



University of
Stavanger

FACULTY OF ARTS AND EDUCATION

MASTER'S THESIS

Programme of study: MLIMAS

Master in Literacy Studies

Spring semester, 2015

Open

Author: Elena Gierstae

Elena Gierstae
(Author's signature)

Supervisor: Brita Strand Rangnes

Thesis title: The Relationship between Fathers and Daughters in *Hamlet*, *Othello*, *King Lear* and *The Tempest*

Keywords: Shakespeare, psychoanalysis
Father – daughter bond

No. of pages: 95
+ appendices/other: 4

Stavanger, 13.05.2015
date/year

Abstract

The aim of the proposed thesis will be to examine the complex and provocative relationship between fathers and daughters in Shakespeare's plays *The Tempest*, *King Lear*, *Hamlet* and *Othello*. The plays take up the stories at the point at which the daughter is moving away of the sphere of her father's control and influence and sets out on her own. The typical pattern of the father-daughter bond is: a middle-aged to old man, usually a widower, has an adolescent daughter just entering the young womanhood. This study will investigate this difficult and challenging process with its psychological conflicts, it will examine how fathers and daughters challenge the traditional family model in concord or in conflict with the ruling philosophy at the time. The study will examine how fathers and daughters undergo this difficult process and their individual drama from a psychoanalytic perspective. It will use psychoanalytic criticism.

The literary works that will be the focus of this thesis are Shakespeare's plays *The Tempest*, *King Lear*, *Hamlet* and *Othello*. I have chosen to examine four daughter- father pairs in these plays (Miranda - Prospero, King Lear - Cordelia, Desdemona – Brabantio, Ophelia – Polonius).

Chapter two offers an overview of the society, family and marriage in Shakespeare's time, and of the theoretical background for this thesis. I will do my study by looking at fathers and daughters in Shakespeare's plays from a psychoanalytical perspective. The father-daughter bond deals with psychological conflicts and tensions, and the premises and the procedures of the psychoanalysis will help us to explore the human mind and heart of our characters. The main part consists of three chapters that examine how this relationship is portrayed in four plays. The selected texts for this thesis provide different representations and pictures of the father-daughter bond. I am looking to this relationship from two perspectives: relationships that conform to the traditional parental model, and relationships that challenge

the traditional parental model. As a conclusion, the study maintains that *Hamlet* and *Othello* conform to tradition, and the relationships between King Lear and Cordelia, Miranda and Prospero challenge the traditional model.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my supervisor Brita Strand Rangnes for her guidance and for all the valuable suggestions that helped me to create this thesis. I also have to express gratitude to my family for their support.

Table of Contents

Abstract	2
Acknowledgements	4
1 Introduction	6
2 Background – The family in Shakespeare`s Period, and The Theoretical Background	9
a. Parents and children in this period of time	11
b. Marriages in this period of time	14
c. Women`s situation in this period of time	17
d. Women`s work	19
e. Women`s education	20
f. The concept of the <i>Dream –Work</i>	23
g. The concept of the <i>Uncanny</i>	25
h. The <i>ego</i> , the <i>super –ego</i> and the <i>id</i>	26
i. Defense mechanisms	27
j. The <i>Oedipus Complex</i>	27
k. Literature review	29
3 <i>Othello</i> and <i>Hamlet</i>, conforming to tradition?	31
4 <i>Miranda</i> and <i>Prospero</i>, challenging tradition?	47
5 <i>King Lear</i> and his daughters, challenging the tradition?	65
6 Conclusion	90
Bibliography	95

1 Introduction

The aim of the proposed thesis will be to examine the complex and provocative relationship between fathers and daughters in Shakespeare's plays *The Tempest*, *King Lear*, *Hamlet* and *Othello*. The plays take up the stories at the point at which the daughter is moving away of the sphere of her father's control and influence, and sets out on her own. This study will investigate this difficult and challenging process with its psychological conflicts, it will examine how fathers and daughters challenge the traditional family model in concord or in conflict with the ruling philosophy at the time.

I find family relationships and gender identity central to Shakespeare's writing. The theme of family relations is an important concern of the entire Shakespearean canon. In his essay *The Family in Shakespeare's Development: Tragedy and Sacredness*, Barber observes that in the major tragedies, Shakespeare approached the problems of family interaction. He claims that 'Shakespeare's art is distinguished by the intensity of its investment in the human family, and especially in the continuity of the family across generations' (1980: 188).

Stephen Orgel (1976:56) argues that 'families in Shakespeare tend not to consist of husbands and wives and their offspring but of a parent and a child, usually in a chiasmic relationship- father and daughter, mother and son'. C.L.Barber, calls psychoanalysis 'a sociology of love and worship within the family' (Schwartz and Kahn: 1982: 199). Coppelia Kahn (1986:35) too sees the family as 'the first scene of individual development and the primary agent of socialization that functions as a link between psychic and social structures and as the crucible in which gender identity is formed'. She notes that 'from being mothered and fathered, we learn to be ourselves as men and women'.

The society of Shakespeare's plays was a patriarchal society. Traditional women spent their lives in submission to male authority figures. The primary considerations regarding marriage in this period of time were family alliances and economic security. The choice of wives and husbands was in the authority of their fathers.

The father-daughter bond was explored by Shakespeare in many plays. Dreher (1986: 164) claims that the father- daughter bond reflects conflicts between progressive and

traditional social norms, youth and age, male and female, self and other and conflicting forces within the individual. In our plays, the main conflict is over the choice of a husband, the point at which the daughter leaves the sphere of her father`s control and power. The typical pattern of the father-daughter bond is: a middle –aged to old man, usually a widower, has an adolescent daughter just entering the young womanhood.

The plays take up the stories at the point at which the daughter is moving away of the sphere of her father`s control and influence, and sets out on her own. Why does Shakespeare focus on the moment when the daughter leaves her father`s power and control? This thesis embarks on the enterprise of answering this question. We will seek to explore how this crucial moment provokes identity crisis for our characters. The aim of the project is to explore the relationship between fathers and daughters on the moment when the daughter is moving away of father`s control because this is a critical moment. Father`s conception of himself and of his daughter undergoes the problematic and difficult test. How well does he understand his daughter? At that point, the daughter makes her choices.

The study will examine how fathers and daughters undergo this crucial moment and their individual drama, and whether their relationship is determined by the way each responds to the challenges of this difficult moment, in concord or in conflict with the ruling philosophy of the time. It will investigate whether these fathers are able to release their daughters into womanhood, whether they struggle to relinquish their daughters to other men, their future husbands. This thesis will explore whether these daughters leave their fathers for the commitment of marriage, whether they struggle to choose between leaving their fathers for the commitment of marriage and paternal obedience.

As stated above, the literary works that will be the focus of this thesis are Shakespeare`s plays *The Tempest*, *King Lear*, *Hamlet* and *Othello*. I have chosen to examine four daughter- father pairs in these plays (Miranda - Prospero, King Lear - Cordelia, Desdemona – Brabantio, Ophelia – Polonius). The reason for this choice was to explore the many variations of father-daughter bond, and to explore a variety of characters.

I will divide the sphere of the conflicts between fathers and daughters in two important conflicts: the political conflict and the emotional conflict. The political conflict refers to the conflict with stereotypes of the patriarchal world .The emotional conflict is examined through the psychological tensions of the relationship between fathers and daughters. I will apply these insights to a detailed study of four father – daughter relationships from these four plays. I will examine how each father – daughter pair undergoes a drama with political and emotional conflicts.

To achieve these aims, the study has to, first and foremost, explore the society in Shakespeare`s time, the family and marriage in that period. This aspect will be presented in chapter two of this thesis. I will do my study by looking at fathers and daughters in Shakespeare`s plays from a psychoanalytical perspective. The father-daughter bond deals with psychological conflicts and tensions, and the premises and the procedures of the psychoanalysis will help us to explore the human mind and heart of our characters. The theory that is the basis for this thesis will be presented in chapter two. Other important theory will be referenced to when needed.

The main part consists of three chapters that examine how this relationship is portrayed in four plays. The selected texts for this thesis provide different representations and pictures of the father-daughter bond. I am looking to this relationship from two perspectives: relationships that conform to the traditional parental model, and relationships that challenge the traditional parental model. Chapter three will examine whether the plays *Hamlet* and *Othello* conform to the traditional model. Chapter four and chapter five will investigate whether the relationships between Prospero and Miranda, King Lear and Cordelia are challenging the traditional model.

By using these works to investigate the daughter-father bond in Shakespeare`s plays, this study will contribute to the field of scholarship by shedding new light on the complex and compelling relationship between fathers and daughters.

2 Background – The family in Shakespeare's Period, and The Theoretical Background

In order to understand the significance of the father- daughter relationship and the condition of women at the time, it is important to take into consideration the historical setting for Shakespeare's plays. Singh (1983: 1) claims that 'family and religion were the two governing principles of the inner life of most people in England in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries'.

As Finn (2007: 2) observes, England in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was a highly patriarchal society with a structured hierarchy, 'both in the greater society, with limited mobility between the classes, as well as within family units'. As Singh (1983: 8) mentions, 'the origins of patriarchy are to be traced to Christianity itself, and the universe is a divinely planned hierarchical structure where man has to accept the place assigned to him'. She explains that 'order in society was dependent on the recognition that all human relationships, including relationships in the family are hierarchical' (Singh: 1983: 8). Singh (1981: 6) stresses the analogy between the head of the family and the head of the state and she suggests that the propagation of loyalty to the king in the name of one's duty to one's parents may have served a definite political need in Tudor times (Singh: 1983: 4).

Singh (1983 : 1) notes: 'in the sixteenth century, the need for the reinforcement of the patriarchal principle was specially urgent as loyalty had to be forged for the new nation state now emerging.' She explains that Tudor dynasty gave a real chance to the nation to settle down, and that it was important to create a general climate in which the King could be respected and obeyed. She points out that the best way to create such a climate was to inculcate respect for authority and a sense of obedience to one's superiors in the family itself (Singh : 1983 : 2). This idea is emphasized by the historian Lawrence Stone in his book *The Family, Sex and Marriage I England 1500-1800* : 'patriarchy was now reinforced by the state, however in the much modified form of authoritarian dominance by the husband and father over the woman and children within the nuclear family' (Stone: 1979: 111). Singh notes

other factors that reinforce the authority of the head of the family. For instance she mentions the Puritan emphasis on the family prayer in the Elizabethan times: ` the preachings of the Puritans specially emphasized the role of the head of the family in educating, instructing children and households to keep the ways of the lord` (Singh :1983 :7). Sara Munson Deats (2001: 235) in her essay *Truly, an Obedient Lady*, mentions that the Puritans of the period affirmed the obligation of the devout Christian to place conscience above law and defy even the monarch if necessary to preserve Christian integrity. She quotes from William Perkins when trying to explicate the doctrine of conscience: ` God`s authority binds conscience, Magistrate`s authority in God`s authority, Therefore , Magistrates bind conscience properly` (*Treatise of Conscience* , 522). She quotes from Perkins when suggesting the analogy between the magistrate and the father: ` For there be sundry authorities ordained of Good, as the authority of the father over the child, of the master over the scholar, which do bind conscience as the authority of God`s law does ` (2001: 236). In the traditional Renaissance, the common thinking was that obedience to social superiors constituted obedience to God. It is notable to take into consideration the Church`s position in this period of time (people had the obligation to obey all persons in authority whether they were parents, husbands, or priests or masters). Charles Frey in his essay *O Sacred, Shadowy, Cold, and Constant Queen*, investigates Shakespeare`s treatment of patriarchy, ` a general rule of depressing male domination ` (1980: 296). He notes that Shakespeare`s plays often open with generational conflicts that point up distressing consequences of patriarchy (1980: 295). Shakespeare did write in the context of a patriarchal society. In this study, we will explore how the concept of patriarchy is seen in each father-daughter relationship, and its consequences.

Stone (1979:93) observes a slow process of evolution in the family structure at the upper levels between about 1500 and 1700. Stone considers that this evolution is a consequence of the increase of the importance of the nuclear core as a state of mind, and of the increase of the importance of affective bonds in the conjugal unit. Lawrence Stone (1979:145) explains that during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries there were important changes in the structure of the English middle and upper-class family in its economic and social functions, and in affective relationships within it. Stone considers that these changes were under pressure from the state and from Protestant moral theology. He characterizes the family in this period of time as `a restrictedly nuclear one`. He shows the causes that reinforced the authority of the father and husband within the family. According to Stone, these causes were: ` the pressure of state propaganda for an authoritarian state and therefore an authoritarian family, protestant Reformation emphasis on the role of the household rather

than the Church as the agency for moral and religious control, Calvinist views about original Sin, and the need for severe measures towards children to defeat the Devil and punish wickedness, the spread of classical education which expressed more and more children to flogging in school, legal changes in women`s rights over property` (Stone: 1979: 145).

a. Parents and children in this period of time

The situation of children in Shakespeare`s time represents a relevant aspect for this study. The reason why this is relevant, is because the present thesis deals with the relationship between parents and children, and it will make it easier to us to understand the father-daughter bond. Stone considers that this relationship, between children and parents, were lacking in affective bonds. He characterizes this society as one in which it was difficult to establish emotional ties between family members. This aspect, of the relationship lacking in affective bonds, will be explored in the analysis of our characters. Stone presents the infants` situation in the sixteenth century and states that it was normal to send the children out to `mercenary wet-nurses`. As Stone (1979:113) observes, `infants were fed on demand, and were not weaned until a year or eighteen months`. Stone considers that the relationships between children and parents were not so affective. He explains that one reason for this aspect was the very high infant and child mortality rates, and also the common practice of `fostering out` (the infants put out to mercenary wet-nurses) : `As a result, in the sixteenth and early seventeenth century very many fathers seem to have looked on their infant children with much the same degree of affection which men today bestow on domestic pets` (Stone: 1979: 82). This fact created a psychological distance between mother and child. In her essay *The Absent Mother in King Lear*, Coppelia Kahn (1986:41) interjects a speculation inspired by Stone`s discussion about this custom. She suggests that many if not most people in the aristocracy of Shakespeare`s time must have suffered `the severe trauma of maternal deprivation brought on by the departure of the wet nurse`. This aspect will be helpful in analyzing King Lear`s behavior as a child deprived of maternal presence (when Lear is losing the `kind nursery` of Cordelia) at a later point in this thesis.

According to Stone, between 1580 and 1640 two forces, one political and one religious, converged to heighten paternal power in the structure of the family. He points out

øthat children left home very young, between the ages of seven and thirteen, in order to go to boarding - school. In the poor families, they left home in order to begin work as apprentices, domestic servants, labourers. He notes: ` some very fragmentary census data suggests that from just before puberty until they married some ten years later, about two out of every three boys and three out of every four girls were living away from home` (Stone: 1979: 84). Stone talks about some consequences of this custom. First, he mentions the apparition of a conflict between parents and children regarding the choice of a marriage partner, and then the strong contemporary consciousness of adolescence, as a distinct stage of life between `sexual maturity at about fifteen and marriage at about twenty –six`. Stone (1979: 88) concludes that `evidence of close bonding between parents and children is hard.

Stone observes that a series of important changes took place between sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in the relationship between parents and children. He notes that ` the function of this nuclear family was now more and more confined to the nurture and socialization of the infant and young child` (Stone: 1979: 145). He talks about the ways in which a child was cared and taught how to behave while it is growing up. He considers that the characteristics of the upbringing of children were: a strict subordination of children to parents, physical severity, and `a psychological coolness`. Stone (1979:124) suggests that the paradox of this education was ` the first result of a greater interest in children`. In this patriarchal society, the father controlled his wife and children, and inheritance went through the male line. In this vision of hierarchical order, children saw obedience to their parents as part of the divine plan. Children were reminded of the fifth commandment: ` Honor thy father and thy Mother. ` Singh (1983: 33) takes into consideration family relationships in the Elizabethan Age. Regarding the relationship between parents and their children, she claims that average Elizabethan children obey their parents and are willing to sacrifice their personal wishes for parental obedience. Stone (1979:71) observes that ` the prime factor affecting all families which owned property was therefore the principle of primogeniture, for the preservation and protection of which the entail was designed`. Stone continues to explain that this aspect ` was something which went far to determine the behavior and character of both parents and children, and to govern the relationship between siblings`. Second and third sons counted for little and daughters for even less. Stone notes that under such a system, ` the younger children inherited neither title nor estate, unless one of them happened to be heir to his mother`s property, and they were therefore inevitably downwardly mobile, until they had made their own fortunes in some profession or occupation` (Stone: 1979: 71). We shall see an explicit example of this aspect, at a later point in this thesis, in the character of King Lear. We

will investigate whether King Lear violates the accepted Elizabethan principle of primogeniture, and the right order of succession. In this thesis, we seek to investigate whether King Lear, Polonius, Brabantio, and Prospero are indeed the authoritarian fathers of Stone's model, or whether they challenge the patriarchal parental model. We will explore whether the relationships between Brabantio and Desdemona, King Lear and Cordelia, Prospero and Miranda are deprived of affect. Do these fathers insist above all that the daughters be obedient and chaste? Are they good examples of fathers that hold themselves and their daughters to high standards of accomplishment and integrity? Are Ophelia, Desdemona, Miranda, and Cordelia typical of the oppressed daughters? We will seek to answer these questions at a later point in this thesis. To achieve these aims, we need to know more about daughters' situation in this period of time.

Singh (1983: 33) claims that daughters were the greatest victims of a patriarchal family and Elizabethan daughters were no exception. Stone (1979:87) shows the daughters' situation in this period of time. This aspect is relevant for our thesis, because it deals with adolescent daughters just emerging into young womanhood, ready to leave the sphere of their fathers control. Stone considers that daughters were often 'unwanted and might be regarded as no more than a tiresome drain on the economic resources of the family'. He explains that brides suffered in this society because of the primogeniture system. Brides who could not provide landed property, were expected to bring a dowry (a substantial cash sum, called portion) that went directly to the father of the groom. In this case, rich wives were valuable. This aspect can be helpful in analyzing the example of Burgundy who does not want marry Cordelia if she cannot bring a dowry: 'Royal King, / Give but that portion which yourself propos'd, / And here I take Cordelia by the hand, / Duchess of Bergundy' (1.1.240-243)

Stone (1979:128) notes that 'all the children until the end of the sixteenth century were so conditioned by their upbringing and so financially helpless that they acquiesced without much objection in the matches contrived for them by their parents'. Singh admits that only rarely children disobey their parents and are against the accepted norms of conduct. She explains this situation using Stone's example, 'the case of the second earl of Southampton who stipulated in his will that both portion and maintenance were to be cut off entirely if his daughter disobeyed the executors' (Singh: 1983 : 38). She continues to quote Stone who says that 'such clauses were common in the sixteenth and continued to appear in the early seventeenth century, though with diminishing frequency and diminishing effect'. Singh (1983: 44) argues that in the patriarchal society, it is the mother who tries to understand the needs of her daughter. In aristocratic families, the care of children was left to servants.

Singh (1983: 34) argues that it would be wrong to point out that all conduct books dogmatically insist on the absolute right of the parents to impose their rules regarding children's marriage. She notes Gibbon's book entitled *A Work Worth the Reading* (1591) that is a more flexible approach to social questions. It presents both traditional and advanced views on the question of parent – child relationship. As Singh (1983: 10) notes: 'Elizabethan patriarchalism should not be treated as a static phenomenon'. She explains that this society is in a process of change and talks about the existence of a conflicting world views between the traditional view and the new view 'fostered largely by the new social and economic forces, which demanded the freedom of the individual and asserted the possibility of change and evolution'. (Singh: 1983: 10). Singh (1983: 35) claims that the question of the rights of parents to marry their children at their will was a lot discussed at the time. Singh takes into consideration the relationship between the 'crabbed age and youth'. Singh (1983:76) talks about the respect for old age as a normal feature of a patriarchal society. She cites Keith Thomas who says that: 'in such a society the prevailing ideal was gerontocratic: the young were to serve and the old were to rule'. (Singh: 1983: 76). She explains that it was commonly believed in the Elizabethan Age that youth was a period of irresponsibility and that wisdom came with old age.

b. Marriages in this period of time

At this point, it is time to take a look at marriages in Shakespeare's time. This aspect is relevant because the present thesis deals with adolescent daughters that have a conflict with their fathers over the choice of a husband.

Stone characterizes the society of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries as one in which close affection between husband and wife is ambiguous and rare. He explains that in practice, in the sixteenth century, affection in the marriage was of secondary importance to interest, and romantic love and lust were 'strongly condemned as ephemeral and irrational grounds for marriage' (Stone: 1979: 70). He considers that expectations of felicity from marriage were pragmatically low. As Stone (1979:81) observes, romantic love and sexual intrigue was the subject of much poetry of the sixteenth and the early seventeenth centuries, and of many of Shakespeare's plays, but this was a reality only for 'one very restricted social group: that of the households of the prince and the great nobles'. Stone (1979:128) claims that

this social group was subjected by the poets and playwrights to propaganda for an entirely antithetical ideal of romantic love. Stone observes that there was a conflict between the idealization of love by some poets and its rejection as a form of imprudent folly and even madness by all theologians, moralists, authors of manuals of conduct, and parents and adults in general. Marriages were still arranged by parents for economic and social reasons. He considers that a consequence of this system was the great power of the head of the family in controlling the marriages of his children. He mentions that marriage among the property-owning classes was a collective decision of family and kin, not an individual one, and the principal considerations for a marriage were past lineage associations, political patronage, extension of lineage connections, and property preservation and accumulation (Stone: 1979: 70). In this society, property and power were the predominant considerations which governed negotiations for marriage. We shall investigate this aspect in the tragedy of *Othello*. Does the marriage between Desdemona and Othello violate the norms of this society? Does this marriage respect the filial obedience and loyalty to the traditional friendship and enemies of the lineage? We will see it at a later point in this thesis.

Stone (1979: 71) observes that this society, interested in status and hierarchy, had the fear of social derogation in marriage, of alliance with a family of lower estate or degree than one's own. In our case, we will see whether Brabantio had this fear - that his daughter will marry someone far beyond his range who challenges his sociopolitical security (Frey: 299). Stone (1979:131) notes that the authoritarian control by parents over the marriages of their children inevitably lasted longest in the richest and most aristocratic circles, where the property, power and status stakes were highest. As Stone (1979:88) observes, the family group was held together by shared economic status and political interests, and by the norms and the values of authority and deference. Stone mentions that things were changing in the arrangement of marriages. He observes that Puritan moral theologians insisted upon the need for parental obedience. This aspect caused conflicts, because children had to submit to the demands for parental obedience and expectations of affection in marriage. Stone considers that Puritans solved this problem by arguing that affection could and would develop after marriage (Stone: 1979: 102). He explains that Protestant moral theology contributed to this change by stressing the importance of the holy matrimony. He notes that it was necessary that the couple should be able to develop some affection for each other, it was necessary to concede to the children the right to reject a spouse chosen by the parents (Stone: 1979: 134). Stone notes that there were some disadvantages in exercising this right (the risk for women to be condemned to spinsterhood). Stone shows that there were some rare occasions when

children married to suit themselves. In this situation, parents emphasized the traditional need to consider the interests of the lineage and the obligation to obey one's parents (Stone: 1979: 130). He describes the accepted view of this period of time: the marriage based on personal selection, and thus inevitably influenced by such ephemeral factors as sexual attraction or romantic love, was if anything less likely to produce lasting happiness than one arranged by more prudent and more mature heads (Stone: 1979: 128).

In order to understand the father-daughter bond, it is important to take into consideration Frey's account. Frey (1980: 295) points out that the elder generation often adheres to a code of revenge or war in which it seeks to over involve the younger generation. Some of the fathers mention their reliance upon their daughters for security and comfort in old age. According to Frey (1980: 298), such considerations of emotional and economic security and of political control and generational extension of line help to dictate the fathers' interest in the choice of his daughter's marriage partner. He suggests that these fathers seek to satisfy their needs for security and power by controlling their daughters. Frey observes that the concomitant absence of any sons is very significant in this relationship. He claims that this absence not only may make plain the father's need for the daughter's support and thus for a congenial son-in-law, it also may turn the son-in-law into substitute son, the inheritor of family power and values (1980: 298). When the daughter chooses against her father's will she effectively shuts him off from patriarchal domination of the son-in-law and consequent sonlike extension of his power and values (1980: 298).

In this patriarchal society, many of Shakespeare's daughters declare their independence and assert their own wishes. In this study, we will examine whether Desdemona, Miranda, Ophelia, and Cordelia assert their wills openly, whether they challenge the daughter's role that was to conform silently to the will of the father. We will investigate whether they defy or obey their fathers

Stone concludes that the functions of the nuclear family were to assure emotional, sexual, and economic of the husband and wife (Stone: 1979: 145). He considers that in this period of time it was doubted that affection could naturally develop after marriage, and he mentions that in the eighteenth century, people began to put the prospects of emotional satisfaction before income or hierarchy. He observes a rise of the companionate marriage. This was a marriage based on the mutual consent and equality of the partners for the purpose of companionship. This was the marital model of the period, and it can be helpful in analyzing the marriage between Desdemona and Othello. Do they follow the companionate model that promoted individual choice as basis for marriage, with mutual support and companionship?

Do they conform to the patriarchal marital model? We will examine this aspect at a later point in this thesis.

Boose's account about the significance of the marriage ritual in Shakespeare's plays, offers a new light to the father-daughter relationship, that we will take into consideration in our study. For centuries, the Christian church has recognized the special bond between father and daughter. Dreher (1986:60) claims that 'the church wedding, like other rites of passage, involves separation, transition and incorporation'. As Boose (1988:326) comments 'The marriage ritual enjoins that the bride stands at the altar between her father and husband. To resolve the implied dilemma, the force of the priest and the community presides over and compels the transfer of an untouched daughter into the physical possession of a male whom the ceremony authorizes both as the invested successor to the father's authority and as the sanctified transgressor of prohibitions that the father has been compelled to observe'. This marriage ritual can help the daughter to transfer her loyalties from father to husband. Boose considers that the daughter remains emotionally and legally bound to her father until the ritual of marriage. She mentions that the ceremony shows the father's consent. She explains that the ceremony resolves the incestuous attraction between father and daughter by ritualizing his gift of her hand. The marriage ceremony is necessary for the transition of the bride to the next stage of her life. In this study, we will explore the significance of the father's blessing in his daughter's marriage for each father-daughter pair.

c. Women's situation in this period of time

At this point it is important to discuss about women's situation in Shakespeare time. This aspect is relevant because the present thesis deals with four women: Miranda, Ophelia, Cordelia and Desdemona, and it will help us to understand their attitude and their behavior.

The Church argued that Eve had played the principal role in the fall of man. Pitt (1981: 15) points out that the Church was very influential in shaping society's expectations of woman. She explains that the official Church's attitude towards women beyond Elizabethan Age was that 'man represented the supreme height of God's creation, while women was inferior to him' (Pitt: 1981: 16). Saint Paul in the New Testament advised wives to submit their husbands. Papp and Kirkland (1988: 74) explain the women's inferior status through the teachings of biology in the period. They mention that the theory of the four

humors, or liquids stated that women's bodies had a greater proportion of the cold and moist humors, while men's bodies consisted primarily of the hot and dry humors. The theory meant that women were passive, timid and hesitating, fit to be dominated by men.

In the traditional view of the hierarchical Elizabethan society, women were expected to be obedient. For the patriarchal society to function, women had to submit to the will of men. Rose (1986: 117) mentions that didactic literature of the sixteenth century advised women to be models of chaste, passive obedience, and sermons, courtesy books emphasized such qualities as modesty, humility, sweetness, and piety. The ideal woman was weak, submissive, charitable, virtuous and modest. Stone (1979:138) talks about woman's function in this society. Her function was housekeeping, and the breeding and rearing of children. Most conduct books of the time, written to direct proper behavior in women, proclaimed that woman was inferior to man and insisted on female silence. Woman was silent in church and in the home, and submissive to men. Papp and Kirkland note that if ever a woman dared to threaten male authority by talking back, showing independence of mind, or even wearing men's fashions, men usually had a strong reaction. (Papp and Kirkland: 1988: 77). Dreher (1986: 18) emphasizes woman's weakness by citing Thomas Heywood: as the left side is the weakest, so the woman made from thence, is the weaker vessel. Also all male children are conceived in the right side, and females in the left. Dreher (1986: 18) explains that Thomas Heywood argued that a wife must submit herself as the body submits itself to the head. Dreher (1986: 18) describes the virtues of the Elizabethan woman: modesty and bashfulness, silence and patience were considered admirable qualities in women. All virtues of restraint, not active endeavor. Rose (1986: 121) notes that sexual chastity was the sole determinant of female honor. Woman's life was a life in continuous submission to the men. Dreher (1986: 18) argues that woman was to speak to her husband only when meet, addressing him with docile submission. The Elizabethan woman was to submit silently and patiently to the wish of her father and after, to that of her husband. In this patriarchal society, many of Shakespeare's daughters declare their independence and assert their own wishes. In this thesis, we will explore whether Desdemona is an interesting character that assert her will openly. Does she challenge the daughter's role that was to conform silently to the will of the father? Does Desdemona defy her father to affirm her love for Othello? We will examine this at a later point in our thesis.

d. Women`s work

In the present thesis, we consider that women`s work and education represent other interesting points that can help us to understand our characters` condition. Papp and Kirkland present the social conditions in which Elizabethan women lived. They provide a detailed picture of women`s opportunities for work and professional status: ` Educated or not, a woman always ran up against the one immutable fact of Elizabethan life: she would never be able to enter the professions, because she was a woman. She couldn`t become a lawyer. She couldn`t be a priest. The only career open to all Elizabethan women was marriage; a wife`s job was to run the household and help her husband in whatever he did. ` (Papp and Kirkland: 1988: 72). But upper – class wives, often had much more free time. Papp and Kirkland (1988: 72) describe the different activities of such women: writing letters, singing, dancing, strolling I the garden, playing with dainty little pet dogs Pitt (1981: 14) presents the politic and economic situation of women in this period of time. She mentions that on marriage, the girl lost her legal rights and she became the property of her husband. She continues to say that ` most women were never able to wield any significant legal or political power because they belonged either to a man or to the Church`. (Pitt: 1981: 15). Pitt explains that on entry a nunnery, all the girl`s possessions were given to the religious house and her secular rights ceased. The only time a woman could be able to have some rights was if her husband died and she was left in charge of a business.

In her essay ` *Women`s Defense of Their Public Role`* (1986: 3), Merry Wiesner quotes Natalie Devis : ` Women suffered for their powerlessness in both Catholic and Protestant lands in the late sixteenth to eighteenth centuries as changes in marriage laws restricted the freedoms of wives even further, as female guilds dwindled , as the female role in middle – level commerce and farm direction contracted, and as the differential between male and female wages increased`. Rose (1986: 4) explains that the theoretical limits of female freedom in economic, political, and familial life were set by a variety of municipal, natihlional, and regional law codes. She claims that along with increasing restrictions of women`s ability to make financial decisions and to handle goods, or loaning, borrowing, or donating money , the Renaissance saw a restriction of women`s work. (Rose: 1986: 6). Singh (1983: 15) points out that an important factor which made the patriarchal family meaningful was the wife`s active participation in its economic life. She mentions the productive role that the

Elizabethan women had in their families and the demands made on women. The average woman found her vocation in marriage, a life of managing a busy household. Singh (1983: 16) presents the demands made on women from different classes. She claims that women of the aristocracy had many roles to play. They were required to have the qualities of courtiers, scholars, soldiers, managers of homes and families. (Singh: 1983: 16). The demands made on women from middle-class were different. Singh (1983: 17) mentions that ` thrift and industry were treated as the most important qualities of a good wife`. Women from the middle class participated fully in the economic life of their households. Dreher (1986 : 18) tries to illustrate the picture of the English housewife by citing from Gervase Markham : ` our English housewife must be a chaste thought, stout courage, patient, untiring, watchful, diligent, witty, pleasant, constant in friendship, full of good neighbourhood, wise in discourse, but not frequent therein... and generally skillful in the worthy knowledge which do belong to her vocation.`

e. Women`s education

In order to understand the condition of woman at the time it is important to take into consideration woman`s access to education. Singh (1983: 23) points out that during the seventeenth century the education of women in England ` was deliberately neglected`. Pitt (1981: 17) argues that the demand for education for women came from the humanists (a group of intellectuals and religious idealists). She explains that their concept was that since women are more frivolous and less stable than men ` it was crucial that they be educated in order to fortify them sufficiently to cope with their inherent deficiencies`. (Pitt: 1981: 17).

Pitt (1981 : 199) claims that the sixteenth century ideal for an educated woman shows a mixture of the skills as for instance neat handwriting, clear reading aloud, dancing, singing, drawing, embroidery and housekeeping with those approved by Humanists (the knowledge of one or two classical languages, and a smattering of logic and rhetoric). As a result of this propaganda promoted by Humanists, there were some aristocratic women who were expert in classical grammar and languages.

Stone (1979:143) notes that this period when aristocratic women received an education did not last much longer than forty years, from about 1520 to 1560. He mentions the apparition in translation Castiglione`s *The Courtier*, which promoted a different ideal of

womanhood, one whose important qualities were now skill in music, painting, drawing, dancing and needlework. Pitt (1981: 27) presents two types of educated women in the Elizabethan period. First, the simply educated woman whose schooling had ended at an early age, and second, the daughters of the rich whose scholastic training could be compared to that of their brothers. The best example of these great ladies was the Queen Elizabeth. She was remarkable proficient in many range of subjects: geography, mathematics, history, Latin, Greek, French, Italian, Spanish, Flemish, music, architecture and astronomy. According to Pitt (1981 : 29) Elizabeth indirectly created a society in which women were more respected and she set high cultural standard for women and ` she was often cited, by those who supported the cause of education for women, as the most compelling proof of their arguments.` (Pitt: 1981: 28). Papp and Kirkland (1988: 69) mention that gentry families often hired tutors to come into their homes and teach their daughters. They note the situation of a number of wealthy families, that rather than keeping their daughters at home, placed them in other wealthy house – holds to be tutored. Papp and Kirkland provide a detailed picture of women`s opportunities for education. They claim that an ordinary young Elizabethan woman could hope for basic reading and writing skills at the local village school , and some rich Elizabethan women gained access through their tutors to ancient languages and ancient literature, just as their brothers did. Papp and Kirkland (1988: 71) point out that there were limits, even for women from the upper classes, because their education was not preparing them to go to a university, or to become a doctor, priest , or politician.

There were plenty of men who worried about the consequences of giving women any learning. Rose (1986 : 13) explains that women who chose the life of learning were generally forced to give up a normal family life, and most of them lived chaste lives of scholarly solitude. As Rose has noted ` They chose celibacy because their desire for learning required it; their male admirers applauded that decision as they felt no woman could be both learned and sexually active. By becoming learned, she had penetrated a male preserve, which was only tolerable if she simultaneously rejected the world of women. ` (Rose :1986 :13). Rose (1986 : 12) explains that educated women had an internal conflict between humanist ideals (that were concerned to choose between the *vita active* and the *vita contemplativa*, between public and private life) and the traditional female role.

A woman in sixteenth century England had no vote, a limited chance of ever getting an education, a job and few legal rights. But in this period of time, Queen Elizabeth was an exception to the rules that governed women`s lives. She ruled an empire. Joseph Papp and Elizabeth Kirkland (1988: 78) point out that while Elizabethan women were battling it out on

the front lines of the household, Queen Elizabeth was proving that a woman was more than capable of mastering a kingdom.

In conclusion, this period was a dynamic period between two historical epochs: the feudal and the capitalist, with new concepts of family and marriage. In this study, we will investigate how Shakespeare's plays *Othello*, *King Lear*, *Hamlet* and *The Tempest* illustrate this period of transition with important changes.

2 Theoretical background

Many critics have applied the procedures and the premises of the psychoanalysis to literature. This thesis deals with the relationship between fathers and daughters in Shakespeare's plays from a psychoanalytical perspective. I consider that psychoanalysis is quite fruitful to the works of Shakespeare. As Kahn (1986:35) observes, Freud viewed the family drama from the standpoint of a son, and he conceived the development of gender as governed primarily by relationship with the father. Shakespeare's plays are significant sources for the theories of the psychoanalysis. Thus, we need to look at what psychoanalytical criticism is. The psychoanalytical criticism is defined in *The Glossary of Literary Terms*, edited by M.H. Abrams (2005: 257) as 'a form of psychological literary criticism, whose premises and procedures were established by Sigmund Freud (1856-1939)'. In other words, psychoanalytical criticism is a form of literary criticism, which uses some of the techniques of psychoanalysis. Abrams (2005:257) explains that Freud had developed the form of psychology that he called 'psychoanalysis' as 'a procedure for the analysis and therapy of neuroses, but soon expanded it to account for many developments and practices in the history of civilization, including warfare, mythology, and religion, as well as literature and the other arts'. Psychoanalysis itself is a form of therapy, which seeks to cure mental disorders. Barry (2009:92) notes that 'the classic method of doing this is to get the patient to talk freely, in such a way that the repressed fears and conflicts which are causing the problems are brought into the conscious mind and openly faced, rather than remaining buried in the unconscious'.

Barry explains that this practice is based upon specific theories of how the mind, the instincts, and sexuality work.

These theories were developed by Sigmund Freud (1856-1939). His theories however controversial, `have changed the way people think about themselves, whether they are aware or not` (The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism, NATC: 2010: 807).` For Freud human reason was not a master in its own house, but a precarious defense mechanism struggling against, and often motivated by unconscious desires and forces` (NATC:807).

All of Freud`s work depends upon the notion of unconscious. Freud did not discover the notion of the unconscious, but he attributed to it a determinant role in our lives. Barry (2009:92) points out that Freud`s uniqueness lies in the recognition of the importance of unconscious process. Barry (2009:92) claims that linked with the idea of the unconscious is the idea of repression, which is `the forgetting or ignoring of unresolved conflicts, unadmitted desires, or traumatic past events, so that they are forced out of conscious awareness and into the realm of the unconscious`. This thesis will use Freud`s psychoanalytic concepts: repression, infantile sexuality, id, super –ego, ego, defense mechanism with sublimation, regression and projection, dream –work, uncanny. These concepts will be useful tools for the analysis of the father-daughter bond.

f. The concept of the *Dream –Work*

The concept of the *Dream- Work* will be an important tool in analyzing our characters. We will examine whether this Freudian concept can be transferred to Brabantio`s dream and repressed fears. In Freud`s account, dreams are not `nonsensical but meaningful` (NATC: 819).He explains that dreams have two types of content- *the manifest content* called the dream content and the latent content called *the dream thoughts*. The manifest content refers to the elements of the dream that we can remember and verbalize, the plot of the dream. The latent content is the hidden content of the manifest content, is the unconscious root of the content. In chapter VI, *The Dream-Work*, Freud defines the `new task`. Freud`s task is to investigate the relationship between the manifest content and the latent content and to trace `the process by which the latter have been changed into the former` (NATC: 818). Freud claims that his predecessors in the field of dream interpretation have dealt with the manifest content of a dream and considered dreams nonsensical.

` The new task` determines how the *dream-work* is carried out. Freud uses the concept of the *dream –work* to present the process by which dreams emerge from the unconscious. According to Freud, all of us have repressed fantasies, fears, and desires. We all have dreams in which repressed desires and traumatic memories emerge disguised because the unconscious wish must evade censorship. The censorship refers to the ego that wants to keep memories, desires, fantasies out of the unconsciousness. Repression, as a dream censor, reworks the latent dream which is forced to assume distorted forms. The dream-work is the process of the unconscious thinking, is a work of translation. In Freud`s account, the dream work is the process by which real events or desires are transformed into dreams images, the translation of the *dream –thoughts* into the *dream-content*. The *dream content* is the translation of the *dream thoughts* into another form of expression, whose signals and meanings the dream analyst has to discover by comparing the original with the translation. The *dream-thoughts* function like a latent content behind the manifest content of the dream. The manifest content is a symbolic representation of the latent content. The latent content refers to what the objects of the dreams represent, to what the unconscious hides. Freud argues that a dream is more than a `pictorial composition` (NATC: 819). He points out that dreams are like a `picture – puzzle, a rebus` (NATC: 819). Beneath the composite surface, which function like a puzzle, lies the wish, the puzzle`s solution. The dream -analyst for Freud is looking on the relationship between these elements, on the associations with linguistic and meanings (words, sounds, syllables, images) like in a pictogram. In Freud`s approach, a dream consists of both pictorial material (visual images) and linguistic material (written words) because the latent content of a dream is verbal in nature and pictorial in content. Thus, Freud suggests that dreams are not `nonsensical but meaningful` (NATC: 819).

Freud believes in the importance of the language in order to reveal the representation of his patients` dreams. In Freud`s theory, dreams are the distorted product of unconscious mental activity. He considers that repressed wishes, fantasies, traumatic memories emerge in disguised forms: in dreams, in language, in art. Freud observes a connection between literature and psychoanalysis, and he uses literature as a piece of evidence in supporting his concepts. In Freud`s account, there is an analogy between literary works and dreams. Dreams are like a kind of poetry. Barry (2009:94) talks about this analogy: ` Dreams, just like literature, do not usually make explicit statements. Both tend to communicate obliquely or indirectly, avoiding direct or open statement, and representing meanings through concrete embodiments of time, place , or person`. Considering Freud`s terminology referring to dreams in literature, we can say that in literature like in dreams there is a *manifest content* and a *latent*

one. The *manifest content* can be interpreted as what the writer puts in front of our eyes, and the *latent content* can be that information to be discovered through the psychoanalysis instruments. Events, figures are represented in dreams like in literature, using the translation by the dream work, of abstract ideas, emotions into concrete images. By studying some literary texts, Freud tries to prove that although dreams and desires are individual, there are some that have universal occurrence: 'There are, says Freud, some dreams that occur widely and point to the existence of universal desires' (NATC: 810).

g. The concept of the *Uncanny*

The concept of the *Uncanny* will be an useful tool in the analysis of our characters. In this study, we will see whether we can apply this concept in the case of Prospero and King Lear, whether we will find uncanny elements in analyzing our characters. Freud's essay *The Uncanny*, represents both a literary application and a new theoretical direction. It represents an extensive analysis of E.T.A. Hoffmann's short story *The Sandman* (1816). In his analysis, two 'courses' (NATC: 825) are open to him. One 'course' takes the form of a linguistic analysis of the meaning attached to the word *uncanny*, the other relies to the 'properties of persons, things, experiences and situations which arouse' (NATC: 825) uncanny feelings. Freud considers that both 'courses' come to the same results: uncanny refers to the class of 'frightening which leads back to what is known of old and long familiar' (NATC:825).

Freud begins his discussion with the characteristics of the word *uncanny*: 'the German word 'unheimlich' is obviously the opposite of 'heimlich'(homely), 'heimisch' (native)- the opposite of what is familiar' (NATC:826). 'Heimlich' can also mean concealed, secret, and thus the opposite of the familiar and open, and 'this process of estrangement of the familiar, of the home, is exactly the same as the process of repression' (NATC: 811). Through his investigation, Freud concludes that the meaning of the two words in different languages seems to coincide.

For Freud, the experience of *uncanny* is the mark of the return of the unconscious wishes, memories that are repressed. Freud (NATC: 833) argues that 'uncanny is in reality nothing new or alien, but something which is familiar and old-established in the mind and which has become alienated from it only through the process of repression'. *Uncanny* represents the summing opposition of the concepts of 'familiar' and 'unfamiliar'. The prefix

uncanny is a mark of repression. As stated above, in Freud's account, *uncanny* refers to the class of frightening which leads back to what is known of old and long familiar (NATC:825). The frightening element is something that is familiar to the psyche, but has been repressed and now recurs. Freud points out that when something is repressed, its return is a source of fear. Freud claims that many people experience this feeling in relation to death and dead bodies, to the return of the dead, and to spirits and ghosts. In recent years, critics have devoted a special attention to elements Freud associates with the *uncanny*: unexpected doubles, severed limbs, bodies buried alive, the return of the dead, magical thinking (NATC: 812). In Freud's approach, animism, magic and sorcery, the omnipotence of thoughts, man's attitude to death, involuntary repetition and the castration complex comprise all the factors which turn something frightening into something uncanny. We can also speak of a living person as uncanny, and we do so when we ascribe evil intentions to him (NATC: 834).

h. The *ego*, the *super-ego* and the *id*

In the present study, we will see whether we will find the Freudian concepts of the *ego*, *super-ego* and the *id* in the analysis of our characters. Freud's terminology of *id*, *ego* and *super-ego* came later in his career. He suggested a structural three-part model of the psyche, dividing it into the *ego*, the *super-ego*, and the *id*. Barry (2009: 93) claims that these three levels of the personality roughly correspond to, respectively, the consciousness, the conscience, and the unconscious. According to this model of the psyche, the *ego* is the consciousness that balance the needs of the *id* against the expectations of the society. In Freud's account, the *id* is part of the unconscious mind that controls a person's basic impulses, such as sex, water, food. The *ego* is the conscious part of the mind that controls a person's needs of the *id*, being one person's intellectual and rational thinking. The *super-ego* has the moralizing and critical role, and is the representation of our societal rules, taboos, morays. It creates a feeling of guilt when social codes are violated. In conclusion, *Id* is the impulsive part of the psyche which responds immediately and directly to the instincts, while the *super-ego* incorporates the morals and values of the society.

i. Defense mechanisms

This Freudian concept will be an important tool in analyzing our characters. In the present thesis, we will see whether we can apply to Prospero the Freudian concept of the defense mechanisms. Barry (2009:94) notes that `The defense mechanisms are psychic procedures for avoiding painful admissions or recognitions`. In order to deal with conflicts and problems in life, Freud considers that the ego employs a range of defense mechanisms. They operate at an unconscious level. A such mechanism is that of *sublimation*, whereby `the repressed material is promoted into something grander or is disguised as something noble` (Barry: 2009: 93). Barry gives the example of the `sexual urges that can be given sublimated expression in the form of intense religious experiences or longings`.

The psychic process *projection* is another defense mechanism. Barry (2009:93) explains that projection happens when `aspects of ourselves, usually negatives one are not recognized as part of ourselves but are perceived in or attributed to another; our own desires or antagonisms, for instance, may be disowned in this way`. Repression is another defense mechanism

`The transference is the phenomenon whereby the patient under analysis redirects the emotions recalled in analysis towards the psychoanalyst : thus , the antagonism or resentment felt towards a parental figure in the past might be reactivated , but directed against the analyst` (Barry: 2009 : 93).

j. The *Oedipus Complex*

This Freudian theory will be an useful tool in exploring the father-daughter bond. In the present study, we will seek to find elements from this theory in the analysis of our characters. We will see whether Desdemona and Ophelia suffer from this Freudian *Oedipus Complex*. Many of Freud`s ideas concern aspects of sexuality. The notion of *infantile sexuality* is an example. `Incest and its prohibition – the universal break between nature and culture, according to anthropologists – form the core of Freud`s theory of unconscious desire` (NATC: 810). As Barry (2009:93) observes, *infantile sexuality* is the notion that `sexuality begins not at puberty, with physical maturing, but in infancy, especially through the infant`s relationship with the mother`. The *Oedipus Complex* is connected with this. According to Freud in *The*

Interpretations of dreams, The Oedipus Complex, the male infant conceives the desire to eliminate the father and become the sexual partner of the mother. Freud notes: ` In my experience, which is already extensive, the chief part in the mental lives of all children who later become psychoneurotics is played by their parents. Being in love with the one parent and hating the other are among the essential constituents of the stock of psychical impulses which is formed at that time and which is of such importance in determining the symptoms of the later neurosis` (NATC: 814). Freud begins his discussion by turning to Sophocles` *Oedipus Rex*. Freud tells the legend of King Oedipus, son of Laius, King of Thebes, and of Jocasta who was warned by an Oracle that he will kill the father and marry his mother. Oedipus leaves home in order to escape his fate. In Freud`s account, there is an analogy between the plot of Sophocles` play and the plot of a patient`s analysis: ` a patient`s resistance to unconscious knowledge is like Oedipus`s reluctance to learn his true identity` (NATC: 810). Freud discusses the relationship between *Oedipus Rex* and Shakespeare`s *Hamlet*, in terms of incest taboo. He makes the distinction between the child`s `wishful phantasy` in *Hamlet* and *Oedipus Rex*. In *Oedipus Rex* it is `realized as it would be in a dream` (NATC: 817), while in *Hamlet* it `remains repressed`. In his analysis of *Hamlet*, Shakespeare considers that `the play is built up on Hamlet`s hesitations over fulfilling the task of revenge that is assigned to him. In his essay, Freud asks this question: `What is then, that inhibits him in fulfilling the task set him by his father`s ghost?` (NATC: 816). Freud continues to answer his question: `Hamlet is able to do anything – except take vengeance on the man who did away with his father and took that father`s place with his mother, the man who shows him the repressed wishes of his own childhood realized`. Freud notes: `Thus the loathing which should drive him on to revenge is replaced in him by self-reproaches, by scruples of conscience` (NATC: 818). Freud suggests in his essay that Hamlet`s uncle has only carried out a murder that he himself wanted to accomplish. He is guilty of wanting to commit the same crime himself. Hamlet has an Oedipus complex, that is, a repressed sexual desire for his own mother, and a consequent wish to take away his father. With this essay, `Freud thus revolutionized the reading of two major canonical texts of Western culture and placed the world of the imagination at the center of human subjectivity` (NATC: 810). In his essay *Filia Oedipi: Father and Daughter in Freudian theory*, David Willbern, talks about Freud`s interest in the relationship between father and daughter. He points out that Freud sometimes characterized the daughter`s perspective` but he was naturally more familiar with the father`s. It is difficult, if not impossible, to be in two places at the same time. Fathers have always been sons as well, but never daughters` (Boose and Flowers: 1989: 75).

k Literature review

There has not been done a lot of research on the complex and challenging father-daughter relationship. Much of the research was devoted to mothers and sons in Shakespeare's plays. I will do my study by looking at fathers and daughters from a psychoanalytic perspective. The literary texts that will be the focus of this thesis are Shakespeare's plays: *The Tempest*, *Hamlet*, *Othello*, and *King Lear*.

With regards to the theoretical background, the most important literature that I used for this thesis are Freud's essays *The Uncanny*, *The Interpretations of Dreams- Oedipus Complex*, *The Dream- Work*. The references to Freud's essays are taken from *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism: 2010* (NATC: 2010). The encounters between Shakespeare and psychoanalysis began in Freud's work.

Although the relationship between father and daughter is a principal theme in Shakespeare's plays, Dreher's book *Domination and Defiance* is the first book on this very challenging relationship in Shakespeare. Dreher (1986:2) notes that "no critical study, however, has fully explored the relationship of Shakespeare's fathers and daughters in its historical and developmental context". This book demonstrates how each father – daughter pair undergoes an inevitable drama of domination and defiance. In her study, Dreher examines the underlying psychological conflicts as well as the changing concepts of marriage and the family during Shakespeare's time. The reason why this book is relevant for my thesis is because it reflects three important themes in Shakespeare's plays: family and marriage, psychological development and a concern with Shakespeare's women characters.

Many literary scholars have different approaches to the field. Adelman's book *Suffocating Mothers, Fantasies of maternal origin in Shakespeare's plays Hamlet to The Tempest* traces the sources of Shakespearean drama to a psychologized version of the Fall, in which original sin is literally the sin of origin, inherited from the maternal body. Adelman explores the masculinity and the maternal body in Shakespeare. I found this book illuminating because the confrontation with maternal body brings dramatic consequences for masculine and female characters in Shakespeare's plays.

Two anthologies *The Woman's Part* and *Representing Shakespeare* offer challenging responses to the questions of sexual identity from a psychoanalytic perspective. I found the

essays from the anthology *Representing Shakespeare* important for my thesis because they show a confluence of critical views made possible by the interaction of individual sensibility and broad agreement in theoretical emphasis as Schwartz and Kahn note in its *Introduction*. The book *The Design Within*, ed. Faber: 1970 offers interesting psychoanalytical approaches on Shakespeare's plays.

With regards to my chapter *The family in Shakespeare's time*, three books were relevant: *Family Relationships in Shakespeare and the Restoration Comedy*: Singh: 1983, *Rewriting the Renaissance*: Ferguson, Quilligan and Vickers: 1986, and *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1500-1800*: Lawrence Stone:1979. *Rewriting the Renaissance* is a challenging book because contributes to the insights about women, gender and sexual difference of the Renaissance period. Stone's book documents views about the English society of that period.

Among studies of Shakespeare's women, marriage and the family Angela Pitt offers a more traditional perception of Shakespeare's women. David Leverenz's essay *The Women in Hamlet: An Interpersonal View* offers a new light on Shakespeare's women. Lynda Boose's work *The Father and The Bride in Shakespeare*, PMLA: 1982, shows the importance of the marriage ritual in Shakespeare's plays. The book *Lear's Self Discovery*, by Paul A. Jorgensen describes Lear's turbulent crisis.

3 *Othello* and *Hamlet*, conforming to tradition?

The above section dealt with the family in Shakespeare's time, and with the theoretical background of this thesis. In this chapter, we will start to examine the relationship between fathers and daughters in Shakespeare's plays *Othello* and *Hamlet*. The reason of this choice is that in these plays, Shakespeare offers us the typical father-daughter relationship for the patriarchal family model.

In *Othello* and *Hamlet*, Shakespeare offers us two examples of young women (Ophelia and Desdemona) who are victimized by the patriarchal society, society that will not allow women to grow up. These two people are very different as characters, but at the same time, they have some similarities. Through this chapter, we will examine whether these daughters make the transition from childhood to adulthood, whether their fathers let them go to the next stage of life, whether their fathers are able to make the passage from adulthood into late adulthood, whether their relationships are conforming or conflicting the tradition.

In the tragedy *Othello*, the conflict between father and daughter starts at the point at which Desdemona has secretly married Othello. In marrying Othello, she leaves the sphere of her father's control and power. Dreher (1986: 96) suggests that this fact creates identity crises for Desdemona as well for her father

The conflict between Desdemona and her father does not develop through the play. It appears from the beginning of the play and it will have consequences in terms of individual deaths. Given these considerations, Desdemona has divorced her family and country, rejecting traditional stereotypes of the good woman in that time (the traditional woman model: silent, dutiful, chaste, obedient). She defies the patriarchal world to affirm her love for Othello.

The father Brabantio is a widower with only one child, a daughter Desdemona that he loves possessively. Refusing to be bartered like property, Desdemona defies her father and the patriarchal stereotypes. As Frey observes, 'the daughter marries someone far beyond her father's range who challenges his sociopolitical security' (Frey: 299). Given these considerations, Brabantio, her father, will not think to extend his line through his daughter, as

suggested by Frey in his essay. Frey (1980: 299) suggests that Brabantio might have dreams of patrilineal extension but they are shattered by her daughter's choice of marriage partner. He points out that his resultant rage may be better understood in this light, as may its terrible consequences (1980: 299). Brabantio disowns Desdemona and dies in despair.

In Desdemona's marriage there is no father's blessing. Given this aspect, the conflict is not solved and it will involve tragic consequences. Singh (1983:44) states that Desdemona is the typical shy daughter of a patriarchal family who instinctively knows that any show of independence would be resisted. So she quietly slips away to marry Othello. In every society women have to evolve their own strategies for self-expression and survival, and in this kind of a society deceit is perhaps the only strategy available.

In the first act of the play, Iago and Roderigo awaken Brabantio. They tell him about Desdemona's marriage. In this patriarchal world, they are treating Desdemona as Brabantio's property: 'Awake! What ho, Brabantio! Thieves, thieves, thieves! / Look to your house, your daughter, and your bags' (1.1.79, 80). Desdemona is regarded as an item in Brabantio's property. Brabantio goes off to check for himself. He continues to say: 'call up all my people. / This accident is not unlike my dream' (1.1.140-141). In his unconscious thoughts, Brabantio was afraid that his daughter will leave from his sphere. The Freudian concept of the Dream-Work can be employed in analyzing Brabantio's dream. According to Freud, Brabantio's repressed fear emerged in the disguised form of a dream. This dream refers to anxieties about the loss of authority and control over his daughter. Brabantio had the fear of losing his daughter, the fear that his daughter will marry 'someone far beyond her father's range who challenges his sociopolitical security'. This fear came disguised, in the form of a dream, because the unconscious fear had to evade censorship. In her interpretation of these lines 'This accident is not unlike my dream / Belief of it oppresses me already' (1.1.141-142) Boose suggests that 'the repressed voyeurism of the father's incestuous projection seeping into the unconscious world of his dreams' (Boose: 1982: 331). Brabantio is completely lost. He shouts something about what happened, he asks Roderigo confused questions, he mourns the sad fate of unfortunate father:

What said she to you?
..... Are they married, think you?
O heaven, how got she out?
Fathers, from hence trust not your daughters' minds
By what you see them act
(1.1 164- 170).

He speaks of his feeling of loss: `..... gone she is; And what`s to come of my despised time / is nought but bitterness` (1.1.159-161). Brabantio feels betrayed: ` O, she deceives me / past thought!` (1.1.163) ` O treason of the blood!`. Brabantio`s exclamation refers to several senses of blood. Desdemona`s elopement is a violation of her noble nature and lineage, a betrayal of duty to her father (whose authority, in patriarchal world, was analogous to that of a monarch (as I described in the first chapter of my thesis)). Brabantio`s love for Desdemona is that of a father to a daughter. She is his only child, and he is a widower, Desdemona being his closest person. These aspects can reinforce the effect of Desdemona`s treason: ` For your sake, jewel, / I am glad at soul I have no other child / For thy escape would teach me tyranny` (1.3.193-195).

Brabantio will arrive at the Senate hoping that it is possible to annul this forbidden marriage. Boose (1982:331) claims that Brabantio attempts to `recapture the bride`. Brabantio addresses to Othello with `a foul thief` (1.2.62) and tells that his daughter is `stolen from me and corrupted` (1.3.61). This exclamation refers to the way in which patriarchal world regarded women as a piece of masculine propriety. He cannot accept that Desdemona left from his sphere of power and believes that she was `enchanted` by Othello:

O thou foul thief, where hast thou stowed my daughter?
 Damned as thou art, thou hast enchanted her;
 For I'll refer me to all things of sense,
 If she in chains of magic were not bound,
 Whether a maid, so tender, fair, and happy,
 So opposite to marriage that she shunned
 The wealthy curled darlings of our nation,
 Would ever have, t` incur a general mock,
 Run from her guardage to the sooty bosom
 Of such a thing as thou – to fear, not to delight?
 (1.2.62-71).

He tries to annul this marriage, hoping to persuade the Duke. In his speech, he is using the word `sans witchcraft`. He tells that Desdemona could not `fall in love with what she fear`d to look on` (1.3.99). Boose (1982:331) explains that Brabantio

is here alluding to a specific impediment recognized by canon law as an *impedimentum dirimens*, one that, if proved, would indeed prevent a marriage or could nullify it retroactively. Specifically, Brabantio is claiming the impediment of *vis et metus*, or a condition of fear, duress, and constraint overruling the will – a general category that included the more specific accusation of witchcraft:

She is abused, stolen from me, and corrupted
 By spells and medicines bought of mountebanks.

For nature so preposterously to err-
being not deficient, blind, or lame of sense
Sans witchcraft could not
(1.3.61-65).

At his first opportunity to confront Desdemona directly, Brabantio does not ask about her marriage but he expects her to relate to him as his obedient daughter. 'Do you perceive in all this company / Where most you owe obedience?' (1.3 177-178). Desdemona's place in a patriarchal world is defined by the direction in which she obeys. Desdemona's speech to the Senate refers to her acceptance of the subservient role as daughter or wife, even as she simultaneously affirms her right to choose her husband:

My noble Father,
I do perceive here a divided duty
To you I am bound for life and education;
My life and education both do learn me
How to respect you. You are the lord of duty;
I am hitherto your daughter. 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. 182-91).

According to Dreher (1986: 44) Desdemona's answer is an attempt 'to assuage her father's feelings while announcing her transition into the adult world'. As Dreher (1986: 90) observes, Desdemona places her love into the traditional perspective, 'speaking of her *divided duty* between father and husband in which filial obedience is transferred for one authority figure to the next'. In this transfer, Othello inherits the father's title *my lord*. Desdemona continues to respect her father by transferring her obedience to Othello, her husband. In his essay *Othello: Portrait of a Marriage*, David Bevington mentions that there is an irony in using Desdemona's brave act of elopement as evidence of her changeability of affection and her deceptive ways. He explains that 'the irony is further intensified by the way in which Desdemona's elopement is presented to us as evidence not of her willfulness, but of her uncomplaining endorsement of a patriarchal world' (2001: 227). She argues to her father that her mother left her own father to live with Brabantio, and that she chooses to do the same. She does not choose to do this independently on her own, but accepting as given the condition that she, as a woman in the patriarchal world, owes obedience to her husband or a father. Brabantio finally submits to the fact that the forbidden marriage has happened. Boose (1982: 332) points out that Brabantio 'instead of presenting his daughter as a

consecrated gift, he hurls her across the stage at Othello with the words: ` I here do give thee that with all my heart / Which but thou hast already, with all my heart / I would keep from thee` (1.3.192-195). He feels betrayed, and he has a revulsion from the physical fact of paternity: ` I had rather to adopt a child than get it` (1.3.190).

In Desdemona`s marriage there is no paternal blessing. Brabantio not only feels betrayed, but he also predicts Othello a future disgrace: “ Look to her, Moor, if thou hast eyes to see:/ She has deceived her father, and may thee.” (1.3.290- 291). Edward Snow in the article *Social Anxiety and the Male Order* claims that ` Brabantio construes Desdemona`s choice in terms of an oedipal anxiety that reduce woman`s capacity for active commitment to a reminder of past betrayals and a premonition of future ones ` (1980: 402). Brabantio feels that his daughter has deceived him, escaped and behaved in a dishonest way. He warns Othello about the deceitful nature of his daughter.

The conflict between Desdemona and her father has an essential role in influencing his daughter`s identity. According to Dreher (1986: 164), his reactions define her as a good daughter, the moral norm that will determine her self- concept and behavior in society. Desdemona is the victim of the patriarchal world. In her elopement, Desdemona defies her father who represents the authority in the patriarchal world. Instead of seeing his daughter as a young woman, Brabantio perceives her as a disobedient child. He refuses to understand that his daughter has grown up. Much of Brabantio`s rage arises from the fact that he does not really know his daughter. Desdemona was his only child, she was an obedient child in managing Brabantio`s wifeless household. She was the obedient daughter that refused to marry any of her Venetian suitors. She was an obedient child that did the households tasks, but as soon as she finished them, she returned to her father`s side to listen to Othello`s odyssey of battles. Brabantio did not understand the enthusiasm with which Desdemona listened to Othello`s stories: ` She`d come again, and with a greedy ear / Devour up my discourse ` (1.3.149-150). Dreher (1986: 45) claims that ` bored with the tame domestic role accorded to venetian women, Desdemona wished for a life of action`: ` She wished she had not heard it, yet she wished / that heaven had made her such a man? ` (1.3.162-163).

The role of Desdemona in a very unconventional marriage, has sparked considerable controversy. Many of the problems arise from the challenging nature of the character of Desdemona : ` How can an audience explain the disparity between the courageous , unconventional, confident, articulate young bride of the opening scenes, who appears to challenge many of the mores of early modern marriage, and the dazed and defenseless wife of the denouement, who declines into complete submissiveness to her husband? ` Sara Munson

Deats (2001 : 241 *Truly, an obedient lady*). From the beginning of the play, Desdemona deviates from the ideal passive daughter affirmed in the patriarchal world.

Desdemona`s marriage is a marriage without paternal blessing, in a patriarchal world. This clandestine marriage, without paternal blessing or proper ceremony, or legal guardians, could be considered unconventional. The political conflict with her father has an essential role in her marriage. This conflict will have tragic consequences in her life and the motif of her deceitful nature will return later in the play as a haunting motif: `Chaos is come again` (3.3.100). Her marriage without paternal blessing, causes problems in her life. Boose points out that `consciously or unconsciously, overtly or implicitly, the father of the bride wants, like Brabantio, to retain, withhold, lock up, and possess his daughter. Prevented by law, custom, and ritual injunction from taking any of these actions, the only satisfaction available to him is to arrogate himself the choice of her husband, most often insisting on someone she does not want, lest a desired husband usurp the father`s primary position in the daughter`s life` (Boose:1982:331).

Cyrus Hoy, in his article *Fathers and Daughters in Shakespeare`s Romances*, considers that Brabantio`s warning `is sowing a seed of suspicion that will later, under Iago`s nurture, come to monstrous flower in the husband`s imagination` (1978: 81). The argument that her elopement was a betrayal will return to plague Othello: `She did deceive her father, marrying you` tells Iago to Othello, `And when she seemed to shake and fear your looks, / She loved them most` (3.3.209-211). As David Bevington observes in his essay, `all that Iago need really do to plague Othello is to induce him to internalize as his own the very arguments brought forward in act one as evidence of the perfidy of women and the unlovable weakness of men` (2001 : 227).

Dreher (1986: 91) considers that Desdemona finds her cause in loving Othello, `subordinating herself in her role as his wife, even as he subordinates his ego to the demands of war`. She claims that `all her young life she had longed for a heroic mission, a cause` (Dreher: 1986: 91). Dreher (1986: 91) explains the paradox of Desdemona`s contradictory image (heroic, passive, and vulnerable): `On the altar of holy love she sacrifices her dynamic self to the image of her dreams, becoming a diminished shadow of herself`. Dreher explains that Desdemona tried to resolve for herself the crisis of identity, but in her marriage, she chooses a new identity: `a controlled, ever modest and obedient self, not Desdemona but the model wife, because this is what she feels Othello deserves.` (Dreher: 1986: 91). Dreher points out that Desdemona becomes a victim of the convention she embraces. Instead of the `maiden never bold` (1.3.95) that her father understands her in a wrong way, Desdemona is a

woman of adventurous spirit who defends her right to marry the man she loves before the Venetian Senate. Othello recalls that Desdemona wished ` That heaven had made her such a man` (1.3.163). Sara Munsen Deats argues in her essay *Truly, an obedient lady* that ` Through this double entendre, she reveals her desire to escape from the claustrophobic confines of woman`s domestic role in marriage` (2001: 244). She points out that` Shakespeare has created in Desdemona an oxymoronic blend of boldness and docility , sophistication and naivete, sensuality and chastity, a formidable and independent woman who challenges the dominant feminine ideals of the period` (2001 : 243).

According to Sara Munsen Deats, the play presents a conflict between two contrasting matrimonial models: the first, the companionate model that was the marital ideal of the period and the second, the patriarchal model. She examines these two models. The first one promoted individual choice as basis for marriage, with mutual support and companionship. She stresses that although striving for mutuality, the companionate marriage denied equality. Given this consideration, ` the dominance of the husband over the wife, ratified in St, Paul`s dictum that the husband should be the head of the wife as Christ was head of the church, was axiomatic` (2001: 235). She suggests that Desdemona and Othello reject the companionate model affirmed at the beginning of the play and accept the patriarchal ideology of absolute authority and subjugation. Desdemona`s attitude toward marriage at the beginning of the play reflects the tenets of the companionate matrimony model. She chooses to cohabit with Othello and to defy her love for him in front of the Senate. ` That I did love the Moor to live with him` (1.3.246). She explains that once they are married, Othello becomes for Desdemona not only her dearest companion but also an extension of her being: ` she totally commits herself to her husband and submerges her identity in his` (2001 : 244) : ` I saw Othello`s visage in his mind, / And to his honors and his valiant parts / Did I my soul and fortunes consecrate .` (1.3.250-252). Sara Munsen Deats explains that initially, Othello embraces this ideal of companiote model but in the middle of the play he starts to accept the traditional patriarchal model, vacillating between these two marital models : “ O curse of marriage , / that we can call these delicate creatures ours/ And not their appetites! “ (3.3.271-273). She argues that Othello has begun to see Desdemona through her fathers`s eyes, seeing her as an erring daughter who has deceived her father: ` And yet how nature erring from itself` (3.3.231). She suggests that ` Othello perceives Desdemona`s alleged unfaithfulness as a defacement of his private propriety, not only a loss of love but also a loss of male honor` (2001: 246). David Bevington in his essay *Othello: Portrait of a Marriage* claims that Othello has become `the stereotype of the anxious male beset by fears of womanly duplicity` (2001: 222).

As the play progresses, Desdemona's political conflict with her father has an essential role in the development of her marriage. Brabantio's warning about the deceitful nature of his daughter will become a haunting motif in the play, a repressed fear in Othello's unconscious mind. As a consequence, Freud's concept of repression can be applied in Othello's attitude. Through the play, Iago poisons Othello's perception of Desdemona. Thus, Othello is not able to see the real Desdemona. Gayle Greene claims in her article, that "men's misconceptions of women are, in Desdemona's words, horrible fancies, projections of their own worst fears and failings" (54). As a consequence, in Ophelia's understanding, Othello resorts to a psychological mechanism, which Freud names projection. In his misconceptions of women, Othello projects his "worst fears and failings".

The unresolved conflict between Desdemona and her father is a haunting motif in the play. David Bevington points out that "In a play that depicts men as strongly masculine and powerful, Othello and Iago are at the mercy of their own fantasies about loss of control of women" (2001: 224). In his account, the entire hypothesis of male self-sufficiency depends "on an assumption that the needed adoration of the woman is genuine and unswerving" (2001: 226). He claims that this assumption is under stress because of the elopement of Desdemona. As Sara Munsen Deats observes, Desdemona's attitude toward marriage changes radically during the play, rejecting the ideal of mutuality from the companionate model, seeking emotional security in the patriarchal model: "rejecting the more liberated attitude endorsed by the Puritan marriage counselors, she affirms her husband's right to chastise her, even though she is unaware of her fault, and she never attempts to retaliate against Othello, even though she has premonitions of her impending death" (2001: 246). Gayle Greene in her article *This that You call Love: Sexual and Social Tragedy in Othello* explains Desdemona's disjunctive character: "her defencelessness is a function of an ideal of womanly behavior that makes her co-operate with him in love and in destruction: as she is essential man, she is essential woman." (50 compendium). She explains the tragic vulnerability of Desdemona and Othello in being rooted in ideals and illusions related to conventional conceptions of man and women at the time. Their tragic vulnerability is also seen in Dreher's approach. She considers that Othello and Desdemona's mistake is in conforming to traditional male and female stereotypes: "Desdemona chastity becomes more important to both of them than Desdemona herself" (Dreher: 1986: 94). Iago poisons Gayle Greene claims in her article, that "men's misconceptions of women are, in Desdemona's words, horrible fancies, projections of their own worst fears and failings" (1995: 54). As a consequence, Othello resorts to a psychological mechanism, which Freud names projection: when aspects of ourselves,

usually negative ones, are not recognized as part of ourselves, but are perceived in or attributed to another” (Barry: 93).

As Dreher (1986: 88) observes, Desdemona “a courageous young woman is moved by the depth of her love to conform to a static and fatal ideal of feminine behavior”. Dreher explains that given these considerations, Desdemona “fails to make the psychological transition to adulthood” (1986: 90). She argues that “Desdemona is arrested in her emotional growth, clinging to childish loyalties or traditional role behavior in which women remain childish and submissive” (Dreher: 1986: 13). By transferring obedience from father to husband, she tries to please everyone, fulfilling the role of the good wife. Desdemona obeys her husband like an obedient child from the patriarchal society: “Whatever you be, I am obedient” (3.3.90).

The conflict between Ophelia and her father starts in the first act, scene III, when her father warns her against falling in love with Hamlet. Like Desdemona from the play *Othello*, Ophelia starts an identity crisis at this point. At the beginning of the play, her brother Laertes explains her that since Hamlet is responsible with his position in the state, it may be impossible for him to marry her. He speaks of how “nature crescent” in Hamlet must be “circumscribed” to the larger “body” of the state: “And therefore must his choice be circumscribed / Unto the voice and yielding of that body / Whereof he is the head” (1.3.22-24). Laertes tries to make Ophelia doubt Hamlet’s affection. He tries to suggest that a prince cannot have feelings for a woman because of his social role. The rest is “the perfume and suppliance of a minute, no more” (1.3.8-9). Laertes calls Hamlet’s courtship “a fashion and a toy in blood” (1.3.6). Ophelia responds: “No more but so?” (1.3.10). In her response, Ophelia is questioning but trusting Laertes. She listens to her brother’s advice as a “lesson” to “keep / As watchman to my heart..” (1.3.45-46). Ophelia answers:

But, good my brother,
Do not, as some ungracious pastors do,
Show me the steep and thorny way to heaven;
Whiles, like a puff’d and reckless libertine,
Himself the primrose path of dalliance treads,
And recks not his own rede
(1.3.46-51).

David Leverenz (1982:118) considers that Ophelia, in her answer, shows “awareness of his brother’s possible double self, the pastor and the libertine”. In Dreher’s approach, Ophelia realizes that not all male authority figures practice what they preach. Her answer suggests her recognition of the reality of hypocrisy. In her answer, she shows that she is a

perceptive, spirited young woman who does not lack intellect. She believes in Hamlet's love and she thinks for herself. Laertes warns Ophelia to defend her honor, her virginity, the 'chaste treasure' in patriarchal society:

Then weight what loss your honour may sustain,
If with too credent ear you list his songs,
Or lose your heart, or your chaste treasure open
To his unmas'tred importunity.
Fear it, Ophelia, fear it, my dear sister
(1.3.29-33).

Laertes leaves and Polonius, alone with his daughter, asks her about her relationship with Hamlet. Polonius and Laertes treat Ophelia like a child and they give her orders. This aspect is suggested in David Leverenz's essay *The Woman in Hamlet: An Interpersonal View*: 'at times their power seems to be defined by their ability to order women and children around' (Schwartz and Kahn: 1982: 110). In Dreher's approach, Polonius is seen as manipulator who watches, analyzes, and uses people: 'Tis told me, he hath very oft of late / Given private time to you; and you yourself/ have of your audience been most free and bounteous' (1.3.91-93). Dreher suggests that in these lines, Polonius 'has intelligence reports about Hamlet's frequent visits with Ophelia'. Polonius repeats Laertes's warning: 'You do not understand yourself so clearly / As it behoves my daughter and your honour' (1.3.97-98). In his essay, David Leverenz (1982:119) considers that Ophelia 'must accept the role of honorable possession and deny her love for Hamlet'. He does not interpret it as a question of repressed sexual desire, but as 'a question of what it means to understand oneself when the price is falseness to others'. Dreher (1986:78) considers that this male obsession for female virginity reflects 'the patriarchal concern for legitimate issue, the demand that young women be presented as chaste vessels by their fathers to future husbands, sacrificing personal identity to their function as child-bearers'. 'Honor' means reputation in Polonius's account. He is concerned to retain Ophelia's honor and reputation because they affect his own. He is interested to remove Ophelia from Hamlet's seduction. He forbids her to be with Hamlet, and tells her that Hamlet has deceived her in telling false 'vows':

Do not believe his vows, for they are brokers,
Not of the dye which their investments show,
But mere implorators of unholy suits
Breathing like sanctified and pious bawds
the better to beguile
(1.3.127-131).

Polonius manifests himself as a loving father, but he sees only his own interest. Like Brabantio from the play *Othello*, who tries to remove Desdemona from Othello's seduction,

Polonius tries to remove Ophelia from Hamlet's seduction. When Polonius repeats Laertes's warning, Ophelia begins her identity crisis. She starts to doubt Hamlet's affection because she trusts her brother and her father that are two important authority figures in her life. She is caught between her love for Hamlet and her obedience for Polonius. Ophelia wants to please her father, fulfilling the role of the good daughter. Like Desdemona from the play *Othello*, she chooses to please everyone, fulfilling the role of the good woman. Desdemona plays the role of the good wife, Ophelia plays the role of the good daughter. Ophelia begins to doubt herself. In her account, Hamlet 'hath importuned' her 'with love in honorable fashion' (1.3.110-111). As Iago tells Othello about the deceitful nature of Desdemona, so do Polonius and Laertes tell Ophelia about Hamlet's bad intentions. They interpret Hamlet's words as 'springes to catch woodcocks' (1.3.115). Dreher (1986:80) points out that 'Ophelia's dream of love lies shattered at her feet': 'I do not know, my lord, what I should think' (1.3.104).

Polonius is not concerned with his daughters' feelings. Ophelia has no choice but to say: 'I shall obey, my Lord' (1.3.136). She plays the role of the submissive woman that obeys to her father. Dreher (1986: 79) claims that Polonius and Laertes present her a view of sexuality that is 'animalistic, degrading, and terrifying'. We can apply this picture of the 'animalistic' sexuality in the play *Othello*, regarding Iago's interpretation of the love between Othello and Desdemona: 'your daughter covered with a Barbary house' (1.1.110), 'your daughter and the Moor are now making the beast with two backs' (1.1.115-116), 'your daughter/ Transported with no worse nor better guard / But with a knave of common hire, a gondolier, To the gross clasps of a lascivious Moor' (1.1.123-125). Dreher (1986:80) interprets Ophelia's submission not only as 'a surrender to convention, but an act of self-preservation by a young woman for whom sexuality has become a frightening animalistic threat'. She explains that Ophelia defeats herself in a society that defines men as active sexual aggressors, 'condoning their promiscuity while valuing women only for their chastity which must be defended at all costs'. In her identity crisis, she conforms to the patriarchal stereotypes of female behavior that subordinates women to male authority figures. The terror of the picture of sexuality presented by Polonius provokes her identity crisis.

When Ophelia sees Hamlet in act II, she runs to her father crying: O, lord, my lord, I have been so affrighted' (2.1.75). She is afraid of Hamlet's appearance:

No hat upon his head, his stockings fouled,
 Ungartered, and down-gyved to his ankle,
 Pale as his shirt, his knees knocking each other,
 And with a look so piteous in purport

As if he had been loosed out of hell
To speak of horrors, he comes before me
(2.1.80-85).

Polonius asks her: `Mad for thy love?` (2.1.86), and Ophelia answers: `My lord, I do not know, / But truly, I do fear it` (2.1.87-88). Her answer illustrates her fear and confusion. Hamlet has confronted his father`s ghost, but Cordelia does not know it. For Ophelia, Hamlet`s appearance confirms her father`s warnings. She runs to her father while crying. She represses her feelings for Hamlet at her father`s wish. She is a young girl with awakening sexuality, but according to Dreher, she represses her feelings and`obliterates her own reality, collapsing into a schizoid divided self and moral confusion` (Dreher: 1986: 80). Attempting to conform to what she is told to be, she fails to see what she is. As Dreher (1986: 81) observes, Ophelia`fails to give Hamlet the reassurance he seeks and confirms his suspicions about women`. Desdemona makes the same mistake. Dreher (1986:94) points out that Desdemona, attempting to conform to what she should be, she fails to see what she is, refusing to recognize Othello`s jealousy and the danger it represents. Given her situation (caught between childhood and adulthood in a patriarchal society) she is more inclined to conform to the wishes of others than to her feelings. Obedience to the parents was an expectation of the patriarchal world.

Ophelia trusts her father and obeys him, representing the model of the good daughter in the patriarchal society. Polonius uses his daughter to increase his power. He asks his daughter to report her most recent encounter with Hamlet. This aspect illustrates that he does not respect her privacy, and he does not see her as an individual. Ophelia is only a pawn in his plan of power and intrigue. Like Brabantio, Polonius thinks of his daughter as his property: `I have a daughter –have while she is mine- /Who, in her duty and obedience, mark, / Hath given me this` (2.2.106-108). In his attempt to increase his power, Polonius manipulates his daughter. Ophelia turns over to her father the love letters that Hamlet has written her. After reading the letter, Polonius says:

This, in obedience, hath my daughter showed me,
And, more above, hath his solicitings,
As they fell out by time, by means, and place,
All given to mine ear.
(2.2.124-127).

He is concerned only for his own position. This aspect can be seen in his answer to Claudius`question about Ophelia flagrantly: `Claudius. But how hath she / Received his love?

Polonius. What do you think of me?` (2.2.128-129). In his hypothesis, Hamlet`s madness is caused by love melancholy for Ophelia. In this case, the marriage of Hamlet to his daughter put his grandchildren upon the throne of Denmark. Polonius` next plan is to use Ophelia to prove his hypothesis. He knows that Hamlet: ` sometimes he walks four hours together / Here in the lobby` (2.2.160-161). Ophelia must obey her father to save Hamlet from the madness caused by love melancholy .Dreher (1986:81) claims that Ophelia `succumbs to convention, becoming a puppet in their hands`. Polonius needs Hamlet`s love declaration to Ophelia. He and Claudius will hide` behind the arras` and spy on the lovers: ` Be you and I behind an arras then` (2.2.164).

In David Leverenz` account (1982: 119), Ophelia is ` an animal whom Polonius can lose to catch Hamlet`s motive`: `At such a time I`ll lose my daughter to him` (2.2.163). David Leverenz considers that fathers in this play ` perceive children as they do their wives and bodies, as beasts to be controlled for the magnification of their self-images, or rather, for the expression of their divided selves, their reason and their lust` (Schwartz and Kahn: 1982: 119). Polonius enlisted Ophelia ` services as an instrument in her lover`s betrayal. Ophelia is loyal, but to her father.

In act III, in the nunnery scene, Ophelia enters with a prayer book. In Boose`s approach (1982: 329) this scene represents an` inverted marriage ceremony`. Ophelia stands between Hamlet and her father, concealed behind the arras. Boose (1982:329) mentions that` instead of the groom`s awaiting the entrance of the bride and her father, the hidden father and the nervous Ophelia await Hamlet; instead of having the groom give the bride a ring, this scene inverts the model by having Ophelia return Hamlet`s gifts`. When Hamlet asks `Where is your father?` (3.1.131), Ophelia answers: `At home, my lord` (3.1.132).Boose (1982:329) interprets her response as an inability ` to break away from the weighty bonds of home and father`. In her response, Ophelia lies and chooses paternal obedience over love and honor to the man she loves. Boose (1982:329) considers that in making such a choice, Ophelia violates the marriage ritual, and ` Hamlet responds in savage parody by giving her the dowry she has indeed received from Polonius: to be as chaste as ice and as pure as snow and yet not escape calumny`. In this scene, Ophelia feels disillusioned. Her answer to Hamlet`s ` I did love you once` (3.1.116) illustrates her disillusion: ` Indeed, my lord, you made me believe so` (3.1.117). Ophelia thinks that Hamlet does not love her. She hears him insult her:

Be thou as chaste as ice.as pure as snow, thou
Shalt not escape calumny. Get thee to a nunnery, go,
farewell. Or if thou wilt needs marry, marry a foul; for
wise men know well enough what monsters you make of

them. To a nunnery go, and quickly too. Farewell
(3.1.138-141).

Ernest Jones in his essay *The Psychoanalytical Solution*, considers that `Hamlet`s resentment against women is still further inflamed by the hypocritical prudishness with which Ophelia follows her father and brother in seeing evil in his natural affection, an attitude which poisons his love in exactly the same way that the love of his childhood` (Faber: 103).

Hamlet`s total reaction culminates in his misogyny against Ophelia. Hamlet says:

I have heard of your paintings too, well enough
God has given you one face, and you make yourselves
another. You jig, you amble, and you lisp, and nickname
God`s creatures, and make your wantonness your ig-
norance. Go to, I`ll no more on`t, it hath made me mad
(3.1.143-147)

Ophelia is devastated at having to hear such insulting to her own offense. She does not know that in his speech Hamlet `is really expressing his bitter resentment against his mother` (Faber: 103). According to Freud, Hamlet has an Oedipus complex, but Ophelia does not know it. Ernest Jones mentions that: `The intensity of Hamlet`s repulsion against women in general and Ophelia in particular, is a measure of the powerful repression to which his sexual feelings are being subjected. The outlet for those feelings in the direction of his mother has always been damned, and now that the narrower channel in Ophelia`s direction has also been closed the increase in the original direction consequent on the awakening of early memories tasks all his energy to maintain the repression` (Faber: 103). Ophelia`s speech at the end of their encounter illustrates her guilt and despair:

And I, of ladies most deject and wretched,
That suck`d the honey of his music vows,
Now see that noble and most sovereign reason,
Like sweet bells jangled, out of time and hash;
That unmatch`d form and feature of his blown youth
Blasted with ecstasy: O, woe is me,
T`have seen what I have seen: see what I see!
(3.1.156-162)

She thinks that love is something like` honey` but transforms men in fearful men.

In Boose`s account, (1982: 329) the fidelity that Ophelia should give to Hamlet `is inextricably entwined with thoughts of her father, the male from whom she has never ritually transferred her obedience or her loyalty`. David Leverenz (1982:119) states: `Not allowed to love and unable to be false, Ophelia breaks`. Polonius dies, behind an arras, while spying and

manipulating. She is alone, without her father, without Hamlet's love. Dreher (1986:83) points out that "stunned into a fear of her lover and a childlike dependency on her father, Ophelia suddenly has them both removed". Dreher explains that Ophelia "collapses into madness because she knows not where to turn for guidance". David Leverenz (1981:19) explains that "even in her madness she has no voice of her own, only a discord of other voices and expectations". In her madness she says: they say the owl was a baker's daughter. Lord, we know / What we are, but know not what we may be" (4.5.41-43). Dreher interprets these lines as Ophelia's acknowledgement of her "own repressed sexuality, the shock of what may be in herself combined with the horrible transformations wrought by romantic love" (Dreher:83). She gives flowers. In her essay, Showalter (2007:3) suggests that "in giving away her wild flowers and herbs, she is symbolically deflowering herself". Dreher (1986:84) sees an Ophelia "unable to combine her conflicting fears, and desires into an integrated sense of self, encircled by this tangle of discordant meanings, she draws". Ophelia collapses into madness, into death.

It is also interesting to consider that Ophelia suffers from an Oedipus Complex. This aspect appears in Theodor Lidz's reading of the play *Hamlet*. In her essay *Representing Ophelia: Women, Madness, and the Responsibilities of Feminist Criticism*, Elaine Showalter suggests that in the Freudian interpretation, *Hamlet* is seen as "two parallel male and female psychodramas, the counterpointed stories of the incestuous attachments of Hamlet and Ophelia" (Showalter: 2007: 8). Elaine Showalter presents Theodor Lidz's reading of Hamlet and Ophelia: "While Hamlet is neurotically attached to his mother, Ophelia has an unresolved oedipal attachment to her father. She has fantasies of a lover who will abduct her from or even kill her father, and when this actually happens, her reason is destroyed by guilt as well as by lingering incestuous feelings". In Theodor Lidz's reading, Ophelia breaks "because she fails in the female developmental task of shifting her sexual attachment from her father to a man who can bring her fulfillment as a woman" (Showalter:2007: 8). We can also speculate that this Oedipus complex appears in the play *Othello*, in the psychological interpretation of Desdemona's behavior. Dreher (1986:13) suggests that Desdemona chooses a father – surrogate to love and obey, her marriage being a transference, not a transition. Gayle Greene points out that "Brabantio's warning suggests similarities between Desdemona's relations with both husband and father" (56). Robert Dickes in his article *Desdemona: An innocent Victim?*, suggests that Desdemona chose as a love object a man representative of her father. Dreher (1986: 91) mentions that some psychological critics have seen Ophelia motivated by an Oedipus complex, in which she wanted to marry someone like her father: "They explain

her subsequent passive behavior as moral masochism, motivated by guilt for her incestuous urgings` (Dreher:1986:91).

4 Miranda and Prospero, challenging tradition?

The above chapter of the present thesis dealt with two typical father-daughter relationships for the patriarchal family model. In this chapter, we will look at the relationship between Prospero and Miranda from the play *The Tempest*. We will seek to explore whether this relationship is challenging or not the patriarchal parental model.

In Coppelia Kahn's reading of *The Tempest*, the separation of family members is made in a literal or metaphorical tempest that has as a consequence sorrow and confusion and reunion of the family with a renewed sense of identity. Kahn calls this passage 'the individual's passage from emotional residence within the family to independence and adulthood' (Kahn: 1982: 218). In Kahn's account, Prospero and Miranda progress in a process of identity formation 'highlighted in two significantly interrelated crises: that of the youth emerging from the family and that of a father who has not yet fully accepted his fatherhood' (Kahn: 218). In Kahn's reading of this play, the tempest represents the violence and the confusion of passing from one stage of life to the next.

Dreher (1986: 40) claims that in this crucial moment of transition, daughter-father relationship undergoes considerable stress as individuals must accept a new distribution of roles, power and authority. Changes, in general, exposes people to something new, unknown, that creates a sentiment of fear. As Kahn (1982: 218) observes, Shakespeare resolves this crisis through the father-daughter relationship, using the daughter's sexuality and capacity to produce heirs as a bridge to the hero's new identity as father. She points out that in *The Tempest*, the daughter instead of the son carries on the father's line.

At the beginning of the play, Prospero thinks that the moment has come for his daughter's transition into womanhood. Miranda is on the moment when she is ready to leave the sphere of her father's control. She is ready to leave behind childhood for the adult commitment of the marriage and love. She is in a process of passage from childhood to womanhood with its awakening sexuality. Prospero knows that this is a turning point in his daughter's self-awareness.

The relationship between Prospero and Miranda, with its political and emotional tensions, progresses through the play. The play begins with the revelation of her true identity and ends with her engagement. Every stage in this process is overseen by her father. Abenheimer (1970:515) sees Miranda as 'the image of the all-pleasing child as Prospero may wish her to be. She is the product of her father's wishful thought'. Prospero senses that this is the moment to reveal the real identity of his daughter: 'Tis time / I should inform thee farther' (1.2.22-23). Miranda does not know about her origins: 'naught knowing/Of whence I am, nor that I am more better' (1.2.18). Prospero was once Duke of Milan, but he was more inclined towards 'the battering of his mind' and less in 'wordly ends': 'I pray thee mark me: / I thus neglecting wordly ends, all dedicated / To closeness and the battering of my mind' (1.2.88-90). He has lost his kingdom because he was more interested in cultivating his mind, than in the 'wordly' affairs. This aspect can be interpreted as a denial of power. Prospero lets his brother Antonio manage the state affairs. Prospero's retreat into the study of magic costs him his kingdom, and almost his life. The affairs of the state and the actual reign of his dukedom he left to Antonio. He trusted his brother. The neglect of his kingdom made him vulnerable to political intrigue by his brother, Antonio. He is betrayed by Antonio, who made a pact with Prospero's enemy, the King of Naples, in order to become the absolute ruler of Milan. They expelled Prospero and his daughter Miranda from Milan, by putting them on an old ship and sending them on a stormy sea, hoping probably that they would die. But, with the help of the noble Neapolitan Gonzalo, who gave them some food and water, they managed to survive and landed on the island that is the setting of Shakespeare's play *The Tempest*. Prospero has lived alone with Miranda, his daughter, for twelve years and with two other inhabitants: Caliban and Ariel.

At the same time, he became completely isolated, living on a small island without human contact (except from his daughter Miranda). In his approach of *The Tempest*, an analysis that reflects the influence of Jung as well as Freud, K.M. Abenheimer interprets Prospero's isolation on the island as a 'paranoid isolation into which he had retired after his expulsion from Milan' (Faber:1970:500). Abenheimer considers that Prospero, as Duke of Milan, expected to live in the 'parentlike care and shelter of his brother' displaying a tendency 'to isolate himself, to reduce human contacts as much as possible and to substitute intellectual pursuits in their place' (Faber: 1970: 500). Abenheimer explains the psychological cause of this isolation. Prospero still longs for the kind of security his brother offered. As a result of this aspect, 'he introjected the images of the caring and protecting parents and played their role himself. Instead of being mothered, he now mothers Miranda, and he also

identifies himself with the image of the omnipotent and omniscient father. Such identification with archetypal images leads inevitably to isolation, for no longer can such a person react to events as his own heart and feelings would demand; he has to hide his own personality and play the part of being nothing but a god and protective parent` (Faber: 1970: 504).

The play opens with a storm staged by Prospero`s magic powers and continues with the demonstration of his ability to subjugate Caliban, the spirit Ariel and finally the prince Ferdinand to his will. Abenheimer considers that ` Prospero, the magician, patronizes others or rules over them and orders them about, but does not expose his own personality to the reactions and the influence of others, and thus is isolated` (Faber: 1970: 504). Prospero has raised this tempest because he wanted to revenge himself on his enemies. This tempest can symbolize the difficult passage with internal conflicts that both father and daughter undergo. In Abenheimer`s approach, with the coming of the tempest, Prospero`s transformation begins. Abenheimer explains that Prospero`s transformation begins when he realizes that he received a chance that will not return. The tempest symbolizes the beginning of psychic progress and moral development for Prospero. Abenheimer (1970: 508) considers that the storm, which separates us from the family and social comfort and security has a double aspect: ` they may lead into emotional crises but can result in progress and conversion`. Abenheimer shows that Prospero acknowledges for the first time since his isolation, the existence of forces outside his ego and his ego domination, `giving vent for the first time to self-assertive feelings other than those needed to ensure his domination and aloof superiority` (Faber: 1970: 511).

At the beginning of the play, we witness the storm staged by Prospero. The conspirators sail near the island and Prospero unleashes the tempest that shipwrecks them on the island. Prospero tells his daughter that he has started everything, ` but in care of thee`: ` I have done nothing but in care of thee, / Of thee, my dear one, thee, my daughter` (1.2.16-17). Miranda is full of pity for the suffering of the ` poor souls` who seem to ` have perish`d`:

O, I have suffered
With those that I saw suffer: a brave vessel
Who had, no doubt, some noble creature in her
dashed all to pieces! O, the cry did knock
Against my very heart- poor souls, they perished
(1.2.5-9).

Prospero does not tell Miranda his true motives for causing the tempest, but tries to quiet her. In his analysis of *The Tempest*, Bernard Paris talks about Prospero`s compassionate side embodied in Miranda. He explains that Prospero no longer has an idealistic view of

human nature, but he has retained many of his self-effacing values and has instilled them in Miranda (Keeseey :2003 :237). Miranda says that if she had been any god of power she would never have permitted the wreck to happen, and neither does Prospero: "Had I been any god of power, I would/ have sunk the sea within the earth or ere/ It should the good ship so have swallowed, and / the fraughting souls within her" (1.2.10-13). She is full of sympathy for fellow creatures she has never seen but has learned of from paternal instruction and books. Prospero assures her that: "There is no harm done" (1.2.16). Through his "art" he has "So safely ordered" the storm:

I have with such provision in mine art
So safely ordered that there is no soul,
No, not so much perdition as an hair
Betid to any creature in the vessel
Which thou heard'st cry, which thou saw'st sink
(1.2. 28-32).

He shows a capacity for care for his beloved daughter. When Prospero begins to tell the story of their exile her heart bleeds / To think o'th'teen that I have turned you to" (1.2. 64).

Prospero tells her about their exile from Italy and he is anxious because Miranda knows him only as a "master of a full poor cell, / And thy no greater father" (1.2.19-20). Prospero's attitude reflects a different father from the patriarchal authority model. Prospero acknowledges that he is a suffering human being who made mistakes and, without Gonzalo's they could die. Miranda admires him and she is both supportive and passive, and her responses are just what her father wants: "More to know/ Did never meddle with my thoughts" (1.2.21-22). This answer reflects a different Miranda from the traditional innocent daughter, it reflects a daughter conscious of what her relation to her father requires her to say. Prospero was Miranda's schoolmaster, training her mind and having high standards for her.

When Prospero reflects on his success as her "schoolmaster": "Have I, thy schoolmaster, made thee more profit / Than other princes can that have more time" (1.2.172-73) she cries: "Heavens thank you for it." (1.2.175). Miranda is the ideal listener for Prospero. She admires her father and she feels sorrows for the sufferings of her father: "Alack, what trouble / Was I then to you!" (1.2.152-53). Throughout Prospero's narration, Miranda has no critical faculty of her own. Sundelson argues that the play belongs to Prospero because "there are no discordant voices with enough wit or dignity to command attention" (1982:34).

Miranda refers to Prospero as `sir` and Prospero to Miranda as `dear lady`. They have a lot of respect for each other. This scene reflects a father - daughter relationship that is tender. Sundelson explains that in his narration about his exile, Prospero `poses to Miranda as an injured ascetic who wanted very little and was denied even that: `Me, poor man, my library / was dukedom large enough` (1.2.109-110). He complains about the loss of `all the honours`: `and confer fair Milan, / With all the honours, on my brother` (1.2. 126-27). Prospero turns his responsibilities as duke over to his brother. He lives in a world of books. As a result of his studies, he becomes: `the prime duke, being so reputed/ In dignity, and for the liberal arts / Without a parallel` (1.2.72-73). In his analysis of *The Tempest*, Bernard Paris considers that Prospero is a detached person that is averse to the struggle of power. He claims that: `Prospero`s study of magic is highly congruent with his personality. Magic is a means of achieving one`s ends without effort and of transcending the limitations of the human condition` (Keeseey : 2003: 236). Sundelson explains that `in casting the government over his brother, Prospero wants both the status of a father and the security and ease of a child` (1982 : 35). Sundelson (1982: 35) claims that `even fatherhood seems to have been doubtful in Milan: ` - Sir, are not you my father? - Thy mother was a piece of virtue, and / She said thou wast my daughter; and thy father / was Duke of Milan; and his only heir / And princess, no worse issued` (1.2.55-59).

Sundelson (1982: 35) talks about an analogy between the anxiety about Prospero`s impotence projected into a personified Milan and the doubts of his wife chastity related to the imagery of his expulsion from the city. He argues that Milan rejects Prospero like a `rejecting woman`. He states: `thrust from Milan` (1.2.160). In Sundelson`s essay, this expression refers to a traumatic birth that Prospero shared with Miranda :

one midnight
 fated to th` purpose , did Antonio open
 The gates of Milan ; and, i` th` dead of darkness,
 The ministers for th` purpose hurried thence
 Me and thy crying self.
 (1.2. 128-32).

Prospero sees his exile as a trial and a blessing: `were we heaved thence, / But blessedly help hither` (1.2.63-64). Dreher (1986: 157) argues that Prospero recognizes that his imbalance was responsible for his loss. Prospero had his books and the cares of the government were upon his brother: `being transported / And rapt in secret studies` (1.2.76-77). He describes his studies as a prefiguration of his dispatch to the island and of his abdication. In his narration, Prospero recognizes his error. This acknowledgement is seen in

Dreher's account as a vital step in the process of regeneration, which leads him from the bitterness of revenge to wholeness, integration, and mercy and the consequences of his imbalance were also the cure (Dreher: 1986: 158). His exile is a consequence both of the natural evil in his brother and his own retreat from ducal duties into studies (magic and the liberal arts). Alone on the island, Prospero was forced to care for Miranda and to become more responsible. Prospero has served as mother to Miranda, as well as father. Dreher (1986: 158) explains that the demands of daily existence have been a spiritual exercise for this contemplative scholar, developing the pragmatic, active side of his nature he had heretofore neglected. Dreher argues that Prospero has been forced by necessity to divide his activities between the active and contemplative, gaining internal balance.

Prospero loves Miranda; he is a father with a strong emotional investment in his daughter. He never hesitates to say how and why he prizes her. He describes her as a third of his own life: a third of mine own life, / or that for which I live (4.1.3-4). He tells his daughter that he has started everything, but in care of thee: I have done nothing but in care of thee, / Of thee, my dear one, thee, my daughter (1.2.16-17). He explains her that she was the reason why he survived, that she gave his life another level of meaning: O, a cherubin / Thou wasn't that did preserve me. Thou didst smile, / infused with a fortitude from heaven (1.2.154-56). In his essay *So rare a Wonder'd father: Prospero's Tempest*, David Sundelson points out that though a child, on their voyage Miranda provided a substitute for the lost maternal protection. Dreher (1986: 158) argues that Miranda has been a source of emotional sustenance for Prospero, she awakened the nurturing tendencies in Prospero who became wiser and deeper.

The dialogue between Miranda and Prospero shows a father's obsessive need for attention and a daughter that fulfills it, it shows Prospero's doubt and Prospero's inner conflicts in this passage from middle life to late adulthood: Prospero. Obey and be attentive (1.2.38); Prospero. Dost thou attend me? Miranda. Sir, most heedfully, (1.2.78); Prospero. Thou attend'st not? Miranda, O, good sir, I do, / Prospero. I pray thee, mark me. (1.2.87-88); Prospero. Dost thou hear? Miranda. Your tale, sir, would cure deafness (1.2.106). In this dialogue Miranda is the perfect listener, a good daughter that respects, obeys and admires her father. She is a sympathetic listener: Your tale, sir, would cure deafness (1.2.106). She is a daughter that corresponds to the accepted patterns of traditional woman behavior at the time (obedient, chaste, dutiful).

After he has told her, he charms her to sleep and he can set about the new plan of giving her a husband. Prospero creates a tempest that produces a suitor for Miranda. The

primary solution the tempest brings is that of a suitor in the person of Ferdinand, the son of Antonio's conspirator, the King of Naples. Miranda and Ferdinand encounter each other and are immediately in love with each other. Prospero sees that they have 'changed eyes' (1.2.442) and he promises to Ariel: 'Spirit, fine spirit! I'll free thee /Within two days for this' (1.2.423-424). In his promise, he shows gratitude to Ariel. When the future husband, Ferdinand, arrives Prospero steps between the two. Prospero wants to cement their love by placing obstacles between Miranda and her love. Miranda does not know about it. He puts Ferdinand to many tests. He calls Ferdinand a traitor, a spy, and a usurper, taking him captive and subjecting him to his will. As Leininger observes in her essay *The Miranda Trap: Sexism and Racism in Shakespeare's Tempest*, 'Prospero has established the principle that stands whether a father's action be just or unjust: the daughter must submit to his demand for absolute unthinking obedience' (1983: 288). The relationship between Miranda and her father is seen as a dominating and patronizing relationship.

In her essay, Leininger sees Miranda as an obedient, innocent young woman dutifully married off by her father. She found that *The Tempest* continued to reproduce oppressive patriarchal confusions. Miranda will remain a property that has passed from her father to her husband. Leininger talks about a moment in the play in which Prospero responds to Miranda's defense of Ferdinand: 'O dear father, / Make not too rash a trial of him, for/ He's gentle, and not fearful (1.2.469-71) with these words: 'What! I say, / My foot my tutor?' (1.2.471-72). Miranda must understand that she is a foot in the family organization in which Prospero is the head. In Leininger's essay, Miranda is seen as a subordinate figure who is not free to speak, since her father at any time can silence her with these words. Leininger (1983: 289) claims that 'Miranda has no way out of the cycle of being a dependent foot in need of protection, placed in a threatening situation which in turn calls for more protection, and thus increased dependence and increased subservience'.

Dreher's interpretation of Miranda (1986:159) is different from that of Leininger: 'Miranda is more than a beautiful pawn in the larger game of courtship and reconciliation'. Miranda represents an interesting challenging figure: she is obedient and at the same time she rebels against her father as Desdemona does. Dreher explains that Miranda disobeys and defies her father, choosing romantic love over parental obedience. At one level Miranda acts on her own behalf pursuing Ferdinand against what she knows of her Prospero's will. When Ferdinand asks her: 'What is your name?' she answers him 'Miranda. O my father, / I have broken your hest to say so' (3.1. 38-40). She defies her father by choosing to defend Ferdinand 'O dear father, / Make not too rash a trial of him, for/ He's gentle, and not fearful

(1.2.469-71). While Miranda talks to Ferdinand in act III, she remembers that her father gave her `percepts` against talking to Ferdinand: ` But I prattle / Something too widely, and my father`s percepts / I therein do forget` (3.1.57-58). She disobeys her father by breaking his given `percepts` .

By the end of the scene, Miranda seems to achieve commitment and personal growth. She trusts her desires and proposes marriage to Ferdinand:

At mine unworthiness, that dare not offer
What I desire to give, and much less take
What I shall die to want, But this is trifling, And all the more it seeks to hide itself,
the bigger bulk it shows. Hence, bashful cunning,
And prompt me, plain and holy innocence !
I am your wife if you will marry me:
(3.1.77- 83).

She asks Ferdinand: ` Do you love me? ...My husband, then? ` (3.1.68-73). The clarity and the simplicity of her language reflects the clarity of the heroine`s desires. As Bamber (1982: 182) observes, ` Miranda`s desires have been if not created by Prospero then at least anticipated by him. At some level, Miranda cannot avoid her father: he makes use of her desires to serve his own purposes`. Bamber explains that although Prospero cannot keep her from sexual maturity, he can direct her to the husband who will serve his own purposes. Now his grandchildren will rule his enemies` land: ` Was Milan thrust from Milan that his issue / Should become kings of Naples? (5.1. 205-6). As Stephen Orgel (2008 : 54) mentions ` If we look at that marriage as a political act, we will observe that, in order to establish the line of succession , Prospero is marrying his daughter to the son of his enemy`. He explains that there is a ` good Renaissance statecraft in this`: ` if Miranda is the heir to the dukedom, Milan through the marriage will become part of the kingdom of Naples`. Kahn (1982: 239) claims that ensuring legitimate heirs to his dukedom, he resolves his old usurpation conflicts and validate his new identity as duke. Given these considerations, Prospero has recouped his throne from his brother: ` The usurping Antonio stands condemned , but the effects of the usurpation, the alliance with Alonso and the reduction of Milan to a Neapolitan fiefdom are, through Miranda`s wedding , confirmed and legitimized` (Orgel:2008 : 54). In Orgel`s reading of *The Tempest*, the marriage between Miranda and Ferdinand is ` as much a means of preserving Prospero`s authority as of relinquishing it` (Orgel: 2008 : 55). In Barker and Hulme`s reading, the purpose of Prospero`s main plot ` is to secure recognition of his claim to the usurped duchy of Milan, a recognition sealed in the blessing given by Alonso to the prospective marriage of his own son to Prospero`s daughter` (Donald Keesey : 2003 : 447).

Prospero's willingness to remain quiet while Miranda talks to Ferdinand in Act III, reflects an evidence of his love for Miranda. Prospero enters unseen and he does not say a word until she and Ferdinand left. And when the scene is over, there is Prospero's pronouncement: 'So glad of this as they I cannot be' (3.1.93). He lets Miranda leave from childhood into womanhood. In act IV, Prospero acknowledges his love for Miranda and releases her from his care:

If I have too austerely punish'd you,
Your compensation makes amends, for I
have given you here a third of my own life,
Or that for which I live; who once again
I tender to thy hand
(4.1.1-5).

But Bamber (1982: 182) claims that 'Miranda's success is under Prospero's control. In his soliloquy from act III Prospero gives his blessing though he may not be so glad at their union as they are:

So glad of this as they I cannot be,
Who are surprised withal, but my rejoicing
At nothing can be more. I'll to my book,
For yet ere supertime must I perform
Much business appertaining
(3.1.93-97).

Cyrus Hoy talks about Prospero's recognition of the inevitability of Miranda's loss. Cyrus Hoy argues that when Prospero finds that Ferdinand has endured the trials he has put him to he is prepared to 'forego his all – too – human inclination to keep his daughter to himself and to give her in marriage instead' (Kay Jacobs: 1978: 89) because he is resigned with the inevitability of her Miranda's loss. Prospero conveys his paternal blessing directly. He explains to Ferdinand that 'the vexations' he has been made to suffer have been but 'trials of thy love': 'All thy vexations / Were but my trials of thy love, and thou/ hast strangely stood the test' (4.1.5-7). His compensation is marriage to one, who 'will outstrip all praise, / And make it halt behind her' (4.1.10-11).

Prospero undergoes a middle life crisis with developmental challenges. He undergoes a difficult process in order to release his daughter from the sphere of his control and power. Prospero is an overprotective father for Miranda. Orgel (2008: 19) claims that 'on the island Prospero undoes the usurpation, recreating kingdom and family with himself in sole command'. Prospero resorts to a psychological mechanism, that Freud names 'defence mechanisms', that is 'as psychic procedures for avoiding painful admissions or recognitions'

(Barry: 2009 : 94). The unconscious anxiety of relieving the past drama triggers in Prospero the necessity of protecting himself. His need to control every creature on the island and even the forces of nature can be interpreted according to Freud`s theory about the `defence mechanisms`. His magic books and power made him a god of his island, displacing Caliban. Caliban is the son of Sycorax, the witch. He appears as half man and half beast. He has taught Prospero about the island and in return, Prospero has taught him speech. But, after Caliban tried to rape Miranda, he was confined to become Prospero`s slave. For many years, Prospero has been running everything, even the local weather. This control is extended to the sexuality of his two human subjects: Miranda and Caliban, and later Ferdinand.

Prospero warns Ferdinand about Miranda`s virginity: ` But / If thou dost break her virgin – knot before / All sanctimonius ceremonies may / With full and holy rite be ministered` (4.1.15-18). Dreher (1986: 160) sees in Prospero`s insistence ` a strong belief in balance, the necessity of love within order`. Prospero responds to the approaching marriage between Miranda and Ferdinand with defense. Sundelson (1982: 46) considers that ` Ferdinand`s awe of Miranda must harness his desire, first of all, and the father must have a symbolic victory over the younger`s man`s confident sexuality`. She considers that many have found Prospero`s insistence excessive, ` indicative of unresolved passions and reluctance to release his much loved daughter to the embraces of another man`. Leininger mentions that ` most critics agree that the chastity of Miranda and Ferdinand in the fourth act symbolizes all human virtue, while Caliban`s lust symbolizes all human vice` (1983: 289). In a psychoanalytic reading, Prospero`s exaggerated insistence and concern for his daughter`s chastity, in the circumstances of his social and sexual isolation, can be considered an incestuous desire.

Dreher (1986: 9) points out that the love between father and daughter inevitably calls up the question of incest. She quotes Geiser: ` Incest generally occurs when daughters enter puberty and their fathers middle life, mothers are either ill or absent, unavailable for sexual relations with their husbands. Incestuous fathers suffer from weak self – images, still emotionally infantile, they expect to be mothered by their wives, and, failing that, they turn to their daughters` (Dreher: 1985: 10). In his career, Freud cited father – daughter incest as a frequent cause of hysteria among women. Dreher (1986: 10) quotes Masson: ` Incest, for Freud, was primarily a strong inclination in the unconscious frustrated by an equally strong taboo`.

This aspect of Prospero`s unconscious incest wishes, is seen in other critics`s approaches. In her account, Bamber (1982: 175) notes that ` It is the terrible possibility of

incest that darkness and dampens the sexuality of *The Tempest*. She claims that when the wife is missing, the father's daughter becomes a temptation to be overcome rather than a force for sexual liberation. Bamber (1982: 175) explains that the sexuality in *The Tempest* is a matter of prohibition. Given these considerations, she argues that Miranda's sexuality is inaccessible to the male Self, offering Prospero a choice between incest and sexual self-denial and the feminine is a challenge to self – possession and restraint. In his essay *Fathers and Daughters in Shakespeare's Romances*, Cyrus Hoy talks about incestuous impulses that Prospero banishes and the foreground of consciousness is occupied with the need to protect Miranda's chastity from rape (1978: 88).

It is also interesting to consider that the Freudian concept of the *defense mechanisms* can be employed in Prospero's behavior towards Caliban. The first mechanism that would explain Prospero's behavior towards Caliban is called transference. The transference is the phenomenon whereby the patient under analysis redirects the emotions recalled in analysis towards the psychoanalyst: thus, the antagonism or resentment felt towards a parental figure in the past might be reactivated, but directed against the analyst (Barry: 2009: 93). This term means, in our case, that Prospero redirects his feelings for one person against someone else. The rage that Prospero feels against his old enemies is redirected against Caliban. Prospero discharges onto Caliban all the anger that he feels toward the enemies back home. Or, he might recognize some part of himself in Caliban: his rage, his violence, his desiring power, his vengefulness. Prospero resorts to another such mechanism called projection. This term means, in our case that Prospero attributes to Caliban his repressed and incestuous desire for Miranda. He does not acknowledge this negative aspect and redirects it toward Caliban.

It is interesting to see that other critics interpret Prospero's behavior according to Freud's defense mechanism. So, our argument becomes re-validated by other critics. For example, Meredith Anne Skura claims that Caliban functions as a walking screen for projection for Prospero's own repressed fantasies of omnipotence and lust (Graff and Phelan: 2000: 311). She considers that Prospero's desire for power, revenge as well as any sexual desire toward Miranda are projected onto the fishily phallic Caliban (2000: 311). Bamber considers that the sexuality of the male Self can only be bestial and must therefore be continuously repressed. Bamber notes that in this play, Prospero's sexual bestiality is displaced into the native Caliban. Meredith Anne Skura considers that there is a childishly amoral and almost asexual glee in Caliban's sexuality (Graff and Phelan: 2000: 315). She claims that Prospero treats Caliban as he would treat the willful child in himself. Caliban represents a projection of Prospero's childishness. As Meredith Anne Skura mentions:

Prospero acknowledges the child like Caliban as his own and he moves for the first time accepting the child in himself rather than trying to dominate and erase that child in order to establish his adult authority` (Graff and Phelan: 2000: 318).

In Abenheimer`s approach, Caliban represents Prospero`s shadow. Abenheimer notes: ` he is earthy and dirty and stinking, animalic and selfish, all those qualities which are opposed to the good, loving parent with whom Prospero is identified` (Faber: 1970: 507). Dreher (1985: 161) quotes Knight: ` Ariel and Caliban represent the twin potentialities of the human spirit` and ` they can be seen as the mental and physical sides of his nature`. Prospero`s psychological profile is best outlined through his interaction with Caliban, not through contrast, but more through similarities. Thus, Prospero`s incestuous sexual desire toward Miranda is repressed and projected into Caliban who represents a threat.

In the above section, we dealt with an unresolved conflict between Brabantio and Desdemona. In the play *Othello*, this repressed conflict appeared through the play as a haunting motive, and it involved tragic consequences. In the case of the *The Tempest*, an unresolved conflict between Caliban and Prospero insinuates itself in the play. Prospero ignores Caliban`s accusations of taking his rightful land: ` This island`s mine, by Sycorax my mother. Which thou tak`st from me` (1.2.331-332). In the essay *Nymphs and Reapers Heavily Vanish: The Discursive Con- texts of The Tempest*, Barker and Hulme claim that Prospero`s only reaction is ` an indirect denial: ` Thou, most lying slave` (1.2.346) and a counter accusation of attempted rape ` Thou didst seek to violate / The honour of my child (1.2.349-50). Prospero`s words refuse engagement with Caliban`s claim to original sovereignty of the island. This is Prospero`s only justification for the arbitrary rule he exercises over the island. The reason for Caliban`s enslavement is his sexual threat to Miranda. Prospero accuses Caliban of trying ` to violate the honor `of his child and Caliban concurs in his answer: ` O ho, O ho! Would `t had been done! / Thou didst prevent me, I had peopled else / This isle with Calibans` (1.2.351- 53). Leininger (1982:291) argues that Prospero must be punitive in order to defend Miranda`s chastity and she sees Miranda ` as deprived of any possibility of human freedom, growth or thought`. She claims that Miranda ` needs only be chaste, to exist as a walking problem of chastity` (Leininger: 291).

As the play progresses, Prospero proceeds to another Freudian defense mechanism called sublimation. In our case, Prospero claims to have been noble in his intention of civilizing the native Caliban, by teaching him his language and by educating him. Abenheimer tries to explain the relationship between Caliban and Prospero as a relationship in which Prospero tries ` to bribe others into conforming to their ideal of kindness and

spirituality and thus, of course, achieve the very opposite of their intention` (Faber: 1970: 507). He explains that Prospero, instead of creating a relationship with independent beings, he tries to impose the superego figure by which he is enslaved. Abenheimer`s account tries to explain Caliban`s enslavement: `any imperfection in the other is a sign of ingratitude and a justification for unqualified rejection. Thus, the overdone longing for kindness leads to a world where only cold and impersonal obligations exist, sanctioned by the threat of disproportionate punishment` (Faber: 1970:5 07).

In their essay ` *Nymphs and Reapers Heavily Vanish: The Discursive Con - Texts of The Tempest` , Barker and Hulme think that it is curious though, while the main part of Prospero`s play runs according to plan, the sub-plot provides `the only real moment of drama when Prospero calls a sudden halt to the celebratory masque , explaining aside` (Donald Keesey: 2003: 447) : ` I had forgot that foul conspiracy/ Of the beast Caliban and his confederates/ Against my life: the minute of their plot / Is almost come` (4.1.139-142). Prospero becomes disturbed and angry. Ferdinand observes this, and Miranda comments: ` Never till this day / Saw I him touch`d with anger so distemper` d` (4.1.144-145). In their essay, Barker and Hulme state that` So at the level of character, Prospero`s excessive reaction represents his disquiet at the irruption into consciousness of an unconscious anxiety concerning the grounding of his legitimacy both as producer of the play and, a fortiori, as a governor of the island (Keesey:2003 : 448). Prospero`s reaction represents a repressed feeling of guilt and the proof of his repressed guilt is the exaggerate perturbation that Caliban`s revolt is causing. Prospero reassures Ferdinand:*

Our revels now are ended. These our actors,
As I foretold you, were all spirits and
Are melted into air, into thin air...
We are such stuff
As dreams are made on, and our little life
Is rounded with a sleep. – Sir, I am vex`d;
bear with my weakness; my old brain is troubled
(4.1.148-150, 156-159).

In her essay, Sybil Houlding claims that in this discourse, Prospero acknowledges his mortality.

The relationship between Miranda and Prospero develops through the play and has internal conflicts and difficult choices. In order to release his daughter into womanhood, Prospero needs a balance within himself. Through the play, he undergoes a process of change that starts with the coming of the storm. Through the play, this tormented character

undergoes an inner crisis of identity between impulses and conscience, like any human being.

We will consider that Prospero's behaviors seem like a case of conflict between the Freudian *id* and *super-ego*. In Freud's account, *Id* represents the unconscious, and the *super-ego* represents the conscience. We can see that Prospero struggles against his desire to possess and dominate, his *id* is in conflict with his *super-ego*. Prospero undergoes a middle life crisis with developmental challenges. Prospero admits that Caliban is his projection: 'This thing of darkness I / Acknowledge mine' (5.1.275-76). In this recognition, Shakespeare makes clear the element of father-daughter incest. In supporting this aspect, we can consider that Ariel and Caliban represent aspects of Prospero's personality. Ariel represents his spiritual side and Caliban represents his physical needs, as well as his incestuous sexual wish for his daughter. As Abenheimer (1970: 508) observes: 'Prospero wants the Madonnalike, kind mother, or the pure, immaterial spirit, but fears and hates the earth mother who appears to him as an evil witch. Caliban, the son of the evil witch Sycorax, is her heir and representative in the play'. Ariel appears in a female disguise (as a nymph, or as Ceres) many times. Abenheimer (1970: 505) claims that 'Ariel, like all anima figures, was originally connected with the mother image'. Prospero keeps him as his slave and in his absolute power. The relationship between Prospero and Ariel is a dominating relationship. Abenheimer considers that Prospero masks his possessiveness with sentimental justifications. In Abenheimer's approach, Prospero's love for Ariel is insincere. He compares the relationship between Prospero and Ariel with the child-parent relationship in which 'submissive dependence on an overvalued love object changes into open possessiveness as soon as the lover passes from a self-effacing phase into an inflated, megalomaniac phase' (Faber:1970:506). Abenheimer sees a paradox in the character of Prospero: 'he wants to master the anima', but 'he himself becomes possessed by her. The anima is not an independent being outside Prospero's ego but the image of the immaterial spirituality, justness, and goodness to which he aspires himself'. (Faber:1970:506).

We consider that Prospero is caught between contradictory wishes. In his unconscious, he is full of rage and of desire of revenge. But his super-ego tells him that revenge is ignoble. Bernard Paris claims that *The Tempest* is 'a fantasy of innocent revenge' (Keeseey: 2003: 237). He points out that Prospero wants to take revenge and to remain innocent. Prospero controls his impulses with his fellow human beings, even though they were his enemies. The norms of the society have tamed Prospero's rage. Bernard Paris explains that even though Prospero's super-ego tells him to repress his anger, he still acts sadistically even against fellow human beings: 'Prospero is a cunning and sadistic revenger who employs his magic to

inflict psychological violence upon his enemies while he shields them from physical injury and thereby preserves his innocence` (Donald Keeseey : 2003 : 238). He enjoys the terror of his victims because he has not injured them physically: ` There `s no harm done ` (1.2.14). He asks Ariel if he has ` perform`d to point the tempest ` he had commanded, and when Ariel replies that he has; Prospero`s delight is evident: ` My brave spirit! / Who was so firm, so constant, that this coil/ Would not infect his reason?` (1.2. 206-208) . In Bernard Paris `s reading, Prospero justifies his treatment of his enemies by seeing it as ` conducive to their moral growth. His object is not revenge but regeneration and reconciliation` (Keeseey: 2003: 240). This aspect can be interpreted, according to Freud, as a process of sublimation. According to Bernard Paris, Prospero manages to take revenge in such a way that ` he emerges as the benefactor of his victims` (Keeseey: 2003: 240).

Abenheimer (1970: 508) talks about a paradox in Prospero`s character. He points out that Prospero, in his attempt to identify himself with the good parents, he starts to display some qualities of the very opposite: the witch: ` Prospero rules over his two slaves by menacing them with exactly the same type of cruel punishment which Sycorax used to employ. This cruelty clashes curiously with Prospero`s role as the all-providing benevolent wizard`.

We observe that Prospero`s super-ego seems to have the final call in Prospero`s play: ` My noble reason` gainst my fury / Do I take part. The rarer action is / In virtue than in vengeance` (5.1.26-28). His rage, his desire for revenge are censored by his super-ego. He represses his vindictive impulses, but only after showing off his superior powers to his former enemies. The Freudian concept of uncanny appears in Prospero `s case in his revenge. Kahn notes that` Prospero uses revenge- repeating what was done to you but reversing it unto the other-and the renunciation of revenge as a way of ending the contest of the self against time and against its own children` (Schwartz and Kahn: 1982: 220). This revenge –repeating represents the double. In Freud`s account, the double is seen as an example of the uncanny, and occupies a prominent space in the theory of the uncanny.

Although Prospero is still furious with his enemies, his super –ego is stronger than his id (vindictive impulses). He has shown his power. Although Prospero has his enemies within his power, he does not choose revenge, and chooses reconciliation and forgiveness instead. He is moving from his wish for revenge to the capacity for forgiveness and love. He undergoes a process of change from the wish for revenge to the wish for reconciliation and love. He renounces to the magic, and he accepts the reality and his mortality. Bernard Paris explains that` in order to satisfy his self-effacing shoulds, he must show his mercy` (Keeseey :

2003 : 241). Given his inner conflicts between id and super-ego, Prospero is bound to feel uncomfortable about his vindictive behavior. He considers revenge ignoble and `abjures` his `rough magic`: `But this rough magic / I here abjure` (5.1.50-51).

We can consider that by forgiving others, Prospero receives his pardon from his super-ego. Like his desire for revenge, his sexual desire for Miranda is censored by his super-ego. Incestuous desire, the desire to keep his daughter for himself, exists in Prospero, but he overcomes it. His rage, his violence, his vengefulness are projected toward Caliban, and censored by his super-ego. He feels that Caliban is subhuman, but he holds him responsible for his acts and he punishes him severely. Prospero controls Caliban by subjecting him to physical pain (tormenting his senses) and psychical pain (humiliating him), he treats him like an inferior being. This exaggerated attitude towards Caliban has been seen by Bernard Paris as resulting from conflicting psychological needs: `he needs to hold Caliban responsible because doing so allows him to act out his sadistic impulses, but he also needs to regard Caliban as subhuman because this allows him to avoid feeling guilt` (Keesey: 2003 : 239). This means that regarding Caliban as subhuman allows to his id to act out his vindictive impulses without guilt. He insists therefore, that Caliban is uneducable: `A devil, a born devil, on whose nature/ Nurture can never stick ! on whom my pains, / Humanely taken, all, all lost, quite lost!` (4. 1.188-190). Bernard Paris explains that Prospero must hold on his image of Caliban as devil in order to hold onto his idealized image of himself: `If Caliban is redeemable, then Prospero has been a monster` (Keesey: 2003 : 240). Bernard Paris claims that what Prospero punishes and hates in Caliban is the forbidden, the repressed part of himself. Prospero lowers his eyes and recognizes a lot of himself in the instinctual Caliban. This disturbing discovery causes an inner tempest and Prospero becomes a conflicting character, torn between conscience and instincts.

Prospero`s reconciliation and his renunciation to magic is differently interpreted by critics. For example, it is important to take into consideration Bernard Paris` approach about Prospero`s magic. He explains that Prospero seems to feel ashamed of his magic and guilty for having employed it: `He gives up his magic because he needs to place himself in a humble position and to show that he has not used his power for personal aggrandizement, but only to set things right, to bring about moral growth and reconciliation` (Keesey: 2003 : 241). In the essay *Mourning as Transformation : The tempest*, Sybil Houlding states that Prospero is moving in the course of the play from a reliance on magic and omnipotence to the resumption of interrupted mourning. Dreher explains that Prospero has to accept his own sexuality and fatherhood, `to develop a nurturing love for his daughter and then release her to

seek her own commitments` (Dreher: 1986: 161). In the analysis of *The Tempest*, Bernard Paris considers that Prospero`s magic enables him to `resolve his psychological conflicts` (Donald Keeseey: 2003: 237).

In Kahn`s essay, the play`s several interwoven actions represent Prospero`s attempts to struggle through `his oedipal past, to complete himself` (Kahn: 1982: 236). Orgel (2008 : 52) points out that leaving the island and reassuming the dukedom , letting Miranda marry , are presented as acts of renunciation for Prospero , `but they are in fact what the exercise of Prospero`s magic is intended to effect, and they represent his triumph`. He argues that Miranda`s betrothal to Ferdinand, the pain of losing his daughter are part of Prospero`s plan: `It pleases Miranda, but it is designed by Prospero as a way of satisfying himself` (Orgel: 2008: 52). In Abenheimer`s approach, Shakespeare makes the hero`s transformation `from an isolated magician to a humble human being within the social world` (Faber: 1970: 517).

Dreher (1986: 161) notes that `the reconciliation in this play has been called disturbing and incomplete for Prospero is not reunited with his wife`. Kahn (1982: 236) argued that the play does not depict the rebirth of a family as well as of a man, thus Prospero`s final identity lacks the fullness of that achieved by the other heroes. She claims that `while Prospero gives up his omnipotence in the end, he never recognizes and accepts his sexuality and his relationship to women`. She sees Prospero as a character who progresses toward a realistic acceptance of the world. Kahn finds Prospero lacking because the maternal is largely missing in the play. Bamber (1982:169) observes that `there is not return of the Feminine` because Prospero` recovers neither his wife nor his daughter at the end of the play`. Prospero cannot be restored to his family (his wife is dead), but Miranda`s marriage insures the perpetuation of his values, but not his lineage. For only sons can continue the lineage. In Bambo`s account, Miranda`s return `is more of a loss than a gain for the central character`: `I / have lost my daughter... In this last tempest` (5.1.147-48). In Bamber`s reading of *The Tempest* the absence of a wife for Prospero is seen as a `liberating feature of the world of the play even though it creates an unhappy sexual atmosphere` (Bamber: 1982: 180). She argues that Prospero `is free of the Other`. In Sundelson`s essay, there is the absence of a daughter, not a wife or mother, `that leaves a man truly vulnerable` (Sundelson : 1982 : 36). As Orgel (2008: 18) observes, the drama that Prospero undergo is a family drama with a significant absence: the wife and the mother. He claims that `the absent presence of the wife and mother constitutes a space that is filled with the good surrogate child-wife Miranda`. Orgel argues that Prospero `has reconceived himself, as Miranda`s only parent, but also as the family`s favourite child`. Dreher (1986: 161) points out that Prospero`s

missing wife represents no deficiency, but an incorporation of the feminine within himself. Dreher explains that having been both father and mother to Miranda he is in touch with his anima which enables him to release his daughter to her destiny. In accepting reality and his mortality, and renouncing incestuous love, he made the transition to late adulthood. Prospero let Miranda leave. Barber considers that by his art Prospero masters a usurping younger brother as well as the temptation to talion violence (Schwartz and Kahn: 1982: 191): 'The rarer action is / In virtue than in vengeance' (5.1.27-28).

It is also interesting to consider that Prospero can be seen as an uncanny character, according to the Freudian theory. In Freud's account, the uncanny is that class of frightening which leads back to what is known of old and long familiar (Freud : 824). Freud mentions in *The Uncanny* that Shakespeare's universe populated with spirits, demons and ghost as an example of uncanny in literature. Prospero's strange magical powers and his omnipotence are more frightening than the spirits. The spirits are only a creation of his imagination. The writer creates a kind of uncertainty in us (...) whether he is taking us into the real world or into a purely fantastic one (Sigmund Freud in *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism* : 831). Shakespeare creates this feeling of uncertainty in *The Tempest*. In the darkness of the storm, he feels in his own element and Miranda and Caliban are the only living creatures around him. He has an uncanny effect on the other characters of the play. 'The devil speaks in him' is Sebastian's reaction when Prospero appears. For the nobleman, Prospero is the dead man that has become an enemy of the survivor, while for Caliban he is the danger of castration because Prospero took his inheritance and forbids him to procreate, emasculating him throughout his physical and psychological dominance.

5 King Lear and his daughters, challenging the tradition?

The chapter of the present thesis, dealing with the relationship between Miranda and Prospero, has already observed that the father-daughter bond developed through the play *The Tempest*, and had an emotional and political conflict. The focus of this chapter will be to explore the complex relationship between King Lear and his daughters. We will seek to examine whether our characters are conflicting or not the ruling ideology of the time, whether King Lear is able to relinquish his daughters into adulthood, whether he is able to make the passage into late adulthood.

Lear, the old king of Britain, announces his retirement from the throne, on the eve of his youngest daughter's marriage. He decides to divide his kingdom while he is still alive among his three daughters: Goneril, Regan and Cordelia.

In Dreher's account, Lear's retirement from the throne signals his awareness of the final stage of life:

Know that we have decided
In three our kingdom: and 'tis our fast intent
To shake all cares and business from our age;
Conferring them on younger strengths, while we
Unburthen'd crawl toward death
(1.1.36-40).

Dreher explains that from a historical perspective, Lear's motives to retire are suspicious and represent a dangerous threat to order in the realm (Dreher: 1986: 64). What Lear does by dividing in three our kingdom, seems to be done without thought. The first scene of King Lear is one of the most diversely interpreted in all of Shakespeare's plays.

In the first scene, Lear wants to give up the responsibilities of government and spend the rest of his life visiting his daughters. This means that he is content with what he has achieved, and that he is retiring from the responsibilities of government. He will Unburden'd crawl toward death (1.1.40). Lear is confronting the crisis of old age. In this statement, he expresses his needs as an old man. He wants enough so that he can 'crawl' toward death. In

his book *Lear's Self-Discovery*, Jorgensen considers that Lear's understanding of the old age that needs spirituality, is shallow. Jorgensen (1967:119) states that Lear's "All cares and business are disposed of as no longer necessary, when in fact, as Everyman and his early Renaissance stage kindred learn, the preparation for death must be attended by the most arduous of thoughtful concern". This is the time when Cordelia must become another man's wife. The king of France and duke of Burgundy are at Lear's court, awaiting his decision (to which of them his daughter Cordelia will marry): "The princes, France and Burgundy, / Great rivals in our youngest daughter's love, / Long in our court have made their amorous sojourn, / And here are to be answer'd" (1.1.44-46).

Lear puts his daughters through a test: he will divide his kingdom in proportion to the amount of love that each of them expresses for him. He demands from his daughters to say which of them loves him most: "Tell me, my daughters, / (Since now we will divest us both of rule, / Interest of territory, cares of state) / Which of you shall we say doth love us most?" (1.1.47-50). Lear asks them an accounting of their love, promising gifts of land. He wishes to hear them declare their love for him. Regan and Goneril, his older daughters, answer him with flattering words. Goneril is first, and she answers her father, calling him "dearer than eyesight, space and liberty":

Beyond what can be valued rich or rare;
 No less than life, with grace, health, beauty, honour;
 As much as child e'er lov'd, or father found;
 A love that makes breath poor and speech unable;
 Beyond all manner of so much I love you
 (1.1.55-60).

In return, she and her husband, Albany receive a large share of the kingdom. Regan is next. She responds to his test with flattery and laudations of her love for him:

I am made of that self metal as my sister,
 And prize me at her worth. In my true heart
 I find she names my very deed of love;
 Only she comes too short: that I profess
 Myself an enemy to all other joys
 Which the most precious square of sense possesses,
 And find I am alone felicitate
 In your dear highness' love
 (1.1.68-74).

She and her husband, Cornwall are awarded with a large share of the kingdom. Finally comes the youngest daughter, Cordelia. From Cordelia he expects a declaration even more extreme than those made by her sisters: What can you say to draw/ A third more opulent than

your sisters? Speak` (1.1.84-85). Lear shows himself guilty of complicity in creating the jealousy of the other two daughters. By granting Cordelia a portion of kingdom` more opulent` than her sisters, he creates jealousy between sisters. The love test is meaningless, as evidenced by the division of the kingdom before all three have spoken. But Cordelia, his favorite and youngest daughter, refuses to do so. Cordelia disappoints him saying: ` Cordelia: Nothing, my lord. Lear. Nothing! Cordelia, Nothing. Lear. Nothing will come of nothing: speak again` (1.1. 86-89). When Lear asks for more, she answers: `I love your Majesty / According to my bond; no more nor less` (1.1.91-92). She cannot lie, she cannot flatter. When she answers inadequately, Lear helps her: ` How, how, Cordelia! Mend your speech a little, / Lest you may mar your fortunes` (1.1.93-94).When Lear insists, Cordelia answers:

Good my lord,
 You have begot me, bred me, lov`d me : I
 Return those duties back as are right fit,
 Obey you, love you, and most honour you,
 Why have my sisters husbands, if they say
 They love you all? Happily, when I shall wed,
 That lord whose hand must take my plight shall carry
 half my love with him, half my care and duty:
 Sure I shall never marry like my sisters,
 To love my father all
 (1.1.95-102).

Cordelia loves his father but she will not flatter him like her sisters. Lear does not need Cordelia`s honesty. When Goneril and Regan offer their declarations of love, he does not comment upon what they have said.

Instead of letting Cordelia leave from his sphere of power, he divides his kingdom. As Lynda Boose observes, he attaches to Cordelia`s share `a stipulation designed to thwart her separation` (Boose: 1982:332). Boose explains that Lear violates his role as a king and as a father in the family, `by substituting his public paternity for his private one, the inherently indivisible entity for the one that biologically must divide and recombine` (Boose: 1982: 332). Dreher (1985: 70) claims that Lear `defies the accepted Elizabethan principle of primogeniture and the right order of succession, dividing his kingdom to ensure that he will not lose his beloved child`. She explains Lear`s plan to keep Cordelia for himself. Instead of giving the kingdom to his daughter Goneril, who is the eldest, he wants to divide it and give the largest share to Cordelia: ` That we our largest bounty may extend/ Where nature doth with merit challenge` (1.1.51-52). She explains that Lear violates tradition in order to give the largest third of his kingdom to Cordelia, in his attempt to keep her love. She says that Lear

arranges to give Cordelia the largest share to ensure her marriage with Burgundy. He knows that Burgundy is cold and formal, and lesser noble than France. Cordelia claims also about Burgundy: ` Since that respect and fortunes are his love, / I shall not be his wife ` (1.1.247-248). Burgundy indicates that he is ready to accept Cordelia`s dowry as Lear has offered it: `I crave no more than hath your highness offer`d, / Nor will you tender less` (1.1.193-194).

Dreher suggests that Lear, knowing Burgundy`s character, if Cordelia were to marry him, she will certainly love her father more. Boose (1982:333) states that Lear imitates the sacramental marriage ritual question when asking Bergundy: ` Will you, with those infirmities she owes, / Unfriended, new adopted to our hate, / Dow`r`d with our curse, and stranger`d with our oath, / take her, or leave her? ` (1.1.201-204). Burgundy answers as Lear anticipates: `Royal King, / Give but that portion which yourself propos`d, / And here I take Cordelia by the hand, / Duchess of Bergundy` (1.1.240-243).As Lynda Boose suggests, this scene is a variant of the marriage ceremony. The mother of the bride is an excluded figure in this play. We can observe that in the plays *Othello*, *King Lear*, *The Tempest* and *Hamlet*, there is no part for the bride`s mother. Given these considerations, Shakespeare articulates the father as an authority figure. Dreher points out that Lear has arranged everything for his own future comfort and security. Boose suggests that Lear intuits that France suitor cannot be persuaded by `so quantitative a reason as her price is fallen`. In Dreher`s interpretation, he fears this suitor and adopts a strategy based on qualitative assumptions, trying to discourage this rival:

For you, great King
I would not from your love make such a stray
To match you where I hate; therefore beseech you
T`avert your liking a more worthier way
(1.1.207-210).

Boose claims that Lear tries to avoid the ritual question that he used with Bergundy. Lear calls Cordelia` a wretch whom nature is asham`d / Almost t` acknowledge hers` (1.1.211-212). Boose interprets this appellation as Lear`s attempt to imply some unnatural impediment in Cordelia`s marriage. Boose talks about a father that defames the character of the bride, in his attempt to retain his daughter rather than to reject her. In her essay, Kahn presents the same hypothesis as Boose. She considers that Lear`s retirement from the throne and his wish to divide the kingdom are only accessory to another purpose (that of giving away Cordelia in marriage). With his love test (in which he asks Cordelia to flatter him), he sabotages his plan. Dreher suggests that Cordelia, in accepting the courtship of Burgundy and France, she has rejected him already. She mentions that Lear knows in his heart that Cordelia

cannot flatter him. Cordelia undergoes the transition crisis from childhood to the puberty. She is ready to leave her father's sphere of power. Given these considerations, Dreher raises a question: 'why Lear would devise this well-crafted scheme and simultaneously undermine it by requiring Cordelia to perform what for her would be impossible?' (Dreher: 1986: 71). Her answer is that Lear created the plan 'in the image of his own ambivalence': 'while emotionally he realizes he has already lost her, he makes a desperate effort to retain her love, to deny time and necessity' (Dreher: 1986: 71).

His love test signals his insecurity and immaturity. He undergoes a difficult crisis from middle life to late adulthood. He does not ask: 'Which of you doth love us most?' but 'Which of you shall we say doth love us most?' (1.1.50) 'as though the love of his daughters were contingent on his saying' (Adelman:1978:7). In his essay, Murray M. Schwartz explains that Lear wants to 'assimilate the existence of his daughters to his own desires, wants them to be only for him' (Schwartz and Kahn: 1982:28). He considers that there is no interplay in this love test: 'I experience Lear dictating the script'. Schwartz (1982: 28) experiences a character Lear that 'puts words in his daughters mouths and demands that they feed the words back to him'. In his essay *King Lear and The Comedy of the grotesque*, Knight considers that Lear creates 'false and sentimentalized images' of his daughters' love: 'he understands the nature of none of his children, and demanding an unreal and impossible love from all three, is disillusioned by each in turn' (Adelman: 1978:36). He does not need the truth from Cordelia, he needs elaborate love speeches, he needs to know how much he is loved by his daughters. Dreher (1986: 67) points out that Lear wants love, affection, tenderness, and comfort. In her account, Lear is 'a frightened child inside an old man's body, desiring the security of maternal love' (Dreher: 1986: 67). When Cordelia answers inadequately, he feels only bitter rejection: 'Lear. But goes thy heart with this? / Cordelia. Ay, my good lord./ Lear. So young, and so untender? / Cordelia, So young, my lord, and true' (1.1.103-106). In his view of love, Lear cannot understand Cordelia's answer. Cordelia tells him that he has loved her, bred and begotten her. But when she marries, half of her love will go to her husband. Jorgensen (1967:96) suggests that 'because of his present hardness of mind, and because Lear cannot see the truth' Lear understand Cordelia in a wrong way. Lear is enraged. His response is: 'Cornwall and Albany, / With my two daughters' sowers digest this third' (1.1.126-127). As Schwartz observes, Lear has reduced the relationship with his daughter 'to a model of infantile feeding'. He cannot make 'his generation messes/ To gorge his appetite' (1.1.116-117). He disinherits Cordelia, and divides the kingdom between the other two. His daughters

Goneril and Regan apparently love him more. He should have reward the speechless love of his third daughter, but he refuses to recognize it.

When he disowns Cordelia, he does so with the invocation of the stars, emphasizing pagan, pre-Christian elements :

Let it be so; thy truth then be thy dower;
For by the sacred radiance of the sun,
The mysteries of Hecate and the night,
By all the operation of the orbs
from whom we do exist and cease to be,
Here I disclaim all my paternal care,
Propinquity and property of blood,
And as a stranger to my heart and me
Hold thee from this for ever
(1.1.107-115).

It is an action governed by the stars. In his essay *King Lear, King Leir, and incest wishes*, Blechner Mark suggests that this action ` is an expression of an unconscious wish` (Blechner: 1988: 313). He explains in his article that there are continual references made to the irrational power behind men`s actions: `In today`s psychoanalytic language, we might attribute the contradictory behavior to unconscious motivation. For centuries ago, the irrational in men`s actions was more commonly attributed to the stars` (Blechner:1988:312).When Lear disowns her, he thinks that he made Cordelia unable to move from the sphere of his power.

With the attitude of a rejected child, Lear turns on his favorite daughter: ` I lov`d her most, and thought to set my rest / On her kind nursery. Hence, and avoid my sight! /So be my grave and peace` (1.1.121-124). Kahn (1986:40) explains Lear`s attitude: `the renunciation of her as incestuous object, awakens a deeper emotional need in Lear: the need for Cordelia as daughter-mother`. Dreher explains that Lear wants to be ` the center of his daughters` universe, feed his despair with adulation, and hide from death` (Dreher: 1986: 66). He is aware that he is an old man, a dying man. Dreher (1986: 64) claims that ` beneath this awareness lurks a desire to shed the responsibilities of age and return to an infantile state bereft of `any cares and business` in which he might thus `unburthened crawl toward death`. Dreher points out that in the Renaissance, the individual`s spiritual growth required burdens: ` one could not simply shed them and return to infantile self-absorption` (Dreher: 1986: 64). She claims that Lear retreats from the confrontation with the death and tries to `crawl` back into a comfortable infancy. Lear wants to rest in Cordelia`s `kind nursery`. As Dreher (1986: 64) observes, he wants to ` hide in the emotional shelter of Cordelia`s love`, retreating to

infancy and immersing in his daughters' love. But as Dreher (1986:68) observes, Cordelia will not speak the words to save him from his cruel confrontation with the death.

After Cordelia is disowned, the loyal Kent speaks out on her behalf: 'Thy youngest daughter does not love thee least; / Nor are those empty-hearted whose low sounds/ reverberate no hollowness' (1.1.150-152). Lear responds: 'Kent, on thy life, no more' (1.1.153). When Kent insists, Lear banishes him. In his article, Blechner explains that Lear does not deny Kent's words but he does not want to hear them like a patient in psychoanalysis who has heard an interpretation that he knows to be true, but cannot tolerate at the moment, and who therefore decides to terminate treatment abruptly' (Blechner:1988:312). Jorgensen (1967:72) considers that there is no flexibility in the disowning of Cordelia and in the banishment of Kent. There is no reflection upon what Lear is doing. Jorgensen (1967:69) argues that at the beginning of the play, Lear's mind is 'rigid'. He observes an inability of the character to engage in dialogue, a capacity to command without arguing.

Lear wants to give up the responsibilities of government and spend the rest of his life visiting his daughters:

Ourself, by monthly course,
With reservation of an hundred knights
By you to be sustain'd, shall our abode
make with you by due turn. Only we shall retain
the name and all that addition to a king; the sway,
Revenue, execution of the rest,
Beloved sons, be yours: which to confirm,
This coronet part between you
(1.1.131-138).

Lear wants to spend a month with each daughter alternately. With regard to the image of the month in the play, Mark Kanzer considers that the 'month becomes even more transparently a female as well as a lunar cycle when Lear invokes upon the sexually rejecting Goneril the curse that she shall be sterile' (Faber:1970:224). Kanzer interprets the sterility as penalty for a failure to receive Lear.

The end of this scene presents another vision of love. Burgundy is uninterested in a dowryless wife, but the king of France, who has courted Cordelia, impressed by her honesty, still wants to marry her without her land. In his words, the King of France shows his love, admiration and respect for Cordelia:

Fairest Cordelia, that art most rich, being poor,
Most choice, forsaken; and most loved, despised!
Thee and thy virtues here I seize upon:

Be it lawful I take up what `s cast away.
 Gods, gods! ` tis strange that from their cold`st neglect
 My love should kindle to inflame``d respect.
 Thy dowerless daughter, King, thrown to my chance,
 is Queen of us, of ours, and our fair France:
 Not all the dukes of wat`rish Burgundy
 Can buy this unpriz``d precious maid of me
 (1.1.249-258).

France`s speech defines the true love. In accepting Cordelia, he gives an example of true love. Cordelia marries the king of France without her father`s blessing.

The first scene in this play raises many questions. Shakespeare gives us no clear sense of why the characters act as they do. In his article *King Lear, King Leir, and incest wishes*, Blechner Mark raises this question: `If Cordelia is Lear`s favorite daughter, would he not know her well enough to expect that she would be unable to flatter him publicly? Would he not know of her unflinching truthfulness and sincerity? And if he would, why does he act surprised and enraged at her response? Why does he put her in a predictably embarrassing position in the first place?` (Blechner:1988: 312).

In her book *Suffocating mothers*, Adelman talks about a substitution of Lear`s daughters with sons. She mentions Lear`s unspoken problem`: `Lear`s daughters disrupt the patriarchal ideal, both insofar as they disrupt the transmission of property from father to son and insofar as they disrupt the paternal fantasy of perfect self-replication` (Adelman: 2008:108). She explains that the presence of daughters in the play instead of sons is seen as a `slight disturbance, a perplexing substitution for the sons we expect him to have`. She interprets Gloucester`s reference to his own two sons (from the play`s opening lines) and Lear`s reference to Albany and Cornwall as his sons as an unconscious substitution of daughters: `Our son of Cornwall, / And you, our no less loving son of Albany` (1.1.34-35). This aspect of the substitution of daughters with sons can be observed in Kanzer`s essay *Imagery in King Lear*. Kanzer observes an analogy between the two fathers Lear and Gloucester and their children. As he states: `the difficulties of each character with its children are set forth in unmistakable parallels and also become inextricably related, as would a tale about one individual` (Faber: 1970: 222). In Kanzer`s approach, Lear and Gloucester are seen as split portions of a single personality. Kanzer explains that the mother in the play `emerges from the figures of the ostensible daughters` (Faber: 1970: 222) so that `our cast is reduced to three persons: father, son and daughter`. From this perspective, Kanzer asserts that `the

familiar oedipal triangle` of father, son, and daughter provides` the deeply running currents of the inner drama that moves the puppets on the surface` (Faber: 1970: 222).

Freud analyzed Lear`s confrontation with his three daughters in Act I, scene 1 in his essay` *The Theme of the Three caskets*` (1913). In this essay, he points up the similarities between the first scene of the play and other scenes from fairy tales, myths, and various works of literature including *The Merchant of Venice*, *Cinderella*. In *The Merchant of Venice*, the wise Portia is` bound at her father`s bidding to take as her husband only that one of her suitors who chooses the right casket from among the three before him. The three caskets are of gold, silver, and lead: the right casket is the one that contains her portrait` (Faber: 1970: 195). Freud compares the legend of psyche and her two sisters, of Paris and his three goddesses, of Cinderella and hers and also the choice of Bassanio between the three caskets in *The Merchant of Venice*. Lear`s choice is between three daughters. Freud states in his essay: ` This may mean nothing more than that he has to be represented as an old man. An old man cannot very well choose between three women in any other way. Thus they become his daughters` (Faber: 1970: 197). Freud continues: ` the relationship of a father to his children, which might be a fruitful source of many dramatic situations, is not turned to further account I the play` (Faber: 1970: 204). Blechner is unable to agree with this point. He states that `the relationship of a father to his children permeates the whole play` (Blechner:1988:323). Freud concludes that Lear is not only an old man, he is a dying man and` the doomed man is not willing to renounce the love of women; he insists on hearing how much he is loved` (Faber: 1970: 204).

According to Freud, Lear`s daughters represent man`s three inevitable relations with women: `the woman who bears him, the woman who is his mate, and the woman who destroys him, or that they are the three forms taken by the figure of the mother in the course of a man`s life- the mother herself, the beloved one who is chosen after her pattern, and lastly the Mother Earth who receives him once more` (Faber: 1970: 205). Freud makes use of an application of psychoanalytic technique and explains the three caskets symbolically as three women. He explains why the choice must fall on the third daughter: ` It must strike us that this excellent third woman has in several instances certain peculiar qualities besides her beauty. They are qualities that seem to be tending towards some kind of unity; we must certainly not expect to find them equally well marked in every example. Cordelia makes herself unrecognizable, inconspicuous like lead, she remains dumb and silent` (Faber: 1970: 198).Freud emphasizes that the youngest woman is the most beautiful, the fairest as Cinderella was. Freud proceeds to demonstrate that if the peculiarities of the third daughter

are concentrated in her dumbness, then psychoanalysis will tell us that in dreams dumbness is a common representation of death` (Faber: 1970:198). In Freud`s account, Cordelia, the silent or mute woman, is in reality a symbolic substitution for the Goddess of Death.

In his essay, Blechner claims that Freud`s focus is primarily on explaining the frequent symbol of the three women. Blechner considers that Freud does not discuss the illogic, motivational ambiguities, and puzzling family dynamics that have been pointed out by various literary critics of *King Lear`* (Blechner: 1988: 310). Blechner claims that Lear`s volitional choice is an action driven by intense emotions toward his daughters, out of Lear`s awareness. Blechner considers that Freud`s focus on the symbolic of the three women signals the issues of incest and destructiveness in familial relations` (Blechner:1988:311).

Faber points out that in his essay *Theme of the Three Caskets*, Freud treats the play on the mythic and folkloric level, and his essay can represent a broad way in which psychoanalytic critics have interpreted the play. He considers that there is a second approach, called realistic psychology, in which characters are treated as real people and psychoanalytic findings are presented in such a manner as to illuminate what the critic considers to be the motivational issue` (Faber:1970:207). Faber explains that the realistic reading of the play tend to echo the conclusions Freud`reached from another perspective and to regard the play`s protagonist as an old man libidiously involved with his daughters, especially Cordelia` (Faber:1970:207). This kind of reading is represented in the work of F. L. Lucas.

In the above chapter, we saw that Prospero had incestuous desire to keep his daughter for himself, but he overcame. Prospero attributed to Caliban his repressed and incestuous desire for Miranda. In King Lear`s case, Kanzer sees an`incest drive` in Lear`s jealous demand that his daughters shall prefer him to their husbands. In his essay *Imagery in King Lear*, Kanzer points out that` it continues as he enters in turn the homes of each of the newlyweds and demands attention and homage` (Faber: 1970: 223). Lear`s anger at Cordelia has long been interpreted as the response of a rejected lover. Unable to agree with Freud`s conclusions about the symbolic interpretation of Cordelia as Death, Lucas turns his attention to the`more interesting question`, namely,`can psychological experience justify this old father`s quarrel with his favorite daughter over the mere wording of her affection? Or the icy ruthlessness of Goneril and Regan toward their father and sister?` (Faber: 19870: 210).What Lucas claims is that the King`s quarrel with Cordelia is a`lover`s quarrel :` and yet Lear`s contention with Cordelia seems as fantastic as lover`s quarrel` (Faber: 1970:210). In his account, *King Lear* is the tragedy of family relations (Lear and his daughters, Cordelia and her sisters).` I do not wish to overstate; but I suggest that the first fatal scene between Lear

and Cordelia becomes more intelligible , and more pathetic , when we see in it a lover`s quarrel , though neither of them knows it. Lear is jealous. ` (Faber:1970: 212). Lucas states that what Shakespeare presents us with *King Lear* is `a concentrated tragedy of the jealousy between parents and children, between sisters or brothers; above all, of a father`s morbid possessiveness towards a favorite daughter` (Faber: 1970:216). In Lucas account, as for Goneril, Regan, and Edmund, they too behave in a way that is consistent with psychological findings: ` There is yet another psychological trait in *King Lear* – the callousness of Goneril and Regan towards their younger sister, and of Edmund towards his legitimate brother` (Faber:1970: 215). Lucas explains that long before Shakespeare, popular psychology talked about the intense hatred that ca be felt by elder brothers or sisters towards younger. This aspect can be seen in Goneril`s words: `he always lov`d our sister most` (1.1.289).

There is no wife in Lear`s life. Lear is facing the crisis of the aging man. In this period of transition from middle life to late adulthood, he feels alone. Two of his daughters are already married, and the youngest is on the verge of marrying. In this transition period, he undergoes a crisis with internal conflicts, with angst at his decline, with angst for death. He is afraid for this late adulthood period that is new and challenging for him. Cordelia represents for him his emotional security. He needs his youngest daughter. She is for him the one person he does love, but he loves her possessively, tyrannically. Love involves more than Lear expected it would. Jorgensen (1967: 95) explains that ` Lear has sought what most old people need: love- the deepest and most certain evidence that they are wanted and needed`. As he releases Cordelia, he must move from middle life to late adulthood. But he wants her exclusively for him. Dreher considers that in the absence of wife and mother, he centers all his wishes for feminine comfort upon his youngest daughter.

Lear as a jealous father is also seen in Dreher`s account. She considers that Lear is so jealous of Cordelia that he cannot release her in marriage without a ritual that requires her to promise the impossible. In his essay, Blechner talks about Lear`s unconscious wish to keep Cordelia from marrying either of her two suitors. Blechner considers that Lear knows Cordelia well enough to predict that she will not flatter him. He suggests that Lear wishes unconsciously that Cordelia will renounce all her suitors and love only him. In Blechner`s account, Lear had an unconscious plan ` to embarrass her in public, causing her to lose her dowry, and thereby preventing her from marrying` (Blechner: 1988: 314). He considers that Lear loves Cordelia with a love that goes ` far beyond society`s bounds of paternal attachment`.

Given these considerations, Lear's discourse can be interpreted as a desperate urgency. Dreher (1986: 69) explains that Lear's repeated references to time and duration signal that the immediate loss of Cordelia precipitates the love test and his abdication:

We have this hour a constant will to publish
Our daughters' several dowers, that future strife
May be prevented now. The princes, France and Burgundy,
Great rivals in our daughter's love,
Long in our court have made their amorous sojourn,
And here are to be answer'd
(1.1.42-47).

The future strife symbolizes for him his personal comfort and security together with the youngest daughter, Cordelia. Dreher (1986: 69) talks about a sense of urgency in Lear's words with the repetition of the word 'now' that demonstrates a hidden motives for the love test: 'Now, our joy, / Although our last and least; to whose young love/ The vines of France and milk of Burgundy/ Strive to be interest'd' (1.1.81-84). Adelman interprets this urgency as an intensified need to assert control over his daughters.

Dreher explains that Lear has seen these two men courting Cordelia, and he is jealous and fearful of losing her. As Blechner observes in his essay, 'we have, then, the pathos of an old man, horribly alone, seeking, perhaps erotically but certainly passionately, to maintain the companionship and intimacy with his one daughter who remains unattached. And the contest scene is an outbreak of that passion, wishing to make itself not only conscious but public' (Blechner: 1988:315). In his essay, Blechner talks about Lear's unconscious concern that the pair of suitors are trying to take his youngest daughter away. He makes an analogy between Lear's first and last words in the first scene, explaining that the relationship between the first and last words, as a sign of unconscious changes, may apply not only to psychoanalytic sessions, but to any human interaction. Lear's first words of the first scene are: 'Attend the lords of France and Burgundy, Gloucester' (1.1.33). His last words of the first scene are: 'Come, noble Burgundy' (1.1.265). 'Only to Lear's unconscious wishes is Burgundy noble, for he has relinquished his attempt to come between the old man and his daughter. However, since Lear's unconscious wish has not been made conscious, nor has it been gratified, it continues to express itself' (Blechner: 1988: 317). Blechner suggests that Lear's first and last words of the first scene reveal Lear's concern about the suitors. It reveals us Lear's unconscious fear that these suitors will take his Cordelia. Given these considerations, Lear cannot let Cordelia go from his sphere of power. According to Blechner, the first scene reveals Lear's unconscious wish to keep his youngest daughter for himself.

Dreher (1986: 66) states that in proposing the love test, he sets himself up for ultimate failure. Dreher considers that Lear arranges this competition to satisfy himself, for now his daughters will demonstrate their love in return for their dowries. Love for him is measured in quantitative terms. Adelman points out that Lear wants to compel their love through a system of barter, so that it becomes something he has purchased and hence has a right to possess, not something spontaneously given and hence outside his control (Adelman: 1978: 7). Dreher interprets Lear as an egocentric father in his identification with his daughters, especially Cordelia. She explains that his daughters' function is only to please or accommodate him, giving as example Lear's bitter rejection of Cordelia: 'Better thou / Hadst not been born than not to have pleas'd me better'. Cordelia denies him, she protests by saying that she cannot satisfy his wish. She will love her husband besides her father:

Why have my sisters husbands if they say
 They love you all? Haply, when I shall wed,
 That lord whose hand must take my plight shall carry
 Half my love with him, half my care and duty.
 Sure I shall never marry like my sisters, To love my father all
 (1.1.98-102).

Janet Adelman points out that for Cordelia, to have a love different in kind and therefore legitimately sexual for her husband, she must be able to imagine dividing her love in just the mechanical way that she suggests (Adelman: 1978:7). She tells the truth. Bradley considers that the matter here is to preserve a father (Adelman: 1978: 29). When Cordelia gives Lear the truth instead of flattery, Lear is enraged. Lear does not engage in a dialogue with her, he does not argue with her. He says: 'Let it be so; thy truth, then, be thy dower!' (1.1.107).

Cordelia is too honest to flatter. She is unable to speak when she has strong feelings: 'Unhappy that I am, I cannot heave / My heart into my mouth' (1.1.90-91). In his essay King Lear, Bradley, mentions that Cordelia is not always 'tongue tied', as many passages in the play show. He points out that tender emotion, and especially a tender love for the person to whom she has to speak, makes her dumb (Adelman: 1978: 27). Cordelia loves her father according to her bond, nor more, nor less. She tells the truth and she is horrified at the absurdities of her sisters' words. She undergoes internal conflicts. As Adelman observes, 'Cordelia's dilemma is complicated and intensified by her particular situation: she is simultaneously fighting for the right to a love separate from her love for her father' (Adelman: 1978:7). Lear realizes that Cordelia cannot love him with the unconditional love he asks. As

Dreher (1986:72) claims, in his crisis from middle life to late adulthood. Lear wants from his beloved child a complete union in love and he finds only rejection.

In his essay *The family in Shakespeare's Development*, Barber talks about Lear's emotional need that can be recognized in Christian marriage ceremonies. He explains that the rites of passage of traditional Christianity, catholic or Anglican, take people through threshold moments of losing or changing family ties by turning their need for total relationship to Christ or God. This is very clear in the services of marriage, confirmation, baptism (Kahn and Schwartz: 1982:197). Barber mentions that Lear begins with a failure of the passage that might be handled by the marriage service, as it is structured to persuade the father to give up his daughter. He considers that Regan and Goneril, though married, pretend to meet Lear's demand on them in all-but-incestuous terms while Cordelia defends herself. In Cordelia's marriage there is no father's blessing. This aspect causes tragic consequences in their life. Refusing to give his blessing, Lear denies Cordelia's rite to passage. He does not help her to make the passage from childhood to puberty. Lear says to Cordelia: "Therefore be gone / Without our grace, our love, our benison" (1.1.264). Boose (1982: 326) explains that when Cordelia wed without paternal blessing, the marriage is affected because the ritual base of marriage has been circumvented and the psychological separation of daughter from father thus rendered incomplete. She explains that in Shakespeare's time, the ceremony acknowledged the bond between daughter and father and the need for the ritual to relinquish the daughter from father's power. Boose (1982:334) claims that "Although the bride and groom have exchanged vows, the denial of the father's blessing renders the separation incomplete and the daughter's future blighted". Boose (1982:326) describes the marriage ritual where the father delivers the daughter to the altar. "to the priest's question, - Who giveth this woman to be married unto this man? - a question that dates in English tradition back to the York manual, the father must silently respond by physically relinquishing his daughter, only to watch the priest place her right hand into the possession of another man" (Boose:1982:326). Lear fails to act out his required role in the marriage ritual. He violates the marriage ritual. Cordelia cannot marry if she loves her father all. Cordelia refuses her father, she chooses husband over father. Boose (1982: 333) considers that by disowning Cordelia, Lear casts her away not to let her go but to prevent her from going. The conflict between Lear and Cordelia is not resolved and it will involve tragic consequences. In order to resolve this conflict, Lear needs an excursion into self-knowledge.

At the beginning of the play, Lear has little self-knowledge. Very important is Regan's coldly and intelligent analysis of her father's behavior: "he hath ever but slenderly

known himself (1.1.292-293). Dreher (1986: 72) mentions that psychologist-critics have observed Lear's infantilism, which leads him to make impossible demands of his daughters. Dreher considers that Lear's parenthood has been incomplete and superficial. As the fool tells him: 'Thou should'st not have been old till thou hadst / been wise' (1.5.41). The fool claims that Lear has been old before learning essential developmental lessons. In Jorgensen's account, Lear's retirement symbolizes the beginning of life instruction.

Knight (1978: 36) mentions that Lear starts to discover himself by a foolish misjudgement. In his interpretation, Lear knows about his fault that is a fault of the mind, a mind unwarrantably, because selfishly, foolish: 'O Lear, Lear, Lear! / Beat at this gate that let thy folly in, / And thy dear judgement out!' (1.4.267-268). Knight mentions that Lear finds he is wrong: 'he has fed his heart on sentimental knowledge of his children's love: he finds their love is not sentimental' (Adelman: 1978: 36).

Through the play, Lear discovers himself. The self-discovery is achieved through a process. He needs to discover himself in order to resolve the conflict between him and Cordelia. He is discovering himself as well as his daughters. In his book *Lear's self-discovery*, Jorgensen (1967: 83) claims that Lear's daughters are foils to Lear in a drama of self-discovery. Jorgensen feels that the tendency to interpret Lear's self-discovery as the discovery of an error in judgement is a limited view of self-discovery. Lear tries to learn who he is in terms of love and suffering. Lear needs to mourn. In his maturation process, Lear needs to set himself up for failure in order to learn a developmental lesson. Lear's fundamental question: 'Who is it that can tell me who I am?' (1.4.227) is very important in his psychological development. Paul Jorgensen states that 'a few friends and enemies can help to tell him, but he must fundamentally learn for himself' (Jorgensen: 1967: 1). Lear answers his question: 'I would learn that' (1.4.229). Blechner claims that 'The man goes through an upset of his entire personality in a much-belated excursion into self-discovery' (Blechner: 1988: 322).

In the process of self-discovery, Lear must learn about the meaning of true love. This aspect is crucial in his development. This is a process that takes time, and Lear does not learn immediately. He will not quickly change his view about love. In Act II, he says to Goneril and Regan: 'I gave you all' (2.4.248). This means that he still sees love as an exchange of commodities, love as security and comfort, love in material terms. This is still the definition of what love means for him. He will not receive from Goneril and Regan the absolute devotion he had expected. At this point, he is unable to argue with his daughters. His knights are diminished by Goneril from one hundred to fifty: 'Here do you keep a hundred knights

and squires` (1.4.238), and from Regan to five and twenty:` The fifty yet doth double five-and-twenty, / And thou art twice her love. Goneril. What need you five-and-twenty, ten, or five, ` (2.4.257-259). When Lear meets Regan in act II, scene IV, he manifests a need for recognition in his speech: ` Beloved Regan, / Thy sister`s naught: O Regan ! she hath tied / Sharp-tooth`d unkindness, like a vulture, here./ I can scarce speak to thee, thou`lt not believe/ With how deprav`d a quality – O Regan! ` (2.4.131-134). Regan represents for him, at this point, his last hope of being loved. Regan and Goneril want Lear to become in his old age a docile man, content with a few old knights. He hears from them cold words instead of the declarations of love he had received in their last meeting. Jorgensen (1967:106) asserts that ` rather than submit to the humiliating kind of recognition his daughters will give him, he will war against the universe itself : ` No, rather I abjure all roofs, and choose/ To wage against the enmity o`th` air; / To be a comrade with the wolf and owl, / Necessity`s sharp pinch.` (2.4.206-209).

Lear undergoes the middle life crisis and he refuses to make the passage into late adulthood. Jorgensen explains that true understanding of love means for Lear a true understanding of himself. Dreher mentions that Lear refuses to face his own individuation. She explains that Lear tries to hide his ` underlying conflicts beneath a façade of flattery and pretense` (Dreher: 1986: 73).

The role of the Fool is very important in Lear`s quest into self-discovery. The Fool teaches Lear lessons about the needs of money, shelter, labor. He gives the example of the snail: ` I can tell you why a snail has a house.../ Why, to put`s head in, not to give it away to his / daughters , and leave his horns without a case` (1.5.27-30). He teaches him that Lear is a fool, and that the human nature is humble. Jorgensen (1967:113) states that the Fool teaches Lear about the ` most important truths about man that are related to survival and do not make him out to be a sophisticated creature`.

In Lear`s quest for self-knowledge (`Who is that can tell me who I am? `), Act III represents the beginning of his understanding. In Adelman`s account, the storm is interpreted as a ` place of the male thunderer classically associated with its powers` (Adelman: 1992: 110).She explains that he invokes this thunderer `rewriting his impotence in the face of the daughters who have thrust him into the storm`(Adelman:1992:110). She considers that Lear cannot `reinstate his own masculine authority by joining with the thunderer in his destruction; he cannot` command this or any other power. Recourse to male authority-his own or that of the gods – will not protect him` (Adelman: 1992: 110). Blechner (1988: 321) interprets the

storm as an` outburst of his unconscious conflict`. Lear talks to the storm. When Lear`s rage starts to turn to sorrow, when Lear begins to accept a sense of guilt, the storm breaks out:

Let the great Gods,
that keep this dreadful pudder o`er our heads,
Find out their enemies now. Tremble, thou wretch,
That hast within thee undivulged crimes,
Unwhipp`d of Justice; hide thee, thou bloody hand,
Thou perjur`d, and thou similar of virtue
That art incestuous; caitiff, to pieces shake,
That under covert and convenient seeming
Has practis`d on man`s life; close pent-up guilts
Rive your concealing continents, and cry
These dreadful summoners grace. I am a man
More sinn`d against than sinning.
(3.2.49-59).

For the first time he expresses a sense of caring: `I have one part in my heart/ That`s sorry yet for thee` (3.2.72-73). During the storm, Lear discovers his guilt, pride and arrogance. As Adelman (1992:114) observes, the storm represents for him `a near-psychotic experience, for it plays out the terror of this discovery: in the storm made of his own irrepressible femaleness, the storm that is the maternal signature, all boundaries dissolve, and Lear is once more inside what is inside him`. Dreher (1986:56) presents the same idea: `Lear must be cast unto the stormy heath before he can see his daughters and subjects as more than extensions of himself`. Like Lear, Prospero experiences the storm. Prospero`s psychological development happens with the storm that he provoked. As the play progresses, he goes like Lear through a self-discovery excursion. Lear learns from his suffering about the meaning of humility, charity and empathy. He prays, feeling compassion for the

Poor naked wretches, wheresoe`er you are,
That bide the pelting of this pitiless storm,
How shall your houseless heads and unfed sides,
Your loop`d and window`d raggedness, defend you
From seasons such as these?
(3.4.28-32).

He agrees that he has taken too little care of this: `O! I have ta`en / Too little care of this` (3.4.33). He concludes with these words: `Take physic, Pomp; / Expose thyself to feel what wretches feel, / That thou mayst shake the superflux to them, / And show the Heavens more just` (3.4.33-36). Lear learns through his suffering and he is able to recognize the truth behind flattery: `They flattered / me like a dog, and told me I had the white hairs in / my

beard ere the black ones were there` (4.6.96-98). Lear`s speech from act III, scene IV is central for his quest into self -knowledge:

is man no more than this? Consider him well. Thou
ow`st the worm no silk, the beast no hide,
the sheep no wool, the cat no perfume.
Ha! Here`s three on`s are sophisticated;
thou art the thing itself,
unaccommodated man is no more but such a poor,
bare, forked animal as thou art.
Off, off, you lending! Come; unbutton here.
(3.4.100-107).

Jorgensen (1967:118) explains that Lear learns about` unaccommodated man-his unwarranted pride and his frailty – through inquiring into man`s necessities, which are in turn closely and humiliatingly related to his body`. In Jorgensen`s approach, Lear discovers himself as a man who had to discover itself in terms of the human body, with its needs, weaknesses, fears, passions, wishes. Jorgensen (1967:123) points out that Lear` through the sufferings of his own flesh and his reduction in status, gains a new insight into man through studying the art of our necessities`. Jorgensen explains that Lear not only learns through the flesh, ` he learns about the flesh and its limitations, its vileness` (Jorgensen: 1967: 125).

The relationship between Lear and Cordelia develops through all the play. In the central part of the play, Cordelia, as a character, disappears entirely (between the first scene of the first act and the fourth scene of the fourth act). In his essay, Blechner suggests that in the central part of the play Cordelia is` played out vicariously with the King by the Fool: Cordelia and the Fool are interchangeable` (Blechner: 1988:320).He explains that immediately after Cordelia is disowned, the Fool is called in and ` it is with him that the romantic relationship between Lear and Cordelia is developed`. Blechner claims that, when Cordelia and Lear are reunited, the Fool disappears from the play. Given this aspect, the Fool can be interpreted as a substitute presence for Cordelia. In his essay, Blechner talks about the Fool and Cordelia that have much in common. They talk only the truth. Lear calls the Fool ` my boy`, showing the tender attention of a father to a young son. The Fool insults Lear calling him ` a fool` and makes jokes. Blechner sees in Lear`s interactions with the Fool the truth –telling that he condemned in Cordelia. This truth represents what he loved most in her. The Fool is associated in Lear`s mind with the lost Cordelia.

Dreher considers that Lear did not resolved his identity crisis in the period of adolescence. She claims that Lear ` cannot dissociate himself from his authoritative roles of king and father` (Dreher: 1986: 72). She interprets ` his inadequate perception of love` as a

confirmation for the fact that he did not learn commitment in young adulthood. She considers that Lear has failed in the assumption of his role as a King and as a father. Given these considerations, Dreher explains that he confronts the challenge of integrity. Unprepared, he recoils in terror, regressing to second childhood` (Dreher: 1986: 72).

We saw that King Lear has no wife, his daughters no mother. At this point in the study, it is important to take into consideration the presence of the mother in King Lear. The Fool`s words are central in analyzing this idea: `thou mad`st thy/ daughters thy mothers; for when thou gav`st them/ the rod and putt`st down thine own breeches` (1.4.168-170). This idea is supported by different critics. In Dreher`s approach, Lear commits` the ultimate folly by making his daughters his mothers` (Dreher: 1986:73). In her book *Suffocating Mothers*, Adelman interprets the Fool`s words as `literal suggestions of both generational and gender reversal, of infantile exposure and maternal punishment` (Adelman: 1992: 104). Adelman (1992:104) notes: `Lear excises the maternal loss, giving us the uncanny sense of a world created by fathers alone`. The psychological presence of the mother in men is also seen in Cappelia Kahn`s essay *The Absent Mother in King Lear*. She notes that in her reading of *King Lear*, she tries `like an archaologist, to uncover the hidden mother in the hero`s inner world`. (Kahn:1986:35). She mentions that `there is no literal mother in *King Lear*`, and `the only source of power, love, and authority is the father- an awesome, demanding presence`. Kahn suggests that the play depicts the failure of a father`s power to command love in a patriarchal society. Kahn interprets Lear`s division of the kingdom as child`s wish to be mothered. She notes: `He wants two mutually exclusive things at once: to have absolute control over those closest to him and to be absolutely dependent on them`. Adelman points out that Lear recognizes his daughters as part of himself and she explains that he will be led to recognize` not only his terrifying dependence on female forces outside himself but also an equally terrifying femaleness within himself-a femaleness` (Adelman: 1992: 104). This femaleness is called: `O! how this mother swells up toward my heart; / *Hysterica passio!* Down, thou climbing sorrow! / thy element`s below. Where is this daughter?` (2.4.54-56). Adelman tries to explain` the bizarreness `of these lines: `Lear acknowledges the presence of the sulphurous pit within him. Suffocated by the emotions that he thinks of as female, Lear gives them the name of the woman`s part, as though he himself bore that diseased and wandering organ within: for *mother* is a technical term for the uterus; *Hysterica passio* or the suffocation of the mother is the disease caused by its wandering` (Adelman: 1992: 114). In her account, Adelman considers that Lear`s redemption can be a maternal presence that can undo pain. In Kahn`s account (1986: 36) this `mother hysteria` is

interpreted as `Lear`s repressed identification with the mother`. She explains that when Lear recognizes his own vulnerability (after feeling the loss of Cordelia, after being wounded by Goneril and Regan), he calls his state of mind `hysteria – the mother`. Kahn suggests that this state of mind called `*hysterica passio*` is `a searing sense of loss at the deprivation of the mother`s presence`. In Kahn`s interpretation, masculine identity depends on repressing the vulnerability.

The uncanny, as we saw in Prospero`s case, can be used to describe something that is both familiar and unfamiliar at the same time. The Freudian concept of uncanny appears in Prospero`s case in his revenge. Prospero used revenge, repeating what was done to him. This revenge –repeating represents the double. The Freudian uncanny, as the class of frightening things that leads back to what is familiar and known, can be employed in King Lear`s case. The loss of Cordelia and the attitudes of Goneril and Regan represent the foregoing factors that provoked the uncanny in Lear. When Lear recognizes his vulnerability and dependency, the repressed mother comes back into the patriarchal world. This subconscious recognition provokes a state of anxiety for Lear that leads to the return of the repressed. As Kahn (1986:41) observes: `In a striking series of images in which parent-child, father-daughter, husband-wife relationships are reversed and confounded, Lear re-enacts a childlike rage against the absent or rejecting mother as figured in his daughters`.

Lear recognizes his part in Goneril, identifying her as the disease in his own body:

We`ll no more meet, no more see one another;
But yet thou art my flesh, my blood, my daughter;
Or rather a disease that`s in my flesh,
Which I must needs call mine: thou art a boil,
A plague-sore, or embossed carbuncle,
In my corrupted blood
(2.4.218-223).

Adelman states that Lear` must acknowledge that she is inextricable his, and hence the sign of corruption in him` (Adelman: 1992: 109). In his essay, Barber (1982: 191) mentions that in *King Lear* is dramatized the fulfillment of the need men have to be validated by women. Lear reveals his plan: to set his rest on Cordelia`s `kind nursery` (1.1.124).But Cordelia cannot give him `all`. Her word to him is `nothing`. Adelman (1992:117) claims that Lear` imagining himself an infant sleeping at her breast, revisions as plenitude the death toward which he is crawling, attempting to replace its nothingness with the all that fusion with her idealized maternal body seems to promise`. Barber claims that in this play, the need for a

maternal presence is directed into daughters: `Lear`s initial abdication amounts, as the Fool says, to his making` thy daughters thy mothers` (1.4.169). Regan and Goneril pretend to meet Lear`s demand for love in all but incestuous terms, Cordelia defends herself by reference to the norm of human development in the rite of passage of the marriage service` (Adelman: 1978: 118). This image of the father as in infant nursing from his daughter is interpreted in Boose`s account as `unnatural, because it allows the father to deflect his original incestuous passions into oedipal ones, thus effecting a newly incestuous proximity to the daughter, from whom the marriage ritual is designed to detach him` (Boose:1982:334). In Barber`s approach, this image is seen as `a need for a complete union in love`. Barber (1985: 197) states: `the full Christian norm would deal with the need for a complete union in love, the need Lear looked for from Cordelia in his hope` to set my rest / On her kind nursery` (1.1.123-124), by redirecting it to divine objects, with the discipline of humility before`. Barber considers that Shakespeare presents social arrangements in the Christian terms of his society. In Dreher`s approach, this image is seen as a projection upon Cordelia of Lear`s need for maternal love. Dreher interprets his desperate desire for a mother`s love as a deep lack of trust and sees his` retreat o childishness that precipitates his tragedy` as a facilitator in his psychological development.

The conflict between Cordelia and King Lear is not resolved. Cordelia wed without her father`s blessing and ritual marriage. According to Boose, Cordelia must return` to be reincorporated with her father before she can undergo the ritual severance that will enable her to progress` (Boose: 1982: 335). Cordelia returns to console Lear in life and join him in death. Singh (1983:49) states that` the daughter`s constant attempt in Shakespeare is to reconcile love and respect for father with duty toward s her husband`. Cordelia must return to Lear to ask his blessing: ` Look upon me, Sir, / And hold your hand in benediction o`er me` (4.7.56-57). Cordelia, temporarily separated from her husband, is reunited with her father. In act IV, scene VII, there is the great reunion of the humbled Lear and the fully loving Cordelia. When he sees her, he is convinced that he is captive, that he is ` bound / Upon a wheel of fire` (4.7.46-47). Gradually, he becomes aware of himself:

I am mightily abus`d. I should ev`n die with pity,
 To see another thus. I know not what to say.
 I will not swear these are my hands .Let` see;
 I feel this pin prick. Would I were assur``d
 Of my condition!
 (4.7.53-57).

Adelman (1992: 121) interprets Lear's awakening to Cordelia as 'an awakening from a dream of death as isolation and endless punishment, in which the tears he had tried to suppress have become instruments of torture': 'upon a wheel of fire that mine own tears / Do scald like molten lead' (4.7.46-48). Adelman (1992:121) explains that Lear can recognize Cordelia 'only by seeing in her the last vertige of the punitive mother his rage at her has released into the play': 'If you have poison for me, I will drink it, / I know you do not love me' (4.7.72-73). Dreher (1985:74) claims that Lear has everything he has ever wanted: Cordelia's love exclusively.

In Barber's approach, Shakespeare presents social arrangements in the Christian terms of his society. Barber considers that the play does not present a Christian resolution, but the tragic consequences of this investment. Barber (1982:198) claims that through Lear's suffering with him, 'Christian expectations come increasingly into play' and 'religious language comes into play to express the investment in the family bond': 'There she shook / The holy water from her heavenly eyes, / And clamour moisten'd then away started / To deal with grief alone' (4.3.29-32). He points out that 'Lear's image on coming back into sanity is shaped by Christian conceptions' (Schwartz and Kahn: 1982: 198): 'Thou art a soul in bliss; but I am bound / Upon a wheel of fire' (4.7.45-47). Barber interprets in Cordelia 's' 'No cause, no cause' a full expression of Christian love without a Christian supernatural.

Jorgensen (1967:110) considers that Cordelia's question 'Sir, do you know me?' is crucial in Lear's self-awakening. He explains that Lear has become aware of his condition and he has learnt the meaning of true love, 'a relationship demanding that he can face himself for what he is because he is accepted for what he is' (Jorgensen: 1967: 110). Lear addresses Cordelia with humility:

I am a very foolish fond old man,
Fourscore and upward, not an hour more or less;
And to deal plainly,
I fear I am not in my perfect mind
(4.7.60-63).

Lear can ask forgiveness: 'Pray you now, forget and forgive: I am old and foolish' (4.7.84). Lear can love Cordelia with a true love. Cordelia has taught him to love, and he learnt the meaning of true love. Kahn (1986:48) interprets these lines as Lear's acknowledgement of his manhood and of his daughter's womanhood. Kahn notes: 'He can stop imagining her as the maternal woman that he yearned for and accept his separateness from her. Yet he also calls her his child, acknowledging the bond of paternity that he denied in the first act'.

In the final scenes of the play, Lear's understanding has changed much. Through the excursion into self-discovery, he grows into a more complete human being. He is tender, unselfish, and understands the meaning of empathy and humility. In Barber's approach, in the final scenes of the play Lear has undergone a discipline of humility and achieved something like Christian disillusion with worldly things, together with a sense of the wrong he did Cordelia: He has seen through royal vanity. But he still wants his daughter to love her father all (Schwartz and Kahn: 1982: 199). Jorgensen (1967:135) claims that Lear once more he wants to retire to Cordelia's kind nursery when the two are taken to prison. By the end of the play, the passion between father and daughter is openly expressed.

In Blechner's approach, when arrested by Edmund, Cordelia and Lear revel in a fantasy of two lovers, without concerning about the realities of the situation. Lear's speech sounds more like those of a lover than a father:

Come, let's away to prison:
 We two alone will sing like birds in the cage:
 When thou dost ask me blessing, I'll kneel down
 And ask of thee forgiveness: so we'll live,
 And pray, and sing, and tell old tales, and laugh
 At gilded butterflies, and hear poor rogues talk of court news;
 and we'll talk with them too,
 Who loses and who wins; who's in, who's out;
 And take upon us the mystery of things,
 As if we were God's spies: and we'll wear out,
 In a wall'd prison, packs and sects of great ones
 That ebb and flow by the moon
 (5.3.8-19).

Adelman (1992:121) interprets the life together in prison as a space of undifferentiated union that itself seems to promise exemption from death. Adelman (1992: 121) explains that Lear recasts the walled prison in the image of a walled garden, with birds and butterflies, by transforming it into a spatialized form of the unfallen maternal body in which he initially sought shelter, the representation of Cordelia's idealized virgin body. Give these considerations, Adelman suggests that the prison is the antidote to the maternal body of the storm and the attendant horrors of the mortality (Adelman: 1992: 121). Kahn (1976:48) interprets the life in prison as a way to transcend the structure of command and obedience from the patriarchal world. She mentions: parent and child are equal, the gestures of deference that ordinarily denote patriarchal authority now transformed into signs of reciprocal love. Dreher (1986:75) notes that with Cordelia he demonstrates commitment.

He manifests commitment in his act of courage (killing the slave who hanged Cordelia). Lear is proud of his act of courage: ` I killed the slave that was a-hanging thee` (5.3.272).

In the final scene, Lear enters with Cordelia in his arms. Blechner (1988:319) claims that` in the final scene, Lear achieves his wish, the taboo is broken, the love is expressed, and, as in nearly all tragedies in which a taboo has been broken, the transgressing characters die`. Boose considers that this reunion take place at the cost of both the daughter`s life and the future life of the family. Barber interprets the final scene as a ` pieta with the roles inversed, not Holy Mother with her dead Son, but father with his dead daughter` (Schwartz and Kahn: 1982: 200). Dreher argues that in his last moments Lear finds his affirmation. Dreher (1986:75) notes:` Affirming a love that cannot be measured or possessed , Lear leaves this life in a final gesture of caring`:

And my poor fool is hang`d ! No.no. no life!
Why should a dog, a horse, a rat, have life,
And thou no breath at all? Thou `It come no more,
Never, never. Never, never, never!
Pray you, undo this button: thank you Sir.
Do you see this? Look on her. Look,her lips,
Look there, look there!
(5.3.304 -310).

Freud reads the last scene of *King Lear* as one in which the old Lear symbolically encounters death in the guise of his daughter, who represents his mother` mother earth`. Freud concludes:` But it is in vain that an old man yearns for the love of woman as he had it first from his mother ; the third of the fates alone, the silent Goddess of Death, will take him into arms`(Faber:1970:205) . Lear`s choice of the earth goddess, Cordelia, is in fact no choice as Freud mentions: ` in her guise as Death, she may be temporarily avoided but will choose him in the end. A sexual fantasy adheres however to man`s last moments; she is also the forbidden mother who embrace is granted at very end` (Faber: 1970: 223).David Willbern interprets this image as a ` compelling blend of frustration and satisfaction, infantile and adult sexuality. Death thus eroticized bears uncanny connotations. It seems a comfortable conclusion: a blend of the erotic and fatal, infantile and adult, infantile and adult, life and death` (Boose and Flowers: 1989: 91).

Freud`s essay explains the final scene of *King Lear*. Cordelia is ` the Death-goddess`. Faber points out that ` when we watch Lear enter with his dead daughter in his arms we are actually witnessing a symbolic enactment of Lear`s being carried off by Death` (Faber: 1970: 193). Cordelia`s silence irritates Lear that banishes her .Goneril and Regan die competing

for the love of Edmund, Lear turns to accept Cordelia and he dies pointing to her lips: ` Look there, look there!` (5.3.308). This time he accepts the silent goddess of death.

As Faber (1970: 194) observes, Lear as a whole, becomes a drama about an old king`s resistance to death and his desire for feminine love. In Dreher`s account, Lear does not want to hear the truth from Cordelia and ` he rejects this message, confusing the silent goddess of death with the mother goddess and the goddess of love` (Dreher: 1985: 65).

6 Conclusion

This thesis has been a study of the complex and challenging relationship between fathers and daughters in Shakespeare's plays *The Tempest*, *King Lear*, *Hamlet* and *Othello*, through a psychological perspective. The aims of this study were to examine how fathers and daughters responded to the challenges of this crucial moment (when the daughter left the sphere of her father's power), in concord or in conflict with the ruling philosophy of the time.

In trying to achieve these aims, it was important to explore the family, marriage and society in Shakespeare's time, in the second chapter of this thesis. The findings of this chapter, came down to the conclusion that the society of Shakespeare's works was patriarchal. Traditional women spent their lives in submission to male authority figures. This was the traditional woman model: silent, dutiful, chaste, obedient. The primary considerations regarding marriage in this period of time were family alliances and economic security. The marriage was considered a parental duty, not a child's prerogative. The choice of wives and husbands was in the authority of their fathers. Fathers demanded hierarchical obedience. As seen in Dreher's account (1986: 29), during Shakespeare's time, attitudes about women and family were in transition, the traditional order was challenged by developments in science, politics, religion and economics. This period was a dynamic period between two historical epochs: the feudal and the capitalist, with new concepts of family and marriage.

In this four plays, we see that daughters undergo a process from childhood to adulthood and fathers from middle life to old age. Each pair undergoes a process from one stage of life to another, in a period of time of dynamic social change. Fathers face the crisis of middle life and experience the changing roles of late adulthood, reluctant to release their daughters into womanhood. They must accept new distribution of authority and roles. Fathers struggle to relinquish their daughters to other men, their future husbands. Fathers face the crisis of middle life and experience the changing roles of late adulthood, daughters face the crisis of puberty period with its awakening sexuality. Daughters leave their fathers for the

commitment of marriage. They struggle to choose between leaving their fathers for the commitment of marriage and paternal obedience.

The aims of the thesis were to explore this difficult and challenging process, of the passage from a stage of life to another, through the tools of the psychoanalysis. The study tried also to examine whether fathers and daughters challenged or conformed to the traditional family model.

In chapter three, this thesis tried to investigate whether the plays *Hamlet* and *Othello* conform to tradition or challenge the patriarchal parental model. The findings of the chapter three came down to the conclusion that the relationships between Desdemona and Brabantio, Ophelia and her father, do not develop through the plays. The conflict between father and daughter is political, because it refers to the conflict with stereotypes of the patriarchal world. These relationships are typical for the patriarchal society, where the father is the authoritarian figure and the daughter is the passive figure that fail to affirm herself as an individual. Ophelia and Desdemona sacrifice themselves to affirm the traditional ideal. They represent two models of the ideal Elizabethan woman. Desdemona is the ideal wife of the patriarchal world, Ophelia is the ideal daughter of this society. Ophelia and Desdemona are in a transition period between childhood and adulthood. The sexuality of the puberty period brings them the awakening desires for other men. Prior the puberty period, these daughters have been obedient, sweet, innocent, passive, modest, chaste, following the patriarchal stereotype of the woman - model. This period is challenging for Polonius and Brabantio. They must see their daughters as individuals, and leave them go from their sphere of power. The more Desdemona and Ophelia seek to be good women, conforming to patriarchal expectations, the more they are victimized. As the plays *Hamlet* and *Othello* progress, Shakespeare shows us Ophelia and Desdemona`s acceptance of this role and the tragic consequences. They fail to make the transition from childhood into adulthood.

Desdemona tries to make the transition. By defying her father, she transcends the stereotypes of the patriarchal society. She challenges traditional sex roles and accepted patterns for woman traditional behavior, in conflict with the ideology at the time. Desdemona is not the good daughter, but she is the good wife for Othello. By transferring her obedience from father to husband, she fails to make the transition between childhood into adulthood.

Ophelia is the ideal Elizabethan daughter, but she fails to enter the stage of adult commitment. She obeys her father but fails to develop autonomy. Dreher (1986:77) suggests that Ophelia cannot make this passage because she does not know who she is. She suggests that Ophelia is caught ` in adolescent uncertainty between childhood and adulthood`. Ophelia

suffers an identity crisis. According to Dreher (1986:77), Ophelia is tormented by her feelings and the external expectations. She wants to be the good daughter that is obedient and submissive to the wishes of her father. But at the same time, she is an individual that has feelings and wishes.

When referring to their fathers, we can observe an absence of affect in the relationship between Polonius and Ophelia. Polonius represents a typical authoritarian father as described in Stone`s model. He is not interested in Ophelia`s feelings, he is only concerned to retain Ophelia`s honor and reputation because they affect his own. The authoritarian fathers Polonius, Brabantio, insist above all that the daughter be obedient and chaste. They are treating their daughters as their property, and they want to barter their daughters in marriage arrangements, more economic than interpersonal. These fathers want to direct their daughters` destinies in marriage. They ignore their daughters` adulthood.

Both Desdemona and Ophelia suffer tragic changes in their characters. At the beginning of the play, Desdemona is unconventional, courageous and dynamic. As the play progresses, she changes into the passive woman of the patriarchal society. Dreher points out that at the beginning of the play, Ophelia is a healthy woman, with` romantic feelings and a normal level of sexual awareness` (Dreher: 1986: 77). Through the play, she changes into a disillusioned, emotionally troubled and devastated woman that collapses into madness. Ophelia and Desdemona become encircled in their passive situation.

Taking into consideration Bosse`s account about the importance of the marriage ritual, we see that the relationships between Hamlet and Ophelia, Desdemona and Othello are deprived of paternal blessing. This fact has tragic consequences in their destinies.

These daughters remain children in their obedience and submission to patriarchal authority, failing to make the passage from childhood to adulthood, and conforming to tradition. Their submission to the patriarchal authority involves tragic consequences. Ophelia and Desdemona are deprived of their lives. They are the victims of the male anxiety from the patriarchal world. According to Frey in his essay *O sacred, shadowy, cold, and constant queen, in Othello* we see` the inability of an authoritarian, aggressive male to enter reciprocal, fruitful relations with women or to foster life or line` (1980: 296). He argues that often tragic results are generated by` the system of near – absolute male authority` (1980: 296). Thus, these plays present the abuse of patriarchal power, and its tragic consequences.

Chapter four and five of this thesis tried to investigate whether the father-daughter bond between Prospero and Miranda, King Lear and his daughters challenge the traditional paternal model. The findings conclude that the relationships between Miranda and Prospero,

and King Lear and Cordelia develop through the play. The conflict between them is political and emotional. It is political because it refers to the conflict with stereotypes of the patriarchal world, and it is emotional because it is examined through the psychological tensions of their relationship.

The relationship between Prospero and Miranda challenges the patriarchal parental model, because it is a successful and tender relationship, based on affection. Prospero is the good example of a father that holds himself and his daughter to high standards of accomplishment and integrity. Miranda represents an interesting challenging figure: she is obedient and at the same time she rebels against her father as Desdemona do. Miranda disobeys and defies her father, choosing the love for Ferdinand over parental obedience. While Miranda talks to Ferdinand in act III, she remembers that her father gave her 'percepts' against talking to Ferdinand: 'But I prattle / Something too widely, and my father's percepts / I therein do forget' (3.1.57-58). She disobeys her father by breaking his given 'percepts'.

At the beginning of the play, Prospero sees his daughter as a part of himself. As the play progresses, he gradually detaches himself from Miranda, and lets her go with another man. In order to release his daughter into adulthood, Prospero needs a balance within himself. Through the play, he undergoes a process of transformation that starts with the coming of the tempest. Through the stormy heath, he gains spiritual growth. This metaphorical tempest represents the beginning of psychic progress and moral development for Prospero. He sees his exile as a trial and a blessing: 'were we heaved thence, / But blessedly help hither' (1.2.63-64).

Prospero becomes a successful, triumphant father in this passage process. For Prospero, to provide a husband for Miranda is to acknowledge his own age and declining powers. He leaves the stage of parenthood and moves on the stage of the late adulthood. In this problematic process, Prospero has the strength and wisdom to release Miranda to the man she loves. Prospero blesses the relationship between Miranda and Ferdinand. This fact implies a successful destiny to Miranda. After a struggling process within himself, he chooses generosity over egotism. He becomes a successful, triumphant father in this passage process. He learnt the wisdom of the late adulthood. He acknowledges his daughter's wishes and needs.

At the beginning of the play, King Lear is a tyrannical, possessive father, in contrast with Prospero. He perceives his daughters as parts of himself. The findings of this thesis show the character King Lear as a child deprived of maternal presence. When Lear is losing the 'kind nursery' of Cordelia, he responds 'by raging at Regan and Goneril when they refuse him

courtesy, by rejecting human society when he stalks off to the heath` (Ferguson and Quilligan: 1986: 41). Kahn believes that Lear`s madness is his rage at being deprived of the maternal presence.

The findings of this thesis arrive at the conclusion that the father-daughter bond between Cordelia and his daughters challenges the tradition. King Lear undergoes a difficult process in order to release his daughter from the sphere of his control and power. Like Prospero, King Lear has to experience a metaphorical storm in order to gain spiritual growth. This metaphorical storm implies suffering, sorrow and reunion of the family with a renewed sense of identity. At the end of the play, he is able to see his daughters as more than extensions of himself. Through an excursion into a self-discovery, he detaches his ego from his mother (in his case, his daughters). At the end of the play, he acknowledges that true love for Cordelia means for him a true understanding of himself. He is able to release his daughters into adulthood and to make the passage into the late adulthood. The relationship between Cordelia and her husband is deprived of paternal blessing. This fact implies a tragic end to Cordelia. For the love`s resolution to be happy, it must be blessed.

The moment when the daughter leaves the father, reveals our eternal drama of identity, of what it means to be a man or a woman in this world, of the eternal conflict between generations. These four plays learn us that a successful relationship between fathers and daughters requires benevolent support and sacrifice on the fathers` part if the child is to grow. A father`s happiness as well as his daughter`s depends on acknowledging her needs and desires.

Bibliography

Abrams, M.H.2005.*A glossary of Literary Terms*. Thomson&Wadsworth.pp.256-262).

Adelman, Janet.1992. *Suffocating Mothers fantasies of Maternal Origin in Shakespeare`s Plays, Hamlet to the Tempest*. Routledge: New York and London

Adelman, Janet. 1978. *Twentieth Century Interpretations of King Lear*. Prentice Hall: Englewood Cliffs

Bamber, Linda.1982.*Comic Women, Tragic Men a study of gender and genre in Shakespeare* Standford: California

Barber, C.L. 1980.*The Family in Shakespeare`s Development: Tragedy and Sacredness*. In Schwartz, Murray M. and Kahn, Coppelia. *Representing Shakespeare New psychoanalytic Essays*. The John Hopkins University Press: Baltimore and London

Barry, Peter.2009. *Beginning Theory. An introduction to literary and cultural theory*. Manchester University Press: Manchester and New York

Blechner, Mark J.1988.*King Lear, Ling Leir, and Incest Wishes*. In American Imago pp. (309-325).

Boose, Lynda.1982.*The Father and the Bride in Shakespeare*. PMLA 97pp.325-47.

Boose, Lynda and Flowers, S Betty. 1989. *Daughters and Fathers*. The Johns Hopkins University Press: Baltimore and London

Carolyn Ruth Swift Lenz, Carolyn and Greene, Gayle and Neely, Carol Thomas.1980. *The Woman`s Part Feminist Criticism of Shakespeare*. Urbana Chicago

Coontz, Stephanie.2005. *Something Old, Something New: Western European Marriage at the dawn of the Modern Age*. Chapter 8 in *Marriage, a History: How Love Conquered Marriage*. London: Penguin (pp.123-142).

Deats, Sara Munsen. 2001. *Truly, an Obedient Lady*. In *Othello New Critical Essays* Routledge. New York and London

Dickes, Robert.1970. *Desdemona An Innocent Victim?* in *American Imago* (pp. 279-97).

Dreher, Diane Elizabeth.1986 *Domination and Defiance fathers and daughters in Shakespeare*. Kentucky

Faber, M.D. 1970. *The Design Within: Psychoanalytic Approaches to Shakespeare*. Science House New York

Ferguson, Margaret W, Qulligan, Maureen and Vickers, Nancy.1986. *Rewriting the Renaissance*. Chicago Press: Chicago and London

Finn, Elizabeth.2007. *Apple and the Tree: Shakespeare`s Use of Father-Child Relationships in Character Construction* Honors Theses. Colby College English Dept.

Freud, Sigmund.2010. In *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*. Letch, Vincent B. General Editor. 2010.pp. 807-45). Norton Company: New York & London

Frey, Charles. *O Sacred, Shadowy, Cold, and Constant Queen: Shakespeare`s Imperiled and Chastening Daughters of Romance*. In *The Woman`s Part Feminist Criticism of Shakespeare*.

Urbana Chicago. Carolyn Ruth Swift Lenz, Carolyn and Greene, Gayle and Neely, Carol Thomas.1980.

Gayle, Greene.1995. *This That You Call Love: Sexual and Social Tragedy in Othello*. In Barker, Deborah E. and Ivo Kamps: *Shakespeare and Gender : A History*. London: Verso.1995 (pp.47-62).

Graff, Gerald and Phelan, James.2000. *William Shakespeare The Tempest A case Study in Critical Controversy*. Bedford: Boston New York

Hamilton, Sharon.2003. *Shakespeare`s Daughters*. McFarland Company: Jefferson, North Carolina, and London

Jardine, Lisa, 1983. *Still Harping on Daughters Women and Drama in the Age of Shakespeare*. The Harvester Press, Sussex: Barnes, Noble Books, New Jersey

Jorgensen, Paul A.1967. *Lear`s Self- Discovery*. University of California Press: Berkeley and Los Angeles

Kahan, Jeffrey.2008. *King Lear New Critical Essays*. Routledge: New York and London

Kahn, Coppelia.1980.*The Providential Tempest and the Shakespearean Family*. In Schwartz, Murray M. and Kahn, Coppelia. *Representing Shakespeare New psychoanalytic Essays*. The John Hopkins University Press: Baltimore and London

Kahn, Coppelia.1981.*Man`s Estate. Masculine Identity in Shakespeare*. University of California Press: Berkeley: Los Angeles: London

Kay, Carol McGinnis and E. Jacobs Henry.1978. *Shakespeare`s Romances Reconsidered* Lincoln and London

Keeseey, Donald.2003.*Contexts for Criticism*. McGraw Hill

Kolin, Philip C. 2001. *Othello New Critical Essays* Routledge. New York and London

Leverenz, David.1980. *The Woman in Hamlet: An Interpersonal View*. In Schwartz, Murray M. and Kahn, Coppelia. 1980. *Representing Shakespeare New psychoanalytic Essays*. The John Hopkins University Press: Baltimore and London

Macey David.2000. *The Penguin Dictionary of Critical Theory*. Penguin Books

Papp, Joseph Papp and Elizabeth Kirkland, Elizabeth.1988. *Shakespeare alive*. Bantam Books: Toronto : New York: London: Sydney: Auckland

Pitt, Angela.1981. *Shakespeare`s Women*. Barnes & Noble Imports

Reid, Stephen.1970.*In Defense of Goneril and Regan*. In American Imago pp. 226-44.

Rose, Mary Beth. 1986. *Women in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance* (Literary and Historical perspectives). Syracuse University Press.

Sarup Singh, Sarup. 1983 *Family relationships in Shakespeare and the Restoration Comedy of Manners*. Oxford

Schwartz, Murray M. and Kahn, Coppelia. 1980. *Representing Shakespeare New psychoanalytic Essays*. The John Hopkins University Press: Baltimore and London

Shakespeare, William. Ed. Neill, Michael. 2008. *Othello, the Moor of Venice*. Oxford

Shakespeare. Ed. Kenneth, Muir. 1972. *King Lear*. The Arden Edition of The Works of William Shakespeare. London Methuen Co LTD

Shakespeare, William, Ed. Hibbard. G.R.2008. *Hamlet*. Oxford

Shakespeare, William.Ed. Orgel, Stephen.2008. *The Tempest*. Oxford

Showalter, Elaine.1997.*Representing Ophelia: Women, Madness, and the Responsibilities of Feminist Criticism*. In Shakespearean Criticism. Vol.35.pp.77-94.

Snow, Edward A. 1980. *Sexual Anxiety and the Male Order of Things in Othello* in *English Literary Renaissance* volume 10 (pp.384-412).

Stone, Lawrence. Abridged Edition. 1979. *The Family Sex and Marriage in England 1500-1800*. Penguin Books

Sundelson, David. 1980. *So Rare a Wonder'd Father: Prospero's Tempest*. In Schwartz, Murray M. and Kahn, Coppelia. *Representing Shakespeare New psychoanalytic Essays*. The John Hopkins University Press: Baltimore and London

Vaughan, Virginia Mason and Vaughan, Alden T. 1998. *Critical Essays on Shakespeare's The Tempest*. G. K. Hall Co: New York

