

## 内容摘要

本文采用以加拿大学者诺思洛普·弗莱的理论为主要代表的圣经原型批评方法对奥尼尔三部主要作品《天边外》、《无穷岁月》、《进入黑夜的漫长旅程》中的人物、结构进行了深入的分析，以此来探讨奥尼尔的宗教观。

全文共分为五个部分。引言和结论再加上三章作品分析。引言首先阐述了本文作者之所以选择运用圣经结构原型理论对三部剧作《天边外》、《无穷岁月》和《进入黑夜的漫长旅程》进行分析研究的原因并解释了采用圣经结构原型理论作为本文的批评方法的可行性；随后简要介绍评论界对其三部作品及奥尼尔宗教观所做出的种种不同评价；最后提出了笔者所探讨的主题：通过对作品中主要人物经历的圣经结构原型分析，奥尼尔具有什么样的宗教观？

第一章分析《天边外》中主要人物的圣经原型及圣经结构原型在主要人物经历中的体现。罗伯特身上体现出了《圣经》人物亚当原型，一个堕落和忏悔的原型；朱安的原型可以追溯到耶稣基督，他既是替罪羊又是圣人；露斯是夏娃的原型，在他们身上体现了两种截然不同的《圣经》结构原型：U型结构即喜剧结构和倒U型结构即悲剧结构。《天边外》是奥尼尔早期的一部成熟作品，在这一部作品中，悲剧结构和喜剧结构交织在一起，形成戏剧复杂的风貌。

第二章探讨《无穷岁月》中主人公约翰·洛文圣经原型及其约翰和洛文这一组由同一人物约翰·洛文分裂出来的两种人格善恶斗争的圣经主题原型在圣经结构原型中的体现。约翰·洛文是天使和撒旦的结合体，约翰是《圣经》中天使的原型，洛文是撒旦的原型。约翰和洛文的对话差不多贯穿了《无穷的岁月》全剧始终。约翰和洛文是分裂人格的舞台形象，他们对话恰如其分地表现了奥尼尔信仰危机，信仰复归的真实心理路程。这一过程是典型悲剧结构和喜剧结构交织在一起。

第三章详尽阐述《进入黑夜的漫长旅程》中主要人物的圣经原型及圣经结构原型在他们经历中的体现。《进入黑夜的漫长旅程》首先是一部家庭悲剧。母亲玛丽是《圣经》中堕落而有又需忏悔来获得拯救的夏娃原型；父亲蒂龙自毁而又自醒的经历是亚当原型；大儿子杰米体现了《圣经》中不同的原型：撒旦和替罪羊的角色使他走向毁灭，预言者的角色使他得到灵魂的飞升；小儿子埃德蒙是《圣经》中罪人原型，他既是家庭的罪人又是一家的希望，两种角色使他身心有着两种截然不同的经历。在现实意义上，主人公面临的是巨大的失败，但在精神层面上他或她却获得了灵魂的飞升，人性的张扬。这是悲剧结构和喜剧结构的充分体现。

因此本文可以得出如下结论：三部作品中结构原型体现出来的内部冲突和矛盾深刻地揭示了奥尼尔本人的宗教理念和矛盾。从这三部不同时期的作品中可看到奥尼尔信仰探索路程，三部作品是奥尼尔三个时期心理发展的代表作，从迷茫，抛弃信仰，回归信仰，再回到迷茫，充分展现了奥尼尔复杂的宗教观。一个是喜剧式的U型结构，一个是悲剧式倒U型结构，两种截然相反的结构原型模式并存于三个故事体系中，充分展现出奥尼尔复杂的宗教观和宗教困惑。可以认为，奥尼尔怀疑宗教但最终走不出宗教的围城：一方面不相信宗教能解决现代人类的精神生存困境，但他又肯定并相信只有信仰上帝才能换来内心的安宁和灵魂的拯救。这是奥尼尔的困惑，也是每一个现代西方人心灵深处的迷惘。

关键词：圣经人物、结构原型，主要人物经历，追寻故事，奥尼尔宗教观

## Abstract

This thesis attempts to use the Biblical archetypal criticism to probe into the mythological archetypes in Eugene O'Neill's three most important plays, mainly focusing on identifying the Biblical archetypal structures in them.

The following plays are discussed in this thesis: *Beyond the Horizon* (1918/1920), *Days without End* (1932-1934) and *Long Day's Journey into Night* (1941-1956). *Beyond the Horizon* is from his early period, and proved to be a seminal play that established a theatrical pattern which endured for at least two decades (Berlin 65). *Days Without End* is an expressionistic play. Although it failed on the stage, yet it appealed to many readers and critics sympathetic to its predominantly Catholic point of view (78). *Long Day's Journey into Night* is O'Neill's masterpiece. It is almost autobiographical and marks the climax of O'Neill's development, both psychological and artistic (96). It is a play about modern man's spiritual plight and crisis. These three plays are from O'Neill's early, middle and mature periods. More importantly, these plays trace O'Neill's spiritual road of puzzlement—returning—puzzlement, which obviously reflects his lifelong contemplation of religion.

This thesis is composed of three parts, plus the introduction and the conclusion. The introduction gives a very brief review of different studies that have been done on these three plays. This review is followed by the reason why the writer of this thesis chose this topic. With a detailed explanation of using Biblical archetypal structures as the theoretical basis for the close study of these three plays, the question is put forward: With a background of a puritanical Irish Catholic family and having lost his faith as a Roman Catholic when he was a

boy, what is O'Neill's religious view?

Chapter One explores the two conflicting archetype structures reflected in *Beyond the Horizon*, which are typical of most of the Biblical stories. Using the theory of Biblical archetypal analysis of characters' experiences and identifying the archetypes of the leading characters (Robert, Andrew and Ruth), O'Neill ingeniously gives these main characters many traits of Biblical archetypes. On one hand, the archetypes of Adam can be found in Robert, while Ruth is compared to Eve. On the other hand, the archetype of Jesus is seen in Andrew, as both a Scapegoat and a Saint. By analyzing the three main characters' two opposite experiences, O'Neill reveals his puzzled feelings toward not only his heroes and heroine but also his religion.

Chapter Two focuses on the textual analysis of *Days Without End*, mainly on Johnloving's experience with an emphasis on the opposite archetypes of Angel and Satan, illustrating O'Neill's inner struggle with his former religion.

Chapter Three discusses *Long Day's Journey into Night* through analyzing the dual roles of the four family members. Mary Tyrone is regarded as a fallen and repentant woman, reflecting the archetype of Eve; James Tyrone embodies the archetype of Adam as both a fallen man and a repentant man; the elder son, Jamie, has the dual roles of Satan and Prophet, and the younger son, Edmund, is viewed as the sinner and the hope of the family. Focusing on the conflicting archetypal structures seen in the characters' experiences, we gradually find O'Neill's own struggling and contradictory attitudes in his heroes and heroines, as well as all modern people. They reveal the playwright's ambiguous feelings toward the religion in which he had been trying to "somehow" find the peace which he couldn't find in modern

society.

The conclusion summarizes O'Neill's two ambivalent views toward religion. In his earlier period, he had been searching something for the replacement of his former religion which is reflected in *Beyond the Horizon*. There is always a mysterious force haunting the characters' lives. Then he faces his religious transitional period after the failure of his replacement. Full of inner struggles, he turns to God again and the result is *Days Without End*, although, after the production of the play, he denied his return. Later, he continues his groping in *Long Day's Journey into Night*. The main characters' painful inner struggles are good illustrations of O'Neill's puzzling journey in his religion as well as his whole life.

O'Neill doubted and had been groping for insights, which actually reflects his denial of the power of a God who cannot solve people's spiritual problem in modern times. At the same time, his writing confirmed his belief in the good side of a God who can bring peace to modern men. These functions of the archetypes greatly add to the readability and profundity of the plays and further enrich its connotations.

**Key Words:** Biblical archetypal characters, structures, main characters' experiences, quest story, O'Neill's religious views

## **Acknowledgements**

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor, Professor Guo Yingjian, for his patient help and valuable, enlightening advice given to me not only through all the stages when I develop this thesis from a mere idea to a full paper but also in my three years of study as a postgraduate.

An inadequate word of acknowledgements should go to all my teachers and friends for their cordial assistance.

Finally, I would like to take this opportunity to express my eternal thanks to my parents for their dearest love and persistent support.

## Introduction

Eugene O'Neill was the first great playwright of the American theatre. He was awarded the Nobel Prize for literature in 1936, only the second American (after Sinclair Lewis) to earn the coveted recognition. He introduced psychological realism in his plays; his constant experimentation with stage craft and acting gave American plays a new vitality and originality. Produced all around the world, his plays continue to attract new generations of readers. Ranging in style from satire to tragedy, they often depict people who have no hope of controlling their destinies in modern times. O'Neill's great purpose was to try to discover the root of human desires and frustrations. He showed most of the characters in his plays as seeking meaning and purpose in their lives, some through love, some through religion, others through revenge (Carpenter 90).

Eugene O'Neill is a dramatist with one theme. Shouted, whispered, or silently assumed, one premise unites all his plays, from the earliest experiments to his last mature work. The theme is rooted in O'Neill's own personal need, and its power to shape both form and meaning in the plays is derived from this source. It represents an attempt at to once express and assuage the lifelong torment of a mind in conflict (Falk 5) .

I choose these three plays (*Beyond the Horizon*, *Days without End*, *Long Day's Journey into Night*) to explore his religious view from the viewpoint of Biblical archetypal structure rather than others for several reasons.

Firstly, the archetypal analysis of a literary work is to uncover archetypes and their symbolic meaning. Canadian critic Northrop Frye established his archetypal criticism system. Frye regards literature as the revival and reappearance of myths, and rituals and myth as the

structural factor of literature. According to Frye, archetypes appear and reappear in many literary works and thus retain a certain continuity. As Frye defines it, the archetype is a typical or recurring image, a symbol that connects one poem with another and thereby helps to unify and integrate our literary experience. And, as the archetype is the set of communicable symbols, archetypal criticism is primarily concerned with literature as a social fact and as a mode of communication (Frye, Anatomy 99).

The story of Adam and Eve in Eden has thus a canonical position for writers in our tradition whether or not they believe in its reality. The reason for the greater profundity of canonical myth is not solely tradition, but the result of the greater degree of metaphorical identification that is possible in myths (188). In Frye's opinion, the whole Bible is

narrative structure that is roughly U-shaped, the apostasy being followed by a descent into disaster and bondage, which in turn is followed by repentance, then by a rise through deliverance to a point more or less on the level from which the descent began. This U-shaped pattern, approximate as it is, recurs in literature as the standard shape of comedy, where a series of misfortunes and misunderstandings brings the action to a threateningly low point, after which some fortunate twist in the plot sends the conclusion up to a happy ending. The entire Bible, viewed as a "divine comedy"... We find that the sequence of U's can also be seen as a sequence of rises and falls of heathen kingdoms, each an inverted U... The inverted U is the typical shape of tragedy, as its opposite is of comedy: it rises to a point of "peripety" or reversal of action, then plunges downward to a "catastrophe," a word which contains the figure of "turning down." (Frye, Great Code 169-176)



According to Frye's opinion, there are two opposite structures co-existed in the Bible stories, one is a U-shaped structure or the comedy structure, the other is an inverted U structure or the tragedy structure.

From the archetypal point of view, *The Bible* is the main source of the symbols in literature and it contains a large number of the archetypes of western literature. Thus the mastering of *The Bible* becomes a necessary step to understand the true meanings of literature, and this is no exception in the understanding of O'Neill's plays. Archetypal criticism endows many modern works with new meanings for the reason that myths and archetypes touch the depths of human emotions and exemplify profound truths of man's universal experience. The twentieth century has witnessed the negative, evil results of modern civilization: the sharpening social conflicts, the degradation of morality, the collapse of ideals, and the disintegration of faith. Besieged in this plight, people are urgently pressed once more for solution and salvation. "Only myth, with its suggestion of an action that can contain the destinies of those who are contemplating it, can provide any hope or support at all" (Great code 50).

Secondly, these three plays are from his early plays, middle writings, and to his later writing period and occupy very important places in these periods, and these three plays can be seen as the epitome of Eugene O'Neill's whole writings.

With great clarity and with the simplicity of a fable, *Beyond the Horizon's* theme established a major tragic motif of American drama (93). More important is that, in this play, the characters' destiny seems to be controlled by some unknown force no matter how hard they struggle. During the years from 1920 to 1931, all of O'Neill's plays had described in

dramatic terms some aspect of his tragic quest for the “secret hidden over there beyond the horizon” (131); It seems a pity it wasn’t, for while it (*Days Without End*) is interesting as a phase of O’Neill’s development, its values are more clinically personal than dramatic or stirring (Anderson 202). In *Days without End*, O’Neill is offering a dramatic review of his past struggles (Winther282). Clearly it described the hero’s quest for a true faith in the modern world, and clearly its story was autobiographical. It is a profound study of the conflict in a man’s nature between his finer spiritual qualities and a cynical one regarding religious faith. If the play did not describe the playwright’s own escape from the wilderness of disbelief, it did mark a milestone in his quest for some “more comprehensive, life-giving formula” (Sophus141). *Long Day’s Journey into Night* is O’Neill’s masterpiece. It is almost autobiographical and marks the climax of O’Neill’s development, both psychological and artistic. It is a play about modern men’s spiritual plight and crisis. Reading this play, one increasingly realizes the enormous power that the past has over the lives of the Tyrones. It is Mary who puts this idea into words: “None of us can help the things life has done to us. They’re done before you realize it and once they’re done they make you do other things until at last everything comes between you and what you’d like to be, and you’ve lost you true self forever”(O’Neill Long 53). It also seems a larger sized piece of work because of its constant recognition of man’s Quest for religious ecstasy (Hews 219).

I can find Biblical archetypes in the main characters’ experiences in these three plays. There are two opposite Biblical archetypal structures in the plays as mentioned above, Frye’s U-shaped structure (comedy structure) and inverted U structure (tragedy structure). That is, following the comedy structure of “living in paradise—committing a

crime—suffering—repenting—final salvation” and the tragedy structure of “facing a plight and dilemma—making a choice—falling into calamity—suffering—gradually awakening—final destruction” (Ma 81). By examining two contradictory Biblical archetypal structures in these three plays, I wish to study O’Neill’s religious view: Does he believe in God or not? What kind of religious view does he have?

For the third reason, O’Neill was raised in a puritanical Irish Catholic family. The role that religion played in O’Neill’s personal life and in his art cannot be ignored. It is necessary to know more about O’Neill and his plays from a perspective of Biblical literature because he was once a pious Catholic and had received a strict Catholic education, then abandoned his religion and never returned to the church. Some critics hold the view that, being a former catholic, O’Neill is influenced by the catholic dogma: original sin, punishment, repentance, forgiveness, etc. In his production interview for *The Iceman Cometh*, O’Neill said, "In all my plays sin is punished and redemption takes place" (Shaughnessy 149). But when asked, later in life, by a Catholic correspondent if he had returned to the faith, his reply was "Unfortunately, no." Eugene O’Neill himself had always said "By God, there’s no hope! I’ll never be a success in the grandstand – or anywhere else! Life is too much for me! I’ll be a weak fool looking with pity at the two sides of everything till the day I die! May that day come soon" (133)! But later he says “Most modern plays are interested in the relationship between man and man, but that does not interest me at all. I am only interested in the relationship between man and God” (Cargill 115). All his life, it seems that he is deeply influenced and tormented by this topic of religion.

During his life O’Neill openly acknowledged his debt to Strinberg, Nietzsche, and the

Attic tragedies. Ideas of Christian love, forgiveness, and reconciliation are intellectually incompatible with O'Neill's sense of the tragic, according to which death is assumed to be permanent, and the gods are defined by the power to create and destroy. From time to time in O'Neill's life, he clearly denied, or at least refused to accept, the intellectual incompatibility of the tragic sense and Christianity and instead tried to bring about some synthesis. The underlying incompatibility of tragic and Christian ideas lay close enough to the surface of his mind and of the play to trouble him greatly (Pellizzi 353). For O'Neill, tragedy held the same significance it did for the Greeks, enabling existence while releasing humans from the bondage of petty concerns. By attempting to create this type of theatre, he hoped to illuminate the hopeless struggle for satisfaction which took place amidst the inescapable desperation of contemporary life. He hoped art could achieve what religion had failed to accomplish (357).

Since O'Neill believed that 'the old God' was dead and a 'new One' was not created by 'science and materialism', his investigation of the relationship between man and God inevitably led to dark thoughts about man's precarious and lonely position, his inability to 'belong', even the absurdity of man's trapped condition (162). For O'Neill, religion and psychology are closely related. He saw modern psychology as the answer to man's loss of faith. The importance O'Neill attached to myth came from his admiration for Greek Tragedy, his love of Nietzsche, his exposure to Expressionism, and ultimately, from his own personal search for religious meaning and purpose. O'Neill's one major theme was man's relation to God (Blackburn 133). Just as the ultimate origin of Expressionism conveyed in the Bahr's Explanation, "Man is crying out for his soul, the whole period becomes a single urgent cry. Art cries too, into the deep darkness, crying for help, crying for the spirit. Many of his plays

were attempts to deal with the 'psychological, mystical, and abstract' " (Hinden 407).

Fourthly, whether O'Neill actually believes in God or not, he has inherited the moral atmosphere of his former religion. No wonder that he subconsciously or consciously weaves into his gorgeous web of enchantment what he has drawn from the Bible, transplants many Biblical archetypes into his work and adds new materials and meanings to it. O'Neill's employment of archetypes is complicated. Sometimes it is direct and obvious; sometimes it is indirect and obscure; sometimes it is only a faint echo or a mocking imitation of archetypes. He uses shadowy family background, his own experiences, coincidences, suspense, and all the other tools of the play to create a sense of the mystery of life.

Certainly I am not the first who studied O'Neill's religious view. A few critics have studied his plays with regard to his religion. Winther remarks that O'Neill has not over-emphasized the problems of modern Christianity, but his plays give ample evidence that, even from the very first, he was interested in the effect of Christian doctrine upon the lives of his characters. The careful reader of his plays will find ample evidence that he has no quarrel with Jesus as a social teacher. O'Neill's view of organized Christianity could be expressed in the words from Renan's *Life of Jesus*: "Even in our days, troubled days, in which Jesus has no more authentic followers than those who seem to deny him, the dreams of an ideal organization of society, which have so much analogy with the aspirations of primitive Christian sects, are only in one sense the blossoming of the same idea" (56).

O'Neill himself felt deeply what he wrote; here the autobiographical pressure makes itself felt. He ransacked his memory, he was intrinsically connected to his Irish and Catholic roots, he wrote out his agony and guilt, and he used the theatre as a vehicle for remembrance

and self-analysis and self-forgiveness (161). When read consecutively and when considered in relation to his life, all his dramas seem to fall into a significant pattern. Beyond their individual qualities, they seem to describe the successive stages of a spiritual quest. Recent critics have recognized this, and have sought it in different ways. Like Melville's actual and fictional voyages, O'Neill's plays, both autobiographical and symbolic, seem to suggest his continuing search for salvation, or for "meaning". They are autobiographical, that is, both in a literal and in a spiritual sense (169).

Fifthly, some critics believe that many characters in O'Neill's play have double sides. That is, some of their complex qualities are divided between the two. So, the two sides of one person lead to two opposite roads, O'Neill consciously and subconsciously wove their roads into two opposite structures based on the Bible. From the days of *Beyond the Horizon*, O'Neill had repeatedly brought forth upon his stage characters who stood in closely related opposition to one another: hero and alter ego, man and his double (Harold 96).

These characters' conflicting personalities make them have contradictory experiences which are reflected in the following two contradictory Biblical archetypal structures. They reveal the conflicting religious view of O'Neill not only toward his main characters in the play but also toward his old religious faith.

Many critics have adopted various methods of criticism to describe their own profound interpretations of these three plays. Some critics have employed the archetypal method to analyze some of his plays which focus on these characters, structures and themes. In a book Eugene O'Neill: A Collection of Critical Essays compiled by Chinese scholar Liao Kedui, there is an essay *Biblical Archetypes in O'Neill's Plays* written by Li Yanxia. But it

seems that few critics have researched O'Neill's complicated religious view based on the Biblical archetypal structures in a comprehensive way. In such case, I attempt to select this topic as my focus.

The archetypal analysis, especially the Biblical archetypes might be a helpful method to discover the motif of these plays and to reveal the author's mentality toward religion. Additionally, the analysis of Biblical archetypes will be very significant in understanding his religious view and the themes of his works.

In these three plays, Biblical archetype is reflected in many aspects, such as characters, plots and structures. However, after thorough and close reading of these plays, I find the structures embody the most obvious and most significant archetypes in these plays, so the emphasis of this paper will be focused on this aspect only.

## Chapter One

### Textual Analysis of *Beyond the Horizon*

#### From the Perspective of Biblical Archetypal Structures

*Beyond the Horizon* was an exciting and important event in the development of American Drama. It was a play with a serious, true, significant message, appearing at a time when the stage was cluttered with trivialities and platitudes. According to Harold, the very fact that it does illustrate a definite philosophical concept, that that concept is O'Neill's own and must be understood by the audience, and the dual nature of the concept itself, all help account for the neglect of *Beyond the Horizon* at the present time. The message of the play concerns contradictions—except, of course, in the specific context of O'Neill's philosophy of opposites (43). We feel the balancing pull not only between reality and idealism, but also between the earthy and the spiritual, joy and sorrow, love and hate, hope and despair (37).

The main characters Robert, Andrew and Ruth's experiences are also confused and impressed the audiences with their dual natures. On the surface, they are destroyed by the hard life or unknown force; they died physically or spiritually. However, all of them reborn by the alternative choice of longing and hope. Their experiences follow two opposite Biblical archetypal patterns of "facing a plight and dilemma—making a choice—falling into calamity—suffering—gradually awakening—final destruction" and "living in paradise—committing a crime—suffering—repenting—final salvation".



## **Robert**

Robert is the typical O'Neill character in one respect and is described: "He is a tall, slender young man of twenty-three. There is a touch of the poet about him expressed in his high forehead and wide open eyes. His features are delicate and refined, leaning to weakness in the mouth and chin" (O'Neill *Beyond* 6).

He is romantic, sensitive, delicate and intellectual. In a different environment, these are the qualities in the O'Neill hero that make for tragedy. Eugene O'Neill writes that Robert has "a touch of the poet about him, a young, farm-born dreamer, whose romantic mind and frail body yearn for the open sea" (90), which is the symbol of his dream. Being an idealist, his idealism has been both his bulwark and destruction.

### **1.1. The Archetype of Adam**

Adam, the first man created by God, lives with Eve in the Garden of Eden before he is tempted by Eve to eat the fruit of the Forbidden Tree. Expelled from the paradise, they fall into a mortal world, wandering in the labyrinth of human history until redeemed to their original state by the Messiah. In *Beyond the Horizon*, the archetype of Adam is embodied in Robert.

#### **1.1.1. Tragedy Structure: A Fallen Man**

The endless illusive quality of the fall of Adam and Eve has been subject to several new interpretations in many literary works. This myth has been one of the most often borrowed Biblical archetypes in literature.

Robert has always dreamed of going away to sea "beyond the horizon," but he changes his plans when Ruth tells him that she really loves him, not his practical brother Andrew.

When they marry, the disappointed Andrew, who is a born farmer, runs away to sea. Once they three make this choice, they commit sin, because they are against their own true nature. So they have begun on the road of “falling into calamity—suffering—gradually awakening—final destruction.”

Robert, a dreamer and poet longs to go to sea and seek the promise that lies beyond the horizon. In the first act, Robert, on the hilltop, proclaims his dream of “the beauty of the far off and the unknown”; but he betrayed his creative gifts, marrying on impulse (reminiscent of O’Neill’s own marriage) and abandoning his dreams, subordinating his talents to the simple determinants of daily existence (134). Just like Adam in Eden, whether eating the fruit to violate the law of God or not, he faces the plight and dilemma: whether to go to the sea (his lifelong dream) or to stay on the farm. In the first flush of happiness, he flings aside ambition and consents to stay so he has to endure the pain from his wrong choice caused by the impulsive passion. O’Neill’s true tragic protagonist Robert was a man who was out of harmony with his environment, who could not “belong” and who therefore was condemned to live between hope’s eternal optimism and the inevitability of despair (Travis 126).

In the second act, the farm has deteriorated under the impractical management of Robert, and his wife Ruth, who has recognized her mistake in marrying him, has grown to hate him. Robert, who has become embittered, now tells his visiting brother: “I’ve given up dreaming” (156). Here Robert gradually awakens from his false dreams and realizes the hardness of life and the uncontrolled force which ruins his life. Ruth turns against him, their child dies and the farm fails.

In the final act, Robert has contracted tuberculosis, and the successful Andrew returns

too late to help him. In the end, the unhappy Robert, utterly misplaced in life and slowly worn down by increasing anxieties, bitter disappointment, the thwarting of his tender affections and finest aspirations, falls into a decline and finally dies with his unsatisfied eyes straining toward the horizon which he was doomed never to cross (16). Hope being gone, what is left is damnation, an acknowledgement of guilt and acceptance of the consequences: human obligation (83). At the end of *Beyond the Horizon*, an unhappily married Robert Mayo dies, emotionally separated from his wife and thus fulfills his following road of Adam.

If Andrew had stayed on the farm, if Robert had gone to sea, each would have held true to his essential nature and been able to live in harmony with the elements around him. But Robert, having turned against his true nature, in the cup of the hills, cut off from the Horizon, is imprisoned, forcibly held back from joining the element to which he rightly belongs. His weakness and his romanticism are irrelevant; until he can unite himself with the sea. He can be no stronger. On land, the unyielding furrows are sterile, and also in this play, the characters' destiny seems to be controlled by some unknown force, no matter how hard they struggle.

In Robert, O'Neill explored his own truth. He told of his desire for a new life, freed from the tortures of false beliefs and unnamed forces of evil. No character in the play quite discovers what it is all about, nor does he quite solve all the problems that he sensed as needing resolution. Decay and death are part of the play's physical and spiritual atmosphere: life as dying, the frustration of hopes.

The tragedy of Robert is that he turns against his true nature and has no ability to face the cruel life. This man is doomed to despair in this world, the romantic dream of beauty, the

romantic reaction of despair, and the other-worldly religion of comfort. O'Neill had explored the beauty beyond the horizon and the wasteland of despair.

While criticizing the incapability of Robert, O'Neill views Robert with sympathy, inviting us to consider the untold force which has been haunting the lives of Robert, Andrew and Ruth, rather than merely on Robert's incapability and bad luck. His archetypal sin and its consequent tragedy have been taken to symbolize the eternal failure of modern people's dream, that is, to find peace and harmony, in the negative, evil results of modern civilization which has the characteristics of the collapse of ideals and the disintegration of faith.

Not only has O'Neill tried to encompass more of life than most American writers of his time but, almost alone among them, he has persistently tried to solve it. Not the minutiae of life, not its feel and color and smell, not its nuance and humor, but its "great inscrutable forces" are his interest. He is always moving toward the finality which philosophy sometimes, and religion always, promises. Life and death, good and evil, spirit and flesh, male and female, the all and the one, Anthony and Dionysus—O'Neill's is a world of these antithetical absolutes such as religion rather than philosophy conceives, a world of pluses and minuses; and his literary effort is an algebraic attempt to solve the equations ( Trilling 13).

### **1.1.2. Comedy structure: A Repentant Man**

Besides the tragedy structure, Robert's experience also follows the comedy structure, the "U" structure, according to Northrop Frye's opinion, the whole Bible is a "divine comedy", and the U structure is its narrative structure (169). That is, following a pattern of "living in paradise—committing a crime—suffering—repenting—final salvation." Just like Adam and Eve in the Bible, once happily lived in the Paradise, Robert has happy dreams of

the sea to strengthen his health and be a search for beauty and mystery beyond the horizon. His brother Andrew is a born farmer who wants nothing more than marrying Ruth and taking care of his family's farm. The two brothers live in the happiness of their dreams. Because of loving the same woman, as mentioned above, both brothers Robert and Andrew choose to go against their original ideas. Robert stays on the farm, and Andrew goes to the sea. Like Adam and Eve, they commit crimes and are driven from the happiness and begin a long journey full of bitterness, like Adam when he was deprived from the Garden of Eden and forced into a mortal world.

Because of Robert's ineptness as a farmer, the farm is in decay, and the relationship between Robert and Ruth is worsening, because Ruth realizes she married the wrong brother. The passing of time also brings death to the Mayo parents, to the child of Robert and Ruth, and, at play's end, to Robert, who suffers from tuberculosis. The great pains, physical or spiritual, make him weaker and weaker, and lead him to a slow death. Only repentance and death can alleviate his pains in some way.

In the end, the dying Robert struggles to the top of a hill, where he can again see the horizon. There he proclaims: "You mustn't feel sorry for me. Don't you see I'm happy at last – free – free! Freed from the farm – free to wander on and on – eternally" (163)! He happily looks forward to death which he considers to be freedom. He will be "free to wander on and on – eternally!" For Robert, "his face radiant", death is not an "end" but "a free beginning – the start of my voyage" (Berlin 53)! His resolution to work toward a "new beginning", a "new love" establishes the possibility for hope in a dead world. His death creates in the natives a freedom from the sin and a close to a life source. Their essence is hope, as similar

concepts gave “hopeless hope” to earlier questers. Robert simultaneously invokes a Christian version of redemption through pain, and a Dionysian encomium on life. He looks forward to the next world, while recalling the purity of his original vision (135). He is even grateful for the torture he has been through, for he feels that he has been saved (and forgiven) through his torment. Thus he dies, believing that he has paid the price for his sin through his suffering, the search for his idea is involved with the suffering of the individual and the need for religious meaning.

O’Neill’s plays portray the same sense of inevitability, the same idea that each person is his own prisoner, a prisoner who can only be released from his cage by death, spiritually or physically (96). But, for O’Neill, death is a kind of rebirth and hope. This is true for Robert. At the end of the play, he seems to find himself in the hope of eternal rebirth and in the comfort offered by something beyond the horizon. Robert, however, is different from the others, for he is touched with a poet’s power of vision and is able to articulate hope, to sense what lies beyond the farthest range of vision.

O’Neill’s tragedy has some hope and, at the same time, we can envision the good life as a force battling against the evil, Robert finally achieved his goal by death; he is free and can go to somewhere in his dream. Thus he finds his salvation.

### **Andrew**

Andrew is Robert’s elder brother. The opposite to his idealist brother, he is a materialist. Just as mentioned above, because of the wrong choice of Robert and Ruth, he is forced to choose to go to sea, which against his nature, for his self-esteem. Andrew, although he was

understood as a complement to Robert, was not viewed as a dispossessed man, who, like Robert, is forced to seek salvation far from his native element (Bogard 117). Just as O'Neill's description of Robert is frequently associated with the Biblical archetypal structures, O'Neill subconsciously and consciously make many suggestions of the analogy between Andrew and archetypes in the Bible. He also undergoes the two contradictory progresses as both Scapegoat and Saint. This pattern is a kind of loss and hope for him.

## 1.2. The Archetype of Jesus

In *the Bible*, Jesus plays the role of a scapegoat and a saint. Being a scapegoat, he sacrifices himself for the benefit of human beings; being a saint, he undergoes the progress of forbearance, sacrifice and eventually salvation.

### 1.2.1. Tragedy structure: A Scapegoat

There are many examples in *The Bible* of selecting a scapegoat to bear all the faults. But when the crimes of the people became larger, it was not enough to select a literal goat, so God sent his son, Jesus, to bear all the sins of the world. As a symbol of the sins, he was crucified. This eventually becomes the archetype of Jesus, a scapegoat. Andrew reflects the archetype of Jesus, a scapegoat, and undergoes the road of "facing plight and dilemma—making a choice—falling into calamity—suffering—final destruction."

Andrew is a more practical man. His desire extends no farther than the family farm which he tends expertly. As mentioned above, he betrays himself, willfully going against his natural instincts, for Andrew destroys his harmonious relationship with the land by becoming a property speculator. Then he is forced to make a choice and falls into calamity.

At the beginning of the play, Andrew is forced to make a choice of going to the sea

because of Robert and Ruth's marriage. Robert and Ruth's marriage makes Andrew seek salvation from the sea; therefore Andrew has paid for his sin by staying on the sea. From this moment, we know that Andrew endures the sin of Robert and Ruth, therefore he has the role of a scapegoat.

Although Andrew is deeply hurt, he still loves his brother Robert who has hurt him. Just like Jesus, although he endures the sins of the human beings, he loves and helps people and will help them whenever they need his help. In desperate Robert and Ruth's eyes, Andrew is their safe refuge. Because of his sacrifice, they can live happily. Of course, he suffers much for his sin of going against his true nature. Instead of being a happy and wealthy man, he has been tortured by his desire for money. Sea life makes him a gambler as well as a capable man.

In the last part of the play, he conquers his weakness and desire for money, and returns to the farm to save the disorder and chaos caused by Robert and Ruth, just like a scapegoat on an altar or Jesus on the cross ready to sacrifice himself for the benefit of others.

The tragic ending is a ceremonial sacrifice. Throughout the play, he sacrifices twice. Firstly, he sacrifices his talent of being an expert farmer and goes to the sea for the happiness of Robert and Ruth; due to the poor management of Robert and Ruth, he sacrifices his opportunity of being a millionaire and returns to manage the insolvent farm.

Andrew's corruption is epitomized by his perverting the farmer's instinct and gambling in wheat. The practical creator, the farmer, destroys his soul by turning from wheat-raising to wheat-gambling. With Robert's death, he is spiritually exhausted.

### **2.1.2. Comedy Structure: A Saint**



From the beginning to the end of the play, Andrew, another failure in life, appears as a saint-like man, just like Jesus, because he always helped Robert and Ruth who have hurt him deeply. From this point of view, he undergoes experience of “living in the Paradise, then falling, suffering, and finally attaining salvation”.

Andrew is “wedded to the soil”, the older son is the father “over again in body and face” (9); to him, living in the farm is like living in paradise. He cannot cope with seeing Ruth and Robert together. Deeply hurt, he tells the family that he wishes to sail in Robert’s place.

When he stays at home, he is considered to be a promising farmer of the future, the father’s favorite, Robert’s idol of farming. Once he knows the love of Robert and Ruth whom he loves deeply, he sacrifices himself to the sea which is a torture for him. However, this choice makes him no longer a happy man. Life at sea is merely a means of accumulating wealth for him. Until he can reunite himself with the land, he can be no stronger.

Andrew’s wants are easily satisfied, but the source of his discontent remains unidentified. Robert makes the point specifically, denouncing the man who sells his soul for material things, Robert exclaims:

You - a farmer - to gamble in a wheat pit with scraps of paper... You used to be a creator when you loved the farm. You and life were in harmonious partnership...But part of what I mean is that your gambling with the thing you used to love to create proves how far astray—So you’ll be punished .You’ll have to suffer to win back – (162)

“There’s a spiritual significance in that picture” (162), O’Neill suggests that if

Andrew had not acted against his true nature, he would have managed the farm and everything would have gone well. But as mentioned above, he is forced to turn against his true heart, and undergoes an unfortunate fall. However his calamity makes him gain a new perspective, an insight, purifying him and saving him at last. This is a permanent theme in O'Neill's plays. His experience is just like one of the saints in *The Bible*: to carry God's mission and endure his trials on earth. Saint Paul says, "In my opinion, God leaves the worst position to us apostles, just like letting one be crucified to show to the crowd and angels" (Holy Bible, Samuel 1.5-10).

As a result, ever since he falls, he has been torturing himself and trying to help others. He cannot help continuing to aid Robert and Ruth who are the source of his falling. Hearing of Robert's illness and the farm's deterioration, he returns home to save his brother and the farm. However, everything seems to be too late; Robert's tuberculosis is serious and he is dying and the farm goes bankrupt. At this point, it is Andrew's turn to take the responsibility of managing the farm and taking care of Ruth.

Robert's words with Andrew at the end of the play reveal Andrew's road: "Ruth has suffered –and for your own sake and hers –remember, Andy—only through sacrifice—the secret beyond there –" (173). At Robert's death, Andrew castigates Ruth: "You damn woman, you coward, you murderess" (174). Then, remembering his own culpability, he begs her forgiveness. His last words to Ruth suggest an attempt on his part to comply with Robert's wishes. Only through sacrifice can Andrew achieve happiness. It is possible that he may marry Ruth after Robert's death to fulfill Robert's wish and come back, joining the element to which he rightly belongs. The last words in the play reveal Andrew's final awakening and his

final salvation. "(Stares at her for a moment, his rage ebbing away, an expression of deep pity gradually coming over his face. Then he glances down at his brother and speaks brokenly in a compassionate voice.) Forgive me, Ruth—for his sake. I know he was right—and I'll remember what he said" (81).

Although his original action has caused suffering, his return is close to a blessing; both a release from pain and a reunification with the element that is rightfully his. His fall and redemption is his progression of loss and longing which reveals O'Neill's contradictory views.

### **Ruth**

Ruth Atkins, the girl next door, is perhaps the most controversial character in the play; she appears as a secondary figure and yet a noteworthy one. At the beginning of the play, Andrew has convinced himself and his family that Ruth Atkins intends to marry him. However, Ruth prefers the romantic Robert and sets out to win him. She successfully tempts Robert to stay on the farm and marry her. She plays her role as Eve, a destroyer, and destroys the life of the two brothers who love her.

However she is also a pathetic woman whose frustration is presented sympathetically. Only after a month of marriage does she realize that the marriage has been a mistake and that she is in love not with Robert but with Andrew. Her consolation is that the absent Andrew still loves her and that he will be a final refuge for her. When Andrew has returned, her dream of final refuge is broken too. Later, she is depressed by these disasters - "the mystical force behind life" in O'Neill's expression. After so many disasters in her life, she begins to

contemplate “silent” and “exhaustion”(175).

### **1.3.1. The Archetype of Eve**

As mentioned above, the story of Adam and Eve in Eden has a canonical position for writers in the western tradition. While the archetype of Adam is mainly reflected in Robert, the hero, the archetype of Eve is embodied in Ruth, the heroine. Just like Eve in the Bible, Ruth undergoes the contradictory experiences of destruction and salvation, following the patterns of “facing plight and dilemma—falling into calamity—suffering—gradually awakening—final destruction” and “to live in Heaven—to commit sin—to fall—to suffer and repent—eventually to return.”

### **1.3.2. Tragedy Structure: A Fallen Woman**

At the beginning of the play, facing the love of two men, she successfully tempts Robert to stay on the farm and marry her. Robert cannot believe he must sacrifice the sea to have Ruth. Whenever he shows sighs of leaving her to pursue his dream, Ruth sobs and begs him to stay. He succumbs to her pleas and promised sexuality, consoling himself with the thought that love might be “the secret beyond every horizon” (31). Ruth takes his hand to lead him homeward, but “his eyes are fixed again on the horizon”(32). Finally, he throws “off some disturbing thought” and follows her (32). From this point, she falls into calamity and suffers the result for she tempts two brothers to betray themselves and she herself suffered by marrying the wrong man who has failed utterly as a qualified husband and a capable farmer.

Then three years elapsed. Ruth, who has assumed some responsibility for running the farm, in addition to caring for her fretful child and complaining mother, has become a bitter drudge. Her face has lost its youthfulness and freshness and become “hard and spiteful.”

Having married the wrong man whom she thought she loved, she must see her marriage fall apart, along with the farm. Her only hope is that Andrew's return will change her miserable life. During her longing for Andrew's return, she acts as a cruel destroyer. She and Robert have quarrels, she tells Robert that their marriage was a mistake and that she hates him and she always loved Andrew; her husband Robert can leave the farm anytime he wants now, for Andrew will be home soon to run it properly. She firmly believes that only Andrew's expected return from the sea can save the farm. Here her role of victim is changing into a Satan. Finally she gradually realizes that marrying Robert is a disaster, waiting for Andrew is a terrible blow.

Besides her sin of temptation, her crudeness and duplicity signal a destructive nature of Satan which forecasts her own doom, too. After Andrew's return, Ruth is depressed and shocked by his answer when he says he is over "that silly nonsense" and he will sail the next day on a steamer bound for Argentina. Ruth suffering from the lost dream of love, dressed in mourning, sits by the stove. Her hair is streaked with grey; her pale face "has the stony lack of expression of one to whom nothing more can ever happen, whose capacity for emotion has been exhausted" (89).

Throughout the play, Ruth has endured the tragedies that have beset her: the deaths of her mother, Mrs. Mayor, and of her daughter Mary, the unending problems with the farm, the deterioration of her husband, and Andrew's irresponsible words that he cannot remain home to help with the farm. All these sufferings followed her choice of marrying the wrong man. O'Neill deliberately planned her road of suffering. As he said, in all his plays, sin would be punished. Tortured by Robert's incapability and Andrew's rudeness, Ruth gradually realizes

that she has no one to rely on; her world is totally destroyed by Andrew's words at Robert's death, "You damn woman, you coward, you murderess"( 174) !

### **3.1.2. Comedy Structure: A Repentant Woman**

Before Ruth confesses her love toward Robert, she lives happily just like an angel in the heaven. Once they marry, Andrew, grievously hurt, determines to go to sea in his brother's place. Thus she falls from heaven and became a Satan. Not only does she tempt the two brothers to go against their true natures but also she has recognized her mistake in marrying Robert and has begun to hate him a few years later. Within a few years, the farm has deteriorated under the impractical management of Robert as mentioned above. Neither she nor Robert sees any meaning in life beyond the love of their children, for whose sake they continue to live together. The ultimate blow comes when the child dies. Robert has contracted tuberculosis and will die soon. Everything seems a disaster to Ruth. Her frustrations are presented sympathetically and she repents and seeks salvation.

We know that her only hope is on Andrew, the man she hurts deeply. Her illusion is that the absent Andrew still loves her and that he will be a final refuge for her. Three years have passed. Andrew has returned. Dressed in her best white dress, Ruth is alone with him on a sun-lit hilltop, and she takes the opportunity to let him know her true feelings toward him. However, Andrew, now a practical greedy speculator, ignores her feelings and brutally lets her understand that he does not love her any longer, describing himself at the time when he did love her as a "dumb fool." Her meager hope is taken away by this man she has thought can bring salvation for her from disaster, finding that he has forgotten her six months after he left the farm and he no longer loves her. Robert and Andrew, these two brothers, cannot give

happiness to her. For a woman, her only hope is to live a happy and comfortable life; but no one can help her. The two brothers fail her sooner or later.

Before Robert's death, he asks Andrew to take care of her. He says: "Remember, Andy, Ruth has suffered double her share, and you haven't suffered at all. (His voice faltering with weakness) Only through contact with suffering, Andy, will you – awaken. Listen. You must marry Ruth – afterwards" (163). After his rudeness, Andrew begs for forgiveness:

I — you — we've both made such a mess of things! We must try to help each other — and — in time — we'll come to know what's right to do — [Desperately.] And perhaps we — [But Ruth, if she is aware of his words, gives no sign. She remains silent, gazing at him dully with the sad humility of exhaustion, her mind already sinking back into that spent calm beyond the further troubling of any hope]. (175)

Ruth, at the end of the play, depressed by the disasters, seems that she herself begins to contemplate the meaning of her life. She unfolds her desires and psyche, tracing her repression and her growth to self-discovery and self-realization. In the last act, Ruth and Andrew are left to marry each other, but there is no indication that they will live happily or not. But Ruth dares to trust herself and to believe in the possibility of a new morality in the new world. By "remaining silent" for Andrew's request, she achieves the spiritual greatness in spite of her own human weakness, in spite of the frustration and bitterness of life. Ruth, the woman is no longer a mere destroyer and suffering woman; she is also a savior for herself. She contemplates life and tries to find the meaning for herself.

There is a kind of finality about the conclusion of each act: a reconciliation and new

understanding between the two brothers in the first act, between Ruth and Robert in the second, and between Ruth and Andrew in the third (Floyd 150). So Ruth probably forgives Andrew and finds a path for herself later. In this sense she finds her salvation.

## Chapter Two

### The Embodiment of Two Biblical

#### Archetypal Structures in *Days Without End*

Eugene O'Neill attempted to confront the big issues of science and religion head-on, and even managed to include a strong dosage of sex. All three - science, religion, and sex - are connected with the search for God. O'Neill's goal, as he stated in a letter to George Jean Nathan, was to

dig at the roots of the sickness of Today as I feel it – the death of the old God and the failure of Science and Materialism to give any satisfying new One for the surviving primitive religious instinct to find a meaning for life in , and to comfort its fears of death with . It seems to me anyone trying to do big work nowadays must have this big subject behind all the little subjects of his plays or novels, or he is simply scribbling around on the surface of things and has no more real status than a parlor entertainer. (Chothia 30)

To confront 'this big subject', *Dynamo* was to be the first play of a trilogy, but unfortunately O'Neill never carried through with this project. (The second play of the trilogy, to be entitled *Without Ending of Days*, eventually became *Days Without End*, written in the



thirties) (104).

The irony presents itself: *Days without End*, a story of salvation, meant damnation for its author; whereas his study of the damned brought his own salvation as an artist (Bloom 81). The eight drafts that O'Neill took to write the play indicate his struggle with the material, which mirrors his struggle with himself (Robards15). The first draft ended with the protagonist's suicide in despair; the last draft ends with his affirmation of faith (123). From these critics' reviews, we know clearly O'Neill's contradictory views toward religion which reflect obviously in this play.

The conflict in *Days Without End* within the split hero, John Loving – called 'John' and, when he is his other self, called 'Loving' ('whose features reproduce exactly the features of John's face – the death mask of a John who has died with a sneer of scornful mockery on his lips') – reflects O'Neill's own search for faith in the modern sick world. In his protagonist's acceptance of Catholicism at the play's end, O'Neill seems to be returning to the Catholicism of his childhood, moving toward Jesus and away from Nietzsche. Later, O'Neill acknowledged that he had not returned to Catholicism, much to the regret of his many Catholic admirers and Catholic critics who believed that *Days without End* dramatized the end of O'Neill's personal search for the faith which he had finally regained.

## **2.1. The Archetype of Angel and Satan**

### **2.1.1. John and Loving: Angel and Satan**

Just as mentioned above, *The Bible* has an important influence in the imaginative tradition of Western literature. The characters, themes, plots, and symbols in *The Bible* have appeared in so many literary works that without a doubt they became literary archetypes.

Judged from the whole text, John is the embodiment of an angel, living happily in the love of God, when his belief in God is shaken, his double, alter ego Loving appears. Thus the double roles of Satan and Angel are reflected in the hero John Loving. The archetype of Loving seems to be Satan in *The Bible*. In the biblical image, Satan is representative of vicious power, evil, and temptation. Loving is actually Satan in modern clothes. Although he has the same appearance as John, his cold expression, and cynical and tempting words are actually the embodiment of Satan who tries to tempt John to turn against God.

## **2.2. The Archetype of Biblical Plot Embodied in Structures**

In John Loving, O'Neill borrows the most fundamental biblical plot: the conflict between good and evil. Manifested in this hero, John Loving represents the conflict between the positive and negative sides of the same person in relation to O'Neill's faith in God. The two halves John and Loving occur between decrees and temptation, paradise and hell, and are manifested in the heart of the hero, John Loving. Therefore, his quest follows the patterns of destruction: "facing a plight and dilemma — making a choice — falling into calamity — suffering — gradually awakening — final destruction" and of salvation of "living in paradise — committing a crime — suffering — repenting — final salvation," which clearly reveal O'Neill's inner struggle with his former religion. These two contradictory structures combine with each other throughout the play, ending with Loving's final destruction and John's eternal return.

### **2.2.1. John and Loving: The Good – Evil Conflict**

The two characters were actually two sides of O'Neill's attitude toward religion. On one hand, John and Loving are actually separate sides of one person; on the other hand, they

are two separate individuals portrayed on stage and O'Neill's version of the answer to the question: Do I still believe in God or not? The author experimented with different methods of dramatizing the conflict between religious certainty and human reason, faith versus science, that, in *Days without End*, ultimately becomes the struggle between good and evil. Not until the fifth draft did O'Neill incorporate the "Mask Scheme," in which two separate entities (and actors) are used to depict the hero's dual natures: John, representing his nobler side, and Loving, wearing the "dead mask" of John's sneering cynicism. Loving can be seen only by John and the audience, but his scornful remarks can, at times, be heard by other characters, and these they attribute to John (407).

*Days Without End* is the dramatist's account of his own spiritual odyssey. The notes for the latter, in their totality, reflect the personal struggle the author waged within his own soul. Despite his denials, he was expressing his own dilemma through his hero and seeking a similar return to his faith (Floyd 419) .

### **2.2.2. John Loving: The Combination of Angel and Satan**

John is actually an Angel, which can be seen in his physical appearance: handsome and the "rather heavy, conventional American type of good looks – straight nose and a square jaw, a wide mouth that has an incongruous feminine sensitiveness, a broad forehead, blue eyes" (O'Neill, *Days Without End*, 7).

John begins life as a devout Catholic, loving both life and God, and is like a total angel living in heaven. At eighteen, he went to college, where he assumed the pose of rebellious "devil's advocate" (19). At this time, John has the potential for being tempted to become a Satan.

The first part, which deals with the hero's boyhood to the age of fifteen, seems like a page taken from O'Neill's own life. This period is a happy time for him and at this time he is still an angel. John had admired his father and adored his mother, his parents were both devout Catholics, but the mother had "an absurd obsession with religion" (30). The boy grew up believing ardently in this loving God. Their God was human, lovable, compassionate, the "God Who became man for the love of men and gave His life that they might be saved from themselves" and not a "stern, self-righteous Being Who condemned sinners to torment" (30). At school, however, "he learned of the God of Punishment" and could not "reconciled Him with his parents' faith" (30). When he was fifteen, all of his "pious illusions" were destroyed when, during a flu epidemic, his parents contracted pneumonia and died. His father died first. After his mother became ill, the young man "vowed his life to piety and good work ...if his mother were spared to him" (32). However he prayed in vain. It was at this precise time in the hero's life, which duplicates O'Neill's, that the doubting, diabolical Loving was born. That is; after his parents' deaths, the hero, in his despair, "had given his soul to some evil power." He makes his choice of beginning to doubt God but, at the same time, he is still influenced by the former belief of God, so "for a long while after their deaths, he went through a terrific inner conflict" (43). This experience is almost autobiographical. O'Neill himself had such a painful experience when he prayed to God for his mother's morphine addiction with no positive answer.

This is his first step to commit sin. Because of abandoning his religion, he feels that he needs something to replace his old faith which he called meaningless illusions. "He ended up by becoming an atheist. But his experience had left an incredible scar on his spirit" (64). He

wondered, doubted and searched; his changed role from the Angel to Satan was gradually forming so he suffered by his rebellious actions. Even later when he found a woman's love for his faith, because of this woman "he was happy again for the first time since his parents' death — to his bewildered joy" (66). But he was still tortured by his uncertainty.

"And found his truth at last — in love, where he least expected he ever would find it. Deeply influenced by his former pious love for God, he had always been afraid of love, and when he met the woman who afterwards became his wife and realized he was in love with her, it threw him into a panic of fear. He wanted to run away from her — but he couldn't (66). O'Neill symbolizes love as the God in John Loving's mind as well as in his heart. Being afraid of losing his love again just like his first loss when he was a boy, he suffered much from his inner struggle. He needs it badly, but at the same time disbelieves it, too. Once again, O'Neill shows the audience his conflicting attitudes toward God.

He suffered for his tormented soul. The two selves' opposite dialogues further reflected John Loving's contradictory views toward God. On the one hand, he thought that only God could give spiritual peace to him; on the other hand, his parents' deaths showed that the powerful God had no pity for him. John Loving lived a painful life, facing the dilemma, to be or not to be. This is a lasting question for human beings as well as for him. During his inner struggles, he was afraid of losing his wife, for his wife's love was his faith and his whole life after losing his religion.

During this period, he committed his second crime, for his negative double Loving dominates. He "was unfaithful to her" and had an affair with another woman for escaping his inner vainness (67). After this second fall, "he often found himself regretting...", "He felt lost

without her — fearful, disintegrated” while the good half, John, was continuing to be tormented by the sins caused by his evil one (67). His wife Elsa knew the truth and couldn’t forgive him. At this point, he suffered greatly and even wanted to die. Father Baird, being his spiritual advisor, persuaded him to believe in God again. His evil side, Loving, cursed God at first, as in the first complete version. However, at the moment of cursing, John, the good double, realized that he believed in God and has always believed and that his hatred should have been love (Doris 152). Loving like Milton’s Satan is the real answer to the problems posed by the poet’s mind, “He was always grasping at some absurd new faith to find an excuse for going on!” This is severe criticism of O’Neill’s own past, and it is also unique as a type of self-analysis of a successful author (284).

After his inner struggle with the evil side, Loving, John finally awakened, realizing that only God could save her wife’s life, so he began to repent, then returned to God and finally had his salvation by regaining his former belief. It is significant that it closes with the words “Life laughs with God’s love again. Life laughs with love” (76). John’s salvation means Loving is totally defeated and had his doom; the acceptance of formal Christianity is the only redemption in this play. Not until twenty years later, in *Days Without End*, did O’Neill identify sacrifice with organized Christianity, and then reluctantly (Doris 18). Doris remarks that “he did so reluctantly”, because, in O’Neill’s mind, he is still doubting and searching. Although Loving is dead in the end of the play, O’Neill’s mind is still with him. Loving again asks questions, suggests doubts, loses battles, but in the end wins the real victory, for his is the inquiring, skeptical mind; his is the mind of Eugene O’Neill (295). The ending brings the promise of peace and a sort of salvation at that moment.

The two halves of one person experience two opposite roads. John had the road of “living in Paradise — commit a crime — suffer — repent — final salvation”, whereas Loving’s progress is “falling into calamity — suffering — gradually awakening — final destruction” which obviously reflects O’Neill’s complicated view toward God. After the production of this play, some critics remarked that O’Neill finally returned to his former religion, although later O’Neill denies that he had returned to his old faith. But we can see clearly that his inner conflict with his religion was still continuing in his later works and through all his life.

O’Neill knew that John Loving’s Kierkegaardian leap to “faith which resolves contradictions” was itself a contradiction of the steadfast belief in life solutions to life problems which O’Neill had maintained in all his previous work. So far, the psychological meaning of the play is completely consistent with O’Neill’s view of life, but that consistency is lost when John finds his solution not only in love, but in the supernatural — in Christianity or, even more specifically, Catholicism (149).

## Chapter Three

### **An Archetypal Interpretation of *Long Day's Journey into Night***

This play is an intensely personal drama, but its autobiographical quality is not what makes it perhaps the highest achievement of the American theatre. It was psychologically necessary for him to confront his family by way of art. Throughout his career, he and members of his family appeared in his plays in different forms and guises. Now he approached himself and his brother and father and mother more directly. Probably more important, writing the play was O'Neill's way to understand himself and his family better and to forgive himself and his family for the hell they created for each other. It was essentially an act of forgiveness, 'writing in tears and blood', as O'Neill's dedication to his third wife Carlotta reveals (148).

For O'Neill, religion and psychology are closely related. He saw modern psychology as the answer to a man's loss of faith. Forces continue to work 'behind life' to control men's lives, the past controls the present and future, frustration remains the condition of man, there is darkness behind the door, life seems a dirty trick, 'hopeless hope' and alcohol remain important means for survival, and the themes of love and death continue to dominate. All the Tyrones, with one exception, wear masks — not actual ones, like those in *The Great God Brown*, or the symbolic grim visages of the Mannons in *Mourning Becomes Electra*, but mercurial facades designed to control their dual personalities (534). The main characters' dual natures offer a twofold view of them and make them have two opposite roads, physically and spiritually.



## **Mary Tyrone**

Mary Tyrone, the heroine of the tragedy, may be the most complicated character in this play. Because of the autobiographical elements of the story, Mary is much like the author Eugene O'Neill's own mother, Ella O'Neill. O'Neill begins his play with Mary's first appearance before the audience, and then ends it with her madness and return. Into this character, O'Neill poured his mother's being, her tormented soul, making her the most human character in the play. Just as Floyd remarked she has the role of "victimizer-victim" (541-542). But most important, in making her the best and the most human character in the story, O'Neill reveals most clearly his conflicting religious views. Mary's long monologues reveal inner contradictions and shed light on the complex family love-hate relationships (547). In Mary's experience, there exist two conflicting Biblical archetypal structures, just like her two dual roles reveal. Being a victim, she meets her destruction; being a victimizer, she awakens to contemplate her real situation and finally finds her own salvation, thus in losing self she has gained self.

### **3.1. The Archetype of Eve**

As mentioned above, the story of Adam and Eve in Eden has a canonical position for writers in the western tradition. The archetype of Eve is embodied in Ruth, the heroine.

#### **3.1.1. Tragedy Structure: A Fallen Woman**

Mary Tyrone plays her role as Eve, a fallen woman. She undergoes almost the same experiences as Eve — "facing plight and dilemma, then making a choice, falling into calamity, suffering, gradually awakening, and final destruction."

Mary Tyrone, when only fifteen, faced a dilemma: to be a wife of a touring actor with

whom she fell in love at first sight or to be a nun and a pianist to realize her childhood dream. Her mother insists that she should be a nun instead of marrying due to her daughter's inability to be a qualified wife. However, she married the actor whom she identified with her father, taking it for granted that her husband was as generous as her dear father. When she made this choice, she fell into calamity; married life showed that she was a total failure and she suffered much more than ever before.

Upon Mary's entrance, O'Neill describes her as a middle-aged woman with distinctively Irish features. What strikes one immediately is her extreme nervousness; she manifests visible signs of illness in her face and her body. This is the result of her tormented married life. At being a wife and a mother, she is unqualified. She is haunted by a summer dump in a place she hates, was cut off from society, and suffered for her father's death, Eugene's death, Edmund's birth, her own addiction and Edmund's illness. Her second fall begins with her drug addiction after Edmund's birth, although this time she is a victim instead of a victimizer. She is blameless in this situation which was caused by her husband's stinginess. However, when she returns from the sanatorium, she has the choice to get rid of the morphine or not. Being unable to resist the temptation, she uses drugs again and again. Her husband Tyrone shows his complicated feelings toward her, full of hate and love, "When you have the poison in you, you want to blame everyone but yourself!" or "Don't be too hard on her, lad. Remember she's not responsible. Once that cursed poison gets a hold on anyone—" (96-121). Here O'Neill also shows his strong and complicated feelings toward his dear mother.

She has no friends and close companions, feels lonely, desperately wants the

acceptance and approval of the native New Englanders but receives only cruel rebuffs, all these dire fears and memories come on her continuously, driving her to her cache of drugs. Her long-term morphine addiction motivated, in part, her near madness, the state of her mind is deteriorating. In the play, the word “detached” is so frequently used by O’Neill to describe Mary, showing her physical and spiritual condition caused by drugs. Mary suffers much for being the role of the victim of the tormented family and her inability to conquer her desire for the drug.

She complained about everything, about every member in the family, especially about the husband’s parsimony and failure to offer the family a decent home, and the sons’ inconsideration, doubt and dissipation. Mary’s constant lamentation for a home and social acceptance demonstrates the essential rootlessness of the Irish (538). It also shows her strong desire for something to rely on after she loses her old faith. Suddenly she finds that she belongs to nowhere. She indulged in the past. The past seems as an eternal refuge for her present dislocated condition because; in the past, she has dreams and she has faith which gives her happiness.

Her tragedy commences with her decision to marry Jamie Tyrone and her inability to control her drug addiction and to be a good housewife. She was hopelessly inefficient at running a household and raising children. Her failure as a wife and mother and her subsequent retreat into an illusionary world may have been forms of revenge for her sins.

At such moments, Mary is a dangerous, destructive force in the family; she is a destroyer as well as a victim. Mary, a mother, had turned her back on life. Mary Tyrone’s cry for something in the end of the play illustrates O’Neill’s plight: he is always looking for

something after he loses his childhood Catholicism. After so much torture and suffering, she begins to repent for her abandoning faith. Without it, she has no peace, physically and spiritually. Her failure lies in that she has no courage to face her present and solve her problems although she knows her problems and situation well.

Fortunately, at last she awakens. She exclaims longingly, "If I could only find the faith I lost, so I could pray again" (92)! Then, derisively, she reasons that the Blessed Virgin would not be "fooled by a lying dope fiend reciting words" (92). It is impossible for her to do so when she lacks religious faith. By the time she is finished, we realize that this simple, convent-bred child was never equipped to face the terrors of life outside (219). Mary's successive relapses after a number of supposed "cures" suggest an ongoing drive for escape that impels her toward self-destruction (41). In the end, Mary becomes crazy. Carelessly carrying her white wedding gown, her face is pale and her eyes glisten "like polished black jewels"(150). She is totally unaware of the presence of others. She is, of course, most afflicted. Disoriented by excessive morphine injections, she manifests visible signs of illness in her face and body. Her tormented soul, detached spirit, long-suffering endurance and the condition of near madness, finally make her fall down. With no hope, no peace in her heart, she is destroyed by her frailty and her environment.

Mary's crimes mainly come from her own characteristic weakness. Her inability to face the future and her indulgence in the past make her retreat from real life. The impulsive decision makes her fall, the morphine addiction is the seed of her destruction, and lack of faith is the root of her fall. Tyrone's words are powerful: "If your mother had prayed, too — she hasn't denied her faith, but she's forgotten it, until now there's no strength of the spirit

against her curse” (67). She does evil, she forgets her faith and has no power to fight her sin, so her sin is certain, the law she breaks is inevitable, thus there is her tragedy. However, besides being a victim, a fallen woman from the paradise, there is another side of Mary, the awakening and repentant angel.

### 3.1.2. Comedy Structure: A Repentant Woman

Just like Eve in *The Bible*, besides being driven from heaven and suffering the hardships of the mortal world, she would be redeemed to her original happy state by God as mention above. Mary’s road has the same pattern as the repentant Eve of “living in Paradise, then falling, suffering, and finally attaining salvation.”

In handling the awakening and repentant Mary, O’Neill reveals his conflicting religious views. Religion still plays a very important role in his life although he consciously abandons it. The crimes Mary commits are balanced by her unhappy marriage life. Her miserly husband’s stinginess and her two prodigal sons are the main reasons of her fall. Her lost faith and her inability is the root of her downfall; her final awakening is her hope for returning.

As a young girl, Mary was spoiled by her father, who would do anything she asked. Her childhood dream to be a pianist and a nun might have come true had she not fallen in love with Tyrone. Her father spoiled her, sending her to most expensive convent. Her days there were the happiest of her life. Before she married Tyrone, she was a happy angel living in paradise, enjoying the love of Father God. Unfortunately, her affectionate father introduced her to Tyrone and provided a lavish wedding for them. With unrealistic expectations for her actor husband, toward him she has naïve and exaggerated hopes. She associates Tyrone with her idealized father, thinking that he is to treat her as good as her

father treated her. This was her first mistake and her first step to a lifelong hard journey, like Eve who was expelled from the Paradise to the earth.

That Mary passed directly from her father's hands into those of his friend suggests that she never had time to develop strong interests of her own or to explore the independence that comes with autonomous living ( 45 ). Here we can see that her impulsive marriage was the crime she committed from which she suffered much later just as mentioned above. Her marriage makes her lose herself and she has no interest and no independence in autonomous living. After marriage, having no decent home, she has to travel around the country being an actor's wife. In each play that has a couple clearly modeled on O'Neill's parents, the husband is at least ten years older than the wife, and the marriage is always described, either in the final text or in the early notes or scenario, as a "mistake" (Floyd 541). O'Neill subconsciously holds the view that his parents' marriage is a mistake, from which every member in the family is tormented.

As described above, Mary's second fall is that she is a morphine addict. Mary Tyrone, has many excuses to indulge in morphine - her husband's parsimony, Edmund's illness, no relatives and friends, etc. The truth is, however, had she not discovered morphine, she would have resorted to some other means of escape from reality, from herself. She is what she is because of her sense of guilt; she feels deeply guilty about her old religion which is her inner core of existence.

Although she continually complains to her husband about his stinginess and two son's dissipation, she also understands that her husband is not easy. By criticizing Jamie, she pours out her deep sympathy toward him:

Stop sneering at your father! I won't have it! You ought to be proud you're his son! He may have his faults, Who hasn't? But he's worked hard all his life. He made his way up from ignorance and poverty to the top of his profession! Everyone else admires him and you should be the last one to sneer—you, who, thanks to him, have never had to work hard in your life! (52)

She shows her sympathy. Throughout the play, she occasionally shows her understanding, sympathy, repentance and forgiveness toward her husband and sons through the dialogues, although the main mood is still her complaint and contempt mixed with love and hate. Once she told her husband: "We've loved each other! We always will! Let's remember only that, and not try to understand what we cannot understand, or help things that cannot be helped — the things life has done to us we cannot excuse or explain" (73). Here O'Neill speaks the inscrutable force through Mary's words.

Feeling alone and tortured by the illness, she feels there nowhere for her to have a rest and there is always an untold force haunting her. The only safe home is her past and she is immersed in the past, especially by the effects of morphine, for forgetting the present pains. In the past, she had her dream and her beloved Virgin Mother, but in the present, she feels puzzled and disenchanted and tormented by the drugs and her uncontrollable fate. However, she gradually realizes that she could cure her drug addiction by prayer and at the same time realizes her repeated crimes leave her almost no chance. On the surface, Mary Tyrone's long day's journey ends in despair. She does not experience some type of victory in the real life. Actually, her repentance and awakening to her own problems is a kind of salvation for her.

The loss of faith to religiously indoctrinated first- and second-generation Irish

immigrants was a traumatic experience. Interpreted in religious terms, Mary Tyrone's long day's journey ends in spiritual despair, in what John of the Cross called the dark night of the soul. Mary Tyrone's cry, in her dazed, drugged state at the end of the play, for "something" she has lost is a sorrowful lament for her religious faith, the inner core of her existence (538). Her cry shows that she realizes that she cannot live peacefully without her religion. She awakes to find that only her old faith can save her. From this discovery, we can say that she has final salvation and achieves her spiritual sublimation. She does not experience some type of victory physically, but she does spiritually by her repentance and awakening. In a sense, we can say that Mary has her salvation by means of this repentance and final awakening. The final curtain of long Day's Journey falls on the most pathetic and terrifying scene in the entire canon. Mary has withdrawn into the dream world of a past when, as a convent schoolgirl, she still had faith in the Virgin (191). In the tragic scene, we can see a glimpse of hope for Mary. She could have peace if only she had returned to her schoolgirl religion, even though she indulges in the past and seems unable to recover from the pain and suffering life has given her. O'Neill's solution for her is clear: only by regaining her faith can she have salvation.

We should note that, although O'Neill cherishes so much love and sympathy toward Mary, who is the embodiment of his mother, in his mind, consciously and subconsciously influenced by his Irish Catholic dogmas, he does believe that Mary's terrible condition is due to her lost religion, an act which cannot be overlooked or forgiven. Having no Blessed Virgin's love in her heart, Mary has no peace in her life, which leads to her final destruction. At the end of the play, Mary says "Something I need terribly. I remember when I had it I was never lonely nor afraid. I can't have lost it forever" (153), Mary's words reveal O'Neill's



inner voice. He and his family members badly need their former religion to depend on.

### **James Tyrone**

The Father, James Tyrone, unlike other members in the family, at the outset, has “never been really sick in his life.” Frankly speaking, he is a very successful man who is famous for his acting and has a beautiful, younger wife and two sons. He had been a happy Adam in the paradise, but for the sake of money, he sacrifices artistic ability and makes his wife have a drug addiction and his two sons feel homeless. He commits unpardonable “sins”; even he himself once deeply regretted these. Like Adam, he is cast out of the happiness and lives a miserable life, although he is rich and famous. He has to suffer and repent to seek his own salvation.

Just like Mary, O’Neill also reflects paradoxes toward James Tyrone and reveals ambivalence and different degrees of hate, love and sympathy; his complex moral features indicate his condition. Apart from the Irish Catholic background O’Neill has designed for James, there are also two Biblical archetypal structures in James Tyrone’s experience which reflect O’Neill’s contradictory religious views.

#### **3.2.1. The Archetype of Adam**

As we mentioned earlier, the story of Adam and Eve has a permanent position in western literature. The archetype of Adam is obviously embodied in the father, James, who has two opposite roles as Mary.

#### **3.2.2. Tragedy Structure: A Fallen Man**

The family members all regard the father as the source of the family’s torment. The

wife and the two sons voice their complaints and contempt toward him; his namesake is a miser. Just as Adam in *The Bible*, he undergoes the same progress of “facing plight and dilemma — making a choice — falling into calamity — suffering — gradually awakening — final destruction.”

James is a very famous actor and a millionaire. Because of his extreme poverty in childhood, he forms the habit of doing everything in a miserly way for the accumulation of money, fearing that one day he will have nothing as that of his poverty-stricken childhood days. Trading on his good looks, the young man seized his opportunity, beginning as an extra and rising to stardom. By his hard work he became one of the most popular actors in the country, adored by all the girls hoping to be one of the most promising artists in the future.

Then he faces a dilemma, to be a genuine artist or to be a man who earns one or two thousand dollars a year by repeating his former successful roles. Wealth was denied him in his childhood and he was deeply hurt by his childhood experience, James, a father, has bartered his artistic integrity for monetary success; therefore, he wastes his great talent “through years of easy repetition”, before that he “was considered one of the three or four young actors with the greatest artistic promise in America.” This is his first choice. From this moment, we know that he falls into calamity which may give him a kind of security which he could not feel in his childhood but which destroys himself as a talented actor. This first fall is caused by the temptation of money. Although he later regrets his choice and wants to do everything to change this situation, it is too late.

While repenting for one sin, he commits another one – irresponsibility. In the early years of their marriage, according to Mary’s words, he habitually disappeared and would

rather stays with his friends to drink than accompany her, only to be brought home dead drunk to his young wife, waiting in “that ugly hotel room.” When Jamie was little, instead of accompanying and educating him, his “remedy was to give him a teaspoonful of whiskey to quiet him if he had a nightmare or a stomach-ache” (97). The bad influence on Edmund is fatal, Mary’s painful hatred shows this, “When he was in prep school, he began dissipating and playing the Broadway sport to imitate you, when he’s never had your constitution to stand it” (29). These facts show that Tyrone is not a qualified husband and a responsible father.

Then, there is another plight following his sins as a miser and a hypocrite. When Mary was ill, he was unwilling to spend money on a good doctor. Instead the fraud doctor gave Mary morphine after a difficult childbirth which began her morphine addiction, tormenting her throughout her life. At the same time, James fails to provide his family a decent home, which makes the other three members always feel homeless. Although later he has to spend thousands of dollars in curing her, his attitude toward Mary’s addiction is negative, “I’ve spent thousands upon thousands in cures! A waste” (141)! In the play, as in real life, much of the blame for the mother’s condition is attributed to her husband’s miserliness. The house was never a ‘home’ because Tyrone did everything in the cheapest way. Physically and spiritually, James is partly responsible for his wife and son’s degraded conditions.

In the play, Tyrone is described as a believer in God toward whom the two sons show contempt such as their mockery at their father’s religion, “praying for nothing” for his prayer cannot cure Mary’s morphine addiction. O’Neill’s denial of his former Catholicism is

affirmed by two sons' remarks in the play. Tyrone's Catholicism in this play is mechanical and dogmatic; he is the archetype of the old harsh puritan God in the Old Testament, who has no passion and sympathy for people's feeling, the only thing for him to do is to torment his sinners ruthlessly according to the puritan dogma. For Tyrone, his strong desire for accumulating wealth makes him a cold person who only cares about money and ignores family members' illness and reasonable request ruthlessly. His actions make him fall away from his family and be tormented by his behavior.

Just as Michael remarks that, "No matter how well we understand Tyrone, it is a shock to learn that he allows McGuire to 'stick' him with another piece of bad property on the very day that he wrangles with Hardy over the choice of a sanatorium for Edmund" (49). When Edmund bitterly criticizes his father's cruel behavior, he firstly explodes with outrage, then awakens and agrees to let Edmund choose any sanatorium where he would like to live. His tragedy lies in that he has illusions of money; he thinks that money can give security, and the security can makes him happy. We know that, although he pays the whole family's expenses, it seem that no one shows much gratitude and sympathy toward him. He feels painful and lonely; only wealth cannot bring him happiness.

In all his life, he faces plight and dilemma and then he makes choices. That is, he has sacrificed his artistic value, wife and children to his need for securing wealth and he invests his money in land to the deprivation of his family. These choices make him fall deeply and isolate him from his family members. With some justice, his family blames Tyrone for most of their afflictions — his wife's need for drugs, one son's alcoholism, and the other's illness and insecurity.

His characteristics prevent him from fully understanding the complex natures and weaknesses of his wife and sons and from accepting and correcting their troubles and grievances (289). The misunderstanding among family members is growing stronger and stronger. The father, James, seems to have more responsibility for this situation. All the other members hate him more than they love him. They are justified when they accuse him of not having provided the family with a decent home, which fully indicates Tyrone's inadequacy as a husband and father.

Not only his desire for money, but his stubborn ignorance and defensive pride in his Irish-Catholic origin, reinforcing his hidden drive to outdo the Yankees, have been at the root of the family's ills. Tyrone always keeps the family waiting at mealtimes. Ultimately, he has his final tragedy. The tragedy of Tyrone is that, like other extremists, he has sold his soul for the illusion of success (187).

As a result of all this suffering - his lost artistic ability, and his wife and sons' contempt and ingratitude - at the end of the play, he has become "sick and sober" from a man who has "never been really sick in his life" at the beginning of the play. For him, this is a crucifying condition although he is physically well.

### **3.2.3. Comedy Structure: The Role of A Repentant Man**

At the root of Tyrone's compulsiveness is a superstitious double attitude. When he expects the worst, he is a miser. When he expects the best, he is a gambler, a "sucker for every con man with a gold mine" (141). Being the miser, he suffers the painful result; being the gambler, he gambles everything in terms of money which makes him sick and sober at last. Fortunately, the disasters in his life makes him contemplate and repent, reaching his final

awakening at the end of the play. From this point of view, we can see another side of Adam embodied in this character, the repentant man. Being the archetypal role of repentant Adam, Tyrone experiences the road of “living in heaven — committing sin — falling — suffering — repenting — final returning”.

As mentioned earlier, Tyrone is the successful star of a romantic melodrama, as was the real James O’Neill, the father of Eugene O’Neill. Everyone admires him. His wife Mary falls in love with him at first sight and married him immediately, giving up her childhood dream and devoting all her life to him. “I’ve loved him dearly for thirty-six years,” is the sign of Mary’s loyalty. He is just like a happy Adam with his beautiful Eve in Eden, but this man of God is tempted by the desire for accumulating wealth and betrays his wife and children. His greed and his obsession to buy land, frequently proves to be pointless and have destroyed his family, his home life, and his career. He violates the principles of being a responsible father and husband and commits sin. Therefore falling from his happy family – the “New Garden of Eden”, the paradise - to the hellish situation is his curse and he suffers painfully for his wrongdoings later.

Different from Mary who is destroyed by the drug addiction, and her inability to face the present, Tyrone’s falling takes place mainly from his characteristics. He is a miser. Though in other people’s eyes, he is a successful actor and real estate owner, his sin isolates him from the happy life of an ordinary man. He suffers from the quarrels, complaints and contempt from his wife and children, and the intense shame and guilt from his inner heart as well.

We know that, just as he takes a cheap way out when his wife is ill after Edmund’s

birth, that he intends to send his tubercular son to an inexpensive state farm for treatment while buying another piece of worthless land. In his youth, James was hailed as a remarkable Shakespearean actor, but he sacrificed artistry for money, wasting himself by appearing endlessly in the melodramatic *Count of Monte Cristo*. Yet, as his wife remarks, "Life has made him like that, and he can't help it." By saying this, O'Neill refers again to the secret force which is controlling people's fate.

As mentioned earlier, being a child, James was forced to go to work to help support his fatherless family. He lacks the courage to admit his misery and is ready to complain about his wasting of money on his wife and children. When Edmund shows his dissatisfaction toward him, he becomes extremely angry, and then feels a sort of truth in his remark and has a sense of repentance.

Frankly speaking, he fails to be a responsible husband and father, but it is also hard to say he is a bad one. He supports two wastrel, alcoholic sons, whose pranks resulted in the expulsion of both from college. Dissatisfied with the two sons, especially the elder son Jamie, the quarrels and love-hate pattern among them continues throughout the play, a pattern which torments all of them. On occasion, he plays the role of the stern father who feels it his duty to rebuke his son's cynicism.

The scene in which Tyrone told Edmund something about his poverty in the past shows O'Neill's sympathy and understanding for his father. Tyrone's father deserted the family, the mother washed and scrubbing 'for the yanks', not enough food to eat or clothes to wear. Thus Edmund finally understands the reason for his father's miserly behavior. At the same time, Tyrone's confession became even deeper when he tells his son how his fear of

being poor prevented him from becoming the great Shakespearean actor he could have been. He bought and acted in a play then became “a slave” to it.

Yes, maybe life overdid the lesson for me, and made a dollar worth too much, and the time came when that mistake ruined my career as a fine actor. (Sadly) I've never admitted this to anyone before, lad, but tonight I'm so heartsick I feel at the end of everything, and what's the use of fake pride and pretence. That God-damned play I bought for a song and made such a great success in – a great money success—it ruined me with. (130)

And then Tyrone describes his own career bitterly by confiding to Edmund that he would be willing to enter the poorhouse in his old age if only he could look back “on having been the fine artist I might have been”.

These talks and confessions cause understanding between the father and son. Now, the son knows more about the father and this knowledge brings the forgiveness among them. The long-term hate and misunderstanding seem to disappear by these confessions.

Tyrone remained perfectly faithful to his marriage vows throughout his life. Mary is proud of this, “We've loved each other ever since. And in all those thirty-six years, there has never been a breath of scandal about him”(91). His stinginess is the cause of Mary's morphine addiction. Later, Tyrone professes to have discovered the dangers of morphine too late and to have tried to help his wife, yet she “always starts again.” He shows his tender love through the play. In the opening scene, his compliments how well she looks and how glad they all are to have her home again. As the situation deteriorates, he makes an effort to soften his tone toward Mary and urges her to forget the past. When his wife criticizes his stinginess,



he consciously echoes Mary's sentiments and feels shame and guilt. Throughout the play, he comforts her physically and spiritually. At the beginning, placing his hand "over one of her nervousness playing ones"(12), and at the end holding her wedding dress "in his arms with an unconscious clumsy, protective gentleness"(153). These scenes illustrate that he is a good man except for his stinginess. In the play, O'Neill shows his complicated feelings toward his father. On the one hand, he is a miser. On the other hand, it is not solely his responsibility; life makes him act like that. Here life means O'Neill's secret force which is continuing to control people no matter how hard they struggle. James's kindness, loyalty, occasional guilty feeling and confessions impress people with a new understanding. The role of a sinner is caused by his poverty-stricken childhood. Although reluctantly, he constantly spends money on them and even repents his sin before his son. His love and loyalty toward his wife and children are a kind of redemption for his sin. From this view, we can say he finally comes to salvation.

After his repentance, he seems to have relief and peace in a certain way. When Mary carries her wedding dress in a half-mad condition, he folds the wedding gown carefully over his other arm and on his lap. His love, sympathy, repentance, and hope give himself a promise of peace and a sort of salvation before the audience.

Despite all his weaknesses, he is a pious Catholic. "As God is my judge! Always and for ever, Mary" (97)! He is fiercely proud of his Irish heritage and religion; Shakespeare and the Duke of Wellington, he asserts (without evidence) were Irish Catholics. He may not be a regular churchgoer but he takes his faith seriously, in contrast to his sons, who are apostates. The words he speaks to his sons demonstrate his piety, "When you deny God," he says, "you

deny hope” (116). The progress he undergoes is much like that of a saint: forbearance, sacrifice, and eventually salvation. His stinginess makes him suffer much and his repentance, love and faith in God make him know himself and have some understanding of his family.

### **Jamie (James Tyrone, Jr.)**

Perhaps Jamie is the most tragic of the Tyrones. Maybe many audiences regard Jamie, the elder brother, as the darkest sinner and the most misbegotten of the O’Neills, for he has corrupted his younger brother and disgraced his parents. However, the way in which O’Neill presents Jamie makes us find it hard to believe that he is merely a sinner and profligate son who has almost destroyed himself by attempting to violate his family members’ heart and lives a meaningless life. Rather he is a tool or a symbol for O’Neill to communicate his deep feelings toward his family and his Catholic dogma. He is the archetype of O’Neill’s elder brother in real life as in the play. Into this character, O’Neill pours his contradictory feelings. For, if we analyze his progress from the point of Biblical archetypal structures, we will find two quite different roads embodied in his experiences. One is the Satan, a fallen angel, and the other is the finder or prophet.

### **3.3. The Archetype of Satan and Prophet**

#### **3.3.1. The Tragedy Structure: A Fallen Angel — Satan and Scapegoat (Destroyer and Victim)**

In the Bible, the Satan has been an angel in heaven but, because of his rebellion against God, he is driven away from Heaven to Hell. In his hatred of God’s punishment, he continues to tempt and corrupt human people against God which leads to his own final destruction.

Being the elder son of the Tyrone family, Jamie's road is just like the fallen angel, Satan, following the patterns of "facing plight and dilemma — making a choice — falling into calamity — suffering — gradually awakening — final destruction."

Jamie was once a promising boy but later became a fallen angel (Satan) as in Mary's description of Jamie:

Who would have thought Jamie would grow up to disgrace us? You remember, James, for years after he went to boarding school, we received such glowing reports. Everyone liked him. All his teachers told us what a fine brain he had, and how easily he learned his lessons. Even after he began to drink and they had to expel him, they wrote us how sorry they were, because he was so likable and such a brilliant student. They predicted a wonderful future for him if he would only learn to take life seriously. (95)

Just like Satan who once was an angel living in the love of God before he made a choice against God; the result was that he fell into calamity. In Mary's description, Jamie was a good boy before his Satan spirit appeared. When he was a little boy, envious of his mother's love for Eugene, his younger brother, he chose to kill him by giving him a drug. Unlike the others in the family, he cannot afford to dream about the past because the memory that brands his childhood is the mark of Cain (55). In *The Bible*, Cain is a killer who murders his brother out of envy.

His life has been marked by repeated failure which "gives his countenance a Mephistophelian cast" (112). O'Neill's allusion suggests that Jamie inhabits a personal hell (54). Just like Satan who is in hell, he also wants some companion to suffer with him. He

deliberately tempts Edmund to fall down - to fight against his father who is the symbol of God.

Two themes darkly stain his life: his intense rivalry with each male in the family and his fatal dependence on his mother (53). Just like Satan in the Bible secretly competes with God to corrupt human beings, Jamie secretly competes with his father and younger brothers for winning his mother. His fall makes him suffer greatly. In fact, he despises himself. Although he never mentions it, the death of Eugene weighs heavily on his conscience (54). Mary's contempt deeply hurts him, for whom he has an "Oedipus complex". He even confesses to Edmund, "I'm thinking to myself that Papa is old and can't last much longer, and if you were to die, Mam and I would get all he's got, and so I'm probably hoping..." (143).

Thus Jamie's "stand-in" bears some of Jamie's responsibility for corrupting his younger brother. Upon the influence of his "Oedipus complex", his Satan spirit goes even deeper; the mark of Cain follows him again. Envious of Edmund being Mother's favorite, like Satan who disguises himself as the Serpent who tempts Eve to eat the forbidden fruit and to violate God's will, Jamie is seen as an exemplary elder brother in Edmund's eyes; but, in actuality, Jamie is a destroyer. He secretly destroys Edmund on purpose and successfully makes him as dissipated as himself, thus he is giving himself over to the devil.

Of his hatred of his mother's drug addiction, Jamie says, "Never forget the first time I got wise, caught her in the act with a hypo. Christ, I'd never dreamed before that any women but whores took dope (143)! Jamie's collapse began at his discovery of his mother's morphine addiction. Then, he found Edmund's illness saying that "this stuff of you getting consumption. It's got me kicked." Facing these plights, Jamie seems to lose hope and choose

to live a dissipated life for forgetting these pains - like a fallen angel who falls into a calamity.

Jamie's alcoholism is tied directly to Mary's morphine addiction. Over the years, his drinking has risen and fallen in relation to Mary's cures. This last time, he says, he really "believed the best." To Edmund he confesses, "I'd begun to hope. If she'd beaten the game, I could, too" (54). We know that, throughout Mary's life, she cannot win over her sin; that is, she cannot conquer her drug addiction. Neither can Jamie so Jamie is mired in a sodden, guilt-laden present. Later he repents of his bad influence on Edmund and hopes his mother will give up her drug. But there is no solution for him. When Edmund, whom he loves very much, seems to die of tuberculosis and mother is still under the control of morphine, he feels totally trapped.

There were many examples in the Bible of selecting a scapegoat to bear all the faults. In Leviticus of the Old Testament, Aaron selected two goats. They sacrificed one to God and, to the other, they admitted all the sin they committed and laid all the faults on the goats and drove it away to the wilderness. The elder son, Jamie, is the symbolic scapegoat, bearing the sin of the whole family to a certain degree. As a symbol of the victim of the whole family, he is deserted by parents, his father is responsible for Jamie's drinking and corruption, Mary says "You (Tyrone) brought him to be a boozier" (96). Father scorns him for his dissipation; mother hates him for killing his brother. Mary feels especially spiteful toward him. She continues to blame him for Eugene's death and claims that he has disgraced the family and will drag Edmund down with him until Edmund is "as hopeless a failure as he is". Unaware of the family's bad influence, she attributes all the wrongs to Jamie. Given these circumstances, the only road for Jamie is destruction. Her rejection of Jamie has effectively

and definitely destroyed him. Acting the role of the victim in the family, he falls down and meets his doom in the end.

Jamie, at the height of drunkenness, reveals that, while he loves his brother, he also has a subconscious wish to destroy him. However, due to the negatives in him - the Satan, Cain, and scapegoat in his character- he follows a course of self-destruction. For him, the long day's journey into night is a hopeless journey into the night of cynicism and despair to a certain degree.

### **3.3.2. Comedy Structure: the Archetype of Prophet (Finder)**

Obviously, the embodiment of the archetype of Satan, Cain and Scapegoat makes Jamie fall but there is something more. In this character, O'Neill has given him another side, regarding him as the symbol of the Prophet or Finder, which is contradictory to his role as Satan, an evil symbol. Being the symbol of the Prophet or Finder, O'Neill subconsciously plans his pattern of "living in paradise — committing a crime — suffering — repenting — final salvation". In Jamie, O'Neill has contradictory feelings of hate and love, showing more clearly that his characters have dual natures, with which many critics agree. In the Bible, the prophet is the tool or agent of God – to lead people to know the power of God and the limitation of humankind, to know themselves, and to seek the truth. In this sense, Jamie becomes a prophet and truth finder of his family.

As described by his mother, Jamie has been a wonderful boy but he doesn't choose to take life seriously and he acts out the roles of Satan and Cain. Therefore, he commits crimes and suffers. The blighted Jamie, with all the potential evils in his nature, carries dissipation, disintegration, cynicism and irresponsibility obviously with him. Actually, besides being a

fallen angel, sometimes he acts like a prophet, a truth finder. He is the knower of his family with his cynical, sober eyes. He is the first to guess that Edmund has consumption and he attempts to convince his father of that unpleasant fact early in the play - that Edmund possibly contracted consumption. He assesses the consequences of allowing Mary to delude herself about Edmund's health and tries to prepare Edmund for the bad news that he knows is on the way from Dr. Hardy. Similarly, he is the first to guess what is happening to Mary.

We don't penetrate the interior of Tyrone's heart until Jamie leads us there. Jamie has predicted it in Act 1 when the miserly father chooses a cheap sanatorium for Edmund. When Tyrone and Edmund are still glad at the news that Mary has gotten well after returning from the sanatorium, Jamie has already penetrated into her heart and perceived her sin. While Edmund and Tyrone continue to deny the truth, having the illusion that Mary has gotten away from the drug addiction, Jamie bluntly forces them to interpret her behavior without illusion: "Another shot in the arm...The truth is there is no cure and we've been saps to hope"(89). Since the Tyrones do not always place the highest premium on truth-telling, Jamie remains a prophet without honor in the family (55).

He represents the processes of his family members knowing the sin in themselves. He is always the first to guess his mother's condition when she reverts to drugs, so her mother dislikes him, perhaps even hates him: "He's always sneering ... looking for the worst weakness in everyone"(52). Besides his role of "Cain", his prophetic eyes are one of the main reasons for his disfavor. He suffers much for her mother's ignorance and contempt toward him. As mentioned earlier, he has an "Oedipus complex". Being the finder, he also finds that, although he deliberately ruins his younger brother Edmund, Jamie actually finds that he loves

him deep in his heart, "Greater love hath no man than this, that he saveth his brother from himself"(147).

Being a fallen angel from heaven, his identity as a prophet is made quite clear by all these findings. Knowing all these, but he has no way to correct them, he suffers deeply by living a dissipated life with drinking and whores for forgetting them temporarily. He is a tormenting alter ego. Having neither past nor future to contemplate, he lives exclusively in the present (55). By standing in the present, he is able to see the hidden truth of everyone in the family. Only through him do we begin to know the sin of O'Neill's family clearly, which he tries to show them. But, it is in a contradictory way; through him, we continue to know the evil and weakness of human beings.

Ironically, being the prophet or finder of the family, he cannot predict his own future which reveals O'Neill's own plight. That is he himself cannot predict where he belongs, even though he is always looking for something to depend on to replace his former Catholic religion.

Jamie's sacrificial confession is a commitment beyond suffering, and one which O'Neill, through his fiction, may have been making for himself as well as for his fictional brother (453). In the last act, Jamie, drunk, explains the subconscious causes of his difference from Edmund, and he confesses that he had led Edmund into temptation on purpose, to make him fall (157). With painful sincerity, his final confession to Edmund in Act Four makes clear that he begins to awake and his spirit is at peace with his hatred and love finally. By acting the role of a prophet or a truth finder, he sees through the human heart and has a hope for the future and finds his final peace by his repentance and prediction.



## **Edmund**

In comparison with the other members of the family, Edmund is a special one and more passive. One critic remarks that Edmund is to be a curiously two-dimensional figure “whose past has been bowdlerized and whose negative characteristics are only lightly touched” (435).

However, being the family’s sinner - his birth caused his mother’s drug addiction - and the family’s inheritor, he listens, observes, reflects, contemplates, repents, despairs, accuses, regrets, hopes and thus serves as the character in the play who most attracts the audience’s attention. He is the spokesman of O’Neill, and his experience reflects O’Neill’s contemplations and thoughts to some degree. Thus, from his dual roles of sinner and inheritor, O’Neill consciously and subconsciously uses Biblical archetypal structures to depict his tormented soul which reflects his complicated religious views with which he was brought up and abandoned and to which he never returned. But he is deeply influenced by them all through his life.

### **3.4.1 Tragedy Structure: The Archetype of A sinner**

Edmund’s progress as a sinner is dramatic and tragic, being described as the following pattern: “facing plight and dilemma — making a choice — falling into calamity — suffering — gradually awakening — final destruction”.

In the first act, Mary reminds herself: “It wasn’t until after Edmund was born that I had a single grey hair. Then it began to turn white” (76). Edmund’s birth, mentioned here by Mary, proves to be a critical event in the Mary’s life. Edmund’s birth caused his mother’s sin – to use drugs throughout her life. This is his first crime, although he is blameless in this situation. That is, he is forced to make a choice and then falls into calamity. Just as the Bible

said, a human being is born sinful by nature. Like all of the descendants of the Adam and Eve, once he is born, he is a sinner. As a price of his sin, he is “plainly in bad health. Much thinner than he should be, his eyes appear feverish and his cheeks are sunken”(17). Edmund has inherited from her his extreme sensitivity, his “nervousness”, and fear of life, and (through her) from her father, his susceptibility to tuberculosis (183). Throughout the play, the main accusation against Edmund by his parents and brother is that his birth precipitated his mother’s drug addiction. As a result, he suffers much from this and always feels guilty.

Jamie resents the fact that Edmund is Mary’s favorite. He led Edmund into temptation on purpose, to make him fall. Under Jamie’s influence, Edmund chooses whores and whiskey, and feeds himself with cynical ‘worldly wisdom’ instead of fulfilling his dream to be “a poet”. Just as the first fall, the role of his second fall is a sinner as well as a victim.

He himself is partly responsible for his own destruction and partly a victim of the family fate. It is not only Edmund’s elder brother who introduced Edmund to a life of “sin”, but also the family’s environment has its part. The parents, James Tyrone and Mary, can be blamed for leading him astray.

His father’s stinginess and irresponsibility are partly responsible for his illness and mother’s love-hate feelings torture him deeply. He feels guilty about his mother’s drug addiction and shows despair over her inability to control herself and to turn over a new leaf. Quarrels, misunderstanding, contempt, and love overwhelm the whole family. In this environment, he cannot breathe freely.

The church could, theoretically, provide absolution, security, love, one-ness — but only for true believers. “God is dead: of His pity for man hath God died” (118) are his words

against his father's Catholicism. With no faith to depend on, no home to live in peacefully and comfortably, the only thing for him is to be corrupted and to corrupt himself. Thus, throughout O'Neill's life, he felt homeless, as though fate does not know exactly where to place him. His inability to know himself, or other men, or his destiny is the author O'Neill's inner voice expressing his real life condition after losing his faith.

Edmund (pseudonym for the author) says "he will always be a stranger who never feels at home, who does not really want and is not really wanted, who can never belong, who must always be a little in love with death"( 135 )! His words reveal his groping and his condition of hopelessness. Like his mother, he doesn't want "to see life as it is'. The reality of life seems unbearable to him. Edmund, O'Neill's self – portrait, being both the sinner and victim, because of his serious illness, copes with an uncertain future.

He tells his spiritual searching in his mysterious experience on the sea, O'Neill speaks through his most accurate self-portrait (Edmund), "I became drunk with the beauty and singing rhythm of it, and for a moment I lost myself — actually lost my life. I was set free! I dissolved in the sea, became white sails and flying spray, became beauty and rhythm, became moonlight and the ship and the high dim-starred sky! I belonged" (133).

O'Neill reveals his affinity for the sea. It was there he found a purpose for his own aimless life and gained a perception of the mysterious behind-the-scenes life force he incorporates in his plays (Virginia 1). Although he loses his faith, for all of his life he tries to find other things to replace it. After the failure of his replacement, he strongly believes that there is some unknown force which control people's fate, which shows in his perplexed feelings and guilt after denying his God.

### 3.4.2. Comedy Structure: Hope

It seems that Edmund is the only hope in this family, although he is plainly in bad health and seems to have an uncertain future. Being the future of this tormented family, he has the experience of “living in paradise — committing a crime — suffering — repenting — final salvation.”

Edmund, in almost perfect counterpoint, begins as, in Jamie’s envious words, “Mama’s baby, Papa’s pet” (146)! Mother Mary’s feeling toward him is strongest, “I did want him! More than anything in the world (76)! His father told him, “But you have been learning, lad. You worked hard before you took ill. You’ve done splendidly. I’m proud of you”(117).

However, such an angel is sinful from his birth. Because of his birth, her mother had a drug addiction throughout her life. This fall may be just a curse on Mary who always thinks that “I’d left Eugene that I wasn’t worthy to have another baby, and that God would punish me if I did” (76). The mother’s suicide attempt, his discovery of her addiction and his subsequent break with Catholicism, the family’s ostracism by wealthy Yankee New Londoners, all these torment him. However, he faces up to the situation bravely – that is, he freely admits his part in Mary’s sin and still has a dream of being a poet.

While in prep school, Edmund begins leading a life of dissipation in direct imitation of his brother. He was later thrown out of college and seems to have ruined his health by leading an irresponsible life. At first, he and Jamie make a common cause against the tyranny of the father, showing their contempt toward him, “Old Gaspard, the miser.” Father Tyrone is a pious Irish Catholic. The denial of their father symbolizes O’Neill’s disagreement with his values including his religion. Edmund’s father’s criticism of him further affirms this, “Filth

and despair and pessimism! Another atheist, I suppose. When you deny God, you deny hope. That's the trouble with you. If you'd get down on your knees..." (116).

But in the final act, James Tyrone explains to Edmund the ancestral causes of his miserliness and his theatrical manner, and Edmund "Moved, stares at his father with understanding — slowly. 'I'm glad you've told me this, Papa. I know you a lot better now.'" The sources of his conflict with his father have been clarified, and Edmund begins to see the light (157). He recounts to his father about his mystical experiences on the sea. In the moment of transcendence, he experienced "the birth of a soul" which would result in his ultimate triumph. At this moment, love not only has triumphed over hatred, but is all the more precious precisely because it emerges in the context of accusations and anger.

One bright note is that Edmund is working for the first time as a cub reporter on the local newspaper, a position that offers him a future. The crucial factor in his life, however, is his illness. Whatever slender hope there is left for the Tyrone family depends on him, but we do not know at the end of the play whether Edmund will live or die (62).

Edmund's psychological journey into light from night is motivated by his conflicts with — and his final understanding of both his father and his brother (156). He is even grateful for the torture he has been through, for he feels he has been saved (and forgiven) through his torment. Thus he achieves his spiritual sublimation by believing that he has paid the price for his sin through his suffering. In the fourth act the father and Edmund discover that they share a common dream, a vision of artistic integrity which furthers his role as the hope of this tormented family.

In O'Neill's eyes, only by confessing the sins— hypocrisy and cruelty, admitting the

importance of understanding and forgiveness - can the whole family be united happily. Luckily, as the play goes on, time will be moving toward revelations, confessions and understandings. That is, while the play progresses, Edmund knows more and more about his family members, displaying his sympathy, love, forgiveness and his dream. If *Long Day's Journey* describes the purgatorial sufferings of the autobiographical hero, it also recalls the exaltation of his mystical experiences at sea, and it suggests his future recovery and final victory (Frederic 78).

Although on the surface, it is a long day's journey into tragedy, each finally reaches a moment of frank confession. Each Tyrone, during the confession, receives our sympathetic attention and finds their salvation by the alteration of loss and hope which is described as "hopeless hope" by some critics. In that living room, the four Tyrones torment themselves and each other, gradually stripping away every protective illusion until, at the end, each character must face himself and the others without hope, but with a measure of tolerance and pity (182).

The rejection of Catholicism by the Tyrones and, by autobiographical implication, by the O'Neill's, and their Yankee neighbors' repulsion of them alienate these Irish from God, New Londoners, and in the end, from each other (538). Because they have no faith in their heart, they feel meaningless. The inner conflict of the Tyrone (O'Neill) family—spiritual vacuity and blind attempts to fill the void with drugs, drink, and sex—reveals the important role Catholicism plays in the lives of the Irish. The Tyrones are haunted not only by what was lost but by what replaced it: the subconscious layers of guilt. One of the major motifs in *Long Day's Journey into Night* is physical illness, which obviously signifies the inner sickness of

the soul (538). Their physical illness and inner sickness of their souls illustrate their failures (losing their old religious faith) and their longing for something which can cure their diseases, which can be called "hopeless hope", which is a permanent theme for O'Neill to seek throughout his life. O'Neill is chiefly concerned with the resolution of inner conflicts, with the search for a philosophy which can give order and meaning to such conflict. Life inevitably involves conflict and tension, but the significance of this pain is spiritual growth. At some point in the play, each member of the family confesses what he or she has contributed to the family tragedy. All the four Tyrones have torments in their life, but they have spiritual sublimation through the pains.

An atmosphere of yearning for the lost past penetrates the whole story, suggesting a permanent seeking by the Tyrones for the lost Paradise, their religion. However, their seeking is their awakening and gives the audience a promise of hope.

## Conclusion

The two structures, the tragedy and comedy, the former displays the unhappy results of the wrong choice, the latter reminds the audience of the possibilities, the horizon and the hope. To produce the effect of 'longing' followed by 'loss', the main characters in the plays are continually searching for the meaning of life.

O'Neill's plan for his main characters' two opposite roads is actually because O'Neill himself faces this dilemma and is not able to finally resolve his own problems. Winther remarks that O'Neill is not a Christian in the conventional understanding of Christianity and he does not deny Jesus as much as he denies what tradition has made out of his teachings (59-78). The search for a God in these three plays reaches a similarly uncertain resolution. It seems that it offers questions and puzzles but no real answers throughout these plays. Neither Robert, Andrew, Edmund, not Jamie, in the end, finds the answer to his puzzle. In *Days Without End*, it seems that the acceptance of God is John Loving's final returning. Unfortunately, O'Neill is still on the brink; the quest is still on. Hope in religion and family love briefly shone through in *Long Day's Journey into Night*. The main characters' puzzlement and troubles reveal O'Neill's tormented situation. The characters in his plays seem to must accept a kind of fate – the unknown force which they believe that has been controlling their life, the untold force O'Neill himself has been seeking in all his life.

There is no doubt that the archetypal method, especially the Biblical archetypes, is an effective way to discover and explain the seemingly contradictory themes in these three plays and to analyze O'Neill's complicated religious views. In his early days, he gave up religion; but, in his early play *Beyond the Horizon*, we can see that he is still groping. His characters



seem to be controlled by some unknown force; this force we can say is fate or God. *Days without End* is his middle-period play. He uses two halves of the same person to be his spokesman to reflect his self-contradictory religious views. In *Long Day's Journey into Night*, he makes Mary speak his inner voice: "I cannot lose it." Although O'Neill has already given up his religion, he never feels peace in his heart. In all his life, he is searching and groping for something which can substitute for his former faith. But he fails; he finally realizes that he cannot lose God but he is still puzzled about whether God can save him or not, which is a question people are continuing to face in a modern world.

Although tragedy and not comedy has been the best medium for O'Neill's art, it is his love for a nobler and a freer life that formed his tragic theme and, at the same time, gives him hope of future. Since to love life means to accept it as essentially tragic is O'Neill's philosophy as an artist, his use of comedy has usually been a means to the development of tragedy (Sophus 243). However, O'Neill does not fall victim to the academic theory of "tragic relief" (293). His characters are never resigned; they are active and affirmative even in the presence of defeat. They meet destruction and death with heads high, bitter words, and an undaunted courage (Winther 70). Just as the characters in Hemingway's novels, O'Neill's man can be defeated, but not be destroyed.

The main characters' consequent tragedies and their inner conflicts reflected in the two Biblical archetypal structures have been taken to symbolize O'Neill's inner struggles facing the loss of religion in modern times. Using these two structures in the three plays reveals O'Neill's ambivalent views toward religion: he is sure that man's solution to life's enigma will not be answered in the terms of the old faith, but he is also certain that the denial of the

power of God cannot solve people's spiritual problem in modern times.

Obviously, O'Neill's former Catholicism influences him greatly. The archetypes and symbolism from the Bible also reflect on the other aspects of the novel, such as the themes, plots, symbols and so on. Concerning the plot as an example: the Biblical mode of conflicts between the virtuous and the evil, we can easily find a kind of opposition between materialism (Andrew) and idealism (Robert) in *Beyond the Horizon*; the inner conflicts of two halves embodied in one person in *Days without End*; the radical difference between Jamie's Mephistophelian cynicism and Edmund's genuine tragic idealism in *Long Day's Journey into Night*.

From the archetypal analysis of the characters' experiences, we see that O'Neill holds conflicting religious views. Additionally, we can see that the writer does not simply copy or transplant the archetypes in the Bible into his plays, but reproduces them in an artistic way. The use of archetypes makes the tragedy into reality. This not only has a sense of historical depth but thus transcends it and becomes universal; it is a projection of the consciousness of the people in modern days.

## Works Cited

- Berlin, Normand. Eugene O'Neill. New York: Grove Press, Inc. 1982.
- Bogard, Travis. "The Historian: Mourning Becomes Electra and Ah, Wilderness!"  
Modern Critical Views: Eugene O'Neill. Ed. Harold Bloom. New York: Chelsea  
 House Publishers, 1987. 106-73.
- Carpenter, Frederick I. Eugene O'Neill. Boston: Twayne Publishers: A Division of  
 G.K. Hall & Co, 1979.
- Clurman, Harold. "Long Day's Journey into Night." Cargill, Fagin and Fisher 214-216.
- Hewes, Henry. "Long Day's Journey into Night." Cargill, Fagin and Fisher 217-220.
- Pellizzi, Camillo. "Irish-Catholic Anti-Puritan ( Italy )." Cargill, Fagin and Fisher 353-357.
- Falk, Doris. "The Way Out: The Many Endings of Days Without End." Cargill, Fagin and  
 Fisher 415-423.
- Cargill, Oscar, N. Bryllion Fagin and William J. Fisher, eds. O'Neill and His Plays: Four  
 Decades of Criticism. New York: New York University Press, 1961.
- Falk, Doris V. Eugene O'Neill and the Tragic Tension: an Interpretative Study of the  
 Play. New Brunswick & New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1958.
- Floyd, Virginia. The Plays of Eugene O'Neill: A New Assessment. New York: The Ungar  
 Publishing Company, 1987.
- Frye, Northrop. Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1975.
- . The Great Code. London, Melbourne & Henley: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1982.
- Hinden, Michael. Long Day's Journey Into Night: Native Eloquence. Boston: Twayne  
 Publishers: A Division of G.K. Hall & Co, 1990.

O'Neill, Eugene. Beyond the Horizon and Gold Two Plays. London: Jonathan Cape Ltd, 1966.

O'Neill, Eugene. Days Without End. London: Jonathan Cape Ltd, 1966.

O'Neill, Eugene. Long Day's Journey into Night. London: Jonathan Cape Ltd, 1956.

Shaughnessy, Edward L. Down the Nights and Down the Days: Eugene

O'Neill's Catholic Sensibility. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1996.

Winther, Sophus Keith. Eugene O'Neill: A Critical Study. New York: Random House, 1934.

The Holy Bible (King James Version), World Bible Publishers, printed in Canada

廖可兑,《尤金·奥尼尔戏剧研究论文集》(1999),北京:外语教学与研究出版社,2000.

马俊杰,从《红字》中人物的圣经原型看霍桑的宗教观.解放军外国语学院硕士研究生毕业论文, CNKI, 2002.

沈建青,《尤金·奥尼尔女性形象研究》,长沙:湖南教育出版社,2002.

王世芸,关于神话原型批评,《文艺理论研究》第1期,1995.34-36

叶舒宪,神话—原型批评的理论与实践(代序),《神话—原型批评》,陕西师范大学出版社,1987.1-38.