



**The Dramatic Effect of the Antagonist in William Shakespeare's
Othello and Henrik Ibsen's *A Doll's House*: A Comparative
Approach**

التأثير الدرامي لشخصية الخصم في مسرحية ويليام شكسبير
"عطيل" ومسرحية هنريك ايسن "بيت الدمية": دراسة مقارنة

Prepared by

Ayham Aref Abdullah Abu Oruq

Supervised by

Dr. Nadia Tariq

**A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Master Degree in English Language and Literature**

Department of English Language and Literature

Faculty of Arts and Sciences

Middle East University

Amman, Jordan

May, 2016

Authorization

I, Ayham Aref Abu Oruq, hereby authorize Middle East University to provide libraries, organizations and even individuals with copies of my thesis upon request.

Name: Ayham Aref Abu Oruq

Date: 23/5/2016

Signature: 

Thesis Committee Decision

This thesis "The Dramatic Effect of the Antagonist in William Shakespeare's *Othello* and Henrek Ibsen's *A Doll's House: A Comparative Approach*" was discussed and certified on 23/5/2016

Examination Committee

Signature

Dr. Nadia Tariq

Supervisor



Dr. Norma Al Zayed

Chairman



Dr. Ahmad Tawfiq

External Examiner



Acknowledgement

I would like to express my gratitude and appreciation to my supervisor Dr. Nadia Tariq for her support and inspiring guidance without which this thesis would not appear in its best form. It was a great pleasure for me to deal with and learn from her throughout the period I was under her supervision. I would like to thank the head and staff of the Department of English Language and Literature at Middle East University for their help, cooperation and valuable guidance.

Dedication

I dedicate this work to my father and mother who made me what I am today. I also dedicate it to my dear brothers, sisters and friends for their words of encouragement and support.

Table of Contents

Subject	Page
Thesis Title	I
Authorization	II
Thesis Committee Decision	III
Acknowledgment	IV
Dedication	V
Table of Contents	VI
English Abstract	VIII
Arabic Abstract	X
Chapter One	
1.0 Introduction	1
1.1 Background of the Study	1
1.2 Statement of the Study	4
1.3 Objectives of the Study	4
1.4 Significance of the Study	5
1.5 Questions of the Study	5
1.6 Limitations of the Study	6
1.7 Definitions of Terms	6
Chapter Two	
2.0 Introduction	8
2.1 Theoretical Literature	8
2.2 Empirical Studies	11
Chapter Three	
3.0 Methods and Procedures	17
3.1 Methods	17
3.2 Sample of the Study	19
3.3 Procedures of the Study	19
Chapter Four	
Discussion	
4.0 Introduction	21

4.1 Iago's Motives	21
4.2 Krogstad's Motives	26
4.3 Iago's Dramatic Effect	30
4.4 Krogstad's Dramatic Effect	41
4.5 Antagonist's End in Othello	45
4.6 Antagonist's End in A Doll's House	47
4.7 Iago and Krogstad: Compared and Contrasted	48
Chapter Five	
5.0 Introduction	54
5.1 Conclusion	54
5.2 Recommendation	59
References	
	60

The Dramatic Effect of the Antagonist in William Shakespeare's *Othello* and Henrik Ibsen's *A Doll's House*: A Comparative Approach

By: Ayham Abu Oruq

Supervised by: Dr. Nadia Tariq

Abstract

This study aims at probing into the antagonist of Shakespeare's *Othello* and Ibsen's *A Doll's House* from three perspectives: the motivation, the dramatic effect and the different presentation of the antagonist's end from the writer's outlooks. The study basically utilizes the comparative approach of the American school as a main methodology in order to draw the similarities and differences between the two antagonists, Iago and Krogstad, taking into consideration the different culture, trend, characterization and historical era of each of the two playwrights, Shakespeare and Ibsen. The findings of the study indicate that the motives of Iago are jealousy, hatred, prejudice, greed, ambition, alongside the loss of lieutenantcy. The study finds that these motives urged Iago to strengthen his revenge, not to drive him into villainy since he is already wicked by nature, while the motives of Krogstad refer to social, emotional and financial variables which did drive him into villainy, and not to his nature. The study indicates that Iago has a strong effect in *The Tragedy of Othello* as the character who directs all other characters into their tragic end, and the one who incites the events of the play by his ability of manipulation, whereas in the case of Krogstad, the study asserts that his dramatic effect is strong in the sense that he is the character who conveys Ibsen's message in the play by being introduced as a victim of an unfair society.

Besides, Krogstad is the character who causes Nora many troubles and brings her close to the reality of her life with Torvald as a doll. Finally, the study indicates that the depiction of Iago's end is different from the depiction of Krogstad's end, for Iago is a tragic antagonist

who ends up punished in prison, while Krogstad is a realistic antagonist whose end is naturally realistic, that is why his end is a happy marriage.

Key words: Othello, A Doll's House, antagonist, Iago, Krogstad, motivation, dramatic effect, tragic drama, realistic drama

التأثير الدرامي لشخصية الخصم في مسرحية ويليام شكسبير "عطيل" ومسرحية هنريك ابسن "بيت
الدمية": دراسة مقارنة

إعداد

أيهم أبو عروق

إشراف

د. ناديا طارق

الملخص

تهدف الدراسة إلى التحقيق في شخصية الخصم في مسرحيتي عطيل لشكسبير وبيت الدمية لابسن من ثلاثة زوايا هي المحفزات والتأثير الدرامي وأيضا التقديم المختلف لنهاية الخصم في المسرحيتين حسب نظرة الكاتبين. تعتمد الدراسة بشكل أساسي على المنهج المقارن للمدرسة الأمريكية كمنهجية رئيسية من أجل تحديد أوجه التشابه والاختلاف بين شخصيتين الخصم ياجو وكروستاد أخذة بعين الاعتبار اختلاف شكسبير وابسن في الثقافة ونوع العمل وبناء الشخصيات والفترة التاريخية. أظهرت نتائج الدراسة بان محفزات ياجو هي والغيرة والكره والانحياز والطمع والطموح وخسارة الملازمة. ولكن الدراسة أكدت إن هذه المحفزات كان لها دور في زيادة قوى الانتقام وليس قيادة ياجو نحو الشر وذلك لأنه شرير بطبيعته. بينما تعود محفزات كروستاد إلى عوامل اجتماعية وعاطفية ومادية وهي التي قادتته إلى الشر ليس بطبيعته. أظهرت الدراسة أن ياجو له تأثير درامي قوي في مسرحية عطيل بأنه الشخصية التي قادت الشخصيات الأخرى إلى نهايتهم المأساوية وانه الشخص الذي حرك إحدات المسرحية بسبب قدرته على التلاعب بالآخرين. في حالة كروستاد فان الدراسة أكدت تأثيره الدرامي القوي بأنه الشخص الذي نقل رسالة ابسن الضمنية من المسرحية عن طريق تقديمه كضحية لمجتمع غير عادل بالإضافة إلى انه الشخصية التي سببت المتاعب لنورا وجعلتها تفهم عن قرب حقيقة حياتها

مع زوجها تورفالد كدمية. أخيرا أظهرت الدراسة بأن تقديم نهاية شخصية ياجو يختلف عن تقديم نهاية شخصية كروستاد وذلك يعود لحقيقة أن ياجو هو شخصية تراجيدية نهايتها كانت العقاب في السجن بينما كروستاد هو شخصية واقعية نهايته كانت واقعية ولهذا كانت النهاية الزواج السعيد

الكلمات مفتاحيه: عطيل, بيت الدمية, الخصم, ياجو, كروستاد, التحفيز, التأثير الدرامي, الدراما التراجيدية, الدراما الواقعية.

Chapter one

Introduction

Chapter one

Introduction

1.1 Background of the Study

In drama, the character that is evil is known as the antagonist. The English word antagonist, meaning opponent, competitor, enemy or rival, is derived from the prefix anti- (against); thus, the antagonist is the character developed by the playwright to represent an opposition against the protagonist. What is of great significance is that not necessarily all antagonists have a strong dramatic effect on the protagonist or on the plot of the literary work. However, some of them have played a dramatically vital role that might be as influential as the protagonist himself. The development of the antagonist is supposedly built by the playwright according to his own views to serve his literary product. For instance, the development of a tragic antagonist is absolutely different from the development of a realistic one due to the different nature of each type. The tragedy, such as *The Tragedy of Othello*, as defined by Aristotle in the *Poetics* is “the imitation of an action that is serious and also, as having magnitude, complete in itself, in the medium of poetic language and in the manner of dramatic rather than of narrative presentation, involving incidents that arouse pity and fear, wherewith to accomplish the catharsis of such emotions”(Abrams and Harpham, 2013 p405). By contrast, a realistic drama, such as *A Doll's House*, is the kind of drama that depicts everyday life in both content and presentation to preserve the illusion of actual life.

Shakespeare's Iago, who is the antagonist in *The Tragedy of Othello*, is one of the most sinister villains in all Shakespearean tragedies. He is a very complex character having many attributes that make his dramatic effect on the play and on the protagonist unforgettable since his actions, words and plans cause the tragic end for his counterparts in the play (Othello, Desdemona, Cassio, Rodrigo and Emilia). As cited in (Erskine, 2001), Zesmer points to the dramatic effect Iago has on all other characters in *The Tragedy of Othello* when he describes him as “a spiritual disease that poisons the whole universe” (p4).

Henrik Ibsen's Nils Krogstad, the antagonist in *A Doll's House*, seems to be a despicable villain like Iago. His character is depicted with no complexity, because he is actually developed by Ibsen to represent the society of his time. His wicked deeds result from his being a victim of circumstances. The dramatic effect he makes on the protagonist and on the play should be deeply analyzed, since he is not represented by Ibsen as the classical antagonist. What is differently compared between Iago and Krogstad in this study is that Iago is a tragic character developed basically from an idea already existing in the historical culture of his time: the devil in religious morality plays, whereas Nils Krogstad is a realistic character with many realistic features.

Accordingly, the study analytically compares between the characters of Iago and Nils Krogstad, paying special concentration on the impact of these two antagonists in the two plays: *The Tragedy of Othello* and *A Doll's House*, the motives that lead each one to be the heinous villain in the plays in which they appear and also the different end of each character from the writers' outlook.

1.2 Statement of the Problem:

The major problem the current study deals with is the representation of the antagonist in both a classical tragic play and a realist play. In other words, the dramatic effect, ending and also the features of a classical antagonist are not the same as those of a realist one.

1.3 Objectives of the Study:

The current study aims to achieve the following objectives:

1. To discuss the motives that make Iago and Krogstad become villains.
2. To investigate the dramatic effect Iago and Krogstad have in *The Tragedy of Othello* and *A Doll's House*.
3. To analyze why the end of each antagonist in *The Tragedy of Othello* and *A Doll's House* is different, taking into account the writers' outlooks, the different historical eras, and the different depiction of the antagonist in a tragic play from a realist one.
4. To draw the similarities and differences between Iago and Krogstad by making special references to their motives, dramatic effects, and ultimate destinies in the two sampled plays.

1.4 Significance of the Study

Although many studies have been conducted on Shakespeare's tragedies and Henrik Ibsen's plays in the world since the time when their literary works were produced until now, the significance of this study is that it compares between two antagonists from different historical eras, and that it discusses two different plays with different trends, and cultures. Additionally, the findings of the discussion might provide a new contribution to the field of studying the dramatic effect of the antagonist in drama, in general, and in William Shakespeare's and Henrik Ibsen's dramas, in particular.

1.5 Questions of the Study

The current study will answer the following questions:

1. What are the motives that lead Shakespeare's Iago and Henrik Ibsen's Nils Krogstad to become villains?
2. To what extent is the dramatic effect of the antagonist in *The Tragedy of Othello* and *A Doll's House* strong?
3. Why do Iago and Nils Krogstad end up differently in the two plays *The Tragedy of Othello* and *A Doll's House* from the writers' outlooks?

4. What are the similarities and differences that can be drawn between the antagonists in *The Tragedy of Othello* and *A Doll's House* in terms of the motives, the dramatic effect and the end?

1.6 Limitations of the Study:

The study is based primarily on one of Shakespeare's tragedies compared to one of Ibsen's plays. For that reason, the findings of the study cannot be generalized or even applied to other plays of the two playwrights.

1.7 Definition of Terms:

Comparative Literature /American School: A school of comparative literature that came as a reaction against the French school. Its main aim is to go beyond the political borders of literary texts. It is basically based on universalism and interdisciplinary studies.

Drama: A composition in prose or verse adapted to be acted on the stage, in which a story is related by means of dialogue and action, and is represented, with accompanying gesture, costume and scenery, as in real life (Esslin, 1977) p9.

Antagonist: The opposing force or character that struggles against or competes with the protagonist in a literary work. The term antagonist originally came from a Greek word which means opponent, competitor, enemy, or rival.

Chapter two

Review of Related Literature

Chapter two

Review of Related Literature

2.1 Theoretical Literature:

In order to understand why any antagonist does what he does, we should study the motives that make him become an antagonist, and thereby, measuring the dramatic effect he has on the literary work. In the case of Iago and Nils Krogstad, many scholars have theoretically discussed their motives, dramatic effect and wicked actions.

To pinpoint the significance of Iago as one of the most famous of Shakespeare's antagonists, Wedes (2008) shares Coleridge's views, attributing Iago's motivation to his reaction to his motiveless malignity (p5). Wedes also points to Robert B. Heilman who believes that it is jealousy that motives Iago to act.

According to Beier (2014) Iago is the one who has self-understanding of his plan to put a plague in Othello's ear that will cause him to misinterpret Desdemona's advocacy for Cassio. From his speeches, he makes it clear that the end is to manipulate and bring Othello to madness and ruin. Beier mainly talks about the art of persuasion which relies primarily on ethical and emotional appeals. These appeals actually allow Iago to establish himself as honest among other characters. Through the ethical appeals, Iago manages to reinforce his reputation being refrained as "the honest Iago", and this helps him to achieve his wicked goals to destroy Othello.

For Sisk (1975), Iago's need to convert others including Othello is at least as strong as the need to feed his revenge. From Iago's view, his impulse to degrade and to desecrate is only liberating. Iago believes that the more his revenge is strong the more he feels liberated. What Iago wants to be liberated from is his feeling of inferiority to Othello, Cassio and Desdemona. Therefore, his revenge is intended to include them all.

Heejung Cha (2001) talks about the high self-esteem Iago has. He says that Iago's pride is badly hurt when he lost the lieutenantcy. Cha claims that Iago is older than Cassio, and has more experience than Cassio. For those reasons, losing the lieutenantcy to Cassio gets rid of Iago who proudly says that he knows his price.

Wood (2009) talks about the ability of Iago to enmesh other characters on the island of Cyprus through his careless narrative invention, pointing out to Stephan Greenblatt's claim that "Iago's ability to possess others lies in his empathetic manipulation of their lives without their understanding that they are being so manipulated" (p19).

Levertom (2015) observes that the relationship between Iago and the audience is unique in comparison to other Shakespearean liars. Iago is described as a mutable arch manipulator and one of Shakespeare's most perplexing villains.

Zender (1994) believes that a convenient feeling of jealousy leads Iago to arrive to his planning of Desdemona's death.

In the case of Krogstad, Henry (1997) takes the view that “Krogstad was forced into crime in order to care for his ill wife and children”. After that, he describes the relationship with Kristine as a subplot that asserts the central theme in the play, that is, the struggle against the cruel society.

According to Bradford (2014), the effect of Krogstad is that he has the power to blackmail Nora. Bradford argues that everything was going well for Nora until Krogstad enters the story and sparks the flames of conflict in the play when he starts threatening Nora to reveal her past unless she persuades Torvald not to fire him. Krogstad's effect on Nora is also seen when he senses her plan to commit suicide. Bradford believes that the motives of Nora and Krogstad are out of desperate desire to save their loved ones. This critic finally points to the sudden change in Krogstad's heart when he starts a new affair with his old love Mrs. Linde. By this change, the antagonist of the play might not seem to be Krogstad, but Torvald's worry about society.

According to Grene (2014), Krogstad is the sinister moneylender who appears as the strange intruder on the family scene. He turns out to have known Helmer since their college days and has a better sense of Torvald's character than Nora has. There is the plotted intrigue of Krogstad's hold over Nora.

Siddall (2008) discusses Krogstad's blackmailing and he describes the presence of Krogstad as sinister as it would be in any thriller. A detached language has become a habitual shell for him as a defense against ill-fortune and emotional misery that he can follow. In addition, he defines Krogstad as a villain in conventional nineteenth century melodrama. He is not looking for a new job, but he wants to keep the one he has: the chief motive is to recover some of his reputation.

Brockett and others (2015) discuss the roles of Krogstad and Mrs. Linde who serve as a contrast to Nora and Torvald. They try to justify why Krogstad is shunned by society as morally corrupt, although he made the same mistake Nora did, that is, the forgery. Besides, they argue that the characters including Krogstad and the actions of the play, are determined by environmental forces, so all of the characters are products of their environments.

2.2 Empirical Studies:

Marie Mott (1983) states in a study that “Iago's hate could do nothing without the use of his incredible intellectual abilities” (p3). Mott also argues that although Iago's hatred is a main motive to destroy others, but what helps him is his powers of perception into other characters, and his control over his appearance to maintain a near impeccable reputation. Actually, the study aims at arguing the reasons of hatred that Iago feels toward all characters in the play including his hatred of Othello as a moor, his envy of Cassio's position, and his suspicion of his wife.

Monda (1995) defines Iago as the perfect spokesman for the ideology of Machiavellianism. She says “Iago's eloquence promotes the plot, both at the figurative level and as a character, his eloquence helps to create a dialectic in the play” (p218). After that, she talks about Iago's motives as his inability to embrace love within marriage, his sexual jealousy, and his anxiety regarding his position in the hierarchy.

O'Neal (2000) conducts a study on the motivation of Iago. She looks at him as a polar opposite to Venice. Venice is described as the city where ideals of fairness and justice precede all other considerations which can be noticed in the behavior of all characters in *The Tragedy of Othello* except Iago. In contrast to Venice, there is Iago who is totally different from his Venetian counterparts being the only ethically corrupt.

O'Neal discusses the promotion Iago loses to Cassio. The reason is that Iago is not a socially acceptable candidate in the eyes of the Venetian community. Furthermore, O'Neal attributes the motive of destroying Desdemona to the reason that Iago is not capable of supplying her with his sweet words of affirmation she is requesting to hear and has always heard from the men of her social rank.

Wedes (2008) examines issues of religious conversion and how these concerns may have entered into *The Tragedy of Othello* and especially the antagonist Iago. This critic concludes that Iago's Jewish identity represents a motive that pushes him to destroy other characters. Moreover, Wedes argues that the motive of Iago is that he is greedy and

ambitious. What makes him include Othello, Desdemona and Cassio in his plan is that he feels they become casualties in his desire to satisfy his avariciousness. He adds that Iago's hatred of Othello motivates Iago to destroy Othello.

Raatzsch (2009) studies the concept of Iago and his character. He investigates why Iago is called Iago by William Shakespeare. He guesses that it could be because of the resemblance between the name Iago and the word ego which comes from the egoism. He believes that calling someone as an egoist is a way of criticizing him morally. Thus, Raatzsch links between the name and the action that both indicate Iago's immorality.

According to Wolfe (2013), Iago's objective is to destroy the relationship between Othello and Desdemona in order to gain revenge for wrongs committed against him. Wolfe's study aims at reproducing the character of Iago who is a manipulative duplicitous antagonist that drives the actions of Othello. Wolfe claims that Shakespeare switched between prose and verse in Iago's speech as a tool of manipulation.

Nils Krogstad has also long been studied as the antagonist in Henrik Ibsen's *A Doll's House*. Larsen (1932) studied three plays written by Ibsen from a psychological perspective. In the analysis of the characters in *A Doll's House*, Krogstad is described as an unhappily married and desperate man who actually realizes what it means to suffer social ostracism and financial need. He is anxious about his position at the bank for the reason that he is a father. He uses his knowledge to save himself and he thinks that to endanger

Nora is the easy and profitable way for that. He realizes that Nora's influence on her husband is the only hope not to be fired.

Zmijewska-Emerson (1996) investigates the construction of social imagery in selected plays by Ibsen. On one hand, he describes the dramatic effect of Krogstad in *A Doll's House* that Krogstad serves as a reference to the past by providing further details about Nora's past. Consequently, the audience becomes familiar with all the facts surrounding Nora's forgery. Also, Krogstad creates Nora's fear which motivates her further actions in the play when he threatens to reveal Nora's secret, he initiates a chain of events that lead to the ultimate tragedy in the Helmer household. On the other hand, Zmijewska-Emerson asserts that the actions of Krogstad are motivated by noble incentives: his love for his children, his feeling of responsibility toward his family and his need to preserve his dignity by restoring his good reputation.

Ungar (2008) conducted his study on secrecy and confession in Western Drama. In his interpretation of Ibsen's *A Doll's House*, Krogstad is described as seemingly morally corrupt. He is a crucial character; that is why he throws a reflection back to the protagonist Nora of the persecuted criminal in an unforgiving society. He serves the play by revealing Torvald as a cruel moralist within the Helmer home, and demonstrating the redemptive power of disclosure. Krogstad is represented as a model for how society treats morally corrupt ones. Because Nora initially takes a hostile attitude toward him as morally and

socially inferior, he becomes motivated to blackmailing her. He is afraid of losing the dignity he has gained if he loses his position at the bank.

Hollywood (2010) studied the personality of Krogstad as a man misunderstood in his society. He claims that Krogstad is a father of two sons and he is totally unsupported by his society; Kristine Linde rejects him for financial reasons; he lost his wife who died before; he works multiple jobs to support himself and his family; and also his past crime: the forgery of the signature. All what Hollywood intends to say is that Krogstad does not have the passion for evil and he is only a victim of the injustice of being marginalized in this unforgiving society. His flaws serve to bring him to life and make him human.

Sharma (2012) describes the character of Krogstad and his actions in the play. He claims that Krogstad can be accepted as a negative character in the first and second acts. However, he redeems himself in the third act exactly when he gets his past love, Mrs. Linde, back.

This study is different from the above studies in the sense it searches for the motivation of the antagonist in order to reach a conclusion about his dramatic effect whether it is more vitally influential or less. The study is different because it compares between Shakespeare and Ibsen although each one represents a different culture. Finally, the study distinguishes the differences between a realistic drama and a tragic drama by discussing the different ending fates of the antagonists.

Chapter Three

Methods and Procedures

Chapter Three

Methods and Procedures

3.1 Methodology of the Study:

The methodology used in the this study is both analytical and descriptive. It seeks to explore the motives behind the behavior of the antagonists in the selected dramas. Also, reading, discussing, and comparing the plays for the sake of the dramatic effect of the antagonists will be utilized as a major method in this study. The American school of comparative literature which allows this kind of comparison is followed since the two selected plays are originally written in the same language. The main principles of the American school are figured out in Rene Wellek's and Austin Warren's book "*Theory of Literature*". These points are:

1. Literature should be a separate study from the barriers of politics, race and language.
2. Literature should not be limited in a single method, so each of the description, designation, explanation, narration, illustration and presentation should be used in the literary study.

3. The comparison should be in its complete form, including the languages and literary genres, which are not linked historically and it should not be limited in the history of literature, excluding the criticism and contemporary literature.

As pointed out in Cluver (2014), comparative literature is the study of literature beyond the confines of one particular country, and the study of the relationship between literature on the one hand and other areas of knowledge and belief, such as arts, philosophy, history, social sciences, sciences, religion and etc. On the other hand, in brief, it is the comparison of one literature with another or others, and the comparison of literature with other spheres of human expression,

Cao (2013) criticizes the French school which has restricted the scope of comparative literature merely in Europe excluding oriental literature, Chinese literature and Slavic literature. He argues that the American school has expanded the scope of the comparative literature and has initiated it to pay attention to the aesthetic nature of literature and the arts. It breaks the narrow study scope of the French school and equals the objects of comparative literature with almost all cultural domains.

3.2 Sample of the Study:

The sample of the study will be one of William Shakespeare's tragedies *The Tragedy of Othello*, and one of Henrik Ibsen's plays *A Doll's House*. The antagonists will only be comparatively investigated from the perspective of motivation, dramatic effect and different end in this study.

3.3 Procedures of the Study:

- Reading the original text of *The Tragedy of Othello*.
- Reading the original text of *A Doll's House*.
- Reading previous studies and critics' views related to the main topic of the study.
- Analyzing the behavior of the selected characters and their actions.
- Comparing the dramatic effect and the motivation between the two antagonists in the two plays.
- Discussing the different end of each antagonist.
- Drawing the conclusions
- Writing references according to the APA style.

Chapter Four

Discussion

Chapter Four

Discussion

As the study inspects the motives, dramatic effect and different presentation of the antagonist's end in *The Tragedy of Othello* and *A Doll's House*, it is important to note that the motives of any antagonist are only variables that urge his actions. His actions which come as a reflection to his motivation specify the extent to which his dramatic effect is strong. His effect and actions would drive him to his end which serves the writer's purposes whether the end is happy or a tragic.

4.1 Iago's Motives

When discussing the motivation of Iago in *The Tragedy of Othello*, it is worth starting with A.C. Bradley as one of the most famous critics who pays special attention to studying the complex psyche of Iago since *The Tragedy of Othello* was first performed in 1603. Bradley holds that "Iago is simply a man who has been slighted and revenges himself; of a husband who believes he has been wronged, and will make his enemy suffer a jealousy worse than his own; or an ambitious man determined to ruin his successful rival-one of these, or a combination of these, endowed with unusual ability or cruelty". (Bradley,1991)

In his words, Bradley makes it clear that Iago's impulse is only revenge. His revenge is firstly fed by the claim that he is slighted, and thus he feels inferior to others. In addition, Bradley hints that Iago's revenge on Othello and Desdemona is motivated by his suspicion

that Othello has wronged him with Emilia. Iago, therefore, plans to make Othello feel suspicious of his wife's betrayal.

Iago himself assures that his plan is to include a woman against a woman. After that, Bradley considers Cassio as Iago's rival, and Iago's impulse to ruin Cassio refers to the claim that Iago is ambitious to be promoted to the lieutenantcy, but Othello has passed over him in favor of Cassio.

From the beginning of the first act in *The tragedy of Othello*, it is apparent that Iago feels envious of Cassio who was promoted to the position of lieutenant, for Iago sees he deserves it more than any other person in Venice. Iago asserts that three of the Venetian noble men beg Othello to give the promotion to him, but Othello declares that he chooses Cassio as his lieutenant. From his speech, Iago shows his envy and jealousy of Cassio when he describes him as:

Forsooth, a great arithmetician,
 One Michael Cassio, a Florentine,
 A fellow almost damn'd in a fair wife;
 That never set a squadron in the field,
 Nor the division of a battle knows
 More than a spinster; unless the bookish theoretic,
 Wherein the togged consuls can propose
 As masterly as he: mere prattle, without practise,
 Is all his soldiership. But he, sir, had the election:
 And I, of whom his eyes had seen the proof
 At Rhodes, at Cyprus and on other grounds
 Christian and heathen, must be be-lee'd and calm'd

By debtor and creditor: this counter-caster,

He, in good time, must his lieutenant be,

And I--God bless the mark!--his Moorship's ancient. (Act 1: Scene1, p4)

In these words, Iago criticizes Cassio's inabilities in the battlefield, claiming that a spinster is better than him in mastering the battle and that his knowledge is only bookish and theoretical. In this respect, Reilly and Wren (2003) comment on Iago's excessive desire to have the promotion instead of Cassio. They claim that Iago steals, deceives and kills as a result of not getting the promotion. In other words, Iago was motivated to do what he did to gain the lieutenantancy.

Hatred can be considered as a motive for Iago. He hates Othello more and more. His reason is only hatred that is revealed in act one, scene three. He is willing to be more conjunctive in his revenge on the Moor whom he hates.

and I re-tell thee again and again, I

hate the Moor: my cause is hearted; thine hath no

less reason. Let us be conjunctive in our revenge

against him: if thou canst cuckold him, thou dost

thyself a pleasure, me a sport (Act 1: Scene 3, p47)

Not only does Iago hate Othello for mere hatred, but there are definitely many reasons that planted the seeds of hatred in Iago's heart toward Othello and other people in Venice. McCloskey (1941) considers hate as the basic motivation for Iago. One reason for this hatred is the professional advancement Iago was deprived of by Othello. Another reason is

the suspicion in which Iago thinks that Othello has played him false with his wife Emilia.

McCloskey states that what Iago seeks is justice and revenge; Othello was unfair in promoting Cassio. Therefore, Iago has a plan to take his revenge on Othello.

From a different point of view, Heejung Cha (2001) explains his unconvinced attitude toward Iago's suspicion of his wife as a factual motive. He claims that there is no physical evidence to prove this suspicion. In fact, Iago himself does not attempt to confirm his suspicion. Cha also sees that Emilia seems very loyal to Desdemona and will never betray her mistress. In conclusion, hate is more apparent than suspicion as one of the main motives that make Iago think of taking revenge on Othello.

Iago does not only carry the feeling of hatred to Othello, but also he carries much hate to women in general and to Desdemona in particular. Zender (1994) discusses the time before the arrival of Othello to Cyprus when Desdemona asks Iago about how he would praise various sorts of women. Iago reveals his views about women who are lazy in all matters except seduction.

Come on, come on; you are pictures out of doors,
Bells in your parlors, wild-cats in your kitchens,
Saints n your injuries, devils being offended,
Players in your housewifery, and housewives' in your beds

(Act 2: Scene 1, p58)

In these words, Iago does not praise women as Desdemona asked him to do. His description seems to be hostile. Actually, throughout the conversation the previous quotation is taken from, it can be noticed that Iago's attitude toward women is based on his suspicion that Emilia has cheated him. Thus, he generalizes his views to include all women.

As for jealousy, it is also obvious that jealousy does urge Iago to be an awry villain. It is long argued that Iago is not as happy as a married man in comparison to Othello's life with Desdemona. Iago is actually jealous that the black Moor wins the heart of Desdemona who is well-known as a virtuous woman in Venice whom any man dreams of having an affair with. Iago's inflammatory words to Desdemona's father to alert him that the Moor has stolen his daughter proves Iago's jealousy of the Moor.

Additionally, prejudice can be seen as a motive for Iago's devilishness. Mott (1983) considers Iago's prejudice against Othello as a moor the chief among the many sources for Iago's hatred. Iago keeps referring to Othello as the Moor in his speech. In the first act, when Iago and Rodrigo come to the street before Brabantio's house to warn him that Desdemona is in danger, Iago refers to Othello as a black old ram and a Barbary horse who is stealing the white ewe Desdemona. In this discrimination between black and white, Iago could seem a racist, and his racism is considered as another source of his hatred for Othello. Accordingly, prejudice here appears in the form of discrimination.

O'Neal (2000) also discusses prejudice as a motive for Iago, but from a different point of view. He believes that Iago's motive is his prejudice of being inferior to Othello, Desdemona and Cassio in terms of social class. For that reason, Iago includes Desdemona and Cassio in his plans, so that there could not be any person to prevent him from

persuading Othello to promote him to a better social rank. Ambition and greed have a main role in motivating Iago to plot and destroy others. From the beginning of the play, the audience is told about Iago's theft and fraud in taking money from Rodrigo and claiming that the money is for the sake of matching between Rodrigo and Desdemona.

According to Wedes (2008), ambition and greedy are Iago's motives. Wedes sees that Cassio, Othello and Desdemona become casualties in Iago's desire to satisfy his avariciousness. They feed his greed for wealth and power which make him expand his plans and include all of them in these plans. In addition, Wedes believes that planning to destroy Othello, Cassio and Desdemona is only circumstantial.

Finally, the desire for power and the devilishness by nature can be seen as motives for Iago. He, as appears in certain parts of the play, is a man who has a blatant love for evil. He delights in others' ruin and misery, that is why he incites the tragic death of others without any mercy.

4.2 Krogstad's Motives

The first presence of Krogstad which is delayed to the end of the first act in the play is to meet with Torvald, a meeting which happens concurrently with Mrs. Linde's visit to Nora. Although Nora and Linde were not happy to see Krogstad, it seems that he does not have any intention toward any despicable action. He is not yet motivated to do any wicked deed; this is clear from his answer to Nora's question about the reason behind his visit as his visit is for nothing but for dry "business matters". The turning point in Krogstad's character is the dismissal from the bank in which he has a subordinate position to Torvald Helmer, his school colleague. This is the first motivation that drives Krogstad into any evasive action he would do. At the end of act one, Krogstad comes again to

Helmer's house; Nora tells him that Torvald is not at home, but Krogstad explains that the reason behind his visit is to meet Nora herself. In the conversation between the two, Krogstad reveals that his position at the bank is in jeopardy and that he might be dismissed as a result of hiring Mrs. Linde to a position at the bank. Krogstad first requests that Nora uses her influence with her husband to convince him to secure Krogstad's job. When Nora denies his request, Krogstad reminds her of the signature Nora left in the promissory note at the bank. Krogstad threatens Nora that he will reveal her past crime of forgery unless she helps him. He remarks that he is prepared to fight for his small position at the bank as if he is fighting for his life. He does not want to lose his reputation, his dignity and his position in society. Thus, Krogstad's despicable blackmail starts against Nora.

It is not only for the sake of the money; indeed, that weighs least
with me in the matter. There is another reason--well, I may as
well tell you. My position is this. I daresay you know, like everybody
else, that once, many years ago, I was guilty of an indiscretion

(Act 1, p53)

In this quotation, it is absolutely clear that what motivated Krogstad to blackmail Nora is the need to save his position in the society rather than for the sake of money. Krogstad seems worried about his position, because he is worried about losing his dignity. In this respect, Sharma (2012) demonstrates that Krogstad's motivation is to regain his position at

the bank in hard times. Sharma believes that losing a job is not an ordinary matter because of the hard times in which Krogstad lives.

The second motive that can be discussed about Krogstad is that he is struggling to secure his children. Krogstad makes a confession to Nora that he is obligated to do the business Nora has already known, he means the forgery, because his children are growing up and, in order to be able to secure them, he must try to get back his position and his respect in the town at any cost. According to Sharma (2012), Krogstad commits some illegal actions as a result of being a father for motherless children. What he wants is only to save these children who are growing without a mother.

Dr. Rank refers to Krogstad as a morally sick man in the first act of the play when Krogstad comes to meet with Torvald at the Helmer's house. Meanwhile, Nora tells Mrs. Linde that Krogstad made a very unhappy marriage in the past. This fact, associated with the fact that Krogstad is a father of motherless children, constitute two sides of the same coin. The unhappy family life of Krogstad did motivate him to some illegal actions which contribute to Dr. Rank's and others' seeing Krogstad as morally sick.

Blackmail is not the first despicable action Krogstad is motivated to do, but also if one looks at Krogstad's past, he will find that Krogstad helped Nora to forge her father's signature so that she could take the loan from the bank. This action causes Krogstad to lose his reputation in society. Krogstad's defense is that his motivation for such action was to save his wife's life. In one of his memorable quotations, he criticizes the society and the law which, as he thinks, does not care about motives.

Nora. You? Do you ask me to believe
that you were brave enough to run a
risk to save your wife's life?

Krogstad. The law cares nothing
about motives.

Nora. Then it must be a very foolish law.

Krogstad. Foolish or not, it is the law
by which you will be judged, if I
produce this paper in court. (Act 1, p60)

The need to commit such a crime is the same as Nora's need to take Torvald to Italy in order to cure him of his illness. From another perspective, Sharma(2012) sees that the reason which makes Krogstad participate with Nora in her crime is because Nora wants to save Torvald's life, rather than because he is elusive by nature. In other words, his reason or motivation is only human.

At the beginning of the third act in the play, another motive is exposed. In the meeting between Krogstad and Mrs. Linde, it becomes clear that there was a romantic relationship between the two. However, Mrs. Linde left Krogstad and married another man for financial reasons. Krogstad himself talks about Mrs. Linde's abandonment as one of his motives. He states that he was emotionally distracted, and describes Mrs. Linde as a heartless woman. As he describes the psychological condition he was under after the rejection of his love, Krogstad describes himself as a shipwrecked man who clings to a bit of wreckage.

Krogstad. Was there anything else to understand except
what was obvious to all the world--a heartless woman

jilts a man when a more lucrative chance turns up?

Mrs Linde. Do you believe I am as absolutely heartless as all that?

And do you believe that I did it with a light heart?

Krogstad [*more gently*]. When I lost you, it was as if all the solid ground

went from under my feet. Look at me now--I am a shipwrecked man

clinging to a bit of wreckage. (Act 3, p126)

4.3 Iago's Dramatic Effect

Many critics have discussed Iago's role in *The Tragedy of Othello*. One of them is Matuska (2003) who describes Iago saying "Othello's ensign who concocts the plot of the play; he is the director who makes the show go on; he is the master of ceremonies who moves easily between the world of the play and the world of the audience". Starting the discussion about the dramatic effect of Iago in *The Tragedy of Othello* with this quotation is absolutely to emphasize the value of Iago in the play, or even the price of him as he refers to himself in the play: "and, by the faith of man, I know my price, I am worth no worse a place" (Act 1: Scene 1, p4)

Matuska (2003) describes the representation of Iago as unique; he is present both in the drama and on the stage. For Matuska and others, the dramatic effect of Iago is as strong as the talent which enables him to manipulate the world around him. Thus, when discussing his dramatic effect, one should analyze not only his effect on the other characters in the play. but also the plot including the rising actions, the tragedy, the suspense, the conflicts, and the climax.

At the very beginning of the play Iago appears speaking to Rodrigo who reveals that Iago has taken much money from him. Iago starts his manipulative action with his friend Rodrigo by taking his money and pretending that he would use the money in trying to bring a match between Rodrigo and Desdemona. Actually, Iago has a magical effect on Rodrigo. Although Iago is stealing his money, also he uses him as a tool to achieve many of his wicked tactics throughout the play. First, Iago plans to spoil Othello's delight with Desdemona by advising Rodrigo to go with him to Desdemona's father. Iago seems very sly because he knows how Rodrigo loves Desdemona; so depending on this fact he can easily persuade Rodrigo to come with him to the street before Brabantio's house proclaiming that Brabantio's daughter is kidnapped by the Moor. Leverton (2015) explains the effect Iago has on Rodrigo when he is urged to alert Brabantio to Othello's illicit relationship with his daughter. Leverton remarks that Iago's sweet-talks with Rodrigo have the effect to draw us into the con, making us as much victims of Iago's duplicity as the hapless Venetian.

In the case of Rodrigo, Reilly and Wren (2003) point out Iago's capabilities to say the right thing in the right time. He manages to steal money from Rodrigo who screams at Iago and expresses that he is ready to make himself known in his suit to Desdemona so that she might give back all of the jewels and money that Iago was supposed to have given her from him. However, Iago's fanciful ability in tricking and plotting deceives Rodrigo, making him forget the theft and agree to kill Cassio. Iago plots that Cassio will be assigned to Othello's place, and Othello will be sent to Mauritania in Africa accompanied by Desdemona. Iago's art of persuasion enables him to persuade Rodrigo to get rid of Cassio as the best solution to prevent Othello from taking Desdemona with him.

IAGO

Sir, there is especial commission come from Venice
to depute Cassio in Othello's place.

RODERIGO

Is that true? why, then Othello and Desdemona return again to Venice.

IAGO

O, no; he goes into Mauritania and takes away with him the fair Desdemona, unless his
abode be lingered here by some accident: wherein none can be
so determinate as the removing of Cassio.

RODERIGO

How do you mean, removing of him?

IAGO

Why, by making him incapable of Othello's place;
knocking out his brains.

(Act 4: Scene 2, p 167)

Iago continues his manipulation of Rodrigo in the second act of the play, when he accompanies Rodrigo to Cyprus for pragmatic reasons. In Cyprus, Othello announces that the city celebrates his marriage to Desdemona at the same day of the victory against the Turks. Before that, Iago tells Rodrigo that Desdemona will long for another man; he means Cassio who is the first choice for Desdemona after Othello. By this act, it is noticeable that Iago's plan is to urge Rodrigo to start a quarrel with Cassio, then he will become the first choice by eliminating this obstacle. Iago thinks the quarrel will be fruitful for him since he will get Cassio out of Othello's favor in this time of tension after the war against the Turks.

On the night of Othello's and Desdemona's wedding, Iago joins Cassio to guard the room of Othello. In this scene Iago speaks aside in front of the audience explaining his scheming plot. He invites three Cypriots to join him and Cassio to drink together. Being drunk, Iago will lead Cassio out of the stage and let Rodrigo provoke Cassio to commit an irresponsible act that might disgrace him.

Iago: If I can fasten but one cup upon him,
 With that which he hath drunk to-night already,
 He'll be as full of quarrel and offence
 As my young mistress' dog. Now, my sick fool Roderigo,
 Whom love hath turn'd almost the wrong side out,
 To Desdemona hath to-night caroused
 Potations pottle-deep; and he's to watch:
 Three lads of Cyprus, noble swelling spirits,
 That hold their honours in a wary distance,
 The very elements of this warlike isle,
 Have I to-night fluster'd with flowing cups,
 And they watch too. Now, 'mongst this flock of drunkards,
 Am I to put our Cassio in some action
 That may offend the isle.--But here they come:
 If consequence do but approve my dream,
 My boat sails freely, both with wind and stream (Act 2: Scene 3, p75)

The second character that is manipulated by Iago is Cassio. Cassio is the one who gains the lieutenantcy that motivated Iago to his villainy. At the end of the third act in the play, Iago

manages to persuade Cassio to drink more with the three invited Cypriots. Iago leads the drunk Cassio out of the stage and urges Rodrigo to start a quarrel with him. Once the two start the duel, Montano and the others intervene to stop the quarrel, Montano is attacked then stabbed by Cassio, Othello comes and takes control of the situation. Here it is apparent how Iago is an artist as a manipulator; he manages to get Cassio divested from his position as a lieutenant. Meanwhile, Iago also imposes his control on Montano who insists on Othello to hear from Iago what happened with Cassio, Rodrigo and Montano. After the dismissal from the lieutenantcy, Cassio becomes more manipulated by Iago who advises him to seek Desdemona's assistance. Iago intends to take advantage of Desdemona's assistance to Cassio by sowing suspicion into Othello's mind that his wife is false.

The day of Othello's and Desdemona's marriage celebration is the day of Iago's sly plot. Iago manipulates Cassio, Montano and Rodrigo as if he is playing chess. He makes the stage like the chess board on which he moves all of them cunningly toward winning the game by reaching the death of the 'king' Othello. Solimene and Algiere (2002) narrate the events of this day. He makes it clear that Iago manipulates all the characters; Iago sings a high-spirited song to encourage Cassio to drink more; he manipulates Montano when he whispers to him that he should tell Othello about Cassio's insult (joke) against him. When the bell rings and Othello attends to take control of the situation, Montano requests Othello to ask Iago about what happened. Othello and others still have no doubt of Iago's honesty; Iago is still looked at as being the honest Iago. Yates (1981) reviews Robert Heilman's quotation in which he calls Iago as "the ingenuity that can at once maneuver a group towards violence and evoke the choral refrain as 'honest' which inhibits doubt and enlarges security at the very point of attack".

Iago is the most memorable and exciting character in the play. His status as paradigm is perhaps more pronounced than Othello. Othello serves Iago rather than the reverse (Raatzsch, 2009). This is the best description for the dramatic effect of Iago on Othello, which sometimes raises the doubts in the audience's mind that the protagonist in the play is Iago, not Othello. Iago plots, manipulates, tricks and even steals in order to achieve his ultimate goal which is to bring Othello's madness and demise. In the first act of the play, Iago discloses that he follows and serves Othello for pragmatic reasons.

I follow him to serve

my turn upon him (Act 1: Scene 1, p6)

Although Iago's loyalty and obedience to Othello is artificial, yet the ingenuity he has supports him in deceiving Othello, and in still being refrained as the honest Iago many times.

Iago starts his actual manipulation of Othello in the third act of the play. He shows how he is intelligently skillful as a spokesman who is able to insert suspicion into Othello's mind smoothly. By his words to Othello, he seems an arch schemer; he plants the poison into Othello's ear; he uses a language of poetic words that would manipulate any person. His strong effect starts becoming clearer and stronger, just as Othello starts suspecting the chastity of his wife, when Othello wonders about the reasons that might make her unfaithful: his Moorish origin, his black face, or his seriousness in speech in comparison with the others who can speak more delicately to women than him.

This fellow's of exceeding honesty,

And knows all qualities, with a learned spirit,

Of human dealings. If I do prove her haggard,

Though that her jesses were my dear heartstrings,

I'd whistle her off and let her down the wind,
 To pray at fortune. Haply, for I am black
 And have not those soft parts of conversation
 That chamberers have, or for I am declined
 Into the vale of years,--yet that's not much--
 She's gone. I am abused; and my relief
 Must be to loathe her. O curse of marriage,
 That we can call these delicate creatures ours,
 And not their appetites! I had rather be a toad,
 And live upon the vapour of a dungeon,
 Than keep a corner in the thing I love
 For others' uses. Yet, 'tis the plague of great ones;
 Prerogativ'd are they less than the base;
 'Tis destiny unshunnable, like death:
 Even then this forked plague is fated to us

When we do quicken. Desdemona comes: (Act 3: Scene 3, p114)

According to Solimene and Algiere (2002), Othello was so caught up in Iago's lies that he refuses to believe Desdemona whom he loves so much. Though Desdemona defends herself that she has never been unfaithful to him, but Othello is still under the influence of Iago's malignant words. Iago's strong effect on Othello goes on in the third act of the play when Othello requests Iago to offer him proofs for what he claims about Desdemona's deceit. Beier (2014) inspects Iago's dramatic effect on Othello which relies on a series of proofs. The first proof is Iago's false appearance as the honest Iago who does not like to tell what he knows about others, he means he does not want to unmask Cassio's guilt. The second proof is that Iago tells Othello about the dream Cassio had with him insisting aloud

to an imagined Desdemona sleeping with him. The third proof is the handkerchief Iago has newly received from his wife Emilia.

In the fourth act of the play, Iago is still seen as honest and loyal in the eyes of Othello. He manages to bring madness to Othello's mind, suspicion to his heart, agony to his soul and disturbance to his psyche. Iago speaks in a very skillfully convincing way that would address the emotions and feelings of Othello who does not have any choice except a serious shock that sends him to a trance.

After providing some proofs in order to seem more persuasive, Iago tricks Cassio by asking him about Bianca, a prostitute Cassio occasionally meets and lusts with. Othello is hiding to listen to the speech between Iago and Cassio as Iago asks him to do. Iago's maliciousness in his speech with Cassio makes Othello think the two are talking about Desdemona, but the truth is that they are talking about Bianca. This is the ultimate proof Iago offers to Othello which drives Othello and Desdemona to their tragic end.

The last character manipulated by Iago is his wife Emilia. Throughout the five acts of the play, Iago and Emilia do not appear with one another as a married couple who have a close relationship. However, this relationship seems to some degrees closer when Emilia brings Desdemona's handkerchief to Iago, which he requested her to do previously.

IAGO

How now! what do you here alone?

EMILIA

Do not you chide; I have a thing for you.

IAGO

A thing for me? it is a common thing--

EMILIA

Ha!

IAGO

To have a foolish wife.

EMILIA

O, is that all? What will you give me now

For the same handkerchief?

IAGO

What handkerchief?

EMILIA

What handkerchief?

Why, that the Moor first gave to Desdemona;

That which so often you did bid me steal.

(Act 3: Scene 3, p116)

Now, if one imagines *The Tragedy of Othello* without its antagonist Iago, what would the play look like then? Of course, it will lose much of its suspense, excitement, tragic tone, conflicts, and even the popularity it has gained since it has been created. Thus, the fact that Iago has the strongest dramatic effect on the plot of the play is one of the most important facts about the play. Though Othello is not aware of being in conflict with Iago, he and the audience know very well the seriousness of that conflict. Iago speaks aside before the audience many times, explaining his malicious intentions to evoke in Othello the feeling of jealousy that would bring him to madness. The most stunning soliloquy in which Iago exhibits his devilish intentions is the one said at the end of act two:

And what's he then that says I play the villain?
 When this advice is free I give and honest,
 Probal to thinking and indeed the course
 To win the Moor again? For 'tis most easy
 The inclining Desdemona to subdue
 In any honest suit: she's framed as fruitful
 As the free elements. And then for her
 To win the Moor--were't to renounce his baptism,
 All seals and symbols of redeemed sin,
 His soul is so enfetter'd to her love,
 That she may make, unmake, do what she list,
 Even as her appetite shall play the god
 With his weak function. How am I then a villain
 To counsel Cassio to this parallel course,
 Directly to his good? Divinity of hell!
 When devils will the blackest sins put on,
 They do suggest at first with heavenly shows,
 As I do now: for whiles this honest fool
 Plies Desdemona to repair his fortunes
 And she for him pleads strongly to the Moor,
 I'll pour this pestilence into his ear,
 That she repeals him for her body's lust;
 And by how much she strives to do him good,
 She shall undo her credit with the Moor.
 So will I turn her virtue into pitch,

And out of her own goodness make the net

That shall enmesh them all.

(Act 2: Scene 3, p91)

In this soliloquy, Iago reveals that his real nature as villain cannot be discovered, because he manages to hide it under the pretension of being an advisor to Othello, Cassio and Desdemona. He wants to take advantage of Desdemona's assistance in convincing Othello to give the lieutenancy back to Cassio in planting suspicion into Othello's heart. In this respect, Gill (1989) argues that Iago is a very different character; he seems to be a friend to all, trusted by Othello, Rodrigo's ally, counselor to the downcast Cassio, and Desdemona's advisor when losing Othello's favor. Briefly, he is looked at as being the honest.

The fact that Iago is the character who decides the destiny of all other characters in the play is important to draw his dramatic effect in the play. The tragic end of the play in which Othello tortures and stabs himself to die upon a kiss over the corpse of his loved wife is undoubtedly caused by Iago. He kills Emilia and Rodrigo, and Rodrigo wounds

Cassio in the last quarrel between them. Much of the suspense of the play's actions is provided by Iago who brings the actions to its climatic point when Othello kneels with Iago and vows not to change course until he has achieved bloody revenge from Cassio and Desdemona. This climax occurs as Iago exactly starts plotting when he gets suspicion that Othello has slept with Emilia.

4.4 Krogstad's Dramatic Effect

Before discussing the dramatic effect Krogstad has on the other characters and the plot in *A Doll's House*, it is worth explaining the nature of his relationship with the protagonist Nora whom the main conflict of the play centers around. The nature of the relationship between them is described by Brocket and others (2015) as "Ibsen could have made his play melodramatic by depicting Krogstad as a villain and Nora as a heroine". Therefore, it is an indubitable fact that Nora and Krogstad have the strongest dramatic effect in the play. Now, the question that would be raised is: "Does Krogstad have a dramatic effect on Nora and the other characters in the play?" The answer can absolutely be determined by referring to the development of the actions Krogstad brings by his arrival from the first appearance until the end of the play. Siddall (2008) describes the presence of Krogstad in the three acts of the play: In the first act, Krogstad's visit shocks Nora into understanding the realities about the public and social worlds outside the doll's house where she lives. In the second act, his visit establishes some sort of weird affinity with Nora, especially through the prospect of suicide. In the third act, Krogstad appears not to visit or meet Nora, but to reveal the truth to Torvald by his letter. Nora seems shocked into understanding the false basis of her marriage and family.

The dramatic effect Krogstad has on Nora was not so clear before the announcement that his position at the bank is in jeopardy. In other words, Krogstad's act of blackmail exhibits the dramatic effect he has on Nora. First of all, the audience gets informed about the

forgery of Nora's signature which has not been revealed until the blackmail starts. In the first act of the play, Nora tells Mrs. Linde about the hard condition she and Torvald lived in when Torvald was ill. She explains that she obtained the money from her father to take Torvald to Italy for treatment. Though, by the arrival of Krogstad at the end of the first act, the source of Nora's loan is disclosed to the audience; she committed the crime of forging her father's signature to receive a loan from the bank.

Furthermore, Krogstad's act of blackmail and threats drive Nora to her dilemma. She seems frightened, worried and tentative. She tries to persuade Torvald to keep the position of Krogstad to overcome her trouble, but Torvald does not accept. According to Siddall (2008) much of the play's tension relies on Nora's persuasion to let Torvald save Krogstad's position.

After the official announcement of Krogstad's dismissal from the bank, he appears again to meet Nora in the second act of the play. As a result of his blackmail, Nora reveals that she is ready to commit suicide if it might be the solution for her. She wants to save her reputation in the eyes of her husband and children, so she finds her death the only way of keeping her reputation intact. Krogstad still imposes his effect on Nora in persuading her not to kill herself. Krogstad tells Nora that even if she kills herself, her reputation will be ruined. He means that her body will be dead, her reputation will not, her crime will be exposed and Torvald will be accused of his wife's crime. After that, Krogstad leaves Nora and on his way out of the Helmer's house, he puts a letter in the letterbox to inform Torvald of his wife's forgery. Leaving the letter has been influential, too. It makes Nora confess to Mrs. Linde her secret about the loan.

In the final act of the play, Krogstad's dramatic effect turns to touch the Helmer family. Torvald reads the letter of Krogstad and becomes outraged. He starts accusing Nora of being a liar and hypocrite. He describes her as his joy and pride in the past which has become the worst criminal. What makes Torvald outraged is not only the crime itself, but also because it leads him to be under the power of the unscrupulous Krogstad. This is actually the only effect Krogstad has on Torvald in the play. That Torvald seems extremely outraged is because his wife's crime was with Krogstad, not any other person. Otherwise, Torvald is the one who has an effect on Krogstad's character. The dismissal from the bank is the most important motive that pushes Krogstad to blackmail

Helmer. Now you have destroyed all my happiness.

You have ruined all my future. It is horrible to think of! I

am in the power of an unscrupulous man; he can do what he likes with me,

ask anything he likes of me, give me any orders he pleases--I dare not

refuse. And I must sink to such miserable depths because of a

thoughtless woman! (Act 3, p153)

Now that the truth is already uncovered, Krogstad contributes to Nora's understanding of the reality of her marriage. She realized that she is like a doll having no independence in her life; she is admired and played with like a puppet by her husband. Furthermore, Krogstad makes it clear that Torvald's fear of losing his position in society is more important than his family.

Unlike Nora, who was seriously affected by Krogstad, Mrs. Linde is the one who manages to change Krogstad. When she tells him that his children need a mother; and she needs to be a mother, and they they all need each other, the changes in Krogstad's personality become obvious. Most likely, she restores him to his good nature which was abused by the society. Another evidence to prove the effect of Mrs. Line on Krogstad is that he decides to take the letter back from the Helmer's letterbox in order not to ruin this family as soon as he gets his past love again.

Mrs Linde. I want to be a mother to
someone, and your children need a
mother. We two need each other.

Nils, I have faith in your real
character--I can dare anything
together with you.

Krogstad [*grasps her hands*].

Thanks, thanks, Christine! Now I
shall find a way to clear myself in the
eyes of the world. Ah, but I forgot-- (Act 3, p130)

Not only does Krogstad have a special effect at the level of the development of the characters in the play, but also he raises the action and affects the events of the plot from the first time he appears until the end. Krogstad can be seen as the character who drives the plot and affects the moral changes of the characters. In fact, the development of the action in the play relies on the presence of Krogstad who causes the climax of the plot when he

puts the letter in the letterbox. The action becomes complex and the fate of Nora becomes more ambiguous. Krogstad's conflict with Nora provides much suspense and thrill for the play. Rush (2005) considers that the rising action in the play begins in act one when Krogstad comes to Nora and informs her about her husband's firing him from the bank; he threatens her that he has the proof of her past crime.

4.5 Antagonist's End in Othello

Once Iago achieved his wicked intentions, his counterparts are finally brought to their tragic ends. The tragic scene starts when Iago positions Rodrigo with a sword in a place to stab Cassio while he visits Bianca. The two fight with swords and are left wounded on the stage in a dark mood. Iago, who disappeared as the quarrel was in progress, returns carrying a light. He stabs the wounded Rodrigo and kills him, leaving Cassio alive. Iago wants to dispose of Rodrigo due to the assumption that Rodrigo is the only proof that might prove his wicked deeds. According to Iago, Rodrigo's role comes to its end, then his existence might be a threatening proof. The reason why not to kill Cassio is that Iago aims to get him stripped off the lieutenantcy, and that his existence will play a vital role in making Othello more outraged because he is Desdemona's partner in betraying him.

Being under the strong effect of Iago's mixture of deceitful words and fake gestures, Othello's determination to kill Desdemona is increasing. He enters her room holding a

candle, he smothers her in her bed without making any response to her last justificatory words. The scene of Desdemona's death ends with the bed curtains drawn by Othello.

Emilia is the only one with Desdemona who still has the last breath. Desdemona tells Emilia that she was not murdered but she killed herself. After Emilia realizes the truth of her husband as the reason behind the tragic end of Cassio and Desdemona, she reveals it to Othello whose emotional state is getting worse. Othello looks as the saddest man on earth when he falls weeping upon the bed where Desdemona's corpse is lying. Emilia is stabbed by Iago and falls dying. Emilia adds more grief to the tragic scene by uttering the last words as she is dying. She sings the song Willow, and informs Othello that her mistress is chaste and loved him very much. Mourning the loss of his loved wife, as well as torturing himself for his foolishness, Othello stabs himself dying upon a kiss on his wife's body. Thus, the tragic end caused by Iago comes to an end.

As for Iago, who decides the destinies of his counterparts, his end in the play is different. He is arrested and sent to prison saying his last memorable words in which he determines not to justify his deeds, and leaves a crucial question about why he is still alive until now!

IAGO: Demand me nothing: what you know, you know:

From this time forth I never will speak word.

(Act 5:Scene 2, p200)

This is the complexity of Iago's characterization that makes him one of the most famous antagonists in literature. From Shakespeare's outlook, he makes his antagonist end up in prison to emphasize the fact that a sinner must be ultimately punished. However Iago is sly, **his deeds must eventually be uncovered so that he could have his punishment.**

4.6 Antagonist's End in A Doll's House

The last appearance of Krogstad in the play is his meeting with Mrs. Linde who informs him of her decision that she wants him again. Although Krogstad intends not to ruin the Helmer family by taking his letter again from the letterbox, Mrs. Linde tells him that he must not recall the letter because she enters the Helmer house and becomes more aware that Nora and Torvald must have a complete understanding of their relationship, and this would not be possible unless the unhappy secret of forgery is disclosed. After that, Krogstad leaves the play expressing the big change in his personality. Krogstad says that he has never had such an amazing piece of good fortune in his life.

In Ibsen's play, Krogstad's role in the play ends with regaining his love and revealing the truth of Nora's secret. The revelation of the secret is of great influence in the play. It

provides Nora with a real understanding of her life in a house where she is treated like a doll. She realized that what she looks like in the eyes of her husband is only a beautiful possession. She is loved by her husband in order for him to feel he is needed. Nora finally manages to reach the truth of her being a human being before being a wife and a mother, and she as a human must have independence, personality and beliefs.

Ibsen does not design for his antagonist to be punished for his illegal actions, because what he wants from the representation of Krogstad as appears in the play is to introduce a victimized sample in an unfair society. Therefore, Ibsen lets his antagonist end up in a happy marriage to contradict the end of his protagonist. The relationship between Krogstad and Mrs. Linde represents a subplot contradictory to the main plot that is represented in the relationship between Nora and Torvald. This contradiction is intended by Ibsen to emphasize the message he wants to convey from his play that is the criticism of the way women were seen in that period of time.

4.7 Iago and Krogstad: Compared and Contrasted

In spite of the idea that Shakespeare's *Othello* and Ibsen's *A Doll's House* are set in different cultural environments, some similarities and differences can be drawn. First of all, Iago and Krogstad are similar in the sense that both are motivated by certain social, emotional and financial variables that provoke them to take wicked actions against the other characters in the two plays where they appear.

For Iago, his motivation starts with the military rank he loses to Cassio. The loss of the promotion he believes he deserves evokes in Iago the feeling of jealousy toward Cassio and the feeling of hatred toward Othello. The feeling of hatred toward Othello has another evidence in the play when Iago reveals that he hates the Moor for the sake of hatred and without a specific reason. Iago's motivation to take a hostile attitude towards others can be seen when he declares his suspicion that Othello has betrayed him with his wife Emilia. This motivation does urge Iago to hate Othello more and feeds his determination of taking his revenge. Prejudice can also be considered a motive for Iago. Iago feels he is not socially equal to Othello, Desdemona and Cassio, and that might be the cause that makes Othello prefer Cassio to be his lieutenant. Racism is obvious in Iago's description of Othello as a black Moor. Iago is jealous of Othello who has a good reputation among the Venetian community although his color is black and his origin is a Moorish. Furthermore, ambition and greed are main motives that provoke the wicked intentions in Iago's mind. He steals money from his friend Rodrigo in order to achieve his goals.

In the case of Krogstad, his motivation starts to be clear when he receives the letter of dismissal from the bank. He finds himself blackmailing Nora to save his dignity in society which would be lost by losing his job. Krogstad's motivation toward villainy is demonstrated in his speech with Nora as both of them committed illegal acts to cure someone else. Krogstad wanted to save his wife's life and that is why he takes part in the crime of forgery that Nora committed. Another important motive for Krogstad's despicable deeds refers to an emotional reason. He was in love with Mrs. Linde, but because of financial reasons, he lost this love. Furthermore, there are more social variables that lead Krogstad to do what he does, one of them is his children who live without a mother. Therefore, Krogstad struggles in life to meet the needs of his motherless children.

Logically speaking, this is a reasonable factor that might make anybody tend to think of any possible source of money without considering the legality of it.

In contrast with the fact that both Iago and Krogstad are motivated by certain incentives, there is a very significant difference between them in terms of the motivation. Iago has his own motives to do any wicked deed. But what is more accurate about his psyche is that his wickedness comes from his devilish nature.

If one supposes that Shakespeare did not introduce the previous motives for Iago, he will still find that Iago is wicked because of his own nature. To prove that, Iago kills his friend Rodrigo without any hesitation. Besides, his revenge is over exaggerated in comparison to his motives. Finally, Iago has a good reputation among the Venetian society and he is highly respected, being referred to as the honest Iago all the time, yet, he still has a hostile attitude and wants to ruin all of his counterparts.

Whereas in the case of Krogstad, he is not evil by nature. He is a victim of the unfair society, and the circumstances he finds himself suffering from. Ibsen's intention to criticize aspects in the society introduced by the case of Krogstad who is obligated to commit the illegal crimes is a reflection of the unfair society he lives in. Ibsen presents Krogstad's motives as bad social, financial and emotional circumstances that push Krogstad to the wrong way. To prove that, the evidence is simply the big change in his behavior once he gains some hope which is the gaining of his old love. Here, Krogstad turns from a miserable person into the happiest man who is purified from any wickedness he might have. The idea that Krogstad directly makes a decision to recall his letter because he does not want to destroy the Helmer family after regaining Kristine does support the claim that he is good by nature.

Second of all, Iago and Krogstad have a strong presence in the two plays in which they appear. Their dramatic effect becomes clear in their abilities of leading the other characters to their destinies. In the case of Iago, he directs Othello into a crazy state caused by a suspicion of the chastity of his loved wife. Iago manipulates the fate of Othello, Desdemona, Cassio, Rodrigo and Emilia. At the end, the stage turns into a bloody place in which Desdemona is smothered by Othello who then stabs himself as soon as he realized that his suspicion is wrong. Rodrigo and Emilia are killed once they finished their roles in serving Iago. Emilia steals the napkin that is used by Iago as the ultimate proof for his claim of Desdemona's betrayal. Rodrigo wounds Cassio and was the main reason to disgrace him in the eyes of Othello.

Like Iago, Krogstad has a strong dramatic effect in *A Doll's House*, but his effect is less influential than Iago. He directs Nora and Torvald to their destinies which is not death, but separation. Krogstad's letter makes Nora aware of her real life with Torvald. It provides her with the understanding of the false basis of her marriage and family. Nora would have never been able to reach a realization of her life as a doll, played with and admired by a man who is more concerned with his position in society, without the presence of Krogstad in the play. In fact, Ibsen takes an advantage of the presentation of his antagonist to draw the intended purpose of his play. Torvald's love to his wife relies on his need to have a wife who loves him and makes him feel he is needed. He is interested in the feeling that his wife is under his control in all cases. For Nora, she was not aware of the social life outside her house. She realized the truth mainly after Krogstad's visit to her. More importantly, she finally realized that she is a human before being a mother and a wife. Therefore, she has to have her own personality, beliefs, ambition, independence and choices in life by exiting from the doll's house where she is treated like a puppet.

Third of all, Iago and Krogstad end up in the two plays gaining something as well as losing something else. Iago takes his revenge, but he loses his freedom as the cost of his deeds. Whereas, Krogstad regains his emotions which were lost, but he loses his reputation.

However, it cannot be assumed that the end of the two are similar since each one is presented according to the writer's outlooks. Shakespeare and Ibsen have totally different cultural backgrounds, and are from different historical eras. Shakespeare's Iago is depicted as the classical antagonist who remains in conflict with the protagonist. He represents evil, his duty is only to ruin philanthropy. But, whatever he achieves, he must be eventually defeated. This is the natural norm of humankind where good triumphs over evil.

In the case of Krogstad, he is a realistic antagonist depicted by Ibsen to represent the society of his time. He ends up in the play as a happy man who returns to his inherent nature. His conflicts with the protagonist differ from Iago's conflicts with Othello, that is why his end is different. He does not represent evil and also Nora doesn't represent the good person. The end in *A Doll's House* is happy for Krogstad to support what Ibsen wanted from his play, that is to uncover certain hypocritical aspects in the family and society in his time regarding the position of women.

Chapter Five

Conclusion and Recommendations

Chapter Five

Conclusion and Recommendations

After the analytical discussion of particular issues in Shakespeare's *Othello* and Ibsen's *A Doll's House*, this chapter is devoted to shedding light on certain important notes, results and conclusions.

5.1 Conclusion

In terms of the variables that motivated Iago in *The Tragedy of Othello*, the first one is a social variable which is the loss of the military rank. Iago and Cassio were noble Venetian soldiers. The fact that Othello prefers Cassio to be his lieutenant instead of the ensign Iago provokes the feeling of jealousy in Iago. Therefore, he starts plotting to replace Cassio in that position. Another variable of motivation for Iago is his hatred of Othello who wins the heart of Desdemona because of his well-known bravery among the Venetian society. Iago hates Othello and looks at him as if he is his enemy. Iago's hatred of Othello is caused by his suspicion that Othello has betrayed him with his wife, Emilia. Moreover, prejudice is considered as a main motive for Iago who feels that he is socially subordinate to Othello, Cassio and Desdemona as a result of two reasons.

One is the promotion Cassio is chosen for, the other is the good reputation Othello has among the Venetian society which qualifies him to win the heart of the most virtuous Venetian woman, Desdemona. Iago's impulse to degrade and to desecrate is only the need of liberating. His revenge from those people is fed by his desire to be liberated. The motivation of prejudice is also supported by Iago's attitude toward Othello as a black moor. Iago feels jealousy of Othello who proves himself among the society in spite of his Moorish origin plus his black color. The last motive for Iago is his avariciousness and ambition. He steals Rodrigo's money to fulfill his wicked tactics, and to be promoted from an ensign to a lieutenant instead of Cassio.

Whereas, the variables that motivated Krogstad to take certain illegal and despicable actions can be divided into social, financial and emotional variables. The social variable can be seen in the dismissal from his job which means for Krogstad losing his dignity and position in society. In his time, a man is no longer respected in society without having a good job from which he can earn money. Once he feels that his job is in jeopardy, Krogstad finds no choice except blackmailing Nora. The financial variable that pushes Krogstad to commit an illegal crime is the need to save his motherless children. Before blackmailing Nora, Krogstad takes part in Nora's crime of forgery, and

demonstrates that his reason is to save the life of his sick wife who dies later leaving behind her the children under Krogstad's care. Without a job, he would not be able to cover the requirements of those children. The last variable that motivated Krogstad is emotional. The fact that Krogstad's emotional state turns from misery to a high degree of happiness after regaining his old love, Mrs. Linde, leads to another possible change that is if he had not lost his love to Christine, he would not be of course motivated to do any bad deed. For that reason, the loss of whom he loved is a main motive for Krogstad's behavior.

Iago's dramatic effect in *The Tragedy of Othello* can be summed up in the fact that he is the character who makes the tragedy. Iago manages to bring madness to Othello's mind which leads him to kill Desdemona then stab himself as a self-punishment for this foolish murder. Othello's capabilities that qualify him to be respected by the senators in Venice, and to attract Desdemona to prefer him could not be easily defeated unless his antagonist is a skillful manipulator. Iago's effect appears in his ability to manipulate the others without knowing that they are so manipulated. He uses Rodrigo as his main tool to achieve many of his goals benefiting from Rodrigo's obsession to have an affair with Desdemona. Iago's benefiting from Rodrigo helps him to disgrace Cassio which leads to his loss of the lieutenantancy. He imposes his effect on Emilia who brings him the most important proof Iago utilizes in practicing his art of persuasion on Othello. Emilia steals

Desdemona's handkerchief and gives it to Iago who finds an opportunity to support his claim that Desdemona betrays Othello with Cassio.

Krogstad's dramatic effect is also very important in *A doll's House*. His presence in the play provides the suspense in the events. His effect on the protagonist Nora is important. Without Krogstad, Nora would not realize the reality of her life with her husband. She would continue her life as a doll who does not have any active role in the society except her duties as a wife and as a mother. She would forget that she is a human before she understands how life is out of her home by the arrival of Krogstad in the play. Krogstad introduces the audience to two different couples in the society of his time. On one hand, his relationship with Christine that insists on the sacrificial role a man and a woman should have. On the other hand, he uncovers the reality of the Helmer's relationship in which Nora and Torvald live in an artificial love relationship. Nora's role of sacrifice is clear, while Torvald is a man who only thinks of his position as the man who should prevail on his wife. Generally speaking, Krogstad's dramatic effect on Nora and on Nora's family cannot be doubted, since the fact that Krogstad is the character who achieves what Ibsen wanted from his play which is the criticism of certain aspects in society.

One of the main concerns the study seeks to discover is the different characterization of the antagonist in a tragic and a realistic play. Krogstad's end with a happy marriage and Iago's end in prison lead to interpret the reasons. In the case of Iago, he is a classical antagonist developed basically from an idea already existing in the historical culture of his time: the devil in religious morality plays. In other words, he is the devilish side who represents opposition against the human side, the protagonist. But in the case of Krogstad, he is a realistic antagonist with many realistic features. To conclude, it is natural for Iago to end in prison because the devilish side must be ultimately defeated whatever he manages to ruin before, while it is also natural for Krogstad to end up in the play with a happy marriage because he is only a sample introduced from a realistic society.

5.2 Recommendations

Finally, this thesis has dealt with the antagonist in *The Tragedy of Othello* and *A Doll's House* from three perspectives which are the motives, the dramatic effect and the different end of each antagonist, utilizing the comparative approach of the American school as the main methodology. Although Iago's character has been universally studied since the first performance of Shakespeare's *Othello* until now, but still there is more to be added about Iago due to the high degree of complexity of his character. Also, I recommend to pay attention to Krogstad's character in *A Doll's House* because it is still negotiable whether he is the real antagonist or not.

References:

- Abrams, M.H. and Harpham, G. (2013). *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. 11th edition. USA: Cengage Learning.
- Beir, B V. (2014). *The Art of Persuasion and Shakespeare's Two Iagos*. University of North Carolina press. 111 (1), 34-64
- Bradford, W. (2014). "A Doll's House" Characters Study: Nils Krogstad. Retrieved on Dec 2015 from <http://plays.about.com/od/adollshouse/a/krogstad.htm>
- Bradley, A C. (1991). *Shakespearian Tragedy: Lectures on Hamlet, Othello, King Lear, Macbeth, with a Forward by John Bayley*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Brocket, O G and others. (2015). *The Essential Theatre*. 11th edition. Canada
- Cao, S. (2013). *The Variation Theory of Comparative Literature*. London: Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg.
- Cha, H. (2001). *The Tragedy of Othello and The Scarlet Letter: A closer look at aspects of male characters*. (Unpublished MA Thesis). Central Missouri State University
- Cluver (2014). *In Memoriam C. Clifford Flanigan*. In Clark, R and Longtin, M. (eds.). *Romard: Research on Medieval and Renaissance Drama* vol 52-53. Ontario: First Publishing Group.

- Erskine, A M. (2001). *A Study of Evil in Othello by William Shakespeare*. (Unpublished MA Thesis). Faculty of California State University Dominguez Hills.
- Esslin, M. (1977). *An Anatomy of Drama*. New York: Hill and Wang.
- Gill, R. (1989). *Oxford School Shakespeare* (ed.), New York: Oxford University Press.
- Greene, N. (2014). *Home on Stage: Domestic spaces in modern drama*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Henry, J E. (2011). A Doll's House. *Masterplots II: Juvenile & Young Adult Literature Series, Supplement*, p 1-2, p339
- Hollywood, B C. (2010). *Nils Krogstad: A man misunderstood*. Retrieved on Dec 2015 from www.hubpages.com/literature/nils-krogstad-a-man-misunderstood.
- Ibsen, H. (2009). *A Doll's House*. The Floating Press
- La Monda, C L. (1995). *Machiavellian Villains: Evil eloquence in Shakespeare's Richard III, Macbeth and Othello*. (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). California: University of Southern
- Larsen, C. (1932). *Psychological Analysis of Certain Dramas Written by Henrik Ibsen*.(Unpublished MA Thesis). University of Southern California

Leverton, T. (2015). Back to Basics: Abrahamse and Meyer's digestible Othello.

Shakespeare in southern Africa. Vol. 27, p47-52.

Matuska, A. (2003). *An Ontological Transgression*. Vol 9, p 46-64, Anachronist

McCloskey, J C. (1941). *The Motivation of Iago*. 3(1) p25-30, Neural Council of Teachers

of English

Mott, B M. (1983). *Iago: Reassessment of a Villain: A character study of Iago from*

Shakespeare's Othello. (Unpublished MA Thesis). Gonzaga University.

O'Neal, P. (2000). *Social Bigotry: The motivation of Iago*. (Unpublished MA Thesis). The

University of Houston Clear Lake

Oscar, G and others. (2015). *The Essential Theatre* (11th edition). Canada

Raatzsch, R. (2009). *The Apologetics of Evil: The case of Iago*, United Kingdom:

Princeton University Press

Relly, C. and Wren, W. (2003). *Nelson Thornes Framework English:2, Nelson Thornes*

United Kingdom: Ltd Delta Place.

Rush, D. (2005). *A Student Guide to Play Analysis*. United States of America: Sothern

Illinois University press/Carbondale.

Shakespeare, W. (2005). *Othello*. Yale University Press

Sharma, R. (2012). *Ready Reference Treatise: A Doll's House*, ISBN: 978-1-300-36960-9

Siddall, S H. (2008). *Humanities Insights: Henrik Ibsen: A doll's house humanities-*
ebooks, LLP

Sisk, J p. (1975). The Promise of Dirty Words. *American scholar*. 44(3), p385.

Solimene, Ph and Algiere, L. (2002). *William Shakespeare Othello Level 5*.(Eds) New
York: EDCON Publishing Group.

Ungar, G W. (2008). *Ancient, Vicious, Luscious: Secrecy and confession in Western
Drama*. (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). Irvine: University of California.

Wedes, J B. (2008). *Iago and Marranism "An essence that's not seen"*. (Unpublished MA
Thesis). The University of Houston Clear Lake.

Wellek, R and Warren, A. (1956). *Theory of Literature*. Retrieved on May 2016 from
<http://readingnow.debbiejlee.com/wellek.pdf>

Wood, Sam. (2009). Where Iago Lies: home, honesty and the Turk in Othello. *Early
modern literary studies*.14(3), p12.

Wolfe, J B. (2013). *Creating the Role of Iago: An analysis of the pre-rehearsal process*.
(Unpublished MA Thesis). University of North Dakota.

Yates, S. (1981). *Iago and Satan: Personal and purpose*. (Unpublished M.A Thesis). The

University of Texas At El Paso

Zender, K F. (1994). The Humiliation of Iago. *Studies in English Literature (Rice)*.34(2), p

323.

Zmijewska-Emerson, H K. (1996). *The Construction of Social Imagery in Pillars of*

Society, A Doll House and Ghosts: A study of the roots of Ibsen's modernity.

(Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). University of Minnesota.