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FOREWORD
The assertion that Molièresque characters are childlike and frequently childish is not new. In fact, one of the criticisms most often levelled at France's best known comic playwright has been his characters' lack of subtlety and sophistication, as though their very presence were an insult to the beholder's intelligence. Molière was attacked by detractors and excused by enthusiasts for writing farces until an important and influential critic, Gustave Lanson, unabashedly called Molière "le premier farceur de France,"¹ and declared that Molière's farces were no mean accomplishment. Since Lanson's heyday, the infantile or regressive nature of many Molièresque characters has been routinely referred to by the best critics of the last three decades. This thesis has been most cogently developed by Charles Mauro³ in his psychocritical study of the comic genre.

The theoretical foundation for this dissertation is provided primarily by the works of Eric Berne, which postulate that important patterns of behavior and life-decisions are determined in the formative years between birth and age six. These patterns and decisions often influence a person's reaction to specific situations, as well as determining the life course he or she chooses to pursue.

Although these concepts will be explained in more detail in the first chapter and in the introductory statements to chapters two and three, it is presently relevant to give a non-specific explanation pursuant to defining the general scope and intent of this dissertation.
The "patterns of behavior" with which we are here concerned are called "games." Children, by virtue of their relative inability to satisfy their needs in a world of adults, who largely dictate what they should do, think and feel, are forced to contrive means of gratifying their "recognition" and "structure" hungers in ways that are "acceptable" to the adult entourage. If, for example, a child learns at an early age that people pay attention to his need for recognition when he is sick, then being sick may become a significant pattern of behavior, as it is for "le malade imaginaire," in his attempt to subserve others to his psychic needs. A fundamental dishonesty is characteristic of games. In the instance just cited, the child learns that a straight-forward request for recognition does not provide the satisfactions that frequent illness does. Berne has formally classified a number of "games" in terms of structure, procedures, and advantages to the players, and these classifications provide new perspectives on and new insights into certain elements of Molière's dramatic creations.

Games are often part of a life plan formulated outside of a person's awareness. Childhood experiences which result in a decision about "what life is like" are often perpetuated in conscious and unconscious attempts to create situations which corroborate an infantile perception. The notion of "script" is developed in the light of Alceste's ever present and unrelenting insistence that self-exile will be the ultimate conclusion to his "joust" with mankind.

Influenced by Freud and Jung, Berne moreover concludes that myths
and fairy tales embody archetypal patterns of life scripts, which are modified in accordance with changing times and personal circumstances but nevertheless retain the archetypal pattern. J. Campbell in *The Hero With a Thousand Faces* remarks that

...Freud, Jung, and their followers have demonstrated irrefutably that the logic, the hero, and the deeds of myth survive into modern times. In the absence of an effective general mythology, each of us has his private, unrecognized, rudimentary, yet secretly potent pantheon of dream. The latest incarnation of Oedipus, the continued romance of Beauty and the Beast, stand this afternoon on the corner of Forty-Second Street and Fifth Avenue, waiting for the traffic light to change.  

Chapter IV is devoted to elaborations of the archetypal Oedipal script in *L'Avare*, of the evidence of an anal fixation which determines the quality of Harpagon's relationship to his son and others, and of the game relationships which on the most literal level provide the means for both enacting and concealing the Oedipal and fixational aspects of Harpagon's repetition-compulsion.

The organization of this dissertation was dictated to some extent by the pyramid of theoretical concepts in Transactional Analysis. The first chapter deals with psychological hungers, personality structure and social interaction; chapter two treats patterns of behavior called "games"; and chapters three and four use the concept of life plans or "scripts" in creative interpretations of *Le Misanthrope* and *L'Avare*.  

THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS

AND THEIR RELEVANCE
Transactional Analysis is the offspring of Eric Berne's quest to find more adequate means of psychotherapeutic treatment. Berne's training prior to 1953 was primarily oriented towards psychoanalysis, but after that date and until his death in 1970, he devoted most of his time to the development of Transactional Analysis as a coherent theory of human behavior and to methods of application. Much of what is now known as Transactional Analysis was the product of Berne's collaboration in a weekly seminar in San Francisco. It has been popularized primarily in Berne's own books on the subject: Transactional Analysis in Psychotherapy, Group Treatment, Principles of Group Treatment, Games People Play, The Structure and Dynamics of Organizations and Groups, Sex in Human Loving and What Do You Do After You Say Hello?, but also in other publications, notably in Thomas A. Harris' I'm OK, You're OK, and more recently in Claude Steiner's Games Alcoholics Play. Transactional Analysis appears to be gaining in importance and popularity. The movement has a formal organization, the International Transactional Analysis Association, with bi-annual conventions and a quarterly publication. In recent years there has also been a proliferation of Transactional Analysis seminars throughout the country.

Although Berne repeatedly emphasized that Transactional Analysis was an "independent discovery,"¹ he credited a number of his mentors and colleagues with research that contributed to and substantiated his investigations. Among others he is indebted to Paul Federn² and Eduardo Weiss³ for the concept of ego states; to Spitz⁴ research on infantile
stimulus hunger and his demonstrations of tissue degeneration and even death as a consequence of a lack of fondling; to Penfield's neurosurgical experiments which confirmed the existence of "discrete" archaic ego states and to Hartman and Chandler whose work with LSD 25 demonstrated striking similarities between the pharmacological reactivation of archaic ego states and Penfield's results obtained from electrical stimulation of the cerebral cortex.

One of the cornerstones of Transactional Analysis is Spitz' research on stimulus-hunger. Spitz discovered that infants who were not fondled after birth became despondent, refused to eat, physically deteriorated and in some instances died of a condition called "marasmus." Berne demonstrated that the basic need to be "stroked" persists throughout life, but that verbal strokes are eventually substituted for physical ones except in intimate situations. Recognition-hunger is a second or derivative of stimulus-hunger. The ritualistic stimulus "How are you" proffered by a passing acquaintance acknowledges one's existence and a possible interest in one's well-being and serves the same function in the preservation of a psychosomatic equilibrium that fondling did in infancy. In both instances the sensory stimulation derived from first physical and later recognition stroking has survival value. The metaphysical ennui that characterized the romantic hero and finds its most powerful expression in Huysman's A Rebours testifies that an absence of stimulation causes despair—a sort of psychological death that precedes the physical one. It is in fact akin to a marasmatic condition in infants.
Berne's last book, *What Do You Do After You Say Hello?*, was so named because of a third need—structure hunger—which emerges when a child's time is no longer planned for him. It is well known that the tensions involved in social intercourse increase with the emotional risks involved. Once the ritualistic "Hello's" and "How are you's?" have been exhausted, decisions have to be made about what to do with oneself and with other people. Complex systems, often stereotyped, are learned by children and modified to suit their special situations in order to remove the ever-present problem of what one does after one says hello. Berne classified the methods of spending time into six categories: withdrawal, rituals, activities, pastimes, games, and intimacy. Of these, only games is of significant dramatic value and is the only one which will receive an extended development.

How one learns to structure and to get recognition, according to many psychologists, is a complex of processes that is learned and accepted during infancy and early childhood when persons are completely dependent on others to satisfy physical, social, and emotional needs. Attitudes toward oneself and one's perception of his relationship to other people are first conditioned by the family system and later confirmed, often involuntarily or subconsciously. It appears that (1) recognition is a requirement for survival, (2) that negative recognition is preferable to no recognition, and (3) that the learned system for satisfying recognition-hunger will be implemented in later life to obtain the same "gains" even if that behavior is no longer appropriate in the adult world, if the "gains" sought are painful or unpleasant, or if it entails
an inevitably tragic course of life.

Berne formulated a system of classifying attitudes toward oneself and other people\(^7\) that has been popularized in Thomas Harris', *I'm OK, You're OK*.\(^8\) Positive feelings toward oneself or others are called OKness, here designated with a plus sign (+), and negative feelings about oneself or others are classified as "not OKness," here designated with a minus sign (−). The possible "two handed" positions then are:

I+ You+ (the healthy position)
I+ You− (the arrogant or 'get rid of' position)
I− You+ (the depressive or self-abasing position)
I− You− (the futility position)

I+ You+ They+ (the utopic ideal of a truly democratic community)
I+ You+ They− (the prejudicial position of demagogues)
I+ You− They+ (the position of agitators, malcontents, and missionaries)
I+ You− They− (the position of the solitary, arrogant, self-righteous critic)
I− You+ They+ (the masochistic or melancholic position)
I− You+ They− (the servile position of people who work for gratuities out of snobbishness)
I− You− They+ (the position of servile envy)
I− You− They− (the pessimistic position)
I− You? They? (the evangelistic position)
I+ You? They− (the aristocratic class position)

The attitude of Molière's most famous characters toward themselves is conditional, that is, there is a condition that must be fulfilled if they are to remain in a + position. For Argan it is his illness, for Orgon the presence of Tartuffe, and for the "Femmes Savantes" it is erudition. This basic fact about Molière's caractères is most graphically illustrated by Harpagon's psychotic reaction to the theft of his gold; and indeed, to the extent that the loss deprives him
of his recognition and structure system, it does pose a threat to his psychic and somatic survival.

These two psychological conditions of survival—recognition and structure hunger—are also the two fundamental problems that confront Molière's characters.9

In a thought-provoking article published in the Revue de Paris nearly three-quarters of a century ago, Gustave Lanson discussed Molière's indebtedness to the theatrical traditions of the Italian impromptu theater and the French farce. The Commedia dell'arte with its colorful repertoire of stock characters primarily relied on convolutions of plot with multiple complications that constantly produced unforeseen turns of events:

L'intrigue, c'est justement la caractéristique de la comédie littéraire que la Renaissance italienne a tirée de la comédie antique. C'est l'intrigue que l'Italie a prêtée à l'Espagne et à la France pour constituer leur comédie moderne. L'invention consiste à mêler et à démêler un écheveau de tromperies et de quiproquo: l'inganno est la source inépuisable de l'intérêt et du rire. Et pour cela les valets, entremetteurs, fourbes de toutes qualités et de tout habit, sont des agents principaux de ce théâtre: ils occupent triomphalement la scène parce qu'en leur esprit sont les ressorts de l'action.10

The two most interesting of these meneurs du jeu created by Molière, the Mascarille of L'Étourdi and the Scapin of Les Fourberies de Scapin, embody man's need to structure in order to maximize the dividends of stimulation. Both are confident tricksters with a genius for manipulating other characters and structuring situations to their own or their allies'
advantage, plus the irrepressible need to avoid boredom at all costs. When Mascarille is momentarily baffled or frustrated by his master's untimely interventions, his desire to succeed despite the odds soon expresses itself in spontaneous invention. And Scapin, Mascarille's doppelgänger in Les Fourberies de Scapin, insists that difficulties are the necessary ingredient to continued happiness in love, for only they give rise to the elaborate stratagems which revive the lust for love and life:

...la tranquillité en amour est un calme désagréable; un bonheur tout uni nous devient ennuyeux; il faut du haut et du bas dans la vie; et les difficultés qui se mêlent aux choses réveillent les ardeurs, augmentent les plaisirs... Je me plais à tenter des entreprises hasardeuses... et je hais ces coeurs pusillanimes qui, pour trop prévoir les suites des choses, n'osent rien entreprendre...

(II, Les Fourberies de Scapin, III, l. pp. 634, 635)

Although the need to structure situations cleverly is characteristic of Molière's protean heroes of farce, the primary interest in those plays for which he is best known lies in the idiosyncrasies of one or several characters to satisfy their recognition hungers. Lanson defines a Molièresque caractère as "... une nature puissamment unifiée par la domination d'une passion ou d'un vice qui détruit ou opprime toutes les autres affectations et puissances de l'âme, et devient le principe de toutes les pensées et de tous les actes du personnage." Lanson's assessment is descriptively correct, but the psychological importance of the "dominant passion" is less the source of motivation than a
recognition hunger expressed in the need to dominate. Tartuffe guarantees Orgon's tyranny, convention the shock that greets Dom Juan's impiety, illness Argan's right to be coddled and so on. Their monomania is both narcissistic and an attempt to force others to recognize their uniquesness and individuality. Further, their reliance on someone or something outside themselves to focus attention on their actions or bodies is evidence of a fundamental insecurity. Their doubts about their capacity to confront unaided the harsh reality of the external world surface when the type of Molièresque character defined by Lanson is deprived of his psychological crutch. It then becomes apparent that recognition-hunger is the primal source of the dominant passion.

Berne perceived the human personality as divided into three distinct parts, like Freud, but the parts Berne distinguishes are extero-psyche, neopsyche, and archeopsyche. These psychic organs manifest themselves in observable ego states referred to as Parent, Adult, and Child.\textsuperscript{13}

An ego state may be described phenomenologically as a coherent system of feelings related to a given subject, operationally as a set of coherent behavior patterns, or pragmatically as a system of feelings which motivates a related set of behavior patterns.

The Parent ego state is a "coherent set of feelings, attitudes and behavior patterns which resemble those of a parental figure,\textsuperscript{14} not necessarily one of the subject's parents (although it can be inferred that one's parents will play an important role in the formation of this ego state). Berne stipulates that the Parent manifests itself
in one of two ways.

The Parent is typically exhibited in one of two forms. The prejudicial Parent is manifested as a set of seemingly arbitrary non-rational attitudes or parameters, usually prohibitive in nature, which may be either syntonic or dystonic with the local culture. If they are culturally syntonic, there is a tendency to dismiss them without adequate skepticism as rational or at least justifiable. The nurturing Parent is often manifested as sympathy for another individual which may again be their culturally syntonic or dystonic.15

The dual aspects of the Parent sheds an interesting light on a particular kind of character-relationship in Molière that is most controversially represented by Philinte and Alceste. Whether Alceste is considered a martyr or a fool, lucid or deranged, idealistic or egocentric, whether Philinte is thought to be realistic or cowardly, reasonable or permissive, are Parent largely value judgments made on the basis of a degree of identification with one or the other character. Philinte's insistence on the necessity for conformity is no less a Parent attitude than Alceste's reactionary non-conformity, even though the former better appreciates what motivates his attitudes than does his intemperate friend. Similarly, the crowd applauds Ariste rather than Sganarelle, Béralde rather than Argan, and Cléante in preference to Orgon (1) on the basis of syntonic attitudes towards egomaniacs that are carefully cultivated by the playwright, and (2) because of the nurturing character of their Parent ego states, which emphasizes the prohibitive nature of their dramatic counterparts.
In drama the Parent ego state is often evident in internal dialogues between ego states and in overt manifestations of Parental behavior.

Internal dialogue is a hallowed theatrical technique used for its expository value as well as to apprise the audience of a character's innermost thoughts and feelings. Tormented characters like Shakespeare's Hamlet or Macbeth, Racine's Phèdre or Corneille's Chimène, incarnate the struggle between what they want (Child) and the dictates of conscience (Parent) in their internal dialogues. An especially graphic instance of this kind of conflict, insofar as two characters can be interpreted as conflicting aspects of a single personality, is provided by the dialogue between "moi" and "lui" in Diderot's Neveu de Rameau.

With very few exceptions Molière's theater is not rich in internal dialogue, because his characters are internally consistent. Farce does not lend itself to pathos, noble thoughts or generous sentiments, inherent in the Parent-Child conflicts of tragedy. The obvious examples that one finds in Molière exploit the comic effects of parody, as for example in Mascarille's Parent exhortation to himself à la Corneille not to succumb to the untimely interventions of his master: "L'honneur, ô Mascarille, est une belle chose: / A tes nobles travaux ne fais aucune pause; / Et quoiqu'un maître ait fait pour te faire enragé / Achève pour ta gloire, et non pour l'obliger." (I, L'Etourdi, III, l, 915-918, p. 75)

The Parent ego state can be diagnosed behaviorally on the basis of posture (rigid), attitude (nurturing, moralistic, or demanding),
gesture (raised finger, wrinkled brow, etcetera), and vocabulary
("ridiculous," "childish," "immature," disgusting," "ought to," "must,
 etcetera). Among the most dramatic instances of Parent behavior are
the punishments Orgon visits upon his family in the name of God and
Tartuffe, Harpagon's extremes of usury and miserliness, the punitive
aspects of Argan's neurosis and the rigors of Arnolphe's laws of
marriage.

Orgon: Ma fille vous devez approuver mon dessein.

(Tartuffe, II, 2, 572, p. 656)

Harpagon: N'as-tu point de honte, dis-moi, d'en
venir à ces débauches là? de te précipiter
dans des dépenses effroyables et de faire
une honteuse dissipation du bien que tes
parents t'ont amassé avec tant de
sueurs.

Argan: ... une fille de bon naturel doit être
ravie d'épouser ce qui est utile à la santé
de son père.

(Le Malade Imaginaire, I, 5, p. 775)

The fact that the origins of the Parent ego state lie in the
identification with figures of authority is sometimes exploited for
comic effect. In Tartuffe, Orgon's attitudes toward humanity are a
replica of Mme Pernelle's. In fact she gives the reader or spectator
an interesting insight into her son's mode of psychic operation: "Je
vous l'ai dit cent fois quand vous étiez petit / La vertu dans le monde
est toujours poursuivie;/ Les envieux mourront, mais non jamais l'envie"
(Tartuffe, V, 3, 1664-1666, p. 696). This axiom is so fundamental a truth for Orgon that four acts of the play are devoted to the confirmation of his Parent prejudice. Orgon selects a man others will "envy" because of his "virtue," then punishes the "envious," each instance furnishing still more proofs to the effect that "les envieux mourront, mais non jamais l'envie." In a like manner the Parent ego state of Armande in Les Femmes Savantes duplicates that of Philaminte in every respect.

The neopsyche or Adult ego state is characterized by an autonomous set of feelings, attitudes and behavior patterns which are adapted to the current reality. The characteristic function of the neopsyche is data-processing, which it does on the basis of past experience and present realities. The neopsyche is capable of computing probabilities and adapting its conclusions to new sets of circumstances. Says Berne:

. . . the Adult is noted to be organized, adaptable, and intelligent, and is experienced as an objective relationship with the external environment based on autonomous reality testing. In each individual case, due allowance must be made for past learning opportunities. The Adult of a very young person or of a peasant may make very different judgments from that of a professionally trained worker. The criterion is not the accuracy of the judgments nor the acceptability of the restrictions but on the quality of the data processing and the use made of the data available to that particular individual.16

The assertion that all persons have an Adult but that there are qualitative, genetic and environmental factors which determine the reliability of the rational processes touches upon one of Molière's
resources as a comic dramatist. Theoreticians from Plato to the present have stressed that feelings of superiority are responsible for laughter. Others have emphasized that incongruity and incongruousness are the essence of the laughter provoking situation, and some have suggested that infantile or regressive conditions in other people provoke laughter. Spectators feel superior to Molière's characters because of the incongruity in the play situation, which is not infrequently a product of inadequate Adult data-processing by a protagonist when his or her capabilities are compared to their own reasoning powers or to that of other characters. Sganarelle's first and last attempt to persuade "rationally" Dom Juan of the existence of God is comic largely because of the inadequacies, ineptness and naïveté of his Adult:

Pour moi, Monsieur, je n'ai point étudié comme vous. Dieu merci, et personne ne saurait se vanter de m'avoir jamais rien appris; mais avec mon petit sens, mon petit jugement, je vois les choses mieux que tous les livres, et je comprends fort bien que ce monde que nous voyons n'est pas un champignon, qui soit venu tout seul en une nuit. Je voudrais bien vous demander qui a fait ces arbres là, ces rochers, cette terre, et ce ciel qui voila la haut, et si tout cela s'est bâti de lui-même. Vous voila vous, par example, vous êtes là: est-ce que vous vous êtes fait tout seul, et n'a-t-il pas fallu que votre père ait engrossi votre mère pour vous faire? (Dom Juan, III, 1, p. 745)

The imperfections of Sganarelle's reasoning processes are visibly represented in a flurry of gestures and gyrations that culminate in a pratfall. As Dom Juan remarks, his argumentative powers have "le nez cassé."
The curious uses of Adult calculation in Molière to obtain predictable results in accordance with Child wishes have long been the subject of adulation. Dr. Diafoirus Senior's attempt in *Le Malade Imaginaire* to prove that his son, described in the stage direction as having "une mine tout à fait niaise," is nevertheless a desirable marriage partner is characteristic of the voluntary distortions of perception by more intelligent, more cunning, or much admired other persons. Diafoirus asserts that his son's apparent lack of imagination, creativity and spontaneity, that his "lenteur à comprendre" and "pesanteur d'imagination" were early omens of future achievements which by dint of hard work have been belatedly fulfilled: "...à force de battre le fer il est venu glorieusement à avoir ses lices." (II, *Le Malade Imaginaire*, II, 5, p. 802) The argument is superficially plausible in its pseudo-logical character, but it is obviously the opposite of true, despite the father's faultless casuistry. Nevertheless, the argument and its maker possess enough authority to insure its effectiveness despite the ironic commentary furnished by Toinette, the impertinent maid. Thus, to the comic effects derived from the logical distortions of language is added the incongruousness of the infantile relationship of Argan to the doctors.

Prejudicial attitudes expounded by authoritative parent figures have not been updated by the Adult's processes of rational analysis. We have previously stated that Philinte and Alceste both frequently operate from a Parent ego state, but whereas Philinte's notion of what is and ought to be conforms to the reality of the play (it works), neither
Alceste's idealism (Parent) nor his egocentrism (Child) is consonant with external reality. Even more detrimental to the misanthrope's internal tranquility is the fact that his Parent attitudes and Child wants are not consonant with each other. Orgon and Cléante, Ariste and Sganarelle, Argan and Béralde, as well as other well known couples Molièresque, also embody antithetical Parent positions. The one conforms to, while the other conflicts with, the reality of Molière's dramatic universe.

The archeopsyche or Child is a set of feelings, attitudes, and behaviour patterns which are relics of an individual's own childhood. The Child is exhibited either as the natural Child (rebellion or self-indulgence) or as the adapted Child (compliance and withdrawal):

The adapted Child is manifested by behavior which is inferentially under the dominance of the Parental influence, such as compliance or withdrawal. The natural Child is manifested by autonomous forms of behavior such as rebelliousness or self-indulgence. It is differentiated from the autonomous Adult by the ascendency of archaic mental processes and the different kind of reality-testing. It is the proper function of the 'healthy' Child to motivate the data-processing of the Adult so as to obtain the greatest amount of gratification for itself. 17

The children of a tyrannical patriarch in Molière's plays manifest both adaptive and natural behavior or primarily one or the other. Cléante (L'Avare), Angélique (George Dandin), Julie (M. de Pourceaugnic), Lucinde (Le Médecin Malgré Lui) all react rebelliously from the natural Child with more or less cunning. Mariane (Tartuffe) and Angélique (Le Malade Imaginaire) are adaptive but resistant and consequently require a
strong maidservant to sustain the dramatic tension between father and daughter. Diafoirus Jr. (Le Malade Imaginaire) exemplifies the epitome of adaptive behavior in his memorized greeting rituals punctuated by requests for his father's approbation. More sinister is Armande's (Les Femmes Savantes) adaptive behavior towards her mother in order to damage or nullify her sister's chances to marry.

W. G. Moore in one of the most remarkable books ever written on Molière has subsumed several kinds of character relationships under the title "Mask"\(^{18}\) that must be restated for our purposes in terms of Transactional Analysis.

The adaptive character of the servant's mentality is the essence of any master-slave relationship and is rigorously enforced by social sanctions. The servant, by virtue of his helplessness, is in a situation analogous to that of a child, and failure to remain in the position of adapted Child--Parent results in punishment. The occasional indulgence of Sganarelle's rebelliousness, for example, results in retributive measures or is rectified only by timely reassumption of his adaptive position.

Mon maître est un fourbe, il n'a dessein que de vous abuser, et en a abusé d'autres, c'est l'épouseur du genre humain, et ... (aperçevant: Dom Juan). Cela est faux; et quiconque vous dira cela, vous lui devez dire qu'il en a menti. Mon maître n'est point l'épouseur du genre humain, il n'est point un fourbe, il n'a pas dessein de vous tromper, et n'en a point abusé d'autres. Ah, tenez, le voila; demandez-le plutôt a lui-même. (Dom Juan, II, 4, p. 741)

Elsewhere Maître Jacques responds to Harpagon's invitation to reveal the
malicious rumors about his master only to learn that a C—P relation-
ship is the only one acceptable to Harpagon.

A second category of "masked" characters is the deceivers, the
the rogues, schemers, and charlatans. The Scapins, Mascarilles, Dom
Juans, Sganarelles and Tartuffes adopt a Parent attitude or Adult air
to exploit characters or situations. The role, for here it is clearly
a role, is a calculated maneuver on the basis of Adult evaluation to
satisfy the rebellious and self-indulgent instincts of the Child.

Finally, there is a class of characters whose prohibitive
Parent injunctions are designed to ward off Child anxieties. Arnolphe
is sure in his Parent position that his "school for wives" is a
solution to the husband's dilemma until Agnes proclaims that she loves
another, at which time Arnolphe is reduced to the pathetic stature
of a helpless child protesting the injustice of her decision, promising
all and demanding nothing. Alceste pontifically delivers ultimatums
from his Parent (P—C), but when Célimène refuses to respond from her
adapted Child, Alceste's own archeopsychic anxiety is manifested in
temper tantrums wherein he blames Célimène and destiny for the deplorable
situation in which he finds himself.

Although the tripartite division of the personality in Tran-
sactional Analysis superficially resembles the structural concepts of
Freudian Psychoanalysis, the adherents of the former insist on funda-
mental differences in theory and in therapeutic techniques. Ego states
according to Transactional Analysis are phenomenological realities which
can be observed and identified, whereas superego, ego and id are
hypothesized constructs which cannot be empirically validated. Transactional Analysis focuses on the ego and on consciousness rather than on the unconscious, because the former help to explain and predict behavior.

In a theoretical and somewhat speculative chapter of *Transactional Analysis in Psychotherapy*, Berne distinguishes between ego states which are observable phenomena, the organs which organize the manifestations of these ego states at any given moment in time and the determinants which are responsible for the quality of ego state organization. These "determinants" are the factors which determine the programming of the psychic organs. Such programming, according to Berne, may be internal, arising from indigenous biological forces, external, arising from persons or institutions outside the corporeal boundaries, or probability programming derived from autonomous data-processing and reality testing. In summary, the determinants provide the stimulus for the psychic organs (exteropsyche, neopsyche, and archeopsyche) to organize their expression into a perceptible ego state (Parent, Adult, Child).

This notion of internal, external, and autonomous determinants suggests the following conclusions: The adapted Child is an externally programmed archeopsychic ego state, while the natural Child is internally programmed. The Adult may be programmed internally by the wants of the Child, or the demands of the Parent, externally by the wants of the Child, or the demands of the Parent, externally by the requirements of the world or it may autonomously program the Parent or
Child. Whatever the source of the programming, the Adult acts on the basis of logical reality testing. Berne further accepts the possibility that there may be some internal programming of the Parent by innate forces which strive toward life (libido) on the one hand and death (mortido) on the other. In addition there is the more familiar external or identificatory programming and finally those Parent attitudes whose accuracy has been corroborated by the Adult.

What Berne referred to as "determinants" resemble the Freudian topographical concepts of "id" (internal determinant), " ego" (autonomous determinant), and "superego" (external determinant): which Freud defined in the following manner:

The id. It contains everything that is inherited, that is present at birth, that is fixed in the constitution—above all, therefore, the instincts which originate in the somatic organization and which find their first mental expression in the id in forms unknown to us. . . . This oldest portion of the mental apparatus remains the most important throughout life.\textsuperscript{20}

The ego. It has the task of self-preservation. . . it performs that task by becoming aware of the stimuli from out, by storing up the experiences of them (in memory), by avoiding excessive stimuli (through flight), by dealing with moderate stimuli (through adaptation), and finally, by learning to bring about appropriate modifications in the external world to its own advantage (through activity). . . in relation to the id, it performs that task by gaining control over the demands of the instincts, by deciding whether they shall be allowed to obtain satisfaction, by postponing that satisfaction to times and circumstances favorable in the external world or be suppressing their excitations completely.\textsuperscript{21}
The superego. The long period of childhood, during which the growing human being lives in dependence upon his parents, leaves behind it a precipitate, which forms within his ego a special agency in which this parental influence is prolonged. . . . The parents' influence naturally includes not merely the personalities of the parents themselves but also the racial, national, and family traditions handed on through them. . . an individual's superego in the course of his development takes over contributions from later successors and substitutes of his parents.²²

The distinction between Parent, Adult, and Child and Superego, Ego and Id, insofar as they can be assimilated into one system, may now be stated. Freud's constructs refer to forces or agencies, in themselves intangible, which serve as a stimulus for the organization of ego states. The Freudian constructs refer to functional aspects of the psychological processes, whereas ego state refers to phenomenological manifestations resulting from the processes of psychic organization.

Since Freud perceived the concepts of superego, ego, and id as functional, Berne observes that "Freud does not raise any question of systematic phenomenology, and it is here that structural analysis can usefully fill a gap in psychological theory, just as transactional analysis fills a gap in social theory by setting up elementary units and larger units of social action."²³

The overt manifestations of "social action" are called transactions. Typically they occur in chains: a transactional stimulus from X elicits a transactional response from Y which in turn becomes a stimulus for and elicits a response from X, etc. Transactional Analysis
is concerned with the analysis of such chains and particularly with their
programming. It will later be demonstrated that once a chain is
initiated the resulting sequence is highly predictable if the
characteristics of the Parent, Adult, and Child of each of the parties
are known.

Every transactional stimulus originates from one of three ego
states and is intended to elicit a particular kind of response.
Transactions are classified as complementary or crossed, depending upon
whether or not the stimulus arouses the desired response.

A complementary transaction is one in which the stimulus
originating in one ego state in one person and directed toward any other
ego state in a second party, elicits the desired response. The ex-
planation becomes clearer when illustrated using the transactional
diagram. Any series of transactions in which the vectors are parallel
are complementary. Communication will continue at that level as long
as the vectors remain parallel or until the series of transactions has
been completed.

Crossed transactions are any series of transactional exchanges
in which the response is not from the ego state intended to be stimulated.
or directed toward the ego state in which the stimulus originated. These situations are visibly represented by any possible series of transactions in which the stimulus and response vectors are not parallel and therefore either cross or would cross if extended.

The two types of crossed transactions illustrated in the above diagrams are the most frequent causes of discord in life situations. An example of the stimulus A—-A, response C—-P occurs in Act II, Scene 3 of Tartuffe. In the previous scene Mariane, despite her abhorrence for Tartuffe, has passively consented to the marriage by not strenuously objecting to her father's insistent proposal. Dorine now initiates the dialogue with an A—-A stimulus: "Avez-vous donc perdu, dites-moi la parole/ Et faut-il qu'en ceci je fasse votre rôle?" (Tartuffe, II, 3, 585, 586, p. 657). Mariane, however, crosses the transaction. She refuses to give an A—-A response, but instead chooses to reply from her helpless Child to Dorine's nurturing Parent: "Contre un père absolu que veux-tu que je fasse?" (Tartuffe, II, 3, 589, p. 657). Dorine instantly recognizes that the conversation cannot proceed further on that level and she therefore adopts Mariane's "game plan" (P—-C) as
the only path leading to a satisfactory solution:

Lui dire qu'un coeur n'aime point pour autrui
Que vous vous mariez pour vous non pour lui
Qu'étant celle pour qui se fait toute l'affaire,
C'est à vous, non à lui que le mari doit plaire,
Et que si son Tartuffe est pour lui si charmant,
Il le peut épouser sans nul empêchement.

(Tartuffe, II, 3, 591, 595, p. 657)

The second type of most troublesome crossed transaction
(stimulus A---A, response P---C) is most consistently exemplified by
Alceste in Le Misanthrope. For instance, Philinte asks Alceste a
rational question, presumably expecting a judicious answer, only to
find himself being treated to a set of dogmatic, ill-considered
prejudices as though he were a backward child in need of correction:

Philinte: Je suis donc bien coupable, Alceste, à
votre compte?

Alceste: Allez vous devriez mourir de pure honte;
Une telle action ne saurait s'excuser,
Et tout homme d'honneur s'en doit scandaliser.

(Le Misanthrope, I, 1, 13-16, p. 817)

The complications of inter-character conflicts are often marked
by a progression from a series of complementary transactions to a series
of crossed transactions. Such is nearly always the case in scenes
based on a misunderstanding, as, for instance, Angélique's belief in
Le Malade Imaginaire that her father is considering Cléante for her
husband while the latter believes that his daughter has made the
acquaintance of Diafoirus Jr. The transactional analysis of the
misunderstanding over Elise and money in Act V, Scene 3 of L'Avare follows this same pattern. In these and many other cases a series of P—C, C—P transactions terminates in a series of P—C, P—C crossed transactions which reflect the polarization of their respective positions.

The last general classification of transactions is referred to as "ulterior," in which the actual stimulus or response does not contain the real meaning of the transaction. The message on the psychological level is not the same as the verbal one. Unlike simple complementary or crossed transactions, they involve more than two ego states and can be further classified as "angular," involving three ego states, or "duplex," involving four ego states.
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Act II, Scene 6 of Tartuffe, one of the most famous scenes in all of Molière's theater, is an excellent example of an angular transaction in the service of a wily hypocrite. Damis has just caught Tartuffe red-handed in the middle of the spiritual adviser's attempt to seduce Elmire, the wife of his benefactor. In response to Orgon's exclamation: "Ce que je viens d'entendre, ô Ciel! est-il croyable?,"
Tartuffe humbly confesses (A—A) that he is a wicked, sinful man: "Un malheureux pêcheur tout plein d'iniquité,/ Le plus grand scélérat qui jamais ait été." (I, Tartuffe, III, 6, 1075, 1076, p. 676). The angular non-verbal transaction, however, is not "See how wicked, sinful and unworthy I am," but rather "See how pious and humble I am." Orgon responds to the angular C—P transaction, banishes Damis, and disinherits his own kin in favor of Tartuffe.

Good examples of duplex transactions are to be found in virtually every scene involving a lovers' quarrel. The argument centers on the verbal content (social level) of the transactions. Their differences are happily resolved when both parties elect to accept the ulterior psychological messages (C—C) rather than the literal content of the communications:

Social Level:

Mariane: My father wants me to marry Tartuffe.

Valere: What do you want to do?

Psychological Level:

Mariane: I don't want to marry Tartuffe.

Valere: Tell me you won't marry Tartuffe.  

(Tartuffe, II, 4)

The dual message characteristic of the ulterior transaction is
also the outstanding trait of Molière's use of language. He himself remarked in the preface to Tartuffe that "...la plupart des contrariétés viennent de ne pas entendre et d'envelopper dans un même mot des choses opposées." It is not surprising then that one finds a veritable gold mine of what Berne calls "games," since a "game" can be loosely defined as a stylized series of ulterior transactions between two or more persons.

This chapter has had two related purposes. The first is to give a schematic presentation of the theoretical concepts of Transactional Analysis including innate needs like stimulus, recognition, and structure hungers, the organization of personality, and the types of transactions encountered in the processes of social interaction. The second is to define important internal and external relationships in Molière's theater in the terms of transactional analysis. Stimulus, structure, and recognition hungers, internal strife, the perennial problem of the raisonneur, parent-progeny and master-servant relationships, role playing and types of defense mechanisms, for example, are problems that have been dealt with extensively by critics of Molière. We have attempted to define these problems in the terminology of Transactional Analysis by using well known examples to illustrate the phenomena of hungers, ego states, and transactions. It has been assumed that the reader is familiar enough with Molière and Molièresque criticism to appreciate the importance of our selective use of theory and illustrations.
CHAPTER II

GAMES
The expression "play the game," so frequently encountered in common parlance, is perhaps the best evidence that "game-playing" is one of the most accepted forms of social intercourse, almost a universal in everyman's experience. Bureaucrats fill out innumerable forms or comply with a multitude of seemingly unnecessary regulations in order to get the simplest task done. Some persons comply with social conventions and customs called good manners, contestants in every kind of event comply with the rules of the contest all because "that is how the game is played." The expression "play the game" as used in everyday speech generally implies that compliance with the rules is necessary to earn a payoff which may or may not be mentioned in the ground rules. For the bureaucrat obedience is necessary to get a job done in a complicated organization, but it is also a means of obtaining promotions; the pleasure of the learning experience and the satisfaction of a paper well written are frequently secondary to the opportunities a diploma affords; and however necessary "good manners" are to the normalization of social relations, they are also the trademark of "sophistication," frequently the prerequisite for social esteem.

Games have been studied with "profit" in diverse social and intellectual circles, but never more intensely or grimly throughout history than by the military.25 The reconstruction of tactical situations in classical battles has been the subject of analysis for students of military science for hundreds of years on the assumption that history
might hold the key to the best way of playing in a given situation. More recently, in the First and Second World wars and subsequently, mock confrontations ("war games") have been used as a means of formulating strategies to be employed in real battle situations.

Mathematical analysis of antithetical games in which one of two sides will win or lose based on the soundness of a player's strategy in response to an opponent's move is frequently applied to questions like the best trajectory of ground to air missiles to maximize the possibility of destroying an enemy aircraft, the optimum number of ships to send in a convoy in waters occupied by enemy submarines to maximize the chances of safe arrival in a friendly port, or the best defense against a chess-playing opponent's latest move.\textsuperscript{26} Strategies are developed on the basis of calculated risk, the famous mini-max\textsuperscript{27} tactic, for example, to insure a satisfactory gain with no gamble, or for more daring players other tactics which entail the danger of greater losses or of a higher frequency of loss but also promises the possibility of a more substantial gain.

Anthropologists of various schools have also shown an interest in games. Some have attempted to isolate structural models for games in primitive social systems in an effort to differentiate between ethical and social systems through an analysis of the games peculiar to a group or subgroup, while other anthropologists have been intrigued by the universality of particular game models and their manifestations in different periods of time and cultural settings.

Political games have also been the subject of intense study and
involvement. International policy is still guided, to some extent, by the balance of power principle, which is predicated upon shifting alliances of weaker nation-states to offset the superior power of another or others. New allies are sought to maintain an equilibrium when the balance of power shifts as a result of wars, trade, poor administration, and so on. More recently, game constructs have been used to explain the paradoxes of international decision-making and the anomalies of the electoral processes in democratic nation-states.

Play, according to Johan Huizinga, is one of the primary bases of civilization, traces of which remain in the arts, philosophy, religion, law, science, and war. Play exists prior to culture but in the form of games it promulgates order and progress, at least within limits. According to Huizinga, game-playing is a voluntary activity that takes place in a "consecrated spot" according to rigorously prescribed rules. The participants are aware that they are engaged in a non-essential activity that sets them apart from other members of their group. Game-playing requires an accurate evaluation of available resources which enables the player to anticipate the outcome, and it encourages the exploitation of windfalls. Within the orderly universe created by freely accepted rules the player attempts to manipulate other contestants for his own advantage, thus fostering both liberty and discipline, fantasy and invention. The abstract structures derived from playing games have furnished models of order in cultural institutions and artistic modes of expression.

In a recent unpublished Rice University dissertation entitled
Principles of Comedy in Eight Plays of Molière, E. Potter uses the game classification of Roger Caillois, who praised the originality of Huizinga's thesis but criticized the reduction of play to an agonistic zero-sum conflict. Potter adapts the Caillois typology into four types of games for application to Molière's plays: The Agon type involves a struggle or competitive conflict; chance games such as poker or roulette are governed by Alea or "lady luck"; Mimicry applies to illusionistic or symbolic games best exemplified by numerous disguises and mime; and Illinx includes games of speed, rotation or falls which distort normal perception and induce intoxicating or dizzying sensations.

H. Walker has also addressed the subject of games in Molière and makes some interesting comparisons between some specific games and recurrent situations in the playwright's works. He suggests, for example, that there are analogies between board games, fencing, ball-games and masking games and the patterns of relationships that are developed in Les Fâcheux and other plays.

In the most general sense of "play the game" and in the most specialized varieties of mathematical, political, economic, sociological or anthropological games, there appears to be at least four constants. Games require a prescribed number of players greater than one to play with or against depending on the nature of the game. Even in games where there is only a single player such as "Solitaire" there is an imaginary opponent called the "odds," "the thing to beat." Games also require rules to govern the players' actions during the course of the conflict or the ordered relationships of the game structure. The rules establish
the limits of a player's liberty to devise strategies for the attainment of whatever gain the game promises, and the tactics are determined by the calculated probability of success and a player's willingness to take risks. The strategy is the means to procure the payoff for which the game is played.

Despite the difference between the game structures of various disciplines, there remain two basic similarities in the relationship between participants in any kind of game in which there are rules, strategies limited by rules, and a payoff. The first of these two similarities is the mutual dependence of the players in order for the game to continue. Refusal to play on the part of any of the minimum required number of players aborts the game. Conscientious players in nearly every game, as Huizinga postulates, prefer cheaters subject to punishment under the rules to those who flagrantly ignore them and who, if permitted to continue, will destroy the game itself. Obvious breaches of implicit or explicit rules in Molière range in quality from the pathetic to the comic. Done Elvire's reprimand of Dom Juan for his lack of expertise in the employment of the most basic strategies is pathetic in context: "Voila comme il faut vous défendre," she says, "et non pas être interdit comme vous êtes" (I, Dom Juan, I, 3, p. 725). Sganarelle's newly discovered polemic skills, found in his doctor's disguise and directed against an antagonist who refuses the conditions of debate, arouses laughter: "...je ne saurois disputer si l'on ne m'interrompt...." (I, Dom Juan, III, 1, p. 745), he cries in exasperation, much like Beckett's Didi complains to Gogo that "Il faut me renvoyer la
The activities of Philaminte's literary coterie in *Les Femmes Savantes* are structured so that each participant's projects are applauded in turn: "Si vous voulez nous montrer quelque chose, A notre tour nous pourrions admirer" (II, *Les Femmes Savantes*, III, 2, 842, 843, p. 716), Trissotin politely defers to the others. The game of mutual admiration proceeds smoothly until Vadius unwittingly violates the rules with his harsh criticisms of Trissotin's sonnet. In a like manner Magdelon protests the "irregularity" of Gorgibus' procedures whereby the payoff (marriage) is had before the game is played out: "Laissez-nous faire à loisir le tissu de notre roman, et n'en pressez point tant la conclusion," Magdelon insists, while her cousin Cathos asserts that all is in the playing and that the payoff is a disgusting prospect indeed: "...je trouve le mariage une chose tout à fait choquante. Comment est-ce qu'on peut souffrir la pensée de coucher contre un homme vraiment nu?" (I, *Les Precieuses Ridicules*, I, 4, p. 200).

A second characteristic in the relationship established between participants in any kind of game is that the relationship exists on at least two levels: (1) the level on which strategy and counter-strategy are designed to deceive the opposition as to one's true intent, and (2) a more profound level of understanding based on the expertise of the players in the interpretation and translation of moves into a more meaningful sequence. According to this observation, Alceste's criticisms of institutions and persons are for their game-playing, that is, seeming other than they are and doing other than they
say. Philinte's judgment that "...il faut bien que l'on rende/ Quelques dehors civils que l'usage demande" (I, Le Misanthrope, I, 1, 65, 66, p. 819). is vigorously countered by Alceste's assertion that the deceptions of social game-playing ought not to be countenanced even in the most petty and innocuous forms. Alceste is in one sense punished for alienating conservative players who prefer the games in progress to those which the misanthrope proposes.

The dual nature of the relationship between participants involved in a transactional game is apparent in the ulterior transactions of which the game is comprised. As stated earlier, an ulterior transaction is one in which the actual content of the stimulus and response does not convey the meaning one intends to express. In other words, the message on the psychological level is not the same as that on the social level. Unlike simple complementary or crossed transactions, they involve more than two ego states.

By definition a transactional game must satisfy four criteria: (1) there must be a "hook" or a "con" which on the surface appears to be an honest proposition designed to achieve an explicit aim, but is in reality intended to satisfy an ulterior end or need; (2) there must be at least one other player with a weakness or need which makes him respond to the "hook"; this is colloquially referred to as a "gimmick"; (3) the complementary transactions must follow in a particular order, i.e., each response or move is expected; (4) finally there is a "payoff" for the
principal player (it), who then collects the gains for which he has been playing. Bearing these characteristics in mind, Berne defines a game in the following manner:

A game is an ongoing series of complementary ulterior transactions progressing to a well-defined predictable outcome. Descriptively it is a recurring set of transactions, often repetitious, superficially plausible, with a concealed motivation; or more colloquially, a series of moves with a snare or "gimmick." Games are clearly differentiated from procedures, rituals and pastimes by two chief characteristics: (1) their ulterior quality and (2) the payoff. Procedures may be successful, rituals effective, and pastimes profitable, but all of them are by definition candid; they may involve contest, but not conflict; and the ending may be sensational, but it is not dramatic. Every game on the other hand is basically dishonest, and the outcome has a dramatic as distinct from merely exciting quality.34

This chapter is an incomplete compendium of transactional games as they have been observed in Molière's plays. Some of the games which will be discussed are evident in nearly every play Molière wrote, for example, "Why Don't You... Yes But" and "Now I've Got You Son-Of-A-Bitch" (MIGYSOB), whereas others like "Schlemiel," "Debtor" and "Courtroom" appear only in isolated instances. Because a given game can be viewed as a mainstay of a play, such as "Yes But" in Les Femmes Savantes, this particular game will be discussed primarily with reference to the aforementioned play and elaborated afterwards in a more general discussion to show how the game is operative in others of Molière's comedies. Games that are important in several different plays
or only in one or two will necessarily receive a more heteroclite development. Although it would be possible to examine the dynamics of some of Molière's plays as artistically structured sequences of psychological games, this procedure has been rejected in favor of a simple classification of forms with examples.

1. **YES BUT**

Les Femmes Savantes is a series of confrontations between the various members of the cast who are caught up in conflicts aggravated by the proposed marriage of Henriette and Clitandre. Because of the circumstances in which they are enmeshed, none of the characters is able to act or to express his opinions freely. Armande cannot openly avow her love for Clitandre or the pain that his abandonment has caused her without forsaking the self-imposed image of the learned woman who scorns the pleasures of the flesh. Henriette and Clitandre are forced to maneuver diplomatically in order to persuade Chrysale to act steadfastly in their behalf without provoking unduly Philaminte's ill-will. Chrysale feels compelled to impose his decision on his wife to save face with his brother and others of the family in circumstances where he is fearful, incompetent and unconfident. Philaminte is grieved that Clitandre has paid no attention to her intellectual triumphs, aggravated by Chrysale's hesitant onslaught on her power position in the family, and she therefore uses the marriage issue to assuage her spite and to
demonstrate the omnipotence of her will in family matters. Trissotin, of course, cannot openly proclaim his reason for infiltrating Philaminte's charmed circle, because such candor would negate his stature and credibility as a disinterested tutor of things of the mind. All are forced to make excuses that mask their underlying motives for their behavior, in short to say "Yes But" or "No But."

The initial confrontation between the two sisters reveals a diametrical opposition as concerns their general perception of what is worthwhile in life. Armande condemns Henriette's intent to marry a man whom she loves and to have children because, she says, they are disgustingly animal pleasures unworthy of enlightened women. Their mother, continues Armande, taught them to marry philosophy, to rise to the sublime by spurning vulgar animal pleasures. Henriette refuses to argue the point, noting only that if Armande aspires to the sublime, Henriette, for her part, prefers the tangible satisfactions of a hearth, husband and children, just as their mother had before them, otherwise neither she nor Armande would have been born. Armande considers their birth an evidence of momentary weakness on Philaminte's part, one certainly not worthy of imitation for one ought only to strive to imitate the quintessential qualities of their mother's higher nature, not the weaknesses of the flesh that are obstacles to a total spiritual triumph. Henriette sarcastically responds that Armande ought not object to the "basses" which have afforded her sister such wisdom nor suppress the birth of another potential "savant."

Armande's inability to convince Henriette that the latter's tastes
are degenerate and unfitting their mother's daughter compels the older sister to introduce indirectly the real contrariety which has aroused her ire against her sibling. She initiates a game of "Yes But" because she will not admit she loves Clitandre, albeit partly out of spite, nor will she concede Clitandre to her younger sister: "Je vois que votre esprit ne peut être guéri/ Du fol entêtement de vous faire un mari;/ Mais sachons, s'il vous plaît, qui vous songez à prendre,/ Votre visée au moins n'est pas mise à Clitandre?" (II, Les Femmes Savantes, I, 1, 85-89, p. 685).

The remainder of the scene is comprised of Armande's objections to Henriette's answers. The transactions on the social level are Adult—Adult, but on the psychological level, Armande seeks reassurance for her stubborn Child with a sublimated expression of anger disguised as rational discussion whereas Henriette insists on the validity of her rationale for refusing to relinquish Clitandre:

Armande: You're not considering Clitandre?

Henriette: Yes, why? Isn't he a worthy choice?

Armande: *Yes but it's dishonest. After all, everyone knows Clitandre sighed for me.*

Henriette: You didn't reciprocate. You renounced marriage in favor of philosophy, so what does it matter to you who marries Clitandre?

Armande: *Yes I refused him in marriage, but I want him in my train as a faithful admirer.*
Henriette: I in no way interfered. He offered me the love you refused.

Armande: Yes but are you certain he doesn't love you out of spite? that his love for me is dead?

Henriette: He tells me so and I believe him.

Armande: Yes but don't believe him. Even if he says so he is only deceiving himself.

Henriette: Here he comes. I'll ask him.

On the social level where the messages are ostensibly Adult---Adult, the essential transactions can be reduced to the following:

Armande: Why are you...

Henriette: Because...

Armande: Yes but...

Whereas on the psychological level (P---C) the real message is quite different.

Henriette: I will explain...

Armande: Go ahead and try.

Armande is "it" in this particular game, that is, it is she who introduces the game and who is most intensely interested in the stakes
or payoff. The introduction of Henriette's interest in Clitandre is, colloquially speaking, the "hook" and Henriette's need to justify her behavior to her older sister is the "gimmick." The discussion on a social level obviously cannot be resolved since both know that the younger sister will not willingly give up Clitandre and that the older sister will find none of Henriette's reasons valid in the face of her objections. Thus their relative positions and subsequent moves are predictable both to themselves and to the spectators.

On the psychological level, however, the two sisters are involved in a very different set of transactions. Armande is not primarily interested in the obviously impossible task of convincing Henriette that she is in error, but the impossibility of the real situation on the social level in no way detracts from the game's excitement since, at this point, Armande's Parent is more intent on procuring the self-satisfaction she will derive from Henriette's failure to present solutions with which Armande cannot find fault than actually persuading Henriette to forego Clitandre by force of superior forensic skill. Armande derives a double payoff from the game: the reassurance for the Child that no matter what Henriette says by way of rebuttal Armande can find more and better counter-points, and the self-evident proof to her Parent that Henriette is as debased as she had hitherto concluded.

Clitandre's untimely entrance verifies the fact that Armande is not genuinely interested in a resolution of her differences with Henriette, despite the former's contention that Clitandre's suit of her
younger sister is only one more proof of his love for the elder. She is unsettled by Clitandre's intervention in their confrontation, which interrupts the verbal skirmishing of the previous scene and forces her to face the real issue of Clitandre's preferences, a question Armande much prefers to avoid. Armande's Adult objections to this unusual procedure are a transparent cover-up for her archeopsychic anxiety: "Non, non, je ne veux point à votre passion/ Imposer la rigueur d'une explication:/ Je ménage les gens et sais comme embarrassé/ Le contraignant effort de ces aveux en face" (II, Les Femmes Savantes, I, 2, 125-128, pp. 685-686), or more precisely, "Don't tell me what I don't want to hear." Clitandre, however, over-rides her objections, founded on proper conduct, in the interest of clarifying whatever ambiguities remain about his and Henriette's relationship. He did indeed love Armande, he says, but the haughty disdain given in return for the "ardeur de ses désirs" and his "tendres soupirs" caused him to seek solace in the company of the younger sister who sympathized with the "rebut" of Armande's charms for which favor Clitandre pledged his undying love. Clitandre's Child is perhaps still more sensitive to Armande's attractions than he is willing to admit, at least his concluding words so indicate: "J'ose maintenant vous conjurer madame,/ De ne vouloir tenter nul effort sur ma flamme;...(Les Femmes Savantes, I, 2, 151-154, p. 687), but the possible implications of Clitandre's discourse are not sufficient to pacify Armande's own Child. She feels obliged to defend herself against Clitandre's implication that she is brazenly attempting to regain his favor with another game of "Yes But" in reply to
what she considers a pretentious discourse (social level). "Hé qui vous dit, monsieur, que l'on ait cette envie, / Et que de vous enfin si fort on se soucie?" (II, Les Femmes Savantes, I, 2, 155, 156, p. 687).
Henriette correctly perceives now that Armande's ostensibly Adult stimulus is a defense mechanism contrived to initiate another game, and she refuses to permit Clitandre to be duped. She instead responds to the ulterior psychological message ("How can you do this to me?") with another ulterior transaction which nullifies the games possibilities: "Hé! doucement, ma sœur. Où donc est la morale/ Qui sait si bien régir la partie animale/ Et retenir la bride aux efforts du courroux?" (II, Les Femmes Savantes, I, 2, 159-161, p. 687) or "You're not the philosopher you pretend to be." Armande makes one last effort to change the focus of the conversation from her hurt Child to Henriette's disrespect with a caustic accusation that the latter is wilfully ignoring her filial duties. Here again with "...Sachez que le devoir vous soumet à leurs lois, / Qu'ils ont sur votre cœur l'autorité suprême, / Et qu'il est criminel d'en disposer vous même"... (II, Les Femmes Savantes, I, 2, 165-168, p. 688), Henriette carefully side-steps the snare, much to Armande's chagrin. The younger sister thanks her for the good advice, urges Clitandre to seek the good offices of Phileminte and Chrysale, thus leaving Armande no recourse but to leave in a rage after a particularly vicious verbal attack on Henriette.

In addition to the expository value of the "Yes But" game in elaborating on the points of conflict between the two sisters, it establishes their relative positions in game-playing with each other for
the duration of the play. Henriette moves from a participant in the first scene to a refusal to let either herself or Clitandre again be involved. When Henriette finally insists on an unequivocal clarification she declines to play the game.

Bélide, Chrysale's sister who suffers from the delusion that all men are irresistibly attracted to her, is also adept at playing either role in a good game of "Yes But" in defense of her most cherished illusion. Reynier suggests that Bélide represents the ravages wrought by extreme forms of pedantic pretentiousness, but her skillful game-playing is evidence that intelligence serves her insanity.

Bélide is a comic figure in a tragic sense. Professor Hubert's suggestion that a pathetic desire for recognition lies beneath the "précieuses ridicules" extravagant pretensions is equally applicable to the "femmes savantes." Without her false self-image, one has the impression that Bélide would be an anonymous entity in her brother's household, but her delusions of grandeur and active participation in Philaminte's literary circle allows her to retain an OK self-image which perhaps explains her steadfast defense of her sanity in the face of Chrysale's and Ariste's objections.

On Clitandre's behalf, Ariste communicates to the girl's father, Chrysale, the young man's desire to marry Henriette. The latter entirely agrees with his brother as concerns Clitandre's merits and heartily endorses the marriage proposal. Bélide, however, overhears the conversation, and emphatically denies Clitandre's interest in Henriette. He is, she says, only one of the many who bemoan an unreciprocated love for
herself.

Ariste: Damis never even comes here.

Bélise: Yes, but that's to make manifest his submissive respect.

Ariste: Dorante publicly makes fun of you.

Bélise: Yes, but that's a manifestation of his jealous rage.

Ariste: Cleante and Lycidas have both taken wives.

Bélise: Yes, but out of despair.

Ariste: You're hallucinating.

Chrysale: You must rid yourself of such delusions!

In this exchange Bélise's basic query, "Why do you doubt me?", is answered by Ariste's and Chrysale's affirmation that she is mad. Bélise, however, manages to refute the objections of her two brothers to her own satisfaction so that they finally give up in exasperation. However valid the protestations of Ariste and Chrysale, it is Bélise who ultimately triumphs since she successfully rebuts all explanations except her own. She thereby avoids a public admission of a basic insecurity and procures a self-permission to retain her fantasies of irresistibility.

Henriette generously attributes her browbeaten father's constant submission to his domineering wife to "...[une] certaine bonté d'âme/
Qui le soumet d'abord à ce que veut sa femme..." (II, Les Femmes Savantes, I, 3, 207, 208, p. 689) and Chrysale indulgently considers himself a man who cherishes "le repos, la paix et la douceur (Les Femmes Savantes, II, 4, 665, p. 707), none of which he can enjoy because his learned wife's philosophy does nothing to temper her choleric nature or her biting tongue. Like his more vociferous counterpart, Alceste, Chrysale glories "le bon vieux temps" of simple tastes where domestic tranquility was untrammelled by women's aspirations to prove their intellectual equality. The "good old days" for both Chrysale and Alceste is symptomatic of their tendency to withdraw, but whereas Alceste considers self-imposed exile a manifestation of his inherent superiority, Chrysale nostalgically yearns for the peace and quiet essential to the happiness of such timorous men. He even occasionally thinks condescension to his wife's most extravagant demands a stoic virtue because only concessions to her intractability afford him a reprieve from what would otherwise be a perpetual conflict with an antagonist whom he is ill-equipped to handle. Unfortunately for Chrysale, his stature as head of the household requires him to make decisions under external pressures that contradict his wife's wishes, and occasionally Philaminte's ultimatums jeopardize his creature comforts more than a disagreeable verbal confrontation. Mauron remarks that Philaminte is the most striking of the matriarchs created by Molière:

Molière a dessiné plusieurs de ces femmes redoutables, dont Philaminte. Leur apparition marque une régression comique vers le régime
matrimonial: le père tombe alors dans un état d'extrême infantilisme et de dépendance, comme le Bourgeois gentilhomme ou le Malade imaginaire.38

Aware of his brother's inclination to let Philaminte make all administrative decisions in the household, Ariste nevertheless manages to convince a balky Chrysale that Philaminte's collaboration is essential to the successful consummation of the projected marriage with Clitandre, but Chrysale's good intentions are nipped in statu nascendi by another household catastrophe: Chrysale learns that Philaminte has just dismissed his prized housemaid, Martine, who like himself deems Philaminte's intellectual pretensions an aberration of nature. Shocked, but momentarily resolute, Chrysale assures Martine that his wife has acted too hastily, but when Philaminte makes a surprise entrance demanding that Martine depart immediately, she virtually deprives Chrysale of the last vestiges of his righteous indignation. No longer in a position to require an explanation from Philaminte, he pleads instead for reasons to justify Martine's dismissal to himself. The game involved here is the obverse of "Yes But"—"No But"—in which the insistent Parent wins and the defensive Child eventually retires in confusion.

Philaminte: Would I dismiss her without legitimate cause?

Chrysale: No but as concerns our servants...

Philaminte: She must leave immediately.
Chrysale: Who said anything to the contrary?

Chrysale reverses sides at this juncture in an attempt to pacify his wife and to salve his own conscience with a false display of his concurrence in his wife's rationale: "Oui, ma femme avec raison vous chasse;/ Coquine, et votre crime est indigne de grâce" (Les Femmes Savantes, II, 6, 443, 444, p. 699). Martine, however, refuses to be so easily dismissed even though her objections cause Chrysale a great deal of embarrassment. When the maid points out that she was convicted before any evidence was presented, Chrysale once again summons his courage and renews his defense of the losing cause:

Chrysale: Did she arouse your anger by breaking a mirror or some porcelaine?

Philaminte: Am I so easily angered?

Chrysale: No but is her offense that serious?

Philaminte: Am I so unreasonable?

Chrysale: No but has she stolen needles or silver plates?

Philaminte: That would be nothing.

Chrysale: (to Martine) Oh! Oh! Peste la fidèle.

It is then revealed that Martine's transgressions amount to "lèse langue
française": habitual use of double negatives and provincialisms, misuse of singulars and plurals, and poor pronunciation, all condemned by the French grammarian Vaugelas. Chrysale considers his wife's offended aesthetic sensibilities the poorest of excuses for dismissing a good cook and maid, but cowed by Philaminte's brutal insistence, he obediently concurs with his wife's desire: "(Haut) ...Allons, sortez! (Bas) va-t-en ma pauvre enfant" (Les Femmes Savantes, II, 6, 510, p. 702).

Although the quarrel on the social-level (A—A) revolves around Philaminte's motives for dismissing Martine, the real issue is her unrelenting control of family affairs. She does not respond directly to Chrysale's queries because on the psychological level Philaminte knows that Chrysale is hazarding a timid protest against her household tyranny. Philaminte's categorical refusal to answer, evidenced in directing questions that require Chrysale to judge her conduct, strengthens her position.

Social Level:

Philaminte: Are you taking sides against me?

Chrysale: No but...

Psychological Level:

Philaminte: How dare you question my decisions.

Chrysale: You're right.
The extent of Philaminte's victory only becomes apparent in the following scene when Chrysale finally broaches the subject of Clitandre's and Henriette's marriage. Chrysale prefaccs his remarks in a conciliatory manner designed to appease Philaminte's wrath before he suggests a suitable husband for Henriette. Anticipating a match proposal, Philaminte preempts Chrysale's proposition with the declaration that she has already decided in favor of Trissotin, a man whom she knows Chrysale dislikes, but then she knows what is best for her own daughter! Her choice is, moreover, not open for discussion: "La contestation est ici superflue,/ Et de tout point chez moi l'affaire est résolue./ Au moins ne dites mot du choix de cet époux" (II, Les Femmes Savantes, II, 8, 635-637, p. 705). Chrysale retires in confusion.

The worst is not over for Chrysale, however, since he must now account for his actions to Ariste who is impatiently awaiting news of the outcome. Ashamed of his failure to subdue his wife and fearful of revealing his weakness to Ariste after his recent show of courage, he decides to make his cowardice appear the better part of wisdom in an effort to save face.

The transactions on the social level are Adult—Adult, but it is evident to the audience that Chrysale's abbreviated answers reveal more than he wants them to but not enough to satisfy Ariste. It is, in fact, Ariste's uncertainty that communicates a non-verbal "but":

Ariste: Did she (Philaminte) consent?

Chrysale: No, not quite yet. (but)
Ariste: Did she refuse?

Chrysale: No. (but)

Ariste: What then?

Chrysale: She offered an alternative.

Ariste: Did you accept it?

Chrysale: No, thanks be to God. (but)

Ariste: What did you say?

Chrysale: Nothing. I didn't want to commit myself. (but)

On the psychological level Ariste's bland Adult "Did you?" is interpreted as an accusatory "Why didn't you?" (Parent). The game stops when Ariste's Parent drops all pretense of continuing the conversation on an Adult level and openly berates the hapless Chrysale: "N'avez-vous point de honte avec votre mollesse?/ Et se peut-il qu'un homme ait assez de faiblesses/ Pour laisser à sa femme un pouvoir absolu/ Et n'oser attaquer ce qu'elle a résolu?" (II, Les Femmes Savantes, II, 9, 659-662, p. 707). When Chrysale realizes that Ariste has penetrated his shallow facade (i.e., won the game), he in turn reveals his archeopsychic anxiety which results in continual submissive withdrawals: "Elle me fait trembler dès qu'elle prend son ton;/ Je ne sais où me mettre, et c'est un vrai dragon./ Et cependant, avec toute sa diablerie,/ Il faut que je l'appelle et mon coeur et ma mie" (Les Femmes Savantes, II, 9, 673-676, p. 707).
Chrysale's very name describes his most profound inner wishes. In times of stress his first reaction is to retire to a metaphorical pupic stage, and failing that he whimsically adapts his response to whichever Parental presence is most felt in any given situation.

Trissotin, the devious literary dilettante who worms himself into the good graces of Philaminte's coterie, is also an avid player of "Yes But" in several scenes of the play. The arrival of Vadius, a poet and scholar of Greek, is warmly greeted in Act III, scene 3 on the basis of Trissotin's recommendation, particularly by Philaminte who covets the honor of capturing and captivating so great a prize. Vadius' welcome, however, is short-lived. He unwittingly violates the rules of "Gee You're Wonderful Mr. Murtgatroyd" when he decries a sonnet written by Trissotin, albeit without knowing the author's identity. Trissotin is forced to play a vicious game of "Yes But" in order both to belittle his erstwhile colleague and to salvage his reputation as a writer, critic and literary polemicist. Vadius attempts to appease Trissotin: "Il faut qu'en écoutant, j'aie eu l'esprit distrait/ Ou bien que le lecteur m'ait gâté le sonnet," (Les Femmes Savantes, III, 3, 1003, 1004, p. 722), but Trissotin is in no humor to accept an apology so easily purchased at his expense. Instead he dangles a tantalizing bait before Vadius who, anxious to claim whatever poetic laurels the salon will distribute for a public reading of his recently composed ballad, cannot refuse:

Trissotin: For my taste the ballad is dull (faire).

Vadius: The ballad nevertheless charms many people.
Trissotin: Yes but popular opinion is no
criterion for judging a poem's worth.

Vadius: Neither is it one to the contrary.

Trissotin: It does appeal to pedants.

Vadius: Well it didn't please you.

Thoroughly exasperated, both antagonists take a momentary respite from
the rigors of "Yes But" to mouth insults at each other, only to resume
the game seconds later when Vadius reminds Trissotin of caustic comments
Boileau has made about his poetry:

Vadius: Boileau slights me but you're
constantly the object of his
disdain.

Trissotin: Yes but that proves what a worthy
adversary I am. He places you in
the crowd of mediocre writers,
whereas he always singles me out
because he never succeeds in his
calumnious enterprise.

In the first phase of the game the A---A transactions on the merits of
the ballad as a literary form terminate in an outraged P---C, P---C
confrontation. The game again resumes, this time à propos the writers'
relative merits vis-à-vis each other, and is concluded when the outraged
Vadius exits, leaving a triumphant Trissotin ready to refurbish his
tarnished image. Throughout the sequence Trissotin poses the problems,
Vadius proposes solutions, and Trissotin "Yes Buts" in his role as
principal player until he wins.

In a later scene with Henriette, however, Trissotin demonstrates that he is equally adept at giving solutions in response to objections in a game where Henriette is "it." In Act V, scene 1, Henriette approaches Trissotin in the avowed hope of persuading him to renounce his intent to marry her: "Je sais qu'avec mes voeux vous me jugez capable/De vous porter en dot un bien considérable;/Mais l'argent dont on voit tant de gens faire cas,/Pour un vrai philosophe à d'indignes appas;/Et le mépris du bien et des grandeurs frivoles/Ne doit point éclater dans vos seules paroles" *(Les Femmes Savantes, V, 1, 1465-1470, pp. 737, 738)*.

---

Trissotin: That's not why you please me. The riches which attract me are your soft piercing eyes, your grace and your carriage.

Henriette: Yes but I love Clitandre and as you know it is impossible to love two men at the same time. I know he is less worthy than yourself but that's how it is.

Trissotin: After we're married my painstaking consideration will make you love me.

Henriette: Yes but love is not governed by reason otherwise I should love you already. I know that you don't want to hurt the one you love, therefore you must withdraw your consent to marry and leave me free to marry Clitandre.

Trissotin: I'm hopelessly in love and therefore unable to make the sacrifice you require.
Henriette: Yes but your poetry is full of charming women for whom you pine...

Trissotin: That's only an intellectual exercise. You I truly love.

Henriette: Yes but you know the risks involved when one marries against her will?

Trissotin: That changes nothing. Philosophers are prepared to stoically accept the ignominies of cuckoldry.

Henriette finally sees that her antagonist by virtue of his position plays a better game of "Yes But" than she does even though it normally wins. She drops the excuses and subterfuges and declares her unwillingness to marry Trissotin under any circumstances: "(Je) vous jure entre nous/ Que je renonce au bien de vous voir mon époux" (II, Les Femmes Savantes, V, 1, 1559-1560, p.

In the final scene of the play, Trissotin plays a last game of "Yes But" to extract himself from the marriage contract once the hope of financial gain disappears: "Yes but it is unseemly to be the cause of family strife."

Although "Yes But" is not used as extensively in any other play as it is in Les Femmes Savantes it is an interesting and necessary dimension in several others, which helps to explain the contradictions of several much discussed and ambiguous characters. The contradictions of an Alceste in The Misanthrope, for example, who vacillates between
tempestuous outbursts against the perversity of the world, but insists on pursuing the courtship of a rich, young, attractive widow whose salon attracts the very sort of people Alceste ostensibly most despises. On the one hand he insists that theirs is a relationship between incompatible personalities whose goals and values are mutually exclusive and, on the other, he persists in his efforts to convert Célimène to his way of thinking. Even more important than Alceste’s doubts about Célimène’s sincerity, at least for the purposes of game analysis, is the fact that Alceste becomes progressively more intent on the rebuttal of Célimène’s arguments. The reader’s or spectator’s annoyance, irritation, or cynical smile is perhaps related to the intuition that Alceste is not genuinely interested in reforming Célimène since, to all appearances, nothing would eliminate his suspicions. On the game-level of interpretation, a helpless and defensive Alceste is in effect saying "See if you can present a solution I can’t find fault with" and finding reassurance in Célimène’s inability to do so, while on the existential level he further entrenches himself in his self-righteous paranoia.

In Dom Juan the title character plays a variety of games which "Yes But" is one of the least interesting, although he does occasionally indulge in it. After falsely promising his father in Sganarelle’s presence to mend his ways, he deflates his squire’s euphoric expectations with the admission that his hypocrisy is only a façade which will enable him to pursue his misdeeds with impunity: "Le personnage d’homme de bien est le meilleur de tous les personnages qu’on puisse jouer aujourd’hui, et la profession d’hypocrite a de merveilleux avantages. C’est un art
de qui l'imposture est toujours respectée, et quoi qu'on la découvre, on n'ose rien dire contre elle" (I, Dom Juan, IV, 2, p. 771). Dom Juan promptly puts his new found ethic into operation in the following scene. Dom Carlos, who had previously spared Dom Juan's life in gratitude for a timely rescue which saved his own, now pursues his former benefactor in order to avenge his sister's and the family's honor. Dom Carlos harbors no ill-will toward the man who abandoned his sister almost immediately after the marriage rite; in fact, he ardently hopes that Elvire and Dom Juan will be reconciled: "Pour moi je ne cède point, je souhaite fort que les choses aillent dans la douceur; et il n'y a rien que je ne fasse pour porter votre esprit à vouloir prendre cette voie, et pour voir publiquement confirmer à ma soeur le nom de votre femme" (I, Dom Juan, V, 3, p. 773). He is, however, ill-prepared to face a Dom Juan who piously proclaims that God himself opposes a reunion with his erstwhile wife:

Dom Juan: Yes but Heaven has made me see my past errors and hereafter I shall abandon my worldly ways and shall do an austere penance for my misdirected youth.

Dom Carlos: A legitimate wife is no obstacle to the praiseworthy thought Heaven inspires in you.

Dom Juan: Yes but your sister has also gone into retreat; we were touched by God's grace at the same time.

Dom Carlos: Her withdrawal could be interpreted as a consequence of your scorn; and our family's honor requires that she live with you.
Dom Juan: Yes but God has revealed that I should no longer think of your sister, and that I could never achieve my salvation with her.

Finally exasperated by Dom Juan's casuistry, Carlos threatens a recourse to trial by combat which Dom Juan welcomes with a sinister repartee scarcely hidden beneath his pious façade: "...ce n'est pas moi qui me veut battre: le Ciel me défend la pensée; et si vous m'attaquez, nous verrons ce qui en arrivera" (I, Dom Juan, V, 3, p. 774).

In L'Avare, Valère chooses to cater to Harpagon's weaknesses through flattery in order to penetrate the miser's formidable defenses; "La sincérité souffre un peu au métier que je fais"; he confesses to Elise, "mais quand on a besoin des hommes, il faut bien s'ajuster à eux; et puisqu'on ne saurait les gagner que par là, ce n'est pas la faute de ceux qui flattent, mais de ceux qui veulent être flattés" (I, L'Avare, I, 1, p. 241). He soon becomes a victim of his own making, however, for shortly thereafter, in an effort to please Harpagon, he sanctions the marriage of his beloved Elise to another before he knows the subject of the father-daughter dispute: "Mais vous ne sauriez avoir tort, et vous êtes toute raison" (I, L'Avare, I, 5, p. 255). He then attempts to renege with a series of "Yes Buts" which are rebutted by Harpagon's famous "Sans Dot." Valère is forced to concur in Harpagon's decision and then to demonstrate its disadvantages without alienating his beloved's father. His too facile morality has made him a player in a game of "Yes But" where his superficially credible Adult transactions are intended to arouse Harpagon's Child fears of social disapproval and ridicule to which the
latter is totally impervious:

Valère: Basically you're right but then she's not completely wrong.

Harpagon: What? Anselme is a rich and noble gentleman, even-tempered, poised, wise and with no living children.

Valère: That's true, but she could argue that you're pushing things too fast, that it would be better to wait and see if they're compatible for...

Harpagon: It is a chance which must quickly be exploited. There is an advantage which I will find nowhere else, he has committed himself to taking her without a dowry.

Valère: Without a dowry?

Harpagon: Yes.

Valère: In that case there's nothing left to say...

Valère's game of "Yes But" is complicated by the fact that Harpagon is insensitive to Valère's objections and is consequently not subject to the disconcertion which normally provides the switch that signals the end of the game. In addition, Valère's primary interest is Mariane rather than winning, and this prevents him from pursuing his objections. Harpagon is, consequently, superior to the rules and technically not a participant since he has the power to disrupt the game.

"Yes But" and "No But" follow basically the same pattern except
that in "Yes But" the Child normally routs the Parent whereas in "No But" the Parent bullies the Child into submission. In the example of "Yes But" between Harpagon and Valère, as in others, real considerations destroy the game. It would be entirely possible for Valère to continue manufacturing "Yes Buts" in response to Harpagon's unequivocal "Sans Dot" but Valère's interest in the game is compromised by his desire to ingratiate himself with his beloved's father. The lover is consequently forced to abandon his superior position in this game in order to obtain a better position in another. Due consideration given to the variants of "Yes But" resulting from peculiar circumstances, the basic pattern coincides with the analysis by Berne:

**Thesis:** See if you can present a solution I can't find fault with.

**Aim:** Reassurance (You can't)

**Social Paradigm:**
- Adult: Why don't you...
- Adult: Yes but...

**Psychological Paradigm:**
- Parent: I'll explain the situation to you...
- Child: Go ahead and try.

**Advantages:**
1. Internal Psychological: Reassurance.
2. External Psychological: Avoids surrender.
(4) Existential: Everybody mistreats me.

2. NIGYSOB

"Now I've Got You, You Son-of-a-Bitch" is a two-handed game colloquially referred to as NIGYSOB. Berne says it may be observed in a classical and simplified form in some poker games: "White gets an unbeatable hand, such as four aces. At this point, if he is a NIGYSOB player, he is more interested in the fact that Black is completely at his mercy that he is in good poker or making money." NIGYSOB players use any available matrix for manipulating people into a vulnerable position where they are at the mercy of the principal player, who then uses his superior position to vent his wrath or sadistic fantasies on his hapless victim. The game is usually arranged so that dishonest ulterior advantages are cloaked in a personally and socially acceptable form.

The plays wherein Molière relies on the infighting between husband and wife provide some archetypal NIGYSOB situations of which George Dandin is the best example. George Dandin is a wealthy bourgeois who aspires to rise above his social class and who manages to do so by marrying the daughter of the Sotenvilles, a destitute family belonging to the provincial nobility. He discovers too late that his new-found title, Monsieur de la Dandinière, affords him no title to respect as far as his in-laws are concerned. Meanwhile his young wife's resentment because of her forced marriage to an unattractive and uncouth bourgeois is actively
expressed in covert attempts to find more appealing male companionship elsewhere, but her flirtations do not escape Dandin's watchful eye, and he resolves to expose his wife's guilt to the very persons least willing to believe their daughter capable of an illicit flirtation, not to say adultery.

Despite many abortive attempts to catch Angélique in compromising circumstances, it is not until the finale that George Dandin confronts Angélique with the indubitable proof of her duplicity. After a moonlight tryst with Clitandre, Angélique hastens to re-enter the house only to discover that her bourgeois Cerberus had not been lulled to sleep as she had thought. George Dandin had hastily followed his wife and overheard the disparaging remarks about her husband that Angélique had addressed to her lover. Thereafter he stealthily returned and barred the door against his mate, then set up the NIGYSOB by expediting a servant to summon his in-laws in all haste. When Angélique realizes that she has been caught en flagrant délit, she abandons the rebellious Child and critical Parent attitudes previously exhibited in encounters with her husband in favor of a highly adapted Child response which she customarily reserves for her mother and father. She first attempts to appease her husband's wrath with the rejoinder that she had only stepped out for a breath of fresh air, but she is finally forced to confess her trespass, plead for clemency, and promise that no further incidents will follow if Dandin shows himself generous enough to forgive this transgression. Her resentment racket which she uses indiscriminately against both Dandin and her parents is not strong enough to withstand the messages recorded in her own Parent in a
situation where she is confronted with the probability of exposure to her own mother and father.

Si vous m'accordez généreusement la grace que je vous demande, ce procédé obligeant, cette bonté que vous me ferez voir me gagnera entièrement. Elle touchera tout à fait mon coeur, et y fera naître pour vous ce que tout le pouvoir de mes parents et les liens du mariage n'avoient pu y jeter. En un mot, elle sera cause que je renoncerai à toutes les galanteries, et n'aurai de l'attachement que pour vous.

(George Dandin, III, 6, pp. 227, 228)

This ploy directed at Dandin's nurturing Parent elicits instead a response from Dandin's critical Parent which is indisposed to forego a game he has so masterfully engineered. Dandin's self righteous Parent replays syntonic maxims of moral law so that he appears to be the defender of the sanctity of marriage. It is all too apparent, however, that his Child has a large investment in the excitement the game affords and is little interested under any circumstances in a reconciliation with Angélique's contrite Child. He taunts her with her helplessness and urges her to find new and better excuses to prolong the game and to augment the tension.

En attendant qu'ils viennent, songez, si vous voulez, à chercher dans votre tête quelque nouveau détour pour vous tirer de cette affaire, à inventer quelque moyen de rhabiller votre escapade, à trouver quelque belle ruse pour éloigner ici les gens et paroître innocente, quelque prétexte spécieux de pèlerinage nocturne, ou d'amie en travail d'enfant, que vous veniez de secourir.

(George Dandin, III, 6, p. 226)
A few lines later Dandin almost completely removes the Parent mask of indignation in an admission of the real payoff: "Je ne veux pas perdre une telle aventure, il m'importe qu'on soit une fois elcaircis à fond e vos déportements" (George Dandin, III, 6, p. 227). In a very real sense, Dandin's archeopsychic investment in the game and the resulting encouragement designed to stimulate in Angélique even greater efforts to increase its tension results in a turn-about where Dandin again emerges second best.

A complete analysis of the game follows:

**Thesis:** NIGYSOB

**Aim:** Justification

**Roles:** Victim, Aggressor

**Dynamics:** Jealous rage

**Social Paradigm:** Adult—Adult

Dandin: "See you've acted badly."

Angelique: "Now that you draw it to my attention, you're right."

**Psychological Paradigm:** Dandin: "I've been watching you hoping you would make a slip."

Angelique: You caught me this time.

Dandin: NIGYSOB.
Moves: 
(1) Provocation: Angélique leaves to meet Clitandre. Accusation: Dandin bars the door and taunts his wife.
(2) Defense: Angélique says she has been out for a breath of air. Accusation: Dandin reveals he has witnessed the tryst.
(3) Defense: Angélique confesses and pleads for clemency. Punishment: Dandin refuses and tells Angélique he has sent for her parents.

Advantages: Internal Psychological: Justification for rage. External Psychological: Avoids confrontation of his own deficiencies (It is all her fault). Internal Social: NIGYSOB External Social: Confirmation of paranoia (They're always out to get you). Existential: "People can't be trusted."

Some of Molière's plays rely almost exclusively on the game of NIGYSOB to stimulate dramatic interest. E. Potter notes a propos L'Etourdi that:

The love theme is of secondary importance and serves primarily as a pretext for knavery; it also lends an aura of benevolence to Mascarille's mischievous activities. Thus throughout the greater part of the dramatic action, the spectator's interest is focused far less on the lovers and their problems than on the success or failure of Mascarille's deceitful plans. 40

Although Mascarille is occasionally chagrined by Lélie's obtuse interferences which overthrow his carefully calculated plans, he is never discouraged by momentary setbacks or by the failure of his meticulously
laid snares to produce "productive" results because the real pleasures are provided by the game's excitement not its by-products. Mascarille is a professional "NIGYSOBer" who glories in his capacity to create situations out of thin air which enable him to exemplify his talents. If his gambits fail on account of Lélie's constant interventions, Mascarille NIGYSOBs Lélie in lieu of the intended victim, then resumes the original game with increased intensity. In a parody of Corneille's heroic style, Mascarille proclaims the internal and external social and psychological gains he reaps from his superb gamesmanship:

Si je suis maintenant ma juste impatience,  
On dira que je cède à la difficulté,  
Que je me trouve à bout de ma subtilité;  
Et que deviendra lors cette publique estime  
Qui te vante partout pour un fourbe sublime,  
Et que tu t'est acquise en tant d'occasions,  
A ne t'être vu jamais court d'inventions?  
L'honneur, ô Mascarille, est une belle chose:  
A tes nobles travaux ne fails aucune pause;  
Et quoiqu'un maître ait fait pour te faire enrager  
Achève pour ta gloire, et non pour l'obliger.  
(L'Etourdi, III, 1, 908-918, p. 75)

In Les Fourberies de Scapin one finds a parallel situation to that in L'Etourdi except that in the former the union of two couples rather than one is the object of the manservant's efforts. Two sons have formed romantic attachments in their fathers' absence: one, Octave, has secretly married; the other, Léandre, is preoccupied with finding the means to do so. Their respective fathers, of course, have other marital plans for their progeny, and to Scapin falls the difficult task of abetting the sons without estranging their fathers. Here again the banal plot of conflicting interests of parents and offspring, which are
magically resolved in a recognition scene at the end of the play, only serves as a framework for the wily servant's escapades. The spectators' interest is focused on Scapin's masterful maneuvers, for which the hackneyed love plot is only a vehicle.

Once the introduction of the protagonists and their situations vis a vis each other have been explained, Molière prepares a series of NIGYSOB scenes all of which stem from an initial ambiguity. In Act I, Scene 4, Scapin attempts to pacify Argante's anger over Octave's secret marriage with the insinuation that the son of his good friend Géronte has had the audacity to act even more perfidiously toward his own father. Moments later when Géronte's parent gloatingly blames Argante's leniency for his son's misconduct, Argante crosses the transaction from his own Parent to Géronte's Child with the assertion that Léandre's conduct has not been a model of filial respect and obedience. Livid with rage, Géronte uses this hearsay evidence to NIGYSOB his son Léandre who attempts a contrite, adapted Child clarification. Soon thereafter Léandre's own Parent vents its wrath on Scapin for alleged but unspecified treachery. The bewildered manservant confesses several misdemeanors before Léandre reveals Scapin's felony, the release of confidential information about his liaison with Zerbinette. Léandre becomes highly adaptive, however, when he learns that he will need the service of a resourceful accomplice to extort money for the purchase of Zerbinette from an errant gypsy company before their imminent departure. The situation is thus reversed and it is now Scapin's Parent's turn to vent its ire on Léandre for the unwarranted abuse heaped on his Child before he consents
to help his master out of this last predicament. Scapin makes a Child-programmed-Adult appeal to Géronte that the latter immediately sacrifice 500 crowns in order to ransom his son, Léandre, who, according to Scapin, is being held prisoner on a Turkish galley. The extortion of money, however, is scant revenge for Scapin's Child, who holds Géronte's malignant Parent responsible for initiating a sequence in which Scapin's Child has been mistreated. He therefore barters the money extorted from Géronte to Léandre in exchange for the right to NIGYSOB the father. Scapin's Child conjures up a story which will enable Scapin to physically release his pent up aggression on the subject of its anger. Ironically, Scapin adopts the posture of Géronte's benefactor. He conveys the information from his Child-programmed-Adult to Géronte that Géronte's life is endangered. The brother of Octave's wife is enraged, says Scapin, because he believes the attempt to supplant Hyacinté with Géronte's own daughter constitutes the principal obstacle to Hyacinté's happiness, and the brother has consequently resolved to kill Géronte to preserve the family's honor. Scapin's confidence in the resourcefulness of his Child-directed-Adult is justified when Géronte responds to Scapin's from his fearful and compliant Child. Géronte eagerly accepts Scapin's proposal that Géronte crawl into a bag so that Scapin can transport him to the safety of his home. At this juncture Scapin apprises Géronte of the fictitious brother's approach and unceremoniously stuffs Géronte into the waiting bag. Scapin then enacts the parts of the brother and his cronies in a demonstration on the bag of what will happen if ever the luckless Géronte should fall into their hands. Scapin is thus enabled to
"act out" his suppressed anger as a result of his masterful ability to structure a NIGYSOB situation. After each beating Géronde timidly peeks out of the sack but is each time convinced that still more of the brother's band approaches in quest of the home-breaker, and each time Scapin unleashes his anger and resentment on Géronde's hide until the latter, incapable of sustaining further physical abuse, sticks his head out of the bag and sees Scapin ready to deal him still another hail of blows.

In Dom Juan as in Les Fourberies de Scapin the master–servant relationships comprising a large part of the play's total content are almost entirely structured in NIGYSOB situations. Unlike Scapin, however, Sganarelle's Child lacks imaginative capacity, his Adult, intelligence, and his Parent the power to retaliate against Dom Juan's cruel insensitivity toward his valet. On the few occasions Sganarelle's Parent voices its opinions there is never any doubt that it is horrified by Dom Juan's Child rebellion against everything Sganarelle and the society at large hold sacred, including God, father, nobility, women, chastity, charity and le moine bouru. Sganarelle's Parent takes and Child resentments, however, are seldom expressed despite the constant incursions on its opinions by Dom Juan because Sganarelle operates almost entirely from his adapted Child except in Dom Juan's absence or when Dom Juan solicits Sganarelle's Parent opinions for the express purpose of NIGYSOBing Sganarelle back into his adapted Child. Beneath Sganarelle's adapted Child's suffering acceptance of Dom Juan's repeated NIGYSOBs, the valet's Child rebelliousness expresses itself in covert attempts to disrupt Dom
Juan's plans, attempts which are usually discovered and form the
ostensible reason for still more NIGYSOBs. It is only after Dom Juan's
consummation by the fires of heaven and his subsequent engulfment in the
abyss that Sganarelle's Child expresses the full measure of its frus-
trated desires in his last bitter cry of "Mes Gages! mes gages! mes
gages!" symbolic of the systematic physical and psychological deprivation
he experiences from the beginning until the end of the play.

From the bitter, earthy atmosphere of George Dandin, to fantastic
farces a l'italien, like L'Etourdi and Les Fourberies de Scapin, to a
play which has excited as much moral and philosophical controversy as
Dom Juan, the structure and enactment of NIGYSOB is one of the most
pervasive games in all of Molière's theater. The Parent of many of
Molière's egocentric heroes is committed to demonstrating that others
or some others are not OK. Alceste considers no one and no institution
virtuous except himself, Arnolphe decries the entire feminine sex, and
Orgon persuades himself that all save Tartuffe and himself are tainted
with the world's inherent perversity. Their Parent tapes are reinforced
by morbid prying and minute observation of "culpable" others for the pur-
pose of finding a justification to NIGYSOB, thus reaffirming their
conviction that others or some others are not OK.

3. UPROAR

The defensive and gratificatory function of "Uproar" in its
classical forms are related to avoiding intimacy, usually of a sexual
nature. "Uproar" is, for example, the terminal phase of "Frigid Woman" in which the wife is anxious to avoid sexual contact with her husband and manages to substitute an uproar in lieu of sexual relations with her mate. The terminal phase precludes any threat of impending intimacy as well as providing an expression for suppressed sexual energy. Although "Frigid Woman" is not a game form directly observable in Molière's plays, extreme cases of preciosity like that of Armande and Philaminte in Les Femmes Savantes, broach the question. In this regard, Hubert has remarked that Les Femmes Savantes is less concerned with learned women than with women without men.  

The classical game of "Uproar" according to Berne takes place between domineering fathers and teen-age daughters where there is a sexually inhibited or absent mother.

Father comes home from work and finds fault with daughter, who answers impudently; or daughter makes the first move by being impudent, whereupon father finds fault. Their voices rise and the clash becomes more acute... Uproar offers a distressing but effective solution to the sexual problems that arise between fathers and teen-age daughters in certain households. Often they can only live in the same house together if they are angry at each other, and the slamming doors emphasize for each of them the fact that they have separate bedrooms.  

In the larger context of the complex inter-relationships in some of Molière's comedies, the father-daughter confrontations are frequently of negligible importance except in the creation of a general framework for the dramatic action as in Les Précieuses Ridicules. In other plays, particularly those that focus on obsessed, egocentric characters, belonging
to what Mauron calls "le cycle du narcissisme" in Molière, the father daughter "Uproar" confrontation is a complementary and complicating factor in the family pathology. Even in these latter cases where the "Uproar" scenes are an aspect of a more general conflict over power and security, the sexual aspects are largely suppressed even though they can be inferred upon reflection.

The pathos-producing potential of a direct confrontation between an outraged father and an impudent daughter explains why most of Molière's "Uproar" scenes do not conform to the classical pattern. Significant "Uproars" in Molière's comedy usually do not pit father against daughter but rather the father against the daughter's alter-ego—a trusted maidservant who carries the daughter's fire against her father's castle, thus enabling the daughter to remain innocent before the father's Parent even though her feelings of resentment and rebellion have been vehemently expressed. In Tartuffe the disagreement between Orgon's Parent and his daughter Marianne's Child over who is to be her future husband is a manifestation of Orgon's need to avoid intimacy with the members of his immediate family. Orgon's Parent soon reveals that it is no Christian in the best sense of the word, but his Parent identifies with the fascist paternal principle of the omnipotent deity ("...je verrois mourir frère, enfants, mère et femme,/ Que je ne m'en soucierois autant que cela;" Tartuffe, I, 5, p. 646), which in turn becomes the dogmatic foundation upon which Orgon's Parent would found his domestic dynasty. Guicharnaud best describes Orgon's hidden, perhaps even subconscious motive in the symbiotic seduction Orgon-Tartuffe:
Ce qu'Orgon recherchait dans ces différents "services," c'était un moyen de commander au nom d'autre chose que lui-même, de s'abandonner à son besoin de domination sans accepter les responsabilités qui accompagnent le pouvoir. Mentalité de sous-officer ou de caporal — cette attitude consiste à affirmer sa force au dépens d'autrui en s'aidant d'une garantie superieure. Dans le cas d'Orgon, certains thèmes de la religion lui offrent un dégagement sans égal. Sa caprice peut s'exercer sur les siens avec pleine licence car la religion lui offrent d'une part la possibilité de mettre son coeur et ses sentiments naturels en sourdine...d'autre part le prétexte d'un ordre infiniment supérieur auquel il doit obéir. Il peut à son aise torturer sans se sentir monstrueux.

Guicharnaud points out that without the strength which dogmatic religiosity imparts to Orgon's Parent, Orgon's defenses against intimacy becomes simply inhuman, anti-social and unnatural.

Orgon's incredible gullibility becomes intelligible and intelligent for readers or spectators when they realize how important it is to Orgon's adapted Child, browbeaten by his own Parent, that he retain his faith in Tartuffe. Orgon's compliant hyperbolical praises of Tartuffe in response to his own Parent tapes turn to evasive Parental malice when Cléante directs an Adult—Adult query to Orgon about the date of Valère's and Mariane's marriage. Orgon side-steps Cléante's attempt to obtain a confirmation of his good faith, and then justifies his purposeful ambiguity with an irrefutable Parent argument.

Cléante: Mais il est nécessaire
         De savoir vos dessins. Quels sont-ils donc?
Orgon: Ce que le Ciel voudra.
(Tartuffe, I, 5, 421, 422, p. 650)

Despite Orgon's expressed belief in justification through God's will, however, his Child betrays an obvious sense of guilt and shame evinced in his furtive glances around the room and in the adjacent closets to detect eavesdroppers before he proposes a new match to Mariane. Orgon's Parent no longer justifies this sudden volte-face in the name of "le Ciel": instead his self-indulgent Child throws a tantrum and demands that Mariane marry Tartuffe so that Orgon can play God's part in the microcosm of his proverbial castle.

The timely entrance of Dorine, who managed to overhear Orgon's proposition despite the latter's painstaking precautions, precipitates the "Uproar" between Orgon and Mariane's alter-ego, Dorine, who later reproaches Mariane's adapted Child for her passive-submissive attitude towards her father. Dorine's active presence in the game is a particularly interesting variation of "Uproar" because of the dramatic intensity that results from the number of abrupt reversals of position in the basic situation: Mariane - victim, Orgon - persecutor, Dorine - rescuer, and because of the bifurcation of Orgon's energy when simultaneously faced with Mariane's passive-adaptive Child and the vehement objections of the natural Child-programmed-Adult expressed by Mariane's alter-ego. Whereas Orgon's power play is designed to force his decision on Mariane's adapted Child, the "Uproar" proceeds from Dorine's defiant natural Child. Thus, in the guise of two different characters Orgon is compelled to contend with Mariane's need to comply and her will to be
gratified:

Dorine: ...qui donne à sa fille un homme qu'elle hait. Est responsable au ciel des fautes qu'elle fait.

Orgon: Je vous dit qu'il me faut apprendre d'elle à vivre.

Dorine: Vous n'en ferez pas mieux de suivre mes leçons.

Orgon: Ne nous amuserons point, ma fille, à ces chansons. Je sais ce qu'il vous faut, et je suis votre père.

(I, Tartuffe, II, l. 514-521, p. 654)

Orgon's success depends on his Parent's ability to quell Mariane's defiance and rebellion out of respect for fatherhood. It is, therefore, imperative that Mariane's alter-ego be silenced if Orgon is to emerge triumphant. Dorine complies with the letter but not the spirit of Orgon's ultimatum to be silent, and, ironically, continues to verbalize her objections while she insists that her remarks are addressed only to herself. Dorine's purpose is obviously to precipitate an "Uproar" which she does so successfully that Orgon retires, albeit not to the bedroom, leaving Dorine momentarily triumphant:

Orgon: Encore un petit mot.

Dorine: Il ne me plait pas, moi.

............... 

Orgon: Enfin ma fille il faut payer
d'obéissance. Et montrer pour mon choix entière déférence.

Dorine: Je me moquerois fort de prendre un tel époux.

Orgon: Vous avez la, ma fille, un peste avec vous. Avec qui sans péché je ne saurois plus vivre. Je me sens hors d'état maintenant de poursuivre. Ses discours insolents m'ont mis l'esprit en feu. Et je vais prendre l'air pour me rasseoir un peu.

(I, Tartuffe, II, 3, 580-594, p. 657)

"Uproar," like other games, can only be initiated and proceed if the required number of players accept the conditions of the game. Had Dorine, for example, not made her timely entrance, the game would have been aborted because Mariane's rebellious instincts would not have been directly or indirectly expressed. Paradoxically, Dorine and Tartuffe both offer Orgon the necessary conditions for re-enforcing his decision to marry his daughter to the hypocrite. Dorine's active resistance to the proposed marriage arouses Orgon's righteous indignation and enables him to expound the usual Parent platitudes about paternal authority. When this active resistance to the principle of obedience is not violated, Orgon must justify his sadistic tendencies on the grounds of the necessity for humility and self-mortification. In Act IV, scène 3, when Mariane begs her father not to force her to marry a man she abhors even if the convent is the only alternative, Orgon's façade is nearly penetrated:

"(se sentant attendrir) Allons, ferme mon coeur, point de faiblesses humaine" (I, Tartuffe, IV, 3, 1293, p. 683). He successfully wards off the
threat of impending intimacy with dogmatic assertions (Parent) which Tartuffe's presence defends and which insure the integrity of his "crimes" against his family: "Plus votre coeur repugne à l'accepter, /
Plus ce sera pour vous matière à mériter; / Mortifiez vos sens avec ce mariage, / Et ne me rompez pas la tête davantage" (I, Tartuffe, IV, 3, 1303, 1306, p. 684).

The dynamics of "Uproar" in Le Malade Imaginaire are basically the same as in Tartuffe with appropriate variations for a new subject and different circumstances, the most important of which is Orgon's imaginary illness. Moore correctly observes that Orgon's hypochondria is the subject of only the first part of the play; the remainder is devoted primarily to a fantastical but frequently bitter satiric attack on the medical profession. The circumstances that surround the "Uproar" belong to that part of the play which makes readers and spectators privy to the psychological origins of Argan's somatic symptoms and which portrays the centripetal force Argan attempts to generate with his diverse complaints. Berne makes the following tailor-made remark about malades imaginaire:

A true hypochondriac not only complains about his health, but uses his complaints in a shrewd way to control his environment. These patients suffer from an excess of inwardly directed or narcissistic libido. They use their energy to 'love themselves.' They continually observe the reactions of their bodies and take alarm at the slightest irregularity.... They call a doctor or visit their favorite quack on the smallest pretext. Their rooms are full of strange medicines and wierd contraptions for giving themselves treatment; many a quack
makes his whole living from feeding the fears of these people and satisfying their self-love. Their households are run entirely for their own comfort no matter what sacrifice this means for the other members of the family, and they will cause an upheaval for the most trivial reasons. 44

The comic in Le Malade Imaginaire largely resides in Argan's naive hyper-concern with his own body and the utter foolishness of his belief in absurd relationships between quacks' prescriptions and his "precarious" state of health. For Orgon truly believes that he is less well this month than last because fewer laxatives, enemas and purges have been administered, that an odd or even number of salt grains may be of medicinal significance, and that it is essential to know whether the doctor's instructions to pace refer to the length or the breadth of his room. The dramatic qualities, on the other hand, are primarily products or by-products of Argan's efforts to "love himself" by subserving others to the fancies of an imaginary invalid's imaginary illnesses.

Either Argan has more insight into the source of his mental aberration than Orgon, or he is more honest. Neither is fully aware of his true motivation, but whereas Orgon never admits his selfishness, Argan proudly proclaims that his daughter must be as completely absorbed in and devoted to Argan's narcissism as the hypochondriac himself:

Ma raison est que me voyant infirme et malade comme je suis, je veux me faire un gendre et des alliés médecins, afin de m'appuyer de bons secours contre ma maladie, d'avoir dans ma famille les sources des remèdes qui sont
nécessaires, et d'être à même des consultations et des ordonnances.... C'est pour moi que je lui donne ce médecin; et une fille de bon naturel doit être ravie d'épouser ce qui est utile à la santé de son père.

(II, Le Malade Imaginaire, I, 5, p. 774)

Toinette is admirably suited to play the part of Angélique's alter ego (rebellious Child) because of her sheer obstinacy and a genuine commitment to the unfortunate daughter's best interest. When Angélique suddenly realizes that the match her father has proposed does not concern the dashing Cléante whom she met only six days earlier but one Thomas Diafoirus, she also finds herself the victim of an earlier admission to the effect that she had a moral responsibility to obey her father in all things. Toinette, however, intervenes to initiate the "Uproar" with precisely those arguments Angélique cannot make in her role of submissive daughter to an ailing father. Toinette protests that (1) Angélique won't marry Thomas Diafoirus; (2) Orgon is too good to carry out the threat to put his daughter in a convent; (3) Diafoirus is beneath Angélique's social, not to mention moral, class; (4) a daughter is entitled to marry according to her own, not her father's, taste. The tension and tempo of the "Uproar" increases until Argan, reminded of the lethal effects of such vigorous physical and emotional activity, collapses in his chair, there to seek the asylum of his second wife's maternal care:

Argan: Chienne!

Toinette: Non je ne consentirai jamais à ce mariage.
Argan: Pendarde!

Toinette: Je ne veux point qu'elle épouse votre Thomas Diafoirus.

Argan: Carogne!

Toinette: Elle m'obéira plutôt qu'à vous.

Angélique: Et! mon père, ne vous faites point malade...

Argan: (se jette dans sa chaise, las de courir après elle) Ah! ah! je n'en puis plus. Voilà pour me faire mourir.

(Le Malade Imaginaire, I, 5, pp. 778, 779)

4. RAPO

It is indeed surprising that one of Molière's most admired heroines is a "Rapo" player when one considers the sordid circumstances that surround a game which frequently ends in the morgue or the courtroom. Such material would certainly not be suitable for comedy in circumstances other than those in Tartuffe where Elmire's "Rapo" is a means to free her step-daughter from Orgon's curse. The game is under Elmire's Adult's control, but the moves bear a striking resemblance to its more sinister counterpart in real life situations.¹⁵

More attention has been paid to Tartuffe's casuistry and his counter-seduction in Act II, scene 3 than to Elmire's role as the
seductress, but it is evident that she initiates the game in accordance with the guidelines established for "Rapo," with the complicity of Dorine. It is Elvire who made the arrangements for a private interview, and it is she who first suggests that the privileged information she will impart must remain confidential: "J'ai voulu vous parler en secret d'une affaire, / Et suis bien aise ici qu'aucun ne nous éclaire!" (I, Tartuffe, III, 3, 897-898, pp. 897, 898). Elmire, Moreover, invites Tartuffe to give expression to his heart-felt feelings, which Tartuffe is so anxious to do that Elmire is thereafter relieved of the task of offering any further provocations in order to manipulate Tartuffe into a compromising situation (hook). Elvire is now in an enviable position for any "Rapo" player: she naively feigns to misunderstand Tartuffe's sexual overtures, thus forcing an overconfident Tartuffe to make an explicit declaration of religion's function in the furtherance of his adulterous intentions. Tartuffe's "platonic" devotion to Elmire's perfection (attributed to her bringing to mind the perfection of her creator) soon becomes nothing more than an eloquent re-statement of "what others don't know won't hurt them or us."

Le soin que nous prenons de notre renommée
Répond de toute chose à la personne aimée,
Et c'est en nous qu'on trouve, acceptant notre coeur,
De l'amour sans scandale et du plaisir sans peur.
(I, Tartuffe, III, 3, 997-1001, p. 673)

The relative innocence and ambiguity of Elmire's provocations, in addition to her privileged position as the wife of Tartuffe's host, guarantees that Tartuffe will be the loser when Elmire stops the game with a threat to
expose Tartuffe's pretensions of piety and asceticism.

Je ne redirai point l'affaire à momepoux;  
Mais je veux en revanche une chose de vous:  
C'est de presser tout franc et sans nulle chicane  
L'union de Valère avec Mariane,  
De renoncer vous-même à l'injuste pouvoir  
Qui veut du bien d'un autre enrichir votre espoir.  
(I, Tartuffe, III, 3, 1015-1020, p. 674)

A partial analysis reveals the same basic structure as in "Rapo" in its "harder" forms:

Aim: Revenge

Roles: Seductress, Wolf

Example: Wronged woman

Social paradigm:
Adult: I'm sorry if you consider my advances improper.

Adult: I do and require a suitable retribution.

Psychological paradigm:
Tartuffe (Child): See how irresistible I am.

Elmire (Child) : NIGYSOB

Moves: (1) Female seduction - Male counter-seduction

(2) Female confrontation - Male collapse

-----Payoff.

The dramatic intensity of this scene and its immediate aftermath is evident in the number of switches of position in a dramatic triangle.
Tartuffe is Elvire's persecutor until she throws the switch, at which time she suddenly becomes the persecutor and Tartuffe the victim. When Damis, the voyeur, makes his appearance, however, Elvire becomes Tartuffe's rescuer and Damis is persecutor. With Orgon's arrival on the scene, the participants again change position: Damis remains the persecutor, Orgon substitutes as rescuer while Tartuffe confesses that he is a justly punished victim. Soon, however, Orgon becomes the persecutor, Damis the victim and Tartuffe the rescuer with the ironic perspective of Tartuffe as persecutor, Orgon as victim and Damis and Elvire in the roles of would-be rescuers.

The most significant variation in the game structure of the second "Rapo" is that Orgon is integrated into the game in the role of voyeur. In the previously discussed scene Elmise remains in complete control of the game by virtue of her power to intervene at any moment with a threat of blackmail and exposure. Events only get out of her control when Damis bursts upon the scene and categorically refuses to be ruled by his stepmother's better judgment. In Act IV, scene 5, however, the very game is predicated upon Elmise's willingness to make Orgon the switch, and it is this condition that is the source of the comic effects since Orgon's failure to intervene gives rise to her futile verbal and physical attempts to communicate her distress to her dullard of a husband. Not only is Orgon the switch, he is also the recipient of the internal social advantage (NIGYSOB) for which Elmise sincerely apologizes to Tartuffe.

Despite these interesting deviations from the basic game
structure, it retains all of its essential characteristics and moves intact:

(1a) Female seduction: Elmire welcomes Tartuffe, rejoicing that Orgon has enjoined Tartuffe to disregard malicious rumors about the latter's intentions toward Elmire, since, she says, it makes their encounters and the free expression of their feelings that much easier.

In response to Tartuffe's objections, Elmire defends her actions in the previous encounter: Tartuffe misinterpreted her feeble resistance to his demands which were calculated to satisfy the demands of conscience (honneur) and to reveal her true feelings to Tartuffe without incurring blame from members of the family. After all, didn't she listen impatiently to all of Tartuffe's professions of love, even insisting that he not marry Mariane so that she be not forced to share her beloved with another woman?

(1b) Male counter-seduction: Tartuffe admits that he is flattered and pleased by Elmire's confession, but he insists that actions speak louder than words. Elmire is forced into a game of "Yes But" as a delaying tactic and as a means to further implicate Tartuffe while she tries to rouse her husband to action. Tartuffe dismisses heaven's objections to adultery and other such silliness on the grounds that sin is determined by one's intentions, but he finally professes callously that the only true sins are those that become public.

(2a) Elmire makes a provisional concession but insists that Tartuffe insure that they are unobserved.
(2b) Tartuffe rejoices, objects to Elmire’s fastidiousness but nevertheless complies with her instructions.

(3a) Confrontation: Orgon confronts Tartuffe (NIGYSOB)

(3b) Disconcertion: Tartuffe momentarily disconcerted.

Although Tartuffe presents the only two examples of "Rapo" in all of Molière’s theater, there are some interesting elements of this game that are integrated into the structure of more important ones. In Act II, scene 1, of George Dandin, for example, the spectators are aware that Angélique’s reprimand of Clitandre is not really a "Rapo" but an impromptu bit of play-acting to be used as evidence in the "Courtroom."

In Monsieur de Pourceaugnac, the "quantité de machines" that Eraste, Sbrigani, Nérine and others have prepared for Pourceaugnac causes such methodical distortions of the real situation that the noble country-bumpkin falls into carefully laid traps at precisely those moments when he is doing his utmost to evade them. The cabale against Pourceaugnac cleverly convinces the prospective father-in-law that Pourceaugnac is ailing with venereal disease, that his motive for marriage is money to pay his enormous debts, and that he is already a bigamist. Meanwhile Sbrigani insinuates that Pourceaugnac’s future bride has a questionable reputation. After much deliberation he finally calls her a "coquette achevée" but strongly implies that her flirtations merit a stronger appellation. As a consequence of the convolutions in the plot, the "Rapo" in Act II, scene 6 follows a course that would normally be its antithesis. Usually counter-seduction leads to the switch and the payoff, but here
Pourceaugnac's refusal to respond to Julie's overt seductive tone ironically produces results like those in the payoff of a genuine "Rapo."
Reality has been distorted to the point that processes of cause and effect are completely reversed.

5. Let's You and Him (Her) Fight (LYAHF)

Berne stipulates that LYAHF may be a maneuver, a ritual or a game. In each case the psychology is essentially feminine, but there are a substantial number of exceptions in literature where a woman is absent or only peripherally involved, such as, for example, Hamlet's duel with Laertes.

As a maneuver LYAHF is romantic. The woman maneuvers two or more contestants into some form of trial by combat in which the winner is promised the hand or favors of the lady. In the best tradition of courtly literature, the novels of Walter Scott, melodrama, or soap opera, the biggest, strongest and most worthy, who also happens to be the heroine's choice, wins the day and the lady.

Chimène's situation vis-à-vis Rodrigue in Corneille's Cid is an interesting hybridization between LYAHF as a maneuver and as a ritual. Chimène is in an impossible psychological corner since she can neither honorably marry her father's slayer nor not love Rodrigue for his paramount virtues. Like many real life situations where what one wants is not what one wants it to be, the only "satisfactory" conclusion requires the death of an important character. Chimène can honorably love Rodrigue
only after his demise, when her father's death has been avenged and Rodrigue's wrong toward herself expiated. The arrangement for a champion, Don Sanche, to fight Rodrigue is both a non-romantic maneuver to avenge her father's death, and a tragic ritual since honor forces Chimène to take an hamartic course of action, and honor, despite momentary doubts about his commitment to duty (devoir), likewise compels Rodrigue to take up the challenge. Chimène loses no matter what the outcome: if Dom Sanche is defeated she loses her honor and if he wins she loses Rodrigue. The "Corner" of which LyaHF is only one aspect is magically resolved by the king, who is superior to the rules which lesser mortals are bound to obey.

Berne notes that as a game LyaHF is comic:

The woman sets up the competition and while the two men are fighting, she decamps with a third. The internal and external psychological advantages for her and her mate are derived from the position that honest competition is for suckers, and the comic story they have lived through forms the basis for the internal and external social advantages.46

Typical of the attitude described by Berne is the hackneyed joke concerning a wife's admonition to her lover not to worry about her husband who is preoccupied elsewhere defending her honor.

In George Dandin, Angélique's appraisal of her husband betrays this kind of scorn for her misshapen bourgeois mate who swept her parents off their feet with a whiff of his fortune and for the social rules intended to normalize marital relations:
Serez-vous assez fort pour avoir cette inquiétude, et pensez-vous qu'on soit capable d'aimer certains maris qu'il y a? On les prend parce qu'on ne s'en peut défendre, et que l'on dépend de parents qui n'ont des yeux que pour le bien; mais on sait leur rendre justice, et l'on se moque fort de les considérer au-delà de ce qu'ils méritent.

(George Dandin, III, 5, p. 224)

For Angélique, LYAHF is a cunning ploy she uses in her position as defendant. She exploits her parents' need to believe in her innocence to negate the validity of Dandin's testimony and then gracefully bows out leaving the Sotenvilles to settle accounts with Dandin.

Although the theme of cuckoldry is a major one in Molière's comedies, wives who actually are intent upon making their husbands cuckolds and who use LYAHF as a part of the strategy only appear in George Dandin and its prototype La Jalousie du Barbouillé. More often, the possibility of becoming a cuckold serves as a caution to old men determined to marry a young woman, as a basis for a protagonist's obsession to keep the prospective bride isolated from a corrupt environment, or as an argument used against materialistic and unsympathetic fathers who insist on marrying their daughters to other materialistic old men, or, in some instances, to young men in a position to perform valuable services for the father.

LYAHF is, nevertheless, a defensive game in some of Molière's better known scenes. In Act II, scene 4, of Dom Juan, for example, the seducer manages to extricate himself from a confrontation with two peasant girls both of whom he has promised to marry by assuring each in private that it is she he truly loves. Dom Juan thereby induces
Mathurine and Charlotte to contest the legitimacy of their claims while he makes a timely exit without compromising his chances for success.

(Bas à Mathurine:) Laissez-lui croire ce qu'elle voudra. (Bas à Charlotte:) Laissez-la se flatter dans son imagination. (Bas à Mathurine:) Je vous adore. (Bas à Charlotte:) Je suis tout à vous. (Bas à Mathurine:) Tous les visages sont laids auprès du vôtre. (Bas à Charlotte:) On ne peut plus souffrir les autres quand on vous a vue. J'ai un petit ordre à donner; je viens vous retrouver dans un quart d'heure. 
(Don Juan, II, 4, p. 740)

Similarly in Act IV, scene 4 of L'Avare, Maître Jacques momentarily manages to escape the consequences of a decision in favor of the father's or the son's better claim to the hand of Mariane by agreeing in private with Harpagon that a son's pretention to marry his father's chosen bride is disgraceful and with Cléante than an aged father who troubles the relationship of two young people is sadistic and foolhardy. Maître Jacques terminates his career as a trouble-shooter with the assurance to each that the other has conceded the rightness of his contention. The miser's utility man then repairs to safety, leaving the negotiants to discover each other's bad faith.

6. COURTRoom

George Dandin is the best example of "Courtroom" as a marital game in all of Molière's theater because the entire play revolves around the attempt of Dandin (plaintiff) to convince his in-laws (judge) that his
wife Angélique (defendant) is guilty of adultery or at least of a conspiracy to commit adultery.  

Within the general "Courtroom" structure of the play there is a rich substratum of games that enriches the play's texture and heightens its comic effects. Dandin plays "Courtroom" with Angélique and the SotENVilles, Angélique plays "Ain't it Awful" with her parents and "See What You Made Me Do" (SWYMD) with her husband. The SotENVilles, in addition to their role of biased judges, enjoy intermittent hands of "Look Ma, No Hands" and "I Told You So."

A complex of "hooks" and "gimmicks" binds the characters together in their game relationships. The SotENVilles begrudgingly married an unwilling daughter to a wealthy tradesman to refurbish a depleted family fortune so that they could maintain their ridiculous and pretentious airs of provincial nobility. Dandin sacrificed a substantial portion of his hard-earned fortune to ally himself with a noble house in order to satisfy his vanity. He recognizes his share of guilt after the fact but is firmly resolved to humble his patronizing in-laws by exposing Angélique's infidelity. Angélique is a married counterpart to the Magdélons, Cathos, and Célimènes who has been forced to marry by her parents and who therefore continues to pursue the amorous pleasures her marriage legally precludes. Dandin is, consequently, hopelessly committed to obtaining a verdict of guilty from the very persons least likely to champion his cause. And even though Dandin himself acknowledges his complicity in his misfortunes (Adult), he continues to play in the chimeric hope of humiliating his condescending in-laws and taking revenge on his cunning wife. (Child):
Vous l'avez voulu, vous l'avez voulu,
George Dandin, vous l'avez voulu, cela
vous sied fort bien, et vous voilà ajusté
comme il faut; vous avez justement ce que
vous méritez. Allons, il s'agit seulement
de désabuser le père et la mère, et je
pourrai trouver peut-être quelque moyen
d'y réussir.

(George Dandin, I, 7, p. 204)

Convinced of his wife's guilt from the outset, Dandin's sus-
picions are confirmed by Lubin who confides to the husband that he, Lubin,
was the intermediary who arranged the first meeting between Clitandre
and Angélique, now in progress. Indignant (Parent) and delighted (Child)
by this evidence of his wife's treachery, Dandin goes in quest of the
Sotenville's that they may witness and pass judgment on their errant
daughter: "Il me faut de ce pas aller faire mes plaintes au père et à
la mère, et les rendre témoins, à telle fin que de raison, des sujets
de chagrin et de ressentiment que leur fille me donne" (II, George
Dandin, I, 3, p. 193). In his haste to present his evidence, however,
Dandin fails to observe the procedural rules the Sotenville's have es-
lished for the plebian they have introduced into their family out of
financial embarrassment. He has the effrontery to call his mother-in-
law his mother-in-law, Monsieur de Sotenville, Monsieur de Sotenville,
and his wife, his wife. Nor does his tactless reminder to these members
of the "gentilhommerie" that his money saved them from aject poverty
endear their son-in-law to the Sotenville's. Dandin manages to file his
complaint between the vehement objections of his in-laws only to discover
that moral if not legal precedents preclude the possibility of his wife's
culpability. Virtue, according to the Sotenville's, is inherent in the
august lineage of Prudoterie and Sotenville. Still the Sotenvilles consent to try the case and to deliver a verdict favorable to Dandin provided the latter can substantiate his allegations. M. de Sotenville's final words, however, ring an ominous note for Dandin's prospects of success: "Suivez moi, mon gendre, et ne vous mettez pas en peine. Vous verrez de quel bois nous nous chauffons lorsqu'on s'attaque à ceux qui nous peuvent appartenir" (George Dandin, I, 5, p. 197).

M. de Sotenville impresses upon Clitandre that nobility and personal merit qualify him to judge the pending case before he confronts the lover with Dandin's accusation. Clitandre flatly denies these allegations, and when he learns the identity of his accuser, he disdainfully compliments Dandin on the protection afforded him by the Sotenvilles for only that, he says, spares him an "épée dans le ventre." Nor does the arrival of Angélique on the scene afford Dandin the prospect of imminent justice. She manages to pacify her judges (A--A), justify her parents' belief in her innocence (C--P), invite Clitandre's further attentions (C--C) and NIGYSOB her pathologically jealous husband (P--C) in one of Molière's inimitable tours de farce:

Moi? et comment lui surais-je dit? est-ce que cela est? Je voudrais le voir vraiment que vous fussiez amoureux de moi. Jouez-vous y, je vous en prie, vous trouverez à qui parler. C'est une chose que je vous conseille de faire. Ayez recours, pour voir, à tous les detours des amants: essayez un peu par plaisir, à m'envoyer des ambassades, à m'écrire secrètement de petits billets doux, à espier les moments que mon mari n'y sera pas, ou le temps que je sortirai, pour me
parler de votre amour. Vous n'avez qu'à y venir, je vous promets que vous serez reçu comme il faut.

(II, George Dandin, I, 6, p. 199)

Angélique appeals to her maidservant and accomplice, Claudine, to confirm her innocence before she withdraws from the hall of justice in the role of wronged spouse, leaving the Sotenvilles to avenge Dandin's trespass. Satisfied that the legal procedures have been followed, "Cela est juste et c'est l'ordre des procédés," M. de Sotenville sentences Dandin to make a public apology to his wife's lover, and then he leaves Dandin to mull over the ironies of destiny.

The game follows the outline furnished for "Courtroom":

Thesis: They've got to say I'm right.

Aim: Reassurance

Roles: Plaintiff (Dandin), Defendant (Angélique), Judges (Sotenvilles).

Dynamics: Sibling rivalry

Example: Married man seeking "help."

Social Paradigm: Adult: This is what she did to me...

Adult: The real facts are these...

Psychological Paradigm: Child: Tell me I'm right.

Parent: Angélique is right.
Advantages:

Biological: Negative stroking from the Sotenvilles, Clitandre and Angélique.

Existential: Depressive position: I'm always wrong.

Internal
  Psychological: Projection of guilt resulting from remorse for complicity in a marriage for egocentric reasons.

External
  Psychological: NIGYSOB.

External
  Social: Courtroom.

The "Courtroom" situation is re-enacted in the second act but the dramatic interest is heightened by some direct confrontations between husband and wife in the pre-trial phase. In Act II, scene 2, Dandin confronts Angélique with his knowledge of her duplicity and gives her a lecture on the marital obligations of a wife to her husband: "Je vous dis encore une fois que le mariage est une chaîne à laquelle on doit porter toute sorte de respect et que c'est fort mal fait à vous d'en user comme vous faites" (George Dandin, II, 2, p. 208). Angélique expends a minimal amount of effort in denying Dandin's accusations before openly declaring her Child resentment for a marriage concluded without her consent: "C'est une chose merveilleuse que cette tyrannie de Messieurs les maris, et je les trouve bien de vouloir qu'on soit mort à tous les divertissements et qu'on ne vive que pour eux." She then blames Dandin and her parents (SWYMD) for the complications in her present
situation:

Moi? Je ne vous l'ai point donnée de bon cœur (her hand in marriage), et vous m'avez l'arrachée. M'avez-vous avant le mariage, demandé mon consentement, et si je voulais bien de vous? Vous n'avez consulté pour cela que mon père et ma mère; ce sont eux proprement qui vous ont épousé, et c'est pourquoi vous ferez bien de vous plaindre toujours à eux des torts que l'on pourra vous faire.

(George Dandin, II, 2, pp. 209, 210)

This recognition of their complicity in the game establishes more firmly their respective roles. They are both committed to pursuing a modified version of Cops (Dandin) and Robbers (Angélique) which will ultimately terminate in "Courtrcom." As Claudine aptly states: "...ce n'est pas lui qu'elle a le plus à menager; c'est son père et sa mère, et pourvu qu'ils soient prévenus, tout le reste n'est point à craindre!" (George Dandin, II, 4, p. 211).

Dandin is again apprised by Lubin that Angélique is presently seeing Clitandre, he again calls on the Sotenvilles to witness Angélique's guilt, is again blamed for his presumption of address and his pathological jealousy and he is again confounded by the wife he catches "en flagrant délit." Angélique contrives a crafty denunciation of Clitandre's advances which appeases her parents at the same time it provides the occasion for a verbal and physical punishment of Dandin:

(To Clitandre) Si mon père savait cela, il vous apprendroit bien à tenter de ces entreprises... L'action que vous avez fait n'est pas d'un gentilhomme, et ce n'est pas en
gentilhomme aussi que je veux vous traiter.
(Elle prend un bâton et bat son mari, au lieu
de Clitandre, qui se met entre-deux).

(George Dandin, II, 8, p. 216)

The second "Courtroom" incident terminated, Dandin is again left alone to bemoan his misfortunes in an heroic supplication of the gods to intervene in the just cause: "O Ciel, seconde mes desseins et m'accorde la grâce de faire voir aux gens que l'on me déshonore" (George Dandin, III, 8, p. 218).

7. CORNER

In the following chapter on "scripts," a great deal of attention will be devoted to a particular form of "Corner" which Gregory Bateson and his associates have called the "double-bind." We shall not, therefore, deal with "Corner" extensively here.

The "Corner" situation involves a manipulation of other persons into a position where their only choices are unpalatable ones. In many of Molière's plays a "Corner" played between a father and a daughter, such as "Tartuffe or the convent!" or "Diafoirus or the convent!" have little dramatic interest in themselves because power rather than deception and covert manipulation is the determining factor. Tartuffe and Le Malade Imaginaire focus attention on other games within the "Corner" that have more dramatic potential such as "Uproar" and NIGYSOB. In those plays where a cunning servant must manipulate a master to whom he is subservient in the normal social hierarchy, however, "Corner"
assumes a more dramatically rewarding dimension, as in *Les Fourberies de Scapin* when Scapin offers a thrifty Géronte the choice between losing his son or paying a ransom of 500 crowns. Géronte's celebrated complaint, "Mais que diable allait-il faire dans cette galère," accentuates his discomfort in the claustrophobic confines of his psychological corner.

The double-bind is a particularly vicious type of "Corner" because the information needed to make reality-oriented decision is subconscious. The capability of making conscious rational choices is therefore eliminated, and this fact we shall contend explains why Alceste is both a frustrated character and frequently an exasperating one for audiences.

An important element of the universal appeal in Molière's theater is its evocation of the Child's situation and desires amongst more powerful Parent figures. In the absence of an option to express aggression, resentment, or rebellion directly against the censoring force, indirect and socially acceptable means are devised which camouflage an ulterior intent beneath a superficially benign façade. The games which we have discussed are ways the child solved its problems in a recurrent type of situation in childhood, and the Child continues to believe in the viability of the game formula on the basis of its past experience despite the fact that the person's existential position has changed.

Games are often the source of the paradoxical comic-pathetic nature of Molière's plays. The audience perceives that the characters' archaic Child or Parent input complicates rather than solves his ostensible
problems—hence the situations are comically incongruous. Some spec-
tators and critics, however, are sensitive to the systematic discounting
of the Child's feelings and ideas which the stage character experiences
in the play and which we have all experienced to varying degrees in real
life.
CHAPTER III

SCRIPTS
The most obvious conclusion to be drawn from three centuries of criticism of Molière's enigmatic Alceste is that interpretations have varied radically with changes in the intellectual and social climate as well as with the personal prejudices of critics.

Although the Misanthrope was not one of Molière's brilliant financial successes, contemporary connoisseurs recognized that it was a masterpiece. A letter published in the Gazette de Loret hailed the play as the best of Molière's comedies, finding the language appropriate, vigorous and original, and the subject an edifying critique of contemporary moral turpitude by a sage who hated vice and not humanity. Even some of Molière's usual detractors, like Subligny, paid tribute to Molière's dramatic genius as exhibited in this latest masterpiece, while condemning the moral content of the play for unstated reasons.

The most perceptive contemporary criticism, however, was that of Donneau de Visé, whose opinions, as W. G. Moore contends, may have been enlightened by Molière's own views on the play. In any event, de Visé affirms that the Misanthrope is above all a satire on seventeenth-century social practices, a conception which, in his view, dictated the choice of the main characters. The social satire, de Visé notes, is the product of the dialectics in successive confrontations of the play: Alceste and Philinte, Alceste and Oronte, Alceste and Célimène, Alceste and Arsinée, etc.

De Visé, moreover, recognizes the complexity and contradictions
inherent in Alceste's character. Alceste is basically an "honnête homme" who is amusing without being ridiculous, a hero who, midst his unreasonable fulminations and his pathologically jealous outbursts, makes perceptive criticisms about the superficiality of seventeenth-century upper-class society. In this sense, de Visé concludes, Alceste's excessive demands are in the best tradition of social reform for "...pour obliger les hommes à se corriger un peu de leurs défauts, il est nécessaire de les leur faire paraître bien grands." 50

The play-going public in the eighteenth-century remained largely indifferent to the Misanthrope, because they did not appreciate its comic aspects and because the sketchy plot failed to maintain their interest. Voltaire, the torch-bearer of the classical tradition, judged the comedy lacking in dramatic content; (a brilliant work to be appreciated by an intellectual elite but more to be read than acted, he observes, and adds to this criticism that the most lively and interesting verbal exchanges are extraneous to the central theme and contribute little to the play as a dramatic spectacle).

The most far-reaching criticism leveled against the Misanthrope in the eighteenth century was that of Jean-Jacques Rousseau. He took violent exception to Molière's ridiculing of Alceste, who in his view is not a misanthrope but an altruist whose love for mankind is borne out by his damning criticism of its faults. Jean-Jacques asserts it would be easier for Alceste to ignore the perversity of the human species, but he elects instead to point out human depravity in the same spirit a loving father berates a wayward child. Molière was, moreover, a vicious, socially
destructive, selfish profiteer, whose only interest was in pleasing a decadent public. His méchanceté is evident in the manner he renders a high-minded, virtuous man ridiculous in the eyes of the spectator and glorifies Philinte, a glib deceiver who distorts the truth and proclaims that all is well because he is satisfied with the world and himself. In fact, Molière missed the perfect opportunity to instruct the beholder: had the author juxtaposed an Alceste always fulminating against vice and indifferent to personal insults and injustices with a Philinte who calmly accepted public depravity but ranted about personal misfortunes, the cause of social justice would have been properly served.

Taking their cue from Rousseau, the Romantics and some later nineteenth-century critics focused their attention on an unjustly persecuted Alceste and largely neglected other characters except in their relationship to the misanthrope. Goethe, MacCaulay, Alfred de Musset and Sainte-Beuve emphasized Alceste's sincerity, his nobility, his unselfishness and his heroic qualities mercilessly quashed by an insensitive flirt and a hostile world. In their view, as in Rousseau's, Philinte is egocentric and apathetic, accepting the basest compromises in the interest of expediency.

The opposite outlook was also advocated by a substantial number of critics and commentators. Napoleon, Taine, Schlegel, Paul de St. Victor, Emile Augier, Coquelin, Edouard Thierry, considered Alceste a peevish, maladjusted malcontent. They deemed Philinte, on the other hand, to exemplify those virtues that make society functional: common sense, indulgence for his fellow-man's shortcomings, a fundamental honesty and
sincerity tactfully tempered by good sense in trying situations.

Still oriented towards a social moral implied in Molière's juxtaposition of Philinte and Alceste, other critics rejected the extremes in favor of a middle course. Among others, d'Alembert, Chamfort, P. Mesnard, F. Hemon, Larroumet, Faguet, and Rigal found laudable and undesirable qualities in both Philinte and Alceste. Both characters are worthy of praise to the extent that their behavior is reasonable and reprehensible in their excessive severity or indulgence. Another faction found both characters unfit models for any social order and accordingly rejected both.

Until recently, Molière's Alceste had been appraised almost entirely out of the context of the play. In the interim between de Visé's letter written in 1666 and the 1940's the vast majority of critics amused themselves speculating about the relationships between Alceste's bizarre behavior and Molière's marital difficulties. Some of them neatly fitted their diverse interpretations of Alceste into their reconstructions of Molière's personal philosophy based on parallel situations in other plays or the prevailing social attitudes in seventeenth century France. Finally, Alceste has been the butt of many critics' personal ideas of what is and is not socially desirable.

During the past three or four decades, critics have reappraised old interpretations of Alceste and advanced new ones in an attempt to do justice to the Misanthrope as a dramatic creation. Lancaster, Moore, and Hubert categorically reject the idea that Molière willfully aired his private grievances on the stage. Taking exception to critics like
Léautaud, who consider many of the scenes in the play to be dramatizations of known incidents in the author's life, these men argue that "Anything in the nature of subjective romantic criticism is quite unthinkable from such a man, working in such a milieu at such a trade." They also repudiate the notion that Alceste is the subject of the play, which is, in their view and as de Visé noted, a satire des moeurs or what Moore calls a "Rochefoucauldian" vision of the nature of society:

I cannot find Molière anywhere in his play precisely because that play is a great comedy. It seems to me to present no lesson, to advocate no view ... a vision presenting an issue from many angles. The subject is central to the age - the nature of society ... The ground plan, so to say, of its vision is drawn by Molière's gifted contemporary, La Rochefoucauld, who states that 'complaisance' is necessary in any society but that it tends to become servitude and must therefore be checked.52

The contrary point of view is most persuasively expounded by René Jasinski. Jasinski maintains that the primary sources for the Misanthrope are Molière's stormy relationship with Armande Béjart, professional rivalries, and the vicissitudes of any seventeenth-century playwright vying for patronage and public esteem. This critic considers Molière's duo, Alceste-Philinte, to be two conflicting aspects of Molière's personality. Alceste represents Molière's deceptions, frustrations and despair exorcised by making Alceste a figure of fun. Philinte voices the playwright's point of view when he confronts Alceste with the absurdity of his misanthropic behavior. Adam also acknowledges the possible psychological bond between Molière and his creation. Molière,
perhaps unconsciously, created an Alcèste who expresses his creator's
anger and sadness as well as his awareness of his own shortcomings.

Recent critics have approached Alcèste from a number of different
starting points that have furnished some perceptive insights into his
character and behavior. It is noteworthy that, insofar as Alcèste the
character is concerned, they have reached similar conclusions.

W. G. Moore, in his influential book, Molière, a New Criticism,
finds that the basic relationship in Molière's personages is that between
the mask and the face. Alcèste, in Moore's opinion, is static; his
attitudes do not change with the progression of time in the play. Scenes
are cleverly arranged to reveal the differences between Alcèste in
theory and Alcèste in practice or in other words the contradiction in
the mask and the man.

Although there is some disagreement over the significance of
detail, Moore, Hubert, Brody, Guicharnaud, Gossman and Jasinski all
agree that the fundamental absurdity in Alcèste's behavior is the
misanthrope's blindness as concerns his own motives. Alcèste prides him-
self on being sincere, on being himself in all circumstances, thereby
unmasking the social hypocrisy of those around him. Paradoxically,
he becomes a mask as a result of his exaggerated desire to be himself,
and he imagines himself to be not merely a sincere man, but truth,
sincerity, and justice incarnate.

The plethora of interpretations and the polemics that have
surrounded Alcèste for three centuries are indicative of critics' in-
ability to comprehend him completely, and it would appear that this is
necessarily so. The ambiguity of a work of art is one of its most frustrating and rewarding characteristics, a kind of infinite prism whose multiple faces are successively illuminated, each new dimension exposing new vistas without ever completely revealing the whole.

Critical works on Molière, as in the case of all "sanctified" literary giants, are replete with apologies for "yet another" interpretation of France's most revered comic playwright. In the final analysis, every approach is a partial one, every proffered idea provokes opposite or alternative approaches or interpretations. It is perhaps the most enduring monument to Molière's genius that some of his characters escape hard-and-fast classifications, that different perspectives alter an Alceste's, a Dom Juan's or an Arnolphe's personality until the features as they were first perceived are scarcely recognizable at a later date ... or are they? And so the battle rages over what Molière's characters are or are not, his texts, like the Bible, furnishing ample material for every point of view.

The critical approach to be used here is "structural" in the broadest sense that the word has when it is applied to literary criticism, that is, certain aspects of some psychological theories are considered axiomatic and used as the basic constructs in the evaluation of Alceste.

It appears hypothetically possible that the recourse to moral judgments, value judgments or interpolations of Molière's marital difficulties are almost unavoidable in the attempt to appreciate Alceste fully precisely because the information about him in the play is inadequate to explain the obvious contradictions in his mental attitudes and his actions.
When the curtain rises or the text is opened, the spectator or reader perceives Alceste at a given point in his own physical and psychical maturation, observes the character's acts and gestures, hears his plaintive or vituperative complaints for whatever period of time it requires to complete the dramatic script, and then Alceste disappears to be rejuvenated at some later staging or re-reading. No matter what emotional reaction one has to this enigmatic character, he is a bundle of contradictions, perhaps because we see Alceste as he has become and not the processes of his arrival. This at least is the fundamental assumption that underlies the following interpretation.

The fact that Alceste's attitudes are stereotyped and his reactions predictable, that there are "patterns of contradiction" suggests that there may be some kind of personality structure of which we are not fully apprised. From the spectator's point of view then, Alceste could be compared to an unassembled puzzle with a few parts missing. If one successfully assembles the parts available, the general outlines of the entire structure can be delineated with the available pieces, and the general shape of some essential missing ones determined by the shape of the empty spaces. The conjectural situation which enables one to integrate Alceste's contradictory behavior into a comprehensible pattern corresponds to the missing parts of the puzzle, and the constructs whose projection enables one to arrive at the above mentioned hypothetical situation are the axiomatic principles of construction.
A "script" as it is defined in Transactional Analysis is a life plan formulated at an early age based upon childhood experiences and impressions absorbed when the child unfortunately has too little information at its disposal to evaluate properly the appropriateness of its decisions, and it evolves toward a cohesive life plan in later childhood and early adolescence. According to Berne, the first script programming takes place during the nursing period in the form of short protocols which can later be elaborated into complicated dramas:

Usually these are two-handed scenes between the baby and his mother, with little interference from the on-lookers, if any, and with such breast-fed titles as 'Public Performance!' 'It's Not Time Yet,' 'Whenever you're ready,' 'Hurry Up,' 'He Who Bites Gets Brushed Off,' 'While Mother Smokes,' 'He Looks Pale,' etc.53

The toilet training phase is also a critical one in the determination of a child's life script because the child then acquires some power in an infantile situation. Parental figures, usually the mother, are forced to bribe, cajole, threaten or force the child to perform, and the child by virtue of the attention he receives, regards his excrement like the Golden Apples of Hesperides that he can give or withhold as it suits his fancy. In many instances a child's conclusions about himself and the world around him are fixed by this time, and barring Adult re-evaluation of his early script decisions, he will find fairy tales, experiences and persons to re-enforce his early impressions: "It is already fairly predictable who the winners and losers will be." Berne
observes, "Isn't he amazing?" re-enforced two years later with 'That's a good boy' will usually do better than 'What's he fussing about?' re-enforced one year later by 'Enema tube.'"

Although it is not our intention to write a novel about Alceste's childhood which will completely explain the contradictions inherent in his personality, we must have recourse to an archetypal situation to use as a critical tool in a character evaluation. Alceste's behavior reminds us of the game "Corner" briefly discussed at the conclusion of the previous chapter. Alceste is in a situation where no matter what action he or other people take the results are unsatisfactory and end in a tragic conclusion to a life script. "Corner," according to Berne, is found in a somewhat different form as a family game involving children where it resembles the "double-bind" described by Bateson and his associates. Here the child is cornered so that whatever he does is wrong. The Bateson school suggests that this may be an important etiological factor in schizophrenia, and conversely that schizophrenia may be the child's antithesis to "Corner":

Experience in treating adult schizophrenics with game analysis bears this out, that is, if the family game of 'Corner' is analyzed to demonstrate that the schizophrenic behaviour was and is specifically undertaken to counter this game, proper remission occurs in a properly prepared patient. 55

A classical example of the double-bind type described by Bateson 56 will prove to be, we hope, an illuminating point of departure for the study of Alceste. A mother invites her young child to be
embraced but when he snuggles up to her breast, it arouses her sexual anxieties and she violently repulses the child's non-verbally expressed need for intimate contact. The child naively draws four conclusions based on this encounter which hypothetically "scripts" his future conduct. (1) Invitations to intimacy are an insincere come-on which result in a form of punishment. (2) Expressions of the need for recognition are in themselves subject to punishment. (3) To avoid pain in accordance with the pleasure principle such desires must be suppressed. (4) Based on my experience with mother this is what the external world is and this is how I must relate to the external world. Berne cryptically remarks on the implications of script theory:

It is incredible to think, at first, that man's fate, all his nobility, and all his degradation, is decided by a child no more than six years old, and usually three, but that is what script theory claims. It is a little easier to believe after talking to a child of six, maybe three. And it is easy to believe by looking around at what is happening in the world today, and what happened yesterday, and seeing what will probably happen tomorrow.  

A tragic script of human life, then, embodies a sense of destiny or fate as in Oedipus Tyrannus or some plays by Racine. Phèdre in this respect can be used as the basis for a comparison between life and tragic scripts. From a certain point of view Phèdre is not responsible for her irrepressible sexual desire for Hippolyte but the victim of an hereditary condition transmitted to her as a consequence of her mother's illicit love for Minos' bull, who is in turn partially responsible for his
wife's guilt since it was the very bull Jupiter had demanded in sacrifice. Games and scripts are also transmitted from parents to progeny in a seemingly hereditary way. In the above cited "double-bind" situation, for instance, the mother's reaction to her child's intimate embrace ultimately becomes the child's response to future analogous situations. Thus the Phaedra story can be viewed as an abstract image of script function, and drama in general as an intuitive derivative of life scripts.

There are indeed a number of comparisons to be made between drama in its most general sense and the notion of life scripts. (1) Both are based on a limited number of themes and situations of which the Oedipal one is the best known. (2) In principle, if the transactional script analyst or the drama critic is familiar with the plot and characters, both know what the final outcome will be. (3) There are frequent rewrites, revisions and rehearsals in the creation of life and dramatic scripts before the final formulation of a definitive version. (4) Life script scenes and theatrical ones are set up by prior events and fantasies before they are enacted. The man who runs out of gas, for example, usually sets the scene up two or three days in advance with a mental observation that the tank is nearly empty and a plan to get some "sometime soon." Repeated plans and re-enactments of this nature, according to Berne, are evidence of a pre-planned scene in a "loser's" script. Similarly, Alceste's confrontations with Célimène are nearly always premeditated before the actual scene is enacted, and Célimène is usually acutely aware of the pre-planning stage, for instance, in their
initial confrontation in Act II, scene 1:

Alceste: Madame, voulez-vous que je vous parle net? De vos façons d'agir je suis mal satisfait; Contre elles dans mon coeur trop de bile s'assemble ...

Célimène: C'est pour me quereller donc, à ce que je vois. Que vous avez voulu me ramener chez-moi.

(Le Misanthrope, II, 1, 447-456, p. 832)

In the above mentioned example of the "double-bind" situation one of the child's probable reactions to similar future incidents will be to suppress conspicuous manifestations of his desire for intimacy. This suppression, however, is not an elimination of his narcissistic libidionous wish, but only the suppression of its overt expression, that is, as has been repeatedly demonstrated in recent years, "... punishment has the effect of teaching the organism to hold back the punishable responses. The impulse or wish remains as strong as ever." In effect when the child suppresses punishable behavior he embraces his own and his mother's original action and reaction, both the desire to express and the act of suppression. He stops directing various energies outward in an attempt to manipulate and bring about changes in the environment that will satisfy his needs; instead, he redirects activity inward and substitutes himself in the place of the environment as the target of behavior. To the extent that he does this, he splits his personality into "doer" and "done to." The child is then constantly organizing his motor apparatus, his posture, pattern of muscular tonus and incipient movements in the direction of expression and organizing opposing forces so that the net result is a
prolonged stalemate until one or the other force predominates. Berne likens this internal muscular and mental conflict between Exteropsychic prejudices and Child desires to a jet aircraft in preparation for take-off: the pilot simultaneously brakes and races the engine—equal but opposite forces neutralizing each other—until the brakes are released and the pent-up energy hurtles the craft forward.

Alceste, as he is most commonly portrayed, evidences the physical symptoms of conflicting emotional responses. Every part of his psychic and corporeal structure striving in the direction of expression are pitted against those that favors suppression until one or the other collapses and the seething contents blow off the lid of Freud's metaphorical cauldron:

J'entre en une humeur noire, et un chagrin profond
Quand je vois vivre entre eux les hommes comme ils font;
Je ne trouve partout que lâche flatterie,
Qu'injustice, intérêt, trahison, fourberie;
Je n'y puis plus tenir, j'engage et mon dessein
Et de rompre en visière à tout le genre humain.
(Le Misanthrope, I, 1, 91-96, p. 820)

In the stereotyped comedy so frequent in Molière's theater wherein a son or daughter has to eliminate parental opposition in order to have his/her way, there is an Agon conflict between the various characters of the play. The parents and children for the most part espouse the patterns of behavior that correspond respectively to the Parent and Child ego-states. The parent figure then blocks the child's desire for an object of affection other than the one designated by virtue of the legal power vested in the figure of authority which enables him
to interfere with his son's or daughter's plans, and he/she also propounds the Parent maxims of bourgeois morality about wealthy, social position and the advantages of a prestigious marriage. The Adult function enabling the hapless lover to obtain his/her wish-gratification by circumventing the paternal obstacle is embodied in the character of a capable servant—a Mascarille or a Scapin—whose knowledge of both father's and son's weaknesses and desires enables him to manipulate them at will. The distinction is not entirely accurate in all instances, particularly as concerns the Mascarilles and Scapins, but in terms of their roles, the tyrannical father, the helpless son or daughter, and the clever rogue or maidservant are functionally analogous to the Parent, Child and Adult, respectively.

Alceste is almost unique in Molière's theater because what interests us in the character is not only the external but also the structural or internal conflicts between his own Parent judgments and injunctions and his Child cravings. Alceste subsumes both aspects of the struggle between extropysychic prejudices and archeopsychic desires which in comedies like L'Etourdi or Les Fourberies de Scapin are inter-character agon struggles. J. Guicharnaud's judgment that Alceste places himself in "... un univers déchiré entre la réalité faite de mensonges et de crimes, et une valeur faite de sincérité et d'honneur" because he only feels comfortable in a world where the real and the ideal do not coincide, is correct but incomplete insofar as he fails to point out Alceste's struggle with Alceste.

As in the "double-bind" situation, Alceste is torn by the desire
to approach other people and the knowledge that attempts to approach others results in rejection. The desire for Child gratification is expressed in his resounding "Je veux qu'on me distingue" and the Parental prejudicial attitude imprinted as a consequence of maternal rejection in his unequivocal position that men are irremediable insincere, perverse and unworthy, which antipathy he thunderously makes known in spite of Philinte's objections to the contrary:

Non: elle [sa haine] est générale, et je hais tous les hommes: Les uns parce qu'ils sont méchants et malfaisants, Et les autres, pour être aux méchants complaisants, Et n'avoir point pour eux ces haines vigoureuses Que doit donner le vice aux âmes vertueuses.  
(Le Misanthrope, I, L, 118-122, p. 820)

In the primal example, the child records in his Parent that even the person nearest and dearest to him is not to be trusted, but the mother also communicates her own Child anxieties to the child's Child, that is the feeling of impending rejection or in Transactional Analysis' popularized vocabulary, of "not OKness." In the first instance the child's Parent position is "I'm OK, You're not OK" (I+, You-); in the second, if the Child in the child focuses on its rejection, his attitude toward himself and others is "I'm not OK, You're OK" (I-, You+). The double message delivered almost simultaneously to the Child is illustrated in the following script matrix:
In conclusion, if the child adopts the Parent attitude \( I^+ \), \( YO^- \), he frustrates his desire for gratification by others, whereas if the child's \( C \) is cathexed, \( 6_1 \), he anticipates and strives for rejection.

Although both the superior Parent position and the inferior Child position are evident in Alceste's personality, even a superficial examination of the text reveals that Alceste's predominant attitude is \( I^+ \), \( YO^- \). The supercilious condescension he displays toward other people provides a façade of moral virtue that hides Alceste's Child feelings of inferiority and furnishes a self-justification for imposing his vision on the world and for setting himself up as the ultimate arbiter of social values and practices. The dual aspect of the problem is summarized in psychological terms by Fritz Perls et. al:

The fear of rejection is crucial with every neurotic.... The picture of being rejected—first by his parents and now by his friends—is one that the neurotic goes to great lengths to establish and maintain. While such claims may have substance, the opposite is also certainly true—that the neurotic rejects others for not living up to some fantastic ideal or standard which he imposes on them. Once he has projected his rejecting
onto the other person, he can without feeling any responsibility for the situation, regard himself as the passive object of all kinds of unwarranted hardship, unkind treatment or even victimization.\textsuperscript{62}

Alceste's neurosis, moreover, is schizoid in character if not schizophrenic in intensity. In the mental illness called schizophrenia, the patient imagines that the world does correspond to his \textit{a priori} notion of it and does not bother to confirm his feelings. "He [the schizophrenic]," says Berne, "differs from the aggressive reformer or the conqueror in that he is unable or unwilling to do the work of changing 'I want' into 'is'.\textsuperscript{63} The use of "I want" in the above quotation is particularly descriptive of Alceste's vituperative impotence to remake mankind into the fantasy world of his impossible "je veux" in which Alceste would become the omnipotent deity midst lesser "not OK" beings:

\begin{verbatim}
Je veux qu'on soit sincère et qu'en homme d'honneur
On ne lâche aucun mot qui ne parte du coeur.
(I, Le Misanthrope, I, 1, 35, 36, p. 818)

Je veux qu'on me distingue, et pour le trancher net,
L'ami du genre humain n'est point du tout mon fait.
(I, Les Misanthrope, I, 1, 63, 64, p. 819)

Je veux que l'on soit homme, et qu'en toute rencontre
Que ce soit lui qui parle ...
(I, Le Misanthrope, I, 1, 69, 70, p. 819)

Qui je veux? La raison, mon bon droit, l'équité.
(I, Le Misanthrope, I, 1, 187, p. 822)
\end{verbatim}

In the terminology peculiar to Transactional Analysis, Alceste
has an excluding Parent whose express function is to prevent the Child's feelings of inferiority from surfacing:

Exclusion is manifested by a stereotyped predictable attitude which is steadfastly maintained as long as possible in the face of any threatening situation. The constant Parent, the constant Adult, the constant Child all result primarily from defensive exclusion of the two complementary aspects in each case. Secondary transactional gains tend to re-enforce the exclusion.

The excluding Parent is classically found in compensated schizophrenics, and in such cases exclusion constitutes the principal defense against the confused archaopsychic activity. Such people have the greatest difficulty acknowledging the Child since the object of the exclusion is to control and deny that aspect. 64

In Brody's judgment, the essential question posed by Alcesté's "bizzarrie" is neither social as Moore contends nor altruistic as Rousseau demands but rather concerns the problem of how to assert one's individuality without incurring reproach. Alcesté is right in principle but wrong in the manner in which he presents his arguments; he has no notion of the proper way to assert himself in given circumstances, as evidenced in the jealous tirades transposed from Dom Garcie de Navarre. Alcesté believes his furor to be sincere, according to Brody, but his contumelious manner of expressing his love is socially unacceptable and remains so until he finished the insulting harangue addressed to the woman he ostensibly loves. Even in the most painful moment of self-humiliation when he almost unconditionally succumbs to his "weakness" for the coquette, his sentiments, like Arnolphe's, rebuff rather than gain
Célimène's sympathy.

Disregarding the rightness, wrongness, unreasonableness, or child-
ishness of Alceste's conduct, the inappropriately violent expression of
Alceste's reactions in several scenes result from the excluding Parent
and are characterized by the classical counter-transference reaction.65
In a psycho-therapeutic setting, counter-transference refers to an un-
justifiably strong punitive Parent reaction to a patient not warranted
by the situation or by the therapist's relationship to the patient. The
therapist transfers the accumulated frustrations of id tensions on the
patient, who is in no way responsible for the aroused feelings. The
therapist's aggressive impulses are expressed against an object that ex-
cites them, but which is not etiologically related to them.

Alceste's vituperative condemnation of Philinte in the opening
scene of the play bears evidence that Alceste is responding from the ex-
cluding Parent to a scene that actually occurred sometime in the past,
precisely because it is an inappropriate expression of aggression. Alceste
is not involved in nor in reality personally threatened by Philinte's
warm greeting of a passing acquaintance, but he reacts pathologically
from the punitive Parent as though his friend's reaction to a third
person were an immediate threat to his own person: "Allez, vous devriez
mourir de pure honte," (I, Le Misanthrope, I, l, 14, p. 817) he says, and
then proceeds to qualify Philinte's benign attitude as "indigne,"
"infâme," "lâche," and finally asserts that any man with a moral sense
would promptly hang himself after such a shameful display of falseness.
All of Philinte's attempts to catech Alceste's Adult with rational
arguments about the necessity for a degree of social conformity, tact, or reminders of the ridiculous figure Alceste cuts with his constant moralizing are in vain because the misanthrope's psychic stability requires that he maintain an I+, You- attitude towards his environment. Thus when Philinte objects that "On entend les gens au moins sans se fâcher" (Le Misanthrope, I, 1, 4, p. 817), Alceste crosses the transaction with a categorical refusal of the appeal to reason: "Moi je veux me fâcher et je ne veux point entendre" (Le Misanthrope, I, 1, 5, p. 817). Several lines further along, when Philinte remonstrates that Célimène's indulgence in the social vices Alceste most deplores is evidence that she is the least suited to his unwavering morality, Alceste likewise answers with an unequivocal refusal to lucidly examine his love relationship.

Two later scenes are analogous to the initial one insofar as they underscore Alceste's passive-aggressive propensity to react to rather than to take positive action against. In Act II, scene 4, his attempt to force Célimène to make a decision for or against his suit is aborted by the arrival of one and then several of the regular members of Célimène's salon. Congregated for the express purpose of indulging in their favorite pastime (Ain't it Awful), the scandalmongers successively denounce a pedant, a busybody, a name-dropper, a prudish bore, a pretentious egotist and a hypercritical wit before Alceste interrupts in the arrogated role of spoiler. "Allons, ferme, poussez mes bons amis de cour;/ Vous n'en épargnez point, et chacun a son tour;" (Le Misanthrope, II, 4, 651-652, p. 840). Here again an action by other
people concerning absent third persons is complete or well in progress before Alceste intervenes.

Similarly, when the prude Arsinoé delivers one of Célimène's letters addressed to his arch-rival, Oronte, Alceste storms back to Célimène's salon, callously proposes to Eliante, convinced that his revenge should matter so much to this latter that she will voluntarily consecrate the rest of her life to assuage his spite. And when Célimène happens upon the scene, Alceste, not entirely without justification, again vents his wrath after the fact: "Que toutes les horreurs dont une âme est capable/ A vos déloyautés n'ont rien de comparables;/ Que le sort, les démons et le Ciel en courroux/ N'ont jamais produit de si méchant que vous" (I, Le Misanthrope, IV, 3, 1281-1284, pp. 859, 860). Célimène, however, is a special case, and cannot be grouped with Philinte, Oronte, Acaste and Clitandre, even though she embraces the same "vices."

Psychodynamically, Alceste adopts his hypothetical mother's reaction to threatening social encounters. Just as in the "double-bind" invitation-approach-rejection situation, the mother's rejection of the child is a defense against anxieties aroused by intimate relationships (I+, You-, a defense against I-, You+), so Alceste now reacts toward others because libidinous gratification is in itself (perceived from Alceste's excluding Parent) as an illicit act. Further, as concerns Alceste's own relationships with other people, his harsh criticisms for actions that in reality do not affect him alienates their sympathies before any relationship can be established. Thus, Alceste's reprimand of
Philinte, for example, serves both as a form of self-affirmation and as a way to eliminate impending intimacy with his "best friend," because the acknowledgment of even Philinte's OKness menaces his own + position. Only Philinte's grudging admiration and an inexplicable loyalty prevents him from renouncing the misanthrope as all others do in the course of the play.

As a game form, the first altercation between the misanthrope and Philinte and later between Alceste and Célimène's "côtérie" are blatant NIGYSOBS, the aim of which is self-justification. Since Alceste's internal psychological motive is to avoid the confrontation of his own infirmities through a condemnation of other peoples's deficiencies, it is essential that the reprehensible act be complete before his intervention. The provocation unwittingly provided by Philinte justifies Alceste's rage, and each successive defense proffered by Philinte further confirms Alceste's existential position that people cannot be trusted. Unbeknown to himself, Alceste reveals the aim of the game in both instances—a confirmation of his a priori moral position and the will to exploit whatever situations provide verifications. In the first scene Alceste's preconception of others stated after Philinte's provocation is that "Tous les hommes me sont à tel point odieux,/ Que je serois fâché d'être sage à leurs yeux" (Le Misanthrope, I, 1, 111-112, p. 280), and in the second that "...jamais morbleu! les hommes n'ont raison,/ Que le chagrin contre eux est toujours de saison,/ Et que je vois qu'ils sont sur toutes les affaires,/ Loueurs impertinents, ou censeurs téméraires" (Le Misanthrope, II, 4, 687-690, p. 841).
The mysterious lawsuit of unknown origin that winds its way through four acts of the play is a duplication on a more grandiose scale of Alceste's confrontation with Philinte. Alceste refuses to intervene before the verdict is rendered, rejecting Philinte's admonition to pay the customary visits to the judge and justifying his passive indifference to the procedural aspects of the case in the name of "la raison, mon bon droit, l'équité". (Le Misanthrope, I, 1, 186, p. 822). Under Philinte's meticulous probing, however, it soon becomes apparent that Alceste's motives are not as pure as he would have us believe; he will derive the same psychological pay-off (I+ You-) from an adverse decision as he did from the unequivocal denunciation of Philinte's "baseness": "J'aurai le plaisir," he says, "de perdre mon procès" and adds a few lines later "Je voudrais, m'en coutât-il grand-chose/ Pour la beauté du fait avoir perdu ma cause" (Le Misanthrope, I, 1, 201, 202, p. 823).

When the verdict is finally rendered against Alceste in the fifth act, Philinte urges Alceste either to resort to a court of appeals to defeat his cunning rival or to accept stoically the court's decision. Philinte, who approaches every problem in a pragmatic, reality-oriented way, fails to understand Alceste's indifference to the real question of personal or social injustice. Thus in spite of Philinte's relevant and rational suggestions and objections, Alceste affirms his psychic imperative that others must be "not OK."
Non je veux m'y tenir.
Quelque sensible tort qu'en tel arrêt me fasse,
Je me garderai bien de vouloir qu'on le casse...
Ce sont vingt mille francs qu'il pourra me coûter,
Mais pour vingt mille francs, j'aurai le droit de pester
Contre l'iniquité de la nature humaine
Et de nourrir pour elle une immortelle haine.
(I, Le Misanthrope, V, l, 1540-1550, p. 868)

There is a paradoxical but explicable inversion of the real
situation from Alceste's point of view, succinctly presented in his law-
suit, that reaffirms the primacy of an early double-bind rejection
scene. In the real situation Alceste is tried and convicted (rejected),
but on the psychological level of Alceste's schizoid delusions where
the "je veux" becomes "is," it is not himself but humanity that is on
trial (rejects), and his verdict becomes an indictment of its guilt
before the jury of posterity. His "Je verrai, dans cette plaiderie,
Si les hommes auront assez d'effronterie,/ Seront assez méchants,
scélérats et pervers/ Pour me faire injustice aux yeux de l'univers"
(I, Le Misanthrope, I, l, 197-200, p. 823), in the first act, ultimately
becomes "Je veux qu'il demeure à la posterité/ Comme une marque insigne,
un fameux témoignage/ De la méchanceté des hommes de notre âge" (I, Le
Misanthrope, V, l, 1544-1546, p. 868). The lawsuit is just another
example of Alceste's desire for recognition that cannot be satisfied
in his own lifetime because of the antithetical elements in his life-
script.

The role of passive victim is a complementary aspect to the
active pursuit of injustices in order to vindicate his moral intransi-
gence. Like the bewildered child who for some incomprehensible reason
is rejected by its mother, Alceste in his passive suffering role
imagines himself to be the butt of a cosmic collusion undertaken to
thwart the total identification with his ideal. He thereby avoids
responsibility for his internal and external inconsistencies, claiming
that exterior forces are the determinants of his behavior.

Jasinski emphasizes one of the aspects of this determinism
with respect to the medical doctrine of the four humors. The two most
important considerations explaining the misanthrope's irascibility and
his baffling contradictions, says Jasinski, are indicated in the play's
title Le Misanthrope ou l'Atrabilaire Amoureux. Alceste is a misanthrope,
"l'ennemi du genre humain," whose dominant moods are determined by an
overabundance of burned black bile which in turn signals an absence of
the body fluids necessary to counteract the bile's corrosive effects.
In connection with Alceste's choleric and pessimistic gloom, several
references are made to Alceste's "sickness" in the first scene of the
play. "J'entre en une humeur noire, en un chagrin profond," Alceste
says, "Quand je vois vivre entre eux les hommes comme ils font" (Le
Misanthrope, I, 1, 91, 92, p. 820). And the "phlegmatic" Philinte, in
an attempt to moderate Alceste's pessimism, remarks that his "noir
excès" (Le Misanthrope, I, 1, 98, p. 820) and his "maladie" (I, Le
Misanthrope, I, 1, 105, p. 320) will make Alceste a subject of
ridicule.

Alceste, Jasinski asserts, is neurasthenic; the sudden behavioral
changes from introverted depression to choleric condemnations of every-
one he comes in contact with are symptoms of his nervous deficiency.
This critic states that Alceste's loss of contact with reality evidenced in his over-reaction to petty, everyday occurrences, the obsession that he is being victimized, and his self-proclaimed moral superiority are the classical symptoms of severe neurosis, and he therefore concludes that the originality of the play is in the presentation of a sick man who lacks the will to combat his illness. Happily, Molière's keen psychological intuition created a character who transcends the relatively primitive psychogenic explanations of seventeenth-century medicine.

Alceste's own Child attitude toward his inanition is filled with a tragic aura of destiny and helplessness. When Philinte counters Alceste's arguments about the absolute necessity of uncompromising frankness in all situations with a pointed reminder that Alceste's beloved Célimène fails to measure up to his own rigid moral specifications, and that Célimène's cousin Eliante or even the prude Arsinoé are better suited to Alceste's temperament, Alceste reveals his utter impotence to alter the course of events: "Il est vrai, ma raison me le dit chaque jour/ Mais la raison n'est pas ce qui règle l'amour" (I, Le Misanthrope, I, 1, 247-248, pp. 824-825). In his first encounter with Célimène, despite the confidence he previously expressed in the underlying goodness of Célimène's nature, Alceste asks God's aid in his effort to disengage himself from the coquette's clutches, but moments later he places the responsibility for his future happiness squarely on the shoulders of the all-too-human Célimène: "...il ne tient qu'à vous que son chagrin (son amour) ne passe" (Le Misanthrope, II, 1, 529,
p. 835). Later, after Arsinoé delivers into Alceste's hands a letter from Célimène ostensibly intended for Oronte, Alceste again blames fate, "mon astre," before succumbing to a fit of jealous rage, but he freely elects to let the tragedy run its course: "Mais il n'importe, il faut suivre ma destinée:/ Je veux voir jusqu'au bout quel sera votre coeur,/ Et si de me trahir il aura la noirceur..." (Le Misanthrope, IV, 3, 1417-1419, p. 863). Finally, when "destiny" pursues the direction Alceste designates, he triumphantly concludes "Que le ciel pour ce noeud ne m'avait point fait naître" (Le Misanthrope, V, 4, 1792, p. 876).

Although Alceste is almost entirely successful in maintaining the illusion of I+, You-, there are special situations (other than those with Célimène) in which his own feelings of inferiority briefly surface before they are ruthlessly suppressed by the excluding Parent. The sonnet incident and a conversation between the misanthrope and Arsinoé in Act III, scene 4 deserve special attention in this regard.

After browbeating Philinte with his moral precepts in the first scene, Alceste is approached by a "fâcheux," Oronte, who proceeds to flatter Alceste in the same manner the misanthrope so violently decried in the previous scene. Between Oronte's superlatives, "L'Etat n'a rien qui ne soit au-dessus/ Du mérite éclatant que l'on découvre en vous" (I, Le Misanthrope, I, 2, 267, 268, p. 825), and "...je vous tiens préférable/ A tout ce que je vois de plus considérable" (Le Misanthrope, I, 2, 269, 270, p. 825), Alceste hasards a timid "Monsieur," and when given the chance to explain, his tone is a decided contrast
with the merciless chastisement he previously recommended to Philinte. "Avant de nous lier il faut nous mieux connoître" (I, Le Misanthrope, I, 2, 282, p. 826), he explains, and then tries to avoid criticizing the sonnet because he has "...le défaut/ D'être un peu plus sincère qu'il ne faut" (I, Le Misanthrope, I, 2, 299, 300, pp. 826, 827). He first attempts to express tactfully his disapproval of the sonnet by recounting an analogous incident in the third person, then comically protests with a series of "Je ne dis pas cela" in response to Oronte's questions, the latter having understood only too well the meaning of Alceste's parable. Jules Brody notes that Alceste's first affirmation of his principles is a polite lie:

Each succeeding "je ne dis pas cela" swells the crescendo of Alceste's frustration... (he is) more concerned with the form than the substance, and his anger is goaded by Oronte's insistence that he be brutally clear in speaking his mind. 'Je ne dis pas cela' is a variation of the 'Je veux qu'on me distingue' but Oronte's persistence deprives him of the opportunity of distinguishing himself as a tactful critic.

In the imposed position of literary critic Alceste finds himself in an unaccustomed role, one he prefers not to play. As previously noted, Alceste prefers to react to completed situations that confirm his a priori judgment about mankind's perversity. Oronte, however, deprives Alceste of the prerogatives of gods and kings with his insistence that Alceste directly involve himself in the mêlée. One of Molière's infrequent stage directions "En cet endroit Alceste paraît
tout rêveur et semble n'entendre pas qu'Oronte lui parle" is perhaps evidence of Alceste's distaste for active participation in nascent situations, at least his efforts to avoid a confrontation so indicate. Alceste almost pleads with Oronte not to place him in compromising circumstances: "Monsieur je suis mal propre à décider la chose;/ Veuillez m'en dispenser" (Le Misanthrope, I, 2, 298, 299, p. 826), and adopts an apologetic attitude for the quality he previously acknowledged to be the highest human virtue. It is only as a last resort that Alceste concedes that the sonnet "est bon à mettre au cabinet. The futility of his position is underscored when the would-be friend and poet exits, threatening revenge after a lively exchange of verbal insults.

It becomes increasingly clear in the course of the play that Alceste generally thinks himself so superior to the rest of mankind that others should grovel in admiration at the base of this pedestal of virtue. And yet when Oronte inundates Alceste in a deluge of flattering superlatives, Alceste deliberately attempts to distance himself from his admirer: "...l'amitié demande un peu plus de mystère,/ ...Et nous pourrions avoir de telles complexions,/ Que tous deux du marché nous nous repentirions" (I, Le Misanthrope, I, 2, 278, 283, 284, p. 826).

This scene differs from most others in that the spectator is here sympathetic to Alceste's refusal to court favors, his commendable notion of personal honor, and the lucid appraisal of Oronte's character. In the larger perspective of Alceste's double-bind, however, it becomes
of paramount importance that he discount Oronte's praise, for if Oronte truly appreciates Alceste's uncompromising virtue, Oronte is OK, and if Oronte is OK, Alceste himself becomes not OK. Similarly, if Alceste acknowledges any intrinsic artistic qualities in Oronte's poem, he also confesses that Oronte has some redeeming qualities. His criticism is flagrantly judgmental—unnatural, figurative style, affectation, bad taste—whereas his popular song is, by his own admission, lacking in poetic ornaments, but sincere. J. Hubert points out that Oronte's sonnet has an ironic value aside from the reactions and arguments which it elicits. Despite the fact that Oronte's poem is characteristic of the preciosity of the period, it accurately depicts Alceste's situation vis-à-vis Célimène. Alceste accuses Célimène of stringing him along; Alceste decries Célimène's complaisance for himself and his rivals; Alceste is a lover who vacillates between hope and despair in the quest for Célimène's hand in marriage. Hubert also finds it significant that Alceste chooses a "vieille chanson" as the perfect expression of a "coeur vraiment épris." The choice of an archaic song reveals Alceste's desire to escape from the real world and life in his fantasy. It foreshadows his ultimate escape to his "désert" in the denouement. The juxtaposition of the two poems is in a sense symbolic of the complexity of Alceste's double-bind—the excluding Parent's failure to acknowledge contradiction or the desire for recognition, and the unexpressed intent to complete a life script.

Alceste's fundamental feeling of inferiority and rejection can only be expressed when the excluding Parent relaxes its relentless
control, thus permitting the Child to vent its feelings of hopelessness, helplessness and rejection. Discouraged by his inability to bring Célimène around to his way of thinking, a seething Arsinoé, embittered by Célimène's undisguised attack on her prudish hypocrisy, encounters Alceste when his defenses are down. Like Oronte, she unstintingly praises Alceste and deplores the court's failure to recognize a man of such paramount distinction. In response to Arsinoé's liberal praise, however, Alceste plaintively denies the arrogant I+ You-position to confess his own inept inadequacy: "Moi, madame! Et sur quoi pourrais-je rien prétendre?/ Quel service à l'Etat est-ce qu'on m'a vu rendre?/ Qu'ai-je fait s'il vous plaît de si brillant de soi,/ Pour plaindre à la cour qu'on ne fait rien pour moi?" (Le Misanthrope, III, 5, 1053-1056; p. 853). Further, when Arsinoé espouses Alceste's own opinion—that merit is no criterion of courtly favor—Alceste adamantly refuses to consider arguments in his behalf, and moreover denies the advisability and practicality of such a course. "Mon Dieu! laissons mon mérite de grace;/ De quoi voulez-vous que la cour s'embarrasse?/ Elle aurait fort à faire, et ses soins seroient grands;/ D'avoir à déterrer le mérite des gens" (I, Le Misanthrope, III, 5, 1061-1064, p. 853).

Even when the dominance of the excluding Parent reasserts itself, Alceste remains torn between the desire for recognition by others and the necessity to reject them. The inadequacies evident in his own feelings of inferiority are blamed on the natural forces that determine his temperament: "L'humeur dont je me sens veut que je me bannisse./
Le ciel ne m'a point fait en me donnant le jour,/ Une âme compatible
avec l'air de la cour; ..." which preempts the nostalgic yearning for
"les vertus nécessaires/ Pour y bien réussir et faire mes
affaires" (I, Le Misanthrope, III, 5, 1085-1086, p. 854). In the
aftermath of his Child's confession, Alceste virtually admits that he
must choose between being rejected ("On n'a pas à souffrir mille rebuts
cruels...") (I, Le Misanthrope, III, 4, 1095, p. 854); and the more
palatable prerogative of rejecting others. For Alceste, there are no
shades of gray between the aloofness of supercilious condescension
(I+, You-) and the loneliness of suicidal despair (I-, You-).70

Molière's own plays are often his own most important source.
Le Misanthrope is structurally more closely related to Les Fâcheux
than any of his other comedies. In Les Fâcheux an impatient lover
tries during three acts to arrange a satisfactory meeting with the
woman he loves, but each attempt is foiled by untimely interruptions
by the "fâcheux." Le Misanthrope is complicated by Alceste's internal
conflict and by the introduction of themes other than the lover's
frustration, but the drama between Alceste and Célimène is sustained
with the technique of introducing "fâcheux." In Act II, scene 1,
Alceste is interrupted by the arrival of Acaste and Clitandre; in
Act II, scene 6, Alceste is summoned before the Tribunal des Maréchaux
to settle accounts with Oronte concerning the sonnet incident; in Act
III, scene 5, Célimène leaves Alceste in the company of Arsinoé while
she departs to write a letter; and in Act IV, scene 4, Alceste, in
possession of the execrable letter given him by Arsinoé, is interrupted
by a messenger sent by Philinte, who informs him that his lawsuit has been lost and that as a consequence he must leave Célimène's salon in the utmost haste. Victimized by circumstances, Alceste can only repeatedly deplore the combinations of events that prevent him from definitively forcing Célimène to make a decision: "Il semble que le sort, quelque soin que je prenne, / Ait juré d'empêcher que je vous entre-tienne;..." (I, Le Misanthrope, IV, 1477, 1478, p. 866).

The technique of introducing "fâcheux" at opportune moments provides a means of elaborating Alceste's double-bind psychopathology in successive confrontations with Célimène for the duration of the play. Enlarged into a three-handed position, Alceste's attitude toward Célimène is a flexible I+, You?, They-. Alceste's opinions of Célimène run the gamut of possibilities afforded by his double-bind; he tenaciously clings to the hope that Célimène will make the required adjustments in her lifestyle which will enable him to conclude that Célimène is OK, and when Alceste confirms to his own satisfaction that she is not OK the play ends. Unfortunately for Alceste, that is not what he wants, but it is what he wants it to be.

The question "Why Célimène?" has been a constant source of puzzlement for reader, spectators and critics. Philinte rightly objects that Célimène is of all people the most contrary to what Alceste ostensibly represents—sincerity, honesty, and uncompromising virtue—better adapted to the temperament of Eliante or Arsinoé. Philinte fails to understand, however, that Alceste is not in love with Célimène; he is in love with the possibility or more accurately the impossibility
of what she can become. If the hypothesis of the double-bind were strictly correct, Alceste is in effect trying to convince mother that she should love him, but his script dictates that he choose precisely the woman he is incapable of convincing because an absent mother cannot be persuaded. Thus, Alceste is torn between the desire for libidinal gratification and the psychic imperative of his script which denies fulfillment. "Tôt ou tard nous romprons indubitablement," prophesies Alceste, "Et je vous promettrai mille fois le contraire/ Que je ne serois pas en pouvoir de le faire" (Le Misanthrope, II, 1, 1452-1454, p. 832).

There is a sense of urgent desperation in Alceste's courtship of Célimène. On the one hand he recognizes her faults and on the other he feels helpless to extract himself from the situation even with the best of evidence. Clinging to the chimeric hope that "...sans doute ma flamme/ De ses vices du temps pourra purger son âme," Alceste makes an intensive effort to convert Célimène, but his efforts are never reality-oriented. He is never able to rid himself sufficiently of the demon that drives him to evaluate realistically Célimène's mentality. From the excluding Parent position, Alceste cannot perceive things as they are but only as they must be, meaning as he desperately wants them to be.

Célimène can only be OK if she, like Alceste, is not responsible for her vitiated condition. Just as Alceste constantly blames "on," "le sort," "le destin," "mon humeur" for his own special circumstances, he adamantly refuses to concede that Célimène is responsible for what
she is, or that she is what she wants to be. In a fervor of messianic enthusiasm, Alceste grapples with the satanic forces that possess Célimène and bely her better nature. Alceste's own feelings of victimization projected onto Célimène form a protective shell that cover his most cherished illusion. "Non morbleu!" he remonstrates against the degenerate "côtérie" of Célimène's salon, "c'est vous; et vos ris complaisants/ Tirent de son esprit tous ces traits médisants./ Son humeur satirique est sans cesse nourrie/ Par le coupable encens de votre flatterie..." (I, Le Misanthrope, II, 4, 659-662, p. 840). When Acaste and Clitandre object to the contrary that Célimène is the most perfect imaginable creature, Alceste obstinately decries her flaws, and transported by his evangelic zeal, testifies that harsh uncompromising criticism is the very essence of true love: "On doit, pour bien aimer, renoncer aux douceurs,/ Et du parfait honneur mettre l'honneur suprême/ A bien injurier les personnes qu'on aime" (Le Misanthrope, II, 4, 708-710, p. 841).

As a game form, Alceste's unwillingness to accept Célimène as she is on the one hand and his inability to extricate himself from Célimène's spell on the other are best exemplified in "Yes But." On the social level (A—A), the game consists of a series of transactions in which Alceste asks Célimène to justify her behavior, Célimène does so, and Alceste refuses to accept her explanations. On the psychological level (P—C) Alceste is insisting that all suitors but himself be dismissed, but Célimène staunchly refuses to comply. Freely translated and abridged, a part of the scene reads as follows:
Célimène: I can't stop them from liking me.

Alceste: Yes but you don't have to encourage them.

Célimène: I need Clitandre to win a lawsuit.

Alceste: Yes but everyone is well received.

Célimène: You should be happy that I bestow my favors on everyone and therefore no one in particular.

Alceste: Yes but I have no assurance that I am preferred.

Célimène: You have my word.

Alceste: Yes but you may say that to everyone.


Social Level:

Alceste: Why do you...

Célimène: Because...

Alceste: Yes but...

Psychological Level:

Alceste: I want you to...

Célimène: I won't...
Alceste wins the game in the sense that his express purpose is to avoid the admission that Célimène's objections are justified; he reaffirms the internal psychological conviction that he is unequivocally right, but he remains in his psychological corner because even the most sincere conviction of his rightness is insufficient to provide a release from the irrational feelings of guilt associated with rejection, or the need to remake Célimène (mother) in the image of his wish-gratification: "Je ne le cède pas, je fais tout mon possible/ A rompre de ce coeur l'attachement terrible;/ Mais mes plus grands efforts n'ont rien fait jusqu'ici,/ Et c'est pour mes pêchés que je vous aime ainsi" (Le Misanthrope, II, 1, 517-520, p. 834).

Whereas "Yes But" ends in a stalemate because of Alceste's double-bind, Alceste's tendency to play a hard game of "Kick Me" tends to alienate Célimène's sympathies from her choleric lover. Disgruntled by Célimène's overly enthusiastic reception of Acaste and Clitandre in spite of his objections, Alceste announces his intention to leave since he cannot tolerate the boorish company of Célimène's admirers or their perpetual back-biting. Despite Célimène's adamant insistence that Alceste remain, Alceste is constant in his resolve until Célimène resigns herself, and even encourages his departure. Rankled by Célimène's sudden complicity in his intent to depart, Alceste suddenly becomes as insistent on staying as he had previously been anxious to leave. Much to Célimène's chagrin, Alceste decides to use the presence of her other suitors as a lever to pry a decision from her. His expressed intention is to force Célimène to make a commitment in his favor, but his acts,
gestures and remarks are all invitations to kick him, and the results are forthcoming. Célimène publicly decries Alceste's contrariness to opinions which he is the first to express but the least willing to condone when others espouse them:

Le sentiment d'autrui n'est jamais pour lui plaire;
Il prend toujours en main l'opinion contraire,
Et penserait paroître un homme du commun,
Si l'on voyait qu'il fut de l'avis de quelqu'un.
L'honneur de contredire a pour lui tant de charmes,
Qu'il prend contre lui-même assez souvent les armes;
Et ses vrais sentiments sont combattus par lui,
Aussitôt qu'il les voit dans la bouche d'autrui.
(I, Le Misanthrope, II, 4, 673-680, p. 840)

Not satisfied to antagonize the present company with denigrating observations, Alceste further resolves to impose his presence. He challenges "les petits marquis" to an endurance test in which he promises to emerge the victor. "Sortez-quand vous voudrez, Messieurs; mais j'avertis/ Que je ne sors qu'après que vous serez sortis;..." (I, Le Misanthrope, II, 14, 735, 736, p. 842). Acaste and Clitandre rise to the occasion.

The scene between Alceste and Célimène prompted by the letter to Oronte in Célimène's handwriting is further evidence that Alceste can neither leave nor stay, neither reject nor accept Célimène. The "homme fatal" launches a denning tirade in which he accuses Célimène of insincerity and disloyalty, threatens revenge, and confesses that in his present state he is capable of anything. Célimène adroitly parries the thrust, insinuating that the letter was written to a woman. Knowing, however, that Alceste will not be fooled by her feint, she puts her
lover on the defensive with an invitation to believe her guilty as charged. Alceste, who obviously expects Célimène to adopt a defensive role which will incite and justify his righteous indignation, is suddenly cheated out of the Parental position by Célimène's violation of the rules. His accusations become supplications for Célimène to justify the letter: "De grace montrez-moi, je serai satisfait/ Qu'on peut pour une femme expliquer ce billet" (I, Le Misanthrope, IV, 3, 1363, p. 862). Célimène, however, is too well aware that the balance of power is in her favor to sacrifice the advantage of her privileged position. She refuses to offer even the tokens of innocence Alceste requires since she well knows that any accession to Alceste's demands would be a tacit admission of guilt. "Efforcez-vous ici de paroître fidele,/ Et je m'efforcerai moi de vous croire telle" (I, Le Misanthrope, IV, 3, 1389, 1390, p. 863). Unable to bend Célimène to his will, Alceste chooses to remain in the psychological corner of suspended indecision, for he can neither sever relations with Célimène, accept her as she is, nor concede his inability to mend her ways.

Brody stresses the analogy between Alceste's and Arnolphe's underlying feelings of inferiority evidenced in the tyrannical fantasies of both men to reduce Célimène and Agnès, respectively, to their will. In the hypothetical invitation-approach-rejection scene, the child is truly the victim of an omnipotent witch-mother imposing the defensive-exclusion-position on the child, who adopts it to insure his psychic integrity against a threatening environment. Here Alceste's own impotence is projected on Célimène; his own unfinished maternal rejection
is inverted, and Alceste becomes in fantasy the omnipotent parent who would "distinguish" Célimène not as she wants to be recognized but as he would like her to be and as he would like to have been.

Oui, je voudrais qu'aucun ne vous trouvât aimable,
Que vous fussiez réduite en un sort misérable,
Que le ciel en naissant, ne vous eût donné rien,
Afin que de mon coeur l'éclatant sacrifice
Vous pût d'un pareil sort réparer l'injustice,
Et que j'eusse la joie et la gloire en ce jour,
De vous voir tenir tout des mains de mon amour.
(Le Misanthrope, IV, 3, 1425-1431, pp. 863, 864)

Alceste is totally oblivious to what Célimène is or wants. She becomes the unmistakable image of his own impotence, while he becomes both the prototype of a yearned-for beneficent parent and the image of his own desire to be unequivocally accepted by an environment that threatens and frustrates his desire for recognition. The desire to reduce Célimène to a helpless child is finally a projection of Alceste's own childlike helplessness, and the imagined injustices of Célimène's pareil sort are not hers but Alceste's.

In accordance with his decision to "suivre (sa) destinée," Alceste persists. After Philinte's vain attempt to console the misanthrope over the lost legal case, Alceste places himself in another "Courtroom" situation, this time in a direct confrontation with his arch-rival Oronte, in which Célimène plays her customary role of unwilling and evasive judge. Both contestants are equally insistent that Célimène render a decision on the fate of the hapless lovers, but Alceste lets it be known that his position as defendant in Célimène's
court is only binding insofar as he will comply with her spoken or unspoken verdict; he reserves the right to pass judgment on the judge in the event the decision is an adverse one.

Unwilling to accept the conditions of her jurisdiction, Célimène declares a mistrial on procedural grounds, and relegates the procedural difficulties to a higher court in a case where she will no longer be the judge, but the defendant in Alceste-Oronte vs. Célimène: "Que vous me fatiguez avec un tel caprice./ Et je ne dis pas quel motif me retient?/ J'en vais prendre pour juge Eliante qui vient" (I, Le Misanthrope, V, 2, 1649-1651, p. 871).

Célimène eloquently pleads her own cause, remonstrating that Alceste's and Oronte's procedure is without precedent in the annals of preciosity, but Eliante abruptly dismisses the defendant's evidence and rules in favor of the plaintiff's. Oronte and Alceste press for the reconvention of the original court to "lâcher la balance" when Acaste and Clitandre burst into the courtroom with the ultimate evidence in the case against Célimène.

Alceste's double-bind with respect to Célimène is fully illuminated after the exodus of all suitors save himself. Célimène freely acknowledges her duplicity, but her invitation to despise her as a consequence is precisely what Alceste cannot do, for his innermost Child desire is to approach the coquette, to force an unequivocal acceptance of his unicity. The pained expression of his cathced Child casts aside Célimène's unwanted invitation: "Puis-je ainsi
triumpher de toute ma tendresse?" (I, Le Misanthrope, V, 4, 1748, p. 875), but his Parent demands a penance, a confirmation of Célimène's (mother's) fundamental change in attitude toward himself tantamount to the exclusiveness of a mother-child relationship. Alceste's own avowal is fraught with a sense of guilt that can only be expiated if Célimène removes his mother's curse through an acknowledgment of her own wrongdoing. As in the conjectural double-bind, Alceste is torn between the archeopsychic feelings of culpability and rejection and the exteropsychic excluding position that requires a retribution, an admission of "not OKness" before a reconciliation:

Pourvu que votre coeur veuille donner les mains  
Au dessein que j'ai fait de fuir tous les humains,  
Et que dans mon désert où j'ai fait voeu de vivre  
Vous soyez sans tarder, résolu à me suivre:  
C'est par là seulement, que dans tous les esprits,  
Vous pouvez réparer le mal de vos écrits,  
Et qu'après cet éclat, qu'un noble coeur abhorre,  
Il peut m'être permis de vous aimer encore.  
(Le Misanthrope, V, 4, 1761-1762, p. 876)

Alceste demands the impossible of the woman least capable of requiting his desire for recognition of his uniqueness: therein lies all the irony of his script. He requires the unattainable, because any attempt to convince mother is destined to failure; the subconscious choice of a woman who will inevitably reject the conditions of his uniqueness amounts to a re-enactment of the original double-bind rejection scene. Alceste consummates his script with a decision to reject others through a withdrawal from society. "Trahi de toutes parts, accablé d'injustices,/ Je vais sortir d'un gouffre où triomphant les
Et chercher sur la terre un endroit écarté/ Ou d'être homme d'honneur on ait la liberté" (Le Misanthrope, 7, 4, 1803-1806, p. 877), Alceste bitterly observes to Philinte and Eliante. He leaves the prospective couple firmly resolved to employ the devices at their disposal to delay Alceste's appointment with destiny.

According to Freud in The Interpretation of Dreams there are three underlying illusions which are never completely dispelled but which are primarily expressed in dreams or mental imbalances. Freud termed these inter-related illusions "omnipotence," "irresistibility," and "immortality" and suggested that their symptomatic manifestations in dreams, neurosis, or psychosis are in somewhat direct proportion to their frustration in real life.

In actuality, Alceste's choice to react to instead of ti act is symptomatic of his impotence to change the real situation. For others, Alceste is a ridiculous egomaniac, at best harmless, at worst an irritable nuisance. Alceste, however, considers himself an omnipotent judge of man's moral condition: his reaction to Philinte, to Oronte and to his lawsuit all confirm his helplessness in the concrete world of reality, but each set-back confirms the misanthrope's delusions of omnipotence and his final right to pass judgment on others. Hubert considers Alceste to be a self-deceiving Don Quixote jousting against the whole human race, but against no particular evil, a pretentious do-nothing who in Hubert's view is no more an upholder of justice than Sganarelle is of religion. The futility of his position is emphasized
when he does resign himself to his desert, symbolic of sterility. For
the modern spectator and for other members of the cast, Hubert's view
is perhaps valid, but for Alceste, each succeeding discomfiture confirms
his own self-importance. His self-imposed exile is a triumph of will
over weakness.

Alceste's impotence in actuality and his delusions of omnipotence
are paralleled by his resistibility in real situations and an un-
shakable belief in his irresistibility. The entire question hinges on
Alceste's various ways of asserting his need to be distinguished.
Alceste directly or indirectly expresses a real need for closeness,
particularly as concerns Célimène, but his script dictates that he
must not accept people as they are. Célimène is not OK, unless
Célimène can be re-made to fit the specifications of Alceste's schizoid
anxieties, but until the bitter end Alceste cherishes an unrealistic
faith in his ultimate triumph.

With others and not infrequently with Célimène, the question
of recognition assumes another dimension. The I+, You- position is
in itself a way to "distinguish" himself; it is a confirmation of his
unicity which, failing a more desirable manner of asserting his
singularity, becomes an affirmation of his self-importance by virtue of
his departures from the accepted social norms.

Alceste's delusions of immortality are umbilically related to
his fantasies of irresistibility, punishment and vengeance. F. Perls
postulates that dreams involving homicide, suicide or visions of one's
own death are evidence of an inadequacy to deal with the environment.
Depressed persons who envision their own death, however, always survive their demise, usually to savor the pathos, the grief of family and friends. Man is incapable of imagining a world from which he is entirely excluded, just as Alceste cannot conceive of a society where Alceste's presence is not felt.

The most vivid example of Alceste's delusions of immortality is the lawsuit. From first to last, Alceste wants to lose his case to prove his thesis that mankind and its institutions are irremediably perverse, which will in turn provide a measure of justification for his withdrawal. But Alceste's case against humanity does not end with his exile or even with his death. Posterity will exonerate Alceste and transform a momentary defeat into an eternal victory. Alceste's failure to achieve the "distinction" he so ardently desires is ultimately the means to its fulfillment, for by virtue of his exclusion from society, he believes he will become an immortal "cause célèbre."

Berne refers to people in the business of accumulating bad feelings as "stamp collectors" because of a curious parallel between these feelings and the stamps one receives as a bonus for purchasing gasoline or groceries. People who collect bad feelings or "brown stamps," like their commercial counterparts, amass them in order to redeem them at a later date for their script prize, a "free" homicide, a "free" suicide, a "free" adultery, or, we might add, a "free" withdrawal. Berne makes the following remark about "stamp collectors," like Alceste, who are in the paranoid category:
Some people, particularly paranoids, collect counterfeit stamps. If no one will provoke them they imagine provocations. Then if they are impatient, they can get a free suicide, or a free homicide without having to rely on the natural course of events to supply enough irritations for a legitimate outburst. In this respect there are two kinds of paranoids. The Child paranoid collects counterfeit wrongs and says 'See what they did to me,' while the Parent paranoid collects counterfeit wrongs and says 'They can't do this to me.' In fact there are 'check raisers' as well as true counterfeiters among paranoids. Those with delusions can pick up very small trading stamps here and there and raise them into a very large denomination so as to get a large payoff quickly.74

Alceste is a "check raiser" of the deluded type, as is apparent in his over-reaction to petty circumstances, his use of exclamatory statements and denunciatory superlatives in everyday occurrences. The colorful expletives liberally sprinkled in Alceste's speeches in his initial encounter with Philinte, in the sonnet incident, in meetings with members of Célimène's clique, with Célimène herself, or with regards to the lawsuit, are all evidence of Alceste's activities as a "counterfeiter" of provocations to justify his paranoid delusions. With Célimène the counterfeit provocations are usually of the "See what you've done to me" type, whereas with others he adopts the Parent attitude "You (they) can't do this to me."

The ultimate payoff to Alceste's script—withdrawal—is evident in virtually every scene in which the misanthrope appears. His first words to Philinte "laissez-moi" are also the first of many
expressions of his desire to separate himself from others or others from himself. In the face of Philinte's unbending resistance, he stubbornly insists that his intention is to "rompre en visiere à tout le genre humain," and moments later projects the ultimate result of his unequal struggle with mankind: "...il me prend des mouvements soudains/ De fuir dans un désert l'approche des humains." After his altercation with Oronte, he again reiterates his desire for solitude: "Plus de société" - "Laissez-moi là" - "point de langage," then, in the following scene prophetically announces an inevitable rupture with Célimène. In the salon scenes, in his tête-à-tête with Arsinoé, he constantly re-emphasizes either society's unworthiness of Alceste, or Alceste's incompatibility with society. In the first instance (I+, You-) as in the second (I-, You +), Alceste ultimately will be alone with the subtle difference that from the - position Alceste would feel abandoned, perhaps suicidal, whereas from the + position Alceste remains the arrogant rejector, savoring the prospect of everlasting rancor against mankind without the embarrassments which his overweening, hyper-critical attitude always brings in its wake.
CHAPTER IV

ARCHETYPAL SCRIPT, FIXATION, AND GAMES
The relationships between comedy and tragedy have been much discussed both in the broad context of all of literature and with reference to particular authors. Bray asserts that "toute bouffonerie repose sur un fond pathétique"; Fernadez, that no situation is intrinsically ridiculous; and for Moore comic and tragic perceptions consist of an alteration in the "angle of vision." Psychoanalytic criticism suggests that tragedy is the de facto reassertion of the superego's prerogatives over the fulfillment of an unconscious drive whereas comedy creates circumstances which enable a normally blameworthy wish-fulfillment to be completed without subsequent punishment or remorse. A more philosophical rapprochement is advocated by Nathan A. Scott, Jr. and John Crowe: Comedy like tragedy effects a catharsis since it enables man to laugh at the absurdity and contingency of the human lot. Another theory of comic catharsis is supported by the Tractatus Coislinianus in which it is noted that "Comedy is an imitation of an action that is ludicrous and imperfect...through pleasure and laughter effecting a purgation of the life emotions." On the basis of this remnant of comic theory, Lane Cooper deems it reasonable to suppose that Aristotle may well have conceived of both tragedy and comedy as cathartic experiences. Frye states that in both comedy and tragedy there is a movement from the mythical and fantastic to the realistic and ironic, and Berne, that both serious and frivolous stories embody the general outlines of "script" types in which details are determined by
individual circumstances and idiosyncrasies. 79

In this section we propose to examine (1) an underlying myth common to both comedy and tragedy, (2) the infantile origins of a particular personality type, and (3) the concrete social manifestations of the two previous levels evident in the game relationships between Harpagon and his son Cléante.

It will be remarked that some of the concepts and terminology used in this section are Freudian. This we do not intend to be a radical departure from Transactional Analysis; rather these concepts originated by Freud were accepted by Berne and incorporated into what he considered to be a more general psychological theory. Berne, like Freud and Jung, for example, agreed that the great themes and patterns of human life, of which the Oedipal type was prominent, were embodied in mythology. Berne, moreover, concurred with Freud that important experiences in the formation of a "script" often originate in the Freudian maturation cycle of successive erogenous zones. The possibility of an Oedipal complex or an anal fixation as determinants in script formation were accepted by Berne. A fixation in the vocabulary of Transactional Analysis is a "protocol" or primal experience and the repetition-compulsion comprises the stimulus which compels the person towards the completion of his script. Thus, Transactional analysis incorporates (a) the notion of Oedipal complex and (b) fixation and repetition-compulsion, within a more generalized concept of script theory. Berne makes his concurrence with and adaptation of Freudian ideas explicit in his earliest attempt to formulate the basics of
script theory.

Freud's reductive sexual theory found its broadest application in Totem and Taboo, where he applied his hypotheses to an analysis of the tribal structure of Australian aborigines and abstracted from this a theory as to the origins of social, religious, economic, and political institutions. He conjectured that civilization had its beginning in the tribe governed by a patriarch who exercised arbitrary power over his sons. The patriarch owned all the women, and only on special occasions or to maintain political division would he give a favored son a wife. Eventually the deprived sons revolted against the patriarchal tyranny, killed the tyrant and took his women as wives. After the murder of their father, the sons, partly out of guilt, partly to guarantee their new-found status against future insurrections, founded a patriarchal religion forbidding incest. The entire system of totem and taboo, according to Freud, was specifically designed to prevent a recurrence of the original act of parricide and incest.

Elements of Freud's myth of the primal horde are evident in L'Avare. Money is the modern counter-part of the authority which confers absolute power on the patriarch and frustrates the son's desire for the woman of his choice. The seventeenth-century chieftain designates the husband of his daughter (a father surrogate who is really her "father") and insists that his son marry a widow, a "used" woman. The son plots against his father, commits a symbolic murder which deprives Harpagon of his influence, and then marries the girl the miser
had chosen for himself.

The question of censorship is central to all Oedipal literature, but is more prominent in drama than in other genres because the spectacle is public. In a psychoanalytic interpretation of Oedipus Rex, for example, Oedipus' flight from these he believes to be his real parents represents the dynamics of resistance and repression, his ignorance of Laius' and Iocasta's relationship to himself symbolizes the unconscious; Oedipus' persistence in finding out the truth represents the strivings of repressed desire, and Oedipal guilt is embodied in his self-inflicted blindness. Thus in Oedipus Rex the unconscious expresses itself in an artistic sublimation, and if Aristotle's theory of catharsis is valid, the spectators' urge toward parricide and incest is relieved by virtue of their vicarious participation.

Social censorship is likewise rigorously applied to objectionable elements in L'Avaré in the name of the bienséances. Cléante's death-wish for his father is expressed indirectly; Valère's and Elise's premarital sexual relations are clearly intimated, the theft (symbolic murder) is accomplished by a valet, and Harpagon, not Cléante, describes the miser's physical and mental anguish caused by the theft. Besides, the unseemly spectacle of a misused parent is justified by audience-child collaboration against the father-figure, who is obviously unfit for his paternal responsibilities:

...le fils, l'auteur et le public sont d'avance certains que la 'mère' est de leur côté dans le conflit, donc que les forces profondes de la vie jouent pour eux, donc
qu'ils ont religieusement raison; le barbon, en revanche, s'il a les apparences pour soi, se révèle faible, immoral, indigne d'amour. Il ne mérite pas la satire mais la derision parfois indulgente, et, de ce fait, peut-être plus cruelle, ou cruellement ressentie... il est redevenu pleinement infantile, crécule, ébloui, à la merci des fourbes. Moralement, il n'apparaît pas moins affaibli, incapable de contrôler voir de cacher ses fureurs et ses appétits, irascible, hypocondre, chagrin, libidineux, égrillard, avare, replié sur soi, préoccupé de sa chère personne.

Thus the unconscious and the conscious provide two different perspectives on L'Avare. On the level of the unconscious or symbolic level, an Oedipal drama of parricide and incest is enacted which satisfies the rebellious instincts of the spectators' Child towards father figures. At the most intensely comic moment of the play, Harpagon is quite right to glare suspiciously at the audience pointing an accusatory finger. The audience sympathizes with and anticipates the theft: its complicity and partial responsibility is evident in the jeers of triumphant laughter. On the conscious or literal level, a comedy is staged in accordance with the demands of social censorship, and this enables the spectators' Child to participate without feelings of laughter-inhibiting guilt.

C. Mauron considers one of the primary differences between tragedy and comedy to be that tragedy is the representation of guilt caused by the fulfillment of a repressed desire whereas comedy is a triumph over repression and guilt. Oedipus Rex presents an expression of repressed desire which is punished by Oedipus' Parent (superego).
In L'Avare, on the other hand, the suggestions of incest and parricide are well hidden from the spectators, while these latter are alienated from a corrupt and degenerate father with the result that Cléante and the audience jubilantly triumph in the good cause:

Figurez-vous, ma soeur, quelle joie ce peut être que de relever la fortune d'une personne qu'on aime; que de donner adroitement quelques petits secours aux modestes nécessités d'une vertueuse famille; et concevez quel plaisir ce m'est de voir que par l'avarice d'un père, je sois dans l'impuissance de goûter cette joie, et de faire éclater à cette belle aucun témoignage de mon amour.

(II, L'Avare, I, 2, pp. 243, 244)

Mauron further stresses the infantile qualities of farce in general, but even though he treats L'Avare at greater length than any other play by Molière, he fails to give an adequate explanation for Harpagon's "infantilism." Freud's classification of developmental stages in the process of maturation provides, we think, some interesting perspectives on Molière's miser. 81

It is the second or anal stage of Freud's four-phase maturation process with which we are here concerned. 82 The anal stage was further divided into retentive and expulsive by K. Abraham. 83 Harpagon falls into the first of these two sub-classifications.

Power, as we have already stated, is of primary importance during toilet training. Prior to that time, the infant is completely dependent upon his parents to gratify his every need, but suddenly the muscular control he acquires over his bowels affords him an instrument
with which to manipulate his environment. The infant suddenly finds himself ensconced on his throne with a host of admirers begging for his favors or insolently demanding that he perform. If he gives too lavishly, he may soon learn, like other generous monarchs before him, that what recipients first accept gratefully they soon take for granted. If he refuses his gifts, on the other hand, he may initially find pleasure in rebellion and the exercise of power, but his behavior may induce retaliation and further alienate the child.

In the anal retentive phase the child learns to postpone elimination and to enjoy retention as if keeping his cherished possessions for a future more enjoyable use. His feces are in demand and his decision to "save" them rather than offer them "in exchange" keeps the parents in a state of suspended anticipation while the child savors their discomfort as well as the sensual pleasures retention provides. The excessive parsimony that develops in the anal retentive stage is expressive of the tendency to retain what one possesses, and feces is the prototype of all systems of exchange, especially that based on gold, because of the physical similarities.

Harpagon's fascination with money is his Child's substitution of gold for feces. The dubious symbolism of the miser's gold buried in the garden is confirmed by at least two explicit equations of gold with the excretory tract. In Act II, scene 5, La Flèche derides Frosine's expectation to extract money from Harpagon for services rendered before characterizing Harpagon in the following manner: "En un mot il aime l'argent plus que réputation, qu'honneur et que vertu; et la vue d'un
demandeur lui donne des convulsions. C'est le frapper par son endroit mortel, c'est lui percer le coeur, c'est lui arracher les entrailles ..." (L'Avare, II, 5, p. 267). Later, when Valère's integrity is spitefully placed in doubt by Maître Jacques, Harpagon uses the same imagery to describe the physiological reaction the theft has wrought and for which Valère is presumably responsible: "Le mal n'est pas si grand que je fais! Quoi? Mon sang! mes entrailles, pendard?" (II, L'Avare, V, III, p. 308).

Harpagon's phobia and his paranoia as concern his gold pieces are likewise reminiscent of behavioral attitudes described by Freud. Just as the infant sees part of his own body in his feces, Harpagon's Child sees money as an integral part of his physical constitution. He refers to money as "mon sang," "mes entrailles" or insists that Mariane's mother, for example, "bleed" herself to provide an adequate dowry for her daughter. Harpagon's defensive Parent is characterized by an excessive, almost physiological fear that incidental visitors or servants will steal some of his wealth. After he has thoroughly searched La Flèche, he still remains unsatisfied that the latter is not spiriting his property away in some mysterious manner: "Je te le mets sur ta conscience au moins," he says before peremptorily dismissing his son's valet. His child is panic-stricken to discover that his children may have overheard a monologue concerning his hidden money, and just as he had previously called La Flèche "un pendard de valet," he now denounces Cléante for declaring that everyone knows his father to be rich. Harpagon declares that his son will be responsible for his death since such
malicious rumors will one day be reason for someone to slit his throat before absconding with his money.

The association between money and death only becomes explicit in Harpagon's psychotic breakdown after the theft, when the miser's conscious Child feelings suddenly surface and exert momentary control over his being. The initial lines in Harpagon's frantic monologue reveal that he does not differentiate between his body and his money—the loss of his gold is equated with the loss of his life: "Au voleur! Au voleur! à l'assassinat! au meurtrier! Justice, juste Ciel. je suis perdu, je suis assassiné, on m'a coupé la gorge, on m'a dérobé mon argent" (II, L'Avare, V, l, p. 302). As he returns to his senses the money loses its absolute identification with self to become a cherished object not to be confused with life but which nevertheless gives value to life as well as sustaining it:

Hélas! mon pauvre argent, mon cher ami! on m'a privé de toi, et puisque tu m'es enlevé, j'ai perdu mon support, ma consolation, ma joie; tout est fini pour moi, et je n'ai plus que faire au monde: sans toi il m'est impossible de vivre. C'en est fait, je n'en puis plus; je me meurs, je suis mort, je suis enterré. N'y a-t-il personne qui veuille me ressuciter....

(II, L'Avare, V, l, p. 302)

Harpagon's complete lack of feeling for other people is one of the recurring themes of the play. He is merciless in his usurious practices; he refuses to requite others for legitimate services or to respond to their supplications for money; he disregards his children's
feelings, and distrusts them as much as he does the servants. Two incidents are especially striking demonstrations of Harpagon's callous insensitivity. In Act I, scene 5, Harpagon enthusiastically endorses Valère's ironic declaration that "sans dot" is the best of reasons to marry off his daughter despite her repugnance for her father's choice:

Valère: Lorsque'on s'offre de prendre une fille sans dot, on ne doit point regarder plus avant. Tout est renfermé la dedans, et sans dot tient lieu de beauté, de jeunesse, de naissance, d'honneur, de sagesse et de probité.

Harpagon: Ah! le brave gargon! Voila parlé comme un oracle. Heureux qui peut avoir un domestique de la sorte.

(II, L'Avare, I, 5, p. 259)

In Act V, scene 4, Valère mistakes Harpagon's accusation of theft for the discovery of his intentions toward Mariane in one of Molière's inimitable malentendus. Mariane subsequently interjects a plea of mercy for her lover on the grounds that his courageous disregard for his own life when he saved her from drowning deserves a father's special consideration. Unmoved, Harpagon displays a total disregard for his daughter's life when the choice is between his gold and herself: "Tout cela n'est rien," he says, "et il valoit bien mieux pour moi qu'il te laissât noyer que de faire ce qu'il a fait" (II, L'Avare, V, 4, p. 312).

Harpagon is a less complicated character than Alceste because there are no conflicts between Harpagon's Parent attitudes, Adult calculations and Child feelings. His Parent expounds the usual maxims about thrift,
unnecessary frills, marrying a rich wife or husband, and so on. His Adult is primarily concerned with maximizing profits and receives support in this endeavor from an unscrupulous profit-oriented Parent, and the Child is intensely involved in a battle for survival in which losing money is perceived by Harpagon's Child to be the loss of his corporeal substance and end of his influence over other people. Mauron correctly integrates L'Avare into what he calls the "narcissistic cycle" in Molière: Harpagon's worship of money is as much the adoration of his body as Argan's hypochondria. All three of Harpagon's ego states operate within the parameters of an infantile fixation. The term immature is applicable since normal personality development has been arrested before the completion of the maturation process.

The dramatic conflict centered on Harpagon is the consequence of Harpagon's "repetition-compulsion," his unconscious drive to repeat first experiences. The child cannot withhold his feces indefinitely even though prolonged retention may require unnatural means of forcing the child to relinquish what he considers his, such as, doses of laxatives or enemas. The mother is usually the other person involved, and retention usually excites greater determination on her part to impose her will until she gets her way, at which time she and others temporarily lose interest in the infant. To the child, then, feces represent the power to keep others in his sphere of influence, and the loss of his feces results in a general loss of esteem, especially by his mother whose attentions the child cherishes above all others.

Thus, L'Avare can be viewed as a compulsive repetition of a
particular kind of toilet-training scene. The miser's efforts to retain
his gold (feces) results in a more determined effort by interested
parties to deprive him of his wealth. Gold is the instrument of power
which enables him to exercise his power over other people, among them a
woman, and the conflict is resolved when others get possession of
Harpagon's gold and reduce him to a state of abject dependence.

The game dynamics are also regulated by Harpagon's retentive
tendencies, the two most important being NIGYSOB and "Kick Me." The inter-
character conflicts are arranged so that every NIGYSOB is an invitation
to be kicked, and every successful "Kick Me" provides a justification
for a NIGYSOB. Each game is a response to a previous game-stimulus
and a stimulus for the next game-response. Cléante's final NIGYSOB—the
theft—completes the repetition-compulsion and thus dissipates the
accumulated tension.

In Act II, scene 1, Cléante's complaints about his father's
penury are given some substance. Cléante's desperate attempts to find
enough money to succour and court Mariane finally reduce him to borrowing
from usurers. The contractual agreement governing the conditions of
the loan in Act II, scene 1 is an excellent example of a well structured
NIGYSOB. The initial proposal of a 6 percent interest rate "hooks"
Clitandre's Child, but the usurer immediately proceeds to exploit the
gimmick—Clitandre's need of money under any circumstances—to NIGYSOB
the borrower. The creditor must borrow from a second party, reads the
contract, at the rate of 20 percent which interest must also be passed
on to the borrower. Further, since he can only obtain a part of the
principal in cash, the remainder in the amount of one-thousand crowns must be paid in odds and ends whose worth Cléante estimates at one-fifth their stated value. When Harpagon and Cléante learn the identity of the creditor and debtor, respectively, the fiasco terminates in an uproar that leaves Cléante more resentful and Harpagon more suspicious and more paranoid.

Harpagon: N'as tu point de honte, dis-moi, d'en
venir à ces débauches-là? de te précipiter dans des dépenses effroyables?
et de faire une honteuse dissipation du
bien que tes parents t'ont amassé
avec tant de sueurs?

Cléante: Ne rougissez-vous point de déshonorer
votre condition par les commerces que
vous faites? de sacrifier gloire et
reputation au désir insatiable d'entasser
écu sur écu et de rencherir, en fait
d'intérêts, sur les plus infâmes
subtilités qu'aient jamais inventées
les plus célèbres usuriers?

----------

Harpagon: Retire toi...Je ne suis pas fâché de
cette aventure; et ce m'est un avis de
tenir l'œil, plus que jamais, sur
toutes ses actions.
(II, L’Avare, II, 2, p. 265)

This NIGYSOB is an unconscious invitation to be kicked. Cléante soon exhibits his talents as an opportunistic NIGYSOB player, second in virtuosity only to his father. Unaware of Cléante's romantic pretensions vis-a-vis Mariane, Harpagon enlists the support of a marriage broker, Prosine, to further his own suit, and upon her promise of success
and the arrangement of a visit, the miser instructs his son and daughter to greet their future stepmother in an appropriate manner. Mariane is dismayed to discover that Cléante is the son of a decrepit money-grubber who now seeks her hand in marriage. He, however, quickly dispels whatever doubts Mariane harbors about his collusion in or approval of his father's plan while pressing his own suit in what appears to be an act of rebellion against his father's intention to marry. The transaction on the Adult level expresses his disapproval of Harpagon's decision to supplant his mother, but it is also a Child-Child profession of love to his beloved Mariane:

Ce discours paraîtra brutal aux yeux de quelques uns; mais je suis assuré que vous serez personne à le prendre comme il faudra; que c'est un mariage Madame, ou vous imaginez bien que je dois avoir de la répugnance; que vous n'ignorez pas, sachant ce que je suis, comme il choque mes intérêts, et que vous voulez bien enfin que je dise, avec la permission de mon père, que si les choses dépendaient de moi, cet hymen ne se feroient point.

(II, L'Avaré, III, 7, p. 285)

Harpagon's shocked Parent reaction to Cléante's apparent lack of tact, accompanied by a demand that his son change his tune, affords Cléante the opportunity to openly avow his Child feelings under a mask of filial compliance:

Hé bien! puisque vous voulez que je parle d'autre façon mon père, et que je vous avoue que je n'ai rien vu dans le monde de si charmant que vous; et je ne conçois rien d'égal au bonheur de vous plaire, et que le titre de votre époux est une gloire, une
félicité que je préfèrois aux destinées des
plus grands princes de la terre. Oui madame,
le bonheur de vous posséder est à mes regards
la plus belle de toutes les fortunes; c'est
où j'attache toute mon ambition; il n'y a
rien que je ne sois capable de faire pour une
conquête si précieuse...
(II, L'Avare, III, 7, p. 286)

Harpagon's Parent objection to the seductive tone of Cléante's eulogy
made by proxy for his father's benefit clears the way for the son to
use the leverage Mariane's presence affords him to punish his father for
his niggardliness while he furthers his own amorous designs. When
Harpagon apologizes for his failure to provide a collation for his
bride-to-be, Cléante reveals that he has repaired his father's oversight
with a few baskets of expensive exotic fruits. He then calls attention
to his father's large diamond ring which he deftly removes and presents
to Mariane on behalf of his father, who, choked with rage but unable to
publicly reprimand his son for this show of generosity in his betrothed's
presence, mutters threats in his son's ear which only encourage Cléante
to greater acts of insolence. Cléante betrays and savors the sheer
pleasure he derives from the game:

Cléante: Le voilà qui se scandalise de votre refus.

Harpagon: (bas à son fils) Ah! traître!

Cléante: Vous voyez qu'il se désespère.

Harpagon: (bas à son fils en le menaçant.)
Bourreau que tu es!
Cléante:  Mon père, ce n'est pas ma faute.  
Je fais ce que je puis pour  
l'obliger à la garder mais elle  
est obstinée.  
(II, L'Avare, III, 7, p. 288)

Cléante's triumph is short-lived, however, for the wily miser's  
suspicious Child divines the true nature of the young couple's relation-  
ship and ensnares Ccléante in a trap of his own devising. In Act IV,  
scene 3, Harpagon, still smarting from the financial beating he has re-  
ceived at his son's hand, once again asks Cléante's opinion of his  
prospective stepmother. Cléante gives a malicious response in the hope  
of disuading his father from pursuing his marriage plans: "Son air  
est de franche coquette; sa taille est assez gauche, sa beauté très  
médiocre, et son esprit des plus communs" (II, L'Avare, IV, 3, p. 293).  
Undeceived by his son's glib denunciation, Harpagon affects a dis-  
appointed, apologetic air, since, so he says, reflexion has convinced  
him that the difference in their ages makes the match unsuitable: "J'ai  
fait en la voyant ici réflexion sur mon age; et j'ai songé qu'on pourra  
trouver à redire de me voir marié à une si jeune personne" (II, L'Avare,  
IV, 3, p. 294). Blinded by the possibility of an immediate wish-  
fulfillment, Cléante forgets Harpagon's deviousness. He first qualifies  
his previous statement with a display of unwilling obedience: "...je  
me résoudrai à l'épouser, si vous voulez...et l'on dit que l'amour est  
souvent un fruit du mariage" (II, L'Avare, IV, 3, p. 294), but is  
finally forced to confess his true sentiments. Still not satisfied,  
Harpagon continues to probe until he learns the details of their re-  
relationship—meetings, visits, marriage declaration—then having extracted
all the desired information from his son under the pretence of awarding
him Mariane's hand in marriage, Harpagon springs his trap with a
MIGYSOB:

Je suis bien aise d'avoir appris un tel
secret; et voilà justement ce que je demandois.
Oh sus! mon fils, savez vous ce qu'il y a?
c'est qu'il faut songer, s'il vous plait,
à vous défaire de votre amour; à cesser
toutes vos poursuites auprès d'une personne
que je prétends pour moi; c'est de vous
marier dans peu avec celle qu'on vous
destine.
(II, L'Avare, IV, 3, p. 296)

The MIGYSOB—"Kick-Me" cycle finally ceases with the theft, since
it removes the motivation for game-playing at that level.

Three possible levels of interpretation have been developed here
from the most abstract to the most concrete. (1) The Oedipal character
of L'Avare is well concealed in accord with the playwright's comic
intentions. (2) More discernible are the traits of miserliness,
orderliness and the equation of gold with corporeal substance which
betrays an infantile fixation of an anal nature. (3) And finally,
an analysis of the games which are played between Cléante and his father
reveal a well defined system of relationships which are repeated in the
re-enactment of Harpagon's repetition-compulsion until the points of
conflict are resolved.

Molière's gallery is full of fixated characters in the sense
that few are possessed of a capacity for selfless object-libido. The
persons, things or abstractions that they adore are projections of their
own self-love which enable them to satisfy their fantasies of omnipotence,
immortality or irresistibility under the superficially plausible guise of a protective front. Orgon uses Tartuffe to establish a formidable power position which enables him to dictate the conditions of their existence to other members of the family, and it is his narcissism, not his love of religion or Tartuffe, which enables the hypocrite to manipulate him so successfully, for Tartuffe recognizes that Orgon will sacrifice everything in the defense of his delusion. Philaminte is a close relative of Orgon's except that sophistication and good taste supplant Orgon's religiosity. It is no accident that a Tartuffian Trissotin, sinister in the same manner as his more famous ancestor, is equally successful using variations of his predecessor's techniques. Social decadence and an essentially Hobbesian view of man provide Alceste and Arnolphe a rationale designed to insulate them from their own inadequacies, while Argan's narcissistic fantasies are vested in his illness. Harpagon's psychic stability is invested in his money, and sadistically maintained in the ruination of borrowers and in the deprivation and control of his son, daughter and others.
CONCLUSION
The chief problem of the teacher, student or director of a play is to imbue with meaning the character relationships established in the course of a reading or a performance of the given theatrical piece. Conventions, a precise technical language, experience and talent have come to the aid of directors and actors, but until recently teachers and students of the comic genre in classroom situations were deprived of nearly everything except talent. Scholars of Molière misapplied the Aristotelian notions of tragedy to Molière's comedies and accused Molière of violating the sacred unities, or condemned the sloppy workmanship they claimed was evident in the absence of meaningful cause and effect sequences, until talented directors and critics like Louis Jouvet peremptorily dismissed three centuries of scholastic argument with the assertion that Molière's endings were not defective but representative of "la plus fine tradition théâtrale." 

One of the problems of meaningful criticism is to formulate a capability to transcend the descriptive, to do more than summarize or give a list of confused impressions. For the student of literature any description which is just description is superfluous since the text itself embodies that description. Methodology and systems of meta-communication which are comprehensible to the study group and which provide the basis for meaningful commentary and praxis must therefore always be the concern of scholars, particularly professional ones.
The controversy between persons who would systematize the study of literature in innovative ways and those who claim that systematization falsifies meaning through a need to conform to the theoretical rigors of a given model has been unjustifiably envenomed by rabid adherents of one or the other point of view—in the interest of argument rather than of clarification. The perfect model escapes us but the models of the past have provided the impetus to create the more sophisticated ones of today. Progress in any endeavor is, after all, a sharpening of perceptions, progressively more accurate and sophisticated explanations which never exhaust the subject. Thus, Newtonian mechanics were supplanted by Einstein's theory of relativity, and it is now conceded that the latter also has its limitations. The nineteenth-century distinction between "homme" and "Homme" has twentieth-century equivalents in orthodox psychoanalysis and Jung's conception of the collective unconscious and of archetypes. Similarly, Taine's observation that literature was the product of the author's race, milieu, and moment, is not less systematic than Marxist criticism but it is less systematically comprehensive.

Transactional Analysis and complementary theory in some ways provide a more meaningful set of concepts and a more precisely defined vocabulary for the study of some relationships than do other loosely defined conceptual frameworks previously in use. The idea that Molière's biography would provide the "meaning" of his plays, or that the dicta of bienséance, vraisemblance, and the three unities are accur
criteria for the appraisal of his plays, has fallen into partial or complete disrepute. It is no more than a description to qualify the characters of a play as "parent," "adult," or "child," but to describe a relationship as P—C, P—C, or P—C, C—P, or A—A, A—A, with appropriate adjective, defines the nature of a relationship without negating the value of precise description and insights which reveal how a given rapport is altered or perpetuated. The relatively simple concept of ego states and the classification of transactions as "crossed," "complementary," and "ulterior" provide the basis for a commentary on the nature of the characters' communications.

Molière was long hailed as an astute observer who transformed his observations into theatrical production. This is certainly not true in any ordinary sense: there were no "précieuses ridicules," no Mascarilles, Pourceaugnacs, Orgons, Argans or Alcestes in Molière's time, at least not as he portrayed them. Molière's plays have the veracity of a caricature rather than of a photograph, but they are true nonetheless. He created characters who defend and advance, in the dishonest "ulterior" ways we have here categorized as games, just as their counterparts in real life have done, are doing, and will do to¬morrow. It was one of Molière's singular virtues that he appreciated and exploited the dramatic and comic potential of games.

But if games are funny, then what of those who, like Goethe, have been sensitive to the tragic or pathetic core of some of Molière's subjects? Without attempting to exhaust this question completely our
contention is that games at the social level, when considered apart from an historical context, often are comic. In the examination of Alceste, however, we have taken Rousseau's side of the controversy for the same reasons but with a less glorified justification. It is, of course, common knowledge that Rousseau identified with Alceste's existential situation and life position. In other words, Alceste appears tragic or pathetic because Rousseau ascribes his own "case history" to Alceste. On the basis of clinical evidence describing the characteristics of latent schizophrenics in double-bind situations, we created a hypothetical case history which accounts for Alceste's apparently irrational contradictions. The nature of Alceste's "double bind" is such that an I+, You- position is a necessary defense against the archeopsychic anxiety created by a maternal rejection. Alceste in fact fails to perceive options other than I+ You- or I- You +, and is consequently forced to reject society in favor of self-exile in order to avoid the suicidal despair of a not OK position.

Script theory is predicated upon the idea that people, by virtue of the similarity of their biological and psychological processes and by virtue of common experiences encountered in life situations, have formulated a limited number of "scripts" which repeat themselves in life and literature. Myth and fairy tales embody the major themes of life scripts but these themes are also present in a contaminated form in literature that is more social, i.e., less archetypal. Elements of the Oedipal complex are detectable in L'Avare, which assumes a comic air
in part because the rebellious Child triumphs over the prohibitive Parent (instead of the obverse of this situation, which is characteristic of Oedipal tragedy).

The Oedipal character of L'Avaré is masked by Harpagon's anal fixation, which is betrayed by his obsession to retain and to control. Harpagon operates primarily from the Parent throughout the play as a protection against his Child's fears regarding the loss of gold, which the latter (Child) confuses with corporeal substance. In the moment of crisis, however, Harpagon's Child is finally activated and reveals that money and self are perceived as part and parcel of a physiological whole.

The mechanics of Harpagon's repetition compulsion resulting from his anal fixation is a rhythmic game cycle in which every "Kick Me" is a stimulus for a NIGYSOB which in turn invites a "Kick Me" etc. The final NIGYSOB completes all three levels of interpretation: (1) a symbolic parricide is enacted; (2) the gold (feces) are forcibly removed; (3) the motivation for game-playing is removed from the game sphere.

Great literature is great because it captures something that is eternally human. Literature that fails to transcend the limitations of its period, manners, customs, institutions and so on, also loses some of its value as literature.

The universal quality of Molière's theater is related to its childlike and childish qualities, that is to ubiquitous feelings that
arise in the Child or to implicit observations about these feelings. Farce deals with feelings of the indulgent and rebellious natural Child liberated from the constraints of the real world, such as Tartuffe's efforts to seduce Elmire, Angélique's contempt for her husband expressed in her efforts to make him a cuckold, Scapin's merciless beating of a miserly father who interferes with the execution of his plans etcetera. The audience's empathy for those characters who represent the opposite of social norms is evidence that the Child feelings of resentment and self-indulgence are real and universal.

And those comedies whose content is sometimes called tragic or pathetic are so from a given perspective largely because the Parent messages and adapted Child responses render some characters incapable of recognizing their own feelings. Alceste, Arnolphe, and Orgon cannot own their need to be recognized by real people because it threatens a psychic position steadfastly maintained by a defensive Parent and adapted Child. The audience, however, discovers and appreciates the ravages wrought by censorship and adaptation—and if it finds their absurd antics uproariously funny at one moment, it may also find them pre-eminently tragic the next. The games some stage characters play are enacted by real men off stage—not always to a happy conclusion.
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FOREWORD


Chapter I : THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS


2 Paul Federn, Ego Psychology and the Psychoses (New York: Basic Books, 1952), pp. 217, 218. Berne's indebtedness to Federn for germinal ideas about his ego state theory is evident, for example, in the following passage: "Ego maturation consists of the acquired ability to react with a part of the ego unit, while the whole of the unit remains quiescent and controls the partial reaction. The adult is able, by giving a sign with his finger, to attack or defend himself, to threaten or forbid. This indicates the difference between the child and the adult. The ego does not develop through crystallization but through organization. This is achieved by acquisition of typical reaction patterns and habitual emotional attitudes, notwithstanding the succession of ego levels. Both acquired ego attitudes and past ego states are to a great extent repressed. Through their access to consciousness and to preconsciousness they influence actual decisions. The influence of ego attitudes and ego states is helpful or disturbing depending upon their normality and fitness for present needs. Integrated personality, therefore, means not only of partial ego reactions but also of ego states." (pp. 217, 218)

In the preface to this same book, Eduardo Weiss, one of Federn's disciples, makes the following observation: "It is meant as an exact description of actual experience and by no means mere theory, when one speaks of investment of continuously changing contexts with the unifying,
coherent ego feeling. Although the ego experience passes from one state to another, it is felt as continuous and is re-established after transitory interruptions. . . . The discrimination between the data which we felt as belonging to the ego and those which are felt as belonging to the non-ego is a matter of a particular sensation, of the 'sense of reality'." (p. 6)


5Wilder Penfield and Lamar Roberts, *Speech and Brain Mechanisms* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1959), pp. 52-55. Berne was particularly influenced by remarks which proved that archaic ego states were retained intact in the human brain and that they affected behaviour even when not available to specific recall. Penfield and Roberts compare the recall of experiences to a tape recording or to a film-strip: "It is clear that each successive recording is somehow classified and compared with previous recordings so that, little by little, each separate song is 'learned' and becomes a unit in memory. And all the familiar things in a man's life undergo the same change. A poem or an elocution may be 'committed to memory'. But memory as we ordinarily think of it is something more, and a great deal less than any recording, unless that recording was made unusually vivid by fear or joy or special meaning. Then perhaps the detail of an original experience and the patient's memory of it might be identical. In that case memory and flash-back would be the same." (p. 52)

"When by chance, the neurosurgeon's electrode activates past experience, that experience unfolds progressively, moment by moment. This is a little like the performance of a wire recorder or a strip of cinematographic film on which are registered all those things of which the individual was once aware — the things he selected for his attention in that interval of time. Absent from it are the sensations he ignored, the talk he did not heed." (p. 53)

"No man can voluntarily reactivate the record. Perhaps if he could, he might become hopelessly confused. Man's voluntary recollection must be achieved through other mechanisms. And yet the recorded patterns are useful to him, even after the passage of many
years. They can still be appropriately selected by some scanning process and activated with amazing promptness for the purposes of comparative interpretation." (p. 55)


9 We are here referring to dramatic characters and not directly to the act of artistic creation. Since Aristotle art has never ceased to be considered an exercise of artistic vision and arrangement. Art is in itself, as the new "Structuralist" critics point out, a projection of man's psychic structure or determined by that structure, and the act of artistic creation is an expression of man's need to structure. Art is also a means of obtaining and vicariously experiencing the prospect of perpetual recognition as poets have constantly reminded us.


11 References to Molière's texts are inserted into this manuscript after each quotation requiring a reference for proper identification. These references will include the volume number of the Garnier edition in roman numerals, the title of the play, the act number in roman numerals, the scene number in arabic numerals, the line number(s) if the play is in verse and the page number.


13 The Parent, Adult and Child ego states are schematically portrayed in the PAC diagram to the immediate right. Parent, Adult, and Child and their derivatives are capitalized when they refer to ego states as hereafter defined. In all other instances they are used in accordance with accepted English usage.

Variations of these two types of transactions are a primary concern of psychoanalysis. A--A, C--P transactions in which the patient responds to the therapist as he once did to a real parental figure are known as "transference" phenomena whereas an inappropriate P--C response by the therapist is sometimes called "counter-transference."

Chapter II: GAMES


Ibid., pp. 68, 69.


35. This is not to suggest that Molière's plays are entirely composed of "games" but only that they are important structural elements. R. Schechner in an article which appeared in the Summer 1966 issue of the *Tulane Drama Review* entitled "Approaches to Theory and Criticism" considers the important public performance activities to be "ritual," "play," "games," and "sports," all of which share some common characteristics.


5. Eric Berne, Sex in Human Loving (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1970), p. 182. Berne makes the following notation: "'Rapo' is most often played by women. . . . The con is a seductive attitude and the gimmick is a desire for sex or power." In Games People Play, Berne notes that "Rapo" in its hardest form "is a vicious game which ends in murder, suicide or the courtroom. Here White leads Black into compromising physical contact and then claims that he has made a criminal assault or has done her irreparable damage. . . . The confrontation may be immediate, as in the illegitimate cry of rape, or it may be long delayed, as in suicide or homicide following a prolonged love affair." p. 126.


7. It is noteworthy that Hubert discusses George Dandin in a chapter entitled "The Legalistic Mind." A major theme of the play, according to this critic, is that of the "lesson." The audience learns a lesson from the spectacle of the lesson taught Dandin by his in-laws. Hubert stresses the infantile character of Dandin's relationship to the Sotenvilles rather than the "sibling rivalry" between the title role and his wife. Cf. Molière and the Comedy of Intellect, pp. 194-198.


Chapter III: SCRIPTS


54. Ibid., p. 81.


56. Gregory Bateson et. al., "Toward a Theory of Schizophrenia," Behavioural Science, Vol. 1 (1956), pp. 251–264. Bateson summarizes the formal characteristics of the double bind as follows: "(1) Two or more persons. Of these, designate one, for purposes of our definition, as the 'victim'. We do not assume that the double bind is inflicted by the mother alone, but that it may be done either by mother alone or by some combination of mother, father, and/or siblings. (2) Repeated experience. We assume that the double bind is a recurrent theme in the experience of the victim. Our hypothesis does not invoke a single traumatic experience, but such repeated experiences that the double bind structure comes to be an habitual expectation. (3) A primary negative injunction. This may have either of two forms: (a) Do not do so and so, or I will punish you, or (b) If you do not do so and so, I will punish you. Here we select a context of learning based on avoidance of punishment rather than a context of reward seeking. There is perhaps no formal reason for this selection. We assume that the punishment may be either the withdrawal of love or the expression of hate or anger—or most devastating—the kind of abandonment that results from the parent's expression of extreme helplessness. (4) A secondary injunction conflicting with the first at a more abstract level, and like the first enforced by punishments or signals which threaten survival. This secondary injunction is more difficult to describe than the primary for two reasons. First, the secondary injunction is commonly communicated to the child by nonverbal means. Posture, gesture, tone of voice, meaningful action, and the implications concealed in verbal
comment may all be used to convey this more abstract message. Second, the secondary injunction may impinge upon any element of the primary prohibition. Verbalization of the secondary injunction may, therefore, include a wide variety of forms, for example, "Do not see this as punishment"; "Do not see me as the punishing agent"; "Do not submit to my prohibitions"; "Do not think of what you must not do"; "Do not question my love of which the primary prohibition is (or is not) an example"; and so on. Other examples become possible when the double bind is inflicted not by one individual but by two. For example, one parent may negate at a more abstract level the injunctions of the other. (5) A tertiary negative injunction prohibiting the victim from escaping from the field. In a formal sense it is perhaps unnecessary to list this injunction as a separate item since the reinforcement at the other two levels involves a threat to survival, and if the double binds are imposed during infancy, escape is naturally impossible. However, it seems that in some cases the escape from the field is made impossible by certain devices which are not purely negative, e.g., capricious promises of love, and the like. (6) Finally, the complete set of ingredients is no longer necessary when the victim has learned to perceive his universe in double bind patterns. Almost any part of a double bind sequence may then be sufficient to precipitate panic or rage. The pattern of conflicting injunctions may even be taken over by hallucinatory voices." pp. 253, 254.


60 Cf. "Theoretical Considerations" above, pp. 7.

61 Freud's discussion of "psychic energy" and "catheisis" (Besetzungsernergie) are difficult to understand. Disregarding the hypothetical and technical aspects of the problem, catheisis here means a shift of psychic energy from one ego state to the other so that the activated ego state will be experienced as "real self."


65 Cf. note 24 "Theoretical Considerations" above. Counter-transference is one of the primary reasons for psychoanalysts to be psychoanalyzed on the theory that to be effective the analyst must be aware of his susceptibilities.


69 Hubert, Brody, Jasinski, and Guicharnaud have noticed Alceste's "will to fail."


71 Ibid., p. 143.

Chapter IV: ARCHETYPAL SCRIPTS, FIXATIONS AND GAMES


81. The behavioural aspect of script or fixation function (as contrasted to the historical one) is related to what some critics have begrudgingly referred to as "comic flaw." Fernandez, for example, states that "the mechanism of the comedy is the unfolding of the plot in such a way as to make all the action of the character work against himself. In this sense, a comic character is wholly wilfull. His will is expressed in complete disregard for the conditions of life...." Cf. *Molière* by Ramon Fernandez, p. 67.

Script or fixation theory is predicated upon the hypothesis that a person's will to frustrate his own ostensible intentions can be explained by the elements of his script and furthermore, that particular types of idiosyncrasies are symptomatic of a general class of causes. Thus, Harpagon's fixation is characteristically anal in origin even though specifics are obviously not available.


84. It is no doubt significant that Plautus' *Aulularia* was the most important source for *L'Avare*. Hubert suggests that Plautus' "'Oneiric' earthiness" was unthinkable in *Molière* not only because of the predominance of the "bien-seances" in the seventeenth century but also as a result of *Molière* 's own personal tastes. *Op. Cit.*, Hubert, p. 205. In any event, the scatological associations between money and avarice are much more explicit in the *Aulularia*, for example, Euclio is said to put "a stopper in his lower windpipe...so as not to
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