



ANKARA
HACI BAYRAM VELİ ÜNİVERSİTESİ
LİSANSÜSTÜ EĞİTİM ENSTİTÜSÜ

**THE REPRESENTATION OF SPLIT SELVES IN
CONTEMPORARY IRISH DRAMA:
SCHIZOANALYTICAL READINGS OF BRIAN FRIEL'S
PHILADELPHIA, HERE I COME!, FRANK
MCGUINNESS'S *OBSERVE THE SONS OF ULSTER
MARCHING TOWARDS THE SOMME* AND MARINA
CARR'S *WOMAN AND SCARECROW***

Merve HANÇER

Thesis Advisor

Assist. Prof. Dr. Yiğit SÜMBÜL

**MASTER'S THESIS
DEPARTMENT OF WESTERN LANGUAGES AND
LITERATURE
DIVISION OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE**

AUGUST 2022



**THE REPRESENTATION OF SPLIT SELVES IN CONTEMPORARY
IRISH DRAMA: SCHIZOANALYTICAL READINGS OF BRIAN
FRIEL’S *PHILADELPHIA, HERE I COME!*, FRANK MCGUINNESS’S
*OBSERVE THE SONS OF ULSTER MARCHING TOWARDS THE
SOMME*, AND MARINA CARR’S *WOMAN AND SCARECROW***

Merve HANÇER

MASTER'S THESIS

**DEPARTMENT OF WESTERN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURE
DIVISION OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE**

**ANKARA HACI BAYRAM VELİ UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE INSTITUTE**

AUGUST 2022

ETİK BEYAN

Ankara Hacı Bayram Veli Üniversitesi Tez Yazım Kurallarına uygun olarak hazırladığım bu tez çalışmada; tez içinde sunduğum verileri, bilgileri ve dokümanları akademik ve etik kurallar çerçevesinde elde ettiğimi, tüm bilgi, belge, değerlendirme ve sonuçları bilimsel etik ve ahlak kurallarına uygun olarak sunduğumu, tez çalışmada yararlandığım eserlerin tümüne uygun atıfta bulunarak kaynak gösterdiğimi, kullanılan verilerde herhangi bir değişiklik yapmadığımı, bu tezde sunduğum çalışmanın özgün olduğunu, bildirir, aksi bir durumda aleyhime doğabilecek tüm hak kayıplarını kabullendiğimi beyan ederim.

Merve HANÇER

10.08.2022

THE REPRESENTATION OF SPLIT SELVES IN CONTEMPORARY IRISH DRAMA:
SCHIZOANALYTICAL READINGS OF BRIAN FRIEL’S *PHILADELPHIA, HERE I
COME!*, FRANK MCGUINNESS’S *OBSERVE THE SONS OF ULSTER MARCHING
TOWARDS THE SOMME*, AND MARINA CARR’S *WOMAN AND SCARECROW*
(MA Thesis)

Merve HANÇER

ANKARA HACI BAYRAM VELİ UNIVERSITY
THE INSTITUTE OF GRADUATE STUDIES

August 2022

ABSTRACT

While the Irish struggled to liberate themselves from the oppression of their colonizer, England, and claim their independence, Irish people found themselves entrapped within the social structures—institutions—of Irish society. These institutions such as family, church, state, gender and social class set the rules for proper conduct for Irish people. In the face of such impositions and societal assertiveness, Irish people experienced an ‘identity crisis’ splitting their selves into two as their true self, whom they reveal to no one but themselves; and their social self, who is conformist and submissive, in order to align with the salient social identities. However, all the characters dealt with in this thesis – Gareth O’Donnell, Kenneth Pyper and Woman – attempt to disavow the rules and laws of these institutions to preserve their identities. These characters, in Brian Friel’s *Philadelphia, Here I Come!*, Frank McGuinness’s *Observe the Sons of Ulster Marching Towards the Somme* and Marina Carr’s *Woman and Scarecrow*, experience a splitting of the self and appear on the stage with their defying the power wielded by the institutions so as not to be cornered by their rules and laws. This thesis, by dealing with taboo subjects such as family, nationalism, gender and social class in Irish society as reflected in Brian Friel’s *Philadelphia, Here I Come!*, Frank McGuinness’s *Observe the Sons of Ulster Marching Towards the Somme* and Marina Carr’s *Woman and Scarecrow*, will examine the split selves of the three main characters in these plays with regards to Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari’s theory of schizoanalysis. The theory of schizoanalysis regards the notion of ‘split self’ into social and self-identity as an escape from social and political pressures rather than a mental illness. In addition, this theory considers ‘split self’, or ‘schizophrenia’ in a more general sense, as individuals’ ability to escape from oppression and to externalise and realise their suppressed desires. In this thesis, the main characters’ splitting and their appearance on the stage alongside their split selves that they cannot reveal in the society will be analysed independently of their psychiatric and clinical context, but as a result of the characters’ defying the rules imposed on them by social, cultural and political institutions and their attempt to emancipate themselves from social oppression as Deleuze and Guattari put forward.

Science Code : 31316
Key Words : Philadelphia, Here I Come!, Observe the Sons of Ulster Marching
Towards the Somme, Woman and Scarecrow, schizoanalysis, schizo,
split
Pages : 113
Supervisor : Assist. Prof. Dr. Yiğit SÜMBÜL

ÇAĞDAŞ İRLANDA TİYATROSUNDA BÖLÜNMÜŞ KİŞİLİK TEMSİLLERİ: BRIAN FRIEL’İN VER ELİNİ YENİ DÜNYA, FRANK MCGUINNESS’İN SOMME’A DOĞRU İLERLEYEN ULSTER’İN EVLATLARINA BAK VE MARINA CARR’IN KADIN VE KORKULUK OYUNLARINA DAİR ŞİZOANALİTİK BİR OKUMA
(Yüksek Lisans Tezi)

Merve HANÇER

ANKARA HACI BAYRAM VELİ ÜNİVERSİTESİ
LİSANSÜSTÜ EĞİTİM ENSTİTÜSÜ

Ağustos 2022

ÖZET

İngiltere’nin İrlanda’da yıllar süren sömürgeciliği sonrasında İrlanda halkı bağımsızlığını ilan etmek ve sömürgeciliğin boyunduruğundan kurtulmak isterken, kendilerini, İrlanda toplumunu şekillendiren sosyal kurumların baskısı altında bulmuştur. Bu süreç içerisinde, devlet, aile, din, cinsiyet ve sosyal sınıf gibi köklü kurumlar, İrlanda’da sosyal değerler üzerine kurularak toplumu şekillendiren baskıcı bir rol haline gelmiştir. Sömürgeciliğin yıkıcı etkisinden henüz kurtulamamışken, kendi toplumlarında böylesine bir sosyal baskı ile karşılaşan İrlanda halkı ciddi bir kimlik sorunu yaşamaya başlamıştır. Sosyal kurumların uygulamış olduğu bu psikolojik baskı sonucunda ise İrlandalılar kimliklerini sosyal ve öz kimlik olarak ikiye ayırarak toplumda kabul görmeyi amaçlamışlardır. Bu noktada, sosyal kimlikleri toplumun onlardan beklentilerini karşılarken öz kimlikleri ise bireylerin gerçek benliklerini, duygularını ve düşüncelerini dışa vurdukları kimlikleri haline gelmiştir. Bu tez, Brian Friel’in *Philadelphia, Here I Come!*, Frank McGuinness’in *Observe the Sons of Ulster Marching Towards the Somme* ve Marina Carr’ın *Woman and Scarecrow* adlı oyunları özelinde İrlanda toplumundaki tabulaşmış aile, milliyetçilik, cinsiyet ve sosyal sınıf konularını ele alarak, bu oyunlardaki üç ana karakterin kişilik bölünmelerini Gilles Deleuze ve Felix Guattari’nin şizoanaliz kuramı açısından inceleyecektir. Şizoanaliz kuramı bireylerin sosyal ve öz benliği olarak ikiye bölünmesini mental bir rahatsızlığın ötesinde sosyal ve politik baskılardan bir kaçış yolu olarak ele almaktadır. Bunun yanı sıra, bu kuram kişilik bölünmesini ya da daha genel anlamda şizofreniyi, bireylerin baskılardan uzaklaşmayı başarması ve bastırılmış arzularını dışa vurup gerçekleştirilmesi olarak ele alır. Bu tezde, oyunlardaki ana karakterler Gareth O’Donnell, Kenneth Pyper ve Woman’ın yaşadıkları kişilik bölünmesi ve toplumda dışa vuramadıkları ikinci şahsiyetleriyle birlikte sahnede belirmesi, psikiyatrik ve klinik bağlamından soyutlanarak Deleuze ve Guattari’nin ileri sürdüğü gibi toplumsal, kültürel ve politik kurumlar tarafından onlara dayatılan kuralları reddetmelerinin ve kendilerini toplumsal baskılardan özgür kılmaya çalışmalarının bir sonucu olarak incelenecektir.

Bilim Kodu : 31316
Anahtar Kelimeler : Ver Elini Yeni Dünya, Somme’a Doğru İlerleyen Ulster’in Evlatlarına Bak, Kadın ve Korkuluk, şizoanaliz, şizofreni, bölünmüş kişilik, sosyal kurumlar
Sayfa Adedi : 113
Tez Danışmanı : Dr. Öğr. Üy. Yiğit SÜMBÜL

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor, Assist. Prof. Dr. Yiğit Smbl for his patient guidance, excellent supervision, and invaluable support throughout my thesis. I would like to thank him for providing me with helpful feedback and advice about my thesis. His support and belief in me encouraged me during this difficult journey.

I extend my heartfelt thanks to Dr. Colin Swatridge who has always encouraged and supported me. Without his academic guidance and constructive suggestions, I would not have come this far. I believe that my words to express my gratitude to him will be inadequate. I would like to thank Prof. Dr. Deniz Bozer whom I have enormously learned from during my undergraduate courses. I also feel privileged to have attended her Irish Drama course at Hacettepe University. I am forever indebted to her for introducing me to Irish Studies. I owe a special thanks to Prof. Dr. Selma Elyıldırım and Assist. Prof. Dr. İmren Yelmiş who provided me with valuable critical feedback. This has contributed a lot to the discussion in my thesis.

And last, but always first, my special thanks go to my family. I feel indebted to my mother, Asiye HANÇER, my father Halil İbrahim HANÇER and my sisters for their unconditional love, constant support, encouragement, and everlasting faith in me during the writing process of this thesis.

I dedicate this thesis to my dearest mother and father.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Sayfa
ABSTRACT.....	iv
ÖZET	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vii
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. THEORETICAL AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND TO GILLES DELEUZE AND FELIX GUATTARI'S CONCEPTION OF SCHIZOPHRENIA.....	15
3. SPLITTING AWAY FROM THE FATHER-LAND: FAMILY AND NATION AS SCHIZOPHRENOGENIC FORCES IN BRIAN FRIEL'S PHILADELPHIA, HERE I COME!.....	27
4. SPLITTING OUT OF CLASS: FAMILY AND SOCIAL CLASS AS SCHIZOPHRENOGENIC FORCES IN FRANK MCGUINNESS'S OBSERVE THE SONS OF ULSTER MARCHING TOWARDS THE SOMME.....	49
5. SPLITTING OFF FROM DOMESTIC ROLES: FAMILY AND GENDER AS SCHIZOPHRENOGENIC FORCES IN MARINA CARR'S WOMAN AND SCARECROW	73
6. CONCLUSION	97
REFERENCES.....	105
ÖZGEÇMİŞ	113

1. INTRODUCTION

“If Ireland had never existed, the English would have invented it; and since it never existed in English eyes as anything more than a patchwork-quilt of warring fiefdoms, their leaders occupied the neighbouring island and called it Ireland.”¹

Throughout history, Ireland has occupied a significant place not only for Irish people but also for English people. Englishmen withheld recognition of the existence of Ireland as a land and Irish people as a nation, and this raises an important question as to how an unrecognized country has become a focal point in British politics. Here, it is noteworthy to state that the issue behind the so-called Irish problem is that Ireland was indeed considered an inseparable part of Great Britain, which made the country a subset of the British Isles rather than a unified and self-governing country. As Ireland was Britain's first and oldest colony invaded by the Normans in 1066, Seathrún Céitinn (Geoffrey Keating), a 17th century historian, described the controversial state of Ireland as a country “never to be seen in itself, but as a flawed version of England.”²

Having been ruled by England and exposed to colonialism for centuries, the Irish have been not only on the brink of losing their identity but also their language. Notably, what ignited the most significant controversy between Britain and Ireland was when the English King, Henry VIII severed the country's ties with the Roman Catholic Church in 1534 and set up his version of Christianity, the Anglican Church. Due to Irish people's devotion to Catholicism, they never converted from what they believed to be the true form of belief and insisted on remaining Catholics, which has caused trouble ever since and made life tougher for Irish people. Nothing eased the tension between England and Ireland: on the contrary, the conflict increased dramatically in the mid-seventeenth century with the outbreak of a brutal civil war in England. As it was ruled by the British Crown, Ireland as a Catholic country was deeply affected by this civil war which was waged by a Protestant force under the leadership of Oliver Cromwell against England's Catholic-leaning king, Charles I. With the victory of the Protestants and beheading of Charles I, Ireland's position under the domination of England reached an impasse with no hope of liberation and self-governance. Cromwell

¹ Declan Kiberd, *Inventing Ireland: The Literature of a Modern Nation* (London: Vintage, 1996), 9.

² Kiberd, 14.

justified his action in the country thus: “I am persuaded that this is a righteous judgement of God upon these barbarous wretches.”³

From here onwards, “England was more determined than ever to keep control of Catholic Ireland. Much of the European continent was now under Catholic rule, and the English could not afford to let a Catholic Ireland join forces with their other enemies.”⁴ In dread of their waning authority in Europe and over Ireland, the British imposed severe sanctions on Ireland to prevent the Catholic Irish from gaining power. First, they applied the Penal Laws (1695), which denied all the civil rights to Irish Catholics, and as a result, the Irish had almost no social, cultural or political rights. In general, they were forbidden both to vote and secure a seat in the Parliament. They were also deprived of a proper education, taking jobs in government and entering professions such as lawyer, doctor or teacher. Should they attempt to object to any laws, they would be confronted with severe punishments, imprisonment or death.

Moreover, the British took control of Ireland that made the Irish people strangers in their native land. As stated in the Penal Laws, “Irish Catholics who made up 90% of Ireland’s population owned less than 10% of the land.”⁵ Taking into consideration the economic, political and social power of the Protestant English over the Irish, it would be fair to state that Britain continued to intensify the injustice in Ireland. Robert Kee, a writer and a historian, in his book titled *The Green Flag: A History of Irish Nationalism*, reveals the dire situation in Ireland under the domination of the Protestant landlords:

By unmeasurable screwing and racking their rents all over the kingdom, they have already reduced the poor people to a worse condition than the peasants in France, or the vassals in Germany or Poland. ‘Whoever travels this country’, ... ‘and observes the face of nature, or the faces and habits and dwellings of the natives will hardly think himself in a land where law, religion, or common humanity is professed.’⁶

Therefore, it is a fact that Ireland became a place of destitution and despair, and a gloomy and bleak atmosphere prevailed over the whole country as Swift observes in *A Modest Proposal*: “It is a melancholy object to those, who walk through this great town, or travel in the country, when they see the streets, the roads, and cabin doors,

³ Antonia Fraser, *Cromwell* (New York: Grove, 2001), 338.

⁴ Timothy J. Paulson, *Irish Immigrants* (New York: Facts on File, 2005), 14.

⁵ Virtual Label, ‘The Penal Laws’, Youtube, 28 August 2015.

⁶ Robert Kee, *The Green Flag: A History of Irish Nationalism* (London: Penguin, 2000), 44.

crowded with beggars of the female sex, followed by three, four, or six children, all in rags, and importuning every passenger for an alms.”⁷

In an attempt to overcome the English colonial mentality that was exhibited in Ireland for centuries and their way of colonizing the country, the awakening in Ireland regarding their social, cultural and political position came about in the late eighteenth century with the foundation of the United Irishmen in 1791 to demand the rights of Irish Catholics and “to press for relief acts from the penal laws by seeking to convince the state that Catholics could be loyal subjects.”⁸ They protested the English by unmasking the damage retained throughout Irish history as uttered by the United Irishmen: “We have no national Government— we are ruled by Englishmen, and the servants of Englishmen whose object is the interest of another country, whose instrument is corruption, and whose strength is the weakness of Ireland.”⁹

Having been inspired by the American and French Revolutions¹⁰ that occurred during the eighteenth century, the Irish people under the leadership of the United Irishmen protested the colonizers to restore their liberty in 1798 – but this attempt was a failure. However, in the second quarter of the nineteenth century, Ireland took one step forward with Catholic Emancipation in 1829, at the initiative of Sir Robert Peel lifting some obstacles¹¹ regarding the field of education and voting. At the same time, the emancipation was limited only to the Irish Catholics holding public offices. While the political changes were not sudden, it was vital to ease the suffering undergone by Irish people. Therein, the Irish came to a realization that to restore and regain their power and liberty, solely political changes fell short; but they needed to revive their culture, language and history.

While one might expect the situation to have got better after reaching a realization of the poor conditions and awareness raised by men of letters and scholars at the time, the situation that Ireland encountered never recuperated, but on the contrary, it became

⁷ Jonathan Swift, ‘A Modest Proposal’, in *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*, vol. 1 (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2012), 2633–39.

⁸ James H. Murphy, *Ireland, a Social, Cultural and Literary History 1791-1891* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 1997), 13.

⁹ Dennis Taaffe, *An Impartial History of Ireland from the Period of the English Invasion to the Present Time*, vol. 4 (Dublin: J. Christie, 1811), 314.

¹⁰ James Murphy H., *Ireland, a Social, Cultural and Literary History 1791-1891* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 1997), 12.

¹¹ James, 27.

much worse with the Act of Union in 1801. At this stage, Ireland lost its status as a separate kingdom and autonomous country, with a parliament of its own, but was entirely united with England under the name of the United Kingdom and Ireland. The main driving force behind this legislative enactment was to strengthen the power of England and to banish any idea of Ireland's breaking its ties with the British colonial power.

The Protestant landlords superseded the Catholic Irish farmers as a result of the Penal Laws and owned the land. In this regard, exercising and maintaining power in Ireland through these landlords, Britain became the authority over the country and, thus, the Irish people. The Protestant landlords told the local Irish farmers what crops to grow and which would be sent to England; they were well-aware of the fact that "the land on which these crops were raised belonged not to the Irish farmers who worked it but to the British landlords who owned it."¹² This practice rendered many poor Irish farmers poorer and had them work for either minimum wage or no payment. Therefore, having nothing to grow except potatoes to feed themselves, the Irish were obliged to depend on this crop, in very desperate poverty, in order to survive their dire conditions. Nonetheless, the country came up against an extreme disaster from 1845 to 1852, the Great Famine, also known as the Great Hunger or Irish Potato Famine, causing about one million Irish deaths¹³ and emigration to countries such as the United States, Canada, and Australia. Since Irish people's staple food was the potato crop, the blight that caused the Great Famine was a catastrophe; it swept through and ruined the potato crop, leading to widespread starvation. Following the Great Famine, the poor Irish people were not supported by the British, and about a million Irish people died of starvation and sickness related to malnutrition. Sadly, according to the British, even famine, which was a natural catastrophe, was seen as a way of God's punishment for the corruption of Ireland and for Irish people's persistence in remaining Catholic. As noted in Terence Brown's book, *Ireland's literature: Selected Essays*, "English opinion, indeed, attributes Irish misery to the faults of the Irish themselves, to their insubordination, to their idleness and improvidence, and to their Popish religion."¹⁴

¹² Paulson, *Irish Immigrants*, 28.

¹³ David Ross, *Ireland: History of a Nation* (New Lanark: Geddes & Grosset, 2002), 226.

¹⁴ Terence Brown, *Ireland's Literature: Selected Essays* (Mullinger: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 1989), 8.

With the dire hopelessness and desperate atmosphere that prevailed over the country and people, many Irish could not find a better way than to migrate from their homeland.

However, this crisis was turned into an opportunity by the colonizer, England, to justify her colonial position over Ireland, “an opportunity to facilitate various long-desired changes within Ireland,”¹⁵ as Christian Kinealy observed. They attributed all the negative connotations to Ireland in an attempt to make the colonized further dependent on the colonizer. Regarding Irish people as backward-looking and incapable of maintaining their lives without the help of a stronger country, the English, indeed, established the basis for the colonization. To be assured that they were not capable of governing themselves, the Irish were cast as sensitive and having feminine qualities to foreground their inefficiency to provide for themselves. Seamus Heaney, Irish poet and playwright, indicates the position and role of Ireland in the face of England in his poem “Ocean’s Love to Ireland”:

Speaking broad Devonshire,
Raleigh has backed the maid to a tree
As Ireland is backed to England.
And drives inland [...].¹⁶

That is to say, “the familiar contrast between imperial England and untamed Ireland is re-cast as a contrast between male and female, the contemporary calamity being understood as the inevitable outcome of an historic sexual assault.”¹⁷

Moreover, Matthew Arnold, who lived during the Victorian era and served as a cultural critic, commented on the issue of colonialism in Ireland, not apologizing for Britain’s violation of Ireland but rather exhibiting the act as a task for the well-being of the Irish people, so as “people went about their daily business, that their condition improved, that things settled down, that the country became peaceful and prosperous and that gradually all remembrance of conquest and confiscation died out”.¹⁸ No matter how

¹⁵ Christine Kinealy, *This Great Calamity: The Great Irish Famine 1845-52* (Gill & Macmillan Ltd, 2006), 353.

¹⁶ Heaney Seamus, *North* (London: Faber and Faber, 1975), 40.

¹⁷ Terence, *Ireland’s Literature*, 11.

¹⁸ Matthew Arnold, *Irish Essays: And Others* (London: Smith, Elder & Co., 1891), 6.

the British attempted to justify their deeds, it is a fact that England used brute force over Ireland for the Irish people to acknowledge Britain's existence and role in the country. In this regard, constructing false images, such as "the Irish people being sensitive, poetic and sentimental [whereas] the English (or Scots) are steady, sober, fitted to rule,"¹⁹ the English strengthened their position in the land of another nation and race. In line with this purpose, the colonizer weakened the colonized making them feel inferior and backward; and therein, it established British culture, language and traditions in the country to demonstrate its dominance.

In pursuit of domination, the English attempted to suppress the history, traditions, culture and even the language of Ireland, or in other words "the oppressed", in just the same way as Britain treated overseas countries in Africa and India whose skin colour, religion and traditions were entirely different from those in Britain. With Britain's desire to pursue colonization over Ireland, they, at first, imposed the English language in Ireland by proscribing the usage of the Irish native language, Gaelic. According to Egenolf, "the usual visual marker of skin colour difference" used to "legitimate domination in other colonized societies" is absent, in Ireland difference is marked primarily through language."²⁰ Thereby, since language is considered as the embodiment of culture and the core value of a nation, the English language became a way to bring about cultural assimilation in Ireland.

However, while all these catastrophes befell the country, many of the Irish became aware of their distinctive identity and of their culture's being damaged and distorted by the colonizer. The colonized Irish people, for instance, were denied the practice of their own language, and even worse, became second-class citizens in their own land or servant to the British. As a consequence of this, they were almost silenced and convinced that their viability depended on England. As Matthew Arnold believed, "the reconciliation between Irish and English could only be achieved through a continuing Irish political subordination. At their best the Irish, like Orientals, had child-like qualities and needed proper guidance."²¹

¹⁹ Terence, *Ireland's Literature*, 6.

²⁰ Susan B. Egenolf, 'Maria Edgeworth in Blackface: Castle Rackrent and the Irish Rebellion of 1798', *ELH*, JSTOR, 72, no. 4 (2005): 849.

²¹ Quoted in James H. Murphy, *Ireland, a Social, Cultural and Literary History 1791-1891* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 1997), 48.

The Irish people were well-aware of the fact that the revival of their culture and language was, indeed, a protest against the colonizer who denied the existence of the colonized culture and replaced their values with their own. As Froude aptly remarks:

The incompleteness of character is conspicuous in all they do and have done; in their history, in their practical habits, in their arts and in their literature. Their lyrical melodies are exquisite, their epic poetry is ridiculous bombast. In their lives of their saints there is a wild if fantastic splendour; but they have no history, for as a nation they have never produced a tolerable drama, it is because imagination cannot outdo reality. In the annals of ten centuries there is not a character, male or female, to be found belonging to them with sufficient firmness of texture to be carved into a dramatic outline [...]. The Irish are the spendthrift of the Aryan race.²²

As can be observed above, the Irish were despised and disregarded by the holders of power. They were condemned for not having a national history; this served the purpose of the colonizer, which was to shatter the nation and annex it. Having been exposed to discrimination and oppression for long years, the Irish suffered inevitable psychological damage. Thus, Irish people, as the oppressed nation, needed to reverse what they encountered in the past in order to restore the nation's spirit and self-confidence by reviving their culture and history, and particularly their language.

In this regard, literature became the fundamental point in their mission to put an end to the history of colonization. To Kiberd,

Eventually, Irish intellectuals deduced that the intent of English policy was straightforward: to create a "Sacsá nua darb anim Éire" (a new England called Ireland) This was undeniably true: but, because it remained an open space in which all kinds of desires and loathings might find their embodiment, Ireland also began to appear to English persons in the guise of their Unconscious. In that covert sense, the effect of official policy was the creation of a secret *England called Ireland*.²³

It would be fair to state that the real Irish, and Ireland, became something of a mystery, unknown to the British since the country and its people could not escape from the authority of England but remained in its shadow. Sadly, the Irish had no opportunity to express and represent themselves but rather were always expressed and represented by the English, leaving them no chance to re-invent the spirit of nation and take over their native soil. Thereby, the usage of literature seemed the only way to overcome the

²² James Anthony Froude, *The English in Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. vol.1 (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1872), 22–24, <https://archive.org/details/in.ernet.dli.2015.191138/page/n43/mode/2up>.

²³ Kiberd, *Inventing Ireland*, 15.

long-lasting effect of the trauma of colonization and find their lost roots. Having been defined as inferior and disqualified as well as presented as a foil to England, the Irish eventually seized a chance to offer a portrait of their lives through literature.

Seamus Heaney notes that “In Ireland, you cannot divorce the literary from the historical, from the political”²⁴ and in this respect, the Irish literature and politics become interwoven to convey the ideas of the Irish so they can free themselves from the stereotyped Irish image. To put it differently, Irish people have used literature as a tool to be heard, to revive their past and to rejuvenate their great nation. Froude, who attempts to attribute negative connotations to the Irish accentuating their sentimentality, unconsciously draws attention to their nationalistic fervour: “they are passionate in everything – passionate in their patriotism, passionate in their religion, passionately courageous, passionately loyal and affectionate”.²⁵ Therefore, with their loyalty and devotion to their country, they attempt to bring to life their history and culture by combining the issues of politics and nation with literature. Though the colonized were not blind to the malpractices and injustice of the English, the Irish underrated those malpractices.

With the waning authority of England over Ireland in the nineteenth century, the social and literary life came in sight, but the domination of England over the country remained and the English language maintained its popularity. Therefore, it would not be right to suppose that it was envisaged to use the literature as a tool to overthrow the existence of the Englishmen whose power permeated every field of Irish social, political and literary life. “It is commonly assumed that Irish literature in the nineteenth century was somehow a failure [and] ... in general the reason for this has been put down to the condition – the colonial condition – of Ireland itself.”²⁶ To some extent, Irish literature had heavily depended on the English language due to the country’s being gradually Anglicized, and thus most of the writers, artists and poets produced their works in English rather than in Gaelic.

²⁴ ‘Obituary: Heaney ‘the Most Important Irish Poet since Yeats.’, The Irish Times, 30 August 2013, <https://www.irishtimes.com/culture/books/obituary-heaney-the-most-important-irish-poet-since-yeats-1.1510684>.

²⁵ Froude, *The English in Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*.

²⁶ James H. Murphy, *Ireland, a Social, Cultural and Literary History 1791-1891* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 1997), 157.

However, one of the most crucial aspects of the Irish literary works was their dealing with the idea of “Irish identity” as they reached a point where the Irish were stripped of individuality and identity. Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin argue that it is at the point of displacement that a “postcolonial crisis of identity”²⁷ emerges. In this connection, identity crisis, cultural chaos and deterritorialization became some of the major issues in Irish literature.

Contrary to the popular belief suggesting that there was no Irish theatre dealing with Irish issues until the establishment of the Irish National Theatre, the enthusiasm and interest in drama in Ireland date back to the twelfth century and

[s]ince the seventeenth century, theatrical performance in Ireland has served as a site of social and political contest at home, and a product of cultural export abroad. Theatre from Ireland dominated anglophone dramatic writing and theatre practice, with many of the great English playwrights and actors, Goldsmith, Sheridan, Macklin, Woffington, Shaw and Wilde, actually having Irish roots.²⁸

Taking Irish literature’s abiding relation with drama into consideration, it is crucial to discuss why drama superseded other genres, such as poetry and novel, with particular attention to the recurring subject matters of Irish drama. As Esslin states in his book *An Anatomy of Drama*, “theatre is the place where a nation thinks in public in front of itself,”²⁹ which distinguishes it from other genres. Moreover, addressing and gathering the masses together, theatre, in general, plays a vital role. As one of the performing arts, theatre provides a realistic presentation of life and human nature. In the Irish context, it held up a mirror to society and its sorrow demonstrating the grim reality and awakening of the society regarding the injustice and malpractices of the English who had prevailed over Ireland for centuries.

Three distinct phases of Irish theatre can be identified to clarify the significance of drama, ranging from the revival of Irish nationalism (the Irish literary revival) under the leadership of William Butler Yeats and Lady Gregory, in the nineteenth century, at the Abbey Theatre; through Brian Friel, Thomas Kilroy, Hugh Leonard and Tom Murphy, who gave a particular character to the Irish stage with their thematic

²⁷ Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin, *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-Colonial Literatures* (London: Routledge, 1989), 8–9.

²⁸ Mary Trotter, *Modern Irish Theatre* (Cambridge: Polity, 2008), 7.

²⁹ Martin Esslin, *An Anatomy of Drama* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1976), 101.

concerns; to Anne Devlin, Marina Carr, Enda Walsh, Martin McDonagh and Frank McGuinness as the representatives of the third phase.

In general terms, the most striking feature of the first phase was the revival of Irish culture which had been dismissed by the colonizer. With the gradual increase of Anglicization in the country and loss of Irish identity which can be observed through re-naming of places and proper nouns, the cultural awareness that arose in Ireland aimed to bring back a supposedly glorious past, including Irish myths and the Gaelic language. In this regard, drama was used as a tool to draw the Irish together and to recapture the Irish national identity at the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth century with the foundation of the Abbey Theatre called at first the Irish Literary Theatre in 1899, but took its final name in 1904. With the leading figures of the Abbey Theatre, Lady Augusta Gregory (1852-1932), William Butler Yeats (1865-1939) and later on with the contribution of John Millington Synge (1871-1909) and Sean O'Casey (1880-1964), the Irish literary revival, or in other words, the 'Celtic Twilight' took shape, giving expression to a nationalist fervour. As regards the thematic concern of the first phase, Irish folklore, myths, legends, and Irish rural life were the characteristic subjects of the work of these pioneers. With Sean O'Casey's works, the Irish stage underwent a notable change from the myths and legends to political issues such as national independence and the struggle between the Unionists and Republicans as well as the setting being shifted from the countryside to urban Ireland. The representatives of the first wave continued to produce their works until the 1960s, or more specifically, until O'Casey's death in 1964.

While the political turmoil between Ireland and England cast a pall upon Ireland due to the Irish Free State in 1922, the radical change that the Irish witnessed during the 1940s ushered in a new age with regard to the political status of the country. The year 1948 put an end to Ireland as a British dominion, breaking all its Commonwealth ties. With the new chapter in Irish history, as the Irish Republic was born, the concern of the Irish playwrights dramatically altered from the national issues and specifically national identity to the issues that arose after the country's independence. In this regard, the works of the leading playwrights of the second wave mainly engaged with 'migration' and the problems of the fragmentation of the 'self' which will constitute the main subject and crux of this thesis. Kiberd aptly summarizes the second wave of

Irish drama in these words: “[it] was as if the old nationalist narrative was beginning to break down, and ‘Ireland’ once again became a problematic notion, as its people renewed their interest in its constituent parts.”³⁰

The second wave of Irish drama led to the third wave which almost severed its ties with national theatre stylistically, thematically and technically. It is believed that the third wave, “which critics have hailed as the new Irish Renaissance” began with Anne Devlin in the 1980s. The third wave encompasses Frank McGuinness, Martin McDonagh, Marina Carr, Anne Devlin, Conor McPherson, Marie Jones, Sebastian Barry, Billy Roche, Enda Walsh, and Mark O’Rowe.³¹ With regard to their thematic concerns, unlike the previous dramatists, the third wave dramatists veered away from the issues of national significance³² and concentrated on the contemporary problems. It is, therefore, worth highlighting that the third wave playwrights came to be regarded as the “alienated generation.”³³ Far from being limited to such issues as national identity, culture, politics and history, these concerns included societal codes, religion, female identity and the representation of women in Irish society. That is to say, Irishness has been regarded neither as a homogenous notion, nor as a discernible national identity, but rather as something individual, diverse and fluid. In this regard, these playwrights baffled the Irish audience who came to the theatre to watch a classical, identity-defining national theatre. “Irish drama has come and gone in waves since the founding of the Abbey Theatre and the Irish Literary Revival,”³⁴ nevertheless, what remained at the core of Irish drama was the problematisation of the notion of ‘identity’. Although Irish identity has occupied the major space in Irish literary history due to the ever-lasting impact of colonialism, not only the English but also some Irish dramatists such as McDonagh disown what many Irish fought for: ‘Irish identity.’ Gülşen Sayın puts it, according to McDonagh, one of the leading dramatists of the contemporary Irish drama, for example, claims that there was never

³⁰ Kiberd, *Inventing Ireland*, 496.

³¹ Ann Dillon Farrelly, “*It Depends on the Fella. And the Cat.*”: *Negotiating Humanness through the Myth of Irish Identity in the Plays of Martin McDonagh* (The Ohio State University, 2004), 5–7.

³² Christopher Murray, *Twentieth-Century Irish Drama: Mirror up to Nation* (Syracuse University Press, 2000), 7.

³³ Eileen Morgan, ‘Introduction: Re-Thinking the Abbey and the Concept of a National Theatre’, *A Century of Irish Drama: Widening the Stage*. Stephen Watt, Eileen Morgan, and Shakir Mustafiti. Eds. *Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana UP*, 2000, xviii.

³⁴ Farrelly, “*It Depends on the Fella. And the Cat.*”, 9.

an Irish identity and there never will be; for him, this Irish identity is just an illusion albeit a necessity to conquer their country from the colonial powers.³⁵

However, Yeats, Lady Gregory, O'Casey and Friel, in retrospect, accentuated the concept of Irishness regarding this identity as sacred; it was that from which the Irish people took their roots and where they would put their roots down in future. For these above-mentioned names, this established Irish identity was the key to their independent nation and the only way to disengage themselves from the oppression. As Farrelly argues:

Friel and other playwrights of his generation wrote of an Ireland that was searching for an identity in the rubble of the aftermath of both the figurative and literal wars for Irishness. With all of these playwrights, frustrations with the Irish people informed their work. They all dealt, in their own specific way, with the sorrows and struggles of the Irish, hoping against hope that the people would see their potential as a community to overcome the oppression. All of these playwrights looked to Irish identity as the cure-all—the magical elixir that would part the dark clouds of the stormy past and shed light on a new and more hopeful future.³⁶

Considering this statement, it would be fair to state that Irish identity has become an inseparable part of the Irish literary world, portrayed as a unified and coherent national identity specifically in the first wave of Irish drama. However, while Farrelly and other critics foreground the significance of Irish identity to foster nationalist enthusiasm and render it an act of colonial resistance, what many Irish literary critics and scholars are missing is that the notion of a unified and strict identity can also pave the way for the oppression of the individual. This is what this study aims to focus on, with reference to the three Irish plays: Brian Friel's *Philadelphia Here I Come!* (1964), Frank McGuinness's *Observe the Sons of Ulster Marching Towards the Somme* (1986) and Marina Carr's *Woman and Scarecrow* (2006). These Irish plays have been chosen for discussion because each in its own way represents the notion of the 'divided self': pressurised Irish characters who are unable to sustain their living according to their desires, on the one hand, under the oppression of totalizing identity categories, and on the other, of the oppressive institutions.

In this regard, the theory of 'schizoanalysis' put forward by Gilles Deleuze, a French philosopher, and Felix Guattari, a French psychoanalyst and political activist, is

³⁵ Gülşen Sayın, *Martin McDonagh Tiyatrosu* (Ankara: Nobel, 2009), 27.

³⁶ Farrelly, 8.

relevant to this study. D&G's³⁷ theory of schizoanalysis regards the notion of 'split self' not as a mental illness, but as an escape from social and political pressures inflicted upon the individual by 'the Oedipal and oedipalized territorialities' (such as family, church, school, nation and party as listed by D&G). In addition, this theory considers 'split self,' or 'schizophrenia' in a more general sense, as individuals' ability to externalise and realise their suppressed desires. In this thesis, the splitting of the protagonists in the plays in question and their appearance on the stage alongside their split selves that they otherwise cannot reveal in the society will be analysed independently of their psychiatric and clinical context, but as a result of the characters' defying the rules imposed on them by social, cultural and political institutions and their attempt to emancipate themselves from social oppression as Deleuze and Guattari put forward.

³⁷ As the names of Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari will be referenced throughout this thesis, their names will be stated only once and abbreviated for the rest of the thesis. The same rule will be applied to the three plays which will be dealt with in the thesis.



2. THEORETICAL AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND TO GILLES DELEUZE AND FELIX GUATTARI'S CONCEPTION OF SCHIZOPHRENIA

At first sight, the term “schizoanalysis” attracts attention due to its combining the words ‘schizo’ and ‘analysis’: together they lead to a common misconception. However, according to D&G, the word ‘schizophrenia’ does not come to mean a chronic mental disorder; and a schizophrenic is not someone who requires treatment in hospital or with medication. The term is used by D&G in a social and cultural, rather than a clinical, context: “a schizophrenic out for a walk is a better model than a neurotic lying on the analyst’s couch.”³⁸ Eugene W. Holland, in his book *Deleuze and Guattari’s Anti-Oedipus: Introduction to Schizoanalysis*, aims at clarifying their complex theory and simplifying their obscure jargon, which might perplex many, in the following words:

For schizoanalysis, schizophrenia is not the disease or mental disturbance characterizing or defining schizophrenics. Schizophrenics as clinical patients (and “schizophrenia” as a reductive and ill-conceived psychiatric diagnosis) result, on the contrary, from the incompatibility between the dynamics of schizophrenia unleashed by capitalism and the reigning institutions of capitalist society – including, *prima para omnes*, the institutions of psychiatry, psychoanalysis, and the nuclear family; hence the sub-title of *Anti-Oedipus*, “Capitalism and Schizophrenia.”³⁹

Deviating from the literal and dictionary meaning of ‘schizophrenia,’ – “a mental illness in which a person becomes unable to link thought, emotion and behaviour, leading to withdrawal from reality and personal relationships”⁴⁰ – D&G approach the term from a broader perspective, giving the condition social, historical and political dimensions. They explain their concept of ‘schizophrenia’ as follows:

what we call ‘schizophrenia’ was one of the forms in which, often through quite ordinary people, the light began to break through the cracks in our all-too-closed minds. Madness need not be all breakdown. It may also be breakthrough (...) The person going through ego-loss or transcendental experiences may or may not become in different ways confused. Then he might legitimately be regarded as mad. But to be mad is not necessarily to be ill, notwithstanding that in our culture the two categories have become confused.⁴¹

³⁸ Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, trans. Robert Hurley, Mark Seem, and Helen R. Lane (Minneapolis: Minnesota U.P., 1983), xvii.

³⁹ Eugene Holland, *Anti-Oedipus: Introduction to Schizoanalysis* (London: Routledge, 1999), 2.

⁴⁰ ‘Schizophrenia’, in *Oxford Learner’s Dictionary*, accessed 14 April 2022, www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/schizophrenia.

⁴¹ Deleuze and Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus*, 131.

In this regard, D&G point out their use of the term ‘schizophrenia’ differently from its commonly evoked medical-clinical meanings. By defining ‘schizophrenia’ as breakthrough, they stress the revolutionary feature of ‘the schizo’, a term they deploy to refer to a person who “escapes all Oedipal, familial, and personological references.”⁴² In so doing, the schizo distances himself/herself from the oppressive institutions and manages to “enable the desire to flow without being repressed.”⁴³ Eventually, the concept of ‘schizophrenia,’ in D&G’s terminology, takes its roots from a coined word (French *schize*), based on the Greek verb *schizein*, ‘to split’, ‘to cleave’, ‘to divide.’⁴⁴ In this respect, D&G use the term ‘schizo’ to describe someone whose identity/self is divided rather than the person’s having a mental disorder, which constitutes the focal point of this thesis. The schizo who cannot cope with the oppression of the above-mentioned territorialities that wield power over the individual finds no way but to divide his/her self. However, the schizoid condition is, of course, not a willed individual choice but rather a consequence of the oppression over the individual by powerful and authoritarian institutions.

In order to have a better understanding of the theory as well as the parallelism between the theory and the notion of ‘split self’ in the plays examined in the thesis, it is vital to return to the jargonistic language in D&G’s book. What makes D&G’s terminology so difficult is that their ideas are conflated with those of other theorists such as Derrida, Foucault, Lacan, Nietzsche, Marx and particularly Sigmund Freud whose psychoanalytic theory is indeed the main point of criticism in D&G’s book as well as of reference in the analysis of the plays in the thesis. Considering the long list of above-mentioned names as the influences on D&G, in this thesis Freud and his theory of the Oedipus complex will be dealt with as a psychoanalytic theory which constitutes one of the most provocative ideas for D&G’s approach to ‘schizophrenia.’ However, as a detailed analysis of Freud’s theory is not the main concern of this thesis, it will be analysed only to the extent that it concerns D&G.

In their book, *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, D&G discuss Freud’s works such as *The Interpretation of Dreams* and *Three Essays on the Theory of*

⁴² Deleuze and Guattari, 361.

⁴³ Beste Öztürk Bakacak, ‘Deleuze and Guattari’s Encounter with Beckett within the Context of Desiring Machines’ (Master’s Thesis, Middle East Technical University, 2014), 167.

⁴⁴ Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, trans. Robert Hurley, Mark Seem, and Helen R. Lane (Minneapolis: Minnesota U.P., 1983), 39.

Sexuality. It is evident from the title of their book, ‘Anti-Oedipus’, that D&G oppose what Freud suggests in his psychoanalytic theory and how he approaches ‘desire theory.’ They counter Freud’s approach to desire with such ferocity that even René Girard – a literary critic as well as philosopher who shares the same ideas with D&G against Freud – claims that D&G’s harsh criticism towards Freud is in his favour and only “aggrandizes”⁴⁵ him.

Developed by Freud in the late nineteenth century, the theory of psychoanalysis came into being in Freud’s two significant works: *Studies on Hysteria* (1895) and *The Interpretation of Dreams* (1899). Although he mentioned the idea of ‘desire’ in these books as a lost object which implies the sexes’ being different from one another, he developed his ideas in *An Outline of Psychoanalysis*; the book baffled many and stirred controversy by the way Freudian theory addressed desire.

In *An Outline of Psychoanalysis*, Freud brings forth the scandalous theory of ‘infantile sexuality’ regarding the Oedipus complex and, therein, he goes against the common belief about sexuality claiming “sexual life does not begin only at puberty, but starts with clear manifestations soon after birth.”⁴⁶ Making the most unexpected assertions, Freud believes that there are three stages: oral, anal and phallic which provide a certain sexual pleasure to the infants and help them construct their *self* and lead them to have a healthy psycho-sexual development. However, it is noteworthy at this point to state that these three stages may not succeed one another consecutively. For instance, one stage may follow the other one, they may overlap one another, or the three stages may appear concurrently.

The first stage is the oral stage and as indicated in the naming of the stage, the concern is focused on the mouth and the pleasure that the infant reaches through its mouth. Freud responds to the harsh criticism as regards his associating the oral stage with sexuality as follows: “the baby’s obstinate persistence in sucking gives evidence at an early stage of a need for satisfaction which, although it originates from and is stimulated by the taking of nourishment, nevertheless seeks to obtain pleasure independently of nourishment and for that reason may and should be described as

⁴⁵ René Girard, *Violence and the Sacred* (London: The John Hopkins University Press, 1979), 213.

⁴⁶ Sigmund Freud, *An Outline of Psychoanalysis* (New York: Norton, 1949), 9.

sexual.”⁴⁷ In this case, the breast becomes the mainstay of the sexual pleasure for the infant. The second stage, which is called the anal stage, features as a bridge between the first and the third stages. This stage represents the cutting of the teeth, development of the musculature along with the infant’s control of the bladder. The third stage – as the foremost stage – is the phallic stage in which the sexual pleasure of the breast has been replaced by the genitalia for the first time. The infant has come to realize the sexual difference between both sexes. Nevertheless, it is vital to assert that “what comes in question at this stage is not the genitals of both sexes but only those of the male (the phallus). The female genitals long remain unknown.”⁴⁸

The phallic stage is where the theory of the Oedipus complex comes in and where D&G’s criticism of Freud is rooted. Going through these three stages, the child indeed comes to the point where he faces the Oedipus complex as Freud calls it. It is in the phallic stage that the process in boys and girls differs. A boy enters the Oedipus phase fearing his father; because he desires his mother who becomes the first object of ‘desire.’ Therefore, the boy cannot help but be jealous of his father: he fancies killing his father out of desire for his mother. He is, however, well aware of the fact that when his father understands his desire towards his mother, he will be castrated. Since he finds no better alternative than protecting himself from the castration, he feels obliged to abandon the desire towards the mother whom he regards as a sexual object. As Freud argues, the fear in this case causes repression and the boy disposes of his incestuous desires yielding to his father, the power figure.

On the other hand, the process a girl undergoes through the phallic stage is very different from a boy’s. Unlike a boy who enters the Oedipus phase in the phallic stage, she enters the Electra phase in which she realizes the lack of a penis and envies boys for possessing it. As observed in the boy’s case, she also fantasises her mother as the sexual object and fears the father. Nevertheless, since she is aware of her lacking a penis, she finds out that she is already castrated. Therefore, she regards her mother as an enemy and directs her desires towards her father. In this regard, it is stated that “penis envy drives the girl to detach herself from her mother and to seek refuge in the

⁴⁷ Freud, 28.

⁴⁸ Freud, 11.

haven of the Oedipus complex.”⁴⁹ However, when she cannot find what she expected, she returns to her mother having no other choice.

Freud’s important points with regard to his approach to ‘desire’ are briefly analysed here, as D&G’s *Anti-Oedipus* is a critique of Oedipal desire. *Anti-Oedipus*, D&G’s best-known work, was published in 1972. In *Deleuze and Guattari*, Ronald Bogue argues:

A succès de scandale in 1972, the book generated heated disputes and violent polemics in France that have since reverberated, with varying degrees of intensity, across Germany, Italy, England, Australia, and the United States. The modern counterpart of *The Antichrist of Nietzsche*, *The Anti-Oedipus* (a more literal translation of its title) is a frontal assault on the contemporary form of piety known as the Oedipus complex. Although directed specifically against psychoanalysis, a pervasive force in French social and intellectual life in the late 1960s and early 1970s, *Anti-Oedipus* ultimately challenges every psychological theory that elevates family relationships and the unified self to positions of pre-eminence.⁵⁰

That is to say, this unconventional book, causing a stir at the time, not only revolts against the Oedipus complex but is also rooted in the political fervour manifested in the events of May 1968 throughout France that help D&G construct their theory. Having experienced a political turmoil which appeared in 1968 against fascism and the French Communist Party, D&G based their theory, schizoanalysis, on the events of May foregrounding the cultural, familial, libidinal, along with the economic and political domains as oppressors in a society. Unlike Freud, who positions the sexual desire and in this way the institution of ‘family’ at the core of his theory, D&G see the concept of ‘desire’ beyond libido, as rather social and political. By attempting to replace ‘psychoanalysis’ with “schizoanalysis,” D&G focus on ‘desire’ which is not generated inside but rather stimulated by exterior forces regarded as repressive structures of society. Thereby, D&G claim that “all desire is social rather than familial, and that the best guide to social desire is the schizophrenic id rather than the neurotic ego.”⁵¹

Ostensibly, D&G despised the negative context created by Freud who associated ‘desire’ with ‘tragic loss’ as well as who merely positions ‘desire’ as ‘sexual.’ Rather,

⁴⁹ Freud, 119.

⁵⁰ Ronald Bogue, *Deleuze and Guattari* (New York and London: Routledge, 1989), 83.

⁵¹ Bogue, 83.

they were immensely affected by what was happening in France regarding the social and political issues raised in the events of May '68. At that time, D&G came to the realization that familial and sexual desires, along with the theoretical perspective of Freud, fell short of explaining the current situation. Later on, Guattari came up with ideas such as the schizophrenic unconscious, the unconscious as a machine and the desiring machine to elucidate the situation of the modern man oppressed by power establishments, or 'territorialities'. When they were seeking to bring forth a new idea that could substitute or, even better, supersede Freud's understanding of the daddy-mommy-me triangle, they understood the larger picture and thus directed their attention toward the social and political fields. D&G "were both of the view that a mode of analysis that insists on filtering everything through the triangulating lens of daddy-mommy-me could not hope to explain either why or how May '68 happened, nor indeed why it went the way it did."⁵²

In such a context, D&G's understanding of desire is related to the social and political fields in which human beings have been supposed to resemble 'abstract machines' whose life is constrained by the rules and laws of repressive territorialities. The reason behind D&G's naming of the concept 'abstract machines' is that human beings function like a machine under the domain of territorialities, unable to give expression to the flow of their desires; rather their desires are socially and politically constructed. At the beginning of their book, *Anti-Oedipus*, D&G highlight the significance of the conceptualization of the 'machine' and the 'desiring machines' as follows: "Everywhere it is 'machines—real ones, not figurative ones: machines driving other machines, machines being driven by other machines, with all the necessary couplings and connections.'⁵³ Although one may assume that these terms are used metaphorically, D&G suggest that the term 'machine' suggests that "something is produced: the effects of a machine, not mere metaphors."⁵⁴

By introducing and emphasizing the term 'machine' in the very first chapter of their book, D&G demonstrate that their concept of 'desire' is different from Freud's notion of desire. As stated earlier, the term 'machine' is used in its real sense but not metaphorically. Having been inspired by Pierre Levy, whose notion of machine is

⁵² Ian Buchanan, *Deleuze and Guattari's Anti-Oedipus* (London: Continuum, 2008), 39.

⁵³ Deleuze and Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus*, 8.

⁵⁴ Deleuze and Guattari, 9.

defined as “trying to break down the ontological iron curtain between being and things,”⁵⁵ Guattari has reshaped the term in accordance with his own understanding. In his book, *Chaosmosis*, leaving aside the technological connotations of the term ‘machine’, Guattari attributes to it the features of ‘machinism’. He asserts that “in order to overcome this fascination with technology and the deathly dimension it sometimes takes, we have to re-apprehend and re-conceptualize the machine in a different way.”⁵⁶ He, therefore, criticizes the meaning of machine as related to the mechanical, as in a dictionary definition.

For D&G, the one who desires is a machine, and as such “can be made to desire its own repression.”⁵⁷ Not only is the individual a machine, however: “The State is desire that passes from the head of the despot to the hearts of his subjects (...) A state desire, the most fantastic machine for repression, is still desire.”⁵⁸ The task of schizoanalysis, therefore, is to work out what the desiring machines are, how they function and what ‘flows’ from them. The schizoanalyst is, they explain, rather a mechanic than any sort of Freudian interpreter; and because society is an assemblage of disparate desiring machines, class struggle, in D&G terms, “goes to the heart of the ordeal of desire.”⁵⁹ We shall see how, and how far, this vocabulary might offer an explanatory way into one or more of the three plays under discussion as we consider the ‘nation’ and ‘social class’ as oppressive territorialities at play in Ireland.

D&G support their theory of desire, finding the correlation between the desire and the machine which is constantly productive as well as “multiple and in a state of constant flux.”⁶⁰ Through the conceptualization of desire which is continuous and active as in a machine, D&G lay bare the fascism in politics as an oppressive force in society. They argue that desire is, as a matter of fact, enslaved by the power establishments and continuously restructured in accordance with their own wills. Therefore, in Deleuze’s notions, desire is defined as “experimental and related to an outside. It is this relation

⁵⁵Felix Guattari, ‘On Machines’, in *Complexity: Architecture/Art/Philosophy*, Trans. Vivian Constantinopoulos (London: Academy Editions, 1995), 8.

⁵⁶ Felix Guattari, 9.

⁵⁷ Deleuze and Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus*, 105.

⁵⁸ Deleuze and Guattari, 221.

⁵⁹ Deleuze and Guattari, 355.

⁶⁰ Kylie Message, ‘Body without Organs’, in *The Deleuze Dictionary*, ed. Adrian Parr (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2005), 32.

to an outside that underpins the social dimension given to desire.”⁶¹ What D&G regard as the exterior forces, or as outside, coincides with their definition of the ‘territorialities.’ They leave the definition of desire as a lack of some kind at the door, and embrace desire as a constant production “of what we want – even though under certain conditions what subsequently gets taken away from us by the repressive figure of a castrating father or the oppressive figure of an exploitative boss (among others).”⁶²

Therein, appearing on the stage, social oppression prevails over psychic repression in D&G’s context. To put it differently, D&G diverge from a psychic point of view to one that is socio-cultural. By virtue of this so-called ‘social oppression’, desire becomes inseparable from the exterior forces such as family, church, gender, nation and party. Also, in D&G’s terms, these exterior forces as mentioned above are called ‘territorialities’ which are the dominant and oppressive powers functioning within society. These territorialities exert power over the individuals not only controlling them, but also seizing their thoughts and decisions, and blocking their desire from flowing. Therefore, the individuals’ attempt to liberate themselves from these forces are referred to as the process of deterritorialization.

Before moving on to the terms: deterritorialization and reterritorialization to finalize the conceptualization of desire as set forth by D&G, it is very important to clarify how the territorialities function within society. Territoriality is used as an umbrella term for the institutions such as nation, family, gender, church and social class which aim at shaping society and exerting dominance over ordinary people to create a stable and coherent society. Since the main concern of this thesis is to lay bare the notion of oppression by institutions to which the Irish were subjected and overwhelmed by, family, nation, gender and social class will be of particularly vital importance, and so they will be touched upon with regard to the ‘schizoanalysis’ of the three above-mentioned Irish plays.

As previously stated, when the Irish were endeavouring to escape from the colonization and oppression of England, they not only established their own institutions but also held on to them in order to exhibit and preserve their identity and

⁶¹ Adrian Parr, *The Deleuze Dictionary* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2005), 64.

⁶² Eugene Holland, ‘Desire and Social-Production’, in *The Deleuze Dictionary*, ed. Adrian Parr (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2005), 65.

further the national cause. However, with their attempt to escape from oppression and construct their identity, they unconsciously wielded power over the Irish people through their established institutions. In this regard, as in the case of England, the coloniser, the institutions in Ireland have turned into other forms of oppression and acted as oppressive, reterritorializing forces in society.

In this regard, the institution of the Church has played a fundamental role and thus effectively served as the central institution in Ireland holding the power in Irish society. Particularly, when Ireland was declared as a Catholic country after their long-lasting religious struggle with England, “in Ireland where political nationality was often tenuous and submerged, the Church became a kind of surrogate State, the only organized and institutionalized expression of nationality.”⁶³ The Catholic Church therefore became the representative of the country and the guardian of not only the Faith but also society in Ireland. The Church, whose power and influence permeated Ireland, was involved in social institutions such as the family, social class and gender. With the teachings of the Church regarding family life, marriage and gender issues, Irish society was also restructured. The Church not only extended its power but also brought the Irish under its control.

In addition, nation as the macrocosm and family as the microcosm of society attempt to territorialise the individual. Imposing their own values on individuals, these two institutions are believed to be integral parts of all nationalist societies. In his book, *National Identity*, Smith states that

the metaphor of family is indispensable to nationalism. The nation is depicted as one great family, the members as brothers and sisters of the motherland or fatherland, speaking their mother tongue. In this way the family of the nation overrides and replaces the individual's family but evokes similarly strong loyalties and vivid attachments.⁶⁴

The interwoven institutions of family and nation have played a vital role inasmuch as the institution of nation was the mainstay of Irish society. Also “[t]he State recognizes the Family as the natural primary and fundamental unit of Society, and as a moral institution possessing inalienable and imprescriptible rights, antecedent and superior

⁶³ Fintan O'Toole, *Black Hole, Green Card: The Disappearance of Ireland* (Dublin: New Island, 1994), 123.

⁶⁴ Anthony D. Smith, *National Identity* (London: Penguin, 1991), 79.

to all positive law”⁶⁵ as written in the Irish constitution of 1937. Having been supported by the Constitution, the institution of family has become the embodiment of nationhood preserving the domestic virtues and establishing the patriarchal family form in Ireland. In this regard, in order to preserve the family defined as “a particular, two-parent, heterosexual, single residential patriarchal family form,”⁶⁶ many legal regulations as well as unwritten laws have been enacted.

These seemingly innocent regulations however did not bring peace, stability and equality to the country; on the contrary, they were used as tools to establish control over the Irish regarding sexuality and prescribed gender roles within the family; because “[i]n post-colonial Southern Ireland a particular construction of sexual and familial roles became the very substance of what it meant to be Irish.”⁶⁷ Since the notion of nation, and a strong country, highly depend on the idea of family and constructions of gender, Ireland is identified with the image of mother and regarded as the Motherland. Moreover, as in the case of the institution of the Church, the Constitution has prepared the ideological ground to exert and extend its power, particularly by confining women to the domestic sphere. Another article from the Irish Constitution asserts:

In particular, the State recognizes that by her life within the home, woman gives to the state a support without which the common good cannot be achieved. The State shall, therefore, endeavor to ensure that mothers shall not be obliged by economic necessity to engage in labor to the neglect of their duties in the home.⁶⁸

Apart from the institutions of Church, Family, Nation and Gender to build a unified and homogenous society, social class has manifested itself through the established social divisions: aristocracy, middle and working class, not only to avoid any social frictions but also to establish order in society. However, classifying people in accordance with their wealth and birth led many people to face stark inequality and exclusion from society. Furthermore, as in the case of other power establishments ruling over society, social class has become the embodiment of the State and its tool to reshape the Irish. Preserving class position has provided a guarantee for social

⁶⁵ Article 41.1.1

⁶⁶ Carmen Kuhling and Kieran Keohane, *Cosmopolitan Ireland* (London: Pluto, 2007), 21.

⁶⁷ Kuhling and Keohane, 21.

⁶⁸ Articles 41.2.1 and 41.2.2

success along with respect, and thus enabled many Irish with higher status to attain political power.

As a result of all social and political developments, what became so striking in Irish society was the unity around a stable national identity which burdened many Irish with the expectations of the rules and norms of these institutions and which did not let individuals live their lives as they willed. In relation to the plays in this thesis, it would be fair to state that the playwrights felt an obligation to reconfigure what means to be Irish, an aristocrat, and a woman in Ireland. The characters in the mentioned plays have become the best representatives of the 'split self' who are subject to others' control and are thus considered to be 'schizos' according to D&G's definition.

In this context, an individual may fantasize liberating his/her desire from the territorialities that have been imposed on him, enforced to obey the rules and laws dictated by them. It is argued by D&G that machines which make the 'schizo' function is constantly deterritorialized; and "deterritorialization indicates the creative potential of an assemblage. So, to deterritorialize is to free up to the fixed relations that contain a body all the while exposing it to new organization."⁶⁹ To be precise, during the process of deterritorialization, which the schizo undergoes, he/she at this point has become the embodiment of the contradictory forces: deterritorialization and reterritorialization. The concepts behind the terms deterritorialization and reterritorialization are inextricably interwoven in that they complement one another, traverse the flows of desire and recode these flows of desire. According to O'Sullivan, "deterritorialization always ends in a reterritorialization and in fact needs a territory from which to operate."⁷⁰ As a result of these two processes undergone by the 'schizo,' deterritorialization constantly shatters the subject during this decoding process, and thus this is the process where schizophrenia can be discerned. "As for the schizo, continually wandering about, migrating here, there, and everywhere as best as he can, he plunges further and further into the realm of deterritorialization,"⁷¹ and he is therefore worn out, seeking for his emancipation and for a way to defeat the power establishments in an attempt to form a self of his own. Therefore, the 'schizo' is

⁶⁹ Parr, *The Deleuze Dictionary*, 67.

⁷⁰ Simon O'Sullivan, 'Subjectivity and Art', in *The Deleuze Dictionary*, ed. Adrian Parr (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2005), 270.

⁷¹ Deleuze and Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus*, 35.

regarded as potentially revolutionary, defying subjection to one or many territorialities.

This thesis consists of three main chapters analyzing the notion of ‘split self’ – a process each character undergoes – in accordance with D&G’s theory of schizoanalysis in which they accentuate the power and influence of the institutions or in their terms ‘territorialities’ as apparatuses that oppress individuals in society. As a result of this oppression, the individuals with the revolutionary potential are considered the ‘schizo’ in their attempt to resist these power establishments that set limits on their life and desire. In this regard, rather than being a clinical entity, the schizo has become the embodiment of the unconscious investment released through this process, attempting to liberate his/her self from the repressive territorialities. The schizo, who cannot cope with the oppression of territorialities that wield power on his/her desire, can, in no other way but unconsciously, divide his/her self in the face of such an oppression.

Therefore, each chapter in this thesis explores a play in the light of D&G’s approach regarding the different territorialities oppressing the individual. The first chapter discusses the institutions of family and nation with a focus on Brian Friel’s *Philadelphia, Here I Come!*. The main discussion in the second chapter is based on Frank McGuinness’s *Observe the Sons of Ulster Marching Towards the Somme* (1986) which addresses the oppression within the family coupled with the social class as an important schizophrenogenic institution crippling the individual’s psyche. The final chapter focuses on Marina Carr and her gripping play *Woman and Scarecrow* which depicts how the family and gender, as schizophrenogenic institutions, put pressure on individuals causing them to split their identity to cope with the situation they are in.

3. SPLITTING AWAY FROM THE FATHER-LAND: FAMILY AND NATION AS SCHIZOPHRENOGENIC FORCES IN BRIAN FRIEL'S PHILADELPHIA, HERE I COME!

*"A nation is a society united by a delusion about its ancestry and by a common hatred of its neighbours"*⁷²

Brian Friel (1929-2015), one of Ireland's most-celebrated playwrights, has produced well-acclaimed plays throughout his career such as *Philadelphia, Here I Come!* (1964), *The Freedom of the City* (1973), *Translations* (1980) and *Dancing at Lughnasa* (1990). Friel started to work as a teacher in primary and intermediate schools in Londonderry from 1950 just like his father and two sisters; yet his teaching journey was not meant to last long as he could teach only up to the 1960s. Soon, he became aware of where his interests lay and made a radical decision, taking up writing as a full-time occupation: "During the following years, he divided his energies between writing short stories and plays; however, his eventual decision to devote himself to the theatre appeared increasingly unlikely as the 1960s commenced."⁷³ Poised between writing short stories and plays, he decided to make a career only as a playwright. Even though Friel faced real artistic frustration and failure with his early plays, he was persistent in making a name for himself in playwriting and thus never gave up producing one play after another. With the Dublin production of *Philadelphia, Here I Come* in 1964 – hailed as his breakthrough play – Friel gained a national as well as international reputation for Irish writing and "made a major contribution to and impact on world theatre."⁷⁴ The most immediately striking feature of *Philadelphia*, is Friel's use of dramaturgy. Thomas Kilroy states: "I remember when I first saw *Philadelphia, Here I Come!* What excited me most, as someone who wished to write plays, was the delicate use of the stage as a place of illusion, play-acting, make-believe."⁷⁵ In this regard, Friel's approach to theatre was quite experimental and innovative which helped him renew attention and awareness of his place in the world of theater with *Philadelphia, Here I Come!*. In the play, Friel splits the protagonist, Gareth O'Donnell, into two personalities as Private Gar and Public Gar. Since the main character Gareth

⁷² William Ralph Inge, 'Sagittarius and George', goodreads, n.d.,

<https://www.goodreads.com/quotes/400468-a-nation-is-a-society-united-by-a-delusion-about>.

⁷³ Scott Boltwood, *Brian Friel, Ireland, and the North* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 10.

⁷⁴ Anthony Roche, *Brian Friel: Theatre and Politics* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 1.

⁷⁵ Roche, 8.

O'Donnell was represented by two different actors on the stage, Friel's determination to achieve his theatrical aims and to make a difference with his dramaturgy was realised.

Having "success is only the postponement of failure" as his motto, Friel received the fruits of his hard work and determination after several failed attempts. His plays enjoyed (and still do) a world-wide success which was quite extraordinary for Irish playwrights since they fell under the domain of English Literature; Friel pulled it off and was now called the Irish Chekhov. At this point, many critics, however, raised a question as to what made Friel an Irish writer since he could not be categorized in a nationalistic framework due to his birthplace in County Tyrone and because he was not blindly defending Ireland. Nonetheless, he followed in the footsteps of Yeats stating: "We will show that Ireland is not the home of buffoonery and easy sentiment as it has been represented but the home of ancient idealism."⁷⁶ Therefore, Friel neither ignored the problems of Ireland nor attempted to show the country as a land of myths. According to Ulf Dantanus, who responds to the question of what makes Brian Friel an Irish writer, "the habitat, heritage, and history of Ireland have made him an Irish writer,"⁷⁷ and elsewhere Friel was positioned "squarely within the tradition of Joyce, Synge and O'Casey."⁷⁸

Through his lifespan, Friel witnessed various challenges which paved the way to a questioning of his identity as well as Irishness as regards his name and birthplace. When England colonized Ireland, they used not only military force on the country but also 'soft power' known as cultural imperialism. They attempted to remove Irish identity and replace it with an English one. They were aware that a nation's language, culture and flag were what united a nation together. Therefore, England reconstructed the Irish identity from her own perspective through Anglicization of Irish names of people and places. This applied to Friel's case in his birth: "although he is known as Brian Friel, his birth certificates bear the names Bernard Patrick Friel. At the time of Friel's birth the Protestant bureaucracy discouraged the registration of 'Gaelic' names, and it is likely that the Anglicization of 'Bernard' was adopted for the purpose of

⁷⁶ Lady Gregory, *Our Irish Theatre: A Chapter of Autobiography* (New York and London: GP Putnam's Sons, 1913), 9.

⁷⁷ Ulf Dantanus, *Brian Friel: A Study* (London and Boston: Faber and Faber, 1988), 20.

⁷⁸ Boltwood, *Brian Friel, Ireland, and the North*, 1.

registration in place of the intended 'Brian.'"⁷⁹ Being thus a divided self in his early years, Friel experienced the very first duality regarding his identity and thus spoke of himself as follows: "Perhaps I'm twins", and later on this paves the way to the creation of his character in *Philadelphia*. Surely, his naming is not the only duality he faced in his life but also the fact of the family's early removal from Knockmoyle to Killyclogher and later to Derry played an important role in shaping his identity as well as in the writing of his plays. Furthermore, Friel's father came from Country Londonderry whilst his mother was from the west of County Donegal. "The Government of Ireland Act of 1920 had effectively partitioned Ireland, establishing the basis for a six-county north and twenty-six county south, each possessing its own executive and its own bicameral parliament; and this arrangement came into effect in May 1921."⁸⁰ So, through this partition of Ireland, Ulster came to be separated due to its loyalty to the British Crown and its religious affiliation. As a result of this partition, Friel's parents happened to have come from separate jurisdictions. Having experienced the life in both jurisdictions, Friel expressed his understanding of the border: "[t]he Border has never been relevant to me. It has been an irritation, but I have never intellectually or emotionally accepted it."⁸¹ Even though at first he did not accept the importance of his birthplace and residence, he later on changed his mind explaining the complex situation he encountered due to the Border: "I live in Derry now. I'm a nationalist too, you know. I feel very emotionally about this country. I wouldn't attempt to rationalize about my feelings, but I get myself involved in stupid controversies about the border ... I don't know why."⁸² Therefore, born in Northern Ireland and living in Derry, a city in Northern Ireland and known as Derry to the Nationalists and as Londonderry to the Unionists, Friel described himself as "a member of the Catholic minority living in the North"⁸³ in a TV documentary. Later, Friel and his family decided to move to Donegal which was not included in Northern Ireland due to its Catholic majority. In this respect, Friel's Irishness seemed quite a complicated issue, particularly for the critics seeking to categorize him in the group of

⁷⁹ Richard Pine, *Brian Friel and Ireland's Drama* (London: Routledge, 1990), 15.

⁸⁰ Richard English, *Irish Freedom: The History of Nationalism in Ireland* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2006), 313.

⁸¹ Desmond Rushe, 'In Interview with Desmond Rushe', in *Brian Friel Essays, Diaries, Interviews 1964-1999*, ed. Christopher Murray (New York and London: Faber and Faber, 1999), 28.

⁸² Peter Lennon and Christopher Murray, 'In Interview with Peter Lennon', in *Brian Friel: Essays, Diaries, Interviews 1964-1999* (New York and London: Faber and Faber, 1999), 2.

⁸³ *Brian Friel* (Ferndale Films, 2000).

nationalist playwrights. Although this division, being a Catholic and a Nationalist in Northern Ireland, seemed to cause drawbacks in Friel's life, this prompted his writing career and provided him with materials to write on. For instance, most of his plays take place in the fictitious town, Ballybeg, invented by Friel himself and situated in County Donegal, which comes to mean "small town" in Gaelic ("baile beag"). Moreover, having been attracted more to his country and his own people, Friel could discern the long-lasting oppression and colonization of Ireland by England which resulted in Ireland's division. Needless to say, Friel was moved by his country's being on the brink of losing its identity. Friel is an artist whose sensibility is reminiscent of Chekhov's Trigorin who states: "I am not a mere landscape painter, I'm also a citizen of my country, I love people. As an author I feel I'm in duty bound to write about the people, their sufferings, their future, and about science, the rights of man and so on."⁸⁴ Friel generally deals with history, nationality, Irish nationalism and identity as well as the themes of emigration, self-exile and family. *Philadelphia* opened on 28 September 1964 at the Dublin Theatre Festival, and "was acclaimed as 'the best new Irish play this year' by the drama critic of the Irish Independent."⁸⁵ When Friel was writing the play, he was in America as a guest of Tyrone Guthrie, a well-known British theatre director, for the want of improving himself in theatre. He remarks:

I found myself at thirty years of age embarked on a theatrical career and almost totally ignorant of the mechanics of play-writing and play-production apart from an intuitive knowledge. ... [A] new theatre was being created by Tyrone Guthrie and there I lived for six months. ... I learned a great deal about the iron discipline of theatre [and] those months in America gave me a sense of liberation – remember, this was my first parole from inbred, claustrophobic Ireland – and that sense of liberation conferred on me a valuable self-confidence and a necessary perspective so that the first play I wrote immediately after I came home, *Philadelphia, Here I Come!*, was a lot more assured than anything I had attempted before.⁸⁶

On the surface, the play seems quite a simple and typical Irish play dealing with the emigration issue, taking an Irish family – a father-son relationship – as its basis. This is also discerned by Roche who argues that the play "resembles a standard Abbey Theatre play of the 1950s, both in its choice of subject – emigration – and in its cast

⁸⁴ Anton Chekhov, *Plays: Ivanov, The Seagull, Uncle Vanya, Three Sisters, The Cherry Orchard* (London: Penguin Books, 2002), 172.

⁸⁵ Quoted in Ulf Dantanus, *Brian Friel: A Study*, 50.

⁸⁶ Friel Brian, 'Self Portrait', in *Brian Friel: Essays, Diaries, Interviews 1964-1999*, ed. Christopher Murray (New York and London: Faber and Faber, 1999), 42.

of secondary characters”⁸⁷ such as the loyal housekeeper and the local priest. However, the play has so much more to offer than presenting the fraught relationship between a father and a son and the wish to flee Ireland. More significantly, *Philadelphia* provides a summation of several topics which deeply concerned Friel throughout his life such as the oppression of institutions (family, nation, religion), displaced identity and the relationship between the individual and the society.

Consisting of three episodes, the play is about Gareth O'Donnell (or Gar), a young Irish man who feels oppressed in the family environment and, more generally, in Ballybeg, Ireland. It does not follow a linear plot structure as the main character has the extensive use of flashbacks throughout the play, and gathers various memories of his family and friends while trying to mend his relationship with his father, S.B. O'Donnell. The play takes place in the small village of Ballybeg in County Donegal, Ireland, portraying the night before Gareth O'Donnell's departure and the morning he is supposed to depart for Philadelphia. When *Philadelphia* opens in the kitchen where Madge, the housekeeper, and Gareth converse about his leaving Ireland for Philadelphia and how much he looks forward to it, their dialogue provides an insight into the abovementioned fraught father-son relationship. Going into his bedroom, Public Gar starts talking with his “alter ego,” Private Gar, and this scene reveals the very first time how Public Gar and Private Gar appear at the same time on the stage talking to each other. On S.B. O'Donnell's return from the shop, the father and the son sit together to have their dinner and become fraught with anxiety. The heavy atmosphere in the dinner is interrupted by Master Boyle, who drops by for a second and discusses Gar's emigration to Philadelphia suggesting that Gar's decision is the best decision he could ever make. In the second episode, Friel demonstrates Gar's disappointment with his girlfriend, and how he decides to move to Philadelphia at the invitation of his aunt, Lizzy, through flashbacks in which Gar recollects his former girlfriend Kate and his aunt Lizzy's visit to Ireland from America. After the flashbacks, the play returns to the present time where Gar meets his group of young Irish friends who visit him to bid farewell before Gar's journey to Philadelphia. The second episode ends with Kate's visit to Gar after hearing he is going to America. When the last episode opens with Private Gar's monologue, Public Gar is kneeling and saying the

⁸⁷ Roche, *Brian Friel*, 39.

rosary. At the end of the rosary, Public Gar addresses a question to his father about his childhood memory of fishing together on Lough na Cloc Cor. However, S.B. O'Donnell cannot remember the memory they once shared together and fails to establish a communication with his son. At the end of the episode, on the eve of his departure, no matter how much Gar seems to fantasize about emigrating to America in order to escape from the stultifying atmosphere of Ireland, the play ends with Gar vacillating between staying or leaving Ireland with the question he raises himself "why do you have to leave? Why? Why?"⁸⁸

On the surface, *Philadelphia* does not seem to offer much regarding its narrative plot; the play is, however, concerned with Gar's psyche and personality facing the oppression in the family environment along with the nation. Gar's fraught relationship with his father and alienation from his country, Ireland, are reflected through Friel's use of "alter ego," a technical innovation by which he startles his audience. The main character, Gareth O'Donnell is split into two as Public Gar and Private Gar and each character is played by a separate actor on the stage. In the stage direction, Friel asserts:

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*.⁸⁹

In this regard, the device of "alter ego" provides the audience with an insight into the thoughts and emotions of the character. Although both Public Gar and Private Gar appear together at the same time on the stage, only Public Gar's speech is heard by everyone while Private Gar is only heard by Public Gar himself. Since Public Gar has grown up in a repressed society, he finds it easier to utter to the audience what is in his mind through Private Gar. In this respect, as McGrath contends, Gar's personality is "split into two voices, one which utters what is acceptable and the other which utters what one would really like to say."⁹⁰

⁸⁸ Brian Friel, *Plays One: Philadelphia, Here I Come!, The Freedom of the City, Living Quarters, Aristocrats, Faith Healer, Translations* (London: Faber & Faber, 1996), 99.

⁸⁹ Friel, 27.

⁹⁰ F.C. McGrath, 'Brian Friel and the Irish Art of Lying', in *Brian Friel: A Casebook*, ed. William Kerwin (New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1997), 69.

Coined by Cicero in the 1st century Rome, the Latin term “alter ego” comes to mean “other I” or “other self” in English. According to the Oxford Learner’s Dictionary, the term refers to “a person whose personality is different from your own but who shows or acts as another side of your personality and a close friend who is very like yourself.”⁹¹ Surely, there are certain motives behind Friel’s use of “alter ego” in *Philadelphia* as a means of splitting his main character. According to some critics, since Friel trained with Tyrone Guthrie in America, he wanted to include some comical elements and scenes to mollify the tragic elements and lighten the mood of the audience in *Philadelphia*. Along similar lines, Roche comments on the issue: “[t]he figure of Gar Private resembles nothing so much as Tyrone Guthrie in rehearsal with his actors, insisting that the play must be kept entertaining.”⁹² On the other hand, Dantanus gives a different sense to the use of “alter ego” saying: “Friel’s approach differs very much, and he has found in this disparity between the inner and outer selves an effective vehicle for both pathos and humour. In order to penetrate the minds of all the characters in the play Friel would have had to provide each one of them with a ‘private’ voice.”⁹³ In this regard, the major driving forces behind Friel’s decision to use the device of alter ego can be, first, to convey the feelings and ideas of each character to the audience and secondly to display how institutions might repress individuals leading them to a splitting of their identity in order to cope with the suffocating situation they find themselves in.

As stated, although Public Gar and Private Gar are meant to be played by two actors, they are inseparable from and complementary to each other. They have different personalities but still they are close friends and they can reveal their weakness to, share their pain with and understand each other. In the moments when Public Gar is not able to abreact his emotions and ideas, especially before his father, Private Gar makes an appearance on the stage being more assertive and bolder than Public Gar. In Episode One, the conversation between S.B. O’Donnell and Gar reveals how much Gar is frightened in his father’s presence so he even cannot respond well upon being addressed a simple question by him. In such moments when he oscillates and

⁹¹ ‘Alter-Ego’, in *Oxford Learner’s Dictionary*, accessed 8 January 2022, <http://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/alter-ego?q=alter+ego>.

⁹² Roche, *Brian Friel*, 40.

⁹³ Ulf Dantanus, *Brian Friel: A Study*, 92.

stammers, Private Gar becomes irritated with Public Gar's unsettled and distressed attitude. As noted in the stage direction, Private Gar remains calm with S.B. O'Donnell's calling Public Gar "the bugger" and even displays a rebellious disposition:

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?

S.B.: How many coils of barbed-wire came in on the mail-van this evening?

PUBLIC: Two. Or was it three?

S.B.: That's what I'm asking you. It was you that carried them into the yard.

PUBLIC: There were two – no, no, no, three – yes, three – or maybe it was ... was it two?

S.B.: Agh!

PRIVATE: What sort of a stupid bugger are you? Think, man! You went out and stood yarning to Joe the Post; then you carried one coil into the yard and came out with the sack of spuds for the parochial; then you carried in the second coil ... and put it in the corner ... and came out again to the van ... and ...

(PUBLIC skips into the air.)⁹⁴

Moreover, Public Gar deems Private Gar superior to him allowing him to rebuke and give directions when necessary. Since he is so caught up in himself and hidden in his shell, Public Gar, sometimes, cannot act according to the situation. Therefore, he portrays himself as a man quite immobile and timid. In such cases, Private Gar, acting as the foil to Public Gar with his ceaseless energy, serves as the driving force behind Public Gar and pushes him to take action. In this regard, despite their being worlds apart, they complete each other and make life more livable. In Episode Two, Kate comes to bid farewell to Gar before his journey to Philadelphia, and Public Gar, as usual, stammers in front of Kate and is incapable of answering back. On the other

⁹⁴ Friel, *Plays One: Philadelphia, Here I Come!, The Freedom of the City, Living Quarters, Aristocrats, Faith Healer, Translations*, 34.

hand, Private Gar, who is not seen to anyone but only heard by Public Gar, speaks as if Kate could hear him. Therefore, since Private Gar is aware that Public Gar cannot utter a word until he encourages him, he feels it necessary to urge Public Gar to respond to Kate:

KATE: (Off) Hello, Gar.

PRIVATE: Kate!

KATE: (On) This isn't a healthy sign, drinking by yourself.

PRIVATE: Talk! Talk!

PUBLIC: What – what are you doing here?⁹⁵

Due to this feeling of superiority over Public Gar, Private Gar feels that he has completely gained dominion over Public Gar. He gives advice to him, questions his decisions and also attempts to steer Public Gar's life as he wishes. In Episode One, Private Gar pretends to be the authority over Public Gar and thus he addresses questions about Public Gar's decision to emigrate from Ireland to Philadelphia:

PRIVATE: Gareth Mary O'Donnell.

(PUBLIC springs to attention, salutes, and holds this absurd military stance. He is immediately inside his bedroom door, facing it.)

PUBLIC: Sir.

PRIVATE: You are fully conscious of all the consequences of your decision?

PUBLIC: Yessir.⁹⁶

Posing as an obedient soldier, Public Gar never hesitates to call Private Gar "sir" and displays his deep respect for him. In this respect, being aware of Public Gar's submissive attitudes, Private Gar goes further, verbally attacking Public Gar and using foul language against him. Private Gar generally calls him "stupid bugger"⁹⁷ and "laddybuck"⁹⁸ throughout the play. Surprisingly, Public Gar takes no offence at such insulting words directed to himself.

Herein, it is also noteworthy to mention that not only do Gar's inner and outer selves differ regarding their personalities and attitudes towards S. B. O'Donnell, but also their performances on the stage contrast sharply with each other. As stated by Roche, "Private Gar has freedom of movement to roam around the stage while Public Gar and

⁹⁵ Friel, 77.

⁹⁶ Friel, 32.

⁹⁷ Friel, 34.

⁹⁸ Friel, 39.

the other ‘realistic’ characters are bound to the prescribed rituals of their everyday dialogue and routines.”⁹⁹ Private Gar is always on the move and appears as a restless soul on the stage. On the other hand, Public Gar is extremely calm and introspective and, if not required to act differently, he chooses to stay put. It seems that even his serene and immobile attitudes disturb Private Gar who urges him to take action. In Episode Two, the stage direction fairly epitomizes this situation:

PRIVATE is slumped in the chair, almost as if he were dozing. [...] Then, suddenly, PRIVATE springs to his feet.

PRIVATE: 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!¹⁰⁰

As seen the quotation demonstrates, whilst Friel depicts the characteristics of Public Gar as calm, timid, desperate and unable to respond to Private Gar’s verbal attack, Private Gar expresses himself and his uneasy energy through his words, gestures and actions in the play. He, also, explicitly asserts his discomfort with calmness and tranquility by saying “tranquillity is their enemy”¹⁰¹ and thus “he insists that momentum be maintained.”¹⁰²

Another significant aspect of the use of “alter ego” or, divided self, which is the thematic crux of this thesis, is to display the oppression of institutions or “territorialities”. In this regard, Friel points out that he lives in a “schizophrenic community” and he goes further calling “both Northern Ireland and Dublin schizophrenic.”¹⁰³ Surely, this statement is confusing until Seamus Heaney responds to what Friel refers to as ‘schizophrenic community.’ As Heaney claims, “the schizophrenic community ... towards what has perhaps been too readily termed ‘schizophrenia’ is a marked condition of Irish life.”¹⁰⁴ Therefore, it would be fair to claim that Friel’s approach to schizophrenia and “schizophrenic” overlaps at some point with that of D&G. None of these writers reckons “schizophrenia” as a chronic mental disorder but rather a mental state of a person whose causes are cultural.

⁹⁹ Roche, *Brian Friel*, 40.

¹⁰⁰ Friel, *Plays One: Philadelphia, Here I Come!, The Freedom of the City, Living Quarters, Aristocrats, Faith Healer, Translations*, 55–56.

¹⁰¹ Friel, 69.

¹⁰² Roche, *Brian Friel*, 40.

¹⁰³ Friel Brian, ‘Self Portrait’, 41.

¹⁰⁴ Quoted in Pine, *Brian Friel and Ireland’s Drama*, 23.

In regard to Gar in *Philadelphia*, his life is overwhelmingly shaped by his father, who is the representation of the family institution, and by Ireland as a Nation. Gar lost his mother three days after he was born and grew up with his strict and undemonstrative father in Ballybeg. The absence of a mother figure and Gar's being in search of motherly love are demonstrated through his substituting the housekeeper, Madge, for a mother figure. Since D&G set themselves against the Oedipal and "oedipalized territorialities" in their book, *Anti-Oedipus*, Gar's situation may provide a basis for their "schizoanalysis" approach. Freud, who poses desire as the person's longing for a lost object, implies the differentiation between the sexes claiming the boy's sexual desire is for the mother, the girl's sexual desire is for the father. In this regard, since the mother is the very first object of desire for the boy, he is afraid of his father for "fantasizing sexuality with his mother."¹⁰⁵ This, surely, leads him to be envious of his father for possessing the mother, and to approach him in an antagonistic manner, even further fantasizing to kill him. Nonetheless, he is aware of the fact that if his father understands his desire towards the mother, he will be castrated. Therefore, he represses his sexual desire for the mother. In this way, the boy feels compelled to subjecting himself to the authoritarian personalities and oppressive institutions, to their laws as in the case of Gar who obeys his father's law in their household. For instance, just the day before Gar embarks on his journey to America, S. B. O'Donnell does not give Gar a day off but instead makes him work in his shop. In this respect, S.B. O'Donnell running a family business does not only act as Gar's father but also his boss. Gar, therefore, stays silent and obeys his father's wish although he is dissatisfied with the situation. In his conversation with Madge, he gives voice to his feelings which he can never reflect to his father:

PUBLIC: What time is it?

MADGE: (Looking at clock) Ten past seven.

PUBLIC: And what time do I knock off at?

MADGE: At seven.

PUBLIC: Which means that on my last day with him he got ten minutes overtime out of my hide. (He releases Madge.) 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.'

¹⁰⁵ Freud, *An Outline of Psychoanalysis*, 25.

MADGE: He's losing a treasure, indeed!¹⁰⁶

Critical of Freud's psychoanalysis and the Oedipus triangle as the "mother-father-child" relationship, D&G attack the reduction of everything to sexual desire. As they assert in *Anti-Oedipus*: "Psychoanalysis is taking part in the work of bourgeois repression at its most far-reaching level, that is to say, keeping European humanity harnessed to the yoke of daddy-mommy, and making no effort to do away with this problem once and for all."¹⁰⁷ As attested by this remark, D&G are dismissive of the restraints of Oedipal and oedipalized territorialities over the individual. They attempt to traverse the codes put forward by these oedipalized territorialities through what they call the "deterritorialized" flows of desire. In the light of all the ideas discussed above, Gar features as the explicit manifestation of the oedipalized territorialities, particularly family and nation in *Philadelphia* and he attempts to deterritorialize himself from these institutions through splitting his identity as an evasion from the oppressive institutions. Surely, this splitting is not a willed action but rather it provides a liberation from the power figures and somehow helps the individual cope with the repressing institutions, family and nation, especially in Gar's situation.

To begin with the family institution, the so-called "schizo," Gar comes to the point that he can no longer endure the repression of the familial authority as the family is "the delegated agent of psychic repression, or rather the agent delegated to psychic repression"¹⁰⁸. As a result of the repressing family, which expects the individual to act in accordance with its law, Gar cannot live beyond the family's law and turns into a subjugated individual under "familial authority in the figure of the aging father."¹⁰⁹ Besides, from the beginning of the play, S.B. O'Donnell is described "'as a responsible and respectable citizen' rather than a mere businessman or shopkeeper, connoting a community stature that extends into the political domain, predisposing the reader to assume that his title of 'county councillor' may be more than honorific."¹¹⁰ Therefore, Gar always feels the presence of patriarchy through his father's hegemonic power over himself; so he does not create a stereotyped father-son relationship in *Philadelphia*.

¹⁰⁶ Friel, *Plays One: Philadelphia, Here I Come!, The Freedom of the City, Living Quarters, Aristocrats, Faith Healer, Translations*, 30.

¹⁰⁷ Deleuze and Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus*, 73.

¹⁰⁸ Deleuze and Guattari, 119.

¹⁰⁹ Boltwood, *Brian Friel, Ireland, and the North*, 9.

¹¹⁰ Boltwood, 56–57.

Roche's following remark attests to the issue at stake: "[T]he disciplinary father, becomes the embodiment of the Law and wields power over the son as a victim."¹¹¹

Facing his father's indifferent and undemonstrative attitudes towards himself and his emigration, Private Gar takes the stage to utter what Public Gar thinks in relation to his father's oppression of him.

Private Gar: I can't order even a dozen loaves without getting your permission. Because you pay me less than you pay Madge. But worse, far worse than that, Screwballs, because we embarrass one another. If one of us were to say, 'You're looking tired' or 'That's a bad cough you have', the other would fall over backwards with embarrassment. So tonight d'you know what I want you to do? I want you to make one unpredictable remark, and even though I'll still be on that plane tomorrow morning, I'll have doubts: maybe I should have stuck it out; maybe the old codger did have feelings; maybe I have maligned the old bastard. So now, Screwballs, say ... (Thinks) ... 'Once upon a time a rainbow ended in our garden' ... say, 'I like to walk across the White Strand when there's a misty rain falling' ... say, 'Gar, son –' say, 'Gar, you bugger you, why don't you stick it out here with me for it's not such a bad aul bugger of a place.' Go on. Say it! Say it! Say it!¹¹²

This outburst of Private Gar amplifies the oppressive atmosphere in the family caused by the authoritarian figure, S. B. O'Donnell. The fact that his father treats Gar even worse than he treats the housekeeper, Madge, does not discomfort Gar any longer. He even receives less money than Madge despite his being the son of the shop owner. Surely, this outburst, however, does not merely come forward due to Gar's wish for a higher wage or an equal treatment with Madge; it is the product of his frustration and yearning for proper treatment from his father, or at least for having a healthy father-son relationship. Therefore, he cannot hold himself back and bursts into screaming how much he feels overwhelmed with his father's attitudes and his restricted life in his father's shop.

Gar, the schizophrenic, demonstrates that he is desperately in need of his father's care and love and thus he pines for a healthy father-son relationship in which he will be taken care of and be dear to his father's heart. Nevertheless, he is in despair at realizing that he is lonely in his relationship with S. B. O'Donnell and will never be loved and respected in return. R.D. Laing's, a Scottish psychiatrist and the author of *The Divided*

¹¹¹ Roche, *Brian Friel*, 65.

¹¹² Friel, *Plays One: Philadelphia, Here I Come!, The Freedom of the City, Living Quarters, Aristocrats, Faith Healer, Translations*, 49.

Self, comments can be illuminating regarding this issue: “The schizophrenic is desperate, is simply without hope. I have never known a schizophrenic who could say he was loved, as a man, by God the Father or by the Mother of God or by another man. We have to recognize all the time his distinctiveness and differentness, his separateness and loneliness and despair.”¹¹³

Apart from this, S. B. O'Donnell acts like a powerful authoritarian figure by not letting his son have a free day on his last day. From this standpoint, it is fair to claim that S.B. O'Donnell acts beyond the role of a father but represents the institutionalization in Ballybeg:

Such forms of knowledge project an image of reality, at the expense of reality itself. They talk figures and icons and signs, but fail to perceive forces and flows. They blind us to other realities, and especially the reality of power as it subjugates us. Their function is to tame, and the result is the fabrication of docile and obedient subjects.¹¹⁴

Turning into a docile and obedient subject under the domination of his father who represents the power figure, Gar cannot oppose his father's wishes and goes to the shop because he fears him and obeys the law of his father. However, living a life without personal autonomy and being treated like a child start to discomfort Gar, impairing the father-son relationship. He comes to a point where he realizes that the life he lives is nothing different from his father's life because he has lost the autonomy of his life and come under the domination of his father. Gar's abandonment of his academic career when he was a student at University College Dublin and his decision to return to his father's business are striking examples of Gar's feeling under pressure from his father, the authoritarian figure in the family. Additionally, Private Gar verbalizes the frustration that Public Gar experiences because he is under much pressure due to the oppressive father figure in the family. He suffers from being treated as a child, and is anxious about being overheard and despised by his own father. Gar's sadness and disillusion reverberate through his words and his yearning for being deemed an adult. Although he is a young man at twenty-five, his father treats him as if he were a child. Private Gar rails against S. B. O'Donnell, shouting, “I'm twenty-

¹¹³ R. D., Laing, *The Divided Self: An Existential Study in Sanity and Madness* (London: Penguin Books, 1990), 38.

¹¹⁴ Deleuze and Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus*, xx.

five, and you treat me as if I were five.”¹¹⁵ As Boltwood states, “the prolonged adolescence manifested by Gar ... reveals a generation grown restive by their elders’ refusal to cede even minimal authority to them. Gar’s decision to emigrate results less from the economic privation of Co. Donegal, than from his inability to usurp the older generation, embodied in the play’s patriarchs.”¹¹⁶ Ignoring Gar’s being an adult, S. B. O’Donnell debars his son from a taste of freedom. He provides Gar with neither social and economic, nor emotional and psychological freedom. Therefore, when considered from this point of view, Gar’s pretending to be joyous for emigration and the reason behind his decision do not purely lie in the economic conditions of the country. Instead, he desires somebody to deter him from his decision and ensure his staying. During the play, Gar repeats the very same sentence “Screwballs, say something! Say something, Father!”¹¹⁷ Demonstrating his reluctance to emigrate, he expects his father to say something to him, at least a good-bye; he, however, cannot receive what he is looking for from his father:

MADGE: ... He’s said nothing since I suppose?

PUBLIC: Not a word.

MADGE: He’ll have something to say then, you’ll see. And maybe he’ll slip you couple of extra pounds.

PUBLIC: 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.¹¹⁸

Having discussed the Family as an institution repressing the individual, nation is another significant institution that seeks to take hold of the individual designated by D&G as one of the oedipalized territorialities “(Family, Church, School, Nation, Party).”¹¹⁹ It is significant to state that nation and family as institutions overlap with their repressive qualities. While family generates the microcosm, which is born within a larger society, it is the nation that constitutes the macrocosm. Therefore, both institutions’ inextricable nature represent the repressive figures in Gar’s life. In this

¹¹⁵ Friel, *Plays One: Philadelphia, Here I Come!, The Freedom of the City, Living Quarters, Aristocrats, Faith Healer, Translations*, 49.

¹¹⁶ Boltwood, *Brian Friel, Ireland, and the North*, 60.

¹¹⁷ Friel, *Plays One: Philadelphia, Here I Come!, The Freedom of the City, Living Quarters, Aristocrats, Faith Healer, Translations*, 80.

¹¹⁸ Friel, 33.

¹¹⁹ Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, trans. Robert Hurley, Mark Seem, and Helen R. Lane (Minneapolis: Minnesota U.P., 1983), xvii.

regard, the close relationship between family and nation shapes Gar's identity and life and paves the way for his making crucial decisions such as emigration to Philadelphia.

As a restrained and frustrated character, Gar does not only feel overwhelmed by the oppressive family but also by his native soil, Ireland, which cannot provide him with the free and peaceful atmosphere that, for years, he has been yearning for, at least to substitute for the lack of a healthy family life. Oppressed by "the imperialism of Oedipus,"¹²⁰ Gar does not want to submit to social repression, but on the contrary, wants to live beyond all laws. Herein, what we mean by the oppression of nation is the Irishness of Gar living in Northern Ireland as a Catholic. Northern Ireland has a majority of Protestants and pays homage to the English monarchy; Gareth suffers from the community he lives in. In this respect, he faces a challenge of subjecting himself to the law of the national authority, which oppresses the desire of the individual and disables the flow of desire. As Dantanus asserts:

In the life of any country, historical, racial, national, religious and linguistic concepts can be potent symbols of unity and serve to express a sense of origin and identity. The fact that within 'the personality of the island of Ireland all of these notions are afflicted with what could with a modern term be described as schizophrenia (the word is often used to describe the divisions in Ulster), goes a long way towards explaining the political turmoil in contemporary Ireland.¹²¹

In this regard, Gar's split identity is the epitome of the Irish psyche and the impasse the Irish people encounter in Northern Ireland as Catholics and nationalists. Since he feels under pressure owing to his Irish identity, he cannot act the way he wants to but instead feels obliged to act the way his Irishness (the Nation as an institution) entails him to do. Herein, when Gar realizes that he no longer wants to be restricted and to obey the laws of the Nation, he unwittingly creates his alter ego, Private Gar, who can speak the mind of Public Gar, to cope with this oppressive institution.

What makes Gar a schizophrenic, since he does not have a mental health condition, is partly the identity crisis caused by his being a Catholic in Northern Ireland that unfortunately led "over 500,000"¹²² Irish to emigrate in order to free themselves from the oppression and the powerful authoritarian figures. In Gar's case, the town,

¹²⁰ Deleuze and Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus*, 58.

¹²¹ Ulf Dantanus, *Brian Friel: A Study*, 11–12.

¹²² 'Migration: Emigration and Immigration Since 1950', *Encyclopedia.Com* (blog), 2 August 2022, <https://www.encyclopedia.com/international/encyclopedias-almanacs-transcripts-and-maps/migration-emigration-and-immigration-1950>.

Ballybeg, which serves as one of the propelling factors behind Gar's decision to emigrate, generates a microcosm of the British oppression of Irish Catholics. As its simplest definition, while Seamus Deane broadly explains that "the town Ballybeg, which occurs so often in Friel plays as a standard setting, has fused within the socially depressed and politically dislocated world of Derry and the haunting attraction of the lonely landscapes and traditional mores of rural Donegal,"¹²³ Friel takes a step further by defining Ballybeg as a merely physical environment and regards the town as a "schizophrenic community" due to its reflection of Irish spirituality, experience and psyche. As a testimony to Friel's description of Ballybeg, it may be illuminating to evoke "Scheper-Hughes' statistics about the Irish rate of schizophrenia [which] suggest that the schizoid condition may be particularly characteristic of the Irish psyche."¹²⁴ Moreover, at the end of Episode three, Gar touches upon the issue of "schizophrenic community" in his conversation with Kate by emphasizing the Irish psyche rather than problematizing the geographical condition of Ballybeg:

PUBLIC: (Rapidly, aggressively) That's his look out! D'you know something? If I had to spend another week in Ballybeg, I'd go off my bloody head! This place would drive anybody crazy! Look around you, for God's sake! Look at Master Boyle! Look at my father! Look at the Canon! Look at the boys! Asylum cases, the whole bloody lot of them!

PRIVATE: (Pained) Shhhhhhh!¹²⁵

In other words, according to Gar, Ballybeg serves as a driving force behind the Irish people's turning into "schizos" in D&G's terminology. Beyond being a clinical entity, these schizos are the products of society and its laws. The Irishness of those whom Gar names is, in a way, imposed upon them as a burden; as a Nation within Northern Ireland, they live in an area where the Irish people are outcasts due to their religion and disloyalty to the British monarch. According to D&G, "[s]ociety constructs its own delirium by recording the process of production; but it is not a conscious delirium, or rather it is a true consciousness of a false movement, a true perception of an apparent objective movement, a true perception of the movement that is produced on the

¹²³ Seamus Heaney, introduction to *Brian Friel Plays One: Philadelphia, Here I Come!, The Freedom of the City, Living Quarters, Aristocrats, Faith Healer, Translations*, 12.

¹²⁴ Maureen S.G. Hawkins, 'Schizophrenia and the Politics of Experience in Three Plays by Brian Friel', *Modern Drama*, no. 39 (1996): 465.

¹²⁵ Friel, *Plays One: Philadelphia, Here I Come!, The Freedom of the City, Living Quarters, Aristocrats, Faith Healer, Translations*, 78–79.

recording surface.”¹²⁶ In this regard, although the effect of the physical environment and economic uncertainty of Ballybeg due to its being located in a remote place is beyond dispute, what causes many Irish people to turn ‘schizoid’ is the land’s role in shaping the Irish psyche and creating a mind map of the Irish people. Ian Rodger also comments on the use of Ballybeg, stating Ballybeg “is a village of the mind, more a depository for remembered or invented experience than a geographical location.”¹²⁷

At this point, it is critical to emphasize Ballybeg as a driving force behind Gar’s emigration and as a force of oppression on the Irish youth. Ballybeg corresponds to what Friel is concerned about during his lifespan, that is, the inextricable and interwoven nature of nationalism and religion as an embodiment of the oppressive and the authoritarian power which endeavours to usurp all the rights and freedoms of the individual. Therefore, the residents of Ballybeg are engulfed in the town’s divisions caused by their being Catholic and Nationalist and in the authoritarian figures’ oppression which shapes their choices and way of living. In other words, the more they are absorbed by Ballybeg, the more they tend to lose their identity and repress the desire because of the oppression in every sphere of their lives. In this respect, Gar chooses Philadelphia over Ballybeg upon the invitation of his aunt, regarding emigration as an escape from the national authority and setting his hopes on America as the land of promise:

PUBLIC: Listen, if someone were to come along to me tonight and say, ‘Ballybeg’s yours – lock, stock, and barrel,’ it wouldn’t make that (Cracks his fingers) much difference to me. If you’re not happy and content in a place – then – then – then you’re not happy and content in a place! It’s, as simple as that. I’ve stuck around this hole far too long. I’m telling you: it’s a bloody quagmire, a backwater, a dead-end! And everybody in it goes crazy sooner or later! Everybody!

PRIVATE: Shhhhhhhh ... ¹²⁸

In this regard, it would be fair to claim that Gar resembles Friel himself who defines his short visit to America as “a sense of liberation [and] as his first parole from inbred claustrophobic Ireland.”¹²⁹ Both suffer from the suffocating and stultifying atmosphere of Ireland that does not provide reassurance and liberty but instead oppression and

¹²⁶ Deleuze and Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus*, 10.

¹²⁷ Ian Rodger, *Radio Drama* (London: Macmillan, 1981), 18–19.

¹²⁸ Friel, *Plays One: Philadelphia, Here I Come!, The Freedom of the City, Living Quarters, Aristocrats, Faith Healer, Translations*, 79.

¹²⁹ Brian Friel, ‘Self Portrait’, 42.

duress, leaving them no choice but to find a way to escape and be free by means of either emigration or splitting the identity. According to R.D. Laing,

[t]he crucial feature of the schizoid individual of this type that we have to understand is the nature of the anxieties to which he is subject. We have already outlined some of the forms these anxieties take under the terms engulfment, implosion, and the dread of losing inner autonomy, freedom; in short, being turned from a man with subjectivity to a thing, a mechanism, a stone, and it being petrified.¹³⁰

As Laing's remarks attest, Gar is coerced to face challenges such as engulfment, imploding and losing freedom in Ballybeg during his life for twenty-five years. Considering his situation as a twenty-five-year-old man living with his father in a repressed nation, Gar, nonetheless, attempts to break the hold of power over himself through rejection of Ballybeg and attempts to escape from the town. Therefore, Gar abreacts his anger, frustration and disapproval of Ballybeg, reiterating how pleased he is for emigrating to Philadelphia and breaking the chains of oppression. He is aware of the fact that his life will always be limited in his father's shop in Ballybeg with nothing to do. On the other hand, his aunt offers "a ground-floor apartment, a car that's air-conditioned, colour TV, and a big collection of all the Irish records."¹³¹ Although Gar is highly impressed by his aunt's offer, what strikes him most is the sense of liberation in America. Therefore, in the beginning of the play, he keeps singing joyfully pointing out his departure from Ballybeg "Rat-tat-tat-tat-tat-tat-tat-tat / Yip-eeeeee! / "Ya-hooooo! / 'Philah-delph-yah, heah Ah come, rightah backah weah Ah stahted from, boom-boom-boom-boom —"¹³²

On the contrary, even the name of Ballybeg is enough to vex him, because he has such an extreme hatred of Ballybeg, regarding the town as the major obstacle to his freedom. Ireland, especially Ballybeg, could not offer Gar any opportunity, expecting him, as an Irishman, to be both a Catholic and a Nationalist. While he cannot comfortably adopt his Republican nationalism in Northern Ireland, he does not approve the Protestant domination of the province. Although Friel does not explicitly demonstrate this political ideology through Gar's speech, he illustrates this division

¹³⁰ Laing, *The Divided Self: An Existential Study in Sanity and Madness*, 75.

¹³¹ Friel, *Plays One: Philadelphia, Here I Come!, The Freedom of the City, Living Quarters, Aristocrats, Faith Healer, Translations*, 73.

¹³² Friel, 30–31.

Irish people encounter in Northern Ireland through splitting Gar's identity, emphasizing the revolutionary side of him by the decision to emigrate:

PUBLIC: There's nothing about Ballybeg that I don't know already. I hate the place, and every stone, and every rock, and every piece of heather around it! Hate it! Hate it! And the sooner that plane whips me away, the better I'll like it!

KATE: It isn't as bad as that, Gar.

PUBLIC: You're stuck here! What else can you say!

PRIVATE: That'll do!

PUBLIC: And you'll die here! But I'm not stuck! I'm free! Free as the bloody wind!

KATE: All I meant was –

PUBLIC: Answerable to nobody! All this bloody yap about father and son and all this sentimental rubbish about 'homeland' and 'birthplace' – yap! Bloody yap! Impermanence – anonymity – that's what I'm looking for; a vast restless place that doesn't give a damn about the past. To hell with Ballybeg, that's what I say!

PRIVATE: Oh, man ...¹³³

In the light of all the points discussed above, it is clear that he is victimized by the oppressing power of Nation, which he strives to forget, the only solution being emigration. Sadly, he cannot recover himself from his agonizing past although Master Boyle gives solace to him saying "You're doing the right thing, of course. You'll never regret it. I gather it's 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."¹³⁴

However, this escape does not fundamentally indicate Gar's withdrawal from the social life; on the contrary, this escape is regarded as an evasion and as a revolution of the schizoid to liberate himself from the power figures. In other words, "escape is revolutionary [and] what matters is to break through the wall"¹³⁵ since Gar's life is governed by the strict social, religious and political norms of Ireland. So, he cannot live out his desires, which induces his denial of all the so-called sacred values such as family, nation, and homeland. D&G's observations are quite telling in this regard:

[T]he schizophrenic escape itself does not merely consist in withdrawing from the social, in living on the fringe: it causes the social to take flight through the

¹³³ Friel, 79.

¹³⁴ Friel, 52.

¹³⁵ Deleuze and Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus*, 277.

multiplicity of holes that eat away at it and penetrate it, always coupled directly to it, everywhere setting the molecular charges that will explode what must explode, make fall what must fall, make escape what must escape, at each point ensuring the conversion of schizophrenia as a process into an effectively revolutionary force. For what is the schizo, if not first of all the one who can no longer bear "all that": money, the stock market, the death forces, Nijinsky said—values, morals, homelands, religions, and private certitudes? ...¹³⁶

Gar is trapped within the existential problems for which he cannot find solutions except his emigration. Therefore, he puts aside his serene and immobile attitudes towards the situations bothering him throughout the play and assumes a revolutionary approach contesting the rigid and repressive institutions such as Family and Nation.

By virtue of the analysis of *Philadelphia*, it can be concluded that Brian Friel tells the story of a frustrated relationship of father and son through an undemonstrative father and a demanding son in pursuit of love. Gar appears to be the most distinct character despite his being pictured as an obedient and docile son in the play. However, through his alter ego, Private Gar, he reveals his real self, which he has had to suppress due to having grown up in a restricted family and society. Therefore, his division of the self and his objection to the authoritarian figures evidence that he assumes a revolutionary approach in life distancing himself from his family and nation. Finally, when the frustrated and demanding protagonist cannot receive what he expects from a healthy father-son relationship, he cannot tolerate his father's indifference and he accepts to emigrate from Ballybeg to Philadelphia.

¹³⁶ Deleuze and Guattari, 341.



4. SPLITTING OUT OF CLASS: FAMILY AND SOCIAL CLASS AS SCHIZOPHRENOGENIC FORCES IN FRANK MCGUINNESS'S *OBSERVE THE SONS OF ULSTER MARCHING TOWARDS THE SOMME*

*"There are but two families in the world (...) the Haves and the Havenots"*¹³⁷

Having written more than thirty stage plays since 1982, Frank McGuinness (1953-) is a prolific and influential Irish playwright. His plays have been performed in regional theatres, the Abbey Theatre, the Swan Theatre and the Hampstead Theatre in London. The best-known and critically acclaimed plays of McGuinness include *The Factory Girls* (1982), *Observe the Sons of Ulster Marching Towards the Somme* (1985, henceforth *Sons of Ulster*), *Carthaginians* (1988), *Mary and Lizzie* (1989), *Someone Who'll Watch Over Me* (1992), *Mutabilitie* (1997) and *Dolly West's Kitchen* (1999). Apart from his stage plays, McGuinness adapted various plays of significant modern playwrights such as Henrik Ibsen, Anton Chekhov, Bertolt Brecht along with those of ancient playwrights including Sophocles, Euripides and Seneca. He also wrote a number of film scripts, including an adaptation of the play of the same title: Brian Friel's *Dancing at Lughnasa*, for which McGuinness received an Oscar. Additionally, McGuinness published several volumes of poetry, two novels and a collection of short stories. Having graduated from the department of English and Medieval Studies at University College Dublin (UCD), McGuinness taught as a lecturer at the University of Ulster, UCD and NUI Maynooth. He has been working as a Professor of English and Writer-in Residence at University College Dublin (UCD) School of English, Drama and Film since 2007.

McGuinness is hailed as one of the greatest contemporary playwrights in Ireland. Michael Caven, an acclaimed stage director, comments on the success of McGuinness stating: "Frank McGuinness is one of the most important playwrights working in the world today. ... Along with people like Marina Carr he is one of the last voices that is writing theatre of imagination and poetry and metaphysics. He creates a theatrical experience that transcends the normal."¹³⁸ This statement is justified by McGuinness's being a winner of such accolades as the London Evening Standard Award for the most

¹³⁷ Miguel De Cervantes, *Don Quixote*, trans. John Ruthford (New York: Penguin Books, 2003), 1348.

¹³⁸ Michael Caven, 'A Director's Perspective on *Mutabilitie*', in *The Theatre of Frank McGuinness: Stages of Mutability*, ed. Helen Lojek (Dublin: Carysfort Press, 2002), 194.

promising playwright, the Rooney Prize for Irish Literature, the London Fringe Award and the Harvey's Best Play Award as well as a Tony Award for his 1997 adaptation of Henrik Ibsen's *A Doll's House*. David Cregan, in his book titled *Frank McGuinness's Dramaturgy of Difference and the Irish Theatre*, comments on the successful dramatic career of McGuinness: "No other Irish playwright of his generation has had the professional consistency, or occupational longevity that has characterized McGuinness's theatrical career."¹³⁹

Born in 1953, in Buncrana, County Donegal, Frank McGuinness grew up within the Catholic nationalist community despite Donegal's being a part of the province of Ulster. At this point, it is essential to point out the geographical and political importance of County Donegal as a force shaping his identity as well his writing career. Donegal appears to be accommodating the dualities within itself, geographically belonging to the province of Ulster, which is regarded by nationalists as the fortress of England to maintain its power in Ireland, and yet being the northernmost county of the Republic. In his interview with Joe Jackson, McGuinness accentuates how deeply he was affected by the division of Ireland into North and South: "I'm not one of those Irish writers who seems obsessed with their childhood. I was more influenced by puberty, because that is the time Derry exploded."¹⁴⁰ Having shared the similar fate with Brian Friel who had witnessed the North-South dichotomy, McGuinness also encounters the regional characteristics and difference of Donegal thanks to the geographical isolation of the county. In this regard, it would not be wrong to claim that McGuinness's writing is deeply rooted in his relation to Northern Ireland and its conflict with the Republic. Therefore, the history of Ireland, particularly the 'Troubles', and the location of his birthplace, Donegal, have become an inseparable part of McGuinness's plays. This is attested by the ensuing remarks which also throw into relief the suitability of McGuinness's plays, particularly *Sons of Ulster*, for a schizoanalytical reading with regard to the issue of split self:

McGuinness himself has suggested that growing up in Buncrana left him straddling 'the split between a southern training and northern temperament.' This split surely contributes to what Joe Dowling, the Artistic Director at the Abbey when it first staged *Observe the Sons of Ulster*, describes as the almost

¹³⁹ David Cregan, *Frank McGuinness's Dramaturgy of Difference and the Irish Theatre* (New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 2011), 1.

¹⁴⁰ Joe Jackson, 'The Healing Touch', *Independent.Ie*, 21 April 2002.

schizophrenic sense of duality in McGuinness's work. "If you live in Buncrana," he says "and you want to go to Derry to the pictures, you have to cross a border and change your money into sterling – and he's made the crossing."¹⁴¹

As such, McGuinness engages in his works with marginalized groups of society and dispossessed people; and as for his themes, colonialism, nationalism, identity and history come to the forefront. Kenneth comments on not only McGuinness's varied subject matter but also his choice of setting as a means to strengthen his themes: "If the size of this oeuvre is remarkable then so too is the diversity of subject matter, for the settings of his works range from ancient Greece to modern Beirut via Renaissance Italy and Derry during the Troubles."¹⁴² She further praises McGuinness as a playwright who skillfully combines his themes with his dramatic style:

His plays probe the margins of society illuminating such varied social and cultural issues as homosexuality, the coercive restraints of the Irish family, the Ulster Protestant identity, homelessness, the role of the artist within society, imprisonment and international terrorism. Each time these concerns are examined with a carefully sculpted dramatic style that consistently focuses on individual states of consciousness.¹⁴³

Furthermore, in his major plays, McGuinness reveals his powerful emotional bond with his country, Ireland. His counterpart Brian Friel says "I'd be very lonely, I think, in the way a child is lonely. I get very nostalgic and very homesick"¹⁴⁴ when he is asked to live in America. Likewise, Frank McGuinness, in one of his interviews, states that he could not live outside Ireland: "It is impossible . . . I get physically sick when I am away for a long time."¹⁴⁵ This statement also features as an answer to why McGuinness cannot dispense with Ireland and the Irish problems in his writings. Nevertheless, despite his tie with Ireland and refusal to leave the land, McGuinness's relationship with Ireland reaches an uneasy resolution when the dichotomy between North and South comes to the fore. McGuinness persistently expresses how he feels

¹⁴¹ Brian Cliff, 'Crossing Through Borderlands', in *The Theatre of Frank McGuinness* (Dublin: Carysfort Press, 2002), 1.

¹⁴² Nally Kenneth, *Celebrating Confusion: The Theatre of Frank McGuinness* (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2009), 1.

¹⁴³ Kenneth, 1.

¹⁴⁴ Quoted in Ulf Dantanus, *Brian Friel: A Study*, 43.

¹⁴⁵ Frank McGuinness, An Interview with Frank McGuinness, interview by Maurice Fitzpatrick, 4 February 2014, <https://breac.nd.edu/articles/an-interview-with-frank-mcguinness-2/>.

insecure, uneasy and even like an outcast in Ireland. He notes, “I’ve always felt like a stranger. An outsider.”¹⁴⁶

Starting his writing career with *The Factory Girls*, which was produced in 1982, McGuinness burst into prominence with his first play. When McGuinness sketched an outline for *The Factory Girls* in 1982, on an invitation to a drama workshop, many stood in awe of him for completing his first play in less than a week. After the workshop in Galway, the play was premiered at the Peacock Theatre, “upon which McGuinness’s rate of production would slow but slightly.”¹⁴⁷ McGuinness cannot abandon the setting of Donegal and his family in the play where he drew on his mother’s and aunts’ experiences working in the local shirt factories. McGuinness expresses his purpose in penning *The Factory Girls* as follows: “I wanted to write a play that celebrated the working-class culture of women in the part of Donegal I grew up in.”¹⁴⁸

Later, in 1985, McGuinness wrote *Sons of Ulster*, a play that helped him establish his reputation and put him at the forefront as a significant Irish playwright alongside Thomas Kilroy, Brian Friel and Tom Murphy. In the play, McGuinness uses the memory play structure in which the story is told by an old Ulsterman-Loyalist, Old Pyper. In general terms, the play deals with the experiences of four pairs of Loyalist Ulstermen who fought at the Somme during the First World War, in 1916. *Sons of Ulster* constitutes the crux of this chapter in terms of how the “family” and “social class” territorialities play out in the life and psychological condition of the protagonist, Pyper, through the lens of Deleuze and Guattari’s theory of ‘schizoanalysis.’

Having produced such a remarkable work during the last quarter of the twentieth century, McGuinness as a famously prolific playwright, continued to produce innovative plays in the next years. In *Carthaginians*, McGuinness cannot disengage himself from Irish history and the setting of Ireland. This time, he concerns himself with the event of Bloody Sunday and the problem of Derry, which he defines as an event putting a punctuation mark in his life. In spite of all that happened after Bloody

¹⁴⁶ Frank McGuinness, A Happy Marriage, 24 April 2008, <https://www.theguardian.com/stage/2008/apr/24/theatre1>.

¹⁴⁷ Kenneth, *Celebrating Confusion: The Theatre of Frank McGuinness*, 1.

¹⁴⁸ Frank McGuinness, *Plays: The Factory Girls; Observe the Sons of Ulster Marching Towards the Somme; Innocence; Carthaginians; Baglady* (Faber, 1996), ix.

Sunday, McGuinness does not focus on that “bloody” day but rather on the trauma Irish people suffered in its aftermath. McGuinness explicitly declares the vital importance of Bloody Sunday not only for his personal life but also for Irish history as follows:

Derry was also the centre for *Carthaginians* (1987). The events of Bloody Sunday ripped Ireland apart. In January, 1972, I was in my first year studying at University College Dublin. My adolescence ended that day. *Carthaginians* is my elegy to the dead and the living of Derry, the living who kept going, in Dido’s words, ‘Surviving. Carthage has not been destroyed.’¹⁴⁹

Having produced powerful dramatic pieces one after another, McGuinness secures his reputation as a major playwright with *Mary and Lizzie*. Regarding the thematic scope ranging from colonialism to socialism, the subject matter and the structure of the play, McGuinness, in an experimental way, interweaves fantastic elements with history by featuring such figures as Friedrich Engels, Karl Marx and Queen Victoria. In this play, McGuinness opens the way for travelling through history, places and the psyche of Irish women. Through his female characters, McGuinness endeavors to lay bare the issue of colonialism in the image of an “oppressed” country under the domination of England for centuries. Eamonn Jordan, in his book, *The Feast of Famine: The Plays of Frank McGuinness*, comments on the play’s subject matter stating that McGuinness engages with “the process of history, the exclusion of women from the historical narrative and the role of women.”¹⁵⁰ In this respect, the female characters, Lizzie, Mary, The Pregnant Girl and The Women of the Trees become metaphorical images of a colonized country as well as the representatives of Irish women who are the victims of British colonization.

Next, McGuinness published *Someone Who’ll Watch Over Me* which is considered a milestone in his dramatic career. Winner of New York Drama Critics Circle Award, this play paves the way for the worldwide recognition of McGuinness. Having been regarded as the most international drama to date, *Someone Who’ll Watch Over Me* is based on a historical event which takes place during the Lebanese Civil War and brings together three people with different occupations in a claustrophobic narrow cell in Beirut. While the three hostages – Adam (the American doctor), Edward (the Irish

¹⁴⁹ McGuinness, xi.

¹⁵⁰ Eamonn Jordan, *The Feast of Famine: The Plays of Frank McGuinness* (Bern: Peter Lang, 1997), 122.

journalist) and Michael (the English language professor) – wait either for their release or execution with fear and anguish, this situation unexpectedly brings them closer through “spending their time in exercises of physical fitness, and in reading the Bible and the Koran provided by their jailers [and] preferring to spend their time talking, reminiscing about family, exchanging jokes and commenting on sports events, or even arguing about Anglo-Irish relationships.”¹⁵¹

What follows is McGuinness’s *Mutabilitie* performed at the Royal National Theatre in 1997. The characters of the play are quite significant ones since McGuinness uses historical figures such as William Shakespeare and Edmund Spenser, who lived during the reign of Queen Elizabeth I, as well as the Irish King, Mad Sweeney, and his wife, Queen Maeve. This play also goes far back in history, like many other plays of McGuinness, to demonstrate the colonialism of the British Empire, which has agonised Ireland for centuries. Murray aptly summarizes what McGuinness attempted to convey through this play: “*Mutabilitie* is a play which, in the guise of a story of ‘Spenser’s failed attempt to impose civilization on what he saw as a barbaric people, recommends a solution to a racial conflict with its roots in colonialism.”¹⁵² *Dolly’s West Kitchen* was first staged at the Abbey Theatre, Dublin in 1999. The play received positive response both from the audience and critics. McGuinness chose his hometown of Buncrana, County Donegal, during the World War II, as his setting. As in his other plays, in *Dolly’s West Kitchen*, McGuinness maintains his focus on the issues of nationalism, colonialism, decolonization and political and the historical condition of Ireland, which constitute his recurring themes.

This sweeping survey of his writing career and his dramatic oeuvre reveals that McGuinness is enthusiastic about drama that he regards as a safe haven in which he could express his true identity as well as the grim reality behind Irish history, touching upon the Northern Ireland problem. In his interview with Charlotte Higgins, McGuinness explains that the theatre is where his words belong:

It may drive me crazy and drive me hard, but I am never happier than when I am writing a play. I had a great and loving family, but by reason of my sexuality, I never felt I belonged; I could be what I wanted in my imagination. Theatre is

¹⁵¹ Reima Shakeir, ‘Transcending Irishness and Reading History in Selected Plays by Sean O’Casey and Frank McGuinness’ (M.A., ProQuest, Harvard University, 2016), 207.

¹⁵² Christopher Murray, ‘Of Mutabilite’, in *The Theatre of Frank McGuinness: Stages of Mutability*, ed. Helen Lojek (Dublin: Carysfort, 2002), 166.

where I should be. I love the thrill of these voices becoming my familiars; I love their company, or am threatened by their company. That's a tremendous, joyous thing, and when it is happening it completely dominates my life: everything else is a sideline.¹⁵³

The best paradigmatic outcome of McGuinness's enthusiasm as a playwright and political sensibility as an Irishman is, perhaps, *Sons of Ulster*, which was originally performed at the Peacock Stage of the Abbey Theatre, Dublin, in 1985. The play was met with a positive response from the audiences and "[a]fter the closing of Mason's Abbey production which extensively toured Northern Ireland with great success, it has already had an English production in London, at the Hampstead Theatre, directed by Michael Attenborough"¹⁵⁴ in 1986. This work, which is considered to have placed McGuinness among the most remarkable Irish playwrights, won the Evening Standard's 'Most Promising Playwright' Award. Helen Lojek summarizes the success of the play as follows: "The response was overwhelmingly positive, and the play has been revived numerous times. Like *Translations*, it breaks down the grand narratives of the past and deliberately undermines stereotypical understandings of sect and violence – and sex, since the play has gay characters."¹⁵⁵ In the play, McGuinness portrays a wide range of characters from different backgrounds, sexes and religions owing to his choice of subject matter. McGuinness does not, however, only produce a multifaceted play regarding its theme and subject matter, but deploys some postmodern elements in the play, which sometimes perplex and even further distress the audience with tragic scenes. The playwright subverts the chronological order of time in *Sons of Ulster* and this non-linear structure of time can be considered the most significant postmodern technique in the play.

This historical play in four parts is about four pairs of young Ulster-men – Loyalists from Northern Ireland – who volunteer to fight for Great Britain during the First World War. Seven of the play's eight characters die at the Battle of the Somme, with the exception of Kenneth Pyper, the play's protagonist and narrator. Since the play does not follow a linear plot structure and is categorized as a memory play, the reader

¹⁵³ Charlotte Higgins, 'Frank McGuinness: 'I'm Not Entirely Respectable. I Couldn't Be'', *The Guardian*, 18 January 2008.

¹⁵⁴ Michael Etherton, *Contemporary Irish Dramatists*. (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1989), 47.

¹⁵⁵ Helen Lojek, 'Troubling Perspectives: Northern Ireland, the "Troubles" and Drama', in *A Companion to Modern British and Irish Drama 1880-2005*, ed. Mary Luckhurst (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2006), 338.

witnesses Pyper's being haunted by his past and the memory of his friends. In his old age, Elder Pyper reminisces about his days at war while recounting his sorrow and burden as having been the sole survivor. Part One "Remembrance" opens with Elder Pyper's waking and his refusal to remember the past. It is set in the present time and takes the form of a monologue in which Kenneth Pyper bears the burden of remembrance and of being the only survivor of the eight volunteers. He remarks: "I do not understand your insistence on my remembrance. ... I have not forgotten, the irreplaceable ones, they kept their nerve, and they died. I survived. ... I want you here. I want you to stay with me."¹⁵⁶ After Pyper's reluctance to recollect his memories of war, "[t]he rest of the play is then set in the past and comprises a tripartite dramatization of the period between the men's enrolment in the army and the moments before their deaths at the Somme."¹⁵⁷

In Part Two, "Initiation", McGuinness sets the play in the past in a makeshift barracks where he brings the seven dead Ulster-men to life on the stage. "They are once again young and energetically alive, banishing from the stage the pain and melancholy of Part One: Remembrance."¹⁵⁸ As defined by the Oxford Learners Dictionary, "initiation,"¹⁵⁹ means "the act of somebody becoming a member of a group" and this part takes the form of a 'reception' where the Ulster-men become acquainted with one another. Kenneth Pyper and Craig appear first onstage, where Pyper cuts his thumb and overstates this situation by asking Craig to kiss his bleeding thumb. Through Part Two, Craig and Pyper's conversation and attraction to each other suggest a shared homosexuality. In addition, Pyper's constant complimenting of Craig's "remarkably fine skin," particularly when he further utters "remarkably fine for a man,"¹⁶⁰ and Craig's calling Pyper "rare,"¹⁶¹ provide an insight into their sexual orientation. Next, with Millen and Moore's joining them, Pyper addresses questions to the newcomers such as "why are you here?,"¹⁶² "where are you from?"¹⁶³ in order to acquaint himself

¹⁵⁶ McGuinness, *Plays*, 97–99.

¹⁵⁷ Kenneth, *Celebrating Confusion: The Theatre of Frank McGuinness*, 79.

¹⁵⁸ Emilie Pine, 'The Tyranny of Memory: Remembering the Great War in Frank McGuinness's *Observe the Sons of Ulster Marching Towards the Somme*', *Irish University Review* 40, no. 1 (2010): 60.

¹⁵⁹ 'Initiation', in *Oxford's Learner's Dictionary*, accessed 19 February 2022, <https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/initiation?q=initiation>.

¹⁶⁰ McGuinness, *Plays*, 100.

¹⁶¹ McGuinness, 106.

¹⁶² McGuinness, 107.

¹⁶³ McGuinness, 108.

with them. When Roulston and Crawford arrive at the barracks after Millen and Moore, Pyper reveals his acquaintance with Roulston who admits it saying “we schooled together.”¹⁶⁴ At last, Crawford and Anderson, the last pair of the group, join the others, whereupon the eight Ulster-men not only adjust to the army life but also to each other. Herein, Pyper differs not only by his sexual orientation but also by his family background since he is of a higher social class than the others in the group. For instance, Millen is a baker, Moore is a dyer, while Roulston is a preacher and Craig is a blacksmith. Pyper is a sculptor and an artist and does not belong to the working class like the rest of the group. At the end of Part Two, each of them busies himself with various tasks except Craig and Pyper who slits his left hand with his penknife.

Ignored by all except Craig, Pyper raises his left hand and with his penknife slits the front of it. Craig takes the shirt Pyper had given him. About to toss it at him, Craig hesitates, tears a sleeve from the shirt and attracts the others’ attention by so doing. They watch as Craig bandages Pyper’s bleeding hand.

Craig: Red hand.

Pyper: Red sky.

Craig: Ulster.

Pyper: Ulster.¹⁶⁵

Adding to the possibility of a homosexual attraction between Pyper and Craig, the last scene of the play, evoking the Red Hand emblem used by the Protestants in Northern Ireland, indicates the devotion of Ulster-men to their cause, as well as their self-sacrifice, without having a second thought about their lives.

Part Three, “Pairing”, takes place five months after Part Two when the eight volunteers have completed their training and adjusted to army life. They, however, become weary of war realizing how futile it is to kill and to be killed in it. Therefore, they can no longer define themselves as patriotic or be regarded as heroes fighting for their country. In this regard, all of them undergo a process of change, developing new identities that diverge from the stereotype of a soldier:

The horror of war is not directly dramatised, but is implicit in every exchange between the men, as they are paired off, occupying four different parts of the stage, each space representing a landmark, and which together represent Ulster: Boa Island, Lough Erne, carvings [Craig and Pyper]; a Protestant church

¹⁶⁴ McGuinness, 119.

¹⁶⁵ McGuinness, 137.

[Roulston and Crawford]; a suspended rope bridge [Millen and Moore]; the Field, a Lambeg drum [McIlwaine and Anderson].¹⁶⁶

By assigning different places to each of the pairs, this part reveals the trauma of the war on the individuals. Craig, sadly, confesses how much he wants to get away from the war and longs to be oblivious of the unsettling memories of it. In this regard, he cannot help saying to Pyper: “I want to get away from the war. We are on the leave. That long five months is behind us for a while.”¹⁶⁷ When the lights fade on Boa Island, we leave Craig and Pyper behind us but see Crawford and Roulston, the latter of whom kneels in the church “asking for strength”¹⁶⁸ from God. Roulston, remaining fraught with vacillation, is unwilling to leave the church since he feels secure there away from the destruction of the war. Later, Moore and Millen appear on the stage and the bridge is lit up. Moore can possibly be considered the one who suffers from the war trauma the most, finding himself on the suspended rope bridge. Since he suffers immensely from the situation, he is unable to summon up his courage and strength to cross the bridge despite Millen’s encouragement:

Moore: I’m tired. I’m frightened. I don’t want to go on. I can’t.

[...]

Moore: I’ve lost my nerve, you bastard. Do you not see I’ve lost my nerve? I can’t move. Leave me alone. I want to fall here. I want to die.¹⁶⁹

Furthermore, Moore claims to hear the voice of the dead soldiers and suggests that he is being haunted by their ghosts. Eventually, with the support of Millen, Moore manages to take one step and lights fade on the bridge.

After Millen and Moore, McIlwaine and Anderson appear on the stage where they both sprawl on the ground and there is a Lambeg drum, a large drum featuring in Protestant marches, placed just beside them. They both reminisce about the Twelfth of July, also known as the Glorious Twelfth or Orangemen’s Day, in order to celebrate and to revive their Glorious Revolution, in an attempt to keep their fighting spirit alive during the Great War, but soon they realize that they have missed the July Twelfth Celebrations. Accordingly, they decide to “re-create their own march. But alone they can’t command

¹⁶⁶ Pine, ‘The Tyranny of Memory’, 61.

¹⁶⁷ McGuinness, *Plays*, 140.

¹⁶⁸ McGuinness, 140.

¹⁶⁹ McGuinness, 143.

the same sense of joy or celebration”.¹⁷⁰ McIlwaine expresses how important the community is to him: “It’s no good here on your own. No good without the speakers. No good without the bands, no good without the banners. No good without the chaps. No good on your own.”¹⁷¹ Since McIlwaine is aware of the significance of community and communal memory, he questions why they come to the Field and why they have to fight. At the end of Part Three, lights on all areas display the four pairs on the stage where they march towards the battle for the last time, and their despair is expressed in Anderson’s words: “We’ll never make it home tonight.”¹⁷²

Part Four, “Bonding”, demonstrates the tie between the eight Ulster-men getting stronger in the face of the brutality and futility of war. When Part Four opens in a trench near the Somme, the eight volunteer Ulster-men appear on the stage altogether where McIlwaine, Young Pyper and Millen are awake while the rest sleep. This time, the eight volunteers encounter the meaninglessness of war and death. McIlwaine’s words foreshadow what will occur at the end of the play: “You’d think they were dead, it’s that quiet.”¹⁷³ However, still by attempting to bring the glory of the past to the present moment, Anderson assembles his friends to re-enact the sham Battle of Scarva, which commemorates the victory of the Protestant William of Orange over the Catholic King James II in the 1690s. Unlike the glory of Scarva, Anderson’s re-enactment of the war with other comrades fails with Pyper’s falling to the ground; this is interpreted as not being a good sign by Millen as it indicates their death at the Somme. When they prepare themselves for “the real thing,”¹⁷⁴ they cannot help questioning the necessity of war since all of them are aware of what awaits them at the Somme. Herein, Craig’s acceptance of the war and its result, since they all are aware of the imminence of death, puts an end to their discussion: “It’s too late to tell us what we’re fighting for. We know where we are. We know what we’ve to do. And we know what we’re doing it for.”¹⁷⁵ Moreover, Craig acknowledges the brutal fact of war; that is, even if any of them comes through this war, it will be the same as dying. In the final scene, Anderson offers an Orange sash to Pyper as a token of their unity and friendship

¹⁷⁰ Pine, ‘The Tyranny of Memory’, 62.

¹⁷¹ McGuinness, *Plays*, 198.

¹⁷² McGuinness, 169.

¹⁷³ McGuinness, 171.

¹⁷⁴ McGuinness, 184.

¹⁷⁵ McGuinness, 188.

while Young Pyper chants “Ulster” before the battle. At this moment, Elder Pyper appears on the stage seeing his own ghost, Younger Pyper, and is reminded that all are dead.

Throughout the play, what is so striking is Kenneth Pyper’s being different from the rest of the group with his sexual orientation, family background and “anarchic nature”¹⁷⁶ as Pine notes. Cregan further observes Pyper’s character to be “hostile and brave, deviant and confrontational.”¹⁷⁷ As explained in depth in the previous chapters of the thesis, *Sons of Ulster*, as in *Philadelphia* and *Woman and Scarecrow*, epitomises the notion of the split self through the division of Kenneth Pyper’s self into Old and Young Pyper on the stage. Unlike Gareth O’Donnell and Woman represented through their alter-egos, Kenneth Pyper’s divided self is rather an alteration of his character from youth to old age and overtly a manifestation of the territorialities of family and social class as authorities wielding power over the individual leaving him no space to be true to himself. Dean also comments on the split self of Pyper as follows: “Kenneth Pyper appears in two incarnations—old and young. That the roles are played by two different actors underscores how profoundly unlike the young man the Elder Pyper is.”¹⁷⁸ Moreover, Pyper’s divided self acutely indicates his internal change as the sole survivor among the eight comrades rather than an external split which can be clearly illustrated in the above-mentioned plays.

Crucially, social class and family become more of an issue as the driving forces behind Pyper’s split self. Although the existence of social class, at first glance, may not be recognized and acknowledged in the play, there are many indications that the division and stratification of society have long been associated with status, power, wealth and property. Furthermore, the grim reality behind social class even dates back to Ancient Greece where “Plato, some 300 years before the birth of Christ, wrote about gold, silver and tin people. [Later], Aristotle wrote that the best-administered states had a large middle class – larger if possible than both the others – which is clearly a reference to the different degrees of political power enjoyed by the classes.”¹⁷⁹ Social class has maintained its forcefulness since the ancient times. As Briggs, a famous English

¹⁷⁶ Pine, ‘The Tyranny of Memory’, 60.

¹⁷⁷ Cregan, *Frank McGuinness’s Dramaturgy of Difference and the Irish Theatre*, 62.

¹⁷⁸ Joan FitzPatrick Dean, ‘Self-Dramatization in the Plays of Frank McGuinness’, *New Hibernia Review/Iris Éireannach Nua*, JSTOR, 3, no. 1 (1999): 102.

¹⁷⁹ Ivan Reid, *Class in Britain* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1998), 7.

historian suggests, class consciousness in the society, as we today understand it, appears after the Industrial Revolution in Britain. Therefore, not surprisingly, the Victorian Era has been notorious for forging a “class-conscious” society. To foreground the distinction structured by social class, Cecil Frances Alexander wrote a hymn titled “All Things Bright and Beautiful” in 1848:

The rich man in his castle,
The poor man at his gate,
He made them, high or lowly,
And ordered their estate.¹⁸⁰

This hymn is a testament to the fact that English class system is such a powerful force in English society that even Christianity was used to reinforce and maintain this rigid system.

The existence of social class has been perpetuated through long ages, the effect of which has been inevitable: the exertion of social agency and control over the individual. Based on Ivan Reid’s compilation of evidence to demonstrate how class shapes the people’s lives and determines their way of living, it would be fair to confirm what Scott claims, stating “[w]e are witnessing not so much the death of class as a restructuring of class relations and their supplementation by new sources of social division and social identity [and] class relations still exist and exert an effect on life chances and conditions of living.”¹⁸¹ Herein, what is significant in the play regarding social class and the oppression exerted on Kenneth Pyper is Northern Ireland’s being a part of the United Kingdom of Great Britain. This belonging requires, or naturally leads, Northern Ireland to adopt the English social class system, in the simplest class scheme, consisting of three basic categories: the upper class, the middle class and the working class, causing the stratification in society.

Focusing on the relationship between McGuinness and Northern Ireland, comparing him with other Irish playwrights such as O’Casey and Shaw who “convey the differing

¹⁸⁰ Cecil Frances Alexander, ‘All Things Bright and Beautiful’, Discover Poetry, n.d., <https://discoverpoetry.com/poems/cecil-frances-alexander/all-things-bright-and-beautiful/>.

¹⁸¹ John Scott, ‘Social Class and Stratification in Late Modernity’, *Acta Sociologica* 45, no. 1 (2002): 239.

perspectives of the Irelands: South and Abroad,”¹⁸² Schrank observes that McGuinness is wholeheartedly dedicated to the North. When McGuinness’s *Sons of Ulster* was first staged, it caused a stir at the time due to a Catholic playwright’s play taking place in Northern Ireland and dealing with Northern Irish Protestants instead of the Irish Republic and Catholics. Inasmuch as McGuinness stirred controversy with his sympathetic treatment of the Northern Unionists, Eamonn Jordan unveils McGuinness’s real purpose behind this concern as “McGuinness’ theatrical search for the existence of many voices.”¹⁸³ His interest in pluralities having been reflected just before writing *Sons of Ulster*, McGuinness, in an interview in 1985, draws attention to “[t]he neglect of diversities other than the Catholic-Protestant/Nationalist-Unionist ones in Field Day: the diversities between the needs of men and the needs of women, between the needs not simply of rich and poor, but within the middle class, and of the homosexual and the heterosexual.”¹⁸⁴ Therefore, as stated previously, with McGuinness’s keen interest in pluralities, *Sons of Ulster* provides a variety of classes and professions, and “the men, including young Pyper, come from different walks of Ulster life, and they pair off according to class, politics, and sexual orientation.”¹⁸⁵ In this regard, Kenneth Pyper appears to be the most distinctive and remarkable character on the stage. His infuriating attitude towards the others, his break with the stereotype of a soldier and lastly his social class distinguish him from the other soldiers in *Sons of Ulster*. Although this distinctness might be interpreted as an advantage over other people, Pyper reaches an impasse, which causes his self to be “divided.” Regrettably, Pyper can only feel revolt against his social status instead of reaping its benefits.

As in *Philadelphia* and *Woman and Scarecrow*, *Sons of Ulster*’s protagonist is considered to be the “schizo” in regard to the definition given to this term by Deleuze and Guattari who consider the territorialities that wield power over the individual as the cause of schizophrenic split of the self. Therefore, appearing on the stage as a divided self, Pyper brings his unconscious to the surface where he can be cured and

¹⁸² Bernice Schrank, ‘World War One in Observe the Sons of Ulster Marching Towards the Somme’, in *The Theatre of Frank McGuinness: Stages of Mutability*, ed. Helen Lojek, Dublin (Carysfort Press: 2002), 23.

¹⁸³ Jordan, *The Feast of Famine: The Plays of Frank McGuinness*, 188.

¹⁸⁴ Jennifer Fitzgerald et al., ‘The Arts and Ideology: Jennifer Fitzgerald Talks to Seamus Deane, Joan Fowler and Frank McGuinness’, *The Crane Bag* 9, no. 2 (1985): 65.

¹⁸⁵ Sanford Sternlicht, *A Reader’s Guide to Modern Irish Drama* (Syracuse University Press, 1998), 140.

thus free himself from the constraints of the family and the expectations of his social class. In other words, Pyper's divided self can be accounted for in terms of Deleuze and Guattari's theory of schizoanalysis as it occurs as a result of the desire to escape from what keeps him back from manifesting his true identity and represses his individuality. Accordingly, this person is considered as a

schizo revolutionary type that follows the lines of escape of desire; breaches the wall and causes flows to move. The revolutionary knows that escape is revolutionary- withdrawal, freaks— provided one sweeps away the social cover on leaving, or causes a piece of the system to get lost in the shuffle. What matters is to break through the wall.¹⁸⁶

What is striking here is the driving force(s) of this revolutionary type that is the oppression of the territorialities of the family and the social class. Unlike the members of the aristocracy who mostly enjoy the benefit of their social status, Pyper overtly suffers from and becomes the victim of his social class. Although Pyper's social status is not explicitly reflected either by McGuinness or Pyper himself, his comrades persistently accentuate his distinctiveness, that is, his being an aristocrat. Throughout the play, Pyper remains reticent about his social status, yet he insinuates it through his words. For instance, in his dialogue with Millen and Moore, Pyper states: "I've never done a day's work in my life."¹⁸⁷ In addition, he unconsciously reveals his family background during his conversation with Craig.

Pyper: Greyhounds?

Craig: You know about dogs?

Pyper: We bred, the family bred greyhounds.¹⁸⁸

Although this detail seems inconsequential, it effectively reveals Pyper's background with his family's having bred greyhounds, which is the only breed of dog mentioned in the Bible and one of the most popular dogs with the British aristocracy as an indication of power and wealth. Chiefly, greyhounds became much more differentiated with Queen Victoria's husband, Albert's, gifting a white greyhound, called Eos, to the Queen¹⁸⁹; and this led to this type of dog's being associated with royalty and nobility, and becoming the representation of the aristocratic way of life. By virtue of this

¹⁸⁶ Deleuze and Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus*, 277.

¹⁸⁷ McGuinness, *Plays*, 109.

¹⁸⁸ McGuinness, 116.

¹⁸⁹ 'A Dog's Life: Eos! Prince Albert's Loyal Greyhound', *The Esoteric Curiosa* (blog), 16 November 2010, <http://theesotericcuriosa.blogspot.com/2010/11/dogs-life-eos-prince-alberts-loyal.html>.

example, it is conceivable that Pyper cannot leave his background behind, but rather it comes forth and haunts him. Since Young Pyper is dissatisfied with the oppression of the social class he belongs to, McGuinness frames the tragic story of Pyper in this play and demonstrates his being oppressed within the above-mentioned territoriality. In Part Two: 'Initiation,' we are informed by Pyper himself that he is "a sculptor" and "works with stone."¹⁹⁰ In this respect, as an artist, Pyper unearths his identity as being a member of the aristocracy. The rest of the group's members are identified and categorized as of the working class by their jobs, these seven Ulster-men acknowledge their low position in society and are aware of the expectations of society from them such as labour and quality of work life. On the other hand, Pyper realizes the limitations and expectations imposed on him and is thus cornered by the rules of his class as an artist:

Pyper: ... I thought I was doing the same when I cleared out of this country and went to do something with my heart and my eyes and my hands and my brains. Something I could not do here as the eldest son of a respectable family whose greatest boast is that in their house Sir Edward Carson, savior of their tribe danced in the finest gathering Armagh had ever seen. I escaped Carson's dance. While you were running with your precious motors to bring in his guns, I escaped Carson's dance, David. I got out to create, not destroy. But the gods wouldn't allow that. I could not create. That's the real horror of what I found in Paris, not the corpse of a dead whore. I couldn't look at my life's work, for when I saw my hands working they were not mine but the hands of my ancestors, interfering, and I could not be rid of that interference. I could not create. I could only preserve. Preserve my flesh and blood, what I'd seen, what I'd learned. It wasn't enough. I was contaminated. I smashed my sculpture and I rejected any woman who would continue my breed. I destroyed one to make that certain. And I would destroy my own life. I would take up arms at the call of my Protestant fathers. I would kill in their name and I would die in their name. To win their respect would be my sole act of revenge, revenge for the bad joke they had played on me in making me sufficiently different to believe I was unique, when my true uniqueness lay only in how alike them I really was. And then the unseen obstacle in my fate. I met you.¹⁹¹

This statement shows that Pyper is not content either with his social status or with his family. However much Pyper attempts to withdraw himself from his family's fancy life, he cannot disconnect himself from them. Unlike most of the people, who could enjoy the privileges of belonging among a "swanky" people, Pyper carries his family

¹⁹⁰ McGuinness, 118.

¹⁹¹ McGuinness, 163–64.

background like a burden of the rules and laws of his class.¹⁹² He suffers, in consequence, from not being able to act out his true self and thus challenges the privileges or, in other words, “obstacles” of that society through “split self.” In this regard, Deleuze and Guattari’s “schizoanalysis” will help us establish the connection between Pyper’s class background and his divided self. Pyper is not allowed to behave like the rest of the society, but rather in accordance with the rules and laws of his family and his social class. Thus, Elder Pyper regards his younger self as in an attempt to escape from the boundaries he encountered in his past. He acknowledges that should he be persistent on acting out his true personality, he will have to bear the consequences of being excommunicated from his own family. Therefore, through his younger self, he has found a way to achieve his emancipation:

Mcllwaine: Pyper? You come from a swanky family, don’t you?

Pyper: Why ask that now?

Mcllwaine: I’m just beginning to wonder what you’re doing down with us instead of being with them.

Pyper: And who are they?

Mcllwaine: Top brass.

Pyper: I’m not top brass, Mcllwaine. Maybe once. Not now. I blotted my copy book.

Mcllwaine: How?

[...]

Pyper: Just being the black sheep.¹⁹³

The above scene indeed depicts how much Pyper yearns to draw himself away from his roots and thus attempts to break with the past as well as the others’ awareness of his social status. Although Pyper does not explicitly tell how and why he refers to himself as the “black sheep”, the conversation between Mcllwaine and Anderson reveals the group’s being aware of Pyper’s homosexuality and of his being the “black sheep” in his family and community:

Mcllwaine: He’s some fighter though. Pyper. Who would have thought it?

Anderson: Who indeed?

¹⁹² As Karl Marx argues “the class in its turn achieves an independent existence over against the individuals, so that the latter find their conditions of existence predestined, and hence have their position in life and their personal development assigned to them by their class, become subsumed under it.” (Marx, “The German Ideology,” 20.)

¹⁹³ McGuinness, 172.

Mellwaine: You said he was a milksop.

Anderson: There's still something rotten there. That time Craig threw himself on him to save him.

Mellwaine: What about them?

Anderson: The look on their faces. Something rotten.¹⁹⁴

In this regard, due to his sexual orientation, Pyper is forced out not only of his family but also of the society he lives in. While heterosexuality is regarded as the normal sexual orientation, Pyper's sexuality makes him an outcast. The British aristocracy with its strict heteronormative and patriarchal codes shows no tolerance towards such marginal individuals as Pyper. Bukowski, for example, explains the reason behind ostracization of homosexual people, especially the upper-classes, as follows:

homosexuality would completely disrupt the established codes of masculinity, class position, capitalism, and patriarchy because it did not fit into the boundaries of the established social ideology. If homosexuality could not be suppressed and controlled, like other deviant behaviors, it could disrupt the ideology of the entire British Empire.¹⁹⁵

In this respect, it is expected from the aristocracy and upper-class male to "create a heteronormative public identity that supports the traditional view of the family as a place of stability, conforms to England's capitalist social ideology."¹⁹⁶

Therefore, Pyper conceives that his so-called 'rareness' dishonours his family name as he does not fit into the traditional family life and he is, therefore, ostracized by his own community. Since the aristocracy "was an institution—a set of constraints . . . that were devised to control the behaviour of a group of individuals,"¹⁹⁷ Pyper is oppressed by his family and his social class to live according to their rules and laws. However, when his family cannot control Pyper and tolerate his distinctiveness regarding his sexual orientation, he drifts away from his own roots and is banished to France where such deviations from social norms and values might be more tolerable than in Northern Ireland. In addition to Pyper's banishment to France as an attempt to keep him away from the public eye, he is completely excluded from his family by their decision to disinherit him:

¹⁹⁴ McGuinness, 147.

¹⁹⁵ Jeffrey Bukowski, 'Unseen Identity' (M.A. thesis, University of Vermont, 2008), 5.

¹⁹⁶ Bukowski, 8.

¹⁹⁷ Douglas W. Allen, 'A Theory of the Pre-Modern British Aristocracy', *Explorations in Economic History* 46, no. 3 (2009): 302.

Pyper: I remember that time in France.

Craig: What?

Pyper: In France. I nearly starved there.

Craig: You've been there?

Moore: When were you there?

Millen: What's it like?

[...]

Pyper: That time I thought my end had come. Well-deserved bad end. Absolutely friendless. ...

Moore: You had no money at all or people to pull you through?

Pyper: None.¹⁹⁸

In line with this scene, it can clearly be observed that Pyper, by embracing his homosexuality and denying the heteronormative codes dominating his family and society, is permanently dismissed from his community and has no one in his life to hold on to. Although Corr interprets Pyper's homosexuality "as a quality that excludes him from the constraints of social class. Or perhaps it is rather that, as a single gay man ... he has removed himself from the heteronormative social paradigm,"¹⁹⁹ Pyper's homosexuality seems to have caused his family to wield enough power on him to lead to a psychological breakdown.

Furthermore, the moment he realizes "exit from the aristocratic group was easy, quick, and often permanent"²⁰⁰ upon a small infraction, Pyper attempts to abdicate his responsibilities and thus overcome the repression over himself by recoding the system according to his own desire: he enlists in the army stating "I enlisted in the hope of death."²⁰¹ Notwithstanding, in bewilderment, McIlwaine foregrounds the social status of Pyper and cannot help questioning why he fights with them at the Somme since only the working class members can be "mere pawns in an aristocratic game,"²⁰² while upper-class people, in comparison with the working classes, "enjoy better health; live longer; live in superior homes; with more amenities, have more money to spend; work shorter hours; receive different and longer education; and are educationally more

¹⁹⁸ McGuinness, *Plays*, 110.

¹⁹⁹ Joseph Corr, 'Queer Identities During the Troubles in Northern Ireland: The Birth of Queer Theatre in Northern Ireland.' (PhD Thesis, University of East Anglia, 2020), 59.

²⁰⁰ Allen, 'A Theory of the Pre-Modern British Aristocracy', 306.

²⁰¹ McGuinness, *Plays*, 98.

²⁰² Declan Kiberd, 'Frank McGuinness and the Sons of Ulster', *The Yearbook of English Studies* 35, no. 1 (2005): 282.

successful... and have different tastes in the mass media, and the arts”.²⁰³ McIlwaine is conscious of this social structure and, as a consequence of this, the stratification in society locating him beneath Pyper as himself being a member of the working class. McIlwaine realises that life can offer every opportunity to Pyper, whilst he and his sort cannot be provided with the simple pleasures of life due to their social status. McIlwaine behaves properly in accordance with his social status while Pyper perplexes his group with his unconventional attitude. In this regard, his questions enable him to comprehend the depths of Pyper’s reason to join the army and even to consent to be a cannon fodder just like average people. In the play, not only McIlwaine but also Craig foreground Pyper’s distinctness in terms of his social status:

Pyper: Why are you changing?

Craig: Because you’re going back. You’ll go back to your proud family. The brave eldest son. Made a man of himself in Flanders. Damn you, after listening to that bit of rabble-rousing, I saw through you. You’re wasted here with us. You’re not of us, man. You’re a leader. You got what you wanted. You always have, you always will. You’ll come through today because you learned to want it.²⁰⁴

Scott also expresses the possible life chances and distinction between the working class and the upper class as follows: “A status situation is a causal component in life chances, and a sophisticated sociological analysis must recognize that inequalities in life chances are the effects of both class and status situations, which operate conjointly to determine life chances.”²⁰⁵ However, what McIlwaine and Craig are missing is Pyper’s dissatisfaction and discordance with aristocratic society. In this respect, Pyper’s situation is aptly summarized by Etherton: “He is in an emotional and mental cul-de-sac by virtue of his background and his history.”²⁰⁶

Ostensibly, Pyper does not want to be subject to economic and cultural discrimination enforced by the aristocracy and denies his “top brass” background as McIlwaine sees it. Thereby, Elder Pyper, reminiscing about his youth and bringing his shadow, Younger Pyper, onto the stage, attempts to eliminate the limitations that restrain him: Deleuze and Guattari’s remarks could be illuminating in this regard:

²⁰³ Ivan Reid, *Social Class Differences in Britain: A Sourcebook* (London: Open Books, 1977), 234.

²⁰⁴ McGuinness, *Plays*, 192.

²⁰⁵ Scott, ‘Social Class and Stratification in Late Modernity’, 30.

²⁰⁶ Etherton, *Contemporary Irish Dramatist*, 48.

The schizo has his own system of co-ordinates for situating himself at his disposal, because, first of all, he has at his disposal his very own recording code, which does not coincide with the social code, or coincides with it only in order to parody it. The code of delirium or of desire proves to have an extraordinary fluidity.²⁰⁷

Relatedly, Pyper disowns the social code of his social class and his family. He remains fraught with doubt and vacillation in regard to the traditions of his class, and its religious and political affiliations throughout the play. Instead of choosing a side on any issue, he refrains from any certainty searching for his true identity.

Furthermore, while working-class people are expected to have manual occupations to serve the need of the aristocracy, the upper classes enjoy their privileges to the utmost with no concern for money and occupation. They employ themselves with arts, media and politics. Or at its simplest, they recreate themselves doing nothing, yet reap the benefit of their status in society. In this respect, Kozyr-Kowalski emphasises the social stratification in society:

One of the characteristic features of the class society is the disconnection of its part from the direct productive activity, the splitting of the society into two groups, one of which is busy solely with the productive work, whereas the other is free to devote itself to other forms of social activity having shifted the burden of productive work on the shoulders of a part of the society.²⁰⁸

Nevertheless, these standards of living do not satisfy Pyper; they rather lead him to a sort of existential crisis pondering on the purpose of his life where he is expected not to work but solely to maintain his life as well as to live up to the rules and laws of his social class by preserving its traditions. Upon the question of Craig, “Why did you enlist, Pyper?”, he responds: “I enlisted, before I was conscripted, because I’d nothing better to do. No, that’s wrong. I’d nothing else to do. I enlisted because I’m dying anyway. I want it over quickly.”²⁰⁹ Not only Craig but also the rest of the Ulster-men cannot hide their astonishment at Pyper’s joining the army. Furthermore, Pyper puts his title as a member of aristocracy aside and just becomes one of the ordinary soldiers with no rank, who fight in the trenches until they die:

Craig: Who the hell are you?

²⁰⁷ Deleuze and Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus*, 15.

²⁰⁸ Stanislaw Kozyr-Kowalski, ‘Marx’s Theory of Classes and Social Strata and “Capital”’, *The Polish Sociological Bulletin*, no. 21 (1970): 18.

²⁰⁹ McGuinness, *Plays*, 111.

Pyper: Pyper, sir, Kenneth Pyper.

Craig: Are you sure, Pyper –

Pyper: Call me Kenneth.

[...]

Pyper: Yes, sir, I wish to serve, sir.

Craig: I'm not sir. I'm the same rank as you. I'm Craig. David Craig.²¹⁰

As can be observed, Pyper distances himself from the possible privileges of his title as an aristocrat but instead pursues a simple life in which he can live outside the expectations of his social class and truly express his own identity. Pyper realizes that his life has reached an impasse where he cannot create a meaning in life but is instead living according to the aristocracy's expectations. R.D. Laing highlights the meaninglessness of life both as a cause and an effect of a schizoid break in individuals:

Everyone is subject to a certain extent at one time or another to such moods of futility, meaninglessness, and purposelessness, but in schizoid individuals these moods are particularly insistent. These moods arise from the fact that the doors of perception and/or the gates of action are not in the command of the self but are being lived and operated by a false self.²¹¹

At this point, Pyper's constant attempt to find a purpose in his life and yet his failure in this are lent countenance to by the theories of Deleuze and Guattari and R.D. Laing. Pyper, the "schizo" in retrospect, projects his dual personality in Young Pyper who attempts to re-create the past and eliminate the repression of the territorialities: the family and the social class. By this way, he intends to liberate and cure himself from the repression.

Ultimately, McGuinness has chosen such a setting for *Sons of Ulster*, in which he could embrace the diversity regarding social class and occupation; by this, McGuinness's play enables him to explore various issues ranging from homosexuality to social class in society. This four-part memory play in which the protagonist, Pyper, confronts the painful and tragic memories of the Battle of the Somme lays bare McGuinness's endeavor to disclose the etiology and symptomatology of split self and the resulting 'schizophrenia'. Pyper's individual problems regarding his family and his social status make a lasting impact on him, shaping his mental condition. Since Pyper cannot explicitly reject his social class and family, through the projection of his

²¹⁰ McGuinness, 104.

²¹¹ Laing, *The Divided Self: An Existential Study in Sanity and Madness*, 80–82.

younger self on the stage, he endeavors to disclose his subordination to the oppressive system and the abiding rules of his social class. Thereby, McGuinness critiques such institutions as the family and social class as the authorities constraining the individual by splitting the main character as Elder and Younger Pyper in *Sons of Ulster*.





5. SPLITTING OFF FROM DOMESTIC ROLES: FAMILY AND GENDER AS SCHIZOPHRENOGENIC FORCES IN MARINA CARR'S WOMAN AND SCARECROW

*"I was tired of being a woman,
tired of the spoons and the pots,
tired of my mouth and my breasts,
tired of the cosmetics and the silks...
I was tired of the gender of things"*²¹²

"If you asked anyone, who are the women in Irish Theatre in the last one hundred years, I think you would be hard pressed to get a response beyond Lady Gregory and Maud Gonne. Playwrights? A blank."²¹³ So speaks Marina Carr (1964-), pointing out the lack of female playwrights on the Irish stage which has not accommodated the female voice under its roof since the Irish Literary Revival. However, Carr captures the stage once again from a male-dominated mainstream theatre. Tom MacIntyre emphasizes the significance of a new female voice and energy emerging in the 1990s in Irish drama as follows:

Marina Carr is at the beginning of her career as a playwright [...]. It makes perfect sense that - with female energy at last being given room to move in this society- a young female playwright should unhesitatingly set about banishing the taboo successfully imposed by male playwrights (with the connivance of critics, and it must be said, audiences) over the period of up to a hundred years.²¹⁴

And soon, she became one of the leading figures and influential voices in contemporary Irish Drama. According to Leeney and McMullan, Marina Carr is not just a representative of the radical experimentation of that younger generation and an important playwright who is also a woman, but "one of the most powerful, haunting voices on the contemporary Irish stage"²¹⁵ evidenced by her formidable body of work. She was born in 1964 and spent her youth in County Offaly in the Midlands of Ireland, where she sets most of her works, such as *The Mai* (1994), *Portia Coughlan* (1996), and *By the Bog of Cats* (1998). Leeney and McMullan explain the significance of the Midlands in Carr's work: "The geography in her plays works on many levels, paralleling emotional states in the characters, opening Ireland out into a metonym for

²¹² Sexton Anne, *Live or Die* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1966), 20.

²¹³ Marina Carr, *Women in Irish Drama: A Century of Authorship and Representation*, ed. Melissa Sihra (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), x.

²¹⁴ Tom MacIntyre, 'Program Note for Ullaloo' (Peacock Theatre, 25 March 1991).

²¹⁵ Cathy Leeney and Anna McMullan, *The Theatre of Marina Carr: "Before Rules Was Made"* (Dublin: Carysfort Press, 2003), xv.

the world as the vulnerable home and sanctuary of the human race: ‘Carr’s Irish Midlands,’ as Claudia Harris has said, ‘are her passageway into an ancient new imaginative World.’²¹⁶ Thus far, Carr has produced sixteen plays “and she is now considered—along with Brian Friel—one of Ireland’s most important playwrights since Beckett.”²¹⁷

Having grown up in a literary and artistic society thanks to her father – a playwright and a novelist – Carr has always been pertinent to theatre. When she attended University College Dublin, where she studied English and Philosophy, she soon joined in the university’s Drama Society and penned her first play, *Ullaloo* in 1987. As Roche puts it: “She later continued her postgraduate studies on Samuel Beckett at Trinity College, Dublin, but she did not complete her thesis on Beckett.”²¹⁸ Instead, she chose to pursue a different career which enabled her to devote herself to writing plays. Her educational background contributed to the development of Carr as a playwright. Today, not only is Carr hailed as one of the most influential voices in contemporary drama in Ireland, but her plays have enjoyed world-wide success.

Carr built a reputation for herself by writing plays that “have premiered in award-winning productions at the Abbey, Peacock, Gate, and Projects Theatres in Dublin.”²¹⁹ However, Carr’s success is not limited to Ireland, but acknowledged worldwide: her plays have also been produced “in the United States by San José Repertory Theatre, Irish Repertory of Chicago, The Pittsburgh Irish and Classical Theatre, and the McArthur theatre at Princeton among others.”²²⁰ Apart from the staging of her plays outside Ireland, Carr’s plays have been translated into many languages as diverse as Korean, Japanese, Hungarian, German, Dutch, and Turkish. Furthermore, Carr has been deemed worthy of such prestigious awards as “the Dublin Theatre Festival Best New Play Award, a Macaulay Fellowship, a Hennessey Award, the Susan Smith Blackburn Prize, and an E. M. Forster Prize from the American Academy of Arts & Letters.”²²¹ Currently, she both teaches playwriting at Trinity College Dublin and “has

²¹⁶ Leeney and McMullan, 217.

²¹⁷ Nancy Finn and Marina Carr, ‘Theater in Eleven Dimensions: A Conversation with Marina Carr’, *World Literature Today* 86, no. 4 (2012): 45.

²¹⁸ Anthony Roche, *Contemporary Irish Drama*, 2nd ed. (London: Palgrave, 2009), 244.

²¹⁹ Melissa Sihra, “‘Nature Noble or Ignoble’: Woman, Family, and Home in the Theatre of Marina Carr”, *HJEAS*, JSTOR, 11, no. 2 (2005): 133.

²²⁰ Sihra, 133.

²²¹ Finn and Carr, ‘Theater in Eleven Dimensions’, 45.

been writer-in-residence at Trinity College, Princeton University, and the Abbey Theatre.”²²²

Carr is described as “the youngest, most accomplished and many would argue the only Irish woman playwright who has made her mark.”²²³ What is so striking about her drama is definitely the interesting contexts and experimental forms. Chiefly she experiments with the Beckettian Absurd Theatre through the use of stops, long pauses, meaningless and trivial conversations, as an indication of the failure of communication. According to Roche, “in theatrical terms, Marina Carr would acknowledge a debt to Samuel Beckett more readily than many of the other playwrights.”²²⁴ Carr, for instance, describes one of her early plays, *Low in the Dark*, as a “homage to Beckett.”²²⁵ Essentially, Carr’s work focuses on the themes of death, violence, gender, family life, and human nature with an emphasis on female characters. A sweeping examination of Carr’s oeuvre reveals a gradual change in her style, her use of narrative techniques, the dramatic language, and the thematic contents. Regarding the first phase of Carr’s dramatic career, it can be claimed that she mainly engages in her works with the themes of love, sexuality and the stereotypical gender roles, and that she follows the Beckettian Theatre of the Absurd. Equally crucially, Carr rejects the conventions of the ‘well-made play.’ She explains the reasons behind this decision in an interview with Erica Nagle:

I just got bored with the “well-made play” – beginning, middle, and end, you know? We’re all kind of bored of it. It’s all shifting so fast now. I think our capacity to take in information has quickened in the past twenty, thirty years [...] It gets harder and harder to keep our own attention and certainly to keep anyone else’s attention. I know that’s true when I go to the theatre. If I know what’s going to happen and the way it’s going to happen within the first 5 minutes, then that’s it, unless there’s another factor like an extraordinary performance or something. I think it’s no longer the story you’re telling but how you’re telling it. There are a lot of great traditional well-made plays out there are, but that form just doesn’t do it for me right now.²²⁶

As evidenced by her early plays such as *Low in the Dark* (1989), *The Deer’s Surrender* (1990), *This Love Thing* (1991) and *Ullaloo* (1991), Carr attempts to challenge the

²²² Finn and Carr, 45.

²²³ Eileen Battersby, ‘Marina of the Midlands’, *The Irish Times*, 4 May 2020, 15.

²²⁴ Anthony Roche, *Contemporary Irish Drama*, 244.

²²⁵ Melissa Sihra, ‘The House of Woman and the Plays of Marina Carr’, in *Women in Irish Drama: A Century of Authorship and Representation*, ed. Melissa Sihra (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), 18.

²²⁶ Marina Carr, *Backwards and Forwards* with Marina Carr, interview by Erica Nagle, 2011, <http://www.mccarter.org/phaedrbackwards/pages/interviewmarina.html>.

patriarchy and approaches her subject matter from a feminist standpoint. More significantly, in these four plays, as in Carr's later works, she pays a great deal of attention to female characters and "the cultural fabrication of gendered hierarchies."²²⁷ She also deconstructs the ideal image of womanhood and motherhood that has been embedded in the Irish psyche. According to O'Gorman, "Carr's work up to 1991 is highly subversive in content, satirically excavating the interconnections of genders, customs and cultural histories. Stylistic features such as self-referential elements, shifting personae and fragmentary, repetitive scenarios block sustained, emotional involvement with any one character."²²⁸

Apart from Carr's thematic concerns in her works up to 1991, the dramatic language she employs in her plays varies from her early works to recent works. In her abovementioned early works, Carr uses the standard Hiberno-English. As Leeney states: "Her use of an idiomatic, heavily accented form of English, as it is spoken in the Midlands of Ireland, marks most of her plays. The eccentric spellings in the quotations that follow are not misprints, but markers of a very particular and muscular engagement with language."²²⁹

Having paid homage to Beckett and made use of her educational background in English Studies, Carr changes her course in writing and starts deviating from the Beckettian 'Theatre of the Absurd.' She explains the reasons behind this decision as follows: "I wrote myself into a corner with the whole absurdist outlook. I didn't believe it anymore. In Beckett there's something passionless, something cold about him, something cold about his writing, almost like everything begins and ends with inertia and the tragedy of that."²³⁰ After a while, Carr realizes where her interest lies and heads towards classical works, particularly those concerning the Greek mythology. Carr set out from a different starting point for her career when she "shook off [Beckett's] ghost"; then she "truly came into her own"²³¹ as McNulty claims. So, Carr's later

²²⁷ Siobhán O'Gorman, 'Writing from the Margins: Marina Carr's Early Theatre', *Irish Studies Review*, tandoonline, 22, no. 4 (2014): 488.

²²⁸ O'Gorman, 488.

²²⁹ Cathy Leeney, 'Marina Carr: Violence and Destruction: Language, Space and Landscape', in *A Companion to Modern British and Irish Drama 1880–2005*, ed. Mary Luckhurst (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2006), 509.

²³⁰ Quoted in James F. Clarity, 'A Playwright's Post-Beckett Period', *New York Times*, 3 November 1994.

²³¹ Charles McNulty, 'Marina Carr: Unmotherly Feelings', *American Theatre* 18, no. 8 (2001): 106.

works appear on the stage with a more tragic tone and in a realistic manner demonstrating her deviation from the absurdist tradition. Moreover, in line with her interest in them, Carr rewrites classical works, interweaving myths with the Irish folklore in an efficient use of the Irish dialect.

When Carr embarks on the second phase of her career, she makes a breakthrough with three remarkable plays: *The Mai* (1994), *Portia Coughlan* (1996) and *By the Bog of Cats* ... (1998), comprising the Midlands Trilogy which derives its name from the plays' setting, to wit, the Irish Midlands – Carr's place of birth. In these plays, Carr puts the absurdist and experimental conduct aside. As Christopher Morash states, these "early, experimental plays gave way to a more naturalistic style in plays with midland settings."²³² For the most part, Carr, in the *Midland Trilogy*, deals with "a kind of Irish heart of darkness."²³³ More significantly, she delves into the Irish female identity interwoven with the Greek myths. She generally recounts the traumatized female characters who are haunted by their past and unable to connect with the present. In addition, Carr delineates the world of Irish women in order to disrupt the ideal image of womanhood and motherhood in Ireland which had been at the forefront especially since *Cathleen ni Houlihan* (1902) written collaboratively by William Butler Yeats and Lady Gregory. The female characters in Carr's aforementioned second-phase plays oscillate between past and present, life and death. Moreover, all these female characters are unable to cope with the maternal burden they face in Irish society and attempt to deny the maternal identity imposed on them. At last, they demonstrate destructive tendencies and do not even hesitate to commit suicide at the end of the plays.

What is more, Carr briefly defines the Midland Trilogy as "the Greek idea of destiny and fate and little escape,"²³⁴ yet she goes beyond her idea and attracts attention with her use of the Irish dialect, a "rediscovering of the poetic and theatrical resources of Irish speech in English"²³⁵ as Welch states. Referring to the change in Carr's dramatic language, Frank McGuinness observes that she carries out a "physical attack on the

²³² Christopher Morash, *A History of Irish Theatre 1601-2000* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 278.

²³³ Cathy, 'Marina Carr: Violence and Destruction: Language, Space and Landscape', 510.

²³⁴ Quoted in Clarity, 'A Playwright's Post-Beckett Period'.

²³⁵ Robert Welch, *The Abbey Theatre, 1899-1999: Form and Pressure* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 250.

conventions of syntax, spelling and sounds of Standard English.”²³⁶ However, he, later on, comes to terms with Carr’s use of language as matching the *Midlands Trilogy*. Considering Carr’s idea of knitting myths into the fabric of the traumatized and docile female characters in Ireland’s dark places, McGuinness further comments:

Death is a big country. And hers is a big imagination, crossing the border always between the living and the dead. She speaks in a strange language, but has no truck with the gift of tongues. In her plays words are like boiling water. They scald you if they so choose. And she knows playwrights have to be in the business of discovering fire, for without it there is no passion, no comfort, no terror, no light.²³⁷

Thanks to the *Midlands Trilogy*, Carr bursts into prominence, ensuring her place in Contemporary Irish Drama. As a female playwright, who is aware of the disempowerment of women in the literary canon, Carr is deemed to be worthy of being a part of the canon. Her powerfully original plays, in the *Midlands Trilogy*, and thematic content where she deals with the struggles of Irish women based on Greek myths even provoke many Irish critics to dub Carr “the female Friel.”²³⁸

Carr’s works following the *Midlands Trilogy* enable her to assure stability in her career and secure her place on the Irish stage. Her later works, *On Raftery’s Hill* (2000) and *Ariel* (2002) cannot be dissociated from the Irish Midlands. Carr deals with the three generations of the Raftery family revealing the darkness in them and presenting sexual abuse, domestic violence and incest, relationships in the Midlands depending on the idea of “dark matter in us and out there.”²³⁹ Ian Kilroy in *The Irish Times* has it that “in her play, *Ariel*, Marina Carr returns to drama’s Greek roots, “by way of the Midlands dialect and modern Irish public life.”²⁴⁰

Four years later, Carr writes *Woman and Scarecrow* (2006), disconcertingly abandoning the setting of the Midlands. Performed at the Royal Court Jerwood Theatre Upstairs, London, in 2006, *Woman and Scarecrow* reveals Carr’s bringing a new perspective to her dramatic career. Considering the development and the course of Carr’s career, it can be affirmed that *Woman and Scarecrow*, albeit overlapping almost

²³⁶ Leeney and McMullan, *The Theatre of Marina Carr*, 78.

²³⁷ Frank McGuinness, ‘Writing in Greek: By the Bog of Cats...’, in *The Theatre of Marina Carr: Before Rules Was Made*, ed. Leeney Cathy and Anna McMullan (Dublin: Carysfort Press, 2003), 87.

²³⁸ McNulty, ‘Marina Carr’, 107.

²³⁹ Finn and Carr, ‘Theater in Eleven Dimensions’, 45.

²⁴⁰ Ian Kilroy, ‘Greek Tragedy, Midlands Style’, *The Irish Times*, 20 September 2002.

with the same thematic content in her previous works, in her naming of the characters and her choice of setting, appears as one of Carr's experimental works. Sierz argues that "[f]inally, Carr's *Woman and Scarecrow* has affinities with her earlier, absurdist style."²⁴¹ The theatrical scene, which is a confined domestic setting consisting of a bed, a chair, a CD player, and a wardrobe, is characteristic of the Beckettian play with a bare and naked stage. Besides, what is significant in restricting the play's setting to a single and confined domestic place is to "bring revelatory attention to space itself"²⁴² which plays a significant role in presenting the physical and psychological condition of the main character. Carr also refuses to identify her characters with conventional names but rather prefers to name them Woman, Scarecrow, Him and Auntie Ah in an attempt to accentuate her humanist and universal attitudes in the play, as well as to demonstrate the Beckettian aspect. In addition, at first sight, *Woman and Scarecrow*, a play of four characters in a single location during a single day, seems to handle the issues of domestic life, family relationship and Woman, who is confined to bed by illness, struggling to survive in a patriarchal system, although the play actually has so much more to offer regarding its content and dramaturgy.

Before examining the play in detail, it is crucial to provide a summary of *Woman and Scarecrow*. The play opens with a conversation between Scarecrow and Woman, who is lying in bed ill as an indication of her dying hours. At that moment, Scarecrow informs Woman about "the thing" in the wardrobe that will take her life saying "You think all the dead were ready? (Whispers) That thing will eat you alive."²⁴³ Woman demonstrates a reluctant attitude towards her approaching death thinking of her eight children and being concerned about their lunches, education, etc. Later on, Woman and Scarecrow's dialogue reminisces about Woman's regrets, passions, joys and even fears on her deathbed. Through Woman's question "What am I dying of?"²⁴⁴ and Scarecrow's response: "spite,"²⁴⁵ Woman implicitly confirms what her husband unremittingly reiterates, that is, his cheating on her. However, although she admits

²⁴¹ Aleks Sierz, 'Marina Carr', in *The Methuen Drama Guide to Contemporary Irish Playwrights*, ed. Martin Middeke and Paul Schnierer (London: Methuen, 2010), 47.

²⁴² Louis Rogers, "'Setting the Stage: Action and Absence in Enda Walsh and Samuel Beckett's Play Spaces', *The Architectural Review*, 18 May 2021.

²⁴³ Marina Carr, *Marina Carr Plays 2: On Raftery's Hill, Ariel, Woman and Scarecrow, the Cordelia Dream, Marble* (London: Faber & Faber, 2009), 121.

²⁴⁴ Marina Carr, 125.

²⁴⁵ Marina Carr, 125.

“from the start I knew this man is no good for me,”²⁴⁶ Woman cannot give up on loving him. Him’s entering the room reveals the broken and fraught relationship between Woman and Him once again. Though Him confessed his misdeeds and asked for forgiveness for his callous treatment of her, Woman cannot stop herself from asking him “why did you keep returning?”²⁴⁷ In the end of Act I, Woman, this time, is accompanied by “god-fearing Auntie Ah.”²⁴⁸ During her visit to Woman, Auntie Ah mainly blames and accuses her of not struggling for her life. She does not even hesitate to call Woman weak. “Your mother was the same. No finishing power. Anyone can get through the first half. You start a life. You finish it. You don’t bail out at the crossroads because you don’t like the scenery.”²⁴⁹ The first act ends with Woman and Him’s fight over their irremediable relationship and Woman’s fear of death reverberated through her own words: “Oh Scarecrow, I’m so afraid.”²⁵⁰

The second act of the play starts with Woman’s repeatedly addressing Scarecrow, “Scarecrow!... Scarecrow... are you alright?”²⁵¹ Following the voices of Woman, Auntie Ah enters the room and starts provoking her in order to encourage Woman to “say a decade of the rosary.”²⁵² However, Woman is willing neither to say the rosary with Auntie Ah nor to confess her sins to Father; instead, she recalls her past days spent with her aunt. Woman eventually reveals her dissatisfaction with Auntie Ah that has been echoed through her confession of going up to university to get away from her. At that moment, Scarecrow enters the room raging against Woman and telling her she bartered herself for half an hour so that she (Woman) could live longer. Woman, recollecting her memories about her mother and childhood, attempts to find herself. Soon after, Him tries to connect with his wife getting into bed beside her for the last time. Nevertheless, they again find themselves caught up in a fervent dispute about Him’s cheating on her. Having an inner struggle from which she suffers from the beginning of the play, Woman cannot help accusing Scarecrow of having thwarted her joy with Him. At the end of the play, Woman attempts to stay in this world, expressing

²⁴⁶ Marina Carr, 131.

²⁴⁷ Marina Carr, 134.

²⁴⁸ Miriam Haughton, ‘Woman’s Final Confession: Too Much Hoovering and Not Enough Sex. Marina Carr’s Woman and Scarecrow’, *Mortality* 18, no. 1 (2013): 74.

²⁴⁹ Marina Carr, *Marina Carr Plays 2: On Raftery’s Hill, Ariel, Woman and Scarecrow, the Cordelia Dream, Marble*, 140.

²⁵⁰ Marina Carr, 147.

²⁵¹ Marina Carr, 148.

²⁵² Marina Carr, 148.

her concern for her eight children; however, Scarecrow bids Woman not to fight her since she has no chance to win. The play ends with Woman's words, "Oh Scarecrow ... the next breath isn't coming and she dies in Scarecrow's arms."²⁵³

Leeney and McMullan argue that Carr's "gender has been used to market her work,"²⁵⁴ and [thus] "she is sometimes perceived as bearing a burden of representing women and women's experience."²⁵⁵ In the play, Carr skillfully weaves the subjugation of women, and universal female grievances with the institution of family in a melancholic way. Therefore, this play is generally read "as an exploration of the many and varied voices of feminist thought"²⁵⁶; however, in this chapter, *Woman and Scarecrow* is examined with reference to the relation between 'schizophrenia,' or, more specifically, 'split self,' and the institutions of family and gender. As in *Philadelphia, Here I Come!*, in which the family institution plays the role of social oppression, Woman is also depicted in an unhappy and damaged family environment, confronting psychological violence due to her husband's adultery. In this regard, this chapter of the thesis is dedicated to the analysis of Woman's oppression in the territoriality of the family along with an emphasis on the gender issue. Since women commonly suffer from oppressive territorialities such as Gender, Family, and Church, they explicitly or implicitly attempt to resist these institutions to regain their freedom and identity. This chapter aims to demonstrate the way the protagonist, Woman, does not submit to oppressive social institutions and attempts to live beyond their laws through the help of her alter ego, Scarecrow, in the play.

Having been represented as a dying woman, Woman is depicted in her domestic sphere which she actually rages against during the play; however, she still finds a way to expand her family, undergoing nine pregnancies and giving birth to eight children. At this point, it is crucial to examine the Irish society and its approach to women in order to understand the situation of Woman in the play. First of all, Ireland, throughout history, has been associated with female figures and is "conceived of as a feminine entity."²⁵⁷ Edna O'Brien comments on this issue as follows: "Ireland has always been a woman, a womb, a cave, a cow, a Rosaleen, a sow, a bride, a harlot, and, of course,

²⁵³ Marina Carr, 173.

²⁵⁴ Leeney and McMullan, *The Theatre of Marina Carr*, 45.

²⁵⁵ Cathy, 'Marina Carr: Violence and Destruction: Language, Space and Landscape', 510.

²⁵⁶ Haughton, 'Woman's Final Confession', 73.

²⁵⁷ Welch, *The Abbey Theatre, 1899-1999: Form and Pressure*, 89.

the gaunt Hag of Beara.”²⁵⁸ Proceeding from this statement, Mac Cana asserts that “In Irish tradition ... the land and its sovereignty [are] conceived in the form of a woman ... [where she is] ... as old as the hills yet endlessly restored to youth through union with her rightful mate.”²⁵⁹ Additionally, in Celtic mythology, female figures are associated with fertility, earth and wisdom. According to Squire, “the most ancient divinity of whom we have any knowledge is Danu herself, the goddess from whom the whole hierarchy of gods received its name of Tuatha Dé Danann. ... She was the universal mother.”²⁶⁰ Furthermore, Schrage-Früh argues that

the earliest known version of Cathleen is the sovereignty goddess ... [where] ... [I]n pre-Christian times she was conceived as powerful, sexually and politically active and as combining a wide scope of aspects ranging from supernatural abilities to the functions of a goddess not only of sovereignty but also of the land, of fertility, death and war.²⁶¹

In pre-Christian times, women held a leading position and they came to the forefront by being active and having an independent role in Irish society. However, after Christianity, this leading and powerful female/goddess figure is replaced by the representation of Mother Ireland, a “figure of femininity characterizing Irish nationalism.”²⁶² More significantly, the image of powerful and beautiful Irish women is reshaped by the representation of ideal Christian women in the teaching of the Catholic Church. While the Catholic Church in Ireland was increasing its power as an institution, women, who were expected to surrender their self and identity, had become one of the main targets of the Church. “Irish mothers were seen as paragons of Christian virtue who were happy to stay at home rearing their children in the love and sight of God”²⁶³ as Inglis asserts. In this respect, it can be stated that with the increasing power of the Catholic Church as an institution in Ireland, the sphere of family life and the position of women were considerably degraded. Inglis comments on this issue

²⁵⁸ Edna O’Brien, *Mother Ireland* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1976), 11.

²⁵⁹ Mac Cana Proinsias, ‘Woman in Irish Mythology’, in *The Crane Bag Book of Irish Studies 1977-1981*, ed. Richard Kearney and Mark Patrick Hederman (Dublin: Blackwater Press, 1982), 523.

²⁶⁰ Charles Squire, *Celtic Myth and Legend Poetry Romance* (London: The Gresham Publishing Company, 1910), 50–51.

²⁶¹ Michaela Schrage-Früh, *Emerging Identities: Myth, Nation and Gender in the Poetry of Eavan Boland, Nuala Ni Dhomhnaill and Medbh McGuckian* (Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier, 2004), 4.

²⁶² Sean Ryder, ‘Gender and the Discourse of Young Ireland Nationalism’, in *Gender and Colonialism* (Galway: Galway University Press, 1995), 213.

²⁶³ Tom Inglis, *Moral Monopoly: The Rise and Fall of the Catholic Church in Modern Ireland* (Dublin: University College Dublin Press, 1998), 246.

pointing out the empowerment of the Church and disempowerment of women in Irish society:

[T]he development of the Church and a rigorous moral discipline could not have been attained without the Irish mother. She became the sacred heart of Irish homes. It was she who inculcated a ritualistic and legalistic adherence to the rules and regulations of the Church. She brought the family to prayer and enforced the Church's code of morality. She was the Church's representative in the home who supervised the moral conduct of her husband and children. She became the living embodiment of Our Lady – humble, pious, celibate and yet fecund. She gave herself to the Church, and in each succeeding generation produced the religious vocations that sustained the Church. [. . .]. The mother maintained her power within the home in the same way as the Church did in wider society.²⁶⁴

Therefore, it is possible to conclude that this idealization of womanhood compelled Irish women to remain in the domestic sphere relinquishing their subjectivity and even identity but consecrating themselves to their family as the key component of society and to their children. In this regard, although they are conceived of as the guardians of the nation and family, this situation was either disapproved of or disregarded by successive generations. When they realized that they were torn between the expectation of the institutions of “family and gender” and their own self “to be,” women, who aimed at overthrowing the burden of this idealization of womanhood in the Irish society, attempted to escape from their position. Nevertheless, it has never been easy to be liberated from their iconic position in the domestic space. As a consequence, it is crucial to remark that when women encounter the identity crisis and cannot find a way to get out of this situation, this may cause self-harm, or even worse, suicide.

In *Woman and Scarecrow*, women's being overshadowed and suppressed by the oppressing institutions is delineated through the protagonist Woman and her alter ego, Scarecrow. As Leeney argues: “She [Marina Carr] splits identity into two archetypal halves: the Woman and the Scarecrow are a divided togetherness.”²⁶⁵ It can be posited that Carr does not bring an innovative technique but rather is inspired by Brian Friel and the representation of the divided self in his play *Philadelphia, Here I Come!*. Also,

²⁶⁴ Inglis, 248–49.

²⁶⁵ Cathy Leeney, ‘Character, Writing, and Landscape in *Woman and Scarecrow* and Other Plays by Marina Carr’, *The Princeton University Library Chronicle*, JSTOR, 68, no. 1–2 (Winter 2007): 712.

Sihra, in her book *Marina Carr: Pastures of Unknown*, comments on Carr's use of the device of the divided self:

Woman converses animatedly with Scarecrow—her eternal guide, which only she and the audience can see. Carr says: 'Scarecrow is an aspect of herself. It is a dialogue between self and soul' (83). 'Scarecrow', ... is a soul figure who has accompanied Woman throughout her life. With the device of the two characters Carr captures the inner and outer worlds, something which Friel had done in 1964 with the two male selves Public and Private Gar in *Philadelphia, Here I Come!*.²⁶⁶

Proceeding from this statement, it can be asserted that Woman and Scarecrow are indeed two halves of one identity completing each other, yet Scarecrow mirrors Woman's unconscious mind unveiling her suppressed feelings and thoughts. To put it differently, they hold a mirror to each other acknowledging their separate but closely related beings. The dialogue between Woman and Scarecrow displays their conceding to each other as well as the inseparable bond between them:

Scarecrow: You haven't changed since your holy communion.

Woman: You don't know the first thing about me.

Scarecrow: I know when you're lying. I was there before you and I'll be there after. Lie away. I'm through with you. I'm just going through the motions. I'll find someone else.²⁶⁷

As can be understood, Scarecrow accompanies Woman from her birth and will walk with her through her death as her alter ego. In this respect, having been represented as two different identities, Woman and Scarecrow are indeed complementary. Also, as in *Philadelphia, Here I Come!*, in which Private Gar is heard only by Public Gar, Scarecrow is invisible to all characters in the play but Woman. Roche discusses the sense of the divided self in *Woman and Scarecrow*, stating:

the play is absolutely centered on the dramatic co-presence of Woman and Scarecrow, the female double-act ... [she] represents with depth and complexity. As with Gar Private, no one else can see Scarecrow and so, when she is addressed by Woman when other characters are present, it appears as if Woman is speaking to herself.²⁶⁸

At this point, one may begin the examination of the divided self and the driving force behind this idea, which forms the principal focal point in the play. It can be claimed

²⁶⁶ Melissa Sihra, *Marina Carr: Pastures of the Unknown* (Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018), 189.

²⁶⁷ Marina Carr, *Marina Carr Plays 2: On Raftery's Hill, Ariel, Woman and Scarecrow, the Cordelia Dream, Marble*, 128.

²⁶⁸ Anthony Roche, *Contemporary Irish Drama*, 256–57.

that Carr commits to bringing the oppressing territorialities to light through her characters, Woman and Scarecrow, in the play, in a similar manner to that of Brian Friel. As a female figure, Woman features as the victim of both her gender and family, overburdened by cultural presuppositions, to the extent that her very identity was threatened. However, as mentioned above, walking away from one's responsibilities and discarding the oppression of certain institutions in society may not be possible in all circumstances. Therefore, Woman, having been married for a long period of time and having eight children, can neither leave them nor live with them in peace. She finds herself entrapped in a life committed to her husband and children. Nevertheless, complying with the rules of the oppressive institutions and renouncing her identity do not satisfy Woman and she ends up having an identity crisis. Throughout the play, she yearns for the days unlived in her life expressing her regret and reflects her sorrow about how much she was cornered within the domestic sphere and the patriarchal system. While Scarecrow helps her face the reality of the constraints of her marriage, Woman recollects the good old days before her marriage, or, as it were, her prison:

Woman: ... Yes, I played it better when I played.

Scarecrow: And then you stopped.

Woman: And then I stopped.

Scarecrow: He didn't like you you playing.

Woman: I played when he wasn't here. A bottle of champagne, the children asleep, just you and me. No, I suppose he never liked me to do anything better than him.

...

Scarecrow: You martyred yourself to mediocrity.

....

Woman: No, he's more fragile than that. I've carried him and his shattered ego for years. ... ²⁶⁹

Ostensibly, Woman is depicted as an intellectual and educated person, yet she seems to have had to put all her qualifications behind her in order to accommodate herself within the patriarchal society and to fulfil the requirements of its rules and laws. Nevertheless, it would not be wrong to claim that she is dissatisfied with the way she has spent her years, cornered by the ideals of the oppressing territorialities and seeking

²⁶⁹ Marina Carr, *Marina Carr Plays 2: On Raftery's Hill, Ariel, Woman and Scarecrow, the Cordelia Dream, Marble*, 135.

to form her unique identity through the help of Scarecrow who represents her inner voice. Although she cannot explicitly deny herself acting according to the rules of the oppressive authorities, she undergoes both self-discovery and self-annihilation on her deathbed through her alter-ego, Scarecrow. As Haughton argues: “Woman is deeply unhappy with this life and ‘decides to die’ according to Scarecrow. Thus, death is an escape from a world where the structures of womanhood and family became imprisoning for Woman.”²⁷⁰ Furthermore, death allows Woman to embrace her intrinsic identity, one that she has had to suppress. Christopher Murray argues that “the battle is for wholeness, for identity. But identity is now no simple matter but can even be a fiction.”²⁷¹

Woman’s unspecified disease along with her divided self, only visible to herself, ensues as a result of her entrapment within the domesticity and the oppression of the power figures. Put differently, not only the decision of death but also the divided self indicate Woman’s unwilling escape from the requirements of the territorialities of gender and family in the play. By representing Woman’s unconscious mind in the form of a split self, Carr manifests the disturbed and depressive state of Woman’s mind because of the oppressing powers.

In this regard, it is essential to lay bare the correlation between D&G’s theory of schizoanalysis and Carr’s dividing the protagonist into two selves on the stage. Since D&G’s social/psychological theory hinges upon the analysis of different kinds of social machines or, in other words, territorialities which attempt to oppress the individual, coding the flows of their desires, Carr’s representation of the unconscious mind of the protagonist under the oppression of social machines lend countenance to their theory. As D&G state in their book, *Anti-Oedipus*:

In the aggregate of departure there is the boss, the foreman, the priest, the tax collector, the cop, the soldier, the worker, all the machines and territorialities, all the social images of our society; but in the aggregate of destination, in the end, there is no longer anyone but daddy, mommy, and me, the despotic sign inherited by daddy, the residual territoriality assumed by mommy, and the divided, split, castrated ego.²⁷²

²⁷⁰ Haughton, ‘Woman’s Final Confession’, 75.

²⁷¹ Quoted in Melissa, *Marina Carr*, 3.

²⁷² Deleuze and Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus*, 265.

In line with this statement, it can be deduced that the divided self, or the castrated ego, is indeed the production of the social machines which aim at controlling the individual by imposing its laws and rules. However, the divided self indicates one's resistance and standing firm against the oppressing powers. In *Woman and Scarecrow*, Woman is imprisoned by the ideals of Irish society, including the expectations of family and gender roles. She does not have an ideal family in which spouses lead a happy life. On the contrary, Woman has a love and hate relationship with her husband, Him, developing a grudge against him as a consequence of his philandering. Scarecrow goes further to claim that Woman's death results from her sorrow caused by her husband's adultery:

Scarecrow: Ophelia died of love.

Woman: And what am I dying of?

Scarecrow: Spite.

Woman: Spite is an honourable emotion. It's no right up there with love but it's better than dying by accident. Spite has been given bad press for too long now. Very well, I'm dying of spite.²⁷³

The above scene displays Woman keeping herself back from revealing her husband's betrayal due to her pride; yet Scarecrow, the unconscious mind of Woman, reveals the hidden and repressed thoughts in Woman's subconscious. As can be understood, she does not live a happy life but rather a life leading her to destruction and depression and eventually her death. In this regard, it would be fair to assert that her illness and death do not occur from natural causes, yet it is a sign of her psychological trouble within her family in which she is surrounded by various problems. Since Woman cannot disengage herself from the family institution, she is unable to utter her feelings "as if the family were the supreme law."²⁷⁴ Instead, Scarecrow, the mouthpiece of Woman, who is regarded as the "navigator" or "guide" by her, unearths the reason for her being on her deathbed. Leeney highlights the relation between Woman and Scarecrow stating that "Woman and Scarecrow are two levels of consciousness, two

²⁷³ Marina Carr, *Marina Carr Plays 2: On Raftery's Hill, Ariel, Woman and Scarecrow, the Cordelia Dream, Marble*, 125.

²⁷⁴ Deleuze and Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus*, 120.

spheres of thought and action. They are our feet in the earth and our spirit or our intellect looking back from space.”²⁷⁵

Notably, the cause of the unspecified disease and the divided self of Woman can be esteemed as an emancipation from the ‘social machines’ and in particular the institutions of family and gender that wield power over her. In *Anti-Oedipus*, D&G argue:

Since the nineteenth century, the study of mental illnesses and madness has remained the prisoner of the familial postulate and its correlates, the personological correlate and the egoic postulate (le postulat moiïque). We have seen, following Foucault, how nineteenth-century psychiatry had conceived of the family as both cause and judge of the illness, and the closed asylum as an artificial family charged with internalizing guilt and with instituting responsibility, enveloping madness no less than its cure in a father-child relationship everywhere present. ... But the resistance of the psychoses on the one hand, and the necessity for taking into account a social etiology on the other hand, has led psychiatrists and psychoanalysts to redeploy under open conditions the order of an extended family, which is still believed to possess the secret of the illness as well as its cure.²⁷⁶

By virtue of this statement, the institution of family has been considered as one of the causes of mental illnesses and madness with regard to Freud’s psychoanalytic theory addressing the problem of the mother-father-child triangle. However, since a detailed analysis of Freud’s theory is not the main aim of this thesis, it is touched upon merely as the theory enabling D&G to bring a new perspective to their “schizoanalysis” theory. While Freud approaches the family as the lost object emphasizing sexual desires, D&G do not theorize from a psychic point of view, decoupling sexual desire from its context; they put forward the family’s oppression that inflicts power over the individual. In this regard, when Woman’s condition is considered from D&G’s perspective, her schizoid split will come to mean an unwilling escape or an attempt at emancipation from the social machines. As D&G argue: “... what we call ‘schizophrenia’ was one of the forms in which, often through quite ordinary people, the light began to break through the cracks in our all-too-closed minds.”²⁷⁷

Furthermore, Woman always implies that her life in the domestic sphere is suffocating, and she implicitly alludes to her displeasure at having enacted the traditional roles

²⁷⁵ Cathy Leeney, ‘Character, Writing, and Landscape in Woman and Scarecrow and Other Plays by Marina Carr’, 713.

²⁷⁶ Deleuze and Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus*, 359.

²⁷⁷ Deleuze and Guattari, 131.

attributed to the female gender. According to Kearney and Headrick, “Women have always spoken within domestic spheres. Their voices have nurtured children, preserved culture, and encouraged families.”²⁷⁸ Since the domestic sphere is ascribed as the Hobson’s choice for women, Woman is expected to behave accordingly and devote her existence to this cause. Otherwise, she would be regarded as a misfit in society. When she is even on her deathbed, she cannot neglect her responsibilities towards her children. She pressures Scarecrow to put her death off only because of her concern for her children:

Woman: What about the twins’ lunches? Did someone buy bread? Cartons of juice? Who is making the lunches?

Scarecrow: We’re beyond making lunches.

Woman: I wonder did Toby bother bringing home his lunchbox. I’m blue in the face telling him, and who is washing the uniforms, I have to stay on top of the uniforms.

Scarecrow: The time for washing uniforms is past.

Woman: And Hal won’t do his homework. Hal can’t even read yet. I have to do his reading with him. I have no business lying here. Who is going to make the sandwiches? ...²⁷⁹

The above scene depicts how Woman is overburdened with her responsibilities in the family. She is dominated by the devotion to her eight children and husband. She ignores her own self as well as her physical condition. However, she still carries out her maternal responsibilities and exhibits motherly affection for her children as society expects her to, because she is well aware of the fact that she lives in a world which has been dominated by the patriarchal ideology. By virtue of her submission to the institutions, it can be asserted that she is utterly oppressed by the patriarchal rule of the family along with her identity as a woman leaving her no choice but to be subject to it. This situation leads Woman to remaining silent while Scarecrow appears on the stage helping Woman penetrate her mind. In regard to the sense of the divided self, Woman represents the characteristics of the “schizo” elaborated by D&G as follows:

When we say that schizophrenia is our characteristic malady, the malady of our era, we do not merely mean to say that modern life drives people mad. It is not a question of a way of life, but of a process of production. Nor is it merely a

²⁷⁸ Eileen Kearney and Charlotte Headrick, *Irish Women Dramatists: 1908-2001* (New York: Syracuse University Press, 2014), 2.

²⁷⁹ Marina Carr, *Marina Carr Plays 2: On Raftery’s Hill, Ariel, Woman and Scarecrow, the Cordelia Dream, Marble*, 122.

question of a simple parallelism, even though from the point of view of the failure of codes, such a parallelism is a much more precise formulation of the relationship between, for example, the phenomena of shifting of meaning in the case of schizophrenics and the mechanisms of ever-increasing disharmony and discord at every level of industrial society.²⁸⁰

As can be observed, the divided self comes in sight as a natural consequence of the burden of womanhood and the dominant patriarchal ideology in Irish society. With the growing patriarchal authority, Scarecrow overtly reveals the psychological condition of Woman under the domination of such powerful territorialities as family and gender. In this respect, Woman bears a very heavy burden on her back, one that even leads her to the death bed along with her domestic way of existence and motherly commitments. In Woman's relationship with Scarecrow, which provides an insight into Woman's life, Scarecrow cannot help but abreact her feelings to Woman. She complains how much Woman is engrossed in domestic duties and the rules of patriarchal society and thus urges her to take the shaping of her life into her own hands:

Scarecrow: ... I never hated you more than when you returned after another sleazy transgression. Leave out the brazen lies of it, leave out my heart in shreds, even leave out the children for a minute. Leave all of that out and consider for one moment what you have done to yourself. You are without pride, without dignity, without any sense of who you are or where your place is in this world or what you are here for.²⁸¹

More importantly, Scarecrow insinuates Woman's conceding to her husband's infidelity. Although she herself admits "I've always known it. From the start I knew this man is no good for me,"²⁸² Woman is desperately in love with her husband saying she could have even had twenty children if he had wanted. However, she reproaches her husband for his adultery:

Woman: You've been just with her.

Him: All right, you want the unvarnished truth. Yes, I've been with her. She's parked up the road. ...

Woman: And after you pour that stuff into me, knock me out, you'll go back out to her.

Him: Yes, I'll go back out to her. She's taking me for a quick dinner before I go mad here.

²⁸⁰ Deleuze and Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus*, 34.

²⁸¹ Marina Carr, *Marina Carr Plays 2: On Raftery's Hill, Ariel, Woman and Scarecrow, the Cordelia Dream, Marble*, 160.

²⁸² Marina Carr, 131.

...

Him: Don't worry. I'm finishing with her too. If she thinks I'm going to set up house when you're gone. I said it right out to her. What's the point in changing horses? Is that enough truth for you or will I go on?²⁸³

On this account, it can be asserted that Woman is entrapped in a broken relationship with an adulterous husband. Although Woman has not unveiled her husband's infidelity until her deathbed owing to her desperate love for Him, she bitterly reproaches him, acknowledging his disloyalty to her and to their marriage. She is aware that her husband's infidelity not only damages their marriage but also the dignity of the family institution. However, she cannot disrupt the family unit and divorce her husband as society lays a burden on Woman disabling her from breaking her ties with her unfaithful husband. In this respect, she cannot help but address a question to Him concerning his recurring return to her:

Woman: Why did you keep returning?

Him: Because you are my wife, because you are the mother of my children, because despite how it appears you have always and will always be the one.

Woman: If only you lived how you speak. I don't believe it any more. You kept coming back because you knew I would never have the courage to leave you, to bar the door, to break my children's hearts. You are suffocating me.²⁸⁴

Bursting out on stage with her forthright statement, Woman reveals her imprisonment in the institutions of family and gender, which precludes divorce and leaving her eight children behind, yet which pinpoints the liberty provided to the male sex. More tragically, she overtly reveals her dissatisfaction and discontentment with having been obliged to abide by the laws of the institutions of family and gender.

On the one hand, Him also realizes his brutal treatment which led to the Woman's depression and even self-annihilation at the end of the play. The idealization of womanhood and the dignifying of the institution of family compel her to maintain the attributed gender roles and be the subdued wife at home. Tragically, she confines herself to the stereotypical ideal of womanhood. On the other hand, he does not pay enough attention to his wife and even worse mistreats Woman by abusing her psychologically. He states: "My life was meant to be various. Huge. ... Women are not allowed that. The whole point of a woman is not so much wanting her, that waxes

²⁸³ Marina Carr, 144.

²⁸⁴ Marina Carr, *Marina Carr Plays 2: On Raftery's Hill, Ariel, Woman and Scarecrow, The Cordelia Dream, Marble* (London: Faber & Faber, 2014), 134.

and wanes, but that no one else can go near her.”²⁸⁵ However, still he bestows his mercy on Woman as if he was not the embodiment of the patriarchal order and had not restricted Woman at home:

Him: (smoothes her hair) My dear, I haven’t always treated you as I should and now there isn’t time.

Scarecrow: You have had abundance of time.

Him: Can you forgive my callous treatment of you?

Woman: (to Scarecrow) Can I?

Scarecrow: Since when have you considered my opinion?

Woman: Your callous treatment of me? Did you rehearse that phrase?

Him: Did I what?

Woman: It was more than callous. Don’t pretty it up for a deathbed.²⁸⁶

In line with this scene, when Him apologizes for what he has done to his wife for years and attempts to calm her down, Woman talks to her conscience about whether she should forgive Him. It is sometimes troublesome to trace whether Woman or Scarecrow responds or to whom they talk. As Laing states “[t]here might be someone addressing us, but in listening to a schizophrenic, it is very difficult to know ‘who’ is talking, and it is just as difficult to know ‘whom’ one is addressing.”²⁸⁷ That is to say, the idea of divided self manifests itself in Woman’s dialogue with Scarecrow, perplexing Him to figure out whom Woman is addressing. Since Woman struggles to disaffirm her image as an ideal woman, Scarecrow appears on the stage conversing with both Woman and Him, albeit her being invisible to him.

Further, Woman’s other self, Scarecrow plays at this point a crucial role in penetrating the voice and recuperating her strength. Scarecrow utters what Woman has not abreacted for years owing to the oppressive powers on women. In this respect, Woman and her unconscious, Scarecrow, function in different ways, yet complete each other in their disparity. Although they appear as two separate selves on the stage, they exist in the same person’s (Woman’s) identity to convey her unpleasurable feelings and ideas about her confinement within the institutions of family and gender. Having been depicted as a hazy figure, Scarecrow’s presence calls into doubt whether she is merely

²⁸⁵ Marina Carr, 166.

²⁸⁶ Marina Carr, 134.

²⁸⁷ Laing, *The Divided Self: An Existential Study in Sanity and Madness*, 195.

an illusion or hallucination of a bedridden woman. This can be accounted for in terms of Laing's arguments regarding the characteristics of the split self:

The splitting of the self ... forms the basis of one type of hallucination. One of the fragments of the self generally seems to retain the sense of 'I'. The other 'self' might then be called 'her'. But this 'her' is still 'me'. Rose says, 'She's me, and I'm her all the time.' One schizophrenic told me, 'She's an I looking for a me.' (The self in chronic schizophrenic states seems to fragment into several foci each with a certain I-sense, and each experiencing the other fragments as partially not-me.)²⁸⁸

Although there are some indications pointing that Woman and Scarecrow are two different identities or Scarecrow is just a shadow, Woman and Scarecrow suggest their existing in one identity through their use of the pronoun "us." In Act I, when Woman is giving orders, Scarecrow responds: "All my life I've been doing as you say and look where it's landed us."²⁸⁹

However still, Scarecrow at some points proves herself to be an independent character in the play, pointing out her existence from the birth of Woman, expressing her own ideas and also pretending as if she had an autonomous identity. She complements Woman and knows everything about her. Scarecrow is always present when Woman is in need or asks for advice as her other self. In this regard, the significance of the idea of the divided self is accentuated by Curtin who states that Woman and Scarecrow "are eventually brought together as part of a symbolic (or psychological) process of self-reckoning."²⁹⁰ Sierz puts this perhaps more graphically when he calls this divided self as "a mixture of exhausted resignation and fighting spirit."²⁹¹

In the light of all the discussions above, it would be fair to state that Scarecrow overtly expresses how Woman is incarcerated within the domestic sphere which eventually led to her illness, a fact which Woman had been reluctant to acknowledge. In this sense, Woman achieves to be the embodiment of all the silenced and disempowered women in history. As Dedebaş argues, "[r]epresenting the two sides of women's status—their victimization and becoming the avenger, Woman and Scarecrow are

²⁸⁸ Laing, 158.

²⁸⁹ Marina Carr, *Marina Carr Plays 2: On Raftery's Hill, Ariel, Woman and Scarecrow, The Cordelia Dream, Marble*, 121.

²⁹⁰ Adrian Curtin, 'Death in Modern Theatre: Stages of Mortality', in *Death in Modern Theatre* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2019), 201.

²⁹¹ Aleks Sierz, 'Marina Carr', 48.

reflective of different manifestations of Carr's women protagonists."²⁹² In this respect, Woman's conversation with her inner voice perturbs not only her husband or aunt but also the audience with her address to Scarecrow as well as Scarecrow's concealing the ugly truths behind the life of Woman. As a case in point, Scarecrow's brutal treatment of Woman in relation to her having eight children reverberates through her words "Numbers. You just wanted numbers. You just wanted to look and say, this one is mine and this one and this and him and her and those and that hair up there in the oak tree. Mine. All mine. That's what you wanted. Greedy for numbers. Insatiable for the head count. The leg count. ..." ²⁹³ She further states:

Scarecrow: It will be used. (Reads.) And the children, admit it, they were your shield to beat the world away?

Woman: Yes, they were.

Scarecrow: (reads) You hid behind the nappies and the bottles?²⁹⁴

Scarecrow, by confronting Woman, unfolds the dark side and the oppressed life Woman had led, cornered by typical gender roles and confinement at home. Therefore, through their dialogue, Carr demonstrates to the reader/audience the repressed and hidden feelings of Woman and presents her as undergoing a self-discovery. Additionally, Scarecrow's statements emphasize the need of escape from the boundaries encircling Woman in her life as well as her refusal to surrender to the patriarchal order. In this regard, the final scene of the play with the death of Woman constitutes the play's climax encouraging some potential interpretations as to whether Woman dies out of natural causes in the arms of Scarecrow or she commits suicide, that is, her split self, Scarecrow, killing her to save her from the confinements of the traditional Irish family life. When Woman cries for help, Scarecrow says: "I'm afraid it's time. ... don't fight with me ... you won't win this time."²⁹⁵ This statement indicates that there is no other way out to endure the oppression Woman experiences than to die. However, as Dedebaş argues, "death may become a positive stance for her

²⁹² Eda Dedebaş, 'Rewriting of Tragedy and Women's Agency in Marina Carr's *by the Bog of Cats*...', *Ariel, and Woman and Scarecrow*, *Women's Studies: An Inter-Disciplinary Journal* 42, no. 3 (2013): 267, <https://doi.org/10.1080/00497878.2013.766113>.

²⁹³ Marina Carr, *Marina Carr Plays 2: On Raftery's Hill, Ariel, Woman and Scarecrow, the Cordelia Dream, Marble*, 124.

²⁹⁴ Marina Carr, 171.

²⁹⁵ Marina Carr, 172.

(Woman),”²⁹⁶ because Scarecrow, by killing Woman, makes a great change and allows Woman to take control of her life. In doing so, Woman no longer bows to her fate but rather “masters her own life.”²⁹⁷

In sum, Carr portrays the crippled psychology of a dying woman whose life is mainly dependent upon domestic responsibilities and motherly commitments. The protagonist, Woman, is, therefore, defined within the domestic sphere bound by the confines of home and patriarchal order. However, even though she cannot overtly express her rage and dissatisfaction, Woman contemplates her unfulfilled life on the deathbed through the voice of her alter ego or unconscious mind, Scarecrow. Since she cannot reject her role as a mother or as a wife despite her husband’s adultery in a patriarchal society, where she is expected to serve the needs of the family and the home, her alter ego, Scarecrow invading the stage, unveils Woman’s regret for her half-lived life and subordination to the norms of oppressive social institutions. Thus, within the framework of the divided self, Carr questions the territorialities of family and gender as institutional powers limiting, controlling and eventually splitting/schizophrenizing the individual.

²⁹⁶ Eda Dedebaş, ‘Rewriting of Tragedy and Women’s Agency in Marina Carr’s *by the Bog of Cats*..., *Ariel*, and *Woman and Scarecrow*’, *Women’s Studies: An Inter-Disciplinary Journal* 42, no. 3 (2013): 262, <https://doi.org/10.1080/00497878.2013.766113>.

²⁹⁷ Dedebaş, 258.



6. CONCLUSION

Throughout history, Ireland accommodated a diversity of beliefs and loyalties. Sometimes, this provided advantages, but at other times, given the proximity of the country to England, this diversity was a burden. They came up against existential problems, which endangered the unity of the country. The Irish found themselves trapped in rebuttal when the colonizer spoke ill of them, and in controverting the colonizer's false allegations, such as that they were unable to rule themselves and that they did not have their own culture and a language comprehensible to the English. Therefore, Irish people felt a necessity for "a renovation of Irish consciousness and a new understanding of politics, economics, philosophy, sport, language and culture in its widest sense."²⁹⁸

This was, perhaps, the grand objective of the Irish playwrights as well as other writers. In other words, Irish intellectuals realized that the only possible way to free themselves from the oppression of English was to revive their culture and language. The Irish identity was dissolving against the English policy implemented for years to justify their act of colonization in Ireland. Thus, the Irish were determined to get rid of the idea of Ireland as England's 'unconscious' or the 'other self'. However, the wish to invigorate Irish culture and nationality was not as easy as the Irish intellectuals and playwrights had expected it to be. The long-lasting effect of colonization was pervasive across the country causing Irish people to feel trapped and suffocated, and as a consequence, they experienced a crisis of identity.

Moreover, apart from the destructive effects of colonization, Ireland's gaining its independence was as painful as shaping its society. While Ireland was undergoing social, political and economic changes on its way to a free and independent country, the idea of being Irish became the focal point of the social complications that had occurred in Ireland since the late nineteenth century. In an attempt to bring about the independence and autonomy of the country, Irish intellectuals, particularly the playwrights, took centre stage producing works based on Irish themes, Irish myths, legends and traditions. In this respect, they could create a theatrical tradition in which they found a way to strengthen Irish people's sense of nationhood. With the passage of time, theatre's unifying role has changed its mission from the idea of the national

²⁹⁸ Kiberd, *Inventing Ireland*, 3.

theatre to the problems of post-colonial Irish identity and the issue of Irishness. In post-colonial Ireland, Irish identity was exclusive, in an attempt to deconstruct and reconstruct it against how Englishmen had defined the Irish. However, in the 1990s, the definition of Irishness underwent a change with the economic growth in Ireland. Taboos, which had been shunned for years in Ireland under the oppression of the establishment, such as homosexuality, sexuality, abortion and divorce started to be questioned and reflected in Irish theatre.

In this respect, although the perception of Irishness changed during the Celtic Tiger era, the sole aim was still to reclaim Irish independence; the institutions in Ireland, which could evoke the sense of nationality and foster people's ties to their country, maintained its significance. The establishment embodied by family, church, nation and school set the criteria for the definition of Ireland and Irishness. However, writers failed to notice that these institutions oppressed Irish people in order to achieve their goal in invigorating Irish identity, by creating an ideal, exclusive, homogenous, Catholic Ireland. It is not surprising, therefore, that these above-mentioned institutions fell short of fulfilling Irish people's needs, but rather cornered them by imposing their rules and laws on individuals. This thesis has argued that these institutions oppressed the people, causing them to experience an 'identity crisis' and thus end up with a split self, or what D&G refer to as "schizophrenia." In this respect, this thesis espouses D&G's theory of schizoanalysis, in which the social and political institutions are depicted as schizophrenogenic territorialities that exert power on individuals, to analyse three Irish plays: Brian Friel's *Philadelphia, Here I Come!*, Frank McGuinness's *Observe the Sons of Ulster Marching Towards the Somme* and Marina Carr's *Woman and Scarecrow*. In offering a three-fold analysis of the idea of 'split self' through the lens of 'schizoanalysis', the thesis has brought a different perspective to the issue of 'split self' and D&G's theory by arguing that social institutions as represented in the plays not only cause the split self in individuals, but also determine the symptomatology of their condition.

Before presenting an overall conclusion, it would be expedient to review the discussion of each of the three chapters. The thesis foregrounds the three Irish plays in which each protagonist is subjected to oppression by different territorialities/institutions as the agencies of oppression. The major reason behind the choice of these plays is not only

their engaging with the notion of ‘split self’ but their representation of ‘split self’ as resulting from the institutions’ oppression of the individual. Additionally, each of the protagonists appears on the stage as a dual personality portrayed by two different actors enabling the audience to hear the private voice of the protagonist. The advantage of such an effective technical innovation is that it reveals how these social institutions wield power on the individuals, how the individuals cannot handle this oppression by keeping to their public selves and how they cannot choose but conceive a private self who can handle it.

As stated, each chapter in the thesis takes up the oppression of a different institution. According to D&G, every “society constructs its own delirium”²⁹⁹ by leaving no place to the individual but rather creating an ideal image or self to be performed. In this respect, Ireland foregrounds its own institutions to establish a unified and strong country as well as nation. The Catholic Church, nationality, gender, particularly, the idea of motherhood and womanhood have become the tools of oppression in Irish society. The English set up the rules with the express purpose of ensuring a long-lasting impact of British colonization and asserting British identity. Nevertheless, they wittingly or unwittingly fostered in Irish people a loyalty to their country and an awareness among many Irish that they had lost their identity. Seumas Shields, in *The Shadow of a Gunman*, therefore, depicts the pitiful situation of the country as: “I wish to God it was all over. The country is gone mad.”³⁰⁰ Sadly, the destructive impact of the institutions on Irish people’s lives increased, and thus, Irish people continued to suffer under the oppression of the establishment.

In the first analytic chapter, the significance of the family and nation as powerful institutions in Irish society has been presented and how these two institutions, by oppressing the individual, play a crucial role in the (de)formation of identity has been discussed. In this respect, Brian Friel, in *Philadelphia*, epitomizes how it feels to be entrapped and suffocated in one’s native land because of the oppressive institutions of family and nation. The main character, Gareth O’Donnell leads an unsatisfactory life sharing the same house with his indifferent father who is also his boss in the family business. As opposed to the ideal image of Irishness and the idyllic representation of

²⁹⁹ Deleuze and Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus*, 10.

³⁰⁰ Sean O’Casey, *Three Plays: Juno and the Paycock, The Shadow of a Gunman and the Stars* (London: Pan Books, 1980), 110.

Ireland, Gar uncovers the gloomy and repressive atmosphere of the country from which he seeks to escape, yet ends up experiencing ‘the process of going mad which is comprehensible’³⁰¹ in Gar’s situation. Freud asserts that our social and family structure is a repressive force, so Gar cannot help but find himself subject to the laws of his family and nation. When he, however, feels cornered by these institutions’ expectations, Gar turns into a ‘schizo’ as defined by D&G and divides his self into two: one being his private self who can explicitly define and express himself and the other one being his public self who performs according to those expectations. In some way, Gar plays a game in his mind taking part as an actor in this game. “Usually, in his mind, he was playing the part of someone else, but sometimes he played the part of himself (his own self): that is, he was not simply and spontaneously himself, but he played at being himself.”³⁰² At last, apart from being a medical case, Gar’ split self can be accounted for in terms of a reaction to the oppression of the territorialities of family and nation, hence a culturally shaped condition.

In the second chapter, it has been discussed how McGuinness presents the splitting of his protagonist Kenneth Pyper in *Sons of Ulster* as resulting from the oppression of social class and the family. Kenneth Pyper, appearing on the stage as Young Pyper and Old Pyper, fits into the definition of the ‘schizo’ put forward by D&G. From the beginning of the play to the end, Pyper recollects his past days under the oppression of the institutions of power which caused him to split his self and “not experience himself as a complete person but rather as ‘split’ in various ways.”³⁰³ As in *Philadelphia*, and *Woman and Scarecrow* where the institutions of family, nation and gender exert power on the individual, Kenneth Pyper is subjected to oppression as a member of the Ulster aristocracy whose expectations are nothing but an unbearable burden on him. He is, as an aristocrat and homosexual, aware of the fact that his peculiarity and sexual orientation would be disapproved of in his class, a more restrictive and rule-based one, and he eventually finds himself cast out from his family and the public eye. At this point, Pyper recognizes the two paths awaiting him: to conform to the rules and laws of these institutions and lose his own identity or rather to diverge from these rules and emancipate himself. At the risk of being ostracized by

³⁰¹ Laing, *The Divided Self: An Existential Study in Sanity and Madness*, Preface.

³⁰² Laing, 71.

³⁰³ Laing, 17.

his community and stripped of the privileges of his social class, he, in an attempt to preserve his true self, enlists in the army and severs all ties with his family and the aristocracy. Unlike in *Philadelphia and Woman and Scarecrow*, Pyper's split self is not an alter-ego but rather occurs as an alteration of his self from youth to elderliness.

The third chapter unfolds the crippled psychology of an unnamed woman (Woman) who experiences an entrapment similar to Gar's. She is somehow forced to live with her unfaithful husband and eight children who are taken care of by her alone, because she was raised in such a patriarchal society that she is expected to perform domestic duties and maternal responsibilities at the expense of her own desires. On this account, she subjects herself to her husband to the extent of tolerating his adultery. In Irish culture and tradition, a woman is commonly regarded as the protector of the nation in macrocosm, and of the family in microcosm, and thus the notions of motherhood and womanhood are highly significant. At this moment, she realizes that there is no escape from the boundaries of the institutions of family and gender in her situation. As in the situation of Gar, Woman goes through a mental breakdown when she cannot flee from her responsibilities; she feels burdened with her motherly and domestic duties and thus brings her alter-ego on stage. Through her split self, Scarecrow, Woman attempts to put an end to her domestic and subservient way of existence. Unlike her social self whom she reveals to everybody, her divided self or alter-ego turns into a woman who is not domestic, silent and subservient; on the contrary, she is assertive, individualistic and demanding. Scarecrow disaffirms the rules and laws of these institutions oppressing Woman and leaving her no space to grow as an individual. She becomes the mouthpiece of Woman uttering what she could not verbalize in the face of such an oppression of the family and gender as institutions in Irish society. Eventually, Woman in the play, is depicted as a woman who attempts to discard her assigned roles in the domestic sphere and who does not want either to be dominated and oppressed by these institutions' expectations; therefore, through her split self, who accompanies Woman until her last breath, she emancipates herself.

Taking all this analysis into consideration, Friel, McGuinness and Carr's representation of the oppressive institutions in Irish society can be accounted for in terms of the theory of 'split self' elaborated by D&G as a part of their schizoanalytical approach. The terms 'schizoid' and 'schizophrenic' are used by them not as purely

clinical or psychiatric terms but rather as a means of freedom, escape and breakthrough from the oppression people experience in society. In this respect, every society has its own major components of social structures consisting of institutions such as family, religion, nation and state. These institutions, called ‘territorialities’ by D&G, play a significant role in shaping individuals’ identity and setting out the limits of proper conduct for them. However, while some could easily adapt to and accommodate the rules and laws of these territorialities and lead their lives accordingly, others find themselves entrapped and suffocated by these rules and thereby experience a mental breakdown. Therefore, the plays *Philadelphia*, *Sons of Ulster* and *Woman and Scarecrow* have been discussed as paradigmatic examples to which D&G’s schizoanalytical method can be applied. The protagonists in these plays experience oppression of the territorialities in their lives one way or another, and thus they have difficulty subjecting themselves to their rules and norms. Gareth O’Donnell through Public and Private Gar, Kenneth Pyper through Old and Young Pyper, and Woman through herself and Scarecrow attempt to emancipate themselves from the oppression and live beyond all laws and rules of the territorialities. In this regard, D&G accentuate the idea of ‘split self’ as: “The subject of the statement is the social person, and the subject of enunciation, the private person”³⁰⁴ by pointing out the difference between the public and private person. Whilst the private person—subject of enunciation—rejects any power over over himself and disclaims being territorialised by the territorialities, the subject of statement—the social person— cannot claim his individuality and remain cornered by the rules and laws of the territorialities. The characters in the plays, therefore, by embodying the two facets of their ‘his selves,’ are considered as the ‘schizo.’ As this thesis has demonstrated, in contrast to how clinical psychiatry characterises schizophrenics, none of the characters in the above-mentioned plays can be treated as purely ‘clinical cases’ who pose a threat to others or themselves or need to be taken care of in a mental hospital. The characters are far from being regarded as ‘psychotic’ in the clinical sense, yet they are oppressed by the laws and rules of the territorialities and fail to adapt to their surroundings. They are mostly torn between subjecting themselves to the expectations of the institutions in Irish society and being true to themselves by fulfilling their desires. In this respect, while

³⁰⁴ Deleuze and Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus*, 265.

Brian Friel foregrounds the institution of family and nation behind the split self of Gar, McGuinness illustrates how destructive the oppression of social class and the family is on the individual. Carr, dealing with the institution of family and gender, demonstrates that women are still imprisoned within the domestic sphere. As the above analyses have demonstrated, split self does not feature as a clinical psychopathology in these plays. Rather, it functions as a means for the protagonists to overcome the oppression of the discussed territorialities and enact their flows of desire; hence justifying D&G's argument: schizophrenia not as a breakdown, but as a breakthrough.





REFERENCES

- ‘A Dog's Life: Eos! Prince Albert's Loyal Greyhound’. *The Esoteric Curiosa*. 16 November 2010. <http://theesotericcuriosa.blogspot.com/2010/11/dogs-life-eos-prince-alberts-loyal.html>
- Alexander, Cecil Frances. ‘All Things Bright and Beautiful’. *Discover Poetry*, n.d. <https://discoverpoetry.com/poems/cecil-frances-alexander/all-things-bright-and-beautiful/>.
- Allen, Douglas W. ‘A Theory of the Pre-Modern British Aristocracy’. *Explorations in Economic History* 46, no. 3 (2009): 299–313.
- ‘Alter-Ego’. In *Oxford Learner's Dictionary*. Accessed 8 January 2022. <http://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/alter-ego?q=alter+ego>.
- Arnold, Matthew. *Irish Essays: And Others*. London: Smith, Elder & Co., 1891.
- Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin. *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-Colonial Literatures*. London: Routledge, 1989.
- Battersby, Eileen. ‘Marina of the Midlands’. *The Irish Times*, 2020.
- Bogue, Ronald. *Deleuze and Guattari*. New York and London: Routledge, 1989.
- Boltwood, Scott. *Brian Friel, Ireland, and the North*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Buchanan, Ian. *Deleuze and Guattari's Anti-Oedipus*. London: Continuum, 2008.
- Bukowski, Jeffrey. ‘Unseen Identity’. M.A. thesis, University of Vermont, 2008.
- Carr, Marina. ‘Backwards and Forwards with Marina Carr’. Interview by Erica Nagle, 2011. <http://www.mccarter.org/phaedrbackwards/pages/interviewmarina.html>.
- . *Marina Carr Plays 2: On Raftery's Hill, Ariel, Woman and Scarecrow, the Cordelia Dream, Marble*. London: Faber & Faber, 2009.
- . *Women in Irish Drama: A Century of Authorship and Representation*, edited by Melissa Sihra. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.
- Caven, Michael. ‘A Director's Perspective on Mutabilitie’. In *The Theatre of Frank McGuinness: Stages of Mutability*, edited by Helen Lojek. Dublin: Carysfort Press, 2002.
- Cervantes, Miguel De. *Don Quixote*. Translated by John Ruthford. New York: Penguin Books, 2003.

- Chekhov, Anton. *Plays: Ivanov, The Seagull, Uncle Vanya, Three Sisters, The Cherry Orchard*. London: Penguin Books, 2002.
- Clarity, James F. 'A Playwright's Post-Beckett Period'. *New York Times*, 3 November 1994.
- Cliff, Brian. 'Crossing Through Borderlands'. In *The Theatre of Frank McGuinness*. Dublin: Carysfort Press, 2002.
- Corr, Joseph. 'Queer Identities During the Troubles in Northern Ireland: The Birth of Queer Theatre in Northern Ireland.' PhD thesis, University of East Anglia, 2020.
- Cregan, David. *Frank McGuinness's Dramaturgy of Difference and the Irish Theatre*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 2011.
- Curtin, Adrian. 'Death in Modern Theatre: Stages of Mortality'. In *Death in Modern Theatre*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2019.
- Dantanus, Ulf. *Brian Friel: A Study*. London and Boston: Faber and Faber, 1988.
- Dedebaş, Eda. 'Rewriting of Tragedy and Women's Agency in Marina Carr's by the Bog of Cats..., Ariel, and Woman and Scarecrow'. *Women's Studies: An Inter-Disciplinary Journal* 42, no. 3 (2013): 248–70. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00497878.2013.766113>.
- Deleuze, Gilles, and Félix Guattari. *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Translated by Robert Hurley, Mark Seem, and Helen R. Lane. Minneapolis: Minnesota U.P., 1983.
- Egenolf, Susan B. 'Maria Edgeworth in Blackface: Castle Rackrent and the Irish Rebellion of 1798'. *ELH, JSTOR*, 72, no. 4 (2005): 845–69.
- English, Richard. *Irish Freedom: The History of Nationalism in Ireland*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2006.
- Esslin, Martin. *An Anatomy of Drama*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1976.
- Etherton, Michael. *Contemporary Irish Dramatists*. New York: St.Martin's Press, 1989.
- Farrelly, Ann Dillon. "*It Depends on the Fella. And the Cat.*": *Negotiating Humanness through the Myth of Irish Identity in the Plays of Martin McDonagh*. The Ohio State University, 2004.
- Finn, Nancy, and Marina Carr. 'Theater in Eleven Dimensions: A Conversation with Marina Carr'. *World Literature Today* 86, no. 4 (2012): 42–46.

- Fitzgerald, Jennifer, Seamus Deane, Joan Fowler, and Frank McGuinness. 'The Arts and Ideology: Jennifer Fitzgerald Talks to Seamus Deane, Joan Fowler and Frank McGuinness'. *The Crane Bag* 9, no. 2 (1985): 60–69.
- FitzPatrick, Joan Dean. 'Self-Dramatization in the Plays of Frank McGuinness'. *New Hibernia Review/Iris Éireannach Nua*, JSTOR, 3, no. 1 (1999): 97–110.
- Fraser, Antonia. *Cromwell*. New York: Grove, 2001.
- Freud, Sigmund. *An Outline of Psychoanalysis*. New York: Norton, 1949.
- Friel, Brian. *Plays One: Philadelphia, Here I Come!, The Freedom of the City, Living Quarters, Aristocrats, Faith Healer, Translations*. London: Faber and Faber, 1996.
- . 'Self Portrait'. In *Brian Friel: Essays, Diaries, Interviews 1964-1999*, edited by Christopher Murray, 37–46. New York and London: Faber and Faber, 1999.
- Froude, James Anthony. *The English in Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*. vol.1. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1872. <https://archive.org/details/in.ernet.dli.2015.191138/page/n43/mode/2up>.
- Girard, René. *Violence and the Sacred*. London: The John Hopkins University Press, 1979.
- Gregory, Lady. *Our Irish Theatre: A Chapter of Autobiography*. New York and London: GP Putnam's Sons, 1913.
- Guattari, Félix. 'On Machines', in *Complexity: Architecture/Art/Philosophy*, Translated by Vivian Constantinopoulos. London: Academy Editions, 1995.
- Haughton, Miriam. 'Woman's Final Confession: Too Much Hoovering and Not Enough Sex. Marina Carr's Woman and Scarecrow'. *Mortality* 18, no. 1 (2013): 72–93.
- Hawkins, Maureen S.G. 'Schizophrenia and the Politics of Experience in Three Plays by Brian Friel'. *Modern Drama*, no. 39 (1996).465-474.
- Heaney, Seamus. *North*. London: Faber and Faber, 1975.
- Higgins, Charlotte. 'Frank McGuinness: 'I'm Not Entirely Respectable. I Couldn't Be''. *The Guardian*, 18 January 2008.
- Holland, Eugene. *Anti-Oedipus: Introduction to Schizoanalysis*. London: Routledge, 1999.
- . 'Desire and Social-Production'. In *The Deleuze Dictionary*, edited by Adrian Parr. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2005.

- Inglis, Tom. *Moral Monopoly: The Rise and Fall of the Catholic Church in Modern Ireland*. Dublin: University College Dublin Press, 1998.
- Inge, William Ralph. 'Sagittarius and George'. goodreads, n.d. <https://www.goodreads.com/quotes/400468-a-nation-is-a-society-united-by-a-delusion-about>.
- 'Initiation'. In *Oxford Learner's Dictionary*. Accessed 19 February 2022. <https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/initiation?q=initiation>.
- Jackson, Joe. 'The Healing Touch'. *Independent.Ie*. 21 April 2002.
- Jordan, Eamonn. *The Feast of Famine: The Plays of Frank McGuinness*. Bern: Peter Lang, 1997.
- Kearney, Eileen, and Charlotte Headrick. *Irish Women Dramatists: 1908-2001*. New York: Syracuse University Press, 2014.
- Kee, Robert. *The Green Flag: A History of Irish Nationalism*. London: Penguin, 2000.
- Kenneth, Nally. *Celebrating Confusion: The Theatre of Frank McGuinness*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2009.
- Kiberd, Declan. 'Frank McGuinness and the Sons of Ulster'. *The Yearbook of English Studies* 35, no. 1 (2005): 279–97.
- . *Inventing Ireland: The Literature of a Modern Nation*. London: Vintage, 1996.
- Kilroy, Ian. 'Greek Tragedy, Midlands Style'. *The Irish Times*, 20 September 2002.
- Kinealy, Christine. *This Great Calamity: The Great Irish Famine 1845-52*. Gill Books, 2006.
- Kozyr- Kowalski, Stanislaw. 'Marx's Theory of Classes and Social Strata and "Capital"'. *The Polish Sociological Bulletin*, JSTOR, no.21 (1970) 17-32.
- Kuhling, Carmen, and Kieran Keohane. *Cosmopolitan Ireland*. London: Pluto, 2007.
- Laing, R. D. *The Divided Self: An Existential Study in Sanity and Madness*. London: Penguin Books, 1990.
- Leeney, Cathy, and Anna McMullan. *The Theatre of Marina Carr: "Before Rules Was Made"*. Dublin: Carysfort Press, 2003.
- Leeney, Cathy. 'Character, Writing, and Landscape in Woman and Scarecrow and Other Plays by Marina Carr'. *The Princeton University Library Chronicle*, JSTOR, 68, no.1–2 (Winter 2007): 705–19.

- . 'Marina Carr: Violence and Destruction: Language, Space and Landscape'. In *A Companion to Modern British and Irish Drama 1880–2005*, edited by Mary Luckhurst. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2006.
- Lennon, Peter. 'In Interview with Peter Lennon'. In *Brian Friel: Essays, Diaries, Interviews 1964–1999*, edited by Christopher Murray. New York and London: Faber and Faber, 1999.
- Lojek, Helen. 'Troubling Perspectives: Northern Ireland, the "Troubles" and Drama'. In *A Companion to Modern British and Irish Drama 1880–2005*, edited by Mary Luckhurst, 329–40. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2006.
- Mac Cana, Proinsias. 'Woman in Irish Mythology'. In *The Crane Bag Book of Irish Studies 1977–1981*, edited by Richard Kearney and Mark Patrick Hederman, 520–24. Dublin: Blackwater Press, 1982.
- MacIntyre, Tom. 'Program Note for Ullaloo'. Peacock Theatre, 25 March 1991.
- Marx, Karl. 'The German Ideology'. In *Classes, Power, and Conflict: Classical and Contemporary Debates*, edited by Anthony Giddens and David Held. London and Basingstoke: The Macmillan Press, 1982.
- McGrath, F.C. 'Brian Friel and the Irish Art of Lying'. In *Brian Friel: A Casebook*, edited by William Kerwin. New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1997.
- McGuinness, Frank. 'A Happy Marriage'. *The Guardian*. 24 April 2008. <https://www.theguardian.com/stage/2008/apr/24/theatre1>.
- . 'An Interview with Frank McGuinness'. Interview by Maurice Fitzpatrick, 4 February 2014. [https://breac.nd.edu/articles/an-interview-with-frank-mcguinness- 2/](https://breac.nd.edu/articles/an-interview-with-frank-mcguinness-2/).
- . *Plays: The Factory Girls, Observe the Sons of Ulster Marching Towards the Somme, Innocence, Carthaginians, Baglady*. Faber, 1996.
- . 'Writing in Greek: By the Bog of Cats...'. In *The Theatre of Marina Carr: Before Rules Was Made*, edited by Leeney Cathy and Anna McMullan. Dublin: Carysfort Press, 2003.
- McNulty, Charles. 'Marina Carr: Unmotherly Feelings'. *American Theatre* 18, no. 8 (2001): 106.
- Message, Kylie. 'Body without Organs'. In *The Deleuze Dictionary*, edited by Adrian Parr. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2005.
- 'Migration: Emigration and Immigration Since 1950'. *Encyclopedia.com*. 2 August 2022. <https://www.encyclopedia.com/international/encyclopedias-almanacs-transcripts-and-maps/migration-emigration-and-immigration-1950>

- Morash, Christopher. *A History of Irish Theatre 1601-2000*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Morgan, Eileen. 'Introduction: Re-Thinking the Abbey and the Concept of a National Theatre'. *A Century of Irish Drama: Widening the Stage*, edited by Stephen Watt, Eileen Morgan, and Shakir Mustafiti. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana UP, 2000.
- Murphy, James H. *Ireland, A Social, Cultural and Literary History 1791-1891*. Dublin: Four Courts Press, 1997.
- Murray, Christopher. 'Of Mutabilite'. In *The Theatre of Frank McGuinness: Stages of Mutability*, edited by Helen Lojek. Dublin: Carysfort, 2002.
- . *Twentieth-Century Irish Drama: Mirror up to Nation*. Syracuse University Press, 2000.
- The Irish Times. 'Obituary: Heaney 'the Most Important Irish Poet since Yeats.'', 30 August 2013. <https://www.irishtimes.com/culture/books/obituary-heaney-the-most-important-irish-poet-since-yeats-1.1510684>.
- O'Brien, Edna. *Mother Ireland*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1976.
- O'Brien, Sinéad. *Brian Friel*. Ferndale Films, 2000.
- O'Casey, Sean. *Three Plays: Juno and the Paycock, The Shadow of a Gunman and the Stars*. London: Pan Books, 1980.
- O'Gorman, Siobhán. 'Writing from the Margins: Marina Carr's Early Theatre'. *Irish Studies Review*, tandoftline, 22, no. 4 (2014): 487–511.
- O'Sullivan, Simon. 'Subjectivity and Art'. In *The Deleuze Dictionary*, edited by Adrian Parr. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2005.
- O'Toole, Fintan. *Black Hole, Green Card: The Disappearance of Ireland*. Dublin: New Island, 1994.
- Öztürk Bakacak, Beste. 'Deleuze and Guattari's Encounter with Beckett within the Context of Desiring Machines'. M.A. thesis, Middle East Technical University, 2014.
- Parr, Adrian. *The Deleuze Dictionary*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2005.
- Paulson, Timothy J. *Irish Immigrants*. New York: Facts on File, 2005.
- Pine, Emilie. 'The Tyranny of Memory: Remembering the Great War in Frank McGuinness's *Observe the Sons of Ulster Marching Towards the Somme*'. *Irish University Review* 40, no. 1 (2010): 59–68.

- Pine, Richard. *Brian Friel and Ireland's Drama*. London: Routledge, 1990.
- Reid, Ivan. *Class in Britain*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1998.
- . *Social Class Differences in Britain: A Sourcebook*. London: Open Books, 1977.
- Roche, Anthony. *Brian Friel: Theatre and Politics*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.
- . *Contemporary Irish Drama*. 2nd ed. London: Palgrave, 2009.
- Rodger, Ian. *Radio Drama*. London: Macmillan, 1981.
- Rogers, Louis. “‘Setting the Stage: Action and Absence in Enda Walsh and Samuel Beckett’s Play Spaces’”. *The Architectural Review*. 18 May 2021.
- Ross, David. *Ireland: History of a Nation*. New Lanark: Geddes & Grosset, 2002.
- Rushe, Desmond. ‘In Interview with Desmond Rushe’. In *Brian Friel Essays, Diaries, Interviews 1964-1999*, edited by Christopher Murray. New York and London: Faber and Faber, 1999.
- Ryder, Sean. ‘Gender and the Discourse of Young Ireland Nationalism’. In *Gender and Colonialism*. Galway: Galway University Press, 1995.
- Sayın, Gülşen. *Martin McDonagh Tiyatrosu*. Ankara: Nobel, 2009.
- ‘Schizophrenia’. In *Oxford Learner’s Dictionary*. Accessed 14 April 2022. <https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/schizophrenia>.
- Schrage-Früh, Michaela. *Emerging Identities: Myth, Nation and Gender in the Poetry of Eavan Boland, Nuala ní Dhomhnaill and Medbh McGuckian*. Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier, 2004.
- Schrank, Bernice. ‘World War One in Observe the Sons of Ulster Marching Towards the Somme’. In *The Theatre of Frank McGuinness: Stages of Mutability*, edited by Helen Lojek, Dublin. Carysfort Press: 2002.
- Scott, John. ‘Social Class and Stratification in Late Modernity’. *Acta Sociologica* 45, no. 1 (2002): 23–35.
- Sexton, Anne. *Live or Die*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1966.
- Shakeir, Reima. ‘Transcending Irishness and Reading History in Selected Plays by Sean O’Casey and Frank McGuinness’. M.A. thesis, Harvard University, 2016.
- Sierz, Aleks. ‘Marina Carr’. In *The Methuen Drama Guide to Contemporary Irish Playwrights*, edited by Martin Middeke and Paul Schnierer. London: Methuen, 2010.

- Sihra, Melissa. *Marina Carr: Pastures of the Unknown*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018.
- . “‘Nature Noble or Ignoble’: Woman, Family, and Home in the Theatre of Marina Carr”. *HJEAS*, JSTOR, 11, no. 2 (2005): 133–47.
- . ‘The House of Woman and the Plays of Marina Carr’. In *Women in Irish Drama: A Century of Authorship and Representation*, edited by Melissa Sihra, 201–18. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.
- Smith, Anthony D. *National Identity*. London: Penguin, 1991.
- Squire, Charles. *Celtic Myth and Legend Poetry Romance*. London: The Gresham Publishing Company, 1910.
- Sternlicht, Sanford. *A Reader’s Guide to Modern Irish Drama*. Syracuse University Press, 1998.
- Swift, Jonathan. ‘A Modest Proposal’. In *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*, 1:2633–39. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2012.
- Taafe, Dennis. *An Impartial History of Ireland from the Period of the English Invasion to the Present Time*. Vol. 4. Dublin: J. Christie, 1811.
- Terence, Brown. *Ireland’s Literature: Selected Essays*. Mullinger: Rowman&Littlefield Publishers, 1989.
- Trotter, Mary. *Modern Irish Theatre*. Cambridge: Polity, 2008.
- Virtual Label. ‘The Penal Laws’. Youtube, 28 August 2015.
- Welch, Robert. *The Abbey Theatre, 1899-1999: Form and Pressure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

ÖZGEÇMİŞ

Kişisel Bilgiler

Soyadı, adı : HANÇER, Merve

Uyruğu : T.C.

Eğitim

Derece Eğitim Birimi

Mezuniyet tarihi

Lisans Hacettepe Üniversitesi

2018

Lise Sivas Gültepe Anadolu Lisesi

2013

İş Deneyimi

Yıl

Yer

Görev

2020

Muş Alparslan Üniversitesi

Araştırma Görevlisi

Yabancı Dil

İngilizce – C2

Rusça – A2



