LIGHT AND DARKNESS
Light and darkness is a metaphor of interplay of desire and depression. There are spaces in the physical and the mental world that are dark and light. Maya is a being who keeps on thinking constantly and during her thought process she is swayed from darkness to light and from depression to hope. Maya was always hoping to have a world of harmony, love and coordination. What she realizes time and again are transformed into depression. There is a juxtaposition of desire and depression. On one side when life seems to be better there is some hope but on the other there is no realization of ambitions. It is a dialectical relation of two sides. What Maya would have thought of life is not complete darkness, there is always a flicker of hope here and there. The struggle continues only if there is a possibility of light or life and then it keeps on changing, light keeps
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changing into darkness and vise versa in the cob-web of her mental horizon:

The verandah chairs had been taken out on the lawn for us, two large, comfortable chairs, rather battered, rather old, and we sat down, as we did each evening, to glasses of fresh lemonade and to an hour or so of matrimonial silences and conversation. The light in the verandah was on illuminating the white pillars with an inward glow, as of soft marble at sunset, though not quite so soft or quite so translucent --- Winter was over, summer had not yet arrived. I lay back in my chair and breathed deeply, lay there waiting- for summer ? for snakes ? for the moon ? did not know.

Yes, I did. It was that something else, that indefinable unease at the back of mind, the grain of sand that irked, itched, and remained meaningless. Meaningless, and yet its presence was very real, and truly physical shadow, like the giant shadows cast by tree spilt across the leaves and grasses towards me, with horrifying swiftness, till, like the crowding blades of grass, it reached my toes, lapped my feet, tickling and worrying and I leapt from my chair in terror, overcome by a sensation of snakes coiling and uncoiling their moist lengths about me, of evil descending from an overhanging branch, of an insane death, unprepared for heralded by deafening drum beats ...

Life, people, light again. (CP.pp.12-13).
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Maya at this stage of struggle is trying to keep up hope. There is undoubtedly despair and obscurity but there is not complete darkness. Maya and Gautama are caught up in a mental conflict. Maya is unable to see anything clearly as one is able to see in the light, there is obscurity leaving the situation hazy for both of them. Gautama and Maya are not simply two robots, they have yet not lost hope of establishing a congenial relationship. The main problem is that he does not understand her level of despair, as he now is unaware of her level of frustration.

An existential problem is a resultant of extreme despair where the being tries to find some way out. Cry, the Peacock is a story of struggle, a continuous effort to get out of the trap of destiny, cultural norms and astrology. Maya is caught in this existential situation which has been created not because of her doing. Whether it is a problem created by culture or by religion, she tries her best to steer through the situation. When there is little possibility, she feels it can be done, but when there is a slight possibility of defying then starts the real human struggle.

Reality is absolute and immutable. It dialectically contributes to practical ideology, a complex formation of nations, representations, images and modes of action, gestures, attitudes, norms which govern men in relation to the objects and problems as their social and individual existence.

Freud talks about 'EGO,' 'SUPER EGO,' 'ID'. Ego is what a child wants himself to be. Super ago is what prohibits. Id is what actually exists. ID is identity or identification and it is the inherited instinctive impulses of
the individual as part of the unconscious. The primary desire which is not fulfilled is ID. There is a split subject when the super ego supresses ego and this process goes on and on because there is a gap between the conscious and the unconscious and this development goes on and as the child grows up this consciousness manifests in psychological bubbles even in dreams. The area at which the unconscious surfaces is DREAMS or in the form of PONS, WORD-PLAY and SLIPS OF THE TONGUE. Freud calls these PARAPRAXES. More important than these functions are NEUROSES and PSYCHOSES and it can erupt in misreading, forgetting, the failing of memory and neuroses in the form of obsessional relationship while touching everything. Hysterical neuroses like pains and fever is caused by obsessional fears. In psychoses ego is partly used to press the unconscious and desire comes under its sway. When this happens the link between the ego and the external world is ruptured and the unconscious begins to build up an alternative disillusioned reality. There are two kinds of psychoses, one is the systematized state of delusion which leads to disillusioned jealousy and the second is the detachment from reality and the turning in of the self with an excessive but loosely systematized production of fantasies. In the case of Maya we find no jealousy at all but what is clearly visible is her detachment from reality and the fantasizes she produces are nothing positive but all negative thoughts like death, suicide, murder.

The equation that Lacan uses for Ego, Super ego and Id is the imaginary, the symbolic and the real that constitute the structure of the subject. The structural relationship between the three has two formulations,
both represented by what Lacan calls the ‘L’ schema. This schema stretches the subject (s) towards the four points characterized by the determination of $O= \text{the other}; o' \text{ or I, Ego}; \text{another figure of the other, but under the irreducible form of the partial object of desire (object O).}$

\[ \text{Ego (infant)} \]

This dialectic goes on for a long time.

This structure, which allows us to identify the axis of the real; the symbolic and the imaginary has a relation to the Oedipus Complex proposed by Freud, in the form of a triangle; the father, the mother and the subject - child in between, for whom the problem is of situating itself between the parental figures. The entire history of the Oedipus Complex deals with the toppling over the figures of the mother and the father; the ‘liquidation’ of the Oedipus Complex signifies symbolically speaking, the entry into life, the end of childhood, the stabilization of identification. The structure of the subject as described by Lacan adopts these terms, but transforms them while adding a fourth term; the subject
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itself, neither father, nor mother, nor child but the structure consisting of these terms. The other is the place of the Law, of cultural order, which gives its particular character to this law, it is the place of the father; the partial object, called ‘petit a’ is the place of the impossible, of unsatisfied desire for a giant body of the mother before the separation, of her body henceforth prohibited by law, this is the place of the mother, total and partial at the same time, impossible to attain. Finally, o’ is the place of the child, which is dependent on the other two places.

The fourth term, the subject, is on the side of the real, which from the outset appears as excluded from the structure, or rather, foreclosed; present and determining, but inconspicuous and repressed, out of the circulation. The play of signifiers, it is the meeting of the two axes, imaginary and symbolic; imaginary, between the place of the Ego and the place of the object of desire; symbolic, between the other and the absent subject of the combination. The two situations can be thus stated; the symbolic is the order which installs the subject in language, in his language, that of his fathers, of his father; the imaginary is that which reflects the desire in the image that the subject has of itself. On the side of the imaginary is variety, diversity, the multiplicity of objects which scatter the desire in a life; on the side of the symbolic is unity, determination, the structuration of time. The imaginary which hinges on the armour of the symbolic, may be represented by the metaphor of “accessories,” objects of disguise, “set of imaginary figures” theatrical forms; while symbolic, as the
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armor represents the support on which hangs the variables of the subject. *Imaginary, Symbolic and Real* by Catherine Clement – Translated from French by Franson Manjali .pp.4-5)

The Ego is all the time positioning itself in terms of others. Maya causes destruction in her life as she is not able to position her ego in terms of others at a proper place causing imbalance in her personality. The Ego is formed at the mirror stage between six to eight months of age when the child looks into the mirror, the state of unbroken image of his or her body. The child has not constituted a misrecognised image - the gap between what the child is and what he will be. It is at this stage that the father, the law intervenes. It is at this precise moment in the individual’s life that the imaginary comes into existence. It is perhaps the only event that can be defined as such in the psychoanalytic scheme. All the other events of one’s life can be referred to by the play of repetition, to the primitive event, an ungraspable one, of an original trauma, which takes place in a temporal unfolding. The mirror stage that marks the birth of the subject is beyond repetition.

The imaginary and the symbolic is the social order, correcting the image. The real has a major role to play because it cannot pass the symbolic, the real can be perceived only through the symbolic. In the case of the imaginary ego, the real is kept away from the individual. It is mediated by the symbolic order and this is where any expression, the only thing that is the subject of creation, is to take certain positions but not to represent the real which is not possible. The signifier cannot be located,
identified, it is always sliding behind the signified. What is desired is not achieved. Lacan says that man does not speak language, language speaks man:

Levi-Strauss, while speaking of the symbolic efficacy in myth and in shamanistic cures, proposed the same distinction in terms of the imaginary individual and the symbolic collective, i.e., between the variable and the order. The distinction is extended to the division between the unconscious and the subconscious. “The unconscious is no longer seen as the ineffable refuge of individual particularities, the depository of a unique history which makes each one an irreplaceable being. It is reduced to a term which we designate a function: the symbolic function, specifically human, surely but which operates according to the same laws in all men, which leads us to the set of these laws” (Structural Anthropology). Thus posed, the unconscious is formal, empty, the bearer of structural laws and having the function of imposing on the subconscious, the set of “non-articulated elements, which originate elsewhere: drives, emotions, representations, souvenirs.” Like the imaginary, the subconscious is a kit, a reservoir of images from which each one draws the lot which characterizes the individual. It can be said that the subconscious is the individual lexicon where each one of us accumulates the vocabulary of his personal history, but this vocabulary acquires meaning for ourselves and for others only to the extent that the unconscious organizes it according to its laws, and makes it a discourse.” The historical convergence between the vocabulary of Lacan and that
of Levi – Strauss can be interpreted as the genesis of a new conceptual cleavage existing between the individual and language, between the individual and the symbolic, between variability and order that governs it, between space and time, between subject and history.

This subject even if it is caught in the history, however has a biographical history; the imaginary, just as the symbolic function, has its proper temporality. The imaginary, in fact, is constituted by a glance, in a specific event that Lacan was the first to isolate as a clinical phenomenon and integrate with psychoanalytic theory, referred to as the Stage of the Mirror (1936). This symbolism raised the question of another time, than of event: the time of death and of history. But at the same time, its involved prioritarily in the process of therapeutic transformation, be it magical or scientific: the symbolic, as it denotes the entirety of language, is the principle of all cures and allows to act upon the imaginary; but the reverse is not true. *Imaginary, Symbolic and Real* by Catherine Clement- Translated from French by Franson Manjali. Pp.6-7).

Maya goes back to her past whenever she visualizes her future and is scared of it. Death, loneliness, fear, frustration are all surrounding her. A series of images which are not only fantastic or physical but gusty images which have the sound and the resonance of the word. There are two impacts on the sub-conscious of the child, the experience of the object and its impression or psychic trace. The experience of hunger or the contact with
an object like a mountain leaves a certain impression or trace but it also leaves a word that is used to express the gusty image of that experience. One is the trace of the experience, the other is the resonance of the same word. The meaning of the word and the word itself acquire a certain association with the child. Both are the expressions of the word, the linguistic expression and the other is what is left, not the substances but the form:

God! God! I cried and sat up in terror. There was no clash and clamour after that I was aware of a great, dead silence in which may eyes opened to a vision that appeared through the curtains of the years, one by one falling back till I saw again that shadow. A black and evil shadow. Its names was not that of a denom in a Kathakali dance drama, nor was it one of the limpid appellations of the moon. It was I remembered it now, Fate.” (p. 28)

The experience and its content have form, if we correlate these two. The word is an utterance but what is left on the sub-conscious is important. One remembers what one wants to remember though it is never the same or identical with the earlier impression but an impression of the same. Seeing a dying man is a very painful experience but the impression it leaves does not always coincide with it. The word ‘hunger’ leaves a dramatic impression of the physical reality.

‘Death – an early one – by unnatural causes’, he said, softly, sibilantly, and gently lowered his arms till they dropped to his side, then became furiously
mobile once more, casting his robes once this way, once that. He cut short the ayah's horrified wail” (p. 30).

The relationship between the signifier and he signified consists of two separate entities the signifier and something signified which emerges from the union of the field of the signifier with the field of the signified. put

And the rain – clouds, emerged again from the horizon that was eternally pregnant with promise at one end, and its opposite pole, was an eternally hungry and open grave. In the shadows I saw peacocks dancing, the thousand eyes upon their shimmering feathers gazing steadfastly, unwinkingly upon the final truth - Death. I heard their cry and echoed it. I felt their thirst as they gazed at the rain - clouds, their passion as they hunted for their mates. With them, I trembled and panted and paced the burning rocks. Agony, agony, the mortal agony of their cry for lover and for death. (p.96).

The image and what it signifies cannot be separated. We come in contact with one image or the other and they leave a trace on us. While reading a narrative we see one picture after the other, we read, we experience an image and that image leaves some impression on us and this goes on and on.

A narrative, whether it is articulated in poetry or prose, presents a series of situations where the concrete linguistic utterances delineate specific images. The linear syntagmatic chain of these situations has superimposed mental images that the reader responds to. These images are then subjected to a global perception of the entire structure of the narrative, its discourse. The independent units, the
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situations, which follow each other like the notes in a musical composition, are apprehended in a structure of the signifying ensembles. The separate ensembles, subensembles and micro ensembles all present one formal mental image. Physically, the separate images keep their singular entity but in the process of perception they all lose their individual beings to be a part of the whole. A narrative as such is like a painting, a tableau, where there are a number of smaller images, but which is perceived as one image. First of all, even in delineating each small image, each element, there is a transformation from the empirical substance of the same image; a tree in a painting, or a narrative, is never exactly identical with the physical configuration of that tree, secondly, the paysage as a whole further dissolves all individual forms. This dissolution, however, is entirely of the order of perception. It is almost an illusion. As we mentally enter into a musical composition, especially the one that is well performed, we hear less and less of the physical, distinct level of the notes or even smaller ensembles of notes. We are carried away by the acoustic image of the musical composition that we become completely oblivious of its physical constitution. In exactly the same way, we perceive the acoustic image of a poem or a narrative.

As we syntagmatically follow a narrative, we keep on mentally accumulating images which interact with other related forms. The manifest patterns of the narrative are presented like the slowly evolving images in a carpet. In the beginning we perceive only partial images on some contours of which complementary forms appear later. As we move further, as we follow the syntagmatic chain, new formal combinations appear and we mentally conceptualise the interrelated images. In the process new illusions are created in the progressive dissolution of physical forms. As we approach the end, we have an entirely different picture that the one established purely at the
physical level. And if we re-read the narrative, we mentally establish new corelation’s, thereby constituting new mental images. This process is most apparent in the cinematographic medium. Like a musician, the film director operates at a number of acoustic levels. The images that we see and perceive on the screen pass through a series of transformations. And as we enter into the discourse of the film, we get lost in the surcharged ambiance of the fast moving images. We move from the physical to the imaginary. We begin to reconstitute our own discourse, our own mental image of what we see. Like the crescendo of the musical composition, the higher echelons of cinematographic composition lead us to a level of pure forms without any corelation with empirical substance. The purpose of rapid juxtapositions of one image against another is to create a mental state of perceiving forms. It is like those children’s games where moving round and round makes one dizzy; the complexity of images creates an ambiance of extreme velocity where the perceived forms not only lose all corelation with the empirical substance, but literally create new forms, over and above the forms constituted by the linguistic descriptions or the specific tableaux of the cinematographic chain.” (FORM and SUBSTANCE Construction and Deconstruction of the Signifier by Harjeet Singh Gill (pp. 5-6).

Maya kills Gautama and goes back to her father’s house. This forces one to think why she is so excited to be back there, probably she never wanted to be away from her father. Gautama in a way had carried her away from her father and now by killing Gautama she had a clear way to go back to her father. All the times it was her father in her sub-conscious. She was all the time talking to him in her imagination and always kept comparing him to Gautama. We can analyse Maya’s psychology with
Freud's example of a young girl of nineteen with superior education and intellectual liveliness changed into a neurotic without any visible reasons. She got into complicated illness which was diagnosed as agoraphobia and obsessional neurosis but what Freud was more concerned was the sleep—the ceremonial with which she tormented her parents. Her nightly precautions were to exclude every source of noise. The clocks and watches were removed, she collected all the flower pots and vases on the writing table so that they might not fall over and break thus disturbing her sleep. The door between her room and her parents rooms should stay half-open and she ensured this by placing various objects in the open door-way. The most important stipulations related to her bed. The pillow at the top must not touch the bed stead, the small top pillow must lie on the large pillow in the way to from a diamond shape. She would place her head exactly along the long diameter of the diamond. The duvet was shaken before being laid on the bed to make its bottom end thick and never failed to press the accumulation to put the feathers apart. What was most abnormal about this ceremonial was that she spent almost two hours during which she could not sleep of course but did not let her intimidated parents sleep either.

Through this analysis the girl gradually learnt the symbols and their symbolic interpretations. She found out the central meaning of her ceremonial one day:

She found out the central meaning of her ceremonial one day when she suddenly understood the meaning of the rule that the pillow must not touch the back of the bed stead. The pillow must not touch the back of the bed
stead. The pillow, she said had always been a woman to her and the upright wooden back a man. Thus she wanted - by magic, we must interpolate - to keep the man and women apart- that is, to separate her parents from each other, not to allow them to have sexual intercourse. In earlier years, before she had established the ceremonial, she had tried to achieve the same aim in a more direct way. She had stimulated fear (or had exploited a tendency to fear which was already present) in order that the connecting doors between her parent's bedroom and the nursery should not be shut. This rule had, indeed, been retained in her present ceremonial. In that way she gave herself the opportunity of listening to her parents, but in making use of it she brought on an insomniac which lasted months. Not satisfied with disturbing her parents by this means she contrived to be allowed from time to time to sleep in her parent's bed between them. The 'pillow' and the 'wooden back' were thus really unable to come together. Finally, when she was so big that it become physically uncomfortable for her to find room in the bed between her parents, she managed, by a conscious simulation of anxiety, to arrange for her mother to exchange place with his for the night and to leave her own place so that the patient could sleep beside her father. This situation no doubt become the starting point of phantasies whose after - effect was to be seen in the ceremonial."

The pillow was a woman according to this girl. The shaking feathers and collecting them at the bottom causing a swelling meant a pregnant woman and her never failing to smooth them away was to smooth away the pregnancy for her fear of her parents intercourse resulting in pregnancy, having another child, or competition to her. The big pillow was a woman, the mother, the small one stood for the daughter.
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"Why did this pillow have to be placed diamond-wise and her head precisely along its centre line? It was easy to recall to her that this diamond shape is the inscription scribbled on every wall to represent the open female genitals. If so, she herself was playing the man and replacing the male organ by her head. (SF-I, pp.307-308)

Maya like the girl in this example could be in the grip of an erotic attachment to her father, the beginning of which went back to her childhood. This fact becomes clear when we gain an insight into the sense and intention of neurotic symptoms. Throughout the narrative whenever Maya is unhappy with either the environment or Gautama she immediately thinks about her father and that too in a very elevated manner:

He starts a bit, then beams at me. Since my ‘ayah’ left, so suddenly, the other day, without even wishing me good-bye, he looked after me alone, and his beam is especially tender, his attention especially loving. I think that he is like a silver oak himself, with his fine, silver-white hair brushed smoothly across his bronzed scalp. He is dressed in white. His eyes are half-closed to the sun, and small crinkles radiate from their corners. I hug his arm tightly, for I have always loved, instinctively, anyone who crinkles the corners of his eyes when he smiles to me, it is a sign of warm-heartedness of tenderness, and reminds me, always, of this man’s open love for me...

People say he spoils me. This means that he fondles my cheek, holds my hand; and says to me, ‘It is getting warm. Time for us to retreat to the hills, isn’t it? Where shall we go this year, Maya? Choose!’ People
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say he spoils me. They also say that I can get anything, I want from him. 'Darjeeling!' I cry, jubilantly. 'Of course!' and jump up and down at his side.

'If only we, could go away for the summer,' I signed, lethargically, breaking my promise never to say such things to Gautama, who had never been able to "go away for the summer" till he married me, and then refused to do so. It was discouraging to reflect on how much in our marriage was based upon nobility forced upon us from outside, and therefore neither true nor lasting. It was broken repeatedly, and repeatedly the pieces were picked up and put together again as of a sacred icon with which, out of the pettiest superstition, we could not bear to part.

Gautama's reaction was exactly what I might have predicted, had I thought before speaking. Immediately he stiffened, turned from me and picked up the papers. 'Why don't you?' he said in a cold astringent tone. 'Your father would take you wherever your wanted to go. He can.' It was the tone he normally used in speaking of my father, but without any leavening of indulgence. (CP. Pp. 39-40)

In this passage we can clearly understand the difference of attitude towards her father and Gautama. The indifference by Gautama, his inability to understand and give value to her desires forces Maya to go to her past, her father. Whenever she has her neurotic pangs she wants to lean against her father for support. She feels probably that he is the only person who could understand her and save her from madness. Or we can put it the other way round that because she cannot get over her father obsession, she in her
inner core always wants to go back to him like the girl of our example who herself drew the conclusion that she was ill. Freud suspects that she became so ill in order not to have to marry so as to remain with her father. Freud comments:

We cannot dismiss the question of why, in what way and for what motive a person can arrive at such a remarkable attitude to life and one that is so inexpedient - assuming that this attitude is a general characteristic of neurosis...

In every one of our patients analysis shows us that they had been carried back to some particular period of their past by the symptoms of their illness or their consequences. In the majority of cases, indeed, a very early phase of life is chosen for the purpose - a period of their childhood or even, laughable as this may sound, of their existence as an infant at the breast. (SF-I, p.314).