

***Days Without End***  
**—Mortality and Immortality of Life Cycle—**

**Kumi Ohno**

**Introduction**

Eugene O'Neill's *Days Without End* (herein referred to as "*Days*") was premiered on December 27th, 1933 at Plymouth Theatre in Boston. The play consists of four acts and six scenes. The author tried to excavate the "crisis awareness" against an intrinsic nature of mankind through this play. In *Dynamo* which was written in 1929, O'Neill introduced four gods: "Puritan god", "electricity god", "Dynamo" and "the real god representing the eternal life". In the story, however, Ruben, the main character, who seeks the salvation from these gods, is unable to find the true answer and commits suicide.

In *Days*, the main character barely but successfully finds out the religious significance of the purpose of life and continues to have hope and the will to live, which is quite different from other O'Neill's plays.

This play was written in 1930s during the great economic depression and the anxiety of the people described in *Dynamo* is inherited by this play, although the subject is dug from the different aspect. However, as seen from the author's efforts of rewriting the script several times, his attempts to reach the final conclusion was not successful for many years.

The play was finally published after rewriting eight times during the period between 1931–1934.<sup>1</sup> *Days* is considered to be the worst play of Eugene O'Neill. *Ah, Wilderness!*, which was highly acclaimed by the critics and which ran 289 performances, was written almost in the same

---

1 Doris V. Falk, *Eugene O'Neill and The Tragic Tension* (Rutgers University Press, 1959), pp. 150–152

period as *Days*, which evoked a host of negative review and ran only 57 performances.<sup>2</sup> However, despite of these adverse bleaks, I consider the play as an important work that best describes the transitional period of Eugene O'Neill.

### I. Until the *Days Without End* is completed

Richard Dana Skinner points out the fact that during the period, O'Neill was working on the play, he tried to return to Catholicism and regard the work highly as the “modern miracle play” which “reveals a man’s search for truth amid the conflicting doctrines of the modern world and his return to his old religious faith.”<sup>3</sup> It is a well-known fact that Eugene O'Neill met one of the Jesuit priests during this period to discuss about *Days*. He also met renowned Priest John Hood and exchanged their views on the religious sects. These meetings inspired the author to disambiguity the sect of the priest character, Father Mathew Baird, which was not clarified in his initial draft, to Catholic, which reflected his intention to return to his former religion. In his real life, however, O'Neill had not recovered his Catholic belief as apparent from his wife, Carlotta’s words:

“I was prepared to join the Catholic Church myself, if Gene wanted to go back: I would have done whatever was necessary to make him happy. But he did not go back. That was last flirtation with Catholicism.”<sup>4</sup>

In the first draft of *Days*, the main character commits suicide in the climax scene. Regarding the scene, O'Neill notes:

Mother worship, repressed and turned morbid, ends by becoming Death-love and longing—thus it is statue of Virgin and child, identification of mother and Elsa with Her, himself with child, longing for reunion with them through Mother Goddess that really drives him to suicide before statue of Virgin—while at the same time it is his old resentment against

---

2 Jordon Y. Miller, *Eugene O'Neill and the American Critic* (London, 1962), pp. 263–272, pp. 299–306

3 Crosswell Bowen, *The Curse of the Misbegotten* (London, 1960) p. 232

4 Arthur and Barbara Gelb, *O'Neill* (New York, 1960) p. 763

mother, against Elsa as mother substitute (infidelity) that keeps him from giving in to Catholicism—longing, confession. . . .<sup>5</sup>

Though the above note mentions the conclusion contrary to the final draft, it is the one of the important clue to find out his intention. In addition, the correlation between *Days* and *Dynamo* can be seen from the plots of these two plays, building up the tension towards the conclusion. In *Dynamo*, Reuben, the main character, grows up under the care of his rigorous priest father and devoted mother who cares her son single-mindedly. His disbelief in god which comes from the hatred towards his father leads to his fear for the future. Reuben falls in love with the neighbor Ada, the daughter of Ramsey Fife, a superintendent of hydro-electric plant. His love triggers the family problem which arouses his rebellion towards his parents. As a result, he abandons his family for year and few months trip. When he returns, he confronts with his mother's death. His father tells Reuben that she passed away two weeks before his return leaving her last words of confession which revealed the renunciation of old god of her husband. Knowing her conversion to electricity god from Puritan god, Reuben develops Oedipus complex towards his mother and voluntary self-punishment, blaming himself for his mother's death. *Dynamo* was no longer just the god of electricity to Reuben as he projects his sexual libido into *Dynamo*, the representation of Mrs. Fife (the mother of Ada, his lover). Realizing his mother's belief in electricity god, he projects his psychological libido into *Dynamo* at the same time, evolving the guilty conscious of vengeance towards himself. When the conflict between the Freudian sexual libido<sup>6</sup> and Jungian psychological libido<sup>7</sup> reaches the peak, Reuben spends the night with Ada trying to overcome the confrontation within himself, though his attempt ends in failure and results in further aggravation of the situation, which triggers the schizophrenic symptoms, resulting in the worst case scenario to shoot down Ada in front of *Dynamo*. O'Neill was never

---

5 Doris V. Folk, *op. cit.*, p. 150

6 Sigmund Freud, *The Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud, Vol. XVIII*, trans. by James Strachey. (London: The Hogarth Press, 1955), p. 255

7 Carl G. Jung *The Collected Works of C.G. Jung, Vol. V, Symbols of Transformation*, ed. by Herbert Read et al. (New York: Princeton University Press, 1956), p. 408

content with this conclusion. Ruben's death was not the answer he was looking for, as the conflict between the contradictory factors remained unsolved, which daggered his heart deeply and which became the main motif to indulge himself in writing and re-writing of *Days*.

In the fourth draft, the main character gives up his efforts to resolve the inner conflict with religious creed to resolve the inner conflict and Elsa, his wife, dies. John Loving is not saved. The act curtains with the main character cursing god.

In the fifth draft, however, the play features the separation of John and Loving, reflecting the author's own past, his internal conflict and turmoil of his experience, where he ventured to express the schizophrenic separation of characters of a person in a generic sense. It is also interesting to know his approach in *Days* to express his self-analytical review of his past struggles. He projected himself into the main character by dramatizing his historical journey.

The author's efforts in finalizing the play can be seen in his sixth draft, which is almost same as the final version. The fusion of John and Loving enables the main character to unite into one without dying. John who had cursed god realizes that he had and has been believing in god and that his hatred was one form of love. He repents and prays to the lord to forgive his past sins, resulting in the endurance of his wife's life, which is same as the final version.<sup>8</sup>

The trend of changing conclusion in these draft (from the main character abandoning his faith in Catholicism, turning to mother-worship and adoration of death to his urge for living through Christian faith and final return to Catholicism) reflects his struggles in deciding the ending of the play.

It is interesting to know that there are two Japanese translations of the title: 限りなき命 (*Life Without End*); 終わりなき日々 (*Days Without End*). These titles may have a slight difference in literal meaning where the former implies the returning to the believing of eternal life (Christian faith) by the main character, John Loving, translated by the people who interpret the play in whole or in part as the story of a man's recurrence to the life of eternity. The latter title signifies that each day may be

---

8 村松正, 愛知淑徳大学論集 8, *Days Without End* の最終場面, 1982, p. 24

intermittently disconnected to each other but each of these fragments is connected to form a sequential flow of life. In other words, each separate day is connected to the eternal life.

We must not forget the heritage passed down from *Dynamo* to *Days*, which are “ambiguity and complexity.” The ambiguity and complexity are the two elements that can be found in the story of *Dynamo*, at the center. In the evolution process from the electric god to the real god, there is no distinct line between each god and their relationships are not clearly defined. In other words, during the transitional period, the borderline demarcating the changes of each god is obscure and the interdisciplinary relationships among these gods are uncertain. In *Dynamo*, the involvement of these four gods from “Puritan god”, “electricity god or machine god” and “Dynamo” to “the real god” that represents an eternal life, which interactively correlate with each other in complication to web the plot of the story, intricately labyrinthines the situation of the characters. O’Neill tried to control all of these four gods with the real god at the center but his experiment ended in vein.

Though John Loving’s “inner continuity” of religious faith as postulated by Richard Skinner is in question, the positive critical reviews include: “strong message of salvation through Christ’s crucifixion”<sup>9</sup> and “the implication of the conclusion results in the audience to believe O’Neill’s return to Catholicism (Clifford Leech)”<sup>10</sup>.

Some of the critics, who have a different view with respect to “god”, mention that John Loving’s “surrender to Christ crucified” is the consequence of his internal conflict and this itself do not have important implications.<sup>11</sup>

## II-i Analysis on *Days Without End* from Freudian psychoanalytical perspective

Act One mainly focuses on the conflict between the two split charac-

9 Richard Skinner, *Eugene O’Neill: A Poet’s Quest* (New York, 1964), pp. 235–240  
村松正, 名古屋大学教養部紀要, 外国文学, 13, *Ah, Wilderness!* と *Days Without End*, 1969, p. 35

10 Clifford Leech, *O’Neill* (London, 1963), p. 92  
村松正, *ibid.*, p. 35

11 Frederic I. Carpenter, *Eugene O’Neill* (New York, 1964) p. 145

ters of John Loving. From Freudian perspective, the conflict described in the act represents the friction between the conscious and subconscious of a person. The stage direction below reflects the similarities and differences between John and Loving.

*Loving sits in the armchair at rear of table. He is the same age, of the same height and figure, is dressed in every detail exactly the same. His hair is the same—dark, streaked with gray. In contrast to this similarity between the two, there is an equally strange dissimilarity. For Loving’s face is a mask whose features reproduce exactly the features of John’s face—the death mask of a John who has died with a sneer of scornful mockery on his lips. And this mocking scorn is repeated in the expression of the eyes which stare bleakly from behind the mask.*

Act One

To the words of John, Loving says, “So it’s come back to that again” and this represents the Freudian conflict between the delusion<sup>12</sup> evolving from subconscious and his conscious.

JOHN

You lie! I want to get at the real truth and understand what was behind—what evil spirit of hate possessed me to make me—

LOVING

So it’s come back to that again, eh? Your old familiar nightmare! You poor, damned superstitious fool!

Act One

The conflict is apparent in the following lines also. “He must go on! He must find faith—somewhere!” shows his real self and “the cowardly yearning to go back—?” shows that his subconscious refutes his conscious.

JOHN

Ah! I see now what you’re driving at! And you talk of courage and

---

12 Sigmund Freud, *The Penguin Freud Library*, Vol. X p. 37

honor! No! He must go on! He must find a faith—somewhere!

LOVING

Somewhere, eh? Now I wonder what hides behind that somewhere? Is it your old secret weakness—the cowardly yearning to go back—?

Act One

John tries to achieve his goal to realize himself through his efforts to lead a multifaceted intellectual path, however, because of his vulnerabilities or impaired personality, he leads a life of “multiple personality”. In other words, the core personality is insufficiently developed, so he tries to wear the mask to cover up while realizing the true self. The road to self-realization is best described in the following lines of Father Baird.

FATHER BAIRD

.....First it was Atheism unadorned. Then it was Atheism wedded to Socialism. But Socialism proved too weak-kneed a mate, and the next I heard Atheism was living in free love with Anarchism, with a curse by Nietzsche to bless the union. And then came the Bolshevik dawn, and he greeted that with unholy howls of glee and wrote me he'd found a congenial home at last in the bosom of Karl Marx.....And what do you think was his next hiding place? Religion, no less—but as far away as he could run from home—in the defeatist mysticism of the East. First it was China and Lao Tze that fascinated him, but afterwards he ran on to Buddha.....But the next I knew, he was through with the East. It was not for the Western soul, he decided, and he was running through Greek philosophy and found a brief shelter in Pythagoras and numerology. Then came a letter which revealed him bogged down in evolutionary scientific truth again—a dyed-in-the-wool mechanist. That was the last I heard of his peregrinations—and, thank heaven, it was long ago. I enjoyed a long interval of peace from his missionary zeal, until finally he wrote me he was married. That letter was full of more ardent hymns of praise for a mere living woman than he'd ever written before about any of his great spiritual discoveries.

Act One

As elaborated by Father Baird, John has the idea to write about his

philosophical findings he had acquired during his quest to pursue the answer. His novel can be themed up into three points as follow. :

First of all, the basic theme of philosophical journey starts from Catholicism and ends in the return to Catholicism. He tried to describe his controversy or self-contradiction through the conflict between himself and the masked Loving.

Secondly, he tried to illustrate the friction between Catholicism and love, the fundamental human emotion, resulting in the return to his original faith, depicting the difference of emotional feeling of each individual.

Lastly, though he resumes his native faith at the end, the death of his parents motivates him to rebel against Christianity.

Act One explicitly reflects John's self-contradiction, exhibiting the split of the main character into John, who had experienced the storms of life, and Loving, pronouncing the conflict within his conscious.

## II-ii Critical study on *Days Without End* from Jungian perspectives

Act Two centers on the psycho-analytical dissection of Lucy's and Elsa's conscious with respect to their love affairs. The Act is plotted to show the transitional process from the Freudian self-contradiction to Jungian conflict.

The next lines show Lucy's self-contradiction:

LUCY

Lover. Say it. How incredibly Mid-Victorian you can be! Don't you know that's all we married ladies discuss nowadays? But you're lucky. Usually the men discussed aren't our husbands, and aren't even good lovers. But never say die. We keep on hoping and experimenting!

Act Two

In the next scene, Lucy considers her affairs as "a little fleeting adultery" and her lover as "a substitute." These lines reveal what Freud calls as rebellion and compensation.<sup>13</sup>

---

13 C. G. Jung, 高橋義孝その他訳, 『心理学的類型 II ユング・コレクション 2』人文書院 1987, pp. 203-205



LUCY

Yes, I went in for a little fleeting adultery. And I must say, as a love substitute or even a pleasurable diversion, it's greatly overrated. (*She gives a hard little laugh.*) How horribly shocked you look! Are you going to order me from your virtuous home?

Act Two

To Lucy's attitude which represents Freudian rebellion<sup>14</sup>, Elsa explains that she was able to win the battle against herself, which signifies the victory of her consciousness over her rebel behavior. Elsa is described as a contrasting figure to Lucy.

ELSA

All that saved me from doing something stupid was the faith I had that somewhere the man was waiting whom I could really love. I felt I owed it to him and to my own self-respect not to deliberately disfigure myself out of wounded pride and spite.

Act Two

Lucy's affair began with her retaliation to her husband that her vengeance allowed her to make love with all the men. In the next lines, she justifies her adultery with words that implies Freudian rebel and retaliation, at the same time, she expresses Jungian 'fusion'.

LUCY

... But I was in hell, I can tell you, and inside I kept swearing to myself that I'd show Walter—And I picked out this man—yes, deliberately! It was all deliberate and crazy! And I had to do all the seducing—

Act Two

On the contrary, the following lines represents that Elsa is able to establish her identity by overcoming the Freudian personal unconscious, iterating her husband's words when they got married that their love

---

14 Sigmund Freud, *The Complete Psychology Works of Sigmund Freud, Vol. XVIII*, p. 20

sacraments their marriage and that their union is the most perfect and beautiful form of self-expression.

ELSA

... our love could make ours into a true sacrament—sacrament was the word he used—a sacrament of faith in which each of us would find the completest self-expression in making our union a beautiful thing.

Act Two

Unlike Elsa who successfully builds the self-awareness and conscious recognition of herself through marriage, Lucy suffers from the guilty conscious to have an affair with John and gradually develops Freudian neurosis.

LUCY

Only my morbidness. I've been accused of so many rotten things I never did that I suppose I'm hipped on the subject.

Act Two

Act Three focuses on the controversial conflict that results from the dual nature of archetype postulated by Carl Jung.<sup>15</sup> Three types of transitional evolutions are observed in this act. The first transition occurs from the conflict that arises from difference in emotional feelings of John and Loving which triggers the gradual split of the character into two separate characters.

John's Freudian conscious is unable to overcome his personal unconscious and tries to harmonize the conflict between his conscious and collective unconscious, as conceptualized by Jung. This transition from Freudian approach to Jungian psychoanalysis is the second transition.

The third transition can be found in the life cycle of John Loving. In his philosophical journey to seek "the multifaceted truth" (philosophy), his intellectual research shifts from West to East, then to Greek philosophies, but returns back to the western religion, which reflects the

---

15 Carl G. Jung, *The Collected Works of C. G. Jung, Vol. V, Symbols of Transformation*, ed. by Herbert Read et al. (New York: Princeton University Press, 1956), p. 438

process of a person who develops the symptom of “multiple personalities”. In other words, John Loving has won the love of a woman and successfully got married but eventually the love turns into hatred as the consequence of his deeds. As John describes in his Nobel, the sudden death of his parents in spite of his prayer to god provokes his hatred towards god and as a result, he discards his religious faith but born as a Catholic, he is not able to cast off his creed completely. This is the scene where his other self, Loving accuses John regarding his faith. The scene represents John’s inner transition from Freudian self-controversy to Jungian dual nature type of conflict.

JOHN

Well, as you can imagine, for a long while after their deaths, he went through a terrific inner conflict. He was seized by fits of terror, in which he felt he really had given his soul to some evil power. He would feel a tortured longing to pray and beg for forgiveness. It seemed to him that he had forsworn all love forever—and was cursed. At these times he wanted only to die. Once he even took his father’s revolver—

Act Three Scene One

LOVING

But he was afraid to face death. He was still too religious-minded, you see, to accept the one beautiful, comforting truth of life: that death is final release, the warm, dark peace of annihilation.

Act Three Scene One

John’s confession reveals that he was trapped with death at the height of his rationalism during his journey of intellectual pursuit with respect to the love and death of a human being.

JOHN

And in after years, even at the height of his rationalism, he never could explain away a horror of death—and a strange fascination it had for him. And coupled with this was a dread of life—as if he constantly

(94)

sensed a malignant Spirit hiding behind life, waiting to catch men at its mercy, in their hour of secure happiness—Something that hated life!—Something that laughed with mocking scorn!

Act Three Scene One

LOVING

... And he carried his credulity into the next period of his life, where he believed in one social or philosophical Ism after another, always on the trail of Truth! He was never courageous enough to face what he really knew was true, that there is no truth for men, that human life is unimportant and meaningless. No. He was always grasping at some absurd new faith to find an excuse for going on!

Act Three Scene One

Next Loving's lines show that he cannot adjust himself, despite of his efforts in resolving his inner conflict to free himself, due to his schizophrenic split of personality (Jungian character split) where he seeks love on one hand and despise, on the other.

LOVING

That is, he saw clearly that this situation was the climax of a long death struggle between his wife and him. The woman with him counted only as a means. He saw that underneath all his hypocritical pretenses he really hated love. He wanted to deliver himself from its power and be free again. He wanted to kill it!

Act Three Scene One

The following conversation of John and Loving also shows this where Loving insists the most appropriate epilogue would be the death of his wife to make the main character finally come to a rational conclusion.

LOVING

Not while the wife is alive.

JOHN

He never tells her.

LOVING

She becomes seriously ill.

ELSA

Oh.

LOVING

Flu, which turns into pneumonia. And she dies.

ELSA

Dies?

LOVING

Yes. I need her death for my end. (*then in a sinister, jeering tone*) That is, to make my romantic hero come finally to a rational conclusion about his life!

Act Three Scene One

Act Three Scene Two below is the scene where the Freudian approach to overcome the inner conflict and the Jungian method of self-adjustment process to solve the controversial confrontation of dual nature that resides in the main character are no longer possible.

JOHN

Freedom demands initiative, courage, the need to decide what life must mean to oneself. To them, that is terror. They explain away their spiritual cowardice by whining that the time for individualism is past, when it is their courage to possess their own souls which is dead—and stinking! No, they don't want to be free. Slavery means security—of a kind, the only kind they have courage for. It means they need not think. They have only to obey orders from owners who are, in turn, their slaves!

Act Three Scene Two

The main character continues to have the ambivalence split, or the division of archetypal dual nature that exists in his psyche and is not able

to conclude the ending of his novel. The root cause of this split is triggered from John who tries to accept the god of love and Loving who denies the god of love and faith. The symptom aggravates as the story reaches the climax.

**II-iii. Nietzschean Perspectivism in *Days Without End***

The split of John and Loving is quite distinct in Act Four Scene One and they start to unveil the contradictions against each other. Loving emerges as Mephistophelean evil.

LOVING

Nothing can save her.

JOHN

No!

LOVING

Her end in your story is coming true. It was a cunning method of murder!

Act Four Scene One

Loving spits out, “There is no god” and denies god. This incidence further accelerates the character split and the disjunction of his two selves becomes evident and discernible. The conversation takes place in front of his wife who is suffering from her illness.

FATHER BAIRD

It is the crisis. Human science has done all it can to save her. Her life is in the hands of God now.

LOVING

There is no God!

FATHER BAIRD

Do you dare say that—now!

JOHN

No—I—I don't know what I'm saying—It isn't I—

FATHER BAIRD

No. I know you couldn't blaspheme at such a time—not your true self.

LOVING

It is my true self—my only self! And I see through your stupid trick—  
to use the fear of death to—

Act Four Scene One

Next lines signify the complete separation of the character where John expresses his suicidal urge as “I'll kill myself”.

JOHN

A fate in my story—the will of God! Something—(*He shudders.*)

LOVING

She will soon be dead.

JOHN

No!

LOVING

What will you do then? Love will be lost to you forever. You will be alone again. There will remain only the anguish of endless memories, endless regrets—a torturing remorse for murdered happiness!

JOHN

I know! For God's sake, don't make me think—

LOVING

Do you think you can choose your stupid end in your story now, when you have to live it?—on to Hercules? But if you love her, how can you desire to go on—with all that was Elsa rotting in her grave behind you!

(98)

JOHN

No! I can't! I'll kill myself!

Act Four Scene One

As seen in the above dialogue, John's attitude towards Elsa who plays the role of sister mother resembles the behavioral pattern shown by Ruben after he kills Ada in *Dynamo*. In Scene Two of Act Four, the change in Loving can be observed from denial of god to repudiation of love.

LOVING

You fool! There is nothing here but hatred!

JOHN

No! There was love! The Cross!

LOVING

The symbol of hate and derision!

JOHN

No! Of love! Mercy! Forgive!

Act Four Scene Two

However, John's confession in the next lines reveals his pain and agony suffering from the inner conflict: the confrontation with Christ at one end and seeking Christ for help at the other.

JOHN

No! O Son of Man, I am Thou and Thou art I! Why hast Thou forsaken me? O Brother Who lived and loved and suffered and died with us, Who knoweth the tortured hearts of men, canst Thou not forgive—now—when I surrender all to Thee—when I have forgiven Thee—the love that Thou once took from me!

Act Four Scene Two

When the conflict reaches the peak calling for a denouement or



resolution, Loving accepts the defeat in the next lines with a feeble voice: “Thou hast conquered...the damned soul—of John Loving!” With these last words, he is down to the ground facing up, which signifies his death and transfusion of Loving into John takes place, the integration of two characters to form one personality.

JOHN

No! I bless! I love!

LOVING

No!

JOHN

Yes! I see now! At last I see! I have always loved! O Lord of Love, forgive Thy poor blind fool!

LOVING

No!

JOHN

Thou art the Way—the Truth—the Resurrection and the Life, and he that believeth in Thy Love, his love shall never die!

LOVING

Thou hast conquered, Lord. Thou art—the End. Forgive—the damned soul—of John Loving!

Act Four Scene Two

### **Conclusion**

I have examined Act One through Act Four and analyzed the play from Freudian, Jungian and Nietzschean perspectives. The findings of these studies had lead me to identify, distinctively, “*Days Without End*” as the chronicle of O’Neill’s philosophical history. However, it is not just the biographical work that elaborates the chain of intellectual development of the author since his younger days, as explained by words in Act One. O’Neill, in his efforts of self-realization through his life cycle, tried to

construct his spiritual identity in pursuit of establishing his subjectivity through his philosophical journey using the play. In conceptualizing his own self, he indulged himself in various religions and philosophies starting from Catholicism to atheism, socialism, anarchism and finally to Nietzschean philosophy of life.

Eugene O'Neill's journey in pursuit of the answer did not stop with western philosophies and concepts. His search extended to the esoterics of the East including various Asian philosophies and religions such as Confucianism and Taoism (Lao Tse) to Buddhism, although he was not able to abyss the depth of these thoughts. He, then, turned to the Greek philosophies, returning to the rationalism of the West but without success. Finally, he recovers his faith in his native beliefs Christianity, the religion of love on the surface. The process of these intellectual and spiritual developments in *Days* is very similar to the role of Nietzschean philosophy in *The Great God Brown*. Nietzsche viewed Christianity as instinctive, resentful and "pity". Christian moral values (the morals of "good vs evil") are therefore life-denying and otherworldly. Christian way of better life is a lie. In this sense, the philosophy of Nietzsche can be best described as anti-morality, anti-Christ and nihilistic, as pure and artistic, as represented by "Dionysus."

Nietzsche, however, argues that Christianity and artist are both the imitator and that Dionysus is the god of art, which signifies that Dionysus is mendacious. He resolves this controversial conceptualism by defining Dionysus extensively as an imitation or transfiguration (Dionysus that generates the creation) in contrast to Apollo (embodiment of Dionysus in the real world) and explained the conflict and fusion of the opposing poles.<sup>16</sup>

In Nietzschean term, the ultimate reality is "apeiron" and "peras" is a virtual image. To him, Apollo is peras and Dionysus, apeiron. In other words, at conceptual level, Christianity or Christian philosophy and Dionysus exist in confrontation but eventually merge as one embodiment (higher level of understanding).<sup>17</sup> Eugene O'Neill injected the concept

---

16 Georg Picht, *Nietzsche*, (Klett-Cotta, 1988) p. 184 邦訳 青木隆嘉『ニーチェ』. 法政大学出版社, 1991年, p. 208

17 *Ibid.*, p.256 邦訳 青木隆嘉, p. 293

into the plot of the play using the John Loving who resembles Dion Anthony in *The Great God Brown* where the name, Dion, represents Dionysus and Anthony, St. Anthony. The name signifies the refutation of Christianity on one end and dependency on the belief on the other end.

In *Days*, John, the main character, who criticizes but relies on Christian faith at the depth of his heart is denied by Loving. The consequence is the bifurcation of the character. Eventually, the two separated characters are amalgamated at the end. In this respect, the play is facing in the same direction as *The Great God Brown*.

We must not, however, forget the influence of *Dynamo* on *Days*. In other words, the transitional process of the character's spiritual travail from Christianity (western philosophy) to the primitive beliefs of the east and to the multi-deity religion in *Dynamo* is inherited by *Days* as the legacy.

These plays all reflect the Freudian, Jungian and Nietzschean concepts from the viewpoint of philosophical development of the plot which mend the story into the structure of complexity.

In *Dynamo*, "Puritan god", "Electricity god", "Dynamo", and "the real god" appear in chronological order based on the character's experience. The story progresses by denying each god to evolve a new god. At the ending of the story, Ruben shoots his lovers Ada, and commits suicide in redemption after death, thereby, recovers his lost faith in the real god. In *Days*, however, John and Loving merge and evolve as John Loving which implies the return to Catholic faith on the surface. Is this what the author intended? As evident in the play, he does not commit suicide nor does he suffer from some kind of fatal disease. He tried to feel love and god in him. The awareness of the character that love and god resides in him enabled him to connect his super conscious (eternity) with his everyday life (fragmentation of life, representing discontinuity). Considering the past experimental plays, We can assume that Eugene O'Neill tried to express that an eternal life is manifested in a daily life as the evidence of existence of fragmentational life through the interaction or correlation of momentary life and eternal life.

In the initial draft, the main character commits suicide, but after rewriting for eight times, O'Neill decided to give him a life by merging the split characters into one. His talent acquired from the past experi-

mental plays lead him to dramatize the eternity of life by showing the fragments of daily life which is not just a part of the everlasting life but perpetuality of a life exists in each every moment. With the split and merge of the character, he tried to reveal that life and death is just one cycle. Merging represents the rebirth and the cycle continues to flow endlessly.

---

All the quotes (lines) used in this thesis are cited from *Days Without End* compiled in O'Neill: Complete Plays 1932–1943 (The Library of America, 1988)

*Days Without End*  
—Mortality and Immortality of Life Cycle—

Kumi Ohno

Eugene O'Neill's *Days Without End* is the chronicle of O'Neill's philosophical journey. This is the argument I would like to prove in this thesis by examining Act One through Act Four of the play, analyzing from Freudian, Jungian and Nietzschean perspectives. In the play, the main character succeeds in finding the religious significance of the purpose of life, quite different from other O'Neill's plays.

The influence of *Dynamo* on *Days Without End* is evident from this philosophical journey of the main character. In *Dynamo*, the character kills his lover and commits suicide but in *Days Without End*, the fusion of John and Loving enables him to connect to his super conscious (eternity), signifying that the eternity of life is embodied in the daily life as the fragments. In other words, the author travels the journey of philosophical concepts in the first play and finds the answer in *Days Without End*, the last play of his trilogy.