THE VALIDITY OF FREUD'S THEORY OF OEDIPUS COMPLEX IN OEDIPUS REX, HAMLET AND DESIRE UNDER THE ELMS

Thesis Submitted to the Institute of Social Sciences

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for

the Degree of Master of Arts

in

English Language and Literature

By

Serpil ARPACIOĞLU

Fatih University

January 2002

Fatih Üniversitesi

Tarih: 30 / 1 /2002

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Müdürlüğü'ne

TUTANAK

..Serpil...Arpacioğlu.....'a ait

"The Validity of Freud's Theory of Oedipus Complex in Oedipus Rex, Hamlet and Desire Under The Elms"

adlı çalışma ...60..... dk.'lık süre içinde savunulmuş ve jüri tarafından İngiliz Dili ve ~~Edebiyatı~~.. Anabilim Dalında *YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ* olarak oy birliğiyle /~~oy çokluğuyla~~ kabul edilmiştir /~~edilmemiştir.~~

~~..... yarıyıl ek süre verilmiştir.~~

Başkan Yrd.Doç. Dr. Metin Bosnak

Metin Bosnak

Üye Prof. Dr. Mohamed Bakari

Mohamed Bakari

Üye Doç. Dr. Bülent Arpacı

B. Arpacı

SUMMARY

The present study attempts to analyze the validity of Freud's theory of Oedipus complex in three plays, Oedipus Rex, Hamlet and Desire Under the Elms written by Sophocles, W. Shakespeare and E.O'Neill respectively. In reference to these works from the Greek, English and American dramas, the struggle between the father (the father figure in Hamlet) and the son is studied. As the title suggests, the Oedipus complex is the main concern in this study.

Freud is known as the first person who used the term Oedipus complex. However, he takes over Jung's term 'complex' and uses it in his most widely read book, The Interpretation of Dreams. Similar to Jung's association tests, Freud first uses hypnosis and then 'Free Association' to make the patients tell what oppresses their mind. In 'Free Association', the patients say out loud everything that came into their minds as one association followed another. By this way of making the repressed emotions or experiences conscious again, the mental conflicts in the patients' minds are removed. Thus, for Freud, turning the mental disorders into words is the only way to rid of them and to develop a healthy personality.

As Freud claims, the concept of Oedipus complex consists of the boy – child's strong attachment to his mother. Whereas, the father is considered as a rival in this love. Since he is the source of all authority and capable of castrating the boy – child, the latter abandons his love for the mother, identifies himself with the father, and later has a much mature relationship with someone outside the family. Thus, the boy – child makes a successful transition to manhood and overcomes his Oedipus complex. Otherwise, the individual may have personality difficulties, such as homosexuality and unsatisfying relationships with women in his future life.

This study falls into six essential parts. Chapter I will focus on the studies and ideas of Freud on the structures of the mind and psychosexual theory of personality development. It will also include Freud's ideas on how the Oedipus complex occurs and what results it may have in the individual's life. Chapter II will be on how the oedipal conflicts take place in the stories of Uranus, Cronus and Zeus referring to their relations with the mother and father figures. It will also tell about how Cronus and Zeus, as the rebellious sons in Greek mythology, depose their fathers with the help of their mothers.

Chapter III will explore Sophocles' play Oedipus Rex whose character, Oedipus, unwittingly kills his own father and again unwittingly marries his own mother. Freud's Oedipus complex is named after Oedipus. Though Oedipus tries to escape the fate reported by the oracle, it becomes his ill – fate to commit the above mentioned 'oedipal dreams' in Freud's words. However, he seems to be the most innocent one among the characters studied here in terms of Oedipus complex. Chapter IV will focus on the Oedipal problem in Shakespeare's Hamlet. The play is built up on Hamlet's hesitations over fulfilling the task of revenge assigned to him by his father's ghost. There are two points that burden Hamlet's mind throughout the play: His mother's hasty remarriage to his uncle just after the unusual death of his father and his uncle's excluding Hamlet from his birth – right. It's this first point that prevents Hamlet from killing Claudius who is considered as the other self by Hamlet. Chapter V is essentially on the struggle between a hard and self – righteous father and a son who is possessed by the memory of his dead mother. The hard working conditions exposed by his father cause the death of son Cabot's mother and he hates his father so much that at the end he makes his father deprived of what the latter has before: his sons, his new wife, his baby, his money and his cows with which he finds peace. Finally, Chapter VI will sum up all that has been analyzed in terms of Freud's theory of Oedipus complex in this study.

ÖZET

Bu tezin yazılış amacı Freud'un Oedipus kompleksi teorisinin geçerliliğini Sophocles'in Oedipus Rex, Shakespeare'in Hamlet ve O'Neill'in Desire Under the Elms adlı eserlerinde incelemektir. Baba (Hamlet'de baba yerine amca) ve oğul arasındaki çatışma incelenirken, Yunan, İngiliz ve Amerikan tiyatrolarından seçilen bu eserlere atıfta bulunulmaktadır. Oedipus kompleksi, başlıktan anlaşılacağı üzere, bu tezin ana konusudur.

Oedipus kompleksi terimini ilk kullanan Freud olmasına rağmen, o, yine ilk kez Jung tarafından kullanılan 'kompleks' teriminden faydalanır ve Oedipus kompleksi Freud'un en fazla ilgi gören kitabı, The Interpretation of Dreams, de ilk kez yer alır. Freud, önce hipnoz daha sonra 'Serbest Çağrışım' tekniğini kullanarak, Jung'ın çağrışım testlerinde yaptığı gibi, hastalarına zihinlerini rahatsız eden şeyleri söyletir. 'Serbest Çağrışım' tekniğinde, hastalar, zihinlerinden geçen herşeyi ardarda dile getirirler. Bastırılmış duygu ve deneyimleri bu yolla tekrar bilince taşıyarak, hastalardaki zihinsel karmaşalar giderilir. Freud'a göre zihinsel karmaşaları kelimelere dökmek, bu karmaşalardan kurtulmak ve sağlıklı bir kişiliğe sahip olmakta izlenecek tek yoldur.

Freud, Oedipus kompleksinde, erkek çocuğun annesine aşırı bir bağlılığı olduğunu iddia eder. onun bu bağlılığı babasını kendisine rakip olarak görmesine yol açar. Çocuk, babasını güç kaynağı ve kendisini iğdiş edebilecek kişi olarak algıladığı için, annesine olan düşkünlüğünden vazgeçer, kendisini babasıyla özdeşleştirir ve sonraları ailesi dışında bir karşı cinse bağlanır. Böylece Oedipus kompleksini bertaraf etmiş olur. Bu gelişmeleri gösteremeyen çocuk, yetişkinlikte, aynı cinse ilgi duyma ya da karşı cinste aradığını bulamama gibi kişilik sorunlarıyla karşılaşır.

Bu tez altı ana kısımdan oluşmaktadır. Birinci kısım, Freud'un zihnin yapısı ve psikoseksuel kişilik gelişimi çalışmalarını ve görüşlerini içermektedir. Oedipus kompleksinin nasıl oluştuğu ve sonuçları da bu bölümde yer almaktadır. İkinci kısımda, Uranus, Kronus ve Zeus'un hikayelerinde Oedipal karmaşaların ne şekilde yer aldığı, anne-babalarıyla olan ilişkilerine atıfta bulunularak anlatılmaktadır. Ayrıca, asi erkek evlada Yunan mitolojisinden örnek olarak alınan Kronus ve Zeus'un, annelerinin desteğiyle, babalarını nasıl tahttan indirdikleri de bu bölümde yer almaktadır. Üçüncü

kısımda Sophocles'in oyunu Oedipus Rex'de, Oedipus'ın bilmeden kendi babasını nasıl öldürdüğü ve yine bilmeden kendi annesiyle nasıl evlendiği yer almaktadır. Freud'un Oedipus kompleksine adını veren Oedipus, geleceği hakkındaki kehanetleri çürütmeye çalışsa da, Freud'un 'Oedipal hayaller' dediği suçları işlemekten kaçınamaz. Yine de Oedipus, bu tezde Oedipus kompleksiyle ilgili olarak yeralan en masum kişidir. Dördüncü kısmın temelini Shakespeare'in eseri Hamlet'deki Oedipal problemler oluşturmaktadır. Oyun, babasının ruhu tarafından öç almakla görevlendirilen Hamlet'in bu görevi yerine getirmekteki tereddütleri üzerine kurulmuştur. Oyun süresince Hamlet'in zihnini kurcalayan iki şey vardır: babasının ölümünden hemen sonra, annesinin amcasıyla aceleten evlenmesi ve amcasının, Hamlet'i tahttan uzaklaştırması. Kendisini özdeşleştirdiği amcasının, annesiyle evli olması Hamlet'in onu öldüremeyişinin en önemli sebebi olarak bu kısımda yer almaktadır. Beşinci kısım, katı ve sadece kendi doğrularını kabul eden bir baba ile ölmüş annesinin hatırasına esir olan bir oğul arasındaki savaşı anlatmaktadır. Annesi, babasının maruz bıraktığı ağır çalışma şartlarından dolayı ölen genç Cabot, babasından öyle nefret eder ki, babasına sahip olduğu herşeyi kaybettirir: oğullarını, yeni karısını, çocuğunu, parasını ve ancak yanında huzur bulduğu ineklerini. Altıncı ve en son kısımda ise konu toparlanıp varılan sonuçlar anlatılmaktadır.

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I must acknowledge here my gratitude to members of thesis committee, Prof. Dr. Mohamed Bakari and Assoc. Prof. Bülent Aras who despite their loaded schedule, accepted to read my thesis, and provided me with invaluable insights about the subject, which has already proved to be very useful not for the present, but also for my future studies. I am also thankful to Fatih University, Institute of Social Sciences, which made it possible for us to study at the university by opening the M.A. programme.

I am most grateful to Dr. Metin Boşnak, who advised me on both academic and personal matters and has patiently encouraged me to write the present thesis when my own patience and enthusiasm tended to flicker out. Without his assistance, the present thesis would have never been completed.

INTRODUCTION

The present study attempts to analyze the validity of Freud's theory of Oedipus complex in three plays, Oedipus Rex, Hamlet and Desire Under the Elms written by Sophocles, W. Shakespeare and E. O'Neill respectively. In reference to these works from the Greek, English and American dramas, the struggle between the father (the father figure in Hamlet) and the son will be studied. As the little suggests, the Oedipus complex is the main concern in this study.

What is a complex?

In Collier's Encyclopedia, James Brussel defines complex as "a group of repressed ideas woven into a complex whole which is never static, but forces the individual to think, feel and act after a habitual pattern". He also adds that

> Carl Gustav Jung, who coined the term, derived it from the Latin word 'complexus', meaning interweaving or braiding. He states that a complex is a "grouping of psychic elements about emotionally toned contents" adding that it "consists of a nuclear element and a great number of secondarily constellated associations." It is obvious that the components of a complex may be present in consciousness or in the unconscious. However it is generally believed that the nuclear portions are always in the unconscious. Ernest Jones felt that a complex is a "group of emotionally invested ideas partially or entirely repressed" (1967:108-109)

Though Freud is claimed to be the first person who used the term Oedipus complex in The Interpretation of Dreams, he takes over Jung's term 'complex' and uses it in this most widely read book of his. As is quoted in Freud on Broadway by Sievers, Jung gives association tests to his patients and interprets the findings. The patient is read a list of words and is asked for the first 'reaction-word' that comes into his mind. Then, the test is repeated and the patient is asked to recall his original words. Any lack of responses indicate that the stimulus word has touched a complex. In this way Jung uses the term "complex" to indicate a cluster of ideas about which the patient has a strong emotional blockage. Jung notes such clusters as "religion complex", "sex complex" and "death complex" (1955:36).

Before explaining his theory of Oedipus complex, Freud, in Studies on Hysteria, a joint work with Breuer, also states that the patient can get rid of his mental disorders only by turning them into words. In the beginning, he uses hypnosis in which the patients are put into deep hypnosis and are made tell what oppresses their mind. Thus, the attacks of depressive confusion and physical disorders are removed. Later, he prefers 'Free Association'. He asks the patients just to "say out loud and without conscious reservation or criticism of any kind, everything that came into their minds, as one association followed another" (Clark 1965:26). By this way of making the forgotten or rather repressed emotions or experiences conscious again, the mental conflicts in the patients' minds are removed.

As is claimed by Freud no experience is forgotten in human life but is only kept or repressed in the unconscious, the largest and the most influential area of the mind. Beliefs, fears and desires as the unconscious processes determine a person's behavior. The person may be unaware of them, though. The three parts of the mind are named as conscious, preconscious and unconscious by Freud. A person is momentarily aware of the conscious content and he can become easily aware of the preconscious content of the mind. Freud emphasizes the importance of unconscious more than the other parts because the unacceptable, forbidden or punished wishes of childhood are also driven out of awareness to be kept in the unconscious where they remain influential.

Freud also discovers in all his patients buried sexual memories. They frequently take the form of recollections of sexual seduction in infancy by the parent of the opposite sex. Later, he recognizes that these are only fantasies called 'screen memories' by Freud and made up by his patients. They represent what the patient feared or wished might happen. It is the standards of the subject's personality that make these memories alarming, painful or shameful. Since the concept of infantile sexuality is against the childhood that is innocent and free from the lusts of sex, this theory is greeted by an outburst of protest. When his theory is regarded as a social danger, Freud reminds that the philosopher Schopenhauer has already told about the character of sexual desire in his work, The World as Will and Idea, before himself. As Schopenhauer states,

> the important role which the relation of the sexes plays in the world of men, where it is really the invisible central point of all action and conduct, and peeps out everywhere in spite of all veils thrown over

> it. It is the cause of war..., the inexhaustible source of wit, the key to all allusions..., the daily meditation of the young...It is however, the piquant element and the joke of life that the chief concern of all men is secretly pursued and ostensibly ignored as much as possible... But 'sexual passion' (when used by Freud, it is translated as 'sexual instinct') is the kernel of the will to live, and consequently the concentration of all desire. (Freud 1986:274-275)

However, Freud rejects the unconditioned obedience to the restrictions of society and demands reduction in the strictness with which the instincts are repressed. He claims that every individual, when a child, has an emotional attachment to the parent of the opposite sex. He finds again and again in his analysis that the "human being's first problem in life is his adjustment to the primeval triangle father-mother-child" (Wittels 1931:199). The son, especially, feels the father as a stranger. Between himself and the mother there exists the closest blood relationship, but there is none between the strange man and the mother. The boy after the appearance of the father has to fight for his mother. For Anna Freud, the relationship between the infant, the tiny human being, and the mother soon goes beyond the striving for the preservation of his life and satisfaction of some vital needs. When the external wold enters disturbingly into the relation between the child and his mother at the end of the first year, he learns that his mother does not belong to him alone. He wishes his brothers and sisters out of the way to restore the original state of affairs. This emotional antagonism is a comparatively harmless prelude to another and a much more powerful emotional conflict in which the father plays a twofold part. The boy hates his father as a rival but also loves and admires him, relies on his help, believes in his strength and omnipotence, and has no greater desire than to be like him in the future. Thus, there arises in the boy the extra ordinary problem (1963:27-33). This is called the Oedipus complex, the peak of early infantile sexual life, by Freud.

As Freud claims, this is not the first separation from the mother. He considers birth as the child's unusual separation from the mother and for him, experience begins with this trauma. Later, the child continues to live in a world of frustration, goaded by unsatisfied desires and envies (Rieff 1961:61). The love of mother remains dominant in the early formative years and the child's relationship with its parents is critical for the achievement of its proper sexual identity. The boy-child perceives the father as rival in

this love and he has fantasies of killing the father to possess the mother again. As Wright narrates, the father is experienced as the source of all authority, all direction of desire and thus capable of castrating the boy child. He abandons his love for the mother and identifies himself with the father, hoping, in time, to occupy such a position of power (1984:14). Perceiving the girl's being castrated and imagining this as a punishment which might be visited upon himself is named as 'castration complex' and is effective in the boy-child's success to overcome the Oedipus complex. "Unconsciously, the boy has thus successfully made the transition to manhood" (Bressler 1999:152).

The girl also forms her own version of the Oedipus complex called the Electra complex. In the beginning, like a boy, a young girl is also attached to her mother. She, too, recognizes the father as a rival for her mother's affection. Realizing that she is already castrated as her mother and holding her mother responsible for it, she gives up her love for the mother. She turns her desires to her father who possesses that which she desires. She develops a wish to become impregnated by her father. She turns back toward the mother and identifies with her, only after the seduction of the father fails. Thus, her transition into womanhood is completed and she dreams possessing a man as her mother possesses her father. These are the expected results of male and female Oedipalization.

The Oedipus complex is the result of the conflict between the two agencies of the mind: id and superego. As Freud states, containing our secret desires, our darkest wishes and our most intense fears, the id wishes only to fulfill the urges of the pleasure principle. It houses the libido, the source of all our psychosexual desires and all our psychic energy. Whereas, the superego represents the demands of the social pressure. It acts as an internal censor. It operates according to the morality principle and society's moral restrictions. It also represents the parental and social influences upon the drives (Bressler 1999:150-151). It is the ego, the third agency of the mind, that mediates between the instinctual (especially sexual) desires of the id and the demands of the social pressure. It operates in harmony with the reality principle.

In order to stop to be a child and to become a member of the social community, the boy has to repress his incestuous desires, adjust himself to the reality principle and

introduce himself into the symbolic role of manhood. Only then he can overcome his Oedipus complex and become a gendered subject. Otherwise, the privileged image of his mother above all other women or the recognition that women are castrated may lead the boy to homosexuality or unsatisfying relationships with women in his future life. Thus, child's success in life is through the mechanism what Freud famously terms the Oedipus complex.

As Freud states, the Oedipus complex is experienced in the phallic stage, between the ages of 3 and 6. Before that, the child experiences the oral stage during the first 18 moths of life and anal stage occurring between 1.5 and 3 years of age. The mouth and the anus are the two parts of the body in which the child experiences pleasure in these first two stages of his psychosexual development respectively. Whereas, in the phallic stage, the child's libido focuses on the genitals. In Freud's view, it is at this stage that children begin to "discover the sex roles of their parents and they unconsciously attach themselves to the parent of the opposite sex" (Carlson 1997:468). Then comes the latency stage, between the age of six and puberty, in which all interest in sexuality is repressed and social and intellectual skills are developed. At this stage, the child is expected to forget his highly stressful conflicts of the phallic stage by canalizing much of his energy into emotionally safe areas. From puberty on is "a time of sexual reawakening; the source of sexual pleasure now becomes someone outside the family" (Santrock 1996:39) and much mature love relationship proves that the Oedipus complex has been resolved successfully. Otherwise, the individual may become fixated at the phallic stage and personality difficulties arise.

Of the mother's role in the instinctual and spiritual world, Jung, also declares that

> the mother is in every way the nearest and the most powerful experience; and the one moreover that occurs in the most impressionable period of a man's life. Since the conscious is as yet only weakly developed in childhood, one cannot speak of an individual experience at all. The mother, however, is an archetypal experience; she is known by the more or less unconscious child not as a definite, individual feminine personality, but as the mother, an archetype loaded with significant possibilities. As life proceeds the primordial image fades, and is replaced by a conscious, relatively individual image, which is assumed to be the only mother image

> we have. In the unconscious, on the contrary, the mother always remains a powerful primordial image, determining and coloring in the individual conscious life our relation to woman, to society, and to the world of feeling and fact (Engel 1953:134).

Similar to Jung's generalization of the mother image, Freud thinks the Oedipus complex to be the collective fate of mankind. Turning to the drama of Oedipus Rex by Sophocles, which he borrowed the name from and making it the central point in building up his theory, he states that

> his fate moves us only because it might have been our own, because the oracle laid upon us before our birth the very curse which rested upon him. It may be that we were all destined to direct our first sexual impulses toward our mothers, and our first impulses of hatred and violence toward our fathers (Sievers 1955:37).

To Freud's view, two Oedipal dreams, making love with one's mother and murdering one's father are the key to tragedy, and it is only Sophocles himself, who satisfies the needs of the genre. He claims that "when attempts have been made, in dramas of destiny similar to Oedipus Rex, to reproduce a tragic effect using material other than Oedipal dreams the result has been total failure" (Vernant and Naquet 1990:90).

As mentioned in the beginning, three dramas from Greek, English and American literature will be analyzed in terms of Oedipus complex in this study. Chapter I will focus on the studies and ideas of Freud on the structures of the mind and psychosexual theory of personality development. It will also include Freud's ideas on how the Oedipus complex occurs and what results it may have in the individual's life. Chapter II will essentially be on how the oedipal conflicts take place in the stories of Uranus, Cronus and Zeus referring to their relations with the mother and father figures. It will also tell about how Cronus and Zeus, as the rebellious sons in Greek mythology, depose their fathers with the help of their mothers. Castrating the father and getting the power for themselves is first seen as the result of father-son struggle between Uranus and Cronus in Greek mythology. In Sophocles' play Oedipus Rex, a similar scene is performed. Oedipus, the son of Laius and Jocasta, king and queen of Thebes, is left to death. Because an oracle warns the parents that the soon will kill his own father and will

also marry his mother. Though it is Laius in Greek legend, in Sohpocles' play it becomes Jacasta who gets rid of the infant by giving it to a shepherd. Oedipus is brought up by other royal parents, the childless king and queen of Corinth, Polybus and Merope. Again an oracle reports that Oedipus is doomed to commit the two 'Oedipal dreams' in Freud's words. Though he leaves his present home, on his journey, he unwittingly kills his own father, Laius, and later again unwittingly marries his own mother, Jocasta. Thus, Oedipus Rex, which gives its name to Freud's theory of Oedipus complex, is explored in Chapter III.

Chapter IV will focus on the Oedipal problem in Shakespeare's Hamlet. The play is built up on Hamlet's hesitations over fulfilling the task of revenge that is assigned to him by his father's ghost. Here is a struggle between Hamlet and his uncle Claudius who is the father figure in this play. His mother's hasty remarriage to his uncle just after the unusual death of Hamlet's father and his uncle's acting as the usurper who excludes Hamlet from his birth-right are the two points that burden Hamlet's mind throughout the play. As Freud in his book, The Interpretation of Dreams, states the child's wishful phantasy to kill the father to take his place as his mother's lover remains repressed in Shakespeare's Hamlet. As it will be studied in this chapter, loss of his mother and his being fatally wounded by Leartes in a duel arranged by his uncle will only lead Hamlet to stab Claudius, who is considered by Hamlet as his other self.

Chapter V will be on the struggle between a hard and self-righteous father, Ephraim Cabot, and his son, Eben, who will have a love affair with his step-mother, Abbie, to castrate his father and also to release his libidinal desires from his mother in Desire Under the Elms, by O'Neill. This chapter will also tell about Eben's stealing his father's money to send his elder brothers to California and thus to cause his father to lose power. Though, at the end, Eben leaves the farm for the prison, it is still his victory against his father since the father Cabot loses what he has at the end of this struggle; his sons, his wife, his baby, his money and his cows because of his son, Eben. Finally, Chapter VI will sum up all that has been analyzed in terms of Freud's theory of Oedipus complex.

CHAPTER I

1.1 Freud and the Oedipus Complex

Sigmund Freud, having a privileged status in his family and remaining his mother's favorite throughout her life, was born as the eldest child of a middle-class Jewish family, on 6 May, 1856 in Freiberg, Moravia. In his family, there were already two grown-up sons by his father's first wife and one of them was already married, with a little boy who had an important part in Sigmund's very early years as his own younger brothers and sisters. This nephew, John, was one year older than Freud and especially Freud felt both jealousy and love for him. As Göka and Türkçapar state, in his adulthood Freud confessed that his relation with John had determined his feelings towards his own friends of the same age, and added that throughout his emotional life he could not dispense with a close friend and a hated enemy (1992: 13).

Though his was a crowded family, he was always treated as special. The increase in commercial difficulties forced the family to settle in Vienna and, there, they lived in poverty during his childhood. Freud didn't feel it because his father gave invariable priority to the charge of his education. His parents had great hopes for him since the time he was born. As an intelligent and hard-working student and regularly top of his class, he began to realize these expectations. However, his father left Freud to follow his own inclinations alone in his choice of profession. In his work An Autobiographical Study (1925) Freud states:

> Neither at that time, nor indeed in my later life, did I feel any particular predilection for the career of a doctor. I was moved rather, by a sort of curiosity, which, however, directed more towards human concerns than towards natural objects (1986: 190).

At that time, the theories of Darwin were of topical interest and strongly attracted him, for "they held out hopes of an extraordinary advance in man's understanding of the world" (Freud 1986: 190). When he was a child, Freud had enjoyed imagining himself as a great general or statesman. Hannibal was a favourite hero of his. However, later in his life, he thought science to be "the surest road to true power and understanding for

the man of integrity, and medicine seemed to combine the opportunity for application of scientific knowledge with the pursuit of individual interest" (Clark 1965: 27).

During the first years at the university, Freud realized that the "peculiarities and limitations of his gifts denied him all success in many of the departments of science into which his youthful eagerness had plunged him" (Freud 1986: 191). He was in no hurry to obtain a medical degree. For his first year or two he attended lectures on a variety of subjects, but gradually concentrated first on biology and then on physiology. In Ernst Brücke's Physiological Laboratory, Freud found rest and full satisfaction. There Brücke gave Freud a problem to work out in the histology of the nervous system and Freud succeeded in solving it. For him psychiatry became the most attractive branch of medicine.

In 1882, as a turning point, he left being decidedly negligent in pursuing his medical studies and in order to meet the needs of his large family at home, he entered the Vienna General Hospital and worked in various departments of it. He started to investigate the spinal cord of one of the lowest of the fishes, as a proposal by Brucke, and passed on the human central nervous system. One day Theodor Meynert, who had given him access to the laboratory even during the times when Freud was not actually working under him, suggested that Freud should definitely devote himself to the anatomy of the brain. He also promised to hand over his lecturing work to Freud. Thus, Freud began to study nervous diseases which as a branch of medicine had few specialists studied and as he stated:

> There was no satisfactory opportunity of learning the subject, and one was forced to be one's own teacher. Even Northnagel, on account of his book, Topische Diagnostik der Gehirnkrankheiten (1879) upon cerebral localization, did not single out neuropathology from among the other subdivisions of medicine (Freud 1986: 194).

While working as a junior physician, Freud published a number of clinical observations on organic diseases of the nervous system. He was able to localize the site of a lesion in the medulla oblongata so accurately that the pathological anatomist had no further information to add. He was the first person in Vienna who sent a case for

autopsy with a diagnosis of polyneuritis acuta. As a result of warm testimonial from Brücke, in 1885, he was awarded a travelling bursary and he made a journey to Paris. There the reigning figure was one of the greatest contemporary neurologists, Professor Charcot. Charcot's claim was that hysterical symptoms could be reproduced in their entirety in patients who had been hypnotized. The patients under hypnosis, with the authority of the hypnotist, had been told that they would "feel pain, lose sensation entirely, shake and tremble or become completely paralysed, lose their memory or perform actions for which they could not account" (Clark 1965: 21). Such patients were indistinguishable from the others who genuinely experienced these symptoms. However, this was the result of commands given them during the hypnotic state. For Charcot, Freud says:

> What impressed me most of all while I was with Charcot were his latest investigations upon hysteria, some of which were carried out under my own eyes. He had proved, for instance, the genuineness of hysterical phenomena and their conformity to laws (introite, nam et hic dii sunt: 'Enter, for here too are gods'), the frequent occurence of hysteria in men, the production of hysterical paralyses and contractures by hypnotic suggestion and the fact that such artificial product showed, down to their smallest details, the same features as spontaneous attacks, which were often brought on traumatically many of Charcot's demonstrations began by provoking in me and in other visitors a sense of astonishment an inclination to scepticism. He was always friendly and patient in dealing with such doubts..... (Freud 1986: 195-196)

The timeless, tremendous, and perplexing challenge of hysteria, both in the form of hysterical symptoms and in that disorder of character, has always lain like a drawn sword across the path of medical progress. As Clark puts it:

> For centuries this challenge had been answered by dismissing it as unreal, so that sufferers from hysterical symptoms were simply excluded from the arena of medical care; or by expelling or displacing this challenge to the other areas of human concern. In the Middle Ages, the preoccupation of various sects of Christendom with demonology and the persecution of heretics had enabled the patients with hysterical symptoms or personalities to be included among those charged with

> witchcraft, and thereby excluded from the concern of medicine, to be tortured or burnt to death instead (1965:20)

And he also adds that "it is one of the signs of genius that its possessor asks questions which have simply never occurred to other people in the face of the same situation" (1965:22). Because before leaving Paris, Freud told Charcot about his plan for a comparative study of hysterical and organic paralyses and his wish to prove that hysteria is in fact a real sickness whose pain, anaesthesia and amnesia are genuinely experienced by patients though they had no structural basis in their nervous system for the disabilities which afflicted them. However, for Charcot, all these were, interesting experimentally but did not have any particular theraupeutic significance. Moreover, the capacity to undergo hypnosis, together with the capacity to develop hysterical symptoms, were evidence of degeneration, probably due to some structural inadequacy of the nervous system. Pierre Janet, too, states that

> A hysterical woman was a wretched creature who, on account of constitutional weakness, was unable to hold her mental acts together, and it was for that reason that she fell a victim to a splitting of her mind and to a restriction of the field of her unconsciousness. (Freud 1986: 214).

To Charcot, all that they ultimately demonstrated was that "the symptoms underlying their unconscious mental activity were a sign of irreversible disability, a disorder capable of clinical demonstration but not of lasting relief" (Clark 1965: 22) Though Charcot himself looked at these subjects purely as branches of neuropathology, for Freud they meant the first beginnings of the investigation of the mind and thus the discovery of psychoanalysis.[1]

---

[1] Psychoanalysis is the contribution of Freud to the science of psychology. It means the "analysis of the psyche, 'mind' " (Kendler 1963:445). E. Wright states in "Modern Psychoanalytic Criticism" that psychoanalysis begins as a therapy which "aimed at uncovering repression and verbalizing what had been repudiated" (1986:145).Freud also says that "while it was originally the name of a particular therapeutic method, it has now also become the name of a science – the science of unconscious mental processes" (1986:255) and he adds that "the theories of resistance and of repression, of the unconscious, of the aetiological significance of sexual life and of the importance of infantile experiences" (1986:223) form the principal constituents of the theoretical structure of psychoanalysis

Freud asked himself whether these powerful unconscious mental mechanisms might well exist in all human beings, and play an important role in their lives though they themselves could not normally be fully aware. His was a tentative theory. However, it was received with utmost hostility by Freud's neurological colleagues in Vienna when he was asked to give a report before the Gesellschaft der Aerzte (Society of Medicine) upon what he had seen and learnt with Charcot. The persons of authority declared that what he said was incredible. Meynert offered him to find some cases in Vienna similar to those which Freud had described and to present them before the society. But senior physicians in whose departments such cases were found refused to allow him to observe them or to work at them. As Freud states:

> One of them, an old surgeon, actually broke out with exclamation: 'But, my dear sir, how can you talk such nonsense? Hyteron (sic) means the uretus. So how can a man be hysterical?' I objected in vain that what I wanted was not to have my diagnosis approved, but to have the case put at my disposal. At length, outside the hospital, I came upon a case of classical hysterical hemi-anaesthesia in a man, and demonstrated it before the Gesellschaft der Aerzte. This time I was applauded but no further interest was taken in me... With my hysteria in men and my production of hysterical paralyses by suggestion, I found myself forced into the Opposition. I was soon afterwards excluded from the laboratory of cerebral anatomy and had nowhere to deliver my lectures, I withdrew from academic life and ceased to attend the learned societies. (Freud 1986: 198).

For such disappointments, Freud states that he was made familiar with the fate of being in the Opposition and of being put under the ban of the 'compact majority' (Freud 1986: 191). Whereas Clark, describing Freud as a wide and enthusiastic reader, reminds him the well-known lines by Rudyard Kipling in the poem 'If': "If you can bear to hear the truth you've spoken / Twisted by knaves, to make a trap for fools" to take comfort (1965:16). And he also likens Freud to Cassandra. [2]

[2] A prophetess from mythology whose message was constantly and seemingly wilfully misunderstood. As one of Priam's daughters, she was loved by Apollo and was given by the power to foretell the future. Since she refused his love, he turned against her but could not take back his gift, because "Divine favors once bestowed might not be revoked. He made it of no account: no one ever believed her. She told the

It was only Breuer, a physician practising in Vienna, who also used hypnosis to allay hysteria and collaborated with Freud. He helped Freud, not only with encouragement and advice, but with money. They also shared each other's experience, and Breuer passed some of his patients on to Freud. Both of them were working largely with hysterical cases and decided to pool and publish their findings. They produced a joint work, entitled Studies on Hysteria (1895) in which they stated that "the precipitant factor in hysteria can as readily be psychological as physical. Yet, when it was psychological, it was characteristically never remembered by the patient, or even available to the patient's memory by introspection" (Clark1965: 22).

One of Freud's patients, a woman of good birth, suffered from hysteria. By hypnotic influence Freud took her out of the misery of her condition but she always relapsed again after a short time. Thus, Freud drew the conclusion that her hypnosis had never reached the stage of somnambulism with amnesia. In order to perfect his hypnotic technique, he made a journey to Nancy where was a school to make extensive use of suggestion, with or without hypnosis, for therapeutic purposes. There he witnessed the astonishing experiments by Bernheim and received the impression of the possibility that there could be "powerful mental processes which nevertheless remained hidden from the consciousness of men" (Freud 1986: 200). In a case of hysteria, a female patient of Breuer fell ill while she was nursing her father, of whom she was devotedly fond. She was suffering from paralyses with contractures, inhibitions and states of mental confusion. Breuer put her into deep hypnosis and made her tell him each time what it was that was oppressing her mind. He removed the attacks of depressive confusion and also inhibitions and physical disorders. It is only in hypnosis that she immediately discovered the link between her symptoms and the experiences of her life. All her symptoms went back to moving events which she had experienced while nursing her father. As Freud states,

---

Trojans each time what would happen.... they would never listen to her... It was her fate always to know disaster that was coming and be unable to avert it" *(Hamilton 1969: 211-212)*

> Her symptoms had a meaning and were residues or reminiscences of those emotional situations. There had been some thought or impulse which she had to suppress while she was by her father's sick-bed, and as a substitute for it, the symptom had afterwards appeared. But as a rule the symptom was not the precipitate of a single such 'traumatic' scene, but the result of a summation of a number of similar situations. When the patient recalled a situation of this kind in a hallucinatory way under hypnosis and carried through to its conclusion, with a free expression of emotion, the mental act which she had originally suppressed the symptom was abolished and did not return (1986: 203).

Thus, by this procedure, Breuer succeeded in relieving his patient of all her symptoms.

As Freud explained in his work, An Outline of Psychoanalysis, an analyst raises the mental processes in the patient's ego to a normal level, transforms what has become unconscious and repressed and returns it once more to the possession of ego (1986:415). In Studies on Hysteria, it is also stated that by forgetting, or fading of memories, some experiences are completely absent from the patient's memory when they are in a normal psychical state. It is only through being questioned under hypnosis that these memories emerge. "The patient gets rid of the picture by turning it into words" (Clark 1965:45). Though he used hypnosis in the beginning, Freud soon abandoned it thinking that it may force 'screen memories' upon the susceptible patients. Finally he preferred 'Free Association' in which he asks the patients just to "say out loud and without conscious reservation or criticism of any kind, everything that came into their minds, as one association followed another" (Clark 1965:26). Shakespeare's famous character Macbeth, in Macbeth, after killing King Duncan and becoming the new king is an example who is in need of such a help. Weighed down by guilt and sleeplessness, he addresses to the physician of that day:

> Canst thou not minister to a mind diseased,
> Pluck from the memory a rooted sorrow,
> Raze out the written troubles of the brain,
> And with some sweet oblivious antidote
> Cleanse the stuff'd bosom of that perilous stuff
> Which weighs upon the heart? (5.3.p74)

But, it is his ill-luck that he lives with his secret guilt up to his death.

The idea that there would have to be an unconscious area of mental life to which significant and emotionally charged memories would be sent led Freud to the concept of 'repression' It is the dynamic, compulsive but completely unconscious forgetting of unbearable, threatening or disturbing experiences. He thought that existence of repression in everybody would hinder the ultimate recovery in patients suffering from hysteria. As Clark points out, reviewing his own unconsciously repressed emotions and experiences and their impact upon his own life and judgement, Freud discovered the repressed sexuality, the unconscious denial of a forbidden and now forgotten sexual wish or experience to be a fundamental cause of the great majority of neuroses (1965: 23). For Freud

> Everything that had been forgotten had in some way or other been distressing; it had been either alarming or painful or shameful by the standards of the subject's personality.... that was precisely why it had been forgotten-that is, why it had not remained conscious... In order to make it conscious again in spite of this, it was necessary to overcome something that fought against one in the patient... The expenditure of force on the part of the physician was evidently the measure of a 'resistence' on the part of the patient.... (1986: 212).

As Freud claimed there is a mental conflict in the patient's mind. The 'instinct' and the 'resistance' would struggle with each other, until the instinct was refused and the cathexis of energy withdrawn from its impulsion. This would have been the normal solution. Whereas, in a neurosis, the conflict found a different outcome. The repressed impulse broke its way through at some point or other. It produces "symptoms as the results of a compromise and as the substitutive satisfactions distorted and deflected from their aim owing to the resistance of the ego" (1986: 213),

In addition to Freud's insistence on sexuality, Breuer's lack of self-confidence and powers of resistance against the severe rebuff from the readers of their joint work, The Studies on Hysteria, a sexual attachment by one of his women patients to him, and his reluctance to spend much of his time on the work of catharsis, as Freud stated, caused

Breuer's retirement from their common work. In his work, On The History of The Psychoanalytic Movement (1914), Freud puts his feelings as follows:

> When I later began more and more resolutely to put forward the significance of sexuality in the aetiology of neuroses, he (Breuer) was the first to show the reaction of distaste and repudiation which was later to become so familiar to me, but which at that time I had not yet learnt to recognize as my inevitable fate (1986: 69).

In his further and now single-handed studies, Freud began to discover in all his patients buried sexual memories. They frequently took the form of recollections of sexual seduction in infancy by the parent of the opposite sex, mostly seduction of infant daughters by their fathers. Later, he recognized that these scenes of seduction had never taken place but were only fantasies called 'screen memories' by Freud and made up by his patients. They represented what the patient had feared or wished might happen. This was a severe blow for his confidence, technique and its results. This meant that the "neurotic symptoms were not related directly to actual events but to wishful fantasies and that as far as the neurosis was concerned psychical reality was of more importance than material reality" (Freud 1986:217), This led to a new revelation on the part of Freud himself: the concept of "infantile sexuality-the innocent, unformed but excruciating passion of the child for the parent" (Clark1965:25), and once again to a novelty and a contradiction of one of the strongest of human prejudices. Since the "childhood was looked upon as innocent and free from the lusts of sex and the fight with the demon of sensuality was not thought to begin until the troubled age of puberty" (Freud 1986: 216), this theory was greeted by an outburst of derision and protest. Whereas, for Freud no other finding of analysis can be demonstrated so easily and so completely.

Freud, in his article, "The Resistances to Psychoanalysis", also tells about the neurotic symptoms and social restrictions claiming that human civilization rests upon two pillars: the control of natural forces and the restriction of our instincts. Though the society expects unconditioned obedience to such restrictions, in his theory of psychoanalysis, Freud shows the "distorted substitutive satisfactions of sexual

instinctual forces, the direct satisfaction of which has been frustrated by internal resistances" (1986:268) as the symptoms of neuroses. He demands reduction in the strictness with which instincts are repressed and claims that every individual, when a child, has an emotional attachment to the parent of the opposite sex. He announces this phase, known as the Oedipus complex, to be the peak of early infantile sexual life. Thus, his theory is regarded as harmful to culture and has been put under a ban as a social danger. However, Freud thinks that what was objected in his theory is not something new because plenty of material from the discoveries of Breuer (on the origin of neurotic symptoms) and the teachings of Charcot (on hypnotic phenomena) were used in his own theory. At this point he also reminds that the philosopher Schopenhauer in his work, The World As Will and Idea, discusses the character of sexual desire "not only the strongest but even specifically of a more powerful kind than any other." Freud, quoting Schopenhauer, says:

> The important role which the relation of the sexes plays in the world of men, where it is really the invisible central point of all action and conduct, and peeps out everywhere in spite of all veils thrown over it. It is the cause of war..., the inexhaustible source of wit, the key to all allusions, ... the daily meditation of the young.... It is, however, the piquant element and the joke of life that the chief concern of all men is secretly pursued and ostensibly ignored as much as possible.... But 'sexual passion' (when used by Freud, it is translated as 'sexual instinct') is the kernel of the will to live, and consequently the concentration of all desire (1986:274-275).

In fact, Freud is ready for any sort of mental reactions for novelty. He says that in the history of scientific research innovations have met with intense and stubborn resistance, though subsequent events have shown that the resistance was unjustified and that the novelty was valuable and important. As a rule, certain factors in the subject-matter of the novelty provoked the resistance. He adds that psychoanalysis contains nothing in favour of releasing instincts that would injure the community; on the contrary it has had a warning and an exhortation to men to mend their ways. He claims the society to have set up a high ideal of morality as the restrictions of the instincts. While trying to fulfill

that ideal, the individual feels the demands of civilization as a constant pressure upon him. In most people sexual instincts are tamed insufficiently and in a psychologically wrong manner. Therefore they are readier than the rest to break loose. Thus, psychoanalysis has revealed weakness of this system and recommended that it should be altered (1986: 264-279).

Freud also reproaches the physicians, the psychiatrists and the philosophers for not supporting his theory. Since the contemporary generation of physicians at that time are brought up to respect only anatomical, physical and chemical factors, they are not ready to take psychical ones into account and therefore meet them with indifference or antipathy. They regard such abstractions as those with which psychology is obliged to work as vague, fantastic and mystical. Even the psychiatrists show no inclination to examine the details of symptoms of hysterical neuroses or inquire into their connections. During this materialistic, or rather mechanistic period, they are content to classify the series of symptoms and trace them back to somatic, anatomical or chemical aetiological disturbances. As for the philosophers, the idea of what is mental for them was not that of psychoanalysis. They regard only the phenomena of consciousness as mental, in other words, the mind has no contents other than the phenomena of consciousness. Psychology, the science of the mind, consequently has no other subject-matter. Thus, anything both unconscious and mental will be an impossibility (1986: 266-67).

> In the course of centuries the navie self-love of men has had to submit to two major blows at the hands of science. The first was when they learnt that our earth was not the centre of the universe but only a tiny fragment of a cosmic system of scarcely imaginable vastness... The second blow fell when biological research destroyed man's supposedly previleged place in creation and proved his descent from the animal kingdom and his ineradicable animal nature... But human megalomania will have suffered its third and most wounding blow from the psychological research of the present time which seeks to prove to the ego that it's not even master in its own house, but must content itself with scanty information of what is going on unconsciously in its mind (Freud 1991:326).

Thus, "what Copernicus had done to man's universe, what Darwin had done to man's ancestry, Freud claimed to have done to man's ultimate resource-his reason" (Rieff 1961:76), and these three blows cosmological, biological and psychological respectively, "awaken the man from his dearest dream and caused the world to lose its sleep" (Özgü 1994:26).

1.2. Structures of The Mind and Psychosexual Theory of Personality Development

For Freud, child development is primarily unconscious and is heavily coloured by emotion. He believes that behavior is merely a surface characteristic and that the symbolic meanings of behavior and the deep inner workings of the mind have to be analyzed to truly understand development (Carlson1997:36). The basic assumption of his theory is that much of our behavior stems from unconscious processes by which he meant beliefs, fears, and desires a person is unaware of but that nevertheless influence behavior (Atkinson1996:13). He names the three parts of the mind as conscious, preconscious and unconscious. The conscious content of the mind is what a person is momentarily aware of. The preconscious content is those events not in a person's consciousness at the moment but which he can become aware of without difficulty. The unconscious of a person's mind is "what he is unaware of and is the largest and most influential area of the mind in Freud's iceberg analogy" (Kendler 1963:446).

> The unconscious is the conception that the unacceptable (forbidden, punished) wishes of childhood are driven out of awareness and become part of the unconscious, where they remain influential. The unconscious presses to find expression, which it does in numerous ways, including dreams, slips of speech, and unconscious mannerisms (Atkinson 1996:667).

Freud views the mind as having three distinct agencies: the 'id', the instinctual drives that spring from the constitutional needs of the body; the 'ego' which develops out of the id to regulate and oppose the drives; and the 'superego', the representative of

parental and social influences upon the drives, a transformation of them rather than an external agency (Wright 1984:11). In The "Theory of The Instincts", Freud maintains that

> The power of the id expresses the true purpose of the individual organism's life. This consists in the satisfaction of its innate needs. No such purpose as that of keeping itself alive or of protecting itself from dangers by means of anxiety can be attributed to the id. That is the task of the ego, whose business it also is to discover the most favorable and least perilous method of obtaining satisfaction, taking the external world into account. The super-ego may bring fresh needs to the fore, but its main function remains the limitation of satisfactions (1986:379).

So, as summarized in one of Freud's own slogans: "Where id was, there shall ego be" and as a pitiable and precarious entity, the ego "is battered by the external world, scourged by the crucial upbraidings of the superego, plagued by the greedy, insatiable demands of the id. It labours under the almost intolerable demands placed upon it by a civilization built upon the repression of desire and the deferment of gratification" (Eagleton:1983:160-61). As Bressler narrates from Freud, containing our secret desires, our darkest wishes, and our most intense fears, the id wishes only to fulfill the urges of the 'pleasure principle' and it houses the 'libido', the source of all our psychosexual desires and all our psychic energy. Whereas the ego, as the rational, logical, waking part of the mind operates in harmony with the reality principle. Though much of its activities remain in the unconscious, it is the ego's job to mediate between the instinctual (especially sexual) desires of the id and the demands of social pressure issued by the superego. Here, the superego acts as an internal censor, operates according to the 'morality principle' and society's moral restrictions, and manifests itself through punishment (1999:150-51).

In a child's developments, Freud asserts that the child is basically controlled by the pleasure principle. The child, while going through five stages of psychosexual development, experiences pleasure in one part of the body more than in others. These

parts that have especially strong pleasure-giving qualities at each stage of development are called, by Freud, the 'erogenous zones'.

> The small baby will suck its mother's breast for milk, but will discover in doing so that this biologically essential activity is also pleasurable; and this, for Freud, is the first dawning of sexuality. The baby's mouth becomes not only an organ of its physical survival but an erotogenic zone, which the child might reactivate a few years later by sucking its thumb, and a few years later than that by kissing (Eagleton 1983:153).

After this oral stage of development, occurring during the first 18 months of life, comes the anal stage occurring between 1.5 and 3 years of age. During this stage the anus becomes an erotogenic zone, and the child expresses both his anger and his excitement upon discovering his independence from his mother and how he may become sadistic, expelling and destroying through elimination. By withholding feces, the child also learns that he can control others (Bressler 1999:151). The phallic stage is the third Freudian stage of development. It occurs between the ages of 3 and 6, and the child's libido focuses on the genitals. In Freud's view, at this stage the child begins to discover the sex roles of his parents and he unconsciously attaches himself to the parent of the opposite sex (Carlson 1997:468). Thus, during this period the Oedipus complex appears. This name comes from Greek mythology, in which Oedipus, the son of the King of Thebes, unwittingly kills his father and marries his mother. As Kendler states,

> Up to and including the early portions of the phallic stage the child's libido is directed towards himself. His pleasures are auto-erotic. At the end of the phallic stage an important change takes place. The child begins to direct his libido to love objects external to himself. Freud hypothesized that the libido of the male child begins to be directed toward the mother resulting in what he called the Oedipus complex. According to Freud the libidinal desires of the son toward his mother are totally unconscious. Although they influence his behavior he is unaware of them. As the desire becomes stronger the child unconsciously competes with his father for the affection of his mother, and becomes hostile toward his father. This brings on another complex-the castration complex-in which the boy fears that his father will retaliate by injuring him, particularly by harming his genitals. However, this fear helps the boy resolve his Oedipus

> complex... He renounces his libidinal desire for his mother and therefore escapes from the castration threat (1963:447).

Following the Oedipal period, the child enters the latency stage in which the child represses all interest in sexuality and develops social and intellectual skills. All these occur between approximately 6 years of age and puberty. This enables the child to canalize much of his energy into emotionally safe areas and helps him forget the highly stressful conflicts of the phallic stage. The final Freudian stage, called the genital stage occuring from puberty on is "a time of sexual reawakening; the source of sexual pleasure now becomes someone outside of the family" (Santrock1996:39). Developing such mature love relationship and functioning independently as an adult can be mentioned if the Oedipus complex has been resolved successfully. Otherwise, the individual may become fixated at the phallic stage and personality difficulties arise.

1.3. Oedipus Complex

The Oedipus complex for Freud is an individual drama, the collective fate of mankind, a psychologic fact, the source of morality, the origin of neurosis and the origin of civilization. The Oedipus complex is the theory of seduction in reverse. It replaces an earlier hypothesis in which the child's reduction by the adult is told about depending on the accounts by the patients of Freud. Now, the father does not seduce the child, but rather the child, in wishing to possess its mother, desires the death of the father (Ricoeur1970:188-189).

Freud, borrowing the name from the play Oedipus Rex, written by Greek playwright Sophocles, makes it the central point in building up his theory. He finds again and again in his analysis that the "human being's first problem in life is his adjustment to the primeval triangle father-mother-child" (Wittels 1931:199). The son feels the father as a stranger; between himself and the mother there exists the closest blood relationship, but there is none between the strange man and the mother, and the boy after the appearance of the father has to fight for his mother For Anna Freud, the

relationship between the infant, the tiny human being, and the mother soon goes beyond the striving for the preservation of his life and satisfaction of some vital needs. When the external world enters disturbingly into the relation between the child and his mother at the end of the first year, he learns that his mother does not belong to him alone. He wishes his brothers and sisters out of the way to restore the original state of affairs. This emotional antagonism is a comparatively harmless prelude to another and a much more powerful emotional conflict in which the father plays a twofold part. The boy hates his father as a rival but also loves and admires him, relies on his help, believes in his strength and omnipotence, and has no greater desire than to be like him in the future. Thus, there arises in the boy the extraordinary problem (1963:27-33).

In fact, this is not the first seperation from the mother. As Freud claims, experience begins with a trauma, birth, and the child's unusual seperation from the mother. Later, the child continues to live in a world of frustration, goaded by unsatisfied desires and envies, and the childhood neurosis is not the exception but the rule, thus, it is unavoidable (Rieff 1961:61). Freud sees the child's relationship with its parents as critical for the achievement of its proper sexual identity. The difficulties begins with the child's dependence on the nurturing mother. The initial seperation from the mother's body forms a self-concept, but the love of mother remains dominant in the early formative years. A perception of the father as rival in this love becomes insistent for the boy-child to the point where he is drawn into fantasies of the killing of this rival and possessing the mother. This is the Oedipus complex. The father is experienced as the source of all authority, all direction of desire, and thus as capable of castrating the boy-child. The boy thus abandons his love for the mother and moves towards identification with the father, with the understanding that he too can in time occupy such a position of power (Wright 1984:14). As asserted by Freud, this happens during the late infantile stage (somewhere between ages 3 and 6) and being already in the phallic stage and therefore sexually aware of his own erogenous organs, the child perceives the father's attention given to the mother as sexual. Bressler says that:

> If a child's sexual development is to proceed normally, Freud maintains, each must then pass through the castration complex. From observing themselves, their mothers, and perhaps their sisters, little boy knows they have a penis like their fathers whereas their mothers and sisters do not. What prevents the male child from continuing to have incestuous desires for his mother is fear of castration by his father. The child therefore represses his sexual desire, identifies with his father, and hopes some day to possess a woman as his father now possesses his mother. Unconsciously, the boy has thus successfully made the transition to manhood (1999:152).

While strong attachment to the mother and hostile and negative feelings for the father are the characteristics of the Oedipus complex, the opposite pattern is said to hold true for the girl. According to Freud, the sequence of events in the phallic stage for the girl begins when she realizes that she has no penis which is recognized as superior to her own anatomy by her. Thus, she develops penis envy. Since her desire having this organ can never be satisfied directly, the young girl develops a wish to become impregnated by her father. Realizing that she is already castrated as her mother and holding her mother responsible for it, she gives up her love for her mother and becomes intensely attached to her father. Thus she forms her own version of the Oedipus complex, sometimes referred to as the Electra complex. In fact, in the beginning, like a boy, a young girl is also erotically attracted to her mother and like the boy, she, too, recognizes the father as a rival for her mother's affection. It is only after her feeling castrated that she turns her desires to her father who possesses that which she desires. She turns back toward the mother and identifies with her, only after the seduction of her father fails. Thus, her transition into womanhood is completed and she dreams possessing a man as her mother possesses her father.

As is seen the difference between the male and female oedipalization is that the girl to enter into the Oedipus complex must change her love-object from mother to father whereas the boy continues loving the mother. Eagleton writes that the child, in the pre-Oedipal stages, is not only "anarchic, sadistic, aggressive, self-involved and remorselessly pleasure-seeking but also incestuous to boot" (1983:154). He also adds that the child does not have any respect for differences of gender; it surges with sexual

derives, but this libidinal energy recognizes no distinction between masculine and feminine. The child's success in life is through the mechanism what Freud famously terms the Oedipus complex. The boy abandons his incestuous desire for the mother perceiving the girl's being castrated and imagining this as a punishment which might be visited upon himself. He represses his incestuous desire in anxious acceptance, adjusts himself to the reality principle, and begins to act the symbolic role of manhood. Thus, he overcomes his Oedipus complex and becomes a gendered subject. He represses his forbidden desire into the unconscious, a place that was not ready to receive such a desire (1983:154-155).

The boy grows up within masculine images and practices of his society. If the boy is unable successfully to overcome the Oedipus complex, he may privilege the image of his mother above all other women, which for Freud may lead to homosexuality; or the recognition that women are 'castrated' may have traumatized him so deeply that he is unable to enjoy satisfying sexual relationships with them. So, in order to stop to be a child and to become a member of the social community, the son has to detach his libidinal wishes from his mother and employ them for the choice of a real outside love-object and reconcile himself with his father. As Freud points out,

> By neurotics, however, no solution at all is arrived at; the son remains all his life bowed beneath his father's authority and he is unable to transfer his libido to an outside sexual object. In this sense the Oedipus complex may justly be regarded as the nucleus of neuroses (1991:380).

Freud also states that "illness is employed as an instrument for the self-punishment, and neurotics have to behave as though they were governed by a sense of guilt, which in order to be satisfied, needs to be punished by illness". (1986:324). In "Taboo and Emotional Ambivalence", the second essay of his book Totem and Taboo, Freud draws attention to the remarkable similarity between the religious practices of totemism and the obsessional acts and beliefs of neurotics. He says obsessional neuroses are a defence against incestuous wishes and rebellions of childhood and religious practises are a defence against the same fear. However, it now spreads among the entire

community as a sense of guilt for their aggressive and rebellious wishes against the sexual morality of their community. He also reminds a rule against incest: "A system of ritual expiation directed against guilt incurred in the mind of the individual occurs by the conviction that the rule of the totem has been broken" (qtd in Clark 1965: 181). In that same book, Freud puts forward a suggestion that "mankind as a whole may have acquired its sense of guilt, the ultimate source of religion and morality, at the beginning of its history, in connection with the Oedipus complex" (1991:375). So, as Eagleton states, the Oedipus complex for Freud is

> The beginnings of morality, conscience, law and all forms of social and religious authority. The father's real or imagined prohibition of incest is symbolic of all the higher authority to be later encountered... It signals the transition from the pleasure principle to the reality principle; from the enclosure of the family to society at large, since we turn from incest to extra-familial relations; and from Nature to Culture, since we see the infants relation to the mother as somehow 'natural', and the post- Oedipal child as one who is in the process of assuming a position within the cultural order as a whole (1983:156).

Whereas, as Anna Freud claims castration fear may lead to the denial of any kind of authority. The child says to himself "when anybody has power, then he has the power to punish me. Consequently every possibility of heavenly or earthly ruler must be removed from the world" (1963:113). An example for this is given by Freud in his book The Interpretation of Dreams. A young man, being tortured by the fear that he would kill everyone he met, is unable to go out into the street. He spends his days in preparing his alibi in case he might be charged with one of the murders committed in the town. The analysis shows that the basis of this distressing obsession is an impulse to murder his somewhat over-severe father. (This impulse had been consciously expressed when he was seven.) After his father's painful illness and death, the patient's obsessional self-reproaches appear (when he is thirty-one), taking the shape of a phobia transferred on to strangers (1991:361-62). In this book, as the name suggests, Freud gives examples and interpretations of many dreams. Castration complex in children is exemplified as follows:

> a) A boy aged three years and five months, who obviously disliked the idea of his father's returning from the front, woke up one morning in a disturbed and excited state. He kept on repeating: "Why was Daddy carrying his head on a plate? Last night Daddy was carrying his head on a plate".
> b) A student who is now suffering from a severe obsessional neurosis remembers having repeatedly had the following dream during his sixth year: He went to the hairdresser's to have his hair cut. A big, severe-looking woman came up to him and cut his head off. He recognized the woman as his mother (1991:485).

Freud says that the encyclopaedist Diderot, in his work Le Neveu de Rameau, considers the two criminal wishes of the Oedipus complex as the true representatives of the uninhibited life of the instincts long before the time of psychoanalysis: "If the little savage were left to himself, preserving all his foolishness and adding to the small sense of a child in the cradle the violent passions of a man of thirty, he would strangle his father and lie with his mother" (1986:427).

Thus, the works in the next chapters will exemplify the struggle between the fathers and the sons.

CHAPTER II

2.1 The Myth: Origin and Dissemination.

Leeming in his book, Mythology. The Voyage of the Hero, states that for an orthodox believer myth is the word of God. Referring to the biblical statement, "in the beginning was the Word; and the Word was with God, and the Word was God", he adds that myth is the word of God; the metaphorical, symbolical or direct expression of the unknown. Thus, myth which comes from the Greek root μv (mu) meaning to make a sound with the mouth is basic to human existence (1981:1). As Rosenberg puts it,

> Myths usually originate in an ancient, oral tradition. Some explain origins, natural phenomena, and death; others describe the nature and function of divinities; while still others provide models of virtuous behavior by relating the adventures of heroes or the misfortunes of arrogant humans. Myths often include elements from legend and folklore. They depict humans as an integral part of a larger universe, and they impart a feeling of awe for all that is mysterious and marvelous in life (1994:XV)

Thus, a myth's serious purpose is either to explain the nature of the universe or to instruct members of the community in the attitudes or behavior. The creation and fertility myths, and the hero myths and epics are used for these purposes respectively.

As the symbols of human experience, myths can be analyzed in a variety of ways. According to Hamilton, myths lead us back to a time when the world was young and people had a connection with the earth, with trees and seas and flowers and hills. The distinction between the real and unreal was little. The imagination was vividly alive and not checked by the reason. So that, anyone in the woods might see through the trees a fleeing nymph, or bending over a clear pool to drink, behold in the depths a naiad's face (1969:13). Jane Harrison, a follower of the 'myth-ritual school', thinks that myth is "the narrative correlative of the ritual act, meaningful only when considered in the context of the ritual" (qtd.in Leeming 1981:2). Mircea Eliade, a historian of religions,

also views myths as the essence of religion, conceived from a genuine religious experience. This experience is a sacred one that "gives myths their structure and their utility. The ancient world contained a multitude of co-existing religious ideas and forms: different types of monotheism and polytheism (both female-dominated and male-dominated), nature worship, and ancestor worship" (Rosenberg 1994: XXI).

On the other hand, some critics assume that a real myth has nothing to do with religion. It is an explanation how any or everything in nature came into existence. For instance, thunder and lightning are caused when Zeus hurls his thunderbolt. A volcano erupts because a terrible creature is imprisoned in the mountain and every now and then struggles to get free. The Dipper, the constellation called also the Great Bear, does not set below the horizon because a goddess once was angry at it and decreed that it should never sink into the sea. So, myths are early science, the result of men's first trying to explain what they saw around them (Hamilton 1969: 19).

Myths are viewed as by Sigmund Freud and his followers the expression of the individual's unconscious wishes, fears and drives. For instance, Otto Rank explains the characteristics of the traditional hero in terms of infantile hostility, childhood fantasies, and rebellion against one's father (Rosenberg 1994: XXI). Freud, in his book Totem and Taboo, applies the principles of psychoanalysis to myth and finds parallels between myth and neurosis (Leeming 1981:2). Carl Jung and his followers, especially Joseph Campbell on top of them, view myths as the expression of a universal, collective unconscious. In their theory innate psychological characteristics, common to all human beings, determine how people experience and respond to the process of living throughout the world and throughout history (Rosenberg 1994: XXI). For Campbell, mythology is as "amenable as life itself to the obsessions and requirements of the individual, the race and the age" and for Jung, "the primitive mentality does not invent myths, it experiences them. Myths are original revelations of the pre-conscious psyche, involuntary statements about unconscious psychic happenings" (qtd. in Leeming 1981:3-4) Anthropologist Claude Lêvi-Strauss views myths as abstract constructions rather than narrative tales or symbols of experience:

> The structure of all human minds is identical and is revealed by the similar ways people solve their problems. Myths are identical products from identical minds, so myths from around the world possess a common structure. They reveal the conflict between opposing forces-such as life and death, or nature and culture. To discover the meaning of a particular myth, one must focus on its underlying structure rather than its narrative content or any symbolic meaning (Rosenberg 1994:XXI).

Though myths are considered to be "symbolic explanations for the powerful forces and incomprehensible movements of nature" (Loomis 1965:11), they ascribe "human characteristics to larger-than-life characters and their deeds and actions often destroy all sense of time and place" (Couch 1977:7-8) because they depict and reveal "behavior and problems common to all human beings" (Rosenberg 1992:2), reminding us that human nature has not changed throughout the long course of history. These imply several diachronically existing behavioral and emotional patterns. For instance,

> Man continues to be violent. He continues to covet his neighbor's (or neighboring countries) possessions, and he will still go to war in order to gain more territory and power. Man has continued to impose his patriarchal, or male, attitudes upon the fabric of society, determining the role of women as well as his own role (Rosenberg 1992:3).

Thus, the word mythical means 'incredible' but it is a constant rule of mythology that "whatever happens among the gods above reflects events on earth" (Graves 1997:VII).

2.2 The Value of Mother (hood) in Greek Mythology

The correlation between nature and the primitive men is obvious in the beginning of life in the Greek mythology. Being farmers, these people revere and worship the earth. Gaia, who is Mother Earth, is the first Great Goddess or Mother Goddess. According to the account,

> Back at the beginning of all things, before even Time began, there was only Chaos broading over the darkness. Nothing had form; there was no light; there was no life. At last, slowly, the Earth, Gaia, the darkness under the Earth, Night, emerged (Loomis 1965:19).

After the Earth (Gaia) is born out of Chaos, she produces Uranus (Father Sky) without the help of a male. Thus, Mother Earth starts creation.

It is Mother Earth who supplies these people with the food they need to survive. It is Mother Earth who receives those who died, both plant and human. It is also Mother Earth who brings forth new life from land that looked lifeless for months, and who nourishes it so that it reaches maturity (Rosenberg 1992:9). As Rosenberg adds, the fertility of the earth is of prime importance to the primitive people:

> Their survival depended upon their ability to raise enough food to sustain them through the non-productive months of the year, and upon their ability to have enough children to assure the continuity of their clan. These people drew a connection between a woman's ability to give birth to children and the earth's ability to "give birth" to all plants. Therefore, the earth spirit was feminine, and the principal divinities that the early Greeks worshipped were also feminine (1991:5).

Feeling a kinship with all of nature, these people think that they, too, are born, mature, and die, just as the plants and animals around them. Therefore, they think Mother Earth to be as responsible for their own fertility as she is for that of the plant and animal kingdoms. They, too, like the plants and, presumably, the animals, must be born in some way after death. Theirs is a religion centered upon the belief in the endlessly recurring cycle of birth, maturity, death, and rebirth. It is only through the

operation of this cycle that their economic security and the continuation of their race are possible. Thus, they worship Mother Earth properly and only then they expect the cycle to continue without interruption (Rosenberg 1992: 9-10).

In these allegedly matriarchal societies, the Great Goddess or Mother Goddess personifies Mother Earth and is the supreme deity, and the queen personifies the Great Goddess, and

> She wielded great political, economic, social, and religious power. Other women were considered daughters of Great Goddess. Thus, all women in the matriarchal society were highly valued, and many of them held important positions. Women were the heads of their families, and inheritance passed from a mother to her daughters, with the youngest daughter being most important because, presumably, she would be the last to die and thus would continue the family line the longest. Children were reared by their mother and her brother, while the father lived in the home of his mother and helped rear his sister's children. The children's primary moral obligations were to their mother and their siblings (Rosenberg 1994: XIX).

Though the family is of principal importance in these societies, the father is an unimportant figure and the status, inheritance and name come from the mother. As Rosenberg states, in early times, people do not realize that a male is necessary for procreation and motherhood is a mysterious, miraculous event, possibly aided by wind or water. The greatest crime is the crime of child against mother. It is considered so heinous that society provides no way for the child to atone for it. Mother love is a humane and pacifying influence, creating an aura of honor, trust, hospitality, generosity, concern and reverence for all life (1992:10-11). Thus, a greater loyalty to the mother than to the father is obvious.

2.3. The Rebellious Sons in Greek Mythology

In the stories of Uranus, Cronus and Zeus, the mothers Gaia and Rhea also get use of such relationship with their sons. The starry heavens, Uranus, is produced by Gaia, the "broad breast and the unshakable foundation of all the immortals who keep the

crests of snowy Olympos, and Tartaros the foggy in the pit of the wide-wayed earth" (Hesiod 1973:130). She marries her son Uranus to bear him twelve Titans and Titanesses, the gigantic immortals who precede the race of gods, three giants having a hundred hands and fifty heads, and three cyclopes, with one eye in the middle of their foreheads. As Grant and Hazel point out, one of these Titans, Cronus, helps Gaia to take vengeance on Uranus, for Uranus is jealous of his children and, when the time comes for them to be born tries to push them back into the body of Gaia (1993:340). He also imprisons the Cyclopes into Tartarus, a gloomy place in the underworld. His eyes shine with pride and satisfaction for he rules without fear of any challenge to his authority and he expects to rule forever. But Gaia is outraged by her husband's actions. She longs for her children and she hates Uranus for what he has done to them. However, she buries her feelings deep in her heart and quietly waits for the time when she can take revenge (Rosenberg 1994:7). About the off-spring of Gaia and Uranus, Hesiod in his works Theogony, a complete work outlining the origin of the world and the genealogies of the gods, writes as follows:

> And they hated their father/ from the beginning, and every time each one/was beginning/to come out, he would push them back again,/ deep inside Gaia/ and would not let them into the light/ and Quranos exulted/ in his wicked work; but great Gaia/ groaned within for pressure/of pain; and then she thought of an evil/ treacherous attack... (1973:132)

As a mother provoking children to patricide, Gaia asks her sons to protect her against Uranus. As Grimal states, she is also tired of endless childbirth and wants to escape from her husband's brutal love-making (1996:463). They all refuse except the "great devious-devising Kronos" (Hesiod 1973:133) who is given a flint sickle by his mother to castrate Uranus when he comes to lie upon Gaia for the next time.

Uranus, being immortal, does not die. However, he screams in agony, for his immortality does not prevent him from feeling excruciating pain. Part of his anguish comes from the realization that his power has suddenly ended (Rosenberg 1994:8). Now the lord of the world and the chief of the Titans, Cronus, rules in Uranus' place, frees

the rebellious sons of Uranus from Tartarus in response to the entreaties of their common mother, Gaia, and marries his own sister Rhea. He quickly becomes as brutal as his father. He swallows his children one by one as they are born

> With the intention/that no other of the proud children/of the line of Quranos/ should ever hold the king's position/ among the immortals./ For he had heard, from Gaia/ and from starry Quranos, /that it had been ordained for him,/ for all his great strength,/ to be beaten by his son,/ and through the designs of great Zeus./ Therefore he kept watch, and did not sleep,/ but waited/ for his children, and swallowed them,/ and Rheia's sorrow was beyond forgetting (Hesiod 1973:150).

Hoping to prevent the fulfillment of the prophecy that one of his children would depose him in the same way as he himself has deposed his father, Cronus imprisons the giants and Cyclopes once more in the earth. He succeeds in eating all except Zeus, for whom a great stone wrapped in swaddling clothes is substituted and his father duly swallows instead. Zeus is reared in secret by the nymphs of Mount Dicte (or Ida) in Crete with the milk of the goat Amalthea, while the Curetes clashed their spears on their shields to prevent Cronus from hearing the baby's cries. (Grant and Hazel 1993:93). When Zeus grows to manhood, the Titaness Metis, reputed to be the wisest of all the immortals, gives Cronus (also with the help of Rhea) an emetic to make him vomit up all the children swallowed by him and emerge from Cronus's belly alive and filled with implacable hatred for Cronus.

> Led by their youngest brother Zeus, these children then declared war on Cronus, whose allies were his brothers the Titans. The war lasted ten years, but at last Mother Earth promised victory to Zeus if he took those whom Cronus had confined in Tartarus as allies. Zeus set them free and gained the victory. Cronus and the Titans were then confined in Tartarus in place of the Hecatoncheries, who became their warders (Grimal 1996:115).

As Hamilton narrates this terrible war between Cronus and Zeus and their allies almost wrecks the universe. 'A dreadful sound troubled the boundless sea/ The whole

earth uttered a great cry./ wide heaven, shaken, groaned.' The Titans are conquered, partly because Zeus releases from their prison the hundred-handed monsters who fight for him with their irresistible weapons- thunder, lightning, and earthquake. One of the sons of the Titan Iapetus, Prometheus, also takes sides with Zeus, to lead the latter to victory (1969:68).

Vernant and Naquet point out that nowhere else in the Greek myths any god or any hero emasculated by his sons, or indeed emasculated at all, can be found. Uranus is the only example of it. Whereas,

> Symbolical substitutes for castration can be found: hurling from a great height, cutting, gouging out, usurping someone's place and power. Furthermore, the devouring of his children by the father or by the wild beasts to which he has exposed them is supposed to constitute a primal and radical form of castration (1990:97-98):

In these myths of succession and struggle for sovereignty, Cronus and Zeus are two example sons who are encouraged by their mothers, Gaia and Rhea, to castrate their fathers and get the power for themselves. It can be said they are led to their deeds by their mothers' wish to avenge for what the brutal husbands have done to them. Both Uranus and Cronus seperate the mothers from their children to keep their own places safe. Also, in Oedipus Rex, by Sophocles, which will be examined in terms of the conflict between the father and the son in the next chapter, the father has the fear of being castrated by losing his power.

CHAPTER III

3.1 Escape From Parrincest

Freud's Oedipus complex is named after Oedipus. In Greek legend, Oedipus is the son of Laius and Jocasta, king and queen of Thebes. Laius is warned by an oracle that he was fated to be killed by his own son who will also marry his mother. Determined to avert his fate, Laius pierces and binds together the feet of his newborn child and leaves him on Mount Kitharon to die. (In Sophocles' play Oedipus Rex, it is Jocasta who gives the infant, Oedipus, to a shepherd to get rid of it.) However, a shepherd finds the infant and gives him to another shepherd who takes him to the childless king and queen of Corinth, Polybus and Merope. There the king and queen bring him up as their own son and the king names the child Oedipus (swollen foot).

The boy does not know that he was adopted and when he learns from the Delphic oracle that he is fated to kill his father and marry his mother, to escape that fate he leaves Corinth never to return. On his journey he meets an old man (Laius) with his servants, quarrels with him and kills him and his followers. Thus, he unwittingly fulfills the prophecy. Lonely and homeless, he arrives at Thebes where a dreadful monster called the Sphinx was killing all who could not solve her riddle. Oedipus answers it correctly and saves the city. Believing that King Laius was killed by unknown robbers and grateful to Oedipus for ridding them of the Sphinx, the Thebans reward Oedipus by making him their king and giving him Queen Jocasta as his wife. Thus, the second part of the prophecy is fulfilled. For many years the couple live in happiness, not knowing that they are really mother and son, and have several children.

When Thebes suffers under a plague and a drought, the oracle reports that the gods are angry because Laius' slayer is unpunished. The only way to rid the land of its pollution is to expel the murderer of Laius.

Sophocles, in his play Oedipus Rex, preserves the mystery of the Oedipus myth and starts his play almost with the end of the story. The people of Thebes come to ask

for comfort and advice from Oedipus who in the past saved their city by solving the riddle of the Sphinx and can now find a remedy for the plague:

> PRIEST: Therefore, O mighty King, we turn to you;
> Find us our safety, find us a remedy,
> Whether by counsel of the gods or men.
> A king of wisdom tested in the past
> Can act in a time of troubles, and act well.
> Noblest of men, restore
> Life to your city! Think how all men call you
> Liberator for your triumph long ago;
> Ah when your years of kingship are remembered,
> Let them not say we rose, but later fell-
> Keep, years ago, with happy augury
> You brought us fortune; be the same again.
>
> (p.38)

Oedipus, in his reply, states as "Each of you suffers in himself alone / His anguish, not another's; but my spirit / Groans for the city, for myself, for you" (p.38). At this moment neither the people of Thebes nor Oedipus knows the reason of the plague. Creon is sent to Apollo, the god of truth healing and light, by Oedipus himself to learn what act of Oedipus can save the city and he informs the rest about the reason and solution of their suffering: Apollo asks the Thebans to make enquiry to find Laius' slayer and to revenge upon him. As Creon narrates, the god wants "by exile or death, blood for blood. It was Murder that brought the plague-wind on the city" (p.39). Thus, Oedipus becomes the man at the target though he has committed the murder unwittingly.

As Segal, in his Sophocles' Tragic World, points out, Oedipus at the beginning of the play is a potential savior, however at the end the becomes the curse and the pollution:

> Now he is not only the polluter of Thebes as the killer of Laios, the original definition of the source of the plague by the oracle, but also the polluter of the symbolic center of the city, the royal house of Thebes, under the terms that he applies to himself, 'father's slayer and mother's ...' (1995:154).

When Oedipus first hears the prophecy that he would lie with his own mother, breed children from whom all men would turn their eyes; and that he should be his father's murderer, he immediately leaves Corinth. In Pucci's words "abandoning his supposed parents for fear of parrincest, Oedipus makes himself an orphan" (1992:109). He considers Thebes as a shelter to avoid the crimes Apollo foresees for him, however his misfortunes start on the way to Thebes: He meets Laius and his men at a crossroad and is provoked by them, especially by Laius himself:

> OEDIPUS: A herald came towards me, and a chariot
> Drawn by horses, with a man such as you describe
> Seated in it. The groom leading the horses
> Forced me off the road at his lord's command;
> But as this charioteer lurched over towards me
> The structure of all human minds is identical and is
> I struck him in my rage. The old man saw me
> And brought his double goad down upon my head
> As I came abreast.
> He was paid back and more!
> Swinging my club in this right hand I knocked him
> Out of his car, and he rolled on the ground,
> I killed him.
> I killed them all
>
> (p.50)

In this story of Oedipus' personal involvement in the murder of Laius, it is clear that the hostile attack by the opposing party leads Oedipus to counteract in the same way. Oedipus' tendency towards violence at the cross-road may seem strange because it is the same Oedipus who leaves his home due to the probability of committing the known crimes against his parents. However,

> The decision to leave Corinth seems at the time to be the best decision Oedipus could make; his only alternative would be to remain in Corinth in the household of the persons he believed he was destined to sin against. The decision to kill Laius-if it can be called a decision-was a choice between acting heroically and fighting back against an attack, or acting cowardly and letting the king pass without responding to being

> driven off the road; most Greeks would have approved of Oedipus' anger (Lemon 1969:147).

Oedipus is so determined not to harm his father that when the messenger from Corinth says that Polybus died because of sickness and tiredness of many years he is pleased with this news. He thinks thus the first part of the prophecy comes to be false:

> OEDIPUS: They prophesied that I should kill Polybos,
> Kill my own father; but he is dead and buried,
> And I am here-I never touched him, never,
> Unless he diet of grief for my departure.
>
> (p.52)

However, he still worries about the second part of the prophecy that tells about Oedipus' sleeping with his mother in the future:

> JOCASTA: From now on never think of those things again.
> OEDIPUS: And yet, must I not fear my mother's bed?
> JOCASTA: Have no more fear of sleeping with your mother.
> No reasonable man is troubled by such things.
> OEDIPUS: That is true; only – If only my mother were not still alive!
> But she is still alive. I can not help my dread.
> JOCASTA: Yet, this news of your father's death is wonderful.
> OEDIPUS: Wonderful. But I fear the living woman. (p.53)

For he has taken the most extravagant precautions to keep far away from his parents, he is sure that he will prevent the oracle from coming true. Now his father Polybos is dead and the only grief for him is to commit incest with his mother, Merope. Up to the end of the play he never meets Merope, but he at last learns about his real father and mother. Thus, he realizes that he has committed parrincest, though unknowingly:

> OEDIPUS: For I am sick in my daily life, sick in my origin.
> O, three roads, dark ravine, woodland and way
> Where three roads meet: you, drinking my father's blood
> My own blood, spilled by my own hand; can you remember
> The unspeakable things I did there, and the things
> I went on from there to do?

O marriage, marriage!
The act that engendered me, and again the act
Performed by the son in the same bed-
Ah, the net
Of incest mingling fathers, brothers, sons,
With brides, wives, mothers: the last evil
That can be known by mean: no tongue can say
How evil!

(p.60)

Though his marriage to Jocasta is nothing other than a social or political necessity and he kills Laius as a result of being insulted by him, Oedipus accuses himself of being blind to those for whom he was searching. He also accuses the divine power, Apollo, of having prepared his misfortunes:

OEDIPUS: Apollo, Apollo. Dear
Children, the god was Apollo.
He brought my sick, sick fate upon me.
But the blinding hand was my own!
How could I bear to see
When all my sight was horror everywhere?

(p.59)

In an agony of horror he blinds himself and relinquishes the throne.

3.2. Power of the Divine Fathers

There are four parental figures in the story of Oedipus. As Pietro Pucci in his Oedipus and the Fabrication of the Father points out ,

> Four figures of the father emerge each with its own ideal and imaginary foundations. We recognize (I) the king as a father of his citizens, (2) Polybus as the provider of cares and affection for the son, (3) Laius as the biological father, and (4) Apollo-and Teiresias, his priest-as a divine Father (1992.5).

The first words of the play, "My children, generations of the living / In the line of Kadmos, nursed at his ancient heart: / Why have you strewn yourselves before these

altars" (p.37), are told by the royal father, Oedipus. Then comes a priest of God, addressing Oedipus as "great Oedipus, o powerful King of Thebes" and informs him why the people gathered to see Oedipus:

> PRIEST: Thebes is in her extremity
> And cannot lift her head from the surge of death.
> .....
> You are not one of the immortal gods, we know
> Yet we have come to you to make our prayer
> As to the man of all men best in adversity
> And wisest in the ways of God. You saved us
> From the Sphinx (p.38).

Oedipus, hoping to get the remedy from the god Apollo, has already sent Creon, brother of the Queen, to Apollo's place of revelation. What act of himself as the king may save the city? He hopes an answer to this question. Creon informs Oedipus and the others that the only remedy would be to find the murderer of Laius, claimed to be among them now, and to punish him by exile or death.

When the play begins, Oedipus has already committed parrincest by unwittingly murdering the father and marrying the mother. He lives happily with his mother as his wife and with his family for many years, before the god sends the plague and forces Oedipus to recognize his pollution and crimes.

In fact the effect of the gods on Oedipus' life is seen from his birth on. Oedipus becomes the "plaything of a destiny imposed upon him by the gods even before his birth" (Vernant and Naquet 1990:77). As is narrated by Edmunds, Laius marries Jocasta, but does not dare to have intercourse with her and have children. For they say that Laius falls in love with Chrysippus, the son of Pelops, and has intercourse with him. Discovering the rape, Pelops curses Laius with destruction through his own offspring. Then Laius goes to the oracle of Apollo, to ask if he ought to beget children. There he is given the oracle, 'do not, contrary to the gods, seed the furrow of children'. However, Oedipus is born as a result of Laius' one day drunkennes by wine. Fearing the oracular response that if he has a son, he will be born to murder him, he wants to rid of

the infant. Though it is not mentioned in Sophocles' play, it is this offense, according to mythological tradition, that brings curse on the house of Laius (1985:8-9).

As his father Laius, Oedipus also believes in the power of the gods. When he hears the oracle that he will commit parrincest, he leaves his supposed parents, Polybus and Merope. For many years he lives away from them to be on the safe side of committing those crimes. Through this escape Oedipus in a way tries to disprove man's complete dependence upon the gods.

Whereas, Lemon writes that for the Greeks the tragedy is a part of sacred ritual. The tragedies, including Oedipus Rex, are written as part of the annual spring festival for Dionysus, the god of wine and a good harvest, who like Oedipus, dies to remove a plague. The constant theme of Greek tragedy is man's relation to the gods and his dependence as well:

> Oedipus Rex is typical in this respect. The inciting force of the drama is a plague sent by the gods in punishment for Thebe's failure to avenge the murder of King Laios; but the King's murder is in turn the working out of a prophecy of Delphi that his son would kill him. As the drama develops, Oedipus and Jocasta, wife and mother of Oedipus, express growing defiance of the oracles through which the gods speak to man, and the chorus constantly reminds the audience that no man may safely defy the gods. In a very real sense, then, the tragedy is a depiction of man's dependence upon the gods (1969:124).

Though Oedipus seems to be a victim undergoing to ordeal that is imposed upon him by the god, throughout the play with the hope having changed their fate, he and Jocasta challange the gods. Jocasta says that leaving the infant Oedipus to death on a lonely mountain and Laius' being killed not by his own son but by a group of highwaymen prove that "Apollo never caused that child / To kill his father, and it was not Laios' fate / To die at the hands of his son as he had feared. / This is what prophets and prophecies are worth! / Have no dread of them" (p.49). Similarly, Oedipus thinks that he got rid of committing those crimes he heard from the oracle as his fate as a young man by leaving his family. However, there are not so many examples of their defiance of oracles. For the play tells about the futility of any attempt to escape from the

oracles and the power of the divine fathers, in their words Oedipus, Teiresias and the Chorus exhibit the gods as the governing part and the man as the governed.

When Oedipus rejects Teiresias who is forced by Oedipus to reveal the truth that Oedipus himself is the pollution of the country as the murderer of Laius and later as the incestuous person, Tiresias says "True: it is not from me your fate will come. / That lies within Apollo's competence, / As it is his concern" (p.43). When Oedipus learns that the information about Laius' death was given to Jocasta by the only one to escape from Oedipus' attack, thus it is most probable to be true, he says,

> OEDIPUS: Now if that stranger and Laios were-kin,
> Where is a man more miserable than I?
> More hated by the gods?
> .....
> Think of it: I have touched you with these hands,
> These hands that killed your husband. What defilement!
> Am I all evil, then? It must be so,
> Since I must flee from Thebes, yet never again
> See my own countrymen, my own country,
> For fear of joining my mother in marriage
> And killing Polybos, my father,
> Ah, if I was created so, born to this fate,
> Who could deny the savagery of God?
>
> (p.50)

Before these words Oedipus questions Jocasta about the place where Laius was killed, the time of the murder and how Laius looks like. All the information he gets from Jocasta overlaps with what he experiences on his way to Thebes before. The more he listens to Jocasta, the surer he becomes about his being guilty. He asks "what net has God been waving for me?" and adds "I am not sure that the blind man (Tiresias) cannot see" (p.49). Oedipus, who thinks that he can disprove the god's oracle, step by step believes in the power of the god on man's destiny and accepts that it is vain to get rid of what is destined for man by the gods. When the truth about his past is completely revealed, addressing to the god, he says:

> OEDUPIS: God, God.

Is there a sorrow greater?
Where shall I find harbor in this world?
My voice is hurled far on a dark wind.
What has God done to me?
(p.59)

He also accepts the greatness of Teiresias, the spokesman for the god, once insulted by Oedipus himself with the words as wicked old man or wizard.

The Chorus whose job in the Greek tragedies is to express opinions, question the characters and to offer advice when requested sets the tone of the play with its speeches. It directs the audience's attention to important ideas expressed and also warns and reminds the characters of the consequences of their actions to act as a mediator. It observes what is said and done then interprets the meaning for the audience. In Oedipus Rex it does not judge Oedipus until all the evidence has been presented. It is the Chorus that offers Oedipus to ask the help of Teiresias in finding the murderer of Laius. However, Oedipus has already sent for him. When Teiresias tells that the murderer searched for the death of Laius is Oedipus himself and presents a riddle about Oedipus' real parents, the Chorus comments on as follows:

CHORUS: But now a wilder thing is heard
From the old man skilled at hearing Fate in the
[wingbeat of a bird.
Bewildered as a blown bird, my soul hovers and
[can not find
Foothold in this debate, or any reason or rest
[of mind
.....
Shall I believe my great lord criminal
At a raging word that a blind old man let fall?
I saw him, when the carrion woman faced him of old,
Prove his heroic mind! These evil words are lies.
(p.45)

These are what Oedipus also thinks about at that moment. He doesn't believe in Teiresias' words and insults him. As Leman tells, the Chorus that earlier takes sides with Oedipus, accuses itself also for being blind for the years before the full story of

Oedipus' birth is told and before everyone realizes his complete guilt as foredoomed by the gods. What remains for the Chorus is to sum up once more, to state the theme and to draw the universal application. The full acknowledgement of man's helplessness before the gods and the fact that no one-not Oedipus, not the Chorus, not the audience-can escape what the gods will are stated by the Chorus. Like Oedipus and Jocasta, the Chorus has doubts about the words of the prophets of the gods, so it feels the same agony as Oedipus (1969:136):

> CHORUS: But all eyes fail before time's eye,
> All actions come to justice there.
> Though never willed, though far down the deep past,
> Your bed, your dread sirings,
> Are brought to book at last.
> Child by Laius doomed to die,
> Then doomed to lose that fortunate little death,
> Would God you never took breath in this air
> That with my wailing lips I take to cry;
> For I weep the world's outcast.
> Blind I was, and cannot tell why;
> Asleep, for you had given ease of breath;
> A fool, while the false years went by.
> (p.57)

At the end of the play, one can feel pity and sorrow for Oedipus because he has been the victim of fate. Though he curses the fate, he still tries to understand what the gods have done to him. He laments that he was never saved from death by the shepherd. His sense of moral outrage and self-loathing make him blind himself. He thinks he deserves punishment because of the horrible crimes he committed against the gods and against the city of Thebes. Oedipus' change of fortune is an example of what happens when men are victims of fate. The Chorus reminds the audience that man's fate is uncertain and unpredictable. Oedipus, once described with warlike images, is now the unwilling victim of a cruel fate:

> CHORUS: Alas for the seed of men.
> .....
> Your splendor is all fallen.

O naked brow of wrath and tears,
O change of Oedipus!
I who saw your days call no man blest-
Your great days like ghosts gone.
.....
Divine king, giver of laws,
Majestic Oedipus!
No prince in Thebes had ever such renown,
No prince won such grace of power.
And now of all men ever know
Most pitiful is this man's story:
His fortunes are most changed, his state
Fallen to a low slove's
Ground under bitter fate.

(p56-57)

When Oedipus hesitates about the power of gods on man's fate before the full revelation of his past and his crimes, the Chorus comments on it as follows:

CHORUS: Haughtiness and the high hand of disdain
Tempt and outrage God's holy law;
And any mortal who dares hold
No immortal Power in awe
Will be caught up in a net of pain:
The price for which his levity is sold.

(p.51)

Thus the Chorus predicts ominously what anyone who questions the will of the gods will meet and as the moral lesson the fall of Oedipus is narrated:

LEADER: Men of Thebes: look upon Oedipus.
This is the king who solved the famous riddle
And towered up, most powerful of men.
No mortal eyes but looked on him with envy,
Yet in the end ruin swept over him.
Let everyman in mankind's frailty
Consider his last day; and let none
Life, at his death, a memory without pain

(p.62)

As Edmunds points out, Oedipus may be the figure of the criminal, or he may represent the problem of fate or the human intellect as the solver which cannot rest until it has solved all the riddles. (1985:2). Though he can easily solve the riddle of the Sphinx, he is not so good at solving the mystery of his birth or the oracles prophecy, may be, to prove how much life is controlled by the gods. Thus, as Schelling puts it, he is a good example of "a mortal ordained by destiny to be a criminal, himself struggling against destiny, and nonetheless frightfully punished for the crime, which was a work of fate" (qtd. in Rudnytsky 1987:106).

3.3 Search for the Truth

In Sophocles' Tragic World, Charles Segal writes that in his search for Laius' killer, Oedipus needs a 'sumbolon'. Though this word is usually translated 'clue', it also means 'tally', one of two parts of a token that fit together to prove one's rightful place in (say) a law-court. Then, Oedipus' investigative skill consists in fitting pieces together. However, the word sumbolon also has another meaning: the token that the child is left exposed at birth as later proof of his identity. Thus, as Segal adds,

> It has this sense in Euripides' parallel foundling tale of Ion (a kind of Oedipus story in reverse). Presented with an old basket that contains the secret of his origins, Ion hesitates to open it and examine the "tokens from his mother" lest he turn out to be the child of a slave; but he takes the risk: " I must dare", he says. Oedipus does the same: "I must hear," he declares at his critical moment of self-discovery, though with a far different result. The initially objective and public task of "tracking down" by "clues" turns into the personal and intimate task of finding the "birth-tokens" that prove his identity (1995:148).

Though Oedipus is asked to find out the murderer of Laius to remove the plague from the city of Thebes, in fact he is forced to reach the details of his own past by this inquiry. When he first asks the god, Apollo, who his real parents are, he could not get any answer. The god just warns him about the crimes he will commit in the future. It is only after his becoming guilty that he is let to learn his own identity.

Plutarch writes in his Moralia that "we learn silence from the gods, speech from men" (quoted in Bushnell 1988:68). What Oedipus mostly tries in the play is to make people speak sometimes even by using force upon them. For the god's keeping silent to his question of his parents, Oedipus says "the god dismissed my question without reply; /He spoke of other things" (p.50). Though it is Creon who is sent to the god to bring the command to find the murderer, thus to start the inquiry that will also reveal Oedipus' identity, it is Teiresias first who gives the clues about the facts. In the beginning he does not want to reveal that Oedipus is guilty of polluting the country, he says, "No, I will never tell you what I know./ Now it is my misery; then, it would be yours" (42). After being accused by Oedipus of killing Laius, he tells a piece of the truth that Oedipus will try for the other parts later.

Jocasta, thinking that her baby died before Laius, misleads Oedipus in his pursuit for truth. She tells the truth unknowingly when she talks about how the infant's ankles were pierced, what Laius looked like, what the oracle prophecied about them and who informed them about the death of Laius. She innocently suggests Oedipus to send for the shepherd who was witness to the attack on Laius. Though she gets the point before Oedipus, she does not want Oedipus to go further. Before her exit forever, she says to Oedipus, "May you never learn who you are!/..../ Ah, miserable!/ That is the only word I have for you now./ That is the only word I can ever have" (54).

As for the shepherd, he is hesitant to speak. He denies he has seen the messenger before and cannot remember giving the infant to the messenger. When the latter says that little child was King Oedipus, the shepherd replies, "Damn you, hold your tongue!" (55). After Oedipus' threat to bind and to kill him if he does not tell the truth, the shepherd says, "If I speak the truth, I am worse than death" (56). Before explaining the truth the shepherd says, "Ah, I am on the brink of dreadful speech!", Oedipus replies, "And I of dreadful hearing. Yet I must hear" (56). Thus, Oedipus learns the truth about the prophecies and his own identity.

As Vernant and Naquet point out, one after another Tiresias, Jocasta and the shepherd all try to deter him. But in vain. Oedipus goes all the way. There is nothing that obliges him to go through the inquiry to its end except for his own determination to

unmask the guilty party, the lofty idea he had of his duty, his capacities, his judgement, and his passionate desire to learn the truth at all costs. (1990:116). In his Aesthetics, Hegel states for Oedipus' insistence on inquiry that

> With this solution of the riddle in his own person. He (Oedipus) has lost his happiness as Adam did when he came to the knowledge of good and evil. The seer now, he blinds himself, resigns the throne, exiles himself from Thebes, just as Adam and Eve were driven away from Paradies, and wanders away a helpless old man (qtd. in Rudnytsky 1987:150).

Teiresias also supports this idea and says to Oedipus, "How dreadful knowledge of the truth can be/ When there is no help in truth" (p.42).

It is not only Oedipus who searches for truth in this play. The herdsman for example has waited many years to reveal the truth of Laius' murder and is given the chance only when Oedipus makes him bring to Thebes. Jocasta also has the opportunity to learn about the truth of Oedipus early years before he became the king of Thebes, as the result of Oedipus' inquiry of his own identity. Only Teiresias can see truths hidden from the others except the gods. However Oedipus' is the most obvious search for truth.

It is true that Oedipus' quest for truth begins for the welfare of the city. However, later it focuses on the true being of Oedipus. As Francis Fergusson in his essay "Oedipus Rex: the Tragic Rhythm of Action" states, Oedipus' quest for the slayer of Laius becomes a quest for the hidden reality of his own past; and as that slowly comes into focus, his immediate quest also reaches its end: he comes to see himself the savior of the city and the guilty one, the plague of Thebes, at once and at one. And he adds that " he (Oedipus) seems to find that he is nothing; yet thereby finds himself" (1986: 405).

While commenting on Oedipus' discovery of himself, Vernant and Naquet compares Oedipus in reality and appearance:

> Oedipus is double, enigmatic. Psychologically and morally he remains the same from beginning to end in the drama: a man of action and decision, unfailing courage and domineering intelligence who can be accused of no moral fault or no deliberate failing where justice is concerned. But without his knowing it, without having wished or

> deserved it, the figure of Oedipus proves to be in every aspect – social, religious and human – the opposite of what, as leader of the city, he seems to be. The Corinthian stranger is in reality a native of Thebes; the solver of riddles is a riddle he himself cannot solve; the dispenser of justice is a criminal; the clairvoyant, a blind man; the savior of the town, its doom (1990:119).

As is seen his is a great change and a great fall from good to evil, from happiness to misery. Oedipus, saying he couldn't bear to see horror everywhere in his actions, takes the responsibility by blinding himself. Whereas, the Chorus implies Oedipus should have killed himself when he discovered his true identity. However, Oedipus justifies choosing blindness rather than death by saying "I could not make my peace/ By strangling my own life" (p.59) Thus, he prefers to live in order to suffer, to pay for his sins, in a form of expiation.

CHAPTER IV

4.1. The Oedipal Problem in Shakespeare's Hamlet

Freud in his book, The Interpretation of Dreams, states that the child's wishful phantasy to kill the father to take his place as his mother's lover remains repressed in Shakespeare's Hamlet, one of the great creations of tragic poetry. He adds that just as in the case of a neurosis, we only learn of its existence from its inhibiting consequences. The play is built up on Hamlet's hesitations over fulfilling the task of revenge that is assigned to him; but its text offers no clear – cut reasons of motives for these hesitations (1991:366-67).

Hamlet, is essentially a tragic character. He is one of whom much is expected but by whom only little is achieved. It is true that the goal, towards which he is enjoined by his father's ghost to strive, is indeed reached, but only at a dreadful cost. Though Hamlet swears the duty of carrying out vengeance on his father's murderer, it is a task essentially foreign to his nature. "A life which appears at one time to have all the auguries of success and fame ends in failure, with vengeance wrought on the wretched uncle, Claudius, and with Polonius, the Queen, Ophelia, Leartes and Hamlet himself meeting their needless deaths" (Notes:1967:35).

GHOST. I am thy father's spirit,
Doomed for a certain term to walk the night,
And for the day confined to fast in fires,
Till the foul crimes done in my days of nature
Are burned and purged away.
But that I am forbid
To tell the secrets of my prison-house,
I could a tale unfold whose lightest word
Would horrow up thy soul, freeze thy young blood,
Make thy two eyes, like stars, start from their spheres,
But this eternal blazon must not be
To ears of flesh and blood. List, list, o, list!
If thou didst ever thy dear father love
Revenge his foul and most unnatural murder (1.5.9-22)

This demand by the Ghost is a burden for Hamlet's mind that is already burdened with the hasty remarriage of his mother, whom he tenderly loves, to his uncle, the usurper who excludes Hamlet from his birth-right and who accuses Hamlet for too much mourning for his father's death:

> KING. 'This sweet and commendable in your nature, Hamlet,
> To give these mourning duties to your father;
> But you must know, your father lost a father,
> That father lost, lost his, and the survivor bound
> In filial obligation for some term
> To do obsequious sorrow. But to persever
> In obstinate condolement is a course
> Of impious stubbornness; 'tis unmanly grief.
> (1.2.87-94)

As Alexander states before the court Claudius uses all the persuasive and concealed coercive power of the state to make his own position clear. He appears to remember his dead brother. His actual intention is to make everyone, including Hamlet, forget him as soon as possible (1971:51)

And, it is again Claudius, the murderer of his father and the lover of his mother that tries to pose to Hamlet as an uncle who wishes to take the place of a father:

> KING: From the first corse till he that died today,
> 'This must be so.' We pray you, throw to earth
> This unprevailing woe, and think of us
> As of a father, for let the world take note,
> You are the most immediate to our throne,
> And with no less nobility of love
> Than that which dearest father bears his son
> Do I impart toward you. (1.2.105-112)

That these two wishes cannot be accepted by Hamlet is obvious. Before Hamlet encounters what claims to be the ghost of his father and reveals to him that his usurping uncle achieved his brother's crown by murder and his queen by adultery, Hamlet is in deep melancholia. He even thinks of self-slaughter. This world for him is "an unweeded

garden; weary, stale flat and unprofitable" (1.2.133). He is so affected by his mother's hasty remarriage to his uncle that he compares his uncle to his father; likening the former to a satyr and the latter to Hyperion. The Ghost also supports this idea in terms of love for Gertrude:

> GHOST: O Hamlet, what a falling off was there!
> From me, whose love was of that dignity
> That it went hand in hand even with the vow
> I made to her in marriage; and to decline
> Upon a wretch, whose natural gifts were poor
> To those of mine (1.5.47-52)

Hamlet's first reaction to the Ghost's demand is "Haste me to know't, that I, with wings as swift / As meditation or the thoughts of love, / May sweep to my revenge" (1.5.29-31), though he doesn't know the details of the murder yet. After telling his story of his death, the Ghost wishes to be remembered, and his words to Hamlet, "Adieu, adieu, remember me" (1.5.111) becomes Hamlet's motto.

"Revenge", "murder" and "remember" are the three requests made by the Ghost. In the course of the play it will be suggested "not only that remembrance comes before revenge but that it may be more important than revenge" (Alexander 1971:54). Before meeting the Ghost and learning about its story, for Hamlet it is a torment to compare his mother's ex-husband and present husband and also to remember that too short period spent by Gertrude before her second marriage. "Heaven and Earth, Must I remember?" and "Let me not think on't" (1.2.142-146) are what he says to soothe his wounded heart. It is also Hamlet's duty to remind Gertrude that she wronged her last husband by marrying his uncle and Claudius that what villainy he committed against old Hamlet. As Alexander points out,

> The play scene, the prayer secene and the scene in Gertrude's closet are all closely connected with Hamlet's desire to make his father's memory live again in the minds of those who have consigned him to oblivion. This desire to make the King and Queen understand their own past actually causes Hamlet to reverse the original command of the Ghost (1971:50).

As Girard states, in this struggle between Claudius and old Hamlet, who are not blood brothers first and enemies second, but brothers in murder and revenge, Hamlet does not want to shrink from revenge in a world that looks upon it as a sacred duty in order not to exclude himself from society (1991:273-74). Whereas, to States, "the true significance of the appearance of the Father's ghost is that it marks the death of Hamlet's freedom and the birth of his responsibility to the Other" (1992:102).

Though the Ghost's command directs the future course of the action and Hamlet in his first reaction to it seems to act immediately, later "throwing himself into the role of revenger and interrrupting himself at the height of his outburst, by freezing the pose" (Goldman 1995:46), he "entertains a doubt concerning the ground of his suspicions, and the evidence upon which he proceeds" (Richardson 1967:18). Being a man of Renaissance, Hamlet is sceptical of the ghost's truth despite his tendency to see the apparition as a proof of his doubts about the causes of his father's death.

> HAMLET: The spirit that I have seen
> May be the devil, and the devil hath power
> To assume a pleasing shape, yea, and perhaps
> Out of my weakness and my melancholy,
> As he is very potent with such spirits,
> Abuses me to damn me. I have grounds
> More relative than this. (2.2.609-615)

About the scepticism of Hamlet, Lowell says

> Even if he only believed in himself that were better than nothing; for it will carry a man a great way in the outward success of life... But Hamlet doubts everything. He doubts the immortality of the soul, just after seeing his father's spirit... He doubts Horatio even and swears him secrecy on the cross of his sword... He doubts Ophelia and asks her, "Are you honest?" He doubts the Ghost after he has had a little time to think about it and so gets up the play to test the guilt of the king (1950:92).

As Chambers points out, once Hamlet "has shrunk from immediate action the possibilities of delay exercise an irresistable fascination over him. His intellect works for the discovery of obstacles; he takes every turn and twist to avoid the fatal necessity

for action" (1950:187). There are times when he questions his own attitudes as well. In his self-judgements Hamlet also accuses himself of being a coward. He likens himself to a pigeon which is thought to be unable to produce gall, and therefore to be without malice, to a whore and a kitchen-servant. He forces his mind to get active to find the way to prove the truth of the Ghosts story thus to prove the guilt of his uncle before his first and last attempt to realize his father's command:

> HAMLET: About, my brain! Hum, I have heard
> That guilty creatures, sitting at a play,
> Have by the very cunning of the scene
> Been struck so to the soul that presently
> They have proclaimed their malefactions.
> For murder, though it have no tongue, will speak
> With most miraculous organ. I'll have these players
> Play something like the murder of my father
> Before mine uncle... The play's the thing
> Wherein I'll catch the conscience of the King
> (2.2.599-616)

Thus, at the end of that play, The Murder of Gonzago, performed by the guest players for the court, Hamlet is sure about the guilt of his uncle. It is only after this moment Hamlet can prove that he can kill. He kills Polonius, sends Rosencrantz and Guildenstern to death, stabs Leartes in the duel and though the last one, he also stabs Claudius. In Goldman's words

> Hamlet is finally destroyed and fulfilled by an action whose source is beyond his control. It is only when he has agreed not to force a significance upon his actions, not to look before and after but to let be, that he is swept to his revenge (1995:54).

4.2. "Frailty, Thy Name is Woman"

HAMLET: (aside) A little more than kin, and less than kind (1.2.65)

Hamlet starts his part in this play with these words. Everybody except himself seems happy at that moment. For instance, Leartes is about to return to his studies in France, which the King grants, Ophelia still has the hope for Hamlet's love, Gertrude has a new husband and Claudius has his place as the new king of Denmark and the new husband of Gertrude:

> KING: Therefore our sometime sister, now our queen,
> The imperial jointress to this warlike state,
> Have we, as 'twere with a defeated joy,
> With an auspicious and a dropping eye,
> With mirth in funeral and with dirge in marriage,
> In equal scale weighing delight and dole,
> Taken to wife.
>
> (1.2.8-14)

Claudius thinks that his marriage to Gertrude will bring peace and happiness to Denmark. Because as the new King only he can prevent the invasion threat from the young prince of Norway, Fortinbras, who claims the surrender of those lands lost by his father in the time of the late king. Though it is set up on his brother's death, Claudius can talk about this marriage as a happy event. As Knight points out "alone in the gay glitter of the court, silhouetted against brilliance, robustness, health and happiness, is the pale, black-rober Hamlet, mourning" (1959:17). For Hamlet's misery there are two reasons: his father's death and his mother's second marriage. Though the play is set up on the revenge that the late King's ghost demands, his mother's marriage to Claudius is what makes Hamlet unhappy rather than his father's death. As Boyce states,

> Hamlet is strongly offended by his mother's hasty and incestuous remarriage, even before he learns from the Ghost of his father's murder. He sees his father as an ideal man and a great king, an assumption supported by other opinions in the play and by the dignity and grandeur of the Ghost. He is thus appalled by his mother's willingness to accept an inferior man, a libertine and-as is soon revealed a murderer. Hamlet

> comes to see his mother as evil and is devastated by the idea. Although he is the son of a godlike father, he is also the son of a mother who readily beds with 'a satyr' (1.2.140). (1990:232)

So, that's why he says to Claudius 'a little more than kin' (because Claudius is the present husband of Gertrude), 'and less than kind' (for Hamlet's father and Claudius are not alike). It is an obligation for Hamlet to accept Claudius as his mother's husband but not as a father for himself. However, since he "idealized his mother, and through her probably, with his dangerous facility in generalization, all women, her behaviour after his father's death profoundly stocks him; he can see in it nothing but lust, the complete subjugation of the spirit by the flesh" (Ridley 1957:139). As Staten in Eros in Mourning points out, two major 'courtly' complaints against a woman, that her heart is a stone and that she is unfaithful are found in Hamlet; but Hamlet directs them primarily against his mother rather than his lady (1995:98). Though he says similar things to Ophelia and suggests she go to a nunnery, remembering his father's love for his mother and his mother's hasty marriage to Claudius, he says:

> HAMLET: So loving to my mother
> That he might not beteem the winds of heaven
> Visit her face too roughly. Heaven and earth,
> Must I remember? Why, she would hang on him
> As is increase of appetite had grown
> By what it fed on; and yet, within a month-
> Let me not think on't-Frailty thy name is woman-
> A little month, or ere those shoes were old
> With which she followed my poor father's body,
> Like Niobe all tears, - why, she, even she-
> O God! A beast that wants discourse of reason
> Would have mourned longer – married with my uncle,
> My father's brother, but no more like my father
> Than I do Hercules. Within a month,
> Ere yet the salt of most unrighteous tears
> Had left the flushing in her galled eyes,
> She married. O, most wicked speed, to post
> With such dexterity to incestuous sheets!
>
> (1.2.140-157)

Thus, Hamlet suffers from "misery at his father's death and agony at his mother's quick forgetfulness: such callousness is infidelity, and so impurity, and since Claudius is the brother of the King, incest" (Knight 1959:18).

As Lisa Jardine in her essay, "No offence i' th' World: Hamlet and Unlawful Marriage", states:

> Hamlet does not sleep with Gertrude; there is no incestuous event in the play, between mother and son to match the excessive emotion on his side, and the excessive guilt on hers. Claudius sleeps with (marries) Gertrude, and it is in fact on her sexual relations with him that Hamlet's excessive emotion concerning Gertrude is focused. And the point about Claudius's marriage to Gertrude historically (as event) is a) that it is unlawful and b) that it deprives Hamlet of his lawful succession (1995:264).

The marriage of Claudius and Gertrude is said to be incestuous, or unlawful, because it "has strengthened the line in Claudius's favour, and to Hamlet's detriment. Claudius's first entrance as King with Hamlet as not-King (dressed in mourning black) immediately emphasises the alienation of the Hamlet line" (Jardine 1995:267). Since this marriage prevents Hamlet's becoming the new King after his father, it is incestuous according to the ecclesiastical law which suggests that no one is harmed by the marriage, and widow and children are appropriately cared for. Hamlet just before his duel with Leartes states the case:

> HORATIO: Why, what a king is this!
> HAMLET: Does it not, think thee, stand me now upon-
> He that had kill'd my king and whored my mother,
> Popp'd in between the election and my hopes,
> Trown out his angle for my proper life,
> And with such cozenage – is't not perfect conscience
> To quit him with this arm?
>
> (5.2.63-69)

Claudius is also aware of the offense he commited that he offers Hamlet to be the next king after himself: "For let the world take note / You are the most immediate to our throne" (1.2.108-109).

The Ghost also uses the words 'incestuous'and 'adulterate' while telling about how Claudius poisoned him:

> GHOST: Ay, that incestuous, that adulterate beast,
> With witchcraft of his wit, with traitorous gifts-
> O wicked wit and gifts that have the power
> So to seduce! – won to his shameful lust
> The will of my most seeming – virtuous queen
> (1.5.42-46)

Expressions like 'witchcraft', 'traitorous gifts', 'seduce' and 'shameful lust' are used here for Claudius. As Carolyn G. Heilbrun in Hamlet's Mother and Other Women points out, the elder Hamlet considers the marriage of Claudius and Gertrude to be unchaste and his use of the world 'adulterate' indicates his very strong feelings about the marriage. However, it does not necessarily mean that he believed Gertrude to have been false to him before his death. Since the Ghost does not apply the term 'adulterate' to Gertrude, he may have considered the term as a description of Claudius's entire sexual life:

> It is quite probable that the elder Hamlet still considered himself married to Gertrude,and he moreover revolted that her lust for him should have so easily transferred itself to another, this is why he uses the expressions 'seduce', shameful lust' and others (1990:16).

As States claims "we are left with no sense of a change, or a choice, having occurred in Gertrude's life. Shakespeare offers no hint of a then / now contrast (as he does with Hamlet) or no 'aside' in which her truth is permitted to surface (as he does with Claudius)" (1992:107).

Dover Wilson in What Happens in Hamlet says "Hamlet knew of the marriage, and his whole soul was filled with nausea at the thought of the speedy hasting to

incestuous sheets" (1951:293). Similarly Heilbrun adds that "the soul of the elder Hamlet was undoubtedly filled with nausea too, and this could well explain his using such strong language" (1990:16).

Though it is Gertrude's desire to be married that makes Claudius king and that keeps Hamlet from the throne, the Ghost still wants Hamlet not to harm Gertrude:

> GHOST: O, horrible! O, horrible! Most horrible
> If, thou, has nature in thee, bear it not.
> Let not the royal bed of Denmark be
> A couch for luxury and damned incest.
> But, howsoever thou pursuest this act,
> Taint not thy mind, nor let thy soul contrive
> Against thy mother aught. Leave her to heaven,
> And to those thorns that in her bosom lodge,
> To prick and sting her.
>
> (1.5.80-88)

As stated by Siegel in his article 'Hamlet, Revenge!' "the Ghost returns not only to renew its call for revenge but to defend Gertrude from Hamlet's tirade" (1993:22). It seems quite right in its warning to Hamlet. Before Hamlet goes to his mother's room in Act III, scene II, he expresses his feelings in his soliloquy as follows:

> HAMLET: O heart, lose not thy nature. Let not ever
> The soul of Nero enter this firm bosom;
> Let me be cruel, not unnatural.
> I will speak daggers to her, but use none
>
> (3.3.400-403)

Also, Gertrude, in The Queen's closet scene, just before Hamlet kills Polonius, expresses her fear to be killed by Hamlet. Heilbrun puts it as:

> When Hamlet goes to his mother in her closet his nerves are pitched at the very height of tension; he is on the edge of hysteria. The possibility of murdering his mother has in fact entered his mind, and he has just met and refused an opportunity to kill Claudius. His mother, meanwhile, waiting for him, has told Polonius not to fear for her, but she knows when she sees Hamlet that he may be violently mad. Hamlet quips with

> her, insults her, tells her he wishes she were not his mother, and when she still retaining dignity, attempts to end the interview, Hamlet seizes her and she cries for help... She has seen from Hamlet's demeanor that he is capable of murder, as indeed in the next instant he proves himself to be (1990:14).

> HAMLET: Come, come, and sit you down; you shall not budge
> You go not till I set you up a glass
> Where you may see the inmost part of you
> QUEEN : What wilt thou do? Thou wilt not murder me?
> Help; help, ho!
>
> (3.4.19-23)

As Lidz states it's the hasty remarriage of Gertrude that changes Hamlet's feelings about marriage, woman and life. In his late adolescence Hamlet feels that his mother is more interested in sexuality than she was in his father or in him. Taking the marriage of his own parents and his father's murder into consideration, he thinks that marriage does not mean security all the time. For him women are treacherous as life itself seems so (1975:187).

4.3 To Act or Not To Act

F. Bacon in his Essays, "Of Delays" writes that "it is good to commit the beginnings of all great actions to Argus with his hundred eyes, and the ends to Briareus with his hundred hands; first to watch and then to speed" (qtd. in Wilson 1990:201). Though Hamlet is given the realest reasons a revenge hero ever had – father murdered, mother whored, kingdom usurped, his innocent maiden corrupted in her imagination, he cannot act (Lanham 1999:138). He is a man uncertain of his duty in these circumstances. He has a mind moving fast:

> HAMLET: To be or not to be, that is the question
> Whether 'tis nobler in the mind to suffer
> The slings and arrows of outrageous fortune,
> Or to take arms against a sea of troubles,
> And by opposing, end them

(3.1.56-60)

First he can't decide whether to murder the murderer of his father and the seducer of his mother later his problem is to catch the exact time for it. He can be cruel to the others in this rotten world he endures. He torments them all and terrorizes them:

> He is cruel to Ophelia and his mother. He exults in tormenting the King by the Murder of Gonzago, and when he finds him conscience-stricken, at prayer, takes a demoniac pleasure in the thought of preserving his life for a more damning death... With a callousness and a most evident delight that shocks Horatio he sends his former school-friends to an undeserved death, 'not shriving time allowed', again hoping to compass the eternal damnation of his enemy (Knight 1959:26-27).

However, he cannot take the expected step towards killing Claudius. As Byron in 'Byron and Shelley on the Character of Hamlet' states Hamlet always boast and brags of his own powers and scorns everyone else. He swears he will sweep to his revenge as quickly as possible. For revenge is his love. But in truth he loves it most platonically (Williamson 1950:51-52). In Frye's words, revenge is a positive action fulfilling divine justice:

> The revenge is usually regarded by an audience as a positive act of retribution that brings the moral norms of society into balance again, and it usually sympathizes with the avenger accordingly. Because in the Bible God is represented as saying "vengeance is mine", the avenger is often regarded, in the tragedies of the period, as an agent of divine vengeance, whatever his moral status (qtd. in Bezel 1990:13).

Thus, he knows he will be supported by his people but he insists on his delay.

A.C. Bradley in Shakespearean Tragedy puts melancholy as his own answer to Hamlet's delay. For him, nervous instability, rapid and extreme changes of feeling and mood, whether it is joyous or depressed, are the symptoms seen in melancholia and Hamlet seems to be an example of it (qtd. in Bezel 1990:17). As Peers in "Elizabethan Drama and its Mad Folk" states, Hamlet's melancholia increases by nature of the command laid on him by the Ghost. Melancholy, a state of mind which cannot be

thrown off like a cloak, furnishes the only satisfying explanation, the self-weariness, the irritability, the violence, the satisfaction at the smallest thing achieved, the impossibility of carrying out the original purpose – all these are the natural outcome of melancholia (1950:350-51). Siegel also agrees with this idea:

> Revenge is so heavy a burden and the revenger is in so terrible a situation that even strong men falter... Hamlet, therefore, is like the other malcontent revengers who, weighed down by their melancholia are temporarily unable to fulfill their missions... His inability to act was a sign of his soul sickness, but if he were to take revenge it would entail his damnation. Either way – obeying the ghost's call for revenge of failing to act because of a debilitating disgust with life – was a path towards Hamlet's destruction (1993:20-21).

Hamlet wishes to go back to school in Wittenberg just after the marriage of his mother to Claudius and he accepts to be taken to England although knowing that the plan is part of Claudius' evil intents after the performance of the play that reflects Claudius' crime also after he murders Polonius. These exhibit his desire to "escape from the complexities of adult living" and how he "is sickened by the world around him" (Foakes 1993:7) in which he feels himself mentally imprisoned. In order to "end the heart-ache and the thousand natural shocks that flesh is heir to" (3.1.62) he even desires to die which means to sleep to him. In order to awake and to "put himself in the right mood for the murder of Claudius Hamlet must receive from someone else, a mimetic model, the impulse that he does not find in himself" (Girard 1991:276). He contrasts his own inaction with the passion of the player who weeps for nothing and the enthusiasm of the Norwegian soldier who risks his life for nothing. For the player who can shed real tears when he pretends to be the queen of Troy, Hecuba, Hamlet says:

> HAMLET: For Hecuba!
> What's Hecuba to him, or he to Hecuba,
> That he should weeb for her? What would he do,
> Had he the motive and the cue for passion
> That I have? He would drown the stage with tears
> And cleave the general ear with horrid speech...
>
> (2.2.566-571)

And after his brief interview with the captain of Fortinbras' troops who are ready to die for a little piece of land, Hamlet questions his own failure to act:

> HAMLET: How stand I then,
> That have a father kill'd a mother stain'd,
> Excitements of my reason and my blood,
> And let all sleep, while to my shame I see
> The imminent death of twenty thousand men,
> That for a fantasy and trick of fame.
> Go to their graves like beds (4.5.56-62)

As Warner points out

> Fortinbras exposes his own life to "fortune, death and danger", for what? – for an "eggshell", that is something with nothing in it, something as abstract as 'honor' or the "fantasy and trick of fame" for which twenty thousand men follow Fortinbras to "their graves like beds". And Hamlet's self accusation is organized around the irony of antithetical disproportions: he has everything prodding him toward action, and does "nothing", they have "nothing" guiding them to act, yet they act with remarkable clarity, purpose, and force (1986:250).

Hamlet also turns toward Leartes, who completely engages in his action, and takes him as model. Leartes' father is also murdered, but he "at once collects people, storms the palace, compels the king, at this peril, to account for the murder. His will he follows impetuously" (Williamson 1950:58). Girard claims, in A Theater of Envy, that it is Leartes who determines Hamlet to act. Leartes provides the most persuasive example because his situation parallels that of Hamlet. As Hamlet's peer his being passionate constitutes the most powerful challenge imaginable. He shouts to Claudius to give himself his father and then he leaps into his sister's grave in a wild demonstration of grief. He performs sincerely all the actions his social milieu demands. He does not question the validity of revenge or the relationship between revenge and mourning. Hamlet watches Leartes leap into Ophelia's grave, and the effect on him is electrifying. At this point he decides to act according to the demands of society. He also leaps into

the grave to become another Leartes there. By entering the circle of mimetic desire and rivalry, he embraces the goal of revenge (1991:277-78).

In the duel with Leartes, Hamlet "is against a rival whom he moreover admires" (Lacan 1977:31). It is only after being fatally wounded by Leartes that Hamlet attempts to fulfill the Ghost's command and stabs the King. (First Leartes wounds Hamlet with a poisoned rapier, then they change rapiers and Hamlet wounds Leartes with that same poisoned rapier.)

LEARTES: Hamlet, thou art slain.
No medicine in the world can do thee good;
In thee there is not half an hour of life.
The treacherous instrument is in thy hand,
Unbated and unvenom'd.The foul practice
Hath turned itself on me. Lo, here I lie,
Never to rise again. Thy mother's poison'd.
I can no more. The King, the King's to blame

HAMLET: The point envenom'd too? Then venom to thy work.
[Hurts the King
KING: O, yet defend me, friends; I'm but hurt.
HAMLET: Here, thou incestuous, murderous, damned Dane,
Drink of this potion. Is thy union here?
Follow my mother.
[King dies
(5.2.317-328)

Why does Hamlet wait till the duel to kill Claudius and why does he not attempt to occasion any opportunity to kill him before? He kills to send people to death. He admires the player, the soldier, Fortinbras and Leartes for their zest in performing their duty. He is also sure about Claudius' crime, however he waits Claudius to act first. Though the Ghost of his father occasionally reminds him of vengeance his murder, Hamlet's unconscious refuses to put an end to Claudius' relation with Gertrude. Because, as Ernest Jones in "Hamlet and Oedipus" states, Hamlet identifies himself with Claudius, a substitute father image married to his mother:

> Hamlet's attitude towards his uncle- father is far more complex than is generally supposed. He of course detests him, but it is the jealous detestation of one evil – doer towards his successful fellow. Much as he hates him, he can never denounce him with the ardent indigration that boils straight from his blood when he reproaches his mother, for the more vigorously he denounces his uncle the more powerfully does he stimulate to activity his own unconcious and "repressed" complexes. He is therefore in a dilemma between on the one hand allowing his natural detestation of his uncle to have free play, a consummation which would stir still further his own horrible wishes and on the other hand ignoring the imperative call for the vengeance that his obvious duty demands.His own "evil" prevents him from completely denouncing his uncles' and in continuing to "repress" the former he must strive to ignore to condone and if possible even forget the latter (1993:145-146).

Freud, too, in The Interpretation of Dreams puts it as: "Hamlet is able to do anything – except take vengeance on the man who did away with his father and took that father's place with his mother, the man who shows him the repressed wishes of his own childhood realized (1991:367).

In the duel, it is not only Claudius or Leartes whose death is certain before Hamlet's. Gertrude drinks from the poisoned cup prepared for Hamlet by Claudius, realizes that she is poisoned and confesses it. Then comes Leartes' confession that Claudius is responsible for all that has been done. Loss of his mother and his being fatally wounded lead Hamlet to stab Claudius, who occupies the places as king, father, and lover Hamlet unconsciously wants. Hamlet kills Claudius neither for Claudius' marriage to his mother nor for the murder of his father. He finally kills Claudius when he finds out that it is Claudius who is responsible for the poisonous rapier, that is for Hamlet's death. By sending Gertrude to death, though accidentally, and by arranging the duel to put an end to Hamlet's life with the help of Leartes, Claudius becomes responsible for the dream Hamlet experiences between Gertrude, Claudius and himself to end. By killing Claudius for his own self and not obeying the command of the Ghost, in a way, he rebels against to his own father. If his intention to kill Claudius had been a real one or had not been prevented by his unconscious, he could have looked for the opportunities to realize his deed. When he sees Claudius praying, he delays killing him

to another moment since as he defends himself, he doesn't want to send him to heaven. For the loss of opportunity in this scene, Yeats proclaims that "the moment Hamlet let pass the chance to stab his uncle, the modern psychological novel was born" (qtd. in Strong 1954:187)

> HAMLET: Up, sword, and know thou a more horrid hent.
> When he is drunk asleep, or in his rage,
> Or in the incestuous pleasure of his bed,
> At game, a-swearing, or about some act
> That has no relish of salvation in't,
> Then trip him, that his heels may kick at heaven
> And that his soul may be as damn'd and black
> As hell, whereto it goes. (3.3.88-95)

Such a moment never comes. His only serious attempt to kill Claudius is in the Queen's Closet scene. There Hamlet and Gertrude's accuse each other of offending the father. Here by 'offending' Hamlet means Gertrude's marriage to Claudius and so being his partner in his crime of killing her ex-husband, and Gertrude means ordering a play to be performed in which the king is poisoned by his nephew so to marry his widow. When Hamlet forces Gertrude not to leave the room, Gertrude cries for help. Polonius, who at that moment listens to them behind the curtain to inform the King about their interview, is stabbed by Hamlet thinking that it is the King. It is an impulsive act of killing though:

> QUEEN: O me, what hast thou done?
> HAMLET: Nay, I know not.. Is it the King?
> (3.4.26-27)

As is stated by Jones:

> In reality his uncle incorporates the deepest and most buried part of his own personality, so that he cannot kill him without also killing himself. This solution, one closely akin to what Freud has shown to be the motive of suicide in melancholia, is actually the one that Hamlet finally adopts. The course of alternate action and inaction that he embarks on, and the provocations he gives to his suspicious uncle, can lead to no other end than to his own ruin and incidentally, to death of his uncle. Only when he

has made the final sacrifice and brought himself to the door of death is he free to fulfil his duty, to avenge his father, and to slay his other self- his uncle (1993:146).

CHAPTER V

5.1 Oedipus Complex in American Drama and in O'Neill

Sam Girgus in his Desire and the Political Unconscious in American Literature points out that America in its history and culture has experienced the Oedipal conflict between generations. He quotes what Thomas Jefferson writes in 1824 to Major John Cartwright about the struggle for power between the old and new generations of politics as follows:

> Can one government bind another, and all others in succession forever?.. The Creator has made the earth for the living, not the dead. Rights and powers can only belong to persons, not to things, not to mere matter, endowed with will... A generation may bind itself as long as its majority continues in life; when that has disappeared, another majority is in place, holds all the rights and powers their predecessors once held, and may change their laws and institutions to suit themselves. Nothing then is unchangable but the inherent and unalienable rights of man (1990:50).

He adds that America also exhibits that conflict in its national organization. Its passage from a colonial to a national entity is like a passage from childish dependency to the maturity and independence of adulthood. England here represents the parental authority and America the rebellious son who tries to get rid of parental control (1990:49-50). Thomas Paine in his Common Sense states that "Britain is the parent country, say some. Then the more shame upon her conduct. Even brutes do not devour their young, nor savages make war upon their families" (qtd. in Girgus 1990:50). With the emergence of this new antipatriarchal belief family relations are also reconsidered in America. Later on the older patriarchal family authority is criticized through the works of literature. The interest of those writers in the psychoanalytic theme causes the period of twenties in American drama be called the Psychoanalytic Era. As Sievers states, "of all the psychoanalytic themes that appeared in the drama of the twenties, the Oedipus complex was the most frequent one appearing in at least fifty plays between 1923 and 1934. Its most characteristic form was that of the dominating mother and fixated son" (1955:77).

However these are not the first examples of its kind. Before this period, in 1893, a Viennese physician, Dr. Arthur Schnitzler, makes the first application of scientific hypnotism to the drama. In his little one – act comedy, Questioning Fate, "Anatol, anxious to learn if his current mistress is faithful to him, hypnotizes her and is about to ask the fateful question when he loses courage to do so and prefers not to hear what her subconscious might reveal" (Sievers 1955:25). Thus he is called the first Freudian dramatist.

Eugene O'Neill, one of the eminent playwrights of American drama, is also influenced by certain ideas of Freud. As Baym and others state these are

> the power of irrational drives; the existence of a subconscious; the roles of repression, suppression, and inhibition in the formation of personality and in adult suffering; the importance of sex; and above all the lifelong influence of parents. But where Freud posited a universal dynamic in the relation between children and parents and rooted development in biology, O'Neill saw each child's experiences as uniquely determined by particular parents. His strongly felt individualism came to focus on the family, rather than the person, as the fundamental human unit.He found inspiration and confirmation for this approach in classical Greek drama, which had always centered on families (1995:1899).

While telling about family affairs and conflicts, the overbearing father is O'Neill's most typical character. For instance, in The Rope he tells about a father's curse upon a rebellious son and in Where the Cross is Made he deals with father – son hostility. In The Moon of the Carribees, turning to the sea and drinking are given as the forms of escape from unresolved inner conflicts whose origin lies in the father – son relationship.

Desire Under the Elms; another play by O'Neill, is about a father, son, and stepmother. It too, expresses oedipal hatred for the father and love for the mother. The chief characters are Ephraim Cabot, a hard and self- righteous father; Eben, a son by his second wife; and Abbie Putnam, an ambitious young woman who marries Ephraim in his old age. There is a three-cornered struggle for power in this play. The father wants to dominate everything, Abbie is in search of a secure place for herself and she considers the farm they live on now to be that exact place, Eben is determined to escape the

domination of the patriarch and also to keep his rights as a son now threatened by Abbie, his stepmother.

The play is a study of manners, morals and psychological process of Puritan New England in the year 1850 and tells about the eternal tragedy of man and his passions. As Racey in his article "Myth as Tragic Structure in Desire Under the Elms" claims, the play combines

> a traditional tragic theme (the Oedipus legend) with a dramatic reconciliation in the interests of a higher virtue (Justice). Abbie and Eben, as they are reconciled to their fate (which they will), assume a dignity which approaches tragic stature. As they acknowledge their guilt and enter into the process of expiation, their characters tend to become generalized, and O'Neill manages to suggest something approaching the idea of universal justice (1964:57).

While dramatizing the conflicts of all men O'Neill implies his interest in Jung's theory of the collective unconscious and of the archetypal patterns and myths. He uses this theory to explain his preference for emotion over conscious thought: "Our emotions.. are the result not only of our individual experience, but of the experiences of the human race back through the ages" (qtd. in Carpenter 1964:48).

O'Neill adopts the structure of classical tragedies as a means of generalization in his telling of the father – son battle and symbolic incest theme. He also uses ghosts and soliloquies to express the Greek themes of incest and infanticide in his contemporary drama. The Greek legends Oedipus, Medea and Phaedra are called to provide the inspiration for some elements of Desire Under the Elms:

> As in Oedipus, the son fights the father, and commits adultery (technically incest) with the mother (in this case, the step- mother). As in Medea, the wife kills her child in order (partly) to gain revenge on the husband. But the plot of Desire changes the pattern of the old Greek tragedies so radically that it creates an essentially new myth. Because the mother is now a third wife, and therefore a young step – mother to the mature son the love of the two becomes

> wholly natural (though technically incestuous). And because the step – mother kills her infant because of a deluded (but genuine) love for the step – son, the cold violence of Medea's hatred is transformed into a warm love (Carpenter 1964:106).

If the infanticide by Abbie reminds us of Medea's killing her two young sons for revenge, as a sign of symbolic castration, the incestuous passion of her also reminds that of Phaedra from Greek legend. As Hamilton narrates, Phaedra falls in love with her stepson, Hippolytus, so madly and miserably that she is overwhelmed with shame at such a love. Though Hippolytus, who never noticed women, does not return this love and leaves the home immediately, Phaedra's passion and despair cause the death of the two. Leaving a letter to her husband to tell that Hippolytus laid violent hands upon herself, she causes the curse of Theseus, the father, upon his son. She kills herself and Hippolytus leaves the home and dies on the way (1969:162-64). Unlike Phaedra's unreturned love, Abbie gets what she expects from Eben, that is love and a son to own the farm. Later on, she sacrifices the infant to revenge her husband who claims that Abbie had that baby to usurp the farm, and also to regain the love of Eben. When the play ends the old Cabot is still proud of his farm and orders Eben to leave the farm as a punishment for his betrayal to himself. Whereas Abbie is pleased with her crime since she proves her love to Eben killing the infant. As for Eben, his oedipal choice causes his loss of the farm; however he, aligning with his father's wife, takes vengeance on his mother's being tortured and being killed by old Cabot. When the sheriff comes, as Bogard claims, Abbie and Eben leave the farm as Eve and Adam:

> They are ejected from the Garden. As Adam accepted Eve's sin, Eben must accept Abbie's, for what is left to them cannot lie beyond themselves. In turning back to Abbie, after his violent rejection of her strange act of faith, Eben reestablished their love so that they need to rely on nothing outward... The play's ending, awakens echoes of older tragic patterns that conclude with the protagonist's acknowledgement of his responsibility for a general guilt. Making such admission Eben becomes nearly heroic in the eyes of his father who speaks grudgingly of his admiration (1988:224-25).

Thus, old Cabot, who accuses Eben not being as hard as himself, is now proud of him though he has betrayed him. While leaving the farm for the prison, both Abbie and Eben feel freer than before. They look at the sun for the last time and declare love to each other. When the play ends sadly, the lovers have already escaped the prison of self. As Cunningham points out, Abbie no more uses Eben to gain control over the farm and loves him as another human being. Similarly, for Eben's part, his

> growth towards selflessness and altruism through his relationship with Abbie represents the Romantic tenet of a boy's mythic initiation into manhood. At first, Eben merely uses Abbie to avenge himself against his father, Ephraim; but gradually as the hovering spirit of his dead mother loses its control over him, possessiveness turns to love, and Eben loses self by engagement with another human being (qtd.in Martine 1984:70).

As is seen in the beginning, Abbie and Eben use each other as the means of usurping the farm and avenging against the father respectively. Eben as the victim of his mother's spirit talks to it although she is dead. He is possessed by the memory of his mother. He also hates his father and prays for him to die. As Engel claims, at the end, their affair leads Eben to his liberation from a mother complex and a tyrannical father. For him, his love to Abbie means vengeance of his mother on old Cabot and his mother can sleep quiet in her grave now. Having released his libidinal desires from his mother Eben, too, is at peace now. However, it is ironical that in freeing himself from his Oedipus complex he should have transferred his love to his stepmother (1953: 131). And he accepts usurpation of his mother's position to use Abbie to touch old Cabot on the raw.

5.2 "God's hard, not easy"

In Desire Under the Elms, Ephraim Cabot is a hard old man who is proud of his hardness and who regards anything soft as worthless and shameful. He is the "image of authority and power, father of the primal horde and prototype of Jehovah" (Engel

1953:202) As stated by Freud in Totem and Taboo, the violent primal father [3] stands in the way of his rebellious sons' sexual demands and desire for power (Clark 1965:183). Similarly, the old Cabot slaves the Cabot boys and the sons feel angry and insulted because of the way in which their father drives them. They feel having been fenced by their father. What they do is to work hard only for the father.

> PETER : They's gold in the West, Sim.
> SIMEON: In the sky!
> PETER : Waal-in a manner o' speakin'-thar's the promise [Growing excited.] Gold in the sky-in the West-Golden Gate-Californi-a! Golden West !-fields o' gold!
> SIMEON: [excited in his turn]. Fortunes layin' just atop o' the ground waitin' t' be picked! Solomon's mines, they says!
> PETER: [with sardonic bitterness]. Here-it's stones atop o' the ground-stones atop o' stones-makin' stone walls-year atop o' year-him 'n' yew 'n' me 'n' then Eben- makin' stone walls fur him to fence us in!
> SIMEON: We've wuked. Give our strength. Give our years. Plowed 'em under in the ground, -[he stamps rebelliously]-rottin'-makin' soil for his crops!
> PETER : If we plowed in Californi-a, they'd be lumps o' gold in the furrow!
>
> (1.1. p.680)

Though they dream of going to the West as an escape from the hard work of their father, they do not seem brave enough. At present they except their father to die soon and in the past they think to get him declared crazy by the court to rid themselves of the old Cabot. Since they do not have enough money to go to California they have to wait Eben's stealing the old Cabot's money and giving the amount to them in return for their share on the farm. Whereas, for the father leaving for the West is not something one can

---

[3] Sievers states in Freud on Broadway that "it was Freud's hypothesis that the 'primal horde' in the prehistory of man consisted of a cluster of females dominated by an all power full male ruler who drives away his growing sons. The sons ultimately kill and eat the primal father. Then, to atone for their guilt and prevent further strife over the females, they agree not to enjoy the spoils but to seek women outside the tribe. The death of the father is absolved by a commemorative feast in which the totem animal, a substitute for the father, is ceremoniously eaten by the whole tribe, shared equally as their guilt is shared". He, quoting Freud, also says thus they created two

be proud of because the life there is not so hard. In his telling of his life to Abbie, Cabot says:

> CABOT: Listen Abbie, when I come here fifty odd year ago- I was just twenty an' the strongest an' hardest ye ever seen-ten times as strong an' fifty times as hard as Eben. Waal this place was nothin' but fields o' stones. Folks laughed when I tuk it. They couldn't know what I knowed. When ye kin make corn sprout out o'stones, God's livin' in yew! They wa'n't strong enuf fur that! They reckoned God was easy... Some went West an' died. They're all under ground – fur follerin' arter an easy God. God hain't easy. An' I growed hard.... God's hard, not easy! God's in the stones! Build my church on a rock – out o' stones an' I'll be in them! That's what He meant t' Peter! Stones. I picked 'em up an' piled 'em into walls... It was hard an' He made me hard fur it.
>
> (2.2 p. 695)

Thus, for him the stony land is symbolized by miles of stone fences, and "these walls were symbols of the old New England farmer's roots – reproachful monuments to the farmers who left their fields to go out west where there were no stones and where farming was easier" (Gelb and Gelb 1962:540-41). As Engel points out, the sons' "hostility to walls of stone are aspects of their antogonism to the Old Testament God. The hard God is in the stones and in the father. Both are inimical to a free and peaceful animal existence" (1953:128).

Ephraim Cabot is a father who wars constantly with his sons. He is pleased with none of his boys. As a hard – working patriarch he is not content with the work of Simeon and Peter. When he returns to the farm with his new wife, Abbie, Simoen and Peter welcome them at the gate. However, what the father first says to them is "Why hain't ye wukin'?" (1.4. p.688). For Eben he thinks no better. "Eben's a dumb fool – like his Maw – soft an' simple" (1.4. p.688). Though he belittles Eben in his words through the play, Eben, by stealing his money to buy the share of Simeon and Peter on the farm and later by announcing himself the sharer of Abbie's sin and by going to

---

fundamental taboos of totemism out of the sense of guilt of the son, and for this very reason these had to correspond with the two repressed wishes of the Oedipus complex" (1955:112).

prison with Abbie, proves to Cabot that he is not so soft. As William Taylor states, Eben Cabot,

> according to the two older brothers, is the "dead spit'n image" of his father –just as ambitious, just as hard, just as relentless; and Eben turns out to be that, too. But there is another side to him. He is, according to his father, according to Ephraim, "the dead spit'n image" of his mother, who was soft, sensitive, and, ultimately defeated (1968:36)

However, Eben denies his obvious resemblance to the man he hates. To Carpenter it is not only Eben who hates father Cabot. Everyone agrees in fearing and hating the old man. Like Milton's Samson and Satan, he is an instrument of evil and of the destruction of others. He is a tyrant, self-righteous and he seeks to possess both the farm and the youth of others wholly for himself. He is the spokesman of a materialistic society which destroys the souls of other men. Therefore, he is hated (1964:108).

His naming the Cabot boys as Simeon, Peter and Eben shows his desire to continue his line through the characters that are as hard and stony as himself. As Schlueter and Lewis in their article, "Cabot's Conflict: The Stones and Cows in O'Neill's Desire Under the Elms" point out, he names them

> Simeon and Peter, clearly suggestive of Simon Peter, the rock upon whom Christ built his church, and in the case of Peter, derivative of Greek word "petra", meaning rock... Eben shares Simon and Peter's nominal identification with stones: "Ebenezer", the fuller version of "Eben", is the name given by the prophet Samuel to the stone set up in memory of divine assistance (1984:112).

However, Eben agrees with his half – brothers about the stones with which their father fences them and claims that they, Simeon and Peter, were not only enslaved by the physical walls but also their hearts have been hardened. He accuses them of not preventing their father when he was making Eben's mother over-worked and sending her to her grave:

> EBEN: An' makin' walls – stone atop o' stone – makin' walls till yer heart's a stone ye heft up out o' the way o' growth onto a stone wall t' wall in yer heart!
>
> (1.2. p.682)

Cabot compares his first and second wives and he is more pleased with the first one. He says, "she was a good woman. She wuked hard...she helped but she never knowed what she was helpin" (2.2. p. 695). Whereas, Eben's mother "was purty-but soft. She tried t' be hard. She couldn't" (2.2. p.695).

When Peter asks Eben why he didn't help his mother when she was having been worked by Cabot, he says

> EBEN: It was on'y arter she died I come to think o' it. Me cookin' – doin' her work – that made me know her, suffer her sufferin' – she'd come back t' help – come back t' bile potatoes... come back all cramped up t' shake the fire, an' carry ashes, her eyes weepin' an' bloody with smoke an' cinders same's they used t' be... she can't find it nateral sleepin' and restin' in peace. She can't git used t' bein' free – even in her grave
> SIMEON: She never complained none
> EBEN: She'd got too tired. She'd got too used t' being too tired. That was what he done. [with vengeful passion.] An' sooner'r later, I'll meddle. I'll say the thin's I didn't say then t' him!... I'll see t' it my Maw gits some rest an' sleep in her grave! (1.2.p.682).

Eben's determination to destroy his father, to avenge his mother's death and the usurpation of the farm from himself continues up to the end of the play. Cabot atones for his injustice and is condemned to the land he has stolen. Eben becomes the antagonist in this act of revenge. The end shows the victory of the mother and the son over the father. As Schlueter and Lewis state Cabot is left to "a life without sons, wife and cows. At play's end, the old New Englander is alone, surrounded by stone walls" (1984:114). As Cabot says, for him, life is going to be "lonesomer now than ever it war afore" (3.4. p.709) as it happened to God, hard and lonesome.

5.3. Castrating the Father

When Ephraim Cabot returns to his farm with his new bride, he finds Simeon and Peter changed. They are not the slave boys of Cabot any more. Because Eben takes the money Cabot hides under floorboard and uses it to get the shares of Simeon and Peter on the farm. Thus, the brothers are provided with the money that will take them to California and Eben becomes the only heir for the farm. After seeing the newly married couple and declaring their independence to make Cabot confused, they leave the farm happily, throwing stones to the farm house's windows and singing songs. This last dialogue between the older sons and old Cabot is full of the Totem and Taboo motif, as Simeon says to his father.

> SIMEON: [With his sardonic burst of laughter].Ha! Eben's a chip o' yew – spit 'n' image – hard 'n' bitter's a hictory tree! Dog'll eat dog. He'll eat ye yet, old man!
> CABOT : [commandingly]. Ye git t' wuk!
> SIMEON: [as Abbie disappears in house – winks at Peter and says tauntingly]. So that thar's our new Maw, be it? Whar in hell did ye dig her up? [He and Peter laugh].
> PETER : Ha! Ye'd better turn her in the pen with the other sows. [They laugh uproariously, slapping their thinghs].
> CABOT : [so amazed at their effrontery that he stutters in confusion]. Simeon! Peter! What's come over ye? Air ye drunk?
> SIMEON: We're free, old man – free o' yew an' the hull damned farm... ye kin take this place an' burn it!...We're free as Injuns! Lucky we don't skulp ye!
> PETER : An' burn yer barn an' kill the stock!
> SIMEON: An' rape yer new woman!
>
> (1.4.p.688)

This is the beginning of loss of power for Cabot and is also the first stage of Eben's revenge on his father. Cabot doesn't learn that his money was stolen by Eben up to when at the end of the play he, too, decides to go to California and needs that money. As Bogard points out,

> Isolated on the land, the lonely men walk hopelessly
> through the tired routines of their lives, dreaming

> only of possessing something that might satisfy them.
> Simeon and Peter hold to their vision of the riches
> in the West; Eben dreams of possessing the farm...
> Like his brothers, he (Eben) at first seeks satisfaction
> in a dream of material possession, yet as
> the play proceeds it becomes clear that his hatred
> of his father and his legalistic claims of ownership
> are only signals of a truer desire, to rediscover
> through an identification with the land the
> security the love of his dead mother brought him...
> He desires not to possess, but to be possessed by
> the force he knew in her love and which he associates
> with the "purty" land (1988:220-21).

For Eben, possessing the farm means possessing the mother who was separated from him by the hard working conditions in the farm, that is by old Cabot. Though Eben expresses his dislike for Abbie when he first meets her, Abbie behaves seductively to him.

> A moment later the kitchen door is slowly pushed open and Abbie enters. For a moment she stands looking at Eben. He does not notice her at first. Her eyes take him in penetratingly with a calculating appraisal of his strength as against hers. But under this her desire is dimly awakened by his youth and good looks....
> ABBIE: [in her most seductive tones which she uses all through this scene.] Be you – Eben? I'm Abbie [she laughs.] I mean, I'm yer new Maw.
> EBEN: [viciously.] No, damn ye!
> ABBIE: ...I want t' be frens with ye. Mebbe with me fur a fren ye'd find ye'd like livin' here better.
> EBEN: [With bitter scorn.] Ha! [They stare again, Eben obscruley moved, physically attracted to her – in forced stilted tones.] Yew kin go t' the devil! (1.4.p.689).

Eben can not accept anybody else to get his mother's place in the house and in his heart. However, he is not strong enough to resist Abbie though he tries to be so. Their spending a night in the parlor that has been closed ever since Eben's mother's death, means Abbie's management to enter all the rooms in her new home. Eben's mother's parlor is the central room of the farmhouse. It is not an ordinary room reserved for company use only. It is "a haunted room, inhabited by his mother's ghost. Eben thinks

of it as a room devoted to her memory" (Bogard 1988:220). She considers it as a sort of occupation in her attempt to make the whole farm her own. Whereas, for Eben it is the second stage of his revenge Cabot. He thinks that it is the spirit of his mother who let them sin there to revenge on her own death:

> EBEN: [to the presence he feels in the room.] What d'ye want? What air ye tellin' me?
> ABBIE: She's tellin' ye t' love me. She knows I love ye an' I'll be good t' ye. Can't ye feel it? Don't ye know? She's tellin' ye t' love me, Eben!
> EBEN: Ay-eh. I feel – mebbe she – but – I can't figger out – why – when ye've stole her place – here in her hum-in the parlor whar she was–
> ABBIE: [fiercely]. She knows I love ye!
> EBEN: [his face suddenly lighting up with a fierce, triumphant grin.]. I see it! I see why. It's her vengeance on him – so's she kin rest quiet in her grave! (2.3.p.698).

After the birth of the baby of Abbie and Eben, Cabot is pleased with its arrival. Because he thinks that he himself is the father of it which is a new hope to remove his loneliness and to continue his line.

He says, he will raise him to be like himself. He thinks before its birth that Eben will also leave him as Simeon and Peter did and he will need another son:

> CABOT:What son o' mine'll keep on here t' the farm – when the Lord does call me?
> ABBIE: They's me.
> CABOT: Ye're on'y a woman.
> ABBIE: I'm yewr wife.
> CABOT: That hain't me. A son is me – my blood - mine. Mine ought t' git mine.
> ABBIE: Mebbe the Lord'll give us a son.
> CABOT: Ye mean – a son – t'me 'n' yew?
> ABBIE: I want a son now.
> CABOT: It'd be the blessin' o' God, Abbie – in my old age-in my lonesomeness! They hain't nothin' I wouldn't do fur ye then, Abbie.
> ABBIE: Would ye will the farm t' me then – t' me an' it...?

As is seen, both for Cabot and Abbie, the baby also means the farm. Considering this as another usurpation, Eben cannot accept Cabot's possessing the baby. Moreover, he

learns, in a quarrel with Cabot, that Abbie has complained about his attempt to seduce her and that Abbie had the baby just to possess the farm. Thus, Eben decides to leave the farm and he announces his hatred for Abbie. Abbie tries to make him stay, however he is determined to leave for California. To prove her love for Eben she kills the baby. This becomes the third stage of his revenge on Cabot, though this time it is indirect. And, when Eben goes to call the Sheriff, Abbie tells Cabot that she never loved Cabot but loved Eben who is the father of the baby. In his return from the Sheriff, Cabot orders Eben to leave the farm and thinking that he would be lonesomer than ever, Cabot decides to go to California and he releases the cows. Then he realizes that his money was stolen by Eben. Thus, he loses everything that once belongs to him: His sons, his wives, his baby, his money and his cows for which he says:

> CABOT: ...it's restful – whar it's warm down to the barn. I kin talk t' the cows. They know. Theyknow the farm an' me. They'll give me peace. (2.2.p.696)
>
> CABOT: I rested. I slept good – down with the cows. They know how t' sleep. They're teachin' me (3.1.p.699).

At the end of the play, Cabot is left alone in the farm which he always tries to keep for himself and at which even the Sheriff acting as a kind of ironic chorus, looks enviously: "it's a jim-dandy farm, no denyin. Wished I owned it!" (3.4.p.710) Thus, Cabot is left to "survey the wreck of his kingdom" (Racey 1964:589) and he "comes out and around the corner of the house, his shoulders squared, his face stony, and stalks grimly toward the barn" (3.4.p.710).

CHAPTER VI
CONCLUSION

In this study three plays Oedipus Rex by Sophocles, Hamlet by Shakespeare and Desire Under the Elms by E.O'Neill were analyzed to see whether they could be mentioned as three examples from the Greek, English and American literature that contain the Oedipal conflicts. Since the struggle for power and being against the authority is general to all cultures, it is not surprizing to find in these plays characters of this inclination.

Though the main concern of this study is to explore the validity of Freud's theory of Oedipus complex and its essence, war with father to own the mother, it is seen that the mother also has an important role in this struggle. In fact the mother has a dominating part in the life of every human being. An infant when compared to the young of other species owes more to his mother. Being carried in his mother's body and being nurtured by his mother for a long time lead his relation to be more intimate with his mother than that of with father. As Anna Freud states it is at the end of the first year that the child learns his mother does not belong to him alone. The brothers and sisters and especially the father disturbs this relationship. The first years' emotional antagonism becomes a much more emotional conflict in the following years (1963:27-33) and this is called the Oedipus complex by Freud. The father means authority and power to the child, and becomes the only obstacle between the child and his mother.

Before the plays mentioned above are studied, examples of this very struggle are given from the Greek mythology. The war between Uranus, Cronus and Zeus as fathers and sons is for power. What Uranus and Cronus, as fathers, want is to rule without fear of any challenge to their authority forever. It is the bruteness of these fathers that fills the sons, Cronus and Zeus, with hatred incited by the mothers, Gaia and Rhea. Because the fathers seperate the mothers from their children to get the power for themselves. At the end, the sons dethrone the fathers and win the struggle.

However, in Oedipus Rex, the father wants to rid of his son for two reasons. As the oracle declares Oedipus will kill his father and marry his own mother. After being brought up by other parents, he hears this same oracle. To escape that fate he leaves his

supposed parents to kill his own father on his journey and to marry his own mother in Thebes. Among the characters of the dramas analyzed in this study, Oedipus seems to be the most innocent. Because he commits these two 'oedipal dreams' unwittingly. He is provoked by Laius and his men and he is also given Jocasta as his wife by the Thebans. Thus, he has no deliberate attempts for these crimes. On the contrary, avoidance is obvious. As Lemon states

> the decision to leave Corinth seems at the time to be the best decision Oedipus could make; his only alternative would be to remain in Corinth in the household of the persons he believed he was destined to sin against. The decision to kill Laius – if it can be called a decision – was a choice between acting heroically and fighting back against an attack, or acting cowardly and letting the king pass without responding to being driven off the road; most Greeks would have approved of Oedipus' anger (1969:147).

He is so deeply affected by the parrincest he has committed that, at the end, he blinds himself to pay for his sins. As a form of expiation, suffering throughout the rest of his life is what he prefers to death. Though he also accuses the God of his ill fate saying, "if I was created so, born to this fate, who could deny the savagery of God?" he mostly accuses himself of not revealing the truth about his past immediately. Thus, he proves he is only a victim who experiences the greatest sorrow.

Hamlet also lives in sorrow during the play, Hamlet. In the beginning though he is determined to fulfil the task of revenge ordered to him by his father, he cannot realize it. He has hesitations with no clear – cut reasons in the text. His mother's hasty remarriage to his uncle is what disturbs his mind since the beginning. Before meeting the ghost and learning about its story he compares his mother's ex-husband and present husband to scold the new one. He likens his dead father to Hyperion and his uncle to a satyr. He even thinks that his mother wronged her last husband by marrying his uncle who is an inferior man, a libertine and a murderer. His ideas about woman in general changes with this marriage. His sentence, "Frailty thy name is woman" (1.2.146), exhibites his feelings also about his own mother. Because she does not mourn enough for her ex – husband. What Hamlet expects from her is to mourn longer, perhaps forever. Only then

his mother could have been his only with no shareholder. Despite his hatred for this third person between himself and his mother, Hamlet cannot act to murder him. As Ernest Jones states, Hamlet's inability to act can be explained as a result of his identification with Claudius who realizes the repressed wishes of Hamlet's own childhood (1991:367). His strong empasis on the hasty remarriage of his mother to his uncle, his willingness to let the chances to murder Claudius pass and his killing Claudius only after the death of his mother prove that Jones is right in his claim which also represents Freud's ideas on Hamlet.

Similar to Hamlet, Eben and his brothers in Desire Under the Elms are in struggle with their father, Ephraim. To the elder brothers, their father imprisons them in the farm and working for Ephraim is what disturbs them most. Since they are not brave enough they need the help of Eben, who is more a rebel than his brothers, to leave the farm for California. In fact Eben helps his brothers for his own sake. Because the more he causes his father to lose, the better he can avenge his mother's departure due to the hard working she was obliged by Ephraim. By paying for the shares of his brothers on the farm, he also aims to get the farm which represents his dead mother for him. Later, his attachment to his step – mother predominates this idea of his and thinking that it is the spirit of his mother who let him sin with the step – mother he spends a night with her. This affair is followed by some other events that lead Eben and his step – mother, Abbie, to the prison. However, Eben manages to castrate his father by depriving him of what he has valuable and also to seperate the step – mother from his father. When considered in terms of the 'oedipal dreams', he is the most successful in realizing them among the characters of this study's dramas.

At the end of this study, it can be said that being in war with father is more obvious than the wish to possess the mother in the works studied here. Though Oedipus has no deliberate attempt to rid of his father his desire to change the fate prophecied by the oracle can be interpreted as being against the father unconsciously, as well. Because the oracle represents the authority, that is the father.

WORKS CITED

ALEXANDER, N.

1971 Poison, Play and Duel. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

ATKINSON, R.L. et al.

1996 Hilgard's Introduction to Psychology. USA: Harcourt Brace Comp.

BAYM, N. et al.

1995 Norton Anthology of American Literature. Shorter 4th Edition. New York: W.W. Norton and Company.

BEZEL, N.

1990 "Critics on Delay in Hamlet." Proceedings of Shakespeare and His Time. The Tenth All-Turkey English Literature Seminar. (March 1989). Ankara: Bilkent University

BOGARD, Travis

1988 Contour in Time: The Plays of Eugene O'Neill. New York: Oxford UP.

BOYCE, C.

1990 The Wordsworth Dictionary of Shakespeare. UK: Charles Boyce and Roundtable Press.

BRESSLER, C.E.

1999 Literary Criticism. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

BUSHNELL, Rebecca W.

1988 Prophecying Tragedy: Sign and Voice in Sophocles' Theban Plays. London: Cornell UP.

CARLSON, N.R. and BUSKIST, W.

1997 Psychology: The Science of Behavior. USA: Allyn and Bacon.

CARPENTER, Frederic I.

1964 Eugene O'Neill. New York: Twayne Publishers.

CLARK, D.S.

1965 What Freud Really Said. UK: Penguin Books.

COUCH, Malcom

1997 Greek and Roman Mythology. London: Tiger Books International.

EAGLETON, Terry

1983 Literary Theory. Minneapolis: Minnesota UP.

EDMUNDS, Lowell

1985 Oedipus: The Ancinet Legend and Its Later Analogues. London: John Hopkins UP.

ENGEL, Edwin A.

1953 The Haunted Heroes of Eugene O'Neill. Cambridge: Harvard UP.

FERGUSSON, Francis

1986 "Oedipus Rex: the Tragic Rythm of Action." ed. D. Lodge. 20th Century Literary Criticism. New York: Longman.

FREUD, Anna

1963 Psychoanalysis for Teachers and Parents. trans. B. Low. Boston: Beacon Press.

FREUD, Sigmund

1987 Historical and Expository Works on Psychoanalysis. ed. A. Dickson. Vol. 15. London: Penguin Books.

FREUD, Sigmund

1991 The Interpretation of Dreams. ed. A. Richards. London: Penguin Books.

GELB, Arthur and GELB, Barbara

1962 O'Neill. New York: Harper and Brothers.

GIRARD, R.

1991 A Theater of Envy. Oxford: Oxford UP.

GIRGUS, Sam B.

1989 Desire and the Political Unconscious in American Literature. London: MacMillian.

GOLDMAN, Michael

1995 "Hamlet and Our Problems." ed. D.S. Kastan. Critical Essays on Shakespeare's Hamlet. New York: G.K. Hall and Co.

GÖKA, E. and TÜRKÇAPAR. M.H.

1992 Freud. Istanbul: Ağaç Yayıncılık.

GRANT, Michael and HAZEL, John

1993 Who's Who in Classical Mythology. London: Routledge.

GRIMAL, Pierre

1996 The Dictionary of Classical Mythology. trans. A.R. Maxwell-Hyslop. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

HAMILTON, E.

1969 Mythology New York: Warner Books.

HEILBRUN, C.G.

1990 Hamlet's Mother and Other Women. New York: Columbia UP.

HESIOD

1973 Theogony. USA: Michigan UP.

JARDINE, L.

1995 " 'No Offence i' th' World': Hamlet and Unlawful Marriage." ed. D.S. Kastan. Critical Essays on Shakespeare's Hamlet. New York: G.K. Hall and Co.

JONES, Ernest

1993 "Hamlet and Oedipus". ed. E. Berman. Essential Papers on Literature and Psychoanalysis. New York: New York UP.

KENDLER, H.H.

1963 Basic Psychology. New York: Meredith Publishing Company.

KNIGHT, G.W.

1959 The Wheel of Fire. London: Methuen and Co. Ltd.

LACAN, J.

1977 "Desire and the Interpretation of Desire in Hamlet." ed. S. Felman. Literature and the Psychoanalysis. The Question of Reading: Otherwise. Yale: John Hopkins UP.

LANHAM, R.A.

1999 "Superposed Plays." eds. S. Orgel and S. Keilen. Shakespeare and the Literary Tradition. New York: Garland Publishing.

LEEMING, D.A.

1981 Mythology. The Voyage of the Hero. New York: Harper and Row.

LEMON, Lee T.

1969 Approaches to Literature. New York: Oxford UP.

LIDZ, T.

1975 Hamlet's Enemy. Madness and Myth in Hamlet. Madison: International

Universities Press.

LOOMIS, J.F.

1965 Mythology. New York: Monarch Press.

Notes on William Shakespeare's Hamlet.

1967 London: Methuen

O'NEILL, E.

1986 Desire Under the Elms. 1952. Masterpieces of the Drama. Eds. Alexander W. Ellison, Arthur J. Carr and Arthur M. Eastman. 5th ed. New York: Macmillian.

ÖZGÜ, H.

1994 Psikanalizin 3 Büyükleri: Freud, Adler, Jung. Istanbul: Mert Yayıncılık.

PUCCI, Pietro

1992 Oedipus and the Fabrication of the Father. London: Johns Hopkins UP.

RACEY, Edgar F. Jr.

1964 "Myth as Tragic Structure in Desire Under the Elms." ed. J. Gassner. O'Neill: A Collection of Critical Essays. Englewood: Prentice-Hall.

RICHARDSON, W.

1967 "Additional Observations on Shakespeare's Dramatic Character of Hamlet in a Letter to a Friend." ed. C. Leech. Shakespeare: The Tragedies. Chicago: Chicago UP.

RICOEUR, Paul

1970 Freud and Philosophy. trans. D. Savage. New Haven: Yale UP.

RIDLEY, M.R.

1957 Shakespeare's Plays. London: J.M. Dent and Sons Ltd.

RIEFF, Philip

1961 Freud: the Mind of the Moralist. New York: Anchor Books.

ROSENBERG, D.

1994 World Mythology. An Anthology of the Great Myths and Epics. Illinois: NTC Publishing Group.

ROSENBERG, D. and BAKER, S.

1992 Mythology and You. Illinois: NTC Publishing Group.

RUDNYTSKY, Peter L.

1987 Freud and Oedipus. New York: Columbia UP.

SANTROCK, J.W.

1996 Child Development. London: MacGraw-Hill Company Inc.

SCHLUETER, June and LEWIS, Arthur

1984 "Cabot's Conflict: The Stones and Cows in O'Neill's Desire Under the Elms." ed. J.J. Martine. Critical Essays on Eugene O'Neill. USA: Prentice Hall.

SEGAL, Charles

1995 Soplocles' Tragic World: Divinity, Nature, Society. Cambridge: Harvard UP.

SHAKESPEARE, W.

1985 Hamlet. ed. N. Alexander. London: Macmillan.

SHAKESPEARE, W.

1993 Macbeth. New York; Dover Publications.

SIEGEL, P.N.

1993 " 'Hamlet, Revenge !': The Uses and Abuses of Historical Criticism." ed. S. Wells. Shakespeare Survey. Vol.45. New York: Cambridge UP.

SIEVERS, W. David

1955 Freud on Broadway: A History of Psychoanalysis and the American Drama. New York: Hermitage House.

SOPHOCLES

1986 Oedupus Rex. Trans. Dudley Fitts and Robert Fitzgerald. Masterpieces of the Drama. Eds. Alexander W. Ellison, Arthur J. Carr and Arthur M. Eastman. 5th ed. New York: Macmillian,

STATEN, H.

1995 Eros in Mourning. London: John Hopkins UP.

STATES, B.O.

1992 Hamlet and the Concept of Character. London: John Hopkins UP.

STRONG, L.A.G.

1954 "Shakespeare and the Psychologists". ed. J. Garrett. Talking of Shakespeare. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

TAYLOR, William E.

1968 "Six Characters in Search of an Author and Desire Under the Elms: What O'Neill Did Not Learn from Europe." ed. W.E. Taylor. Modern

American Drama: Essays in Criticism. Florida: Everett.

VERNANT, Jean-Pierre and NAQUET, Pierre Vidal

1990 Myth and Tragedy in Ancient Greece. New York: Zone Books.

WARNER, W.B.

1986 Chance and the Text of Experience. London: Cornell UP.

WILLIAMSON, C.C.H.

1950 Readings on the Character of Hamlet. London: George Allen and Unwin.

WILSON, J. Dover

1990 What Happens in Hamlet. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

WITTELS, M.D.

1931 Freud and His Time. New York: Liveright Publishing Corporation.

WRIGHT, E.

1984 Psychoanalytic Criticism: Theory in Practice. London: Methuen.

WRIGHT, E.

1985 "Modern Psychoanalytic Criticsm". eds. A. Jefferson and D. Robey. Modern Literary Theory. London: B.T. Batsford.