

EVIL IN FAIRY TALES ACROSS CULTURES:
A STUDY OF TURKISH AND BRITISH FAIRY TALES
FROM A PSYCHOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

GÜL BÜYÜ

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LITERATURE

JUNE 2013

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Meliha Altunışık
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy.

Prof. Dr. Gölge Seferoğlu
Head of Department
Foreign Language Education

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully
adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Assist. Prof. Dr. Margaret J-M Sönmez
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members:

Prof. Dr. Ayten Coşkunoğlu Bear (METU,FLE) _____

Assist. Prof.Dr. Margaret J-M Sönmez (METU, FLE) _____

Prof. Dr. Meral Çileli (METU, FLE) _____

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Huriye Reis (HACETTEPE, ELL) _____

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Aytül Özüm (HACETTEPE, ELL) _____

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last name: Gül Büyü

Signature :

ABSTRACT

**EVIL IN FAIRY TALES ACROSS CULTURES:
A STUDY OF TURKISH AND BRITISH FAIRY TALES FROM
A PSYCHOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE**

Büyü, Gül

Ph.D., Department of English Literature

Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Margaret J-M Sönmez

June 2013, 274 pages

The thesis analyses the concept of evil in Turkish and British fairy/folk tales from Melanie Klein and C. Fred Alford's psychoanalytical point of view. The study concentrates on Naki Tezel and Joseph Jacobs's collections of fairy/folk tales and examines twenty-nine Turkish and thirty-nine British tales. The thesis argues that evil in these fairy tales results from the feeling of envy, jealousy, greed, dread or the struggle for power and superiority. In these selected tales, evil is observed in the form of theft, violence, torture, transformation or even murder. The research shows that to have a superior position and power, the characters enter into endless struggles with others, which lead them to commit evil. As Klein and Alford claim, these tales may play an important role in the development of children as they may encourage children to get rid of their problems. Therefore, the thesis also argues that by revealing the motives of evildoers, children may learn to cope with their latent fears and anxieties and re-establish their integral world after reading or listening to these tales.

Key Words: fairy/folk tale, evil, educational role, Melanie Klein, Fred Alford

ÖZ

FARKLI KÜLTÜRLERE AİT MASALLARDA KÖTÜLÜK: TÜRK VE BRİTANYA MASALLARININ PSİKOLOJİK AÇIDAN İNCELENMESİ

Büyü, Gül

Doktora, İngiliz Edebiyatı Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Margaret J-M Sönmez

Haziran 2013, 274 sayfa

Bu tez, Türk ve İngiliz masallarında yer alan kötülük kavramını Melanie Klein ve C. Fred Alford'un psikanalitik yaklaşımı açısından incelemektedir. Çalışma, Naki Tezel ve Joseph Jacobs'un masal derlemelerine odaklanmakta ve yirmi dokuz Türk, otuz dokuz Britanya masalı incelemektedir. Tez, seçilen masalarda, kötülüğün kendini hasetlik, kıskançlık, açgözlülük, kaygı veya üstünlük ve güç savaşı olarak gösterdiğini tartışmaktadır. Kötülüğün bu masalarda, hırsızlık, şiddet, işkence, başka bir varlığa dönüştürme ve hatta cinayet şeklini aldığı gözlemlenmektedir. Bu araştırma, karakterlerin üstün bir pozisyon ve güç elde etmek amacıyla başkaları ile sona ermeyen bir çatışma döngüsüne girdiğini ve bu çatışmanın onları kötülük yapmaya sürüklediğini göstermektedir. Klein ve Alford'un iddia ettiği gibi, masallar çocukların problemlerinden uzaklaşmalarını sağlayarak gelişimlerinde önemli bir rol oynar. Bu yüzden, bu tez aynı zamanda, kötü karakterlerin dürtülerini ortaya çıkararak, masalları okuyan ya da dinleyen çocukların bastırılmış oldukları korku ve endişeleri ile baş edebileceklerini ve kendi iç dünyalarını yeniden kurabileceklerini tartışmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: masal, kötülük, eğitici rol, Melanie Klein, Fred Alford

To My Inspiration, My Beloved Husband ...

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor Assist. Prof. Dr. Margaret J-M Sönmez for her guidance and continuous encouragement. She supported me throughout my thesis with her patience and knowledge while allowing me to develop my own ideas in my own way. Her friendship helped me at my difficult and desperate times.

I am deeply grateful to Prof. Dr. Ayten Coşkunoğlu Bear for her invaluable suggestions and comments. She always believed in me and encouraged me to finish this thesis. Her love, motivation and enthusiasm were really important for me to get over difficult times. I owe her a great deal as without her I could not have made it here.

I would also like to thank Assoc. Prof. Dr. Huriye Reis for her constructive and inspiring criticism. She read the draft of the thesis meticulously even when she was extremely busy. Her advice and insight were invaluable to me throughout my studies.

My sincere thanks go to the members of my doctoral jury, Prof. Dr. Meral Çileli and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Aytül Özüm for their valuable contribution and suggestions.

I am also indebted to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Joshua Bear for his interest and sincere support to my thesis with the articles and news he sent me throughout my research.

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my family, Tanesen and Büyü, for always believing in me, for their unconditional support, love and motivation.

Above all, the person who deserves great acknowledgement, thanks and gratitude is my dearest husband Levent. I would like to thank him for his unconditional love, support and encouragement. He endured many personal sacrifices throughout my doctoral education. He always comforted me even at my sleepless nights with his presence, patience and continuous motivation during this tough journey.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM.....	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
ÖZ.....	v
DEDICATION	vi
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	viii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
i.i Methodology	4
i.ii The Origin and Definition of the Fairy/Folk Tale	11
i.iii The Differences Between the Fairy Tale and Other Genres	16
i.iv Approaches to Fairy/Folk Tales	19
i.v The Development of the English Fairy/Folk Tale	25
i.vi The Development of the Turkish Fairy/Folk Tale	30
II.THEORETICAL BACKGROUND	36
ii.i The Theological and Philosophical “Problem of Evil”	38
ii.i.i Evil in the Islamic Tradition	41
ii.i.i.i The Mutezilites	42
ii.i.i.ii The Asharies	43
ii.i.i.iii Ghazali.....	44
ii.i.i.iv The Koran	46
ii.i.ii Evil in Christian and Western Thought	48
ii.i.ii.i St. Augustine	50
ii.i.ii.ii St. Thomas Aquinas	54
ii.i.ii.iii Gottfried Leibniz	56
ii.i.ii.iv The Lisbon Earthquake & The Eighteenth Century	58
ii.i.ii.v J. L. Mackie & Alvin Plantinga	63
ii.ii The Psychological “Problem of Evil”	70

ii.ii.i Carl Jung & Philip Zimbardo	70
ii.ii.ii Melanie Klein	71
ii.ii.iii C. Fred Alford	84
III. A KLEINIAN ANALYSIS OF EVIL IN THE TURKISH AND BRITISH TALES	94
iii.i Envy	96
iii.ii Jealousy	114
iii.iii Greed	119
IV. AN ALFORDIAN ANALYSIS OF EVIL IN THE TURKISH AND BRITISH TALES	126
V. CONCLUSION	177
REFERENCES	186
APPENDICES	
A. SUMMARIES OF THE TURKISH FAIRY/FOLK TALES DISCUSSED IN THE THESIS	198
B. SUMMARIES OF THE BRITISH FAIRY/FOLK TALES DISCUSSED IN THE THESIS	214
C. THE GRIMMS' AND PERRAULT'S FAIRY TALES REFERRED IN THE THESIS	233
D. CURRICULUM VITAE	258
E. TURKISH SUMMARY	259
F. TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU	275

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Story-telling is a universal human activity. Every society in world history at any period of time has told itself tales, albeit for different reasons ranging from instruction to religious explication and from entertainment to the recording of their history (Ashliman 1). Fairy tales¹ were born from this human tendency and they continue to be told and written, adapted for film, theatre, TV, jokes and even Hollywood cartoons, drawing the attention of not only children but also adults. Human beings have always been attracted to fairy/folk tales inasmuch as they are stories expressing hope and a happy end, fulfilling the impossible wishes of the real world (Zipes, *Why Fairy* 27). Fairy/folk tales are products of fantasy that create a new world, taking the individual from the monotony of reality to the domain of dreams and wishes, at the same time their fantasy elements provide the possibility of escaping fears, frustration, poverty and humiliation. They introduce us to worlds of talking animals, supernatural characters, handsome kings and beautiful queens, golden palaces with marvellous gardens, fantastic characters and many other events that fascinate the readers or listeners, impelling them to absorb everything without question. They are stories that provide wish-fulfilment and hope at the end (Ashliman 1).

What is of paramount importance about fairy/folk tales is that they are thought to play a special role in the upbringing of children. Many scholars and critics draw attention to the didactic side of these tales. Ali Fuat Bilkan, a Turkish folklore

¹ The Turkish word *masal* does not completely refer to the word “fairy tale” in English. In Turkish folk literature, there are two kinds of *masal*; *olağüstü masallar* and *gerçekçi masallar*. The first one is longer and more complicated than the second one and is mostly about supernatural characters. The latter is about realistic characters such as the Padishah, Keloğlan or Köse (Boratav, *100 Soruda* 81-83). Although these two types have slightly different names in Turkish, in English there is no such difference and they are all called fairy tale. Thus, to avoid confusion for the Turkish reader, the words fairy and folk tale will be used together throughout the thesis.

scholar², elucidates the significance of fairy/folk tales for children in terms of their representation of good and evil (32). He asserts that children's lives can be affected by hearing repeatedly of the victory of the good in its struggle against the wicked, in that this can lead children to adopt the role of the good in their lives. Furthermore, Bilkan is convinced that religious and national values are presented to children in such tales, and these play an essential role in their education (32). Ahmet Efe, another Turkish folklore scholar, also emphasises the educational role of fairy/folk tales, urging that tales in which the wicked are punished and the good are rewarded "must be used" in the upbringing of children (129). Similarly, Eflatun Cem Güney, a Turkish folklore scholar and collector, highlights the didactic side of fairy/folk tales and acknowledges the necessity of these tales in school curricula for the education of children (20-21). In his works, Pertev Naili Boratav, one of the most important Turkish folklore scholars, emphasises the educational side of fairy/folk tales and says that these tales "[ö]ğretir, eğitir ve özellikle tanıklık eder, bilgi verir"³ (*Folklor* 276). Thus, it can be observed that the educational side of these tales have been emphasised by most of the folklore scholars who, however, have put forth different reasons. Involving supernatural characters, a simple language, a clear style, and embodying a didactic message with rewards for the good and punishments for the wicked, fairy/folk tales charm almost every child in all cultures.

The child, or an ordinary reader, absorbed in the magical world of the tale, does not question the events of this world (Yearsley 2). However, as Maria Tatar claims, "the overvaluation of fairy/folk tales promotes a suspension of critical faculties and prevents us from taking a good, hard look at [their] stories" which clearly play a great role in shaping the values, expectations and attitudes of the human being, starting from his/her childhood (*The Classic Fairy* xii). Regarding the tales as simple works for children hinders a critical questioning of the underlying issues in the tales and makes fairy/folk tales look like a source of great truth (*ibid.*).

In the nineteenth century, such writers as the Grimm Brothers in Germany and Charles Dickens in England regarded fairy/folk tales as innocent texts- as texts which should not present any violent or evil acts. In fact, the Grimms emphasised the purity of the fairy world, which they claimed was not corrupted by the adverse

² Bilkan is at the same time the chairman of International Language Teaching Institute and Yunus Emre Institute.

³ "[t]each, train, and in particular witness and give information"

effects of civilisation (Tatar, *The Classic Fairy* xi). As regards to Dickens, he celebrated the “simplicity”, “purity” and “innocent extravagance” of fairy/folk tales (xi). However, the Grimm Brothers’ assessment of the tales as “innocent” was itself not so innocent, because they spent much of their time editing and cleansing the tales they collected in order to adapt them to the world of children, because they wanted to use the tales to socialise children. This editing of most of the tales was carried out according to their Western patriarchal viewpoint, which can today be conceived as prejudiced (Tatar, *The Classic Fairy* xii), since they presented beautiful women as passive and docile, while presenting handsome men as strong and powerful.

Therefore, present critical studies mostly focus on the one-sided viewpoints of the earlier collectors and writers of fairy/folk tales in order to reveal the inequalities or contradictions within them. In fact, the tales have been the focus of interest in diverse disciplines ranging from psychology, linguistics, politics and religion to ethics and cultural theory (Tatar, *The Classic Fairy* xii). Fairy and folk tales today have been deconstructed by various critical schools with the aim of investigating the extent of the “innocence” these tales were once claimed to have. They have been closely analysed to disclose any inequality, violence, murder, cannibalism or incest in these stories for children by such critics as Maria Tatar, Marina Warner or Jack Zipes.

The aim of this thesis is to contribute to contemporary critical studies of Turkish and British folk/fairy tales, analysing the concept of evil in these tales through Melanie Klein’s and Fred Alford’s psychoanalytical points of view. This study aims to use Klein’s and Alford’s theories on evil and child development in selected British and Turkish fairy/folk tales in order to explain evil in these tales and to show the theurapatic effect of these tales in child development as Klein and Alford suggested (Klein, “The Development” 67; Alford, *What* 112). The thesis examines the works of Naki Tezel from Turkish and Joseph Jacobs from British folklore. Both Tezel and Jacobs claim in their introductions to their collections that they aimed to teach children good and evil through the tales they presented. Jacobs states that children will listen to these tales and that his “book is intended for the little ones” (viii); Tezel draws attention to the educational side of fairy/folk tales saying:

Çocuk eğitiminde [...] masalın önemli rolünü kabul etmemek mümkün değildir. Küçük çocukların dikkatini, ilgisini yalnız masallar çektiği için, folklor malzemesi olarak derlenen masallardan, açık bir anlatım, basit ve kısa cümlelerle yazılmış, eğitici ve “kıssalı” hikayeler yazmak, kötü unsurları atıp, çocuk hayalini işletecek iyi unsurlarla güzel masallar hazırlamak, çocuk edebiyatına büyük hizmet olur⁴.

(18)

Therefore, as mentioned above, the educational role of folk/fairy tales cannot be ignored as they have been used for this purpose for centuries. While some scholars claim that these tales should be used for religious education, some others support the view that they should be used to teach children good and evil, or right and wrong. This thesis aims to show that folk/fairy tales can be used for the education of children in their development in that children can become aware of their unconscious fears of loss or lack and their anxieties as Klein and Alford believed. Thus, it is argued that these tales may help children project their problems onto fictional others and not carry the burden themselves.

This study shows that a Kleinian and an Alfordian psychoanalytical perspective presents evil in the tales as emerging from either feelings of envy, greed and jealousy, or the struggle of characters to survive, both of which are caused by the death instinct. The needs to adopt a superior position, and to prevent any persecutory harm lead characters to enter an endless struggle with others and perform evil deeds. In the tales, all characters, even the “good” ones, enter this never-ending cycle, trying to gain superiority over another person and often harming others in the process. In other words, the conflict between good and evil no longer applies in these tales.

i.i Methodology:

The thesis aims to pursue a thematic analysis of the British and Turkish tales to examine how the concept of evil is presented and which roles these tales may play in child development. Accordingly, it is hypothesized that fairy/folk tales may help children overcome certain anxieties and evil tendencies by representing evil. In the

⁴ In the education of children [...] it is not possible to deny the important role of the fairy tale. As only fairy tales draw the attention and interest of children, it would be a great service for children’s literature to write didactic stories with simple, short sentences and in a clear narration based on the fairy tales compiled as products of folklore, and to produce a collection of fairy tales eliminating evil and promoting goodness that would nourish the child’s imagination.

analysis of the concept of evil in selected fairy/folk tales from Turkey and Britain, Melanie Klein's and Fred Alford's psychoanalytical interpretations are used. The texts are analysed both in terms of manifest content- the surface meaning- and latent content to demonstrate the underlying meaning. It is of primary importance to analyse the latent content of the tales to show the theme of evil according to the theories of Melanie Klein and Fred Alford, and to tie this in with the existence of evil tendencies in children as described by Klein (Klein, "Criminal Tendencies" 185, "On Criminality" 280).

Before turning to the latent content, however, the materials are chosen according to the manifest themes of evil they are dealing with and categorised according to the theories of Melanie Klein and Fred Alford; thus, a structural categorisation is followed as a way of organising the materials.

The thesis first aimed to make a comparative study of evil in Turkish and British fairy/folk tales and it was discovered that throughout the study more similarities than differences were observed in both of the collections, in terms of the presentation of evil and the motives of the evildoer. It was also observed that these fairy/folk tales represent universal psychological problems and deal with similar anxieties, regardless of culture.

The most important reason why the thesis concentrates on the collection of Joseph Jacobs is the fact that he included British fairy/folk tales in his collection. According to various sources, until the nineteenth century there was a lack of fairy/folk tales which were of British origin as there had been no attempt to collect and print British tales (Yearsley 23-27). Instead, at the time French and German tales were popular in Britain, particularly those of the Grimm Brothers and Charles Perrault. Collectors such as Andrew Lang compiled mostly French and German fairy/folk tales as he did in his *Blue Fairy Book* (1889), which includes "Cinderella", "Little Red Riding Hood" and "The Sleeping Beauty". Lang's collection cannot be considered under the title of British fairy/folk tales as he directly adopted Perrault's and the Grimms' tales. On the other hand, Joseph Jacobs, as he emphasises in his "Notes and References for English Fairy Tales", made the first attempt to collect British tales from different regions of Britain, purposefully excluding French and German tales, which were familiar to most of the readers at the time (289). This makes Jacobs' collection more suitable for the aim of the thesis which is to compare

the Turkish tales with British ones rather than with adaptations of French and German tales.

As for Turkish tales, there are several original collections in Turkish literature, the earliest collection belonging to K.D. (1912), whose full name and gender are not known. However, the study focuses on the collection of Naki Tezel, which outnumbers the previous collections with a total of fifty-four tales. Focusing on a greater number of tales helps to prevent any distortions in the data and to enable a more accurate analysis of the concept of evil in these two cultures. Pertev Naili Boratav has only twenty-two tales in *Zaman Zaman İçinde* (1959) and forty-eight tales along with some anecdotes in his famous collection *Az Gittik Uz Gittik* (1969). While some of these tales were collected by Boratav, including the ones he heard from his mother, others were compiled by his students (Sakaoğlu, *Masal* 43). Another important collector and scholar Saim Sakaoğlu has sixty-four tales in his notable collection *Gümüşhane Masalları*; however, this collection is restricted to the tales of a single city in Turkey, Gümüşhane, excluding all other regions. Tezel; on the other hand, like Jacobs, collected his tales from different regions of the country without making any changes in language and plot, which is especially significant for fairy/folk tale studies (Sakaoğlu, *Masal* 42).

Furthermore, as noted above, both collectors, Jacobs and Tezel, emphasise the didactic side of their tales, which plays an essential role for the aim of this thesis as this thesis discusses the educational nature of fairy/folk tales in terms of Melanie Klein's and Fred Alford's theories of child development.

Regarding the concept of evil, psychoanalytical theories of the nature of evil are studied and the tales are analysed accordingly. As all other researchers in the field of "evil studies" have noted (Peterson, *God and Evil* 5-6; Paulson 1-2; Kelly 2), theological views of evil are of paramount importance because for many centuries evil was considered as a theological problem. Besides, because fairy/folk tales have their roots in primitive cultures where faith in gods or one God was an important shared belief in communities, it was inevitable for people to reflect, directly or indirectly, some aspects of their faith and rituals in these tales. Thus, it is important to understand the theological ideas that may underlie the presentation of evil in fairy/folk tales.

In the modern period, the concept of evil has especially attracted psychoanalysts such as Carl Jung, Melanie Klein and their followers; therefore, the thesis explains psychoanalytical theories of evil and then analyses the motives and actions of the fairy/folk tale characters with regard to the psychoanalytical concept of evil. Melanie Klein and C. Fred Alford, who give particular attention to the topic of evil tendencies and to the ways of coping with these tendencies through art, are two psychoanalysts whose theories of evil this study uses in its examination of Tezel's and Jacobs' fairy/folk tales.

As it is born out of primitive societies, folklore is about primal wishes and fears just like the mind of the child in his/her early development (Kidd 126). Freud claims that "poets and philosophers before me discovered the unconscious. What I discovered was the scientific method by which the unconscious can be studied" (qtd. in Trilling 34). Therefore, it is impossible to consider psychoanalysis apart from literature, since by offering ways to transform destructive feelings into positive ones through the assistance of these tales, psychoanalysis is a way of revealing all these desires, anxieties and fears to allow a healthy development for the reader.

This thesis aims to show how Klein's psychoanalytical theories of child development and aggression, and Alford's thesis about the concept of evil can be used to explain "evil" in the collections of tales under investigation, and postulates that these fairy/folk tales may relieve children from their anxieties and may even help them cope with destructive and evil tendencies through the expression of evil. Evil in these tales may manifest itself in the forms of envy, jealousy, greed or the struggle for power just like in the repressed anxieties of the infant towards his/her primal objects (the mother's breast/mother or the father's penis/father). After reading or listening to these tales, the child may realise his/her hatred, and love (Eros) can grow stronger in his/her relationships with the external world than can his/her death instinct (Thanatos).

Melanie Klein's contribution to child psychology and her play technique along with her ideas on fairy/folk tales in the development of mental health have been of great importance in choosing to use her theories in this thesis. It was Klein's concern for children and their play that drew scientific attention to children's symbolic activity, and the child him/herself became an object of inquiry in psychoanalysis. Klein gave her first paper on child analysis in Berlin in 1921 at the

Berlin Psychoanalytic Society (Kidd 120). She likened the play technique to the free associations of adults and made important advancements in the understanding of narrative and child development. In her works she emphasises symbolisation and its powerful effect on children in bringing relief from intense anxieties and fears (“The Importance of Symbol” 220). In her article titled “The Early Development of Conscience in the Child” (1933), one can notice Klein’s interest in fairy/folk tales and folklore. For Klein, the child’s interest in fairy/folk tales and characters demonstrates an expression of a defence mechanism against infantile anxieties and aggressions. Similar to Bruno Bettelheim, an American psychoanalyst, there is an implication in Klein’s work that fairy/folk tales act therapeutically, as she was convinced that the child felt relief from his/her anxieties after reading or listening to these tales (Kidd 124). In her view, then, fairy/folk tales do not only present child anxiety and fear but can also deal with such problems by helping them project their anxieties onto fictional others.

Alford, who develops Melanie Klein’s theories of evil, brings a new perspective to the study of evil by mingling an existentialist viewpoint with psychology. Having not been studied for analyses of literature before, Alford’s claims about evil, the connection he builds between evildoing and positions of development along with the concept of dread are worth examining for this study. When we look closely at the motives of evildoers in fairy/folk tales, it can clearly be seen that most of the evil deeds result from dread, which is discussed in detail in Chapter II and IV. Alford is a strong present-day proponent of Melanie Klein’s views and he employs her theories of positions, anxiety and envy in his theories of evil. Similar to Klein, Alford also believes in the therapeutic effect of fairy/folk tales, particularly in depicting for the child the idea of dread, which, for Alford, enables him/her to know and locate dread and to prevent him/her from inflicting it on others through violence. The study provides an introduction to both Klein and Alford’s theories as they relate to evil, and explains the terms that are then used in the analyses of Tezel and Jacobs’ fairy/folk tales. The thesis, thus, analyses the fairy/folk tales according to the theories of these two psychoanalysts and tries to highlight what motives are presented by the tales as lying behind evil.

The thesis argues that envy, jealousy, greed and the struggle for power are the major motives behind evil deeds in the fairy/folk tales; thus, whatever the character’s

gender or role in society and family is, similar motives trigger the practice of evil. Synopses of the fairy/folk tales are provided in the Appendices for the reader who may not have heard of the tales before. The tales are analysed according to their order in the collections. Some tales, however, which have similar structure are analysed one after another regardless of their order in the collections. Along with the already numbered tales in the original collections, the fairy/folk tales in Chapters III and IV are numbered with their titles for the convenience of those who prefer to read the complete stories rather than their summaries.

While choosing the material, it has been essential to concentrate on the motives of the evil characters in the fairy/folk tales and so the tales which have nothing to do with themes of evil, envy, jealousy, greed or superiority have been excluded, along with the tales which are not fairy/folk tales according to the definition given in this introduction to the thesis. The tales containing themes of envy, jealousy, greed, superiority or evil have been selected, amounting to sixty-eight examples in these two collections. Twenty-nine Turkish tales and thirty-nine British fairy/folk tales have been included. The excluded tales comprise, from the Turkish collection: “Kırk Kardeş”, “Kara Kedi”, “Keçi Kız”, “Kırkıncı Oda”, “Bahtiyar’la Hoptiyar”, “Kırk Arap”, “Sihirli Yüzük”, “Altın Kozalaklı Gümüş Servi”, “Çifte Kanbur”, “Zanni Oğulları”, “Kırk Oğlan”, “Kaldı ile Geldi”, “Rüzgaroğlu”, “Fatma Nine”, “Akıllı Evlat”, “İbiş ile Memiş”, “Çoban Ali”, “Kırk Haramiler”, “Sihirli Çeşme”, “Keloğlan ile İhtiyar”, “Keloğlan Hindistan Yolunda”, “Keloğlan’ın Köseye Masalı”, “Tembel Keloğlan”, “Keloğlan Yedi Kat Yerin Altında” and “Keloğlan’ın Tokmağı⁵”; the English tales that have been excluded are: “How Jack Went to Seek His Fortune”, “Mr. Vinegar”, “The Story of Three Little Pigs”, “Jack and His Golden Snuff-Box”, “The Golden Arm”, “Children in the Wood”, “A Pottle O’Brains”, “Master of All Masters”, “The Golden Ball”, “The Three Feathers”, “Sir Gammer Vans”, “Tom Hickathrift”, “Mr. Miacca”, “Lazy Jack”, “My Own Self”, “The Hedley Kow”, “The Wee Bannock”, “The Pedlar of Swaffham”, “Scrapefoot”, “A Son of Adam”, “The Buried Moon”, “The Cauld Lad of Hilton”, “The Ass, the Table

⁵ “Forty Brothers”, “Black Cat”, “Goat Girl”, “Fortieth Room”, “Bahtiyar and Hoptiyar”, “Forty Arab”, “Magic Ring”, “Silver Cypress with Golden Cones”, “Double Hunchedback”, “Zanni’s Sons”, “Forty Boys”, “Kaldı and Geldi”, “Son of the Wind”, “Granny Fatma”, “Good Boy”, “İbiş and Memiş”, “Shepherd Ali”, “Forty Thieves”, “Magic Fountain”, “Keloğlan and the Old Man”, “Keloğlan on his Way to India”, “Keloğlan’s Tale to the Köse”, “Lazy Keloğlan”, “Keloğlan Seven Layers Under Ground” and “Keloğlan’s Stick”.

and the Stick”, “The Three Wishes”, “The Wise Men of Gotham”, “Princess of Canterbury” and “The King of Cats”. All of these tales have been excluded because they do not deal with the theme of evil. Besides, some of the British tales do not fit the definition of the fairy/folk tale given in the introduction of the thesis: “The Three Sillies”, “The Old Woman and Her Pig”, “Mouse and Mouser”, “Teeny-Tiny”, “Titty Mouse and Tatty Mouse”, “Henny-Penny”, “Johnny-Cake”, “The Strange Visitor”, “The Cat and the Mouse” and “The Wee Wee Monnie” are all cumulative tales, while “Lawkamercyme”, “News”, “Puddock, Mousies and Ratton”, “Old Mother Wiggle-Waggle” are either in dialogue or verse form. Furthermore, some stories such as “Childe Rowland”, “The King of England”, “Whittington and His Cat”, “Tom Hickathrift” and “King John and the Abbot of Canterbury” are not studied because they contain national elements and can be identified as legends or sagas. Similarly, as it is closer to the definition of myth rather than of fairy/folk tale, “The Magpie’s Nest” has also been excluded from this study.

The thesis has four chapters, and in the first chapter the study focuses on the origin and definition of the fairy/folk tale in order to clarify its difference from other similar genres such as the legend, saga, fable and myth. As the study covers British and Turkish fairy/folk tales, it also traces the historical development of the fairy/folk tale in these two cultures. After the introduction to the genre, Chapter II begins by laying out the theoretical dimensions of the concept of evil and looks at how this concept changed throughout history. The chapter also provides information about Melanie Klein’s and Fred Alford’s theories of evil.

Chapter III analyses the tales in question through a Kleinian approach to evil and focuses on evil in the tales from three perspectives: envy, jealousy and greed, and how these desires lead to evil and how they affect childhood development in terms of criminal and evil tendencies. Chapter IV discusses evil in the tales from an Alfordian perspective and argues that evil in the tales is the attempt of the individual to project his/her dread by harming the other in order to feel relieved, and after reading or listening to such tales the child will at some level recognise this dread and eventually try to cope with his/her worries or disappointments.

i.ii The Origin and the Definition of the Fairy/Folk⁶ Tale:

There are a number of theories regarding the origin of fairy tales, yet none of them have drawn a definite conclusion about their beginning. It is thought that today's fairy tale evolved by incorporating many motifs and signs from folklore and fusing them with a great many elements from other genres, particularly from the oral wonder tale which was called "Zaubermärchen" or the "conte merveilleux", and which existed in many diverse forms in Medieval Europe (Zipes, *The Oxford* xvi). In his book *Breaking the Magic Spell* (1979), Jack Zipes, a folklore scholar, explains the etymology of the word *Märchen* as stemming from the Old High German *Mâri*, Gothic *Mêrs* and Middle High German *Märe*, which meant "news" or "gossip". *Märchen* is the diminutive form of *Märe* and the term *Volksmärchen* (folktale) indicates that "the people were the carriers of the tales" (23). However, in the English language, the term *fairy tale* does not have the same meaning as the *Volksmärchen*; rather, it has a meaning similar to the French term *conte de fées* (*ibid.*). Nonetheless, the English term fairy tale is used to refer to both the oral folk tales and the fairy tales written in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (*ibid.*).

The fairy tale is a problematic genre as it cannot be completely separated from other oral narratives; therefore, it resists the definition as "an independent genre" (Zipes, *The Oxford* xv). The fairy tale is believed to have developed out of a wider genre of the oral folk tale, which was transmitted among both the illiterate and literate communities, "addressing the wishes and needs of its audience through mythic themes of heroism, imperilment and adventure" (Mikics 116). Stith Thompson, in his canonical work *The Folktale* (1978), states that there is no clear, distinct line dividing the written fairy tale from the oral folk tale. The reason why the exact definition of fairy tale cannot be given is related, according to Thompson, to the fact that in the English language itself there is little attempt to clarify the sharp distinctions between the fairy tale and the term folk tale, which has been seen to "loosely cover" any traditional oral narrative (21). Stories involving marvels were sometimes called folk tales, fairy tales, or wonder tales, the distinctions between them having never been made in other European languages. In French, we have the

⁶ Since the differences between the fairy and the folk tale will be explained, the words "fairy tale" and "folk tale" will be used separately in this section.

term *conte de fées*, in German *Märchen*, in Norwegian *eventyr*, in Swedish *saga* and in Russian *skazka*, and none of these signify the same thing; none of them have been used to correspond to the English terms the folk tale or fairy tale (*ibid.*).

A common belief among the folklorists of the nineteenth century and the early twentieth century was that the fairy tale was a part of an oral tradition lasting for thousands of years. Nonetheless, Albert Wesselski, in his book *Versuch einer Theorie des Märchens (Attempt at a Theory of the Fairy Tale, 1931)* discarded the thesis that the fairy tale developed out of the oral folk tale, asserting that the fairy tale was a genre belonging to individual writers who started it in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries (qtd. in Zipes, *Why Fairy* 46-47). Though Wesselski was right in his claim about the individual fairy tale writers, he ignored the fact that these writers were adopting certain motifs, characters and symbols from oral narratives, and that from time to time they were rewriting tales which were already known to the general public. So the classic fairy tale is a literary appropriation of the oral folk tale, which still embodies folkloric elements. Most of the writers have enriched their tales with recollections of oral tales (Tatar, *The Hard Facts* 32). As a transitional genre, it carries the traces of folkloric tradition although there were attempts to edit it for the reading public (Bacchilega 3).

As noted above, the line between the folk tale and the fairy tale is blurry and most present-day scholars, like Zipes, emphasise that what may separate them from each other is the period of time during which they were transmitted among the public (Zipes, *Why Fairy* 47). For Zipes, whereas the folk tale belongs to the oral narrative period, the fairy tale belongs to the written one, though the latter has still much in common with the former, having stemmed from it. So, originally, the fairy tale was an oral narrative form popular among common people to express their perceptions about “nature, social order, and [...] to satisfy their needs and wants” (Zipes, *Breaking* 6). Zipes claims that the oral folk tale transformed itself into literary fairy tales so as to conform to the needs of the communities along with the changes of time (*Why Fairy* xii).

As regards the origin of oral folk tales or oral wonder tales, it is difficult to mark an exact date as they seem to have been narrated since the beginning of humanity. The existence of the oral wonder tale is explained by critics through such evidence as “cave paintings, pottery, tombs, parchments, manuscripts and scrolls”

which narrate supernatural creatures and wondrous events (Zipes, *Why Fairy* 13). Some wonder tales were forgotten; perhaps others, of more significance in the lives of people, continued and were passed down to following generations with alterations according to changing conditions and values. Due to folkloric heritage and its oral circulation, there are no identifiable authors and no fixed titles. In the oral tradition, tales were circulating over thousands of years in diverse versions by different narrators with different styles and manners of narrating (Jones 3). There are various claims about the tellers of these stories; whereas some believe that women were the chief transmitters, others are convinced that people from all walks of life, such as merchants, slaves, kings, soldiers, woodcutters, innkeepers, nuns, knights, tailors and many others were contributors. All in all, everyone in society has, to a certain extent, acted as a tale-teller (Zipes, *Why Fairy* 54).

Most of the motifs, plots and characters along with the wonder in the tales can be traced back to collections from the Orient, particularly India and Egypt, as well as to Greek and Roman collections of tales, legends, myths and religious texts (Zipes, *Why Fairy* 46). One of the first examples is the fairy tale of Apuleius (c.125-c.180), “Cupid and Psyche”, a part of *The Golden Ass* that appeared in the second century A.D. It is marked by a high style indicating the writer’s good education and by references to literature, customs and religion (46).

Oral wonder tales were transmitted to Europe via Spain, Sicily and Greece through trade, migrations and the Crusades (Zipes, *Why Fairy* 46). The structural similarities between the literary fairy tale and the oral folk tale were particularly palpable in Europe in the early Medieval Period when the scribes decided to write them down, first in Latin and then in vernacular languages. Male scribes, mostly the clergy, organised them in scripts starting from the tenth century. The early writers of these tales were generally well-educated, drawing upon both oral and literary materials while writing their tales. These early tales were not intended for children, nor indeed, for most of the people in Medieval Europe as there were not many who could read (Zipes, *The Oxford* xx- xxi). From the twelfth century to the fifteenth century, the recording of more oral wonder tales continued developing the literary fairy tale (Zipes, *Fairy Tales* 3).

These writers also began forming the conventions, motifs, characters and plots, besides employing those of the oral wonder tale. It was inevitable for these

writers to make a great many changes so as to address a reading public which was largely composed of the clergy, the middle classes and the aristocracy. Although the peasantry seemed to be excluded from the development of the literary fairy tale, their values, life styles and beliefs were inserted into the tales from the point of view of the clergy (Zipes, *Why Fairy* 42-44; *When Dreams* 3).

The literary fairy tale flourished in France at the end of the seventeenth century with such writers as Charles Perrault, who particularly developed the genre for children, placing special interest in its educational aspects. He was followed by writers like Marie-Catherine d'Aulnoy, Gabrielle Suzan de Villeneuve, Marie-Jeanne Lhéritier and Jeanne-Marie Leprince de Beaumont (Zipes, *Fairy Tales* 15). The creativity and new literary trends in France in terms of literary activities made the fairy tale become accepted at courts, especially in theatrical forms. So, in the mid-seventeenth century, the popularity of the fairy tale was reinforced through theatrical adaptations of the genre, fairy tale recitations and games held at court, mostly by women. Among these was Madame d'Aulnoy, who was a leading figure in the French court, and who published her own collection of fairy tales between the years 1696-1698 (Zipes, *When Dreams* 12). In fact, the term fairy tale, *conte de fée*, emerged in 1697 in France with the title of Madame d'Aulnoy's fairy tale collection (Stein, "Folklore" 167).

One of the turning points for the development of the fairy tale was the translation of *One Thousand and One Nights*⁷ (1704-1717) in ten volumes by Antoine Galland who, while translating, also adapted it to the French culture. Later, many writers adopted certain motifs, characters and plots from this collection, expanding them with their own creative endeavour. By 1715, fairy tale conventions had been established with a type of canon, which included other tales, such as the well-known fairy tales of today, like "Cinderella", "Rapunzel", "The Sleeping Beauty", "Rumpelstiltskin", "Puss in Boots", "Little Red Riding Hood", "The Beauty and the Beast", "Bluebeard", "The Yellow Dwarf", "The Blue Bird" and "The White Cat". The writers were rearranging, expanding and playing with certain motifs and plots from the French fairy tales as well as some tales from the collection of *The Arabian Nights* (Zipes, *When Dreams* 15).

⁷ It will be referred as *The Arabian Nights* from now on.

The French fairy tale and *The Arabian Nights* had a great influence on German writers during the Enlightenment and the Romantic Period, paving the way for the important German fairy tale collections of Johann Musäus, *Volksmärchen der Deutschen* (1782-6) and those of Benedikte Naubert, *Neu Volksmärchen der Deutschen* (1789-93), both of which reflected German traditions and values. Both writers adopted French themes and motifs along with elements of myth, folk tales and legends to address the educated public. One can see the development of the genre especially after the contributions of such Romantic writers as Wilhelm Heinrich Wackenroder (1773-1798), E. T. A. Hoffmann (1776-1822), Joseph von Eichendorff (1788-1857) and others. German tales began to deal with philosophical topics and the daily concerns of the middle-class. These Romantics did not aim to entertain their readers with a happy ending and reunion; on the contrary, most of these tales ended with a loss, provoking thought on art, education, philosophy and life in general (Zipes, *The Oxford* xxv).

Fairy tales for children were meticulously censored until the 1820s in Germany on the grounds that they might include improper elements such as obscenity. As the aim of the fairy tale was regarded as being to educate young minds, some of the tales were not considered as suitable for children's moral training (Zipes, *The Oxford* xxvi). The greatest contribution to the fairy tale in Germany was by the Grimm brothers, whose works address not only children but also scholars. They published seven editions: the Large Edition (*Grosse Ausgabe*) between the years 1812-1857 and the Small Edition (*Kleine Ausgabe*) in 1825, which included the well-known fairy tales like "Cinderella" and "Little Red Riding Hood" that emphasise morality, patriarchal values and Protestant ethics (*ibid.*). Their collection was a blend of oral folktales with their realistic settings and characters, and literary fairy tales with their fantastic characters and settings (Tatar, *The Hard Facts* 32).

The fairy tale for children began to take its present shape between 1830 and 1900, during which time Hans Christian Andersen emerged as a significant figure who, like the Grimms and Perrault, aimed to insert Christian values into his tales, to instruct both children and adults (Zipes, *The Oxford* xxvii).

i.iii The Differences between the Fairy Tale and Other Genres:

Apparently, the origin of the fairy tale is related to the evolution of oral folk narratives; thus it is not possible to point to “one single *Urform*” behind its rise (Zipes, *Breaking* 14) and thus the evolution of the fairy tale can be better grasped through its relationship with other genres.

It is known that in the antiquity, people in Europe and Asia told fantastic tales about gods, the universe, the nature of the world and natural disasters along with simple daily occasions, which are known today as myths. Myth, unlike the fairy tale, tells the story of gods, semi-immortals, heroes, the relationships of deities with the mortals and stories of origins (Ashliman 3-4). Myths are expressions of people’s religious beliefs and heroes in the narratives which “are systemized and given religious significance” (Thompson 9). Indeed, the hero is to some extent related to the adventures of some gods or semi-gods (*ibid.*). Therefore, myths are attempts to give a logical explanation of the place of the human being in the cosmos, yet their primary subject matter is not the daily lives of men and women “as social animals” but rather “as spiritual beings” (Crossley 15).

Another genre that was popular before the Medieval Period was the legend, which expresses a “communal belief” (M. Harris 3-4). The word “legend” (deriving from the Latin word *legenda*, which means things to be read) was first used for narratives about the lives of the saints, which were read aloud in the church in the Medieval Period, although today the term refers to “hero tales” (Gamble and Yates 105). Legends, (mono)episodic in structure, are “localised and historicised narratives” of past events told more realistically (M. Harris 4). They reflect the collective experiences of a certain group of people, particularly heroes of the nation, who undergo adventurous encounters with some supernatural or real characters (*ibid.*).

Closely related to legends, a saga is a traditional narrative which is accepted as true and which relates to a certain person who is held to have really lived. The hero is believed to have some power or to have done deeds of bravery. It is essential for the people among whom the story is narrated to have faith in the occurrences of some particular events (Hartland ix). Though the saga may carry some supernatural

elements- such as talking animals- real characters and settings distinguish it from the fairy tale (Yardımcı 14).

Thompson draws attention to the similarities between the fairy tale and novella, the features of which are possible to be detected in the tales of Boccaccio. The primary difference between the two genres is that the latter takes place in a real world with an identifiable time and place, although some marvels can appear in the novella as well. However, Thompson underlines the fact that the two genres are not too distinct from each other and, in fact, they sometimes overlap, and this can then be called *Novellenmärchen* (8).

The fable, another genre similar to the fairy tale, is primarily about animals and contains a moral maxim. The moral purpose is crucial, for it is this basic feature that separates the fable from other genres. The well-known fable collections are those of Aesop, the Indian collection, *the Panchatantra*⁸ and those of Jean de La Fontaine (1621-1695), by whom Madame d'Aulnoy was influenced in her collection of fairy tales (Warner 13). Although from time to time animals are personified in fairy tales and appear as protagonists, these tales do not necessarily embody moral messages.

Romance is another genre, which carries some features that are similar to those of fairy tales. Romance is a fictional narrative in verse or prose that is about improbable adventures of idealised characters in some remote setting (Baldick 291). Although the term now connotes many forms of fiction such as the Gothic novel and the escapist story, it usually refers to the tales of King Arthur and his knights written in the late Middle Ages (*ibid.*) It involves a medieval apparatus of questing, knights, ladies in distress, dragons, wizards and magic spells (Mikics 55).

As for the fairy/folk tale, it employs several features from each genre above, which is why it can be claimed not to be an independent genre. Both the folk tale and the fairy tale are defined as narratives of a certain length “involving a succession of motifs or episodes” (Thompson 8). An unrealistic setting and uncertain time with unrecognisable characters and a marvellous atmosphere are their basic features.

What distinguishes the fairy tale from other genres is the impression it leaves on the reader or the listener. It “evokes wonder and admiration” as well as “hope” for the unfortunate (Zipes, *Why Fairy* 50). Indeed, it is the element of wonder that

⁸ *Panchatantra* is an anonymous Indian collection of fables and other moral tales. It is thought to be compiled between the first and the sixth centuries. It is composed of five books, aiming to teach lessons for future kings (Zipes, *The Oxford* 375).

separates the fairy tale from moral stories such as the fable and novella. Zipes asserts that with wonder, the reader or the listener is led to “astonishment, admiration, fear, awe and reverence”, all of which are caused by the “workings of the universe where anything can happen at any time” (*Why Fairy* 50-51). Marina Warner defines wonder in fairy tales as follows;

[it] has no opposite; it springs up already doubled in itself, compounded of dread and desire at once, attraction and recoil, producing a thrill, the shudder of pleasure and of fear.

(3)

In contrast to the realistic elements of the other forms such as setting or characters, fantasy is the core of this genre. More than the deeds of fairies, wonder is the element that characterises the genre and in fact, fairies do not appear in all fairy tales (Warner 4). While the other genres of the folktale are mimetic, the fairy tale pictures magical and supernatural events as a part of life (Jones 10; İvgin 57; Batur 349). Furthermore, in these tales the recipient does not question the logical explanation behind the marvellous events and there is no aim to convince the reader or the listener of the reality in the tales (Yardımcı 12). Starting the tale with a well-known formula such as “Once upon a time...”, which has its equivalents in almost all languages, the narrator takes the listener or the reader to a fantastic world where wishes are fulfilled, lovers are united and the poor become rich. The tales open up a path for hope and remedy for the plight that man suffers in daily life. It is the hope for might, wealth, happiness and pleasure. Hardships, prohibitions and deprivation in daily life lead people to seek fulfilment in these tales by means of which they may feel they escape from the troublesome world even for a while.

Certain features that can be detected in almost all fairy tales are the beginning and ending formulas, single plots, repetitions, potent numbers like seven, three and forty, and characters who directly contrast with one another, such as the strong and the weak (Walker xxiii).

Moreover, unlike myths, the fairy tale is concerned with the human being, animals and supernatural characters, not with celestial beings. The characters include fairies, goblins, dragons, giants, hobbits, kings or queens along with ordinary human beings. The emphasis in the tales is on action rather than on feeling or idea, and its

ultimate aim is to picture human experiences; “the longings, sorrows, rewards, frustrations, hazards and absurdities” (Crossley 15).

The characters are not real people living at a certain time. They are, for example, an unrecognisable queen and king of an unknown land in an unspecified time. Though there are some names such as Keloğlan in Turkish tales and Jack in British tales, these names are given to make the tales easier to understand (Yardımcı 13).

Boratav emphasises human characteristic of fairy/folk tales. Even though supernatural characters abound in the tales, the narrators or writers humanise these characters in the depiction of their daily lives. Witches, goblins or giants fall in love like human beings, they farm or hunt, trying to survive like all mankind (“Türk Masal.” 235; *Folklor* 276-77).

Most fairy tales have a recognisably simple and clear language, and most of them are in prose form. What is significant about the narrative is that the existence of both a listener and a teller can be felt during the narrative through several interruptions and comments of the narrator, creating an intimate communication, reminding the reader of its roots in the oral tradition.

i.iv Approaches to Fairy/Folk Tales:

There are various schools of thought concerning the origins of fairy tales and their nature. The most important are The School of Mythology, The School of Sanskrit, The School of Anthropology, The Finnish School, The Formal School and The School of Psychology. Although the scholars pursuing these studies did not consider themselves as belonging to particular schools, later critics grouped them according to their similar stances in their works on fairy tales (Yardımcı 8).

The School of Mythology carried out the first formal studies of folk tales with the contributions of Jacob and Wilhelm Grimm. They put forth the earliest theoretical and methodological statements about the tales they collected. For them, their studies were part of a “conceptually holistic project of *Germanistik* (German Studies) including the areas of philology, law, mythology and literature” (Stein, “Schools” 445). Therefore, the earliest studies were mostly comparative and were dependent on the Grimms’ understanding of the oral tradition and on their interest in

the origin of fairy/folk tales and the problems of language. Their interest in comparative studies of language and mythology led them to believe that folk/fairy tales originate from “a common Indo-European past containing ‘fragments of belief dating back to the most ancient times’” (Stein, “Folklore” 168). They believed that the origin of tales should be compared to the *Vedas*, as most European languages are related to Sanskrit (Sakaoğlu, *Masal* 5-6). Their ultimate aim was to contribute to the history of German literature, but they were convinced that German oral literature was a part of an Indo-European cultural heritage; thus they focused on other folk/fairy tales of Europe as well. Bearing this in mind, they published their *Household Tales* in 1822 with critical annotations, notes on sources and variants of the tales (Stein, “Folklore” 168). After the Grimms, German scholars continued to play a leading role in the study of fairy/folk tales. Mary Beth Stein claims that through these early scholars’ efforts “German became a lingua franca for European folk narrative research” (“Folklore” 169).

Max Müller (1820-1900), a Sanskrit scholar, is another representative of this school of thought. Like the Grimms, he supported the theory of mythic origins, claiming that European folk/fairy tales were “the fragmented remains of the myths of Indo-European people”. His research also aimed to reconstruct the myths, which had been involved in the development of folk tales (Stein, “Schools” 446).

Another school of thought was the School of Sanskrit. The supporters of this school also pointed to Indian sources as the origin of folk tales, but they believed that tales were shaped over many years as they spread among diverse cultures. The ultimate premise of the method was that each tale had a single origin (*monogenesis*) and instead of the *Vedas*, they took the *Panchatantra* as the main source (Sakaoğlu, *Masal* 7). Multiple variants of a tale were attributed to the spread of the tale from its original point (Stein, “Schools” 446). Another German scholar, Theodor Benfey (1809-81) is the chief proponent of this belief. In his translation of *Panchatantra* (1859), he asserted that while animal tales (fables and tales about Reynard the Fox) had been born in Europe, most of the other tales had come into being in India, spread to Persia and then after the advent of Islam they came to the whole Muslim world. According to him, fairy/folk tales came to Europe after the tenth century, either through the Muslims coming to Spain and Sicily, or through the Crusades. Benfey’s claims dominated the academic world in the second half of the nineteenth century

and the early part of the twentieth century (Ziolkowski 209). Nevertheless, the school was criticised by an English scholar, Andrew Lang and by the French scholars Henry Gaidoz and Joseph Bediér on the grounds that one should separate local and Indian tales. They claimed that motifs found in Buddhism can also be found in other works of literature in the world, so it is not logical to attribute these motifs only to Buddhism (Sakaoğlu, *Masal* 7).

The School of Anthropology was another school of fairy/folk tale studies and the representatives of this school of thought are Edward Burnett Tylor (1832-1917), Andrew Lang (1844-1912) and James George Frazer (1854-1941). All of these scholars supported the view that all human cultures developed in the same way; thus, it is possible to have similar or identical tales developing independently in response to similar hopes, needs and desires (Ziolkowski 21).

Another school of thought, the Finnish School, aimed to reconstruct the history of a tale and to determine its original form (*Urform*). The goal of this approach was to assemble as many variants of a given folk tale as possible, recording the text exactly as received and noting the date and the location of its recital or publication (Ashliman 138). The central claim of this school was that each tale had a single origin. Finnish folklorist Antti Aarne (1867-1925) prepared a catalogue of the most important tales (Ziolkowski 21). Aarne's *Types of Folklore* was expanded and translated by an American scholar, Stith Thompson, who categorised the variants of a particular tale through a comparative method. The index is therefore known as the Aarne-Thompson, AaTh or AT Index (Ziolkowski 21; Stein, "Schools" 446-47). In addition to this, Thompson published a *Motif Index of Folk Literature* in six volumes (1955-58), contributing greatly to folk studies (Ziolkowski 21).

There are three important scholars that contributed to the Formal School: Vladimir Propp, Claude Lévi-Strauss and Tzeveton Todorov (Zipes, *Breaking* 21). In the 1920s, the famous structuralist Vladimir Propp's work *Morphology of the Folktale* (1928) was very influential, since Propp was the first to demonstrate the morphological patterns and structures of tales (Zipes, *Breaking* 21-22). His basic unit of analysis was the "function", defined as the actions of a character according to their significance for the development of the course of action. With a typically structuralist approach, he claimed that functions occur in a fixed order, often in pairs composed of an action and its result, and he claimed a maximum of thirty-one possible

functions. He analysed one hundred tales and showed that folk tales with different contents have actually a similar structure.

According to Claude Lévi-Strauss, myths reflected the logical structure of the human mind. He studied myths in relation to religion, and unlike Propp, who paid attention to syntax, Strauss attempted to relate structure to cultural context (Stein, "Schools" 447).

Tzveton Todorov highlights the significance of the structuralist approach in literary analyses, calling it the "internal approach", because it focuses only on the work itself (70). He claims that there are five stages in every plot and that all plots start with a state of equilibrium, which is later disrupted by an event. After the recognition that a disorder exists, an attempt appears in order to repair the situation and at the end equilibrium is re-established (75).

Of all modern interpretive methods, perhaps the psychological approach has been the most prevalent. The supporters of the School of Psychology try to focus on the mental and emotional states of the narrators or characters in the tales, or to uncover the meaning of folk/fairy tales in the unconscious desires of individuals. In fact, there are two distinct directions in the School of Psychology: Either the interpreter can analyse the psychology behind a narrator's creative process, or the interpreter can analyse the psychological motivation of the fairy/folk tale characters (Ashliman 140).

The followers of this school are mainly influenced by either Freud or Jung in their interpretations. Freudians study tales in relation to sexual drives, dream symbolism and the sexual development of an individual (Zipes, *Breaking* 21-22). Freud generally interpreted tales as if they were dreams, reflecting the repressed sexual feelings of an individual. He analysed some tales in his essays, "The Occurrence in Dreams of Material from Fairy Tales" (1913) and "The Theme of the Three Caskets" (1913). In his first essay, Freud examined some of his patients' dreams in connection with their readings of fairy tales. "The Theme of the Three Caskets" is about Freud's psychoanalytic interpretations of three sister tales and of the tales where the protagonist has to make a choice among three options (such as King Lear or Paris). He claimed that the "paleness" of the third choice (the answer by the third sister) suggests death and no one would like to choose death (114). Freud added: "These indications would lead us to conclude that the third one of the sisters

between whom the choice is made is a dead woman. But she may be something else as well- namely, Death itself, the Goddess of Death” (115).

Among Freud’s followers were Franz Riklin, Ernest Jones, Erich Fromm and Geza Roheim. A neo-Freudian Bruno Bettelheim (1903-1990) was particularly significant in fairy tale studies with his book *The Uses of Enchantment* (1976). He proposed that through simple situations and happy endings, fairy/folk tales affect the unconscious of children leading them to overcome their inner struggles and psychological problems of growing up, such as sibling rivalry or Oedipus dilemmas (6-7). He stated: “[F]airy tales have unequalled value, because they offer new dimensions to the child’s imagination which would be impossible for him to discover as truly on his own” (7). The characteristic of fairy/folk tales to simplify a significant existential problem, such as a loss or death of a parent, and they help the child recover easily. Bettelheim asserted that these tales enable the child to have a healthy development:

The child intuitively comprehends that although these stories are *unreal*, they are not *untrue*; that while what these stories tell about does not happen in fact, it must happen as inner experience and personal development; that fairy tales depict in imaginary and symbolic form the essential steps in growing up and achieving an independent existence.

(73)

After explaining the functions of fairy/folk tales, Bettelheim analysed some well-known fairy tales like “Sindbad the Sailor”, “Cinderella”, “Little Red Riding Hood”, “Jack and the Beanstalk”, “Hansel & Gretel” and “Snow-white”, trying to show how these tales may influence the unconscious of a child. One problem with Bettelheim’s arguments, however, is the idea of the happy ending as a way of healing. He believed that happy endings play a crucial role in the development of children, which puts him into a position where he seems to have made generalisations about fairy/folk tales and to have ignored those tales which do not have happy endings, such as the “Pied Piper”. Furthermore, he seems to have overlooked the fact that the line between good and evil is very blurred in fairy/folk tales, since he claimed that these tales teach children good and evil through reward and punishment.

Alan Dundes (1934-2005) was another neo-Freudian, who contributed to the study of fairy and folk tales. Among his notable works one can count *Cinderella: a Folklore Casebook* (1982), *Little Red Riding Hood: a Casebook* (1989) and *Folklore Matters* (1993).

Carl Jung was a prominent figure in fairy/folk tale studies, particularly because of his essay “The Phenomenology of the Spirit in Fairy Tales” (1948). He laid down the patterns and figures of the tales in relation to archetypes of the collective unconscious. One of his most important followers was Marie Luise von Franz (1915-1998), who wrote several books on fairy/folk tales such as *The Interpretation of Fairy Tales* (1970) and *Archetypal Patterns in Fairy Tales* (1997). In *The Interpretations of Fairy Tales*, she proposes that fairy/folk tales are the best way to express the collective unconscious as they contain less cultural material than legend or myth, and thus fairy tales reflect the psyche in their purest forms (15). Following Jung, she claims that fairy/folk tales are closed systems in which the meaning is expressed through symbolic events and pictures (2). Franz explains that fairy/folk tales are remembered easily by everyone, which, for her, shows that in fairy/folk tales there is a pattern which fits into the unconscious of everyone and is thus retained (16). She adds that as the kind of fairy/folk tales that expresses collective structures touches the emotions more deeply, it stays better in one’s memory (*ibid.*) According to Franz, if many stories are studied together, it is possible to notice some typical archetypal process in the collective unconscious (21).

A 1984 doctoral thesis written on the topic of evil in fairy tales belongs to Sara Miller. The thesis investigates the witch figure as an evil character in the light of Jung’s theories. In this dissertation, Miller studied the symbols of evil associated with the witch figure and the characters’ responses to evil in tales from the Grimm Brothers (“Rapunzel”), Andrew Lang (“Sweetheart Roland” and “The Witch and Her Servants”) and Alexander Afanasyev (“The Bones Story”, “The Comb and Towel Story” and “Jorinda and Joringel”). She concluded that fairy tales can teach people about ignoring, identifying with, outwitting or even killing evil.

This thesis is the first study to focus on the Turkish and the British collections of fairy/folk tales through a different psychoanalytical approach- Melanie Klein’s and Fred Alford’s view of evil, though there are some Jungian and Freudian studies of fairy/folk tales as seen in the works of Maria Louise von Franz and Bruno

Bettelheim along with the ones of Jung and Freud. Rather than looking at archetypes or the unconscious desires of the collectors, this study focuses solely on the evil motives and actions depicted in the plots themselves, in terms of envy, jealousy, greed and dread and analyses evil according to the theories of Klein and Alford.

i. v The Development of the English Fairy/Folk Tale:

Fantasy in English literature has its recorded beginnings in the Anglo-Saxon epic poem, *Beowulf*, one of the earliest works in English literature. The poem's written version is supposed to date back to the eighth century, while the oral version goes back to much earlier times. Medieval writers often showed the supernatural and the natural side by side. Geoffrey Monmouth in his *Historia Regum Britanniae* (c. 1136) presented the mythic history of the British kings with various fantastic characters, such as ogres, dragons, a sea-monster, giants and Merlin the magician (Avery, "British" 66).

Marvellous stories have always been appealing for people, as one can see from the popularity of the later *Gesta Romanorum*, a collection of tales compiled from different sources in the thirteenth century, and "frequently drawn upon by preachers to hold listeners' interest" (Avery, "British" 67). Another significant fantastic work in the Middle Ages is the romance, *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, where young King Arthur celebrates the New Year with his court. The poem is a chivalric romance with elements from old tales of beheading games (Avery, "British" 67). It is about the temptation of Sir Gawain through challenges to his honour and chastity. In the story, a green man on a green horse rides into the hall where Arthur's court is feasting, and challenges any person to strike him in a single combat. Sir Gawain accepts the challenge and beheads the strange man with a blow, but the following New Year's Day, as agreed, the green man waits for him at his Green Chapel for the second part of the contest. Another writer, Sir Thomas Malory, in *Le Morte d'Arthur* (1485), used magic, mystery and enchantresses along with Merlin as well (67).

After the Medieval Period, the Arthurian legend almost disappeared from English literature as it was used very little by writers until the nineteenth century. Although the *Faerie Queen* (1590-6) is thought to contain strong Arthurian elements,

what should not be forgotten is that Spenser was primarily influenced by the Italian epic poetry and so his work does not contain any original English fairies (Avery, “British” 68). Nevertheless, the Renaissance Period did see attempts by such poets as Ben Jonson (1572-1637) (*The Fairy Prince*), Michael Drayton (*Nymphidia*) (1563-1631) and Robert Herrick (*A Description of the King and Queen of Fairies*) (1591-1674) to use folklore and fairy tale motifs in their works. Moreover, Shakespeare used magic and fairies in his plays such as *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*; however, he changed the image of fairies in English literature since before his joyful spirits, the folk view was that these creatures were malevolent spirits associated with witchcraft (*ibid.* 69). For instance, Puck (pouke) was thought to be from a class of demons, a little devil visiting London, but Shakespeare fused Puck with Robin Goodfellow, a hobgoblin, who helped household tasks but at the same time played some tricks. Furthermore, Shakespeare depicted his fairies with pretty names, enjoying themselves making elfin coats (*ibid.*).

Milton is another important writer who used magic in his works such as *Comus*, which was written for a performance at Ludlow in 1634 and involved fantastic elements. The protagonist Comus himself is a pagan god, who uses magic against travellers. Another work to mention is *L’Allegro* (1645) where Milton made use of fairies such as Faery Mab.

During the Romantic period, Samuel Taylor Coleridge and John Keats were two of the leading names to use magic and fantasy in their poems. While Coleridge used the fantasy world of fairies and pixies in his poem “Songs of the Pixies” (1793), Keats employed the elements of fantasy in some of his poems such as “Fairy Song” and “La Belle Dame sans Merci” (1819).

There are many other works in English literature with fantastic elements, yet as the thesis focuses not on fantasy but on the fairy tale itself, we will not examine these works of fantasy in depth. As for the fairy tale, there was no collection of fairy tales, nor any attempt to collect folk tales until the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. A few d’Aulnoy tales were translated in 1699, and more in 1707 and 1716. Perrault’s work, *Histoires ou contes du temps passé*, was translated in 1729. Oriental magic tales gained popularity and influence in the eighteenth century, particularly with Galland’s translation of *The Arabian Nights* in 1704, affecting English folk literature more than French tales did. Exotic settings, geniis and such magical objects

as rings started to be used by English writers in their stories, such as James Ridley's *Tales of the Genii* (1764) and William Beckford's *Vathek* (1786) (Avery, "British" 71).

Yearsley explained the reason for the scarcity of English fairy tales as the lack of collections of local English *Märchen* (25). Though in Germany and France the collection of nursery tales and *Märchen* constituted the largest proportion of fairy tales, in England there were not so many records of tales and indeed, in Wales there was "not a single *Märchen*". Yearsley asserted that the recorded stories in Wales and England were mostly sagas (25-27). On the other hand, according to Zipes the reason for a lack of recorded fairy tales is related to the effects of the Puritans, who saw fantasy as dangerous for children and instead emphasised the importance of moral tales:

[I]t was not magic as much as the actual social enforcement of the Puritan cultural code which led to the suppression of the literary fairy tale in England. The domination of Calvinism after the revolution of 1688 led to a stronger emphasis on preparing children and adults to be more concerned with moral character and conduct in this world [...] In particular, the oral folk tales were not considered good subject matter for the cultivation of young souls, and thus "civilized" appropriation of these tales which took place in France during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries [...] didn't occur in England.

(Zipes, *Victorian* xiii)

However, the real change occurred in the Victorian period when more fairy tales from Europe were translated. Gillian Avery claims that the English at that time were searching for an escape from the "ugly side of industrial society", so they were "turning back to fairy mythology" ("British" 73). The foreign fairy tale collections translated into English influenced some English writers in the Victorian Period, whose interest manifested itself in two ways: either collecting fairy tales or rewriting them (M. Harris 5). In fact, in Victorian England, folklore studies gained such importance as to lead to the coining of the word *folk-lore* in 1846 by William John Thoms. Moreover, with the interest and studies of the anthropologist E. B. Taylor, the Folk-Lore Society was founded in England in 1878. From that time until the beginning of World War I, such figures as Andrew Lang, Sidney Hartland, Sir

George Laurence Gomme, Edward Clodd and Alfred Nutt developed folklore into an acknowledged science (Dorson v). The interest in folklore was strengthened with the translation of The Grimms' *Household Tales* in 1823 by Edward Taylor (Avery, "British" 73). A later translation appeared in 1884 by Margaret Hunt, with a long introduction by Andrew Lang, analysing primitive ideas in the tales (Dorson vi). According to Stith Thompson, folklorists had noted "the scarcity of the authentic folktale in England" (19), and Dorson claims that, in comparison to the Grimms' collection, English collectors could not find "such a harvest" of fairytales in England (vi). In 1829, Edward Sidney Hartland published a volume titled *English Fairy and Other Folktales*, including only twelve "nursery tales" among his seventy-two tales, most of which were sagas about local events. Hartland was careful to be faithful to his sources as they appeared in chapbooks or the journal of Folk-lore society, presenting the tales from the mouths of their tellers with representations of their regional accents (Dorson vii). Andrew Lang's (1844-1912) tales are not considered to be original English tales, although one might come across some, as in his work *Fairy Books of Many Colours* (1889-1910); mostly he adapted European tales like "Little Red Riding Hood" and "Cinderella".

Joseph Jacobs (1854-1916) published a collection of fairy tales in the same year as Hartland. Jacobs, a historian and folklorist, is significant for his efforts to introduce British fairy tales to the academic world. He made notable contributions to English folklore as he compiled only British tales in several books, rather than French or German ones. He edited the British journal *Folk-Lore* between the years 1889 and 1900, which provided him with many materials for his collections. He published the tales he collected in his first collection titled *English Fairy Tales* in 1890, which was followed by *More English Fairy Tales* in 1893. With the aim of exploring more British tales, he then concentrated on the Celtic tales and published *Celtic Fairy Tales* (1891), which was to be followed by a sequel *More Celtic Fairy Tales* in 1894 (Avery, "Joseph" 268).

In his introduction, Jacobs also complained about the lack of fairy tales in English literature. For Jacobs, French fairy tales, particularly Perrault's, had invaded British folklore introducing such tales as "Cinderella, Puss-in-Boots" and "Little Red Riding Hood", which had "ousted" the popularity of "Mr. Fox", "Childe Roland" and "Catskin" (289). Jacobs claimed:

The Fairy Tales of England have been treated in rather a step-motherly fashion. That they once existed in tolerable numbers there are still traces in the library list of Captain Cox [...] and in odd references in literature and in chapbooks. But in the middle of the last century the genius of Charles Perrault captivated English and Scotch children with as much force as or, probably, with even more force than he had entranced French ones.

(289)

For Jacobs, what Perrault started was completed by the Grimm Brothers. The publication of the Grimms' tales in 1812 continued the "usurpation" of the English tales as we can see in the case of "Rumpelstiltskin" which replaced "Tom Tit Tot" (289). From that moment onwards, so-called English fairy tales became a fusion of those of the Grimms and Perrault.

Mrs. Bray (1790-1883) was another significant figure in the collection of fairy tales in the Victorian Period. She published a three volume collection in 1836, *The Borders of the Tamar and the Tavy*. Bray used the epistolary narrative style in her tales (Dorson xii). However, the most complete collection of traditional tales in England was by Robert Hunt (1807-1887) in Cornwall. His work, *Popular Romances of the West of England, or The Trolls, Traditions and Superstitions of Old Cornwall*, was published in 1865. In this work, he divided the subject matter under these headings- "Saints, Giants, Fairies, Demons & Spectres, King Arthur, and Mermaids & Sailors" (*ibid*). However, Dorson asserts that these tales have nothing in common with *Märchen*, as they are closer to legends with their historical personages (xiv). Although there are some fairies, witches and wizards in the work of Sidney Oldall Addy, *Household Tales with Other Traditional Remains* (1895), his fifty-two tales are also closer to legends, due to their local colour (Dorson xv).

In the twentieth century, folklore studies gained significance along with attempts to find original tales belonging to the English culture. Katherine Briggs investigated sixteenth and seventeenth century folktales, and published two works, *The Anatomy of Puck* (1959) and *Pale Hecate's Team* (1962) (Dorson xviii-xix).

Contemporary writers like Alan Garner (1934-) started a new kind of fantasy for children with *The Weird Stone of Brisingamen* (1960), and similar books from other writers followed, merging myth with characters from the past and the present. The fascination with fairy tale writers especially began in the 1960s, and such writers as J. R. R. Tolkien and C. S. Lewis gained popularity. After World War II, many

students turned to fantasy literature and fairy tales as a revolt against the reality of the war (Zipes, *The Oxford*. xxx). Tolkien with *The Hobbit* (1937) and *The Lord of the Rings* was perhaps one of the most influential fantasy writers of the twentieth century.

Feminist fairy tales began to be produced by writers such as Anne Sexton and Angela Carter. Angela Carter (1940-1992) created an adult interest in fairy tales by “rewriting the traditional tales with dark comedy” in her work *The Bloody Chamber and Other Stories* (1979) (Avery, “British” 77). Salman Rushdie (1974-), on the other hand, is another British writer, who uses Western and Oriental folklore in his novels, such as in *Haroun and The Sea of Stories* (1990). A. S. Byatt (1936-) is also a significant contemporary writer and a critic. Her famous novel, *Possession: A Romance* (1990) interweaves Victorian lives with the twentieth century, including pastiches of several fairy tales of the period (Benson, “A. S. Byatt” 81).

i.vi The Development of the Turkish Fairy/Folk Tale:

In the Turkish language the term fairy/folk tale refers to *masal*, which is a comparatively recent term in Turkish literary history. According to the sources, such as *Kamus-ı Osmaniye*, the term has been used for only, approximately, one hundred and thirty years (Yardımcı 8). Before this, there were other terms used for this genre, such as *kıssa*, *hikâye* and *dâstân*, the first of which is a short narrative giving a moral lesson. *Hikâye* is similar to the word story in the English language, while *dâstân* is translated as legend. As a result, it is possible to notice that fairy/folk tales in Turkish literature, like English fairy/folk tales, have a problematic position as well, as they are also not completely independent of other narratives in oral folk literature. Similar to the developments in Europe, the fairy/folk tale in Anatolia began to take its form in the nineteenth century when the name of the genre became *mesel*, which means a word teaching morals and values. This implication demonstrates that fairy/folk tales were written to instruct readers about certain values and morals (Batur 349; Sakaoğlu, *Masal* 3).

As in Europe, the Turkish fairy/folk tale has its roots in the oral folk tale of Anatolian literature, from which it later adopted certain motifs, characters, themes and plots. In their oral journeys through generations, the tales have lost many

elements, sometimes as a result of changes in time and in the environment, yet almost all of them had the object of leading people to righteousness, justice and truth (Batur 349). As Turkish people were nomads, the tales have a rich heritage, with roots in diverse regions like the Middle East and Macedonia. Apart from the Middle Eastern effect, the Anatolian tales were also influenced by the Chinese, Indian and then Islamic cultures, from all of which the tales got different religious and cultural tones (Demiray 41-42).

Similar to the situation in Europe, Anatolian tales were strongly influenced by the tales of *The Arabian Nights*, which was translated into Turkish as *Elf Leyle ve'l Leyle* (1897-1899); however, this influence was reciprocal, as the former also embodies some Turkish elements. The Arabic impact on Turkish fairy/folk tales is particularly noticeable in the motifs of the Padishah tales (Demiray 42).

Another foreign influence was from Iranian literature with the *One Thousand and One Day Tales*⁹, a parody of *The Arabian Nights*. While the latter centres on the infidelity of women, the Iranian collection deals with that of men (Sakaoğlu, *Masal* 18).

Dede Korkut, which is a significant epic in Turkish folklore, is the earliest tale collection in Turkish literature, dealing with the hardships of the Oğuz tribe. It is supposed to have been written in the second half of the fifteenth century, depicting the war of the Oğuz Turks against Georgians, Abhazas and the Greeks in Trabzon (11). There are traces of shamanism as well as Islamic elements in the tales (Gökyay 14-15). The protagonist, Dede Korkut, is a sage, a sacred personage in the Oğuz, Kırgız and Kıpçak tribes. In the tales, he is a shaman playing a *kopuz*, a Turkish musical instrument, and acts as a hero, solving all problems (Demiray 43). The epic is composed of twelve stories, which also includes some supernatural features of fairy/folk tales as well as the historical elements of legends (Oktürk 9).

Other earlier examples go back to the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, to the translation of a Chinese collection into Uyğur Turkish, *Altun Yaruk*. This comprises religious writings and some fairy/folk tales dealing with three princes and leopards. Another anonymous collection is the *Kuanşi İm Pusar*, another Uyğur translation of Chinese tales. Although these were not original to the Turks, the motifs

⁹ The collection was first translated into Turkish from French by Ahmed Raşid in 1867-71. Another translation belonged to Ahmed Hami and his three friends in 1873 again from French (Sakaoğlu 18).

of these tales appear in the later Anatolian tales, which demonstrates their influence on the Anatolian tale tradition. *Destan-ı Ahmedî Haramî*, whose writer is not known, is the next collection. Including a prayer to God and the Prophet in the first twenty-six stanzas, it dates back to the thirteenth century. The story depicts a robber who is good at magic, and his love for Gülendâm, the Padishah's daughter (Sakaoğlu, *Masal* 21-23; Demiray 46-47).

Anatolian fairy/folk tales were at first mostly studied and collected by foreigners. The first person to publish Anatolian tales such as "Halil", "Şirvanlı Tüccar" and "Derviş" was a secretary to Louis XIV, M. Digeon, in 1781. A Russian Turcologist F. Wilhelm Radlof compiled Anatolian fairy tales in his *Proben der Volksliteratur der Türkischen Stämme*- a ten volume work published between 1867 and 1907. After him, a Hungarian scholar, Ignaz Kúnos (1862-1945), did research on Anatolian tales in 1887, and collected the tales from villagers, listing them according to their subjects with his comments thereon. He published the tales he gathered between the years 1887-1905 under the title, *İstanbul Halk Masalları*¹⁰ (Yardımcı 23).

One of the most significant collections among Turkish fairy/folk tales is the *Billur Köşk Masalları*¹¹, which is composed of fourteen tales and whose exact publication date is not certain. George Jacob remarked that he saw one copy of the collection in 1899, while Tahir Alangu explained that it may date back to 1876. The collection is not of pure Turkish origin as it still has some Arabian and Iranian traits (Sakaoğlu, *Masal* 24).

The first original Turkish fairy/folk tale collection was published in 1912, written by a woman whose initials were K.D. The collection, composed of twelve tales, was published under the title of *Türk Masalları*¹² and it was first introduced by Pertev Naili Boratav (Sakaoğlu, *Masal* 53). Ziya Gökalp is another notable figure in Turkish fairy/folk tale studies with his academic studies. He did not collect any tales but he published his own tales titled as *Alageyik* in 1912 and he wrote about fairy/folk tales in several journals (Sakaoğlu, *Masal* 222). He was influenced by the Grimm brothers in his views about the educational side of fairy/folk tales and highlighted that in child education fairy/folk tales must be used (Özünel 64).

¹⁰ *Istanbul Folk Tales*

¹¹ *Billur Mansion Tales*

¹² *Turkish Fairy Tales*

Naki Tezel (1915-1980), an important fairy/folk tale compiler and a bureaucrat at the same time, published the tales he gathered in the *Halk Bilgisi Halk Dergisi*¹³ as a book entitled *Kelođlan Masalları*¹⁴ in 1936. The same year he published some tales in the same journal titled as *İstanbul Masalları*¹⁵, which were compiled in a book with the same title two years later. Another of his works, *Türk Masalları*¹⁶, was published first in two volumes consisting of fifty-four tales from different regions of Turkey and it has continued to be published by different publication houses, with the latest edition having come out in 2009 (Bilkan 53). He paid special attention to keeping the original versions of the tales he collected, making almost no changes to accent and plot (Sakaođlu, *Masal* 42).

Pertev Naili Boratav (1907-1998) made one of the most significant contributions to the study of Turkish fairy/folk tales by focusing on their historical development and preparing catalogues. Boratav's works, *Zaman Zaman İinde*¹⁷ (1959) and *Az Gittik Uz Gittik*¹⁸ (1969) are notable for fairy/folk tale studies as he gives information about fairy/folk tales along with the development of the Turkish tale. In addition, in collaboration with Eberhart, Boratav published a catalogue of Turkish tales called *Typen Turkische Volksmarchen* in 1953 (Yardımcı 23). It is the only published catalogue of Turkish folk/fairy tales; however, Sakaođlu criticises the work as Boratav and Eberhart included only 378 types in the catalogue and did not spare any space for possible types that could be found in future studies (Sakaođlu, "Türk Masal" 47-48). Thus, this defect of the Turkish catalogue was seen as potentially preventing contemporary folklorists from locating new types in the catalogue, and limiting their studies (*ibid.*). In contrast, in Aarne-Thomson's catalogue there are spaces left for new types that could be added to the already existing catalogue.

Eflatun Cem Güney is another important figure in Turkish folklore. Though some of his tales were put in some foreign anthologies, such as the works of O. Spies, A. Uzunođlu-Ocherbauer and Barbara Pfliegerl (Sakaođlu, *Masal* 46) and won many awards, his collections cannot be taken into consideration in comparative

¹³ *The Journal of Folklore*

¹⁴ *Kelođlan Tales*

¹⁵ *Istanbul Tales*

¹⁶ *Turkish Fairy Tales*

¹⁷ *Time in Time*

¹⁸ *Went a Little, Went Far*

studies, on the grounds that he rewrote the tales. Sakaoğlu asserts that in folklore studies it is essential to compare and contrast original collections, as “any change in tales will cause the tale to lose its original atmosphere” (*Masal* 46).

At Turkish universities the study of folk/fairy tales gained popularity especially after the 1940s and theses started to be written in this area. The first doctoral thesis on fairy/folk tales belongs to Saim Sakaoğlu; it came out in 1971 and is titled “Gümüşhane Masalları/Metin Toplama ve Tahlil”¹⁹. Today there are numerous other theses written on fairy/folk tales in different universities in Turkey. The psychological interpretations of Jung and Freud are used in one of these theses, belonging to Neşe Işık (“Türk Masallarının Sembolik Açıdan Çözümlemesi”²⁰ 2009). In the thesis, Işık analyses the dream motifs and archetypes of departure, initiation and return in tales by Esmâ Şimşek, Ali Berat Alptekin, Umay Günay, Saim Sakaoğlu and Bilge Seyidoğlu.

Though Turkish fairy/folk tales carry elements similar to those found in European tales, they have some differences in terms of their structure and characters. The Anatolian tales are composed of three parts, called “Döşeme”, “Gövde” and “Üç Elma”²¹. In the first part, the narrator utters a long tongue-twister to give the impression that what he is going to narrate is not a real story. In this long introduction, which has no relation to the plot of the tale and is full of paradoxes, he aims to draw the attention of the listener or the reader to his language skills (Gökşen 56-57):

Once there was, once there wasn't a dwarf. If you ask what his mother's name was, it was Nebiye. I flew across and looked at his roof, with its one side of straw and its other side of smoke and dust. The blacksmith beats the iron with skill, and the painters paint with many colors. Here and there they fight with cannons and guns. “What is this? What is it?” you ask. Listen! This is a lie, and that is a lie. So? A snake swallowed an elephant. And there went someone riding a donkey across a river with a camel on his lap. That is a lie, too. Well, now, we get to the story.

(Walker 111)

¹⁹ “Gümüşhane Fairy/Folk Tales: the Collection and Analyses of Texts”

²⁰ “A Symbolic Analysis of Turkish Fairy Tales”

²¹ “Tongue Twister”, “Body”, “Three Apples”

Gökşen notes that the longer and the more creative the “Body” (“Gövde”) is, the more gifted the narrator is supposed to be (57). The second part starts mostly with the words, “Once there was, once there wasn’t...” or “One day in such and such a kingdom...” preparing the listener or the reader for the main plot of the tale (Yardımcı 18). Different from the European fairy/folk tales, the last part (“Üç Elma”) is a kind of prayer for the characters and listeners. It is sometimes called the “Well-wishing” part as well, since it ends with good wishes (Gökşen 57; Yardımcı 18): “And if you have not been as fortunate as they, I can at least wish health to the ears of those who heard this tale and health to the tongue of him who told it” (Walker 33).

As tales reflect the culture of their countries, there are differences between the characters of English and Turkish fairy tales. Şerif Oktürk explains that every culture has its own way of telling tales with traces of their own culture. The Western countries have fairy/folk tales which include mostly goblins, fairies and devils as characters. In the Eastern cultures, however, there are mostly Shah, princes, palaces, dervishes, wizards, old beggars, mysteries, magic, snakes and poisoned arrows (15). In Anatolian tales, the characters are generally Keloğlan, an Arab, a Köse, a Padishah, a witch, a giant and an innocent lady (Yardımcı 21), whose characteristics are dealt with in detail in the following chapters.

Fairy/folk tales of various cultures differ insofar as their setting, characters or structure are concerned; however, one of the concepts common in tales is the idea of evil, which is evident in many of these tales, either in the depiction of characters, in their motives and deeds, or in the punishments given to bad characters. To focus on evil in Turkish and British fairy/folk tales, in the following chapters, the thesis first concentrates on the concept of evil in history as well as in modern times, and then particularly on the theories of psychoanalysis.

CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND THE CONCEPT OF EVIL

*I and the public know
What all schoolchildren learn,
Those to whom evil is done
Do evil in return.*

W.H.Auden, "September 1, 1939" (19-22)

The problem of evil is "an enigma" which still cannot be solved and still continues to draw the attention of mankind (Rudwin vii). For centuries, many thinkers and writers have been preoccupied with the concept of evil and its mystery, and man has always questioned the nature of the hidden powers that may cause his/her suffering on earth (Yasa 9). Peterson claims that the concept of evil is the most recurring theme in literature and that it leads writers to demonstrate "the capability of the human being for evil" (*God and Evil* 3). Starting from the ancient Greek tragedies, evil has been shown to ruin the lives of humankind. The downfall of the tragic hero occurs owing to his *hubris*, causing him/her to lose his/her high status, as in the *Oedipus the Rex* by Sophocles. Almost two thousand years later, Fyodor Dostoevsky questioned the perfectibility of man with the complexities in his nature in which evil is in constant battle with innocence. In the *Brothers Karamazov*, the novelist writes:

[G]od sets us nothing but riddles. Here the boundaries meet and all contradictions exist side by side [...] It's terrible what mysteries there are! [...] I can't endure that a man of lofty mind and heart begins with the ideal of the Madonna and ends with the ideal of Sodom. What is still more awful is that a man with the ideal of Sodom in his soul does not renounce the ideal of Madonna, and his heart may be on fire with that ideal, genuinely on fire, just as in his days of youth and

innocence. Yes, man is broad, too broad, indeed. I'd have him narrower. The devil only knows what to make of it! [...] God and the devil are fighting there and the battlefield is the heart of man.

(Dostoevsky 107)

English Romantics were very interested in the topic of evil, famously William Blake and Samuel Taylor Coleridge among others. Blake, for example questions the problem of evil in his famous poem "The Tiger". In this poem, Blake raises the question whether both lamb, the symbol of innocence, and tiger, the symbol of destruction and evil, were created by the same God. On the other hand, Coleridge, in his famous poem "the Rime of the Ancient Mariner", questions how man inflicts evil on nature, which is the symbol of innocence.

In fact, evil as a concept has always been a subject for the attention of many writers and there are numerous examples of evil characters in literature, such as Grendel's mother in *Beowulf*, Claudius in *Hamlet* and Iago in *Othello*, Mephistopheles in *Dr. Faustus*, Satan in *Paradise Lost*, Mr. Hyde in *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*, Heathcliff in *Wuthering Heights*, Mr. Kurtz in *Heart of Darkness* and very many others. One reason for the continuing mystery of evil is that there are different interpretations of the meaning of evil and there are many books on the subject; nevertheless, there is still no "satisfying theory of it" (Lara, "Narrating" 239). While some critics focus on evil's "philosophical roots", others try to define it semantically, or to find anthropological definitions (*ibid.*). Furthermore, some concentrate on the psyche and attempt to find psychological explanations.

Since Plato, people have tried to categorise certain things as evil, such as natural disasters, sicknesses, brutality, murder and the faults of human beings (Lara, Intro. 2). Even death itself was regarded as one of "the greatest natural evils" by some people (M. Adams 1). All of the bad things on earth such as tyranny, disasters in nature and the suffering of man have been put "under the rubric of evil" (Peterson, *God and Evil* 6). Peterson asserts that evil dominates the lives of human beings, and that evil is everywhere "in our news, common experiences, popular periodicals" (6), so the premise that "evil exists" cannot be denied (*ibid.*).

However, as mentioned above, there is no single definition or approach and perspective to "cover the vast and richly detailed ways in which evil is part of human lives" (Myers 1). Some intellectuals define evil in theological terms as sin and regard all evil deeds as a kind of rebellion against God. Others define evil as "finitude" and

reduce all evil to “human perversity”, which is the outcome of being human with its limitations (Peterson, *The Problem* 10). Thus, it is clear that neither a single perspective nor a single written work can clarify the concept of evil, which results in the ongoing difficulties in comprehending it. Gloria Cigman highlights the changing nature of the definition of evil, claiming that it “changes from one century to another, from one decade to another” (2). Indeed, Ronald Paulson, similarly, claims in his book *Sin and Evil* that, “evil is a cultural construct” (xiii). He continues to explain that evil is “in the eye of the beholder” and the evil for one person can be good for another, besides, “what is evil to one may be merely wrongdoing to another” (xiii). In order to concentrate on the modern perception of evil, it is essential that we first trace the development of the discourse of evil throughout history.

ii.i The Theological and Philosophical “Problem of Evil”:

The ambiguous nature of the definition of evil gave rise to the so-called “Problem of Evil”²², which has been the subject of interest in a large number of fields including theology, psychology, philosophy, literature and ethics. Theologians aimed to defend God in their discussion of the existence of evil in the suffering of man. On the other hand, metaphysical conceptions of evil linked physical phenomena like storms and earthquakes, with human deeds like cruelty, murder and torture. This “lack of conceptual clarity” has brought about diverse attempts to conceptualise evil in religious, naturalistic and psychological terms; however, they have not been successful in clarifying the concept of evil (Lara, Intro. 2).

First, evil was categorised in three different ways in the Western world before the nineteenth century: “natural evil”, “metaphysical evil” and “moral evil” (Robbins 133-34). Natural evil included disasters such as floods, volcanoes, earthquakes and other natural calamities for which the human being bears no responsibility. On the other hand, metaphysical evil consisted of the outcomes of people’s actions which are caused by “ignorance, inattention, forgetfulness, misunderstanding, mistaking, misperceiving and misconstruing” (*ibid.*). As for moral evil, it is caused by “human will, desire or intention” (Robbins 133-34). John Hick

²² Hereafter, the three propositions in the Problem of Evil will be shortly referred as the Problem.

explains it further, asserting that moral evil is what human beings do, comprising “cruel, unjust, vicious and perverse thoughts and deeds”, and this is completely different from “the natural evil” that originates “independently of human actions” (qtd. in Peterson, *The Problem* 11).

Until the eighteenth century, most Western intellectuals, commenting on the Problem were theologians, who were at the same time the philosophers of their time such as Augustine and Aquinas, and they therefore questioned the concept of evil in terms of religion (Kelly 2). The concept of evil was and remains a significant problem, especially for theologians (Yasa 9), and the Problem is conceived to be “enduring and serious” (Peterson, *The Problem* 1) in the philosophy of religion as it poses a threat to traditional faith in God. The problem arises from a certain “instance of suffering” and the evil that someone has to face (Feinberg 21). When confronted by such an evil occurrence, the victim finds it difficult to bear what is happening with his/her faith in God and His power. The sufferer starts to question the fairness of the situation, asking why that evil thing happened to him/her (*ibid.*).

Many people were convinced that evil evokes doubts about the “omnipotent, omniscient and greatly perfect God” (Peterson, *The Problem* 11). They wondered why the Almighty would inflict misery on His own people and cause their devastation. In their efforts to clarify the concept, the link between evil and God was questioned by various thinkers in the past to clarify the term. Every culture focuses on evil according to its own perspective. For Buddhism, evil exists in the nature of the human being, leading to the goal of non-existence (*nirvana*). For Hindus, evil is “in the world of illusion (*maya*)”, and man has to “find release from cyclical rebirth (*samsara*)” (Peterson, *The Problem* 6). For Zoroastrianism, evil is an endless “cosmic principle” standing against good (*ibid.*). In Christianity, people think that God as the ultimate source of all would not let evil and suffering dominate the lives of man, which is the core of the Problem of Evil (Peterson, *The Problem* 7). Therefore, most of the problem about understanding and defining evil derives from monotheistic religions: one perfectly good and almighty God does not stop evil, however powerful He is. Nevertheless, in religions where people believe in more than one god, the problem loses its significance as people may attribute evil to one god and good to another (Kelly 15).

According to some Christian and Muslim thinkers, moral evil is the sin and error that comes out of abusing the free will given to man, and that can be practised through selfishness, jealousy, lying, cruelty and murder. The reason why theologians have accepted these deeds as evil is because they are listed as sins in the holy books of their religions. Furthermore, some Christian theologians have tried to form a close relationship between these deeds and Original Sin (Yasa 17). Christian thinkers regard the three groups of evils as interrelated and falling under the rubric of “the Fall of Adam” and its results (Robbins 133-34). They have claimed that the “evils” that came to the world with the Fall of Adam and Eve were “death, strife and labour-disease, pain and natural disaster”, all of which were explained under the title of “suffering-evil” and “doing-evil” (Paulson 4). Suffering-evil covers all those experiences including pain, death and disease, which form the basis for the Problem. Such evil is inflicted on someone by another, and here it is the pain that matters- as in the case of Adam and Eve, who were punished by God. On the other hand, what Cain did to Abel is an experience of “doing-evil”, which is inflicting suffering on someone, and what matters is the intention of giving harm (*ibid.*).

Both suffering and doing evil can be observed in the British and Turkish fairy/folk tales that the thesis examines; thus, to focus on the concept of evil in the tales, it is of paramount importance to concentrate on the nature of evil in Anatolian and Western thought. In both cultures, the view of fairy/folk tales as teaching children is generally based on such views of evil as badness or sin, whereas the psychological school focuses on explanations for evil and tries to investigate why people do evil. In this respect, this study focuses on the writings of early theologians and philosophers on the concept of evil in both cultures and then on the psychoanalytic view of evil.

In the Western and Eastern tradition major advances in the topic of evil have been made by theologians and non-theologian philosophers. Furthermore, it is conventional in all studies of evil to present brief background information about these theological views on the topic of evil. Thus, in this section these thinkers are discussed chronologically regardless they have religious or secular view points. Moreover, in order to provide a background to the Turkish tales, regardless of how distant from we only have Islamic tradition to rely upon. Therefore, this section

provides a summary of the views of certain theologians and religious groups on the topic.

ii.i.i Evil in the Islamic Tradition:

There are hardly any written records of pre-Islamic thoughts about evil in Anatolia; in fact, the concept of evil is only seriously discussed in religious writings of the early days of Islam, and for the purposes of the thesis, it appears essential that we concentrate on the thoughts of these early philosophers and the Koran.

Islamic thinkers have been preoccupied with the “Problem of Evil” for centuries; however, when Christianity and Islam are compared, it is possible to notice that the former has produced a larger number of interpretations of the Problem. Cafer Sadik Yaran, a scholar on Islam, states that one of the reasons for the fewer discussions of the Problem in Islam is that Muslim thinkers can find their answers in the Koran, either directly or indirectly (17). The Koran itself is at the centre of the Problem; that is, it asks the questions and gives the answers on its own.

In Christian theology, views about sin, evil, goodness or righteousness have been shaped by the Bible and by what the Church fathers said or other philosophers suggested. In contrast, as just mentioned, in Islam, views about evil and good are mostly featured in the Koran and the Sunnah²³ of the Prophet. All the succeeding Islam philosophers and thinkers have tried to base their arguments and interpretations on the Koran and what the Prophet said. All in all, the Koran is at the core of Islam, and it “formats the minds of Muslims and helps them pay attention to certain things and ignore others” (Aslan 25).

The Koran gives its message through various parables, metaphorical and allegorical examples, and what is good or what is evil is illustrated through certain stories. Since most Islamic interpretations come from the Koran, they are not as various as the interpretations in Western cultures.

As for the meaning of the term “evil” in Islam, evil can be translated as *sû'* and *şerr*, and the person who commits an evil deed is called *şirrîr* (Özdemir 17), while the word “good” can be translated as *khayr* (*hayr*). Whereas in English good and evil mostly refer to right or wrong, in Islam, *khayr* and *şerr* do not always have

²³ The sayings and habits of Muhammad, the Prophet of Islam.

moral implications, but imply “a benefit or a loss that something brings” (Murata and William 109).

Though not very different from each other, there are a few diverse voices in the Islamic discourse on evil such as the Mutezilites, Asharies and Ghazali. They are mentioned briefly to show the concept of evil in Anatolian thought in the earlier times and then the thesis concentrates on different perspectives on the concept of evil in the Western culture from early times to the present day.

ii.i.i.i The Mutezilites:

A group of Muslims called the Mutezilites²⁴ believed that to determine whether a deed is evil or good depends not on the commands or prohibitions of God, but on its utility; whether it is beneficial or harmful for the human being (Altıntaş 220). The Mutezilites believed that God is just, and evil cannot be attributed to Him. A question then arises: “To whom can we attribute evil?” Özdemir, a scholar in the area of Islamic studies, pointed out that most of the Mutezilites proposed that the human being cannot understand the will and wisdom of God (79); therefore, they seem not to have sought the answer for this question, but simply to have evaded any negative assumption about God.

The Mutezilites interpreted moral evil as the misdeeds of the human being. They were of the opinion that moral evil comes out of human free will (Yaran 154). Besides, they thought that human reason can independently judge good and evil in things (Naseem 28), which strengthened their argument regarding man’s free will. Thus, they attributed the responsibility for moral evil to man himself and believed that man is free and he should be responsible for his actions; otherwise, it would be hard to justify God punishing sinners (Naseem 28). As regards evil done to children, it implies a kind of warning for the adults, and these children will be rewarded with Heaven in the end (*ibid.*). They claimed that God brought calamity upon children and the innocent in order to bring some good afterwards. Since these victims are aware of the possible benefits coming from such suffering, their pain will not be severe

²⁴ *Mutezilites* were formed during the caliphate of Mâmûn (813-833) and his two successors. They defended free will and called themselves “defenders of unity and justice” (Lammens 57).

(Özdemir 82-83). Most of the beliefs in Islam are based on the same deduction; that is, in every deed and every disaster there is some *khayr*.

As for natural evil, the Mutezilites were convinced that it is metaphorically evil, but in reality it is for the benefit of the human being; in other words, it exists for humankind's *khayr*, which is similar to the belief regarding the suffering of the innocent and of children. They explained that God brought disasters upon humanity on purpose. If the human being displays patience in these catastrophes s/he will be rewarded with Heaven. Moreover, these disasters are like foreshadowings of Judgement Day, by means of which the human being learns to show patience and not to rebel against God, bearing the Last Day in his/her mind (Özdemir 66).

Thus, the Mutezilites were concerned that evil is the outcome of the wrong choices of the individual, and the reason for suffering is to signal that something good will happen afterwards. However, one of the key limitations of the explanations of the Mutezilites is that they did not focus on what drives man to make wrong choices before committing evil. They, like other Islamic theologians, tried to explain the compatibility of evil with God along with the suffering of the individual.

ii.i.i.ii The Asharies:

The Asharies²⁵ are another group of believers; they reacted against the claims of the Mutezilites. The separation of the Asharies from the Mutezilites is said to have been brought about by a discussion of evil. According to the story, El'Eşari's teacher Mohammad Ibn Abdul al-Wahab al-Jubbai told him a story: There were three brothers; two adults and a little boy. One of the brothers was a good man, and when he died, he went to Heaven. The other was wicked and he was sent to Hell. As for the little boy, he died when he was a child and was sent to Heaven. Upon being asked why he was sent to Heaven, El'Eşari's teacher answered that God knew he would become a bad boy in the future, so God took him at an earlier age to avoid such a future. The teacher was then asked about the situation of the brother in Hell: "What if he complained to God about why He had not done the same for him before he had grown up and become sinful?" The teacher could not give an answer as, according to

²⁵ *Asharism* was a school of thought in Islam history. They were influenced by the thoughts of Ebû'l-Hasan el-Eş'ari (941-92) (Kalaycı 399). Asharism was born as a reaction to Mutezilites.

the Mutezilites, God is just. However, in this anecdote He appears to be unjust, which contradicts their belief (Naseem 31).

After this discussion El'Eşari is said to have left his teacher and the Mutezilites. He founded another group and formed his own philosophy. Unlike the Mutezilites, the Asharies were convinced that the human being is not free in his/her acts and all his/her actions are bound to God's will (Yaran 154). The Asharies believed that God is the creator of all; thus, He is the creator of evil (Özdemir 319). One wonders then whether He is responsible for the suffering of all. Like the Mutezilites, the Asharies also defended the belief that divine acts do not follow a discernible pattern; the human being is not capable of understanding the purpose of God (Naseem 37). Hence, the Asharies tried to clarify the suffering of the innocent by attributing it to the will of Divine power, which is beyond human understanding. In fact, by asserting that humans are not free, the Asharies seemed to adopt rather a pessimistic view about evil based on the principle that human beings are determined to act in a particular way, and that for this reason it would be wrong to blame the other for his/her acts of evil. Like the Mutezilites, the Asharies also overlooked the motives for doing evil; instead, they sought ways to defend the existence of evil that were compatible with the existence of God.

ii.i.i.iii Ghazali:

Ghazali (1058-1111) was a significant theologian and philosopher, who influenced the Islamic world. He was one of the members of the Asharies; nonetheless, he developed his own philosophy to such an extent that he is referred to as an independent source for most of the Islamic arguments.

Ghazali claimed that human behaviour is determined by four basic factors: "greed for food, for sexual passion, for material things and for supremacy" (Naseem 123). He used the metaphors of the pig, the dog, the devil and the sage in order to describe human nature. He stated:

So there are gathered inside of a man's skin, as it were, a pig, a dog, a devil and a sage [...] [f]or the pig is not blamed for his colour [...] but for his covetousness, his voracity and his greed. The dog is anger [...] [t]he meaning of this bestial quality is savageness and enmity and

slaughter [...] The devil or Satan continues to stir up the appetite of the pig and the wrath of the wild beast and to incite the one by means of the other

(Al-Ghazali 32-33)

Ghazali believed that first among these feelings is greed for food. He said:

Greed for food is a destructive evil [...] In fact; [the] belly is the container of greed and the breeding ground of diseases and disasters. In case of satisfaction of [the] belly, sexual passion rises high [...] Desire for name and fame grows from greed. Then come the evil attributes of hatred, clash of interests, pride, self-conceit, etc. These can be removed by hunger.

(qtd. in Naseem 123)

Evidently, Ghazali provided a psychological explanation for the reason of evil. Like a modern psychologist, he analysed human beings and connected his psychological analysis with theology. For this reason, Dr. Ahmad Faud Ehwany called Ghazali the founder of the science of Islamic psychology (Naseem 124).

In addition to this, Ghazali claimed that this world is the best possible world (Ghazali 398). This statement reminds one of Leibniz, who, as stated below, defended the same idea six hundred years later. In Ghazali's thought, considering power and all the other qualities attributed to God, this world and life on earth is the best, the most beautiful and the most complete one (*ibid.*). Ghazali thought that evil is not only necessary for knowledge, but for the coming of good things as well. Through evil and suffering, man gets more mature, having learned to feel gratitude and patience. Thus, Ghazali seems to have supported an optimistic view of evil by claiming that it is normal, even enriching the spiritual world of the human being. The idea of *khayr* is repeated in Ghazali as well; that is, in everything that looks evil, there is surely *khayr*. If we eliminate *sharr* completely, *khayr* disappears, too, and we may then encounter greater *sharr* (Ghazali 107).

Like other groups of thinkers, Ghazali attributed the source of evil to God. Nevertheless, for him, God did not bestow evil upon man for the sake of suffering. In fact, God caused evil as it has some goodness in the end (Ghazali 105). Ghazali

urged that everyone should believe in God and His power and that anything God created has a purpose and nothing He created can be ugly or evil. Ghazali was convinced that unless there was deficiency, there was no perfection, and maintained that perfection and deficiency are subjective (Ghazali 398). He illustrated his idea with an example of a patient suffering from gangrene. Someone can interpret the amputation of a leg of a gangrene patient as suffering; nonetheless, it is to prevent further suffering (*ibid.*).

ii.i.i.iv The Koran:

It is also essential to focus on the Koran in terms of the “Problem of Evil” and the motives of the evildoer in order to understand the concept of evil in the Islamic thought. The Koran abounds in references to evil and suffering along with some answers for the sceptics about the compatibility of evil and God. The crux of the argument about evil lies in the idea of testing. There are recurrent references to testing in various *suras* (Al-Anbiyáa, Al-Nur, Banî Israel, Ibrāhīm, Al-Qamar, Al-Nisáa) each of which serves to strengthen the idea that man on this earth is to be tested, explaining the existence of evil and suffering.

In Islam, it is believed that both *khayr* and *sharr* come from God, and man is not only tested through evil but also through good things. The Koran underlines the significance of trial by wealth and goodness as well, and it requires man to thank God for all good things s/he has: “Every soul shall have a taste of death: and We test you by evil and by good by way of trial. To Us must you return” (Al-Anbiyáa 21: 35).

Then a question arises as to why man is tested. The Koran reiterates the idea that this world is temporary, and on the Judgement Day man will be sent to Heaven or Hell according to his/her deeds in the world (Al-Imran, Al-A’raf, Al-Fath). Therefore, God tests man with suffering and evil, or with wealth to determine whether s/he remains loyal to Him and shows his/her gratitude to God in any condition: “He it is who created the heavens and the earth in six Days- and His Throne was over the waters- that He might try you, which of you is best in conduct” (Hūd 11: 7).

Likewise, in another *sura*:

He who created Death and Life, that He may try which of you is best in deed.

(Al-Mulk 67: 2)

It is He who hath made you the inheritors of the earth: He hath raised you in ranks, some above others: that He may try you in the gifts He hath given you.

(Al-Anām 6: 165)

The verse above explains why some suffer on this earth, while others live in wealth and luxury. The Koran highlights the importance of gratitude and patience, and it emphasises the fact that every human being will be tested one day. This is how the question of why the innocent suffer is answered in the Koran; that is, all is for the testing of faith.

Free will is another topic that is stressed in the Koran with the idea that man is free in his/her actions: “Whatever good, (O man!) happens to thee, is from Allah, but whatever evil happens to thee, is from thy (own) soul”.

(Al-Nisáa 4: 79)

According to the Koran, man falls into evil due to his/her passions and desires, which is the idea of *nefs* in Islam. *Nefs* is the weakness of mankind against which he tries hard to struggle, and it separates him/her from angels. A Muslim tries hard to struggle against his/her *nefs*. Hilmi Yavuz explains *nefs* as leaving anything apart from God (89). *Nefs* has to be controlled all the time since it seduces man to choose evil.

As for natural evil, the Koran explains that it is either for the purpose of trial or for punishment. There are several examples in the Koran about the societies which did not heed the warnings of the Prophets and God, hence, were punished by natural disasters; such as floods, earthquakes and volcanic eruptions as in the case of prophets Lut, Moses and Noah (*Suras* 7, 26, 71). The Koran explains that natural disasters sometimes happen not owing to a punishment but as of warnings for others and to maintain discipline on earth (Yaran 132). All in all, what Islam particularly

defends is that this world is not permanent and it is a place of testing, implying that the other world is more important than this one, and that there the earthly suffering of the innocent and the good will be rewarded by eternal happiness and wealth.

According to the Koran, there is always a chance to perform *tawba*²⁶ as God is all-merciful. The only unforgivable sin is to deny the Almighty. The Koran lays particular emphasis on this sin and draws the attention to the fact that these sinners will never be allowed to leave Hell (Özdemir 301).

ii.i.ii Evil in Christian and Western Thought:

Western thinkers before the eighteenth century generally used The Old Testament as their guide for the concept of evil, and they eventually developed their own views (Kelly 6-7). The writings in the Old Testament imply that human beings live in a “moral universe” that is created by God (Peterson, *The Problem* 23). It is believed that God created the world in such a way that the wicked should be punished and the good should be rewarded according to their deeds (*ibid.*). However, the Book of Job questions the accepted religious belief by showing that the justice of God may not be confirmed by the “facts of human experience” (*ibid.*).

It is not certain when the Book of Job was written, as some scholars place it around the year five hundred BC, while others claim it was written in the seventh or fourth centuries BC (Kelly 17). The narrative is regarded as unique in history as it asks basic questions about the Problem of Evil, questioning why innocent people suffer and “how to bear undeserved suffering” (Lara, “Narrating” 241). According to the story, Job was an innocent man with a strong faith in God:

There was a man in the land of Uz, whose name was Job;
And that man was perfect and upright, and one that feared God, and
eschewed evil.

(Job 1. 1)

²⁶ Repentance

However, when Satan asked God to test Job with loss, all kinds of evil befell Job, who lost all his wealth and his children. First, he lost his animals, and then his children and his house were destroyed by a strong wind:

Thy sons and thy daughters were eating and drinking wine in their eldest brother's house,
And, behold, there came a great wind from the wilderness, and smote the four corners of the house, and it fell upon young men, and they are dead.

(Job 1. 18-19)

Job yielded to his fate, suffering in silence, even protesting against the provocative words of his wife, who told him to curse God (Hartley 81). Thus, Job's case formed one of the ultimate points of argument for theologians, and Job became the supreme example and type of suffering of the innocent in discussions about the existence of evil and God. In fact, this story became cardinal to scholars' search for the question of why the just should suffer (Lara, "Narrating" 241); Job shows evil's "inextricable" link with the human being and the limits of mankind (*ibid.*).

Hence, there is a great conflict between what Christian religion puts forth about the "unrivalled power, unlimited knowledge and unrelenting love of God" and what it affirms about the existence of evil on earth, despite this perfect God (Peterson, *The Problem* 7). It is a great problem to attempt to explain the existence of both God and evil on earth as this leads to the question of why God allows suffering, particularly of the innocent (Yasa 9-11). Even ordinary people have found it hard to relate evil to God in a logical way (Peterson, *The Problem* 7). This problem has produced diverse interpretations about evil and God. Whereas some have tried to provide a logical explanation for the coexistence of a good God and evil without losing their faith in God, others have denied His benevolence (Yasa 11).

Thus, the crux of the argument in Western philosophy is as follows:

- 1- God exists, and is omnipotent, omniscient and perfectly good, [and] is logically consistent
- 2- Evil exists.

(M. Adams, Intro. 2)

According to Adams, the problems which arise from the question of how an omnipotent, omniscient and perfectly good God can coexist with evil are:

- 1- A perfectly good being would always eliminate evil so far as it could,
- 2- An omniscient being would know all about evil,
- 3- There are *no limits* to what an omnipotent being can do.

(*ibid.*)

It is difficult to accept the first two premises at once as they contradict one another. Orthodox theism tried to deny the second one stating that, “though it *looks* as if evil exists in abundance, behind the appearances, sanity reigns” (Neiman, “What” 35). Accordingly, things that look like absolute evil are necessary so as to achieve some good (*ibid.*).

There have been various attempts to explain the existence of evil in Western history and one of the most significant attempts that shaped the Middle Ages belonged to St. Augustine.

ii.i.ii.i St. Augustine:

In Western thought, St. Augustine, both a theologian and a philosopher, was an important figure, who probed into the problem of evil through a theistic approach. He attributed evil to the “‘wrong choices’ of a free rational will” (Neiman, *Evil* 240). By doing so, he tried to disprove that the Christian God was in any way blameworthy (*ibid.*). He was convinced that everything that exists is the outcome of God’s grandeur and goodness, on the grounds that God would not create something bad or wicked (Yasa 11). The goodness of the human being is the goodness of God, and evil arises just because of a lack of goodness in man (12). In *Confessions* and *Enchiridion*, Augustine compared evil to the wounds of animals, saying:

What, after all, is anything we call evil except privation of good? In animal bodies, for instance, sickness and wounds are nothing but the privation of health. When a cure is effected, the evils which were present (i.e., the sickness and the wounds) do not retreat and go

elsewhere. Rather, they simply do not exist anymore. For such, evil is not a substance; the wound or the disease is a defect of the bodily substance, which as a substance, is good. Evil, then, is an accident, i.e., privation of that good which is called health. Thus, whatever defects there are in a soul are privations of a natural good. When a cure takes place, they are not transferred elsewhere but, since they are no longer present in the state of health, they no longer exist at all.

(The Confessions 342-43)

Therefore, for Augustine, evil is “the absence of existence of good” (Mathewes 6).

Augustine claimed that all good things come from God:

For the Christian, it is enough to believe that the cause of all created things, whether in heaven or on earth, whether visible or invisible, is nothing than the goodness of the Creator, who is the one and the true God [...] [e]ach single created thing is good, and taken as a whole they are very good, because they constitute a universe of admirable beauty.

(The Confessions 342)

So, if there were no privation of good, there would be no evil. Furthermore, even if the soul happens to be corrupted, there is still some good in the nature of that person because God created everything as good. However, this corruption can continue until the whole nature is spoilt and no goodness remains:

As long, then, as a thing is being corrupted, there is good in it of which it is being deprived; and in this process, if something of its being remains that cannot be further corrupted, this will then be an incorruptible entity [*natura incorruptibilis*], and to this great good it will have come through the process of corruption. But even if the corruption is not arrested, it still does not cease having some good of which it cannot be further deprived. If, however, the corruption comes to be total and entire, there is no good left either, because it is no longer an entity at all.

(Augustine, The Confessions 343-44)

Since “every actual entity is good”, there cannot be evil alone, but some good in it (344). However, Augustine warned that God’s words about the free choice of man should not be ignored as, according to Augustine, it is man’s free choice and his/her sense of responsibility that is in question as far as evil is concerned:

[W]e must take warning lest we incur the prophetic judgment which reads: "Woe to those who call evil good and good evil: who call darkness light and light darkness; who call the bitter sweet and the sweet bitter." Moreover the Lord himself saith: "An evil man brings forth evil out of the evil treasure of his heart."

(344)

Thus, Augustine was convinced that a bad man is not bad because s/he is a human being, and all humans are created good. Nonetheless, his/her evilness comes out of his/her own wicked choices (344-45).

However, the problem about his concept of evil and good is that Augustine believed that evil cannot exist without some good, yet good can exist without evil. While he stood against dualism²⁷, he conceived that evil can coexist with good:

[t]wo contraries cannot coexist in a single thing. Nevertheless, while no one maintains that good and evil are not contraries, they cannot only coexist, but the evil cannot exist at all without the good [...] On the other hand, the good can exist without evil. For a man or an angel could exist and yet not be wicked [...].

(*The Confessions* 345)

According to Augustine, God gave the human being free will, so s/he has a choice between good and evil (Coekelbergh 339). Coeckelbergh states that Augustine’s view is “very asymmetric” as he implied “good happens to me”, yet it is the choice of man to be evil (*ibid.*).

In *On the Free Choice of the Will*, through the mouth of Euodius, Augustine again questioned whether God is the source of evil (Augustine 3). Augustine replied

²⁷ In theology, *dualism* refers to a universe as the “outcome of two eternally opposed or coexisting principles” like good and evil, or light and darkness (Maher 1).

that it is not Him but the human being who is the source, as s/he has the free choice, doing every deed through his/her will:

Euodius: Unless I am mistaken, we do it [evil] out of free choice of the will
[...]
(30)

Augustine: Thus we must admit that we have free choice for doing both evil and good. But in doing evil each person is free from justice and enslaved to sin [...].
(186)

As for the reason of the birth of evil, Augustine asserted that desires are to be blamed as they cause man to yearn for temporal benefits, rather than eternal ones. Once one desires something in an excessive way, evil is bound to follow that deed:

All the while, that reign of desires savagely tyrannizes and batters a person's whole life and mind with storms raging in all directions. On this side fear, on that desire; on this side anxiety, on that empty spurious enjoyment, on this side torment over the loss of something loved, on that ardour to acquire something not possessed; on this side sorrows for an injury received, on that the burning to redress it. Whichever way one turns, greed can pinch, extravagance squander, ambition enslave, pride puff up, envy twist, laziness overcome, stubbornness provoke, submissiveness oppress- these and countless of others throng the realm of lust, having the run of it.
(Augustine, *On the Free* 19)

For Augustine, free will is “intermediate good” owing to the fact that it can be used by the human being for either evil deeds or the good ones. Hence, if man abuses his/her free will, it will be his/her own responsibility, and his/her sin, and God should not be blamed for this. In addition, he claims that the human will is “the radical root of all evil” (Feinberg 70).

ii.i.ii.ii St. Thomas Aquinas:

Aquinas was of the same opinion as Augustine in terms of “the privation of good” (Davies 89). For him, goodness exists within creatures. He believed that that something is good as it has everything it needs to exist, and that if something is bad, it indicates that it “lacks something” (Davies 90). Therefore, Aquinas was convinced that badness is a “privation of form²⁸” (*ibid.*):

[t]he meaning of evil depends on the meaning of good. Now everything desirable is good, and since every nature loves its own being and perfection, it must be said that the being and perfection of any nature has the force of good. Consequently, it cannot be that evil signifies a being, or form, or nature. We are left, therefore, to draw the conclusion that evil signifies some absence of good.

(Aquinas 164-65)

Aquinas was careful to distinguish between “absence” and “privation” in his work, *Summa Theologica*. For him, evil cannot be attributed to every non-existing thing, but to things which lack the goodness they should have:

Evil denotes the lack of good. Not every absence of good is an evil, for absence may be taken either in a purely negative or in a privative sense. Mere negation does not display the character of evil, otherwise, non-existents would be evil, and, moreover, a thing would be evil for not possessing the goodness of something else, which would mean that man is bad for not having the strength of a lion, or the speed of a wild goat. But what is evil is privation [...].

(167)

Further, Aquinas believed in the interrelation of goodness and badness and was convinced that everything that is created has its opposite. Good cannot be identified unless there is bad on earth:

Every evil is based on some good, for it is present in a subject which is good as having some sort of nature. Evil cannot exist but in good; sheer evil is impossible [...] Many good things would be missed if God permitted no evil to exist; fire would not burn unless air were

²⁸ According to Aquinas, *form* means the “essence” of things. It refers to the material “substance itself” in objects (Eco 69).

consumed, lion would not thrive unless asses were killed, nor would just retribution be inflicted and long-suffering patience praised but the iniquity of persecution.

(168)

Hence, both good and evil reach meaning through their coexistence.

Aquinas categorised evil as “natural” and “moral” evil, and interpreted the latter in terms of religion, and defined moral evil as “sin” (Yasa 13). In fact, Aquinas believed that moral evil is twice as much evil as natural evil:

An evil in natural things is privation of a due form, and therefore to receive a form which involves the loss of a proper form is evil; thus to be set on fire. In moral matters, to attach oneself to an end which involves missing the due end²⁹ is evil, not precisely because of the end desired but because of the coupled deprivation.

(Aquinas 172)

Aquinas believed that all people through a moral reasoning are aware of what is good and what is evil in order to continue their lives. Certain things are regarded as good, because they contribute to the welfare of the community. For Aquinas, if something sets a bad example for the rest of the community, then it is regarded as evil. Man’s conscience helps him/her to show the way to goodness. However, man sometimes acts against his/her conscience, which leads to evil (Bourke 182-83).

For moral evil Aquinas, following Augustine, held the human being responsible and presumed that an evil deed can only be related to free creatures, so it “is only caused” by those who performed an evil deed (Davies 95). God cannot be blamed for the evil deeds; the blame is the human being’s as s/he has free will, which makes him/her the sole responsible for his/her actions. Aquinas said, “In voluntary activity it [evil] is called not only a sin but also a *culpa* or fault, since the doer is responsible and therefore deserves blame and punishment” (173). He was convinced that if man acts on his/her sensations rather than on his/her reason, then his/her actions can lead him/her to evil (Bourke 163). As for the cause of evil in general, Aquinas admitted that God is the creator of everything on earth. However, he also asserted that God cannot be held responsible for the existence of evil as there is

²⁹ Aquinas believed that in every action there is an “intended good”, for the sake of which everything else is done. This intended good in every “choice or action is called an end” (Bourke 190).

moral evil, which is the outcome of the faulty choices of the human being. Aquinas remarked, “With voluntary causes, the deficient action proceeds from an actually deficient will, that is a will not submitted to its rule and measure” (qtd. in Davies 95). Hence, it can be said that God wills evil only in terms of permitting it as everything comes from Him, but not directly in causing it (Davies 97). Therefore, it appears that both Augustine and Aquinas were careful not to say anything controversial about the existence of evil for fear that they may misguide people about the existence of God.

ii.i.ii.iii Gottfried Leibniz (1646-1716):

A group of Enlightenment intellectuals known as “Socinians” supported the idea that the existence of evil was not “incompatible with the existence of God” (“Leibniz” 1). Nevertheless, they asserted that this existence of evil was not compatible with a God who is omnipotent and omniscient. Therefore, they put forth the premise that God does not know everything (*ibid.*). In response to these ideas, Gottfried Leibniz tried to support the idea that God is all-knowing and benevolent, and that the human being is living in a world, which is “the best of all possible worlds” (*ibid.*). He approached the problem of evil through deduction (Wootton xviii). For him, the existence of God could be proved because even the idea of God “required that God must exist”. Leibniz believed that God created a universe that is huge and diverse, convenient for “intelligent and sentient beings” (*ibid.*). Susan Neiman, a scholar studying the concept of evil, remarks that Leibniz emphasised not the “goodness of the world” but “its comprehensibility” (“What” 36). Leibniz put forth the “first philosophical theodicy³⁰” to show that God should not be blamed for the evil in the world (Lara, “Narrating” 240). Though reality has some evil in it, he stated that this world is “the best possible” one (*ibid.*).

Both Augustine and Leibniz held that evil was essential for the richness and diversity of the world. Both stated that evil is an indispensable part of the “whole complex reality” (Lara, “Narrating” 240). For Leibniz, evil and misery exist only to make things “greater good” (Wootton xviii).

³⁰ The term *theodicy* comes from Greek, *theos* (God) and *dike* (justice), the justification of God. The term was first used by Leibniz in 1710 in his essay, “Essais de Théodicée sur la bonte de Dieu, la liberté del’homme et l’origine du mal”. He aimed to demonstrate that evil on earth is not inconsistent with the existence of the goodness of God. The ultimate purpose of theodicy is to prove the existence of God. Besides, theodicy seeks to question “His nature and attributes” (Kempf).

Unlike the earlier thinkers, Leibniz approached the concept of evil through a philosophical perspective. He tried to classify evil into three types as “physical, moral and metaphysical” in his work *Theodicy*. While maintaining that metaphysical evil “consists in mere imperfection” (136), he continued the views of the medieval thinkers like Augustine in his claim that natural evil is the outcome of moral evil and is a punishment by God, and this was adopted by many people for many years (Neiman, “What” 38).

As for the cause of evil, which concerned a great many intellectuals at that time and before, Leibniz found it within the nature of the human being. As the human being is limited, s/he is not perfect by nature, and therefore has the tendency to perform evil deeds:

The question is asked first of all, whence does evil come? [...] The ancients attributed the cause of evil to *matter*, which they believed uncreate and independent of God: but we, who derive all being from God, where shall we find the source of evil? The answer is, that it must be sought in the ideal nature of the creature, in so far as this nature is contained in the eternal verities which are in the understanding of God, independently of his will. For we must consider that there is an *original imperfection in the creature* before sin, because the creature is limited in its essence; whence ensues that it cannot know all, and that it can deceive itself and commit other errors.
(Leibniz 135)

Hence, Leibniz tried to clarify the cause of evil, which also deeply concerned Augustine and Aquinas, both of whom conceived of it as the “privation of good”, having no formal cause because it implies an absence. Leibniz explicated that God does not will evil for His objects; however, when man out of his imperfection brings about moral evil, there appears the requirement of some kind of punishment, which is manifested in physical evil:

God wills moral evil not at all, and physical evil or suffering he does not will absolutely. Thus it is that there is no absolute predestination to damnation; and one may say of physical evil, that God wills it often as a penalty owing to guilt, and often also as a means to an end, that is to prevent greater evils or to obtain greater good.

(137)

So, Leibniz ranked moral evil, or sin, as the greatest and the real evil, justifying the physical evil given by God. From this assumption, Leibniz concluded that God created man innocent, yet “liable to fall”, which gives Him the opportunity to “re-create” him after he falls (141).

In the end, Leibniz accepted the fact that he was of the same opinion with his predecessors, Augustine and Aquinas, and he stated:

I have followed therein the opinion of St. Augustine, who said a hundred times that God permitted evil in order to derive good, that is to say, a greater good, and Thomas Aquinas says that the permission of evil tends towards the good of the universe.

(378)

When compared to the Muslim philosopher Ghazali, Leibniz’s claims are complementary, supporting the premise that this is the best possible world, which appears to justify the existence of evil and God Himself. Both Ghazali and Leibniz were the optimists of their ages, defending God’s power, magnificence and justice.

ii.i.ii.iv The Lisbon Earthquake and the Eighteenth Century:

The eighteenth century scholars generally regarded the Lisbon earthquake of 1755 as the paramount event that changed the opinions of many intellectuals in diverse disciplines. It shattered the established views about the nature described in Western thought (Sanides 107). Discussions about the nature of the physical nature amounted to a rise in Europe after the disaster; in fact, people started to question whether physical nature is indeed evil (*ibid.*). The earthquake brought about a challenge against the beliefs in the omnipotence and benevolence of God. In addition, such presumptions as that God rewards the good and punishes the wicked with a disaster were put under question. The calamity reminded people of the basic question in theology: “Why does God, so mighty and benevolent, give such sufferings to the innocent people in Lisbon?” (Robbins 134).

Lisbon at the time was deemed to be one of the most devout cities in Europe; it had “more than ninety convents and forty churches” (Sanides 108). In fact, Pope

Benedict XIV gave the title “the most pious majesty” to the Portugal King, John V, in 1748 as a sign of the Catholic loyalty of the country (*ibid.*). The earthquake took place on a Catholic holy day, on All Saints’ Day, when most people went to church. It was later announced that the disaster caused the death of two thirds of the population, demolishing almost the entire city (*ibid.*). The Catholic Church declared that it was an act of God, a punishment given to the people in Lisbon for their sins (*ibid.*). Across Europe, universities organised essay competitions about the justice of God in allowing the suffering of people in Lisbon. Such questions as why God chose Lisbon and not another city in Europe became the subjects of fierce discussions in the academic world (Neiman, “What” 27). Thus, the problem of evil dominated the intellectual discussions in the eighteenth century, in which the Lisbon disaster marked the separation between moral and natural evil (*ibid.*). Much of the argument was manifested in the works of Voltaire (1694-1778), Rousseau (1712-1778) and Kant (1724-1804) (Sanides 108).

Highly influenced by the Lisbon earthquake, Voltaire expressed his reflections on the problem of evil and nature in his work, “On the Lisbon Earthquake”, which was an attack on Leibniz’s argument that the “distribution of happiness is just” (Pattison 5; Neiman, “What” 38). Since the first part of the poem on the Lisbon earthquake evoked no hope, Voltaire was harshly criticised (Wootton xxvii). The poem starts with the description of a catastrophe along with a protest at the injustice of the situation:

Unhappy mortals! Dark and mourning earth!
Affrighted gathering of human kind!
Eternal lingering of useless pain!

(Voltaire 1-3)

Voltaire argued that those, such as Leibniz, who believed that all catastrophes were also for the best of the humankind, in fact, ignored suffering and accepted everything without questioning:

Come, ye philosophers, who cry, “All’s well,”
And contemplate this ruin of a world.
Behold these shreds and cinders of your race

(Voltaire 4-6)

Witnessing the death of millions and the ruins of the city, Voltaire challenged what the Catholic Church proclaimed about the punishment of God and the Lisbon victims (Sanides 109). He urged the human being to question his/her fate and the Maker who led man to suffer on earth. It was, for him, essential to protest against what happened so as not to lose the integrity of humanity (Pattison 6).

Rousseau, on the other hand, supported the idea that evil is the outcome of man's deeds and hence, to some extent, it can be prevented (Gourevitch 201). He expressed most of his defence of God in the "Creed of the Savoyard Vicar", which is a part of *Emile* (1762). He starts the work with the sentence, "Everything is good as it leaves the hands of the Author of nature, everything degenerates in the hands of men" (qtd. in Neiman, "What" 38). His ideas shocked many people, even causing his books to be burnt in Paris. The church regarded his book as an attack on religion since Rousseau rejected the idea of Original Sin, and other religious teachings of the church (Neiman, *Evil* 40). Thus, for Rousseau, evil has "social origins" rather than "natural" ones (Garrard 46). Similar to Augustine, for Rousseau, free will is a gift given to the human being by God (*ibid.* 43). He also defended Leibniz, connecting moral evil to the acts of human beings. According to him, the reason for moral evil should be sought in man (Gourevitch 204). Rousseau was the first to form a connection between moral and natural evil in a rational way by claiming that natural evil is not the punishment for moral evil. Furthermore, he was convinced that the human being is not wicked by nature; on the contrary, s/he becomes evil as evil "develops over time" because human beings change over time and their choices can determine their nature. (Neiman, *Evil* 44). The belief in Original Sin required that man is sinful due to the wrong choice of Adam and Eve, and Rousseau believed that if one wrong choice introduced evil to the earth, then another choice can eradicate it (*ibid.*).

One year after the Lisbon earthquake, another significant philosopher, Kant, published three articles on the disaster, denying all religious, mystical and astrological explanations for earthquakes. He claimed that earthquakes did not have any direct link with divine justice since everything on earth has a cause (Hirvonen and Porttikivi 2). The idea that such disasters could be punishments for moral evil was completely rejected by Kant (Neiman, "What" 39). Kant did not hold that Original Sin, the Fall or desires could be the cause of moral evil (*ibid.*). With his

famous statement, “Man is evil by nature”, in his essay titled “On the Radical Evil in Human”, Kant shocked the intellectuals to such an extent that Schiller remarked that the essay was “scandalous” (qtd. in Cherkasova 327). According to Rogozinski, what was scandalous was Kant’s claim that man is born with a tendency to evil (31). Kant’s propositions marked a significant change in history as they drew attention to human nature through the concept of an “evil heart” (Lara, Intro. 3).

Kant included the essay in his book *Religion within the Limits of Reason Alone* (1793) along with more discussion on the free will of the individual and moral law, as well as a discussion about man’s choice of evil. The book demonstrates free choice not as a manifestation of a “good will”, but as a will which is unpredictable, having the capacity to lead man to wickedness (Cherkasova 328). He pointed to the darkness of the human heart, trying to reveal the origin of evil in the human being and his “arbitrary will” (*ibid.*). Kant called the human being evil not because s/he performs an evil deed, which is against moral law, but because an “evil maxim” can be detected in his/her deeds (Kant 46).

The human being can be good; however, s/he can also be evil (Coeckelbergh 345); hence, it is impossible to define one person as completely good in the Kantian sense. In the book, Kant differentiated predisposition to goodness and the propensity to evil in man. Even though man has a predisposition to good, he can become evil through his free will. Goodness is not inherent in man; on the other hand, man acquires it if he “incorporates the moral law in” his maxims as the “primary incentive” (Coeckelbergh 344).

What Kant meant by “radical evil” is not being evil in extreme forms, rather, it implies the “propensity” in the human being towards evil (Coeckelbergh 344). According to him, evil emerges out of the evil will of the human being as there is a tendency in man to evil, which he cannot escape from (Peters 218). He explained in *Religion*:

Now if a propensity to this [...] does lie in the human nature, then there is in the human being a natural propensity to evil; and this propensity itself is morally evil, since it must ultimately be sought in a free power of choice, and hence is imputable. This evil is *radical*, since it corrupts the ground of all maxims; as natural propensity, it is also not to be *extirpated* through human forces, for this could happen

only through good maxims- something that cannot take place if the subjective supreme ground of all maxims is presupposed to be corrupted.

(59)

For Kant, the human being has a “predisposition” to good, but this does not imply that man is good (*ibid.*). In fact, man becomes good or evil through his choices. The “propensity” to evil does not depend on man’s nature or will; on the contrary, it depends on his choices (*ibid.*). Thus, Kant conceived that nothing is “morally evil”, but that evil is “our own act” (Lara, Intro. 3).

Kant did not imply that man always follows his propensity to evil, yet even in “the best man”, there is such a capacity, which is “rooted in human nature” and which requires one to struggle against it (Allison 92).

The ultimate difference between the evil man and the good one lies not in their “incentives”, but in their way of using these incentives in accordance with the moral law (Kant 57). Kant said:

Hence, whether the human being is good or evil, must not lie in the difference between the incentives that he incorporates into his maxim (not in the material of the maxim) but in their *subordination* (in the form of maxim): *which of the two he makes the condition of the other*. It follows that the human being (even the best) is evil only because he reverses the moral law of his incentives in incorporating them into his maxims. He indeed incorporates the moral law into those maxims, together with the law of self-love, since he realizes that two cannot stand on an equal footing, but one must be subordinated to the other as its supreme condition.

(59)

Thus, for Kant, evil resides in “self-love” as it refuses to set the limits required by moral law. In its extreme forms, self-love turns into “pursuit of self-interest”, which can lead to horrendous crimes in social contexts (Allison 95). Kant said that self-love involves “comparison” of oneself with others to “gain worth in the opinion of others” (Kant 52). Nevertheless, this comparison can produce unnecessary desires such as the urge to be superior to others, bringing “jealousy” and “rivalry”

with it (*ibid.*). The tendency to compete with others and to gain power over them will grant one a sense of security, which will reinforce competitiveness in relationships. This tendency will manifest itself in “envy, gratitude, joy in others’ misfortunes”, all of which Kant defined as “diabolical vices” (51).

Kant emphasised the freedom of the human being in his/her choices; nonetheless, he also pointed out that if the individual wants to become good, s/he has to adjust his/her free will to the moral law. Otherwise, innate inclinations will lead him/her to choose evil (Coeckelbergh 348). Kant remarked:

He (the human being) has been created for the *good* and the original *predisposition* in him is good; the human being is not thereby good as such, but he brings it about that he becomes either good or evil, according as he either incorporates or does not incorporate into his maxims the incentives contained in that predisposition (and this must be left entirely to his free choice).

(65)

It is man’s freedom that brings him/her misery according to Kantian ideas of evil. Rogozinski interprets Kant’s statements as follows: “The radicalness of evil would therefore seem to indicate that it is so deeply rooted in my freedom that ‘it cannot be eradicated’; that this manner of being bad, adherence to which corrodes the flesh of my being, distorts each of my acts and stigmatizes them” (33). It is embedded in the very free will that can lead man to morality or to corruption. Different from his predecessors, for Kant, evil is “radical” not because it is the “privation of good”, or the source of “ignorance”, but because it resides in the freedom itself (Cherkasova 330). Human beings are completely responsible for their choices and actions, whether they choose to be good by obeying the moral law, or to be evil by disobeying their duty, as all decisions are the outcomes of their will. Therefore, all human deeds have direct relations with the “maxims in the human volition” (Bernstein 58).

ii.i.ii.v J.L. Mackie (1917-1981) and Alvin Plantinga (1932-):

The Problem of Evil still continues today albeit in different forms. Today it is not only a problem in theology but in other disciplines as well. The two most cited

modern philosophers on the topic of evil are J.L. Mackie and Alvin Plantinga (Peterson, 18; Hasker 50; M. Adams 13).

In the twentieth century, atheological (atheistic) ideas appeared in attempts to disprove the existence of an omnipotent and omnibenevolent creator in relation to the Problem of Evil. J.L. Mackie, an Oxford scholar, was one of the proponents of this approach (Peterson, *God and Evil* 18). Mackie, in his famous article titled “Evil and Omnipotence”, asserted that the propositions put forth in traditional theology about the existence of God and evil are not consistent. He believed that the existence of evil generates difficulty in understanding the existence of God; thus, it is “positively irrational” to accept the two premises as essential parts of one theology, because they are “inconsistent” with one another (J. Harris 236). He regarded the problem of evil as the problem of only those who believe that there is an omnipotent God. He stated that “The problem of evil, in the sense in which I shall be using the phrase, is a problem only for someone who believes there is a God who is both omnipotent and wholly good” (Mackie, “Evil” 25). He clarified the logical problem of evil as, “God is omnipotent; God is wholly good; and yet evil exists” (*ibid.*). He believed that these three propositions should be “affirmed as true” if the problem of evil is a theological one (Mackie, “Ground” 215), for there is an essential contradiction between these. Mackie discussed:

There seems to be some contradiction between these three propositions, so that if any two of them were true the third would be false. But at the same time all three are essential parts of most theological positions: the theologian, it seems, at once *must* adhere and *cannot consistently* adhere to all three.

(“Evil” 25)

Mackie analysed a number of solutions to the Problem of Evil and argued that they are not satisfactory in explaining the existence of God and evil (Hasker 56). The first of these solutions, which he held as “fallacious”, is the assertion that “‘Good cannot exist without evil’ or ‘Evil is necessary as a counterpart to good’” (Mackie, “Evil” 28). Mackie reacted against this argument with the assumption that the human being notices things due to their opposites, so if God created everything good, the human being would not notice it, and evil would not be a problem:

I suggest that it is not really impossible that everything should be, say, red, that the truth is merely that if everything were red we should not notice redness, and so we should have no word “red”; we observe and give names to qualities only if they have real opposites. If so, the principle that a term must have an opposite would belong only to our language or to our thought, and would not be ontological principle, and correspondingly, the rule that good cannot exist without evil would not state a logical necessity of a sort that God would just have to put up with. God might have made everything good, though *we* should not have noticed it if he had.

(“Evil” 29-30)

Furthermore, he continued his counterargument by explaining that if evil is required to exist as an opposite of good, then a “minute dose of evil” would already be enough for good to exist. Therefore, for him, the proposition of evil as a necessity for the existence of good fails. Next, he argued against the validity of the statement “Evil is a necessary means to good”, which suggests a “causal” relationship and thus poses a threat to the omnipotence of God, since all causal laws are made by God himself (Mackie, “Evil” 30). If a theist accepts the premise that there is a causal relation between good and evil, then s/he should accept that God’s power is limited and that He is subject to this relationship:

This certainly conflicts with what a theist normally means by omnipotence. This view of God as limited by causal laws also conflicts with the view that causal laws are themselves made by God [...] This conflict would, indeed, be resolved if it were possible for an omnipotent being to bind himself [...] Unless a favourable answer can be given to this question, the suggestion that evil is necessary as a means to good solves the problem of evil only by denying one of its constituent propositions, either that God is omnipotent [...].

(Mackie, “Evil” 30)

The third proposition Mackie found fallacious is that “[T]he universe is better with some evil in it than it could be if there were no evil” (“Evil” 30). This statement is the one made by Leibniz, who argued that the existence of evil enriches the universe. Mackie stressed that the assumption about the evil in question refers to “physical evil”, which is primarily composed of “pain” (“Evil” 31). He took this kind of evil as the “first order of evil”, which is contrasted with the “first order of good”, such as “pleasure and happiness” (*ibid.*). Moreover, there is the “second order of

good”, which does not necessarily have a causal relation with the first order of evil. Mackie explained that this second order of good is “the heightening of happiness by contrast with misery”, in some instances “it includes sympathy with suffering, heroism in facing danger and the gradual decrease of the first order of evil and increase of good” (*ibid.*). He emphasised that this second order of good is more important than the first one as “it more than outweighs the first order evil it involves” (*ibid.*). Mackie argued that theists who support this thesis believe that this is the best possible world, as Leibniz proposed, on the account of the fact that the world involves the second order of good along with the first order of evil (*ibid.*). For him, the first order of evil is directly contrasted with the first order of good; on the other hand, the second order of good, like “benevolence”, tries to “maximise” the first order of good and “minimise” the first order of evil. However, God’s goodness does not minimise the evil on earth. He asserted:

Our analysis shows clearly the possibility of the existence of a *second* order of evil, an evil (2) contrasting with good (2) as evil (1) contrasts with good (1). This would include malevolence, cruelty, callousness, cowardice and states in which good is decreasing and evil (1) is increasing. And just as God is concerned to promote evil, so evil (2), will, by analogy, be the important kind of evil, the kind which God, if he were wholly good and omnipotent, would eliminate. And yet evil (2) plainly exists.

(“Evil” 32)

Hence, the third proposition about the existence of evil fails for Mackie as well. The last thesis is about the free will of the individuals, which was later developed by Alvin Plantinga. It is purported that “evil is due to human freewill”, which tries to distance the responsibility of God in the Problem of Evil. This time Mackie asked if God created man as free, why then He did not make him always choose good (“Evil” 33). Mackie was convinced that His being wholly good opposes man’s choice of evil. In addition, if the human being is completely free in his/her choices, then God is “not omnipotent”, or if He “refrains from” controlling the choices of man on purpose, then He is not again “wholly good” (“Evil” 34). Therefore, Mackie concluded that there is a “paradox” about the omnipotence of God. For him, the solutions found for the Problem of Evil are not valid as none of them offer to change any essential part

of the three propositions that define the Problem, which would in fact destroy the whole theistic premise. He finally asserted that the powers of God must be limited for the logical explanation of the existence of evil:

[t]he paradox of omnipotence has shown that God's omnipotence must in any case be restricted in one way or another, that unqualified omnipotence cannot be ascribed to any being that continues through time.

(“Evil” 37)

In modern times, another approach to evil, the “Free-Will Defence”, has been developed by Alvin Plantinga. He challenges the propositions of Mackie and argues that the existence of God is not inconsistent with the existence of evil in the Problem (R. Adams 225). Like Leibniz, he suggests that God might have created evil for the human being to “achieve” good (M. Adams 11). However, his views are different from the former, in that, Plantinga believes that “the occurrence of the greater goods without the evils, while perhaps possible in itself, may have been unobtainable even by an omnipotent God” (*ibid.*). Plantinga bases his arguments on the Free Will Defence, supporting the idea that man is free in his choices; nevertheless, Plantinga does this in an “incompatibilist” sense, which means “freedom is incompatible with determinism” (R. Adams 226). For compatibilists, an action performed by an agent on purpose is free. They do not question whether or not that action was “causally determined” (M. Adams 12). On the other hand, incompatibilists believe that an action is free if the agent performs it independently, without any causal relation (*ibid.*). Thus, for Plantinga, God does not determine the free choice of the individual:

Now God can create free creatures, but he cannot *cause* or *determine* them to do what is right. For if he does so, then they are not significantly free at all; they do not do what is right *freely*. To create creatures capable of *moral good*, therefore, he must create creatures capable of moral evil; and he cannot leave these creatures *free* to perform evil and at the same time prevent them from doing so. God did in fact create significantly free creatures; but some of them went wrong in the exercise of their freedom: this is the source of moral evil.

(Plantinga 85)

Plantinga emphasises the freedom of the human being in his/her deeds. If God led man in what to choose, then it would not be freedom at all. He discusses the validity of Mackie's objection about the possibility of God creating human beings who only choose good. Plantinga asserts that to do that God should know "what the various possible free creatures would freely do in the various possible situations in which they could be placed" (M. Adams 13). Against the possible objection which purports that "if God is omnipotent, then God could have actualized just any possible world" (88), he says:

But this will not be entirely accurate [...] For if he (God) is a contingent being, then there are worlds in which he does not exist; and clearly he could not have actualized any of *these* worlds. Clearly the only worlds within God's power to actualize are those that include his existence.

(*ibid.*)

According to Plantinga, if God created free beings following a "certain procedure", they would choose the right thing all the time. However, they may also "sin". It is not certain whether God "followed a certain procedure" and whether free beings always choose the right or the wrong. Thus, "even an omnipotent God" could face with failure in his attempt of creating free beings (M. Adams 15).

Plantinga defends the omnipotence of God with the assertion that God wanted to create creatures with complete freedom. Thus, man's choice is not determined by any power at all:

More broadly, if I am free with respect to an action *A* then God does not *bring it about* or *cause it to be the case* either that I take or that I refrain from this action; he neither causes this to be so through the laws he establishes, nor by direct intervention, nor in any other way. For if he *brings it about* or *causes it to be the case* that I take *A*, then I am not free to *refrain* from *A*, in which case I am not free with respect to *A*.

(89)

Plantinga separates natural evil from moral evil just like many other thinkers before him as mentioned above. He applies natural evil to the deeds of “non-human spirits”, in a way similar to the interpretation of St. Augustine:

[m]ore traditional line of thought is pursued by St. Augustine, who attributes much of the evil we find to *Satan*, or to Satan and his cohorts. Satan, so the traditional doctrine goes, is a mighty non-human spirit who, along with many other angels, was created long before God created man. Unlike most of his colleagues, Satan rebelled against God and has since been wreaking whatever havoc he can. The result is natural evil. So the natural evil we find is due to free actions of non-human spirits.

(107)

Nonetheless, unlike Augustine, Plantinga asserts that it is “possible” that non-human creatures cause natural evil:

This is a *theodicy*, as opposed to a *defence*. St. Augustine believes that natural evil [...] is *in fact* to be ascribed to the activity of beings that are free and rational but non-human. The Free Will Defender, on the other hand, need not assert that this is *true*; he says only that it is *possible* [...] [p]ossibly natural evil is due to the free activity of a set of non-human persons, and perhaps it was not within God’s power to create a set of such persons whose free actions produced a greater balance of good over evil.

(108)

Moreover, Plantinga realises that it is difficult to draw a clear line between moral evil and natural evil as both are the results of the deeds of free beings; the former is the deeds of the human beings, whereas the latter is of the non-human beings. Thus, he unites these two types of evil, calling them “broadly moral evil”:

[t]hen *natural* evil significantly resembles *moral* evil in that, like the latter, it is the result of the activity of significantly free persons. In fact both moral and natural evil would then be special cases of what we might call *broadly moral evil*-evil resulting from the free actions of personal beings, whether human or not.

(108)

Finally, by claiming that man, not being determined by any external force, is completely free in his/her deeds, Plantinga demonstrates that the existence of God and evil, either natural or moral, are consistent with each other.

ii.ii The Psychological “Problem of Evil”:

ii.ii.i Carl Jung (1875-1961) and Philip Zimbardo (1933-):

Apart from theology and philosophy, there are some relatively recent psychological attempts to clarify the concept of evil. In the twentieth century, with the developments in psychology, man focused on the nature of the human being more than ever, examining his/her psyche in all aspects. Evil was one of the most important questions that psychologists were led to ponder over, and still remains a controversial topic. Scholars with a psychological approach to the concept of evil maintain that evil is the outcome of an “immature personality, a personality that has not come together”; thus, such a person lacks a coherent self (Dilmen 114). Several psychoanalysts like Carl Jung, Philip Zimbardo, Melanie Klein and Fred Alford have tried to concentrate on human motives which lead to destruction and wickedness.

In his *Answer to Job* (1952), Jung attempted to clarify his views about evil and good, and was convinced that evil cannot be separated from good as God cannot be considered without His shadow. Only with the inclusion of evil- the dark shadow- can God be regarded as one. Jung reached the conclusion that evil is the shadow of an individual and with his/her shadow- the unconscious desires- one can become a unified subject. For him, the conscious part of the individual only becomes a whole with its dark shadow, so evil is integrated with good, making an object a whole (355-475).

Philip Zimbardo (1933-) is one of the contemporary social psychologists focusing on the concept of evil. He is particularly well-known for his Stanford Prison Experiment (1971) and his book the *Lucifer Effect* (2007). The Stanford Prison Experiment was carried out in order to understand how good people turn to evil, and the relationship between evil and power. In the experiment, a simulation of a prison was built in the basement of the psychology building of Stanford University and twenty-four healthy individuals participated in the study. Some of these individuals

were randomly grouped as prisoners, while the others were given the role of guards. Although the study was designed to be carried out for two weeks, after six days the experiment had to be abandoned since the students as “prisoners” started to develop some psychological problems and those acting as “guards” turned out to be sadistic. Zimbardo notes: “[O]ver time, this experiment has emerged as a powerful illustration of the potentially toxic impact of bad systems and bad situations in making good people behave in pathological ways that are alien to their nature” (195). At the end of the study he reached the conclusion that sometimes situations are powerful enough to make people behave in such ways that they themselves cannot predict in advance (211).

In *The Lucifer Effect* (2007), Zimbardo makes a thorough analysis of the Stanford Experiment and compares it to recent events in the Abu Ghraib prison, where American soldiers have brutally treated Iraqi prisoners. He attempts to reveal how and why a good man turns to evil in certain situations.

Nevertheless, one limitation in Zimbardo’s interpretation of evil is his primary focus on the power relations. He believes that evil is closely related to the concept of authority and thus his interpretations cannot be applied for such deeds as robbery or lying.

C. Fred Alford is another contemporary psychoanalyst whose interpretations seem to be broader than Zimbardo’s and can be seen to encompass his thesis on evil since Alford defines evil in relation to an individual’s dread or fear, which can manifest itself in any form, such as fear of death, of life or of being inferior (*What* 80; “Talking” 318). As Alford’s concept of evil is much broader than those of his contemporaries, his theories of evil are worth focusing on in this thesis; however, in order to comprehend his ideas of evil, Melanie Klein should be studied as Alford developed her theories of evil in relation to the positions of development Klein put forth.

ii.ii.ii Melanie Klein (1882-1960):

Melanie Klein highlights the significance and destructive effects of “envy” in human relationships, and attempts to form a connection between envy and evil. Klein is a significant psychoanalyst, concentrating on children and human nature along

with the development of the psyche (Alford, *What* 18). To comprehend how she perceives the relationship between envy and evil, it is necessary first to understand Klein's theories about the development of the child's psyche. For Klein, the basic human struggle lies in the conflict between "love and hatred, care and concern for others and their malicious destructions", all of which are formed in the earliest ages of childhood (Marcus and Rosenberg 118).

Klein was an important pupil of Freud, but by the second half of the 1930s, her contributions to psychoanalysis were developing into an autonomous unit and started to be independent from the theories of Freud. Unlike Freud, Klein believes that ego is not something that develops at later periods of a child's life. On the contrary, she asserts that "ego is present at birth" (Vetlesen 115). Nevertheless, ego is not very strong and it can easily be "disintegrated" through the feeling of anxiety (*ibid.*). Moreover, this feeling of anxiety and fear of fragmentation does not disappear from one's life (*ibid.*).

What makes Klein unique is her special technique developed in order to interpret the repressed feelings of children. "Play technique" is her first departure from the classical analysis of "free association"³¹ developed by Freud. Klein draws attention to the significance of play technique and writes:

[T]he special primitive peculiarities of the mental life of children necessitate a special technique adapted to them, consisting of the analysis of their play. By means of this technique we can reach the deepest repressed experience and fixations and this enables us fundamentally to influence children's development.

("The Psychological Principles of Infant Analysis" 150)

As noted above, it is of importance that there should be a different technique developed for children to reveal their repressed feelings. During her analyses, Klein provided children with little wooden toys, and then encouraged them to play freely. While observing them, Klein also interpreted their play, which expresses their feelings and desires (Jones 12). She explains in "The Psycho-Analytic Technique:

³¹ This is a method used in psychoanalytic treatments. It was developed by Sigmund Freud, who describes it in *The Interpretations of Dreams* (1900) as follows: "We tell him [the patient] that the success of psychoanalysis depends on his noticing and reporting whatever comes into his head and not being misled, for instance, into suppressing an idea because it strikes him as unimportant or irrelevant or because it seems to him meaningless" (101).

It's History and Significance" that some children express their aggression in their play, either directly or indirectly (20). In this respect, play, like dreams, can express the latent content of the unconscious. Thus, Klein attempts to interpret the child's playing by connections to particular emotions and anxieties that lie in the unconscious of the child (Mitchell 20). Klein elaborates on this as follows:

Play analysis has shown that symbolism enabled the child to transfer not only interests but also phantasies, anxieties and guilt to objects other than people. Thus a great deal of relief is experienced in play and this is one of the factors which make it so essential for the child.
(“The Psycho-Analytic” 20)

As mentioned above, from the very early stages of development, the infant begins to look for symbols in order to reflect its repressed fears or desires, and feels somewhat relieved in the end from its painful experiences. The infant, in its play, represents symbolically its phantasies³², wishes and experiences, and at the end, by sometimes breaking, hitting or cutting the objects, it reaches a degree of relief from its anxieties (“The Importance of Symbol-Formation” 236-37).

From the experiences of the infant in its external and internal world, Klein also developed her “object relations theory”. She points out that object relations start at the very early phases of development, even at birth: “I found that object relations start almost at birth and arise with the first feeding experience; furthermore, all aspects of mental life are bound up with object relations” (“The Psycho-Analytic” 21). The mother, particularly her breast at first, is the primal object for the infant's introjective³³ and projective processes. For Klein, during this stage of relationship between the child and the mother/the breast, love and hatred are first projected onto the mother and her breast (Oedipus objects) (“On Identification” 310). Thus, aggressive impulses and phantasies arise in the infant's first relation to its mother's breast- the child's primal object- such as “sucking the breast dry and scooping it out” (*ibid.*), and then this soon leads to further phantasies of “entering the mother and

³² Phantasy is spelt with “ph” by Klein in order to show the unconscious component (Gounelas 33).

³³ The term “introjection” was first coined by Sandor Ferenczi in 1909 to refer to the opposite of projection. Freud also used the term, arguing that “the purified pleasure-ego” is constituted by the introjection of anything that is a source of pleasure. Klein used the term to describe the introjection of objects. It is the symbolic identification (Evans 90). For Klein, the infant introjects the ideal breast both in phantasy and in real feeding, and desiring its goodness, the infant identifies with it. The introjection of the object is the basis of the ego and also the superego (Segal, *Klein* 102).

robbing her of the contents of her body” (*ibid.*). Klein, therefore, argues that the very first relations of the infant to the external world are of an extremely primitive kind, based on the basic needs of sucking the breast. However, as noted above, this first relation comprises contradictory emotions- love and hate together- springing from two main instincts- desire and aggression (350-351).

For Klein, the object is related not only to reality but also to its phantasy, and unconscious phantasies are associated with the infant’s experience of pain and pleasure, happiness and anxiety (Heimann 24). In the Kleinian view, phantasy is a mechanism of defence against any anxiety (Segal, *Introduction* 30). It is about things good and bad, real and imagined, and the influence of phantasy on everyday life, interaction, art and science “cannot be overrated” (Klein, *Envy* 251). Klein further argues that anxiety originated in aggression, which she claims as being innate and grounded in the projection of the death instinct³⁴.

Klein is convinced that the instincts of the infant are all about an object and the experience of instinct in phantasy relates to an appropriate object. Once the infant introjects the primal object (the mother’s breast or the father’s penis), it does so in response to an already existing knowledge of these primal objects. The infant, after forming images within its ego, projects its feelings out onto “real” objects (Gounelas 33). Therefore, the infant’s phantasy is built upon from the inner and outer reality as it is determined by feelings, desires, fears and instincts and then projected out onto objects. Klein maintains:

We see that the child’s earliest reality is wholly phantastic; he is surrounded with objects of anxiety, and in this respect excrements, organs, objects, things animate and inanimate are to begin with equivalent to one another.

(“The Importance of Symbol-Formation” 238)

³⁴ The idea of the death instinct (Thanatos) was first developed by Sigmund Freud, who describes it as the destructive instinct in constant conflict with the life instinct or Eros. While the aim of the latter is “to establish ever greater unities and to preserve them” [...] to bind together; the aim of the death instinct is “to undo connections and [...] destroy things” (*An Outline* 18). Freud also points out that “the aim of all life is death” and that “inanimate things existed before living ones” (*Beyond Pleasure* 46), drawing attention to the idea of the death instinct. Furthermore, in a letter to Einstein, Freud mentions these two instincts again and contends that “this instinct [death instinct] is at work in every living creature and is striving to bring it to ruin and reduce life to its original condition of inanimate matter” (*The Standard Ed.* 211).

Object relations are highly important for the development of the child. It begins to mould the child's relation to his/her mother and father along with other people. Anxiety, guilt and depressive feelings are intrinsic elements of the child's emotional life and they are all related to his/her object relations, which consists of the relations not only to real people but to their representatives in his/her inner world as well (Klein, "Mourning" 319). From these introjected feelings and figures, the infant's superego comes out and it influences its relations both to its parents and to its sexual development (*ibid.*). Therefore, for Klein, there is an interaction between the formation of the superego and object relations from the very early stages of development. The infant needs the object when it desires satisfaction and it thinks it possesses the object when it is satisfied. Furthermore, when it is gratified and happy, the infant regards the object as the "good breast" and the infant reflects its love. Nevertheless, when the infant is hungry or feels pain, it believes that the pain is due to the "bad breast", which the infant thinks is not part of itself. The infant holds the breast as responsible for its suffering and it develops hatred for it (Heimann 24-25). Klein contends that the infant's anxiety emerges depending on the relation of the infant to the object, whether it "allays anxiety or excites it" (Klein, *The Psychoanalysis of Children* 50). To put it another way, the infant's emotional life is determined by a sense of losing and regaining the good object. Klein argues that if the anxiety of the infant is too strong, the Oedipus objects have not become good *imagos* (*ibid.*) and there is no recovery for the child.

In dividing the breast and thence the mother into a "good" mother and a "bad" one, and its father, similarly, into a "good" father and a "bad" one, the infant attaches its hatred to the "bad" object and turns away from it, directing its "restorative tendencies to the good object" (Klein, *The Psychoanalysis of Children* 300). The infant tries to identify with the good breast, which becomes the foremost entity for the ego. Indeed, the good breast forms the core of the child's ego, and is the source of nourishment and life itself for the infant (Klein 178). While the good breast is regarded as a whole, the bad breast is felt to be disintegrated. The infant feels a continuous fear of losing the good breast, that is, the wholeness of the ego (*ibid.* 116). Hence, the conflict between love and hate are first manifested in the struggle between the good and the bad breast, which later dominates the relationships of the infant with others. Throughout one's life, the individual seeks ways to protect

his/her loving relationships from being destroyed by his/her hatred (Alford, *What* 121).

Projective identification is another term that is associated with Klein and is very much related to the infant's inner world and its defence mechanisms. Accordingly, the ego projects its feelings onto the object that it identifies with. The ego uses defence mechanisms to cope with the inner world and anxiety. Its destructive feelings, which emerge from the death drive (Thanatos), make the baby anxious. The infant then develops fear of the object as because of the infant's hatred and destructive feelings, the object might retaliate (Mitchell 21). In self-protection, as mentioned above, the ego splits the object into good and bad breast and projects all its hatred and badness into the outside world so that the bad breast becomes the hating breast. The child then desires to destroy the object and reflects his/her destructive feelings in various forms, such as smashing things, tearing them up or wetting, which is regarded as cutting, stabbing, burning or drowning (Klein, "The Importance of Symbol-Formation" 236; "Infantile Anxiety" 229, "On Criminality" 279; Klein, "Early Stages" 207), all of which represent the child's sadism. Klein claims:

The sadism becomes a source of danger because it offers an occasion for the liberation of anxiety and because the weapons employed to destroy the object are felt by the subject to be levelled at his won self as well. The object of the attack becomes a source of danger because the subject fears similar-retaliatory- attacks from it.

(Klein, "The Importance of Symbol-Formation" 237)

Thus, what reinforces the child's anxiety is the fear of a possible punishment given by the primal object.

For Klein, the Oedipus conflict begins with the dominance of the feeling of sadism. Sadism and criminalistic feelings, as Klein describes, become apparent during the stage when dread arises from the subject's fear of an analogous attack upon him/herself from the external objects (Klein, "Infantile Anxiety" 229). Klein also describes the oral-sadistic stage as a cannibalistic phase ("The Early Development of Conscience" 272). According to her play observations, the child's extreme aggression manifests itself in its continuous acts of tearing and cutting up,

breaking, wetting and burning things like paper, boxes and small toys, which represent the child's parents, its mother's breast or its siblings (274).

This stage, when the child regards the primal object as split, is called the "paranoid-schizoid position". Klein made a significant development in psychoanalysis when she introduced two positions, rather than stages of development. The paranoid-schizoid position results from the infant's disintegrated and violently conflicting attitudes to primal objects, especially to its mother's breast (Jones 12). As mentioned earlier, the ego is still largely disintegrated and is thus liable to split itself, its emotions and its internal and external objects, but splitting is also one of the fundamental defences against persecutory anxiety (Klein, "On Identification" 311). Klein believes that, in this position, one of the reasons for the need for integration is being alive and being loved by internal and external good objects. However, the infant's feeling of disintegration, of chaos due to splitting, is related to the fear of death. Klein highlights that the fear of annihilation by destructive forces within is the deepest fear of all (312). The child's anxiety grows particularly with the fear of loss of the good object. Joan Riviere, a strong proponent of Klein, explains that the deeper source of fear is actually the fear of loss of life itself and all fears are in fact related to the deepest fear that is the fear of total loss (356).

While the first position is characterised by disintegration, the next position is determined by integration, which is called the "depressive position". This position is reached by the infant's recognition that its mother and other people (its father and siblings) are real people, which suggest that its object relations have undergone an essential change. In the previous position, the child was aware of the "part objects", but in this position, s/he perceives them as complete persons, not split objects. S/he sees the object as a whole, both good and bad. Then the whole object is loved and introjected and this forms the basis for the ego (Segal, "A Psycho-Analytical" 386). Thus, the depressive position is reached once the child realises that his/her love and hate are directed at the same object, at the mother or her body. However, this position, for Klein, is painful and in order to escape this, the child denies that his/her destroyed objects are good or that they have been injured. S/he either regresses to the previous persecutory position or feels guilt and concern as a defence (Jones 11-12). If s/he can tolerate depressive feelings, s/he feels the need to make reparation for the

damage s/he has given. Klein points out that the extent to which the child overcomes or fails this position determines his/her stability of health (*ibid.*) If the child overcomes his/her anxieties and regard his/her parents as whole objects that is, as persons, s/he can gain a greater sense of reality (Heimann 25). Therefore, depressive feelings make the infant wish to restore and repair what s/he has done to the bad breast in her/his phantasy and continue developing (Segal, "A Psycho-Analytical" 387) only if the depressive anxiety can be tolerated by the ego. In fact, the tendency to make reparation implies the transition of the child to the feeling of love (Eros) in order to overcome the feeling of death and destruction (Alford, *Psychology and the Natural* 108). The recognition of the infant that the good breast and the bad breast are actually one leads the child to the feeling of guilt as s/he regrets that such bad feelings emerge from within (Klein, *Envy* 30-31).

With this in mind, Klein believes that the world is a huge battleground between death and life drives, between the forces of destroying and repairing. So, the human being has an "innate desire to rend, spoil and destroy", which is the cause of all evil (*Envy* 264). This actually reminds one of Kant's comments on the propensity of man to do evil; both good and evil are in fact part of man's nature and it is man's choice to be good or evil (Kant 33).

Klein talks about evil when she focuses on the topic of envy and she is convinced that envy is "the root of all evil" (*Envy* 189), and in her major work, *Envy and Gratitude* (1957), she writes: "I arrived at the conclusion that envy is a most potent factor in undermining feelings of love and gratitude at their root" (Klein ix). Klein draws attention to the distinctive nature of envy, jealousy and greed, highlighting envy as the most primitive and destructive among the three.

Although there seems to be little difference between envy and jealousy in definitions such as those provided by the *Oxford English Dictionary*, Klein contends that these two feelings are different from each other. In the *OED*, jealousy is defined as "fear of losing some good through the rivalry of another; resentment or ill-will towards another on account of advantage or superiority, possible or actual, on his part; envy, grudge" (4b, 503). However, in Klein's account, jealousy is based on love, and unlike envy, there is the aim of gaining the loved one with the removal of the rival. Thus, it is possible to mention a triangular love relationship in jealousy, which requires the projection of aggression onto the person who is regarded as a

threat (*Envy* 189-90). On the other hand, envy is more destructive, taking place between two people (190), and it is not necessarily related to a love relationship. The significant thing for the envious person is the aim of possessing whatever the other has. Klein explains: “Envy is the angry feeling that another person possesses and enjoys something desirable- the envious impulse being to take it away or spoil it” (6). While jealousy can be overcome by a regained love, envy never disappears. Envy wishes to be good like the object, yet when it realises that this is not possible, it plans to destroy and spoil the good sides of the object. Therefore, it is associated with the death instinct rather than love and life (Segal, *Introduction* 40-41).

Klein also draws a distinction between envy and greed, explaining that the latter indicates a sense of wishing everything for itself without aiming purposefully to damage the third party; it may well be interpreted as embodying egoistic motives. Nonetheless, the envious person aims to destroy the good object “out of sheer spite” (Alford, *What* 127). Klein distinguishes these two feelings as:

One essential difference between greed and envy, although no rigid dividing line can be drawn since they are closely associated, would accordingly be that greed is mainly bound up with introjection and envy with projection.

(*Envy* 181)

In fact, greed is as dangerous as envy, aiming to get all goodness and to be the winner. Nevertheless, in envy, the individual not only wants to be the winner and get everything good but also wants to project badness onto the good object. Klein writes, “its [greed’s] aim is destructive introjection, whereas envy not only seeks to rob in this way, but also put badness, primarily bad excrements and bad parts of the self” into the good object (181). She also asserts that the envious man “sickens at the sight of enjoyment. He is easy only in the misery of others” (182). In fact, envy can sometimes mingle with greed, becoming more harmful to the object.

Focusing mostly on envy as one of the most pivotal feelings in shaping the psyche of a child, Klein traces the roots of envy back to the childhood of an individual. Envy begins once the infant has difficulties in obtaining the good object and feels that s/he has been deprived of satisfaction because of the bad breast (*Envy* 180). She states:

The infant's feelings seem to be that when the breast deprives him, it becomes bad because it keeps the milk, love and care associated with the good breast all to itself. He hates and envies what he feels to be the mean and grudging breast.

(*Envy* 183)

The infant feels envious when s/he realises that the good breast is the source of life and love. Thus, the infant's first object for the feeling of envy is the good breast as it keeps all the things the infant desires- milk, love and affection; in other words, life itself. This feeling and the following feeling of hatred for the good breast forms the relation to the mother (*Envy* 183). The infant idealises the good breast as the object of comfort and warmth to such an extent that s/he starts to wish all of the goodness of the object for itself. First, s/he will only wish to possess and protect the good object; however, after a while, the infant will desire to destroy the goodness of the object as s/he wants to take its place (Segal, *Introduction* 40-41). Therefore, the infant feels if s/he cannot have the goodness her/himself, then no one should have it. If the child cannot overcome such envious feelings, s/he may suffer from serious psychological problems in her/his later life (*Envy* 183). Vetlesen, a Kleinian critic, clarifies Klein's explanation of envy, stating:

In terms of logic, to envy someone implies [...] a recognition. The experience, however, entails that this other is someone who is something, or has something, that I myself am not, do not have, or have not done; and since I lack this, I do not want anybody else to have it either. In other words, envy involves the agent in a comparison with something or someone that is perceived as different, with the result that the one who makes the comparison emerges as inferior, as lacking in some quality that is deemed valuable.

(124)

Once the infant realises that the breast has all goodness, but s/he has all badness and feels the lack, the infant begins to project his/her inner evilness into the breast. In his/her phantasy, s/he attacks it by splitting, destroying, or just looking continuously (Segal, *Introduction* 41). As the infant splits the ideal object, s/he searches for another ideal object to preserve or identify but ends up with none; thus, s/he suffers during his/her development since the introjection of the ideal object cannot take place. The infant cannot find love and affection from outside and as a

result feels great despair, which destroys his/her ego, bringing a distance between him/her and the other object. Hence, a “vicious circle” emerges in which the infant’s envy increases since s/he lacks a good introjection (Segal, *Introduction* 42). For Klein, an envious person can never be satisfied with anything inasmuch as his/her envy “stems from within and therefore always finds an object to focus on” (*Envy* 182). The envious reactions continue during the development of the child; after his/her envy for the breast, the child gets envious of the mother, then of other babies and the parental relationship (Segal, *Introduction* 41). What is paramount in envy is that such a person desires to destroy goodness without any aim, but just because it is good and beautiful. The existence of goodness outside generates tension for the envious person, which causes suffering from an inferiority complex (*Envy* 182).

Klein lays particular emphasis on the connection between envy and creativity. She asserts that as the good breast is the source of the life instinct, which can be regarded as the first steps of creativeness, the infant not solely gets gratification from the good breast but also “feels that he’s kept alive” (*Envy* 201). If the infant cannot get such satisfaction and feels hunger, s/he also feels the threat of death. As long as the infant identifies himself/herself with life, this feeling gives him/her “an impetus towards creativeness” (201). Moreover, Klein makes the point that this creativeness can manifest itself in wealth, power and prestige, which form the source of envy for the human being (*ibid.*). She illustrates her point with Milton’s Satan, who out of his envy of God, attempts to destroy Heaven (*ibid.*).

Just as an evil person acts with his/her inordinate passions, which is similar to what Augustine and Leibniz maintain, so does an envious person to destroy the object that s/he is envious of. Furthermore, Vetlesen remarks that an envious person for Klein does not feel any guilt for what s/he has done. The envious person is “deprived of capacity for guilt, reparation and responsibility”; therefore, what s/he has done can be regarded as an act of evil, in which there is the motivation of hurting someone (127). Klein herself admits envy as one of the greatest sins, supporting her statement with references to literary figures, such as Chaucer:

There are very pertinent psychological reasons why envy ranks among the seven ‘deadly sins’. I would even suggest that it is unconsciously felt to be the greatest sin of all, because it spoils and harms the good object which is the source of life. This view is consistent with the

view described by Chaucer in *The Parson's Tale*: 'It is certain that envy is the worst sin there is; for all other sins are sins only against one virtue, whereas envy is against all virtue and against all goodness.'

(*Envy* 189)

The type of evil that comes out of envy is in the form of "devaluation", "denigration" and "ridicule" (*Envy* 217), which are adopted as defence mechanisms by an envious person. These can occur in four ways; by ignoring the features of the object; by just regarding them as non-existent; by mocking them, or condemning them (*ibid.*). As a consequence, the object in question is deprived of all superior qualities in the eyes of the other to accept him/her as an individual (*ibid.*) and the envious person feels that there is no superior quality for him/her to envy any more.

Klein also draws attention to evil tendencies and the criminalistic behaviour in children and claims that all these destructive behaviours can be healed through psychoanalytic treatments, which will allow us to have less criminals in later life. She maintains that through psychoanalytic experience, children will be protected from any "over-strong repression, and thus from illness or a disadvantageous development of character" (Klein, "The Development" 13). During her observations, she noticed that cannibalism and murderous tendencies lie behind the repressed feelings of the child. She defines these behaviours as the primitive part of the personality, which contradicts the cultured part of the personality and thus requires repression ("Criminal Tendencies" 185). Klein further explains that psychological roots might develop into either paranoia or criminality as "phantasies of persecution are common to both conditions" ("On Criminality" 280) and the criminal feels s/he is persecuted, which leads him/her to destroy the others (280).

The conflict between the primitive part and the cultured part of the personality is at its height especially during childhood, which Klein believes plays a significant role for the child's future. The extent to which the child will have criminalistic behaviours is related to character formation in its Oedipus development ("Criminal Tendencies" 186). Moreover, Klein contends that psychoanalysis shows that all sufferings of later life are mostly repetitions of early ones and most of the destructive tendencies of later life are also repetitions of the early development (188-89). She claims:

I pointed out an analogy between some very horrible crimes which had recently happened and corresponding phantasies which I had found in the analysis of some small children. One was a case which really was a combination of perversion and crime.

(192)

In such people, Eros, love, is hidden and hatred and the feelings of destruction are stronger, and they hate and persecute the loved object (“On Criminality” 280). Thus, Klein believes that psychoanalysis will certainly help overcome these criminalistic tendencies and change these behaviours directing into better channels (201).

One of the significant ways to transfer this anxiety, criminalistic behaviour and evil tendencies in the child is through the work of art. Klein acknowledges the healing effects of art in her works though the idea is later developed by her followers and her students, such as Joan Riviere and Hanna Segal. Klein highlights the importance of psychoanalysis and its effects in revealing the repressed fears, anxieties and feelings in the treatment of children (“The Development” 13). Apart from the play technique, she also read Grimms’ fairy tales to her patients and observed their reaction to these tales. When she read one of the tales to Fritz, her first patient, she saw that there was a release of fear in the boy; however, at the end of her treatment, the boy felt more relaxed after listening to the same tale (“The Development” 53). On another occasion, Klein read another tale of the Grimms and writes: “It was the tale of a witch who offers a man poisoned food but he hands it onto his horse who dies of it” (55). Klein observed that the child associated with the evil witch poisoning the people (56). She admits that she chose the Grimms’ tales on purpose as a manifestation of anxiety in children and adds:

I am of opinion [...] that with the assistance of analysis, there is no need to avoid these tales but that they can be used directly as a standard and an expedient. The child’s latent fear, depending upon repression, is more easily rendered manifest by their help and can then be more thoroughly dealt with by analysis.

(67)

Hanna Segal, Klein’s pupil and important follower, develops Klein’s theories in relation to aesthetics and points out that one feels pleasure in the work of art due to an identification of him/herself with the work of art as a whole (“A Psycho-

Analytical” 399). Through identification, the individual experiences a successful mourning, re-establishes his/her own internal objects and world and thus feels reintegrated (400).

For Klein, the only way to overcome the destructive feelings the infant feels for the good object is through the feelings of guilt and the urge to “make reparation” (*Envy* 133), which suggests the child should overcome depressive feelings in the depressive position. Klein is convinced that the ability to realise the death instinct and the harm the individual has given to the other and then to make reparation for this damage plays a vital role in mental health of the individual (*Envy* 15, 44, 133). Should the individual not go through this process successfully, s/he will not be able to have a healthy development in his/her future life (133-34).

Thus, through reading or listening to fairy/folk tales, the child can show a sign of recovery of his/her evil tendencies, which will help him/her to make reparation and feel guilt for his/her previous destructive feelings for the primal object. Fairy tales, as Klein believes, can act as tools for treatment for the mental health development of the child through the depiction of conflict between good and evil and through the punishment of evil at the end (“The Development” 67).

ii.ii.iii C. Fred Alford:

In contemporary studies of evil, C. Fred Alford, an American philosopher and psychoanalyst, provides an in-depth analysis of the concept of evil through an existential perspective. Alford is one of the contemporary proponents of Klein and develops her theories of anxiety, positions of development, destructive feelings and envy in connection with the concept of evil. His most famous book, *What Evil Means to Us* (1997), is composed of interviews with criminals and college students along with the analyses of these in terms of evil. He interviewed a number of prison inmates, including rapists, murderers, and other dangerous criminals, in an American prison. From his interviews and analyses, Alford develops his concept of evil, which is also later discussed in his other books and articles, and he reaches the conclusion that evil is “not a state of mind, but a state of world” (*What* 15). Though the book is composed of interviews, Alford emphasises that his book is not a report but “[i]t is a

*thesis*³⁵ (*What* 9). For him, evil stems from the “formless dread” of our presymbolic experience. The individual can live with his/her dread only if s/he gives it a symbolic form and this can only be achieved through art (12).

Alford employs Thomas Ogden’s autistic-contiguous position to clarify his thesis. Ogden added this third position to Klein’s positions of development; it is a presymbolic state and is composed of bodily experience. Since there is no symbol to give form to anxieties and dread, the anxiety emerging from the autistic-contiguous stage can be overcome by forcing form onto others (Ogden 2-3). Ogden describes this anxiety as a “feeling of entrapment in a world of sensation that is completely [...] undefined by symbols” (80). For Ogden, this position is the most primitive mode of being and it precedes the paranoid-schizoid and depressive positions. He claims that this position “consists of an unspeakable terror of dissolution of boundedness resulting in feelings of leaking, falling, or dissolving into endless, shapeless space” (81). Thus, Alford explains Ogden’s position as a realm of formless dread and it is the “fear of formlessness, the loss of context, meaning, and containment, where boundaries fail” (*What* 39). Ogden’s autistic-contiguous position and Klein’s paranoid-schizoid position almost merge with each other; in the paranoid-schizoid position, there is a confusion of reality and symbol since the infant fears to be destroyed by persecutory forces, which are actually the infant’s projections. Alford, thus, integrates Klein’s positions with that of Ogden and defines his concept of evil. He contends that evil takes place between the autistic-contiguous and paranoid-schizoid positions and defines his concept of evil as follows:

*From this perspective, evil is a paranoid-schizoid attempt to evacuate the formless dread by giving it form via violent intrusion into another, the other’s body giving presymbolic form to the dread that is evacuated there.*³⁶

(43)

Alford, drawing upon Ogden’s presymbolic stage and Klein’s positions of development, claims that the violence and aggression of the paranoid-schizoid position come out of the dread in the autistic-contiguous position, and symbols are

³⁵ The emphasis is original.

³⁶ The emphasis is original.

essential to move this aggression away, a removal which can be possible in the depressive position (*What* 43-44, 112).

Alford also refers to Augustine, who claimed that evil is the privation of good (*The Confessions* 344-45), and asserts that evil in fact is “no-thing” (*What* ix). It is “the nothingness we dread” (*ibid.*), by which he means the dread of living, dread of “boundlessness” and “the loss of self, loss of meaning, loss of history and loss of connection to the world itself” (*What* ix). It is the “dread of limits, of mortality, of meaninglessness, of vulnerability and loss” (Alford, *What* 80).

From this perspective, it is possible to state that Alford not only interprets the concept of evil through a psychological approach, but through an existentialist point of view as well. He associates evil with the fear of existence, that is, being itself. Alford’s views on the concept of dread and the idea of nothingness recall the existentialists’ ideas of existential *angst*, which originated first in the work of Søren Kierkegaard, the *Concept of Dread* (1844). Kierkegaard examines the feeling of anxiety in the face of freedom and claims that in every decision one may face the feeling of dread due to the necessity of choice. Jean Paul Sartre also mentions dread in his works and focuses on the freedom of choice as the ultimate reason for this existential dread. In his *Being and Nothingness* (1943), Sartre contends that dread is the feeling of nothingness. He agrees with Kierkegaard’s concept of dread and elaborates on the idea as follows:

[D]read is distinguished from fear in that fear is fear of beings in the world whereas dread is before myself. Vertigo is dread to the extent that I am afraid not of falling over the precipice, but of throwing myself over.

(31)

For the existentialists, dread comes out when the individual experiences existential nothingness. Thus, drawing upon the existentialists, Alford claims that dread is “primordial”, and it is the fear of human limits- “of living and dying in a single human body” (Alford, *What* 50). Moreover, it is the anxiety of “being human” (*ibid.*). Indeed, he emphasises that dread is not abnormal; on the contrary, “dread is what it is to be human” (Alford, “Talking” 318). Alford also holds similar ideas to those of the existentialists in terms of his concern about choices made in life. Sartre

writes in his famous essay, “Existentialism is a Humanism”, that “man is condemned to be free” (353) and makes it clear that man did not create himself but he is responsible for everything he does (*ibid.*). Thus, man has the great burden of making a choice in life, which leads him/her to the feeling of anguish. Alford, by the same token, states: “We dread what it is to be human- not just because we shall soon die but because the limits revealed to us by our choices make it so hard to find meaning in anything” (*What* 50). Vetlesen clarifies Alford’s existential stance, stating:

[W]hat Alford retains from this position is the individual-oriented, existential approach to evil, inviting his readers to scenes where evil is something *experiential*: not a “problem” for thinking, for judgment, to clarify and resolve, but evil understood as pointing to, even *constituting a dimension of experience*, of our being-in-the-world that is so integral to our existence as to help define us [...] Rather, on the existential and experiential level intended, the thesis is that *to be a human being entails being in a relationship with evil*: with the impulse to hurt others, with thoughts, images and fantasies about what such hurting would mean in terms of *attaining relief from the burden of being human and so vulnerable*.³⁷

(109)

Alford believes that humans try to escape dread by projecting it onto others, which is manifested in their acts of evil. Unlike his predecessors on the concept of evil, Alford claims that evil, thus, is “an experience of dread. Doing evil is an attempt to evacuate this experience by inflicting it on others” (Alford, *What* 3). That is, if humans project their suffering onto others, they feel freed from this fear, and we can suggest that it is the result of an egotistic wish to be freed from the individual’s own complexes. Furthermore, he connects evil with sadism as the person feels joyful in getting rid of his/her dread. “Evil in general and sadism in particular are about the relief sought in placing the sense of vulnerability and the fear of dread onto another person” (Vetlesen 106). By doing evil, humans take the role of the victimiser driven by a sadistic joy of victimising the other. The evildoer enjoys the idea of taking control of his/her victim, which according to Alford is a way of discarding the existential burden of being helpless and vulnerable. He asserts that “doing evil is an attempt to transform the terrible passivity and helplessness of suffering into activity”

³⁷ The emphasis in the paragraph is original.

(Alford, *What* 3). It would then be suggested that Alfordian evil implies that all humans have the tendency to do evil and that evil is as natural a component of being human as dread.

Alford further connects doing evil with the idea of power. By this, he means that if doing evil is victimizing, then the evildoer feels powerful and feels that it is better to do evil than to be a victim in life. Upon being asked, most of Alford's informants responded that they liked doing evil as it gave them some sort of power (*What* 8). They admitted that if they had not done evil, they would be nothing in life (*ibid.*) This reminds one of Kant, who said- as was mentioned above- that the tendency of the human being to compete with others and to gain power over them will grant one a sense of security and this feeling will lead man to destroy the other (Kant 51). For Alford, the human being, thus, finds a meaning by doing evil in this meaningless world. He suggests that "doing evil is also an attempt to shortcut our access to the autistic-contiguous position, a dimension of experience that is not only a source of dread but also a source of vitality and meaning in life " (9). The person who commits a wicked deed is aware of the fact that s/he is nothing and is vulnerable to dread and anxiety. Alford contends that evil is the loss of everything that makes life worth living, "an experience so awesome and awful that it must be attributed to malevolent forces, lest life itself be emptied of meaning, and goodness rendered void" (*Psychology and the Natural* 78). This is similar to what Klein explains about the loss of the good object, which creates meaning for the infant. Alford connects this loss with that of goodness in the world and asserts:

[t]he loss of all goodness in the world becomes an experience of evil in the paranoid-schizoid dimension because in a secret part of ourselves [...] we are intimately acquainted with the devil who would destroy goodness for its own sake.

(78-79)

Thus, for Alford, the evildoer attempts to overcome this nothingness through acts of harming. He describes the intention of the evildoer as follows: "Better to ally oneself with the devil than to be annihilated by nothingness" (*Psychology and the Natural* 89). As noted above, the evildoer chooses to escape from fear of nothingness by harming others. Alford illustrates his argument by stating: "The death fear of the

ego is lessened by the killing, the sacrifice, of the other; through the death of the other, one buys oneself free from the penalty of dying, of being killed” (*What* 10). Alford lays particular emphasis on the fact that the evildoer does not, then, intend pure evil or cruelty. It is rather a selfish motive- to get away from the suffering of being human (*What* 15-16).

Nevertheless, Alford’s concept of power differs from that of Foucault in terms of the relationship of the individuals who exercise power with their subjects. For Foucault, power is everywhere, coming from everywhere (*History* 92). It exists in every relation and even silence does not signify a lack of power. In fact, power can be exercised from all points in any relation. It is not an institution, nor a structure, but it is a complex strategical situation in a society” (*ibid.*). He forms an intense connection between power and knowledge, and claims that what we know about a particular topic is determined by the power relations that motivate our will to know about that topic. Furthermore, Foucault believes that power is not a simple exercise of violence (“The Subject” 780); on the contrary, it is a way of acting upon an acting subject. However, in Alford’s view, power operates in the acts of the individual who attempts to project his/her existential dread onto another person in order to victimise him/her. While Foucault believes that power cannot be possessed and exercised upon individuals through oppression, from Alford’s perspective the evildoer oppresses the other to exert his/her power.

It can be suggested that the Alfordian evil is related to an attempt to be recognised in the eye of the other. When the individual realises his/her helplessness and passivity, s/he seeks ways to transfer it into the other in order to make him/her passive instead. In other words, the individual searches for ways to be recognised as powerful and superior in the eye of the other. By transforming his/her dread and helplessness into the other, the evildoer appears to rob the existence of his/her victim. With respect to this, Alford makes the following point:

Evil is absence of humanity, the failure to understand or appreciate the humanity of the other. It chills because it threatens our existence, like being dead in the eyes of another.

(*What* 23)

What Alford suggests here reminds us of Klein, who asserts that the world is a huge battleground between life and death instincts (*Envy* 264). Thus, the individual destroys the other to gain vitality and life. Evil then is a matter of destroying and constructing. Furthermore, Alford's argument is similar to Sartre's theory of "the Gaze", which suggests that the human being is subjected to the Gaze of the Other, which is a threat to the self since the Other might try to objectify the individual so as to establish his/her own subjectivity. Sartre argues that the presence of the Gaze of the Other is "a limit of my freedom [...] it is given to me as a burden which I have to carry without ever being able to turn back to know it, without even being able to realize its weight" (*Being* 262). The individual seeks to objectify people around him/her in order to escape his/her state of being-in-itself. In fact, s/he has to nullify others' existence in order to assert his/her existence. Sartre maintains that "the Other has to make my being-for-him *be*³⁸ in so far as he has to be his being" (*ibid.*). In other words, the subjectivity and freedom of the other depends on the loss of the integrity of the self. Similar to the Sartrean Gaze of the subject, the evildoer in Alford's theory exerts his/her power in order to claim his/her authority over the other, but s/he does this by harming the other.

As noted above, Alford follows Klein's steps in interpreting evil, and focuses on the concept of the positions put forth by Klein: the "paranoid-schizoid position" and the "depressive position". Alford focuses on the paranoid-schizoid position in which the human being is afraid of "his doom at the hands of malevolent external persecutors who seek to destroy" him/her and try to rob him/her of all the good s/he has. Klein, actually, stresses the fact that all these evil motives are the projected feelings of man her/himself- his/her wrath and envy come back to him/her as s/he fears anything s/he could do to other people. It can be suggested that the evildoer feels dread and a sense of a possible threat that can come from external objects and, thus, out of anxiety s/he can harm others (Alford, *What* 40).

Alford concentrates on this paranoid-schizoid position out of which evil emerges as it is "an attempt to evacuate the formless dread by giving it a form via violent intrusion into another" (*What* 43). By harming others, the evildoer gives form to his/her anxiety; in fact, s/he also gives a meaning to his/her existence (43-44). It would not be wrong to state that committing evil is an excuse for the evildoer to

³⁸ The emphasis is original.

discard her/his dread. Alford further adds: “It is as though the other were the frame for the picture of our dread, a picture that must be framed before we can paint it, and destroyed immediately afterward, lest it remind us of our dread” (*What* 44). Once the evildoer harms the other, s/he also destroys his/her own anxiety and fear, and this process continues endlessly as individuals may need to escape from their dread.

Alford also believes that evil is “suffering and loss, anguish and terror at being human” (*What* 67). He is convinced that experiencing such anguish forms the most significant part of doing evil (*ibid.*). From this perspective, he reaches the conclusion that the powerlessness of the human being lies at the root of evil. He supports his claim with the example of the Greek tragedies which are about human powerlessness (*What* 68). He states that where the human accepts his/her powerlessness and his/her limits, there is no need for him/her to do evil and on the contrary, where s/he does not accept his/her human limits, s/he will be seeking for someone on whom s/he can lash out with his/her dread and do evil. “Evil inflicts one’s fate, doom, on others” (*What* 69). In this respect Alford is similar to Klein, who asserts that evil comes out of being envious of the goodness of the other- as mentioned above. To rob the other’s goodness and possessions, one victimizes the other. For both Klein and Alford, some individuals may not tolerate the existence of the other as s/he reminds them of their anguish. Alford says: “Evil is not just the devaluation of the otherness because otherness is frightening and bad. Evil is the destruction of the other because the other is *good*” (*What* 71). To both Klein and Alford, there is a selfish motivation for the individual to do evil- to destroy the other. Alford states: “People demonize the other not out of ignorance or intolerance but to protect their own threatened goodness” (*What* 72).

Similar to Klein, Alford is also convinced that evil is an expression of envy, that is, “the avatar of Thanatos” (*Psychology and the Natural* 109). Following Klein, he believes that the human being hates before s/he loves. In the end, love might be stronger, but first comes hate. As Freud puts it first, the human being has the tendency to destroy rather than to create (*Beyond Pleasure* 46) since for Alford, the infant feels anxious due to persecutory feelings, which leads it to destroy the objects.

In *What Evil Means to Us*, just as Klein used fairy tales in her sessions with children, Alford also connects evil with fairy tales. He gives examples of the tales in which a child whose mother leaves is left alone with wild animals. Alford explains

that such tales do not tell children that the mother will always come back. In this way, these tales teach children to “know, locate and contain” such dread (112). Alford is convinced that such fairy tales exist so that man can recognise his/her dread. To be good is to know the dread one feels inside rather than inflicting it on others, and self-discovery is, then, essential for Alford in order to heal evil in man.

We can conclude that what Alford especially focuses on is the idea that evil is related to who we are and how we feel. It comes out with the inability of the individual to recognise and cope with his/her inner conflicts. Like Klein, Alford believes in the healing effect of the fairy tales through the depiction of the struggles of good and evil, which will enable the child to overcome his/her dread of nothingness and anxieties throughout the development. He acknowledges that if the individual learns to express his/her evil tendencies more abstractly, in stories or pictures, he/she will less likely to do it. It is the matter of finding symbols to form our dread and express it in ways that do not inflict on others (*What* 12, 15, 112-13). As evil comes out of the attempt of the evildoer to find symbols to his/her aggression, then narratives can work more efficiently as symbols in literature can connect the body to the external world. In this view, then, the evil depicted in fairy tales becomes perhaps their most important component and the educational value of fairy tales is one that is essential for the well-being of society.

Looking at the comments of both Western and Eastern thinkers on evil, we can deduce that evil exists in this world, and it manifests itself in the suffering of innocent, religious people, children or animals. Arguments about the sources of and reasons for evil are not likely to end. Nevertheless, what is common among these theologians, philosophers and psychologists is that evil originates from the earthly passions of man as observed in the Koran, Augustine, Aquinas, Leibniz, Kant, Klein and Alford. Evil manifests itself in man’s greed, envy of the other, or ambition to be powerful in his/her relations with the others, all of which make the two psychoanalysts, Klein and Alford, suitable for the study of evil in the fairy/folk tales. Psychological approaches to evil do not attempt to justify what they put forth, but they just try to explain human nature and help individuals overcome their inner conflicts and form healthy relationships with their external world. Accordingly, Klein and Alford’s psychoanalytical theories on evil can be useful in analysing evil in fairy tales. Both psychoanalysts believe in the healing effect of fairy tales on child

psychology because the depiction of conflicts and motives of evildoers in fairy/folk tales may help the child realise his/her own Oedipus conflicts, destructive and evil tendencies.

CHAPTER III

A KLEINIAN ANALYSIS OF EVIL IN THE TURKISH AND BRITISH TALES

When examined from the psychoanalytical perspective of Klein and Alford, it can be observed that all of the sixty-eight tales included in this study and summarized in the Appendices include evil deeds and motives. Evil in these tales is causing physical or emotional pain and suffering to another person and is the outcome of the character's envy, jealousy or greed, or of his/her desire to victimise the other due to his/her dread, all of which are the result of his/her death instinct as Klein and Alford claim (Klein, "On Identification" 312; Alford *What* 10). As we have seen in the previous chapter, Klein and Alford suggest that evil is the outcome of the death instinct, and that fairy tales help children cope with developmental anxieties. What might be considered as of paramount importance with evildoing is that the evildoer inflicts deliberate pain on another person and experiences no feeling of remorse nor does the evildoer enact any reparation. By dealing with the problems, such as the loss of a beloved object, which the child may face, these tales may promote a healthy development and relieve the unconscious anxieties that can be manifested in envy, jealousy, greed or dread. In this respect, the analyses of the evil characters' motives make both Klein and Alford relevant to this study. Accordingly, it is possible to categorise evil in the fairy/folk tales in this study into Kleinian and Alfordian evil and to focus on the evil characters' motives and their deeds in this context. Hence, this chapter focuses on "Kleinian" evil in the tales which address the repressed feelings of the child and offer solutions as through identification the child may re-establish his/her integral objects as Hanna Segal also suggests ("A Psycho-Analytical" 400). The chapter will also provide an analysis of the evil characters from a Kleinian point of view, in terms of her theories of anxiety in children and envy, jealousy and greed and the tales of the two collections will be categorised accordingly. In fact, envy is at the root of evil depicted in eleven tales in the Turkish

collection and six tales in the British collection. Furthermore, Kleinian jealousy in the evil doing is present in one tale of the Turkish and three tales of the British collections. Likewise, Kleinian greed can be found in two Turkish and three British tales. Evil caused by an envious, jealous or greedy character in these tales can reflect the repressed feelings of the child, who has had to cope with them early in childhood. By reading/hearing these tales, the child may re-live these developmental problems and learn to escape possible destructive attitudes as Klein notes (“The Development” 53, 67).

Both in Tezel’s and Jacobs’ collections, there are tales in which evil performed can be suggested to be the result of the destructive feelings of envy, jealousy or greed. As we have seen in the previous chapter, Klein makes clear-cut distinctions between envy, greed and jealousy. Envy, the most dangerous of the three, aims to destroy and spoil the good object according to Klein (*Envy* 202). As stated, Klein considers envy to be the root of all evil inasmuch as what is perceived as good is considered intolerable by the envious person (*Envy* 189). Since that person does not possess what the good object has, s/he does not want the other to have it either, which implies an inferiority complex in the envious person who lacks what is deemed to be valuable. Envy, therefore, “enjoys a particularly close relationship with evil, with the inclination to hurt” (Vetlesen 127). Greed, on the other hand, is ultimately related to introjection and does not seek “to put badness” into the good object as envy does (Klein, *Envy* 181). As for jealousy, it involves a relation to at least two people and is concerned “with love that the subject feels is his due and has been taken away, or is in danger of being taken away, from him by his rival” (*ibid.*). Hence, in jealousy, aggression is directed against the person who is perceived as a threat to the loved object. The jealous person aims to eliminate the rival, but not to harm the other, for whom his/her love remains.

In the following analyses, the tales in question are grouped according to their order of appearance in the Turkish and the British collections, based on the themes of envy, jealousy and greed that Klein defines in her book, *Envy and Gratitude* (1975). Klein acknowledges the importance of the child’s splitting primal objects in order to deal with his/her problems and anxieties (“On Identification” 31). As mentioned before, the child splits the primal object into the good and the bad. The good object (the mother/the breast) always cares and provides love and affection for the child,

while the bad one poses a threat to the child, implying a deprivation of love and affection. In fairy/folk tales, there is this image of splitting objects, which can be regarded as the reflection of the child's early conflicts. In these tales, the bad object is manifested in the envious, jealous or greedy person, who attempts to destroy the innocent and the beautiful protagonist.

Klein regards envy as a more dangerous desire for doing evil and concentrates on this feeling more than the other two, for this reason, this part of the study focuses more on the tales that contain envy and provides more details of it. As some tales have similar structures and themes, they are analysed one after another regardless of their place in the collections.

iii.i. Envy:

Envy as the angry feeling felt for another person due to possessing what the envious person lacks can be observed in seventeen tales in both of the collections- eleven Turkish and six British tales. Seven of these tales depict the step-mother as the envious person, who desires to spoil the step-daughter's life as she is frustrated to see that her step-daughter has superior qualities when compared to her. It is possible to apply the split object theory of Klein to all these step-mother tales, which suggests that the child fears any retaliatory harm from the external object after splitting the object in his/her mind ("The Importance of Symbol-Formation" 237).

Turkish Tale Number 10, "Bir Göze Bir Gül" ("A Rose for an Eye") - a Cinderella variant³⁹- is a tale of envy in the Kleinian sense as envy for the step-daughter leads the step-mother to destroy her for the sake of giving pain. The tale starts with the loss of the real mother, the good object, who is supposed to provide love and affection for the child. The bad object, the step-mother, is a complete opposite of the good one, especially as she deprives the innocent girl of motherly love. The infant's splitting of the primal object and feeling of envy are represented in the bad object/s, that is, the step-mother/the step-daughter in the tale.

The step-mother's and her own daughter's ugliness compared to the step-daughter's beauty and purity provoke the step-mother's envy and rage. When the

³⁹ The tale bears some similarities to Perrault's "Cinderella" in terms of the characters of the step-mother, step-sister, the innocent girl and the prince who wants to marry the beautiful and innocent protagonist.

Padishah visits their home to ask for the hand of the step-daughter, the step-mother seeks ways to get rid of the girl and to marry her own daughter to the Padishah:

Bu kız güzel olduğu, ağladıkça gözlerinden inciler döküldüğü, güldükçe de yanaklarından güller açtığı için padişah onunla evlenmek istiyor. Halbuki kendi kızı biraz çirkince [...] Üvey kızı padişahla evlenecek, kendi kızı evde kalacak ... Buna hiç de razı değil⁴⁰⁴¹.

(Tezel 149)

The narrator uses such words as “poor girl” and “beautiful girl”, raising pity for the step-daughter. On the other hand, remarks such as “Bu nasıl şey böyle?”⁴² and “Bir parça su için bir göz istenir mi?”⁴³ (Tezel 150) show the brutality of the step-mother and her daughter.

The bad mother figure does not nurture the innocent girl; on the contrary, she persecutes her by threatening and harming her. The step-mother’s envy is so great that she even, with the help of her own daughter, tortures her innocent and beautiful step-daughter. The Padishah’s wish to marry the step-daughter not only doubles the step-mother and her daughter’s envy but also prompts the two to destroy the docile step-daughter. It could be conceivably hypothesised that the devaluation of the step-daughter and the brutal acts performed with the aim of discarding her altogether are defence mechanisms. Klein argues that the envious person regards it as vital to develop some defence mechanisms against anxiety (18). She claims that these mechanisms of defence can manifest themselves in devaluation, denigration or ridicule of the object (217).

On their way to the palace, the step-mother plucks out the step-daughter’s eyes, depriving her of one of her most valuable possessions. The duplicitous nature of the step-mother is apparent in her treatment of the innocent girl, first acting as a nurturer and giving food to the girl, and later plucking out her eyes. In her book, Vlanov, a Kleinian critic, argues that the envious person attacks the other, taking her/his “subjective reality” (19) to make the object inferior to the self; in other words,

⁴⁰ Since fairy/folk tales have a language of their own, the literal translation method from Turkish to English will be used for the fairy/folk tales in this thesis and the translations will be source oriented.

⁴¹ The Padishah wants to marry this girl because she is beautiful, sheds pearls when she cries and roses blossom on her cheeks when she laughs. However, her daughter is a bit ugly [...] Her step-daughter will marry the Padishah, and her daughter will remain a spinster... She won’t let this happen!

⁴² How come?

⁴³ How can one ask for the eye of someone in exchange of water?

by robbing his/her subjectivity, the envied person is turned into an object (*ibid.*). Vlanov adds: “Her reality as a person is obliterated [...] The envied one no longer exists as a valid subject. She is changed into a ‘thing, a mere object of envy’.” (19-20)

In this respect, by depriving the step-daughter of her eyes and then leaving her alone in the forest, the step-mother and her daughter feel relief since the innocent girl is no longer perceived as a threat. As Klein argues, the envious person cannot tolerate what the other has and therefore feels an impulse to harm the other with the idea that the other should not have anything better than s/he has (124). The step-mother’s and her daughter’s desire to get rid of their ugliness by destroying the innocent girl’s beauty, and their attempt to possess what that beauty owns constitute an example of such a motive. Klein suggests that “a particular cause of envy is the relative absence of it [the good object] in others [the lack of good qualities in the envious self]. The envied person is felt to possess what is at bottom most prized and desired, and this is a good object” (203). In this tale, we can see an example of this in the disguise motif- the ugly daughter masquerades as her step-sister. It can be suggested that this disguise motif may show the disintegration of the ego. The infant not only splits the objects, but also feels him/herself as disintegrated in the paranoid-schizoid position and cannot feel himself/herself to be a whole object. The step-sister and the innocent girl are like the two sides of a whole object. By disguising, the ugly girl feels she has adopted the step-sister’s beauty and innocence, which she lacks. Both acting like the beautiful girl and deceiving the Padishah satisfy the step-mother and her daughter. However, at the end everything is revealed and the step-mother and step-sister are punished with death and the eyes of the innocent girl are recovered, which suggests that she has become a whole object again. Getting rid of the bad object and the persecutory harm, the innocent girl begins a happy life with the Padishah.

Similarly, in the British collection, Tale Number 3, “The Rose Tree”, deals with the envy and deeds of a monstrous and wicked step-mother along with cannibalism, which is one of the fears of the infant in the oral development phase (“Criminal Tendencies” 185). As in the previous tale, it starts with the death of the real mother; thus, the protagonist is subject to the cruel behaviours of the bad object- the step-mother.

The British tale “The Rose Tree” and the Grimms’ German tale “Juniper Tree” are both a variant of the same plot. In the “Rose Tree”, the victim is a step-daughter. The ideal beauty of her step-daughter raises the step-mother’s anxiety, who as a result performs evil deeds as she is not as beautiful as her step-daughter. The tale shows that the step-mother hates her step-daughter and gives her the hardest tasks in order to victimise her. The phrases used to describe the girl, such as “white as milk”, “cherry lips”, and “golden silk hair” (Jacobs 15), demonstrate the features the step-mother lacks. Particularly, the incomparable charm and purity identified with the step-daughter irritate the step-mother, which, as seen in its Turkish counterpart, stimulates the jealous step-mother to commit evil acts such as lying, deceiving, torturing and killing. What particularly stirs up the step-mother’s envy is her step-daughter’s beautiful hair. Before she reveals her real intentions, she pretends to be the good mother and speaks softly to the girl, saying she wants to comb her hair. Nurturing and destroying are the two qualities that appear in the dual nature of the step-mother. Soon this duplicity becomes apparent in her destructive attitudes. The narrator states:

Then the step-mother hated her more for the beauty of her hair [...] Then said the step-mother, “I cannot part your hair with a comb, fetch me an axe.” So she fetched it.

(Jacobs 16)

Chopping off her step-daughter’s head relieves the step-mother since she thinks she has destroyed her rival. Therefore, envy is seen to be strong enough for the step-mother to kill the innocent girl. The step-mother simply gets rid of the beautiful girl, who is a reminder of the step-mother’s ugliness and old age. The step-mother chops the girl in pieces and cooks her in a stew, serving it for dinner, the story thus providing an expression of the infant’s fear of cannibalism in the oral phase. As shown, the step-mother acts as a caregiver with evil intentions. There is the clash between the good and the bad object. This double nature of the mother-figure may play out the infant’s perception of the mother as a split object. Furthermore, with the death of the innocent girl, the tale expresses the child’s fear of losing her/his position and being replaced by the step-mother, a cannibalistic figure. It shows a deep anxiety in oral phase. Nevertheless, the death of the step-mother at the end may allow the

child to enjoy the story as it may act on his/her unconscious needs and desires, and may give the child unconscious reassurance of the desire to kill off bad objects.

The mothers in both Turkish Tale 10 and British Tale 3, display a dual nature which is shown in false affection. They act as both good mothers and witch-like characters, signalling the image of the good and the bad mother at the same time. They approach their step-daughters as a good object with an aim of nurturing, but later act as a bad one with persecutory aims. Therefore, in both of these tales, it can be suggested that the image of the mother is split as good and bad and again reflects children's unconscious fears.

Similarly, in "Laidly Worm of Spindleston Heugh" (Number 33), a lack of beauty and purity is recognised to be powerful enough to impel the step-mother to do almost anything, including- literally- dehumanising the protagonist.

We are told that the king mourned long after the death of his wife, but then he fell in love with a lady, who attracted the King with her beauty: "[h]e (the King) came across a lady of great beauty, and became so much in love with her that he determined to marry her." (Jacobs 183) Thus, the tale, similar to the previous ones, starts with the loss of a good object. However, when the new Queen sees Margaret, her step-daughter, she cannot stand her grace. What makes the Queen more envious is the moment when one of the knights expresses his admiration for Margaret, stating: "Surely this northern Princess is the loveliest of her kind." (Jacobs 184) The knight's remarks recall the mirror in "Snow-white", which confirms the beauty of the Princess and evokes the wrath of the step-mother. By the same token, the Queen in this tale cannot bear what the knight says and realises her inferiority in beauty to that of Margaret. She mutters: "I'll soon put an end to her beauty" (184) and, using her magical power, the envious step-mother transforms Margaret into a snake. Thus, the step-mother robs the girl of her beauty and the admiration of the others, which she regards as a threat to her own beauty and position in society. The frustration she feels, that comes from her envy, can only be overcome by practising defence mechanisms of denigration and devaluation of the other, in this case, the innocent step-daughter. When the girl is deprived of all positive qualities, she is literally reduced to an object position and, as Vlanov states, the envied person- here it is the step-daughter- does not "exist as a valid subject" (20).

Margaret is denied of her kingdom- home, which might represent the mother's womb or body, as everyone is afraid of her in the form of a snake. She is alone without any support or anyone to protect her. Only after her brother saves her and kills the step-mother does Margaret get over her object relations anxieties and turn back to her kingdom- the mother's body- as a whole object. Besides, the death of the step-mother signals a life without anxieties concerning the split mother.

Tale 37, "Kate Crakernuts" presents a rare example of a girl siding with her step-sister against her mother. Kate helps and protects her sister, Anne, unlike other step-sisters in both the Turkish and British collections. Both Kate and Anne are like real sisters:

The king had a daughter, Anne, and the queen had one named Kate, but Anne was far bonnier than the queen's daughter, though they loved one another like real sisters.

(Jacobs 198)

It is not Kate but her mother, who sees her daughter as her own reflection and grows envious. In other words, the step-mother is frustrated to see the superior nature of her step-daughter, which her own daughter lacks. The step-mother sends her step-daughter to a hen-wife to transform her lovely head into a sheep's head in order to undermine her beauty and eventually disgrace her in society.

Similar to Margaret in "Laidly Worm of Spindleston Heugh", the step-daughter is literally made an object, losing some part of her humanity. Kate, however, not embodying her mother's antagonistic feelings, determines to leave her mother and help Anne: "Her own daughter, Kate, however, took a fine linen cloth and wrapped it round her sister's head and took her by the hand and they both went out to seek their fortune." (199) Kate, unusual among most ugly step-sisters in the two collections, can be interpreted as having a healthy character as opposed to her wicked mother, who seeks ways to overcome her complexes by doing evil. Kate, on the other hand, does not regard Anne as a threat to her ugliness, nor does she develop any envious feelings. She acts like a good mother to Anne, helping, nurturing and guiding her. Reparation is provided by Kate on behalf of her mother, and the tale does not mention the step-mother again after the girls leave the house. The fairy tale starts with the anxiety of retaliatory harm for Anne; however, in the second half of

the tale, the disappearance of the bad object provides relief for her and also for the reader.

British Tale 41, “The Well of the World’s End”- a variant of Grimm’s “Frog Prince” and another version of British Tale Number 3- depicts a cruel step-mother with motives similar to those of the step-mother in Tale 3. There is again the image of the split mother with the fearful step-mother and an affectionate wise old woman as a good mother figure.

The contrast between the step-mother’s ugliness and the step-daughter’s freshness and physical attractiveness result in hard, endless tasks and suffering for the step-daughter, and along with the enjoyment of the step-mother. The step-mother aims to discard the girl, whose striking beauty she perceives as being her only obstacle; however, unlike Tale 3, magical intervention saves the girl from a possibly tragic end and reverses the protagonist’s fate. The step-mother’s wicked attempts are defeated through magical help, which we may see as a Cinderella motif. First, the old woman, who is like the fairy in “Cinderella”, guides the girl to the Well of the World’s End. Unlike the step-mother, the old woman becomes a good mother to the girl, guiding her to the true path. The second figure that helps the girl is a frog, which tells her how to fill a sieve with water:

Stop it with moss and daub it with clay,
And then it will carry the water away.

(Jacobs 216)

If it were not for the intervention of the frog and the old woman, the good object, the girl might have faced a tragedy similar to that of the step-daughter in Tale 3. Another feature that differentiates this tale from Tale 3 is the fact that in the end the step-mother cannot overcome her envy as the girl marries a rich man.

In British Tale 73, “Rushen Coatie”, one can come across envy as defined by Klein. The fairy tale is a variant of Perrault’s “Cinderella” and the Grimm brothers’ “Aschenputtel”⁴⁴ in terms of its depiction of the step-mother and her impertinent daughters, who lack the qualities which Rushen Coatie possesses. The parallel is that this lack provokes their hatred, and urges them to inflict pain on Coatie. In fact their

⁴⁴ It is a variant of Perrault’s “Cinderella”. The protagonist in “Aschenputtel” is helped by a wishing tree that grows on her mother’s grave.

deficiencies when compared to the perfection of Coatie motivate them to rob the innocent girl of her superior qualities. The narrator simply explains the reason for their envy as: “[t]hey hated the king’s daughter because she was so bonny.” (Jacobs 241) Envy, as Klein states, is “the angry feeling that another person possesses and enjoys something desirable- the envious impulse being to take it away or to spoil it” (176). This is why, along with other evil deeds, the step-mother and the step-sisters provide Coatie with only a coat made of rushes. This cruelty, however, does not satisfy them, and the step-mother also tempts Coatie’s father to kill her best-friend- a red calf, which her mother left before she died in order to protect and provide for Rushen Coatie. The red calf stands for the good mother figure, which provides not merely food but also love. Thus, by killing the red calf, the Queen will not only cause Coatie to feel grief but she will also get rid of the spirit of her mother. In addition, the red calf stands for Coatie’s creative source since it helps her to find food when she is left hungry. The step-mother and step-sisters cannot tolerate seeing Coatie’s life source and energy. The tale reads: “Now the king’s wife thought Rushen Coatie would soon die from the scanty food she got, and she was surprised to see her as lively and healthy as ever.” (Jacobs 241) Upon discovering that the red calf is her provider, the Queen makes the King kill it.

It can, therefore, be suggested that there is a similarity in the defence mechanisms of the evil step-mothers in British Tale 73 and 41, and Turkish Tale 10. By devaluing the step-daughter, the step-mother reduces the girl to an object position. The step-mother attempts to eliminate all the good qualities of the step-daughter in order to feel relieved from her envy. As Vlanov claims, the envied person (here, Coatie) is nullified by the envier (19) (the step-mother); that is to say, she is stripped of all her subjectivity by the step-mother. Similar to the previous tales, there is no reparation for the step-mother as we do not know what happens to her or to the step-sisters after Coatie’s marriage. Seen in this light, one might conclude that Coatie’s marriage to a wealthy man and the regaining of her beauty may provide the child reading or listening to the fairy tale a degree of relief associated with the disappearance of bad objects.

Turkish Tale 4, “Peynir Tulumu” (“The Cheese Case”) is a representative of what Bruno Bettelheim calls “sibling rivalry” (237). Klein explains that “every analysis proves that all children suffer great jealousy of younger sisters and brothers

as well as of older ones” (“Criminal Tendencies” 188). This time the split object theory can be observed in the relationships between the sisters. When the child feels jealous towards his/her sister/brother, s/he develops sadistic desires against them (*ibid.*). The tale presents the motif of three sisters: the older two are depicted as the evil characters of the tale, harming their youngest sister because of envy. The older sisters’ realisation of the fact that they missed a chance to marry a handsome husband and to live in wealth is frustrating for them. They project their anger onto their little sister, who seems to be happy with her marriage and a prosperous life. Once the sisters enter the little sister’s magnificent mansion, they struggle to hide their envy and look for something faulty with which to ridicule their sister. Supposing that her husband is a real cheese case, the elder sisters target the husband as the object of ridicule. Nevertheless, when the sisters learn that her husband is in fact a handsome young man who was enchanted by a fairy, they feel more envious, and they exercise the Kleinian defence of “ridiculing” (*Envy* 217) with the aim of giving vent to their envy. They reflect their envy by shouting and raging at the young woman: “O böyle deyince büyük kızla ortanca kız, hiddetlerinden kıpkırmızı olmuşlar. Küçük kardeşlerine ağır, fena laflar söyleyerek odadan çıkıp gitmişler.”⁴⁵ (Tezel 80) In fact, they attack their sister verbally and try to underestimate her superiority in order to protect themselves from an unbearable situation, which they could not otherwise cope with.

Insulting and leaving their sister alone satisfy the elder sisters since they feel they have reduced the young woman to a position of being a helpless victim. However, neither of the sisters reaches gratification and reparation, which Klein believes is necessary to overcome the individual’s envy and frustration (*Envy* 255).

Tale 12, “Yeşil Kuş” (The Green Bird) too presents envy as the cause of evil. The extreme jealousy of the husband causes the young woman’s suffering, and since the husband harms the good object (his wife) as a result of his schizoid passions, we can categorise this tale as a tale of envy.

Although the tale contains the common folktale motif of a loyalty test on the wedding night, it is completely different from other tales with the same motif in the two collections. The young woman’s unexpected answer- choosing the black grape

⁴⁵ “When she said this, the eldest girl with the middle one went red due to their wrath. They uttered bad words to their little sister and left the room.”

rather than the white- provokes the husband's rage and envy. The husband interprets his wife's choice of the black grape as preferring the Arab servant to him. The triangular relationship appears to be shaped around the Arab servant, the envious husband and the innocent wife. The husband feels that he is in danger of losing his wife and thinks that he is in a rivalry with the servant. The husband's anxieties of losing his wife and being in a competition with a third person seem to be because of jealousy, but his mixed feelings of love and hatred for his wife can be interpreted as a defence of an envious person. He condemns his wife and even beats her terribly, almost to her death:

Kocası eline geçirdiği bir sopa ile üzerine doğru geliyormuş. Kendini korumak için odanın bir köşesine kaçmışsa da delikanlı hemen arkasından yetişerek onu yakalamış, dövmeye başlamış. Tam kırk sopa vurarak zavallı kızı adeta hasta etmiş. Bir gün böyle, iki gün böyle ... Kırk gündür kız kocasından her gün kırk sopa yiyormuş⁴⁶.
(Tezel 187- 88)

Hence, here, envy is integrated with the death wish, destroying love and creative force. Similar to *Othello*, the husband is blinded with the bitter feeling of jealousy and paranoia towards his wife and he keeps on torturing her. The tale deals with the battle between love and hatred, which is common to all individuals according to Freud and Klein (Freud, *Beyond Pleasure* 46-47; Klein, *Envy* 264). The husband has to deal with his fear of loss of the good object and he thus tortures the wife as in the images of an infant who devours, splits and tortures the good object out of his/her fear of loss in the paranoid-schizoid position (Klein, "The Importance of Symbol-Formation" 236). Nevertheless, the husband, like an infant with anxieties, reaches the depressive position as a whole object at the end, since the child learns to integrate his/her objects in this position, and the husband realises his defects and feels gratitude for his wife. The child, hearing such a tale, may also escape his/her fear of loss raised in the paranoid-schizoid position.

Turkish Tale Number 25, "Güneş Kızı" ("The Sun Girl"), contains a great many motifs found in other tales in the collection such as children without parents,

⁴⁶ Her husband approached her with a stick. Though she hid in a corner of the room, the young man trapped her in the corner and started to beat her. He injured her after clubbing her for forty times. This lasted one day...two days...For forty days, the young man beat his wife forty times.

an old couple raising the children, sibling rivalry and the motif of the potent number three- three sisters. Whereas in Turkish Tale Number 4, the elder sisters' envy does not go beyond ridiculing, in this tale the older sisters cruelly attempt to kill the youngest sister and her children. First, their sister's wealth and then her fair children, which they lack, reinforce their envy and fury and strengthen their aim to destroy her. By causing the young woman's humiliation not solely in her husband's eyes but also in the public's, the elder sisters intend to steal their sister's subjectivity and all her possessions- her husband, her children and her high position in society. It can be suggested that the tale deals with the infant's desire to make his/her mother bad in the eye of the father; therefore, there is the image of splitting the mother figure. While the good mother is taken away from the children, the aunts stand for the bad mother, trying to harm and persecute the children.

For the older sisters, the children of their little sister are reflections of her; which stirs up their envy and aggression against the children. Considering them as a threat to their comfort and position at the court, they scheme to kill the children as well. Murdering the son is their only chance to get rid of him completely, since the elder sisters' antagonistic feelings towards their nephew and niece do not diminish. However, at the end the son saves his mother and helps to form the whole object image for the reader/listener. Furthermore, the banishment of the sisters signals the complete recovery of the good mother.

Turkish Tale 32, "Konuşan Kaval" ("The Talking Flute"), presents half-sisters as evil out of their insatiable envy. Bettelheim describes such tales of two sisters/brothers as representing the two aspects of human nature (75). The ugliness of the two elder girls is contrasted with the striking beauty of their little half-sister. In fact, the narrator emphasises the elder girls' physical unattractiveness as a reflection of their personalities: "Ama, gelgelelim, her iki çocuk da çirkinmiş. Sadece yüzleri çirkin olsa neyse... Doğrusu, ahlakları da pek iyi değilmiş."⁴⁷ (Tezel 356) In contrast, from her birth, everyone at the court admires Dal and as she matures people get more fascinated by her elegance and good-will:

⁴⁷ "But, as for the children, both of them were ugly. It was not only their faces that were ugly anyway... In fact, they themselves were a bit immoral."

Yıllar el ele verdikçe, Dal daha da büyümüş. Güzel yüzünden başka ahlakı da güzel olan Dal'ı herkes seviyor, hele onun terbiyesine, iyi kalpliliğine bütün saraydakiler hayran kalıyormuş⁴⁸.

(Tezel 356)

Thus, what incurs the envy of the sisters is not merely the physical attractiveness of Dal, but also people's attitudes towards her.

When Dal asks humbly for a silver bowl from her father when he goes to India, the sisters, driven by greed, ask him to bring them more precious objects. However, they still get envious of Dal's silver bowl, which suggests that it is not just Dal's superiority that the sisters envy, but that whatever she has makes the elder sisters uncomfortable:

[o]nlar Dal'a:

-Sen de gümüş tasını güle güle kullan! dememişler. Çünkü, kendi armağanlarından daha değersiz olduğu halde, onun gümüş tasını pek kıskanıyorlarmış⁴⁹.

(Tezel 359)

Their wish for the little sister's bowl to be lost demonstrates their intolerance for Dal's happiness. When Dal is drowned in a river, while trying to recover her bowl, they do not feel any remorse; on the contrary, they seem relieved at the disappearance of an obstacle for their gratification. Similar to Turkish Tale Number 33 and British Tale Number 3, the transformation motif serves to demonstrate how the protagonist has been reduced to an object position as a manifestation of the enviers' defence mechanisms. While the good object is turned into a dove and then a tree in Tale 33, and into a tree in Tale 3, the protagonist of this tale is transformed into a branch of a tree and then into a flute. This protagonist's fate changes with a shepherd's discovering the tree and making a flute out of it, which ultimately gives power to Dal, who, having lost her power as a subject, regains her voice and reveals the evil-doers.

⁴⁸ As the years passed, Dal grew up more. Everyone at the court loved Dal, who was not only physically attractive but also decent, and they admired especially her good manners and warm heart.

⁴⁹ They didn't tell Dal: "Enjoy it". Because, though it was less valuable than their presents, they envied her silver bowl very much.

Tale Number 11, “Altın Bülbul” (“The Golden Nightingale”) is a variant of the three-sister-tales where the characters are three brothers. The failure of the elder brothers in finding the golden nightingale, which their father requested, frightens the brothers who fear losing their father’s favour. They attempt to kill their little brother with a view to discarding the threat he poses to their ranking in the family:

[b]üyük kardeş, yanındaki ortanca kardeşine dedi ki:

-Padişah babamız, çok akıllı çocuk diye her zaman onu bizden daha çok severdi. Şimdi Altın Bülbul’ü bunun getirdiğini öğrenirse, daha çok sevecek. Bizim hiç kıymetimiz kalmayacak [...] Gel şunu bir uçuruma atalım?⁵⁰

(Tezel 175)

They change their mind about murdering him not for reasons related to any feeling of repentance but because they fear their fiancées may reveal the murder. Thus they decide to leave him alone, helpless in a well, giving the impression that they did it accidentally:

Küçük oğlan ağabeylerine:

- Ben çok susadım, demiş, burada biraz duralım.

Ötekiler:

- Duralım ama, demişler, biz susamadık. İstersen seni kuyuya indirelim, suyunu iç. Sonra yukarı çekeriz [...]

Büyük kardeş kuşağın ucunu elinde tutuyormuş. Ortanca kardeşine bir göz işareti yaptıktan sonra, kuşağın ucunu yavaşça bırakmış⁵¹.

(*ibid.*)

By victimising the young man and adopting his role by taking the valuable bird to their father, the two elder brothers ultimately feel satisfied.

The defence mechanism the brothers use can be “ignoring”, since they regard the good object as absent. By informing their father that their youngest brother has died, they simply ignore his existence. Being robbed of his identity, the young man

⁵⁰ The eldest brother told his middle brother: “Our Padishah father always loved him more than us because he was very clever. If our father now learns that he has brought the Golden Bird, he will love him far more. We will further lose our value [...] Let’s push him down a cliff.

⁵¹ The youngest brother to his elder brothers: “I’m very thirsty. Let’s stop here.” The others: “We can stop, but we aren’t thirsty. If you like, we can help you get down the well and you can drink water. Then we can hoist you. [...] The eldest was holding the rope. After signalling the middle brother, the eldest brother released the rope slowly.

has no chance but to disguise himself as Kelođlan. In the end, the young prince, after undergoing a series of adventures and ordeals, reveals himself to his father and eventually regains his identity.

Tale 31, “Sihirli Tavşan” (“The Magic Rabbit”), shares a similar plot structure with Turkish Tale 11, except for a lost sister motif. As in Tale 11, the brothers are anxious about falling out of their father’s favour and so they leave their little brother to starve, with the goal of causing his downfall.

Tale 24, “Alabalık” (“The Trout”), which is a shorter tale than the others in the collection and which has no subplots, depicts an envious Arab who victimizes the protagonist. When the prince marries an angelic girl, her Arab maid becomes overwhelmed by the very feeling of envy and cannot tolerate the fact that the girl is far more charming and has a higher position in society than she has. She thinks: “Nasıl yapsam da řu kızı ortadan kaldırsam, řehzade beni alsın”⁵² (Tezel 291). Knowing that she can only get the prince by masquerading, as in Turkish Tale 10, the maid schemes to get rid of the girl. She pushes the prince’s wife and her new-born baby into the river and goes back to court after disguising herself as the beautiful woman. Here the maid and the angelic girl can be seen as enacting two sides of a split ego, represented by the ugly and evil Arab, and the good and innocent protagonist. For Klein, if the infant cannot integrate the good object sufficiently enough, it cannot rely on the external or the internal good object, and thus it cannot rely on itself, which results in a splitting of the ego as good and bad (*Envy* 303). In the tale, by pushing the girl into the river, the Arab maid not merely puts an end to the princess’ existence but also creates an opportunity to adopt the role of the good object. Free from any threat, the Arab maid enjoys her new life with the prince at court for some time, but before long the truth is revealed, and she is given the “forty asses”⁵³ punishment. At the end, the punishment of the Arab maid may act on the unconscious desire of the child about killing his/her bad side.

⁵² “What can I do to get rid of this girl and make the prince marry me instead?”

⁵³ This type of punishment is common in Turkish tales and the question whether the criminal prefers forty asses or forty axes is asked at the end of tales in various ways, such as “Does your head want forty asses or forty axes?” or “Would you prefer to leave here by mad forty asses or prefer curved forty axes?” (Sakaođlu 64), and the answers can be “Forty axes to my enemy, I prefer forty asses so that I can go to my hometown”, or “A curved axe is for your neck, I prefer mad asses” (*ibid*).

Similar to the preceding tale, another envious and frustrated character is the Arab in the Turkish Tale 33- “Limon Kız” (“The Lemon Girl”), which again deals with the theme of split ego. This tale is much longer than the previous one, with a subplot and long-winded descriptions. Similarly, the Arab girl is presented as the foil of the fairy-like protagonist, called Limon Kız. The Arab girl’s poverty and ugliness are contrasted with the attractiveness of Limon Kız. When she sees Limon Kız’s charm and her mysterious powers, she decides to harm the girl, thus presenting a good example of the Kleinian envious person. The envious person enjoys the idea of the destruction of the good one, and thus spoils and hurts the object. The Arab girl puts Limon Kız’s magical comb, which gives Limon Kız her human form, in the wrong place in her hair with the goal of reducing her into an object. Limon Kız metamorphoses into a dove, losing her human form. As in Tale 10, “Bir Göze Bir Gül” (“A Rose for an Eye”) and Tale 24 “Alabalık” (“The Trout”), the envious girl masquerades as Limon Kız, by which the Arab girl not only nullifies Limon Kız but also robs her of her identity to deceive the prince. Achieving her goal for a while, the Arab girl enjoys her false identity and the power that goes with it. Nonetheless, the appearance of Limon Kız as a bird reinforces the Arab’s envy, reminding the reader of Klein’s comments that: “[a]mbition is another factor highly instrumental in stirring up envy [...] failure to fulfil one’s ambition is often aroused by the conflict between the urge to make reparation to the object injured by destructive envy and a renewed reappearance of envy” (197-98). The Arab girl feels no need to provide reparation for her victim, and her destructive envy leads her to transform the bird, this time, into a tree. As a bird, Limon Kız could fly and tell her story in a song; as a tree, she is doomed to stay still, losing all her independence. After destroying her for the second time, the insatiable craving for complete destruction of the good object moves the Arab to ask for a throne made of the tree, as she feels disturbed, even threatened by Limon Kız’s existence in the form of a living piece of wood. However, as expected from a fairy/folk tale, the remains of the tree turn into Limon Kız through the help of a wise old woman. After everything is revealed, the Arab girl is given the punishment of “forty asses”. The death of the Arab girl signals the recovery of the ego, which is united at the end.

Tale 42, “Doğruluk” (“Righteousness”) is about two greedy elder brothers who desire to get hold of the possessions of their clever little brother. What

differentiates the tale from the tales in the subsection of “Greed” is the brothers’ aim of “putting badness” into what is envied, as Klein expresses it (*Envy* 181). Klein describes how the envious infant sucks her/his mother’s good breast dry and devours it (*Envy* 126), and similarly the elder brothers in the tale consume the young man’s food on the quest and share nothing with him, which can be interpreted as sucking dry his life source as a sign of the elder brothers’ envy. The intensity of their envy is revealed through their attempt to leave the young man alone while picking apples, which may well demonstrate their desire to obliterate the young man’s being. After the little brother gets wealthy and marries a beautiful princess through the tricks he learned at the giants’ house, the brothers’ envy gets even bitterer, reinforced by hatred and greed. An interpretation of this is that what the brothers cannot tolerate in any condition is the life force that the little brother has, embodying vigour, self-assurance and health. Klein highlights that the good object can be regarded as a life force, while envy is a destructive force (*Envy* 202):

Though superficially this may manifest itself as a coveting of the prestige, wealth and power which others have attained, its actual aim is creativeness. The capacity to give and preserve life is felt as the greatest gift and therefore creativeness becomes the deepest cause for envy.

(*Envy* 202)

Not only does the envier want to destroy the creative force of the good object—as manifested in this story in the form of wealth, prestige and status, but the envier also seeks ways in which to imitate the good object and his/her creativeness. In this respect, the brothers in the tale grow extremely envious of their little brother’s wealth, marriage and above all his ability to survive, all of which can be regarded as the basis of the life force Klein mentions in her work (*Envy* 201). The brothers’ desire to learn his tricks in the house of the giants indicates their attempt to surpass the little brother’s creative force. Unlike the other tales in which the brothers are evil, here the brothers repent and reach Kleinian reparation and gratitude. Klein claims that if an envious person feels guilt and reach reparation, s/he can overcome his/her depressive position (*Envy* 286). She maintains that “the urge to make reparation, the working through of depressive position breaks up the vicious circle because destructive impulses [...] have diminished and the relation to the loved object has

been re-established (*Envy* 295). The brothers thank God for their safety and feel sorry for their previous mistakes:

Ölmediklerini görünce, Allah'a şükretmişler [...] O zaman, kardeşlerini yolda bırakıp kaçtıklarını, sonra da onu kıskandıkları için başlarına bu felaketin geldiğini, ancak Allah acıdığı için de devlere lokma olmaktan kurtulduklarını birbirlerine söylemişler.⁵⁴
(Tezel 454)

Klein explains: "The ego feels impelled [...] to make restitution for all the sadistic attacks that it has launched on that object [...] (T)he subject attempts to restore the former, making good in the restoration every detail of his sadistic attacks" ("A Contribution" 285). As a result, it appears that the brothers' anxieties and frustrations disappear as a sign of healthy development.

British Tale Number 43, "The Three Heads of the Well", depicts an envious sister and a step-mother about whom we are informed that the step-mother is "old, ugly, hooked-nosed and hump-backed" (Jacobs 222), all of which might be regarded as manifestations of her ill-manners. Similar to British tale 37 and Turkish tale 10, the step-mother and her daughter attempt to spoil the creative force and try to create their own by imitating the innocent step-daughter. With this in mind, the ugly girl goes on a quest with her step-sister to seek her fortune. It can be suggested that the step-sister's attempt at imitating the innocent girl shows the split ego as good and bad. However, embodying antagonistic feelings, the ugly step-sister cannot fulfil the quest and brings her own misery. Her daughter's failure in life along with the blissful marriage of her step-daughter to a rich man nurtures the step-mother's envy to such an extent that she hangs herself upon her daughter's marriage to a cobbler: "When the queen found that her daughter had married nothing but a poor cobbler, she hanged herself in wrath." (Jacobs 227) When her last hope vanishes with the marriage of her own daughter to a man of lower status, the projection of hatred to the good object turns into an introjection that ultimately destroys the step-mother herself. Neither the step-mother nor her daughter feels reparation in the end. With such an ending, the child may unconsciously witness the destruction of the bad and

⁵⁴ They thanked God when they realised they did not die. [...] Then, they realised that the reason for all these trouble was that they envied their brother and left him in the middle of the road, and that since God pitied them they were saved from being a tasty morsel for the giants.

threatening ego. This might be a relief for the reader/listener who might be struggling against his/her split ego.

In the Turkish tale 46, “Oduncu Keloğlan” (“Keloğlan the Lumberjack”), evil is inflicted by a minor character, who is an old woman living next door to Keloğlan. From a Kleinian perspective, greed and envy appear to be the dominant stimuli that drive the old neighbour irresistibly to Keloğlan’s magic box that symbolises the life source. The way Keloğlan has got powerful and rich whets the old neighbour’s appetite to seize his magic box. By stealing the box, the woman might, in the Kleinian sense, suck Keloğlan and his life source dry.

These analyses of envious characters’ motives show that the tales belong to three different categories. There is one type in which the evil character attempts reparation, feeling gratitude and repentance for what he/she has done to the good object, as Turkish Tale 42. In this respect, it might not be wrong to assert that this character demonstrates a healthy character development in the Kleinian sense and demonstrates the possibility of reaching the depressive position in which a child introjects the object as a whole and starts to develop his/her relationship with the external world, with an awareness of the fact that he/she has created images due to retaliatory anxiety and s/he repents later on (“Criminal Tendencies” 186-87). The second type deals with the unsatisfied evil character, who cannot overcome his/her envy, and the reader is not informed what happens to him/her after the performance of evil as in British Tales 37, 41, 73 and in Turkish Tales 4, 46. The last type is characterised by the punishment of the evil character, who is generally condemned to death. Thus, this type displays the adverse outcomes of envy, showing what may befall the person who attempts to harm others as in Turkish Tales 3, 12, 24, 25, 32, 11, 31, 33 and in British Tales 3, 33, 43. Many of these tales start with the loss of a mother figure and there is the situation of the splitting of the mother into the good and the bad objects, which is mostly represented by the cruel step-mother. Furthermore, Klein is convinced that particularly female infants anticipate a kind of retribution from their mothers since they feel destructive tendencies towards their mothers and their mothers’ bodies (“Early Stages” 211). This anticipation is the root of the dread that most women face about their beauty, which they fear can be destroyed by their mother (*ibid.*) In her article titled “Infantile Anxiety-Situation Reflected In a Work of Art and In the Creative Impulse”, Klein elaborates on this

topic and states that a girl's early sadistic desire felt for the mother emerges in the early stages of the Oedipus conflict and there is a desire to rob the mother's body of its contents and destroy the mother herself (234). However, the girl feels anxious at the same time, because the mother can in turn rob the girl of the contents of her body and her body can be mutilated (*ibid.*) Thus, it can be suggested that this fear and anxiety of the child is present in these step-mother tales, in which the step-mother tries to kill or destroy her step-daughter due to her beauty and innocence. When at the end of these tales the step-mother is killed or punished and the split image of the mother is recovered, the child as the reader may feel relief since for Klein the presence of a real, loving mother or a substitute for her can diminish the dread of a terrifying mother figure ("Infantile Anxiety" 234).

Sister/brother tales, similar to the step-mother tales, represent the splitting of objects, but this time it is the ego which is split as good and bad, representing the dual nature of the human being. Besides, these tales usually involve the motifs of oral sadism. There is the fear of being eaten by the dangerous bad object, which makes the ego take a defence of projection and feel the persecutory anxiety of the paranoid-schizoid position.

iii.ii Jealousy:

In her *Envy and Gratitude*, Klein distinguishes jealousy from greed and envy, and she lays particular emphasis on love as the driving force of jealousy (181). She further argues that while envy begins in the very early stages of infancy with the good breast, jealousy comes to the fore with the Oedipal situation resulting from the entrance of the father figure into the infant's world, jeopardising his/her wholeness with the mother (Klein, *Envy* 79). Klein adds that there is a direct connection between envy and jealousy since jealousy begins with the infant perceiving that the father takes the mother's breast away from him/her, which brings about a strong sense of rivalry with the father (*Envy* 196). Driven by hatred and the death wish, the jealous infant shows his/her hostile feelings not to the primal object but to his/her siblings or his/her father. If the infant has a healthy development, s/he overcomes his/her feelings of jealousy and instead develops love for the father and his/her siblings. However, if s/he cannot work through the rivalry and jealousy in the

Oedipal phase, it is possible that s/he will make generalisations in his/her later life, hating all male or female figures that stand for members of the family (*Envy* 198).

The line between envy and jealousy appears to be blurred, but, as explained in detail in Chapter II, Klein maintains that in jealousy there is love for the good object and the loved object is not destroyed or harmed unlike the case in envy (*Envy* 182). While the jealous person fears losing his/her good object, the envious person “is pained at seeing” the good object has what s/he wants for him/herself (*Envy* 181). Klein provides Shakespeare’s *Othello* as an example for these two different feelings and draws attention to the protagonist, who, in his jealousy, harms Desdemona, which obviously does not fit the definition of jealousy, but rather that of envy (*Envy* 182).

Two tales in the Turkish collection and three tales in the British collection can be categorised as the tales with Kleinian type of jealousy. In these tales, a triangular love relationship and aggressive impulses lead the characters to wish to hurt and destroy his/her opponent.

The Turkish Tale 36, “Şamdan Kız” (“The Candlestick Girl”) is built on the Vizier’s daughter’s attempts to get rid of the protagonist, Şamdan Kız, in order to get the prince for herself. While the Vizier’s daughter is planning to marry the prince, an unexpected intruder at the palace poses a great threat for her. Though there is an attempted murder, which might appear to be the illustration of Kleinian envy (with the desire to destroy the good object), love for the prince, which is maintained throughout the tale, can be taken as evidence of Kleinian jealousy instead. Furthermore, the Vizier’s daughter’s wrath is only directed towards the third person, whom she feels might spoil her relation with the good object, the prince. The tale expresses the Vizier’s daughter’s anxiety as follows:

Ertesi sabah uşak, gördüklerini başvezirin karısı ile kızına anlatmış. Şamdan Kız’ın güzelliğini de söyleye söyleye bitirememiş. Başvezirin kızı, şehzadeyi elinden kaçırmak üzere olduğunu artık iyice anlamış. Hemen annesiyle bir olup şamdanı balta ile parçalamaya karar vermişler.⁵⁵

(Tezel 389)

⁵⁵ The next morning, the butler told the Vizier’s wife and daughter the things that he had seen. He praised the Candlestick Girl’s beauty to the skies. The Vizier’s daughter realised well that she was about to lose the Prince. Together her mother, the Vizier’s daughter decided to break the candlestick into pieces with an axe.

Being afraid of the prince's wrath, the Vizier's daughter changes her mind about harming the Şamdan Kız, and she instead just banishes the poor girl from the court. However, at the end the prince learns everything and banishes the Vizier's daughter and her mother from the court; the Şamdan Kız returns to court, which marks the recovery of the good object.

British Tale 25, "The History of Tom Thumb", as different from the preceding tale, presents a variant of the Kleinian type of jealousy in that the evildoer, in this case the Queen, acts aggressively not to another woman but simply to the jester Tom Thumb due to a decline of love and affection of the good object- her husband. After a series of adventures, when Tom accidentally ends up at the court, the King and his subjects happen to enjoy his presence and Tom becomes the King's jester. Through tricks and gambols, Tom soon becomes the centre of attention, which feeds the Queen's jealousy day by day. The narrator states: "The queen was so enraged at the honours conferred on Sir Thomas that she resolved to ruin him, and told that the little knight had been saucy to her." (Jacobs 146) She requires him to be sent away from the court since she is jealous of Tom as the King's favourite; in other words, she is jealous of her primary object. In fact, she cannot tolerate the pleasure that the King gets from Tom's company and orders the little boy to be banished from court. However, Tom manages to return, which reinforces the Queen's rage, and this time she commands that he should be beheaded, with the goal of ending the rivalry for good. The Queen does everything she can to take back her beloved object from the other whom she considers a great menace to her relationship with the King. It can be suggested that the Queen represents the bad mother figure, trying to separate the child from his father figure.

"Binnorie", Number 9, carries similarities with the Grimm's "Singing Bone" in which one brother slays the other and buries him under a bush. However, this tale offers a variant of Grimm's "Singing Bone" in terms of the gender of the victim and the murderer. "Binnorie" also bears similarities with Turkish Tale Number 32, "Konuşan Kaval" in which a shepherd finds the bones of a deceased lady and makes a flute from the bones, and the flute tells the listeners all about the murderer. What distinguishes this tale from "Konuşan Kaval" is that "Binnorie" can be categorised under the subsection "Jealousy" owing to the triangular love relation between Binnorie, her elder sister and Sir William. Similar to sister/brother tales, "Binnorie"

also shows the split of the ego, represented in the evil sister and Binnorie. We are told that the sisters are tremendously in love with Sir William, who has been flirting with both of them. When the elder sister is turned down by Sir William, who has chosen her sister instead, she is not only disappointed but also extremely jealous of her rival - Binnorie. Considering her as an obstacle for her primal object, the elder sister is ready to project her aggression onto Binnorie: "So she hated her sister for taking away Sir William's love and day by day her hate grew upon her, and she plotted and planned how to get rid of her." (Jacobs 243) How the elder sister feels resembles an infant's feelings in the presence of his/her sibling before the infant's good object- his/her mother/father. Klein elucidates this as follows:

Jealousy is, as we know, inherent in the Oedipus situation and is accompanied by hate and death wishes. Normally, however, the gain of new objects who can be loved- the father and siblings- and other compensations which the developing ego derives from the external world, mitigate to some extent jealousy and grievance. If paranoid and schizoid mechanisms are strong, jealousy- and ultimately envy- remain unmitigated.

(Klein 197)

Likewise, we may suggest that Sir William is the representation of the father figure in that he appears as the good object of the elder sister. Eventually, the intervention of Binnorie, who poses a threat as the rival, in the elder sister's relationship with Sir William creates a hostile atmosphere. Ultimately, the elder sister drowns Binnorie in order to live peacefully with her primal object since she feels he was always her due, and had unfortunately been stolen by her sister. Klein suggests that the child in his/her phantasy destroys the good object by flooding, drowning or soaking as a reflection to his/her being deprived of fluid by his/her mother and ultimately directed against her breast (*The Psychoanalysis of Children* 125). Therefore, the fairy tale may be interpreted as representing one of the main anxieties of the child in his/her early stages of development and as helping the child cope with these through the recovery of the state at the end. The harp player gives life to Binnorie through his music, which enables her to reveal the murderer. It can be suggested that the tale satisfies the reader's- the child's- desire of revenge on the sister, who stands for the mother figure preferred by the father.

In British Tale Number 75, “Tamlane”, jealousy can be observed between a fairy, the bad mother, and two human beings. The tale includes the motif of a fairy kidnapping a human being, which one can see when the fairy queen, who feels that Tamlane rightfully belongs to her, kidnaps him and makes him one of her knights. Once Tamlane’s fiancée, Burd Janet, comes out and tries to save Tamlane, the queen’s greed turns into harmful jealousy towards the hostile intruder, and she fights to take back Tamlane for herself. After losing him, one can feel the touch of destructive jealousy in the fairy queen’s mourning. She sings:

But had I known, Tamlane, Tamlane,
A lady would borrow thee,
I’d hae ta’en out thy two grey eyne,
Put in two eyne of tree.

[...]

I’d hae ta’en out thy heart o’ flesh,
Put in a heart of stone.

[...]

I’d paid the Fiend seven times his teind
Ere you’d been won away.

(Jacobs 249)

The fairy queen faces the great fear of losing Tamlane and cannot endure losing him to her opponent. What Klein highlights about jealousy is that it is accompanied strongly with the death wish and with a wish to harm the rival (197), which is manifested here with the queen’s wish to destroy Burd Janet through a Fiend and in her desire to take Tamlane’s eyes out to prevent him from seeing anyone else apart from herself. Tamlane is saved at the end of the tale and the bad mother is thus eliminated and Tamlane is united with the good mother figure, Burd Janet.

In both collections love for the good object can lead one to cause the misery of the third person owing to the fear of losing the primal object to the rival. The tales about jealous characters in these collections can be divided into two types. In the first type, the villain loses his/her primal object to his/her rival as in Turkish Tale 36 and British Tale 75. In the second type of the tales, the good object is retained by the subject, who performs evil for the sake of his/her love as in British Tales 25 and 9.

As opposed to the envious person in the preceding subsection, the object is not harmed in these tales, and the death wish, which is not mingled with love but with pure hatred, is only projected onto the rival.

iii.iii. Greed:

For Klein, greed is a desire that is just as dangerous as envy; however, it does not destroy the good object as envy does. She suggests that “[g]reed is an impetuous and insatiable craving, exceeding what the subject needs and what the object is able and willing to give.” (181) In fact, greed, like envy, is an inordinate desire to adopt the good object for oneself. Klein states:

At the unconscious level, greed aims primarily at completely scoping out, sucking dry and devouring the breast: that is to say; its aim is destructive in introjection, whereas envy not only seeks to rob in this way, but also put badness, primarily bad excrements and bad parts of the self, into the mother, and first of all into her breast, in order to spoil and destroy.

(181)

Whereas in envy, hostile feelings are directed against the good object, in greed the only desire is to keep the good object, which implicates an egoistic wish. In this respect, envy destroys the creative source as in the example of Satan that Klein gives (202). However, should Satan not bring about the fall of the human being and a war against the angels, his inordinate intentions to possess the good object can be categorised within the definition of greed, not envy. In greed it is affirmed that goodness remains as something positive and what is of paramount importance is that the good object is desired to such a great extent that others are prevented from sharing it.

Two tales in the Turkish collection and three tales in the British collection can be put into this subcategory on the grounds that the characters excessively desire to possess a particular object without any intention of spoiling it.

In the Turkish Tale 2, “Peri Kızı” (“Fairy Girl”), sisters-in-law are depicted as dangerous for an innocent fairy girl. Getting curious about the fairy girl, who comes

to court as a bride, the sisters one by one peep through the keyhole, trying to learn what makes this girl distinguished.

First, the eldest sister-in-law, driven by curiosity and greed, kills herself accidentally in the end. When the sister-in-law sees that the fairy girl is able to make fire with one word and cook fish by putting her fingers into the pan, the sister gets jealous. Unaware of the fairy girl's mysterious powers, the eldest sister-in-law attempts to do the same, subconsciously desiring to have the same power as the fairy girl. However, in order to suppress this inordinate wish, the sister-in-law belittles the fairy girl's skills by saying to herself; "Onun yaptığını ben de yaparım"⁵⁶ (Tezel 48). The sister-in-law's "denigration" of the fairy girl and her skills can be an example of a defence mechanism (Klein, *Envy* 217) against anxiety.

Thus, by trying to cook with her fingers as the fairy girl does, the elder sister-in-law burns herself. Had the sister-in-law accepted her inferiority and inability to perform the same acts as the fairy girl, she may not have suffered from the destructive outcomes of her greed.

A similar fate can be observed with the second sister-in-law, whose greed causes her to die burning. She also tries to hide her insatiable feeling of greed and, like the elder sister, she says: "Kardeşim bu ekmekleri bunun yaratıverdiğini öğrenirse, her şeyi unuttur. Onunla barışır. Halbuki herşey kendiliğinden oldu. Ben de onun gibi yapabilirim..."⁵⁷ (50). By underestimating the fairy girl's power, the sister tries to overcome her inferiority complex. Hence, the sisters' harming themselves and not others can be described as greed defined by Klein. Klein explains that "greed is mainly bound up with introjection and envy with projection" (*Envy* 181). Thus, because of their insatiable greed, the sister-in-laws introject their destructive feelings onto themselves rather than inflicting evil on the fairy girl.

In the "Arrogant Girl" ("Gururlu Kız"), Number 39, the protagonist does not explicitly perform an evil deed- she does not harm or destroy anyone. The only defect of the girl is her pride (Tezel 416). However, what the narrator, in fact, means with pride is the girl's excessive desire to seize a higher status or more valuable possessions. When the girl visits the mansion of the vizier's wife, she feels

⁵⁶ "I can do the things she can do"

⁵⁷ "If my brother learns that she has made these loaves of bread, he can forget everything. He can reunite with her. But everything happened by itself. I can do like her."

uncomfortable as she ardently wants to possess whatever the woman has. The tale reads:

Hizmetçiler, kahya kadın, bunları karşılamışlar. Öne düşüp bir salonun kapısını açmışlar. Güzel kız etrafını hayran hayran seyrederek salona girmiş. Gördüğü şeylerin güzelliği karşısında hem hayranlık duyuyor, hem de arap vezirin karısını kıskanıyormuş.⁵⁸

(Tezel 418)

The girl is blinded by the wealth in the mansion and the fairy-like girls who are at the command of the hostess. The narrator does not explicitly write about the girl's feelings but the descriptions of the girl make it clear that the girl tries to suppress her inferiority and greed:

Güzel kız, içinden “Ben misafirim,” diyerek, arap kadından önce arabadan inmiş. Vezir karısı, bu işe hiç ses çıkarmadan, kızın arkasından arabadan inmiş, mermer merdivenlere doğru yürümüş.⁵⁹

(Tezel 418)

As the girl, who is inferior both in terms of age and social status, is supposed to follow the vizier's wife; nevertheless, the girl, overwhelmed by her complexes, tries to give the impression that she is equally superior. Narcissism is also apparent in the attitudes of the girl as she has a grandiose ego.

When the vizier's wife tells the girl's fortune, she sees an ugly old man, whom she interprets as the ill-manners of the girl and says:

Gördün ya kızım, demiş, güzelim diye hiç gururlanma! Benim gibi alçakgönüllü, güler yüzlü olursan, her istediğine kavuşursun! Yoksa, işte, talihin, hastalıklı, ihtiyar bir adamdır.⁶⁰

(Tezel 420)

⁵⁸ The maids, the housekeeper met them. They opened the door of the hall to the guests. The beautiful girl entered the hall, gazing around admiringly. She admired what she saw, but at the same time she envied the Arab wife of the Vizier.

⁵⁹ The beautiful girl, thinking to herself; “I'm the guest”, got off the car before the Arab woman. The Vizier's wife, saying nothing to this situation, got off the car after the girl and walked towards the marble stairs.

⁶⁰ As you see my dear, do not boast that you are beautiful. If you are modest and smiling as I am, you can achieve anything. Otherwise, your fortune will be an old sick man.

As it is reflected in her fortune, the girl's greed destroys herself with its uncontrollable desire to possess anything the other person has. With a strong sense of greed, the girl introjects frustration and aggression onto herself, which is symbolised in the ugly old man in her fortune. The vizier's wife stands for the good mother figure, who helps the girl find the right path for a healthy development. At the end, girl's recuperation is signalled by her marriage to a prince and by her listening to the vizier's wife about being a humble person.

As for the British collection, "The Master and His Pupil", Number 15, can be regarded as one of the good illustrations of the greed in every man who has the goal of reaching knowledge beyond the limits of humanity. The tale presents a man at the edge of a fall as a result of his greed and ambition. In fact, in this tale greed appears to be the desire to attain an almost divine power- an omnipotent position. The tale recalls Mephistopheles and Faust, as well as Eve and Satan, with the depiction of man's same insatiable thirst for knowledge.

Intoxicated with the passion to know what only his master knows, the foolish student almost brings catastrophe to the whole town. When his master is away, the student tries to work the secret apparatus, which helps transform copper into gold and reveals the secrets of the world. Nevertheless, calling Beelzebub accidentally almost brings his misery:

It was the demon Beelzebub whom he had called up to serve him.
"Set me a task!" said he, with a voice like the roaring of an iron
furnace. The boy trembled, and his hair stood up.

(Jacobs 75)

The student's thirst for knowledge and power differs from that of Satan, who causes the destruction of others, and thus Satan's motives are mingled with envy- more dangerous than greed. However, the student's motive can be defined as only greed since what he attempts is bound up with introjection, rather than projection of badness onto the good object. Furthermore, it can also be suggested that Beelzebub is the personification of the student's destructive impulses, which may reflect the reader's oral sadistic desires.

In the British Tale 18, "The Story of Three Bears", the old woman who is depicted as wicked utters bad words in moments of dissatisfaction. She breaks into

the house of three bears and eats whatever she finds, out of greed. We are told that she is a “bad old” and “naughty” woman, using “wicked words” (Jacobs 94-95). Her attitude can be taken as an example of a greedy person with an inordinate passion to own everything that belongs to someone else. The narrator tries to give a moral lesson while describing the old woman’s unpleasant character and says:

If she had been a good little old Woman, she would have waited till the Bears came home, and then, perhaps, they would have asked her to breakfast [...] But she was an impudent, bad old Woman, and set about helping herself.

(Jacobs 94)

The old woman feels no remorse for what she has done as she considers it as her right to get hold of all that is good. Vetlesen, a Kleinian critic, describes Klein’s greedy person as an individual who tries to “ensure that no one else gets access to the good, that the good is completely had for oneself only, sucking it dry, devouring it.” (126)

Like the motives of the student in Tale 15, the protagonist in Tale 76, “The Stars in the Sky” craves to reach limits beyond her capacity. Her passion to reach the stars can symbolically represent the attempt to attain godly power and knowledge, like in Tale 15. The girl, unsatisfied in the end, sits and weeps for what she cannot achieve:

But she clomb and she clomb, till she got dizzy in the light and shivered with cold, and dazed with the fear; but still she clomb, till at last, quite dazed and silly-like, she let clean go, and sank down-down-down.

And bang she came on to the hard boards, and found herself sitting, weeping and wailing, by the bedside at home all alone.

(Jacobs 252)

In fact, her impetuous craving blinds her to the recognition of her limits as a human being. The girl in the tale is egotistic, like the greedy person characterised by Klein; however, unlike an envious person, the girl affirms the goodness of the object as something positive and worthy of existing. The girl does not long for the destruction of the good object, but wishes just to have it all for herself. Besides, her gazing at the

stars and desiring to reach them can be suggested to be an attempt to regain her good object which she feels is lost.

The analyses of the greedy characters in the two collections indicate that this attribute involves no explicit evil doing to another person, but it can be suggested that there is still the capacity to do evil as the characters are driven by greed. As repeatedly pointed out above, what distinguishes these tales from those of envy is that the characters do not destroy or harm anyone. The analyses show that there are two types of greedy characters in the tales. The first type harms him/herself out of his/her greed as in Turkish Tale 2, British Tales 15, 76, and in the second type, there is no explicit harming of anyone as in Turkish Tale 39 and British Tale 18. It must be noted that the tales do not include any evil characters similar to those in the categories of envy and jealousy. It is possible, however, that greed is transformed into the destructive feeling of envy if the character does not follow a healthy development and does not overcome his/her greed.

As Klein puts it, envy is one of the main impulses to provoke evil inflicted onto another person. In all the fairy/folk tales of envy, the envious person “sickens” (Klein, *Envy* 182) at the superiority or enjoyment of the good object and is unable to accept his/her inferiority or lack. The envious person, thus, develops several defence mechanisms, such as denying the positive qualities of the other, ignoring or just ridiculing him/her in order to protect himself/herself against anxiety.

In the fairy/folk tales of jealousy, the jealous person in both the Turkish and the British collections are women and unlike in the fairy/folk tales of envy, they aim to destroy their rivals rather than the good object.

The tales of greed show variety since it cannot be just categorised as the desire to possess another object but also to acquire limitless knowledge as observed in British Tales 15 and 76. The greedy person projects frustration onto himself/herself, leaving the good object unharmed as it is the case in the fairy tales of jealousy.

In all these fairy/folk tales of envy, jealousy and greed, evil performed on the other person can be observed through the acts of theft, violence, torture and even murder. All the evil deeds result from the individual’s feelings of insecurity and inability to control his/her desires and to accept the other person’s goodness and prosperity.

Hence, it is argued that the tales deal with the child's primary anxieties of separation and loss in the paranoid-schizoid position, which cause the projection of violence and evil tendencies onto the external world. Reparation is provided at the end of these tales with the punishment of the evil character and the recovery of happiness; thus, it can be suggested that these tales can help the child face his/her anxieties about the loss of the good object and about the possible retaliations of the bad object as Klein claims.

CHAPTER IV

AN ALFORDIAN ANALYSIS OF EVIL IN THE TURKISH AND BRITISH TALES

*“Better to be evildoer than
the victim if one has to
choose, as so many may feel
they must.”*

(Alford, *What* 17)

As pointed out in Chapter II, Fred Alford, developing Klein’s theory of positions and anxiety and connecting them to evildoing, brings an existential dimension to the concept of evil, noting that evil is a way of obtaining relief from existential burden, that is, the dread, and existential *angst* that the individual has to face (Vetlesen 128). As mentioned before, Alford explicitly talks about the concept of evil in his works and his thesis claims that evil comes out of a formless dread (*What* 9). Besides, he lays particular emphasis on the feeling of inferiority the evildoer experiences. According to Alford, evil is the outcome of weakness and nothingness that one feels when compared to another who is regarded as “good”, full of vitality and energy (*What* 45). The point which brings Alford and Klein close is their view of the good object, that is to say a person who emerges as a target for the evildoer to destroy since s/he has what the evildoer desires to possess. Similar to Klein’s views on object relations, Alford is convinced that evil is an intense object relationship and it is about searching for “a hot, intense connection of power and control to manage the cold, isolated dread within” (*What* 119). Furthermore, Alford, drawing on Klein’s definition of envy, believes that evildoing is the result of an attempt to cause the destruction of the good object just because it is good. Alford explains this with the example of Milton’s Satan:

I am going to define evil as Milton's Satan does when he says "Evil be thou my Good" (PLIV, 105-110) [...] I'm going to read Milton differently. "Evil be thou my Good", taken in the context of Satan's project, means that Satan would take revenge on God *because* His rule was mild and loving [...] Satan does not just envy God's power; he envies His goodness.

(Alford, *What* 86)

Alford also believes that the goodness of the other threatens the individual, incurring his/her hatred just because the other is more powerful than the self. He explains: "[t]he very existence of goodness outside the self generates a destructive narcissistic rage that would destroy goodness because it is good" (*What* 71). It is therefore likely that the individual (the evildoer) fears being given the role of the victim, which is the source of weakness and vulnerability that makes him/her dependent on others' recognition.

However, as we said in Chapter II, what sets Alford apart from Klein is his existentialist outlook bringing a new perspective to evil. He suggests that inflicting evil on others in order not to suffer from dread and pain is an inseparable part of being human, which is an existential *angst*. Once the self feels the existential dread, s/he feels s/he should project it onto others in order to be relieved of this dread. In this respect, Alford defines evil as "an attempt to evacuate the formless dread by giving it a form via violent intrusion into another, the other's body giving presymbolic form to the dread that is evacuated there." (Alford, *What* 43) Clearly, the victim is regarded as possessing ordinary human traits that make him/her a suitable target for the evildoer, who incessantly searches for ways to hurt and cause suffering in order to get rid of his/her anxiety and dread. In other words, the evildoer feels powerful by subjugating the other and thereby turning his/her own passivity into activity. As mentioned before, for Alford, the only way to overcome evil tendencies is through symbolisation as Klein and Segal also note. He explains that "[t]he ability to symbolise is the ability to control, but only in the realm of imagination. Symbolisation requires that we abandon fantasies of narcissistic omnipotence, acknowledging something of our terrible dependence on others" (*What* 113). Thus, through literature, and through fairy/folk tales, one can find an opportunity to symbolise one's dread and give it a form, rather than inflicting it on others through violence. Fairy tales may function as tools presenting some

developmental anxieties. Alford also claims that by reading these tales, fairy tales help the child recognise his/her dread, which will enable him/her to locate his/her dread rather than trying to get rid of it through acts of violence (*What* 110).

Evil as the outcome of a feeling of inferiority, anxiety, dread or loss, which stirs the self to seek ways to evacuate all these feelings by harming the other is present in both the Turkish and the British fairy/folk tales studied in this thesis. Twenty-five tales in the Turkish and thirty-two tales in the British collection are tales of evil in the Alfordian sense. Furthermore, sixteen tales analysed in Chapter III from the Kleinian perspective of envy may also be usefully classified according to Alford's point of view. These tales are studied according to their position in the collections, but those with identical structures are analysed one after another regardless of their place in the collections.

In Turkish Tale Number 3, "Kısmetimi Arıyorum" ("Looking for My Fortune"), evil is the outcome of the inordinate desires of a vizier to take over the throne by practising manipulative power over the others in order to get rid of his passivity. Extremely powerful viziers are stereotypes in Anatolian tales. Still inferior to the Padishah, in most of the tales these viziers intend to marry either their sons or daughters to the Padishah's children in order to ascend in their court position (Boratav, "Türk Masal." 229). By forming a family connection, viziers guarantee their posts at court and in the Padishah's favour. However, the Vizier, in this tale, performs evil to attain ultimate power, representing what Alford emphasises about the evildoer: "Doing evil is an attempt to transform the terrible passivity [...] into activity." (3) After the Padishah dies, the Vizier starts to scheme to discard the three princes as he feels it is his due to ascend the throne, which seems to be the only way to escape the fact of being an object. The narrator describes the Vizier's desires as follows:

Büyük kardeş Kaya, babasının tahtına oturmaya, Yalçın da hazineden altınların yarısını almaya hazırlanırken, hiç hatırlarına gelmeyen bir felaketle karşılaşmışlar: O zamana kadar babalarına hep saygı göstermiş olan başvezir, meğer padişah olmak istiyormuş. Önce Kaya'nın, sonra da Yalçın'ın başlarını kestirmiş, tahta çıkıp oturmuş. Memleketin her tarafında davullar çaldırarak padişah olduğunu halka duyurmuş⁶¹.

(Tezel 54)

⁶¹ While the eldest brother Kaya was preparing to ascend the throne and Yalçın to get half of the gold from the treasury, they faced an unexpected tragedy: to their surprise, the Vizier, who had paid respect

Having felt like a victim before by being the subject of the Padishah, the Vizier decides to project his sense of weakness and helplessness onto others in order to feel powerful rather than to bear the suffering himself. The Vizier may well regard the princes as fully human since they are more powerful and wealthier than he is. Considering the princes as the good object to be destroyed, the Vizier seeks ways to control them so as to eliminate the feeling of victimisation he had for quite some time. By killing the princes and usurping the throne, he gains a voice of his own and desires to maintain this power by sending messages to every corner of the kingdom. Supposing that he has reached the level of being a full human even without a single frailty, the Vizier enjoys his position for a while. However, Alford highlights the fact that the individual only cheats himself/herself by assuming that s/he has got rid of his/her existential dread (45). The struggle of the evildoer will continue as s/he will be threatened by another subject, who also seeks ways to project his/her dread onto him/her. Acar, the youngest prince in the tale, victimises the Vizier again, reducing him into his previous position. After a series of ordeals, Acar returns to his kingdom in order to take over the control of his country, which implies his ambition to rise to the level of the good object. In fact, Acar had fled from his kingdom for fear of being killed by the Vizier. After gaining power with the help of a company of supernatural people-Alev and Ateş- Acar returns, feeling fully human. We are told:

Nihayet, uzun bir yolculuk yaptıktan sonra memlekete varmışlar [...] Kendisini zorla Padişah ilan etmiş olan başveziri, hemen tahtından indirmişler [...] Halk, kötü idaresi ile herkesi inim inim inleyen eski padişahın cellatlara verilmesini istiyormuş. Fakat, Acar buna taraftar olmamış. Haksız yere oturduğu tahttan indirilmekle zaten yeter derecede cezasını bulduğunu bilerek onu memleketten dışarı attırmiş⁶².

(Tezel 73)

to their father till then, desired to become the Padishah. He beheaded first Kaya and then Yalçın, and ascended the throne. He announced his accession to the public by having drums played all around the country.

⁶² Eventually, after a long journey they arrived in the country [...] They dethroned the Vizier, who had, by force, announced himself as the Padishah [...] The people wanted the Vizier, who had caused the bitter groaning of all through his bad rule, to be beheaded. However, Acar was not in favour of this. Knowing that the Vizier had already been punished enough by being deposed from the throne he had never deserved, Acar banished him from the country.

Having regained his previous status, Acar continues the power struggle by projecting his dread onto the Vizier and victimising him. However, as Alford states, such struggle never ends until the object realises the fact that his/her weakness is a part of being human, not something to escape by inflicting pain on others.

Similar to this tale, Tale 44 “Keloğlan Yemen’de” (“Keloğlan in Yemen”), presents an evil vizier who uses Keloğlan as a tool to project his own helplessness and eventually to feel superior. By trying to manipulate the poor boy, the Vizier feels secure since he is freed from his own complexes that confine him to a passive position. Keloğlan hunts a gazelle and gives it to the Padishah as a present though the Vizier wanted it for himself. Thus, Keloğlan’s attitude incurs the Vizier’s wrath and jealousy as he realises the fact that he is inferior to the Padishah. What doubles the Vizier’s rage is the presence of a rival- Keloğlan. The Vizier cannot tolerate Keloğlan’s becoming the favourite of the Padishah, which puts Keloğlan in the place of the good object with all its positive qualities: wealth, health and prestige. Just like the infant, the evildoer gets jealous of the life source of the good object/ the mother’s breast. The narrator states: “Keloğlan paraları alınca zengin olmuş, konaklar yaptırmış, atlar, arabalar, cariyeler almış. Fakat bunlara vezirin fena halde canı sıkılmış.”⁶³ (Tezel 466)

Alford suggests that the evildoer perceives the victim as fully human in all aspects, which disturbs the evildoer to such a great extent that s/he projects his/her existential discomfort in a destructive way (*What* 145). Vetlesen explains Alford’s thesis of projection of evil:

[t]he sought-out victim *is* recognised as fully human in all relevant existential and experiential respects of being a human being [...] that marks the *suitability* of the other as the chosen target of the relief-seeking project that evildoing basically is. If the chosen target were *not* the kind of object in the world that is exposed to affliction, hurt, suffering, and so to fearing all of these, then it would be wholly unfit to meet any desire to achieve relief from the burdens following from this fact.

(110)

⁶³ When Keloğlan got the money, he became rich and had mansions built, bought horses, carriages and female slaves. However, all of these vexed the Vizier to a great extent.

It can thus be suggested that the Vizier might well regard Kelođlan as a victim suitable to be exposed to suffering because of his vitality. With this goal in mind, he provokes the Padishah to order Kelođlan to complete the most challenging tasks, such as building a mansion of ivory. The Vizier, overwhelmed by the desire to kill Kelođlan, aims not only to reduce Kelođlan to a helpless position but to get rid of him completely. He tells the Padishah: “Şu Kelođlan’ı çağırırım da fil dışından bir köşk yapmasını emredelim, eđer yapamazsa, kendini cellatlara vereceđimizi söyleyelim.”⁶⁴ (Tezel 466)

However, Kelođlan, as in most of the Turkish tales, outwits the Vizier, which reinforces the Vizier’s anger and hatred for the young man since he cannot put Kelođlan into an object position. The Vizier then manipulates the Padishah and makes him ask Kelođlan to bring him the Princess of Yemen. Contrary to the Vizier’s expectations, Kelođlan manages to complete the second task, which condemns the Vizier to a feeling of nothingness, the utter passivity that he had intended to inflict on Kelođlan in the first place. While on the one hand Kelođlan retains his quality of being the good object after surviving all the life challenging tasks, the Vizier, on the other hand, eventually becomes aware of the fact that he has lost the struggle for the recognition of others and is abandoned with all his complexes and anxieties. The punishment given to the Vizier shows how the uncontrollable dread is dangerous for the individual. Therefore, the child in reading or listening to the tale may see how harmful it is to transfer dread onto another person through harm.

Tale 7 “Avcıođlu” (“The Son of the Hunter”) is about an orphan who was born into an already helpless position- “aware of human pain, vulnerability and death” (Alford, *What* 9). His asking for his father’s rifle may be interpreted as the search for power through which he will be strong and courageous in society, proving himself as a young man. Blinded by his desires to be powerful and discard his dread in this existential quest, he even imprisons his mother in a coop, which has no window or even a small crack for fresh air. We are told: “Kadın kümesin içinde bir taraftan havasızlıktan bođuluyor, diđer taraftan da üzerine üşüşen pirelerden

⁶⁴ Let’s call Kelođlan and order him to build a mansion of ivory. Let’s tell him that we will give him to the executioners unless he can do it.

kaşınıyormuş.”⁶⁵ (Tezel 110) The orphan’s attitudes are similar to those of the child who fears any retaliatory harm from his/her good object/the mother, and thus, harms his/her primal object to gain power. After managing to get hold of the rifle, the orphan releases his mother and leaves on an adventure in order to prove his power to the country and gain the recognition of all. Similar to Acar in Tale 3, his befriending people of supreme power comforts the young man as it guarantees his position as a powerful figure even in moments of danger. Particularly the second half of the tale presents the orphan as having been freed from his existential burden and anxiety with his new company.

The moment when the Padishah invites the orphan and his friends to his palace to challenge them can be interpreted as an attempt of the Padishah to get relief from his dread. He realises the power of the orphan and his friends and feels threatened by their presence since he is afraid of losing his status as the supreme power. Inviting these young men to the palace marks their suitability as the Padishah’s target for the relief-seeking project in which he aims to place his vulnerability outside of himself. Nevertheless, scared by the mighty men, the Padishah, instead of fighting, seeks ways to be saved from possible victimisation by using his daughter as his saviour. Here we observe the Padishah yielding to his doom of suffering and passivity. The narrator states:

Padişah bu dört arkadaşın yaptıklarına akıl sır erdirememiş. Onların kendisini bile bir saniyede öldürebileceklerini, isterlerse sarayını da biranda havaya uçurabileceklerini düşünmüş, kızının hazırlanmasını emretmiş⁶⁶.

(Tezel 114)

Thus, the struggle ends with the defeat of the Padishah and the victory of the young men, rewarded with the Princess. It would not be wrong to state that the Padishah has in fact found a new victim on which to project his affliction and fear in order to protect his threatened goodness.

⁶⁵ While the woman was almost suffocating in the coop, she at the same time was scratching because of the fleas, swarming around.

⁶⁶ The Padishah wasn’t able to make heads or tails of the things these four friends were doing. He thought they could even kill him in one second, and blast his palace if they wanted, so he ordered his daughter to get ready.

Another evil character is Ayşe in Tale 9, “Etme Bulma” (“What Goes around Comes Around”). As in the previous tale, the protagonist Ayşe is a poor orphan, having already become familiar with human pain in her early life. Her desire to overcome the difficulties in her life is so great that she does not refrain from enacting wickedness. Reminding the reader of Alford’s inmates, she would rather do evil than remain a victim, which implies being dead in the eye of another. Therefore, by destroying the other, she thinks she will gain some kind of power and confirm her existence. She says to herself: “Herkes doğru dürüst çalışarak hayatını kazanmıyor ya, [...], ben de çalışmadan, kendimi yormadan geçinmenin yolunu bulurum.”⁶⁷ (Tezel 142) In addition to victimising others and turning them into helpless beings, she acts like a sadist with “the joy of having taken the control of an experience of victimhood by inflicting it on another” (Alford, *What* 52). After killing the old woman’s hen, and lying to her about its death, she experiences a sadistic joy as a result of the discovery of her skill in manipulating others. The narrator describes her schizoid manners with Ayşe’s own words to herself:

Yalnız kalınca, kız bir kahkaha atarak aynanın karşısına geçmiş:
- Eee, Ayşe, [...], açlıktan ölecekken tavuk buldun, yedin. Bir ay canını badem içi, kuru üzüm ile besledin. Şimdi ne yapacaksın? Haydi başının çaresine bak!⁶⁸

(Tezel 144)

Similar to Klein, what Alford suggests about the evildoer is that “[b]ehind evil lies the will to destroy the pure, innocent and the good because the other is pure, innocent, and good, and the evildoer is not” (*Psychology and the Natural* 81). All this is valid here in this tale for Ayşe, who enjoys causing the destruction of the good and the innocent as she is exempt from all of these positive qualities. As Alford states, the evil one does not stop harming others until s/he feels completely relieved from suffering (Alford 12 Feb. 2012⁶⁹). The moment Ayşe feels she may face the suffering and pain of survival alone, she schemes to manipulate another. Ayşe thinks

⁶⁷ “Nobody makes their living by working honestly”, [...], “I can also make my own way without working and tiring myself.”

⁶⁸ When she was left alone, she looked at the mirror, laughing loudly: “Well... Ayşe”, [...], “while you were about to die, you found a hen and ate it. You fed yourself with almonds and raisins. What are you going to do now? Let’s take care of yourself!”

⁶⁹ Alford, Fred. “About Evil”. email to Gül Tanesen Büyü. 12 Feb. 2012.

that what may save her forever is to attain royal support and she therefore seeks ways to get into court and become Padishah's wife. She tells him that she is the sister of his deceased wife and manages to marry him. Being a Padishah's wife will not only save Ayşe from poverty but also guarantee her prestige and endless power. She thinks to herself: "Eee, Ayşe, [...], birkaç hafta evvel kimsesiz, fakir bir kızdım. Bugün bir Padişah karısı, bir Sultansın [...] Ama şu kocakarıyı yok etmen lazım. Daha bitmedi."⁷⁰ (Tezel 147) The reason why she wants to get rid of Padishah's mother is the desire to be the only woman with supreme power at court. Ayşe still feels threatened by the existence of her mother-in-law since she is much stronger than she is, and so she cruelly causes the old woman's death:

Gelinin sözlerine pek sevinen kadın, öpsün diye ona dilini uzatmış, Ayşe "hart" diye kadının dilini ısırıp koparmaz mı? Padişahın annesi dilinin acısından düşüp bayılmış [...] Fakat hekim gelinceye kadar ihtiyar kadın acıya dayanamayıp ölmüş⁷¹.

(Tezel 147)

The Padishah is another of her victims for as long as he is ignorant of the realities, but he gains superiority in Ayşe's struggle of survival after he learns the facts and punishes her brutally, turning her into a helpless victim again. The tale also deals with the infant's cannibalistic tendencies, which are connected to oral-biting fixations in very young children (Klein, *Envy* 185). Ayşe's act of ripping her mother-in-law's tongue may reflect the child's desire to hurt his/her primal object through cutting, ripping or devouring in the oral phase. Hence, the child reading/listening to this tale may unconsciously recognise his/her dread and anxieties that developed in the oral phase.

Turkish Tale 15, "Ağlayan Nar ile Gülen Ayva" ("Crying Pomegranate and Smiling Quince") is about a Padishah who wishes to have a son- a common theme in Anatolian tales (Batur 357). In such tales, the Padishah attempts to maintain and consolidate his status and power through a rightful heir to his throne. Likewise, in

⁷⁰ "Well, Ayşe", [...], "a few weeks ago, you were a lonely poor girl. Today, you are the wife of the Padishah, you are the Sultan [...]. But you have to get rid of this old woman. It isn't finished yet."

⁷¹ The old woman having been glad with the words of her daughter-in-law, she reached out her tongue for her to kiss, but what did Ayşe do? She bit her tongue, ripping it violently. The Padishah's mother fainted out of her pain [...] By the time the doctor arrived, the old woman had already died from her unbearable pain.

this tale, the Padishah longs for a son with the aim of further strengthening his hold on the throne and his long-lasting power in the country. With this in mind, he divorces his wives who have been unable to bear him a son and marries for the last time with the hope of having a son:

Padişah mutlaka bir oğlan çocuk babası olmak istiyormuş. Ne yapsın? Tekrar evlenmekten başka care yok ... Son defa olmak üzere evlenmiş. Çok geçmeden karısı hamile kalmış⁷².

(Tezel 223)

Terrified by the idea of having a baby girl, the Padishah threatens his wife with death if she gives birth to a girl, which will, for the Padishah, indicate his weakness and failure to continue his rule. He says to his wife: “Eğer bu çocuk kız ise, senin başını cellat ettireceğim!”⁷³ (Tezel 223) In the past, giving birth to a girl was considered to be a symbol of lacking masculine power for men in Anatolian patriarchal social system (Buyurucu 59). This seems to be the case with the dread of the Padishah, which is, in fact, noticeable on two levels: the dread of weakness in masculinity and in authority. However, the Padishah loses his last chance of maintaining his power as he has another baby girl, of whom he is not yet aware. If revealed, he will lose his good reputation and will face the possibility of losing his kingdom. While the Padishah is troubled by the possibility of a baby girl, the queen, to her dismay, faces the bitter reality by giving birth to a girl.

The Padishah’s fear of loss and mortality can only be overcome through negating this mortality by transferring it into another object. Therefore, negating his mortality, the Padishah exhibits his vitality by subjugating his wife and threatening her with death- ultimately, killing her vitality. In other words, he retains his subjectivity and the others’ objectivity by controlling their fate. The fear of being beheaded devastates the poor woman for a short while until the midwife comes up with a cunning solution, which is to disguise the girl as a boy. After years of comfort, nevertheless, the mother’s anxiety grows as the girl reaches the age of sixteen- the time for the boy’s circumcision in the fairy/folk tale. To avoid the circumcision, the girl in the disguise of a boy rides away on her horse and experiences a series of

⁷² The Padishah insistently wants to be the father of a son. What shall he do? There is no way but to marry again... He marries for the last time. Soon his wife gets pregnant.

⁷³ “If this baby is a girl, then I will have you beheaded!”

adventures. The girl, with the help of her horse, completes all the difficult tasks and in the end is transformed into a real boy through a giantess' spell. The tale ends with the reunion of the Padishah and his wife with their child: "Padişah oğlunu tekrar bulduğu, Sultan da kızını oğlan gördüğü için çok sevinmiş."⁷⁴ (Tezel 229) In the end, the tale justifies the Padishah's cruel intentions by allowing the girl to be transformed into a boy. Not only the mother but also the daughter are victimised- the mother is valued only for her capacity to give birth to a son, and the problematic existence of the girl vanishes, first with her disguise and finally with her complete transformation. The Padishah's fear of passivity is transferred to the women in the tale by symbolically killing their vitality and ignoring their right to exist. It can also be suggested that the tale deals with the castration complex of the little girl, which is reflected by the fear and threat that her father poses. Klein explains that "the dread of injury to her womanhood exercises a profound influence on the castration complex of the little girl, for it causes her to overestimate the penis, which she herself lacks" ("Early Stages" 212). Therefore, the threat of the Padishah for a son reflects the anxiety that the little girl may face, which is solved at the very end with the reunion of the Padishah with his son.

Similarly, Tale 20, "Seksen Göz" ("Eighty Eyes") deals with a Padishah's anxiety over having a son. The narrator, unlike in the previous tale, highlights the Padishah's brutality and describes his evil acts in detail:

Can yakmaktan hoşlanan padişah, hemen çocuk doğurmadı diye, evlendiği kadının gözlerini çıkarttırıp bir kavanozda saklatır, kendisini zindana attırır, yeniden başka bir kadınla evlenirmiş⁷⁵.

(Tezel 254)

The Padishah's sadistic joy in inflicting pain on others because of his anxiety and vulnerability is manifested in his obsession of blinding and imprisoning women, thus robbing them of their full existence: "Gözlerinin çıkarılmasından canı çok yanan kadın bağıırıp çağırırken, o, kahkahalar atıp dururmuş"⁷⁶ (Tezel 254). The Padishah

⁷⁴ The Padishah is happy to be reunited with his son and the Sultan is happy to see her daughter transformed into a boy.

⁷⁵ The Padishah, who likes hurting people, plucks out the eyes of the woman whom he marries if she cannot immediately give birth to a son. He keeps the eyes in a jar, imprisons the woman and remarries another woman.

⁷⁶ While the woman whose eye is plucked out shrieks with pain, he keeps laughing loudly.

enjoys the women's suffering so as to feel a full human. With this desire, he victimises thirty-nine women. The Padishah plucks out his wives' eyes and keeps them in a jar, which, we can suggest, gives him comfort for his meaningless existence since the jar is the symbol of his evacuated dread. We can come to the conclusion that the evil Padishah matches with Alford's metaphor of the vampire. Alford proposes that

[i]t is a pure relationship of power with a strange twist. It is the living who possess the life force, the vampire destroying life to preserve its unlife. The vampire is a parasite like a little boy, totally dependent on its mother's milk for survival.

(*What* 88)

Furthermore, the sadistic tendencies of the Padishah reflect the anxieties of an infant developed in the oral phase. Klein contends that phantasies of destroying by tearing, cutting up, breaking, wetting or burning all reflect the rage of the infant for its mother or her breast during the oral aggression ("Early Development" 274).

Getting his life force from his victims, the Padishah marries for the fortieth time and his last wife eventually gives birth to a son, but this time the Padishah falls in love with a fairy and finds another excuse to pluck out this wife's eyes:

İyiler memleketinin padişahı, kendisine bir erkek çocuk kazandıran kadının suçsuz olduğunu düşünmemiş. Hatta onun canının çok yanacağını, bağırıp çıkararak inleyeceğini hatırına bile getirmeden, celladı çağırılmış. Karısının gözlerini çıkarttırarak kavanoza koydurmuş⁷⁷.

(Tezel 256)

The second part of the tale continues with the evil acts of the fairy, now married to the Padishah, who faces the fear of losing her powerful status as a queen. The fairy also represents the child's split mother image as the bad object. The good object/ the real mother is imprisoned and taken away from the protagonist and the bad mother does everything to persecute him. She hates the young Prince, Uğur, as he poses a potential threat to her position, hence, she asks her husband to give him

⁷⁷ The Padishah of the Good-fellows kingdom does not think about the innocence of his wife, who gave birth to a son. He calls the executioner without even thinking about the possibility that she can be hurt, cry with pain and moan. He has his wife's eyes plucked out and put in a jar.

the hardest tasks in faraway countries. The very existence of Uğur reminds her of her shaky position since with the death of the Padishah, the Prince will gain supreme power and may well victimise her:

Uğur büyüdükçe, perinin korkusu büyüyormuş. Çünkü, bir gün gelip Uğur'un kendisini saraydan atacağını, anasının öcünü almak isteyeceğini düşünüyormuş⁷⁸.

(Tezel 257)

By sending Uğur away from home, the fairy aims at exposing him to danger and making him vulnerable to threats from giants or lions. Thus, she places her fear of weakness and helplessness onto Uğur so as to control it. Nonetheless, Uğur, returning to his kingdom after a series of ordeals, manages to kill the fairy and punish his father. Uğur gets completely rid of the bad object and punishes his father who preferred the bad mother to the good one. Like Acar in Tale 3, Uğur manages to rise above the challenges he was exposed to and regain his status. Banishing the Padishah from the court, Uğur takes his turn in the cycle of victimisation. He releases all the captive women and recovers their sight; therefore, the tale ends, unlike the previous one, with the failure of the villains. Thus, the reader may feel relieved with the recovery of the whole object and the alleviation of anxieties based on a split mother figure and existential dread.

British Tale 83, "Catskin" has similar traits with the previous ones in that it depicts evil inflicted by a male authority. Similar to Turkish Tales 15 and 20, the father expects a son as an heir, however, to his consternation, a girl is born, which frustrates him to such an extent that he does not want to see her face. As in the previous tales, the King faces the dread of losing his earthly power and worries that his sovereignty will come to an end with a female heir. To repress his anxiety, the King refuses to see his daughter as she stands as a mark of his failure. Therefore the girl grows up in a family where she is subject to a lack of affection and inadequate care. Her existence is denied for the second time by her father through the forced marriage to a "nasty rough old man" (Jacobs 268). A marriage against the will is another way of showing masculine authority, which many female protagonists have

⁷⁸ As Uğur grows up, the fairy's fear becomes bigger, because she thinks Uğur will, one day, come back, banishing her from the court and take her mother's vengeance.

to face. The girl in this tale escapes as the sole solution to resist masculine power and soon arrives at a palace where she starts working as a scullion. The tale is different from the previous ones because it presents the father as suffering from a sense of remorse, which is a sign of guilt and a positive evacuation of dread. When the protagonist marries a prince she visits her father, who does not recognise her at first and confesses his regret: “I am a hardened sinner. But I would give all my worldly goods if I could but see her [his daughter] once before I die.” (Jacobs 271) Alford believes that this remorse that the evildoer feels occurs particularly during “the depressive-position” which Melanie Klein explained in her studies. Alford reasserts the dynamism of Klein’s depressive position, which is a process rather than a state, and adds:

In the depressive position we come to experience genuine remorse and regret for harm done to the good object. At first this remorse is selfish, “I have harmed or wished to harm, the goodness upon which my life depends; how shall I survive?” Soon, however, the depressive position comes to include a genuine love and concern for the other and a desire to make reparation for the damage one has done to the other’s goodness.

(*What* 41)

Therefore, the King’s acceptance of his guilt and the concern that he decides to show for the good object- his daughter- demonstrates his moral development in Alfordian terms, and through the King’s remorse, the reader may well realise the harm of inflicting dread on another person.

Turkish Tale 26, “Altın Araba” (“Golden Car”) presents a hideous Padishah, who threatens his Vizier with death if he cannot solve his perplexing puzzles. Victimising his subjects is a way for the Padishah to acknowledge his own ongoing power and it provides him with the sense that he can still frighten his subjects through his orders. He is quite aware of the fact that the more his subjects fear him, the more powerful he will be, strengthening his status.

Another tale with a pitiless Padishah, who attempts to retain his power through threats and fear, is Tale 30, “Mor Menekşe” (“Violet”). The fear of losing his status induces him to give his subjects ridiculous orders such commanding everyone to turn off their lights in their houses. Any rebellious act is considered as

possibly a great threat to his authority; therefore, upon seeing that the house of three girls is lit and the youngest girl is talking about him, he is infuriated and orders the girls to be present at court the following day. His command of marriage of the two elder girls to two strangers shows not only female victimisation but also the anxiety of the Padishah to emphasise his power. Besides, he orders the youngest girl to be beheaded as the previous night he heard her saying: “Beni bir Padişah alsa elime su döktürür, sonra bu suları gene ona içiririm”⁷⁹ (Tezel 336). Feeling this as a menace to his status, the Padishah wishes to kill the girl in an attempt to prove that he has the supreme power. Here one comes across the Snow-white motif of the executioner who pities the girl and releases her in a wood, taking a piece of cloth covered with the blood of a bird. Released from the atrocity of the Padishah and from the burden of his dread, the girl grows up taking an oath of revenge on the Padishah. When, one day, she goes to the court in purple clothes with the aim of attracting the Padishah, she, in fact, intends to gain superiority for power. She wishes to use her feminine power to defeat the Padishah and take revenge. The tale ends with their marriage leaving unanswered the question of whether there is genuine love between the Padishah and the girl. The girl, having faced the doom of helplessness and loneliness, manages to survive by marrying the Padishah. Now, it is her turn to transform her utter passivity into activity by reducing him to a position from which he formerly tried to escape. At the end, the girl not only manages to marry him but also declares her victory by making the Padishah wash her hands.

Similar to these Padishah tales, in British Tale 54, “Gobborn Seer”, the King desires to demonstrate his sovereignty by ordering Jack and his father, Gobborn Seer, to build a castle which surpasses any other castle in beauty. Upon seeing his castle’s pre-eminence, the King fears the possibility that they can build an equally beautiful castle somewhere else, which will then suggest that he is not the sole supreme power. Both Gobborn Seer and Jack stand for the good object with their skill as craftsmen and ability to build a magnificent castle. The King plans to capture them to prevent the possibility of losing his status. The narrator says:

But after the King was gone off, the housekeeper sent for Gobborn and Jack, and told them that she had watched for a chance to warn

⁷⁹ If a Padishah marries me, I will make him wash my hands and then make him drink that water.

them, for the King was so afraid they should carry their art away and build some other king as fine a castle, he meant to take their lives on the morrow.

(Jacobs 182-83)

As in the previous Padishah tales, in this tale evil performed by the supreme power is also the result of his anxiety caused by the fear of losing his high position. The only thing he concentrates on is to perpetuate his already existing comfort, prestige and wealth and to be recognised by all. It is similar to the infant's envy, which is combined with narcissism. Segal claims that the death instinct and narcissism are like two sides of the same coin and that narcissism is a defence against envy (Segal, *Psychoanalysis* 17). The child believes that s/he is the source of all satisfaction, which suggests its primary narcissism. Once s/he recognises s/he is not the only source of satisfaction, s/he develops feelings of envy and aggression.

Evil caused by the anxiety over being hurt is evident in all these Turkish tales (15, 20, 26, 30) and British Tales 83 and 54, where the Padishahs or the Kings are the actors of evil deeds being driven to harm others as the outcome of a desire to protect their established positions of power. Sartre states that the individual objectifies the other by his/her continuous gaze (*Being* 262) and gains his/her freedom through the loss of integrity of the other (*ibid.*). For Alford, this objectification is achieved through projecting dread on others, which can be done by evildoing (*What* 8). In all these tales, the Padishah or the King victimises others to gain subjectivity similar to the individual in Sartre's theory.

Turkish Tale 16, "Altmış Akıllı Yetmiş Fikirli" ("Sixty Brains Seventy Aims") presents a selfish type of a mother, who causes her daughter's possible catastrophe. The mother lies to a man of high status about her daughter's intelligence, stating: "Kızım! Kızım! Altmış akıllı, yetmiş fikirli, saç ipek, güzel kızım!"⁸⁰ (Tezel 231). Upon hearing that the woman has such a clever daughter, the man wishes to marry her immediately. The mother, regarding this as an opportunity to rise in the society, accepts the offer and marries her daughter to the man without even asking her. The mother does not even think about her daughter's future within the hands of a complete stranger, but just considers how grand the marriage will be:

⁸⁰ "My daughter! my daughter! My beautiful daughter with sixty brains, seventy aims and with silky hair,!"

“Kadıncağz bakmış, genç adam, temiz, pak, üstü başı düzgün [...] Kendi kendine, ‘Kızımı bundan daha iyisine verecek değilim ya,’ diye düşünmüş”⁸¹ (Tezel 231). When her husband tests the young woman about the forty-first room, the reader expects a possible danger awaiting the young woman or through in the mysterious room, along Bluebeard lines. Nevertheless, the wife in the tale is loyal to her husband and does not open the door, preventing a possible tragic end, which pleases her husband and justifies her mother’s words about how clever she is (from her husband’s perspective). In fact, the young woman is not only subjugated by her mother but also by her husband since she has to obey whatever they require her to do as though she were their object. Alford points out that evil is “monopolizing the other good” (*What* 70) and here the other good is the young woman who holds their dread, being fully victimised. By eliminating her right to exist as an independent individual, both the mother and the husband inflict their own anxieties on her. The mother transfers her dread of living in poverty and vulnerability onto her daughter by forcing her to marry a stranger, and the husband projects his anxiety of losing his masculine power and authority by controlling his wife. These two characters seem not to perform any explicitly evil act; however, by projecting their own fears caused by their complexes, they are psychologically harming the young woman and they may well be regarded as evil from an Alfordian perspective.

Like this tale, British Tales Numbers 1 and 81 are also examples of tales presenting selfish mothers, who are driven by earthly passions. In “Tom Tit Tot” (Number 1) (a variant of the Grimms’ “Rumpelstiltskin”), the mother tells a lie to the king about her daughter’s talent of spinning five skeins a day. When the king states his intention to marry her daughter, the woman directly accepts the proposal and thinks “what a grand marriage” (Jacobs 3) that will be. She ignores the king’s condition, which is that the girl has to spin five skeins a day in the last month of their first year of marriage, and if she cannot the king will kill her. Though the man tells her mother he will kill her daughter, the mother, overjoyed at the idea of present happiness and wealth, does not think about the consequences, even though she knows her daughter cannot fulfil the task:

⁸¹ The poor woman looks at the man who is well-groomed [...] she thinks to herself; “I can’t find a better husband than this one for my daughter.”

“Alright”, says the woman; for she thought what a grand marriage that was. And as for the five skeins, when the time came there’d be plenty of ways getting out of it, and likeliest, he’d have forgotten all about it.

(Jacobs 3)

As in the previous tale, the selfish mother is impressed by the idea of marrying her daughter to a wealthy man and by getting benefit from her marriage. The narrator does not talk about the mother in the second part of the tale as she is satisfied with the marriage and not interested in it any longer.

This act of the mother is “not out of ignorance or intolerance but to project [her] own threatened goodness” (*What* 72). She feels threatened as a poor widow who has to protect her daughter. With this in mind, she manipulates the other as a defence against her destiny. She is doomed to live as a poor woman with a daughter with no abilities, and she now regards the king’s offer as a great opportunity to fight against her fate. The daughter is persecuted not only by her mother but also by her husband and a creature called Tom Tit Tot.

The husband, in order to confirm his masculinity and authority, threatens his wife with death if she cannot spin five skeins a day: “Now, my dear, here you’ll be shut in to-morrow with some victuals and some flax, and if you haven’t spun 5 skeins by the night, your head’ll go off” (Jacobs 3). The young woman is transformed into a helpless victim, first by her mother and then by her husband. Alford explains such a victim as: “being the victim of evil is associated with utter passivity, to the point of helplessness, doomed to suffer such victimhood alone, expecting nobody else to stand up for one.” (75) At the moment of despair, a dark small creature appears to help the young woman. The narrator describes the creature as: “a small little black thing with a long tail” (Jacobs 3). The thing promises to help the girl by spinning for her only if she guesses its name: “I’ll give you three guesses every night to guess my name, and if you haven’t guessed it before the month’s up you shall be mine” (Jacobs 4). Jacobs explains in “Notes & References” that these name-guessing games show the survival of a superstition, and that “to know a man’s name gives you power over him, for which reason savages object to tell their names” (230). Furthermore, Edward Clodd, an English anthropologist, explains that before the discovery of iron, when men found it important to name each other, names were regarded as a significant part of man:

Barbaric man believes that his name is a vital part of himself, and therefore that the names of other men and of superhuman beings are also vital parts of themselves. He further believes that to know the name is to put its owner, whether he be a deity, ghost, or mortal, in the power of another, involving risk of harm or destruction to the named. He therefore takes all kinds of precautions to conceal his name, often from his friend, and always from his foe.

(28)

In this respect, if the young woman guesses the thing's name, then she will gain power over it. She is trapped by two male figures in the tale and both of them threaten to kill her- one literally and the other metaphorically. Every night her husband comes and says: "I see I shan't have to kill you to-night, my dear" (Jacobs 5) as if there is an obligation to kill her. On the other hand, the creature gets uglier and more wicked each day, threatening her. The narrator says: "And as it got towards the end of the month, the impet began to look so malicious, and that twirled that's tail faster and faster each time she gave a guess" (Jacobs 6). With each wrong guess, the thing gets further satisfied with the idea of possessing the lady. The tale reads: "Then that look at her with that's eyes like a coal o'fire, and that says: 'Woman, there is only tomorrow night, and then you'll be mine!'" (6). Both of the male figures attempt to project their dread onto the young lady so that they can be recognised as powerful masculine figures. When her husband comes and says that he has seen a creature, singing that its name is "Tom Tit Tot", the woman realises that that creature must be the one that frightens her and that she is eventually saved. Then, the moment when the young woman makes a correct guess of the creature's name, it immediately disappears: "[t]hat gave an awful shriek and away that flew into the dark, and she never saw it any more" (Jacobs 8). Confinement, threat of death and causing fear and anxiety are the psychological harm given to the young woman by the mother, the husband and the dark creature. However, at the end of the tale, the woman gains power over these two male figures by making the creature vanish forever and by leaving her husband in dark about how she span those skeins. With the help of the creature, she is able to defeat her husband and fulfil the task, and with the help of her husband, she is able to guess the creature's name and defeat it.

Likewise, British Tale 81, "Habetrot and Scantlie Mab", presents a joyful girl who faces a fate similar to the one in "Tom Tit Tot", but is saved by some fairies.

The tale presents spinning as a female duty which should be fulfilled by all young women in order to find a husband. The girl in the tale, however, is unable to spin, which frustrates her mother to such an extent that she becomes the subject of ill-treatment by her mother. To marry her daughter to a husband is of high priority for the mother: “She coaxed, threatened, even beat her daughter, but all to no purpose; the girl remained what her mother called her, ‘an idle cuttie’” (Jacobs 262). Unlike the young woman in the previous tale, Scantlie Mab- the girl- is helped by three female figures, who are in this tale described as ugly “with lips more or less disfigured” (263). Spinning, which is associated with femininity, is also equated to ugliness in the tale. Unaware that the fairies helped her daughter, the mother cries out that her daughter is able to spin seven skeins. Upon hearing that there is such a skilful girl, a man of high status comes up and proposes marriage. The narrator says:

The mother dragged in her girl. He vowed he was lonely without a wife, and had long been in search of one who was a good spinner. So their troth was plighted, and the wedding took place soon afterwards, though the bride was in great fear that she should not prove so clever at her spinning-wheel as he expected.

(Jacobs 264)

The mother, as in the previous tale, is motivated by materialistic needs to such an extent that she uses her daughter as a means of rising in society. Not to miss any chance, the mother marries the daughter immediately to the wealthy man. Old Dame Habetrot, one of the three fairies, comes to the young woman’s aid and tells her to bring her husband to the cell where she is living with the other two ugly fairies. When he is taken to the cell, her husband is shocked to see such ugly creatures spinning and realises what will happen to his wife if she is to spin:

All, however, made the bridegroom understand what was the cause of their ugliness; while Habetrot slyly hinted that if his wife were allowed to spin, her pretty lips would grow out of shape, too and her pretty face get an ugsome look.

(Jacobs 265)

So, the tale links spinning to ugliness, and with the advice of the old fairy, the young woman manages to escape confinement and victimisation by her husband. The man prefers a beautiful wife to an ugly and a lazy one, therefore, the woman continues wandering in the meadows by his side.

In these two tales, spinning symbolises femininity and at the same time confinement, imprisonment and victimisation. Both of the girls are used by their mothers as means to rise in status, and in order to achieve this the mothers drag their daughters into an unknown future where the young women continue to be subjugated by male figures, who try to establish their masculinity through them. Evil practised on these women is mainly psychological in the forms of fear and horror as the young women are forced to marry strangers, who threaten the women with death. Nevertheless, in both tales, we can observe the victory of female intelligence. Both young women, passive and weak at the beginning, gain the control at the end and victimise their husbands by deceiving them. Besides, there is the split image of the mother figure in both of these tales; though the characters are real mothers, due to their indifference and selfish motives they function as the bad object rather than acting as an affectionate good mother. At the end of these tales, the girls not only get away from their husbands and from the bad objects, but also rise as independent beings.

British Tale 26, “Mr. Fox” is also similar to British Tale 1 with the test of loyalty motif and is a variant of Perrault’s *Bluebeard* with its monstrous husband figure. Among many suitors, Lady Mary decides to marry Mr. Fox, who is not only wealthy but mysterious at the same time. Though Mr. Fox is a complete stranger, Mary’s parents agree upon her marriage to Mr. Fox, which clearly indicates again that marriage is used to climb up the social ladder rather than being the outcome of pure love. The tale begins with a similar anxiety of Mary’s family to that of the mother in “Tom Tit Tot”, “Habetrot and Scantlie Mab” and “Altmış Akıllı Yetmiş Fikirli”. Suspicious of Mr.Fox’s mysterious existence, Lady Mary decides to track him down in his castle, to which she and her family have not been invited before. Her curiosity grows when Mary realises the following writing on the door:

Be bold, be Bold, but not too bold
Lest that your heart’s blood should run cold

(Jacobs 149)

From the entrance of the castle, Mr. Fox's threatening existence is felt, reminding the reader of Alford's statement that evil chills "because it threatens our existence" (*What* 23). Inside, Lady Mary discovers a room full of skeletons of beautiful ladies, which the narrator later calls "the Bloody Chamber": "[B]odies and skeletons of beautiful young ladies all stained with blood" (Jacobs 149). The room may symbolise female victimisation by a devilish man, who, we can suggest, tries to exert his masculinity. Unlike the previous heroines, Mary is courageous enough to discover the forbidden room and the sadistic nature of her fiancé, and eventually is saved from being his subject. One can say that by capturing other women and transforming them into mere meaningless objects, Mr. Fox feels he has reached an existential relief from any vulnerability and pain. Choosing female victims may also suggest that Mr. Fox's attempts to exert his masculine power over physically weak beings. He fits Alford's definition of a psychopath; "so cold and remote he remains untouchable while treating others as objects of contempt, manipulation and destruction" (*What* 54). Mr. Fox keeps the dead bodies in the secret chamber in order to remind himself of his own power. Alford believes that psychopaths are devoted to their victims since without them they feel they do not exist: "Psychopaths need victims to quite literally [...] hold their dread" (*What* 55). The Bloody Chamber, full of his victims, gives meaning to Mr. Fox's meaningless existence. Besides, Alford explains that evil is so complicated that sometimes it takes the form of a defence against what the self desires most. He gives an example of an inmate, who claims that women are the most evil creatures because they make men need them. In fact, he is attracted to any woman around him. Alford states that:

Evil is the dread of a need so bottomless it threatens the self, the self that knows it would do anything to fulfil itself, including lose defence against this experience, as though we could master our desire by terrorizing its object.

(*What* 65)

Mr. Fox's killing the ladies show his attempts to kill both the desire he feels for women and his dread that he may do anything for women- "losing his manhood" in Mr. Smith's- Alford's inmate's-words (*What* 65). The acts of killing others give Mr. Fox the life energy he needs in order to tolerate his existential dread.

In the other Turkish fairy/folk tales, the Köse appears as another main example of a stereotypical character. Batur describes the Köse as an evil person, who takes pleasure from the suffering of others and likes to plot behind people's backs (359). On the other hand, Demiray claims that there are good as well as bad Köses in Anatolian tales and turns his attention to their cunning nature (44). Among the three Köse tales in Tezel's collection, Tale 17, "İhtiyar Kuş" ("Old Bird") is an example of the evil Köse tales. The tale begins with a dying father who advises his three sons not to talk to any Köse. When the youngest son, after a series of adventures, encounters a Köse on his way, he forgets his father's advice and befriends him. Justifying the father's advice, the Köse deceives the young man and kidnaps his wife, probably due to his masculine defect that prevents him from finding a woman to marry in society. Desiring to seize another's possession, the Köse feels relief by depriving the young man of the object that Köse lacked. Alford states: "[E]nvy-based evil that seeks to *deny* all positive otherness in the other may take the form of mistreatment- initially psychically, later also physically" (*What* 125). Here, the Köse gets into a deadly struggle with the young man; first by kidnapping his wife and then killing him. The narrator describes the murder as: "Köse bir kılıç vurarak oğlanı parça parça edip kadını almış⁸²" (Tezel 238). Klein states that the boldness, skill and cunning with which a child defends himself against his enemies in his game of fighting assume that he can successfully combat his father, which lessens his fear of the father (*The Psychoanalysis* 270). In this respect, the child tries to prove that he has a penis and sexual potency as well. Similarly, in this tale the things whose loss causes anxiety for Köse lead him to harm other people to prove that he is as powerful as the other. The Köse's fear can be defined as a feeling emerging out of his inferiority complex, in which case it is the fear of humiliation because of his defect. The description of the Köse is more like the description of a monster or a giant than that of a human being: he sleeps regularly for seven, fifteen and twenty-four days, and he has a magical horse, which flies him over hills and mountains.

The tale repeats itself with the Köse's attempts to kidnap the wife and to kill the young man, but the struggle for victory between the two characters continues with the young man's resurrection from his bones with the help of an old magical bird. The tale ends with the death of the Köse:

⁸² The Köse slices the man with a single sword blow and takes the woman away.

Bir uçurumun kenarından geçerken [tay] sırtından [Köseyi] fırlatmış. Uçuruma yuvarlanan köse, parça parça olup, herkesin eşini kaçırmanın, delikanlıyı kesmenin, kendini sırtında taşıyan atı aç bırakmanın cezasını çekmiş⁸³.

(Tezel 240)

Had the Köse not died, the struggle for superiority and power would have continued. The end of the tale marks the final victory of the young man. Evil in this fairy/folk tale manifests itself as the Köse's attempt to be superior by harming others because of his defect and inability to overcome his dread.

In Tale 37, "Tuz" ("Salt"), the egoistic Padishah bears a resemblance to King Lear, though the children in the tale are not girls but boys. As in Shakespeare's work, the capricious father asks how much his sons love him. While the elder sons express their love with valuable materials such as diamonds, the youngest son answers that he loves his father as much as salt. Such a simple item, of course, does not satisfy the capricious Padishah, who was expecting from his youngest son a similar comparison to an object of grandeur. He says: "Ne dedin, ne dedin?! [...] Beni tuz kadar seviyorsun ha? Seni utanmaz, hain evlat seni. Dünyada tuzdan daha kıymetli bir şey bulamadın mı?!"⁸⁴ (Tezel 394).

The narcissist Padishah cannot see the sincere response of his youngest son, yet the honesty of the young man causes him to be exiled to a faraway land. Alford explains that narcissism is an important factor in evil acts. He states:

Primary narcissism is also a state of terror-that one's weakness will be discovered, one's vulnerability exposed, one's powerlessness apparent for all to see. Shame is the narcissist's terror, the narcissist constantly working to prevent exposure, like the vampire who cannot bear the light.

(*What* 89)

The Padishah tries to conceal his sense of inadequacy and inferiority through an inflated ego. Narcissism is often depicted in a person who has an inflated sense of him/herself. However, this inflation is to hide a sense of weakness and unworthiness.

⁸³ While he is passing by a cliff, the colt throws the Köse down from its back. The Köse falls down the cliff and dies cruelly. He is punished for kidnapping everyone's wives, cutting off the boy and leaving the horse hungry.

⁸⁴ "What did you say? What did you say? You love me as much as salt! Shame on you, you disloyal son! Couldn't you find a more valuable thing than salt in the world?"

In the traditional conception, the Padishah constitutes the supreme power that is not supposed to have any weakness or insecurity and, accordingly, that does not need to be flattered. Asking such an ordinary question to his sons reveals the Padishah's inner conflict where his superiority is obviously threatened by his very human feelings of losing the power he is temporarily holding. Now, at this stage, what the Padishah is really interested in is his recognition as the supreme power by his subjects.

Although he expects to be praised by all, he is disappointed by the terrifying truth about the love of his youngest son. The Padishah feels insecure and wishes to evacuate his weakness and passivity by transferring his own insecurity to the other with the flattering remarks of his subjects and his sons. By frightening people, the Padishah perpetuates his authority and position in both the family and society. This strategy and his inability to bear his son's response lead the Padishah to order the young man to be beheaded. Here, evil comes both psychologically and physically as a result of the Padishah's inferiority complex. His ego is grandiose but needs to be flattered as it is in fact empty.

British Tale Number 11, "Cap o'Rushes" bears similarities to "Tuz", with a three-daughter motif this time. Like the previous tale and *King Lear*, to the same question of the father, who is at the same time the a rich gentleman, the youngest daughter's response is: "as fresh meat loves salt" (Jacobs 52). Outraged by such a plain answer, the father banishes the girl from the palace: "'You don't love me at all', says he, 'and in my house you stay no more'" (52). Driving the girl from the house relieves the father as he transforms his daughter into a passive object and feels victorious in his power struggle. As Alford calls it, evil in this tale is "a form of malignant narcissism." (*What* 23) It is how evil people "relate to the world, as though others do not really exist, as though their feelings do not matter. Evil is moral autism, unadulterated selfishness" (23).

Feeling his authority and position as an absolute power to be shattered, the rich man feels anxious that he is reduced to a position of a simple and an ordinary person and thus needs to transfer his dread onto the other. Prohibiting the girl from entering the palace may give others the impression that the young woman is no longer an important person, but a simple citizen. Relief comes first as a result of transferring his simplicity- which he felt due to his daughter's response- to his

daughter, making her an ordinary subject, and second as a result of the confirmation of his ongoing authority.

British Tale 35, “The Fish and the Ring”, is similar to the previous tale in that evil inflicted upon the other also comes from a narcissistic father figure, who is this time a baron. The “mighty” baron, after learning from a magician that his son is going to marry a lowly maid, feels anxious that his family reputation might be disgraced by this marriage. Apparently prestige and wealth are the two essential things for the baron, both of which acknowledge his existence as a valid subject. In case of a threat to his position, the baron does everything he can to protect his and his son’s future. With this goal, he plots against his daughter-in-law so as to kill her and feel relief. By getting rid of the young woman, the baron feels he guarantees his position in this world as a wealthy being and no one can spoil it. Before the marriage, he visits the young woman’s father and convinces the man to give his daughter to him:

[H]e went in and brought out the lass and gave her to the Baron, who mounted his horse and rode away with her. And when he got by the bank of river Ouse, he threw the little thing into the river and rode off to his castle.

(Jacobs 191)

Alford states that “evil is an intense object relationship [...] it consists in seeking a hot, intense connection of power and control to manage the cold, isolated dread within” (*What* 119). Here we see the baron struggling hard to control his own fear and anxiety by exerting his authority and power over his victim. The girl, by chance, does not die and meets the baron again. The helplessness of the young woman is clear in her remarks: “‘I have not done anything’ [...] ‘if you will only spare me, I will do whatever you wish. I will never see you or your son again till you desire it.’” (Jacobs 193) Alford emphasises that evil is not just about hurting. He also adds:

It is about the pleasures of absolute control inherent in the ability to harm another. “For a minute I’m this guy’s god” is how Mr. Beaty [a criminal Alford interviewed] describes his relationship to the victim who begs him to spare his life.

(*What* 21)

Therefore, in the tale we might interpret that the baron feels satisfied with the idea that he controls the lives of his son and his wife, which is evident in the silence of the baron's son, symbolising that he is already victimised. Nevertheless, realising in the end that he cannot victimise his daughter-in-law as he cannot defeat fate, he accepts the young woman as his son's wife: "Then at last the Baron saw that no one could fight against fate, and he handed her to a seat and announced to all the company that this was his son's true wife." (194) Alford is convinced that accepting powerlessness in the face of fate saves the person from performing possible evil on another. He explains:

If we do accept, then we may learn pity. Why pity? Because to accept humanity's vulnerability and powerlessness means to stop fighting one's fellow sufferers, joining with them in human solidarity against a world that cares not at all about human suffering unless perhaps to inflict it.

(*What* 69)

Thus, the mighty baron seems to have come to a realisation of his weakness as a human being before fate and of the fact that he has no choice but to raise the poor object from her previously miserable position.

British Tale 56, "Tattercoats", depicts a similar father figure, who is at the same time a lord. He is cruel to his granddaughter to such an extent that he does not even provide her with basic needs such as clothing. In fact, he does not recognise the little girl as a valid subject since she reminds him of his deceased daughter:

He hated her bitterly, because at her birth his favourite daughter died; and when the old nurse brought him the baby, he swore, that it might live or die as it liked, but he would never look on its face as long as it lived.

(Jacobs 185)

Similar to Klein's defence mechanism of ignoring, the lord rejects the existence of his granddaughter as a way of coping with the death of his daughter. His granddaughter reminds him of not only the death of his daughter but also of death itself, which is approaching the old man. Rivierie explains that the fear of loss, which underlies most of the developmental anxieties, is also related to the fear of death and

this fear leads to the destructive tendency if it is not controlled. He elaborates on this and states: “It’s ultimately the fear of death which is behind our cravings to acquire, possess and incorporate behind our greed and sadism” (356).

The old man, trying to tackle the dread of death, ignores the girl and kills her psychologically by providing her with almost nothing. Thinking that his granddaughter killed his daughter, he kills the little girl and feels that he not only has taken his revenge but also that he has killed his fear of death and remained alive. When the King invites him to the ball, the lord immediately forgets his grief and prepares for the invitation:

But when he heard the king’s command, he dried his eyes and bade them bring shears to cut him loose, for his hair had bound him a fast prisoner and he could not move. And then he sent them for rich clothes, and jewels, which he put on; and he ordered them to saddle the white horse, with gold and silk, that he might ride to meet the king.

(Jacobs 186)

Refusing to take his granddaughter to the ball, he denies her existence for a second time, again in order to get rid of the discomfort he has had since the death of his daughter. Restricting her life and imprisoning her in the castle with limited resources, the lord feels he controls the granddaughter’s fate, something he could not do for his daughter.

In all these tales, the father figure, who is at the same time either a Padishah, a King or an equally powerful being, intends to rob the identity of another in order to protect his own power and authority. Any threat to his position gives him the feeling of dread and fear- the fear of being a simple object in this world. Thus, not to experience such a degrading feeling and to feel alive, he rejects the existence of the other, either by reducing him/her to a simple being or even attempting to kill him/her in order to feel alive. Robbing someone’s identity in such a tale is thus connected to the fear of identity loss and reminds us of a response in one of Alford’s interviews with inmates. In the interview, Alford asked Patricia what her worst experience of evil was and she answered: “It was last year, this feeling I couldn’t shake. That I was losing myself, my separate identity, to my boyfriend” (*What* 10). Alford believes that this lies behind one type of evil and continues:

What's *that* got to do with evil, you might ask? Everything. If we can understand why Patricia experienced her fear of losing her identity as evil, we shall have learned the most important things about it.

(*What* 10)

For all these male figures, performing evil is a way of being recognised; they expect to be acknowledged as the sole power controlling the fate of others and to feel a divine power. By inflicting pain and suffering onto others, the evildoer gains meaning for his existence, which, in fact, is hollow.

Turkish Tale 15, “Keloğlan’ın Ali Cengiz Oyunu” (“Keloğlan’s Ali Cengiz Game”) presents a struggle for superiority between Keloğlan and Ali Cengiz, his master. Keloğlan is a famous trickster character, known for his cunning and wit. He defeats his enemies through trickery and can bring witty solutions to any problem (Batur 357). Demiray states that Keloğlan is a positive character (44) and is presented as an ordinary man- poor, looking physically weak and experiencing the problems that affect us all, which helps the reader identify with him easily (*ibid.*) It is worth pointing out that Keloğlan also has negative traits, as Boratav indicates, although he omits any detailed description of these in his article (“Türk Masal.” 229). He explains that Keloğlan is a complicated character, and that his negative traits as well as his positive ones make him a realistic hero (*ibid.*) He is victorious over brutal people, who usually have power and high status in society, such as Padishahs, Viziers or rich merchants.

Another common motif in Turkish fairy/folk tales is the fake Keloğlan- some princes dress like Keloğlan and wear sheep tripe on their heads, disguising themselves as Keloğlan, when they are in trouble (*ibid.*) Turkish Tale 10, “Altın Bülbül” (“Golden Nightingale”), which is analysed in the previous chapter, is an example of this type of Keloğlan tale. In Tezel’s collection, there are twelve Keloğlan tales in which he appears as the protagonist, while in one tale- “Bahtiyar ile Hoptiyar” (“Bahtiyar and Hoptiyar”), Number 12- he is a minor character, helping the hero. “Keloğlan ile İhtiyar” (“Keloğlan with the Old Man”-Number 43), “Keloğlan Hindistan Yolunda” (“Keloğlan on his Way to India”-Number 47), “Keloğlan’ın Köseye Masalı” (“Keloğlan’s Tale to the Köse”-Number 48), “Tembel Keloğlan” (“Lazy Keloğlan”-Number 50), “Keloğlan Yedi Kat Yerin Altında” (“Keloğlan in Sevenfold Underground”- Number 52) and “Keloğlan’ın Tokmağı”

(“Keloğlan’s Stick”-Number 53) are not analysed in this thesis since they do not serve the aim of the study. So only four Keloğlan tales are analysed in this chapter.

In Tale 45, “Keloğlan’in Ali Cengiz Oyunu” (“Keloğlan’s Ali Cengiz Game”), Keloğlan is an ordinary shepherd living alone with his old mother. When he wants to marry the Padishah’s daughter, he is told to learn Ali Cengiz’s game in order to marry her. Ali Cengiz is famous not only for knowing the tricks of any games in the country but also for killing young boys whom he teaches these tricks in forty days once they admit to have mastered them all. From an Alfordian point of view, it is possible to assert that once the master is no more the only one to embody these skills he cannot stand being in competition for superiority with his apprentices. Ali Cengiz is like Alford’s inmates, someone who aims at omnipotence and complete control over others. Manipulating others with his mysterious power and tricks, Ali Cengiz keeps his superiority and overcomes his existential dread.

Keloğlan enters a harsh struggle with Ali Cengiz after he has learnt all the tricks. When Ali Cengiz learns that Keloğlan has become his rival, he feels threatened by an equal and uses all his skills to kill him. During their fight they are transformed into a great many animals, ranging from a fox to a chick, trying to defeat each other. Metaphorically taken, both of them harm each other, striving to overcome the feeling of inferiority and weakness, and trying to be the only power in the district. At the end of the tale, as in most Keloğlan stories, Keloğlan wins the fight.

“Keloğlan Ölüyü Diriltiyor” (“Keloğlan Resurrects the Dead”, Number 49) depicts another typically poor Keloğlan, who gets into a struggle with two salesmen and is victorious at the end of the tale. If evil means “inflicting pain, abandonment and helplessness on others” as Alford argues (*What* 50), then we can assume that the trickster Keloğlan, in this tale, is acting evil in a way that as the inmates of Alford. First, evil starts with the attempt of two salesmen to trick Keloğlan during the sale of his ass. Feeling that he is being manipulated by these men, Keloğlan prepares a trick: he goes to the open market and shouts out that his ass eats barley and defecates silver. By deceiving these two men, Keloğlan seeks ways to get rid of the passivity and helplessness he has been in. The men offer the highest amount of money and buy the ass, which suggests that, having been tricked by him, they are now in the inferior position. Though he has evacuated his dread, Keloğlan prepares another trick for the men, this time to get all their money. The tale continues with a series of tricks

practised by Kelođlan in order not to lose his power over the salesmen and not to suffer from powerlessness and vulnerability. The tale ends with the victory of Kelođlan as is the usual case, but this time with the death of an innocent woman, a shepherd and two salesmen, who may not be considered as more evil than Kelođlan. The narrator ends the tale, saying: “Kelođlan ermiş muradına, biz ıkalım kerevetine⁸⁵” (Tezel 500). This remark demonstrates that the narrator sides with Kelođlan, whom he seems to think deserves to be the winner. Nevertheless, it is Kelođlan who led innocent people- children and a shepherd along with a woman- into their deaths in the process of transforming his passivity into activity. By causing the death of innocent people, Kelođlan cannot be defined as an innocent character in this tale.

Turkish Tale 51, “Dev ile Kelođlan” (“Kelođlan and the Giant”), presents a greedy Kelođlan, who is enriched through a giant’s treasure. When a messenger announces that the Padishah will give money as a prize to anyone bringing him a giant’s horse, Kelođlan accepts for the challenge and steals the horse, as he has already been seeking ways to become wealthy. Seeing the fulfilment of such a difficult mission, the Padishah sets for another and more difficult task, which is to steal the giant’s bedcover. With each task, Kelođlan gets more money from the Padishah and he becomes blinded with the desire to get more even if it requires him to kill someone. The narrator states:

- Ağacın dibinde bir deđirmen taşı var, onun üzerinde de bir demir var, ona bastım, hoplayarak yukarı çıktım. Sen de öyle yap!... diye dev kandırmış. Azgın dev buna inanmış, Kelođlan’ın dediđini yapmış. Fakat kızgın demirden haşlanarak düşmüş, deđirmen taşının altında kalarak ölmüş⁸⁶.

(508)

It is normally giants that are depicted as cruel beings, but here the giant is a helpless victim of Kelođlan’s tricks. He not only deprives the giant of his wealth but

⁸⁵ “Kelođlan has reached his aims, we shall take his place.”

⁸⁶ “There is a millstone near the tree and on it stands an iron. I climbed up by stepping on it and bouncing. You can do the same!”, so he deceives the giant. The wild giant believes this. He does what Kelođlan has told him to do. But he gets burnt by the hot iron, falls down, and then dies after falling under the millstone.”

also takes his life. Having started as a poor man, Keloğlan turns into a wealthy and strong young man by the end.

Turkish Tale 54, “*Hamamcı* ile Keloğlan” (“The *Hamamcı* and Keloğlan”) is the last tale in the collection and depicts a very greedy Keloğlan. Similar to Tale 49, in this tale Keloğlan tortures another man to protect his own threatened goodness. After realising that the *hamamcı* has deceived him and that he is under the menace of another person, Keloğlan tries many ways to turn the situation to his advantage. He deceives the *hamamcı* and seduces him in the disguise of a woman and then finds another way to beat him. He turns his passivity into action by giving physical and emotional harm to the *hamamcı*. Furthermore, it is not only the *hamamcı* upon whom Keloğlan inflicts pain, but also the Padishah, who imprisons Keloğlan on hearing a complaint about him. In order to free himself, Keloğlan cheats the Padishah, causing fear and horror, and manages to take control again. The tale ends, as in the previous Keloğlan tales, with the victory of Keloğlan and the defeat of the *hamamcı*, who is presented as the antagonist.

As for the British collection, similar to the Keloğlan tales, there are Jack tales, in which the protagonist has similar traits with Keloğlan, in that he is either a simple boy living alone with his mother, or the youngest son in a family with two elder brothers. Jack is also presented as a trickster who has several adventures and who, in the end, rises in social status by marrying a princess or making wealth through trickery. The first Jack tales were collected and reported in the early eighteenth century in England (Zipes, *The Oxford* 267). In these tales, the protagonist Jack is the wise son of a farmer. He kills numerous giants after a series of adventures and gets rich with their wealth (*ibid.*) The first documented collection of Jack tales was titled as “Jack and the Gyant” in 1708. In the later eighteenth century many writers such as Henry Fielding, John Newberry, Dr. Johnson, Boswel and William Cowper referred to Jack and the giants in their works (*ibid.*).

Tale 8, “Jack Hannaford” is one of the examples of a Jack tale in which the protagonist is a trickster with a full name. Like Keloğlan, Jack is also driven by materialism, which stimulates him to deceive other people. When he lies to the old woman that he comes from the Paradise, the poor woman gives all her money to him. Feeling no remorse, Jack cheats the old woman’s husband as well and steals his horse. He uses the couple’s naiveté in order lead a comfortable life exempt from

worries. By stealing others' possessions, Jack gets rid of his fear of having to work hard to earn money.

Tale 45, "Hereafterthis" is very similar to the previous tale with a trickster Jack and a naïve old woman. As in the previous tale, Jack's deceiving the old woman to take all her money and leaving her and her husband in despair and anguish may well be defined as evil in Alfordian terms. One of the most outstanding points about the characters' evil nature in these two tales is that neither Jack feels remorse and pity for what they have done. The great pleasure he takes in stealing others' possessions is apparent in the second Jack's luxurious entertainment with his friends. We can suggest that robbing others is also robbing their life source and vitality, which the evil self does out of sheer spite. In contrast to the previous tale, however, here the farmer and his wife regain their superior position by frightening Jack and his gang. When Jack and his friends run away, all the money they stole is left behind with the old couple and the tale ends with the recovery of their confidence and security.

In Tale 13, "Jack and the Beanstalk", the hero and his initial situation is again very similar to Kelođlan and his lifestyle- a simple man, living alone with his old mother. Bettelheim describes this tale as the tale of maturation in which the protagonist learns to deal with his problems related to sexuality (190). Like Kelođlan in Tale 49, Jack goes to the open market to sell his cow. The tale reads thus:

There was once upon a time a poor widow who had only son named Jack, and a cow named Milky-white. And all they had to live on was the milk the cow gave every morning which they carried to the market and sold. But one morning Milky-white gave no milk and they didn't know what to do.

(Jacobs 59)

The tale is one of the most famous Jack tales in Europe. Jacobs states in "Notes and References" that he made some changes to the original plot by deleting the part where Jack meets the fairy, and explains:

[w]hen Jack arrives at the top of the Beanstalk, he is met by a fairy, who gravely informs him that the ogre had stolen all his possessions from Jack's father. The object of this was to prevent the tale from becoming an encouragement to theft!

(233)

Although Jacobs claims that he did not want to encourage theft, one may still wonder why he did not delete the part where Jack steals the giant's possessions. We can hypothesise that without any background information about the giant, Jack's going into the giant's house and stealing his possessions provide more encouragement for theft. Though Jack is welcomed by the ogress, he afterwards betrays her hospitality: "Well, the ogre's wife wasn't such a bad sort, after all. So she took Jack into the kitchen, and gave him a hunk of bread and cheese and a jug of milk." (Jacobs 62)

Poverty-stricken with his mother, Jack needs to find a way to survive and thus gets into the ogre's house and steals his possessions. The tale depicts the loss of the father; therefore, Jack has an attempt to prove that he is the head of the family and as powerful as a father figure. The tale also deals with the fear of cannibalism, of being eaten by an ogre, which suggests an anxiety rooted in the oral phase. When Jack enters the ogre's house, he hides from it, which reveals Jack's fear of cannibalism like an infant who fears cannibalistic power in the oral phase (Klein, "The Early Development of Conscience" 274) When the ogre is away, Jack first steals the ogre's gold and then its golden harp and at last its golden hen, which grants Jack a kind of power. The golden harp even cries out after its master when Jack steals it: "But just then the harp cried out: 'Master! Master!' and the ogre swung himself down the beanstalk which shook with his weight." (Jacobs 67) As in the Kelođlan tales, Jack shows no remorse or pity after each of his thefts since he continues stealing all the valuable possessions of the ogre, who, in the end, dies in a fall from the beanstalk:

Then Jack gave another chop with the axe, and the beanstalk was cut in two and began to topple over. Then the ogre fell down and broke his crown, and the beanstalk came toppling over.

(Jacobs 67)

At the end of the tale, Jack and his mother become rich with the giant's wealth and they seem freed from their worries and anxiety about poverty and suffering. The narrator says: "Then Jack showed his mother his golden harp, and what with showing that and selling the golden eggs, Jack and his mother became very rich, and he married a great princess, and they lived happy ever after." (67) Alford claims:

When we are faced with intolerable, uncontainable dread, the natural tendency is to identify with the persecutor, becoming the agent of doom, as the only way of controlling it. Evil is the attempt to inflict one's doom on others, becoming doom, rather than living subject to it.
(*What* 58)

As for Jack, the moment he feels that he is likely to suffer even more poverty with his mother, he seeks ways to get rid of his helplessness and transfers his dreaded future onto the giant by depriving him of his wealth. Furthermore, the ogre, as Bettelheim suggests (190), acts as a father figure, to whom Jack attempts to prove his superiority and over whom he needs to win a victory in his struggle of development. The tale starts with the suffering and destitution of Jack and ends with the passivity and poverty of the giant.

British Tale 19, "Jack and the Giant-Killer" bears some similarities to Turkish Tale 51. Unlike the Turkish version, in this tale, the giant is not nameless, being named, "Cormoran". It is narrated that the giant is so huge that it poses a threat to the local inhabitants, stealing their animals. To save the people of his village, Jack takes action, which brings him fame and good reputation. The giant's treasure that he is rewarded with entices him to wish for more and, thus, to kill the giant's relatives, who come to take revenge. After a series of adventures, Jack becomes famous as "Jack the Giant Killer". Nevertheless, in the second part of the tale, Jack kills an innocent giant in order to maintain his reputation as Giant Killer and in order to seize the giant's treasure. He deceives the giant, telling him that a thousand armed men are awaiting him in ambush and the poor giant begs for his help. The narrator says: "[T]he poor giant lay trembling in a vault under the ground" (Jacobs 105). While the giant is hiding, Jack has got hold of the giant's valuable possessions and then kills

the giant brutally. His killing of giants continues with some other giants until- we can suggest- he guarantees his fame as the giant killer.

The tale again ends with the victory of Jack and the defeat of the giants. Having been a simple poor boy, Jack rises in society by mastering others and inflicting his own suffering on them. He tortures them for his own advantage which in this case is prestige and wealth. Starting as a simple action of self-defence, Jack's motive in his encounters with the giants soon takes the form of evil as defined by Alford.

Tale 61, "The Blinded Giant" shows Jack rebelling against his master, a giant. The tale recalls the Cyclops episode in the *Odyssey* (91-102) and "Basat'ın Tepegözü Öldürdüğü Boyu"⁸⁷ in the tales of famous epic *Dede Korkut* (174-188). After serving the giant for seven years, Jack begs him for a holiday, which the giant refuses to grant. This behaviour reveals the giant's fear of losing the authority he has maintained through threats and restrictions. In order to escape, Jack stabs a knife into the giant's eye and blinds him, which grants Jack the power he has been devoid of. Having a taste of the power that previously was exercised upon him, Jack goes one step further and kills the giant's innocent dog for no reason. The giant groans: "At him, Truncheon, [...] at the little wretch that I've fed these seven years and now has blinded me" (Jacobs 201). Fleeing from the giant, in fact, means becoming free from the fear and confinement that Jack has been subject to for seven years, and this brings him existential relief after he has evacuated this dread onto the giant and his dog. Jack's deeds refer to the continuation of a power conflict cycle and can be defined as evil.

As for other British tales, Tale 7, "Nix Nought Nothing" can be counted as one of the representatives of an Alfordian struggle and of the relationship between power and evil. When the king is on his way back home, he arrives at a river difficult to cross. While desperately seeking a solution to this problem, a giant appears and offers help:

At length the king was on his way back; but he had a big river to cross, and there was a whirlpool, and he could not get over the water. But a giant came up to him, and said: "I'll carry you over."

(Jacobs 33)

⁸⁷ "How Basat Killed Goggle-eye"

Feeling weak and exposed to danger and death, the King accepts whatever the giant wishes. The giant says: “O give me Nix, Nought, Nothing, and I will carry you over the water on my back.” (33) Unaware of the fact that his wife named his son “Nix Nought Nothing”, the king does not turn down the offer. Once he arrives home, he faces the dread of losing his son- his only heir- and his kingdom. At this point, the king crosses the line of evil by exploiting his power to escape his own victimhood by deceiving the giant with the hen-wife’s son. The narrator says: “When the giant comes we will give him the hen-wife’s boy; he will never know the difference.” (34) When the giant realises that the king has deceived him, he cruelly dashes the boy’s head on a stone and kills him. Feeling that he has been humiliated by the king, the giant gets extremely angry. When the giant comes back for the second time, the king, this time victimises the gardener’s family, giving the giant their son. Already victimised by hard life conditions, the families of the hen wife and gardener are confined to utter passivity by the king and the giant. The giant kills the gardener’s son and takes the king’s son at last. With the loss of his son, the king is reduced to passivity again. Nonetheless, the giant’s daughter saves the prince from the hard tasks he has to fulfil. On his way back home, the hen-wife encounters the prince and desires to take revenge, which may also be accompanied with the feeling of taking control, and she puts a spell on him:

[O]n the way he came to the cottage of the hen-wife whose boy had had his brains dashed out by the giant. Now she knew Nix Nought Nothing in a moment, and hated him because he was the cause of her son’s death.

(Jacobs 38)

By putting the Prince into sleep, the hen-wife transfers her insecurity onto the prince, making him completely passive and so takes her revenge. With the help of the giant’s daughter and a gardener’s daughter, the king is reunited with his son, and is thus victorious in his struggles with the giant but then he finally arrives at a position in which he forgets his anxiety about loss and death, and punishes the hen-wife for what she has done to his son.

In the British collection, there are also other characters who are depicted as heroines or heroes but have some adverse features in their nature. For instance, Tale

22, “Molly Whuppie”, is a variant of the Jack tales since the protagonist is an astute girl called Molly Whuppie, who takes the role of Jack. The tale depicts the power struggle between a giant and a passive, ordinary girl, who, in the end, projects her fear and passivity onto another being. The tale begins with the isolation and loneliness of Molly and her three sisters who have been abandoned in the woods by parents who feel they cannot afford their upkeep. The tale starts with the loss of mother figure in the woods. For Klein, the woods stand for the mother figure (“Infantile Anxiety” 230). In this respect, it can be suggested that real mother takes the form of the bad object as opposed to the woods, which shelters Molly and her sisters. The children’s suffering and dread of an unknown future commence from the outset of this tale in which they are left to die. So, when they arrive at a giantess’ house, as in Tale 13 (“Jack and the Beanstalk”), Molly feels she has to find a way to overcome the distress they are to suffer. Similar to Tale 13, the giantess, as a mother figure, welcomes them and warns them against her husband. Molly uses her wits to escape from the giant’s house and his trap. However, when the king requires her to bring him the giant’s sword, she does not hesitate to go back and steal it. Seeing it as a chance to rise in society and to gain tremendous wealth, Molly faces a hazardous experience and steals the giant’s most important possession. As a second task given by the king, Molly steals the giant’s purse and lastly, she steals his ring. With each task, she feels more confident and powerful against the giant since- in Kleinian terms- she “sucks him dry” (*Envy* 181) by depriving him of his significant possessions. The balance of power alters at the end of the tale, with Molly becoming a wealthy and powerful woman after marrying the prince. Her earlier tragedy and suffering turn into a prosperous and a blissful life, as in the Kelođlan and Jack tales. Molly and her sisters learn to take responsibility after being left in the woods and they find their way, just like an infant in Klein’s depressive position. By making the right choices and taking responsibility, the infant matures and learns to remove from the depressive position.

British Tale 58, “Johnny Gloke” is also very similar to the Jack and Kelođlan tales in depicting a false hero who gains fame through trickery. Tired of his ordinary job, tailoring, he tries to find a way to be well-known. Feeling he has no meaning in life, pursuing his mundane job, Johnny seeks ways to get rid of his feeling of monotony. When he hears that the king is offering a valuable reward and the hand of

his daughter to he who manages to kill the giants who live in the town, Johnny volunteers, regarding this as a great opportunity to find a meaning for his existence. Instead of attacking the giants, however, he hides himself and throws a pebble at one of the giants, giving the impression that the other giant did it. Watching their fight, Johnny waits until they feel exhausted and then cuts off their heads. Claiming his reward, he becomes wealthy at the end of the tale. The narrator says: “He received the king’s daughter in marriage and for a time lived in peace and happiness. He never told the mode he followed in his dealing with the giants” (Jacobs 192). Attaining both the fame and the prestige he was looking for, Johnny gains a sense of security by leaving the others in dark about his way of getting famous.

Tale 64, “The Old Witch”, presents the struggle of a girl who tries to get rich and powerful through trickery. The tale begins with a quest of the youngest girl of the family to seek her fortune. It can be suggested that the girl leaves the house in order to get rid of her poverty-stricken life. Her employment as a servant in a witch’s house is one of the ways through which she can survive. The old witch is trying to evacuate her anxiety and fear of losing power by setting strict rules and forcing her servants to work hard. One of the rules the protagonist has to obey is not to look at the chimney, about which the witch severely warns the girl. As with the forbidden rooms in Turkish Tale 16 and the British Tale 26, the chimney in this tale represents the mysterious power of the other. In the former tales it was the husband, and here it is the witch who feels anxious about these places on the grounds that any intrusion into, or inspection of them may suggest an intrusion or inspection into their privacy and this thus threatens their security. The possibility of a danger against their safety, both the husbands in the former tales and the witch here warn the protagonists about these forbidden places. However, curiosity about the other’s privacy impels the protagonists to look at the forbidden place. Therefore, when the girl in this tale looks at the chimney, ignoring the warning, she actually invades the old witch’s solitude and generates a threat for the old woman. The girl, thus, takes control by disregarding the warning and stealing the money she finds there:

[O]ne morning as she was cleaning, and the witch was out, she forgot what the witch said, and looked up the chimney. When she did this a great bag of money fell down in her lap. This happened again and again. So the girl started to go off home. (Jacobs 207)

Stealing the money that she finds in the chimney suggests a crime of not only theft but also trespass into the other's privacy. In fact, she robs the old woman of her security. With the old witch's money, the girl becomes wealthy and goes back to her hometown.

Tale 44, "The Pied Piper", which is well-known in Europe. When the town is invaded by rats, the townsfolk desperately search for ways to be saved from this unpleasant situation. The narrator says: "The place was so infested with them [rats] as to be scarce worth living in. There wasn't a barn or a corn-rick, a store-room or a cupboard, but they ate their way into it" (Jacobs 147). Feeling powerless and vulnerable against the rats, the townsfolk feel relief once the Pied Piper promises them to catch the rats on condition that he is granted fifty pounds. The narrator describes the Piper as a "queer fellow" (Jacobs 148): "For there wasn't a colour of the rainbow but you might find it in some corner of his dress and he was tall and thin, and had keen piercing eyes. (148) After he rescues the town from the rats by playing his flute, the town celebrates with great joy since the people feel they have restored security- the safe state they had before the invasion of the rats. However, the mayor explains they cannot give the Piper the money they promised because of the damage the rats have caused. Frustrated by this, the Pied Piper threatens the mayor: "Fifty pounds was what I bargained for', [...] ; 'and if I were you I'd pay it quickly. For I can pipe many kinds of tunes, as folk sometimes find their cost.'" (149) The fear and terror he creates can be interpreted as his wish to take control and establish his authority. Nonetheless, the mayor's sarcastic tone doubles his frustration and causes him to take action: "The mayor says: 'Would you threaten us, you strolling vagabond? [...] You may do your worst, my good man'" (149). The mayor, regaining his confidence after the death of the rats, hurts the Piper with humiliation and denigration. Moreover, the self-worth of the folk leads them to perceive the Piper as a helpless victim. Consequently, upon the wrong-doing of the townsfolk, the Piper plays a joyful song, which lures the children and makes them follow him. At the end of the tale, the Piper and the children vanish leaving the reader with the idea that the Piper has been able to exact his revenge and has reached a superior position by robbing the town of its life-source, in which case he becomes the evildoer this time. The Piper transfers his weakness and passivity onto the town and holds them as "the container of his dread and anxiety" (x) in Alfordian terms. By removing from them

their life energy- the children- he leaves the townsfolk in a situation little removed from death:

All the while, the elders watched and waited. They mocked no longer, now. And watch and wait as they might, never did they set their eyes again upon the Piper in his parti-coloured coat. Never were their hearts gladdened by the song and dance of the children issuing forth from amongst the ancient oaks of the forest.

(Jacobs 149)

The tale ends with the Piper's relief from his vulnerability and anguish, and the despair and the renewed anguish of the townsfolk.

The British collection contains some tales in which the supernatural creatures generate fear and tension for human beings, controlling them by enacting evil. These characters are mostly goblins, imps, witches and giants. Apart from the giants, the other supernatural creatures generally frighten and harm the human being in these fairy tales. Tale 23, "The Red Ettin" is such a tale presenting a monstrous character terrorising a kingdom. The narrator introduces: "the Red Ettin, who was a terrible beast, with three heads, that spared no living man it could get hold of" (134). This monster expresses its power by asking three challenging questions to people and if they cannot answer the questions, it turns them into stones. Through the questions, the monster attempts to maintain its well-being by discarding any threat to its superior position. This dread of inferiority, as Alford puts it, causes the individual to harm the other so as to get rid of any feeling of victimisation.

Two sons of an old widow go on a quest to find the Red Ettin, and when the elder son first encounters the Red Ettin, he is not able to answer the questions and is transformed into pillars of stone. Turning the boy into inanimate objects suggests his surrender to the Red Ettin's enchanting power. However, the younger boy, who arrives at the castle in search of his brother, is able to answer the Red Ettin's questions easily as he has learnt the answers from an old woman he met on his way. As in British Tale 1, on hearing the answers the creature loses his power: "When the Ettin found this, he knew that his power was gone. The young man then took up an axe and hewed off the monster's three heads" (Jacobs 137). The Red Ettin, having dreaded becoming susceptible to the authority of another being, was asking people his puzzling questions and imprisoning them. The young man's answers shakes the

monster's monopolising control and leaves him vulnerable to the external threat he was escaping. The puzzling questions were the defence mechanisms of the monster and once they were gone, the monster lost his struggle to be powerful.

Tale 29, "Earl Mar's Daughter" presents a double subjugation. The transformation of the young man into a bird by his fairy mother demonstrates his victimisation by supernatural powers. To prove her power and control, the fairy mother reduces her son to an object position, robbing his identity and existence as a human being. The boy in the form of a dove falls in love with the Earl's daughter and transforms into his human form at night. He then confesses to the girl that he has not obeyed his mother: "My name is Florentine, and my mother is a queen, something more than a queen, for she knows magic and spells, and because I would not do as she wished she turned me into a dove" (Jacobs 160). Feeling that her authority is at stake, the woman uses her power- magic- to reinforce her superior position and victimises even her son.

The tale depicts the second manipulation through the forced marriage of the Earl Mar's daughter. The Earl forces his daughter to marry a man of high status to guarantee his own position and his daughter's future, which, of course, the young woman resists by saying that she is happy with her dove, about whose background her father does not know. The father, feeling anxious that the dove will prevent the marriage, decides to kill it in order to avoid any threat to his safety. He threatens: "To-morrow, so sure as I live and eat, I'll twist that birdie's neck," and out he stamp[s] from her room" (161). The young couple is saved from the rage of the Earl by the fairy queen, who later pities her son and transforms him into his former position. From an Alfordian approach, the fairy queen's behaviour can be regarded as a sign of moral development.

Tale 40, "Fairy Ointment" is about an evil imp, who also attempts to retain his superiority by creating terror in a human. At the time of his need, feeling the fear of loss, he asks Dame Goody, an old nurse, for help and takes her into his house. When Goody secretly puts magic ointment on her eyes in the house, she gains a kind of power and sees beyond the human world. After Goody sees the squinny-eyed man in the street next day while he is stealing bits and pieces from the shops, she approaches him, revealing the secret that she is able to see him. Feeling that, as a supernatural power, he has lost his mysterious strength, the imp blinds the woman.

With the revelation of Goody, the imp's dread of losing his power grows and, eventually, he projects his dread onto the woman by depriving her of the superior quality that had brought her closer to him in status.

Tale 49, "Yallery Brown", depicts another supernatural creature as evil, troubling the protagonist and feeling a sadistic joy with his dejection. When Tom, the protagonist, removes a stone and awakens the strange creature from his sleep, he disturbs the creature, harming it unintentionally. While in the beginning, the thing looks like an innocent baby, day by day it grows into an ugly, monster-like creature. Like the genii in Aladdin's lamp, the thing tells Tom that whatever he wishes it is ready to do; however, Tom rejects the offer, thanking it. The thing turns into a wicked creature the moment Tom thanks it: "I want no thanks, I'll have no thanks, and he stamp't his tiddy foot on the earth and looked as wicked as a raging bull" (Jacobs 165). The thing feels it has been woken up for nothing, which makes it furious and causes his decision to take revenge on Tom. On the following day, the creature completes all of Tom's work, while destroying his colleagues'. The tale reads:

For Tom could do nothing himself; the brooms wouldn't stay in his hand, the plough ran away from him, the hoe kept out of his grip [...] He could only sit by and look on, and have the cold shoulder turned on him, while the unnatural thing was meddling with the others, and working for him.

(Jacobs 165)

Day by day, Tom is left alone and at last he is sacked. The creature takes its revenge by exerting isolation and loneliness on Tom, which satisfies it. The helplessness of Tom is evident in his begging, but the creature does not stop bothering him: "The horrid thing broke into a screeching laugh, and pointed its brown finger at Tom" (166). It can be argued that the thing, in Alfordian terms, enjoys the pain and suffering it has inflicted on Tom. Regarding sleep as its life source, the creature feels vulnerable upon its wakening, which leads it to devour not only the life source of Tom but that of the other people and things around him as well:

He worked here and he worked there, and turned his hand to this and to that, but it always went agee, and 'twas all Yallery Brown's doing. And the children died, and the crops rotted- the beasts never fattened, and nothing ever did well with him; and till he was dead and buried, and m'appen even afterwards, there was no end to Yallery Brown's spite at him.

(Jacobs 167)

The evil deeds that the thing performs in Tom's life helps the thing evacuate its dread and vulnerability onto another being and eventually reinstate its former secure position.

Another example of supernatural evil, that is to say, evil practised by supernatural creatures is in Tale 60, "The Three Cows", in which the imps "suck the life source" (Klein 181) of a farmer and his three cows. From the beginning of the tale, evil is prevalent with the cruel death of the cows. The helplessness of the human being against supernatural creatures is observed in the trembling of the old man while watching the imps devour his cows: "The farmer really thought he should have died with fright, and so perhaps he would had not curiosity kept him alive." (Jacobs 198) The supernatural creatures have powerful dominance over the human being in these tales and they retain their power by creating fear and terror. They mock at the farmer's weakness and inferiority by playing with his animals. The narrator says: "Well, when they had all eaten, and had devoured every scrap of beef on the cow, they began playing games with the bones, tossing them one to another." (Jacobs 199) The tale ends with the helplessness of the human being and the frightening power of the supernatural creatures.

Tale 69, "The Hobyahs" is akin to the previous tale in presenting the atrocity of supernatural creatures, which devour an old man and his wife, and carry the little girl away of the house. As in the previous tale, the Hobyahs manipulate man by creating terror and horror, and frighten humans.

Tale 59, "Coat o'Clay" is about a wise woman who is at the same time known as a witch due to her ability to heal people and animals with herbs, which shows the town's prejudice against unknown powers. They simply label people because of their own weakness and inferiority. The narrator emphasises that the old woman hates people asking too many questions: "But she was ill pleased if folks questioned her too much or too long, and she sore disliked fools. A many came to her asking

foolish things, as was their nature, and to them she never gave counsel.” (Jacobs 193) Feeling superior to the others, the old woman isolates herself from the rest, enjoying her wisdom alone, it being her defensive power. When a foolish boy comes to ask her some advice, she shares nothing and fools him. Opening herself to him would mean losing something from herself, thus, she misleads the boy about his quest and tells him he should find the coat o’clay, which reduces the boy to a more foolish position. It can be suggested that the old woman humiliates him in order to prove her existence from an Alfordian perspective.

As for British Tale 79, “The Little Bull-calf”, it is similar to other step-mother tales with a vicious step-father figure. The tale reads:

[S]oon after his father died, [...] his mother got married again to a man that turned out to be a very vicious stepfather, who couldn’t abide the little boy. [...] the stepfather said: “If you bring that bull-calf into this house, I’ll kill it!” What a villain he was, wasn’t he?

(Jacobs 257)

By threatening the little boy, who owns nothing but a bull-calf, the step-father establishes his authority over the poor boy. Long victimised by his step-father, the boy decides to go on a quest with the aim of finding a meaning for his existence and escaping his desolate life. Lacking a father figure, the boy is guided by the bull-calf, which nourishes him both physically and emotionally. After his marriage to a princess and gaining wealth, the step-father reappears to apologise, but the young man rejects him: “Then his stepfather came and wanted to own him, but the young king didn’t know such a man” (Jacobs 259). Not being able to overcome the manipulation and victimisation of himself as a human being, as in the Turkish Tale 17, the boy is saved from his inferior position by magical help from the bull-calf. After reaching a superior status by wealth and power, he reduces his step-father to an inferior position by rejecting him in public. In other words, the young man denies his step-father’s existence as a father and so takes his revenge.

Klein’s view of envy as the basis of evil is also supported by Alford, who wrote that “envy is the root of evil” (Alford 02 Sept. 2012⁸⁸). Therefore, the tales in

⁸⁸ Alford, Fred. “About Evil”. email to Gül Tanesen Büyü. 02 Sept. 2012.

which envy-based evil was analysed in the previous chapter are also suitable for Alford's understanding of evil and thus are studied in this section.

In all the tales (Turkish Tales 10, British Tales 3, 33, 37, 41, 43 and 73) where the step-mother is the villain, envy- either for the beauty or the wealth of the step-daughter- is presented as the motivation of the evil character. Considering their situation in the light of Alford's interpretation of evil, we can suggest that envy is a strong trigger for developing anxiety in the step-mother and her daughter, who feel inferior when compared to the protagonist, who is, on the other hand, far more elegant and beautiful in all these tales. We can see that the evil-doer's attempts to harm the innocent girl show that the envious self tries "to rob the other of his [her] existence" (Alford, *What* 23). Having to live as an ugly old woman (British Tales 3, 33) engenders fear and dread in these step-mothers and leads them to try to escape their doom by either providing nothing for the step-daughter, torturing her or even killing her (British Tale 3). In order to avoid the existential burden, the step-mothers place their own dread onto the step-daughter through the acts of swearing or brutality. In some of these tales (British Tale 3, 33, 73) even sadism exists as the step-mother enjoys transferring pain and anguish to the innocent girl. Relief is realised once the step-mother gets rid of the girl who has the youth, charm and purity she longs for.

All these step-mother tales illustrate how the chain of a power struggle operates. It is a condition of all these tales that the previously superior step-mothers eventually lose power and position, while the protagonists build up self-confidence and rise in society. Among these tales, Turkish Tale 10 and British Tales 3 and 33, in particular, show the step-mothers losing all power and being victimised by their step-daughters.

Turkish Tales 4, 25, 32, 11 and 31 deal with envy-based evil among siblings. In all these tales, harm is inflicted by the elder brothers/sisters because they feel their youngest brother/sister is favoured by their father. The youth, vitality and beauty of the little sister/brother pose a threat to the elder siblings, who feel worthless when compared to their rival. Lacking self-esteem and self-confidence is the ultimate reason for the inevitable dread they develop.

In "Güneş Kızı" ("The Sun Girl", Turkish Tale 25), the elder sisters' only dream is to marry rich men and live in luxury with maids to serve them. They state:

- Ben zengin bir adama varsam da şöyle bir rahat hayat yaşasam, uşaklar etrafımda dolaşsalar, ne iyi olur...
- Ablasının bu sözleri üzerine, ortanca kız:
- Ben de zengin bir adamla evlenmek isterim doğrusu, [...] Aşçılara her gün güzel yemekler yaptırıp can beslerdim⁸⁹.

(Tezel 293)

Having strong materialistic desires, the sisters do not want to continue to live as poor and ordinary people but to live in comfort and luxury. The moment they cannot achieve this unlike their little sister, the elder sisters aim to locate their fear of poverty and their despair into her by hiring someone to kill her babies. They know that this will spoil her blissful life with her husband and drive her into desolation and eventual poverty.

The lack of beauty is the origin of the evil sisters' envy in "Konuşan Kaval" ("The Talking Flute", 32). When they cause the death of Dal, the elder sisters feel relief as it has been the only wish they have unconsciously desired to fulfil. The narrator says: "Yaprak'la Fidan, hiçbirşey olmamış gibi saraya dönerlerken, Dal'ın suya gömüldüğü yerden küçük dalgalar meydana gelmiş"⁹⁰ (Tezel 359). There is no remorse felt by the sisters; on the contrary, through the death of Dal, they get rid of their feelings of isolation, humiliation and being unloved.

"Altın Bülbül" ("The Golden Nightingale"-11), "Sihirli Tavşan" ("Magic Rabbit"-31) and "Doğruluk" ("Righteousness"-42) represent older brothers' anxiety about losing their father's affection. Losing their father's support also means losing the possibility of ascending the throne. Thus, when the youngest brother achieves the task given by their father, the older brothers' dread escalates and their fear of being abandoned by their father is reflected in their attempt to leave their youngest brother alone and vulnerable to external threat.

In all these sibling tales, only in Turkish Tale 42 there is guilt and moral development as in the case of the person who, according to Klein, makes reparation.

⁸⁹ -If only I could marry rich man and live a comfortable life, and it would be great if only servants spin around me...

To the words of the elder sister, the middle sister says:

-I would also like to marry a rich man indeed, [...] I would have the cooks cook beautiful meals and take good care of myself.

⁹⁰ "While Yaprak and Fidan are returning to the palace as if nothing happened, little wavelets have appeared where Dal was drowned."

Admitting that having done wrong, the older brothers show signs of guilt, which indicates that they achieve an ability to “traffic with their dread and “to be able to live with it” (Alford, *What* 59). In the rest of the sibling tales (Turkish Tales 25, 32, 11 and 31), the power is transferred to the youngest sister/brother, while the older siblings end up suffering the punishment they had aimed at the youngest. In Tale 25 they are killed; in Tale 32 they are turned into uglier girls; and the brothers in Tales 11 and 31 are banished and driven not only from their families but also from their own countries. All of them are transformed into victims, becoming what they were most afraid of.

“Limon Kız” (Turkish Tale 33- “Lemon Girl”) is different from the other envy tales as it presents an already victimised character, an “Arab” (which in the Anatolian tales actually refers to any North African Muslim), trying to project her shortcomings onto Limon Kız. Considering the socio-economic conditions of the Africans during the period of the Ottoman Empire⁹¹, the “Arab” girl can be regarded as a social victim.

The use of the word Arab for this and other characters does not refer to race, but to the dark complexion of people originally coming from Africa. In Anatolia at the time of the Ottomans they were generally placed in the lowest class and were employed as maids or servants in the mansions of the rich, which can also be noticed in this tale as in most Anatolian tales (as in Tale “Alabalık”- 24). The narrator says that the master of the Arab servant orders her to bring some water from the lake where the Arab girl sees Limon Kız’s reflection. Thinking that the reflection belongs to herself, the Arab girl says to herself: “Ben çok güzel bir kızmışım. Ne diye bana hizmetçilik yaptırılıyorsunuz? Bundan sonra ben su getirmeye falan gitmem!”⁹² (368). In an interview (2012) with the president of “Afrikalılar Kültür Dayanışma ve Yardımlaşma Derneği”⁹³, Mustafa Olpak explains that these people particularly suffered from poverty, hardship and isolation during the Ottoman Empire and were subject to racial prejudice as “the Arab” in Turkish nursery rhymes⁹⁴ (Olpak).

⁹¹ Africans were first brought to Anatolia in the 19th century (Salman 1) so such tales in which there is an Arab figure can be regarded to be originated in the Ottoman period.

⁹² “I can see I am a very beautiful girl. Why do you make me serve? I won’t go to fetch any water or anything else from now on”.

⁹³ “The African Foundation of Social Aid and Solidarity”

⁹⁴ “Yağmur yağıyor, seller akıyor, Arap kızı camdan bakıyor” (“It’s raining, it’s pouring, the Arab girl is looking out of the window.”)

Thus, the Arab girl in the tale embodies adverse qualities such as ugliness, poverty and being the other in the society. Even the narrator calls her “the Arab”, giving her no full name but referring only to the colour of her complexion. What Olpak says about the African youth in Turkey in fact describes the Arab with all her dread in the tale:

[Ü]çüncü kuşağa kadar renginden utanan yüzlerce genç kızımız, kendi çektiklerini ‘çocuğu çekmesin’ diye bir beyaza kaçar [...] Sosyal yaşamda bağlantıyı kuramayan, içe kapanık, aman bizi görmesinler, aman bizi bilmesinler [...] diye diye eve kapanmışlar⁹⁵. (“Biz”)

Once the Arab girl sees the charm and purity of Limon Kız, she projects her own fear of alienation onto Limon Kız in order to feel that she is also a member of the society and that she is as attractive as her. It can thus be understood that the victory over Limon Kız through her transformation into a bird and then into a tree shows the Arab’s malicious attempt to gain more power by obliterating the girl’s beauty. For a while, the Arab enjoys her new social power by taking the role of the princess. However, when the tree is transformed back into Limon Kız social superiority is transferred back to her and the Arab girl is punished with the forty ass death penalty, which in fact is a punishment for her attempt to evacuate her dread onto another being. So the child reading or listening to this tale might learn to locate his/her dread rather than transfer it into another person.

Another fairy/folk tale which is described in Chapter III and which also matches Alford’s definition of evil is “Oduncu Keloğlan” (Number 46- “Keloğlan the Lumberjack”). The fairy/folk tale depicts an envious neighbour, planning to steal the magic box which has brought Keloğlan wealth. Alford describes the cause of envy as follows: “I have all I need, I just don’t want you to have more” (Alford 02 Sept. 2012). In this way, the neighbour, desiring to possess the magic box, aims to get wealthier and stronger than Keloğlan and deprives him of his life source.

There is a chain of manipulation in most of the Turkish and the British tales. The evil character intentionally hurts another, whom s/he thinks embodies all the

⁹⁵ For three generations, our young girls ashamed of their colour marry white males so that their children do not suffer what they have suffered [...] In social life, being an introvert and not being able to communicate with others, they stay indoors not to be noticed.

positive qualities, in order to gain a higher status. In twenty-eight of the tales, the balance of power alters twice within the story, and the victim becomes the victimiser by evacuating his/her dread and fear onto the previous victimiser, thus, indicating the social fact of an almost endless chain of subjugation and struggle.

However, out of forty-one tales, nine tales do not appear to follow a cyclical pattern of struggle. In the tales in which a male figure is the sole authority (Turkish Tales 15, 26, 37 and the British Tales 83, 24, 11, 15, 56, 29), he is not reduced to the position of a mere victim, even though the previous victim gains power and superiority at the end of the tale. The reason why the narrator does not want to present these figures as victims at the end might be related to the reluctance to show weakness in a patriarchal system. These fairy/folk tales were all collected by male figures, and showing an evil male authority that loses everything and becomes a victim at the end might be an improper example for children since both Tezel and Jacobs regard fairy/folk tales as tools for education. Furthermore, all these male figures are at the same time representatives of supreme powers, such as the King or the Padishah, and thus the narrator may not have been willing to undermine their superior status in the eyes of the public. Only in Turkish Tale 37 and British Tale 15 one can come across guilt felt by an evildoer at the end, which is a sign of a possible recuperation for them.

Furthermore, in all the Turkish (15, 20, 37) and British tales (83, 11), the father figure who is at the same time a king or an equally powerful being has concerns about losing his long-lasting sovereignty and is on guard against any external threat to his power. With this in mind, he is ready to harm anyone preventing him from enjoying his luxurious life and privileges. It can be argued that these tales also deal with narcissistic feelings of the infant, which is closely related to the feeling of envy. Rivierie explains that “if we feel wrong and guilty, then one of the purposes for which we need or use our internal object is that of attributing our own badness to them inside us. Thus our narcissism is relieved and enabled to escape blemish in some degree” (350). The king or the Padishah in these tales persecutes the other for the sake of feeling relieved from his sense of inferiority and weakness.

Another finding that can also be noticed is that in four tales (Turkish Tale 9 and British Tales 13, 22, 64), the protagonist appears as the victim of socio-economic conditions, which impel the character to find a way to transform his/her inadequacy

into a meaningful existence. By manipulating others, the character attempts to gain superiority and wealth, but ends up performing evil and victimising others.

All the Kelođlan and Jack tales follow a clear cycle of a struggle between the protagonist, who is depicted as a poor victim, and a giant or an ogre. Towards the end of the tales, the protagonist takes hold of the power through trickery or deceit and eventually becomes the new victimiser. What is interesting in these findings is that although the narrator presents the protagonist, Kelođlan or Jack, as innocent beings, the deeds they perform against the giants or other people cannot be described as completely innocent from an Alfordian perspective of evil. In these tales, in order to be superior, both Kelođlan and Jack commit theft, tell lies, torture others or kill giants, which can no longer be regarded as innocent deeds. In all these tales, we can suggest that there is the dread of retaliation as Kelođlan or Jack harms the other in order not to be injured by them. It can be suggested that the tales start with the insecurity of the protagonist and move on with their attempt to prove their sexual potency from a psychoanalytic point of view. Projecting their dread and anxiety on another being is the result of their weakness or insecurity. By reading or listening to these tales, the child may recognise his/her developmental problems and anxieties.

It can also be suggested that there is the superiority of the supernatural creatures, excluding the giants or the ogres, over the human beings in the tales. In British Tales 40, 49, 60 and 69, the supernatural creatures are presented as the source of great fear and horror for the human being who appears as a poor and weak victim facing them.

For Klein, we have seen that the goal of the individual should be to transform his/her love and hate into symbols; otherwise, if s/he cannot keep them under control, they may cause some anxieties (“On Criminality” 201). Alford supports the view that life should overcome the death instinct, that love should win over hate and good over evil. In this understanding, rather than denying that we have evil tendencies and take pleasure in destruction, we should accept them and make reparation for them, (*Psychology and the Natural* 111) and this reparation can only be achieved through art and literature.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

This thesis has aimed to contribute to the study of evil in fairy/folk tales, by analysing the concept of evil in Naki Tezel's and Joseph Jacobs's fairy/folk tale collections, using Melanie Klein's and Fred Alford's theories of child development, anxiety and dread in connection with their view of evil. This has shown that evil in these tales may manifest itself in the form of envy, jealousy, greed and uncontrolled dread, and may be practised through violence, torture and even murder. By revealing the underlying psychological motives of the evildoer, the thesis has demonstrated that with the assistance of these tales, the child may cope with his/her own latent fears and anxieties and re-establish his/her sense of an integral world as described by Klein and Alford.

This thesis has argued that fairy/folk tales have a considerable effect in the development of the child as these tales appeal to the unconscious problems and anxieties of children, encouraging them to get away from these problems and feel relief as psychoanalysts such as Melanie Klein and Bruno Bettelheim describe (Bettelheim 6-9; Klein "The Development" 67). It has been suggested that while reading/listening to these tales, the child identifies him/herself with the characters and experiences their adventures, finding a relief at the end with the victory of the protagonist. The analyses of selected fairy/folk tales have illustrated that fairy/folk tales address the basic problems and anxieties children experience such as the loss of parents and/or of a beloved object, the fear of abandonment, the fear of death or the fear of harm and torture. In line with Klein's and Alford's claims, it has been argued that in addressing these issues, the tales may lead the child to learn and to recognise certain anxieties and grow into an independent individual.

As mentioned in the introductory chapter, fairy/folk tales have circulated for hundreds of years in the oral tradition, and have been adapted by various narrators in different cultures. Thus, with such diversity, defining the genre would appear to be

problematic; nevertheless, certain features have been found to characterise these tales. In this respect, the fairy/folk tale can be described as a tale of a certain length involving supernatural characters living in an unknown land in an unspecified time. In the study, the fairy/folk tale has been defined as a story of wonder, which takes the reader/listener away from reality into the fantastic world it creates and helps him/her envision a dreamlike world in which nothing is impossible.

Both Naki Tezel and Joseph Jacobs claim that tales of this nature aim to educate children by showing that good is rewarded and evil is punished (Tezel 12; Jacobs viii). Bearing this in mind, the thesis has analysed the concept of evil in these two collections through Klein's and Alford's psychoanalytical points of view and answered three questions: what are the main motives (in psychoanalytical terms) for evil deeds in these tales? Can we consider evil in these tales in terms of Klein's and Alford's theories of evil? and do these analyses support the psychoanalysts' claims that tales like this can help children overcome certain fears and anxieties?

Chapter II, the background chapter, has provided a theoretical background to the concept of evil and has been structured around the examination of theories of evil in both Islamic and Western thought. Although the thesis has focused on psychoanalytical approaches to evil in the selected fairy/folk tales, it has been of paramount importance to be aware of the philosophical and theological understandings of evil, since the concept was first addressed by scholars who did not separate the two areas of study and, in the case of a scholarly historical background to the question of evil in the Anatolian tales, we have no records of early thinkers from the region who separated the concept of evil from their religious beliefs. These are theologians who, through their arguments, have influenced even today's thinkers.

It has been argued that evil is a problematic issue, resisting one strict definition. It has been noted that people have always been concerned with the "Problem of Evil" and asked questions as to why some people suffer or why there is evil. Today psychology is one of the most significant disciplines to concentrate on human nature and evil, attempting to display the motives behind evil deeds. It has been noted that there is an implicit agreement in modern times that man is responsible for his/her actions and that the origin of evil cannot be attributed to a non-human being or to fate. The theoretical background has illustrated that today, the

problem is, rather, what lies behind the choice of man in his/her enactment of evil, and what situation makes man susceptible to evil.

Melanie Klein is one of the two psychoanalysts who is particularly concerned with children's psychology and who at the same time brings a new perspective to the concept of evil tendencies in children. Klein believes in the significance of psychoanalysis in child development and claims that it can "spare the child unnecessary repression by freeing" him/her from any anxiety ("The Development" 13). Similar to Freud's free association technique, Klein's play technique helped her to interpret the basic problems of children. In normal conditions, while it is difficult to manifest latent anxieties and fears of children, Klein is convinced that it is possible to do so through psychoanalysis ("The Development" 66-67). Furthermore, she also draws attention to the need for fairy/folk tales as a technique in psychoanalysis to reach underlying problems, which she herself witnessed in her treatment of Fritz, her first patient (*ibid.*). While entertaining, these tales may enable a child to reveal his/her normally repressed problems.

Klein focuses on evil and criminalistic tendencies in children while laying out the differences between envy, jealousy and greed in their relations to evil, and, like Alford later, she claims that envy is at the root of all evil, being the most dangerous desire of the three (*Envy* 189). In this respect, Chapter III, "A Kleinian Analysis of Evil in the Turkish and British Fairy/Folk Tales", has analysed the selected fairy/folk tales of Tezel and Jacobs through the definition of evil suggested by Klein and categorised the tales into three groups: envy, jealousy and greed.

It has been observed that the evil performed is the result of envy more frequently in the Turkish tales (in eleven Turkish tales) than in British ones (only in six), whereas the situation is reversed (one Turkish and three British tales) in the less frequent cases of jealousy being the root of evil doing, and there is no significant preference shown by either collection for greed being the cause of evil (this is the case in only two Turkish and three British tales).

Although jealousy and greed are equally dangerous feelings in terms of their propensity to prompt sufferers to inflict pain on others, it has been noted that, as Klein claims (*Envy* ix), most cruel deeds are the outcome of envy. In the tales where envy is the main motive of evil this claim is born out: torture, transformation into an ugly creature or an animal and murder are common deeds performed on the

protagonist- the victim, who is mostly represented as an innocent being. The study has also shown that the internal struggle that lies behind jealousy, in both the single Turkish Tale (No. 26) and the three British Tales (Nos. 9, 25 and 75) where this is the case, is the result of love felt by two characters for the same person. Interestingly, the five tales, which deal with greed as the reason for evil-doing, all end with the self-destruction of the evildoer. On this evidence it can be said that the tales provide independent support for the Kleinian distinctions between evil caused by envy, jealousy and greed.

It has been suggested that in the tales in which evil is performed by the step-mother, there is the image of the other as split into the bad and the good object. The thesis has illustrated that in these tales evil manifests itself in the forms of cannibalism, torture, decapitation, tearing or cutting up the protagonist, which are similar to the infant's anxieties in the oral sadistic phase as suggested by Klein. In all these tales, the protagonist, who is beautiful and innocent, is threatened by the ugly and evil step-mother, which may be interpreted as a fear of the persecutory bad mother image. However, at the end of these tales, there is either punishment or no mention of the step-mother, which may allow the child to reform his/her whole object and escape from his/her bad object image in his/her inner world.

An expression of the split ego of the child into good and bad, what Bettelheim describes as the dual nature of the individual with good and evil sides (69), has been observed in the sister/brother tales along with the tales containing an Arab figure.

The thesis has shown that the tales in both the Turkish and the British collections present envy as causing the most dangerous acts of evil since it manifests itself in causing the psychological suffering of others, such as denigration, humiliation or devaluation, or in the form of physical pain, such as torture, transformation or even killing.

A more recent psychoanalyst, C. Fred Alford, one of the strong proponents of Klein, was referred to as the only other modern psychoanalyst publishing explicitly on the subject of evil. As shown in Chapter II, he puts forth the idea that man performs evil in the pursuit of self-interest, reminding one of Kant (52). Alford identifies the evildoer's motive as dread, with the perpetrator attempting to become superior to the victim in order to get rid of his/her fears and anxieties in life. Alford

states that transferring a sense of fear and victimhood to another person grants the evildoer not just power but also a meaning to his/her meaningless existence (*What* 9).

In Chapter IV, it has been argued that the evil performed in many of these tales can also be seen as coming out of the individual's dread of being inferior to others. Twenty-five Turkish fairy/folk tales and thirty-two British fairy/folk tales along with the tales of envy, in which we observe evil as defined by Klein, have been examined using Alford's theories of evil. The study has suggested that in these tales envy rooted in this Alfordian dread has been found to be partly involved as a triggering force of the conflict between the protagonists and antagonists.

Klein explains that the dread of injury to womanhood exercises a profound influence on the castration complex of the little girl, "for it causes her to overestimate the penis which she herself lacks" ("Early Stages" 212) and this exaggeration is often manifested in her anxieties. Therefore, it has been observed in these tales that although both boy characters and girl characters experience anxiety, the girls appear to be more subject to terror and fear, particularly the fear of castration in Padishah or King tales, in which the father figure wishes to have a son or forces the girl to marry a stranger. In these tales, the male characters seem to be agents of evil, holding power and status. Either a father, or a husband or a King/Padishah attempts to maintain supreme authority and thus acts accordingly, harming others. Out of the fifty-seven tales analysed in Chapter IV, only twenty-one tales depict female characters as victimisers. Hence, when looking from an Alfordian viewpoint, it is mostly, though not invariably, the male characters who are evil and victimisers.

It has also been noted that there are not as many supernatural creatures doing evil in the Turkish collection as in the British one. There are only giants in the Turkish collection, while the British collection includes goblins, imps and witches. Besides, most of these creatures are presented as more powerful than the human beings, who are reluctant to get into a struggle with them, which may reflect the fear of the infant toward the unknown. Furthermore, in both the English and the Turkish collection, the giant figures are not presented as winners in these tales, and they are usually depicted as a frightening power in the beginning, but later outwitted by a human being, and thus doomed to be victims at the end. In other words, no supernatural creature ever predominates in the Turkish tales, while they can

sometimes defeat humans in the British tales. From a Kleinian perspective, this defeat by unknown powers may be interpreted as similar to that by the destructive and cannibalistic bad object image of the infant.

Klein and Alford both believe that all human beings have evil tendencies, which is necessary for a healthy development (Klein, "Criminal Tendencies" 195; Alford, *What* 112, "Talking" 318); the thesis has shown that this is also reflected in these tales, which present a chain of evil deeds performed not only by the antagonist but also by the protagonist. The analyses of these tales have revealed that the characters find themselves in a cycle of struggle to discard their dread and to be powerful. No less than twenty-nine tales have been found to depict a cyclical relationship and to show that evil is a matter of power. With this in mind, it is also possible to assume that the protagonists, who seem good, may also be the agents of evil, pursuing the same motive in their deeds; that is, to be superior and powerful. Particularly the Keloğlan and Jack tales are similar in depicting their protagonists, who are tricksters, as characteristically struggling to get wealthy and superior through trickery and lies. The thesis has argued that evil is a matter of endless struggle in these tales, in which even these "good" characters may also carry some evil traits.

In both of the collections, the tales analysed have shown that both Keloğlan and Jack, along with other seemingly good characters such as Molly Whuppie and Johnny Gloke, have motives similar to those of evil characters, in their actions towards giants, the salesmen in "Keloğlan Ölüyü Diriltiyor"- 49 and a Turkish Bath attendant in "*Hamamcı ile Keloğlan*" 54, respectively.

The thesis aimed to make a comparative study between Turkish and British tales, but it has been observed that, in terms of their presentation of evil, there are more similarities in these two collections of tales than differences. Although the tales in both collections have different characters and plots, and there are some concomitant differences in the causes of evil actions when Kleinian distinctions are used, they nevertheless display overall similarities related to the concept of evil as defined by Klein and Alford, which suggests that fairy/folk tales even from very different cultures present similar psychological problems and anxieties that children experience throughout their development.

During the analysis of the selected texts from Turkish and British collections, several common points are distinguished: firstly, both of the collectors aim to teach children through their tales and with this aim they present good as rewarded and evil as punished at the end of their tales. The thesis has argued that through the punishment of an evil character the reader may feel relieved from his/her anxieties and get rid of his/her evil and criminalistic tendencies as claimed by Klein. Furthermore, in both of the collections evil results from the envy or dread of the character, who feels inferior to the other. Since the evil character is punished at the end of the tales, they act as fairly straightforward warnings of the consequences of allowing one's sense of inferiority to manifest itself in evil actions.

There are some differences distinguished in these two collections. First, the British collection has various supernatural characters that harm the human being, while in the Turkish collection there are only giants, who are later outwitted and victimised by the human being. Moreover, there are some cultural differences in terms of punishments given to the evil characters. While in the Turkish tales it is common to ask the evildoer to choose between the forty asses' or the axes punishment, or while the boys are banished from court, the British tales do not present such harsh punishments; there is either a transformation into an ugly creature or simply no mention of the fate of the evil character at the end.

Though there are some cultural differences in terms of supernatural characters and punishments, then, the tales of these two cultures are similar in terms of their insights into the roots of evil doing and in terms of their functions in the psychological development of their child audiences.

The use of evil and violence in fairy/folk tales has recently become a controversial issue as some people believe that fairy/folk tales should not include any violent or evil acts. However, as Klein and Alford claim, all human beings have some criminalistic and sadistic tendencies, which are necessary to a certain degree for symbol formation and phantasy (Klein, "The Importance of Symbol-formation" 238; Alford, "Talking" 318). Both of these psychoanalysts acknowledge the therapeutic effect of art and culture for a healthy development in which any kind of dread and anxiety may be worked out successfully (Klein, "The Importance of Symbol-formation" 236-50; Alford, *What* 12, 15, 112-13). Klein emphasises how the criminalistic and sadistic tendencies that emerge out of dread can be turned into

positive behaviour through symbol formation, which will enable the child feel relieved from early anxieties (*ibid.*). Therefore, as Segal claims about psychoanalysis and aesthetics (“A Psycho-Analytical 400”), the reader identifying him/herself with the characters in these tales may re-experience his/her own anxieties in the depressive position, and through identification s/he can re-establish his/her internal objects and integral world. By exposing children to fairy/folk tales which include some evil and violent acts children may be enabled to identify with the characters and this may help them project their repressed feelings onto others and feel relieved from the burden of such evil tendencies. Both in Turkish and British fairy/folk tales, envy, jealousy, greed or dread are the main causes of evil acts, and the punishments given to evil characters at the end may contribute to the purgation of stresses and anxieties associated with repression and of criminalistic tendencies in children. It has been argued that after the reading/listening process, the reader may not only form his/her whole object image but also learn about his/her existential dread, and may escape his/her own evil and violent tendencies through the acts of evil represented in these tales. It has further been suggested that at the end of these tales the death instinct, which was first noted by Freud, is replaced by the life instinct as the reader may reach a kind of purgation of his/her destructive feelings as Alford claims (*Psychology and the Natural* 111).

In Chapter IV, it has been suggested that through fairy/folk tales the child can learn to give form to his/her formless dread that emerges from the autistic-contiguous position put forth by Ogden; it can be given a shape, and form a meaningful existence. In other words, fairy/folk tales offer a form for anxieties and allow the individual to transfer them affirmatively. In this respect, introducing some kind of evil acts and violence in these tales may enable the child to learn and recognise his/her developmental problems and provide an opportunity to solve them in the real world.

Over the centuries such collectors as the Grimm brothers attempted to censor their tales from evil and violent acts in order to teach children good manners. In fact, this thesis has shown that by censoring, these collectors might have prevented children from being exposed to such destructive feelings, which can normally be worked out through reading or listening to these tales. The study has illustrated that

exposing children to controlled violence and evil acts through these tales might allow a healthy psychological development of children.

In this study, it has been noted how good characters may also develop into evildoers, which might be further explored in a future study. Based on the points of analyses used in this study, it may be possible to carry out a further analysis of the fairy/folk tales of other cultures or collections which cannot be covered in this thesis.

REFERENCES

- Adams, Marilyn and Robert Adams, eds. Introduction. *The Problem of Evil*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1990. 1-25. Print.
- Adams, Robert. "Plantinga on the Problem of Evil". *Alvin Plantinga*. Ed. James E. Tomberlin and Peter Inwagen. Dordrecht: Reidel, 1985. Print.
- Al-Ghazali. *Wonders of the Heart*. Trans. Walter James Skellie. Petaling Jaya: Islamic Book Trust, 2007. Print.
- Alford, Fred. *Psychology and the Natural Law*. New York: Cambridge UP, 2006. Print.
- . "Talking About Evil, Even When It is not Supposed to Exist". *Forensic Psychiatry: Influences of Evil*. Ed. Tom Mason. New Jersey: Humana, 2006. 313-24. Print.
- . *The Psychoanalytic Theory of Greek Tragedy*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1992. Print.
- . *What Evil Means to Us*. New York: Cornell UP, 1997. Print.
- Allison, Henry. "Reflections of the Banality of (Radical) Evil: A Kantian Analysis." *Rethinking Evil- Contemporary Perspectives*. Ed. Maria Pia Lara. California: California UP, 2001. 86-100. Print.
- Altıntaş, Hayrani. *İslam Düşünce Tarihi*. Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi Off-set, 2005. Print.
- American Standard Version*. Michael Paul Johnson, ed. May 2006. Web. Dec. 2012. <ebible.org>.
- Aquinas, Thomas. *The Philosophical Texts*. Trans. T. Gilby. London: Oxford UP, 1962. Print.
- Ashliman, D. L. *Folk and Fairy Tales: a Handbook*. Westport: Greenwood, 2004. Print.
- Aslan, Adnan. *Religious Pluralism in Christian and Islamic Philosophy: the Thought of John Hick and Seyyed Hossein Nasr*. Kent: Curzon, 1994. Print.
- Auden, W.H. "September 1, 1939". *Academy of American Poets*. Mar. 2007. Web. June 2010. <www.poets.org>.
- Augustine. *On the Free Choice of the Will, On Grace & Free Choice and Other Writings*. Ed. Peter King. New York: Cambridge UP, 2010. Print.

- . *The Confessions of St. Augustine*. Trans. Edward D. Pusey. New York: Cosimo, 2006. Print.
- Avery, Gillian. "British & Irish Fairy Tales". *The Oxford Companion to Fairy Tales*. Ed. Jack Zipes. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000. 66-77. Print.
- . "Joseph Jacobs". *The Oxford Companion to Fairy Tales*. Ed. Jack Zipes. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000. 268. Print.
- Bacchilega, Christina. *Postmodern Fairy Tales: Gender & Narrative Strategies*. Philadelphia: Pennsylvania UP, 1992. Print.
- Baldick, Chris. *Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2008. Print.
- Batur, Suat. *Türk Halk Edebiyatı*. İstanbul: Altın, 1998. Print.
- Benson, Stephen. "A. S. Byatt". *The Oxford Companion to Fairy Tales*. Ed. Jack Zipes. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000. 81-82. Print.
- Bernstein, Richard. "Radical Evil: Kant at War with Himself". *Rethinking Evil-Contemporary Perspectives*. Ed. Maria Pia Lara. California: California UP, 2001. 55-85. Print.
- Bettelheim, Bruno. *The Uses of Enchantment: The Meaning and Importance of Fairy Tales*. New York: Knopf, 1976. Print.
- Bilkan, Ali Fuat. *Masal Estetiği*. İstanbul: Timaş, 2009. Print.
- Blake, William. "The Tyger". *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*. Ed. M.H. Abrams. New York: Norton, 1993. 37-38. Print.
- Boratav, Pertev Naili. *Folklor ve Edebiyat II*. İstanbul: Adam, 1982. Print.
- . "Türk Masalına Giriş". *Masal Araştırmaları*. Ed. Nuri Taner. İstanbul: Art-San, 1988. 225-35. Print.
- . *100 Soruda Türk Halk Edebiyatı*. İstanbul: Gerçek, 1982. Print.
- Bourke, Vernon J., ed. *The Pocket Aquinas*. New York: Simon, 1960. Print.
- Buyurucu, Gürkan. "Erkekleştirebildiklerimizden misiniz?ya da Erkek M(illeti)". *Migration und Männlichkeiten*. Dec. 2005. Berlin. 59-66. Web. Oct. 2012.
- Cherkasova, Evgenia. "The Mystery and the Misery of Freedom; or 'Man is by Nature Evil'." *Proc. of First International Conference on Considering Evil and Human Wickedness*. Ed. Daniel E. Keen and Pamela Rossi Keen. Oxford: Inter-Disciplinary, 2004. 327- 337.

- Cigman, Gloria. "The Evil that Men Do". *Proc. of First International Conference on Considering Evil and Human Wickedness*. Ed. Daniel E. Keen and Pamela Rossi Keen. Oxford: Inter-Disciplinary, 2004. 1-6.
- Clodd, Edward. *Tom Tit Tot: An Essay on Savage Philosophy in Folk-Tale*. London: Duckworth, 1898. Print.
- Coeckelbergh, Mark. "Can We Choose Evil? A Discussion of the Problem of Radical Evil as a Modern and Ancient Problem of Freedom". *Proc. of First International Conference on Considering Evil and Human Wickedness*. Ed. Daniel E. Keen and Pamela Rossi Keen. Oxford: Inter-Disciplinary, 2004. 339- 353.
- Coleridge, Samuel Taylor. "The Rime of the Ancient Mariner". *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*. Ed. M.H. Abrams. New York: Norton, 1993. 330-46. Print.
- Crossley, Kevin. "Different But Oh How Like!". *Tales, Tellers and Texts*. Ed. Gabrielle Hodges, Mary Jane Drummond and Morag Styles. London: Continuum, 2000. 15-26. *Google Books*. Web. May 2010.
- Davies, Brian. *The Thought of Thomas Aquinas*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1992. Print.
- Dede Korkut Hikayeleri*. Ed. Orhan Şaik Gökyay. İstanbul: Kabalcı, 2006. Print.
- Demiray, M. Güner. "Türk Masalları Üzerine". *Masal Araştırmaları*. Ed. Nuri Taner. İstanbul: Art-San, 1988. 41-48. Print.
- Dilman, İlham. *The Self, the Soul and the Psychology of Good and Evil*. New York: Routledge, 2005. Print.
- Dorson, Richard. *The British Folklorists: A History*. Chicago: Chicago UP, 1968. Print.
- Dostoevsky, Fyodor. *The Brothers Karamazov*. Trans. Constance Garnett. New York: Barnes, 2004. Print.
- Eco, Umberto. *The Aesthetics of Thomas Aquinas*. Trans. Hugh Bredin. USA: Harvard College, 1988. Print.
- Efe, Ahmet. "Ninni ve Masalların Dünyasında Çocuk". *Hece Dergisi, Çocuk Edebiyatı Özel Sayısı*. 104-105 (Eylül 2005): 128-131.
- Evans, Dylan. *An Introductory Dictionary of Lacanian Psychoanalysis*. New York: Routledge, 1996. Print.
- Feinberg, John. *The Many Faces of Evil: Theological Systems and the Problems of Evil*. Illinois: Crossway, 2004. Print.

- Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality*. Trans. Robert Hurley. New York: Random, 1978. Print.
- . "The Subject and Power". *Critical Inquiry* 8. 4 (1982): 777-795. *JSTOR*. Web. 08 Apr. 2013.
- Franz, Marie-Louise von. *The Interpretation of Fairy Tales*. Boston: Shambhala, 1996. Print.
- Freud, Sigmund. *An Outline of Psycho-Analysis*. Trans. James Strachey. New York: Norton, 1970. Print.
- . *Beyond the Pleasure Principle*. Trans. James Strachey. New York: Norton, 1975. Print.
- . *The Interpretations of Dreams*. London: Wordsworth, 1997. Print.
- . "The Occurrence in Dreams of Material from Fairy Tales". *Writings on Art and Literature*. Ed. Werner Hamacher and David Wellbery. California: Stanford UP, 1997. 101-109. Print.
- . *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud- New Introductory Lectures on Psycho-Analysis and Other Works*. Vol. 22. Trans. James Strachey. London: Hogarth, 1986. Print.
- . "The Theme of the Three Caskets". *Writings on Art and Literature*. Ed. Werner Hamacher and David Wellbery. California: Stanford UP, 1997. 109-122. Print.
- Gamble, Nikki and Sally Yates. *Exploring Children's Literature*. 2nd ed. Los Angeles: Sage, 2008. Print.
- Garrard, Graeme. *Rousseau's Counter-Enlightenment: a Republican Critique of the Philosophies*. New York: Routledge, 2006. Print.
- Gazzali, İmam. *Esmâü'l Hüsnâ*. Trans. Yaman Arıkan. İstanbul: Elifbe Yayınları, 1983.
- Ghazali, İmam. *Ihya Ulum-id-din*. Trans. Fazl-ul-Karım. Vol. 1. Pakistan: Darul, 1993.
- Gounelas-Parkin, Ruth. *Literature and Psychoanalysis: Intertextual Readings*. New York: Palgrave, 2001. Print.
- Gourevitch, Victor. "The Religious Thought". *The Cambridge Companion to Rousseau*. Ed. Patrick Riley. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001. 193-219. Print.
- Güney, Eflatun Cem. "Folklor ve Eğitim". *I.Uluslararası Türk Folklor Semineri*

- Bildirileri*. Ankara : Başbakanlık Basımevi, 1974.19-26. Print.
- Gökşen, Enver Naci. *Çocuklar İçin Edebiyat: Fikir ve Sanat Eğitimi- Şiir, Masal, Temsil Üzerine İncelemeler*. İstanbul: Bakış Kütüphanesi, 1960. Print.
- Gökyay, Orhan Şaik. “Giriş”. *Dede Korkut Hikayeleri*. İstanbul: Kabalcı, 2006. 6-22. Print.
- Grimm, Jacob and Wilhelm. *Household Tales. Project Gutenberg*. Trans. Margaret Hunt. Mar. 2004. Web. June 2012.
- Grimm, Jacob and Wilhelm. *The Grimms’ Fairy Tales. Project Gutenberg*. Trans. Edgar Taylor and Marian Edwardes. Dec. 2008. Web. June 2012.
- Harris, James. *Analytic Philosophy of Religion*. Dordrecht: Klywer, 2002. Print.
- Harris, Marc Jason. *Folklore and Fantastic Nineteenth Century British Fiction*. Hampshire: Ashgate, 2008. Print.
- Hartland, Edwin Sidney. Introduction. *English Fairy and Folk Tales*. Canada: Dover, 2000. vii-xxiii. *Google Books*. Web. Feb. 2010.
- Hartley, John E. *The New International Commentary on the Old Testament- The Book of Job*. Michigan: Eerdmans, 1988. Print.
- Hasker, William. *The Triumph of God over Evil: Theodicy for a World of Suffering*. Downers Grove: Intervarsity, 1985. Print.
- Heimann, Paula. “A Contribution to the Re-evaluation of the Oedipus Complex- The Early Stages”. *New Directions in Psycho-Analysis: The Significance of Infant Conflict in the Pattern of Adult Behaviour*. Ed. Melanie Klein and Paula Heimann. New York: Basic Books, 1957. 23-39. Print.
- Hirvonen, Ari and Janne Porttikivi, eds. *Law and Evil: Philosophy, Politics, Psychoanalysis*. New York: Routledge, 2010. Print.
- Homer. *The Odyssey*. Trans. T. E. Shaw. Hertfordshire: Wordsworth, 1992. Print.
- Işık, Neşe. “Türk Masallarının Sembolik Açıdan Çözümlemesi”. Diss. Fırat U, 2009. Print.
- İvgin, Hayrettin. “Türk Masalları ve Kaynakları”. *Masal Araştırmaları*. Ed. Nuri Taner. İstanbul: Art-San, 1988. 57-62. Print.
- Jacobs, Joseph. *English Fairy Tales*. USA: Feather Trail Press, 2009. Print.
- “Jealousy”. *The Oxford English Dictionary: A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles*. Vol. 3. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1993. 503.

- Jones, Ernest. Introduction. *Contributions to Psycho-Analysis- 1921-1945*. London: Hogarth, 1968. 9-13. Print.
- Jones Swann, Steve. *The Fairy Tale: the Magic Mirror of the Imagination*. New York: Routledge, 2002. Print.
- Jung, C.G. "Answer to Job". *The Collected Works of C.G.Jung*. Vol. 11. Ed. Herbert Read Fordham. Trans. R.F.C. Hull. New Jersey: Princeton UP, 1977. 355-475. Print.
- Kalaycı, Mehmet. "Eşarîliğin Tarihsel Arka Planı: Küllabîlik". *Ankara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 51:2(2010), 399-431.
- Kant, Immanuel. *Religion within the Bounds of Bare Reason*. Trans. Werner S. Pluhar. Indianapolis: Hackett, 2009. Print.
- Kelly, Joseph Francis. *The Problem of Evil in the Western Tradition: From the Book of Job to Modern Genetics*. Minnesota: Liturgical, 2002. Print.
- Kempf, Constantine. "Theodicy". *The Catholic Encyclopaedia*. Vol. 14. New York: Appleton, 1912. Web. Nov. 2010. <<http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/14569a.htm>>.
- Kidd, Kenneth. "Psychoanalysis and Children's Literature: the Case for Complementarity". *Lion and Unicorn*. 28 (2004): 109-130. *Project MUSE*. Web. Feb. 2013.
- Kierkegaard, Søren. *The Essential Kierkegaard*. Ed. Howard V. Hong and Edna Hong. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2000. Print.
- Klein, Melanie. "A Contribution to the Psychogenesis of manic-depressive states". *Contributions to Psycho-Analysis- 1921-1945*. London: Hogarth, 1968. 282-310. Print.
- . "Criminal Tendencies in Normal Children (1927)". *Contributions to Psycho-Analysis- 1921-1945*. London: Hogarth, 1968. 185-202. Print.
- . "Early Stages of the Oedipus Conflict (1928)". *Contributions to Psycho-Analysis- 1921-1945*. London: Hogarth, 1968. 202-215. Print.
- . *Envy & Gratitude & Other Works 1946-1963*. New York: Delta, 1977. Print.
- . "Infantile Anxiety-Situations Reflected in a Work of Art and in the Creative Impulse (1929)". *Contributions to Psycho-Analysis- 1921-1945*. London: Hogarth, 1968.227-236. Print.
- . "Mourning and Its Relation to Manic-Depressive States (1940)". *Contributions to Psycho-Analysis- 1921-1945*. London: Hogarth, 1968.311-339. Print.

- . "On Criminality (1934)". *Contributions to Psycho-Analysis- 1921-1945*. London: Hogarth, 1968. 278- 282. Print.
- . "On Identification". *New Directions in Psycho-Analysis: The Significance of Infant Conflict in the Pattern of Adult Behaviour*. Ed. Melanie Klein and Paula Heimann. New York: Basic Books, 1957. 309-346. Print.
- . "The Development of a Child (1921)". *Contributions to Psycho-Analysis- 1921-1945*. London: Hogarth, 1968. 13-68. Print.
- . "The Early Development of Conscience in the Child (1933)." *Contributions to Psycho-Analysis- 1921-1945*. London: Hogarth, 1968.267-278. Print.
- . "The Importance of Symbol-Formation in the Development of the Ego (1930)." *Contributions to Psycho-Analysis- 1921-1945*. London: Hogarth, 1968. 236-251. Print.
- . *The Psychoanalysis of Children*. New York: Grove, 1960. Print.
- . "The Psycho-Analytic Play Technique: Its History and Significance". *New Directions in Psycho-Analysis: The Significance of Infant Conflict in the Pattern of Adult Behaviour*. Ed. Melanie Klein and Paula Heimann. New York: Basic Books, 1957. 3-23. Print.
- . "The Psychological Principles of Infant Analysis (1926)". *Contributions to Psycho-Analysis- 1921-1945*. London: Hogarth, 1968.140-152. Print.
- Lammens, H. Islam: *Beliefs and Institutions*. London: Frank, 1987. *Google Books*. Web. Sept. 2010.
- Lara, Maria Pia. Introduction. *Rethinking Evil- Contemporary Perspectives*. Ed. Maria Lara. Los Angeles: California UP, 2001. 1-17. Print.
- . "Narrating Evil: A Postmetaphysical Theory of Reflective Judgment". *Rethinking Evil- Contemporary Perspectives*. Ed. Maria Lara. Los Angeles: California UP, 2001. 239-251. Print.
- Leibniz, Gottfried. *Theodicy: Essays on the Goodness of God, the Freedom of Man and the Origin of Evil*. Illinois: Open Court, 1990. *Google Books*. Web. Sept. 2010.
- "Leibniz on the Problem of Evil". *Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy*. 4 Jan. 1998. Web. 27 Sept. 2010. <<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/leibniz-evil/>>.
- Mackie, J.L. "Evil and Omnipotence". *The Problem of Evil*. Ed. Marilyn Adams and Robert Adams. New York: Oxford UP, 1990. 25-38. Print.
- . "Ground Rules for Forming a Theodicy". *Exploring Christian Theology*. Ed. Ronnie Littlejohn. Boston: American UP, 1985. 215-229. *Google Books*. Web. May 2010.

- Maher, Michael. "Dualism." *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. Vol. 5. New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1909. Web. Nov. 2010
<<http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/05169a.htm>>.
- Marcus, Paul and Alan Rosenberg, eds. Introduction. *Psychoanalytic Versions of the Human Condition: Philosophies of Life and Their Impact on Practice*. New York: New York UP, 1998. 1-12.
- Mathewes, Charles. *Evil and the Augustinian Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001. Print.
- Mikics, David. *New Handbook of Literary Terms*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2007.
- Miller, Sara. "Evil and Fairy Tales: the Witch as Symbol of Evil in Fairy Tales". Diss. of California Inst., 1984. *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses*. Web. Mar. 2010.
- Mitchell, Juliet. "Introduction to Melanie Klein". *Reading Melanie Klein*. Ed. John Phillips and Lyndsey Stonebridge. New York: Routledge, 1998. 11-31. Print.
- Murata Sachiko and William C. Chittick. *The Vision of Islam*. London: Tauris, 2006.
- Myers, William Andrew, ed. Introduction. *Proc. of Second International Conference On The Range of Evil: Multidisciplinary Studies of Human Wickedness*. Oxford: Inter-Disciplinary, 2006. 1-5.
- Naseem, Hamid. *Muslim Philosophy Science and Mysticism*. New Delhi: Sarup, 2001.
- Neiman, Susan. *Evil in Modern Thought: An Alternative History of Philosophy*. New Jersey: Princeton UP, 2002. Print.
- . "What is the Problem of Evil". *Rethinking Evil- Contemporary Perspectives*. Ed. Maria Lara. Los Angeles: California UP, 2001. 27-46. Print.
- Ogden, Thomas. *The Primitive Edge of Experience*. New York: Rowman, 1989. Print.
- Olpak, Mustafa. "Biz Varız, Bizleri Fark Etmeniz İçin Çabalıyoruz: Söyleşi". *Yurtsuz*. May 2012. 18.15. Web. August 2012. <www.yurtsuz.net>.
- Oktürk, Şerif. *Anadolu Masalları*. İstanbul: Kastaş, 2002. Print.
- Özdemir, Metin. *İslam Düşüncesinde Kötülük Problemi*. İstanbul: Furkan Kitaplığı, 2001. Print.
- Özünel, Evrim. "Yazının İzinde Masal Haritalarını Okuma Denemesi: Masal Tarihine Yeniden Bakmak". *Milli Folklor Dergisi*. 23.91 (2011): 60-71. Print.

- Pattison, George. "Outrage and Rebellion". *Evil: A Reader*. Ed. Peter Astley. New York: Clark, 2003. 5-11. Print.
- Paulson, Ronald. *Sin and Evil: Moral Values in Literature*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2007. Print.
- Perrault, Charles. "Bluebeard". *The Classic Fairy Tales: Texts, Criticism*. Ed. Maria Tatar. New York: Norton, 1999. 144-148. Print.
- Peters, Ted. *Sin: Radical Evil in Soul and Society*. Michigan: Eerdmans, 1994.
- Peterson, Michael L. *God & Evil: An Introduction to the Issues*. Colorado: Westview, 1998. Print.
- . Ed. Introduction. *The Problem of Evil: Selected Readings*. Notre Dame: Notre Dame UP, 1992. Print. 1-25.
- Plantinga, Alvin. "God, Evil and the Metaphysics of Freedom". *The Problem of Evil*. Ed. Marilyn Adams and Robert Adams. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1990. 83-110. Print.
- Propp, Vladimir. *Morphology of the Folktale*. Ed. Louis Wagner and Alan Dundes. Trans. Laurence Scott. 2nd rev. ed. Austin: Texas UP, 1968. Print.
- Riviere, Joan. "The Unconscious Phantasy of an Inner World Reflected in Examples from Literature". *New Directions in Psycho-Analysis: The Significance of Infant Conflict in the Pattern of Adult Behaviour*. Ed. Melanie Klein and Paula Heimann. New York: Basic Books, 1957. 346-370. Print.
- Robbins, Susan. "Metaphysical Evil". *Proc. of First International Conference on Considering Evil and Human Wickedness*. Ed. Daniel E. Keen and Pamela Rossi Keen. Oxford: Inter-Disciplinary, 2004. 133-39.
- Rogozinski, Jacob. "It Makes Us Wrong: Kant and Radical Evil". *Radical Evil*. Ed. Joan Copjec. New York: Verso, 1996. 30-46.
- Rudwin, Maximillian. *The Devil in Legend & Literature*. New York: Open Court, 1959. Print.
- Sakaoğlu, Saim. *Masal Araştırmaları*. 3. Baskı. Ankara: Akçağ, 2007. Print.
- . "Türk Masal Tipleri Kataloğu Taslağı Üzerine". *Milli Folklor Dergisi*. 22.86 (2010): 43-49. Print.
- Salman, Umay Aktaş. "Afro-Türklerin Tarihi". *Radikal*. Aug. 2008. Web. Oct. 2012. <www.radikal.com.tr>.

- Sanides-Kohlrausch, Caludia. "The Lisbon Earthquake, 1755: A Discourse About 'the Nature' of Nature". *Is Nature Ever Evil?: Religion, Science and Value*. Ed. Willem Drees. London: Routledge, 2003. 106-119. *Google Books*. Web. May 2011.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. *Being and Nothingness: An Essay on Phenomenological Ontology*. Trans. Hazel E. Barnes. London: Routledge, 1989. Print.
- . "Existentialism is a Humanism." *Existentialism from Dostoevsky to Sartre*. Trans. Walter Kauffmann. New York: Meridian Books, 1989. 345-369. Print.
- Segal, Hanna. "A Psycho-Analytical Approach to Aesthetics". *New Directions in Psycho-Analysis: The Significance of Infant Conflict in the Pattern of Adult Behaviour*. Ed. Melanie Klein and Paula Heimann. New York: Basic Books, 1957. 384-406. Print.
- . *Introduction to the Work of Melanie Klein*. London: Hogarth, 1973. Print.
- . *Klein*. London: Karnac, 1989. Print.
- . *Psychoanalysis, Literature and War: Papers 1972-1995*. Ed. John Steiner. New York: Routledge, 1997.
- Shakespeare, William. *Othello. The Complete Works of William Shakespeare*. Kent: Wordsworth, 1996. 818-858. Print.
- Stein, Mary Beth. "Folklore & Fairy Tales". *The Oxford Companion to Fairy Tales*. Ed. Jack Zipes. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000. 165-170. Print.
- . "Schools of Folk-Narrative Research". *The Oxford Companion to Fairy Tales*. Ed. Jack Zipes. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000. 445-49. Print.
- Tatar, Maria, ed. Introduction. *The Classic Fairy Tales: Texts, Criticism*. New York: Norton, 1999. ix-xviii. Print.
- . *The Hard Facts of Fairy Tales*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1987. Print.
- Tezel, Naki. *Türk Masalları*. 4. Basım. İstanbul: Bilge Kültür Sanat, 2009. Print.
- The Holy Qur'an*. Trans. Abdullah Yusuf Ali. Elmhurst: Tahrike, 2000.
- Thompson, Stith. *The Folktale: A Märchen*. London: California UP, 1977. Print.
- Todorov, Tzeveton. "Structural Analysis of Narrative". *Novel* 3. 1 (1969): 70-76. *JSTOR*. Web. 01 Apr. 2013.
- Trilling, Lionel. "Freud and Literature". *The Liberal Imagination*. London: Martin Secker, 1951. 34-57. Print.

- Vetlesen, Arne Johan. *Evil and Human Agency*. New York: Cambridge UP, 2005. Print.
- Vlanov, Ann and Barry Vlanov. *Cinderella and Her Sisters: The Envied & The Envyng*. Philadelphia: Westminister, 1983. Print.
- Voltaire. "The Poem on the Lisbon Disaster". 13 Sept. 2008. Web. June 2009. <<http://ashutosh-ghildiyal.blogspot.com/2008/09/voltaires-poem-on-lisbon-disaster.html>>.
- Walker, Barbara. *The Art of Turkish Tale*. Vol. 1. Texas: Texas UP, 1993. Print.
- Warner, Marina, ed. Introduction. *Wonder Tales*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1994. 1-17. Print.
- Wootton, David. Introduction. *Voltaire: Candide and Related Texts*. Indianapolis: Hackett, 2000. viii-xlii.
- Yaran, Cafer Sadık. *Kötülük ve Theodise: Batı ve İslam Din Felsefesinde Kötülük Problemi ve Teistik Çözümler*. Konya: Vadi, 1997. Print.
- Yardımcı, Metin. *Yaşayan Malatya Masalları- Metinler ve İncelemeler*. Malatya: İnönü Üniversitesi, 1996. Print.
- Yasa, Metin. *Tanrı ve Kötülük*. Ankara: Elis, 2003. Print.
- Yavuz, Hilmi. *İslamın Zihin Tarihi: Bir Müslüman Aydının İslam Üzerine Düşünceleri*. İstanbul: Timaş, 2009. Print.
- Yearsley, Macleod. *The Folklore of Fairy Tale*. London: Watt's, 1924.
- Zimbardo, Philip. *The Lucifer Effect: Understanding How Good People Turn Evil*. New York: Random, 2007. Print.
- Ziolkowski, Jan. *Fairy Tales from Before Fairy Tales: the Medieval Latin Past of Wonderful Lies*. Michigan: Michigan UP, 2007. Print.
- Zipes, Jack. *Breaking the Magic Spell: Radical Theories of Folk and Fairy Tales*. London: Heinemann, 1979. Print.
- . *Fairy Tales and the Art of Subversion. The Classical Genre for Children and the Process of Civilization*. London: Heinemann, 1983. Print.
- , ed. Introduction. *The Oxford Companion to Fairy Tales*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000. xv-xxxii. Print.
- , ed. Introduction. *Victorian Fairy Tales: the Revolt of the Fairies and Elves*. New York: Methuen, 1987. xi-xxix. Print.

---. *When Dreams Come True: Classical Fairy Tales and Their Tradition*. New York: Routledge, 1999. Print.

---. *Why Fairy Tales Stick: The Evolution and Relevance of a Genre*. New York: Routledge, 2006. Print.

APPENDIX A

SUMMARIES OF THE TURKISH FAIRY/FOLK TALES DISCUSSED IN THE THESIS

“Peri Kızı” (Number 2)

A rich handsome boy meets an old woman who spills some milk outside. Upon being asked, the woman answers that it is the dirt of her daughter. The boy thinks she must be very beautiful since even her dirt is milk. Thus, he wants to marry her. The old woman does not know what to do as she has lied to the boy. In reality, she has no daughter. Therefore, the woman makes a girl out of dough, and dresses her like a bride. She covers the face and head of the dough girl. While the boy is taking the girl to his palace in his carriage, the old woman pushes the dough girl into a river. There happen to be three fairies deep inside the river. One of them sees the people searching for the girl and comes to the surface, since she is curious about the human world. The old woman tells the boy that this fairy is her daughter. The boy and the fairy get married, but the fairy girl does not talk to anyone. The boy locks the girl into a room. When he is away from home, his eldest sister peeps into the room and she sees the girl practising magic to have food and to warm herself. The sister gets incredibly jealous: she tries to do the same magic but she burns herself. The same thing happens to the second sister-in-law. Both sisters die because of their envy. The boy, one day, watches the fairy girl and learns a way to make her speak. When she speaks she tells him everything about herself- that she is a fairy- and they are united, becoming happy forever. Thus, the sisters’ jealousy cost their lives.

“Kismetimi Arıyorum” (Number 3)

The tale starts with a will motif. A Padishah announces his will to his three sons. The eldest son ascends to the throne after the death of his father. However, the vizier beheads the eldest son. Then the second son becomes the Padishah, who is also

killed by the vizier. Finally, the vizier usurps the throne and becomes the Padishah. While this is happening, the youngest son, Acar, is on a quest. He decides to return to his kingdom as he has heard the bad news. He encounters a series of adventures on his way. He meets two men, Alev and Ateş, both of whom get married and have to leave the boy alone. Both of them give him magical objects in case of danger. On his way, Acar meets a girl in distress. The boy saves the girl's village from a brutal master and he marries the girl. Acar and his wife return to his kingdom. As a punishment he banishes the vizier, and is reconciled with his people.

“Peynir Tulumu” (Number 4)

A boy in the form of a cheese case goes to an old woman's house and gives her a silver coin, telling her to arrange a marriage with the Padishah's eldest daughter. The woman goes to the palace and tells the Padishah what she has been told. The Padishah requires ten jars of silver coins, which are later provided by the cheese case, and the case marries the eldest daughter. Upon seeing a fat cheese case, the girl kicks it and turns back to her father's house. Then, the cheese case asks the old woman to arrange a marriage with the second daughter. This time, the Padishah wants twenty jars of pearls, which are also provided by the case. The second girl reacts in the same manner as her elder sister. Finally, the cheese case asks the old woman to arrange a marriage with the third one. The Padishah asks the cheese case to give forty jars of gold as she is the most beautiful of the sisters. The case hands over the jars and they get married. The young woman thinks that the cheese case is a lovely fat creature. Upon her reaction, the case transforms into a handsome young man. There is a warning motif in the tale, that is, the boy warns the young woman not to tell anything about his transformation to her sisters. Besides, there is a test of loyalty according to which the boy asks the woman not to reveal his identity to her sisters the next day when he is walking in the garden of the palace. The next day, the sisters mock their little sister about her husband. Then they see a handsome man in the garden, and each of them says she would like to have the man for herself. The youngest girl gets furious and reveals that he is her husband. The sisters get angry and insult her, leaving her alone. However, as she has not listened to her husband, she loses him. The tale has a quest motif in that the girl goes on a quest, encountering

different characters on her way. She finds the young man who turns out to be the son of a giantess. The giantess allows him to leave with the young woman and they are reunited.

“Avcioğlu” (Number 7)

There is an orphan who lives with his mother. One day, he learns that his father was a hunter and he asks his mother to have his father’s gun. Upon not being given what he wants, he imprisons his mother in a coop, which has no crack or window for fresh air, and leaves her. She is almost suffocated and starts to itch due to fleas. After his mother tells him where the gun is, he releases the woman and decides to leave the house in order to seek his fortune. On his way, he accidentally kills a bear and his mother praises him everywhere. Then the boy is tested by the Padishah. First, he requires the boy to kill thirty-nine bears, which he does. Second, he is ordered to bring him the daughter of a certain Padishah. The boy befriends two men with magical powers. Then, one day, he and his friends are invited by another Padishah to the court, and he orders them to complete certain tasks before letting his daughter go with them. Upon carrying out all the trials, the second Padishah is afraid of their power and cunning, so he wants to burn them. The three men escape from the Padishah’s trap. The Padishah yields to his fate and lets his daughter go with them. The hunter’s son marries the Princess and has a wedding for forty days and nights.

“Etme Bulma” (Number 9)

Ayşe is a poor orphan, trying to survive alone. The tale is full of incidents in which Ayşe performs all kinds of evil. She tricks everyone to get rich. The narrator depicts her as a cruel hypocrite who pretends to be saddened by the financial loss of her neighbours but laughs behind their backs. Upon hearing that the Padishah’s wife has died, Ayşe pretends to be the sister-in-law of the Padishah and manages to get into court. She marries him in the end. Then, one day she compliments her mother-in-law and asks her to kiss. However, when the old woman reaches her tongue out, Ayşe bits and causes her death. The Padishah learns of her deeds when she talks to a mirror. She is punished by death, being dragged by forty asses.

“Bir Göze Bir Gül” (Number 10)

A step-mother with the help of her daughter tortures her innocent and beautiful step-daughter. When a Padishah sees the step-daughter, he wants to marry the beautiful girl. On their way to the palace, the step-mother gives food to her daughter and her step-daughter, but the food she gives to her step-daughter is salty in order to make her suffer from thirst. The step-mother plucks out the eyes of her step-daughter in exchange for some water, and she takes the eyes. Then, on their way, they leave the step-daughter alone in the forest. The cunning step-mother plots against the Padishah, and she makes her own daughter masquerade as the innocent one. The Padishah thinks that the bride is the woman he has seen before and marries her. Meanwhile, an old man finds the step-daughter in the forest and takes her to his home, and they start to live together. One day, the old man goes to the court in order to sell some roses in return for eyes. Upon hearing this, the step-mother gives the step-daughter’s eyes and buys the roses. Soon the truth comes out, and the Padishah learns everything. The punishment for this wickedness is torture in return. The step-mother is asked to choose their punishment, with a traditional question in Anatolian tales; “forty asses or forty axes”. The step-mother and the step-sister prefer forty asses, which drag them over the hills and rocks.

“Altın Bülbül” (Number 11)

A Padishah asks his three sons to bring a golden nightingale, which lives beyond Mount Kaf⁹⁶. The three brothers go on a quest in iron clothes and iron shoes. While riding, they arrive at an intersection, where the road divides into three. While the elders choose the smooth roads, the youngest decides to go through the muddy one. The elder brothers meet again in a town and waste all their money. Meanwhile, the youngest brother meets an old man who gives the young man some advice in order to find the golden bird. Then, the young man comes across a giant on his way and kills him cruelly. After this incident, the young man meets a beautiful girl on his way and takes the girl for his eldest brother. The tale repeats itself, in that, the boy meets another giant and kills him in a brutal way, meets another girl and takes her for

⁹⁶ A mythical mountain, which is used to symbolise a remote and an inaccessible place.

his second brother. The boy later meets a giantess, who helps him to find the bird in a palace. He steals the bird from a fairy's room and leaves for his father's palace. Excelling all tasks, he turns back and on his way, he meets his brothers. He introduces them to their wives and then gives them the news about the golden bird. They get envious and fear that they will lose importance in their father's eyes. They plan to kill their brother, but they are afraid that their fiancées may reveal the murder. So, to conceal the murder, they ask their brother to get into a well as they have got thirsty. While climbing down, the elder brothers loosen the rope and the brother is left alone in the dark well. The brothers deceive not only their little brother but also their father, saying that they have brought the golden nightingale. Meanwhile, the young man is saved by a villager. There is a disguise motif- the man buys a sheep, guts it, and wears it on his head, becoming "Keloğlan". After revealing his brothers' lies, he reveals his real identity to his father and is reconciled with him. His father leaves the throne to his youngest son and banishes his elder sons from the kingdom.

"Yeşil Kuş" (Number 12)

A rich man marries the Padishah's daughter. On the wedding night, he presents two plates of grapes to the young woman; one is black and the other is white. He asks the woman to choose one of the plates, and in response to this, the woman prefers the black one. This unexpected answer provokes the husband's rage and envy. He interprets the woman's choice as choosing the Arab, the servant, as her lover. He gets incredibly furious and starts to beat the woman. Indeed, he beats her until she gets sick. An old woman visits the young woman and witnesses her suffering. When the old woman tells her son the poor woman's story, he suggests that she should send her husband on a quest to find the green bird's master. The woman listens to the advice and asks her husband to find the green bird's master. The cruel husband gets curious and sets off to find the master. After a series of adventure, he meets the master and sees that he has many green birds. The master tells him that everyone in the world may have problems and shares his own tragedy with the husband. The man gives a flower to the husband to take it to his wife. The husband returns to his home and gives the flower to his wife. Yet, the moment the young woman puts the flower in her hair, she transforms into a green bird and flies

away. The husband thinks it is useless to go to the land of the green birds, so he yields to his fate and lives alone.

“Ağlayan Nar ile Gülen Ayva” (Number 15)

A Padishah threatens to behead his wife if she does not bear a son. However, the wife gives birth to a girl, which leads her to desperation and misery. A midwife offers a solution to the lady. They masquerade the little girl as a boy. Nevertheless, the child reaches the age of circumcision; thus, she has to escape so as to avoid a possible catastrophe. The girl goes on a quest and experiences a series of adventures. In disguise of a boy, the girl starts to work at another Padishah’s palace. Then, upon the request of the Padishah, she goes to the land of the giants in order to find a magical mirror. There is again a transformation motif- with the magical words of a giant, the girl turns into a real boy. The boy returns to his kingdom, having married a princess of a foreign country. The Padishah gets happy to be reunited with his son and the Padishah’s wife gets happy to see that her daughter has turned into a real boy.

“Altmış Akıllı Yetmiş Fikirli” (Number 16)

A mother deceives a man of a high status about the intelligence of her daughter, who has not been able to get married. The man wants to get married to the girl, thinking she is very clever. The mother decides to marry her daughter to the man without hesitation. After the wedding, the man prepares a test of loyalty for the girl and orders her not to open the door of the fortieth room. The tale is similar to the Perrault’s *Bluebeard*; however, the girl in the Anatolian tale passes the test of loyalty by not ignoring the command of her husband, thereby proving her obedience to him, which satisfies her husband at the end.

“İhtiyar Kuş” (Number 17)

The tale starts with a dying man, who warns his three sons against Köses. After the death of their father, the boys go on a quest. At night, getting tired, two of them fall asleep but the youngest stays awake. He goes for a stroll and meets

cannibal giants. They threaten to kill the boy if he does not complete certain tasks. However, he fulfils all of the ordeals and kills the giants. All of the brothers marry wealthy ladies. When they return to their kingdom, they meet a Köse on their way and he tries to trick them. Whereas the elder brothers do not listen to him, the youngest one forgets his father's warning. Thus, the Köse kidnaps his wife. On his way to find his wife, the young man comes across an old bird, which warns him against possible dangers. The young man ignores this warning as well. When he finds the Köse's house, he sees that the Köse is in his seven days sleep. Thus, the young man takes his wife back while the Köse is sleeping. Nevertheless, after getting up, the Köse finds the young man, kills him and kidnaps the woman again. There is the motif of resurrection- the young man is resurrected from his bones and rescues his wife while the Köse is having his fifteen days sleep. However, after waking up, the Köse kills the man again. The tale repeats itself for the third time and the young man is again reborn from his bones and this time with the help of the old bird. He saves his wife and they escape from the Köse. The Köse tries to catch the man and his wife, but the horse throws the Köse down from its back, and then he falls down a cliff and dies.

“Seksen Göz” (Number 20)

There is an atrocious Padishah, who likes doing evil, plucks out the eyes of women who do not bear him a son. Then he puts these eyes into a jar and imprisons the women. Afterwards, he marries again. Besides this, he laughs at the suffering of his victims, which demonstrates his sadistic pleasure. The Padishah marries many times, doing the same to each wife. He marries for the fortieth time and finally, his wife gives birth to a son. Nevertheless, one day, the Padishah falls in love with a fairy he sees in the mirror. For the sake of this supernatural creature he plucks out the eyes of his fortieth wife and imprisons her. The fairy requests the Padishah to send his son, Uğur, on long quests as she feels threatened by the presence of the prince. The prince has three dangerous ordeals given to him by his father. In each of them, he stands on the edge of death. With the help of magic and supernatural creatures, the son turns back to his kingdom. He saves his mother and the previous wives. He finds a way to kill the fairy. As a punishment, the father is banished from the court.

“Güneş Kızı” (Number 25)

The tale starts with three sisters who talk about their expectations about their future husbands. The two elder sisters wish to have rich men, while the youngest, the modest one, wishes to have children with teeth as white as pearls and hair as soft as silk. A rich man hears this and decides to marry the youngest girl. The young woman asks to have her sisters live with them in their mansion, since they are poor. Later, she gives birth to twins, a boy and a girl, who have teeth like pearls and hair like silk. However, the sisters are jealous of her happiness and pay the midwife and order her to get rid of the children. The midwife gives two puppies to the man, saying his wife has given birth to these two puppies. The man gets furious and punishes the poor woman. She is half buried in an open public place where everyone spits at her. The children are found by an old shepherd and raised by him and his wife. Coincidentally, one day, the boy learns that they are not the real children of this couple. They go on their first quest to find their own parents. They find a hut and start a new life. The boy goes hunting and meets his real father by chance. The man, having married one of the sister-in-laws, talks about the beauty of the boy at home. The sisters realise that he is the real son and they start making their evil plans. They find an old woman to get rid of the child again. The old woman finds the girl and convinces her to ask her brother to undertake the hardest tasks, such as bringing leaves from Mount Kaf. The boy completes the first task, and his second task is to bring the daughter of the Sun, which he completes with the help of a giantess. When the aunts learn that the child is still alive, they decide to poison him at a banquet. The daughter of the Sun, having super-human powers, foresees what will happen and warns the boy about it. The boy reveals the truth at the banquet and is reconciled to his father. The father and the son rescue the children’s mother. The sisters are punished with death by forty asses.

“Altın Araba” (Number 27)

A Padishah threatens to behead his subordinates if they do not do whatever he wants. As an ordeal, the Padishah gives a puzzle to his vizier. If he cannot solve it, he will be beheaded. While thinking about a way to solve the puzzle, the vizier meets a

farmer who has a clever daughter. Realising that the girl can solve the puzzle, the vizier asks her the question. The clever little girl solves the puzzle and saves the vizier. Then, the Padishah gives a puzzle to the girl, who solves it easily again. The girl is rewarded by the Padishah.

“Mor Menekşe” (Number 30)

There is a pitiless Padishah in one of the countries. He likes giving orders to his subjects, and one day he commands everyone to turn off their lights. However, he sees that there is a light in the house of three poor girls. He secretly listens to the girls outside and hears that the youngest girl says: “If a Padishah marries me, I will make him wash my hands and then make him drink that water” (Tezel 336). Upon hearing this, the Padishah gets furious and the next day, he marries two of them to men of the lower class and orders the last one to be beheaded. Like in the “Snow-white” tale, the executioner pities the girl and leaves her in the wood. The girl meets an old man, who brings her up. The girl grows up to have her revenge on the Padishah. She goes to the court and makes the Padishah fall in love with her. The young woman and the Padishah marry, and at the end, the woman makes him wash her hands and drink the water.

“Sihirli Tavşan” (Number 31)

A king has three sons and a daughter, but one day, the girl is lost and nobody can find her. There is a valuable apple tree in the garden and someone mysteriously steals apples from the tree. The brothers decide to take turns at keeping guard in the garden. On the first night, the eldest brother keeps guard; however, he falls asleep. The same thing happens to the second brother and on the third night the youngest keeps guard of the tree. The boy cuts his finger so as not to sleep due to its pain. At midnight he sees a bird taking an apple from the tree. The boy is able to get only its feather. Then, the three brothers go on a quest. The eldest son travels long distances and meets a magic rabbit, which warns him about possible dangers. Nevertheless, the boy forgets the warnings and spends all his money. The same things happen to the second brother. Finally, the youngest brother goes on the quest and does whatever the

rabbit says. Obeying all instructions, he steals the golden bird; nonetheless, he is caught by the Padishah of the birds and released only on condition of bringing him a golden girl. With the instructions of the magic rabbit, the young man finds the golden girl and kidnaps her. Nevertheless, he is again caught and released only on condition of bringing a golden horse to the Padishah of the girls. With the help of the magic rabbit, the young man finds the golden horse and steals it. He takes the horse to the Padishah of the girls, who gives him not only the golden girl but also the golden horse because of his bravery. Then, he takes the golden girl to the Padishah of the birds, who also gives him not only the golden bird but also the girl as a reward. While going back to his kingdom, the young man meets his brothers on his way. The brothers leave him alone in a well and escape with the golden possessions. This time the rabbit rescues the young man, and he returns to his kingdom. Apart from the reunion of the youngest brother with his father, there is another reunion with a transformation- the rabbit turns into the little sister. The elder brothers are banished from court as punishment.

“Konusan Kaval” (Number 32)

A Padishah, who has two daughters, loses his wife and remarries. His new wife treats the girls as if they were her real daughters. Soon the new queen gives birth to a beautiful daughter named “Dal⁹⁷”. The sisters get extremely jealous of her striking beauty. Though the parents treat the girls equally, the elder sisters are not pleased with anything. Their father travels to India and brings golden bracelets and cloth to the elder girls and a silver bowl to the youngest on their request. Although the elder sisters have the more valuable presents, they still want to possess the youngest sister’s gift. They wish the bowl to be lost. One day, Dal drops the bowl into the lake and is drowned while trying to get it. The elder sisters do not rescue her although they see her in the lake. The transformation motif is found here, when Dal turns into a branch of a tree. A shepherd makes a flute out of the branch. The flute sings her story and reveals the truth about her identity. The father realises that the sisters did not rescue Dal and caused her death. There is a second transformation; the flute turns into Dal again and she is reconciled with her parents. The sisters are

⁹⁷ Branch

punished cruelly- their father throws the flute at their faces and they instantly become ugly. The narrator states that they get so ugly that they have to leave the palace.

“Limon Kız” (Number 33)

A Padishah’s son has heard of a girl named Limon. He goes on a quest to find her. The son finds the beautiful girl after a long series of actions. The boy first wants to go to the palace to bring some nice clothes to the girl, and inform his parents about the girl. Before leaving, the girl warns him against kisses on his forehead by his parents, which will make him forget the girl. Nevertheless, the prince forgets the warning, and upon being kissed by his parents, he forgets the girl. While the girl is waiting for him, an ugly Arab servant sees her. Pretending to be her friend, the servant learns the secret of the girl’s beauty; that is, the golden comb in her hair. The servant asks to comb the girl’s hair. The Arab puts the comb in the wrong place on purpose and the girl is transformed into a bird. The Arab masquerades as Limon Kız and goes to the prince. She deceives the prince and marries him. Upon finding the bird in the garden of the palace, the Arab orders it to be killed. There is a second transformation- the bird turns into a tree. This time, the Arab orders a throne from this tree. The remains of the tree are given to an old woman and she sees that the remains of the tree turn into a beautiful girl- into Limon Kız. At the end, Limon Kız finds a way to reveal herself to the prince. The Arab is punished with the forty asses death sentence.

“Şamdan Kız” (Number 36)

The protagonist is a girl who is hidden in a candlestick. The prince buys the candlestick from an antique shop. One night the girl shows herself to the prince and he decides to protect the girl in his room. However, the prince leaves the palace for a battle. The vizier’s daughter, who is in love with the prince, has suspicions of the candlestick. She and her mother decide to burn the candlestick while the prince is away. When they are about to burn the candle stick, the girl gets out of it. The vizier’s daughter gets envious of her beauty and banishes the girl from the court. The prince returns and he realises what has happened. He decides to test all the girls in

the town so as to reveal the candlestick girl. The test requires every girl to make soup for the prince. It is revealed that the vizier's daughter cannot cook, but the candlestick girl makes the best soup. The girl puts a ring, which the prince has given to her, into the soup; thus, the prince understands who she is. The vizier and his family leave the town. The prince marries the candlestick girl.

“Tuz” (Number 37)

A Padishah asks how much his sons love him. Whereas the first two sons express their love with valuable materials (like diamonds), the youngest son answers that he loves his father as much as salt. Similar to King Lear, the Padishah gets crazed with anger, and orders him to be beheaded. However, the executioner pities the prince and releases him, making the prince's shirt bloody with a rabbit's blood. The prince goes on a quest and reaches a country where there is no Padishah. The townsmen fly a bird to select the Padishah. The bird flies three times over the prince and eventually he becomes the new Padishah. Later, the new Padishah gives a banquet for other kings and invites his father as well. However, the young man does not put any salt into his father's meal. Upon being asked why there is no salt by his father, the young man answers they may not like salty food. The father explains that there can be no life without salt and then realises his previous mistake. There is reconciliation at the end, and apparently there is no punishment for the father.

“Gururlu Kız” (Number 39)

The protagonist is a young and poor girl, living with her mother. The girl is very beautiful but she is very arrogant. One day, she goes to the Turkish Bath and meets an Arab woman, who is the wife of a vizier. The woman invites her to her mansion. The girl gets jealous of the wealth and the luxurious life style the Arab woman has. The Arab tells the girl her fortune and says she sees an old ugly man for her, which she interprets as the girl's arrogance and advises her to be modest like her.

“Doğruluk” (Number 42)

A mother asks her three sons to go on a quest and work for their livelihoods. The boys, with a pack of food, travel long distances and decide to eat from each other's packs. They start to eat from the food of the youngest and refuse to give him any food later. However, they leave him alone, when he is picking apples. The boy travels alone and happens to find a giants' palace. He hides and learns some secrets from the giants. When he goes out, he applies all the tricks he has learnt inside. Through these tricks, he gets rich and also marries an Indian princess. One day, he meets his brothers and tells them what has happened. They get extremely envious and decide to do the same things. They hide in the giants' palace and learn the tricks. But the giants discover the brothers, who have fainted from fear. They throw the brothers out of the palace. The brothers realise their mistake and thank God for their safety.

“Keloğlan Yemen'de” (Number 44)

Keloğlan hunts a gazelle which the vizier wants for himself. Keloğlan refuses to give the gazelle to the vizier and gives it to the Padishah instead. The Padishah gives presents to him, which reinforces the vizier's wrath. The angry vizier provokes the Padishah to order Keloğlan to build a palace of ivory and tell him that if he cannot fulfil this task, he will be beheaded. Keloğlan's mother advises him to find an elephant and with the help of the animal Keloğlan fulfils the duty. As a second ordeal, the vizier orders him to bring the daughter of the King of Yemen. Again with his mother's suggestion and the help of a fish, he completes the mission. He kidnaps the girl while pretending to show her his ship. When the Padishah learns what the vizier has done to Keloğlan, he banishes him, and Keloğlan becomes the new vizier. At the end, Keloğlan marries princess he has kidnapped and becomes wealthy with the reward of the Padishah.

“Kelođlan’in Ali Cengiz Oyunu” (Number 45)

Kelođlan wants to get married and tells his mother to go to the court and ask the Padishah for the hand of his daughter in marriage. The Padishah tells the mother that he can marry his daughter on the condition that Kelođlan learns the tricks of Ali Cengiz, who is the master of all tricks. Ali Cengiz is also famous for teaching his tricks to young men and then killing them if they say they have learnt all his tricks. Kelođlan goes on a quest in order to find Ali Cengiz. When Kelođlan finds him, he becomes his student for forty days. On the last day, when Ali Cengiz asks Kelođlan whether he has learnt all his tricks, he answers he could not. Upon his answer, Ali Cengiz releases Kelođlan, but soon he realises that Kelođlan lied to him. They get into a harsh struggle with several transformations. First, Kelođlan turns into a sparrow and flies away, and Ali Cengiz turns into an eagle and flies after him. Then, Kelođlan turns into a bunch of roses and Ali Cengiz turns into a beggar. While the beggar is about to take the roses, Kelođlan transforms into some corns and Ali Cengiz transforms into a chick to eat the corns. In the last minute, Kelođlan turns into a fox and eats the chick, completely defeating his master. When the Padishah learns that Kelođlan has learnt Ali Cengiz’s tricks, he marries his daughter to him.

“Oduncu Kelođlan” (Number 46)

One day, Kelođlan, while cutting some wood, saves a cub and its father gives Kelođlan a magic box as a present. When Kelođlan tells the box to open, many men come out of the box and do all the tasks for Kelođlan. Day by day, Kelođlan and his mother get wealthy and live in a big palace. One day, an old woman visits them and steals the magic box, which has made him rich. Kelođlan’s dog and cat find the box and bring it back to him at the end.

“Kelođlan Ölüyü Diriltiyor” (Number 49)

One day, Kelođlan wants to sell his ass for money, yet some cunning men attempt to deceive him. They secretly cut off the ass’s tail to decrease the price. Soon Kelođlan understands their trick and decides to take revenge on them. He goes to the

open market and shouts out that his ass eats barley and defecates silver. The cunning men all wish to have the ass and they give the most money. On the next day Kelođlan is expecting the men to come back to fight with him when they cannot see any silver. He gets ready for the meeting and plans another trick. He tells them that he has a magical rabbit which understands all his commands. This time the men want to buy the rabbit and give 200 liras. Kelođlan gets ready for their third encounter. This time, he includes his wife in his cunning plan and puts a mow, which he has filled with sheep's blood, under his wife's dress. He pretends to kill his wife after a heated discussion in front of the men, who have come back to take their revenge. Then Kelođlan pretends to resurrect his wife with his flute. The men give lots of money for the flute, and one of them does the same thing as Kelođlan, killing his own wife and trying to resurrect her. However, when he sees that she does not get up, the cheated men go to Kelođlan and put him in a sack. They plan to throw the sack into the river, but they fall asleep when resting after a long walk. While they are sleeping, Kelođlan sneaks out and deceives an innocent shepherd, who gets into the sack instead of Kelođlan. The men throw the sack into the river, causing the death of the innocent shepherd. When they see Kelođlan on the other side of the river, with a flock of sheep, they are frightened. Kelođlan says: "If you had thrown me deeper into the river, I would have come to the surface with more sheep". Upon this, the men get into the river to have a flock of sheep and they die. The tale ends with the victory of Kelođlan's wit, nonetheless, with the death of two naïve men and an innocent shepherd. Besides, apart from a woman, who is killed by her husband, their children are left orphans due to Kelođlan.

"Dev ile Kelođlan" (Number 51)

A Padishah's messenger announces that he will give money to anyone bringing him a giant's horse. Kelođlan, who is a little boy, volunteers to do this. He steals the horse and brings it to the Padishah. The Padishah then requires him to bring the giant's bedcover, offering more money. After Kelođlan has succeeded this task he is given the third and the last task- to kill the giant. Kelođlan tricks the giant, bringing him a huge cage in which there are four dead men for the giant to eat. The moment the giant gets into the cage, Kelođlan locks the door. When the giant wants

to get out, Kelođlan makes him step on hot iron, which he has put there before. The giant dies after he has stepped on hot iron and been smashed under a millstone. The tale ends with the happiness of Kelođlan, who has got rich, but the death of an innocent giant.

“*Hamamcı* ile Kelođlan” (Number 54)

One day, Kelođlan sells his hen to a *hamamcı*; however, the man does not pay for it, so Kelođlan seeks revenge. First, he takes the hen back, and then he masquerades as a woman and seduces the *hamamcı*. When the disguised Kelođlan and the man go to the *hamamcı*'s home, he pushes the *hamamcı* down the stairs, and steals all his gold and silver. Next, Kelođlan disguises himself as a doctor and beats the *hamamcı* terribly. Once the *hamamcı* realises that these are Kelođlan's tricks, he asks the Padishah to punish him. The Padishah puts Kelođlan into the prison; nevertheless, Kelođlan finds a way to get out, and masquerades as the angel of death and frightens the Padishah. He commands the Padishah to release Kelođlan and also to give him some gold and his daughter to marry. The Padishah does everything and the tale ends with the victory of Kelođlan, and the complete defeat of the *hamamcı*, who is presented as the antagonist of the tale.

APPENDIX B

**SUMMARIES OF THE BRITISH FAIRY/FOLK TALES DISCUSSED
IN THE THESIS**

“Tom Tit Tot” (Number 1)

A woman lies to a man, saying that her daughter is able to spin five skeins a day. Upon learning that she is skilful, the man wants to marry the woman’s daughter. The man tells the young woman that she will have to spin five skeins a day in the last month of the year and if she fails, the young woman will be beheaded. They get married but when it is the last month of the year, the husband locks his wife into a room for the task. A little black supernatural creature appears in the room and tells her that he will help her on one condition. It plays a name-guessing game. The thing requires the girl to have three guesses every night. If she cannot guess its name before the month ends, it will take her for itself. The girl learns its name by chance when her husband says that he saw a little creature in the forest and it was singing that its name was “Tom Tit Tot”. The woman tells the creature its name at night and is saved from both the supernatural being and her possible murder by her husband.

“The Rose-Tree” (Number 3)

A man has two children, a girl from his deceased wife and a boy from his second wife. The step-mother hates her step-daughter, who is far more beautiful than her. She assigns duties to the girl and when she fails, the step-mother gets angry. The step-mother pretends not to care and approaches the girl with a show of false affection. She tells her to come and put her head on her knee. The woman cuts off the girl’s head, while combing her hair. Then she takes the girl’s heart and liver out and stews them. She makes her husband eat them for dinner. The step-daughter’s half-brother mourns over her death as he loves her, and buries her bones under a rose-tree. One day the rose-tree flowers, and a white bird starts to sing among the flowers. The bird sings the girl’s sad story. In return for her wickedness, the step-mother is

punished by a cruel death, being killed by a millstone on her head. The brother and the father are awarded with presents brought by the bird.

“Nix Nought Nothing” (Number 7)

A giant helps a King to cross a river. The giant tells the King that he should give Nix Nought Nothing in return, which the King accepts. When the King arrives in his kingdom, he learns that his wife named their son Nix Nought Nothing. The King feels frightened that the giant will come and take his son away. Thus, he thinks of a way to be saved from the giant and he gives the giant the hen-wife’s son instead. The revelation of the trick drives the giant mad and he dashes out the boy’s brains. When the giant comes back again, the King this time gives the gardener’s son. When the giant realises he is deceived again, he turns back to the palace and gets the real prince. The prince escapes with the help of the giant’s daughter. On his way, the prince meets the hen-wife, who casts a spell on him and kills him. The prince is awakened from his sleep of death by the gardener’s daughter, who has learnt unspelling from the hen-wife. At the end, the hen-wife is put to death as a punishment and the prince marries the giant’s daughter.

“Jack Hannaford” (Number 8)

There is a trickster called Jack Hannaford. One day, he meets a farmer’s wife, who is described as a foolish widow, having got married for the second time, to a farmer. Jack knocks at her door and the woman asks where he comes from. Jack responds he comes from Paradise. The woman, remembering her deceased husband, asks him whether he knows her husband. Jack responds he does and says that the man is in need of money. The woman, foolish enough, gives the only money they have to Jack. When the farmer comes home and learns what the woman has done, he rides after Jack. Jack, realizing that the farmer is following him, lies down on the ground and tells the farmer that he is watching a man going up to the sky. The farmer lies on the ground to see the man as well and Jack gets on his horse and rides away.

“Binnorie” (Number 9)

Two sisters fall in love with the same man, called Sir William. First, Sir William dates with the eldest sister, but later he starts to date with Binnorie, the youngest sister. The elder sister gets jealous and one day pushes her sister into a river, where she drowns. A famous harper finds her body and makes a harp out of her bones and her hair. The harp sings the tragic story of Binnorie at court and reveals the murderer.

“Cap O’Rushes” (Number 11)

A rich man asks how much his three daughters love him, and one by one they answer his question. However, he does not like the youngest daughter’s answer since she says, “I love you as fresh meat loves salt” (Jacobs 52). Maddened by the answer, the father drives her out of the house. The girl makes herself a coat of rushes, hiding her beautiful clothes. She arrives at a mansion where she starts to work as a maid and they call her “Cap O’Rushes”. One day a ball is announced and the girl cleans herself to go to the ball. There she dances with the master’s son, who falls in love with her. When the dance is over, the girl slips and goes back to the mansion. Next day, another ball takes place and Cap o’Rushes goes there again and dances the young man, who gives her a ring. However, when the dance is over, the girl slips again and the master’s son tries every way to find her. He gets sick for the love of her. The girl tells the cook to make gruel and puts the ring which the master’s son gave her. Soon, Cap O’Rushes’s identity is revealed and she gets married to the boy. After they are married, they give a banquet where the meat is tasteless as there is no salt in it. Cap O’Rushes’s father, who is at the dinner as well, realises his mistake and starts crying. In the end, she reveals herself and is reunited with her father.

“Jack and the Beanstalk” (Number 13)

Jack is a simple man, living with his old mother. One day, he goes to the marketplace to sell his cow. A man approaches and offers some strange beans in exchange for his cow. The beans are said to grow up to the sky in one night. Jack

gives him the cow and goes home with the beans, at which his mother gets furious. However, the next day, Jack sees that the beanstalk has grown so high that he decides to climb it. At the top, he finds an ogre's home and meets his wife. He asks for some food, which the ogress gives him, as she is a good one, and warns Jack about her husband, who may eat him. When the ogre arrives, Jack hides, and takes some bags of gold with him the moment he can escape while the ogre is sleeping. On the next day, Jack returns to the ogre's house and steals a golden hen which lays golden eggs. The third time he goes there it is for the ogre's golden harp, which calls out help from its master, who runs after Jack. After managing to get to the bottom of the beanstalk, Jack he cuts it down with an axe and the ogre falls down to his death. The tale ends with the happiness of Jack and his mother, who have become rich through the wealth of the ogre.

“The Master and the Pupil” (Number 15)

There is a wise man in the north of the country, who knows all the languages and the mysteries of creation. He has a secret book, which contains all the secrets of the universe. The man's foolish pupil has never asked about the book. However, one day, he wonders about his master's machine, which can transform copper into gold. He cannot start it as he does not know the right words to utter, which are all in the book. He finds that his master has forgotten to lock up the book. The moment he opens it, Beelzebub comes out and tells the boy to give him a task, which he must do or be strangled. The narrator describes Beelzebub as having “a horrible, horrible form, breathing fire and with eyes like burning lamps” (75). The boy accidentally touches the devil and burns his finger, so he asks for water. The creature incessantly fetches water, almost causing flood. By chance the master returns and utters the words which make Beelzebub go back into the book.

“The Story of Three Bears” (Number 18)

An old woman breaks into the three bears' house when they are away, and eats whatever they have. She uses bad words when she is not satisfied with whatever she encounters in the house. The narrator describes her as an “impudent, bad old

woman” (Jacobs 94) and “naughty” using “wicked words” (95). When the bears come back to their house, they find out that someone has got into their house. The woman jumps out of the window and starts to run away.

“Jack and the Giant Killer” (Number 19)

There is a giant named “Cormoran”. The narrator tells the reader that Cormoran is so huge that he poses a threat to the local inhabitants: “He was 18 feet in height, and about 3 yards round the waist, of a fierce and grim countenance, the terror of all the neighbouring towns and villages” (Jacobs 99). The giant harms the villagers and steals their animals. Jack decides to take action and hides in a pit and kills the giant. When it is heard that Jack has killed Cormoran, the giant’s relatives want to take revenge. Jack manages to kill the second giant as well. On his way back home, he meets a third giant, which Jack feels is trying to trick him. Jack stays with the giant at night on his request, but with a trick he kills the third giant, too. As a third quest, Jack leaves the country with a prince. On their way, they want to lodge in a giant’s house. Jack deceives the giant and tells him there are one thousand men in arms waiting to kill him. The giant asks for Jack’s help and hides. The narrator says: “[...] they made themselves heartily merry whilst the poor giant lay trembling in a vault under the ground” (105). On the next morning, Jack takes gold and silver from the giant’s house. Moreover, he deceives the giant again and takes his magical shoes, sword and cap. Wearing the cap, which makes him invisible, Jack approaches another giant and cuts off his nose and then kills him. He gets into a cave and finds all the giant’s gold and silver. When the giant’s kinsman wants to take revenge, he cuts off the giant’s head and sends it to King Arthur. In the end, the king rewards Jack with his daughter and a beautiful castle, where they live happily ever after.

“Molly Whuppie” (Number 22)

This protagonist is a girl called Molly. The tale begins with a man and a woman who have too many children. They leave their three youngest children in the wood because they feel they cannot afford them any more. In the wood, these children travel and happen to come to a giant’s house. The giantess warns them about

her husband. Molly, suspicious of the giant, changes the clothes of her sisters with those of the giant's children. That night the giant eats his children by mistake. Molly and her sisters escape that same night and by chance they arrive at the king's palace. The king requires Molly to steal the giant's sword, which she does. She then steals the giant's purse, and last, the giant's ring. After completing all these tasks, she gets married to the king's youngest son.

“Red Ettin” (Number 23)

There is a hideous supernatural creature called the Red Ettin. There are two sons of a woman, who go on a quest. When the eldest sets off, he meets a giant with two heads and on every head there are four horns. While escaping from this ugly creature, he arrives at a castle where the Red Ettin lives. The narrator tells the reader: “Ettin, [...] was a terrible beast, with three heads, that spared no living man it could get hold of” (Jacobs 134). The monster finds the boy and promises to spare his life if he can answer three questions. Each head asks a question, none of which the boy is able to answer. The Red Ettin takes a mallet and knocks him on the head and turns him into a pillar of stone. The younger son leaves home and on his way he encounters an old woman with whom he shares his cake. The woman, in fact a fairy, warns the boy against Ettin, telling him what will happen. The boy answers all Ettin's questions when he meets it. Ettin realizes that its power is gone with the answers. The boy cuts off the three heads of the monster and saves all the prisoners in its castle. The tale ends happily as he gets married to a princess, whom he saves from the Red Ettin.

“The History of Tom Thumb” (Number 25)

One day, the famous magician Merlin meets an old woman, who desires to have a son, even if he should be only as small as her finger. Merlin, enjoying the idea, fulfils her wish, so the old woman has a son, whom they call Tom. Tom is described as a small boy with lovely features. One day, Tom is lost and after several adventures of being picked up by a raven and swallowed by a large fish, he arrives at King Arthur's palace. Everyone in the court loves him and he is pronounced a

knight. However, day by day, the Queen's jealousy of this boy grows. She requires him to be sent away. The King obeys the request and banishes the boy from the court. Tom suffers from hunger for some time, but he is saved somehow. When the Queen sees him again, she orders him to be beheaded, to which the King assents. Though he is saved from being beheaded, he dies tragically after some time, being bitten by a poisonous spider.

“Mr. Fox” (Number 26)

The tale is a variant of Perrault's “Bluebeard”, and presents a monstrous husband. A girl called Lady Mary gets engaged to Mr. Fox, who is wealthy but a bit mysterious. No one knows anything about him. Before their wedding day, Lady Mary wonders about his castle and decides to visit it secretly, when Mr. Fox is away on business. Mary sees that “Be bold, be bold” is written on the gate of the castle. When she gets into the castle, she notices that there are more notes on the doors, such as:

Be bold, be bold, but not too bold
Lest that your heart's blood should run cold.

(Jacobs 149)

Mary opens the door of a room, and finds skeletons and bodies of beautiful ladies. Mary is shocked and wants to rush out of the palace immediately, yet she sees Mr. Fox dragging in another woman. She hides and watches Mr. Fox cut off the hand of the lady in order to get her diamond ring. The hand falls onto Lady Mary's lap and she runs out of the house with the hand of the poor lady. On their wedding day, Mr. Fox asks why she looks so pale and she explains that she saw everything the day before. Upon this revelation, Mary's brothers cut Mr. Fox into a thousand pieces.

“Earl Mar's Daughter” (Number 29)

One day, Earl Mar's daughter sees a bird in her garden and takes it to her room. At night, to her surprise, the bird turns into a handsome boy. The boy explains that his mother, who is in fact a fairy, has transformed him into a bird as he has not done whatever she wished. The girl and the boy start to spend their time together and

they have children each year. Unaware of their relationship, the Earl wants to marry his daughter to an old man. The girl tells him that she does not want to marry, which angers the Earl to such an extent that he threatens her to kill the bird. The prince's fairy mother decides to help the couple, and transforms the dancers and pipers into herons and swans in order to spoil the wedding ceremony. They carry the bride away. The tale ends happily as the fairy mother decides to revoke the spell on the prince.

“The Laidly Worm of Spindleston Heugh” (Number 33)

A king mourns for a long time for the death of his wife, but one day he falls in love with a beautiful lady, who is actually a witch. She practises her evil and magic in a “lonely dungeon” (Jacobs 184). However, unaware of the real identity of the woman, the king marries the lady. When the new queen sees the king's daughter, Margaret, she gets envious of her beauty. The new queen seeks ways to destroy her beauty and she transforms the girl into a snake through a magic spell. The princess in her new form frightens everyone in the city. A warlock helps his brother, Childe Wynd, about how to rescue his sister. Wynd kisses the monster three times and it turns into Margaret again. He punishes the witch through transformation; she turns into an “ugly toad, with bold staring eyes and a horrible hiss” when he touches her with a twig of a rowan tree (Jacobs 187).

“The Fish and the Ring” (Number 35)

One day, a magician tells a baron that his son is going to get married to a lowly maid. The Baron learns about the girl's family from the magician and deceives the father, taking the girl. The Baron pushes the girl into a river, and thinks that he has saved his son from his fate. A fisherman finds the girl and brings up her. One day, the Baron and his men stop at the fisherman's hut and see the girl. The Baron writes a letter to his brother and gives it to the girl, telling her that she should take the letter to his brother. In the note he has written that the brother should kill the girl. Nonetheless, at night some robbers break into the house and find nothing but the letter. They pity the girl and write instead that the brother should marry the girl to the

Baron's son. When the girl takes the letter, the brother does what he is asked to do. The Baron later sees that she has married his son. He takes the girl outside and goes near a cliff. He throws his ring down the cliff and says that he will not see her until she brings the ring to him. Days pass, and the girl wanders on and on. Eventually, she starts to work as a maid at a noble's house. By coincidence, the Baron and his son stop at the noble's house. The girl, who has found the ring in the stomach of a fish, cooks that fish. Upon eating such a delicious fish, they want to see the cook. To the Baron's great surprise, the girl comes again, but with the ring this time. The Baron realises that he cannot defeat fate and leaves the house with his son and the girl.

“Kate Crakernuts” (Number 37)

It is about the jealousy of a Queen and the events thereafter. A king marries for the second time, and the new Queen is jealous of the beauty of her step-daughter Anne, who is far more beautiful than her daughter Kate. The Queen wants to destroy her step-daughter's beauty and sends the girl to a hen-wife, whom the Queen has taught to cast a spell on the girl. The girl goes to the hen-wife twice but each time the woman cannot fulfil the magic. The woman is able to cast a spell the third time- she tells the girl to lift the lid off the pot, and once the girl does this, her head is transformed into that of a sheep. Kate, her step-sister, pities the girl and covers Anne's head with a cloth. They go on a quest together and arrive at a palace where a prince lies sick. Kate promises to heal the prince and starts to watch him at night. She sees that the prince goes to fairyland at night and gets sick there. By watching and listening to the fairies, Kate learns how to heal the prince and her step-sister Anne. Then, she applies all she has learnt and heals both of them. The tale ends with the marriages of the two girls to the princes; Kate marries the sick prince and Anne marries to the prince's brother. There is no punishment for the step-mother and the reader is not informed what has happened to her.

“Fairy Ointment” (Number 40)

It is about an evil imp and a woman called Dame Goody. Dame Goody is a nurse, looking after sick people, and one day she is visited by a “squinky-eyed” man. He asks for some help and takes her to his cottage where a lady is in bed with a “squinky-eyed” boy. The lady gives an ointment to Dame Goody and tells her to put it on the eyelids of her son. Goody, wondering about what it is for, secretly puts it on her eyelids as well. Then she starts to see that everything has changed. The cottage is in fact an elegant house, and the mother and the children are beautiful imps. Only then does she realise it is a house of pixies. After she has completed her job, the man takes her home. Next day, she sees the squinky-eyed man in the marketplace, going into shops and taking bits and pieces, while no one is looking. When Goody goes and asks after the health of his wife and the baby, the man is shocked because Goody can see him. He realises that Goody has put the fairy ointment on her eye. He asks her which eye she can see him with, and on hearing her answer, he hits on that eye, making her blind.

“The Well of the World’s End” (Number 41)

A step-mother is jealous of her step-daughter’s beauty and gives her some hard tasks to complete. She orders the girl to carry water in a sieve at the well of the world’s end, and the girl fails. Then, the girl is helped by an old woman who tells her to find the well of the world’s end. Later she is helped by a frog which helps her on one condition that the girl will do whatever the frog wishes for one night. The next day, the girl fulfils the task, which angers the step-mother. Then, the girl has to do whatever the frog requires her to do. She takes the frog into her bed and in the morning, upon its request, she chops off the head of the frog and it turns into a handsome prince. The tale ends with the marriage of the girl and the prince. There is no punishment for the step-mother.

“The Three Heads of the Well” (Number 43)

After the death of his wife, a king marries a wealthy lady though she is ugly and old. The woman also has an ugly daughter. They get envious of the King's daughter, who is more charming than both of them. The step-mother and her daughter set the King against his daughter by false reports and the daughter loses her father's love. The King's daughter gets unhappy at court and leaves on a quest. On her journey, she meets an old man with whom she shares her food. The old man tells the girl about the three heads of a well and explains that she should do whatever they require her to do. The girl does whatever the old man advises and the three heads wish her to be beautiful and marry a prince. Then, the girl meets a king hunting in the park. He falls in love with her and they get married. When her step-mother and step-sister see that she is happy with her husband, they get envious of her. The step-sister decides to leave on a quest as well, thinking that she may have a similar fate. However, she does not share her food with the old man and the three heads wish misfortune to her. In the end, she gets leprosy and marries a cobbler. Upon hearing of her daughter's misfortune, the old and ugly queen hangs herself.

“The Pied Piper” (Number 44)

A little town is infested with rats and the townsfolk do not know what to do and desperately seek someone to save them from these ugly creatures. The Pied Piper arrives, with colourful clothes and “keen piercing eyes” (Jacobs 148). He promises to save the town if he is given fifty pounds, and then he plays his flute. He gathers all the rats with his melody, drives them to the sea and throws all of them into the water. The town celebrates with great joy, but when the Piper asks for his money, the Mayor answers that they have no money due to the rats' invasion, and they can only give him twenty pounds. The man gets angry and threatens the Mayor. Then the Piper plays a joyful tune, which enchants all the children in the town and makes them follow him. Before the eyes of the townsfolk, the children and the Piper are lost in the deep forest.

“Hereafterthis” (Number 45)

There is a farmer called Jan and his wife, who is depicted with a naïve nature, doing everything that Jan tells her to do. However, she is such a clumsy woman that she cannot fulfil her responsibilities. She accidentally chokes the pigs, drowns the cows and so on. One day, she finds a bag of groats and asks Jan what this is for. He answers: “for hereafterthis” (Jacobs 151). A robber, passing by the house, hears the conversation and next day comes to deceive the woman. The robber says he is Hereafterthis and asks for the bag of groats. When Jan learns what his wife has done, he collapses and decides to look for the robber. At night, Jan and his wife see a group of people, some gentlemen and women, among whom Jan’s wife recognizes the robber. As they are looking from the top of a tree, Jan frightens the group by throwing down a branch. Once the group has run away, Jan and his wife come down and find many other bags full of money along with their own bag. They take all of the bags and get rich. The tale ends with the wealth and happiness of the couple.

“Black Bull of Norroway” (Number 48)

In Norroway, there lives a certain lady who has three daughters. When they grow up, they go on a quest. The youngest one sets off with a black bull, which helps her during the journey by offering its flesh when she is hungry. During the journey, she is given some magical fruit. The bull warns the girl against a possible danger but she ignores the warning; thus, she gets lost. The girl meets an old woman and her daughter, who put her into their service for seven years. She is forced to work to help the old woman’s daughter get married to a certain knight. The girl wants to meet the knight as she has fallen in love with him. She makes an agreement with the old woman’s daughter to see the knight for one night in exchange for some jewellery she found in the magical fruit. The daughter accepts the condition, but the old woman gives a potion to the knight, who sleeps when the girl comes in. The girl offers jewellery again for the second night, on which the same things happen. The girl offers jewellery for the third night and the knight finds a way not to drink the potion. Hence, he does not sleep and he sees the beautiful girl. Everything is revealed. They

decide to get married. As a punishment, the knight orders the old woman and her daughter to be burnt.

“Yallery Brown” (Number 49)

One day, a boy, called Tom, finds a big stone in a field. He removes the stone, under which he finds a strange creature that looks like a baby but has the face of a two hundred-year-old man. The creature, who calls itself Yallery Brown, tells Tom that whatever the boy desires it will fulfil. Tom thanks the creature; however, the little thing says it asks no thanking. While the creature says so, its appearance becomes more wicked, and the narrator likens it to a “raging bull” (Jacobs 165). The thing disappears, reminding Tom that it can come back anytime he needs. On the following days, Tom’s work is done miraculously and the others’ work is destroyed by Yallery Brown and this situation irritates his colleagues and his boss. Eventually, he is sacked and isolated from people. He calls the strange creature; its appearance has become uglier and more horrid. The narrator describes that it has “a wrinkled face and wicked glinting black eyne” (166). The creature feels a sadistic pleasure at the pain suffered by Tom; it “breaks into a screeching laugh” (166). The thing explains that if Tom had not thanked to it, it would not have created such misfortune for him. The tale ends with the thing saying that it will continue causing trouble for Tom till the end of his life.

“Gobborn Seer” (Number 54)

A king as a minor character is the wicked figure in the tale. Jack and his father, Gobborn Seer, are the protagonists. Jack is a stupid boy who cannot fulfil the duties given by his father. Jack finds a cunning and clever girl whom he marries and with whom he lives happily. His father plans to build a castle for the king, who wants it to surpass any other castles in beauty. They build the castle at the end of twelve month and everyone admire it. The king plans to kill them as he fears they can do a better one somewhere else. He keeps Jack and his father captive and sends his own son to bring what they require from their house. Jack’s cunning wife keeps the prince

as her captive on condition that her husband and her father-in-law are released. Jack and Gobborn are released and they built a new castle of their own.

“Tattercoats” (Number 56)

A rich old lord lives with his granddaughter; however, he is cruel to her as at her birth his daughter died. He ignores her granddaughter to such an extent that he does not provide her with basic needs such as clothes. Hence, she is left barefoot and with torn clothes, and little to eat. One day, the king gives a ball in the town. The lord is dressed up to attend the king’s ball, not taking the girl though she begged him to do so. The girl meets a gooseherd, who, with his flute, makes her happy. When the girl and the gooseherd are walking to the town, they meet a handsome young man who asks the way to the palace. The young man falls in love with Tattercoats and with the music of the gooseherd, the young man’s love for the girl grows. He proposes marriage to Tattercoats and invites her to the palace in order to present her as his bride. When Tattercoats goes to the ball at night, everyone is surprised to see her in poor clothes. It is also revealed that the young man who has proposed marriage is the prince. The gooseherd plays his flute and transforms her into a richly dressed lady. The king greets the girl as his daughter-in-law. Though her identity is revealed at the end, the grandfather stands stubborn and does not even look at her.

“Johnny Gloke” (Number 58)

Johnny Gloke, a tailor, is fed up with his life. He wants to be rich and famous. He travels and arrives in a country where two giants live. The king offers a reward for the person who will kill the giants. Though he is weak, Johnny undertakes to kill them. He hides behind the giants while they are walking, picks up a pebble and throws it at one of them. The giant, thinking that the other giant has done this, gets furious. They fight, get exhausted and lie down. While they are lying down, Johnny approaches from behind and cuts off their heads. Giving the heads to the king, Johnny becomes rich and famous. In other words, he gets his fame through trickery and deception.

“Coat O’Clay” (Number 59)

This tale presents a wise woman, who is known as a “witch” in town. Though the woman is not depicted as a typical witch, with an ugly appearance and evil deeds, the woman is regarded as a witch due to her ability to heal people by mixing various herbs. The narrator emphasizes that the woman hates people who ask foolish questions (Jacobs 193). One day, a fool comes to her in order to learn how to be wise. She tells him that he will remain a fool until he gets a coat o’clay. From then onwards, the boy searches for the coat o’clay. Each time he thinks he has found the coat and got wise. He is reminded of his foolishness either by his mother or by the people he encounters. He returns to the woman to complain about not having found the coat o’clay and the woman responds, saying he will never find one. As he is born a fool, he will die a fool.

“The Three Cows” (Number 60)

There lives a farmer who has three cows. Each day, his cows start to lose weight and die. Then, the farmer decides to watch what happens to his cows and sees that thousands of pixies come into the house, dancing and laughing. They drag the cow into the middle of the room and throw it down, fall on it and kill it. They bake and boil, and they stew and fry the cow. The farmer cannot do anything as he is trembling with great fear.

“The Blinded Giant” (Number 61)

The tale is similar in some ways to the encounter of Odysseus with Cyclops. It is about a cruel giant who has only one eye in the middle of his forehead. He captures Jack, and forces the boy to serve him. The boy has served him for seven years and wants to go on holiday, for which the giant does not give permission. While the giant is sleeping, Jack takes out his eye with a knife. Besides, he kills the giant’s dog and skins it. The tale ends with the hideous groan of the giant and the flight of Jack. The reader does not know what happens to Jack or the giant later.

“The Old Witch” (Number 64)

The youngest daughter of a house wants to seek for her fortune. The tale starts with the motif of three sisters, and first the youngest leaves home. On her way, she encounters several talking objects and animals, such as an oven, some bread, a cow and an apple tree. She helps all of these on their request. Later on, she asks to stay in a witch's house because she knows that the witch employs girls as servants. The witch tells her to clean all of house, except the chimney, about which she tells the girl not to look at. However, the girl gets curious and looks at the chimney, where she finds lots of money. She escapes with the money and on her way back home, she asks for help from the oven, the cow and the apple tree, to hide from the witch. The witch cannot find the girl and goes back to home. The girl goes to her home, getting rich and also marrying a rich man. Then, her sister decides to go on a quest to do the same things with her sister. She meets the oven, the bread, the cow and the apple tree, all of which ask her for some help, but she does not help them. Later, she is employed by the witch, who warns the girl about the chimney. When the witch is out, the girl looks at the chimney and finds a lot of money. She escapes with the money, but the witch runs after her. On her way, the objects do not help her and reveal where she is running to. The old witch catches the girl and beats her.

“The Hobyahs” (Number 69)

The Hobyahs appear at night and scare human beings, and they disappear during the day. The creatures come to a house, where an old couple and a girl live along with their little dog. Hobyahs want to devour the human beings at home, yet with the barking of the dog, they disappear. The old man, unaware of the reason for the dog's behaviour, cuts off the dog's tail. Next day, the same thing happens and the man cuts off the dog's leg. This continues until the man cuts off the dog's head. When the Hobyahs come to the home again and see that the dog is dead, they have nothing to fear, so they devour the couple, and spare the girl for the next day. The girl is saved by a passer-by, and the Hobyahs are devoured by his dog.

“Rushen Coatie” (Number 73)

The ugliness and nastiness of the step-mother and sisters stand against the purity and docility of the girl. In the tale, the innocent girl is to do all the hard tasks at home, and she is deprived of basic needs such as clothes and food. She is given only a coat made of rushes and this is the reason she is called Rushen Coatie. The step-mother provokes the girl’s father, who kills the red calf, which is his daughter’s only friend and food provider. When the protagonist is desperate the red calf comes back to life magically. The girl is turned into a fine lady and she meets the prince at church, where she drops one of her glass slippers. The prince wants to find the girl and he requests all the girls in the city to try on the slipper. After the three ugly sisters are shown not to be the owners of the slipper, it is revealed with the help of some animals that there is another girl at home. The girl and the prince get married. There is no explicit punishment for the mother and sisters.

“Tamlane” (Number 75)

A fairy Queen kidnaps Tamlane, who is engaged to Burd Janet. The girl accidentally sees Tamlane in a wood and he gives her instructions to save him from the Fairy Queen. Next day, Halloween, during a march of elves, Burd sees Tamlane and grabs his arm to save him from the fairies. Even though the fairies try their best, they cannot manage to keep Tamlane, and Burd rescues him. The fairy Queen mourns him with a song, in which one can feel the touch of jealousy.

“The Stars in the Sky” (Number 76)

A girl leaves her home to reach the stars and she asks everyone and everything how to reach the stars. She climbs and climbs but she becomes unsuccessful in the end. At the end, she finds herself in her room and starts to weep for her failure.

“The Little Bull-Calf” (Number 79)

There is a boy who has a cruel step-father. He is such a wicked man that he threatens the boy all the time. Finally, the boy leaves home on a quest with his little bull-calf. The calf gives him instructions to survive, and tells the boy that it will be killed by a dragon. The boy is to hit the dragon with the calf’s bladder and cut its tongue out. The boy does all of these, and from the dragon’s castle he saves a princess and sends her to her kingdom. The king wonders about the hero and asks him to reveal himself. The boy reveals himself and brings the tongue as a proof. He marries the princess and becomes the new king. In the end, the step-father comes for an apology, and is punished with rejection by the young king, who says he does not know the man.

“Habetrot and Scantlie Mab” (Number 81)

A woman has a daughter who is playful and joyful, and prefers wandering around to spinning. As the girl does not perform the duties expected from her, the mother “coaxed, threatened, even beat” her and “called her idle cutie” (Jacobs 262). One day, the mother gives her seven heads of lint to be spun into yarn in three days. With the assistance of a supernatural being the girl fulfils her duties, surprising her mother. The mother tells her daughter’s success everywhere and upon hearing that there is such a dutiful daughter, a man wants to marry her and the mother willingly accepts the man’s proposal without asking her daughter. The young woman is in great fear that she cannot prove her ability in spinning. Dame Habetrot tells her that if her husband asks such a thing, she should take him to their cave. Next day, the girl takes her husband to where Habetrot and her sisters are spinning. The man is shocked to see such ugly creatures spinning. Habetrot hints that if he requires his wife to spin, she will turn into such an ugly woman. Thus, the man vows that his wife should not spin in her life and lets her wander in the meadows by his side.

“Catskin” (Number 83)

There lives a gentleman who wants to have a son to be heir to his possessions. However, his wife gives birth to a girl, which angers the gentleman and says he does not want to see her face. When the little girl grows up, her father wants her to marry “a nasty rough old man” (Jacobs 268). The girl goes to a hen-wife and asks her advice. The hen-wife tells her to ask the old man to bring a coat o’ silver as a condition of marriage, which later he provides. Then, the girl asks him to bring a coat o’ beaten gold, which is also provided and last she asks him to bring the feathers of all the birds in the air. When the man fulfils this task as well, the girl makes a coat of these feathers, wears it and then runs away. She arrives at a castle and starts working there as a scullion. She becomes the subject of ridicule at the castle and particularly the cook is very cruel to her. Then, a ball is given at the castle. The girl leaves the castle and dresses up in her previous elegant clothes. She goes to the ball and the young gentleman of the house falls in love with her. At night, the girl leaves the ball suddenly and wears her coat of feathers. Next day, another ball is given and the girl leaves the ball suddenly at night. The young man gives a third ball and this time he follows the girl and sees she changing her clothes. They get married and soon they have a son. The woman reveals her identity to her husband and they visit her father, who is living alone as his wife died long ago. The father confesses that he is regretful and is reunited with his daughter. They live happy ever after.

APPENDIX C

THE GRIMMS' AND PERRAULT'S FAIRY TALES REFERRED IN THE THESIS

“The Frog-Prince”

One fine evening a young princess put on her bonnet and clogs, and went out to take a walk by herself in a wood; and when she came to a cool spring water, that rose in the midst of it, she sat herself down to rest a while. Now she had a golden ball in her hand, which was her favourite plaything; and she was always tossing it up into the air, and catching it again as it fell. After a time she threw it up so high that she missed catching it as it fell; and the ball bounded away, and rolled along upon the ground, till at last it fell down into the spring. The princess looked into the spring after her ball, but it was very deep, so deep that she could not see the bottom of it. Then she began to bewail her loss, and said, “Alas! If I could only get my ball again, I would give all my fine clothes and jewels, and everything that I have in the world.” Whilst she was speaking, a frog put its head out of the water, and said, “Princess, why do you weep so bitterly?” “Alas!” said she, “what can you do for me, you nasty frog? My golden ball has fallen into the spring.” The frog said, “I want not your pearls, and jewels, and fine clothes; but if you will love me, and let me live with you and eat from off your golden plate, and sleep upon your bed, I will bring you your golden ball again.” “What nonsense,” thought the princess, “this silly frog is talking! He can never even get out of the spring to visit me, and therefore I will tell him he shall have what he asks.” So she said to the frog, “Well, if you will bring me my ball, I will do all you ask.” Then the frog put his head down, and dived deep under the water; and after a little while he came up again, with the ball in his mouth, and threw it on the edge of the spring. As soon as the young princess saw her ball, she ran to pick it up; and she was so overjoyed to have it in her hand again, that she never thought of the frog, but ran home with it as fast as she could. The frog called after her, “Stay, princess, and take me with you as you said,” But she did not stop to hear a word.

The next day, just as the princess had sat down to dinner, she heard a strange noise- tap, tap- splash, splash- as if something was coming up the marble staircase: and soon afterwards there was a gentle knock at the door, and a little voice cried out and said:

“Open the door, my princess dear,
Open the door to thy true love here!
And mind the words that thou and I said
By the fountain cool, in the greenwood shade.”

Then the princess ran to the door and opened it and there she was the frog, whom she had quite forgotten. At this sight she was sadly frightened, and shutting the door as fast as she could come back to her seat. The king, her father, seeing that something had frightened her, asked her what was the matter. “There is a nasty frog,” said she, “at the door, that lifted my ball for me out of the spring this morning: I told him that he should live with me here, thinking that he could never get out of the spring; but there he is at the door, and he wants to come in.”

While she was speaking the frog knocked again at the door, and said:

“Open the door, my princess dear,
Open the door to thy true love here!
And mind the words that thou and I said
By the fountain cool, in the greenwood shade.”

Then the king said to the young princess, “As you have given your word you must keep it; so go and let him in.” She did so, and the frog hopped into the room, and then straight on- tap, tap- splash, splash- from the bottom of the room to the top, till he came up close to the table where the princess sat. “Pray lift me upon the chair,” said he to the princess, “and let me sit next to you.” As soon as she had done this, the frog said, “Put your plate nearer to me, that I may eat out of it.” This she did, and when he had eaten as much as he could, he said, “Now I am tired; carry me upstairs, and put me into your bed.” And the princess, though very unwilling, took him up in her hand, and put him upon the pillow of her own bed, where he slept all night long. As soon as it was light he jumped up, hopped downstairs, and went out of the house. “Now, then,” thought the princess, “at last he is gone, and I shall be troubled with him no more.”

But she was mistaken; for when night came again she heard the same tapping at the door; and the frog came once more, and said:

“Open the door, my princess dear,
Open the door to thy true love here!
And mind the words that thou and I said
By the fountain cool, in the greenwood shade.”

And when the princess opened the door the frog came in, and slept upon her pillow as before, till the morning broke. And the third night he did the same. But when the princess awoke on the following morning she was astonished to see, instead of the frog, a handsome young prince, gazing on her with the most beautiful eyes she had ever seen, and standing at the head of her bed.

He told her that he had been enchanted by a spiteful fairy, who had changed him into a frog; and that he had been fated so to abide till some princess should take him out of the spring, and let him eat from her plate, and sleep upon her bed for three nights. “You,” said the prince, “have broken his cruel charm, and now I have nothing to wish for but that you should go with me into my father’s kingdom, where I will marry you, and love you as long as you live.”

The young princess, you may be sure, was not long in saying, “Yes” to all this; and as they spoke a gay coach drove up, with eight beautiful horses, decked with plumes of feathers and a golden harness; and behind the coach rode the prince’s servant, faithful Heinrich, who had bewailed the misfortunes of his dear master during his enchantment so long and so bitterly, that his heart had well-nigh burst.

They then took leave of the king, and got into the coach with eight horses, and all set out, full of joy and merriment, for the prince’s kingdom, which they reached safely; and they lived happily a great many years.

(The Grimms, *The Grimms*’)

“Cinderella” (“Aschenputtel”)

The wife of a rich man fell sick, and as she felt that her end was drawing near, she called her only daughter to her bedside and said, “Dear child, be good and pious, and then the good God will always protect thee, and I will look down on thee from heaven and be near thee.” Thereupon she closed her eyes and departed. Every day

the maiden went out to her mother's grave, and wept, and she remained pious and good. When winter came the snow spread a white sheet over the grave, and when the spring sun had drawn it off again, the man had taken another wife.

The woman had brought two daughters into the house with her, who were beautiful and fair of face, but vile and black of heart. Now began a bad time for the poor step-child. "Is the stupid goose to sit in the parlour with us?" said they. "He who wants to eat bread must earn it; out with the kitchen-wench." They took her pretty clothes away from her, put an old grey bedgown on her, and gave her wooden shoes. "Just look at the proud princess, how decked out she is!" they cried, and laughed, and led her into the kitchen. There she had to do hard work from morning till night, get up before daybreak, carry water, light fires, cook and wash. Besides this, the sisters did her every imaginable injury- they mocked her and emptied her peas and lentils into the ashes, so that she was forced to sit and pick them out again. In the evening when she had worked till she was weary she had no bed to go, but had to sleep by the fireside in the ashes. And as on that account she always looked dusty and dirty, they called her Cinderella. It happened that the father was once going to the fair, and he asked his two step-daughters what he should bring back for them. "Beautiful dresses," said one, "Pearls and jewels," said the second. "And thou, Cinderella," said he, "what wilt thou have?" "Father, break off for me the first branch which knocks against your hat on your way home." So he bought beautiful dresses, pearls, and jewels for his two step-daughters, and on his way home, as he was riding through a green thicket, a hazel twig brushed against him and knocked off his hat. Then he broke off the branch and took it with him. When he reached home he gave his step-daughters the things which they had wished for, and to Cinderella he gave the branch from the hazel-bush. Cinderella thanked him, went to her mother's grave and planted the branch on it, and wept so much that the tears fell down on it and watered it. And it grew, however, and became a handsome tree. Thrice a day Cinderella went and sat beneath it, and wept and prayed, and a little white bird always came on the tree, and if Cinderella expressed a wish, the bird threw down to her what she had wished for.

It happened, however, that the King appointed a festival which was to last three days, and to which all the beautiful young girls in the country were invited, in order that his son might choose himself a bride. When the two step-sisters heard that

they too were to appear among the number, they were delighted, called Cinderella and said, “Comb our hair for us, brush our shoes and fasten our buckles, for we are going to the festival at the King’s palace.” Cinderella obeyed, but wept, because she too would liked to go with them to the dance, and begged her step-mother to allow her to do so. “Thou do, Cinderella!” said she; “Thou art dusty and dirty and wouldst go to the festival? Thou hast no clothes and shoes, and yet wouldst dance!” As, however, Cinderella went on asking, the step-mother at last said, “I have emptied a dish of lentils into the ashes for thee, if thou hast picked them out again in two hours, thou shalt go with us.” The maiden went through the back-door into the garden, and called, “You tame pigeons, you turtle-doves, and all you birds beneath the sky, come and help me to pick

The good into the pot,
The bad into the crop.”

Then two white pigeons came in by the kitchen-window, and afterwards the turtle-doves, and at last all the birds beneath the sky, came whirring and crowding in, and alighted amongst the ashes. And the pigeons nodded with their heads and began pick, pick, pick, pick and the rest began also pick, pick, pick, pick, and gathered all the good grains into the dish. Hardly had one hour passed before they had finished, and all flew out again. Then the girl took the dish to her step-mother, and was glad, and believed that now she would be allowed to go with them to the festival. But the step-mother said, “No, Cinderella, thou hast no clothes and thou canst not dance; thou wouldst only be laughed at.” And as Cinderella wept at this, the step-mother said, “If thou canst pick two dishes of lentils out of the ashes for me in one hour, thou shalt go with us.” And she thought to herself, “That she most certainly cannot do.” When the step-mother had emptied the two dishes of lentils amongst the ashes, the maiden went through the back-door into the garden and cried, “You tame pigeons, you turtle-doves, and all you birds under heaven, come and help me to pick

The good into the pot,
The bad into the crop”.

Then two white pigeons came in by the kitchen-window, and afterwards the turtle-doves, and at length the birds beneath the sky, came whirring and crowding in, and alighted amongst the ashes. And the doves nodded with their heads and began pick, pick, pick, pick and gathered all the good seeds into the dishes, and before half

an hour was over they had already finished, and all flew out again. Then the maiden carried the dishes to the step-mother and was delighted, and believed that she might now go with them to the festival. But the step-mother said, "All this will not help thee; thou goest not with us, for thou hast no clothes and canst not dance; we should be ashamed of thee!" On this she turned her back on Cinderella, and hurried away with her two proud daughters.

As no one was now at home, Cinderella went to her mother's grave beneath the hazel-tree, and cried,

"Shiever and quiver, little tree,
Silver and gold throw down over me."

Then the bird threw a gold and silver dress down to her, and slippers embroidered with silk and silver. She put on the dress with all speed, and went to the festival. Her step-sisters and the step-mother however did not know her, and thought she must be a foreign princess, for she looked so beautiful in the golden dress. They never once thought of Cinderella, and believed that she was sitting at home in the dirt, picking lentils out of the ashes. The prince went to meet her, took her by the hand and danced with her. He would dance with no other maiden, and never left loose of her hand, and if any one else came to invite her, he said, "This is my partner."

She danced till it was evening, and then she wanted to go home. But the King's son said, "I will go with thee and bear thee company," for he wished to see to whom the beautiful maiden belonged. She escaped from him, however, and sprang into the pigeon-house. The King's son waited until her father came, and then he told him that the stranger maiden had leapt into the pigeon-house. The old man thought, "Can it be Cinderella?" and they had to bring him an axe and a pickaxe that he might hew the pigeon-house to pieces, but no one was inside it. And when they got home Cinderella lay in her dirty clothes among the ashes, and a dim little oil-lamp was burning on the mantle-piece, for Cinderella had jumped quickly down from the back of the pigeon-house and had run to the little hazel-tree, and there she had taken off her beautiful clothes and laid them on the grave, and the bird had taken them away again, and then she had placed herself in the kitchen amongst the ashes in her grey gown.

Next day when the festival began afresh, and her parents and the step-sisters had gone once more, Cinderella went to the hazel-tree and said-

“Shiver and quiver, my little tree,
Silver and gold throw down on me.”

Then the bird threw down a much more beautiful dress than on the preceding day. And when Cinderella appeared at the festival in this dress, every one was astonished at her beauty. The King’s son had waited until she came, and instantly took her by the hand and danced with no one but her. When others came and invited her, he said, “She is my partner.” When evening came she wished to leave, and the King’s son followed her and wanted to see into which house she went. But she sprang away from him, and into the garden behind the house. Therein stood a beautiful tall tree on which hung the most magnificent pears. She clambered so nimbly between the branches like a squirrel that the King’s son did not know where she was gone. He waited until her father came and said to him, “The stranger-maiden has escaped from me, and I believe she has climbed up the pear-tree.” The father thought, “Can it be Cinderella?” and had an axe brought and cut the tree down, but no one was on it. And when they got into the kitchen, Cinderella lay there amongst the ashes, as usual, for she had jumped down on the other side of the tree, had taken the beautiful dress to the bird on the little hazel-tree, and put on her grey gown.

On the third day, when the parents and sisters had gone away, Cinderella went once more to her mother’s grave and said to the little tree-

“Shiver and quiver, my little tree,
Silver and gold throw down on me.”

And now the bird threw down to her a dress which was more splendid and magnificent than any she had yet had, and the slippers were golden. And when she went to the festival in the dress, no one knew how to speak for astonishment. The King’s son danced with her only, and if any one invited her to dance, he said, “She is my partner.”

When evening came, Cinderella wished to leave, and the King’s son was anxious to go with her, but she escaped from him so quickly that he could not follow her. The King’s son had, however, used a stratagem, and had caused the whole staircase to be smeared with pitch, and there, when she ran down, had the maiden’s left slipper remained sticking. The King’s son picked it up, and it was small and

dainty, and all golden. Next morning, he went with it to the father, and said to him, "No one shall be my wife but she whose foot this golden slipper fits." Then were the two sisters glad, for they had pretty feet. The eldest went with the shoe into her room and wanted to try it on, and her mother stood by. But she could not get her big toe into it, and the shoe was too small for her. Then her mother gave her a knife and said, "Cut the toe off; when thou art Queen thou wilt have more need to go on foot." The maiden cut the toe off, forced the foot into the shoe, swallowed the pain, and went out to the King's son. Then he took her on his horse as his bride and rode away with her. They were, however, obliged to pass the grave, and there, on the hazel-tree, sat two pigeons and cried,

 "Turn and peep, turn and peep,
 There's blood within the shoe
 The shoe it is too small for her,
 The true bride waits for you."

Then he looked at her foot and saw how blood was streaming from it. He turned his horse round and took the false bride home again, and said she was not the true one, and that the other sister was to put the shoe on. Then this one went into her chamber and got her toes safely into the shoe, but her heel was too large. So her mother gave her a knife and said, "Cut a bit of thy heel; when thou art Queen thou wilt have no more need to go on foot." The maiden cut a bit off her heel, forced her foot into the shoe, swallowed the pain, and went out to the King's son. He took her on his horse as his bride, and rode away with her, but when they passed by the hazel-tree, two little pigeons sat on it and cried,

 "Turn and peep, turn and peep,
 There's blood within the shoe
 The shoe it is too small for her,
 The true bride waits for you."

He looked down at her foot and saw how the blood was running out of her shoe, and how it had stained her white stocking. Then he turned his horse and took the false bride home again. "This also is not the right one," said he, "have you no other daughter?" "No," said the man, "There is still a little stunted kitchen-wench which my late wife left behind her, but she cannot possibly be the bride." The King's son said he was to send her up to him; but the mother answered, "Oh, no, she is much

too dirty, she cannot show herself!” He absolutely insisted on it, and Cinderella had to be called. She first washed her hands and face clean, and then went and bowed down before the King’s son, who gave her the golden shoe. Then she seated herself on a stool, drew her foot out of the heavy wooden shoe, and put it into the slipper, which fitted like a glove. And when she rose up, and the King’s son looked at her face he recognised the beautiful maiden who had danced with him and cried, “That is the true bride!” The step-mother and the two sisters were terrified and became pale with rage; he, however, took Cinderella on his horse and rode away with her. As they passed by the hazel-tree, the two white doves cried-

“Turn and peep, and turn and peep,
No blood is in the shoe,
The shoe is not too small for her,
The true bride rides with you,”

and when they cried that, the two came flying down and placed themselves on Cinderella’s shoulders, one on the right, the other on the left, and remained sitting there.

When the wedding with the King’s son had to be celebrated, the two false sisters came and wanted to get into favour with Cinderella and share her good fortune. When the betrothed couple went to church, the elder was at the right side and the younger at the left, and the pigeons pecked out one eye of each of them. Afterwards as they came back, the elder was at the left, and the younger was at the right, and then the pigeons pecked out the other eye of each. And thus, for their wickedness and falsehood, they were punished with blindness as long as they lived.

(The Grimms, *Household Tales*)

“The Singing Bone”

In a certain country there was once a great lamentation over a wild boar that laid waste the farmer’s fields, killed the cattle, and rigged up people’s bodies with his tusks. The King promised a large reward to anyone who would free the land from this plague; but the beast was so big and strong that no one dared to go near the forest in which it lived. At last the King gave notice that whosoever should capture or kill the wild boar should have his only daughter to wife.

Now there lived in the country two brothers, sons of a poor man, who declared themselves willing to undertake the hazardous enterprise; the elder, who was crafty and shrewd, out of pride; the younger, who was innocent and simple, from a kind heart. The King said, "In order that you may be the more sure of finding the beast, you must go into the forest from opposite sides." So the elder went in on the west side, and the younger on the east.

When the younger had gone a short way, a little man stepped up to him. He held in his hand a black spear and said, "I give you this spear because your heart is pure and good; with this you can boldly attack the wild boar, and it will do you no harm."

He thanked the little man, shouldered the spear, and went on fearlessly.

Before long he saw the beast, which rushed at him; but he held the spear towards it, and in its blind fury it ran so swiftly against it that its heart was cloven in twain. Then he took the monster on his black and went homewards with it to the King.

As he came out at the other side of the wood, there stood at the entrance a house where people were making merry with wine and dancing. His elder brother had gone in here, and thinking that after all the boar would not run away from him, was going to drink until he felt brave. But when he saw his young brother coming out of the wood laden with his booty, his envious, evil heart gave him no peace. He called out to him, "Come in, dear brother, rest and refresh yourself with a cup of wine."

The youth, who suspected no evil, went in and told him about the good little man who had given him the spear wherewith he had slain the boar.

The elder brother kept him there until the evening, and then they went away together, and when in the darkness they came to a bridge over a brook, the elder brother let the other go first; and when he was half-way across he gave him such a blow behind that he fell down dead. He buried him beneath the bridge, took the boar, and carried it to the King, pretending that he had killed it; whereupon he obtained the King's daughter in marriage. And when his younger brother did not come back he said, "The boar must have killed him," and every one believed it.

But as nothing remains hidden from God, so this black deed also was to come to light.

Years afterwards a shepherd was driving his herd across the bridge, and saw lying in the sand beneath, a snow-white little bone. He thought that it would make a good mouth-piece, so he clambered down, picked it up, and cut out of it a mouth-piece for his horn. But when he blew through it for the first time, to his great astonishment, the bone began of its own accord to sing:

“Ah, friend, thou blowest upon my bone!
Long have I lain beside the water;
My brother slew me for the boar,
And took for his wife the King’s young daughter.”

“What a wonderful horn!” said the shepherd; “it sings by itself; I must take it to my lord the King.” And when he came with it to the King the horn again began to sing its little song. The King understood it all, and caused the ground below the bridge to be dug up, and then the whole skeleton of the murdered man came to light. The wicked brother could not deny the deed, and was sewn up in a sack and drowned. But the bones of the murdered man were laid to rest in a beautiful tomb in the churchyard.

(The Grimms, *Household Tales*)

“The Juniper-Tree”

It is now long ago, quite two thousand years, since there was a rich man who had a beautiful and pious wife, and they loved each other dearly. They had, however, no children, though they wished for them very much, and the woman prayed for them day and night, but still they had none. Now there was a court-yard in front of their house in which was a juniper-tree, and one day in winter the woman was standing beneath it, paring herself an apple, and while she was paring herself the apple she cut her finger, and the blood fell on the snow. “Ah,” said the woman, and sighed right heavily, and looked at the blood before her, and was most unhappy, “ah, if I had but a child as red as blood and as white as snow!” And while she thus spake, she became quite happy in her mind, and felt just as if that were going to happen. Then she went into the house and a month went by and the snow was gone, and two months, and then everything was green, and three months, and then all the flowers came out of the earth, and four months, and then all the trees in the wood grew

thicker, and the green branches were all closely entwined, and the birds sang until the wood resounded and the blossoms fell from the trees, then the fifth month passed away and she stood under the juniper-tree, which smelt so sweetly that her heart leapt, and she fell on her knees and was beside herself with joy, and when the sixth month was over the fruit was large and fine, and then she was quite still, and the seventh month she snatched at the juniper-berries and ate them greedily, then she grew sick and sorrowful, then the eighth month passed, and she called her husband to her, and wept and said, "If I die then bury me beneath the juniper-tree." Then she was quite comforted and happy until the next month was over, and then she had a child as white as snow and as red as blood, and when she beheld it she was delighted that she died.

Then her husband buried her beneath the juniper-tree, and he began to weep sore; after some time he was more at ease, and though he still wept he could bear it, and after some time longer he took another wife.

By the second wife he had a daughter, but the first wife's child was a little son, and he was as red as blood and as white as snow. When the woman looked at her daughter she loved her very much, but then she looked at the little boy and it seemed to cut her to the heart, for the thought came into her mind that he would always stand in her way, and she was for ever thinking how she could get all the fortune for her daughter, and the Evil One filled her mind with this till she was quite wroth with the little boy, and slapped him here and cuffed him there, until the child was in continual terror, for when he came out of the school he had no peace in any place.

One day the woman had gone upstairs to her room, and her little daughter went up too, and said, "Mother, give me an apple." "Yes, my child," said the woman, and gave her a fine apple out of the chest, but the chest had a great heavy lid with a great sharp iron lock. "Mother," said the little daughter, "is brother not to have one too?" This made the woman angry, but she said, "Yes, when he comes out of school." And when she saw from the window that he was coming, it was just as if the Devil entered into her, and she snatched at the apple and took it away again from her daughter, and said, "Thou shalt not have one before thy brother." Then she threw the apple into the chest, and shut it. Then the little boy came in at the door, and the Devil made her say to him kindly, "My son, wilt thou have an apple?" and she looked

wickedly at him. "Mother," said the little boy, "how dreadful you look! Yes, give me an apple." Then it seemed to her as if she were forced to say to him, "Come with me," and she opened the lid of the chest and said, "Take out an apple for thyself," and when the little boy was stooping inside, the Devil prompted her, and crash! she shut the lid down, and his head flew off and fell among the red apples. Then she was overwhelmed with terror, and thought, "If I could but make them think that it was not done by me!" So she went upstairs to her room to her chest of drawers, and took a white handkerchief out of the top drawer, and set the head on the neck again, and folded the handkerchief so that nothing could be seen, and she set him on a chair in front of the door, and put the apple in his hand.

After this Marlinchen came into the kitchen to her mother, who was standing by the fire with a pan of hot water before her which she was constantly stirring round. "Mother," said Marlinchen, "brother is sitting at the door, and he looks quite white and has an apple in his hand. I asked him to give me the apple, but he did not answer me, and I was quite frightened." "Go back to him," said her mother, "and if he will not answer thee, give him a box on the ear." So Marlinchen went to him and said, "Brother, give me the apple." But he was silent, and she gave him a box on the ear, on which his head fell down. Marlinchen was terrified, and began crying and screaming, and ran to her mother, and said, "Alas, mother, I have knocked my brother's head off!" and she wept and wept and could not be comforted. "Marlinchen," said the mother, "what hast thou done? But be quiet and let no one know it; it cannot be helped now, we will make him into black-puddings." Then the mother took the little boy and chopped him in pieces, put him into the pan and made him into black puddings; but Marlinchen stood by weeping and weeping, and all her tears fell into the pan and there was no need of any salt.

Then the father came home, and sat down to dinner and said, "But where is my son?" And the mother served up a great dish of black-puddings, and Marlinchen wept and could not leave off. Then the father again said, "But where is my son?" "Ah," said the mother, "he has gone across the country to his mother's great uncle; he will stay there awhile." "And what is he going to do there? He did not even say good-bye to me."

"Oh, he wanted to go, and asked me if he might stay six weeks, he is well taken care of there." "Ah," said the man, "I feel so unhappy lest all should not be right. He

ought to have said good-bye to me.” With that he began to eat and said, “Marlinchen, why art thou crying? Thy brother will certainly come back.” Then he said, “Ah, wife, how delicious this food is, give me some more.” And the more he ate and ate and threw all the bones under the table, until he had finished the whole. But Marlinchen went away to her chest of drawers, and took her best silk handkerchief out of the bottom drawer, and got all the bones from beneath the table, and tied them up in her silk handkerchief, and carried them outside the door, weeping tears of blood. She laid them down beneath the juniper-tree on the green grass, and after she put them there, she suddenly felt better and did not cry anymore. Then the juniper-tree began to stir itself, and the branches parted asunder, and moved together again, just as if some one was rejoicing and clapping his hands. At the same time a mist seemed to arise from the tree, and in the centre of this mist it burned like a fire, and a beautiful bird flew out of the fire singing magnificently, and he flew high up in the air, and when he was gone, the juniper-tree was just as it had been before, and the handkerchief with the bones was no longer there. Marlinchen, however, was as gay and happy as if her brother were still alive. And she went merrily into the house, and sat down to dinner and ate.

But the bird flew and lighted on a goldsmith’s house, and began to sing,
“My mother, she killed me,
My father, he ate me,
My sister, little Marlinchen,
Gathered together all my bones,
Tied them in a silken handkerchief,
Laid them beneath the juniper-tree,
Kywitt, kywitt, what a beautiful bird am I!”

The goldsmith was sitting in his workshop making a gold chain, when he heard the bird which was sitting singing on his roof, and very beautiful the song seemed to him. He stood up, but as he crossed the threshold he lost one of his slippers. But when he went away right up the middle of the street with one shoe on and one sock; he had his apron on, and in one hand he had the gold chain and in the other the pincers, and the sun was shining brightly on the street. Then he went right on and stood still, and said to the bird, “Bird,” said he then, “how beautifully thou canst sing! Sing me that piece again.” “No,” said the bird, “I’ll not sing it twice for

nothing! Give me the golden chain, and then I will sing it again or thee.” “There,” said the goldsmith, “there is the golden chain for thee, now sing me that song again.” Then the bird came and took the golden chain in his right claw, and went and sat in front of the goldsmith, and sang,

“My mother, she killed me,
My father, he ate me,
My sister, little Marlinchen,
Gathered together all my bones,
Tied them in a silken handkerchief,
Laid them beneath the juniper-tree,
Kywitt, kywitt, what a beautiful bird am I!”

Then the bird flew away to a shoemaker, and lighted on his roof and sang,

“My mother, she killed me,
My father, he ate me,
My sister, little Marlinchen,
Gathered together all my bones,
Tied them in a silken handkerchief,
Laid them beneath the juniper-tree,
Kywitt, kywitt, what a beautiful bird am I!”

The shoemaker heard that and ran out of doors in his shirt sleeves, and looked up at his roof, and was forced to hold his hand before his eyes lest the sun should blind him. “Bird,” said he, “how beautifully thou canst sing well.” Then he called his daughter and children, and apprentices, boys and girls, and they all came up the street and looked at the bird and saw how beautiful he was, and what fine red and green feathers he had, and how like real gold his neck was, and how the eyes in his head shone like stars. “Bird,” said the shoemaker, “now sing me that song again.” “Nay,” said the bird, “I do not sing twice for nothing; thou must give me something.” “Wife,” said the man, “go to the garret, upon the top shelf there stands a pair of red shoes, bring them down.” Then the wife went and brought the shoes. “There, bird,” said the man, “now sing me that piece again.” Then the bird came and took the shoes in his left claw, and flew back on the roof, and sang,

“My mother, she killed me,
My father, he ate me,

My sister, little Marlinchen,
Gathered together all my bones,
Tied them in a silken handkerchief,
Laid them beneath the juniper-tree,
Kywitt, kywitt, what a beautiful bird am I!”

And when he had sung the whole he flew away. In his right claw he had the chain and the shoes in his left, and he flew far away to a mill, and the mill went, “klipp klapp, klipp klapp, klipp klapp,” and in the mill sat twenty miller’s men hewing a stone, and cutting, hick hack, hick hack, hick hack and the mill went klipp klapp, klipp klapp, klipp klapp. Then the bird went and sat on a lime-tree which stood in front of the mill, and sang,

“My mother, she killed me,”

Then one of them stopped working and listened to that,

“My father, he ate me,”

Then two more stopped working and listened to that,

“My sister, little Marlinchen,”

The four more stopped working and listened to that,

“Gathered together all my bones,

Tied them in a silken handkerchief,”

Now only eight only were hewing,

“Laid them beneath”

Now only five,

“The juniper-tree,”

And now only one,

“Kywitt, kywitt, what a beautiful bird am I!”

Then the last one stopped also, and heard the last words. “Bird,” said he, “how beautifully thou singest! Let me, too, hear that. Sing that once more for me.”

“Nay,” said the bird, “I will not sing twice for nothing. Give me the millstone, and then I will sing it again.”

“Yes,” said he, “if it belonged to me only, thou shouldst have it.” “Yes,” said the others, “if he sings again he shall have it.” Then the bird came down, and the twenty millers all set to work with a beam and raised the stone up. And the bird stuck his

neck through the hole, and put the stone on as if it were a collar, and flew on to the tree again, and sang,

“My mother, she killed me,
My father, he ate me,
My sister, little Marlinchen,
Gathered together all my bones,
Tied them in a silken handkerchief,
Laid them beneath the juniper-tree,
Kywitt, kywitt, what a beautiful bird am I!”

And when he has done singing, he spread his wings, and in his right claw he had the chain, and in his left hand the shoes, and round his neck the millstone, and he flew far away to his father’s house.

In the room sat the father, the mother, and Marlinchen at dinner, and the father said, “How light-hearted I feel, how happy I am!” “Nay,” said the mother, “I feel so uneasy, just as if a heavy storm were coming.” Marlinchen, however, sat weeping and weeping, and then came the bird flying, and as it seated itself on the roof, the father said, “Ah, I feel so truly happy, and the sun is shining so beautifully outside, I feel just as if I were about to see some old friend again.” “Nay,” said the woman, “I feel so anxious, my teeth chatter, and I seem to have fire in my veins.” And she tore her stays open, but Marlinchen sat in a corner crying, and held her plate before her eyes and cried till it was quite wet. Then the bird sat on the juniper tree, and sang,

“My mother, she killed me,”

Then the mother stopped her ears, and shut her eyes, and would not see or hear, but there was a roaring in her ears like the most violent storm, and her eyes burnt and flashed like lighting.

“My father, he ate me,”

“Ah, mother”, says the man, “that is a beautiful bird! He sings so splendidly, and the sun shines so warm, and there is a smell just like cinnamon.”

“My sister, little Marlinchen,”

The Marlinchen laid her head on her knees and wept without ceasing, but the man said, “I am going out, I must see the bird quite close.” “Oh, don’t go,” said the

woman, "I feel as if the whole house were shaking and on fire." But the man went out and looked at the bird:

"Gathered together all my bones,
Tied them in a silken handkerchief,
Laid them beneath the juniper-tree,
Kywitt, kywitt, what a beautiful bird am I!"

On this the bird let the golden chain fall, and it fell exactly round the man's neck, and so exactly round it that fitted beautifully. Then he went in, and said, "Just look what a fine bird that is, and what a handsome gold chain he has given me, and how pretty he is!" But the woman was terrified, and fell down on the floor in the room and her cap fell off her head. Then sang the bird once more,

"My mother, she killed me,"
"Would that I were a thousand feet beneath the earth so as not to hear that!"
"My father, he ate me,"

Then the woman fell down again as if dead.

"My sister, little Marlinchen,"

"Ah," said Marlinchen, "I too will go out and see if the bird will give me anything," and she went out.

"Gathered together all my bones,
Tied them in a silken handkerchief,"

Then he threw down the shoes to her.

"Laid them beneath the juniper-tree,
Kywitt, kywitt, what a beautiful bird am I!"

Then she was light-hearted and joyous, and she put the new red shoes, and danced and leaped into the house. "Ah," said she, "I was so sad when I went out and now I am so light-hearted; that is a splendid bird, he has given me a pair of red shoes!" "Well," said the woman, and sprang to her feet and her hair stood up like flames of fire, "I feel as if the world were coming to an end! I, too, will go out and see if my heart feels lighter." And as she went out at the door, crash! The bird threw down the millstone on her head, and she was entirely crushed by it. The father and Marlinchen heard what had happened and went out, and smoke, flames, and fire were rising from

the place, and when that was over, there stood the little brother, and he took his father and Marlinchen by the hand, and all three were right glad, and they went into the house to dinner, and ate.

(The Grimms, *Household Tales*)

“Rumpelstiltskin”

Once there was a miller who was poor, but who had a beautiful daughter. Now it happened that he had to go and speak to the King, and in order to make himself appear important he said to him, “I have a daughter who can spin straw into gold.” The King said to the miller, “That is an art which pleases me well; if your daughter is as clever as you say, bring her tomorrow to my palace, and I will try what she can do.”

And when the girl was brought to him he took her into a room which was quite full of straw, gave her a spinning-wheel and a reel, and said, “Now set to work, and if by tomorrow morning early you have not spun this straw into gold during the night, you must die.” Thereupon he himself locked up the room, and left her in it alone. So there sat the poor miller’s daughter, and for the life of her could not tell what to do; she had no idea how straw could be spun into gold, and she grew more and more miserable, until at last she began to weep.

But all at once the door opened, and in came a little man, and said, “Good evening, Mistress Miller, why are you crying so?” “Alas!” answered the girl, “I have to spin straw into gold, and I do not know how to do it.” “What will you give me,” said the manikin, “if I do it for you?” “My necklace,” said the girl. The little man took the necklace, seated himself in front of the wheel, and “whirr, whirr, whirr,” three turns, and the reel was full; then he put another on, and whirr, whirr, whirr, three times round, and the second was full too. And so it went on until the morning, when all the straw was spun, and all the reels were full of gold. By daybreak the King was already there, and when he saw the gold he was astonished and delighted, but his heart became only more greedy. He had the miller’s daughter taken into another room full of straw, which was much larger, and commanded her to spin that also in one night if she valued her life. The girl knew now how to help herself, and was crying, when the door again opened, and the little man appeared, and said,

“What wilt you give me if I spin that straw into gold for you?” “The ring on my finger,” answered the girl. The little man took the ring, again began to turn the wheel, and by morning had spun all the straw into glittering gold.

The King rejoiced beyond measure at the sight, but still he had not gold enough; and he had the miller’s daughter taken into a still larger room full of straw and said, “You must spin this, too, in the course of this night; but if you succeed, you shall be my wife.” “Even if she be a miller’s daughter,” thought he, “I could not find a richer wife in the whole world.”

When the girl was alone the manikin came again for the third time, and said, “What will you give me if I spin the straw for you this time also?” “I have nothing left that I could give,” answered the girl. “Then promise me, if you should become Queen, your first child.” “Who knows whether that will ever happen?” thought the miller’s daughter; and not knowing how else to help herself in this strait, she promised the manikin what he wanted, and for that he once more spun the straw into gold.

And when the King came in the morning, and found all as he had wished, he took her in marriage, and the pretty miller’s daughter became a Queen.

A year after, she had a beautiful child, and she never gave a thought to the manikin. But suddenly he came into her room, and said, “Now give me what you promised.” The Queen was horror struck, and offered the manikin all the riches of the kingdom if he would leave her the child. But the manikin said, “No, something that is living is dearer to me than all the treasures in the world.”

Then the Queen began to weep and cry, so that the manikin pitied her. “I will give you three days’ time,” said he, “if by that time you find out my name, then shall you keep your child.”

So the Queen thought the whole night of all the names that she had ever heard, and she sent a messenger over the country to inquire, far and wide, for any other names that there might be. When the manikin came the next day, she began with Caspar, Melchior, Balthazar, and said all the names she knew, one after another; but to every one the little man said, “That is not my name.” On the second day she had inquiries made in the neighbourhood as to the names of the people there, and she repeated to the manikin the most uncommon and curious. “Perhaps your name is

Shortribs, or Sheepshanks, or Laceleg?” but he always answered, “That is not my name.”

On the third day the messenger came back again, and said, “I have not been able to find a single new name, but as I came to a high mountain at the end of the forest, where the fox and the hare bid each other good night, there I saw a little house, and before the house a fire was burning, and round about the fire quite a ridiculous little man was jumping, he hopped upon one leg, and shouted-

“Today I bake, tomorrow brew,
The next day I’ll have the young Queen’s child.
Ha! Glad am I that no one knew
That Rumpelstiltskin I am styled.”

You may think how glad the Queen was when she heard the name! And when soon afterwards the little man came in, and asked, “Now, Mistress Queen, what is my name?” at first she said, “Is your name Harry?” “No.”

“Perhaps your name is Rumpelstiltskin?”

“The devil has told you that! The devil has told you that!” cried the little man, and in his anger he plunged his right foot so deep into the earth that his whole leg went in; and then in rage he pulled at his left leg so hard with both hands that he tore himself in two. (The Grimms, *Household Tales*)

“Bluebeard”

There once lived a man who had fine houses, both in the city and in the country, dinner services of gold and silver, chairs covered with tapestries, and coaches covered with gold. But this man had the misfortune of having a blue beard, which made him look so ugly and frightful that women and girls alike fled at the sight of him. One of his neighbours, a respectable lady, had two daughters who were perfect beauties. He asked for the hand of one, but left it up to the mother to choose which one. Neither of the two girls wanted to marry him, and the offer went back and forth between them, since they could not bring themselves to marry a man with a blue beard. What added even more to their sense of disgust was that he had already married several women, and no one knew what had become of them. In order to cultivate their acquaintance, Bluebeard threw a party for the two girls with their

mother, three or four of their closest friends, and a few young men from the neighbourhood in one of his country houses. It lasted an entire week. Everyday there were parties of pleasure, hunting, fishing, dancing, and dining. The guests never even slept, but cavorted and caroused all night long. Everything went so well that the younger of the two sisters began to think that the beard of the master of the house was not so blue after all and that he was in fact a fine fellow. As soon as they returned to town, the marriage was celebrated. After a month had passed, Bluebeard told his wife that he had to travel to take care of some urgent business in the provinces and that he would be away for at least six weeks. He urged her to enjoy herself while he was away, to invite her close friends and to take them out to the country if she wished. Above all, she was to stay in good spirits. "Here," he said, "are the keys to my two large store rooms. Here are the ones for the gold and silver china that is too good for everyday use. Here are the ones for my strongboxes, where my gold and silver are kept. Here are the ones for the caskets where my jewels are stored. And finally, this is the passkey to all the rooms in my mansion. As for this particular key, it is the key to the small room at the end of the long passage on the lower floor. Open anything you want. Go anywhere you wish. But I absolutely forbid you to enter that little room, and if you so much as open it a crack, there will be no limit to my anger." She promised to follow the orders he had just given exactly. After kissing his wife, Bluebeard got into the carriage and embarked on his journey.

Friends and neighbours of the young bride did not wait for an invitation before coming to call, so great was their impatience to see the splendours of the house. They had not dared to call while the husband was there, because of his blue beard, which frightened them. In no time they were darting through the rooms, the closets, and the wardrobes, each of which was more splendid and sumptuous than the next. Then they went upstairs to the storerooms, where they could not find words to describe the number and beauty of the tapestries, beds, sofas, cabinets, stands, and tables. There were looking glasses, in which you could see yourself from head to toe, some of which had frames of glass, others of silver or gilded lacquer, but all of which were more splendid and magnificent than anyone there had ever seen. They kept on expressing praise even as they felt envy for the good fortune of their friend who, however, was unable to take any pleasure at all from the sight of these riches because she was so anxious to get into that room on the lower floor. So tormented was she by

her curiosity that, without stopping to think about how rude it was to leave her friends, she raced down a little staircase so fast that more than once she thought she was going to break her neck. When she reached the door to the room, she stopped to think for a moment about how her husband had forbidden her to enter, and she reflected on the harm that might come her way for being disobedient. But the temptation was so great that she was unable to resist it. She took the little key and, trembling, opened the door. At first she saw nothing, for the windows were closed. After a few moments, she began to realize that the floor was covered with clotted blood and that the blood reflected the bodies of several dead women hung up on the walls (these were all the women Bluebeard had married and then murdered one after another). She thought she would die of fright, and the key to the room, which she was about to pull out of the lock, dropped from her hand. When she regained her senses, she picked up the key, closed the door, and went back to her room to compose herself. But she didn't succeed, for her nerves were too frayed. Having noticed that the key to the room was stained with blood, she wiped it two or three times, but the blood would not come off at all. She tried to wash it off and even to scrub it with sand and grit. The blood stain would not come off because the key was enchanted and nothing could clean it completely. When you cleaned the stain from one side, it just returned on the other. That very night, Bluebeard returned unexpectedly from his journey and reported that, on the road, he had received letters informing him that the business upon which he had set forth had just been settled to his satisfaction. His wife did everything that she could to make it appear that she was thrilled with his speedy return. The next day, he asked to have the keys back, and she returned them, but with a hand trembling so much that he knew at once what had happened. "How is it," he asked, "that the key to the little room isn't with the others?" "I must have left it upstairs on my dressing table," she replied. "Don't forget to bring it to me soon," Bluebeard told her. After making one excuse after another, she had to bring him the key. Bluebeard examined it and said to his wife: "Why is there blood on this key?" "I have no idea," answered the poor woman, paler than death. "You have no idea," Bluebeard replied. "But I have an idea. You tried to enter that little room. Well, madam, now that you have opened it, you can go right in and take your place beside the ladies whom you saw there." She threw herself at her husband's feet, weeping and begging his pardon, with all the signs of genuine regret

for disobeying him. She looked so beautiful and was so distressed that she would have melted a heart of stone, but Bluebeard had a heart harder than any rock.

"You must die, madam," he declared, "and it will be right away." "Since I must die," she replied, gazing at him with eyes full of tears, "give me a little time to say my prayers."

"I will give you a quarter of an hour," Bluebeard said, "but not a moment more." When she was alone, she called her sister and said to her: "Sister Anne"—for that was her name—"I implore you to go up to the top of the tower to see if my brothers are on the way here. They told me that they were coming to visit today. If you catch sight of them, signal them to hurry." Sister Anne went up to the top of the tower, and the poor distressed girl cried out to her from time to time: "Anne, Sister Anne, do you see anyone coming?" Sister Anne replied: "I see nothing but the sun shining and the green grass growing."

In the meantime, Bluebeard took an enormous cutlass in hand and cried out at the top of his voice to his wife: "Come down at once or I'll go up there!" "Just a moment more, I beg you," his wife replied and at the same time she called out softly: "Anne, Sister Anne, do you see anyone coming?" And Sister Anne replied: "I see nothing but the sun shining and the green grass growing." "Come down at once," Bluebeard called, "or I'll go up there!" "I'm coming," his wife replied, and then she called: "Anne, Sister Anne, do you see anyone coming?" "I can see a great cloud of dust coming this way," replied Sister Anne. "Is it my brothers?" "No, oh no, sister, it's just a flock of sheep." "Are you coming down?" Bluebeard roared. "Just one moment more," his wife replied, and then she called: "Anne, Sister Anne, do you see anyone coming?" "I see two horsemen coming this way, but they're still far away," she replied. "Thank God," she shouted a moment later, "it must be our brothers. I'll signal to them to hurry up." Bluebeard began shouting so loudly that the entire house shook. His poor wife came downstairs, in tears and with dishevelled hair. She threw herself at his feet. "That won't do you any good," said Bluebeard. "Prepare to die." Then, taking her by the hair with one hand and raising his cutlass with the other, he was about to chop off her head. The poor woman turned to him and implored him with a gaze that had death written on it. She begged for one last moment to prepare herself for death. "No, no," he said, "prepare to meet your maker." And lifting his arm . . . Just at that moment there was such a loud pounding at the gate that

Bluebeard stopped short. The gate was opened, and two horsemen, swords in hand, dashed in and made straight for Bluebeard. He realized that they were the brothers of his wife: the one a dragoon and the other a musketeer. He fled instantly in an effort to escape. But the two brothers were so hot in pursuit that they trapped him before he could get to the stairs. They plunged their swords through his body and left him for dead. Bluebeard's wife was as close to death as her husband and barely had the strength to rise and embrace her brothers. It turned out that Bluebeard had left no heirs, and so his wife took possession of the entire estate. She devoted a portion of it to arranging a marriage between her sister Anne and a young gentleman with whom she had been in love for a long time. Another portion of it was used to buy commissions for her two brothers. She used the rest to marry herself to a very worthy man, who banished the memory of the miserable days she had spent with Bluebeard.

Moral

Curiosity, in spite of its many charms,
Can bring with it serious regrets;
You can see a thousand examples of it every day.
Women succumb, but it's a fleeting pleasure;
As soon as you satisfy it, it ceases to be.
And it always proves very, very costly.

Another Moral

If you just take a sensible point of view,
And study this grim little story,
You will understand that this tale
Is one that took place many years ago.
No longer are husbands so terrible,
Demanding the impossible,
Acting unhappy and jealous.
With their wives they toe the line;
And whatever colour their beards might be,
It's not hard to tell which of the pair is master.

(Perrault)

APPENDIX D

CURRICULUM VITAE

PERSONAL INFORMATION

Surname, Name: Büyü, Gül
Nationality: Turkish (TC)
Date and Place of Birth: 20 September 1981, Bandırma
Phone: +90 505 628 07 82
Email: tanesengul@gmail.com

EDUCATION

Degree	Institution	Year of Graduation
PhD	METU, English Literature	2013
MA	METU, English Literature	2007
BA	Hacettepe University, English Language&Literature	2004

WORK EXPERIENCE

Year	Place	Enrollment
2011- Present	Ankara University, School of Foreign Languages	Academic Coordinator, Lecturer
2005- Present	Ankara University, School of Foreign Languages	Lecturer
2004-2005	Alkan English Course	English Teacher

FOREIGN LANGUAGES

Advanced English, Intermediate German

AWARDS

İhsan Doğramacı Üstün Başarı Ödülü, Hacettepe University, 2004
Öğrenci Başarı Ödülü, Hacettepe University, 2004

PUBLICATIONS

1. Büyü, Gül. "Nazlı Eray'ın *Uyku İstasyonu*'na Psikanalitik Bir Yaklaşım". *Türk Dili Dergisi*. CII (736): 54-61. 2013.
2. Büyü, Gül. "Sartrean Look in *The Zoo Story* and *A Delicate Balance*". *Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakülte Dergisi*. 50 (1): 95-111. 2010.

APPENDIX E

TURKISH SUMMARY

“Farklı Kùltùrlere ait Masallarda Kùtùlùk: Tùrk ve İngiliz Masallarının Psikolojik Açıdan İncelenmesi” başlıklı tez, Tùrk ve İngiliz masallarındaki kùtùlùk kavramına psikanalitik bir bakış açısıyla yaklaşarak, masal araştırma ve çalışmalarına katkıda bulunmayı amaçlamaktadır. Tez, seçilmiş olan Tùrk ve İngiliz masallarında kùtùlùk kavramını Melanie Klein ve Fred Alford’un psikanalitik bakış açısı doğrultusunda incelemektedir.

İncelenmek üzere masallar seçilirken, Naki Tezel ve Joseph Jacobs’un derlemelerinde yer alan masalların “masal” tanımına uyup uymadığı ve masalların içinde tezin amacı doğrultusunda olan kùtùlùk kavramının yer alıp almadığı göz önüne alınmıştır. İçinde kùtùlùk olmayan veya masal tanımına uymayan hikâyeler ayıklanmıştır ve geriye kalan yirmi dokuz Tùrk masalı, otuz dokuz İngiliz masalı incelenmektedir. Masalları daha önceden duymamış ya da okumamış olanlar için ekte masalların özetleri sunulmaktadır. İncelenen masallar, derlemelerinde geçen sıralarına göre düzenlenmiş ve numaralandırılmıştır. Benzer masallar numaraları göz önüne alınmaksızın ardı ardına incelenmektedir. Bu masallarda ortaya çıkan kùtùlùğün nedenleri fesatlık, kıskançlık, açgözlülük veya endişe olarak belirlenmiştir. Bu masallarda kùtùlùk şiddet, işkence ve hatta karşısındakini öldürme yoluyla işlenmektedir. Bu tez Klein ve Alford’un iddia ettiği gibi, masalı okuyan ya da dinleyen bir çocuğun içindeki kùtùlùk ve endişe duyguları ile baş edebilme yollarını bulabileceğini göstermiştir.

Tez dört bölüme ayrılmaktadır ve tezin ilk bölümünde okuyucuya genel bir bilgi vermesi amacıyla masalın tanımı yapılmaktadır. Masal bir edebi tür olarak tek başına tanımlanamadığı için, etkilenmiş olduğu diğer türlerden bahsedilmekte ve aralarında yer alan farklar açıklanmaktadır. Masallar genel olarak okuyucuya ya da dinleyiciye kısa düzyazılar halinde sunulmaktadır. Masallardaki karakterler genellikle kùltùrlere göre farklılık göstermekle beraber, o kùltüre ait eserlerde belli karakterler okuyucunun/dinleyicinin karşısına çıkar. Örneğin, Batı masallarında

cadılar, hayaletler, kısa ve tüylü yaratıklar ve ejderhalar yer alırken, Doğu masallarında şahlar, şehzadeler, vezirler ve Sultanlar yer almaktadır.

Tezin bu bölümünde ayrıca geçmişten günümüze masal çalışmaları ve teorileri hakkında kısa bir bilgi verilmektedir. Birçok okul masal çalışmaları ve araştırmaları yaparak masalın ortaya çıkışı hakkında farklı tezler öne sürmüşlerdir. Bunlardan “Mitoloji Okulu”, masalların mitlerden doğduğunu belirtmiş ve en önemli temsilcileri olan Jacob ve Wilhelm Grimm kardeşler çalışmaları ile ön plana çıkmıştır. Bu okulun savunucularına göre masalların temeli Hint mitolojisinde, *Veda*’larda, aranmalıdır. Max Müller, masalların Hint-Avrupa mitlerinden ortaya çıktığını savunan diğer bir halk bilim uzmanıdır.

“Sanskrit (Hindoloji) Okulu” ise masalların temelini Hint kültürü olduğunu iddia etmiş ve *Pançatantra* masallarından ortaya çıktığını savunmuştur. Theodor Benfey, bu okulun savunucularındandır ve ona göre masallar Avrupa’ya Haçlı seferleri sırasında ya da Müslüman tacirler yolu ile İspanya’ya gelmiştir.

“Antropoloji Okulu” ise tüm toplulukların aynı şekilde ortaya çıktığını savunmuş ve bu yüzden de masalarda ortak motiflerin yer aldığını belirtmiştir. Bu okula göre, masallar mitlerden değil, hayatın kendisinden ortaya çıkmıştır. Bu okulun savunucuları arasında James George Frazer (1854-1941), Edward Burnett Tylor (1832-1917) ve Andrew Lang (1844-1912) sayılmaktadır.

“Fin Okulu” ise, masalların tarihini tekrar yazarak, tek bir temel oluşturmuştur. Antti Aarne (1867-1925) Avrupa masalları ile ilgili bir katalog hazırlamış ve bu katalog daha sonra Amerikalı araştırmacı Stith Thompson tarafından geliştirilmiştir.

“Yapısalcılık Okulu”nda öne çıkan isimler Vladimir Propp, Claude Lévi-Strauss ve Tzeveton Todorov’dur. Propp, ünlü eseri *Masalın Biçimbilimi*’nde (1928) masalların temel işlevlerini belirleyerek, masallardaki kişiler farklı da olsa işlevlerinin aynı olduğunu savunmuştur. Strauss, mitlerin insan beynin yapılarını gösterdiğini iddia etmiş ve mitlerin din ile olan ilişkisini incelemiştir. Todorov ise, her olay örgüsünde beş aşama olduğunu savunmuş ve her halk masalının belli bir denge ile başladığını ve bu dengenin bozulup sonra tekrar kurulması ile beş aşamanın tamamlandığını iddia etmiştir.

Öte yandan, günümüzde hala önemli rol oynayan “Psikoloji Okulu”, karakterlerin ya da anlatıcıların duygusal ve bilişsel durumlarını incelemiş, aynı

zamanda masalarda yatan gizli mesajları ortaya çıkararak bireylerin bilinçaltında yatan arzu ve korkularının olduğunu iddia etmiştir. Bu okulun en önemli savunucuları Sigmund Freud ve Carl Jung'dur. Freud, masallar ve rüyalar arasında bir bağlantı kurmaya çalışarak, masalarda yer alan sembolleri yorumlamış ve bunları bilinçaltında yatan bastırılmış istekler olarak adlandırmıştır. Freud'un önemli takipçileri arasında Franz Riklin, Ernest Jones, Erich Fromm ve Geza Roheim yer almaktadır. Bruno Bettelheim ise Freud'un fikirlerini devam ettiren diğer bir psikologdur.

Bettelheim'e göre, çocuklar masalların basit ve sade dili sayesinde bilinçaltında yaşadıkları sorunların üstesinden gelebilirler. Bettelheim, masalların mutlu sonla bitmesinin çocuk gelişimi için iyi olacağını savunmuş ve bunun tedavi edici etkisinden bahsetmiştir.

Carl Jung, masal çalışmalarında öne çıkan diğer bir isimdir ve masalların, insanların ruhunda bulunan arketiplerden ortaya çıktığını iddia etmiştir. Jung'un en önemli takipçilerinden birisi Marie Luise von Franz'dır (1915-1998). Franz, masalların kolektif bilinçaltını yansıtan en önemli edebi tür olduğunu savunmuştur. Masallardaki kötülük kavramına psikolojik olarak yaklaşan bir doktora tezi de Sara Miller'a (1984) aittir. Bu çalışmada, Miller Jung'un öğretilerinden yola çıkarak Afanasyev, Lang ve Grimm masallarında cadı karakterini incelemiştir.

Bu tezde iki kültürün- Türk ve İngiliz- masalları incelendiği için bu iki kültürde yapılan masal çalışmaları hakkında kısaca bilgi verilmektedir. İngiliz fantezi unsurları Ortaçağ edebiyat eserlerinde kendini göstermeye başlamış olup, en eski eser olan *Beowulf* 'da (8. y.y.) bunu görmek mümkündür. Diğer bir fantastik eser de Kral Arthur'un şövalyeleri ile Yeni Yıl'ı kutladığı ve sonrasında Gawain adlı bir şövalyenin yeşil canavarın şatosunda yaşadığı olayların anlatıldığı *Sir Gawain and Green Knight*'dir. Ortaçağ'dan sonra fantastik edebiyat alanında göze çarpan isimlerden birisi Spencer'dır. İtalyan edebiyatından etkilenen Spencer, *Faerie Queen* adlı eserinde İngiliz perilere eserinde yer vermemiştir. Fantastik unsurlara eserlerinde yer veren diğer isimler ise Ben Jonson, Michael Drayton ve Robert Herrick'dir. İngiliz edebiyatının en önemli isimlerinden birisi olan William Shakespeare de eserlerinde perileri kullanmış ve bunun en güzel örneğini *A Midsummer Night's Dream* adlı oyununda sergilemiştir. Önemli isimlerden bir diğeri olan Milton da aynı şekilde *Comus* adlı eserinde fantastik unsurlara yer vermiştir. Romantik dönemde ise

Samuel Taylor Coleridge ve John Keats gibi şairler fantastik unsurları şiirlerinde kullanmıştır.

Peri ve fantastik unsurların yer aldığı birçok İngiliz eseri bulunmasına rağmen, masal derlenmesi ve yazılması ile ilgili olarak İngiliz edebiyatı on dokuzuncu yüz yıla kadar pek verim gösterememiştir. İngiliz masal yazarları genellikle Perrault, Grimm kardeşler ve Arap masallarının etkisi altında kalmışlardır. Jack Zipes, İngiliz masallarının çok fazla sayıda olmamasını fanteziyi zararlı gören Püritenlerin etkisine bağlamaktadır (Victorian xiii).

Viktoryen Döneminde, İngiliz edebiyatı masal araştırmalarında ve yazmalarında önemli gelişmeler gerçekleşmiş, Avrupa'dan yapılan çevirilerin sayısı artmış ve Folklor toplulukları oluşturulmuştur. William John Thoms tarafından 1846 yılında “folklor” sözcüğü ortaya atılmıştır. Andrew Lang (1844-1912) İngiliz masal çalışmalarına önemli katkılarda bulunmuş, ancak derlemiş olduğu masallar orijinal İngiliz masallarından ziyade “Külkedisi” ve “Kırmızı Başlıklı Kız” gibi Fransız ve Alman masallarından derlenmiştir. Fransız ve Alman masalları dışında, sadece İngiliz masallarını derleyen ilk tarihçi ve halkbilimci Joseph Jacobs'dır. İngiltere'de yirminci yüzyılda masal çalışmaları önemli bir boyut kazanmış ve Katherine Briggs gibi yazarlar on altıncı ve on yedinci yüzyıllara ait masalları tekrar derlemeye başlamışlardır. Diğer yirminci yüzyıl yazarlarından Alan Garner (1934-) çocuklar için yeni bir fantezi edebiyatı oluşturmakla birlikte eserlerinde mit öğelerini günümüz karakterleri ile geçmişte yer alan karakterlerle birleştirmiştir. J. R. R. Tolkien ve C. S. Lewis savaş sonrası fantezi edebiyatının popüler olmasını sağlamış, Angela Carter, gibi isimler ise geleneksel masalları yeniden yazarak, eserlerinde yetişkinlere hitap etmiştir.

Türk masalları da Avrupa masalları gibi sözlü edebiyattan gelmekte olup diğer edebi türlerden etkilenmiştir. Türk toplumu göçmen olduğu için masalarda özellikle Ortadoğu, Çin, Hint ve Arap masallarının etkisi görülmektedir. *Binbir Gece Masalları*'nın yanı sıra İran edebiyatına ait *Binbir Gün Masalları* da Türk masallarında etkili olmuştur. *Dede Korkut Hikâyeleri* Türk edebiyatındaki en önemli ve ilk epiklerden biridir. İslam ve Şamanizm etkileri olan eser on iki hikâyeden oluşmaktadır ve dönemle ilgili olarak önemli bilgiler vermektedir.

Türk masalları genellikle yabancılar tarafından çalışılmıştır ve örneğin, “Halil”, “Şirvanlı Tüccar” ve “Derviş” adlı hikâyeleri ilk yayınlayan XIV. Louis'nin

sekreteri M. Digeon'dur. Diğer bir örneği ise, 1887-1905 yılları arasında köylerden derlediği masalları yayınlayan Macar araştırmacı Ignaz Kúnos'dur.

İlk önemli eserlerden biri olan *Billur Köşk Masalları* on dört hikâyeden oluşmaktadır ve ancak yayınlanma tarihi kesin olarak bilinmemektedir. İlk orijinal Türk masalı, K. D. baş harflerine sahip bir kişi tarafından derlenip 1912 yılında basılmıştır. K. D.'nin masalları Pertev Naili Boratav tarafından akademik dünyaya tanıtılmıştır. Diğer önemli isimlerden birisi de Ziya Gökalp'dir. Gökalp kendi yazdığı masalları *Alageyik* (1912) adlı masal kitabında toplamıştır ve birçok dergide masal çalışmaları üzerine makaleler yazmıştır (Sakaoğlu, *Masal* 222).

Boratav (1907-1998), Türk masal çalışmalarına büyük katkıda bulunmuş ve *Zaman Zaman İçinde* (1958) ve *Az Gittik Uz Gittik* (1969) adlı eserlerinde Türk masal tarihi hakkında önemli bilgiler vermiştir. Bunların yanı sıra hocası Eberthart ile beraber *Typen Turkische Volksmarchen* başlığı altında 1953 yılında Türk masal kataloğu hazırlamıştır.

Eflatun Cem Güney masal araştırmalarında göze çarpan diğer önemli bir isimdir ve yaptığı çalışmalar sayesinde birçok ödül almıştır.

Bu tezde çalışılan halk bilim uzmanı Naki Tezel ise, 1936 yılında *Keloğlan Masalları* adı altında derlemiş olduğu masalları yayınlamıştır. *İstanbul Masalları* ve *Türk Masalları* adlı diğer önemli iki önemli eserinden, *Türk Masalları* adlı eserinde elli dört tane masal derlemiş olan Tezel, Türk masal çalışmalarına önemli katkıda bulunmuştur.

Türkiye'de masal araştırmaları ile ilgili ilk tez çalışması 1971 yılında "Gümüşhane Masalları/Metin Toplama ve Tahlil" başlığı altında Saim Sakaoğlu tarafından yapılmıştır. Bu tarihten sonra üniversitelerde masal araştırmaları üzerine birçok yüksek lisans ve doktora tezleri yazılmaya başlanmıştır.

Tezin diğer bölümünde Türk masal özelliklerinden bahsedilmekte olup Türk masalına ait olan karakterler hakkında genel bir bilgi verilmektedir.

Tezin ikinci bölümünde kötülük kavramı çalışılmaktadır ve bu kavramının geçmişten bugüne nasıl algılandığı üzerine incelemeler yapılmaktadır. Tezde Türk ve İngiliz masalları çalışılacağı için, bu bölümde kötülük kavramının hem İslam hem de Batı düşüncesinde nasıl algılandığı incelenmektedir. Tezin bu bölümünde kötülük kavramının nasıl ortaya çıktığı üzerinde durularak, ünlü teologların görüşlerine yer verilmektedir. Bu bölümde yer alan görüşlere göre, kötülük kavramı insan zihnini

hemen hemen her dönem meşgul etmiştir. Kötülük kavramı ilk dönemlerde özellikle teologlar tarafından tanımlanmaya çalışılmıştır, bu yüzden tezin bu bölümde filozofların yanı sıra İslam ve Hıristiyan dünyasından ünlü teologların da görüşlerine yer verilmektedir.

İnsanlar neden bir kısım insanların daha çok acı çektiğini, diğer bir bölümünün ise neden daha refah içinde yaşadığını sorgulamışlardır. Tüm bu sorgulamalar sonucunda hem İslam âleminde hem de Batı’da “Kötülük Problemi” ortaya çıkmıştır. Bu bölümde, İslam kültüründe öne çıkmış olan “Muteziler”, “Eşariler” ve “Gazali”nin yanı sıra Kur’an hakkında kısa bilgiler verilmektedir. Muteziler, kötülük ve iyilik kavramlarını fayda getirip getirmemesine bağlamışlardır. Onlara göre, kötülük insanın özgür iradesinden ortaya çıkar, Allah’tan gelmez. Eşarilere göre, yaratılan her şey Allah’tan gelir ve yaratılan her şeyin bir amacı vardır.

İslam âlimleri içerisinde önemli bir konuma sahip olan Gazali (1058-1111) ise kötülüğün açgözlülüğten kaynaklandığını savunmuştur. Gazali, insan doğasını inceleyerek, kötülüğün nedenlerini ortaya koymaya çalışmış ve modern bir psikolog gibi yorumlarda bulunmuştur. Ona göre, şu an yaşadığımız dünya en iyi yaratılmış olandır.

Kur’an ise, her yaratılan şeyin bir amacı olduğunu vurgulamış ve insanların bu dünyada sınıdığının altını çizmiştir. Bu bölümde bu görüşlerin geçtiği surelerden örnekler verilmektedir.

Batı düşüncesinde kötülük kavramı ile ilgili olarak daha farklı gruplar ortaya çıkmıştır. Batı dünyasındaki görüşler Eski Ahitle başlar ve Eyüp Kitabı bu kavramın ilk sorgulandığı yerdir. Buna göre, Eyüp inançlı bir insan olmasına rağmen, tüm kötülükler onun başına gelir ve her şeyini kaybeder. Eyüp’ün yaşadıkları insanların aklına neden masum insanların acı çektiği sorusunu getirmiştir. “Kötülük Problemi”nin en önemli üç dayanağı şunlardır;

Tanrı vardır,

Tanrı mutlak iyidir ve her şeyi yaratandır,

Kötülük vardır;

Yüzyıllardır insanları meşgul eden soru ise bu iyiliği yaratan Tanrı’nın kötülüğü de yaratıp yaratmadığıdır. Bu sorulara cevap bulma çabalarına “teodise” denmektedir ve bu sorulardan yola çıkarak birçok düşünür kötülük kavramı üzerine

görüřlerini bildirmiřtir. Bunlardan en önemlisi Aziz Augustine'dir. Tezin bu bölümünde Batı dünyasında kötülük kavramı üzerine görüşlerini bildiren önemli düşünürlerden bahsedilmektedir.

Aziz Augustine'e göre, var olan her şey Tanrı'dan gelmektedir. İnsanlardaki iyilik Tanrı'nın iyi olmasından dolayıdır, ancak kötülük insanlarda iyiliğin olmamasından kaynaklanmaktadır. Diğer bir deyişle, Augustine'e göre, kötülük iyiliğin yokluğudur. Tanrı insanı iyi olarak yaratmıştır, ancak insan yaptığı yanlış seçimler ve arzuları nedeniyle kötü olabilmektedir.

Diğer önemli bir düşünür Aziz Aquinas'dır ve Augustine'nin etkisi altında kalmıştır. Ona göre de, bir şeyin kötü olması onda iyiliğin olmamasından kaynaklanır. Aquinas, yokluğu her var olmayan şeyle karıştırmamak gerektiği üzerinde durmuş ve kötülüğün sadece iyiliğin yokluğundan ortaya çıktığını belirtmiştir.

Gottfried Leibniz kötülük kavramı ile ilgili olarak öne çıkan diğer bir isimdir. Leibniz, aynı Gazali gibi, yaratılan bu dünyanın "mümkün" olan dünyalar arasında en iyi olanı (Lara, "Narrating" 240) olduğunu ve kötülüğün de bu dünyayı zenginleştirdiği fikrini savunmuştur. Ona göre, Tanrı insanı iyi olarak yaratmış, ancak insan mükemmel olmadığından dolayı kötülüğe yönelmiştir.

Leibniz'den sonra, tez on sekizinci yüzyıl ve Lizbon depremi hakkında kısa bir bilgi sunmaktadır. Buna göre, 1755 yılında gerçekleşen Lizbon depremi, kutsal bir gün için toplanan birçok insanın ölmesine neden olmuştur. Bu olay, insanların kötülük ve Tanrı ile ilgili sorularının daha da artmasına neden olmuş ve birçok düşünür ve yazar bu konu hakkında yorum yapmıştır. Bunlar arasında en göze çarpan isimler Voltaire, Rousseau ve Kant'dır.

Voltaire düşüncelerini bir şiirde ifade ederken, insanların acılarını sorgulamaları gerektiğini savunmuştur. Rousseau ise tüm kötülüklerin insanlardan kaynaklandığını, o yüzden engellenebileceğini belirtmiştir. Ona göre, insan temelinde kötü değildir, ancak onu zamanla çevresi kötü yapmaktadır. Bu isimler arasında öne çıkan en önemli düşünür ise Kant'dır. Kant, insan doğası kötüdür diyerek tartışmalara yol açmış ve insanoğlunun doğası gereği kötülüğe eğilimli olduğunu savunmuştur. Ona göre, bir insan iyi de kötü de olabilir ve yaşadığı toplumdaki ahlaki kurallara uyduğu sürece, eylemleri iyi olarak adlandırılabilir. Kant, kişinin kendi arzuları peşinde koşması sonucunda kötülük yapma potansiyeline

sahip olduğunu belirtmiş ve bu konu da kıskançlık, başkalarının gözünde daha değerli olma isteği ve bencillik duygularının altını çizmiştir. Yorumlarında tüm bu duyguların insanlar arasında kötülüğe neden olabileceğini söylemiştir.

Yirminci yüzyılda öne çıkan isimler ise J. L. Mackie ve de Alvin Plantinga'dır. Mackie, kötülüğün var olmasının Tanrı'nın varlığı ile çeliştiğini bildirmiş ve Tanrı'nın olmadığını savunmuştur. Plantinga ise, özgür irade taraftarı olarak, Tanrı'nın var olduğunu savunmuş ve insanoğlunun kendi iradesinden dolayı kötülük yaparak etrafına zarar verdiğini bildirmiştir.

Türk ve İngiliz masallarında kötülük kavramını psikolojik açıdan inceleyebilmek için kötülük kavramının tarih boyunca nasıl algılandığı önemlidir. Bu bilgilerden sonra, tez kötülük kavramının yirminci ve yirmi birinci yüzyıllarda en çok etkili olduğu psikoloji alanına odaklanmaktadır. Psikoloji okulu kötülük kavramını açıklarken kavramını varlığını ispat etme yolundan ziyade insanların neden kötülük yaptığını açıklamaya çalışmıştır. Buna göre, tez ilk olarak Carl Jung'un fikirlerine yer vermektedir. Jung'a göre, Tanrı gölgesinden ayrılamayacağı gibi, iyilik de kötülükten ayrılamaz. Ona göre, insanların bilinci ancak gölgeleri ile bir olduğunda tam bir benlik oluşturur.

Günümüzde kötülük kavramını inceleyen en önemli psikologlardan biri Philip Zimbardo (1933-)'dur. Zimbardo, 1971 yılında Stanford Üniversitesi'nde uygulamış olduğu deneyle gündeme gelmiştir. Buna göre, insanlar zor koşullar altında güç elde etmek için karşısındakine kötülük yapabilir. Zimbardo, kötülük kavramı ile ilgili olarak sadece güç ilişkisine odaklandığı için bu çalışmada kendisine yer verilmemektedir.

Fred Alford günümüzde ortaya çıkan diğer önemli bir isimdir. Ancak Alford'un kötülük kavramı üzerine görüşlerini anlayabilmek için öncelikle Melanie Klein'in çocuk gelişimi, endişe ve nesne ilişkileri teorisi incelenmelidir.

Klein, çocuklar için "oyun terapisini" geliştirerek çocuklarda bastırılmış olan endişe ve korkuların ortaya çıkarılabileceğini savunmuştur. Oyun terapisi, Klein'in geliştirmiş olduğu önemli bir teknik olup kendisine psikanalitik alanda ün kazandırmıştır. Klein'a göre, çocuklar ilk dönemlerden itibaren yaşadıkları endişe ve korkularını şekillendirmek için semboller ararlar ve bu semboller sayesinde bastırılmış oldukları duygulardan kurtulurlar ve rahatlarlar. Klein, çocuğun iç ve dış dünyası ile olan ilişkisi sonucu nesne ilişkileri teorisini geliştirmiştir. Buna göre, çocuğun ilk

nesnelere ile olan ilişkisi bebeklik döneminde anne memesi ile başlamaktadır. Bebeğin anne ile ilk ilişkisi nefret ve sevgi karşımı duygulardan oluşmaktadır. Bebek iç dünyasında ilk nesnesine karşı kötü ve iyi olarak belli imajlar oluşturmuştur ve bunun sonucunda hissettiği duygularını dış dünyaya yansıtır.

Klein, kötülüğü kıskançlık, hasetlik ve açgözlülüğe bağlamıştır ve aralarında en tehlikeli olarak hasetlik duygusunu göstermiştir. Ona göre, bu duygu bebeklikten başlar. Bebek anne memesini iyi ve kötü olarak ikiye ayırır ve içinde hissettiği tüm saldırgan duygularını iç dünyasında kötü memeye karşı yansıtır. Ancak, bebek karşı taraftan da aynı saldırgan duyguların gelme olasılığı olduğunu düşünür ve endişe duyar. Bebek buna karşı savunma mekanizması geliştirir ve altını ıslatma, nesnelere atıp kırma olarak bunu dış dünyaya yansıtır. Bebek bu dönemde Klein'ın adlandırdığı “paranoid-şizoid” dönemdedir ve tüm nesnelere ayrı olarak düşünür. İyi ve kötü memenin aslında tek bir memeden oluştuğunun farkında değildir. Bebek, “depresif” döneme girdiği zaman nesnelere kafasında birleştirir ve hissettiği saldırgan duygular için suçluluk duymaya başlar. Bu dönemde, bebek iki memenin de annesine ait olduğunu algılar ve nesnelere bütün olarak algılamaya başlar. Bu dönemi başarılı ile atlatan bir bebek sağlıklı bir gelişim gösterir.

Klein'a göre, bebeğin anne memesine olan duyguları kıskançlık ve sevgiden oluşur. Bebek iyi nesnenin yerini almak ister, ancak bunu başaramamasından dolayı bebek “iyi nesneye” karşı hasetlik duymaya başlar. Klein, eseri *Haset ve Şükran*'da hasetlik, kıskançlık ve açgözlülüğü birbirinden ayırmaktadır. Ona göre, hasetlik tüm kötülüklerinden temelinde yatan duygudur. Haset bir kişi karşısındaki insanın sahip olduğu şeye sahip olmanın yanı sıra, o kişiye de zarar vermek ister ve verdiği bu zarardan ötürü de sadistçe bir zevk duyar. Öte yandan kıskançlık, bir kişinin sevdiği bir kişiyi paylaşamamasından kaynaklanır ve bu duyguyu hasetlik duygusundan ayıran özellik ise kıskanç olan kişinin kıskandığı kişiye zarar vermemesi, sadece rakibine zarar vermesidir. Bu iki duygudan farklı olarak, aç gözlülük bir insanın elinde olmayan bir şeyi arzulamasıdır ve bu duygu sonucunda karşısındaki bireyden ziyade kendisine zarar vermesidir. Klein'a göre, haset bir kişi yaptığı kötülükten pişmanlık duymaz ve karşısındakini iyi hissettirmek için bir şey yapmaz. Aksine, karşısındakine zarar vermek amacı ile dalga geçme, önemsememe ya da küçümseyerek değerini alçaltma gibi belirli savunma mekanizmalarını kullanmaktan çekinmez.

Klein, çocuklarda kötülük eğiliminin yattığını savunmuş ve bunların psikanalitik yollarla tedavi edilebileceğini savunmuştur. Yapmış olduğu analizler sonucunda çocuklarda bastırılmış duygularının arkasında sadist eğilimler olduğunu gözlemlemiştir. Bu tür davranışların ilkel benliğe ait olduğunu savunan Klein, bunların kültürel benliğe dönüştürülerek tedavi edilebileceğini iddia etmiştir. Klein bu tür ilkel benliğe ait olan davranışların sanat yoluyla olumlu davranışlara dönüştürülebileceğine inanmıştır ve bu konu özellikle öğrencisi Hanna Segal tarafından geliştirilmiştir. Klein, gözlemlerinde masalların etkisine tanık olmuş ve çocuklarda bastırılmış duyguların açığa çıkmasına yardımcı olduğunu gözlemlemiştir. Segal de bireylerin yazarla kendilerini özdeşleştirerek iç dünyalarını yeniden şekillendirebileceğini iddia etmiştir. Bu görüşler doğrultusunda, masalları dinleyen ya da okuyan bir çocuk hissetmiş olduğu endişe ve kötülük eğilimlerinden kurtulabilir ve sağlıklı bir gelişim gösterebilir.

Klein'dan etkilenen Fred Alford ise kötülüğü kişinin varoluşundan kaynaklanan kaygısına bağlamaktadır. Ona göre, kişi insan olmasının bir parçası olarak yaşama, ölme, birinin astı olma kaygısı gibi belli kaygılar duyar. Alford, Amerika'da bir hapisanede yaptığı röportajlar sonucunda insanın üstün olma arzusundan kaynaklanarak kötülük yaptığını iddia etmektedir. Kişi hissettiği kaygıyı karşısındaki insana transfer ederse, kendini bu kaygıdan kurtulmuş olarak hisseder ve rahatlar. Karşısındakine transfer etmenin tek yolu ise ona kötülük etmektir; böylece kişi kendini daha üstün görür ve hayatına bir anlam kattığını zanneder. Kişi, hayatta mağdur, tehlikeye açık ve pasif olduğu düşüncesi ile yola çıkarak karşısındakini mağdur eder. Klein gibi, Alford da kötülük yapan kişinin pişmanlık duymadığını, hatta karşısındakine zarar vermekten zevk aldığını ifade etmektedir. Alford'a göre, kötülük, bireyin şekillendiremediği kaygılarına karşısındakine zarar vererek şekillendirmeye çalışma çabasıdır. Buna göre, birey kaygılarına sembolik şekiller verme arayışındadır ve bu arayışı yanlış yollarda bulmaktadır. Alford varoluşçulardan etkilenmiş ve insan olmanın en önemli yükünün bireyin yaptığı seçimler olduğu belirtmiştir. Birey içinde yaşadığı kaygıyı ya olumlu bir şekilde transfer eder ya da karşısındaki kötülük yaparak kurtulur. Kaygısını karşısındakine transfer eden birey kendini rahatlamış bulur ve bir anlamda karşısındaki tarafından güçlü olarak görülmeye başlamıştır. Birey karşısındakine zarar vererek kendi benliğini oluşturur. Alford'a göre de hasetlik kötülüğün temelinde yatan en önemli

duygudur. Ayrıca, Klein ve Freud gibi, Alford da insanların sevgiden önce nefret duyduklarını iddia eder ve ölüm içgüdüsünün kötülüğe neden olduğu belirtir.

Alford da masalların çocukların kaygıyı tanımları ve ondan kurtulmaları için iyi bir yol olduğunu savunur. Alford, bireyin içindeki kötülükten ancak kaygısını tanıyıp şekillendirebildiği sürece kurtulabileceğini savunur. Bu şekillendirme ise olumlu transfer yolu ile olabilir. Alford'a göre, birey sanat ve edebiyat yoluyla kaygılarına şekil verebilir ve kötülük yapma olasılığından kurtulur.

Tüm bu teorik bilgiler ışığında, kötülüğün dünyada var olduğunu ve masum da olsa tüm insanların kötülüğe maruz kalabileceğini görebiliriz. Teologlar, filozoflar ve psikologları bir araya getiren ise kötülüğün insanın sınır tanımaz arzularından (kıskançlık, hasetlik, bencillik, üstün olma arzusu) ortaya çıktığıdır. Bu görüşler arasında günümüzde daha yaygın olduğu ve bir şey kanıtlamaktan ziyade insan doğasını sadece gözler önüne serdiğinden dolayı, bu çalışmada psikolojik yaklaşım temel alınmaktadır.

Bu tezde, Alford'un ve Klein'in çalışılmakta olmasının sebeplerinden birisi, her iki psikanalistin de kötülük kavramı üzerine fikirlerini açıkça bildirmelerinin yanı sıra iki psikanalistin de masalların çocuk üzerinde olumlu etkilerinden bahsetmiş olmasıdır. Buna göre, masallarda yer alan kötülük kavramı sayesinde çocuk kendi içinde yaşadığı endişe ve kaygılardan kurtulabilir ve kötülük eğiliminden sıyrılabilir. Masallar çocuk eğitiminde kullanılırsa sağlıklı bir gelişimin oluşmasını sağlayabilirler.

Üçüncü bölümde, Türk ve İngiliz masallarında kötülük kavramı, Melanie Klein'in bu kavramı eserinde tanımladığı doğrultuda incelenmektedir. Bu bölümde, kötülük kavramının sebepleri Klein'in da eserinde yaptığı gibi üçe ayrılmaktadır: hasetlik, kıskançlık ve açgözlülük. Yapılan inceleme sonucunda, on bir Türk, altı İngiliz masalı olmak üzere toplam on yedi tane masaldaki kötülük kavramının Klein'in tanımladığı hasetlik ve kötülük tezine uyduğu görülmektedir. İngiliz masallarında haset karakter üvey anne olarak okuyucunun karşısına çıkarken, Türk masallarında bu değişiklik gösterir. Haset üvey anne, çocuğun iç dünyasında yarattığı kötü nesne imajını yansıtmakta olup yaptığı tüm kötülükler çocuğun korku ve endişelerini göstermektedir. Bu tür masallar, iyi nesnenin (öz annenin) ölümü ile başlamakta olup iyi nesnenin yokluğuna işaret etmektedir. Buna göre, üvey anne bazı zamanlarda şefkatli gibi yaklaşarak iyi nesne gibi gözükür. Ancak, yapmış olduğu

işkencelerde ve kötülüklerde üvey annenin kötü nesne imajı olarak ortaya çıktığı görülür. Bu tür masalların sonunda üvey anneye verilen ceza okuyucuyu bir anlamda rahatlatır. Çocuk kötü nesnenin cezalandırıldığını görerek karşıdan gelebilecek saldırılara karşı duyduğu kaygıdan bir anlamda kurtulur ve tekrar kafasındaki imajları birleştirerek bütün bir nesne imajı yaratır.

İncelenen masalarda haset karakter üvey annenin yanı sıra (üvey) kız/erkek kardeş, Arap ve komşudur. Üvey kız/erkek kardeş masalları ise bireyin iyi ve kötü taraflarının yansımaları görülebilir. Bu tür masalarda, haset üvey kardeş iyi olan kardeşe zarar vermek ister; bu da çocuğun içinde iyilik ve kötülük arasında yaşadığı ikilemi ortaya koyar. Türk masallarında yaygın olan bir karakter de Arap karakteridir. Arap hizmetçi kız (Numara 24) “Alabalık” ve (Numara 33) “Limon Kız” masallarında olduğu gibi güzel ve masum olan başkarakterin yerine geçmeye çalışır ve ona kötülük yaparak etrafındakileri kandırır. Masum olan kızın yerine geçmeye çalışması da psikanalitik açıdan değerlendirildiğinde çift kişilik bunalımını yansıtabilir. Masalın sonunda, Arap kızın cezalandırılması okuyucuyu rahatlatarak içinde bulunan ikilemin giderilmesini sağlayabilir.

İngiliz masallarında üvey anne karakterinin Türk masallarından daha fazla sayıda olmasının nedeni İngiliz masallarının Fransız ve Alman masallarından etkilenmiş olmasından kaynaklanabilir.

Klein’in iddia ettiği gibi hasetlik duygusu besleyen kişi karşısındakinin daha güzel, daha üstün veya daha güçlü olmasından dolayı ona kötülük yapmakla birlikte fiziksel olarak da zarar verebilir. İncelenen masalarda hasetliğin sonucu olarak kişi karşısındakine işkence yapma, başka bir hayvana dönüştürme ve hatta öldürme gibi yollar seçebilmektedir.

Kıskançlık bölümünde ise yapılan çalışma sonucunda, üç tane Türk masalı bir tane de İngiliz masalı olmak üzere toplam dört masaldaki kıskançlık duygusunun Klein’in tanımlamış olduğu kıskançlık duygusuna uyduğu görülmektedir. Klein’in iddia ettiği gibi, bu masalarda karakterler sevdiği kişiyi elde etmek için karşısındakine zarar vermek isterler. Yapılan incelemeler sonucunda bu bölümdeki masalların hepsinde kıskanç karakterlerin kadın olduğu ortaya çıkmaktadır.

Açgözlülük bölümünde ise iki Türk ve üç tane İngiliz masalı olmak üzere toplam beş masalda açgözlülük ve kötülük ilişkisi görülmektedir. Türk masallarında açgözlü karakter kadın iken, İngiliz masallarında bu değişiklik göstermektedir. Beş

masalın sonunda da açgözlü karakter, Klein'in tezinde olduğu gibi, kendine zarar verir.

Bu bölümde incelenen masalların sonunda yer alan cezalar sonucunda okuyucu yaşadığı endişe ve kaygılardan kurtulabilir ve nesnelere karşı yaşadığı çelişkili duyguları gözden geçirebilir.

Bir sonraki bölümde Türk ve İngiliz masalları Alford'un kötülük yaklaşımına göre incelenmektedir ve Alford'un kötülük kavramı daha kapsamlı olduğu için daha fazla sayıda masal bu bölümde çalışılmaktadır. Yirmi beş Türk masalı, otuz iki İngiliz masalında kötülüğün Alford'un kötülük tanımına uyduğu saptanmaktadır. Aynı zamanda bu masallar içinde Klein'in hasetlik grubuna giren masalları da çalışılmaktadır. Yapılan incelemelere göre masalarda kötülüğün genellikle güç veya refah elde etmek için gerçekleştiği görülmektedir (Kırk masal: on üç Türk, yirmi yedi İngiliz).

Aynı zamanda çalışmada ortaya çıkan, her iki kültürün de, ataerkil toplum yapısına sahip oldukları gerçeği göz önüne alınırsa, güç ve üstünlük elde etmek için kötülük yapan karakterlerin erkek olduğu görülmektedir. Bu erkeklerin ya gücünü ve otoritesini korumaya çalışan Kral ya da Padişah, ya da evdeki hâkimiyetini sürdürmeye çalışan koca veya baba karakteri olduğu belirlenmiştir. Bu karakterlerin güçlerine ve pozisyonlarına dışarıdan bir tehlike geldiğini hissettikleri zaman karşılardaki karakteri pasif duruma düşürmek için onlara zarar verdiği görülmektedir. Bu zararın fiziksel olduğu gibi psikolojik olarak da kendini gösterdiği belirlenmiştir.

Ayrıca, Padişah ve Kral masalları kız çocukların hissetmiş olduğu hadım edilme kompleksini de yansıtıyor olabilir. Bu göre, kız çocuklarında baba figürüne karşı bir korku ve endişe duygusu hâkimdir. Padişah ve Kral masallarında baba karakteri genellikle kız çocuklarını istemedikleri biriyle evlendirme çabasıdadırlar ve bu masalarda kız çocuklara karşı korku ve tehdit vardır. Kız çocuk, Türk masalı "Ağlayan Nar Gülen Ayva" (numara 15)'da olduğu gibi erkek olmanın yollarını arar ve masalın sonunda erkek olur. Böylece masal mutlu sonla biter. Bu masal kız çocuğun hadım edilme endişesini ortaya koymakla beraber sonunda erkek olmasından dolayı okuyucuya bir rahatlama hissi veriyor olabilir.

Bunların dışında, çalışmada ortaya çıkan diğer bir tespit ise olağanüstü karakterlerle ilgidir. İncelemeler sonucunda İngiliz masallarında daha fazla

olağanüstü karakterler olduğu görülmektedir ve masallar bu karakterleri insanoğlundan daha güçlü olarak göstermektedir. Masalların sonunda insanlar bu karakterler karşısında zayıf, yardıma muhtaç ve pasif olarak gösterilmektedir. Bu da çocuğun bilmediği bir güce karşı hissettiği korku ve endişe duygularını yansıtır olabilir.

Hem Türk hem de İngiliz masallarında olağanüstü karakterler arasında sadece dev karakteri zayıf olarak resmedilmekte ve masalların sonunda da yenik olarak gösterilmektedir. Her iki kültürde de dev karakteri masalın başında daha güçlü ve korkutucu olarak betimlenirken, insanın zekâsı tarafından yenilgiye uğratarak ülkeyi terk etmek zorunda bırakıldığı ya da öldürüldüğü görülmektedir.

Ortaya çıkan diğer bir bulgu da, her iki kültürde “iyi” olarak görülen karakterlerin aslında Alford’un tezine göre kötü olarak tanımlanabileceğidir. Türk masallarında Keloğlan adlı karakterin, İngiliz masallarında ise Jack adlı karakterin içinde buldukları zor durumdan kurtulmak için karşılarındakine zarar verdikleri ve üstün olmak amacıyla kötülük yaptıkları görülmektedir. Böylece, bu karakterler mağdur pozisyonunda iken ve karşısındakinin zararına uğrarken, koşulların değişmesi ile ya da zekâları sayesinde karşılarında bulunan karakteri mağdur pozisyonuna getirerek, onlara zarar vermektedirler. Bu bulgu da okuyucuya kötülüğün zincirleme olarak devam ettiğini ve masalların sonunda ortadan kaybolmadığını göstermektedir. Ayrıca, masalların bir özelliği olarak söylenenin aksine iyi ya da kötü karakterlerin birbirinden tamamen ayrılamayacağı ve iyi sandığımız karakterlerin de aslında işledikleri eylemler ve sahip oldukları dürtüler ile kötü olarak adlandırılacaklarıdır.

Klein ve Alford her insanda kötülük eğiliminin olabileceğini savunmuşlardır. Keloğlan ve Jack karakterlerinde de kötülük eğiliminin olması masallarda işlenmiştir. Klein ve Alford’a göre, önemli olan kötülük eğilimlerinin eyleme dönüştürülmemesidir ve olumlu yollarla transfer edilmesidir.

Segal’in de dediği gibi, çocuk bu masalları okuduktan ya da dinledikten sonra yapılan kötülükleri görerek içinde yer alan kötülük eğilimlerinin yansıtıldığını düşünerek bir anlamda rahatlama yaşayabilir. Bu anlamda, bu masallar çocuğun içindeki ölüm içgüdüsünü ortadan kaldırarak yaşam içgüdüsünü ortaya çıkarabilir ve çocukta sağlıklı bir gelişim sağlayabilir.

Bu tez, diğ er masal ç alıřmaları göz önüne alınır sa Jung ve Freud'un teorileri dıřında bařka bir psikanalist yaklařıma odaklanan ve teorileri ç alıřılan ilk tez olarak adlandırılabilir. Jung ve savunucuları sadece arketiplere odaklanırken, Freud ve arkasından gelenler Oedipus Kompleksini ç alıřmıřlar ve masalarda ç ocuğ un cinsel kimliđ i ile ilgili semboller aramıřlardır. Bu tez de ise Klein ve Alford gibi daha önceden ç alıřılmamıř iki psikanalistin kötülük üzerine olan görüřleri ç ocuk geliřimi ile ilgili olan görüřleriyle birleřtirilmiř ve masalların ç ocuk geliřiminde önemli rol oynadıđ ı iddia edilmiřtir.

Bu tez, derleyicilerinin de iddia ettiđ i gibi masalların eđ itimsel iřlevi olabileceđ ini iddia etmiřtir. Yıllarca masalların didaktik özelliklerinden bahsedilmektedir. Bazı arařtırmacılar masalların dini bilgiye katkısından bahsederken, diğ erleri iyi ve kötülüğ ün masallar yoluyla anlatılabileceđ ini savunmuřlardır. Farklı sebeplerle de olsa, masalların eđ itimsel iřlevi yansınamaz. Bu tezde de, kötü karakterlerin yapmıř olduđu eylemler yoluyla okuyucu ya da dinleyicilerin içinde bulunan kötülük eğ ilimlerinden kurtulabileceđ i ve sađ lıklı bir geliřim elde edebilecekleri gösterilmiřtir. Masalları okuyan ya da dinleyen ç ocuklar kendilerini masalda geç en karakterlerle özdeřleřtirerek onların deneyimlerini paylařır ve kendi içinde yařadıkları řiddet duygularının masalarda geç tiđ ini görerek bir ç eřit rahatlatma hissederler. Buna göre, Klein ve Alford'un iddia ettiđ i gibi ç ocuklar masallar sayesinde yařamıř olduđu kaygılara ve korkulara sembolik bir řekil vererek iřleyebileceđ i kötülüklerden arınmıř olabilirler.

Yıllar boyunca, Grimm kardeřler gibi bazı derleyiciler masalarda yer alan kötülük ve řiddet konularını sansürlenmeye ç alıřmıřlardır. Ancak, bu tez, ç ocukların bu tür konulara maruz kalmalarının geliřimleri için olumlu bir rol oynayabileceđ ini göstermiřtir. Ç ocuklar bu tür konulara maruz kaldıkça içlerinde yařadıkları kötülük eğ ilimlerinden kurtularak bunu dıřarıya yansıtırılar. Bu ç alıřma, ç ocukların belli bir düzeyde kontrollü řiddet ve kötülük konularına maruz kalmalarının onların sađ lıklı geliřimleri için önemli olduđ unu ortaya koymuřtur.

Bu ç alıřmada, tam bir karřılařtırma tekniđ i kullanılmamakla birlikte, Türk ve İngiliz masallarında kötülük kavramı incelenmektedir. Bu iki kültürün koleksiyonlarından seç ilen masalarda benzerlikler farklılıklardan daha fazladır. Öncelikle olarak, her iki derleyici de masalların eđ itimsel iřlevini vurgulamıřtır ve buna göre masalarda iyi ödüllendirilir, kötü cezalandırılır. Bunun dıřında, her iki

koleksiyonda da kötülük hasetlik duygusundan ya da karşısındakinden aşağıda olma kaygısından ortaya çıkmaktadır. İki koleksiyon benzer olmasına karşın bazı kültürel farklılıklar da söz konusudur. İngiliz masallarında olağanüstü karakterler çeşitlilik gösterirken, Türk masallarında sadece dev karakteri yer almaktadır. Bunun dışında kötü karaktere verilen cezalar da iki kültürde farklılıklar gösterir. Türk masallarında, kötü karaktere kırk katır, kırk satır sorusu sorulurken, ya da erkek evlatlar genellikle saraydan uzaklaştırılırken, İngiliz masallarında cezalar daha hafiftir, ya da kötü karakterin sonundan bahsedilmez. Bazı kültürel farklılıklar olmasına rağmen, iki koleksiyonda benzerlikler daha belirgindir ve bu da psikolojik olarak bazı endişe ve kaygıların tüm kültürlerde aynı olabileceğini göstermektedir. Aynı zamanda benzerliklerin olması masalların eğitimsel işlevinin hemen hemen her kültürde aynı olduğunun da bir göstergesi olabilir.

Bundan sonraki çalışmalarda farklı kültürlerin masallarında geçen kötülük kavramları karşılaştırma yolu ile incelenebilir. Ayrıca, iyi karakterlerin nasıl kötü karaktere dönüşebileceği ile ilgili detaylı bir çalışma yapılabilir.

APPENDIX F
TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU

ENSTİTÜ

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü

Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü

Enformatik Enstitüsü

Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü

YAZARIN

Soyadı :
Adı :
Bölümü :

TEZİN ADI (İngilizce) :

TEZİN TÜRÜ : Yüksek Lisans Doktora

1. Tezimin tamamından kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir.
2. Tezimin içindekiler sayfası, özet, indeks sayfalarından ve/veya bir bölümünden kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir.
3. Tezimden bir bir (1) yıl süreyle fotokopi alınmaz.

TEZİN KÜTÜPHANEYE TESLİM TARİHİ: