

Love is in the Earth 4

“Love in ‘a Wilderness of Tigers’: the shifts and collision between the ‘self’ and the ‘other’ in Shakespeare’s Revenge Tragedy *Titus Andronicus* and its insights for Dramatherapy.”

Bruce Howard Bayley, Ph.D.

Presented at the “Renewal, Restoration & Revenge” Conference
The British Association of Dramatherapists
Royal Agricultural College
Cirencester, Gloucs.
September 2013

“Love in a ‘Wilderness of Tigers’: the shifts and collision between the ‘self’ and the ‘other’ in Shakespeare’s Revenge Tragedy *Titus Andronicus* and its insights for Dramatherapy. (This paper was presented at BADth’s “Renewal, Restoration & Revenge” Conference held at the Royal Agricultural College, Cirencester, Gloucs in September 2013.)

This paper *cum* workshop, hopefully, has a multi-dimensional theme. I am not presenting it in a scholastic or academic manner in order to seek to persuade but rather in the spirit of explorative consideration, of “discovery”, “questions”, “points” and “signs” that may suggest ways forward. The workshop elements will include some work with characters drawing from the theatre-model approach. As I began preparing this presentation I became all too aware of the vast scope that was opening up to me. There are many, many themes running through the play that can be explored and directions in which the exploration could develop. We will begin by looking at the shifts in the positions of “persecutors”, “victims” and “mediators” within the play and then the dynamic relationships between notions of the “self” and the “other” within the context of Lacanian and Jungian concepts and then move on to the question of Love in a world of Conflict and how we, as dramatherapists, may address notions of Love and Conflict. Here I will be drawing on the work of Dr. Jose Luis Stevens, a psychotherapist, family and child therapist in New Mexico and California. Dr Stevens has worked extensively in the area of Relationship Dynamics and shamanic healing systems.

(Workshop element – Group Gesture – 4 gestures – a) separate selves; b) mediating selves; c) aggressive/attacking selves; d) embracing/joining selves)

Why *Titus*?

Titus has through the ages received very bad press due to the levels of violence, the spiralling series of destructive acts that increase in ferocity from state sanctioned executions, sacrificial killings, rape and body mutilation to a cannibalistic meal with Titus feeding Tamora, Queen of the Goths, her sons ‘baked in a pie’. Peter Brook, however, saw that the play “touched audiences directly because we tapped in it a ritual of bloodshed that was recognized as true.” (1) While it is undoubtedly horrific, the violence is not without significance and symbolic value and appears to have some curative functions. This makes it relevant to us as dramatherapists.

The title I chose focuses on Rome as described by Titus to his son Lucius in Act 3 Sc1: “*Rome is but a wilderness of tigers? /Tigers must prey, and Rome affords no prey/but me and mine.*” The urban setting provides the landscape for many of our current cultural tensions and anxieties - the “wicked streets of Rome” are not so far different from those of London or New York, the gang-culture on the streets, suicide bombers, sacrificial ritual murders, honour killings,

disempowerment of women via physical assaults, apart from rape, on their bodies (such as female genital mutilation), institutionalized bullying and corruption within organizations and governments. These constitute much of the external landscape from within which many of the issues presented by our clients (and by ourselves as therapists) can arise. The images of dark violence, pollution, incest taboos, body mutilations, fragmenting identities and so on encountered in the play also constitute much of the dark side of our inner landscapes. So, essentially, it is an extremely rich play from which manifold images and metaphors with relevance to our work as therapists leap out at us from every scene.

Loss of Unity: The Drama Triangle

At the very opening of the play we are presented with the theme of *Loss of Unity*. Caesar is dead and his two sons, Saturninus and Bassianus, present themselves to Rome's senators as rival contenders. The people are divided. Saturninus protests his right to be claimed as Caesar's elder son while Bassianus insists on an election claiming that he is the people's favourite and implying his moral superiority over Saturninus – "*Suffer not dishonour to approach /The imperial seat, to virtue consecrate, /To justice, continence and nobility; /But let desert in pure election shine...*" (120) Senator Marcus Andronicus, Titus' brother, takes a mediating position, informing them that the people of Rome have already "*by common voice in election*" chosen Titus and suggests – "*That you withdraw you and abate your strength; /dismiss your followers and, as suitors should, /plead your deserts in peace and humbleness.*"(149)

We can see here a potential example of what Dr. Stephen Karpman (2) calls The Drama Triangle of Persecutor/Victim/Rescuer in Transactional Analysis where there is a maintained oppositional, conflicting dynamic between Persecutor and Victim in which each takes on alternately shifting positions and where the Rescuer attempts some form of mediation. Saturninus and Bassianus are here in the potential roles of Victims and/or Persecutors and Marcus as Rescuer, or, if we wish, Rome as Victim whose stability and peace is threatened by the 2 rival brothers as Persecutors and Marcus as Rescuer. Later in the scene when Titus defers the "*sceptre to rule the world*" in favour of the elder brother, Saturninus, it is reasonable to question his position as a Rescuer here. Just before Titus declares his decision, Saturninus takes a Persecutor position and issues a threat of violence: "*Patricians, draw your swords: and sheathe them not/till Saturninus be Rome's emperor. /Andronicus, would thou wert shipp'd to hell /Rather than rob me of the people's hearts!* (1228). In this view Marcus could be seen to be in a Victim position. We see these kinds of shifting dynamics developing throughout the play.

Titus makes his first entrance in a ritual-procession with the corpses of 25 of his warrior sons who have died in warfare against the Goths, and Tamora, Queen of the Goths who he has just defeated and taken prisoner together with her sons and entourage, including Aaron the Moor. He presents a complex initial position - the "*victorious conqueror*" but with the

rhetoric of a Victim who has lost 25 sons in the war against the Goths. It is a self-righteously expressed sense of loss, a sacrifice for the love and honour of Rome, and at his son, Lucius' bidding Titus calls for a sacrifice in return – the life of Tamora's son, Alarbus, "*that so the shadows be not unappeased*"(1116). When Tamora, already a conquered prisoner of war and Victim, appeals to his love for his own sons and begs him to show mercy and spare Alarbus' life Titus refuses and shifts into the role of Persecutor. This develops into the double revenge cycle that continues throughout the play. After Titus chooses Saturninus to succeed the throne, Saturninus declares that in honour of Titus he will elevate his family by marrying Titus' daughter and making her Empress knowing that she is betrothed to his brother Bassianus thus continuing his persecutory stance against his brother. Titus acquiesces in this and enflames the wrath of Bassianus as well as his own sons. Defending his right, Bassianus seizes Lavinia and flees. Titus seeks to run after them and is opposed by one of his four remaining sons, Mutius, who obstructs him. In his rage Titus kills Mutius and, here, too, he may be seen to hold a shifting position between Persecutor and Victim while attempting, at times, to hold that of Rescuer. As the play develops, Titus will enter a prolonged cycle of revenge against Saturninus and Tamora in which he will, severally, shift between being Persecutor and Victim.

Tamora's position changes from a Victim prisoner of war pleading for her son Alarbus' life to being advanced as Empress of Rome when Saturninus chooses her to be his bride after Bassianus has fled with Lavinia. While she will not take on a visible and active Persecutory position until the following Act, Tamora's shift has already taken place internally. Her shift involves her dissembling a temporarily acquiescent position. She accepts Saturninus' offer of marriage with the rhetoric of humility pledging that she "*will a handmaid be to his desires, /a loving nurse, a mother to his youth.*"(1371). When Saturninus and Bassianus with Lavinia re-enter the scene, Saturninus calls Bassianus a traitor and declares that he will make him repent what he calls the 'rape' of Lavinia. Tamora takes the opportunity to play a seemingly Rescuing role. She outwardly urges Saturninus to "*hear me speak indifferently for all; /and at my suit, sweet, pardon what is past.*"(1479). When Saturninus questions that he should be dishonoured and "*basely put it up without revenge?*"(1481) she reminds him that he has only recently been made Caesar and that the senators may turn against him if he was seen to be ungrateful and counsels him to "*dissemble all your griefs and discontents.... yield at entreats; and then let me alone /I'll find a day to massacre them all/ and raze their faction and their family, /the cruel father and his traitorous sons, /to whom I sued for my dear son's life, /and make them know what 'tis to let a queen /kneel in the streets and beg for grace in vain.*" (11500) In this speech she announces her conscious intention to move from a Victim role into a Persecutor role exacting her revenge on Titus and his family which will involve encouraging her sons, Chiron and Demetrius, to rape Titus' daughter, Lavinia, and "*use her as you will*" in Act 2 - an assault on Lavinia's body that will end by lopping off her hands and tongue as their brothers body was dismembered. Titus's revenge on Tamora will eventually culminate in him killing her after getting her to eat a pie made out of her two sons' heads.

Lavinia almost always appears in a Victim role. Described as *"Rome's richest ornament"*, Lavinia is largely objectified as property to be married, bartered, cast off, admired, lusted after, mutilated and eventually destroyed. It is Lavinia's body that constitutes a major battlefield in the war of Revenge waged by the Goths for the killing of Alarbus. At the commencement of the play she is heralded by Titus' words *"Lavinia, live!"* During the banquet in the last Act that life is taken by her father with the words, *"Die, die, Lavinia, and thy shame with thee; And, with thy shame, thy father's sorrow die!"* However, there is a scene when she may be perceived as entering a Persecutor role in Act 2 just before the rape when she and Bassianus come upon Tamora and Aaron, Tamora's lover enjoying a stolen moment in the forest. With a sense of superiority she joins Bassianus in mocking Tamora and is scornful of her. They accuse her of "foul desires" with her "spotted, detested, abominable" lover, the "barbarous Moor." However, Tamora has planned (in an anticipated Persecutor role), with her sons Chiron and Demetrius, to provoke this altercation knowing that they are planning to violate Lavinia. When Bassianus and Lavinia threaten to tell Saturninus about her infidelity, Chiron and Demetrius appear. Tamora feigns a Victim role and tells them that she has been lured into the forest by Bassianus and Lavinia who were threatening to bind her to a tree and leave her to die. In feigned rage Demetrius kills Bassianus and Lavinia is left on her own in a Victim position pleading to Tamora's womanhood to save her from whatever fate her sons have in mind for her – which is to rape her and then lop off her hands and tongue – disempowering her so that she cannot speak nor act. Tamora continues in a Persecutor role and leaves Lavinia to her fate.

Before we do some practical work it would do well to say a few words about the role of Rescuer within the Drama Triangle. The Rescuer's attempt at mediation may arise from many senses - from a sense of altruism, from an insecurity experienced when there is a perceived threat to the status quo, from an egoic need or low esteem that requires self-gratification by "putting others to rights" and so on. Within the play we can see 2 characters in this role - Marcus, who begins the play seeking to *"set a head on headless Rome"* and ends with seeking *"to knit again/This scatter'd corn into one mutual sheaf,/These broken limbs again into one body"*; Lucius, Titus' last remaining son who initially, in a Persecutor role, called for the death of Tamora's son, Alarbus, as sacrificial offering for the lives of his brothers killed in the war, who shifts into a Victim role when Saturninus banishes him from Rome, facilitates Titus' revenge by enlisting the Goths' aid to rescue Rome from Saturninus and Tamora (who is no longer seen as a Goth but as an undesirable and persecuting Roman Empress) and who ends the play as Emperor in a Rescuer role seeking *"to heal Rome's harms, and wipe away her woe"*.

We can see that the Rescuer may well have an agenda of his own. There is another role that is not included in Karpman's original Drama Triangle that we, as therapists, might be very aware of – that of Leveller, outside the Triangle in the form of Witness, Observer, whose

potential for a neutral, unalloyed mediation may be overlooked and who is in a position to see all 3 positions with their various agendas and who may be able to containment of processes. Marcus Andronicus may be seen as taking this position when helps Titus to contain his grief over the violation of Lavinia and there is within the play, there is another character that could be seen as taking this role – Young Lucius, Titus' grandson - who is silent until Act 3; he is a constant witness to all the events throughout the play though he appears at times as Rescuer, seeking to heal Lavinia's wounds and facilitate his grandfather's acts of revenge. Both the BBC's and Julie Taymor's films of the play open and close with close-up shots of Young Lucius which gives a sense of placing him apart from the action and containing the entire story.

(Workshop element 2 – Groups of 4 – Tamora/Titus/Rescuing character/and a levelling Witness – Working through movement OR Building Large Group Sculpt and move it – depending on time)

'Self' and 'Other'

Moving away from the Transactional Analysis Drama Triangle and approaching the dynamics between notions of the 'self' and 'other' in the play, we could see the drama of a violent clash of two cultures – Roman and Goth – as illustrating a collision where each may be seen as Self and Other carrying out extreme acts of sustained violence on each other that are rationalized by appealing to Honour, Tradition, Law and Revenge. Rome becomes "*a wilderness of tigers*" in which, according to Mary Easo Smith, "*the myth of the 'Other' is seen as more violent and horrible than the 'Self'*" (3) and where legal jurisdiction becomes problematic.

Looked at this way, the Romans identify them-'selves' with Civilization, the Patriarchy, Honour, Law, Morality, Tradition, A sense of Imperial Right as they identify the Goths/the 'other' with Primitive Barbarity, Matriarchy (they have a Queen), Lasciviousness, Corruption, Immorality, Dishonour. This duality is portrayed in the use of oppositional images of Cleansing Rituals, Honorific Sacrifices, Purity, The Revered Tomb of the Andronici, The Virginal Lavinia, etc. as against the Grotesque Dismemberments, Illicit Love, Secrecy, Conspiracies, the Loathsome Pit, the Swallowing Womb, The Heinous Tiger Tamora and so on.

There are, however, 2 characters one of whom - Aaron the Moor, Tamora's lover - is neither Roman nor Goth and the other who is only an infant of mixed Goth and Moorish heritage – Aaron and Tamora's love child. As far as Rome is considered as an image of the 'self', all others whether Goth, Moor or Mixed heritage are considered to be 'other'. To the Romans Aaron is a "*barbarous Moor*", "*inhuman dog*", "*unhallow'd slave*", "*accursed devil*". He is Tamora's servant and, therefore, not her equal. But he is her lover and also the father of her love child (the only mixed race individual in the play) whom she sends to Aaron to kill. Aaron refuses

to kill the child saying that Tamora is merely his mistress but “...*this myself, /the vigour and the picture of my youth: /this, before all the world, do I prefer; /this maugre all the world will I keep safe....*” In her doctorate thesis *“Something old and dark has got its way: Shakespeare’s Influence in the Gothic Literary Tradition.”* Prof. Natalie Ann Hewitt suggests that “Aaron represents the emblematic figure on the scaffold, a presence repulsive and unwanted, yet enigmatic and captivating to behold.” (4) We may view Aaron as taking a position where the sense of ‘self’ is so alienated that the only viable position is one of total opposition. He it is who master-minds the murders of Bassianus; the imprisonment of Titus’s sons in the forest; he aids and abets the rape of Lavinia; he plans and deceives Titus by persuading him that Saturninus will exchange his remaining sons (whom he has imprisoned for treason) for his dismembered hand and then presents Titus with their executed heads; it is he who spontaneously stabs the Nurse who brings him the infant that he has fathered with Tamora lest she spread the news. In his final speech he declares: “*Why should wrath be mute, and fury dumb? /....ten thousand worse than ever yet I did /Would I perform, if I might have my will; /If one good deed in all my life I did, /I do repent it from my very soul.*”(12729). He could be seen as the supreme modern guerrilla warrior/terrorist/freedom-fighter or the client who has been so alienated that the only refuge can be found in extremely destructive/self-destructive behaviour.

However, it is not just a clash of 2 cultures here - Rome itself is divided from the beginning, “*headless Rome*”, Saturninus identifies himself with Traditional Justice, Patriarchal Right to Succession, Bassianus identifies himself with Virtue, Contenance, Nobility, implying that his brother Saturninus is the opposite. When Saturninus makes Tamora, Queen of Goths, Empress of Rome the constituents of the original ‘self’ and ‘other’ begin to change. She declares: “*Titus, I am incorporate in Rome, /A Roman now adopted happily...*” The Conquered has become one of the Conquerors. She has now joined the Patriarchy but she will use this position to advance her personal agenda of revenge of violence against Titus and his family; an agenda which is hidden, occluded – Grotto-esque – against what she identifies as the ‘other’ – the Andronici – and which will culminate in her own destruction.

In his book *Violence*, Slovenian philosopher Slavoj Žižek, distinguishes 2 main categories of state-sanctioned violence – *Subjective Violence* which is “*performed by a clearly identifiable agent*” and *Objective Violence* which he sub-divides into *symbolic violence* which is “*embodied in language and its forms...in our habitual speech...*” and *systemic violence* which is the “*often catastrophic consequences of the smooth functioning of our economic and political system*”.(5) Much of the violence in the play is state-sanctioned – honourable death in war, in honour killings, sacrificial rituals to appease the “*shadows of the dead*” – even the rape of Lavinia by the two Goths may be seen as a kind of act of terror stemming from a cultural/political tolerance of misogynistic values (India ?).

As Steven Gregg in his article *Titus Andronicus and the Nightmares of Violence and Consumption* (6) points out conflict and violence are both intrinsic to the societies of both the Romans and the Goths and how violent actions are interpreted depends on how they are experienced and perceived in relation to the mores of the society – i.e. Žižek's *systemic violence*. When the Andronici kill Tamora's son, Alarbus, they offer his entrails as part of Roman militaristic custom - "*for their brethren slain /religiously they ask a sacrifice: /to this your son is mark'd, and die he must, /to appease their groaning shadows that are gone.*"(1140). To Tamora and the Goths, this is a barbarous act of "*cruel irreligious, piety.*"(1148) This becomes the foundation for the revenge exacted not only by Tamora against Titus' family but by Goths against Romans. Demetrius declares the vengeful hope that the "gods" may "*....with opportunity for sharp revenge /favour Tamora, the Queen of Goths— /When Goths were Goths and Tamora was queen— /to quit the bloody wrongs upon her foes.*"(1155). The carnage that ensues from this collision of 'self' and 'other' is catastrophically destructive for the individuals involved in this drama but will also contribute to upheavals in the political and economic body of Rome which we may wish to view as the destructive/transformational processes within the 'Self' which we could see here as represented by The State - a Self that has within itself tensions and contradictions.

Lacan

For Jacques Lacan, in "*The Mirror Stage as Formative of the I*"(7) , it is within a developmental Mirror Stage that we obtain a sense of self when as infants we learn to experience reflections of ourselves as whole entities rather than fragmented parts and movements within the undifferentiated boundaries between infant as a 'self' and mother as an 'other'. During the Mirror Stage we create 'fantasies' of a fragmented body as well as of an alienating identity. Our sense of individuation does not, stem from an "organic" or "natural" development of any source innate within us but from an experienced reflection of ourselves as an 'other'. For Lacan, as Dr. Matthew Sharpe says, "*the 'I' is an 'Other' from the ground up.*" (8) We are able to say "it's me" only in relation to the external effect of some image of ourselves reflected in a dynamic with an "other". This Lacan referred to as "méconnaissance", misrecognition.

This relationality gives rise to a sense of lack and fear of fragmentation. As we develop out of the Mirror Stage and become 'social' we find ourselves at odds with ourselves and we obtain the sense that our 'self' is protecting something that is "more real" within us. We, and our clients, may seem to overcome the sense of lack and fragmentation as adults but there is always the threat of the thought that we may "fall apart" (Titus) or "go to pieces" (Lavinia) or that we discover that we have little substantiality "in ourselves". The ego is, at root, a projection of a subjective unity modelled on the visual images of objects and others that the individual confronts in the world and Lacan maintains that it is identification with the ego that is the source of Aggressivity in human behaviour. Freud indicated this in *Three*

Essays on Sexuality when he stressed the ambivalence in children towards their love object/s - to love/to devour; to master/to destroy.

So if we then consider Rome, the Wilderness of Tigers, as a metaphor for the 'self' containing within it internalized 'others' we may find in ours and in our clients' inner landscapes images of both Romans and Goths, Titus and Tamora, Lavinia and her violators, Aaron and the rest of the World (the darker images perhaps residing within the unconscious) or in conflict and possible collision with each other, more consciously, as Persecutors and Victims but also Marcus Andronicus, Lucius and Young Lucius as Rescuers and Mediators and work with rather than against these images.

Jung

For Jung, the 'ego' is the centre of the conscious mind whereas the 'self' is the whole circumference which embraces both the conscious and the unconscious; it is the centre of the totality. (9) Following Jung, the 'self' is definable as an archetypal urge to mediate the tension of opposites which are the ineradicable and indispensable pre-conditions of psychic life." (10) They co-exist in an undifferentiated way within the unconscious and are harmonious in an individual in "balance". However, when we experience them as being disproportionate to each other, there is a sense of disequilibrium and rising tensions that are experienced as intolerable (at times of neurotic disturbance) and a resolution or mediation needs to be found. It is out of this collision that a third possibility/symbol arises – perhaps an irrational one, incomprehensible to the conscious mind (Titus becomes depressed, disturbed and disoriented; Tamora becomes a "heinous tiger"). It is this that gives rise to transformation. This is what makes the relationship of 'ego' to 'self' a never-ending one as there is no hope of bringing more than a fragment of the unconscious within consciousness and, Jung says, "*we turn the ego into a seat of anxiety which it would never be if we did not defend ourselves against ourselves so neurotically*" (11) What Jung means is the neurotic defence the ego sets up against the unconscious – in which we may wish to see the 'ego' as 'I' defending itself against the unconscious as 'other' in order to avoid the collision of opposites that arises from the unconscious as if from a dangerous 'other' – a monster. Jung writes of "*the totally erroneous supposition that the unconscious is a monster*" and that it is a "*natural entity*" but that its danger arises and increases "*to the degree that we repress it.*" (12)

[\(Workshop element 3 – Small Groups - reflections and considerations around how what we have been exploring translates into their work practice with clients\)](#)

Love

Turning now to the question of Love, this presentation forms part of my work in a series I call "Love is in the Earth" which I have been developing since 2009. Identifying Love as our Desire to seek mutual nourishment by growing together and the Joy we derive therefrom, I

suggest that it is a *major* integrating factor not only in bringing people and cultures together in collaborative, practical action, but also within the therapeutic process in grounded practice which is symbolized for me by the Earth.

In the first half of the play we can identify traditional forms of love and desire – love of Honour, love of Rome, possessive love, the paternal-filial love of Titus for Lavinia and his sons, sexual desire between lovers (Tamora-Aaron), the misogynistic lust of Chiron and Demetrius for Lavinia – forms of love that are natural but that can underpin and be the cause of conflict leading to violence and revenge. We would find it more difficult to identify many examples of truly empathic love. In fact, it is the almost complete lack of the ability to empathize with the ‘other’ that fuels the carnage in the cycles of revenge.

As the carnage continues, however, we can identify a change in the expressions of love and the level of empathy. We hear intense expressions of love that arise out of the deep sorrow of a parent for his mutilated child – *“he that wounded her hath hurt me more than if he had killed me dead”, “Give me a sword, I’ll chop off my hands too.”* A few speeches later in the same scene when Aaron tells him, duplicitously, that the Emperor will exchange the lives of his sons if he will cut off one of his hands, Titus immediately agrees: *“With all my heart, I’ll send the emperor My hand: /Good Aaron, wilt thou help to chop it off?”* When his brother, Marcus, kills a fly Titus we can identify empathic stirrings within Titus as he berates him: *“Out on thee, murderer! Thou kill’st my heart”.... “How, if that fly had a father and mother? /How would he hang his slender gilded wings, /and buzz lamenting doings in the? /Poor harmless fly...”* It is only in the last scene at the end of all the carnage that the language begins to change subtly – we see grieving Lucius, Marcus and Young Lucius and we begin to hear phrases like “gentle Romans”, and “kind and gentle friends”. Marcus declares a need and desire for a mutually healing intervention *“to knit again /this scatter’d corn into one mutual sheaf, /these broken limbs again into one body; /lest Rome herself be bane unto herself, /and she whom mighty kingdoms court’sy to.... do shameful execution on herself.”*

Dr José Luis Steven is a licensed Integrative Counsellor and Psychotherapist, Clinical Social Worker, Marriage, Family and Child Therapist in New Mexico and California. Together with his partner, Lena Stevens, an internationally known teacher and shamanic practitioner, who has studied cross cultural shamanic healing from numerous traditions, Dr Stevens has established and developed a system called “Personnesence”, as the basis for much of his work.

[\(Present José’s Relationship Dynamics and Levels of Love and Conflict\)](#)

- 1) Peter Brook. *The Empty Space*. New York: 1969. 86
- 2) Karpman, S. (1968). Fairy tales and script drama analysis. *Transactional Analysis Bulletin*, 7(26), 39-43.
- 3) Molly Easo Smith, 'Spectacles of Torment in Titus Andronicus', *Studies in English Literature 1500-1900*, 36: 2 (1996), pp. 316-7.
- 4) "Something old and dark has got its way": Shakespeare's Influence in the Gothic Literary Tradition. Prof. Natalie Ann Hewitt, Ph.D. Claremont Graduate University 2003
- 5) Slavoj Žižek, *Violence* (London: Verso, 2008), p. 1
- 6) Steven Gregg. "Titus Andronicus and the Nightmares of Violence and Consumption" *Moveable Type* vol. 6 (2010) <http://www.yumpu.com/en/document/view/4315481/titus-andronicus-and-the-nightmares-of-university-college-london>
- 7) Jacques Lacan. "The Mirror Stage as Formative of the 'I'." *Écrits. A Selection*. Anne Sheridan. Tavistock. 1977.
- 8) Dr. Matthew Sharpe. "Lacan's Philosophical Anthropology" <http://www.iep.utm.edu/lacweb/>
- 9) C.G.Jung. *CW Vol 12 para. 444*
- 10) C.G.Jung. *CW Vol 14 para. 206*
- 11) C.G.Jung. *CW Vol 10 para. 360*
- 12) C.G.Jung. *CW Vol 16 para. 328/9*
- 13) Dr José Luis Stevens. "The Seven Dynamics of Relationship Interaction" <http://www.josestevens.com/inside2.php>