Chapter II

Unraveling of the Self: Male Archetypes
CHAPTER II

UNRAVELING OF THE SELF: THE MALE ARCHETYPES

Literary writing explores certain phases of life, and among these aspects are the relationship between the individual and the community not only in social but also in psychological terms, the soiling of consciousness and the isolation of the individual. The writer presents the hero as an individual caught in the world around him, looking for his salvation either by escaping from it or by committing to its codes. Eric Fromm in his *Zen Buddhism and Psychoanalysis* views that, “The sufferings from an acute sense of rootlessness may manifest itself as the alienation from oneself, from one’s fellow-men and from nature” (86). It is visible that there is a constant scuffle in the midst of what the individual hankers after, and the austere reality of what he attains, what he professes and what he practises, what he really is and what he would like to be taken for. This has crumbled his life leaving an insidious effect on his inner being. The injuries inflicted and the scars left on his psyche make him apprehend only of his helplessness. Painfully sentient of his precarious position, man experiences severe limitations arising out of randomness and alienation.

The present chapter proposes to explore the isolation, alienation and archetypes. Although O’Neill and Karnad belong to two farthest social milieus, the attributes, the likeness in archetypes and the existentialism their characters confront appear to be more or less the same. The heroes suffer for their biological or sociological reasons, which cramp their spirits, thwart their ambitions and frustrate their designs to get elation. They are crafted with deep inner conflicts and their introversion and lopsided thinking connote their neurotic nature. They design their self-image in order to enable them to acclimatize
with the external world. The inner conflict is between their super-ego and the deep unconscious, which is primitive, abysmal, inscrutable and unfathomable. The self-realization has been retarded and handicapped owing to their self-images. They are isolated from the reality and the neurotic pride is their hubris, which validates their devastation. These characters have been living in an illusory world of their own.

King Yayati of the play *YAYATI* has qualities similar to O’Neill’s Ephraim Cabot of *DESIRE UNDER THE ELMS*. Further, there are certain concepts in these plays which can be correlated to *MOURNING BECOMES ELECTRA*. Yayati, Ezra Mannon and Ephraim confer prior importance to passions and epitomize the patriarch archetypes. There is lack of filial affections in all the three father figures. The opposition between father and son, father and daughter and the incest motif have made the theme broad-based. The incest motive merged with the mythic structure denotes the playwright’s ability to decipher an old situation in the light of the Freudian researches. Freud avers that in human life the unconscious plays a pre-eminent part. The repressed sexual desires evince themselves in dreams, reveries and in other human functions.

Yank, Brutus Jones and Tughlaq do not perceive any sense of identity and are out of tune with the environment. The wretchedness is born out of either their heredity as in the case of Jones and Yank, or in generating materialistic advancement of the modern society as in Tughlaq. In Yavakri, Billy Brown and Paravasu, the quest for knowledge and material powers are portrayed in the negative aspects. Dion, Devadatta and Arvasu represent the failed artist archetype.

*YAY, DUE and MBE*, are based on mythical background. Myth is a blanket permeated with mythological characters. These characters represent attributes found in every human being. Myth is essential for psychological balance. Each person has an unconscious, part of it is very personal indeed and the other is identical for all human
beings. This section is named the ‘collective unconscious’, where the archetypes are
hoarded. Archetype cannot be a pure ‘breed’ it is a hybrid. All archetypes have positive
and negative aspects, and each person has more than one archetype or is a synthesis of
archetypes.

Ephraim in *DUE* has in him many archetypes in both positive and negative
shades. He is the father figure in the play. He takes the role of a shadow patriarch as he
cannot guide or mend his sons in a proper way. The tussle for material wealth sets the
father against the sons thereby transmuting the filial love into hatred. The Marxian
principle that the human relationship is transformed favourably or adversely by money or
wealth is especially applicable to the theme in *DUE*, showing the strained relation
between father and sons. He is a domineering father and all his sons though timorous of
him, later rebel one by one. His philosophy in life is toil and trouble. Ephraim is the
archetypal patriarch and for O’Neill, the father figure. The name ‘Ephraim’ in Hebrew
means ‘fruitful’. Contrary to the Biblical Ephraim, the originator of the tribe of Israel,
Ephraim in the play is the source of his own and his family’s fall. He boasts of his
physical strength and manhood, and his Biblical name ‘Ephraim’.

The play *DUE* begins with the conversation between Simeon and Peter, and it is
informed that their father departed from home two months ago, and nothing has been
learned of him since then. It is for the first time in thirty years, ever since he married his
second wife Eben’s mother that he has been away from the farm. They have not received
any message from him and as he was old, naturally they think that he is no more. They do
not love him for he made them work hard like slaves. Eben, who has been heeding to his
half-brothers from the window, also concurs with them in wishing his father dead. He
believes that his mother died of overwork given by his father. He himself could not
succour her because he has been too young at the time. As he is matured now, he wishes
to retaliate for the wrong done to her. He would stand up for her and affirm facts to his father, which he could not assert earlier. His mother’s spirit is troubled and restless but he would avenge for her, so that she may rest in peace in her grave.

It is in part I scene 3, Eben delivers the hearsay that their father, Ephraim has married again. Simeon and Peter as they determine to leave home curse their father mock, jeer and stage a dance before him to celebrate their emancipation. Ephraim is dumb-founded at the insolence and impertinent conduct by his sons. They fling stones at Abbie and mockingly tell that they would rape her and burn the farm. Their father stands amazed, gazing at them, and curses for their undutiful deportment. The primal father-son conflict is enacted unconsciously by every generation, and this theme is predominant in the play. The clash is ingrained in the human psyche and is a universal phenomenon.

Ephraim feels isolated and hence marries Abbie. Though he is old, he does not want to be conscious of it. Ephraim feels aloof not only in the presence of his sons but also in the company of his new wife. When Abbie doubts whether Ephraim would leave the farm to Eben, Ephraim replies that in his dying hour, he would set his farm on fire, as he does not want anybody to own his property. These words depict how possessive Ephraim is of his farm. He laments about the loneliness of his life on the farm and his going after women when solitude made him despair. He feels Abbie is not riveted in him and proceeds to the cows who he thinks will give him peace. Meanwhile, Abbie has sexual relation with Eben and bears him a son, which is unknown to Ephraim. When Eben affirms to Ephraim that the farm belonged to him, Ephraim retorts that the farm will belong to the baby who is going to be born to Abbie. The tragic flaw of Ephraim lies in his indulgence in instinctual pleasures and comforts and the concomitant negligence of his family liability towards his three sons. There is an inability in him to maintain a balance between instinct and reason. Later his instinct begins to reign supreme over his
reason thereby upsetting the glossy run of the actions in the family. Ephraim is a victim of self-image and puts on a mask. He has suppressed his legitimate urges, has viewed love as lust, and has defied the puritanical creeds. He has been glued to his farm which is a cage to him and to which he is condemned at the end. The super-ego, the denunciation of sex, his wealth and cruelty to his sons and his rocky nature all are the projections of his repression. His real-self has been crushed and his own projections create difficulties to him making him an existential character. That is the reason he finds that he could attain peace of mind by going down to the barn, which is the only place of solace, and talking out his emotional disturbances with the cows, who offered an understanding ear.

King Yayati has numerous interchangeable idiosyncrasies with Ephraim. They are the symbols of shadow patriarchs as their guardianship and protection turns into dictatorial control. Ephraim subdues his wives and sons, and it is the same with Yayati in his relationship with Sharmishtha and Chitralekha. Both the characters do not have any filial attachment towards their sons. As both Ephraim and Yayati are indulged in pleasure, it is impossible for them to muse of death. Ephraim views that he will live until he is hundred. Yayati cannot even cogitate of the concept of death. However, towards the culmination of the play both the characters are alienated. Yayati, understanding the truth, retakes the curse and advances to the forest for penance while Ephraim is left unassisted in the farm and he encounters consolation not in human beings but in the cows. Both are mythical characters and they stand for everyman.

Karnad’s \textit{YAY} is an existential play on the theme of responsibility. Yayati is the typical representative of the common man who inspite of enjoying happiness from varied sources, is always discontented and is always madly running in pursuit of new contentments and gratifications. He finds himself in a world in which spiritual values have entirely swept away. Blind pursuit of bliss has become the supreme religion in his
life, which ultimately leads to existentialism. It is also a reflection on the condition of
modern man, whose mind disturbed by many worldly and sensuous passions have turned
into a veritable zoo inhabited by wild desires, physical pleasures, and irresponsible
exercise of power and utter forgetfulness of the imperishable values of life.

Yayati portrays the shadow King Archetype. He, as a king is surmised to defend
and counsel his citizens, anticipates for only one deed: nectar to be immortal. As a father
and father-in-law, also Yayati is a fiasco. The father archetype must cater volatile stability
and take care of other members in the family. He must be a role model to his children.
Yayati, when execrated by Shukracharya, does not know how to sort out the situation.
The king by transferring his old age to his son Pooru becomes a shadow destroyer. He
even blights the life of his daughter-in-law, Chitralekha. Millions of people revel in
gratification throughout their life and they have their representative in Yayati. Yayati
reveals the existential view that each man is what he chooses to be or makes himself.

YAY, which was initially written in Kannada and not so far translated into English
by the author as his other five plays, is the most mythical of Karnad’s plays. The spawn
of this play is abrupt and unpremeditated. R.K. Dhawan summarizes the occasion and the
process of its writing in The Critical Perspectives as follows:

“When Karnad was preparing to go to England amidst the intense
emotional turmoil, he found himself writing a play. One day as he was
reading the Mahabharata just for fun, he read the story of Yayati. It clicked
his mind. He started writing. It came as a play. He suddenly found he was
a playwright at that. This was so sudden and so natural. The play was in
Kannada, the language of his childhood. The theme of the play, Yayati
was taken from ancient Indian mythology. While the theme and language
were typically native the play owed its form, not to numerous
mythological plays he watched but to the Western playwrights whom he had read. While the subject matter was purely native and traditional, the form and structure were essentially western”(13).

Karnad has given the traditional tale a new denotation and purport highly relevant in the context of life today. His originality lies in working out the galvanization behind Yayati’s ultimate assortment. In *The Mahabharata*, Yayati perceives the nature of desire and comprehends that fulfilment of desire does not subside. In Karnad’s play, however, Yayati apprehends the trepidation of his own life and presumes his moral liability after a sequence of symbolic encounters. Karnad’s reading of Sartre and other existentialists helped to give a contour and worth to his play. In an interview, he once said:

“I was excited by the story of Yayati, this exchange of ages between the father and the son, which seemed to me terribly powerful and terribly modern. At the same time, I was reading a lot of Sartre and the Existentialist. This consistent harping on responsibility, which the Existentialists indulge in suddenly, seemed to link up with the story of Yayati”.

The character Yayati in the play *YAY* is introduced in act 1 through Sharmishtha. In the fracas between Devayani and Sharmishtha, the latter states that Yayati married the former only for his lust for immortality – for her father’s art of ‘sanjeevani’. Devayani easily trapped by the acerbic words of Sharmishtha, rejects to concede Yayati’s contention that she has been very appealing to him and therefore proposed to marry her. Yayati is shrewd to understand Sharmishtha who is the cause of all the troubles. When Yayati asserts that he would like to converse with Sharmishtha in the chamber, Devayani refuses to leave them unassisted for which Yayati says, “I am no stranger to woman,
darling” (16). Through these words, Yayati himself brings out the truth that he is an easygoing man with woman.

The conversation between Yayati and Sharmishtha brings into light the veracity about the feud between Devayani and Sharmishtha. Yayati enquires as to why she has pushed Devayani into the well, she retorts that it is because Devayani referred her and her caste, as poor people. Comprehending that nobody in the palace likes her, Sharmishtha consumes poison and Yayati stops her. Later Yayati poses a question to Sharmishtha, if she really wants to put an end to her life. Yayati is so obsessed with the sensual pleasures of life that he can never ruminate of his death.

Yayati is unaware of the conundrum due to the liaison between Sharmishtha and himself. When Devayani entreats Yayati to send Sharmishtha out of the palace, he remarks that he has made up his mind that Sharmishtha would be his Queen and Devayani his Senior Queen. Yayati’s enticement for the female sex transcends all social bulwarks and states to Devayani that Sharmishtha has enthused and restored his youth to him due to which he cannot forsake her. Here, one is reminded of Baroka of The Lion and the Jewel of Wole Soyinka. Devayani is unable to cope up with the situation and the stage direction focuses on her gestures: “(Devayani stares after him. Then, as Swarnalatha watches horrified, she tears the marriage thread from around her neck and flings it on the floor)” (31). She declares she is not a Kshatriya queen to suffer and departs from the palace. During the conversation between Yayati and Pooru comes Sharmishtha, with the news of the curse of Shukracharya that Yayati would lose his youth and become decrypt by nightfall.

When Pooru notifies that, the curse will not have the efficacy on Yayati if a young man acquiesces to take it upon himself and offer his youth as substitute, there is a sense of abatement in Yayati. He has a delusion that his people would take up the curse fallen on
him, but it is shattered when Pooru declares that people are prone to take upon death 
rather than decrepitude. Later, Pooru himself accepts the curse and informs Sharmishtha 
that the reason is because, “I want to root mystery back in my family. I want to realize the 
vision that drove my ancestors” (50).

When the son willingly proffers himself to take the curse and grows older than his 
father, the son takes the role of a husband to his mother. Karnad however does not 
proceed in recounting anything about this as he concludes with the curse. He invents the 
character named Chitralekha, Pooru’s wife who has a significant role in Yayati’s life. 
Yayati has substantiated patriarchy when he soothes Chitralekha by saying that she 
should accept the ‘aged’ Pooru to oblige Bharata family. When she denies, he exercises 
his authority as her father-in-law and as a king. Chitralekha cannot bear the reality and 
commits suicide, and this opens the eyes of Yayati. He owns the responsibility of all the 
havoc in the family and restores the youth to Pooru.

YAYATI: Take back your youth, Pooru. Rule well. Let me go and face my 
destiny in the wilds.

(He embraces Pooru. When they part, Pooru has become young again 
and Yayati is bent with age). (69)

Karnad seems to have used this myth with a view to expose the absurdity of life with all 
its elemental passions and conflicts, and to show man’s eternal tussle to achieve 
perfection. The playwright takes a deep insight into Yayati’s character and portrays his 
passion for the enjoyment of life, which ultimately turns into detachment and aloofness. 
Yayati is a true ambassador of men who, in spite of having had many pleasures in life, 
still feel impatient and dissatisfied. He takes the youth of Pooru, but soon perceives the 
impropriety of his shallow action and feels like an alienated individual. Yayati feels 
cataclysmic disillusionment and loss of faith in life. He has had his fill but remains
unfulfilled. Yayati is an archetype and represents people who aspire to remain young forever. These are the quirks, which are comparable with Ephraim of *DUE* and Ezra Mannon of *MBE*.

*MBE* is a trilogy modelled on *Orestia*, and it transposes the Greek elements of fate and the Greek mythology to delineate the psychological friction of the modern man. The play depicts the story of man’s unending tribulation for the search for identity. All the major characters of this tragedy are living a life without any sense of relatedness with others though they belong to the same family. Ezra, the senior member of the family, is haunted by seclusion, which is evident from his mask-like look, symbolizing the split of his life. Outwardly, he is a vulnerable person, entirely cut off from the marital bliss. His wife abhors him owing to his puritanical attitude, a shared characteristic of Mannons. He takes up various vocations in order to forget his unsuccessful marital life. Ezra joins the Mexican war and rises to the rank of a Major. In the meantime, his father dies and he has to leave the army and later takes shipping as a profession. Yet the agony of his life still gnaws at his heart; his restlessness drives him to seek some other avenues of satiation and therefore studies law and becomes a judge. He takes part in politics and becomes a Mayor. Meanwhile the Civil War breaks out and he rejoins the army where he rises to be a Brigadier-General. During these years, he undergoes bitter encounters of marital relations. Ezra always feels that Christine wants him to desert her because she loathes him. He aspires to be killed in action, which would make Christine happy. When he returns home, he traces that his wife has turned to Orin. Thereon he makes up his mind to occupy himself in worldly affairs and leaves Christine alone.

The first voice of Ezra’s heart that the audience listen to is his veneration of Christine’s beauty that betokens his ever-burning flame of love for her, but Christine does not respond to it. Being dissatisfied with his wife, he turns to Lavinia in quest of peace,
which generates another obstacle between the mother and the daughter. To bridge the gap, finally the Major capitulates himself to the arms of his wife, but to his ill luck fails to obtain any thread of belongingness. Comprehending the reality of their relation, he says to his wife in a bitter tone:

MANNON. Is that your notion of your love? Do you think I married a body?... you were lying to me tonight as you always lied! You were only pretending love! 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! (60)

However, this is not the final realization. To his great amazement and horror, Christine discloses to him before giving the poison instead of medicine, that she loves Adam Brant. Thus, a brave warrior like him dies a treacherous death plotted by his own wife. Like the general traits located in Ephraim, Yayati and Ezra there are also certain shared properties in their sons Orin, Pooru and Eben and the most prominent in all the three is the mother fixation.

Eben of DUE is the victim of Oedipus complex intercepted between the father’s appetite to possess and the mother’s craving for reprisal. The incest with his stepmother is an outlet for this double accomplishment as well as a means of normalizing his psychic urges. The mother fixation ascertains his stimulation to the advances of Abbie. He is sexually enticed towards Abbie from the very beginning, but repulses her calls and perceives her with hostility. Ultimately, he succumbs to her seductions because he understands that, that would be a suitable revenge for the wrongs done to his mother. He senses that his consent of the love of Abbie has gratified his mother and her soul would henceforth repose in peace.
O’Neill employs the mother archetype to probe into Eben’s personality. In the beginning of the play, Eben recounts to Simeon and Peter of the adoration for his mother and the repugnance for his father. He lodges a gripe against his father’s demeanour to her. “Didn’t he slave Maw t’death?” To which Peter rejoins thus, “He ‘s slaved himself t’ death. He’s slaved Sim’n’ me’ n’ ye t’death – on’y none of us hain’t died – yit” (207). For this exploitation Cabot is never exonerated, and Eben takes retribution on him by seizing his third wife and by rendering intense love to her. She is the first woman with whom Eben comes into contact, and hence plays a great role in the development of his personality.

When Cabot informs that Abbie has been utilizing him as an implement for begetting a son for Cabot and for seizing away the farm of his mother, Eben goes wild. This spawns a misconstruction in the relationship between Abbie and Eben and, Abbie pleads, “He won’t steal! I’d kill him first! I do love ye! I’ll prove t’ye”(258). To validate this, Abbie kills her newborn baby. Unable to bear the pangs of his son’s separation, Eben in frenzy scampers to the Sheriff to incriminate him to arrest Abbie. Returning home and perceiving her truly repentant Eben finds that he too is guilty of insinuating her to slaughter the child.

O’Neill attempts to turn his tale of adultery and infanticide into something of a modern Oedipus, where a strong passion gains a kind of glory. In order to fathom Eben’s reason for falling in love with Abbie, it is imperative to analyze not only the story of Oedipus but also Freud’s oedipal complex. In the story-myth of Oedipus, adopted by Sophocles in his Oedipus Rex, Oedipus unknowingly murders his father and marries his mother. This myth forms Freud’s oedipal complex theory. Freud found a recurring pattern of attraction for the parent of the opposite sex and, jealousy, hatred and even a death wish towards the parent of the same sex that he eventually named the Oedipal Complex.
According to Freud’s theory, Eben finds his father in competition, first for his own mother and then for his stepmother’s love. Like Oedipus, Eben does not intentionally perpetrate his crime, but his fury and betrayal gives Abbie the stratagem of murdering their son to substantiate her love. Eben partakes in his maltreating by succumbing himself to the police and sharing the blame with Abbie for the murder of their son. Like Eben, Pooru of *YAY* also undergoes mother-fixation.

In the play *YAY*, Pooru on his first visit to the palace with his wife after the marriage, informs his father that he wants to be back in the palace and be in the ‘room’ which belongs to his mother. The room is an archetypal symbol. When Pooru expresses that he wants to be alone in the room, Yayati is scandalized.

POORU: No, I don’t. But just now – when she stepped in here-suddenly it was like a violation of this air. Desecration. This room is mine. It is a sanctum that belongs to me- only me-and my memories. I don’t want a third person to come in. At least, not today. (39)

As a child, Pooru has harboured the feeling of excessive attachment to his mother. He has always pined for his mother when he has been away from her, like Orin in *MBE*. To give a vent to his feelings of love for his mother he accepts the old age of Yayati, thereby satisfying the desire of his unconscious mind. Karnad just hints at the theme of incest but does not proceed further. In *MBE*, O’Neill discusses in detail the incest of Orin with his mother as well as his sister, Lavinia. When Orin was, born Christine turns to him, as her relations with her husband are too disgusting. Her dream of the love for her son fizzes out when Lavinia and Ezra imposes Orin to enrol in the army. The dramatist does not reveal about Orin’s riposte to his mother’s coddling in his childhood and adolescence.

Inspite of the fact that Orin loves his mother so much, he cannot condone her when he is convinced that she is in love with Adam. He says, “Mother! (Then seizing her
by the shoulders and staring into her eyes-with somber intensity.) I could forgive anything – anything! – in my mother – except that other – that about Brant!” (89) His affection for his mother becomes a sort of infatuation. He says “And I’ll never leave you again now. I don’t want Hazel anymore. (With a tender grin.) You’re my only girl!” (90) He has a strong yearning to live with his mother after marrying off Lavinia to Peter. At a time Orin seems to be imperceptive in his love for her, he cannot accept the truth that his mother is in love with Adam. As Orin attains certain proof of her affair with Adam, he becomes incensed to the extent that he resolves to kill her lover. Orin cries, “You say Brant is her lover. If that’s true, I’ll hate her! I’ll help you punish her!” Through these words, he reveals the ambivalent nature of human behaviour, the mask-like quality of society’s moral code. Orin is aware of his duty to avenge the death of a father whom he wanted to be dead, to punish a mother whom he dearly loved. Punishing the mother is a painful task. Although Orin never lays hands upon his mother, he suffers the deepest anguish of guilt and eventually shoots himself. For by killing Christine’s lover he has directly caused her death and feels as responsible as if he had murdered himself.

Orin eventually murders Adam and when he glares at Adam’s visage, he endures as if he has killed himself. In Freudian terms, he has killed the lover of his mother who he himself is. However, Orin is not been able to free himself from his mother fixation even after astuting her tie with Adam. He still craves for his long cherished yearning to live with her.

ORIN. … Mother! Don’t moan like that! You’re still under his influence!

But You’ll forget him! I’ll make you forget him! I’ll make you happy!

We’ll leave Vinnie here and go away on a long voyage – to the South Seas— (121-22)
After the suicide of Christine, Orin becomes a nervous wreck, as he believes that he drove his mother to death. In order to divert Orin’s attention Lavinia accompanies him to his ideal Island, but nothing attracts or diverts his mind from his guilty consciousness. On the Islands, he misjudges that Lavinia has fallen in love with one of the natives and so hastens back home disclosing that he would like to face the ghosts and dispose of his guilt-obsession. He moves to the study, feeling that his mother must be waiting for him there, but finding none, he cries in despair that she is not anywhere.

Just as Orin’s puritan possessiveness combined with Lavinia’s jealousy is culpable for Christine’s tragic end, it is Orin’s looking at Lavinia as his mother-substitute that is liable for the wreck of Lavinia’s liaison with Peter. He imparts that he has written in the history of the Mannons the crime by Lavinia to prejudice Peter against her. He also does not vacillate to indicate his idea about Lavinia’s lusting with the native in the Islands. Orin’s every gesture from then on verges on incestuous advance. He has a strong desire for his sister and says, “I love you now with all the guilt in me – the guilt we share! Perhaps I love you too much, Vinnie!” (165) Later, Lavinia ceases to be his mother in his eyes and becomes an alien.

LAVINIA: *(her control snapping-turning on him now in a burst of frantic hatred and Rage).* I hate you! I wish you were dead! You’re too vile to live! You’d kill yourself if you weren’t a coward! (166)

These words work their influence on him like wildfire and ultimately he joins his mother in death. When Orin decides to kill himself, he declares that it is the way to find his mother again. He imagines Death as an ‘island of peace’, where his mother would be waiting for him. He escapes from death- in - life to death - birth - peace, to the womb, by which he escapes from the real world. Thus in Eben, Orin and Pooru the mother fixation is very pre-dominant.
Every playwright or novelist has to instigate certain characters in his play or novel to bridge over the apertures, to plug the loopholes and to tell the untold story through them. Thus, though branded as minor characters, they go a long way in the evolution of the story for without them the story would remain undone.

In *MBE* Seth Beckwith, the Mannons’ gardener and jack-of-all-trades, is allied with the family since the days of Abe Mannon. He is an old man of seventy-five and he distinguished himself mainly for three things in the play – his charity, his gossip, and for his knowledge of the family secrets of the Mannons. He is a loyal servant of the Mannons and takes pride in bragging about their riches, their social status and his close alliance with them. Seth reveals some family secrets to the audience through Seth. He is the one who apprises Lavinia of the secret of Marie Brantome, David Mannon and their son Adam Brant. Besides this, the story of the Mannon House being haunted would never have come to the fore but because of the trick played on his friend Abner Small, whom he locks up in the house to test his nerves. Furthermore, he earnestly impresses upon Peter Niles and Hazel Niles about the gossip of the Mannon house and of the ghosts of the Mannon dead. Seth is perhaps the only man who knows the arcane of the Mannons right from the days of Abe, but he remains so tight-lipped ever since. He keenly watches the events in the family and despite knowing what is wrong he never airs his views. Rather he passively carries out the orders given to him and runs errands. For example, Seth goes to Doctor Black, once to inform him that Mrs. Mannon has killed herself and the second time to report him about Orin’s death. In spite of his own inhibitions in both these cases, he obeys Lavinia. This is perhaps the climax of his obedience and loyalty to the family he has so long been associated. He is a true representative of the present day servant archetypes who pretends to remain loyal to the family in which they work.
In *NAGAMANDALA*, *STRANGE INTERLUDE* and *BALI*, the theme of patriarchy gains eminence. Professor Leeds of *SI* and Appanna of *NAG* are archetypal examples of patriarchs. Professor Leeds is the representative of the patriarch archetype in its negative aspects. Instead of giving emotional stability, worldly-wisdom, love and care, he turns out to be a shadow father figure like Cabot, Yayati and Ezra. The play starts in the study of Professor Leeds in the small University town of New England. The aura of the room symbolizes the jilted character of the old Professor who has been isolated from the mainstream of life. He immures himself to the cosy atmosphere of the study. Living in the shadow of fallacious exemplariness, he curbs his daughter and himself from the world of reality. After the death of his wife, he becomes more insecure. In order to mitigate the pain of solitude, he tries his best to reserve the love of Nina for himself. However, the love of Gordon makes a wall of disgust between the father and the daughter.

PROFESSOR LEEDS. … It is also true I was jealous of Gordon. I was alone and I wanted to keep your love. I hated him as one hates a thief one may not accuse nor punish. I did my best to prevent your marriage. I was glad when he died. (503)

Professor Leeds’ well-constructed plot goes against his expectation. In order to free herself from the mental agony, Nina resolves to desert her home to serve as a nurse in a military hospital. Not only the possessiveness but also his strong sense of Puritanism is also the cause of Nina’s revolt against him. In this context, he can be comparable with the old Cabot of *DUE*. Like Eben, Nina dissents against the repressive puritanical father, who denies her all possible opportunities for the execution of her desires. As a result, the possessive father has to spend the last breath of his life in a state of wilderness. In his sanctuary-like home, he is compelled to think about Nina’s hatred for him. His thoughts are presented as ‘Thought Asides’ a dramatic technique used by O’Neill, in which he
even facilitates the reading audience through using a smaller font size. For example, Professor Leeds thinks, “… She still must hate? … Oh, God! … I feel cold! … alone! … this home is abandoned! … the house is empty and full of death! … there is a pain about my heart! …” (505). He anticipates dying someday there, lonely and crying for help. This expectation of the Professor becomes true very shortly. He dies a helpless death after whiling away his last days in utter loneliness. Neither he keeps Nina as his possession, nor is he able to get convicted for himself in his self-created no man’s land. Throughout his life, he remains isolated from others. Undoubtedly, he is one of the key characters of the play and under his shadow, the entire play moves. Like Professor Leeds, Appanna in NAG, is also a symbol of a shadow patriarch.

Appanna stands for any man who tortures his wife. He is an adulterer, who goes after a concubine, yet thinks that his wife should be chaste. He becomes a shadow destroyer who demolishes the life of Rani. He keeps her under lock and key, which serve as archetypal symbols, and tells her that he would come every day only for lunch. He becomes so cruel that Rani loses her equilibrium and she has only dreams left which haunts her day and night. It is due to Appanna’s failure to love his wife that Naga manages to court Rani. Appanna is staggered to detect that Rani is pregnant in spite of all restraints that he has imposed on her and hence charges her with the offence of adultery and perjury.

APPANNA: Aren’t you ashamed to admit it, you harlot? I locked you in and yet you managed to find a lover! Tell me who it is. Who did you go with your sari off? (33)

Appanna leads her to the village elders who implore her to hold a red-hot iron bar to prove her innocence, though they are acquainted that Appanna himself is an adulterer. Rani passes the test, but it does not efface the qualm of Appanna. He is aware that Rani’s
child is not born of him, and raves as the Elders exhort him to spend his life in Rani’s service.

APPANNA: What am I to do? Is the whole world against me? Have I sinned so much that even Nature should laugh at me? I know I haven’t slept with my wife. Let the world say what it likes. Let any miracle declare her a goddess. But I know! What sense am I to make of my life if that is worth nothing? (41)

It is the greatest torment to a man if he comprehends as does Appanna that his wife is an adulteress. He has to serve Rani the whole life in spite of his cognition that she has copulated with someone else. Appanna, who is not just an individual but also a representative of chauvinistic males, has to get the nemesis in the end. By all standard of judgment, he is ordained to live in hell fire for all of his life without any aspiration of redemption.

Appanna’s conduct exhibits his divided emotional and physical selves. In fact, the emotional aspect of his personality seems to be underdeveloped, as he treats both Rani and the prostitute in an unfair manner. Neither of the relationships is intact and satisfactory. Rani and Appanna are alien to each other as Appanna treats her with contempt, aggression and mistrust. It is Naga, who engenders alteration in the life of Rani. Naga is the archetypal symbol of procreation. It is a symbol of energy and pure force (libido). In its negative aspect, it signifies evil, corruption, sensuality and destruction but in the play, the Naga plays a positive role. He apprehends the pain and woe of Rani. During the ordeal scene, he plays the role of an advocate archetype. The advocate embodies a sense of lifelong devotion to championing the rights of others in the public arena.

The psychological self-division in NAG crops up through the device of the
snake-lover. Snakes are said to have nothing but poison in their fangs, though in the myths they are assumed to have the power to take shape at will and to do improbable feats of power and love. Naga turns up in Rani’s life all by chance. As Rani fails to sum up the courage to give the concoction to Appanna she pours it in an anthill in which lives a cobra. The cobra, which consumes it, falls in love with Rani, and thus comes into her life. The Naga assumes the shape of Appanna because he knows that the love of any man other than the husband is anathema to a Hindu wife. He proceeds tactfully to win Rani’s love. He flatters her by saying: “You are very beautiful” (19). He expresses sympathy with her with queries “… Did it hurt … the beating this morning?”(19) Such remarks and queries make Rani dauntless. Thus, Naga goes gradually to befriend Rani and finally she begets a son from him.

The real Appanna is exasperated to descry that Rani is pregnant and summons her to substantiate her chastity. When the village elders demand her to hold a red-hot iron, Naga comes to salvage her. As per his admonition, she holds the cobra in her hand, as he has assured her that no misfortune will revive her if she tells the truth. The village people are taken aback by the incident and she is promulgated her as a Goddess. Rani gets her husband and a child, but Naga forfeits his beloved. In the beginning, he is resentful of Appanna because being a true lover he cannot endure to see his beloved being loved by any other man. Soon Naga realizes that Rani belongs to a man, not to a snake.

Naga arrives in the life of Rani to resuscitate her from the tyrannies of Appanna and goes out of her life when his errand is executed. Karnad has glorified Naga, because he wants to give the message that a loving animal is better than a tyrant. He is duly rewarded for the noble service he has rendered to Rani and the society in general. When Appanna kills Naga, Naga is given the honour of a father as Rani insists that her son should perform the rituals every year to commemorate his death. The snake again incarnates
itself and Rani shields it in her tresses. Thus, Naga finds his heaven in the tresses of his beloved and thereby the poetic justice is done to both Naga and Appanna.

Naga and Appanna may be studied as one or facets of a single character as Karnad comments at the end of Act I: “The cobra takes the shape of Appanna. To distinguish this Appanna from the real one, he is called as Naga, meaning the Cobra”(18). Naga can therefore be considered the shadow of Appanna, the unconscious part of his personality or as the projection of Rani’s fantasy about Appanna. The real Appanna has a personality, whose anima is distorted. The anima is the female factor in the unconscious of man contra sexual to the male-ego and which is shaped by a man’s relationship with his mother or mother surrogate who comes early in his development. This should engender in him healthy attitudes towards women. Otherwise, he may feel only extreme hostility or develop an oedipal attitude. A distorted anima can make a man treat a woman as an entity; a possession that can be used or misused according to his whim. Appanna treats Rani like an object, someone who has to appease his physical needs. Like Naga the Mahout in BALI also serves as a catalyst archetype.

Though the basic concern of the play BALI is the concept of sin, male-female relationship also gains vital importance in the play. The queen is transfixed towards the voice of the elephant-tamer Astavakra, and this enthralment shifts from his voice to his manly odour. While the Queen wants to continue to be unwavering to her husband, she does not want to miss the body of the Mahout. The physical aspect of the relationship has been accented and it is made illegal since it is extra-marital. Karnad’s quest for completeness begins after the marriage. He seems to challenge the age-long social institution of marriage and focuses that it is an institution founded for the convenience of the people. The play begins with the discourse between the Queen and the Mahout. It is stunning to grasp that both of them are unaware of each other. In course of time he
understands that the Queen is a Jain. When the King realizes about the adultery and slashes at the Mahout with his sword, he says, “Of course, how could I forget? You are a Jain. You can’t indulge in violence. You aren’t permitted to shed blood. Ooh! I forgot that –” (88) The Queen loves her husband, yet here she comes to fortify the Mahout. When the Mahout is aware that a hundred fowl is about to be sacrificed as a penance, he supplicates to the king, “… A hundred fowl – I know what that slaughter means. It’s witchcraft. Whip me, sir, brand me. But don’t take away my voice” (105). The Queen swears that nothing would happen to him. The Mahout imparts propositions to the King of how he should act with his wife and what part of her body he should touch to please and satiate her physical hunger.

The Mahout comes as a savoir whose divine voice enchants the Queen far-off from her palace to a ruined temple with ‘absent deity’. The presiding deity here appears to be the Mahout— the representative of the Dionysian aspect of life who rejuvenates the Queen, fills her with warmth and gratifies her without any burden of conceiving. Like the Mahout and Naga who acts as saviours to the Queen and Rani, Edmund Darrell in SI also plays the same role to Nina. Though she is married to Sam Evans, Nina begets a child from Darrell.

Darrell seems to be the most wanted person in Nina’s list of men. Clifford Leech, describes him as, “much needed than the others of understanding Nina.”2 Professionally he is a physician, and emotionally an ardent lover. He is a rootless person having no familial attachment like Sam or Marsden. He enters the story as a sympathizer to Nina but turns to be an isolated figure due to his deep unification with her. His hypocritical perspective is the root of his disillusionment because of which he agonizes from a deep sense of anguish throughout his life. He is enticed towards Nina in his first meeting but instead of marrying her, he proposes her for Sam like Kapila in HAY. He admits the truth
to Nina that he desired her physically since the day he first met her. The proud scientist within himself forbids him to accede to this veracity. He considers his physical involvement with Nina only as a scientific approach for breeding children, like Paravasu in his relation with Vishakha in *TFTR*, and for him love is only the physical union of two guinea pigs. He thinks, “Let me see …. I am in the laboratory and they are guinea pigs … in fact, in the interest of science, I can be the purpose of this experiment, a healthy guinea pig myself and still remain an observer …” (567). This illusory concept of love is splintered when he finds himself truly in love with Nina. In course of time, Darrell feels that he has beguiled Sam and behaves like a coward when Nina is about to tell the truth that it is Darrell who is the father of Gordon and not Sam. Hence, he determines to flee to Europe.

Darrell’s sympathies for Nina are double sided like Eben in *DUE*. He loves as well as hates Nina at the same time. As love is an overwhelming and mysterious power against which neither science nor human will can prevail, Darrell detaches from Nina and ruins his career unable to find any interest in his studies. To mitigate the pain of separation, he engrosses with other women but is never able to get appeasement. In pursuit of happiness, he comes back and confesses to Nina after spending a long period of frustration and desperation in Europe.

DARRELL. … Other women- they only made me love you more! I hated them and loved you even at the moment when-that’s honest! It was always you in my arms- as you used to be- those afternoons- God, how I’ve thought of them-lying awake-recalling every word you said …. 

(611)

But destiny has played its part as it has left Darrell in a state where he finds himself alone. He has lost his beloved Nina and his son and therefore he wants Nina to divorce Sam to which she dissents. She says that Darrell can remain as her lover and that is the only way
to make everyone delighted for which he says, “(miserably) But I don’t understand! Sam gets everything – and I have nothing!” (612) He decides to go back to Europe. Submitting himself to the cruel hands of reality, he chooses to remain as a father alienated from his son and a lover isolated from Nina for the remaining years of his life.

Like in DUE, MBE and YAY some of the characters in SI, BALI and NAG also suffer from mother fixation. Charles Marsden in SI is a victim of the romantic imagination like Orin in MBE. He loves Nina but cannot enunciate his feelings due to his deep attachment to his mother. His indifferent attitude towards sex and his hidden love affairs keep him apart from others. Disclosing the roots of his bachelorhood, he admits, “You were my only true love, Nina. I made a vow of perpetual bachelorhood when you threw me over in Sam’s favor!” (595)

Marsden has no fortitude to disclose his inner feelings as his idea of love is opposite from Darrell’s scientific approach. His is a Platonic love as he passionately says:

(Passionately –thinking)

My love is finer than any she has known! … I do not lust for her! … I would be content if our marriage should be purely the placing of our ashes in the same tomb … our urn side by side and touching one another … could the others say as much, could they love so deeply? … (629).

This fanciful concept alters after the death of his mother who is the only companion in his lonely life. His work as a novelist, his friendships, his travels and all the major events in his life are governed by the prevailing will of his mother. Naturally, he becomes infirm after her death. He says, “If only Mother had lived! … how horribly I miss her! … my lonely home… who will keep house for me now? …” (594).

Marsden’s fallacy is crumbled with Nina’s offer of marriage. Her physical beauty has always fascinated him but when she asks him to get married to her he gets shattered. Finally, he accepts the truth with a tone of reconciliation. In case of Professor Leeds and
Marsden, the prison in which they existed was securely barred. The only unique thing about it is that for the most part they refuse to admit its existence. They endure in the belief that they are free, while every major act of their lives emphasizes the fact that they are imprisoned. In the play *Bali*, the King too is deeply appended to his mother.

Freud’s Oedipus complex is given an Indian hue in *Bali*. In the play when the king transmits to his mother that she is going to have a grandson, she determines to offer a sacrifice. The king refuses to it and the mother becomes furious and replies, “You were not born a Jain. You were born my son. But, you betrayed me and my faith. Instead of choosing the woman and bringing her to your faith, you chose hers”(98). She makes up her mind to withdraw from the palace, as her son and daughter-in-law, do not have faith in her sacrifices. Her Gods have been expelled from the house, and when the king tries to negotiate a truce, he is caught in the crossfire between the two women – his mother and his wife. Both wield power, which makes him powerless. He cannot stand by his mother because at the nearest hint of misfortune, her only solution is the sacrifice of a live animal. Nor can he assist his wife because she insists that the mother’s behaviour is a direct provocation to her beliefs, as she is a Jain. The mother calls the queen a ‘whore’ as she comes to know that her daughter-in-law has committed adultery. She becomes frantic and tells her son to throw the queen’s bones to the dogs and kill her as well as her lover.

The mother calls the king ‘impotent’ for not taking any action against his wife’s illegal act. The stage directions given by Karnad are very vital to understand the relationship between the mother and the son.

*(Spits in his face. He moves back. But that action suddenly calms her. She suddenly realizes what she has done. Quickly moves forward and wipes his face.)*

Forgive me. Forgive me.
(They look at each other. Their deep fondness for each other is clear in that look.) (108)

When the mother asks him what he is going to do for the wrong deed, he says that he does not know. As a sign of repentance, the mother offers the sacrifice of a cock of flour for the adultery perpetrated by her daughter-in-law. Thus, the king suffers in the hands of his mother, wife and even the mahout.

In *THE GREAT GOD BROWN, HAYAVADANA* and *THE FIRE AND THE RAIN*, Dion, Devadatta and Arvasu are portrayed as victim archetypes who are put into distress by their friends or families. All the three characters employ the masks to reveal or conceal their feelings. Dion plays the role of an artist archetype. As an artist, he is unsuccessful as he is disgusted with sketching a plan for municipal buildings. He projects the enigma of a creative artist whose spirit is clamped in an uncongenial materialistic atmosphere.

The play incorporates the devastation of the creative urge in an atmosphere where wealth has been deified, and material prosperity is the highest yearning. Dion, the architect and artist, is in love with Margaret, and Margaret too loves Dion who is unlike others. She admires the mask which Dion wears and cannot love him without it. After their marriage, Dion becomes addicted to drinking and dissipation. Margaret persuades him to resume his paintings, but Dion has depleted his income. He is unable to support his wife and children, and thus assumes the role of a shadow husband and a shadow father. The mask of Pan, which Dion puts on as a boy, is not only a defence against the world for the supersensitive painter poet underneath it, but also an integral part of his character as an artist. He has failed to live up to the ideals of beauty and art, and wears the mask to live the life in its double role as a conformist and businessperson and an artist. This is the universal conflict, which causes anguish and discord in the life of a man.
Dion’s outer world is dominated by the life-frustrating drives of materialism represented by William Brown, the ‘Great God of Success’. As an artist in a hostile world, Dion is pressurized to barter his soul for the visionless routine of getting and spending. He has lost touch with the creative resources within him. Therefore, instead of painting the great emanations of nature, he turns out to sketch buildings and says, “Ha! And this cathedral is my masterpiece! It will make Brown the most eminent architect in this state of God’s Country… He only believes in the immorality of the moral belly.”

Brown feigns Dion’s mask, his bizarre antics and his alienation after the demise of Dion. The technique, which is used to indicate the transfer of personality, is the mask of Dion, which Brown puts on after the death of the former. In HAY, too the swap of heads in the temple is possible with the aid of a mask. Dion, a critic of the traditional hypocritical religion, feels that the Mother Earth is for the affirmation of life. He has failed to live up to the ideals of beauty and art and has put on a mask to live his life with divergent roles as a confirmist, businessman and an artist. This is the universal conflict, which causes misery and discord in the life of a man. It is Nietzschean in its essence. Like Dion, Devadatta also faces existentialism. If Dion is a failed artist, Devadatta is a failed poet. Both suffer in the hands of their wives and their friends.

Devadatta is a passionate lover of beauty. In twenty years of life, he has been in and out of love fifteen times. The libido of Padmini enchants him that he fails to judge her, but Kapila easily makes out that she is too fast for the delicate Devadatta. What she needs is a strong man, but Devadatta cannot judge this basic difference, which results in his tragedy. He is enthralled by her that he thinks of outshining Kalidasa only if she accedes to be his muse. Though a man of high intelligence, he perceives only the pristine beauty but misfires to fathom the woman in her.
The adversary of the marital joys of Devadatta is none other than his own friend Kapila, like Brown in *TGGB*. Intruding in Devadatta’s personal matters, Kapila steals away the joys of married life, and very soon, he becomes the source of his agony. Devadatta and Kapila, the two intimate friends, face an existential crisis when Padmini falls in love with Kapila. Devadatta feels alienated and estranged from himself first and from Kapila and Padmini. He knows that there is some hidden bond between Padmini and Kapila, but dares not to question it.

Devadatta loved Kapila as much as he did Padmini, but at the same time cannot endure to live with the notion of sharing his wife with anyone. Unable to keep up the tension and anguish of isolation, he resolves to end his life, and actually does so but the fate rules otherwise. He comes to life again by the intervention of Goddess Kali, but this time with a greater peculiarity – with the body of Kapila. It leads to a discrepancy between the will and the mask that make the poet turning away from poetry. Kapila and Devadatta yearn to be each other. Kapila longs to be Devadatta so that he can express his love to Padmini while Devadatta craves to be Kapila so that he can charm his wife and win her love. ‘The irony of the transposed heads on the bodies of two friends, who stands at opposite poles of personality, viz, the intellectual versus the activist is employed here to raise the problem of identity.’ In case of Kapila and Devadatta, their conflict of identity cannot be easily resolved, and the only feasible solution to the situation is their death. There is no other way in which they could have accepted a resolution for their catastrophe, as going back to their old bodies could only have made it more intricate.

After undergoing, a short interval of merriment and good days with his wife Devadatta once again loses his wife to Kapila, and his end is disastrous. He departs to the jungle where his wife had gone to meet Kapila with a decisiveness to end the love triangle. In fact, he loves Padmini too much; that is why he snubs the proposal of Kapila
to live like Pandavas and Draupadi. He cannot ponder of sharing her, and so exhorts Kapila to fight a duel. The identity crises reach its peak when Devadatta asks Kapila whether he loves Padmini, and the latter replies in the affirmative. A similar situation is seen in *TGGB*, where Brown says to Dion that he is in love with Dion’s wife. He defies a spar because this is the last resort to solve a moral problem. In case of Dion and Devadatta, the complication emerges from their companions, but in *TFTR*, Arvasu faces torture in the hands of his own brother who does not allow him to marry Nittilai.

Arvasu, aged about eighteen, is Paravasu’s younger brother, and is portrayed as ‘the antithesis to Raibhya, Paravasu and Yavakri.’ He detests the false sense of superiority, egocentrism, hypocrisy and pedantry of Brahmanism. He born as a Brahmin sheds his caste for the love of Nittilai, a tribal girl, like the King in *BALI*. Though he recollects that his brother abhors him, he loves him so much that he says to Andhak that his brother has been his mother, father, brother, nurse and teacher. When Arvasu realizes that, his brother has betrayed him, his heart burns with vengeance. Paravasu makes Arvasu a scapegoat for the crimes he has committed.

Arvasu turns bold and defiant at the end of the play when he decides to act in a play within the play. Enacting the role of Vritra, he desecrates the sacrificial precincts for taking reprisal on Paravasu who walks into the blazing enclosure and immolates himself. Arvasu is the most archetypal of all. He has to undergo a series of ordeals to clean the dirt and clear the confusion. He does everything – he cremates the dead body of Yavakri, performs the obsequies of Paravasu, and saves the sanctity of fire sacrifice. Therefore, Arvasu is the real archetypal sacrificial scapegoat who forgoes everything including Nittilai for the sins, pretensions and hypocrisies of others, and brings rain and happiness back to the country. If Dion, Devadatta and Arvasu are examples of victims and scapegoats, Brown, Kapila, Paravasu and Yavakri are examples of archetypes who
victimize others but in turn are victimized. The athlete archetype in Kapila embodies the ultimate expression of the strength of human spirit as represented in the power and magnificence of human body. It is to this body that Padmini is allured. Though he is friendly to Devadatta, later in the play he turns out to be a shadow companion archetype. When he catches sight of Devadatta dead in the Kali temple, like a coward, Kapila beheads himself being afraid that he would be censured.

Kapila, the bosom friend of Devadatta, is dark and plain to look at, and in deeds, that require physical strength and skills, none can rival him. He possesses a strong body with rippling muscles – an example for an athlete archetype. In the play, he is described as a rustic young man with little intelligence. With his innocence of a child, he becomes an exact opposite of the scholar Devadatta beating the latter with his greater reservoir of vitality and energy. Despite their difference of physique and mind, they are characterized as Lava and Kusha, Rama and Lakshmana, and Krishna and Balarama. Being a true friend of Devadatta, Kapila has been always desirous of bringing joy to him. Devadatta has an immense faith in Kapila, as it is to him that he confides his cryptic. He sends Kapila on the important mission of proposing to Padmini on his behalf, though he regrets it later. Kapila executes his duty well, and wins the hand of Padmini for Devadatta. He fathoms that Padmini is not the right choice, as she needs a ‘man of steel’. Yet he paints Devadatta as a perfect human being with the result that she agrees to be his wife.

The personality of Kapila is altered by the presence of Padmini. The man of muscles gets enthralled by her beauty, and always hops around her. It is only she who makes him blush which he has never done before. When the trip to Ujjain stands cancelled, he is overcome by a strange void.

KAPILA [aside]. So it’s off. What am I to do for the rest of the day? What am I to do for the rest of the week? Why should it feel as though the
whole world has been wiped out for a whole week? Why this emptiness … Kapila, Kapila, get a tight hold on yourself. Don’t lose that hold. (23)

It shows he is fatally gripped in Padmini’s charm. Her charisma reduces him to the status of a puppet, and Padmini too cannot resist his vigour and starts drifting towards him. If Kapila only blushes on seeing Padmini in the beginning after the transposition of heads, he becomes more assertive and aggressive. He asserts, “I mean, you are Devadatta’s wife. I have Devadatta’s body now. So you have to be my wife …” (36). His sincerity towards Devadatta becomes his weakness. He fails to allege himself because he does not like to harass Devadatta. He is so fond of him that even his love for Padmini remains a concealed reality for a long time. Though Kapila leaves for the jungle as a defeated man, he finishes up as a winner, and fares better than Devadatta in the game of life. When Padmini tries to break the social barriers and meets Kapila in the jungle, he tries to persuade her to go back to her husband. Kapila tries his best to forget the faceless memories of the past but Padmini’s appearance revives him. Kapila’s desperation, anguish and dread in this existential situation are symbolically revealed in the song sung by the Female chorus and Bhagavata, which is suffused with existential thoughts.

FEMALE CHORUS. The river only feels the pull of the waterfall.

She giggles, and tickles the rushes on the banks, then turns

a top of dry leaves
in the navel of the whirlpool, weaves
a water- snake in the net of silver strands
in the green depths, frightens the frog
on the rug of moss, sticks and bamboo leaves,
sings, tosses, leaps and
sweeps on in a rush –

BHAGAVATA. While the scarecrow on the bank
has a face fading
on its mudpot head
and a body torn
with memories. (58-9)

The symbols like water-snake, scarecrow and river illustrates the existential situation.

Yet in the end, there is a duel where Devadatta and Kapila die and Padmini commits Sati.

Kirtinath Kurtoki writes, “Neither the death of the lovers nor the subsequent sati of Padmini is presented as tragic; the death serves only to emphasise the logic behind the absurdity of the situation.” In HAY, Karnad’s aim is to highlight the absurd in the accepted norms of social behaviour. The reinterpretation of folk tale in the light of contemporary concerns and existentialism is a great and monumental achievement in Indian English Drama.

Like Kapila, Brown in TGGB also is attracted to his friend’s wife, Margaret but with a difference that the latter does not reciprocate his love. In the relation between Dion and Brown as friends, Brown takes the role of a shadow companion. He is the epitome of archetypal materialistic modern man for whom a relationship has no meaning. He also tries to possess Dion’s wife, and takes the role of a vampire archetype.

Brown always envied the creative life force in Dion – what he himself lacks. In Brown is epitomized the myth of the worldly success, and glorification of wealth. He feels that through Dion’s mask of Mephistopheles he can gain the power of success and
wealth, but he secures only power which razes him. He lacks self-realization and integration in his life.

Sophus Keith Winters in his work, *Eugene O’Neill: A Critical Study* has underlined the fact that *TGGB* is a scathing denunciation of the puritanical ideals. In the life of Brown there is glorification of the material success and wealth. His ideal is profit, and he has sacrificed other values of life for this. “Profits have become his ideal, and for profits, he will sell his little, shrivelled life-soul; he will sell the lives of men; he will imprison free spirits; he will do all that is mean, niggardly and vicious; worst of all, he will do it in the name of virtue, prosperity, religion, politics or any other term that may be used interchangeably to describe his befuddled conception of human values.”

The theme of alienation is also protruded through Brown who typifies the anguish of the uncreative man, and the despair of the person who cannot fantasy. Brown is an ‘anti-poet’ by nature. Due to the dearth of this artistic sensibility, he is spurned by Margaret and cheated by Cybel. Later he steals the mask of Dion, and accepts Margaret as his wife and Cybel as his mistress. This is quite ironic that the person, who has forced Dion to wear the mask of falsity, seeks shelter under the same mask. When he steals Dion’s mask of Mephistopheles he thinks he is gaining the power to live creatively, whereas in reality he is stealing that creative power made self-destructive by complete frustration.

Putting on the mask of Dion, Brown tries to merge his identity with the identity of Dion, and intends to live in his disguise to enjoy the fame and fortune of the latter. At the same time, he vulnerably enquires to the mask of Dion in a doubtful tone: “What’s that? She’ll never believe? She’ll never see? She’ll never understand? You lie, Devil!” (359) Gradually he reaches a state of hypocrisy. Kissing the mask, he reveals the reason for loving it, “I love you because she loves you!”(360) But it is not the reality. It is a fantasy
never to be fulfilled rather; it is the self-satisfaction of a hypocrite, separated from his own self and possessing other’s fortune. He is compelled to play the role of both Dion and Brown simultaneously, and ultimately becomes a split personality.

Brown’s hope of dominating Margaret smashes because she concedes him in his real self. He in the disguise of Dion cannot oppose Margaret when she takes him to be Dion and berates Brown. Pathetically he exclaims, “Poor Billy! Poor Billy the Goat! (with mocking frenzy) I’ll kill him for you! I’ll serve you his heart for breakfast!” (363) Even knowing Margaret’s attitude of negligence towards him, he hypocritically tells her, “I tell you I’ll murder this God-damned disgusting Great God Brown who stands like a fatted calf in the way of our health and wealth and happiness!” (363) His expectation of possessing Margaret is faded completely when she reveals, “I’ve never thought of Billy Brown except as a friend and lately not even that! He’s just a stupid old fool!” (364)

Brown’s desire to get the status of Dion proves futile. His tragedy is that he cannot demolish the image of Dion, who is residing within him safely. Brown, the visionless ‘demi-god’ who has never trusted in the supreme power, is compelled to importune him to get rid of the clutches of Dion’s mask. Having transposed his identity for the sake of materialistic fulfilment he is isolated from God and realizes his mistake.

BROWN. Mercy, compassionate Savior of Man! Out of my depth I cry to you! Mercy on thy poor Clod, thy clod of unhallowed earth, thy clay, the Great God Brown! Mercy Saviour! (371)

The quest for material possessions leads to the fiasco of Brown. What he cannot possess he demolishes, and his character is akin to Yavakri in TFTR.

TFTR deals with the existentialist problems of Brahminism, seduction, deception, treachery, ego, revenge, ruthlessness and sexuality. Yavakri in TFTR is a modern man who strives to get the knowledge direct from the Gods. Such a short cut of knowledge for
supremacy is perilous which may induce the humanity to disaster. Even after obtaining knowledge, Yavakri cannot emancipate himself from the bondage of selfhood. Like a coward, he avenges Raibhya and his son Paravasu by seducing Vishakha, the wife of Paravasu. His frivolous intelligence does not help him at all to conquer the evils residing within him. On the contrary, it inflames his passions and boosts his pride and desire for revenge.

Yavakri molests Vishakha, and knowing the incest, Raibhya, her father-in-law, decides to annihilate Yavakri by sending the Brahma-Rakshasa. Vishakha ventures her best to save his life but, to her horror, finds that she has been utilized by Yavakri as a tool to exercise his vengeance upon her family. His sweet words and amorous gestures are meant only to snare her, so that by arousing the chagrin of Raibhya and Paravasu he could extirpate them. Yavakri’s selfishness and monstrosity come to the surface when he, as if to justify his act of betrayal, says, “… that you happened to marry Paravasu is not my fault” (24). This displays that he has a scheming mind.

Vishakha acts as his nemesis by pouring out every drop of sanctified water from his ‘kamandalu’ which Yavakri prepares to ruin Raibhya and his son. He is defenceless, and the Brahma-Rakshasa assassinates him. Yavakri depicts the archetypal shadow figure of trickster or a fraud. He is full of venom and hatred, and does not hesitate to manipulate the emotions of Vishakha. His challenge is so brutal which only a hard-core criminal can think of. Yavakri represents the contemporary scholar of knowledge who tries to remove all ladders of experience, to reach the peak of knowledge and seat of learning with less-experience and less knowledge. The story of Yavakri is a lesson to people that knowledge should be persuaded in the right manner.

All these characters – Brown, Yavakri and Paravasu – exploit others for their own personal gains, and in turn are exploited. They have the traits of existentialism in them,
and the circumstances are similar as seen in TUGHLAQ, THE EMPEROR JONES and THE HAIRY APE. In TUG, the hero is the blend of a ruler, visionary, scholar, murder, crafty politician, hypocrite, and cruel tyrant archetype. The play works out its protagonist’s progressive alienation with the existential overtones. He is estranged at various levels, from society and the individuals around him, from tradition, religion and from existence.

Karnad’s TUG is an existentialist play. As a famous school of philosophy, existentialism presents a definite attitude of looking at life. It expounds man’s search for himself and his potentialities to create his own values in the world. He is the maker of himself. Tughlaq finds himself in an existential situation when he ruminates of how to bring peace and amity between the Hindus and the Muslims, and how to change the stereotyped administrative set up. Tughlaq’s existentialist approach seems absurd to his countrymen, especially to the ecclesiastics, and they are bent upon dissenting him. Rash and impulsive by nature, Tughlaq explores another solution to fulfill his ideals. He recourses to murder and shed blood of those who oppose him. He is vehemently opposed, and he feels frustrated and lonely. Tughlaq’s existentialist approach proves to be an utter failure.

Tughlaq is isolated from his society primarily because he is a man ahead of his age. He is not understood by the society around him because his ideas and ideals are far above the comprehension of his contemporaries. His broadminded religious tolerance seems uneasy to the Muslims and devious to the Hindus who suspect his motives. He wants to win the confidence of his subjects and build an empire together with them, but fails to carry his people with him. The modification proposed by Tughlaq poses a threat to the time honoured conventions and beliefs of society, and so he confronts stiff opposition from all classes of people. The first line of the play itself brings out the dilemma of the
citizens. An Old man in the play says, “God, what’s this country coming to!” (1)

Tughlaq’s scheme regarding the change of capital and the introduction of copper currency are sound and reasonable, but he cannot convince his subjects. It is the alienation of Tughlaq from his people, which is responsible for the failure of his grandiose schemes. He fails to understand the emotional attachment of the people to their native soil.

Tughlaq tries his best to impress his people by playing the role of a just and impartial ruler. He enacts in front of his Stepmother as well. When she questions why he does not sleep at night, he launches into a long piece of rhetoric and the Stepmother replies, “I can’t ask a simple question without your giving a royal performance” (10-11). Erving Goffman views that, “To the degree that the individual maintains a show before others … he can come to experience a special kind of alienation from self.” In the later scenes, the inability to communicate becomes a matter of anguish for him, and Tughlaq unburdens his soul to a young guard at Dauladabad. The young man cannot comprehend what the Sulthan says and he replies, “I don’t understand what your majesty is saying.” (54) This infuriates Tughlaq who rages at him, “You don’t understand. You don’t understand. Why do you live? Why do you corrupt the air with your diseased breath?” (54)

Tughlaq senses the abyss and futility of his attempts, which bring anguish. Anguish is the prominent characteristic of the Existential hero, because it is the result of his reaction towards the realization of the nothingness and void of existence. This existential dilemma leads Tughlaq to cruelty, frenzy and madness. Existentialism is mostly concerned with man and his problems of life, and he sees the world from the viewpoint of man’s existence. Man as the existing individual, with infinite interest in himself and in his destiny, is the metaphysical principle on which the structure of existentialist thought is built. The existential philosophers and thinkers have channalised
their intellectual acumen and focus on the picture of humanity. They hold the mirror to those aspects of man’s life where there is a fight for the right to exist, and they reflect upon problems like man and his self, man and isolation, man and conformity, man and uncertainties, insecurities and nothingness of the world.

Alienated from society and individuals around him, Tughlaq is also estranged from the religion. He comes into discord with the orthodox believers, and it is vividly presented in the debate between Sheikh Imam-ud-din and Tughlaq. The Sheikh believes that the Holy Koran is the only guide for which Tughlaq says, “I have never denied the Word of God, Sheikh Sahib, because it’s my bread and drink” (20). He declines to depend only on God and prayer, and relies on his own strength and resources. Tughlaq finds Holy Koran and Islam too narrow to hold his comprehensive spirit. This sounds blasphemous to the Sheikh.

Tughlaq tries to dominate and release his metaphysical anguish by an exercise of tyrannical power. His cruelty in the play arises from his anguish. Anguish in existential philosophy is the reaction of a man who has had a vision of the absurd and realizes the nothingness. The repeated frenzied stabbing of Shihab even after he is dead and the order that the bodies of the conspirators should be stuffed with straw and exhibited throughout the kingdom amid the insistence in the immediate vacating of Delhi are acts of cruelty and tyranny arising from Tughlaq’s existential anguish.

Murder is seen as a deed, which leads to self-recognition and self-identity. Slaughtering has given Tughlaq power and self-realization through independent thinking and action. Cruelty and tyranny are seen almost as a vehicle to help him to overcome existential alienation, and a sense of the absurdity of human existence. Tughlaq undergoes intense self-estrangement after condemning his Stepmother to death. Left alone he falls to his knees clutches his hands to his breast and desperately pleads with God to help him.
MUHAMMAD. God, God in Heaven, please help me. Please don’t let go of my hand … I started in Your path, Lord, why am I wandering naked in this desert now? (67)

The tone of despair, helplessness and bewilderment are found in this prayer. He comprehends his own self-alienation and recognises that he has come to the extreme edges of self-estrangement, which is madness. He says, “I am teetering on the brinks of madness”(68).

In an interview, Karnad explained that Tughlaq’s sense of failure has found an immediate echo in his own personality. He said:

“I think basically, as a person I am very much afraid of failure, and this particular point in Tughlaq, of a person struggling against failure and failing more, somewhere must have found an immediate echo in me.” 8

The plight of Tughlaq has been the scrape of every conscientious ruler in all ages. It ultimately proves that there is a mysterious power in all human societies, in human nature itself, which tends to produce adverse reactions to attempt to do good. This has imparted authenticity to the picture of Tughlaq. He suffers from the problem of ‘becoming’, and in this and in various other traits he is similar to Jones and Yank.

The play **TEJ** is one of the best of all the O’Neill plays, unfolding the tragic epic of the American Black. The play has a thin plot with very few incidents. It is the drama of the arrogant Jones’s flight through the impenetrable forest, the protrusions of his visionary fears, guilts and the conflicting motives of the sub-conscious. The mental processes are exhibited on the stage. O’Neill assays to fathom the sub-conscious and portrays the guilt-motives and racial memories dormant in his unconscious.

Jones, the full-blooded Negro, is a porter in the Pullman Railroad Car. It is through deception and corruption he has become the emperor and possessor of great
wealth on an island in the West Indies. He is involved in a clash with one of his friends Jeff and murders him for which he is send to a prison. In the prison, he kills the guards, and again turns into a convict. Jones is autocratic, dominating and has a rich reservoir of resourcefulness. He imposes extra-taxes and other duties, which are unendurable for the subjects. He hoards money and deposits it in a foreign bank as well as keeps it concealed under the white rocks in the jungle. Jones himself says that he takes the role of the Emperor only for a brief period to make enough money, and then escape from the island, and here he acts contrary to the views of Tughlaq. Tughlaq is a visionary, whereas Jones is not.

JONES: … I knows dis Emperor’s time is sho’t. Dat why I make hay when de sun shine….And when I sees dese niggers gittin’up deir nerve to tu’n me out, and I’se got all de money in sight,I resigns on de spot and beats it quick. (11)

Jones considers himself as superior to the blacks and calls them ‘nigger’, ‘bloody nigger’ which indicates that he has no sense of goodwill. He hates both white and black people, and this ultimately separates him from the society. In the meantime, he has to leave for the forest, as there is a threat to his position. As Jones enters the forest, he loses his self-confidence, and is haunted by a sense of loneliness, but his egoistical temperament does not allow him to accept the fear wholeheartedly. Just like Yank, there is separation between his mind and body. He seems to be an abnormal being as his body does not cooperate with his will, and it is beautifully presented in the forest scene.

The forest is the archetypal symbol of the unconscious, the mysterious, the secrets, and primitive instincts. Nowhere in O’Neill’s works is his theatrical skill more evident than in Jones’ flight through the jungle. As Jones proceeds, lost in the forest he is confronted with one ghost after another from his past. First emerges his ‘Little Formless
Fears’, his guilt in two visions – the ghost of Jeff for whose murder in a gambling fight he has been sent to prison, and the spectre of the guard whom he kills in his escape from prison. This fear and guilt emerge from Jones’ personal unconscious. He rips the ‘frippery Emperor trappin’s’ from his body which makes him feel lighter. His guilty conscience makes him perceive the vision of the white prison guard, whom he has killed in a fit of anger. The whole scene is re-enacted on the stage of his mind. The impression is so vivid that he actually gets into the posture of striking at the guard. Just as he feels sure that he has caught him, he realizes with sudden horror that his hands are empty.

The auction-scene, set in a Southern State of America, is the first Jungian touch that O’Neill provides in the play. It is part of the racial memory of the Negroes, what Jung calls ‘the collective unconscious’. The hallucinatory vision of Jones being sold as a slave is the greatest triumph of the modern psychoanalysis, and the law of mental association. The pathetic wail of the slaves in which Jones also joins is symbolic of the bottomless pit of despair into which he has fallen. Finally, the unconscious associations in Jones’ mind carry him to the original home of his ancestors, into the dark and dreadful jungles of Africa where he joins the dance of the Congo Witch Doctor who by a gesture seems to tell him that he must offer himself as a sacrifice in order to appease an angry God. The huge head of a crocodile with wide-open jaws appears on the stage, and Jones is shown to be hypnotized by the fascinating glare of its green eyes. He moves towards it with deliberately slow steps, all the time praying to Lord Jesus to have mercy on him. All of a sudden, the spell is broken, and coming out of his trance, Jones fires at the crocodile. From the symbolism of the dance and the use of the silver bullet it is conveyed that in killing it, Jones has killed himself – at least the distorted image of the self which has been his life motivation. He has performed the justice demanded by the dance.
In TEJ there is an eternal conflict with those powers, which are beyond man’s control. Man’s lack of faith in some supreme power, too much materialism and inner emptiness are the causes of his tragic fate similar to Tughlaq. Ultimately, they isolate man from his environment as well as from his inner being. He reaches a position where he finds himself alone and insecure, and becomes an isolated being. For his happiness and tranquility, he needs a sense of security and stability. When this age-old belief of belongingness shatters, he becomes isolated from his being. He considers himself a different person, completely alien to his circumstances. Being cut off from his immediate environment, he is led to seek an identity of his own. This happens in the case of Jones, Tughlaq and Yank.

In Yank, the combination archetype of a leader, warrior, rescuer and knight is found. In THA, Yank represents a class of stokers. All the workers are ‘hairy chested’ and Yank seems broader, fiercer, more truculent, more powerful and surer of himself than the rest. To the other stokers he is the leader –‘their most highly developed individual’, the man who is the symbol of power and energy behind the ship. This is Yank’s illusion, which originates in what the others think of him, and is fostered by his brute strength. He has no belief of God, fate, home or society. Like Paddy, he has no reminiscences of the past. He says, “Home? Home, hell! I’ll make a home for yuh! I’ll knock you dead. Home! Home! T’hell with home!”(211) The most salient trait of Yank’s character is his total acceptance of the predicament in which he is placed. He accepts without one word of protest, the humble vocation which destiny has assigned him. Yank’s sense of belonging, however, is strengthened because he is a symbol of the primitive creative force, which converts iron into steel or produces steam from coal.

YANK: I’m smoke and express trains and steamers and factory whistles;

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 steel, de punch behind it! (216)

This created ‘self-image’ receives a rude shock when Mildred’s derogatory remarks shake the confidence of Yank. She is horrified to see the Gorilla-like brutal face of Yank and ejaculates, ‘Take me away! Oh ! the filthy beast’ and faints. Yank is not grieved by those words but by the expression, she makes by closing her eyes with her hands at the sight of Yank. He who has taken pride in his muscular strength has realized after his injury to his pride that the body, symbolic of his strength, has become a prison. Thereon he devotes himself to escape from the prison in which he cannot be content to belong but every effort to decamp only makes him more aware of the strength of the barrier. The psychological wound lacerates and since it is impossible for him to take revenge on Mildred, he revolts against the society, which she represents. He cannot forget the insult heaped on him by being compared to a beast. It haunts him like an obsession and drives him like an avalanche to the course of revenge. A character works out his destiny not under the control of a power outside him, but under the impact of the crossovers of the hidden conflicts of the mind, which agitate his being. Yank enters The Fifth Avenue and becomes a victim of ridiculous circumstances. Constantly egged on by his primitive instinct to take retribution, Yank goes to the church road to face the class, to which Mildred belongs. He faces each churchgoer but is greeted with utmost difference. This situation becomes yet another threat to Yank’s attempt at heroism. He feels that the entire world is indifferent to him. Failing to see himself as part of the social system, he resorts to show a brute force, seeks recognition through physical violence and is imprisoned. His failure to adapt to forces, which conditions a capitalist society, makes him a rebel-victim archetype.
In the prison, Yank realizes that the force, which he thought to be his strength—namely steel—was in reality no fortitude for him. His concept of steel and steamers, engines and buildings is gradually transformed into cages, cells, locks and bars where he is locked like a gorilla. O’Neill notes that Yank’s concept of steel as strength is changed to ‘steel bars of the cell’ where he is a prisoner. His conscious mind recapitulates Mildred’s words and slowly, he tries to accept the fact that he is an ape in the cage. The problem of Yank is essentially the loss of self. His search is for freedom and self-definition. Yank revolts against the class, which suppresses his efforts in achieving an identity, and he joins the I.W.W. When Yank presents his proposal for a radical confrontation, the members of I.W.W are confused and conclude that Yank is an agent provocateur. Like a rebel, Yank asks for the total destruction of the capitalist property.

YANK: I mean blow up de factory, de woiks, where he makes de steel.

Dat’s what I’m after – to blow up de steel, knock all de steel in de woild up to de moon. (249)

When threatened by the Secretary of the I.W.W, Yank realizes another dislocation from the world where he ‘belonged’.

YANK. I’m a busted Ingersoll, dat’s what. Steel was me, and I owned de woild. Now I ain’t steel, and de woild owns me. Aw, hell! I can’t see-it’s all dark, get me? It’s all wrong! (250)

Yank’s last shred of his contact with the world has been broken when he is thrown out of the I.W.W. He feels insulted when he is called ‘a brainless ape.’ When a police officer finds him sitting disconsolately on the sidewalk and asks him what he is doing, he replies, “Enuf to gimme life for! I was born see? Sure, dat’s de charge. Write it in de blotter. I was born, get me!”(251) When a man loses his way and finds no solution to his
problem, he considers his life as a curse. Finally, he descends to a position where he thinks that the greatest mistake is nothing but existence. Travis Bogard says:

In the stokehole, Yank belongs. His Credo- that he is the force at the bottom that makes the entire mechanized society move-is right. He is such a force until the meeting with Mildred causes him to doubt himself and sends him out in a frenzied effort to destroy the God of power he has served at his furnace alter.  

However, he finds no solution to his problems either in his acceptance or in his rejection. The last scene of the play is one of O’Neill’s most memorable strokes of fantasy, where the bewildered Yank finds himself face to face with a gorilla in the zoo. Search for identity becomes an obsession, and it leads him to the zoo where he stands face to face with a gorilla in its cage and seeks its companionship. He says, “Ain’t we both members of de same club – de Hairy Apes?” (252) Like other human beings, he has neither the sweet past nor the memory of home life. The life he has chosen places him at the point of no return. Even then, his search for identity does not end. To join the class of ape he invites it, but is finally seized by the brutish ape itself.

YANK. He got me, aw right. I’m trou. Even him didn’t think I belonged.  

(Then with a sudden passionate despair) Christ, where do I get off at?  

Where do I fit in? (254)  

The play ends with the note, “(And, perhaps, the Hairy Ape at last belongs.)” (254). Where does he belong to is the ultimate question. Torn between the two worlds – the animal and the spiritual, he does not know where he stands. The word ‘Perhaps’ signifies that may be even to belong to death, certain qualities are necessary. The search for identity is not only a personal problem but becomes the collective universal problem of humankind. Yank cannot go forward to the spiritual or can he go back to nature and
therefore stands in between, taking all punishment. With a deep sense of responsibility, he searches for an image of himself but cannot see beyond his conscious self, and this barrier can be overcome only by death. The subtitle of the play is also significant. It becomes a comedy because whatever Yank has done has gone waste. Futility is tragic yet it is a hilarious joke. The tragedy of the play lies in the helplessness of the author of what he must do with the protagonist, and hence the author lets him die out of mercy. Yank’s movement has a resemblance to Lear’s passage to self-realization.

Yank is a victim of his own fate and his own past. He is governed by his own self-image. He creates an image, which is like a “figurative mask”. This putting on a mask or living in a mask, fails to satisfy the soul, rather it destroys it. Yank’s self-image is necessary to enable him to live, but this self-image is not the real self, and its nature is determined by his conscious ego. The hero creates self-images to exist in this world. This mask creates problems. Doris Falk has analysed Yank’s predicament of “not belonging”, in the light of Sartre’s existentialist philosophy. ¹⁰ The man is a creator of his own fate. Man to facilitate him in his adjustment with life and to enable him to live in security has built up various institutions of the society. But he has his own responsibility, and he is to be blamed for his failures. He cannot get satisfaction by identifying himself with one institution or the other. He must belong to himself. Yank’s sufferings and problems are the products of his self.

The crisis of Yank is essentially one of the loss of self. His search is for existential meaning, that is, for freedom and self-definition. Where did Yank really belong was the question, which occupied O’Neill. O’Neill realised as Jung did, that man’s basic need in life was not so much the satisfaction of physical desires, as a sense of order in the universe, which he could trust and believe in. The longing lay in the ‘collective
unconscious’ shared by all men, an unconscious which realised itself in archetypal symbols and patterns of behaviour.

The Existentialist holds that man is born unmasked into a world, which is illogical, confused, bewildered, and here he has to live his life, making his own decisions. This leads to his coming up against number of conflicts and obstructions in life. To these existentialists, Yank is a great man, because even though he lives in a meaningless world, he does not accept humanity passively, but seeks to find meaning in life, which no organisation or social code can provide. He is willing to do this even though pain or suffering maybe his reward. Yank suffers knowingly, accepting full responsibility for his actions futile though they may be. His words deserve mention here, “I was born, see? Writ it in de blotter. I was born, get me!” Yank, the hero is a modern ‘Everyman’ who denies the moral security of his life as a stoker and sets out to re-discover where he belongs.

Tughlaq, Yank and Jones could never establish a good rapport with their fellow beings. They have never understood themselves, and hence nobody understands them. There is a sort of innocence in the plight of Yank, but not in Jones and Tughlaq. Both Tughlaq and Jones try to find solace in God in the end, but Yank does not. Tughlaq and Jones unlike Yank are able to react to their enemies by murdering them. Towards the end Yank, Jones and Tughlaq feel estranged, as there is nobody to trust.

In these three plays, there are minor characters like Henry Smithers, Najib, Paddy, Long and others who perform a major role in the life of the protagonist. Some of them take the part of shadow archetypes. Smithers is an ex-convict and a fugitive doing some shady business with the bush Negroes in an island of the West Indies. He is the typical riff-raff of American civilization who carries on dubious trade with the natives. He is
mean, treacherous, envious and deceitful. He hates Jones who within two years, succeeds in assuming the rulership of the island of natives. He is the only white man in the play.

Smithers gets to know from an old black woman that the natives have all gone to the hills to rebel against Jones. Smithers has a sneaking admiration for Jones who in turn has nothing but disdain for the former. Smithers acts as a foil to exemplify the antecedents of Jones. Smithers grasps that the days of the Emperor are over. It is his tip-off that makes Jones leave his palace and make his escape into the forest. His treachery against Jones is evident from the way he derisively says to Jones ‘What blooming Majesty!’ with contempt in his voice. Towards the last scene, he is seen in his true colours egging Lem, the chief enemy of Jones, to hunt for Jones in the depth of the forest. He is in one way the cause of the downfall of Jones. In a way, Smithers is a foil to Jones and the same can be seen in Najib of \textit{TUG}.

Najib plays a decisive role in the fate-laden career of Tughlaq. He has no illusions about the nature of people and his techniques are tailor-made to suit the occasion. In this regard, he is a corrective to Tughlaq who is carried away by his visionary idealism. For instance, when Tughlaq declares that thereafter justice will be handed down impartially and any subject will be free to criticize the Sultan and voice his grievances openly, Najib dismisses the move. Najib tells Barani that courage, honesty, justice and other such terms do not mean anything in dealing with a political problem. That is why when Sheik Imam-ud-din starts trouble in Kanpur and then moves towards Delhi, Najib counsels Tughlaq that the Sheik should be got rid off. He plans to send the Sheik as Tughlaq’s ambassador and the Sheik gets killed as he is mistaken as Tughlaq. Being loyal to the throne at all costs, Najib could not oppose the Sultan straightaway. Just like Najib in \textit{TUG} and Smithers in \textit{TEJ} who play a major role in the lives of the protagonists, Long in \textit{THA} too is an important character in the evolution of Yank.
Long is one of the firemen of the international liner, and is a representative of the half-literate crew. While the rest of the crew are mere voices, Long along with Paddy are the only articulate individuals. Long emerges as a sort of a symbol of American Radicalism, identifying himself with the workers. He projects himself as a political worker with a mission to stir discontent among the wage-earners and to rouse the class-consciousness of labour as against the Capitalist class. He makes a soapbox oratory on Mildred’s insult of Yank. Further, it is Long who takes Yank to the Fifth Avenue to show him the contrast of the luxury of the Capitalist class. Gradually he arouses Yank’s hatred of the superior class. He says to Yank that the latter should keep his temper and see several Mildred’s and Douglas’s coming out of the church. He tells Yank, who is roused into primitive anger, that force is not their weapon and they should demand it through peaceful means.

The cause of the rottenness in society for Long is the economic system. Since the basic evil is capitalism, the workers according to Long must be educated about the economic structure of society. Long tells Yank, “I wants to awaken yer bloody clars- consciousness. Then yer’ll see it’s ‘er clars yer’ve got to fight, not ‘er alone” (235). The one idea of Long that Yank accepts is the idea that he is enslaved by capitalism and says, “She grinds de organ and I’m on de string, huh?” (251) Yank’s final analysis of his relationship to Mildred’s father is entirely in line with Long’s statement.

YANK. Sure-her old man-president of de steel Trust-makes half de steel in de world- steel – where I tought I belonged- drivin’ trou- movin’ – in dat – to make her and cage me in for her to spit on! Christ! (244)

Yet Yank rejects entirely any hope in a social or economic system. In his final comment on the I.W.W Yank rejects any hope of bettering the society.
Paddy, on the other hand, suffers from a feeling of alienation in the kind of the world around him. He recapitulates the old memories of his Irish home, and the days of his youth. The ship, which Yank calls their ‘home’, is really hell to him. He speaks in poetic prose of the old days when they had sailing ships driven by the winds, tall masts reaching up to the sky that seemed to bear them like the mother. He expresses a lived experience of inner and outer harmony of a sailor at sea in the old sailing ship. Paddy has the old bravado to challenge Yank on his own ground. After the scene between Yank and Mildred, Paddy acts as a Nemesis putting thoughts into Yank’s mind. He first tells that Yank has fallen in love with her. With righteous indignation, Paddy vividly describes the scene of Mildred’s arrival. He converses as if he is an authentic mind reader of the second engineer who when pointing to Mildred says like a circus manager that, “in this cage is a queer kind of baboon not found even in the darkest Africa” (259). He succeeds in rousing the ire of Yank by hinting at first and then affirming at the proper psychological moment, that she called Yank, ‘the hairy ape.’

Paddy has driven it hard into Yank that he is the hairy ape. Interestingly Yank, towards the end of his tragic predicament inside the gorilla’s cage, remembers Paddy’s words about the Second Engineer pointing him like a circus manager. The words are Yank’s last words holding to the bars of the cage and dramatically announcing like the circus barker, “Ladies and gentlemen, step forward and take a slant at de- one and only, one and original- Hairy Ape …” (254).

Yayati in *YAY* and Ephraim in *DUE* impart import to passions and there is absence of filial affections. They are the symbol of shadow patriarch archetypes, as their caring guidance and protection turn into dictatorial control. The conflict between body and mind is also vital in both the characters. They stand for ‘Everyman’. Even Ezra of *MBE* plays the role of a shadow father archetype. His caring guidance and protection turn to
possessiveness. The unsuccessful relationship between husband and wife like in *MBE* still bear contemporary relevance and hence it is archetypal.

The failed artist archetype is predominant in Dion in *TGGB* and Devadatta in *HAY*. Dion is unsuccessful as he is disgusted with sketching the plan for municipal buildings. He yearns to draw sea, waves and so on. As he is abhorred with life, his marital life becomes a failure. Devadatta on the other hand is a poet who marries Padmini. His marriage becomes a debacle as his wife gets attracted to his friend Kapila. In case of Dion, his friend Brown falls in love with his wife, Margaret. Both the characters die in the end as victim archetypes unable to bear the vindictive attitude and possessiveness of their friends.

Professor Leeds in *SI* and Appanna in *NAG* represent the shadow patriarchs. Professor Leeds takes the role of a negative Mr. Mom archetype. He becomes very possessive of his daughter like Ezra in *MBE*. Appanna on the other hand plays the part of a negative patriarch by keeping his wife under lock and key. He does not allow Rani to enjoy the pleasures of life but he himself goes out with a concubine. Both Professor Leeds and Appanna take the role of shadow destroyer too.

In Brown of *TGGB*, Yavakri of *TFTR* and Kapila of *HAY* it is the shadow companion archetype, which is predominant. Betrayal is a common example of this archetype in negative aspect. Brown wishes to possess his friend’s wife and the same goes for Kapila and Yavakri. Brown is addicted to gain material wealth and possession and Yavakri wants to possess supreme knowledge. All the three take the role of destroyer archetype. Their hope of seizing the female counterpart gets diminished completely which ultimately leads to their death.

Dr. Ned Darrell in *SI*, Naga in *NAG* and the Mahout in *BALI* represent the catalyst archetype. Naga is the archetypal symbol of procreation. Naga understands the pains and
sufferings of Rani. He plays the role a teacher and mentor archetype. In case of the Mahout, it is he who gives the worldly pleasures to the Queen. Though Nina is married to Sam, it is from Darrell she begets a son. There are similarities between Darrell and Paravasu of TFTR as both of them consider lovemaking as just mechanical.

Tughlaq of TUG, Jones of TEJ and Yank of THA can never establish a good rapport with their fellow beings. They have never understood themselves and hence nobody understands them. Jones and Tughlaq are exceptionally shrewd and crafty as they are cunning in gaining anything, which they need or wish to possess. Karnad portrays Tughlaq as a great hypocrite who is irreligious but pretends to be religious. In the beginning, he makes the prayers compulsory but later, he says that nobody must pray in his kingdom. Yet in the end, he believes that God would protect him. Jones too in the end prays to the lord to forgive his sins and not to forsake him.

If a man has to be any kind of archetype, woman also plays an important role to make the male archetypes. When man wears masks, even woman wears it. The archetypes must be complimentary. If there is a victim archetype, there should be a devouring mother archetype to victimize the former. Any society is structured with its indispensable and coordinating elements and when the emotions of the people are suppressed there emerges the problem. It may lead to incest, extra-marital relationship, murder, suicide and so on. The conflict between mind and body is a never-ending antagonism and is shared by the whole humanity. This sane conflict between mind and body is dealt in the third chapter with emphasis on the female characters. The woman characters of O’Neill and Karnad have certain common traits in them. Most of them are portrayed as prostitutes, nymphomaniacs and sexual delinquents and many of them have the attributes of the Mother archetype.
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