TYRANNY IN RICHARD III. A JUNGIAN PSYCHOANALYTIC APPROACH TO ITS AETIOLOGY AND PSYCHOGENESIS

Emilian Tîrban
PhD Student, „Lucian Blaga" University of Sibiu

Abstract: "Richard III" has fascinated the world of theatre and the intellectual endeavour of literary criticism for centuries by displaying Shakespeare's intemperate interest in portraying the tyrant's psychology. To locate the psychogenesis and aetiological elements that influenced the protagonist's violent ambitions, the present article will focus on psychoanalytic interpretations of Richard III's psyche emphasising the underlying tyrannical propensity of his behaviour and environmental causes. As a result, this article will also look at the collective shortcomings portrayed in the play, such as the family and community's failure to accept responsibility for fostering tyrannical behavioural patterns in Richard.
Given Richard's centrality and the play's minute investigations into the workings of a tyrant's mind, this article aims to present an interpretation of Shakespeare's first attempt at portraying the (psycho)genesis and demise of a tyrant concerning his later tragedies. Occasional comparisons might show how Shakespeare's portrayal of the psyche's tortuous development in tragedy has evolved from 1592-3, the years "Richard III" was written and first performed (Bloom "Invention" xv), into the "tragic period" (Bradley 84) of 1600-1606 (with "Hamlet", "King Lear", and "Macbeth" especially). Investigating Richard's descent from psychic integrity to psychic atrophy will best demonstrate Shakespeare's early attempt to depict a tyrant's mental cosmetics by focusing on the Marlovian overabundances of character that make Richard III such a puzzling figure. This article shows how Richard is psychologically different from Shakespeare's later tragic protagonists, whose psyches are partly accessible to them, but are tapped into to an eventually fatal effect.

Keywords: Shakespeare, tragedy, tyranny, Richard III, psychoanalysis.

After exploring the conflicts of the Wars of the Roses in the three parts of *Henry VI*, Shakespeare abruptly shifts his theatrical focus to the Duke of Gloucester's personality. In the earlier plays, Richard's psychological motivations were hinted at through perfunctory replies to the vituperative attacks on his appearances and the revelation of the character's proclivity for violence. In this respect, Richard erupts on the scene at the beginning of his own play, *Richard III*, as the "culmination and final flower of a long-gathering evil (as Shakespeare wants us to feel)" (Tanner 349). Richard's mind has been conditioned to associate his deformities with villainy, as stated in the opening soliloquy,

> […] But *I*, that am not shaped for sportive tricks,
> Nor made to court an amorous looking glass;
> *I*, that am rudely stamped and want love's majesty
> To strut before a wanton ambling nymph;
> *I*, that am curtailed of this fair proportion,
> Cheated of feature by dissembling nature,
> Deformed, unfinished, sent before my time
> Into this breathing world scarce half made up,
> And that so lamely and unfashionable
> That dogs bark at me as *I* halt by them—
> Why, *I*, in this weak piping time of peace,
> Have no delight to pass away the time,

Unless *to see my shadow in the sun*
And *descant on mine own deformity*. (1.1.14-27 my emphasis)[1]

The soliloquy begins with Richard pontificating about the current state of affairs after the victory of the House of York and the coronation of King Henry VI described as the agent of the Sun and the categorical antipode to Richard's Shadow. This excerpt makes the Duke of Gloucester's self-awareness about the others explicit. Marlowe's influence is still simmering in Shakespeare's mind at this point, and *Richard III* makes the case of the Marlovian villain (Dobson and Wells 388; Bloom 64; Tanner 350) innately endowed with incredible psychological wholeness. Richard offers proof of his conscious psychic integration of public and familial vilification of his appearance and conscious repression of certain diminishing psychological features. This contends that Richard's psychic integrity is excessive for a realistic portrayal of the psychological development of a tyrannical mind.

However, the ego-centric expository soliloquy follows precisely the lines of an ego-self axis with the constant repetition of the first-person singular pronoun "I" since "The ego itself is the centre of consciousness and it is what we refer to when we use the terms 'I' or 'me' (Stevens 63). Richard's extraordinary ego-consciousness shows from the outset and reiterates his experience of himself as the congenitally misshaped pariah forced to individuate his Shadow from his Persona and his Self from the collective Self.

There is no buffer between Richard's conscious repression of the Persona and his awareness of his own Shadow drives. Such a buffer would betray a deeper level of self-understanding and inflict moral revision best displayed by Hamlet "That I, the son of a dear father murdered/ Prompted to my revenge by heaven and hell/ Must, like a whore, unpack my heart with words" (2.2.612-14) and Macbeth "If it were done when 'tis done, then' twere well / It were done quickly" (1.7.1-2). Unlike Richard, both later tragic protagonists are psychologically burdened by hesitation and moral compunction. The cumulative effects of psychological stressors become devastating only in the last phases of *Richard III*, nearly instantly, rather than gradually, as seen in Macbeth's and King Lear's journeys from wholeness in the Persona to mental degradation in the Shadow. Richard has fully integrated the Shadow, tapping into the darkest recesses of his personality to release what would otherwise be repressed primal drives contained within the archetype described as "a complex within us loaded with *emotional weight*. Our persona is what we most want to be seen to be; the shadow is what we least want to be" (Bobroff 54 my emphasis). Richard reverses Bobroff's categorisations and turns the Shadow into the admirable feature of his character. The respective emotional weight stems from the previous play, *3 Henry VI*, when Gloucester confronts King Henry VI:

Indeed, 'tis true that Henry told me of,
For I have often heard my mother say
I came into the world with my legs forward.
Had I not reason, think you, to make haste
And seek their ruin that usurped our right?
The midwife wondered, and the women cried
"O Jesus bless us, he is born with teeth!"
And so I was, which plainly signified
That I should snarl, and bite, and play the dog.
Then, since the heavens have shaped my body so,
Let hell make crook'd my mind to answer it. (3 Henry VI 5.6.70-80)

Richard yields to Henry VI's invectives against his appearance and his laments for the mother of a misshaped villain, implying a consensus on Richard's congenital deformity.

[1] All quotations are from The Folger Shakespeare Library editions.

Consequently, collective opinion had a definitive effect on the psychopathology of Gloucester's mind throughout childhood; hence, "Richard's deformity – or, rather, his society's reaction to his deformity – is the root condition of his psychopathology" (Greenblatt 57). The opening soliloquy reiterates Richard's intention of becoming an agent of Hell, "Let hell make crook'd my mind to answer it," which is anathema to the momentary peace of the present moment "I am determined to prove a villain/And hate the idle pleasures of these days" (*Richard III* 1.1.30-1). At this point, Richard's shadow begins to loom over the entire play and reflects what Tony Tanner calls, drawing on the influence the allegorical Vice of the morality plays had on Shakespeare, gratuitous evil effectuated by the boredom that fuels narcissistic desires (ibid. 349-353).

Richard III's psychological integration of the two opposing dualities (Shadow/Persona) shows Shakespeare's interest in depicting the conflicted psyche of the tyrant king, and how this psychological schism produces psychopathology in a historical context. In this respect, *Richard III* deals less with the physical body of the king in connection with the body politic, a touchstone motif of later historical plays such as *Richard II*, *Henry IV 1,2*, and *Henry V*. Furthermore, there is a distinct initial interest of Shakespeare's in *Richard III* in the function of "curses" and "dreams" and their premonitory power. The three "wailing queens" point to the equivocating effect the language of the three witches has on Macbeth's psyche in the later tragedy. A similarly corrosive amphibolic language of treason (Mullaney 38) stems from the nationwide defamatory rhetoric on Richard's foreboding birth with neonatal teeth. His mother first propounded the troubled birth to a detrimental effect of motherly vilification integrated by Richard during his childhood, as she laments her son's intrauterine and extrauterine life,

> I have stayed for thee,
> God knows, in torment and in agony. […]
> Thou cam'st on Earth to make the Earth my hell.
> A grievous burden was thy birth to me
> Tetchy and wayward was thy infancy;
> Thy school days frightful, desp'rate, wild, and
> furious;
> Thy prime of manhood daring, bold, and venturous;
> Thy age confirmed, proud, subtle, sly, and bloody,
> More mild, but yet more harmful, kind in hatred. (4.4.168-79)

Richard was betrayed and ostracized on a social and moral level by his peers and kin from birth. Jung saw the mother as the archetypal "foundation of consciousness", and the mother's lament "kind in hatred" harkens back to Richard's subversive awareness of his d(a)emonic theatrical duality in having free-will over the Persona and the Shadow when he says of himself in *3 Henry VI*, "I can smile, and murder whiles I smile, …/ And wet my cheeks with artificial tears." (3.2.184-86). He accepts this duality and his penchant for villainy without a shred of ego-dystonic pressure or psychic atrophy – he is made whole by the full integration of the Shadow. Nevertheless, Richard's psychic integrity crumbles as the battle between opposing dualities progresses. Shakespeare echoes Richard's psychogenesis of tyrannical behaviour in Hamlet's psychological submission to the Ghost's account of his father's demise. The Ghost's commands make the prince aware of his uncle's duplicity and determine Hamlet to become revengeful: "My tables—meet it is I set it down/ That one may smile and smile and be a villain." (1.5.114-5). This metacognition has a doubling effect of projection of Hamlet's feelings directed also at his mother and her incestuous remarriage "O most pernicious woman!" (1.5.112) that triggers his psychological atrophy – Hamlet's love for his mother clashes with the hatred for the father figure and his psychic integrity weakens. Hamlet's mind is the epitome of Shakespeare's understanding of the human psyche influenced and thwarted by inward, outward, and metaphysical forces.

Conversely, even after hearing his mother's defamatory account of his life and receiving her "most grievous curse", Richard maintains his psychological composure and moves single-mindedly from the mother's malison to his narcissistic courtship by proxy of Elizabeth that displays "a further feature that Shakespeare associated with tyranny: utter shamelessness" (Greenblatt 91), but also impassive ambition. The mother's articulation of filial odium has no immediate effect on Richard's conscience. Hence the contention that Richard displays an exaggerated psychological withdrawal from his environment that borders on psychopathology. Richard is, therefore, the opposite of Hamlet, who ponders painstakingly everything that happens around him and is "shaped" into the justiciar for the former King. Inklings of the prince's Protestant education irrupt from the unconscious to hinder his ambition; this happens not in *Richard III*. Hence, there is an overt lack of inner feelings of sorrow or moral destitution stemming from a possible Oedipal complex that is "an important and never-failing element in pathological fantasy" (Jung *Lectures* 75). There is no point of inwardness as a mode of revisionism in Richard, unlike in Hamlet (Bloom *Invention* 400)[2]. Even though Harold Bloom disregarded Freud's popular idea of an Oedipus complex as the sole subject of *Hamlet*, the mother-son relationship is a touchstone in one's psychological development.

On the other hand, the mother archetype in *Richard III* is only a promoter of hatred (for Richard based on his appearance/demeanour) and one of the doomsayers foreshadowing the tyrant's downfall. The separation of Richard III from the mother figure bears no conscious weight upon the protagonist's psyche as it did in Hamlet's case. Furthermore, Shakespeare reuses this trope in his future tragedies until his last, *Coriolanus*, where separation from the mother is potent. Hamlet's cathexis of the mother's actions led to a detrimental escalation of feelings of depression and animosity; hence Jung's contention that the mother complex "is an aetiologically significant factor in the development of abnormal fantasies" (*Lectures* 75) becomes apparent. This factor is more at work in *Hamlet* than in *Richard III*. The introversion of the mother complex is only partial in *Richard III* in so far as this state is "when libido is used for the maintenance of fantasies and illusions instead of being adapted to the actual conditions of life" (ibid. 51). Richard makes his conditions of life and his psychological mechanisms of adaptation to the world by "playing the villain" and acts out the negative aspects of the Animus to be unimpeded in his ambitions by the pangs of conscience contained within the Anima (Jung *Archetypes* 124). Against everyone's expectations, Richard succeeds at his game when his narcissistic dream of the crown fuelled by hatred becomes a reality,

> Then, since this Earth affords no joy to me
> But to command, to check, to o'erbear such
> As are of better person than myself,
> I'll make my heaven to dream upon the crown,
> And, whiles I live, t' account this world but hell
> Until my misshaped trunk that bears this head
> Be round impaled with a glorious crown. (*3 Henry VI* 3.2.166-73)

Macbeth's "dream" of the throne, distinct from Richard's, as I have shown elsewhere (Tîrban 2022), has more libidinal/archetypal implications regarding the inner drives that prompted the usurpation. However, both usurpers find, once their dreams have been achieved, that their tyrannical drives have been archetypal prescriptions for their "psychological" fall from grace while aspiring to a social position for which they are not prepared. The higher they climb the social ladder, the further the world they have envisioned for themselves becomes a hellish place. The fear they want to instil turns against them, and the psychological mechanisms

[2] An explanatory note should be made about these comparisons. They are not meant to detract from Shakespeare's obvious poetic power in presenting the "far-reaching moral consequences of a corrupt ruler" (Bloom in *Richard III* 263), nor to diminish Marlowe, but to put Richard into perspective as Shakespeare's intemperate attempt at portraying the psychogenesis of tyrannical behaviour within the personal psyche.

employed for the task fail incrementally. The once Duke of Gloucester, soon-to-be Richard III, finds the prescribed hell he had envisioned for himself constantly reiterated to him by other characters 17 times within the play, 15 of which are direct references to Richard himself, "Avaunt, thou dreadful minister of hell." (1.2.47); "And thou unfit for any place but hell" (1.2.116); "Thou cam'st on Earth to make the Earth my hell." (172); "As long as hell and Richard likes of it." (4.4.368). These few references to hell are spoken by the distraught weeping women who play an instrumental role in the metaphysical dimension of the tragedy. It follows that Richard is indelibly connected with hell in the collective imagination. His person, perceived analytically, is the Shadow of the prelapsarian Persona. The former is always condemned for staining the beauty of others "Witness my son, now in the shade of death/ […] thy cloudy wrath/ Hath in eternal darkness folded up" (1.3.284-6); Richard's actions and thoughts are anathema to their "glorious summer" and his shade is meant only to kill the Sun/King "And turns the sun(son) to shade" (1.3.283). Everyone in the play sees Richard as the shade the Sun leaves behind, the mere Shadow of the King. The lamenting women's chorus epitomises his tenebrous otherness,

> I had an Edward till a Richard killed him;
> I had a husband till a Richard killed him.
> Thou hadst an Edward till a Richard killed him;
> Thou hadst a Richard till a Richard killed him. (4.4.42-5)

and reveals Richard's existence in the collective imagination as the surviving shade of waning royal incandescence. The stichomythic passage also highlights Gloucester's subordinated hierarchical/familial position relative to the late kings and princes. The downtrodden women now find mournful consolation in belittling and spurning Richard's name because of his murders; what once may have been gratuitous odium is now a painful psychic wound made to fester by Richard's expedient.

Like Hamlet, Richard is constantly placed beneath the Sun that shines irksome light on the tyrant's darker nature or the son's destitution. Hamlet's ironic answer to his uncle's question about what depresses him, "I am too much in the sun" (1.2.69), reiterates Shakespeare's punning insistence on the Sun imagery associated with the symbol of the Sun and the King in *Richard III* "this glorious son (sun) of York". While the analogy in *Hamlet* has been found to contain a multiplicity of meanings (Papahagi 132), a psychologically striking effect of it may be linked to Richard's subordinated position to the King/Sun but also the loved Son(s) (Queen Margaret's to-be-king son Edward VI, The Duchess' Henry VI, and future king(s) Edward V and the Duke of York). Hamlet is invested in his Father's ghost to a large psychological extent, thus exacerbating his role as the revengeful son who has been for a "long" time under the influence of the King/Sun/Father archetype and must do his bidding (Armstrong 35). Likewise, Richard has been under the scornful rays of the King/Sun for so long that his function as a son has been rejected. Richard has always been *under* rather than *in* the Sun (literally to be King or one of the sons dotted on by their mother); hence the pun can also describe a lack of recognition and acceptance by his family (du Brul 9). Fraternal animosity is evident in his ironic mourning of King Edward IV when he says, "All of us have cause/ To wail the dimming of our shining star" (2.2.104-5). In a mock show of piety, Richard requests the blessing of his mother, who, before this encounter, admitted that he is her only remaining son, the "false glass" that can only reflect the woman's shame. Consequently, Richard sneers at his mother's perfunctory blessing, "That is the butt end of a mother's blessing;" (2.2.113) which seems to be a curse in disguise (Wheeler 314). The following aside reveals his awareness of his mother's enmity and indifference towards him. Consequently, Richard is forcefully barred from a position of emotional stability, and parental/societal love and is therefore entombed in a resentful mental space that directs its ill will at both the self and the collective since "Mental

representations of the self and interpersonal relationships are reciprocally influential and inextricably tied […]" (American Psychological Association 772).

Therefore, notwithstanding the lesser effect of the mother complex in this play, the mother figure is allotted its place in the scornful collective that holds values opposite to Richard's. Conflicting values play a key part in developing the latter's tyrannical drives as he consciously integrates the developmental trauma caused by collective opprobrium into his psyche. Stephen Greenblatt comments that "Shakespeare does, however, suggest that a child unloved by his mother, ridiculed by his peers, and forced to regard himself as a monster will develop certain compensatory psychological strategies, some of them both destructive and self-destructive" (57), and evidences Shakespeare's possible interest in depicting the psychogenesis of tyrannical behaviour in Richard.

The lack of psychological effect derived from a parental complex reinforces the idea that Richard's psyche is incredibly self-sufficient. Nevertheless, Shakespeare distances himself from Marlowe's influence in depicting the self-serving tyrant by penetrating the unconscious of his character to such a surprising effect that confuses the theatrical Machiavel himself. Tony Tanner notes in his Preface to *Richard III* how "Shakespeare was clearly fascinated by the question of whether there could be a man completely devoid of *conscience* (i.e., *not conscience totally repressed*, but just nothing there at all)" (356 my emphasis, the author's brackets). In this vein, *Richard III* stands in contradistinction from Shakespeare's late tragedies by its incessantly explicit investigation of "conscience" and the lingering effects of its "dregs" (1.4.125) on the psyches of the characters – the word "conscience" is used 13 times in *Richard III*, 8 times in *Hamlet*, and never in *King Lear* and *Macbeth*. The latter plays, notwithstanding the lack of explicit reference to conscience, offer some of the most striking portrayals of psychosomatic degradation and moral investigation of a torn psyche. *Richard III* is also stylistically/thematically different from, or superior to, Shakespeare's earlier three plays. Hence Jonathan Bate's question and answer, "What is it that makes 'Richard III' a better play than the three parts of 'Henry VI' that precede it? The answer is Richard's *theatrical self-consciousness*, his sheer delight in turning justice on its head" (*Soul* 328 my emphasis). A slip in Richard's mind seemingly downplays this defensive theatrical self-consciousness of his psyche. However, this slip is nevertheless quickly repressed during the jarringly self-critical soliloquy (Wolfgang 43) preceded by the stichomythic dialogue with Lady Anne:

> Hath she forgot already that brave prince,
> Edward, her lord, whom I some three months since
> Stabbed in my angry mood at Tewkesbury?
> A sweeter and a lovelier gentleman,
> Framed in the prodigality of nature,
> Young, valiant, wise, and, no doubt, right royal,
> The spacious world cannot again afford.
> And will she yet abase her eyes on me,
> That cropped the golden prime of this sweet prince
> And made her widow to a woeful bed?
> On me, whose all not equals Edward's moiety?
> On me, that halts and am misshapen thus?
> My dukedom to a beggarly denier,
> *I do mistake my person all this while!*
> Upon my life, she finds, although I cannot,
> Myself to be a marv'lous proper man. (1.2.260-75 my emphasis)

The former exchange between Richard and Anne makes explicit the duke's mental power and psychological cunning in duping those around him to perceive him as the projected Persona that secretly exploits others. Although she bears resentment and constantly expresses

her own Shadow's drives to curse and ridicule the "dissembler" before her, Anne restrains her violent urges and becomes amazingly charitable towards Richard. Unlike her, he hides his true nature under the socially acceptable guise like “the serpent under’t (The flower)” (*Macbeth* 1.6.78, my brackets). No matter how small or big, every conquest comes as a surprise to Richard. Since this interaction between Anne and Richard has no bearing on the historical context and Richard's political expedient (Racking in Folger *Richard III* 339), it is Shakespeare's original depiction of a serpentine demeanour at work. This moment affords the audience a revelatory glimpse into the tyrant’s complex psychological makeup. As a result, in determining the aetiology and psychogenesis of Richard's tyranny, his self-reflexive remark "I do mistake my person all this time!" will be considered a Jungian feeling-tone complex. Richard "jumps" in surprise at the awareness that by impersonating the Persona, he can be integrated into the society that has for so long ostracized him. Lady Anne's apparent acceptance of him acts as an emotional trigger of "certain constellations of psychic elements (ideas, opinions, convictions, etc.) that are grouped around emotionally sensitive areas" (Singer 43). Richard's sensitive area, in this respect, is his programmatic introjection of the constant invectives about his appearance voiced by the collective. A feeling-toned complex is "a feeling-toned centre of psychic energy that operates autonomously beneath our awareness" (Bobroff 43), and Shakespeare masterfully integrates this sudden interjection to hint at Richard's unconscious desire for inclusion and familial acceptance. The sustained projection of the Persona has pushed the nagging conscious insistence on Richard's physical ugliness into the background of awareness, thus momentarily eliminating the conscious need to act out the Shadow, hence this sudden (ironic though it may be) forgetfulness of his person/appearances (*Richard III* Folger 38). In a way, this is how Shakespeare proves that "Some individuals will identify too strongly with these attitudes (Shadow, Persona) so that they lose contact with their true personality" (Ellenberger 707). Furthermore, this confusing cry might be Shakespeare's prototypical exposition of an ensuing, though here unexplored and quickly scrapped, psychosis in Richard if compared to King Lear's pathologically charged "And my poor fool is hanged!" (5.3.369). Michael Conran reads The Fool in *Lear* as Shakespeare's anticipation of Freud's discovery of the splitting of the ego (Wise and Mills 76). This reading furthers the argument that Lear projects the love he once had for his daughters onto the Fool in his final moments, thus confusingly associating his real daughter with the mental surrogate no less dear to him. The Fool is Lear's sole companion during his traumatic trials, and therefore the projected son, but also the specular entity reflecting the King and his royal/human shortcomings onto himself to a mind-breaking effect. In this vein, Kent, the Fool, and Edgar are projections of Lear’s conscience; instead of conscience, Richard projects the Shadow, "Why, I, in this weak piping time of peace,/Have no delight to pass away the time,' Unless to see my shadow in the sun/And descant on mine own deformity." (1.1.24-7). But unlike in Shakespeare's later tragedy, Richard's excessive self-awareness and integrated individuation of the Shadow from the Persona, and himself as distinct from the others "I am myself alone" (3 *Henry VI* 5.6.84), does not allow for the incorrigible tyrant to incur neurosis/psychosis. His newfound ambition is not initially a burden but a gratifying contest against the world that sustains wholeness and wards off melancholy.

Richard's psyche fails eventually, notwithstanding his initial psychic stoutness shielded by theatrical self-awareness. For the purpose herein, this psychic failure marks, as Harold Bloom notes, Shakespeare's "permanent success" distinct from Marlowe's influence on this early play (*Invention* 64). This surprising moment in Richard's self-awareness might be an early failed attempt, maybe on the part of Shakespeare as well, at purposeful anagnorisis. This lack of a potential moment of revisionist introspection links to Tanner's comment that *Richard III* is Shakespeare's incursion into the portrayal of a person devoid of conscience, but not essentially lacking it, as parts of a repressed conscience surface here from the personal

unconscious. Nevertheless, these bits of conscience are quickly feigned back into obliviousness, and Richard turns his back on the illuminating Sun of "conscience" to maintain the introjected Shadow as his *modus operandi* "Shine out, fair sun, till I have bought a glass,/ That I may see my shadow as I pass" (1.3.283-4). This rare occurrence of psychic miasma in Richard's control over his Self shows a slip of conscience in the tyrant's mind – a slip Richard perceives as a *faux pas*, "Upon my life, she finds, *although I cannot*/ Myself to be a marv'lous proper man" (1.2.274-5 my emphasis). The blunder betrays a repressed inner contemplation on his inherent morality, as opposed to Richard's usual part in the play as the pragmatic villain, not the pensive anti-hero known for his notorious "delay," hence "Not very much of Richard's own inner states is revealed as […] we see only deeds, not thoughts." (Hughes 850).

Richard's crimes take centre stage in the psychological portrait of this unshaken villain. However, considering that persons commissioned by Richard commit the majority of the crimes, a glance at his real murders of Prince Edward and King Henry VI illustrates the pathogenic impact the escalating crimes have on Richard's mind during his final dream. In his soliloquy after the wooing of Lady Anne, Richard references the moment he kills King Henry VI in an "angry mood". This angry mood stems from the ending of *3 Henry VI* when Richard's patience finally breaks down. He relents from hearing any more of the King's curses deriding his appearance and the misfortune his existence entails on the lives of others "I'll hear no more. Die, prophet, in thy speech;" (5.6.58). Confrontive anger (Kramer 92) reveals how Richard's mental exhaustion transforms him into a murderer. A symptomatic outburst of this kind is not available in *Richard III* because such an exhibition of anger would impede the tyrant from acting out his hidden ambitions and reveal his emotional vulnerability to the other personages in the play. The final confrontation with King Henry VI is a rare instance in which Richard is genuinely emotional in the presence of another character. This emotional undertone translates into the psychological stressors underlying the tyrant's political expedient because "Anything which has ever been in consciousness remains as an affective moment in the unconscious." (Herman Paull 25 qtd. in Jung *Psychology* 486). Richard's outburst of pent-up rage implies an underlying emotional unwillingness on his side to continue being the target of everyone's scorn. This sudden interjection overdetermines the murder that sets off the pathological nature of the complex and evidences Richard's conflicted psyche because "for the complex to become pathogenic, it must precipitate a conflict; the conflict in itself is inactive, must be activated and intensifies to the point where a conflict breaks out" (Jung *Lectures* 75). The conflict between Richard's psychic wound and repressed wish for integration has been "activated" at the end of *3 Henry VI* and conducted to a pathogenic effect in *Richard III* where the shunned Duke can no longer "cry 'Content' to that which grieves my (Richard's) heart," (*3Henry VI* 3.2.185) and finally acts. Therefore, the pragmatic murderer at the end of *3 Henry VI* has incredibly changed his violent nature into that of the scheming Machiavel - equally violent but now incredibly self-aware of his psychological makeup (more colourful than the chameleon) that leads to clarity of his purpose and the subversive means required for it "Plots have I laid, inductions dangerous" (1.1.32).

Consequently, the Richard of *Richard III* consciously represses confrontive anger not to compromise his darker ambitions when he holds back the desire to reprimand his nephew York who derisively describes his uncle as a mangled bear that "[…] like an ape,/ He (Prince Edward) thinks that you should bear me on your/ shoulders" (3.1.132-4). The prince references bearbaiting – a popular form of grotesque entertainment intimately close to Shakespeare's Globe (Shapiro 111), which makes the joke all the more insulting. This repressed violent desire manifests later in the cold murder by proxy of the juvenile family member "Shall I be plain, I wish the bastards dead" (4.2.20). Richard's restraint follows precisely the lines of Machiavelli's instruction that a prince must "avoid those things which might make him hated, and whenever he does avoid them, he will have done his part and will not find that reputation for other faults

will endanger him" (*The Prince* 53). There is no end to the calumny, and Richard has to bear it even from the youngest of his family who are influenced by the older members displaying the same resentment towards him "O, 'tis a parlous boy, / Bold, quick, ingenious, forward, capable. / He is all the mother's, from the top to toe." (3.1.157-9). Shakespeare makes explicit the contagious hatred permeating the minds of those around Richard and thus bolsters the argument that this collective hatred is an aetiology of tyranny and psychopathic drives systematically grafted on the psyche of its victim hence "He (Richard) substitutes sadistic violence for the need for love; he transforms shame for his deformity into disgust for others" (Wheeler 312). Richard admits in his opening soliloquy that his ego is a violent one based on the socially inherited insistence on the misbegotten nature of his body. Moreover, the "slips" shown in the protagonist's psychic unity underlie the idea that the Ego is contained in a patchwork psyche systematically assembled to become what it is in the present, as Jung notes, "For indeed our consciousness does not create itself – it wells up from unknown depths. In childhood it awakens gradually, and all through life it wakes out of the depths of sleep from an unconscious condition. It is like a child that is born daily out of the primordial womb of the unconscious" (*CW* XI 935 qt. in Stevens 65).

Psychic exhaustion pervades the tyrant's mind during the tell-tale dream of the ghosts before the battle of Bosworth and evidences Richard's mounting Self-distorting psychological stressors accrued throughout his life. His narcissistic use of the Persona to the detriment of the integrated Shadow orchestrates the psychological loss of touch with the reality of his person "Richard loves Richard, that is I [am] I" (5.3.195) and has overbearing pathologic effects on the psychic stability displayed throughout the play. Mental degradation now tyrannises the tyrant, and the schizoid distortion of an ideal Self once used to appeal to darker instincts in defiance of a more amiable deportment shatters Richard's psychic unity,

> Alack, I love myself, Wherefore? For any good
> That I myself have done unto myself?
> O, no. Alas, I rather hate myself
> For hateful deeds committed by myself. (5.3.199-202)

Furthermore, the English chronicler, Raphael Holinshed, from whose chronicles Shakespeare borrowed and adapted Richard's dream of the ghosts, describes with mighty analytic power the psychological implications of the historical figure's dream in connection with a possible impending pathology owed to an overburdened conscience,

> But I thinke this was no dreame, but a punction & pricke of his sinfull conscience... which sting of conscience, although it strike not alwaie; yet at the last date of extreme life, it is woont to shew & represent to us our faults and offenses, & the paines and punishments which hang over our heads for the committing of the same... (III. 483. Qt. in Arnold 55)

Holinshed's humanism ascribes the mental "faults and offenses, & the paines and punishments" that follow in the wake of murderous ambitions to the entire humanity "our heads". He expresses how, no matter the perpetrator, immoral deeds are heavy psychological burdens that the unconscious always finds ways to express. Therefore, Richard's deeds irrupt in a chain of ego-dystonic stressors that reduce the psychopathic tyrant to a state of self-hatred, absolute loneliness (Greenblatt 92), and overwrought suspicion "Under our tents I'll play the eavesdropper/ To see if any mean to shrink from me" (5.3.234-5). Richard's individuation and repression see an ironic twist when his psyche fails to sustain psychic integrity. Said psychic integrity has been punctured constantly by concealed psychic stressors, overshadowed by the individuation process, that have become conscious and expressed in the final, hysterical soliloquy. Harold Bloom thought this soliloquy was Shakespeare's most inept passage (*Invention* 67), which bolsters the argument for the playwright's excesses in portraying the

sustenance of a larger-than-life psyche, and also its downfall expressed sluggishly as opposed to the language of the later plays. Richard's introjection of his sinful deeds, "But I am in/ So far in blood that sin will pluck on sin./Tear-falling pity dwells not in this eye." (4.2.66-8),[3] paves the way for the tyrant's subversive awareness "I am a villain" (5.3.203) and stands in stark psychological contrast with his initial desire to "prove a villain" (1.1.30). The latter ambition, like a "quenchless thirst", made the Richard at the beginning of the play "clime proud" of his designs only to incur a surreptitious psychological downfall and "with shame to tumble down" (John Taylor qtd. in *Richard III* Folger 304).

Though this final soliloquy lacks the poetic force of Shakespeare's later tragic protagonists, such as Lear's final anguishing cry that "rises note by note till the heart breaks […]" (Bradley 270), it espouses the construction of the tyrant's psyche as a Tower of Babel built from the ground up by a blasphemous collective that effected the psychological drives of the psychopath. Stressors, known (collective opprobrium) and unbeknownst (hidden psychological stressors) to Richard coalesce in his mind and shatter the psychic integrity to a final foregone conclusion "My conscience hath a thousand several tongues/ And every tongue brings in a several tale/ *And every tale condemns me for a villain*" (5.3.205-7 my emphasis). Tongues branch out into tales and every tale recounts the same story that tells of how sustained "protective hatred" (Anderson 705), which previously worked as a barrier between the Self, the collective, and the vulnerable parts of one's psychology, retaliates and turns in on itself. Richard's belaboured psychic investiture into the tenets of the Shadow is his psychological hubris that has led to inevitable self-hatred, despair, and death, as Jung notes:

> A man who is possessed by his shadow is always standing in his own light and falling into his own traps. Whenever possible, he prefers to make an unfavourable impression on others. In the long run luck is always against him, because he is living below his own level and at best only attains what does not suit him. And if there is no doorstep for him to stumble over, he manufactures one for himself and then fondly believes he has done something useful. (*Archetypes* 123)

The tales told by the multitudinous tongues hearken back to the mystical rumours surrounding Richard's birth that in the collective imagination has become "the stuff of legend" (Greenblatt 55). To make it worse, the inception of the tales rests on the mother's unloving attitude towards her child, whose life led to the miseries that "crazed my [The Duchess'] voice/That *my woe wearied tongue* is still and mute" (4.4.18-9, my emphasis). The mother's tongue and virtually the tongues of every other character in the play are made weak by continuous derogatory curses and damnings. The after-effects of these curses irrupt from Richard's unconscious to distort and shatter his ideal image of himself against the ideal image of the beloved Sovereign. Moreover, it was this nagging comparison that formed the incentive and psychological adhesive for his tyrannical ambitions "And if King Edward be as true and just/As I am subtle, false, and treacherous" (1.1.36-7). The latter virtues have overshadowed Richard's person with the "heat o' the sun(son)" for so long that the only thing left for him to cling on to psychologically is the overdetermined rebirth of the hankering "furious winter's rages" (*Cymbeline* 4.2.332). Richard's wintry rages come freezingly back to stump the tyrant's narcissistic confidence, augment his psychotic severity, and finally make *him*[4] emphatically admit *in extremis* "I fear, I fear" (5.3.227).

[3] Richard's line eerily mirrors Macbeth's murderous ambition when he says "I am in blood/ Stepped in so far that, should I wade no more,/Returning were as tedious as go o'er." (*Macbeth* 3.4.168-70),

[4] The line "I fear" is pervasive throughout the play. It is repeated 13 times, out of which only 4 instances of it are spoken by Richard and the last two of them, quoted forthwith in the article, seem to be genuinely emotionally charged. The other instances of it recount the foreboding "fear" and the misgivings of other characters - Lady

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Shakespeare, William. *The Tragedy of Richard III*. An Updated Edition. Edited by Barbara A. Mowat, and Paul Werstine. Folger Shakespeare Library. Simon & Schuster Paperbacks. 2018. Print

---. *The Tragedy of Macbeth*. An Updated Edition. Edited by Barbara A. Mowat, and Paul Werstine. Folger Shakespeare Library. Simon & Schuster Paperbacks. 2013. Print

---. *The Tragedy of Hamlet Prince of Denmark*. An Updated Edition. Edited by Barbara A. Mowat, and Paul Werstine. Folger Shakespeare Library. Simon & Schuster Paperbacks. 2012. Print

---. *The Tragedy of King Lear*. An Updated Edition. Edited by Barbara A. Mowat, and Paul Werstine. Folger Shakespeare Library. Simon & Schuster Paperbacks. 2015. Print

---. *The Life of King Henry V*. Edited by Barbara A. Mowat and Paul Werstine. Folger Shakespeare Library. From Folger https://shakespeare.folger.edu/. Accessed 13. Feb. 2022

---. *The Tragedy of Richard II*. Edited by Barbara A. Mowat, and Paul Werstine. Folger Shakespeare Library. From Folger https://shakespeare.folger.edu/. Accessed 20. Feb. 2022

---. *Henry VI Part 3*. Edited by Barbara A. Mowat, and Paul Werstine. Folger Shakespeare Library. From Folger https://shakespeare.folger.edu/. Accessed 20. Feb. 2022

---. *Cymbeline*. Edited by Barbara A. Mowat, and Paul Werstine. Folger Shakespeare Library. From Folger https://shakespeare.folger.edu/. Accessed 20. Feb. 2022

Secondary Sources

American Psychiatric Association: *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fifth Edition*. Arlington, VA, American Psychiatric Association, 2013.

Anderson, Maxine K. "The death of a mind: a study of Shakespeare's Richard III." *The Journal of Analytical Psychology* vol. 51,5 (2006): 701-16. doi:10.1111/j.1468-5922.2006.00627.x. Accessed 20. Mar. 2023.

Armstrong, Phillip. *Shakespeare in Psychoanalysis*. London: Routledge. 2001.

Arnold, Aerol. "The Recapitulation Dream in Richard III and Macbeth." *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 6, no. 1, 1955, pp. 51–62, https://doi.org/10.2307/2866053. Accessed 20 Mar. 2022.

Bate, Jonathan. *The Genius of Shakespeare*. London: Picador. 2008.

---. *Soul of the Age: The Life, Mind and World of William Shakespeare*. New York: Penguin Group. 2009.

Bistoen, Gregory, et al. *"Nachträglichkeit: A Freudian Perspective on Delayed Traumatic Reactions."* Theory & Psychology, vol. 24, no. 5, Oct. 2014, pp. 668–687, doi:10.1177/0959354314530812.

Bloom, Harold. Ed. *Richard III. Shakespeare through the Ages*. Bloom's Literary Criticism an Imprint of Infobase Publishing. 2010. New York

Anne, The Citizens, Queen Elizabeth, King Edward, The Duke of York, and Buckingham – that foreshadow the impending tyranny and tragedy 'full of fear and fury'.

---. *Bloom's Shakespeare Through the Ages, Macbeth*. Ed. Harold Bloom and Janyce Marson. New York: Infobase Publishing. 2008.

---. Shakespeare: *The Invention of the Human*. New York: Penguin Group. 1998

Bobroff, Gary. *Carl Jung Knowledge in a Nutshell*. Arcturus Publishing Limited. 2020.

Bradley A. C. *Shakespearean Tragedy*. London: Penguin Group. 1991.

Brown, Carolyn E. *Shakespeare and Psychoanalytic Theory*. London: Bloomsbury. 2015.

Comber, Elizabeth Abigail. *"A Medieval King 'Disabled' by an Early Modern Construct: A Contextual Examination of 'Richard III'*". Eyler, Joshua R. Ed. *Disability in the Middle Ages Reconsiderations and Reverberations*. Ashgate Publishing Limited. 2010. Pp.183-196

Dobson, Michael, and Stanley Wells (Eds.). *The Oxford Companion to Shakespeare*. Oxford University Press. 2001

Du Brul, Sophia. *Richard III and The Theme of the Three Caskets*. Literature of Grief and Mourning, ENG 405. Taken from https://www.academia.edu/6618828/Richard_III_and_The_Theme_of_the_Three_Caskets_A_Psychoanalysis_of_Richard_III. Accessed 16. Mar. 2023.

Felt, Catherine, "Richard III: An Outer Deformity Defines Inner Self-Perception" (2012). Student Works. 101. https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/studentpub/101. Accessed 30 Mar. 2023.

Fretz, C. (2017). 'Full of ugly sights, of ghastly dreams': Dreams and Tragedy in Shakespeare's Richard III. Cahiers Elisabethains, 92(1), 32-49. https://doi.org/10.1177/0184767816681250. Downloaded on 05. Apr. 2023.

Freud, Sigmund. *Some Character Types met-with in Psycho-analytic Work (1916).* in *The Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud Vol. 1-24 Volume Set) Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud.* W.W. Norton & Company, Inc. 1976. Pp. 3100-3120

Freyd, Jennifer. *Betrayal Trauma: The Logic of Forgetting Child Abuse*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1996.

Greenblatt, Stephen. *Tyrant Shakespeare on Power*. Vintage. London. 2019.

Heilman, Robert B. "Satiety and Conscience: Aspects of Richard III." *The Antioch Review*, vol. 24, no. 1, 1964, pp. 57–73, https://doi.org/10.2307/4610570. Accessed 20 Mar. 2023.

Hughes, Daniel E. "The 'Worm of Conscience' in 'Richard III' and 'Macbeth.'" *The English Journal*, vol. 55, no. 7, 1966, pp. 845–52, https://doi.org/10.2307/812167. Accessed 29 Mar. 2023.

Jung, Carl Gustav. *Dreams*. With a new Foreword by Sonu Shamdasani, Translated by R.F.C. Hull. From The Collected Works of Carl Gustav Jung Volumes 4,8,12,16, Bollingen Series XX. Princeton University Press. 1974

---. *Jung Contra Freud The 1912 Lectures on the Theory of Psychoanalysis*. Trans. R.F.C. Hull. From *The Collected Works of C.G. Jung Volume 4, Part 2* Bollingen Series XX. Princeton University Press. 1961

---. *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*. Second Edition. Trans. R.F.C. Hull. From *The Collected Works of Carl Gustav Jung Volume 9, Part 1*, Routledge. London.

---. *The Undiscovered Self*. Routledge. 2002

---. *Psychology of the Unconscious*. Authorised translation with Introduction, by Beatrice M. Hinkle. Dover Publications, Inc. New York. 2002

Kantorowicz, Ernst Hartwig. *The King's Two Bodies A Study in Mediaeval Political Theology*. Princeton University Press. 1997

Kermode, Frank. *Shakespeare's Language*. London: Penguin Group. 2001.

Kramer, L.(2016). *Familial Betrayal And Trauma In Select Plays Of Shakespeare, Racine, And The Corneilles*.(Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/etd/3874

Kushner, Dale. *Trauma's Lingering Effects and the Creative Self*. August 31 2018, Taken from shorturl.at/gjtNO. Accessed on 20 Mar. 2023.

Lesser, Simon O. *The Whispered Meanings: Selected Essays of Simon O. Lesser*. Ed. Robert Sprich, and Richard W. Nolan. University of Massachusetts Press. 1977

Machiavelli, Niccolo. *The Prince*. Translated by J.G. Nichols. Alma Classics. 2009

Maguire, Laurie E. *Studying Shakespeare: A Guide to the Plays*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd. 2004.

Mandel, Jerome. "Dream and Imagination in Shakespeare." *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 24, no. 1, 1973, pp. 61–68, https://doi.org/10.2307/2868739. Accessed 22 Mar. 2023.

Milton, John. *Paradise Lost and Paradise Regained*. Collins Classics by Harper Press. 2013

Mullaney, Steven. "Lying Like Truth: Riddle, Representation and Treason in Renaissance England." *ELH*, vol. 47, no. 1, 1980, pp. 32–47, https://doi.org/10.2307/2872437. Accessed 3 Apr. 2023.

Papahagi, Adrian. *Shakespeare interpretat de Adrian Papahagi, Titus Andronicus, Hamlet*. Polirom. 2021

Singer, June. *Boundaries of the Soul. The Practice of Jung's Psychology*. Revised and Updated. Anchor Books published by Doubleday. 1963.

Shapiro, James. *The Year of Lear: Shakespeare in 1606*. Simon & Schuster. 2016.

Stevens, Anthony. *Jung A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford University Press. 1994

Tanner, Tony. *Prefaces to Shakespeare*. The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press. 2012.

Tîrban, Emilian. *The Aetiology and the Pyschogenesis of Tyrannical Behaviour in Macbeth*. East-West Cultural Passage 22.2 107–124. Web.

Wheeler, Richard P. *History, Character and Conscience in 'Richard III.' Comparative Drama*, vol. 5, no. 4, 1971, pp. 301–21, http://www.jstor.org/stable/41152567. Accessed 3 Apr. 2023.