from the unexpected sources where it ought to come from the daughters. So it is self-evident that Bond presents the same nature-scheming she-wolves daughters. However, Shakespeare's account of the daughter's has been reduced into two, maintaining the only selfish ones and casting the good-intentioned Cordelia, whereas the name Cordelia is given to the Gravedigger's Boy who eventually is seen in kingdom after being oppressed to be indulged in the wall-building project. Thus, Bond necessitates the absence of Shakespeare's in a brutal and cruel time, in spite of the presence of other evil-doers.

Bond's dissatisfaction with the appropriateness of Shakespeare's play for his time has propelled him to make minor alternations of the play. Although evil-doers receive the penalty deservedly, yet this does not seem Bond's ultimate goal; he is after a change in the society not the character. Shakespeare's Lear has changed at the full circle; however, no one is changed. The foreseen change is buried before Lear's death while Bond's desired changed is lucidly hinted in the very end when one of the workers turns his head back indicating of his perception of Lear's experience. This is a reference of changing not only *one* worker, but probably the coming society as a whole. Edward thus, attempts to demonstrate such verity through investing whatsoever technique might be effective.

Bond's technique in the play is surely of some difference from Shakespeare's according to the playwright's viewpoint of investigating the present ambience. As a result, "Shakespeare's cracks of rifle shots as the natural storm metaphor is recast onto the social plane of modern warfare; King Lear's complaint that his daughters have created 'an engine beating at my head', wrenching and torturing the mind becomes an actual instrument of torture that blinds its victim by wrenching out the eyes, King Lear's desire to 'anatomize' the soul of Regan becomes an actual autopsy"⁽²⁹⁾ which are all terrorist tactics. Digging deeply enough into Bond's construction of the play, it turns out that he is in the process of moving from "the metaphor to the literal, from the verbal gesture to the concrete action, from symbolic to physical reality"⁽³⁰⁾; a trend towards the didactic functions of the play. This is what perfectly accords with Bond's belief about violence and its vital role in the modern time to the extent that he would "write about violence as naturally as Jane Austen wrote about manners."⁽³¹⁾

Bond's attempt of re-presenting Shakespeare's *King Lear* does not ground Edward Bond's superiority to his master. The fact of having Shakespeare's Lear, as a cosmic representative, is vouched. However, the affectivity of Bond's Lear is hugely raised in

accordance with the in-course conditions; the post-war era where people by nature grow violent. Such a remark is, of course, temporary. Thus, it is a problem in the society not the play and perhaps Shakespeare's vitality would be rejuvenated in a not war-suffering societies where it is readily to address balanced societies.

NOTES

(1)Hind Sabah," The Dramatization of History in Selected Plays by WilliamShakespeare", An Unpublished M.A Thesis,(University of Al-Qadissiya, 2012), 8.

Ibid ,8.⁽¹⁾

Kenneth Muir, *The Sources of Shakespeare's Plays* (New Haven : Yale University Press, 1978), 198. ⁽⁷⁾

(4) Ibid., 196.

(5) William Shakespeare, *King Lear*, edited with introduction by RamjiLall(New Delhi: University of New Delhi , 2009), 29.

(6) Muir, 198.

(7) Ibid.

(8) Ibid., 199.

(9) Ibid.

(10) Kenneth James, *The Use of Historical Material in Comparative British Drama* (Master's these, University of British Columbia, 1978), 1.

(11)Dokeith Peacock, *Radical Stages : Alternative History in Modern British Drama* (New York : Greenwood Press, 1991), 4.

(12) Peacock, 9.

(13) Ibid., 11.

(14)Lall, 25.

(15) R. A. Foakes , *Hamlet versus Lear Cultural Politic and Shakespeare's Art* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 213.

(16) William Shakespeare, *King Lear*(I, i,55-60). All references of Shakespeare's play are from this edition; henceforth, will be parenthetically cited within the text.

(17)Lall, 32.

(18) Ibid., 156.

(19) Ibid., 94.

(20) Dennis Brown, " 'King Lear': The Lost Leader; Disintegration, Transformation and Suspended Reconsolidation ,"*Critical Survey* , vol. 13, no. 3 (2001), 26.

(21) Leslie Smith," Edward Bond: *Lear*". *Comparative Drama*, vol.13, no. 1, (Spring 1979), 67.

(22) Edward Bond *Lear* (London: The Chaucer Press, 1986), ix.

(23) Debra A. Castillo, "Dehumanized or Inhuman: Doubles in Edward Bond," *South Central Review*, vol. 3,no. 2(Summer 1986), 78.

(24) Sonia James, *Constructing the Subject, Rewriting Shakespeare: A Study of Select Modern Shakespeare* (Ph.D. Dissertation, Mahatma Gandhi University, 2007), 209.

(25) Ibid.

(26) Bond, xiii.

(27) Ibid., xi.

(28) Arnold Wesker, interview with Edward Bond, (New York Dec.,1976).

(29) Jenny S. Spenser, *Dramatic Strategies in the Plays of Edward Bond* (Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1992), 80.

(30)Ibid., 83.

(31)Edward Bond *Lear* (London : Methuen, 1986), v. Jane Austen (1775-1817) is an English novelist who is known for her creation of the comedy of manners of middle-class life in the England of her time in her novels , *Sense and Sensibility*, *Pride and Prejudice*, *Mansfield Park*, *Emma* and *Northanger Abbey*.

Bibliography

- Bond, Edward. *Lear*. London: The Chaucer Press Ltd., 1986.
- Castile, A. Dehra."Dehumanized or Inhuman: Doubles in Edward Bonds',*South Central Review*, Vol.3. no. 2 (Summer 1986) : 78-89.
- Foakes, R.A. *Hamlet versus King Lear Cultural Politics and Shakespeare's Art*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Halio, Jay H. (ed.). *The Tragedy of King Lear*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- James, Kenneth. "The Use of Historical Material in Comparative British Drama." An Unpublished M.A. Thesis, University of British Columbia, 1978.



-
- Muir, Kenneth. *The Sources of Shakespeare's Plays*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1978.
 - Peacock, Dokeith. *Radical Stages: Alternative History in Modern British Drama*. New York : Greenwood Press, 1991.
 - Sabah, Hind. " The Dramatization of History in Selected Plays byWilliam Shakespeare" An Unpublished M.A. Thesis, University of Al-Qadissiya, 2012.
 - Shakespeare, William. *King Lear*, edited with introduction by RamjiLall. New Delhi : University of New Delhi, 2009.
 - Smith, Leslie. "Edward Bond *Lear*.", *Comparative Drama*. Vol.13.No.1. (Spring 1979): 65-85.