

University of Algiers 2 (Bouzareah)
Faculty of Arts and Languages
English Department

**THE DISCOVERY OF THE SELF IN EUGENE
O'NEILL'S THE EMPEROR JONES AND THE
ICEMAN COMETH AND JOSEPH CONRAD'S
HEART OF DARKNESS AND "TO-MORROW":
A COMPARATIVE STUDY**

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Magister in English (Literature and Civilisation)

Submitted by:
Mr. Mohamed Amine Dekkiche

Supervised by:
Prof. Yamina Déramchia

2014

THE DISCOVERY OF THE SELF IN EUGENE O'NEILL'S
THE EMPEROR JONES AND THE ICEMAN COMETH
AND JOSEPH CONRAD'S HEART OF DARKNESS AND
"TO-MORROW":
A COMPARATIVE STUDY

Board of Examiners

Chairperson: Prof. Nadjia Amrane University of Algiers 2 (Bouzareah)

Supervisor: Prof. Yamina Déramchia University of Algiers 2 (Bouzareah)

Examiner: Dr. Sabrina Zerar, M. C. “A” University of Tizi Ouzou

For my dearest grandmother and for the soul of my grandfather

To my beloved Family with its broadest sense,
The family that brought me up and covered me with the uttermost love,
The family that bore me to life and never ceased to support me,
The family that taught me what life might better be in school or university,
And to the only family I chose and cherished willingly: my friends...

To all those I love, whether alive or a living memory, I dedicate this work.

Declaration

I hereby declare that the substance of this dissertation is entirely the result of my investigation and that due reference or acknowledgment is made, whenever necessary, to the work of other researchers.

Date:

Signature:

Acknowledgments

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to Prof. Yamina Deramchia, for her kindness, encouragement, guidance and assistance both as a teacher and a supervisor. I appreciate very much her useful suggestions and corrections.

I am also deeply indebted to all the teachers who influenced me along the road of my studies especially Dr. Foued Djemai, Prof. Nadjia Amrane, Prof. Faiza Bensemmane, Prof. M'hamed Bensemmane, Dr. Louiza Ait Hamou and Dr. Brahim Mansouri: the source of my inspiration.

I am also really indebted to Dr. Richard Rhayes for his conference and documentations which triggered this study.

I might be ungrateful if I do not recall the tremendous help of all my benevolent postgraduate friends: Amina Bezzouh, Lilia Kirate, Youcef Nedjari, Khadidja Guedouani, Chahrazed Ounis (Sally), Dalila Matmer (Taous), Sanaa Zerar, Saida Zerrara, Yasmine Lamali, Fatima Bechani, and Rebiha.

Many special thanks for the librarians whose kindness and commitment to work really earned my respect.

Let all those who contributed to the fulfilment of this work, even with a simple word or smile, have my warmest thanks and regards.

Abstract

This dissertation is a comparative study between some of the works of the American playwright Eugene O'Neill's and the British writer Joseph Conrad. It aims to trace the hidden links between *The Emperor Jones* (1920) and *Heart of Darkness* (1902) from the one side and between *The Iceman Cometh* (1946) and "To-morrow" (1903) from the other. It is based on two complementary approaches. On the one hand, it uses Julia Kristeva's theory of intertextuality which is backed up with a number of textual notions and views by Ihab H. Hassan, Mikhail Bakhtin and Harold Bloom. On the other hand, it uses psychoanalysis which tries to narrow the scope of the intertextual study with some concepts of Sigmund Freud and Carl Jung.

In this sense, this dissertation deals in the first chapter with the different sources of influence which led to the unification of the views of these two writers despite their relative distance from each other in space and time. While dealing with the effects of similar aspects of their life and age, it aims to expose the feelings and the mood of the internal realities instead of depicting the panoramic view of what surrounds them. As this study claims that O'Neill and Conrad tried to dig up the truth of the self, this chapter endeavours to identify some basic conceptions of the Self.

Building on the relational assumption between O'Neill and Conrad, their works not only expose explicit similarities but also implicit ones, once we come to the journey and the result of self-discovery. The second chapter explores the similar universes of *Heart of Darkness* and *The Emperor Jones*. At the first glance, there are few notable similarities between the works. However, when we try to follow the stages of their inner journey, Brutus Jones and Kurtz in fact give us astounding complementary views to the ways and effects of finding the truth of the self beneath their false conception of civilisation.

The last chapter tries to trace the hidden relationships between "To-morrow" and *The Iceman Cometh*. Despite the difference in genre, length and value of each work, we can find that their structure and the dilemma of characters in the two works correspond amazingly with each other. Their characters are led to undertake a similar painful inner journey. At this level, the residents of Harry Hope's small hotel illustrate

the inner struggle of old Hagberd in the short story. Each shows directly or indirectly the truth of the self that lies beneath a fake conception of hope.

According to these readings, new dimensions of interpretation appear because of the hidden links between the works. Not only do the works of O'Neill respond to those of Conrad but even the works of Conrad have their say in the works of O'Neill. As if the texts are connected out of space and time. This situation urges the reader to redefine the very meaning of literary creation. In fact, this dissertation claims that literary beauty does not mean - because of the limitation of human beings - the creation of a text out of nothing. The act of writing is dependent and its beauty is seen in the ability of the writer to assemble texts, in their broadest sense, in a unique way.

Table of Contents

Declaration.....	i
Acknowledgment.....	ii
Abstract.....	iii
Table of Contents.....	v
Introduction	1
Chapter One: Contextual Similarities and their Role in the Unification of Joseph Conrad’s and Eugene O’Neill’s Visions.....	10
1. Contextual Similarities	11
2. The Inevitability of Looking for the Self.....	22
Chapter Two: <i>Heart of Darkness</i> and <i>The Emperor Jones</i> : An Intolerable True Self underneath “Civilisation”.....	27
1. Introduction.....	28
2. Establishing Similarities between <i>Heart of Darkness</i> and <i>The Emperor Jones</i>	33
2.1. Characterisation	36
2.1.1. Kurtz and Jones as Modern Tragic Heroes.....	36
2.1.2. Marlow and Smithers as Mouthpieces of the Writers.....	41
2.1.3. The Natives	44
2.2. Setting	45
3. Stages of the Introspective Plunge.....	49
3.1. Defence mechanisms	54
3.2. Alienation	63
3.3. Confrontation	65
3.4. Confession	73
4. Conclusion.....	76
Chapter Three: "To-morrow" and <i>The Iceman Cometh</i> : A painful True Self underneath “Hope”.....	78
1. Introduction.....	79
2. Establishing Similarities between “To-morrow” and <i>The Iceman Cometh</i>	84
2.1. Characterisation.....	87
2.1.1. Harry Hagberd and Theodor Hickman.....	87
2.1.2. Bessie’s Shadow in Evelyn, Parritt and Larry	89
2.1.3. Captain Hagberd and All.....	92
2.2. Setting	94
3. Stages of the Inner Journey.....	96
3.1. Defence mechanisms	100
3.2. Confrontation	117

3.3. Confession	123
4. Conclusion	130
Conclusion	132
Bibliography.....	143
Abstract in Arabic	153

Introduction

As human beings, it seems that we shall never abandon the quest of knowledge by questioning big issues related to our inner and outer worlds. Of course this is not a choice since we are endowed with the power of reasoning and this blessing is what makes us unique creatures. The complexities of both worlds push us to the boundaries of our minds requiring more research and more pain, though sometimes we come to know that all our efforts only shook slightly the truth but did not move it to the light of utter comprehension. Among the biggest issues that still astonish us is the question of creation. More specifically to my context, what is literary creation? If creation means bringing something out of nothing, can we say that a certain writer has fully created a literary work? In fact this dissertation is not going to deal directly with this big question but the latter will be read between its lines.

This research work came out as a result of some similarities in the works, and the lives, of the American playwright Eugene Gladstone O'Neill and the British writer Joseph Conrad. In fact both of them are considered as significant writers and much has been said about their lives and works. Less critical analysis, however, has tried to relate them to each other. As a result, this work is going to investigate the points of divergence and convergence in some of their selected works. It focuses on the point of the discovery of the self of their major characters and the stages they go through in order to reach their inner truth. It also aims to depict how some of their works contribute to a better explanation of each other both by their similarities and even differences. This project will show how people hide beneath some false conceptions and lies to escape both their inner and outer worlds. Furthermore, it will try to see the effect of the breakup of the self-image and how the characters fail or succeed to cope with their new images.

The similarities between Conrad and O'Neill bring to the fore the possibility of some of their common views to the world. We should not forget that the two writers witnessed many parallel events in their lives. Perhaps their sense of alienation in a non-native country, their wandering in the seas in addition to their failed suicide attempts might direct some of their views to a common ground. I have chosen these two writers because of their affinity on one side and because of their high value in the

world of literature on another. Their importance led to many critical examinations and reviews and this study is just another building block in the tower of their importance.

In fact, Joseph Conrad is considered, as the influential British literary critic F. R. Leavis argues in his book: *The Great Tradition*,¹ as a unique genius in the world of literature. No one denies that his works transcend seafaring adventures, race and colonialism with their deep insights in the heart of the individual. He represented the plight of the modern man in the new age where the universe became indifferent, man was forced to alienation, and uncertainty filled all the corners of the established truths. Accordingly, his characters were made to face their fragile concepts of the self. Much can be said about him but he was, unarguably, among the leaders of the trek that found the disillusionment of the new world in man's inner conflicts and self-deception.

While Conrad succeeded in the representation of literature's beauty with his questioning, exploration and discussion of man's situation in the world mostly on the face of the written pages, Eugene O'Neill found his triumph in these subjects on the stages of theatre. Undeniably, he is considered as the father of the American theatre. C. W. E. Bigsby summed up his importance asserting that "if any one writer can lay claim to having invented that [American] theatre it was [Eugene O'Neill]. From a disregarded and parochial entertainment he had raised it to a central cultural activity, making it hereby a focus of world attention."² In fact, the startling contribution of O'Neill to the American stage is so obvious. His attempts to transform the previously conceived stage of merely imported European plays and musical entertainment into a literary place were awarded by the Nobel Prize of literature in addition to four other Pulitzer Prizes. Moving with the theatre to literary seriousness, he never ceased to look for the inner truth in his characters. He said "I'm always, always trying to interpret Life in terms of lives, never just lives in terms of characters. I'm always acutely conscious of the Force behind."³ In his attempts to reflect his tragic visions while,

¹ F. R. Leavis, *The Great Tradition: George Eliot, Henry James, Joseph Conrad* (1948) (Reprinted, New York: George W. Stewart, 1950)

² C. W. E. Bigsby, *Modern American Drama, 1945-2000* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), p. 14.

³ Eugene O'Neill, quoted in Egil Tornqvist, "O'Neill's Philosophical and Literary Paragons" in Michael Manheim (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Eugene O'Neill* (1980) (Reprinted, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), p. 20.

starting the quest of understanding the self in this new world, he watered the seeds of the American theatre that sprouted later in a new literary world.

The works I am going to focus on are O'Neill's *The Emperor Jones* and *The Iceman Cometh* and Conrad's *Heart of Darkness* and "To-morrow". When reading these works something inevitable imposes itself. Not only do they contain similarities, though generally more implicit, but they complete each other in more than one way. For example the mystery that Conrad had bequeathed with Kurtz finds a suggestive answer in O'Neill's Jones. Similarly, what Bessie has always avoided with Captain Hagberd in "To-morrow", Hickey in *The Iceman Cometh* adopts as his clarion call. Despite their differences, these works introduce some attempts to understand the nature of truth that surrounds people in general. The characters are plunged in fiery circumstances and situations where the true self has no choice but to leave its hiding place and expose itself.

The significance of these works is found not only in their common intersections but also in the possibility of their conscious and intended meeting. Actually, Travis Bogard, in his book: *Contour in Time*,⁴ supports, to some extent, this suggestion since he attempts to hunt occasionally for some of O'Neill's sources in the discussion and analysis of the plays. He finds the traces of Conrad, among other contributors to his works, especially in *The Emperor Jones*, *The Hairy Ape*, *Bound East for Cardiff* and *The Iceman Cometh* as compared to *Heart of Darkness*, *Amy Foster*, *The Nigger of the "Narcissus"* and "To-morrow" respectively. In addition, Kristin Morrison states that O'Neill had read Conrad's works since high school. This is not surprising because he was very well known as an avid reader especially during the period which he spent in the sanitarium. She even considers *Ile*, for instance, "a very Conradian piece."⁵

Another important affinity between Conrad and O'Neill is their presence at the turn of the twentieth century when several drastic changes were taking place ushering the climax of the modern age. The world no more remained the same with its

⁴ Travis Bogard, *Contour in Time: The Plays of Eugene O'Neill* (1972) (Revised Edition, New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), <http://www.eoneill.com/library/contour/contents.htm>, (Accessed on June 1st, 2012)

⁵ Kristin Morrison, "Conrad and O'Neill as Playwrights of the Sea" (1978), http://www.eoneill.com/library/newsletter/ii_1/ii-1c.htm, (Accessed on June 6th, 2011)

accelerated progress. New philosophies and artistic movements, the advance of science and the spread of industrialization proved the futility of many pre-established notions that man had believed in. Man became weaker in front of the forces that governed his behavior from inside and outside.

In order to draw links between the previous writers in the particular point of the discovery of the self, our study is going to be based theoretically on intertextuality and psychoanalysis as two complementary literary approaches. In fact we cannot isolate any literary text from its community of texts, be they literary productions or contextual texts. In this special society “every word is directed toward an *answer* and cannot escape the profound influence of the answering word that it anticipates.”⁶ As a result of this constant and perpetual interaction, Mikhail Bakhtin assumes further in his notion of dialogism that even “literary structure does not simply exist but is generated in relation to another structure.”⁷

Julia Kristeva’s concept of intertextuality is highly indebted to Bakhtin’s notion of dialogism and his postulate that “writing [is] a reading of anterior literary corpus and the text [is] an absorption of and a reply to *another* text.”⁸ These ideas provided a new spirit in the understanding of the literary text as an area of intersected voices. Her deduction differed from his dialogism in the consideration that not only two voices but a number of voices and texts intervene in the semantic as well as the syntactic and phonic fields.⁹ She also said “in the space of a given text, several utterances, taken from other texts, intersect and neutralise one another.”¹⁰ This can be better seen in the notion of ideologeme, which she also borrowed from Bakhtin, that is “the intersection of a given textual arrangement (a semiotic practice) with the utterances (sequences)

⁶ Mikhail Bakhtin, “**Discourse in the Novel**” (1935) in Michael Holquist (ed.), *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M. M. Bakhtin* (Reprinted, Texas: University of Texas, 2006), p. 280.

⁷ Julia Kristeva, “**Word, Dialogue and Novel**” (1969) in Leon S. Roudiez (ed.), *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*, trans. Leon S. Roudiez et al., (Reprinted, New York: Columbia University Press, 1980), p. 64.

⁸ Mikhail Bakhtin, cited in Julila Kristeva, “**Word, Dialogue and Novel**”, op. cit., p. 69. (Emphasis mine)

⁹ Margaret Smaller, “**Intertextuality: An Interview with Julia Kristeva**” (1985), trans. Richard Macicsey, <http://www.msu.edu/user/chrenkal/980/INTEXINT.HTM>, (Accessed on February 3rd, 2012)

¹⁰ Julia Kristeva, “**The Bounded Text**” (1969), in Leon S. Roudiez (ed.), *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*, trans. Leon S. Roudiez et al., (Reprinted, New York: Columbia University Press, 1980), p. 36.

that it either assimilates into its own space or to which it refers in the space of exterior texts (semiotic practices).”¹¹ In other words, the text, like a word, can have its own denotative meaning, in which it refers to itself, and connotative one, in which it is related to the effects of other *texts*. So the text is a melting pot of various transformed and transposed contextual texts. Their signs and utterances converge and “neutralise” each other creating the foundations of new signs and utterances. With the consideration of this effect we might have another reading of the neutralised constituents.

The core of our study is going to be concerned with the “vertical axis” of intertextuality which is the orientation of a text toward the previous, and even coming, literary corpus.¹² This is exactly what made Kristeva say that “each word (text) is an intersection of words (texts) where at least one other word (text) can be read ... any text is constructed as a mosaic of quotations; any text is the absorption and transformation of another.”¹³ Here again we need to look at her teacher’s enunciation that a text is “a multi-dimensional space in which a variety of writings, none of them original, blend and clash. The text is a tissue of quotations drawn from innumerable centres of culture.”¹⁴

Any further account for the function of text requires from us to discover the relations between the studied text and other texts. As Harold Bloom said, the purpose of literary criticism is to track the trails and hidden roads that link those texts

¹¹ Id.

¹² Julia Kristeva wanted to describe the dimensions of the text by setting them on the bases of the writing subject, addressee and exterior texts (meaning context). She looked at the relationship between these dimensions from two axes: “horizontal” and “vertical.” While this study is based on the vertical axis, the horizontal one needs to be mentioned here for the sake of clarification. She meant by this the relationship between the reader and the subject of his reading. Thus the meaning is determined only within their spheres. The more the reader shares common grounds with the subject, the more clarifications and understanding he or she gets. Julia Kristeva, “**Word, Dialogue and Novel**” op. cit., p. 66. Since the relation between the reader and the subject is the focal point in the horizontal axis, the echoes of Roland Barthes’s “The Death of the Author” are heard from his student. He says that “The reader is the space on which all the quotations that make up writing are inscribed without any of them being lost; a text’s unity lies not in its origin but in its *destination*.” Roland Barthes, “**The Death of the Author**” (1968), in Stephen Heath (ed. and trans.), *Image – Music – Text* (Reprinted, London: Fontana, 1977), p. 148. (Emphasis mine)

¹³ Julia Kristeva, “**Word, Dialogue and Novel**”, op. cit., p. 66.

¹⁴ Roland Barthes, “**The Death of the Author**”, op. cit., p. 146.

together.¹⁵ However, we should not neglect the fact that this connection between texts is not always explicit or logical.¹⁶ Hence, the study of sources and influence can illuminate our path in the intertextual deciphering.

In Ihab Hassan's essay, "The Problem of Influence in Literary History: Notes towards a Definition,"¹⁷ he exposes us to the multiplicity and complexity of the term "influence." Now when we consider influence we consider its sources which are diverse in themselves. They can be the outcome of the age, tradition, literary movement, biographical affinities and so on. In other words influence can be detected in the convergent points of the life and the mind of writers.

While Hassan introduces a wide variety of the notion of influence, Harold Bloom expounded other notions of influence concerning the category of writer-writer influence. He argues in his book, *The Anxiety of Influence*, that poets, in this case even novelists and playwrights, rewrite older works. As a result, a text becomes a tool of completion and opposition. Among the categories he sets to this "intra-poetic" relationship is *tessera* where a poet "antithetically 'completes' his precursor, by so reading the parent-poem as to retain its terms but to mean them in another sense, as though the precursor had failed to go far enough."¹⁸

Since intertextuality cannot be fully grasped because of the numerous and various threads that compose a text, the psychoanalytic approach seems quite effective in achieving the aim of this study and helping us to focus on one element among others. In this respect, when dealing with Freudian psychoanalysis, we are exposed to many concepts. Those used in this study are chosen due to their accordance with our attitudes and inclination because we cannot cover the whole range of his postulates and the interpretations of his theories. As a matter of fact, the principal concepts of psychoanalysis are summed up in Freud's article "The Corner-Stones of Psychoanalysis", in which he built its essence on "The assumption that there are

¹⁵ Harold Bloom, *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry* (1973) (Reprinted, New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), p. 96.

¹⁶ Julia Kristeva, "The Bounded Text", op. cit., p. 52.

¹⁷ Ihab H. Hassan, "The Problem of Influence in Literary History: Notes towards a Definition", *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, Vol. 14 No. 1 (Sep. 1955).

¹⁸ Harold Bloom, *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry*, op cit., p. 14.

unconscious mental processes, the recognition of the theory of resistance and repression, the appreciation of the importance of sexuality and of the Oedipus complex.”¹⁹ As we see here the common element between all of these is the ability to link concrete actions and feelings to the inner forces which are presided especially by the unconscious motivations of those actions. In fact, in this study, the discovery of the self has a lot to do with questions of unconscious resistance and repression. Meanwhile, some notions set by the Swiss psychologist Carl Gustav Jung prove their usefulness here. I find his concept of the “collective unconscious” quite necessary to the discussion of the second chapter of this study. It gives a broader meaning to the unconscious since it explores the inner human psyche from the perspective of inherited memories and impulses compared to the individual personal unconscious which arises from personal experiences.

With the help of these tools, this dissertation will discuss two of Eugene O’Neill’s plays and two works by Joseph Conrad in the light of both intertextuality and psychoanalysis. We are going to see how the works of a “disciple” can give another meaning to the works of the “master” and at the same time set another dimension on interpretation. In other words, the newest texts provide us with new meanings of the oldest texts and vice versa.

In order to be able to do this, and according to the requirements of the previous literary tools, this dissertation is divided as follows. The first chapter will deal with the contextual similarities which I suggest led to the unification of O’Neill’s and Conrad’s views towards the inevitability of looking for the self. In other words, since intertextuality refers both to the contextual text and the literary text, the first chapter deals with the first aspect. It aims to set the stage for the coming chapters by linking the two writers together either directly or indirectly because what they had experienced and witnessed was quite similar. However, we should not forget that Conrad preceded O’Neill by nearly three decades and each of them lived other major events the other did not. Actually, the purpose of this dissertation is not to theorise about a perfect match between them but the mood and the cyclical events made them what I can call

¹⁹ David Carter, *Literary Theory* (Hertfordshire, England: Pocket Essentials, 2006), p. 70.

inner oriented writers who were in constant quest for the mysteries of the inner worlds. Accordingly, this chapter will be divided into two sections. The first will expose the inner realities and feelings of the age while the second section will deal with how they were obsessed with this question of the self in an indifferent environment that caused the alienation of the individual. I shall also try to shed some light on the different concepts of the “self” inside the existential world.

The second chapter will try to accumulate their visions. With the help of the previous theoretical tools, it will investigate the first pair of works, O’Neill’s *The Emperor Jones* and Conrad’s *Heart of Darkness*, into two sections. Since what links these works is mainly hidden, I shall try to pinpoint the spots of their convergence in characters and setting in the first section. The second section, which is built on the assumption of thematic similarity, tries to follow the stages of the discovery of the self which is hidden beneath the veneer of civilisation. The self of the two protagonists, despite their different colours, is quite the same if we look at them closely. In fact they follow the same processes to hide their true feelings and even the same stages in revealing them. At the same time, this section will show the different dimension of meaning when we read Jones from the stance of Kurtz and vice versa.

The last chapter will deal with another point of convergence between the British writer and the American playwright. Following the same structure of the previous chapter, I shall try to investigate the intertextual relationship between O’Neill’s play *The Iceman Cometh* and Conrad’s short story "To-morrow". Bearing in mind that certainty shattered out and futility dominated all the scenes, as will be shown in the first chapter, the characters in these works are trying to run away to the fragile shelter of hope. In this respect, the first section will try to expose the hidden close relationship between the characters and the settings of the two works. While foreshadowing a kind of logical reading of the texts, the second section attempts to show how the self-deceiving characters follow similar stages in the discovery of their inner truth. In addition, this section aims at giving another reading of both works where we find that the words Bessie could not say to Captain Hagberd were brought up by Hickey.

Chapter One

Contextual Similarities and their Role in the
Unification of Joseph Conrad's and Eugene
O'Neill's Visions

1. Contextual Similarities

Some of O'Neill's plays seem to provide other possibilities for the understanding of Conrad's works. But before going any further with this assumption, I will try to set the very first bases of the discussion. If we consider intertextuality, according to Julia Kristeva, as an explanation for an arena in which different quotations struggle together, absorb and transform each other into a new text, we can suggest that one of the primary causes of this phenomenon is the direct and even the indirect influences of internal and external powers. As language is the natural "ground of existence," Vincent B. Leitch writes, "the world emerges as infinite Text. Everything gets textualised. All contexts, whether political, economic, social, psychological, historical or theological become intertexts; that is, outside influences and forces undergo textualisation."¹

O'Neill was a influence by some writers and philosophers like Ibsen, Strindberg and Nietzsche. However, Conrad is given less attention compared to them. For example, the bookcases of James Tyrone in *Long Day's Journey into Night* in the beginning of the first scene do not bear his name and even the American playwright did not refer to him so often. Yet, the impression we get from O'Neill in some of his works is similar to that of Conrad. We cannot neglect Conrad's impact on O'Neill because the British writer had influenced a whole generation of writers, even his former sea companions as well as his family kept their own written records, let alone an American playwright calling for the reformation of the American theatre.

So if we consider that O'Neill had found a soul mate in the works of Conrad, it means that he found himself as a part of the Conradian world. In other words, what shaped the British writer and was expressed in his writings earlier also impacted the American writer who wanted to express it later. Anyway, influence can be seen when a person finds the words and feelings he wanted to inscribe but could not in another

¹ Vincent B. Leitch, *Deconstructive Criticism: An Advanced Introduction* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1983), p. 122. Cited in Hans-Peter Mai, "Bypassing Intertextuality: Hermeneutics, Textual Practice, Hypertext" in Heinrich F. Plett (ed.), *Intertextuality* (New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1991), p. 31.

place written instead of him. This leads us to say that there was a connection between the “lives” or “minds” of these two writers.² In fact, the purpose of this study is not to justify Conrad’s influence on O’Neill. While this issue may look like a weak argument, we need to remember that O’Neill was similarly influenced by German expressionism but refuted “accusations” of its direct imitation.³ Yet, O’Neill attended some shows and was influenced by Strindberg who used it in his works. This is not to say that he was ungrateful but rather unconscious of this influence. Similarly, we might suggest that O’Neill was unaware of the impact of Conrad on some of his works.

Along with the suggestion of O’Neill’s influence by the Conradian literary oeuvre, I would propose that the artistic and thematic beauty of the master’s works not partly led the works of the disciple to be seen as a continuation. Some similar aspects in their lives may have further contributed to the convergence of their world views as reflected in their works. O’Neill might have found a guiding spirit emerging from the works of Conrad which led them to share some subject matters. This supposed intimacy cuts through a number of biographical, historical and philosophical affinities. That is why it is important to devote this first chapter to a discussion of some of the similar aspects of their lives, both intrinsic and extrinsic,⁴ in order to establish the intertextual relationships.

Starting with the biographical similarities, Eugene Gladstone O’Neill was born inside the literary milieu of his father. The world of blossoming words, emotions and performance was his playing ground. Though Joseph Conrad was not born in the world

² Ihab H. Hassan, “**The Problem of Influence in Literary History: Notes towards a Definition**”, op. cit., p. 68.

³ Virginia Floyd argues: “When O’Neill was charged with having been influenced by Kaiser’s *From Morn to Midnight*, he stated that he had seen the play in 1922, after he had written the two plays, adding: ‘I had read *From Morn to Midnight* before *Hairy Ape* was written but not before the idea for it was planned. The point is that *The Hairy Ape* is a direct descendant of *Jones*, written before I had ever heard of expressionism.” Virginia Floyd, “**The Search for Self in The Hairy Ape: An Exercise of Futility**” (1978), http://www.eoneill.com/library/newsletter/i_3/i-3c.htm, (Accessed on February 2nd, 2012)

⁴ Ihab H. Hassan considers that influence has an intracultural significance articulated in historical, social, psychological and aesthetic contexts of the literary work. In other words, there are intrinsic as well as extrinsic aspects of the notion of influence. Ihab H. Hassan, “**The Problem of Influence in Literary History: Notes towards a Definition**”, op. cit., p. 66.

of theatre, his father was a patriotic literary man who wrote some plays,⁵ albeit little known ones, and encouraged his son to read major works. Hence, both of them were exposed intellectually to the same circumstances. However, what life brought in its hidden pockets shaped them more than what their family did.

The family played an important role in moulding both Conrad's and O'Neill's early vision of the world. While the Conrad family was socially isolated because of its opposition to the tsar rule, O'Neill's family was in opposition with itself. As shown in his masterpiece *Long Day's Journey into Night*, Edmund, who personifies Eugene, struggles with and suffers from guilt. While his relationship with his brother and father was unstable, his mother's depression and addiction were thought to be a result of his own birth. Because of struggle, O'Neill considers Nietzsche's *Thus Spake Zarathustra* his own holy book. Perhaps not the book itself is important but the thoughts of this German philosopher and his profound influence on the American playwright. Life for O'Neill was a tragedy, a quest for belonging and discovery. In an interview he said: "A man wills his own defeat when he pursues the unattainable. But his *struggle* is his success!"⁶ This statement recalls Nietzsche's notion of struggle of the ideal man to be a superman. From the other side of the world, Conrad was exposed to more struggle than O'Neill. His family was exiled and he tasted the meaning of helplessness earlier. While his world was dark from its inception, it became darker with the rising disillusionment of the age.

This led to another element that might bind the two writers together. Their religious attitudes undertook a drastic change once they abandoned their Catholic beliefs. O'Neill could no longer pretend to have faith in religion when he said: "I must confess to you for the past twenty years almost, (although I was brought up a Catholic, naturally, and educated until thirteen in Catholic schools), I have had no faith."⁷ Conrad also expressed his suspicion about his religious practices saying: "I always,

⁵ Grzegorz Zych, "Apollo Nałęcz-Korzeniowski as a Playwright" (2010), <http://www.wuj.pl/UserFiles/File/Yearbook%20V/2-zych.pdf>, (Accessed on February 17th, 2012)

⁶ Eugene O'Neill, quoted in Egil Tornqvist, "O'Neill's Philosophical and Literary Paragons", op. cit., p. 19.

⁷ Edward L. Shaughnessy, *Down the Nights and Down the Days: Eugene O'Neill Catholic Sensibility* (Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 2000), p. 9.

from the age of fourteen, disliked the Christian religion, its doctrines, ceremonies and festivals.”⁸

This rebellion against the religious codes led them to the experience of what they were strictly prohibited. They stepped at the threshold of death attempting to commit suicide. Whatever the different reasons behind that act, it proves their utter disappointment with both religious consideration and earthly lives. So we can see their hankering after seafaring, adventure and exploration of the unknown as the quest of meaning in their lives and a confrontation of inner emptiness and nothingness.

Though the biographical element is sometimes considered irrelevant in the study of influence and intertextuality,⁹ and despite the autonomy given to the text, under the light of modern claims, by exiling the author from the work once he finishes it,¹⁰ we cannot ignore that the writer as a person is an outcome of his own experiences. The act of writing relieves the author from those happenings, either good or bad, by hailing or mourning them. This, in fact, is a part of human nature when we need to communicate our past and present with the others. As the personal experience is a motivation for writing, a similar experience may produce a similar mode of writing. Bearing in mind that this proposition may diminish or strengthen the effect of direct influence at the same time because in this situation either the two writers’ similarities coincided with each other, out of what has shaped them, or the “disciple” has read himself in the works of the “master” and then wanted to use his unique vision. In both cases, this evidences the presence of the intertext.

The vision of any writer is not shaped by his personal experience only. What surrounds his world impacts him as well whether he was aware of it or not. That is why we can by no means neglect the happenings of the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth century which drastically revolutionised the

⁸ Joseph Conrad, quoted in Owen Knowles, “Conrad’s Life” in J. H. Stape (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Joseph Conrad* (1996) (Reprinted, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), p. 7.

⁹ Jay Clayton and Eric Rothstein, “Figures in the Corpus: Theories of Influence and Intertextuality” in Jay Clayton and Eric Rothstein (eds.), *Influence and Intertextuality in Literary History* (London: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1991), p. 14.

¹⁰ Roland Barthes, “The Death of the Author”, op. cit., p. 142-148.

thoughts and ideals of people. They even redirected the course of artistic, scientific and philosophical production and perception. Perhaps if we can sum it up in a few words, we would say it was the age of uncertainty, the age of questioning when confidence was annihilated and the truth's meaning had changed and was "stripped of its cloak of time."¹¹ This was not only the feeling of Conrad because Eugene O'Neill also bequeathed it. Perhaps the images of futility became much clearer to the latter in the thirties when his Larry Slade asserted: "... To hell with the truth! As the history of the world proves, the truth has no bearing on anything. It's irrelevant and immaterial, as the lawyers say."¹²

The truths that characterised the previous centuries were declining one after the other in an unstoppable pace. While some were mourning the shocking new facts, others looked for havens out of this modern decline. Alternatives to the moral and psychological decline were offered but only to be questioned again. So, each phenomenon or an explanation of a phenomenon was put under the lenses of suspicion. That resembled an extended form of Plato's "allegory of the cave" in these modern times where the seeker of knowledge thinks that he achieved the ultimate truth only to be contradicted by the only truth that he knew nothing. Those modern changes were seen by the whole humanity. While the artistic, philosophical and scientific changes were mostly exposed to a specific group of people, the devastating imperial war and its results were obvious to every single person, whether literate or not. Thus, none could exclude himself from the common mood of modernity.

In a particular period of time, the subtle scientific, political and economic achievements led the Western world to place itself in the centre of all other civilisations. It even granted itself, in the fashion of the old times, some justifications to its unmistakable actions. They were not granted by the holy church but by what had replaced it and its dogmas; science. For example, the Darwinian Theory and its interpretation by the philosopher and sociologist Herbert Spencer gave rise to new

¹¹ Joseph Conrad, *Heart of Darkness* (1902) (Reprinted, London: Penguin Popular Classics, 1994), 52. Hereafter, all references to this work will be cited in the discussion as (*HD*).

¹² Eugene O'Neill, *The Iceman Cometh* (1946) (Reprinted, London: Jonathan Cape, 1980), 15. Hereafter, all references to this work will be cited in the discussion as (*TIC*).

notions like the survival of the fittest and the superiority of a race over another justified and multiplied imperialism and wars under the pretext of civilising the uncivilised.

The end of the nineteenth century witnessed mass colonial expansionism and the first part of the twentieth century was the time of the two wars that ended all the wars. The world was deluded by curtains of pretexts while the fittest were performing alone on the stage. However, those justifications which were based on centralised views of the world proved their futility. In its apex, many found themselves entrapped between the same fires of their paradoxical beliefs. Conrad, for example, had lived inside this phenomenon. He was a Russian subject and was brought up in a conquered country. Though this case was different, its essence was very similar to the non-European colonised people. However, later, when his family was exiled he worked in the service of colonial activities. Hence he drank from both cups and had the chance to look at the prism of colonialism from two opposite sides while he belonged in a period of time to the oppressed, he was in another at the oppressor's side. This allowed him to judge the accepted truth and the new "scientific" right, which took shape in the superiority and colonialism, more objectively. Furthermore, imperialism led to the questioning of pre-established absolute truths not only because of its contradictory essence but also through the discovery of non-European philosophies, literature, art and cultures.

Another major event was the break of the First World War and the events that preceded it, followed it and culminated in another world war. The world changed with the emergence of strong European forces like Germany beside old ones like Britain and France. This proved that nothing could hold still because the aim of the major powers of the previous century was to prevent the rise of other rival powers. The war swept over Europe and caused deaths and injuries everywhere. By its end it was not important who won or lost; the most prominent thing was the proof that no absolute belief was necessarily more correct than the other. The civilised world in a moment was just like the "uncivilised" one they despised. "Savagery" proved its presence in all human hearts whatever their colour or race is. This new disillusionment was added to

the previous one. It was another evidence of the futility and shallow understanding of humanity be it civilised or not.

Among the characteristics of this era was the expansion of industrialisation. The Industrial Revolution gave birth to mass production and offered inventions that bettered and eased life. However, the industrial appetite, as well as the movement of people from the countryside to the city, led to a social and moral change among people. One of its direct results was the concentration of power in the hands of the few. The economic doctrine that hosted this system of production was capitalism. It contributed to the change of the social landscape because of the principles set by its proponents. For example, Adam Smith, considered as the father of modern economics, supported the idea of the need of individual ambition to serve the common good. But fierce competition led to the oppression of the majority. So again the life of a bunch of people was figuratively and literally based on the suffering of the other majority. Consequently, the need for more economic prosperity contributed to the poor working and sanitary conditions, long working hours and low wages. In fact, this was another face of slavery which had been incarnated in another form of internal colonialism reflecting, even if not in full terms, the external one as willed by human nature.

Another result of industrialisation was the emergence of the machine. This new “creature” replaced man efficiently. With its useful rise, however, it alienated the human workers. It contributed to the strengthening of the owners’ wealth while it weakened the poor workers. Accordingly, the value of the individual was standing only on fragile notions called humanism. These were only abstract words that could not stand the solidness and noise of steel. The dilemma of modern man was whether to be enslaved or to be alienated in his own world. This is in brief just another social type of uncertainty among others. In all cases, the human being found himself alone in a world where every man stood for himself looking for the best results.

If we try to trace the spark that started these tides of uncertainty and change we will find it in science. This era witnessed unprecedented accelerated achievements which surpassed the rest of the previous centuries put together. Be it in geography, biology, chemistry or physics, the newly assumed facts were in direct opposition to the

very established beliefs. The mood of the century cannot be neglected because every person was affected and shocked by the new discoveries. Whether they were reflected in literature or not, they contributed further to strengthen this feeling of uncertainty.

The long held dogma of Christianity was also challenged in the second half of the nineteenth century by many theories and discoveries. To mention here but a few; the Scottish geologist Charles Lyell declared in his *Principles of Geology* that the formation of the surface of the Earth is a result of physical, chemical and biological processes, proving thus that the Earth is older than four thousand years as opposed to the biblical interpretation.¹³ Charles Darwin's ideas were much more revolutionary. His works in biology were seen as a continuation of this idea of natural procession and evolution.¹⁴ The British biologist came to challenge the very concept of creation in his work *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection*. Since science could be applied to such new fields, everything else, be it concrete or abstract, was seen through its lenses. For example, in psychology, Sigmund Freud with his psychoanalysis endeavoured to analyse the human psychology in a more rational way. Despite its challenge to religion and traditions, he built his explanations of human behaviour and psyche on sexuality and its mental consequences.

Science achieved the status of religion but could not replace it or give more satisfying accounts for the world. However, it revolutionised people's perception of themselves and their universe since what had been established and could not be opposed for a long time was now a subject of objection. Nothing could hold still and even these notions and new theories were put into question.

Just like everything, philosophy and literature were in a constant change. The dominant philosophy of scientific positivism assumed that truth can be determined by the application of scientific rules. Even in sociology, for example, Engels said "... just as Darwin discovered the law of development of organic nature, so Marx discovered

¹³ Ian Angus, "Marx and Engels...and Darwin? The Essential Connection between Historical Materialism and Natural Selection" (2009), <http://www.isreview.org/issues/65/feat-Marx-Darwin.shtml>, (Accessed on March 5th, 2012)

¹⁴Id.

the law of development of human history.”¹⁵ Everything embraced the scientific rules not so much for their complete accuracy, since nothing was ultimate, as for their temporary usefulness. Since philosophy became more scientific, this led to a decline in faith and religion resulting in more spiritual emptiness and identity crisis. As science achieved the status of religion, and because of the dominant feeling of the indifference of nature, Nietzsche, in his utter disappointment, declared the death of God. He found the importance of life in its journey of struggle. Thus he found that the transformation, whether successful or not, of the ideal man into the superman was the ultimate goal of life. His ideas have influenced the modern thought concerning the physical and metaphysical worlds. Nietzsche in fact is just a loop in a long chain started earlier by existentialist thinkers like Kierkegaard who supported individual uniqueness compared to God.¹⁶ Thus philosophy tried to take refuge from the cursed knowledge of the absurd human existence within an indifferent universe.

The disappointment of philosophy was furthered by the anthropological record of Sir James Frazer who investigated the origins of Christianity. His work, *The Golden Bough*, attempted to trace the roots of the Christian faith in the fertility rites performed by the old cults.¹⁷ This work influenced a whole generation of writers among them T. S. Eliot who represented and perhaps summed up the American modernism in his subtle poem *The Waste Land*. Modernism emerged out of this chaos trying, like what science has done, to surpass and encompass all the previous literary movements. It was characterised by an inconclusive ending as a reflection on the uncertain world. It moved its focus from the outer world to the inner one, attempting to account for the psychological and illogical organisation of the individual. In addition, it concentrated on the conception of the self within an indifferent universe and alienated individual in

¹⁵ Friedrich Engels, quoted in Ian Angus, “**Marx and Engels...and Darwin? The Essential Connection between Historical Materialism and Natural Selection**”. Id.

¹⁶ Anonymous, “**Kierkegaard, Nietzsche, and the Autonomous Individual: The Convergence of Two Existential Philosophers**” (2008), <http://mcamp.hubpages.com/hub/nietzschekierkegaard>, (Accessed on January 10th, 2012)

¹⁷ F. D. Muntean, “**Frazer’s The Golden Bough: A Critical Appreciation**” (1994), <http://findpdf.net/reader/Frazer39s-The-Golden-Bough-A-Critical-Appreciation.html>, (Accessed on January 10th, 2012)

this modern world by industrialisation, imperialism or even the profound knowledge which, to some extent, became a curse because of its uncertainty.

Perhaps all the previous issues led to the discussion of the nature of what holds them all together: civilisation. That age's new inventions contributed to a faster circulation of ideas. Even the contact with the "other" far areas produced novel consideration for the non-Europeans. As history has always repeated itself, the holders of the reins of power saw themselves and their ideals as the centre of the world. They thought themselves unsurpassed and unchallenged. However, they found themselves in front of each other fighting not for the sake of their white "burdens", but for the sake of their white ambitions.

What in sum was put at stake was the very notion of civilisation. It came to a collapse under the weight of the violent gushes of the new century. They blew out the certainty of humanity which once thought to have mounted its highest summit. But later, those strong winds cleared the sky of another unattained summit. It was another proof of the triviality and shallow understanding of human beings. Now the way seemed longer especially with the apocalypse-like of the World Wars, the ruin and decay of morals and ideals along with intellectual uncertainty. Henry James asserted that

(t)he plunge of civilization into this abyss of blood and darkness ... is a thing that so gives away the whole long age during which we have supposed the world to be, with whatever abatement, gradually bettering, that to have to take it all now for what the treacherous years were ... really making for and meaning is too tragic for any words.¹⁸

Civilisation represented an ambivalent and a nightmarish atmosphere. It offered a title that could not be refused; in return it demanded hypocrisy and fall in the pit of bloodshed and darkness. This disappointment of the modern wasteland and the hollowness of human soul made even words that were supposed to be natural means of conveying the meaning unable to do their natural task. The tragedy of this new age was the subject of many works.

¹⁸ Henry James, quoted in S. Coote, *T. S. Eliot: The Waste Land* (1985) (Reprinted, London: Penguin Books, 1988), p. 9.

The former comprehensible notions were based on religion and science, but with the shaking of these old bases most of the fruit of civilisation littered on the ground of suspicion. As a result, confidence collapsed especially after the failure of religion, science, politics or art to provide a better explanation or cure to the modern depredation. Nor could they provide substitutes to the dissolved long held notions.

These are in brief some of the sensations of the modern age that hosted, with its uncertain aura, both of Eugene O'Neill and Joseph Conrad. The aim here is not to depict the external panoramic view of the happenings but to expose some of their psychological impacts. I think it is impossible to cover them thoroughly in this study. Conrad makes it clear in his *Heart of Darkness*, "No, it is impossible; it is impossible to convey the life-sensation of any given epoch of one's existence—that which makes its truth, its meaning—its subtle and penetrating essence. It is impossible." (*HD* 39) I tried to explore some of the feelings of that period in which the two writers, as witnesses of this era, could not exclude themselves from the drastic changes whether in science or humanities. Even the gloomy atmosphere and the dark aura of loss and despair that surrounds some of their works are simply the reflection of their attitudes and feelings toward an important age of wastelands.

These lands came to exist after the violent shaking of the long pre-established notions. Hence, uncertainty was the only certain thing. Nothing could hold more especially with the challenge of Christian theology and of the notion of civilisation. The nature of the world, the individual's self and every held code needed revision. However, the proposed alternatives that sought to provide certainty turned out as useless as the preceding ones. The scientific experimental method could not account for the change of human behaviour or the constituents of his soul, which as it did to the universe. If this had proved anything, it was the triviality of the individual against this big world despite the upheaval caused by the accelerated process of science and the aforementioned events.

So what was certain? Was it civilisation, belonging to a certain social group or a faith in a better future? What many people were sure of was the alienation of the individual in his own world. Accordingly, the individual started his quest to find a real

meaning for life in a modern age. With awful disappointment, people saw their age condensing nearly all the achievements of the previous centuries but unable to offer a stable meaning for their existence. Since the modern age alienated the individual and pushed him to look for an isolated sanctuary, he turned his attention from the understanding of the outside worlds to the internal ones. In this utter desolation, in this complete emptiness and loneliness, the only companion was one's inner voice. Digging in the darkness of the self, trying to bring to light its real essence, the endeavour to discover the self was necessary and inevitable haply it would save them from the claws of despair.

2. The Inevitability of Looking for the Self

The modern tragedy of shattered beliefs and uncertainty pushed every intellectual mind to reassess what stands in front of his eyes in an attempt to rediscover its reality. Conrad said in his preface to *The Nigger of the "Narcissus"*

My task which I am trying to achieve is, by the power of the written word, to make you hear, to make you feel – it is, before all, to make you *see*. That – and no more, and it is everything. If I succeed, you shall find there according to your deserts: encouragement, consolation, fear, charm – all you demand; and, perhaps, also that glimpse of truth for which you have forgotten to ask.¹⁹

A truth veiled by the new happenings of an age which alienated the individual. Likewise, O'Neill was drifted by the same stream, thus he declared that his mission is

to ... dig at the roots of the sickness of today as he feels 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.²⁰

When the two writers broke the codes of their age they found that the main problem lays within the individual himself. Therefore, any explanation of a particular

¹⁹ Joseph Conrad, *The Nigger of the "Narcissus": A Tale of the Sea* (1897), in *The Works of Joseph Conrad* (Reprinted, London: William Heinemann, 1921), p. x.

²⁰ Eugene O'Neill, quoted in Egil Tornqvist, "O'Neill's Philosophical and Literary Paragons", op. cit., p. 21.

phenomenon needs to be explored on the personal level first and how a person defines his own self in accordance with it.

In fact, the pre-occupation of the western world for the thorough knowledge of the self runs deep in its history. Socrates who had influenced philosophers and thinkers throughout centuries regarded that the ultimate task of a person's existence is in the attainment of the internal meaning. "Know thy Self" was interpreted from different sides. To know one's self was considered to know its external world of which the self is an outcome. Since it exists and cannot be concretely described, its definitions are speculated by the context from which it emerged. So the self is not only an internal "entity" but also a perspective reflected in and by the other. It can take a life-long quest, in some cases, to only scratch its peel of truth. That is why the "others" are important because the accumulation of clues can be easier through reading or interacting with past and present experiences.

As we have seen previously, humanity found itself entrapped in a sea of uncertainty, probability and worst of all contradiction. Man assumed that he was left alone in an indifferent universe. His belief in the concrete and visible was undermined, let alone in the abstract and invisible. The realisation that the earth moves whatever the way people live and die can be seen as the most difficult lesson for humanity. Accordingly, more analytical concern of the concrete individual's personality in the tangible world became the subject matter of many works.

Perhaps we can give another interpretation of this concern to this existential thought. The widespread feeling of the futility of religion and moral codes depended on the justification of the absence of God. As a result, there was a rising need to find the absolute truth within each person maybe to renew the relationship between the absented God and the desperate individual. This is better expressed by O'Neill himself who, despite his loss of faith, declared that he was primarily interested in the relation between man and God.

Actually, like God, the self, among others, haunts the reality of human beings.²¹ But before going any further in its discussion, it is crucial to discuss the meaning of the self I am dealing with. In fact, it is difficult to give a full definition of the self because it may lead our studies to drift away into other fields like philosophy, psychology, religion or science rather than literature. This complexity is an outcome of the abstract nature of the self. However, if we take its simplest definition we can say that the self is an idea combined to the body that gives the person his sense of existence and guarantees his persistence. This view is a result of the very meaning of existence in which we declare or feel our selves first in the form of an idea. The process of feeling or thinking is taken by the body. So, the self is an abstract idea in the first place contained in a concrete body. It is the cornerstone of this conscious and unconscious life. Inevitably, this notion is a result of past experiences that culminated in the process of shaping a specific idea of the individual. But most of the time, when we are dealing with the self we do not confine it to the realm of the individual only, it encompasses the human self.²²

Despite its abstractness, we cannot neglect its reality.²³ This is not to say we can separate and look at it in terms of a “thing.” Jean Paul Sartre held the view that “we are only our experience and not an underlying substance which undergoes this experience.”²⁴ His view is much similar to that of David Hume who could not find this “thing” or substance and thus he even denied its existence.²⁵ Nonetheless, the self is not something to prove but something to feel and we can step further to discover our true feelings. It is

²¹ According to Sartre, the consciousness or the reality of a person is mainly haunted by six things: the self, time, emotions, others, god and freedom. Cited in Hazel E. Barnes, “**Jean Paul Sartre and the Haunted Self**”, *Western Humanities Review*, 10 (1956), p. 121.

²² J. Dashiell Stoops, “**The Real Self**”, *The Philosophical Review*, Vol. 12, No. 1 (Jan., 1903), p. 37-46, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2176816>. [Accessed on April 2nd, 2012]

²³ *Ibid.* 39.

²⁴ Hazel E. Barnes, “**Jean Paul Sartre and the Haunted Self**”, *op. cit.*, p. 121.

²⁵ This led David Hume to say: “when I enter most intimately into what I call myself, I always stumble on some particular perception or other, of heat or cold, of light or shade, love or hatred, pain or pleasure. I never can catch myself at any time without a perception, and never can observe anything but the perception.” Quoted in Frank Thilly, “**The Self**”, *The Philosophical Review*, Vol. 19, No. 1 (Jan., 1910), pp. 25-26, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2177637>. (Accessed on April 2nd, 2012)

a symbol – like any “thing” named and characterized. Its reality is not adequately represented in categories of “permanence”, “substantiality” and the like; for it is not something behind or more real than experience. It is not an entity but a law, which, like any other law, denotes a unique type of relationship within experience, its inner and individual aspect which the presentational method of science cannot reach. And the individual is at the centre of that law, as to all other laws he is external.²⁶

In that existential world, acceptable visions of the “self” became almost the greatest thing in life since there were needs to justify existence. However, the quest of its discovery proved its uselessness. In Sartre’s words, those who might achieve it can be called “gods.” Thus this lack of full reality imprisoned the individual in a labyrinth of uncertainty where the ghosts of its primordial fears dominate its corners. Meanwhile, the human reality, according to Sartre, “results from a lack of existence.”²⁷ In other words, when human beings lack existence or *do not exist* they will discover their own reality. But when they exist, they are miles away from it because while they exist they give justifications to their impulses, they sustain their illusions or show unawareness of the reality of the lack of existence. So if we take the example of the era mentioned before, humanity came to a point in which it felt a lack of existence because of the destruction of the presupposed foundations of existence.

All in all, the modern age pushed both Conrad and O’Neill to shift their attention from the description of the external world to the analysis of the internal one. The explanation of a particular action in life depended much more on the personal definition of the individual rather than its collective perception. Thus discovering the real self gives another dimension to the understanding of human behaviour.

Whether the historical, economic, political or the biographical context itself led to the convergence of the interests and ideas of Conrad and O’Neill, especially in their primary concern with the self, or the personal influence of this latter, be it great or small since his sentiments echo in some works of Conrad, the similarities look

²⁶ Carl V. Tower, “**An Interpretation of Some Aspects of the Self**”, *The Philosophical Review*, Vol. 12, No. 1 (Jan., 1903), pp. 35, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2176815>. (Accessed on April 2nd, 2012)

²⁷ Hazel E. Barnes, “**Jean Paul Sartre and the Haunted Self**”, op. cit., p. 121.

amazing and we might suspect their coincidence. The coming chapters will try to illustrate this relationship in two pairs of their works.

Chapter Two

Heart of Darkness and *The Emperor Jones*: An
Intolerable True Self underneath “Civilisation”

1. Introduction

This chapter focuses on the interaction between Joseph Conrad's *Heart of Darkness* and Eugene O'Neill's *The Emperor Jones*¹ and the way in which we can read each one of them from the perspective of the other. This allows us to come up with another dimension of meaning for both works while trying to trace one of the hidden links of the American playwright's play.

But before dealing with these works, we need to identify them in the world of literature. Essentially, *The Emperor Jones* marked both the elevation of Eugene O'Neill to the status of a professional playwright and the birth of the modern American theatre. The importance of this play for O'Neill is not found only in its financial success but also in its artistic one. With the depiction of the regression of Brutus Jones and the use of new theatrical devices, O'Neill was able to establish the foundations and reputation of the theatre he wished for. Travis Bogard insists on the value of the play and its vividness saying that

the technical excitements of the play, with its drums, its sustained monologue, its rapidly shifting settings framed into a single desperate action were almost blinding in their virtuosity and in their assurance of important theatrical things to come. Not only the literate American drama, but the American theatre came of age with this play.²

What also mirrors the artistic value of this play is the multiplicity of its interpretation, the controversies it raised, the critical reviews written in response to and the various discussions and analyses of its main purpose. This dissertation is just a further endeavour to reflect its artistic success.

Apart from the artistic justifications of the play, we should remember that *The Emperor Jones*, among other works, ushered the modernist movement in American literature in general and the theatre in particular. It can be seen as a modernist work not for its coincidence with the era of great American modernists like T. S. Eliot,

¹ Eugene O'Neill, *The Emperor Jones* (1920) in *The Plays of Eugene O'Neill* (Reprinted, New York: Random House, 1928) Hereafter, all references to this work will be cited in the discussion as (*TEJ*).

² Travis Bogard, *Contour in Time: The Plays of Eugene O'Neill*, op. cit., <http://www.eoneill.com/library/contour/amateursend/jones.htm>, (Accessed on June 1st, 2012)

Francis Scott Fitzgerald but because of Eugene O'Neill's unprecedented crafting both of its techniques and themes. He succeeded in plunging his audience into the play with the use of novel theatrical devices based on expressionism while centring his ideas on the primordial and traumatic fear, the discovery of the self in addition to the futility of the pre-considered convictions. These topics characterised the dilemma of modern man in his modern age which, as dealt with in the previous chapter, was full of uncertainty.

If one may feel a need to identify the status of *The Emperor Jones* in the literary world, we have to bear in mind that Joseph Conrad's *Heart of Darkness* epitomised it. It is considered as one of the most studied works in the world of literature. The reputation it acquired is due to its aspects and legacy. In this work, Joseph Conrad did not tell his readers about the unidentified horrors of his colonial experience but made them feel and see them. He portrayed the hypocrisy required in bragging about the notion of civilisation and the mystery of the self-understanding while concentrating on the emotional impacts of his major characters.

For these reasons and others, *Heart of Darkness* succeeded in compelling the thoughts of its readers. For instance, Kenneth Graham, in response to some effects of the novella, says that

there is nothing more radically ambiguous in modern English fiction than the “dream-sensation”, the “word”, of Kurtz's concluding cry, “The horror! The horror!” ... This can be either an ethical judgement against himself (thereby sustaining the concept of human values) or a summing-up of the “truth” about life that destroys the whole basis of ethical judgement and humanist confidence.³

Perhaps what helped the novella to perch on this high status were its modernist aspects. Harold Bloom said that “many scholars would come to argue that it was the seminal work in the emergence of modernist literature.”⁴ Joseph Conrad dealt here with the psychological dilemma of modern man, the uncertainty of the age and the fear that resulted, using a new and clever frame narration. The work ushered a new era in literature and was translated into several languages. For this reason, its influence is so

³ Kenneth Graham, “Conrad and Modernism” in J. H. Stape, (ed.). *The Cambridge Companion to Joseph Conrad*, op. cit., p. 213.

⁴ Harold Bloom (ed.), *Bloom's Guides: Heart of Darkness* (New York: Bloom's Literary Criticism, 2009), p. 17.

great to trace because it did not only impact writers but also a worldwide generations of artists. To mention but a few: T. S. Eliot's in his poem "The Hollow Men", Francis Ford Coppola's movie adaptation *Apocalypse Now*, Tayyib Salih's novel *The Season of Migration to the North*, in addition to Eugene O'Neill's play *The Emperor Jones*.

But before tracing the hidden ways between the two mentioned works, we should keep in mind that intertextuality has proved that the threads of any artistic production are multiple and even hard to trace. Accordingly, the meaning of any work might change when we compare a new text to an older one, let alone when we relate a text to a wider circle of texts being literary, social or even scientific. If we take O'Neill's *The Emperor Jones*⁵ alone for its own sake, its surface meaning, in this case, is what we can understand of the play even if we go deeper in its themes and interpretations. Our attempts to understand the work here can be seen as the first stage of interpretation. However, once we put it amidst the intentions of the writer and in parallel to different sources, which might even have faint similarities with the studied text, we open new gates for literary interpretation and explanation based on our readings of the text and the different sources that contributed to shape it. This helps us move to a second stage of understanding while we process the revelation of the hidden roads between the compared works.

Therefore, the sources of the work are important for the second stage of further understanding of a work. But to put the play amidst its jingling sources, a number of questions are to be asked in this case. Did the sources of this story come from O'Neill's daily life from which he wanted to depict the downfall of someone he knew? Did he want to explore the personal and racial psychology of a black person bearing in mind the studies and works Carl G. Jung?⁶ Did he intend to create his own scenario to the story of the Haitian president Vilbrun Guillaume Sam who exploited his people,

⁵ My focus here is on *The Emperor Jones* because it came after *Heart of Darkness* and consequently, the play is supposed to contain some traces from the novella as I will discuss later.

⁶ O'Neill wrote in a letter to Martha Carolyn Sparrow (October 13th, 1929): "The book that interested me the most of all those of the Freudian school is Jung's "Psychology of the Unconscious" which I read many years ago. If I have been influenced unconsciously it must have been by this book more than any other psychological work." Quoted in Egil Tornqvist, "**O'Neill's Philosophical and Literary Paragons**", op. cit., p. 22.

thought of his infallibility but whose subjects overthrew him by the end?⁷ Did he write the play bearing in mind Henrik Ibsen's *Peer Gynt*, Jack London's *The Call of the Wild*, or his favourite poem of Francis Thompson "The Hound of Heaven"?⁸ Maybe he wanted to find another reading, as I argue in this work, for Conrad's *Heart of Darkness* which deals with the capitulation of man to the mysterious primordial powers. O'Neill might have used another work we could not know. Perchance he planned to use the mentioned works and events all together or perhaps none of them at all because even O'Neill himself did not and could not find the absolute right answer to this since no one can explain the process of creativity. He could be aware of those sources, but there is a big difference between awareness and complete knowledge. This is just to show that the process of thinking is dependent in a way or another and cannot transcend the boundaries of the surrounding literary and social texts. For instance, O'Neill said about his way of the development of an idea into a work:

[The idea] usually begins in a small way. I may have it sort of hanging around in my mind for a long time before it grows into anything definite enough to work on. The idea for *The Emperor Jones* was in my mind for two years before I wrote the play. I never try to force an idea. I think about it, off and on. If nothing seems to come of it, I put it away and forget it. But apparently my *subconscious mind keeps working on it*; for all of a sudden, some day, it comes back to my conscious mind as a pretty well-formed scheme.⁹

In sum, what we can deduce from intertextuality is that the absolute correctness of the previous speculations is not necessary since there are hidden threads binding the suggested texts among others whether we like it or not. This inevitable outcome is due to our inability to control our unconscious world which is the playing ground of all what we look at, overlook, neglect, memorise or even try to forget.

⁷ O'Neill said: "The idea for *The Emperor Jones* came from an old circus man I knew ... [who] had been travelling with a tent show through the West Indies. He told me a story current in Haiti concerning the late President Sam. This was to the effect that Sam had said they'd never get him with a lead bullet; that he would get himself first with a silver one ... This notion about the silver bullet struck me, and I made a note of the story." Quoted in Michael Hinden, "**The Emperor Jones: O'Neill, Nietzsche and the American Past**" (1980), http://www.eoneill.com/library/newsletter/iii_3/iii-3b.htm, (Accessed on July 2nd, 2012)

⁸ Travis Bogard, *Contour in Time: The Plays of Eugene O'Neill*, op. cit., <http://www.eoneill.com/library/contour/amateursend/jones.htm>, (Accessed on June 1st, 2012)

⁹ Eugene O'Neill, quoted in Louis Sheaffer, "**Behind the Tomtoms of the Emperor Jones**" (1971), <http://www.eoneill.com/companion/jones/sheaffer.htm>, (Accessed on July 30th, 2012) (Emphasis mine)

In this case, we feel the broadness of the intertextual approach because we are put in front of a variety of works, a multiplicity of interpretations and different points of view even in the same work. Inside this turmoil of suggestions, our stand might be right or wrong. However, what soothes us is the fact that we do not fail to deal with the idea that O'Neill, just like any other writer, did not create this story out of nothing but he assembled many shattered shards that were thrown both in his conscious and unconscious mind and assembled them together to produce such a work. This does not have the slightest intention to criticise his originality or underestimate his literary productivity but we need to define originality and productivity under a new light. In other words, we have to consider O'Neill the writer as a unique point of a special convergence of texts and contexts. Consequently, *The Emperor Jones* came out as a result of the conscious and unconscious intersection of at least the aforementioned works.

One might ask, what are the different links between *The Emperor Jones* and *Heart of Darkness*? Though they were written in different genres, countries, periods, and surrounded by different circumstances, they almost deal with the same topic when we come to the point of the capitulation of a successful man to the dark powers of the self and the world. Actually, this sense of doom had been shaped by O'Neill's and Conrad's backgrounds that revealed to them the terror of existence.

Coming back to the relationship between these two works, what binds them is the idea of the failure of the material civilisation to conceal the instincts and fears of the one who adopts its hypocrisies and tries to adapt to its rotten environment. For this reason, the purpose of this chapter is to show how the major characters hide behind the veneer notions of civilisation. In addition it deals with the way and the effect of reversing this process which culminates in the discovery of the self especially for Kurtz and Jones. In fact, when we consider these works together we should forget nationality, race and whatever distinguishes a human being from another because the writers are not dealing with the external decaying aspects of this creature but with what constitutes his innermost. They are dealing with the universal man who is white and black, who is good and bad, whose backgrounds do not count, whose tongue does

not matter since these human beings will behave almost in the same way in the same situation that they had been lured to by the same temptation.

Despite the twenty years that separate the works, O'Neill continued to carry the elements of uncertainty of his modern era. He introduced a kind of timeless play, just like Conrad's novella, trying to explore the relative nature of a human being. The American playwright did not deal with the effects of industrialisation, the aftermath of the First World War, though not heavily felt in the United States, nor did he deal with the economic side and the changing way of life. Actually, *The Emperor Jones* does not deal with the wastelands of the doomed war or the emptiness of the jazz age. It may hint at the injustice of imperialism as reflected in *Heart of Darkness* but if we look at those age's characteristics more thoroughly, we can see that they are merely the side effects of a bigger issue named the hollowness of the human self.

As a result, the play and the novella carry the general mood of the time and the falling apart of various solid notions. Among these what happened to the human status and its downfall from the apex of power to the abyss of helplessness. The shown "paradigm" is not new to anyone since it proved its universality and recurrence from the earliest past and will do so in the coming future. The certainty of this assumption lies in the simple fact of the presence of weak human souls able to wander in the different corners of this world.

2. Establishing Similarities between *Heart of Darkness* and *The Emperor Jones*

It is quite important and demanding to establish logical bases for the similarities between *The Emperor Jones* and *Heart of Darkness*. Nevertheless, perhaps what comes first to the reader's mind is the questioning of the foundations of comparison between a work that marked the epitome of literary production for Conrad and another work considered as minor for O'Neill since he is well known for other plays like

Beyond the Horizon, *Anna Christie*, *Strange Interlude* and *Long Day's Journey into Night*. In fact, we are dazzled by what separates more than what unites them.

First, at a superficial glance, the plot of each work seems to have no relation with the other. *The Emperor Jones* dramatises throughout full eight scenes the downfall of an Afro-American stowaway called Brutus Jones who found himself in rule of a group of superstitious and primitive natives on an island in the West Indies. He tightens his grips over the natives and exploits them in the fashion of the ancient empires in which the ruler is seen as a god. The trick for doing this, with a great deal of luck, was to convince them that he cannot be killed except with a silver bullet which they cannot produce. The first scene opens after two years of being an emperor. Jones is awakened by his white servant Henry Smithers who has learnt about the plot of the natives from an old woman caught while escaping from Jones' castle to the nearby hills. The natives under the leadership of Lem seem to have found a way to make a silver bullet which Jones thought they could not accomplish that soon. However, Jones, revealing his cunning intelligence, appeared to be prepared for such a situation. He heads towards the forest in which he had hidden some food and marked his way of escape. As he leaves his palace, the natives in the hills start drumming the tom-tom whose sounds accompany most of the rest of the play in a rising tempo until Jones' death.

The next six scenes depict Jones' running away in the woods. Once he is on the threshold of the black forest, he starts to hallucinate and lose his wits. During his "physical" flight between the trees, he takes a psychological journey into fearful events witnessed in his past life and others related to his ancestors'. Jones fires all his lead bullets along with his silver bullet in panic to get rid of the upsetting apparitions that incarnated those memories. In his frenzied mental and physical state, he comes to run into a circle in which he finds himself by the end at the same point of departure.

The last scene depicts the end of Jones. Despite Smithers' suspicion of the ability of the natives to kill the emperor, Lem, the rebellion leader, tells him that they were able to break the curse and make a silver bullet made of molten silver coins.

However, *Heart of Darkness* discusses throughout three parts the tale of Marlow who went to the Congo hoping to fulfil one of his childhood dreams. Once there, he is

encountered with the maltreatment and exploitation of the black natives by the whites. He later hears about a mysterious and accomplished person called Kurtz who had achieved a high status in the company and is feared, revered and even hated by the chief. Marlow's boat is damaged and he waits for two months before he gets to the Inner Station where he is supposed to take the sick Kurtz. The latter seems to be worshipped by the natives and exhausted by the universal knowledge he gets from being there alone. None learns of his deeds there except for some of the relics and stories about him. Kurtz, being seriously ill, is taken by force from his subjects. He later entrusts some letters to Marlow whose growing interest in this person pushes him to carry on his journey till the end. On their way, Kurtz dies uttering his final judgment: "The horror! The horror!" Marlow falls ill after this incident and comes back to London loaded with new insights about the human nature in response to his mysterious and inconclusive adventure in the Congo.

In addition to the seemingly divergent plots, the different genres of these works mark other kinds of differences according to the very nature and characteristics of the written and performed works. Conrad gives us a story teeming with unidentified mysteries since he is communicating primarily with the mind of his readers. However, in order to meet the hearts of audience first and then their thoughts, O'Neill needed to select a type of mystery and present it in his play. In addition, while the novella uses a frame narrative which may result in a kind of confusion the first time, the theatre needs a kind of simplification and explanatory movements so as to attract more viewers.

In spite of all these differences, we should not stop in front of a mirage groaning about the inability to see the truth behind. Surely, we cannot neglect the fact that *The Emperor Jones* and *Heart of Darkness* are quite different at the *surface* level. Nonetheless, the effect we get from the end of the two tales is quite similar. Both works imprint on us the impression of the futility of self-deception and the instability of the illusionary foundations on which some lives are built. This uncertainty is simply a result of Conrad's and O'Neill's dealing with the disintegration and fall of Man who has never accepted his weaknesses and kept soothing himself with the abstract belief of his infallibility. Here we can ask another question, why do we feel the same effect though these works are quite different? Consequently, we can speculate that this

impression is caused by common elements. Digging deeper in the impacts of the two works and reading the works much closer helps us to find that the similarities between the novella and the play are too striking to ignore. The gist of Joseph Conrad's *Heart of Darkness* becomes clearer to us. Some elements in their characters and settings strengthen our assumption of many familiarities between the two works proving the presence of some intertextual elements.

2.1. Characterisation

2.1.1. Kurtz and Jones as Modern Tragic Heroes

Jones and Kurtz in fact have a very similar inner side though their skins and circumstances differ. Kurtz is a white European who came with pride and honour to Africa. He was equipped with moral ideas and incarnated the ideals of Europe both in his bloodline and desired achievements. All Europe contributed to the making of this remarkable person who appeared further by the end of the novella to be an artist, a lovable person, or what we can call in short, "a universal genius." (*HD* 103) His gifts and strong character led him to obtain a high position in a trading company sent to the Congo in charge of a precious natural resource. However, while Kurtz embodies the idealistic Europeans, Jones represents a marginalized category in the United States. He is an Afro-American who worked as a Pullman porter. He seems to be a villain in the sense of having been in jail more than once. Later, it is revealed that he killed a black man called Jeff and a white prison guard and then took refuge on an island in the West Indies. Unlike Kurtz who was a prototype of moral success before going to Africa, Jones was an example of failure.

However, if we take a closer look at these differences, we can say that they are made primarily by their surroundings. As behaviour and achievements are determined much by external factors, we deduce that we have not touched their inner truths yet. Actually, we pay much attention to what we shallowly perceive of their appearances and attainments and this is usually what blinds our deep perception of reality.

Nonetheless, there comes a time when the outwardly quite different characters are transformed into, talking in a scientific way, the same comparable samples. Kurtz takes advantage of the trading company and indulges himself with the presidency of the black natives of the Congo. “To speak plainly, he raided the country.” (*HD* 80) From the other front, Jones finds himself acting in the play the same destiny as Kurtz when the natives of the island declare him as their supreme ruler thanks to their superstitious beliefs on one hand and Jones’ cunning intelligence on the other. He finds himself their “Emperor [and] Great Father.” (*TEJ* 175) The importance of this comparison lies not in their ways of becoming kings, but in the fact of their establishment of absolutism over these new worlds.

To hanker after this new mood of life, surely they willed for power but could not find it at their home towns. O’Neill presents Jones as a man with “*something decidedly distinctive about his face – an underlying strength of will, a hardy, self-reliant confidence in himself that inspires respect.*” (*TEJ* 175) However, these features collided with the past that confined him. The same situation is found with Kurtz who had a strong will, even if he was an extremist, but could not exercise his ideas and influence in Europe. Now we achieve another common denominator between these two characters. As a matter of fact, they were both materially unsuccessful and this stood in the way of their dreams of power. Obviously, Jones’ work did not provide him with the necessary amount of money and Kurtz, whose occupation we do not know exactly, “was not rich enough.” (*HD* 108) Still, they never stopped looking for the land that may embrace their inner flooding will. Perhaps, the seeming past quietness of Kurtz and the violence of Jones are only means to express their inability to attain the inner desires of power. For this reason, we have to consider the conscious and unconscious needs that were struggling within and pushing them to assert themselves. Thus, Kurtz threw himself in the Dark Continent as if he had been looking for this opportunity for a long time while Jones, because of the restraints imposed by his race, social situation and his criminality, found himself in that Caribbean “paradise” accidentally.

Destiny gathered two different characters in a very similar situation. They found themselves revered in the same fashion as the old Roman emperors. Shedding some

light on the name of Jones, we find it preceded by the word “Brutus” which has nothing to do either with his English name or with his “modern” age. Apparently, O’Neill tried to echo the old times of Rome and its absolute rulers. When talking about the emperors of the Roman world, some images of cruelty and exploitation invade our minds. The “uncivilised” races and “barbarians,” whose only fault was not to have the same blood as the legendary Romulus circulating in their veins, were tortured, killed and reduced to slavery. In the same way, Kurtz and Jones sprouted out of this everlasting family tree not in terms of blood relation but in terms of vaulting ambition. Their exercises of brutality and the aura of fear they released with their presence might have given them, as it was the case with past kings and emperors, the feeling of divinity.

In order to ensure the flow of power, they needed to possess the land’s wealth by whatever means possible. If we link this situation to Jones’ conception of the way of being an emperor, we find that Kurtz was applying the plan of the “big stealing.” This is seen in Jones’ explanation to Smithers: “Dere’s little stealin’ like you does, and dere’s big stealin’ like I does. For de little stealin’ dey gits you in jail soon or late. For de big stealin’ dey makes you Emperor.” (*TEJ* 178) Being emperors, god’s representatives on earth, they needed to adopt godlike means. They subjugated and exploited the people who now only listen and do not speak. They were not judged for what they did like Jones who claims: “Ain’t I de Emperor? De laws don’t go for him.” (*TEJ* 178) Similarly, the harlequin asserts to Marlow that he “can’t judge Mr Kurtz as you would an ordinary man. No, no, no!” (*HD* 80)

If we look again at the tragedy of their death, we can see it as a punishment for their “big stealing.” The world is not theirs, nor is it the native’s. What they mistakenly did was an attempt to rob the real Owner. Indeed, they believed in the acquisition of some of its parts only to be cursed by their inability to encompass them. Both of them tried to obtain and maintain the world but their quest was doomed to failure. They gaped at the world trying to absorb it but it was much stronger and bigger to endure.

As modern men like Kurtz and Jones acted in the modern play of uncertainty, other questions appear to the surface binding them further together. By the end of the

protagonists' life spans, Conrad and O'Neill confuse us with the right classification of Kurtz and Jones. Are we going to consider them as victims or victimisers? What happened to them is evidently tragic. They truly represented the common man who, despite his roots and soil, breathes opportunities in the same way. They could not, as many holders of the reins of power at those warlike times, suppress their temptation to destroy the other. The seal to ensure the stability of this lurking "drive" was the outer world. This can be noticed in the huge change of these characters between their past and present worlds. But once the person becomes the world itself, the power of the seal turns to have no effects. Worst of all, it is transformed into a cover supporting the inner dark side. The seal dissolves and becomes a further means used by the drive.

Kurtz and Jones talked instead of all modern people. The two works reflect two tragic heroes different in colour, origin and circumstances but similar in destiny. They represent not a specific class but humanity in general. In short, it is the tragedy of the modern common man. They lived under generally accepted perceptions for well-being just to prove their inadequacy. Like the old Greek tragedy, the heroes were determined by the will of their gods even though they try to meet their needs. When they fail in their missions, they are neglected and punished. In this modern time, the gods that determined the world in the time of the Greeks are incarnated in other forms like "civilisation." Being aware of it, Jones and Kurtz strive to please its needs. Furthermore, Jones as an American citizen would have wished to realise his own American Dream which acknowledges the material success rather than the spiritual one. As they fail, they come to the truth of their "god" but they cannot escape anywhere since it dominates the whole world. In addition, they find themselves spiritually empty and confused. Their only refuge in this case is death because of their tragic flaws. This was determined from the very beginning and they behaved according to the fact of their underestimation or overestimation in their societies.

As we claim that Kurtz and Jones are tragic heroes, we may look at some elements in *The Emperor Jones* and *Heart of Darkness* that embody the principles of the tragedy. For example, we can find the retroactive construction of the work which dramatises the events of the past and summons them to the present. Hence, the present's puzzles and mysteries are revealed through the culmination of the pieces of

the past. Accordingly, the past returns to determine the present and to shape the future. This is quite clear in O'Neill's play. The tragic hero regresses into his personal and racial past. He was moving backward in memory while ostensibly forcing his way forward in the forest. Though this is not seen in Conrad's work, my claim in this dissertation, as will be seen later with the application of the aforementioned theoretical approaches, is that Kurtz had undertaken the same experience. In this case, according to the difference between drama and prose fiction, Conrad did not dramatise this aspect while we find that O'Neill provided us with an explanation of one of the novella's mysteries. Since we can consider Kurtz as a modern tragic hero, we might assume that he regressed in his own personal and racial memory because the novella carried the sense of unidentified past throughout various situations.

Thus we can see that O'Neill, from the perspective of Conrad's novella, wanted to create an American tragedy incarnating the fall of the protagonist from the apex of illusionary pleasure to the bottom of his inevitable death. Jones and Kurtz did not only resemble the same external prototype of absolute rulers, they were also affected by other internal forces like the inability to understand the self. Their real tragedy started when they acquired the wrong type of self-knowledge, which contributed to their destruction. The ultimate mistake of Kurtz and Jones is their incorrect definition of the world and the self. They tried to exert the logic of white civilisation on seemingly primitive races. However, they discovered the futility of their established convictions and this discovery contributed to their psychological decline before their physical death. They claimed to know how people think and behave, but by the end they profoundly knew that they could not explain their own thoughts and behaviour let alone the others'. They also depicted the contradictory aspects of the modern age. When taking all of these together, we find them victims and perpetrators at the same time. As they oppressed their outer worlds, they were oppressed by the inner ones. Unfortunately, we cannot decide which started the oppression first. All in all, we find that Kurtz and Jones were put in the same situation, they reacted in the spit image of each other and, amazingly, died in the same way.

When Jones passed away we knew what happened to him because we have just lived it. O'Neill has bound our heart beatings, as audience, to those of Jones making us

live the story not only watch it. Jones shows us his inner side but Kurtz only talks for a few moments without reflecting anything. What we hear of him is only a final judgment about “The horror!” that can be detected in the story of *The Emperor Jones*. In fact we are living the same phenomenon. Though not uttered in the same way, it can be read with these unsaid words.

2.1.2. Henry Smithers and Charlie Marlow as Mouthpieces of the Writers

Another significant similarity in characterisation is found between the cockney trader Henry Smithers and the English sailor Charlie Marlow. In fact, I do not claim that they totally play the same role in those works. While Smithers had known Jones for a long time and lived under his rule, Marlow has barely heard about Kurtz before accompanying him for a short period of time. In the first scene of the play, Smithers appears to be at the service of Jones. He carries with him a riding whip and an automatic revolver to control the natives. Yet, Marlow is not a servant of Kurtz. He is appointed as the skipper of a river steamboat in a trading company and this mission does not require him to have any direct contact with the natives. Furthermore, their adventures in these different places seem to affect Marlow more than his counterpart, Smithers.

Physiologically speaking, they are quite different except for the fact of being changed slightly by the tropical environments. For Smithers “*The tropics have tanned his naturally pasty face with its small, sharp features to a sickly yellow.*” (TEJ 174) Likewise, because of his previous journeys in eastern lands, Marlow has “sunken cheeks, [and] a yellow complexion.” (HD 6) This small but indicative similarity is important for the presentation of two adventurous personas.

If we consider these common grounds inferior compared to main aspects of the play and the novella, we cannot neglect the fact of Marlow’s and Smithers’ piercing vision to the coming actions of each work. Indeed, the flashback narrative of a very

short linear story¹⁰ used in *Heart of Darkness* is summoned up, in a way, with the reminiscent scenes in *The Emperor Jones*. Significantly, these characters become tools for raising the curiosity of the readers and the audiences from the very beginning.

What is remarkable here, especially for Smithers, since we know that Marlow has witnessed the events in the Congo, is the fact that they give us some insights to the works and they establish the mood of the rest of the events. For instance, Smithers felt the rebellion against Jones earlier. When he catches the old native woman sneaking out of the castle he reveals that he anticipates something unusual saying that “There’s somethin’ funny goin’ on. I smelled it in the air first thing I got up this mornin’.” (*TEJ* 174) Once the old woman tells him about the natives’ plan, he gives us a vision of the remaining parts of the play: “Ow! So that’s the ticket! Well, I know bloody well wot’s in the air – when they runs orf to the ’ills. The tom-tom’ll be thumping out there bloomin’ soon ... I only ’opes I’m there when they takes ’im out to shoot ’im ...” (*TEJ* 175) Actually, he is the first one to talk about the rituals of the tom-tom. Even Jones who was prepared for the natives’ revolt has known nothing about the drumming and its significance. Smithers has “eard it before and [he] knows” (*TEJ* 184) as if he had witnessed a similar situation before. Furthermore, he hopes for the emperor’s death with a shot which is seemingly far since Jones has convinced the natives that lead bullets do not kill him. Another dazzling hint presented by Smithers is about the ghosts in the forest. It looks like that he also knows about this: “Ternight when it’s pitch black in the forest, they’ll ‘ave their pet devils and ghosts ‘oundin’ after you. You’ll find yer bloody ‘air ‘ll be standin’ on end before termorrow mornin’.” (*TEJ* 185) When Jones was going to escape, he told him “Give my regards to any ghosts yer meets up with.” (*TEJ* 186) Jones faces the apparitions during his flight in the forest though it appears that both of them do not believe in their presence. These remarks seem to be mockery but once they come true, we cease to think of Smithers as only a passive servant to his master. Indeed, he plays a more active role in the play than we think.

¹⁰ What I mean here is the linear story of Marlow narrating a tale to his friends on a boat while playing a domino game. He ends his narration after a couple of hours. This is indeed a very short linear story in itself. It is enriched by a flashback narrative that dominates most of the novella.

In the same way, Marlow gives us glimpses of the tale from the very beginning. But while Smithers gives us elements from the scenes of the play, Marlow establishes the general mood of the novella. Though this appears different, we find that O'Neill and Conrad have set these characters as attention grabbers. Marlow sums up his views about the trip to Africa in a short comparison with the past of Britain. He tries to put the British listeners in the same situation as the colonised Africans when he starts his tales recalling the Roman invasion of Britain. He considers that old Britain "also ... has been one of the dark places of the earth" (*HD* 7) for the Romans in the same way modern Africa is to the West. Therefore, the listeners on the *Nellie* as well as the readers are put in an ambivalent situation. Later in the novella, we find that his descriptions of the river, legionaries, savages, harsh environment, wilderness, death and the way he thought he is taking the torch of light to Africa are paralleled to the coming of the Roman settlers.

As these characters provide the readers with the first glances of the stories, they also play seminal roles with their judgments of the events. They are the ones who tell us about their attitudes about the tragic ends of Kurtz and Jones. In a way, they despise and admire them at the same time. Actually, their puzzled judgments are not clear cut because of the difficulty of the happenings from one side and their contradictory feelings towards their "masters" from the other. For example, Smithers challenges Lem, the leader of the rebellion, saying that: "Aw! Garn! 'E's a better man than the lot o' you put together." (*TEJ* 203) However, he faces Jones' limp body saying in a frightened awe and then with a mockery and smile: "Well, they did for yer right enough, Jonesey, me lad! Dead as a 'erring! ... Where's yer 'igh an' mighty airs now, yer bloomin' Majesty? ... but yer died in the 'eight o' style, any 'ow!" (*TEJ* 204) In fact, this scene echoes the death of Kurtz in which Marlow, though he acted without sympathy, says about the "poor chap": "I affirm that Kurtz was a remarkable man. He had something to say. He said it." (*HD* 101) Furthermore, his adventure revealed to him the real meaning of strength and weakness. With this new finding, he did not judge Kurtz only but the whole humanity. He considers strength as "[n]othing to boast of ... since [it] is just an accident arising from the weakness of others." (*HD* 10) This

voice is heard, as shown previously, with Smithers questioning of the same idea in front of the corpse of Jones.

From these common aspects between Smithers and Marlow, we come to feel that they embody the voices of their authors. They anticipate and establish the mood of the work from the very beginning since Eugene O'Neill and Joseph Conrad had a clear vision as to the direction of their works. In addition, the uncertainty of their judgment, which is a characteristic of Modernism, serves as a method for not dictating their own stances to the readers and audience. Moreover, if we look at the backgrounds of *Heart of Darkness* and *The Emperor Jones* we may suggest other links between these characters. We cannot neglect the fact that Conrad went to Africa and kept notes about his journey. Also, O'Neill was fascinated by the sea and went to tropical islands of which he had interiorised, as I discussed earlier in relation to intertextual elements, the deep meanings of his travels. Therefore, Smithers and Marlow can be considered as two different kinds of mouthpieces which transmitted, in the same way, the past sea experiences of O'Neill and Conrad respectively.

2.1.3. The Natives

Though the events of these stories take place in their lands, we can say that the natives are weakly present. In *The Emperor Jones*, Smithers interrogates briefly an old native woman at the beginning of the play. In the final scene, we meet Lem and his soldiers for the first time at the death of Jones. Similarly, the natives have no striking presence in *Heart of Darkness*. Conrad presented their suffering in servitude, their manipulation by Kurtz in addition to the briefest moment in which he gives a native child a voice to impart the death of Kurtz. For this reason, by the end of these works, we start ruminating about the mysterious happenings of Jones and Kurtz rather than the natives' as if, despite their illtreatment and exploitation, they are not the essential purpose of these works. Indeed, these stories depict them, but they are not about them.

Still, in the moments of their brief presentation, a number of similarities can be detected. Compared to their colonisers, they are isolated from the world. At that time,

the lands of Africa as well as parts of the Caribbean islands were considered as undiscovered black spots on the world map. They are considered as primitive and superstitious because of their different cultural beliefs. Furthermore, they give these new comers the status of gods. In *The Emperor Jones*, they consider Jones as their Great Father and in *Heart of Darkness* they are depicted as a “wild crowd of obedient worshippers” (*HD* 105) of Kurtz. Hence, these natives revere and fear those oppressors because of their supposed divinity. For example, there are certain ways followed by the natives, which Marlow refuses to know, in order to speak with Kurtz. Compared to the play, though the procedures taken before talking to Jones are not mentioned, the natives would follow the same ways. As we see, when the old woman is caught by Smithers in the first scene, she is not afraid of him as much as of Jones. Instead of begging him to let her go, the first thing she pleaded him was not to tell the emperor. She “(... gives way to frantic terror, and sinks to the ground, embracing [Smithers’] knees supplicatingly) No tell him! No tell him, Mister!” (*TEJ* 174)

2.2. Setting

What is also remarkable about the novella and the play is that they take place in recently discovered lands. The actions of *The Emperor Jones* are set “on an island in the West Indies as yet not self-determined by White Marines.” (*TEJ* 172) Likewise, the place Marlow went to is still considered as a mysterious land in the process of discovery. It was “the biggest, the most blank, so to speak – that [he] had a hankering after.” (*HD* 11) This provides a new safe haven for displaced characters like Jones and Kurtz. Their displacement in these lands provides them with an opportunity to embody what they were not able to do in their previous societies. Furthermore, these isolated lands give us an overview about pure and natural environments which are not yet stained by colonial hands. However, it seems that just in the very beginning of these lands’ occupation, their status changed to misery. The wealth of these lands is consumed voraciously, their people are treated brutally and their systems were changed to please these new comers.

Because of these changes, the lands cease to be mere geographical entities. They become a reflection of the inner sides of these violators. If this explains anything, we understand that the nature of any intruder emerges from these neutral and isolated places. The latter can be considered as a measuring rod which reacts to the positive or negative effects of the others. Consequently, when we find that the natives in *The Emperor Jones* and *Heart of Darkness* suffer with this new form of life, we deduce the evil nature of the preachers of civilisation. Now, the blame is not thrown on the past but on the present. They cannot blame their new environments since they are the environments themselves. The results are theirs and they are looking straightforward to what they had wished for consciously or not.

The landscape in the two works has many forms. We find hills, seashores and rivers but what is common and remarkable in itself is the presence of the jungle. It is the common denominator of secrets and mysteries. Like the African tropical areas, the islands in the Caribbean Sea contain dense forests. *The Emperor Jones* came second to *Heart of Darkness* but it voices more clearly the sounds of the jungle's darkness, the undefined fear and the unbearable hidden knowledge. The symbolic meaning of the forest is important. It is the source of life and the land of different creatures. It was not violated by the corrupted human hands. It incarnates innocence, and brutality, the strength of the past and the triviality of the present. It urges the desires for its discovery and the fear from its findings simultaneously. Smithers considers it as a "bleedin' queer place, that stinkin' forest, even in daylight. [He does not] know what might 'appen in there, it's that rotten still. Always sends the cold shivers down [his] back minute [he] gets in it." (*TEJ* 185) Near its thresholds, human beings realise their weakness and inability to understand either its primal nature or even themselves. It makes Marlow wonders whether its stillness "were meant as an appeal or as a menace ... could [he] handle that dumb thing, or would it handle [him]? [He] felt how big, how confoundedly big, was that thing that couldn't talk, and perhaps was deaf as well." (*HD* 38)

Furthermore, the jungle transcends its physical presence to encompass the psychological one. It is a "curtain of trees" (*HD* 50), "a wall of darkness dividing the world ..." (*TEJ* 187) Here we are not talking about a separation inside the tangible, but

a barrier between the concrete physical environment and the abstract self. To run amidst its trees and shade may lead to the discovery of spectacular sceneries or to the fall into the fangs of one of its callous monsters. Just like the self, many avoid going to its heart for fear of its unknown and thus undesired aspects. For this reason, the landscape describes more than what the eye can see. The “Great Forest,” like the psyche, hides more than anyone can imagine. For example, Jones lost his way in the forest though he had prepared it before. He did not go astray there because of a mistake he made. He is nervous because of this illogical situation: “Is I lost de place? Must have! But how dat happen when I was followin’ de trail across de plain in broad daylight?” (TEJ 189) In spite of his certainty of the right way, the jungle looked at him with the “air of hidden knowledge, of patient expectation, of unapproachable silence.” (HD 81) This is just to show that in contrast to one’s belief in one’s utter self-knowledge, one can be misled in the same way as Jones.

However, the jungle is not the same in the two works. While we are pushed to wonder about its dominating muteness in Conrad’s work, O’Neill’s makes it show its mysteries. In his play, the jungle is not given the ability to speak but it is endowed with the power to express. We know from the trip of Kurtz in the jungle that it whispered to him knowledge about himself. When he was fine, surely he was shown its beautiful hidden gardens. But when he declined psychologically by the end of the novella, we can say that what he met is a monstrous reality. The mask he wore for a long time is shattered now because of the break out of undesirable hidden secrets.

While the still presence of the jungle serves to link it to the still psychological state of a silent wondering, its change accounts for the inner happenings of its characters. In fact, the trees are unmoved, but because of the feeling of a character and his psychological state, they are perceived as changing. The more the events advance, the more the characters are suffocated by their new findings, the more they feel the jungle closing around them. In *The Emperor Jones*, the jungle is depicted as “a wall of darkness” (TEJ 187) and “an encompassing barrier...” (TEJ 190) It has its own aim and looks forward to “accomplish[ing] its veiled purpose.” (TEJ 192) Despite its “serried ranks of gigantic trunks of tall trees whose tops are lost to view.” (TEJ 195), it shrinks steadily till the “limbs of the trees meet over ... forming a low ceiling about

five feet from the ground ... The space thus enclosed is like the dark, noisome hold of some ancient vessel.” (TEJ 198) Once the Great Forest has achieved its goal, it starts to regain its usual form slowly: “*The nearest tree trunks are dimly revealed but the forest behind them is still a mass of glooming shadow.*” (TEJ 202) Though the jungle in *Heart of Darkness* is mostly silent and still, it is also given aims and some movements. It has its own “moment of triumph ... an invading and vengeful rush.” (HD 105) In addition, it encloses over its interlopers just like it did to the Eldorado Expedition on which it “closed upon it as the sea closes over a diver.” (HD 48)

As the setting is concerned, the two tales take place mainly on the land. Nonetheless, we cannot neglect the ethereal presence of the sea. As displaced characters, it is the means to reach those lands as well as the same means to run away from them. We know that Jones used the sea as a stowaway from the United States to escape from punishment and Kurtz used it to come to get rid of his past in Europe. It helped them to find a new future and even if they wished to leave those places, the sea would remain the sole carrier of their hopes.

Just like Conrad, the influence of the sea on O’Neill can be detected in many of his plays. Conrad worked for the French merchant marine and then joined the English merchant navy. He pursued a seafaring career until his retirement. When he started writing, the aura of the sea never left him in works like, to mention but a few, *An Outcast of the Islands*, *The Nigger of the “Narcissus”* and *Heart of Darkness*. In the same way, though O’Neill was not primarily a seaman, he experienced this career for a period of time and then abandoned it because of his poor health. His love of the sea was also present in his early sea plays like *Bound East for Cardiff*, *The Long Voyage Home*, *Ile* and even in *The Emperor Jones*.¹¹

¹¹ Despite the fact that the sea is mentioned only on few occasions, R. Viswanathan insists on the impact of the sea on the play especially in the sixth scene. Actually, the ship does not appear completely in this scene especially for the audience, yet we can sense its presence. In the article, the critic says: “In setting as well as in spirit, this scene stands out from all other nautical scenes in O’Neill as something unique, for it introduces the ship only as part of a vision encountered by Brutus Jones in the jungle.” R. Viswanathan, “**The Ship Scene in *The Emperor Jones***” (1980), http://www.eoneill.com/library/newsletter/iv_3/iv-3b.htm, (Accessed on July 2nd, 2012)

In spite of the nearly complete absence of the sea in both works, the expectancy of its blurred presence is very important. The sea means the only way to escape from those places. Marlow at the end of the novella finds himself in London thanks to the ship that crossed the sea. In the same way, after the rebellion, Jones intended to escape across the sea. He says: “Dawn tomorrow I’ll be out at de oder side and on de coast whar dat French gunboat is stayin’. She picks me up, takes me to Martinique when she go dar, and dere I is safe ...” (*TEJ* 183) Ironically, in the past they were trying to escape the strains of their societies, but now they are running away from themselves. They are looking for the only way they came from, the sea. The similarity here between *The Emperor Jones* and *Heart of Darkness* is that the shadowy presence of the spirit of the sea reflects the inner affinity between O’Neill and Conrad and the hidden wishes of Jones, Kurtz and even Marlow.

3. Stages of the Introspective Plunge

The second section of this chapter deals with the steps of self-discovery taken by the major characters of these works. According to the reading of the play and the novella, we find that Conrad and O’Neill present us with two connected characters. Kurtz gives us a different view of the life of Jones before his running into the forest and Jones gives us a suggestion as to what might have happened to Kurtz in his mysterious solitude. This provides us with complementary readings of both characters and the meaning of their struggle. Accordingly we detect the presence of the intertext on one hand and what Harold Bloom called an antithetical completion on the other.

When we take *Heart of Darkness*, we sense its aura of mystery from the very beginning. Conrad envelops us with the feeling of uncertainty and inconclusiveness about the conception of one’s self. We suggest in this work, as the doctor told Marlow before the latter went to Africa, that “the changes [which] take place inside ...” (*HD* 17) are due to a destructive discovery of the self. In fact, even if we discuss this

process by Kurtz¹² and the effect of his realisation on Marlow, we cannot forget that this mood was established by the irrational death of usually two neglected characters. Conrad puts us in the scene of the mysterious inner changes when we hear of the unreasonable death of Fresleven. This incident is important because the former Danish captain in the Company was quiet and gentle but his change causes his strange and trivial death. One can wonder whether he would have died in the same way if he had been in Europe. It was the need to satisfy the voracious demands of his “id,” even if it hankered after two black hens. Later, we meet another mysterious death of a Swedish person who committed suicide because “[t]he sun [was] too much for him ...” (HD 21) What sun? Is it the literal sun of the Congo or the figurative sun of a destructive finding concerning self-knowledge? What makes Kurtz remarkable compared to them is that though he was more or less like these characters, he succeeded in giving us a final judgment about “The horror!” that echoed within the dark and empty hearts of human beings. Because of this, the majority behave and adopt any possible means consciously or unconsciously to evade it. But we need to question the nature of this horror, what horror are we talking about? Indeed, this is the mystery of Conrad. Kurtz glimpsed it, felt it, judged it but did not identify it for us. Amidst this whirlpool of the unknown, O’Neill suggests a shape for this formless horror as depicted in Jones. His horror is a result of the pride of today and the mistakes of yesterday, the present fake understanding of civilisation and the discovery of its cursed roots in the past primitiveness, in addition to the encounter with personal and racial memories.

The realisation of the truth of the self is also sensed by Smithers and Marlow through the final mysterious discoveries of Jones and Kurtz. However, the focus here will be on the leading characters rather than the followers. They were the doers, the ones who pursued their desires and suffered their consequences. What I want to achieve by the end of this discussion is that what Jones and Kurtz built their plans on,

¹² Usually, Marlow represents this journey of the discovery as Michael Levenson says: “Marlow’s journey only incidentally involves movement through physical space; in essence it represents a ‘journey into self,’ an ‘introspective plunge,’ a night journey into the unconscious.’ The African terrain is taken as a symbolic geography of the mind, and Kurtz as a suppressed avatar lurking at the core of the self.” Michael Levenson, *Modernism and the Fate of Individuality: Character and Novelistic Form from Conrad to Woolf* (1991) (Reprinted, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), p. 6. However, the concern in this dissertation is focused on the journey within as taken by Kurtz and clarified by Jones.

the only string that held their pride was the simple definition of material civilisation. This was used as a pretext, as a crucial defence mechanism as I will argue later, to draw a permanent dividing line between themselves and the others. As a by-product of their established assumptions, they deceived themselves while thinking of deceiving the others. Thus they fell gradually in the trap of modernity and the fragility of its falling apart definitions.

What I need also both to remark and suggest is the alternative reading given by Jones to the unidentified end of Kurtz and his judgement. Surely, his words are striking in the world of literature but the reason of their uttering remains as speculative as what I am offering in this work. As discussed before, Kurtz and Jones are two sides of the same coin. As a result, we may define the nature of this coin and its value if we consider them simultaneously. In fact, the psychological turmoil of Jones is illuminated by the startling use of expressionism. O'Neill's experiment in this field allowed him to "physicalise" Brutus Jones' abstract inner side which we could not touch in the work of Conrad. A point is given to the theatre against written prose in this context. Yet the latter provides us with the sense of continuous mystery and the beauty of its unuttered words. As a matter of fact, the combination of the two works broadens the scope of understanding of both Kurtz and Jones. The former is provided with new images and the latter is provided with profound words.

What the two works have in common is that the destructive self-knowledge is shown only by the end. Marlow presents to us the common mood of the novella that we encounter and agree with later in the play: "Droll thing life is – that mysterious arrangement of merciless logic for a futile purpose. The most you can hope from it is some knowledge of yourself – that comes too late – a crop of indistinguishable regrets." (*HD* 100) In the two works we know that "reality ... fades. The inner truth is hidden – luckily" (*HD* 49) under a specific kind of "makeup" and "futile purposes." Here we come to think of the knowledge of the self that comes too late. What is the kind of this knowledge? Here, I argue it is the effect of the sudden realisation of a person who thought himself flying high with the civilised eagles, while he is in fact only a dying primitive creature crawling on the surface of earth. That primitiveness,

which he despised in those he ruled, because of the wrong conception of civilisation, is also present inside him.

Indeed, it is not easy to speculate about the inner changes that take place within a character. In order to start the explanation of the inner side we need first to take a look at the outer side and possibly discern the symptoms of inner struggle. Somehow we feel that these characters are hiding from something; they are abnormally afraid of what might happen in the future and what foreshadows it in the present. We come to see their behaviour as the expression of a state of anxiety. The latter is defined as “an unpleasurable affect in which the individual experiences a feeling of danger whose cause is unconscious.”¹³ It is a result of the leap into another culture and the attempt to shore the edifice of the civilised image. Generally speaking, it is a dilemma whose roots lie in the unconscious mind of a person before its coming to the fore. It emerges out of the failing attempts of the ego’s defence mechanisms to maintain the secrecy of one’s covered and meanwhile dangerous fears. In this situation, if a person becomes aware of his inner fears, the result might be hard to deal with and even catastrophic especially if he cannot confront them. This is due to the fact that the role of the ego is to preserve the self-image in contrast to whatever threatens it. What is at stake in case of failure is the obliteration of the very meaning of existence, the only thing that proves the presence of a person in this world.

Because of this anxiety, we are pushed to re-evaluate the situation and think about the hidden hands whose effect was not clear on the surface. As a possible key to this problem, we turn to Freud who considers that psychic processes are determined and manifested by physical processes.¹⁴ When we take the case of Jones, we find that O’Neill exploited the rising tempo of the tom-tom to echo the rising palpitation of his anxious, and sometimes even neurotic, character in response to his fear. Heart beating, perspiration and quick breathing are actually a few symptoms of anxiety among others depicted in this play. However, though these symptoms are not used to describe Kurtz,

¹³ Francisco Palacio Espasa, “Anxiety” in Allain de Mijolla (ed.), *International Dictionary of Psychoanalysis* (Detroit: Thomson Gale, 2005), p. 99.

¹⁴ Karen Horney, *New Ways in Psychoanalysis* (1939) (Reprinted, London: Routledge, 1999), p. 21. Karen Horney is viewed as one of the greatest psychoanalytic feminist. Though she followed her own way in psychoanalysis and disagreed with Freud on certain points, parts of this book were taken because of its subtle discussion of some Freudian concepts which, apparently, she agrees with.

his physical state reflects his psychic one. His deteriorating health is not only the result of an unknown disease but also the result of the inner conflicting forces. And as I have argued before, both of them serve to describe the inner happenings of each other.

In order to account for their inner selves, we need to find what they are and what they do not want to be thought of. It was mentioned in the previous section that they ran away from the limitations of their societies and adopted absolutism somewhere else. Their vaulting ambitions never thought of their fallibility. They needed perfection to meet self-satisfaction. When the image of the perfection is measured by standards like physical and psychological strength, cunning intelligence, exploitation and oppression, there is a vital need to maintain them. However, the day these foundations begin to crack is the same day when the life time achievements begin to crumble whatever the sacrifices offered to the pain of perfection. As a result, the images of imperfection start to be summoned along with the unfavourable faces of weakness, fallibility and helplessness.

That is why they consider their worlds as coming threats. Because of this, they try to fortify themselves against this potential danger so as to guarantee their safety while they dominate those very worlds. Some defence mechanisms are taken to ensure the distance with the coming risks and save the building blocks of their personality. Despite these outlets, anxiety persists because there might be some moments where the very foundations of the established safe havens are menaced by unexpected external factors. Thus, since the “ego” is responsible for the maintenance of the equilibrium of personality regardless of the nature of the procedures, the disturbance of the psychic world is not a result of the “id” or “super-ego”, since they are knowingly dangerous in the first place, but of the possible failure of the defensive measures taken by the ego. If defence mechanisms fail, the characters are going automatically to meet what they tried not to discover. This journey will bring with it a rising tension of anxiety starting first from the encounter with their shapeless fears as not well defined in their first stage and then these will evolve to take the real shapes in front of which the previously infallible characters bow and crawl involuntarily. Accordingly, Kurtz and Jones start their inner journeys from a stage of defence in which they have fortified themselves under a specific conception of the notion of civilisation. Then, once they find

themselves alone in front of their inner selves they confront the intolerable bitter realities that end with the final stage of confession.

3.1. Defence Mechanisms

As we have seen, Kurtz and Jones saw their self-fulfilment in being absolute rulers and they were trying to keep their positions as long as they could. However, this self-fulfilment appears later to be nothing more than a sham. What is remarkable here is that each means they use appears later to be ambivalent. Once they have achieved this universal desire for control, their obsession focuses on retaining their acquired positions. Now they need both physical and abstract witnesses to confirm their state of superiority. Hence certain notions about the self are formulated besides physical power in order to be acknowledged by their subjects. Actually, those means of assault are intended to create defensive walls as well. While the natives are busy with their handling, Jones and Kurtz remain safe. Ironically, those fortresses prevent not only the natives from discovering their rulers' reality, but also the rulers from seeing their own selves. In fact, psychoanalysts give us a wide range of defence mechanisms¹⁵ because of their vitality for the preservation of the self-image which the ego has to protect. It is rather impossible to deal with all of them in this research; that is why I'm dealing only with the ones that seem more appropriate to this context.

If we put the first stage of discovery in simpler terms, we can say that in order to unveil the truth about one's self, we need primarily to understand the process of shaping the character and reverse it. What psychoanalysis strives to prove is the fact that beneath every action there is a motivation either conscious or not. The natures of the drives, especially the unconscious ones, are sometimes in opposition to the very belief of the person and his perception of the world and himself. This is a result of the

¹⁵ The concept of defence or defence mechanism appeared first with the works of Sigmund Freud. Later, other psychoanalysts tried to list a number of the defences taken by the ego. Among them his daughter Anna Freud who listed nine defence mechanisms: regression, repression, reaction-formation, isolation, undoing, projection, introjection, turning against the self and reversal. She suggested the tenth defence mechanism of sublimation or the displacement of instinctual aims. Elsa Schmid-Kitsikis, "Defense Mechanisms" in Allain de Mijolla (ed.), *International Dictionary of Psychoanalysis*, op. cit., p. 376-7.

long-time attempts of the ego to change or swerve the directions of some bitter “realities” so as to maintain the stability of the psyche since “unconscious motivations remain unconscious because we are interested in not becoming aware of them.”¹⁶ This means we need to consider that their present situations are nothing more than changes and swerves of a certain reality and we need to look at them in a different way.

The most common way to avoid an inner dilemma is to shut the awareness of a certain idea or feeling. This requires an elaborate defence system because what lurks within is highly decisive. Accordingly, the ego is going to distort the view of the inner reality making the person dimly aware of it but with an ornamented view of the situation. Otherwise it makes the person ignore continuously the source of the disturbance. In other words, they are repressed and kept out of the conscious awareness of the person while in fact they continue to affect his personal behaviour unconsciously. In this case, since the personal ego of both Kurtz and Jones wants to shield the conscious mind from the realisation of its dark sides, they are going to formulate some notions and perform some actions so as to ensure the distortion and denial of the realities of their past and present mistakes and most of all the primitiveness that lurks within them.

The most prominent defence mechanism in these two works is a false Western conception of the notion of civilisation. For both Kurtz and Jones it works as an ultimate hide-out from the external and internal threats for the destruction of their presupposed convictions. Since it is considered as the ultimate defence mechanism, the conception of its cruel practices is rationalised and sublimated. In order to avoid the acknowledgement of the inner dark side, the usually unacceptable behaviour is covered by social, political and economic justifications. It is converted, or sublimated, unconsciously into a more acceptable form.

Probably, we can put most of the other defence mechanisms under the umbrella term of civilisation since all the other means serve only to strengthen its bases. From the very beginning it is a means of justification of cultural domination. Those who adopt it “have the name of liberty on their lips when they proclaim their corrupt self,

¹⁶ Karen Horney, *New Ways in Psychoanalysis*, op. cit., p. 21.

and call it progress when they extol crime, deny morality, raise altars to instinct, scoff at science, and hold up loafing aestheticism as the sole aim of life.”¹⁷ As history used to repeat itself, the interaction with a different culture creates a depreciation of the other’s customs and behaviour. These differences are identified as innate “savagery” and require big efforts in order to wean “those ignorant millions from their horrid ways.” (*HD* 18) Thus the “White Man’s Burden” did not only mark a dividing line between one culture and another but also defined the superiority and the inferiority of races from the perspective of the white man. Albeit civilisation was supposed to be the extract of humanity’s good moral and physical achievements, its false conception introduced only its dark sides. Those who carried its torch

grabbed what they could for the sake of what was to be got. It was just robbery with violence, aggravated murder on a great scale, and men going blind – as is very proper for those who tackle darkness ... What redeems it is the idea only. An idea at the back of it; not a sentimental pretence but an idea; and an unselfish belief in the idea – something you can set up, and bow down before, and offer a sacrifice to. (*HD* 10)

If civilisation is considered as a corrupted defence mechanism, this is due to the absence of control over its “emissaries of light.” In fact Freud’s structural model of the psyche with its three main parts lost its equilibrium. For him, the inner conflicts of any person are the result of the inability to satisfy the inner world in accordance with the outer one. In other words, the id’s demands are limitless and the ego serves to meet its needs with regard to the society and its mores which are summed up in the superego. But when the needs of the id exceed their limits, when the ego cannot compromise anymore and when the unacceptable hidden drives and urges threaten to come to the surface against the conception of guilt and conscience, the very existence of lawful restrictions of the outer world stand on the precipice of defeat. In the case of Kurtz and Jones, it crumbles when these characters attempt to incarnate the superego itself. This means that they cut the roots of the dilemma and let the id unleashed without restrictions. Now conformity to society is established according to their whims. Jones

¹⁷ Max Nordau, *Degeneration* (1895) (Reprinted, London: Henemann, 1920), p. 554. Cited in John W.Griffith, *Joseph Conrad and the Anthropological Dilemma: ‘Bewildered Traveller’* (1995) (Reprinted, Oxford: Claredon Press, 2007), p. 157.

declares that he cannot be judged and the rules do not go for the Emperor, and in the same way Kurtz's followers cannot question his actions whatever they are.

In order to incarnate the superego and satisfy the needs of the id, Kurtz and Jones established their own myths so as to prove their invincibility and to ensure the subjugation of the natives. The latter are superstitious and isolated from the outer world which these characters had previously known. They took advantage of this situation and made it the primary basis for their scheme of exploitation. They used the unknown products of civilisation, which are out of the natives' reach, to accomplish this mission while hiding behind the defensive walls of those myths. If we take a closer look at the two works we find that the natives of the West Indies are slightly different from those of the Congo since the former can use guns but are unfamiliar with silver bullets while the latter cannot use guns at all. Hence Jones used his silver bullet and Kurtz, in the same fashion as Jupiter, the Roman chief god, "came to them with thunder and lightning" (*HD* 80) which allude to guns with their flashing and loud noises. In other words they brought with them miracles to appear as supreme as possible. In *Heart of Darkness*, the report of Kurtz to the "International Society for the Suppression of Savage Customs" reveals the steps of deification which becomes later a formula for the foundations of their myths. In this case of Kurtz and Jones they "must necessarily appear to [the savages] in the nature of supernatural beings ... approach them with the might of deity ... By the simple exercise of [their] will [they] can exert a power for good practically unbounded ..." (*HD* 71-2) This is in fact the main purpose of those who will to power and want to establish their own myths at the expense of humanity.

Remarkably, when the myths were established, the natives declared their submission and the new godlike kings started to pick up the fruits of their achievements. Now, they are living within a world of their visions. They controlled it, determined its directions and the inner drives set free from their past restrictions. Since the main nemesis of the desires is crushed, nothing can stand in the face of the id. At this stage, greed and destruction among others can be released without the fears of external judgement. They could devour whatever they desired. For example, Marlow felt the outpouring of Kurtz's id when he proclaimed absolute ownership of his

surroundings “[m]y intended, my ivory, my station, my river, my ... everything belonged to him.” (*HD* 70) Similarly, Jones declares the ownership of his surrounding by robbing the entire world he dominates or what he called “the big stealing” that satisfies his voracious demands.

Kurtz and Jones need to feel the success of their myths. As a result, their subjects are used as mirrors reflecting their newly established “self-image”. Actually, their perception of these people can be seen as a defence mechanism since the more they remain inferior, the more Kurtz and Jones enjoy their status of superiority. The ego in this case projects what may hurt their psychological establishments on those natives. So they despise what lurks within their unconscious but instead of facing it they ascribe it to the “inferior” races. Literally speaking, Jones is a better example of this method. We know that he is a black person but ironically he used to scorn his black subjects by calling them “ign’rent bush niggers dat ain’t got brains enuff to know deir own names.” (*TEJ* 183) This situation is quite symbolic since it is not only the colour of the skin which is despised but mainly one’s conception of oneself. Probably when Jones mingled with these people he forgot his colour once he found himself an Emperor. Likewise, Kurtz has felt what lies inside him in terms of savagery and primitiveness but did not acknowledge it. He might have included himself unconsciously when he ended his report by the post script “Exterminate all the brutes.” (*HD* 72) When both Jones and Kurtz hinted at their inner sides unconsciously, we should remember that the role of the ego and its defence mechanisms in this case is to prevent the unconscious reality from floating to the surface of their conscious. This is done by making them busy in despise of the reality not of their own selves but as projected on the natives.

So the main idea here is to keep their people as low as possible in order not to fall in the contradiction of their misjudgement of primitiveness and savagery of these natives. To guarantee the efficiency of their projection, they start convincing the natives of their relatively “inferior” positions compared to theirs and the higher status they created in this modern world. The more the “self” appears supernatural, the more the “other” becomes more subjugated. Moreover, Jones and Kurtz impose and fortify their vision of the world and try to plunge the natives’ into that stream. In this case,

they enslave the natives' ability to think out of this sphere and push them to try to cope with the newly introduced notions of civilizations which, according to the false conception of its apostles, require submission to the superior supernatural. Accordingly, the attempts of the subjects to cope with this new situation is faced by a psychological and cultural gap between the coloniser and the colonised since the latter are drawn suddenly into a different time and place as defined by the new comers. Because of this, there would be a period of time to fill the void between the civilised and the "savage." This duration is factually the terms of the rulers to reign and maintain their self-image.

The relationship with the natives is far more complicated and transcends the simple fact of governing. As we have seen, the purpose of Kurtz and Jones is not only to enjoy a political position but also to achieve self-fulfilment which is reflected in the intimidated behaviour of the panic-stricken subjects. While projection as a defence mechanism is associated with the demonstration of inner unacceptable qualities of Jones and Kurtz on their people, displaced aggression, as another defence mechanism, strengthens further the self-image. I suggested before that their societies had hindered their progress and will then they found themselves in uncontrolled lands. Once they personified the forces of society, their powers faced no limits. As a result, in order to deny the pains of the past, they discharge their past weaknesses in form of oppression and exploitation towards their new societies avenging, whether consciously or unconsciously, the limitations of the places they escaped from. In this case, they both react to their inferiority complexes exercising cruel power and simultaneously they are kept far away from looking inward since they are mainly concerned with the accomplishment of that project. In order to keep the veils hanging longer, they need to underpin their sense of superiority above their natives. In other words, they have to retain their self-images. As the previous means were double standards, this one followed the mainstream too. It creates the space that Kurtz and Jones need because the period of their ruling is determined by the duration and strength of their exercise of power. Meanwhile it masks them from the discovery of their inner selves since they stick to this image of infallibility.

When we chant about these characters longing for life, we should not forget what hides beneath their songs of happiness. What lies within may threaten the very conception of the beautified image of normality. The usually conceived dark side of humanity is governed by the need to impose oneself, to destroy in order to establish a satisfying image of strength. As the main purpose of defence mechanisms is to hold the stability of a character, the case here can take other dimensions. Freud pointed to the destructive instincts which need to be discharged away from the person. If not, we may witness self-destruction. Accordingly, displacement does not only discharge the past traumas but also the present inner destructive powers.

Undeniably, the human self contains destructive instincts. Acts of violence have been played all over the world since the inception of human history. Cruelty, exploitation, aggression, violence and the tendency to do evil in general have never stopped telling their same stories over different times and places. Perhaps Freud expressed his ultimate scepticism about human nature when he said that

[t]he element of truth behind all this, which people are so ready to disavow, is that men are not gentle, friendly creatures who want to be loved, and who at the most can defend themselves if they are attacked; they are, on the contrary, creatures among whose instinctual endowments is to be reckoned a powerful share of aggressiveness. As a result, their neighbour is for them not only a potential helper or sexual object, but also someone who tempts them to satisfy their aggressiveness on him, to exploit his capacity for work without compensation, to use him sexually without consent, to seize his possessions, to humiliate him, to cause him pain, to torture and kill him. *Homo homini lupus*. (Man is a wolf to man).¹⁸

This evidences the evil part of the nature of human beings who might look for the smallest chance to perform these repressed attitudes without bearing in mind the faintest idea of describing their actions as evil ones. They may cover and rationalise them under justifications like superiority, civilising the uncivilised and maintaining peace through violence. While the end seems beautiful regardless of the means used, the ultimate satisfaction that emerges out of these “noble” feelings pushes us to consider also the dark side of those actions. In other words, there are many beautiful fake assumptions that are evil in purpose and nature.

¹⁸ Sigmund Freud, *Civilization and Its Discontents* (1930), trans. and ed. James Strachey, (Reprinted, New York: W. W. Norton & Company Inc., 1962), p. 58.

While we see in the previous discussion that the dark destructive instincts are discharged properly outside affecting the others, they might be directed at the self as well. When the destination of destruction is the self, we can start talking about the battle within. What interests us here is the way self-destruction takes place. The fact of taking the risk of putting oneself in a potentially dangerous place or doing actions that will have terrible consequences in the future deserves to be investigated. If we take the example of *Heart of Darkness* and *The Emperor Jones*, we find that though the destructive instincts were displaced on the natives, they rebounded later on the self. Perhaps both of the major characters wanted to avenge the society whose memory they were tortured with. Brutus Jones was oppressed because he was seen among the dregs of a humanity who cheats, kills and perhaps is despised because of his black skin while Kurtz was overestimated and bore the whole burden of Europe though he was not rich enough. In short, both of them were put under the spotlight in which they felt uneasy and hoped for another unknown place where they could exert their inner wishes. Because of the effect of society they are determined to behave not in accordance with its rule and requirements but with a radical opposition. Perhaps if they were not too much regarded or despised by the society, the sad results of their destruction would have been avoided from the very beginning. In case they had such destructive forces within, the explosion would not have been so big in their natural environment as compared to somewhere else where the superego is completely absent and worst of all, they become its incarnation.

Since the destruction instinct can be directed both inward and outward, in an exotic situation, where the need to maintain life prevails, a person releases it on the outer world so as to protect the inner one. Hostility in this respect is nothing more than a defence mechanism that strives to present a better image of the self. It is for the sake of their lives not for the sake of destruction in itself. Accordingly, their life assertion is fortified especially when the process of discharge is successful. But why do they need such an action to affirm their existence? Undeniably, despite their temporary high status in the world they established far away from their home, the traits of the past follow them wherever they escape.

Though interaction with the natives is needed so as to exercise personal power, establishing barriers with the outer world is highly crucial for the preservation of the aura of divinity. The supposed element of distinction from the other's world, civilisation, makes them believe that they are not like the rest. Since they do not need to be like them they have to be away from them. Hence, isolation becomes another defence mechanism that serves to protect the outside threats from even approaching Jones and Kurtz. They are kept away from them both psychologically and physically.

As discussed before, the natives are put in an inferior state and distanced from their superior rulers and this created a psychological gap between them. This was furthered by the very components of the civilisation that its apostles preached about. Among the means that certified the detachment between those rulers and natives are language, intelligence and even clothes. As intelligence is meant to exploit the naivety of the blacks in the two works, language and clothes are means to dazzle them with their exotic and unique features. Jones, in a Napoleon-like fashion, "*wears a light blue uniform coat, sprayed with brass buttons, heavy gold chevrons on his shoulders, gold braid on the collar, cuffs, etc. His pants are bright red with a light blue stripe down the side. Patent leather laced boots with bass spurs, and a belt ...*" (TEJ 175) He is quite different from the natives who appear in the last scene "*in different degrees of rag-concealed nakedness.*" (TEJ 202) It is the same with Kurtz who is presented in European clothes as compared to his natives' "primitive" way of dressing. This is just one part of the apparent side of their difference and distance from the others. Jones and Kurtz also introduce a new language and impose their views using their "cunning intelligence" over the "inferior" natives. Hence, the latter are put in a lower position and need to start over in order to reach this superior level by their attempt to master the language, dress in a similar fashion and develop a kind of similar intelligence.

There are other means that guarantee their establishment as supernatural beings and warrant their isolation from the rest of the people. Physically speaking they used what helped them to create their myths to keep the natives away once they are about to approach the truth and when they experience what we can call their self-deception. Since they made themselves in the status of godlike despots, they lived in their own sky far from the rest of the people. Both of the lodges of Kurtz and Jones are not easily

reached because they are built far from the natives' villages. The palace of Jones as it appears in the first scene is "*situated on high ground for beyond the portico nothing can be seen but a vista of distant hills...*" (TEJ 173) Meanwhile, Kurtz's house stands so far that Marlow needs binoculars to see it. It is surrounded with "ornamental" skulls to ensure that the natives remain far from it. Both of them were isolated in order to serve many goals among which creating the same distance that I argued above and entertaining themselves with their pretentious notions of superiority. So we can see that their actions are only acts of self-fulfilment so as not to look inside and discover what emerges later in shapes of primitiveness and fear.

3.2. Alienation

It is noticeable that since Jones and Kurtz have been trying to avoid these conceptions about the self, a fierce struggle was taking place within. The traits of this struggle are manifested in a kind of not fully expressed anxiety. When a person is anxious about something, most of the time we cannot see the source of the danger in his normal situations. Perhaps these moments of stability are the greatest moments of psychic achievement since his efforts to avoid what he might fight with and cause his pains are quite effective. Nonetheless, the question here is how long will they last? If the measures taken by a person are considered infallible, what guarantees that the interference of an outside world, ignorant of the dilemma of this person, will not bring it down? What ensures the strength of the ego against the eruption of the undesirable unconscious?

What can be deduced from the contexts of Kurtz and Jones, as discussed in the first chapter, is that nothing can stand still forever. Accordingly, their defence mechanisms are temporary solutions for hiding the inner dilemmas that are in constant change in accordance with the outer world. The next level of self-discovery brings with it the futile attempts of the measures taken by the ego. If we take a closer look we find that they were built at the expense of some people who were pushed to revere and even deify these characters. The group here helps them to externalise their views of the

world making them concerned with its truth rather than that with themselves. Nonetheless, the inevitability of looking inward starts when they are alienated and put amidst those who do not show them the importance they wanted to be recognised with. In order to discover the dark corners of the self, the individual has to be torn from the fake ground that nourished his conception and put alone. Once the group, which filled and gave purpose to these characters, dissolves, they face an unprecedented emptiness which they never tried to explore. Thus, the second stage of discovery consists of the way Jones and Kurtz are pushed into alienation, willingly or not, from their established world so as to face the reality of the self.

The situation seems different in *The Emperor Jones* compared to *Heart of Darkness* because the natives did not attack Kurtz while they did so to Jones. They revered Kurtz and did not want him to be taken away from them. In other words his methods of deification were stronger than those of Jones who established the whole plan on a single silver bullet. This means that Kurtz made a wider gap between him and the natives which they could not bridge as easily as they did with Jones who was dethroned after two years. Here we can suggest that only time prevented rebellion from taking place during Kurtz's days as a ruler. Probably he would have experienced the same situation as Jones if the natives had been able to decode the safety measures he enslaved them with.

Despite the different circumstances that were separated by time and strength, they found themselves in a state of alienation. In fact they felt the end approaching them steadily but they could not tear themselves from the benefits of self-satisfaction. Jones knows that the game will not be played for long: "Oh, I'se good for six months yit 'fore dey gits sick o' my game. Den, when I sees trouble comin', I makes my getaway." (*TEJ* 180) "When I knows de game's up I kisses it good-by widout no long waits." (*TEJ* 182) Even Kurtz considered this kind of resignation as the Harlequin tells Marlow that Kurtz

hated all this, and somehow he couldn't get away. When I had a chance I begged him to try and leave while there was time; I offered to go back with him. And he would say yes, and then he would remain; go off on another ivory hunt; disappear for weeks; forget himself among these people. (*HD* 81)

Though Jones expresses his willingness to leave that game, Kurtz shows us the truth that it cannot be abandoned so easily. This “job” obsessed them and they could not run away from it because if they did, they would have nothing to live with. Still, they were forced to end all of this and to be alone with no one to exercise their powers on. This kind of alienation is quite different from the one in which they were “forgetting themselves” and travel in the woods voluntarily. As discussed before they wanted to be near and far at the same time. By his own will, Jones underwent this alienation because the natives had bridged the gap he established and they started to rebel under the leadership of Lem, while Kurtz entered this state, unwillingly, when he was taken by Marlow and his crew in an attempt to save his life.

A very important point needs to be clarified in the journey within Jones and Kurtz. Here we need to compare Jones when he ran from the natives to that when Kurtz wanted to escape from the rescuing crew. Apparently they both headed towards the jungle in their attempts to escape from the present events only to step on the fact of their inability to escape from their inner selves. They found themselves on the threshold of self-discovery at the gates of the jungle. With its dead silence and pitch darkness, it serves as the common denominator of their alienation. Before finding themselves in such a situation, the group deafened these characters with its constant din and prevented them from listening to their inner voices. Thus, the silence of the jungle pushes them to listen to the meanings of their empty insides and speak to their corrupted selves. Its darkness gives them the opportunity to look within their souls so as to find a possible beam of light. As truth is usually symbolised by the white colour or an echoing word, the jungle is the most appropriate place to find that light or voice since these can only appear in the heart of silent darkness not in the dazzling din of their own established worlds.

3.3. Confrontation

As discussed before, there is a relationship between literary structures in which texts intersect and give a new meaning according to the concept of intertextuality. This

was also dealt with by Harold Bloom's notion of *tessera* in which he discussed the antithetical completion. In this case we consider this stage as the most important part of the study of this chapter in which the most prominent differences between the two works come to the surface. In fact, we can assume that O'Neill continued, clarified, or in other words externalised what Conrad vaguely interiorized in his work. In fact here we obtain another dimension of the mysterious struggle and inner confrontation of Kurtz through the experience of Jones in the jungle. What makes *The Emperor Jones* remarkable, at this stage, is its manifestation of the untold story in *Heart of Darkness*.

We have seen that once the characters are put alone, they start to move away from the outer world to the inner one. The wilderness

had whispered to [them] things about [themselves] which [they] did not know, things of which [they] had no conception till [they] took counsel with this great solitude – and the whisper had proved irresistibly fascinating. It echoed loudly within [them] because [they] are hollow at the core. (*HD* 83)

In this utter solitude, the previous processes of the ego become futile. Actually, they were based mostly on the establishment of the stability of personality via the recognition of the others. Safety measures like civilisation and its requirements represented some defence mechanisms like rationalisation, sublimation, displacement and projection. All of these are to be applied on certain people and their reflection is what soothes one's self esteem and fulfilment. Nevertheless, once alone, no lies can work since there is no one to lie to, no power to cover the self since there is none to oppress nor havens or shelters to hide the trivial conception of the self and the world. In their states of alienation, the three parts of Freud's structural model of the psyche, the id, the ego and superego, become neutralised. There is no one to apply the demands of the id on and no one to fear in the outside world. In this nothingness, the silhouette of the self begins to appear clutching the unbearable truth that was once buried in their unconscious mind by different defence mechanisms.

I have mentioned before that *The Emperor Jones* acquired such a reputation because of the use of expressionism. Unlike the impressionistic aspect of Conrad's narrative, it gives a better look at the inner happenings. While Kurtz summed up his bitter experience in the painful words of "The horror! The horror!" without giving any

sign of their cause, Jones did not judge his journey because in the end he could not utter any more words. However, unlike Conrad, O'Neill shows us his speculation about the cause. This is indeed what leads us to say that these two characters are complementary. Actually, we only touch the peel of Kurtz's deterioration, and see how "he struggled with himself" (*HD* 95) from outside. But for Brutus Jones, we grasp both the peel and the core and see him from two different sides. He is thrown into a dream-like world to face his self where moments of the past "come back ... in the shape of an unrestful and noisy dream." (*HD* 48) At this moment we need to compare the play to the novella bearing in mind that the interpretation of the concrete proved its multiplicity in *The Emperor Jones* let alone that of the abstraction in *Heart of Darkness*.¹⁹ However, the relation between the two works can be further considered according to the quite similar situations which Kurtz and Jones find themselves in by the end of their journeys.

My argument about the similarity between the unrevealed inner struggle of Kurtz and that of Jones comes out from the very understanding of expressionism. O'Neill used it so as to "physicalise" the emotional and abstract inner side of his Brutus Jones on the stage. In other words, he externalised what only Jones abstractly undertakes in that dream-like atmosphere. Since the playwright was concerned only with the visions of his protagonist throughout six scenes surely he did not focus on the outside physical movement. What we perceive of his running into the forest is nothing more than another expressionistic aspect in the play. This means that the physical movement in the play is only an exteriorisation of the movement from one psychological encounter to another. Accordingly, I have to point to the alternative reading focusing on the fact that Jones has never gone into the forest physically but only psychologically. He could not penetrate the forest and what we have perceived of this movement is just like a journey inside the dream of a person who is still lying on the ground. He moved inside but did not take a step outside. If we have, for example, another character in the play

¹⁹ At this moment, I am trying to read Conrad's work from the perspective of the play of O'Neill. In fact, we should bear in mind that even *The Emperor Jones*, which was primarily watched and used physical movements and conceived to be easier, was read from different perspectives like in Julia A. Walker, *Expressionism and Modernism in American Theatre: Bodies, Voices, Words*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), p. 125-137. It might require a longer discussion if we try to link the "few" readings of the play to those "numerous" readings of the novella.

witnessing Jones' attempts to escape, he would tell us just what Marlow has conceived of the futile attempt of Kurtz to run into the forest:

'I kept to the track though – then stopped to listen. The night was very clear; a dark blue space, sparkling with dew and starlight, in which black things stood very still. I thought I could see a kind of motion ahead of me. I was strangely cocksure of everything that night. I actually left the track and ran in a wide semicircle (I verily believe chuckling to myself) so as to get in front of that stir, of that motion I had seen – if indeed I had seen anything. I was circumventing Kurtz as though it had been a boyish game.

'I came upon him, and, if he had not heard me coming, I would have fallen over him, too, but he got up in time. He rose, unsteady, long, pale, indistinct, like a vapour exhaled by the earth, and swayed slightly, misty and silent before me... (HD 93)

This can evidence the similarity between the play and the novella especially at this point of confrontation. The words of Kurtz later fill the inability of Jones to judge his life and the actions of Jones give glimpses of what might have happened to the deductive Kurtz.

Amazingly, there is a common image in both *The Emperor Jones* and *Heart of Darkness* at the final moments of Kurtz and Jones in the forest. We know that the novella takes place in the Congo and Marlow grabbed Kurtz and returned him to his steamer near the Congo River. What he spotted, as if Marlow interfered momentarily with the introspective journey of Kurtz, was a "black figure stood up, strode on long black legs, waving long black arms, across the glow. It had horns – antelope horns ... on its head. Some sorcerer, some witch-man, no doubt: it looked fiendlike enough." (HD 94) This encounter has much affinity with the seventh scene of the play in which Jones, as if he had travelled in time and space, found himself on the banks of the Congo River where

the figure of the CONGO WITCH DOCTOR appears. He is wizened and old, naked except for the fur of some small animal tied about his waist ... His body is stained all over a bright red. Antelope horns are on each side of his head, branching upward. In one hand he carries a bone rattle, in the other a charm stick with a bunch of white cockatoo feathers tied to the end. A great number of glass beads and bone ornaments are about his neck, ears, wrists, and ankles ... he begins to dance and to chant. (TEJ 200)

I only need to point here that unlike Jones who declined shortly after the confrontation in the Great Forest, Kurtz would have experienced a series of confrontations since he

did not fall at the footsteps of the jungle but continued to take his battle within even inside the steamer's solitude which provided him with the possibility to dig up the bones of darkness.

Other elements culminate to strengthen the similarity of conflict foreshadowing their conclave with their inner selves. During these great moments of confrontation, the throbs of drums never ceased beating in both works. They are "regular and muffled like the beating of a heart" (*HD* 105) "*corresponding to normal pulse beat – 72 to the minute.*" (*TEJ* 184) Furthermore, O'Neill's six scenes of confrontation carry with them the tone of the vague words of Conrad. Marlow looks into the forest which he has just torn Kurtz from and wonders: "I tried to break the spell—the heavy, mute spell of the wilderness—that seemed to draw him to its pitiless breast by the awakening of forgotten and brutal instincts, by the memory of gratified and monstrous passions." (*HD* 94-5) This makes us describe Kurtz's inner journey as regressive as that of Jones who "live[ed] his life again in every detail of desire, temptation, and surrender during that supreme moment of complete knowledge ..." (*HD* 99-100)

This movement backward in time and place is not fully described in *Heart of Darkness* as in *The Emperor Jones*. But before linking these actions together, we need first to deal with regression from different sides. In psychoanalysis Freud considered it as a defence mechanism: "in all probability this regression, wherever it may occur, is an effect of a *resistance* opposing the progress of a thought into consciousness along the normal path ..." ²⁰ Accordingly, it can be considered as a fall into a dark pit of nothingness once a person is put alone and starts to ruminate about his past or as a defence mechanism in which he digs in the past memories in an attempt to find a basis for a new belief. However, the more they dig the more they find nothing to grasp and worst of all, what they find contributes further in their bitter discovery. A character might dig in his personal memory or even falls deeper and breaks the barrier of time to find himself in front of the truth of his racial memory excavating primal images. This is what Carl Gustav Jung called the "collective unconscious" in which the

²⁰ Sigmund Freud, *The interpretation of Dreams* (1900a) parts I and II. SE, 4–5. (pp. 547–548). Cited in Martine Myquel, "Regression" in Allain de Mijolla (ed.), *International Dictionary of Psychoanalysis*, op. cit., p. 1459. (Emphasis mine)

personal unconscious rests upon a deeper layer, which does not derive from personal experience and is not a personal acquisition but is inborn ... universal ... [and] more or less the same everywhere and in all individuals. It is ... identical in all men and thus constitutes a common psychic substrate of a suprapersonal nature which is present in every one of us.²¹

Though the term “collective unconscious” was introduced in the twentieth century, it echoed the anthropological dilemma of the Victorian Age. It is worth mentioning that this notion of degeneration was hotly debated after the Darwinian theory of evolution. Western civilisation then was confronted to the duality of progress since it did not mean only movement forward but also backward. As many images of history accounted for the behaviour of many civilised “civilising” missions, “advance or atavism remained equal possibilities.”²² None could escape the truth that “man’s capacities of degradation stand in close relation and are proportionate, to his capacities of improvement.”²³

Different attempts to deal with retrogression, as in *Heart of Darkness*, scratched only the peel of this reality depicting the external fall rather than giving possible explanations to its reasons. It was commonly conceived that a deeper contact with the “primitives” would hide the skin of the civilised people and make them retrograde into “less evolved” states. So how would a person like Kurtz, and to a lesser extent Jones, who stood as the epitome of culture and the quintessence of civilisation, come to such states? As mentioned before, once being alienated from a world built on fragile bases of single minded definitions, they “struggle with themselves” in a battle of survival where none interrupts its process. Since I have argued that Jones presented to us a similar kind of the inner struggle of Kurtz, their confrontation with the inner sides followed three stages.

²¹ Carl Gustav Jung, *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious* (1934), trans. R. F. C. Hull (Reprinted, New York: Bollingen Foundation INC. 1990), p. 3-4. http://books.google.dz/books?id=Yc5PIU9MyDwC&printsec=frontcover&hl=fr&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false, (Accessed on July 15th, 2012)

²² John W. Griffith, *Joseph Conrad and the Anthropological Dilemma: ‘Bewildered Traveller’*, op. cit., p. 99.

²³ George Douglas Campbell, *Primeval Man: An Examination of Some Recent Speculations* (London: Straham & Co., 1869), p. 192. Cited in John W. Griffith, *Joseph Conrad and the Anthropological Dilemma: ‘Bewildered Traveller’*, op. cit., p. 8.

The pre-established confidence about the self begins to crumble at the doors of the forest. This starts with the first injections of doubt, of unidentified feelings, or what O'Neill presents to us, as "little formless fears." The playwright wants to give us a situation with a small proportion of fear to test the psychological state of his character. If this explains anything, we find that O'Neill stresses the precarious situation of anxiety that I dealt with before in which Jones and even Kurtz strive to avoid by different defence mechanisms. Their discovery of the self develops gradually. In the beginning, they do not identify the inner reality but they feel its veiled bitterness. O'Neill tried to "physicalise" this feeling in

the LITTLE FORMLESS FEARS [which] creep out from the deeper blackness of the forest. They are black, shapeless, only their little glittering little eyes can be seen. If they have any describable form at all it is that of grubworm about the size of a creeping child. They move noiselessly, but with deliberate, painful effort, striving to raise themselves on end, failing and sinking prone again. (TEJ 189)

What causes the inability of these little formless fears to stand properly and to personify the reality of Jones is the vestige of resistance that the Emperor still has. These fears could not tell their names but they whispered the reality of their existence to their suppressor. They opened the first gate to other buried traumas. Now we know that he has struggled with the unknown because the ego has always covered these disturbing things under various defence mechanisms. When Jones tries to kill them because of sheer fear, he reveals that there is something wrong inside him.

When Jones shot those "little formless fears" he did not frighten them but, as a dreamer, was on the verge of waking up. Nevertheless, he is unable to escape that inner journey and returns deeper into that psychological discovery. The third and fourth scenes deal with the bitter memories that pushed him to escape from his past life. In other words, the formless fears start to take the shape of his personal memory. He first meets the apparition of one of his old companions, Jeff, whom he killed in an affray because of a dice game and whom he shoots now for no obvious reasons. Later, he finds himself amidst black prisoners and then he is lashed by a white prison guard

whom he kills at once as he did in the past. In fact he is entrapped within traumas rather than fears since these experiences are not only remembered but relived.²⁴

O'Neill here gives us a full account of the most difficult moments in Jones' life. Within a few hours, the Emperor finds himself struggling with the bitter realities of his past. In the morning of that day he bragged about his importance and free will but now he confronts the old truth of being nothing more than a dreg of society. Consequently, Conrad's Kurtz does not necessarily find himself struggling with people like Jeff or the white prison guard but the idea of reliving the past bitter experiences is what concerns us more. Jones and Kurtz might have dug further in their personal memories in an attempt to find true bases for their established self. Unfortunately for them, they encountered only what they once ascribed to the people they ruled. They considered them as savages and ignorant and this is exactly what they were in the past and present but they failed to see it.

When we take the concrete example of Jones in regard to his regressive movement we feel the heavy weight of his inner struggle. Now the sun is too much for him and he runs deeper inside the self looking for a spot of shade. Accordingly, regression is an inevitable movement inward and, as Freud considered it, a defence mechanism by which the person summons up former stages of development in order to avoid a certain situation. However, according to the formula of O'Neill, when this person finds nothing to hold up with he might drown further into racial memory. Jones undertakes primordial experiences that he never witnessed from the fifth to the seventh scene. He finds himself in an auction where he was going to be sold, in a ship along with black slaves and then in front of a witch-doctor and a crocodile god. This indicates that the energies of his collective unconscious are unveiled to his conscious system. When Jones was running away from a painful memory, he was confronted with another one more painful and more severe than the previous one. He reaches the end and retrogrades to the furthest point where "*he lies with his face to the ground, his arms outstretched, whimpering with fear*" (TEJ 202) without uttering a word. What

²⁴ Radmila Nastić, "Eugene O'Neill Reconsidered: Trauma and the Tragic in *The Emperor Jones*" (2011), <http://www.eoneill.com/library/laconics/6/6b.htm>, (Accessed on January 8th, 2012)

lies in front of him made him forget to ask his proud question “Is you civilized, or is you like dese ign’rent black niggers heah?” (*TEJ* 193) He faces the inner primitiveness that shakes off the bases of his supposed civilisation.

This is what we could not find in Kurtz and this is why Jones serves to explain his inner struggle because we know that “the mind of man is capable of anything – because everything is in it, all the past as well as all the future.” (*HD* 52) If one might wonder that the European ancestors of Kurtz have different customs and history compared to those of Jones, we should not forget that even the whites have their own dark and primitive practices like druidism. As W. Armistead concludes

Were it not so indubitably recorded on the page of history, we should hardly be willing to believe that here was a time when our ancestors, the ancient Britons, went nearly without clothing, painted their bodies in fantastic fashion, offered up human victims to uncouth idols, and lived in hollow trees, or rude habitations, which we would now consider unfit for cattle.²⁵

In case of establishing the whole bases of superiority on the disgust of conceived savagery and primitiveness, these two supreme rulers face the fact that the gap between them and what they abominate is very narrow. They fall under the weight of this reality looking for the dispersed shards of their pre-established self-image. The upright confidence of man who carried the pride of civilisation disintegrated revealing his primitiveness and helplessness.

3.4. Confession

At last, Jones and Kurtz reach the end of their inner journey. They have experienced the bitter realities that they have avoided ever since both consciously and unconsciously. After looking into their own eyes, they no longer become the same people they used to be in their high times. In all cases, though this stage of confession converges and diverges in methods in the two works, this makes the two characters

²⁵ W. Armistead, *A Tribute to the Negro: Being a Vindication of Moral, Intellectual, and Religious Capabilities of the Coloured Portion of Mankind* (Manchester: William Irwin, 1884), p. 31-2. Cited in John W. Griffith, *Joseph Conrad and the Anthropological Dilemma: ‘Bewildered Traveller’*, op. cit., p. 113.

complementary giving us different views of the same fact. They lose the battle of resistance and become exhausted both physically and psychologically. The previous reading of Kurtz's defence mechanisms, alienation and especially confrontation are based on Jones who escorts us all over these stages. However, this moment of truth is clarified better by the mysterious confession of Kurtz who stands up and summarises the whole bitter experience.

After the decline of all defence mechanisms, they discover the germs of corruption, savagery and primitiveness inside them. In addition, they face the fact of the futility of their past procedures to hold their seats high in the sky. All the defensive measures they undertook were not intended only to prevent the natives from finding the truth about them but mainly to prevent Jones and Kurtz from looking inside their selves. Furthermore, what they abhorred and exploited in those people was present within them as well. Only they defined the break out of their residual primitivism and savagery with ornamented rhetoric. However, as Theodor Waitz wrote,

[t]he civilized European is accustomed to look so much down upon the so-called savage that he deems it an insult to be compared with him; and yet, even in the midst of civilization we find traces of customs, manners, and modes of thinking which, like the relapse of man into a savage state, prove their intimate connection.²⁶

Therefore, the worlds they established on the basis of "philanthropic" intentions were only lies in attempts of running from the harsh truth that "civilization is a disease produced by the practice of building societies with rotten materials."²⁷

They hoped to establish their own myths but they failed in the end. While this cannot be seen with Kurtz because as I said before the gap between him and his subjects was big enough to prevent rebellion, Jones is a prototype of this since he has witnessed the end of his deception. He killed himself with his silver bullet the day he said that only the silver bullet could kill him. Ironically, what becomes a mystical

²⁶ Theodor Waitz, *Introduction to Anthropology*, trans. J. Frederick Collingwood, 2 Vols. (London: Longman, 1863), i. p. 306. Cited in John W. Griffith, *Joseph Conrad and the Anthropological Dilemma: 'Bewildered Traveller'*, op. cit., p. 121.

²⁷ George Bernard Shaw, *Man and Superman: A Comedy of Philosophy* (1903) (Reprinted, London: Penguin, 1957), p. 262. Cited in John W. Griffith, *Joseph Conrad and the Anthropological Dilemma: 'Bewildered Traveller'*, op. cit., p. 100.

power for the domination of the natives turned to be only amulets for the myth founders. They allow no one to approach them, for example, Jones' rejection of Smithers' request "on'y I ain't 'lowin' nary body to touch dis baby. She's my rabbit's foot." (*TEJ* 180) As they believe strongly in their usefulness, they became in a sense even more superstitious than the natives. Once standing on the bitterness of this reality, the rulers became aware of their simplicity and imperfection. What they were exercising during their thought of infallibility was to be done over them in the same fashion. Still, being a godlike person does not mean being god himself. Because of their flaws, the natives could differentiate between the two. All in all, the seeds of destruction were found inside their very definitions of strength.

Amidst the whirlpools of these discoveries, Jones and Kurtz confess their inner truths in several ways. Ironically, what conveyed their confessions is the weak presence of language. They feebly uttered the nature of truth they found about the modern world and the self. By the end of his journey, Jones "*cries out in a fierce, exhausted spasm of anguished pleading*" (*TEJ* 202); while Kurtz cries in a whisper "a cry that was no more than a breath – 'The horror! The horror!'" (*HD* 100) Since language is associated with their power, figuratively, their loss of language is another way of their loss of power. They lose their language as a result of the heavy weight of truth. Jones could not speak at all while Kurtz did it with remarkable efforts not to show everything but only to sum it up. Shortly after this statement he dies leaving so big questions to be asked about his cathartical knowledge of the self which we may have found in O'Neill's work.

O'Neill and Conrad depict the weak physical states of these characters in which they are unable to stand and resist any more. Both of them were healthy before the beginning of their journeys. Jones appears in the first scene as a "*tall, powerfully-built, full-blooded negro of middle age...*" (*TEJ* 175) From the other side, though we do not have the physical description of Kurtz before the beginning of his journey, surely it was not as bad as we encounter him later. His envied achievements would have never been done if he was not healthy. After that adventure, they no longer remain the same. The weight of truth deprived them of the ability to move; Jones cries for mercy and then "*lies with his face to the ground, his arms outstretched, whimpering with fear...*"

(TEJ 202) In the same way, Kurtz was only escorted by Marlow to a couch in the cabin of the steamer where he was unable to move. Actually, their physical weakness is just an exteriorization of their inner psychic deterioration. The latter was shown also with the disintegration of some emblems of civilisation. While we cannot find this in Kurtz's silence, we see it in Jones' clothes. Undeniably those clothes indicate the apparent side of civilisation and their abandonment blurs the division between the primitive and civilised people and accounts for reversion. Thus, even if Kurtz does not tell us about the atavism of what he deems as primitive and uncivilised, the clothes of Jones confess this symbolically.

4. Conclusion

This chapter has dealt with the psychological happenings of Kurtz and Jones in order to see how they fell from the peak of supreme god-like kings to the pit of helpless animal-like beings. We found that the inner truths of Kurtz and Jones are better defined when we read *Heart of Darkness* through the eyes of *The Emperor Jones* and vice versa. The inner dilemmas of these characters appear as a result of this kind of reading. This is exactly what we mean by the opening of another dimension of meaning since we cease to read the play and the novella for their own sakes but in relation to each other. Because of this, we consider Jones as a perfectionist who, despite his different motives and aspirations, behaves in the same way as Kurtz. At the same time, Kurtz takes the same introspective journey as Jones who retrogrades slowly because of the decline of his defence mechanisms from a precarious anxious state, to face his personal fears and finally finds himself confronted with his "collective unconscious" and racial memories. By the end of their inner journeys, Kurtz and Jones surrender to the painful truths they strove to avoid but the former succeeds in judging that experience unlike the latter. However, we cannot say that their destructive realisation was only the result of the discovery of shocking primitiveness, corruption and atavistic fear but also of the futility of their perception of the values of modern

man who sacrificed the integrity of his self, as shown in the first chapter, so as to please his personal satisfaction.

While discussing this resemblance between those two characters, other similarities come out to support our suggestions further. Whether a result of conscious influence or not, the notion of intertextuality proved its existence in O'Neill's play. The texts intersected in themes as well as in different motifs and images like darkness, the natives, perfectionist and despotic rulers, the faraway lands that embraced those two displaced characters, the dream-like atmospheres, and the drums among others.

Because of the presence of such connections between the two works, while we experience the last stage of Kurtz's inner journey in the jungle, we better witness the previous stages of defence mechanisms, alienation and confrontation with Jones. We accompany him where we do not fully meet Kurtz and we accompany Kurtz where we do not fully find Jones as if O'Neill was filling the gaps that Conrad had left in *Heart of Darkness* while Conrad was reacting in response to O'Neill and his play. This very circumstance responds to Mikhail Bakhtin's "dialogism" where we find, in this study, that O'Neill's play as a word answered Conrad's novella while even the word of past finds itself changing the meaning of the present; Julia Kristeva's conception of intertextuality by which we deduce that *The Emperor Jones* as a text was a reading of *Heart of Darkness* while the novella provided the American playwright with colourful quotations for his mosaic; and finally to Harold Bloom's postulate of antithetical completion which leads us to say that O'Neill antithetically completes Conrad as if the British writer could not go far enough.

Undeniably Conrad's influence on O'Neill as well as on other artists is deep. Since we pinpointed such affinity between these two influential writers in *The Emperor Jones* and *Heart of Darkness*, we can suggest that perhaps there are other works which might contain such similar connections. Accordingly, this research will try to find other intertextual elements so as to broaden the scope of understanding of both Conrad and O'Neill and thus approaching the notion of literary creation from different angles.

Chapter Three

"To-morrow" and *The Iceman Cometh*: A painful
True Self underneath "Hope"

1. Introduction

If we look closer at the works of Eugene O'Neill we find that Joseph Conrad has spread his influence over a number of the American playwright's works. Trying to trace the hidden links between these two writers, this last chapter focuses on the presence of the British writer's short story "To-morrow"¹ in one of O'Neill's masterpieces: *The Iceman Cometh*. Since we suggest here that the works of the American playwright came in "response" to Conrad's, we shall try to expose a new dimension of meaning and, accordingly, a wider perspective to the play and the short story which emerges as a result of the interaction between them.

After Eugene O'Neill received his Nobel Prize for literature in 1936, not a single play was produced over the next ten years. Many thought that the prize had crowned and ended his career. However, this strange interlude was broken by the production of *The Iceman Cometh* that was written in 1939 but produced in 1946. His coming back to the theatre with this play was not paved with roses. Though the play was acknowledged by some critics, a lot of responses disfavoured it because of its length, repetition, absence of plot in the traditional sense, disappointing climax, parody, closeness to a novel than to a play, and various other responses.² Perhaps one of the harshest receptions was by Sterling North in the *New York Post* who saw the play as a failure since its "action draggeth, dialogue reeketh, play stinketh" and wondered how it was published or even produced.³ Though the previous criticism never diminished his value that much, a revival of the play in 1956, after O'Neill's death, brought him back his high position as America's greatest dramatist. It was run for 565 performances breaking all the records as the longest run of any of O'Neill's plays. Wolcott Gibbs in the *New Yorker*, who himself considered the play as inferior to O'Neill's oeuvre in

¹ Joseph Conrad, "To-morrow" (1903) in *The Works of Joseph Conrad: Typhoon and Other Stories* (Reprinted, London: William Heinemann, 1921) Hereafter, all references to this work will be cited in the discussion as (T).

² I tried to reflect the general mood of O'Neill's play reception by the adoption the words that were used in the judgments of the play from the part entitled "Individual Plays" in Jordan Y. Miller, *Eugene O'Neill and the American Critic: A Summary and Bibliographical Checklist* (London: Archon Books, 1962) This part contains several critical views of most of Eugene O'Neill's plays.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 365.

1946,⁴ sees its revival “better appreciated than the original because its great length is expected and not a hindrance. All modern tragedies seem like soap operas compared with this.”⁵ Actually, this change in the tone of reception had been anticipated by O’Neill who said:

A New York audience could neither see nor hear its meaning. The pity and tragedy of defensive pipe dreams would be deemed downright unpatriotic ... But after the war is over ... [the] American audiences will understand a lot of *The Iceman Cometh* only too well.⁶

While *The Iceman Cometh* defines O’Neill’s status in the world of literature, Conrad’s “To-morrow” is considered a minor work compared to his masterpieces. This compact short story has not received much literary criticism and appreciation. It was promptly judged with simplicity in themes and techniques because of the restrictive standards of the publishing house.⁷ Furthermore, Jocelyn Baines underrates it and argues that it “is not one of Conrad’s most impressive short stories and there is something gratuitously unpleasant in a madman and a blind old tyrant being the cause of Bessie Carvil’s tragedy. It has in fact a rather un-Conradian flavour ...”⁸ In spite of all these views, other critics, like Owen Knowels and Moore M. Gene consider it “an unjustly neglected tale.”⁹ We should point also that the short story is among the fewest attempts of Conrad to turn to stage. It emerged on the stage under the title *One Day More* but, unfortunately, it did not enjoy a lot of success. However, Max Beerhom

⁴ Ibid., p. 368. He said “[the] central theme of illusion [is] very ordinary; ambiguity about ending shows O’Neill not the craftsman he should be. Not up to his best.”

⁵ Ibid., p. 373-4.

⁶ Eugene O’Neill, quoted in Travis Bogard, *Contour in Time: The Plays of Eugene O’Neill*, op cit., <http://www.eoneill.com/library/contour/mirror/iceman.htm>, (Accessed on September 20th, 2012)

⁷ Gail Fraser argues that Conrad’s short story sought to meet the standards of the Pall Mall Magazine, Conrad’s publishing house, and this led to the restriction of the development of his characters. Gail Fraser, “**The Short Fiction**”, in J. H Stape (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Joseph Conrad*, op. cit., p. 34.

⁸ What pushed Jocelyn Baines to say that was due to Conrad’s letter to Ford Madox Ford. Conrad wrote: “To-morrow” is “all your suggestion and absolutely my conception.” Jocelyn Baines, *Joseph Conrad: A Critical Biography* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1959), p. 269. Cited in Richard J. Hand, *The Theatre of Joseph Conrad: Reconstructed Fictions* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), p. 20.

⁹ Owen Knowels and Moore M. Gene, *Oxford Reader’s Companion to Conrad* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), p. 413. Cited in Richard J. Hand, *The Theatre of Joseph Conrad: Reconstructed Fictions*, op. cit., p. 21.

appreciates the work of Conrad and sees the problem of the play, as well as the short story since they are almost the same, in the fact that

[t]he play is a tragedy, set in modern times; and that fact alone is, of course, enough to damn it in the eyes of most critics. A man who detects and depicts anything like a tragedy in modern life is instantly by these critics suspected of “morbidness”, and of not thinking that life, generally, is worth living. Of course, the “morbidness” inheres really in these critics themselves, whose taste for life is so slight that they shrink away in horror from any phase of life that is not delicious.¹⁰

It is important to mention that some revivals of the play inside Britain were undertaken by a number of producers. In addition, translations and adaptations in France, Germany and the United States were taking place. The work inspired the Polish opera in Tadeusz Baird’s *Jutro* (To-morrow)¹¹ and even, as I will argue later, the American theatre in O’Neill’s *The Iceman Cometh* and his only published short story “Tomorrow” that took the same title and the main theme of Conrad’s short story.

We need to remember that Conrad’s short story is just one of the roots that helped O’Neill’s play to sprout in the American theatre. As this thesis deals with intertextuality we should hint again to the complex and ambiguous process of thinking and writing and the writer’s conscious and unconscious awareness of the various sources that knit the work together. It seems that a text is inevitably indebted to different texts. This is not surprising since *The Iceman Cometh* is given numerous interpretations and each one corresponds with a specific referential text. As a result, the play can be seen from religious, biographical, and literary dimensions.

Egil Tornqvist refers to the biblical allusion in the play starting from its biblical-like title and ending with the comparison of the play with the Last Supper.¹²

¹⁰ Max Beerbohm, *Around Theatres*, (London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1953), p. 385-6. Cited in Richard J. Hand, *The Theatre of Joseph Conrad: Reconstructed Fictions*, op. cit., p. 50.

¹¹ Moor M. Gene, “Conrad’s Influence”, in J. H. Stape (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Joseph Conrad*, op. cit., p. 224- 5.

¹² The comparison with the Last Supper gives a religious dimension to the play. Egil Tornqvist builds his argument on Cyrus Day’s “The Iceman and the Bridegroom: Some Observations on the Death of O’Neill’s Salesman” in which he links the archaic word “cometh” as it appears in the biblical text “the bridegroom cometh” with the play’s title *The Iceman Cometh*. Accordingly, the saloon resembles the religious feast with its derelicts standing for the twelve disciples. Hickey as a saviour, Don Parritt who is the twelfth on the list is related to Judas Iscariot with his sin of betrayal, the three tarts are compared

Concerning the playwright's context, the play carries the shadowy presence of O'Neill's past and present. His grim vision in the play might reflect, as discussed in the first chapter, the uncertain state of the world and the beginning of the Depression and the Second World War. As an artist, he was deeply affected by those happenings which took him back to the memories of his worst time in the saloons of lower New York in "Jimmy the Priest's" and "The Hell-Hole", their inhabitants and his unstable relationship with his family.¹³ O'Neill's play also spreads its roots in the literary worlds. Its pipe dreamers, who do not want to differentiate between reality and illusions, correspond to their spit images in various sources. They can be found in the universe of William Shakespeare's *Hamlet* whose continuous delay cannot be clearly explained. Whether for psychosexual reasons, cowardice or morality, he avoids the reality of the present by looking for the unknown of tomorrow. This kind of delay, this life-lie, self-deception and self-solace is drawn from many writers and works notably: Henrik Ibsen's *The Wild Duck*, Maxim Gorki's *The Lower Depths*, John Millington Synge's *The Well of the Saints*, and Joseph Conrad's "To-morrow".¹⁴ Furthermore, these numerous threads are painted with his philosophy of life as shaped mostly by Friedrich Nietzsche and August Strindberg.

to the three Marys in addition to the wine and bread (Hope's cake). Egil Tornqvist, *Eugene O'Neill: A Playwright's Theatre* (London: McFarland, 2004), p. 148.

¹³ Barbara Gelb focuses on the setting of the play "1912" which was the year in which O'Neill "hit the bottom" and attempted to commit suicide. She also hints to the alliteration in the name of bar of Harry Hope and its resonance of the real bar: Hell Hole. Barbara Gelb, "O'Neill's 'Iceman' Sprang From the Ashes of His Youth" (1985), <http://www.eoneill.com/library/on/gelbs/times9.29.1985.htm>, (Accessed on September 5th, 2012) Furthermore, Black A. Stephen relates the play to O'Neill's life. He sees "Jimmy Tomorrow [as] a representation of the friend who saved [his] life when he tried to kill himself, and who himself died of suicide the next year. The boy Parritt [as] a version of O'Neill's youthful self ... [and] Hickey represents aspects of Jamie. Between them they enact versions of O'Neill family crimes, guilt and atonement." Black A. Stephen, "'Celebrant of Loss': Eugene O'Neill 1888 – 1953" in Michael Manheim (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Eugene O'Neill*, op. cit., p. 14. On the other hand, Eugene O'Neill may stand for Hickey returning to his old friends and preaching the happiness which he might have never found.

¹⁴ The relationship of these works to *The Iceman Cometh* is dealt with in Peter Egri's seminal article "The Iceman Cometh: European Origins and American Originality". I should clarify here that my way and method in linking Conrad's work to O'Neill's is totally different from his. Peter Egri, "The Iceman Cometh: European Origins and American Originality" (1981), http://www.eoneill.com/library/newsletter/v_3/v-3c.htm, (Accessed on July 17th, 2011) Furthermore, it is not only Peter Egri's article that refers to the influence of "To-morrow" on this play. Other writers like, Richard J. Hand says: "In Captain Hagberd's dream of tomorrow, we find a sentiment to be found in the wretched barflies of the Harry Hope's bar in Eugene O'Neill's *The Iceman Cometh* ..." he refers later to some affinities between these two works. Richard J. Hand, *The Theatre of Joseph Conrad: Reconstructed Fictions*, op. cit., p. 37.

Though this chapter focuses on the interaction between Conrad's short story and O'Neill's play, the previous sources illuminate the notion of intertextuality further. As dealt with above, we can read the play in religious terms because of its interaction with the biblical text or in biographical terms as we detected the meaning of the setting in O'Neill's life. Similarly, the various literary works and their numerous themes allow the play, in case of study, to be read and re-read in relation to the different aspects of those works. All of these sources that are known or unknown by O'Neill, the readers or the critics collide, fall apart and then they are collected together in a different order with the help of the creative touch of O'Neill by which he assembles them in the mosaic masterwork of *The Iceman Cometh*. Each segment tells another story of that pattern whose beauty can also be seen from the perspective of these parts' beauty.

In this case we may see the text as a composition of two layers of meanings: shallow and deep. These two are not meant in the traditional sense. By the term shallow I do not mean what we understand from the work on the surface but the work itself can be seen as a surface even with its own deep meaning. This can be seen as the first level of meaning in which we take isolated texts out of the circle of their textual connection. Once we transcend the "surface" meanings, once we peel off the covers of the first level and move to the second level of meaning of the text that emerges out of its *interaction* with the text(s) it is related to intertextually, we start talking about the deeper meaning of the text. What is used here is a level based on our *readings* that can spot similar points between the apparently different works. Now, we are not concerned only with the interpretation of a single text but also its hidden relations to other texts.

Coming back to the focus of this study, "To-morrow" has many characteristics that differentiate it from *The Iceman Cometh*. In 1903, the short story was written in Britain while the play was written thirty six years later in America. None of these aspects match each other. However, since the two works reflect similar modern psychological problems, a deeper look must be thrown on them in order to define their common grounds. It is not a coincidence that both writers' views converge in one of modern sicknesses since they set their quests to find them.

The pipe dream of the unknown future of tomorrow welds these two works. This illusion was established just to run away from the inner dilemmas of existence and its meaning. Consequently, the aim of this chapter is to identify the reasons and the ways of hiding beneath this veneer notion of “hope”. It will investigate the effect of the revelation of reality and its deep effects on those followers of the universal hollow creed of, using Edward L. Shaughnessy’s term, tomorrowism. But before our plunge in the nothingness of their selves, we have to demonstrate the knots of convergence and even divergence in Conrad’s “To-morrow” and O’Neill’s *The Iceman Cometh*. We need to figure out the similar external symptoms before the suggestion of any internal diagnosis.

2. Establishing Similarities between “To-morrow” and *The Iceman Cometh*

Before going any further in our discussion of the interaction between Conrad’s “To-morrow” and O’Neill’s *The Iceman Cometh*, it is important to expose the analogical pillars on which these works are built. From a cursory glance, what binds these works is only the leitmotif of the pipe dream of tomorrow. It might be argued that the different genres of these works, their reputation and literary value set them further apart. This is not surprising since the critical response to Conrad’s short story is nothing compared to that of O’Neill’s play.

The plots of the two works seem very different from each other. In *The Iceman Cometh*, O’Neill dramatises the psychological dilemma of the characters in Harry Hope’s saloon in four long acts. The first act presents us a big number of characters sharing a number of characteristics. Most of them are lazy drunkards who are waiting for tomorrow in order to take action. Hope, the proprietor of the saloon, assumes that he will go outside after twenty years spent in the bar, Jimmy will get his job back and so will Pat McGloin and Ed Mosher, Willie Oban will be a good lawyer, Joe Mott will reopen his own gambling house, Piet Wetjoen and Cecil Lewis will be welcomed as heroes when they go back home, Chuck Morello and Cora will marry, and Hugo

Kalmar will destroy capitalism. Rocky Pioggy convinces himself that he is a bartender and not a pimp, Pearl and Margie that they are only tarts and not whores, Larry Slade of being an exception in the saloon, and the new member Don Parritt of not betraying the Movement. They seem to look forward eagerly for the coming of Theodor Hickman (Hickey) to celebrate Harry Hope's sixtieth birthday. Nevertheless, the Hickey of this year seems very different. Instead of bringing them his usual jokes he starts preaching them about the lie of pipe dreams and how he got rid of his. Now, he wants to bring them the peace he proclaims he feels. Most of the play shows how he processes this project and urges them to take action. Nonetheless, none of them could do what they were talking about. When asked of what has changed him, Hickey answers that it is a result of his wife's murder. By the end of the fourth act, Hickey meets most of the previous characters and starts telling them his true story. He confesses that he is the one who killed his wife because she made him feel guilty. Hickey was unable to bear the burden of his pipe dream of faithfulness to his ever forgiving wife. When he is arrested by the policemen, whom he called before, he claims insanity. As a result, the saloon derelicts are freed and given a new excuse to go back to their old pipe dreams. However, only Larry and Parritt feel the bitterness of reality. Larry falls in an utter despair and Parritt confesses that he betrayed the Movement because he hated his mother. Consequently, he commits suicide while the other new pipe dreamers drink and sing loudly.

In "To-morrow", Conrad depicts the tale of an old man called Captain Hagberd. This character has just moved from Colchester to live in the town of Colebrook in an attempt to find Harry Hagberd, his long-lost son. The short story shows also how old Hagberd is gossiped about and mocked all over the town because of his strange pipe dream. He owns two cottages; one is occupied by him and the other by a tyrant blind father called Josiah Carvil. The latter has a daughter called Bessie who becomes later the closest person to Hagberd and shares with him his everlasting dream of tomorrow which will bring his son back. He even makes her take part in this dream since he promises to marry her to his son as soon he comes back. After a long time of intimacy with her landlord, a person appears and claims to be his son. Yet, instead of welcoming him, Captain Hagberd flares up with rage denying that he is his son. Bessie

distrusts the person at first; but he proves to be Harry the lost son. His father keeps rejecting him claiming that the person in front of him is only an “information fellow” and his son will come tomorrow. A few days later, Harry leaves and this makes his father live happily in a perpetual future. Bessie is the only one who suffers from this experience. Figuratively, she was slapped in the face by everyone. Her father enslaves her, her landlord is partially insane and her promised husband is nothing less than an opportunist Casanova.

However, amidst these rising voices of difference we need to pay more attention to the quiet voice of affinity. We should not underestimate the literary genre of Conrad’s story because, as Gail Fraser argues, he did not like distinction between literary genres. He did not refer to his long works as novels but as stories and tales and most of what we know of his great works emerged from the ashes of intentionally short stories.¹⁵ Furthermore, the capability of this tale to be staged without many changes as *One Day More* attests to its theatrical aspects.

We should not forget that when we peel the bark of the two works we discover the gloomy aspect of hope. The reading of “To-morrow” and *The Iceman Cometh* stamps on us the impression of a desperate and forlorn world where illusion is the sole factor of survival. It is also noticed that their psychological investigations led them to be described as the most “nihilistic plays” in drama¹⁶ and that is what made the critics of both works refer to them as unpleasant and pessimistic stories. This convergence in their literary reception helps us to feel the invisible net that connects these two works. Away from themes of self-deception and vital lies that attracted the critics to the common table of Conrad and O’Neill, other links between their works push us to define the one in relation to the other. What they have in common is tremendously big since many ideas, qualities and processes make us think that even if O’Neill did not intend to carry the mood of Conrad’s work, the texts themselves communicate with each other intertextually.

¹⁵ Gail Fraser, “**The Short Fiction**”, op. cit., p. 25.

¹⁶ For *The Iceman Cometh*, it is found in Cyrus Day, “**The Iceman and the Bridegroom: Some Observations on the Death of O’Neill’s Salesman**” Cited in Jordan Y. Miller, *Eugene O’Neill and the American Critic: A Summary and Bibliographical Checklist*, op. cit., p. 373. For “To-morrow”, it is found in Richard J. Hand, *The Theatre of Joseph Conrad: Reconstructed Fictions*, op. cit., p. 51.

2.1. Characterisation

2.1.1. Harry Hagberd and Theodore Hickey

Among the most striking similarities between *The Iceman Cometh* and “Tomorrow” is the role played by Harry Hagberd and Theodore Hickey. These two characters fit to clarify the structure of the play and the short story as well. If we look closer, we find that O’Neill and Conrad divided their works into three parts in accordance with the actions of each of these characters. They started with the absence of Harry and Hickey, then with their arrival and its unexpected effect on the rest of the characters and finally with their departure and the different reactions it entailed.

Harry and Hickey are the most anticipated characters in the two works. They are both absent from the beginning of the works and much talked about. The atmosphere before their coming is quiet, full of optimism and hope. Harry is expected to bring harmony to both his father and Bessie. Because of this they are building their future plans on his expected arrival. Captain Hagberd promises to marry Bessie to his son. He seems to prepare his cottage for this great event. In the same way, the calm residents of Harry Hope’s saloon expect the arrival of Hickey with his jokes and generosity. They are eager to meet him and express their happiness in this annual event of Hope’s birthday. In fact, even the success of this party is built on his coming since Hope himself expresses his impatience to meet him: “what the hell you think’s happened to Hickey? I hope he’ll turn up. Always got a million funny stories ... I’d like to laugh with old Hickey.” (*TIC* 59) The absence of Hickey and Harry and their presence in the dialogue of different characters in the two works serve the same purpose of raising the air of expectancy of the readers and the viewers.

After waiting for a long time, Harry Hagberd appears in the middle of the short story while Hickey appears by the end of the first act. However, their coming meets the expectations of neither the readers and viewers nor the waiting characters. Actually, once they set their feet near the lodges of Captain Hagberd’s and Harry Hope’s saloon, an aura of mystery envelops the placid flow of the events. The fuss

raised about them comes to be anticlimactic. Harry breaks the idealistic waiting of Bessie and his father. Though he revealed his identity as his father's son, Captain Hagberd never believed it and shut himself indoors. Later, Bessie realised that he is not the knight she was dreaming of since he is rude and not thinking of loving her at all. In fact, Harry "had come just in time to spoil their sport." (T 303) He was only the night that fell on the hopes of their sunny days. Meanwhile, Hickey's coming was not usual at all. When the saloon residents hear that he is just around, "Harry is instantly wide awake and everyone in the place." (TIC 69) However, this time he is not going to soothe the souls of the pipe dreamers there but to torture them with reality. His new "gag" of "figurin' out de best way to save dem and bring dem peace" (TIC 70) factually has good intentions compared to those of Harry Hagberd. Nonetheless, his project of stopping the farce of tomorrow disturbed the calm atmosphere of the saloon. Hickey is no longer seen as the salesman of joy and smiles but of death. It is to be mentioned here that the main difference between O'Neill's and Conrad's characters is that while Hickey planned previously that change, Harry finds himself inadvertently sparking it. Nonetheless, even if the disturbance of the previous placidity had different aims, the fact of the similar consequences binds the function of these characters closely together.

As the situation was quite similar before their coming and then was agitated in the same way at the time of their arrival, their departure generally has dispersed most of the clouds of the unexpected discontent. It is noticed that those who had wished for their comings before wish for their departure now. In "To-morrow", Bessie who established her future dreams on Harry Hagberd now pleads "Oh, go away! Go away for God's sake!" (T 318) In *The Iceman Cometh*, Hickey is a dear person and a friend. Though he was not asked directly to leave the place, the groans shown in his face and the expressions of discontent behind his back were asking him to leave. The bravest action taken against Hickey is by James Cameron calling him "(in a burst of futile fury) You dirty swine! (He tries to throw the drink on Hickey's face ... but it lands on Hickey's coat ...)" (TIC 166) In addition, by the end of the play, most of the characters burst in singing expressing their inner happiness once Hickey is taken out of the bar by the police. Moreover, when Harry and Hickey are removed from the scene, a

permanent chasm divides the characters into two fronts. The first one was healed from the “disease of hope” (T 287) but opened its eyes on the ugly face of reality thus falling in utter despair or even committing suicide. The other group “didn’t want to be saved from themselves” (*TIC* 16) and continues living with that disease which at least gives them an illusionary happiness.

Hickey and Harry resemble each other in various ways, but we need to stress the point that though these two characters played the same role in the works of O’Neill and Conrad, they were not completely alike. As it is argued in this study, the American playwright was trying to broaden the scope of the understanding of the British writer’s short story. When O’Neill married *Bessie* Mosher to *Harry* Hope in *The Iceman Cometh*, he seems to insist that illusions persist any way. As if he were trying to say that Conrad’s story does not end so easily. That is why he reveals through his Harry the cloak that was also worn by Conrad’s Harry. He makes him another pipe dreamer since he left Colebrook, like the Gambucinos, going to the unknown. Consequently, Hickey completes antithetically the journey that was only mentioned by Harry Hagberd.

2.1.2. Bessie’s Shadows in Evelyn, Parritt and Larry

In fact Bessie of “To-morrow” is nowhere fully present in *The Iceman Cometh*. Even her role in the short story seems a little different when comparing Conrad’s and O’Neill’s works. Most of the time she is seen as the victim of both her father’s physical blindness and her landlord’s psychological blindness. Josiah Carvil enslaves her under a merciless patriarchal control and Captain Hagberd chains her to his own illusions. Though she does not match completely any of the characters in the play, some of her features are present all over O’Neill’s work. First, he implicitly connects her to the play when he gives her name to Harry Hope’s deceased wife: Bessie Mosher. Yet, most of O’Neill’s characters are male and apparently Bessie Carvil does not match any of the characteristics of the female ones: Margie, Pearl or Cora. In fact, where as she does not appear in the play she, is quite similar to the two women that are

mentioned but do not appear in O'Neill's work. Digging deeper in the play, we find the second link of Bessie to this work. When we come to psychology, we know that self-deception, dreams and despair transcend the boundaries of race and gender. Accordingly, she is connected not only with female characters but even with male ones like Larry and Parritt.

In Conrad's short story, we find that Bessie is drawn into Captain Hagberd's dream because she could find real love neither with her father nor within her society. The Captain seems to be the only one who promises her love through the illusion of his son's return. Even it "was easier to half believe it (her)self..." (T 304) Hagberd's tomorrow becomes her only salvation and she becomes another pipe dreamer inside the pipe dream of her landlord. In her futile attempts to catch the ghost of her future husband, she has spent years in that illusion. Similarly, Hickey's wife Evelyn was drawn into the pipe dream of her husband for years because of love. Like Conrad's Bessie, though Evelyn was extremely faithful to her husband, she could not find her own fantasy without the help of Hickey. The change of his bad habits seems unlikely to happen but she holds onto him anyway. Therefore, both female characters are linked with passivity since they could not stand against those illusions despite their recurrent failure over years. In spite of this seemingly negative naivety, both Conrad and O'Neill stress the idea that those recurrent hopes have a purpose. They are necessary to live through a bitter reality that we may never know. In other words, we witness the ugly face of Bessie's life but we never heard the details of Evelyn's. As the latter sticks to the hopeless hope of Bessie in the same way, we can suggest that Hickey's wife, life just like Bessie, has suffered in her even though she was richer.

Like Bessie, Evelyn is not the only character that cannot establish her own fantasy in *The Iceman Cometh*. O'Neill spreads her shadow over other characters and asserts the idea that it is not only the female characters that might be dependent on the others in search of pipe dreams but also male characters. In this case Parritt is quite similar to Bessie. Though Bessie found herself chained in Captain Hagberd's pipe dream unconsciously, Parritt, feeling guilty, goes to Larry in an attempt to find it. Since both of them abandoned the Movement, Parritt wished to find the justifications for his motives in Larry's. In fact, he was not sure of finding his illusionary pretexts

alone and this pushed him to tell Larry: “I was glad to find you. I kept saying to myself, ‘If I can only find Larry. He’s the one guy in the world who can understand –’” (*He hesitates, staring at Larry with a strange appeal.*)” (TIC 28)

Remarkably, though Bessie and Parritt are involved in that game, they appear to be out of it. When reality came to confront the illusions of the people whom they planted their pipe dreams in, they collapsed not because they were targeted as the centre of the shock but because of the shock waves. They were confronted indirectly and witnessed their self-discovery in the pots of captain Hagberd and Larry Slade. However, while Bessie suffers within this psychological catastrophe silently, Parritt gradually gives a voice to the real motives of his past actions. In addition, since Bessie experienced the discovery through the denying words and actions of Captain Hagberd, she can be compared to what happened to Larry. Accordingly, other links with O’Neill’s characters are established here. Larry and Bessie would argue that they are not involved in that dilemma and consider themselves out of it. For instance, Larry here answers Parritt when asked about his pipe dream: “Oh, I’m the exception.” (TIC 28) Similarly, Bessie thinks herself out of Hagberd’s affair and pities him as a poor and mad fellow. However, when Harry Hagberd and Hickey come, Bessie, Larry and Parritt see the changes over the people who surround them and then their recovery and invention of new pipe dreams once Harry and Hickey are out of the scene. This makes them the only “converts to death” by the experience of the inner changes through the eyes of those who surround them.

When Larry, Parritt and Bessie realise that they were entrapped in the “disease of hope,” they face the truth and mourn its bitterness. However, they find themselves the sole people who could see through this psychological blindness. Their recovery from the “disease of hope” becomes a curse because they desert conformity. Bessie finds herself looking in the ugly face of reality and realises that there is no tomorrow. Thus, O’Neill uses both Parritt and Larry to account for the two faces of her conversion. Since the story ends without Bessie taking any action, O’Neill presents the two possible views of her state. Either she is going to fall in despair like Larry and suffer psychologically or commit suicide and end her miserable life physically. As if in all

cases, she is determined to meet the same destiny as Bessie Mosher and Evelyn literally or figuratively.

2.1.3. Captain Hagberd and All

Characters in *The Iceman Cometh* are numerous compared to those in Conrad's short story "To-morrow". This in itself creates a kind of versatility since they may serve different purposes. Hence, the characters that matched partially Harry Hagberd and Bessie also have the traits of Captain Hagberd. Again we cannot extract a full individual counterpart to this character in O'Neill's work but we can never neglect the fact of his shadowy presence in Harry Hope's saloon. However, the fact that, for example, Hickey resembles Harry and as I suggest here Captain Hagberd seems paradoxical since father and son are completely opposite to each other. However, when taking a closer look at this confusion we deduce that O'Neill wanted to expand the presence of this character even in those who oppose him proving the universality of Captain Hagberd and his hopeless hope.

Actually, in Conrad's short story we barely scratch the inner truth of Hagberd the father. What we conceive of his inner changes is judged only from the outside. However, O'Neill gathers most of the characters of the play to account for that inner truth from different points of view. Each one of them takes the characteristic of Hagberd's "tomorrowism" and explains it in his own way. In other words, the silence that envelops Hagberd's dilemma is exposed through various mouthpieces of the saloon derelicts in the play. Because of this, while we claim similarity between these characters, it is noticed that they complete each other.

Among the striking similarities between Captain Hagberd and Harry Hope, Cecil Lewis, Peit Wetjoen, James Cameron, Ed Mosher, Pat McGloin, Joe Mott, Hugo Kalmar, and even Larry Slade and Theodore Hickman is, in fact, that all of them are old pipe dreamers burdened with long painful years. Hagberd, as well as the "family circle of inmates" (*TIC* 37), reached the end of the road by their fifties and sixties. They live in a hopeless void sustained only by an illusion of a bright tomorrow that

will make their abstract words concrete actions. Standing in front of this everlasting dead end, all of them carry the scars of past mistakes and failure. Because of their faith, drinking, cowardice or violence they lost their jobs, self-esteem, reputation and even, for Hagberd, a member of the family. In fact, the memories of that past block their progress in the present. At the same time, they ostensibly dream of having a second chance in the future to correct their mistakes. In O'Neill's list of characters, he refers to the people of the "family" that Larry lists to Parritt as *one-time* captains, correspondents, anarchists and so on. Meanwhile, we can see that Captain Hagberd is an ex-sailor but most importantly a *one-time* father. Their way to correct their past's failure is through delay. Accordingly, if we judge their present situations from the first glance we may think that they are only enjoying another kind of softened failure. The surprise comes when despite all evidence Hagberd never ceases to think that his son is coming tomorrow. When tomorrow comes without his son, he does not hesitate and waits for another day more as if nothing had happened. Similarly, the saloon residents wait for tomorrow to get their jobs back, to go to their hometowns and so on. However, when tomorrow comes, they start looking endlessly for another tomorrow.

A more concentrated diagnosis reveals that thanks to their sins, they are trying to escape forward to the unknown future. This is what makes them under the scolding side-looks of their societies. For Hagberd, he "was unwilling now to talk with the townsfolk." (T 286) He, just like the characters in Harry Hope's bar, barely leaves his fixed location. Indeed, they keep away from society and enjoy the calm atmosphere of their own created worlds for they know that their harsh surroundings are able to reopen the wounds of the past with their careless comments. For this reason they contribute to imprison themselves because of their necessary beliefs that ensure their future and ornament their past.

When we say that the saloon residents shape together the image of Hagberd, we see this in their elderly states, their dreams, their situation in society and even in their reaction to change. The latter is a very striking similarity since they respond in time of crisis in the same way. When they fall into the claws of reality, such as when Harry returned and Hickey brought his project of salvation, their psychological and even physical states hit the bottom. Hagberd shuts himself in his cottage and from his

window “the sound of his voice seemed to Bessie to make the night itself mad – to pour insanity and disaster on the earth.” (T 316) Quite similarly, when the saloon residents come to meet their promised days, they become just like Willie whose “*face is sick, and his nerves in a shocking state of shakes*” (TIC 149) and Lewis whose “*manner is full of a forced, jaunty self-assurance. But he is sick and beset ...*” (TIC 150) They also start reacting to the traits of Hagberd’s madness by the various fights and exchange of insults. However, once they find the road that leads them back to the bosom of illusions, they recover their former states in a strikingly similar way. They return to the same pipe dreams with a new spirit as if nothing happened. In fact we come to wonder about the situation in the same way because of the closeness between the psychological manifestations of O’Neill’s play and Conrad’s short story. Accordingly, we see their representation of the collapse of beliefs in this modern age.

2.2. Setting

When we come to the setting of *The Iceman Cometh* and “To-morrow”, we find that Harry Hope’s hotel-restaurant cognates with Captain Hagberd’s cottages in various ways. Though the play takes place in New York and the short story in Colebrook, there are many similarities in those two places despite their main purposes. The common denominator between these buildings is that those who abide them tend not to leave them as much as possible. In fact, the bar and the cottages are made as the permanent fixed locations for the aforementioned pipe dreamers. In Conrad’s work, Hagberd’s cottages seem to be isolated from the rest of the city. He never concentrated on the description of the neighbourhood. Captain Hagberd “bought a plot of ground and had a pair of ugly yellow brick cottages” (T 281) and most of the short story is told from around his gardens. Equally, the saloon in O’Neill’s play is isolated and the story whirls inside its walls. We need to point that even in this enclosed place, the saloon residents gather not in the “spacious” bar but in the back room which is “divided from the bar by drawing a dirty black curtain across the room...” (TIC 8) Furthermore, these fixed locations are small in size to ensure a kind of intimacy between the characters they contain. In the short story, the cottages are small and in

the play the space inside the back room of the bar is piled with tables. While this creates closeness between them, it serves to put those characters under the lenses of experiment.

Eugene O'Neill crams the small place that was established before by Joseph Conrad with numerous examples of the dilemma of Captain Hagberd. As a matter of fact, the idea of the small place aims not only to keep those characters closer together but also to make of them a microcosm of humanity. In other words, while Conrad uses few samples for the dilemma of hope, the way of the discovery of the self beneath it and the effect of this action, O'Neill expands the number of samples at the same small spot. Since those characters are put away from the rest of the society, it seems that both writers want to corner and exclude the second possibility of hiding so as to explain better the process of their psychological dilemmas.

In addition, though the cottages and the hotel-restaurant seem to be clear on the outside, they are covered with silent mysteries. We feel this from the description of their miserable, old and neglected states. The cottages in the short story are ugly while the back room in Harry Hope saloon's "*walls and ceiling once were white, but it was a long time ago, and they are now so splotched, peeled stained and dusty that their colour can be described as dirty.*" (TIC 9) Additionally, those places share the aura of death. From the beginning of O'Neill's play, Hope, the proprietor of saloon is described as a "*bag of bones...*" (TIC 13) The description fits not only the character but also, as we feel it later, the place. Similarly, Harry Hagberd thinks of his father's location as a "dead-alive place." (T 305) Moreover, those lodges are not fully described by O'Neill and Conrad. Perhaps this is the salient similarity here since we neither see the inside of Captain Hagberd's cottage nor the rooms of the saloon residents. For instance, though Bessie is the closest person to Hagberd, he "described to her all the splendours accumulated for the setting-up of their housekeeping, but had never invited her to an inspection." (T 296) Likewise, the rooms in O'Neill's play "had [their] door[s] locked." (TIC 137) Furthermore, Larry did not want to go to Parritt, even though he invited him, since he does not care about his truth. In other words, those abodes are the symbols of the self in the two works. We are not the only ones denied from inspection, but none is allowed to step inside and discover what the owner

really is.¹⁷ The only exception made in O'Neill's work is Hickey. In fact, this is not surprising since this character proclaims the utter knowledge of each individual and what lurks inside them from the very beginning. Because of this, it is useless to keep him outside their rooms for long.

As was mentioned in the previous chapters, the sea is not totally absented from the settings used by both writers. In "To-morrow" it is seen in the back stage with its movement in accordance with the change of psychological state of the characters. For example, by the end of the short story, the "thundering of the surf, the voice of the restless sea itself, seemed stopped" (T 319) when Harry left his father's abode. Meanwhile, though it is not found in the play, the allusions to the sea are present in *The Iceman Cometh* especially when Larry perceives the saloon as "The Bottom of the Sea Rathskeller! ... and the last harbour." (TIC 27) Besides, it can be argued that what surrounds the setting of the play resembles the sea symbolically. Since the characters of the saloon are under the "care" of Harry Hope, his bar might be viewed as a ship. He is her captain and the rest of the crew depend on their captain to lead them safely in the sea of pipe dreams and illusions. He heartens his crew against the storms and the breakers of reality with the pints of the "booze."

3. Stages of the Inner Journey

The relationship between the two works goes beyond the above mentioned similarities. What can be remarkably noticed about them are the steps of self-discovery and its results on the characters in the short story and the play. In fact this section presents to us the new dimension of meaning. Perhaps we could not talk about these similar steps of the inner journey if we did not look at each work from the lenses of the other. What urges us to think about the common grounds on which these works stand is the common mood established by the two writers. If we can sum up these works in a few words we can say that they are trying to depict the emptiness and purposelessness

¹⁷ In this play, it is not mentioned whether the rooms are inhabited by individuals or by pairs. My arguments were based on the first speculation. In case of the second possibility, we can say that those who have reciprocal pipe dreams are the closest to reside with each other. For example, Wetjoen with Lewis, Ed with McGloin and Margie with Pearl.

of the modern age and how their characters, which stand for human beings in general, try to fill and give meaning to their lives. Probably this echoes the quest of O'Neill and Conrad who looked for, as shown in the first chapter, the real meaning of life and self. They found it just like the place Harry Hagberd describes to Bessie as

the gold country ... [but] [i]t's all a desert: cracks in the earth that you can't see the bottom of; and mountains – sheer rocks standing up high like walls and church spires, only a hundred times bigger. The valleys are full of boulders and black stones. There's not a blade of grass to see; and the sun sets more red over that country than I have seen in anywhere – blood-red and angry. (T 313)

And the people are just like the Gambucinos wanderers who wandered there alone and

had a sort of gift for prospecting, and the fever of it was on them too; and they did not seem to want gold very much ... it was not for the gold they cared; it was the wandering about looking for it in the stony country that got into them and wouldn't let them rest. (T 313)

This incessant journey, whether psychological as in the case of Captain Hagberd or symbolically physical as in the case of his son, is also found in O'Neill's play where each one hankers after an unattained mirage in a hopeless desert or as Larry describes: “(*sardonically*). It's a great game, the pursuit of happiness.” (TIC 19) Here we find ourselves standing in front of an ostensibly similar way to remain restless looking for the unknown future but in fact this is just a delay to avoid looking inward and discovering the futility of all their present and past.

Apart from this common mood of purposeless and worthless quest of motives, the play and the short story not only follow the formula of revealing the inner truths of the characters, but also clear up the obscure side of each other. As previously stated, the affinities between the worlds of Joseph Conrad and Eugene O'Neill can make them comparable samples. Now, since we are dealing with the same phenomenon, we can assume that the characters in these two works try to hide their inner selves. Hence they fail or succeed in the same way. However, bearing in mind that O'Neill's play came after Conrad's short story, we strongly suggest that the American playwright wanted to see this situation from his own perspective. As a result, each piece of writing becomes in a way explanatory of the other. For example, we have never seen the characters of O'Neill outside the bar but we might guess how the people of New York look at them

as they do in Colebrook. At the same time, O'Neill reveals to us the backstage story of old Hagberd and the reasons why the people of the town laugh at him. He does not tell us about the society but makes the readers and the audiences of *The Iceman Cometh* perform that role through the reaction to several comic situations especially in the first act.¹⁸ In addition, what is remarkable in this study is the appearance of the supposed words of confrontation that Bessie lacked in the short story.¹⁹ This point marks the major difference between the two works. The short story, in relation to the style of Conrad, gives us the impression of the futility of modern assumptions rather than the "clarity," because of the dramatisation of a single situation, found in O'Neill's plays. All of these along with the different reactions to the confrontation will be presented in this section in an attempt to pinpoint one of the universal aspects of intertextuality in the literary world. Indeed the characters of the two works are complementary and broaden the vision of this phenomenon of pipe dreams, that we promptly judged with simplicity, both by their conformity to the previous texts, completion and even opposition.

While I suggest that O'Neill is filling the gaps that were left by his predecessor Conrad, I should further say that he approached the texts of the British writer from an inner perspective. This means that he focused more on the internal changes with regard to psychology rather than anything else. In fact he sets this aim from the beginning to this psychological investigation since he wanted to write "a play when at the *end* [we] know the *souls* of seventeen men and women who appear – and women who don't appear – as well as if [we]'d read a play about each of them."²⁰ It must be mentioned here again that by the understanding of this microcosm, O'Neill's concern was not

¹⁸ In the play, O'Neill swings from comedy to tragedy in order to dramatise the inner emptiness and the futile illusions of his characters. He says: "The first act is hilarious comedy, *I think*, but then some people may not even laugh. At any rate, the comedy breaks up and the tragedy comes on." Eugene O'Neill, quoted in Normand Berlin, "The Late Plays" in Michael Manheim (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Eugene O'Neill*, op. cit., p. 86.

¹⁹ Compared to "To-morrow", Conrad's adaption of his short story into a play entitled *One Day More* presents to us a slightly different version of Bessie. Even if she does not contradict his pretty notion of tomorrow all over the play, by the departure of Harry she gathers some courage and tells him in despair that there is no tomorrow before she sinks sobbing on the ground. As if Conrad gives another reading to his own short story while asking a question: what would happen to the old man if he were really contradicted? That will be better answered in Eugene O'Neill's *The Iceman Cometh*.

²⁰ Eugene O'Neill, quoted in C. W. E Bigsby, *Modern American Drama, 1945-2000*, op. cit., p. 16. (Emphasis mine)

only the stage or merely an individual but life as a whole, the macrocosm, in order “to make [it] reveal about itself fully and deeply and roundly.”²¹

Coming back to the two works, what we sense from the very beginnings of *The Iceman Cometh* and “To-morrow” is a precarious situation filled with a number of characters who must not be offended. Before even asking the question why, we find them showing us a red line that would not be crossed even by the closest friends. Though naturally we cannot know what lurks inside at this stage, the manifestation of their inner struggles cannot be denied by their oscillation between violence and madness, weak physical conditions and sometimes parapraxes. In other words, a great dilemma is taking place inside and they must keep it in lest their masks fall.²² The turning point of our understanding of these works comes when we think that when their long awaited future meets them, when their hopes come true, they will live happily ever after. Instead, they use whatever they can to reject it. During these continuous contradictory attempts, we realize that the pipe dreams that attracted our compassion are only a cover they live with. It is not for what they ostensibly hope they wait for, but they are only avoiding their innermost sides that might bring up to the fore what they really fear. In other words, what they use as an ultimate means to keep their lies vital and to hide beneath is their altered notion of hope.

Actually, because they spent long years living in such a situation, the ego succeeded in keeping the unfavourable realities of their past mistakes and present emptiness in the unconscious. It found its temporary triumph in pipe dreams and hope. What helped it most to bury those destructive realities is its avoidance of struggle with the superego. As it is shown in Freud's structural model of the psyche, the ego is always trying to compromise between the inner urges and fears with regard to the external world. However, the most important thing is to survive amidst these two contradictory forces. The fruits of success in this case are picked up when neither the

²¹ Eugene O'Neill, quoted in id.

²² O'Neill shows his concern with masks, concrete or abstract, in a number of his plays. He even links them with the existence of humanity: "One's outer life passes in a solitude haunted by the masks of others; one's inner life passes in a solitude hounded by the masks of oneself." (O'Neill, the *American Spectator*, Vol. I, No. 1, p. 3.) quoted in Sophus Keith Winther, *Eugene O'Neill: a Critical Study*. (1934) (Enlarged Edition, New York: Random House, 1961), <http://www.eoneill.com/library/winther/XI.htm>. (Accessed on October 3rd, 2012)

id nor the superego overwhelm the other. What is remarkable about these two works is the absence of the superego. It is to be noticed that most of the characters avoid contact with the outside world since it is seen, as in the case of captain Hagberd, as a threat. The real superego may drive the hidden urges to come outside once they are remembered. Therefore, the characters in the two works try to choose their own inner circle of very close companions who “suffer” from the same disease. In other words, they establish their own superego which, instead of digging up the fears of one’s innermost fears, helps to bury the painful past once it is about to resurrect. However, unexpectedly, representatives of the real superego penetrate the fortresses they have already built. They start digging up the bones of their fears. Hence, Harry Hagberd and Hickey put Captain Hagberd, Bessie and the saloon inhabitants in front of their unconscious urges, the true reasons behind their present day’s actions, feelings and motivations, in other words, their true selves. Therefore, some of them jumped from the cliff of reality once they met the ghost of their pasts, others found a way to avoid looking at those scary apparitions and sustained life there. This means that the recent confrontation is going to darken their visions of the future in case it did not destroy them. Therefore, the characters in the two works are pushed into an inner journey of self-discovery starting from a stage of defence mechanisms in which they have strengthened themselves with a special understanding of the concept of delay and hope. Later, in a quite similar way, they were forced to confront the painful realities of their inner selves. However, when they reach the final stage of confession, some stand and fall while other run away and persist.

3.1. Defence Mechanisms

When Parritt comes to Larry looking for justifications to what appears later to be hatred of his mother, the “grandstand philosopher” says: “I feel you’re looking for some answer to something. I have no answer to give anyone, not even myself.” (*TIC* 33) But just before the end of the play, Larry seems to find an answer of some sort to himself when his psychological defensive walls crumble before Parritt and Hickey.

This takes us back to the beginning of the work to question the reasons behind Larry's inability or unwillingness to give answers to himself. This reversal movement is found all over *The Iceman Cometh* and "To-morrow" in which we are faced with a strong conscious and unconscious defensive mechanisms that we are not aware of till the characters experience a sudden and an unexpected disturbance to their quiet psychological states. Actually, the role of the ego, as suggested first by Sigmund Freud, is to preserve the image of the self amidst the conflicting forces of the id and the superego. The former strives to overwhelm the person with its voracious desires and utter fears while the latter tries to impose its external control. In order not to be dominated by either, the ego takes vital defensive measures to maintain the stability of a character. Most of the time, these are taken unconsciously so as to avoid even the slightest possibility of knowing them. In addition, since the self-image is crucial to one's confidence and fulfilment, the ego has to find ways to avoid other "unnecessary" dilemmas. Among these are one's past mistakes, inferiority complex and inability to achieve goals. Accordingly, within the destructive impact of reality and the inner and outer conflicting forces, the triumph of the ego and its defence mechanisms are found when a character is contended with his or her image of the self. In other words, we need to consider the placidity of characters in both works as the fortified stage of defence mechanisms. Actually, in order to discover the self, the identification of the vital defensive measures in both works can be considered as the first step of discovery.²³

By the beginning of the play, Larry asks Parritt to "notice the beautiful calm in the atmosphere" (*TIC* 27) and then acknowledges that he has "never known more contended men" (*TIC* 37) than those he introduced despite their obviously miserable and pathetic states. The same can be applied to the calm Captain Hagberd in Conrad's work who finds his natural place within the space of Harry Hope's saloon. Despite his "madness," Bessie finds "no harm in him" (T 287) and he seems happy with the dreams of tomorrow and the supposed return of his son. In fact, because of his contentment, she takes him as her only friend. While we can link *The Iceman Cometh*

²³ Just like the previous chapter, we have a wide variety and classification of defence mechanisms. This section is going to use only those which fit the context of "To-morrow" and *The Iceman Cometh*.

to "To-morrow", I suggest in this study, bearing in mind the textual relations between these works, that the characters of O'Neill's play are primarily further clarification of Conrad's Captain Hagberd. When the British writer put few passengers aboard the boat of pipe dreams and hope, the American playwright considers that all his characters "are in the same boat, one way or another." (*TIC* 77) This means that the saloon derelicts, with all their different goals and means, expound and provide other defensive procedures taken by Captain Hagberd in the short story. They are linked together and each of them illustrates the dilemma of the other. As a matter of fact, they can be seen as one person, probably Captain Hagberd, since they help to explain different aspects of their same situation.

In this first stage of discovery, it is supposed that the characters should be distant from any signs of inner unconscious conflicts. However, as nothing is perfect or certain, the incessant attempts of the ego to fight its way within the conflicting forces of the id and the superego may show the traits of its struggle. As dreams are supposed to be the harmless arena of the meeting of both unfavourable and desirable unconscious, Willie Oban brings this to the fore when he "(blurts from his dream). It's a lie! ... Papa! Papa!" (*TIC* 19) In other words, since the tight defensive system in this case is set loose, the former ghosts of the past attempt coming back. Now we stand before what is supposed to bury such a dilemma when he is awake. It is, as Larry tells Rocky at the opening of the first act, "[t]he lie of a pipe dream [which] gives life to the whole misbegotten mad lot of us." (*TIC* 15-6) In both Conrad's and O'Neill's work, in order to avoid the impact of the mistakes of the past, to sustain life with the inner emptiness, to proceed despite failure and purposelessness, to attain even a virtual success, Captain Hagberd and the saloon derelicts have to hide beneath the delusional pipe dreams of the past and tomorrow hoping for a better life even if it is unreal.

What is remarkable about *The Iceman Cometh* and "To-morrow" is their convergence in the notion of the life-lie. As I consider the latter as the ultimate defence mechanism in this study, it also provides us with a major intertextual link between the play and the short story. The strategy of Captain Hagberd to deceive the others, as well as himself, is the common denominator that gathers the souls of O'Neill's characters on one stage. It would be impossible or rather it would require "a play about each of

them” if the saloon derelicts were too different. Thus, illusions about the past and the future dominate the present of both works. It must be mentioned here that the other defence mechanisms taken by any of Conrad's or O'Neill's characters serve only to reinforce those vital lies. These can be reduced to only one word: hope. A hope to be something, to do it or not to be it. They hold its mast tightly because in reality they have no chance against the strong winds of life. They have reached the end where they are not living but only surviving. Consequently, their version of hope is invented to sustain life and accordingly has changed there because in the beginning it was only a justification for “now,” then it represented a complete relief of giving more time so as not to face what they pretend to desire. Hope becomes associated not with a short period of climbing the ladder of dreams and ambitions but with its mirage that they are too happy not to catch. For us unmasking this illusionary pipe dream leads to truth, but for them, if they do this they will find themselves in the pit of life's hell or what can be better identified as an utter despair.

When talking about the pipe dreams of the past and the future, the first question that comes to our mind is what is the place of time in these two different contexts? Actually, time loses its conformity there. If we look closer we find that O'Neill's characters as well as Conrad's Captain Hagberd and Bessie live outside their present. They look for motives and disguises for the bitter reality by going beyond the boundaries of the time and living not in the present but in the past and the future. Their actual states and motives serve only to heal or conceal the chronic wounds of the past. Indeed, this leads us to the moment in O'Neill's masterpiece *Long Day's Journey into Night* where Mary states: “The past is the present ... It's the future, too. We all try to lie about that, but life won't let us.”²⁴ In fact, time is ignored and there is no need to recall it. This is further evidenced in O'Neill's description of Ed Mosher who does not, just like his companions, give any value to his present time since he wears “*a heavy brass watch-chain (not connected to a watch)...*” (TIC 13) Consequently, the present there barely exists. Mainly, it has two sides, an ornamentation of the past and a delay to an unknown future.

²⁴ Eugene O'Neill, *Long Day's Journey into Night* (1956) in *Eugene O'Neill: Complete Plays 1932-1943*, Vol. III (Reprinted, New York: The Library of America, 1988), p. 765.

Concerning the present life as a decoration of the past, we find in the course of O'Neill's play that Harry Hope remembers his past in a very affectionate way. However, this ceases to be usual when Larry Slade reacts: "[i]sn't the pipe dream of yesterday a touching thing?" (*TIC* 49) Before, we thought of the pipe dream as an idea or a plan that are impossible or unlikely to happen in the present or future. But because of the loss of the concept of time and since "tomorrow is yesterday" (*TIC* 45), it becomes associated with the past. The latter left its perpetual mark on both Conrad's and O'Neill's characters. This is shown in O'Neill's insistence on the stamp of the past or the nature of each of his characters as carried through the description of their present states and then on what they pipe dream of yesterday. So Hugo Kalmar has "the stamp of an alien radical," Larry Slade has "the quality of a pitying but weary old priest," Piet Wetjoen has "a suggestion of old authority lurking in him," James Cameron has intelligent eyes and the aura of once "competent ability," Cecil Lewis has a "big ragged scar of an old wound" and the old title of "The Captain," Pat McGloin "has his old occupation of policeman stamped all over him," the "influence of [Ed Mosher's] old circus career is apparent in his getup" and so on. It is to be noticed that we are not told of the past of the two bartenders and the three "tarts." In fact we are living it and discovering how it is going to leave its marks on them since they are younger compared with the rest of the saloon derelicts. As to Hickey and Parritt, their nature and pipe dreams of the past appear only by the end of the play and that is why they are going to be discussed later in this section. Actually, they will prove to be not so much different from the rest despite their incessant attempt to hide them.

Consequently, these traits are the main harbingers to their dilemmas of the past. As seen in the case of Captain Hagberd, though he looks for a son he lost so many years ago, he does not "tell you plainly how his son looked" (T 284), and worst of all he "described a boy of fourteen or so..." (T 284) That is to say that what he recalls of the past is not complete. Actually, these kinds of pipe dreams of yesterday are nothing more than a diversion of an old harsh truth like failure, inability or unwillingness. In other words, instead of repressing favourable facts it is much easier to divert it into another more acceptable version of the old story. The defence mechanism of repression aims to move the disagreeable memories and facts out from the conscious

system. Probably the ego tries to suppress them but this is impossible since the unconscious is not fully understood and can record and recall the event or its impression on the character. This means that it cannot be fully hidden. Sometimes there is a leak of the repressed memories as seen in the dreams and parapraxes. As mentioned above, it is Willie who shows us a part of his unconscious when he talks in his dream. In fact, after a little hinting to the inner dilemma, O'Neill does not take us inside him but exposes Willie's innards throughout the play. Meanwhile, we feel that the saloon residents are about to tell us something contradictory to what they intend to say when their tongues slip in some situations. For example, Larry nearly exposed one of the main reasons for his abandonment of the Movement when he tells Rocky about Parritt's claim of his friendship: "He's a liar. I wouldn't know him if he hadn't told me who he was. His mother and I were friends years ago on the Coast. (*He hesitates – then lowering his voice*)..." (TIC 23) A better example for the emergence of the repressed memories through the slips of the tongue is found in Jimmy Tomorrow's remembrance of his pipe dream of yesterday: "I met Dick Trumbull [who] ... said, 'Jimmy, the publicity department's never been the same since you got — resigned.'" (TIC 51)

Hence, to avoid the present, they keep repeating altered versions of their past. Indeed, we feel from the aforementioned reaction of Larry to Harry Hope that the latter is the best representative of the pipe dream of yesterday. It is through him that we understand the process of hiding what is perceived as a failure by the others. Generally speaking, Harry Hope considers himself as the faithful husband of a deceased wife. He "see[s] her in every room just as she used to be." (TIC 49) In addition, he feels that he would have won the election easily if he wanted to since his Bessie made him know "every man, woman and child in the ward, almost ... [and] made [him] remember all their names." (TIC 50) However, if we look closer we find this story of yesterday cracking for two reasons. We already know that Harry Hope is a shy and soft person and he enjoys the company of his friends though sometimes they make fun of him. He is "*waiting for any excuse to shy ... [and he] attempts to hide his defencelessness behind a testy truculent manner...*" (TIC 13) Nevertheless, Hope's wife "nagged the hell out of him." (TIC 49) As if the saloon proprietor remembers the

past in a glorious way just to convert the fact that he was divided between the love and the hatred of his wife and her open manners that made him know a lot of people despite his shy nature. Perhaps she made him unconfident about his sociability and this created a kind of an “inferiority complex” that pushed him to brag in front of the saloon derelicts about his numerous acquaintances outside the bar. In addition, he rationalises his rejection of the possibility of being nominated for “Alderman” by taking his wife’s death as a pretext for his unwillingness or inability to go outside and meet the world. In fact either he did not want to be publically known or failed in his career as “jitney Tammany politician.”

The other drunkards in the saloon, as well as Captain Hagberd, follow the same steps. They tend to show us only the brightest and touching side of their past stories which contain the very seeds of their present failure. That is why, during his pipe dream of the past of his high-spirited boy, old Hagberd never comes across the way he treated him brutally. In general this is the dilemma of the pipe dream of yesterday in both works. As we find that Harry Hope hides behind the sweet and bitter memories of his past, so we find that, for example, Jimmy Tomorrow hides behind the pretext of his wife’s adultery which ruined his career as a correspondent at the time of the Boer War and Willie Oban hides behind his brilliance as a student of law at Harvard and then his discovery of “the loophole of whisky to escape his [father’s] jurisdiction.” (*TIC* 39) None of these examples look at the other side of what they claim lest blaming themselves bitterly for what they failed instead of blaming the others. That is to say that they use displacement on past figures as a defence mechanism to avoid “unnecessary” inner conflicts since the supposed reasons of their present misery are not here to question reality. This may look different but it serves only to rationalise their victimisation. All in all, they redirect their dereliction outside their selves.

Actually, this formula of rationalisation can take another form once it is accompanied with the denial of the reality of the pipe dream of yesterday. For instance, Rocky denies that he is a pimp constructing his arguments on a fragile basis. When he hears Hugo’s hinting to his immoral trade, he defends himself: “Hell, yuh’d tink I wuz a pimp or somethin’. Everybody knows me knows I ain’t. A pimp don’t hold no job. I’m a bartender. Dem tarts, Margie and Pearl ... And I don’t beat dem up

like a pimp would ... We're pals." (TIC 17-8) And so are the characters in *The Iceman Cometh* who deny being something while in fact they are what they strive to rebut. They reject the description of being cowards, unable or unwilling to act, but the moments come within the work when we discover that their truths are what they strongly reject by all means. Actually, this process of rationalisation while denying the pipe dream of the past is better shown by Larry Slade who is the first to comment on his friends' pipe dream of yesterday. He tries to convince the others, as well as himself, that he is the only exception in the bar. He claims that his pipe dreams "are all dead and buried behind [him]" (TIC 16) and seems content with his stance as a grandstand philosopher. Nonetheless, when Parritt asks Larry about the reason that led him to desert the Movement, we face the strongholds of psychological barriers constructed with ready-made answers. Even by the end of the play when we discover the real motives of Larry we find that his rationalisation of his sophisticated story is almost flawless only if he could keep Rosa Parritt out of it:

You asked me why I quit the Movement. I had a lot of good reasons ... For myself, I was forced to admit, at the end of thirty years' devotion to the Cause, that I was never made for it. I was born condemned to be one of those who had to see all sides of a question ... [but in] revolution you have to wear blinders like a horse and see only straight in front of you ... As for my comrades ... I felt as Horace Walpole did about England that he could love it if it weren't for the people in it. The material the ideal free society must be constructed from is men themselves and you can't build a marble temple out of a mixture of mud and manure ... Well, that's why I left the Movement ... at any rate, you see it had nothing to do with your mother. (TIC 31-2)

Here, just like Rocky who rejects the fact of being a pimp, and like Joe Mott who wants to believe that he is the whitest coloured man ever, and like Captain Lewis and general Wetjoen who conceive themselves as heroes, Larry seems to reject the fact that he quit the Movement because of Rosa Parritt. In fact, the saloon echoes the truth which is always the opposite of what they claim or reject. It also echoes Captain Hagberd's story of his son while he is away from him.

While the alteration of the past provides precariously a limited escape from the present reality, the continuous expectation of the future gives the characters in *The Iceman Cometh* and "To-morrow" an unlimited chance to remain far from it. Of course, Conrad's short story, according to its title, is mainly about the unknown future

and so is O'Neill's play. Undeniably, the waiting for tomorrow is the main excuse to avoid their current situations as much as possible by living or hoping to live in a virtual future that they feel will never come. At this moment, the future acquires another meaning. It ceases to be only a tense among tenses perceived by one's self as an outer factor and becomes a psychological element fundamental to its inner equilibrium and survival. In other words, during the incessant attempts of the ego to ensure the balance of the psyche, it uses different defence mechanisms to keep destructive instincts and undesirable facts out of one's conscious system. As seen before, rationalisation, denial and displacement among others are used to divert the meaning of the leaks resulting from the occasional failure of repression. Indeed, it is impossible to cover up all the uncontrolled leakage of the unconscious even with the use of the previous rational defence mechanisms, especially when they talk about their past sowing while they do not find any present harvest. Now, in order to contradict truth, in order to escape from the present, they have to plunge forward into the future. They pretend even with irrationality to await it eagerly just like to what they did to the past which they adapted to their favour as a way to escape from it. Here, the pipe dream of tomorrow is taken by the ego to postpone the confrontation with one's mistakes, emptiness, dereliction or worthlessness to the eternal and never coming unknown. With these characters it is no longer run away and live, but stand still, pretend to face, delay, survive and eternally hope.

In Conrad's short story, Captain Hagberd is described as an old and lonely person with a lost son and a deceased wife. Here we can imagine how this old man feels and how much pain and misery fill his empty life. Despite his small chance to find his son, he seems unwilling to abandon hope. He "had been advertising in the London papers for Harry Hagberd, and offering rewards for any sort of likely information." (T 284) He visited every place in the town and asked as many people as he could about him. However, "after a time the old man abandoned the active search. His son had evidently gone away; but he settled himself to wait." (T 284) However, when the dream comes true with the sudden coming of the son Harry Hagberd, his father unexpectedly rages and denies his presence instead of welcoming him. Once we are put in such a situation we realise that the previous attempts and wishes of the father to find his son have

another meaning for the old man. His pipe dream of tomorrow was built on the idea of restless waiting which gave him, in a way, a purpose in life and hid his past mistakes. In fact, Captain Hagberd connected his life strongly to the hope of the coming tomorrow to the extent of forgetting its essence and transformed it into new notions. He asks for an everlasting tomorrow claiming: “I’ve all the information I want. I’ve had it for years – for years – for years – enough to last me till tomorrow...” (T 300) In fact, just like the Gambucinos, he was truly looking forward to meet his son. As time passes, he found his fulfilment not in the purpose but in the quest itself. He pretended to look for and await his son while he was restlessly prospecting for gold in the desert.

Similarly, Harry Hope’s saloon residents establish iron walls in the paths of their self-discovery. All of them create lies and believe them in order to avoid their sense of purposelessness and worthlessness. What puts us first amidst this phenomenon is the comic scene of Harry Hope and his intentions to turn over a new leaf and oblige everybody in the saloon to pay up his rent. When Larry is informed by this from Rocky he answers: “I’ll be glad to pay up – tomorrow. And I know my fellow inmates will promise the same. They’ve all a touching credulity concerning tomorrows ... It’ll be a great day for them, tomorrow – the Feast of All Fools.” (*TIC* 15) Indeed, the saloon proprietor starts threatening the derelicts in case they do not pay up; however, when tomorrow really comes in the play none is asked for rent money. Accordingly, such a situation transmits the purposelessness of the characters in the play and their attempts to create temporary and repetitive pipe dreams of the future led by Hope. Just like old Hagberd, they enjoy the quest itself on the small as well as the large levels.

When talking about the pipe dreams of the future, we must mention that it is James Cameron, the true legitimate and representative leader of the “Tomorrow Movement,” who makes the hope of a better tomorrow his ultimate defence mechanism. Eugene O’Neill brings him back to life in this play giving him another chance in an attempt to explore other realities concerning his avoidance of the discovery of the truth of the self.²⁵ Just like what happens in the O’Neill’s short story,

²⁵ O’Neill’s only short story, “Tomorrow”, is about Jimmy Anderson who, in various ways, resembles James Cameron. In his reform movement, he stops drinking and tries to get his job back. However, once he meets his “tomorrow”, he realises that he is lost: “it’s hell ... to realize all at once – you’re

Jimmy keeps repeating that tomorrow he will take back his job in the publicity department. However, when tomorrow really comes, he convinces himself that the other tomorrow will bring better business conditions and so he waits for a bigger salary. What is remarkable about Jimmy Tomorrow is the effect of his pipe dream on the rest of the saloon. He “start[s] them off smoking the same hop (*sic*).” (*TIC* 52) As a result we come to know the pipe dreams of the tomorrow of the saloon derelicts. So we find that each of Lewis and Piet plan to go home, Joe wants to reopen his gambling house, Hope intends to take a walk outside and see some old friends, Ed Mosher thinks of getting his job back in the circus, McGloin wills to clean his records and become a policeman again, Willie decides to go to the D. A.’s office asking for a lawyer’s permission, Cora and Chuck arrange to buy a farm and marry, and amazingly Larry declares that he is waiting for death. Nonetheless, just like the pipe dreams of yesterday that they claim while they are not fully true, they pipe dream of tomorrow while they truly want to avoid. In fact, their impossible hopes are nothing more than fake concepts of the unknown taken as a defence mechanism hiding the truth in both “To-morrow” and *The Iceman Cometh*.

Since Jimmy Tomorrow is the best representative of the creed of “tomorrowism,” two instances in the first act show that the future he pretends to await along with the others is not a time to fulfil a wish but a lie to escape the fear of the futile existence. The second time he speaks he says “(*as if reminded of something – with a pathetic attempt at a brisk, no-more-nonsense air*). Tomorrow, yes. It’s high time I straightened out and got down to business again.” (*TIC* 45) As he uses the past to talk of the future, the future is no longer an expectation of an event. It is a lie already made in the past. Hence “tomorrow” is an impromptu concept equivalent to whatever may happen in the unknown future regardless of the attention to the meaning of the word. This is seen when Jimmy thinks that Hickey was only kidding and “he’ll probably be his natural self again tomorrow — (*Hastily*.) I mean, when he wakes up.” (*TIC* 81) This is just an instance in which we take a glimpse at the buried unconscious of this character. A profound moment which came after a long process clarified by Conrad’s Captain

dead!”. Because of the strong impact of this realisation, Jimmy commits suicide. Eugene O’Neill, “**Tomorrow**” (1917) in *Eugene O’Neill: Complete Plays 1932-1943*, op. cit., p. 964.

Hagberd whose future becomes a lie linked to tomorrow “because with him it was no longer ‘next week’, ‘next month,’ or even ‘next year.’ It was ‘to-morrow’.” (T 287) The question now must be asked, since their waiting for tomorrow is a lie, why do they lie about it? As mentioned before, the answer is fear. Again, it is Jimmy who shows his hidden fear of the future in the first act. An implicit chill follows his talk of tomorrow when he says: “I must have my shoes soled and heeled and shined first thing tomorrow morning. A general spruce-up. I want to have a well-groomed appearance when I — (*his voice fades out as he stares in front of him*)...” (TIC 49)

In general, the pipe dream of tomorrow is another form of lie. It is a defence mechanism that sustains the stability of Captain Hagberd and most of the characters of O'Neill's play. As we discover their inner emptiness, unwillingness, and inability to cross from the realm of words to the realm of actions, we realize that they really have only the thin rope of tomorrow so as to avoid falling in the pit of despair. It is Larry Slade who sums up this situation: “[t]he tomorrow movement is a sad and a beautiful thing, too!” (TIC 49) Indeed it is sad since we realize that, for example, Jimmy's, McGloin's and Ed Mosher's attempts to get their jobs back, Hope's will to take a walk outside and Cora's and Chuck's plan to get married are just like, as the Algerian proverb says, the attempts of salt to sprout. However, the fact remains that no one “here has to worry about where they're going next, because there is no farther they can go. It's a great comfort to them. Although even here they keep up the appearances of life with few harmless pipe dreams about their yesterdays and tomorrows...” (TIC 28)

Definitely, the pipe dreams of the past and the future are the ultimate defence mechanisms in Conrad's "To-morrow" and O'Neill's *The Iceman Cometh*. That is why, in order to maintain the inner balance of the psyche, the characters in both works have to protect themselves from outer factors. In other words, they should avoid any person who might talk about their hidden and undesirable inner side or question the viability of their pipe dreams. Accordingly, another defensive wall must be erected in order to block the outsiders. The simplest means to run away from the nagging voice of the superego, or society, is to find an isolated haven in order not to be scorned and pushed to look in the faces they fear most: their own. In Conrad's "To-morrow", Captain Hagberd shuts himself from the outside as much as he can. We are already told that he

moved from Colchester to Colebrook, a city that does not know much about him, and then he decided to remain around his cottage as long as possible because of his fruitless contact with the people there. In the same way, characters in *The Iceman Cometh* have moved from the society to Harry Hope's saloon. "The first quality of this place is that it looks like a *cimetière marin*, where human wrecks disintegrate in indifference, without the rest of society taking any notice."²⁶ In fact they are happy to find such a sanctuary and with time they are, just like the agoraphobic proprietor of the place, unwilling to go to the hell of the outside.

Nonetheless, human nature cannot tolerate isolation forever. Communication is needed at least to prove one's existence. This is seen, for instance, with Willie who "(dissolves into pitiable terror) ... I'll go crazy up in that room alone! It's haunted!" (TIC 42) In this case, in order to avoid the continuous criticism of the outside world while maintaining a necessary interaction with people, Captain Hagberd and the saloon derelicts must find, or even found, some friends in the cause. At this moment, they can live in their own society where everyone is careful not to disturb the others' pipe dreams. On the contrary, this close group nourishes and supports each one's illusions. Moreover, while each one is concerned with the other, this helps to prevent the individual from looking inside his or her inner side. Hence, they live in their own created worlds without any fear of the negative effects of the superego or the outside surveillance. In fact, each one incarnates the superego of the others and since they do not disturb the other it remains under their control. For example, it is known that the standards of success and failure are decided by society. But for them, instead of regretting failure and looking for success, whose road is ostensibly clear, they seem to enjoy failure and postpone their journey on the road of success. They avoid the standards of society together and they are not disturbed since the ones who surround them feel the same. In other words, like their alteration of the notion of the future which no longer becomes associated with the short period of realising something, the new group mechanism changed the standards of the society outside their established realms. In their closed universe, they give different perspectives of the past, present,

²⁶Thierry Dubost, *Struggle Defeat or Rebirth: Eugene O'Neill Vision of Humanity* (London: McFarland, 1997), p. 82.

success and failure. This is not surprising since “[w]orst is best here, and East is West, and tomorrow is yesterday.” (*TIC* 45)

Captain Hagberd could not stand his world alone. The townspeople, as represented by the barber, caused his pains. “Yes, people's grins were awful. They hinted at something wrong: but what? He could not tell.” (T 300) However, he seems happy in the presence of Bessie who tries to soothe his pipe dreams. He “talked with her paternally, reasonably, and dogmatically, with a touch of arbitrariness. They met on the ground of unreserved confidence, which was authenticated by an affectionate wink now and then.” (T 287) With her he can stand up against the looks of the villagers to the extent in which “away from the sanction of her pity, he felt himself exposed without defence.” (T 297) Therefore, in order to ensure her presence on his side, he converted her to his creed of “tomorrowism.” He “was soothed by the part she took in his hope, which had become his delusion.” (T 295) However, the years Bessie spent in his “faith” were not a result of pure compassion and pity. She found herself in need of hope in order to escape the tyranny of her father. Unlike her landlord, she was stuck naively to the future in its traditional sense. She did not know that her conception of tomorrow is quite different from Hagberd’s who sees it from the same lenses of Hope’s derelicts.

Compared to Conrad's short story, the role of the group is better expounded in *The Iceman Cometh*. The play is full of examples as if O'Neill wants to go further on a point not very much focused on by Conrad. It is strongly noticed that each one in the saloon tolerates and affirms the other’s pipe dream and prevents him or her from facing their bitter truth as a mutual beneficial action. They avoid criticism as much as possible and apologise quickly and sincerely once they do.²⁷ In case they cannot provide the other with heartening words, at least they give him the silence which does not hurt anyone. This serenity in the atmosphere pushes Hickey later to remark: “it’s always fair weather, when good fellows get together!” (*TIC* 70)

Actually, the need for the affirmation of one’s story through the acceptance of the others is present from the early beginning of the play. For example, Larry asks Hugo:

²⁷ Perhaps the only exception there is Hugo, and of course the new Hickey, but they agree on not taking his whiskey talk seriously since he seems to be the drunkest among the drunkards.

“[a]in’t I telling the truth, Comrade Hugo?” (*TIC* 16) in an attempt to justify his pipe dream of the past. And so the others need encouragement and justification to their pipe dreams and support the others like Larry who tries to affirm Rocky’s claim of not being a pimp: “A shrewd business man, who doesn’t miss any opportunity to get on in the world. That’s what I’d call you” (*TIC* 18) and Lewis’s apologise for Joe whom he has already called “Kaffir”: “my profound apologies, Joseph, old chum ... Whitest coloured man I ever knew. Proud to call you my friend.” (*TIC* 43) In fact this group is their only family and they live by reciprocity. The best example of all this is the situation of Captain Lewis and General Wetjoen. Despite their deep knowledge of each other, they nest the other’s pride of heroism. They create from their former enmity an epic past in which they fought against each other in the Boer War. While Lewis nourishes Wetjoen’s pipe dream when he says that “it was a grave error in our foreign policy ever to set you free” (*TIC* 44), Wetjoen nourishes Lewis’s pipe dream when he says “I shoot clean in the mittle of forehead at Spion Kopje, and you I miss! I neffer forgive myself!” (*TIC* 44) From the other side, the characters in the play do not help each other for the pure sake of friendship but because of the cursed connection that made them silent in front of each other. For Wetjoen and Lewis, neither of them wants to mention the other’s cowardice lest the other mentions his scandal. Another example is found with the night bartender and the two “tarts.” Rocky does not refer to Pearl and Margie as whores not because he does not want to hurt them but because if he did he would make of himself a pimp and vice versa. In other words, they have to support the other in return of support since they do not have other alternatives.

Furthermore, they not only nourish the pipe dream of the past but also never disturb the pipe dream of tomorrow in fear of the rebound. Throughout the play, no one asks Harry to go outside the bar or Jimmy to go and work as he is talking about his tomorrow that has never come yet. They did not show their frank doubt about Cora and Chuck’s supposed marriage or Larry’s pretension to await death. All in all, they scratch the other’s back trying hard not to touch the wounds of the past, the present or the future since all of them came out from the same battle of despair, pain, worthlessness and purposelessness. To put it in O’Neill’s word, “they’re a bunch of cuckoos.” (*TIC* 45) In fact, while he seems to say here that in their funny support of

each other the saloon residents are silly, O'Neill also means that they are just like the cuckoos laying their eggs, here the pipe dreams, in another bird's nest. We can say, to use psychoanalytic terms, that in this defensive altruism,²⁸ each character in the play tries to project the reconciliation with his or her inner side through the temporary acceptance of the others' pipe dreams.²⁹

However, while the group proves its usefulness in many situations, in a way or another Conrad and O'Neill hint at its fragile bases. Hence, even within the chosen worlds of their characters, they must not be fully plunged inside them. They try to be partially isolated from those they seem to trust most. In fact, people need to contact with each other so as to confirm their existence. But they also need to be alone so as to think about it. As seen in "To-morrow", Captain Hagberd is always keeping his own secrets away from Bessie though she is the only one whom he trusts in the village. She has never been allowed to be in his cottage and sometimes she is prevented from knowing what he buys. In such situations, Hagberd wants some loneliness even while he enjoys, and utterly needs, Bessie's company. For him it is not wise to tell her about everything especially his full reality. That is why, despite the intimacy that lasted between them for years, "they have never talked without a fence or a railing between them." (T 296) Likewise, the saloon residents partially isolate themselves even amidst the group they like most. As they all implicitly admit that they need to be inside and outside the gang at the same time, no one questions the other's reasons. They never talk without a symbolic fence between them.

What makes this seemingly paradoxical situation possible in the play is drinking. Alcohol becomes a way to prevent them from facing both the outer and inner worlds while they remain inside and outside the group at the same time.

²⁸ Edward L. Shaughnessy, *Down the Nights and Down the Days: Eugene O'Neill Catholic Sensibility*, op. cit., p. 149.

²⁹ The need for companionship and support is better shown in O'Neill's *Hughie*. Erie Smith, who is mourning the death of the deceased night clerk Hughie, looks for another container for his self-image in the new one Charlie Hughes. By the end of this short play, with an incessant appeal to the new night clerk, he regains his self-image and pipe dream as a lucky gambler after losing it since Hughie was taken to the hospital. In return, Erie Smith helps Charlie Hughes "to live through the night". Eugene O'Neill, *Hughie* (1959), in *Eugene O'Neill: Complete Plays 1932-1943*, op. cit., p. 846.

[P]roviding a cheap means of losing consciousness, it reigns supreme to the extent that it prevents any analysis of the true relations which exist between [these] characters and the world. Thanks to alcohol, those who partake of it manage to persuade themselves that their condition is not as debased as they thought. The effect it produces of being out of step with reality gives it a grotesque aspect.³⁰

Drunkenness took them to a haven far from their own tortured selves. That is why they look for it as a way of salvation and progression to their lives even if it leads to their decline. It also helped their state of idleness because if they act it means not to dream, to act is to live the present and that is why they avoid actions as much as possible. The saloon residents try to avoid death but in a case like this there is no meaning for life. Despite this they never miss the whiskey's blessing and, as Larry tells Parritt, "they manage to get drunk, by hook or crook, and keep their pipe dreams, and that's all they ask of life I've never known more contented men. It is not often that men attain the true goal of their heart's desire..." (*TIC* 37) In this case, the role of drinking and drunkenness is important for the explanation of defence mechanisms. Actually, as the ego attempts to prevent one's surrender to his dark and undesirable side, drinking makes the characters in the play succumb into oblivion. It helps to reduce anxiety in the saloon with the help of Hope who has "never refused a drink to anyone needed it bad in [his] life!" (*TIC* 20) Indeed, drinking is highly important since in the span of two days in the play, none describes his need for food. The people there prefer to feed their illusions rather than their bodies. This brings us back to the play's first stage directions to understand the reasons behind the exceptionalism of Harry Hope's not serving food:

The renting of rooms on the upper floors, under the Raines-Law loopholes, make the establishment a hotel and gives it the privilege of serving liquor in the back room of the bar after closing hours and on Sundays, provided a meal is served with the booze, thus making a back room legally a hotel restaurant. This food provision was generally circumvented by putting a property sandwich in the middle of each table ... the drunkest yokel ... [finds this as a] noisome table decoration. But at Harry Hope's ... [even] this food technicality is ignored as irrelevant... (*TIC* 8)

³⁰ Thierry Dubost, *Struggle Defeat or Rebirth: Eugene O'Neill Vision of Humanity*, op. cit., p. 132.

3.2. Confrontation

In Conrad's "To-morrow", Captain Hagberd has locked himself in his own pipe dream. The way he clutches on the hope of his son's return raises suspicion even in his closest friend. Likewise, the repetitive pipe dreams in *The Iceman Cometh* spread doubt all over the play. Since doubt calls for questioning and questioning requires confrontation, there was a need to check the truth of their vital lies. Actually this is a striking link between the short story and the play. The American playwright brought to the stage the words Bessie lacks in Conrad's work. In fact she tried "pityingly to throw some doubt on that hope ... but the effect of her attempt had scared her very much ... She never tried again, for fear the man should go out of his mind." (T 296) Bessie never had the courage or the will again to face the old man directly and this pushes Conrad to use the return of his long-awaited son indirectly. In spite of this, we could not see the response of the thunderstruck father clearly because he shuts himself in his cottage at the first sight of his son and threatens him with a shovel. Obviously, the new comer has spoilt the most precious thing the old man had. Hence, as a reader of the short story, what O'Neill tried to present in his work is the extension of what we have already expected in Conrad's work but did not see too much. While we only speculate about what is taken from Hagberd the father and the inner happening in reaction to it, O'Neill's play allows us to enter his abode from Harry Hope's back room and see the facts from the eyes of those cornered by Hickey. Actually, this is precisely what makes the play complete the short story antithetically. It spreads its root in the same soil of the short story but grows differently once Hickey declares frankly that he has come to save them from their pipe dreams and to "spoil their sport." (T 303)

As a second stage of the discovery of the self in the two works, both Conrad and O'Neill use Harry Hagberd and Hickey as the destroyers of the pillars of the previous stage. What is deduced from the first step of discovery is that the ego strives hard to maintain its defence mechanisms. However, the complicated scheme's fragile bases to protect one's self-image might not stand against the unexpected tides of change. In fact, the aforementioned defence mechanisms are dialectical. They contain the seeds of destruction in the very foundations of their strength. As they maintain the inner

serenity and avoid undesirable facts, any turbulence to their states damages the whole scheme. This flaw in the system might help Harry and Hickey to penetrate the front lines of the defensive mechanisms of the first stage easily. The more these confronters annihilate them the more the characters sink inward till they are put in front of the gates of their true selves.

With their questioning of the pipe dreams, Harry and Hickey brought to the closed universe of Captain Hagberd and Harry Hope's the voice of the society they were escaping from. As mentioned above, the characters in the play, as well as Captain Hagberd in the short story, isolated themselves from the outside world. They know, whether consciously or not, that there is something wrong with them. This is seen in the grins of people that Captain Hagberd despised most. Actually, to avoid the dilemma of the external control of the superego, they did not fight against it but tried to compromise with it by establishing their own creed of "tomorrowism." They tried to guarantee that the surveillance of morality and conformity serve the laws of their small world. Nonetheless, the reality of the outside slithers into their strongholds through Harry and Hickey. It starts to poison their established world with the truth. As Captain Hagberd sees his son leaning over the gate, he notices in his face what causes his fears, unhappiness and pain. "Yes, people's grins were awful ... and that stranger was obviously grinning – had come on purpose to grin. It was bad enough in the streets, but he had never before been outraged like this..." (T 300) Similarly, Hickey surprises his friends with what becomes later the source of their fears, unhappiness and pain. Indeed, Hickey used to fly in the same direction as Harry Hope's flock when he was a "sinner among sinners," but this time he opposes the mainstream and brings to the saloon the words that were once forbidden. Something pushed him to change his own views about the pipe dreams he used to believe in. Thus he announces purposefully:

I swear I'd never act like I have if I wasn't absolutely sure it will be worth it to you in the end, after you're rid of the damned guilt that makes you lie to yourself you're something you're not, and the remorse that nags at you and makes you hide behind lousy pipe dreams about tomorrow. You'll be in today where there is no yesterday or tomorrow to worry you. (TIC 131)

It is already mentioned that the pipe dreams of yesterday and tomorrow sustain the lives of both Conrad's and O'Neill's characters. They are the ultimate means that

convert, rationalise and displace their inner inadequacy into more acceptable versions of reality. In fact, Hickey would succeed in his mission if he could deprive his targets of their lying pipe dreams. He wants them to feel just like him the real peace which is “a grand feeling, like when you’re sick and suffering like hell and the Doc gives you a shot in the arm, and the pain goes, and you drift off.” (TIC 80) However, the road in Harry Hope’s saloon is not paved with flowers. As he ostensibly carries on his project with good intentions, the other characters cannot accept this easily. Probably they would not allow him to discuss this very topic of pipe dreams if he did not show himself in such a surprising way. For them he has “started a movement that’ll blow up the world.” (TIC 93) Nevertheless, since he is one of them, and since he brought with him the truth that they have always feared, they could not send him out from their haven. After using his elaborated salesman skills in preaching about the futility of their pipe dreams, “Harry and Jimmy Tomorrow run ragged, and de rest is hidin’ in deir rooms so dey won’t have to listen to him ...” (TIC 89) This very situation reminds us of old Hagberd’s methods to avoid his son. However, they could not stay there for long because of their need for communication and cooperation as Willie says “(... *in a low shaken voice*). It’s been hell up in that damned room ... The things I’ve imagined! (*He shudders.*) I thought I’d go crazy.” (TIC 107)

Hickey wants to be effective in his attempts since he claims that he does not have much time. Instead of convincing each of the numerous characters alone, he heads straight for the three most influential patrons in the bar. Accordingly he tells Larry “I knew you’d be the toughest to convince of all the gang ... And, along with Harry and Jimmy Tomorrow, you’re the one I want most to help.”³¹ (TIC 106) As a first step, Hickey starts his campaign on the false conception of the past. Larry was supposed to be among his first converts but he could not do it from the beginning since indeed he is “the toughest.” As a result, he intends to use Parritt for this purpose: “I’m glad he’s here because he’ll help me make you wake up yourself.” (TIC 105) Consequently, Hickey tends to bring to the fore the truth about Larry’s pipe dream of the past through

³¹ We notice that these three characters are usually the leaders of the bar. Harry leads the “Yesterday Movement”, Jimmy leads the “Tomorrow Movement” while Larry, the grandstand philosopher, leads the movement of resistance against Hickey.

his investigation of Parritt's suffering. In other words, he uses Parritt as the alter ego of Larry who suffers as well from the same symptoms: a woman. Then Hickey moves to the touching pipe dream of the Governor who chokes up once his wife Bessie is mentioned. Unlike the others before, he questions the credibility of Harry Hope's pipe dream provokingly:

Hickey (*grins at him – amusedly*). Yes, we've all heard you tell us you thought the world of her, Governor.

Hope (*looks at him with frightened suspicion*). Well, so I did, bejees! Everyone knows I did! (*Threateningly*.) Bejees, if you say I didn't —

Hickey (*soothingly*). Now, Governor. I didn't say anything. You're the only one who knows the truth about that. (*TIC 124*)

Later in the play, he does not hint only to the truth but exposes it: "you never did want to go to church or any place else with her. She was always on your neck, making you have ambition and go out and do things, when all you wanted was to get drunk in peace." (*TIC 169*) After that, Hickey turns to the last patron of Harry Hope's. Jimmy Tomorrow finds the truth of his pipe dream of the past confronted for the first time in the play when he remembers with sorrow his beloved wife Marjorie and her betrayal. Hickey tries to wake him up from that dream but Jimmy is hurt:

Hickey (*with an amused wink at Hope*). Now, listen, Jimmy, you needn't go on. We've all heard that story about how you came back to Cape Town and found her in the hay with a staff officer. We know you like to believe that was that started you on the booze and ruined your life.

Jimmy (*stammers*). I — I'm talking to Harry. Will you kindly keep out of — (*With a pitiful defiance*.) My life is not ruined!

Hickey (*ignoring this – with a kidding grin*). But I'll bet when you admit the truth to yourself, you'll confess you were pretty sick of her hating you for getting drunk. I'll bet you were really damned relieved when she gave you such a good excuse. (*Jimmy stares at him strickenly ...*) (*TIC 125*)

Since the play presents to us the pipe dreams of the past in parallel with those of the future, Hickey doubts the validity of their tomorrows as well. At the time of his arrival, he urges his friends in the bar to take actions. Starting with the proprietor of the place, Hickey hints to the safety of walking outside on which Hope, just like Jimmy Tomorrow after him who is reminded of his pipe dream, "*stiffens resentfully for a second...*" (*TIC 76*) Hickey stands on the reality of their unwillingness to realise their supposed dreams when he tells Larry "*(injuredly)* ... Hell, if you really wanted to

die, you'd just take a hop off your fire escape, wouldn't you? And if you really were in the grandstand, you wouldn't be pitying everyone." (*TIC* 103) Actually, Hickey not only questions the veracity of their pretence but also tries to vanquish what nests it. For this part, he prepared a plan to catch the never coming tomorrow in front of them responding to Harry Hagberd's question in Conrad's short story: "why won't to-day do?" (*T* 303) It has already been mentioned that the notion of time has been changed in the saloon. For the derelicts there the future is always the past. Because of this, they do not walk on the way they are always talking about since they are always using delay to lose their tomorrows. Thus, Hickey uses Harry's birthday party first as a monument of the present:

Hickey (*grinning*). Harry's the greatest kidder in this dump and that's saying something! Look how he's kidded himself for twenty years! ... Unless I'm wrong, Governor, and I'm betting I'm not. We'll soon know, eh? Tomorrow morning. No, by God, it's *this* morning now!

Jimmy (*with a dazed dread*). *This* morning?

Hickey. Yes, it's today at last, Jimmy. (*He pats him on the back*) Don't be so scared! I've promised I'll help you. (*TIC* 122)

Then, in order not to waste this great achievement, Hickey presents Hope with "a watch all engraved with [his] name and de date" (*TIC* 123) in an attempt to mark that moment of the present. However, as expected, the Governor refuses it and turns away asserting that in his utopian world, as in the beginning of the play, watch-chains must not be connected there to any watch. Finally, the importance of time in Hickey's plan brings us back to his stand against drinking. It is already known that drunkenness corrupts the unity of time and reinforces oblivion and this pushes Hope to avoid the mental presence in his party by drinking heavily just before its beginning. He "don't (*sic*) even want to remember it's his birthday now!" (*TIC* 119) It is to be mentioned here that though one of Hickey's surprises in the party is "*(basket ... piled with quarts of champagne)*" (*TIC* 101), he figuratively deprived the booze of its effect. We must remember here that his method is progressive and gradual. He does not aim to stop his friends from drinking at once because he knows that they grab life when they grab the bottle: "If anyone wants to get drunk, if that's the only way they can be happy, and feel at peace with themselves, why the hell shouldn't they? They have my full and entire sympathy." (*TIC* 74) Nonetheless, from the point in which he declares

revolution against pipe dreams, the characters in the play are drinking without getting the desirable effect. They even start blaming him: “what did you do to the booze, Hickey? There’s no damned life left in it.” (*TIC* 177)

Turning to the host of the pipe dreams, Hickey’s strategy which is conscious and Harry Hagberd’s which is unconscious, but proceeded in the same way, is to divide and conquer. They removed the soil that nourishes those sham dreams. As I have mentioned before, the atmosphere of the group mechanism helped them to maintain their states of self-deception. Therefore, they easily shook the fragile bases of the group which were built on feigned “sympathy.” In the short story, a permanent gulf is created between Bessie and her landlord. When Harry tells her of the reality of his father’s past, she discovers the truth of his present “madness.” Once she realises the misconception of old Hagberd’s tomorrow, she does not provide further support to the old man. As both of them are isolated for a while, the vision of their inner sides starts to clear up. Similarly, in O’Neill’s play, Hickey isolates the saloon derelicts. In fact, he disturbs the calm atmosphere without fear of any reaction. It is discussed before that the characters of the play support each other not only because of love but also because of fear. However, Hickey is distinguished here with his claim of getting rid of his pipe dreams. He knows the reality of the others and he is willing to go against them since they have nothing to counterattack with. Furthermore, he creates chasms within the group, turning them against each other asserting that: “I had to make you help me with each other. I saw I couldn’t do what I was after alone ... [you] didn’t have to see through people ... [you] had to see through [your]self.” (*TIC* 130) Consequently, Harry Hope’s saloon becomes a battle ground for the old friends once they sensed no more tolerance and back up from the others. For example, Rocky’s cursed relationship with Pearl and Margie revealed its reality, “Aw right Rocky. We’re whores. You know what dat makes you, don’t you?” (*TIC* 91) Even the harmony between Lewis and Wetjoen is shattered because Hickey made “the Boer War raging again!” (*TIC* 154) Later, the crack within the group appears in the stage directions of the last act where the characters sit either on right or on left leaving a space between them. As they are divided from each other, none is going to help them to avoid looking inward as before.

We must remember here that though Harry and Hickey destroyed the house of cards that was built in both works, their intentions were not entirely the same. Hickey has planned for this because he wanted to be the “saviour” of his friends while Harry found himself inadvertently crushing his father’s and Bessie’s pipe dreams. In both cases, the similar role they play in both works is not easy at all. They are faced with characters who use all their might to resist them. However, compared to the short story, the reaction of the saloon derelicts is not violent. Captain Hagberd, as well as Bessie, are shocked by the character of Harry. His “mysterious” intentions added to his sudden coming created a revolution around the cottages of his father. In fact, as Bessie half believes Captain Hagberd’s pipe dream, he “had come just in time to spoil their sport. He was entertained by the idea scornful of the baffled plot.” (T 303) On the other side, Hickey does not face such a strong resistance from his friends. His aim to show them what they really are and then to push them to face their true selves is gradual. The saloon derelicts submit to his will despite futile attempts to resist. Larry Slade leads a movement to stand in his face. He is the only one who keeps pretence of believing his companions despite their obvious lies. For example, he soothes Hugo who wants to think that he is drunk and sides by Hope who deludes himself that an automobile ran over him. Though the others were simmering and could not oppose him, they all explode in a unanimous support of Larry once he asked him about the reasons of his change. Unexpectedly, Hickey reverses the situation once he mentions his wife’s death. His “tellin’ about his wife croackin’ put de K. O. on it.” (TIC 136) By the end, when they realise that they can resist no more, they find themselves at the river of truth.

3.3. Confession

Actually, the acknowledgment of the self in "To-morrow" is different from that of *The Iceman Cometh*. As I claim in this chapter, these two works imply striking similarities and complete each other though they are not entirely the same. In this point, Conrad shows us the reaction of Bessie and old Hagberd to their meeting with Harry leaving us with a dark impression after the discovery of the reality of their

selves. However, O'Neill's play explores this realm with a detailed explanation giving us various different faces to that discovery because of his numerous characters. Furthermore, he does not only classify, with another vision, his characters under the previous categories of Conrad's Bessie and old Hagberd, but adds to them a third one taking the case of Hickey who suggests to us some aspects of Harry Hagberd himself. Despite the complementary differences found in these works, O'Neill retains the fundamental ideas of Conrad. In this last stage of self-discovery, the characters stand armless against their inner truth. They find that the latter is factually very painful and destructive. What make their situations worse are their limited choices which swing only between insanity and death. However, those wounded badly from their confrontation with Harry Hagberd and Hickey prove that they do not want to choose from the previous set. Although they tell us what they really are, implicitly or explicitly, their confession means the realisation of their inner truth but does not mean necessarily its acceptance.

The fact that old Hagberd "runs away" from his son shows a lot between its lines. As discussed before, he finds himself facing his tomorrow all of a sudden. His retreat and violence transmit his inability to accept the truth. Despite the concrete evidence, he keeps rejecting his son and perceiving him as "the information fellow." When the old man asks Bessie "in the silence of the stony country ... [with] the voice of madness, lies, and despair – the voice of inextinguishable hope. 'Is he gone yet – that information fellow? Do you hear him about, my dear?'" (T 319-20), we realise that he has been mourning in silence. He has been waiting for this moment of departure to gain back his illusions after his brief and bitter encounter with reality. Similarly, O'Neill dramatises these moments in his play exploring the impact on his character after meeting their "tomorrows." Proceeding gradually, he shows us characters confessing their truth in two stages. The first one includes Act II and Act III where he depicts their reaction to their hollow pipe dreams. The second one includes Act IV in which he depicts what happens once they acknowledge their futility.

In the second and third acts, O'Neill uses Hickey to urge the saloon derelicts to confess the irrationality of their pipe dreams. After he moved from one room to another in silence selling his salvation to each one of them, they discovered first the

hollowness of their pipe dreams and all that nourished it. In order to meet again their true selves, they abandon the group, desert “the booze” and look for a new beginning from where they have stopped. This means that they finally regained the sense of time and met their “tomorrow.” Even if they look sick, the fact that they finally take action is a landmark per se. Their pipe dreams of the past are left behind. During the conflict between the characters, most of them heard the bitter truth they were kidding themselves about. They later acknowledge it implicitly and against their wills. It is just like what Hugo remarks: “I hear myself say crazy things. Don’t listen please.” (*TIC* 173) In fact, the first sign of their indirect confession is not verbal. It is what I have already referred to as their silent departure. With their inability to stand against the reality of their pipe dreams anymore, they start up fighting and leave in peace like Wetjoen, Lewis, Joe and the others. The other form of their meek confession is illustrated by their last hopeless attempts to question Hickey. They thus create a link between their lies and their own truth unconsciously. For example, Hugo reveals his once he exclaims with no obvious reasons: “[d]oes that prove I want to be aristocrat? I love only the proletariat! I will lead them! I will be like Gott to them! They will be my slaves!” (*TIC* 146) Larry also questions Hickey’s diagnosis and confesses indirectly:

“(with increasing bitter intensity, more as if he were fighting with himself than with Hickey). I’m afraid to live, am I? – and even more afraid to die! So I sit here, with my pride drowned on the bottom of a bottle, keeping drunk so I won’t see myself shaking in my britches with fright, or hear myself whining and praying: Beloved Christ, let me live a little longer at any price! (TIC 170)

As they cannot hide the truth anymore under the pressure of the impact, be it verbal or not, they acknowledge it without even taking notice of what they have said like in the case of Hope. He shows his latent hatred of his beloved Bessie when he compares her to Hickey who is urging him to take a walk outside: “[b]ejees, you’re a worse gabber than nagging bitch, Bessie, was...” (*TIC* 174)

As a matter of fact, after the confession of the misery of their current states, the characters in the play have to acknowledge the reality of their inner sides. Moving to the most difficult part of the self-discovery, they find themselves alone in front of the stark reality. But herein lies one of O’Neill’s recurrent questions: “[w]ho wants to see

life as it is, if they can help it?”³² Hickey pretends that he feels the inner peace because he is able to see reality as it is. However, his friends at Harry Hope’s cannot help it. They realise that they are only liars, cowards and drunkards who are afraid all the time of their past, present and future. They were failures and their serious mistakes cannot be corrected. They have lost all their chances in life because they cannot change. Once they are pushed against their wills to meet their inner truth they are figuratively crushed beneath its wheels just like what Hope tells us in a terrifying tone: “bejees, something ran over me! Must have been myself I guess.” (*TIC* 173) Because of the “peace of death” that was brought to the bar by Hickey, Harry Hope’s becomes a real morgue rather than a palace of pipe dreams. As an expression of their failure, those who left to battle the self return to the bar mortally wounded. They are like waxed figures, sick and insensible. They are unable to fight anymore so they only sit and listen. They want to heal their painful injuries with the “booze” but they cannot pass out. The fact of their return and of their urging need to drunkenness is an acknowledgment of their inner futility. This is illustrated by Rocky who tells that they

can’t even get drunk ... Dey’re all licked ... de poor bums when dey showed up tonight, one by one, lookin’ like pooches wid deir tails between deir legs, dat everyone’d been kickin’ till dey was too pucn-drunk to feel it more. Jimmy Tomorrow was de last. Schwartz, de copper, brung him in. Seeing him sittin’ on de dock on West Street, lookin’ at de water and cryin’! Schwartz thought he was drunk and I let him tink it. But he was cold sober. He was tryin’ to jump in and didn’t have de noive ... Jees, dere ain’t enough guts left in de whole gang to battle a mosquito! (*TIC* 183)

The weight of the truth made them helpless and about to condemn themselves aloud unlike what they did when they were leaving “proudly.” Jimmy, the leader of their previous Tomorrow Movement, verbalises the scene. As he represented once the uttermost delusion, he confesses the full fatal reality of his inner emptiness lifelessly:

Yes. Quite right. It was all a stupid lie – my nonsense about tomorrow. Naturally, they would never give me my position back. I would never dream of asking them. It would be hopeless. I didn’t resign. I was fired for drunkenness. And that was years ago. I’m much worse now. and it was absurd of me to excuse my drunkenness by pretending it was my wife’s adultery that ruined my life ... Long before, I discovered early in life that living frightened me when I was sober. I have forgotten why I married Marjorie. I can’t even remember now if she was

³² Eugene O’Neill, *Long Day’s Journey into Night*, op. cit., p. 796.

pretty. She was blonde, I think, but I couldn't swear to it. I had some idea of wanting a home perhaps. But, of course, I much preferred the nearest pub. Why Marjorie married me, God knows. It's impossible to believe she loved me. She soon found I much preferred drinking all night with my pals to being in bed with her. So, naturally, she was unfaithful. I didn't blame her. I really don't care. I was glad to be free – even grateful to her, I think for giving me such a good tragic excuse to drink as much as I damned well pleased. (*TIC* 195)

Nonetheless, with their coming back to their hosting nests, with their surrender and inability to act, Hickey's project falls down because the inner truth was too destructive to endure. It put them in a state of war rather than peace with their selves. They can acknowledge their inner reality but they cannot accept it. In fact, they want death at Harry Hope's by hanging themselves on the gallows of his whiskey.

Paradoxically, Hickey expects the return of his old friends though he cannot understand the idea behind it. He thinks that his plans of killing the pipe dreams will bring them peace like he did to his. His friend's coming back pushes him to burst resentfully:

Can't you appreciate what you've got, for God's sake? Don't you know you're free now to be yourselves, without having to feel remorse or guilt, or lie to yourselves about reforming tomorrow. Can't you see there is not tomorrow now? You're rid of it for ever! You've killed it! (*TIC* 192)

Nonetheless, Hickey's failure is not only a result of the stubbornness of his companions. His friends' inability to continue living without a pipe dream is a reflection of his lying about killing his own. As he realises something about himself before leaving the stage, he is in a way similar to Conrad's young Hagberd who leaves his father's cottages. Though he says that what obliges him to leave is that place's madness, he might have identified his inner truth with that dead-alive place. The quest of his father that he disgusts and cannot understand is factually his. However, he leaves not because of full realisation or understanding but because of a strong feeling of being related to it. It was like the Gambucinos' quest he admired the most.

Actually, this is the turning point in the play. Hickey claims that he wants his friends to get rid of their illusions in order not to "show [them] what a pipe dream did to [him] and Evelyn..." (*TIC* 194) It pushed him to kill her because he did not want to her to suffer while he could not change his bad habits. As he says, he killed her out of

pure love. However, the longer he speaks, the more he digs up his unconscious. In fact he killed her because she made him guiltier with her continuous forgiveness and creation of excuses to defend him against himself. He says: “I began to hate that pipe dream ... I even caught myself hating her for making me hate myself so much. There’s a limit to the guilt you can feel and the forgiveness and the pity you can take.” (*TIC* 205) In a way, he realises that he came to Harry Hope’s not to brag about getting rid of his pipe dream but only to confirm his new pipe dream that he killed his pipe dream by killing his wife for love. However, while keeping on narrating his story, he unconsciously calls his beloved wife a “bitch.” He confesses that he killed her not for the sake of love but because she was the nagging voice of his conscience. He realises that he hated all of this and at this moment he discovers further that he is just like those who are listening to his story and cannot live without a pipe dream. While he felt a fake peace in his finding of a new pipe dream, they looked pale because till that moment they had found none. That was one of the biggest dilemmas in the play. For Hickey is supposed either to acknowledge the full reality of his pipe dream, make his project work and burn himself under its bitter reality, or to create another pipe dream at the spot thus crushing his project and saving himself. In fact he chooses the second possibility and claims madness because the latter is the only justification for what he tells the silent corpse of his wife. As a result he maintains the illusion of his wife’s love. Actually the scene of that dilemma deserves to be quoted here because it shows us a decisive moment in which Hickey and Hope, representing his friends, are about to create a new pipe dream simultaneously:

Hope (... *suddenly he looks at Hickey and there is an extraordinary change in his expression. His face lights up, as if he were grasping at some dawning hope in his mind. He speaks with a groping eagerness.*) Insane? You mean – you went really insane?

(At the tone of his voice, all the group at the tables by him start and stare at him as if they caught his thought. Then they all look at Hickey eagerly, too.)

Hickey... Yes, Harry, of course, I’ve been out of my mind ever since! All the time I’ve been here! You saw I was insane, didn’t you? (*TIC* 208-9)

Then, after the police officer asks them not to fall for Hickey’s claim Hope answers:

Bejees, you dumb dick, you’ve got a crust trying to tell us about Hickey! We’ve known him for years, and every one of use noticed he was nutty the minute he

showed up here! Bejees, if you'd heard all the crazy bull he was pulling about bringing us peace ... if you'd seen all the damned fool things he made us do! We only did them because – (*He hesitates – then defiantly.*) Because we hoped he'd come out of it if we kidded him along and humoured him. (*He looks around at the others.*) Ain't that right, feller? (*TIC 209*)

Later, Hope and the others promise to testify that Hickey was crazy in order not to be given the “Chair.” As they intend to do it, they narrowly escape their confrontation with the self. Now, they are able to create new pipe dreams since, building on the change of the events, the mirror which was supposed to expose their inner selves is broken. As they stand in front of distorted images, they convince themselves that those images are not theirs. They snatch this chance of relief and return to their previous states under the leadership of their Governor. After the departure of Hickey, they start laughing, getting drunk and soothing each other's lies again. In sum, they recover the first stage of defence mechanisms where pipe dreams, group altruism and drunkenness are resurrected with a new spirit. For example, Rocky admits that the imaginary automobile narrowly missed his boss, Cora and Chuck say that they are going to marry when they buy a farm and Jimmy scorns Hickey's talk about tomorrow. They forget what the “intruder” did and start to strengthen their previous defence mechanisms. They drink, sing, pipe dream and declare that “[they] are all all right.” (*TIC 218*) In the same way, old Hagberd echoes this moment when he expresses his happiness because of the departure of the “information fellow” announcing that he “(will) be all right ... One Day More.” (*T 320*)

However, in Conrad's short story, Bessie abolishes her illusion and falls into despair. She acknowledges that she shares half of her landlord's pipe dream because of her miserable life. She clings to the hope of marrying Harry though she realises that he will not take her as a wife. Her self-contradictory dilemma is reflected when she asks him to take the money and leave and then begging him to stay. But with the departure of young Hagberd she becomes painfully aware of the atmosphere of madness and sterility around her. Gaping at the face of nothingness, she “began to totter silently back towards her stuffy little inferno of a cottage. It had no lofty portal, no terrific inscription of forfeited hopes.” (*T 320*) Likewise, Parritt and Larry find a sense in what Hickey did even if he was using them to reinforce his own pipe dream. Unlike the rest

of the characters in the play, they can no longer bear their delusional lives. Larry who was striving to avoid the quest initiated by Hickey collapses in silence. Despite his advice to Parritt, “if you don’t keep still, you’ll be saying something soon that will make you vomit your own soul like a drink of nickel rotgut that won’t stay!” (*TIC* 157), he finds himself by the end of the play admitting his futile purposes and unmasking the truth of his inner self with full awareness:

Be 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! (*With an intense bitter sincerity.*) May that day come soon! (*He pauses startledly, surprised at himself – then with a sardonic grin.*) Be God, I’m the only real convert to death Hickey made here. From the bottom of my coward’s heart I mean that now! (*TIC* 222)

Actually, he was the most tormented soul in that bar. Even if he avoided confession by keeping still throughout the play, his inner voice was always there. O'Neill uses Parritt as Larry's alter ego from one side and as an expressionistic device from the other. Indeed, Parritt as a character throws himself from the fire escape once he meets the darkness of his self and figures out the reality of the future waiting for him from the eyes of Larry. At the same time, he “physicalises” the utter despair of Larry who is unable to join the creed of the group anymore. As a matter of fact this is not the only instance of Parritt's expressionistic role. His gradual confession in the play shows us how the other saloon derelicts move from denial of their inner reality to lies and then acknowledgment as he moves from his denial of betraying the Movement to his confession that he did so out patriotism, then money and finally standing in front of the truth that he hated his mother.

4. Conclusion

An intertextual approach accompanied with a psychoanalytic reading to O'Neill's *The Iceman Cometh* in parallel with Conrad's "To-morrow" provides us with a broader perspective of both works. By the end of this chapter, we discover new facets to the notion of delay and the waiting for a “one day more.” Indeed these pieces share similar aspects both inside and outside their structure. As mentioned before, the characters of

the play can be labelled under those of the short story. In addition, the contexts of these works can be interconnected both literally and symbolically. We need to point that it is not only similarities bind them but even differences. As they intersect and share some threads, they complete each other. As if O'Neill's play were another reading of Conrad's short story. Furthermore, while the American playwright was trying to answer the word of his British predecessor, he antithetically completed another vision to his short story exploring the deep inside of Captain Hagberd while "physicalising" the probable words of the other silently tortured character: Bessie.

Since this research deals with intertextuality as a primary theoretical tool, we should mention also another aspect of this literary theory. The links between different works do not connect only writers or texts but even the literary production of the same writer. For example, we notice here that O'Neill's *The Iceman Cometh* not only an intimacy with various external works and texts, as mentioned in the first section of this chapter, but also with internal ones written by O'Neill. Bearing in mind the connection of the Gambucinos's incessant pursuit of gold in "To-morrow" while hiding from the discovery of their empty and futile journey, we find the same quest taken in other works, whether intentionally or not, like *The Emperor Jones*, *The Hairy Ape* and *The Fountain*. In other words, in order to understand the meaning of external intertextuality, we have to pay attention to the nature and the process of the internal intertextuality. Accordingly, a more logical connection between the studied play and short story is brought to the fore. O'Neill's only short story is entitled the same as Conrad's thus it is not surprising to find some of its ideas in his later plays, as they evolved unconsciously and took other forms through the process of internal intertextuality. Consequently, O'Neill's "Tomorrow", which is highly indebted to Conrad, might have sown the seeds of an idea which sprouted later in one of the masterpieces of American literature.³³

³³ For further discussion of the relationship between O'Neill's "Tomorrow" and *The Iceman Cometh* see Julie M. Gram, "'Tomorrow': From Whence *The Iceman Cometh*", *The Eugene O'Neill Review*, Vol. 15, No. 1 (Spring 1991), pp. 79-92, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/29784407>.

Conclusion

This dissertation tried to articulate a relationship between some selected works of Eugene O'Neill and Joseph Conrad. The discussion was based on intertextual relations seen from the lenses of some psychoanalytical concepts introduced by Sigmund Freud and Carl Jung. As the psychological readings were very fruitful for the discussion of the topic, they helped to concentrate our concern on one field lest we go astray in an infinite comparative and intertextual reading of the studied works. Furthermore, the suggestion here was that Conrad might have only provided O'Neill with some necessary pieces to complete his patchworks. In fact, because of the inability to explain exactly the processes of the mind, or even the world, we cannot fully grasp, prove or refute the presence of intertextuality. This complication arises from the simple fact that we cannot lay hands on its ends and beginnings.

In addition, while this research project showed different readings of both anterior and posterior texts, because of the hidden threads that link them together, it tried to deal indirectly with the notion of literary creation. It considered that O'Neill, for example, a creative writer not because of his dealing with the unprecedented but because of his ability to be a unique melting pot of textual and contextual elements. As an artist, this is not something embarrassing since limitations and boundaries are the natural aspects of human beings. Probably the word "limitation" might give a negative connotation but we need to remember that between two limited numbers there are full universes of infinity.

Actually, we found that the notion of intertextuality has its ghostly effect on the author especially in regard with the notion of originality. But if we come back to the very meaning of the term "literature", a logical justification can be proposed. What literature does is the transmission of certain ideas and feelings through language. So to discuss its nature is to come back to its main components: expressions and language. For the latter, the modern linguists assume the presence of a hidden relation between the different languages of the world. The fact of the presence of verbs, nouns, adverbs and the like in addition to similar tenses and grammatical rules can strengthen this assumption of a shared aspect between different tongues which we might refer to as linguistic universal or, in a way, as the "intertext." Likewise, expressed ideas and imagination presumably share the same features. On one side, we cannot neglect the

function of language as I have just discussed, on the other there are archetypes in various works in the world as if a connection is drawn between the ideas and imagination of human beings. Furthermore, ideas are in a constant dialogic process because

[t]he idea *lives* not in one person's *isolated* individual consciousness – if it remains there only, it degenerates and dies. The idea begins to live, that is, to take shape, to develop, to find and renew its verbal expression, to give birth to new ideas, only when it enters into genuine dialogic relationships with other ideas, with the ideas of *others*.¹

In fact, not only the linguists had their share of setting the bases of the intertextual study but also the psychologists. Carl Jung believed in the “collective unconscious” and the fact of shared elements within the deep inside of a race as well as humanity in general. Thus we can notice inherent and referential common aspects between people, and more specifically writers, from different places and times.

Accordingly, the various propositions about the true nature of literature paralleled those of language. We can say further that the formation of a text, as a language, cannot only be seen as an entity shaped by itself, or with the help of the author, but an outcome of a conscious or unconscious interactive aspect found in communication. Since dialogue is a dominant characteristic that binds a certain community, we come back to the Russian linguist Mikhail Bakhtin and his fundamental concept of dialogism. The importance of this concept takes us far in the past to the aspect of Socrates's form of dialogue in his discussion of philosophical issues and brings us back to the present fact that things exist dialogically. To put it more simply we can say that every action has a reaction. And since we are human beings in need of contact with each other, our discourses, including the literary text which is seen as an extended form of language,

[are] full of other people's words: with some of them we completely merge our own voice, forgetting whose they are; others, which we take as authoritative, we

¹ Mikhail Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* (1963), cited in Morris Pam (ed.), *The Bakhtin Reader: Selected Writings of Bakhtin, Medvedev, Voloshinov* (1994) (Reprinted, London: Arnold, 2003), p. 98.

use to reinforce our own words, still others, finally we populate with our own aspirations, alien or hostile to them.²

Furthermore, the scope of literary creation is discussed in Julia Kristeva's essay "The Bounded Text" in which she states that a text cannot go beyond the notion of intertextuality.³ Even Carl Jung in his essay "Psychology and Literature" says that the personal experience cannot transcend the human possible.⁴ In other words, whether liked or not, no text transcends its borders. It reflects in a way the elements from which it emerged. Any given text cannot bypass, for example, the boundaries of its literary, artistic, cultural, moral, social aspects. It has come to life as a reaction and reflection to them. They mutually represent each other though we cannot always figure out their traces. If one can cross their boundaries by finding other "contexts," we cannot escape the fact of only broadening the boundaries not annihilating them. Hence, Society, history, culture and biography among others can be seen as texts surrounding and containing the written text.

Though Julia Kristeva seems to give importance to what surrounds and composes the text, she complains about the misunderstanding of intertextuality once it is confused with the study of influence and source hunting. For her, intertextuality is a much larger phenomenon. Nonetheless, we cannot neglect that what she described as a "banal sense"⁵ provides us with the first clues for the investigation of intertextual intersections.

Out of the necessity of comparing each of the two writer's sources of influence, and with compromise with Julia Kristeva's claim, we must not look at influence as a direct impulse a writer or a text has on another writer but, according to Ihab H. Hassan, as the intrinsic and extrinsic elements that serve to expose two visions of the same feelings despite their distance from one another. In view of that, I started the discussion of this topic with a short overview on the age and the lives of the two

² Ibid., p. 106 – 7.

³ Julia Kristeva links the boundaries of literary creation to the act of writing itself. For her, "writing is an artificial limit, an arbitrary law, a subjective finitude ... Writing itself appears only to bound the book ..." Julia Kristeva, "The Bounded Text", op. cit., p. 58.

⁴ Carl Gustav Jung, *Modern Man in Search of A Soul* (1933), trans. W. S. Dell and C. F. Baynes (Reprinted, New York: Routledge, 2004), p. 160.

⁵ Julia Kristeva, "Revolution in Poetic Language" (1974), in Toril Moi (ed.), *The Kristeva Reader*, trans. Margaret Walter, (Reprinted, New York: Columbia University Press, 1986), p. 111.

writers. My argument was about influence and its possibility to create alike bases for future thematic similarities whether O'Neill was aware of it or not. At this point, I focused on the idea that influence must not be seen only as a direct impact of the text or the writer has on another but as the inner and external elements that culminate to direct two visions, or more, into the same topics despite the distance in time and space that may separate the writers. Therefore, the first chapter dealt with some biographical, political, historical, economic, philosophical and artistic elements that characterised the life and the age of the two writers. The aim here was not to recall the major events of that time, but to grasp the mood and the feelings they resulted in change of the conception of the individual and then in the shattering of his certainties. Of course it might be illogical to say that O'Neill and Conrad were the spit image of the other, yet we should not underestimate the impact which creates, as this study tried to deal with, an intertext. All in all, whether the influence of Conrad's life and works on O'Neill was conscious, unconscious or accidental, it is a proof of the existence of intertextuality. The latter represents what is hidden and common between the British writer and the American playwright who found, and declared, themselves looking for the truth of the alienated individual of this new and uncertain age. In other words, this is what gives us the similar impression from some of the works of the two writers and pushes us to read them in parallel with each other.

If we come back to the writings of Eugene O'Neill, a number of similarities can be linked to those of Joseph Conrad. Yet, the purpose of discussion in this study is not to focus on the indebtedness of O'Neill to Conrad, since O'Neill himself cannot defend or refute this because of his unawareness of the unconsciousness of influence, but to pay attention to the interaction between both texts and the new dimension of interpretation it results.

Starting with *The Emperor Jones* and *Heart of Darkness*, a number of links can be established between them despite their seemingly divergent plots. The two story lines are ostensibly different but they contain, in a way, some shared aspects between their settings, characters and themes. The two works take place in faraway lands with similar landscapes and most importantly in a thick forest. The latter echoes in silence the darkness of the incomprehensible which stands for a symbolic self. Those places

are inhabited by black natives who are subjugated and oppressed by godlike rulers. As a result, *The Emperor Jones* and *Heart of Darkness* carry the sense of doom from their beginnings. Something about the understanding of the human values is violated because of the surrender to the inner greedy and infinite demands of those in charge. The striking link between these two works exists in the characters of Jones and Kurtz. As they stand for modern tragic heroes, O'Neill and Conrad try to approach the reasons behind their capitulation and destruction by the inner dark forces. I argued that the essence on which those characters built their self-image was deceptive. As a result, the annihilation of what they have established as the only truth dragged them to their downfall. Despite the dissimilarities between Jones and Kurtz in various situations, we deduce that even if their colours are different from the outside, they are the same inside. The two characters were put in the same high position. They reacted with the same greed, ambition and oppression. In the end, they died in the same way. The main discussion of this section was based on a parallel reading of the novella and the play. We presumed that Jones and Kurtz followed the same stages of their self-discovery. They wore the royal cloak of civilisation to justify their absolutism and create a myth about their infallibility. However, a moment came when they found themselves alienated from the world they established. This is exactly the beginning of their inner journey and the confrontation with what they disliked in those whom they loathed and underestimated. Actually, Conrad did not show this in his work and left us only the impression of the destructive inner journey of Kurtz. From that dead end starts the role of O'Neill who tried to express that journey from the eyes of Jones. With the use of expressionism, the play presents to us the regression of the tragic hero in his personal and racial memories. His state by the end of the journey is quite similar to that of Kurtz. The similarity between Jones and Kurtz can be more logical if we question the very meaning of expressionism. As the latter is the "physicalisation" of the inner abstraction, we can say that Jones' cyclical movement in the forest is just an expressionistic device in itself. From another perspective, he did not enter the forest at all but fell on its doors. A situation quite similar to that of Kurtz who ended what he could see alone with the words "The horror! The horror!" As a result, the hidden threads between these texts not only link them to each other, but also provide us with a

completion of the “anterior” text which, in its turn, expounds some realities about the “posterior” text.

While *The Emperor Jones* completes a moment in *Heart of Darkness*, O'Neill's *The Iceman Cometh* completes an idea set in Conrad's "To-morrow". The two writers investigate how their characters try to hide the truth of the self by their incessant search for nothingness. In fact, their delay is the only way to defend their inability and paralysis in the world. They lie and become the sole believers of that lie. The latter becomes a truth and a conviction whose source cannot be remembered because it was buried deep in the unconscious. However, while Conrad presents to us a silent struggling character whose hopes and dreams are destroyed before him revealing his lifelong lie, O'Neill gives a voice to his characters who undertake the same process. This, just like the previous pair of works, proves that while Conrad leans towards impressionism, O'Neill favours expressionism. We only see Conrad's characters from the outside in the short story while we feel what he suffers in O'Neill's play.

In spite of the difference between the plots, the genres and the lengths of the two works, the play contains the very basic elements of the short story. *The Iceman Cometh* and "To-morrow" take place in an isolated and closed space. They hide some refugees from the universal truth of the world. They embrace harmless, but to some extent strange, characters. If not disturbed about their present situation, they are peaceful and quiet despite the halo of madness above their dreams. Following the function of each character, we found that the short story is the small paradigm of the play. While the shadow of Captain Hagberd enshrouds all the characters of the play, some links between the long-awaited Hickey and Harry Hagberd can be drawn. In addition, some aspects of Conrad's Bessie can be found in O'Neill's Evelyn, Parritt and Larry. What is also remarkable in these works is the structure of their plots. They can be divided into three parts: the waiting for a person, the coming of that person and then the impact he leaves on the rest of the characters. As discussed before, the derelicts in Harry Hope's hotel are waiting for Hickey just as Captain Hagberd and Bessie are waiting for Harry. However, the arrival of Hickey and Harry does not bring the happy tidings of joy. They lead those who are waiting for them, as well as themselves, to undertake a similar painful journey of self-discovery. While we see this journey only

from the outside in the case of Captain Hagberd, the characters of the play join their dilemmas together to explain his. At the first stage, they establish a self-image and rationalise their miserable situations. They are hoping, “vital-lying” and deferring their lives to the unknown where they cannot meet the reality of their present. However, in the second stage, they are obliged to confront the inner realities and fears. The previously established mechanisms reach a dead end before the walls of Hickey and Harry Hagberd. The train those characters pretended to wait for arrives, the mirage they were happy not to touch is caught, and the group which embraced them together dissolves. Once there are no more justifications to cover the self, each of them stood alone facing the incarnation of his words into concrete realities. O’Neill’s Hickey and Conrad’s Harry bring with them what is supposed to be truth to the roaming souls of Harry Hope’s derelicts, Captain Hagberd and Bessie. The argument at this stage was that Hickey brought the silent words of confrontation. The play tried to explore the failed attempt of Bessie to contradict her landlord. In the last stage of self-discovery, the departure of Hickey and Harry Hagberd causes the same divided atmosphere. While Parritt and Larry surrendered to the bitter reality like Bessie, the rest of the characters followed the same doctrine of new tomorrowism and escaped from the bitter reality like Captain Hagberd. In short, they did not want to be saved from themselves. Accordingly, the thin links between these texts are magnified from this parallel reading. *The Iceman Cometh* provided us with another view of "To-morrow" and vice versa. Furthermore, O’Neill’s play broadens the view of Conrad’s short story and makes the saloon a microcosm of this world. Most of its residents live only in a place called “hope” where they can hide, forget and wait there peacefully just like what Hope does to his customers.

Both Conrad and O’Neill dealt with the covered truth of the self in the aforementioned works. I have argued that their works helped in a better explanation of each other. Bearing in mind that Conrad’s short stories and novels retained their beauty in mystery, O’Neill had to clarify the ambiguity. The demands of the written work and the performed work are different to some extent. The playwright must be clear in order to meet the demands of his audiences. Consequently, O’Neill masked

conceptually his characters and then unmasked them.⁶ This led to their downfall from a world they established on veneer notions. His characters take a long journey into the night of the self hoping to find light at its heart. Throughout this quest, each character finds that he has established and underpinned an image of the self to avoid some of its bitter realities. When time comes, there is a questioning of the established notions that leads either to denial or annunciation.⁷ Actually, the self-discovery is not something new because the characters turn in a cycle they have avoided its starting point. Unfortunately for them, they end at the same spot of departure which seems new but this newness is just the result of their eyes that now, unlike before, do not avoid looking. The cycle in O'Neill shows how things exist but we fail to see them. The reality is there before the eyes but it is considered as unnecessary dilemma. It needs to be peeled through acts and scenes to discover that it was always there from the very beginning.

If we can sum up the main dilemma of this work, we have to refer to O'Neill's unfinished cycle of plays: *A Tale of Possessors, Self-Dispossessed*. The title is significant not because of what might have been written if O'Neill had finished this work but because it can cover *The Emperor Jones*, *Heart of Darkness*, *The Iceman Cometh* and "To-morrow" under its shade. Jones and his counterpart in this study, Kurtz, possessed the world with their misleading conception of "civilisation" but dispossessed their selves. In the same way, Harry Hope's derelicts and their counterpart, Captain Hagberd, possessed their own world with lying hopes but dispossessed their selves. In reverse, once they were pushed to possess the real self, they lost their worlds.

⁶ Though O'Neill does not use concrete masks in *The Emperor Jones* and *The Iceman Cometh*, both civilisation and hope can be seen as abstract ones. Thierry Dubost argues that the "references to the mask go far beyond the concrete object, whose dramatic possibilities O'Neill had wished to exploit in a new approach to the theatre. The mask must be understood in its conceptual sense, as an element which allows the characters to escape the scrutiny of others, like a veil covering a reality which they wish to keep private." Thierry Dubost, *Struggle Defeat or Rebirth: Eugene O'Neill Vision of Humanity*, op. cit., p. 119. Therefore, we can consider these plays as plays of masks.

⁷ In fact, when we explore the depths of the self we come to the instincts and their imageries. Their eruption may be constructive or destructive according to the preparedness of the conscious mind. Carl Gustav Jung, *The Undiscovered Self* (1957) (Reprinted, London: Routledge, 2002), p. 75.

Because of the imperfection of human beings and the multiplicity of reality, any work is full of gaps. However, there is an advantage in this “weakness” since the gaps require filling. The studied works of Eugene O’Neill were just parts of an infinite process of filling, as called by Roland Barthes, the “writerly” texts of Joseph Conrad. With his attempts to complete what the British writer left, he multiplied, whether consciously or not, the interpretation of some of his predecessor’s works. As long as literary texts can be read from different perspectives, we cannot claim that this study was able to cover all the relationships between Conrad’s and O’Neill’s oeuvres. However, it may open new gates for further researches about textual relations between these prominent writers.

Bibliography

I. Primary Sources

- Conrad, Joseph. *Heart of Darkness* (1902). Rpt., London: Penguin Popular Classics, 1994.
- Conrad, Joseph "To-morrow" (1903) in *The Works of Joseph Conrad: Typhoon and Other Stories*. Rpt., London: William Heinemann, 1921.
- O'Neill, Eugene. *The Emperor Jones* (1920) in *The Plays of Eugene O'Neill*. Rpt., New York: Random House, 1928.
- O'Neill, Eugene. *The Iceman Cometh* (1946). Rpt., London: Jonathan Cape, 1980.

II. Secondary Sources

II. 1. Other Literary Works Consulted

- Conrad, Joseph. *One Day More: A Play in One Act* (1905), <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/17621/17621-h/17621-h.htm>, (Accessed on October 13th, 2012)
- Conrad, Joseph. *The Nigger of the "Narcissus": A Tale of the Sea* (1897), in *The Works of Joseph Conrad*. Rpt., London: William Heinemann, 1921.
- O'Neill, Eugene. *Hughie* (1959), in *Eugene O'Neill: Complete Plays 1932-1943* (Vol. III). Rpt., New York: The Library of America, 1988.
- O'Neill, Eugene. *Long Day's Journey into Night* (1956) in *Eugene O'Neill: Complete Plays 1932-1943* (Vol. III). Rpt., New York: The Library of America, 1988.
- O'Neill, Eugene. *The Fountain* (1926), <http://gutenberg.net.au/ebooks04/0400121h.html>, (Accessed on June 6th, 2012)
- O'Neill, Eugene. *The Hairy Ape* (1922), in *The Plays of Eugene O'Neill*. Rpt., New York: Random House, 1928.
- O'Neill, Eugene. "Tomorrow" (1917) in *Eugene O'Neill: Complete Plays 1932-1943* (Vol. III). Rpt., New York: The Library of America, 1988.
- Shakespeare, William. *Hamlet* (1604). Rpt., London: Penguin Popular Classics, 1994.

II. 2. Books of Criticism on Eugene O'Neill and Joseph Conrad

- Alexander, Doris. *Eugene O'Neill's Creative Struggle: The Decisive Decade 1924-1933*. Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1992.
- Berkowitz, Gerald M. *American Drama of the Twentieth Century*. London: Longman, 1992.
- Bigsby, C. W. E. *Modern American Drama, 1945-2000*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Bloom, Clive (ed.). *American Drama*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1995.
- Bloom, Harold (ed.). *Bloom's Guides: Joseph Conrad's Heart of Darkness*. New York: Bloom's Literary Criticism, 2009.
- Bloom, Harold. *Bloom's Modern Critical Views: Eugene O'Neill*. New York: Bloom's Literary Criticism, 2007.
- Bogard, Travis. *Contour in Time: The Plays of Eugene O'Neill* (1972). Revised Edition, New York: Oxford University Press, 1988. <http://www.eoneill.com/library/contour/contents.htm>, (Accessed on June 1st, 2012)
- Dubost, Thierry. *Struggle, Defeat or Rebirth: Eugene O'Neill's Vision of Humanity*. London: McFarland & Company Inc., 1997.
- Erdinast-Vulcan, Daphna. *Joseph Conrad and the Modern Temper* (1991). Rpt., Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001.
- Fleche, Anne. *Mimetic Disillusion: Eugene O'Neill, Tennessee Williams, and U.S. Dramatic Realism*. Tuscaloosa, Alabama: The University of Alabama Press, 1997.
- Griffith, John W. *Joseph Conrad and the Anthropological Dilemma: 'Bewildered Traveller'* (2005). Rpt. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2007.
- Hand, Richard J. *The Theatre of Joseph Conrad: Reconstructed Fictions*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.
- Harpham, Geoffrey Galt. *One of Us: The Mastery of Joseph Conrad*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1996.
- Leavis, F. R. *The Great Tradition: George Eliot, Henry James, Joseph Conrad* (1948). Rpt., New York: George W. Stewart, 1950.

- Levenson, Michael. *Modernism and the Fate of Individuality: Character and Novelistic Form from Conrad to Woolf* (1991). Rpt., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Manheim, Michael (ed.). *The Cambridge Companion to Eugene O'Neill* (1980). Rpt., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Miller, Jordan Yale and Frazer, Winifred L. *American Drama between the Wars: A Critical History* (1991). Rpt., Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1997.
- Miller, Jordan Yale. *Eugene O'Neill and the American Critic: A Summary and Bibliographical Checklist*. London: Archon Books, 1962.
- Moore, Gene M. (ed.) *Joseph Conrad's Heart of Darkness: A Casebook*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Murphy, Brenda. *American Realism and American Drama 1880-1940* (1987). Rpt., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Peters, John G. *The Cambridge Introduction to Joseph Conrad*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Shaughnessy, Edward L. *Down the Nights and Down the Days: Eugene O'Neill's Catholic Sensibility*. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 2000.
- Stape, J. H. (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Joseph Conrad* (1996). Rpt., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Tornqvist, Egil. *Eugene O'Neill: A Playwright's Theatre*. London: McFarland & Company Inc., 2004.
- Walker, Julia A. *Expressionism and Modernism in American Theatre: Bodies, Voices, Words*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Winther, Sophus Keith. *Eugene O'Neill: A Critical Study* (1934). Enlarged Edition, New York: Random House, 1961. <http://www.eoneill.com/library/winther/contents.htm>. (Accessed on October 3rd, 2012)

II. 3. Articles on Eugene O'Neill and Joseph Conrad

- Berlin, Normand. “**O’Neill And Comedy: The Iceman Cometh**” (1988), <http://www.eoneill.com/library/newsletter/xii-3/xii-3b.htm>, (Accessed on January 5th, 2012)
- Bloom, Steven F. “**Drinking and Drunkenness in *The Iceman Cometh*: A Response to Mary McCarthy**” (1985), <http://www.eoneill.com/library/newsletter/ix1/ix-1b.htm>, (Accessed on January 9th, 2012)
- ————— “**The Role of Drinking and Alcoholism in O’Neill’s Late Plays**” (1984), <http://www.eoneill.com/library/newsletter/viii1/viii-1e.htm>, (Accessed on January 5th, 2012)
- Butler, Robert. “**Artifice and Art--Words in *The Iceman Cometh* and *Hughie***” (1981), <http://www.eoneill.com/library/newsletter/v1/v-1b.htm>, (Accessed on February 5th, 2012)
- Dave, Jagdish V. “**Eugene O’Neill’s Philosophy of life, in ‘The Iceman Cometh’**”, <http://yabaluri.org/TRIVENI/CDWEB/eugeneoneillsphilosophyoflifejul81.htm>, (Accessed on August 3rd, 2012)
- Duclos, Donald P. “**A Plank in Faulkner’s "Lumber Room": *The Emperor Jones* and *Light in August***” (1987), <http://www.eoneill.com/library/newsletter/xi-2/xi-2c.htm>, (Accessed on January 5th, 2012)
- Egri, Peter. “***The Iceman Cometh*: European Origins and American Originality**” (1981), <http://www.eoneill.com/library/newsletter/v3/v-3c.htm>, (Accessed on July 17th, 2011)
- Floyd, Virginia. “**The Search for Self in *The Hairy Ape*: An Exercise of Futility**” (1978), <http://www.eoneill.com/library/newsletter/i3/i-3c.htm>, (Accessed on February 2nd, 2012)
- Gelb, Barbara. “**O’Neill’s 'Iceman' Sprang from the Ashes of His Youth**” (1985), <http://www.eoneill.com/library/on/gelbs/times9.29.1985.htm>, (Accessed on September 5th, 2012)
- Gelb, Barbara and Arthur. “**As O’Neill Saw the Theatre**” (1961), <http://www.eoneill.com/library/on/gelbs/times11.12.1961.htm>, (Accessed on March 3rd, 2012)

- Gram, Julie M. “**‘Tomorrow’: From Whence *The Iceman Cometh***”, *The Eugene O'Neill Review*, Vol. 15, No. 1 (Spring 1991), pp. 79-92, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/29784407>. (Accessed on October 7th, 2012)
- Hawkins, Hunt “**Conrad's Critique of Imperialism in Heart of Darkness**”, *Modern Language Association*, Vol. 94, No. 2, (Mar., 1979), pp. 286-299, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/461892>. (Accessed on April 2nd, 2012)
- Hawley, William. “***The Iceman Cometh* and the Critics--1946, 1956, 1973**” (1985), <http://www.eoneill.com/library/newsletter/ix3/ix-3b.htm>, (Accessed on January 5th, 2012)
- Hooti, Noorbakhsh and Maleki, Nasser. “**Terror and Ambivalence of the Human Soul in O’Neill’s *The Emperor Jones* and *The Hairy Ape***” (2008), <http://www.scribd.com/doc/128001645/Terror-and-Ambivalence-of-the-Human-Soul-in-the-Emperor-Jones-and-the-Hairy-Ape>, (Accessed on August 5th, 2011)
- Hinden, Michael. “***The Emperor Jones: O’Neill, Nietzsche, and the American Past***” (1980), http://www.eoneill.com/library/newsletter/iii_3/iii-3b.htm, (Accessed on July 2nd, 2012)
- Iverson, John. “**The Id, Ego and Super Ego of O’Neill: Reflected in *The Iceman Cometh***” (2008), <http://www.eoneill.com/library/laconics/3/3f.htm>, (Accessed on January 5th, 2012)
- Llácer, Eusebio V. “**O’Neill’s *The Emperor Jones* and *The Hairy Ape: The Alienation of the American Anti-hero***”, *Journal of American Studies of Turkey* 18 (2003): 35-48. <http://ake.ege.edu.tr/new/jast/Number18/eusebio.pdf>, (Accessed on July 07th, 2011)
- Manheim, Michael. “***The Iceman Cometh***” (1982), <http://www.eoneill.com/library/on/manheim/ickinship.htm>, (Accessed on January 5th, 2012)
- ————— “**The Transcendence of Melodrama in O’Neill’s *The Iceman Cometh***” (1984), <http://www.eoneill.com/library/on/manheim/iccritical.htm>, (Accessed on June 5th, 2012)
- McClintock, Anne. “**‘Unspeakable Secrets’: The Ideology of Landscape in Conrad's Heart of Darkness**” (1984), <http://www.english.wisc.edu/amcclintock/writing/Unspeakablearticle.pdf>, (Accessed on August 7th, 2012)

- Morrison, Kristin. “**Conrad and O’Neill as Playwrights of the Sea**” (1978), <http://www.eoneill.com/library/newsletter/ii1/ii-1c.htm>, (Accessed on June 6th, 2011)
- Manuel, Carme. “**A Ghost in the Expressionist Jungle of O’Neill’s *The Emperor Jones***” (2005), <http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mim2838/is1-239/ain15763301/>, (Accessed on August 3rd, 2011)
- Murphy, Brenda. “**O’Neill’s Realism: A Structural Approach**” (1983), <http://www.eoneill.com/library/newsletter/vii2/vii-2b.htm>, (Accessed on March 5th, 2012)
- Nastić, Radmila. “**Eugene O’Neill Reconsidered: Trauma and the Tragic in *The Emperor Jones***” (2011), <http://www.eoneill.com/library/laconics/6/6b.htm>, (Accessed on January 8th, 2012)
- Nolan, Patrick J. “***The Emperor Jones*: A Jungian View of the Origin of Fear in the Black Race**” (1980), <http://www.eoneill.com/library/newsletter/iv1-2/iv-1-2c.htm>, (Accessed on July 5th, 2012)
- Reilly, Kara. “**Dreaming Pipe Dreams Under the Influence of Dionysus: Nietzsche’s *The Birth of Tragedy* as Inspiration for Eugene O’Neill’s *The Iceman Cometh***”, <http://www.eoneill.com/library/essays/reilly.htm>, (Accessed on January 9th, 2012)
- Sheaffer, Louis. “**Behind the Tomtoms of the Emperor Jones**” (1971), <http://www.eoneill.com/companion/jones/sheaffer.htm>, (Accessed on July 30th, 2012)
- Shaughnessy, Edward L. “**Question and Answer in Hughie**” (1978), <http://www.eoneill.com/library/on/shaughnessy/newsletter78.htm>, (Accessed on January 4th, 2012)
- Viswanathan, R. “**The Ship Scene in *The Emperor Jones***” (1980), http://www.eoneill.com/library/newsletter/iv_3/iv-3b.htm, (Accessed on July 2nd, 2012)
- Watt, Stephen M. “**The ‘Formless Fear’ of O’Neill’s Emperor and Tennyson’s King**” (1982), http://www.eoneill.com/library/newsletter/vi_3/vi-3f.htm, (Accessed on July 5th, 2012)

- Zych, Grzegorz “**Apollo Nałęcz-Korzeniowski as a Playwright**” (2010), <http://www.wuj.pl/UserFiles/File/Yearbook%20V/2-zych.pdf>, (Accessed on February 17th, 2012)

II. 4. Books on Literary Theory and History:

- Bloom, Harold. *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry* (1973). Rpt., New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Bradbury, Malcom and McFarlane, James Walter (ed.) . *Modernism: 1890 – 1930*. London: Penguin Books, 1976.
- Carter, David. *Literary Theory*. Hertfordshire, England: Pocket Essentials, 2006.
- Clayton, Jay and Rothstein, Eric (eds.) *Influence and Intertextuality in Literary History*. London: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1991.
- Coote, S. *T. S. Eliot: The Waste Land* (1985). Rpt. London: Penguin Books, 1988.
- Davis, Robert Con and Schleifer, Roland. (ed.) *Contemporary Literary Criticism: Literary and Cultural Studies*. New York: Longman, 1998.
- De Mijolla, Allain (ed.), *International Dictionary of Psychoanalysis*. Detroit: Thomson Gale, 2005.
- Dentith, Simon. *Bakhtinian Thought: An Introductory Reader* (1995). Rpt., London: Routledge, 1996.
- Eagleton, Terry. *Literary Theory: An Introduction* (1983). Rpt., Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 1996.
- Holquist, Michael. *Dialogism: Bakhtin and His World* (1990). Rpt. London: Routledge, 2002.
- Holquist, Michael (ed.). *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M. M. Bakhtin*. Trans. Emerson, Caryl and Holquist, Michael (1981). Rpt., Texas: University of Texas Press, 2006.
- Horney, Karen. *New Ways in Psychoanalysis* (1939). Rpt., London: Routledge, 1999.

- Jung, Carl Gustav. *Modern Man in Search of a Soul* (1933). Trans. Dell W. S. and Baynes Cary F. Rpt., London: Routledge, 2004.
- ————— *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious* (1934). Trans. Hull R. F. C. Rpt., New York: Bollingen Foundation Inc., 1990. <http://books.google.dz/books?id=Yc5PIU9MyDwC&printsec=frontcover&hl=fr&source=gbsgesummaryr&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false>, (Accessed on July 15th, 2012)
- ————— *The Undiscovered Self* (1957). Rpt., New York: Routledge, 2002.
- Mills, Jon. (ed.) *Rereading Freud: Psychoanalysis through Philosophy*. New York: State University of New York Press, 2004.
- Moi, Toril (ed.), *The Kristeva Reader*. Trans. Walter Margaret et al. Rpt., New York: Columbia University Press, 1986.
- Morris, Pam (ed.). *The Bakhtin Reader: Selected Writings of Bakhtin, Medvedev, Voloshinov* (1994). Rpt., London: Arnold, 2003.
- Plett, Heinrich F. (ed.), *Intertextuality*. New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1991.
- Kristeva, Julia. *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art* (1941). Leon S. Roudiez (ed.), Thomas Gora et al. (trans.). Rpt., New York: Columbia University Press, 1980.
- Sigmund, Freud. *Civilisation and Its Discontents* (1930). James Strachey (trans. and ed.) Rpt., New York: W. W. Norton & Company Inc., 1962.
- Webster, Roger. *Studying Literary Theory: An Introduction* (1990). Rpt. London: Arnold, 1996.
- Wright, Elisabeth. *Psychoanalytic Criticism: A Reappraisal* (1998). Rpt. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2006.

II. 5. Articles on Literary Theory and History

- Angus, Ian. “**Marx and Engels...and Darwin? The Essential Connection between Historical Materialism and Natural Selection**” (2009), <http://www.isreview.org/issues/65/feat-MarxDarwin.shtml>, (Accessed on March 5th, 2012)

- Anonymous, “**Kierkegaard, Nietzsche, and the Autonomous Individual: The Convergence of Two Existential Philosophers**” (2008), <http://mcamp.hubpages.com/hub/nietzschekierkegaard>, (Accessed on January 10th, 2012)
- Barnes, Hazel E. “**Jean Paul Sartre and the Haunted Self**”, *Western Humanities Review*, 10 (1956) p. 119- 128.
- Barthes, Roland. “**The Death of the Author**” (1968), in Stephen Heath (ed. and trans.) *Image – Music – Text*. London: Fontana, 1977.
- Calkins, Mary Whiton. “**Psychology as Science of Self: Is the Self Body or Has it Body?**”, *The Journal of Philosophy, Psychology and Scientific Methods*, Vol. 5, No. 1 (Jan. 2,1908), pp. 12-20, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2012278>. (Accessed on March 2nd, 2012)
- Dodge, R. E. Neil. “**A Sermon on Source-Hunting**”, *Modern Philology*, Vol. 9, No. 2 (Oct., 1911), pp. 211-223, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3693733>, (Accessed on February 3rd, 2012)
- Eliot, T. S. “**Tradition and the Individual Talent**” (1921), <http://www.bartleby.com/200/sw4.html>, (Accessed on October 13th, 2011)
- Hassan, Ihab H. “**The Problem of Influence in Literary History: Notes towards a Definition**”, *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, Vol. 14 No. 1 (Sep. 1955), 66-76.
- Kendra, Cherry. “**Defense Mechanisms and Ego Anxiety**”. <http://psychology.about.com/od/theoriesofpersonality/ss/defensemech.htm>. (Accessed on March 24th, 2012)
- Kern, Edith. “**The Self and the Other: A Dilemma of Existential Fiction**”, *Comparative Literature Studies*, 5(3) (Sept. 1968), pp. 329-337.
- Miller, Arthur. “**The Nature of Tragedy**” (1949) in *The Theatre Essays of Arthur Miller*. Robert A. Martin and Steven R. Centola (ed.). New York: Da Capo Press Inc., 1996.
- ————— “**Tragedy of the Common Man**” (1949) in *The Theatre Essays of Arthur Miller*. Robert A. Martin and Steven R. Centola (ed.). New York: Da Capo Press Inc., 1996.

- Muntean, F. D. “**Frazer’s The Golden Bough: A Critical Appreciation**” (1994), <http://findpdf.net/reader/Frazer39s-The-Golden-Bough-A-Critical-Appreciation.html>, (Accessed on January 10th, 2012)
- Smaller, Margaret. “**Intertextuality: An Interview with Julia Kristeva**” (1985), trans. Richard Macicsey, <http://www.msu.edu/user/chrenkal/980/INTEXINT.HTM>, (Accessed on February 3rd, 2012)
- Stoops, J. Dashiell. “**The Real Self**”, *The Philosophical Review*, Vol. 12, No. 1 (Jan., 1903), p. 37-46, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2176816>. (Accessed on April 2nd, 2012)
- Thilly, Frank. “**The Self**”, *The Philosophical Review*, Vol. 19, No. 1 (Jan., 1910), pp. 22-33, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2177637>. (Accessed on April 2nd, 2012)
- Tower, Carl V. “**An Interpretation of Some Aspects of the Self**”, *The Philosophical Review*, Vol. 12, No. 1 (Jan., 1903), pp. 16-36, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2176815>. (Accessed on April 2nd, 2012)

إكتشاف الذات في الإمبراطور جونز و أتى بائع الجليد ليوجين أونيل و قلب الظلام و"إلى الغد" جوزيف كونرد

دراسة مقارنة

الملخص

هذا البحث نتيجة لبعض الصلات الموجودة بين حياة و أعمال الكاتب المسرحي الأمريكي يوجين غلادستون أونيل (Eugene Gladstone O'Neill) والكاتب البريطاني جوزيف كونراد (Joseph Conrad). في الحقيقة كلاهما يعتبران ككاتبان هامين ولقد قيل الكثير حول حياتهم وأعمالهم و لكن على الرغم من هذا لم يوجد تحليل أو نقد ملحوظ حاول ربط بينهم. كنتيجة، هذا العمل سيتحرى نقاط التقارب، و حتى التفرق، في البعض من أعمالهم. تُركّز هذه الأطروحة على إكتشاف الذات في الشخصيات الرئيسية والمراحل التي يمرون بها لكي يصلوا الى حقيقتهم الداخلية. و تُهدف هذه الدراسة أيضاً الى افتراض أن البعض من أعمالهم تُساهم في تفسير أفضل لبعضها البعض بتشابهاتهم وحتى باختلافاتهم. هذا المشروع سيُرى كيفية اختفاء بعض الشخصيات تحت بعض الأفكار للهروب من كلتا عوالمهم الداخلية والخارجية. علاوة على ذلك، هو سيحاول رؤية تأثير تحطم صورة الذات و نتيجتها على الأشخاص الذين يفشلون أو ينجحون لتحمل صورهم الجديدة.

التشابهات بين كونراد و أونيل يَجَلبانِ إلى السطح إمكانية ترابط البعض من وجهات نظرهم نحو العالم. يَجِبُ أَنْ لَا نَنْسِي بَأَنَّ الكاتِبينَ شَهدا الكَثِيرَ من الأحداثِ المتشابهة في حياتِهِم. ربما إحساسهم مِنْ العزلةِ في غيرِ وطنهم الأصلي، التَّجَوُّلُ في البحارِ الواسعة، بالإضافة إلى محاولاتِ إنتحارهم الفاشلةَ قَدْ تُوجِّهُ البعضِ مِنْ وجهاتِ نظرهم إلى أرضية مشتركة. و لقد تم اختيار هذين الكاتِبينَ بسببِ صلتِهِم من جهةٍ وبسببِ قيمتِهِم العاليةِ في عالمِ الأدبِ من جهةٍ أخرى. أهميتِهِم أدَّتْ إلى العديدِ مِنْ الكتاباتِ وهذه الدراسةِ مجردَ قطرةٍ أخرى في بحرِ أهميتِهِم الأدبية.

في الحقيقة، جوزيف كونراد مُعْتَبَرٌ، كما يناقش ذلك الناقد الأدبي البريطاني المشهور ليفيس (F. R. Leavis) في كتابهِ التقليد العظيم: جورج اليوت، هنري جايمس، جوزيف كونراد (The Great Tradition: George Eliot, Henry James, Joseph Conrad)، يعتبر كعبقري فريد في عالمِ الأدبِ. لا أحدٌ يُنكرُ بَأَنَّ أعمالَهُ تَتجاوَزُ مغامراتِ البحارةِ، الأجناس البشرية و القصص الإستعماريةِ ببصيرته العميقة في قلبِ الفردِ. لقد طرح معضلة الرجلِ الحديثِ في العصر الجديدِ اين اصبح الكونِ العالمِ غيرِ مباليا بالفردِ، البشرِ مدفوعون الى الياس و العزلة، و الشك و الحيرةَ ملاً كَلَّ زوايا الحقائقِ المسبقة. وفقاً لذلك، زجت الشخصية الموجودة في أعماله لمُواجهَةِ مفاهيمهم الهشةِ للنفسِ. كثيرٌ يُمكنُ أَنْ يُقالَ عنه لَكِنَّه كَانَ بدونِ منازع من بين زعماءِ الرحلةِ الذي وَجدوا أوهام العالم الجديد منعكسة في نزاعاتِ الرجلِ الداخليةِ وخداعِ النفسِ.

بينما نجد أن كونراد نَجَحَ في تمثيلِ جمالِ الأدبِ بإستجوابه وإستكشافه ومُناقشتِهِ حالةِ الانسان في العالمِ في الغالب على وجهِ الصفحاتِ المكتوبةِ، وَجدَ يوجين أونيل نصره في هذه

المواضيع على خشبات المسرح. بشكل لا يمكن انكاره، يُعتَبَرُ أونيل أب المسرح الأمريكي الحديث. يلخّص بيغسبي (C. W. Bigsby) أهمية هذا الكاتب المسرحي بقوله " إذا امكن لأي شخص أن يدّعي الأحقية في أنه إخترع (المسرح أمريكي) لكان (يوجين أونيل). لقد رفعه من أفق ترفيه ضيق إلى موقع نشاط ثقافي مركزي، يجعله بموجب هذا بؤرة للانتباه العالمي." في الحقيقة، المساهمة المذهلة لأونيل في المسرح الأمريكي واضحة جداً. محاولاته لتحويل المرحلة المَحْمُولَة سابقاً من المسرحيات الأوروبية المستوردة و أخرى محلية الصنع و لكنها لم تتعدى حيز الترفيه الموسيقي إلى مكان أدبي توجت بجائزة نوبل الأدب بالإضافة إلى أربعة جوائز بوليتزر (Pulitzer) أخرى. بالانتقال بالمسرح إلى مرحلة الجدية الأدبية، لم يتوقف الكاتب المسرحي الأمريكي عن البحث عن الحقيقة الداخلية لشخصياته. قال أونيل "أنا دائماً، دائماً ما احاول ان ارى الحياة كعبارة عن مجموعة من الحياة بدلا من شخصيات. أنا دائماً أشعر بحدّة بالقوة وراءها." في محاولاته لعكس رآه المأساوية بينما، مثل أسلافه، سعي لفهم الذات في هذا العالم الجديد، سقى أونيل بذور المسرح الأمريكي التي أوقرت لاحقاً في عالم أدبي جديد بالكامل.

الأعمال المتناولة في هذه الدراسة هي الإمبراطور جونز (*The Emperor Jones*) سنة 1920 و أتى بائع الجليد (*The Iceman Cometh*) 1946 ليوجين أونيل و قلب الظلام (*Heart of Darkness*) سنة 1902 و "إلى الغد" (*To-morrow*) سنة 1903 لجوزاف كونراد. عندما نقرأ هذه الاعمال، هنالك أمر شيء حتمي يفرض نفسه علينا. اننا لا نجد بانهم يحوتون على مجموعة لا باس بها من الصلات، على الرغم من أن عمومها ضمني، و لكن بطريقة أو بأخرى فان كل زوج منها يكمل بعضهم البعض. على سبيل المثال، اللغز الذي كونراد ورثه كونراد

في شخصيته العالمية كورترز (Kurtz) من خلال قلب الظلام يجد جواباً إيحائياً في شخصية أونيل المسرحية جونز (Jones). بنفس الطريقة فاننا نجد بان الشيء الذي تفادته بيسي (Bessie) دائماً مع النقيب هاغبرد (Hagberd) في "إلى الغد"، قد تنبأه هيكي (Hickey) في أتى بائع الجليد كندائه العالي. و على الرغم من إختلافاتهم، نُقدّم هذه الأعمال بَعْض المحاولات لفهم طبيعة الحقيقة الذي تحيطُ بالناس عموماً. إنَّ الشخصيات في الأعمال المذكورة أعلاه قد دفعت بقوة في حالات و مواضع نارية وهذا ما يجعل ذواتهم الحقيقية تكشف أنفسها من غير ارادتها من مخبأها المعتاد.

أهمية هذه الأعمال لا تُوجدُ فقط في تقاطعاتهم المشتركة لكن أيضاً في إمكانية ترابطهم المقصود. في الحقيقة، ترافيس بوغارد (Travis Bogard) في كتابه حد بمرور الوقت: مسرحيات يوجين أونيل (*Contour in Time : The Plays of Eugene O'Neill*) يساند، إلى حدّ ما، هذا الإقتراح. فلقد حاول مُطارَدة بعض مصادر الكاتب المسرحي من حينٍ لآخر في خلال مناقشته وتحليله المسرحيات. و لقد وَجِدُ آثارَ كونراد، بين المساهمين الآخرين إلى أعماله، خصوصاً في الإمبراطور جونز، القرود المشعر (*The Hairy Ape*)، رُبطَ شرقاً لكارديف (*Bound East for Cardiff*) و أتى بائع الجليد بالمقارنة مع قلب الظلام، أيمي فوستر (*Amy Foster*)، زنجي "النرجس" (*The Nigger of the "Narcissus"*) و"إلى الغد" على التوالي. بالإضافة الى هذا، تقول كريستين موريسون (Kristin Morrison) بأن أونيل قرأ أعمال كونراد منذ المدرسة الثانوية. هذا لا يُفاجئُ لأنه كَانَ مشهورَ جداً كقارئ نهم خصوصاً أثناء الفترة التي قضاها في المصحّة. حتى أنها تَعْتَبِرُ إيل (*Ile*)، على سبيل المثال، "كقطعة جد كونرادية".

الصلة المهمة الأخرى بين كونراد أونيل هي وقوفهم في منعطف القرن العشرين عندما حصلت عدّة تغييرات صارمة كانت جد معبرة على ذروة العصر الحديث. العالم لم يعد نفسه على الكل بتقدّمه المتسارع. الفلسفات الجديدة والحركات الفنية، تقدّم العلم وانتشار التصنيع أثبت عدم صحة الكثير من الأفكار السابقة و المفاهيم المؤسسة التي وثق فيها البشر منذ أمد بعيد. و نتيجة عن هذا، أصبح الإنسان أضعف أمام القوات التي حكمت سلوكه من داخل وخارج.

لكي ننسج الصلات بين الكاتبين السابقين في النقطة المعيّنة لإكتشاف الذات، دراستنا ستسند نظرياً على التناص (Intertextuality) والتحليل النفسي (Psychoanalysis) كمقاربتان نظريتان أدبيتان مكملتان. في الحقيقة نحن لا نستطيع عزل أي نص أدبي من مجتمعه النصي سواء كان هذا الأخير عملاً أدبياً أو ما يحيط بالنص بحد ذاته. في هذا المجتمع الخاص، كما يقول ميخائيل باختين (Mikhail Bakhtin) في مقاله المطول "الخطاب في الرواية" ("Discourse in the Novel") "كلّ كلمة موجهة نحو جواب ولا تستطيع الهروب من التأثير العميق لكلمة الإجابة التي تتوقعها." كنتيجة لهذا التفاعل الثابت والدائم، يفترض باختين أبعد في فكرته للحوارية (Dialogism) بأن "التركيب الأدبي لا يوجد ببساطة ولكنه يتولّد بالعلاقة مع تركيب آخر."

في حقيقة الأمر، مفهوم جوليا كريستيفا (Julia Kristeva) للتناص مدين جداً إلى فكرة باختين للحوارية و مسلمته بأن " الكتابة هي قراءة للمجموعة الأدبية السابقة والنص إمتصاص و اجابة لنص آخر." هذه الأفكار زوّدت هذه الدراسة بروح جديدة في فهم النص الأدبي كمنطقة لأصوات منقّاطعة. استنتاج كريستيفا يختلف عن حوارية باختين في الإعتبار بانه

ليس فقط صوتان ولكن العديد من الأصوات والنصوص تتداخل في المجال السميائي بالإضافة إلى المجالات النحوية والصوتية. و قد قالت أيضاً "في فضاء أي نصّ، عدّة كلمات، مؤخوذة من نصوص أخرى، تتقاطع و تُحيّد بعضها البعض." بالإضافة لهذا فقد نظرت في مقالها "الكلمة، الحوار و الرواية" ("Word, Dialogue and Novel") بأن " كلّ كلمة (نصّ) تقاطع للكلمات (نصوص) حيث يُمكن أن تُقرأ على الأقل كلمة واحدة أخرى (نصّ) ... أي نصّ بُني من فسيفساء من المقولات؛ أي نصّ الإمتصاص وتحويل آخر." بعبارة أخرى، النصّ، مثل الكلمة، يُمكن أن يأخذ معناه الدلالي الخاص، الذي فيه يُشير إلى نفسه، وواحد تلميح، في أي هو يُتعلّق بتأثيرات و العلاقات مع النصوص الأخرى. ولهذا يمكننا اعتبار النصّ كبوتقة و وعاء تذيب لعدة نصوص متحولة و منقولة. إشاراتهم و كلماتهم تلتقي و "تحيّد" بعضهم البعض صانعة أسس جديدة للإشارات و الكلمات. بأخذ هذه الحالة بعين الاعتبار، تفترض هذه الدراسة بأنه قد توجد قراءة أخرى للعناصر المحيدة.

أي حساب آخر لوظيفة النصّ يتطلّب منا لإكتشاف العلاقات بين النصّ المدروس والنصوص الأخرى. كما قال هارولد بلوم (Harold Bloom) في كتابه القلق من التأثير: نظرية في الشعر (The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry) بأن غرض النقد الأدبي هو تعقّب الآثار والطرق المخفية الذي تربط تلك النصوص سوية. على أية حال، يجب أن لا نُهمّل الحقيقة بأنّ هذا الإتصال بين النصوص ليس واضحة أو منطقيّ دائماً. وفقاً لذلك، دراسة المصادر و منابع التأثير يُمكن أن يُنيرا طريقنا في حبك خيوط التناس.

بما أن دراسة التناص لا يُمكن أن تُدرَك بالكامل بسبب الخيوطِ العديدةِ والمُختلفةِ التي تكون النصّ، تبدو النظرة التحليلية النفسية فعالة جداً في إنجاز هدفِ هذه الدراسةِ وتُساعدنا للتركيز على عنصرٍ واحد بين عدة عناصر أخرى. في هذا المجال، عندما نتعامل مع التحليل النفسي الفرويدي فإننا نواجه العديد من المفاهيم. تلك المستعملة في هنا مُختارة بسبب ثلاثتها مع هذه الدراسة لأننا لا نستطيع تغطية المدى الكامل من مسلماته وتفسيرات نظرياته. في واقع الامر، المفاهيم الرئيسية للتحليل النفسي مُلحّصة في مقالة سيغموند فرويد (Sigmund Freud) "أحجار زاوية التحليل النفسي" (The Corner-Stones of Psychoanalysis)، التي بنى فيها جوهره على "الفرضية بأنّ هناك عمليات عقلية غير واعية، الإعتراف بنظرية المقاومة و الكبت، تقدير أهمية الجنس و عقدة أوديب." كما نرى هنا العنصر المشترك بين كلّ هذا هو القدرة على ربط الأعمال الملموسة والمشاعر إلى القوات الداخلية و التي مُترأسه خصوصاً بالحوافز الغير واعية لتلك الأعمال. في الحقيقة، في هذه الدراسة، إكتشاف الذات له متعلقة أكثر بمواضيع المقاومة و الكبت للا وعي. في هذه الأثناء، بعض المفاهيم الموضوعية من قبل العالم النفساني السويسري كارل غوستاف يونج (Carl Gustav Jung) قد أثبتت فائدتها هنا. أجد مفهومه من "اللا الوعي الجماعي" (Collective Unconscious) ضروري جداً إلى مناقشة الفصل الثاني هذه الدراسة. انه يعطي بدوره معنى أوسع إلى العقل الباطن بما أنه يُستكشف النفسية الإنسانية الداخلية من منظور الذكريات و الدوافع الموروثة مقارنة بالعقل الباطن الشخصي الفردي الذي ينشأ عن التجارب الشخصية.

انطلاقاً من هذا، تبدأ مناقشة هذا الموضوع، في الفصل الأول، من نظرة عامة قصيرة على حياة الكاتبين. حجتي تتمحور هنا حول تأثير حياة و أعمال كونراد على أونيل وإمكانيته في خلق القواعد للتشابهات الموضوعية المستقبلية سواء أكان أونيل مدركاً لها أم لا. في هذه النقطة، نركز على الفكرة بان التأثير لا يجب أن يرى فقط بالقوة الممارسة من النص أو الكاتب له على آخر ولكن كالعناصر داخلية وخارجية تدفع لتوجيه رؤيتين، أو أكثر، إلى نفس المواضيع على الرغم من الفاصل الزمني و المكاني بين الكاتبين. وفقاً لذلك، يتعامل الفصل الأول مع بعض العناصر الفنية والفلسفية والإقتصادية والتاريخية والسياسية والمتعلقة بالسيرة التي ميّزت الحياة وعمر الكاتبين. الهدف هنا ليس هو التذكير بالأحداث الرئيسية ذلك الوقت، لكن لإدراك المزاج والمشاعر التي أدت إلى تغيير مفهوم الفرد بعد تحطم حقائقه. بالطبع قد يكون من غير المنطقي لقول أن أونيل و كونراد كانا صورتين كاملتين لبعضهما. رغم ذلك، يجب أن لا نُقلل من تقدير التأثير الذي يخلق، بينما تحاول التعامل هذه الدراسة معه، النص الداخلي (Intertext) سواء كان تأثير حياة وأعمال كونراد على أونيل واعياً، غير واعياً أو عرضياً. في حقيقة الأمر ما ها الا برهان على صحة مفهوم التناص الموجود بين الكاتبين البريطاني و الأمريكي الذان وجداء، وأعلنا، أنفسهما كباحثان على حقيقة الفرد المعزول هذا العمر الجديد والمجهول. بعبارة أخرى، هذا الذي يعطينا الإنطباع المماثل من البعض من أعمال الكاتبين ويدفعنا لقراءتهم بالتوازي مع بعضهم البعض.

على الرغم من عدد الصلات التي يُمكن أن ابرازها بين جوزيف كونراد و يوجين أونيل فان غرض المناقشة في هذه الدراسة ليس التركيز على دين أونيل إلى كونراد، بما أن أونيل نفسه

لا يستطيع الدفاع أو الدخض و هذا بسبب عدم الشعور بالتأثر. الهدف الاساسي هو الإنتباه إلى التفاعل بين كلتا النصوص والبعد الجديد للتفسير الذي ينتج من خلاله.

وبناء على هذا الاقتراح العلاقتي بين أونيل و كوند، فإننا لا نجد فقط صلات ظاهرية بين كل زوج من الأعمال و لكن أيضا صلات أخرى ضمنية خاصة عند تناول رحلة اكتشاف الذات ونتائجها. ففي الفصل الثاني، تستكشف هذه الدراسة العالم المتشابه لكل من قلب الظلام و الإمبراطور جونز. من النظرة السطحية، هنالك القليل من الصلات البارزة بين هذين العاملين. ولكن، عندما نحاول تتبع مراحل الرحلة نحو الداخل فان بروتس جونز و كورتز يعطونا رؤى متكاملة و مذهلة لمراحل و نتائج التعرف على حقيقة الذات المغطاة بمفهوم الخاطى لمعنى التحضر. فالجوهر الذي فيه بنى عليه كورتز و جونز صورتهم الذاتية كان خاطئا. كنتيجة، إبادة الحقيقة الوحيدة التي أسسوا عليها رقيهم أدت إلى سقوطهم المدوي. على الرغم من الاختلافات بين جونز وكورتز في الكثير من الأمور، فإننا نجد بأنه حتى لو كانت ألوانهم مختلفة من خارج، هم في الحقيقة نفس الشخص من الداخل. الشخصان وُضعا في نفس الموقع العالي، ردوا بنفس الطمع والطموح والظلم، و في النهاية، ماتوا بالطريقة نفسها.

الفصل الأخير يحاول تقصي الصلاة الخفية بين "إلى الغد" و أتى بائع الجليد. على الرغم من الإختلاف في نوع، طول و قيمة كل عمل فإننا نجد بأن تركيبتهما و عضلات الشخصيات تتواصل مع بعضها البعض بطريقة مذهلة. الأكثر من هذا، شخصيات العاملين تُدفع لخوض نفس التجربة المؤلمة للرحلة نحو الداخل. في هذا المستوى، القاطنون في الفندق الصغير لهاري هوب يمثلون الصراع الداخلي للعجوز هاغبرد في القصة القصيرة. كل منهم يرينا بطريقة

مباشرة أو غير مباشرة حقيقة الذات المخبئة تحت المفهوم المزيف للأمل. بالرغم من الإختلاف بين الحكايات تحتوي المسرحية العناصر الأساسية للقصة القصيرة. فالعملان يحدثان في فضاءان معزولان و يأويان شخصيات جد سلمية وهادئة على الرغم من هالة الجنون التي تحيط فوق أحلامهم. و تعتبر قصة كونراد القصيرة مثالا مصغرا للمسرحية. بينما يكفّن ظلّ التقيّب هاغبرد كلّ أشخاص المسرحية، بعض الصلات بين هيكي و هاري هاغبرد الذان طال انتظارهما. بالإضافة، بعض سمات بيبي في قصة كونراد يُمكن أن تُوجَد في إفيلن ، باريت ولاري في مسرحية أونيل. وفقاً لذلك، الصلات الرقيقة بين هذه النصوص يمكن لها ان تتضخم من هذه القراءة المتوازية للعملين. أتى بائع الجليد تزوّدنا بوجهة النظر الأخرى "إلى العَدِّ" والعكس بالعكس. علاوة على ذلك، تُوسّع مسرحية أونيل وجهة نظر قصة كونراد القصيرة وتَصنَع من الصالون عينة صغيرة من هذا العالم. أغلب سكّانه يعيشون في مكان يسمّى "الأمل" أين هم يُمكن أن يَخْتفوا، و أن يَنسوا و أن يَنتظروا بسلام مثلما يفعله مالك الفندق، أمل (Hope) بزبائنه.

طبقاً لهذه القراءة يظهر هنالك بعد جديد للتأويل وبسبب وجود هذه الصلات الخفية بين هذه الأعمال. ليست فقط أعمال أونيل تجيب أعمال كونرد، ولكن أيضا حتى أعمال كونرد تجد ما تقوله في أعمال أونيل. وكأن النصوص مترابطة خارج الحيز الزماني والمكاني. هذه الحالة تدفع القارئ إلى إعادة تعريف المعنى الحقيقي للإبداع الأدبي. في حقيقة الأمر، هاته الأطروحة ترى بأن الجمال الأدبي لا يعني - بسبب نقصان الكائن البشري - خلق النص من لا شيء. عملية الكتابة مترابطة و جمالها يمكن رؤيته في مقدرة الكاتب على تجميع النصوص، بمعناها الواسع، بطريقة فريدة.