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**I. Answer the following questions in about 200 words each: (2x15=30)**

1. Examine your experiences/learning of sibling rivalry. Do these experiences offer a point of entry into ideas from Freud such as the Oedipus and the Electra complex? Explain.
2. In what context is gossip part of the conversation for you? Which is the better way of analysing this—as pathology or as creativity? Explain.

**II. Read the following write-up on the psychoanalytic film criticism:**

Psychoanalytic film theory occurred in two distinct waves.

The first, beginning in the late 1960s and early 1970s, focused on a formal critique of cinema’s dissemination of ideology, and especially on the role of the cinematic apparatus in this process.

The main figures of this first wave were Christian Metz, Jean-Louis Baudry, and Laura Mulvey. They took their primary inspiration from the French psychoanalyst Jacques Lacan, and they most often read Lacan through the Marxist philosopher Louis Althusser’s account of subject formation.

The second wave of psychoanalytic film theory has also had its basis in Lacan’s thought, though with a significantly different emphasis. Beginning in the late 1980s and early 1990s, this manifestation of psychoanalytic film theory, which continues to remain productive even today, shifted the focus from cinema’s ideological work to the relationship between cinema and a trauma that disrupts the functioning of ideology.

In Lacan’s terms, the terrain of psychoanalytic film theory shifted from the axis of the symbolic order and the imaginary to that of the symbolic order and the real. Although psychoanalytic film theorists continue to discuss cinema’s relationship to ideology, they have ceased looking for ideology in the cinematic apparatus itself and begun to look for it in filmic structure. Cinema remains a site for the dissemination of ideology, but it has also become a potential site of political and psychic disruption.

According to the main figures of the second wave, the initial wave of psychoanalytic film theory failed to be psychoanalytic enough, and the result was a hodgepodge of Marxism and psychoanalysis that produced a straw position that anti-theorists such as David Bordwell could easily attack. The initial aim of the second wave was to create an authentic Lacanian film theory that would approach the cinema with the complexity that it merited.

 II. A. **Answer ANY THREE in about 150 words each: (3x10=30)**

1. The writer mentions Lacan several times. What can you deduce about him from a reading of the above account? What can you add?
2. The term cinematic apparatus covers the technologies and processes that go into film-making. What do you understand from the phrase ‘filmic structure’ in the passage?
3. How would you interpret the term ‘ideology’ from a reading of this passage?
4. How do you explain the fact that psychoanalytic interpretation seems more developed as a domain linked to cinema rather than theatre?

**III. Read this excerpt from the Greek play Oedipus Rex by Sophocles. This is Oedipus recalling an incident that he had forgotten to Jocasta, his mother. Answer ANY TWO of the questions that follow in about FIVE sentences each (2x5=10)**

I came in time across the junction where,

by your account, that tyrant met his end.

With you, I’ll be completely honest. I

had gotten near the triple path on foot.

A herald met me there together with

a man aboard a carriage drawn by colts,

like you describe. The leader tried to block

my progress using force. The older man

did too. I hit the driver angrily

for pushing me away. The older man

withdrew until I crowded past, then took

a double cattle prod and struck my head!

He didn’t pay an equal price. In brief,

he felt the walking stick I had in hand,

fell backward off the cart and rolled away,

and then I slaughtered everyone. Now if

that foreigner and Laius were somehow

akin, is any man less fortunate,

more dogged by hostile deities, than me,

whom neither foreigners nor citizens

may greet or offer entertainment to

but have to shun? I placed those curses on

myself. Nobody else has any blame.

My guilty hands, which spilt Laius’s blood,

have stained his bed. Am I an evil man

by birth? Is every part of me defiled,

compelled to flee this country, yet avoid

my native land and kin or else become

my mother’s spouse and murder Polybus,

the man who gave me life and nurtured me?

I think it’s only rational to see

in these events some savage god’s design

1. What kind of man is Oedipus? Which of his words lead you to an understanding of the person he is? Explain.
2. What does Oedipus mean in the line “He didn’t pay an equal price’?
3. What has Oedipus not yet understood in these lines? What is your evidence?
4. Read the section that begins “ I placed these curses…’ down to the end. Do you notice any contradictions here? What does this tell us about Oedipus?
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