

At the Edge of the Modern, or Why is Prospero Shakespeare's Greatest Creation?

William L. Benzon
708 Jersey Ave. Apt 2A
Jersey City, NJ 07302

ABSTRACT

The plots in three of Shakespeare's plays are launched by the same device: the protagonist mistakenly believes that his beloved has betrayed him. One of these plays is a comedy, *Much Ado About Nothing*, one a tragedy, *Othello*, and one a romance, *The Winter's Tale*. Shakespeare thus considered this one problematic situation, which has to do with a male difficulty in accepting one's beloved as both a sexual and a nurturing person, at three times in his life and produced different kinds of plays. By looking at his career through modern studies of adult development, we can see that the shift from one genre to another follows the reorganization of Shakespeare's psyche. The ultimate fruit of that development is Shakespeare's final play, *The Tempest*, whose protagonist, Prospero, has managed to integrate those aspects of himself which had been in conflict in earlier plays. If we then place Shakespeare's career in a broader psycho-historical context we can see how he helped make the modern nuclear family psychologically possible.

The answer to the title question can be simply stated: Because Prospero is both mother and father to Miranda. As such, his actions are guided by both a male ethic of rights (and revenge) and individual autonomy and a female ethic of responsibility and relatedness - to use concepts from Carol Gilligan's *In a Different Voice* (1982). Prospero is Shakespeare's embodiment of human wholeness. That it is a male embodiment needs to be noted. But that is secondary to the fact that it is an embodiment which transcends the distinctions between masculinity and femininity which, early in his career, had Shakespeare realizing masculine values in histories and feminine values in comedies. Then he turned to tragedies, in which corrupted relations between men and women clothe a struggle to integrate masculine and feminine. With the romances Shakespeare found a dramatic form in which he could integrate the two, and within that form he created Prospero. And, this final creation was not only a personal triumph for Shakespeare, it is also his major contribution to our culture.

The rest of this essay explicates and justifies that first paragraph. The thesis is large and so this essay is only exploratory and speculative, covering a broad evidentiary base in a highly selective way. At the center of my argument is a comparative analysis of three plays, which I will sometimes refer to as the Triad, *Much Ado About Nothing*, a comedy, *Othello*, a tragedy, and *The Winter's Tale*, a romance.¹ As I will argue, these plays are centered on the same problematic, male ambivalence about women as both love objects and sex objects. Hence, Shakespeare has given us the equivalent of a scientific experiment. He has, in logical effect, held the theme constant while varying

the genre. Our analytical task is to see just how he configured his characters and situations, how he structured the donnee, to adapt his theme to three different genres. It turns out that there is a strong pattern as we move from one donnee to the next. That strong pattern bears the major burden of my argument. Since my argument concerns the relationship between Shakespeare's choice of genre and his psychological development, that strong pattern is very important. It covers three of the four dramatic genres Shakespeare employed and it is the only place in the canon where we have three different treatments of the same subject.² The insight we can obtain from this analysis is thus unique.

The rest of my analysis is deployed about this core. My aim is not to prove that my thesis is true but only to prove that it is significant enough to be worth the effort required to establish its truth, or, as might turn out, its falsity.

A Playwright and His Characters

I want to assume that we can talk about Shakespeare's psyche before talking about his plays. Since the only good evidence we have on the nature of Shakespeare's psyche comes from his plays, my strategy is but a rhetorical pretence.

The purpose of this section is to show that this strategy is not *mere* rhetoric. There is a reason for proceeding in this way. Nothing is so banal as the observation that Shakespeare's characters, and anyone else's, are not real people. They are fictions. But it has been impossible deeply to base critical strategy on this insight, primarily because we have no critical language in which to discuss characters which is not eclipsed, in descriptive and explanatory power, by the languages we have for discussing people. I am in no position to remedy that situation. If, however, I cannot convincingly sustain discussion about Shakespeare's characters as only imaginative creations, at least I can begin by talking of Shakespeare as a man, thereby creating a context in which his characters can be seen as creatures of his heart and mind.

The effect of this orientation can best be grasped by considering the final words of Coppélia Kahn's study (1981: 225):

At the cost of great suffering, Leontes wins the fullest acceptance of woman, and *The Winter's Tale* presents the richest vision of male identity defined within the family. Leontes is both, and equally, husband and father. Significantly, though, the family romance concludes with *The Tempest*, in which woman is most strongly repressed. Prospero's identity is based entirely on his role as father, and his family is never united or complete.

This is all true, but *The Tempest* does not represent the step back which Kahn's analysis implies. Or rather, it does so only if we think in terms of the world Shakespeare depicts rather than in terms of the mind, Shakespeare's, out of which the plays have grown.

As David Sundelson (1980) has argued, Prospero is androgynous. Many of his actions and motivations are, in Shakespeare's cultural code and in ours too, feminine. The absence of women in *The Tempest* only serves to emphasize that point. Women, other than Miranda, who functions more as a child than as a woman, don't exist in the play because Shakespeare no longer needs them to carry, preserve, and defend feminine values. He has a male protagonist who can do that.

Prospero is a reflection of the fact that, by this time in his life, Shakespeare had, within himself, significantly transcended the division of experience into male and female. He had, at last, become comfortable with feminine aspects of himself. Prospero is thus a stronger statement of the possibilities of male identity than is Leontes. Leontes did not actively bring about the reconciliation which happened at the end of his play. But Prospero's play is devoted entirely to his actions leading to reconciliation. *The Tempest* is thus not a final valorization of masculinity, but a statement of just how deeply a male can integrate both femininity and masculinity into his character. Prospero has done so more deeply than Leontes, but the situation appears, paradoxically, just the opposite.

Yet it couldn't be any other way. Shakespeare was a man. As such he could directly know only what it is for a male to incorporate the feminine into his Self. He could not know what it is to be a woman entirely within a feminine sphere, or what it takes for a woman to incorporate the masculine into her Self. Thus there is no woman in Shakespeare whose feminine actions, attitudes, and aspirations are comparable to those of Virginia Woolfe's Mrs. Ramsay, nor is there any woman whose incorporation of masculinity is comparable to Lily Briscoe's. Those women could only have been created by a woman, someone who directly knows those attitudes and stations of the heart.

Shakespeare's dramatic career reflects development in a male life cycle. We know that female development follows a distinctly different course (Miller 1976, Gilligan 1982). The strength of Shakespeare's work, and most of its cultural importance, comes from his ability to articulate feminine values and, ultimately, to incorporate them into himself. Shakespeare's only female contemporary of equivalent power and impact was, of course, Queen Elizabeth. But she left us no literary works through which we could see her development, or, more importantly, in which subsequent women could see models for themselves. Her legacy was a nation-state, England.

Masculine, Feminine, and Shakespeare's Development

Before considering Shakespeare's development I wish briefly to consider masculinity and femininity in relationship to behavioral mode. Marilyn French (1981) has provided the most extensive account of the masculine and the feminine in Shakespeare and sees this polarity as a mediated form of a nature (feminine) culture (masculine) polarity. For French (p. 21) the masculine principle "is the pole of power-in-the-world. It is associated with prowess and ownership, with physical courage, assertiveness, authority, independence, and the right, rights, and legitimacy." The feminine principle is split in two, which French terms inlaw and outlaw. The inlaw feminine principle is centered on maternity and "includes qualities like nutritiveness, compassion, mercy, and the ability to create felicity . . . It exalts the community above the individual, feeling over action. . ." (p. 24). This aspect of the feminine principle is inlaw because its virtues are generally subordinated to male virtues, as for example, mercy (feminine) to justice (masculine), thereby legitimizing it. The outlaw feminine aspect of the feminine is centered ultimately on sexuality, which is deeply problematic precisely because it is always subversive of control - the goal of the masculine principle. Masculine sexuality is, of course, no more controllable than feminine sexuality; but the cultural politics of gender has projected the responsibility for uncontrollable sexuality onto women.

This partitioning of human capacity along gender lines can usefully be related to Warren McCulloch's (Kilmer, McCulloch, and Blum 1968) concept of behavioral mode. McCulloch observed that an animal must always be in one of a relatively small number (under a hundred) of distinct behavioral modes, such as eating, exploring, courting, fighting, nursing, sleeping, etc. A structure deep in the core of the brain, called the reticular formation, makes a global assessment of the animal's inner and outer environments, decides on an appropriate mode, and then commits the animal to that mode. The division of experience along gender lines can thus be seen as assigning some modes higher priority for females, such as feeding the young, while other modes have higher priority for males, such as fighting. The important concept of androgyny (Heilbrun 1973) asserts that all modes are available to members of both sexes and the gender specialization of modes owes as much, if not more, to culture as to biology. The assertion that Shakespeare, in his life and in his plays, moved toward a reconciliation of the masculine and the feminine then means that, not only did he come increasingly to value the feminine modes, but that he became more comfortable enacting them himself, that he revised the boundaries of his own gender identity. Of course we have very little evidence of what Shakespeare was like as a man but, as I will argue more extensively later, on the assumption that the protagonist of a play most clearly embodies the capacities of the playwright's ego, we can speculate that this is, in fact, what happened.

In considering Shakespeare's development, we have a wealth of recent work to draw from. A number of psychoanalytically inclined critics have produced readings of Shakespeare's plays which are convergent enough to suggest, in broad outline, the general structure of Shakespeare's psychological development in adulthood (Barber 1980, Fineman 1980, Kahn 1981, Schwartz 1973, 1975, 1980, Sundelson 1980, Wheeler 1981; see also Boose 1982, and French 1981, which are not particularly psychoanalytic but which deal with themes particularly close to the psychoanalytic readings). The picture of Shakespeare's adult development which emerges from this work goes, to simplify matters a great deal, like this: During the first decade of his career Shakespeare concentrated on two genres, comedy and history. The world of the histories is predominantly male, and is concerned with sons, fathers, and the state. In this context a male achieves an adult identity by succeeding to his father's role in the state. The world of the comedies, however, serves the feminine principle. There are many strong and vibrant women in the comedies and the relations between men and women are clearly central. After all, the comedies do lead to marriage and to a celebration of community. Thus it seems that Shakespeare uses these two genres to give priority to different aspects of himself, a masculine and a feminine aspect. While the feminine is never completely excluded from the histories, nor the masculine from the comedies, it is clear that the two genres are ultimately regulated by one principle or the other, not both.

In the tragedies the masculine and the feminine clash violently. For, whatever else is going on, the tragedies involve corrupted relationships between men and women - Hamlet cannot deal with either his mother or Ophelia, Lear turns against his daughters, Othello cannot trust Desdemona, Macbeth feels unmanned by his wife. What Shakespeare had previously been keeping separated in himself he is now attempting to connect, with conflict and destruction being the initial fruits of this conjunction. The

outlaw aspect of feminity is particularly problematic in the tragedies - Hamlet cannot face up to his mother's sexuality, nor to Ophelia's, Othello is appalled at Desdemona's, Lear's wayward daughters, Goneril and Regan, end up opposed to one another over rights to Edmund's sexual favors, and Lady Macbeth is very explicitly asexual, as the couple is explicitly without child (in contrast both to Banquo and Macduff). As for *Antony and Cleopatra*, it is Antony's obvious pleasure in and acceptance of Cleopatra's sexuality which makes him so enigmatic to his fellow Romans. But, in all cases, the disgust extends from outlaw feminity to inlaw femininity (French 1981), almost as though, in attempting to see women whole, Shakespeare is so disturbed over sexuality that he has to reject women, whole.

The confluence of masculine and feminine finally bears fruit in the romances. The corrupted relationships between men and women are still there, and the corruption is sexual - Antiochus's incest, Cymbeline's paternal tyranny, Leontes's paranoid jealousy - but the destructive consequences of this corruption are not final. The romances end in new and renewed marriages. Except for *The Tempest* the romances seem, in form, to be tragedies concluded by comedies. This is most strongly the case for *The Winter's Tale* - and the tragic past is certainly there in *The Tempest*, but it hasn't been made part of the form. As a dramatic form, Shakespearean romance gives scope to both the masculine and the feminine, without subordinating one to the other.

This account of Shakespeare's development is consonant with the account of adult male development developed by Daniel J. Levinson and his colleagues (1978). Their basic theoretical construct is that of the life structure, the disposition of one's psychological investments in the world, with occupation and marriage/family being the central arenas in which the life structure is realized. Adult male development moves through alternating phases of stable and transitional periods. The life structure changes during the transitional periods while a given life structure is elaborated in stable periods. A second major theoretical construct centers on polarities: young/old, destruction/creation, attachment/separateness, masculine/feminine. Just where and how these polarities are lodged in the psyche is not clear; but the major task of the midlife transition (generally in the early forties) is to break down these polarities.

If we read Shakespeare's career against Levinson's description then we can guess that the tragedies reflect Shakespeare's midlife transition. In the first phase of his career his masculine side found expression in the histories while his feminine side lived through the comedies. As he moved into his late thirties and early forties the masculine/feminine polarity begins to break down, and the initial stress of this shows in the tragedies. The chronology is about right. Shakespeare was born in 1564 and the major tragedies started appearing in 1604 (*Hamlet* is the exception, appearing about 1600), putting Shakespeare in his early forties while writing them. What, then, of his early career?

Levinson notes that while most men have gotten married and chosen an occupation by their early twenties, this early adult life structure is tentative and is revised during the late twenties and early thirties. During this transition a man makes the occupational choice which will carry him through his thirties. Shakespeare's plays start showing up during his late twenties, suggesting that the decision to become a playwright reflects a revision of an earlier occupational choice (on which we have no conclusive evidence). For the first four or five years Shakespeare was learning his

craft. In Levinson's terms, the first five years or so of Shakespeare's dramatic career are a transitional period in his life while the next five years, in which he writes the major comedies and the *Henriad*, are a stable period, one in which Shakespeare is building on the life structure created earlier. At the end of this period comes another transition, the one which finds its language in the tragedies.

Now, Levinson and his colleagues had a great deal of information about the lives of their subjects. We know almost nothing about Shakespeare's life. The only useful evidence we have on his psychic life comes from his plays. What little else we know, about his family, his business dealings, tells us little about his psyche. But, if the psychoanalytic approach to literature is at all valid, then the plays contain the very best evidence we could want about Shakespeare's psyche. If only we can read it, if only. I am arguing that Shakespeare's generic preference *is caused by*, in Levinson's terms, his life structure. Or, perhaps a better formulation, Shakespeare appropriated the formal capacities of dramatic genres to the requirements of his life structure.

To get a start on figuring out how Shakespeare did this we can turn to the Triad: *Much Ado About Nothing*, *Othello*, and *The Winter's Tale*. The action in these plays hinges on one situation - a man mistakenly believes that the woman he loves has been unfaithful to him. On the assumption that each play has the same psychosocial issue at its core, hence the same motivating incident in the plot, an examination of the differences between them should give us clues about Shakespeare's evolving character structure.

The Pattern: Paradigmatic and Syntagmatic Structure of the *donnee*

Let us begin with the comedy. *Much Ado about Nothing* has two linked plots. One of them is about Beatrice and Benedick, but this isn't the plot which gives the play its overall shape, hence I won't be discussing it. In the other plot, Claudio is deceived into thinking that his betrothed, Hero, has been unfaithful. The deception is cleared up and the couple reunited, but not before Claudio has denounced Hero in such a forceful way that she faints - many think she is dead. Othello's deception about Desdemona occurs after he has married her but before they have consummated their marriage. Desdemona's death, unlike Hero's, is real. Finally, in *The Winter's Tale*, the marriage between Leontes and Hermione has existed for some time before the deception occurs; they have one son, Mamillus, and another child is expected. Here the accusation results, indirectly, in the death of the son (*The Winter's Tale* 3.2.144-145), and Hermione is presumed dead by all except Paulina. This contretemps isn't straightened out until the second child, Perdita (who has been presumed dead) is ready to marry. What we see then is that, as the disruption moves deeper into the sequence of betrothal, consummation, and childbirth, which defines the course of marriage, we move from comedy, to tragedy, to romance.

Further, as the couple moves deeper into this sequence, their relationship becomes closer, more of their lives have been shared. The betrothed couple barely know one another and they aren't subject to any binding contract; the betrothal can be broken. The married couple have made a commitment, one which will become unbreakable when consummated (cf. Lever 1965: liv - lv). The couple with children have shared considerable portions of their lives (at least seven years, for Mamillus is six) and have a

shared commitment to their children. With this in mind as background, we can observe that as we move from the comedy to the tragedy to the romance, the general configuration of characters we have at the opening of each play is closer, more intimately involved with one another.

We have already briefly considered the relationship between the protagonist and his beloved. Let us consider as well the protagonist's mentor, the deceiver, and the beloved's presumed paramour - how intimately are they related to the protagonist? Consider Table 1:

	<i>Much Ado</i>	<i>Othello</i>	<i>Winter's Tale</i>
Protagonist	Claudio	Othello	Leontes
Mentor	Don Pedro	_____	_____
Deceiver	Don John	Iago	_____
Paramour	Borachio	Cassio	Polixenes
Beloved	Hero	Desdemona	Hermione

Table 1: Initial Configuration of Characters

In the first place, note that neither Othello nor Leontes has a mentor comparable to Claudio's Don Pedro. Don Pedro talked with Hero's father, Leonato, and arranged the marriage. Othello obviously arranged his own marriage to Desdemona, whose father didn't even know about the marriage. Othello has thus absorbed the mentor's function. We know nothing about how Leontes managed his marriage to Hermione, but he doesn't have anyone associated with him who could be called his mentor. Further, there is no deceiver in *The Winter's Tale* comparable to Don John or Iago. Leontes deceives himself; he has thus absorbed the function of deceiver into himself. Iago, Othello's deceiver, is closer to Othello than Don John is to Claudio. And, finally, among the presumed paramours, Cassio is closer to Othello than Borachio is to Claudio. And Polixenes and Leontes have known one another since boyhood; they are so closely identified ("We were as twinn'd lambs that did frisk i' th' sun" 1.2.67) that we can consider them doubles.

Thus relationships between key characters and the protagonist become more intimate as we move from the comedy to the tragedy to the romance and some characters, mentor and deceiver, seem to disappear, their functions being absorbed into the protagonist. Finally, note that the protagonist becomes more powerful as we move through the sequence of plays. Claudio is a youth just beginning to make his way in the world. Othello is a mature man, a seasoned general at the height of his career; but there are men who have authority over him. Leontes is king (and father); there is no mundane authority higher than his. Perhaps this increase in power is correlated with the absorption of functions into the protagonist. The absorption of functions increases the behavioral range of the protagonist - the modes he can enact. And this increased range is symbolized by higher social status.

These two structural features, the relationships between the characters at the beginning of the play, and the point in the marriage sequence at which the play begins, constitute the *donnee* of the play. What is so remarkable is that the *donnee* changes in a

consistent way as we move through the Triad *in temporal order*. When we move from the first to the second play, and then from the second to the third:

- the protagonist absorbs the functions of one of his "satellites" into himself,
- the protagonist moves up in the world,
- the relationships between the characters become closer, and
- the disruption moves deeper into the marriage sequence.

This correlation between the structure of the donnee and the order of the plays suggests that the donnee, and hence the genre, reflects a developmental pattern. What we are seeing is the way in which Shakespeare's character structure is manifested in dramatic structure. Changes in one give us clues to changes in the other.

Let us assume that the process by which a playwright creates characters out of himself, and the process by which playgoers and readers recreate the characters within themselves, is a controlled splitting, in contrast to the uncontrolled splitting of people with multiple personalities (Thigpen and Cleckley 1957, Shreiber 1973). Various components of the Self, including behavioral modes, are identified with various characters. In this process the protagonist is a central embodiment of the ego; that is, the protagonist's range of actions and perceptions corresponds to the range of actions the playwright is comfortable with in ordinary life. If we now reflect this assumption back through our three plays we are led to the conclusion that the general direction of Shakespeare's development is toward deeper acceptance and awareness of himself even as his protagonists become more and more deranged.

Leontes is clearly paranoid, and Othello only slightly less so. Claudio seems to be reasonably healthy, bland but sane. But Claudio is attended by a mentor and a deceiver, while Othello is attended only by a deceiver; Leontes stands alone. The mentor and deceiver figures embody aspects of his Self which Shakespeare could not assimilate to his ego during his thirties; as he moved into his forties partial assimilation became possible while only in the romances was full assimilation possible. The absorption of functions into his protagonists is the dramatic reflection of this development.

Further, let's reflect on the fact that comic protagonists are junior in their worlds, while tragic and romantic protagonists are not. Comic protagonists live in a world whose integrity is ultimately guaranteed by more powerful and older adults. This is certainly true of *Much Ado*. The felicitous conclusion of that play depends on bonds forged by and between Don Pedro and Leonato. Don Pedro engineers the betrothal of Claudio and Hero, and of Beatrice and Benedick too. Leonato forces Claudio to marry his brother's daughter, who is, of course, Hero in disguise. Powerful elders play similar roles in other comedies as well, certainly in *A Midsummer's Night's Dream*, *A Merchant of Venice*, and *As You Like It*. Whatever role elders play in blocking the marriage of the youngsters, the role emphasized in Northrup Frye's (1965) discussion, they also ratify the framework in which the marriage will take place.

Twelfth Night is more problematic on this account. In a sense, the most powerful elders are the dead fathers of Olivia and Viola; the sea captain, Antonio, plays a minor, but not quite dispensable role - he brings Sebastian to Illyria and he saves Viola (as Cesario) from a duel. As for Sir Toby Belch and Sir Andrew Aguecheek, they are older, but also less powerful. And they ratify nothing. However, *Twelfth Night* is one of Shakespeare's last comedies, written just before he moved through the problem

comedies to his major tragedies. In the tragedies his protagonists are at, or near, the pinnacle of power. I am thus suggesting that by the time Shakespeare had written *Twelfth Night* he had come to the end of one stage of his development and was ready to embark on the next, more problematic, stage. And we can see this in the almost complete absence of elder figures to guarantee social structure. Olivia and Orsino may have been relatively young, but they were rulers, not vassals.

Reflecting this back onto Shakespeare's character, what seems to be going on is that he is moving from a character structure which depends on more authoritative others to guarantee the integrity of his world to a character structure in which he will do that himself. He has been an adult for ten or fifteen years, but only now is he freeing himself from the last vestiges of a child's psychological dependence on adults. I am thus suggesting that the elders which are so important in the comedies are adult, even parental, imagos. As Shakespeare moves to the tragedies he gives up those imagos, or, more interestingly, he becomes or absorbs them.

A navigational analogy is useful here. The North Star is a useful guide only to those who are far away from it. To those who live on it, it is the uncharted sea. While Shakespeare was young, he lived, psychologically, far from the North Star - the elders who guarantee the integrity of his comic world (they also guarantee the integrity of the histories). As he reached middle age he moved close to his North Star, until he got there and, in his tragedies, showed us the uncharted sea.

I don't see that any of this is particularly remarkable. It is quite consistent with Levinson's (1978) account of male development. Immediately preceding the midlife transition (that is, "midlife crisis") is a period in which the major developmental task is "Becoming One's Own Man" in which the "urgency of the desires for manhood, however, bring about a resurgence of the *little boy* in the adult" (146) thus

When severe conflicts and difficulties occur at this time, they must be seen both as a renewal of pre-adult problems and as a reflection of the developmental work of becoming more fully adult. The overthrow of the mentor is not just an irrational re-enactment of boyish Oedipal revolt. Even more, it is part of the developmental process by which a young man becomes an adult and mentor."(148)

Shakespeare is simply undergoing a typical pattern of adult development. Part of this process, according to Levinson, is a lessening of the polarity between masculinity and femininity. And that gives us another clue about what is going on.

The general psychoanalytic view of development (for example, in Erikson 1950, 1982) suggests that the psyche is arranged in layers. The deepest layers mature first and then are overlaid by more sophisticated structures. If conflicts become embodied in deeper layers, then they will be transmitted though later more superficial layers. If the conflicts are debilitating enough it becomes necessary to bring the deeper layers to consciousness so that they can be reworked - that is the job of psychoanalytic therapy. I'm suggesting that adult development involves a reworking of earlier layers, not necessarily because of any pathology, but simply in the interests of greater integration. Thus the polarity of masculine/feminine which Levinson finds in force up through the thirties is embodied in a relatively deep layer of the psyche. The attenuation of that polarity in the early forties suggests an awareness of and a reworking of the layer in which that polarity is embedded.

But we can do better than this. There is evidence that male and female infants are behaviorally different at birth (Money and Ehrhardt 1972). Quite independently of that, they are certainly treated differently. However, the difference between male and female is not cognitively stable to children themselves until they are about five years old (Money and Ehrhardt 1972). Before that children don't think of sex categories as stable and exclusive attributes of people. The very young girl doesn't know that she will grow up to be a woman and not a man. But, by the time she is five, she comes to know that, as the boy comes to know that he will grow up to be a man. This is, of course, the age at which, in psychoanalytic theory, children enter the Oedipal phase. Thus I want to suggest that, in order to restructure his personality in a way which integrates feminine attitudes and values more deeply into his psyche, Shakespeare had to restructure himself from the Oedipal level on up. He had to revise the conceptions of male and female roles which he had adopted by the age of five.

The plunge into tragedy reflects a reworking of the psyche. Material which had been inaccessible before now comes forth - and is experienced as threatening. Material which in the comedies had been split between two characters, the protagonist and the mentor, can now be absorbed into the protagonist. And, as the reworking proceeds, material which had been split off into the deceiver can be absorbed into the protagonist of the romance. As Shakespeare grows, he can acknowledge deeper conflicts within himself and therefore gives us more deeply divided, and more deeply satisfying, protagonists.

Before the "tragic transition" (that is, the midlife transition) a man lives in a world run by older and more powerful adults. The tragic transition is a transition to a life structure in which one no longer invests primary responsibility for the world in the older generation. One is on the way to becoming the older generation, to accepting primary responsibility oneself. And so we see Shakespeare's protagonists growing older and more powerful; they cannot assume that, if they get into trouble, someone older, wiser, and more powerful will get them out. Negotiating the transition requires a deep restructuring of the psyche. Finally, once the tragic transition has been made, it is possible to care for other (younger) adults (Levinson 1978), to move on to Eriksonian generativity, which takes us to the world of the romances, where mature adults actively work to insure that there is a younger generation committed to marriage and to the adult life cycle.

This is as far as we can go without considering the nature of the psychological conflict which animates our three plays, which will take us more deeply into the issue of masculinity and femininity in Shakespeare's character.

Jealousy and Male Ambivalence

In a detailed psychoanalytic reading of *The Winter's Tale*, Murray Schwartz (1973, 1975) argued that Leontes's jealousy is caused by a deep ambivalence about the nature of women, that they can be both objects of sexual desire and of love, that, in Marilyn French's terms, the feminine embodies both an inlaw and an outlaw aspect. This ambivalence is thus not unique to Shakespeare; Freud also knew it well (1910, 1912). However, this split is the central focus of *The Winter's Tale*, rather than being just a prominent aspect of the play; and, I will argue, it is also central to *Much Ado About*

Nothing, and Othello.

In discussing this ambivalence I want to bring in some work in ethology and ethologically influenced psychoanalytic theory. The basic idea is that primates have several different affectional systems, behavioral systems organizing affiliative interaction with others (Harlow and Harlow 1970, Bowlby 1969: 232). These are different behavioral modes, in McCulloch's sense. One of these systems is an infant-mother system, which John Bowlby calls attachment (Bowlby 1969, 1973, 1980; Rajecki, Lamb, and Obermascher 1978; Parkes and Stevenson-Hinde 1982); another distinctly different system is for heterosexual mating. In contrast to the classical psychoanalytic view, these two types of relationship are not seen as reflecting the presence of one, essentially sexual, libido system. Attachment to parents involves one behavioral mode, attraction to a sexual partner involves another.

Marriage, as we understand it, and as Shakespeare was coming to understand it, requires that one's spouse be assimilated to both of these systems. Male ambivalence about women can thus be seen in terms of the difficulty of assimilating one woman into both systems. Robin Fox (1983) argues that incest avoidance reflects a conflict between attachment (though that isn't his term) and sexuality. The work of J. Shepherd (1971) is crucial in Fox's argument. Shepherd investigated marriage patterns among people raised (communally) on a kibbutz. Shepherd found no marriages, or sexual affairs, between people who had been raised together before the age of five. It was not that they were attracted, but for some reason restrained themselves. They just weren't interested in having any sort of sexual relations with the people with whom they were raised. Very few of these people, of course, would have been blood relatives, so that doesn't seem to be the issue. Rather, as Tiger and Fox (1971: 116) have said, it seems that "One good bond seems to inhibit another." That is, once a person is strongly assimilated to one behavioral mode they cannot be assimilated to another. Having formed one sort of bond with their age-mates, one which would be a secondary attachment in Bowlby's terms, the children of the kibbutz cannot break the attachment bond and institute a sexual bond in adolescence and adulthood. It would seem that attachment behavior is mediated by one system and sexual behavior by another and that a given individual cannot be a suitable object for both systems. It must be one or the other.

In this view, avoiding incest is simply a matter of not making sexual advances to someone with whom an attachment relationship was established before the age of five. But, if marriage requires attachment to one's spouse, and the attachment bond inhibits sexual approach, how can marriage possibly work? One answer is that quite often marriage doesn't work - adultery seems to be universal (Tiger and Fox 1971: 117). And Shakespeare's protagonists in the three plays we're considering are deeply ambivalent. They split their sexuality from themselves and project it onto a double, the paramour, and two of them, Claudio and Othello, are helped in this by a deceiver. They then become jealous of the double in a hopeless dialectic which allows them to deal with a sexuality which is theirs, and to see their love objects as objects of sexual desire, without having to acknowledge that sexuality. In these plays Shakespeare thus deals with a split conception of women, not by having one male make sexual advances in one direction and seek love in another, but by splitting one male into several, each focused on the same woman.

permit Desdemona to accompany him, he asserts that he wants her with him

not

To please the palate of my appetite,
Nor to comply with heat - the young affects
In me defunct - and proper satisfaction;
But to be free and bounteous to her mind.

(1.3. 256-260)

Nor should we forget the handkerchief which becomes the ocular proof that Othello demands of Desdemona's infidelity. It was given to his mother as a charm to insure her husband's fidelity. She, in turn, gave it to Othello as she was dying "And bid me, when my fate would have me wived, /To give it her" (3.4. 64 - 65). Desdemona is thus clearly identified with his mother. His conscious relationship with her is mediated by the attachment system.

Thus each of these plays has a male protagonist who is caught in a conflict between attachment and sexuality. Each is attached to a woman which whom marriage obligates him to have sexual relations. And each deals with the problem in the same way, by projecting his sexuality onto a third party. The sexual relationship each protagonist irrationally sees - Borachio and Hero, Cassio and Desdemona, Polixenes and Hermione - is his own sexuality, denied, and projected onto an other. There is thus no mystery about why these men accuse their women on the basis of such flimsy evidence, refusing to give credence to anything those women say in their own defense. Their jealousy is a means by which they can become aware of sexuality. But it is a defective means, giving them awareness of the sexual attractiveness of their women, while denying them the knowledge and feeling that those women are sexually attractive *to them*.

This, the conflict between attachment and sexuality, is the central conflict in each of these plays. And jealousy, which drives the action, is a defense against that conflict. It is a poor defense, succeeding only in displacing the conflict from the intrapsychic realm, the protagonist's mind, to the interpersonal realm. And, it is one which, incidentally, places a masculine concern with rights above a feminine concern with relatedness, to use Gilligan's (1982) terms.

However, we are not limited to talking about these characters as though they are real people. We can also talk about them as creatures of Shakespeare's mind. In this context we are dealing with a temporary splitting of the Self into an ego-syntonic protagonist, a double (the paramour) and, depending on the genre, a mentor and a deceiver. The jealousy plot then becomes Shakespeare's means of revealing what he does not consciously know. Shakespeare was ambivalent about women. That ambivalence is expressed in these three plays. As we move from comedy, to tragedy, to romance, that ambivalence is more deeply revealed, it is less mediated, less obviously defended against and hence closer to the ego. For Shakespeare's character structure has changed, he has different means of dealing with that ambivalence. And he uses different dramatic forms as instruments of perception and recognition appropriate to his character (recall Norman Holland's remarks on form as defense, 1968).

In the comedy, Claudio never himself reaches any recognition of this ambivalence. Shakespeare presents it, but it has been split among so many characters that the

protagonist doesn't himself recognize it. Thus it is necessary to have an external, and elder, agent, Don John, force Claudio into a recognition of female sexuality, and, by reflex, of his own as well. Other elders, the Friar and Leonato, save the situation and force Claudio into a marriage. The marriage is not the one Claudio thought it would be - and that too is part of the trick. Claudio is allowed to believe that Hero is dead and that he is going to marry a cousin of Hero's to atone for the wrong he did to her family. The woman he does marry is of course Hero, who, as she says "died defiled; but I do live,/ And surely as I live, I am a maid" (5.4. 63 - 64). In this way, other elders force Claudio into marriage despite his revulsion with sexuality. That is, despite the fact that Claudio apprehends the feminine only as split into the inlaw and outlaw aspects, and is himself split by that apprehension, he is forced into marriage. While the elders who bring this about are male, they are serving the inlaw feminine principle, with its emphasis on human relatedness and compromise (see also Everett, 1970, on the feminine in *Much Ado*).

In the tragedy, Othello does reach a final recognition of his complicity in the calumny of Desdemona. The speech is well-known:

When you shall these unlucky deeds relate,
Speak of me as I am. Nothing extenuate,
Nor set down aught in malice. Then must you speak
Of one that loved not wisely, but too well;
Of one not easily jealous, but, being wrought,
Perplexed in the extreme; of one whose hand,
Like the base Judean, threw a pearl away
Richer than all his tribe.

(5.2. 337 - 344)

Again, reading the protagonist, Othello, as the chief representative of Shakespeare's ego, we see an ego which can be brought just to a recognition of repressed elements of the psyche but which cannot adjudicate between those forces. Othello could not see that Desdemona is a repetition of his mother, nor could he acknowledge his own sexual desire. But he could see that the destruction which resulted from this conflict was destruction for which he, and not Desdemona, was responsible. Through Othello we come to see that the split between the inlaw and the outlaw feminine principles is not a split in woman's nature, but a split in male apprehension of that nature.

Finally we have *The Winter's Tale*, in which Leontes is able to survive his recognition of his own destructiveness and to take pleasure in giving his daughter in marriage. This pleasure reflects the acceptance of the inlaw feminine principle within himself - he comes to nurture and to reconcile. But, beyond the brief allusion to incest, outlaw sexuality is present in the last half of *The Winter's Tale* only so far as it is implicit in the relationship between Perdita and Florizel, which Leontes accepts, especially as it is a means of becoming reconciled with his old friend, Polixines.

Thus, in tragedies Shakespeare begins to gain explicit control over the split image of women, over the difference between the inlaw and outlaw feminine principles. As he moves toward acceptance of the fact that one woman is both mother and sexual partner, both an object of love and of sexual desire, woman becomes ambiguous - and so does self. Tragic destructiveness is thus an attempt to resolve this ambiguity simply

by destroying it (see also Wheeler 1981). Once Shakespeare has gained control over the difference between the outlaw and inlaw aspects of the feminine he is able, in the romances, to assimilate the inlaw feminine to his (male) ego. Outlaw femininity is still beyond the pale, but finally, in Prospero, through Caliban, Shakespeare realizes that it is sexuality as such, and the body, which he finds disgusting, beyond control. He ceases to project that onto women. That recognition, that it is sexuality as such which is problematic, and not just female sexuality, is as close as Shakespeare is able to come to psychic integration.

Prospero, and Integration

Prospero spent over a decade on the island with Miranda, his daughter, Ariel, and Caliban, his servants/agents. He ended up on the island because his brother Antonio had usurped his dukedom. And that was in turn possible because Prospero had retreated into his study, leaving governance to his brother - much as Lear wanted to retain the title and honor of king, but leave the responsibility of rule to his daughters. This is a contradictory move. On the one hand it is consonant with a masculine ethic which stresses individuation and autonomy (Gilligan 1982). But it is also a denial of power. Prospero's abdication of that aspect of the masculine role costs him his kingdom, and almost his life. And the fact that he retreated from masculine power to study magic, which is, as Marilyn French has pointed out, clearly a feminine discipline, compounds his distance from the traditional masculine role. Prospero is androgynous.

Most importantly, Prospero has served as mother to Miranda, as well as father. When they were floating at sea Miranda "wast that did preserve me! Thou didst smile,/ Infused with a fortitude from heaven" (1.2.153 - 154). He tells her that "I have done nothing but in care of thee" (1.2.16). Prospero certainly isn't the only Shakespearean father with a strong emotional investment in his daughter (cf. Boose 1982), but the quality of that investment is different, it isn't so entangled with the masculine requirements of honor and power as is the very strong investment of, for example, Capulet, Brabantio, or Lear. The way in which Prospero actively works to bring about Miranda's marriage distinguishes him from other Shakespearean fathers. He puts his daughter's need for a husband above his need for her. In this he displays a generosity of spirit which is fundamentally feminine. In order to understand just what, in Shakespeare's world, this entails, we can return to *Othello*, to the scene where Othello and Desdemona are justifying their marriage before Brabantio and the Duke of Venice. Desdemona is speaking:

. . . But here's my husband,
And so much duty as my mother showed
To you, preferring you before her father,
So much I challenge that I may profess
Due to the Moor my lord.

(1.3.183-186)

While Prospero is ambivalent about giving up his daughter to Ferdinand, to a man she will prefer over him (4.1.1 - 11, 5.1.145 - 148), he overcomes this ambivalence. In giving

his daughter to Ferdinand, Prospero becomes creative through giving up rather than through controlling. Thus David Sundelson (1980: 51) is only partially right when he asserts that *The Tempest* is a "celebration of Prospero's paternal power," for much of that power stems from Prospero's internalization of feminine modes. Prospero is male, a parent, and hence paternal. But his power is feminine as well as masculine.

Further, Prospero's giving his daughter in marriage is closely linked to his reconciliation with his enemies, suggesting that Shakespeare sees these actions as two sides of the same psychological coin. Actively making amends with the men who exiled him requires the same transcendence of masculine concern with honor and power as giving his daughter to another man.

His attitude toward his enemies is not, however, unambiguous. He does exact revenge, but that revenge is precisely measured and delivered with care. He has the power to kill them - as they tried to kill him. But he doesn't. Instead, he teaches them a moral lesson. And he does so in a very interesting way. He has Ariel arrange a banquet for them (3.3). However, before they can eat, the banquet is removed and Ariel, as a harpy, recounts their past sins for them. Prospero has aroused their appetite and then fed them, not food, but their past. Laying on a banquet is, literally, nurturing; it is feminine. But it serves masculine vengeance; for the food is exchanged for conscience. Only when Alonso, Sebastian, and Antonio have been forced to accept, to absorb, their past misdeeds does Prospero forgive them. But, he does forgive, again showing a generosity of spirit in which the ends of community are served over and above his individual desire for revenge.

Next, consider Prospero's treatment of Caliban. Caliban fell from Prospero's favor after attempting to rape Miranda. During the play Caliban is part of a ludicrous plot to overthrow Prospero - which will then give him sexual access to Miranda. When the plot is finally foiled Prospero asserts of Caliban that "this thing of darkness I/Acknowledge mine" (5.1.275 - 276). In this recognition Shakespeare makes clear the element of father-daughter incest which was explicit in *Pericles*, and veiled in *The Winter's Tale*. Incestuous desire, the desire to keep Miranda for himself, exists in Prospero too, but he overcomes it.

More importantly, in acknowledging his kinship with Caliban, he acknowledges fear of his own sexuality rather than simply projecting that fear onto the women who are its object. Female sexuality is dangerous, not only because it endangers the honor of husbands - "O curse of marriage,/ That we can call these delicate creatures ours,/ And not their appetites" (*Othello* 3.3.267 - 269) - but because it calls forth male sexuality. And a man can no more control his own sexuality than he can his wife's. Masculine disgust with female sexuality is thus a man's projection of disgust with his own sexuality, and its attendant loss of control, onto women. Leontes, like Othello, like Claudio, projected his fear onto women; but Prospero doesn't do so. He acknowledges Caliban to be his.

One last detail. Prospero asserts that, when he has returned to Milan "Every third thought shall be my grave" (5.1. 312). While I have no objection to seeing resignation in these words, especially when they are coupled with Prospero's epilogue, there is perhaps more to them. If Prospero is returning home to die then he is most emphatically not returning to exercise secular power. Thus we cannot read Prospero's actions as ultimately serving masculine power. To the extent that we see resignation in Prospero we must see him as submitting to the furthest reach of the outlaw feminine

principle, for death is even further beyond control than is sexuality.

Context: Evolution of the Family

Now I want to place this analysis of Shakespeare's drama in a broader historical context. We know that major change in affective life was taking place at this time. Lewis (1936) talks of the rise of courtly love while De Rougemont (1956) traces its course and metamorphosis up to the early Twentieth Century. Aries is concerned with new conceptions of childhood (1962) and of death (1974). Most centrally for us, Lawrence Stone (1977) describes the transformation of the English family.

According to Stone the English family was, during the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries, reconstructed to accommodate affective individualism, which stressed autonomy, privacy, and long-term emotional commitment. Stone sees a three part movement, from the Open Lineage Family (1450 - 1700), to the Restricted Patriarchal Nuclear Family (1550 - 1700), and finally to the closed Domesticated Nuclear Family (1640 - 1800) - note the overlap in the dates, the evolution is gradual and affects different strata of society in different ways. My argument is that while the marital and familial conventions in Shakespeare's plays are those of the earlier family types, he is using them to work out the inner dynamics of the domesticated nuclear family, which is restricted to a couples and their children. The male integration of masculine and feminine characteristics which Shakespeare finally achieved in the late romances is suited to the domesticated nuclear family, but irrelevant for the earlier types. If we think of literary works as equipment for living (Burke 1973), providing us with ways of organizing our experience, then Shakespeare's plays provided people with ways of organizing experience which were consonant with the demands of the nuclear family, which didn't appear in any very strong way until after Shakespeare's career was over.

The play in which this affective shift is most explicitly thematized is *Romeo and Juliet* - that the story existed in many versions in Europe makes it quite clear that the conflict it captures was an important one. Romeo and Juliet are caught between their private desires for one another and the public feud between their families. Those private desires became the ideological foundation of the domesticated nuclear family, a family contracted out of the mutual affection and desire of the couple and extending only to their children. The public feud between the Montagues and the Capulets reflects the dynamics of open lineage. Mere marriage centers on the lineage; it is an alliance, political, economic, and social, between two families. In this alliance the bride is assimilated to the groom's lineage. The personal, and private, affection between Romeo and Juliet was at variance with the public conflict between their lineages. With the claims of both person and lineage being deemed valid, there was no outcome possible but stasis. A new couple is constituted, but only in a death which ends their lineages.

In this context the fact that Leontes and Prospero have daughters, not sons, is particularly significant. For only sons can continue the lineage. Thus the reconciliations which take place at the end of *The Winter's Tale* and *The Tempest* do not make sense in the ideology of the open lineage family, which is the explicit ideology of these plays. Neither Leontes nor Prospero can extend their lineages through the marriages of their daughters; those marriages only extend the lineages of their

daughters' husbands. The reconciliations do make sense, however, within the psychology of the closed domesticated nuclear family, which is focused inward on a couple and their children and not outward toward a lineage. In this context the recovery of Perdita, and the consequent unveiling of Hermione, restores Leontes to his family and Perdita's marriage insures that the values of the nuclear family will continue into the next generation. As for Prospero, he cannot be restored to his family (his wife is, presumably, dead), but Miranda's marriage, likewise, insures the perpetuation of his *values*, but not his lineage, in the next generation. For, the labors which Prospero has Ferdinand perform, the prenuptial masque he stages for Ferdinand and Miranda, and the truncated banquet he arranges for his old enemies, these are all devices for transmitting values. The transmission of values from generation to generation has thus taken precedence over the transmission of lineage solidarity. This is a modern conception of the family and its social role, not a medieval one. Thus, as I noted above, Shakespeare is using the explicit conventions of an essentially feudal world to encode stories about psychology in an essentially post-Renaissance world.

If the closed nuclear family is not an alliance between lineages, what is it? In what way is it focused inward? A passage from Milton's *Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce*, published in 1644 (see Hughes 1957: 703) is suggestive. Milton asserts that

. . . God in the first ordaining of marriage taught us to what end he did it, in words expressly implying the apt and cheerful conversation of man with woman, to comfort and refresh him against the evil of solitary life, not mentioning the purpose of generation till afterwards, as being but a secondary end in dignity.

This conception was not commonplace in Milton's time, much less Shakespeare's - recall the references to procreation which are part of the explicit ideology of marriage in Shakespeare. But we can find a similar sentiment from Shakespeare's time, in John Donne's "The Extasie." Using sexual orgasm as his vehicle, and after asserting that "Wee see by this, it was not sexe," Donne goes on to assert that

When love, with one another so
Interanimates two soules,
That abler soule, which thence doth flow,
Defects of lonelinesse controules.

Like Milton, Donne is concerned with loneliness, the evil of solitary life. That is a question of attachment, not of sexuality. Yet the fact that Donne used sexuality as his poetic vehicle suggests that what he was after was a union of sexuality and attachment.

And that, from the male side, requires a unified conception of women. No longer can women be divided into two classes, the pure and the fallen. What Shakespeare achieved in his romances was a conception of male identity which could embrace the inlaw aspects of the feminine and, with Prospero, a recognition that the outlaw aspects of the feminine are not specifically feminine at all. Sexuality is sexuality and it is beyond control in men as it is in women.

There is another, perhaps more subtle, point here. If sexuality still remains problematic, but that problematic can be acknowledged, then it seems that Shakespeare has achieved an identity which could tolerate conflict within the Self. This suggests George Vaillant's (1977) argument that, as males mature, their defensive styles shift

from relatively immature defense mechanisms to more mature mechanisms. This line of thought is also consistent with Richard Wheeler's (1981) account of the tragedies and romances. Calling on Winnicott's work (1971) he argues that much of the destruction in the tragedies belies an attempt, with respect to emotionally important others, to distinguish between projective fantasy and reality. To the extent that others survive the protagonist's aggression they are real; where they don't survive they are revealed to be projections. The tragic protagonists live in worlds populated by projections. But, in the romances, there are survivors, with children being among the most important of these survivors. For it is around the children that the protagonists create a new life. Thus Wheeler has, in effect, argued that, by the time Shakespeare had written his romances, he had achieved a character structure which could reliably distinguish between self and other.

This is important for the evolution of the nuclear family. The concept of marriage discussed in the section on "Jealousy and Male Ambivalence" is, of course, Stone's closed domesticated nuclear family. The point of that earlier section was that such a marriage is based on a relationship in which one's spouse is both beloved and a sexual partner. If, however, it is difficult to assimilate one person both to the attachment and the sexual systems, then such marriages are going to be psychologically difficult - as, indeed, they all too often are. Even if this integration is not easy to achieve, it would be a good thing if people trying to achieve it could distinguish between self and other reliably enough to curtail the (defensive) jealous rage of Claudio, Othello, and the early Leontes. That capacity, to distinguish between self and other in the context of a closed nuclear family, is what Shakespeare has embodied in the late romances.

That is, in his late romances Shakespeare succeeded in creating an imaginative space in which the nuclear family becomes *psychologically* possible. And I want to emphasize "psychologically." We don't really know just how or why the closed nuclear family came about. But we have to distinguish between external social, political, and economic forces, on the one hand, and the psychological requirements of living in a nuclear family. Whatever the nature of those external forces, and Stone does discuss them, they aren't enough. Those forces won't, themselves, make the nuclear family psychologically habitable. That task requires a reworking of motives and emotions, of character structure.

That is the sort of reworking we see in Shakespeare's plays. My argument is that the plays reflect Shakespeare's own psychological development, and that we can see the major turns in that development through his genre preferences. Because he was, as an artist, able to externalize his inner life, his plays could provide a source of templates, of myths, for others to use in adapting their psychic life to new social conditions. Thus, not only is the family central to Shakespeare's dramatic life, but his drama has played a role in reshaping that family.³

Notes

¹ References to *Much Ado About Nothing*, *Othello*, and *The Tempest* are to *The Signet Classic Shakespeare*, general editor Sylvan Barnet (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1972). References to *The Winter's Tale* are to the Arden Shakespeare edition, J. H. P. Pafford, ed. (London: Methuen, 1963).

² Because my argument is so closely structured around the Triad I find it rhetorically awkward to include a discussion of the histories in that argument, though, logically, such a discussion is needed. The general outline of that argument, can however, be easily sketched.

The basic point is that the histories are set in a male world in which feminine values are alien and therefore rejected. Thus, for example, in *Richard III* women are only victims; Richard uses them as instruments of his march to the throne while they have only the power to curse him, which they exercise freely. But they have no virtues which are important in the play.

Henry IV, Parts I and II, is more interesting. Here we have Falstaff. Marilyn French argues that Falstaff, as lord of misrule, embodies elements of the outlaw feminine principle. And Sherman Hawkins (1977, referenced in Kahn 1981) asserts that Falstaff is maternal too. Thus, Falstaff represents feminine values in the world of the histories, and that is surely the source of his immense appeal. But, however much Hal may have learned from Falstaff, however much he may have loved him, he does, in the end, do what his father would expect of him. He banishes Falstaff. Falstaff's virtues can be tolerated in the male world only in very limited ways.

Thus, in the histories, male values hold sway. Only in the concurrent comedies are feminine values given scope and force.

³ While this statement is a convenient closing point to this essay, I can't let it stand without noting that it raises enormous problems of historical interpretation. What we need is a coherent account of the interaction between social, political, and economic forces, on the one hand, and ideas and imagination on the other. Merely to assert that the relationship is dialectical, that causality flows in both directions - from social forces to ideas, from ideas to social forces - isn't helpful; it merely labels the problem to be solved. What we need is a theory of psychology which tells us where new ideas come from and a theory of society which tells us when new ideas are likely to have social effect and delineates the mechanisms through which that effect operates. As far as I know we do not have either of these theories.

References

- Aries, P. (1962) *Centuries of Childhood*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Aries, P. (1974) *Western Attitudes Toward Death*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Univ. Press.
- Barber, C. L. (1980) "The Family in Shakespeare's Development: Tragedy and Sacredness." In *Representing Shakespeare*. Ed. Murray M. Schwartz and Coppélia Kahn. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Univ. Press: 188 - 202.
- Bowlby, J. (1969) *Attachment and Loss. Vol. 1: Attachment*. New York: Basic Books.
- Bowlby, J. (1973) *Attachment and Loss. Vol. 2: Separation: Anxiety and Anger*. New York: Basic Books.
- Bowlby, J. (1980) *Attachment and Loss. Vol. 3: Loss: Sadness and Depression*. New York: Basic Books.
- Boose, L. E. (1982) "The Father and the Bride in Shakespeare." *PMLA* 97: 325 - 347.
- De Rougemont, D. (1956) *Love in the Western World*. New York: Pantheon Books.

- Erikson, E. H. (1950) *Childhood and Society*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Erikson, E. H. (1982) *The Life Cycle Completed*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Everett, B. (1970) "Much Ado About Nothing." Reprinted in Ed. James L. Calderwood and Harold E. Toliver. *Essays in Shakespearean Criticism*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall: 273 - 290.
- Fineman, J. (1980) "Fratricide and Cuckoldry: Shakespeare's Doubles." In *Representing Shakespeare*. Ed. Murray M. Schwartz and Coppélia Kahn. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Univ. Press: 70 - 109.
- Fox, R. (1983) *The Red Lamp of Incest*. Notre Dame: Univ. of Notre Dame Press.
- French, M. (1981) *Shakespeare's Division of Experience*. New York: Summit Books.
- Freud, S. (1910) "Contributions to the Psychology of Love. A Special Type of Choice of Object made by Men." Trans. Joan Riviere. *Sigmund Freud: Collected Papers*. New York: Basic Books, 1959, 192 - 202.
- Freud, S. (1912) "Contributions to the Psychology of Love. The most Prevalent Form of Degradation in Erotic Life." Trans. Joan Riviere. *Sigmund Freud: Collected Papers*. New York: Basic Books, 1959, 203 - 217.
- Frye, N. (1965) *A Natural Perspective*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press.
- Garber, M. (1981) *Coming of Age in Shakespeare*. London: Methuen.
- Gilligan, Carol. (1982) *In a Different Voice*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press.
- Harlow, H. F. and Harlow, M. K. (1970) "Developmental Aspects of Emotional Behavior." In *Physiological Correlates of Emotion*. Ed. Perry Black. New York: Academic Press.
- Hawkins, S. (1977) "Falstaff as Mom." Paper delivered at the convention of the Modern Language Association, Chicago.
- Heilbrun, C. G. (1973) *Toward a Recognition of Androgyny*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Holland, N. N. (1968) *The Dynamics of Literary Response*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Hughes, M. Y. Ed. (1957) *John Milton: Complete Poems and Major Prose*. New York: the Odyssey Press.
- Kahn, Coppélia. (1981) *Man's Estate*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Kilmer, W.L., McCulloch, W. S. and Blum, L. (1969) "A Model of the Vertebrate Central Command System." *International Journal of Man-Machine Studies* 1: 279 - 309.
- Lever, J.W. (1965) "Introduction." To the Arden Shakespeare edition of *Measure for Measure*. New York: Vintage: xi - xcvi.
- Levinson, D. J. (1978) *The Seasons of a Man's Life*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Lewis, C.S. (1936) *The Allegory of Love*. London: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Miller, J. B. (1976) *Toward a New Psychology of Women*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Money, J. and Anke A. E. (1972) *Man & Woman, Boy & Girl*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Univ. Press.
- Parkes, C. M. and Stevenson-Hinde, J. (1982) *The Place of Attachment in Human Behavior*. New York: Basic Books.
- Rajecki, D. W., Lamb, M. E. and Obmascher, P. (1978) "Toward a General Theory of Infantile Attachment: A Comparative Review of Aspects of the Social Bond." *The Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 1: 417 - 464.
- Schwartz, M. M. (1973) "Leontes' Jealousy in *The Winter's Tale*." *American Imago* 30: 250 - 273.

- Schwartz, M. M. (1975) "*The Winter's Tale: Loss and Transformation.*" *American Imago* 32: 145 - 99.
- Schwartz, M. M. (1980) "Shakespeare through Contemporary Psychoanalysis." In *Representing Shakespeare*. Ed. Murray M. Schwartz and Coppélia Kahn. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Univ. Press: 21 - 32.
- Shepher, J. (1971) "Mate Selection Among Second Generation Kibbutz Adolescents and Adults: Incest Avoidance and Negative Imprinting." *Archives of Sexual Behavior* 1: 293 - 307.
- Schreiber, F. R. (1973) *Sybil*. New York: Warner Books.
- Stone, L. (1977) *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1500 - 1800*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Sundelson, D. (1980) "So Rare a Wonder'd Father: Prospero's *Tempest*." In *Representing Shakespeare*. Ed. Murray M. Schwartz and Coppélia Kahn. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Univ. Press: 33 - 53.
- Tiger, L., and Fox, R. (1971) *The Imperial Animal*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Thigpen, C. H. and Cleckley, H. M. (1957) *The 3 Faces of Eve*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Vaillant, G. E. (1977) *Adaptation to Life*. Boston: Little, Brown & Company.
- Winnicott, D. W. (1971) *Playing & Reality*. London: Tavistock Publications.
- Wheeler, R. P. (1981) *Shakespeare's Development and the Problem Comedies*. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press.