



Pride and Punishment: The Tragic Arcs of Lear and the Earl of Gloucester in *King Lear*

Krste Iliev^{a*}, Natalija Pop Zarijeva^b, Dragan Donev^c

^{a,b,c} *Goce Delchev University, Krste Misirkov 10-a, 2000 Shtip, North Macedonia*

^a*Email: krste.iliev@ugd.edu.mk*

^b*Email: natalija.popzarijeva@ugd.edu.mk*

^c*Email: dragan.donev@ugd.edu.mk*

Abstract

This paper examines the tragic arcs of King Lear and Gloucester in William Shakespeare's *King Lear*, focusing on how their unchecked pride initiates a vicious cycle that leads to anger, revenge, madness, and ultimately, shame and wisdom. Both Lear and Gloucester begin the play as powerful figures whose excessive pride blinds them to the truth and causes them to misjudge their loyal children. Lear's demand for declarations of love from his daughters leads him to disown Cordelia and fall prey to Goneril and Regan's betrayal, while Gloucester's confidence in his judgment allows Edmund to deceive him and frame the innocent Edgar. As each man's pride spirals into anger and a desire for revenge, they are driven into madness—Lear through mental breakdown and Gloucester through physical blinding. In their suffering, both characters reach a point of shame and regret, ultimately gaining humility and understanding. This paper argues that Shakespeare uses the parallel journeys of Lear and Gloucester to critique the destructive force of pride, illustrating a vicious cycle that leads from power to helplessness and, finally, to wisdom. By analyzing this cycle, the paper sheds light on *King Lear* as a cautionary tale about human frailty and redemption through suffering.

Keywords: pride; anger; revenge; madness; shame; wisdom.

Received: 4/4/2025

Accepted: 5/28/2025

Published: 6/7/2025

* Corresponding author.

1. Introduction

While this paper focuses on the emotional and moral decline of Lear and Gloucester through the lens of pride and punishment, further insight can be gained by engaging with broader critical frameworks, including psychoanalytic, feminist, historical, and performance-based interpretations.

Reference [7] situates King Lear within the cultural anxieties of early modern England, arguing that Lear's downfall is emblematic of a crisis in paternal and royal authority. His theory of "self-fashioning" suggests that Lear's identity is constructed through power and performance, and once that power is relinquished, his sense of self disintegrates. This contextual lens allows us to interpret Lear's pride not only as a personal flaw but as a product of an unstable socio-political system in which monarchy and masculinity were deeply intertwined.

A psychoanalytic perspective, as developed by [1], explores the father-daughter dynamic as a site of psychological conflict. Reference [1] argues that Lear's demand for verbal proof of love reveals an unconscious dependency masked as authority. Cordelia's resistance to his expectations triggers a narcissistic injury that sets the tragic arc in motion. Lear's descent into madness, from this viewpoint, is less divine punishment and more the collapse of a fragile male psyche struggling with emotional vulnerability and unmet needs.

Feminist scholars such as [9] provide an alternate reading of the sisters' rebellion. While Goneril and Regan are traditionally vilified, their actions can be read as responses to the restrictive roles imposed upon women in a patriarchal society. Their rejection of Lear's control and their performative flattery underscore the transactional nature of female expression in a world dominated by male authority. Meanwhile, Cordelia's refusal to play the game of verbal adoration presents a quiet resistance to gendered expectations, making her a morally upright but also subtly defiant character.

Reference [5] interprets Lear's tragedy through the lens of epistemological skepticism. He argues that Lear's downfall stems from a refusal to acknowledge what he already knows: Cordelia's love. This denial is not merely ignorance but a metaphysical blindness echoed in Gloucester's literal blinding. Reference [5] links the theme of recognition in the play to a broader human struggle between knowledge and denial, illuminating the deeper existential stakes of pride and judgment.

Performance history also offers insights into the interpretation of Lear's pride and punishment. [10] traces how theatrical portrayals have shifted over time—from tyrannical Lear figures in earlier stagings to more empathetic and vulnerable portrayals in the modern era. These shifting depictions suggest that the understanding of Lear's character is not static but evolves alongside societal attitudes toward authority, age, and emotional expression.

Together, these expanded perspectives reinforce the argument that the downfall of Lear and Gloucester transcends personal flaws and reflects systemic, psychological, and cultural tensions. By viewing the characters' tragic arcs through multiple lenses, we gain a more nuanced appreciation of Shakespeare's critique of pride—not just as an individual vice, but as a condition rooted in human fragility, patriarchal power, and the challenge of self-knowledge.

Despite the wide range of critical approaches—ranging from formalist to psychoanalytic to historicist—few studies have concentrated on how Lear and Gloucester’s arcs mirror each other in a cyclical pattern of pride, punishment, and wisdom. This paper builds on prior research by foregrounding this shared tragic structure and emphasizing Shakespeare’s broader moral commentary on pride and redemption.

Several critics have acknowledged Lear’s pride and anger. For example, Reference [8] points to Lear’s anger and pride. [8: 189] states: “His purgatory has been this: cruelly every defense of anger and pride that barriers his consciousness from his deepest and truest emotion—his love for Cordelia, whom he loved most, on whom he had thought to set his rest [12: I. i. 125]—has been broken down”. [6:223] also depicts Lear as proud “Lear, at the beginning of the play, possesses physical eyesight, so far as we know, as perfect as Gloucester’s. But morally he is even blinder. He is a victim, to the point of incipient madness, of his arrogance, his anger, his vanity, and his pride”. Another critic, [3:168] shares the same view: “The balance is upset, he has been hurt in his pride as king and father, and he falls into wrathful confusion”. Reference [6:165] also stresses Lear’s pride when he compares Cordelia to her father: “She is flesh of the flesh of old Lear; she has inherited her father’s stubbornness, his limitless pride, his terrible inability to compromise”.

While this paper offers a focused analysis of the tragic arcs of King Lear and the Earl of Gloucester, it is important to acknowledge its limitations. The discussion centers primarily on the themes of pride, anger, and madness as depicted in Shakespeare’s text, without engaging with broader critical approaches such as feminist, psychoanalytic, or historical interpretations that might offer alternative insights. Furthermore, the analysis is confined to the parallel journeys of Lear and Gloucester, leaving aside other characters—such as Cordelia, Kent, or Edmund—whose roles and perspectives could further enrich the discussion of pride and redemption. The study also draws upon a limited number of secondary sources, with a focus on those that emphasize emotional and moral failings, potentially narrowing the scope of critical viewpoints. Lastly, the paper does not consider audience reception or performance history, which might affect the interpretation of these characters and their arcs across different contexts.

2. Pride and punishment

The desire to have his proud ego flattered proved to be one of the causes for the downfall of King Lear. After asking for and receiving exaggerated and false praises from his two daughters Goneril and Regan on the question which one loves him most, his youngest daughter Cordelia is laconic and shortly answers: “Nothing, my lord” [12:Act I, Scene 1, 96] and “I love your Majesty /According to my bond; no more nor less” [12: Act I, Scene 1, 101-102). Her father receives these answers as a slight or an injury which shows that he is proud, prone to anger and retorts wrathfully and revengefully:

Let it be so! thy truth then be thy dower!

For, by the sacred radiance of the sun,

The mysteries of Hecate and the night;

By all the operation of the orbs
From whom we do exist and cease to be;
Here I disclaim all my paternal care,
Propinquity and property of blood,
And as a stranger to my heart and me
Hold thee from this for ever. The barbarous Scythian,
Or he that makes his generation menses
To gorge his appetite, shall to my bosom
Be as well neighbour'd, pitied, and reliev'd,
As thou my sometime daughter.

[12: Act I, Scene 1, 20-133]

Lear's reaction is understandable if we consider [11:49]'s explanation that anger becomes more violent as we raise in station and enjoy good fortune and that it shows itself in "rich men and notables and magistrates: anything frivolous and vacant in their mental makeup takes wing when the breeze is at its back". As a king, Lear is rich, noble and becomes angry about trivial matters such as a refusal to be flattered. When the Earl of Kent intervenes about the injustice regarding Cordelia, King Lear shows again how angry he is: "Peace, Kent! /Come not between the dragon and his wrath" [12: I, I, 135-136]. The fact that Lear has renounced his daughter, is deaf to reason and advice and is offended by trifling causes such as flattery and is unable to distinguish between true and false, shows that Lear is proud and prone to anger. This is corroborated by [11: 14]'s stance that anger "[is] a brief madness: for it's no less lacking in self-control, forgetful of decency, unmindful of personal ties, unrelentingly intent on its goal, shut off from rational deliberation, stirred for no substantial reason, unsuited to discerning what's fair and true, just like a collapsing building that's reduced to rubble even as it crushes what it falls upon". Kent notices that Lear's anger has led him to acting madly and says: "Be Kent unmannerly/When Lear is mad" (12: Act I, Scene 1, 262-263). Just because Kent is telling him that he is making a mistake and he is pointing to what is true and just, Lear utters "Out of my sight!" [12: Act I, Scene 1,165], lays his hands on his sword and banishes Kent on pain of death. As a result of his old age and conceit, Lear in both cases is exaggerating trifles. [11:72] explicitly says that conceit leads to anger: "Many people manufacture their own causes for complaint through false suspicion and by exaggerating things that are trivial. Anger often comes to us, but we more often go to it". Regarding old age, [2:145] in his essay "Of Anger", mentions that anger is found in "children, women, old folks, sick folks". Lear has more than eighty years and can be regarded as an old man. When Goneril halves his retinue of hundred knights, Lear unleashes an outburst

of curses. Angered Lear leaves Goneril's castle and goes to his other daughter Regan. Regan starts to defend Goneril and search reasons to exculpate her sister, but Lear is adamant: "My curses on her!" [12: Act II, Scene 4, 163]. When Regan tells him that he should ask forgiveness from Goneril, Lear again starts to curse Goneril: "All the stor'd vengeance of heaven fall / On her ingrateful top! Strike her young bones, / You taking airs, with lameness!" [12: Act II, Scene 4, 182-184]. When the Duke of Cornwall interrupts, Lear continues with curses: "You nimble lightnings, dart your blinding flames / Into her scornful eyes! Infect her beauty, / You fen-suck'd fogs, drawn by the pow'rful sun, / To fall and blister!" [12: Act II, Scene 4, lines 186-189]. Regan however is even less willing to accommodate Lear's fifty attendants. She reduces the number of his retinue to twenty-five. Lear promises revenge on both of his daughters: "I will have such revenges on you both / That all the world shall- I will do such things- / What they are yet, I know not; but they shall be / The terrors of the earth!" [12: Act II, Scene 4, 320-323] Lear is so angered at the behavior of his daughter that he is on the verge of going mad. As previously stated, [11:14] describes anger as a brief madness. Lear follows this pattern, he states "You think I'll weep. / No, I'll not weep. / I have full cause of weeping, but this heart / Shall break into a hundred thousand flaws / Or ere I'll weep. O fool, I shall go mad!" [12: Act II, Scene 4, 323-327]. Lear specifically mentions the ingratitude of his daughters for his dire situation and madness:

"Filial ingratitude!

Is it not as this mouth should tear this hand

For lifting food to't? But I will punish home!

No, I will weep no more. In such a night

To shut me out! Pour on; I will endure.

In such a night as this! O Regan, Goneril!

Your old kind father, whose frank heart gave all!

O, that way madness lies; let me shun that!

No more of that."

[12: Act III, Scene 4, 17-25]

When he meets Cornelia in a tent in the French camp, Lear admits that he is not a completely sane person:

"And, to deal plainly,

I fear I am not in my perfect mind.

Methinks I should know you, and know this man;

Yet I am doubtful; for I am mainly ignorant

What place this is; and all the skill I have

Remembers not these garments; nor I know not

Where I did lodge last night. Do not laugh at me;

For (as I am a man) I think this lady /To be my child Cordelia.”

[12: Act IV, Scene 7, 71-79]

This play ends with Lear being ashamed from his unjust action towards Cordelia becoming wiser and urging his youngest daughter not to weep: “I pray weep not. If you have poison for me, I will drink it./ I know you do not love me; for your sisters /Have, as I do remember, done me wrong. /You have some cause, they have not” [12:Act IV, Scene 7, 81-85). In addition, Lear is again ashamed but wiser and he asks for forgiveness from Cordelia: “No, no, no, no! Come, let's away to prison. / We two alone will sing like birds i' th' cage. /When thou dost ask me blessing, I'll kneel down/ And ask of thee forgiveness” [12:Act V, Scene 3, 9-12).

Gloucester shares in many ways the fate and approach to life, such as credulousness, to Lear`s fate. Gloucester`s illegitimate son Edmund, forges a letter inculpating Gloucester`s legitimate son Edgar in conspiracy to overthrow their father`s so-called tyranny. When Gloucester reads “Edgar`s” letter, like Lear he becomes angry and goes into rage: “O villain, villain! His very opinion in the letter! Abhorred /villain! Unnatural, detested, brutish villain! worse than /brutish! Go, sirrah, seek him. I`ll apprehend him. Abominable /villain! Where is he?” [12: Act I, Scene 2, 79-83]. Edmund in order to reassure his father, the Earl of Gloucester of Edgar`s involvement, convinces Gloucester that the latter will obtain “auricular assurance” [12: Act I, Scene 2, 97]. In addition to rage, Gloucester starts to swear, a sign of anger: “To his father, that so tenderly and entirely loves him. /Heaven and earth! Edmund, seek him out; wind me into him, I pray /you; frame the business after your own wisdom. I would unstate /myself to be in a due resolution” [12: Act I, Scene 2, 101-105].

As a revenge for Edgar`s supposed conspiracy, Gloucester wants his son Edgar dead, promising rewards to the one who will apprehend him:

“Not in this land shall he remain uncaught;

And found- dispatch. The noble Duke my master,

My worthy arch and patron, comes to-night.

By his authority I will proclaim it

That he which find, him shall deserve our thanks,

Bringing the murderous caitiff to the stake;

He that conceals him, death.”

[12:Act II, Scene I, 67-73]

Like Lear`s anger, Gloucester anger, love and grief for his outlawed son, leads him to madness. During the storm at the heath, he states:

“Thou say'st the King grows mad: I'll tell thee, friend,

I am almost mad myself. I had a son,

Now outlaw'd from my blood. He sought my life

But lately, very late. I lov'd him, friend No father his son dearer. True to tell thee,

The grief hath craz'd my wits. What a night 's this!

I do beseech your Grace.”

[12:Act III, Scene 4, 174-181]

As in the case of Lear, Gloucester in the end understands that he has been wrong in disinheriting and outlawing his son Edgar. As Lear, he goes from pride to anger to revenge to madness to shame: “O my follies! Then Edgar was abus'd. /Kind gods, forgive me that, and prosper him!” [12: Act III, Scene 7, 111-112]. The blind Gloucester recognizes that Edgar has not deserved to be the object of his anger: “O dear son Edgar, /The food of thy abused father's wrath! Might I but live to see thee in my touch, /I'd say I had eyes again!” [12:Act IV, Scene 1, 22-24).

Gloucester is so ashamed of his actions that he asks Edgar, who is disguised as a peasant to lead him to a cliff near Dover so that he can commit suicide. Prior to jumping from the “cliff”, Gloucester renounces this world, leaves behind his troubles and problems, grows wiser and blesses Edgar:

“O you mighty gods! He kneels.

This world I do renounce, and, in your sights,

Shake patiently my great affliction off.

If I could bear it longer and not fall

To quarrel with your great opposeless wills,

My snuff and loathed part of nature should

Burn itself out. If Edgar live, O, bless him!

Now, fellow, fare thee well.

He falls [forward and swoons].”

[12: Act IV, Scene 6, 44-51]

3. Conclusion

The intertwined downfalls of King Lear and the Earl of Gloucester offer a powerful meditation on the corrosive effects of pride and the painful path to self-awareness. Shakespeare crafts their parallel journeys as cautionary tales, where unchecked ego and rash judgment give way to suffering, madness, and, ultimately, insight. Lear’s insistence on public flattery blinds him to Cordelia’s quiet integrity, just as Gloucester’s credulousness and favoritism make him vulnerable to Edmund’s deceit. In both cases, pride initiates a chain reaction of anger, misjudgment, and vengeance—culminating in physical and psychological torment. Yet through this suffering, both men arrive at a kind of tragic wisdom. Lear learns to love without condition and to seek forgiveness; Gloucester, stripped of sight, finally sees with moral clarity. Their arcs are not simply about downfall, but about the costly acquisition of humility and emotional truth. Shakespeare thus presents a deeply human critique of arrogance and blindness, underscoring the redemptive potential that can arise—however belatedly—from honest self-recognition and the capacity to change. In *King Lear*, redemption comes not through triumph, but through the wreckage of pride and the fragile, painful emergence of wisdom.

References

- [1]Adelman, J. (1992). *Suffocating Mothers: Fantasies of Maternal Origin in Shakespeare’s Plays, Hamlet to The Tempest*. Routledge.
- [2]Bacon, F. (1994). *Essays*. Orion Publishing Group.
- [3] Blok, A. (2007). *Shakespeare’s King Lear: An Address to the Actors*. In H. Bloom & N. Heims (Eds.), *Bloom’s Shakespeare Through the Ages: King Lear* (pp. 164–169). Infobase Publishing.
- [4] Bloom, H., & Heims, N. (Eds.). (2007). *Bloom’s Shakespeare Through the Ages: King Lear*. Infobase Publishing.
- [5] Cavell, S. (1987). *Disowning Knowledge in Six Plays of Shakespeare*. Cambridge University Press.
- [6] Goddard, H. (2007). *King Lear*. In H. Bloom & N. Heims (Eds.), *Bloom’s Shakespeare Through the Ages: King Lear*. Infobase Publishing.

- [7]Greenblatt, S. (2004). *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare*. University of Chicago Press.
- [8]Knight, W. G. (2007). *The Lear Universe*. In H. Bloom & N. Heims (Eds.), *Bloom's Shakespeare Through the Ages: King Lear*. Infobase Publishing.
- [9] Neely, C. (1985). *Women and Men in Othello: "What should such a fool do with so good a woman?"* In C. R. S. Lenz, G. Greene, & C. Neely (Eds.), *The Woman's Part: Feminist Criticism of Shakespeare* (pp. 211–239). University of Illinois Press.
- [10]Rosenberg, M. (1972). *The Masks of King Lear*. University of California Press.
- [11]Seneca, L. (2010). *Anger, Mercy, Revenge* (R. Kaster, Trans.). University of Chicago Press.
- [12] Shakespeare, W. (2015). *King Lear*. Simon & Schuster.