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Ever since Ancient Drama, the absent character has played an important part in the dramatic construction of the play. Many dramas are set around the quest for such an absent character. If we take, for example, the dead father in Oedipus Rex and the ghost in Hamlet, we see that they are all driving forces of the play’s dramatic action. However, the absent character is not necessarily dead. It is true that he never appears, but his implied presence acts as a dramatic catalyst. He acquires the focus of attention for the other characters and is central to the play’s plot as well.

As far as Eugene O’Neill’s Desire Under the Elms is concerned, he takes it further to the extent that the absent character becomes the most influential one in his tragedy. Eben’s mother is dead, yet she is present and haunting in almost every incident in the play. It is worth noting here that O’Neill’s absent character differs from his predecessor in certain facets. Firstly, O’Neill has chosen for his play a female not male character to take the role of the hero which is rare especially in Ancient Drama. Secondly, his absent character has a sense of reality unlike Ancient Drama which is woven by imagination. Thirdly, as a modern dramatist, O’Neill depends heavily on psychology and classical patterns of tragedy in creating his character. In doing so, the character drawn took another dimension which is so deep and comprehensive.

No doubt, the twentieth century witnessed drastic developments in the fields of ideas. This goes back to the revolution in depth psychology in the late nineteenth century that has affected both the interpretation and creation of literary works. Scientific explanations became more subtle and difficult for the layman to understand. The orderly world that had been presented to the reader in Elizabethan and even Victorian literature is superceded by chaotic world. This condition imposed on the modern artist new strategy to be followed. Therefore; new systems must be developed, and the modern artist finds himself in need for new methods and techniques to adjust to his audience. He is highly influenced by the psychological investigation which “reveals the complexity of the human personality, and of philosophical inquiry.”(1) The modern artist, in turn, is
concerned with the inner conflict of human being. The external reality is not of paramount importance.

The relationship between psychoanalysis and literary criticism covers much of the twentieth century. The movement from the conscious sphere of man to unconscious, from the physically oriented view to the spiritual factors found their best expressions in the works of Freud and Jung, who are clearly the most outstanding figures in the development of the modern psychoanalytical myth criticism. The depths and hidden layers of the psyche became an arena not to be ignored by the modern artists.

In their search for the ideal, the twentieth century writers began to look back toward the classical world with its harmonious perfection and its simple elemental aesthetic delights. Hence, they have begun to use the mythical method instead of the narrative method. In 1923, T. S. Eliot issued his famous call for a “mythical method” in “Ulysses, Order and Myth”. In discussing the matter, he said that “In using the myth, in manipulating a continuous parallel between contemproneity and antiquity, Mr. Joyce is pursuing a method which other must pursue after him . . . . It is a way of controlling, of giving shape and significance to the immense panorama of futility and anarchy which is contemporary history.”(2) Mythological and psychological criticism share a close connection. Both are concerned with the motives underlying human behaviour which assume that psychic processes of one generation continue in the next. In other words, the inheritance of psychic dispositions are transferred from one generation to another.

However the psychological impact of the mother on her son is one of the many issues which appears in different literary works which belong to different periods. Eugene O’Neill’s Desire Under the Elms reflects clearly the great role the dead mother played on her son. Moreover, in fulfilling his intention to write “modern psychological dramas modeled on the old legend plots of Greek tragedy”, O’Neill employs the theories of Freud and Jung in the hope of getting:

a 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. (3)
In the life of O’Neill’s characters, fate assumes various forms. O’Neill states that he is always “acutely conscious of the force behind- fate, God, our biological past creating our present, [and] whatever one calls it.”(4) Thus, the dramatization of inner changes and conflicts of the character is O’Neill’s special interest. His concept of the character is essentially Greek. He does not present his characters in a normal milieu, as the case in Miller and William’s plays. Rather, his characters are lonely figures that are blindly and helplessly driven by forces they have not the power to withstand. (5) They are alone in their confrontation with fate in whatever shape it may appear. Psychological and biological impulses rather than social factors bring about their tragic ends.

The Oedipus Complex is one of the most recurring psychoanalytic themes that appear in twentieth century American drama. Next to it are the themes of sexual suppression, frustrations, and aggressiveness. In fact, the tragic plays, to a certain degree, illustrate the father and mother figures, sexual frustrations, guilt feelings, death wishes, and incestuous drives. However, the flesh and blood of their characters and their emotional agonies are the dramatists’ concern.

Eugene O’Neill selects the ancient ‘Oedipus myth’ to structure his play, Desire Under the Elms , and at the same time to show the psychological impact of the dead mother on a longing son. It is the tragedy of human desire which means an emotional desire for aid. The principal subject of the play is Cabot’s son, Eben. The desire of the mother is essentially manifested in an idealized and exalted mother. Eben looks to his mother as an ideal figure, engraved in his mind.

Psychologically speaking, this is naturally justifiable because of the intimate affinity between the mother and the son. The child’s adherence to his mother began from the early period of her pregnancy. He depends entirely on his mother for food-supply when he is in her womb. In addition, the child spends more than fourteen years depending on his mother. As a result, the relationship with his mother would be greater than his father. In the play under discussion, Eben was fifteen when his mother died. In Desire Under the Elms, Eben’s mother forms the permanent dimension of his drama. His devotion to his mother makes him indulge in seclusion. Her image hovers on him from time to time. He feels her alive although she is dead. The love bond between them is beyond reach. So, Eben, at the beginning, is plunged into anguish at the thought of his mother being replaced by Abbie, his step mother. The responsibility of his mother’s death has put on his father. This feeling leads him to look at his father with intense hatred. He clearly declares that “I pray he’s died” (O’Neill, 2004,7) (6). He even
denied fatherhood when his brothers, Simon and Peter, tell him that he is their father, Eben responds: “Not mine! ...I meant- I hain’t – I hain’t like him- he hain’t me!” (O'Neill, 2004, 9). He thinks that he is his mother’s heir: “I be thankful t’ye. I’m her- her heir” (O'Neill, 2004, 9). Eben’s grudge against his father increases day by day because of the bad treatment he has done to his mother. This hatred becomes a rebellious spirit against his father. He said “I’m gettin’ stronger. I kin feel it grow in’ in me- growin an’ growin’ – till it’ll bust out- !” (O'Neill, 2004, 13).

Ephraim Cabot is so self-reliant as to be cut off from humanity. He is cruel, harsh and unable to relate to his sons. In Ephraim Cabot, W. David Sievers said, O'Neill“ creates the prototype of the primal father, hard, all-powerful,[and] ruthless ” (7). This cruelty and ruthlessness make an iron bar between himself and his sons. There is no unity or community of privilege, only greed and autocratic power. He lives in his own created world although he lives with others. His God is a unique one. He worships this God in the stones around him or in the nature he senses. To him, stones do not mean walls and separation but the domination of his will over the earth. Ephraim Cabot is described in the play as hard as the stones:
When I come here fifty odd year ago- I was jest twenty an’ the strongest an’ hardest ye evr seen – ten times as strong an’ fifty times as hard as Eben. Waal- this place was nothin’ but fields o’ stones. Folks laughed when I tuk it. They couldn’t know what I knowed. When ye kin make corn sprout out o’stones, God’s livin’ in yew! They wa’nt strong enuf fur that! They reckoned God as easy. They laughed. They don’t laugh no more. Some died hereabouts. Some went west an’ died. They’re all under ground-fur follerin! Arter an easy God. God hain’t easy ….An ! I growed hard. Folks kept allus sayin’ he’s a hard man like ‘t was sinful t’be hard so’s at last … they was so many stones … God’s hard, not easy ! God’s in the stones! Build my church on a rock- out o’stones an’I’ll be in them ! That’s what He meant t’Peter! Stones … I lived with the boys. They hated me ‘cause I was hard. I hated them ‘cause they was soft. They coveted the farm without knowin’ what it meant. It made me bitter’n wormwood. (O’Neill, 2004,45)

Ephraim is fond of hardness of isolation. He was a man of little or no real emotion. He was very hard on his children and his first two wives. Ephraim Cabot and his sons do not have a meaningful relationship. The only bond between them is mechanical. It depends on taker and giver. Ephraim provides them room and food, and in return he makes them work in the farm. He is sadistic. He has the paternal authority over his sons. Ephraim tortments them. This way of behaviour makes his sons to be resentful of him. The many years of hard work on the farm have made them immune to emotion or caring. Peter expresses his feelings in the following words: “Here-it’s stones atop o’ the ground- stones atop o’stones – makin’ stone walls- year atop o’year- him ‘n’ yew ‘n’ then Eben- makin’ stone walls fur him to fence us in!” ( O’Neill, 2004, 6 )

In this atmosphere of family hates, and striving against the cold, hard Calvinism of Old Ephraim Cabot, the motif is established. It reveals at every turn of the action the
transcendent, inscrutable force working through the multiplicity of identifiable human motives in the play. In the exchange between Eben and his brothers, the basic significance of the dead mother is already revealed. Eben bitterly accuses Ephraim of having killed his mother:

   Eben (fiercely): An’fur thanks he killed her!
   Simeon (after a pause): No one never kills nobody. It’s allus somethin’. That’s the murderer.
   Eben: Didn’t he slave Maw t’ death?
   Peter He’s slaved himself t’ death. He’s slaved Sim ‘n’ me ‘n’ yew t’ death- on’y none o’us hain’t died-yit.
   Simeon: It’s somethyn’- drivin’ him-t’ drive us!

(O’Neill, 2004,10)

The above lines show that the main characters are aware of ‘something’ which leads the whole action. The principal characters are “motivated directly by demonic elements … the ghost [Eben’s mother], Ephraim’s god, the “desire” of the title” (8). which are in some way apprehensible and identifiable, though beyond the ken of science and reason.

O’Neill makes use of the mother archetype to find out Eben’s personality. Eben’s internal conflict is not to be missed, for it goes to the psychological core of O’Neill’s play. The examination of Eben’s personality depends on his relationship with his mother. The main source of his tragedy originates from his psychological quest for a mother figure. In the play, Eben suffers from an inner conflict between emotional demands for a woman and inner subjectivity. O’Neill explores the dilemma in Eben’s character and ascribes it to his early childhood. His quest is only a reflection of the need for an emotional bond which is lost. The dead mother always plays an active part in his quest although she does not exist physically. She does not appear in the play yet she unifies all parts of it. As an audience, we know her from Eben’s infantile remembrances. He narrates his fondness for his mother and his hatred for his father to his brothers.

The sense of wonder is established early in the play. When Eben is asked by Simeon to explain his long-standing grudge against the elder brothers, he remarks that “year after year it’s skulked in yer eye. . somethin’ ” (O’Neill, 2004,11) Eben and others unconsciously feel that there is something which stimulate them to action. Eben’s mother imposes her power not only on her son but almost on all the characters in the play. Later Ephraim, recounting to Abbie how he once left his stony new England farm for a rich and
easy life in Ohio, only to abandon his crop and return home, explains “I could ‘o been a rich man . . but somethin’ in me fit me and fit me . . the voice of God sayin’ : This hain’t with nothin’ t’ Me. Get ye back t’ hum!” ( O’Neill, 2004,45). Throughout the play, the old man is conscious of a hostile presence in the house: “They’s thin’s pokin’ about in the dark, in the corners”. Even the music can’t drive it out” ( O’Neill, 2004,63), he exclaims during the festivities in honor of the baby, “somethin”. And finally, after he learns the truth about Eben and Abbie’s relationship and the child’s paternity: “That was it - what I felt- pokin’ around the corners . . while ye lied . . holdin’ yeself from me . . sayin’ ye’d already conceived … I felt they was somethin’ onnateral . . Somewhars . . the house got so lonesome . . an’ cold . . drivin’me down to the barn . . t’ the beasts o’ the field” ( O’Neill, 2004, 75 ). The mysterious influence at work on Eben and his father can be seen, at one level, with the avenging spirit of Eben’s mother. Having driven Ephraim out of the house, the same “onnateral” force seems to impel Eben toward Abbie in spite of the young man’s fierce resistance and to preside over their union in the parlor that is sacred to the dead woman’s memory:

Abbie: When I first come in . . in the dark . . they seemed somethin’ here.
Eben: (simply) Maw.
Abbie: I kin still feel . . somethin’ ….
Eben: It’s Maw.

(O’Neill, 2004,50)

Eben is the victim of a sinister maternity. He talks to his mother as if she is not dead. The claims of the past render the play to a revenge play. As Normand Berlin points out that “Eben’s mother, like Hamlet’s father, seems to be saying throughout: ‘Remember me ‘! Mother hangs over the play and lurks within the play; she acquires a deterministic force as potent as the gods in Greek drama.” (8) A sin has been committed against Eben’s mother by Ephraim. He is guilty of doing something wrong her. Eben, then, is in a continual antagonism against his father, and he insists that the farm is his.

Eben’s quest for a mother figure goes hand in hand with his wish to own the farm. The possession of the farm is the most dominant single passion which is clearly connected with Eben’s mother. For Eben, the farm is an object of greed, beside being a ‘thing’ he inherited from his mother but has been tricked out of by his father. It serves as a mirror “that will reflect the mind and personality of man,”(9) to use N. S. Pradhan’s words. The destructive family life of Cabot in the farm has a very great impact on them. The subplot of Simeon and Peter, Ephraim Cabot’s sons by his first wife, shows this clearly. At the play’s beginning the sunset reminds Simeon of his lost wife and of “gold
in the west”. The farm helps at creating a tension between security and freedom, between lost possibility and the escape from present confining authority.

Abbie, Ephraim’s third wife, also struggles for freedom, left motherless as a child, she was married to a drunkard, saw her baby die, and was widowed.

an’ I was glad sayin’ now . . .

My own wuk in my own hum . . .

(O’Neill, 2004,32)

Not only is the family of security shown to be oppressively rigid, but it is also a place of selfish greed rather than nurture. O’Neil hints that “some moderation of the possessiveness of the Cabot family may exist in his references to Cabot’s second wife”. (10) Eben’s mother represents, apparently, the feminine principle without its possessiveness. She gave kindness and softness to all without its having to be earned. Because of her death, the atmosphere of the house is of a man’s camp kitchen rather than that of a home. This home becomes a place of ghosts cursing its head.

Another part of the landscape of the farm, and one of the most important, are the two elm trees on each side of the house. The elms represent the spirit of Eben’s mother and her domain. Ephraim gives a clue to this when he leaves his party and the yard says, “Ye kin feel it droppin’ off the elums, climbin’ up the roof, sneakin’ down the chimney, pokin’ in the corners! They’s no peace in houses, they’s no rest livin’ with folks. Somethin’ always livin’ with ye. I’ll go t’ the barn an’ rest a spell.” (O’Neill, 2004,63) This statement has two very important aspects. First, it shows that the spirit of his former wife is still in the house. Moreover, it shows Ephraim’s close ties to the land, and illuminates the fact that he cannot share his life with other people. He feels that the animals in the barn can understand him better than any human since the animals and Ephraim are close to the land, and fail to show emotion.

At the outset of the play, the two enormous elms on each side of the house represents the dominance of mother over the play, although she is not seen on the stage. O’Neill sets the stage for Desire Under the Elms with this use of psychoanalytic symbolism:

Two enormous elms are on each side of the house. They bend their trailing branches down over the roof. They appear to protect and at the same time subdue. 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.

( O'Neill, 2004,3 )

The maternal significance of the trees in the garden of the Cabot farmhouse is made explicit in their bending over the house like a mother who is embracing her child. The elms, her outward farm, are an ever-present maternal set piece. They protect and shelter the house with their long branches. O’Neill describes their function in the scenic design with words that suggest the visual presence of a significant, not mere set decoration, as he notes their “sinister maternity” and “crushing jealous absorption”. In Jungian psychology, the tree has maternal significance. It is the symbol of the mother archetype. It is closely associated with “the origin in the sense of the mother. It represents the source of life, of that magical life force”. (11)

On the other hand, the elms assume “the role of mute stage actor, growing in importance as the play progresses.” (12) When Cabot and Abbie make their entrance in the second scene, the shapes of “sinister maternity” recall the previous wives of Cabot, who were worked to death to serve his passion for the farm. No one can ignore the evil vitality they suggest when Abbie suffocates her child, much as the elms smother the house and those within. Ernest G. Griffin has referred to the elms as an “arboreal oversoul”, a term too poetically pale for such a dynamic symbol. They represent the possessing deity as mystic grotesque, the diamon who instills desire. Their presence is like the static figure of the god announcing vengeance (13).

So, too, as the elms which watch over the house, O’Neill’s absent heroine has a spiritual quality beyond the ken of simple rustics. The dead mother, in memory at least, possesses everyone beneath the elms. She represents the “somethin’ that all are aware of but cannot see or articulate. The enigmatic “Somethin’” that defines the unseen force in these people’s lives transforms itself into an ambiguity of desires and needs. And a confusion between wanting and needing sets in motion the tragic events of the play as Abbie is brought to the farm. Her desire for Eben appeals to his elemental, instinctual longings; “Nature’ll beat ye, Eben. Ye might’s well own upt’ it fist’s last” (O’Neill, 2004,36). Her words synthesize the tragic essence of the play, the confusion of passionate desire with a nobility in love.
The mother’s existence is sensed most strongly at the moment of Eben’s sin. Mother hangs over the play like a curse. Eben’s desire subdues his good judgment. He is driven unconsciously to commit sin. Although he still senses the ghost of the mother he adored, he allows Abbie to seduce him. The scenes working up to the seduction scene play with tremendous irony. At one hand, Ephraim describes his first two wives as greater loneliness than he’d ever known. Meanwhile, Abbie, the Rose of Sharon he longed for, sit in his bed and stares across stage through imaginary walls into the eyes of Eben who is isolated in his room. O’Neill here makes us anticipate the following step, concerning Eben and Abbie. Their awareness of each other foreshadows the seduction scene that follows.

The role of the dead mother id best felt in the parlour in which the passionate sexual desires of Eben and Abbie are fulfilled. It is the mother’s parlour. She is laid there when she is died. It’s a “repressed room like a tomb”(O’Neill, 2004,49). Even Abbie, when she enters the room, she is frightened and ready to run away

To take revenge from her husband, the punishment of the dead mother is at work. She occupies his son’s mind. Since his mother’s image is unconscious, it is unconsciously projected upon Abbie. Abbie, here, plays double roles as a mother and as a lover. She is the symbol of both maternal and sexual love, when Abbie and Eben enter the tomb-like room which has not been opened since Eben’s mother’s death, Abbie plays her double roles at the same time:

Eben: They hain’t nothin’ much. She was kind and good
Abbie: (Puttinrone arm over his shoulder. He does not seem to notice- passionately): I’ll be kind an’ good t’ ye!
Eben: Something she used t’ sing fur me
Abbie: I’ll sing fur ye!

(O’Neill, 2004,51)

We notice above that Eben and Abbie are driven unconsciously and intentionally to this certain room not other rooms in the house. This reveals that there’s somebody leads them, that is, Eben’s mother. In addition, Abbie in this greater moment, repeats and does what Eben’s mother did.

In the shuttered parlour, Eben acts in a way that suggests he is being manipulated-being directed by some force other than his own. As Abbie beckons him to meet her in that place which will stir his passion the most, the stage directions reveal the other force at work in his confused, driven mind. In the seduced night, Eben is directed to dress

The answer to Eben’s question soon becomes apparent. His behaviour in this scene suggests that his mother exists in more just the darkened, airless room where she lay in death. Eben strongly feels the presence of his mother in the room and talks to her. He senses that his mother would approve his union with Abbie, as a way of revenging herself on Cabot.

Acting the role of Eben’s mother-image, Abbie externalizes for him his infantile wish to return to his mother. Their kisses are but momentarily pure however and then surge into fierce passion:

Abbie: (both her arms around him-with wild passion): I’ll sing fur ye! I’ll die fur ye! (in spite of her overwhelming desire for him, there is a sincere maternal love in her manner and voice- a horribly frank mixture of lust and mother love) Don’t cry Eben! I’ll take yer Maw’s place! I’ll be everythin’ she was t’ ye! Let me kiss ye, Eben! (she pulls his head around … She is tender) Don’t be feered! I’ll kiss ye pure, Eben-Same’s if I was a Maw t’ ye-an’ ye kiss me back ’s if yew was my son-my boy –sayin’ good-night t’ me! kiss me, Eben. (They kiss in restrained fashion. Then suddenly wild passion overcomes her. She kisses me lustfully again and again and he flings his arms about her and returns her kisses …)

(O’Neill, 2004,52)

In the seduction scene, we see that Eben’s consciousness is invaded by the image of the mother. Eben is torn between nobility and desire. He himself, baffled at first that his mother’s ghost should seem to favor a union between him and Abbie. At last, he comes to realize that he discerns the spirit’s purpose: “I see it! I see why it’s her vengeance on him . . . so’s she can rest quiet in her grave! ” (O’Neill, 2004,52). But we know that in fact this love, while punishing Ephraim, will also destroy the dead woman’s beloved son as well as his child. When Eben learns that Abbie has murdered their child, he cries “Maw, where was ye, why didn’t ye stop her?” (O’Neill, 2004,72). Again, it is Abbie who tells the truth: “she went back t’ her grave that night we first done it, remember? I hain’t felt her about since” (O’Neill, 2004,72).
The sense of doom lingering above the Cabot farm house is well integrated with the rest of the play. The charm of the room is destroyed only by the thought of revenge. The power of the dead, of the past, ceases when Abbie takes the place of Eben’s mother and mistress. The crucially dramatic curse of Eben’s mother is fulfilled now. Finally, Ephraim is left alone surveying the wreck of his kingdom. We are reminded of Ephraim’s sin by Eben’s continued antagonism, his insistence that the farm is his and his mother’s who was slaved to death after being cheated. Edgar F. Racey believes that if the wrong done, the mother hangs over the play like a curse. Eben and Abbie may be seen as “agents of process of justice”, directed against Ephraim. He sees that without this framework of the curse, the reader is faced with a problem of ‘dialectical’ motivation: Eben and Abbie become simply the victims of their lust, and fail to assume the stature of agents of tragic retribution.\(^{14}\) They are locally motivated- Eben by the desire for revenge, Abbie by her desire to possess the farm.

O’Neill here succeeded in writing a modern tragedy, employing psychology as a situation for the Greek fate to produce the mood of impending doom. The end of the play is in line with the classical tradition going back to ancient Greek tragedy of its concept of guilt and atonement. Eben and Abbie become the victims of their lust as we said before. Therefore, they doom themselves by their incestual sin and suffer the terrible consequences. They have to take the ultimate responsibility of their sinful acts. Justice is achieved through retribution. Abbie accepts her guilt: “I’ got t’ take my punishment-t’ pay for sin” (O’Neill, 2004,76). Eben also sees that he is also as guilty as Abbie in their crime: “I want t’ share with ye, Abbie,- prison ’r death ’r hell ’r anythin’ !” (O’Neill, 2004, 77). They are reunited in their love with Eben’s sharing the guilt. Arguably, Eben comes to know more than lust with Abbie, but his moral amelioration does not occur until the end of the play, when he realizes that he has been used for the vengeance of his mother and then acknowledges his love for Abbie and shares in her guilt. Not until that moment is there truly a transformation.

Like Greek drama, the haunting past, which is embodied in Eben’s dead mother play an important role in determining the present and future state of the characters. And this is one of tragic elements O’Neill used in Desire Under the Elms. The dead mother which is absent is the hero herself. It is neither Eben nor Abbie that leads the tragic action of the play to its utmost. The two are used to execute the mother’s revengeful desire. She is like giant which embraces everything in the play.
Although she does not appear, yet she dominates the whole action of the play. She is the strongest till the end. There is no escape from her magical influence. Eben’s mother takes the decisive role in heading the whole events in the play.

Thus; Desire Under the Elms is a modern tragedy though it has the Greek mythical background as a fundamental bases for the theme and the plot. O’Neill put the emphasis on the psychological side which gave it modern taste. This trait makes O’Neill a unique modern dramatist. Almost in all his plays, O’Neill preoccupied himself with the inner thoughts and feelings of his protagonists. His greatest success lies in the exploration and dramatization of their inner world. Thus, his plays attracted the attention of any psychological and psychoanalysts.
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