



# 14<sup>th</sup> International IDEA Conference *Studies in English*

BOOK OF ABSTRACTS  
&  
PROCEEDINGS

*6-8 October 2021*

*Trabzon / TURKEY*

[www.ktu.edu.tr/idea2021](http://www.ktu.edu.tr/idea2021)  
Karadeniz Technical University





**THE 14<sup>TH</sup> INTERNATIONAL IDEA CONFERENCE**

**STUDIES IN ENGLISH**

# **BOOK OF ABSTRACTS**

**&**

# **PROCEEDINGS**

**ISBN 978-605-81907-1-9**

## **Editors**

Mustafa Zeki ıraklı

Nazan Yıldız

Muzaffer Zafer Ayar

Nilgün Müftüođlu

Tuncer Aydemir

**KARADENİZ TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY**

**Trabzon – Turkey 2021**

**[www.ktu.edu.tr/idea2021](http://www.ktu.edu.tr/idea2021)**

Conference Date: **6-8 October 2021**

Publication Date: **30 December 2021**

**ISBN 978-605-81907-1-9**

No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the author, except as provided by official copyright law.

***Conference Academic Advisory Committee (English Literature)***

Prof. Dr. Işıl Baş (İstanbul Kültür University)

Prof. Dr. Himmet Umunç (Başkent University)

Prof. Dr. Maria Isabel Carrera-Suarez (University of Oviedo)

Prof. Dr. Esin Akalın (İstanbul Kültür University)

Prof. Dr. Emma Parker (University of Leicester)

Prof. Dr. Burçin Erol (Hacettepe University)

Prof. Dr. Jacob Blakesley (University of Leeds)

Prof. Dr. Rezzan Silkü (Ege University)

Prof. Dr. Walter Grunzweig (University of Dortmund)

Prof. Dr. Huriye Reis (Hacettepe University)

Prof. Dr. Atilla Silkü (Ege University)

Prof. Dr. Mehmet Ali Çelikel (Pamukkale University)

Prof. Dr. Mukadder Erkan (Atatürk University)

Prof. Dr. Katerina Kitsi-Mitakou (Aristotle University)

Prof. Dr. John Pier (University of Tours)

Prof. Dr. Mehmet Takkaç (Atatürk University)

Prof. Dr. Zekiye Antakyalıođlu (Gaziantep University)

**Chair**

Prof. Dr. Işıl Baş (IDEA, Studies in English, Turkey)

**Coordinators**

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mustafa Zeki Çıraklı (English Language and Literature, KTU, Turkey)

Asst. Prof. Dr. Nazan Yıldız (English Language and Literature, KTU, Turkey)

**Co-Coordiators**

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Badegül Can Emir (Faculty of Letters, KTU, Turkey)

Dr. Muzaffer Zafer Ayar (School of Foreign Languages, KTU, Turkey)

**Representatives**

Asst. Prof. Dr. Ali Şükrü Özbay

Asst. Prof. Dr. Selçuk Şentürk

**CTO**

Inst. Murat Şahin

**Conference Assistants**

Dr. Nilgün Müftüoğlu

Res. Asst. Tuncer Aydemir

**Website:** <https://www.ktu.edu.tr/idea2021>

Dear participants!

The English Language and Literature Research Association of Turkey (IDEA), founded in 2004, is a national academic association for Turkish academics engaged in teaching and research in the fields of English literature, British and comparative cultural studies, linguistics, English language teaching (ELT), and translation studies. The IDEA encourages academic collaboration among its members, supports academic research and publication related to its major fields of concern, organizes annual international conferences and, thus, creates a scholarly platform for academic interaction and cooperation. The IDEA is a member of the European Society for the Study of English (ESSE).

International IDEA Conference has been a prestigious international event acquiring strong and diverse conventions of its own. It has been gathering scholars and researchers from all over the world. The event has been a doorway between disciplines and diverse fields of research into language, literature and culture. IDEA conference foregrounds a significant feature in that it has brought together various distinguished scholars of the studies in English.

14<sup>th</sup> IDEA Conference, Studies in English, will be jointly hosted on 6-8 October 2021 by the Department of English Language and Literature, Faculty of Letters, and the School of Foreign Languages, Karadeniz Technical University (KTU, Trabzon, Turkey) in collaboration with the English Language and Literature Research Association of Turkey (IDEA). We want to convey our kind regards and warm feelings to those who have supported us from the beginning, our Keynote Speakers, our presenters, our participants and students. Notably, we should like to thank our Keynote Speakers, whose abstracts are available in the following pages. Without their noteworthy rejoice of English studies and remarkable interest in the sessions with keen insights, elevated excitement and enthusiastic motivation, the conference would be so colourless.

We look forward to seeing you at the next conferences!

Organising Committee

## **Nature and Animal Imagery in Shakespeare's *Richard III***

**Gül Kurtuluş**

Bilkent University

kurtulus@bilkent.edu.tr

### **Bio**

**Gül Kurtuluş** received her PhD from Bilkent University in 1997, with the Dissertation titled "The Carnavalesque in Ben Jonson's Three City Comedies: Volpone, The Alchemist and Bartholomew Fair." Her first book, *Stereoscopic London: Plays of Oscar Wilde, Bernard Shaw and Arthur Wing Pinero in the 1980s* is published by Peter Lang in 2020. The book is about the representations of London in the plays of three prominent British playwrights. Her research interests are English Renaissance Literature, early modern and modern drama. Her latest publications are about drama during Shakespeare's time, and English drama in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries.

### **Abstract**

In most of Shakespeare's tragedies and history plays nature and natural forces play an important role making the plays even more intriguing. Shakespeare's use of nature in such plays tends to express aggression and harshness rather than inspiring utopic visions or tender pastoral settings. This paper aims to discuss how nature serves to create or break order and hierarchy and how man is indispensable part of it in Shakespeare's history play *Richard III*. It also aims to explore the interdependent relationship between nature and man that forms a chaotic and confusing hierarchical order, as seen in the play. The Renaissance concept of The Great Chain of Being creates a clear hierarchical order giving the ultimate priority to human beings and above them to divinity. However, the disappearance of human superiority and distinction from the natural world creates a more cautious realization of nature about unstable and dynamic relations between man and nature. Indeed, man and nature are always relatable and indispensable, and this adds more complexity to characters' identities and their understanding of themselves and the world around them. In Renaissance, physiognomy denotes the outer-self as the representation of the inner-self which forms the basis of the understanding of people who are disabled and deformed as evil by nature in Shakespeare's time. *Richard III* is known as "unnatural" due to his physical appearance. In the play, he abandons his place in "the chain of being" both as a king and a human and degrades himself to the place of animals.

**Key words:** *Richard III*, nature, animal imagery, deformity, villain

In Shakespeare's plays, nature, human beings, and environment are in a recurrent relationship. Elizabethan worldview dictates that nature is God's art, perfection, and reflection. God has created the natural world according to a certain order positioning man below the celestial beings and above animals and plants. E.M.W. Tillyard (1943) in *The Elizabethan World Picture* outlines the desire of the Elizabethans to find patterns and connections between animate and



inanimate elements in nature and highlights Elizabethan concept of the Great Chain of Being, which binds everything together in unity and harmony (p. 45). Man lacks control over nature as opposed to God's domination over it. Amid unremitting transformations and evolutionary procedures, humans are involved in a mutual contact with non-human and other than human creatures that reinforce humans' social responsibilities. Shakespeare makes ample use of images of nature in his plays. *Richard III*, which considered to be written and performed in 1592 and published in 1597 is a chronicle play that embraces the interconnectedness between man and nature. The title character is the villain of the play who is a master of rhetoric and who performs wicked acts to achieve his goals without hesitation. Shakespeare depicts Richard as an allegorical figure, a representation of evil whose downfall provides the audience with a moral lesson. In the play, Richard puts on masks to hide his villainy and the evil within him appears through the animal imagery. Throughout the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, the use of animal imagery that symbolizes morality has been a practice in use with symbols taken from pagan literature, the Bible, treatises by naturalists, and folklore. Shakespeare employs the animal imagery and masks in *Richard III*, which are not only depicted in dialogues and soliloquys but also in the appearance of Richard. Therefore, this paper aims to explore the link between the animal imagery Shakespeare deploys in the play and Richard III's actions, his obligation to his social role, and his political impact.

127

The use of nature imagery is known as a vital part of Shakespearean plays such as the sea imagery in *Othello* and the storm imagery in *King Lear*. *Richard III* also embodies images of nature and different than the above-mentioned plays, the dominant element of the imagery used in this play is the animal symbolism. Throughout the play, Richard is associated with multiple wild and poisonous animals and thus the animal imagery becomes an important element for understanding Richard's political and human relations. Richard's analysis of himself at the beginning of the play exposes his devious means that initiates his political impact and helps contextualizing the role of animal imagery in relation to his characteristics. Richard describes the political atmosphere of the era from his own point of view. The play depicts the Machiavellian ascension of Richard, from Duke of Gloucester to King of England, based on the real event of Richard III's rule after Edward IV. Richard dissolves to kill his two brothers to disable them from claiming the throne and makes Edward's two sons, the rightful heirs, imprisoned to prevent them from inheriting the crown. Richard's true intentions are revealed through soliloquys and asides as the characters in the play are unaware of his ruthless determination to become the King of England. King Richard III willingly adopts the role of the villain while also masterfully disguising himself as an innocent character: "[he] seem[s] a saint, when [he] most play[s] the devil" (I, iii, 338). He is portrayed as socially inept and unable to form interpersonal relationships. His physical deformity and appearance confirm his character and personality as an outcast. However, in the play, there are instances where Richard forms close relationships with other characters and even pursues a love affair with Lady Anne. He is very convincing and can get close to people wearing the mask of kindness. This pushes the audience to reconsider Richard's intentions for deliberately choosing to pursue evil and cutting ties with people whom he is able to charm and befriend. While Richard is never honest with other characters, he always makes his intentions clear to the audience through his soliloquies.

Indeed, he poses a paradox per se. On the one hand, he is a master manipulator, gaining social leverage through his charm and intellect and on the other hand, he is very lucid when he gives the audience the rationale behind his deeds. This dilemma stems from Richard's given social roles, one that he feels pressured to perform.

Richard makes explanatory remarks about his foul nature and his devious political schemes in the opening act of the play. He describes himself as a man who is "Deformed, unfinished, sent before [his] time" (I, i, 20). His impression of himself is quite negative that he is aware of his distinct appearance and nature. He depicts his character as an incomplete, misshapen, and untimely creature, all of which dehumanizes Richard in the very first scene. As a character of distorted image, his motivation and purpose are of a malevolent kind and prove Richard to be an ill-mannered man. He claims: "I am determined to prove a villain," (I, i, 30). Even if the self-analysis shows no example about animal imagery defining Richard's malevolence, it provides the essence of Richard's nature and characterization. He portrays himself as a dehumanized anti-hero, which is an image that will later be described with animal imagery by the opposing characters. Another crucial point for contextualizing animal imagery in *Richard III* depends on understanding the political climate of the era. Richard's response to Queen Elizabeth summarizes the central idea: "...the world is grown so bad / That wrens make prey where eagles dare not perch" (I, iii, 70-71). Richard uses an animal imagery in a threatening tone against the Queen in order to indicate that the order is to be reversed dramatically. He also utilizes animal and nature associations to identify the political climate as above and identify his role under King Edward IV's authority: "I was a pack-horse in his great affairs," (I, iii, 122). Within the political environment, which is about to change drastically, Richard's image emerges in terms of a passive, obedient and utilized animal. After Richard's ascension to the throne of England, the political change he mentioned earlier begins to be reified and Richard, more as a king, later appears as a bloodthirsty hunter associated with wild animals rather than a prey. As an older and wiser figure of the play, Margaret, the former queen, describes Richard as a "dog" and as an "abortive rooting-hog" (I, iii, 213-225). In the following part, Margaret diversifies the use of animal imagery and identifies Richard with a "bottled spider" and a "poisonous bunch-backed toad" (I, iii, 242-246). Animals are selected to refer to the different characteristics of Richard in various ways. The members of the royal family highlight the fact that Richard is sly, dangerous, treacherous, entrapped, and corrupt. Indeed, Richard cunningly takes the opportunity to ascend the throne and organizes a bloody plot to become the king. The family curses his vile agenda through which he ascends the throne and unjustly reigns the country. Shakespeare's use of imagery reflects Richard's personality exposed in his personal and political relations.

In the climactic third act of the play, Young Duke of York makes fun of Richard's hunchback: "Because I am little, like an ape, / He thinks that you should bear me on your shoulders" (III, i, 130-131). Earl of Richmond's description in the fifth act is based on the boar symbolism:

The wretched, bloody, and usurping boar,  
That spoils your summer fields and fruitful vines,

Swills your warm blood like wash, and makes his trough  
In your in bowelled bosoms, this foul swine. (V, ii, 7-10)

Earl of Richmond describes Richard as destructive as a boar. He establishes an image of a beast which destroys fields and feeds on people. Richard tramples over people's rights and plots to kill them as he pleases and is named as a boar, which degrades him from any noble resemblance and demonstrates him as a dishonorable man. Bridget Gellert Lyons in her article, "'Kings Games': Stage Imagery and Political Symbolism in '*Richard III*'" argues,

The emblems that noblemen or noble families took for themselves in the Renaissance were public symbols of their honor and worth, displayed particularly on ceremonial occasions. [...] great noblemen tended to emphasize the aggressive aspects of the animals. [...] Richard was therefore not unusual in taking as his emblem a fierce and unpleasant animal [a boar], whose aggressive qualities could be dramatized. In Shakespeare's play, however, Richard's emblem loses its abstract, noble qualities, and becomes naturalized by the language of his victims and opponents. (25-26)

With already strongly negative connotations, the boar symbol adds to the offensive tone. On the other hand, the image of a toad refers to Richard's ugliness, deformity, and incompleteness as if he were a half-metamorphosed toad. The images of a dog and hog underline Richard's ferocity and wildness, specifically with the image of a rooting hog, Shakespeare points out Richard's harmfulness to the native land. Wolfgang Clemen (2010) states, "*Richard III* is Shakespeare's first play in which the chief character is delineated by symbolical images recurring as a *leitmotif*" (p. 51). The animalistic aspect of Richard's characterization consistently continues till the end of the play and thus becomes a central theme that accompanies the harm done by Richard during his reign. In the last scene, Richmond who dethrones Richard III at the Battle of Bosworth, stresses the despotic regime of Richard, and motivates his lords against him: "The wretched, bloody, and usurping boar, / That spoils your summer fields and fruitful vines" (V, ii, 7-8). Richmond emphasizes Richard's wild and vicious nature and underlines the fact that he is harmful to the native land. Earlier, "rooting-hog" has also the same reference as the "usurping boar," but Richmond's symbolism creates a more violent and politically charged image. Before the battle takes place, he defines Richard as a wild, unwanted, bad tempered, and harmful creature for the native land and emphasizes that Richard's rule is illegitimate. This animal imagery recalls all the dishonest and diabolical schemes of Richard in relation to his political strategy. Greta Olson (2003) points out that, "the historical Richard had to be depicted as ugly so as to stress the attractiveness of Tudor rule" (304). Olson's (2003) interpretation denotes that the depiction of Richard might be influenced by political motivations. As can be noted in Richard's and Richmond's use of animal imagery, this literary device is employed to depict the political climate and political figures of the era dramatically. Olson's (2003) argument can also be applied to the period before Richard's ascension. Animal imagery used to describe Richard creates a difference between Richard and the other royal members. Therefore, it might also stress the attractiveness of the earlier periods when King Henry VI and King Edward IV were respectively in charge. Thus, the

use of animal imagery is a consistent and central element of the play in order to depict the political tumult took place at the end of 15<sup>th</sup> century.

Besides Richmond's use of animal imagery in the play, women characters define Richard as animals. Caroline Spurgeon (1971) draws the attention to the animal imagery utilized by women figures and claims, "By his womenkind, who hate and fear him, Richard is likened to everything most repulsive in the animal world" (p. 232). Margaret is one of the women figures calling Richard symbolic animal names. She likens Richard to a diabolic creature even when she is in a conversation with Richard's mother: "A hell-hound that doth hunt us all to death. / That dog that had his teeth before his eyes" (IV, iv, 45-46). Upon Margaret's remarks, Richard's mother, the Duchess of York, follow her in calling him animal names referring to repulsive attributes of the animal world. The women characters, including his mother despise Richard. Margaret also indicates the so-called prey becomes a bloodthirsty hunter who first pulls out his teeth and seems hostile without even looking at an issue from different angles and thinking like a human being. Even though Richard is constantly despised and belittled, Olson (2003) suggests that Richard is a man "whose animal attractiveness and criminality are manifest in his visible difference" (p. 309). Olson's (2003) remark leads to a different interpretation of the relationship between Richard and the women characters of the play. Olson (2003) elaborates on a certain kind of attractiveness within the animalistic disposition and appearance of Richard. An appropriate example is the relationship between Richard and Lady Anne. Lady Anne spits at Richard's face and calls him a "fouler toad" pertaining to the poisonous speech and behavior that Richard performs against her (I, ii, 145). Even though Lady Anne resembles Richard to a hunch-backed and small creature, she is eventually convinced by Richard's animalistic behavior and queer attractiveness. The act of spitting and pulling the sword are two central actions that dramatically increase the sexual tension between Lady Anne and Richard. At last Lady Anne agrees to marry Richard despite all the dehumanization and disgust centered at Richard's depiction. Lady Anne's case is a unique one in terms of analyzing Richard's human relations. It contrasts with all other relationships that Richard has with the rest of the women figures of the play. Even though Richard is not truly in love with Lady Anne and deceives her in order to utilize the relationship for his advantage, having an animal-like disposition and looks appears for the first time as an attractive and intriguing feature.

Shakespeare's dominant nature imagery appears in the form of animal images that specifically identify Richard's personality traits and physical appearance in *Richard III*. The images are of a various kind and consistent throughout the play in order to emphasize the certain aspects of Richard's disposition which truly influences his political and personal affairs. Being wild, hostile, poisonous, bloodthirsty, aggressive, and vindictive are the main negative features that are symbolically conveyed through Shakespeare's imagery of dog, spider, toad, and boar. In spite of the animal attractiveness that sexually beguiled Lady Anne, Richard is mostly dehumanized and humiliated due to his looks and deceitful manners as an anti-hero and a true villain.

*Richard III* becomes unique its visual aspect fostered by the animal imagery, which is extracted from natural imagery. However, some of the characters who name Richard with different animals, call him “unnatural.” Moulton (1996) argues that Richard, Duke of Gloucester’s physical deformation signifies his destructive nature. He also argues that this deformation is connected with the animal imagery used in the play (p. 265). “In the absence of strong masculine royal authority, English manhood, unruly and untamed, turns to devour itself. It is this unregulated, destructive masculine force that is personified in the twisted and deformed body of Richard III” (Moulton 1996, p. 258). In the play, Richard makes plans to eliminate his enemies to seize the throne for himself and he accuses his older brother of treason. He plots to kill anyone who supports the rightful heirs of the throne. The absence of a strong royal authority can be filled with the Earl of Richmond, since he shows himself as a hero who can make things right again with his appearance. In his speech at the end of the play he says, “England hath long been mad, and scarred herself / [...] O now let Richmond and Elizabeth / True succeeders of each royal house / [...] Enrich the time to come with smooth-faced peace (V, vii, 23, 29-30, 33). In his speech, he also refers Richard as, “The day is ours; the bloody dog is dead” (V, vii, 2). In *Shakespeare and the Remains of Richard III*, Philip Schwyzer (2013) explains the significance of the dog figure. He argues, “[...] the phrase ‘like a dog’ points us toward from the early modern era to all-to-contemporary failures of humanity, it can also lead us back to classical discourses of justice and ethics” (p. 38). He compares this imagery with Plato’s *Republic*, in which Socrates compares those who violate corpses to the dogs.

131

In the play, Shakespeare’s characters use the boar to describe Richard. Since this work is a play, visual qualities also become important to consider. According to Moulton (1996),

It is in this context that one must read the frequently reiterated trope of Richard as a wild boar. While a white boar was historically Richard III’s heraldic emblem, the image of a ‘bloody, and usurping boar’ [...] indeed the pig in general, is a creature who occupies a special place in the symbolic topography of early modern European culture. Kept in the home and fed on scraps, an animal whose pink skin ‘disturbingly resemble[s] the flesh of European babies’, the pig was a ‘creature of the threshold’ which overlapped with, and confusingly debased, human habitat and diet alike. Its mode of life was not different from, but alarmingly imbricated with, the forms of life which betokened civility. (p. 265)

Moulton’s (1996) example strengthens the connection between Richard’s physical appearances to a boar. He supports his claim with on point background information, “In early modern England the birth of a deformed child was inevitably seen as portentous” (Moulton, 1996, p. 262). This occurrence can be connected to the physical appearance Richard has since his birth. Moulton (1996) states, “Richard’s social position is manifested by a precise physical change” (p. 260). Also, the young Duke of York makes fun of his hunchback in these lines, “Because I am little, like an ape, / He thinks that you should bear me on your shoulders” (III, i, 130-131). Yet, animal imagery used in the play does not only demonstrate Richard’s physical

appearance but also indicates his destructive actions. Richmond's description in Act V is as an example:

The wretched, bloody, and usurping boar,  
That spoils your summer fields and fruitful vines,  
Swills your warm blood like wash, and makes his trough  
In your inbowelled bosoms, this foul swine. (V, ii, 7-10)

Richmond describes Richard as a destructive beast like a boar. The reason for this is because Richard tramples over people's rights and plots to kill them as he pleases. This description also degrades him from any noble resemblance and demonstrates him as a dishonorable man. In his speech, Richmond establishes an image of a beast which destroys fields and feeds on people. Accordingly, no noble quality is left in Richard's actions. Queen Margaret in the play also refers to him as an "abortive rooting hog" for what he has done (I, iii, 225). Margaret's speech also foreshadows Richard's future malicious actions. Moreover, another foreshadowing imagery appears in act three, where a messenger visits Lord Hastings' house to give Lord Stanley's message, "He dreamt tonight the boar had razed his helm" (III, ii, 9). The line indicates Lord Stanley's subconscious fear of Richard, since Richard is the one who is often associated with the boar.

Animal imagery and physical deformations also bring the topic of Shakespeare's view of nature. In *King Lear*, the title character is punished for breaking "the great chain of being." This Elizabethan belief was considered as an order of everything, including nature. In the following lines Richard talks about himself:

I that am curtailed of this fair proportion,  
Cheated of feature by dissembling nature,  
Deformed, unfinished, sent before my time  
Into this breathing world scarce half made up,  
And that so lamely and unfashionable  
That dogs bark at me as I halt by them:  
[...] I am determined to prove a villain  
And hate the idle pleasures of these days. (I, i, 19-23, 30-31)

Lady Anne refers to him as someone unnatural when she says, "Thy deed, inhuman and unnatural, / Provokes this deluge most unnatural" (I, ii, 58-59). Richard resembles a boar, a toad, a dog. All these animals can easily be related with nature and the barking dogs indicate a rejection by the nature, however, according to Lady Anne, Richard represents both natural and unnatural features. Marvin Rosenberg (1972) argues, "sometimes the word and sight-sound ram head-on: the language of love is spoken by those who hate. Or the words themselves strain with contradictory meanings. A nuclear word like "nature" may fission into multiple significances, including anti meanings" (p. 6). In Shakespeare's *King Lear*, Lear's defiance of nature has been caused by his own actions. On the other hand, Richard claims that his twisted

moral values were caused by his unnatural appearance. Ian Moulton's (1996) comment about the belief relating deformities to the evil in early modern England confirms the reason for Richard's portrayal.

In Shakespeare's (2008) *Richard III*, characters use different animals to describe both Richard's physical appearance and his moral compass. Richard embodies the destructive meaning of the animals with his malicious actions like deception and murder. According to the Elizabethan worldview, Richard abandons his place in "the chain of being" as a human and degrades himself to the place of the animals. He defines himself as someone unnatural and deformed. His noble qualities disappear as he causes the death of more people. At the end of the play Richmond kills Richard, which is a kind of punishment for being unnatural.

Richard's deformity leads to his disposition which makes him a villain. This intricate evaluation of the character bears a question: Is deformity a sign that one suffers from or is it a cause of villainy? In Shakespeare's (2008) *Richard III*, Richard's deformity has tendency to give an answer to the second option posed in this question even although Richard claims that he suffers from his physical deformity which brings misfortune, ferocity, and calamity to his life. Richard's deformity causes his inferiority among family and society, and it ends up with his villainy. Not loved by his mother, not seen as a normal person, and being humiliated by the others provide a just cause for Richard's developed self-defence mechanism and desire for revenge because of his maltreatment. With his diabolical genius, he starts to use his deformity in the form of multiple saint-like masks such as his imitated vulnerability, manipulation, and fake victimization. People see him inherently evil due to his deformity and he makes use of his masks that his deformity provided to protect himself.

133

According to the early modern view, deformity is the manifestation of the inner wickedness and accordingly, strong religious belief of society causes discrimination of deformed and disabled people. In the play, Richard's mother, who is supposed give love and affection and provide a secure attachment to Richard does not supply these feelings, sees him as inferior and therefore, cannot be loved. She says, "And I for comfort have but one false glass, / Which grieves me when I see my shame in him" (II, ii, 52-3). She grieves over the fact that her only living child is a reason for her embarrassment. Richard is also humiliated by others. He is called as "lump of foul deformity," "hedgehog," "diffused infection of a man" by Lady Anne, "the slave of nature and the son of hell" by Margaret and "bottled spider," "foul bunch-backed toad" by Queen Elizabeth. Richard generates revenge plans against these humiliations. Richard's deformity breeds villainy, which can be considered as a sign of revenge and self-assertion. In "Of Envy," Francis Bacon (1985) asserts that deformed, elderly people, bastards and eunuchs are jealous of other people since they own what they don't have hence, they try their best to impair others (p. 28). In the play, Richard tries to compensate his imperfection by achieving a stronger status, becoming a king so that no one will ever criticize his weakness and sees his malformation as inferiority. On his way to ascending the throne, he murders everyone who comes to his way and disturbs others' happiness as they did to him. Linda Charnes (1999) states, "his entire course of action can be seen as directed toward gaining control over the

social construction, perception, and manipulation of bodily signifiers” (p. 274). Richard’s deformity provokes him to create a mask of villainy where he tries to achieve the control of others with his diabolical genius. Making use of his deformity for masks for manipulation, vulnerability, and victimization he achieves his goals.

His wickedness is the consequence of his deformity but his imitated vulnerability that he performs to Anne is his tool where he tries to show himself fragile because of his deformity. With his manipulative skills and realistic lies and actions, he succeeds to convince Anne that he loves him. At the beginning of Act I, scene ii, Anne’s approach to Richard is cold and merciless, “No excuse current but to hang thyself” (I, ii, 80). However, through the ending of the scene, Anne’s perception on Richard changes from cruel and revengeful to soft-hearted person. Suddenly she wishes to “know [his] heart”. Vulnerability that Richard’s deformity creates and his manipulative skills along with his use of language achieve to soften the impression of Richard in Anne’s eye. As Michael Torrey (2000) states, “For the moment [...] his body no longer disgusts her, nor does it represent for her a signal of his villainy” (p. 144). His seductive behaviour blinds Anne. Not only in Anne’s case, but also in Hasting’s case Richard manages to show himself vulnerable and use it as a reason to kill him where he defends that Hasting is in cooperation with Elizabeth to harm Richard.

Then be your eyes the witness of this ill.  
See how I am bewitched. Behold, mine arm  
Is like a blasted sapling withered up.  
This is that Edward’s wife, that monstrous witch,  
Consorted with that harlot strumpet Shore,  
That by their witchcraft thus have marked me. (III, iv, 72-77)

He tries to show himself as a vulnerable victim in order to eliminate Hastings. He defends that his “blasted sapling”-like arm is due to the witchcraft of Elizabeth even though his deformity caused this and when Hastings tries to refuse it, he declares him as a traitor and he a reason to kill Hastings. He uses his deformity as in Anne’s case a mask of vulnerability and victimization, as Torrey (2000) argues, “he now makes it the mark of his vulnerability to, and victimization by, the conspiratorial actions of others” (p. 146).

He cleverly plots the scene, again with his manipulative skill, by showing himself fragile and wounded. Richard’s soliloquy in Act I, where he declares that he will be seen as saint when he plays the devil in fact is performed by Richard wittily. He plays the delicate and hurt victim yet, he performs a devil inside.

In conclusion, in Shakespeare’s time, people believed in the concept of physiognomy, which suggests that the outer-self is the representation of the inner-self. Therefore, they regarded people who are disabled and deformed evil by nature. Along with the concept of physiognomy which generates Richard as wicked, Richard creates himself a ferocious persona and the reason behind this creation is his urge to get revenge and make self-assertion through which



he can gain power to control the others who once controlled him. Richard's personality masks are observed throughout the play. As he tries to achieve his goal of taking the throne, he uses his deformity as saint-like figure and creates weak personality masks. He uses the powerless side of his deformity where he exhibits his fragility and victimhood with his genius manipulative mind. By using masks, he stimulates people to feel pity for him and thus he captures these moments to take advantage on his way to success. Therefore, it can be suggested that Richard plays both saint and sinner in the play where he is forced to be a sinner by the circumstances, and he uses circumstances to play the saint. King Richard in Shakespeare's (2008) *Richard III* is a cunning character with strong abilities to manipulate those around him, whose true intentions and motivations are revealed through the use of animal imagery. Richard's personality traits and morality are based on animal imagery and "although [the audience] is supposed to feel uneasy about Richard's evil deeds and despise him, the virtuous superego of the crowds is lulled by those deeds, and the naked id awakes to enjoyment of Richard's virtuosity in villainy", as McNeir (1971) argues in "The Masks of Richard III" (p. 173). The animal imagery suggests that Richard is an appealing character who influences the audience with his rhetoric and excites them with his games. Richard puts on masks to cover his evil face and each time his sinful soul is revealed when he is called by animal names that symbolize vanity, lust, lechery, and avarice.

### References

- Bacon, Sir Francis. (1985). "Of envy." In *The essays or counsels, civil and moral*. Clarendon Press.
- Charnes, Linda. (1999). The monstrous body in *king richard III*. In Hugh Macrae Richmond (ed.), *Critical essays on shakespeare's richard III*. (pp. 273-281) G.K. Hall & Co.
- Clemen, Wolfgang. (2010). *The development of shakespeare's imagery*. Routledge.
- Lyons, Bridget Gellert. (1978). Kings games: Stage imagery and political symbolism in richard III. *Criticism*, 20(1), 17–30. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/23103144>
- McNeir, Waldo F. (1971). The masks of richard the third. *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, 11(2), 167–186. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/450058>
- Moulton, Ian Frederick. (1996). A monster great deformed: The unruly masculinity of richard III." *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 47(3), 251–268. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2871377>
- Olson, Greta. (2005). Richard III's animalistic criminal body. *Philological Quarterly*, 82(3), 301-324. [https://7110766/Richard\\_III's\\_Animalistic\\_Criminal\\_Body](https://7110766/Richard_III's_Animalistic_Criminal_Body)
- Rosenberg, Marvin. (1972). *The masks of king lear*. Associated University Press.
- Shakespeare, William. (2008). *Richard III*. Oxford University Press.
- Spurgeon, Caroline. (1971). *Shakespeare's imagery and what it tells us*, Cambridge University Press.
- Schwyzler, Philip. (2013). *Shakespeare and the remains of richard III*. Oxford University Press.
- Tillyard, E. M. W. (1943). *The elizabethan world picture*. Penguin.
- Torrey, Michael. (2000). The plain devil and dissembling looks: Ambivalent physiognomy and shakespeare's richard III. *English Literary Renaissance*, 30(2), 123-153. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43447599>