

M.L.

T H E S I S

NIETZSCHEAN THEMES IN O'NEILL'S PLAYS

Eurides Rossetto

1979

UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE SANTA CATARINA
Departamento de Língua e Literatura Estrangeiras

NIETZSCHEAN THEMES IN O'NEILL'S PLAYS

Tese submetida à Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina
para a obtenção do grau de
MESTRE EM LETRAS

Eurídes Rossetto

1979

ESTA TESE FOI JULGADA ADEQUADA PARA A OBTENÇÃO DO GRAU DE
 - MESTRE EM LETRAS -
 OPÇÃO INGLÊS E LITERATURA CORRESPONDENTE E APROVADA EM
 SUA FORMA DEFINITIVA PELO PROGRAMA DE PÓS-GRADUAÇÃO

John B. Derrick

Prof. John Bruce Derrick, Ph.D

Orientador

Hilário Inácio Bönn
 Prof. Hilário Inácio Bönn
 Coordenador do Curso

Apresentada perante a
 Banca Examinadora com-
 posta dos professores:

John B. Derrick

Prof. John Bruce Derrick, Ph.D

Presidente

Hugh Bernard Fox

Prof. Hugh Bernard Fox, Ph.D

Edward Stanley Jayne

Prof. Edward Stanley Jayne, Ph.D.

À minha esposa

LOURDES LAGO ROSSETTO.

AGRADECIMENTOS

À Faculdade de Filosofia, Ciências e Letras de Palmas, Pr., pela oportunidade e apoio constante.

À integradonia e aos professores do programa de Pós-Graduação da UFSC, em especial aos professores Paulino Vandresen, Mário Feiten e Hilário Bohn.

Ao prof. JOHN BRUCE DERRICK, dedicado orientador e amigo.

Ao prof. Arnold Gordenstein, pelo incentivo e envio de material de pesquisa dos Estados Unidos.

A todos aqueles que direta ou indiretamente contribuíram para que eu pudesse realizar este trabalho.

KEY TO ABBREVIATIONS USED

In this thesis I have abbreviated the following O'Neill's plays and sources in the following manner:

O'NEILL'S PLAYS (Chronologically ordered)

Bound East for Cardiff, 1914. Henceforth termed: B.E.C.

The Emperor Jones, 1920. Henceforth termed: E.J.

The Hairy Ape, 1921. Henceforth termed: H.A.

Desire Under the Elms, 1924. Henceforth termed: D.E.

The Great God Brown, 1925. Henceforth termed: G.G.B.

Marco Millions, 1925. Henceforth termed: M.M.

Lazarus Laughed, 1926. Henceforth termed: L.L.

Mourning Becomes Electra, 1930. Henceforth termed: M.B.E.

Ah, Wilderness! 1933. Henceforth termed: W.

Days Without End, 1934. Henceforth termed: D.W.E.

A Long Day's Journey into Night, 1941. Henceforth termed:

L.D.J.N.

The Iceman Cometh, 1946. Henceforth termed: I.C.

OTHER SOURCES

Kaufmann, Walter. The Birth of Tragedy and the Case of Wagner.

New York: Randon House, 1967. Henceforth termed: B.T.

_____. The Portable Nietzsche. New York: Viking Press, 1954.

Henceforth termed: Z.

_____. Nietzsche: Philosopher, Psychologist, Antichrist.

Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969. Henceforth

termed: Kaufmann.

A B S T R A C T

In The Birth of Tragedy, Nietzsche envisaged two great artistic powers in Greek tragedy before Euripides: Appolo and Dionysus. If we add to the concept of Appolo the meaning Nietzsche gave to the word "Perspectivism" in Human-All-Too-Human, we may approach to the psychological meaning of the word Appolo in this thesis; while Dionysus keeps its original meaning.

In the meditation entitled "Of The Use and Disadvantages of History for Life," Nietzsche described the "Historical" and the "supra-historical man." The former is also called the "false superman" or the "Appolonian man" in this thesis; the later one becomes a synonym of the "Dionysian man" or the "superman."

In O'Neill's first plays, most of them one-act plays about the sea, the Appolonian elements prevail, and symbolize the necessity of illusions for life; while the Dionysian elements are less common, and generally symbolize man's hope in the world of becoming. In O'Neill's middle period, Dionysus overcomes Appolo with a Zarathustrean apotheotic affirmation of life. In the last plays, O'Neill is back to Appolo again, but without the Dionysian hope of his first plays. In these last plays O'Neill seems to suggest that man must face life, and the painful consequences of the "principium individuationis" in a hopeless world, where the wisdom of the Great God Pan becomes that of his wise companion, Silenus:

"Oh, wretched ephemeral race, children of chance and misery, why do you compel me to tell you what it would be most expedient for you not hear? What is best of all is utterly beyond your reach: not to be born, not to be, to be nothing. But the second best for you is—to die soon" (B.T., Sec.3, p.42).

R E S U M O

Em O Berço da Tragédia, Nietzsche percebeu duas grandes expressões artísticas na tragédia grega antes de Eurípides: Apolo e Dionísio. Se nós acrescentarmos ao conceito Apolo o sentido de "Perspectivismo," como foi descrito por Nietzsche em Humano, Tudo Muito Humano, nós entenderemos o conceito Apolo como ele é empregado nesta tese; o conceito Dionísio conserva o mesmo sentido que lhe foi conferido originalmente por Nietzsche.

Na meditação intitulada "Do Uso e Desvantagens da História para a vida," Nietzsche nos fala a respeito do "homem histórico" e "supra-histórico." O primeiro é aqui também denominado de "falso super-homem," ou de "homem apolínico;" o segundo torna-se um sinônimo de "homem dionisíaco" ou de "super-homem."

Nas primeiras peças teatrais de O'Neill, em sua maioria peças de um só ato que versam sobre o mar, prevalecem os símbolos apolínicos, que sugerem a necessidade existencial de ilusões para o indivíduo; enquanto os símbolos dionisíacos são menos frequentes e sugerem a esperança do homem no mundo do devir. Em seu segundo período de desenvolvimento, O'Neill dá preferência aos símbolos dionisíacos e à apoteótica afirmação da vida, conforme foi pregada por Zarathustra. As últimas peças teatrais de O'Neill sugerem que o homem deve enfrentar a vida e as penosas consequências do "principium individuationis" em um mundo sem esperanças, onde a sabedoria do Grande Deus Pã assemelha-se àquela do seu companheiro, Sileno:

"Oh! raça desgraçada e efêmera, filhos do acaso e da miséria, por que me forçais a dizer-vos aquilo que seria muito melhor para vós não ouvirdes? O que é melhor para vós está definitivamente além do vosso alcance: não ter nascido, não existir, não ser nada. Mas, a segunda melhor coisa para vós é—morrer logo" (O Berço da Tragédia, Sec. 3, p.42).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE	PAGES
1.i A THEATER OF IDEAS.....	01
1.ii REVIEW OF PREVIOUS CRITICISM.....	05
1.iii STATEMENT OF PURPOSE.....	16
NOTES ON CHAPTER ONE.....	23
CHAPTER TWO	
THE APOLLONIAN AND THE DIONYSIAN IN O'NEILL'S PLAYS.....	26
NOTES ON CHAPTER TWO.....	87
CHAPTER THREE	
THE HISTORICAL, UNHISTORICAL AND SUPRA--HISTORICAL IN O'NEILL'S PLAYS.....	89
NOTES ON CHAPTER THREE.....	104
CHAPTER FOUR	
THE SUPRA--HISTORICAL VALUE OF THE ETERNAL RECURRENCE.....	105
NOTES ON CHAPTER FOUR.....	120
CHAPTER FIVE	
THE FALSE SUPERMAN AND THE STATE.....	121
NOTES ON CHAPTER FIVE.....	141
CHAPTER SIX	
LAZARUS, A ZARATHUSTRIAN SAVIOR.....	142
NOTES ON CHAPTER SIX.....	154
CHAPTER SEVEN	
A SELF-PORTRAIT IN <u>A LONG DAY'S JOURNEY INTO NIGHT</u>	155
NOTES ON CHAPTER SEVEN	175'
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	
O'NEILL'S PLAYS.....	176
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY ON FRIEDRICH NIETZSCHE.....	177
CRITICAL BOOKS AND ARTICLES ON O'NEILL'S PLAYS.....	177

CHAPTER ONE

i

A THEATER OF IDEAS

Eugene Gladstone O'Neill may be said to have been a thinker who wrote plays. Because he was a thinker he used the whole machinery of the theater as a medium to give emotional expression to his own way of thinking; because he was an artist, he created highly effective devices for the staging of his plays, and has repeatedly been praised as the greatest American playwright:

"Find fault with O'Neill," John Gassner says, "and you find fault with the entire American stage; find merit in him and you find worth in its striving, or straining, toward significant drama." (1)

Although we recognize the greatness of Eugene O'Neill's artistic power, we theoretically assume his art had been possible because of the philosophical and psychological meaning he tried to convey to his plays. In a letter to Arthur Hobson Quinn, for instance, published in Quinn's A History of the American Drama in 1945, O'Neill is reported to have said:

"I'm always, always trying to interpret Life in terms of lives, never just lives in terms of characters. I'm always acutely conscious of the Force behind—Fate, God, our biological past creating our present, whatever one calls it—Mystery certainly—and of the one eternal tragedy of Man in his glorious, self-destructive struggle to make the Force express him instead of being, as an animal is, an infinitesimal incident in its expression." (2)

The "Force behind" or the "Mystery" O'Neill tried to express in his plays seem to take precedence over development of character, aesthetic pleasure, moral texture, or individual behavior of the spectator. And O'Neill often complained about the public who failed to realize the symbolical meaning of his plays, for it was through symbols he tried to express the "Force behind," which makes life either tragic, or glorious,

or worthless. In 1924, for instance, after a performance of The Hairy Ape, he said in the New York Herald Tribune that the public "saw just the stoker, not the symbol," and that the symbol would make "the play either important or just another play." (3)

Eugene O'Neill, however, was not a philosopher or a psychologist in the strict sense of the word, therefore, he sought answers for his philosophical and psychological questions in Nietzsche, Schopenhauer, Buddha, Lao-Tze, Freud, Jung, ... to quote only some. None of them, however, seems to have impressed him more than Friedrich Nietzsche. In fact, Nietzsche exerted his influence not only on O'Neill's theater, but on most dramatists of the early nineteenth century, as Robert Brustein points out in his book The Theater of Revolt:

"... Nietzsche remains the most seminal philosophical influence on the theater of revolt, the intellect against which almost every modern dramatist must measure his own. When Nietzsche declared the death of God, he declared the death of all traditional values as well. Man could create new values only by becoming God: the only alternative to nihilism lay in revolt.... The modern dramatist takes up Nietzsche's challenge, assuming an attitude of refusal which puts him in conflict with the laws of modern necessity. Rejecting God, Church, community and family--vindicating the rights of the individual against the claims of government, morality, conventions, and rules--he adopts the posture of the rebel, chafing against restraints, determined to make all barriers crack." (4)

This same idea is shared by Edwin A. Engel, who also points out how Nietzsche had a special appeal for those like O'Neill who suffered from world-weariness:

"He (Nietzsche) provided a formula for such as O'Neill, who had repudiated both Scripture and Darwinism: substitute Dionysus for Christ, the satyr for the ape. He not only anticipated Freud; he helped clear the way to Freudianism. To the artist who wished to escape from real-

ism he lent support by disparaging the "naturalistic and inartistic tendency." He offered the doctrine of Eternal Recurrence, his own version of death and rebirth. And to those, like O'Neill, who suffered from world-weariness and life-sickness, he taught struggle in place of resignation, ecstasy in place of denial. Such was the Dionysian way of life that O'Neill tried to adopt." (5)

O'Neill is reported to have got acquainted with Nietzsche's philosophy when he was still an undergraduate at Princeton, 1906. There he knew some of Nietzsche's enthusiastic admirers and for the first time he got a copy of Thus Spoke Zarathustra. "When O'Neill was not talking about Nietzsche, "Edward Keefe, one of his friends, said, "he was likely to hold forth on the greatness of Ibsen." (6) Since then Zarathustra had an everlasting influence on Eugene O'Neill. In 1928, O'Neill was asked if he had any literary idol. "The answer to that," he said, "is in one word—Nietzsche." (7) A year before, O'Neill told critic Benjamin de Casseres that Zarathustra had influenced him more than any book he had ever read. "I ran into it when I was eighteen," O'Neill said, "and I've always possessed a copy since then and every year I reread it." (8) Barret A. Clark reports us that when he met the playwright in 1926, he noticed that O'Neill carried "a worn copy of Nietzsche's The Birth of Tragedy in his coat pocket." (9) Agnes Boulton, O'Neill's second wife, tells us that,

"Thus Spake Zarathustra... had more influence on Gene than any other single book he ever read. It was a sort of Bible to him, and he kept it by his bedside in later years as others might that sacred book. In those early days in the Village (i.e. ca. 1917) he spoke often of Zarathustra and books of Friedrich Nietzsche, who at that time moved his emotion rather than his mind. He had read the magnificent prose of this great and exciting man over and over again, so that at times it seemed an expression of himself. I have some copies of Nietzsche that belonged to him, which he bought and read before I knew him, and which are copiously marked...." (10)

Among the playwrights of the time who most influenced O'Neill

August Strindberg—"whose temperament and genius were strikingly similar to Nietzsche"—⁽¹¹⁾deserves special reference. In his Nobel Prize acceptance speech, O'Neill hailed Strindberg as "that great genius of all modern dramatists.... It was reading his plays," O'Neill then said, "that, above all else, first gave me the vision of what modern drama could be, and first inspired me with the urge to write for the theater myself."⁽¹²⁾ Engel, quoting the Gelbs, says that Nietzsche and Strindberg were O'Neill's literary idols and they "became in some ways a pattern for O'Neill's life."⁽¹³⁾

Törnqvist still points out that most of O'Neill's closest friends in the first three decades of the nineteenth century were all enthusiastic admirers of Nietzsche's philosophy. H. L. Mencken, for instance, who was the co-editor of the theater critic George Jean Nathan, was a great admirer of Der Antichrist. He gave O'Neill a copy of it in 1909, and even translated the book in 1920. Inspired by the example of one of his friends at George Pierce Baker's playwriting course at Harvard, O'Neill read "the whole of Also Sprach Zarathustra in the original." Another of his friends, Terry Carlin, considered himself an example of the super-man, and O'Neill immortalized him as Larry Slade, the philosopher of The Iceman Cometh. Another example is O'Neill's attempt to convert his New London girlfriend, Maibelle, to Nietzscheanism, which is remembered in Ah, Wilderness.⁽¹⁴⁾

Although this thesis is not a source study of the plays, and these references are not an exhaustive study of O'Neill's direct and indirect acquaintance with Nietzsche, they seem to be enough to prove the playwright's affinity with the philosopher. To depict such an influence by the internal discussion of the plays, and to show its philosophical and psychological importance in O'Neill's theater of ideas is our main purpose in the following chapters.

REVIEW OF PREVIOUS CRITICISM

Although some critics have already recognized the important influence of Nietzsche's thought in the plays of Eugene O'Neill, we have not found any full-length study to support all of the ideas discussed in this thesis, but only some articles about some specific plays and some specific Nietzschean themes

Edwin A. Engel is one of this critics. In his article, "Ideas in the Plays of Eugene O'Neill," Engel suggests that Nietzsche had special appeal for O'Neill only in some plays written from 1924 to 1926, which followed his parents' and older brother's death. At that time, Engel thinks, O'Neill was imbued with Nietzschean defiance and vitality and he "managed to overcome his grief, to affirm life," and to declare his family "good and sanctify them—all as Nietzsche had directed." (15)

According to Engel, O'Neill's life was then marked by this tragic, familiar event. In his following plays—Desire under the Elms, 1924; The Great God Brown, 1925; and Lazarus Laughed, 1926—Nietzsche's Apollonian and Dionysian concepts, his idea of Eternal Recurrence and the doctrine of the Superman stimulated O'Neill's imagination to write of deep personal feelings, while Jung's and Freud's psychological speculations about father-son enmity and mother-son affection illuminated the results.

Doris V. Falk in her book Eugene O'NEILL and the Tragic Tension also favors a psychoanalytic interpretation of O'Neill's plays, though she also suggests a Nietzschean one.

According to Falk, O'Neill's plays are an attempt to explain human suffering and to justify it. The result is "the classic twofold justification of the ways of God— or

fate—to man: first, that suffering and the very need to explain it are the fountainhead of human action and creativity; and second, that fated though he may be, man is ultimately a free and responsible agent who brings most of his grief upon himself through pride." (16)

This view of life, Falk says, is not a new theme in literature. It has a long familiar history both in philosophy and art:

"O'Neill's conception of process as the unity in which opposites are reconciled has numberless philosophical parallels and sources—in the works of Heraclitus, Plato, Aristotle, Lao-tze, Nietzsche, Emerson...; "while his greatest heroes and heroines belong to "the literary tradition of Fall through Pride—the tradition of Prometheus, Oedipus, Tamberlaine, Macbeth, Satan—and Adam, Faust, Ahab." (17)

As O'Neill was neither a Greek, nor an Elizabethan, but a nineteenth-century writer, he found in modern living and in the language of psychoanalysis a modern vehicle to interpret his ideas. Falk, then, emphasizes that the Sin of Pride means to O'Neill what it did to Jung:

"Man is in fatal error," Falk says interpreting Jung, that his conscious ego can fulfill all his needs without acknowledgment of the power of the unconscious, the modern equivalent of the gods. Clinically speaking, the ignorance or suppression of unconscious needs results in neuroses and psychoses; poetically speaking, to consider oneself the sole arbiter of one's destiny is to court destruction. On the other hand, the conscious ego must attempt to assert itself, for complete submission to the unconscious drives means withdrawal from reality and action, just as does the fatalistic and complete submission to the "will of God." O'Neill's answer, like Jung's, is the classic one. Men must find self-knowledge and a middle way which reconciles the unconscious needs with those of the conscious ego. This means that life inevitably involves conflict and tension, but that the significance of this pain is the growth which Jung calls "individuation"—the gradual realization of the inner, complete personality through constant change, struggle and process." (18)

Falk affirms that O'Neill consciously developed these Jungian concepts, while unconsciously he anticipated the findings of the "Neo-Freudians," Karen Horney and Erich Fromm:

"Freud saw man as the victim of animal drives which, at best, could be sublimated to constructive ends. Although the Neo-Freudians revere and use Freud's insights and techniques, they see man as a free and dignified being capable of creating his own destiny. The first, however, of his Deadly Sins against self and others is Pride. This is not, of course, that healthy self-respecting pride which gives man confidence to act; it is instead the false pride that Nietzsche calls "vanity"—the attempt to create oneself according to an impossible, untrue self-image. The sick and swollen ego cannot differentiate between humility and humiliation, and therefore cannot face the reality of its falseness without complete destruction. The victim of this neurotic pride, like the classic tragic hero, has unconsciously rejected his humanity—his real, imperfect self—for aspiration to Godlike perfection. His desperate, unconscious urge to achieve this divinity may drive him forward with the compulsive monomania of a Napoleon or a Hitler; the shame of his inevitable failure to achieve it may cause him willfully to punish or destroy himself, or to seek asylum from the struggle in apathy or death."(19)

Supported by these general ideas, Doris V. Falk divides O'Neill's plays in seven different parts: The Searchers, The Extremists, The Finders, The Trapped, The Way out, Fatal Balance and Long Day's Journey.

What is important here are not the details of each of these parts, but Falk's many suggestions of a possible Nietzschean interpretation of the plays. She recognizes that "O'Neill felt, with Nietzsche, that tragedy is an affirmation—a symbolical celebration of life;" that the entire "Christ-Dionysus dichotomy," and "the transvaluation of former values" we find in O'Neill's plays, especially in those written before 1927, are Nietzschean themes. (20)

We obviously agree with Falk's suggestions that the pull between opposites is a unifying theme in O'Neill's plays, and

that the struggle between the unconscious and conscious ego is a manifestation of such opposition; but we may interpret it as a manifestation of the Dionysian and Apollonian strength Nietzsche describes in The Birth of Tragedy, for two main reasons: First because Nietzsche has always been considered a precursor of Psychoanalysis; and second, because O' Neill rejected its influence in his plays. In 1926, for instance, he complained about Clark's criticism of Mourning Becomes Electra:

"I don't agree with your Freudian objection. Taken from my author's angle, I find fault with the critics on exactly the same point—that they read too damn much Freud into stuff that could very well have been written exactly as is before psychoanalysis was ever heard of. Imagine the Freudian bias that would be read into Stendhal, Balzac, Dostoievsky, etc., if they were writing today!... Authors were psychologists, you know, before psychoanalysis was invented. And I am no deep student of psychoanalysis. As far as I can remember, of all books written by Freud, Jung, etc., I have read only four." (21)

Uppsala Törnqvist, also known as Egil Törnqvist, shares our point of view. In his article, "Nietzsche and O'Neill: A Study in Affinity," which was published in Orbis Litterarum in 1968, he thinks, like Doris V. Falk, that the most obvious and fundamental affinity between Nietzsche and O'Neill is found in their view of tragedy.

"Nietzsche's view of tragedy," Törnqvist says, "as a metaphysical solace and of the theatrical experience as affecting a sense of Dionysiac oneness with one's fellows and with the universe led him to believe that the pre-Socratic Greeks "could not endure individuals on the tragic stage," and that the protagonists in the plays of Aeschylus and Sophocles are, in fact, only masks of the original hero: Dionysus. At this Dionysiac stage tragedy was still mythopoeic, was still an "artistic reflection of a universal law," which could convey an ecstatic, metaphysical experience. When, beginning with Euripides, tragedy began to draw finely

individualized portraits, it was a sign that the mythopoeic power had become corrupted by scientific reasoning. Without nourishment from the fertile, visionary Dionysiac realm, tragedy was dwarfed and crippled; no longer the higher human task, the true metaphysical activity, the writing of tragedy shrank to mere "quasi-anatomical preparation." In Wagner's work... Nietzsche saw a hopeful return to the high aim of the pre-Socratic Greeks." (22)

O'Neill, according to Törnqvist, always shared this mystical Dionysian feeling, because he never ceased to favor the general, the universal, the "mystery," or the "Force behind." He also thought that Greek tragedy was the unsurpassed example of art and religion; "that the tragic spirit has nothing to do with pessimism in its common sense; that the "deepest abysses of being" are not get by logical reasoning; and that the tragic hero's struggle symbolizes the only worthwhile struggle of man,

"A man wills his own defeat when he pursues the unattainable," O'Neill said. "But his struggle is his success!... Such a figure is necessarily tragic. But to me he is not depressing; he is exhilarating!" (23)

Törnqvist also suggests that the main symbols we find in O'Neill's plays may also be related to Nietzsche's basic view of tragedy. O'Neill's usage of mask devices, for instance, in the experimental plays of the middle period (roughly from 1923 until 1928), expresses the inner division of the characters, and it symbolizes the truly Dionysian suffering, its physical dismemberment. The high frequency of musical elements in the plays may also be related to Nietzsche's view of music as an integral part of tragedy. Also to Nietzsche's view of tragedy, as well as to "Zarathustra's remain-faithful-to-the-earth" may be related O'Neill's juxtaposition of nature and civilization, country-side and city, sea and earth.

Another major point of affinity between Nietzsche and O'Neill is "the death of God" and "the theme of the anti-

political individual who seeks self-perfection far from the modern world." (24)

Like Nietzsche, O'Neill thought that the State and the Church are the two main forces which lead men into animalistic conformity. O'Neill lost his faith when he was thirteen, and he dramatized it in his biographical play, A Long Day's Journey into Night, which also suggests his conversion from Catholicism to Nietzscheanism:

EDMUND. (Bitingly) Did you pray for Mama?

TYRONE. I did. I've prayed to God these many years for her.

EDMUND. Then Nietzsche must be right. (He quotes from Thus Spake Zarathustra) "God is dead: of His pity for man hath God died." (25)

Nietzsche saw as his task to attempt to fill the terrifying void after the death of God and to give modern man a faith in which he can believe. O'Neill declared in a letter to George J. Nathan, published in Nathan's Intimate Notebooks in 1932, that there is a "big subject" behind all his plays, and he described it thus:

"The playwright today must dig at the roots of the sickness of today as he feels it-- the death of the Old God and the failure of science and materialism to give any satisfying new One for the surviving primitive religious instinct to find a meaning for life in, and to comfort its fear of death with." (26)

Some years earlier, O'Neill saw the cure for "the sickness of today" in Zarathustra's gospel, "the only way we can get religion back," he then said, "is through an exultant acceptance of life."⁽²⁷⁾ In O'Neill's Lazarus Laughed, for instance, both Jehovah and Jesus are replaced by a Zarathustrian Savior, Lazarus. That O'Neill had Zarathustra in mind, Törnqvist points out, when he wrote Lazarus Laughed becomes plain from his letter to Benjamin de Casseres, dated June 22, 1927,

"What you say of Lazarus Laughed deeply pleases me-- particularly that you found something of "Zarathustra" in it." (28)

Another cardinal point of Nietzsche's philosophy, emphasized by Törnqvist, is the superman's attitude toward life, which is characterized by the superman's acting beyond good and evil. O'Neill would reveal the hollowness of traditional morality by showing how what is commonly held to be good often appears as evil and vice-versa. Many of his characters, like Jack in Abortion, or Dion in The Great God Brown, are victims of a society with warped morals. He is even reported to have said in 1922,

"To me there are no good people or bad people, just people. The same with deeds. "Good" and "evil" are stupidities, as misleading and outworn fatishes as Brutus Jones' silver bullet...."(29)

And among O'Neill's notes we find the following:

"Verily, I tell you: Good and evil, which would be imperishable, do not exist! Of themselves they must ever again surpass themselves." (30)

And like Nietzsche in The Birth of Tragedy, O'Neill would blame the "Alexandrine Man," who is called the "Historical Man" or the "False Superman" in this thesis, for combating the Dionysian wisdom, or for acting within the common concepts of good and evil.

"Alexandrine optimism," Nietzsche says in The Birth of Tragedy, "combats Dionysian wisdom and art, it seeks to dissolve the myth, it substitutes for metaphysical comfort an earthly consonance, in fact, a deus ex machina of its own, namely the god of machines and crucibles, that is, the powers of the geni of nature recognized and employed in the service of higher egoism; it believes in amending the world by knowledge, in guiding life by science...."(31)

William Brown, for instance, according to Törnqvist and O'Neill's explanation of The Great God Brown, has much in common with Nietzsche's Alexandrine man.

"He (Brown) is the visionless demi-god of our new materialistic myth—a success—building his life of exterior things, inwardly empty and resourceless, an uncreative creature of superficial preordained grooves, a by-product forced aside into slack waters by the deep main current of life-desire." (32)

The Alexandrine Society, according to Nietzsche, still "requires a slave class to be able to exist permanently: but in its optimistic view of life, it denies the necessity of such a class." (33) In The Great God Brown Törnqvist points out that this class is represented by Cybel,

"doomed to segregation as a pariah in a world of unnatural laws, but patronized by her segregators, who are thus themselves the first victims of their laws." (34)

Törnqvist claims that other examples of Alexandrine Man in O'Neill's plays are Charles Marseden, "the professor of dead languages in Strange Interlude; Marco Polo, in Marco Millions; Benny, in Different, the Roman mob and Caligula in Lazarus Laughed....

At the end of his article, "Nietzsche and O'Neill: A Study in Affinity," Törnqvist emphasizes the Nietzschean symbolism of Lazarus Laughed. Most of these ideas, however, are expounded in a second article, also by Törnqvist, called "O'Neill's Lazarus: Dionysus and Christ." (35) In this article Törnqvist suggests that Lazarus resembles a composite of saviors, namely, Dionysus, Zarathustra, Christ and Buddha. Törnqvist, however, claims that O'Neill's main emphasis in the play is on Lazarus' "Dionysiac nature" while "his gospel is almost wholly Zarathustrian."

"Lazarus... is Dionysiac in a Nietzschean sense and in an abstract sense, mythical sense; he is at once a superman and an incarnation of life. Dressed like Dionysus—he wears the "hide of a bull with great gilded horns" and carries the rod "with a pine cone on top" in his hands, while the seven Greeks who form the chorus "in imitation of the old followers of Dionysus" are

dressed in goat skins and have their bodies daubed with wine lees. There is laughter, singing, dancing, and music from cymbals." (36)

According to Törnqvist, O'Neill's leaning toward religious syncretism expressed in Lazarus Laughed and some previous plays suggests the playwright's believe that "all faith... are one and equal--within."

"Brought up a Catholic and turned into a Nietzschean, he (O'Neill) felt it a matter of particular concern that Jesus and Zarathustra--the spokesman for meekness and other wordly hopes and the spokesman for pride, joy, and love of the earth--somehow be found "one and equal." (37)

Another important article about Lazarus Laughed is Cyrus Day's "Amor Fati: O'Neill's Lazarus as Superman and Savior." (38) In this article Cyrus Day points out O'Neill's attempt to reinterpret Nietzsche's doctrine of the Superman, "amor fati," eternal recurrence and pity:

"Amor fati, or love of necessity," Day says, "may be defined as the superman's attitude toward life and death. On the positive side it implies the joyful acceptance and affirmation of earthly life and of earthly suffering. On the negative side it implies the rejection of the Christian believe in personal immortality. "Remain true to the earth," Zarathustra advises, "and believe not those who speak unto you of super-earthly hopes.... Ye want to be paid besides, ye virtuous ones? Ye want reward for your virtue?"

"O Curious greedy Ones," says Lazarus, "is not one in which you know not how to live enough for you?"

"This life is thy eternal life," says Nietzsche.

"Men must learn to live," says Lazarus." (39)

According to Cyrus Day, Lazarus represents the superman. He triumphs over his animal passions; spiritualizes his will to power; affirms life saying "Yes" to every pain and suffering, while his wife Miriam negates life; finally, Lazarus believes in the world of becoming. Lazarus' ministry, however, becomes a failure. His followers forget it

just after Lazarus' departure, and Lazarus himself recognizes that the "greatness of Saviors is that they may not save," and the "greatness of Man is that no God can save him-- until he becomes a God." (40)

At last, Cyrus Day points out that Lazarus Laughed is a failure as drama, because it is "a play about an idea rather than a human being's reaction to an idea. Lazarus is an integrated, undivided character, and the idea he advocates is presented in the form of undivided truth. Effective drama cannot be erected on such foundations." (41) Egil Törnqvist thinks Lazarus is unsatisfactory as a tragic protagonist, because "he is beyond suffering;" (42) and Doris V. Falk, because "drama should "act out" man's dilemma, not explain it in intellectual and expository terms." (43)

As we are not concerned in this thesis with the validity of O'Neill's art, we may say that these last critical comments support our main theory that O'Neill's theater may be called a theater of ideas. Unfortunately, the critics we have read almost unanimously point out the influence of Nietzsche only in O'Neill's plays written before Lazarus Laughed, 1926. Edwin A. Engel even thinks that with Lazarus Laughed O'Neill's ended his discipleship to Nietzsche. After a careful reading of the plays, however, we disagree from Engel's point of view, but we are not alone. Egil Törnqvist also recognizes that Nietzsche's influence on the playwright was an everlasting one. According to Törnqvist, O'Neill's last plays--The Iceman Cometh, Moon for the Misbegotten, A Touch of the Poet, A Long Day's Journey into Night,...-- are marked by Nietzsche's dictum in Human, All-to-Human that "illusions are expensive amusements; but the destruction of illusions is still more expensive." (44) In the Iceman Cometh, for instance, O'Neill points out, that man

needs to surround himself with protective illusions to be able to live, that life itself may be seen as an illusion hiding the true reality which can only be partaken in brief moments. To Nietzsche these moments are characterized by a Dionysiac rapture,

"the artistic power of all nature here reveals itself in the tremors of drunkenness to the highest gratification of the Primordial Unity." (45)

Törnqvist emphasizes that many O'Neill's characters experience such a Dionysian rapture, even in his last plays, like Edmund in A Long Days Journey into Night:

"For a second you see-- and seeing the secret, are the secret. For a second there is meaning! Then the hand lets the veil fall and you are alone, lost in the fog again, and you stumble on toward nowhere, for no good reason!" (46)

Although the clearness of such Dionysiac raptures in many of O'Neill's plays, even in his last ones, it is surprisingly that no one of the above critics mentions the Apollonian elements in O'Neill's plays. It seems clear from The Birth of Tragedy that both are equally needed for tragic art, as Kaufmann says:

"Nietzsche starts with the antithesis of the Dionysian and the Apollinian; and their synthesis is found in tragic art." (Kaufmann, p. 337)

We think this is an indication that the specific influence of The Birth of Tragedy in O'Neill's plays has not been adequately studied yet ; and mainly in this we find fault in the critics.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

In 1923, when his talent had matured and his reputation was at its peak, O'Neill pleaded for the rebirth of an imaginative theater,

"the theater of the Greeks and Elizabethans, a theater that could dare to boast--without committing a farcical sacrilege--that is a legitimate descendant of the first theater that sprang, by virtue of man's imaginative interpretation of life, out of his worship of Dionysus. I mean a theater returned to its highest and sole significant function as a Temple where a religion of a poetical interpretation and symbolical celebration of life is communicated to human beings...." (47)

O'Neill's plays may be said to have been an attempt to interpret life imaginatively. Each new play is a new theatrical experiment, which makes it difficult to ascribe a unifying theme to the plays. A cosmological principle, however, underlies everything he wrote, "the universe and human existence conceived as an endless series of polarities, antithesis, oppositions, antinomies." (48) When the tragic hero becomes conscious of the oppositions, he is requested to endure them alone and fearlessly in order to celebrate, to affirm life as something powerful and worth living. How O'Neill has given emotional expression to the antinomies in his plays, following Nietzsche's philosophy, is one of the basic themes in this thesis.

Nietzsche recognized in Greek tragedy before Euripides two tremendous oppositions in origin and aim between the Apollonian art of sculpture and the Dionysian art of music. According to Nietzsche, Apollo represents "the power to create harmonious beauty;" "the strength to shape one's character no less than a work of art;" "the principle individuation," whose "psychological analogue is dream."

Dionysus is the symbol of that "drunken frenzy which threatens to destroy all forms and codes;" "the ceaseless striving which apparently defies all limitations;" "the ultimate abandonment one sometimes senses in music, its psychological analogue being the state of drunkness." (49)

By that time Nietzsche wanted to prove that "every artist is an imitator, that is to say, either an Apollonian artist in dreams, or a Dionysian artist in ecstasies, or finally—as for example in Greek tragedy—at once artist in both dreams and ecstasies" (B.T., p. 38); and that the tragic art created by the Greeks succeeded in imposing Apollonian forms upon the tumultuous struggle of the will in its perpetual cycle of fragmentation and return to unity. This struggle has been embodied by the Dionysian hero, or the chorus of satyrs, who celebrated the ritual destruction and reunification of their God, Dionysus.

"We must understand Greek tragedy," Nietzsche says in The Birth of Tragedy, "as the Dionysian chorus which ever anew discharges itself in an Apollonian world of images. Thus the choral parts with which tragedy is interlaced are, as it were, the womb that gave birth to the whole of the so-called dialogue, that is, the entire world of the stage, the real drama. In several successive discharges this primal ground of tragedy radiates this vision of the drama which is by all means a dream apparition and to that extent epic in nature; but, on the other hand, being the objectification of a Dionysian state, it represents not Apollonian redemption through mere appearance but on the contrary, the shattering of the individual and his fusion with primal being" (B.T., p. 64-65).

Our theoretical assumption in this thesis is that O'Neill, throughout most of his plays, always reflects these basic ideas from The Birth of Tragedy, but he never achieves an equilibrium between them. In his first plays about the sea, roughly from 1913 until 1923, the Apollonian world of dreams, or illusions prevails; while the Dionysian

world remains as a hope, or an undeveloped theme. In O'Neill's middle period, 1923-1927, Dionysus overcomes Apollo, and the critics unanimously recognize O'Neill had Nietzsche in mind when he wrote these plays. In his last period, O'Neill is back to the Apollonian world of illusions again, but without any hope. Even Dionysus, then, becomes an illusion, a dream of the past, which is beyond man's reach.

Apart from this opposition of The Birth of Tragedy, Nietzsche also maintains that the phenomenal world is a "mere appearance" of the "primordial unity" which is the core of nature. The "primordial unity" cannot be thought as a thing in itself, because it cannot be isolated or thought out of the process of becoming. It can only be felt as a universal principle of eternal contradiction and eternal pain, which is beyond and prior to all phenomena. As such, the "primordial unity," or ultimate reality, is rationally unattainable, because, rather than a thing, it expresses an irrational force, symbolized by the Greek God, Dionysus.

O'Neill suggests in his plays that the individual must live in this irrational universe of inevitable oppositions, such as birth and death, and whatever moral or rational order—in this thesis identified with the Apollonian world of illusions—he tries to impose on it becomes an illusion which has only a survival value for him. Obviously, in this sense, the word Apollo carries a wider meaning than Nietzsche gave it in The Birth of Tragedy. It also implies what Nietzsche called "perspectivism" in later works. In The Will to Power, for instance, Nietzsche says that "there are no facts, only interpretations," and that "every interpretation is a distortion." "Euclidean space," for instance, "is a mere idiosyncrasy of a specific kind of animal, and is only one among many others." (50)

"The doctrine that there are no facts but only interpretations," Arthur Danto says commenting about Nietzsche, "was termed Perspectivism. To be sure, we speak of seeing the same thing from different perspectives, and we might allow that there is no way to see the thing save through a perspective and, finally, that there is no one perspective which is privileged over any other." (51)

In this sense, the whole of philosophy, religion, metaphysics, moralities, science, and even art resembles an Apollonian illusion, but illusions are a necessary presupposition of art and life:

"Countless illusions of beautiful appearance are what make existence in general worth while." This is "the wisdom of illusion." (52)

Nietzsche thought that the illusion is and must be a conscious one for the superior man, but its consciousness, he seems to suggest in The Birth of Tragedy, would be unbearable and should lead to suicide without the middle world of art.

We think the Apollonian in O'Neill's plays may be understood in its wider sense, while the Dionysian generally preserves its original Nietzschean meaning. In this thesis, the former is related to the conscious ego, to culture, to knowledge, or to what can be rationally understood; while the latter is related to the unconscious drives, or instinctive strength. In other words, the Apollonian expresses the "historical" elements of O'Neill's plays; while the Dionysian, the "supra-historical" ones.

In his Second Meditation, Of The Use and Disadvantage of History for Life, Nietzsche discussed the "historical", "unhistorical," and "supra-historical" concepts. The "historical" is that aspect of consciousness commonly designated as the faculty of memory; the "unhistorical" represents the ability to forget; and the "supra-historical" represents those

elements which are independent of historical changes" (See Kaufmann, p.123).

According to Nietzsche, the "historical man", also identified with the "Alexandrine man" or the "false superman," "has faith in the future" (See Kaufmann, p.123). Because he has faith in the future, on the one hand, he believes in an ideal, a dream, or an Apollonian illusion, instead of striving to be a self-master; on the other hand, he uses any means to destroy those who go between himself and his dream, as Hickey says in O'Neill's The Iceman Cometh, "I've seen the day when if anyone forced me to face the truth about my pipe dreams, I'd have shot him dead" (I.C., III, p.192). Nietzsche denounces the "historical man's" "naked admiration for success," his "idolatry of the factual," his saying "yes" to every "power" and "wealth" (See Kaufmann, p.127). Nietzsche even thought that the "historical man" is not different from the "lower animals," and that he "lacks all essential dignity or worth" (See Kaufmann, p.127).

O'Neill's bitterness against the "historical man" always reflects these basic Nietzschean ideas. Billy Brown, for instance, in The Great God Brown, is helpless without the creative strength of Dion Anthony. Marco Polo, according to Kublai-Kan in Marco Millions, "has not even a mortal soul, he has only an acquisitive instinct" (M.M., II, 1, p.251). Sam Evans is a "fount of meaningless energy" in Strange Interlude. The Roman citizens in Lazarus Laughed look like a "multitude of terrified rats," and Caligula is repeatedly described in a childish and monkeyish way. In The Iceman Cometh, Larry Slade, the philosopher, describes mankind "as a breed of swine called man in general" (I.C., I, p.30).

In The Birth of Tragedy, Nietzsche suggested that "individuation," an Apollonian principle, caused all pains

and sufferings to the world. In his Second Meditation, he analyses the "historical" in terms of suffering; the "unhistorical" in terms of happiness; and the "supra-historical" in terms of the relativity of values (See Kaufmann, p. 24-27). The beauty of Greek tragedy, for instance, has been elevated into a timeless symbol, a "supra-historical" value, because it is still beauty for us. In the "highest specimens" of humanity—also called the "supra-historical man", and later, the "superman"—we envisage the meaning of life and history as timeless symbols, or "supra-historical" values.

The Dionysian elements in O'Neill's plays may be envisaged "supra-historically;" for they favor, as in Greek tragedy, the general, the universal, and always attempt to express the true Dionysian primordial unity, the God's physical dismemberment, sufferings and pains, which made tragedy possible. O'Neill's idea of eternal recurrence, for instance; his usage of masks in many of his plays; the splitting personalities in some of his characters; the importance of mother-son relationships in some other plays, ... may be said to be modern psychological ways to express the Dionysian myth; and Lazarus, his best attempt to express the "supra-historical man" and to convey the meaning of Zarathustra's doctrine of the superman to the theater.

These themes, however, are almost always dominant in O'Neill's plays written before Lazarus Laughed. In his last plays some of them, like the doctrine of eternal recurrence and the usage of masks, are only suggested. O'Neill's enthusiasm for Dionysus and Zarathustra's apothotic affirmation of life are then softened. What remains is the painful reality of the Apollonian "principle individuation," and the necessity of illusions to escape the wisdom of Silenus, Dionysus' companion:

"Oh, wretched ephemeral race, children of chance and misery, why do you compel me to tell you what it would be most expedient for you not to hear? What is best of all is utterly beyond your reach: not to be born, not to be, to be nothing. But the second best for you is - to die soon" (B.T., p.42).

Finally, O'Neill's last and autobiographical play, A Long Days Journey into Night, may be said to be not only an autobiographical review of the playwright's own life and plays, but also the fulfillment of Zarathustra's admonishment to the creator: "Write in blood, and you will experience that blood is spirit" (Z., I, 7, p.152); which has been echoed by O'Neill in the dedication of the play, "I give you (his wife, Carlotta) the original script of this play of old sorrow, written in tears and blood."

NOTES ON CHAPTER ONE

1. Gassner, John. O'Neill: A Collection of Critical Essays, p.1
2. Cargil, Oscar. O'Neill and his Plays, p.126
3. Clark, Barret H. Eugene O'Neill: The Man and his Plays,
p.84
4. Brustein, Robert. The Theater of Revolt, p.8
5. Griffin, Ernest G. Eugene O'Neill: A Collection of Criticism,
p.24
6. Sheaffer, Louiz. O'Neill: Son and Playwright, p.139
7. Ibid., p.128
8. Ibid., p.123
9. Clark, Barret H. Eugene O'Neill: The Man and his Plays,
p.5
10. Törnqvist, Egil. "Nietzsche and O'Neill: A Study in Affinity."
Orbis Litterarum, XXIII (NO.2,1968), p.98
11. Griffin, Ernest G. Eugene O'Neill: A Collection of Criticism,
p.24
12. Sheaffer, Louiz. O'Neill: Son and Playwright, p.252
13. Griffin, Ernest G. Eugene O'Neill: A Collection of Criticism,
p.24
14. Törnqvist, Egil. "Nietzsche and O'Neill: A Study in Affinity,"
Orbis Litterarum, XXIII (No.2,1968), p.98
15. Griffin, Ernest G. Eugene O'Neill: A Collection of Criticism,
p.25
16. Falk, Doris V. Eugene O'Neill and the Tragic Tension, p.4
17. Ibid., p.5
18. Ibid., p.7
19. Ibid., p.7,8
20. Ibid., pp.44, 84, 108, 117,118.
21. Clark, Barret H. Op.cit., p. 136.
22. Törnqvist, Egil. Op.cit., p.104
23. Ibid., p. 104

24. Ibid., pp.110-111
25. Ibid., p.111
26. Ibid., p.112
27. Ibid., p.112
28. Ibid., p.97
29. Ibid., p.115. Quoted from Arthur & Barbara Gelb. O'Neill
(New York, 1962), p. 487
30. Ibid., p.115. See also Thus Spoke Zaeathustra, II,12.
31. Ibid., p.118
32. Ibid., p.118. See also Clark, p.105
33. Ibid., p.119. See also The Birth of Tragedy, p.105
34. Ibid., p.111
35. Törnqvist, Egil. "O'Neill's Lazarus: Dionysus and Christ."
American Litterature, XLI (January, 1970), 543-554
36. Ibid., 546
37. Ibid., 554
38. Day, Cyrus. "Amor Fati: O'Neill's Lazarus as Superman and
Savior." Modern Drama, III (December, 1960), 297-305
39. Ibid., 300
40. Ibid., 304
41. Ibid., p.305.
42. Törnqvist, Egil. "O'Neill's Lazarus: Dionysus and Christ,"
p.543
43. Falk, Doris. Op.cit., p.113
44. Törnqvist, Egil. "Nietzsche and O'Neill: A Study in
Affinity," p.117
45. Ibid., 117. See also The Birth of T ragedy, 1.
46. Ibid., 117
47. Cargil, Oscar. Op.cit., p.121
48. Raleigh, John H. The Plays of Eugene O'Neill, p.3
49. See Kaufmann, p.108. The Bith of Tragedy, p.20. Griffi,
Ernest G. Op.cit., p.24.

50. Solomon, Robert C. Nietzsche: A Collection of Critical
Essays, p. 37

51. Ibid., p. 37

52. Ibid., p. 85.

CHAPTER TWO

THE APOLLONIAN AND THE DIONYSIAN IN O'NEILL'S PLAYS

O'Neill's conception of life as an endless struggle between opposites, and his pleading for the rebirth of a theater out of men's worship of Dionysus made him believe that it was still possible to revive in modern audiences, through modern values and symbols, "their enobling identity with the tragic figures on the stage." (1) Of course this was very much of a dream, but O'Neill thought in 1932 that "where the theater is concerned one must have a dream, and the Greek dream in tragedy is the noblest ever!" (2)

The Greeks, according to Nietzsche in The Birth Of Tragedy, felt existence as something terrible and horrible. In order to endure terror at all, they had to create the Olympian World, "a world of illusion," which "gradually evolved through the Apollinian impulse toward beauty, just as roses burst from thorny bushes" (B.T., pp. 42-43). O'Neill, following Nietzsche, thought that modern men are not less delicate than the Greeks. Modern men also need, like every age and culture, some metaphysical, or religious, or scientific solace to give life a meaning or value. But any meaning or value man gives life may be said to be an illusion created by the human intellect, modeled in what man calls "ego." "The ego," Nietzsche says, "is only a fiction," "an attempt to see and understand our infinitely complicated nature in a simplified fashion—an image to represent a thing." (3) Through the "ego" men reduced the world to terms of his own being, his own logical or psychological prejudices and presuppositions, as things in themselves. A thing in itself, however, is always an illusion, because there is no distinction between things. That there is no

distinction between things, Nietzsche would have termed a Dionysian insight, an insight we could not live with very long. (4)

O'Neill's tragic heroes, generally speaking, need a world of illusions to live in. The illusion is expressed in the hero's pursuit of his own self, or an outward reality, like religion, science, wealth, political power, etc. The destruction of the illusion, or the dream, however, means the hero's destruction, symbolised by his death or seclusion from the social world. In his death, though the hero recognizes he has lived a dream, he is requested, especially in the plays written before Lazarus Laughed, to affirm life as something powerful and undestructible at the bottom. In O'Neill's last plays, however, life itself becomes an illusion, and the hero's struggle, a worthless one.

In his first plays about the sea, O'Neill stated this theme which has been fully developed in his later plays. In the slight plot of Bound East for Cardiff—O'Neill's first play produced in 1914—we can already grasp the positive value of illusions for life, and the Dionysian strength, the force behind individuation.

Bound East for Cardiff merely shows us the death of a sailor in the forcastle of a British tramp, which was going from New York to Cardiff, on a foggy night.

Yank, the dying sailor, is first presented to the audience, sleeping. The fact that Yank is thus presented, symbolizes Yank's lifelong illusion or dream of having a farm and a wife:

"It must be great to stay on dry land all your life and have a farm with a house of your own with cows and pigs and chickens, 'way in the middle of the land where yuh'd never smell the sea or see a ship. It must be great to have a wife, and kids to play with at night

after supper when your work was done. It must be great to have a home of your own, Drisc" (B.E.C.,p.49).

Yank had nothing to lean on for support, but his dream. God was his enemy, because Yank had killed a man in a fight. The captain of the ship could do nothing for Yank, either, as Yank tells his friend, Drisc, "the captain can't do me no good, yuh know it yourself"(B.E.C.,p.46). Neither Drisc or the money Yank had could help him to solve the tragedy of life, "whatever pay's comin' to me yuh can divy up with the rest of the boys; and yuh take my watch"(B.E.C.,p.53). What remains is the Apollonian "principle individuation" symbolized by Yank's loneliness and the necessity to face death and suffering courageously and alone, "It's hard to ship on this voyage I'm going on--alone"(B.E.C.,p.53).

O'Neill thought that individual death must be a symbolical celebration of life, a hope, even a hopeless hope for mankind, because, as Doris Falk suggests, death is a consolation for the hopelessness of the hope, and it makes life seem less tragic, while life makes death seem less terrible. (5)

"This sailor's life ain't much to cry about leavin'," Yank says, "yuh mustn't take it so hard, Drisc. I was just thinkin' it ain't as bad as people think-- dyin'." (B.E.C.,p.49)

As soon as Yank dies, the fog, which remained throughout the play, lifts; symbolically, Yank's dream lifts. The Apollonian world of dreams is torn aside. The sailors are relieved by Yank's courage to face death as an inevitable complement of life. The Dionysian world is then suggested by the power of the sea--a symbol of Dionysus in O'Neill's next plays--and by Yank's last vision of "a pretty lady dressed in black"(B.E.C.,p.54). Life and death, like in Greek tragedy, are celebrated in only one rite: Yank's

death and the hope of a new birth in his last vision.

The themes of Bound East for Cardiff are developed in The Hairy Ape, which was published in 1921. The protagonist of O'Neill's new play is also called Yank. When the play opens, Yank and other stokers of a transatlantic liner are seen in the stokehole. They resemble "those pictures in which the appearance of the Neanderthal man is guessed at. All are hairy chested, with long arms of tremendous power and low receding brows above their small, fierce, resentful eyes." Yank, however, "seems more truculent, broader, fiercer, more powerful, more sure of himself than the rest. They respect his superior strength—the grudging respect of fear. Then, too, he represents to them a self-expression, the very last word in what they are, their most highly developed individual" (H.A., sc.1, pp.39-40). (6)

In these stage directions, O'Neill made his stokers resemble a Greek satyr dressed in Charles Darwin's clothes. Like the satyrs, the stokers are part man and part animal, but the animal resembles a mokey and not a goat. Like the followers of Dionysus, the stokers enjoy drinking and singing and no social or religious considerations seem to trouble them. Those who try to break the unnaturalness of this symbolically natural state are despised by the stokers. Paddy, from the beginning of the play, is considered a coward by his comrades; Long, a pessimist. The only respectable and acceptable authority is Yank's superior strength.

At the beginning of the play, Yank illusionary thinks he "belongs." He identifies himself with the power of the engines, with the gold, and the steel. His comrades see him in the same way. Thus, Yank's self-image, his ego, becomes an illusion which reflects his friends' believing in him; and his physical power, a vain symbol of his rootless

authority, an Apollonian illusion.

"...I'm smoke," Yank tells us, "and express trains and steamers and factory whistle; I'm de ting in gold dat makes it money! And I'm what makes iron into steel! Steel dat stands for de whole ting! And I'm steel--steel--steel! I'm de muscles in woiks! All de rich guys dat tink dey're sump'n, dey ain't nothin'! Dey don't belong. But us guys, we're in de move, we're at de bottom, de whole ting in us" (H.A. Sc.1, p.48).

Yank thinks of the engines as he thinks of himself-- a strong physical power-- and according to it he values everything: society, morality, beauty, religion...

"De Bible, huh! De Cap'list class, huh! Aw mix on dat Salvation Army--Socialist bull.* Git a soapbox! Hire a hall! Come and be saved, huh! Jerk us to Jesus, huh! Aw g'wan!... yuh're all wrong!" (H.A., Sc.1, p.44).

That Yank's self-image, however, is an illusion, will soon be proved by Mildred's appearance in the stokehold.

Mildred is Mr. Douglas', the owner of the ship, daughter. Her father owns almost all of the steel produced in the world. When she sees Yank, she falls back in horror, crying: "Take me away! Oh, the filthy beast!" As Paddy will say later in the play, "'t was as if she'd seen a great hairy ape escaped from the zoo" (H.A., Sc.1, p.62).

With Mildred's appearance, Yank's world of illusions begins to be shaken. From here on, his feeling of "belonging" will gradually disappear, and O'Neill repeatedly describes him as "Rodin's Thinker." The more he thinks, however, the more he feels he does not "belong," and the more he becomes conscious of the necessity of illusions for life. His first attempt to restore things again, he thinks, is to get revenge upon Mildred, "I was going to spit in her pale mug, see! Sure,

* O'Neill seems to tell us here, through the protagonist, that any kind of government, be it connected to capitalism, socialism or religion, is an illusion, whose value is not different from Yank's feeling of belonging.

right in her pop-eyes! Dat woulda made me even, see?" (H.A., Sc.5, p.67).

Looking for revenge, Yank goes to Fifth Avenue with Long, a socialist stoker. Long tries to convince Yank to avenge himself not upon Mildred, but upon the class she represents, "I wants to awaken yer bloody clarss consciousness," Long says. "Then yer see it's 'er clarss yer've got to fight not 'er alone. There's a 'ole mob of 'em like 'er, Gawd blind 'em!" * (H.A., Sc.5, p.68).

Yank rejects Long's advise. He still believes in his physical power. After stopping some passers-by without any result, he strikes a gentleman's face. The policemen rush in on Yank from all sides, and take him to jail.

The bars of the jail were made of steel, in which element Yank ironically thought he belonged. To destroy all steel factories and prisons, symbolically his own self-image, is Yank's next step after getting free from jail. He goes to the office of the I.W.W.—a socialist organization—to offer his services to bomb the steel mills, "Dynamite! Blow it often de oith—steel— all de cages— all de factories, steamers, buildings, jails— de Steel Trust and all dat makes it go" (H.A., Sc.7, p.81).

Yank's progress in the play is a progress toward self-destruction, for it is an attempt to destroy his own illusion. The illusion, in O'Neill's plays, has a survival value for the character. He who destroys it within himself, as Nietzsche says, is "punished by that most severe of tyrants, nature."⁽⁷⁾

Yank's last attempt to keep his own illusion, to fix all things again, vanishes when he is thrown out of the I.W.W. Then he realizes he is alone, and alone he has to face life, like the hero of Bound East for Cardiff. His self-image, the ego, which was supported by his comrades in the stokehole,

* Long's words always reflect the influence of socialism on O'Neill at the time, 1921.

has vanished, "Steel was I and I owned de woild. Now I ain't steel, and de woilds owns me" (H.A., Sc. 7, p. 83). O'Neill then points out that once the illusion has been destroyed only the Dionysian truth remains, "I was born," Yank says, "see?" (H.A., Sc. 7, p. 84) But the Dionysian truth cannot be endured for long, for it requires the wisdom of Silenus. To escape Silenus' wisdom is Yank's last attempt. He goes to the zoo, and faces the gorilla in the steel cage, not without envy, "...yuh, yuh're at de bottom. yuh belong! Sure! Yuh're de only one in de woild dat does, yuh lucky stiff" (H.A., Sc. 8, p. 85).

The gorilla and the steel cage symbolize Yank's last desperate attempt to keep his illusion. The gorilla stands for physical power, in which Yank thought he belonged and by which he is now destroyed; the steel, Yank's best self-image. O'Neill, then, ironically comments, "and, perhaps, the Hairy Ape at last belongs" (H.A., Sc. 7, p. 88).

O'Neill's symbolism in the play reaches its culmination here. Yank, after trying to destroy his illusion of belonging to a world of strong physical power, feels the Apollonian necessity of keeping the illusion to save his life. He tries to go back, but it is a hopeless hope. The illusion has already been destroyed. Once the illusion is destroyed, the tragic hero belongs to death; symbolically, the Dionysian gorilla kills him. What remains is life, as something powerful and tragic. "It's way down-- at de bottom," Yank says, "yuh can't grab it, and yuh can't stop it. It moves and everything moves" (H.A., Sc. 8, p. 83).

If the world of illusions is well illustrated in Bound East for Cardiff and in The Hairy Ape, the Dionysian world becomes the main theme of Desire Under the Elms, which was written in 1924.

When the curtains rise, Eben-- the protagonist and his two half-brothers are shown. Eben's dark eyes "remind one of a wild animal in captivity. Each day is a cage in which he finds himself trapped but inwardly unsubdued. There is a fierce repressed vitality about him"(D.E., Part I, Sc.1, p. 137). His two half-brothers are "more bovine and homelier in face.... They smell of earth.... They hurry clumsily to their food, like two friendly oxen toward their evening meal" (D.E., Part I, Sc.1, p.140).

Both in The Hairy Ape and in Desire Under the Elms, O'Neill first describes his characters as animals. In The Hairy Ape, the stokers look like "chained gorillas," in Desire Under the Elms, the family resembles the beast of the field. In Desire Under the Elms, however, there is something like an irresistible life-force, the Dionysian element of the play, which makes the characters follow their instincts.

Simon and Peter look like oxen. They eat, work and behave like a team of oxen, and feel tied up to the other animals of the farm by bonds of brotherhood: "...the cows knows us an' like us.... An' the horses, an' pigs, an' chickens.... They knows us like brothers-- an' likes us" (D.E., Part I, Sc.1, p.152). In spite of their complaint of having worked hard during their life-time, O'Neill's describes them in the first part of the play as being only able to eat, drink, and fornicate.

Eben is not different from his two half-brothers. In a bestial way he himself describes his lust for Min, the prostitute of the play, "I begun t' beller like a calf an' cuss, at the same time, I was so darn mad-- an' she got scared-- an' I jest grabbed holt an' tuk her" (D.E., Part I, Sc.3, p. 148). When Abbie courts Eben, the scene is not different:

"At first he submits dumbly, then he puts his arms about her neck and return her kisses, but finally, suddenly aware of his hatred, he hurls her away from him, springing to his feet," and O'Neill adds, "they stand speechless and breathless, panting like two animals" (D.E., Part II, Sc.2, p.174).

Ephraim Cabot, in this sense, is not different from his three sons. He prefers to sleep in the barn with the cows because they know him, "I kin talk t' the cows. They know. They know the farm an' me. They'll give me peace" (D.E., Part II, Sc.2, p.174). When Spring comes and Ephraim listens to the "heñs cluckin'" and "the roosters crowin'" and "the cows lowin'" and "everytin'" else "kickin' up," he is impelled to leave the farm "t' learn God's message" for him (D.E., Part II, Sc.2, p.173). Meanwhile, his two elder sons, Simon and Peter, leave for California, and Ephraim finds Abbie, his third wife. Now the farm resembles a parody of Eden. The names Abbie and Eben sound like Adam and Eve; old Ephraim Cabot indentifies himself with God the Father.

The God which Ephraim identifies himself with is in opposition to the life-force described above; it expresses the Apollonian elements of the play. Like himself and the farm, Ephraim's God is hard and lonesome. "God's hard, not easy," Ephraim says, "God's in the stones" (D.E., Part II, Sc.2, p.172).

Ephraim has dedicated his entire life to this Puritanical God. In his name, as Doris V. Falk points out, he has enslaved his sons to the farm, and let his second wife, Eben's mother, die overworked and love-starved. Now, her spirit—the Dionysian instinctual life-force—opposes the Puritanical Ephraim and his God. "Her self-sacrifice, her longing for beauty, her need of natural sexual love demand

fullfilment. (8) O'Neill symbolizes it in two elms on each side of the farmhouse, which dominate the entire play:

"There is a sinister maternity in their aspect, a crushing, jealous absorption. They have developed from their intimate contact with the life of man in the house an appalling humaneness. They brood oppressively over the house. They are like exhausted women resting their sagging breasts and hands and hair on its roof, and when it rains their tears trickle down monotonously and rot on the shingles"(D.E., Setting, p.138).

This something felt in the elms as an irresistible life-force, or sexual drive, or Dionysian strength, is, in different ways, expressed by all the characters of the play.

Simon finds in it an excuse even for murder, "No one never kills nobody. It's allus somethin' that's the murderer." "What's somethin'?-- Eben asks-- and Simon answers: "Donno." Soon after Eben recognizes there is something in himself he can feel but not explain, "I kin feel it growin' in me-- growin' an' growin'-- till it'll bust out." Like Eben, Ephraim, in spite of all his insensibility, also feels "somethin'" he cannot explain, "They's thin's about in the dark-- in the corners.... Even the music can't drive it out -- somethin'! ye kin feel it droppin' of the elums, clibin' the roof, sneakin' down the chimney, pokin' in the corners. They's no peace in houses, they's no rest livin' with falks. Somethin's always livin' with ye... (D.E., Part III, Sc.2, p. 189). But what is this something?

Simon defines it in Part one, scene one, as being "Lust;" Abbie, as being Nature: "Hain't the sun strong an' hot? Ye kin feel it burnin' into earth-- Nature-- makin' thin's grow -- bigger 'n' bigger-- burnin' inside ye-- makin' ye want grow -- into somethin' else-- till ye are jined with it-- an' it's your'n-- but it own ye-- too-- an' makes ye grow bigger-- like a tree-- like them elums" (D.E., Part II, Sc.1, p.164).

In short, "somethin'" is the desire expressed in the title of the play: an irresistible life-force which makes everything grow, whether animate or inanimate, into life, into force, into beauty; in opposition to the stones of the farm and Ephraim's Puritanical God. It is the eternal becoming; the tragic hero's fate; the Greek Moira; an instinctual strength which stands beyond good and evil and breaks all moral codes. In one word, it is the Dionysian strength Nietzsche celebrates in The Birth of Tragedy.

Under the charm of this pagan God, Dionysus, all things, whether good or evil, are deified. Man himself is deified and transformed into a timeless symbol, as if he were a work of art. Eben becomes an inspired poet; Min and Abbie, an incarnation of fertility and life: "She's (Min) like t'night, she's soft 'n' wa'm, her eyes kin wink like a star, her Mouth's wa'm, her arms're wa'm. She smells like a wa'm plowed field, she's purty" (D.E., Part I, Sc.1, p.145). Eben says. Ephraim, though a hard Puritan, feels the same when he courts Abbie, "Yew air my Rose o' Sharon! Behold, yew air fair; yer eyes air doves; yer lips air like scarlet; yer two breasts like two fawn; yer navel be like a round goblet; yer belly be like a heap of wheat"(D.E., Part II, Sc.1, p.167).

To resist nature, symbolically Dionysus, becomes, in Desire Under the Elms, an impious struggle, as Abbie says to Eben, "Ye can't. It's agin nature, Eben. Ye been fightin' yer nature since the day I come.... Nature'll beat ye, Eben. Ye might's well own up t'it fust 's last" (D.E., Part II, Sc.1, p.146). Even the notion of sin becomes meaningless; and the sin itself, something beautiful and desirable: "By God A'mighty," Eben says to his half-brothers

when he remembers Min, the prostitute, "she's purty, an' I don't give a damn how many sins she's sinned afore mine or who she's sinned 'em with, my sin's as purty as any one on 'em" (D.E., Part I, Sc. 2, p. 143). Abbie, in Part three, scene four, after murdering her son, lifts her head, "as defying God," "I don't repent that sin! I ain't askin' God t' forgive that" (D.E., Part III, Sc. 4, p. 203). "Nor me," Eben answers. Certainly, the god Abbie and Eben deny is not the pagan Dionysus, but the Christian God worshiped by Epraim Cabot: the God of repression, lonesomeness and hard work.

In Desire Under the Elms, we thus witness the dramatic development of two opposite philosophies: Old Cabot's Puritanism and Dionysus' worship, a conflict between the sterile stones of the farm and the desire which circulates through the elms. That O'Neill sympathizes with Dionysus becomes clear at the end of the play. The two lovers, Abbie and Eben, instead of committing suicide, surrender courageously to the Sheriff. "They both stand for a moment looking up raptly in attitudes strangely aloof and devout," O'Neill says, while Eben points to the sunrise sky and comments, "Sun's a-rizin'. Purty, Hain't it?" (D.E., Part III, Sc. 4, p. 206). *

The Dionysian theme of Desire Under the Elms appears again in The Great God Brown (1925), Lazarus Laughed (1926), and Mourning Becomes Electra (1930). In all three, O'Neill's characters use masks as an artificial attempt to conceal their real nature which approves the sex instinct as the purest manifestation of the creative impulse. At the same time, O'Neill's claims for an "imaginative theater" seems to get its highest expression in these plays.

* Doris V. Falk recognizes a psychoanalytic interpretation of Desire Under the Elms, based upon the triangular relationship, father-mother-son.

The use of masks had already been touched slightly in The Hairy Ape, but in The Great God Brown it is fully explored. All the main characters, except Billy Brown in the first part of the play, are masked.

Not less important than the masks in The Great God Brown are the names of O'Neill's characters. He himself explained them in The New York Evening Post, in 1926:

"Dion Anthony—Dionysus and St. Anthony—the creative pagan acceptance of life, fighting eternal war with the masochistic, life-denying spirit of Christianity as represented by St. Anthony—... Margaret is my image of the modern descendant of the Marguerite of Faust—the eternal girl woman with a virtuous simplicity of instinct, properly oblivious to everything but the means to her end of maintaining the race. Cybel is an incarnation of Cybele, the Earth Mother doomed to segregation as a pariah in a world of unnatural laws, but patronized by her segregators, who are thus themselves the first victims of their laws. Brown is the visionless demi-god of our new materialistic myth...." (9)

The play opens with a Prologue in which the Brown and the Anthony families are contrasted. The contrast is important because it throws light upon the two main characters: Billy Brown and Dion Anthony. Billy's future has already been assigned to him by his parents. He is supposed to become a success and to take up Architecture—an Apollonian art—a dream his father failed to reach. Beside this, Billy has a personal dream, i. e., independent from his parents' planning of his future: to be loved by Margaret. Dion, on the other hand, like Eben in Desire Under the Elms, is at odds with his father, "This Mr. Anthony is my father, but he only imagines he is God the Father" (G:G. B., Prologue, p. 310). There is no future planned for Dion. O'Neill presents Dion masked. His mask is a "fixing forcing of his own face—dark, spiritual, poetic, passionately supersensitive, helplessly unprotected in its childlike, religious faith in life—into the expression of a mocking, reckless, defiant,

gayly scoffing and sensual young Pan" (G.G.B., Prologue, p. 310).

The Dionysian strength, which is beneath representation, is here paradoxically presented as a maskie, a representation. At the same time the description of Dion's mask fortells the conflict throughout the play: the spiritual man versus the Dionysian man; the poet, Dion, versus the businessman, Brown.

In the Prologue O'Neill also shows Billy and Dion courting the same girl, Margaret. Margaret falls in love with Dion's mask of Pan, never even recognizing the other face beneath it. So, when Billy steals Dion's mask of Pan, Margaret mistankenly loves Billy thinking he is Dion. On the other hand, Dion's love for Margaret is something impersonal, "I take this woman.... Hello woman!" (G.G.B., Prologue, p. 318). In this way O'Neill's characters become more symbols than individual characters.

Cybel, or Mother Earth, embodies pure paganism. She may be said to be the feminine counterpart of Dionysus. She symbolizes nature, instinct, naive sex without consciousness of guilt, and the hope to restore the Dionysian primordial unity. Her panacea for human suffering approaches a Dionysian festival, "I'd like to run out naked into the street," she tells Dion, "and love the whole mob to death like I was bringing you a new brand of dope that'd make you forget everything that ever was for good" (G.G.B., Act II, Sc. 2, p. 337). But soon after she realizes that Puritan society lives in a world of illusions. Innocent sensuality has been corrupted by it, "But they wouldn't see me any more than they see each other. They've got to kill someone... to live" (G.G.B., Act IV, Sc. 2, p. 372).

Cybel's direct antagonism is Billy Brown, the successful businessman, who gains success by exploiting the Dionysian genius of his life-long friend, Dion Anthony. Brown becomes a symbol of the Puritan society, or the communal self which

which lives on illusions. He is a respectable man, especially in matters of sex. But to suppress the sex instinct, which represents the wisdom of Cybel, is, in the play, the same as to suppress the instinct of life itself. Only by stealing Dion's mask of Pan, Brown gains insight into the superiority of the pagan ideals and feels the necessity to protect himself behind a mask.

Between these two antagonists of opposing philosophies stands Dion Anthony. In his soul there is a perpetual conflict between pagan acceptance of life (the Dion(ysus) principle, or individual self) and Christian masochism (the Anthony principle, or social self), as Dion expresses it in the beginning of the play: "Now! Be born! Awake! Live! Dissolve into dew—into silence—into night—into earth—into space—into peace—into meaning—into joy—into God—into the Great God Pan!" And the Anthony principle adds: "Wake up! Time to get up! Time to exist! Time for school! Time to learn! Learn to pretend! Cover your nakedness! Learn to lie! Learn to keep step! Join the procession! Great Pan is dead! Be ashamed!" (G.G.B., Prologue, p. 318). In such a context the individual self, symbolically the Dionysian wisdom, needs "an armour" to be protected:

"Why am I afraid to dance," Dion asks himself, "I who love music and rhythm and grace and song and laughter? Why am I afraid to live, I who love life and the beauty of flesh and the living colors of earth and sky and sea? Why am I afraid to love, I who love love? Why must I pretend to scorn in order to pity? Why must I hide myself in self-contempt in order to understand? Why must I be so ashamed of my strength, so proud of my weakness? Why must I live in a cage like a criminal, defying and hating, I who love peace and friendship?... Why was I born without a skin, O God, that I must wear an armour in order to touch and to be touched?... Or rather, Old Graybeard, why the devil was I ever born at all? (G.G.B., Prologue, p. 315).

Dion lacks a "skin," that is, an Apollonian complement to give form to his tortured Dionysian creativity. He would like to worship "the Great God Pan," to be full of laughter; instead he has to bear "the intolerable chalice of life," and the masochistic Christian principle within him makes laughter die on his lips. As a follower of Dionysus, who has gained insight into the essence of things, Dion understands the wisdom of the sylvan God, Silenus: "he is nauseated" (B.T., p. 60).

O'Neill's temporary solution—the Apollonian "skin"—for Dion's conflict is the same he offered to Eben in Desire Under the Elms: love. Like Eben, Dion accepts love as a synthesis for his psychological dichotomy, "she loves me! I'm not afraid! I'm strong!...She is my skin! She is my armour!" (G.G.B., Prologue, p. 316).

That love was a temporary solution, an Apollonian illusion, for Dion's conflict becomes clear after his marriage with Margaret. He proves to be a good lover, but a failure as father. The conflict makes him increasingly incapable to do anything, except drink and gamble, like the followers of Dionysus. He is unable to paint or to support his family in any way. After seven years of marriage, Dion is again nauseated by life, and "nausea inhibits action," as Nietzsche says in The Birth of Tragedy:

"The Dionysian man resembles Hamlet: both have once looked truly into the essence of things, they have gained knowledge, and nausea inhibits action; for their action could not change anything in the eternal nature of things;... action requires the veil of illusion" (B.T., Sec. 7, p. 70).

Dion's whole struggle to exist in a Puritan society resulted in exhaustion and frustration; his love has passed like a dream; his creative spirit is stifled. Conscious of the psychological truth, he sees everywhere, like Hamlet,

only the horror or absurdity of existence, which has changed the Pan quality of his mask into "a diabolical Mephistophelean cruelty and irony;" his face, into "an ascetic, a martyr, furrowed by pain and self-torture"(G.G.B., Act II, Sc. 1, pp.335-36).

Cybel, the prostitute, tries to inspire Dion with her trust in life for its own sake. In her lap, Dion feels comfortable enough to face the tragedy of life unmasked, without succumbing to it. He then realizes that the very tragedy of existence sprang out from the splitting up of 'noumenal' nature into a 'phenomenal' world, the world of individuation. What matters, however, is not the phenomena, but the primordial unity existing in the very heart of nature. Even individual life in this sense is unimportant, as Cybel tells Dion, "your life is not important, ...and it is not sacred"(G.G.B., Act II, Sc.1, p.337).

Cybel gives Dion's weakness "strength to live" and "strength to die." For a while he is able to forget the Anthony principle in himself, and to understand the cosmic symbolism existent in Cybel's Dionysian old rotten tunes, "Every song is a hymn. They keep trying to find the world in the Beginning"(G.G.B., Act II, Sc.1, p.335). He also understands the necessity of illusions for life, and he is forced to turn his poetic talents to plastic, Apollonian arts. He takes a job at Brown's office and realizes his masterpiece: a design of a Cathedral for William Brown. Yet, in his design, like in the Olympian world of the Greeks, there is nothing which indicates asceticism, spirituality or duty; but the accents of an exuberant, triumphant life, in which all things, whether good or evil, are deified:

"This Cathedral is my masterpiece! It will make Brown the most eminent architect in this state of God's country. I put a lot into it—what was left of my life! It's one

vivid blasphemy from sidewalk to the tips of its spires! — but so concealed that the fools will never know. They'll kneel and worship the ironic Silenus who tells them the best good is never to be born" (G.G.B., Act II, Sc. 3, p. 348).

Dion's design becomes an attempt to justify the universe as an aesthetic phenomenon. The Dionysian world of eternal pain and contradiction is concealed under a veil of illusion, artistically conceived to form the Cathedral's visible part.

The artist, like Dion who is able to grasp ultimate reality by insights, may feel himself nullified in the presence of such a design because it leads him back to the very heart of nature; the common man, like Billy Brown who is unable to contemplate reality out of the rational realm, may be fascinated by its beautiful appearance, although he is unable to understand what is concealed under them.

Brown's inaptitude to understand the creative talent in Dion makes him envy his life-long friend, and take advantage of his design in order to become an "eminent architect."

"Brown," O'Neill said in The New York Evening Post in 1926, "has always envied the creative life-force in Dion— what he himself lacks" (10). Of course, Brown does not understand that what is a sign of life in Dion is precisely what makes him suffer. Therefore, he has always envied not only Dion's talent, but also his love for Margaret and the children. Brown does not understand either of them; he does not recognize that the unhappiness of Dion's marriage any more than he does the satire of Dion's design. Dion, however, has always been aware of his friend's envy:

"One day when I was four years old," Dion says, "a boy sneaked up behind when I was drawing a picture in the sand he couldn't draw and hit me on the head with stick and kicked out my picture and laughed when I cried. It wasn't what he'd done that made me cry, but him!

I had loved and trusted him and suddenly the good God was disproved in his person and the evil and injustice of Man was born! Everyone called me cry-baby, so I became silent for life and designed a mask of the Bad Boy Pan in which to live and rebel against that other boy's God and protect myself from His cruelty. And that other boy, secretly he felt ashamed but he couldn't acknowledge it; so that day he instinctively developed into the good boy, the good friend, the good man, William Brown"(G.G.B., Act II, Sc.3, p.348).

From here on the play gains a new dimension: the poet's exploration and inner struggle against the businessman, i.e., the individual self which struggles to escape from being nullified by the social self. In a way it approaches the conception of original sin. The social self, made of Apollonian illusions, imposes himself on the individual self, which expresses the Dionysian instinctual strength. The sensitive man, like Dion, turns on itself and becomes guilty. He is forced to design a mask of the "Bad Boy Pan" to protect himself and take revenge upon the "Good Boy Brown," or society, who has forbidden his artistic genius free expression. "When Pan was forbidden the light and warmth of the sun," Dion tells Brown, "he grew sensitive and self-conscious and proud and revengeful-- and became Prince of Darkness" (G.G.B., Act II, Sc.1, p.348). In this sense the forbidden Pan becomes for O'Neill the same as the Christian devil, also called the "Prince of Darkness."

Dion is unable to bear his double identity for much longer. He longs for death, the end of the principle individuation. His death, however, like that of a tragic hero, should be a symbolical celebration of life; and O'Neill performs it masterfully. Who first dies is the pagan principle, the Dionysian; after, the life denying Christian, Anthony. The pagan Dion -- after leaving his last testament and will to Brown, "I leave Dion Anthony to William Brown"-- looks upward "defiantly"

to celebrate life by laughter, "Nothing more-- but Man's last gesture-- by which he conquers-- to laugh"(G.G.B., Act II, Sc. 3, p. 350).

Dion mask of Pan falls and the "Christian Martyr's face at the point of death" is revealed. The Anthony principle, then, negates life asking Brown forgiveness:

"Forgive me, Billy. Bury me, hide me, forget me for your own happiness! May Margaret love you! May you design the Temple of Man's soul! Blessed are the meek and poor in spirit! (He kisses Brown's feet-- then more and more weakly and childish) What was the prayer, Billy? I'm getting so sleepy..."

BROWN(in a trancelike tone) Our father who art in Heaven.
DION. (drowsily) Our Father...." (G.G.B., Act II, Sc. 3, p. 350)

O'Neill ironically explains this scene as follow:

"It is as Mephistopheles he (Dion) falls stricken at Brown's feet after having condemned Brown to destruction by willing him his mask, but, this mask falling off as he dies, it is the Saint who kisses Brown's feet in abject contrition and pleads as a little to a big Brother to tell him a prayer" (11).

With Dion's design and mask, Brown appears to the American audiences as Apollo did to the Greeks. Apollo symbolized the Olympian manifestation of the Dionysian strength to the Greeks; Brown, the successful American businessman who has built his success out of Dion's energy. Now we should expect that by taking Dion's mask the Brown principle would fuse with the Dion principle, symbolically realizing the Apollonian and Dionysian synthesis. The power of Dion's Mephistophelean mask, however, will soon develop that "gnawing of a doubt," that "question mark of insecurity" Dion thought Brown has stolen from him. And O'Neill again, better than anyone, explained it in The New York Evening Post in 1926,

"When he (Brown) steals Dion's mask of Mephistopheles he thinks he is gaining the power to live creatively,

while in reality he is only stealing that creative power made self-destructive by complete frustration. This devil of mocking doubt makes short work of him. It enters him, rending him apart, torturing and transfiguring him until he is even forced to wear a mask of his Success, William A. Brown, before the world, as well as Dion's mask toward wife and children. Thus Billy Brown becomes not himself to anyone. And thus he partakes of Dion's anguish—more poignantly, for Dion has the Mother, Cybele—and in the end out of this anguish his soul is born, a tortured Christian soul such as the dying Dion's, begging for believe, and at the last finding it on the lips of Cybel."

(12)

Brown's dreams or illusions are now represented in his two masks. The mask of his Success represents the fulfillment of the self-image created for him by his parents. The mask of Pan represents that self-image which sprang from his envy of Dion.

From his contact with the mask of Pan, Brown gradually gains insight into the superiority of the pagan ideal. He becomes more sensitive, and this only intensifies his feeling of frustration and guilt. He even attempts to kill the Billy Brown in himself to find integration as one person, as Dion. Soon after, however, he realizes that the solution of the opposition requires self-destruction. He could not destroy the "I in You," i.e., Billy Brown without destroying Dion Anthony, too.

Brown decides, then, to become a pagan and a preacher of the pagan ideals. First he identifies himself with Dion, "we're getting to be like twins;" after, he designs the new State Capitol, which turns to be a parody of Dion's Cathedral, "Here's a wondrous fair Capitol! The design would do just as well for a Home for Criminal Imbeciles! Yet to them, such is my art, it will appear to possess a pure common-sense, a fat-bellied finality, as dignified as the suspenders of an assemblyman! Only to me that pompous façade reveals itself

as the wearily ironic grin of Pan as, his ears drowsy with the crumbling hum of the past and future civilizations, he half-listens to the laws passed by his fleas to enslave him: Ha—ha—ha!" (G.G.B., Act IV, Sc.1, p.365); finally, he mocks at the Christian God, "Bah! I am sorry, little children, but your kingdom is empty. God has become disgusted and moved away to some far ecstatic star where life is a dancing flame! We must die without him." (G.G.B., Act IV, Sc.2, p.372).

Brown, like Dion, becomes the artist who is forced to turn to plastic, Apollonian arts. O'Neill seems to suggest that the real protagonist of the play, the tragic hero or the force behind life is the original Dionysus, whose dismemberment caused the painful state of individuation now moving once again toward its redemption through pain and suffering. Brown expresses it in "the pompous façade" of the State Capitol, which, like Dion's Cathedral hides underneath it the cosmic Dionysian energy. Brown himself gradually becomes absorbed by this Dionysian power. In a way, he loses his own identity when, just before his death, he announces to the petrified little audience, present in his office, that "Mr. William Brown is dead." (G.G.B., Act IV, Sc.1, p.370). They believe so, except Cybel, who identifies Brown with "Dion Brown," and then she tells the Captain that "Dion Brown's" name is "Man."

By identifying "Dion Brown" with "Man," Cybel suggests that the individual, which belongs to the phenomenal world, is unimportant. He must die, but there is no death for "Man," which is life itself. Life is prior to all phenomena, it expresses the primordial unity existing in nature— the noumenal world—which is indestructible.

Through Cybel, the individual Brown realizes this basic principle of life that makes pagan happiness possible. So,

in his deathbed, he is able to face death courageously and to celebrate "Man's" life as indestructibly powerful and pleasurable at the bottom, despite all the changes of appearances.

BROWN. What's the prayer you taught me—Our Father?

CYBEL. (With calm exultance) Our Father Who art!

BROWN. (Taking her tone—exultantly) Who art! Who art!
 (Suddenly with ecstasy) I know! I have found Him!
 I hear Him speak! "Blessed are they that weep, for they shall laugh!" Only that who has wept can laugh!
 The laughter of Heaven sows earth with a rain of tears, and out of Earth's transfigured birth-pain the laughter of Man returns to bless and play again in innumerable dancing gales of flames upon the knees of God!" (G.G.B., Act IV, Sc. 2, p. 374).

Brown's last words summarizes both the general cosmology of O'Neill's The Great God Brown and Nietzsche's "mystery doctrine of tragedy:"

"The fundamental knowledge of the oneness of everything existent, the conception of individuation as the primal cause of evil, and of art as the joyous hope that the spell of individuation may be broken in augury of a restored oneness" (B.T., Sec. 10, p. 74).

Brown's death also suggests a return of the real tragic hero, Dionysus, to the womb of Mother Earth, or Cybel. She, on the other hand, promises a rebirth of the dead God,

"Always spring comes again bearing life!"—Cybel says—
 "Always again! Always, always forever again!—Spring again!—
 —Summer and fall and death and peace again!— (With agonized sorrow)—but always, always, love and conception and birth and pain again—spring bearing the intolerable chalice of life again! (Then with agonized exultance)—
 bearing the glorious, blazing crown of life again!"
 (G.G.B., Act IV, Sc. 2, p. 375).

The rebirth of this new God occurs in O'Neill's next play, Lazarus Laughed (1926). Lazarus may be said to be not only a fulfillment of Cybel's prophesy, but also of Brown's announcing in Act four, scene one, that "the streets are full of Lazaruses," as well as, a continuation of "Dion Brown's" laugh. Unlike "Dion Brown," however, Lazarus, the reborn God, is an integrated perso-

nality who echoes Zarathustra's gospel:

"This crown of him who laughs, this rose-wreath crown: to you, my brothers, I throw this crown. Laughter I have pronounced holy; you higher men, learn to laugh!" (Z., Part IV, Sec. 20, pp. 407-408).

This doesn't mean that Nietzsche is the only underlying philosophy of the play. Edwin A. Engel suggests a Freudian interpretation when he recognizes in Lazarus "the Mother and the son in one person." (12) Doris V. Falk says that O'Neill had in mind Jung and Schopenhauer when he wrote Lazarus Laughed. (13) Doris M. Alexander thinks that without Buddha's doctrine the meaning of Lazarus, as a savior, becomes unclear. (14) Although I accept the plausibility of the above interpretations, in this chapter I am only concerned with the relation of Lazarus Laughed to The Birth of Tragedy.*

The action of Lazarus Laughed begins at Bethany, in Lazarus' father's house, just after the miracle and the departure of Jesus, who is not seen. The joy of parents and people at Lazarus' return from death is soon overshadowed by their fanaticism, which caused a battle between the followers of Jesus and the followers of Jehovah. As the fight is at its height, a Roman Centurion and a squad of soldiers come to take Lazarus to Rome. Tiberius Caesar has heard the story of his return from the grave and hopes Lazarus may bring him renewed youth. The following scenes tell us the progress of Lazarus, who grows younger and younger, as he preaches to the Greeks and Romans, until his symbolical new birth while still alive,** and his final death at the stake.

* In Chapter VI, "Lazarus, a Zarathustrian Savior," we are going to relate Lazarus to Nietzsche's later philosophy: the philosophy of the superman as it has been preached by Zarathustra.

**Lazarus' symbolical new birth and his relation to the rebirth of Dionysus will be analyzed in Chapter IV, which is called "The supra-Historical Value of the Eternal Recurrence."

Unlike other plays we have just analysed, Lazarus Laughed suggests not a simple pattern of oppositions, but a complicated net of them.* On the one hand, Lazarus stands alone, which means he is a complete, unified and harmonious human being; on the other hand--represented by the other characters of the play, almost three hundred--humanity stands masked, which means it needs a world of illusions to be able to live. Thus the Dionysian-Apollonian dichotomy will be analysed as Lazarus versus every day reality.

This opposition is not a new theme in O'Neill's Lazarus Laughed, for it has already been suggested in previous plays. In Bound East for Cardiff, for instance, it prevails throughout the play, except for Yank, the dying sailor, who tells us his dreams just before he dies. In The Great God Brown, O'Neill opposed the poet to the businessman--a success--until he steals the poet's mask. In Lazarus Laughed, every day reality, better expressed by Caligula than any other character of the play, opposes the Dionysian laugh of Lazarus.

This opposition, parallel to the pagan-Christian dichotomy, ** is already suggested in the first act of the play,

"Neighbors!-- an aged Jew says-- "Our young people are corrupted! They are leaving our farms-- to dance and sing! To laugh! Ha--! Laugh at everything!... How can we compete with labor for laughter! we will have no harvest. There will be no food! Our children will starve! Our race will perish! And we will laugh!" (L. L., Act I, Sc. 2, pp. 394-95).

*Some of them are recognized by John H. Raleigh: "death vs. life; hate vs. joy; despair vs. ecstasy; Jew vs. Nazarene; Lazarus vs. Orthodox Jews; Jews vs. Greeks; Roman vs. Greeks; Roman vs. Greeks and Jews; Lazarus vs. Humanity; and so on." See Raleigh, John H. The Plays of Eugene O'Neill, p. 42

** The pagan-Christian dichotomy suggested here will be analysed in Chapter VI, under the title "Lazarus, a Zarathustrian Savior."

The aged Jew's remark expresses every day reality, which keeps most men fighting, willing and living according to a rational and conscious world, within the realms of the ego. Underneath it a quite different, irrational, unconscious and not less powerful reality stands, which finds expression in the intoxicating laugh of Lazarus. An eye-witness, who once heard Lazarus' ecstatic laugh, describes it as follow:

"One look at his eyes while his laughter sings in your years and you forget sorrow! You dance! You laugh! It is as if a heavy weight you had been carrying all your life without knowing it suddenly were lifted. You are like a cloud, you can fly, your mind reels with laughter, you are drunk with joy.... He heals the sick, he raises the dead, by laughter." (L.L., Act II, Sc. 1., p. 408).

The cosmic symbolism of the laugh of Lazarus discloses the innermost heart of the Dionysian music Nietzsche describes in The Birth of Tragedy : its symbolic relation to the primordial unity, whose immediate effect on the individual is self-forgetfulness and annihilation of the boundaries which separate the world of every day reality (the Apollonian world) and Dionysian reality. Under the charm of the Dionysian music, the individual needs a new symbolism to express himself; he forgets "how to walk and speak and is on the way toward flying into the air, dancing" (B.T., Sec. 1, p. 37). "Ecstasy" and "drunkenness" were the best words Nietzsche found to express it.

The charm played by the laugh of Lazarus, as described above, is not different than the one played by the Dionysian music. The individual feels, rather than understands, enchantment in life, and sees himself changed into a dancer, a laughter, whose very gesture proclaims joy in the whole of life. Indeed, throughout the play, O'Neill explicitly identifies Lazarus with the God Dionysus, as, for instance, in his description of Lazarus at the beginning of Act II:

"His countenance now might well be that of the positive masculine Dionysus, closest to the soil of the Grecian Gods, a Son of Man, born of a mortal. Not the coarse, drunken Dionysus, nor the effeminate God, but Dionysus in his middle period, more comprehensive in his symbolism, the soul of the recurring seasons, of living and dying as process in eternal growth, of the wine of life stirring forever in the sap and blood and loam of things" (L.L., Act II, Sc.1, p.415).

A Pan-cult grown around Lazarus. The choruses and his singing and dancing disciples, all dressed in goat skins, identify Lazarus with the positive pagan God, "they surround him, throw over his shoulders and head the finely dressed hide of a bull with great gilded horns, force into his right hand the mystic rod of Dionysus with a pine cone on top, then prostrate themselves" (L.L., Act II, Sc.1, p.415).

The effect of this Dionysian-Lazarus upon his followers is not different from that the Greeks felt in a festival, or in the dramatic dithyramb, or in the mysterious doctrine of tragedy, as Nietzsche describes it:

"... with the gospel of universal harmony each one feels himself not only united, reconciled and fused with his neighbour, but as one with him, as if the veil of māyā had been torn aside and were now merely fluttering in tatters before the mysterious primordial unity" (B.T., Sec. 1, p.37).

Under the charm of the laugh of Lazarus, Nazarenes and Orthodox Jews, for instance, suddenly stop their bigotry and, compelled against their will, join in by groups of one by one to sing, to dance, to laugh in an ecstatic affirmation of life. The same spell changes the Roman soldiers and the Greeks' attitude of "murderous hate" into "sheepish of children caught in mischief," then, into Lazarus proud and dancing and laughing guard.

Not only the mob, however, becomes spell-bound and

intoxicated by the power of the laugh, the Roman Senate, too. They forget their ancient nobility, they laugh at Caesar and at themselves and look like an excited "crowd of school-boys going on a vacation" (L.L., Act II, Sc. 2, p. 431). Crassus, the Chief-Commander of the invincible Roman Legions, in spite of his stubborn struggle to control himself, cannot resist Lazarus' peace—"peace to laugh in— to laugh at war. ... To laugh at Caesar" (L.L., Act II, Sc. 2, p. 430). Tiberius Caesar almost becomes a Lazarite, "I am proud of being Caesar.... If fools kneels and worship me because they fear me, should I be proud? But Caesar is a fact, and Tiberius, a man" (L.L., Act IV, Sc. 1, p. 426).

The feeling of oneness, however, which comes from this Dionysian musical laugh, cannot be endured for long without the complete destruction of the individual-self. Its effect is only temporarily, as long as Lazarus is there. Soon after Lazarus' departure, Roman, Jews, and Greeks awake from their state of drunkenness and are again wrapped in their every day reality. The boys go back to the farm; the Christian and Orthodox Jews begin to fight; Crassus is again the proud commander of the Roman Legions; the free men are again slaves; and Caesar forgets the Tiberious in himself. It is the coming back of the Apollonian "principium individuatio-nis" in which man desperately searches a rational meaning for every day existence.

Lazarus himself, freed now from any illusion about existence, recognizes that man's forgetfulness constitutes his very tragedy,

"That is your tragedy! You forget!... Remembrance would imply the high duty to live as a son of God—generously!—With love!—With pride!—With laughter! This is too glorious a victory for you, too terrible a loneliness! Easier to forget, to become only a man, a son of a woman, to hide from life against her breast,

to whimper your fear to her resigned heart and be comforted by her resignation! To live by denying life!... Throw your gaze upward! To Eternal Life" (L.L., Act I, Sc.2, p.397).

This remark may be overshadowed by the different meanings Lazarus gives to the word "life." I think we cannot call it an inconsistency* in O'Neill's plays, since we have in mind the underlying theme of it, i.e., the Apollonian and Dionysian worlds of The Birth of Tragedy.

The word "life," generally printed in small letter, refers to individual life—the Apollonian state of individuation—which Nietzsche regards as the cause of all pains. The word "Life," generally beginning with capital letter, refers to the primordial unity existing in nature which, in a mysterious way, links all individuals to each other. But this mysterious linking, rather than being a metaphysical reality, is a feeling which springs from music, and can only be expressed in musical symbols. It is the Dionysian element which, according to Nietzsche, provides us the mysterious doctrine of tragedy. So, when Lazarus and his followers affirm that "there is only life," they refer to Eternal Life, not individual life; when they say that "there is no Death," they refer to Man as species, not the individual. "Men die," Lazarus says. " Even a Son of Man must die to show men that Man may live! But there is no Death!" (L.L., Act I, Sc.2, p. 401).

In this same sense, Cybel refers to the dying "Dion Brown" as "Man" to celebrate Eternal Life; and the laugh of Lazarus, which O'Neill always describes as a music, symbolizes the end of individuation in augury of a restored oneness. So, when the

* Cyrus Day points out some inconsistencies in Lazarus Laughed. The word "life" is one of them. Day, Cyrus. "Amor Fati: O'Neill's Lazarus as Superman and Savior." Modern Drama, III (December 1960), pp.297-305.

multitude of Lazarus' followers kill themselves outside the Roman walls, Lazarus laughs to celebrate the end of individuation:

"He (Lazarus) turns," O'Neill says in the stage directions, "throwing back his head and stretching up his arms, and begins to laugh low and tenderly, like caressing music at first but gradually gaining in volume, becoming more and more intense and insistent, finally ending up on a triumphant, blood-stirring call to that ultimate attainment in which all prepossession with self is lost in an ecstatic affirmation of Life" (L.L., Act II, Sc. 2, p. 426)

The emotional power of Lazarus' laugh incites his followers to the greatest exaltation of their passions. Something they have never experienced before struggles for utterance, namely, the Apollonian consciousness gives place to the Dionysian frenzy. While they take the soldiers' swords to stab themselves, they affirm Life negating Death, "Fear, no more! Death, no more! Death is dead!" (L.L., Act II, Sc. 2, p. 428).

Meanwhile the Roman Legions, the Senators and the slaves become drunk with laughing intoxication. They forget all sorrow, and pain, and former fears, and social barriers to express themselves as members of a higher community. "Now," as Nietzsche says, "the slave is a free man; now all the rigid, hostile barriers that necessity, caprice, or "impudent convention" have fixed between man and man are broken" (B.T., p. 37). They acclaim Lazarus as their new leader, "Hail, Lazarus Ceasar, Hail!" (L.L., Act III, Sc. 2, p. 430).

To this apotheotic affirmation of Life, O'Neill opposes the "never laughing" Caligula in his violent struggle to keep his life-long dream: to be the Roman Caesar, a prophet of death, who declares that Lazarus' laugh "is too cruel to us" (L.L., Act II, Sc. 2, p. 448).

No less important than the half-mad Caligula is Tiberius Caesar's wisdom: "I can deal with men. I know them well. Too

Therefore I hate them" (L.L., Act II, Sc. 2, p. 448).

Tiberius' wisdom has been accumulated through years. It is based on the rational explanation of every day existence. When he knew about Lazarus' resurrection, he hoped Lazarus would bring him renewed youth, but not without giving him a rational explanation about everything. "There is one certainty about you (Lazarus) and I must know the cause-- for there must be a cause and a rational explanation! You were fifty when you died..." (L.L., Act IV, Sc. 1, p. 462). But Lazarus knows that "age and time are but timidities of the thought" because they refer to individual life, not to Eternal Life!

"Men are also unimportant! Man pass! Like rain into the sea! The sea remains! Man slowly arises from the past of the race of men that was his tomb and death! For Man death is not! Man, Son of God's laughter, is! (L.L., Act 4, Sc. 1, p. 469).

The sea becomes again, like in Bound East for Cardiff, a symbol of Life or of the Dionysian primordial unity. Tiberius, however, fails to understand Lazarus' wisdom, and let his wife, Pompeia, test Lazarus' power. Pompeia offers Miriam, Lazarus' wife, a poisonous peach. Soon after Miriam dies, Tiberius' Court mocks Lazarus. Caligula slaps him viciously across the face. But suddenly a voice of unearthly sweetness begins to laugh. A shuddering murmur of superstitious fear comes from them, while Miriam is heard, "Yes! There is only Life." Lazarus, then, like the Dionysian God of fertility, "touches one hand on her (Miriam's) breast as if he were taking an oath to life on her heart, looks upward and laughs, his voice ringing more and more with a terrible unbearable power and beauty that beats those in the room into an abject submissive panic" (L.L., Act IV, Sc. 1, p. 457).

The whole Court, Tiberius, Caligula, Pompeia, the soldiers, the slaves and prostitutes of both sex, seem to understand Lazarus' wisdom for a moment; all of them begin to laugh

sheepishly and beg Lazarus to let them die, "Let us die! Lazarus." But again the Dionysian ecstasy proves to have a temporary avvect. Next morning, Tiberius order Lazarus to be burnt at the stake.

While Lazarus' flesh melts in the fire, his laugh increasingly becomes more like the laugh of a God. The crowd, staring toward him, in a trance, laugh with him in a frenzied rythmic chorus. Pompeia, "descending the steps like a sleep-walker," throws herself into the fire. Tiberius stands on the raized dais "laughing great shouts of clear, fearless laughter," like a man under a spell, and embraces Lazarusism,

"I have lived long inough! I will die with Lazarus! I laugh! I laugh at Ceasar! I advise you, my brothers, fear not Caesars! Seek Man in the brotherhood of the dust! Caesar is your fear of Man! I counsel you, laugh away your Caesars!" (L.L., Act IV, Sc.2, p.478).

Caligula, fearing a revolution from the mob which would mean the end of his dream to be Caesar, first grabs Tiberius by the throat and kills him to gain the throne; after, snatching a spear from a soldier, he disappears toward the flames and stabs Lazarus, with a cry of rage: "I have killed God! I am Death" (L.L., Act IV, Sc.Sc.2, p.479)

Here the opposition of the play once more stands out clearly. Lazarus' laugh is a triumphant assertion of the victory of life over pain and death, the principle individuation, but Caligula's madness remains, which represents human reality in every day existence. Like in a Greek tragedy, where APollo always triumphs over Dionysus (who never ceases to be the tragic hero), in Lazarus Laughed, Caligula remanains as the apparent triumph of every day existence or the ego. Symbolically, O'Neill let him alone in the Roman Amphitheater to symbolize the necessity of the dream—the Apollonian principium individuationis—for life; while Lazarus' last faint dying note "rises and is lost in the sky like the flight

of his soul bsck into the womb of infinity: There is no death" (Act IV, Sc. 2, p. 480).

O'Neill thought Lazarus Laughed had been his best attempt to recreate a theater out of the worship of Dionysus, which, still according to him, would raise modern men to a deeper spiritual understanding and release them from the "petty greeds of everyday existence." Oscar Cargil even thinks that Lazarus Laughed "seems to be a better "tragedy" in the Nietzschean sense-- a better combination of form and rhythm, of dreams and drunkenness, of the Apollonian and the Dionysian-- than anything the philosopher cites." (15)

Summing up the play, O'Neill wrote to the theater historian Arthur Hobson Quinn that the fear of death

"is the root of all evil, the cause of all man's blundering unhappiness. Lazarus knows there is no death, there is only change. He is reborn without that fear. Therefore he is the first and only man who is able to laugh affirmatively.

His laughter is a triumphant Yes to life in its entirety and its eternity. His laughter affirms God, it is too noble to desire personal immortality, it wills its own extinction, it gives its life for the sake of Eternal Life.... His laughter is the direct expression of joy in the Dionysian sense, the joy of a celebrant who is at the same time a sacrifice in the eternal process of change and growth and transmutation which is life.... And life itself is the self-affirmative joyous laughter of God." (16)

Though the underlying philosophy of the play seems to be clear, we have to recognize with O'Neill that the part of Lazarus is virtually impossible to enact, "I know of no play like Lazarus at all, and I know of no one who can play Lazarus at all." (17) In fact Lazarus Laughed has been produced only twice in the United States, in 1928 and in 1948. (18)

In the plays that come after Lazarus Laughed, we will take a new approach to O'Neill. Until this point, Dionysus has increasingly become the real tragic hero of O'Neill's plays. From Lazarus onwards, Apollo will gradually prevail and the

plays may well be called tragedies about family life.

In a way O'Neill is turning back to his first plays about the sea. There, as we have already seen in Bound East for Cardiff and in The Hairy Ape, the Apollonian world of illusion prevailed. If we add "fate" to this world of illusions as it springs from the hero's relations to his own family, we may approach O'Neill's plays after Lazarus Laughed

For several years O'Neill thought of writing a drama based on one of the Greek tragedies, but set in America and embodying present days concepts and insights. "Is it possible," he asked in 1926, "to get a modern psychological approximation of (the) Greek sense of fate into such a play, which an intelligent audience of today, possessed of no belief in gods or supernatural retribution, could accept and be moved by?"⁽¹⁹⁾

O'Neill's answers to this question was the Mourning Becomes Electra trilogy based on the Orestia of Aeschylus. Both plays, as John Hutchens points out, resemble each other in their general structure: first part, the homecoming and the murder of the husband; second part, the revenge of the daughter and the son on the mother and her lover; finally, the fate of the sister and brother. Giving the three parts individual titles, O'Neill called them, Homecoming, The Hunted, and The Haunted.⁽²⁰⁾

O'Neill gives his principal characters the surname of Mannon, perhaps for its resemblance to Agamemnon. The father, who has been a judge and a mayor, and now is a brigadier general in Grant's army, is named Ezra Mannon, while Clytemnestra appears as Christine, Orestes as Orin, Electra as Lavinia, and Aegystus as Adam Brant.⁽²¹⁾

From this simple analogy of names, we clearly perceive a major theme of the play— the Oedipal Complex— although O'Neill always denied being a Freudian:

"I don't agree," O'Neill said to Barret H. Clark in 1931, when Mourning Becomes Electra was first produced, "with your Freudian objection. Taken from my author's angle, I find fault with critics on exactly the same point--that they read too damn much Freud into stuff that could very well have been written exactly as is before psychoanalysis was ever heard of. Imagine the Freudian bias that would be read into Stendhal, Balzac, Strindberg, Dostoevsky, etc., if they were writing today! After all, every human complication of love and hate in my trilogy is as old as literature, and the interpretations I suggest are such as might have occurred to any author in any time with a deep curiosity about the underlying motives that actuate human interrelationships in the family. In short, I think I know enough about men and women to have written Mourning Becomes Electra almost exactly as it is if I had never heard of Freud or Jung or the others. Authors were psychologists, you know, and profound ones, before psychoanalysis...." (22)

In spite of O'Neill's complaining, many Freudian and Jungian interpretations have been given to his trilogy, and we may admit that psychoanalysis may at least be considered a modern vehicle to carry the Mannon's tragic conflict--the Oedipal and Electra complexes--as it has been in Desire Under the Elms. *

Following our Nietzschean interpretation, however, we should say that in Mourning Becomes Electra, O'Neill once more states the pagan-Christian dichotomy. Pagan joy in life, as manifested in the free exoression of sex; Christian hostility to life, as expressed in supression of sex; and the revenge which the sex instinct takes on the Puritan-Christian by degrading sex into vile lust. The tension between these opposites may be what O'Neill called "a modern tragic interpretation of classic fate without the benefit of Gods" as it sprangs from the family tragedy.

* There is a story that Freu (who knew some Nietzsche) deliberately postponed reading the rest of his work because it was so startlingly close to Freud's own ideas that it disturbed him.

This family fate of the New England Mannons began when the old Abe Mannon-- father of Ezra and grandfather of Lavinia and Orin-- disinherited and put his brother, David, out of the house for having a love affair with a French nurse girl, Marie Brantôme, which resulted in her pregnancy. Though David married her, since then his name has been forbidden in the family, and, Abe Mannon, according to Lavinia, tore the old house down and built a new one "because he wouldn't live where his brother has disgraced the family" (Homecoming, Act I, p. 701). The child of David and Marie is Adam Brant, the Aegystus of the play, who returns to avenge his parents' death in poverty and misery after their exile.

The house of Mannon, therefore, was built out of Abe's Puritan hate for life. In the stage direction O'Neill describes it as "a white Grecian temple portico" which looks like "an incongruous white mask fixed on the house to hide its somber gray ugliness." Christine, Ezra's wife, calls it "our tomb" because, she thinks, it appears more like a sepulcher, "the whited one of the Bible," and because she recognizes hidden in it, as Dion and Brown did in their designs, the truth of Silenus: "(a) pagan temple front stuck like a mask of Puritan gray ugliness" (Homecoming, Act I, p. 699).

The mask-like-looking of the house resembles the Mannons' mask-life-faces which emphasize not only the queer feeling one senses when it looks at the house, but also when one looks at a Mannon.

To the Mannons' house, O'Neill opposes Seth's green house. Seth is the Mannons' gardener. He is the first character seen in the trilogy together with some townsfolk. According to O'Neill, the townsfolk may be considered as types, which form the "chorus representing the town come to look and listen and spy on the rich and exclusive Mannons" (Homecoming, Act I, p. 689).

It is also through Seth that we first know about the main characters of the play and about the Civil War, which, like the Trojan War in Orestia, becomes the background of the play.

Seth informs us that Ezra is an able man, who has been mayor and judge in the town, and now is a general in Grant's army. While he is in the war, with his son Orin, both Christine and Lavinia fall in love with Captain Adam Brant, the son of Marie and David. Lavinia hates Adam when she discovers the truth about him; Christine, whose lust resembles that of Marie Brantôme, carries on a secret love affair with Adam and plots her husband's death in case he escapes the war alive. Lavinia, however, whose Puritan sense of justice resembles her father's, grows revengeful when she knows about her mother's love. O'Neill, then, describes Christine as an embodiment of life; while Lavinia, as an embodiment of death:

"Christine Mannon is a tall striking-looking woman of forty but she appears younger. She has a fine, voluptuous figure and she moves with a flowing animal grace. She wears a green satin dress, smartly cut and expensive, which brings out the peculiar color of her thick curly hair, partly a copper brown, partly a bronze gold, each shade distant and yet blending with the other. Her face is unusual, handsome rather than beautiful. One is struck at once by the strange impression it gives in repose of being not living flesh but a wonderfully life-like pale mask, in which only the deep-set eyes, of a dark violet blue, are alive. Her black eye-brows meet in a pronounced straight line above her strong nose. Her chin is heavy, her mouth large and sensual, the lower lip full, the upper a thin brow, shadowed by a line of hair. She stands and listens defensively, as if the music held some meaning that threatened her. But at once she shrugs her shoulders with disdain and comes down the steps and walks off toward the flower garden..." (Homecoming, Act I, p. 691).

Christine's acceptance of life, as regard to sex, makes her grown younger, like Lazarus. But her "life-like pale mask" together with her disdain for music betrays the Puritan strict consciousness of sin within her. To Christine, O'Neill opposes

Lavinia:

"She is twenty-three but looks considerably older. Tall like her mother, her body is thin, flat-breasted and angular, and its unattractiveness is accentuated by her plain black dress. Her movements are stiff and she carries herself with a wooden, square-shouldered, military bearing. She has a flat dry voice and a habit of snapping out her words like an officer giving orders. But in spite of these dissimilarities, one is immediately struck by her facial resemblance to her mother. She has the same peculiar shade of copper-gold hair, the same pallor and a dark violet-blue eyes, the black eyebrows meeting in a straight line above her nose, the same sensual mouth, the same heavy jaw. Above all, one is struck by the same strange, life-like mask impression her face gives in repose. But it is evident Lavinia does all in her power to emphasize the dissimilarity rather than the resemblance to her parent. She wears her hair pulled tightly back, as if to conceal its natural curliness, and there is not a touch of feminine allurements to her severely plain get-up..." (Homecoming, Act I, p. 692).

Lavinia's countenance fits the Puritan life-denying morality. Symbolically she grows older, dresses in black and carries herself in a military way. But her "life-like mask" hides underneath it a repressed sexual vitality, the Dionysian strength, which makes her look like her mother.

The other Mannons-- Ezra, Orin and David's son, Adam-- do not look different than Christine and Lavinia. The mask-like quality of Ezra's face, however, is more pronounced in him than in the others; while Adam's makes him resemble a poet. We already know what the mask and the poet mean in O'Neill. The mask is used by the Puritan, as in The Great God Brown, to conceal his natural instincts, especially as regards sex; the poet, like Dion Anthony, would like to affirm life as desirable; but the Puritan, The Anthony principle, is afraid of life and seeks death even in life. "Why are you talking of death?" Christine asks her husband Ezra Mannon. He replies: "That's always been the Mannon's way of thinking.

They went to the white meeting-house on Sabbaths and meditated on death. Life was a dying. Being born was starting to die. Death was being born" (Homecoming, Act III, p.738).

The repressed sex instinct, the Dionysian life-force, however, takes revenge on the Mannons. They sinned against nature, and they should pay for their sins. A brooding fate, like in Aeschylus' Orestia, remains enthroned over them demanding justice, whose accomplishment O'Neill symbolizes in the tragic flaw of each Mannon.

Ezra is the first one to be trapped. Although real death had freed him to think about imagined death as something meaningless, he cannot stop talking about it, "I had my fill of death; what I want now is to forget it....Death made me think of life. Before that life had only made me think of death. I am sick of death. I want life" (Homecoming, Act III).

Ezra's Puritan obsession with death has kept him from fulfilling his wife's demands of love. Desire for his wife has always taken the form of lust. Even the night he returns from the war, though his pleading to love and life, he condemns the lust in her.

CHRISTINE.... You acted as if I were your wife-- your property-- not so long ago!

MANNON. (With bitter scorn) your body? What are bodies to me? I've seen too many rotting in the sun to make grass greener! Ashes to ashes, dirt to dirt! ...You let me take you as if you were a nigger I'd bought at auction! You made me appear a lustful beast in my own eyes!-- as you've always done since our first marriage night! I would feel cleaner now if I had gone to a brothel! I would feel more honor between myself and life!" (Homecoming, Act IV, pp.745-46).

Christine, however, like Abbie and Eben in Desire Under the Elms, cannot avoid lust and she hates her husband as passionately as she loves Adam Brant. She tells Ezra she has

fallen in love with Adam; this causes Ezra to have a heart attack. Christine replaces the medicine prescribed with the poison sent by Adam and kills Ezra. Now, she thinks, she is free to love Brant, but that terrible hate set in motion over the Mannons' house by the aged Abe Mannon will finally defeat her. O'Neill, like Nietzsche in The Birth of Tragedy, seems to suggest in his trilogy that where Pan is forbidden it grows revengeful and destructive.

In Mourning Becomes Electra, Pan is clearly associated to the Mannons' longing to escape the ugly reality of Puritanism to find release in love, especially regards sex. According to Doris V. Falk, O'Neill suggests this longing with three principal symbols: "the South Sea islands, the fused mother-images-- Marie and Christine (Clytemnestra)-- and the sea chanty sung at intervals by Seth, the gardener-- the Silenus who leads the chorus of townspeople." (23)

The islands represent peace, beauty and sinlessness, as Captain Brant describes them:

LAVINIA. (in a dry, brittle tone) I remember your admiration for the naked native women. You said they have found the secret of happiness because they had never heard love can be a sin.

BRANT.... So you remember that, do you? (Then romantically) Aye! And they live in as near the Garden of Paradise before sin was discovered as you'll find on this earth! Unless you've seen it, you can't picture the green beauty of their land set in the blue of the sea! The clouds like down on the mountain tops, the sun drowsing in your blood, and always the surf on the barrier reef singing a croon in your ears like a lullaby! The Blessed Isles, I'd call them! You can forget there all men's dirty dreams of greed and power!
(Homecoming, Act I, p.706).

This Blessed Isles in the South Seas, whose natives live in a state of innocence because they have never heard that love is a sin, are repeatedly mentioned in the play. Those

members of the family who wish to shake off the Mannon inheritance dream of living on the Blessed Isles: Adam Brant, Christine, Orin and even Lavinia in her later metamorphosis. In a way, the same pagan spirit of the South Islands animated Marie Brantôme's life loving attitude to David, as Seth tells us:

"She was always laughing and singing-- friskly and full of life-- with something free and wild about her like an animile. Purty she was, too!" (Homecoming, Act III, p.728)

Of the third symbol of release, the sea chanty, Shenadoah,* O'Neill says, "... its simple sad rhythm of hopeless sea longing peculiarly significant-- even the stupid words have striking meaning when considered in relation to the tragic events of the play!" (24)

So, the undelying theme expressed by the sea symbolism becomes important in Mourning Becomes Electra. It may stand for the unconscious or the Dionysian frenzy Nietzsche speaks of in The Birth of Tragedy, "whose waves overwhelmed all family life and its venerable traditions" (B.T., Sec.2, p.39). It contrasts with the rigid Puritanism of New England, the dreariness of life on land, the Civil War, the Mannon's tragedy and Lincoln's death. But this freedom, rhythm, brightness and beauty of life at sea has already to be corrupted by mechanization: the steam ships are taking the place of the skippers, as a chantyman observes regretfully to Adam Brant:

"Aye, but it ain't fur long. Steam is comin' in, the sea is full o' smoky tea-kettles, the old days is dyin', and where'll you an' me be then?... Everything is dyin'! Abe Lincoln is dead. I used to ship on the Mannon packets an' I seed in the paper where Ezra Mannon was dead!... Heart failure killed him, it said, but I know better I've sailed on Mannon hookers an' been worked t' death and gotten swill fur grub an' I know he didn't have no heart in him! Open him up an' you'd find a dried turnip! The old skinflint must have left a pile o' money..."
(The Hubted, Act IV, pp.792-93).

* Shenadoah means the river of life.

O'Neill suggests that death is already underneath everything. It becomes clear with the developing of his trilogy, in the second book, after Ezra's death.

Christine's dying husband accused her of guilt just before dying. Lavinia, driven by the Mannons' sense of justice and hate, grows revengeful when she takes the box of poison from her mother. Both of them try to get Orin to her party. Lavinia succeeds, not because of her father's murder, but for catching Christine and Captain Brant on Brant's skipper making plans to go to the Blessed Isles. Orin, like his ancestors, cannot bear it, for since David's exile, love has always been a sin to the Mannons. He kills Adam Brant, and, for a moment, until his mother shoots herself, he thinks he has done his duty. Soon after, however, he becomes guilty, and, like his father, he is obsessed by death; as if something queer like a "rotten dirty joke" could not give him peace. He reminds Lavinia that when he was at the war he had the same feeling,

"I had the queer feeling that war meant murdering the same man over and over and that in the end I would discover the man was myself! Their faces keep coming back in dreams—and they change to Fahter's face—or to mine—..."(The Hunted, Act III, p.781)

After murdering Adam, Orin feels the same again, "he (Adam) looks like me, too! Maybe, I've committed suicide" (The Hunted, Act III, p.803).

Orin's queer feelings seem to suggest fate. Ezra felt the same the night he was murdered, "It's something uneasy troubling my mind—as if something in me was listening, watching for something to happen" (Homecoming, Act IV, p.745). So did Adam Brant, "There's something gone wrong" (The Hunted, Act IV, p. 795), and Christine, "I'd planned it (her husband's murder) so carefully—but something made things happen.... It was as

if something in me forced me to see it" (Homecoming, Act II, p.723). Townsfolk do not feel different about the Mannons. There is something ghostly and dead which runs through the house and garden like the Mannons' life mask face. Borden and Mrs. Hills, for instance, two townspeople, think it is fate. In the stage directions, O'Neill tells us that the portraits of the Mannons, too, "have the same mask quality of those of the living characters in the play" (The Hunted, Act II, p.765). The spirit of the dead, like Eben's mother in Desire Under the Elms, goes on alive among the living Mannons, with the difference that in Desire Under the Elms it expressed the Dionysian sex instinct which demanded fulfillment; in Mourning Becomes Electra, it is the "Bad Boy Pan" who wants revenge.

In the third play of his trilogy, O'Neill tells us how Orin and Lavinia try to escape their fate, and how they are finally trapped. First they take a trip to the Blessed Isles. Lavinia becomes increasingly more like her mother, and Orin like his father. She is able to free herself from any Puritan influence,

"I loved those Islands. They finished setting me free. There was something there mysterious and beautiful— a good spirit— of love— coming out of the land and sea. It made me forget death. There was no hereafter. There was only this world— the warm earth in moonlight— the trade wind in the coco palms— the surf on the reef— the fires at night and drum throbbing in my heart— the natives dancing naked and innocent— without knowledge of sin. ..." (The Haunted, Act I, Sc.2, p.834).

Later she tells Peter, her boyfriend, "Orin suspects I'd lust with him (an islander)! And I had!" (The Hunted, Act IV, p.865).

The "good spirit" Lavinia talks about obviously symbolizes the Dionysian vitality which ran through the elms, in Desire Under the Elms, and made Eben love Abbie against his will.

Orin, on the other hand, has become increasingly disgusted with the Islanders, "I guess," he says, "I'm too much of a Mannon, after all, to turn into a pagan" (The Haunted, Act I, Sc.2, p.831).

When they turn back to New England, one is struck by Lavinia's resemblance to her mother. Her brown-gold hair, her dresses, the movements of her body, and even her soul are a copy of her mother's. While Orin's soldierly way of carrying himself, his movements, his attitudes, and the lifeless expression of his face accentuate his resemblance to his father.

Lavinia now is free to love. She has turned into a pagan; she does not hate - love anymore. When she finds her boyfriend, Peter, she kisses him passionately, repeating the same words Christine used to tell Adam Brant her love. Orin could not do the same with his girlfriend, Hazel. On the contrary, he looks at her sister with jealous rage as if he were going to attack her, "Love! What right have I-- or you-- to love?" He asks Lavinia. He begins to write a history of the family crimes to foretell "What fate is in store" for the last two Mannon. He finds out that Lavinia is the most interesting criminal of them all, and he is the Mannon Lavinia is chained to. Then he becomes to Lavinia what the Furies were to Orestes, a constant reminder of guilt, driving him toward madness. He wants to become her lover in order to force her to share his guilt, "How else can I be sure you won't leave me? You would never dare leave me-- then! You would feel as guilty then as I do!" (The Haunted, Act III, p.853). Lavinia repels him, "I hate you! I wish you were dead! You're too vile to live! You'd kill yourself if you weren't a coward!" (The Haunted, Act III, p.854). With these words Lavinia committed her last murder. Orin shoots himself, and her

illusion of innocence begins to crumble. She makes one more desperate effort to reach from behind her mask of death toward life. She asks Peter to marry her, but when she is speaking words of love she finds Adam's name on her lips. She suddenly breaks with Peter, loses her feminine grace, orders Seth to nail the blinds of her house, and goes into the house to live there till her death,

"Don't be afraid," she tells Seth, "I'm not going the way Mather and Orin went. That's escaping punishment. And there's no one left to punish me. I'm the last Mannon. I've got to punish myself! Living alone here with the dead is a worse act of justice than death or prison! I'll never go out or see anyone! I'll have the shutters nailed closed so the sunlight can never get in. I'll live alone with the dead, and keep their secrets, and let them hound me, until the curse is paid out and the last Mannon is let die!... It takes the Mannons to punish themselves for being born!" (The Haunted, Act IV, p.866).

Lavinia's last attitude deserves some further psychological considerations which connect Mourning Becomes Electra to Desire Under the Elms and The Great God Brown.

Dion, at his deathbed, refers to his childhood victimization as a "snide neutralizing of life force"(G.G.B., Act II, Sc. 3, p.147). "I," Dion tells Brown, "had loved and trusted him (Billy) and suddenly to Good God was disproved in his (Billy's) person and the Evil and injustice of Man was born!" (G.G.B., Act III, Sc.2, p.346). We have already pointed out back how this scene bears a symbolism related to the idea of original sin.

According to the Bible, Adam and Eve had been forbidden their instinctual life free expression—symbolized by the apple—and, in a way, they revolted against God. Man's awareness of sin and sense of guilt was then born. Dion's life had been pure until he also was forbidden to draw on the sand, and since then he has revolted "against that other's boy's God" (G.G.B., Act II, Sc.3, p.347).

Later in the play Dion comments, "when Pan was forbidden the light and warmth of the sun he grew sensitive and self-conscious and proud and revengeful—and became prince of darkness" (G.G.B., Act III, Sc. 3, p. 348).

According to Nietzsche in The Birth of Tragedy, Apollo was also called "the shining one," of "the deity of light" (B.T., Sec. 1, p. 35). So, Dion's words suggests that man's awareness of sin originates when Dionysus, or the unconscious, is forbidden the light of its complement, Apollo or the conscious. Then the unconscious turns on itself and becomes guilty and revengeful: the "prince of darkness" which attempts to destroy the principle individuation and restore the "primordial oneness" through pain and suffering.

The same cosmology underlies Mourning Becomes Electra. Since David's love affair with Marie Brantôme, Pan has been forbidden for the Mannons, and sex—a Dionysian symbol—has been turned into vile lust. But Pan, like in The Great God Brown, "grew sensitive and self-conscious and proud and revengeful." Each Mannon in turn, like Brown, must be trapped by Pan's revenge. The first is Ezra, then Christine and Grin, and finally Lavinia. But Lavinia does not go the way her ancestors did. She isolates herself from the world, like Ephraim Cabot in Desire Under the Elms. Symbolically, Lavinia becomes integrated with her family; and Ephraim with his dead wife, Eben's mother. The original Dionysian unity, the "behind life force," is restored again through pain and suffering.

In this sense, Pan's revenge becomes the subconscious motive which determines not only the hero's social behavior, but also his fate. Thus fate may be thought of as something born from man's guilty consciousness of sin. Perhaps, because man's consciousness is generally molded within the family

frame, O'Neill idea of fate is better expressed in his plays about family life. It becomes particularly clear in O'Neill's Trilogy, where the revenge of Pan becomes the Furies within the Mannons that seek to destroy them.

This, however, does not mean that all O'Neill's plays about family life follow the same pattern. His two next plays, Ah, Wilderness and Days Without End, surprised the critics. They are conventional plays about family life and acceptance of the "status quo."

In 1933, O'Neill was working hard on Days Without End when he conceived the idea of Ah, Wilderness. In a month, according to Barret A. Clark, the first draft was ready and he published it that same year without much correction.

The story of the play refers us to the beginning of the century, 1906. Nat Miller is the editor of a small town newspaper. He is a respectable man, who lives happily with his wife and four children. Sid Davis, Nat's brother-in-law, and Lily Miller, Nat's sister, also live with the family. Lily has long loved Sid, and she promises to marry him some day, if he only gives up drinking. It does not happen in the play. Richard Miller, Nat's and Essie's second child, is something of a family problem. He is seventeen and likes to read Wilde, Swinburne, Bernard Shaw, Nietzsche, etc. When his mother, Essie, discovers his reading, she becomes alarmed, and betrays him to his father. Nat thinks it is normal for a youth of Richard's age to read such things. Nat did the same when he was a boy. Richard is also fond of a fifteen-year-old girl, Muriel McComber, whose father becomes angry when he discovers that Richard had been sending her some love poems by Swinburne, and other "vile" missives. He even makes his daughter write Richard a letter putting an end to their friendship. Richard is overcome by a full pessimism. He leaves home to meet a

prostitute, but out of a certain self-respect and consideration for Muriel, he refuses to go to bed with her. Late in the night he arrives home completely drunk. When he sees Muriel again, she tells him that the letter has been dictated by her father, and that she was still fond of him. Richard frankly confesses his misdeeds, and the two are reconciled again.

The plot of Ah, Wilderness does not offer us any deep psychological or philosophical complication. Richard's radical ideas and social criticism are simply an adolescent revolt against authority, "as his father puts it,

"Can't you see," Nat tells Muriel's father, "Richard's only a fool kid who's just at the stage when he's out to rebel against all authority, and so he grabs at everything radical to read to pass it on his elders and his girl friend to show off what a young hellion he is!... (W., Act I, p.39)

O'Neill called Ah, Wilderness "a comedy of recollection" and his biographers unanimously recognize that the play was rooted on the playwright's own history. (25)

"My purpose," O'Neill wrote in a short note in The Wilderness Edition, "was to write a play true to the spirit of the American large small-town at the turn of the century. Its quality depended upon atmosphere, sentiment, and exact evocation of the mood of a dead past. To me, the American which was (and is) the real America found its unique expression in such middle-class families as the Millers, among whom so many of my own generation passed from adolescence into manhood." (26)

Almost the same soft tone of love goes through Days Without End (1934). The play is about John Loving: two personalities are presented within him in everlasting conflict one with the other. One of them is known simply as John; the other, as Loving. Each is played by a different actor. Loving is only seen by John and the audience.

The protagonist's split personality was born when he was

a fifteen-year-old boy. His parents were devout Catholics, and both died during a flu epidemic in which they contracted pneumonia. The boy had prayed with perfect faith, hoping his parents' would be spared. Then, "he saw his God as a deaf and blind and merciless—a Deity who returned hate for love and revenged Himself upon those who trusted Him" (D.W.E., Act I, p.49). Overcome by grief, he cursed his good God, like Dion in The Great God Brown, and "promised his soul to the devil" (D.W.E., Act I, p.49). John Loving's awareness of sin was born. Instead of designing a mask for him, O'Neill preferred to express John Loving in terms of two different personalities.

"John... is forty, of medium height. His face is handsome, with the rather heavy, conventional American type of good looks—a straight nose and a square, a broad forehead, blue eyes.... Loving is the same age, of the same height and figure, is dressed in every detail the same.... In contrast to this similarity between the two, there is an equally strange dissimilarity. For Loving's face is a mask whose features of John's face—the death mask of a John who has died with a sneer of scornful mackery on his lips..." (D.W.E., Act I, pp.15-16).

The Loving principle resembles the Dion principle in The Great God Brown, full of mocking irony and cruelty; the very devil whose scepticism tortures John and takes revenge upon God and society.

John's loving tortured life becomes a permanent quest for the "somehow," an Apollonian illusion, to replace his lost faith in God, as his uncle, Father Baird, tells Mr. Eliot, John's partner:

"If you know what a burden he made my life for years with his preaching. Letter upon letter—each with a soap box inclosed, so to speak.... Not a moment's peace did he give me. I was the heathen to him and he was bound he'd convert me to something. First it was Atheism unadorned. Then, it was Atheism wedded to socialism. But Socialism proved too weak-kneed a mate, and the next I heard Atheism was living in free love with Anarchism,

with a curse by Nietzsche to bless the union. And then came the Bolshevik dawn, and he greeted that with unholy howls of glee and wrote me he'd found a congenial home at last at the bosom of Karl Marx. He was particularly delighted when he thought they'd abolished love and marriage, and he couldn't contain himself when the news came they'd turned naughty schoolboys and were throwing spitballs at Almighty God and had supplanted Him with the slave-owning State—the most grotesque god that came out of Asia.... And what do you think was his next hiding place? Religion, no less—but as far away as he could run from home—in the defeatest mysticism of the East. First it was in China and Lao-tze that fascinated him, but afterwards he ran on to Buddha.... I enjoyed a long interval of peace, until finally he wrote me he was married. That letter was full of more ardent hymns of praise for a mere living woman than he'd ever written before about any of his great spiritual discoveries. And ever since then I've heard nothing but the praise of Elza—in which I know I'll be ready to join after I've met her" (Act I, pp.32-35).

John Loving finally convinces himself that all psychological, philosophical or religious systems are "perspectives" or illusions with only a survival value for life. Yet, driven by his complicated motives, John is unfaithful to the wife whom he loves. First, he feels guilty; after, driven by the need to tell his wife the whole truth, he grows self-tortured; then, to find an answer to his uncertainties—like Orin in Mourning Becomes Electra— John begins to write an autobiographical novel about his past. In telling the plot of it to Elza, who is recovering from flu, and his uncle, Father Baird, the Loving principle confesses what John Loving has done and proposes to end his story with the wife's death. Elza goes on purposely out in the rain, and she contracts pneumonia. Though she is about to die, she cannot forgive John, and she will make no effort to live. John—always at war with Loving, who refuses to change the end of the novel, and rejecting Father Baird's attempt to bring him back to the faith of his boyhood—cannot face Elza's death, particularly

since John holds himself responsible for it. Her death means his own death, and, according to the play, there is no other way to save Elza's life, but her forgiveness. Elza finds it in her heart, and from that moment on the crisis is over. The final scene opens with John knelt in front of a crucifix, still followed by the rebellious Loving, asking God's forgiveness. "I have come back to Thee," John sobs. "Let me believe in Thy love again!" With his eyes fixed on the Crucified, John feels he has at last been forgiven, "Ah, Thou hast heard me at last! Thou hast not forsaken me! Thou hast always loved me! I am forgiven! I can forgive myself-- through Thee! I can believe!" Loving, "slumps forward to the floor and rolls over on his back, dead, his head beneath the foot of the Cross, his arms outflung so that his body forms another cross." The Loving and the John principles are finally integrated. Elza lives, while John cries, "Love lives forever! Life laughs with God's love again. Life laughs with love!" (D.W.E., Act IV, pp.153-57).

This last scene seems to be particularly at odds not only with O'Neill's previous plays, but also with Nietzsche's contempt for religion. Doris V. Falk points out that O'Neill only completed Days Without End after eight tortured drafts, and Barret H. Clark informs us that O'Neill once said that the "hero's final gesture calls for alteration." (27) However, the play may be called a study of "perspectives" or illusions and their survival value for life. Perhaps we could say, from the general cosmology of the play, that man needs the power of any illusion, especially religion, to have peace of soul, as Nietzsche says: "If you wish to strive for peace of soul, then believe; if you wish to be a devotee of truth, then inquire" (Kaufmann, p.32).

O'Neill proved he was a devotee of truth. After Days

Without End he permanently abandoned his philosophy of love and religion to turn back to his life-long "imaginative theater." In The Iceman Cometh, the last play published during his life-time (1946), O'Neill isolates his characters from society and makes them live in a Godless world, without any possibility of being possessed by Dionysian ecstasy. What lies outside Harry Hope's Saloon is a world without value, a hostile society to which no man can possibly belong, and from which they must take refuge.

As the play opens the back room and a section of the bar at Harry Hope's is shown. A dozen drunken men are sat at round tables drinking and dreaming of that golden tomorrow which will see them restored once more to a living world. They are waiting for Hickey, a traveling salesman, who arrives at the bar every year to celebrate Harry Hope's birthday with plenty of whiskey and jokes, particularly one about his wife who has been safely left at home in bed, "with the iceman." While they are waiting for Hickey, Larry Slade, a philosophic ex-anarchist, tells the new arrived Parrit—who seems to be Slade's son—all about the main members of the club.

Captain Lewis and General Wetjoen once belonged to the British Army; now "they dream the hours away in happy dispute over the brave days in South Africa when they tried to murder each other" (I.C., Act I, p.35). Jimmy Tomorrow, once a correspondent for some English paper, is the leader of the "Tomorrow movement." Harry Hope was a politician, but since his wife, Bessie, died (twenty years ago) he has managed that Saloon, and has never set foot out of it. Ed Mosher, who once worked for a circus, is Hope's brother-in-law. Pat McGloin was a police lieutenant. Willie Oban, educated at Harvard, is a lawyer. Hugo Kalmar was an ex-anarchist. Joe ran a colored gambling house. Rocky and Chuck are the bartenders. Pearl,

Margie and Cora are "typical dollar street-walker." Each one in this "family circle of inmates" lives in an alcoholic "pipe-dream" of future hope, and do as little as possible to keep on living. "They manage to get drunk, by hook and crook," Larry tells Parritt, "and keep their pipe dreams, and that's all they ask of life. I've never known more contented men" (I.C., Act I, p.36).

With Hickey's arrival a little more action is introduced in the play. Hickey, however, is no more the gay and dissolute man they all expected. He has given up drinking and, according to him, found salvation by facing the truth about himself. He intends to bring the same peace and happiness to his friends by destroying their illusions about "tomorrow" and making them to see themselves as they really are. But the results of his preaching are disastrous. Although he persuades all, except Larry and Parritt, to go out into the daylight and attempt the social rehabilitation they have always promised themselves, all of them come back to the bar, wretched. They have faced the truth, but it has robbed them of the last trace of hope.

Hickey finds to his horror that his gospel does not work. He is forced to explain the cause of his own reform to prove he is right. He reveals that he attained his state of peace by killing his wife, Evelyn, whom he loved since he was a boy, and who loved him, too. "I'll bet," Hickey says, "never was two people who loved each other more than me and Evelyn" (I.C., Act IV, p.253). But the problem with their love was that Evelyn always forgave Hickey's uncontrollable drunkenness and dissipation. Her love always won, even when his playing around with women had to come out in open. Hickey's reformation became Evelyn's "pipe-dream." His running gag with the boys of Hope's had been that Evelyn was

betraying him "in the hay with the iceman," but this was only his own wishful thinking. "Christ," Hickey exclaims, "I loved her so, but I began to hate that pipe dream! I began to be afraid I was going bughouse, because sometimes I couldn't forgive her for forgiving me. I even caught myself hating her for hating myself so much. There's a limit to the guilt you can feel and the forgiveness and the pity you can take" (I.C., Act IV, p.239). Hickey killed Evelyn because that was the only way he could free himself from her eternal forgiveness and achieve self punishment. For him to commit murder was to commit suicide. He has already called the police at the time of his confession.

When the police arrive, however, Hickey is concluding his story. His guilt becomes too much for him to face. Ironically he creates another pipe dream by persuading himself that he was insane at the moment of the murder. "I must have been crazy," Hickey cries out in despair. This, as Doris V. Falk points out, sounds as a blessing to his friends, for it restores their own illusions. They believe Hickey was crazy all the time. His reform was a pipe dream, too. They can go back to their own illusions, their whiskey, their dreams. They reach thirstily for their bottles.

Hickey, however, is not the only protagonist of the play. Larry Slade, Parrit, Harry Hope and Jimmy Tomorrow also deserve some further consideration.

Larry Slade, the philosopher, is the only occupant of the room who is wide awake throughout the play. He is not given to long speeches, like Hickey, but to short, sardonic and comic comments-- "In the grand stand of philosophical detachment" (I.C., Act I, p.11)-- as if he were the story teller of the play. He not only describes to Parrit his friends' pipe dreams and life, he also baptize Hickey as the "Iceman"

or "Death," and lets us know the theme of the play:

"No one her," he tells Parritt, "has to worry about where they're going next, because there is no farther they can go. It's a great confort to them. Although even here they keep up the appearance of life with a few harmless pipe dreams about their yesterdays and tomorrows, as you'll see for yourself if you're here long.... They've all a touching credulity concerning tomorrows. It'll be a great day for them, tomorrow--the Feast of All Fools, with brass bands playing!...To hell with the truth!As the history of the world proves, the truth has no bearing on anything. It's irrelevant and immaterial, as the lawyer say. The lie of a pipe dream is what gives life to the whole misbegotten mad lot of us, drunk or sober" (I.C., Act I, p. 25).

The pipe dream is the obvious leitmotif of O'Neill's The Iceman Cometh. Truth itself is a pipe dream, not different from error, but man cannot live without it, or, in Nietzschean terms, it is "the basic condition of life." (28) Self-knowledge, or the truth about oneself, becomes man's curse, since he cannot tolerate the truth because it is hopeless. Therefore, man must construct illusions or pipe dreams to be able to live. It does not matter whether the pipe dream is true or not, since it makes life tolerable while the dreamer waits for Hickey or death. As Nietzsche says "it is nothing but a moral prejudice that regards truth as of more value than illusion... there would be no life at all were it not on the basis of perspective valuations and semblances" (29) O'Neill's characters in The Iceman Cometh support this Nietzschean point of view, for their illusions always mean the reverse of the truth.

Larry's illusion, or pipe dream, for instance, is that he has no longer cared for life since he has broken with the Movement, an anarchist organization, and with Parritt's mother, Rosa, whom he thinks he no longer loves. But the truth is that Larry still clings to life, and still loves

Rosa, although he refuses to admit it. The more Parrit talks about his mother, however, and his hate of whores, the more Larry hates Parrit, because Parritt forces him to admit the truth about his pipe dream. Finally, after Hickey's imprisonment, Larry, to free himself, condemns Parritt to suicide: "Go! Get the hell out of life, God damn you, before I choke it out of you" (I.C., Act IV, p.248). But Larry's freedom is another illusion. First he admits that Rosa was a real whore, and because of it he has always hated her; then, that he has always clung for life, and that he is the only converted to Hickey's gospel of death, for he can longer turn back to live on a lie.

"Be God, there's no hope! I'll never be a success in in the grandstand—or anywhere else! Life is too much for me! I'll be a weak fool looking with pity at the two sides of everything till the day I die! (With an intense bitter sincerity) May that day come soon! (He pauses startledly surprised at himself—then with a sardonic grin) Be God, I'm the only real convert to death Hickey made here. From the bottom of my coward's heart I mean that now!" (I.C., Act IV, p.258).

"Self-knowledge," according to Nietzsche in The Birth of Tragedy, is an Apollonian demand (B.T., Sec. 10, p.72). But the excess of self-knowledge becomes dangerous for it leads to the destruction of the beautiful inner world of fantasy, or illusion, that means death. Larry's excess of self-knowledge makes him feels nauseated with life, like Dion. But "nausea," as Nietzsche says, "inhibits action" (B.T., Sec. 7, p.60). So, Larry—though he recognizes Silenus' wisdom that "the best of all was never to be born" (I.C., Act I, p.32)—is unable to kill himself, like Hamlet, or to turn back to his own pipe dream, that is the Apollonian world of illusion. Thus, Larry—like Lavinia, who finally discovered she loved Adam Brant, and buried herself alive in the Mannon's "White Sepulcher"—also

accepts a 'living-death' for he considers life as a hopeless illusion.

Parrit, however, who was not a philosopher, kills himself when he discovers there were no more illusions to sustain his life. For a long time he has believed in his Mother's and Larry's love for him, as well as in the Movement, which his mother carried on "like a Revivalist preacher about religion" (I.C., Act I, p.29). But later he discovers that the Movement "was a crazy pipe dream;" he betrays it denouncing his mother to the police; then, he becomes guilty because he thinks he has always loved his mother, and she has always loved him. With Hickey final confession, however, Parritt grasps the final truth about himself: he has always hated his mother because she was a whore.

Parritt's family, in a way, resembles the Mannon's. In both families Pan grew revengeful because it has been forbidden. Parrit, like Lavinia and Orin, kills her mother sending her to prison, for he did not admit her free love. Larry Slade also abandons her for the same reason. Both of them must pay for their "original sin." Parritt, like Orin, commits suicide; Slade, like Lavinia, surrounds himself from life, which is still worse than death.

Jimmy Tomorrow's pipe dreams are that his wife Marjorie's infidelity drove him to drink and at "tomorrow" he will reform and return to work. The truth he cannot bear is that he was a drunkard before he was married, and that his drinking drove his wife to adultery. He has only a vague recollection of her, finding it "impossible to believe she loved" him (I.C., Act IV, p.231).

Harry Hope's pipe dreams are that after his wife Bessie's death he began to drink in the back room of his bar and that "tomorrow" he will once again walk around the neighborhood

to see his friends. Twenty years have passed, when Hickey makes Harry admit that he did not love Bessie, for "she was always on your neck," Hickey tells Harry, "making you have ambition and go out and do things, when all you wanted was to get drunk in peace" (I.C., Act III, p.195).

Although Jimmy and Harry recognize the truth of their pipe dreams, they do not kill themselves because they are able to recover their illusions when Hickey declares he was insane.

The pipe dreams in The Iceman Cometh express the Apollonian world of illusion and its survival value for the dreamers. It exists beyond human desire and physical necessity. Whiskey alone— "a cheap ginmill of the five-cent whiskey"— sustains physical life. Hunger for food is not expressed in the play, and the sandwich on the table is considered a mere decoration:

"... this food provision was generally circumvented by putting a property sandwich in the middle of each table, an old desicated ruin of dust-laden bread and mummified ham or cheese which only the drunkest yokel from the sticks ever regarded as anything but a noisome table decoration. But at Harry Hope's, Hope being a former minor Tammanyte and still possessing friends, this food technically is ignored as irrelevant, except during the fleeting alarms of reform agitation" (Scenes, Viii).

Analogous to the food, sexual desire does not disturb the dreamers, either. In O'Neill's plays of the twenties lust always expressed the Dionysian power, in The Iceman Cometh the God of Fertility seems to be dead. The three whores arouse no one to lust; Cora, one of the prostitutes, has forgotten how to play the piano; and Hugo angers Hope when he begins to sing. Nothing is allowed to disturb the quint. Their lives are spent beyond desire.

O'Neill suggests here, like in The Great God Brown, that love is also a pipe dream. In fact it entails a destructive

power which causes hate and death. For the female, love is a pipe dream; for the male, an excuse for his failure, as Robert J. Andreach wrote in his article "O'Neill's Women in the Iceman Cometh:"

"If Hickey-- or any one of the characters-- admits he hates the female, he must then admit he has a reason for her: she destroyed his hope. This admission is unendurable-- except for someone like Parritt, who commits suicide immediately after making it-- not merely because each would then have to admit that he is a derelict, which each is willing to do, but because the one who loved him hoped he would be different, which is precisely what each one has always been hoping (part of his nature). To be loved made each one aware of the impossibility of exactly what he has been hoping for himself. Love asks the impossible-- that the loved one will rise above his nature-- making a pipe dream of the hope each has that he can rise above his nature. Hence each one's guilt because he can't be other than himself to the one who wants him to be more than himself and hence hatred for her for constantly making him aware that his hope that he can rise above himself is an illusion. The truth is hideous; it forces each character to accept his past and to discard the illusion that "tomorrow" he will be different." (30)

From this text we conclude that even Nietzsche's superman becomes an illusion in O'Neill's The Iceman Cometh. Nietzsche thought that a few men were able to rise above their natures, to improve themselves, and realize the superman. Self-improvement in The Iceman Cometh is considered an impossible dream, an illusion, that causes guilt and self-destruction. Hickey becomes a preacher of death. He teaches Hope's inmates to kill their pipe dreams of "yesterdays" and "tomorrows." "You'll in a today," Hickey says, "where there is no yesterday or tomorrow to worry about" (I.C., Act II, p.148). Like Lazarus, Hickey thinks that those who foster their pipe dreams are able "to laugh" (I.C., Act IV, p.241). But Hickey also knows that to get peace and freedom

"to laugh" means the destruction of the self, the end of the Apollonian "principium individuationis" which causes all human pains, even the fear of life and death, as Lazarus preaches to his followers. So, Hickey, like a Lazarusite, embraces death fearlessly, for he does not have any pipe dream left: "God, you're a dumb Dick! Do you suppose a give a damn about life now? Why, you bonehead, I haven't got a single damned lying hope or pipe dream left!" (I.C., Act IV, p.245).

In this sense, O'Neill's last play--The Iceman Cometh--resembles his first one--Bound East for Cardiff.- In both plays O'Neill recognizes the necessity of the Apollonian world of illusion for man's life. In his early play, however, a hope remains. It is expressed by Yank's last vision of a pretty lady dressed in black, which symbolizes, as we have stated in the beginning of this chapter, the primordial unity of existence embodied by the Greek God of Fertility, Dionysus. In The Hairy Ape, Yank is left alone in a Godless and unsocial world to which he could not belong. He experiences a physical regression back to his natural origins, but he could not belong there, either. In The Great God Brown, the old God Pan, of Dionysus, is forbidden, and transformed into the Christian devil with a mocking laugh. But he is still strong enough to take revenge upon society. The Dionysian Savior proposed in Lazarus Laughed is killed by man's envy and greed for power. From Lazarus on, Dionysus is dead. The Apollonian world of illusions begins. O'Neill depicts it in Days Without End and Ah, Wilderness, but only in The Iceman Cometh he expresses it fully. In a way he is back to his first play, but without any hope. The pretty lady dressed in black is replaced by a team of whores who are unable to rise man's desire or hope. Everything which

seems good covers up basic evil, and man needs to lie to himself to be able to tolerate life, as Nietzsche expressed it in Human All Too Human,

"What we call the world is a result of errors and fantasies.... Now we must embrace untruth, now at last error becomes a lie, and lying to ourselves a necessity of life."
(31)

This is the tragic end of O'Neill's plays, and it refers us once more to The Birth of Tragedy. According to Nietzsche, the Greeks also felt "the terror and horror of existence" as an insane energy enthroned over all knowledge, and they called it "Moirai." In order to endure this terror they had to interpose between themselves and life "the Olympian middle world of art" (B.T., Sec. 3, p. 42). So, when they saw a tragedy on the stage, it brought them exaltation, life and enobled hope.

O'Neill's plays are an attempt to revive the theater of the Greeks, in "its highest and sole significant function as a Temple." Death and suffering are always the price of man's attainment, while back of this human scene is "an infinite, insane energy which creates and destroys without other purpose than to pass eternity in avoiding thought" (M.M., Act III, Sc. 1, p. 291). Modern man also needs to create an "Olympian middle world of art," a dream which keeps him fighting, willing and living. The playwright becomes the preacher of this "Temple, where a religion of poetical interpretation and symbolical celebration of life is communicated to human beings" (32)

But O'Neill's preaching in this Temple is not different from Lazarus' and Hickey's. He offers us a Nietzschean diagnosis of man's psychological needs, but, like Lazarus, his message ends in a sad tone, "The greatness of Saviors is that they may not save!" (L.L., Act 1, Sc. 2, p. 398).

NOTES ON CHAPTER TWO

1. Cargil, Oscar. O'Neill and his Plays, p.126
2. Ibid., p. 126.
3. Solomon, Robert C. Nietzsche: A Collection of Critical Essays, pp.92-93
4. Ibid., p.32
5. Falk, Doris V. Eugene O'Neill and the Tragic Tension,p.20
6. Ibid.,p.29
7. Solomon, Robert C. Op.cit.,p.85
8. Falk, Doris V. Op.cit.,p: 95
9. Clark, Barret H. Eugene O'Neill: The Man and his Plays, p.104
10. Ibid., p.105
11. Ibid., p.105
12. "Lazarus was, in short, the masculine counterpart of the Earth Mother and the pagan equivalent of Christ-- the Mother and the Son in one person. O'Neill reconstructed everything to fill the heart's need: the conception of the Mother, the philosophy of Nietzsche, the teachings of Freud." See Griffin, Ernest G. Eugene O'Neill: A Collection of Criticism, p.29
13. "In referring to death as eternal life, O'Neill does not mean the eternal life of the individual will or conscious ego. It is the individual will-- the self-- which limits us, and which makes us proud and fearful of the loneliness and loss of that will which is death. As always in O'Neill's work, the conscious ego in its effort to control the unconscious, to preserve its proud individual will, limits and divides the personality. In Jungian terms it is as if the individual ego emerges for a while from the vast realm of the personal and collective unconscious, fights to maintain itself against the encroachments and control of the unconscious, and finally, when the tension is relaxed, sinks back into the unconscious, only to emerge again, continually repeating the process, but in different individuals. This is not a concept of reincarnation of an individual soul but, as Jung points out, is comparable to the organic conception of the conservation of energy-- here, psychic rather than physical energy." In the same page, Falk adds in a foot note: "A further link between the two plays is the influence of Schopenhauer. Lazarus Laughed echoes many of the concepts and even some of the

wording of the chapter entitled, "On Death and Its Relation to the Indestructibility of our True Nature," from The World as Will and Ideas." See Falk, Doris V. Eugene O'Neill and the Tragic Tension, p.116.

14. "Lazarus' abstraction at moments of great danger to his family or his disciples, the cool impersonal quality of his affection, cannot be explained through his derivation from the Biblical Lazarus, from Dionysus, or from Zarathustra. These unexplained elements in the characterization of Lazarus, which make him so difficult to understand, form, however, a unified picture resembling one other great savior of mankind. If one adds to the Christ, the Dionysus, the Zarathustra in Lazarus the image of Gotama the Buddha, the character of O'Neill's Lazarus becomes fully understandable." See Alexander, Doris M. "Lazarus Laughed and Buddha." Modern Language Quarterly, 17 (Dec. 1956), p.358.
15. Cargil, Oscar. O'Neill and his Plays, p.413
16. Sheaffer, Louiz. O'Neill: Son and Artist, p.201
17. Ibid., p. 200
18. Ibid., pp. 202-03
19. Ibid., p. 336
20. See Cargil, Oscar. Op.cit., pp.190-92
21. Ibid., pp.190-92.
22. Clark, Barret H. Op.cit., p.136
23. Falk, Doris V. Op.cit., p.131
24. Ibid., p.131
25. Ibid., p.137 and also Sheaffer, Louiz. Op.cit., p.404
26. Clark, Barret H. Op.cit., p.138
27. Falk, Doris V. Op.cit., p.145, and also Clark, p.142
28. See Solomon, Robert C. Op.cit., p.94
29. Ibid., p.94
30. Griffin, Ernest G. Op.cit., pp.106-07
31. Ibid., p. 87
32. Cargil, Oscar. Op.cit., p.121.

CHAPTER THREE

THE HISTORICAL, UNHISTORICAL AND SUPRA-HISTORICAL
IN O'NEILL'S PLAYS

Soon after The Birth of Tragedy, Nietzsche published his Untimely Meditations. The most famous of them is entitled Of the Use and Disadvantages of History for Life. In it three key concepts are developed: the "historical," the "unhistorical" and the "supra-historical," whose meaning O'Neill expressed in his plays, especially in The Emperor Jones (1920) and in many Dionysian and Apollonian symbolism we have not explained in our last chapter. Our main concern here is to deal with this Nietzschean concepts in O'Neill's plays and to analyse O'Neill's symbolism supra-historically.

In his maditation, Nietzsche was not interested in the course of historical events, but in the value and disvalue of History for life. The value of the "historical" and "unhistorical," as Walter Kaufmann explains it, was analysed by Nietzsche at first in terms of happiness and suffering; then, in terms of life and health:

"The study of history does not, prima facie, make us happy; rather it tends to make us unhappy. The "historical" as the aspect of consciousness which is commonly designated as the faculty of memory seems to be the very factor which prevents us from being happy. "In the smallest ... as in the greatest happiness, it is ever one factor which makes happiness happiness; the ability to forget... to feel unhistorical while it lasts."... "The unhistorical and historical are needed equally for the health of an individual, a people and a culture. "In every day language: man must "know how to forget at the right time as well as how to remember at the right time."

So far Nietzsche is able to apply the standards of life and health. A complete lack of memory would incapacitate man for life. The "historical," in the widest sense of the word, is necessary for life, and this is

its value. If man would remember everything, however, if he were only "historical" and not at all "unhistorical," i.e., able to forget also, he would again be incapacitated for life. Both are necessary. The lack of the "historical" in the narrower sense, i.e. of the awareness of one's past history, would similarly constitute not only a statistical abnormality but a defect which, in direct proportions to its extent, would destroy the chances of the organism to survive. A people with absolutely no memory of their past would be unable to govern themselves successfully, to abide by a proven way of life, and to keep the law; a culture with no traditions, with no memory of past techniques or customs, would be similarly incapacitated. On the other hand, a people or a culture without the ability to forget would be unable to make decisions, to act, and to be creative" (Kaufmann, 123).

When O'Neill's The Emperor Jones was first published, 1920, the critics called him Expressionist, but O'Neill denied any contact with German Expressionism before 1922. (1) Doris V. Falk thinks that what excited O'Neill's mind at the time was Jung's fundamental premise-- "the existence and power of the collective unconscious." (2) In 1926, however, as we have already seen, O'Neill complained about the critics Freudian and Jungian interpretation of his plays. (3) What no one can deny, however, is that O'Neill, at the time he wrote The Emperor Jones, was an enthusiastic Nietzschean admirer. Supported by it, rather than by any critical study, we will venture in this chapter an analyses of The Emperor Jones according to Nietzsche's concepts in his Meditation about History.

The play tells us the story of an American negro, Brutus Jones, who came to an Island in the West Indies, after escaping from prison in The United States of America. In two years Jones made himself Emperor and possessor of a great fortune by imposing heavy taxes on the Islanders.

When the play opens, O'Neill shows us Jones boasting to Smithers, his friend, about his rise to power in spite of

violence, trickery, murder and cheating. Luck has played a part, too, but Jones has been quick to take advantage of it. Once a native tried to shoot him, but the gun missed fire. Jones then announced that only silver bullets could harm him. But Jones has already gone too far in his exploitation of the islanders. A rebellion is taking place without Jones knowing of it. Jones must flee for his life's sake. At this point the steady beat of a big drum begins— "exactly corresponding to the normal pulse beat," O'Neill says in the stage directions, "72 the minute"— and continues uninterruptedly at a gradually accelerating rate from this point to the very end of the play. Jones, realizing that his reign is over, starts to make his escape to the coast where a French ship is anchored. To reach the coast, he needs to travel through the jungle, but he becomes lost in it. Then demons and apparitions begin to torment him, and the only way to get free from them is firing one of his six precious bullets. His first visions are "his little formless fears;" then, the figure of a negro named Jeff, whom Jones killed in the States; after, is a ghost of a guard Jones killed to escape from prison; next, Jones sees himself being sold in a slave market; and then among a group of savages; finally, he is beset by a Congo Witch doctor and a Crocodile. While he runs through the forest, Jones, little by little, loses his Emperor's clothing. At last he finds himself at the same point he entered the jungle. A complete circle has been made. There Jones is killed.

What is the relation of this plot to the "historical" and "unhistorical?" How are these concepts integrated in Brutus Jones? Are happiness and suffering two historical factors? What about life and health?

Nietzsche related the "historical" to consciousness and

to the faculty of memory; the "unhistorical" to the ability to forget. The "historical man" has faith in the future, for he knows how to forget and how to remember at the right time.

In the first scene of the play, Jones' life is revealed to us in his dialogue with Smithers. Like a "historical man" Jones has faith in the future, and avoids remembering sad events about his past. He even threatens Smithers, when Smithers reminds him about his misfortunes, "Talk polite white man! Talk polite, " Jones tells Smithers with his hand on his revolver menacingly, "you heah me!" (E.J., Sc.1, p.7). Some pages further, when Smithers reminds Jones of his killing of a white man in the States, Jones' reaction is again violent, "I kills another right heah 'fore long if he don't look out" (E.J., Sc.1., p.11). Because he also "unhistorical" Jones seems to have forgotten all the sad event about his past:

"Maybe I goes to jail dere (in the States) for gettin' in an argument wid razors ovah a crap game. Maybe I gits 'nother argument wid de prison guard was overseer ovah us when we're wukin' de road. Maybe he hits me wid a whip and I splits his head wid a shovel and runs away and files de chain off my leg and gits away safe. Maybe I does all dat an' maybe I don't. It's a story I tells you so's you knows I'se de kind of man dat if you evah repeats one word of it, I ends yo' stealin' on dis yearth mighty damn quick" (E.J., Sc.1, p.11).

It seems plain here that the "historical" or the ability to remember prevents us from being happy. Jones keeps everything as an unconscious reality. He is "unhistorical" toward his memories because they bring him unhappiness.

In his Maditation about History, Nietzsche imagined a question put to a number of people "whether they would like to live through the last or twenty years once more" (Kaufmann, p.125). He was sure that everybody would anser "No" because

everybody believes that the meaning of existence comes to light progressively "in the course of its process." Obviously, Brutus Jones' answer would be "No" for he is a "historical man," and a "historical man" has faith in the future not in the past.

"Look-a-head, white man," Jones tells Smithers. "Don't you s'pose I'se looked ahead and made sho' af all de chances?... Dawn tomorrow I'll be out at de oder side on de coast whar dat French gunboat is stayin'. She picks me up, takes me to Martinique when she go dar, and dere I is safe wid a mighty off a log" (E.J., Sc.1, p.13).

The "historical man" for having faith in the future feels the necessity of an illusion to believe in. The dispelling of the illusion, as we have already seen, means disintegration of the self or death.

Brutus Jones, in the first scene of the play, seems to be "historical" toward his future and "unhistorical" toward his past. From the second scene on, as "the tom-tom beats" increase, he becomes increasingly "historical" even toward his past. O'Neill stresses this by making Brutus appear from the right in the first scene; and from the left always when he appears from the second scene on. He does it also contrasting light and darkness. In the first scene sunshine and white colors serve as background for the character's action; from the second scene on, darkness prevails. In the beginning of the second scene, for instance, when Brutus reaches the forest, we are suddenly struck by the detail of darkness, "in the rear of the forest is a wall of darkness dividing the world" (E.J., Sc. 2, p.17).

Which worlds are these? The world of the future and the world of the past, both divided by the wall of the present world. Jones begins to lose his faith in the future; symbolically he cannot go beyond the wall. He starts a hideous voyage toward his past, and his own origins. He becomes

historical, but only toward his past, without any faith in the future. This fact throws him into suffering and despair, because he becomes conscious of precisely those aspects of his life he desperately has attempted to forget; and because fate becomes increasingly plain for him.

In The Emperor Jones as in Mourning Becomes Electra, O'Neill assumes fate in a "historical" sense, i.e., as something which comes to us from our biological past. In a letter published by Arthur H. Quin in his A History of the American Drama (1945), O'Neill is reported to have said:

"I'm always acutely conscious of the Force behind-- Fate, God, our biological past creating our present, whatever one calls it--Mystery certainly..." (4)

Nietzsche also was conscious of the influence of past generations over the present ones:

"One cannot erase out of the soul of a man," he says in Beyond Good and Evil, "what his ancestors have done most eagerly and often.... It is not at all possible that a man should not have in his body the qualities and preferences of his parents and ancestors" (Kaufmann, p. 264). And in Human All Too Human he adds, "the son uses the father's Headstart and inherits his habits" (Kaufmann, p. 250).

All of the six apparitions Jones has when he runs through the forest are connected to images of fate. Jeff, the negro Jones killed back in the States, is throwing a pair of dice; the prison guard and the small group of negroes look like automatons; there is something stiff, rigid, unreal, marionettish about the movements of the auctioneer and the crowd in the slave market; the chorus of singing negroes, to whom Jones joins as one under a spell, sways back and forth rhythmically; when the Congo Witch-Doctor appears, Jones becomes completely hypnotized before the "implacable deity" which is demanding him as a sacrifice.

I think the symbolism of the play is intensified in this last scene. Not only the value of the "historical" but the Dionysian myth and the idea of eternal recurrence are here fused.

The "historical man," as we have just seen above, has faith in the future and despairs of the past. The faith in the future resembles an Apollonian illusion. Jones loses it when he encounters the "wall" in the realm of the forest. Then he becomes historical toward his past, he feels the horror of existence, but he cannot go beyond his racial origins. What remains is his brooding fate in the eternal becoming of everything. Jones is again the victim which stands before the altar to be offered as a sacrifice. Only the circumstances are different now. Lem, the leader of the negroes who follow Jones, represents the Witch Doctor; his negroes, the chorus; the tom-tom represents the holy, Dionysian music; the silver bullet, the crocodile eyes; and Jones is the tragic hero who is defeated by fate. In a way, redemption takes place again through pain and suffering.

At this point Jones seems to understand the meaning of life and fate, or, parodying The Birth of Tragedy, he realizes a Dionysian insight in the very heart of nature. He forgets his individuality and joins to the dance as if compelled by an invisible force; it's the Dionysian strength which breaks the spell of individuation to celebrate the primordial oneness of everything, as O'Neill describes it in the stage directions, "he (Jones) beats his forehead abjectly to the ground, moaning hysterically," and "the whole spirit and the meaning of the dance entered into him, has become his spirit" (E.J., Sc. 7, p. 32). At the same time O'Neill points out that Jones' imperial costume has been torn into pieces, and that the soldiers carry his limp body to Lem.

O'Neill's connection to The Birth of Tragedy seems to be again evident here. In a way, Jones' sufferings recalls the ones of the real tragic hero, Dionysus, who was torn to pieces by the Titans when he was a child, from whose dismemberment all kinds of sorrow and pain entered the world. According to Nietzsche the Greeks also felt such terror and horror in existence and, like Jones, they could not face it without an overwhelming dismay and a cry of horror. Still according to Nietzsche, the Greeks found in music and in tragic art an expression of the Dionysian intoxicating rapture; in the meaning of tragedy, the "manifestation and illustration of Dionysian states" (B.T., Sec. 1, p. 14); in both of them, life as powerful and undestructible at the bottom. In the two last scenes of The Emperor Jones, O'Neill seems to bring again to the stage the whole symbolism of Greek music and Greek tragedies, while the last words of the play becomes an affirmation of life, "Gawd blimay, but yer (Jones) died in the 'eight o' style, any'ow!" (E.J., Sc. 8, p. 35). And here a new concept may be added to our interpretation, the "supra-historical."

In our long quotation of Nietzsche at the beginning of this chapter, we pointed out that the "historical" and "un-historical" are equally needed for the health, life and happiness of an individual. We also stated that in the beginning of the play Jones was "historical" toward his future, and "unhistorical" toward his past. From the second scene on, however, Jones becomes "historical" toward his past. This is the very factor which prevents him from being happy and guides him to final destruction. The last symbol of the play, however, (as it is common in most of O'Neill's plays) may be explained "supra-historically". But what is the "supra-historical?"

According to Kaufmann's Nietzsche, the "supra-historical" was not fully and clearly developed by the philosopher. At the time Nietzsche intended to criticize the preoccupation of his age with "historical" research and past values. In The Birth of Tragedy, however, Nietzsche says that "the existence of the world is justified only as an aesthetic phenomenon" (B.T., "Attempt at a Self-Criticism," p.22); in the Meditation on History, that "the goal of humanity cannot lie in the end but only in its highest specimens" (Kaufmann, p.127). This implies three further considerations. First, that aesthetic must be considered as the true values of mankind; second, that in the highest specimens of mankind this values become living symbols; and third, that the "historical" and "unhistorical" are finally integrated in the "supra-historical," and that this integration involves the problem of the relativity of values. How does the work of art performs such an integration?

Nietzsche thought that the aesthetic values are, in a way, related to History, but they are not only "historical." The beauty of Greek Tragedy, for instance, is still beauty to us; it is independent from time, it is "supra-historical." Thus, the "historical," through the art of the Greeks, has been intensified into a timeless symbol, a "supra-historical" value. The same Nietzsche thought of "the highest specimens" of humanity: artists, philosophers and saints. In them the events of History have been intensified into symbols, and Nietzsche adds that the value of the "supra-historical" is just this: "to circumscribe... an every day melody... to elevate it (History) to intensify it into a comprehensive symbol" (Kaufmann, p.126).

Though Nietzsche does not define the "supra-historical," the "supra-historical," one thing, at least, becomes clear:

it is expressed through symbols. On the other hand, his praising of Greek Tragedy makes us believe that any true tragedy should symbolize the suffering Dionysus, i.e., the eternal pain and eternal contradiction existing in nature. O'Neill's plays, especially those of the twenties, are an honest attempt to modernize the Greek Dionysus, as he is conceived by Nietzsche in The Birth of Tragedy. Our next step in this chapter is to relate Apollo and Dionysus to the "historical" and "supra-historical" concepts, both in Nietzsche and in O'Neill.

Nietzsche's view of tragedy as a metaphysical solace and of the theatrical experience as effecting a sense of Dionysian oneness with one's fellows and with the universe led him to believe that the pre-Socratic Greeks "could not endure the individual on the tragic stage" (B.T., Sec. 10, p. 73), and that the protagonists in the plays of Aeschylus and Sophocles were only masks of the original Dionysus. With Euripides and Socrates, however, individualized portraits and scientific reasoning were introduced in tragedy, and Dionysus ceased to be the tragic hero (See B.T., Sec. 10).

Whether Nietzsche's assumption of the anti-individualistic tendency in the oldest Greek Tragedy is historically accurate or not does not concern us here. Right or wrong, it had a definite impact on O'Neill in his attempt to recapture what he considered the Greek tragedy spirit. What was essential to Nietzsche was the rapturous feeling of being, not an individual but part of the life force. O'Neill shared this mystical Dionysian feeling:

"I'M always, always trying to interpret Life in terms of lives, never just lives in terms of characters. I'm always acutely conscious of the Force behind." (5)

By declaring himself mostly interested in "Life in terms

of lives" O'Neill, along with Nietzsche, favors the general, the universal, not the particular--this or that man--but the image of man in his eternal struggle to express the "Force behind" which is unconscious, uncontrollable, irrational and "supra-historical." Thus, in The Hairy Ape, O'Neill complained that "the public saw just the stoker, not the symbol, and the symbol makes the play either important or just another play." (6) In The Great God Brown, he identifies the "Force" with mystery, "the mystery one man or woman can feel but not understand as the meaning of any event--or accident--in any life on earth. And it is this mystery I want to realize in the theater." (7)

The mystery O'Neill talks about is the same mystery the Greeks felt in life, but O'Neill needs a more modern symbolism to express it. So, his characters' struggle is first of all a psychological struggle, or man's inner division, whose equivalent in Greek tragedy was the sufferings of Dionysus; the physical dismemberment of the God by the Titans.

The inner division of O'Neill's characters could also be related to psychoanalysis, but we prefer to relate it to Thus Spoke Zarathustra. "The worst enemy you can encounter," Zarathustra says, "will always be you, yourself" (Z., Part I, Sec.17, p.176). O'Neill echoes Zarathustra when he states that "one's inner life passes in solitude bounded by the masks of oneself;" (8) and he expresses it in his plays of the middle period when the split personality is characterized by mask devices, which always resemble the character's face. Dion's mask, for instance, is "a fixing forcing of his own face" (G.G.B., Prologue, p.310); the Mannons have "mask-life faces;" and Loving's mask in Days Without End is almost identical with John's face. In the description of the masks O'Neill seems to be once more inspired by Zarathustra:

"Verily you could wear no better masks, you men of the present, than your own faces! Who could possibly find you out?" (Z., Part 2, Sec. 14, p. 231).

These mask devices may be portrayed as a modern vehicle to express Dionysus; while the real face of the character implies Apollo. In modern psychological terms we could say that the mask portrays the unconscious, and the character's face, the conscious ego. So, the whole symbolism of masks, I think, bears a timeless connotation and it may be called a "supra-historical" element in O'Neill's plays.

A similar connotation may be attached to music. Nietzsche considered music an expression of Dionysian rapture, and the meaning of tragedy was to him essentially the manifestation and illustration of Dionysian states "out of the Spirit of Music" (B.T., Sec. 2, p. 38). The musical element in Greek tragedy was embodied in the choral songs. When these were reduced in favor of dialogue elements, the very foundation of tragedy was threatened:

"Optimistic dialectic," Nietzsche says, "drives music out of tragedy with the scourge of its syllogism; that is, it destroys the essence of tragedy, which can be interpreted only as a manifestation of projection into images of Dionysian states, as the visible symbolizing of music, as the dream-world of a Dionysian intoxication" (B.T., Sec. 15, p. 92).

The Wagnerian opera, Nietzsche thought, was a rebirth of the spirit of music as a basis for and an integral part of tragedy.

O'Neill's plays are full of music and songs, which should be seen in relation to Nietzsche's view of music as an integral part of tragedy.

In The Great God Brown, for instance, Cybel has a player piano, which is "groggily banging out a sentimental meddley of "Mother-Mammy" tunes," she tells Dion (G.G.B., Act I, Sc. 3, p. 329). Cybel being a nature goddess, her music is

Dionysian in a Nietzschean sense, "I love those rotten old sob tunes," she tells Dion, "they make me wise to people. That's what's inside them--what makes them love and murder their neighbor--crying jags set to music." And Dion answers: "every song is a hymn. They keep trying to find the World in the Beginning" (G.G.B., Act II, Sc.1, p.335). Like Cybel, Cora--one of the three prostitutes in The Iceman Cometh--plays an old tune to Harry Hope "The sunshine of Paradise Alley."

Folk song, Nietzsche claims, should be regarded as "the original melody," a musical mirror of the world, and "every period rich in folk songs has been most violently stirred by Dionysian currents" (B.T., Sec.6, p.53). The drunk stokers in The Hairy Ape forget fighting to sing "Whiskey Johnny," and Paddy comments, "'Tis only when I'm dead to the world I'd be wishful to sing at all" (H.A., Sc.I, p.42). The two chanty-men in Mourning Becomes Electra contrast the Puritan Mannons' contempt for life. In The Emperor Jones the drum beats are associated with "the normal pulse beat" (E.J., Sc.1, p.14)--life itself-- and "the whole spirit and meaning" of the "Congo Witch-Doctor's dance becomes Brutus Jones' spirit" (E.J., Sc.7, p.32). In Lazarus Laughed the Dionysian spirit of music is brought out not only in the dance music played by Lazarus' followers on flutes, but also in Lazarus' contagious laughter.

This exceedingly high frequency of musical elements in O'Neill's plays is almost always associated with drinking, which points out the Dionysian intoxication Nietzsche describes in The Birth of Tragedy, and, I think, another "supra-historical" element in the plays.

Parallel to the use of masks and the spirit of music, O'Neill envisages the power of fate, which emerges from family tides

in Mourning Becomes Electra; from the Biological past in The Hairy Ape; from an ancestral spirit in The Emperor Jones; from man's struggle with nature in Bound East for Cardiff....

The fate of O'Neill's heroes resembles, in a way, the Greek "Moirai enthroned above gods and men as eternal justice" (B.T., Sec. 9, 70), which symbolizes the metaphysical reconciliation for the violated order of the cosmos. In Greek tragedy, the violated order was symbolized by "the immeasurable suffering" of the bold "individual" on the one hand, and "the divine predicament and intimation of the twilight of the gods," on the other (B.T., Sec. 9, p. 70), with the final tragic flaw of the hero as the only free and responsible agent of his own fate. O'Neill finds in the power of the unconscious the modern equivalent of the gods, the Dionysian strength which expresses the power of nature; in the ego, the rational world which attempts to assert itself and to surpass the unconscious needs. The Mannons' conscious sense of justice, for instance, and their attempt to subjugate the sex instinct lead them to family destruction, to death.

The unconscious is always an irrational force, the "supra-historical" element which stands beyond good and evil, as Lazarus tells Caligula, "You are so proud of being evil! What if there is no evil? What if there are only health and sickness?" (L.L., Act IV, Sc. 1, p. 469). The conscious ego, on the other hand, is always a rational force, a social, moral, or scientific illusion, which constitutes the "historical" element of the play and has a survival value for the character. We assumed, quoting Nietzsche in the beginning of this chapter, that the "historical" and "unhistorical" run together, and are equally needed for the health and life of an individual. Therefore, we may conclude that O'Neill's symbolism is finally perfectly met. The "unhistorical" and

"unhistorical" psychologically correspond to the conscious ego; philosophically and historically, to the Apollonian world of illusion. The "supra-historical" psychologically corresponds to the unconscious; philosophically and historically, to the Dionysian world of suffering.

NOTES ON CHAPTER THREE

1. In 1922 Clark asked O'Neill whether he had made use of German Expressionism to write The Hairy Ape and The Emperor Jones. O'Neill answered that the first Expressionistic play he ever saw "was Kaiser's From Morn to Midnight," produced in New York in 1922, after he had written both The Emperor Jones and The Hairy Ape.
Clark, Barret H. Eugene O'Neill: The Man and his Plays, p.83
2. Falk, Doris V. Eugene O'Neill and the Tragic Tension, p.66
3. See Chapter One, p.8
4. Cargil, Oscar. O'Neill and his Plays, p.125
5. Ibid., p. 125
6. Clark, Barret H. Op.cit., p.84
7. Ibid., p.106
8. Cargil, Oscar. Op.cit., p.117.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE SUPRA-HISTORICAL VALUE OF THE ETERNAL RECURRENCE

Nietzsche considered the eternal recurrence idea "the most scientific of all possible hypothesis" (Kaufmann, p. 282), and he himself "the last disciple of the philosopher Dionysus ... the teacher of eternal recurrence" (Kaufmann, p. 279). O'Neill, whose enthusiasm for Nietzsche remains indisputable, gave emotional expression to the doctrine in his plays. Our aim in this chapter is to emphasize the "supra-historical" meaning of the doctrine, either to Nietzsche or O'Neill, and the Playwright's different approach to it.

Nietzsche became aware of the importance of the eternal recurrence of everything in his later philosophy, but he did not leave any substantial argument to demonstrate its metaphysical truth. So, it may be outlined from his previous writings.

In The Birth of Tragedy, Nietzsche stated that "the existence of the world is justified only as an aesthetic phenomenon" (B.T., "Attempt at a Self-Criticism," p. 22); in the Meditation about History that "the goal of humanity cannot lie in the end but only in its highest specimens" (Kaufmann, pp. 126-27); and that the "supra-historical man does not envisage salvation in the process;" but, for him, "the world is finished in every single moment and its end attained" (Kaufmann, p. 276). These concepts, as Kaufmann points out, suggest Nietzsche's denial of indefinite progress, and the possible infinite value of the moment and the individual, who can live "supra-historically."

In The Gay Science, Nietzsche presents the thought of the eternal recurrence not as a truth but as an experiment:

"How if some day or night, a demon were to sneak you into your loneliness and say to you: "This life, as you

now live it and have lived it, you will have to live once more and innumerable times more; and there will be nothing new in it, but every pain and every joy and every thought and sign... must return to you— all in the same succession and sequence— even this spider moonlight between the trees, even this moment and myself. The eternal hourglass of existence is turned over and over— a dust grain of dust!" Would you not throw yourself down and gnash your teeth and curse the demon who spoke thus? Or have you once experienced a tremendous moment when you would have answered him: "you are a god and never did I hear anything more godlike!" If this thought were to gain possession of you, it would change you as you are, or perhaps crush you. The question in it and everything, "do you want this once more and innumerable times more?" would weigh upon your actions as the greatest stress. Or how well disposed you would have to become to yourself and to life to crave nothing more fervently than this ultimate eternal confirmation...? " (1)

Definitely, Nietzsche rejects here the idea of indefinite progress, for the individual would live this moment, just the same, "innumerable times more." The consequences which interest us here, are, first of all, the infinite value of this moment; after, its "supra-historical" meaning; finally, the rejection of a possible after life.

This moment has a "supra-historical" meaning because it is timeless. If it were related to time, the "historical", the individual would remember it, for the "historical" is linked to the faculty of memory. On the other hand, the idea of recurrence does not confer any extra-value, or supernatural dignity, to the individual— "a dust grain of dust"— as it implicitly negates the possibility of an after life better than this one. Nietzsche, however, thought at the time that the psychological consequences of the doctrine would crush the weak, but not the strong (the highest specimens), whose creed follows Zarathustra's: "I beseech you, my brothers, remain faithful to the earth and do not believe those who speak to you of other-wordly-hopes" (Z., Part IV, Sec. 5, p. 279).

Although the doctrine of eternal recurrence does not confer any supernatural value, Nietzsche thought that the overman--the man who has organized the chaos of his passions and integrated every feature of his character, redeeming even the ugly, as Kaufmann says, by giving it a meaning in a beautiful totality"--would realize the cosmological integration of his own being, and by affirming his own being he would also affirm all that is, has been or will be. The conscious aspect of this affirmation brings not only a profound feeling of power, but the ultimate attainment of joy too, "for all joy wants--eternity," Zarathustra says, "...you higher men, do learn this, joy wants eternity. Joy wants eternity of all things, wants deep, wants deep eternity!" (Z., Part IV, Sec. 19, p. 429).

Although Kaufmann recognizes in this affirmation "the ultimate apotheosis of the supra-historical outlook, the supreme exaltation of the moment," we may add that it does not contain a philosophical explanation of the doctrine, which indicates that Nietzsche was not primarily concerned with the theoretical content of it. Perhaps, as Arthur Danto points out, the most detailed statement of it may be found in Nietzsche's Nachgelassene Werke:

"The total amount of energy is limited, not "infinite:" let us be aware of such excesses in concepts! Consequently, the number of states (lagen), combinations, changes, and transformations (Entwicklungen) of this energy is tremendously great and practically immeasurable, but in any case finite and not infinite. But the time through which this total energy works is infinite. That means the energy is forever the same and forever active. An infinity has already passed away before this present moment. That means that all possible transformations must already have taken place. Consequently, the present transformation is a repetition, and, thus also that which gave rise to it, and that which arises from it, and so backward and forward again! Insofar as the totality of states of energy always recurs, everything

has happened innumerable times..."(2).

If we assume that energy is "forever active" we may also assume an active principle in the universe. For Nietzsche this basic principle is force, or strength, or power. A force, however, can only be conceived in relation to another force, which makes us believe that the universe, the phenomenal, is a tremendous complex of interrelated forces. But this does not mean that two forces must be identical. Nietzsche thought they are essentially different, and he called this differential element "Will."

If we assume that energy is finite, as Ivan Soll, points out, in a "finite space" and "infinite time," it might follow that only a "finite number of configurations of the power quanta is possible." In this case, either an end state must be reached or the same configuration must eventually be repeated and recurs eternally. (3) Nietzsche thought that "if the world could in any way become rigid, dry, dead, nothing, or if it had any kind of goal that involved duration, immutability the once-and-for-all (in short, speaking metaphysically: if becoming could resolve itself into being or nothingness), then this state must have been reached." (4) But Nietzsche argues: "Had an equilibrium of forces ever once been reached, it would still be the case. Thus it has never occurred. The present situation (of change) contradicts that assumption." (5)

By this argument, Nietzsche thinks of recurrence as the identical and cyclical repetition of things and events. Obviously, this repetition is impossible within the course of known history, but inevitable from one cycle of history to another, as one cycle of history is completely and identically repeated by another. Because recurrence is impossible within the course of known history, we cannot remember anything

about our previous recurrences, although the present action has already be repeated innumerable times. So, we may conclude that Nietzsche's eternal recurrence takes place in time but not in history, that is, not in known history as a phenomenon of the individual, or collective unconscious of mankind, therefore, it is a "supra-historical" symbol.

From the above considerations we are finally able to consider how O'Neill expressed the doctrine of recurrence in his plays. First of all, unlike Nietzsche and perhaps driven by the necessity of emotional expression, O'Neill approached the idea of recurrence "historically," that is, he used a phenomenal symbolism to convey the meaning of it. On the other hand, the eternal becoming idea is not a constant theme throughout O'Neill's plays. He suggested it in his earlier plays about the sea; expressed it fully in his middle period when it did his best to restore Dionysus to the stage; after Lazarus Laughed, however, the eternal recurrence idea deserves a secondary place in the Playright's writings. But in his last play published, A Long Day's Journey into Night, O'Neill takes the theme back again. *

At the end of Bound East For Cardiff, O'Neill's first play produced, Yank, the dying sailor and protagonist, is comforted by the vision of a woman. In later plays, except The Emperor Jones, the idea of recurrence is always associated to a woman's image or to nature. This association helps us to point out an important feature in O'Neill's idea of the eternal recurrence: its relation to Dionysus, the god of recurring seasons, of birth and death as eternal process.

In The Emperor Jones, the idea of recurrence is suggested twice. First when Brutus Jones has a mystical experience in the Cogo scene,

* This play will be analysed in our last chapter.

"What-- what is I doin'? What is-- dis place? Seems like I know dat tree-- an' dam stones-- an' de river. I remember-- seems like I been heah befo'" (E.J., Sc. 7, p. 31).

Second, by the fact that Jones performs a full cycle in his running through the forest during the night. He is found in the morning lying down at the same spot he entered the wood.

Jones' cyclical movement and his recognition of the place suggests not only the cyclical recurrence of everything, but it also suggests O'Neill's rejection of an indefinite progress idea, in a Zarathustrian sense,

"I come back not for a new life, or a better life, but back eternally unto this one and the same life and the smallest thing" (Z., Part III, Sec. 13, p. 327).

Brutus Jones' mystical vision is repeated by Juan Ponce de Leon in The Fountain (1921). * Ponce de Leon is first presented as a young noble man from Granada, hungry for action, wealth and fame. After having a love affair with a lady and a quarrel with her husband-- in order to take retribution back and to seek new fortunes-- Juan joins Columbus on his second voyage to the East, that was to end with the discovery of America.

Twenty years later, Juan has realized all his ambitions. He has been appointed the Governor of Puerto Rico; he has become a wealthy man well known either in the New or the Old Worlds for his great military deeds and the conquest of new lands for Spain. But now his old aims and victories seem meaningless, and he cannot find anything to take its place. With the arrival from Spain of Beatriz, the beautiful daughter of the woman Juan had a love affair with twenty years ago, he is reawakened to action. The old man falls in love with Beatriz,

* The quotations here are taken from Falk, V. Doris, Eugene O'Neill and the Tragic Tension, because I could only get a copy of the play in Portuguese.

and the dream of youth seizes him. He tortures a captive Indian for the secret of the Fountain, whose rumor has spread abroad: from it he will drink and renew his youth. In the jungles of the newly discovered Florida, the Indians have set a trap for him and his followers. As Juan kneels beside a spring, that he thinks is the Fountain of Youth, he is wounded by an Indian's arrow and left for dead. As he lies down semiconsciously in the mist around the fountain, the figure of an old woman appears to him from the mist. When she steps aside, Beatriz appears singing the life song of the first part of the play:

Love is a flower
 Forever blooming.
 Life is a fountain
 Forever leaping
 Upward to catch the golden sunlight,
 Striving to reach the azure heaven;
 Failing, falling,
 Ever returning
 To kiss the earth that the flower may live" (Part I, sc.1)

After Beatriz' apparition, some other figures rise in the fountain and join hands. Juan becomes confused. He cannot understand the riddle. A last vision takes place, it is an old woman. As she beckons to him, Juan goes to her, but as he touches her hands, "her mask of age disappears. She is Beatriz"

Juan finally understands the meaning of everything, "Beatriz! Age— Youth are the same rhythm of eternal life!" (6)

And he addresses to the Fountain:

"I see! Fountain Everlasting, time without end!
 Soaring flame of the spirit transfiguring Death! All is within! All things dissolve, flow on eternally! O aspiring fire of life, sweep the dark soul of man! Let us burn in thy unity!... O God, Fountain of Eternity, thou art the All in One, the One in All— the Eternal Becoming which is Beauty!" (Part III, Sc.10)

After this revelation, Juan lives for a short while in a

Monastery. When he lies dying, Beatriz comes to him, bringing her boy friend, Juan's nephew. In him she has found again the young Ponce de Leon of old whom her mother had taught her to adore. While Juan dies, the young couple sings the fountain song, and Juan affirms life in the eternal becoming of everything:

"... I am that song! One must accept, absorb, give back, become a symbol! Juan Ponce de Leon is past! He is resolved into the thousand moods of beauty that make up happiness.... Oh, Fountain of Eternity, take back this drop, my soul!" (Part III, Sc.10).

That all things recur becomes plain from the above quotations, but what may not be wholly understandable is its relation to Nietzsche's thought.

First of all, O'Neill's cosmology in the play involves the Apollonian and Dionysian symbols. Apollo is revealed in Juan's progress toward his own illusions of power and glory and fame and renewed youth, until he becomes a devout believer in eternal recurrence. The Dionysian world is symbolically represented by the "Fountain of Eternity" which expresses not only the oneness of everything, but, as Doris V. Falk points out, "it is equivalent in mind of the fecund cycles of nature and therefore expresses itself in natural symbols." So, Falk goes on, "when Juan recognizes the relationship between the flower that dies so that another may bloom, and the youth and old age cycle of Beatriz (and later, of himself);" when he realizes the cosmological integration of his own being by accepting the eternal becoming, "he has placed man back into the context of the natural world from which he was alienated in The Hairy Ape." (7) Consequently, Juan rejects a supernatural life, and, like the overman, becomes a symbol which is "resolved into the thousand moods of beauty that make up happiness." In this sense, birth and death and suffering have the same meaning for human life

as they have for nature. They are "supra-historical" symbols of the eternal process of growth.

Juan Ponce de Leon's dying revelation discloses to him that his individual soul will be absorbed like a drop by the Fountain of Eternity—Life—and that, as part of the Fountain, it will eternally reccur, "O Fountain of Eternity, take back this drop, my soul!" Zarathustra uses the same imagery for his identical longing:

"O heaven over me.... You are looking on? You are listening to my strange soul? When will you drink this drop of dew which has fallen upon all earthly things? When will you drink this strange soul? When, well of eternity? Cheerful, dreadful abyss of noon! When will you drink my soul back into yourself?" (Z., Part IV, Sec. 10, p. 390).

Pnce de Leon, like the highest specimens of mankind, becomes a symbol. As a symbol, he embodies the "supra-historical" man who does not envisage salvation in the process, but in "his fusion with the primal being" (B.T., Sec. 8, p. 65). On the other hand, the whole symbolism also suggests O'Neill's dependence on the myth of Dionysus, who teaches that all the sorrow in the world comes from the splitting up of Nature into individual beings; who promises a return to universal oneness and assures us of the joy behind phenomena.

Juan's mystical rebirth into eternal life means primarily the end of individuation and suffering; next, that life, though its everlasting flowing, is undestructibly pleasurable at the bottom; and finally, that the world can only be justified as an "aesthetic phenomenon"— "the Eternal Becoming which is Beauty"— and man, as " a work of art" (B.T., Sec. 1, p. 37).

O'Neill's Dionysian vision of recurrence is more fully carried out in The Great God Brown. Dion Anthony is the central representative of the conflict Juan Ponce de Leon felt in himself. But Dion's conflict is a more crucial one. Dion needs a mask to protect himself which indicates both his

inner and outer conflict, as we have stated earlier.

As the play opens, Dion's quest for Dionysian wholeness, after experiencing love with Margaret, is threatened by the moral world which increases his intuition of suffering which is caused by individuation. He affirms the everlasting meaning of that moment, but the "Anthony principle" makes him feel guilty:

"I love, you love, we love! Come! Rest! Relax! Let go your clutch on the world! Dim and dimmer! Fading out in the past behind! Gone! Death! Now! Be born! Awake! Live! Dissolve into dew-- into silence-- into night-- into earth-- into space-- into peace-- into meaning-- into joy-- into God-- into the Great God Pan! (While he has been speaking, the moon has passed gradually behind a black cloud, its light fading out. There is a moment of intense blackness and silence. Then the light gradually comes again. Dion's voice, at first in a whisper, then increasing in volume with the light, is heard) Wake up! Time to get up! Time to exist! Time for school! Time to learn! Learn to pretend! Cover your nakedness! Learn to lie! Learn to keep step! Join the procession! Great Pan is dead! Be ashamed!" (Prologue, 318)

From such a monosyllabic context, we are definitely able to relate O'Neill's idea of recurrence to Nietzsche's earlier philosophy, mainly to the myth of Dionysus, the God of fertility. Perhaps we should admit that the playwright needs a more concrete symbolism than the philosopher to express "Life in terms of lives" or to express the "Force behind" the phenomenal world. Therefore, O'Neill's imagery always approaches the "historical," but his symbolism has a "supra-historical" connotation. Let's take, for instance, the symbolical relation of the idea of eternal recurrence to the image of a woman-- Beatriz, in The Fountain; Margarete and Cybel, in The Great God Brown; Miriam, in Lazarus Laughed-- or the recurring seasons of the year, which point out O'Neill's empirical view of the cyclical myth of fertility the Greeks celebrated in the Dionysian festivals. This marks a major difference

between the Philosopher's doctrine and the Playwright's view of it. The former emphasizes the total state of all forces that constitutes a cycle and its psychological consequences for the individual; the later, the individual cycle of birth and death. Nietzsche's approach goes from the "supra-historical" to the "historical;" O'Neill's, from the "historical" to the "supra-historical." *

The Great God Brown, for instance, follows a seasonal pattern in its structure. The action begins in the Spring, goes on through each one of the other seasons, and in the final scene Spring returns in Mother Cybel's words:

"Always spring comes again bearing life! Always again! Always, always forever again!— Spring again— life again— summer and fall and death and peace again!" (G.G.B., Act IV, Sc.2, p.375).

Then as if considering individuation as the primal cause of evil she adds with agonized sorrow:

"But always, always, love and conception and birth and pain again— spring bearing the intolerable chalice of life again! (G.G.B., Act IV, Sc.2, p.375).

But here sorrow gives place to an "agonized exultance" when she recognizes that, in spite of the flux of phenomena, life is infinitely powerful: "— bearing the glorious, blazing crown of life again!" (G.G.B., Act IV, Sc.2, p.375).

O'Neill, like Nietzsche, that the joyful and courageous acceptance of eternal recurrence holds a redeeming power for the individual, and that it even points the way toward his eventual transcendence. Billy Brown's last words, for instance, are not words of lamentation or self-pity. As he approaches death, his words rise with the wisdom of Lazarus:

* Nietzsche recognized his doctrine of the eternal recurrence in earlier philosophers. He quotes Pythagoras, the Stoics and Heraclitus (See Kaufmann, p.274-75). Doris V. Falk tells us that O'Neill's idea of recurrence may not be traced only in his reading of Nietzsche, but also in his reading of Lao-tse, Strindberg, Jung and Schopenhauer.

"The laughter of Heaven sows earth with a rain of tears, and out of Earth's transfigured birth-pain the laughter of Man returns to bless and play again in innumerable dancing gales of flame upon the knees of God" (G.G.B., Act IV, Sc.2,p.374).

The symbolism of recurrence may be also found in O'Neill's exploration of some apparently Freudian themes, like Eben's love for Abbie or Dion's for Margaret. We say apparently Freudian themes, for O'Neill's owes a lot to Nietzsche's principle that individuation—symbolical separation from the mother—is the source of suffering, which is represented by the everlasting cycles of existence: birth and death, growth and decay. Thus Eben only accepts Abbie's love when she identifies herself with his mother,

"Don't cry, Eben! I'll take your Maw's place! I'll be everythin' she was t' ye! Let me kiss ye, Eben!... Don't be afeered! I'll kiss ye pure, Eben—same 's if I was a Maw t' ye—an' ye kin kiss me back 's if yew was my son—my boy—sayin' good-night t' me! Kiss me, Eben!" (D.E., Part II, Sc.3, p.178).

Eben's acceptance of love, symbolically his return to the womb, suggests the Dionysian "oneness" which is prior to individuation.

Margaret, in The Great God Brown, falls in love with Dion's mask and she, also in a symbolical way, is willing to give birth again to Dion(ysus): "And I'll be Mrs. Dion—Dion's wife—and he'll be my Dion—my little Dion—my baby" (G.G.B., Prologue, p.314). Dion feels as if he has returned to the womb; with a mystical feeling of joy he celebrates the end of individuation, and the restoration of the "Primordial Oneness" existing in Nature: "Her arms are softly around me! She is warmly around me! She is my skin! She is my armour! Now, I am born—I—the I!—One and indivisible—I who love Margaret!" (G.G.B., Prologue, p.316).

But Margaret is able to accept Dion only in the guise of his corrupted mask, and when he reveals himself without it, she rejects him; then, Dion goes to Mother Cybel or Mother Earth. In her arms Dion seeks death and rebirth again. But when he realizes that life is only meaningful and joyful within the process of eternal becoming, he longs for death, "you've given me strength to die" (G.G.B., Act II, Sc.1, p.337). Mother Cybel answers in an apothotic affirmation of the eternal becoming, "I've— just— seen— something. I'm afraid you're going away a long, long ways. I'm afraid I won't see you again for a long, long time" (G.G.B., Act II, Sc.1, p.339).

Cybel suggests Nietzsche's "supra-historical" outlook of recurrence: she assures Dion they will meet again in the recurrence of this same cycle. Cybel must also be understood as a symbol, perhaps, the feminine counterpart of Dionysus as it is expressed in O'Neill's Lazarus Laughed.

Lazarus, as we have already pointed out earlier, has long been recognized by the critics as a reencarnation of Dionysus. What we have not emphasized enough, however, is his relation to the idea of the eternal recurrence.

First of all, like Dionysus, Lazarus is reborn and testifies to the possibility of resurrection. Like Dionysus, he becomes a Savior who preaches Zarathustra's gospel. Unlike Zarathustra, however, his life does not testify to Nietzsche's idea of recurrence. Zarathustra says that the individual comes back "eternally unto this one and same life" (Z., Part III, Sec. 13, p.327). Lazarus, we are told at the beginning of the play, was, in his previous life, "a bad farmer, a poor breeder of sheep," who longed for death as the only way to escape misfortune, "I have known my fill of life and the sorrow of living. Soon I shall know peace... and she smiled" (L.L., Act I, Sc.1, p.384). One of the guests comments that it was the first time he had seen Lazarus smile in years. Obviously, this aged

Lazarus does not resemble the one who resurrects the dead "by laughter" and preaches "Eternal Life." We must have in mind, however, that O'Neill's idea of recurrence is supported by Nietzsche's earlier philosophy, rather than by Nietzsche's later one.

The main symbolism of recurrence in Lazarus Laughed follows the same patterns of The Fountain and The Great God Brown. It is suggested by the recurring seasons of the year; Miriam's image; and Lazarus' symbolical return to the womb.

The theme of recurring seasons is suggested in Lazarus' entrance in Athens. Lazarus is physically described as Dionysus reincarnated,

"the soul of recurring seasons, of living and dying as processes in eternal growth, of the wine of life stirring forever in the sap and blood and loam of things" (L.L., Act II, Sc.1, p.414).

His followers, young men and women, "all have wreaths of ivy in their hair and flowers in their hands" (L.L., Act II, Sc.1, p.414); while the chorus of Greeks, seven in number, "are clad in goat skins... in imitation of the old followers of Dionysus" (L.L., Act II, Sc.1, p.406).

Cybel has been repeatedly described in The Great God Brown as an "Idol of Earth;" Miriam, Lazarus' wife, is first described as "a statue of a Woman, of eternal acceptance of the compulsion of motherhood, the inevitable cycles of love into pain into joy into separation and pain again and the loneliness of age" (L.L., Act I, Sc.1, p.382). As the play progresses Miriam grows older, while Lazarus' grows younger. Symbolically, Miriam becomes Lazarus' mother; and Lazarus, Miriam's son.

This is a relevant fact, because we are told at the beginning of the play that Lazarus' and Miriam's children died one after another. Only the last one was a boy and he died at birth. Now Miriam, like Margaret, is willing-- in a mystical way-- to give a new birth to Lazarus, the new Dionysus. The

boy who died at birth represents Lazarus; and Miriam, Lazarus' mother. Just before dying, Miriam fills the role of Lazarus' mother rather than of Lazarus' wife:

"Once I knew your laughter was my child, my son of Lazarus; but then it grew younger and I felt at last it had returned to my womb--and ever younger and younger--until, tonight, when I spoke to you (Lazarus) of home, I felt new birth-pains as your laughter, grown too young for me, flew back to the unborn--a birth so like a death!" (L.L., Act III, Sc. 2, p. 453).

Miriam's expression refers to birth and death as two inevitable complementaries of the eternal becoming process. The child who died at birth is compared with the man who is born at death. Thus, the child and the man becomes the same person, symbolically, they must be compared to Dionysus, who also died as a child and experienced a new rebirth each year.

With the idea of the eternal recurrence, O'Neill, like Nietzsche in Zarathustra, seems to have found an answer to death, and a psychological basis for man's joyful acceptance of life.

Lazarus thinks that what man calls evil is born from his fear of death, "Men call life death and fear it." But there is no evil, "there are only health and sickness" for those who believe in the endlessness of life in the universe. Man as dust is "eternal change and everlasting growth, and a high note of laughter soaring through the chaos from the deep heart of God! Be proud, O Dust!" (L.L., Act II, Sc. 1, p. 417). Because man thinks only in terms of his temporary form, rather than of the agelessness of his dust, he lives and dies of self-pity. If he could but say with Lazarus that-- "Millions of laughing stars are around me! And laughing dust, born once of a woman, now freed to dance! New stars are born of dust eternally" (L.L., Act III, Sc. 2, p. 455)-- then, he would believe in the joyful world of the eternal recurrence with the soft laughter of being and becoming, for "all joy wants deep, deep eternity" (Z., Part IV, Sec. 19, p. 429).

NOTES ON CHAPTER FOUR

1. Solomon, Robert C. Nietzsche: A Collection of Critical Essays, p. 327
2. Ibid., p.318
3. See Ivan Soll's article, "Reflections on Recurrence: A Re-examination of Nietzsche's Doctrine, Die Ewige Wiederkehr des Gleichen," in Solomon's Nietzsche: a Collection of Critical Essays, pp.321-42.
4. Ibid.,330
5. Ibid., 330
6. Quoted by Falk, Doris v. Eugene O'Neill and the Tragic Tension, pp.82-83
7. Ibid.,p.84

CHAPTER FIVE

THE FALSE SUPERMAN AND THE STATE

In our previous chapter we related Apollo and Dionysus to the "historical" and the "supra-historical." We also suggested that the Dionysian theme in O'Neill's plays, especially in the eternal recurrence idea, realizes a symbolical integration of the "historical" and the "supra-historical." In this chapter we are going to see how "the false superman" and the "State" resemble the "historical" and why they have been equally condemned by Nietzsche and O'Neill.

Nietzsche thought that the phenomenal world is the expression of a basic drive, the will to power.

"Wherever I found the living," Zarathustra says, "there I found the will to power.... Only where there is life, there is also will: not will to life but will to power. There is much that life esteems more highly than life itself; but out of the esteeming itself speaks the will to power" (Z., Part I, Sec. 12, p. 226-28).

If the will to power is the ultimate expression of all living beings, then we must admit that all psychological phenomena are reducible to the will to power; and that power is the standard and measure of values. What matters here are the psychological implications of such a theory for human life.

Nietzsche recognized two basic tendencies in man's struggle for power. On the one hand stand those who look for a goal beyond themselves; on the other hand, those who want self-mastery. Nietzsche was particularly bitter against the first, and even identified them with the animal; while he praised the latter class as the true representatives of mankind.

"I teach you the overman," Zarathustra says. "Man is something that shall be overcome. What have you done to overcome him?"

All beings so far have created something beyond themselves; and do you want to be the ebb of this great flood and even go back to the beasts rather than overcome man? What is the ape to man? A laughing stock or a painful embarrassment. And man shall be just that for the overman: a laughingstock or a painful embarrassment. You have made your way from worm to man, and much in you is still worm. Once you were apes, and even now, man is more ape than any ape" (Z., Prologue, p.124).

Zarathustra's remark emphasizes that in terms of human worth or dignity there is no essential difference between man and animal. What elevates man is self-mastery, which, according to Kaufmann's interpretation of Nietzsche, "consists in the sublimation of their (men's) impulses, in the organization of the chaos of their passions, and in man's giving "style" to his own character" (Kaufmann, p.219). But Nietzsche realized that the mass of mankind instead of perfecting themselves craves for worldly power, which he repudiated as harmful:

"I have found strength where one does not look for it: in simple, mild, and pleasant people, without the least desire to rule—and, conversely, the desire to rule has often appeared to me as a sign of inward weakness: they fear their own slave soul and shroud it in a royal cloak; (in the end, they still become the slaves of their followers, their fame, etc.). The powerful natures dominate, it is a necessity, they need not lift one finger. Even if, during their life time, they bury themselves in a garden house" (See Kaufmann, p.219).

Nietzsche was also bitter against those who seek for wealth:

"Behold the superfluous! They gather riches and become poorer with them. They want power and first the level of power, much money—the impotent paupers!" (Z., Part I, Sec. 11, p.162).

Nietzsche saw the source of this search for wealth, power, in

personal weakness:

"The weak, lacking the power for creation,... unable to gain mastery of themselves, seek to conquer others. Men dedicate their lives to the accumulation of riches; nations make wars to enslave other nations" (See Kaufmann, p.224).

Nietzsche also thought that the lack of power is dangerous for human characters, because the weak needs to convince himself and the others of his power by inflicting hurt, as Nietzsche says in The Dawn: "Only the weak man wishes to hurt and to see the signs of suffering" (Quoted by Kaufmann, p.167).

O'Neill's depiction of those who seek after wealth or worldly power-- for us the false superman-- always reflects these Nietzschean ideas. On the other hand, the falso superman-- also called the "Alexandrine man" in The Birth of Tragedy, or the "historical man" in Nietzsche's Meditation about History-- unlike Dion who lacked an Apollonian counterpart, a "skin," to his Dionysian tendencies, lacks a Dionysian counterpart to his Apollonian dreams. To illustrate our point of view, let us begin with The Emperor Jones.

Two facts at the beginning of the play make us think that O'Neill is concerned with exploring the false superman. The first is related to Jones' name Brutus. The Roman Brutus conspired against Caesar; Brutus Jones is the victim of a conspiracy. The second is related to the fact that Brutus Jones is sleeping when he is first presented to us.

Nietzsche praised the Roman Brutus, as he is presented by Shakespeare, for his integrity and self-overcoming which involves a measure of suffering and also of cruelty, not only in his individual's relations to others but also in his attitude toward himself,

"Independence of the soul-- that is at stake here! No sacrifice can then be too great; one dearest friend even one must be willing to sacrifice for it, to be yet the

most glorious human being embellishment of the world, genius without peer" (Quoted by Kaufmann, p.212).

Nietzsche, however, would not praise Brutus Jones, and O'Neill, purposely or not, calls the reader's attention to the fact that the Emperor is sleeping when he is first presented in the play, while an old negro woman peers into the chamber of the Royal Palace. Although he is sleeping, Jones' description some pages further on is suitably imperial, and it makes us think of the superman,

"Jones enter from the right. He is tall, powerfully-built, full-blooded negro of middle age. His features are typically negroid, yet there is something decidedly distinctive about his face—an underlying strength of will, a hardy, self-reliant confidence in himself that inspires respect. His eyes are alive with a keen, cunning intelligence. In manner he is shrewd, suspicious, evasive. He wears a light blue uniform coat,... yet, there is something not altogether ridiculous about his grandeur. He has a way of carrying it off" (E.J., Sc.1, p.5).

Jones' first words fit the Emperor, too, but not the superman, for they betray his desire to be a master of others, "who dare whistle dat way in my palace? Who dare wake up de Emperor? I'll git hide frayled off some o' you niggers sho'!" (E.J., Sc.1, p.6).

As the play progresses, however, O'Neill shows us Jones' craving for political and economical power. It indicates that Jones was not a master of himself, so he needed to pass strong laws, he needed the charm of the "silver bullet," and big talking to sustain his power.

SMITHERS.... Look at the taxes you've put on 'em. Blimey!

you've squeezed 'em dry!

JONES.... No, dey ain't all dry yet. I'se till heah, ain't I?

SMITHERS.... And for me breakin' laws, you've broke 'em all yerself just as fast as yer made 'em.

JONES. Ain't I de Emperor? De laws don't go for him.... Ain't a man's talkin' what makes him big—long as

falks believe it?

.....
 JONES. Dawn tomorrow I'll be out at de oder side (of the wood) on de coast whar dat French gunboat is stayin'! She picks me up, takes me to Martinique when she go dar, and dere I is safe wid a mighty big bankroll in my jeans.... I's after de coin. ... And I's got little silver bullet o' my own, don't ofrgit! (E.J., Sc.1)

It is plain from the above quotations that Jones' power was not the power of the strong Nietzsche praised, but the power of the weak, who puts the whole of his faith in an Apollonian illusion to be able to live.

Wordly power, however, is powerless at the bottom, a sign of impotence, a disguised manifestation of fear. O'Neill expresses it in the second part of the play, when Jones runs through the forest. Because he was weak he could not overcome his own fears, and finally he is killed and carried naked by those he despized so much. In a way, they are promoted to Jones' place, who becomes naked, i.e., deprived of his power, or Apollonian illusions.

The same attitude of the rejection of the false "superman" O'Neill carries on against society in The Hairy Ape, through his central character, Yank.

Yank, according to O'Neill, is "every human being," and Doris Alexander in his article, "Eugene O'Neill as a Social Critic," points out that O'Neill faces Yank with three possible attitudes toward modern society. ⁽¹⁾ The first is represented by Yank's acceptance of the industrialized society, and his identification with it at the beginning of the play. The second, by Paddy's, the chantyman, longing for the days before society became industrialized, with "sun warming the blood of you, and wind over the miles of shiny green ocean like strong drink to your lungs. Work-- aye, hard work-- but who'd mind that at all? Sure you worked under the

sky and 'twas work wid skill and daring to it" (H.A., Sc.1, p. 46). (2) The third attitude toward industrialized society is represented by Long's and the I.W.W's—a socialist organization—* diagnosis of the modern state: "the structure of society is rotten," (3) and the cause is the economic system:

"They dragged us down 'til we're on'y wage slaves in the bowels of a bloody ship, sweatin', burnin' up, eatin' coal dust! Hit's them's ter blame—the damned Capitalis clarss!" (H.A., Sc.1, p.44) (4)

Long thinks that the way to defeat Capitalism is through the workers' social education, and the usage of legal means, like the vote:

"I wants to awaken yer bloody clarss consciousness. Then yer'll see it's 'er (Mildred's) clarss yer've got to fight, not 'er alone. There's a 'ole mob of 'em like 'er, Gawd blind 'em!...We must impress our demands through peaceful means—the votes of the on-marching proletarians of the bloody world!" (H.A., Sc.1, pp.68-69) (5).

At first Yank's agree with Paddy's longing for a natural, a Dionysian state, but he soon realizes it is an illusion, "...dat's all right. On'y it's dead, get me?" (H.A., Sc.1, p.47). At the end of the play, however, Yank tries to go back to this natural state, but he is killed by the Dionysian gorilla.

Yank's feeling of belonging, as we stated in our first chapter, is shaken by Mildred's appearance. After that incident he could no more think of himself as a strong physical power, and he accepts Long's social diagnosis, although he does not agree with Long's solution for it, as Doris Alexander says:

"O'Neill, through Yank, agrees with Long's diagnosis of the social problem, but not with his solution to it, nor with his method of achieving a solution. The one idea of Long's that Yank's accept is the idea that he is enslaved

* Doris Alexander tells us that "O'Neill's reading of Marx is evident in his analysis of the material evils of the capitalist state, but it was his reading of Nietzsche that determined his most consistent criticism of the state—its spiritual sterility." See also Clark, pp.14,25.

by capitalism. To Long's comment on Mildred's father, "Er old man's bleedin' millionaire, a bloody Capitalist! ...'E makes arf the bloody steel in the world! 'E owns this bloody boat! And you and me, Comrades, we're 'is slaves!" Yank replies not with his usual contempt for Long, but with bewilderment, "Is all dat straight goods?" By the end of this scene, Yank shows that he accepts Long's statement, by saying, "She grinds de organ and I'm on de string, huh?" Yank's final analysis of his relationship to Mildred's father is entirely in line with Long's: "Sure—her old man—president of de Steel Trust—makes half de steel in de world—steel—where I thought I belonged—drivin' trou—movin'—in dat—to make her— and cage me in for her to spit on! Christ!" In diagnosis at least, Doris Alexander adds, Yank agrees with Long and the I.W.W." (6).

The above commentaries suggest two further conclusions. The first, that O'Neill, through Yank, seems to believe that "the truly vicious effects of the capitalist state are not physical, but spiritual," (7) as Yank puts it referring to Mildred's "hinsults to our dignity as 'onest workers"(H.A., Sc.IV,p.61), or, as he says later in the play, "Dis ting's in your inside, but it ain't your belly" (H.A.,Sc.7,p.83). The second, that any struggle to change society is a false struggle, a hopeless hope, or an illusion, for it aims to change man's physical condition, which cannot give him any extra-value above the lower species. "Dey're in de wrong pew," Yank says— "de same old bull— soap-boxes and Salvation Army— no guts!" (H.A.,Sc.7,p.83).

O'Neill, like Nietzsche, rejects here not only the existing society—where the best adjusted workers look like "hairy apes," and the capitalist class, like a lifeless "procession of gaudy marionettes" (H.A.,Sc.5,p.69), but also the possibility of a better society, for Yank's last words quoted above refers first of all to the socialist organization, the I.W.W. In this sense, both Socialism and Capitalism become worthless illusions, because they represent the struggle to

gain what Nietzsche considered "worldly power," and do not help men to become self-masters. Thus, the State resembles the false superman. Both of them desire power of the world which is a sign of weakness. On the other hand, they may be said to be the counterpart of the "Dion principle" in The Great God Brown. Dion lacked an Apollonian "skin" to give his life a meaning; the false superman, like the State, lacks a Dionysian complement to balance his vain dreams of power. And this is a major point which helps us to affirm that O'Neill's criticism of the State approaches more Nietzsche's than Marx', for Nietzsche depicted the inner "sterility," the "souless conformity" caused by the State; while Marx, it materializes evils.

In The Great God Brown, O'Neill adds to the power of the State the power of the Church—the "life denying" principle—both embodied by William Brown, the false superman of the first part of the play. O'Neill's own comments on Brown states this criticism explicitly:

"Brown is the visionless demi-god of our new materialistic myth—a success—building his life of exterior things, inwardly empty and resourceless, an uncreative creature of superficial preordained social grooves, a by-product forced aside into slack waters by the deep main current of life-desire" (8).

Billy Brown's inward emptiness, caused by his living in a Puritan society, is symbolically represented by his incapacity to love, to be creative, and his life-long envy of his closest friend, Dion. In order to protect himself against the Puritan and the businessman Billy Brown, Dion had to design a mask for himself since he was a child, as he remembers it at his death-bed. Dion was drawing a figure on the sand, when Billy—the "boy's God"—kicked it out and hit Dion on the head. Since then Dion had to use a mask to protect himself against "the cruelty" of a Puritan society, represented

by William Brown. And Dion emphasizes just before dying, that it was not what Billy had done him-- the material evil-- that made him "cry," "but him," that is, Brown's spiritual sterility, or his inward evil. Dion calls that scene "a neutralizing of life forces," and, like Zarathustra, he advises Brown to escape from society, "Hate them! Fear thy neighbors as thyself! That's the leaden rule for the safe and sane" (G.G.B., Act II, Sc. 3, p. 346).

With Brown's stealing of Dion's mask, in the second part of the play, a new cycle begins. Like the boy Dion, Brown puts on a mask to protect himself against society. But the critical point is that Brown begins to question the "status quo," which he has served during his whole life. His craving for wealth and social success changes into a bitter mocking. He even tears up his design for the New State Capitol, while Cybel advises him to run from society:

"Then run, Billy, run! They (the cops who represent the coercive forces of society) are hunting for someone! ... They must find a victim! They've got to quiet their fears, to cast out their devils, or they never sleep soundly again! They've got to absolve themselves by finding a guilty one! They've got to kill someone now, to live! You're naked! You must be Satan! Run, Billy, run! They'll come here! I ran here to warn-- someone! So run away if you want to live!" (G.G.B., Act IV, Sc. 3, p. 372).

The evildoings of those who lack creative power-- the Dionysian life force-- is particularly emphasized in Cybel's context. Men, generally speaking, lack inner power. So they need to absolve their weakness by inflicting pains on someone, in this case Billy Brown, who has become the artist. But Brown's words point out not only his rejection of Capitalism, and his condemnation of the craving for wordly power, but they also sound as an absolution of himself,

"Welcome, dumb worshippers! I am your Great God Brown! I have been advised to run from you but it is my almighty

whim to dance into escape over your prostrate souls"
(G.G.B., Act IV, Sc. 3, p. 373).

This same criticism O'Neill carried out in Marco Millions, published in the same year as The Great God Brown, 1925.

In Marco Millions, O'Neill adds to his criticism of the State, the Church and the false superman, the criticism of the relations between states. He does it by placing Marco Polo in the legendary East and contrasting his values with those of a society superior to him in every respect—intellectually, culturally, spiritually—though Marco considers the Orientals as infidels.

In the Prologue, O'Neill shows us a Christian, a Persian and a Buddhist under the Sacred Tree discussing its origins. The three of them are business travellers more interested in exploiting each other than in any kind of brotherhood, according to the preaching of any religion. The Buddhist travels in Christian countries to sell "prayer beads;" the Persian Magian, in Arabian countries to sell an "Arab-block printed book," containing "one-thousand Arabian lies;" the Christian goes to Persia with "a whole fleet-load of goods." O'Neill suggests that commercial exploitation rather than spiritual life is the source of religious relations.

In the first scene, Marco Polo and Donata, his girl-friend, are introduced. Marco is a handsome boy of fifteen, whose future, like Billy Brown's, has already been planned for him by his father, Nicolo, and his uncle, Maffeo. Marco is supposed to be an explorer of the resources of the East. But Marco is, in a way still innocent. He promises Donata his love, and even writes her a poem before greeting her good-bye.

The second scene is spent in the Papal Legate's Palace at Acre, "a combination of Church and government building," where the Polos meet the Legate Tenaldo. Kublai-Khan, the King of

Cathay, has ordered the elder Polos to take one hundred Christian sages to Cambaluc for an open religious discussion. While they explain to Tenaldo the advantages of Kublai's conversion—"he is the richest king of the world"—Marco remains absent-minded "striving with all his might to compose a poem to Donata" (M.M., Act I, Sc. 2, p. 222). Maffeo, with a sudden motion, snatches the poem from his nephew's hands. Marco, like Dion when his picture on the sand was spoiled, begins to cry, while Tenaldo joins Nicolo and Maffeo in "a roar of laughter" (M.M., Act I, Sc. 2, p. 225). "You will be happier," Tenaldo comments, "as a Polo than as a poet" (M.M., Act I, Sc. 1, p. 225). Marco, like one caught in a sin, stamps on the paper and swears them he will never poetize again, "It was silly. Poetry's all stupid, anyway. I was only trying it for fun, to see if I could. You won't catch me ever being such a fool again" (M.M., Act I, Sc. 2, p. 225).

O'Neill's suggestion here is the same as in The Great God Brown. When Pan, the life-principle, is forbidden, it turns inward on itself and changes to guilt. Tenaldo's comment, however, sounds like an absolution, a commercial one; while Polo's repenting, like a retribution for his sin. So, Marco does not need to design a mask for himself; he uncritically accepts the commercial and religious code, an illusion he would follow all his life.

Just before the Polos leave the Papal Legate's Palace, an exhausted messenger brings Tenaldo the greatest news, he has been chosen to be the new Pope. "I come from the Conclave," the messenger says, "you were chosen. Your Holliness" (M.M., Act Act I, Sc. 2, p. 226). O'Neill suggests here that Christianity has the same evil purposes as the Capitalistic State, that is, to get money and worldly power.

As his Holliness does not have one hundred sages to send

to the Khan, he entrusted the mission to Marco Polo, "Master Marco can be my missionary" (M.M., Act I, Sc. 2, p. 227).

As the play progresses, O'Neill shows us the Polos' trip through Persia, India, Mongolia, and finally, Cathay, the Khan's Empire, where Marco lives for twenty years.

Marco has been appointed mayor of a large city, Yang-Chau. Like Brutus Jones, he enslaved the citizens, passing strong tax-laws to profit his own purse. When the sages and poets begin to escape from Yang-Chau, and the Khan received a petition accusing Marco of "endeavouring to stamp out their ancient culture," Kublai decides to deprive Marco of the cargo. In the Khan's presense, Marco boasts of the "unprecedented amount" of taxes he has "sweated out" of the local citizens, and explains how he has done it:

"My tax scheme, your Majesty, that got such wonderful results is simplicity itself. I simply reversed the old system. For one thing I found they had a high tax on excess profits. Imagine a profit being excess! Why, it isn't humanly possible! I repealed it. And I repealed the tax on luxuries. The tax wasn't democratic enough to make it pay! I crossed it off and I wrote on the statue books a law that taxes every man's pockets equally, be he beggar or banker! and I got results" (M.M., Act II, Sc. 1, p. 256).

In the eyes of the philosopher ruler, Kublai-Khan, and his court, Marco's political success is a gross failure, a sign of weakness and impotence, for it does not help man to improve themselves and to be self-masters.

"He (Marco) is beginning to weary me with his grotesque antics. A jester inspires mirth only so long as his deformity does not revolt one," the khan says. Marco's spiritual hump begins to disgust me. He has not even a mortal soul, he has only an acquisitive instinct. We have given him every opportunity to learn. He has memorized everything and learned nothing. He has lusted for everything and loved nothing. He is only a shrewd and crafty greed. I shall send him home to his native wallow" (M.M., Act II, Sc. 1, p. 255).

Marco, however, cannot understand Kublai's wisdom. He is a man of action, a false superman, in constant need of external activity to hide his inner weakness, "I hate idleness where there's nothing to occupy your mind but thinking.... I'm sure, I'd make a pretty dull person to have around if there wasn't plenty to do" (M.M., Act II, Sc. 1, p. 263).

O'Neill's false superman always avoids thinking and wants action, a sign of inner sterility. "I want action," Brutus Jones declared; and Yank in The Hairy Ape, "Tinkin' is hard;" the same happens to Marco Millions. It indicates that the false superman lacks soul and spirit, that is, interior life.

For this same reason, O'Neill offers in Marco Millions a mocking criticism of the democratic state; and it becomes clear from the play itself that his criticism is primarily directed toward the United States of America. O'Neill's ironic description, for instance, of Marco's entrance to Kublai's Palace, points it out:

"... preceded by a conscious cough, Marco Polo makes his entrance.... As he steps on he takes off his gilded, laced hat with its Bird of Paradise plumes and bows with a mechanical dignity on all sides. He has the manner and appearance of a successful movie star at a masquerade ball, disguised so that no one can fail to recognize him. His regular, good-looking, well-groomed face is carefully arranged into the grave responsibility expression of a Senator from the South of the United States of America about to propose an amendment to the Constitution restricting the migration of non-Nordic birds into Texas, or prohibiting the practice of the laws of biology within the twelve-mile limit" (M.M., Act II, Sc. 1, p. 255).

O'Neill's criticism of the state is thus determined by its spiritual sterility; and Doris Alexander points out how it resembles Nietzsche's, "Both O'Neill and Nietzsche believe that the state produces soulless conformity, that those who seek worldly power, money, do so out of inner weakness and sterility!" (9) No less significant, however, is O'Neill's

criticism of the relations between states.

Marco, taking advantage of some powder use in children's fire works, invented a clumsy cannon. He explains to Kublai how he conceived the idea of it, and what it is for. He conceived it while his uncle was reading "a prayer which spoke of our Lord as a Prince of Peace" (M.M., Act II, Sc. 1, p.258). It serves to gain peace and to end war, "there's only one workable way (to gain peace)," Marco says, "and that's to conquer everybody else in the world so they'll never dare fight you again!" (M.M., Act II, Sc.1, p.259).

O'Neill's irony becomes plain here. While the false superman, as Nietzsche says, "seeks to conquer others," the "nations make wars to enslave other nations," and Marco's unscrupulous commercial ethics calls this "peace." But the irony becomes more pignantly when Marco says he conceived his cannon while his uncle was praying. O'Neill, following Nietzsche, once again emphasizes his rejection of the state, the Church and the false superman because of their inner sterility, their Apollonian illusion of worldly power. In fact, what Marco really wants is to sell the Khan his new invention, "you become the bringer of peace on earth and goodwill to men, and it doesn't cost you a yen hardly. Your initial expense--my price--is as I can possibly make it out of my deep affection for your Majesty-- only a million yen" (M.M., Act II, Sc.1., p.260).

O'Neill's new irony points out the commercial purposes of wars, "wealth they acquire," Zarathustra says, "and become poorer thereby. Power they seek for, and above all, the level of power, much money-- these impotent ones!" ⁽¹⁰⁾ Apparently wars are fought to bring peace to the states, and the government makes people believe so. But O'Neill suggests that wars are a product to be sold, despite their tremendous power to

destroy life. What is important, Marco tells Kublai, is to "make people believe so" (M.M., Act II, Sc. 1, p. 258).

Marco's words echo Nietzsche's "perspectivism" of Human-All-Too-Human. In this work Nietzsche's view of the world verges on a mystical, ineffable vision of a primal, undifferentiated union, he expressed as the Dionysian depth in The Birth of Tragedy. Men will never reach the truth of such a depth, because it is an irrational, cosmic power out of the realms of reason. The best man can do is to build systems of concepts, mere Apollonian impositions upon the chaos. The Church and the State are the two best expressions of such systems, and the false superman, the best representative of the Church and the State, for he accepts their teaching uncritically, and what is worse-- as Marco puts it-- he makes people believe so. Any believing, however, is a perspective, an Apollonian illusion, which aims to extirpate man's instinctual, Dionysian power; and O'Neill, like Nietzsche, condemns it, condemning the false superman.

The khan, however, has already become disgusted with Marco's lack of inner life. He orders him to leave his frontiers and go back to Venice. But Kukachin, Kublai's daughter, has fallen in love with Marco. She is ready to live to Persia, to be married there, and begs the Khan to let Marco take her to the Prince of Persia. Marco accepts the job only after considering the good possibilities of trade in the ports along the way, the amount he would earn from Kublai and the Prince of Persia. Chu-yin, however, knowing that Kukachin would die love-starved if Marco did not perceive her love, asks him to look deeply into her eyes every day, and to "converse on love and marriage" with her.

After two years in the sea, they arrive in the harbor of Hormuz, Persia. Marco, the man of action, feels "something

queer," like Eben in Desire under the Elms, and "feverish" when he looks the last time into Kukachin's eyes:

"She throws her head back, her arms outstretched. He bends over and looks into her eyes. She raises her hands slowly above his head as if she were going to pull it down to hers. Her lips part, her whole being strains out to him. He looks for a moment critically, then he grows tense, his face moves hypnotically toward hers, their lips seem to meet in a kiss..." (M.M., Act II, Sc. 3, p. 279).

Meanwhile, the two elder Polos are counting money. Marco comes to himself and forgets Kukachin's Dionysian passion when he listens Maffeo saying, "One million in God's money" (M.M., Act II, Sc. 3, p. 280). Then she orders Marco to kneel down and asks Ghazan, the Prince of Persia, to bring a "chest of gold coins." She takes handfuls and throws them over the kneeling Polos, who—"surreptitiously"—snatch them, one by one. Finally, the Princess comments, "I implored an ox to see my soul! I no longer can endure the shame of living.... There is no soul even in your (Marco's) love better than a matting of swine" (M.M., Act III, Sc. 3, p. 280-81).

In the last scene, O'Neill tells us about Kukachin's death and burial, and about Marco's marriage with Donata, "in the Grand Chamber-of-commerce style." Marco is last shown making a speech to his friends about his success in the East, and about "the millions upon millions upon million of worms" which are employed in the silk business. Ironically, like Zarathustra, O'Neill suggests how much of worm there is still in man. "You have made your way from worm to man," Zarathustra says, "and much in you is still worm" (Z., Prologue, p. 124).

In Marco Millions, perhaps better than anything Nietzsche cites, O'Neill depicts the inner sterility of those who seek external power. Marco, first of all, resembles the "historical man," for his living in the immediate present and putting his faith in the future. He has no imagination for love, no secrets,

no fears, no passions or loneliness, he has only "an acquisitive instinct." Because Marco has a minimum of conscience, or because he seems to lack the unconscious Dionysian strength, he can accept life and his commercial ethic uncritically.

What is "acquisitive instinct" in Marco Millions becomes craving for political power in Lazarus Laughed. O'Neill makes it plain, first of all, in his description of the Roman Senate and Tiberius' Court.

The members of the Roman Senate "are all masked in the Roman mask, refined in them by nobility of blood but at the same time with strength degenerated, corrupted by tyranny and debauchery to an exhausted cynicism" (L.L., Act II, Sc. 2, p. 420). The masked members of Tiberius' youthful Court resemble the Senators, except for their accentuated sex inversion:

"There is a distinctive character to the mask of each sex, the stamp of an effeminate corruption on all the male, while the female have a bold, masculine expression. ...The whole effect of these two groups is of sex corruption and warped or invented lusts and artificial vices" (L.L., Act III, Sc. 2, p. 444).

The effect of all this corruption accentuates the spiritual sterility, "the strength degenerated" of all those who follow the state— "the coldest of all cold monsters," according to Zarathustra. But O'Neill is especially bitter about Caligula, Tiberius' heir:

Caligula's craving for political power is, above all, a compensation for his inward weakness and emptiness. His childish attributes and ape-like qualities point it out:

" His (Caligula's) body is bony and angular, almost malformed, with wide, powerful shoulders, and long arms and hands, and short, skinny, hairy legs like an ape's. ...Below his mask his own skin is of an anaemic transparent pallor. Above it, his hair is the curly blond hair of a child of six or seven. His mouth also is childish. The red lips soft and feminine in outline. Their expression is spoiled, petulant and self-obsessed,

weak but dominnering. In combination with the rest of the face there is an appalling morbid significance to his mouth. One feels its boyish cruelty, encouraged as a manly attribute in the coarse brutality of camps, has long ago become naively insensitive to any human suffering but his own" (L.L., Act II, Sc.1, p.407)

This example helps us depict Caligula's weakness in more than one way. First of all, his ape-like features takes us back to Zarathustra's denunciation of those who are unable to perfect themselves, "Once you were apes," Zarathustra says, "and even now, too, man is more ape than any ape" (Z., Prologue, p.124).

Caligula is not the first of O'Neill's characters to be described with animal characteristics. The stokers, in The Hairy Ape, resemble "beasts in a cage" (H.A., Sc.1, p.39); the farmers in Desire under the Elms, beasts of the field; Kukachin calls Marco "Ox," and Marco's love is compared to a "mating of swine" (M.M., Act III, Sc.3, p.281); in The Iceman Cometh, men are also identified with swine, "the breed of swine called men in general" (I.C., Act I, p.30); Caligula's legs look like an ape's, and he addresses the Roman mob, which "looks like a multitude of terrified rats," like "my good people, my faithful scum, my brother swine" (L.L., Act IV, Sc.2, p.479).

Cyrus Day points out that O'Neill thought that "most men are curs, dogs, pigs, swine, rats, jackals, and hyenas," because "only a few of them have the strength to re-create themselves as superman." ⁽¹¹⁾ It seems that O'Neill's identification of men with animals, rather than an evolutionary concept, indicates "that the mass of mankind," as Zarathustra says, "lack all essential dignity or worth" (See Kaufmann, p. 127).

Another aspect of Caligula's weakness is the anaemic transparent parllor of his boyish, cruel face and his insensitiveness toward human suffering. In fact, he enjoys death,

"I like to watch men die.... Tiberius is a miser. He wants to hoard all of death for his own pleasure" (L.L., Act II, Sc. 1, p.409). And when anyone menaces his dream of being a Caesar, killing becomes his immediate reaction, "Order them (the soldiers) to use their swords, Cneius. Let the scum look at their dead and learn respect for us!... Corpses are so educational!" (L.L., Act II, Sc.1, p.408). As if the living were not his only enemies, Caligula, like Brutus, is repeatedly described struggling against imaginative foes, for he fears everyone, "I must fear everyone," he tells Cneius, "the world is my enemy." He is even suspicious of Cneius Crassus, his best friend, "Even with you who used to ride me on your knees.... I do not eat nor drink until you have tasted first" (L.L., Act II, Sc.1, 409).

Because Caligula fears everyone, pain is his weapon to make everyone fear him:

"Do not take pain away from us," he asks Lazarus, "it is our own truth. Without pain there is nothing.... We must keep pain! Especially Caesar must! Pain must twinkle with a mad mirth in a Caesar's eye—men's pain—or they would become dissatisfied and disrespectful" (L.L., Act IV, Sc.1., p.467).

And O'Neill repeatedly describes Caligula as a forsaken, crying boy who kneels at Lazarus' feet for protection.

Not less frightened than Caligula is Tiberius. When he sees Lazarus for the first time he, like the Roman mob, looks like a "terrified rat." He steps down the imperial throne, hides himself in a corner and orders the guards to cover him with their shields. Like Caligula, Tiberius hates men, "I can deal with men. I know them well, too well! Therefore I hate them" (L.L., Act III, Sc.2, p.448). Because Tiberius hates men, he lets Augustus kill his first wife and son, and he himself killed his mother in "a subtle and cruel" way. Because he is impotent, a false superman, he fears death and old age, and orders Lazarus to restore his youth for power's sake. The will to rule in

O'Neill's plays, however, is always a sign of inward weakness, as Nietzsche says, "they fear their own slave soul and shroud it in a royal cloak; in the end, they still become the slaves of their followers, their fame, etc." (Kaufmann, 219).

Caligula and Tiberius are also the true representatives of the state. And the picture of the state O'Neill offers in Lazarus Laughed, as the one he offered in The Hairy Ape and in The Great God Brown, resembles Nietzsche's, "The state is the very Devil," Nietzsche says, "who tempts and intimidates man into animalic conformity and thus keeps him from rising into the heaven of true humanity" (Kaufmann, 399).

In Lazarus Laughed, men become completely dominated by the power of the state. The mob has no life of its own. It is equally able to laugh with Lazarus, or to "crouch close to the ground like a multitude of terrified rats" to hail Caesar, and death. "The mob," Caligula says, "is the same everywhere, eager to worship any new charlatan!" (L.L., Act II, Sc.1, p.410). Really, when men show some sign of nobility, like the Greeks, they are soon lead into conformity by the soldiers' swords.

O'Neill suggests that the state is nothing better than Caesar. Both of them bear the same signs of weakness, that is, to make people fear the power of death, and to conform to all kinds of tyranny. In fact the state resembles the false superman, who compensates his inner weakness by being cruel and dominating others. In this sense, O'Neill's picture of the state in Lazarus Laughed resembles Nietzsche's in Thus Spoke Zarathustra: "This sign I give you as the sign of the state. Verily, this sign signifies the will to death. Verily it beckons to the preachers of death" (Z., Part I, Sc.11, p.101).

As false superman, Caligula and Tiberius have faith in the future. They are "historical man," therefore they need a world of illusion-- the Apollonian world-- to be able to live. Caligula

is repeatedly talking about his dream of being a Caesar. Just after choking Tiberius and stabbing Lazarus, for instance, Caligula exclaims relieved, "A moment and there would have been a revolution--no more Caesars--and my dream!...My dream!" (L.L., Act IV, Sc. 2, p. 479). Like Caligula, Tiberius ordered Lazarus to be burnt at the stake, because Lazarus failed to fulfill his "dream" of restored youth.

In Days Without End, O'Neill echoes Nietzsche's perspectivism, perhaps better than in any other play. The "Loving principle," a symbol of Dionysus, is at war with the "John principle," an Apollonian symbol, throughout the play. Loving makes John look for relief in all philosophical and religious systems, to discard each one soon after as a mere illusion, a perspective, as Father Baid puts it.* At the end, after Loving's death, John turns back to his original faith: acceptance of Puritanism and Capitalism. O'Neill's solution in the play, as we have already pointed out earlier, surprised the critics, for it is at odds with his life-long criticism of the spiritual evils of the "status quo."

In The Iceman Cometh, however, O'Neill turns back to his life-long criticism. The characters of the play are spineless human beings, i.e., they need to keep their pipe dreams about tomorrow in order to be able to live. Because they believe in the "tomorrow" they are "historical" men; they believe in love; they need heavy drinks to maintain their illusions; and they extirpate their passions. The external world and society become their biggest menace. Harry Hope, for instance, just after Hickey convinces him to take a walk in the neighborhood, comes back in horror. He has found in the "ghost automobile" an excuse for his own failure to cross the street. "All a lie! No automobile," he recognizes later. "But bejees, something

* See quotation in our second chapter, pp. 74-75.

ran over me! Must have been myself, I guess" (I.C., Act III, p.200). The "ghost automobile" symbolizes the real menace of industrialized society.

But O'Neill not only condemns the mechanized state, he also rejects the possibility of any better social order. Therefore, he sees the social reformer in the same light he has seen Capitalism in Marco Millions, and the Roman Empire in Lazarus Laughed. All of them are false seupermen who strive for power over others to compensate their inner weakness. In The Hairy Ape, for instance, he condemns not only Capitalism through Yank's speeches, but also Long's longing for Socialism and Paddy's, for a true democratic state. Only in The Iceman Cometh, however, O'Neill's reveals the true motives of his rejection, through Hugo, the ex-anarchist:

"Hello, leedle peoples! Neffer mind! Soon you will eat hot dogs beneath the villoow trees and trink free vine— (Abruptly in a haughty fastidious tone) The champagne vas not properly iced. (With guttural anger) Gottamned liar, Hickey! Does that prove I vant to be aristocrat? I love only the proletariat! I vill lead them! I vill be like a Gott to them! They vill be my slaves! (I.C., Act III, p.169).

It becomes plain here, why O'Neill, following Nietzsche, could not put his faith in any mass solution of the social problems, since any leadership for him is automatically suspect. We may ask, then, what hope does O'Neill offer for man? The hope for men lies in the individuals who must have the courage to be masters of themselves, as Larry Slade puts it: "The material the ideal free society must be constructed from is men themselves" (I.C., Act I, p.30).

NOTES ON CHAPTER FIVE

1. Published by Falk, Doris V. Eugene O'Neill and the Tragic Tension, pp. 390-407.
2. Quoted by Doris Alexander. Ibid., p.391
3. Ibid., 392
4. Ibid., 392
5. Ibid., 392
6. Ibid., 392
7. Ibid., 393
8. Clark, Barret H. Eugene O'Neill: the Man and his Plays, p. 105
9. Falk, Doris V. Op.cit., p.401
10. Ibid., p.399
11. Day, Cyrus. "Amor Fati: O'Neill's Lazarus as Superman and Savior." Modern Drama, III (December 1960) p.300

CHAPTER SIX

LAZARUS, A ZARATHUSTRIAN SAVIOR

O'Neill thought by the time he wrote Lazarus Laughed that modern man was in desperate need of some metaphysical solace to comfort his primitive religious instinct and fear of death. "He did not consider modern Christianity capable of fulfilling either of these primary religious functions." ⁽¹⁾ O'Neill dramatized this dilemma in many of his plays, and proposed an answer to it in Lazarus Laughed. In the image of Nietzsche's Zarathustra, Lazarus was conceived to teach modern man how to live joyously and how to die fearlessly.

Lazarus' message for mankind, however, has not only been preached by Zarathustra, but by other great religious redeemers of mankind, too. We have already identified Lazarus with Dionysus; Egil Tønqvist, in American Literature, identifies him with Christ, too; ⁽²⁾ Doris M. Alexander with Buddha; ⁽³⁾ and Cyrus Day, with the Superman. ⁽⁴⁾ In this chapter we shall consider some of the ways in which the influence of Zarathustra's doctrine is revealed in Lazarus Laughed. We shall stress in particular Lazarus' resemblances to Zarathustra, and O'Neill's Christian criticism, as it appears in the play.

The play opens with Lazarus' resurrection, and O'Neill describes it as follows:

THIRD GUEST....Jesus looked into his (Lazarus') face for what seemed a long time and suddenly Lazarus said "Yes" as if he were answering a question in Jesus' eyes.

ALL THE GUESTS. (Mystified) Yes? What could he mean by Yes?

THIRD GUEST. Then Jesus smiled sadly but with tenderness, as one who from a distance of years of sorrow remembers happiness. And then Lazarus knelt and kissed Jesus' feet and both of them smiled and Jesus blessed him and called him "My Brother" and

went away; and Lazarus, looking after Him, began to laugh softly like a man in love with God! (L.L., Act I, Sc.1, p. 385).

Commenting on this passage Cyrus Day says:

"This little tableau is apt to convey the erroneous impression that Lazarus' doctrines are compatible, in O'Neill's opinion, with Christ's. It is clear, however, that it is Jesus who learns from Lazarus, and not Lazarus from Jesus, and that the substance of what he learns is contained in the word "Yes" and in the contrast that is drawn between sorrow and happiness. The implications are that He disavows His gospel of tears and authorizes Lazarus, by giving him His blessing, to preach the Nietzschean gospel of happiness. When He goes away, O'Neill is, in effect, dismissing Him and promoting Lazarus to the position of Savior in His place" (5).

Doris V. Falk, on the other hand, claims that Lazarus has "found the secret which he knows is man's salvation" in Jesus' eyes. (6) Egil Törnqvist thinks that far from being antithesis, as Day indicates, or master and disciple, as Falk claims, Jesus and Lazarus "are spiritual kinsmen." (7)

If we consider, however, Lazarus' own version of the miracle, and if we relate his previous life to Christ, we may admit, with Törnqvist, an affinity between both of them. On the other hand, if we compare Lazarus' ministry with Zarathustra's, it seems that Lazarus' promotion to Christ's place occurs later in the play.

Before dying, Lazarus was a man full of sorrow, "a poor breeder of sheep," who "wished for death" (L.L., Act I, Ac.1, p.384). Christ, from the beginning, has been identified by his followers as "The Good Shepherd" (John, X, 11), and a man of sorrow (First Corinthians, XV, 3). The present Jesus, as Törnqvist points out, resembles the old Lazarus; but the happiness Jesus is said to remember from a distance of years symbolizes the happiness He knew in God's heart before He became the Son of Man, and began to preach His evangel of

of sorrow. So, the present Lazarus resembles Jesus, Son of God, and Lazarus' evangel may be said to be an adequate expression of Jesus' faith before He knew sorrow. (8)

This same idea seems to be implied in Lazarus' version of the miracle:

"There is only life! I heard the heart of Jesus laughing in my heart; "There is Eternal Life in No," it said, "and there is the same Eternal Life in Yes! Death is the fear between!" And my heart reborn to love of life cried "Yes!" And I laughed in the laughter of God!" (L.L., Act I, Sc. I, p. 378)

Egil Tönqvist points out that this context does not imply that Jesus has learned the laughter from Lazarus, on the contrary, Lazarus heard the heart of Jesus laughing in his heart. The idea of antithesis, at the same time, may not find support in this context. What seems plain is Lazarus' identification with Christ's happiness before He knew sorrow, "I laughed in the laughter of God." (9)

O'Neill's suggestion here resembles Nietzsche's in Thus Spoke Zarathustra. According to Zarathustra, if Jesus had lived longer, He would have recanted his doctrine, but He died too early (Z., Part I, Sec. 21, p. 185). O'Neill seems to leave an open possibility to Nietzsche's suggestion.

On the other hand, if we consider the circumstances of Lazarus' beginning ministry and Zarathustra's, we may find, besides a strange similarity, O'Neill's promotion of Lazarus to Christ's place.

Zarathustra was forty when his ministry began. He came to the "market place" and found many people gathered together, waiting for the performance of a "tightrope walker." Zarathustra soon realized he was being misunderstood, for they wanted a performance of the "Last Man." As Zarathustra could not give them such a performance, people hated and mocked him, as if there were "ice" in their laughter. At first Zarathustra

could not avoid rage, "Forward, lazybones, smuggler, pale-face, or I shall tickle you with my heel!" (Z., Prologue, p.131). But while he was speaking, the multitude suddenly "rushed apart" with "stupefied eyes." The body of the tight-rope walker fell on the ground right next to Zarathustra. Zarathustra remained unmoved for a while; after he knelt down beside the dying body, took it in his arms and carried it to be buried.

Lazarus was the same age as Zarathustra, when he came to his father's house, soon after the miracle. A hostile multitude, set apart by their religious beliefs, was waiting for him. Lazarus also, like Zarathustra, soon realized they were not interested in his preaching, but in what he had found beyond the grave. Their laughter seemed a "laughing cry of hyenas," and Lazarus was even cursed by his father. Then, the two hostile groups, since Lazarus did not answer their question, began insulting each other with cries of rage. They were about to rush on one another, when Lazarus' mother fainted on the ground. The two groups suddenly fell back, like in the tightrope walker's episode. Lazarus began to laugh, and they forgot bigotry for a while. But with the Nazarene Messenger's news that Jesus had been murdered, the two groups grew hostile again. Mary, Lazarus' sister, showing the most unevangelical feeling, demanded retribution for the Crucified Master, "An eye for an eye! Avenge the Master!" (L.L., Act II, Sc.2, p.398). A struggle took place, resulting in ten dead from each party. Lazarus, like Zarathustra, remained unmoved for a while, then he knelt by the dead bodies.

Nietzsche had already stated that there was only one true Christian "and he died on the cross," what has been called "evangel" from that moment on should have been called "dysangel" for it has precisely expressed "the most unevangelical

feeling, revenge" (Kaufmann, p. 294). Egil Törnqvist suggests that with Mary's and the disciples' feeling of resentment, O'Neill, ironically and dramatically, suggests that Christ's evangel died with Him on the cross. Lazarus, then, arises as the new Savior to take Christ's place.

O'Neill's tries to express Lazarus' message through the mystical laughter, the monosyllabics "Yes" and "No," and through Lazarus' assertion that there is no death, there is only life, or as Cyrus Day puts it,

"...believing as he does that earthly life (becoming) is the only reality he can ever know, the superman deliberately immerses himself in it, affirms it, says Yes to it, and not only endures its pains and vicissitudes, but even welcomes them and rejoices in them. "My formula for greatness in man," Nietzsche says, "is amor fati: That a man should wish to have nothing altered, either in the future, the past, or for all eternity. Not only must he endure necessity:...but he must also love it." Lazarus Laughed is the result of O'Neill's intellectual and emotional commitment to this philosophy" (10).

Lazarus is first of all a self-master, a superman, whose conscious possession of joy and power takes him to the supreme exaltation of life, the whole of life. Because he is a self-master, he realizes that ultimate happiness which Nietzsche ascribed to the superman, which implies the joyful acceptance and affirmation of earthly life and suffering, as well as, the rejection of the Christian beliefs in personal immortality. "I beseech you, my brothers," Zarathustra says, "remain faithful to the earth, and do not believe those who speak to you of otherworldly hopes." (Z., Prologue, p. 125).

Lazarus' strength and boldness may be first of all traced to Zarathustra's "remain faithful to the earth." "There is a hope for Man," Lazarus says, "Love is Man's hope—love for this life on earth, a noble life above suspicion and distrust!" (L.L., Act IV, Sc. 1, pp. 460-61).

Love for this life becomes thus the first insight Lazarus gained beyond the grave. So, when Jesus commended him to come out the tomb, Lazarus, in a deep voice, with a wonderful exultant acceptance in it, answered "Yes" and began to laugh.

What Lazarus has learned, according to Doris V. Falk, is that death is only a stage in the natural process of eternal becoming. Life and death, like day and night, are not essentially different. So, the conception of death as a finality is a mistake; the conception of it as evil is equally mistaken, for death is neither better nor worse than its complements, life and birth. It is man who projects an evil significance upon death and fears it, in a sense, man fears his own creation. Therefore, one cannot love life without loving death, too, since they are inevitable complementaries of the same cycle, like day and night, which are significant only in relation to each other. "There is only life," Lazarus says, "there is Eternal Life in No, and there is the same Eternal Life in Yes! Death is the fear between!" (L.L., Act I, Sc.1, p.387).

Doris V. Falk still suggests that "if fear of death is a projection of man's needs and values, then the cure for it lies within man." (11) Man must embrace his life on earth with a positive love, in order to overcome the fear and hate of life. But O'Neill, like Nietzsche, suggests that only the overman is able to do it. First, by laughter; then, by creating a new set of values which will enable him to live gloriously and proudly, like a God:

"You forget the God in you," Lazarus says. Remembrance would imply the high duty to live as a son of God—generously!—With love!—With pride!—With laughter. Easier to forget, to become only a man, the son of a woman, to hide from life against her breast, to whimper your fear to her resigned breast and be comforted by her resignation! To live by denying life! (L.L., Act I, Sc.2, p. 397).

When Lazarus refers to "Eternal Life" and "God" he does not mean a supernatural life or a supernatural being. He refers to life as existence, which must be embodied by the individual who is able to realize the unity with himself and life. In it lies man's greatness, for no supernatural being can help man realize this desirable integration. "God is dead," Nietzsche proclaimed. "There is no God," Lazarus says in Act Two. "Let it be my pride as Man to recreate the God in me," he adds in Act four.

God becomes thus not a supernatural entity, but man's innermost self. Man must discover the God in himself to give birth to his new greatness. "The greatness of man," Lazarus affirms, "is that no God can save him--until he becomes a God" (L.L., Act I, Sc. 2, p. 398). How can man realize the God in himself?

Generally speaking, we shall say, according to Nietzsche, that the Christian conception of life after death and the belief in the immortality of the soul has historically furnished the basis for the deprecation of this life. The desire of perfection in another world has made man condone his imperfection in this world. Instead of striving to become perfect here and now, man has always put his trust in the distant future, and has become slave of his immortal soul. Life on earth has thus been deprecated as something evil; while an after life has been considered as good. Therefore, Nietzsche exhorts man to act beyond good and evil, for-- as we stated in the Meditation upon History-- there are only "health" and "sickness."

O'Neill had already pointed these Nietzschean ideas in Desire under the Elms, The Great God Brown and Mourning Becomes Electra, and now he does it again in Lazarus Laughed. "Man has always suspected his life," Lazarus says, "and in

revenge and self torture his love has been faithless! He has even betrayed Eternity, his mother, with his slave he call Immortal Soul!" (L.L., Act IV, Sc.1, p.461). Yet, if the "soul" is a false concept, then all morality which comes from the believe in God and in the immortality of the soul is also false, as well as, the concepts of good and evil, as Lazarus tells Caligula:

"You (Caligula) are so proud of being evil! What if there is no evil? What if there are only health and sickness? Believe in the healthy God called Man in you! Laugh at Caligula, the funny clown who beats the backside of his shadow with a bladder and thinks he is Evil, the Enemy of God!" (L.L., Act IV, Sc.1, p.469).

If God is dead and man, in this case represented by Caligula, resembles a "clown" then we may conclude that to become a God means to overcome one's self, or in Nietzschean terminology, to realize the "overman."

O'Neill's Lazarus embodies the overman. He is a master of himself who has triumphed over his animal passions and acquired that kind of happiness Nietzsche predicted for those who are strong enough to perfect and master themselves. "You (Lazarus) are a holy man," Caligula says, "you are a God in a mortal body—you can laugh with joy to be alive" (L.L., Act IV, Sc.1, p.468).

Opposing Lazarus in the play, as Cyrus Day points out, is Miriam, his wife, a "life-denying" Christian, who extirpates her passions and considers this life as a vale of tears, resigning herself to sorrow and suffering as a preparation for an after life. "Lazarus affirms life; she negates it and longs for death." (12) As the play progresses, she, symbolically, grows older, while Lazarus grows younger; she dresses in black, Lazarus in white; She never laughs, Lazarus, like Zarathustra, consecrates laughter. In front of the Roman

Senate, for instance, Miriam is described as a "black figure of grief...kneeling in her black robes, swaying backward and forward, praying silently with moving lips like a nun who asks mercy for the sins of the world.... Her arms raised outward like the arms of a cross" (L.L., Act II, Sc.2, pp. 421,426); while Lazarus, "in his robe of white and gold, the aura of light surrounding his body," stands gazing upward and laughs in "an ecstatic affirmation of Life" (L.L., Act II, Sc.2, p.426).

Miriam bows with grief, brokenly, when members of her family are slain at a religious riot, and when Lazarus' followers kill themselves outside the Walls of Rome; Lazarus laughs. Cyrus Day points out that pity is a Christian virtue, and O'Neill suggests there is no place for it in Lazarus' creed, which is the overman's creed. The overman knows that self-overcoming involves a measure of suffering and also of cruelty, not only in the individual's relations to the others, but also in his attitude toward himself.

Zarathustra advises his followers to flee from the market place, "I see you stung all over by poisonous flies. Flee where the air is raw and strong" (Z., Part I, Sec.12, p.164).

"Out into the woods! Upon the hills!—Lazarus exclaims—
"Cities are prisons wherein man locks himself from life. Out with you under the sky! Are the stars too pure for your sick passions? Is the warm earth smelling of night too desirous of love for your pale introspective lusts?" (L.L., Act II, Sc.1, p.419).

It seems that also from Thus Spoke Zarathustra, O'Neill drew the symbolism of Lazarus' radiation, and of Laughing Lion outside Tiberius' Villa-Palace.

Lazarus is first described "on a raised platform,... his head haloed and his body illuminated by a soft radiance as of tiny phosphorescent flames" (L.L., Act I, Sc.1, p.382). Throughout the play Lazarus' "body is softly illuminated by its inner

light" (L.L., Act II, Sc.1, p.307); of "his bronzed face and limbs radiant in the halo of his own blowing light" (L.L., Act II, Sc.1, p.415). As the play progresses and Lazarus grows younger "the aura of light surrounding his body seems to grow more brightly" (L.L., Act II, Sc.2, p.421). When he enters triumphantly in Tiberius' Palace, "He walks into the black archway of the darkened place, his figure radiant and unearthly in his own light" (L.L., Act III, Sc.1, p.443). Finally, Lazarus symbolically "burnt alive over a huge pile of faggots" while he affirms life with his thundering laughter and a joyful "Yes" on his lips.

Although Doris Alexander says that Lazarus' radiance "recalls most powerfully the radiance of Buddha" ⁽¹³⁾ and Egil Törnqvist refers it to Dionysus and Christ, ⁽¹⁴⁾ both of them, together with Cyrus Day, recognize we may also relate it to Nietzsche's vision of a "light-surrounded" superman. Following our interpretation, we'd rather emphasize once more Lazarus' relation to Zarathustra, for two main reasons. First of all because neither Christ nor Buddha, like Lazarus and Zarathustra, urged man to laugh. "Laughter have I pronounced holy," Zarathustra says, "you higher man, learn to laugh!" (B.T., "Attempt at a Self-Criticism," p.27). Second, and more relevant, as Cyrus Day points out, because Zarathustra considered himself "pregnant with lightning with bolts," who, like Lazarus, says "yes and laugh yes" to life:

"If I am a soothsayer of that soothsaying spirit which wanders on a high ridge between two seas, wandering like a heavy cloud between past and future, an enemy of all sultry plains and all that is weary and can neither die nor live—in its dark bosom prepared for lightning and the redemptive flash, pregnant with lightning bolts that say Yes and laugh Yes, soothsaying lightning bolts—blessed is he who is thus pregnant!" (Z., Part III, Sec. 16, p.340).

The symbolism of the Crucified Lion may also be referred to Thus Spoke Zarathustra. Outside Tiberius' Villa-Palace (L.L., Act III, Sc. 1, p. 434-43) Lazarus and a Crucified Lion are brought together, "a cross is set up on which a full grown male lion has been crucified" (L.L., Act III, Sc. 1, p. 434), with an inscription above its head, "From the East, land of false Gods and superstition, this lion was brought to Rome to amuse Caesar" (L.L., Act III, Sc. 1, p. 436). Again Doris Alexander and Egil Törnqvist refer the symbolism of the lion also to Buddha and Christ. We prefer to relate to Zarathustra for two main reasons.

The lion symbolically appears in Nietzsche's philosophy as "the blond beast" to symbolize man's strong animal impulses (Kaufmann, pp. 195, 256). Nietzsche denounces Western Civilization for the emasculation of "the blond beast;" and O'Neill significantly chooses Rome—which has for a long time been the spiritual and political Capital of the civilized world—to bring together the overman, Lazarus, and the Lion. "My father, Caligula ironically comments, "frequently plants whole orchards of such trees, but usually they bear human fruit!" (L.L., Act III, Sc. 1, p. 435).

Caligula's refers to man's fear of death as "human fruit," which all tyrants—like he and Caesar—use to destroy man's will. So, he advises Lazarus "not to roar—or laugh—at Caesar" (L.L., Act III, Sc. 1, p. 436), but Lazarus' reaction surprises him.

LAZARUS. (Walks up the steps to the cross and, stretching to his full height, gently pushes the lion's hair out of its eyes—tenderly) Poor brother! Caesar avenges himself on you because of me. Forgive me, your suffering!

CALIGULA. (With a start backward—with frightened awe) Gods! He licks your hand! I could swear he smiles—with his last breath!

This scene reminds us, as Doris M. Alexander points out, of the end of Zarathustra. A laughing lion appeared to Zarathustra as a sign that his hour has come. Zarathustra's heart was loosed, tears dropped from his eyes, fell on his hands, and were licked by the lion (Z., Part IV, Sec. 20, p. 438). The Crucified Lion also licks Lazarus' hands, and forebodes Lazarus' end on the cross. "You will be in his place soon," Caligula tells Lazarus pointing to the lion. "Will you laugh then?" "Yes," Lazarus replies, "I will laugh with the pride of a beggar set upon the throne of Man!" (L.L., Act III, Sc. 1, p. 435).

In The Great God Brown, O'Neill showed us a Dionysian man, Dion, and an Apollonian man, Brown. It became clear that the Dionysian man cannot endure the principle individuation without an Apollonian complement to his personality; while the Apollonian man, called the false superman in this thesis, is particularly satirized by O'Neill, because of his inner sterility and because he is a slave of his own illusions. In Lazarus Laughed, O'Neill proposes modern man a Zarathustrian Savior, a metaphysical solace to comfort man's primitive religious instinct and fear of death. This Zarathustrian Savior preaches man to overcome himself by laughter, to believe in the world of eternal becoming, to say "Yes" to life even in the face of individual defeat, but his message ends in a sad tone, "the greatness of Saviors is that they may not save;" while "the greatness of man is that no God can save him--until he becomes a God!" (L.L., Act I, Sc. 2, p. 398).

O'Neill clearly suggests that if man's greatness lies within himself, than man is the only responsible for his own weaknesses and destruction, as it is expressed in his last play, A Long Days Journey into Night.

NOTES ON CHAPTER SIX

1. Day, Cyrus. "Amor Fati: O'Neill's Lazarus as Superman and Savior." Modern Drama, III (December 1960), p.299
2. Törnqvist, Egil. "O'Neill's Lazarus: Dionysus and Christ." American Literature, XLI (January 1970), pp.543-54.
3. Alexander, Doris M. "Lazarus Laughed and Buddha." Modern Language Quarterly, 5 (December 1956) pp.357-66
4. Day, Cyrus. "Amor Fati: O'Neill's Lazarus as Superman and Savior." Modern Drama, III (December 1960), pp.297-305.
5. Ibid., pp.304-05
6. Falk, Doris V. Eugene O'Neill and The Tragic Tension, p.108
7. Törnqvist, Egil. Op.cit., p.548
8. Ibid., p.548
9. Ibid., p.548
10. Day, Cyrus. Op.cit., p.301
11. Falk, Doris V. Op.cit., p.109
12. Day, Cyrus. Op.cit., p.300.
13. Alexander, Doris M. Op.cit., p.547
14. Törnqvist, Egil. Op.cit., p.547.

CHAPTER SEVEN

A SELF-PORTRAIT IN "A LONG DAY'S JOURNEY INTO NIGHT"

O'Neill diagnosis of "the sickness of today" has been variously manifested in this thesis through the Apollonian-Dionysian opposition. In his first plays, O'Neill was more concerned with the necessity of illusions for life and the character's unconsciousness of it. In his next plays, with the Dionysian primordial oneness and the eternal becoming of everything. In his last plays, with the tragic consequences of the "principle individuation" and the character's hopeless struggle to escape Silenus' wisdom.

The psychological implications of such a view of life helped O'Neill to show us the inner sterility of the false superman; the inner struggle of the artist; and the boldness of Lazarus. On the other hand, these same psychological implications help us to relate the Playwright's own life to his plays, mainly as they are expressed in A Long Day's Journey into Night, O'Neill's autobiographical play.

In the late twenties, O'Neill had already thought of writing an autobiographical play, "the grand opus of my life," which he intended to call "Sea-Mother's Son." The project only materialized in 1941, under the title A Long Day's Journey into Night.⁽¹⁾ His third and last wife, Carlotta, informs us about O'Neill's painful effort to write this play. He was affected not only by the Last World War and Parkinson's disease, but also because "he was writing from his very guts."

"After his day's stint," Carlotta says, "he would be physically and mentally exhausted. Night after night I had to hold him tight in my arms so he could relax and sleep. ...Thus the play was written." (2)

Without disclosing that it was autobiographical, O'Neill

had told Nathan, after finishing the first Act, that the play would cover one day in his family's life,

"a day in which things occur which evoke the whole past of the family and reveal every aspect of its inter-relationship. At the final curtain, there they still are, trapped within each other by the past, each guilty and at the same time innocent, scorning, loving, pitying each other, understanding and yet not understanding at all, forgiving but still doomed never to be able to forget" (3)

When the play was ready, O'Neill allowed it to be read by some of his closest friends, but the play was not to be produced or published until twenty-five years after his death, because "there is one person in it (the author himself) who is still alive." In 1956, however, three years after O'Neill's death, Random House published A Long Day's Journey into Night with Mrs. O'Neill permission.

This restriction proves that O'Neill tried to be realistic in portraying us his family's life, and his own. According to Doris V. Falk, only one important fact of O'Neill's life before 1912, the year in which the action took place, has been missed. O'Neill's first marriage to Kathleen Jenkins in 1909 and his divorce from her in 1912, and the birth of Eugene, Jr., whom O'Neill did not see until he was ten years old and who committed suicide at the age of fifteen. (4)

The O'Neill family becomes the Tyrone family in the play. Eugene's father, James O'Neill, is James Tyrone; his brother, James O'Neill, Jr., is James Tyrone (Jamie); and Eugene O'Neill, the playwright, is called Edmund, the name of his brother who died as a child before Eugene had been born, 1888.

The philosophical and psychological implications of the action in A Long Day's Journey into Night remind us of three Nietzschean concepts previously discussed in this thesis. First, the universe and human life conceived in The Birth of Tragedy

as an endless series of polarities; second, "the state of individuation" regarded as the "origin and primal cause of suffering, as something objectionable in itself" (B.T., Sec. 10, p. 73); finally, that "illusions have a survival value for life" (5)

The antithesis are variously manifested either in the general cosmology of the play or in the split personality of the characters. Such antinomies as darkness and light, fog and sunshine, present and past, youth and old age, reality and illusion, etc., underly the general cosmology of the play, and create a suitable environment for each character to reveal his own and the family tragedy, according to the topics discussed in the play: Mary's hatred of doctors, her drug addiction, her convent days, her intolerable life in shabby hotels after marrying James; Mr. Tyrone's "stinginess," his hard childhood, his drinking habits; Jamie's failure; Edmund's illness, his rebellious opinions on politics and literature, his admiration for Nietzsche, and his experiences on the sea.

Mary Ella Quinlan, Mary Tyrone in the play, (5) was a convent-girl when she first met the famous actor James O'Neill, James Tyrone in the play. She was the only daughter of an Irish immigrant, settled in Cleveland, who had prospered in various enterprises, particularly through a liquor store and some state investments. Mary was given every advantage. As she showed musical talent, her father had her well taught and bought a piano. At fifteen, he sent her to St. Mary's Convent at Notre Dame, Indiana. St. Mary's offered a good education, and its music department was excellent. Mother Elizabeth, who ran it, had been educated in Europe. She thought Mary's talent was considerable. Once Mary had a sort of vision, a call to be a nun. Mother Elizabeth advised her to wait a couple of years after leaving school to justify her

foresight. Before two years had elapsed, 1877, she was married with James. Mary, however, soon realized she was fatally unfit to be an actor's wife. She soon began regretting James' drinking, the dirtiness of trains, the small and dilapidated theaters, the atrocious cooking, the few and far restaurants in small towns, etc. She was always conscious of having taken a step down, not because she married James, but because she had associated with lesser actors and their wives, whose manners were freer than she was used to. With the birth of James, Jr., however, it seemed that difficulties were one their way to solution, and she became a too affectionate mother. When little James was four years old, a second son was born, Edmund, in real life, Eugene, in the play.

It became obvious that at least for a time, Mary could no longer take the children on circuit with her husband. James, Sr., bought a house on Pequod Avenue, in New London, Connecticut, where Mary had family connections.

It is in the living-room of this house (the Cottage of Monte Cristo) that the action of A Long Day's Journey into Night takes place. In fact it had already inspired the setting for two other O'Neill's plays, Ah, Wilderness and Desire under the Elms.

By the time Edmund, Eugene in the play, was born, Mary divided her time between tours with her husband, and temporary retirement in the Cottage of Monte Cristo, or with her mother in New York. Once, while she was on a tour, she had the bad news that her elder son had caught measles. The younger son, not yet a year old, also caught the disease and died.

Ells, Mary in the play, never could get over the tragedy. She blamed herself for leaving the children, her husband for not having given her a real home, and Jamie for having deli-

berately exposed his younger brother to measles in hope he would die. At first she did not desire another child. Later, yielding to James' claims that another child would help her to forget what had happened and could never be undone, Mary agreed with him in the hope her next child would be a girl. After the long months of pregnancy, haunted by anxieties and fears of some new disaster awaiting her, in a hotel room in New York, Eugene Gladstone O'Neill, Edmund in A Long Day's Journey into Night, was born. It was October 16, 1888. With the new birth, something like a brooding fate, had been set in motion in the family. Mary, according to the play, was attended by an "ignorant quack of a cheap hotel doctor" James had casually found in a barroom for a low price. He prescribed morphine for Mary. As a consequence, Mary caught rheumatism, became a tortured drug addict, and her religion served to deepen her shame and sense of degradation, as she describes it in A Long Day's Journey into Night:

"I was so healthy before Edmund was born. You remember, James. There wasn't a nerve in my body. Even traveling with you season after season, with week after week of one-night stands, in trains without Pullmans, in dirty rooms of filthy hotels, eating bad food, bearing children in hotel rooms, I still kept healthy. But bearing Edmund was the last straw. I was sick afterwards, and that ignorant quack of a cheap hotel doctor--all he knew was I was in pain. It was easy for him to stop the pain.... Above all, I shouldn't have let you insist I have another baby to take Eugene's place, because you thought that would make me forget his death. I knew from experience by then that children should have homes to be born in, if they are to be good children, and women need homes, if they are to be good mothers. I was afraid all the time I carried Edmund. I knew something terrible would happen. I knew I'd proved by the way I'd felt Edmund that I wasn't worthy to have another baby, and that God would punish me if I did. I never should have born Edmund" (L.D.J.N., Act II, Sc. 2, pp. 87-88).

When the play opens, Mary is back home after a cure in a sanatorium for drug addicts. The three Tyrone men happily

live the illusion that she will resist the temptation this time. Consciously, however, they know it is a "pipe dream," for they saw her going to the spear room—the room where Mary used to take morphine before she went to the sanatorium—the night before, and the brightness of her eyes confirms their suspicions. But, like the dreamers of The Iceman Cometh, they refuse to believe it, and the subject, together with Edmund's illness, is always left in suspense, as if it was a forbidden thing in the family. Mary feels uneasy and guilty. She suspects they are spying and accusing her all the time. Her splitting personality is then revealed: that of an old woman, extremely nervous, with white hair, knotted fingers and never still hands; and that of an "unaffected charm of a shy convent-girl youthfulness she has never lost—an unworldly innocence" (L.D.J.N., Stage directions to Act I).

Thus Mary becomes the inverse image of Mother Earth, or Cybel, for whom her sons long. "Her hair," Doris V. Falk points out, "was once the same "rare reddish-brown," which symbolizes prenatal freedom, security in Mourning Becomes Electra," the symbolical Dionysian oneness in mother-son relationship. But this Dionysian hope is only an illusion of the past, which remains beyond one's reach. Mary, then becomes conscious of her failure as mother. She constantly apologyses for the whiteness and disorder of her hair, for the tapering of her fingers, for having misplaced her glasses. In fact, there is no illusion left for Mary. Unlike the derelicts' pipe dreams of tomorrow in The Iceman Cometh, she becomes "historical" toward her past. When she is not under morphine, she remembers the misfortunes which followed her marriage; when she takes morphine she lives in her convent-days. The other characters of the play behave according to the alteration of these two roles. Before pointing out their behavior, however, let us

summarize their historical background.

Mr. O'Neill, Mr. Tyrone in the play, unlike his wife, had a hard time in his youth. He was a son of an Irish immigrant, who came to the United States in 1856, and settled down in Buffalo. His father soon gave up the struggle in the new country. He left behind him a poor widow and six children to look after themselves. James was then the man of the house, though he was only ten years old. He had to work in a machinist's shop twelve hours a day. His mother went out as a cleaning woman. His elder sister took in sewing. Such jobs were precarious and underpaid. Hunger was familiar enough to them, while the dread of starvation was ever present. James never forgot those days, which made him know the worth of a dollar, as he tells Edmund in A Long Day's Journey into Night:

"When I was ten my father deserted my mother and went back to Ireland to die. Which he did soon enough, and deserved to, and I hope he's roasting in hell. He mistook rat poison for flour, or sugar or something.... My mother was left, a stranger in a strange land, with four small children, me and a sister a little older and two younger than me. My two older brothers had moved to other parts. They couldn't help.... I worked twelve hours a day in a machine shop, learning to make files. A dirty barn of a place where rain dropped through the roof, where you roasted in summer, and there was no stove in winter, and your hands got numb with cold, where the only light came through two small filthy windows, so on grey days I'd have to sit bent over with my eyes almost touching the files in order to see!... My poor mother washed and scrubbed for the Yanks by the day, and my older sister sewed, and my two younger stayed at home to keep the house. We never had clothes enough to wear, nor food enough to eat.... It was in those days I learned to be a miser. A dollar was worth so much then. And once you've learned a lesson, it's hard to unlearn it... (L.D.J.N., Act IV, pp. 147-48).

Luckily for James, however, his older sister made a good match, and he got a chance to go to school. Once, when he was playing billiards, the manager of the stage came in, looking

for help. It was the beginning of a career. The magic of the stage excited James. Through hard work, he became a famous actor, and was considered as having the finest voice in theater. He had the talents to be a great actor. Once he had a chance to alternate with Edwin Booth in playing Othello and Iago, and James did it masterfully. Booth, perhaps the greatest American actor of time, could not avoid praising James' talent and performance. Later, Booth's Theater in New York offered James the star part in The Count of Monte Cristo. James was a success from the start. His fortune was made, but his career was ruined. He began to play it in 1883, and only stopped in 1912. In fact, he made some efforts to get free from his slavery, but in vain, ⁽⁶⁾ as he tells us in A Long Day's Journey into Night:

"Yes," James tells Edmund, "maybe life overdid the lesson for me, and made a dollar worth too much, and the time came when that mistake ruined my career as a fine actor. (Sadly) I've never admitted this to any one before, lad, but, tonight, I'm so heartsick I feel at the end of everything, and what's the use of fake pride and pretense. That great damned play I bought (Monte Cristo) for a song made such a great success in—a great money success—it ruined me with its promise of an easy fortune. I didn't want to do anything else, and by the time I woke up to the fact I'd become a slave to the damned thing and did try other plays. It was too late. They didn't want me in anything else. I'd lost the great talent I once had through years of easy repetition, never learning a new part, never really working hard.... I could have been a great Shakespearean actor, if I'd kept on. I know that! In 1874 when Edwin Booth came to the theater in Chicago where I was leading man, I played Cassius to his Brutus one night, Brutus to his Cassius the next, Othello to his Yago, and so on. The first night I played Othello, he said to our manager, "that young man is playing Othello better than I ever did."... It (The Count of Monte Cristo) was a great box office from the start—and then life had me where it wanted..." (L.D.J.N., Act III, pp. 149-51).

James becomes thus the image of the false superman. Like Marco Polo, he buried his artistic talent for the love of

economical success; like Ephraim Cabot, he enslaved his family because of his obsessive fear of poverty that made him invest his money in cheap land bargains. His miserliness and his career as an actor, however, are directly related to the misery of his wife and children. His "stinginess" has caused Mary's addiction, and his inability to provide her with a proper home, because he was always on the road, has intensified her bitterness and sense of loss. Tyrone's misery has also affected, in a direct or indirect way, his two sons. Edmund and Jamie blame him for their alcoholism, because he used to give them whisky to sleep, when they were children. Edmund calls his father "stinking old miser" when James wants to send him to a state tuberculosis sanatorium in order "to save a few lousy dollars to buy more bum property with" (L.D. J.N., Act IV, p. 145). Edmund's tuberculosis, in turn, partially accounts for Mary's resumption of her habit, because she cannot face the fact of his bad health; and Edmund's birth caused the illness which eventually introduced her to drugs. Jamie is affected by the very existence of Edmund, since his brother's literary gifts fill him with envy and a sense of failure; and his mother's inability to shake her habit has made him lose faith in his own capacity for regeneration. At last, Mr. Tyrone is also accused for his Irish Catholic pride, which made him strive to excell the yankees, as Doris V. Falk says, "He (Mr. Tyrone) has sold his soul for the illusion of success." (7)

Tyrone's illusion at the beginning of the play, is that his wife would finally give up morphine. From the second act on, however, Mary goes deeper and deeper into the world of drug addicts. Tyrone becomes desperate, like the derelicts in The Iceman Cometh when Hickey makes them face the truth about themselves.

"On my solemn oath," Tyrone tells Edmund, "I'd gladly face not having an acre of land to call my own, nor a penny in the bank.... I'd be willing to have no home but the poor house in my old age if I could look back now on having been the finest artist I might have been" (L.D.J. N., Act IV, p.151).

Tyrone becomes "historical" toward his past. First he begins to drink to forget it. Next, he remembers Booth's praising of his Othello, words which he had written down and lost. But they are not enough, he also needs his lost faith. "When you deny God," Tyrone tells Edmund, "you deny hope" and "sanity" (L.D.J.N., Act IV, p.134).

The meaning Tyrone gives to God here seems to be the same Nietzsche gave to "illusion." Man needs to believe in something, an Apollonian illusion, to escape the wisdom of Silenus, be it a memory of the past, like a Booth's praising, a convent-day remembrance, or any kind of belief; be it a hope in the future, like Mary's cure, or the pipe dreams of tomorrow in The Iceman Cometh. It seems clear, however, that Tyrone's illusion is always determined by his relation to Mary, and some those of his sons.

Jamie is portrayed throughout the play as a cynic, with a "tongue like an adder," a dissolute alcoholic, both corrupted and corrupting. The description of his face reminds us of Dion's "Mephistophelean mask." His nose," O'Neill says in the stage directions to Act I, "is, unlike that of any other member of the family, pronouncedly aquiline. Combined with his habitual expression, it gives his countenance a Mephistophelean cast" (L.D.J.N., Act I, p.19). When he smiles without sneering, his face reveals "humorous, romantic irresponsible Irish charm."

In Act I, when there is still hope of Mary's recovery, Jamie romantic irresponsibility prevails. He is able to look at his father "with an understanding sympathy," as if a deep "bound of common feeling existed between them in which their

antagonism could be forgotten" (L.D.J.N., Act I, p.36); he becomes moved, "his love for his brother coming out" when he thinks Edmund has got consumption; and he looks at this mother with "an old boyish charm in his loving smile," like Dion, in The Great God Brown, who remembered his mother as "a sweet, a strange girl, with affectionate, bewildered eyes as if God had locked her in a dark closet without any explanation" (G.G.B., Act I, Sc.3, p.333). Jamie's "romantic Irish charm," however, gives place to his "Mephistophelean cast," when he discovers his mother's failure. He deserts her, like Dion who deserted Margaret to seek consolation in the lap of Cybel, the prostitute of The Great God Brown. Jamie turns to fat Violet, also a prostitute, at whose breasts he seeks consolation. Jamie's hatred is then revealed. First he gets terribly drunk; then, he blames his mother for his failure,

"... this time Mama had me fooled. I really believed she had it licked. She thinks I always believe the worst, but this time I believed the best. (His voice flutters). I suppose I can't forgive her--yet. It means so much. I'd begun to hope, if she'd beaten the game I could, too.... Christ, I'd never dreamed before that any woman but whores took dope!" (L.D.J.N., Act IV, pp.162-63).

His contemptuous hatred is directed toward Mr. Tyrone, too, "What a bastard to have for a father! Christ, if you put him in a book, no one would believe it." Neither his brother, whom he has always considered as his best friend, can be safe:

"Mama and Papa are right. I've been (a) rotten bad influence.... Did it on purpose, to make a bum of you. Or (a) part of me did. A big part that's been dead so long. That hates life. My putting you wise so you'd learn from my mistakes. Believed that myself at times, but it's a fake. Made my mistakes look good. Made getting drunk romantic. Made whores fascinating vampires instead of poor, stupid, diseased slobs they really are. Made fun of work as sucker's game. Never wanted you succeeded and made me look even worse by comparison. Wanted you to fail. Always jealous of you. Mama's baby, Papa's pet!... And it was

your being born that started Mama on dope. I know that's not your fault, but all the same. God damn you. I can't help hating your guts!... But don't get wrong idea, kid. I love you more than I hate you. My saying what I'm telling you now proves it.... But you'd better be on your guard. Because I'll do my damndest to make you fail. Can't help it. I hate myself. Got to take revenge. On Everyone else. Especially you.... The dead part of me hopes you won't get well. Maybe he's even glad the game got Mama again! He wants company, he doesn't want to be the only corpse around the house!" (L.D.J.N., Act IV, p.166).

Jamie, like Dion-- who wanted revenge upon his closest friend, Brown-- or, like Yank in The Hairy Ape-- who wanted revenge upon Mildred-- wants revenge upon society. But his revenge is useless since the Tyrones' long for death.

Edmund is the most sensitive of all the Tyrones. He is said to have acquired his sensitiveness from his mother,

"Edmund's hands," O'Neill says in the stage directions to Act I, "are noticeably like his mothers, with the same exceptionally long fingers. They even have a minor degree the same nervousness. It is in the quality of extreme nervous sensibility that the likeness of Edmund to his mother is most marked!"

Edmund's, in fact Eugene O'Neill's, and Mary's sensitiveness point out their artistic talent. Mary likes music and once she played the piano; Edmund also likes music, but instead of playing, he prefers poetry and even writes romantic poems. (9)

Music and Lyric Poetry are two Dionysian symbols. So is the Sea, Edmund is fond of, and on which he has had many interesting adventures. But Mary fails to understand the mystical Dionysian meaning of life. Symbolically, she loves the fog because it hides her from the world, and preserves her own individuation; she loves to be alone; she has forgotten how to play the piano, like the prostitute Cora in The Iceman Cometh; and she negates life by turning back to the past. Edmund, on the contrary, tries to tear aside "the veil of māyā, "represented by the fog, to contemplate the force behind the spell

of individuation: the primordial oneness of everything, which the Dionysian answer to the tragic tension between the opposites in the unity of process.

"... When I was on the Squarehead square rigger," Edmund tells his father, "bound for Buenos Aires. Full moon in the Trades. The old hooker driving fourteen knots. I lay on the bowsprit, facing astern, with the water foaming into spume under me, the masts with every sail white in the moonlight, towering high above me. I became drunk with the beauty and singing rhythm of it, and for a moment I lost myself—actually lost my life. I was set free! I dissolved into the sea, became white sails and flying spray, became beauty and rhythm, became moonlight and the ship and the high dim-starred sky! I belonged, without past and future, within peace and unity and a wild joy, within something greater than my own life, or the life of Man, to Life itself! To God if you want to put it that way. Then another time, on the American Line, when I was lookout on the crow's nest in the dawn watch. A calm sea, that time. Only a lazy ground well and a slow drowsy roll of the ship. The passengers asleep and none of the crew in sight. No sound of man. Black smoke pouring from the funnels behind and beneath me. Dreaming, not keeping lookout, feeling alone, and above, and apart, watching the dawn creep like a painted dream over the sky and sea which slept together. Then the moment of ecstatic freedom came. The peace, the end of the quest, the last harbor, the joy of belonging to a fulfillment beyond men's lousy, pitiful, greedy fears and hopes and dreams! And several other times in my life, when I was swimming far out, or lying alone on a beach, I have had the same experience. Became the sun, the hot sand, green seaweed anchored to a rock, swaying in the tide. Like a saint's vision of beatitude. Like the veil of things as they seem drawn back by an unseen hand. For a second you see—and seeing the secret, are the secret. For a second there is meaning!" (L.D.J.N., Act IV, p.153).

Edmund's visions approach Dionysus' suffering, his dismemberment and symbolical transformation into "air, water, earth and fire," which caused the Greeks to regard the state of individuation as the origin and primal cause of suffering, as "something objectionable in itself" (B.T., Sec.10, p.73). But Edmund's poignant vision of lost rapture remains beyond his grasp, just another Apollonian illusion, a "pipe dream" of the past, not

different from his mother's or father's, because it is beyond man's reach. Like in The Iceman Cometh, O'Neill suggests again that the Great God Pan is dead, he has been overcome by Apollo, who has been symbolically expressed by the false feeling of belonging in The Hairy Ape, by Brown's power in The Great God Brown, by the Puritan sternness in Mourning Becomes Electra, by a pipe dream of tomorrow in The Iceman Cometh, and by a dream of yesterday in A Long Day's Journey into Night. It is the dream, however, which keeps the heroes "fighting, willing, living," and daring to face a chaotic universe, they cannot understand. But only the sensible man, like the philosopher Larry Slade, and the artists, like Dion and Edmund, can realize the true tragedy of life. Therefore, they are doomed to suffer more than any one. In a sense, O'Neill agrees with Nietzsche's later thought that the artists and philosophers are the true representatives of mankind. But in O'Neill's last plays they have lost Zarathustra's and Lazarus' capacity for an apothecic affirmation of life. So, Edmund, the suffering artist, summarizes his rapturous vision,

"The hand lets the veil fall and you are alone, lost in the fog again, and you stumble on toward nowhere, for no good reason!... I will always be a stranger who never feels at home, who dares not really want and is not really wanted, who can never belong, who must always be a little in love with death" (L.D.J.N., Act IV, pp.153-54).

Edmund's rapturous vision, a past reality, summarizes the main theme of this thesis: in O'Neill's first plays the Apollonian elements prevail; in his middle period, Dionysus overcomes Apollo; in his last plays, he is back to Apollo again, and even Edmund's Dionysian feeling is a reality of the past, an Apollonian illusion because it cannot be felt again.

The protagonist of O'Neill's first play, Bound East for Cardiff, was left alone on the fore-castle of the British tramp steamer Glencairn on a foggy night on a voyage between

New York and Cardiff. Yank's loneliness, reinforced by the fog which secluded him from the world, symbolized then the Apollonian state of individuation; the sea—the life-force—a symbol of Dionysus' primordial unity which gave direction to the boat and, in a symbolical way, to Yank's life; while the "blast of the steamers whistle," which Yank hated, symbolized the hero's tragic fate. But there was still hope in Bound East for Cardiff that the fog would lift and the boat would reach New York before Yank's death. Finally, after Yank's death, hope still remains—Dionysian hope which we analysed in Chapter II—in the symbolical meaning of a pretty lady dressed in black.

All these symbols are brought back in A Long Day's Journey into Night, but without any hope. The Apollonian "principle of individuation" is more than once emphasized. First by the fog which also secludes the Tyrone family from the world, but, unlike in Bound East for Cardiff, it becomes thicker and does not lift at the end of the play. Mary, for instance, declares that she loves the fog, but, like Yank, hates the foghorn,

"I really love the fog.... It hides you from the world and the world from you. You feel that everything is changed, and nothing is what it seemed to be. No one can find or touch you any more.... It's the foghorn I hate. It wouldn't let you alone. It keeps reminding you, and warning you, and calling you back" (L.D.J.N., Act III, pp. 98-99).

Mary's words become the apotheosis of the "principle of individuation." The fog isolates her from the world. It helps her loneliness and stimulates her happy dreams of the past, like Yank whose life had depended for value on an ideal which never became true: to have a wife and a farm. In the fog no one can touch Mary's dreams, neither they can be touched, for they are all illusions of the past, dreams of "yesterday." The foghorn brings her back her fate, her guilt, her family tragedy, her conscious ego. Then, she is no more alone, she must face Tyrone and his two sons, who caused her disgrace.

Edmund likes the fog, too. The fog takes him back to his rapturous vision of the sea, which has the same basic symbolism as in Bound East for Cardiff.

"The fog was where I wanted to be," Edmund says. "Everything looked and sounded unreal. Nothing was what it is. ...Who wants to see life as it is, if they can help it. It's the three Gordons in one. You look in their faces and turn to stone. Or it's Pan. You see him and you die" (L.D.J.N., Act IV, p.135).

Edmund looks like Larry Slade in The Iceman Cometh; he was born condemned to see all sides of life. However, he already knows he has caught tuberculosis, one of the most feared diseases of the time. The fog helps him, like his mother, to live in the past, avoiding facing both life and death, both the Gordons and Pan.

The Apollonian principium individuationis is also emphasized by Mary's loneliness. The Tyrones leave her alone for three times, and more than once she is told to have gone to the spare room to take morphine. It is also emphasized by her and Edmund's attempt at suicide. Finally, by the three men's fear of being alone when Mary takes an overdose of morphine.

"The hardest thing to take," Edmund says, "is the blank wall she builds around her. Or it's more like a bank of fog in which she hides and loses herself. Deliberately, that's the hell of it! You know something in her does it deliberately-- to get beyond our reach, to be rid of us, to forget we're alive! It's as if, in spite of loving us, she hated us!" (L.D.J.N., Act IV, p.139).

The Apollonian "blank wall" of illusion, which becomes thicker as the play progresses, reaches its highest peak in the last scene of the play. The three Tyrones are heavily drunk in the living-room, when they listen someone, like "an awkward school-girl," playing the piano. It is Mary. She is damned poisoned, dressed like a school-girl. Over one arm, she carries her wedding gown. Oblivious of the men in the living-room, as if they were objects, she looks for something.

"Something I need terribly," she says. "I remember when I had it I was never lonely nor afraid. I can't have lost it forever, I would die if I thought that. Because then there would be no hope" (L.D.J.N., Act IV, p.173).

The "something" Mary is looking for is no more the Dionysian life-force expressed in Desire under the Elms, or the hidden strength Dion and Brown put into their drawings in The Great God Brown, but the Apollonian illusions of Mary's convent days. With them, there is hope of living; without them-- because illusions are a necessary factor of life-- there is only death and despair. Thus, in O'Neill's biographical play, the present becomes the past and the future, but in a hopeless way. The four Tyrones, like the derelicts of The Iceman Cometh, need heavy drinks or drugs to avoid facing both life and death.

This last scene takes us back to the last scene of Bound East for Cardiff, with one major difference. In Bound East for Cardiff, as we saw in chapters II and III, the fog that lifted while Yank's saw the pretty lady dressed in black, meant Dionysian hope in the world of becoming; Mary's last gesture means Silenus' despair in the world of becoming, and points out the vital necessity of illusions for life, symbolized by the fog which grows thicker.

O'Neill's idea of the eternal becoming is here suggested in a more sophisticated and hopeless way than in his previous plays. It should be related to Nietzsche's Second Meditation and The Gay Science.

In his Meditation about History, Nietzsche tells us that the study of history does not make us happy, rather it tends to make us unhappy (Kaufman, p.123). In The Gay Science, Nietzsche thought that most men would gnash their teeth and throw themselves down if some day "a demon were to sneak" after them into their "loneliest loneliness," and tell them: "this life, as you now live it and have lived it, you will

have to live...innumerable times more" (See Kaufmann,p.280). Nietzsche thought that this idea would be exhilarating, "god-like," for the superior man, who finds in pain the fountain of pleasures; but it would be the eternal damnation for the weak.

The general cosmology of the Tyrone's tragedy in A Long Day's Journey into Night seems to be an open suggestion that history is a very factor which prevents us from being happy, and causes suffering. On the other hand, Mary's present has a timeless connotation, it is the past and the future at the same time; while her appearance, like a school-girl, using a "marble mask of girlish innocence," and Mr. Tyrone's regret that he is "old and finished," suggest O'Neill's idea of recurrence as it has been expressed in Lazarus Laughed and in The Fountain. Youth and old age are again brought together to symbolize the eternal repeating cycles of nature. The difference is that in his two previous plays, O'Neill expressed the doctrine as something exhilarating; while in A Long Day's Journey into Night it is more sophisticated and means eternal damnation, as Edmund expresses it quoting Baudelaire:

"Be always drunken. Nothing else matters: that is the only question. If you would not feel the horrible burden of Time weighing on your shoulders and crushing you to earth, be drunken continually" (L.D.J.N., Act III, p.132).

Actually the state of drunkenness Baudelaire teaches seems not the Dionysian version of The Birth of Tragedy, but the Apollonian dream world, a hope that is really an illusion, that keeps man's will to live by escaping Silenus' wisdom. It means that to face the truth about one's self entails also the destruction of the self. Man, therefore, needs to "lie to himself," as Nietzsche says in Human-All-Too-Human, to bear the heavy burden of individuation. "Facts don't mean a thing," Edmund says, "do they? What you want to believe that's the only truth" (L.D.J.N., Act III, p.127). "Now we must embrace untruth," Nietzsche

remarks in Human-All-Too-Human, "now at last error becomes a lie, and lying to ourselves a necessity of life" (9)

What remains in O'Neill's A Long Day's Journey into Night is a brooding fate--like the Greek "Moirai"--which is beyond man's reach and control.

"None of us can help the things life has done to us," Mary says. "They're done before you realize it, and once they're done they make you do other things until at last everything comes between you and what you'd like to be, and you've lost your true self forever" (L.D.J.N., Act II, p.61)

Mary's poignant view of life summarizes O'Neill's final pessimism and sentimental realism, which may no more be called an expression of Nietzsche's celebration of life, but the painful affirmation of the Apollonian "principium individuationis" and of the necessity of illusions for life. This does not mean, as Törnqvist points out in his article "Nietzsche and O'Neill: A Study in Affinity," that there has been a fundamental change in O'Neill's attitude to Nietzsche over the years. O'Neill, consciously or not, always tried to resemble Nietzsche:

"Many aspects of O'Neill's later life," Törnqvist says quoting the Gelbs, "strikingly paralleled those of Nietzsche's. The drooping black mustache O'Neill grew in his late twenties, the solitude in which he spent his last years, the tremendous strain he put on his creative spirit, the somber satisfaction he took in being misunderstood, and the final collapse--all are a mirroring of Nietzsche"(10)

What is not clear in O'Neill's biographical studies, still according to Törnqvist, is whether O'Neill's resemblances to Nietzsche were conscious, unconscious, or due to a basic spiritual affinity between the two men. Perhaps, following the evidences suggested in this thesis, we would rather say that the three of them may be taken into account to explain the high frequency of Nietzschean themes in O'Neill's plays.

Although we may not agree with them, we may at least admit O'Neill's sincerity in diagnosing "the sickness of today." Early in his writing career (1922) O'Neill revealed his integrity as a playwright, declaring that he should never be influenced by any consideration, but one:

"Is it the truth as I know it— or, better still, feel it? If so, shoot, and let the splinters fly wherever they may. If not, not. This sounds brave and bold— but it isn't. It simply means that I want to do what gives me pleasure and worth my own eyes, and don't care to do what doesn't. ... It's just life that interests me as a thing in itself. The why and wherefore I haven't attempted to touch yet" (11).

In 1941, O'Neill wrote on the script of A Long Day's Journey into Night a dedication to his wife, Carlotta, "I give you the original script of this play of old sorrow, written in tears and blood." According to Egil Törnqvist, the two statements form a fitting epitaph for a lifework which, like Nietzsche, was characterized by "unusual integrity, sincerity and earnestness." (12) To prove it O'Neill left us his plays and his life as the living embodiment of Zarathustra's admonishment to the creators: "Write in blood, and you will experience that blood is spirit" (Z., Part I, Sec. 7, p. 152).

NOTES ON CHAPTER SEVEN

1. Sheaffer, Louis. O'Neill: Son and Playwright, p.154
2. Ibid., p.509
3. Ibid., p.509
4. Falk, Doris V. Eugene O'Neill and the Tragic Tension, p.188
5. For this summary of Mary's life, see Sheaffer's chapter, "Apprehensive Mother," in O'Neill: Son and Playwright, pp.1-24. See also Clark, Barret H. Eugene O'Neill: the Man and his Plays, p.1-47.
6. For the summary about James' life, see Sheaffer's chapter, "Actor and Peasant," in O'Neill: Son and Playwright, pp.26-46. See also Clark, Barret H. O'Neill: The Man and his Plays, pp.1-47.
7. Falk, Doris V. Op.cit., p.186
8. In 1912, before Eugene O'Neill went to a sanatorium, he was working as a reporter at a daily newspaper, The New London Telegraph. Then he published some poems, but soon he recognized that poetry was not his best, as he recalls in A Long Day's Journey into Night where his father says there is "the makings of a poet" in him. "The makings of a poet," Edmund answers. "No, I'm afraid I'm like the guy who is always panhandling for a smoke. He doesn't even got the makings. He's got only the habit.... I just stammered. That's the best I'll ever do I mean, if I live. Well, it will be faithful realism, at least. Stammering is the native eloquence of us fog people"(L.D.J.N., Act IV, p.154).
9. Solomon, Robert C. Nietzsche: a Collection of Critical Essays, p.87
10. Törnqvist, Egil. "Nietzsche and O'Neill: a Study in Affinity." Orbis Litterarum, XXIII(No.2, 1968), p.126
11. Ibid., p.126. See also Clark, Barret H. Op.cit., p.163
12. Törnqvist, Egil. Op.cit., p.126.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

O'NEILL'S PLAYS

The Long Voyage Home: Seven Plays of the Sea. New York:

Random House, 1940. A one volume compilation consisting of The Moon of The Caribbees, Bound East for Cardiff, The Long Voyage Home, In The Zone, Ile, Where the Cross is Made and The Rope. (The quotations of Bound East for Cardiff in this thesis refer to this edition).

Eugene O'Neill. Introduced and edited by E. Martin Browne.

Penguin Books, 1970. A one-volume compilation consisting of Ah, Wilderness! The Hairy Ape, All God's Chillun Got Wings, The Emperor Jones and Desire Under the Elms.

(The quotations of Ah, Wilderness! in this thesis refer to this edition).

Nine Plays. Introduction by Joseph Wood Krutch. New York:

Liveright, 1932. A one-volume compilation consisting of The Emperor Jones, The Hairy Ape, All God's Chillun Got Wings, Desire Under the Elms, Marco Millions, The Great God Brown, Lazarus Laughed, Strange Interlude and Mourning Becomes Electra. (The quotations of all the above plays in this thesis refer to this edition).

Days Without End. I recieved a xerox of this play from the United States, but I do not have any source of information about it.

A Long Day's Journey into Night. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957.

The Iceman Cometh. New York: Random House, 1957.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY ON FRIEDRICH NIETZSCHE

Kaufmann, Walter. The Portable Nietzsche. New York: Viking Press, 1954

_____. Nietzsche: Philosopher, Psychologist, Antichrist. Princeton: Princeton University, 1965

_____. The Birth of Tragedy and The Case of Wagner. New York: Random House, 1967

Solomon, Robert C. Nietzsche: A Collection of Critical Essays. New York: Anchor, 1973.

CRITICAL BOOKS AND ARTICLES ON O'NEILL'S PLAYS

Alexander, Doris M. "Lazarus Laughed and Buddha." *Modern Language Quarterly*, XVII (December 1956) pp.357-365.

Brustein, Robert. The Theater of Revolt. Atlantic-Little, Brown, 1964

Cargil, Oscar, et al., eds. O'Neill and His Plays. New York: New York University Press, 1961

Clark, Barret H. Eugene O'Neill: The Man and His Plays. New York: Dover, 1947

Day, Cyrus. "Amor Fati: O'Neill's Lazarus as Superman and Savior." *Modern Drama*, III (December 1960), pp.297-305.

Falk, Doris V. Eugene O'Neill and the Tragic Tension. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1958

Gassner, John, ed. O'Neill: A Collection of Critical Essays. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1964

Griffin, Ernest G., ed. Eugene O'Neill: A Collection of Criticism. McGraw-Hill Paperbacks, 1973

Raleigh, John H. The Plays of Eugene O'Neill. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1965