

**T. C.**  
**ISTANBUL AYDIN UNIVERSITY**  
**INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**

**Deceit, family, and justice in Miller and Ibsen's plays**

*Crucible, All My Sons and Ghosts*

**THESIS**

**Ahmed Azeez Mohammed**

**Department of English Language and Literature**

**English Language and Literature Program**

**Thesis Advisor: Assoc. Prof. (Ph.D.) Ferma Lekesizalin**

**May 2016**

**T. C.**  
**ISTANBUL AYDIN UNIVERSITY**  
**INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**



**Deceit, family, and justice in Miller and Ibsen's plays**

*Crucible, All My Sons and Ghosts*

**M.Sc. THESIS**

**Ahmed Azeez Mohammed**

**(Y1412.020022)**

**Department of English Language and Literature**

**English Language and Literature Program**

**Thesis Advisor: Assoc. Prof. (Ph.D.) Ferma Lekesizalin**

**May 2016**



T.C.  
İSTANBUL AYDIN ÜNİVERSİTESİ  
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ MÜDÜRLÜĞÜ

**Yüksek Lisans Tez Onay Belgesi**

Enstitümüz İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Ana Bilim Dalı İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Tezli Yüksek Lisans Programı Y1412.020022 numaralı öğrencisi AHMED AZEEZ MOHAMMED MOHAMMED'in "DECEIT, FAMILY AND JUSTICE IN MILLER AND IBSEN'S PLAYS CRUCIBLE, ALL MY SONS AND GHOSTS" adlı tez çalışması Enstitümüz Yönetim Kurulunun 06.04.2016 tarih ve 2016/07 sayılı kararıyla oluşturulan jüri tarafından *uygunluğu* ile Tezli Yüksek Lisans tezi olarak *kabul*....edilmiştir.

Öğretim Üyesi Adı Soyadı

İmzası

Tez Savunma Tarihi :03/05/2016

1)Tez Danışmanı: Doç. Dr. Ferma LEKESİZALIN

*[Handwritten signature of Ferma Lekesizalin]*  
.....

2) Jüri Üyesi : Yrd. Doç. Dr. Gillian Mary Elizabeth ALBAN

*[Handwritten signature of Gillian Mary Elizabeth Alban]*  
.....

3) Jüri Üyesi : Yrd. Doç. Dr. Özlem Gülgün CEYLAN

.....

Not: Öğrencinin Tez savunmasında **Başarılı** olması halinde bu form imzalanacaktır. Aksi halde geçersizdir.

## **FOREWORD**

I am proud of this opportunity to express my untold appreciation and thanks to my dear professors, to all my teachers who educated me and anyone who taught me a word. I firstly thank Professor Ferma Lekesizalin, the advice-giver of my thesis, for her great patience, and cooperation. Her comments and advices has always been guidance to me.

Also I would like to express my profoundest thanks to thank my family who were the first reason of all my successes in my life and as usual. it is due to their support that I am able to do my study successfully. From my heart I thank their interest and encouragement, especially my father who taught me to strive and be rational, my dear mother for her attempt of making me successful in my life and my life partner Sewe Selman, the one without her help the study could never succeed.

I am always indebted to my family members for their support and motivation. I cannot find adequate words to convey my gratitude to my brother Idrees Azeez who paved the way to my education and study.

Furthermore, I would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge all those friends who have helped me during this thesis work namely; Soran Abdullah and Qaidar Rheem. Finally, I would like to thank all the faculty and staff at the Department of English Language and Literature at the Istanbul Aydin University for their assistance during my master study.

**March 2016**

**Ahmed Azeez MOHAMMED**

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
FOREWORD .....	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	iv
ÖZET.....	v
ABSTRACT .....	vi
<b>1. INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Historical and Critical Background of Drama.....	2
1.2 The Enlightenment and Victorian Scholars Who Laid Out the Foundation of Modern Drama and Criticism.....	11
1.3 Modern Critical Views on Drama .....	14
<b>2. DECEIT, FAMILY, AND JUSTICE IN MILLER’S <i>CRUCIBLE</i> .....</b>	<b>17</b>
2.1 Deceit in <i>Crucible</i> .....	18
2.2 Family in <i>Crucible</i> .....	23
2.3 Justice in <i>Crucible</i> .....	27
<b>3. DECEIT, FAMILY AND JUSTICE IN MILLER’S <i>ALL MY SONS</i>.....</b>	<b>32</b>
3.1 Deceit in <i>All My Sons</i> .....	33
3.2. Family in <i>All My Sons</i> .....	36
3.3 Justice in <i>All My Sons</i> .....	40
<b>4. DECEIT, FAMILY, AND JUSTICE IN IBSEN’S <i>GHOSTS</i>.....</b>	<b>45</b>
4.1. Deceit in <i>Ghosts</i> .....	46
4.2. Family in <i>Ghosts</i> .....	51
4.3. Justice in <i>Ghosts</i> .....	55
<b>5. CONCLUSION.....</b>	<b>61</b>
<b>REFERENCES .....</b>	<b>65</b>
<b>RESUME.....</b>	<b>67</b>

## MILLER VE IBSEN OYUNLARINDAKİ ALDATMACASI, AİLE VE ADALET POTA, ALL MY SONS VE GHOSTS

### ÖZET

Bu M.A Tezi temel amacı döneminde, yani Arthur Miller ve Henrik Ibsen en etkili isimlerinden birlikte genel olarak modern dram incelemektir. Onlar modern çağın belirgin play-yazar olarak kabul edilir. Arthur Miller, hangi ben iki pick up Pota ve All My Sons incelemek için onun trajik çalış iyi bilinmektedir. İkincisi, ben, Henrik Ibsen'in ünlü oyunundan Ghosts odaklanır. Arthur Miller ve Henrik Ibsen, modern drama iki güçlü yazar ve onların çalış kadar modern bir tiyatro söz konusu olduğunda en ilginç ve inandırıcı olanlar olduğunu söyleyebilirim. Ama önemli olan soru onların çalış çağdaş bireyler, ahlak ve sosyal gerçeklik hakkında bize göstermek ne olduğunu. Bu çalışma çeşitli bu soruya cevapları ve üç oyunlarla ilgili diğer pek çok soru vardır. Ben çalış içsel unsurları ile ilgili ana tema düşünün ve dönemin genel yönlerini bir tartışma yoluyla çözmek için çalışıyoruz. çalış başa ana tema Yalanlar ve aldatma, aile ve adalet vardır. Ben biz drama tarih boyunca yazılı oyunların çoğunluğu temalar herhangi ayırmak olamaz sade ve net olduğunu düşünüyorum.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** *Aile, Aldatmacası, Adalet, Pota, All My Sons, Ghosts, Henrik Ibsen, Arthur Miller, Drama.*

**DECEIT, FAMILY, AND JUSTICE IN MILLER AND IBSEN'S  
PLAYS *CRUCIBLE*, *ALL MY SONS* AND *GHOSTS***

**ABSTRACT**

The main goal of this M.A. Thesis is to examine the modern drama in general, along with the most influential figures of the period, namely Arthur Miller and Henrik Ibsen. They are considered to be the prominent play-writes in the modern era. Arthur Miller is well-known for his tragic plays of which I pick up the two, *Crucible* and *All My Sons* to study. Secondly, I focus on Henrik Ibsen's famous play, *Ghosts*. I would say that Arthur Miller and Henrik Ibsen are the two powerful authors of the modern drama and their plays are the most interesting and credible ones as far as the modern drama is concerned. But the important question is what their plays can show us about contemporary individuals, morality, and social reality. This study has variety answers to this question and many other questions about the three plays. I try to consider the major themes which are related with the intrinsic elements of the plays and tackle them through a discussion of the general aspects of the era. The major themes that the plays deal with are Lies and deceit, family, and justice. I think it is plain and clear that we cannot dissociate any of the themes from the majority of the plays written throughout the history of drama.

**Keywords:** *Family, Deceit, Justice, Crucible, All My Sons, Ghosts, Henrik Ibsen, Arthur Miller, play.*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

This study has been divided into five chapters, each of which discusses how deceitful attitudes have detrimental effects on the family life and bonds and how characters' pursuit of justice is related with their struggles for restoring morality in the plays of Miller and Ibsen. First and foremost, I try to have a historical and critical background of drama and a clear view of the theory of drama with reference to the major theorists and critics of the theory of drama. In chapter one, I would give a brief background of the theory of drama in general. Then the focus will be on the ideas of the first significant critic and philosopher about the criticism of drama. Moreover the aim of the first chapter is to provide Aristotle's criticism with regard to the *Oedipus the King* and chronologically, I would discuss the theories of the renaissance scholars who lay out the foundations of modern drama and literary criticism. Then, I will talk about some modern views on drama. After the theoretical background about drama, the second and third chapters are dedicated to Millers, *Crucible* and *All My Sons*, and I would discuss the theme of deceit, family and Justice in both of the plays respectively. Moreover the themes are combinatory enough, to the extent that I cannot segregate them from each other. I would explain these themes in detail, raising the answer of the question of why Joe lies so as to be exonerated. Also, it is the matter of my concern to know the nature of deceit, family and justice. The clarification of the nature of these themes would be shown through the examples of the character and events.

In chapter four, I deal with the themes in Ibsen's *Ghosts*. The theme of family is an interesting and controversial issue of the play. For example, in *Ghosts*, we have a family based on money that lacks love. This leads to the destruction of the relations between all the members. Simultaneously, it leads to extramarital relations which cause emotional and physical damage. One of the characters even contract a venereal disease and it causes the death of Mr. Alving, and threatens the life of the innocent characters such as Oswald. Although marriage is meant to be the source and cause of life and enlivening society, in some cases it may be the source of death and destruction in itself when it is not based on the true love.



Also, I would focus on the theme of justice as well as lies and deceit. A clear illustration of the theme would be exposed with regard to each of the plays. Meanwhile, we bring the example of the characters and events so as to bring the discussion forward. For example, how the term of “justice” is practiced by the puritan society? How politician and religious leaders exploit their position to paint their black deeds with white and brilliant colors? Why Mr. Proctor is to be executed, based on fraud evidence? We would show Miller’s power in portraying the idea of McCarthyism in the American society. Moreover, in chapter five I would give a brief conclusion of the thesis, with reference to the major messages of the plays.

Thus, the aim of this study is to discuss Miller and Ibsen’s plays with regard to the themes of lies and deceit, family and justice, under the spotlight of the *Crucible*, *Ghosts* and *All My Sons*. These are the plays of two influential play-writes, who have written in the modern era, as far as drama and literature is concerned.

### **1.1 Historical and Critical Background of Drama**

Sophocles’ *Oedipus the King* in accordance with Aristotle’s *Poetics* is the oldest known information that we have about the origin of drama. A unique example of tragic hero is Sophocles’ Oedipus. In this study I attempt to closely examine and analyze this ancient play, in terms of tragic plot, character, and the final aim of tragedy. Later, in the next chapters I would give Miller and Ibsen’s way of representing tragedy. In order to be accurate in my study, firstly I deal with *Oedipus the King* and the events of the play in order to have a view of the real and pitiful spirit. Secondly, in this section, I focus on Aristotle’s *Poetics* and his ideas about the essence of tragedy.

Meanwhile, concentrating on the most substantially intrinsic elements of tragedy, I will explain the human condition and challenges as the main theme of literature generally and drama specifically. Our target is Aristotle’s definition of tragedy. Who is the tragic hero? This question requires giving an overview of Aristotle’s views about tragedy and Sophocles’ play. Although, the play is not directly related to modern drama, it is still regarded as a base to the coming plays after it such as Miller and Ibsen’s plays in the modern era. This play undoubtedly is one of the best examples of the plays which had a huge effect on Aristotle’s description of tragedy. Aristotle is the first and foremost philosopher who argues for tragedy and poetry in

contrast to his teacher Plato. Thus, the critical relation between Sophocles and Aristotle is totally considerable. Firstly, *Oedipus the King* or sometimes it is called *Oedipus Tyrannus* is an example of tragic flaw. By tragic flaw I mean in the play we see that the hero faces a tragic breakdown when he blinds himself. This is very relevant to this study, because it is one of the most repeated themes of the plays which are written throughout the history of human kind. That kind of tragic fall is the same as the pitiful fall which Oswald faces in *Ghosts*. Oswald suffers from the fatal disease of sexually transmitted diseases. The disease leads to his blindness. So, actually we have a parallel between the blindness of the hero in *Ghosts* and the hero of *Oedipus the King*. It is said that *Oedipus the King* is written in 430 BC. The playwright and author is Sophocles. The city in which the play develops is Thebes. This was a name of a real city in the ancient Greece, but actually the play is entirely mythical. The writer deliberately does this to give a sense of credibility to the play in order to have a great psychological impact on the people of the city. The city or let's say Thebes is governed by the king, Laius. The reflection and the affection of the play are very prominent on Aristotle's *Poetics*. On one hand, it is about a man, who kills his father, in other words he is involved in patricide. On the other hand, he gets married with his own mother. When he gets to know that he made these two terrible mistakes he blinds himself in a way which shows the accumulated pitiful cases of fatal fate from which humans cannot flee. This is the power of fate and uncontrolled results which we also see in *Ghosts*. The theme of fate versus human freedom is shown by Ibsen in his *Ghosts* as well, because Oswald inherits a disease in which he does not have any hand. It is just due to his determined fate he faces the illness. The events of Sophocles' play goes in this way; a dangerous plague spreads in the city. The prominent figures of the city go to the king to know the reason of the disease. Oracle, who is considered to know some hidden and mysterious things in classical literature, is the king of the city. He asks the religious priests to talk to the gods so as to unmask the cause of the spread disease. Then, the priests say to the king that the cause of the deadly plague is a murderer in the city. The ruling people command the citizens to reveal the name of the murderer, because the suffering of all the inhabitants of the city is due to that sinner and criminal.

Apollo as another character of the play says that all the malevolent is because of a mysterious, and harsh crime of the murder of the previous king, the late husband of Locaste namely Laius. So he says that the murderer has to be killed as a

remuneration of his crime and the people have to unmask the killer of their king. This declaration by Apollo obsesses his wife Lokaste. She starts thinking of the crime and she narrates it to Oedipus the king. Then the king gets obsessed by the narration, because the play uniquely the same as the play of a man that Oedipus killed at past. Soon after a messenger comes from Corinth, He has the news that the king of Corinth, Polybus has died and Oedipus is elected to succeed him. At First, he is skeptical and does not decide to be the successor, because he may get involved in incest. With the reason of the crime's obscenity, Oedipus swears in front of his people that, while he is the king, the priority of his duties is to find the murderer and to kill him in a way that may be a lesson to all criminal's prejudices in the city in which he is the judge. That is to say the hatred of people gets stronger and stronger toward the criminal who is a curse to the city. Then Oedipus talks to Tiresias, who is the blind seer, and a prophet who knows the mysterious matters, to tell him about the person who committed the unforgivable sin. But unexpectedly, Tiresias seems not to have the intention of telling the name of the murderer. Oedipus accused Tiresias of having a secret plan with Creon who is the brother of his wife, to stand against Oedipus. Oedipus is interrupted by the return of his messenger and Apollo's explanation. As the result of this, he accuses Tiresias and condemns Creon for having a plan against their loyal king. They ask him to not try to reveal the case, because it may have some difficult ramifications for Oedipus. But he does not quit until they tell him that he is the real brutal murderer. The next event is that Oedipus expels Tiresias and accuses Creon and asserts that they, hand in hand, want to topple him down of his kingship. But when he talks to Creon's sister, he doubts himself. She consults a Shepard, the Shepard states that he was the man who found Oedipus while he was a baby in the mountain and brought him to the king. Finally, when he comes back home, he sees that his wife who is his mother meanwhile hanged herself at home. Afterwards he knows that he is the curse, criminal and involved in incest, and then he blinds himself and leaves his throne.

I want to give a thematic and critical analysis of the play as far as the techniques of plays are concerned. Aristotle's view of the three most important elements of tragedy as he refers to successively; are plot, character and catharsis. Moreover, Aristotle's definition of tragedy, as it is mentioned in "*A History of Literary Criticism*", is as follows; "Tragedy is, then, an imitation of an action that is serious, complete and of a

certain magnitude – by means of language enriched with all kinds of ornament, each used separately in the different parts of the play: it represents men in action and does not use narrative, and through pity and fear it effects relief to these and similar emotions” (M. A. R. Habib p. 54). Let us explain the definition in detail. The first idea is that tragedy is an imitation of action. Here it seems that Aristotle has no sensitivity to use the word imitation.

The major difference between Aristotle and his teacher is that Plato blames imitation and even what come from imitation. For example, poetry, and drama, while Aristotle thinks that imitation is the notion which is unalterable. It gives benefits to human beings. Imitation is the very nature of mankind. The next term is action. Action includes plot, character and spectacle. One of the intrinsic attributes of tragedy is being serious. If the action is not serious then we don't have tragedy, instead we have a comedy. Then it has to be complete. The completeness is the second attribute of the action. By this, he means to refer to the exclusion of interruption. Imagine if we get a drama in which the completeness is lacking, although we expect the final end and look at it as the most distinctive and important element of the play, the play would lack the final effect of the drama. So, according to Aristotle this kind of play is rubbish and nonsensical. Moreover, he focuses on magnitude. Then he goes on to comment on the time and place. The time of tragedy should be no more and no less than twelve hours and the place should be one place and not showing some characters as if they are supernatural beings flying in the sky and traveling from one country to another.

The characters should abide by the unity of place and not be able to go from one castle to another. For example, in the Shakespearian plays we have the full opposite scenes to these theories. So, Shakespeare is not a good dramatist according to Aristotle. But, Why to have this time and place? Because the mental power of the audience is limited. For instance they cannot wait and remember the whole action that takes place in fifteen hours. But generally they are able to get the message in a day. As far as the unity of place is concerned, it is appreciated and adapted by some modern play-writes. At the top of those play-writes is Ibsen. For example in his play *Ghosts* he has only one place in which all of the events of the play happens. The entire play happens in one house which is the house of Mr. Alving. That is why, the historical background of drama is not irrelevant to the modern drama, and it is still working for some play-writes such as Ibsen.

The second reason is that if it takes place in a day it means the credibility, and applicability of the play to the real life of the people is sensible. So, the more suitable to their life the play is, the more they are affected and enthralled by it. For example if a character grows up ten years in the play which equals to ten real minutes for the audience, the audience may laugh at that, instead of being influenced by it. The complexity is also central. The play should give some teachings and complex ideas to improve the mental power of the audience. In other words, it should not be simplistic and childish. Furthermore, the tragedy has to conduct its aim in arousing fear and pity. For this the word catharsis is used. Fear is aroused when we have a character that is in a situation as our situation. Also pity is aroused when we see a character's downfall, then we pity him. Moreover, the language has a very significant role in tragedy. Aristotle refers to this as ornamented language. The powerful language is a language which is not a daily language. It has to be difficult to some extent, but understandable as well. If it is the daily language of people, then it cannot get into its purpose of purgation and relief. For example in *Doctor Faustus* and in most of the tragic plays we have the words of supernatural powers, like gods, angel, devil, and jinn. On the other hand, it has to include rhyme and rhythm. This point is very important so as to have a spiritual effect on the audience.

Also, we can see the same thing in the modern plays. We as the audience of *All My Sons* feel the same sense of relieving fear and pity. The fear of the deceiving characters of the modern society. And the fear of the modern social stresses which push us towards adoring money and even betraying our community, the feeling of being a character as Mr. Joe Keller who kills twenty four pilots is fearful, on the other side, the pity of Joe as a man whose psychological stresses push him to commit suicide, after he had imprisoned his friend for the entire of his life. We pity him most, when he regrets for his past, the past that he cannot go back for it. The audience has the same feeling of purgation and catharsis, when they see the execution of the hero, John Proctor. Arthur Miller shows this in *The Crucible*. Proctor is the only man in the Salem who tells the truth to the court. Also, he is the only person who gets executed. The audience pities him as a truthful character who is killed unjustly and just for the sake of some lies told by his enemies in front of the court.

Thirdly, the most important element of tragedy, according to Aristotle, is the plot. Previously, we declared the real plot of the play, so here I track the critical points

about plot and then the connection between Aristotle's criticism and the play of Oedipus. Plot deals with the entire structure of the events that happen in the play. The audience is not concerned regarding the name of the characters. Aristotle argues that literature portrays life of the people and their action, rather than focusing on the individual agents. The unity of the plot is a means by which the play write makes the events colorful and interesting to the audience. The plot should have a unity and not be interrupted in the mental process of thinking. Furthermore, Aristotle Talks about the elements of plot like magnitude, universality and defected plot. Then he goes on to discuss the syntheses of an actual tragic plot. He has categorized them in

"Aristotle, p. 13-20" as Astonishment, reversal, recognition, and suffering. These are considered as simple plots. In tragedy we cannot have two plots. But we can have sub-plots. Aristotle tries to link the concepts of fear and pity to the plot of the plays.

The completeness means the chronological structure of the play. This can be referred to as the logical structure of the play. The action of the play has to be divided into three basic parts. In his *poetics* Aristotle states "a whole is what has a beginning and middle and end" (Aristotle, VII. P. 2-3) the starting event, the middle and the end. The beginning does not necessarily start from something else. But it has to have a causal relationship with the second one which is the middle. Unlike the first, the second one has a logical connection between both the starting point and the end of the play. Then, we have the third one which is the result of its prior events. The logical relations are very important to drag the audience's attention to the play. Now, what is the connection between the completeness and the Oedipus the king? The murder and the plague are the beginning steps of the play, and then the Oedipus' succession and accusing others for having an unjust plan are the middle of the plot. The final result is the deadly suicide of Locaste and the cinematic view in which Oedipus blinds himself.

Another attribute of plot is magnitude. The magnitude means ornamentation and coherence. The structure and the construction of the plot should include a language that is as powerful as being able to give a beauty to what is shown, in the sense that the events have to be flexible and fluent in the mind of the audience. For example, the focus on the final event of the play should attract the reader as if it is a gravity of the magnet that ropes them to the extent that they remember the events and they will be a part of their imagination. Like what we see in *Oedipus*, and the great magnitude that drags our attention mainly in the final scene when he blinds himself.

The third attribute of plot that we attempt to focus on is universality. Universality is a very significant part of the plot. It gives the play a higher status than history. In the other book of Habib entitled as *Literary Criticism* (2005), He explains this; saying that poetry is universal while history is particular. History deals with some specific events of past which we may not necessarily even need to know. On the other hand, poetry deals with the universal facts. This means that poetry has no limits while the history has many. Poetry is not bound to time or place. What poetry says in a country it is the same in all of the other countries. For example, hurting the parents is blameworthy, all around the world.

The idea of universality is very prominent in all of the plays all around the history of mankind. It is very relevant to the modern age as well. For example, in *Ghosts* we have the theme of family. It deals with the modern problems of the modern families. The brake down of the family relations is pretty clear in Ibsen's works, mainly in his *Ghosts* when we see the familial problems between family members. The relationship between Mr. Alving and Mrs. Alving is too shaky. She loves him, but not the vice versa. Mr. Alving has illegal sexual relations with his maid, and he neglects his real wife. Thus, as Aristotle says, the universality of some themes makes them undying and immortal. We have the same case in Oedipus. No matter to which continent the reader belongs, they pity the father of Oedipus and Oedipus in particular. In poetry human beings are taught the universal rules of nature, such as the law of probability and causality. These rules are applicable to every person, no matter where do they live. So, poetry has the power of universalizability through which it teaches us, no matter who we are, while history cannot teach us except for narrating what had happened in a particular spot of this earth.

Nonetheless, Aristotle explicates and gives a more detailed critical analysis of the plot. But, he does not talk about what is the plot and how it should be; instead he says how the plot should not be, so as to lead the writers to avoid producing some unappreciated and no interesting plays. Every kind of illogical events should be excluded. For example when the writer characterizes Zeus as a man who comes down from the sky and solves the problems of all mankind, then the play would not be interesting for the audience. Although the way of producing such character is very challenging, it is also an illogical state of affairs. The audience devaluate the play and the writer. In this case, the main purpose of the writer is to produce a work which is lovely for the audience and not in vain.

Reversal is one of the other components of tragedy. It is mostly like dramatic irony. The character expects some events, and the result is very ironic and unanticipated to them. In most of the cases it brings shock to the atmosphere of the play. But when the character is unaware of what is happening next, we as the audience know the result. For example Oedipus sends a man to the seer to reveal the mystery of the spread disease to find a solution for that big problem. Unexpectedly the result is damaging to Oedipus.

Recognition is one of the significant ones of the elements. Most of the times, recognition occurs and coincides with the reversal one. For example if a person who lost her child and after ten years of struggling to find him, finally she finds him due to a natural and special sign on the forehead of her son. It is precisely prominent in the Oedipus the king as well. Although they are married together, Oedipus recognizes his mother and his mother recognizes him. As it is shown the reversal is not necessarily has an optimistic connotation. In tragedy these are all the elements which arouse pity and fear to the audience.

The final element of the tragic plays is calamity that encompasses the tragic hero. The aim of tragedy gets to its high intensity. This raises the actual and the big feeling of catharsis, and then the people purgates themselves by feeling of relief. And the curtain of the tragic events gets to a silent end, but never has an end in the mind and the heart of the people. It has a resounding feeling to the extent of their life totally. Nevertheless, the character has its special role in tragedy. In a book entitled as (Johnson, Thomas R. Arp and Greg. 2006) it is clarified that the analysis of the characters and what happens to them is more complicated than the description of the plot. It is challenging sometimes the character is ambiguous and complicated. The hero is the one that the play-writer should maximize his or her role. The hero has to be shown as honest, good, generous, and kind-hearted. Generally characters can be divided into two kinds. The first one is flat character, whose attitude does not include a radical change. The second one is the round character, who involves a great transformation. Sometimes different names are used by different critics, for example, some refer to this as major and minor characters.

In *Poetics*, (Aristotle, 1965) does not focus on character, the way he does on the plot. Similarly, he seems as a misogynist towards women. He looks down at women, and considers them not just inferior to man, but equal to slaves. He thinks that women are lacking rationality. Likewise, in his argument about character, he equates them with



slaves. Firstly, goodness of the characters has to be based on their behavior. In other words, the good characters have to be painted as white and given the good attitudes. Although, says Aristotle women and slaves are lacking rationality in their nature, we can have them given the good role in the play.

Most of the previous points are relevant to the modern age. That is so, Aristotle's view of almost all of the elements of tragedy are applied in the modern drama. As I clarified in this chapter, his views are relevant to the plays of Ibsen and Miller, except for his idea about women. Women in the modern era are excessively honored in Ibsen and Miller's plays, in comparison to the status that Aristotle gives to women. For instance, Mrs. Alving is respected as a lady in her society. She is able to read free thinking books and she is given the role of having argument and disagreements with Pastor Manders. Although, Manders is shown as a religious man, she rebels against the rules and duties that Manders tells her under the name of religion.

On the other hand, Aristotle gives importance to the term appropriateness. This means that the action of the characters should suit their innate nature. For example women according to Aristotle cannot have a role of a brave or intelligent person, because they are lacking such qualities in their nature. So doing this produces the play which is irrational. The characters of tragedy have to be different, than in comedy. They should be better than the ordinary people. The taste of tragedy is that the characters are sacrificing their own life. They are supremely good, kind, courageous and determined.

The last point that we try to focus on is the matter of the final aim of tragedy. According to Aristotle, The overall purpose of tragedy is to arouse pity and fear. Affecting the emotional status of the audience is the final aim of tragedy. The word catharsis means to purify and purgate the mind from the emotions of the current life and the past. When the audience looks at the pitiful life and situation in which the tragic hero is struggling, they have an emotional feeling towards the hero. They'd like to directly go into the events to help and defend the hero. This makes them to forget the hard working in the real and suffering situation that they are in. They are ready to replicate such a thing in their real life and suffer, only for getting the honor that the hero has.

Tragedy arouses pity for this kind of people who do not expect the trouble to happen to them. But they pity the hero and would love to support him. On the other side, the

fear is triggered if the audience is afraid such a trouble to happen to them. For example if the hero is suffering to death due to poverty, and the one who looks at the scene is a poor man they get skeptical about their real life and they afraid of such things to happen to them. This idea is clarified in (*poetics* XIII. P. 2-4).

In conclusion, we have verified the details of the classical definition of the dramatic and tragic action. Nonetheless, we have shown the essence of tragedy according to Aristotle and the way of its relevance to the modern drama. Aristotle's view on the magnitude, completeness, action and imitation provides the earliest critical points about how to view drama. Moreover, he discusses the characters and their role in the unique plays. He thinks that the characters are not as important as the plot of the plays. The all in all priority is to the plot. Plot includes all of the other necessary elements of the plays, but not the vice versa. Meaning, when the other elements are organically united then the plot is achieved.

Almost all of the characteristics of an ideal drama of which Aristotle thinks are reiterated in the modern age. Ibsen and Miller are the top of those who abide by many rules that Aristotle explained about drama. They do so through the characters that they have in their plays, such as in *Crucible*, *Ghosts* and *All My Sons*. And among the influential characters are John Proctor, Mr. Joe, and Mrs. Alving and many others. We have precisely explained the connections between *Oedipus the king* and Aristotle's theory about tragedy. In most of the cases the play clearly matches the approaches that Aristotle argues for, in his definition and explanation, as far as tragedy and its components are concerned, for example the beginning, the mild and the final end of *Oedipus*. After all, Aristotle's theory about the final purpose of tragic plays is metaphorically the mirror of *Oedipus the king*. Aristotle thinks that the tragic plays final end is to arouse pity and fear. The plays' final events are calamity-bringing in terms of rising purgation, relief and catharsis. The plot of the play is the recognition when Oedipus gets to know that he is involved in incest and patricide. This leads him to blind himself.

## **1.2 The Enlightenment and Victorian Scholars Who Laid Out the Foundation of Modern Drama and Criticism**

The Enlightenment theorists had a significant effect on all those who succeeded them. The goal of this section is to explicate their philosophical theories in general

and literary criticism in particular. In relation to modern drama, the way that modern writers such as Ibsen and Miller are affected by their prior criticism of literature and its themes, here I focus on some thinkers, namely, Kant who is an Enlightenment philosopher and scholar, and Karl Marx who is a Victorian philosopher. Kant's taste, on the other hand Maxis' class struggle are all to be made pretty clear as has never been before in few pages. We throw light on each one of them according to the historical record of their life. Immanuel Kant (1724-1804), the great German philosopher, is well known for his argumentation about the very nature of aesthetic judgment. He thinks that human's judgment of taste and beauty is subjective.

Although he lived in eighteenth century, he has a wide effect on English literature. For example, the modern way of looking at art. Ibsen does the same in his *Ghosts*. Oswald as he refers to himself as a prodigal son is the same way of being subjective. The term prodigal son means the extravagant one. The one who spends money the way they desire. This is one side of the coin, on the other side; he goes to French to learn art. Art is based on free thinking, in other words viewing life subjectively and the way the personal taste likes. So, the modern writers got ideas from the previous generation of critics.

Nevertheless, he does not ignore the universal effects on the former subjectivity even as a base of it. He depicts the proverb which says beauty is in the eyes of the beholder because whoever decides on something to be beautiful is due to a prior form of a beautiful object on which they make their decision subjectively. It is because of this that the beauty of something differs from a person to another. Another point about his view of beauty is that he divides beauty to two kinds, as it is discussed by (Leitch, Vincent B. 2001) The first one is free beauty which means the judgment is not dependent on some other prior ideas. And the second one is accessory beauty. In this one the judgment is based on some prior concepts which exist in the imagination of the person who makes the judgment on a particular thing. As it is been shown Kant mostly focuses on individuals, imagination, emotional attitudes, and subjectivity. Due to the over usage of these concepts, it is precise that he was a pure romanticist. Even it is Kant that illuminates the spirit of criticism inside Romanticism.

Karl Marx (1818-1883) is another philosopher that we want to talk about. His writings are influenced by Hegel. Nonetheless, he did not write any specific book or essay about criticism, but Marxist critics derived his critical view points from his

political, philosophical, economic, and theoretical perspectives. His ideas were reiterated in the coming generation after him. The more we come closer to the modern life and literature, the more we realize the practicability of Marxism as far as economy is concerned. Also, this is what Miller shows us in *All My Sons*. The main theme of *All My Sons* is money. Money is the main reason of disintegrating the family relations. The purpose of life for most modern individuals is money. Joe Keller does everything to collect money.

Marxist way to critique is that in every literary critical analysis we have to understand the text through the social and historical atmosphere in which it is written. He explains that literary works are no more than the production and reproduction. So they are just like goods, some of them are very valuable and some others are not. Marx laid the foundation of some influential literary criticisms, like historicism, deconstructionism and post-colonialism. Instead of Hegel's slave and master struggle, in Marxism we have capitalism and feudalism; in a different angle he proposes the class struggle between bourgeoisies which have control over society and proletariats, the persecuted class. He thinks that the artistic production is not independent, but rather it is dependent on the economic and political power which leads it according to the interests of the bourgeoisies. So art is not for the sake of art, it is for the sake of high class in the societies.

In conclusion, it has been shown the answer of what is the nature of the criticism of Kant, and Marx? Kant's taste is subjective, and Marx is politically economizes not just history but even the future of man and the timeless clash between bourgeoisie and proletariat. The modern writers such as Miller and Ibsen got the main themes of their works from the criticism of Kant and Marx, as it is shown in *All My Sons and Ghosts*. Finally, I think the most beneficial one of the previously mentioned ideas, as far as literary criticism is concerned, is Kant's criticism. The other critics are great but they cannot challenge Kant's criticism. Kant is straightforward, while the others appear as philosophers rather than as literary critics. For example, Marx was not focused on literary criticism; instead, his main argument is about political economy. He argues for communism and socialism. But on the other hand, when it comes to Kant, He argues about literary elements and attempts to analyze the major literary terminologies such as the concepts of beauty, taste and almost all of the aesthetic elements in literary criticism.

### 1.3 Modern Critical Views on Drama

After reviewing the classical and the Enlightenment and Victorian perspectives of criticism and drama, I will try to clarify modern views about drama and dramatic action. The major theorists are Roland Barthes (1915-1980) and Ransom (1888-1974), and many other post-structuralist and formalist thinkers who back up the text versus the author or the reader versus the writer. Generally, the classical theorists are on the side of the author. But rather, the modern and postmodern author defends the idea of fading the role of the author in literature and drama as well. This idea is true for the plays that we deal with such as *All My Sons*, *Crucible* and *Ghosts*. So, Ibsen and Miller are practicing the same thing, because when we read for example *All My Sons*, the main focus of the play is the real life in the American society. The play draws our attention to the theme of materialism and family. I mean, what is prominent in the play is not the real life of the author. The focus is on the problems of the prewar and postwar generation. The critics that we deal with deeply are the Barthes, and Ransom. They have the same attitude of preferring the text over the author. If we have a difference it is the fact that Barthes' language is stronger and more straightforward in defending the position of the reader, meanwhile attacking the role of the author. We try to make a comparison between his ideas of the text versus author and Barthes' ones; simultaneously we would prefer to have a warm dialogue and discussion via having some other critics' views of the issue. We try to give some hints to some other critics to crystalize their vantage, points as long as they are related to our intention and reason of supporting the text and the deconstruction of the text in the modern literary criticism. Thus, in the modern literary criticism, the critics are mostly concerned about the text itself.

Barthes view of the privileging the text over the author is expressed in his well-known essay called "*The Death of the Author*". the opening part of the essay which is an introduction about the fact that the authors have no direct affect to their writings which obliges the reader to focus on the writer. Roland Barthes gives an example of a short novel called *Sarrasine* by Balzac. Balzac talks about a castrato which is a castrated boy, portrayed as a woman. Then he argues about the quote giving some rhetorical questions to prove that there are variety possibilities about who is speaking? And the quote is said by who? We cannot know, because the writer confesses what comes to his conscious mind. So the reader instead of being stuck and

dizzy for striving to find out who is the speaker, they should think by themselves and compose a character in their reasoning and logic power, then decide by themselves. Another reason for which we cannot know the character is that what the writer expresses is deconstructed, and it is not understood through being in need of the author or what the origin of the text is.

History in many cases in literature has a very significant role. The playwright narrates what had happened in a historical record of time. The playwright does not have any hand in the story, except for expressing what had occurred and mirroring it through an ornamented language and giving a taste to the events. So, what is very important is the event and not the playwright. Backing this idea about the author M. H. Abrams in *a glossary of Literary Terms* says; “The Elizabethan chronicle plays are sometimes called history plays. This latter term, however, is often applied more broadly to any drama based mainly on historical materials, such as Shakespeare's Roman plays *Julius Caesar* and *Antony and Cleopatra*, and including such recent examples as Arthur Miller's *The Crucible* (1953), which treats the Salem witch trials of 1692, and Robert Bolt's *A Man for All Seasons* (1962), about the sixteenth-century judge, author, and martyr Sir Thomas More.” (M. H. Abrams, 1999. p. 37). Thus, the main focus of *the Crucible* and Shakespeare's plays is on history. This means that the subject matter of their plays is not the playwright, but rather it is history. So, the literal word of the death of the author is absent in the Elizabethan plays, but its idea does exist. What I say is not blaming Shakespeare and praising Bathes, since they belong to way different periods and genres.

Ransom (1888-1974), one of the well-known critics among the formalists is concerned about the text like Barthes. According to Ransom we have to understand the text through the text itself, so we should evaluate and understand Miller and Ibsen's works based on the, texts their language, and the figure of speeches used in the plays, for example in *Ghosts* the title represents the content, it is a metaphor that she uses to convey Mrs. Alving's message. She says that Oswald and Regina are like the *Ghosts* of their father and mother. So, according to Ransom, we should get the ideas from the text, and the metaphors used in the play, not from the life of Ibsen. I think this is a very objective and scientific way of understanding the texts. Ransom advises the teachers of literary criticism to not be affected by any other thing rather than the literary context of the works. On the other hand Barthes discusses the idea of showing a difference between the post structuralism of criticism and the ancient one. The life, past, present time and even the childhood of the author was enormously

important to understand their texts. In contrary to this in the post structuralism era we are interested in the text itself. Modern man in the post structuralism era has a little question about the literary history before a writer and after them; we are considering the text and not the condition in which the author lived. It is a classic way of understanding the texts. That time of contemplation is bygone and past and not able to buy anything in the modern market. Thus Barthes think of himself very modernized to the extent that he does not need to look back at the classic and traditional way of thinking of the texts.

In conclusion, what has been shown is the criticism of the most important critic and philosophers in our argumentation concerning the idea of text versus the author. The critics' thought of the text and its significance is very powerful as it is compared to the author. Ibsen and Miller affected the ideas of the critics who came after them such as Bathes and Ransom. In other words Bathes and Ransom expressed their ideas based on the evaluation of the previous authors such as Ibsen and Miller. In this debate we had the top of those authors who consider the text as the most important means in understanding and the interpretation of it. For example Barthes as a post-structuralist argues that the death of the author is inevitable and unavoidable. At the first glance of his essay the reader is satisfied that the death of the author is unalterable. So as to prove his point of view he uses numerous critics. For example a short novel called Sarrasine by Balzac. He proves that the best way to understand the characters of the novel is the deconstruction of the text and understanding it through the contextual analysis of the text, and then nothing else is needed.

## **2. Deceit, Family, and Justice in Miller's *Crucible***

*Crucible* is considered to be based on historical period that left its marks on the memory of the American society. It deals with the real life of the people of Salem, and the puritan rule of the religious people of that time. During 1690s in Massachusetts, many people were executed for being suspected of witchcraft. The play starts with the situation in which a niece of Reverend Parris is unconscious. They do not know what the problem is, so they doubt that it may be an unnatural or supernatural reason. A rumor is spread throughout the village. The first thing that people think of is witchcraft. They notice some unexplainable events, and then they attribute them to witchcraft. For example, Mrs. Putnam had lost five children. They died after living for some hours of the time they born. Parris thinks that the unwelcome event is backed by some enemies of him in the town. He thinks that his enemies are very hidden and well-organized to him. He seems to exaggerate his enemies, and their power of touching Betty by witchcraft. Procter is inside his house and teasingly, he says he wishes to find his enemies and join them. He says this to mock Parris, because he does not believe in any enemies of Parris at all.

When the great reverend Hale comes to the town to heel Betty, Corey claims that his wife is reading some strange books which cause him to not be able to say his payers. He is not able to explain this. Finally, Corey's silly mistake leads to the execution of his wife, for having bonds with Satan. Parris has no doubt that Devil is in Salem and works on hurting the pious people of the town. Parris is still not able to understand why he is the target of Devil? Why God does not protect him? Why the angels do not stand on the Devil's way? But Hale explains that for Devil the great horror is to enter the house of the pious people, not the house of the sinners, because the sinners are already surrendered.

Abigail hates Mrs. Proctor. She is waiting for a chance to spread her poison on her. Deceivingly, she shows herself as a victim of witchcraft accuses Mrs. Proctor for putting a needle in her belly. Cheever orders to check Proctor's house so as to find any symbol or hint of witchcraft. Abigail makes this as a snare to show that Proctor and her wife are guilty. Proctor proves that she and her uncle hate them. It is their hatred that makes them to accuse him and his wife. The court asks them to confess



their sins and if they do so they will be good to go and be safe. His wife begs proctor to confess, but he does not. He says he is not able to hide the truth and lie in front of the people, even if they kill him. Although she has no proof that they are involved with magic, the court decided that they are guilty and they should be put to death.

The theme of deceit is one of the mostly repeated themes in modern literature. It is one of the prominent motifs in the plays written by Arthur Miller and Henrik Ibsen. Miller is an American author and his plays affected the way of life in the American society. Miller left high school when he was a young boy. It was due to poverty. The time coincided with a disastrous situation for the American society. In 1932 the great depression in other words the economic depression faced the American society generally, and the depression was doubled to the downtrodden people. On the other hand, Miller made a surprise to the American readers, because he was used to and also known to write about the critical problems of his contemporary age but unexpectedly he wrote a historical drama about the McCarthyism and the time in which the puritans were oppressing people under the curtain of religion. Actually it is about the Salem tragedy in which the Catholics practiced a theocratic state. Under their religious rules no one had the right to say a word against religion. In other words, they developed the amalgamation of the political power and the religious power to stand against any outsider and ideological enemy which was a far fast spreading ideology of that time, known as communism. The basis of the communist ideology was to disbelieve in God and all sacred norms of the societies.

### **2.1 Deceit in *Crucible***

After I summarized a Synopsis of the *Crucible*, I would discuss the theme of lies and deceit in Miller's *All My Sons*. It is portrayed through a character called Abigail. She is the niece of Parris. Her uncle shows off himself as a religious man, a man who takes care of the religion of God and tries to protect the Salem as a religious district against any attack. He thinks of himself as a man who reacts against not just the human enemies of the town but also the supernatural enemies such as the power of the evil angels and Satan.

This is a direct quote from the *Crucible* which is a discussion between Parris and Abigail. It says;

“Parris, *to the point*: Abigail, is there any other cause than you have told me, for your being discharged from Goody Proctor's service? I have heard it said, and I tell

you as I heard it, that she comes so rarely to the church this year for she will not sit so close to something soiled. What signified that remark?

Abigail: She hates me, uncle; she must, for I would not be her slave. It.'s bitter woman, a lying, cold, sniveling woman, and I will not work for such a woman!

Parris: She may be. And yet it has troubled me that you are now seven month out of their house, and in all this time no other family has ever called for your service.

Abigail: They want slaves, not such as I. Let them send to Barbados for that. I will not black my face for any of them! *With ill-concealed resentment at him:* Do you begrudge my bed, uncle?

Parris: No - no.

Abigail, *in a temper:* My name is good in the village! I will not have it said my name is soiled! Goody Proctor is a gossiping liar!" (*The Crucible*, Act one, p. 10)

As it is referred to by Parris, he is suspicious about the reason for which his niece is discharged from Goody Proctor's service. That is why he asks her about the other reasons. Here she wants to deceive her uncle by saying that she is she is the one who rejects Goody Proctor and it is not the vice versa. She lies by telling him the there are many reasons, but the main reason is that she is not ready to be a slave of Goody Proctor. Although he does not seem to be satisfied with the reasons that she justifies, she accumulates some other reasons by saying that Goody Proctor is a bitter woman, a lying, cold, sniveling woman. These are all lies that she saying to justify her discharge.

Furthermore, Abigail's uncle throws another suspicion. He says she might be right when she says that Goody Proctor hates her, but what is wondrous is why after seven month of leaving her service she is not called by any other one for any service. So, her uncle is quite doubtful of her truthfulness. In reality he knows that she lies and tries to deceive him, because the main reason is that people question her character, and they don't trust her to leave in their homes, due to her rudeness. She tries to give a repeated answer to his question, because she doesn't seem to have a new and satisfying answer. She says that the reason is that people want to treat their servants as slaves. So, she questions her uncle as if she thinks that the best way to protect herself is to attack the opponent. She tries to question her uncle's conscientiousness, saying that the cause of these questions may be the idea that her uncle does not like to see her living in his house. But again he replies that he doesn't say that at all.

Abigail replies to the question of Reverend Parris. She clarifies that her name is good in the village, but the rumor about her is all related to Goody Proctor. She accuses her for lying and spreading lies in the village about her reputation.

The previously discussed argumentation between Abigail and her uncle is one of the clear quotes about the theme of lies and deceit. At first she doesn't seem to be successful, because her uncle doesn't go the way he likes in believing in her. But the question is something else. Let's wait and observe whether she is able to convince her uncle by lying to him.

Miller portrays the real facts about the nature of humans and the reality of his contemporary age by this play he criticizes his society and the political situation of his time. Here we have a different point about his view of the motif of lie and deceit as in *SOCIAL HYSTERIA VERSUS INDIVIDUAL DILEMMA*, Aziz and Qunayeer say "During McCarthy's congressional hearings, as in Salem's court, the proper process of justice was overlooked and hysteria prevailed through raving rumors and vengeful lies. Many witnesses found no escape but to deliver dishonest confessions and were forced to falsely accuse their friends and acquaintances to save their careers. As in the miserable instance of Salem, naming others was regarded as an indication of honesty and seriousness. Those who protested against the hearings were charged of collaborating with "the red devil" or communist Russia rather than simply the devil as in Salem. Miller in the introduction of *The Crucible* alludes to the play's contemporary reference and invites comparisons between the two widely separated events." (Aziz and Qunayeer, 2004, p. 241) the authors are discussing the purpose for which the play is written. They refer to the idea of McCarthy's judgment which was based on lies by some characters in the court without any jurisdictionally satisfiable proof. But Miller indirectly criticizes and condemns that kind of judgment through his play with the help of a historical time in Salem in Massachusetts of America. Justice was completely forgotten element of that time the rules were based on the vengeful lies of some hostile people. So, the judges are in love to sentence to death anyone who was told to have any connection with the Communism, regardless of the truthfulness of the speech whether it is based on doubt or actual proofs.

Aziz, and Qunayeer, also discuss a phenomenal aspect of that time. They mention many people who were victims of lies. The lies were made up out of oppression and torture. The political system of that time in America was so rude to torture people until they confess or make up a lie to accuse an innocent person, friend or relative so

as to protect themselves, go back to work and be free of torture. Accusing others was regarded as a sign of a patriotic feeling towards the society and nation. That is why it was a moving motive to motivate the citizens so as to lie and sometimes to get an economic reward. That is how Miller makes a connection with the trail of Salem and the ideological war between America and the red evil or the communist nation, a nation which rejects the root of divinity which is the existence of God. So, the Christian ideology was aggravating the conflict between Russia and America to worse.

In *Crucible*, Miller shows another aspect of the puritanical society of Salem. He reflects the real life of the people under the theocratic power of the puritans. They were accusing and executing people based on the delusion and illusions. The churchmen of the Salem killed many people because they were thought or accused for having bonds with the devil. Aziz, and Al Qunayeer, explain this when they say “The second scene occurs in act IV, three months after Proctor's arrest on the night before he is to be hanged. He and his wife have been apart during this period and have never seen each other since. Elizabeth's life, as Danforth declares, has been spared till she gives birth to her baby. She has been previously urged by deputy governor Danforth and Reverend Hale to prevail upon her husband to confess to a lie to save his life. The court officials are desperate for his confession. Rebellion is spreading around. To keep hold of its power, the court needs one of the convicted prisoners to confess thus proves to the seditious public the guilt of the victims. Elizabeth agrees to speak with her husband but does not promise to ask for his confession.” (Aziz and Qunayeer, 2004, p. 251) Miller declares that even if the society demands lies and falsehood, there are some righteous people who don't lie and are ready to put their life in danger so as remain righteous. So, in the last night when Proctor and his wife are together to talk, they decide to say what is right and never lie. After he had been imprisoned for three months, Proctor is resolute and determined to remain on the right track. What is surprising is that his wife is not ready to urge him to confess to the court and save his life by telling a lie.

Wendy Schissel argues the theme of deceit and lies in the *Crucible* of Miller. He says that there is no doubt Elizabeth's slight involvement in the issue. She tells a lie.

Directly Schissel says “No critic, not even Carson, questions Miller's insistence that Elizabeth is at least partly to blame for John's infidelity. Her fate is sealed in the lie she tells for love of her husband because she proves *him* a liar: "as in *All My Sons*," John has told several lies throughout the play, but it is Elizabeth's lie that the critics (and Miller) settle upon, for once again the lie fits the stereotype - woman as liar, woman as schemer, woman

as witch sealing the fate of man the would-be hero.” (Wendy Schissel. 1994. P. 468) so, although she does not mean any harm, but unfortunately the ramification is so hard to herself and her husband. She says that there is a love relationship between Proctor and Abigail. So, unintended she betrays her husband. This lie can be considered as one of the big lies in the play. It is the second in rank as it is compared to the lies of Abigail. Abigail is portrayed as an extremely mean liar in the play. The cause of all of her lies is her damaging lust for Proctor. Schissel thinks that there is no critic to doubt the unwelcomed consequences of Elizabeth’s lie. The lie is enough to make her a liar.

In the play we have a variety of instances in which the characters lie, to conceal the true side of reality. For example Ibsen, through the tongue of Abigail says;

“Abigail: Now look you. All of you. We danced. And Tituba conjured Ruth Putnam’s dead sisters. And that is all. And mark this. Let either of you breathe a word, or the edge of a word, about the other things, and I will come to you in the black of some terrible night and I will bring a pointy reckoning that will shudder you. And you know I can do it; I saw Indians smash my dear parents.’ heads on the pillow next to mine,” (Miller, Act One, p. 16). So, in the play we have many characters that lie, but as far as Abigail is concerned, she lies and systematically teaches the other students to lie. She says, addressing all of the girls, you should say that we were dancing and Tituba conjured up the spirit of the dead. Nevertheless, she threatens them to avoid saying anything else, and if they do then the disaster follows them in a midnight time. So, it is clear that she threatens them to lie.

We have some other cases of lying in *the Crucible*. For example we find some lies in the discussion between Hale, Abigail and Parris. It is realized when we read the discussion. When Hale asks Abigail about the things they were doing in the night that they went to the forest. She says they were just dancing and they did nothing else. But then her uncle Parris corrects her and says that he saw a kettle. And inside the kettle there was soup in which there was a frog. Although Abigail put a chicken into the kettle, she denies that it was not a chicken and she did not put the frog into it. Illogically, she says that the frog jumped into the kettle. It means that she is not aware of her lie, because she should have been aware that the frogs don’t come close to the fires.

After all, we have numerous other cases of lying. For example Miller shows another way of lying. As for the case of Mrs. Corey, she is accused for killing pigs of her

neighbor. Her neighbor says after Mrs. Corey had sold a pig to them, the pig died after some few days. So, their neighbor complains that from that time onwards she has never been able to keep a pig from their house for more than four weeks. So, she accuses Mrs. Corey for being the reason behind the pig's death. But, actually the main reason behind the accusation is her husband's silly mistake. He told Mr. Hale that his wife reads some strange books, and she doesn't let him to look at those books. Irrationally, he says when his wife reads the books, he is not able to pray, but when she quits, he is able to pray. So, in other words, stupidly he puts his wife in the aware of the magicians.

In addition to all of the previously discussed lies. Abigail deceives the ministers. She tells them that she feels an agonizing pain in her belly. When the ministers look at her belly, they find a needle. So, Abigail intentionally accuses Goody Proctor for putting the needle in her stomach, although she knows that she had put the needle in her stomach to prove Goody Proctor as a magician. And to practically show the ministers that she had not done so, because she cannot hurt herself. Abigail had already put a needle in the belly of a doll when she sat with the Marry Warren. She did so to approve herself right to the ministers when they look at the needle. Then, exactly the ministers did so and when they saw the parallel they took her, even after they had been shown that she is not the one to be blamed, but Abigail had wanted to set her put. So, the ministers are deceived by the snare which Abigail made to Goody Proctor.

## **2.2 Family in *Crucible***

The theme of family, and family conflicts is one of the themes of, almost all the plays written by Miller. Also, many of the characters are motivated by suspicion and appetite in *The Crucible*. The characters' desire leads all of them to the destruction of the family relations. Abigail is motivated by hatred of Elizabeth Proctor; she wants Elizabeth to perish so she can marry John, Elizabeth's husband. Although Abigail hates Elizabeth Proctor, she is not the only problem and bad character in the play. John Proctor's desire during his relation with Abigail, when he was in lust of his sexual attraction for her, is the source of the play's familial breakdown and disintegration as well.

Miller produces a play in which there is the picture of all the problems that the American people had in 1692 in Massachusetts, in the town of Salem and out of the Salem and in America in general. In *Crucible* there are some families which are full of social problems. John Proctor is the most important character and the play's tragic hero. Proctor is a virtuous man, but one with a fatal fault. His desire for Abigail leads to their love affair. This relation with her created Abigail's jealousy of his wife. One of the most prominent problems of the families is the sexual desire that Abigail has for Proctor. So, due to that past relation with Abigail, she hates Elizabeth. Now, Proctor is not interested in Abigail, because he has her wife Elizabeth. So, Abigail is jealous of Elizabeth.

It seems that there was a relationship between Abigail and Proctor, because Miller, in *Crucible*, states:

“Abigail: I know how you clutched my back behind your house and sweated like a stallion whenever I come near! Or did I dream that? It's she put me out, you cannot pretend it were you. I saw your face when she put me out, and you loved me then and you do now!

Proctor: Abby, that's a wild thing to say -

Abigail: A wild thing may say wild things. But not so wild, I think. I have seen you since she put me out; I have seen you nights.

Proctor: I have hardly stepped off my farm this sevenmonth.

Abigail: I have a sense for heat, John, and yours has drawn me to my window, and I have seen you looking up, burning in your loneliness. Do you tell me you've never looked up at my window?” (*Crucible*, Act One, P. 18)

As it is shown in the quote, Abigail loves Proctor, she wants him to leave his wife and turn to Abigail. Also, she reminds him of their passionate feelings for each other, while Proctor was riding a horse behind her and clutching her behind. Although Proctor loves her and is lustful of her, but he does not want to make that love connection, as he says he talks about her wife, because she knows the connection

between Abigail and Proctor. He says that his wife was crying all the times, because she knew the relationship.

So, actually, Proctor does not want to destroy his family due to making a sexual relationship outside marriage. That is why it cannot be interpreted as a religious feeling of responsibility by Proctor, no; rather it is a moral act towards his family and his wife, because we don't have any tangible evidence proving that he is a religious man. So, Proctor is not ready to sacrifice his family to Abigail and her desires.

The reason that Abigail goes out is that Elizabeth realizes the relationship between Proctor and Abigail. She asks and urges him to let her to get Abigail out, and she does. In the previous quote, Abigail prevails that Proctor did not like Elizabeth's action when she led Abigail out of their house, because he had a feeling for her. Proctor wants to deny that loving her, but she is able to prove that he loves her. She reminds her of the nights that they met and also, she explains that Proctor came to her and looked up at her window to respond to his love and get rid of the loneliness that he had before coming close to her house.

Elizabeth has her response to Abigail's jealousy. When the trials begin, John Proctor understands that he can end Abigail's storm of rumor in Salem. Because he knows what she has done with Proctor. The problem is that he can ruin Abigail's name, but only if he confesses to his sexual and hidden relationship with her, which ruins and blackens his name as well. Such an admission would ruin his good fame. Proctor is an honored man who gives a great importance to his status.

He finally makes an endeavor, through Warren's witness, to name Abigail as a deception without revealing the fact that he had relations with her, when she was a servant in Proctor's house. When this endeavor fails, he lastly explodes the real confession, calling Abigail a "prostitute". Then people get to know that if she is a whore, it means that he had relations with her, because they know she was a servant of Proctor and is the closest person to her. So, actually, Proctor declares his guilt openly. Only then he realizes that it is too late, because he told all of the people that is Abigail is a whore, then he is an adulterer. Actually, as Miller shows, one of the reasons of the disintegration of Proctor' family is that he has a sexual relation outside of his house. Although Elizabeth has not a big problem with that inside the family,



Abigail enlarges the problem because she is fallen in a deep love with Proctor. So, the problem that faces his family is an external rather than an internal hand.

There is a hard struggle between two families in the *Crucible*. The first one is Parris' family and the second one is Proctor's one. Proctor's confession leads to His arrest and sentence as a man who is involved with witchcraft and is behind all of the diseases that are spread around Salem. So, he is thought to be the hand of devil in the village. He has a bond with devil to faint and touch the children of the village. It was easy to Parris to believe in the scenario that Abigail has created to set up Proctor, because Parris was already has a big challenge with some delusions that he has hidden enemies in the village.

Also, Parris' connection with Proctor was extremely shaky, because he told Proctor said that he would like to know Parris' enemies and join them. Although Proctor did not mean that he considers himself to be an enemy of Parris because he wanted to tell Parris that his ideas are based on nothing except for fear and delusion, but Parris gets the literal meaning of his speech and understands him in a wrong way. So, the problem is not only a simple misunderstanding between two characters, rather it is related to the connection and relationship between two families, who have a deep historical and contemporary challenges.

After all, Proctor is the main character and the protagonist in *Crucible*. Miller portrays him as a brave character. He follows his personal and individual power. He is considered to have a very strong will power. With reference to this idea Aberg says:

“Once again, Miller is criticizing social conformism, this time through the character of John Proctor by suggesting that the only way to a righteous life is listening to your own conscience. Proctor refuses to be a part of this mildness and erratic which hunt precisely because it is conflicting with his own morality. He cannot abandon his morality even though he will pay for it with his life; he feels that it is his responsibility to act.” (Aberg, 2006, 14-15).

Proctor arguably reminds the readers the idea of conformism versus individualism. He is pro individualism, and stands out against all forms of conformism. By this Miller criticizes the conformism and the conformist figures of the fifties in the American society. Proctor prevails that the upright way to be a righteous character in

the family and the social affairs is to obey your conscience and do what thou wilt. He suggests avoiding being a passive agent in society. The individuals should act with accordance to what they think to be moral and true, regardless of the finger points of the surrounding atmosphere.

Proctor is the hero who stands against the society in which he lives. He is in a huge struggle and between the crossroads. He is struggling whether to go to the direction of the conformism and others or to choose the way he thinks to be right. Actually, he is conflicting with his own morality and mentality. Finally, he chooses to be different and decides to take his responsibility forwards his own character and conscience. Although he is aware that if he does not abide by the social and religious rules, he is going to be executed, he continues on his way of standing against the theocratic rule of the puritans.

### **2.3 Justice in *Crucible***

The theme of justice is the most significant theme in *Crucible*. It is not inaccurate if we say that the main purpose behind writing *Crucible* is to discuss the idea of justice. Miller wanted to write a history drama so as to criticize the jurisdictional processes, the political and governmental power of the American society. He does criticize his contemporary court decisions in fifties which were based on suspensions and lacking real evidences. He uses a historical record of time to show his attitude and objections towards the American jurisdictional system.

The Salem trail which was a historical event of the seventeenth century in the history of Massachusetts is the main idea of the play. All of the events of the play are dependent on the facts in that town in Massachusetts during seventeenth century. It is real to the extent even the language of the play is a language which is affected by the language of seventeenth century. The best example is Tituba who has got a broken and ungrammatical language. Also, the language of the other characters is not the same language used by the people of America in fifties. There are so many victims of the jurisdiction system, but John Proctor is on the top of the victims and the tragic hero of the *Crucible*. Even Though he attacks the unhealthy court and its actions, he is also conscious of his role in allowing his desire to grow unchecked towards Abigail.

Proctor provides a final accusation of the witch trials in his last act, when he unmakes his illegal relationship with Abigail. He was given the opportunity to make an open confession of his guilt and save himself; he is not ready to surrender, even signing a written confession is not allowed by his moral and righteous decision. They tell him that he can set himself free, after signing a document in which it is written that he was involved in witchcraft. On the other side, His pride and terror of public opinion forced him to hide a reality which was his relation with Abigail, but when he is extremely angry, he bursts out and calls Abigail a whore which means that he has been in lust for her. His refusal to provide a wrong confession which is a lie is a true individual and personal attitude.

The biggest crime is the one of Abigail. She loves a married man. She is an ex-servant of that man called Proctor. She hates his wife, because she is the one that is an obstacle in front of her and does not let her to communicate with Proctor. Elizabeth tells Proctor to send Abigail out of their house and to the house of her uncle called Parris. Proctor obeys her. Abigail blames her for blackening her name in the village. She wants to have a chance to take her revenge from Elizabeth.

She wants to punish Elizabeth, but her crime and unfair act leads to a bigger crime which is the killing of nineteen innocent villagers. Abigail is the source of the crimes in the *Crucible*. She is obviously the criminal and the lair of the play. Her crime is bigger than Parris' or Danforth's or anyone else. Because she spreads lies, and convinces her friends to lie and to tell whatever she tells them regardless of whatsoever happens.

She tells the Childs that if they don't obey her she will come to them during the midnight and kills them. Also, she spreads an untrue rumor in the entire town, and finally she is the cause behind sending nineteen innocent villagers to death. Abigail's crime is nothing than a strong jealousy and desire to take revenge on Elizabeth Proctor. Nonetheless, it is a very important fact that the reader should understand about Abigail's background. If we think of the play and the characters in a different angle, it seems that Abigail is not as guilty as the reader might guess.

Abigail is left without the affection of the parents and she unmarried adult girl. She is occupied by the unhealthy and dogmatic theocracy in the Salem social relations. The people think. For the girls and most of the inhabitants of the Salem society, the

ministers God's worldly representatives, their authority is derived the providential power of God. The ministers let the girls to speak as if they have a direct connection to God. For Abigail, this is a very chance to take her revenge from Elizabeth and even Proctor. A simple accusation from one of Abigail's group is sufficient to be cogent evidence on any inhabitant of Salem, regardless of their reputation and fame.

Regarding the theme of justice there are many critics who have their own ideas about justice in *Crucible*. For example, Chaswal and Pradeep state: "As regards political overtones in *The Crucible*, it is pertinent to point out that witch-hunt in Salem created mass hysteria, and the individual had to make a false confession before a false court. During witch-hunt trials Salem was governed by theocracy. Contemporary similarity of the Salem trials lies in the fact that at the time of McCarthy trials too, in 1950's, mass hysteria was generated and created, and individuals were pressed and coerced to confess their allegiance to communism, and to save themselves from punishment they were asked to name the fellow travellers." (Deepak Chaswal and Pradeep Kumar Chaswal, 2012, 9)

So, The root of the political injustices in the *Crucible* is the theocratic rule of the society. In the village there is a public phobia regarding witchcraft. The accused civilians have to confess the crime of being connected to a witch. If they don't confess, then their punishment is death. So, in other words they are obliged to say something which is not true, and they do so, because their confession is the only cause to let them survive. The court is a false court, because it is not concerned about concrete evidences, it is rather concerned and based on the superstitious sayings of some teenager girls. The biggest crime of the court is that they kill nineteen people based on such fraud evidences.

The idea here is that Miller uses this Salem court as an allegory to explain the same instance of McCarthy during the fifties. At that time after the world war two, when there was a cold war and a big challenge between United States of America and the Russian power of the word. The communism was rapidly spreading throughout the world. The Political power in America spread a public hysteria among the people, saying that communism wants to primarily take advantage from the cultural colonization, and then they will colonize America.

The politicians spread this fear inside society. There were many people whom were arrested based on the false evidences. They arrested ones were asked to confess and tell the authority the name of those who work with the KGB agency. To have a little

connection with Russia was considered as a crime, and helping the enemy of America. Miller's *Crucible* stands for showing the fact that there were many intellectual and activists whom were arrested, because their ideas in their articles show their feeling for communism. Arthur Miller himself was one of those whom where accused for being the sympathizers of communism. He was trailed with such a conviction, by Senator McCarthy.

In the *Crucible* Reverend Hale one of the main characters. He is considered to be a religious man from another village that is able to cure the patient like Betty and all of the fainted girls in Salem. Hale, the knowledgeable, simple witch-hunter enters the town so as to heel the girls, when Parris calls him to observe his daughter, Betty and uncover the hand of the witches in Salem. He enters the village and brings some big books to show his knowledge. He depends on his book to try to uncover the reason behind the unconsciousness of the girls.

Hale in the play, experiences a change. So he is almost a round character. When he is listening to Proctor and Warren, he comes to know that Abigail is laying and Proctor and her wife are truthful. He realizes that fact when he is no longer powerful to be able to decide. Now Danforth is the most powerful man among the lawyers. Though Hale knows the injustice of the witch trials, his attitude is not satisfying for the readers, because he is not able to stand and tell the truth to the trail and the lawyers, but rather he surrenders and sides the conformism.

In the final argument between Proctor and the ministers, it is clear that they are not able to find any evidence in Proctor's house, when they say:

“Proctor: Here now! Mary, how did this poppet come into my house?”

Mary Warren, *frightened for herself, her voice very small*: What poppet.'s that, sir?

Proctor, *impatiently, pointing at the doll in Cheever.'s hand*: This poppet, this poppet.

Mary Warren, *evasively, looking at it*: Why, I - I think it is mine.

Proctor: It is your poppet, is it not?

Mary Warren, *not understanding the direction of this*: It - is, sir.

Proctor: And how did it come into this house?

Mary Warren, *glancing about at the avid faces*: Why - I made it in the court, sir, and - give it to Goody Proctor tonight.

Proctor, *to Hale*: Now, sir - do you have it?

Hale: Mary Warren, a needle have been found inside this poppet.

Mary Warren, *bewildered*: Why, I meant no harm by it, sir.

Proctor, *quickly*: You stuck that needle in yourself?

Mary Warren: I - I believe I did, sir, I' ( *Crucible*, Act Two, P. 75)

It is pretty clear in the previous quote that Abigail wants to set up Elizabeth and show the ministers that she is a witch. She does this, while she is in the church. She puts a needle inside the belly of a poppet which belongs to Warren. Then she goes home and puts a needle in the same place inside her belly. She claims that Elizabeth Proctor has put the needle in her belly. When the ministers with Hale go and check Proctor's house for a sign of witchcraft, they find Marry Warren's Poppet. When they see the stuck needle in the belly of the poppet in the same place of Abigail's belly, they doubt Elizabeth. But when Proctor calls Warren and asks her who put that needle in the belly of the poppet, she says Abigail did it. Finally, the ministers and Hale realize that it is a lie. Abigail wants to see the death of Elizabeth. Hale knows that Abigail is a liar and the criminal, but he does not speak up, because Abigail is a niece of the reverend Parris. So, the main injustice in the play is that, the liars and the criminals are not punished, because they are the relatives of the high rank crass of the ministers. Here, through this, Miller shows the real face of nepotism in the village of Salem during seventeenth century and in the fifties in America.

### **3. DECEIT, FAMILY AND JUSTICE IN MILLER'S *ALL MY SONS***

*All My Sons* is one of the most influential plays in the history of drama in America. The play deals with the real life of the people of that time, and tries to tackle the problems of the American society. The play starts with introducing the most prominent character of the play who is Joe Keller. He is a successful business man. He did not inherit his business, but he made up the business by himself. He has a factory in which he sells the parts of the airplanes to the army, during the world war two.

Joe is well known to his neighbors. He is notorious for being so deceitful and cunning. By using his lingual power he is the master of deceiving others to build up his business. In spite of that he is so funny and intends to show people that he is a funny man. Joe as the commander of the factory orders to send out some cylinder of the planes, while he knows that they are defective and cracked cylinders. His action leads to the death of twenty-one American pilots during world war two. Police came to their house and arrested him, but he was able to lie in the court and said that the cylinders were sent out without his knowledge. The lawyers believed him, because the day of shipping the cylinders out he said to his partner that he is sick and is not able to come to the factory. He said to him that he must ship them out. And Steve Deever did the same. After all, he knew that there is no responsibility for saying something in the phone that is why he said that he has no knowledge of the shipment. Moreover, Joe said Deever is responsible for all, because he did all. Then, the court ordered that Joe is to be exonerated and Deever is to go to prison.

One of the sons of Joe, Larry, is missing, after a military operation. His mother insists that her son is alive. George, the son of Deever claims that Joe is the Killer of the pilots, but still Joe denies being the mastermind behind the action. Finally, the ghost of his crime comes back to him. Chris shows him a document on which there is the signature of Larry who wrote that he is going to commit suicide for the crime that

his father did towards the American pilots. He attests that if his father is able to kill the American soldiers for money, then he kills his son, because his son is among the soldiers. When Joe looks at his sons will, he is not able to survive the psychological stresses. He goes up stairs and puts a bullet in his head and dies.

### **3.1 Deceit in All My Sons**

In *All My Sons* everyone can be regarded as a liar. Joe Keller is in the top of the liars. He lies to all of the other characters. He is able to deceive all of the surrounding figures all challenge them all. He lies to his son Chris and his wife; almost to all of his family members. He greases his relationship with his neighbors through lies. He tells lies about a crime in which he killed 21 American pilots during war time against the enemies. He has the role of a traitor. He is the mastermind behind the crime. He lies in front of the court and sends his partner and coworker to prison. Again by lies he exonerates himself.

His wife called Kate seems to know about the real face of her husband. But she keeps quiet about what she knows and is not keen to understand what she does not want. Chris, the beloved son and inheritor to Joe Keller's money, lies to himself about his father's position of deceiving his neighbors, because he knows his father but he keeps silent.

We have variety of scenes in which Joe Keller lies to himself, his family and his society. Now, we would like to focus on one of those pictures. As we have the picture of the situation in full text of *All My Sons* by Miller (act one. P. 30-31). Keller defends himself while he talks to his son Chris, his wife Kate and his imprisoned brother's daughter. He clarifies that the lay he came back from the court, people all thought that he was a criminal and the traitor, the one who betrayed his country by selling cracked cylinders to his counties air forces.

But Keller has a bigger agenda of deceiving not just the people but the jurisdictional system of his country. He lied in front of the law to exonerate himself and put the blame on his coworker. There was no possibility of Joe being exonerated as far as people's thinking of Joe is concerned, but finally he gets exonerated with the help of his smooth tongue to lie in the court.

He states he came back from the court and put his car a side and away from his house. Then, he went slowly on the street and putting his head up with a smile of



happiness. He was thought to the criminal for killing twenty one pilots of his country during the world war two. Then he goes back to business and is able to have one of the biggest shops in the country, just after fourteen months. He became the respected man again even better than he was before his crime.

This is the situation in which Miller shows the real activities going on in his society. He criticizes lying and in justice in his society. In the modern societies the winners are the liars. Those who lie and have tongue power will survive, but the truthful characters are behind bars and inside prison cells. This is the credibility of Miller to criticize the liars and those who are deceived by their lies.

I would want to discuss some critics who wrote about the themes of deceit and morality in Arthur Miller's play. Abd-Aun and Muhsin say; "*All My Sons* deals with the dream delusion of Joe Keller, seemingly successful, self-made man who, to attain the material upward mobility, adopted unethical and immoral means in the past. At the introspective phase of life, Keller realizes the emptiness of his success. The seeds of unethical means he has sowed in the past have brought him bitter harvest and sore fruits. The protagonist is a representative type of the character who has lived through the Depression and despite a lack of education has been able to attain the worldly success, hoping his son would inherit it. Joe represents common hopes and aspirations of American society, ultimately willing to achieve material prosperity."

(Abd-Aun and Muhsin. 2014. p. 136)

Keller is the man of business. He justifies all of the immoral means so as to obtain the material interests he wants, regardless of all the bad and fatal consequences that his unethical deed may have, as it is referred to in the previous quote by Abd-Aun and Muhsin. That is why; he abides by the Machiavellian way of dealing with business. He says the praiseworthy things justify all of the illegal irrational means. So, Keller does the same.

Nonetheless, Abd-Aun and Muhsin concentrate on the time of the Great Depression in 1930 in the history of America. It was a time uneducated people in some cases were so rich in comparison to the educated people. The educated class of society were not having money, they were dependent on the government more than the uneducated ones. Keller represents those who are interested in money and business more than the morality and ethical norms of the society. Thus, he has a good business

and he is successful in his career, but as far as morality is concerned he seems to have no interest in it. He would to inherit his knowledge of business and his money to his son Chris. The point that I am trying to make is that the liars of the modern world survive easily. The question is bigger than mentioning a man who lies and is exonerated; it is really about the actual life of the modern humans. But does it worth to lie and commit crimes for the sake of money? Is it going to be the way the liars want all the time? Is it going to continue till going to grave? Are there ramifications and unwelcome consequences?

Miller gives his readers these controversial questions. And finally, he gives answers to all of the questions. He does so through flaw of the actions in the scenes. This is the future of all of the liars. They cannot flee from the ruined past. Even if they does so, and are able to be exonerated, that is not going to last forever. There will be a time in which they go trapped in a snare, a snare the made to others, but finally, it is going to face them. Exactly, the way Keller does. He is careless about the life of the other people, and only takes care of his interests.

But, what Miller shows us as the readers is that Keller's son is going to kill himself after having knowledge of his father's betrayal. And after all, when Keller knows about this, he commits suicide and killed himself. So, the idea is to let the reader know about the fact that the crimes are going to be back to the doers of the crime. It is the same for Keller, killing others carelessly leads to his death.

On the other side of the coin, there is something else which is the psychological state of mind of the criminal and the liars. They are in an uneasy condition. They never fell relaxed. They liars feel guilty all the times. This is psychologically proven and Miller is obviously clarifies this through a man called Keller who is the most focused on character in *All My Sons*. He feels guilty all the times, until it leads to his downfall as a criminal and a liar.

Keller's downfall is not a quick incident. It is unveiled through a process. The first cause of it is the time that George who is the son of Deever goes to visit his father in the prison. Although, after the time that his father was accused for selling cracked cylinders to the army, he looked at his father as a criminal, he was not interested in visiting his father. But, lately he decided to go and see his father, when he goes there

he suspects Joe more than he had before. After his visit he knows about almost every detail of the crime.

Miller dives into the real betrays of the modern characters, the unjust things that modern man does so as to get money. Money is the main and we can say only source of the crimes of the modern age. It is exactly the same issue which Miller criticizes. The topic is clear. It is clarified through George. He mentions what he knows to Ann and Chris.

It is mentioned in *All My Sons* (act two, p 55) that George says his father went to his work and a man showed him the defected cylinder heads. He claims his father directly called Joe to come and see the defect cylinder heads. Joe ignores him and does not appear in the factory, he deceives him and says he is sick and is not able to come to the factory, and he suddenly gets flu. His father calls him again, after having over hundreds of the defect cylinder heads. Joe told George's father to ship the aircrafts out. Deever said it is impossible to do so, Joe replied he takes full responsibility.

George clarifies that Joe said he takes full responsibility. But after the time they shipped the aircrafts and many soldiers died due to the defect cylinders, police came and arrested the two. During the time of shipping Joe was not in the factory. In the court he denied his approval to the shipment process and accused Deever. He was able to deceive the judges; because no one at that time was taken to prison due to phone calls the speeches of the telephone system of that time was dying out in the air.

So, the theme of deceit is very prominent in the play. Joe Keller is the master of deceit and lying. His power of deceiving others is not belittled in lying and deceiving his surrounding people, but rather he is able to deceive the lawyers and actually he does. Nevertheless, prior to lying in front of the court, he lies and deceives George's father Deever.

### **3.2. Family in *All My Sons***

In the of the economic depression during the World war II, in which people were suffering from war and hunger, they were asking for the basic needs of the humans. American society faced a new social way of problems, which could be mentioned as

the disintegration of family relationships. This phenomenon was accelerated by the unhealthy relations between the family members on one side, and the social members on the other side.

The eminent writers of that period such as Arthur Miller and his inheritor Ibsen were greatly motivated the social awareness when they realized the devastating impact of this disintegration in their societies. That is so; they began spreading their views against this integration of the society. They responded to the contemporary problems of their society, and were able to cast the intellectual solutions to the problems. And they were able to do so, through their play and characters.

Thus, there was a unanimous sound among the people to love the plays and read them by heart, because they were not talking about things from the other countries, they were retailing what was really happening in the living society. People saw themselves and their families in the plays as characters. In this chapter which is the third one, we discuss theme of family with the glasses of Miller and Ibsen, under the spotlight of the three plays, namely *Crucible*, *Ghosts* and *All My Sons*.

We can say from the title of *All My Sons* that the play all in all is full of concerns about family. We see three most appearing families. They seem to be successful in their relations. But when money comes to the stage, they face problems. They include Joe's family, Deever's one and Joe's neighbor. At first Joe's family seem to be so strongly connected, but Deever's family is the same as spider's house. Joe loves his wife; he is working with his son in his factory. Then, we come to know that one of his sons is missing who is Larry. The problems of the family start with missing a family member. Then the other problems continue till, the past comes back to judge the head of the family.

Ironically, for Deever's family the opposite is true. At first, they are so disintegrated. Their father is in prison, the daughter and the son are suffering, due to the crime their father had done. Although, they are not going to be happy, they seem to be a little alleviated, when they know that it is not just their father, but Joe is involved in the crime as well, Whereas Ann and Chris plan to inaugurate a new family and give the story a little hope. But, they are not going to be successful, due to the atmosphere they live in. their fathers now seem to be enemies, instead of coworkers, and their brothers inherited the same enmity from their fathers. So, they don't have anywhere to live, because their neighbor's wife Sue asks them to live in a place far from her

husband. The idea of marriage itself seems doomed by the complex norms of the world war two, surrounding the two young couple.

The critical question is the place of family in the greater social system? Discussions of the family are represented as a big distinction between characters' views about an individual's responsibilities towards family versus society in a larger context. For example, Joe is on the crossroad between choosing his family's interest or the societal interest. As all of the social characters during wartime he chooses to side his family's interest and neglect the country's good. That is why, the family and then society can be corrupted by the actions and mistakes of the individuals.

Joe tries to blame everyone for crimes during the wartime, except for himself, first by disorganizing his partner's family, when he deceives the lawyers and lets his partner go to jail. Then, when he is unmasked by the truth, he blames the nature of business practice even he tries to explain that it was a normal business, because you can never know what is going to happen. If he knew the ramification of the act, he wouldn't do what he did. Then, even he puts the blame on the U.S. Army and everyone who comes to his mind except for himself. When he accepts the blame, after knowing how Larry had taken the social responsibility on himself, he feels pity and regret for the twenty one pilots he killed and the sufferings he left to their families.

Miller mirrors the shaky relations between the family members of the American society. Man kills their own offspring for the sake of money. Money is the monster of the modern society. It is the main cause behind all of the crimes. As far as Joe is concerned he does the crime. He thinks that he is going to get money to his boys, but paradoxically, the coin turns around and Joe unintentionally kills Larry. He kills the one who is his son, which is why the title of the play is *All My Sons*. All the soldiers whom Joe is behind their death are his sons. Also, it is the crash between Joe and George is paradoxically changes Chris.

At the beginning, Chris wings with his father and rebukes George so harshly, even as a liar. But then, he gets to know the secret about Joe, when Kate hysterically states: "your brother's alive, darling, because if he's dead, your father killed him." (Act Two, P 66) It is this speech which changes Chris totally. At that time he hates his father. He knows that his father is the betrayal, the one who is the cause behind his son's death.

The play portrays the corrosion of Joe Keller's family, but it also shows how Joe's crime caused many other families to dissolve and especially Deever's family. Accusing Deever unjustly, subsequently, caused the break down the family. It was not only Deever's family that Joe disintegrated, he did crash twenty one other families, because he is the cause behind the death of the other family members. Miller shows one example of a mother whose boy is missing. Kate is almost becoming crazy, due to his passion to his missing son, she cannot get rid of the psychological stresses that she has. So, it is through Kate as a mother Miller mirrors the suffering of the other families and mothers.

Nevertheless, the theme of family and family relations is overused Miller's works. In another instance of *All My Sons*, the family relations are focused on, for example, the discussion between Sue and Ann about Chris and Jim (Miller, Act Two, 2002). Sue states to Ann that she is lucky, because she has got a rich young man as a couple. In response to this Ann thinks that money is not a matter of concern for her. But Sue says that money makes all of the differences. She thinks of herself as a real example, saying she got married to an intern; their life is on her salary. Moreover, she argues whenever someone benefits others, they owe them something, it means then she resents the owed one. So, according to Sue, one of the major pillars of a healthy family is the financial support of the husband. After, she explains her experience, Ann laughs.

Another thing that Sue and Ann talk about is the relationship between Chris and Jim who is Sue's husband. She says to Ann if she gets married to Chris, they should be far away of their house. She explains that Jim and Chris and so problematic to settle next to each other. Jim has to focus on her research as a doctor, while Chris wants to criticize everything. In the middle of their discussion Ann tries to defend her supposed husband, but then Sue continues and does not let Ann to do so.

As Dillingham labels it, "Keller's extreme allegiance to a lesser good, the family, destroys his social consciousness; he becomes merely a shell, a man without conscience" (Dillingham, 1977, p. 342).

Dillingham describes the idea that Keller thinks that his crime does not have a direct reflection on his family. He thinks it is not a big deal. But, then he thinks his social relationship is entirely broken. He loses his connection to his neighbors. Finally, he loses his blood relation with his family. Kate knows he is responsible for a crime. Also, his son Larry commits suicide and his living son, Chris looks down at him as a

criminal. Even Chris tells him that he is going to call police and he must go to prison. So, he loses his temper and consciousness. For Joe everything turns around and comes back reversely. He had thought whatever he had been doing was for the sake of his sons and family, but now they all hate him. He thought he was intelligent, now he knows that he is the silly man. Thus, this kind of situation irony leaves him unconscious. And finally, he cannot survive, and then he commits suicide.

### **3.3 Justice in *All My Sons***

One of the other themes that Miller refers to in *All My Sons* is the theme of justice. In *All My Sons* there is a clear crime which is considered as a major crime. The crime of the shipment of the cylinder heads which were known to be defective. The other unjust part of the crime is that Joe lies in front of the lawyers. Then, they decide that Joe is innocent and they let him go easily. For Joe the moral and ethical norms are nothing in comparison to his success in business. He is able to break all of the social and humanistic norms for the sake of the money he earns.

The feeling of guilt is so prominent in *All My Sons*. For example when they sit on the table of jokes, fruits and high life dreams or the American dreams, they are not happy. They feel that there is a conscience which hurts them. This idea of reality versus appearance is very relevant to the modern man. The modern man wears masks. They have a reality which is hidden by the masks and make ups of appearance. Although they show to be happy, they are not. Because there is something in their heart which wants to boil out, but they don't let it.

Joe Keller is not shown as a criminal. Rather, he is characterized as a very warm, open-hearted, and generous person. He even antagonizes Ann and George for neglecting their father badly since they decided to avoid visiting him in the prison. He argues them to look at their father's case in a humanistic and philanthropic way Keller says:

“The man was a fool but don't make a murderer out of him... It was a madhouse.

Every half hour the Major calling for cylinder heads, they are whipping us with the telephone. The trucks were hauling their away hot, damn near. I mean just try to see it human, see it human. All of a sudden a batch comes out with a crack. That happens, that's business... so ... your father always scared of loud voices. What'll I say? You know what I mean? Human... so he takes out his tools and he - covers the

cracks. All right- that's bad, it's wrong, but that's what a little man does. If I could have gone in that day I'd a told him gentleman, Steve, we can afford it. But it isn't murder. You mustn't feel that way about him". (Miller, Act I, p.30-31)

Joe's justification and apology of Deever's action is just a defense and excuse for himself. He wants to show them that it is the nature of business, In other words it is the nature of life, it is not related to them, and rather it is related to fate. Because, indirectly, here he cleans up the way for himself, in other words, he wants to tell his family members if his crime is exposed, he sought not be treated like a beast by his family and relatives. So, in this way Keller prepares Chris psychologically so that

Joe, therefore, is both the criminal of his action and a victim. Miller, here, shows the complicatedness of the modern society. In the modern societies man becomes a tool in a huge factory by which he squeezes and vaporizes those below him or in them. So, it is the modern feeling of responsibility that urges him into a state of criminality and lack of any philanthropic feeling.

In the war time Larry has disappeared. In reality, no one is sure of his fate except at the very end of the play Chris gives Larry's letter to Keller. The letter approves his death. Then, they realize that Larry did not die a natural death, but he has suicided in due to his father's criminal action:

Nevertheless, there is the idea that Joe apologizes, because he is a businessman. Even Joe himself is surprised when his son Chris says that Joe is the killer. He does not think of the act as a crime, he thinks that he has done what business required. PRASAD argues the same case, when he says:

“Had Joe not wanted so desperately to pass on the family business to his son, he might not have been as profit-oriented as a businessman. He might have halted the production of cylinders and not met the government contract, despite the financial consequence.” (PRASAD. 2011. P. 48)

As Prasad refers to, one of the controversial issues of the play is the question whether Joe is a criminal or a practical business man. What he has done for Joe was only business, it was not a crime, because he did not want to kill twenty one pilots. He wanted to leave a profitable business to his inheriting son Chris. Joe has put his



entire endeavor to make money and build up his business. He was determined to the idea that what he and his partner did was not a crime.

Even At the end of Act Two, when Chris understands that Joe is responsible for the shipment, Joe says he did it for the sake of Chris, to bring back money to his family. In Joe's mentality, this is not a crime, and even if it is the crime then he is not alone for sharing the crime, because he did it for the sake of his family and Chris, that is why they, Chris and the family have to share a part of the crime. Thus, he did it for Chris: "Chris, I did it for you, it was a chance and I took it for you." Chris Shocked and states: "Is that as far as your mind can see the business? ... What the hell do you mean, you did it for me?" In Chris's opinion, people have responsibility towards man in general, and to society as well: "Don't you have a country? Don't you live in the world?" (Miller, 2002, Act Two, p. 72).

According to Joe's view it was a good job he did for his son. He refers to it as if it was a chance and he took it for his sons. But, Joe's view was true for past, now it seems that he is completely wrong. And instead of showing their appreciation, his sons curse the act Joe involved in. on one side, his elder and as he thought of practical son, commits suicide. Larry cannot stay in life having the burden of his father's crime in his mind. On the other side, his younger son whom Joe thought of as an idealistic son is disapproving Joe's crime and he is shocked when his father says that he did it for his sons. Moreover, Chris questions his mind when he says it was business. And more perplexed when he wants to put the blame on Chris saying he did it for his sons.

Miller shows us that there is a huge gap between those who sacrifice and serve their country, and those who are only concerned about business and money. There is an understood difference between the selflessness of the men who died in the war, some of them as a result of Joe's cylinder heads, and those who were regarding their own business and interest, like Joe. The first class of people are selfless ones who feel responsible towards their country, while the other ones are selfish and never think of the sufferings of the other members of their society. This is how the criminality and the selfishness of Joe are portrayed in *All My Sons*.

But it does not mean that the only criminal of the act is Joe, because Deever, Kate and Chris have a portion of the crime as well. As for Deever, he is the one who

ordered the factory men to ship the cylinder heads, though he was aware of the defectives of the cylinder heads. In spite of the fact that Joe told him to ship them, Deever himself has the portion of a direct order. So, he is the first to be blamed, because he is the first and direct cause of the crime. Also, Kate is responsible for not blaming Joe for his crime. If we cannot say she is unjust, we can think of her as a character that has a moral responsibility towards her society. Nevertheless, Chris has no objection for getting benefit from the money which comes from an immoral source. Thus Deever, Kate and Chris, each one has a portion and a share of the crime, though as far as Deever is concerned, his crime is not smaller than Joe's one.

The only difference between Deever and Joe is that Joe in spite of his criminality; he is a deceitful man as well. He is able to deceive the government, and all his neighbors. It is not fair, if we say that the Deever and Joe's crime equals the Kate and Chris' one, because Kate and Chris cannot be considered as criminals, but rather I dare to say they are lacking moral and ethical responsibilities towards Larry and the government.

Jim enters and tells Chris that George has "blood in his eye" (Miller, 1973, p. 98). Another question is about the jurisdictional system in the American government, with regard to the injustices in the political system of that time Deepak Chaswal states: "He also tells that George is insisting on Ann's departure with him after his visit. While Bayliss is talking to Chris, George enters. Both Chris and George greet each other. George's conversation with Chris reveals the inability of the court of law to provide justice. It is a system in which guilty are rewarded and the innocent are crucified. He emphasizes the fact that he is now convinced that his father is innocent." (Chaswal, 2011, P. 15- 16). Here Chaswal means that George is criticizing the court for not being able to find the criminals. He gives the idea that the lawyers are careless. Simply, He thinks the lawyers are not doing their job. George wants to convey another surprising message. He criticizes the governmental system, saying that the government rewards the guilty and punishes the innocent people for a crime on which they have had no hands. Also, their decisions are based on the unconfirmed documents.

In the quote George has a different view about his father's conviction. In past he thought that his father was a criminal that is why he had neglected his father in the

prison. But after he had visited his father in the prison for the last time, he has got the idea that his father is innocent. George's idea of his father seems to be hyperbolized in his mind, because he already knows that his father did ship the defective cylinder heads. If Joe is guilty, it does not mean that all the other people are innocent. Even his father did not tell him that he did not ship the cylinders. He did not deny that, except he added another thing which confirmed that Joe is a liar, the criminal and the first cause of the crime.

#### **4. Deceit, family, and justice in Ibsen's *Ghosts***

*Ghosts* are full of living *Ghosts*. The events start with Engstrand. He wants to open a house for sailors. He needs his girl to serve the men who come to the house. For Engstrand it is very important to convince Manders to support him religiously. Although, Manders seems to be deceived by Engstrand, he may know that Engstrand does not have a good intention, because he intends to open a brothel, rather than a house for sailors. Moreover, he has to convince her to serve the sailors.

Manders enters the house of Mrs. Alving. Regina welcomes him warmly. It is clear that she needs him. She says that she would like Manders to find her a husband or a partner to leave with as the other ladies of the town. He does agree on the idea. Suddenly, Manders notices some books on the table. He gets surprised and says why Mrs. Alving reads what he calls free thinking books. Manders is the priest of the town, he wants her to abide by religion and do not read the books that may lead her to think about the anti-religion movements of the time.

Mrs. Alving has sent her son abroad to go and see the new differences which came to being. She sends him for two years. Now he is back home. He comes and greets Manders. Manders disapproves his visit. He calls him the prodigal son. This word is a biblical allusion that Manders uses to describe Oswald. Prodigal son means the extravagant son. Manders means to criticize Oswald for his visit.

Oswald is in love with Regina. He admires her for her beauty and healthiness. He thinks that she is strong. While Mrs. Alving talks about the scandals of her husband, Manders gets upset. She says to Manders that her husband was used to have illegal sexual intercourse with his maid. She unveils this to purgify herself from the psychological pains she got from her husband. Manders is numb. He cannot say anything. During their discussion Oswald goes to the kitchen to help Regina.

Suddenly, they hear a sound of a chair which is knocked over. She hears Regina saying to Oswald to let her go. Her sound appears as an echo of a similar sound. It is a parallel of Mr. Alving's maid. The maid, Johanna, is the mother of Regina. She was conceived by Mr. Alving. So, Regina's mother is Johanna and her father is Oswald's father. It means that Regina and Oswald are brother and sisters of each other.

When, Mrs. Alving hears Regina saying to let her go. She calls Oswald and Regina *Ghosts*. She thinks and recalls the same events in past. It reminds her the times that Johanna was saying to Mrs. Alving to let her go. She thinks that they are the *Ghosts* of their father and mother, because they are doing the same as their father and mothers. Engstrand comes in and says that the orphanage which was intended to be a charitable memorial for Mr. Alving is on fire. They do not know who the cause of the fire was. Manders argues with Engstrand each one of them blames the other. Then, Engstrand says that he saw Manders extinguishing a candle in the orphanage. He doubts if Manders was able to extinguish the fire. After that, Manders is afraid of his witness, but Engstrand keeps it as a secret, because he wants Manders to officially let him open the brothel, what he calls a house for sailors. Also, Manders seems to be lenient enough to let him open the brothel.

After Manders and Mrs. Alving knew that Regina and Oswald are brothers and sisters, Manders disapproved their marriage and considered it as incestuous. But, still Mrs. Alving does not have a big problem with that, because she says that we are told in the bible that the sons and daughters of Adam and Eve were married to each other. The Past affects the present. Oswald gets an agonizing headache. He says that he visited the doctors and they say it is a disease called sexually transmitted diseases. Oswald says that he is not the reason of the disease, but he inherited it from his father. He calls for champagnes to alleviate her pain. Regina goes out, and Oswald cries and his mind loses balance.

#### **4.1. Deceit in *Ghosts***

The theme of deceit is very important in *Ghosts*. It greases the wheel of the imaginary machine on which the social communication between the characters stand. That's what's happening in *Ghosts*. The heroine, Mrs. Alving, thinks she can cover her past mistakes so as to be hidden. She does not want to let anyone to know about

her agonizing pains of her husband. If she plays nice, pretends to be an obedient believer, although sometimes she wants to stand against the regulation and duties of which Manders talk about so, she sets the orphanage up and runs it. It is because of the orphanage, she is able to conceal all the shames of her husband, the play's hypocritical character who pretends to speak on the behalf of God, Pastor Manders, incites her to keep everything to her grave.

On the other side, another lair is Mr. Engstrand. He lies to convince Manders that he is going to establish a home for sailors, as if he is a good guy and wants to benefit the sailors. On the other side when Mrs. Alving's son comes home, she is unmasked. She is not able to flee from her unwelcome past. Her past comes up as if it is a Ghost of her husband and made. Mrs. Alving is not comfortable, because there is something which triggers her psychological state of mind. So, she has to tell the truth.

There are uncountable cases of lies by the characters. Each one of them does it to get a benefit or to avoid a danger. For example, let us observe this following discussion between Mrs. Alving and Mr. Manders. Ibsen in *Ghosts* says:

“MRS. ALVING. The girl left our service at once, and got a good sum of Money to hold her tongue for the time. The rest she managed for herself when she got to town. She renewed her old acquaintance with Engstrand, no doubt let him see that she had money in her purse, and told him some tale about a foreigner who put in here with a yacht that summer. So she and Engstrand got married in hot haste. Why, you married them yourself.

MANDERS. But then how to account for--? I recollect distinctly Engstrand coming to give notice of the marriage. He was quite overwhelmed with contrition, and bitterly reproached himself for the misbehaviour he and his sweetheart had been guilty of.

MRS. ALVING. Yes; of course he had to take the blame upon himself.

MANDERS. But such a piece of duplicity on his part! And towards me too! I never could have believed it of Jacob Engstrand. I shall not fail to take him seriously to task; he may be sure of that.--And then the

immorality of such a connection! For money--! How much did the girl receive?" (Ibsen. Act Two, 1995. p34)

So, what is obvious in the quote is the deception and lie of Engstrand. He was able to deceive all the people of the town. The mastermind of the deception is Mr. Alving. He was a fallen man as they call him. He had an illegal relationship with Johanna. They made sexual intercourse which led to a child. They wanted to hide their socially not allowed relations. This reminds us of the theme of reality versus appearance. Hypocritically, Alving wants to conceal the reality. So as to do so they set up a marriage. Alving wants Engstrand to marry Johanna and show people that the baby is their baby not Alving's one. Alving gives a large amount of money to Johanna. She managed all the money to herself. She gets engaged with Engstrand. So, he marries her as soon as possible.

Nevertheless, Mrs. Alving responds to his accusations referring to something to attack Manders. She says why she married them? He answers he was not aware of the hidden part of the story. Actually, Engstrand went to him as a good Christian. He made his confession of his mistakes, to deceive Manders so as to never let him know about the reality of her marriage. But, now Manders agrees that he should have been aware of the bottom of the lake, because there was a kind of disagreement and discrepancy in his way of expressing himself.

Manders considers this as a very unforgivable crime. Their connection was illegal. It was made to hide reality and the facts about their disgusting sexual relationship. But in reality Engstrand did so for the sake of fifty pounds, given to him by Mr. Alving. On the other side Johanna received three hundred dollars for getting married to Engstrand and keeping Mr. Alving's reputations in the town.

Although one of the major reasons seem to be money which urged Engstrand to marry her, it is clear that he has a strong relationship with the house of captain Alving. Now, we can see that Alving is not alive, but still he has a strong social connection with his wife. Although, she does not like him, the relation is a kind of de facto. So, we could say one of the other reasons behind the marriage is a strong loyal relation between Alving and Engstrand. Engstrand did his job as a close friend to Mr. Alving. So, he married Johanna to hide the real face of his friend. The third possible reasons can be related to Engstrand's love relation with Johanna. Although it is

difficult to prove the idea of having love with a fallen in to intercourse, it can be real in some cases.

The critics of Ibsen have said many things about the tragedy of Ibsen and his powerful language of conveying all of the tragic themes in English literature. One of the themes is deceit. The lie and the deceit is not necessarily a quick lie. It can be a long lie. It can be a lie which expands all of the aspects of the character's life. The lie affects their way of thinking and regretting about the past. This is very controversial argument in naturalism. Heredity affects present. Humans suffer from their everlasting past. Oswald and Mrs. Alving are two examples who represent the theme of naturalism.

One of the critics is Anne-Marie Victoria Stanton-Ife. He refers to this idea of what he calls life-lie in his doctorate thesis named as *Ibsen and Tragedy: A Study in Lykke*. He says; "This is not an anti-idealist gesture to rid Oswald of the very life-lie that she cultivated in him and for which Pastor Manders applauds her as the only positive thing she ever achieved in her dismal career as failed mother and wife. No, she is not on an anti-idealist mission. Rather she is in open combat with the truth, the truth of Regina's paternity, which she feels she has to disclose so that Oswald can choose whether he wants to pursue his happiness with Regina nevertheless."(Stanton-Ife. 2003. P. 172)

As the matter of fact, Ife means that Mrs. Alving is on the crossroads of two contradictory ways. She does not want to satisfy Pastor Manders for he has considered hiding the real face of her husband as one and only positive thing she has ever done to her husband as a wife and as someone who is conscientious about her religious duties. Manders gratifies her for doing so, but actually she does not care about that. On the other side she is indifferent to correct the life lie of Oswald. The lie he has never been aware of it.

That is why Mrs. Alving does not carry the motto of an idealistic mission which Manders urge her to do. What she is obsessed by is the truth, the true side of the case which prevents Oswald to marry Regina. The fact that Regina is the daughter of Mr. Alving takes over her mind. As is obvious that Oswald is the son of Mr. Alving. This means that they are brother and sisters together. Mrs. Alving does not care whether Oswald marries her or not. What she cares about is to say what is real and purgate



her mind from that agonizing secret. She wants to obtain a psychological relaxation through telling the truth.

Another critic discusses the theme of lies and deceit as far as the Ibsenian way of life and philosophy is concerned. John Howard Lawson mirrors this issue “Ibsen’s social philosophy never went beyond the limits of early nineteenth-century romanticism; he searched for the right to happiness and for the triumph of the individual will; this led him to a devastating analysis of social decay. But there is not a socially constructive idea in the vast range of his work. He attacked conventions and narrow moral standards; but as a substitute he offered time-worn generalities: we must be true to ourselves, we must expose lies, and we must fight hypocrisy and sentimentality and stupidity.”(Lawson, 2014. P. 95 )

Ibsen has strived for the idea of will power of the individuals. His social philosophy is to give the individuals a ways to express what they want subjectively and without any kind of shame of the eyes of the others. Actually, he abides by the rules of the romanticism. Ibsen is keen to pave the way to the individuals. Moreover, he shuffles this idea through the analysis of tragic fall of the social commination among the family members. His criticism of the society is to attack the conformity and passiveness of the social members of the society.

Ibsen wants to tell the people to be themselves, and do what they want to do, and neglect what others want them to be. For Ibsen lie and deceit do not have the traditional and dictionary meaning, but rather they have a far deeper meaning than that. So, when we have hypocritical humans who hide what is in their mind and heart for the sake of being like society, and not being rebuked; that is the root and the essence of deceiving ourselves.

Ibsen’s *Ghosts* is one of the most powerful plays in modern literature. We cannot belittle the play, considering it as a simple tragedy. As a matter of fact, *Ghosts* is neither a tragedy nor a comedy, it is a serious play. It tackles the real issues and problems that face society. Although, it portrays the Norwegian society, it refers to the real life of the humans, all around the world. Furthermore, Ibsen criticizes the religious sects of the society. As far as the biography of Ibsen is concerned he was not interested in attacking religion itself, rather he attacks those who exploit religion for their interests. He does this through creating characters like Engstrand and Manders. In *Ghosts* Ibsen says;

“ENGSTRAND. Yes; it might be a sort of Orphanage, too, in a manner of speaking. There's such a many temptations for seafaring folk ashore. But in this Home of mine, a man might feel like as he was under a father's eye, I was thinking.

MANDERS. What do you say to this, Mrs. Alving?

ENGSTRAND. It isn't much as I've got to start with, Lord help me! But if I could only find a helping hand, why--

MANDERS. Yes, yes; we will look into the matter more closely. I entirely approve of your plan. But now, go before me and make everything ready, and get the candles lighted, so as to give the place an air of festivity. And then we will pass an edifying hour together, my good fellow; for now I quite believe you are in the right frame of mind.” (Act Two, p. 40).

Here again we have the theme of deceit and lies. It is clear that in the quote Engstrand wants to establish a brothel. But he twists this idea and shows it as a very different thing. He states that he wants to establish a house for sailors. Furthermore, Engstrand makes an obvious parallel with the orphanage. Literally, he says what he has in his mind is a good intention and it can be compared to the orphanage. Moreover, he considers himself to be as a father for the sailors.

What makes Engstrand's speech very tempting and deceitful is his way of expressing his view point. Then he asks for the help of the others. And finally he is able to deceive Manders. What is very significant here is that Ibsen clarifies the hypocrisy which occupies his contemporary time. The reality which is hidden by the other covers, on the top of all is religion and money. Also, they are all built on the pillars which are made of lies and deceit.

#### **4.2. Family in *Ghosts***

The theme of family is the most prominent theme in *Ghosts*. It deals with the problems that face the families. To be known, the theme of family is a verily discussed theme in world literature. It tackles all of the aspects of families. In *Ghosts*

we have some disorganized families. For instance, Mr. Alving's family, and Engstrand's one. With his accurate portrayal of a dysfunctional family, Ibsen paves the way to understand the nature of families and family relations. He shows what is real, regardless of it is reality, and without coloring. He isn't afraid to display families as they are, because in reality, sometimes we have ugly and rude families. Ibsen does not support the hypocrite societies. He is not interested in hiding reality and wearing masks.

In *Ghosts* he encourages everyone that the addresses that we chose to the humans is a just a reference as Mom, Dad, and Son or Daughter. There are some addresses to relate to each other as human beings. So, the most important reference that we all as family members carry is being human. This is an existentialistic and humanistic way of understanding the social connection in society.

In *Ghosts*, it appears the higher your social position is, the more depressed you are. You can only keep that position by appearing to be perfect and happy. But the question is whether we are able to be happy, in that case? No, because if we have hypocrisy somewhere then, there is no happiness. Even is the humans are able to show off that they are happy, if they don't have the inner happiness, they cannot reach that position. What is firstly important is the essence. For example, Mrs. Alving shows to the people that she lives in a zero-problem family, but actually, she does not.

In *Ghosts* we have a parallel of the character's behaviors. Mrs. Alving and Regina depend on men. Mrs. Alving depends on her husband. Later, she realizes that her husband is not satisfactory, due to his immoral acts towards his servant. She would to depend on Manders, but then she realizes that he is not interested in her and he does not have an emotional feeling towards her. When she is disappointed by the action of both of them, her last hope is her son Oswald. The other lady who is a servant of Mrs. Alving's house, depends on Manders to solve her problems with her father and also, to find a new family for her. Manders does not seem to be able to do so. That is why; Regina's final hope is Oswald to get married to him. But finally, we realize that the only hope of Regina is going to face a fatal disease.

Nevertheless, Ibsen mirrors many problems of the Norwegian society throughout the play. The first family is the one of Mr. Alving. The second one is Engstrand's one.

The familial relationship between Mrs. Alving and Captain Alving is unhealthy. The basis of their marriage is corrupted, because it is based on money. Although at first Mrs. Alving was not obliged to get married to Captain Alving, but she got married to him for the sake of money. On the other hand, Engstrand's family was based on money as well, when he was married to Johanna. The only difference between Captain Alving and Engstrand's marriage was that Mrs. Alving got married to Mr. Alving optionally, while Johanna obligatorily got married to Engstrand.

Regarding Manders, he is considered to be a religious man. For him there is a big religious and moral difference between Alving and Engstrand's marriage. Why?

Because he thinks that is a huge mistake when Engstrand was ready to get married with a fallen lady like Johanna, although Engstrand knew that Johanna had illegal sexual intercourse with her. Manders does not regard another mistake which is when Mrs. Alving got married for the sake of money. Another issue is that for Manders disagrees with is that Oswald wants to get married to Regina. He thinks it is incestuous. So, they should not get married to each other, because now we come to know that they are brother and sisters to each other. But Mrs. Alving says that he does not have any problem with that, because we are told in the bible that the origin of the humans is that they come from Adam and Eve. So, their son and daughters have had been married to each other.

Mrs. Alving has a different view of the family and familial relations within family and also outside family. She has her own special understanding of the social norms. Her special understanding is based on her reading of the free thinking books that she reads and she is affected by. For example, V.MEENAKSHI says:

“ The fact that Mrs. Alving takes charge of the family, the finances, the business, and even goes so far as to send her son away shows that she is rebelling against what society expects of her. She has her own ideas of right and wrong but still worries about society at large and her reputation as well as that of her family.” (V.MEENAKSHI, 2015, 56)

Here MEENAKSHI intends to say Ibsen portrays Mrs. Alving as a different character. She is different because she thinks differently. So, she does not try to show off that she is different, just for the sake of being different. Mrs. Alving shows that she is the one who is in charge of the family relations to the surrounding society and the neighbors. She is able to take care of the financial affairs and the business related

matters. So, as a feminine member of the family, she is able to do whatever a man is able to do for his family. This shows Ibsen's support for the feminist intellectual revolution in the western societies and in Norway in particular. In past it was thought that ladies are lacking mental and physical abilities to take care of the familial affairs. But now Mrs. Alving as a character shows the practical way of proving the ladies ability to organize the families.

On the other side, Mrs. Alving has a rebellious spirit towards the social and conventional norms about the families and the role of women in society. She is able to send her son abroad and to let him been educated. When she sends her son to French Manders as a religious man has his objections to this, but she is more rebellious than obeying Manders. She thinks that society must not invade the individual life of the people. Although Manders has a neurotic concern for the keeping up the appearances and he is obsessed by the public opinion, Mrs. Alving does not care about how the society might think of her and her family. That is why she sends her son abroad.

Also, we should not forget that although Mrs. Alving does not have a neurotic concern about the public opinion, she does not completely neglect the social view of her family. Because of that she sets up the orphanage with the help of Manders. It is evidence that she does not have an extreme view of society and the people's concern. Thus, Mrs. Alving has a moderate way of understanding the social communication with relation to women and their ability and role inside family. She does reject the social norms that degrade the role of women in society and inside the families, but she does not reject all of the moral sets of the society.

There is a variety of intellectual figures that put the spotlight on the issues of familial regards in Ibsen's works. Among them is Brian Plumb who talks about the disease which is the cause of the collapse of the families. He says, "It was in 1881 that Ibsen's *Ghosts* was first performed (and then banned for about 25 years). Being set in a house in Norway where it is hardly ever daylight makes it gloomy enough, but it was the first time that any dramatist had portrayed syphilis sympathetically and accurately." (Plumb, 1997, 5)

Plumb refers to two facts. One of them is that the play, *Ghosts* was firstly not allowed for being published. The second one which is my aim is that syphilis is one of the very deadly diseases. It is also referred to as the STD disease which is the

abbreviation of sexually transmitted diseases. This fatal disease which is not inferior to HIV or disease is portrayed in sympathetic and literary way. Plumb says that this is the first time that the issue of syphilis is connected with a piece of literary work.

On the other side Ibsen recalls another angle of the familial problems. Oswald is apparently a goody boy. He inherits the venereal disease from his father. The disease causes his mental deterioration. As it is clear, he calls Regina to bring him the champagne to drink. There is a problem with his spinal cord in his back. So, he is in a very shaky and abnormal physical state. The disease leads to his downfall.

The only cause of the collapse of Mr. Alving's family is rooted in his illegal sexual intercourse with Johanna. That unhealthy relationship brakes Captain Alving's relation to her life partner and wife. His wife is in hell on earth, when she realizes that her husband has a connection with his maid. This leads to the Mr. Alving's lacking passion and love for his wife. She is far away from the pleasures of the family.

The problem gets bigger, when she realizes that her son has an inherited disease from his father. Mrs. Alving sends his son abroad to make him far from his father's affection. She wanted to make her son step after her and be like her or let's say inherit her characteristics, but when his son is back and carries the same disease of his father she comes across the reality that his son does not go after her, rather he goes after his father even in the diseases that he has. After she understands that, she loses his son which is her final hope.

### **4.3. Justice in *Ghosts***

In *Ghosts* the theme of justice is not known for the characters. Each character thinks what they do is just and fair. Nevertheless, it is not clear for the readers as well, because it is very controversial and arguable matter. Ibsen does this intentionally. The aim of this is to have some codes or hidden ideas, so as to lead the reader think and have their own critical understanding of the conflicts of the society. Ibsen's tradition is to pave the way to the reader to have their own view points on the social, religious, political, and psychological phenomena. So, he does not invade the readers' mind.

One more point which is necessary to be mentioned is that we the discussion about justice in Ibsen's play, *Ghosts* is very different in comparison to the argumentation of justice in Miller's play. For example in *Crucible* the injustice is the matter of killing many innocent man based on some fraud evidences under the hand on the religious people who are allegorically portrayed to stand for American lawyers during the time of cold war between Russia and America, while in *Ghosts* the idea of justice is concerned about the social and religious injustice in a family through which Ibsen portrays the Norwegian society. Also, when it comes to the discussion of justice in *All My Sons*, it is all about the jurisdictional and social injustice linked with the betrayal of a man called Joe Keller.

In *Ghosts*, For instance, when Manders comes to Mrs. Alving's house, he comes in and faces Regina. Here is one of the cases in which Ibsen portrays the theme of justice as he states:

“REGINA. Shall I tell Mrs. Alving you are here?

MANDERS. Thanks, thanks, there is no hurry, my dear child.--By-the-bye,

Regina, my good girl, tell me: how is your father getting on out here?

REGINA. Oh, thank you, sir, he's getting on well enough.

MANDERS. He called upon me last time he was in town.

REGINA. Did he, indeed? He's always so glad of a chance of talking to you, sir.

MANDERS. And you often look in upon him at his work, I dare say?

REGINA. I? Oh, of course, when I have time, I--

MANDERS. Your father is not a man of strong character, Miss Engstrand. He stands terribly in need of a guiding hand.

REGINA. Oh, yes; I daresay he does.

MANDERS. He requires some one near him whom he cares for, and whose judgment he respects. He frankly admitted as much when he last came to see me.

REGINA. Yes, he mentioned something of the sort to me.” (Ibsen, Act One, Page, 12-13).

As it is shown in the quote, when Manders comes to Mrs. Alving’s house, Regina wants to call Mrs. Alving, but Manders has kind of passion for her, saying that Regina does not need to bother herself hurrying up to call Mrs. Alving. What is relevant to my discussion is that Manders wants to open a matter with her, about her so called father Engstrand, which is why he wants to talk to Regina, before Mrs.

Alving’s arrival.

Firstly, Manders asks after her. Then, Manders says that Engstrand called on him. Although Regina does not seem to agree, Manders starts judging her father.

Manders’ unjust judging is that he blames Engstrand for being a weak character. Manders states that Engstrand is extremely in need of a guiding hand. These words have a religious connotation. He says this, because he considers himself to be a religious man. The words “guiding hand” are the parallel a statement which Engstrand uses to advise Regina, saying that Regina needs a “guiding hand” to protect her.

The idea is that Ibsen criticizes the religious figures of his contemporary age. He shows their common mistakes. Manders thinks of himself as if he is a just man. But actually, does not know that he is proud of his knowledge of religion. He is judgmental, because of his little knowledge about religion. Manders’ judgmentality leads him to taint everyone except for himself. So, when someone judges and looks down everyone, they will find themselves in the top of pride and they forget criticizing themselves. Moreover, it is a fact that the more somebody criticizes and reproaches themselves, the lesser they care vulnerable to be criticized by others. Thus Ibsen criticizes the religious people for unjustly criticizing others. He considers them to be unjust.

Amir refers to the idea of justice. He states that “Even though Captain Alving is condemned from the social and moral perspective, but I think, Mrs. Alving is no less responsible for the sexual relationship between Captain Alving and Johanna. In accordance with the balance of Justice, both husband and wife may be equally punished.” (Amir, 2014, 4). So, as it is clear in the quote that according to Amir, Mrs. Alving is not free of scruple. She is responsible for her husband’s illegal relation with Johanna. Maybe she lacks her familial and affectionate relationship as a wife of Captain Alving. It is



as a result of this that Mrs. Alving suffers. Amir thinks that Captain Alving and Mrs. Alving are equally responsible for the breakdown of their family.

Manders is one of the main characters in *Ghosts*. He accuses her for many mistakes. As it is shown in *Ghosts* (Act One, p. 26), He thinks that Mrs. Alving has ignored her duties as a wife, because she has decided to leave her husband. Although she had a feeling of love for Manders and wanted him to marry her, but he rejected her and send her back to her husband. According to Manders she has done another mistake which is that she does not abide by the religious discipline, duty and rules, Also, The event that she send her son as Manders says to live among the strangers. So, she das disowned her son as well. It means that she is not successful as a mother.

Simply, Manders criticizes her for being in lust for her desires. He wants her to not follow her will and follow the duties and responsibilities. He thinks that she did what she desired. Firstly, she left her husband, and secondly, she disowned her son. But she denies all of the things that Manders tell her. She apologizes that she left her husband because he was involved in debauchery and did not have a passionate feeling for her. Also, she states that she did send her son away, but it was because she wanted his son to be completely far away from being contaminated by the debauchery of his father, not because she disowned him. Thus it is not fair at all to decide that she is infallible and put all the blame on the shoulder of Captain Alving. The justice and reality for Amir is that she is unjust and guilty for the breakdown of her family.

In another place Amir argues a different injustice that Ibsen talks about in *Ghosts* is the incestuous relation within the family members. So, Amir says that “The legislation of punishment has been prevailed for the criminals according to the state law. The incestuous relationship is accepted as dreadful social and religious injustice throughout the Northern Europe due to this crime, the capital punishment is sentenced to death, and property of the criminals has been confiscated and forfeited by the state/king, or is exiled from the state.”

(Amir, 2014, 13). The idea of the previous quote is that Religion has a great role in directing the mentality of the humans, throughout the history of mankind. The definition of justice and injustice has been changing through the change of the societies and the chronological process of the age of the societies. According to the governmental law of the states of Europe and the northern part of it specifically,

incestuous relationship was a crime in past. It was not only a religious crime, rather it was considered as a social and religious injustice.

Nevertheless, the punishment of incest was the capital punishment of death. According to the law of past, the jurisdictional decision was the death of anyone who is involved in an incestuous act. Moreover, the government was confiscating and seizing the financial assets of the person to the state. So, it was highly detested by the people and the political powers of that time. But now, it is very different. No one talks about that kind of punishment. There is not the idea of killing the practitioners of the act or forfeiting their money. Now, the law has changed and in Europe, it is no longer regarded as an injustice at all.

The idea is that the term of justice and injustices are not like the colors to say that there is a unanimous sound among the humans that justice means this and that. No, it is a flexible term. It depends on the way the humans interpret it. Also, it depends on the ones who interpret the term. Actually, it differs from one person to the other and from one state to the other. But, after all, it does not mean that the analysts are not able or should not discuss the terms, because each one may has a different and truer view. Also, if the analysts of the literary works are not able to have the same view on the some specific issues, it does not mean that they don't have sharing views. And it does not mean that one of them is just and the others are not. In literature the analysts can have different and complimentary ideas, as far as the understanding of the works is concerned.

One of the other things that Ibsen considers to be injustice is that the characters in *Ghosts* are surrounded by the Social responsibilities, class limitations, religion, and family boundaries. The central character, Mrs. Alving, is a best example. She does everything to defend her bad husband's reputation, and to be successful in fulfilling her duty as a mother. Whatever she does Manders as a religious priest intrudes and advises her to protect her responsibilities as a wife of Captain Alving and a mother of Oswald.

The class limitation is very important for Manders and Mrs. Alving, but it does not appear to be a big deal for Oswald, he loves Regina, and she likes her until she realizes that he has an inherited venereal disease. In the play Ibsen deals with some

realities which were unjust and practiced in the Norwegian society. For, example he criticizes the social, religious and moral injustices in the society he lived in.

## 5. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, I have clarified the main goal of this M.A. Thesis which is to study the modern drama and the works of the most influential figures of the period, such as Arthur Miller and Henrik Ibsen. Miller is famous for his *Crucible* and *All My Sons*. I have tried to consider the plays with reference to the major themes which are intrinsic elements of the ideas that are tackled in the era in general and in the plays specifically. I have discussed the theme of deceit, family and Justice in all of the plays respectively. The nature of these themes has been shown through the examples of the character and events.

In the first chapter, I have tried to have a historical and critical background of drama and a clear view of the theory of drama with reference to the major theorist and critics of the theory of drama. I have tried to make a connection between the critical history of drama and the plays of the two authors. Nonetheless, we have shown the essence of tragedy according to Aristotle and the way of its relevance to the modern drama. Aristotle's view on the magnitude, completeness, action and imitation provides the earliest critical points about how to view drama. There in chapter one, I have given a brief background of the theory of drama in general. Then the focus will be on the ideas of the first significant critic and philosopher about the criticism of drama and I have shown the link between the critics' ideas and Ibsen's works. Also, Aristotle thinks that the characters are not as important as the plot of the plays. The all in all priority is to the plot. Plot includes all of the other necessary elements of the plays, but not the vice versa. Moreover, in the first chapter I have provided Aristotle's criticism with regard to the Oedipus the King and, I have discussed the theories of the renaissance scholars who lay out the foundation of modern drama and literary criticism. As it is shown, Although, Miller has similar ideas about the criticism of drama, as it is shown in his works, *All My Sons* and *The Crucible*; Ibsen seems to have a clearer view of having connection with the classic and renaissance criticism of drama.

Almost all of the characteristics of an ideal drama of which Aristotle thinks are reiterated in the modern age. Ibsen and Miller are the top of those who abide by many rules that Aristotle explained about drama. Miller and Ibsen's theory matches the approaches that Aristotle argues for, in his definition and explanation, as far as tragedy and its components are concerned, for example the beginning, the middle and the final end of tragedy. After all, Aristotle's theory about the final purpose of tragic plays is metaphorically the mirror of the plays. Aristotle thinks that the tragic plays final end is to arouse pity and fear

I have given the top of those authors who consider the text as the most important means in understanding and the interpretation of it. For example Barthes as a post-structuralist argues that the death of the author is inevitable and unavoidable. At the first glance of his essay the reader is satisfied that the death of the author is unalterable. So as to prove his point of view he uses numerous critics

In chapter two I have clarified the themes of deceit, family and justice in *Crucible*. Miller's message in the play is to convey some moral messages to the American society. And criticize the liars. Those lie for the sake of their lust such as Abigail. She sets up Goody Proctor. For example, Abigail tells them that she feels an agonizing pain in her belly. When the ministers look at her belly, they find a needle. So, she accuses Goody Proctor for putting the needle in her stomach, although she knows that she had put the needle in her stomach to prove Goody Proctor as a magician. And to show the ministers that she had not done so, because she cannot hurt herself. Abigail had already put a needle in the belly of a doll when she sat with the Marry Warren. She did so to approve herself right to the ministers when they look at the needle. That is the most prominent lie among the lies that Abigail spreads so as to accuse Goody Proctor. Through her lie Abigail is able to be the source of Goody Proctor's death, because she tells the ministers that she is a magician.

Ibsen shows the real problems of the families, some of the problems may be internal and some others maybe external like the familial problem that Abigail makes for Mr. Proctor's family. As for The theme of family, and family conflicts is one of the themes of, almost all the plays written by Miller. Also, many of the characters are motivated by suspicion and appetite in *Crucible*. The characters' desire leads all of them to the destruction of the family relations. Abigail is motivated by hatred of

Elizabeth Proctor; she wants Elizabeth to perish, so she can marry John, Elizabeth's husband.

The theme of justice is the most significant theme in *Crucible*. It is not inaccurate if we say that the main purpose behind writing *Crucible* is to discuss the idea of justice. Miller wanted to write a history drama so as to criticize the jurisdictional processes, the political and governmental power of the American society. He does criticize his contemporary court decisions in fifties which were based on suspensions and lacking real evidences

Chapter three is dedicated to the discussion of Miller's *All My Sons*. The main idea of the play is to show Miller's moral criticism about lies and deceit, family and justice. *All My Sons* is one of the most influential plays in the history of drama in America. The play deals with the real life of the people of that time, and tries to tackle the problems of the American society. Joe Keller is in the top of the liars. He lies to all of the other characters. He is able to deceive all of the surrounding figures all challenge them all. He lies to his son Chris and his wife; almost to all of his family members. He lies in front of the court and sends his partner and coworker to prison. Again by lies he exonerates himself.

Miller's point of justice is shown through Joe. In *All My Sons* there is a clear crime which is considered as a major crime. The crime of the shipment of the cylinder heads which were known to be defective. The other unjust part of the crime is that Joe lies in front of the lawyers. Then, they decide that Joe is innocent and they let him go easily. For Joe the moral and ethical norms are nothing in comparison to his success in business.

In chapter four, I deal with the themes in Ibsen's *Ghosts*. Deceit is very important in *Ghosts*. It greases the wheel of the imaginary machine on which the social communication between the characters stand. That's what's happening in *Ghosts*. The heroine, Mrs. Alving, thinks she can cover her past mistakes so as to be hidden. She does not want to let anyone to know about her agonizing pains of her husband. Another example, in *Ghosts*, we have a family based on money that lacks love. This leads to the destruction of the relations between all the members. Simultaneously, it leads to extramarital relations which cause emotional and physical damage. So, captain Alving's relations breaks down the family. In *Ghosts*, Ibsen critiques some

disorganized families. For instance, Mr. Alving's family, and Engstrand's one. With his accurate portrayal of a dysfunctional family, Ibsen paves the way to understand the nature of families and family relations.

In *Ghosts* the theme of justice is not identified for the characters. Each character thinks what they do is just and fair. Nevertheless, it is not clear for the readers as well, because it is very controversial and arguable matter. Ibsen does this intentionally. The aim of this is to have some codes or hidden ideas, so as to lead the reader think and have their own critical understanding of the conflicts of the society. Ibsen's tradition is to pave the way to the reader to have their own view points on the social, religious, political, and psychological phenomenon. So, he does not occupy the readers' mind.

After all in conclusion, I have given a brief sum up of the Thesis. In which we argue the main points of the plays and the purpose of the authors to analyze their contemporary age. The authors give their moral messages through their plays, For example, blaming the concepts of lies and deceit, and criticizing the disintegrated families and praising justice via attacking the injustices.

## REFERENCES

- Abd-Aun and Muhsin**, (2014). *GUILT, BETRAYAL, AND SELF-DECEPTION IN ARTHUR MILLER'S ALL MY SONS AND DEATH OF SALESMAN*. College of Education for Human Sciences/University of Babylon. P. 136.
- Aristotle**. (1996) *Poetics*. Trans. Malcolm Heath. London: Penguin Books,. Print.
- ABRAMS, M. H.** (1999) *a glossary of literary terms*. MEXICO: earl McPeck,.
- Aziz, A. G. PhD. Qunayeer, S. H. PhD** (2004). *SOCIAL HYSTERIA VERSUS INDIVIDUAL DILEMMA: A PRAGMATIC STUDY OF CHARACTER RELATIONSHIP IN ARTHUR MILLER'S THE CRUCIBLE*. european scientific journal. p. 241.
- Amir H, A.** (2014) *Power and Sexuality in Henrik Ibsen's Ghosts*. IRWLE VOL. 10. No. I.
- Aristotle:** (1996) *Poetics*; Longinus: *On the Sublime*; Demetrius: *On Style*. Trans.W.
- Aberg, M.** (2006) *Social awareness in the works of Arthur Miller*. Lulea university Of Technology, Department of Language and Culture.
- Chaswal, D.** (2011) *Betrayal and Guilt in Arthur Miller's All My Sons*. IUP 16  
Journal of English Studies • Vol. VI, No. 3.
- Dillingham, W. B.** (1977) "*Arthur Miller and the Loss of Conscience*."
- Deepak C. and Pradeep K. C.** (2012) *Arthur Miller Revisited*. IRWLE VOL.8.No.I.
- Habib, M.A.R.** (2005) *A History of Literary Criticism*. BLACKWELL,.
- Habib, M.A.R.** (2012) *A Literary Criticism*. WILEY-BLACKWELL,.
- Hamilton F.** (1965) *Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press/Heinemann*.
- Improve indigenous literature**, (2007). Available from:  
<[7.http://www.megaessays.com/viewpaper/15544.html?page=2](http://www.megaessays.com/viewpaper/15544.html?page=2)>
- Ibsen, H.** (1995) *Ghosts*. Beirut: York Press.
- Johnson, T. R.** (2006) *Arp and Greg. Literature*. Boston: Michael Rosenberg.
- Leitch, V. B.** (2001) *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*. New York: Norton. Print.



- Lawson, J. H.** (2014) *Theory and Technique of Playwriting and Screenwriting*.
- Miller:** *Death of a Salesman—Text and Criticism*. Ed. Gerald Weales. New York: Viking Press.
- Miller, A.** (1973), *Collected Plays*, Allied Publishers Pvt. Ltd., Bombay.
- Miller, A.** (2003) *Crucible*. Beirut: York Press,.
- MEENAKSHI. V.** (2015) *OFFENSIVE WOMEN AND DEFENSIVE MEN IN IBSEN'S PLAYS*. Research Journal of English Language and Literature (RJELAL) A Peer Reviewed (Refereed) International Journal. Vol.3.Issue.1. Oxford. (2010) *Oxford dictionary of Classical World*. Oxford: Oxford University.
- Plumb, B.** (1997) *SEXUALLY TRANSMITTED DISEASES: AN HISTORICAL RETROSPECT*. Based on a paper delivered to the Liverpool Medical History Society.
- Prasad D.** (2011) *FAMILY VALUES AND AFFINITY IN THE WORKS OF ARTHUR MILLER – A THEMATIC STUDY*. TAMILNADU: BHARATHIDASAN UNIVERSITY press.
- Rahimipoor1, S.** (2013) "*Evaluating the Effects of Drama Techniques on Improving the Writing*." Nova Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences 23-33.
- Stanton-Ife, and A. M. Victoria.** PHD. (2003) *Ibsen and Tragedy: A Study in Lykke*. University College London.
- Schissel, W.** (1994) *Re(dis)covering the Witches in Arthur Miller's The Crucible*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

## RESUME



**Name Surname:** Ahmed Azeez Mohammed

**Place and Date of Birth:** Takya/ Iraq, 11/ February/ 1992

**E-mail:** [1monotheist1@gmail.com](mailto:1monotheist1@gmail.com)

### EDUCATION:

**Bachelor:** 2014, Salahaddin University, College of Languages, Department of English Language

**Master:** 2016, Istanbul Aydin University, English Language, English Language and Literature Program

### PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE AND REWARDS

#### PUBLICATION/ PRESENTATION OF THE THESIS:

Mohammed, Ahmed Azeez. (2016). Deceit, Family, And Justice in Miller and Ibsen's Plays, *Crucible*, *All My Sons* and *Ghosts*. *The International Journal Of Media, Culture And Literature*.