

People's Democratic Republic of Algeria
Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research
HammaLakhdar University of El-Oued
Faculty of Arts and Languages

Department of Arts and

English Language



**Parody in English Literature. The Case of Edward Bond's *Lear*. A
Stylistic Study.**

**Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
Master's Degree in Literature and Civilization**

Submitted by:

KORDI Nihed Nour El Houda

MEHELLOU Soukaina

Supervised by:

Dr. MEGA Afaf

Board of Examiners:

Dr. DIDA Nassireddine

President

University of El-Oued

Dr. MEGA Afaf

Supervisor

University of El-Oued

Dr. KADDOURI Souad

Examiner

University of El-Oued

Academic year: 2024/2025

Dedication

To those who planted the seeds of dreams in my heart, and watered them with their prayers, effort, and patience, to my mother and father, to my dear brothers and sisters: Zahia, Khadija, Mostafa, Toufik, Mohammed El Amin, and my dear nephew Aman Allah, to you all my love and gratitude, you have always been my support in every step, and to all my friends and relatives who have been a source of support and assistance... To the university students of Gaza who left before their story was completed, this achievement is the fruit of your support, and to you I dedicate it with pride and gratitude. Alhamdulillah for what has been achieved, and I ask Him for success in the upcoming endeavors.

Nihed

Alhamdulillah, for granting me the strength, patience, and guidance throughout this journey. I am deeply grateful for the gift of knowledge that enlightens minds and for the unwavering support of my family, friends, and mentors who have stood by me. Every challenge I faced was a lesson that shaped me, and every moment of growth was a blessing. May this work be beneficial and meaningful, by the will of Allah. And thus concludes a lengthy journey. The time has come to turn the page. And close this chapter of my story, marked with sacrifice and change.

Soukaina

Acknowledgements

In the name of the Most Gracious and the Most Merciful ALLAH. We are grateful to Almighty ALLAH for providing us with the chance, strength, and knowledge to start this study and finish it satisfactorily.

With deepest gratitude, we honor Dr. Mega Afaf, whose wisdom and guidance illuminated every step of our journey. Her unwavering support turned challenges into triumphs, shaping our dissertation with brilliance and insight.

Our sincere thanks to the jury members for accepting and devoting time to examine and discuss our dissertation.

Many thanks to our beloved university teachers for all the precious knowledge and for being a part of our academic journey as well as all the academic staff of the Faculty of Arts and Languages at the University of El Oued.

Thank you to all our families, our friends and the people who supported us during this challenging but rewarding endeavor, we wish you good luck in your lives.

Abstract

This study investigates the nature and function of parody in literature in general. As a case study, an analysis of parody, as a stylistic and thematic tool, is followed in Edward Bond's *Lear*, a modern reinterpretation of Shakespeare's *King Lear*. The research pursues to explore how parody works beyond simple imitation or satire, serving instead as an effective device for socio-political critique. In addition, the study appoints qualitative and stylistic approaches to investigate how Bond reinterprets the original text through linguistic, narrative strategies and intertextual theory. Instead of utilizing parody only for humor, Bond employs it as a process of socio-political critique, detecting the issues of authoritarianism, violence, and ethical dissolution in modern society. Stylistically, Bond diverges from Shakespeare's poetic grandeur through a fragmented, direct, and often brutal language. His rejection of traditional aesthetics reflects a postmodern skepticism toward inherited literary forms. Edward Bond is considered as a controversial figure in modern theatre due to his explicit portrayal of violence and his belief that art must fulfill ethical and political functions. Bond views theatre as a moral force—a means to expose and challenge power structures instead of merely entertain. By analyzing Bond's dramatic methods and language, the study illustrates how parody in *Lear* confronts conventional literary norms and mirrors on power, justice, and familial relationships. The findings emphasize the importance of parody as a transformative literary technique in literature, able to re-contextualize classic narratives to address contemporary cultural and political concerns.

Keywords: Intertextuality, King Lear, Lear, Parody, Postmodern critique, Stylistic analysis.

Tables of Contents

Dedication	I
Acknowledgements	II
Abstract.....	III
Tables of Contents	IV
General Introduction.....	1

Chapter One: Introduction to Parody

Introduction.....	7
1.1. Different Definitions of Parody.....	7
1.2. Types and Functions of Parody.....	10
1.2.1. Pastiche	10
1.2.2. Burlesque	11
1.2.3. Satire	13
1.2.4. Skit.....	14
1.2.5. Spoof.....	14
1.2.6. Travesty	15
1.3. Early Appearance of Parody in English Literature	16

Conclusion	18
------------------	----

Chapter Two: Parody in Postmodern in English Literature

Introduction.....	18
2.1. Forms of Parody in Postmodern English literature	19
2.1.1. Intertextuality	19
2.1.2. Pastiche	21
2.1.3. Metafiction Parody	22
2.1.4. Meta-parody	24
2.1.5. Self-parody.....	26
2.2. The Functions of Parody in Postmodern English Literature.....	28
2.2.1. Constructive Parody	28
2.2.2. The Role of Parody in Critique	29
2.2.3. Questioning Authenticity.....	30
2.2.4. Blurring High and Low Culture	31
2.2.5. Examining Fragmentation and Meaning.....	32
Conclusion	32

Chapter Three: Stylistic Analysis of Parody in Edward Bond's Lear

Introduction.....	32
3.1. Exploring Edward Bond's Lear	32
3.1.1. The Author's Biography	32
3.1.2. Historical and Cultural Context	33
3.1.3. Plot and Summary.....	34
3.1.4. Characters.....	37
3.1.4.1. Lear	37
3.1.4.2. Bodice	37
3.1.4.3. Fontanelle.....	38
3.1.4.4. Warrington	38
3.1.4.5. The Gravedigger's Boy.....	39
3.1.4.6. Cordelia.....	39
3.1.5. Themes	40
3.1.5.1. Violence	40
3.1.5.2. Abuse of Power	41
3.1.5.3. Parents and Children.....	41

3.1.5.4. Social Justice and Morality	42
3.2. Exploring Shakespeare's King Lear	42
3.2.1. The Author's Biography	42
3.2.2. Historical and cultural context.....	44
3.2.3. Plot and summary	45
3.2.4. Characters.....	47
3.2.4.1. King Lear	47
3.2.4.2. Cordelia.....	48
3.2.4.3. Goneril and Regan.....	49
3.2.4.4. Kent	50
3.2.4.5. The Fool.....	50
3.2.4.6. Edgar.....	51
3.2.4.7. The Duke of Cornwall	51
3.2.4.8. The Earl of Gloucester.....	52
3.2.5. Themes	52
3.2.5.1. Violence	53
3.2.5.2. Power and Authority.....	53

3.2.5.3. Justice and Injustice.....	54
3.2.5.4. Family Relationship.....	54
3.2.5.5. Blindness.....	55
3.3. King Lear and Lear Intertextuality.....	55
3.4. Style and Stylistics	57
3.4.1. Style	58
3.4.2. Stylistics	58
3.5. Stylistic Analysis of Parody in Edward Bond's Lear	59
3.5.1. Phonological Features.....	59
3.5.1.1. Alliteration and Consonance	59
3.5.2. Lexical Features.....	60
3.5.2.1. Diction.....	61
3.5.2.2. Juxtaposition.....	62
3.5.3. Figurative Language	63
3.5.3.1. Symbolism.....	63
3.5.3.2. Euphemism.....	63
3.5.3.3. Allusion.....	64

3.5.4. Syntactic Features	65
3.5.4.1. Fragmentation.....	65
3.6. Findings and Discussions	66
3.6.1. Representation of Modern World	66
3.6.2. Political Manipulation.....	66
3.6.3. Intertextual Subversion	67
Conclusion	67
General Conclusion	69
References.....	71
المخلص	78

General Introduction

Background of the Study

An integral element of global literature is composed of English literature. It encompasses poetry, prose, and drama composed in the English language by numerous remarkable literary authors and figures from England, Scotland, and Wales. English literature comprises masterworks in different styles especially the novel, short story, epic and lyric poetry, essay, literary criticism, and drama. It is considered one of the richest and oldest national literature.

Furthermore, English literature has been shaped by numerous influential authors who have left a lasting impact on the literary world, figures such as, Geoffrey Chaucer, William Shakespeare, Christopher Marlowe, Daniel Defoe, Jonathan Swift, George Gordon Byron, Charles Dickens, Bernard Shaw, John Galsworthy and many others like, Emily Dickinson, Emerson Ralph Waldo, William Carlos Williams, Ernest Hemingway, Kurt Vonnegut they are famous in English literature and all over the world. Many writers, poets, and playwrights from various countries have been inspired by their writing style. The writers use different techniques and styles such as literary devices as a potent tool in their literary works to convey meaning.

In the same context, these writers employ various techniques like literary devices to enhance their works and convey deeper meanings. Literary devices are a method employed by writers to indicate or imply more extensive themes, concepts, or interpretations within their works. Literary devices exist in different forms and serve multiple purposes, also they can be used simultaneously. Some writers tend to work on a sentence-by-sentence basis, while others contribute to the overall text. Literary devices consist of patterns and techniques of language that authors utilize to improve the aesthetic and effectiveness of their work, convey meaning, and evoke

emotion. Writers have refined the art of literature and developed numerous techniques; therefore, the variety of literary devices is virtually limitless. Some common types of literary devices such as, allegory, irony, paradox, anaphora, alliteration, allusion, flashback, foreshadowing, imagery, juxtaposition, metaphor, pastiche, parody and many others.

Among these literary devices, parody stands out as a powerful and widely used technique across different literary traditions. Parody is an artistic form that has existed in the arts for an extended period. It has been employed since the era of ancient Greek theatre to the present day. Parody is consequently a space of interaction between two texts or a collection of canonical texts and the final text. Notable writers that use parody in their work such as, Geoffrey Chaucer, William Shakespeare, Ernest Hemingway, James Joyce, Charles Dickens, T.S. Eliot, Edward Bond and many others.

Statement of the Problem

Parody serves as an important literary tool used in various works in postmodern English literature. It is used in Edward Bond's work *Lear* as a thematic device. While much research has studied thematically Bond's *Lear*, there remains a gap in understanding how parody works in his play. There is lack of a comprehensive stylistic analysis examining how Bond employs rhetorical strategies; the stylistic study of parody in Bond's *Lear* has not been fully explored in existing literary scholarship.

Research Questions

This study is guided by the following questions:

- 1) What is parody and what are its manifestations in the literary text?

- 2) How does Edward Bond use parody in *Lear*?
- 3) What is the function of Bond's parody in his play?

Literature Review

Over time, the study of parody in English literature has been the focus of several academic debates and since *Lear* by Edward Bond relies heavily on parody as a key stylistic and thematic device, it has also attracted much attention from scholars.

In this context, parody is studied throughout several genres of expression, and through inquiry of works the diversified intent of parody and its differentiation from pastiche, burlesque, travesty, and satire is clarified in Linda Hutcheon's *A Theory of Parody: The Teachings of Twentieth-Century Art Forms* (1985). Moreover, she shows how the critical commentary is combined with artistic expression through parody.

Similarly, from old to recent times Margaret A. Rose in her work *Parody: Ancient, Modern, and Post-modern* (1993), and building upon her earlier work *Parody/Meta-Fiction* (1979), provides a comprehensive analysis and history of theories and applications of parody and offers to the concept parody a new substantial approach to the analysis and classification of modern, late-modern, and post-modern theories. She also discusses the work of theorists and authors in her book.

Building on these perspectives, parody has been approached as a literary form that assumed diverse forms, classifications and functions throughout history and a sophisticated understanding provided to how it has been applicated from the ancient period to contemporary times in Nil Korkut's work *Kinds of Parody from the Medieval to the Postmodern* (2005). Korkut's book

asserts that there are different kinds of parody in various literary-historical periods in Britain that have been common and it explores the reasons behind it.

Extending this discussion, the term "parôidia," have been estimated how ancient customs have embodied modern thoughts of parody as a method of expression and a genre from its classical Greek roots through tracing its origins and development in literary history in Paul S. Martin's academic dissertation *Parody and Parôidia: A Study in Literary Genre and Mode* (2017). He explicates the uses of parody and the way it works as a tool to criticize and mirror current literary works and cultural attitudes across different time.

In a related vein, the role of language and its binary relationship with power and its influence on socio-political relations have been highlighted in Shakespeare's *King Lear* and Edward Bond's *Lear* in Fatemeh Mahmoudi Tazehkand's study, "*Language Kingdom in William Shakespeare's King Lear and Edward Bond's Lear*" (2019).

Moreover, the contemporary playwrights' reinterpretations of traditional works to reflect the modern attitudes examined in Ayman F. Khafaga's article "*Intertextual Relationships in Literary Genres*" (2020), he mentions Edward Bond as example in which Bond utilized Shakespeare's play *King Lear* (1606) as an intertext in his play *Lear* (1978).

Furthering, parody development, its applications, its diverse nature across historical and cultural contexts from the Middle Ages to contemporary times, its relationship with travesty, burlesque, and satire, and its ability to transcend genre boundaries through intellectual essays is explored in a comprehensive anthology titled "*Parody: Dimensions and Perspectives* (2023)" edited by Beate Müller.

Finally, Edward Bond's *Lear* is compared and contrasted with the Shakespearean text in *King Lear* as a reimagining text to show in which ways it is beneficial for the ideas that Edward Bond wants his audience to pay attention to; Through, the study "*Edward Bond and the Struggle with Shakespeare: A Study of Shakespeare's King Lear and Edward Bond's Lear*" (2024) by Ali Laith Aziz.

Aim of the study

The research intends to highlight the function of parody as a means for social and political commentary. In other words, this paper aims to offer a broader perspective on parody as a literary technique in drama, highlighting its role in reflecting contemporary political and social issues.

The purpose of the current study is to analyze the role of parody in Edward Bond's play "*Lear*" from a stylistic theory. This study seeks to explore how does bond employ parody to reinterpret and critique Shakespeare's *King Lear* by examining Bond's linguistic choices, dramatic structure, and intertextual strategies.

Significance of the Study

This study contributes to understand the role of parody as a literary and stylistic tool in English literature specifically in contemporary literature. The research illuminates and shows that the use of parody is not only bounded to humor, it can be used as a technique for profound critique. Additionally, the study shows that the traditional narratives can be used to analyze and engage with the modern issues. The research also provides insight into the developing relationship between literature and society. The study will also help academics who are interested in parody and its role, Edward Bond's works, adaption studies, stylistic and literature analysis.

Research Methodology

In conducting research, a qualitative approach is relevant for exploring and gathering different definitions, meanings and types of parody, as well as their diverse functions within literary discourse especially in relation to postmodern English literature. Furthermore, this method allows for an in-depth examination of how parody has evolved over time, tracing its historical roots and early appearances in English literature.

Moreover, this research examines Edward Bond's *Lear* utilizing a qualitative descriptive approach using stylistic and thematic analysis. The study differentiates the cases of parody and their stylistic manifestations through a close textual reading of the play. Particular attention is paid to the linguistic choices, narrative structure, and thematic parallels with Shakespeare's *King Lear* in this study. In addition, Secondary sources such as critical essays and scholarly articles, offer a crucial information for the interpretation of findings.

Structure of the study

This study is organized into three main chapters, two theoretical chapters and a practical one. The first chapter is titled "Introduction to Parody". It is divided into three principal parts; the first one is about the concept of parody and its different definitions. The second one is about parody types and its function with different examples. The third part is conducting the evolution and the history of parody in English literature.

The second chapter is titled "Parody in Postmodern English Literature", It is divided into two parts. The first part defines the forms of parody within postmodern literature. The second one explains the role of parody in postmodern literature.

The third chapter is titled “Stylistic Analysis of Parody in Edward Bond’s *Lear*” it is a practical part that highlights how parody is used to criticize socio-political realities by conducting a stylistic analysis of Bond’s *Lear*, examining his linguistic and narrative techniques. The study concludes with a summary of findings and recommendations for further explorations.

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction to Parody

Chapter One: Introduction to Parody

Introduction.....	7
1.1. Different Definitions of Parody.....	7
1.2. Types and Functions of Parody	10
1.2.1. Pastiche	10
1.2.2. Burlesque	11
1.2.3. Satire	13
1.2.4. Skit.....	14
1.2.5. Spoof.....	14
1.2.6. Travesty	15
1.3. Early Appearance of Parody in English Literature	16
Conclusion	18

Introduction

Over time, parody is serving as a prominent artistic mode frequently used by writers and critics, and it holds a significant place in the arts. As a literary genre, parody has appeared across history with a range of diverse aspects, purposes, and functions. It is also characterized by a significant ambiguity that arises from the diverse definitions offered by many theorists and authors, as well as the multitude of its applications by several writers. Furthermore, the object of parody may focus on a tradition, genre, or discourse as well as a particular work or someone's style.

The exploration of parody is pivotal in literature. This chapter seeks to investigate the concept of parody by defining it through various perspectives. Then, it aims to classify parody into specific types, offering examples and analyzing their functions in literary discourse. Ultimately, the chapter traces the historical development of parody in English literature, from its early manifestations in medieval and Renaissance texts to contemporary literature.

1.1. Different Definitions of Parody

There are various definitions of parody that highlight its diverse characteristics in literature and art. Fundamentally, the concept of "parody" comes from the ancient Greek term *parodia*, which combines the prefix *para*—meaning either "against" or "beside"—with the noun *ode*, meaning "song" (Hutcheon, 1991a, p. 32). This etymology proposes two seemingly paradoxical interpretations. According to the *Explanatory Dictionary of the Romanian Language (DEX, 2009)*, parody is defined in two primary ways: firstly, as a literary composition that adopts themes, motifs, and artistic techniques from another work to create a satirical or humorous effect, and secondly as an inferior imitation of an original work or prototype, often perceived as a failed reproduction.

Beyond these definitions, different scholars in the field of literature have explored and identified the characteristics of parody based on their perspectives. For example, Walter Hamilton (1884), in his book *Parodies of the Works of English & American Authors*, defines it as “parody is a form of composition of a somewhat ungracious description, as it owes its very existence to the work it caricatures.”

Similarly, Samuel Johnson in his *Dictionary of the English Language* (1755) states that parody is a kind of writing in which the utterance of a writer or his ideas are taken and, by a small change, convenient to some new objective (Johnson, 1986, p. 177)

Moving into the 20th century, another definition is given by Linda Hutcheon in her work *A Theory of Parody. The Teachings of Twentieth-Century Art Forms* (1985), which provides a significant contribution to the study of parody. She argues that parody is among the most outstanding art forms of the 20th century, analyzing examples from architecture, visual arts, literature, film, and music as a sample. Hutcheon defines the contemporary parody as a “repetition with critical difference” (Hutcheon, 1985, p. 32). Hutcheon highlights that parody is not just copying or repeating an original text; it is a repetition that adds a new meaning or critique to the original work.

Expanding on this notion, Margaret A. Rose defines the term in her book *“Pictorial Irony, Parody, and Pastiche”* (2011), stating that “parody can in general be described as the comic reworking of preformed material.” Her definition illustrates that parody does not constitute a completely original creation; instead, it represents a creative reworking of pre-existing material, whether it's a text, a style, or a genre. In addition, parody is defined by Rose as intertextual, a fictional piece that is remarked on or reflected by another text by having the words, phrases, or ideas

of the original re-presented. Margaret A. Rose introduces parody as a metafictional, interrelated, and humorous genre (Rose, 2011, p. 283).

In this context, a historical study and interpretation of literary parody is conducted by one of the pioneering literary theorists, Mikhail Bakhtin. Bakhtin (2011, p. 54) regards parody as "one of the most ancient and widespread forms of representing the word of another (Uściński). Furthermore, parody is comprehended by Mikhail M. Bakhtin as double-voiced narrative in which the author's critical voice is heard concurrently with the original text itself, a concept also emphasized by Simon Dentith.

Expanding the discussion further, there is "specific" and "general" parody according to Simon Dentith. He states that the former "consists of a parody of a specific artwork or piece of writing ... [while] general parody takes as its hypotext not one specific work but a whole manner, style, or discourse" (Dentith, 2000, pp. 193-194).

To further enrich the discussion, another valuable perspective is from Nil Korkut, who offers a distinct definition of parody in his thesis *"Kinds of Parody from the Medieval to the Postmodern"* (2005). Korkut emphasizes that parody constitutes a deliberate reworking of a text, style, genre, or discourse that incorporates humor with the intention to convey a specific perspective on its subject —the humor fulfills a purpose. It is employed to convey a specific point of view or to critique aspects of the original subject (Korkut 14).

Eventually, according to *Literary Devices*. (n.d.) parody is defined as a literary device which aims to imitate and exaggerate a specific work, author, artist, or kind for humor. This implies that parody functions by borrowing recognizable elements from a pre-existing text or artistic style

and then modifying or amplifying them to create a humorous or ironic effect. The intention is not solely to entertain but also to expose flaws, or absurdities in the original source. This device is applied on the original work for the sake to entertain or critique. Parody allows the writers to show their own creativity, it also enables the audience who are familiar with the original work to engage and appreciate the humor. Additionally, parody can be practiced in different fields like, literature, music, film, and social context.

1.2. Types and Functions of Parody

Parody has been defined in distinct ways by writers and scholars, mirroring its developing part throughout literary history. These definitions go with diverse types of parody, that writers have used for various purposes, such as humor, satire, critique, or homage.

1.2.1. Pastiche

According to "*The Penguin Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory*" by J. A. Cuddon, pastiche is defined as a patchwork composed from multiple authors or a single author, consisting of a set of words, sentences, or entire passages. Therefore, it is a form of imitation that may be considered a parody when it is used purposely.

Moreover, pastiche is introduced in "*101 Literary Devices and Figures of Speech*" by Raupp, E. R. as "a creative work that imitates another author or genre. It's a way of paying respect, or honor, to great works of the past. Pastiche differs from parody in that pastiche isn't making fun of the works it imitates" (Raupp, 2024, p. 74); it copies the style, tone, or structure of another author, genre, or period, but without mocking or criticizing it. In this context, pastiche is a creative technique of producing a new piece that honors the original while maintaining its own distinct

uniqueness by borrowing and integrating components from different sources, styles, or genres. Its goal is to celebrate and imitate the core qualities of diverse artistic inspirations, frequently leading to a harmonious mix of several elements.

Fredric Jameson claims that pastiche is “blank parody” (1983: 114), which means an imitation “amputated of the satiric impulse” (Jameson, 1991). For instance, “nostalgia films,” such as *American Graffiti* (1973), are films that aim to imitate and celebrate past styles and eras without any fundamental commentary (Brodie, 2020, p. 5). Furthermore, as an example to portray the notion of pastiche, the “westerns” and “kung fu” movies are two distinct genres combined in Quentin Tarantino’s “*Kill Bill*” films, in which both styles are being honored by Tarantino without mocking or criticizing them, which is a key feature of pastiche (Raupp, 2024, p. 7).

Thus, based on the earlier explanations, it is concluded that pastiche can be defined as a blank imitation without any underlying critique or satire, and that pastiche imitates works, genres, and styles to celebrate and pay homage.

1.2.2. Burlesque

The term comes from the Italian word *burlesco*, from *burla*, which means “ridicule” or “joke”. Typically, burlesque is related to theater entertainment the most, and it is both stronger and wider in tone and manner than parody. It is a mocking imitation or exaggerated “sending up” of a work of literature or music (Cuddon & Preston, 1999).

Raupp, E. R., defines burlesque in “*101 Literary Devices and Figures of Speech*” as a designed work that evokes humor through mocking the style or essence of earnest pieces or by ridiculous dealing of their themes.

According to the book “*A Glossary of Literary Terms*,” eleventh edition, by M. H. Abrams and Geoffrey Galt Harpham, the term is divided into “high burlesque” and “low burlesque.” High burlesque is when low or insignificant theme is presented through high, grand, formal and dignified form and manner. It includes both parody and mock-epic (or mock-heroic) poetry. One example is Fielding’s *Joseph Andrews* (1742), which parodies Richardson’s *Pamela* (1740). While *Pamela* follows a young persecuted heroine, *Joseph Andrews* humorously reverses the scenario by portraying a virtuous, hearty, chaste, and strong-willed male protagonist facing similar challenges. In the case of mock-epic (or mock-heroic) poetry, which means imitating an epic genre, ornate form, and ceremonial manner while narrating an ordinary and trivial event such as *The Rape of the Lock* (1714) by Alexander Pope, in which he mocks the exaggerated seriousness of social customs. Low burlesque occurs when a serious or highly respected subject is conveyed in a crude, silly, or undignified style and tone. An example of this is the “Hudibrastic poem,” that is named after Samuel Butler’s *Hudibras* (1663). This work makes fun of strict Puritan beliefs by telling the story of a Puritan knight named Sir Hudibras. However, instead of writing the poem in a grand, heroic style, Butler uses doggerel style— in irregular, and comedic verse— to mock his topic. In addition, the “low” type of burlesque includes “travesty”, which ridicules a serious work by using silly, ridiculous, or crude ways to present its important subject. A notable example is *The New Yorker*’s parody of Ernest Hemingway’s novel “*Across the River and Into the Trees*” (1950), humorously titled *Across the Street and Into the Bar*. This travesty trivializes Hemingway’s novel title seriousness.

So that, burlesque functions as a mock and ridicule tool to evoke humor and entertainment of a literary or musical work.

1.2.3. Satire

Satire can be defined as the literary technique of undermining, ridiculing, revealing, and criticizing a subject or others' foolishness or shortcomings using irony, comedy, exaggeration, or mockery in an attempt to bring about a change. It uses laughter as a weapon (Abrams & Harpham, 2013; Raupp, 2024; AP Literary Terms, n.d.).

Initially, both satire and parody employ irony. In satire, irony is used to manifest the derogatory negative point of view of the satirist. The difference between parody and satire, according to Linda Hutcheon, is represented in their function and theme, in which satire ridicules the original work and mostly focuses on moral and social matters, aiming for improvement, while parody may honor the work, and it could either end or create a new genre of art (Ismail, 2023, p. 7).

Accordingly, Margaret Rose distinguishes between parody and satire is that the former requires an original work to rely on, and it provides sarcasm to the audience, while the latter does not need any original work, and it creates a derogating impact utilizing vice.

Ultimately, satiric parody is a concept that arises from combining satire and parody, which simultaneously entertains and critiques through creating a powerful style of social suspension so that satire promotes the critique of the subjects, institutions, or attitudes. Accordingly, Swift's *Gulliver's Travels* is considered as an example of this blend in English literature, in which he satirizes British politics and European society in general during his parodying of the prior narratives of exploration. Considering this context, the objective of satire is values, politics, societal standards, or traditions, whereas in parody, it is the author, or its original work (Ismail, 2023, p. 8).

In satire, there are three main types. The first type is Juvenalian; it is the most powerful and harsh one, as it attacks a sole target. Political satire counts as the most popular shape of this kind, which offends politicians and pundits, such as in George Orwell's *Animal Farm*. Secondly Menippean is more general than Juvenalian while the same in harshness, as attacking figures and beliefs in religious satire like in Thomas More's *Utopia*. The third kind is Horatian; this type uses a soft and kind style while mocking things, as exemplified by Jonathan Swift's *Gulliver's Travels* (Raupp, 2024, p. 9).

Eventually, satire has different types and uses, but its most common function is attacking and satirizing political, societal, or traditional values and standards.

1.2.4. Skit

Skit is very related and equivalent to parody and burlesque. It depicts or exaggerate the way of writing or the particular mode of performance and interpretation of an individual. A skit is a kind of entertainment that is popular in musical revues and similar performances, in which a manner of a melodist, writer, or famous figure is being impersonated humorously and mocked (Cuddon & Preston, 1999).

1.2.5. Spoof

The comedian Arthur Roberts invented this new term. In literature, spoof uses parody and burlesque as a kind of trick that mocks. (Cuddon & Preston, 1999).

According to Cambridge University Press (n.d.), a spoof is a humorous and exaggerated absurd piece of writing, music or theatre, that mimics the manner of an original work (Cambridge

Dictionary, March 21, 2025). Moreover, Spoof borrows elements from the original work imitating the style and features that obviously indicate the topic of the spoof (Vocabulary.com, March 21, 2025).

1.2.6. Travesty

The term came into English through French, which was borrowed from the Italian word *tra-vestire*, which means ‘to cross-dress’ or ‘to dress in disguise.’ Eventually, in English, the meaning of ‘to travesty’ lost the word ‘dress’ in ‘to dress ridiculously’ while keeping humor, and it became ‘devolve into to pervert, spurious representation, or absurd (Bracewell, 2024, p. 4).

According to Florio dictionary (1598), travesty originally means "to change apparel"; however, over time, the meaning shifted from simply “changing” to more figurative sense signifying the application of a humorous, unceremonious, and irreverent treatment in the modification of noble themes (Priestman, 1980, p. 13).

Travesty is a kind of parody that mockingly degrades and belittles an esteemed topic. According to Propp’s approach (2009 [1976]: 63), travesty is a form of directed criticism toward something other, in which it entertains its audience by giving ordinary, casual portrayals of narratives, figures, dialogs, and settings taken from the timeworn volumes of classic literature. Travesty differs from parody in the textual transformation performance, in which parody does it in a playful way while travesty does it in a satirical manner. An example of travesty is Cervantes *Don Quixote* (1605), which is considered a travesty of chivalric Romances, and another like *Ulysses* (1922) by James Joyce is somehow a travesty of Homer's *Odyssey* (Baldick, 2001; Brodie, 2020; Dentith, 2002; Juvan, 2008).

Parody is a varied literary device that extends various forms serving distinct functions, whether they honor or critique the original work. Entertainment is a key characteristic of parody, but it also prompts reflection on social standards and artistic conventions by converting and reworking previous works.

1.3. Early Appearance of Parody in English Literature

Parody as a concept goes back to Greek antiquity or may be even older than that, it has been a component of Western culture. According to Aristotle Hegemon of Thasos was the first person to introduce parody in the theater in the 5th c. BC; he portrayed men less than what they actually are in true life by using an epic manner. It is also attributed to the 5th-century poet Hipponax. Aristotle also mentions parody in *Poetics* (Cuddon & Preston, 1999).

Aristophanes and Plato utilize parody to take and mock styles of different writers, such as Plato's *Symposium*, also Aeschylus and Euripides manner in Aristophanes *The Frogs*. Moreover, Lucian's varieties of his parodied Dialogues were enumerated by Cicero, and they were very well known among Latin writers (Cuddon & Preston, 1999).

In the Middle Ages, parody was commonly used in liturgical texts, chants, and even the Holy Writ. Chaucer's skit *Tale of Sir Thopas* (c. 1383) which was about some of the most ridicule features of romance in the medieval age, it was the first famous parody in English. Then, Alexander Pope and W.W. Skeat parodied Chaucer (Cuddon & Preston, 1999).

Late in the Renaissance period, the entire tradition of the Middle Ages romances in *Don Quixote* (1605, 1615) was parodied by Cervantes. John Lyly's euphuism in *Henry IV, Pt I* (1597), the embellished manner of Marlowe in *Hamlet* (c. 1603), and Nashe's common mode in *Love's*

Labour's Lost (c. 1595) were also parodied by Shakespeare. Later, Donne John was imitated by Sir John Suckling as a splendidly love poet. In 1701, so smartly John Philips mocked Milton in *The Splendid Shilling*. Earlier, the dramatic parodies *Rehearsal* (1671) by Buckingham ridicule Dryden's *The Conquest of Granada* (Cuddon & Preston, 1999).

Furthermore, in 1736, a notable precedent was formed by Isaac Hawkins's *A Pipe of Tobacco*, as it characterizes the premier anthology of parodies that purported attempts on a sole topic of diverse authors. Earlier, in 1730, Tom Thumb burlesque drama appeared, and thereafter, Fielding's *Shamela* (1741) served as an entire parodic work that ridiculed Richardson's *Pamela* (1740) (Cuddon & Preston, 1999).

In the 18th c., a prosperous parody of emotional drama and the malignant literary criticism of the era was created by Sheridan's *The Critic* (1779). Later, in 1812, Scott, Wordsworth, Byron, Coleridge, Dr. Johnson, and others were prosperously parodied by James and Horace Smith in *Rejected Addresses*. Generally, it was agreed that Max Beerbohm's *A Christmas Garland* (1912) is a set of parodies that have established a standard that may never be overridden, and according to him, parody is an art (Cuddon & Preston, 1999).

In a period that is called "post Beerbohm," which refers to the period after the work of Max Beerbohm that sets a high standard for the art of parody, there was as much diversity and skill as in the 19th c. During the 1930s, Stella Gibbons's *Cold Comfort Farm* (1932), which is considered a classic parody of the era, was a brilliant satire of the primitivism of Mary Webb's novels as well as of Hardy J. C. Powys and D. H. Lawrence. Subsequently, in 1960, *Parodies: An Anthology from Chaucer to Beerbohm and After* was a wonderful set of antiquated pieces that was published by Dwight MacDonald (Cuddon & Preston, 1999).

In postmodernism, parody becomes the most broadly used genre in literature and functions as a critical role. In 20th century parody, the theorist states that it is “a perfect postmodern form” (Hutcheon 1988: 11). Parody manifests itself in postmodern literature, such as British narratives like Iris Murdoch’s *The Black Prince* (1973) and Malcolm Bradbury’s *Mensonge* (1987). In the contemporary period, Wendy Cope is considered a masterful verse parodist. Several good epitomes are found in her gathering of poems, *Making Cocoa for Kingsley Amis* (1986) (Cuddon & Preston, 1999).

Conclusion

In this chapter, different types and functions of parody have been examined by tracing its historical development in literature. Beginning with its definition and different types, the chapter has explored the evolution of parody from ancient Greece through the Middle Ages, the Renaissance, and into the contemporary era. In this chapter parody’s role in literary discourse, has been highlighted from its use in classical texts to its impact on contemporary literature. Furthermore, parody lasting existence as both a tool of critique and a means of artistic homage, shaping and reshaping literary traditions across various historical periods has been impersonated in English literature through prominent figures and works. From our research, we conclude that there is no fixed literary definition of parody because of the artistic evolution and individuals’ perspectives. Moreover, through history, writers have used parody to defy dominant narratives, satirize societal standards, and involve with bygone literary traditions.

CHAPTER TWO

Parody in Postmodern English Literature

Chapter Two: Parody in Postmodern English Literature

Introduction.....	18
2.1. Forms of Parody in Postmodern English literature	19
2.1.1. Intertextuality	19
2.1.2. Pastiche	21
2.1.3. Metafiction Parody	22
2.1.4. Meta-parody	24
2.1.5. Self-parody.....	26
2.2. The Functions of Parody in Postmodern English Literature.....	28
2.2.1. Constructive Parody	28
2.2.2. The Role of Parody in Critique	29
2.2.3. Questioning Authenticity	30
2.2.4. Blurring High and Low Culture	31
2.2.5. Examining Fragmentation and Meaning.....	32
Conclusion	32

Introduction

The use of literary devices like fragmentation, paradox, unreliable narrators, frequently implausible and downright impossible plots, games, parody, paranoia, dark humor, and authorial self-reference are characteristics of postmodern literature, both stylistically and ideologically. In their novels, novellas, and poems, postmodern writers frequently reject overt meanings in favor of highlighting and celebrating the potential of numerous interpretations—or even a complete lack of meaning—within a single creative work. (Brian, 1987).

Parody is a common key device in postmodernism. While encouraging readers to examine their assumptions about literature and reality, parody enables writers to critically interact with already-existing texts and genres. Great critics like Fredric Jameson, Linda Hutcheon, and Simon Dentith are all considered significant figures in the realm of postmodern criticism, each contributing unique perspectives to the understanding of postmodernism, especially parody in postmodern English literature. Linda Hutcheon (1989) emphasizes the value of parody as fundamental to postmodernism, which argues that "postmodern parody is a kind of contesting revision or rereading of the past that both confirms and subverts the power of representations of history" (p:91).

In the light of this, this chapter explores the concept of parody within the realm of postmodern English literature. It begins by defining parody and then classifies it into distinct forms prevalent in postmodern works. Additionally, the chapter examines the functions of parody, illustrating its diverse roles in literary discourse with specific examples from literature.

2.1. Forms of Parody in Postmodern English literature

Both postmodernism's supporters and critics generally agree that parody, also known as ironic quotation, pastiche, appropriation, or intertextuality, is essential to the postmodern movement. Parody indicates how current representations are derived from earlier ones and what ideological implications result from both continuity and diversity through a dual process of installation and ironization (Hutcheon, 1989).

Building on this understanding of parody's significance in postmodernism, it becomes crucial to explore the various forms through which parody manifests, each contributing uniquely to its role as a critical and creative literary tool.

2.1.1. Intertextuality

The art of making connections between literary or creative works is known as intertextuality. One postmodern aspect of literature and art is intertextuality, which indicates that every text incorporates the meaning, denotation, and impact of earlier works. The study of postmodern literature lays a lot of emphasis on intertextuality since postmodernism reflects a decentered vision of the universe in which individual works are not independent entities: the relationship between one text and another or one text within the interwoven fabric of literary history (Allen, 2000). On her part, Hutcheon (1988:118) explains: “intertextuality is a formal manifestation of both a desire to close the gap between past and present of the reader and a desire to rewrite the past in a new context”

Postmodern intertextuality, characterized by the recognition and citation of prior works, is seen as a fundamental postmodern writing technique that facilitates a connection between the past

and the present in relation to literary genres for both readers and writers. It allows readers to view historical events via the writers' perspectives of past centuries and to critique them using contemporary literary language (Ayar, 2022).

Another important theorist, Julia Kristeva (1981), expands on the concept of intertextuality. She states that any text is primarily a “mosaic of quotations” (p: 36). A text is simply a collection of different texts that have been assimilated and combined into one; intertextuality, then, is the process of learning new texts from previously written, spoken, and, most commonly, produced meaning processes rather than just the writer or reader consciously "copying" earlier texts.

An example of “intertextuality” is the poem *Teeth* (1986) by Morrison. It is a parodic and intertextual commentary on Robert Browning's *My Last Duchess*. Both poems exhibit significant variances as well as commonalities in terms of structure, tone, and artistic purpose. Robert Browning's *My Last Duchess* (1842) portrays his late wife, the last Duchess, who is being shown to the emissary by the Duke of Ferrara. He talks about how beautiful she was and how he thought her too wide smile was flirty. The Duke adds that because he did not want her to bring disgrace to the family name, he had to stop her behavior. He adds that the painting depicts her smile wonderfully, and that it is now his property. The Duke's statements imply that he was involved in the Duchess's demise, and his tone is threatening (Hassan, 2024). In both Browning's and Morrison's poems, characters disclose their emotional states to a silent audience through a dramatic soliloquy. Their tone and construction are similar, yet their personalities are not. In Browning's poem, a Renaissance Duke talks about a new wife, whereas Morrison's poem includes an anonymous 20th-century businessman. Envious and doubtful, the interlocutors control their spouses. The Duke does not appreciate his wife's aristocratic behavior and hates her caring demeanor. In Morrison's poem,

the character is irritated with his late spouse, Janine, who hates a portrait of Bacon. (Al-Tameemi& Muneer, n.d.).

Concluding with veiled threats, the Duke ends with another aesthetic object: "Notice Neptune, though, Taming a sea-horse." (Browning, 1994: 54-6), which is a veiled threat to his future bride, and similarly, Morrison's speaker ends with threatening, violent imagery directed at rivals: "We'll see that bastard roasting yet"(Morrison, 1986: 60-4). (Al-Tameemi& Muneer, n.d.).

Visual art as a central motif connects both works, as Browning's speaker is fixated on a 'portrait of his last duchess', which had been painted by an artist, Fra Pandolf, while Morrison's speaker is fixated upon a 'portrait of the tortured Pope', which was based on a painting by Velázquez and reinterpreted by Francis Bacon (Al-Tameemi& Muneer, n.d.).

2.1.2. Pastiche

A literary technique utilized in postmodern writing; pastiche is the replication of a prior works style without the derisive tone of parody. It aims to highlight different aspects of the narrative by blending earlier, related pieces (Ayar, 2022).

Pastiche is: "a text consisting wholly or largely of direct borrowings from one or more other works" (McArthur, 1992). Additionally, unlike parody, pastiche tends to borrow pieces of other texts in varying quantities and does not always aim to make fun of them. This allows pastiche to create an intertextuality between various literary creations (Ayar, 2022).

According to Bran Nicol (2009: 61), in his book *The Cambridge Introduction to Postmodern Fiction*. Cambridge Introductions to Literature, comments on the relationship between

the texts: “Barthes contends that literary composition is not and never has been an ‘original’ activity, but a matter of the author rearranging previous literary and linguistic conventions rather than creating something completely new”.

Moving to the well-known work Postmodernism, or the *Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism* by Fredric Jameson (1989), defines pastiche as a “blank parody,” he explains as follow: “Pastiche is, like parody, the imitation of a peculiar or unique, idiosyncratic style, the wearing of a linguistic mask, speech in dead language. But it is a neutral practice of such mimicry, without any of parody’s ulterior motives, amputated of the satiric impulse, devoid of laughter and of any conviction that alongside the abnormal tongue you have momentarily borrowed, some healthy linguistic normality still exists. Pastiche is thus blank parody, a statue with blind eyeballs”. (Jameson, 1991).

In his 1977 book *The Public Burning*, Robert Coover blends fictional characters like Uncle Sam and Betty Crocker with factually erroneous descriptions of Richard Nixon's interactions with historical persons (Hutcheon, 2004), which was represented in: “Very well,” says Uncle Sam, and he picks up Betty Crocker’s fallen dentures and bites Manny in the nose with them (p. 497).

2.1.3. Metafiction Parody

Metafiction parody is a combination of two concepts which are “Metafiction” and “Parody”. In the following, we start with ‘Metafiction’.

2.1.3.1. Metafiction

According to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, metafiction is ‘fiction in which the author self-consciously alludes to the artificiality or literariness of a work by parodying or departing from novelistic conventions...and narrative techniques.’ (Vachon, 2006, p:4)

In addition to this definition a: "novel that imitates a novel rather than the real world" is John Barth's succinct definition of metafiction (quoted in Currie (1995). It is also a genre of fiction in which readers recognize that they are engaging with a fabricated narrative.

Patricia Waugh argues:

Metafiction is a term given to fictional writing which self-consciously and systematically draws attention to its status as an artefact in order to pose questions about the relationship between fiction and reality. In providing a critique of their own methods of construction, such writings not only examine the fundamental structures of narrative fiction, they also explore the possible fictionality of the world outside the literary fictional text” (Waugh 1984: 2).

2.1.3.2. Parody

Postmodern parody serves as a tool for ironically reinterpreting previously published materials in order to highlight specific story points. According to Linda Hutcheon (1985: xii), parody is “a form of repetition with ironic critical distance, marking difference rather than similarity”. Also, she adds: “Parody [...] is an integrated structural modeling process of revising, replaying, inverting, and ‘trans -contextualizing’ previous works of art” (p:11).

By merging these two concepts, as a functional definition of Metafiction Parody: “Metafictional parodies often serve 'to criticise and refunction less self-reflective works of fiction' and 'to educate their own readers to a greater awareness of both the possibilities and limitations of fiction’” (Nünning, 1999:128).

Additionally, some researchers suggest that parodic metafiction is a writing style that emerges from irony's constant evolution, particularly since the emergence of late-modernist fiction. This literary form, known as parodic metafiction, is employed methodically, with irony purposefully hidden and purposefully used to achieve various goals. A parody of tired realist tropes, *An Unwritten Novel* by *Virginia Woolf* is about a first-person narrator who travels from London to Eastbourne and creates a fictional life for an elderly woman named Minnie Marsh. In addition to highlighting the challenges of character development in fiction, the narrator's trip contradicts the story's stream-of-consciousness narrative method and the problems of constructing fiction within fiction (Lojo Rodríguez, 2001). Parody is itself, as Linda Hutcheon has suggested (1980: 25) one of the essential qualities of metafictional narrative, which implies an exploration of difference and similarity. *An Unwritten Novel* overtly plays with naïve realist conventions – all those elements which intervene in the construction of Minnie's character and her story – by means of the ironic use of certain literary codes that no doubt the reader will recognize. Yet the story goes beyond mere ridicule, mockery and destruction: *An Unwritten Novel* is an example of how metafiction parodies and imitates as a way to a new form. It is not what the story tells that is important, but the way in which it is told, which becomes the core of this kind of narrative as the narrator implies with his or her comments on her role, such as:

«Have I read you right? ... Hang still, then, quiver, life, soul, spirit, whatever you are of Minnie Marsh – I, too, on my flower – the hawk over the down – alone, or what were the worth of life? ... Alone, unseen; seeing all so still down there, all so lovely. None seeing, none caring. » (1985: 117; emphasis added). (Lojo Rodríguez, 2001)

2.1.4. Meta-parody

To introduce the term of meta-parody that is considered as a form of parody in postmodern English literature, it is necessary to define the prefix meta. This prefix denotes an

additional layer of parody that goes beyond what is typically considered to be the extent of parody. It is a prefix that means "among, after, behind," and particularly "beyond." According to Sekules: "[i]t suggests the experience in question may be digested on more than one level" (quoted in Safire, 2005). When discussing an idea that transcends a common scale and establishes a new level above it, the prefix meta- is frequently employed. Subsequently, the term can be defined as follows: A parody that explains a parody should then be suggested as meta parody. Nevertheless, the word "meta parody" refers to a genre that parodies parody rather than one that describes it. Thus, in meta-parody, the prefix meta-designates a parody of parody rather than a text about parody (Kravalová, 2009).

One of the best examples of the employment of meta-parody in African American discourse to subvert and recast language as well as cultural traditions is visible in Ishmael Reed's novel, *Mumbo Jumbo*. Reed's complex satiric technique is reflected in the example of the Villa Lewaro. The name of the villa, "Villa Lewaro," is in fact an anagram of the hostess's name, thereby reflecting African American traditions characterized by linguistic cleverness, including wordplay and anagrams. Reed's articulation finds its analogy with the rhetorical approaches frequently observed in African American culture. According to Henry Louis Gates Jr., "Lewaro" is also an anagram for "we oral," which highlights the African American oral story telling tradition and adds another degree of linguistic history. Reed, however, subverts both interpretations with his final irony: since there is no hostess at Villa Lewaro and secrecy surrounds her identity, Reed challenges both perspectives. This mirrors Reed's self-referential parody as commentary on the way language is used to create meaning; this very intended ambiguity is used to satirize the processes involved in using linguistic structures to communicate meaning (Kravalová, 2009). Satire and parody frequently occur together, and as a result, their dictionary and everyday definitions are treated as related, and

sometimes slightly synonymous. While parody is concerned primarily with transformations of literary or artistic forms, thereby giving it the status of a genre, satire is a better abstract noun to use when one identifies a critical or humorous element in various circumstances (McCutcheon, 2008). Through the use of anagram "Villa Lewaro" in *Mumbo Jumbo* Ishmael Reed creates a satirical and parodic connection. The anagrammatical method accomplishes two things: It displays African American linguistic elements and simultaneously dismantles universal understanding about meaning and identity. The absence of a hostess in his presentation about the villa enables Reed to analyze the language-based construction of meaning thus transforming his work into a meaningful study of cultural expression. Satire and parody smoothly interpret the complex ways which linguistic structures and cultural presentations play out within African American speech patterns.

2.1.5. Self-parody

From the *Collins English Dictionary*, self-parody is defined as “the act or an instance of mimicking oneself in a humorous or satirical way” which means that the writer or the author parodying himself or his style of writing in ironic or humorous way; The narrative possesses an ironic self-referentiality, being concurrently composed and parodied, as if hypertext and hypertext coexisted or, more accurately, merged into one another (Kravalová, 2009).

Richard Poirier (1968) combines parody and post-modernism, defining the new type of fiction as: “a literature of self-parody that makes fun of itself as it goes along”, using Nabokov as one of his prime examples (qtd. in Dentith 2000, 154). In addition, Nabokov’s novel states the title of the novel has an ironic relationship to itself, making a statement about the nature of writing in general. It is simultaneously manufactured and self-referential (Kravalová, 2009)

Let me state that without my notes Shade's text simply has no human reality at all since the human reality of such a poem as his (being too skittish and reticent for an autobiographical work), with the omission of many pithy lines carelessly rejected by him, has to depend entirely on the reality of its author and his surroundings, attachments and so forth, a reality that only my notes can provide (1962:16)

Charles Kinbote is a fictional character who acts as the unreliable narrator in Vladimir Nabokov's novel *Pale Fire*. This quotation is spoken by him, who serves as the fictional editor and commentator in Vladimir Nabokov's novel. The 'self-parody' in this excerpt is encapsulated in Kinbote's inflated sense of ego and his erroneous assumption that his notes are crucial to Shade's poem.

In Miguel de Cervantes's '*Don Quixote*' (Part I published in 1605, Part II in 1615), the tension between the romanticized knights and the worldly anti-hero is highlighted in Part I of '*Don Quixote*'. It is largely a parody work. However, Part II of '*Don Quixote*' becomes a self-parody by raising questions regarding the genuineness of the book. This shift is contained in *Don Quixote*'s own words: "No doubt, Senor Don Diego de Miranda, you set me down in your mind as a fool and a madman, and it would be no wonder if you did, for my deeds do not argue anything else" (971). His words acknowledge the building of his madness, but also prefigure the deeper metafictional aspects of the novel. '*Don Quixote*' turns into a picaresque novel of adventure where the hero and the novel must be disentangled from imitations. Its attention is turned to the Don's metafictional character, as he must defend his (Cervantes's) story against other 'false' versions, such as those written by Don Alonzo Fernandez de Avellaneda (Cordeiro, 2014).

In addition to these forms, there are others that lack precise or generally recognized definitions; instead, authors and writers creatively employ them to achieve certain objectives in their work. These include cultural parody, which questions accepted social norms and ideals, and genre

parody, which exaggerates the conventions of specific literary or creative genres. As a literary and creative medium, parody is dynamic and multifaceted, as these and other examples demonstrate.

2.2. The Functions of Parody in Postmodern English Literature

In postmodern English literature, parody is a versatile weapon that gives writers a way to interact with and question literary conventions, cultural norms, and societal issues. This section examines the many purposes of parody, showing how it may be used to amuse, stimulate the mind, and promote a greater comprehension of the source literature it alludes to. We will discover how parody enhances the literary environment and captures the complexity of postmodern identity and experience by looking at particular examples.

2.2.1. Constructive Parody

Polish critics and scholars like Michał Głowiński and Ryszard Nycz have highlighted the strengths of Hutcheon's theory of parody, with Nycz writing that parody can be characterized by four functions: ludic, satirical, critical, and constructive. Nycz explains the final function as follows:

The constructive function of parody is a style-creating mechanism when it creates critical distance in relation to the repertoire of styles and allows for discovery of one's own stylistic idiom, as well as a genre-creating one when it leads to defining new genealogical rules as a result of critical transformation and reorganization of petrified models. The construction of parodic form ... also makes it possible to elaborate an original, dynamic and highly complex structure, which can be used to articulate new issues ... and create one's own world of a work of art. (2000: 221).

The constructive parody is manifested in *Alice Randall's* novel *The Wind Done Gone* (2001) by rejecting a very particular (mis)perception of the Southern past; Randall does reject tradition. The problematization of the Cavalier ideal, the perversion of planter whites, and the

emphasis on (non)planter blacks, the worry about breaking patriarchal norms, and revolt are some of the ways that this rejection shows up:

Debt Chauffeur, that's my name for him now, wants to marry me. He asked me down on bended knee, and I would have been honored—except he wants us to live in London, and he wants me to live white. I crowed at that. I laughed so hard, and not a tear came. He couldn't understand it. I don't often think on how white I look; it's always been a question of how colored I feel, and I feel plenty colored. He said that no one in London will know that I'm supposed to be colored. And I said I am colored, colored black, the way I talk, the way I cook, the way I do most everything, and he said but you don't have to be. She was "black" and she didn't seem it, and she was not that much lighter than you, and she was "black."(p.72).

Randall creates a sense of uncertainty and indeterminacy in her book to accomplish this.

As we have seen, if the parody does draw readers' attention to what has been absent from *Gone with the Wind*, it also regrettably draws our attention to what has been absent from the rewriting of one of the most influential female writers in the South, thereby reaffirming the fact that Margaret Mitchell (writer of *Gone with the Wind*) herself had fully recognized: "the Past is selling better than the future" (Huyssen 20).

2.2.2. The Role of Parody in Critique

One of the main purposes of parody is to offer a sarcastic assessment of the original work or the genre to which it belongs. Through mimicry and exaggeration, parody draws attention to the shortcomings, cliches, or ridiculousness inherent in the original content. This type of criticism can be amusing and thought-provoking, causing viewers to consider the underlying themes and customs that are being ridiculed. Hutcheon, L. (1978) outlines the purpose of parody in contemporary works in her article "Parody without Ridicule," emphasizing that its goal is not to mock or destroy the works' reputation. According to her:

parody implies a distance between the backgrounded text being parodied and the new work, a distance usually signaled by irony but irony is more playful than ridiculing, more critical than destructive (p.09).

For instance, *The Penelopiad* (2005), Margaret Atwood's masterpiece, is a perfect example of parody. Atwood's work is a mocking reworking of Homer's Greek epic, *The Odyssey*. With its dedication to the resurrected voices of Penelope and her maids, this Atwoodian masterwork appears to be an attempt to update the well-known tale of *Penelope* and *Odysseus*. She parodies Homer's *Odyssey* in her novel. Atwood uses the original pretext as the basis for a subplot in her writing. Her use of parody led to the demythologizing of the myths of Helen's greatest beauty, Penelope's image of devotion, and *Odysseus's* myth of valor. Additionally, Atwood exposed new facets of *Penelope* and her twelve maids, the two central characters in her work who were marginalized in *The Odyssey*, in order to assert her parodic tendencies. As a result, parody allows them to express their ideas and become the focal point of the story. However, Atwood does more than just invent a distinctive style in her parody. She takes aim at the prevailing cultural conception of gender and the patriarchal distribution of power (Belzeckour, 2023).

2.2.3. Questioning Authenticity

Parody is essential for examining the nature of representation in a postmodern setting where the idea of authenticity is frequently questioned. Parodies are intentional imitations of the tone or subject matter of a unique performance for a critical and humorous effect at the same time. While parody borrows from and keeps some elements of its source material, it modifies the original's semantic meaning to make it seem absurd or even amusing (Hariman 2008).

Don DeLillo's *White Noise* (1985) effectively exemplifies this, which uses satire to criticize commercial culture and the pervasiveness of media in daily life. The hyperreal aspects of

the book make it difficult to distinguish between simulation and reality, which makes readers think about how authenticity is created in a society where pictures and ads rule. DeLillo examines how people negotiate their identities in a world that is becoming more and more mediated through parody. DeLillo aims to investigate "what place there is, if any, for the notion of the individual or the authentic" in *White Noise*, which more than any other of his novels emphasizes the loss of reality and authenticity as the distinguishing characteristic of postmodern America (Gray, 2004: 617). This is never clearer than in *White Noise*, particularly in the way Jack Gladney, the protagonist, is portrayed. In fact, "most of DeLillo's characters [...] seem like simulations of characters" (Douglas, 2002: 105), as opposed to real people. Despite his high professional status and global reputation as a Hitler scholar, Jack, the creator of the department of Hitler studies, is actually plagued by insecurity and self-doubt because he is well aware that his prosperous academic career is predicated on "the construction of a false persona" (Tate, 2003: 29).

2.2.4. Blurring High and Low Culture

The hierarchical divisions between popular culture and high art are frequently questioned in postmodern literature. By combining aspects from many cultural sources, parody makes this blending easier and produces a rich tapestry of references that appeal to a wide range of viewers (Eshmamatov, 2024).

This strategy is best illustrated by David Foster Wallace's (1996) *Infinite Jest*, which engages with philosophy, athletics, addiction, and movies in a lighthearted manner. By combining these seemingly unrelated components, Wallace crafts a complicated story that captures the intricacies of modern life while also allowing readers to interact with both highbrow and lowbrow cultural allusions. The Tennis Match at Enfield Tennis Academy, Wallace blends accurate

terminology with lighthearted, humorous asides to present a thorough technical analysis of a tennis match at Enfield Tennis Academy. The combination of comedy and technical skill upends established cultural hierarchies by rooting a "lowbrow" sport in common, approachable language and elevating it via intellectual conversation. The novel highlights the difficulties facing sports in the modern world by weaving together high art and popular culture, each of which informs and deconstructs the other (Redgate, 2021).

2.2.5. Examining Fragmentation and Meaning

Additionally, parody can be used to explore more profound philosophical issues of purpose in a fractured society. Parody can draw attention to the ridiculousness of trying to find conclusive interpretations in postmodern literature, since tales frequently defy closure and consistency (Eshmamatov, 2024). This idea is best shown by Pynchon's (1966) *The Crying of Lot 49*, which has a complex plot with conflicting interpretations and ambiguous implications. The text's humorous components inspire readers to accept ambiguity and acknowledge the limitations of words in expressing reality. By making fun of modern America and the American Dream in particular, Pynchon also demonstrates skepticism against great narratives. Since Sullivan (2004) contends that: "myths are master narratives; they are mere stories that attempt to find truth in unexplainable phenomena," Pynchon views the American Dream as a myth that belongs in the realm of fiction rather than reality and attempts to discredit it in this book. By using Maxwell's Demon and the idea of entropy, the grand story of the American dream is diminished (Rezaei, 2013).

Conclusion

Parody is a complex literary form with various definitions and practices. Linda Hutcheon's *A Theory of Parody* (1985), Margaret A. Rose, and Frederic Jameson contribute to the theory of postmodern parody. Postmodern parody differs from traditional parody in that its primary goal is not to ridicule the parodied author or style for its own sake. Instead, it uses irony to highlight the differences between earlier art forms and sensibilities as well as the gap between the past and present which is illustrated in different forms. In this chapter, parody is demonstrated in several ways that set it apart from the traditional form in postmodern English literature, as Linda Hutcheon and others have argued in their writings.

Postmodern parody takes many different forms, Intertextuality deals with interdependence between texts, blending previous influences into new narratives. Pastiche imitates previous styles but not in satirical tones, dealing with playing around with forms. Metafictional parody directly copes with the fictional nature of itself, questioning reality and representation. Meta-parody parodies the act of parodying itself. Authors can humorously lampoon their writing style or topic matter through self-parody. All of these forms work together to improve postmodern literature by questioning norms, subverting popular narrative, and rewriting cultural and historical narratives.

Considering what has been discussed, the functions of parody are various: it blends high and low culture, challenges social norms, productively reinterprets earlier writings, challenges authenticity, and explores fragmented meanings. Parody is essential to postmodern literature; it enables writers to interact with the intricacies of modern culture in fresh and provocative ways by challenging conventional narrative conventions. As postmodern literature keeps evolving and adapting to the shifting cultural landscape, parody continues to play a crucial and dynamic role in

the genre, providing fresh viewpoints and insights on the difficulties and paradoxes of the postmodern society.

CHAPTER THREE

Stylistic Analysis of Parody in Edward Bond's Lear

Chapter Three: Stylistic Analysis of Parody in Edward Bond's Lear

Introduction.....	32
3.1. Exploring Edward Bond's Lear	32
3.1.1. The Author's Biography	32
3.1.2. Historical and Cultural Context	33
3.1.3. Plot and Summary.....	34
3.1.4. Characters.....	37
3.1.4.1. Lear	37
3.1.4.2. Bodice	37
3.1.4.3. Fontanelle.....	38
3.1.4.4. Warrington	38
3.1.4.5. The Gravedigger's Boy.....	39
3.1.4.6. Cordelia.....	39
3.1.5. Themes	40
3.1.5.1. Violence	40
3.1.5.2. Abuse of Power	41

3.1.5.3. Parents and Children.....	41
3.1.5.4. Social Justice and Morality	42
3.2. Exploring Shakespeare's King Lear	42
3.2.1. The Author's Biography	42
3.2.2. Historical and cultural context.....	44
3.2.3. Plot and summary	45
3.2.4. Characters.....	47
3.2.4.1. King Lear	47
3.2.4.2. Cordelia.....	48
3.2.4.3. Goneril and Regan.....	49
3.2.4.4. Kent	50
3.2.4.5. The Fool.....	50
3.2.4.6. Edgar.....	51
3.2.4.7. The Duke of Cornwall	51
3.2.4.8. The Earl of Gloucester.....	52
3.2.5. Themes	52
3.2.5.1. Violence	53

3.2.5.2. Power and Authority.....	53
3.2.5.3. Justice and Injustice.....	54
3.2.5.4. Family Relationship.....	54
3.2.5.5. Blindness.....	55
3.3. King Lear and Lear Intertextuality.....	55
3.4. Style and Stylistics	57
3.4.1. Style	58
3.4.2. Stylistics	58
3.5. Stylistic Analysis of Parody in Edward Bond's Lear	59
3.5.1. Phonological Features	59
3.5.1.1. Alliteration and Consonance	59
3.5.2. Lexical Features.....	60
3.5.2.1. Diction.....	61
3.5.2.2. Juxtaposition.....	62
3.5.3. Figurative Language	63
3.5.3.1. Symbolism.....	63
3.5.3.2. Euphemism.....	63

3.5.3.3. Allusion	64
3.5.4. Syntactic Features	65
3.5.4.1. Fragmentation.....	65
3.6. Findings and Discussions	66
3.6.1. Representation of Modern World	66
3.6.2. Political Manipulation.....	66
3.6.3. Intertextual Subversion	67
Conclusion	67

Introduction

Parody in Edward Bond's *Lear* is not only used as a frequent literary device but also as an intentional stylistic strategy in which Bond's *Lear* is a reinterpretation of Shakespeare's *King Lear*, as a reimagining of the original narrative. Bond's *Lear* is considered a critique and not a rejection of Shakespeare's *King Lear*, the original play. He seeks to reinterpret King Lear by proposing a version that engages with and addresses contemporary societal challenges and seeks to integrate and adapt the timeless narrative within a modern framework using parody.

While parody has historically been linked to comedy, this chapter shows how Edward Bond uses parody in *Lear* as an effective technique for socio-political suspension and critique through stylistic analysis of language, structure, and dramatic techniques of the play.

3.1. Exploring Edward Bond's *Lear*

3.1.1. The Author's Biography

Edward Bond (1934 –), a passionate young figure with reformatory revolutionist fervor is considered a prominent British playwright, theatre director, poet, theorist, screen writer, all rolled into one. He pictures the world as a vehement place because he was exposed to violence, shelling, and an enduring feeling of danger when he was evicted to the countryside at the beginning of the Second World War in 1939, similar to many children. So, his theatre hallmark becomes the portrayal of violence. During 1953 and 1955 Bond joined the British Army conquest forces in Vienna after trying a different labor in factories and offices. Then he decided to start writing after seeing the violence hidden behind natural social attitude during his service in the army (Kumar, 2023).

In literature, Bond is considered the most debatable playwright due to his portrayal of violence in his works. His writing is distinguished by an awareness of social alienation that he gained from his experience. The 1970s period was famous for the political disorder and activism, and it was where most of Bond's writing conduct spread in which his works criticize the corrupted capitalist system and the ruling class (Kumar, 2023).

Bond is considered one of the distinctive and innovative figures in modern British drama (Elsom 1997: 79). His prominent works encompass *The Pope's Wedding* (1962), *Saved* (1964), *Narrow Road to the Deep North* (1968), *Early Morning* (1968), *Lear* (1971), *The Sea* (1973), *Bingo* (1973), *The Fool* (1975), *The Bundle* (1978), and *Restoration* (1981). Moreover, he contributed adaptations of the drama *Walk About* (1971), directed by Nicolas Roeg, and Nobokov's *Laughter in the Dark* (1968), directed by Tony Richardson. Also, he has participated in dialogue in the film *Blow-Up* (1966) and *Nicholas and Alexandra*. Furthermore, Bond has several cinema contributions (Kumar, 2023).

3.1.2. Historical and Cultural Context

A renowned play by Shakespeare, recognized as *King Lear*, has been rewritten by Edward Bond, a British playwright. In 1971, the play was first performed in England, at the Royal Court Theatre, with Harry Andrews as its lead actor. It was revitalized in 1982 by the Royal Shakespeare Company and again in 2005 at the Crucible Theatre. Furthermore, it was adapted once again in Sheffield, featuring Ian McDiarmid (Khafaga, 2019).

The majority of Edward Bond's works occurred during the 1970s, a period characterized by socio-political turmoil, economic decadence, racial conflicts, and violence. This era witnessed

the last years of Harold Wilson's Labor Administration and the election of Margaret Thatcher's Conservative Government in 1979. Andy Beckett asserts that "since the Second World War, by common consent for decades now, the worst of times came between the election of Edward Heath in 1970 and the election of Margaret Thatcher in 1979," and it was substantially anticipated that Heath would deal with issues related to minorities and class divides, which continued as the most significant challenges of Britain, and it was the political troubles of Britain that were not effectively addressed by the leaders of the time. Evidently, Bond's plays were directly affected by the political issues and the deep social alteration in the 1970s, in which all his plays present a vehement accusation of capitalism and the ruling class he views as unchangeably corrupt and corrupting. So, he has characterized himself as a revolutionary socialist and his works as 'rational theatre' (Özmen, 2018; Kumar, n.d.).

3.1.3. Plot and Summary

Edward Bond's *Lear* (1971) is considered a contemporary adaptation of Shakespeare's classic work "*King Lear*" (1600s). The play's protagonist, "King Lear," wanted to safeguard his realm from his most potent enemies, so he built a wall. The king waged war against his daughters, who became his enemies because they married his foe as an interception for building the wall. During the construction of the wall, many workers got injured and died. He lost the war, and then he was mercilessly tortured (Kumar, 2023).

The play is structured into three acts. The first act begins with Lear, his two daughters, Bodice and Fontanelle, his adviser Warrington, and an old councilor visiting the vindictory wall that he is constructing to ensure the peace and safety of his kingdom from his enemies, the Dukes of Cornwall and North as he claims. Because of his cruel behavior when the worker died his daughters

complain against him and decide to marry his enemies. The king is beaten in a war by his daughters and their husbands (GÜNAYDIN YILDIRIM, 2022). Lear's loyal servant Warrington is apprehended by the sisters, and they seek to seduce him to betray Lear, to no avail. Then the sisters free him after making him deaf and dumb. Lear escape, and the gravedigger's boy gives him refuge out of compassion, despite the worry of his pregnant wife. Warrington attempts to kill Lear and runs away, then Bodice and Fontanelle soldiers arrive and shoot the gravedigger's boy and rape his wife, Cordelia. Lear is taken prisoner. The carpenter who loves Cordelia murders the soldiers in punishment for their actions. (Kumar, 2023; Bond, 2014).

Lear is portrayed as a madman in the second act by his daughters, Bodice and Fontanelle, and brought him before a judge, where he rejects recognizing them. Lear views himself as a tormented animal in a cage when he looks into the mirror that Bodice offered him, who thinks that madmen are afraid of themselves thereby proves his madness to the court. Meanwhile, Bodice discloses that insurgents are grouping under Cordelia's command, expecting civil disorder. Lear desires for a reunion with his daughters, who temporarily appear as child ghosts before they disappear after the ghost of the Gravedigger's Boy shows up in Lear's cell, in which the Ghost proposes a companionship with Lear that brings them both consolations. Simultaneously, Bodice and Fontanelle struggle with deserting husbands, and Fontanelle signs Lear's execution order, Cordelia arrives with her soldiers. Lear and Fontanelle are apprehended by Cordelia's forces, and Lear rejects Fontanelle's proposal of safeguard because he concentrates on searching for the Ghost. Fontanelle is executed at the Carpenter's command, who is Cordelia's husband. Bodice is also captured and executed. Although Cordelia saves Lear's life, she gives the instructions for removing his eyes. Lear leaves alongside the Ghost, blind and in pain. Eventually, he is disappointed with Cordelia's system after he meets a farming family at the wall and testify their bleak future as

workers and soldiers, he insists them to escape, he decides to write to Cordelia her about the people's hardship, in which he realizes that power continues to practice oppression, regardless of who controls it (Kumar, n.d.).

In Act Three, Lear has adjusted to his blindness several months later, and currently he is staying at the Gravedigger's Boy's previous house alongside a young couple, Thomas and Susan, who is pregnant and loved by a peasant named John, but she rejects him. Lear has become an example of resistance against Cordelia's authoritarian system, attracting individuals who come to hear his politically charged tales. A trivial black-market merchant and Ben, a young orderly who once has provided Lear with food during his imprisonment, arrives at Lear's home after escaping from the wall. Cordelia's soldiers alert Lear that he is currently under supervision after checking the area and going without finding the apostates. Eventually, Ben and the other deserter are apprehended. The idealistic Ben willingly returns to the wall to organize resistance, while the other man faces the gallows. Lear becomes angry because of the brutality and disloyalty of the new system, and he realizes that he lacks the power to make change. The sallow and fading Ghost of the Gravedigger's Boy advises Lear to give up his political fight and withdraw into calm isolation. Cordelia asserts that emotional secession is substantial for societal reconstruction, as Lear attempts to convey to her the significance of compassion during her visit with the Carpenter to ask him to stop blocking her leadership. Cordelia cautions Lear about his close lawsuit and execution. The Ghost follows Cordelia unseen, then he is mortally injured by pigs and dies a second time, allowing Lear to achieve his goal. Lear later asks Susan's assistance for a final quest. In the concluding scene, Lear, as an act of defiance and penance, climbs the wall with a spade and attempts to destroy it. Although he is ordered to stop, he persists until a soldier shoots him. Lear's dead body left by the wall serves as a stark representation of victimization and unresolved conflict (Bond, 2014).

3.1.4. Characters

3.1.4.1. Lear

Lear is the protagonist of the play he is a despotic, megalomaniac King who is obsessed with constructing a wall to protect his kingdom from his imagined enemies and to be shown as a potent and politically effective ruler. He kills a worker who has fortuitously killed another without allowing the man to prove his innocence because it has led to delaying the accomplishment of the wall. His actions show his apathy to their lives. As an objection to his action, his daughters Bodice and Fontanelle marry their father's enemies the Dukes of Cornwall and North against their father's willingness. The cruel and tyrannical old man begins suffering with the disloyalty of his daughters, who proclaim him insane, sign his death sentence, and insulate and wrestle him from power, leading to his collapse. Furthermore, Lear becomes a weak prisoner of his daughters, incurred to indignity, segregation, and intense physical pain while removing his eyes; thus, his blinding becomes both a physical and figurative retribution for his once ethical blindness as a cruel king. Lear suffers by his guilt and the recognition of his defeat after he realizes the brutality he once has done and he is killed when he was trying to destroy the wall (Swathy, 2021; Kumar, 2023; Jones, 1980; Gale, n.d.).

3.1.4.2. Bodice

Bodice and Fontenelle Lear's daughter, at the beginning, seem to be well-disposed and counter to their father's nature, but once they come into power, they become upholders of violence and turn out to be more brutal than Lear himself. Bodice is aspirant, smart, disciplined, and dangerous, and shares her sister's desire for political power. She protests to her father's brutality by killing one of his workers in the initial scene, but once she marries the Duke of the North and leads a

successful revolution, she overthrows her father, she turns into a harsher person than him, even calmly plotting her husband's death. Bodice is the coldest and calculating person. She has been knitting peacefully as Warrington is being tormented, and her concentration during this horrific moment has been so extreme that it has turned into black humor. In her monologue, she expresses her own sensation that all of her power ensnares her and makes her its thrall because her willingness for power increases. Also, she detains her husband and thinks of ultimately killing her sister. It is clear that Bodice does not learn anything; she has been finally jailed, and killed by Cordelia's soldiers (Swathy, 2021; eNotes, n.d.; Gale, n.d.).

3.1.4.3.Fontanelle

Unlike Bodice, however, Fontanelle is easily deceived. She is distinguished by being passionate in the opening scene, particularly her interception of her father's murder of a laborer. Fontanelle's emotional wounds, stemming from a solitary childhood without a mother and the experience of soldiers' deaths during wartime, run deeper than those of her sister. This pain drove her to seek the love and safety that have always been denied to her, but sadly, she is unable to find them. After her marriage to the Duke of Cornwall and when she and Bodice have led the mutiny against Lear, it becomes obvious that she is such a cruel, chilly, and excited person that she revels in tormenting people like Warrington. Her extreme enjoyment in Warrington's suffering from torture results in a sort of black humor. Fontanelle has her own spies. Although she and Bodice are probably working together, they are not faithful to one another. Fontanelle is detained and dies like her sister and it was executed by Cordelia's soldier, although she learns nothing herself, her death leads to Lear's comprehension of his harshness (eNotes, n.d.; Gale, n.d.).

3.1.4.4.Warrington

Warrington is head administrator, and Lear's sincere companion. Warrington receives letters from Bodice and Fontanelle asking him to betray both the king and the other sister. In their letters, they both propose to marry him. However, he refuses their appeals and subsequently he is cruelly tormented him after their rebel against their father. Warrington escapes the war, and for a time he stays in the woods and fails to knife Lear in Gravedigger's Boy and his wife's house, so he needs to hide in the well. Then he takes compassion and is called "the wild man" by the Gravedigger's Boy and his wife. Warrington falls because of his loyalty to Lear (eNotes Editorial, n.d; eNotes, n.d.).

3.1.4.5.The Gravedigger's Boy

The Gravedigger's Boy is living in a rural environment with his pregnant wife, Cordelia, when he first meets Lear. He is lavish to Warrington and Lear, providing both nourishment and shelter. The unpretentiousness of Gravedigger's Boy's life and his courtesy function as a potent role in Lear's education and his start to alteration. Later he is shown as a ghost after being killed by soldiers in Lear's prison cell to give Lear hope and escapes from reality. The Gravedigger's Boy keeps to educate and assist Lear as a ghost even though he himself is in a situation of continuing decay. He is scared because he is slowly dying. The Ghost is called by Lear as his boy and safeguard, although Lear is not able to save him from decay, the Ghost continues to save Lear. Courtesy and sympathy are shown to each other, and help and knowledge are learned by the two. At the end, Lear feels the suffering for the second ghost's death (eNotes, n.d.; Gale, n.d.).

3.1.4.6.Cordelia

Cordelia, the Gravedigger's Boy's Wife, is initially viewed at home with her husband, happily pregnant, when Lear comes looking for refuge. Cordelia is anxious about her husband's charitable trait and wants Lear to depart. Bodice and Fontanelle's soldiers kill her husband and harshly rape her. After that, she marries the carpenter and commands a successful insurgency against Bodice and Fontanelle. When she wins power, she becomes a bit tough like them. Cordelia leaves her own injured soldier to die alone, instructs the executions of Bodice and Fontanelle, and blinds Lear. She tries to prevent Lear from public speaking after allowing him to live, but at the end he is killed by her soldiers (eNotes, n.d.; Gale, n.d.).

3.1.5. Themes

3.1.5.1. Violence

Bond's *Lear* is recognized for its brutal and unflinching portrayal of violence, which stands as the most prominent theme in the narrative. For Bond, violence represents a crucial part of modern society; addressing contemporary culture inherently means discussing violence. Thus, the play begins and ends with acts of violence. In the initial scene, Lear shoots a laborer; in the closing scene, a soldier wounds and kills Lear. Throughout the play, there are various acts of cruelty, such as Bodice knitting while her sister tortures Warrington and ultimately using her knits to poke into his ears. *Bodice: "I'll just jog these in and out a little. Doodee, doodee, doodee, doo."* (Bond 1976: 15), and Fontanelle, who has Warrington's tongue severed to prevent him from disclosing her correspondence, exhibits her own brutality: *Fontanelle: "O let me sit on his lungs"* (15). One of the many instances in which violence is glaringly present is when the innocent Gravedigger's Boy is shot, and his wife is assaulted. Moreover, the Gravedigger's Boy meets a second death as a ghost.

Bond applies violence in *Lear* as a means to expose the oppressive techniques within authoritarian regimes, not only as a scene (Gale, n.d.; Hashir, 2024; Kumar, 2023; Pietrzykowska-Motyka, 2016).

3.1.5.2.Abuse of Power

Abuse of power is also considered one of the key themes of the play. Bond's *Lear* embodies a despotic ruler. He is a prime illustration of positions of authority that can devolve into corruption and abuse their power for their selfish purposes, in which ultimately egocentric and impulsive decisions contribute to his demise. *"The wall isn't just stones. It's the law. It's the order that protects us."* Through this statement, Lear illustrates a contrast of safeguarding with oppression, emphasizing how authoritarian power is frequently defended by the discourse of security. Lear, in order to construct the wall, forces many farmers to abandon their homes and families and labor on the wall until their hands bleed, making them slaves. Also, wall building results into the murder of many workers who refuse or slow the work; either they died from work or they shot for their refusal to work. Ultimately, Lear himself dies due to the wall (Manoliu, 2014). Additionally, characters such as Lear's daughters Bodice and Fontanelle represent the corruption of power, for in favor of personal profit, they ignore any allegiance to family or ethics (Anonymous, 2021; Kumar, 2023; Hashir, 2024).

3.1.5.3.Parents and Children

In the opening scene of the play, Bond provides a portrait of a decayed family. He depicts antagonism between Lear and his daughters and how he is always aware of their malignancy, that they would marry his foes and demolish his wall. Lear and his daughters were literally in conflict with each other; they passionately sign his death sentence. After his repudiation

of his children entirely, saying he has no daughters at his trial, Lear exhibits his wish for a connection with his daughters while he is in jail. The audience is given a feeling of gladness and more pacific times when Lear recognizes that in the past his daughters have been generous, lovely people when the apparitions of his ghost daughters as little girls manifest. Lear comes to the understanding during his daughter's autopsy that he is accountable for their wickedness and that he has influenced their character and behavior; they learn all of their ruthlessness, avarice, and desire for power from him. Thus, Lear can no longer consider himself as a sufferer of his daughters' abuse. It is very late when Lear perceives that there is an inherent bond between Lear and his daughters. Both his daughters are dead, and he cannot change the past. Lear will live with regret as he is unable to rebuild his disintegrated family (eNotes, n.d.).

3.1.5.4.Social Justice and Morality

Another worthy side of Bond's *Lear* is justice. The play illustrates the injustice and arbitrariness ingrained in the social systems of that time, especially between the poor, vulnerable, and suffering lower class and the strong upper class. During his trial in the court, Lear does not recognize his daughters; he says that his daughters are murdered and replaced by monsters: "*My daughters have been murdered, and these monsters have taken their place! I have all their victims cry, where is justice?*" (Lear: Act 2, Scene 1, p. 35). Now Lear is asking for justice, and he, himself, does not realize that he has killed this justice when he has killed the workers on the wall without a mercy. Lear is also chastised for his criminality (Anonymous, 2021; Kumar, 2023; Khafaga, 2020).

3.2. Exploring Shakespeare's King Lear

3.2.1. The Author's Biography

William Shakespeare (1564–1616) was an English dramatist, poet, and performer who existed during the Renaissance—particularly throughout the Elizabethan Era in England. Many consider Shakespeare to be the finest playwright ever. He is frequently titled the Bard of Avon, or simply the Bard. (Bard means poet.) Shakespeare was born in Stratford-upon-Avon, England, to parents John and Mary Shakespeare. Shakespeare most likely attended grammar school in Stratford but did not pursue further education at a university. Some believe that Shakespeare lacked enough teaching to write perfectly as he did, proposing that his works were in fact authored by someone else. Other people, however, argue that Shakespeare’s grammar school education would have provided a solid foundation. When he was in his twenties, Shakespeare departed from his family and relocated to London to become an actor. In that era, traveling actors had bad notoriety; they were labeled as instigators because they attracted noisy audiences, and some acting troupes asked for the patronage of noblemen, seeking respect. It was uncommon for a nobleman to let a group use his name. One such ensemble was Lord Chamberlain’s Men, eventually recognized as The King’s Men, and it was the group that Shakespeare joined. He likely performed in the group and also recorded plays for them. In 1599, his wealth grew when he became a co-owner of the illustrious Globe Theater (Core Knowledge Foundation, n.d.; Mustafa, 2010).

Whereas the theaters were closed due to the bubonic plague, Shakespeare recorded sonnets, a form of poetry. Despite Shakespeare’s gift in poetry, he was mostly famous for his thirty-eight dramas, which are categorized into tragedies (like *Romeo and Juliet*), comedies (like *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*), and histories (such as *Richard III*). Shakespeare frequently blended genres within one drama; for instance, he mixed comedy and tragedy, and it was an uncommon thing for playwrights of his era. His works were performed in England’s royal courts and also in famous theaters. Individuals from different social and educational backgrounds entertained

Shakespeare's creations due to his understanding of human nature. His narratives were around situations and feelings that many people could relate to: love, hate, jealousy, and sorrow, most of Shakespeare's characters were neither fully good nor entirely evil. Today, Shakespeare's plays remain popular across the world, his impact is also obvious in many of the English terms. Experts consider that Shakespeare invented approximately 1,500 words. He died when he was fifty-two years old on April 23, 1616 (Core Knowledge Foundation, n.d.).

Shakespeare is perhaps most famous for his tragedies; he wrote all of his tragedies over the course of seven years from 1601 to 1608. They include his four master tragedies *Hamlet*, *Othello*, *King Lear* and *Macbeth*, in addition to *Antony & Cleopatra*, *Coriolanus*, *Cymbeline*, *Julius Caesar*, which are immediately recognizable, studied periodically, and performed widely (Mustafa, 2010).

3.2.2. Historical and cultural context

A play on kingship, *King Lear* (1606) was written during a time when monarchy was highly prized and the role of the monarch was continuously being discussed. When Shakespeare was composing *King Lear*, England had endured many years of civil struggle and unrest in both politics and religion, like the massive disorder after the death of Henry VIII and country civil and religious conflicts during his oldest daughter's rule (Mary I). Elizabeth I conducted the throne after Mary's death, leading to a period of extended peace. She was a powerful and terrifying but lovely monarch who ruled with competence and fantastic political success during an era in which a lot of Europe was being divided apart due to upheavals and conflicts. In spite of their satisfaction with Elizabeth's regime, the citizens were very anxious about England's future because Elizabeth was unmarried, and she refused to choose a potential heir, and they did not want a recurrence of the earlier events of

transfer of power. Eventually, in 1603, Elizabeth nominated James IV of Scotland to be her successor and the new king of England, and he became James I. Unlike Elizabeth, James I believes a lot in the patriarchal kingship. His court, as Norton Anthology tells, "by contrast with Elizabeth's . . . was disorderly and indecorous, marked by hard drinking and late-night feasting, a craze for hunting, and great extravagance" (p. 1211). *King Lear* is a play that seems like a kind of warning to rulers who either do not govern well or are not responsible. In addition, the play shows what occurs when power is given to the wrong hands. (Danyaji, n.d.; CliffsNotes, n.d.; Joy, n.d.).

3.2.3. Plot and summary

In the play "*King Lear*," the story opens with Kent and Gloucester talking about who will inherit Lear's kingdom. Lear decides to divide his realm among his three daughters Goneril, Regan and Cordelia, requiring them to profess their love for him. Goneril and Regan show their love, but the youngest beloved daughter Cordelia says she loves him only as a father and does know how show her true emotions. Angered, Lear disinherits Cordelia, and when Kent tries to advocate her, Lear expels him too. The Duke of Burgundy does not want to marry Cordelia without a dowry, but the King of France marries her for her virtue, and they depart to France. Goneril and Regan conspire against Lear to take control. Meanwhile, Edmund, Gloucester's illegitimate child, becomes jealous of his brother Edgar and planning to gain his father's favor by forging a letter that falsely claims Edgar wants to take the territory. Lear visits Goneril's castle, where he struggles with her servant Oswald, leading Goneril to plot against him. Kent, disguised as Lear's servant, tries to help him. Lear angrily heads to Regan's house, while Goneril informs Regan of his coming. Lear then sends Kent with a message to Gloucester (Orlando-UCF Shakespeare Festival, n.d.).

In Act two, At Gloucester's castle, Edmund wounds himself after warning Edgar about their father coming. He then tells Gloucester that Edgar injures him for rejecting to join in taking their father's power. Kent meets Oswald and arraigns him of siding with the evil Goneril, then pulls his sword, leading to Regan and Cornwall and putting Kent in stocks for a day despite Gloucester's protests. After being freed, Kent reads a letter from Cordelia thanking him for helping Lear. Edgar hides in the forest as Poor Tom. Lear finds Kent in stocks and learns about Regan and Cornwall's punishment. Lear gets angry when Regan refuses to help him in his ill, and despite pleading for care, she tells him to return to Goneril, which disgusts Lear as he leaves with Kent and his fool. In the third act, the storm raging, Kent hurriedly goes onstage to find King Lear in the woods. Upon learning of the French spies' imminent attack, he sends one of Lear's companions to Dover to report on Lear's health and bestows him with a ring and purse for Cordelia, with his Fool by his side, Lear is hesitant to seek refuge, considering the storm as a penalty for his daughters. Kent finds Lear and persuades him to seek refuge in a cave. In Gloucester's castle, Edmund pretends to support his father while secretly betraying him. During the cave encounter, Lear shares his sorrow, while Gloucester, unaware of Edgar's presence, insists on finding a better place to hide. Lear holds a mock trial against his daughters, becoming enraged. Gloucester tells Kent of threats against Lear, and Cornwall blinds Gloucester for his treason, revealing Edmund's betrayal. Gloucester is thrown out of the castle by Regan (Orlando-UCF Shakespeare Festival, n.d.).

Gloucester in act four, under the leadership of an aged man, is eager to meet Edgar again. As Poor Tom, Edgar appears and assists Gloucester to go on to kill himself in Dover. By Edgar's trickery, Gloucester falls but survives as he believes they are at the edge of the cliff, which the thought of not being able to die is disheartening to him. While at Gloucester's castle, Oswald warns Goneril and Edmund about Albany's reversal in tone, which Albany is angry with Edmund for

getting Gloucester blinded, and vows to take revenge. At the same time, Regan tells Oswald they should have killed Gloucester and worries about her sister's connection with Edmund. In addition, the news that Lear and Cordelia are still apart has been revealed to Kent. Lear meets Edgar and Gloucester, then runs from Cordelia's men out of fear. Following the death of Oswald, Edgar learns about Goneril's plan, and Cordelia finds Lear, ensuring his safe care (Orlando-UCF Shakespeare Festival, n.d.).

In final act, Regan inquiries about Edmund's association with Goneril, to which he replies that his relationship with her is simply professional, citing the latter's closeness to him, which makes Regan has a preference for losing the war over leaving Edmund to go with Goneril. meanwhile, she and Albany exchange proposals on how to remain united against France, while Edgar in disguise, sends a letter to Albany offering his aid. Edmund decides to side with Goneril if she can eliminate Albany, as he aims to rule a united Britain. As a result, Lear and Cordelia take charge of the French troops as the war begins, which leads to the arrest of both of them by Edmund, who orders their execution; while Regan and Goneril's jealousy escalates, leading Cordelia to death. At the end, Lear discovers Cordelia's death and grieves deeply, Edmund dies, and Albany names Kent and Edgar as leaders, with Edgar eventually becoming King of Britain (Orlando-UCF Shakespeare Festival, n.d.).

3.2.4. Characters

3.2.4.1. King Lear

King Lear is the aged but still reigning monarch of Ancient Britain. He has decided to abdicate as king and split his kingdom in three to be governed by his three daughters and their

husbands. He intends to spend his retirement enjoying the hospitality of his hundred knights: hunting and drinking, and staying with each of his daughters in turn. When his youngest daughter Cordelia behaves out of character, he rejects her, but realizes his other two daughters are not as obedient, thankful, and loving to him as he expected them to be (Royal Shakespeare Company, n.d.).

Lear, the play's main character, elicits devotion from characters like Gloucester and Kent, but also elicits hatred from two of his daughters, hence making him a victim and an offender since he treats Cordelia with cruelty after the game of flattery. His ignorance of his situation and the peculiar kind of his daughters, however, result in his failure. With time, he matures from a man accustomed to absolute power and obedience into a humbler and more sympathetic individual, caring for the Fool and learning lessons. Although he loses his sanity, he is still capable of feeling shame, as seen when he reunites with Cordelia after banishing her. Despite this transformation, Lear's self-awareness is strangely limited, particularly for an older man who has more than enough time to know and reflect on life. He is tough and unyielding initially, but not in a sinister manner. He is a human and complex character, both evil and good. He is deaf to the dangers and the burden of power but also to the hidden agendas of all those around him, including his own daughters (Lofgren, 2010).

3.2.4.2.Cordelia

Honorable and tolerant King Lear's favorite and youngest daughter is Cordelia. She is quiet because she thinks that deeds speak louder than words. Although Cordelia respects and loves her father, she avoids flattery because she wants to be honest (Latosinsky et al., 2021). When Cordelia, Lear's youngest daughter, declines to join the flattery game, she demonstrates bravery and moral character. In spite of her own father's expectations, Cordelia's noble act of self-sacrifice and

acceptance of God's plan is demonstrated by her reluctance to flatter her father. She is a beautiful example of Christian goodness in a pagan community that existed before Christianity. Her small but significant role serves as the basis for the remainder of the play. Similar to how Albany fought the British, Cordelia is appealing because she is engaged in combat with the French. Given that Cordelia has been exiled by her father, this choice makes human sense and draws attention to the tragic circumstances and significant topic of the play (Lofgren, 2010). King Lear leaves Cordelia dowerless, despite suitors wooing her; however, the King of France, realizing her worth, marries her despite her father's disinheritance. Although Cordelia discovers her father's madness in Dover and sends her men to search for him, she brings him back to sanity, whereas the Duke of Albany disowns her. Albany joins Edmund to protect England against the French army; nevertheless, the French are defeated, and Cordelia and Lear are taken prisoners. Edmund murders Cordelia, calling it a suicide, and King Lear dies (Mohanraj, 2024).

3.2.4.3. Goneril and Regan

Little good can be said for Lear's older daughters, who are all but indistinguishable in their wickedness and spitefulness. Goneril and Regan are smart—certainly smart enough to flatter their father in the first scene of the play—and, early in the play, their cruelty to Lear seems equalled by his own temper and pride. But whatever sympathy the audience might have for them is lost, first when they turn their father out into the storm at the end of Act II and then when they cruelly blind Gloucester in Act III. Goneril and Regan are, in a sense, personifications of evil—they have no conscience, only appetite. It is this greedy ambition that enables them to annihilate all opposition and make themselves mistresses of Britain. Eventually, however, this same appetite causes them to fall. Their lust for power is satiated, but both are sexually attracted to Edmund, which destroys their

partnership and leads them to destroy each other. Evil, the play suggests, eventually turns in on itself (Lear, as cited in SparkNotes, 2002).

3.2.4.4.Kent

Kent, the earl of Kent, is a regular Kent County guy who is renowned for his loyalty and tenacity, and he is direct and obeys the monarch in spite of the Fool's cautions. Moreover, the first person to notice that Lear is going to make a mistake is Kent, and he argues with Lear and stands up for Cordelia, saying that banishment is here and freedom lives here. However, Kent finds it difficult to keep him safe and is so worn out that he suggests he will die. Since he stands up for the aristocratic society in his arguments with Oswald, the servant of Goneril, when he treats Lear disrespectfully, Kent is hence a symbol of aristocratic ideals. Furthermore, Kent survives but Oswald perishes in this symbolic struggle between the new generation and aristocratic ideals. Finally, because of his loyalty to the king and his spirit of tenacity, Kent stands in for the proud and resilient residents of Kent County (Lofgren, 2010).

3.2.4.5.The Fool

The Fool, a major character in King Lear, is a vital outsider who gives advice and prophecy. He is a straightforward speaker and is closest to King Lear, predicting future events with profound philosophy. The Fool's insightful remarks work best when the characters are deviating from their parts, and thus they are more effective. He is more conscious of other characters as well, and he prefers to direct his riddles and songs to members of the court. This means that the Fool's "in the shadow" period is done, and the hour is upon the characters to proceed towards tragedy. Having his prophecies fulfilled, his tragic wisdom works to teach the audience a lesson by allowing them to

figure out the desires of the characters without a good glance ("King Lear: Themes, Characters & Analysis Essay," 2024).

3.2.4.6.Edgar

Within King Lear's story, Edgar stands as the Hero while encompassing several conflicting attributes between good and bad aspects. Edgar endures tremendous pain because Edmund tricks him, and his father, the Earl of Gloucester, displayed unsound decision making. As the Earl of Gloucester's true son, Edgar faces expulsion after his brother deceives him and his destiny shares many similarities with Cordelia's destiny. Edgar displays a basic trust toward people, so his brother Edmund takes advantage of this to deceive him. Through the story, his character develops beyond his initial naivety because he develops ruthless tendencies and lethal capabilities. He saves his dying father through Oswald's murder, though he treats him cruelly before pretending to assist with a suicide attempt. The protagonist waits until the story's end to disclose his true identity to his father, maybe out of his father's past mistreatment. At the start of the play, Edgar suffers mistreatment from his father and brother until he matures into one of the few living characters in King Lear. Through his story, Edgar represents the pursuit of justice, which proves difficult to achieve without active conflict (Lofgren, 2010).

3.2.4.7.The Duke of Cornwall

Cornwall is a violent and controlling man (Lofgren, 2010). As ruler of the dukedom, Cornwall demonstrates success through practicality in his administration. The ethical considerations do not restrict his decisions since he operates through his position's power, The Duke of Cornwall feels his authority provides him with unlimited power to make unethical choices. In his role as a

man in power, he views violent tactics as a natural instrument by which an objective may be gained. Similar to his wife, Regan, Cornwall's objective is power. This objective drives him without any ability to deflect him from his pursuit. The position of his fixed identity prevents him from leaving the path he chose. According to Cornwall, King Lear stands as an obstacle that interferes with his pursuit of power because he considers him an irritant that must be destroyed. The Duke of Cornwall maintains an intense rivalry with Albany because he sees him as a major challenge to his ambitions of power subjugation (Latosinsky et al., 2021).

3.2.4.8.The Earl of Gloucester

White-haired Gloucester displays admiration for King Lear's authority while upholding both Duke of Cornwall and Albany's superiority as well as traditional laws and their places. Astrology holds profound importance to him as he trusts the gods to control his life's events. Gloucester shows both honorable traits including decency together with courage and wisdom as well as problems through his officious and commanding attitudes. Although he professes equal love toward his sons, he remains ignorant about their true personalities. From his observation Lear's personality emerges clear as well as Kent's steadfast loyalty while he recognizes Goneril and Regan's devious nature. Gloucester demonstrates unwavering loyalty toward Lear while showing an unwillingness to see through Edmund's deceptions. The character maintains blindness throughout the entire play regardless of whether he already has lost his sight. Although he betrays his wife through adultery Gloucester demonstrates his love for his sons and displays strength when he refuses to allow Kent to endure public humiliation. Gloucester's honorable nature and sincerity make him a heroic figure despite his mistakes with adultery and inadequate decision-making.

3.2.5. Themes

3.2.5.1.Violence

The female characters in *King Lear* engage in diverse violent acts, including acts of physical violence and manipulation. For instance, Goneril and Regan are depicted as vicious and cruel, killing and treating their father, King Lear, with disrespect and cruelty. Their violence is in the form of physical abuse, since they take away Lear's authority and banish him from their households. They also demonstrate verbal abuse, since they mock and insult him. Cordelia is also a victim of violence, as she is imprisoned and ultimately executed because of her insistence on not playing along with Lear's game of authority. (Talukder& Rathore, 2023). The physical violence in this play occurs in Act 3 Scene 7 at Gloucester's castle. The Duke of Cornwall, sends attendants after the Earl of Gloucester, and he is captured and questioned. Cornwall tries to blind him as punishment. A servant intervenes but is attacked by Regan. Gloucester is eventually banished (Sundiartiko& Ayu, 2025).

3.2.5.2.Power and Authority

The theme of power is achieved by the symbolic action of Goneril dismissing Lear's train of knights, as seen in her line, "A little to disquantity your train." Goneril's resentful dismissal of "a hundred knights and squires" is a symbolic act of defiance. She is trying to take control and inform her father that she is now in power, insisting, "you are old and reverend.". The reader is taken aback by the stark display of Goneril renouncing her father and denying his characterization of "Men so disordered, so deboshed" that exposes her naked ambition for power. Further, Regan's rejection of Lear's knights can be envisioned as a great act of rebellion. It is clear that her reason for denying the knights is not merely because she doesn't wish "To have the expense and waste of his revenues", but because she and Goneril are conspiring together to assert their power over Lear. Both

of their refusal to house his knights is symbolic as it reveals their lust to exhibit their power over Lear, as well as highlighting how together they are more powerful ("*King Lear*: Imagery and Symbolism Sample Answer," n.d.).

3.2.5.3. Justice and Injustice

According to Cantor, when Lear asks, “what is the cause of thunder?” he *considers King Lear’s* question about thunder as a question about gods and justice. The play does not provide an answer to this question, which suggests that if tragedy is to reward the good and punish the bad, then King Lear fails. Cornwall's death, Regan, Goneril, and Edmund suggest divine justice, while Cordelia's death is unjust. Lear and Gloucester's deaths are a punishment for their cruelty to their children, but the punishment is greater than their evil (Latosinsky et al., 2021). Edgar, represents the problem of social unfairness by pretending to be poor Tom. The fact that his brother Edmund had deceived him into thinking their father is after him is evidence of the injustice. The fact that Edgar must pose as poor Tom in order to get away from his father illustrates the humiliations that members of the lowest social class endure. Additionally, poor Tom reveals the disparities between socioeconomic levels. Edgar's status as a Bedlam beggar represents the state's innate injustice and its lack of concern for the impoverished. Edgar's creative and representative representation raises awareness to the period of injustice ("*King Lear*: Imagery and Symbolism Sample Answer," n.d.).

3.2.5.4. Family Relationship

Shakespeare's *King Lear* is a drama of parent-child and brother-sister relationships, and love is the pivot. The parents, King Lear and Gloucester, realize the true intentions of their children who betray them, and coexistence becomes impossible. King Lear and Gloucester like words and

pretended love instead of action and true love, and it destroys them. Cordelia's and Edgar's help and good deeds come too late to prevent the tragic conclusion. Children grow independent when they become adults, and parents grow old and cannot look after themselves. Through their actions both Regan and Goneril demonstrated the attitude of neglecting their father. Their relationship with their father consists only of formal interactions as they completely ignore him. After achieving what they want they cast him off and declare him a madman. Aside from two independent daughters Gloucester has a deceptive son named Edmund who works against both his father and his brother to achieve his wicked ambitions. His decision to betray his father allows enemies to abuse Gloucester by gouging out his eyes. (Mahmoud, Alshageri, & Mirgane, 2024).

3.2.5.5. Blindness

King Lear elaborates on the theme of blindness in Lear's love test. In Act I Scene I, Lear asks his daughters to compete with one another for inheritance by pronouncing their love for him. Lear's test symbolizes his blindness to the actual character of his daughters, since Goneril and Regan perceive it as an opportunity to manipulate their father. Lear's pride leads him to give the test, and he is oblivious to reality. Lear is offended when Cordelia refuses to take the test, failing to observe her silent refusal as proof of her real love and respect. The test of love is therefore a symbol for Lear being blind to true love to the audience, and it is a moving and poignant symbol ("*King Lear: Imagery and Symbolism Sample Answer*," n.d.).

3.3. King Lear and Lear Intertextuality

In contemporary literature, Shakespearean masterpieces have been reinterpreted by some neoteric playwrights for their own theatrical intentions, to show the Shakespearean effect and his classics in modern times, and to renew the ancient notion in contemporary culture (Khafaga, 2020).

One of the modern English playwrights who uses Shakespeare as an inspiration for his works is Edward Bond. According to Khafaga (2020), Bond believes that the playwright does not always need to directly transact with the present in order to declaim an audience's immediate attitude; "the past is also an institution owned by society" (Bond, 1978, p. xiv), because he adds our current social issues are rooted in history and by only comprehending that history we can identify and address the problems. Thus, Bond believes the artist's essential role is to portray and reinterpret facets of the historical and cultural heritage so as to create a more usable past by providing a collection of historical dramas for his readers. Furthermore, according to him even when the Greek and Shakespearean tragic narratives have outlasted their social relevance, they still continue to supply cultural and technical criteria for modern audiences (Spencer, 1981, p. 127; Khafaga, 2020).

Bond employs *King Lear* as an intertext to create *Lear*, a drama that incorporates numerous aspects of Shakespeare's original play, especially the initial act, which is recognized a parody of his play. Bond borrows some components from Shakespeare's original text, and this method of borrowing is seen as the core of intertextuality. The act of borrowing can occasionally include a parody of a concept or the adoption of certain terms that are used in Shakespeare's work. Bond employs intertextuality to preserve the core narrative structure of *King Lear*. Each play features a king named Lear, an authoritarian leader who mislaid power and ultimately engages in violent confrontations with his daughters Goneril and Regan, who are reimagined as Bodice and Fontanelle in Bond's *Lear*. Both Regan and Fontanelle share numerous similarities. They are

powerful volitional, and are consumed by visions of power. They are also ruthlessly calculating in their manipulation of others, demonstrating traits of selfishness and passion. These two kings forfeit their realms to their daughters and also their sanity before attaining genuine insight. Madness is a motif utilized in Shakespeare's *King Lear*; toppled from their thrones, the two kings act like madmen. Both have gone mad and roam in a confused state of mind, unable to endure the brutality and torment inflicted on them by their own daughters (Studocu, n.d.; Khafaga, 2020).

Furthermore, Bond's interpretation of Shakespearean characters is evident in his version of *Lear*, such as Cordelia, Lear, and the Duke of Cornwall. Additionally, we encounter scenes of blindness in both plays; in Bond's *Lear*, Lear himself is being blinded, whereas in Shakespeare's, Gloucester experiences blindness by Lear's brutal daughters Goneril and Regan. Warrington, Lear's counselor in Bond's play, serves as a reimagining of Shakespeare's Gloucester, remaining loyal to the king (Studocu, n.d.; Khafaga, 2020).

Edward Bond's work is influenced by Shakespeare's *King Lear*, not merely to copy it, but to critique its structure, principles, and beliefs. Through this intertextuality, Bond creates a parody that contradicts conventional concepts of tragedy and authority. Bond's play is set out as an extensive critique and reimagining of Shakespeare's *King Lear*, using the promote function of parody within postmodern literature. By challenging traditional interpretations of the original text, Bond re-explains its remaining themes through the lens of contemporary socio-political issues. His adaptation confronts contemporary societal challenges and integrates them into the framework of Shakespeare's narrative, ultimately offering a version of *Lear* that speaks directly to modern concerns (Khafaga, 2020).

3.4. Style and Stylistics

3.4.1. Style

According to Lucas (1955), style is “the effective use of language, especially in prose, whether to make statements or to rouse emotions” (Lucas, 1955, p. 16). Additionally, style is referred to by Crystal and Davy (2013) as “a selection of language habits, the occasional linguistic idiosyncrasies that characterize an individual's uniqueness” (Crystal & Davy, 2013, p. 9). Leech and Short (1981) define style as "the manner of language use in a certain context by a certain person" (p. 10). They also assert that it can indicate both spoken and written language, as well as literary or non-literary compositions (p. 11). Warner (1961, p. 1) states that style is the way of manifesting an individual's ideas and feelings in words; moreover, Finch (2000, p. 189) asserts that "whenever we utilize language, we inevitably choose a particular style: we select from an array of syntactic and lexical options based on the intention of our communication" (Muhammed & Sharhan, 2022).

3.4.2. Stylistics

Crystal (2008, p. 460) determines stylistics as "a field within linguistics that investigates the characteristics of contextually special usage (variations) of language and aims to formulate principles that can explain the special selections made by both individuals and social groups in their linguistic practices"; he characterizes stylistics as the examination of how and why individuals or social groups select specific language choices in particular contexts, aiming to reveal the principles behind these special variations in usage. Widdowson (2014) asserts that "stylistics encompasses the examination of literary language through the stylistic coordinate. According to Leech and Short (1981, p. 74), “Stylistics is the examination of style; it characterizes what is applied and how it is utilized to produce language. Furthermore, they state that stylistic analysis is "an effort to discover the artistic essentials implied by a writer's preference of language (Muhammed & Sharhan,

2022). This definition means that stylistic analysis focuses on understanding how and why a writer chooses particular words, structures, or literary techniques—they reveal profound artistic purposes.

3.5. Stylistic Analysis of Parody in Edward Bond's *Lear*

Edward Bond's *Lear* (1971) is considered a reimagining and a powerful critique of societal frameworks and authoritarianism by parodying Shakespeare's "*King Lear*." In addition to the thematic parody discussed earlier, an exhaustive stylistic analysis is essential. This stylistic analysis can be divided into different linguistic features, including phonological, lexical, syntactic, and figurative language. An examination will be offered with examples from the play to show how Bond uses parody not only to rewrite Shakespeare's work but also to mirror contemporary socio-political realities.

3.5.1. Phonological Features

Phonology involves the arrangement of sounds within a text, incorporating elements such as alliteration, assonance, consonance, and rhythm.

3.5.1.1. Alliteration and Consonance

Alliteration refers to the recurrence of the identical or similar consonant sounds in words that are nearby together. The stylistic use of alliteration is to boost the meaning, to connect related words, or to supply tone color and reinforce the palpability of pronouncing the words (Abrams & Harpham, 2015).

Shakespeare's *King Lear* frequently employs rhythmic iambic pentameter and poetic style to enhance the tragic language and showcase a more traditional style characterized by formal

language. Unlike Bond, it deviates from classic standards, employing non-linear narratives, unconventional stage directions, and an innovative approach to language (Bradley, 2008; Kumar, 2023). Shakespeare utilized alliteration to enhance the tone and add lyrical quality to his verses. While Bond employs this technique to highlight brutality, absurdity, and emotional detachment present in the characters' dialogue, he simultaneously satirizes the poetic rhythmic style of Shakespeare's original tragedy and reflecting the vehement, fragmented fact of modern regimes.

For example, in Act One, Scene One:

I knew it **w**ould come to this! I knew you **w**ere **m**alicious! I built my **w**all against you as **w**ell as **m**y other. **e**nemies! You talk of **m**arriage? You have **m**urdered your family. There **w**ill be no **m**ore children. Your husbands are impotent. That's not an empty insult. You **w**rote? **M**y spies know **m**ore than that! You will get nothing from this crime. You have **p**erverted lusts. They **w**on't be satisfied. It is **p**erverted to **w**ant your **p**leasure where it **m**akes others suffer. I **p**ity the **m**en **w**ho share your **b**eds. I've **w**atched you scheme and **p**lan – they'll lie by you **w**hen you dream! **W**here **w**ill your ambition end? You **w**ill throw old **m**en from their coffins, **b**reak children's legs, **p**ull the hair from old **w**omen's heads, **m**ake young **m**en **w**alk the streets in **b**eggary and cold **w**hile their **w**ives grow empty and despair – I am ashamed of **m**y tears! You have done this to **m**e. The **p**eople **w**ill judge **b**etween you and **m**e (Lear, p. 5)

Edward Bond's application of alliteration in *Lear* serves to emphasize essential themes such as power, violence, and dominance by creating a harsh, jarring tone that reflects the play's cruel and oppressive world. The repeated consonant sounds focus attention to significant ideas, heighten emotional intensity, and disrupt natural speech rhythms, supporting Bond's intention of engaging the audience intellectually rather than emotionally. This method also accentuates characters' psychological conditions and struggles, making the language more impactful and reinforcing the play's political critique.

3.5.2. Lexical Features

3.5.2.1.Diction

Diction refers to the selection of words employed in a literary work (Baldick, 2001, p. 65). The cruel and tyrannical diction in Edward Bond's *Lear* is a major role for the play atmosphere and to the parody he constructs of Shakespeare's *King Lear*. Bond chose a cruel vocabulary such as 'kill,' 'wall,' 'blood,' 'dead,' and 'break' which mirror the vehemence world that he characterizes, in which he portrays realism and sorrow and unlike the complex metaphors, poetic tone, and sentimental vocabulary of Shakespeare. This diction contrasts with the frequently lofty, poetic expression of suffering and grandeur in the Shakespearean play; Bond portrays the dehumanization and brutality that infiltrate the society.

Bond portrays the violence, control, and paranoia diction through the character of Lear; he speaks in a tone that resembles the commands of a paranoid military leader rather than the reflections of a tragic king. For instance, Lear dialogue in Act One Scene One:

LEAR: I started this wall when I was young. I stopped my enemies in the field, 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. My wall will make you free. That's why the enemies on our borders – the Duke of Cornwall and the Duke of North – try to stop us building it. I won't ask him which he works for – they're both hand in glove. Have him shot. LEAR: Work! Get your men to work! Get them on the wall! (Lear, p. 3)

The diction in this passage from *Lear* is blunt and authoritarian presenting the character's obsession with control and power. Lear uses short, strong orders such "Have him shot" and "Get them on the wall," which carry a cruel, violent and militaristic accent. The vocabulary is straightforward and specific with repeating the terms to enemies, walls, and work that boosts a fanatic worldview driven by scare and control. This diction shows Lear's delusional belief that authoritarian rule ensures peace and liberty.

In Bond's *Lear*, the characters don't speak in a traditional or "poetic" style like in Shakespeare's works; rather, they use natural, colloquial, and modern language to appropriate the play with contemporary audiences and to criticize the notion that tragedy is noble or beautiful and that violence is not majestic—it is common, gruesome, and everywhere. For example, in Act Two Scene Five: "*SOLDIER J. Wass up?*" *'Wass up?'* is a colloquial word means *"What's the matter?"*

3.5.2.2.Juxtaposition

According to the *AP Literary Terms* document Juxtaposition is a poetic and rhetorical technique in which typically unrelated concepts, terms, or phrases are positioned next to each other, producing an effect of unexpectedness and brilliance ("AP Literary Terms," n.d.).

Juxtaposition in Bond's *Lear* is harsher, in which it is deliberated to startle and alienate the audience; he frequently places extreme violence alongside trivial actions to show that brutality becomes common in authoritarian societies. An instance of this occurs when Bodice was torturing Warrington by inserting knitting needles into his ears, and she was humming or chanting softly while doing this horrific act: *Bodice: " (She pokes the needles into Warrington's ears.) I'll just jog these in and out a little. Doodee, doodee, doodee, doo."* the sound "doodee, doodee" is a childlike, whimsical tone. The line emphasizes an effort to juxtapose the weighty, sorrowful nature with petty, absurd behaviors or speech and could be interpreted as diminishing the dramatic tone of the play *Lear* by introducing something trivial or ridiculous in a scene that might be majestic (Pietrzykowska-Motyka, 2016).

Bond's *Lear* exposes a juxtaposition of safeguarding with oppression in the statement "*The wall isn't just stones. It's the law. It's the order that protects us.*" emphasizing how authoritarian control is frequently justified through the rhetoric of safety (Hashir, 2024).

3.5.3. Figurative Language

Edward Bond employs the figurative language in *Lear* as a device to convey the facts of violence and power, thus contributing a crucial role to Bond's parody of classical tragic traditions.

3.5.3.1. Symbolism

The wall carries profound importance and symbolism in Edward Bond's reimagining of William Shakespeare's "*King Lear*" (Kumar, 2023). In Edward Bond's *Lear*, the building of the wall works as a parodic reinterpretation of the theme of division in Shakespeare's *King Lear*. In Bond's *Lear*, rather than a symbolic division of loyalty and family, a physical wall is constructed to segregate Lear's world from a delusional foe, in which this wall embodies a totalitarian mindset, underlining the way rulers establish real divisions that dehumanize both themselves and their citizens, stemming from fear and the urge for control. It reveals the emptiness of authoritarian rationale, where "security" and "order" become pretexts for oppression (Hashir, 2024).

3.5.3.2. Euphemism

Orwell argues that euphemism is applied to make lies look truthful, often in political language. He states that language should camouflage facts and intentions, as it is "the defense of the indefensible". Euphemism can be utilized to avoid insulting others or to hide reality, and deceive (Khafaga, 2019).

Euphemism is an important stylistic tool both in Shakespeare's *King Lear* and Edward Bond's *Lear*. While Shakespeare frequently employs euphemism to uphold theater manners or enhance tragic irony, Bond applies euphemism to reveal modern violence and political insincerity. Bond's manner is cruel and more defiant; he employs euphemism ironically to criticize systemic vehemence—those who sanitize violence through soft speech. In Bond's *Lear*, many characters use euphemistic expressions to hide the truth, cheating, and injustice. Lear and other figures utilize euphemism to fool and to hinder their understanding to make them incapable of comprehending the true significance and limit their capacity to criticize, for instance, in Act One, Scene One:

LEAR. I started this wall when I was young. I stopped my enemies in the field, 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. My wall will make you free. (Lear, p. 3)

Lear employs euphemism to justify the building of a wall, which led to many workers being killed. He uses the term "free" to soften the implications of the wall's construction, intending to influence subjects into notarizing that walls will fulfill peace and safety. He asserts the beneficial aspect of the project, alleging liberty as the ultimate outcome (Khafaga, 2019). In this context, euphemism serves to cover reality and oppression and to soften the harsh truths, thus to be accepted quite willingly.

3.5.3.3.Allusion

Allusion commonly an implied indication, possibly to another piece of literature or art, to a person or an occurrence (Cuddon & Preston, 1999). In Bond's play, allusion does not function just as homage; he intentionally alludes to Shakespeare's *Lear* but dismantles and interprets it to impose on the audience a reconsideration of the significance of kingship, power, and ethics in a

modern framework. Bond uses a direct allusion to Shakespeare's main plot, an elderly ruler, disloyalty by daughters, and falling into madness, but he removes Shakespeare's language, its grandeur and poeticism. Nevertheless, Edward Bond fundamentally changes the setting; rather than the ceremonial division of a kingdom based on expressions of love in *King Lear*, Bond's play begins with Lear obsessively supervising the building of a vindictory wall, representing paranoia and authoritarian rule. This transition from emotional treachery to political brutality underscores how Bond reimagines Shakespeare's personal tragedy into a critique of modern structures of oppression.

Bond alludes to Shakespeare's *King Lear*, where Shakespeare's tragedy is elevated and cathartic; Bond's tragedy is cruel, senseless, and gloomy. He frequently ironizes it by distorting noble suffering into meaningless truculence and converting tragedy into materialistic vehemence.

3.5.4. Syntactic Features

3.5.4.1. Fragmentation

Edward Bond applies fragmentation in *Lear* as a sort of parody by dismantling and destabilizing the structure and language of Shakespeare's *King Lear* to provide political and ideological critique. Bond fragments Shakespeare's unified tragedy to reveal its limitations in confronting modern vehemence, class conflict, and authoritarian rule. Bond's characters frequently converse in short, disassembled sentences that mirror psychological instability, emotional separation, and social dissolution. Edward Bond utilizes fragmented, sudden, and non-poetic syntax as an intentional stylistic approach to parody the rhetorical framework of Shakespeare's *King Lear*, such as in *LEAR*: "*I destroyed her! I knew nothing, saw nothing, learned nothing! Fool! Fool! Worse than I knew!*" (Edward Bond, *Lear*, Act III, Scene 4). This part represents fragmented syntax:

short, interrupted sentences filled with emotions that show Lear's psychological collapse. Bond speaks in intense impulses, driven by guilt, trauma, and insanity. Bond's syntactic options show a world where language is not anymore, a device for conviction or poetry but a reflection of madness, injustice, and moral decay.

3.6. Findings and Discussions

A stylistic analysis of Edward Bond's *Lear* shows how the writer employs various stylistic techniques (phonological, lexical, syntactic, and figurative language) to deliberately parody and dismantle Shakespeare's *King Lear*. The analysis clearly indicates that Bond structures a broken and cruel linguistic world that reflects contemporary political and social turmoil.

3.6.1. Representation of Modern World

The diction, the frequent use of violent terms, and the conversion of speech to orders in *Lear* undermine the poetic nobility of Shakespeare's original work, in which he utilizes language to irradiate the internal lives of the characters, while Bond's characters communicate in disjointed, often incoherent statements that reflect emotional anesthesia and social and psychological disintegration. This alteration in diction serves as a parodic reflection, representing a modern world where language does not function as a tool to express truth but as a device of control and violence (Akondo, n.d.).

3.6.2. Political Manipulation

Bond's euphemisms underscore the political manipulation, where terms like "peace" and "freedom" justify suppression and killing. Similarly, the juxtaposition of strange sounds with acts of

murder satirizes the earnestness of suffering in traditional tragedy, changing it with absurdity and inconvenience. These stylistic elements function to critique the romanticized perspectives of tragedy, power, and suffering and parodies the ethical rationalization of violence in both classical and modern political speech (Khafaga, 2019).

3.6.3. Intertextual Subversion

Bond's intertextual relation with Shakespeare is both respectful and critical. Bond borrows the basic structure and figures from *King Lear*, yet he rewrites the characters to show the failing of traditional tragedy in portraying the political facts of modern society. The parody is embedded in the reimagination of the characters such as Cordelia, Lear, and the daughters, portraying them as victims of governmental violence rather than moral symbols (Khafaga, 2020).

Conclusion

This chapter has examined the use of parody in Edward Bond's *Lear* through an in-depth thematic and stylistic analysis of the phonological, lexical, figurative, and syntactic features of the text to conclude that Bond employs parody not just for humorous imitation but also as a significant critique of Shakespeare's *King Lear* and the ideological frameworks it supports. His deviation from poetic language to harsh realism, his ironic application of euphemism, and his fragmentation of traditional syntax all function to parody the majesty of Shakespearean tragedy while mirroring the broken and vehement nature of modern community. Bond reinterprets Shakespeare's tragic play to reveal the cruelty, manipulation, and alienation that distinguish modern political structures. In this way, parody becomes a technique of political involvement, undermining

the foundations of traditional tragedy and convincing audiences to reconsider their presumptions regarding justice, authority, and redemption

General Conclusion

Parody has consistently held an important place in English literature, serving not just as a means for humor and imitation but also as a technique for critique, subversion, and artistic innovation. From its classical origins in ancient Greek works to its diverse manifestations in modern and postmodern literature, parody has ensured to be a multilateral literary device able to interact with established narratives, genres, and discourses. Parody has gained regenerated relevance in contemporary literature, especially within the framework of postmodernism. It now often serves as a kind of intertextual dialogue, where writers recontextualize the traditional works to critique dominant ideologies or to highlight present social and political status.

Central to this research were three questions. What is parody and what is its manifestations in the literary text? How does Edward Bond use parody in *Lear*? What is the function of Bond's parody in his play? utilizing a qualitative descriptive approach, this research examined parody concepts, forms and functions in literary discourse especially postmodern literature. Through the combination of stylistic and thematic analysis that the present methodology allowed for profound investigation of Bond's choice of language, narrative structure, and intertextual references, primarily to Shakespeare's *King Lear*. Eventually, this study offers a complete view of the function of parody in Bond's work and the way in which parody fulfils a double role of literary tool and that of social critique.

Indeed, this research examines the role and function of parody in English literature, with particular focus on Edward Bond's *Lear* (1971) as a case study. Bond's *Lear* stands as a reimagining of Shakespeare's *King Lear*, combining elements of tragic drama with modernist and postmodernist techniques. Through parody, Bond both pays homage to and critiques Shakespeare's work,

converting it into a strong commentary on contemporary violence, authoritarianism and ethical disintegration. His play radically reconstructs old narrative to question institutional power, explore social injustice.

Though Bond's interaction with parody is rich, much of the existing researches have concentrated primarily on thematic or political interpretations of the play, often overlooking the stylistic techniques through which parody is articulated. This study, therefore, aims to fill that gap by offering a stylistic analysis of parody in Bond's *Lear*. It examines how linguistic choices, syntactic structures, figurative language, and dramatic devices reinforce the construction of parody, and how these stylistic features contribute into the play's critical position toward both its literary and the sociopolitical realities it reflects.

By placing Edward Bond's *Lear* within the spacious tradition of English literary parody and exploring its postmodern stylistic strategies, this study aims to display the transformative possibility of parody in literature. It debates that parody in Bond's play surpasses ridicule or imitation, functioning instead as a tool of deconstruction and reinvention. Thus, the research contributes to the outstanding critical conversation about parody's role in literature, particularly as a means for ideological opposition and inventive reinterpretation.

References

- Abby, S. (n.d.). *King Lear analysis*. Academia.edu. Retrieved April 26, 2025, from https://www.academia.edu/32742824/King_lear_analysis
- Abrams, M. H., & Harpham, G. G. (2015). A glossary of literary terms (11th ed.). Cengage Learning.
- Aithor. (2024, March 3). *King Lear* themes, characters, & analysis essay. Aithor. <https://aithor.com/essay-examples/king-lear-themes-characters-analysis-essay>
- Alamin, T. M. K. P. M., & Bashri, A. A. P. N. T. (2022). The Postmodern novel. *Humanities & Natural Sciences Journal*, 3(8), 618-627.
- Ammanamanchi, S. L., Meeran, J. A., Dharmapuri, K., & Sharma, N. (2023). Basic Concepts Of Literary Devices In English Literature. Academic Guru Publishing House. <https://books.google.dz/books?id=FQ7wEAAAQBAJ>
- Anonymous. (2021). Themes of the play *Lear* by Edward Bond. University of Kerala. Retrieved April 20, 2025, from <https://www.studocu.com/in/document/university-of-kerala/ma-english-language-and-literature/themes-of-the-play-lear-by-edward-bond/58058941>
- AYAR, M. Z. (2022). HOW TO COPE WITH POSTMODERN TEXTS: TEXTUAL ANALYSIS OF INTERTEXTUALITY, PARODY, AND PASTICHE IN READING POSTMODERN TEXTS. *JOURNAL OF MODERNISM AND POSTMODERNISM STUDIES (JOMOPS)*, 3(1), 183-191.
- Bader, M. A. Reading Edward Bond's *Lear* from An agitprop perspective.
- Bakoeva, M., Muratova, E., & Ochilova, M. (2006). English literature. Tashkent: Uzbek State World Languages University / Bukhara State University.
- Baldick, C. (2001). The concise Oxford dictionary of literary terms (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Belzeckour, S. (2023). Reading Margaret Atwood's The Penelopiad as a Parody to Homer's The Odyssey. 179-193, *مجلة أنسنة للبحوث و الدراسات*, 14(1).
- Bond, E. (1972). *Lear*. Eyre Methuen.
- Borghi, M., & Ismail, M. Parody Exception in Copyright Law.
- Bradley, L. (2008). Meddling with masterpieces: The on-going adaptation of *King Lear* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Victoria]. University of Victoria Libraries.

- Brand, P. Z. (n.d.). Parody. In Oxford Reference. PhilPapers. <https://core.ac.uk/display/131214565>
- Brodie, I. (2020). Parody: Intertextuality and music. *MUSICultures*, 47, 1-10.
- Cambridge University Press. (n.d.). Spoof. In Cambridge Dictionary. Retrieved March 21, 2025, from <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/spoof>
- CliffsNotes. (n.d.). About *King Lear*. Retrieved May 6, 2025, from <https://www.cliffsnotes.com/literature/k/king-lear/about-king-lear>
- Çolak, M. (2022). Intertextuality, pastiche and parody in postmodern cinema. *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi* (49), 261-274.
- Cordeiro, W. (2014). A Double Capacity: Self-Parody In Britain'S Long Eighteenth Century.
- Core Knowledge Foundation. (2017). Biography of William Shakespeare. In *England in the Golden Age* (Nonfiction Excerpt 1, pp. 1–2). Core Knowledge History and Geography (CKHG), Grade 5, Unit 6.
- Crystal, D., & Davy, D. (2013). *Investigating English style*. Routledge. <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/mono/10.4324/9781315538419/investigating-english-style-david-crystal-derek-davy>
- Cuddon, J. (1999). English penguin dictionary of literary terms and literary theory. In: Harmondsworth: Penguin Reference.
- Currie, M. (2014). *Metafiction*. Routledge.
- D'Angelo, F. J. (2009). The rhetoric of intertextuality. *Rhetoric Review*, 29(1), 31-47.
- Dentith, S. (2002). *Parody*. Routledge.
- eNotes Editorial. (n.d.). In *Lear*, what is the significance of Warrington's torture scene? eNotes. Retrieved April 20, 2025, from <https://www.enotes.com/topics/lear/questions/what-importance-scene-which-warrington-tortured-305880>
- eNotes Editorial. (n.d.). *Lear*: In-depth analysis. eNotes. Retrieved April 20, 2025, from <https://www.enotes.com/topics/lear/in-depth>
- eNotes. (n.d.). *Lear* – Themes. eNotes. <https://www.enotes.com/topics/lear/themes>
- eNotes. (n.d.). *Lear*: Characters. eNotes. Retrieved April 19, 2025, from <https://www.enotes.com/topics/lear/characters>

- Eshmamatov, A. B. (2024, December). The role of parody in postmodern literature. *Modern Education and Development*, (15, Part 7), 316–319.
- Faster Capital. (2024, April 10). The role of parody in creative work. Retrieved April 10, 2024, from <https://fastercapital.com/topics/the-role-of-parody-in-creative-work.html>
- Gale. (n.d.). *Lear*. Encyclopedia.com. Retrieved April 19, 2025, from <https://www.encyclopedia.com/literature-and-arts/literature-english/english-literature-1499/lear>
- Hashir, K. P. (2024). The subversion of Shakespearean legacy: Reinterpreting *King Lear* in Edward Bond's *Lear*. *International Journal of Creative Research Thoughts*, 12(10), 284–286.
- Hutcheon, L. (1990). *The politics of postmodernism* (1st ed.). Routledge.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203129876>
- Hutcheon, L. (2003). *A poetics of postmodernism: History, theory, fiction*. routledge.
- Inoyatova, G. D. Q. (2024, November). The role of parody in postmodern literature. 37-to'plam, 3-qism. Chirchik State Pedagogical University, Faculty of Tourism, Department of Foreign Language and Literature (English).
- Jameson, F. (2016). Postmodernism, or the cultural logic of late capitalism. In *Postmodernism* (pp. 62-92). Routledge.
- Jones, D. R. (1980). Edward Bond's " *Rational Theatre*". *Theatre Journal*, 32(4), 505-517.
- Joy, E. A. (n.d.). ENG208 notes on *King Lear*. Southern Illinois University Edwardsville. Retrieved from <https://www.siue.edu/~ejojoy/eng208KingLearNotes.htm>
- Juvan, M. (2008). *History and poetics of intertextuality*. Purdue University Press.
- Khafaga, A. (2019). Linguistic representation of power in Edward Bond's *Lear*: A lexicopragmatic approach to critical discourse analysis. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 9(6), 404-420.
- Khafaga, A. F. (2020). Intertextual relationships in literary genres. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 10(3), 177–188. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v10n3p177>
- Korkut, N. (2009). *Kinds of Parody from the Medieval to the Postmodern*. Lang.
https://books.google.dz/books?id=Gip7FzJN__AC
- Kostka, V. (2016). Linda Hutcheon's theory of parody and its application to postmodern music. *AVANT. Pismo Awangardy Filozoficzno-Naukowej* (1), 67-73.

- Kostka, V. (2016). Linda Hutcheon's theory of parody and its application to postmodern music. *AVANT. Pismo Awangardy Filozoficzno-Naukowej* (1), 67-73.
- Kravalová, B. (2025). Parody: A study of its role and function in literature (Bachelor's thesis, Masaryk University). Masaryk University Information System.
https://is.muni.cz/th/ct5ob/Kravalova_Bachelors_Thesis_Parody.pdf
- Kravalová, M. (2009). Parody, meta-parody and self-parody in Ishmael Reed's *Mumbo Jumbo* (Bachelor's thesis, Masaryk University, Faculty of Arts, Department of English and American Studies).
https://is.muni.cz/th/217950/ff_b/Kravalova_Bachelors_Thesis_Parody.pdf
- Kumar, S. (2023). Edward Bond and *Lear* – A study. *International Journal of Novel Research and Development*, 8(2), 645–656. <https://www.ijnrd.org/papers/IJNRD2302080.pdf>
- Kumar, S. (n.d.). Edward Bond: *Lear*. In Twentieth Century English Literature. e-PG Pathshala. Retrieved April 15, 2025, from <https://ebooks.inflibnet.ac.in/engp04/chapter/edward-bond-lear/>
- Latosinsky, C., Porter, E., Farrow, L., Zemajtis, K., Latosinsky, K., & Yin, A. (2021). *King Lear*: Background guide (Version 4). University of Toronto Model United Nations (UTMUN).
<https://static1.squarespace.com/static/533e6b7de4b0d84a3bd7c4be/t/600707911f93806a3206415b/1611073472263/background+guide+-+king+lear+v4.pdf>
- Ledinski, M. (2021). Parody in Samuel Beckett's *Molloy* University of Rijeka. Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences. Department ...].
- Leech, G. N., & Short, M. H. (1981). *Style in fiction: A linguistic introduction to English fictional prose*. Longman.
- Liktor, C. The postmodern condition in Don DeLillo's fiction: *White Noise* and *Players* Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü].
- Literary Devices. (n.d.). Parody. Retrieved March 21, 2025, from <https://litdevices.com/parody/>
- Löfgren, U. (2010). The Complexity of the Major Characters in Shakespeare's *King Lear*.
- Lucas, F. (1955). *Style*. Cassell. Retrieved from
<https://archive.org/details/style0000luca/page/n5/mode/2up?q=effective>
- Mahamoud, A. M. A., Alshageri, S., & Mirgane, V. R. (2024). Family Relations and the Theme of Love in William Shakespeare's Tragedy *KING LEAR*. *United International Journal for Research & Technology*, 5(7), 49-53.
- McHale, B. (2003). *Postmodernist fiction*. routledge.

- Muhammed, Q. T., & Sharhan, K. S. (2022). A gender-based stylistic analysis of selected English love poems. *Al-Adab Journal*, 2(141), 73–82. <https://doi.org/10.31973/aj.v2i141.3713>
- Mustafa, N. (2010). THEME IN SHAKESPEARE’S “*KING LEAR*”. *SAWERIGADING*, 16(1), 122-135.
- Narcis Manoliu, M. (2014). VIOLENCE-A RECURRENT THEME IN EDWARD BOND’S PLAYS IMAGERY AND SYMBOLS. *International Journal of Communication Research*, 4(4).
- Nicol, B. (2009). *The Cambridge introduction to postmodern fiction*. Cambridge University Press.
- Nünning, A. (1999). The creative role of parody in transforming literature and culture: An outline of a functionalist approach to postmodern parody. *European Journal of English Studies*, 3(2), 123-137.
- Orlando-UCF Shakespeare Festival. (n.d.). William Shakespeare's *King Lear*: Study guide. Orlando Shakes. https://www.orlandoshakes.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/KingLear_SG.pdf
- Özmen, Ö. (2018). Re-Writing Shakespeare in the twentieth century: Edward Bond’s *Lear*, Arnold Wesker’s *The Merchant* and Howard Barker’s *Gertrude-The Cry* in Socio-Historical Context.
- Padmaja, T. V. S., & Rajmohan, U. *Fundamentals Of Literary Devices In English Literature*. AG Publishing House. <https://books.google.dz/books?id=ADPZEAAAQBAJ>
- Pietrzykowska-Motyka, A. (2016). Appropriations of Shakespeare’s *King Lear* in modern British drama: Edward Bond’s *Lear* (1971) and Howard Barker’s *Seven Lears* (1989). *Kwartalnik Neofilologiczny*, 63(4), 447–457.
- Priestman, J. (1980). *The age of parody: literature parody and some nineteenth century perspectives*. University of Kent (United Kingdom).
- Radetič, A. (2018). What is Style? *International Journal Of English Literature And Social Sciences*, 3(4), 484-487.
- Raupp, E. R. (2024). 101 Literary Devices and Figures of Speech. *Caucasus Journal of Milton Studies*, 3(1), 56-66.
- Redgate, J. (2022). The triumph of the will of athletes in *Infinite Jest*. *English Literature*, 8, 91-104.
- Rezaei, H., & Azari Samani, M. (2012). The Chaotic World and the Entropic Crisis in Thomas Pynchon’s *The Crying of Lot 49*. *Journal of Foreign Language Teaching and Translation Studies*, 1(1), 83-98.

- Rezaei, H., & Azari Samani, M. (2012). The Chaotic World and the Entropic Crisis in Thomas Pynchon's *The Crying of Lot 49*. *Journal of Foreign Language Teaching and Translation Studies*, 1(1), 83-98.
- Robles, S. O. (2008). Intertextuality, Pastiche, and Allegory in Postmodern Aesthetics: An Analysis of Enrique Vila-Matas, Cindy Sherman, and Cristina Peri-Rossi.
- Rodríguez, L. M. L. (2001). Parody and metafiction: Virginia Woolf's " *An unwritten novel*". *Links & letters*, 71-82.
- Rose, M. A. (1993). *Parody: Ancient, Modern and Post-modern*. Cambridge University Press.
<https://books.google.dz/books?id=xMzfcHztMa4C>
- Rose, M. A. (2020). *Pictorial Irony, Parody, and Pastiche*.
- Sadrian, M. R. (2010). *Parody: Another revision*.
- Saint Louis University, Department of English. (n.d.). Ph.D. reading lists combined.
<https://www.slu.edu/>
- Salomon, V. B. (2006). The claim of postmodern parody. *TEXTURA-Revista de Educação e Letras*, 8(13).
- Seucan, A. (2015). The concept of parody. *Tribuna Juridică*, 5(09), 99-105.
- Singh, J. (n.d.). *King Lear* plot summary. Scribd.
<https://www.scribd.com/document/302154067/King-Lear-Plot-Summary>
- Studocu. (n.d.). Comparison of Shakespeare's *Lear* with Bond's *Lear*. Retrieved April 23, 2025, from <https://www.studocu.com/in/document/mahatma-gandhi-university/m-a-english-language-and-literature/comparison-of-shakespeares-lear-with-bonds-lear/41980671?origin=search-results>
- Studyclix. (n.d.). *King Lear*: Imagery and symbolism sample answer.
<https://studyclix.blob.core.windows.net/static/content/file/uploads/d/df64cc12-71e9-4012-81c9-fef3c9a7f4d5.pdf>
- Sullivan, B. A. (n.d.). Pynchon papers & essays: Bruce A. Sullivan. Shipwreck Library.
<https://shipwrecklibrary.com/the-modern-word/pynchon/sl-papers-sullivan/>
- Sundiartiko, Y. C. (2015). VIOLENCE IN SHAKESPEARE'S *KING LEAR*. *LITERA KULTURA: Journal of Literary and Cultural Studies*, 3(1).

- Swathy. (2021). A philosophical and political analysis of Edward Bond's play *Lear*. *International Journal of English Literature and Social Sciences (IJELS)*, 6(4), 312–315. <https://dx.doi.org/10.22161/ijels.64.49>
- Tugalova, M. (2024). IMPORTANCE AND EFFECT OF LITERARY DEVICES IN WRITING. Conference Proceedings: Fostering Your Research Spirit,
- Unknown Author. (n.d.). AP literary terms [PDF]. Retrieved from <https://www.houstonisd.org/cms/lib2/TX01001591/Centricity/Domain/16378/AP%20LITERARY%20TERMS.pdf>
- Uściński, P. (2015). The creative role of parody in eighteenth-century English literature (Alexander Pope, John Gay, Henry Fielding, Laurence Sterne) (Doctoral dissertation, University of Warsaw). University of Warsaw, Institute of English Studies.
- Vachon, E. J. (2006). Seeking an Aesthetics of Metafiction.
- Vocabulary.com. (n.d.). Spoof. In Vocabulary.com Dictionary. Retrieved March 21, 2025, from <https://www.vocabulary.com/dictionary/spoof>
- Warner, R. (1961). *The study of literature: An introduction*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Waugh, P. (2002). *Metafiction: the theory and practice of self-conscious fiction*. Routledge.
- Williams, J. P., & Khoo, A. M. G. (2020). “Honestly, you just have to be famous!”: Parody and the art of identity authentication in Singapore’s social media influencer culture. In *Studies on the Social Construction of Identity and Authenticity* (pp. 127-142). Routledge.

المخلص

تبحث هذه الدراسة في طبيعة ووظيفة المحاكاة الساخرة في الأدب عمومًا. كدراسة حالة، يُتبع تحليل المحاكاة الساخرة، كأداة أسلوبية وموضوعية، في مسرحية إدوارد بوند "لير"، وهي إعادة تفسير حديثة لمسرحية الملك لير لشكسبير. يسعى البحث إلى استكشاف كيفية عمل المحاكاة الساخرة، متجاوزًا التقليد أو الهجاء البسيط، ليُصبح أداة فعّالة للنقد الاجتماعي والسياسي. بالإضافة إلى ذلك، تُعيّن الدراسة مناهج نوعية وأسلوبية للتحقيق في كيفية إعادة بوند تفسير النص الأصلي من خلال استراتيجيات لغوية وسردية ونظرية تداخل النصوص. فبدلاً من استخدام المحاكاة الساخرة للفكاهة فقط، يستخدمها بوند كعملية نقد اجتماعي وسياسي، كاشفاً عن قضايا الاستبداد والعنف والانحلال الأخلاقي في المجتمع الحديث. من الناحية الأسلوبية، ينحرف بوند عن عظمة شكسبير الشعرية من خلال لغة مجزأة ومباشرة، وغالبًا ما تكون وحشية. يعكس رفضه للجماليات التقليدية تشككًا ما بعد حداشي تجاه الأشكال الأدبية الموروثة. يُعتبر إدوارد بوند شخصية مثيرة للجدل في المسرح الحديث نظرًا لتصويره الصريح للعنف وإيمانه بأن الفن يجب أن يؤدي وظائف أخلاقية وسياسية. ينظر بوند إلى المسرح كقوة أخلاقية، ووسيلة لكشف وتحدي هياكل السلطة بدلاً من مجرد الترفيه. من خلال تحليل أساليب بوند الدرامية ولغته، توضح الدراسة كيف تتحدى المحاكاة الساخرة في مسرحية "لير" المعايير الأدبية التقليدية، وتعكس السلطة والعدالة والعلاقات الأسرية. تؤكد النتائج على أهمية المحاكاة الساخرة كتقنية أدبية تحويلية في الأدب، قادرة على إعادة صياغة السرديات الكلاسيكية لمعالجة القضايا الثقافية والسياسية المعاصرة.

الكلمات المفتاحية: التناس، الملك لير، لير، المحاكاة الساخرة، نقد ما بعد الحداثة، التحليل الأسلوبي.