

The Myth of Oedipus Complex

Abstract — Freud mistakes dispensable forms in the myth for essential content.

1 — In a semiotic system, there are family resemblances between the signs. No matter how arbitrary the relationship between the signifier and the signified ... the relationship between *inter-relationship* of the signifiers and those of the signifieds incorporated in a semiosis is less than arbitrary, most visible in semantic rules of suffixation and prefixation.—In a stoplight there is more family resemblance between red and yellow and between green and yellow than between red and green either as signifieds or as signifiers.—That yellow is phenomenologically between red and green parallels its intermediary semiotic functionality.

2 — In the grammatical sense there is no mystification of the metaphor that A is B where A really is not B: the metalingual function is the establishment of predication in the expression: B as an entity of which *already* a collection of identifiable predicates are true is such also of which another predicate B is true. In contrast the poetic function in a text invoking that A is B presupposes a semiotic system structured *intemperately* by A being forced to predicative proximity of B sharing a *near* family resemblance. In other semiotic systems, A is systematically predicatively distal to B sharing a *far* family resemblance.

3 — A belated text as in a myth or even a dream consists of a set of selective exploitative adaptations of precursor versions to establish acute predicative proximity between signs previously less predicatively proximal in existing semiotic systems. The dream work and mythologization *thus* simultaneously condenses and displaces that which it is struggling to make manifest as its object of desire.

4 — There is a *superstructural* unity of a text which may be described as that which is reflected by taking for granted that the object of desire contributes equally to the displaced parts constituting the text as a whole. The *infras-structural* unity of a text is that which is reflected by specifying that to which the object of desire attributes the most *direct instrument* making them content-bearers. The other constituents while bearing some superficial content have poetic evocative function.—*forms* serving aesthetic fortification and narrative condensation not really condensation of content relevant to the object of desire.

5 — The minimal indispensability of otherwise *contingently* superficial content of a form is its role in the reduction of excitation the desire of which the text undertakes to fulfill. The tragic elements, for instance, are condensed into the text only after juxtaposition of tragic elements in terms of such reducibility potentials adopted from a *finite* repertoire of precursor texts (semiotic systems).

6 — Let *contra* Freud, in the context of Oedipus myth, the preconception of the interpreter be the socio-ontological primacy of mechanisms of power in the genesis of the *original* myth rather than primacy of early psychosexual development—sociogenesis over psychogenesis. The myth insinuates the ultratragic fate of Oedipus as refusal of Laius to resolute acquiescence to the prophesied fate. As if by the refusal Laius venturing unto violation of inviolable laws of cosmos—only a pretext for unthinkable ramifications for human. The *original* mythologizing essentially serves a political purpose: to inculcate in king total compliance to political scientists disguised as oracles for the sake of governance.

7 — Mythology consists of assignment of significance in a hermeneutic circle for demarcation content as direct emissaries from the object of desire and form as primarily evocative. The narrative uniformity of the myth mutes the originally intended signification.—In mythology there is nothing outside the text.