CONCLUSION
Archetypal criticism is not a unifying category of criticism, but itself a part of a total form, and its objective is to find whatever total form criticism can see in literature. It is clear that criticism cannot be systematic unless there is a quality in literature which enables it to be so. There is an order of words corresponding to the order of nature and the natural sciences.

Our survey of drama has taken us as far as literary history goes. If not the oldest profession in the world, the theatre is one of the oldest. Its origins are lost in the prehistoric mists and the only certainty is that its matrix or womb was religious ritual. The first play in our consideration is one among the first, produced by the first known playwright in 458 B.C. The last one is the latest among the group, produced in 1943 A.D., and exhibits the advancement in theatre art as well as the most recent thought pattern of man. It has taken us from ancient Greece to renaissance England and from twentieth century England to America and France. I hope that it gives a universality to the subject matter in hand. The study illustrates that the total history of literature moves from the primitive to the sophisticated and here we glimpse the possibility of seeing literature as a complication of a relatively restricted and simple group of formulas that can be studied in the primitive culture.
The search for archetypes is a kind of anthropology, concerned with the way that literature is informed by pre-literary categories such as ritual, myth and folktale. From our examination we come to the conclusion that the relation between the pre-literary categories and literature is not purely one of descent as we find them reappearing in the great classics. We realize that there is a general tendency among the great classics to revert to them. Nevertheless, the greatness of the literature obviously does not depend merely on the mythical nature of its subject-matter. In the original myth the mystery was doubtless directly symbolized, as directly as the process of symbolization will allow. But for the later ages, for audiences who were losing their apprehension of mystery, the authors found it necessary to rework the mythic material and to shift the emphasis from bald presentation of the symbolic events to such a treatment as would promote awareness of the mystery symbolized.

When the study of mediocre works of art, however energetic they may be, remains obstinately at random and peripheral from critical experience, a profound masterpiece seems to draw us to a point at which we can see an enormous number of converging patterns of significance. At this point we wonder if we cannot see literature, not only as a complicating in time, but as spread out in a conceptual space from some unseen centre.
A search for the centre of the tragedies that interested us, take us to their source in the myth of the Greeks. It also becomes clear that the myth is not the converging point of the sources and archetypes of the plays in our consideration, but also of the entire tragedy and a good extent of serious literature. This finding compells on us a close examination of the myths, legends and folktales.

They are verbal narratives symbolizing and preserving individual and national exploits. The serious stories are information about valuable human experience that each culture nourishes and on which the society bases its spiritual foundations. They are attempts to unravel the mysteries of the universe, to explain and make its phenomena intelligible, and to influencing and possessing it. A myth can be understood as an account of true events covered with the accretion of legends that have multiplied over time. Only an authentic event that moved the national soul gives birth to epic and legend. The myths are high philosophic truths that are entirely true. They are historical truths embedded in allegories and shaped by the constitutive imagination, the creative faculty of a nation. Their existence is like that of living organisms that grow and flower in nature. A myth never dies, it only gets transformed.

In the myth of Orestes, which is a source or a centre of origin for the plays in question, we discern a movement of
self-assertion and submission, which is also the principal movement that we see in nature. Any poet, who is serious about what he writes, who is concerned with the origin and destiny of man and is eager to know the meaning of his existence, cannot help returning to the myth. Thus, the structure of the tragedy, which is undoubtedly the most serious of all literary forms, is invariably that of the myth. Only the explanation for the movement of self-assertion and submission, we find varying in different authors. The movement is being interpreted, by a few, as being forced by external elements, making the hero a person who is acted upon than acting. Some other dramatists depict the fall as the hero's bringing down doom upon him by his own evil. A third group explains that man and god work in coalition. The expiation of sin, the sacrifice for the salvation of the community, or both in one are the objectives attributed by the playwrights for the essential fall of the hero. The myth of Orestes provides tragedy with almost all the themes and characters apart from the archetypal structure.

The core-structure provided by the myth of Orestes to the group of tragedies that we have taken for our study is the focus of our mythical analysis. The structure always presents the son of a murdered father, having to avenge his father by killing both his mother and the supplanter. This in each drama presents the hero with considerable moral,
metaphysical and psychological problems. To see whether the myth contains all this poetic experience and to find how it happened to be there, we have to undertake an in-depth study of the myth with the help of anthropology.

The short anthropological study in the Introduction has shown us that the matricide committed by Orestes in the myth marked a total change in all the spheres of human life. Thus it was to substitute a mother-goddess concept with a father-god concept in religion, a blood-for-blood-feud with an institution of justice in moral life, the rule of mother with that of father in family, matriarchy with patrilineal inheritance and rule in social set up, the Greek primitivism with the Hellenic civilization politically and culturally, and the working of the instincts with that of rational in the intellectual life. Psychologically it shows the freeing of man from the parental bonds. In short, the myth of Orestes is the myth of change, development and growth, of man's acquiring knowledge and civilization.

Aeschylus, the first poet to dramatize the mythical narrative, is also the greatest dramatic genius, a product of the time and born with a deed allotted for him. He made a path for himself whereas the others only followed him on the well-beaten track. It was his duty to dramatize the myth and restore the faith of the people in myth, which was
steadily diminishing as they were passing into another phase of rationality. The men, who no longer found Zeus and the lesser gods among them as in the myths, started to question the gods as well as their deeds in the myths. Aeschylus humanizes the gods giving them human motivations and providing a cause-effect relationship to the incidents that just happened in the myth. This renders the myth a new credulity and a new life.

In Aeschylus' dramatic version, The Orestia, he does not make any modification in the structural pattern of the myth. He only gives a definite beginning for the events in the house of Atreus, in Atreus' sacrifice of Thyestes' children, which he places in the dramatic past and conveys through effective choral songs. In the trilogy, which gives a fuller version of the myth, the playwright dramatizes a threefold action, each with the essential tragic structure. The first movement shows the murder of Agamemnon, the second the twin murder of Aegisthus and Clytaemnestra, and the third, the trial of Orestes.

Aeschylus has successfully coordinated all the different themes we can find in the myth, in his greater than myth portrayal of them. The conflict between the Furies, who are daughters of night and thus the older gods, and Zeus and other younger generation gods, presents before the audience the theological problems in the myth. The ritual elements involved
in the murder of Agamemnon shows the suppressed political and sociological significance of the myth of Orestes. The psychological complexities that affect the thoughts and actions of Orestes and Electra also are beautifully conveyed to us by the poet.

The central theme accepted by Aeschylus, anyhow, is the moral question. According to him human suffering comes out of man and the remedy also is to be found in man only. Atreus disbalanced the order in the society and after three generations, Orestes, through his deed and suffering, brings back order and justice and gains wisdom. Each character in the play exhibits an immense love for justice, but with that each merge his own personal ambitions. Orestes, who has the purity of purpose and the willingness for self-sacrifice, alone can bring the perpetuating disaster to an end. Through the trilogy Aeschylus celebrates the progress man achieved through suffering. Aeschylus' play concerned mainly with the emergence of man into the light of knowledge and civilization from the darkness of untold ages is an unqualified success.

In the play the Electra, by his junior contemporary Sophocles, we see the faith of the people in gods as having further diminished. The role assigned to the gods is less and they no longer move among the people as we see in the plays of his master. Sophocles utilizes only a smaller segment of the mythical narrative than Aeschylus, though with frequent references to the past, and the action is entirely focussed
on the matricide of Orestes. By a deliberate distancing of the original sin and by a suppression of the working of the curse he isolates the murder of Agamemnon by Clytemnestra and Aegisthus in the immediate past of the events and sternly dismisses any consequence to Orestes' act of retribution. It would be wise to call the modifications as dramatic suppression than structural changes. Sophocles has done this with a view to projecting the role of Electra, who has undertaken an action of endurance in the story.

We can find two equally relevant themes in Sophocles' play, though the action is simple and woven round a single principal event. The first is the question of the rightfulness of the action of killing the mother. After presenting it as a deserving punishment for Clytemnestra and as a necessary action for Orestes from different angles Sophocles implies the statement that the necessary action is right. The second theme is the validity and necessity of Electra's suffering. Through Electra's single minded endurance and persistence, that finally bring deliverance to the people and to herself, the poet declares that endurance also can serve as a necessary and rightful action. But critics, blinded by their own prescriptive criticism and tendency to study the play in analogy with Aeschylus' play, fail to recognize the value of it and call it a failure.

Euripides' plays, the Electra and the Orestes, best illustrate the extent to which a Greek playwright could depart
The theme of humanism turns out to be the only clear message in the *Electra*, though it is only a minor aspect. The universality of human nature and the possibility of finding goodness in the poor and evil among the noble is brought out successfully. The theme of scepticism and the idea that matricide is wrong under any circumstance are weakened by Euripides' introduction of the gods in the end of the play. In spite of the presentation of the gods in the end of the plays there is a deliberate and evident attempt in the two plays to shift the responsibility of human act from the gods to the human beings. Several statements scattered everywhere in the *Electra* and in the *Orestes* propagate the idea that man should take the responsibility of his own acts. Through the suffering of the doers and their all out efforts for deliverance without the help of any external agent, the playwright almost conveys it. But the presentation of gods in the end of the plays undo what Euripides diligently
creates in the plays. They prove not only that they exist and can interfere in the affairs of human beings, but also that matricide is right if demanded.

The Hamlet has a few structural complications that make the identification of the myth behind it, not easy at a glance. Yet, to the one who observes the play from the archetypal point of view the structure becomes simple as the son's revenge for his murdered father on the suppliant and his mother. The repetition of the structure where we see three wronged sons having to avenge their fathers is a strange thing that we see in Shakespeare's play alone. Further the three are contrasted with each other providing an unusual variety and plentifulness. In the essential action all the three, Fortinbras, Hamlet, and Laertes have their revenge. This is made possible by a splitting up of the mythical character Orestes into three persons as well as by attributing more than one role to the central character, Hamlet. The actions and motives of Agamemnon, Aegisthus, Orestes and Apollo are merged in the protagonist.

Hamlet is plagued by the problem of the rightfulness of the action, though the deed that troubled the Orestes figures prior to him is taken away from him. The influence of its period of production is evident in this dilemma of the character. In the Renaissance England, where Christianity prevailed, no god can be expected to share the responsibility of human actions. Again, God is sure to punish if he erred in
his judgement and performance. It is clearly a problem
created by intelligence, reason and education. The Oedipal
tendencies of Hamlet also govern him in his decisions. Moreover,
Shakespeare implies that the actions of the chief characters
will directly affect the state and thus restore the political
significance of the myth, in his play. He concludes the play
with the statement that readiness to perform the necessary
act is more important than speculation over the moral,
metaphysical, political, and legal aspects of it. The Hamlet
is by the far the fuller and more successful dramatization
of the myth after The Oresteia.

Eugene O'Neill's play the Mourning Becomes Electra
closely follows the structural pattern of the myth except
in the conclusion. The death of Orin after the killing of
his mother and her lover is the variation that he has effected.
When Shakespeare allowed Hamlet to die he preserved another
Orestes figure in Fortinbras for the death of Orestes is
certain to produce a meaning diametrically opposite to that
of the myth. O'Neill, in his eagerness to illustrate the
Freudian theories of Oedipus and Electra complexes, reverses
the meaning of the myth. The action of the trilogy with the
murder of Mannon in the first play, the murder of Christine
and Brant in the second and the trial and death of Orin in
the third brings the deliberately created similarity to
The Oresteia, closer.
In O'Neill's family play the characters are not troubled by moral, metaphysical, religious or political concerns as in the myth or as in the earlier interpretations. According to him every character is governed by an uncontrollable Oedipal tendency that is exaggerated to a high degree of morbidity. Orin and Lavinia are guided not by a desire for revenge, but sexual jealousy. Once they realize this, they sentence themselves either to death or to a self-destructive, and masochistic solitary confinement. The psychological interpretation based on the Freudian theories converts the myth of progress and growth into a destructive one.

The structure of *The Family Reunion* shows more resemblance to the myth of Oedipus and its dramatization by Sophocles than to the myth of Orestes. The action of the play, without the murder of a father or a revenge for him by the murder of the mother and the supplanter, is the search for the identity of the protagonist. Finding himself in the position of Oedipus, Harry leaves Wishwood for penance and inside the room Amy dies a silent death. The elements of the myth of Orestes, like archetypal characters and themes are only secondary in the play.

The search for one's identity, sin and expiation, the displacement of the old values, and the Christian idea of suffering for the salvation of others are made themes at
one time or other by Eliot. The lack of an objective correlative, the absence of a definite beginning and an end and the ambiguity that surrounds many of the incidents in the play make it an artistic failure.

Sartre resorts to the same old characters and structure of the myth of Orestes for his play, *The Flies*. He follows Sophocles for the structure, action, and even to some extent the theme of the play. Orestes is equal to the role assigned to him and performs it without any qualms, once the recognizes his deed. The action is centred round the twin murder of Clytemnestra and Aegisthus by Orestes.

The question why Orestes should kill his mother and the supplanter is the major concern in the play. It is not because a god or a ghost has commanded it, as in most of the plays, that Orestes kills the wrongdoers. Neither is the hero guided by his Oedipal tendencies and sexual jealousy. The intellectual hero recognizes that there is a deed allotted to each man and only through the performance of it he can give meaning to his existence. But it is not unknown to Sartre's existential hero that he is free to do it or not and so the responsibility will be on him if he commits an action. It is to find his own identity and become the essential self that Orestes performs the action and not because of any external compulsion. He knows that the allotted deed is not wrong since it is needed and demanded. In his choice he chooses for others also and rescues the country from the grip
of political tyranny and a religion of guilty conscience.

We feel that all these dramatic masterpieces draw us to a point at which we can see an enormous number of converging patterns of significance. Each play has a meaning of its own and another in the structure that involves the entire group. We know that this group forms only a sub-structure in the world of literature. Each play becomes a ritual in performance and acquires a greater significance gained by its position in the structure.

The sub-structure formed by the tragedies that we examined is analogous to the solar system. The tragedies revolve round the myth, near and far as the planets rotate the sun. They depend for their life, energy and existence on the myth, but none of them exhausts or extinguishes the myth. The myth is there, full of meaning, energy and life. So we can hope for more and more tragedies, more and more interpretations of the myth in the future.