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Abstract

The notion of “Innocence” is the starting point of the human cognitive journey which can be observed through countless socio-cultural and literary narratives. With establishing a literary and psychoanalytical definition for innocence and its gradual loss through experience human cognitive journey can be put into a universal frame. Various psychoanalytical theories portray this cognitive journey including the works of Sigmund Freud, Jacques Lacan, Gustave Jung, Julia Kristeva and Margaret Schönberger Mahler. For the purpose of this thesis, I aim to illustrate the universality of growing up process and losing one’s innocence in a psychoanalytical pattern mainly based on Jacques Lacan’s Theory of the three registers supported by other theories in the field. The primary methodology is to make a close reading of select literary works to present socio-cultural examples of human cognition which will dictate three distinct modalities of the psyche: The Self, The Other and The Real that are both foundations of the cognition and the human journey of growing up.
Özet:

INNOCENCE AND EXPERIENCE IN WESTERN LITERATURE: A PSYCHOANALYTIC STUDY ON THE NOTION OF GROWING UP

“When we are children we seldom think of the future. This innocence leaves us free to enjoy ourselves as few adults can. The day we fret about the future is the day we leave our childhood behind.”

– Patrick Rothfuss, *The Name of the Wind*

**Introduction**

Innocence is an elusively ambiguous term, whether it be interpreted philosophically, politically or in terms of law. It is even more elusive to describe in terms of art and literature, since they would always be open to interpretations concerning the source, the era, the outlook and all other connotations; yet here, for the purpose of this thesis, I will be mainly concentrating on its literary definition with an outlook defined by western narrative and put into words by William Blake: as simply a lack of experience bound by time, which will be eradicated for every human being with a normal cognitive pattern who lives as part of any societal system. Bearing a certain capability to gradually transform acquired knowledge into life experience and a certain wisdom, a know-how; every individual inevitably grows up. Utilizing literary texts and mainly, the literary theory for hero’s journey as examples for this process, I aim to establish a psychoanalytical outline for this specific process of growing up.

Our cognitive properties evolve in a certain order which allows us to establish the understanding of certain notions, which may be explained with Jacques Lacan’s terminologies for *The Imaginary, The Symbolic and The Real* narrated in his *Écrits*. The Imaginary may be roughly explained as the establishment of the self through self-identification – namely the birth of Ego and every other notion associated with it. The Symbolic mostly consists of the social structure from language to laws, as an embodiment of all notions created through common consensus of humankind, mostly attributed to the bulk of rules that would facilitate a
functioning society. And finally, the Real presents the unknowable beyond our concrete observation or cognitive ability, as an excess that resists symbolization. Its occurrence is always traumatic and most fittingly may be presented with the notion of death and arises with a confrontation with the fact of mortality. These terms do categorize our ways of understanding through language, intercepting among each other to portray a map for human cognition. They can better be put into example by Slavoj Žižek’s Chess Analogy, though:

"[The three orders] can be nicely illustrated by the game of chess. The rules one has to follow in order to play it are its symbolic dimension: from the purely symbolic standpoint, ‘knight’ is defined only by the moves this figure can make. This level is clearly different from the imaginary one, namely the way in which different pieces are shaped and characterized by their names […] Finally, [the] real is the entire complex set of contingent circumstances that affect the course of the game: the intelligence of the players, the unpredictable intrusions that may disconcert one player or directly cut the game short."\(^1\)

This construct of categorization, may also be read as a developmental diagram and a procedural formation for the notion of growing up, based on the loss of innocence. The Imaginary presents the phase where a child would recognize his/her own self and define his/her own being not only as an extension of the mother, but as an established and constructed, yet subjective self – otherwise defined as the Mirror Stage. Thus, the Imaginary is also the birth of the Ego in Freudian terms.

Nearly simultaneously, the child is introduced to social norms, rules and conventions, which would be an introduction to the Symbolic order. The Symbolic mostly represents the collection of norms and conventions: what to do, what not to do and in which certain ways it should be done. By instating Superego, in Freudian terms, a control mechanic is established for the individual through the introduction of boundaries. The transition from the Imaginary to the Symbolic – the construct of the self against the construct of the majority – is the start of growing up and the herald for the loss of innocence, since it directly challenges the construct of self with

the construct of other selves. The way we perceive ourselves clashes and contradicts with the way others perceive us, and the result will be an eventual compromise where we accomplish our transition for the Symbolic. This whole process indicates a cumulation of experience, jeopardizing the innocence.

This whole battle between the Self and the Other continues indefinitely, and it consists of the main bulk of growing up process, until it is cut by the introduction of the Real at some point. The Real basically serves as the great unknown; uncontrollable and unperceivable. The concept covers for the areas that cannot be “known” or foreseen in any way, through language, sciences or social rules – or even accumulated experience thus far. It is the one thing that the individual could not possibly prepare the self for. When it arises, it disrupts the Symbolic and maims the Imaginary: causing a trauma, terminating the growing up journey and ensuring that the innocence is permanently lost.

The paradox of innocence is that the lack of knowledge indicates a choice in either preserving or altering the state of being innocent. It presents an illusion that anyone could choose to stay innocent, thus oblivious; as long as the accumulation of information would be avoided. Yet, when we objectively evaluate the nature and societal formation of mankind, staying oblivious would be completely impossible, since we are continuously subjected to all kinds of experiences. Choosing not to accumulate knowledge and turn it into experience in gradual time, would not preserve innocence, yet simply invoke ignorance. The moment we’d like to go back, it would simply mean that we have lost it already.

Any and all beings that live through a societal formation, thus becoming subjected to any and all interactions with the rest of their kind – and any notions that their kind would be able to construct – lose their innocence by learning. Thus, the matter of innocence cannot be discussed as the lack of knowledge. It is, on the other hand, can be redefined as the timely lack of experience as I have briefly discussed before. The gradual obtainment of this experience is the primary object of any growing up tale, from various theological and mythological examples to medieval folktales, essentially presenting a whole genre for itself in Bildungsroman narrative and even taking a hold for itself in modern fantasy and science-fiction literature. These growing
up tales do always present an identification of the self, followed by the recognition of the exterior wills through the introduction of others and ends with the traumatic experience for their subject, presenting a fundamental model for the innocence/experience passage.

For the main purpose of this thesis, I will be examining this transition period through various psychanalytical theories and presenting literary examples, starting with William Blake’s *Songs of Innocence: Introduction, The Lamb* and *The Tyger (348-350)* as the fundamental literary definition for the concept of innocence in the first chapter. The clashing narrative Blake uses in describing the lamb and the tiger in each related poem, possibly presents the epitome of literary depiction for both notions. This narrative will be supported by different examples in either poetry or prose, and a commentary on the nature of sexuality will follow, including a close reading of *-in Just* by E.E. Cummings. This chapter will establish the definition for the notion of innocence which will be utilized for the remainder of this work.

The following chapter presents an outline for the growing up process by taking a close look on literary examples with fantastic and symbolic aspects in narrative, such as mythological and/or theological narratives, children’s tales and medieval folktales by explaining Joseph Campbell’s monomyth theory through its Jungian connotations. This chapter intends to cover for the literary narrative of growing up and the loss of innocence from ancient times through Middle Ages, with both sociological and psychological analysis. Carl Gustave Jung’s collective unconscious theory and how it influenced Campbell’s literary theory is the focus – followed by relevant mythological references coming from Ovid’s *Metamorphosis* and chosen narratives from Homer’s *Odyssey* and old English *Beowulf* saga to illustrate the universality of hero’s journey. This chapter presents a valid understanding for the initial state of innocence and its gradual loss through obtainment of experience being universal.

In all other following chapters, the notions of Self, the Other and the Real will be explained with their Lacanian connotations and accompanying literary examples, added with integral psychoanalysis theories coming from Freud, Jung, Mahler and Kristeva, who has built upon Lacan’s work with a feminist outlook. Accompanying these chapters, I will focus on a select few novels, hailing from relatively modern periods. Relevant aspects of events and
characters, and their probable psychoanalytical impact on the protagonists as part of their growing up tale, are analyzed and presented in relevant chapters. By making a close psychoanalytical reading of these chosen novels, I intend to try and establish an understanding of the nature of innocence and its gradual loss due to social, cultural and cognitive processes, resulting in what we call “growing up”. For this reason, I have selected two examples – Dickens’ *Great Expectations* and Dostoyevsky’s *the Idiot* - presented by authors of different nationalities, which would serve to be one successful and one failing story in terms of the protagonist growing up and becoming an individual, presenting a statement concerning an establishment for the notions of the Self and the Other being crucial.

**Hypothesis**

The concept of growing up may be interpreted and ornamented differently due to different social norms, values and customs in different cultures, yet the process always follows a fundamental psychological model, which starts with the identification of the self, gets challenged with the introduction of others and finalizes with the realization that there is a boundary to one’s dominance, ability and understanding. This pattern can be observed through various literary narratives which are the symbolic embodiments of the society and the human condition for the time period they’ve been written.

**Methodology**

As my methodology, I will start with analyzing the literary and psychological definitions of innocence, then compare various examples of growing up tales to identify a certain psychoanalytic pattern for the protagonist of the tale. Through close reading of all relevant literary texts, I will try and explain the presented notions in appropriate stages to see whether there is any deviation which wouldn’t fit into my theory. I will support my reading with various psychoanalytical theories and academic articles, coming from both the discipline of literature and psychology.
CHAPTER 1
THE DEFINITION OF INNOCENCE IN PSYCHOLOGY AND LITERATURE

Representing the line between safety and danger, ignorance and wisdom, even obedience and crime; the notion of innocence, and its opposed notion of experience have always been one of the main focuses of literary narrative. All beings start life with utter lack of experience, and this lack presents itself as the core for the concept of innocence. Gradually, all beings pass through certain cognitive, social and cultural journeys, some even harbored with certain rituals, resulting in the loss of this notion with the fundamental obtainment of experience, whether it be through certain facts about our societal system or simply by the acknowledgement of a concept, such as death. Ways of losing one’s innocence are countless. But the fact that we lose our solipsistic perception through the acknowledgement of the existence of factors independent from us: will of other people, notions we cannot control or sometimes even explain - is constant. Eventually, we come into terms with the fact that our perception isn’t the only one that exists or matters. In this introductory chapter, the very concept of innocence, the literary terminology it is associated with and its psychoanalytical connotation will be explained with exemplary texts from Western Literature.

The notion of innocence is usually described as the lack of knowledge. Once, a creature – or man, thereof- comes to being, it has no predetermined information except what would be genetically coded, which consists of certain instincts. Thus, it has no means of knowing the collective social rules, contracts, sin, or guilt. All these notions are man-made; thus, they are to be gradually learned through observation, with proper faculty to obtain results from and recorded as an intelligible data that would result in the cumulation of experience. As described by John Locke: “Let us suppose the mind to be, as we say, white paper, void of all characters: Tabula Rasa.” As in its nature, any creature would be idle and carefree if its basic needs of survival – like food, sleep and safety – are met thoroughly. As long as the subject is protected from the occurrence, categorization and acknowledgement of new data, theoretically, it can

maintain innocence. Yet “theoretically” is the key word. Descartes, on the other hand, declares that there is much to be learned, much to process within simply our own cognition, even certain a priori notions to recall: “Doubt is the origin of wisdom.\(^3\)”

Within connotations of John Locke’s definition for the mind, presented by pure theory and philosophy, the lack of knowledge indicates an illusion of choice in either preserving or altering the state of being innocent: an illusion that anyone could choose to stay innocent, thus oblivious if information would be avoided. When we are to take a close look on the nature and societal formation of mankind, staying oblivious would be completely impossible though. All beings that live through a societal formation, thus becoming open to acknowledging the results of all interactions they may conduct with the rest of their kind – and get subjected to any ideas, ideals, collective and sociocultural experiences that their kind would be able to present – lose their innocence by learning.

At this point we must seek a differentiation between “knowing” and “understanding” to point out that information alone cannot affect the subject. One does need to have appropriate faculty to obtain experience out of the information he/she becomes subjected to. The difference between perceiving a concept or occurrence and processing it to obtain an understanding of its dynamics define the thin line whether a certain knowledge may result in the loss of innocence or not. There is a crucial difference between knowing and understanding – which mostly loses its connotations in English language yet may be observed better in French as in with verbs “connaitre” and “savoir”. Basically, both verbs mean “to know” but “connaitre” means “to know” in the sense of being acquainted with someone or something. You may use the verb “connaitre” when you can substitute the words “to be familiar with”. Savoir means “to know” in the sense of knowing how to do something or knowing something by heart, through mental ability or through a learning process. Savoir expresses the knowledge of facts or reasons about certain thing.\(^4\) These connotations of “knowing” cannot be observed in English language but can be vaguely described by another verb: “understanding”. This differentiation is especially underlined by Michel Foucault:

“Foucault’s positive account of the relationship of discursive formations to sciences is based on the special sense he gives to the distinction between *connaissance* and *savoir*. By *connaissance* he means (in accord with ordinary French usage) any particular body of knowledge such as nuclear physics, evolutionary biology, or Freudian psychoanalysis; thus, *connaissance* is what is found in what Foucault characterized as disciplines. *Savoir*, on the other hand, refers to the discursive conditions that are necessary for the development of *connaissance*, to, in Foucault’s words “the conditions that are necessary for a particular period for this or that type of object to be given to *connaissance* for this or that enunciation to be formulated.”

According to this specific differentiation between acquiring the knowledge and possessing the capability to process that knowledge to acquire wisdom, establishes the ground for any notion of growing up and the gradual loss of innocence. There are many requirements concerning the ability to obtain experience which will be discussed further during the appropriate chapters of this thesis. The state of being free from social constructs such as sin, guilt or moral wrong may be the defining quality of innocence, underlining a certain lack, which generally indicates that innocence can be better defined by what it is not, rather than by what it is. This definition of the notion – as it can also be encountered in psychoanalysis – keeps the psychotic personality as the abnormal exception, which could never be prone to obtain a certain *savoir* from *connaissance*, which may be considered ever-innocent.

Etymologically, innocence derives from the Latin verb “*nocere*” – which means harming – with the negation of the action as “*innocent*” – which means not harming. The noun form of the verb is “*innocentia*”: the one who does not harm. This etymological root implies an active choice, but in means of mental procession, rather than a social procession, it may be rather passive. Considering the action of harming another is usually a reactive form of self-preservation, this state of pureness – or innocence - can only be displayed through the genuine lack of experience, or an attachment to imagination to preserve the ego and our control on

---

reality, as a child would do. Thus, lacking the capability, or physical and even mental faculties to protect and preserve themselves due to the developmental phase they are in, children are usually depicted as symbolic embodiments of innocence itself.

Yet, this lack of capability in comprehension doesn’t present itself in the form of a lack of capability in action. An innocent is very much capable of inducing harm, yet still – again, with the lack of experience and the ability to interpret the action that causes harm – is directly incapable to being held accountable for the action. Both the sociocultural experience and the literary narrative is full of examples of “the innocent that causes irreversible harm”, thus the proverb, “the road to hell is paved with good intentions”. From Pinocchio who runs away from home to take on an adventure in spite of his father’s many sacrifices to protect him, to Pandora, the beloved creation of Hephaestus, who opens the box that contained “the burdensome toil and sickness that brings death to men”7, the innocent who acts without the faculty to predict the results of his/her actions is a primary motif in all literary narrative.

“The hegemonic discourse of childhood is intimately linked with the concept of innocence, which is equated with purity, naivety, selflessness, irrationality, and a state of unknowingness, or of being less worldly – all of which characterize the child as vulnerable.”8

This vulnerability described in children redefines the concept as not “me who does not harm”, but rather “me who can be harmed”. This vulnerability also arises from a certain lack of experience, not knowledge itself. Even though a child would be thought the theory of a notion and imparted with a certain information, his/her lack of practical understanding would render him/her completely open to any kind of new experience, and every “new” event the child is to encounter would make a certain impact, either verifying or falsifying the information formerly presented, resulting in both impressions and expressions with the definitive accumulation of experience itself. In this manner, the state of being completely innocent, may be considered the zero point, the absolute initium for the human cognitive journey and any growing up tale, in

means of experience. Thus, the matter of innocence cannot be discussed as the lack of knowledge. It is, on the other hand, can be redefined as the lack of experience which was put into poetry by William Blake.

William Blake, English poet and painter of the 18th century, is known to set a baseline for the definition of innocence in literature, in his Songs of Innocence and Experience, specifically with poems such as The Lamb and The Tyger. The whole poetic fresco that Blake paints is the primary display of the clashing difference between innocence and experience in literary narrative – Two Contrary States of the Human Soul, as Blake himself titled the collection of poems. With pastoral symbolism dominating all his poems in this collection, both animalistic and divine depictions of beauty are narrated in a duality to represent the two-different perspectives of the world through the lenses of innocence and experience. If we are to establish metaphorical scenes for the starting and ending point of a growing up tale, there is no grander or befitting an example in Western Literature. To better understand the literary point of view for the notions explored, a close reading of Blake’s various poems in this collection is mandatory.

In the Introduction poems for both books, Blake takes on different roles as the teller of different conceptions. In Songs of Innocence’s Introduction, Blake enacts us a conversation between a piper and a gleeful child – maybe a muse for the poet, as a personification of innocence - in a valley. The child is described to be carefree and joyful, with an excitable temper, and he asks the piper to “Pipe a song about a Lamb?” This imagery is also later used by Antoine de Saint-Exupéry in his world-famous novel, The Little Prince. The hero of the novel, eccentric Little Prince appears out of nowhere in the desert and asks the author to draw him a sheep, where the heroes first meet.

The persona of the Piper is a common motif in pastoral poetry, harbored in the free, open nature and the idealized, carefree renaissance depiction of a classical utopia. From the first

---

line of the poem, the piper is directly associated with nature itself, encountering the figure in the “valley’s wild”. The poem portrays the scene with childhood innocence and relies on the simplicity of perception in innocence. Wording itself seems to belong to a child, certain words being repeated in lines like a nursery rhyme, as if the intended audience of the poem are children. Overall, the message itself is quite clear: we are in a happy state.

For the Songs of Experience’s Introduction, the persona clashingly changes into the Bard, a figure “Whose ears have heard/The Holy Word”. The Bard demands to be heard, carrying a divine message, promising an understanding at a deeper level compared to the gleeful Piper who “pipes a song about a Lamb”. The Piper writes down his message for anyone to acquire, yet the Bard demands the message to be heard. He is the herald of an enforcement, a divine authority who demands humanity to rise “from the slumberous mass”. The Bard carries a certain mission to wake humanity from its sinful corruption, associated with adulthood and experience; addressing to humanity itself, inviting them to the way of God.

The two different narratives target different audiences, children – the innocent - and adults – the experienced. Addressing innocence, the portrayal of God is gleeful, ever forgiving, utterly peaceful and without any conception of either sin or guilt. Happiness itself is the main theme. Yet, in addressing the experienced, the portrayal of God is firm, didactical, powerful and omnipotent. The duality of divine love presented in most biblical texts is summarized in these portrayals, also signifying that while the world is full of optimistic promises for the innocent; its harbors challenges to overcome for the experienced.

From here on, it would be critical to make a close reading on the personifications of “the innocent” and “the experienced” through Blake’s iconic poems from each section to fully appreciate the duality. The first personification is encountered in – “The Lamb” – from the Songs of Innocence section. The poem presents a description for the lamb, both in appearance and nature in forms of questions, asking whether it knows who made it, who gave it life and fed, and tend for it. Here, the conversation is modelled after Sunday School catechism: a question – answer structure which aims to teach children the basics of Christianity. We encounter a similar style of repetition, common in children’s wordplays. The lamb serves to be
a symbol of both pastoral purity of the nature and childhood innocence. Aside biblical symbolisms, we are directly able to observe that the lamb has every attribute of the innocent, kind and good natured, from the content of this narration. It is well-fed, tended for and cared. It hasn’t gone through any hardship or endure any test. As in a child’s perception of God, his bliss in existence is codependent on his caregiver and faith alone. Until he grows up, he will believe unconditionally, thus he will stay innocent, as any child would be.

After the soft and peaceful imagery of the Lamb, the second personification comes from the Songs of Experience section – “The Tyger”. This new figure is in direct contrast with all images of innocence we have encountered with the Lamb before. With its fearsome form, endurance and ability, the tiger is the exact opposite of the lamb. Here, the reader goes through the same inquisitive narration about the origin of the animal, yet there are no definite answers given. Instead, we encounter a sense of awe, a kind of disbelief whether the creator of the meek little lamb is the same force that has designed, forged and governed such a powerful, dangerous and fierce beast. A narrative of industrial dynamics, a careful, even mechanical calculation can be read from the design of the tiger throughout the poem. It is strikingly beautiful, yet horrendously capable of violence. Here, through the description of tiger, we are hinted that it indeed is the same creator which has designed and created the lamb and the tiger, yet the tiger is a product of experience, a creature of survival. The poem is an adult’s perception of the divine power, which is capable of both striking beauty and horrendous violence. His sure physical and aesthetical stature casts a shadow over the concept of morality, unity and any possibility for an innocent utopia. In contrast to the steady faith of Innocence, Experience is a state of disillusionment in which distress breeds anger and a new kind of hope.11

The question here is whether the tiger is still innocent? As deemed by its nature, he may be interpreted as so, but the tiger’s very presence, the possibility of such beauty and such danger coexisting in the same vassal, living side by side with the meek lamb is a crippling awakening for a child’s persistent belief in a benevolent universe. Thus, the tiger is the incarnation of experience, which replaces the imaginative with the symbolic to initiate a growing up narrative, in Lacanian terms.

In the biblical connotations of the text, the lamb is the common biblical symbol for Jesus, referred to as *Agnus Dei* in Catholic Mass, the Lamb of God. The lamb is to sacrifice itself for the sins of others as Jesus Christ does during Crucifixion. The lamb is to be meek and mild, and neither ask any questions, nor complain about injustice. The lamb is to endure any circumstance, any will or judgement with only faith as its answer at hand. This complete submission and the abandonment of will may be interpreted as either a state of purity and trust, or the complete lack of willful decision and the faculty to make a willful decision. Thus, the lamb is a Christian symbol of innocence, but also sacrifice. Yet, even Jesus of Nazareth’s faith weavers during crucifixion, calling out for the creator: “And about the ninth hour Jesus cried with a loud voice, saying, Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani? that is to say, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?”

Could it be read as a moment of the Real? An awakening? A moment of experience, nonetheless?

This description concerning *Agnus Dei* also brings in the relation between terms “innocence” and “ignorance”. Explaining this interrelation, if innocence is explained as the lack of experience which will eventually be remedied by our cognitive faculties; ignorance is an active and conscious refusal to obtain knowledge, or even convert knowledge into experience through mental faculties. An inability to convert knowledge into experience and a direct refusal of obtaining experience from accumulated knowledge differ in both process and result, and also condition. Thus, this lack of will described in the previous divine narration shouldn’t be perceived as ignorance. For the subject matter, Amelie Rives’ introduction says it all:

“It seems hardly possible to open this subject, without at first becoming involved in a statement of axioms; for, on reflecting that Ignorance means a want of knowledge, may often be innocent, the very lack of knowledge may as often lead him into guilt.”

---

Keeping this definition in mind, not being introduced to the concept of sin, guilt or moral wrong is one of the presuppositions of being innocent. Thus, a lack of will and a refusal to take willful action are two separate concepts. The Innocent is expected to be ever happy, joyful, forgiving. Such boundless bliss cannot be obtained. It must be an a priori disposition of the “starting point”.

With all its Biblical connotations, the Innocent – or namely the Child, the Youth or the Utopian – is also one of the Jungian Archetypes, as an element of the collective subconscious. According to Carl Gustav Jung’s collective unconscious theory, all members of the same species share a common psyche, in which they engrave certain symbols, myths and personifications, that can be encountered in different folklore narratives, belonging to different sociocultural structures or even different timelines. “While the personal unconscious is made up essentially of contents which have at one time been conscious, but which have disappeared from consciousness through having been forgotten or repressed,” Jung discusses, “the contents of the collective unconscious have never been in consciousness, and therefore have never been individually acquired, but owe their existence exclusively to heredity. Whereas the personal unconscious consists for the most part of complexes, the content of the collective unconscious is made up essentially of archetypes.”

These archetypes are a collection of symbols, myths and motifs, and they are ever present in human social narrative. The Innocent, is among them, described as the one who craves for simple happiness, oblivious to the dangers and dualities of a social complex. The Innocent desires a utopian state of bliss for everyone. Its very presence is inspiring, a beacon of hope and optimism. Thus, most child heroes or child/infant figures of various mythologies directly fit into this archetype. The Child motif represents the preconscious, childhood aspect of the collective psyche.

“The concept of the archetype, which is an indispensable correlate of the idea of the collective unconscious, indicates the existence of definite forms in the psyche which seem to be present always and everywhere. Mythological research calls them “motifs”; in the psychology of primitives they correspond to Levy-Bruhl’s concept of “representations collectives,” and in the field of comparative religion they have been defined by Hubert and Mauss as “categories of the imagination.” Adolf Bastian long ago called them “elementary” or “primordial thoughts.” From these references it should be clear enough that my idea of the archetype—literally a pre-existent form—does not stand alone but is something that is recognized and named in other fields of knowledge.”

One dominant problematic for this utopian innocence though, is the discovery of sexuality. The sexual awakening – whether it can be explained by Freud’s psychosexual stages or Lacan’s jouissance - is often a primary drive for the loss of innocence. According to Lacan, all drives are sexual drives, and every drive is a death drive (pulsion de mort) since every drive is excessive, repetitive and destructive. Thus, the discovery of sexuality starts the first introduction of the Lacanian “the Real” – which I will explain in detail later in this thesis – and has a specific role in terms of losing innocence.

The sexual discovery – from the domain of the Real - being a primary transition for the loss of innocence may well be one of the primary constructions of monotheistic religions. To present an example, one of the most well-known utopian descriptions is perhaps the Garden of Eden, followed by humanity’s banishment from the garden through the offense of eating a fruit. This fruit here, is of course highly symbolic: a symbol of sexual awakening, which brings in the result of childbirth aka the act of creating which comes from the created, and sin, as a side effect. Such is a primary construction in various growing up tales, and this narrative is often read as an analogy for the discovery of sexuality, thus, the end of innocence. According to the myth of the loss of Eden, which we first encounter in the Old Testament – and which can again be encountered in both New Testament and the Koran – God allows Adam and Eve to eat any


fruit from any tree at the garden of Eden yet forbids them to eat from a specific tree: the tree of the knowledge of good and evil: “And the LORD God commanded the man, “You may freely eat of every tree of the garden; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil you shall not eat, for in the day that you eat of it you shall die.”  

As the story continues, a serpent visits Eve and convinces her to taste the fruit and make her convince Adam to do the same. The results of their actions are metaphorically thought-provoking: “But the serpent said to the woman, “You will not die; for God knows that when you eat of it your eyes will be opened, and you will be like God, knowing good and evil.” So, when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was a delight to the eyes, and that the tree was to be desired to make one wise, she took of its fruit and ate; and she also gave some to her husband, who was with her, and he ate. Then the eyes of both were opened, and they knew that they were naked; and they sewed fig leaves together and made loincloths for themselves.”

This whole narrative is an allegory for the discovery of sexuality. God forbids them from procreating, but the serpent – the embodiment of carnal desire – provokes them to procreate. The female shares the fruit – her womb – with the male. Eve obtains the capability to create through the sexuality and childbirth – as God would be capable of. At the end of their action, they discover sexuality and acknowledge the concept of sin, alongside the concept of procreation. Thus, they try and cover their genitals. Because of their discovery again, they are punished accordingly: the female will give birth through great labor and pain; and the male will have to work to feed his offspring.

“To the woman he said, “I will greatly increase your pangs in childbearing; in pain you shall bring forth children, yet your desire shall be for your husband, and he shall rule over you.” And to the man he said “Because you have listened to the voice of your wife, and have eaten of the tree about which I commanded you, ‘You shall not eat of it, ‘cursed is the ground because of you; in toil you shall eat of it all the days of your

life; thorns and thistles it shall bring forth for you; and you shall eat the plants of the field. By the sweat of your face you shall eat bread until you return to the ground, for out of it you were taken; you are dust, and to dust you shall return.”

As it can even be observed through the most canonical of western mythological narrations – the Genesis: the discovery of sexuality and its initiation effect which carries the individual from the Lacanian imaginary to the Lacanian symbolic by the introduction of sin is a mandatory medium in terms of losing innocence, whether it be explained by Freudian psychosexuality or Lacanian jouissance. There is an ambiguous, one-way transition between the imaginary and the symbolic through this first introduction of the Real, which results in the unavoidable gain of experience. This transition is probably best hinted in one of e.e. Cummings’ poems, *in Just-*. an Eden poem of sexual awakening as a literary device to further example the weight of sexual discovery in means of the loss of innocence. The poem "*in Just-*" is the first in a section entitled *CHANSONS INNOCENTES*-literally "songs of innocence." This clearly links Cummings back to Blake and alludes to Blake's own *Songs of Innocence*, which present a series of poems apparently simple and childish.

The poem is basically the pastoral depiction of spring coming, with vibrant imagery and children’s games. The whole narration is ornamented with fictive word puns like “mud-luscious” or “puddle-wonderful”, as if they are crafted only to underline a state of being limitless, both in possibility and ability - the natural condition that children enjoy (but that adults dislike). The spring itself – and children, who are irredeemably excited about this lively time – are already pregnant with endless possibilities. The whole scenery is one dreamlike depiction with springtime and endless games for children. Yet, one central figure dominates this feast of imagination and innocence, ominously.

The silent, yet dominant figure of this dreamy picture is a balloon man – a clown maybe, who is described as little and lame, as queer and old. These adjectives are in direct contrast with

---

21 Landles, Iain, *An Analysis of Two Poems*,
www.english.illinois.edu/maps/poets/a /cummings/Landles10.html.
the spring itself and children playing around. As we keep reading the poem, it slowly becomes obvious that something’s not right with this specific balloon man. Yet, he “whistles far and wee⁴⁷⁴⁷,” and children come running to him, as if he is the primary sign of spring’s arrival. The balloon man feels alien to this whole picture of innocence, yet very deliberately, he manages to become the central figure by taking his place at the very ending of the poem, with another ominous adjective: the goat-footed.

In Greek mythology, a creature known as satyr or faun is depicted with goat legs, with mischievous and even lecherous attitude. A satyr – or Pan, the god of satyrs, music and festivity, also male fertility is the primary symbol of the loss of innocence. He plays his pipe – or whistles, as in the poem – and children come running to him, as if they are running through their lifespan to meet their adolescence, learning about sexuality and losing their innocence. In the last part of the poem, the term balloonman is written with capital M – as balloonMan, for pointing his role as a bringer of experience as a dominant male presence. Through this little and lame balloonman, children are to lose their innocence eventually.

As we can observe through many literary sources, innocence and experience – just as the Real and the Imaginary – are in direct opposition to each other. One cannot choose to stay innocent, as the experience is only a matter of time, certain and unavoidable. Any and every creature with a progressive lifespan is subject to the passage of time, thus to the experience brought alongside it. Innocence – or imagination – are innate notions for the ones without experience only. After a state of “growing up” is reached, one can only hope to grasp the concept of innocence and call forth an imitation of the actual through pretend-play, yet neither the action, nor the act of choosing are innocent themselves.

CHAPTER 2

HERO'S JOURNEY: A TEMPLATE FOR THE GROWING UP TALE

As in many other archetypal patterns, the narrative of growing up, being a fundamental and universal part of simply being human, consistently repeats its journey in various literary sources throughout history. From ancient mythology to modern literature, we constantly encounter the same template for the hero: the story starts with the innocent and inexperienced hero, continues with a mandatory journey – either literal or symbolic – which the hero should take on, that concludes with the hero’s eventual return to his/her starting position; only with accumulated experience and a changed perception. On that manner, the classical pattern for the hero’s journey is possibly the most basic template for both the rite of passage in the classical manner, and a psychanalytical event that can describe the evolution of a consciousness, from blessed innocence to hard earned experience.

This template is perhaps best explained by Joseph Campbell’s literary theory: The Monomyth, which indicates that all variations of mythical narrative are indeed the culturally repurposed and redefined versions of a single great story. Campbell being a mythologist and literary analyst, has taken the term “Monomyth” from James Joyce’s *Finnigan’s Wake*, to redefine the purpose of myths and their narrative in societies, as metaphorical guidelines to overcome thresholds of transformation, both for the individual and the society itself. When the given threshold belongs to a single individual’s transition, the term may be named as the “rite of passage” -which every individual who lives as part of a societal formation encounters:

“When we turn now, with this image in mind, to consider the numerous strange rituals that have been reported from the primitive tribes and great civilizations of the past, it becomes apparent that the purpose and actual effect of these was to conduct people across those difficult thresholds of transformation that demand a change in the patterns not only of conscious but also of unconscious life. The so-called rites of passage, which occupy such a prominent place in the life of a primitive society

---

(ceremonials of birth, naming, puberty, marriage, burial, etc.), are distinguished by formal, and usually very severe, exercises of severance, whereby the mind is radically cut away from the attitudes, attachments, and life patterns of the stage being left behind. Then follows an interval of more or less extended retirement, during which are enacted rituals designed to introduce the life adventurer to the forms and proper feelings of his new estate, so that when, at last, the time has ripened for the return to the normal world, the initiate will be as good as reborn.25

So, according to Campbell, all mythological narratives of a Hero’s Journey serve to be a guideline for the psychosocial transition of the child into an adult. Mythical archetypes, retold in different cultures with different motifs are steps of this growing up process, and even though their shapes and faces change according to the culture and the time period that they hail from, their elementary form and essence – perhaps best defined and explained by Adolf Bastian – don’t change.

“Bastian indeed insists that the primary source of all cultural innovation - in the wide meaning of the word -lies in his "elementary ideas“ which include the response of collectivities to basic needs. Yet he adds that for the development of civilized life, "culture in the narrower sense", movement and contact of and between people and ideas is a necessary precondition.26

19th century polymath Adolf Bastian’s well-known theory Elementargedanken – also known as “Elementary Ideas” makes a clear differentiation between the notions created by the ethnological and geographical conditions – which are called “Folk Ideas”- and notions that simply belong to the domain of psychology that evolved throughout history to produce certain universal symbols. Bastian’s claim suggests that certain notions, ideas and symbols are not created and groomed by culture; yet arise from the most basic and even instinctual needs of simply being human. Motifs that arise from this need continuously repeat in every culture and society, independent from geographical, historical and ethnological elements. Surely, all

26 Köpping Klaus-Peter, and Adolf Bastian. Adolf Bastian and the Psychic Unity of Mankind the Foundations of Anthropology in Nineteenth Century Germany. Lit, 2005.
humans are born, given a name, go through adolescence where biological and hormonal changes both in their bodies and mental abilities become apparent, change social classes within their society according to their change in experience, chose a mate and reproduce offspring, survive through becoming a productive part of their society and meet death at the end of their lifespan. So, even though the ornamentations and traditions concerning these stages of life differ from one society to another, their narratives and notions themselves exist in all societies independent from culture and time period.

Bastian’s notion of elementary ideas has been an inspiration to Campbell and later serve to be the prime matter of his Monomyth theory, focusing on what would be symbolically universal for all mankind. On that manner, Carl Jung’s – Swiss psychoanalyst of the 20th century - theories of the psyche, and especially his narrative of “collective unconscious” and “Jungian archetypes” also been referred to, for the indication that there are indeed certain patterns of symbolism for the human psyche, independent from cultural connotations.

A brief narrative of the Jungian archetype of the child has already been given in the previous chapter. At this point, it may be enlightening to describe the concept as a whole: In Jungian Psychology, the term “collective unconscious” refers to the collectivity of unconscious minds shared by the members of the same species – which Jung defines as an element that underpins the personal unconscious, differentiating it from the Freudian connotation. Archetypes, then, are symbols that repeat in all individual members of the collective unconscious, containing the same metaphorical content which serves to be the same embodiment for a universally fundamental notion for every individual.

“Archetypes are ancient or archaic images that derive from the collective unconscious. They are similar to complexes in that they are emotionally toned collections of associated images. But whereas complexes are individualized components of the personal unconscious, archetypes are generalized and derive from the contents of the collective unconscious.”

Explaining the elements of Jungian Psychoanalysis furthermore, archetypes as symbols are counterpart to instinct. They are inherited potentials which are actualized when they enter consciousness as images or manifest in behavior on interaction with the outside world\textsuperscript{28}. Once they are introduced into consciousness, they are given various expressions in repeating patterns of tales, images and figures by cultures. Some of the most common examples of these archetypal figures are the mother, the child/the innocent, the wise old man, the trickster, the hero; while some of the most common examples of archetypal events are the apocalypse, the deluge, the creation, the exile. These figures or events, independent from any cultural ornamentation they may earn, are universal notions governed by instinct for every individual of our species.

"The most profound influence of archetypal functioning on the experience of the individual is the manner in which archetypes are held to control the human life cycle. Jung postulated that as we mature, we pass through a programmed sequence which he called \textit{the stages of life}. Each stage is mediated through a new set of archetypal imperatives which seek fulfilment in both personality and behaviour — being parented, exploring the environment, playing in the peer group, meeting the challenges of puberty and adolescence, being initiated into the adult group, accomplishing courtship and marriage, child-rearing, gathering, hunting and fighting, participating in religious rituals and ceremonials, assuming the responsibilities of advanced maturity, old age and the preparation for death.\textsuperscript{29}"

To elaborate the cultural variations of the same figure; the mother, for example, takes the various shapes and names in every narrative from nourishing Mother Earth – who will be continuously reinvented as Gaia, Kybele, Durga, even Virgin Mary of the Christian narrative, and many other holy mother figures of different cultures and time periods - to Fairy Godmother from the tale Cinderella — reimagined throughout Europe, by narratives of different nationalities such as Italian (Giambatista Basile), French (Charles Perrault) and German (Brothers Jacob and

\textsuperscript{28} Stevens, Anthony in "The archetypes" (Chapter 3.) Ed. Papadopoulos, Renos. The Handbook of Jungian Psychology (2006)
\textsuperscript{29} Stevens, Anthony in "The archetypes" (Chapter 3.) Ed. Papadopoulos, Renos. The Handbook of Jungian Psychology (2006)
Wilhelm Grimm). Just like primary motifs of the Mother Earth or Mother Goddess changing from narrative to narrative; the context of Cinderella and her Fairy Godmother change heavily in all variation, yet one thing remains a constant: the mother is an ever protecting and nourishing force, whose reproductive abilities and sexuality is always suggested, yet never openly presented. This figure of the mother and her psychosexual interpretation, mainly by Freud will later be explained in following chapters. Yet, as an archetypal reading, her core content and motivation never changes. As a contradicting, yet expected notion, it can present a complete antithesis of its notion, though, as any archetypal concept: the witch or the seductress, one we may recall from countless other narratives like the Evil Queen in Snow White and the Seven Dwarves, or Mother Goethel from the tale of Rapunzel – the mother figure who is to safekeep and protect the child reinvented as the twisted opposite. This brings forth the Jungian narratives of other structures into question. In addition to the Self, the psychic nucleus responsible for coordinating this lifelong sequence, Jung postulated other structures which play crucial roles in the psychic development and social adjustment of everyone. These include the persona, shadow, anima and animus.\(^{30}\)

Just as Freudian Psychology separates the mind into three distinct elements – the Id, the Ego and the Superego – Jungian Psychology utilizes similar elements with slightly different connotations. For Jung, the Self is the utmost potential for the Ego itself – while in Freudian terminology, the Ego is responsible for whole quest for fulfillment, Jung uses the term for simply one part of the conscious mind. The Self consists of a unified form of the consciousness and unconsciousness of an individual. While the Ego represents the center, the core of consciousness, the Self represents the whole potential of a personality which will actualize itself through life choices. The Self appears in dreams, myths, and fairytales in the figure of the “supraordinate personality,” such as a king, hero, prophet, savior, etc., or in the form of a totality symbol, such as the circle, square, quadratura circuli, cross, etc. When it represents a complexio oppositorum, a union of opposites, it can also appear as a united duality, in the form, for instance, of tao as the interplay of yang and yin, or of the hostile brothers, or of the hero and his adversary (arch-enemy, dragon), Faust and Mephistopheles, etc. Empirically,

therefore, the self appears as a play of light and shadow, although conceived as a totality and unity in which the opposites are united.31

The Persona, on the other hand, deriving from the Greek word for Mask, is a collection of behavior patterns adopted by the sanction of the society, which consists of what would be socially acceptable – what one would become as a reflection in other individuals’ perception. On the manner of it being created as a control mechanism for our urges, our faculties of simple desire, it can be correlated to the Superego, which is instated for the purpose of differentiating the right from the wrong; or to simply craft a “mask” upon the Self to present an acceptable facade. Yet, from the standpoint of the psyche, it is much more and even a bit prone to the danger of getting associated with the Self. As a literary example, the protagonist of Fitzgerald’s *The Great Gatsby*, James Gatz, gets consumed by the persona of Jay Gatsby which he has created as an integration into social expectancy of riches and success of 1920s American Dream.

“Persona (...) is the individual’s system of adaptation to, or the manner he assumes in dealing with, the world. Every calling of profession, for example, has its own characteristic persona. It is easy to study these things nowadays, when the photographs of public personalities so frequently appear in the press. A certain kind of behaviour is forced on them by the world, and professional people endeavour to come up to these expectations. Only, the danger is that they become identical with their personas - the professor with his text-book, the tenor with his voice. Then the damage is done; henceforth he lives exclusively against the background of his own biography. For by that time it is written: "... then he went to such and such a place and said this or that", etc. (...) One could say, with a little exaggeration, that the persona is that which in reality one is not, but which oneself as well as others think one is.32”

The Shadow directly correlates with the Id – representing our impulsive and unconscious qualities such as a desire, a need for sex and life, which in return is associated with

both danger and creativity. Everything that is repressed due to it being defined as socially unacceptable becomes the part of this Shadow. In the case of the mother archetype – who is represented as ever benevolent, changes to become the witch/the seductress who acts upon her own passions and desires, even sacrificing the child in that manner. In literary sense, Euripides’ Medea presents a textbook example of the archetype, who prioritizes her own desire for vengeance over the well-being of her children, going to the extent of killing her own children to simply hurt her unfaithful husband. While the witch/the seductress archetype – being the shadow for the mother archetype– is a symbol of empowerment and even feminism for women today, her image in narrative is always disturbing to encounter openly, challenging the dogma against a mother’s capability of harming her children to reinstate her own individuality.

“The shadow is a moral problem that challenges the whole ego-personality, for no one can become conscious of the shadow without considerable moral effort. To become conscious of it involves recognizing the dark aspects of the personality as present and real. This act is the essential condition for any kind of self-knowledge, and it therefore, as a rule, meets with considerable resistance. Indeed, self-knowledge as a psychotherapeutic measure frequently requires much painstaking work extending over a long period.33"

Lastly, anima/animus are terms created by Jung to describe the image of a gender as it takes place in its opposing counterpart’s perception: the male as imagined by the female and the female as imagined by the male. Jung believed that physiological changes as well as social influences contributed to the development of sex roles and gender identities. Jung suggested the influence of the animus and anima archetypes were also involved in this process. According to Jung, the animus represents the masculine aspect in women while the anima represented the feminine aspect in men.34 To present literary examples: all mother archetypes and any female character who possesses masculine qualities like dominance, will, reason, empowerment would indicate an animus archetype: like Athena from Greek mythology, or even Nora Helmer from Henrik Ibsen’s Doll’s House; who forges a signature to save her husband’s life and leaves her

husband at the end of the play to seek her own fulfillment in life. As for the anima archetypes: poets, lovers, heroes; male characters with feminine traits like arts, instinct, nourishment, magic may be considered examples: like the poet Orpheus, who ventures into the Underworld to save his lover from Death, with only his lyre and his voice as his weapons. “The conscious side of woman corresponds to the emotional side of man, not to his "mind." Mind makes up the soul, or better, the "animus" of woman, and just as the anima of a man consists of inferior relatedness, full of affect, so the animus of woman consists of inferior judgments, or better, opinions.35

All these elements and images created and shared by the collective unconscious establish the primary characters of any growing up journey, as if they are the cast for a movie or a set of characters in a novel. In the case of the narrative of growing up and losing innocence, one archetypal event becomes central: The Hero’s Journey. As narrated by Joseph Campbell, even though the narrative of this process utilizes different motifs in different cultures, its fundamental elements and the steps that journey follows do not change. This narrative of growing up immediately suggests for an individual’s transition from one social group – and state of mind – to another, so the term to revisit at this point should be, again, the rite of passage:

“The term rite of passage was first used in anthropology to encapsulate rituals that symbolize the transition of an individual or a group from one status to another, or to denote the passage of calendrical time, but soon it was embraced in other disciplines. The concept was developed by the Durkheimian anthropologist Arnold Van Gennep in Les Rites de passage (1909), in which he explored the nature of ceremonies that mark personal or collective changes of identity (childbirth, puberty, marriage, motherhood, and death), as well as collective celebrations of seasonal change (Easter, harvest). Van Gennep identified three phases in these rites: (1) separation, when the individual or the group is distanced from their former identities; (2) liminality, the phase in between two conditions (the one from which the individual/group departs and the one which they will enter); and (3) reaggregation (or incorporation), the final stage in which the individual/group is readmitted to society as bearer of new status. Because rites of passage belong to sacred time (not the profane of everyday life), their performance is formalized. The initiate(s) are placed in a symbolically subordinate position vis-à-vis

those who have been initiated (elders, married, mothers) and have to go through elaborate “trials” (isolation, humiliation, fasting) before they are accepted back into the community.\textsuperscript{36}

Campbell’s literary theory for the Hero’s Journey, contains similar stages, adorned with archetypal motifs, consisting a combination of anthropology, sociology and psychology, suggesting the universality of the specific process of growing up and losing innocence, through certain stages of a metaphorical journey. Campbell’s description for the template is summarizing enough: “A hero ventures forth from the world of common day into a region of supernatural wonder: fabulous forces are there encountered, and a decisive victory is won: the hero comes back from this mysterious adventure with the power to bestow boons on his fellow man.\textsuperscript{37}"

Various narratives worldwide, - from Beowulf to Gilgamesh, from the Odyssey to story of Moses, from Gautama Buddha, to Jesus of Nazareth – may be presented as examples to this template. Campbell divides the journey into three acts – Departure (Separation), Initiation (sometimes subdivided into Descend and Initiation) and Return – which consists of seventeen stages in elaborate forms, and twelve stages in its most basic form. Later narratologists and mythologists, such as David Adams Leeming and Phil Cousineau, and even screenwriters such as Christopher Vogler divided these three acts into various other sections – even though all are similar in narrative, some parts are taken as separate instances or optional motifs, others are kept as mandatory events in all expositions of the pattern. Yet, the baseline of the narrative for hero’s journey is agreed by most narratologists and always contains the event of losing innocence nearing the accomplishment of the quest for the given journey. For the purpose of this thesis, two tales are chosen to exemplify and narrate related acts and stages of the process, based on Campbell’s work: Homer’s Odyssey and Old English Saga of Beowulf. In both chosen tales, the narrative starts at the middle of things – \textit{in medias res} – as customary to epics of the era (Odyssey starts the narrative years after Odysseus’ first journey, first narrating the passage of time in Ithaca and then, portraying him confined in Calypso’s island; and Beowulf starts

from the point where the hero is already in battle with Grendel) but the origin of heroes and prior events are suggested or clarified later through narrative, either through narration of other characters or simply introducing a narrative of the past events, fitting into the chronology of Hero’s Journey template.

At the beginning of every narrative, the hero is part of the ordinary world, oblivious to the challenges and his particular role in events ahead. At some point a Call to Adventure arises, beckoning the hero to leave the world of the familiar and venture into the unknown for a specific quest or action. In most narratives, content with his initial world’s conditions, its security and the territory of the familiar, the hero is reluctant to take on the journey, as a child being reluctant to grow up. This is the point of the story, where a mentor, a figure of wisdom, knowledge and adulthood is introduced into the hero’s life—apparent as the Wise Old Man archetype most of the time—who will guide the hero through various hardships of the road ahead. Then, the journey itself starts with one symbolic event, which will separate the static ordinary world from the kinetic temperament of many hardships ahead: Crossing the Threshold. After this first magical or extraordinary event takes place, it becomes undeniable for the hero, that the banality and the security of his former life is left behind. This part is followed by the Belly of the Whale part, signifying the start of a willing metamorphosis for the hero, where he acknowledges that this is the beginning of change for him in various fundamental levels, usually symbolized by the introduction of a structure, where the nature of the quest will be outlaid for the hero’s understanding. This is the moment, where the hero acknowledges the nature and the necessity of the quest, effectively participating the quest:

"The idea that the passage of the magical threshold is a transit into a sphere of rebirth is symbolized in the worldwide womb image of the belly of the whale. The hero, instead of conquering or conciliating the power of the threshold, is swallowed into the unknown and would appear to have died. (...) This popular motif gives emphasis to the lesson that the passage of the threshold is a form of self-annihilation. Instead of passing outward, beyond the confines of the visible world, the hero goes inward, to be born again. The disappearance corresponds to the passing of a worshipping into a temple—where he is to be quickened by the recollection of who and what he is, namely dust and ashes unless immortal. The temple interior, the belly of the whale, and the heavenly land
beyond, above, and below the confines of the world, are one and the same. That is why the approaches and entrances to temples are flanked and defended by colossal gargoyles: dragons, lions, devil-slayers with drawn swords, resentful dwarfs, winged bulls. The devotee at the moment of entry into a temple undergoes a metamorphosis. Once inside he may be said to have died to time and returned to the World Womb, the World Navel, the Earthly Paradise. Allegorically, then, the passage into a temple and the hero-dive through the jaws of the whale are identical adventures, both denoting in picture language, the life-centering, life-renewing act.\textsuperscript{38}

In \textit{Odyssey}, the tale starts by referring to the events of \textit{Iliad} by Homer, the Trojan War, and as the king of Ithaca, Odysseus’ participation in it. At the beginning of the tale, various other powers and events that’s been taking place at Odysseus’ homeland are introduced. On that manner, events of \textit{Iliad}, serve to be the first part of Odysseus’ journey, presented in a frame tale fashion. At the beginning of \textit{Iliad}, Odysseus is at home, with his wife Penelope and his newborn son, Telemachus. The Trojan War is the Call to Adventure, as it is an unavoidable obligation for the King of Ithaca. Even though, Odysseus is reluctant to sail for Troy, he takes on the journey, with the guidance of goddess Athena, who will continue to share her wisdom with the Greek king, even saving his life in many occasions. Yet, after the war, majority of gods being angry about the plight and pain of Trojans -mainly the god Poseidon-, they summon a great storm that throws them off-course on their way back home, which leaves the world as they know behind, and starts a series of fantastic and dangerous events. The Crossing of the Threshold already occurred the moment Odysseus set sail for home. As Hermes arrives to command Calypso to let Odysseus go back to his journey, the Belly of the Beast takes place, since this is the part where Odysseus gains an understanding about the nature of the journey that waits him still. The moment that Odysseus is back at the sea, continuing his journey, his distress yet again begins.

\textquote{Ulysses, noble son of Laertes, so you would start home to your own land at once? Good luck go with you, but if you could only know how much suffering is in store for you before you get back to your own country, you would stay where you are, keep

house along with me, and let me make you immortal (...)

(nymph Calypso, to Odysseus)

Similarly, in Beowulf’s tale, being a hero of Geats, Beowulf hears the tales of Grendel, a monster of unmeasured violence, terrorizing Hrothgar, the King of Danes’ hall and travels to face this monster. Maybe as a cultural element, the refusal part never occurs in Beowulf’s tale: his primary motivation in the journey, is to battle the monster and gather valor, to begin with. His refusal to become the King of Geats on a later part may still be categorized as this motif though. Yet, the archetypal mentor arises here in the form of Hrothgar, the King of Danes, who is the primary quest-giver, and the figure of wisdom who will later warn Beowulf against pride and advise him to reward everyone that serves him accordingly. Concerning the pace of events, Beowulf’s arrival to Heorot, the hall of Hrothgar is the part of Crossing the Threshold, starting the series of events that will change the hero’s life forever; and him plunging to the bottom of the lake to hunt Grendel’s mother in a later chapter, is the metaphorical Belly of the Beast phase, and the point of no return.

“So Healfdene’s kinsman constantly mused on

His long-lasting sorrow; the battle-thane clever

Was not anywise able evils to ‘scape from:

Too crushing the sorrow that came to the people,

Loathsome and lasting the life-grinding torture,

Greatest of night-woes. So Higelac’s liegeman,

Good amid Geatmen, of Grendel’s achievements

Heard in his home: of heroes then living

He was stoutest and strongest, sturdy and noble.

He bade them prepare him a bark that was trusty;

He said he the war-king would seek o’er the ocean,

The folk-leader noble, since he needed retainers.

For the perilous project prudent companions

Chided him little, though loving him dearly;

They egged the brave atheling, augured him glory.\(^40\)

The Initiation or the Descend part of the template contains most challenges that the hero must eventually overcome. These challenges may well be physical, mental or purely symbolic. Campbell divides these challenges in to steps such as The Road of Trials (where most trials of the journey will take place, from riddles to physical combats), The Meeting With the Goddess (where an item or a piece of information crucial to the success of the quest will be presented to the hero), The Woman as a Temptress (where various worldly temptations will be offered to the hero for him to stray from his destined path), Atonement with the Father/the Abyss (where hero will confront a figure of ultimate power in his life, usually in the form of a male entity), Apotheosis (where the hero reaches an ultimate point of understanding about the nature of events, his role in the events etc. aka. the point of reaching adulthood) and the Ultimate Boon (where the hero successfully accomplishes the main purpose of his quest and rewarded accordingly).

"Atonement consists in no more than the abandonment of that self-generated double monster—the dragon thought to be God (superego) and the dragon thought to be Sin (repressed id). But this requires an abandonment of the attachment to ego itself, and that is what is difficult. One must have a faith that the father is merciful, and then a reliance on that mercy. Therewith, the center of belief is transferred outside of the bedeviling god’s tight scaly ring, and the dreadful ogres dissolve. It is in this ordeal that the hero may derive hope and assurance from the helpful female figure, by whose magic (pollen charms or power of intercession) he is protected through all the frightening experiences of the father’s ego-shattering initiation. For if it is impossible to trust the

\(^{40}\)HALL, LESSLIE. BEOWULF: an Anglo-Saxon Epic Poem (Classic Reprint). Project Gutenberg, 2015. TRANSLATED FROM THE HEYNE-SOCIN TEXT
terrifying father-face, then one's faith must be centered elsewhere (Spider Woman, Blessed Mother); and with that reliance for support, one endures the crisis—only to find, in the end, that the father and mother reflect each other, and are in essence the same. (…) The problem of the hero going to meet the father is to open his soul beyond terror to such a degree that he will be ripe to understand how the sickening and insane tragedies of this vast and ruthless cosmos are completely validated in the majesty of Being. The hero transcends life with its peculiar blind spot and for a moment rises to a glimpse of the source. He beholds the face of the father, understands—and the two are atoned.41n

Following the story of Odysseus, he encounters various challenges throughout his journey, both before and after he was stranded in Calypso’s island, like Polyphemus the Cyclops, Sirens, Scylla and Charybdis, Lotus Eaters, cannibalistic Laestrygonians, the greed of his own comrades who open a bag that contains all the winds, the Cattle of the Sun and Circe the Witch Goddess. Odysseus’ journey follows the narrative of the Initiation with similar patterns. While some of these encounters are simply physical challenges, some are symbolic temptations like Lotus Eaters introducing a fruit of merriment which will make anyone that consumes it forget past burdens and that they were journeying towards home; or Calypso’s continuous offer for Odysseus to forget about this home and become her immortal husband. His encounter with Circe serves to be the Meeting with the Goddess though, presenting him further means to continue his journey after overcoming the challenge. All these encounters serve to be either mental or physical challenges he must overcome before reaching the final confrontation for the Atonement with the Father/the Abyss: his journey to the underworld. There, Odysseus is to summon the spirit of Tiresias, the Theban oracle, to learn how to appease Poseidon, so he may finally return home. This part of the journey, and many revelations he will encounter in the underworld, where he will meet heroes of the past; will change Odysseus forever, especially with the revelation of the suitors for Penelope’s hand and the threat to his homeland they cause. This part of his search nearly becomes the end of the Ithacan king. Another alternative reading may present that his time with Calypso was already the part for the Atonement with the Father, presenting him time for looking back and contemplating over past actions. In either case, his Apotheosis is where he would be telling the Phaeacians of his past adventures: a period of

merriment and understanding, followed by the ultimate boon: him being presented with treasures and a way back home.

"Then came also the ghost of Theban Teiresias, with his golden scepter in his hand. He knew me and said, 'Ulysses, noble son of Laertes, why, poor man, have you left the light of day and come down to visit the dead in this sad place? Stand back from the trench and withdraw your sword that I may drink of the blood and answer your questions truly.'"^{42}

Going back to the narrative of Beowulf, his story of challenges is less symbolic, and a bit more down to earth compared to Odysseus, maybe as another cultural appropriation. Yet, his journey is no less perilous. Beowulf spends his first night at Heorot, waiting for Grendel to appear; and when the troll-like creature appears, he jumps on it and a violent combat arises. He refuses to use any weapons and rips the creature's arm with his bare hands, killing it. Following night, while Beowulf was away, Grendel's mother attacks the Heorot to avenge her son, killing various warriors. Beowulf follows the creature to her lair, an underground lake. There, even though he was thought to be dead by his companions who waited for his return at the cave, he manages to stab Grendel’s Mother with a giant-slaying blade, finally ending the ongoing violence. Upon his return, Hrothgar presents Beowulf various gifts, including his ancestral sword Naegling. This part comes to its conclusion with Hrothgar’s speech, warning Beowulf against pride and greed. Hrothgar’s sermon here, and his warnings serve as the Atonement with the Father.

"Then bruised in his bosom he with bitter-toothed missile
Is hurt ’neath his helmet: from harmful pollution
He is powerless to shield him by the wonderful mandates
Of the loath-cursèd spirit; what too long he hath holden
Him seemeth too small, savage he hoardeth,

---

Nor boastfully giveth gold-plated rings,  
The fate of the future flouts and forgetteth  
Since God had erst given him greatness no little,  
  Wielder of Glory. His end-day anear,  
It afterward happens that the bodily-dwelling  
  Fleetingly fadeth, falls into ruins;  
Another lays hold who doleth the ornaments,  
The nobleman’s jewels, nothing lamenting,  
  Heedeth no terror. Oh, Beowulf dear,  
Best of the heroes, from bale-strife defend thee,  
And choose thee the better, counsels eternal;  
Beware of arrogance, world-famous champion!  
But a little-while lasts thy life-vigor’s fulness;  
'Twill after hap early, that illness or sword-edge  
Shall part thee from strength, or the grasp of the fire,  
Or the wave of the current, or clutch of the edges,  
Or flight of the war-spear, or age with its horrors,  
Or thine eyes’ bright flashing shall fade into darkness:  
'Twill happen full early, excellent hero,  
  That death shall subdue thee.43
The Return part of the journey narrates Hero's way back to his initial world and taking a place in the society which he was once familiar with. Yet, his journey and the wisdom he has gained through it changes the hero so fundamentally, he fails to fit into his former position without overcoming yet another kind of final challenge. At the start of this part, a Refusal to Return may occur for the hero, him finding enlightenment and achievement in this new world, he may become reluctant to go back to the mediocrity of his past, yet he must go back and share the symbolic boon – a weapon, a treasure or a kind of critical information that may help his society – with his people. In some narratives a Magic Flight occurs, if the hero acquired the boon from a power that has been protecting it. Another mandatory part of the narrative is the Rescue from Without, where the hero's transition back into the ordinary world needs assistance from other exterior characters like supporting heroes, especially if the hero has taken a wound from his last challenge during the Magic Flight. The trickiest part of the journey though, is The Crossing of the Return Threshold, where the hero should manage to keep the boon and the wisdom he has acquired through his journeys and find a way to incorporate this into everyday life. The success of the journey usually depends on whether the hero would be capable of accomplishing this specific task: the integration and incorporation. If not, the journey itself becomes a simple cautionary tale for generations to come. If it was successfully attained though, the hero become the Master of Two Worlds. This part may be represented as a state of transcendental enlightenment for more spiritual narratives. For the earthly hero, it signifies a balance between body and mind, earthly and spiritual: a state of belonging within the social structure and the solution to the personal challenge for finding a place and a purpose. At this point, the process for growing up is accomplished, making the hero a functioning individual for the society. This enlightenment brings in the last stage of the journey: Freedom to Live. Enduring the worst that the world had to offer so far, and solving various challenges, the hero is now liberated from the fear of unknown, fear of death. Thus, coming into terms with his own mortality, he has freedom to live as he chooses to do so, ready for the final, probable embrace of the Lacanian Real.

"The hero is the champion of things becoming, not of things become, because he is. "Before Abraham was, I AM." He does not mistake apparent changelessness in time for the permanence of Being, nor is he fearful of the next moment (or of the 'other thing'), as destroying the permanent with its change. 'Nothing retains its own form; but Nature, the greater renewer, ever makes up forms from forms. Be sure that nothing perishes in
the whole universe; it does but vary and renew its form.' Thus, the next moment is permitted to come to pass.44n

In Odysseus' journey, the Refusal to Return never occurs, since returning home was his ultimate boon to begin with. Rescue from Without occurs through the help of Phaeacians, Goddess Athena and eventually his son, Telemachus who all aid him on reaching Ithaca. The crucial part for Odysseus' story and the Crossing of the Return Threshold is him coming home and putting to use all the wisdom that he gathered during his journeys: rather than barging in and directly attacking suitors, he waits and listens to the wisdom of Gods, namely Zeus and Athena. He goes through an elaborate ruse which will prove his identity and eliminate the threat of suitors for once and for all. He is patient, respectful and cunning: he utilizes his experience to reclaim his home, his throne and his wife. He becomes the Master of Two Words by physically and mentally overcoming the suitors, and more importantly, trusting the wisdom of Gods to do so. Thus, Odyssey is a success story in term of the hero’s journey.

"Then Ulysses in his turn melted and wept as he clasped his dear and faithful wife to his bosom. As the sight of land is welcome to men who are swimming towards the shore, when Neptune has wrecked their ship with the fury of his winds and waves; a few alone reach the land, and these, covered with brine, are thankful when they find themselves on firm ground and out of danger—even so was her husband welcome to her as she looked upon him, and she could not tear her two fair arms from about his neck. Indeed they would have gone on indulging their sorrow till rosy-fingered morn appeared, had not Minerva determined otherwise, and held night back in the far west, while she would not suffer Dawn to leave Oceanus, nor to yoke the two steeds Lampus and Phaethon that bear her onward to break the day upon mankind.45n"

Beowulf, on the other hand, is the story of a failure, in terms of hero’s journey. After the festivities following Grendel’s Mother’s demise, Beowulf returns home, where he will reign for some fifty years. Yet, he fails to apply the wisdom which he has gathered from his previous

journeys to the conditions of his homeland and his rule. He crosses the Return Threshold and comes back to Geatland, yet when a slave steals a golden cup from a dragon’s hoard, the dragon comes down from the mountains and starts terrorizing the country. Beowulf faces the dragon, and the Rescue from Within occurs only through Wiglaf, who comes back to aid Beowulf during the battle, while all his other companions flee away when they observe Beowulf to be losing before the dragon. Together, they manage to kill the dragon; yet, Beowulf is mortally wounded and dies, nonetheless. Hrothgar’s warning for not being prideful, and always awarding the ones that serve becomes a hard-earned lesson. Beowulf becomes a victim between Two Worlds: he conquers the physical, yet he fails to overcome the spiritual.

“Thou art latest left of the line of our kindred, 
Of Wægmunding people: Weird hath offcarried
All of my kinsmen to the Creator’s glory,
Earls in their vigor: I shall after them fare.”
’Twas the aged liegelord’s last-spoken word in
His musings of spirit, ere he mounted the fire,
The battle-waves burning: from his bosom departed
His soul to seek the sainted ones’ glory.46

This pattern for hero’s journey, applies to all growing up narratives, outlining the gradual process of a person’s struggles to become an individual. The hero – or any individual – goes through this two-sided blade, to balance two worlds, the physical and the spiritual, the body and mind. This dual conception common in hero’s journey also bore the connotation for the struggle between the Jungian Shadow and the Persona to eventually give birth to the Jungian Self, which bears all potential of the Ego to begin with. This struggle of life and growing up, is also a struggle of individuation both internally and externally, resulting in the loss of innocence via accumulation of experience. As the innocent becomes the experienced, the proclaimed Self, the potential becomes the actual Self: the individual.

As the main part of my thesis, I claim that with generalizing this pattern furthermore, and focusing on the element of losing innocence, Jacques Lacan’s model on the structure of the psyche, three orders that signify different cognitive aspects of human psyche would represent a perfect categorization for all stages of this journey, further adding on to its Jungian subtext, portraying a modernized version of hero’s journey: The domain of the Imaginary, where the hero’s battle is with his own self and actualizing his own person; the domain of the Symbolic, where the hero is to face the will and the sanction of all exterior structures, including other people; and finally the domain of the Real; where the hero must face an undeniable truth about how limited both his own and even any other exterior challenge’s earthly sanction has been in the grand scheme of events.

All these parts, and Lacan’s relevant theories, supported by various Freudian and other psychoanalytical elements, are explained, alongside close readings of various growing up narratives from European authors in following chapters. From here on, relevant psychanalytical theories of the psyche will be studied with appropriate narratives that would support the claim, in three chapters dedicated to relevant orders: The Imaginary, the Symbolic and the Real.
CHAPTER 3

IDENTITY: THE INNOCENT BEGINNING

The journey of the innocent starts with the identification of the Self. At the beginning, every child begins its cognitive life as an extension of the mother rather than a separate being, as described by Freudian psychoanalysis. Even though, Freud himself presents a detailed theory on psychosexual development, centering on libido – sexual energy – as the primary drive of our being and setting the build-up of a countering Ego and Superego to take control of our pleasure drive, deep rooted in the Id; Mahler focuses on the cognitive part of earlier stages, by introducing the terms of Separation and Individuation: a missing link from Freud’s theory. The starting point of this separation, and following individuation is what Jacque Lacan will later call as the Mirror Stage. Even though, there are various definitions of the Self in psychoanalytical theory, the basic concept and its effectivity on our individuation is predominant and never changes.

“Concepts of "the self" in psychoanalytic theory have important philosophic underpinnings which may not be adequately appreciated. Both self-psychology and ego psychology, with their contrasting positions on the self as a mental structure, retrace paths taken by Western philosophy beginning at least with Hume and Descartes. They reflect traditional philosophic questions, notably of a homuncular self-internal to consciousness and the isolation of the subject from other selves. Psychoanalysis has not utilized Hegel's conception of the intersubjective origins of the self, in which the self emerges only in an encounter with another subject, although this approach is implicit in the work of Winnicott on the mother-infant dyad. This movement from a one- to a two-person psychology also presents conceptual problems, as illustrated by the psychoanalytic theories of Sartre and Lacan, who take up opposing positions on the status of consciousness and on intersubjectivity in the formation of the self. Sartre's phenomenology, with its emphasis on the questing nature of the subject in search of an identity, resonates with contemporary theories of narcissism in which the painful isolation of self from self-affirming and mirroring objects is central to clinical practice. Lacan's insight into the role of acquisition of language helps us to understand the

As a common point to all these theories, and psychoanalytical approach itself, most of people’s personality forms during early childhood years. The experience accumulated during following years will keep reinstating and confirming what would be gathered in this period, setting a baseline for the Self, which, according to Lacan, belongs to the domain of the Imaginary, as any and all “dimension of images, conscious or unconscious, perceived or imagined.\footnote{Alan Sheridan, "Translator's Note", Jacques Lacan, The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psycho-Analysis (London 1994) p. 279} Even though, the Imaginary would be the primary concern of this chapter as the beginning of innocence narrative, it is necessary to discuss what takes place in one’s cognitive process, prior to this stage, in psychoanalytical terms.

For the purpose of presenting a comprehensible enough timeline for the subject’s introduction into the Imaginary, we must start from earlier years where the consciousness itself is quite questionable. It is almost certain that prior to Freud’s psychosexual development, the infant has no sense of the Self separate from the mother. Only when a moment of recognition for the Self as a separate entity from both the form and the will of the mother arises – anywhere from 6 to 18 months of age – a notion of Self takes root. Lacan fails to attain a certain place to the semi-conscious or non-conscious period for younger ages, when the subject would lack any kind of cognitive activity in the observable sense in his psychoanalytical structure, considering the Imaginary Order as Lacan describes, can only start with the identification of the self. Bulgarian-French philosopher Julia Kristeva, on the other hand, adds another dimension to Lacan’s module on the structure of the Psyche, where this semi-conscious period might belong to, which goes hand in hand with Lacan’s pre-Mirror Stage and Mahler’s pre-Separation: The Semiotic Order.

The Semiotic Order can be defined as an emotional field, tied to the instincts, which dwells in the fissures and prosody of language rather than in the denotative meanings of
words.\textsuperscript{49} The infant who is yet to attain any sense of Self, considers itself as an extension of the mother, and connects with the mother through sound, smell, temperature, rhythm, movement etc. According to Kristeva, this semiotic presence is the starting point of our psyche, where we simply respond without any masculine trait of logical procession or meaning, in a domain that lacks language, the domain of the feminine. Later, with the introduction of language and any other societal structure, Lacan’s Symbolic Order will be introduced to our consciousness, separating us from the domain of the feminine, the mother, irreversibly – which will later be discussed as the point of no return for the innocence.

“It seems that the very essence of the semiotic is its indefinability, although to understand what that means, one must try to define it. My own provisional definition of the semiotic is: the “being” before language identifies it as such, the source of biological drives, rhythm and sound; it is existence beyond words, beyond literal meaning; but it only exists in relationship with and through the “symbolic,” through the structure of language that attributes meaning to things. How else could we be thinking about it? The semiotic comes before the symbolic, is repressed by the symbolic, but also “speaks” through and disrupts the symbolic through music, art, and, poetry.\textsuperscript{50}”

There are various examples that portray the fundamental and shaping power of the Semiotic process in western literature, even in a nearly supernatural connotation, especially in folktales. Snow White’s most common narrative starts with her mother, sitting and sewing near an open window during a harsh winter. She pricks her finger on the needle, causing three drops of blood falling onto the snow covered, ebony windowsill. There, she says: “how I wish that I had a daughter that had skin as white as snow, lips as red as blood, and hair as black as ebony.”\textsuperscript{51} Later, she gives birth to a daughter with these exact traits. Even though, this occurrence may be disregarded as simply magical, expectant of the genre; it still presents a powerful enough motif for the power of a mother’s intent. Can it be considered a narrative on an unconscious communication with the mother and the child? Does the mother “will” and the child

\textsuperscript{49} Perumalil, Augustine. The History of Women in Philosophy
\textsuperscript{50} Bailey, Lorie, “On Julia Kristeva’s ‘the Semiotic.’” feminisstheory2013, 8 Feb. 2013, feminisstheory2013.wordpress.com/2013/02/04/on-julia-kristevas-the-semiotic/.
unconsciously “responds” in a fantastic yet highly symbolic narrative? That would be impossible to account for, yet the question lingers in the Imaginary domain anyhow.

“Kristeva’s Semiotics includes her psychoanalytic presentation of two stages of normative development: Semiotic (based upon Freudian Primary Stage), and Symbolic (centering on Lacanian definition of the stage). What differs in Kristevan presentation is the shift of attention from the domain of Symbolic, language, and law to the prior one, the pre-lingual realm of Semiotic, abjection, and the process of exit from Chora.52”

Another notion, first described by Plato, as the Receptacle, and interpreted by Kristeva, takes priority to explain the existential and philosophical mother/child dyad: Chora. In Plato’s narrative in Timaeus, Chora is introduced as the “third kind” in which the creation would need a “place” to occur. So, Chora itself is in a state between existent and nonexistent, ever changing, a force to reckon, without any forceful impulse of its own. Through a more feminist reading, Chora is basically an analogy for the womb – or any place of space, place or dimension capable of harboring creation: a maternal substratum. According to Kristeva’s narrative, it can be shaped into a form and given a purpose, yet it can never be defined and categorized into the domain of the Symbolic. Chora is completely out of the domain of the Symbolic, yet predominantly necessary for any Symbolic to occur, the Chora is the embodiment of anything Semiotic, which again, psychoanalytically, would underline the creative and willful power a mother would hold over a child.

“Such then is the statement for which I give my sentence, as we have briefly reasoned it out: that there are Being and Space and Becoming, three in number with threefold nature, even before the heavens were created. And the nurse of becoming, being made liquid and fiery and putting on the forms of earth and air, and undergoing all the conditions that attend thereupon, displays to view all manner of semblances; and because she is filled with powers that are not similar nor equivalent, she is at no part of her in even balance, but being swayed in all directions unevenly, she is herself shaken

by the entering forms, and by her motion shakes them again in turn: and they, being thus stirred, are carried in different directions and separated, just as by sieves and instruments for winnowing corn the grain is shaken and sifted, and the dense and heavy parts go one way, and the rare and light are carried to a different place and settle there.  

A symbolic narrative of Chora can be observed in the Greek mythological narrative, concerning the birth of Achilles, the great hero of the Trojan War. According to Statius’ Achilleid, Achilles is the son of Sea goddess, Thetis. There has been a prophecy concerning the child, which states he will become grander than his father. Thus, Thetis takes a mortal king, Peleus as her husband. Yet, after his birth, Thetis tries to make Achilles immortal by dipping him into river Styx: “Soon will I restore the plains and the fields where the Centaurs roam: by this beauty of thine and the coming joys of youth I pray thee, if for thy sake I endured the earth and an inglorious mate, if at thy birth I fortified thee with the stern waters of Styx (...)” This is a symbolic and fantastic action for the child, once created as a mortal, going back into the womb, to be created again as something magnificent. The river Styx has various mystical and uncanny qualities, one noted by various sources “making the form forget its own mortality”. This fantastic act between the mother and the child, concerns Thetis taking Achilles back into Chora, where he may be crafted as something more than once he was, again portrays the power of the mother over a child’s fate, as a fantastic yet highly metaphorical example.  

Freud also attributes indisputable power to the mother, - yet, excluding necessarily biological context of the term - or simply the primary caregiver when it comes to the any kind of psychological development and a sense of Self. The child’s relationship with the mother is “unique, without parallel, established unalterably for a whole lifetime as the first and strongest love-object and as the prototype of all later love-relations - for both sexes.” Yet, for a healthy sense of the Self to form, a Separation from the mother is mandatory. Only then, the process can be followed by Identification.

According to one of the main contributors to the fields of ego psychology, based on Freud’s model of the unconscious (Id-Ego-Superego); Margaret Mahler, the child goes through certain key phases to first separate itself from the conscious and the form of the mother – or any primary caregiver – then identifies itself as an independent Ego, leaving the form and domain of the mother: Theory of Separation-Individuation for child development. Following these steps, first month is called the Autistic Stage, where the child lacks any conscious activity that may receive satisfaction which comes from outside, thus, also lacking any attention to external stimuli. During this phase, the mother is observed as an intrinsic part of the infant. Next five months are called the Symbiotic Stage, where the child recognizes the mother not as a separate entity, yet the object of all its desires and needs, capable of fulfilling its needs. Mother’s attendance to the child in this period is crucial to the future Self where the child will establish a relationship between desire and satisfaction, and all its connotations.

During the following 5-24 months, the crucial stage of Separation-Individuation takes place. Child increasingly starts to perceive the mother as a separate individual – in which the child observes mother being capable of leaving the room, yet coming back etc. -, and later on begins to identify itself as another separate individual, instating a sense of Self. The attention is directed towards the outside world, when motor function development also allows certain acts of wandering away from the caregiver, such as crawling during 5-9th months, and walking during 9-14th months. As its ability and curiosity augments, a dilemma occurs: between the protective environs of the mother and the desire for independence. Various tantrums are to be expected during this phase, yet the separation eventually occurs when the child internalizes that he/she is still cared for and supported by the mother, even though they’d be physically separated from time to time. When a healthy resolve for this dilemma is reached, the child recognizes the mother as a separate entity who chooses to care for him/her, and recognizes itself as an independent Ego, which is crucial to the development of personality.

“The normal symbiotic phase marks the all-important phylogenetic capacity of the human being to invest the mother within a vague dual unity that forms the primal soil from which all subsequent human relationships form. The separation-individuation phase is characterized by a steady increase in awareness of the separateness of the self
and the "other" which coincides with the origins of a sense of self, of true object relationship, and of awareness of a reality in the outside world.\textsuperscript{56}

This recognition that he/she is a separate individual, is discussed by Lacan as the Mirror Stage – a theory which is also his first contribution to psychoanalysis. According to the theory, the incident takes place in any probable moment between 6 to 18\textsuperscript{th} months of child development, where the child sees its own reflection through a mirror, and recognizes the image reflected on the mirror as himself/herself. Aside it being any reflective surface in the literal meaning of the occasion, a symbolic contraption may take place to start apperception: the turning of the self into a perceivable object from the outside. An exterior will may comment on physical features or cause/consequence dynamics for the child’s action, perceivable in a physical manner, beckoning that the child is a person of its own.

This realization – aside its literal connotation of self-recognition in a reflection- carries bears the symbolic factor of apperception. The child recognizes itself as an object that can be viewed from the outside. From that point on, the infant starts to build an object relationship with its own body image, which will gradually affect personality structure. The relationship is libidinal – in which the infant will emotionally invest in the body image – and bears the duality between the perceived visual appearance and the emotional experience of the one that creates the appearance. Lacan describes this identified duality as the alienation.

"The mirror stage is a phenomenon to which I assign a twofold value. In the first place, it has historical value as it marks a decisive turning-point in the mental development of the child. In the second place, it typifies an essential libidinal relationship with the body image.\textsuperscript{57}"

During the following years of his career, Lacan brought this theory into its maturity, by declaring it to be not only a singular event that will serve as the foundation of an infant’s Ego,
yet also the primary permanent structure of any kind of subjectivity as the primary paradigm of Imaginary Order. The gap between the perceived image and the experience itself will continuously challenge the individual, and will set the baseline for individuality itself, feeding the object relationship which has been settled between the subject and the image, creating an inner conflict: in which the result itself would be the Ego. The specular image that creates the challenge between the perceived and the experienced is “the other” – or “l’autre” as in the original French explanation - which, in time, gets assimilated into the Ego, which will become a sense of aspiration and a driving force for the subject, to reach its own specular perfection. It should be noted that this connotation of “the other” is different from “the Other” in Lacanian Psychoanalysis, which will later be explain as a part of the domain of the Symbolic Order.

“The little other is the other who is not really other, but a reflection and projection of the Ego. He is both the counterpart or the other people in whom the subject perceives a visual likeness (semblable), and the specular image or the reflection of one's body in the mirror. In this way the little other is entirely inscribed in The Imaginary Order.”

Apart from its any psychoanalytical connotation, mirror as a symbol has always been a common motif in Western Literature, since the specular image, the reflection has always been a fascination for the human psyche. It stands for various notions in the Imaginary Order, representing our potential, a prediction of our future, our perfect self, our persona – or as we are perceived from the outside: the other. In all these connotations the reflection is the other: the specular image that hints on exterior observations, and the counterpart, which is paradoxically both the subject and anything but the subject. This conflict sets the foundation of personality.

Maybe the most obvious example of this motif can again be found in the tale of Snow White, narrated by Brothers Grimm. According to the narrative, the queen of the land dies, giving birth to princess Snow White, and the king gets married again, to a beautiful yet vain

woman, who is called as Evil Queen for the purpose of the narrative. The Evil Queen possesses a magical mirror which always tells the truth. Every day, she converses with the mirror, asking the same question: "Spieglein, Spieglein, an der Wand / Wer ist die Schönste im ganzen Land?"\(^{59}\), and the answer of the mirror stays the same: "Frau Königin, Ihr seid die Schönste im Land."

The translation from the German original varies depending on the version and the edition, yet the meaning may be commonly translated as: "Mirror, mirror on the wall, who is the fairest one of all?"\(^{60}\), and the answer: "You, my queen, is the fairest one of all." This routine persists indefinitely, until Snow White grows into a beautiful young maiden – the hypothetical counterpart of the queen. Then one day, the mirror’s answer differs from the previous ones for the first time: "You, my queen, is the fairest here so true, but Snow White is fairer than you." And this change in the answer results in the queen’s obsessive plotting to get rid of the young maiden, starting the series of events for the remainder of the story. Interpreting through Lacanian psychoanalysis, The Evil Queen doesn’t only watch her specular image, she declares the reflection, the imaginary as the sole motivator of her actions to restore her sense of Self. The moment that the specular image and the experience itself fails to meet, the narcissist becomes violent and desperate. Since the specular image itself declares her to be the fairest for her stature in the Imaginary, she must act according to her object of desire – the specular image itself, in this case, as it can be encountered in narcissism- and reinstate her image as the primary actuality by killing Snow White.

Another literary example for the mirror symbol, may be encountered in Oscar Wilde’s \textit{The Picture of Dorian Gray}. Young lord Dorian Gray possesses a cursed portrait of himself, painted by a friend and an admirer. Dorian picks the habit of bringing a mirror alongside to the room of the portrait to observe his facial features in the mirror and compare with the portrait. With each vile act he commits, the portrait becomes darker, uglier, more sinister; yet his image in the mirror stays the same. In this narrative, there is an apparent separation within the specular image/the ego itself. The reflection in the mirror would symbolize Dorian as he would hope to


see himself – a specular image on the positive side; yet the portrait is an embodiment of shame, the counterpart that he is afraid of, being a specular image on the negative side. This division through shame – a deep settled conflict between Dorian’s fleeting and weak Superego, and a ferocious and shameless Id creates a rift so grand thanks to Dorian’s weak Ego; that he ends up destroying himself by destroying the portrait at the end of the novel, as one grand symbolic act.

“He turned around, and, walking to the window, drew the blinds up. The bright dawn flooded the room, and swept the fantastic shadows into dusky corners, where they lay shuddering. But the strange expression that he had noticed in the face of the portrait seemed to linger there, to be more intensified even. The quivering, ardent sunlight showed him the lines of cruelty round the mouth as clearly as if he had been looking into a mirror after he had done some dreadful thing.”

At this point, going through all relevant stages for the discovery of the Self, the subject is introduced into the Imaginary Order, seeking ways to match its specular image with the experience itself, going on an endless and futile quest to bring two sides of his mirror together: how the subject feels himself to be and how he is observed from the outside. This conflict creates the basis of the personality and establishes the notion of the Self. With the rise of this notion, the innocence gets threatened for the first time, since the first experience is gathered the moment the Ego is introduced during the Mirror Stage: there is such a thing as “I”, and the “I” that is and the “I” that can be experienced from the outside are not the same. So, who or what the ultimate, the conclusive “I” would be? This is the moment; the hero’s journey starts. The subject leaves the confines of protective and ever static obliviousness, by obtaining the pursuit itself, in a continuous drive to shape that ultimate I – which serves to be everything that is within the borders of the Imaginary.

Domain of the Imaginary mainly consists of any fictional aspect of the Ego. Since Ego is established through both an identification with the specular image, and an alienation of the counterpart – the process invokes conflicting feelings for the subject, for its own self. This

---

alienation is constructive of the Imaginary Order. This relationship built on the contradiction of both maintaining and challenging the alienation in between the image and the Ego, it feeds on images, imaginations, depictions, all kinds of fictions. It feeds from the notion and the domain of crafted within the confines of the psyche. It holds the field for the hero’s battle against its own Self. For this battle to first arise to its most bloody state, then an uneasy armistice, tools of the Symbolic Order will be later needed.

"With his choice of the word “imaginary,” Lacan indeed intends to designate that which is fictional, simulated, virtual, and the like. However, the phenomena of the Imaginary are necessary illusions (to put it in Kantian locution) or real abstractions (to put it in Marxian parlance). This signals two points. First, as one of Lacan’s three basic, essential registers, the Imaginary is an intrinsic, unavoidable dimension of the existences of speaking psychical subjects; just as an analysis cannot (and should not try to) rid the analysand of his/her unconscious, so too is it neither possible nor desirable to liquidate the illusions of this register. Second, the fictional abstractions of the Imaginary, far from being merely “unreal” as ineffective, inconsequential epiphenomena, are integral to and have very concrete effects upon actual, factual human realities."

This conflict can be categorized as one of Freud’s terminologies: The Uncanny. The definition of the Uncanny – or Unheimlich in German, as referred by Sigmund Freud – is the midpoint of the familiar and the unfamiliar that end up being disturbing and mysterious. The Uncanny is either the object or the situation that we are repelled by and attracted to at the same time. Elements that fabricate the Uncanny are in continuous dissonance; thus, the attainable part of the notion resides just outside of our cognitive reach. It is peculiar and ever-present; a problem to deal with, which drives the subject to try resolving this unresolvable dilemma. Thus, the Uncanny resides between The Imaginary and the Real, which shall later be discussed in the relevant chapter.

---

“What interests us most in this long extract is to find that among its different shades of meaning the word Heimlich exhibits one which is identical with its opposite, unheimlich. What is heimlich thus comes to be unheimlich. [...] In general we are reminded that the word heimlich is not unambiguous, but belongs to two sets of ideas, which, without being contradictory, are yet very different: on the one hand it means what is familiar and agreeable, and on the other, what is concealed and kept out of sight. Unheimlich is customarily used, we are told, as the contrary only of the first signification of heimlich, and not of the second. [...] On the other hand, we notice that Schelling says something which throws quite a new light on the concept of the Unheimlich, for which we were certainly not prepared. According to him, everything is unheimlich that ought to have remained secret and hidden but has come to light.64"

Now, a baseline for the Order of the Imaginary is set, it can be interpreted as the period, when the subject takes a step out of the blissful ignorance, towards self-discovery – as Freud vaguely suggests. In this period, the first threat towards the innocence commences. As the subject realizes that he/she is a separate, individual being with certain desires and a will of its own, he/she starts taking actions to fulfill those desires – however conflicting or misguided they may be. By watching its specular image, the subject seeks to fill the gap between himself/herself and the image, in a desperate subconscious effort to actualize himself/herself. This whole process takes place within the boundaries of the imaginary, slowly building a suspension between this gap, to protect newly forming Ego. In this manner, the domain of the Imaginary and all subconscious constructs deriving from its tools, serves to concretize the Ego in the process of building the personality, or the Self. For the remainder of his/her adult life, the subject will be in a continuous battle to fill the gap between the specular image and the actual form, constantly failing and the Imaginary becoming a safety mechanic for the purpose of protecting the conscious from the futility of this effort. With each newly gained personal experience in the endeavor, the innocence takes a dent.

At this point, looking at literary examples may solidify the claim, thus, starting from this chapter, I will try to analyze relevant dimensions of two chosen literary pieces in each following chapter. In those short interpretations of chosen narratives, I hope to exemplify

famous growing up stories as gradual and unavoidable losses of innocence, specific to human nature, by following the protagonists’ story lines. For this purpose, I have chosen Charles Dickens’s *Great Expectations* and Dostoyevsky’s *The Idiot.*

Dickens’ *Great Expectations* is a textbook bildungsroman, a specific genre that narrates the growing up process of the protagonist. It can be defined as a genre of novel that shows a young protagonist’s journey from childhood to adulthood (or immaturity to maturity), with a focus on the trials and misfortunes that affect the character’s growth. For the purposes of psychoanalytical perception, it can be read as a perfect example for a growing up and loss of innocence tale too. In this specific example, our hero is a young boy named Phillip Pirrup – or Pip as he presents himself, for the remainder of the narrative. Pip is a young orphan who lives with his sister and brother-in-law at the marches of Kent, England. His life takes a series of unexpected turns with the appearance of a convict, his introduction to the Satis House and young noblewoman Estella whom he falls in love with; and later, the appearance of a nameless benefactor who will pay for his transformation into a gentleman. As the story progresses, Pip encounters many social, monetary and legal challenges – with his main aspiration being Estella’s love. The story bears two different endings – the original and the one Dickens had to rewrite due to editorial sanctions – which will also later be discussed.

Pip is a protagonist with many layers, like any real individual, demonstrating at once the traits of criminal and gull, of the victimizer and victim. He is victimized by his dream, and the dream itself, because its profoundly anti-social and unethical nature, forces him into a relation with a world in which other human beings fall victim to his drive for power. He starts as an innocent young boy, who would be willing to help a convict, without any social context of crime and slowly evolves first into a selfish, dastardly gentleman and then, finally, a fine young man. Throughout his journey, Pip passes every classical Lacanian stage of growing up.

---
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“What I wanted, who can say? How can I say, when I never knew? What I dreaded was, that in some unlucky hour, I, being at my grimmest and commonest, should lift up my eyes and see Estella looking in at one of the wooden windows of the forge. I was haunted by the fear that she would ... exult over me and despise me.\(^\text{67}\)"

Pip’s first and foremost problem lies deep in the Imaginary Order: his name. His inability to pronounce his own name, his inability to read his parents’ names from their tombstones refers to a deeper problem at the beginning of the novel: Pip is a child stuck in the Mirror Stage, and he will through a difficult transformation to an adult with the introduction of Symbolic factors, only later in the novel. The name Pip, an amalgamation of his given and last name, is also a metaphor for this state of innocence, since the name for the Self and the name for the Law - elements of the Imaginary and the Symbolic, separately – has no difference in his tongue.

“It is deferment in another sense as well, the redoubling of the single sign, Pip. A single signifier swings in significance like a pendulum, from both first and last name, the Christian or "given" name—given by his parents, by the novelist, and by anyone who reads the line—and the family name. It is the name of Christ's freedom from the law and of legal right.\(^\text{68}\)"

He bears no notion of right or wrong, lawful or criminal, reality and daydream: he simply wishes for the best without any in-depth understanding of the social connotation this wish may bear, so innocently, as a child would do. He doesn’t realize there might be a differentiation between the specular image and the Self, since he doesn’t know what the Self is. With the introduction of Estella into the picture, a drive, a motivation arises for the protagonist; and from there on, Pip’s real battle begins. He realizes that he and the specular image are separate as the Self and the other – his own self as the uneducated and penniless youth; and the specular image, as the well-respected young gentleman which Estella might take as a husband. For the remainder of the novel, his primary and futile motivation will be, as Lacan defined
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priorly, to bring the Self and the specular together. In this pursuit, Estella is the specular image itself, a symbol for everything Pip wishes for himself, yet unreachable, unattainable. Even the name Estella – Occitan for star - signifies a far and away entity, whose beauty cannot be held yet only gazed upon.

"Estella and Pip are linked through ties of identification as well as opposition. In this sense Estella is the mirror-image of Pip: "if we observe the role of the mirror apparatus in the appearances of the double, in which psychical realities, however heterogeneous, are manifested". The inverted symmetry of Lacan’s mirror stage, which "symbolizes the mental permanence of the I, at the same time as it prefigures its alienating destination", is itself perhaps derived from Freud’s discussion of the means of representation used in dreams (Bloom, 1996: 267). 69"

*The Idiot*, on the other hand, is kind of an anomaly when it comes to the process of growing up. The titular character is Prince Lev Nikolayevich Mishkin, who is a descendant of an old noble line in Russia. He has spent several years at a clinic in Switzerland, getting treated for his “idiocy” and epilepsy. When he comes back to Russia, to live with a distant relative, he gets thrown into the world of Russian high society, with various social conventions and relations of self-interest. He relentlessly tries to help people around him – especially women – yet continuously fails to protect anyone, including himself. He seems to be continuously appalled and surprised by either sarcastic or apathetic attitude of people towards misery and misfortune. Again, he fails to recognize any immoral behavior, continuously looking for explanations for the grander good. He insists that if the chance would presented, the natural state of any individual is kind and good. He ends up being a victim and a statement against the sorry ethical and humanitarian values of the Russian aristocracy.

---

"I don't understand how one can walk by a tree and not be happy at the sight of it! Or to speak with a man and not be happy in loving him? ... There are so many things at every step so beautiful.\textsuperscript{70}"

Mishkin, through a psychoanalytical reading, is an anomaly as an adult— a child as described by Jung, as the archetype: the one utopian character who would wish solely for the good of all. Another archetype who follows a similar pattern in Mark-Pearson reading of archetypes – even though the narrative mainly aims to build brands, the categorization is simply a modernized and reinvented version of the Jungian categorization - is the Innocent: a thoroughly selfless person who would fail to recognize even the probability of ill intention in others and the world. All he witnesses and experiences are mere proof of a grand, perfect design, evidence of a higher notion of right and wrong, beyond any kind of mortal self-interest. In all these manner, Prince Mishkin is a reinvention of the Christ, \textit{Agnus Dei}, the perfect innocent who will continuously suffer for the sins of others.

“Every culture has myths of a golden age when life was perfect and utopian visions of how it might become that wonderful again. Symbols like the Star over Bethlehem announcing the birth of the Christ child, the Holy Grail appearing to the knights of the Round Table, or a vine-covered house with a white picket fence suggest that it is possible to find happiness through the triumph of a kind of simple purity or goodness. The Innocent in each of us wants to live in that perfect land where we are “free to be you and me.” The promise of the Innocent is that life does not need to be hard. You are free to be yourself and to live out your best values right now, right here, just by following simple guidelines. (...) The Innocent is extraordinarily attractive in this hectic, stressful age because it promises that you can get out of the fast lane, relax, and truly enjoy your life.\textsuperscript{71}

On all manners, the ever-innocent is an abnormal character through the lens of healthy adult behavior in a psychoanalytical reading. Considering being innocent is a temporary state,

\textsuperscript{71} Mark, Margaret, and Carol S. Pearson. \textit{The Hero and the Outlaw}. McGraw-Hill, 2002.
and has cross correlation with the passage of time, due to the amount of exposure to experience; Mishkin's persistent innocence, derives from an inability to form a sense of Self. Without a sense of self, the Ego has never been properly founded, making the subject engulfed within the boundaries of the Imaginary, without any probability for to interact with the Symbolic. He doesn't understand social connotations, necessities, context and relationship. He fails to present any sense of Self, since he never came to realize there was a specular image to begin with. He keeps seeing himself simply as a part of something grander and more beautiful. Mishkin being completely selfless, he is stuck within the boundaries of the Imaginary, and he never comes to understand any Symbolic connotation.

Since Mishkin lacks any actual drives or any personal interest of his own, Dostoyevsky presents an exterior personality to underline what Mishkin lacks. In the novel, the opposite of Mishkin is represented through the character of Rogozin – Mishkin's counterpart, his shadow and a personality that serves as an exterior Id – someone who acts simply upon desires and drives. This duality between two men, serves to be the main dynamic of the whole novel, and the ending punishes them both. Rogozin's punishment is simple imprisonment and exile, yet Mishkin's disillusionment completely makes his character crumble. Even Mishkin's epilepsy might be interpreted as a subconscious rebellion for the lack of will and fulfillment – portraying him devoid of any personal force to affect things or even will to declare personal wishes. He is oblivious to the probability of personal interest.

"One has the sense in reading The Idiot that the action of the novel is balanced quite perilously, that just beyond or beneath its precarious coherence is a kind of maelstrom or abyss in which emotion might lose its connection with intelligible form and manifest itself in some unimaginably direct, "raw" state; here ordinary coherent speech and gesture might give way to frenzy or blankness. And indeed, the novel does present us with the image of this extremity in the epileptic seizure. In fact, the seizure is a sort of paradigm of the emotional progression in the book's great scenes..."{72}
As it can be observed through various literary examples too, any individual that comes to this world starts its journey devoid of experience – not innate knowledge or a sense of aspiration itself, yet necessary faculty to analyze, interpret and understand even its own being, desires and aspirations. The moment any subject realizes that he/she is a separate entity that has a free will and a motivation to act upon his/her desires, is the moment he/she discovers Self. From thereon, the first battle starts: becoming an individual. If the drive for the fusion of the specular image and the experienced subject never arises, the first phase of growing up never occurs. Only, as the mending process for the impossibility of this fusion, the Imaginary Order takes root, after a sense of Self is reached, the battle against the Other can begin, introducing the Symbolic Order.
CHAPTER 4

AND THE SANCTION: THE CLASH OF INNOCENCE AND EXPERIENCE

As another stage of growing up and losing innocence, the realization and the integration of the Self is not the only challenge. Nearly immediate to this first stage, another parallel challenge is introduced: The Other. This Otherness differs from the other – which is essentially both a potential and a counterpart to the Self, which will become a tool for the establishment of personality. The Other – written with capital O, in Lacanian narrative, indicates a force or a will exterior to the one generated by the Ego. Basically, it is the will or the Ego of another, or a collection of exterior Egos – which will present the baseline for the term Superego for Freud, and the Lacanian Order of the Symbolic.

Explaining what would be defined as the Superego according to Freud, and what forms the borders of the Symbolic Order according to Lacan is crucial for the remainder of this chapter. According to Freud, as a core part of our unconscious, the Superego is a distinct apparatus like the Ego (the Self) and the Id (the Shadow) which serves to be a control mechanism for the individual, differentiating what would be acceptable, proper and responsible thing to do, act upon or even think about. It reflects the internalization of cultural rules, mainly taught by parents applying their guidance and influence73.

“In Freudian psychology, the superego, or above-I, represents the moral and ideal aspects of personality and is guided by the moralistic and idealistic principles as opposed to the pleasure principle of the Id and the realistic principle of the ego. The superego grows out of the ego, and like the ego, it has no energy of its own. However, the superego differs from the ego in one important respect—it has no contact with the outside world and therefore is unrealistic in its demands for perfection (Freud, 1923/1961a).”74

Since the individuation process is not a singular, but a universal occasion for every human being, there is a collection of Egos – or individuals that form any given society. For a collection of Egos to coexist in societal formation, a consensus must be fashioned, according to what specific desire that the collectivity should strive towards as the ultimate drive. Since Id is inclined to seek personal pleasure constantly, even if it would mean contradicting other Egos and harming others, it is impossible and unnatural for a collectivity to seek the fulfillment of every individual within itself. Thus, the term, social contract arises in political philosophy. Social contract, in political philosophy, is an actual or hypothetical compact, or agreement, between the ruled and their rulers, defining the rights and duties of each. In primeval times, according to the theory, individuals were born into an anarchic state of nature, which was happy or unhappy according to the particular version. They then, by exercising natural reason, formed a society (and a government) by means of a contract among themselves, consequently creating an stature of power or a notion that dominates their individual drives, effectively creating the father function and introducing themselves into the domain of the Symbolic, which is, in Lacanian psychoanalysis, the Order that allows the maintenance of civilization, through comprehensible communication. Every manmade notion that dictates the outline of our daily lives, from intersubjective relations to the acknowledgement of a higher authority (the Other) is part of this Symbolic Order.

"Whereas the imaginary is all about equations and identifications, the symbolic is about language and narrative. Once a child enters into language and accepts the rules and dictates of society, it is able to deal with others. The acceptance of language's rules is aligned with the Oedipus complex, according to Lacan. The symbolic is made possible because of your acceptance of the Name-of-the-Father, those laws and restrictions that control both your desire and the rules of communication: "It is in the name of the father that we must recognize the support of the symbolic function which, from the dawn of history, has identified his person with the figure of the law" (Écrits 67). Through recognition of the Name-of-the-Father, you are able to enter into a community of others. The symbolic, through language, is "the pact which links... subjects together in one..."
action. The human action par excellence is originally founded on the existence of the world of the symbol, namely on laws and contracts" (Freud’s Papers 230).76

Aside the political philosophy concerning the term, the nature of men can either be viewed from the perspective of Hobbes – that man is innately violent and competitive for the sake of survival, as any other animal, or Rousseau – that man is innocent and benevolent in the absence of a challenge, but it is an undeniable fact that the moment we have even imagined a collectivity of Egos, a common point for norms and social functions must have been reached, concerning various notions such as language, religion, law, governance, social dynamics, ethics and morality. The content of such notions may have been interpreted from society to society, yet the need to define a basic line is inevitable: “Don’t do unto others what you don’t want done unto you.”77

This code, and any collection of notions designed by men, lie in the domain of the Symbolic, and are established through language, forming the basis of civilization. Yet, going back to psychoanalytical narrative, while the mother persona dominates the form and function of the Imaginary, the father persona – or simply father function, as discussed by contemporary psychoanalysis – rules the domain of the Symbolic, and introduces the Superego in Freudian terminology. Vaguely, this position signifies and defines any exterior force that enforces a set of rules to the subject: the rule maker, the governor, the dictator, the father – who is both loved and envied. To define the conditioning more elaborately, looking at various psychoanalytical theories like the murder of the primordial father, the introduction of the third, arising castration anxiety and Freud’s famous Oedipus Complex – which all can be defined as the forms and phases of the Symbolic domain, internalized by the Superego - may be vital.

“Psychoanalysts today fully realize a father’s influence on his child’s reality-based ego functioning and object relations, both in dyadic (pre- oedipal) and triadic (oedipal) paternal countenance (Diamond 2007, 2015). Moreover, the core structure of


human relatedness is triangular (Aisenstein 2015), and it is "the fate of the human psyche to have always two objects and never one alone" (Green 1986, p. 146). Thus, in appreciating the ever-present role of the father in the mother's unconscious mind, it seems apt to paraphrase Winnicott's (1960) iconic adage and declare that there is no mother without a father, nor any baby without both mother and father. Moreover, there can be no father without the mother's—as well as the child's own (unconscious)—relationship to him.  

Here, we step back and take a closer look at the Freudian narrative for a societal and religious formation. Freud explicitly stated in his Totem and Taboo, that every civilized society is founded upon a primordial murder: the murder of the father. In his narrative, Freud fashions a hypothetical tribe, which consists of a strong father figure, whose reign over the tribe is absolute. Children, at some point, harboring conflicted feelings towards the male leader—both envy of the authoritarian position, and love for the protection and acceptance he has presented thus far—murder this hypothetical father figure. Later, his flesh is consumed by the children to internalize the strength of the father, yet the guilt over ending his life compels them to raise a symbolic replacement, a totem which would symbolize the father. Based on this narrative, every civilized process is based upon a challenge between the father and the child, which will eventually end with the replacement of the child as the father; and the father as the symbolized notion of authority rather than a person. Also, according to Freud's theory, the basis of religion, is founded upon this primordial murder and the ascension of the father from a person to a concept. Every religious or spiritual narrative is mostly based upon the frustration the child feels towards the father—the authority figure—which will end in his revolt against the father and the following guilt which will make him seek atonement through deification—which is also defined as a part of Hero's Journey by Campbell.

"The situation created by the removal of the father contained an element which in the course of time must have brought about an extraordinary increase of longing for the father. For the brothers who had joined forces to kill the father had each been

animated by the wish to become like the father and had given expression to this wish by incorporating parts of the substitute for him in the totem feast. In consequence of the pressure which the bonds of the brother clan exercised upon each member, this wish had to remain unfulfilled. No one could or was allowed to attain the father’s perfection of power, which was the thing they had all sought. Thus, the bitter feeling against the father which had incited to the deed could subside in the course of time, while the longing for him grew, and an ideal could arise having as a content the fullness of power and the freedom from restriction of the conquered primal father, as well as the willingness to subject themselves to him. The original democratic equality of each member of the tribe could no longer be retained on account of the interference of cultural changes; in consequence of which there arose a tendency to revive the old father ideal in the creation of gods through the veneration of those individuals who had distinguished themselves above the rest. 79

Various narratives of the revolt against the father figure, which will be followed by loss and deification is told throughout western literary narrative, religious or fictional. One solid example of the narrative can be observed in Greek mythology, especially the creation myth concerning titan Chronos and one of his sons, Zeus. According to concerning myth, recorded in Hesiod’s *Theogony: Works and Days*, Kronos is the eldest of the first generations of titans, as the embodiment of time itself. He overthrows the reign of Uranus – his progenitor and the Sky itself and imprisons many of his brothers. Later, he swallows all his children from Rhea, to ensure his reign would never be challenged. Still, Rhea manages to save one of her sons, tricking Kronos to swallow a rock instead. That son is no other than Zeus: the youngest of the Olympians who will end his father’s reign, free his siblings from his father’s stomach and battle the titans to form a new order.

“(…) The others great Kronos swallowed, as each of them reached their mother’s knees from her holy womb. His purpose was that none but he of the lordly Celestials should have the royal station among the immortals. For he learned from Earth and starry Heaven that it was fated for him to be defeated by his own child, powerful though he was, through the designs of great Zeus. So, he kept no blind man’s watch, but observed

and swallowed his children. (...) Seizing it in his hands, he put it away in his belly, the brute, not realizing that thereafter not a stone but his son remained, secure and invincible, who before long was to defeat him by physical strength and drive him from his high station, himself to be king among the immortals.80

But why does the notion of the father is so effective and important in psychoanalysis, enough to have a whole literature of its own? Not because of who he is, but for what he symbolizes, the father figure and the father function itself is widely encountered in all literary sources. He is the main object of the child’s envy: for his possession of the mother, and as the possessor of power to decide, to legislate and to castrate. The phallus – or the penis – possessed by the father is more of a symbol for all these powers. The very presence of this male authority serves to be the main object of Freud’s Castration Anxiety theory – the child’s fear that the father would emasculate him by harming the child’s genitals as a punishment for his desire towards the mother. Even though the fear itself is discussed in the literal sense for the child in phallic stage, overall, this is more of a symbolic process, which would refer to simply being degraded, dominated or being made insignificant in the presence of the socially superior function a.k.a. the father. Thus, the child internalizes what the father figure would teach him concerning what is right and what is wrong, which will become the main drive for the construction of a Superego. Therefore, the Superego, is the hypothetical voice of the father, who holds the power to decide what can be done and what cannot be done. According to Lacan, the child's acceptance of its castration marks the resolution of its Oedipal complex, Lacan holds, again shadowing Freud. The Oedipal child remains committed to its project of trying to fathom and fulfil this desire81.

“(…) whoever looks attentively through the history of little John will also find there abundant proof that the father was admired as the possessor of large genitals and was feared as threatening the child’s own genitals. In the Oedipus as well as in the castration complex the father plays the same role of feared opponent to the infantile

sexual interests. Castration and its substitute through blinding is the punishment he threatens.\(^{82}\)

Going back to the previous chapter, the unity of the mother and the child, is a predominant dyad, and the moment the child realizes that he/she is a separate entity that harbors a will of its own, immediately a third will and presence is introduced to his/her perception: the father. As being an archetypal figure of its own, the father, or the individual/the concept that would introduce the father function into a child’s perspective is the child’s first introduction to Superego and the Symbolic Order itself. The moment the child realizes that there is a third Self besides the mother and its own, he realizes that his/her own will won’t be the sole determinant on his/her thoughts, actions, drives and desires. There will be an exterior factor which would either allow/affirm or prevent/prohibit the child’s various tendencies. This father figure itself and its various effective functions differ greatly from the child’s perspective of the father: the murdered primordial father narrated by Freud is a symbol of authority and perfection, and the dead father – as the focus of the fantasy of patricide itself – simply takes the role of the transitory force for the child’s separation and initiation into society.

“Lacan was the first psychoanalyst who gave conceptual status to the term dead father, utilized by Freud in Totem and Taboo, establishing the equation between the symbolic father and the dead father. This line of thinking was further developed by Rosolato (1969) in his distinction between the idealized father and the dead father. In my own work I have elaborated the distinction between the murdered father and the dead father and its crucial presence in the clinic (Perelberg, 2009, 2011, 2013b). If the Oedipus story represents the former – the story of the murdered father, and matricide as a universal, infantile phantasy – the Oedipus complex represents the latter – the dead father as the symbolic third.\(^{83}\)”

At this point, to better explain the father function effective on a child’s conscious and unconscious development, the term Oedipus Complex developed by Freud, would better be


noted. Oedipus Complex derives from Sophocles’ *Oedipus Rex*, an ancient Greek play narrating the tragedy of Theban King Oedipus. Throughout the duration of the play, the past concerning Oedipus’ rise to the throne of Thebes is investigated to reveal that Oedipus unwittingly killed his own father, the previous king in a petty argument and married his own mother, Jocasta, as the widow of the former king. Apparently, there has been a prophecy dictating that Oedipus would bring misfortune upon Thebes, and thus he was abandoned by the royal family when he was a child. Whence the tragic and complicated past is revealed Jocasta kills herself, and Oedipus blinds his own eyes, exiling himself from the throne of Thebes.

“People of our country Thebes, behold this Oedipus,

who knew the famous riddle and was a most powerful man,

whose fortunes all the citizens watched with emulation,

how deep the sea of dire misfortune that has taken him!

Therefore, it is necessary to call no man blessed

as we await the final day, until he has reached

the limit of life and suffered nothing grievous.”

Even though, the play primarily centers on the idea of fate being unavoidable, Freud utilizes it as a mandatory narrative for all children secretly harboring the fantasy of killing their father and acquiring the sole right over their mother. Yet, the fantasy doesn’t directly dictate this to be a wish on the literal sense. It solely suggests that the father, being the ultimate form of power as the primary possessor of the mother’s affections, and also the embodiment of symbolic order itself; invokes a continuous sense of competition for the child. Thus, the child wishes to become the father to reach the stature of perfection he has identified with the father, and have the sense of security, unison and belonging facilitated by the mother. This process is a symbolic manifestation of the unconscious, and the conscious mind which acknowledges its impossibility. Yet, the unconscious keeps trying to reach the perfection of character displayed by this metaphorical father and keeps trying to substitute the absence of the mother with other

---

various object relationship: catexes; notions, people and objects to replace the longing for the mother. This subconscious process also defines what is the part of the subconscious as an Ego manifestation, and what takes place within the boundaries of the Superego, to form an auto control over various desires.

"His destiny moves us only because it might have been ours—because the oracle laid the same curse upon us before our birth as upon him. It is the fate of all of us, perhaps, to direct our first sexual impulse towards our mother and our first hatred and our first murderous wish against our father. Our dreams convince us that that is so. King Oedipus, who slew his father Laius and married his mother Jocasta, merely shows us the fulfilment of our own childhood wishes. But, more fortunate than he, we have meanwhile succeeded, in so far as we have not become psychoneurotics, in detaching our sexual impulses from our mothers and in forgetting our jealousy of our fathers. Here is one in whom these primaeval wishes of our childhood have been fulfilled, and we shrink back from him with the whole force of the repression by which those wishes have since that time been held down within us."85"

Again, according to Lacan, all human beings are primarily driven by desire, and this desire needs a figure, a notion to center on. This designated notion as the primary object of desire is otherwise known as the big other, or the Other, in Lacanian psychoanalysis. The Other is the symbolic texture of human subjectivity, centering the domain of the symbolic as the primary object of desire. It indicates both pleasure through the aspiration of reaching for it, and fear of it, if its rules are not followed. The primary Other at the start, is the mother, for whom the child will continuously feel a yearning. Later, through a symbolic transition with a tool known as the Name of the Father, the father becomes the Other.

"If the castration complex is to normalize the child, Lacan argues, what the child must be made to perceive is that what satisfies or orders the desire of the mother is not any visible (imaginary) feature of the father (his obviously better physical endowments, and so on). The child must come to see that the whims of the mother are themselves

---

ordered by a Law that exceeds and tames them. This law is what Lacan famously dubs the name (nom) of the father, trading on a felicitous homonymy in French between nom (name) and non (the "no!" to incestuous union). When the father intervenes, (at least when he is what Lacan calls the symbolic father) Lacan's argument is that he does so less as a living enjoying individual than as the delegate and spokesperson of a body of social Law and convention that is also recognized by the mother, as a socialized being, to be decisive. This body of nomoi is what Lacan calls the big Other of the child's given sociolinguistic community. Insofar as the force of its Law is what the child at castration perceives to be what moves the mother and gives the father's words their "performative force" (Austin), Lacan also calls it the "phallic order." 86

This is more of a prohibiting function rather than a persona. According to Lacan, Freud’s castration anxiety comes into resolution the moment that the child’s separation from the mother is complete. From thereon, through the individuation, the child comes to accept that the complete fulfillment through the possession of mother – or all that she signifies – cannot ever be acquired, creating a certain lack. This lack drives the child into becoming a part of the Symbolic Order, in which the Name of the father, is a tool of initiation. The father doesn’t have to be a physical, actively enforcing entity: the mention of his will and presence through mother, effectively starts the initiation into the Symbolic. Later in life, various the Other notions will dominate the individual’s life, both as persona and concept: our boss, our colleagues, people that we seek validation from; the government, religion, law and social norms. This Otherness also carries an aspect as part of the domain of the Order of the Real, which will be explained in the following chapter.

"The capital-O Other refers to two additional types of otherness corresponding to the registers of the Symbolic and the Real. The first type of Other is Lacan’s “big Other” qua symbolic order, namely, the overarching “objective spirit” of trans-individual socio-linguistic structures configuring the fields of inter-subjective interactions. Relatedly, the Symbolic big Other also can refer to (often

fantasmatic/fictional) ideas of anonymous authoritative power and/or knowledge (whether that of God, Nature, History, Society, State, Party, Science, or the analyst as the "subject supposed to know" [sujet supposé savoir] as per Lacan’s distinctive account of analytic transference).^77^7

This Otherness through the function of the Name of the Father, may better be observed through the dynamics of Shakespeare’s iconic play: Hamlet. In the play, the young prince of Denmark is shaken by the atrocities committed within the royal family, and as he witnesses the ghost of his father, a plot for revenge begins, since Hamlet’s uncle Claudius killed his own brother and married Hamlet’s mother to seize the throne. In the play, King Hamlet’s presence and will, dominates Hamlet, even though he is no more a material presence. Through the symbolic downfall of the father at the hands of his uncle, Hamlet criticizes the whole ethical obscenity that takes place in Denmark’s royal court, as simply stated by Marcellus, a guard, shortly after the appearance of the late king, at the beginning of the play: “Something is rotten in the state of Denmark.”^88^8 The father’s will, carries through the son and keeps defining what would be righteous and proper.

“(…) Hamlet’s tragedy shows the idiosyncratic intervention of the law in the creation of human subjectivity, an intervention that relies on the agency of a (dead) father to regulate the subject’s desire. Hamlet’s tragedy, it suggests, is characteristically modern not because Hamlet unconsciously desired to do what Oedipus consciously did, but because of the added ingredient of Hamlet’s, and of the father’s, knowledge: Hamlet not only knows of the father’s death, he also knows that the father knows. In Hamlet the prior father, the father of Totem and Taboo, is reincarnated in the person of Claudius so the ‘progress’ from Oedipus to Hamlet, is from tragedy to obscenity. The Crown as phallus is called upon to conceal the obscenity but Hamlet, like any good analyst, plays


and displays language to reveal the rotten crime at the heart of the State of Denmark and of the Law.\textsuperscript{89}

As another psychoanalytical notion, the young Hamlet’s struggle with language and communication begins, as part of his display of a madman. Considering language to be the foundation of the Symbolic Order, his monologues, his impressions and metaphors on human nature, various soliloquies are heavily symptomatic of his struggle with structure and morality itself. The father’s downfall and an arising need for him to be avenged serves to be a driving force for the son to challenge the undeserving replacement. Only then, the sense of structure, morality and order can be reinstated, even though the father is immaterial, insubstantial – effectively dead; both for Hamlet’s subconscious and the state itself. Here, the state serves to be a metaphor in Hamlet’s reality. The fall of the father symbolizes a fall of order and security itself. Yet, Hamlet is virtually able to do anything but taking revenge, endlessly postponing the act itself, as Freud once explained:

“The play [Hamlet] is built up on Hamlet’s hesitations over fulfilling the task of revenge that is assigned to him; but its text offers no reasons or motives for these hesitations and an immense variety of attempts at interpreting them have failed to produce a result. [...] The answer, once again, is that it is the peculiar nature of the task. Hamlet is able to do anything— except to take vengeance upon the man who did away with his father and took the father’s place with his mother, the man who shows him the repressed wishes of his own childhood realized. Thus, the loathing which should drive him on to revenge is replaced by self-reproaches, by scruples of conscience, which remind him that he himself is literally no better than the sinner whom he is to punish. Here I have translated what was bound to remain unconscious in Hamlet’s mind. (Freud 264)\textsuperscript{90}

From a Lacanian point of view, Hamlet can be read as a tragedy of desire. According to Lacan, desire is the primary driving force for all human behavior. Hamlet’s indecision lies in

his confusion with the Other, since the father and the mother seems to bear different desires. The father wishes for revenge, yet he himself is a lack, being dead and gone; and the mother is already married to the uncle, and her desire seem to be in conflict with the sense of order in Hamlet’s perception. So, this inability to attain the Other – whether it be the incestuous mother containing the will of the uncle or the dead father, who is not there – renders Hamlet unable to act, effectively creating a separation between personal desire and the desire of the Other. Which one is which? It is impossible to tell. The notion of will and desire dominates the whole play, and the desire only arises when to attain the object of desire becomes impossible. For example, Hamlet only declares his love for Ophelia, after her death.

“Language, the unconscious, the parents, the symbolic order: these terms in Lacan are not exactly synonymous, but they are intimately allied. They are sometimes spoken of by him as the ‘Other’ — as that which like language is always anterior to us and will always escape us, that which brought us into being as subjects in the first place, but which always outruns our grasp. We have seen that for Lacan our unconscious desire is directed towards this Other, in the shape of some ultimately gratifying reality which we can never have; but it is also true for Lacan that our desire is in some way always received from the Other too. We desire what others — our parents, for instance — unconsciously desire for us; and desire can only happen because we are caught up in linguistic, sexual and social relations — the whole field of the ‘Other’ — which generate it."\(^{91}\)

“The structure of Hamlet is held by “his situation of dependence with respect to the desire of the Other ("Desire" 17). Even more, he is truly attached to the desire of his m/other. His dependence to her desire keeps Hamlet from choosing between his idealized dead father and the “degraded, despicable object Claudius” ("Desire" 12). Hamlet is constantly wondering: what is my mother’s desire? Or more precisely, what does she want from me? (Che vuoi?). Consequently, this questioning about the desire of

---

the (m)Other keeps Hamlet out of action since he is structured solely by the desire of the Other.92

Going back to the narrative of Pip, from Great Expectations, his battle within the realm of Symbolic is an apparent one. His conflict within the realm of the Imaginary was problematic to begin with, yet his conflict within the Symbolic is even more complicated. Still, as he manages to establish a sense of Self through various inner challenges, the theoretical or abstract knowledge, the knowledge he has gathered through personal deductions will gradually turn itself into understanding (connaître-savoir) in his journey, via various revelations, with the intervention of various Symbolic tools, resulting in attaining various examples of the Other.

Since the Other declares, as the Symbolic power, what is law, and what is acceptable, the object of aspiration and desire, will continuously change for Pip, containing different undertones and aims, throughout the story. The common point to all these notions of the Other, is that they will drive Pip to discovery, to the existence of other Egos concerning his affairs and fate, eventually allowing him to separate his own will from the will of others. In terms of growing up, identification of the Self and the attainment of the Other carry near synchronous process, yet the continuous challenge with the Other, even in defying or trying to reach it, is the main motivation of our lives and the foundation of growing up. Most obvious examples in Pip’s journey are Magwitch, Mrs. Joe and Estella - through Mrs. Havisham. Even though both Magwitch and Mrs. Joe serve to be father replacements, all these figures contain various aspects of the Other, reigned by different desires and aspirations. Let us start by analyzing the family dynamic and the father function itself, though.

Magwitch makes a short, yet impactful appearance at the beginning of the novel, and his name and presence disappears for a long while, buried within Pip’s unconscious. When an anonymous benefactor rises to affect his journey, Magwitch doesn’t even come to Pip’s mind, he assumes it to be Mrs. Havisham – because he wishes it to be Mrs. Havisham, as it would mean a solid possibility for him to eventually reach Estella. Magwitch, on the other hand, being

a mistreated orphan himself, utilizes Pip to reconstruct his own Ego, much like Mrs. Havisham does to Estella. Pip is a tool of self-expression or self-actualization for Magwitch, just as Estella is one for Mrs. Havisham. Even from the moment Pip steals food for Magwitch, he starts to mirror Magwitch’s journey as a criminal, unwittingly. His presence becomes a haunting, unconscious presence: The Name of the Father. Pip’s journey will be one engulfed by constant guilt: over rejecting Joe – replaced by Mr. Jaggers-, over accepting Magwitch’s money, over belittling Biddy. This guilt will also become a primary drive on his in-effectivity at the face of lack and loss, quite Hamletian.

“For Lacan, the coming to awareness of the symbolic order involves an unconscious awareness of the prohibition implicitly contained in the father’s name and the No-of-the-Father. Lacan believes that symbolic order or the realm of the Father includes Otherness and Lack. The position of other/Other (Otherness) entails a Lack that in turn entails a desire, desire to be the center of the symbolic order, the center of language. The Father (not the real father) comes to represent cultural rules and Laws in symbolic order (Rabaté, 2001: 12). In the case of Magwitch, Pip’s surrogate father, the name ‘Magwitch’ remains hidden for most of the narrative even though Magwitch causes Pip to lose his name – Pip of course becomes ‘Handel’ in his new role as a gentleman.  

Mrs. Joe, on the other hand, as the Other, is the primary rule maker in Pip’s life. Even referred to as Mrs. Joe – the sister is stripped from any feminine or motherly connotations. She is known to be strict on Pip, seeming invincible, unbreakable as the law itself. Thus, her getting hurt is another shock for Pip, a symbol for the downfall of authority, which will beckon him to reconcile with his past. Thus, Magwitch’s second appearance as the revealed benefactor, will instate the father figure in Pip’s life, since being a figure of unconditional love, Joe has been no other than the mother figure for Pip, all along.

“As the two figures of the father – Magwitch and Mrs. Joe – inspire the same feelings – fear and guilt – it is this parallelism between them which explains the fact that

---

93 Sahi, Sarah Dehghanzadeh. “The Relationship between Selfhood and Otherness in Great Expectations: A Lacanian Reading.” Daniel Meyer-Dinkgräfe, Daniel Meyer-Dinkgräfe,
Pip, against all reasons, sees Magwitch’s second appearance as the return of the dead Mrs. Joe. "What nervous folly made me start, and awfully connect it with the footstep of my dead sister, matters not. It was past in a moment, and I listened again, and heard the footstep stumble in coming on" (Dickens, 1996: 254).94

Pip’s more obvious and conscious challenge within the Symbolic Order, starts with the Satis House, though. The Other for Pip, the primary object of all his aspirations, desires and wishes is no other than Estella. Even though he craves for her attention and affection, any probability for his unison with her goes through Miss Havisham’s approval. Thus, Miss Havisham becomes the Other for Pip, through inference. Also, she is totally strange and incomprehensible to Pip, feeding into his fantasies concerning Estella and a realm of elegant riches. The desire for Estella and Pip’s feeling of inadequacy are two sides of the same coin: desire is the feeling of a lack. It is Estella’s perfection and self-sufficiency (her pride) that shows Pip what he is lacking, and it is the fact that she makes him feel imperfect, transforms her in his eyes to a perfect and totally self-sufficient creature.95 Pip’s inability to center a Self and continuously misinterpreting Otherness as a probable Self is a dominant motif in the novel, since as he tries to follow rules of many Others, he sacrifices pieces of himself. Mrs. Havisham, on the other hand, utilizing Estella as a tool, a mirror to Pip in terms of being an agent of revenge to someone else’s Ego, only wishes to avenge her own broken heart, by victimizing Pip.

“I had been looking round—in fact, for Estella—and I stammered that I hoped she was well. “Abroad,” said Miss Havisham; “educating for a lady; far out of reach; prettier than ever; admired by all who see her. Do you feel that you have lost her?” There was such a malignant enjoyment in the utterance of the last words, and she broke into such a disagreeable laugh, that I was at a loss what to say.96

94 Sahi, Sarah Dehghanzadeh. “The Relationship between Selfhood and Otherness in Great Expectations: A Lacanian Reading.”  Daniel Meyer-Dinkgräfe, Daniel Meyer-Dinkgräfe,
95 Sahi, Sarah Dehghanzadeh. “The Relationship between Selfhood and Otherness in Great Expectations: A Lacanian Reading.”  Daniel Meyer-Dinkgräfe, Daniel Meyer-Dinkgräfe,
Otherness in *the Idiot*, on the other hand, is not that layered, yet blatantly obvious, mainly revolving around Mishkin’s inability to acknowledge social norms and expectation dominating the Russian high society. What heavily differentiates Mishkin from Pip, though, is Mishkin’s inability to progress in his journey and assimilate into the realm of the Symbolic. Pip constantly wages war against various Others, and eventually integrates himself in pursuit of jouissance, as Lacan would call. Mishkin denies the rules of the Symbolic Order altogether, directly living within the boundaries of his own Imaginary Order. There is a huge gap between the world as Mishkin perceives it, and the world within its own rules and dynamics. Whether the reason for his inability lies in his temperament or an actual psychosis is open to debate, yet one thing is certain: this inability prevents his integration into the Symbolic, effectively making him not only an outcast, but also an ever-child, much like the fool archetype that we encounter in biblical narrative and classical literary narrative – like Voltaire’s *Candide*. Thus, Mishkin’s growing up journey, is doomed to end in failure, considering he shall never integrate the knowledge (*connaitre*) to understanding (*savoir*).  

"The theme of the Idiot is the inadequacy of mere goodness in the world today. The Idiot is the modern morality story in the same sense that Hamlet is the modern rendition of Oedipus situation. (...) So weak is Mishkin’s sense of reality that in the last analysis, he is an idiot. There are of course, ironies on ironies in calling him that. He is morally so superior to, and in many respects so much wiser and more penetrating than, the characters who think of him as an idiot that our first tendency is to laugh at them. But if we set up the simplest operational definition of intelligence: self-knowledge and a capacity to appraise people and situations accurately enough so that one can thread one’s way safely through the jungle of the world, we see at once that Mishkin is indeed an idiot."  

Delving deeper into Mishkin’s character, a reoccurring motif attracts attention: epilepsy. Today, we understand it is simply a neurological disorder, yet in classical literary narrative, epilepsy is widely used – primarily by Dostoevsky himself – as some kind of Stigmata, a symptom for the exalted, the elevated, the one who carries and pays for the sins of others. Note

---

that Mishkin’s nickname is “the Prince”, effectively coinciding with one of the biblical titles for Jesus of Nazareth, who is deemed to be the Prince of Peace: "For to us a child is born, to us a son is given; and the government shall be upon his shoulder, and his name shall be called Wonderful Counselor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace." An epileptic seizure is a transient occurrence of signs and/or symptoms due to abnormal excessive or synchronous neuronal activity in the brain. Epilepsy is a disease characterized by an enduring predisposition to generate epileptic seizures and by the neurobiological, cognitive, psychological, and social consequences of this condition. It is also, as it would be so in most of Dostoevsky’s novels, used to signify both self-sacrifices, a sense of goodness and holiness, a sign of sainthood – and an inability to cope and interact with the materialistic world. During an epileptic attack, the patient loses both the control of his body and his/her ability to perceive the world. An epileptic attack puts the patient in an unconscious and incapable state, quite befitting Mishkin’s position in the novel.

“At the heart of the enigma presented by Mishkin and the novel is epilepsy. It is a terrifying and degrading illness: the seizure is a sudden and total loss of control and even of consciousness. But at the same time, epilepsy is the sacred disease of shamans and prophets, who are said to experience ecstasies and visions during the "aura" preceding the fit: thus, the seizure can also be seen as a representation of the violent descent of divine power. Much of the extraordinary psychological excitement and aesthetic tension of Dostoevsky’s fiction comes from the juxtaposition of the darkest forces in the human soul with radiant images of great spiritual beauty.”

As encountered in the narrative, Mishkin’s relationship with women is also problematic. He seems to be incapable in Other-ing women, not being able to see them beyond the holy incarnation of Mary herself. This problem occurs both with Anastasya Filippovna and Aglaia. He is engulfed by the vision of the ideal woman, quested to save women, rather than Other-ing them as a separate entity and will. He doesn’t recognize their will, character and condition,

specific to each person. The sacred female, the holly mother is an idea to chase for him, much like Don Quixote quested for the sake of imaginary Dulcinea. Anastasya Filippovna, isn’t the pure, victimized woman he sees her to be; and Aglaia, even though coming from a wealthy family who sheltered her, accordingly, isn’t that much of a saint either. Both women are sarcastic, highly intelligent, observant and wholly aware of their intentions. Neither is innocent in the traditional sense. The difference that stirs Mishkin towards Anastasya Filippovna is, that she might need saving. As the disgraced woman she is, she fits into Mishkin’s fantasy of being a knight for the damsel in disgrace. Aglaia calls that out even, during a family meeting, but quoting Pushkin’s poem, *Poor Knight*; which narrates a knight who quests for his lady and meets a tragic ending.

“Anyway, the ‘poor knight’ did not care what his lady was, or what she did. He had chosen his ideal, and he was bound to serve her, and break lances for her, and acknowledge her as the ideal of pure Beauty, whatever she might say or do afterwards. If she had taken to stealing, he would have championed her just the same. I think the poet desired to embody in this one picture the whole spirit of medieval chivalry and the platonic love of a pure and high-souled knight. Of course, it’s all an ideal, and in the ‘poor knight’ that spirit reached the utmost limit of asceticism. He is a Don Quixote, only serious and not comical. I used not to understand him, and laughed at him, but now I love the ‘poor knight,’ and respect his actions.”

The reasoning behind Mishkin’s unique state and inability to perceive various realities of life rather than his own idealized values is not revealed in the novel. It is simply stated that he has been treated for his epilepsy and “idiocy” at Switzerland, at the beginning of the book. Yet, one would assume, his secluded upbringing combined with possessing the unlucky disposition of having the neurological disease, Mishkin probably was never exposed to the society openly until the beginning of the novel; thus, he never had an opportunity to attain and challenge the Other properly. Considering the Self is already problematic with his character, his challenge with the Real couldn’t have been a successful one – which will be discussed in the following chapter.

---

“If a person such as Mishkin were to appear in real life, one would be curious about his childhood, particularly about the character of his father and the relationship between his parents, expecting to find in them circumstances that had shaped his personality and his response to instinctual drives. A character in a novel is not a real person; but it is in the power of the great writer to create the illusion of reality, and in fact to create through illusion a reality more vivid than that of life because more consistent and lucid.\textsuperscript{102}

As it can be observed through literary narrative, a successful integration into society bears the pre-requisite of a healthy dynamic between the Ego and the specular image, establishing a healthy sense of Self. If a sense of self is acquired through certain faculties as discussed in the previous chapter, the big Other will be put into perspective to attain an aim and a course for the growing up journey, continuing towards establishing a sense of Other. If not, the Other will continuously be rejected by the protagonist, if the Self has never been internalized, the Other cannot be internalized anyhow – crippling the chance of a triumphant encounter with the Real, which is discussed in the following chapter.

CHAPTER 5

HERO VS. THE REAL: THE DISCOVERY OF REALITY, ID, FUTILITY AND FALL: INNOCENCE SHATTERS

Every journey eventually ends: the human journey of growing up, is no exception. The process of individuation continues indefinitely, altering between the battle for defining and coming into terms with the Self and the battle against various Others; for either internalizing or eliminating them. These battles are not ever thoroughly won though, yet they facilitate assimilation processes, according to compromises made between personal aspirations and exterior sanctions. The individual keeps moving with the desire of compensating for various lacks, continuously trying to fulfill the gap left in his/her being with the separation from the mother – which is simply a separation from the whole, unattained reality itself. Aside its various Freudian connotations, the separation from the womb, and later our introduction into the Symbolic Order through individuation signals the end for our undiluted participation into the Real – which is simple, physical, factual and grander than our mortal perception. It indefinitely resists symbolization for human mind to grasp. The moment we have been brought into this world, parting Kristeva’s Semiotic Order, and becoming a part of the Symbolic, we have lost something. That something can be called as our unified state with the mother, the in-utero paradise where we existed in an unaltered, peaceful stasis; yet that is only one part of it. That is the sole part of the Real that we have ever participated in, and we remember the simple wholeness of it unconsciously, trying to reach that wholeness without having any means to even define it. All we know is, as Lacan says, that we lack (manque) something indefinitely.

“(…) Lacan tends to speak of the Real as an absolute fullness, a pure plenum devoid of the negativities of absences, antagonisms, gaps, lacks, splits, etc. Portrayed thusly, the Symbolic is primarily responsible for injecting such negativities into the Real. For instance, only though the powers of language can material being in itself be said to be “missing” things, since, on its own, this dimension of being always is simply
whatever it is in its dumb, idiotic presence as never more and never less than sheer, indifferent plenitude.\textsuperscript{103}

Various Others will be pursued for the purpose of regaining what was lost, yet since the actual nature of loss cannot be defined anymore, none accomplishes the ideal. We never regain what we have lost, or still, maybe continuously losing which I would call, for the purpose of this thesis, the innocence. This state of wholeness where everything naturally belongs to, is the starting point for every living creature. Only, with its remarkable cognitive abilities, humanity can leave it behind, to assimilate into a constructed societal order, governed by various manmade notions, such as law, morality, politics, diplomacy, esthetics etc. Yet, the primary tool that creates and configures these series of crafted notions is language. We name things, and as in naming we attach symbolic meanings to a set of sounds and signifiers, invent completely abstract notions to define our relationship both with the natural order, and among each other; and invented notions themselves. We restructure our perception by applying a certain set of rules and live by them, starting with language.

"Lacan's unconscious is structured like a language, which gives language a key role in constructing our picture of the world, but also allows the unconscious to enter into that understanding and dissolve essential distinctions between fantasy and reality. There are no primordial archetypes (Jung) or entities beyond the reach of language (Freud) or logical-sensorimotor structures (Piaget). (...) The Real is the unnamable, the outside of language. The Imaginary is the undifferentiated early state of the child, a fusion of subject and parent, which remains latent in adult life, manifesting when we falsely identify with others. The Symbolic is the demarcated world of the adult with its enforced distinctions and repressions. The unconscious is not simply reflected in the language we use but is equally controlled by it. Discourse, including social, public language, shapes and enters into the structure of the unconscious, and is inextricably mixed with the unsatisfied sexual desire that emerges disguised in dreams, jokes and art.\textsuperscript{104}"


By growing up, we delve into the world of the Symbolic further, coming into contact with all that it contains. Doing so, we become symbolic creatures, ourselves. If we were to call our Semiotic or Primary Real participation the initial and absolute state for innocence, our participation into the Imaginary slightly mars it, yet our introduction and our participation into the Symbolic consistently chips away from it, until we arrive at a definitive moment in our lives: the return of the Real. At some point in our lives, during our continuous conflict with the Self and Others, we encounter an event which undeniably states our own mortality: like the death of a parent, a natural disaster, even some kind of apocalyptic event, favorable in science-fiction genre. Whatever this event may be, it creates a traumatic experience, due to its nature of being a simple, clean-cut look at the Real. In that moment, we face our own mortality and lose whatever innocence we have managed to spare up until that point. The natural human reaction to such a trauma – an indefinite representation of *memento mori* – is absolute horror, since there is nothing to counter either the imminent or slowly approaching end of our existence, no way to describe or contain it within the boundaries of language. As Lacan dictates: “The real is what resists symbolization absolutely.”

“In Lacanian terms, we claim that any encounter with an object is already embedded with previously determined symbolic meanings. Or in other words, that things “exist” in reality as long as they are symbolically significant. Without having a symbolic attribution, a “thing” cannot be an object, and thus cannot exist. The *Real*, therefore, can be characterized as that aspect of an encounter with an object which does not have any symbolic designation. It is exactly that which does not “exist” in our reality. It is that part of our symbolic reality which is not signified. Nevertheless, that is not to say that it does not *exist* in the strictest of senses, but that if it does, it does so in a different way than the objects in our reality. This conception of the *Real* can be partially accredited to Heidegger’s use of the term “*ek-sistence*” – a unique form of existing from within which is utterly exterior. The *Real ek-sists*, and thus can be

---

somehow discerned within our symbolic order, and even named, but its logic nevertheless remains ineffable, unsignifiable.\textsuperscript{106}

As a classic example of such dreadful, yet simple face-off, Albert Camus’ \textit{The Stranger} is iconic, both in terms of existentialist philosophy as an undeniable suggestive of \textit{memento mori} and a portrayal of the absurd at its simplest. In the short, yet impactful novella, Meursault, the protagonist – who is simply referred by a last name, and any details concerning the actual name, age or definitive physical features omitted – receives the news from an asylum that his mother passed away, and later, attends the funeral. He doesn’t cry at the funeral and doesn’t show any signs of empathy or moral concern about various following events. Later, he commits murder during his stay at a friend’s beach house – and he fails to state a reasoning for the act aside from being distressed by the sun. The second part of the story narrates his admittance to prison, the trial and his final conversation with a chaplain who tries to overcome his apathy – which only invokes rage from Meursault. The end is unclear though, yet it only states Meursault’s wishes concerning on the day of his “execution there should be a huge crowd of spectators and that they should greet him with howls of execration.\textsuperscript{107}

“MOTHER died today. Or, maybe, yesterday; I can’t be sure. The telegram from the Home says: YOUR MOTHER PASSED AWAY. FUNERAL TOMORROW. DEEP SYMPATHY. Which leaves the matter doubtful; it could have been yesterday.\textsuperscript{108}

Meursault is a stranger – an \textit{Outsider}, as he is called in contemporary translations -, as the title suggest; an outcast who fails to empathize with any Symbolic connotations of the society. We do not know his reasons, or the details of his prior “hero’s journey” but we can see the results of it the moment narrative starts. He states directly, matter-of-factly that he has been informed that his mother died. He doesn’t show any grief, yet simply dictates it as simple, factual information in the opening lines of the novel. As the narrative progresses, we realize


this is not due to simple shock or inability to elaborate due to grief. This is Meursault’s character— or what remained of it. Whatever he has endured throughout his lifetime priorly, seems to have left him as a shell, as a being that simply exists without character, without morals, without attachment. He doesn’t even seem to be highly concerned about the probability of his own death at the end. He observes things, recalls them and fills time—as he lists his belongings in his mind, to pass time in prison—waiting until whatever may follow. Meursault is a creature that solely exists on the Real—who fails to take part on the Symbolic, who even doesn’t try to overcome the Imaginary to establish a character, a personality. His murder of the Arab, cannot be attested to anything else rather than there being the sun, and annoying him at the time. As a creature of pure existentialism, Meursault just exists, and waits for things to happen, without any concern for their probable nature, befitting to definitions of both Heidegger and Sartre. The protagonist simply acts on the impulses of Id—feeding, having sex etc. and responds to exterior influence with similar reaction, devoid of any intention beyond instinct. It is impossible to note whether the death of the mother was the reintroduction of the Real, or any other prior event, yet his actions can be observed starting with that point. Thus, the death of the mother, can also be read as the death of the Imaginary in Lacanian context. There is nothing to do, since there is nowhere to go back to.

If we are to go back to the term innocence and continue our outlook for the hero’s journey to be a gradual loss of such innocence, it must be reminded that innocence doesn’t only carry a holy, guilt-free connotation as it would be depicted in Christianity. It simply dictates a lack of experience, which is yet to come through going through paces of life, by interacting both with the inner world and the exterior society. Experience, thus the loss of innocence, on that manner is a collection of impressions and resulting expressions, which will accumulate certain information and wisdom, acquired from that information. Thus, any innocent is completely capable of committing atrocious acts, when they encounter certain events without proper experience to deal with them within their Symbolic or Superego driven connotations—like Meursault killing the Arab, or children form Lord of the Flies killing Simon—the soul of man—and Piggy.

“Ralph looked at him dumbly. For a moment he had a fleeting picture of the strange glamour that had once invested the beaches. But the island was scorched up like
dead wood-- Simon was dead--and Jack had... The tears began to flow, and sobs shook him. He gave himself up to them now for the first time on the island; great, shuddering spasms of grief that seemed to wrench his whole body. His voice rose under the black smoke before the burning wreckage of the island; and infected by that emotion, the other little boys began to shake and sob too. And in the middle of them, with filthy body, matted hair, and unwiped nose, Ralph wept for the end of innocence, the darkness of man's heart, and the fall through the air of the true, wise friend called Piggy.\textsuperscript{109}

Golding's \textit{Lord of the Flies} was a sensation at the time of its publishing, and as it was predicted Floyd C. Gale\textsuperscript{110}, it became a modern classic. As an obvious interpretation of human nature, the story focuses on the theme of civilization vs. nature, yet psychoanalytically, it indicates that even though establishing a civilized society within the boundaries of the Symbolic may be the taught behavioral pattern; if the said behavior isn't established strong enough, or supported by certain comforts of the civilization like shelter, nourishment and safety: it is unavoidable for a collective to not to revert back to the Real: an Id driven chaos, a continuous conflict of need, want and instinct like it has happened among the surviving children of the plane crash. The shell which has priorly chosen as a symbol of power and civilized thinking breaks within the story, as the last remnants of a Symbolic formation are eradicated. From thereon, the animal within children are predominant and real. They will hunt, torture and kill to affirm superiority, just as animals would do. One does recall Hobbes' statement about human nature: "Homo homini lupus\textsuperscript{111}" – a man is a wolf to another man. Once stripped from the symbolic order of language which defines our capability to exist as a society, we become animals. Maybe more so with children, whom would be deemed indefinitely innocent in Christianity. Is evil an adjective that can be used about children in Golding's \textit{Lord of the Flies}? No, they are still innocent: a tragic innocence which faced the Real at an early age. The moment they witness the corpse of the pilot - mistaken as the beast, their imagination- is a point of no return for most of the children, and from thereon, civilized living starts to erode indefinitely.

"Behind them the silver of moon had drawn clear of the horizon. Before them, something like a great ape was sitting asleep with its head between its knees. Then the wind roared in the forest, there was confusion in the darkness and the creature lifted its head, holding toward them the ruin of a face."\textsuperscript{112}"

At this point on the narrative, it is mandatory to further explain the relationship between loss & lack, Lacanian term \textit{Jouissance} and the famous statement that any drive being a death drive. Loss would indicate possessing something – an item, a capability or a notion definitive, and then its disappearance from the effective function. Lack, on the other hand, is something that has never been possessed to begin with: it is a definitive absence, and since it has never been possessed to begin with, any effectivity concerning its presence or absence cannot be differentiated by the subject either. Lack (or \textit{manqué}), in Lacanian psychoanalysis is directly tied to desire. We want what we lack, without definitively or specifically knowing what is it that we want. Lack – as attributed to the exclusion of our initial belonging to the Real, which has never been consciously possessed - always causes for desire to arise.

"The domain of the Freudian experience is established within a very different register of relations. Desire is a relation of being to lack. This lack is the lack of being properly speaking. It isn’t the lack of this or that, but lack of being whereby the being exists. This lack is beyond anything which can represent it. It is only ever represented as a reflection on a veil. The libido, but now no longer as used theoretically as a quantitative quantity, is the name of what animates the deep-seated conflict at the heart of human action (...) Desire, a function central to all human experience, is the desire for nothing nameable. And at the same time this desire lies at the origin of every variety of animation. If being were only what it is, there wouldn’t even be room to talk about it. Being comes into existence as an exact function of this lack. Being attains a sense of self in relation to being as a function of this lack, in the experience of desire."\textsuperscript{113}"

Etymologically, \textit{Jouissance} would directly mean enjoyment: joy or pleasure with either physical or intellectual connotations, yet whence elaborated it can also mean delight or ecstasy.

\textsuperscript{112} Golding, William. \textit{Lord of the Flies}. Longman, 1995
It derives from the old French word *joissance* which means "possession and use" of something. According to Lacanian connotation though, jouissance goes beyond simple Freudian pleasure principle that governs Id: while pleasure principle simply governs instincts and impulses as a notion of reaction, jouissance is the force that drives the subject out of its comfort zone and even against various prohibitions of the Symbolic, to actively seek such pleasure. While the pleasure principle seeks for pleasure, yet primarily avoids pain: the drive for jouissance cannot be stopped by pain. It goes beyond the primitive reaction of conserving oneself. Since there is a limit to the amount of pleasure one can experience, the pleasure sought turns to pain in pursuit of jouissance. Thus, jouissance is a drive that actively hurts us, drives us towards pain, yet also one that we cannot ignore. The excess of jouissance, the promised pleasure turning to pain is symbolized as *object petit a* in Lacanian psychoanalysis: the unattainable object of desire, the imagined other or any kind of cathexis to replace the original unattainable; one we can neither define, nor eventually reach; yet drives us to pursue after it.

"The problem involved is that of jouissance, because jouissance presents itself as buried at the center of a field and has the characteristics of inaccessibility, obscurity and opacity; moreover, the field is surrounded by a barrier which makes access to it difficult for the subject to the point of inaccessibility, because jouissance appears not purely and simply as the satisfaction of a need but as the satisfaction of a drive (...) the drive as such is something extremely complex for anyone who considers it conscientiously and tries to understand Freud's articulation of it. It isn't to be reduced to the complexity of instinct as understood in the broadest sense, in the sense that relates it to energy. It embodies a historical dimension whose true significance needs to be appreciated by us."

Remembering that every drive is described as a death drive by Lacan – since it is always excessive and, in its pursuit, brings us closer to the end of every notion – jouissance is the painful path of growing up itself, bringing us closer to the loss of our peaceful obliviousness in each step. In pursuit of desire, motivated by our indefinite lack, we encounter jouissance – which takes us further away from our initial state, making less of us, as part of the death drive,

---

114 "Jouissance (n.)," *Online Etymology Dictionary*, www.etymonline.com/word/jouissance.
rather than augmenting us in any notion. In pursuit of fulfilling what we lack, we end up losing our innocence in this pursuit, and finalize our lifetime with the accumulated experience of all that we have encountered. Our secondary encounter with the Real, is the moment that we recognize the death drive, for what it was: the fact that our continuous conflict with various statements, wasn’t moving us towards anything else but the end.

“If then all organic instincts are conservative, historically acquired, and are directed towards regression, towards reinstatement of something earlier, we are obliged to place all the results of organic development to the credit of external, disturbing and distracting influences. The rudimentary creature would from its very beginning not have wanted to change, would, if circumstances had remained the same, have always merely repeated the same course of existence. But in the last resort it must have been the evolution of our earth, and its relation to the sun, that has left its imprint on the development of organisms. The conservative organic instincts have absorbed every one of these enforced alterations in the course of life and have stored them for repetition; they thus present the delusive appearance of forces striving after change and progress, while they are merely endeavoring to reach an old goal by ways both old and new. This final goal of all organic striving can be stated too. It would be counter to the conservative nature of instinct if the goal of life were a state never hitherto reached. It must rather be an ancient starting point, which the living being left long ago, and to which it harks back again by all the circuitous paths of development. If we may assume as an experience admitting of no exception that everything living dies from causes within itself, and returns to the inorganic, we can only say ‘The goal of all life is death’, and, casting back, ‘The inanimate was there before the animate.’”

But since we have once belonged to the Order of the Real, - or the Semiotic Order as Kristeva described - beyond any social or symbolic connotation, what declares the encounter with the Real so traumatic an experience? Why the connotation of embracing our own mortality is psychoanalytically devastating, causing the immediate shattering of innocence? Kristeva’s Abjection Theory mainly explains that every encounter with the Real, after our gradual

assimilation into the Symbolic disrupts the unity and dominance of social order, not only showcasing our mortality, but also breaking our sense of reality and identity by displaying a total loss of control and meaning. At the face of the Real, the cut that Symbolic Order displayed within reality thus far, falls apart. It signifies loss of meaning, loss of control and consequentially, loss of sanity.

"When I am beset by abjection, the twisted braid of affects and thoughts I call by such a name does not have, properly speaking, a definable object. The abject is not an object facing me, which I name or imagine. Nor is it an object, an otherness ceaselessly fleeing in a systematic quest of desire. What is abject is not my correlative, which, providing me with someone or something else as support, would allow me to be more or less detached and autonomous. The abject has only one quality of the object—that of being opposed to I. If the object, however, through its opposition, settles me within the fragile texture of a desire for meaning, which, as a matter of fact, makes me ceaselessly and infinitely homologous to it, what is abject, on the contrary, the jettisoned object, is radically excluded and draws me toward the place where meaning collapses. A certain "ego" that merged with its master, a superego, has flatly driven it away. It lies outside, beyond the set, and does not seem to agree to the latter's rules of the game."

Thus, not only the fundamental connotation of the Real itself, but also whatever has been cast out of the Symbolic Order in its procession – corpse, waste, any kind of bodily secretion – invokes the abhorrent feeling of not containing a meaning and a function for us. The simple truth of mortality and physicality breaks the continuous and autonomous pocket of the language, by eluding any kind of constructed meaning. The theory of Abjection is usually coupled with Freud’s Uncanny, considering Uncanny indicates an object that creates attraction and repulsion at the same time: The Abject notion still bears a familiarity, since we are physical creatures fundamentally, yet our cultural constructs invoke the feeling of horror and confusion to revolt against it.

“Abjection is a depression occurring where the stitches of our reality become opened and the Symbolic Order, we believe in is usurped. Kristeva builds abjection as the kernel to which culture revolves around and that is negation is how practices are built. However, as speaking subjects in a world of language (which is of itself flawed) we are bound to come into contact with the Real. When our notions of self are called into question, we can only look towards the Symbolic to stigmatize the abject experience. It is through this bordering of self that abjection can be occluded and made sense of. Yet, with every linguistic form, a remainder remains, and it is that excess of the untranslatable which may eventually disrupt the concrete reality we believe to be absolute.\textsuperscript{118}

One most fitting literary example of the Abject, or simply the dissolution of the Symbolic at the face of Real, can be encountered in Karin Tidbeck’s \textit{Amatka}, an example of dystopian surrealism. In Tidbeck’s fictional narrative, it describes a small colony in an alien planet, where people must mark the shape, form, content and purpose of every item by verbally declaring the universally accepted name for it. If no one declares and mentally recognizes the properties of items for a set amount of time, they seem to dissolve into a gooey substance, losing any possible symbolic connotations. In the narrative, the main character Vanja, recalls a memory from her childhood, where she was given the duty of “marking” pencils at school. Yet when she fails to force her will upon the matter by clearly dictating the word, pencils dissolve into goo. Whenever a similar event happens within the storyline, characters react with utmost urgency, a sense of horror and direct repulsion, since the gooey matter is the clear proof of their Symbolic connotations losing its purpose, being dominated and consumed by simple nature of the planet itself, as an example of Abjection.

“Vanja had been in a storeroom, tasked with marking pencils and rulers. \textit{Pencil pencil pencil pencil pencil pencil}, she had chanted, touching the pencils one by one, until the stream of words inverted and made a sound like \textit{cil-pen cil-pen cil-pen cil-pen cil-pen cil-pen} cil-pen, and the row of pencils had shuddered and almost turned into something else, and she realized that this is how it happens, and her whole chest tingled. Right then,

the door to the storeroom opened, and Teacher Jonas was in the doorway. He looked at the row of pencils, at Vanja, and then he grabbed her by the arm and steered her into the classroom.¹¹⁹

The Real, being one of Lacan’s most surreal, hardest to grasp concepts, is hard to outright describe, aside the fact that it governs anything outside of either our social contracts or personal imageries. It resists symbolization, and it is there indefinitely. There are at least three modalities of the Real, as Slovenian philosopher Slavoj Zizek describes, coinciding into the territories of either the Imaginary or the Symbolic Order – or the pure form of it. According to whichever boundary it touches or breaks into, it takes different shapes and creates different experiences, in literary narrative; the common point of all being equally traumatic, and somewhat coinciding with some version of the horror genre.

“There are three modalities of the Real: the ‘real Real’ (the horrifying Thing, the primordial object, from Irma’s throat to the Alien); the ‘symbolic Real’ (the Real as consistency: the signifier reduced to a senseless formula, like quantum physics formulas, which can no longer be translated back into – or related to – the everyday experience of our life-world); and the ‘imaginary Real’ (the mysterious je ne sais quoi, the unfathomable ‘something’ on account of which the sublime shines through an ordinary object.”¹²⁰

Presenting different examples for these different modalities, from literary sources, may clarify the pace and nature for the loss of innocence as a simple cognitive pattern furthermore. A direct and mostly anticipated example for the ‘real Real’ would be from H.P. Lovecraft’s Cthulhu Mitos, which can be observed through tales such as At the Mountains of Madness, The Call of Cthulhu, The Shadow Over Innsmouth, The Music of Erich Zann, The Case of Charles Dexter Ward etc. As particular to Lovecraft’s narrative, which was heavily utilized in all gothic literature, the concept of indescribable evil is of renown. In nearly all Lovecraftian narrative,


an entity wrapped with a series of uncanny mysteries and ominous occurrences, whose mere mention would threaten sanity of the protagonist and whose various proofs for its existence would do nothing more than drifting our understanding further away from the safety of the Symbolic is present. The attained notion and purpose to these entities ever change – with one narrative consistency present: they are alien, they are exterior, and we are not capable of comprehending their devices, much to our own dismay.

"The most merciful thing in the world, I think, is the inability of the human mind to correlate all its contents. We live on a placid island of ignorance in the midst of black seas of the infinity, and it was not meant that we should voyage far."\(^{121}\)

The Symbolic Real, which serves to muddle our understanding of the comprehensible baseline of the Symbolic Order, is another version, which can be encountered in science-fiction genre. In this modality, our understanding of the reality is reduced to a series of formulas, orders, mathematical components, scientific deductions that cannot be converted to everyday information – which is only theoretically logical, yet its verity can never be completely put into a comprehensive cause/consequence dynamic, like black holes or quantum mechanics. As an example, even though not literary, *The Matrix* may be considered – where the involvement of sentient machines reducing humanity to energy sources, and our whole reality becoming nothing but elaborate computer programming. In this setting, a "chosen one" with the name Neo, emerges, who apparently is capable of seeing the matrix program as it is, rather than the reality itself: a series of elaborate coding, nothing but an illusion, a replacement for the symbolic reality.

"Oracle: "I'd ask you to sit down, but you're not going to anyway. And don't worry about the vase."
Neo: "What vase?" [Neo knocks over a vase of flowers, which shatters on the floor.]  
Oracle: "That vase."
Neo: "I'm sorry..."

\(^{121}\) Lovecraft, H. P. *The Call of Cthulhu and At the Mountains of Madness: Two Tales of the Mythos*. Dover Publications, Inc., 2018.
Oracle: "I said don't worry about it. I'll get one of my kids to fix it."
Neo: "How did you know?"
Oracle: "Ohh, what's really going to bake your noodle later on is, would you still have broken it if I hadn't said anything?"122

As the final modality of the Real, the Imaginary Real – which always serves to be a part of the *Uncanny* experience – creates the effect of taking something, anything that is simple with its connotation for our imaginary perception and turning it into something sublime and incomprehensible – like the very sense of self itself. It always disturbs us, but we cannot even put our finger on the reason why. Another dystopian literary example, quite fitting to the genre is Philip K. Dick’s *Do Androids Dream of Electric Sheep*, where the line between human sentience and cognitive abilities between machinery is blurred. When the essence of what makes us human cannot be grasped at the face of artificial intelligence, it serves to be another horror touch of the Real to our own sense of Self.

“At that moment, when I had the TV sound off, I was in a 382 mood; I had just dialed it. So, although I heard the emptiness intellectually, I didn’t feel it. My first reaction consisted of being grateful that we could afford a Penfield mood organ. But then I realized how unhealthy it was, sensing the absence of life, not just in this building but everywhere, and not reacting—do you see? I guess you don’t. But that used to be considered a sign of mental illness; they called it ‘absence of appropriate affect.’ So I left the TV sound off and I sat down at my mood organ and I experimented. And I finally found a setting for despair. So, I put it on my schedule for twice a month; I think that’s a reasonable amount of time to feel hopeless about everything, about staying here on Earth after everybody who’s smart has emigrated, don’t you think?"123

The common point of all these modalities, however fantastic or unlikely in ordinary life, may they sound, are the immediate effect of the Real itself: reminding us our own mortality. Whether it be an actual creature of horror, a system of governance that becomes alien to us or

a moment of questioning our own nature, the resulting experience immediately creates an existential crisis, a moment of abject, in Kristeva’s terms. This mortality salience can be blatantly undeniable – as in, facing a natural disaster or living through an event of pure terror – or something far rather subtle and common – as the passing of a loved one or having a critical yet simple accident that may cause permanent injury. Even though, the amount and properties of the trauma may severely change, it does create that moment of shock and coming into terms with mortality. One primary consistent for that nature of this event, is that it should be irreparable and unchangeable; it should indicate a loss on the part of Symbolic control and the futility of the Imaginary, for preventing it.

Up until that point, every human being goes through the cognitive and consequential paces of his/her life, gaining experience and comprehension about both his/her own self and the notion of Others: coping with rules, morality, governance; any and all kind of responsibilities. Our battle continues indefinitely, chipping away from our initial innocence with each lesson learned until that glimpse of horror: the realization of the banal fact that we are one of millions of living organisms and us being sentient doesn’t necessarily arm us with control over our eventual fate. The innocence, as we have defined through a state of inexperience indefinitely comes to an end, since the simple disillusionment of this particular experience renders any subject incapable of focusing on trivialities of past. The most common, and I’d say, natural reaction to this memento mori, is embracing the Symbolic Order to maintain a sense of normalcy, a sense of control: which has been carefully constructed by generations past who have gone through the very same experience in essence, since the very function and the purpose of a Symbolic Order to exist is the protect the unconscious pattern of individuals from what would lie beyond our social order: the Real itself. Thus, every subject unconsciously comes into a compromise between its own Imaginary context and the regulations of the Symbolic, which I’d like to define, simply, as growing up. Thus, this is the end of every innocence, through the gathering of the ultimate wisdom: the wisdom of our own mortality.

The Real in Great Expectations bears quite a lot of layers and is primarily set upon Pip’s disillusionment concerning various characters for the purpose of Lacanian Other, and the continuous brush with death, in the form of various villains and a period of prolonged sickness nearing the end of the novel. Even though, its presence is always reminded through mortal
misfortunes befalling on supporting characters, Pip never lives it through a crushing trauma of his own. He continues to be a bystander for many events that end up affecting him – quite like the Hamletian character he is, who is strongly stuck between the Imaginary and the Real, unable to tap into Symbolic.

One instance that can be read as the introduction of the Real is Mrs. Joe’s death. After Orlick’s attack upon her, Pip’s stern and cruel sister becomes an invalid, rarely talking and unable to do her work. Between this period, and the funeral, Pip becomes further estranged to his former family, getting ashamed of their status. The news of her sister’s death, forces Pip to acknowledge their presence yet again, through dynamics of lack and desire, as it was discussed in the text priorly. It also is the primary wound of Real within the symbolic, as permanent loss of the previous father function. Yet, not much later than this instance, Pip will discover the actual identity of his benefactor, and the father function will be reinstated, mending the trauma, yet further harming the Symbolic connotation by shaking the distinction between appearance and fact.

“And now, the range of marshes lay clear before us, with the sails of the ships on the river growing out of it; and we went into the churchyard, close to the graves of my unknown parents, Philip Pirrip, late of this parish, and Also Georgiana, Wife of the Above. And there, my sister was laid quietly in the earth while the larks sang high above it, and the light wind strewed it with beautiful shadows of clouds and trees. Of the conduct of the worldly-minded Pumblechook while this was doing, I desire to say no more than it was all addressed to me; and that even when those noble passages were read which remind humanity how it brought nothing into the world and can take nothing out, and how it fleeth like a shadow and never continueth long in one stay, I heard him cough a reservation of the case of a young gentleman who came unexpectedly into large property. When we got back, he had the hardihood to tell me that he wished my sister could have known I had done her so much honour, and to hint that she would have considered it reasonably purchased at the price of her death. After that, he drank all the rest of the sherry, and Mr. Hubble drank the port, and the two talked (which I have since
observed to be customary in such cases) as if they were of quite another race from the deceased and were notoriously immortal.\(^{124}\)

The fall of the Symbolic Order furthers with his discovery concerning the identity of his benefactor, who is no other than the convict Magwitch. Up until that point in the narrative, Pip strongly believes that Miss. Havisham was his benefactor, who has been financing his education and social involvement in the city. His disillusionment concerning this very fact, shatters the illusion that Miss. Havisham ever intended choosing him to be an appropriate mate for Estella. Magwitch—a convict who he barely remembers, helping him on this manner, even jeopardizing his own safety to come back to England to help Pip shatters any Symbolic connotation that the young protagonist may have. As a lesson of the Symbolic narrative, this is when he realizes that there is gray between black and white. No stereotype would utterly fit into actual experience. As revelations accumulate—Estella being Magwitch’s daughter, Orlick being Mrs. Joe’s attacker, the convict that Magwitch had a fight with at the churchyard, Compeyson, being no other than Miss. Havisham’s former fiancé, who jilted her—Pip keeps living through dents on the symbolic, and as a result the Self and the specular image within the Imaginary, come closer unwittingly, to battle this intrusion of the Real. Yet, the most brutal tear of the Real can be observed through Miss. Havisham’s demise.

"‘I have been informed by a person named Abel Magwitch, that he is the benefactor so long unknown to me.’

‘That is the man,’ said Mr. Jaggers,’ - in New South Wales.’

‘And only he?’ said I.

‘And only he,’ said Mr. Jaggers.

‘I am not so unreasonable, sir, as to think you at all responsible for my mistakes and wrong conclusions; but I always supposed it was Miss Havisham.’\(^{125}\)

The most gruesome introduction of the Real, and the shattering form of the Imaginary rather than the symbolic furthermore is Pip’s last visit to Miss Havisham. Prior to the event,


Pip confronts Miss Havisham about her not being the benefactor, and never intending to allow him to marry Estella. He also declares his love to the young woman, but Estella rejects him, announcing that she intends to marry Bentley Drummle, a young man from a wealthy noble family. Brokenhearted, Pip leaves the Satis house, only to return sometime after to have his last conversation with the eccentric lady. She confesses that Estella was brought to her by Jaggers and she has no information concerning Estella’s parentage. While Pip was about to leave, through pure accident, the old wedding dress she never takes off, catches fire, mortally burning Miss Havisham. Pip tries to save her, burning himself in the process, yet Miss Havisham eventually passes away due to this injury. Her death by fire, even with Pip trying to save her, is a deep satiated wound of the Real: introducing the frailty of life, the futility of trying to control social connotations due to personal agenda. From here on, fire becomes some sort of an embodiment for the Real, deeply disturbing him. Pip’s later showdown with Orlick, – in which he’ll come close to dying himself – will carry this effect. Also, the following conflict between Magwitch and Compeyson at the river – ending with Compeyson’s death – and Pip’s long period of sickness after Magwitch’s passing, in which he’ll be nursed back to health by Joe are accumulated experiences, continuous flashes of the Real, alongside the fire that burns all illusions. Each and every one of these experiences disillusion Pip about his social expectations and wishes for personal achievement, enforcing him to create his of sense of the Symbolic, to attain a sense of order to his life.

“My hands had been dressed twice or thrice in the night, and again in the morning. My left arm was a good deal burned to the elbow, and, less severely, as high as the shoulder; it was very painful, but the flames had set in that direction, and I felt thankful it was no worse. My right hand was not so badly burnt but that I could move the fingers. It was bandaged, of course, but much less inconveniently than my left hand and arm; those I carried in a sling; and I could only wear my coat like a cloak, loose over my shoulders and fastened at the neck. My hair had been caught by the fire, but not my head or face."\textsuperscript{126}

The most speculated part of the book though, is its ending. Due to editorial discussions, the ending of the book has been altered by Dickens. The current edition that we know of,

narrates an ordinary happy ending scenario, for Pip and Estella to come back together after years, and somewhat promising never to part ways again – which oddly disregards all relevant character development. The original ending, leaves things ambiguous whether they’d ever be together again, yet primarily underlines the Pip being a grown up now, after all the tests and trials his life has ever presented him with. He manages to survive the scar of various events that unraveled around him and becomes a fine gentleman not by the way he has hoped for, but by a way, nonetheless. The original ending proves that through hardship; through inner turmoil and exterior conflict, an individual grows up to reach his/her potential – yet not necessarily through the way he expected. At the original ending, Estella remarries after the passing of Drummle, and Pip remains single. This ending made more sense, since Pip never actually loved Estella; he loved what she symbolized for him, and his marriage to her only would never definitely spell a happy ending: it would simply be something new to reach for, marring any indication that Pip did learn from experience. As Lacan state: “I love you, but, because inexplicably I love in you something more than you – object petit a – I mutilate you."\(^{127}\) Original ending signifies Pip coming into terms with this fact; yet the altered ending simply declares protagonist and the shallow, placeholder female lead – whom seemed to be incapable of free will, learning and compassion throughout the whole narrative - comes together to set a new illusion, in the place for all others that shattered along the way.

If we were to consider the original ending cannon – Pip’s narrative is a success on terms of growing up. He starts his life with a broken sense of Self, continuously trying to redefine it through Others, and going through various conflicts to reach an appropriate sense of self and finally, he comes into terms with the Symbolic Order through the initiation of the Real. Pip did indeed grow up.

Mishkin’s story is another issue though, and his conflict with the Real is what breaks him rather than making him. Considering Mishkin has never been able to establish a sense of Self and integrate into society by compromising in certain levels with the Symbolic order, his encounter with the Real simply ends with the kind of misery he couldn’t have bounced back from. Throughout the whole narrative, he keeps insisting on a Quixotic sense of honor and purity, with unbelievable naïveté, alienating himself from the social context, consistently.

is the character that everyone mocks openly, yet wishes for him to be right and safe, secretly. Thus, when Mishkin is proven undeniably wrong during the closing events of the narrative, by his counterpart, Rogozin: when he learns that the woman he deified, Anastasya Filippovna has been killed, he simply breaks down.

"Neither of the men spoke a word while at the bedside. The prince’s heart beat so loud that its knocking seemed to be distinctly audible in the deathly silence. But now his eyes had become so far accustomed to the darkness that he could distinguish the whole of the bed. Someone was asleep upon it—in an absolutely motionless sleep. Not the slightest movement was perceptible, not the faintest breathing could be heard. The sleeper was covered with a white sheet; the outline of the limbs was hardly distinguishable. He could only just make out that a human being lay outstretched there. All around, on the bed, on a chair beside it, on the floor, were scattered the different portions of a magnificent white silk dress, bits of lace, ribbons and flowers. On a small table at the bedside glittered a mass of diamonds, torn off and thrown down anyhow. From under a heap of lace at the end of the bed peeped a small white foot, which looked as though it had been chiseled out of marble; it was terribly still. The prince gazed and gazed and felt that the more he gazed the more death-like became the silence. Suddenly a fly awoke somewhere, buzzed across the room, and settled on the pillow. The prince shuddered." 128

Throughout the whole novel, Rogozin, a rowdy, morally downtrodden bourgeois has been the complete opposite, the Jungian Shadow of Prince Mishkin. While Prince preaches morality and compassion as if they are essential facts of life; Rogozin underlines the foul nature of humanity. They both shared a love for Anastasya Filippovna, one being a symbol of redemption, and the other being a symbol of retribution for the woman. Anastasya’s inability to choose between them, and Mishkin’s inability to do anything effective to protect her – even though it has been his deepest desire – ends in him losing Aglaia’s favor, any kind of social approval and Rogozin killing the woman. After this loss, Mishkin’s not only psyche fails to assimilate into the Symbolic yet loses its contact with it altogether. He is again, committed back to the asylum in Switzerland as the novel comes into an end.

"The prince’s further fate was more or less decided by Colia, who selected, out of all the persons he had met during the last six or seven months, Evgenie Pavlovitch, as friend and confidant. To him he made over all that he knew as to the events above recorded, and as to the present condition of the prince. He was not far wrong in his choice. Evgenie Pavlovitch took the deepest interest in the fate of the unfortunate ‘idiot,’ and, thanks to his influence, the prince found himself once more with Dr. Schneider, in Switzerland."

As a problematic, or even psychoanalytically psychotic character – in which the Name of the Father has never been integrated into the Symbolic Order, leaving a hole in the transition from the Imaginary into the Symbolic in Lacanian psychoanalysis - in means of innocence, Mishkin never established a sense of Self, by continuing to perceive himself as a piece of something grander than himself: a fool, an ever innocent, a saint. Following this problem in the occurrence of Self, he failed to assimilate into the Symbolic in means of pursuing various Others in the context of the Other. Whatever he pursued, wasn’t a separate entity for him to begin with. He failed to recognize the will and reasoning for various Other individuals, and any resulting incident that may follow. Thus, the introduction of the Real, as the undeniable loss of Anastasya Filippovna through simple mortality, at the hands of Rogozin even, a blatantly dangerous and ill-natured individual whom Mishkin insistently called a “friend”: simply broke Mishkin’s psyche, as it also proved that his own imaginary establishment of what is right wasn’t a universal fact.

Following the narrative pace, character content and events of both novels, while Dickens’ Great Expectations is a success in terms of growing up; Dostoyevsky’s The Idiot is a failure. For any the growing up process to occur, the protagonist has to face certain challenges in certain terms – as they can be read through Lacanian orders – to establish a sense of Self and a sense of the Other. Only in gaining experience in relevant psychanalytical processes, the character readies himself for the decisive trauma, which will either turn out to be the initiation to adulthood through compromising and assimilating into the Symbolic or a complete regression into the Imaginary. As the Real shows its head, the ever-innocent breaks; and the experienced grows into maturity.

---

Conclusion

If I were to summarize the content of this thesis, I would say that I have tried to illustrate the relevance between the human psyche, its progression in both cognitive and socio-dynamical development and literary narrative of human experience throughout ages in various cultures. If we are to consider that the most commonly accepted literary and philosophical definitions for innocence being not guilt-free, yet simply lacking experience that could either condemn or clarify intent: the process of growing up simply becomes a process of gradually losing that innocence through accumulated experience. Such is the direct reason that most modern societies dictate a legal age for being considered an adult. Thus, no creature with elaborate cognitive abilities as the mankind can escape this process of losing innocence, since every information that we are being subjected to, will threaten that innocence and the instance that we manage to turn any relevant information into experience, into know-how and an understanding of personal and/or social dynamics – and even the nature of our own mortality - will result in our initiation into what we call adulthood, stripping us of our blissful innocence. For the purpose of this thesis, this given definition of innocence is not to be confused with ignorance, which simply dictates a direct refusal of either accumulating the presented knowledge to begin with or convert information into wisdom, which would result in a refusal to grow up to begin with. Most would discuss innocence in terms of being “selective about the reality one does accept\textsuperscript{130}”; yet being selective indicates awareness, and awareness arises from experience; thus, immediately categorizing this form of innocence as ignorance.

As my subject of study for the purpose of this thesis, I have chosen to interpret this notion through psychoanalytical study, since psychoanalysis has been one of the earliest attempts of “humanism” in the field of psychology, prior attempts mostly consisted of behavioral psychology, which bore the tendency of treating human cognition as a simple test subject: a subject that can be rationalized and studied only through positive sciences, which reduces human cognition to mechanical function, simplifying the factor of personality and ignoring the subjectivity human cognition may contain. Historically, by definition, and conceptually, psychoanalysis is first and foremost, an "internalist" theory of psychological

meanings. Its epistemological position on the non-reducibility of mental phenomena to physiological or neurological explanations overlaps extensively with that of other psychologies of meaning (Chomsky, 2000). Thus, psychoanalysis, the practice which doesn’t only treat human mind more than calculable fact, but also examines cognition via symbols – an ability unique to human perception – has been my primary area of study, in examining the concept of growing up. By introducing cultural elements – like literature - into this internalist dynamic, I aimed to attach a universal form to this particular area of study.

“The coupling of literature and psychoanalysis goes back to Freud himself. A new world of research and speculation began when he observed that the creative faculty draws on drives and fantasies buried in the unconscious, and that they provide the clue to understanding the imaginative mind as well as individual works. Freud also noted the parallels between literary composition and such common activities as children’s play and daydreaming, and between literature and myths, which reveal the fantasies of entire communities and nations and even of the whole of early humanity.”

If the method has been psychoanalysis for the study, the source material is the bulk of literary experience – which focuses on the narrative of experience, personal or collective for the mankind. Our stories – from the earliest sagas narrated by polytheistic societies, to modern myths of achievement and wonder – one central theme, always repeats: hero’s journey. Hero’s journey, first theorized by Joseph Campbell who thoroughly studied on mythological archetypes and Jungian psychoanalysis, elaborately describes an outline for an individual to overcome various challenges – some that are partial to the protagonist’s own character, others presented by the society – for the purpose of attaining his proper place in the given society as he comes into terms with his limits as part of the appropriate cultural rite of passage. In all narratives, the hero is naïve at the beginning, who will gradually gain experience that will result in the elimination of the said naivete. From thereon, the hero, reaching his potential, becomes an adult.

In my study, I have chosen to follow this pattern of growing up, while presenting a Lacanian outline for it. Lacan’s theory of three orders, does describe various parts of human cognition, which I have come to attribute to types of various challenges which can be associated with the classical growing up narrative in western literature. To simplify the theory; the Imaginary order presents the individual’s inner workings, the Symbolic order presents all relevant and constructed social connotations and the Real simply dictates that there would be a part beyond either individual or collective cognition and control.

This categorization is applicable to both literary narratives, and our actual lives, through the psychoanalytical perspective. We lack the appropriate experience concerning life itself as we start our lives – which constitutes the baseline for the said notion of innocence. As our cognitive abilities develop, we first come to explore our own perspective and capability: The Imaginary Order. The notion of society – the collection of sanctions established by the multitude of egos that coexist in a given community – follows this early discovery by imposing certain rules and borders to our own individuality, which serves to be no other than the Symbolic Order. As we slowly but gradually familiarize ourselves with these notions, contained in an ebb and tide between the pursuit of individuation and the pursuit of belonging, conflicted by our own desires: there comes a moment when we realize that there even are limits to both these notions: The Real. This process ends with the individual’s assimilation into society by taking on the role of an adult.

As it can be observed through my research, literature records the human experience, and psychoanalysis seeks to give meaning to the recorded experience, which essentially contains symbols – whether they be dreams, stories, narratives, depictions or art. It is a well-known fact that Freud himself – and many following psychoanalysts, including Lacan – has chosen literary sources to illustrate the nature of their theories: Oedipus Rex, Hamlet, Elektra, Works and Days were just some of the texts that Freud utilized to illustrate his point. Even though, psychoanalysis is established as a clinical technic and practice, its use stretches further into interpreting various social sciences and arts today; also giving rise to a complete literary theory: Psychoanalytical literary criticism. “Psychoanalytic literary criticism does not constitute a unified field. However, all variants endorse, at least to a certain degree, the idea that literature
(...) is fundamentally entwined with the psyche. By being the product of human mind and spirit, literature presents a window to better understand our own humanity and psychoanalysis is a valid method for commenting on it, in return, feeding from literature to better theorize on the dynamics of human psyche.

"The interest of literary critics from Sigmund Freud to Jacques Lacan has been noticeable and remarkable in the field of psychoanalytic criticism. It is known that the closest connection between literature and psychoanalysis has always been deployed by the academic field of literary criticism or literary theory. Thus, this discussion, once again, endeavored to emphasize the importance of using the method of psychoanalysis to interpret literature and how literature has also used psychoanalysis for creative purposes. Moreover, this has assisted the artists, novelists, dramatists, and poets etc., to make use of this creative approach to enrich their own work."

The purpose of this thesis was to examine the literary connotation of the notion of innocence and detect an outline for the universal process growing up, through psychoanalytical narrative. Accordingly, intertwining disciplines of literature and psychoanalysis were main sources, as the psychoanalytical reading of various literary texts being the main method of research. Following the chapters within, a literary and philosophical definition of innocence has been established, the notion of growing up being universal through hero’s journey is noted and aspects of growing up are deeply elaborated by applying Lacan’s three orders into relevant processions of the psyche in selected literary texts. Coming into a conclusion, both through psychoanalytical theory and literary evidence, it can be said that the process of growing up consists of stripping from the initial innocence the mind may contain within its lack of experience and the necessary process is universal for the human psyche, even though its narrative may contain different ornamentations in different cultures. Essentially, the individual goes through a mental and social turmoil to establish a sense for both the self and the other; and eventually comes into contact with the uncontrollable, discovering his own limit. The research

---


indicates that the universality of human psyche in its transition from infantility to maturity can be traced in its narratives.

As a closing argument, I would like to note that the theory established here may still be improved; particularly by studying closely the scarcity of female protagonists in growing up narratives. Not only western literature, but the majority of world literature mainly focuses on the tale of the male protagonist, his coming of age and his mental development, while the similar progression for the female protagonist is rarely the issue of focus. Even though, certain theories and narratives are present within the dynamics of psychoanalytical study, main theories developed that dominate the area may still be considered a bit androcentric. Also, in literary narrative – excluding some rare and mostly feminist literary pieces – a similar progression for growing up for the female protagonist rarely takes place prior to waves of feminist movement. Mythological, theological and classical literature contains two dual archetypes – the self and the shadow – for the female: woman is either the mother or the witch; highly marginalized and straightly categorized into these archetypes. Prior to 19th century, women are rarely protagonists in literature.

"It is always difficult to describe a myth; it does not lend itself to being grasped or defined; it haunts consciousnesses without ever being posited opposite them as a fixed object. The object fluctuates so much and is so contradictory that its unity is not at first discerned: Delilah and Judith, Aspasia and Lucretia, Pandora and Athena, woman is both Eve and the Virgin Mary. She is an idol, a servant, source of life, power of darkness; she is the elementary silence of truth, she is artifice, gossip, and lies; she is the medicine woman and the witch; she is man’s prey; she is his downfall, she is everything he is not and wants to have, his negation and his raison d’être."

For the purpose of examining the notion of growing up and losing innocence in a more gynocentric point of view, Julia Kristeva’s *Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection* may prove to be a more than valuable source, considering Kristeva mostly builds upon Lacan’s work, with the addition of a valuable feminist point of view. It should be noteworthy to add the notion of

Penis Envy and Elektra Complex in Freudian psychoanalysis to establish a background for the outlook, added with a psychanalytical reading of Shakespeare’s *Macbeth* and various classical Greek tragedies. For criticizing literary sources, works Jane Austen, Henrik Ibsen, Emily Bronte, Virginia Woolf, Margaret Atwood and Sylvia Plath would serve to be invaluable literary sources for a similar growing up narrative for a female protagonist; as well as selected works from Ursula Le Guin, in whose fiction both Jungian and Lacanian elements may be encountered.
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