DISSOCIATION OF LITERARY CHARACTERS: THE USE OF "THE DOUBLE" AS A DEFENSE MECHANISM IN AYCKBOURN'S *WOMAN IN MIND*, FRIEL'S *PHILADELPHIA HERE I COME!*, AND SHAFFER'S *EQUUS*.

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

BY

SERKAN ERTİN

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS
IN
FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION

JUNE 2006

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Sencer Ayata
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

Prof. Dr. Wolf König
Head of Department

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 Master of Arts.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ünal NORMAN
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof. Dr. Meral ÇİLELİ	(METU, ELIT)	_____
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ünal NORMAN	(METU, ELIT)	_____
Dr. Rüçhan KAYALAR	(BİLKENT, ELIT)	_____

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: Serkan ERTİN

Signature :

ABSTRACT

DISSOCIATION OF LITERARY CHARACTERS: THE USE OF "THE DOUBLE" AS A DEFENSE MECHANISM IN AYCKBOURN'S *WOMAN IN MIND*, FRIEL'S *PHILADELPHIA HERE I COME!*, AND SHAFFER'S *EQUUS.*

Ertin, Serkan
M.A., Department of Foreign Language Education
Supervisor : Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ünal Norman

June 2006, 104 pages

"Dissociative Identity Disorder", also known as split or multiple personality disorder, made its appearance in literature in the form of 'the double', a projected dual personality. Ralph Tymms is believed to be the first to use the psychological provenance of the double as a literary device. To date, many publications have been made on Dissociative Identity Disorder, and many literary works dealing with 'the double' have been published. However, the subject of the double, in all its literary and psychological manifestations, has not yet found the sufficient research and up-to-date study that it deserves. This paper ventures to study some of the links between Modern British Drama and Clinical and Social Psychology. It analyses the fact that although people adopting Dissociative Identity Disorder as a defence mechanism against social and personal constrictions are viewed outside the norms of personality structure, this practice allows them to create a personal space and a personal voice in the conditions they find themselves in. To this end, the characters Susan, Gareth, and Alan in the plays *Woman in Mind, Philadelphia, Here I Come!*, and *Equus*, written by Alan Ayckbourn, Brian Friel, and Peter Shaffer, respectively, will be studied.

Keywords: Defense Mechanisms, Dissociation, Double Identity, Multiple Personality Disorder, Split Personality.

ÖZ

YAZINSAL KARAKTERLERDE DİSOSİYASYON: AYCKBOURN'UN *WOMAN IN MIND*, FRIEL'İN *PHILADELPHIA, HERE I COME!*, VE SHAFFER'İN *EQUUS* ADLI OYUNLARINDA ÇİFT KİŞİLİĞİN SAVUNMA MEKANİZMASI OLARAK KULLANILMASI.

Ertin, Serkan
Yüksek Lisans, Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Bölümü
Tez Yöneticisi: Doç. Dr. Ünal Norman

Haziran 2006, 104 sayfa

"Disosiyatif Kimlik Bozukluğu", diğer adıyla bölünmüş kişilik veya çoklu kişilik bozukluğu, edebiyatta dışa vurulmuş çift kişiliği temsil eden çift karakterlerle ortaya çıktı. Psikoloji kökenli bu terimi yazınsal anlamda ilk kullanan tarihçinin Ralph Tymms olduğuna inanılmaktadır. Bugüne dek Disosiyatif Kimlik Bozukluğu üzerine çok sayıda kitap basılmış, "çift" karakter içerikli birçok yazınsal eser yayınlanmıştır. Ancak "çift kişilik" konusu hem edebi hem psikolojik anlamda hak ettiği yeterli araştırmayı ve güncel çalışmayı henüz bulamamıştır. Bu çalışma, Modern İngiliz Tiyatrosu, Klinik ve Sosyal Psikoloji disiplinleri arası bazı bağlantıları irdelemektedir. Analiz ettiği konu, Disosiyatif Kimlik Bozukluğu'nu toplumsal ve bireysel engellemelere karşı bir savunma mekanizması olarak kullanan bireylerin, genel geçer kişilik kalıplarının dışında algılanmalarına rağmen, bu uygulamanın onlara kendilerini içinde buldukları şartlarda kişisel alan ve benlik yaratma olanağı sağladığıdır. Bu amaçla, sırasıyla Alan Ayckbourn, Brian Friel, ve Peter Shaffer tarafından yazılan *Woman in Mind, Philadelphia, Here I Come!*, ve *Equus* adlı oyunlarda Susan, Gareth, ve Alan kişileri incelenecektir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Savunma Mekanizması, Disosiyasyon, Çift Kişilik, Çoklu Kişilik Bozukluğu, Bölünmüş Kişilik.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am deeply indebted to my supervisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ünal NORMAN, whose meticulous help, stimulating suggestions, and encouragement helped me in my research and the writing of this thesis. She provided a motivating, enthusiastic, and critical atmosphere during the many discussions we had. It was a great pleasure and opportunity for me to write this thesis under her supervision

I am also grateful to the jury members, Prof. Dr. Meral ÇİLELİ and Dr. Rüçhan KAYALAR, for their detailed review, constructive criticism, and excellent advice during the preparation of this thesis.

I would like to thank everyone whose direct and indirect support helped me complete this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Dissociative Identity Disorder

"Dissociative Identity Disorder" is the current term used to describe a psychiatric condition, a mental disturbance, in which two or more separate identities alternately control a person's behaviour patterns, memories, and consciousness. When triggered off by some undesirable conditions and constrictions, such an individual immediately shifts into another identity for relief. These conditions and constrictions could be external or internal. In either case, the individual employs identity shifts as defense mechanisms.

1.1.1 Historical Background

The history of Dissociative Identity Disorder, also known as split or multiple personality disorder, is complex and vague. It dates back to the ancient civilizations of Greece and Egypt beginning with the documentation of hysteria. The story of dissociation itself, as known today, however, began with Franz Anto Mesmer in the eighteenth century, and the interest in Dissociative Identity Disorder peaked in the late-nineteenth century (Robertson 2003).

It was Pierre Janet who coined the term "Dissociative Identity Disorder" in scientific usage in 1880s and replaced the "lay" term "split personality" with it. Heidi Strengell remarks that Dissociative Identity Disorder "includes various states and signifies a personality disorder in which the person is unaware of what his 'other half' is doing" (2003).

Split personality has been under discussion for ages from Plato to present time, and numerous attributes have been ascribed to it so far. Contradictory behaviour patterns are one of the most common stereotypical attributes of the individuals having split identities. Jeremy Hawthorn emphasizes the importance of

"different and mutually exclusive memories" in such cases because the individual suffering from split personality disorder has "a memory barrier which separates off at least one of his or her personalities from one or more of the others" (2). Therefore, the individual may seem to be concealing facts, denying the truth, or acting. Henri F. Ellenberger points out that a split person's actions might be "cut off from the continuity of consciousness", and the individual might seem "utterly unaware of what he had done" when he is conscious (124). Each split personality disorder is peculiar to the individual it possesses, and it does not necessarily share the same characteristics with all others. In this respect split personality is similar to Foucault's definition of madness, which is "not linked to the world and its subterranean forms, but rather to man, to his weaknesses, dreams, and illusions" (26).

One of the terms used to refer to a person with split identity is "schizoid" and this term generally bears on an individual whose personality is split in two ways: In the first place, there is a rent in his relation with his world, and, in the second, there is a break of his relation with himself. According to Ronald David Laing, a schizoid person "experiences himself in despairing aloneness and isolation; moreover, he does not experience as a complete person but rather as 'split' in various ways" (17). He thinks he is the only one in the world, and there is no one else to share the same experiences.

In the past, split personality was associated with the phenomenon of possession. Many people misconceived split personality disorders since they were not familiar with psychology. They believed that individuals having such disorders were possessed by the devil. As the reliable case histories of split personality began to appear, this misconception lost its validity (Ellenberger 127).

By the end of the eighteenth century and during all of the nineteenth century, more cases of split personality came into light, and by 1880 this problem was among the most discussed by psychiatrists and philosophers. After the 1880s, there was a shift from the simple split personality definitions to more complex ones and "all kinds of transitory stages between actual personality split and the normal occurrence of facets of personality".

The truly objective study of split personality was introduced in France in the nineteenth century by the publication of a case story about a girl, Estelle, who was

under psychiatric treatment by Antoine Despine. Despine was a general practitioner, appointed Medical Inspector of the thermal station of Aix-en-Savoie, and he is known to have practiced magnetic treatment on his patients:

> In her normal state she [Estelle] was still paralyzed. The slightest movement caused her intolerable pain. She had to be covered with cushions, blankets, eiderdown blankets; she loved her mother and demanded her constant presence; she addressed Despine respectfully with *vous*. In her magnetic state, she became able to move, started to talk, felt a craving for snow and could not tolerate her mother's presence; she addressed Despine in the familiar way with *tu*. (Ellenberger 130)

The example of Estelle, to the surprise of many, showed that her "normal" condition was pathological, whereas her "magnetic" and abnormal condition was the healthier one. This example added to the discussions on the definition of normal and schizoid state. For Laing, the critical test of whether or not a patient is schizoid is "a lack of congruity, an incongruity, a clash" between his own recognition of himself and the others' recognition of him (36). A schizoid man has a highly subjective viewpoint, and he is adept at self concealment. He learns to cry when he is amused, and to smile when he is sad. He frowns his approval, and applauds his displeasure. He says that his actions are not his real self, which makes him, according to Laing, "irreal", and finally "no-body" (37).

In the twentieth century, new dimensions were added to the study of split personality; the emphasis on the many facets of human personality, the interplay among them, and the "polypsychic structure of the human mind" gained more significance (Ellenberger 167).

Laing considers clinical psychology limited to dealing with people with split identities since it covers only the case histories encountered. Instead, he suggests an understanding of schizoid individuals' "existential context". For him, a patient brings into treatment his existence, his "whole being-in-his-world" (25). What a patient is constitutes the problem in the treatment, for split personality is not a physical deformity or a disease to be healed or removed from the body. Therefore, Laing remarks, it is the task of existential phenomenology to examine the schizoid's world and his existence in it (25).

Major wars and far-reaching disturbances of society are some occasions

causing man to ask himself fundamental questions about his existence in the world and about his identity, "an identity which he finds existing on various levels or even in fragmentation" (in Rank xx-xxi). This questioning of identity has always occupied an immense space in man's existence.

The primitive concept of the soul as a duality shows itself in modern depiction of man in the motif of the double, "assuring him, on the one hand, of immortality, and, on the other, threateningly announcing his death" (Tucker in Rank xv). "The Double" also points to man's eternal conflict with himself and others, the struggle between his need for likeness and his desire for difference (Tucker in Rank xvi). Conflict is always in the centre of man's life as long as he tries to live in a society. As Gardner Murphy puts it, conflict and split personality is "the organism's effort to live, at different times, in terms of different systems of values" (in Ellenberger 141). Hawthorn also ascribes duality to the environment which consists of contradictory systems of value. If an individual cannot recognize and internalize these contradictions, his/her psyche will become internally divided (135). In this way, social, religious, moral, economic, sexual conflicts stemming from the valid system of societies lead to the division of personality, which in return leads to contradictory behaviours of individuals in societies.

David Cooper includes more social aspects in his view of recent psychiatric research and states that people suffering from split personality do not actually go mad, but are "driven mad by others who are driven into the position of driving them mad by a peculiar convergence of social pressures" (in Hawthorn viii). Thus, the origin of split personality lies not only in personal factors but also in the pressurizing social circumstances.

1.1.2 In Literature

In accordance with the rising psychological and philosophical interest, in the nineteenth century, the theme of split personality also began to appear in literary works. Nevertheless, according to Harry Tucker, the critics and literary historians of this century were "not able to penetrate beyond a surface interpretation of the portrayal of doubles in literature". They saw the use of split personality as a

technique in comedy and they ascribed its use to the authors' taste of "the unreal and uncanny". To put it in another way, split personality was the author's projection of his own distinct traits, or his desire for another existence (in Rank xiii).

The theme of split personality, which inspired many writers, appeared in literature in the form of the "double", a projected dual personality (Ellenberger 162). Ralph Tymms is believed to be the "first chronicler of the psychological provenance of the double as a literary device". The inventor of the term "Doppelgänger", however, is Jean-Paul Richter, who presents "pairs of friends, who together form a unit, but individually appear as a 'half', dependent on the *alter ego*" (Herdman 13).

In the sixteenth century, the idea of the double was used in *The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus*, a play by Christopher Marlowe, based on the story of a man who sells his soul to the devil for power and knowledge. Beyond the surface meaning, this play points at the corruption of a man whose desire for material gains and evil side are represented by the devil.

In the eighteenth century, Goethe picked the same idea in his *Faust*, and used pairs of characters who might be taken as the divided parts of personality. Schiller's drama, his *Die Räuber* [The Robbers] in particular, aroused more interest and became more cogent in terms of "dualistic fashion" (Herdman 13). This play deals mainly with the conflict between two brothers, Karl Moorland and Franz Moorland. Karl, who is the beloved of his father, is an intelligent and liberty-loving robber, whereas Franz Moorland, who is covetous of Karl and wants to take over the inheritance of his father, is designing and shrewd.

In the last decade of the eighteenth century duality was everywhere. The Marquis de Sade wrote two separate novels: *Justine* and *Juliette*, which, according to Angela Carter, reflect and complement each other, like a pair of mirrors (in Herdman 14). Justine is the good girl whose story shows the misfortunes accompanying virtue. Her sister Juliette, on the other hand, leads to the inference that vice is the key to happiness and prosperity (Herdman 14). In this way, two sisters reflect the double sides of human personality; the virtuous and the evil.

In the twentieth century, literary works about the topic of split personality abounded alongside with the growing interest in psychology. Oscar Wilde's *The Picture of Dorian Gray* is one of the well-known examples dealing with one of the

greatest problems and fears of mankind: Ageing. “The handsome and vigorous Dorian, when viewing his well-done portrait, expresses the presumptuous desire always to remain so young and handsome and to be able to transfer any traces of age and of sin to the portrait - a wish to be or the alter-ego of Dorian as it stands for his conscience. The portrait becomes, finally, the second personality fulfilled in a sinister way” (Rank 18).

For Rogers, the motif of homosexuality in *The Picture of Dorian Gray* bears upon Oscar Wilde’s sexual practices (in Slethaug 13). This belief dates back to Freud, who claimed that an author writes of his neuroses rendering literary double “an image of the author’s repressed, regressive, autoerotic unconscious” (Slethaug 13).

Herdman claims that Dostoyevsky’s novels furnish examples of almost every kind of double. His *The Brothers Karamasov*, for instance, is one of the well-known examples. Before Ivan Karamasov goes mad, the devil appears to him and acknowledges himself as his double. When Ivan comes home later one evening, a gentleman appears and tells him things Ivan himself had thought of when he was young and then forgotten. Ivan objects to the man’s existence and says: “You are a lie, a disease, a phantom. I only don’t know by what means I can destroy you. You are my hallucination […] You are I myself, but only in ugly caricature; you say just what I am thinking” (Rank 13). Ivan is well aware of the fact that the man is one side of his personality, but he cannot cope with it.

Stevenson’s *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* is another famous fictional representation of the double. Hyde, Herdman states, emerges as the “embodiment of Jekyll’s suddenly released instinctual nature” (158). He is, in other words, the shadow, the darker side of Dr.Jekyll. Dr. Jekyll is the representation of the ego and the conscious, whereas Hyde stands for the alter ego and the unconscious.

The theme of split personality disorder comes out in different literary works in different forms. Whereas it stands for conscience in *The Picture of Dorian Gray,* it is the evil side of Ivan in *The Brothers Karamasov*. Seeing that more and more cases and examples were published during the nineteenth century, Ellenberger reckoned it was necessary to distinguish their clinical varieties, and made a tripartite classification of split personality disorders: In Simultaneous Multiple Personality

Disorder, personalities appear at the same time, and this type of disorder is seen rarely indeed. As for Successive Multiple Personality Disorder, in some cases personalities are aware of each other, in some they are mutually amnesic, and in some cases one-way amnesia is seen. The third type is Personality Clusters, in which different subpersonalities appear and distinguish themselves (Ellenberger 131).

1.1.3 In Three Modern British Plays

'The Double' can be seen everywhere in life: Man and woman, day and night, body and soul, light and darkness, good and bad, etc. The two aspects of the double usually appear in the form of contrast or opposition, but John Herdman says that it can also be similarity. He adds, "It can be complementarity, as in the Platonic conception of twin souls which seek each other in order to make a whole out of their sundered halves; sympathy between individuals, even human love, can be seen under one aspect as ultimately the search for wholeness or integration within the self" (1).

Herdman regards duality as only one way of "giving expression to the consciousness of self-division, opposition, contradiction and ambiguity, and it often shades off into, or interpenetrates with, related approaches and forms" (11). Accordingly, these expressions appear in the works of writers of different cultures and ages in various forms. "The writer can devote increasing interest to the inner world of characters through the development of techniques such as the internal monologue and dialogue, and the stream-of-consciousness narrative. Alternatively he or she can project such inner conflicts outwards, objectifying them in doubles, parallel characters, and so on" (Hawthorn 135). In accordance with the variety of definitions made for split personality, *Woman in Mind*, *Philadelphia, Here I Come!*, and *Equus,* written by Alan Ayckbourn, Brian Friel, and Peter Shaffer, respectively, present different forms of split personality disorder in drama.

In *Woman in Mind*, Susan begins to question her existence in her forties. She is a suburban housewife. She has been under psychiatric treatment for a while. She is unable to relate either to her husband Gerald or her son, Rick. Gerald is an insensitive, apathetic husband who shuts himself in his study most of the time, supposedly writing a book. Rick is involved in a religious group, lives away from

home, and does not even talk to his parents. Also Muriel, Susan's sister-in-law, lives in the same house, and they do not get on well with each other at all. Under these circumstances, she creates an illusionary family; a husband like Andy, a brother like Tony, and a lovely daughter like Lucy, all of whom are tall, good-looking, athletic, and charming. It seems to be the ideal family for a vulnerable woman like Susan to take refuge in. The attentive and compassionate members of her imaginary family treat her as if she were the Queen of the family.

In *Philadelphia, Here I Come!,* Gareth is Sean B. O'Donnell's son. His mother has died, and he lives with his father and their housekeeper, Madge. He constantly tries to see whether his father cares for him, yet he cannot find out one single symptom of love. In addition to this, the girl he is in love with, Kate Doogan, is to marry Francis King, who will apparently make a better husband for her. He is afraid of the competition with another suitor. He can neither face nor fight all these bitter facts in his present life, and tries to take refuge in the future. The invitation of his aunt Liz and uncle Con, who live in Philadelphia, to the USA to work and live with them seems to be the only shelter to end his desperate loneliness and disillusionments. To this end, he gets packed to leave for Philadelphia. Meanwhile, the only person he can really talk to and communicate is his double, the personification of his alter ego. When he finally finishes getting packed, and is ready and eager to leave for Philadelphia, he can still not silence the voice of his alter ego.

In *Equus*, seventeen-year-old Alan Strang is the son of Frank, a printer, and Dora, an ex-school teacher. He has had a religious upbringing because of her mother, who would read stories from the Bible to him. Some of these stories are about horses, and these stories including the pagan idea that the rider and the horse are one has been confusing for Alan. His father is a very strict man who has even forbidden his son to watch television. One day he tears up the religious picture on Alan's wall, and replaces it with the picture of a horse. Alan, misidentifies the picture hanging on his wall with the religious figure it has replaced. Alan's religious feelings towards horses mix with the sexual ones especially during his pubescence. When one day he meets Nugget, a horse, on the beach, he inevitably feels sexually attracted to the horse. As a result of his confusion and the limitations he faces, Alan creates his own reality and his own religion, and falls in love with and worships horses.

1.2 Aim of the Study

To date, many publications have been made on Dissociative Identity Disorder, and many literary works dealing with 'the double' have been published. However, Tucker feels that "the subject of the double, in all its literary and psychological manifestations, has not yet found the sufficiently searching and up-to-date study that it deserves" (in Rank xxi). This thesis, therefore, ventures to study some of the links between Modern British Drama and Clinical and Social Psychology. For this objective, it will analyse the fact that although people adopting Dissociative Identity Disorder as a defence mechanism against social and personal constrictions are viewed outside the norms of personality structure, this practice allows them to create a personal space and a personal voice in the conditions they find themselves in. To this end, the characters Susan in Ayckbourn's *Woman in Mind*, Gareth in Friel's *Philadelphia, Here I Come!*, and Alan in Shaffer's *Equus* will be studied. When in brackets, the plays will be referred as *W, P, E* all throughout this study, and the terms "split personality", "the double", and "duality" will be used interchangeably.

CHAPTER 2

CHARACTERS SPLIT BETWEEN THEIR OUTER AND INNER WORLDS

2.1. Social Constrictions

Dissociative Identity Disorder is peculiar to the individual it inflicts and it might have unique characteristics for each individual. As seen in Ellenberger's tripartite classification, while some people are aware of their split identities, some remain unconscious about what is going on with the other half. Similarly, while some may have hallucinations, break off with the real world, and need psychiatric treatment, others may not even reveal their split identity to other people.

Despite these alterations in the forms of Dissociative Identity Disorder, the reasons lying behind the outbreak of the disorder are usually typical. Social constrictions are one of the major reasons. No matter how important people's individuality is, particularly in the twenty-first century, social influences always play a significant role in individuals' lives. What is considered individual or private is often within the limits allowed by the society because individual behaviour is involved in larger systems, which is called "The functional perspective" (Douglas 210).

In a social system, people tend to accept whatever others say and do, and especially when they are in a group (Eiser 32). Moreover, "individuals would rely upon the responses of other people, albeit no more expert than themselves, when making judgements about an ambiguous perceptual stimulus, so that judgements made in a group setting would show a convergence towards a collective norm" (Sherif in Eiser 32).

The control of the society over the individual is enabled through a process called "socialization". Socialization means learning about and accepting the valid norms of the society. Douglas asserts that it is a lifelong process and only after this process can humanbeings "locate themselves in society" (169). Being a part of the society is important for individuals, for "they must rely on others' interpretations of

their presentations of self" (Douglas 177).

For Hawthorn, some triggering elements underlying Dissociative Identity Disorder are the adult trauma (double-bind), familial constrictions, morality, religious belief, and childhood trauma (17). These elements, for Douglas, are called "the agencies of socialization" (193).

Adult trauma, or double-bind, as Hawthorn puts it, stems from different reasons in men and women. "War, unemployment, financial crisis" seem to be the sources of personality dissociation for men; for women, the reason is rather personal; complex and contradictory personal relationships, and sexual experiences cause personality disorders. However, he remarks that even personal relationships and sexuality is connected with public and social constrictions (19).

Familial constrictions are another form of social constrictions. Hawthorn believes family relationships are not only personal relationships; but they also involve and are influenced by larger social constitutions (19). Thus, in many cases the personal overlaps the social and it is hard to tell them apart. Born without a self, a child inevitably depends on his family even for his basic needs. For "a normal social development" interaction with the family is essential. The family is the first and the most important model for children to imitate. "Children imitate parents' language, values, goals, morality, and general behavior since such behavior allows the child to control his environment by making it a stable but interesting place" (Douglas 195).

Morality is another cause of the conflict between the society and individuals. Morality consists of the "standards of what is right and wrong, good and bad, what one should and should not do". There are some specific morality rules of the society, and the duty of individuals is to accept and apply these rules to "an infinite number of situations". Only in this way will individuals feel that they belong to the society they live in, and that their life has a meaning and justification (Douglas 188).

Religious belief is the next factor leading to Dissociative Identity Disorder. This aspect, Hawthorn claims, is "far more culture-specific". The important thing about an atmosphere of religious belief is that it taboos certain possible solutions to problems faced by people in their adult lives. In different case histories, it is almost impossible to find an example where no mention of religious belief on the part of the individual, his or her family or community is made. Especially those suffering from a

mental breakdown are more likely to seek the consolation of religion (20). However, religion imposes social constrictions on people, their conducts in their relationships, their values, and daily lives. Religion also conflicts with their sexual drives, which finally leads to the feeling of guilt. Esman claims that "all sexual avenues open to adolescents have been potentially – and often actually – burdened with guilt and/or shame and every adolescent engaged in them has been obliged to make some accommodation to this burden" (66). Nevertheless, he also adds that "the new sexuality" has already replaced the old and conservative concept of sexuality, and proved to be a significant change in social norms (67).

Childhood trauma, another factor, is often associated with the death or loss of a parent or parent-substitute, or physical or sexual molestation. Sexual molestation by a parent, in particular, seems to be a common experience of those who later dissociate or hallucinate (Hawthorn 14). Childhood is a bridge between societal and individual development. "The structure and form of society influence socialization by shaping the social and cultural framework of childhood" (Frønes in Adler 206).

Throughout the period of childhood, every culture has its own methods of socialization to have its ideal type of people in the end. "This is, after all, what education –formal or informal- is all about. In 'primitive' cultures the father teaches his young son to use a spear and to bait fishhooks; the mother teaches her little daughter to plant yams and weave raffia cloth" (Esman 94-95).

Unlike the adults, children do not have a "self" at birth. "The self", Douglas defines, is the individual's typifications of himself, and the sources of these typifications are not limited to the individual, but they also involve the relationships of individuals with the society (190). The self develops only after the process of socialization and personal experiences with other individuals.

2.1.1. Susan in *Woman in Mind*

Ayckbourn, in many of his plays, depicts married couples and defines their relationship on the basis of their lack of communication, misunderstanding, and the inability to fulfil their desires and expectations. Felicia Hardison Londré calls Ayckbourn England's "finest feminist writer" and "the only contemporary

playwright who shows the plight of the average woman in today's world" (in Dukore 87). Michael Billington is stricter claiming that Ayckbourn has been writing "constantly about masculine insensitivity towards women" (181). Ayckbourn uses disillusioned and dissatisfied female characters desperately in need of love and attention in contrast to his indifferent male characters who are far from understanding their wives and meeting their needs.

Woman in Mind is one of his best-known plays dealing with a distraught woman in an unhappy marriage. What makes the play interesting is the fact that it depicts the events from the wife's "subjective viewpoint" which might sometimes be "less than accurate", as indicated in the very early stage directions in the play (*W* 9). All through the play, the audience follow the wife, Susan, see what she sees, feel what she feels, and have to believe what she believes.

Billington states that *Woman in Mind* is the theatrical equivalent of the first-person narrative and it resembles *Hamlet* in that they both employ protagonists who are driven into madness and are victims of visitations by ambiguous phantoms (182). However, the triggering elements lying behind Susan's case are her adult trauma and familial constrictions.

Susan, a lower-middle-class woman, lives in a suburban house with a small and tidy garden with her husband Gerald, a vicar, and his widowed sister, Muriel. As stated in the stage directions, Susan has recently been questioning her life since she feels "cast in" her life (*W* 9). She feels as if she had no control over her life and the circumstances seem to be responsible for what she lives through.

Susan's adult trauma stems mainly from her husband, "a solemn man in his middle forties". Gerald is quite indifferent to her problems and does not really take care for her even when she has had a head injury in the garden. He accuses her of sleeping all day. Susan responds:

> SUSAN. Might I remind you, I only came out of hospital this morning.
>
> GERALD. Presumably they released you because they considered you fit and well. Anyway, Bill Windsor just phoned. Said he'd look in later (*W* 23).

He is ready to shift the responsibility to the "hospital" and Bill Windsor, the doctor. Moreover, when she confesses that she suffers from insomnia and she is unhappy, he

just replies “Well who is? These days. Very few” (*W* 23).

Londré claims that this lack of compassionate understanding for Susan after her head injury pushes her over the brink into madness (in Dukore 90). Albert E. Kalson takes the accusations a step further and finds Gerald pompous and self-satisfied (107). For Michael Holt, Gerald is “a self-obsessed man in retreat from responsibility, dedicated to writing his history of the parish from the Middle Ages to the present day. But he is incapable of real affection for his wife, offering only empty pious platitudes” (42). He acts as if he were dealing with something of vital importance. He is proud of having been commissioned by the Civic Society to condense six hundred years of the history of the county into sixty pages (*W* 34). He communicates with Susan only when he takes brief breaks from writing his book. Even after an argument with Susan about Rick, their son, Gerald uses the same trick to escape: “I must get on. Do another half hour on the book” (*W* 32).

Susan also suffers from Gerald’s indifference to love and lovemaking. Billington suggests that Gerald’s book is just a tool for him to “justify years of sexual and emotional neglect” (183). When Susan expresses her discontent about the monotony of their relationship, Gerald claims that he still loves Susan and feels the same. Susan, on the other hand, is concerned with the lack of physical side of their marriage, and she complains: “We don’t kiss – we hardly touch each other – we don’t make love – we don’t even share the same bed now. We sleep at different ends of the room” (*W* 26). Gerald tries to justify himself by blaming Susan for thinking only about the sexual side of their marriage:

GERALD. That’s just sex you’re talking about. That’s just the sexual side-
SUSAN. Well, of course it is-
GERALD. There’s more to it than that, surely? (*W* 26)

Upon this accusation, Susan explains the importance of making love in a relationship, pointing out sadly that they share nothing any more:

> What I’m saying is… All I’m saying is, that once that’s gone – all that – it becomes important. Over-important, really. I mean before, when we – it was just something else we did together. Like gardening. Only now I have to do that on my own as well. It was something we shared. (*W* 26)

Susan undergoes a heavy psychic trauma because of her neglected sexual and emotional desires. She makes it quite clear that her husband has been neglecting her to a great extent lately and she does not accept any excuse for this neglect, the book included. It has not been too long since Gerald started writing the book and the book will consist of only sixty pages. Thus, it is obvious that the book cannot itself be a pretext for stopping Gerald from meeting the sexual and emotional needs of his wife. Susan, while talking to Bill about their only son Rick, admits they would "probably have had more [children] if it hadn't been for [her] husband's book" (*W* 40). For Susan, Gerald's book is responsible even for their not having any more children.

Gerald's attempts of justification do not end with his occupation with his book. Next, he puts forth that he thought that women at Susan's age lost interest in sex and did not need affection any more. He is under the miscomprehension that women after a certain age "more or less…switched off" the sexual desires (*W* 27). He is far from understanding Susan and his explanations are just excuses for his neglecting Susan's needs

When Susan comes back from the hospital and complains about her lack of sleep, he advises her to find more work to do during the daytime so that she could sleep tight at night. "There's your solution", he adds (*W* 23). When Susan talks about her fear of losing her role as a mother and wife, Gerald responds: "Oh, we're back on that, are we? [...] The trivial round, the common task / Will furnish all we need to ask" (*W* 24). He is so apathetic to his wife's problems that he does not even intend to listen to them. He regards talks and discussions trivial and common. His answers to Susan's plights are in clichés, and impersonal clichés provide Gerald with something to say without having to think about the issue at hand. He also regards their problems within the family trivial and when Susan attempts to talk to Bill about Rick, Gerald interrupts and says they do not need to share their "little family problems with everyone" (*W* 42).

SUSAN. I hardly ever saw the boy. You bullied him into that scholarship and then packed him off to that piddling little public school where he never saw anything female aged under fifty-five or weighing less than fifteen stone till the day he left.

GERALD. Let's not get into this, Susan.

SUSAN. You forget I used to have to listen to his prayers every night of his holidays, Gerald. 'Please God, don't make me have to get married.'
GERALD. That is nonsense. (*W* 32)

Gerald considers every problem trivial and avoids discussing or talking about it. He is an escapist who never likes taking on responsibilities. When Rick arrives, Gerald hides in the cupboard, which is quite unexpected and astonishing for a Reverend of his age. He is a coward, indeed, and prefers not to face problems unless he is forced to.

Susan and Gerald argue a lot about their son. Rick has got married without telling his parents and plans to go to Thailand with his wife, Tess, soon. Tess has been offered a job there, but Rick does not have a job and hopes to work there as an odd job man. Rick informs only Susan about his news, and expects Susan to relate them to Gerald. Apparently Susan and Gerald have been incompatible as parents. Gerald puts some blame on Susan. However, he does not want to argue any more: "I'm not going to start on this. We have argued our lives away over that boy and we're not going to do it any more. I refuse to become involved" (*W* 58). One problem is that they are incapable of having a discussion. Another one is that Gerald avoids any unpleasantness that may come out in a discussion. His continual excuse is: "I must get back to my labours" (*W* 59).

Gerald leaves Susan and goes to his study. When he returns to take his card table, Susan wants to talk to him, but he replies with more clichés: "I think talking has got us precisely nowhere. East is East. Never the twain shall meet. Jack Spratt could eat no fat. We beg to differ" (*W* 60). Gerald does not mind admitting that they can never see eye to eye. He knows neither of them will change and, unlike Susan, he accepts it as a fact. Susan warns him that if he leaves her for "that damn - book" again he "will have nailed up the final - door" in their relationship. Even then Gerald does not take the threat seriously and considers Susan's threat "nonsense" (*W* 60).

Susan blames Gerald for Rick's behaviour and his timidity toward girls. She believes its reasons date back to his childhood and upbringing, and she resembles Rick to his father. However, Gerald is reluctant to take any responsibility. He wants to remain unquestioned and in the background as a father and husband figure. Thus,

whenever Susan makes an attempt to reach him, he refuses because he believes "talking has got [them] precisely nowhere" (*W* 60).

Susan points out the meaninglessness and tediousness of their marriage from her viewpoint. Her accusation and desire to divorce comes right after the fire in their house. In the middle of the night, the household wakes up and finds Gerald's study set on fire. Gerald blames Susan for the fire because he thinks she has wanted to destroy his book. In fact, Susan wants to be the centre of attention in her family and she is envious of Gerald's book since it takes most of his time. She wants to eliminate the book, which she regards as her rival, and she resorts to setting fire on Gerald's book. Gerald is devastated by the fire. He cannot understand why Susan has done it. He scolds Susan for destroying all sixty pages he has written. He underlines the fact that years of work has gone into the research and preparation of his book, and that he was on his last chapter (*W* 78). All his effort has been ruined and Gerald tries to understand the reason lying behind Susan's rage:

> GERALD. Why? What terrible, nameless, unmentionable thing can I possibly have done to you?
> SUSAN. Married me? (*W* 78)

She obviously regrets having married Gerald. She treats Gerald as if she were punishing him. She believes he deserved this treatment because he "married [her]".

Rick is also one of the agents of her unhappiness. Susan has not seen her son Rick for the two years he has spent in Hemel Hempstead. Rick used to be a scholarship student at a school for boys, but then got involved with a quasi-religious sect that prefers to call itself a philosophical group, "Trappists", one of whose rules is silent order (*W* 31). Rick has to keep silent on his rare visits home, but he can talk to other people except for his parents and can send letters to his parents:

> GERALD. He still writes letters, doesn't he? Very newsworthy letters…
> SUSAN. He does. To you. (*W* 31)

Rick only writes to his father and it makes Susan feel discriminated.

Susan accuses Gerald of not taking an active role in Rick's upbringing, especially in matters related to the sexual development of a growing boy. Susan has had to take on this job, too:

SUSAN. Sixteen years old and, until I told him, he thought his bed got damp in the night because the roof leaked. You did nothing for him, Gerald. Nothing. He could have died for all you cared. (*W* 32)

Gerald reminds Susan that Rick will be visiting them at lunch. They have not seen him for a long time. Nevertheless, Susan is pretty sure that Rick is not coming to see them. When she asks the reason for Rick's visit, Gerald explains that Rick is in need of money and he wants to sell all his belongings in his room. Susan objects to this idea because selling Rick's belongings in his room equals losing her son.

Rick finally arrives and surprises Susan because he has left the Trappists three months ago and he now speaks to his parents. During his talk to Susan, he reveals many changes in his life, about which his parents were not informed:

SUSAN. Where are you living now? Not still in Hemel Hempstead?
RICK. No I've moved back into London. South London.
SUSAN. I see. And so? What are you doing? Have you got a job?
RICK. Not just at present, no.
SUSAN. Must be difficult, then? Making ends meet? Oh, this feels so odd talking to you – like a stranger. Do you have a room in South London?
RICK. No, we've got a flat.
SUSAN. We?
RICK. Me and this girl.
SUSAN. Oh? You've got a girl friend?
RICK. Well, she's more than that, really.
SUSAN. (Smiling rather coyly) A lover, then?
RICK. No. Really, more of a wife, really… (*W* 52)

He is more than "a stranger" for Susan and likely to remain so forever, for he will be leaving for Thailand soon (*W* 51). He has moved into London with his wife Tess, whom he married at a date he does not exactly remember and at a registry office whose name he does not know. Obviously Rick is not indifferent only to Susan but also to Tess. Indifference seems to be a male family trait. Susan wants to be introduced to Tess as soon as possible and make up for the lost time; but Tess, a trained nurse, was offered a job in Thailand and the couple are leaving England soon. Rick is also unwilling to introduce them because he thinks that an unsophisticated girl like Tess cannot get by a manipulating mother like Susan. He claims that Tess

"looks at things simply, that's all. She's straightforward. I just don't think she could cope with you. Not with your attitude" (*W* 55). As an only son, Rick disappoints Susan to a great extent and that grieves her. Susan regards her son "selfish, insensitive and priggish" (*W* 55).

The last agent of Susan's familial limitations is her sister-in-law Muriel, who is "grim-looking in a rather firm sort of way" (*W* 17). She is a woman who has known her share of suffering and is anxious that others should know about it too. With her brother Gerald, she forms "an unattractive picture" (*W* 22). Muriel looked after her ailing mother for twelve years and her bedridden husband for seven years. Since then, she has been living with Susan and Gerald. She cannot, however, get over the death of her husband and sometimes she feels that her late husband Harry is trying to get in touch with her. Kalson claims that "Expending her energies on calling her inattentive husband Harry back from the dead, she is an extra burden for Susan". Susan becomes exasperated with Muriel's practice of her religious beliefs in Susan's own home. Muriel attempts to help Susan with the housework, but her awkward efforts end in "comic fiascos" and bring more stress to Susan's life. For instance, she mistakes the tea tin or the spice tin, which leads to "her masterpiece […] Earl Grey omelette" (107-108). Muriel is obviously unfamiliar with the kitchen, and Susan believes that she has to run the house despite Muriel's help:

> SUSAN. I do all the cooking, the bulk of the washing up, all the laundry –including Muriel's- I cope with the sheer boring slog of tidying up after both of you, day after day, I make the beds, I- (*W* 23)

Susan is tired of doing all the mundane jobs of the household, which exhausts her both physically and psychologically.

Muriel already challenges Susan with her existence in the same house as a woman, and makes Susan feel she is losing her roles. Worst of all, Susan is accused by Muriel of not being a good wife. When Susan gets mad at Gerald because of his obsession with his book, Muriel interferes and points out that that is no way to talk to her husband. She adds, "Susan, you've never learnt how to treat a man properly" (*W* 59). Muriel also finds fault with Susan as a housewife. When she decides to make coffee, she complains: "I thought I'd make some coffee. Since nobody else was" (*W*

27). She also adds that the kitchen is a "very inconvenient" one to work in, and "the garden could do with a tidy" (*W* 44, 27). Susan feels desperate because she thinks everybody blames her for everything. Her self-esteem is eroded by the members of her family.

"Susan has a boring vicar for a husband, a muddled sister-in-law who lives with them, and a lout of a son who will not speak to his mother" (Londré in Dukore 110). Social constrictions including her unsatisfactory familial relationships and her neglected emotional and sexual desires culminate in her adult trauma. Gerald is a vicar who sees himself as "a custodian of tradition and history", but fails as a husband and a father. Muriel is another believer, that of "eccentric spiritualism" (Billington 185); her attempts to contact her dead husband, and her coarseness and tactlessness irritate Susan. Rick "simply represents the declension of religion"; Susan is unhappy because of Rick's adoption of corrupted religious codes, and his disrupted relationship with her (Billington 185). In addition to the various agents which lead Susan into unhappiness, Kalson also finds fault with the malpractice of religion, and states: "Established religions, quasi religions, and spiritualism have all failed a family in disarray" (108).

2.1.2 Gareth in *Philadelphia, Here I Come!*

In many of his plays Brian Friel deals with the themes of lack of love, joy, and economic freedom in Ireland. In *Philadelphia, Here I Come!* , Friel is concerned with the same themes; moreover, he creates his first and most famous play. This play is regarded as "a landmark in Friel's development" because in the play he divides the protagonist, Gareth, into two personalities, and uses two actors to represent split personality on the stage (O'Brien 41). Gareth is represented by two separate personalities: Public and Private. This innovative presentation of split personality, according to Richard Pine, is used to illustrate the clash between individuals and the society:

> It explains the tension between the two positions of the artist in relation to the alter ego or 'enemy within', and in relation to the public world. It also explains the sense of loss which has fractured a people's history, and the hope of reparation or restoration which gives them a

> sense of their future. Friel has taken this tension and this dichotomy and made them his personal style; in each of his characters who portrays the inner man in conflict with the public world […] we also see a man trying to make himself whole and to complete his vision of the world by satisfying the world's demands. (17)

Friel's characters are usually torn between their own desires and those of the society they live in. They are heavily under the influence of social norms and values, and they inevitably try to fulfil the needs and expectations of society.

Gareth is a typical Frielian character; he is confused because he is split between his own unfulfilled desires in Ireland and his hopes for a new life in the United States. The major social constrictions lying behind his confusion and split personality are familial constrictions, his childhood trauma, and the people in his life.

Gareth's father is the agent of familial constrictions leading to his Dissociative Identity Disorder. Gareth, twenty-five years of age, lives with his father S.B. O'Donnell and works in his shop. He attended a university for a year in Dublin, but left school and returned to his father's business. Their housekeeper Madge also lives with them.

Gareth is stuck in a rut, in a small village. He has no prospects for a better life. His aunt Lizzy's visit from the States triggers this realization:

> LIZZY. Typical Irish! He will think about it! And while he is thinking about it the store falls in about his head! What age are you? Twenty-four? Twenty-five? What are you waiting for? For S.B. to run away to sea? Until the weather gets better? (*P* 61)

Lizzie and Con, her husband, offer Gareth to come live with them and paint an attractive picture of the life in the States:

> LIZZY. We have this ground-floor apartment, see, and a car that's air-conditioned, and colour TV, and this big collection of all the Irish records you ever heard, and 15,000 bucks in Federal Bonds- (*P* 63)

Besides these facilities, they have also arranged a job for him there. Gareth accepts their invitation and starts packing his suitcases.

While getting packed, Gareth is grumbling because even though it is his last day at home, his father gives him some work to do. He expects his father to let him

have his last day free.

> PUBLIC. Instead of saying to me: [grandly] 'Gar, my son, since you are leaving me forever, you may have the entire day free,' what does he do? Lines up five packs of flour and says: [in flat dreary tones] 'Make them up into two-pound pokes.'(*P* 16)

S.B. O'Donnell has not said even a single word to Gareth about his going away. Gareth pretends not to care about his father's indifference, but he obviously needs some show of affection and resents his father's apathy. "He's said nothing!", he repeats sadly and angrily, which shows how much he is hurt by his father's indifference (*P* 20). Madge tries to make Gar believe that his father loves him but cannot demonstrate his feelings. She claims that "just because he doesn't say much doesn't mean that he hasn't feelings" (*P* 20). S.B. did not show any emotion even when his wife died, but Madge is certain of his capability of affection. However, she cannot convince Gar to talk to his father. Since his father avoids speaking to Gar about his leaving, Gar is determined not to speak to him first.

Gar needs attention, so he resents his father's not talking to him about his departure. He tries to make up for his father's lack of concern by asking Madge "Will you miss me?" several times until Madge tells him that she will (*P* 16).

Gar is not comfortable with his father. When he is with him, "he assumes in speech and gesture a surely, taciturn gruffness. He always behaves in this way when he is in his father's company" (*P* 21). When S.B. comes home, Private Gar draws attention to his monotony and dullness. His father wears a "collar stud", which he wears "six days a week, in or out of bed" (*P* 38). Then S.B. follows his everyday routine; he takes a seat, removes his hat, and utters the same sentences. Private mocks him:

> PRIVATE. Perfectly trained; the most obedient father I ever had. And now for our nightly lesson in the English language. Repeat slowly after me: Another day over.
> S.B. Another day over.
> PRIVATE. Good. Next phrase. I suppose we can't complain.
> S.B. I suppose we can't complain.
> PRIVATE. Not bad. Now for a little free conversation. (*P* 39)

Gar pretends to be enjoying himself by making fun of his father's typical behaviour

and speech. Actually, he is bored with his father's predictable life. He craves for one single unpredictable remark or any sign of feelings and affection from his father. There is a huge rift of communication between the two mainly because the father is rigidly set in his unchanging ideas and routines. S.B. cannot express himself properly and uses ambiguous words in his awkward sentences:

S.B. I suppose you'll be looking for your pay.
PUBLIC. I earned it.
S.B. I'm not saying you didn't. It's all there - you needn't count it.
PUBLIC. I didn't say I was going to count it, did I? (*P* 41)

They apparently do not understand each other and speak as if they had hostile feelings towards each other. The central conflict, therefore, is directly between Gareth and his father. Even at the end of Episode II, Gar is still yearning for a response from his father: "Screwballs, say something! Say something, father!" (*P* 83). O'Brien describes S.B., which to Gar stands for Screwballs, as "an undemonstrative, unappealing, unprepossessing figure, his mind fixed on practical matters and his emotions heavily under wraps" (49). Gareth needs his father's love, but even when he openly asks for it, the father in his set ways will not be capable of responding. Private, not Public Gar, questions S.B:

> When you're curled up in your wee cot, Screwballs, do you dream? Do you ever dream of the past, Screwballs, of that wintry morning in Bailtefree, and three days in Bundoran? [...] God –maybe- Screwballs- behind those dead eyes and that flat face are there memories of precious moments in the past? (*P* 89)

Referring to a few simple but happy memories of his childhood, Gar tries to establish a line of communication with his father, " to coax him into recognizing that they had once shared that same experience; the mere details of the 'fact' being immaterial compared with the importance of the shared memory" (Pine 20).

PRIVATE. Is it possible that you have hoarded in the back of that mind of yours –do you remember- it was an afternoon in may- oh, fifteen years ago- I don't remember every detail but some things are as vivid as can be: the boat was blue and the paint was peeling […] You had given me your hat and had put your jacket round my shoulders because there had been a shower of rain […]

> Between us at that moment there was this great happiness, this great joy- you must have felt it too." (*P* 89-90)

Gar makes continuous efforts to relate himself to his father. He cannot find any connection in the present, so he goes back to the past to try his chance. He wonders whether his father remembers that day and the blue boat. In Episode III Part 2 Public asks his father about the blue boat, the rainy day when his father gave him his own jacket, and the song he sang:

> PUBLIC. You put your jacket round my shoulders and gave me your hat-
> S.B. Aye?
> PUBLIC. -and it wasn't that we were talking or anything-but suddenly- suddenly you sang 'All Round My Hat I'll Wear A Green Coloured Ribono'-
> S.B. Me?
> PUBLIC. -for no reason at all except that we-that you were happy. D'you remember? D'you remember?
> [There is a pause while S.B. tries to recall.]
> S.B. No…no, then, I don't…. (*P* 105)

S.B. does not remember the blue boat, the jacket, or singing that song ever. He remembers a brown one belonging to a doctor. What the child remembers is not the same as what the father remembers. Gar does not realize that people's memories do not necessarily match, so he feels highly disappointed, lonely, and isolated.

S.B. actually loves his son. He is quite worried about him, so he cannot sleep. He makes tea in the early hours of the morning. He even goes over Gar's suitcases and touches his coat. Later, Gar wakes up to take an aspirin. When he sees Gar awake late at night, he shows that he cares for his son:

> S.B. There is tea in the pot.
> PUBLIC. Aye?
> S.B. If it's a headache you have. (*P* 101)

They talk about everyday business for a while. S.B admits that he has listened to the weather forecast and hopes that it will be a fair day for Gar's flight. He advises Gar to sit at the back of the plane in case there might be an accident. He adds, "If there was an accident or anything – it's the front gets it hardest-" (*P* 104). That he cares for Gar in his own way is seen towards the end of the play, but not by Gar. In fact, S.B

has never been able to show is feelings, and now he cannot either. Hence, their parting is unsatisfactory for Gar.

Childhood trauma is also a factor behind Gar's Dissociative Identity Disorder. With *Philadelphia, Here I Come!*, the mothers and wives exit the stage "to create a discussion between fathers and sons", and to create a "discussion of the mother's role" (Pine 76). In Gar's case, the trauma results from the death of Gar's mother at a very young age, only three days after Gar was born. For this reason, Gar has never had a mother figure during his upbringing despite the presence of Madge, a substitute mother for him. Pine points at the "bitterness of *Philadelphia*: the mother's intervention, which will be possible in *Philadelphia* only through the surrogate role of the housekeeper, Madge, and impossible thereafter, is here inconclusive and, implicitly, ineffectual" (73). Madge has brought up Gar, yet she can never be a real substitute for Gar's mother.

Gareth, at twenty-five, is still trying to learn about his mother. He learns that his old teacher Master Boyle had proposed to his mother, but his mother had chosen to marry his father. Gar wants to know if Boyle really loved his mother. Then, he asks Madge why his mother preferred to marry his father instead of Boyle. He continually tries to find out more and more about his mother. He cannot compensate for the absence of a mother in his life in Ireland. Now, Gar finds not only the chance to leave Ballybeg but also another surrogate mother in his aunt Lizzy, who really cares for and loves him. Lizzy clearly states that Gar is the only reason why they have visited O'Donnels. She could not have a child and now wants to offer Gar everything she has. She is sincere and straightforward. She needs a son and Gar needs a mother.

Kate Doogan, the girl Gar was in love with, and Gar's loutish friends are the other agents of his Dissociative Identity Disorder. Kate's parents expect her to marry someone within her own class, which O'Brien names "a coalition of personal impoverishment and social expectations" (48). Kate actually demands Gar to talk to her father, Senator Doogan, and ask his permission to marry her. She even persuades Gar to lie about his income so that her parents would probably consent to their marriage. She asks Gar to say that he has "£20 a week and £5,000 in the bank and [his] father is about to retire" (*P* 31). However, when Senator Doogan informs Gar

about a richer suitor, Francis King, Gar feels humiliated because of his lower-middle-class background. Private discourages Public: "Cripes, you look a right fool standing there […] Get out! Get out quick before the others come in and die laughing at you!" (*P* 33). Senator Doogan makes him believe that Gar cannot afford the Doogans' hopes for their only daughter Kate. Kate's "happiness is all that is important to [them]", which is based on solid financial advantages (*P* 33). Thus, Gareth cannot dare to talk to Senator Doogan to ask for his permission to marry Kate, and loses her forever.

As for Gar's friends, they are totally indifferent to his departure. They do not even know where he is going. Gar wants to be reassured that they care for him and they will miss him:

> PUBLIC. Well, boys, when you're lining out on the pitch, you can think of me, because I'll be thinking of you.
> JOE. Lucky bloody man, Gar. God, I wish I was in your-
> NED. By the way, lads, who's the blondie thing I seen at the last Mass on Sunday? (*P* 69)

Whenever Gar tries to talk about his departure, his friends change the topic and start talking about girls:

> PUBLIC. I'm for off tomorrow, boys.
> NED [indifferently] Aye, so, so….
> TOM. Brooklyn, isn't it?
> PUBLIC. Philadelphia.
> TOM. Philadelphia. That's where Jimmy Crerand went to, isn't it? Philadelphia….
> NED [quickly] Mind the night Jimmy and us went down to the caves with them Dublin skivvies that was working up at the Lodge? (*P* 72)

Gareth's friends are not sad or worried about his leaving for Philadelphia. Their exaggerated account of their sexual life "serves to underline not only the emptiness of their boasts but also the lack of adventure and romance in Ireland, a culture where strong taboos forbid sexuality outside of marriage, an institution which many cannot afford" (Ferris in Kerwin 119).

Another component of social constrictions in the play is the parish priest Canon Mick O'Byrne. In Episode III, just as Gar is asking his father about the blue boat, he suddenly drops in. Canon is the representative of institutionalized religion in

the play. He is the man of customs, repetitions, clichés, and ennui. His presence is always felt. He can drop in at any household unannounced:

CANON. Hee-hee-hee- you're a terrible woman.
S.B. Well, Canon!
CANON. That Madge… hee-hee-hee.
PUBLIC. Good night, Canon.
CANON. She says I wait till the rosary's over and the kettle's on… hee-hee-hee.
S.B. She's a sharp one, Madge.
CANON. 'You wait', says she, 'till the rosary's over and the kettle's on!'
PRIVATE. Hee-hee-hee.
S.B. Pay no heed to Madge, Canon.
PRIVATE. And how's the O'Donnell family tonight?
CANON. And how's the O'Donnell family tonight? (*P* 91)

The Canon repeats what he says over and over. Also he uses the same sentences at the same time whenever he pays a visit to the O'Donnels. His predictability is similar to that of Gareth's father and it annoys Gar very much. That is the reason why Gar guesses each sentence of the priest and mocks him by uttering the exact sentence beforehand. He is repetitive and he suffocates Gar with his long and boring talks:

CANON. You'll have rain before morning.
S.B. D'you think so?
CANON. It's in the bones. The leg's giving me the odd jab.
S.B. We could do without the rain then.
CANON. Before the morning you'll have it.
S.B. Tch tch tch. We get our fill of it here.
CANON. The best barometer I know.
S.B. Aye. No want of rain.
CANON. Before the morning.
S.B. As if we don't get enough of it.
CANON. The jabs are never wrong. (*P* 92-93)

Nevertheless, this boring and disinterested man has to be put up with, for he is the priest on whose teaching and guidance the society depends.

Gareth's old school teacher Master Boyle is the last agent of his social constrictions. Boyle now is a disillusioned old man. In the past, Gar's mother did not marry Boyle, and she preferred S.B. because he was a better suitor. Likewise, Gar feels defeated by Francis King, who would apparently make a better husband for Kate. In Boyle Gar sees what his own future will be like; lonely and disillusioned "if he does not escape Ireland, where he too has lost his girl to a wealthier man, and

where marriage is frequently arranged as a matter of financial convenience" (Ferris in Kerwin 119-120). Boyle regrets the life he spent in Ireland. Now he thinks Gar should leave for the States because Ireland is "a vast restless place that doesn't give a curse about the past; and that's the way things should be. Impermanence and anonymity – it offers great attractions" (*P* 44).

When Gar looks at his father, Kate, and his friends, he sees how impossible it is to find love and happiness in his homeland. O'Brien states that "To Gar, Ballybeg has meant lovelessness, boredom, and the fecklessness of imperfectly realized ambitions […] Gar's loutish friends, the unctuously banal clichés of the parish priest, the demoralized state of Gar's old schoolteacher, and above all Gar's nonrelationship with his father bespeak an emotional and cultural wasteland" (48). No one can make him feel that he is important and loved. He has a tedious life and a job in his father's shop. He cannot communicate with his father and still desperately looks for a surrogate mother. Hence, his aunt Lizzy seems to be the only chance for him to begin a new and better life.

2.1.3 Alan in *Equus*

One of the most prominent and controversial playwrights of the twentieth century, Peter Shaffer, writes his plays on a variety of subject matters. Existential and psychological themes make up an integral and common element in all his plays because in these plays the protagonists, C. J. Gianakaris alleges, move toward the understanding of God, and "seek to discover how far man might assume the powers of God and become God – if indeed He exists" (4).

Equus, "Shaffer's attempt to unite an existential and sexual search for identity with a ritualistic representation of spiritual freedom", is one of his most disputable plays (Plunka 152). Many theatergoers have complained about its subject matter as they found it improper for the stage. They thought Shaffer attacked the concept of normal and any organized form of religion in this play (Plunka 149). Taylor holds to this criticism to the extent that the play looks like a "Black Comedy", but he regards the play one of the greatest achievements of Shaffer in the theatre (27).

Equus portrays Alan Strang, a young man suffering from Dissociative Identity Disorder. Alan mysteriously blinds six horses with a metal spike and the play explores the reasons underlying this weird crime. This plot has been strengthened with R. D. Laing's idea that "conventional modern psychiatry has been unconsciously moulded by the Establishment into a tool for social manipulation, for preserving the 'norm'" (in Taylor 27). Dysart, the psychiatrist who examines Alan, is the representative of norms and values of the society. His interviews with Alan's parents reveal the major factors behind Alan's Dissociative Identity Disorder: His familial constrictions, religious belief, and morality.

Frank Strang, Alan's father, "oppresses Alan more than anyone else does" in the play (Plunka 153). First, he forbids Alan to watch television. He considers television harmful and argues about it with his wife, Dora:

> DORA. That's a little extreme, dear, isn't it?
> FRANK. You sit in front of that thing long enough, you'll become stupid for life – like most of the population. [To Alan.] The thing is, it's a *swiz*. It seems to be offering you something, but actually it's taking something away. Your intelligence and your concentration, every minute you watch it. That's a true swiz, do you see? (*E* 27)

Frank is prejudiced against television and he advises Alan to read books instead of watching television. He imposes his own likes and dislikes on his son. He is a printer; thus, he maintains that the son of a printer must read a lot. He wants Dora to return the television set back to the store the next morning.

Besides being oppressive, Frank is also negligent about his son's education. When Dysart asks him whether he instructed Alan on sex or not, Frank has to admit: "Not in so many words, no." (*E* 34). Alan's not having been instructed about sex in his puberty also contributes to his Dissociative Identity Disorder. The gaps in his psychosexual development will lead to his sexual dilemma.

One of Alan's childhood memories dates back to the day when he meets a horseman while digging a sandcastle on the beach. The man is "like a college chap. He [is] on a big horse – urging him on" (E 39). The name of the horse is Trojan. The horseman asks Alan if he would like to ride with him. Alan accepts and mounts the horse, but while riding, his father sees them. Alan is six years old and it is the first

time he rides a horse. As soon as Frank sees them, he begins shouting at and insulting the horseman. He orders Alan to come down the horse:

> FRANK. Come down at once. Right this moment.
> ALAN. No…No!
> FRANK. [in a fury] I said – this moment!
> [He pulls Alan from the horseman's shoulders. The boy shrieks, and falls to the ground] (*E* 41)

Frank is a real tyrant. He takes Alan off the horse by force and he does not mind hurting his son while pulling him from the horseman's shoulders. He accuses the horseman of endangering the lives of children and even threatens him with calling the police. Alan loves riding the horse. It gives him some pleasurable sensations, which he cannot not decipher as a child. Later, he realizes that he has found it "sexy" (*E* 47). His father's reaction makes him frightened and conceal the pleasure he has had. Later, as a young man he rides horses only at night when there is no one to see him. This is "an incident that becomes a traumatic experience because Alan's sexual and spiritual freedom [has been] disturbed. This disruption […] [helps] to form Alan's 'strange' personality" (Plunka 154).

Frank makes Alan work in an electrical shop. Alan does not even have the right to choose his own job because of his father's oppression. Frank does not want Alan to work with him as Alan does not have "the aptitude. And printing's a failing trade" (*E* 53). By imposing his own opinion of Alan on him, he damages his son's self-esteem. Frank does not care about whether his son likes his job or it satisfies him. Plunka puts forth that Alan's job in the electrical shop "does little to provide the confused lad with the spiritual freedom that he seeks" (155).

Frank oppresses Alan to such a great extent that Alan feels that he even has to go home when his father tells him to do so. He internalizes everything his father commands him to do. Jill, the girl who helped Alan to find a part-time job at the stables, asks him out one day. He rejects her on the grounds that he has got to go home since his parents expect him:

> ALAN. I've got to go home.
> JILL. What for?
> [He tries to escape upstage]
> ALAN. They expect me.
> JILL. Rung up and say you're going out.

ALAN. I can't.
JILL. Why?
ALAN. They expect me. (*E* 91)

He knows what he is supposed to do and he acts accordingly. He cannot make even a simple decision on his own.

Jill finally convinces Alan to go to the cinema. The film they watch is a blue movie. In the film Alan sees a girl who "went into the bathroom and took off all her clothes […] It was fantastic! The water fell on her breasts" (*E* 92). Alan gets very excited because it is the first time he has seen a naked girl. At that time, Frank catches his son in the cinema watching the film, and he scolds Alan:

FRANK. Alan! You can hear me! Don't pretend!
PATRONS. Sssh!
FRANK. [approaching the row of seats] Do I have to come and fetch you out?...Do I?...
[cries of 'Sssh!' and 'Shut up!']
Do I, Alan? (*E* 93)

Frank obviously has come to watch the blue film, too; but he defends himself claiming that he went there that night to see the manager. Frank, unintentionally, "represses the development of any mature sexual knowledge on Alan's part" (Plunka 160). He tries to justify himself by explaining that he was there for business purposes:

FRANK. I came here tonight to see the Manager. He asked me to call on him for business purposes. I happen to be a printer, Miss. A picture house needs posters. That's entirely why I'm here. To discuss posters. While I was waiting I happened to glance in, that's all. (*E* 94)

He even pretends to be surprised to see such films there, and suddenly decides to complain about the cinema to the city council. He degrades blue movies. He embarrasses Alan before his girlfriend, and accuses him of watching a nasty movie. Plunka states that by doing so, Frank "relieves the boy of the few pleasurable moments in his life, and as a prying Grand Inquisitor, the printer more than stamps his impression on his son and takes away his freedom" (154). Frank, also, must have had a sexually suppressed childhood and youth. His own upbringing, coupled with the guilt of having been found out by Alan at the cinema, drives him to cover up his

presence. The encounter is traumatic for both the father and the son. Alan is very disturbed by finding out his father's hypocrisy:

> ALAN. I kept seeing him, just as he drove off. Scared of me…And me scared of him…I kept thinking – all those airs he put on!... 'Receive my meaning. Improve your mind!'… All those nights he said he'd be in late. 'Keep my super hot, Dora!' 'Your poor father: he works so hard!'… Bugger! Old bugger!... Filthy old bugger!" (*E* 95)

Apparently, Frank has certain secrets kept from both his wife and son. This incident gives Alan the message that one's sexual fantasies have to be kept secret.

Religion is the second reason for Alan's trauma. Dora Strang, an ex-school teacher, is not only another agent of Alan's familial constrictions but she also imposes her extreme views of religion on Alan. Alan does not have a close relationship with his father and he is no longer in school. Hence, most of his education and knowledge consists of the things he learned from his mother. When Alan was a child, she used to read him a book over and over. The book was about a horse called Prince, a horse which could be ridden only by his young master. This story fascinated Alan and caused him to idealize horses as unapproachable creatures ridden only by some special people.

Dora, the "zealous mother", makes another mistake by telling Alan about the pagan belief that the horse and the rider was one person (MacMurraugh-Kavanagh 90). Alan is fascinated with the idea of the unity between the horse and the rider:

> DORA. Did you know that when Christian cavalry first appeared in the New World, the pagans thought horse and rider was one person?
> […]
> ALAN. [sitting up, amazed] One person?
> DORA. Actually, they thought it must be a god.
> ALAN. A god!
> DORA. It was only when one rider fell off, they realized the truth. (*E* 31)

Dora supposes that she is being quite clear about this pagan belief as she explains that the horse and the rider was not one in fact. However, Alan is too young to grasp this distinction. He takes whatever she tells him for granted and he is carried away by

these stories from the Bible. He even memorizes some parts of these stories and recites them with Dora:

DORA. 'Hast thou given the horse strength?'
ALAN. [responding] 'Hast thou clothed his neck with thunder?'
DORA. [to Alan]'The glory of his nostrils is terrible!'
ALAN. 'He swallows the ground with fierceness and rage!'
DORA. 'He saith among the trumpets-'
ALAN. [trumpeting] Ha! Ha! (*E* 31)

Dora finds reciting biblical stories with her son exhilarating. She is proud of teaching his son. She boasts about having had "a horsey family" throughout her life and about her grandfather who "used to ride every morning on the downs behind Brighton, all dressed up in bowler hat and jodhpurs! He used to look splendid" (*E* 32).

She remembers having taught Alan the word "equitation" and that the word came from "equus", "horse" in Latin (*E* 32). She is not aware of the fact that Alan has been stupefied with the word, for it is the first time he has seen a word with double "u". With its constantly increasing charm and strength, religion imposes social constrictions on Alan, his conducts in his relationships, his values, and daily life.

Dora whispers the Bible to Alan hour after hour in his room. She brainwashes Alan with stories from the Bible. She admits to Dysart that she taught Alan few things about sex. She recalls having told Alan that "sex is not just a biological matter, but spiritual as well. That if God willed, he would fall in love one day" (*E* 35). She confuses Alan with what she teaches, and because of her stories Alan links religion to sex in his mind. Klein states that Dora relates sex to love and love to God. Thus, it is natural for Alan "to turn the object of his worship into the object of his sexual attraction" (106). Dora's religious instructions and Alan's sexual drives become confusing in his mind. The boundaries between the two become blurred, which bring on feelings of guilt.

Alan buys a picture of Christ on his way to Calvary due to his mother's influence on him. The picture has a significant place in his psychosexual development. Alan loves the picture and hangs it at the foot of his bed so that he can see it as the last thing every night. Six years after the incident on the beach, Frank

argues about religion with Dora. He does not like the picture because it is extremely religious. In the picture, Christ is loaded down with chains. Finally, Frank "[goes] upstairs, [tears] [the picture] off the boy's wall and [throws] it in the dustbin. Alan [goes] quite hysterical. He [cries] for days without stopping" (*E* 45).

The picture which Frank tears off Alan's wall also turns out to be an object of sexual attraction for Alan. Frank is in no doubt that "it's the Bible that's responsible for all this" (*E* 34). He maintains that the boy is totally fascinated by the story of Christ and he always moons over religious pictures. He claims that Dora made Alan obsessed with religion, and with the idea that God was watching him everywhere.

Later Frank gives another picture to Alan; the picture of a horse looking over a gate from an angel "absolutely head on" (*E* 45). This picture is "most extraordinary. It comes out all eyes" as if staring at onlookers (*E* 45). Also it has replaced the picture of Christ. Thus, it highly influences Alan and raises his interest in horses, but Frank is unaware of this fact.

The influence of Dora and the pressure of religion on Alan is very strong. One night Frank hears him chanting in his room. He is chanting "like the Bible. One of those lists his mother's always reading to him" (*E* 50). It was a list like Genealogy. Alan was listing who begat whom: "Flankus begat Spankus. And Spankus begat Spunkus the Great, who lived three score years" (*E* 51). Since Alan is confused with his mother's religious instructions, he is reciting the stories according to his own understanding of religion. "Myth, pagan belief, and Christian dogma imprint themselves on the mind of the susceptible, anxious [child] […] Years later, Alan apparently unaccountably blinds six horses" (MacMurraugh-Kavanagh 90).

Morality is another source of anguish for Alan. Moral values and the norms of the society amplify Dissociative Identity Disorder that manipulates Alan further. "Morality", Torre puts forth, "has a strong individual character: its ultimate point of reference is the individual who asks –whatever the others do or think- 'what is the right thing to do?', or 'what should I do?'" (in Pauer-Studer 114). For Alan, what his parents regard and accept as right constitutes morality. Dora constantly makes attempts to make Alan a pious child, to lead his life according to the teachings of religion. Frank's norms are all forbidding; he disapproves and bans anything that would give Alan pleasure or spiritual relief. Neither Dora nor Frank notices that their

moral values cause Alan to have inner conflicts.

In *Equus,* Dysart both represents and deconstructs morality. He is the psychiatrist who is expected to treat Alan back to normal life. However, Dysart also feels the pressure of the social constrictions: "All reined up in old language and old assumptions, straining to jump clean-hoofed on to a whole new track of being I only suspect is there. I can't see it, because my educated, average head is being held at the wrong angle. I can't jump because the bit forbids it" (*E* 18). He yearns for a pagan life like that of the ancient Greeks, away from the norms of the society he lives in; but he feels bridled like a horse by the society, for he can never really get out of its limitations. He tries to comprehend Alan's case, but he cannot strip off his acquired values, norms, and prejudices.

Dysart, just like Alan's parents, is another authority representing and conforming to the values of normative society. MacMurraugh-Kavanagh argues that "Alan's anarchic individualism is again pitched against the forces of authoritarianism; his 'religious mind' is again set in conflict with 'the abstract and scientific mind' of normative society and its agent, Dysart" (113). Dysart with his vain attempts to heal Alan back to normality proves to be another component of social constrictions.

Alan was brought up in a home teeming with "head-on clashes between individuals and ideologies which are seen to be at least partially responsible for [his] chaotic state" (MacMurraugh-Kavanagh 111). Frank is an atheist father who communicates little with his son except for giving him commands. Dora is a pious mother who unintentionally brainwashes her son with the biblical stories she reads. Alongside with all the differences they have from each other, they have only one thing in common as Taylor points out: "Neither can understand their son's development towards his own private mythology" (29). After Alan blinds the horses, both parties blame each other for his upbringing. After all, Frank's and Dora's ideologies are "different facets of the same authoritarian principle: Each propose the values of individual discipline, communal conscience and civic order. Both suppress personal desire" (MacMurraugh-Kavanagh 112). Finally, they resort to the professional help of Dysart, who only adds to the pressure Alan feels on himself. Dysart is aware of the influence of the society on individuals and he envies the

passion and devotion Alan has. He knows that the system he is imprisoned in is insufficient to understand people like Alan. He feels uneasy when he is expected to interfere with and change Alan as a professional agent of the system. Nevertheless, he has to do what he is supposed to do even if it means returning Alan to the normally acceptable state.

2.2. Inner Constrictions

Dissociative Identity Disorder changes from person to person regarding its forms. Social Constrictions have a leading role among the factors that inflict human beings with conflicts. However, sometimes individuals internalize these conflicts so firmly that conflicts cannot be told apart either as internal or external. In such cases, individual factors may overweigh external ones.

The problem with a schizoid individual can be due to what and who the person is (Laing 25). Because split personality is not a physical ailment to be removed from the body, it entirely depends on the person it inflicts. Generally speaking, there are some symptoms the individual with split identity displays. A split individual is at odds with his \ her own recognition of himself \ herself and that of others (Laing 36). He \ She lacks objectivity in his \ her self-assessment. Therefore, full recognition of reality may cause irreparable harm on the split individual's mind.

A schizoid individual is quite skilful at self-concealment. He \ She believes that his \ her actions are not his real self (Laing 37). He \ She does not demonstrate his \ her real feelings, which exacerbates his \ her ailment, and prevents early diagnosis and treatment.

In addition to subjective self-assessment and self-concealment, there are some other cognitive symptoms the individual with split personality displays. These symptoms appear particularly because of the anxiety a split person encounters. Laing explains that the use of split personality is "an attempt to deal with" disturbing thoughts and feelings (65). What bothers or what is problematic with the individual are his \ her obsessions, worries, distractiveness, detachment, apathy, and numbness (Zuckerman 85).

2.2.1 Susan

"The typical Ayckbourn female character fights a sometimes losing battle to maintain her sanity as she suffers indignity, embarrassment, even neglect as her mate calls the tune […] It is the female who sometimes loses the thread of reality", like Susan in *Woman in Mind* (Kalson 19). Susan displays most of the cognitive symptoms of Dissociative Identity Disorder: She has a subjective view of her life, she withholds her thoughts, she has severe obsessions and worries, she is often and easily distracted, and she is gradually detached from real life.

Woman in Mind is "Ayckbourn's most devastating study of incipient madness" because the play is presented through the disoriented and subjective viewpoint of Susan, a woman gradually losing her touch with reality. After the accident in the garden, Susan is attended not only by a doctor but also by an alternate family, which is in direct contrast to her real one. The play moves forward between the real and imaginary. Susan remains an "average humanbeing, ordinary but troubled – a twentieth-century Everywoman" until her total mental breakdown (Kalson 90).

Susan has a subjective viewpoint since she "clearly has a Manichean notion of good and evil" (Billington 185). When she regains her consciousness after the accident, she thinks she has gone to hell: "Why have I gone to hell? Why me? I've tried so terribly hard, too. Terribly hard" (*W* 10). She believes she deserves to go to heaven. Regarding her marriage, she is subjective as well. Susan does not love Gerald and she claims that Gerald does not love her either. However, Gerald refutes her subjective truth and states he does love her: "I'm not aware that my feelings towards you have altered that much… I still feel the same" (*W* 26). Susan's assessments, values, reality are far from being objective. Because of her lack of objectivity, she cannot see that "she might well be the author not only of her own unhappiness but also that of the other members of her family" (Holt 43).

Susan begins to question the "role she's played or perhaps been cast in" in life only in her forties (*W* 9). The outcomes of her late-coming queries are the cognitive symptoms of her inner constrictions. Among these symptoms, obsessions and worries form the basis of other symptoms, and thus play the most important role

in Susan's Dissociative Identity Disorder. Susan's major obsessions and worries are related to her lack of love and sex in her marriage, lack of self-esteem, her fear of losing roles in life, and her desire for higher life standards.

Susan has an apathetic husband like Gerald and she can frankly state that she no longer loves Gerald: "We've known each other rather a long time, haven't we? [...] Well, you know I don't love you any more, Gerald" (*W* 25). However, she desperately needs love and affection. She wants to revive the excitement of love and sex, which they have lost in the course of their marriage. They have become a dull couple trapped in the daily routines of married life. Now they do not even share the same bed. Sex is of great value for Susan. On sex, she states: "Everything else, the everyday bits, just ticked along nicely. But take that away, the really joyous part of us – and everything else rather loses its purpose" (*W* 26). When left without love and sex, she sees no point in life. Her dissatisfaction results in her inability to sleep during the night. Talking to Gerald, she explains the reason why she cannot sleep: "Because I'm not very happy, Gerald" (*W* 23). She cannot repress her unhappiness and cannot prevent its physical outcomes.

Susan believes that Gerald is not in love with her, either. However, she sees this situation understandable and does not blame anyone for it. She claims that "it's nobody's fault. It's just happened, over the years" (*W* 27). Unfortunately, having come to this understanding and acceptance does not relieve her unhappiness.

Susan also suffers from lack of self-esteem. Right after her accident, although she has just regained her consciousness, she is not comfortable with the attention she gets from her doctor; she does not want to be a nuisance even for the doctor:

SUSAN.	Please don't bother on my account.
BILL.	Thanks.
	(A pause. Bill glances at his watch. Susan sits.)
	Well…
SUSAN.	(Sensing his unease) You don't have to stay if you've-
	(*W* 11)

Susan is a very vulnerable and sensitive woman. Having been neglected by her husband for a long time both emotionally and sexually, she regards herself trivial. She does not want to be a burden on any one, including the doctor. When she first hears about her accident, her reaction is not the expected one:

SUSAN. Did I bang my head? How did I bang my head?
BILL. I think it was the old trick. You stood on the end of the garden rake. Nasty thing to happen.
SUSAN. (Disgusted) Typical of me. Typical. (*W* 11)

She feels disgusted with herself. Due to her low self-esteem, she is much too critical of herself. She feels embarrassed and considers herself accident-prone without any valid reason.

Susan passes through the midlife crisis and she considers life too difficult to cope with. She is always at home with Muriel and she does not have any occupation, hobbies, or activities to spend her energy on. Although she claims that she does all the housework, she has too much free time. Conventionally women are expected to work all day long because there is always work to do at home. Some women can be happy and satisfied with housework. For Susan, housework does not bring any satisfaction any more. She feels quite tired and bored because of housework, but Gerald thinks she does not have enough work and this is why she sleeps all day but not at night. Susan replies: "No, you're absolutely right, Gerald. I don't. Not nearly enough. Not any more" (*W* 24). Not having a real job makes her feel vulnerable and inferior. She also would like to have a worthwhile occupation and to be praised for it. She cannot accept the fact that Gerald has a profession and also an occupation, writing a book, whereas she is supposed to stay at home to do the housework

When she talks to Bill, her envy of Gerald is revealed. She is jealous of Gerald's book because he is at least busy with something absorbing. Bill thinks that the book is "interesting" and "fascinating". She tries to belittle Gerald's book by pointing out that it would be interesting "only to people who've lived here […] Preferably since 1386" (*W* 40). When she has the opportunity, she undervalues the content and the spectrum of the book. Her envy also reflects her low self-esteem. Susan's jealousy and sense of inferiority becomes clear when one night she sets Gerald's book on fire:

GERALD. The fire in my study, presumably started by you…
SUSAN. Me? Never…
GERALD. Don't try and deny it, Susan.
SUSAN. I've been out here.
GERALD. All sixty pages blazing away. Do you realize the years of work that went into that book? The research? The

> background reading? The hours of grubbing around, rubbing tombstones? I was on my final chapter, Susan. How could you do it? (*W* 78)

Susan does not remember anything about the fire and she denies having set it, which shows that she begins to lose her control. Worst of all, she is not even aware of the damage she has done to Gerald's work. The fire reveals the extent of her hatred and obsession with the book.

Susan is not comfortable with Gerald. Gerald is neither a vicar nor a husband for her. He is like a stranger. She confesses that talking to Gerald is just like "undressing in front of him" (*W* 66), as if she were with a stranger. She always keeps secrets and does not even share with him the fact that she hallucinates from time to time. This is why she lies to him whenever he asks her about her hallucinations:

> GERALD. You looked as though you'd seen something?
> SUSAN. Only a bee.
> GERALD. A bee?
> SUSAN. A December bee (*W* 33).

Fear of losing her roles contributes to Susan's worries. Gerald accuses her of doing nothing all day. Muriel blames and criticizes her for not organizing her kitchen: "I do wish you'd label things, Susan. It's a very inconvenient kitchen to work in, it really is" (*W* 44). Muriel, a second woman in the same house, is already a threat to Susan's roles. Since Muriel continuously criticizes her, Susan feels irritated. She is not sure whether she really is an unsuccessful wife or housewife.

In addition to feeling inadequate as a wife, Susan also feels she is inept as a mother. Rick has not been talking to them for some time, and now he comes for a visit. Susan finds out about the reason for this sudden visit: He is in need of money:

> SUSAN. He's getting nothing from us. Not for that lot.
> GERALD. So he wants to sell all his personal possession to raise money…
> SUSAN. What personal possessions?
> GERALD. His things. In his room. He wants to sell his room.
> […]
> SUSAN. I won't have it. You are not going to let him do that, Gerald. He can't sell them. They're things we gave him. They're our things. We gave them to him-
> GERALD. No, dearest, they're *his* things. We gave them to *him*. That makes them *his*. You see?

SUSAN. (Suddenly deeply distressed) But… that's all that's left of him. If we sell… his bed… and his- swivel chair… Then he'll have gone completely. We'll have nothing left of him at all. (*W* 43)

She has identified the unity of her family with Rick's room and furniture in it in his absence. "F for furniture. F for family" demonstrates how Susan relates furniture to family (*W* 57). She regards the furniture as something she still shares with Gerald, and, in an indirect way, with Rick. Losing the furniture is a further rift in the marriage and in her motherhood. Thus, she does not want to lose her identity and role as a mother.

Before Rick shows up, Gerald, Susan, and Bill talk about him. The couple talk to the doctor about the problems they have with their son. Meanwhile they drink Marsala. Susan is quite eager to drink: "What I'd love more than anything else is a glass of Marsala" (*W* 41). Susan takes another glass after draining the first one, and then another one:

SUSAN. Cheers. (She drains her Marsala.)
GERALD. Steady, dear…
(Susan ignores him.) (*W* 45)

Susan needs to drink. She uses drink as a means of forgetting about the problems with her son. When Rick arrives, Susan needs time to come round, for she is drunk. It is significant that she gets drunk just before her son arrives. She looks as if she resorts to alcohol since she does not feel strong enough to meet her son when wide awake. She is afraid of further remonstration that may come her way.

During his son's visit, Susan is even more hurt. Rick complains that he has never felt comfortable to bring his girlfriends home because Susan would always invade their privacy and embarrass them. Rick explains the reason:

RICK. I just don't think she could cope with you. Not with your attitude.
SUSAN. What attitude?
RICK. Well… I remember how you used to be with girls I used to bring home.
SUSAN. I remember, too. We got on terribly well.
RICK. No, you didn't, Mum. I mean, frankly, you used to embarrass the hell out of them. Didn't you know that?
SUSAN. Nonsense.
RICK. You did. You used to get them into corners and start

> going on about – I don't know – contraception methods and multiple orgasms… I mean, I'd hardly even kissed them, you were asking them for their medical histories. (*W* 55)

Susan is appalled with Rick's sudden and unexpected accusations. She would like to believe that it has been because of Gerald that Rick does not want Tess to meet them.

> SUSAN. Why? Because of your father? Well, we can keep him out of the way, can't we? They need hardly meet at all. Don't worry, I'll arrange things…
> RICK. It's only partly Dad.
> SUSAN. Well, who else? (Slight pause.) Me? (*W* 54)

To Susan's surprise, it turns out that she is also to blame. Rick destroys her self image and shows her her shortcomings. However, Susan would rather not see the fact that she has been "a total failure": "Up to now, I always thought I'd managed well" (*W* 56).

The attitudes of Gerald, Muriel, and Rick towards her make Susan feel unimportant. She has been gradually losing her roles as a wife, house wife, and mother:

> SUSAN. I don't know what my role is these days. I don't any longer know what I'm supposed to be doing. I used to be a wife. I used to be a mother. And I loved it. People said, Oh, don't you long to get out and do a proper job? And I'd say, No thanks, this is a proper job, thank you. Mind your own business. But now it isn't any more. The thrill has gone. (*W* 24)

Susan sees that all the effort she has made for years has meant nothing for her family. What she gets in return for her slavery is nothing but accusations. She regrets not having got a job instead of looking after her husband and son.

Susan is obsessed with high life standards. She cannot accept her socio-economic class and yearns for a higher one. At the beginning of the play, when Bill finds her lying in the garden he tries to bring her consciousness back:

> BILL. This is your garden. You're in your garden…
> SUSAN. My garden? This isn't my garden…
> BILL. Yes, yes, it is. I promise you.
> SUSAN. My garden's enormous. Five times the size of this, I can tell you. (*W* 10)

Susan's garden is a small and tidy one with a little pond. However, the garden she imagines is quite different from the real one. She is disgusted with the place Bill describes:

BILL:	I see – a small garden- very pleasant, very tidy, about 29 feet wide by maybe about 30 foot long…There's a little pond over there. Not a lot in it – a stone frog, is it? – I think it's a frog – the ting I fell over, anyway. Some flowerbeds with wallflowers –shrubs, several shrubs- one newly planted. Presumably by you. A rockery there –
SUSAN.	Please don't go on.
BILL.	What?
SUSAN.	I don't want to listen to any more of this.
BILL.	(Gently) I'm afraid it's what's here.
SUSAN.	You're describing some place I wouldn't choose to live in, even in my wildest nightmares. (*W* 21)

Susan internalizes the external conflicts, and her familial setbacks arouse her inner restrictions. These restrictions lead to some cognitive symptoms, of which obsessions and worries form the most crucial part. She is enwrapped in yearning for love and sex since she lacks them in her monotonous and boring marriage. She lacks self-esteem, for she does not have a job and status in life. She feels a growing inferiority to her husband. Susan also feels worthless since she is not accustomed to receiving affection and care from her family. Moreover, she is scared to lose her roles in her family. She assumes that she is no more regarded as a wife or mother in her household. Finally, she craves for higher life standards: a better house with a better garden, and a better household living there. She cannot accept her economic class any more. These are the major reasons underlying Susan's break-off with reality. Susan cannot endure real life and cannot accept it as it is. She is never happy and sleeps all day to kill time. She cannot cope with reality. No matter how hard she tries to be a good wife and mother, she fails and she is always criticized. However, she is quite subjective in her self-assessments. She does not accept criticism and turns a deaf ear to what all the others say.

2.2.2 Gareth

The Friel cannon is full of "images of the quest for and dim perception of transcendence. In almost all of his plays, the protagonist is under the charge of an unseen force to leave the familiar in order to take up life on the boundary between two worlds" (Cawthon 2004). In *Philadelphia, Here I Come!*, Friel uses the same themes and style within the context of Gareth O'Donnel's desire for immigrating to the States. Gareth wants to leave his homeland and live in the United States with his aunt and uncle. Just like other Frielian protagonists, Gareth is disturbed by the familiar, and split between two worlds, two lives, and two personalities.

Irish people are fond of the American dream because throughout their history they have regarded immigration to America as a way of escape from famine, poverty, and political chaos sweeping through their homeland. "To be in America in one's mind and yet in Ireland in one's body […] is part of the bifurcation or schizophrenia of the Irish mind, the ability to be in two places at one time, to hold two contradictory thoughts in congruence, to achieve bilocation of the affections" (Pine 78).

For Gareth, the reasons for escaping to America abound. His sudden decision to leave for the States reveals his inner limitations leading to his dissociation and identity conflict. The major restrictions he suffers from are his lack of interaction and intimacy with people, his obsession with the past, and his inability to foresee the future.

Gar's lack of intimacy stems from having lost his mother at a young age, and being brought up by a loveless father. His father is an undemonstrative man, who does not talk to his son about his leaving home. However, Gareth does not intend to begin the talk, either. On Gar's last day in Ballybeg, his father gives him more work in the shop to make five packs of flour into two-pound bags. Gar resents his father's apparent inconsideration, but tries to conceal his resentment. He talks to Madge about the incident:

> So d'you know what I said to him? I just drew myself up and looked him straight in the eye and said to him: 'Two-pound pokes it will be'— just like that. (*P* 16)

Gar has the self-delusion that if he does not disclose his emotions, he will

become stronger. He does not state his expectations from his father clearly and directly. Instead of talking to him, he complains about him to Madge. While talking, he pretends not to care about his father's apathy: "Whether he says good-bye to me or not, or whether he slips me a few miserable quid or not, it's a matter of total indifference to me, Madge… I'm damned if I'm going to speak to him first" (*P* 20). Madge sees Gar's stubbornness and couldn't-care-less attitude quite similar to that of S.B.:

> When the boss was his [Gar's] age, he was the very same as him: leppin, and eejitin' about and actin' the clown; as like as two peas. And when he's [Gar] the age the boss is now, he'll turn out just the same. And although I won't be here to see it, you'll find that he's learned nothin' in-between times. (*P* 109)

It is his tragic irony that Gar does not realize this resemblance and resorts to indifference in response to his father's indifference.

Actually, Gar yearns for some affection from his father, and he is deeply disappointed for not getting a caring response. McGrath explains why Gar resembles his father in his incapability of showing intimacy. He puts forth that "this is a typically Irish disability born perhaps of generations of colonial servitude in which fathers, deprived of self-respect and self-confidence, were particularly inept or inhabited in providing a role model for their sons and all the intimacy that would entail" (70). There is a huge breach between the father and son:

> S.B. I suppose you'll be looking for your pay.
> PUBLIC. I earned it.
> S.B. I'm not saying you didn't. It's all there—you needn't count it.
> PUBLIC. I didn't say I was going to count it, did I? (*P* 41)

Father and son are far from understanding each other. They do not make much effort to overcome the lack of communication between them. The assumptions they make about each other hamper communication.

Gar is fond of silence. He would rather think than speak or act. This is the reason why Public is often silent, whereas Private never stops speaking or singing. Because Public is silent, Gar lacks interaction with people:

> PRIVATE. What the hell do you care about him. Screwballs!

Skinflint! Skittery face! You're free of him and his stinking bloody shop. And tomorrow morning, boy, when that little ole plane gets up into the skies, you'll stick your head out the window [Public acts this] and spit down on the lot of them!

[…]

S.B. Gar!

[Public reacts instinctively. Private keeps calm.]

PRIVATE. Let the bugger call.

S.B. [louder] Gar!

[Instinct is stronger than reason: Public rushes to his door and opens it. But as soon as he opens it and looks out at his father he assumes in speech and gesture a surly, taciturn gruffness. He always behaves in this way when he is in his father's company.]

PUBLIC. Aye? (*P* 20-21)

Gar is often annoyed with his father's attitude and behaviour. However, he never expresses his feelings as he is not intimate and comfortable with him. There is a serious emotional distance between the father and son.

Gar's inability to interact with people is the cause of his losing Kate. Gar and Kate make plans for their wedding. The only obstacle is Gar's low income. Kate's parents want her to marry a proper and wealthy man. When Kate learns Gar's income, she finds it inadequate:

KATE: But £3 15s Gar! We could never live on that.

PUBLIC. [kissing her hair] Mmmm.

KATE. Gar! Listen! Be sensible.

PUBLIC. Mmm?

KATE. How will we live? (*P* 28-29)

Gar feels humiliated and talks to Kate about his secret income, about which no one knows. When he goes round the country every Tuesday and Thursday in the lorry, he buys eggs from farms and sells them to a hotel. He thinks the profit he makes in this business will be enough for them to get by. However, he only earns between 12s 6d to £1 per week, which does not amount to much.

Kate concludes that her parents will never consent to their marriage unless Gareth has a better income. For this reason, she wants Gar to overstate his income when he asks her parents' permission to marry her:

KATE. [rapidly] You have £20 a week and £5,000 in the bank and your father's about to retire." (*P* 31)

Kate plans everything and takes Gar to meet her father. Gar is scared to talk to Senator Doogan. He feels he is not ready yet and wants to postpone the talk:

PUBLIC. God, they'll wipe the bloody floor with me!
KATE. Gar!
[…]
PUBLIC. God, my legs are trembling! Kathy…
KATE. Anybody at home? Mammy! Daddy!
[Public hesitates before entering Doogan's house. Private is at his elbow, prompting him desperately.]
[…]
KATE. Don't look so miserable. Here… [fixes his tie].
PUBLIC. Kathy, maybe we should wait until—until—until next Sunday—
KATE. [earnestly] Remember, it's up to you, entirely up to you. (*P* 30-31)

Kate loves Gareth and does not want to delay their wedding plans. She encourages Gar to talk to her father. Even though Gar does not earn enough to meet her needs, she accepts to marry him. She does not even mind telling a lie to her parents. However, when Gareth meets Senator Doogan, he is tongue-tied:

DOOGAN. And how are things with you, Gareth?
PUBLIC. Mr Doogan, I want—
PRIVATE. Go on.
PUBLIC. I won't be staying long.
[…]
[Kate gives Public a last significant look]
KATE. You talk to Daddy, Gar.
PRIVATE. God, I will, I will. (*P* 32)

Gar does not know how to begin to talk. When he is about to ask for Doogan's permission to marry Kate, Doogan mentions about Francis King, Kate's suitor. Gar feels ashamed and humiliated. He wants to leave as soon as possible. He gives up the idea of talking to Senator Doogan about marrying Kate. Doogan tries to talk to him, but the only thing Gar feels like doing is to get out of the place "before the others come in and die laughing at" him:

DOOGAN. […] your father, Gareth?
PRIVATE. He's talking to you, thick-skull.
PUBLIC. What—what—what's that?
DOOGAN. Your father—how is he?
PUBLIC. Oh he—he—he's grand, thanks.

PRIVATE. Get out! Get out!
PUBLIC. Look Mr Doogan, if you'll excuse me, I think I'd better move on— (*P* 33)

Gar now becomes mesmerized in Mr. Doogan's presence, and cannot follow the conversation. He tries to escape without being able to express the reason for this visit. Even though Senator Doogan tries to make him talk by giving hints, Gar becomes dumbstruck:

DOOGAN. Oh, Gareth—[Public pauses]
[Awkwardly, with sincerity.]
Kate is our only child, Gareth, and her happiness is all that is important to us—
PRIVATE. [sings] 'Give the woman in the bed more porter—'
DOOGAN What I'm trying to say is that any decision she makes will be her own—
PRIVATE. '—Give the man beside her water, Give the woman in the bed more porter, —'
DOOGAN. Just in case you should think that her mother or I were…in case you might have the idea…
PUBLIC. [rapidly] Good night, Mr Doogan. (*P* 33-34)

Mr Doogan is not prejudiced against Gar and he is quite friendly. He tries to make Gar grasp the fact that Kate is free to make her own decisions. Senator Doogan expects Gar to speak to get it off his chest, but Gar cannot dare and withdraws. His low self-esteem and insufficient communication skills cause him to lose Kate forever.

The emotional pain and rage of the loss of Kate make Gar a vulnerable and indecisive young man. He is further hurt "by the wedding [of Kate]", as a result of which he makes a "silly and impetuous" acceptance of his aunt Lizzie's invitation (O'Brien 48).

Another inner constriction for Gareth is that he can neither forget the past nor foresee the future. Boyle advises Gar not to keep looking back over his shoulder but to look forward and to become hundred per cent American. However, Gar's obsession with the past makes him "unable to obliterate Ballybeg and the human experiences that typify it. He cannot find within himself an indifference to match its apparent indifference to him: instead he finds rage, disgust, and pain" (O'Brien 48). He cannot avoid thinking of the past because he is stuck there. Gareth often lets his

thoughts wander about his father, Senator Doogan, and his plans for the future. Private warns him:

PRIVATE. You know what you're doing, don't you, laddybuck? Collecting memories and images and impressions that are going to make you bloody miserable; and in a way that's what you want, isn't it?
PUBLIC. Bugger!
[Private springs to his feet again. With forced animation.]
PRIVATE. Bugger's right! Bugger's absolutely correct! Back to the job! Keep occupied. Be methodical. (*P* 54)

Gareth makes continuous attempts not to think about the past, yet he cannot help the memories crowding in his mind.

The fact that Gareth has lost Kate disturbs him all the time because it was his fault. Now he cannot get her out of his mind:

PRIVATE. Great big sexy dames and night clubs and high living and films and dances and—
PUBLIC. Kathy, my own darling Kathy—
PRIVATE. [sings] 'Where bowers of flowers bloom in the spring'
PUBLIC. I don't—I can't. (*P* 48)

Gar still loves Kate. Losing her is painful for him. He tries to think of other women he can have fun with to obliterate the pain; but knows deep down they cannot take her place. For this reason, Public turns a deaf ear to the suggestive words of Private.

Trying to escape his past, Gareth cannot see his future, either. The future looks hopeful, but it is still unknown to Gar:

PRIVATE. You are full conscious of all the consequences of your decision?
PUBLIC. Yessir.
PRIVATE. Of leaving the country of your birth, the land of the curlew and the snipe, the Aran sweater and the Irish Sweepstakes?
PUBLIC. [with fitting hesitation] I-I-I-I have considered all these, Sir.
PRIVATE. Of going to a profane, irreligious, pagan country of gross materialism?
[…]
PRIVATE. And yet you persist in exposing yourself to these frightful dangers?
PUBLIC. I would submit, Sir, that these stories are slightly exaggerated, Sir. For every door that opens— (*P* 18-19)

Gareth tries to look confident and to be aware of what he lets himself in for. Philadelphia is the unknown, yet he wants to go "in order to escape the asylum of 'home'; it is not just a simple question of flying from the emotional centre in order to make a better life, however stifling that centre may be and however attractive that better life might appear" (Pine 81).

Gareth expects a much better life in the States. He believes he will leave all financial and emotional problems behind once he leaves Ballybeg. This is nothing but self-deception. He is still haunted by his past, and he cannot yet see what shape his future will take. In Con and Lizzie's letter, this new life bedazzles Gar. He will live in their house and have "the spare room which has TV and air-conditioning and window meshes and [his] own bathroom with a shower… [He] will begin [work] at the Emperor Hotel on Monday 23rd which is only twenty minutes away" from their house (*P* 55). O'Brien states that Gar's social and economic status will hardly change in the States. Instead of living with his father and Madge, he will live with his uncle and aunt. He will not have his own house. He will be attached to his family "in the person of his aunt Lizzie, who is as erratic and garrulous as Gar's father is predictable and taciturn" (47). As for the job, he will not have a better one. Instead of working in his father's shop, he will work in a hotel, which will not make much of a difference. He will still be under someone's employment. He will not be his own boss. The wages may still be low since it will be another menial job.

Gareth's dissociation with reality and sufferance from incessant conflicts is partly due to his inner constrictions. He lacks intimacy and communicative skills when with people, which causes misunderstandings and resentments. These misunderstandings and resentments add to his disillusionment with his life. Gar is also wrapped up in the past. He cannot reconcile with his disquieting memories and cannot help thinking about them. This fixation prevents him from foreseeing the future, and he miscalculates the life waiting for him in the States.

2.2.3 Alan

Generally speaking, Shaffer's protagonists are split between two or more forces. "With Shaffer, the ancient question is posed like this: Was I born one or two, different or same? What are the parameters of self, and what does it mean to be separate?" (Michael Hinden in Gianakaris 159). In the search for their identity, Shaffer's characters are "stripped of social and psychological shields" and they "exist in pain and torment" (Barbara Lounsberry in Gianakaris 80).

Alan, in *Equs*, is one of the most troubled characters of Shaffer. He stands out of the boundaries of the society. He is regarded as a "loony" because he is a nonconformist (*E* 47). Normality is what is accepted by the majority of the society. Any behaviour out of the standards is regarded as abnormal and disdained. MacMurraugh-Kavanagh blames the society for naming Alan's passion and capacity for worship as clear signals of "insanity", while accepting spiritual numbness and an absence of "extremity" as characteristics of "normality" (95).

Alan is not the standard citizen expected by everyone. Dysart finds out that Alan "can hardly read. He knows no physics or engineering to make the world real for him. No paintings to show him how others have enjoyed it. No music except television jingles. No history except tales from a desperate mother. No friends. Not one kid to give him a joke, or make him know himself more moderately. He's a modern citizen for whom society doesn't exist" (*E* 81). He is a very lonely young man. Alan is deprived of many skills and opportunities which most children have.

Without any of the tools of socialization, Alan cannot get over his identity crisis on his own. He tries to internalize the norms of the society, but his abortive attempts culminate in his growing dissociation with reality. Alan cannot avoid gradually losing his touch with the real world because he has inner constrictions as well as the social ones. A schizoid person, a person with split identity, is very lonely and isolated (Laing 17). In his despairing aloneness, Alan becomes skilled at self-concealment, he is sexually vulnerable, and he makes a wrong assessment of both himself and others.

Alan keeps himself to himself and does not talk to anyone after the crime he commits. Even in the court, he does not respond to the questions and just sings. This

attitude continues when Alan first meets Dysart:

DYSART. Won't you sit down?
[Pause. He does not. DYSART consults his file.]
Is this your full name? Alan Strang?
[Silence.]
And you're seventeen. Is that right? Seventeen?... Well?

ALAN. [singing low] Double your pleasure / Double your fun / With Doublemint, Doublemint / Doublemint gum. (*E* 22)

Alan does not want to talk because he is disturbed by what he has done. He does not believe that anyone will really understand him. Thus, when Dysart asks him questions, he starts singing jingles from advertisements. Dysart does not give up easily and he continues inquiring:

DYSART. You work in an electrical shop during the week. You live with your parents, and your father's a printer. What sort of things does he print?

ALAN. [singing louder] Double your pleasure / Double your fun
With Doublemint, Doublemint / Doublemint gum.

DYSART. I mean does he do leaflets and calendars? Things like that?
[The boy approaches him, hostile.]

ALAN. [singing] Try the taste of Martini / The most beautiful drink in the world, / It's the right one— / The bright one— / That's Martini! (*E* 22)

Alan is an introvert. He does not intend to speak to Dysart. To avoid his questions, he tries singing commercials. He does not want to let Dysart into his inner world. He thinks his privacy will be invaded and he feels oppressed.

Alan's need for self-concealment hinders him from responding to Dysart's questions. After a while, Alan begins responding to Dysart's questions, but not straight away. For instance, Dysart asks Alan which parent forbids him to watch TV. The answer comes only two days later: His dad. To avoid Dysart's questions, Alan begins asking him questions in return. Alan sticks to his delay tactics and does not always tell the truth. Especially the questions likely to invade his privacy frighten and disturb him deeply. However, Dysart is an expert, and he knows that Alan has nightmares and screams a particular word during his sleep: "Ek". When Dysart asks

him what this word means, Alan is reluctant to tell him the truth:

DYSART. What is Ek?
[Pause.]
You shouted it out last night in your sleep. I thought you might like to talk about it.
ALAN. [singing] Double Diamond works wonders, / Works wonders, works wonders!
DYSART. Come on, now. You can do better than that.
ALAN. [singing louder] Double Diamond works wonders, / Works wonders / For you! (*E* 37)

Alan does not want to reveal his inner life and continuously resorts to singing as a way of escape from Dysart's questions. Dysart asks Alan many questions, such as what he thinks about horses. The questions are related to taboo subjects for Alan and they embarrass him. By asking Alan questions about his inner life, Dysart devastates Alan's privacy and causes "this restless primitive to regress to the state of repeating Doublemint gum jingles or other such advertisements" (Plunka 155).

Alan also lies to Dysart about his first memory of seeing a horse. He admits that he often thinks about the first horse he has seen "'Cos it's funny… What else?" (*E* 43); but he does not tell him the real reason why he does so. Alan states that he thinks about the scene. Dysart is aware of the fact that Alan may not be able to tell him everything truthfully. Hence, he gives Alan a tape recorder so that Alan will record the things he cannot tell Dysart in person on tape. Dysart finds out Alan's real feelings only when he receives the tape:

> It was sexy […] All right: it was. I'm talking about the beach. That time when I was a kid […] I was pushed forward on the horse. There was sweat on my legs from his neck. The fellow held me tight, and let me turn the horse which way I wanted. All that power going any way you wanted… His sides were all warm, and the smell" (*E* 47-48)

Alan describes the scene as if he were talking about his relationship with a girl. He is sexually attracted to the horse, but he does not utter it directly to Dysart. He is afraid of his reaction.

Alan delays telling Dysart the truth as long as he can. Meanwhile, he gradually loses his touch with reality, and because of his lies Dysart cannot diagnose the origin of the problem early. During the interviews, Dysart attacks and Alan

defends. The questions bring Alan to the point of bursting with anger. When Dysart asks Alan about Jill, it is the last straw for Alan:

DYSART. Did you like her?
ALAN. All right.
[…]
DYSART. Did you take her out? Come on now: tell me. Did you have a date with her?
ALAN. What?
DYSART. [sitting] Tell me if you did.
[The boy suddenly explodes in one of his rages]
ALAN. [yelling] TELL ME!
[all the masks toss at the noise.]
DYSART. What?
ALAN. Tell me, tell me, tell me, tell me!
[Alan storms out of the square, and downstage to where DYSART sits. He is raging. During the ensuing, the horses leave by all three openings.]
On and on, sitting there! Nosey Parker! That's all you are! Bloody Nosey Parker! Just like Dad. On and on bloody on! Tell me, tell me, tell me!... Answer this. Answer that. Never stop!— (*E* 58-59)

Dysart, regarding his inquiries into Alan's private life, resembles Frank, which further increases Alan's disturbance. Alan finally loses his control and feels terrified lest people in his life should find out every secret in his life.

Dysart still insists that he be told everything about Jill. Because he believes that she constitutes a significant part of the crime Alan has committed:

DYSART. Tell me about Jill.
[Pause. The boy turns away.]
ALAN. There's nothing to tell.
DYSART. Nothing?
ALAN. No.
DYSART. Well, for example—is she pretty? You've never described her.
ALAN. She's all right.
DYSART. What colour hair?
ALAN. Dunno.
DYSART. Is it long or short?
ALAN. Dunno.
DYSART. [lightly] You must know that.
ALAN. I don't remember. *I don't!* (*E* 88)

Alan obviously tells blatant lies to Dysart. It is out of question that Alan should not

remember the colour or style of Jill's hair. Jill belongs to his private life, which he tries to guard against any intrusion vehemently. His insistence and steady attempts on concealing his private self are the cognitive symptoms of his schizoid personality.

Alan's sexual vulnerability is another restriction bringing him closer to breaking off with reality. His sexual frustration is also the underlying reason for his reluctance to talk about Jill. He is sexually vulnerable because he has not received any education on sex. He first sees a naked girl only when he goes to the cinema with Jill. He feels very excited even while talking to Dysart about the film. He finds the scene "fantastic" (*E* 92). The film greatly influences Alan, and after the film, he becomes aware of his feelings for Jill:

ALAN. [to Dysart] Her eyes. She's the one with eyes!... I keep looking at them, because I really want—
DYSART. To look at her breasts?
ALAN. [to DYSART] Yes.
DYSART. Like in the film (*E* 97)

Alan has always been attracted to horses sexually. This is the first time he sees a girl as a sex object in his life. He associated "eyes" with horses previously, but now he notices Jill is the one with beautiful eyes.

Alan feels attracted to a girl, yet he becomes sexually impotent with her. His sexual familiarity and experience is with horses, not with girls. He does not want anyone to learn about his embarrassment. Because of his sexual failure, Alan does not want to talk to Dysart about his relationship with Jill. That night after the film, Jill takes him to the stables. Alan is not comfortable there because he is obsessed with the eyes of horses. Horses are his God. They are omnipresent and omniscient. He is scared that they will see him with Jill, and punish him for having changed his object of sexual devotion. Thus, he wants Jill to lock the doors:

JILL. Lock?
ALAN. Yes.
JILL. It's just an old door. What's the matter with you? They're in their boxes. They can't get out… Are you all right?
ALAN. Why?
JILL. You look weird.
ALAN. Lock it! (*E* 100)

Alan has worshipped horses so far. They have been everywhere: In his mother's

biblical stories, on his wall staring at him, on the beach, and even in his dreams. Especially with the influence of the picture on his wall, he is now obsessed with the eyes of horses and he believes that horses will always observe him.

By attempting at sexual intercourse with Jill, Alan will not only violate the Straw Law, the law of Equus, but also will expose his lack of sexual performance. He is in a deep dilemma. When Dysart inquires, Alan lies about what has happened in the stables:

DYSART.	Yes, what happened then, Alan?
ALAN.	[to DYSART: brutally] I put it in her!
DYSART.	Yes?
ALAN.	[to DYSART] I put it in her.
DYSART.	You did?
ALAN.	[to DYSART] Yes!
DYSART.	Was it easy?
ALAN.	[to DYSART] Yes.
DYSART.	Describe it.
ALAN.	[to DYSART] I told you.
DYSART.	More exactly.
ALAN.	[to DYSART] I put it in her!
DYSART.	Did you?
ALAN.	[to DYSART] All the way!
DYSART.	Did you, Alan?
ALAN.	[to DYSART] All the way. I shoved it. I put it in her all the way.
DYSART.	Did you?
ALAN.	[to DYSART] Yes!
DYSART.	Did you?
ALAN.	[to DYSART] Yes!... Yes!
DYSART.	Give me the TRUTH!... Did you?... Honestly?
ALAN.	[to DYSART] Fuck off! (*E* 102)

Dysart repeats the same question over and over again. He does not believe that Alan actually has had sexual intercourse with a girl. He knows how strongly Alan is emotionally involved with horses and he tries to learn more about the case:

DYSART.	You couldn't? Though you wanted to very much?
ALAN.	[to DYSART] I couldn't… see her.
DYSART.	What do you mean?
ALAN.	[to DYSART] Only Him. Every time I kissed her—He was in the way.
DYSART.	Who?
	[ALAN turns on his back.]
ALAN.	[to DYSART] You know who!... When I touched her, I

> felt Him. Under me… His side, waiting for my hand… His flanks… I refused him. I looked. I looked right at her…. and I couldn't do it. When I shut my eyes, I saw Him at once. The streaks on his belly… [With more desperation.] I couldn't feel her flesh at all! I wanted the foam off his neck. His sweaty hide. Not flesh. Hide! Horse-hide!... Then I couldn't even kiss her (*E* 102-103)

Alan is overwhelmed with horses and even when he is with a girl, he cannot get horses out of his mind. From his early experience of riding a horse, Alan has learned to gratify his sexual needs on horses. Thus, his sex life is programmed to horses, and he finds it impossible to change it to the opposite human sex. D.A. Klein puts forth that "Alan's first love affair proved to be a disaster" and that "his attempt at sex was ruined", for Alan is "possessed" by his demons of horses (in Gianakaris 139).

After his abortive attempt at sex, Alan wants Jill to go out. He is ashamed of his failure even though Jill tries to pacify him by saying it is quite common. He wants to be alone and out of sight. He is preoccupied with the fear of being observed. This is why he commits the weird crime, i.e., blinds the horses in the stable in order not to leave any witnesses behind.

Alan's conception of himself as a weird human being, as far as his sexual practice is concerned, is due to the fact that he does not know much about other men. His trust in misleading appearances causes him to make wrong assessments of both himself and others. Brought up by strict parents, Alan has not questioned anything in his life until the day he saw his father at the cinema. He used to believe that only he was different and only he had secrets about his private life. He felt lonely due to his difference. However, after the incident, he sees the real man for the first time:

> Scared of me… And me scared of him… I kept thinking—all those airs he put on!... 'Receive my meaning. Improve your mind!'… All those nights he said he'd be in late. 'Keep my supper hot, Dora!' 'Your poor father: he works so hard!'… Bugger! Old bugger!... Filthy old bugger! (*E* 95)

Alan has realized that people are not what they appear to be. His apparently hardworking, strict, and educated father makes him aware of this fact. Alan now feels relieved of his sense of guilt stemming from his sexual drives. He notices that

everyone, including his father, has such drives, and they need to satisfy these needs. Alan acquires a new perspective:

> I kept looking at all the people in the street. They were mostly men coming out of pubs. I suddenly thought—*they all do it! All of them!* … They're not just Dads—they're people with pricks!... And Dad—he's not just Dad either. He's a man with a prick too. You know, I'd never thought about it. (*E* 96)

Alan begins regarding people as living organisms. For the first time in his life, he sees what people are like behind their social and cultural masks. He puts the blame on his mother for not meeting his father's needs: "He's got mum, of course, but well—she—she—she […] doesn't give him anything […] Never!... Never!" (*E* 96)

Alan also discovers the surprising resemblance between himself and his father. MacMurraugh-Kavanagh points out this similarity:

> Both detest the snobbery of Dora, both slide off at night for furtive bouts of 'worship' and sexual self-gratification, both need to do so because of their 'extreme' repression (insisted upon by Dora), both seek passionate experience and have the capacity for it, and both subsequently lie about their activities. (113)

Alan knows that his mother "likes Ladies and Gentlemen" because they "aren't naked" (*E* 96). She is pious, and regards sex as a necessity only for reproduction. Alan understands that she has been unfair to his father. His father is a human being, just like Alan. Alan talks to Dysart about this newly discovered similarity:

> He's just like me! He hates ladies and gents just like me! Posh things—and la-di-da. He goes off by himself at night, and does his own secret thing which no one'll know about, just like me! There's no difference—he's just the same as me—just the same! (*E* 97)

Alan has got rid of his feeling of guilt and feels free. He sympathizes with his father because he does not only consider him as a father figure but also as a man with basic sexual needs. However, Alan is too late to discover this fact. This new discovery only gives him a wrong and extreme sense of freedom. As Dysart states, Alan feels "free to do anything" (*E* 97). He assumes that he can do anything as long as he keeps it secret.

In his “struggle for identity”, Alan tries to conceal his inner life from the outside world (Plunka 153). He does not want to let anyone invade his privacy, which is the only medium he can be himself. Alan is sexually vulnerable, too. His sexual world is with horses, and he does not live in the sexual world of humans. Alan also makes the wrong assessment of himself and other people around him. For years, he has taken it for granted that people are social and cultural constructs absolved from any primitive sexual desires. These inner constrictions mingle with social constrictions “that [Alan] can only deem contradictory”, and culminate in his dissociation with reality (Plunka 153).

CHAPTER 3

COPING STRATEGIES ADOPTED BY CHARACTERS

Man has a wide variety of needs. Karen Horney regards these needs as essential in man's progress toward self-realization. "Like any other living organism, the human individuum needs favourable conditions for his growth 'from acorn into oak tree'" (Horney 1970 18). Some of these conditions can be met, whereas some cannot because of some obstacles. The barriers of satisfying needs could be either inner or external constrictions. Rhawn Joseph explains, "We deny some of our needs and impulses, and we disguise or misinterpret others in accordance with how we see ourselves and how we think others view us" (304). Anna Freud maintains that the ego protects itself not only against the "unpleasure arising from within" but also against the one "which has its source in the outside world" ; she points out that "the greater the importance of the outside world as a source of pleasure and interest, the more opportunity is there to experience unpleasure from that quarter" (70). Man instinctually tries to escape or avoid "unpleasure" since such feelings lead to conflicts. If the conflicts persist and the individual delays trying to solve these conflicts, the person soon experiences a very unpleasant emotional state: Anxiety (Miller and Swanson 17). When unsatisfaction causes conflicts or anxiety, one has to find a way to cope with these unwanted feelings. Thanks to certain methods, man "blinds himself to the nature of his real wishes, usually by substituting more permissible versions" (Miller and Swanson 19). These methods, which the ego makes use of in conflicts likely to cause anxiety, are called defense mechanisms. In this way, the ego does not solve or get over problems, but it reduces anxiety.

Joseph defines defense mechanism as "a protective strategy most often used by the conscious mind and the left brain" which is employed "to prevent conscious recognition of information that is in some manner threatening to the conscious self-image" (304). Miller and Swanson assert that defense mechanisms are applied automatically; "without awareness that a choice is being made, or even that a conflict

exists" (19). Anna Freud confirms that these mechanisms are "unconscious" and explains their functions:

> Defenses keep 'ideational representatives of repressed instincts' from becoming conscious, and create a 'transformation' in the affects associated with the need […] Defenses may serve to regulate needs which, if expressed directly, would create a realistic problem: To avoid failing, a boy transfers his ambition to another field of endeavor. Defenses may also be used to alter needs with excessive strength. Even an appropriate sexual impulse may be inhibited when it threatens to overwhelm the individual. Finally, defenses may be applied to problems created by external events or static personal traits: A man who has lost his money or is sensitive about his short stature, may never think about these facts. (in Miller and Swanson 195)

With a wide range of application and functions, defenses change sharply from person to person. However, they have one common point: Every single one of them "depends for its effectiveness upon the substitution of a socially acceptable alternative for the original form of the need" (Miller and Swanson 21). In other words, defense mechanisms shift the target of the unsatisfied needs and suggest alternatives, which, unlike the original needs, do not cause anxiety for the individual. Thus, use of defenses is healthy if individuals do not resort to it time and again. The use of defense mechanisms brings temporary relief, but if it becomes automatic, it might cause individuals to lose their problem management skills and their touch with reality in the long run.

There have been numerous definitions for defense mechanisms so far, and these mechanisms have been ascribed to various reasons. Today there are many more defense mechanisms than Sigmund Freud first named. One of these mechanisms is the use of Dissociative Identity Disorder. Hawthorn states that "the desire for escape from otherwise insoluble problems" is a triggering element underlying the disorder (17). Therefore, dissociation can also be taken as a means of coping with anxiety and conflicts. Having encountered the conflicts and contradictions in life, individuals feel stuck between the demands of the society and the yearnings and aspirations of the self. Not having enough strength to deal with these facts, they prefer to take the gentle and soothing paths of dissociation.

Susan in *Woman in Mind*, Gareth in *Philadelphia, Here I Come!*, and Alan in *Equus* are three characters suffering from both social and inner constrictions. The

constrictions surrounding them lead to conflicts and anxiety for the characters. To deal with these disturbing feelings, they have no choice other than breaking up with the real world and creating their own reality. To break away with the real world, they each shift into a secondary personality. These characters with split identities are traditionally viewed outside the norms of personality structure. Nevertheless, the practice of dissociation as a defense mechanism allows them to create a personal space and a personal voice in the conditions they find themselves in.

3.1 Susan: Creating Fantasy

Horney considers fantasies of great importance for the understanding of human psychology since "they are a relatively direct expression of unconscious feelings and strivings" (1968 135). Anna Freud states that fantasy, the reversal of real facts, is based on the method of denial, and it "is employed in situations in which it is impossible to escape some painful external impression" (93). Susan, through fantasies, shifts into her secondary personality and tries to avoid conflicts and anxiety. According to Ellenberger's tripartite classification, she has "Simultaneous Multiple Personality Disorder" since she manipulates both lives and personalities at the same time. However, in the course of time, she does not remember what she says or does. Thus, the symptoms she shows rather indicate "Successive Multiple Personality Disorder", in which individuals' personalities may be mutually or one-way amnesic (131). In both cases, this disorder is hazardous for her. Fantasy, which is a normal stage during the development of the infantile ego, "indicates an advanced stage of mental disease" if it appears in later life, and "it is certain that in adult life gratification through fantasy is no longer harmless" (Freud 80-81). Susan is in her forties and it is too late for her to gratify her needs by way of fantasies. Her attempts at satisfaction through fantasies gradually lead to her loss of the concepts of people, place, and time.

Susan leads an unsatisfactory life, so she creates a new family, and by fantasizing, she "compensates" for her unhappy life (Londré in Dukore 93). Her fantasies "portray the kind of self-definition she would desire. She would be the charming, intelligent, spoiled darling of an affectionate, Noël Cowardesque family

circle: a lovingly teasing husband, a brother who drinks champagne while playing tennis, a devoted and attractive daughter" (Londré in Dukore 96).

Andy is the ideal husband Susan creates in her fantasies. He is "a tall, good-looking, athletic man, easy-going and charming. He is perhaps a year or two younger than Susan" (*W* 12). He is the personification of Susan's unfulfilled needs. He is a very attentive, affectionate, and gentle husband. Whereas Gerald does not consider Susan's injury in the garden significant, Andy gets worried and rushes on as soon as he sees Doctor Bill Windsor:

> ANDY. Susie? I've just seen Bill Windsor. Are you all right?
> SUSAN. I'm perfectly fine, Andy. Just a silly accident, that's all.
> ANDY. (Sitting beside her, immensely concerned) Darling, what on earth happened? I can't leave you for five minutes, can I? what happened? He said you knocked yourself out…
> SUSAN. I just – banged my head. It's nothing, Andy, really. You mustn't fuss.
> ANDY. Of course I fuss. You're my wife. I love you. How on earth did you do it? (*W* 13)

Andy really cares for Susan and he is anxious about her. He often expresses his love and affection for Susan in his speech.

Susan's imaginary daughter Lucy and imaginary brother Tony are also tall, good, looking, athletic, easy-going, and charming. Moreover, they constantly try to please Susan and they often express how much they love her. For instance, when they need to boil some water for Susan, Lucy immediately says that she will make it. They exaggerate Susan's importance and "spoil" her (*W* 15). Andy, comparing Susan and Tony, praises her intelligence and beauty:

> ANDY. When you get a brother and a sister like you two, things get shared. She gets the beauty, he gets the brains; or he gets the beauty, she gets the brains. Or even a bit for each of them. But with you and Tony, you've got the lot. All the brains, all the beauty. Hardly fair, is it?
> SUSAN. It's not true.
> ANDY. I'm afraid it is.
> SUSAN. But I love you for saying it, all the same. (*W* 15)

Susan needs flattery. She wants to hear compliments because she hardly receives any praise from Gerald, Rick, or Muriel in real life.

Just because Susan had a trivial accident, Andy does not want to send her to hospital. Andy is Gerald's opposite, for the latter is quite eager to shift all the responsibility to doctors and hospitals. However, Andy wants to look after Susan in person at home:

> ANDY. I don't want you in hospital. I want you here where we can look after you properly. Get you into that place, we'll never see you again-
> SUSAN. (Calling him back) Andy…
> ANDY. Hmmm?
> SUSAN. Seriously. You do spoil me far too much. (*W* 16)

Susan enjoys being flattered, complimented, praised, and spoiled by her imaginary family. She utters that they exaggerate, but she loves every minute of it, which reveals the fact that Susan feels neglected in terms of love and care in her real life. This is why she actually wants her imaginary family to emphasize her importance.

She makes sure that her imaginary family pay her attention and depend on her completely. She wants to know that the family is nothing without her existence:

> ANDY. We'd all be lost without you. There's only one of you, you see. (Smiling slightly) Unfortunately. And we all need you very much. Me most especially. I mean, after all, what does Tony stand to lose? Just a big sister […] And Lucy? Well- girls and their mothers. We all know what they are like. She'd soon get over it. But me? I'd be losing a wife. And that I'd never get over. Not one as dear and as precious as you. (He kisses her tenderly.) Whom, incidentally, I love more than words can ever say. (*W* 16)

Andy's words and behaviour indicate that Susan fixates on her indifferent husband and son in real life. She tries to make up for her unfulfilled emotional needs in her imaginary life.

In her imaginary world, Lucy also continuously praises Susan. However, she praises her mother for things Susan has never actually done. These imaginary achievements and praises reveal Susan's envy of Gerald, and her desire for success, public recognition, and compliment. She talks to Lucy about the book she pretends to be writing:

> LUCY. How's it coming?
> SUSAN. (With a quiet confidence) All right, I think. I've done

all the slog, all the heavy research, now I can actually get down to real writing…

LUCY. I think you're amazing. I don't know how you do it.

SUSAN. (Shrugging) Well..

LUCY. We're just all so proud of you, Mummy, you've no idea. I know you won't read these things, but did you know that last Sunday in the *Observer,* they called you probably our most important living historical novelist. (*W* 35)

Susan does not know where to stop fantasizing. She behaves as if the only way for her to survive is to ignore and escape the reality. This is why she creates a daughter like Lucy in her imagination. "The alternative family is so attractive; they are a picture of what Susan aspired to before sexual affection died between her and Gerald" (Holt 42).

Susan creates not only an imaginary family but also an alternative house and life style in her fantasies instead of her small suburban house. Her real house sounds like a place she would only see in her "nightmares" (*W* 21). In the imaginary one, there are tennis courts behind the house, a swimming pool, a lawn, rose beds, and a lake. She is so preoccupied with upper-class life that she denies her real house and life. Susan, in her imagination, has servants as well. When Andy learns that Susan banged her head, he asks Lucy: "Ask Mrs Simmonds to make a hot water bottle and light the fire in the master bedroom". He wants her to help Mrs Simmonds because "It's Ethel's day off" (*W* 15). Susan, tired of all the housework, creates several servants in her mind. She also creates a life in which her family and she eat delicious food and drink champagne during the day. This is the life she has idealized:

SUSAN. My brother brought me some champagne, you know.

BILL: Did he? Jolly nice.

SUSAN. Dom Perignon. Vintage 1978. (*W* 21)

She denies the fact that Muriel serves her tea and imagines Tony serving her champagne instead.

Susan's statements indicate that in addition to people and place, she has lost her concept of time, too. When Bill describes the real house she lives in and contradicts her imaginary house and life, Susan feels highly disturbed. Susan does not want him to destroy her defenses. She asks him to leave and says "Good

afternoon", but Bill points out that "it's not the afternoon, it's eleven-fifteen in the morning" in fact (*W* 21). As soon as her hallucination ends, there is a sudden change in the weather; "The sunset is replaced by a normal mild afternoon light" (*W* 64). Shifts in the weather introduce the shift in Susan's identity. Another example for this parallelism is seen when Tony finds Susan lying in the garden in the rain. Tony holds his umbrella over her head and "at once the weather is transformed. The rain stops. The sun shines and it is noon on a glorious country" (*W* 82). Susan's defense mechanism changes anything which disturbs her in the real world and turns it into an acceptable form for her.

Susan's fantasies, apparently outcomes of her repressed and ungratified desires, gradually begin to control her. Her split personality is no longer a daydream that she uses to relax temporarily. She shares her dreams with the others and makes them her real life. Talking to Bill about going to hospital in the ambulance, she shows that she totally believes in what she creates:

SUSAN. [My husband] seemed to feel I shouldn't go. He felt I'd be better off staying in bed here.
BILL: Really? When did he say this?
SUSAN. Just a minute ago.
BILL: Extraordinary. I mean, I didn't even know he was home. I understood he was on his way. He'd been telephoned and was on his way.
SUSAN. Well, he's here. He's just been talking to me.
BILL. How odd. Your sister-in-law obviously got it wrong.
SUSAN. My sister-in-law?
BILL. Yes—Marion, is it?
SUSAN. You mean my brother?
BILL. Muriel. That's it.
SUSAN. Tony.
BILL. Tony?
SUSAN. You mean my brother, Tony. Tall, fair, slim, good-looking in a rather weak sort of way…
BILL. No, definitely Muriel. Short, dark, angular, grim-looking in a rather firm sort of way. (*W* 17)

Susan talks about her imaginary family members, and Bill does not understand anything. Her dissociation causes the lack of communication in her conversations and relationships. The family Susan creates is the exact reversal of her real family; it functions as a defense mechanism for Susan.

Susan cannot bear hearing about her husband and sister-in-law. Bill wants to prove to be right. He sees Gerald and Muriel approaching them and is glad to see them:

> BILL. Susan? Remember them now? Your husband and your sister-in-law? (Gently) Mrs Gannet…
> SUSAN. (Turning) Who on earth's Mrs Gannet when she's-?
> (As she speaks and turns, her real family enters. She breaks off […] Susan looks at them in horror. Her knees buckle, she gives a terrible moan and falls into a faint causing a blackout). (*W* 22)

Gerald and Muriel arouse Susan's conflicts and anxiety. She is only satisfied in her fantasies. When she suddenly sees her husband and sister-in-law, she wants to escape, but it is too late to call for her alternate family members' assistance. Hence, Susan breaks off her ties with real world and faints, which is another means of defense for her.

The members of Susan's imaginary family often appear right after she has any feeling leading to disturbance. For instance, Rick is one of the biggest reasons for Susan's anxiety. They often argue with Gerald upon the upbringing of Rick and Rick's alienation to them. At the end of one of these rows, Gerald reminds Susan that Rick loves her indeed. Nonetheless, Susan is quite anxious and disturbed:

> GERALD. He always sends you his love, you know. Rick. When he writes. He always sends you his love.
> SUSAN. Does he? You must send mine back then, mustn't you?
> GERALD. Yes, I usually do. When I write. Well.
> (At this point, LUCY, now in a light, flowing summer dress comes chasing past them laughing. The sound is very faint. TONY comes on in pursuit. They chase off. SUSAN watches them.) (*W* 33)

Susan cannot stand listening to Gerald's talk about Rick. The way to avoid hearing him is to focus on something else which will please her. Thus, she asks for Lucy's and Tony's help. Even a short appearance of them relieve her for the time being.

Susan needs Lucy as she thinks she should have had a daughter instead of an ungrateful son like Rick. She believes she could have coped with a daughter. She cannot control her son, and this really upsets and disturbs her. Even the name and mention of Rick leads to conflicts and anxiety in Susan. This is why she denies that

she has a son and tells Bill she has a daughter instead. However, as in the case of her denial of Gerald and Muriel, when Rick comes for lunch, she has to face real life:

> GERALD. Don't forget Rick's here for lunch, will you, dear?
> SUSAN. (With a flashing smile) Oh, heavens above! Thank you for reminding me, I practically forgot.
> BILL. Rick? That's your son, Rick? (He looks at SUSAN for confirmation.)
> SUSAN. Yes. I remember him now. It's all right.
> BILL. Good, good. You keeping busy, Gerald?
> (SUSAN moves away from the men and wanders a little as they talk, half listening to them […] As GERALD is speaking, LUCY enters and comes to SUSAN, carrying two glasses of champagne.) (*W* 34-35)

Susan tries to repress and forget anything about Rick, even his long-expected visit. As soon as he comes back into her consciousness, she dissociates with her real family and takes refuge in the imaginary one. Only in this way can she cope with nervousness.

As soon as Susan joins her alternate family, they celebrate being together and raise their glasses of champagne to "The family!" (*W* 35). The use of definite article "the" before the word "family" gives the impression that Susan's imaginary family is getting ready to replace her real one. For lunch, Andy cooks salmon dish with a special mayonnaise. He also makes summer pudding and some peach sorbet for lunch. Meanwhile, he sends Susan a glass of champagne, for she still looks pale. The food he prepares is not common and proper food for an ordinary lunch. Whereas they offer Bill frozen food in real life, she has a feast in her daydreams. Her fantasies relieve her of stress, and demonstrate her desire for higher life standards.

Susan is still able to control her fantasies. However, her hallucinations appear more frequently. Her continuous shift between the imaginary and the real are symptoms of Simultaneous Multiple Personality Disorder. Her two personalities and two lives begin to clash and overlap each other:

> BILL. Gerald was telling me that—Shall we sit down?
> SUSAN. Yes, of course.
> (BILL adjusts the chairs. SUSAN notices LUCY.)
> (To LUCY) Just put it there, darling, thank you.
> LUCY. Right.
> BILL. Right you are.

[…]

SUSAN. Did I— ? Did I say something just then?

BILL. When?

SUSAN. While you were moving the chairs?

BILL. Er—yes. You said—just put it there. Darling.

SUSAN. I did? (*W* 38)

Susan tries to manipulate both her lives simultaneously. However, what she tells Lucy is heard by Bill as well. She does not know whether she has really uttered what she has thought of. She is likely to lose the distinction between reality and imagination.

When Rick arrives, Susan gets very anxious and she cannot go inside. Lucy reappears and asks her to join their lunch. Susan turns down the offer and insists on going inside. Her alternate family does not let her go. Tony explains the reason; "We love you and we don't want to see you hurt" (*W* 47). They state that Susan's real family always hurt her, and they want to protect and cheer her, which makes it clear that they function as a defense mechanism for Susan.

When Susan finds out why Rick is visiting them, she feels disenchanted and disturbed. She does not want his son to sell his furniture in his room because she fears losing him completely. She argues with Gerald about this issue and Gerald refuses to talk to her. Muriel blames her for not knowing how to treat her husband properly. Susan feels distressed because of the accusations and she needs help urgently:

LUCY. Mother?... Mummy, don't be unhappy. (Kneeling by SUSAN) Can we talk about my wedding?

SUSAN. (Rather more curtly than normal) Yes, we will do, darling, but not just at this moment.

LUCY. Even if they don't appreciate you, we love you, Mother (*W* 59).

Lucy appears exactly when Susan is in need of affection. Susan uses Lucy's wedding to distract herself and focus on something which will not lead to anxiety for her. However, she loses the control of her hallucination and Lucy claims that Susan is "just the most marvelous person—ever" and "the most brilliant woman heart surgeon there was" (*W* 59). Though Susan needs flattery, she does not like this overstatement and asks Lucy to go away. However, right after she dismisses Lucy, she feels sorry

and apologizes; she wants her back. Susan plays with her defense mechanism; she resorts to it haphazardly. She is not aware of the damage it might cause.

After another quarrel with Gerald, Susan is left alone again. Gerald returns to his book and he frustrates Susan. She yells at him: "If you leave me now for that damn—book, I warn you, Gerald, you will have nailed up the final—door—in our relationship [...] You will have dug that final yard of moat between us! [...] You will have—You will have uncoiled the final strands of electrified barbed wire that serve to keep us" (*W* 60). She uses far-fetched metaphors to express her dissatisfaction with her relationship. At that instant, the weather suddenly shifts from afternoon into sunset and Andy appears. He utters beautiful words and soothes Susan. He is the fulfilment of Susan's emotional and sexual desires. In contrast to Gerald, he attracts and charms Susan easily and frequently. Even a single kiss from him makes Susan excited and happy. She asks him: "How do you make me feel so helpless? You only have to touch me and my knees give way" (*W* 61). With the help of Andy, Susan temporarily calms down and represses her frustration.

Susan's secondary identity, used as a defense mechanism, gradually takes her towards chaos. When used extensively, defense mechanisms are harmful. For this reason, Susan's alternative family may be harmful as well. Holt argues that the members of the family "start to make inconvenient appearances, interrupting at crucial moments and no longer playing a purely passive role. Worse, they seem to be acquiring sinister aspects. The bloody animal corpse hanging from the gun bag of Susan's perfect brother may be linked to the [lost] dog in the garden next door" (43). Billington agrees on the demonic nature of the family: "Not only do they start to put words into Susan's mouth and anticipate her every thought; they start to behave in a demonstrably cruel manner (184).

The moment Susan sees Tony returning from his shoot with the "bloodstained game bag" is the beginning of her nightmare. Only then does she question the existence and reliability of this alternate family. She admits the change: "I don't think I do know Tony. Not any more. Any more than I think I know you. You've altered. You've altered, recently […] What do you want from me? What are you doing here? [...] Yes. I whistled and you came. Yes. But not now. You just keep popping up. All of you" (*W* 61-62). She feels that the family is getting out of her

control step by step and talks to Bill about it: "If I let them out, these people, I don't know that I can control them. Not any more" (*W* 68).

She has created this family since she could not manipulate her real family members. However, seeing that she fails once again disappoints her deeply. She thinks she does not need the family any more and accuses them of appearing randomly. She asks Andy to go, but Andy knows that she does not mean what she says: "Is that you telling me to go away or could that be me telling you to go away? It's sometimes hard to tell, isn't it?" (*W* 63).

Susan, suffering from split personality, develops a "memory barrier", which initially makes her "seem to be concealing facts, denying the truth, or acting" (Hawthorn 2). She plays with facts and shapes them as she wishes. She talks to Bill about Rick:

> SUSAN. He's just told us some wonderful news actually. We were very thrilled.
> BILL. Oh, what's that?
> SUSAN. He's getting married.
> BILL. Oh, super. Presentable, is she?
> […]
> SUSAN. She's—all right. Not striking, you know. Quite plain […] Got one of those heavy faces. Bit jowly. Or it will be, when she's forty […] And that terribly fine hair that you can never quite do anything with […] She's a Thai, actually. (*W* 69)

Rick has already married Tess and Susan has never seen her before. She cannot tell Bill the unpleasant facts about her relationship with Rick, so she changes the story. She makes up that Rick "has a job lined up there", too (*W* 69). Susan is overdependent on her defense mechanisms, which brings her towards her catastrophic end.

Susan's hallucinations are products of intertextuality. She mixes all her memories and creates a new memory out of them:

> ANDY. Remember our honeymoon? [...] I had to sell my desk and my swivel chair, so we could eat…
> (They laugh.)
> SUSAN. Eat? What about that first meal I cooked for us? In the pressure cooker?
> ANDY. Best meal I've ever eaten off the ceiling.
> (They laugh again.)

SUSAN. You've never let me live that down. Not after—what is it?—ten years.

ANDY. Eleven. You're still as young. You haven't changed. Just the same. (*W* 75)

The dialogue is woven out of Susan's earlier memories and conversations with Rick and Bill. She uses the memories which create conflicts to make up her love story with Andy. From here on Susan "surrenders to the happily inevitable", that is her secondary personality (*W* 76).

Susan's actions are "cut off from the continuity of consciousness" (Ellenberger 124). Her memory barrier prevents her from remembering the fact that she has set Gerald's study on fire. She persistently claims that she is not the one who has done it. Susan's Simultaneous Multiple Personality Disorder changes into Successive Multiple Personality Disorder, in which individuals' personalities may be mutually or one-way amnesic (Ellenberger 131). Susan is amnesic because she does not think that she is the one to blame. Instead, she claims that her brother Tony started the fire, which is not a plausible explanation for Gerald.

Susan does not care about what others think about her behaviour any more. She has given up struggling for her real family. Lying in the garden in rain, she refuses Gerald's help and wants him to leave her alone:

SUSAN. I'm being looked after perfectly well, thank you […] I'm free of you all now, you see. All of you. You with your prim little, frigid little, narrow-minded little meanness. And that priggish brat who's ashamed of me. Who'd faint at the sight of a pair of tits. As for her with her dead husband. No wonder he died. (*W* 81)

Susan is pleased with the attention and care she receives in her fantasies, so she is willing to submit to the control of her imagination.

After her driving Gerald away, she can never regain her consciousness. "Everything from here on is in a slightly heightened colour and design, suggesting Susan's own extreme mental state. What we see are images remembered by her from films she has seen, books she has read, TV she has watched" (*W* 82). When she shifts into her secondary personality, she thinks she is at Lucy's wedding. In the course of time, she notices some ridiculous actions and talks. For instance, Tony reports that Lucy is "in peak condition" and that "she's free of injuries" (*W* 84). Every one uses

horse race terminology and Susan's doubts grow. She asks Andy what is going on:

> SUSAN. I thought this was a wedding.
> ANDY. Put a tenner on for me, will you, Bill?
> BILL. Will do. Each way?
> SUSAN Andy, I thought this was a wedding.
> ANDY. (Amused) What's that about a wedding, you daft old thing? (Ignoring her again) What are you offering, Bill? Ten to one? (*W* 84-85).

What Susan sees is a nightmare rather than a fantasy. She does not understand anything and people do not pay attention to her. She is lonely and ignored. She expects a wedding, but she is actually attending a horse race, in which Lucy is one of the horses. The use of horse race is significant; it refers to the relentless rush and competition in man's daily life. Capitalistic system is the target of criticism since it puts people in a constant rivalry with one another. With the image of race, "Lucy's wedding becomes a Lewis Carroll-like race meeting in which both existences intermingle grotesquely" (Watson 200). Susan is aware of the fact that things are "getting so stupid", but she cannot help creating all this nonsense. She sees Muriel serving drinks in a maid's dress and Muriel is pregnant (*W* 86). Moreover, "people appear to be less and less aware of SUSAN. As if she herself were slowly slipping from the dream whilst it carries on without her" (*W* 88). Susan tries to manipulate the dialogues and she wants to receive attention, but she fails. She is furious and cries:

> This is grossly unfair, it really is. Why doesn't anyone take any notice of me? (Louder) Why won't you look at me? (Very loudly) LOOK AT ME AT ONCE, DO YOU HEAR? ALL OF YOU!!! (She stamps her foot.) (*W* 89)

Upon her outcry, they surround her and talk to her as usual. Muriel informs others that the ambulance is on its way. Reality and imagination totally merge. According to Londré, when Susan's fantasies begin to "spin out of control", and "fantasy and reality collide", Susan completely "loses the ability to define herself (in Dukore 96). Billington claims that the inability to distinguish between reality and fantasy "is a clinical symptom of madness" (184). Susan perceives both the thunder and sun. She has resorted to defense mechanism so often that finally she has lost her ability to

solve problems and deal with anxiety. She can manage to survive only in her fantasies.

In the final scene of the play, Susan is expected to make a speech on the occasion, the wedding. She stands and begins her speech:

> Dearest friends. Family. My happiest moment has been to stand here with you all and share this, my most precious of days. I grow hugh, summer few bald teddy know these two wonderful children, Lucy and Rick. I cannot tell you how heaply cowed siam. (*W* 91)

Susan's speech becomes unintelligible, but she continues to speak until she becomes totally invisible to others. When an ambulance's blue flashing light illuminates her, "the others have frozen in the shadows. They appear neither to see nor to hear her now" (*W* 92). She slides into total insanity and dissociation. This striking end, for Dukore, "visually and audibly evokes Susan's mental breakdown" (79).

Susan grows a split personality owing to the numerous social and inner constrictions in her life. These constrictions lead to conflicts, anxiety, and disturbance in her mind. Being accustomed to sticking to defense mechanisms, Susan cannot face these unpleasant feelings. Whenever she feels threatened, she shifts into her secondary personality, where she finds temporary relief. She uses her split personality as a method of defense. However, when used too often, any defense method can be hazardous. Susan becomes gradually addicted to fantasizing; unfortunately her fantasy is no longer gratifying. Her defense mechanism culminates in her final downfall and she becomes utterly insane.

3.2 Gareth: Inner Dialogues

Repression is "a generic term for the whole class of defensive processes" (Sjöbäck 15). It is not a defense mechanism; the defenses are subcategories of repression. Repression is employed to relieve anxiety and disturbance by pushing the underlying factors into unconscious and prevent them from entering consciousness. Miller and Swanson argue that repression "requires a rather protracted period of education":

> Before a child can repress the fact that he has had a serious failure, for

> example, he must have developed a body image and a conception of self, he must have learned different standards of accomplishment, and he must have identified with individuals to whom such standards are very important for maintaining self-esteem. Once these are acquired, only the specific information immediately associated with the repressed material has to be eliminated from consciousness. The child does not have to retreat into his private world of fantasy or radically interpret what he sees in order to overcome his anxiety. (235)

Repression is an acquired skill used to cope with anxiety and insoluble problems. Individuals unable to face up to the social restrictions or their inner conflicts resort to this particular method.

In *Philadelphia, Here I Come!* , Gareth displays "the difficulties of reconciling the inner life, the saving of one's soul, personal integrity, with the competing claims of the public world, one's family, one's external faith" (Pine 77). To be able to deal with the irreconcilable constrictions encircling him, Gareth develops a method of repression peculiar to himself; he creates an alternate personality.

Gareth is torn between the values of the society and his own yearnings. His personality is "split into two voices, one which utters what is acceptable and the other which utters what one would really like to say" (McGrath 69). Two actors appear on the stage to represent Gareth's Simultaneous Multiple Personality Disorder. Both personalities, Public and Private, appear at the same time and they converse. Friel clarifies his use of two actors for two personalities:

> The two Gars, Public Gar and Private Gar, are two views of the one man. Public Gar is the Gar that people see, talk to, talk about. Private Gar is the unseen man, the man within, the conscience, the alter ego, the secret thoughts, the id. Private Gar, the spirit, is invisible to everybody, always. Nobody except Public Gar hears him talk. But even Public Gar, although he talks to Private Gar occasionally, never sees him and never looks at him. One cannot look at one's alter ego. (*P* 11-12).

Private Gar, whom only Public can see and talk to, is Gareth's coping strategy. Certain incidents in the play, which disturb Gar and turn out to be insoluble for him, trigger this defense mechanism. Whenever he finds himself lonely and anxious, he uses his alter ego for relief. By means of the inner dialogues he has with his alternate personality, Public Gar tries to forget about his problems. These problems mirrored

by Private Gar simply consist of the people in his life and his leaving home

The first appearance of Private is right after Gareth feels the burden of his father's indifference towards his leaving for Philadelphia. Sean B. O'Donnell is one of the major causes of Gar's distress. Talking to Madge about his last day with his father, Public is highly disturbed by the fact that his father gave him work to do and said nothing. However, not to demonstrate his frustration, he employs an air of indifference:

> At six o'clock he remembered about the bloody Pollock, and him in the middle of the Angelus [stands in imitation of the Father: head bowed, hands on chest. In flat tones—) 'Behold-the-handmaid-of-the-Lord-Gut-and-salt-them-fish.' So by God I lashed so much salt on those bloody fish that any poor bugger that eats them will die of thirst. But when the corpses are strewn all over Ballybeg, where will I be? In the little old U.S.A! Yip-eeeeee! (*P* 16-17)

He does exactly what his father wants him to do. He does not object to him; in this way, he thinks, he punishes his father's apathy.

Despite his apparent obedience and indifference, Gareth is still not comfortable. He needs a strategy to cope with this anxiety. He immediately starts singing: "Philadelphia, here I come rightah backah where Ah started from—" (*P* 17). Pine claims that this is a "corrupted song", a repeated motif in the play, underlining Gar's unease (77). Private sings the song with him, though he is still off the stage. Public needs Private' help, so Private appears:

> PUBLIC. It's all over.
> PRIVATE. [off, in echo-chamber voice] And it's all about to begin. It's all over.
> PUBLIC. And all about to begin.
> PRIVATE. [Now on] Just think, Gar.
> PUBLIC. Think…
> PRIVATE. Think… Up in that big bugger of a jet, with its snout pointing straight for the States, and its tail belching smoke over Ireland; and you sitting up at the front [Public acts this] with your competent fingers poised over the controls; and then away down below in the Atlantic you see a bloody bugger of an Irish boat out fishing for bloody Pollock and—
> [Public nose-dives, engines screaming, machine guns stuttering.]

PUBLIC. Rat-tat-tat-tat-tat-tat-tat-tat-tat-tat. (*P* 17)

Private is Public's accomplice; they kill Gar's memories of fishing and boats together. In this way, Private helps Public feel in control of his life and think about the attractive future awaiting him. Private functions as a defense mechanism for Public.

S. B. is a key stimulant of Gar's anxiety and conflicts. Even when he is mentioned in a talk, Gar feels distressed. Madge and Gar talk about S.B.'s indifference. Gar is determined not to talk to him first. To get over his disturbance, he calls for Private's help straight away. Private soothes him:

> What the hell do you care about him. Screwballs! Skinflint! Skittery face! You're free of him and his stinking bloody shop. And tomorrow morning, boy, when that little ole plane gets up into the skies, you'll stick your head out the window [Public acts this] and spit down on the lot of them! (*P* 20)

Private is able to say whatever Public cannot. O'Brien contends that Private is "the witty, outrageous, satirical, sensitive, fantasizing, distancing Gar. He is the essentially theatrical Gar, who acts out what his public brother has no audience for" (50). Private debases S.B. by using slang words. He also reminds Public of the freedom waiting for him in the States. The approaching flight to the U.S.A., the beginning of Gar's new life, turns out to be the only escape for Gar. This is the only hope he holds on to for future.

Gareth is bored to death with the dull life he leads with his father. His father's repetitive speech and acts, particularly, irritate him. He seldom talks to his father and his responses are often quite brief. Private, on the other hand, never keeps silent when Gar is in his father's presence:

> And here comes your pleasure, your little ray of sunshine. Ladies and Gentlemen, I give you—the one and only—the inimitable—the irrepressible—the irresistible—Country Councillor—S—B—O'Donnell! [...] I would draw your attention to the large collar stud which is highly decorative and can be purchased separately at our boutique. We call this seductive outfit 'Indiscretion'. It can be worn six days a week, in or out of bed. (*P* 38)

Private mocks S.B. because of his dry personality and shabby clothes. O'Brien asserts that Private Gar is "by far the abler and freer of the two" because he is witty, straightforward, and humorous (50). Private tries to make Gar's life less unbearable for him. That is why he never stops talking whenever Gar is distressed.

S.B. O'Donnell, either with his presence or absence, disturbs Gar. He comes to ask Gar the number of barbed-wire coils delivered that evening. Gar cannot remember the exact number and S.B. gets angry. Gar is the one who has carried the goods into the yard. He feels guilty and immediately calls for Private's assistance. Private changes the course of the dialogue: "After tomorrow a bloody roll of barbed-wire will be a mere bagatelle to you […] And what'll you wear on the plane tomorrow, old rooster, eh?" (*P* 22). Private changes the topic of their conversation and activates Gar's American dream. Gar's attention shifts back to his future plans and he momentarily forgets about his father.

Public finds consolation in the States; that's why he takes refuge in his American dream whenever he feels stuck. With his alter ego, Gar rehearses the job interview in store for him in Philadelphia:

> PRIVATE. [in heavy U.S. accent] I'm Patrick Palinakis, president of the biggest chain of biggest hotels in the world. We're glad to have you, Mr O'Donnell.
> PUBLIC. [Sweet, demure] And I'm glad to be here, Sir.
> PRIVATE. Handsomely said, young man. I hope you'll be happy with us and work hard and one day maybe you'll be president of the biggest chain of biggest hotels in the world.
> PUBLIC. That's my ambition, Sir […] [Suddenly breaking off: in his normal accent: rolling on the bed—] Yahoooooo! It is now sixteen or seventeen years since I saw the Queen of France, then the Dauphiness, at Versailles—
> PRIVATE. Let's git packin' boy. (*P* 22-23)

During their dialogues, Public and Private shift roles. They are sometimes father and son, or employer and employee, or judge and suspect. Gar's split personality breaks into a multiplicity of characters, who are usually real people in his life. The reference to the Queen of France is another repeated motif, "a cryptic reference to Burke's French Revolution" (Pine 77). French Revolution came out as a consequence of the desires for freedom and a new order. It was a bloody revolution and led to fresh

problems afterwards. Similarly, Gar yearns for a new life because only then can he have his freedom. However, the conflicts and anxiety he suffers from suggest pitfalls in his life in the States.

The motif of French Revolution reappears when Gar feels depressed. Private reminds Public of the unhappy marriage of Gar's mother and father:

> When she was pregnant with you, laddybuck, the other young girls from Bailtefree would call in here to dress up on their way to a dance […] He must have heard her crying herself to sleep… and maybe it was good of God to take her away three days after you were born….[Suddenly boisterous.] Damn you, anyhow, for a bloody stupid bastard! It is now sixteen or seventeen years since I saw the Queen of France, then the Dauphines, at Versailles! (*P* 26)

The recurring motifs, uttered by Private, are a part of Gar's defenses. They emerge when he cannot cope with his anxiety and annoyance. Gar knows that he cannot fight his challenging thoughts on his own, so he needs Private. Private points out his function to Public: "You jist keep atalkin' to you'self all the time, Mistah, 'cos once you stop atalkin' to you'self ah reckon then you jist begin to think kinda crazy things" (*P* 26). Talking to his Private self averts Public from going crazy with too much thinking.

Kate is also a factor of Gar's anxiety and disturbance. Although she cannot be blamed for their break-up, Gar feels uneasy since he has lost her. He cannot avoid the pangs of his conscience. While singing a song and dancing, Public stops suddenly because he remembers that it is Katie's tune. With his sudden stop, he demonstrates that he still loves Kate, upon which Private interrupts: "Aul bitch. [Loudly.] Rotten aul snobby bitch! Just like her stinking rotten father and mother—a bugger and a buggeress—a buggeroo and a buggerette!" (*P* 27). Private tries to lessen Gar's pain and sense of guilt, so he insults Kate and her parents.

Kate is still everywhere for Gar. Remembering Aunt Lizzy's letter, Gareth comes across the date September 8th, the day when Kate got married. He feels desperate and calls for Private's help. Private barges in: "Shut up, O'Donnell! You've got to quit this moody drivelling! [Coaxing.] [Con and Lizzy] arrived in the afternoon; remember? A beautiful quiet harvest day, the sun shining, not a breath of

wind; and you were on your best behaviour" (*P* 56). Private takes Public to the day he mentions. Recalling the day Con and Lizzy invited him to the States to live with them does Gareth good. Now Gar feels much better to remember how considerate and affectionate his uncle and aunt were; they regard Gar as their own son, and he is glad to receive this affection.

Kate disturbs Gar unintentionally when she visits him to say "good-bye" (*P* 79). Kate just wants to see Gar for the last time and wish him a happy life in the States. Gar needs to defend himself without any good reason and he starts debasing Ballybeg: "If I had to spend another week in Ballybeg, I'd go off my bloody head! This place would drive anybody crazy! [...] I hate the place, and every stone, and every rock, and every piece of heather around it!" (*P* 80-81). He pretends to be glad to leave Ireland, though he is in a big dilemma. As soon as Kate leaves, he buries his head in his hands and cries: "Kate… sweet Katie Doogan… my darling Kathy Doogan" (*P* 82). He still loves her and the pain is unbearable. Private interrupts him:

> Oh my God, steady man, steady—it is now sixteen or seventeen years since I saw the Queen of France, then the Dauphiness, at Versailles, and surely never lighted on this orb—Oh God, Oh my God, those thoughts are sinful. (*P* 82)

Private wants to remove Kate from Gar's mind. He represents reason when Public stands for feelings.

Boyle is another reason for Gar's uneasiness. When they talk about Gar's future plans, Boyle advises Gar to forget about Ireland and become a hundred per cent American. However, he also admits that he will miss Gar and asks Gar to write to him. Private interferes to protect Gar from any emotional involvement with him and the other people in Ballybeg:

> PRIVATE. For God's sake get a grip on yourself […] [Boyle embraces Public briefly.] Stop it! Stop it! Stop it! [...] Remember—you're going! At 7.15. you're still going! He's nothing but a drunken aul schoolmaster—a conceited, arrogant wash-out! [...] Get a grip on yourself! Don't be a damned fool! [Sings.] 'Philadelphia, here I come—' (*P* 47)

Private does not want to see Gar under anyone's influence. When leaving for the

States, Gar should leave everything and everybody behind, and not look back. This is the only way to repress his doubts about leaving his unhappy life and start a new one. To this end, Private cheers Public for the time being, and they sing together: "Philadelphia, here I come." (*P* 48).

Private does not give Public a chance to catch his breath. When he notices Gareth lying on his bed and contemplating, his hands behind his head, Private suddenly realizes that Public might be thinking about the past. He tries to engage his attention: "What the bloody hell are you at, O'Donnell? Snap out of it, man! Get up and keep active! The devil makes work for idle hands! It is now sixteen or seventeen years since I saw the Queen of France, then the Dauphiness, at Versailles" (*P* 51). He repeats the same motif of the French Revolution to distract Gar. Private fears the fact that man is haunted by his past so long as he is not busy with an activity. Thus, he asks Public absurd riddles: "Why does a hen lay an egg? [...] Because it can't lay a brick. Yo-ho. Why does a sailor wear a round hat? [...] To cover his head" (*P* 52). Private asks these riddles just in order to distract him. Then he suddenly begins praising Gar: "You'd make a hell of a fine President of the United States […] What about Chairman of General Motors? [...] What about Hollywood?" (*P* 52-53). Private tries to please him and boost up his morale:

> PRIVATE. You're hard to please too. Still, there must be something great in store for you. [Cracks his fingers at his brainwave.] The U.S. Senate! Senator Gareth O'Donnell, Chairman of the Foreign Aid Committee!
> [He interviews Public who continues packing his clothes busily.]
> Is there something you would like to say, Senator, before you publish the findings of your committee?
> PUBLIC. Nothing to say.
> PRIVATE. Just a few words.
> PUBLIC. No comment. (*P* 53)

Gar rejects all these offers for various reasons: He is not born an American citizen, so he cannot be the President; he does not like the idea of becoming a chairman; he finds Hollywood corrupted, far from its glorious days.

Public is fond of shifting roles and personality; he imagines as if he were the senator indeed. He is not satisfied with being just Gareth, so he takes refuge in personalities other than himself. His constant attempts at escape and repression

indicate that he is overdependent on his defense mechanisms.

Private does not let Public think about the past; he does not want any memories lurking in his mind. While talking to Public about S.B., they hear a sound outside the room. Private asks Public whether it is his friends, who might be there to say good-bye. They understand that it is Madge; Public drops into his armchair. Private is alert: "Off again! You know what you're doing, don't you, laddybuck? Collecting memories and images and impressions that are going to make you bloody miserable; and in a way that's what you want, isn't it? [...] Back to the job! Keep occupied. Be methodical. *Eanie-meanie-minie-mow / Catch-the-baby-by-the-toe*." (*P* 54). Private tries to make Public repress his thoughts about Ballybeg; he sometimes yells at him, and sometimes uses absurd dialogues or tongue twisters to distract him. Especially opening the topic of the States turns out to be the best weapon for Private:

PRIVATE. Will all passengers holding immigration visas please come this way.
[Public produces documents from a drawer. He checks them.]
PRIVATE. Passport?
PUBLIC. Passport.
PRIVATE. Visa?
PUBLIC. Visa.
PRIVATE. Vaccination cert.?
PUBLIC. Vaccination cert.
PRIVATE. Currency?
PUBLIC. Eighty dollars
PRIVATE. Sponsorship papers?
PUBLIC. Signed by Mr Conal Sweeney. (*P* 54-55)

Gareth is easily carried away whenever the issue is Philadelphia. When he lets his thoughts wander about the U.S.A., he temporarily forgets about the social and inner constrictions suffocating him in Ballybeg.

Private attacks Gar's memories. Gar asks Madge questions about his mother and he tries to understand why she chose Sean as her husband. He demands to learn the reason why she did not marry Boyle. Private sees the danger and stops him before he goes further: "What the hell had you to go and ask that for! Snap, boy, snap! We want no scenes tonight. Get up and clear out of this" (*P* 95). He wants Gar not to think about his past any longer so that he can begin a new life in the States.

Gar's friends add to his anxiety and annoyance. They are real tramps totally

indifferent to Gar's leaving. During the visit, Ned, for instance, just talks about his sexual adventures. He claims that he has had many girls so far, including one called big Annie:

> PUBLIC. You were never out with big Annie McFadden in your puff, man.
> NED. Are you calling me a liar?
> […]
> PUBLIC. Have it your own way. (*P* 70)

Seeing no point in arguing about the incident, Public surrenders. Private breaks in and tries to soothe Gar: "They're louts, ignorant bloody louts, and you've always known it! […] And you know what they'll do tonight, don't you? They'll shuffle around the gable of the hotel and take an odd furtive peep into the lounge at those English women who won't even look up from their frigid knitting" (*P* 78). Private shows Gar that his friends are worthless creatures and relieves him of his disappointment in them. Private helps Gar "see through and expose the lies told by other characters" since it is one of his roles "to uncover the despair and pain that often lie behind false words" (Ferris in Kerwin 119).

Canon Mick O'Byrne is another factor triggering Gar's split personality. With his intolerable dullness and predictability, he activates Private's humour. The canon talks to Sean about the likelihood of rain. Their repetitive talk goes on for a long while, and Private interrupts in the end:

> CANON. You'll have rain before morning.
> […]
> CANON. Before the morning you'll have it.
> […]
> CANON. Before the morning.
> S.B. As if we don't get enough of it.
> CANON. The jabs are never wrong.
> PRIVATE. [wildly excited] Stop press! News flash! Sensation! We interrupt our programmes to bring you the news that Canon Mick O'Byrne, of Ballybeg, Ireland, has made the confident prediction that you'll have rain before the morning! Stand by for further bulletins! (*P* 93)

The Canon's speeches make life harder for Gareth. He can breathe only when Private breaks in and makes fun of the people in his life. Private is "Gar's potential, rather than Gar's reality. He is also what the culture of Ballybeg has no room for. The

division of Gar, thus, is an imaginative measure intended as a critique of local and familial narrowness and repetitious, mundane routine" (O'Brien 50).

His relationships with the people in his life have worried Gar profoundly, but at present the main conflict he encounters is leaving Ireland for the States. In Gareth's last night at home, Gar, S.B., and Madge say rosary. During the prayers, Public is totally silent, and his face is not seen by the audience. He is confused and distressed, for his departure is now imminent. In contrast to Public, Private never stops talking:

> Ah-ho-ho-ho-ho-ho. This time tomorrow night, bucko, you'll be saying the rosary all by yourself […] You'd need to be careful out there, boy; some of those Yankee women are dynamite. But you'll never marry […] When you're quite old—about forty-three—you'll meet this beautiful girl of nineteen, and you'll fall madly in love. Karin—that's her name—no—ah—ah—Tamara—[caressing the word]. Tamara—grand-daughter of an exiled Russian prince. (*P* 87-88)

To lessen Public's nervousness, Private once again makes use of the American dream. He incessantly talks about Gar's flight to the States, American girls with whom Gar will hang around, and the new life awaiting him. This is the best and easiest way to help Gar repress his anxiety and conflicts about leaving.

The more Private comes to the limelight, the more Public is disturbed. Private, principally serving as Gar's defense mechanism, in time starts giving confusing messages. For instance, while singing the song which he previously sang with Kate, Gar remembers Kate, but he pretends to ignore it. He does not want to think about her, but this time Private insists on remembering her:

> You needn't pretend you have forgotten. And it reminds you of the night the two of you made all the plans, and you thought your heart would burst with happiness […] You loved her once, old rooster; you wanted so much to marry her that it was a bloody sickness. Tell me, randy boy; tell me the truth: have you got over that sickness? Do you still love her? Do you still lust after her? (*P* 27)

Public has lost Kate to a much better man, which hurts his pride. He tries to repress his feelings, yet Private does not let him get it off lightly. Overuse of defense

mechanisms may lead to the loss of coping skills and the individual may lose control over his thoughts or acts. Similarly, Gar gradually loses his control over Private and Private begins disturbing him by bringing the repressed memories back into his consciousness.

Private, acting as Gar's foil, disturbs him time after time. Besides cornering Gar about Kate, Private also questions him about his decision to leave Ireland. He asks Public if he has any uncertainties or reservations about moving to the States. Public looks determined and denies having any doubts. Private tries him: "You don't want to go, laddybuck. Admit it. You don't want to go" (*P* 66). Private now stands for his hesitations and conflicts, especially when Gar depends largely on him. When he has the opportunity, he attacks Gar's vulnerable issues.

Private, on the whole, represents reason, whereas Public acts by his feelings. However, when Public stands for reason, Private stimulates his feelings. He is always in antagonism to Public. Moreover, he increasingly gets out of control and harms Public by reminding him of snatches of past dialogues he had with various people. Private repeats some sentences uttered before by Kate, S.B., Madge, and Boyle, one after the other.

> We'll go now, right away, and tell them—Mammy and Daddy—they're at home tonight—now, Gar, now—it must be now—remember, it's up to you entirely up to you—gut and salt them fish—and they're going to call this one Madge, at least so she says—
> [Public makes another attempt to whistle.]
> —a little something to remind you of your old teacher—don't keep looking back over your shoulder, be 100 per cent American. (*P* 82)

Private's aim is to disturb and discourage Public. Various voices rushing into Gar's mind become excruciating. When Private is used extensively, he becomes dangerous and unmanageable.

Private is the one who has discouraged Gareth from asking Mr. Doogan's permission to marry Kate. Talking to Gar, Senator Doogan praises Francis King, the man who Doogans hope Kate to marry: "We're living in hope. A fine boy, Francis; and we've known the Kings, oh, since away back" (*P* 32). Gareth feels humiliated. Francis is supposed to get the new dispensary job there and he is believed to make a

good husband for Kate. Since Gar feels distraught, Private comes out and deters Gar from talking to the Senator about Kate:

> O God, the aul bitch! Cripes, you look a right fool standing there—the father of 14 children!—Get out, you eejit you! Get out! [...] And all the time she must have known—the aul bitch!—And you promised to give her breakfast in bed every morning! And you told her about the egg money! (*P* 33)

Private speaks ill of Kate and provokes Public. He exerts his power on Public and increases his sense of humiliation. Senator Doogan admits that "any decision [Kate] makes will be her own" (*P* 33). However, Private is stronger than both the senator and Public; he incites Public to leave. After Gar gives up the idea of talking to the Senator, Private increases his torture and gives Gar more pain: "Mrs Doctor Francis King. September 8th. In harvest sunshine. Red carpet and white lilies […] Honeymoon in Mallorca and you couldn't have afforded to take her to Malahide" (*P* 34). Public tries to sing and repress these thoughts, but Private does not let him.

Seeing that Private does not help him repress his disturbing thoughts, Public himself takes over the responsibility. He uses the accent and style previously used by Private:

> PUBLIC. [in absurd Hollywood style] Hi, gorgeous! You live in my block?
> PRIVATE. [matching the accent] Yeah, big handsome boy. Sure do.
> PUBLIC. Mind if I walk you past the incinerator, to the elevator?
> PRIVATE. You're welcome, slick operator.
> [PUBLIC is facing the door of his bedroom. Madge enters the kitchen from the scullery.]
> PUBLIC. What'ya say, li'l chick, you and me—you know—I'll spell it out for ya ifya like. [Winks, and clicks his tongue.]
> PRIVATE. You say the cutest things, big handsome boy!
> PUBLIC. A malted milk at the corner drug-store?
> PRIVATE. Wow!
> PUBLIC. A movie at the downtown drive-in?
> PRIVATE. Wow-wow!
> PUBLIC. Two hamburgers, two cokes, two slices of blueberry pie?
> PRIVATE. Wow-wow-wow. (*P* 36)

His exaggerated American accent and images from American lifestyle signify

Gareth's desire for escape to the States. His life renders him no satisfaction and he cannot tolerate it any more. Hence, he or his alter ego often uses an American accent in their dialogues, which brings him some relief.

Gareth uses his alternate identity as a defense mechanism. With Private's assistance, he temporarily represses his disturbing thoughts, memories, and conflicts. This is why he "splits himself in two and performs endless duets with his alter ego" (Gleitman in Kerwin 233). Private is the part of Gar who utters whatever he really thinks about people in his life and Ballybeg "unthinkingly, unfeelingly, unconsciously" (O'Brien 50). Private's non-stop talk is in direct contrast to Public's general silence. Only through Private can Gar have his personal space and personal voice in his life. Otherwise, he would be in total silence.

3.3 Alan: Disclaiming Norms

Alan, having encountered both social and inner constrictions, is not able to deal with them on his own. He is too weak to face the factors triggering anxiety and disturbance for him. The religious trauma he suffers from is the most important one and the basis of all these factors. Klein lists more anxieties regarding Alan's case: "First, he saw his father at a pornographic cinema. Then he realized that his mother was the cause of his father's having to go to such a place. Finally, he experienced impotence, brought on by the religion that his mother had taught him" (106). To these factors, two more should be added: His first memory of riding on a horse turns out to be a disaster for him because of Frank's harsh interruption; Added to his former anxieties, now Dysart's bombardment of questions disturb, embarrass, and confuse Alan. These are the major anxieties which induce Alan to fall back on a number of defense mechanisms: Fantasy, Denial, Sublimation, Projection, Rationalization, Displacement, and Regression. Alan indiscriminately and awkwardly uses one or more of these defense mechanisms for each anxiety he encounters.

The religious trauma Alan finds himself in makes him restless. To fight back the pain and strain, he denies the norms of the society and creates an alternative life in his fantasies. **"**Tripped in an impoverished contemporary context, and caught

between the warring ideologies of his mother's Christianity and his father's atheistic socialism, Alan has sought escape in a unique form of self-created worship" (MacMurraugh-Kavanagh 91). By refusing to live by the rules set by his parents and the society, Alan establishes his own set of values, norms, and religion. Plunka blames particularly Mr. and Mrs. Strang for Alan's strange case since they "have tried to raise Alan according to conflicting philosophies, so it is no wonder that Alan has developed sexual and spiritual anxieties that culminated in psychiatric treatment" (160). Alan cannot cope with the demands of his parents and the outside world, and denies them by means of fantasies.

In the fantasy world he has established, he creates a new reality for himself: A pervert form of sexuality hidden behind a new kind of religion with a God, a temple, a holy book, and certain practices of worship. Dysart relentlessly tries to understand the world in Alan's fantasies. He gets Alan to play a game called "blink", which is a kind of hypnotism. He asks Alan to go back in time and think about the day when he saw Nugget on the beach. Nugget is in chains. Dysart wants Alan to ask Nugget whether its chains hurt him. Alan confirms:

DYSART. Like Jesus?
ALAN. Yes!
DYSART. Only his name isn't Jesus, is it?
ALAN. No.
DYSART. What is it?
ALAN. No one knows but him and me.
DYSART. You can tell me, Alan. Name him.
ALAN. Equus.
DYSART. Thank you. Does he live in all horses or just some?
ALAN. All. (*E* 66)

Especially with her mother's influence during his upbringing, Alan identifies God with Equus, the horse he creates in his fantasies. Just like God, Equus has some attributes: He is omnipotent and omnipresent. He suffers like Christ "for the sins of the world" (*E* 66). Religions and their sects usually have certain places for worship. Similarly, in Alan's worship, Equus has a temple of his own. Dysart finds out the holy place of Equus:

DYSART. Now: think of the stable. What is the stable? His temple? His Holy of Holies?
ALAN. Yes.

DYSART. Where you wash him? Where you tend him, and brush him with many brushes?
ALAN. Yes. (*E* 67)

The stable is the sacred place where Alan performs his prayers and religious practices.

Like many religions, Alan's worship has a particular book it follows: "Straw Law". Equus is "a mean bugger" according to Alan; he teaches Alan nothing, and leaves him on his own to learn everything. It is a very demanding book: "Ride-or fall! That's the Straw Law […] He was born in the straw, and this is his law" (*E* 67).

Alan also invents some rituals and methods of worship. During hypnosis, he explains and mimes everything for Dysart:

DYSART. What do you do, first thing?
ALAN. Put on his sandals.
DYSART. Sandals
[He kneels, downstage centre.]
ALAN. Sandals of majesty!... Made of sack.
[…]
DYSART. Then?
ALAN. Chinkle-chankle.
[He mimes picking up the bridle and bit.]
He doesn't like it so late, but he takes it for my sake. He bends for me. He stretches forth his neck to it.
[NUGGET bends his head down. ALAN first ritually puts the bit into his own mouth, then crosses, and transfers it into NUGGET's.] (*E* 69)

Late at night, Alan prepares Nugget for his so-called rituals, and takes it out into fields. He crosses himself; even in his fantasy, he reveals the extent of the influence of Christianity on him.

Alan puts on a pseudo-religious air while talking about or miming these rituals. Talking about his fantasies, he uses "sublimation" as his primary defense. Sublimation is "the displacement of the instinctual aim in conformity with higher social values" (Freud 52). Alan talks about his sexual practices as if they were religious ones. Horses mean much more than worship for Alan. Klein calls attention to this fact: "The horse was not only the object of his worship, but also his invitation to freedom and the source of his sexual release" (105). Jung states that the horse is often used as "a symbol of the animal component in man" (in MacMurraugh-

Kavanagh 91). The sexual orientation of his acts becomes obvious once he gets out of the stables with Nugget. In the fields, Alan takes his clothes off. He is totally naked, just like Nugget. He takes out a stick called "The Manbit":

> ALAN. The stick for my mouth.
> DYSART. Your mouth?
> ALAN. To bite on.
> DYSART. Why? What for?
> ALAN. So's it won't happen too quick.
> DYSART. Is it always the same stick?
> ALAN. Course. Sacred stick. Keep it in the hole. The Ark of the Manbit.
> DYSART. And now what?... What do you do now?
> [Pause. He rises and approaches NUGGET.]
> ALAN. Touch him […] All over. Everywhere. Belly. Ribs. His ribs are of great value!... His flank is cool. His nostrils open for me. His eyes shine. They can see in the dark… Eyes! (*E* 71).

"Alone and naked at midnight on Equus, Alan freed both himself and his horse from society's restrictions" (Klein 105). The statement "It won't happen too quick" has sexual implications. Alan uses the stick to avoid early ejaculation. Then he touches Nugget and his worship continues with overtly sexual elements.

Alan combines sexual and religious images to create his own understanding of religion. He wants to be one with the horse, just like the riders in pagan stories. He cries: "Feel me on you! On you! On you! On you! / I want to be in you! / I want to BE you forever and ever!- / Equus, I love you! / Now!- / Bear me away! / Make us One Person!" (*E* 74). He wants to unite with his God and become one. He is deeply under the influence of what his mother has taught him so far. Nevertheless, MacMurraugh-Kavanagh points out the distinction between Alan's and Dora's understandings of religion:

> Dora's Christianity was seen to involve a radical breach between God and man, but when Alan, seated on the back of his tangible God, states "Two shall be one", he creates a fusion between traditionally disparate elements. When horse and rider become one entity, the oppositions between man and animal, man and god dissolve. (112)

Alan, in his own religion, concretizes God and internalizes him, which would be more than blasphemy in the fanaticism of Dora's version of Christianity.

Alan's fantasy is a denial of and defense against the conflict between the

teachings of his mother and the conservatism of his father. Miller alleges that fantasy is employed as a defense to "obliterate awareness of a painful sight or reinterpret it in accordance with wishful fantasy. Denial in fantasy is such a mechanism. It helps to distort observable facts" (20).

The disturbance of seeing his father at the pornographic film is a turning point for Alan. To deal with his unquiet mind, he defends himself with projection. Frank begins shouting at Alan and they get out of the cinema to talk. Alan felt "agitated": "We just stood there by the bus stop—like we were three people in a queue, and we didn't know each other. Dad was all white and sweaty. He didn't look at us at all. It must have gone on for about five minutes. I tried to speak […] He just went on staring, straight ahead. It was awful" (*E* 93-94). Especially that Frank pretends to be at the cinema just for business and that he degrades the movies shown there embarrasses Alan. Alan is ashamed and scared, and he trembles during all the way he walks home. His fear later turns into a recognition: He notices that his father was as much scared as he was. He understands that all the airs his father puts on are just pretence.

This new awareness activates Alan's projection; a defence mechanism "in which basically sexual or aggressive impulses intolerable to the individual possessing them are attributed to an outside person or agency (Brown 71). Alan projects his repressed feelings on the people he sees in the street; now he regards all people as human beings, who have sexual desires and make love. He can see people stripped off their social standings and roles. Just like other men, his father is "a man with a prick", too. He reflects on his father and understands "how he was nothing special—just a poor old sod on his own" (*E* 96). Only with this incident can Alan realize that people are not what they appear to be. This new awareness relieves him of his anxiety and conflicts. Now he can justify himself.

His new recognition is a turning point in Alan's life since it renders him a new understanding of people. However, it also leads to new anxieties in his life. For instance, he realizes that his father goes to pornographic movies due to his mother's neglect. The recognition of the hypocrisy of both his parents activates Alan's mechanism of rationalization and he finds a way to justify himself. Right after the incident at the cinema, he discovers the fact that his mother is responsible for his

father's pursuit of satisfaction. He accuses her of being "unfair to [his] dad" since she "doesn't give him anything" (*E* 96). Dora's religious stories also "become less acceptable when the young man sees that his parents contradict their own values. Everyone tries to be what they are not, but only Alan strives to understand and control his own life, free from the influence of others" (Plunka 161). He realizes that his father is just like him since they both have secrets.

Alan, by rationalizing, tries to justify his pervert religious and sexual desires. Rationalization "allows people to excuse their threatening and unacceptable behavior and thoughts (Allen 26). Dysart spots Alan's relief after his discovery of his parents' hypocrisy:

DYSART.	You were happy at that second, weren't you? When you realized about your dad. How lots of people have secrets, not just you?
ALAN.	[to DYSART] Yes.
DYSART.	You felt sort of free, didn't you? I mean, free to do anything?
ALAN.	[to DYSART, looking at JILL] Yes! (*E* 97)

That he sees the distinction between reality and appearances renders Alan an undue sense of freedom. He feels himself freed from the norms and values of the society he has been taught so far.

Alan's disappointments come out "in rapid succession" (Klein 106). Jill turns out to be another source of anxiety for Alan. To struggle with the stress of his impotence, he employs displacement as a defense strategy and transfers his fury to horses in the stables. With the new self-confidence he has acquired, Alan feels free to have sex with Jill. After the movie incident, he takes her to her house. On the way, he realizes that he wants her. However, Jill takes him to the stables, which intolerably disturbs Alan. He refuses being taken there:

ALAN.	[recoiling] No!
JILL.	Where else? They're perfect!
ALAN.	No!
	[…]
JILL.	Why not?
ALAN.	Them!
	[…]
ALAN.	[desperate] Them!...Them!...
JILL.	Who?

ALAN. Horses. (*E* 98-99)

Alan cannot sleep with Jill in the stables because he associates horses with religion and sex. He is afraid of being punished by Equus.

Jill "introduces Alan to the world of heterosexuality and thus brings about his failure, his shame, and finally his crime" (Klein 111). She takes Alan into the barn and closes the door. Alan is still anxious because of the presence of the horses. He hears the trampling of their hooves. The noise becomes louder and louder. The moment Jill kisses him, "the noise of EQUUS fills the place. Hooves smash on wood. ALAN straightens up, rigid. He stares straight ahead of him over the prone body of the girl" (*E* 101). Alan's disturbance and anxiety prevents him from making love with Jill. He admits his impotence to Dysart:

> When I touched her, I felt Him. Under me… His side, waiting for my hand… His flanks… I refused him. I looked. I looked right at her….and I couldn't do it. When I shut my eyes, I saw him at once. The streaks on his belly…[With more desperation.] I couldn't feel her flesh at all! I wanted the foam off his neck. His sweaty hide. Not flesh. Hide! Horse-hide!... Then I couldn't even kiss her. (*E* 102-103)

Alan is wedded to male horses, Nugget in particular. Thus, he cannot have sex with Jill. He is ashamed of having failed with her. Jill tries to calm him by explaining that impotence is quite normal. Alan does not listen to her. He is pretty angry. He demands Jill to leave him alone. He is so humiliated due to his failure that he threatens Jill not to tell anyone about it, yet he cannot attack or kill her.

Then he asks Equus for forgiveness, but Equus is furious: "Mine!... You're mine!... I am yours and you are mine!... Then I see his eyes. They are rolling! [NUGGET begins to advance slowly, with relentless hooves, down the central tunnel.] I see you. I see you. Always! Everywhere! Forever!" (*E* 105).

What disturbs Alan most is the feeling of being observed. When he was a child, the horse picture on his wall used to stare at him day and night. When he was seen by his father at the cinema, his father became the reason for his annoyance. Finally, Equus sees him kissing Jill. Alan has failed and Jill has seen everything. However, he cannot harm Jill. For this reason, Alan thinks Equus mocks him, which

drives him crazy. Alan associates his father and Jill with Equus; in other words, he uses displacement as a defense to get over the burden of disgrace. When an individual gets angry with someone, yet cannot express his feelings because "the other individual is someone no one would dare retaliate against […] one may take out his or her anger against the very next person or thing he or she happens upon in order to safely vent this rage" (Joseph 311-312). Similarly, Alan transfers his frustration to the horse. He cannot attack his father or Jill, so he decides to end Equus' omnipresence and omnipotence:

> ALAN. Eyes!... White eyes—never closed! Eyes like flames—coming—coming!... God seest! God seest!... NO!...
> [Pause. He steadies himself. The stage begins to blacken.]
> [Quieter.] No more. No more, Equus.
> [He gets up. He goes to the bench. He takes up the invisible pick….]
> [Gently.] Equus… Noble Equus… Faithful and True… Godslave… Thou-God-Seest-NOTHING!
> [He stabs out NUGGET's eyes.] (*E* 105)

Alan, by blinding Nugget and the other horses, ends the existence of a God and gains his freedom as well. He also disclaims the institutionalized religion. Klein argues that there are two reasons for this bizarre crime: "First, Equus saw [Alan] in his moments of failure and disgrace; second, he turned away from Equus, and like other Gods, Equus is jealous and vengeful. Alan knew that Equus would never allow him to be successful with a woman" (106). By blinding his God, he makes sure that there is no one else to watch and control him. Taylor gives a different account of the crime: "Alan's parents have forced him to suppress and so divert his normal sexual drives, so when he finds himself sexually involved with a girl at the stables where he works, his build-up of guilt finds expression in destructive action against the horse-god as embodiment of his own super-ego" (Taylor 30).

Alan is apprehensive because his first memory of a horse turns out to be a traumatic one for him due to his father's interruption. To deal with his nervousness about his feelings towards horses, he simply denies them. Frank is the representative of the norms and values of the society. He is a conservative and strict father. He forbids even watching TV at home. However, Dora secretly lets his son watch TV at

a neighbour's house, and teaches Alan hiding the truth. At a very young age, Alan learns that "What the eye does not see, the heart does not grieve over" (*E* 31). He applies the same philosophy when his father interrupts his first ride on a horse. A horseman helped Alan ride Trojan, but his father saw them and pulled Alan from the horseman's shoulders. Alan fell off the horse because of his father, and the adventure culminated in a disaster for the child. Alan is torn between his desires and the demands of his father. To deal with this conflict, he resorts to denial. From then on, he never tells anyone about his fondness of horses and he denies the fact that he rides:

DYSART. You know, I've never been on a horse in my life.
ALAN. [not looking at him] Nor me.
DYSART. You mean, after that?
ALAN. Yes.
DYSART. But you must have done at the stables?
ALAN. No.
DYSART. Never?
ALAN. No.
DYSART. How come?
ALAN. I didn't care to (*E* 42-43).

Alan denies the fact that he rides and he even pretends not to care about horses, which is clearly a sign of both denial and reaction formation.

As for Alan's post-crime anxieties, Dysart's presence and his consecutive questions take the lead. To cope with these questions, Alan uses regression as a defense method. He does not like being questioned, for he does not want to be judged over what he feels or what he has done. Even at the court, "any time anyone asked him anything", he only sang (*E* 20). This method is called regression; "The return to a lower form of functioning" to cope with intolerable anxiety and conflict (Freud in Joseph 53). Alan's childish defense lingers when Dysart attempts to learn why he has blinded the horses. When they first meet, Alan just keeps silent and does not respond to Dysart's questions. He has sung TV jingles to shut out the interrogation. He does not want to reveal his secret life lest Dysart should try to heal him. Then Dysart asks Alan about the word, "Ek", Alan cries out in his dreams:

DYSART. What is Ek?
[Pause.]
You shouted it out last night in your sleep. I thought

you might like to talk about it.

ALAN. [singing] Double Diamond works wonders,
Works wonders, works wonders!

DYSART. Come on, now. You can do better than that.

ALAN. [singing louder] Double Diamond works wonders,
Works wonders
For you! (*E* 37)

Once again Alan feels cornered by Dysart's question and he gets nervous. He realizes that Dysart gets closer and closer to his inner world. He responds to Dysart's question with the same tactic: He sings jingles not to hear him, a typical way of regression for him. His defense is an "infantile" one, whereby he feels in "a safe environment, free of threats and temptations" (Sjöbäck 233).

Imprisoned in an electrical shop to work, and surrounded by the conflicting demands and restrictions of his parents, Alan takes refuge in his fantasies, for he has got nothing else. Dysart believes that the worst thing to do to Alan is to take away his worship because "it's the core of his life" (*E* 81). Without his worship, Alan would be lost in nothingness. Only in the world he creates can he find his personal space and personal voice. Especially his midnight ride is of great value, Plunka asserts, since it is "a break with his mother's values-principles that confine the young man to a role or codified behavior defined by others" (158).

CHAPTER 4

CONCLUSION

Man is a social entity; he can never be considered outside the boundaries defined by it. Society is always determining and dominant; it shapes and controls individuals. However, its authority over individuals may not always yield beneficial effects. “Our self is never, in no society, fully identical with our social identity” and this discrepancy leads to conflicts and anxieties for man (Torre in Pauer-Studer, 114). These conflicts or restrictions imposed on man may be external, but sometimes they shift into inner constrictions, especially when individuals ineptly internalize the values of the society. In either case, having confronted undesirable feelings, man tries to find permanent solutions for his problems. Nevertheless, some problems may be beyond the individual’s capacity to cope with them; thus, they require alternative remedies. Then the individual would adopt some defense mechanisms to block out unwelcome feelings of anxiety, frustration, and disillusionment. However, defense mechanisms may not always generate the expected results. Overuse of these methods can be addictive, and the individual might lose his/her problem-solving skills in the long run. This loss can be finally catastrophic for the individual and produce irreversible damage. The most important conclusion of this study is that the defense mechanisms of these characters fail rather than heal their sufferings.

In *Woman in Mind*, Susan’s escape from her discontent to her fantasy world progressively becomes more serious till she crosses the line from sanity to insanity. Whether her hallucinations appear after her accident is not known, but they increase their influence on Susan day by day. During the early appearances of her dream family, the members of the family are very obliging. They exist to serve and please Susan. “When her [dream] family first emerges, they are a most engaging group, healthy, charming and totally dedicated, offering champagne, love and consideration. Pleasing Susan seems the object of their existence” (Holt 41). They serve as Susan’s defense mechanism against the social and inner restrictions troubling her. Whenever she feels disturbed and cannot cope with the demands of her real life, she calls for

their help and breaks off with her real life. “Dreamers and visionaries want to make a better life for themselves” (Pine 81). Susan uses her alternative identity, with an ideal family life, to soothe herself and satisfy her ungratified needs.

However, the members of her dream family slowly possess Susan and begin to appear even when she does not want them to. They gradually get out of her control, and begin to agitate and harm her. At the end of the play, her fantasies turn out to be a nightmare for her since imagination merges with reality. She can no longer discern what is real and what is not. The characters now become ghostly in a lunatic behaviour and appearance; they surround Susan, but they seem neither to notice nor hear her. She loses coherent expression of self as her speech becomes more and more slurred. “Susan gives a last despairing wail. As she does so, the lights fade to blackout” (*W* 92). Susan is able to breathe only in her fantasies; now that her dreams have turned into a nightmare, she does not exist any more.

In *Philadelphia, Here I Come!*, Gareth leads a highly dissatisfactory life. He does not possess his own house, his own job, or even his own life. After losing the girl he loves, he makes sure that there is nothing left for him to do in Ireland. He turns inward to lessen his pain and creates an alternate identity, with whom he dances, performs endless duets and various scenes from his life. By using “his alter ego as narrator, spectator, director, and co-star”, Gareth “seeks to distance himself from the miserable realities of his daily life and probable future, reconstructing them through energetic, nearly desperate play” (Gleitman in Kerwin 233-234). Not only his painful past but also his uncertain future disturbs him; that is why he needs to recreate both with his split identity. His life in the States will not bring him the freedom and satisfaction he looks forward to. There will be almost no change or improvement in his life. He will live with his relatives and have a job arranged by them. That life will not make much of a difference from his current life in Ireland. However, Gareth cannot foresee the pitfalls of his future.

Although his departure is imminent, Gar is still obsessed with his past. When he pretends to ignore it, his alternate self reminds him of his past, and Gareth fails to stop his continuous questioning. Self-questioning becomes a torture for Gareth. He is “prey to indeterminacy, to the finality of choosing, to irreconcilable ambivalences” (O’Brien 47). Even when he has few hours left to set out, his oscillation lingers,

which indicates that his defense mechanism has failed. The play ends with his agonising cry of indecision, "I don't know. I—I—I don't know" (*P* 110). Indecision becomes more traumatic for Gareth than the miseries of his life in Ireland.

In *Equus*, Alan is a prisoner behind the iron bars of the society and its institutions, mainly his parents. He owns as few things as a prisoner does: He has got no friends, no education, no hobbies except for his horse riding. The midnight rides prove to be his only breaks out of his cell. To cope with his social and inner constrictions, Alan makes abortive attempts to employ various mechanisms of defense. The major defense he makes use of is his fantasy world, in which he worships horses both as religious and sexual idols. What he creates turns out to be an alternative world and life style, which is highly unlike his real one. He takes refuge in his dream world only after midnight in total secrecy. During the day, he works in an electrical shop, and leads a very dull life, which is actually the expectation of his parents and the society. Thus, he leads two different lives with two different identities. However, his split identity renders him more than pleasure and relief. "Establishing one's own brand of worship can be disastrous", Shaffer claims; for Alan is finally destroyed by the external forces that instruct him that it is more important to conform to the accepted and acceptable norms than it is to create his own personal identity. The norms and values of the society triumph over Alan, and they are partly responsible for the crime he commits. His late coming recognition of the hypocrisy of people, and the sense of freedom accompanying it also bring on his final downfall.

Dysart, representative of the society, is entitled to heal Alan back to normality. However, Dysart is far from being able to solve even his own inner conflicts. Although he does not believe that there is "normality", he has to fit Alan into the straight jacket of the society. He must make Alan forget about what he has so far believed in, Equus in particular, but he knows that Alan will not be easily saved from his attachment to Equus. When and if Equus leaves, it will be with Alan's "intestines in his teeth", that is, it will cause inestimable damage to him (*E* 107). Dysart knows that once an individual steps out of his ordinary life imposed on him by the society, he may never be able to come back. To function with self-satisfaction again in that life would be impossible. Alan is to turn into an empty shell, a robot.

Although the other selves created by these characters turn out to be damaging, to obliterate them is very difficult. Individuals with multiple identities have a "certain I-sense" in each of their personalities and none of these split identities can be destroyed in any way. "It is in fact impossible to murder the inner phantom 'self' although it is possible to cut one's throat. A ghost cannot be killed" (Laing 158).

Susan, Gareth, and Alan make various attempts to recreate their lives. However, the self exists only in strong relation to real people and things. If it is "transcendent, empty, omnipotent, free in its own way, [it] comes to be anybody in phantasy, and nobody in reality" (Laing 142). These characters try to maintain their existence as somebody, but they fail in the end. Moreover, while creating a personal space for themselves in their fantasies, they yearn to satisfy their sense of pleasure and happiness. However, they become disillusioned in their desire to be happy in an unreal world of their own making.

Another conclusion to be drawn from this study is the criticism of the shortcomings and the hegemony of the society through the depiction of individuals viewed outside the personality structure, from their own viewpoint. By giving voice to Susan, Gareth, and Alan, these plays question and deconstruct what is considered normal in society. With its tools of socialization, society shapes individuals and marginalizes anything and anybody different. It does not let people achieve "self-realization", that is the development of the intrinsic human potentialities (Horney 1970 17). If individuals cannot achieve self-realization, they dissociate with the outside world and create alternate lives. The life and the self they create are the idealized life and self which they cannot realize in real life. Horney calls self-idealization, when it involves the need for perfection, neurotic ambition, and the need for a vindictive triumph, "the search for glory" (24). Susan's, Gareth's, and Alan's search for glory has got nothing to do with self-realization or self-glorification since it is mostly influenced by popular culture and media.

Susan is victimized by the standards of "self-idealization" established by social constructs imposed by popular culture and media. The life Susan aspires is a typical life depicted in Hollywood romances: An affectionate and charming husband; a beautiful and obedient daughter; a charismatic and good-looking brother; and a manor house with a huge garden and a lake in it. Such a life style is not peculiar to

Susan; it has been imposed on her by various constraints of culture and media. Therefore, Susan's search for glory is not directed by her own aspirations, but by the upper-class life standards determined by the society.

Gareth cannot achieve his self-idealization in Ireland. He cannot stand on his own feet and he loses the girl he loves since he thinks he cannot afford a satisfactory life for her. He looks forward to his new life in the States as if it would change everything in his life. However, the life in Philadelphia will not bring any change, and the capitalistic system will haunt him wherever he goes. The apparent life he imagines he will have in Philadelphia is the product of popular culture and media. Opportunities to have his own business in future, many girls waiting for him, and the luxury and freedom are the illusions created by capitalism. Gareth's vain search for glory will end in new anxieties and disillusionments for him.

Alan is deprived of the right to determine his idealized self and realize it. His parents, the agents of society, decide what he will do and even where he will work. With their oppressive attitudes, his parents even try to determine who he is. Society avoids Alan's self-realization, marginalizes him especially in terms of sexual orientation, and imposes heterosexuality on him. He is not allowed to exist as a dissimilar individual in society; he has to be assimilated. Capitalistic system would rather not have differences in itself, and zoophilia is not a desirable trait since it is different. That is why Alan temporarily thinks he should like a girl and attempts to sleep with Jill. Heterosexuality is not what Alan yearns for; it is the construct of popular culture and media. The use of Dysart in the play supports the social criticism prevalent in the play. Even though he represents the standards of normality, he questions what is normal and does not want to heal Alan back to normality. Even if there is something called normality, it is not an attractive feature according to Dysart as long as it renders no satisfaction, and allows no tolerance for individual differences.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Ayckbourn, Alan. *Woman in Mind*. London: Faber and Faber, 1986.

Friel, Brian. *Philadelphia, Here I Come!* London: Faber and Faber, 1965.

Shaffer, Peter. *Equus*. London: Penguin, 1977.

Secondary Sources

Adler, Patricia A. and Peter Adler. *Peer Power: Preadolescent Culture and Identity.* New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1998.

Allen, Bem P. *Personality Theories: Development, Growth, and Diversity.* London: Allyn and Bacon, 1997.

Billington, Michael. *MacMillan Modern Dramatists: Alan Ayckbourn.* London: Mac Millan, 1990.

Brown, J. A. C. *Freud and the Post-Freudians.* London: Cassell, 1963.

Cawthon, Dan. "Images Of Transcendence In The Plays of Brian Friel." *The Journal of Religion and Theatre*. 3.1 (2004): 151-160 pp. 16 May 2006 <http://www.rtjournal.org/vol_3/no_1/cawthon.html>.

Cooke, Virginia and Malcolm Page, eds. *File on Shaffer.* London: Methuen,1987.

Douglas, Jack D. *An Introduction to Sociology: Situations and Structures.* New York: The Free Press, 1973.

Dukore, Bernard F. *Alan Ayckbourn: A Casebook.* London: Garland, 1991.

Eiser, J. Richard. *Social Psychology: Attitudes, Cognition and Social Behaviour.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1986.

Ellenberger, Henri F. *The Discovery of the Unconscious: The History and Evolution of Dynamic Psychiatry.* N.Y: Basic Books Inc, 1970.

Esman, H. Aaron. *Adolescence and Culture.* New York: Columbia UP, 1990.

Foucault, Michel. Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason. London: Routledge, 1965.

Freud, Anna. *The Ego and the Mechanisms of Defense*. Madison: İnternational UP, 1966.

Gianakaris, C.J. *Peter Shaffer: A Casebook.* London: Garland, 1991.

Hawthorn, Jeremy. *Multiple Personality and the Disintegration of Literary Character: From Oliver Smith to Sylvia Plath*. London: E.Arnold, 1983.

Herdman, John. The Double in Nineteenth-Century Fiction. London: MacMillan, 1990.

Holt, Michael. *Alan Ayckbourn.* Plymouth: Northcote House, 1999.

Horney, Karen. *Self-Analysis.* New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1968.

Horney, Karen. *Neurosis and Human Growth: The Struggle Toward Self-Realization*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1970.

Joseph, Rhawn. *The Right Brain and the Unconscious: Discovering the Stranger Within*. New York: Plenum Press, 1992.

Kalson, Albert E. *Laughter in the Dark: The Plays of Alan Ayckbourn.* London: Associated UP, 1993.

Kerwin, William, ed. *Brian Friel: A Casebook*. London: Garland, 1997.

Klein, A. Dennis. *Peter Shaffer: Revised Edition.* New York: Twayne, 1993.

Laing, R.D. *The Divided Self: An Existential Study in Sanity and Madness.* Middlesex: Penguin, 1965.

MacMurraugh-Kavanagh, M.K. *Peter Shaffer: Theatre and Drama.* London: MacMillan, 1998.

McGrath, F.C. *Brian Friel's (Post)Colonial Drama*: *Language, Illusion, and Politics.* New York: Syracuse UP, 1999.

Miller, Daniel R. and Guy E. Swanson. *Inner Conflict and Defense*. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1960.

O'Brien, George. *Brian Friel.* Boston: Twayne, 1990.

Pauer-Studer, Herlinde, ed. *Norms, Values, and Society*. Dordrecht: Kluwer

Academic Publishers, 1994.

Pine, Richard. *Brian Friel and Ireland's Drama.* London: Routledge, 1990.

Plunka, A. Gene. *Peter Shaffer: Roles, Rites, and Rituals in the Theater.* London: Associated UP, 1988.

Rank, Otto. *The Double: A Psychoanalytic Study.* Harry Tucker, ed. Chapel Hill: N.Carolina UP, 1971.

Robertson E. Rachel "The History of Dissociative Identity Disorder." *UCLA Undergraduate Psychology Journal.* 1.2 (2003). 16 May 2006 <http://www.studentgroups.ucla.edu/upj/spring2003/rachelrobertson.html>

Sayers, Janet. *Mothers of Psychoanalysis.* New Yowk: W. W. Norton & Company, 1991.

Sjöbäck, Hans. *The Psychoanalytic Theory of Defensive Processes.* New York: Halsted Press, 1973.

Slethaug, Gordon E. The Play of the Double in Postmodern American Fiction. Illinois: S.Illinois UP, 1993.

Strengell, Heidi. "The Monster Never Dies":An Analysis of the Gothic Double in Stephen King's Oeuvre." *Americana: The Journal of American Popular Culture (1900-present)* 2.1 (2003) 16 May 2006 <http://www.americanpopularculture.com/journal/articles/spring_2003/strengell.htm>

Sturges, James W. "Frequently Asked Questions About Clinical Psychology." csupomona.edu. 16 May 2006. <http://www.csupomona.edu/~jwsturges/clinicalfaq.html>.

Taylor, Russell John. *Writers & Their Work.* Ian Scott-Kilvert, ed. Edinburgh: Longman, 1974.

Watson, Ian. *Conversations with Ayckbourn.* London: Faber and Faber, 1988.

Zuckerman, Marvin. *Vulnerability to Psychopathology: A Biosocial Model.* Washington DC: American Psychological Association, 1999.