T.C.

ISTANBUL UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

WESTERN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURE

ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

MASTER'S THESIS

THE TRAUMATIC EFFECTS OF COLONIALISM IN THREE IRISH PLAYS

Ertuğrul BAŞÇINAR

2501201996

THESIS ADVISOR

Assoc. Prof. Özlem KARADAĞ

İSTANBUL – 2023

ABSTRACT

THE TRAUMATIC EFFECTS OF COLONIALISM IN THREE IRISH PLAYS

ERTUĞRUL BAŞÇINAR

According to trauma studies, violent and horrific incidents inflict various psychological effects on the human mind. People who experience distressing events display different coping methods individually and collectively to repress their traumas.

This study examines the subject of trauma in the context of the colonial exploitation of Ireland under the British Empire's oppressive control. To scrutinise the traumatic results of colonialism, it utilises George Bernard Shaw's **John Bull's Other Island**, Seán O'Casey's **Juno and the Paycock**, and Brian Friel's **Translations**. They focus on the psychological effects of Britain's colonial policies on Irish society in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. These policies consist of confiscating Ireland's lands, exploiting its labour force, assimilating its culture, and violently eliminating the opposing groups. In the light of postcolonial and trauma theories, and through the historical background of Ireland's colonisation, this work exhibits that these violent and assimilative acts caused personal and collective trauma among the Irish.

The Irish characters in these plays either refuse to confront their trauma or display their repressed emotional pain and hatred against the coloniser in violent ways. The refusal of confrontation occurs when they escape from the distressing colonial oppression by fabricating imaginary realities. This method provides a temporary sense of relief at the expense of disassociating them from reality. On the other hand, the violent discharge of suppressed trauma causes more conflict and tension between the coloniser and the colonised, which eradicates the possibility of reconciliation between these sides. Therefore, the plays depict these approaches as dangerous and ineffective methods that fail to provide a permanent resolution to colonial trauma.

Keywords: Irish Theatre, Irish History, Trauma Theory, Postcolonial Theory, English Literature.

ÖZ

ÜÇ İRLANDA OYUNUNDA SÖMÜRGECİLİĞİN TRAVMATİK ETKİLERİ

ERTUĞRUL BAŞÇINAR

Travma çalışmalarına göre, şiddetli ve korkunç deneyimler insan zihninde çeşitli psikolojik etkiler bırakır. Normal insan deneyiminin ötesinde seyreden bu olaylar, psikolojik açıdan kişinin sınırlarını zorlar ve duygusal yaralanmaya sebep olur. Bu olaylar doğal afetler, kazalar, savaşlar, fiziksel yaralanmalar, belli bir kişi veya grup tarafından zorbalığa veya tacize uğrama gibi durumları kapsamaktadır. Dolayısıyla travma tek bir kişide görülebildiği gibi belli bir grup içerisindeki kişilerde de ortaya çıkabilmektedir. Bu olaylar kişilerin fiziksel bütünlüğünü tehdit etmekte ve kişide korku, çaresizlik, dehşet ve öfke gibi negatif duygular uyandırmaktadır. Bu travmatik olayların sebep olduğu ruhsal hastalıklar arasında bellek sorunları, kafa karışıklığı, suçluluk duygusu, depresyon, panik bozukluğu, sosyal fobi, travma sonrası stres bozukluğu, psikoz, kaygı bozukluğu ve çeşitli psikomatik hastalıklar bulunmaktadır.

Travma çalışmalarına göre insan zihni, kişiyi rahatsız eden anıları tamamen unutmak yerine bilinç altında depolar. İnsan davranışlarının, düşüncelerinin ve gelişiminde önemli bir rol oynayan bilinç altı, bastırılmış deneyimlerin uyandırdığı duygu ve düşünceler doğrultusunda kişinin davranışlarına yön vermektedir. Sıkıntı verici olaylar yaşayan kişiler veya gruplar, travmalarını bastırmak için bireysel ve toplumsal olarak farklı başa çıkma yöntemleri sergilerler. Aşırı stres, kaygı bozukluğu ve öfkeden ötürü sağlıklı düşünebilme yetisi zarar gören bu bireylerin başvurduğu yöntemler hem kendileri hem de çevrelerindeki insanlar için yıkıcı sonuçlar doğurabilmektedir.

Uzun süre boyunca tedavi edilmeyen travmalar kişinin zihninde dağınık halde birikir ve zaman zaman kişinin aklına gelerek rahatsız edici duygular uyandırır.

Kişinin zihninde donuk olarak duran ve hatırlanmayan travmalar ise bireyin davranışlarını dolaylı olarak etkiler. Bu kronik rahatsızlık hastayı stres kaynağıyla yüzleşerek başa çıkma ya da ondan kaçmaya zorlar. Travmanın kaynağından kaçma isteği, hastayı fiziksel ve sözlü şiddet gibi ilkel ve zararlı yöntemlere başvurarak olumsuz duygu ve düşünceleri geçici olarak tatmin etmeye ya da bastırmaya iter. Bu yüzden travma yaşayan kişilerin sorunlarını mümkün olduğunca hızlı ve doğru bir şekilde tespit etmek ve bunlara uygun çözümler üretmek hayati önem arz etmektedir.

Çalışmanın ana odağı olan travma konusunu irdeleyebilmek amacıyla tezde, travmanın kuramsal çerçevesi açıklanmaktadır. Bu çerçeveyi oluşturmak için travma ve psikanaliz çalışmalarında önde gelen kuramcıların kaynaklarından faydalanılmıştır. Travmanın genel tanımını ve semptomlarını açıklayan bu kısım, ayrıca sömürgeci travmanın da karakteristik özelliklerinden bahsederek tezde ele alınan oyunların kuramsal incelemesi için zemin hazırlamaktadır. Oyunlar içerisindeki travmaya örnek verilebilecek diğer spesifik durumları açıklamak için gerekli olan kuramlar ise tezdeki bölümler içerisinde ayrıca verilmiştir.

Bu çalışma travma konusunu, sömürgeci Britanya İmparatorluğunun ekonomik, kültürel ve politik kontrolü altındaki İrlanda toplumunun yaşadığı olumsuz psikolojik etkiler bağlamında incelemektir. İrlanda'nın 16. Yüzyılda başlayan sömürgeleştirilme sürecinin etkileri 21. Yüzyıla kadar devam etmiş, ülkenin tarihinde, kültüründe ve edebiyatında derin izler bırakmıştır. Bu süreç içerisinde iki taraf arasında pek çok savaş ve katliam yaşanmış, binlerce insan ölmüş veya yaralanmış ve İrlanda'daki binalar ve altyapılar büyük hasar görmüştür.

İngiltere'nin İrlanda üzerindeki despotik kontrolünü incelemek amacıyla çalışma, sömürgeciliğin travmatik sonuçlarını incelemek için George Bernard Shaw'ın **John Bull's Other Island**'ından, Seán O'Casey'nin **Juno and the Paycock**'ından ve Brian Friel'ın **Translations**'ından faydalanmaktadır. Yukarıda adı geçen oyunlar, İrlanda tiyatrosunda önde gelen eserlerden sayılmaktadır. Bu oyunlar, İngiltere'nin sömürgeci politikalarının on dokuzuncu ve yirminci yüzyıllarda İrlanda ve İngiltere toplumu üzerinde bıraktığı olumsuz fiziksel ve psikolojik etkilere odaklanırlar.

İngiltere'nin ilk kolonisi olarak kabul edilen İrlanda, İngiltere'nin agresif sömürgeci taktiklerini geliştirdiği yer olarak görülmektedir. Bu taktikler İrlanda'nın topraklarına el konulması, işgücünün ve doğal kaynaklarının sömürülmesi, dilinin ve kültürünün asimile edilmesi ve karşıt grupların şiddet yoluyla tasfiye edilmesinden oluşmaktadır. Bahsi geçen bu politikalar, yukarıda bahsedilen üç oyunda ayrıntılı olarak tasvir edilmektedir.

Baskıcı sömürge politikaları meşru kılmak amacıyla İngiltere, İrlanda halkını eğitimsiz, gelişmemiş, irrasyonel ve bağnaz bir toplum olarak ötekileştirme yoluna gitmiştir. Bu yöntem iki taraf arasındaki ayrışma ve nefreti daha da artırmış ve İrlanda toplumunda radikal milliyetçilik gibi görüşlerin artmasına yol açmıştır. İngiltere daha sonra bu baskıcı politikaları diğer sömürge ülkelerinde de uygulayarak Kuzey Amerika, Doğu Afrika ve Avusturalya kıtalarına kadar uzanan geniş bir imparatorluk inşa etmiştir. Bu imparatorluk günümüzde ortadan kalkmış olsa da İrlanda'nın kolektif hafızasında bıraktığı etkiler hala sürmektedir.

Hem İngiliz hem de İrlanda toplumunun tutum ve politikalarını objektif bir bakış açısıyla inceleyen bu üç oyun, İrlanda'nın sömürge döneminde yaşanan travmatik tarihsel olayları anlatılarında sık sık yer vermektedir. Bu oyunlar, Britanya İmparatorluğunun kontrolü altındaki İrlanda'nın fakir ve gelişmemiş kasaba ile şehirlerinde geçmekte ve orada yaşayan yerel halkın sosyal, kültürel ve ekonomik sıkıntılarına odaklanmaktadır. Oyunlar, bu sıkıntıların yol açtığı çatışma ve gerilimlerin her iki tarafa da fiziksel ve psikolojik zararlar verdiğini göstermektedir. Bu sebepten ötürü çalışma, sömürgecilik-sonrası ve travma kuramları ile İrlanda'nın sömürülmesinin tarihsel arka planı ışığında, İngiliz sömürgeciliğinin hem İrlanda hem de İngiliz toplumunda kişisel ve toplumsal travmaya sebep olduğunu ortaya koymaktadır.

Bu oyunlardaki İngiliz ve İrlandalı karakterler ya travmalarıyla yüzleşmeyi reddederler ya da bastırılmış duygusal acılarını ve sömürgeciye duydukları nefreti şiddet aracılığıyla gösterirler. Psikanaliz çalışmalarında "bastırılanın geri dönüşü" olarak tanımlanan bu durum, oyunlarda yukarıda belirtilen bu iki yaklaşım aracılığıyla

ortaya konulmaktadır. Travma kuramı, bu iki yaklaşımı "fanteziler" ve "agresif dürtüler" olarak iki ana başlık altında değerlendirmektedir. Bu iki yöntem bireyin kişisel ve kolektif travmadan geçici olarak kaçmasına olanak sağlayarak kişinin sıkıntılarıyla sağlıklı bir biçimde yüzleşmesine engel olmaktadır. Dolayısıyla oyunlar, her iki yaklaşımın da yıkıcı yönlerini tasvir ederek bu yöntemlerin travmayla yüzleşme konusunda sağlıksız çözümler olduklarını ortaya koymaktadır.

Fantezi başlığı altında değerlendirilen yüzleşmeyi reddetme eylemi, bireyin gerçekleşme ihtimali olmayan hayali gerçekler üreterek sömürgeci baskı ve travmadan geçici bir şekilde kaçmasıyla gerçekleşir. Bu yöntem, bireyi gerçeklikten koparmak pahasına geçici bir rahatlama duygusu sağlar. Arzu ve isteklerini günlük hayatında gerçekleştirme şansı bulamayan birey, bu hayali gerçeklik aracılığıyla isteklerini yapay bir şekilde gerçekleştirerek duygusal olarak rahatlamaya çalışır. Gerçeklikle bağları zayıflayan kişi anksiyete, paranoya ve sosyal ilişkilerde yetersizlik gibi duygular yaşar ve kendini içinde bulunduğu durum ve toplumdan soyutlar. Bu durum bireyin çevresine yabancılaşmasına ve yalnızlaşmasına sebep olarak kişinin travmalarını derinleştirir.

Diğer taraftan bastırılmış travmanın fiziksel ve sözel şiddet aracılığıyla boşaltılması, sömürgeci ile sömürgeleştirilen arasında daha fazla çatışma, nefret ve gerilime neden olur. Bunun sonucunda iki taraf arasında sağlıklı bir iletişim aracılığıyla uzlaşma ihtimali tamamen ortadan kalkar. Bu sebepten ötürü oyunlar, bu yaklaşımları kolonyal travmaya kalıcı çözüm sunamayan tehlikeli ve etkisiz yöntemler olarak tasvir etmektedir. Bu yöntemlerin yıkıcı sonuçlarını ortaya koymak adına çalışma, sömürgeci ile sömürülen arasındaki umutsuz ilişkiyi ve bastırılmış nefretten doğan gerilimi yukarıda söz edilen travma ve psikanaliz kuramları aracılığıyla ele almaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: İrlanda Tiyatrosu, İrlanda Tarihi, Travma Kuramı, Postkolonyal Kuram, İngiliz Edebiyatı.

PREFACE

This study provides a close analysis of George Bernard Shaw's **John Bull's Other Island**, Seán O'Casey's **Juno and the Paycock**, and Brian Friel's **Translations**, and elucidates the topic of colonial trauma in these plays. In this work, I aim to explicate the various psychological outcomes of Britain's oppressive presence and control over the society of Ireland. As the first colony of Britain, Ireland was subjected to aggressive colonial policies, which aimed to violently subjugate their community and systematically assimilate their culture, language, and history.

The characters in each of these plays demonstrate the often-negative psychological results of this colonial subjugation in the shape of trauma, which is a strong emotional shock or pain that affects the psyche of the individual. These characters aim to suppress their traumas by figuratively escaping from the harsh reality of colonial oppression through their delusional fantasies or by executing verbal and physical violence against the coloniser.

To elaborate on how these plays evaluate the colonial past between Britain and Ireland, the thesis provides a detailed historical background at the beginning of each chapter that relates to the specific events in the plays. Then it scrutinises the characters' emotional responses to these historical events of colonialism through the theories of postcolonial and trauma studies. In the end, the conclusion assembles the results inferred from the close examination of these plays.

I would like to thank the members of my department, the English Language and Literature, for giving me a deep knowledge of my field. I am especially grateful to my supervisor, Assoc. Prof. Özlem Karadağ, for her support and kindness, and for providing me with excellent ideas, suggestions, and sources that helped me to complete this work.

I am also deeply indebted to my family for showing me extraordinary patience and understanding during the challenging process of writing this work. To whom I am

grateful most is my brother Emre, who supplied me with immense emotional support through his cheerful and encouraging personality. Finally, I would like to express my appreciation to my close friends, Ali, Tunahan, and Gülce. During my academic journey, they were always there for me to offer their precious friendship and support, which helped me to maintain my motivation and belief in myself.

ERTUĞRUL BAŞÇINAR

İSTANBUL, 2023

CONTENTS

Page

ABSTRACT ii
ÖZ iv
PREFACE viii
INTRODUCTION 1
1. **PHANTASY AND AGGRESSIVE IMPULSES OF THE COLONISED IRISH: GEORGE BERNARD SHAW'S JOHN BULL'S OTHER ISLAND**
1.1. THE BEGINNING OF IRELAND'S COLONISATION AND THE CONFISCATION OF ITS LANDS 16
1.2. PHANTASY AND AGGRESSIVE IMPULSES IN GEORGE BERNARD SHAW'S **JOHN BULL'S OTHER ISLAND** 24
2. **THE COLONIAL TRAUMA IN THE WAR-TORN SLUMS OF IRELAND: SEÁN O'CASEY'S JUNO AND THE PAYCOCK**
2.1. THE CONFLICTS THAT LED UP TO THE IRISH CIVIL WAR 50
2.2. THE TRAUMATIC COLONIAL WAR IN THE IRISH SLUMS IN SEÁN O'CASEY'S **JUNO AND THE PAYCOCK** 57
3. **THE TRAUMA OF ANGLICISATION: BRIAN FRIEL'S TRANSLATIONS**
3.1. THE HISTORY OF IRELAND'S LINGUISTIC ASSIMILATION 89
3.2. THE TRAUMATIC RESULTS OF IRELAND'S ANGLICISATION IN BRIAN FRIEL'S **TRANSLATIONS** 96
CONCLUSION 134
BIBLIOGRAPHY 144

INTRODUCTION

Through the lenses of trauma and postcolonial theories, this thesis scrutinises the destructive aspects of repressing colonial trauma in George Bernard Shaw's **John Bull's Other Island** (1904), Seán O'Casey's **Juno and the Paycock** (1924), and Brian Friel's **Translations** (1980). As pieces of Irish drama, these plays demonstrate the traumatic outcomes of colonial oppression which Britain inflicted on its first colony, Ireland. Each play portrays the violent imposition of Britain's exploitative colonial policies in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Through these policies, they maintain their authority and made financial and political profits by subjugating and assimilating the Irish. These plays also depict the various emotional responses of the psychologically deteriorated Irish people towards the coloniser Britain's repressive actions. Therefore, a theoretical framework of trauma studies needs to be established beforehand to analyse how these characters attempt to overcome their distress. Initially, this section provides a general description and the characteristics of trauma. Secondly, it conveys the specific variations of psychological distress as well as the characters' coping methods of repression, which are exemplified in the plays. Lastly, it briefly discusses the devastating outcomes of repression as a coping strategy, which is later elaborated on in each chapter.

In the plays, the psychological results of Britain's oppressive actions manifest themselves in the forms of personal and collective "*trauma*"[1]. According to Bessel van der Kolk, trauma is a strong emotional response to a distressing event that radically alters the individual's cognitive process of decision-making:

> Traumatized people become stuck, stopped in their growth because they can't integrate new experiences into their lives. […] Being traumatized means continuing to organize

[1] David Lloyd, "Colonial Trauma/Postcolonial Recovery?", **Interventions**, June 1, 2011, (Online) https://doi.org/10.1080/136980100427324, 18 March 2023.

> your life as if the trauma were still going on — unchanged and immutable — as every new encounter or event is contaminated by the past.[2]

Van der Kolk adds that these traumatising experiences include actual or threatened death, serious injuries, oppressive treatment from an authority, or sexual violence. The psychological impact of these horrifying events leads the individual to lose their ability to cope with the traumatic experience in an effective and rational way. This damaged psychology often provokes the person to desperately apply unsustainable and potentially harmful solutions, which focus on "*suppressing inner chaos*"[3] momentarily. In line with Van der Kolk's argument, the plays portray Irish figures who are unable to find an effective solution to the colonial trauma due to their impaired psychologies. Therefore, they intend to repress their mental suffering through delusional and destructive approaches, which only provide short-term relief instead of a perdurable resolution.

In the plays, the Irish characters attempt to overcome the trauma of colonisation through different methods, which can be explicated through Sigmund Freud's psychoanalytic theory. Freud suggests that the individual copes with their distressed psychological state by either acknowledging the sources of their trauma or denying their existence completely. He refers to this process of denial as "*repression.*" He describes this concept as the banishment of inappropriate thoughts and desires from the conscious mind: "*We have reason to assume that there is a primal repression, a first phase of repression, which consists in the psychical (ideational) representative of the instinct being denied entrance into the conscious.*"[4] Freud claims that these banished notions are not erased from the individual's psyche. Instead, they are stored in the unconscious mind, which has a significant impact on human development and behaviour.

---

[2] Bessel van der Kolk, **The Body Keeps the Score: Mind, Brain and Body in the Transformation of Trauma**, w. Place, Penguin Group, 2014, p.64.
[3] **Ibid.**, p.64.
[4] Sigmund Freud, **Repression**, Vol.XIV, London, Hogarth Press, 1915, p.148.

To further explore the process of repression, Daniel K. Lapsley and Paul C. Stey refer to Freud, who explicates the layers of the human psyche in three categories: "*id, ego, superego*"[5]. The id is the component of the psyche that is responsible for retaining the basic and instinctual desires that society labels as inappropriate, unrealistic or dangerous.[6] Unlike the id, the ego functions by reason, which makes it the decision-making part of the mind. Thus, it constitutes the conscious mind that represses the inappropriate notions of the id by casting them into the unconscious mind:

> As a result of the experience, an instinctual demand arises which calls for satisfaction. The ego refuses that satisfaction, either because it is paralyzed by the magnitude of the demand or because it recognizes it as a danger […] The ego fends off the danger by the process of repression. The instinctual impulse is in some way inhibited, its precipitating cause, with its attendant perceptions and ideas, is forgotten.[7]

The last layer, the superego, is regarded as the ethical component of the mind as it regulates the moral standards which control the ego. It contains the rules and values that are constructed by the society in which the individual lives.[8] At a young age, individuals start to learn these rules and values from their parents, relatives, and other people in their society. When the excluded feelings, thoughts, and wishes are repressed by these regulations of society for an exceedingly long time, they often forcefully reveal themselves in indirect forms. As the suppression of these unfulfilled notions often causes frustration, the indirect manifestation of trauma tends to be extreme or violent.

In **Unclaimed Experience: Trauma, Narrative, and History**, Cathy Caruth elaborates on the indirect and involuntary manifestations of suppressed emotions and

---

[5] Daniel K. Lapsley, Paul C. Stey, "Id, Ego, and Superego," **Encyclopedia of Human Behavior**, w. Place, 2011, p.1.
[6] **Ibid.**, p.1.
[7] Sigmund Freud, **Moses and Monotheism: Three Essays**, Vol.XXIII, London, Hogarth Press, 1939, p.128.
[8] Lapsley, Stey, **op. cit.**, p.1.

thoughts by explaining the repetitive nature of trauma. Caruth argues that distressed individuals display an unconscious urge to repeat the experiences that give them anxiety, pain, and sorrow. [9] In her work, she refers to Freud, who explains the human being's unwitting desire to re-enact the traumatic events in the context of Torquato Tasso's poem, "*Gerusalemme Liberata*":

> The [poem's] hero, Tancred, has unwittingly slain Clorinda, the maiden he loved, who fought with him disguised in the armour of an enemy knight. After her burial he penetrates into the mysterious enchanted wood, the bane of the army of the crusaders. Here he hews down a tall tree with his sword, but from the gash in the trunk blood streams forth and the voice of Clorinda whose soul is imprisoned in the tree cries out to him in reproach that he has once more wrought a baleful deed on his beloved.[10]

According to Freud, the knight Tancred, who is the hero of the poem, repeats his trauma by unintentionally killing his beloved maiden Clorinda, who fought with him disguised in the enemy's armour, and then unwittingly hurting her again by thrusting the tree that hosts her spirit. Freud utilises this incident as an example of the human's underlying desire to reexperience their agonising memories, which he calls "*repetition-compulsion*"[11]. Freud suggests that this subconscious compulsion stems from the individual's inability to leave behind their disquieting past. The individual's fixation with the past drives them to repeatedly act out these traumatic memories as a desperate attempt to achieve partial control over their distress. In her work mentioned above, Caruth contributes to Freud's theory by comparing Tancred's trauma to a "*moving and sorrowful voice that cries out, a voice that is paradoxically released through the wound*"[12]. She asserts that this "*uncanny repetition*"[13] brings the covert

[9] Cathy Caruth, **Unclaimed Experience: Trauma, Narrative, and History**, Baltimore, The John Hopkins University Press, 1996, p.1.
[10] Sigmund Freud, **Beyond the Pleasure Principle**, Ed. by. Ernest Jones, w. Place, The International Psycho-Analytical Press, 1922, p.15.
[11] **Ibid.**, p.13.
[12] **Ibid.**, p.2.
[13] **Ibid.**, p.9.

distress of the past, which is buried in the subconscious mind, to the surface, unsettling the individual who is unaware of their own trauma.

In alignment with Caruth and Freud's views on trauma, Dominick LaCapra advocates that the distress of the past repeats itself by haunting the individual's present. These post-traumatic effects create "*double binds*" [14] that blur the border between these two timelines. These binds enable disturbing memories to continue to damage the individual's current mental state as long as they remain untreated. For this reason, he points out that the individual's present mental and psychological problems should be evaluated in relation to the subject's past, which might constitute the root of their trauma:

> With respect to trauma, a simple postulation does not suffice to distinguish between past and present, and it may function to occlude the role of trauma and post-traumatic effects. The ability to make an effective, nondeceptive distinction depends on working through traumatic and post-traumatic experience in a way that requires inter alia memory work that situates the trauma in a past related to—even in a sense still bound up with live issues in, but not repeatedly relived or conflated with—the present.[15]

In this case, LaCapra asserts that anger, frustration, and suffering become recurrent feelings in the experiences of the victim since their unpleasant memories influence their current psychology. This negative influence often leads individuals to repeat their trauma by pushing them to take dangerous, irrational, and violent actions that are harmful to their surroundings and themselves.

According to LaCapra, the distressed individual often displays the compulsion to reexperience their trauma in two fundamental forms: "*acting out*" and "*working through*"[16]. LaCapra advocates that these two concepts are closely interrelated and

---

[14] Dominick LaCapra, "Trauma, History, Memory, Identity: What Remains?" **History and Theory**, 2016, (Online) https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/hith.10817, 09 April 2023.
[15] **Ibid.**, p.377.
[16] Dominick LaCapra, **Writing History, Writing Trauma**, Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press, 2014, p.148.

necessary to understand and overcome trauma. The first term, acting out, refers to individuals that are unable to move on with their current lives since they are psychologically impaired by the distressing events of the past. As a result of this negative influence, they demonstrate a tendency to reenact the traumatic memories compulsively to master their distress:

> In post-traumatic acting out […] one is haunted or possessed by the past and performatively caught up in the compulsive repetition of traumatic scenes – scenes in which the past returns and the future is blocked or fatalistically caught up in a melancholic feedback loop. In acting out, tenses implode, and it is as if one were back there in the past reliving the traumatic scene. Any duality (or double inscription) of time (past and present or future) is experientially collapsed or productive only of aporias and double binds.[17]

As long as the trauma remains untreated, the person gets increasingly frustrated and fixated on the distressing past, which leads their suppressed emotions to "*implode*" in the forms of aggression and violence. For this reason, these feelings are often manifested in destructive and negative behaviours like addiction, emotional outbursts, and attention-seeking actions. This approach temporarily reduces the discomfort of the traumatised person through the forceful satisfaction of their frustrated feelings. However, it also imprisons the individual into "*a melancholic feedback loop*" in which they obsessively repeat their traumatic experience. Therefore, it does not allow the individual to undergo a healthy process of overcoming trauma and carry on with their present lives.

However, as Özlem Karadağ points out, acting out and/or spectatorship also "*helps the audience/witness to familiarize themselves with traumatic experiences*"[18] in drama. Karadağ adds that the audience's act of witnessing the distressing event that is acted out on stage constitutes the threat of transmission of trauma, which may even

[17] **Ibid.**, p.21.
[18] Özlem Karadağ, "Rewriting Women and Trauma: Zinnie Harris's This Restless House," **Tiyatro Eleştirmenliği ve Dramaturji Bölümü Dergisi**, Vol.XXXIV, İstanbul, İstanbul University Press, 2022, p.23.

trigger the audience's own traumas. Yet, this unsettling confrontation can also heal the audience's repressed psychological struggles by granting them an opportunity to witness and analyse their distress from an alternative and potentially safer viewpoint.[19]

This therapeutic property of witnessing trauma can be explored through Shoshana Felman and Dori Laub's "*testimony*"[20] theory. In **Testimony: Crises of Witnessing in Literature, Psychoanalysis, and History**, Felman and Laub scrutinise the function of witnessing a disturbing event in relation to the Holocaust.[21] Based on their video archive that documents the experiences of Holocaust survivors and bystanders, Felman and Laub argue that the listener should delicately encourage the distressed individual to narrate their trauma without pushing them to recall memories that might result in an emotional breakdown. In this way, the individual can organise their traumatic memories into words and process the pain while sharing them with the listener and calling for social justice:

> Testimony has become a crucial mode of our relation to events of our times – our relation to the traumas of contemporary history: the Second World War, the Holocaust, the nuclear bomb, and other war atrocities. As a relation to the events, testimony seems to be composed of bits and pieces of a memory that has been overwhelmed by occurrences that have not settled into understanding or remembrance.[22]

According to Felman and Laub, testifying about these disquieting events is a healthy way of acting out the traumatic memory. It does not only raise social awareness by documenting the horrors of history but also helps the listener/witness reach a cathartic release of their own buried traumas.[23] In this regard, Felman and Laub add that testifying is also interrelated with drama, which is an ancient form of acting out the

[19] **Ibid.**, p.23.
[20] Shoshana Felman, Dori Laub, **Testimony: Crises of Witnessing in Literature, Psychoanalysis, and History**, New York, Routledge, 1992, p.1.
[21] **Ibid.**, p.5.
[22] Felman, Laub, **op. cit.**, p.5.
[23] **Ibid.**, pp.12-14.

traumatic past.[24] Akin to the method of testimony, drama narrates the discomforting history to the audience, who reaches an understanding of both the historical traumas and their own repressed distress.

Apart from this, LaCapra outlines the second term, working through, as a process in which the person attempts to gain a critical distance from the traumatic past. Through this distance, the subject aims to reach an analytical and impartial evaluation of the problem:

> In working through, one tries to acquire some critical distance that allows one to engage in life in the present, to assume responsibility – but that doesn't mean that you utterly transcend the past. It means that you come to terms with it in a different way related to what you judge to be desirable possibilities that may now be created, including possibilities that lost out in the past but may still be recaptured and reactivated, with significant differences, in the present and future.[25]

For LaCapra, working through is a method which allows the individual, whether victim or secondary observer, to distinguish the experience that traumatises them in the past. This enables them to rationally evaluate their psychological problems. Through this approach, the person is freed from their entrapment by the distressing past and carries on with their life. Thus, LaCapra defines working through as an efficient and healthy way of coping with traumas.

Psychoanalytic theories describe these repetitions of suppressed traumas through the term called the "*return of the repressed*"[26]. In "Freudian Repression, the Common View, and Pathological Science," Simon Boag defines the return of the repressed as the process in which the individual unintentionally exposes their repressed thoughts, desires, and memories in the forms of "*phantasy*" and "*aggressive*

[24] **Ibid.**, p.6.
[25] LaCapra, **op. cit.**, p.148.
[26] Simon Boag, "Freudian Repression, the Common View, and Pathological Science," **Review of General Psychology**, 2006, (Online) https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2680.10.1.74, 18 April 2023.

impulses"[27]. The first term, phantasy, elucidates the fictitious fulfilment of these suppressed elements. As pointed out by Boag, the repression of these wishes often occurs when their satisfaction entails some external danger, such as legal punishments, social exclusion, and death.[28] As a result, individual's wish to protect their distance from these dangerous notions and simultaneously experience it encourages them to fantasise about an imaginary ground where they can freely satisfy these wishes without facing any harmful or unwanted consequences. The second term, aggressive impulses, explicates the situation in which the individual attempts to reveal their constrained thoughts and desires by employing violence that often disregards other people's safety and well-being.

Each play displays the return of the repressed through the traumatised Irish characters. For phantasy, they either imagine themselves as a member of the coloniser by adopting their culture or daydreaming about an independent Ireland to avoid colonial reality. These phantasies are later elaborated on in each chapter mainly through the theories of trauma, mimicry, escapism, and double displacement, the common concepts that are present in multiple plays. The plays also demonstrate aggressive impulses through the figures who desire to stop their exploitation by rebelling against Britain, which leads to bloodshed and murder. Therefore, this only increases the hostility between the opposing sides by provoking British forces to employ brute force to abolish their opposition.

John Bull's Other Island represents phantasy through the Irish heiress Nora Reilly. She imagines a peaceful Ireland where she lives with Larry Doyle.[29] Her phantasy enables her to withstand the coloniser Tom Broadbent, who proposes to her to abuse her title.[30] Thus, Nora's double marginalisation as a colonised woman parallels Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak's "*double displacement*"[31] theory. In **Can the Subaltern Speak?**, Spivak aims to recover the absent voice of the subaltern, the

[27] **Ibid.**, pp.76-77.
[28] **Ibid.**, p.77.
[29] George Bernard Shaw, **John Bull's Other Island**, London, Constable and Company Ltd., 1912, p.95.
[30] **Ibid.**, p.103.
[31] Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, **Can the Subaltern Speak?**, Ed. by. Patrick Williams, Laura Chrisman, w. Place, Afterall Books, 2020, p.90.

communities that are subordinated due to their community, caste, class, race, ethnicity, physiology, gender, and sexuality. One of the subaltern groups that she focuses on is the Third World and the non-European women, who remain outside of the exclusionary borders of the Eurocentric viewpoint of the Western communities. According to Spivak, colonialism and patriarchy are oppressive systems that produce the hierarchical dynamics of domination. Hence, colonised women are victimised as both sexual and racial others. She calls this two-sided subjugation "*double displacement*":

> Within the effaced itinerary of the subaltern subject, the track of sexual difference is doubly effaced […] both as object of colonialist historiography and as subject of insurgency, the ideological construction of gender keeps the male dominant. If, in the context of colonial production, the subaltern has no history and cannot speak, the subaltern as female is even more deeply in shadow.[32]

These structures portray women as objects whose purpose is to fulfil their oppressors' desires. They also marginalise the female subaltern who attempts to transcend these predetermined borders of womanhood, labelling them as demonic, immoral, unnatural, or mentally ill. They strip them of their right to voice their feelings and opinions.[33] Likewise, Nora is subjected to colonial and patriarchal oppression by Broadbent. He wants to convert her into an obedient wife who gives unconditional support to his political campaign.[34]

Doyle also uses phantasy by adopting English culture to accomplish his wish of being a part of the British[35], which parallels Homi K. Bhabha's "*mimicry*"[36]. Bhabha argues that the colonial discourse imposes the coloniser's racial and cultural superiority. This establishes a collective trauma as it victimises the colonised as

[32] **Ibid.**, pp.82-83.
[33] **Ibid.**, pp.88-89.
[34] Shaw, **op. cit.**, p.103.
[35] **Ibid.**, p.108.
[36] Homi K. Bhabha, "Of Mimicry and Man: The Ambivalence of Colonial Discourse," **The Location of Culture**, London, Routledge, 1994, p.86.

inferior others.[37] The sense of inferiority forces them to imitate the coloniser's culture to reform their subpar identity and undermine the coloniser's superiority:

> Colonial mimicry is the desire for a reformed, recognizable Other, *as a subject of a difference that is almost the same, but not quite*. […] [It] is constructed around an *ambivalence*; […] to be effective, mimicry must continually produce its slippage, its excess, its difference. The authority of that mode of colonial discourse that I have called mimicry is therefore stricken by an indeterminacy: mimicry emerges as the representation of a difference that is itself a process of disavowal.[38]

Bhabha specifies this process as mimicry. It grants the cultural and racial others a chance to disrupt the colonial hierarchy by expressing their "*difference*" from the coloniser. Here, the term difference "*suggests multiplicity, heterogeneity, plurality, rather than binary opposition and exclusion*"[39]. Mimicry aims to overcome polarising borders of imperialism by encouraging racial and social diversity.

Through the articulation of racial or social differences, the marginalised individuals put themselves in a position that is similar, yet not identical, to the coloniser. Bhabha explicates this unique position as "*the third space of enunciation*"[40], a hybrid position which fosters compromise between the coloniser and the colonised:

> The split-space of enunciation may open the way to conceptualizing an international culture, based not on the exoticism of multiculturalism or the *diversity* of cultures, but on the inscription and articulation of culture's *hybridity*. […] It makes it possible to begin envisaging national, anti-nationalist histories of the 'people' […] [which] may elude the politics of polarity.[41]

---

[37] **Ibid.**, p.12.
[38] **Ibid.**, p.86.
[39] Linda Hutcheon, **A Poetics of Postmodernism: History, Theory, Fiction**, New York and London, Routledge, 2003, p.61.
[40] **Ibid.**, p.37.
[41] **Ibid.**, pp.38-39.

The third space is an ambiguous area where different cultural identities intersect. This creates a "*hybrid identity*"[42], which abolishes the cultural borders that promote discrimination. Bhabha considers the third space as an opportunity to go beyond "*the politics of polarity*"[43] between the self and the other, the East and the West, and the coloniser and the colonised. Similarly, Doyle intends to overcome his sense of inferiority by mimicking English social behaviours. In addition, **Translations** also portrays the colonised society's tendency of mimicking the coloniser through Owen and Maire, who suffer from an underlying inferiority complex for being Irish. They repress this complex by imitating the British and renouncing their native identity.[44] Their prejudice against their culture shows that they are manipulated by the colonial discourse, which propagates the inferiority of the colonised.

In **Juno and the Paycock**, the method of phantasy is delivered by Jack Boyle, who fantasises about a powerful Ireland where he was a heroic captain.[45] He uses alcohol to reduce his consciousness, which helps him to immerse himself in these phantasies.[46] His alcoholism fits into Hannu Jouhki and Atte Oksanen's "*escape theory*"[47]. They elaborate on Roy F. Baumeister's theory, which conceptualises escapism as a process in which the person "*escape[s] from the self*"[48]. When humans are unable to solve their problems, they feel depression and social inadequacy.[49] These feelings force them to judge their actions and compare themselves with others:

---

[42] Bhabha, **op. cit.**, p.38.
[43] **Ibid.**, p.39.
[44] Brian Friel, **Translations**, London, Faber and Faber, 1981, p.25.
[45] Seán O'Casey, "Juno and the Paycock," **Three Plays: Juno and the Paycock, The Shadow of a Gunman, The Plough and the Stars**, London, Macmillan Press, 1966, p.14.
[46] **Ibid.**, p.6.
[47] Hannu Jouhki, Atte Oksanen, "To Get High or to Get Out? Examining the Link between Addictive Behaviors and Escapism," **Substance Use & Misuse**, November 23, 2021, (Online) https://doi.org/10.1080/10826084.2021.2002897, 28 May 2023.
[48] Roy F. Baumeister, **Escaping the Self: Alcoholism, Spirituality, Masochism, and Other Flights from the Burden of Selfhood**, w. Place, Basic Books, 1991, p.12.
[49] Jouhki, Oksanen, **op. cit.**, pp.202-204.

> [Escapism] involves decreasing self-awareness and forgetting the meaningful aspects of the self. By contrast, high self-awareness makes individuals compare themselves to standards that may evoke feelings of inadequacy. According to the escape theory, escapism is a means of letting go of high-level conscious thinking and turning to bodily sensations and impressions. In this way, escapist behavior is meant to free people from incessant self-evaluations, analyses, comparisons, and judgment (Silvia & Duval, 2001; Baumeister, 1991).[50]

To avoid self-evaluation, people seek habits that distract their attention from their problems. Therefore, they apply to addictive substances such as "*alcohol consumption, smoking, drug use*"[51]. They suppress traumas by decreasing the brain's activity.[52] Likewise, Boyle uses alcohol to inebriate his mind and escape from the realities of poverty and colonial conflicts. On the contrary, his daughter Mary deals with the distress of the war-torn slums through books and socialist ideologies. Yet, her interests are belittled by her father[53], which represents her subjugation by patriarchy. She is oppressed by colonial power and patriarchal discourse, rendering her an example of "*double displacement*" theory. O'Casey also presents Johnny, Mary's brother, who uses nationalist ideologies and religion to overcome his war-related traumas.

Additionally, the headmaster Hugh in **Translations** serves as another patriotic character who uses alcohol to cope with the British policies that forcefully anglicise their language.[54] Hugh resembles his son Manus, another nationalist who refuses to use the coloniser's language.[55] In terms of their devotion to preserving traditional values, Hugh and Manus compare to the Irish bachelor Jimmy Jack Cassie.[56] He escapes from Ireland's anglicisation by clinging to the pre-colonial past.[57]

---

[50] **Ibid.**, p.202.
[51] **Ibid.**, p.202.
[52] **Ibid.**, pp.202-203.
[53] O'Casey, **op. cit.**, pp.20-21.
[54] Friel, **op. cit.**, p.23.
[55] **Ibid.**, pp.36-37.
[56] **Ibid.**, p.11.
[57] **Ibid.**, p.11.

Each play also portrays aggressive impulses as another outcome of colonial oppression. In **John Bull's Other Island**, these impulses are shown through verbal and physical violence. As for verbal violence, Shaw confers the Irish townspeople whose resentment drives them to voice bigoted opinions about the coloniser.[58] For physical violence, Shaw presents Andy Haffigan, a farmer who attacked another farmer out of anger against his oppressive landlord.[59] In this regard, the play scrutinises his trauma in the context of Irish landlordism, which Britain used to exploit the country by collecting money from the locals. **Juno and the Paycock** also presents aggressive impulses in the contexts of the Easter Rising and the Civil War. It portrays the story of the Boyle family in 1922[60] during the Irish Civil War. The play represents the violence of war through Tancred's murder. Another instance of violence is delivered through the murder of Johnny by the Irregulars, the Irish Republican group that executes him as he betrays them.[61] O'Casey displays the traumatic effects of these deaths on their families, who lose them due to the colonial conflicts. In **Translations**, Friel portrays aggression in Irish society's ordinary life. He shows the underlying tension between the local Irish community and the British army, which executes the assimilation policies. This tension leads the Irish to show physical violence and prejudice against them. Yet, their aggression escalates colonial violence by infuriating the army. In return, the army aggravates their trauma by taking oppressive measures.

In conclusion, phantasies and aggressive impulses cannot offer a permanent solution to colonial trauma, but only a temporary relief. The characters refuse to face their distress by establishing imaginary worlds. This deepens their trauma by disassociating them from reality. They also discharge colonial distress by retaliating against the British through aggression. This provokes the coloniser to employ brutal measures, which causes casualties and feeds the resentment between these sides. Their relationship reaches a point where a non-violent compromise becomes impossible.

[58] Shaw, **op. cit.**, p.66.
[59] **Ibid.**, p.55.
[60] O'Casey, **op. cit.**, p.3.
[61] **Ibid.**, p.70.

To explore the portrayal of colonial trauma, the thesis is divided into three chapters, each of which initially delivers the historical information that is relevant to the play they scrutinise. Then they provide a close examination of Shaw's **John Bull's Other Island**, O'Casey's **Juno and the Paycock**, and Friel's **Translations**, respectively. Each chapter also utilises van der Kolk, Cathy Caruth, LaCapra, Felman, and Laub's views on trauma as well as Freud's theory of the return of the repressed and Boag's definition of phantasy and aggressive impulses as their overarching concepts. The first chapter examines the capitalist exploitation of the Irishtown Rosscullen by the opportunist British man Broadbent, which pushes the townspeople to either accept his abusive authority or aggressively rebel against the coloniser. In the second chapter, the emotional and physical damage of the Easter Rising and the Irish Civil War is discussed through the Boyle family, who attempts to escape from their war-torn slum environment through their unrealistic phantasies. The last chapter scrutinises the trauma inflicted by the British military, which aims to systematically assimilate the Irish language. In the play, this trauma of assimilation is delineated through the local Irish people who either acknowledge the coloniser's superiority by mimicking their culture or resist their assimilation policies through physical and non-physical aggression. Through these close examinations, the thesis attempts to reach an understanding of how the psychologically impairing policies of British colonialism have left a profound mark on both Irish drama and society.

CHAPTER ONE
PHANTASY AND AGGRESSIVE IMPULSES OF THE COLONISED IRISH: GEORGE BERNARD SHAW'S JOHN BULL'S OTHER ISLAND

1.1. THE BEGINNING OF IRELAND'S COLONISATION AND THE CONFISCATION OF ITS LANDS

Since **John Bull's Other Island** is intertextually linked to Ireland's colonisation and Britain's capitalistic confiscation policies of the land, historical knowledge is required to comprehend how the play conveys the traumatic outcomes of these policies. The play refers to the distressing outcomes of Britain's oppressive actions over the Irish between the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. However, the exploitative relationship between these sides has a long history that dates back to the twelfth century. Thus, this section starts with Britain's first political and military involvement in Ireland to establish an understanding of how Britain's presence evolved into colonialism over the years. Then, it delivers the significant colonial experiences that traumatised the Irish until the twentieth century. As these historical experiences are also the main focus of the play, they need to be explained beforehand to provide a theoretical analysis of this work.

Ireland has been widely accepted as the first colony of the British Empire.[1] Britain is argued to have developed its colonisation policies and tactics in Ireland before exporting them throughout the world. Between the sixteenth and the twentieth centuries, it became "*a heterogenous collection of trade colonies, Protectorates, Crown colonies, settlement colonies, administrative colonies, Mandates, trade ports, naval bases, Dominions*"[2] and other territories that were strictly administered by the

[1] Kevin Kenny (editor), **Ireland and the British Empire**, New York, Oxford University Press, 2004, p.1.
[2] **Ibid.**, p.4.

United Kingdom. Through this expansive reach, the empire exploited the labour force and the natural resources of various countries from North America to East Africa and Australia. Even though the British Empire does not exist today, the effects of its oppressive policies are still prevalent in the colonised communities in the forms of poverty, undeveloped cities, and collective trauma.

The British political and military involvement in Ireland started with "*the Anglo-Norman Invasion*"[3], which occurred in 1167 when Anglo-Normans partially conquered Ireland and took possession of large portions of the land. As the country consisted of several fragmented kingdoms with distributed power instead of a single unitary state, the Normans succeeded in gradually conquering the land.[4] Until 1171, they continued to invade the land and capsize Dublin and Waterford, the most important ports of Ireland, under the command of the Anglo-Norman nobleman Richard "*Strongbow*" de Clare. This growing control and authority of Anglo-Norman invaders in Ireland posed a threat to Henry II, the King of England. In 1171, King Henry came to Ireland with his army to assert authority over Anglo-Norman forces and Irish society:

> Henry II only became directly involved in 1171, presumably nervous of the growing power of some of his barons. Strongbow took control of Dublin and Waterford, Ireland's most important ports, and, as a consequence, posed a threat to Henry. The king responded by sailing to Ireland and asserting his authority. It was only logical that he would keep the profitable ports, with their longstanding trade with England, for himself. [5]

After his arrival, he made Strongbow a feudal lord by giving him the province Leinster as a fiefdom and proclaimed the Irish towns and profitable ports a part of their royal

[3] Kenneth L. Campbell, **Ireland's History: Prehistory to the Present**, London, Bloomsbury Publishing, 2014, p.61.
[4] **Ibid.**, p.61.
[5] Caitlin Ellis, "The Other Invasion: The Anglo-Norman Invasion of Ireland in 1167 Sowed the Seeds for Centuries of Tension Between England and the Irish," **History Today**, Vol.LXVII, No:9, w. Place, 2017, p.14.

domain. Strongbow also became the second Earl of Pembroke, which stood out as an important event that signifies the British intervention on Irish soil.

Hoping that he would restrain invasions from Anglo-Norman barons, many Irish Kings acknowledged King Henry's authority.[6] During this period, Anglo-Norman settlers intermarried with the locals and became a part of their society. Likewise, the Anglo-Norman authorities partially retained Irish laws and political systems. This rendered the invasion an event that is generally evaluated as outside of the colonisation process of the country, even though it marked the violent relationship between England and Ireland that lasted over 800 years. Today, the process is considered as an unsystematic and partial takeover of the land, rather than a systematic invasion that extended throughout the nation.[7]

In the traditional sense, Ireland's systematic colonisation started with the establishment of English and Scottish Protestant settlements in Ulster Plantation[8], one of the traditional rural provinces located in Northern Ireland. In the sixteenth century, during the reign of King James I, the British authorities in Ulster permitted Protestant settlers to take over Gaelic Catholics' lands. As Kieran Allen indicates in "Catholicism and the Irish State-Time to Separate," they oppressed original settlers by enacting laws that limited the Irish Catholics' freedom and rights:

> The Catholic religion was targeted in a series of penal laws imposed from Britain. Catholics were barred from inheriting Protestant land; excluded from occupying public office; forbidden to marry Protestants; banned from entering Trinity College. As a result, the Catholic Church took on all the appearance of an oppressed church and adherence to Catholicism a sign of resistance to imperialism.[9]

---

[6] **Ibid.**, pp.14-16.
[7] **Ibid.**, p.14.
[8] Gerard Farrell, **The 'Mere Irish' and the Colonisation of Ulster 1570-1641**, London, Palgrave Macmillan, 2017, pp.1-2.
[9] Kieran Allen, "Catholicism and the Irish State-Time to Separate," **Irish Marxist Review**, 2017, (Online) https://marxists.architexturez.net/history/etol/newspape/irishmr/vol06/no18/allen.pdf, 17 June 2023.

Allen points out that England imposed these laws until the end of the eighteenth century to decrease the Irish Catholic Church's authority in the region. These laws deprived the Catholic natives of their right to claim authority over their own land, participate in positions within the government and have higher education by forbidding them to enter Trinity College, the university founded by Queen Elizabeth I in 1592 in Dublin. While the penal laws severely limited the freedom and rights of the Irish Catholic population, it also raised the popularity and support for Catholicism throughout the country as they granted the Catholic Church the image of an oppressed institution.

In this period, most of the new settlers came from the southern parts of Scotland and England, whose culture and language differed from the native population. Since the British laws also forbid the local society to marry Protestants, they rarely established any familial or social connection with these newly emerged British settlers. These factors cemented the social and cultural alienation and tension between these already conflicting societies. As Eamon Darcy points out in **The Irish Rebellion of 1641 and the Wars of the Three Kingdoms**, a violent uprising named "*the Irish Rebellion of 1641*"[10] was held by the Irish Catholic society as a result of this increasing conflict. The main motivations of this rebellion were to stop the social and political prejudice exerted on the Irish Catholics, achieve the right to self-govern, and retrieve the confiscated Catholic lands.[11] Ended in defeat for the Irish rebels, the uprising sparked new controversies among both the Catholics and the Protestants:

> One serious issue has tainted the historiography of the 1641 rebellion. Within months of its outbreak Protestant commentators claimed that the rising was a premeditated plot to murder all members of the reformed faiths in Ireland, cloaked in fabricated political and economic grievances. These commentators could point to the 1641 depositions as evidence and provide suitably gory and graphic testimonies to support their arguments. In response, Catholic commentators stressed their coreligionists' hardships and denied that their actions were designed to exterminate the Protestant population in Ireland.

[10] Eamon Darcy, **The Irish Rebellion of 1641 and the Wars of the Three Kingdoms**, Vol.LXXXVI, Suffolk, The Boydell Press, 2013, p.195.
[11] **Ibid.**, pp.48-53.

> They claimed that the outbreak of popular violence was spontaneous and indulged in by the lower social orders without sanction from their social superiors.[12]

As stated in the quotation above, the Protestant people viewed the rebellion as a massacre that had been planned beforehand to kill the recently established Protestant community in Ireland. They also accused the Catholics of trying to justify this violent uprising by portraying it as a spontaneous event triggered by the political and economic hardships of the local Catholic community. The Catholics, on the other hand, refused that the uprising was a premeditated massacre which was designed to eliminate this newly emerged Protestant society in Ireland. According to them, the violence and murders were spontaneous events that took place due to the deep-seated restlessness of the lower-class Catholic community, who acted without the orders and permission of their social superiors.

In 1642, the rebellion began to spread around the nation through Catholic landowners, both native Irish and Anglo-Irish engaging in arms to protect their properties, and lands. This allegiance was officially founded at a meeting in Kilkenny, Ireland, and referred to as the "*Confederation of Kilkenny*"[13]. To subdue the rebellion, the English parliament enacted acts that granted the investors the right to pay the price of suppressing the uprising in exchange for land, which would be confiscated in Ireland. Shortly after, an army that was mostly comprised of Scottish Protestants arrived in Ireland to repress the uprising, which only resulted in increased tension and violence in the country.

Apart from the Irish Rebellion of 1641, the sectarian-based tension between the Catholic local society and the new Protestant settlers also led to the violent invasion of Ireland named "*the Cromwellian Conquest of Ireland*"[14]. It took place between 1649

[12] **Ibid.**, p.52.
[13] John Lowe, "Charles I and the Confederation of Kilkenny, 1643-9," **Irish Historical Studies**, Vol.XIV, No:53, 1964, pp.1-19.
[14] Elaine Murphy, "The Navy and the Cromwellian Conquest of Ireland, 1649–53," **Journal for Maritime Research**, May 3, 2012, (Online) https://doi.org/10.1080/21533369.2012.672803, 16 April 2023.

and 1653 under the command of the English politician, statesman, and military officer Oliver Cromwell:

> Following the execution of Charles I in January 1649, the English parliament prepared an expeditionary force to be led by Oliver Cromwell to suppress its enemies in Ireland. In August 1649 he landed in Dublin and in the years that followed Cromwell and the military commanders who came after him gradually defeated the alliance of confederates and royalists in Ireland.[15]

As Elaine Murphy points out, the Cromwellian Conquest was commenced by the English parliament after the execution of Charles I, who was the King of England, Scotland, and Ireland, as a violent expedition to suppress the Irish people. This conquest was held to achieve the vast confiscation of land so that Britain could expand their borders as well as its presence and control over the country. The event completed the colonisation of Ireland, which became a member of the British governmental system referred to as "*the Commonwealth*"[16] in 1649. The newly emerged system abolished most of the native Irish Catholic land-owning classes and replaced them with the British colonialists. The conflict created by these Cromwellian states increased the influence and popularity of nationalism in Ireland from the seventeenth century onwards.

At the beginning of the seventeenth century, the presence and control of old Gaelic landowners were almost entirely abolished due to the "*Flight of the Earls*" (1607).[17] It is one of the breaking points in Irish history in which some of the most influential Irish Earls, such as Hugh O'Neill, the second Earl of Tyrone, and Rory O'Donnell, the first Earl of Tyrconnell, and about ninety followers of the Earls, were exiled from Ireland to mainland Europe. It led to the increasing despotism of the already exploitative British control in the lands of Ireland. Most of the clansmen were

[15] **Ibid.**, p.1.
[16] Leopold Von Ranke, **A History of England: Principally in the Seventeenth Century**, Vol.III, w. Place, Cambridge University Press, 2011, p.6.
[17] William F. Butler, **Confiscation in Irish History**, Dublin, Talbot Press, 1917, p.38.

deprived of all legal titles to land.[18] This granted the English settlers the right to fully use and capitalise the natural sources, historical and natural landmarks, and native labour force in Ireland.

After the Flight of the Earls, the British businessmen and nobles increased their abusive activities in Ireland.[19] They built infrastructures, established educational, professional, and social buildings and institutions, and restored historical landmarks in the country so that they could utilise their lands to make financial and political profit. Even though it seemed beneficial for the Irish society at first sight, this recently established capitalist system also allowed the coloniser to abuse the lands in Ireland as tourist landmarks and attract foreign capital for themselves. The British law also confiscated the Catholic Irish Church's lands in Armagh, Derry, and Tyrone.[20] After most of the social, political, and religious native authorities were pacified, the British businessmen and nobles found an opportunity to actively interfere with the internal sociopolitical affairs and either participate in the influential political positions in English and Irish parliaments or boost their current political power.

Britain also confiscated Ireland's lands through the system of landlordism.[21] Eamonn Slater and Terrence McDonough describe the system as a "*feudal mode of production*"[22] in which private owners, the landlords, possess lands and rent them to the labouring class. To elaborate on the relationship between the landlords and the tenants, Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels' description of Irish landlordism can be utilised. In their study, Marx and Engels focus on the subject in the context of colonisation. They advocate that the Irish landlords functioned as the representatives of British authorities.[23] From the nineteenth century onwards, they contributed to

[18] **Ibid.**, p.39.
[19] **Ibid.**, p.38-39.
[20] **Ibid.**, p.42.
[21] Eamonn Slater, Terrence McDonough, "Bulwark of Landlordism and Capitalism: The Dynamics of Feudalism in Nineteenth Century Ireland," **Research in Political Economy**, Vol.XIV, w. Place, JAI Press, 1994, pp.63-65.
[22] **Ibid.**, p.66.
[23] Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels, **Ireland and the Irish Question**, w. Place, Progress Publishers, 1974, pp.69-70.

colonial oppression by collecting rent from the tenants, the labouring class that occupies the land, on behalf of the English aristocracy:

> A tenant having incorporated his capital, in one form or another, in the land, and having thus effected an improvement of the soil, either directly by irrigation, drainage, manure, or indirectly by construction of buildings for agricultural purposes, in steps the landlord with demand for increased rent. If the tenant concede, he has to pay the interest for his own money to the landlord. If he resist, he will be very unceremoniously ejected, and supplanted by a new tenant, the latter being enabled to pay a higher rent by the very expenses incurred by his predecessors.[24]

Marx and Engels convey that the tenants had no option but to contribute to the capital by either tilling the land or constructing the buildings to raise the effectiveness of agriculture. In return, they received poor salaries due to excessive rent prices, whose amount was adjusted by the English nobility. If they could not afford their rent, they were forcefully replaced with another tenant, who was forced to pay higher rent than the previous tenant. This often leads the former tenant to face extreme financial difficulties due to the lack of job opportunities in rural areas. The strict hierarchy between the landlords and the impoverished local peasants also socially alienated the native population, which rendered it difficult for them to organise against the British colonisation.

As a reaction against these systematic procedures of confiscation, the goal of establishing a self-governing Ireland became the defining trait of Irish nationalism during the nineteenth century. This goal led to the foundation of the nationalist movement called the "*Home Rule*"[25], which aimed to form an autonomous Irish legislature and end Britain's sociopolitical discrimination against the Irish. It was the dominant political ideal of Irish nationalism from 1870 to the end of World War I. Campaigned by the political parties of the Home Rule League and the Irish

[24] **Ibid.**, pp.69-70.
[25] Thomas Mohr, "Irish Home Rule and Constitutional Reform in the British Empire, 1885-1914," **French Journal of British Studies**, 2019, (Online) https://doi.org/10.4000/rfcb.3900, 20 June 2023.

Parliamentary Party, it advocated that Ireland should have control over its internal affairs while it continues to be a member of the United Kingdom:

> The notion of "Home Rule", originates from Irish parliamentary constitutional nationalism, which became influential at Westminster from the end of the 19th century. Home Rule was then a means to ensure the preservation of the United Kingdom, as well as cope with the demands for more political independence from Ireland. […] Debates about the memory of the Home Rule movement, among historians but also politicians, journalists and the general public can still be fierce in 21st century Ireland.[26]

As pointed out in the quotation above, the movement intended to decrease England's strong authority by distributing power to Ireland. To achieve this goal, the followers of the movement advocated that it is necessary to establish a domestic parliament in Ireland while the British Parliament at Westminster would continue to govern the imperial affairs. The Home Rule laws were fully enacted through the introduction of the Third Home Rule Bill in 1912. Yet, the Bill was "*put on ice*" after the outbreak of World War I in 1914[27], which rendered Ireland's struggle for independence unresolved. As a result, Britain's abuse of the sources of Irish lands for their economic and political benefit continued during the twentieth century.

1.2. PHANTASY AND AGGRESSIVE IMPULSES IN GEORGE BERNARD SHAW'S JOHN BULL'S OTHER ISLAND

John Bull's Other Island was first performed in 1904, the period when Ireland was still an integral part of the English imperial system, and what Shaw aims in this play is to establish the objective portraits of both the coloniser English and the

[26] Sylvie Mikowski, Marie-Violaine Louvet, "Home Rule in Ireland: New Perspectives in History, Culture, Art and Literature," 2020, (Online) https://www.efacis.eu/sites/default/files/CFP%20Rise-2.pdf, 3 November 2022.
[27] Paul Bew, "Ten Narrative and Graphic Panels," (Online) https://www.decadeofcentenaries.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/Bew-Home-Rule-exhibition-text.pdf, 19 November 2022.

colonised Irish. He emphasises this unbiased nature of his play in his letter to the American performer Ada Rehan:

> In the midst of composing John Bull's Other Island, Bernard Shaw remarked enthusiastically in a letter to Ada Rehan about his nonpartisan play: "This is the first time I have tried my hand on Ireland; and of course, being an Irishman, I get a quality into the play that is quite unlike anything in any other plays. It is not particularly complimentary to either the English or the Irish; but it is fascinating."[28]

As it can be inferred from his letter, he does not attempt to valorise or degrade these conflicting sides. Instead, he provides an impartial criticism by exposing the capitalistic and greedy approach of the imperial authorities as well as the delusional aspects of Irish nationalism that exclude any non-Irish concepts. In the play, the British Tom Broadbent, who represents the aggressive British capitalism, aims to take control of the Irishtown Rosscullen for his personal benefit. This causes distress and tension in the local Irish society. To overcome the psychological affliction of this exploitative British intervention, they employ various forms of delusional phantasies and aggressive impulses that fail to provide an effective solution to the colonial trauma.

The play focuses on two civil engineers, Broadbent and Larry Doyle, who run a firm in Westminster, London. They go to Rosscullen, where Doyle was born, to work on a project for the development of the land. Broadbent, who has a covert agenda of abusing the land and its people to achieve wealth and status, attempts to establish social connections with the townspeople. Unlike him, the Irish Doyle keeps his distance towards the local community as he views them as narrow-minded people who are stuck in poverty due to their romanticised views on life. To further isolate himself from the Irish, he also adopts the British appearance, mannerisms, and mindset. He also rebuffs Nora Reilly, the Irish heiress who loves him and yearns for his return to Rosscullen

[28] Audrey McNamara, "John Bull's Other Island: Taking the Bull to Ireland," **SHAW Annual: The Annual of Bernard Shaw Studies**, January 1, 2012, (Online) https://doi.org/10.5325/shaw.32.1.0133, 15 February 2023.

for eighteen years. Broadbent, who wishes to marry Nora to achieve political power by abusing her title, consoles her as she cries due to Doyle's rejection. After he convinces her to accept his marriage proposal, he cheerfully claims that she will be of great use in his campaign for the Irish parliament. Thus, she becomes an instrument of Broadbent as she is forced to become a public figure and advertise his campaign to local people. In the end, Broadbent looks forward to making changes in Rosscullen, which signifies the impending exploitation of the land at the hands of the coloniser.

In terms of the greediness of the imperial force, Shaw reflects the British intervention in the land and politics of Ireland to earn financial and political power. This intervention is mostly represented through the cunning plans of Broadbent, who claims that he wishes to develop and modernise Rosscullen by building and restoring various institutions and landmarks in the town:

> BROADBENT. […] I shall bring money here: I shall raise wages: I shall found public institutions, a library, a Polytechnic (undenominational, of course), a gymnasium, a cricket club, perhaps an art school. I shall make a Garden city of Rosscullen: the round tower shall be thoroughly repaired and restored.[29]

However, his true intention is to profit from the land by utilising its landmarks and institutions as places of entertainment for tourists. This aim is indicated through his plan of restoring "*the round tower*," one of the town's historical buildings, to turn Rosscullen into an attractive place for the people who are willing to visit the town's landmarks. This may indicate that he is a dominant capitalist who wishes to exploit the town's resources through the excuse of bringing civilisation and development. He reveals this covert wish when he claims that it is the Englishman's "*duty*" to civilise the countries that are supposedly not able to thrive by themselves:

[29] Shaw, **op. cit.**, p.110.

> BROADBENT. […] I am an Englishman and a Liberal; and now that South Africa has been enslaved and destroyed, there is no country left to me to take an interest in but Ireland. Mind: I dont say that an Englishman has not other duties. He has a duty to Finland and a duty to Macedonia. But what sane man can deny that an Englishman's first duty is his duty to Ireland?[30]

According to Broadbent, the Irish people are innately "*rash*" and "*improvident*," which makes it impossible for them to successfully run their own businesses[31]. On account of this, he insists that English intervention is necessary for the sake of modernisation and economic growth of Ireland.

From a postcolonial viewpoint, it can be argued that Broadbent's degrading approach towards the Irish fits into the theory of "*othering*"[32]. Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin use the term to define the coloniser's tactic of marginalising the colonised. During the process of marginalisation, they label the colonised as uncivilised, violent, impulsive, and indolent, which allows them to justify their exploitation: "*In post-colonial theory, it can refer to the colonised others who are marginalised by imperial discourse, identified by their difference from the centre and, perhaps crucially, become the focus of anticipated mastery by the imperial 'ego.*"[33] While the hegemonic imperial discourse attaches these negative connotations to the colonised, it praises the coloniser as a benevolent master who is destined to teach morality and order to the colonised. By embedding this "*binary logic of imperialism*"[34], they intend to eliminate the moral concern of performing oppression and violence over the colonised in the name of civilisation and progress.

Similarly, Broadbent degrades the Irish community as violent and indolent others, which enables him to intervene in their affairs through the justification of developing their country. For instance, he advises Hodson to take a revolver before

[30] **Ibid.**, pp.7-8.
[31] **Ibid.**, p.9.
[32] Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths, Helen Tiffin, **Post-Colonial Studies: The Key Concepts**, London, Routledge, 2007, p.156.
[33] **Ibid.**, p.155.
[34] **Ibid.**, p.19.

they go to Ireland[35], which indicates that he views the Irish as dangerous people who are prone to violence. As for indolence, his prejudice is reflected through his surprised state when Judy Doyle calls the Irish farmer Matt a decent and industrious man:

> BROADBENT. Was he industrious? Thats remarkable, you know, in an Irishman.[36]

According to him, Irish people are inherently not capable of being hard-working. For this reason, he defines Matt's industriousness as an unusual trait for an Irish person.

Apart from this, he also uses the excuse of bringing development by claiming that he is going to participate in the Irish parliament to introduce them to the progressive notions of liberalism and freedom.[37] To persuade the Irish that he is not going to abuse his political position to colonise the land, he pretends to support the "*Home Rule*"[38], the nationalist policy that aims to establish a self-governing Ireland. He also reprimands "*the Union Jack*," the national flag of the United Kingdom, for being a "*detestable symbol of a decadent Imperialism*"[39] to portray himself as a charitable master who has no intention of exploiting their land. However, Shaw exposes that his kind and helpful behaviour is a cunning tactic to manipulate the Rosscullen community so that they vote for him and make him a member of the parliament:

> BROADBENT. [*hugely self-satisfied*] I think Ive done the trick this time. I just gave them a bit of straight talk; and it went home. They were greatly impressed: everyone of those men believes in me and will vote for me when the question of selecting a candidate comes up.[40]

---

[35] Shaw, **op. cit.**, p.5.
[36] **Ibid.**, p.55.
[37] **Ibid.**, pp.69-70.
[38] **Ibid.**, p.19.
[39] **Ibid.**, p.70.
[40] **Ibid.**, p.72.

By exposing Broadbent's sinister plan, Shaw subverts the colonial discourse that associates the imperial force with morality. He portrays Broadbent as a hypocritical coloniser whose aim is not to develop Rosscullen, but to achieve a powerful political status through which he can freely control the land.

Broadbent's desire to conquer and control Ireland is also embodied through his abusive relationship with Nora, the Irish heiress who is considered wealthier than the poor townspeople due to her annual income of forty pounds.[41] Shortly after he meets Nora, Broadbent proposes to her. He claims that he falls in love with Nora since he considers her as an ideal representative of the Irish identity, towards which he appears to show deep interest and respect: "*Miss Reilly is one of the finer types: a type rare in England, except perhaps in the best of the aristocracy.*"[42] Even though she initially rejects his love due to her love towards Doyle, she eventually accepts to marry Broadbent since Doyle neglects her emotions.[43] However, after she agrees to marry him, he reveals that his actual intention is to utilise her identity and status in his campaign for the parliament:

> BROADBENT. […] Wait till you find out what an exciting game electioneering is: youll be mad to get me in. Besides, youd like people to say that Tom Broadbent's wife had been the making of him—that she got him into parliament—into the Cabinet, perhaps, eh?[44]

Here, he indicates his goal of attracting the sympathy of townspeople by marrying an Irishwoman. He also demands to use her position as an influential heiress to advertise his campaign and persuade townspeople to vote for him. Thus, his abusive interaction

[41] **Ibid.**, p.24.
[42] **Ibid.**, p.58.
[43] **Ibid.**, p.99.
[44] **Ibid.**, p.103.

with Nora can be interpreted as an analogical representation to demonstrate the coloniser's exploitation of the colonised.

Through the relationship between Broadbent and Nora, the play portrays colonial oppression in the context of gender roles. From a postcolonial feminist lens, Broadbent's domineering position as an imperial force and an abusive husband signifies the correlation between the oppressive systems of colonialism and patriarchy. Spivak defines this doubly subjugated position of women in colonised societies as "*double displacement*"[45]. She argues that colonised women are stripped of their rights and put into the position of second-class citizenship by both the coloniser and the patriarchal discourse. As a suitable instance of Spivak's theory, Nora is converted into an instrument whose only purpose is to comply with her suitor Broadbent's opinions and propagandise his campaign.[46] On that account, her acceptance of Broadbent's oppressive demands represents her double submission to both imperial and patriarchal power as a colonised woman.

The effects of Broadbent's exploitative actions on the Rosscullen community's psychology can be scrutinised through the concept of the "*return of the repressed*," which Boag defines as the process of manifesting trauma indirectly.[47] The subject often manifests their trauma in two approaches: "*phantasy*" and "*aggressive impulses*"[48]. The first term of phantasy is used by Sigmund Freud and Melanie Klein to point out the individual's approach to fulfil frustrated wishes through imagination and creativity:

> [Phantasy] has a connotation of the imagination and creativity that underlie all thought and feeling, but it also has a connotation of make-believe, a daydream, something that is untrue by the standards of material reality […] Freud's central usage emphasises the

[45] Spivak, **op. cit.**, p.90.
[46] Shaw, **op. cit.**, p.103.
[47] Boag, **op. cit.**, p.75.
[48] **Ibid.**, pp.76-77.

> fictitious, wish-fulfilling aspect of the everyday usage, whereas Klein's usage tends to focus on the imaginative aspect.[49]

Freud and Klein argue that phantasy derives from unconscious urges, which society views as inappropriate desires that are either unlikely or perilous to execute. The individual represses the unconscious urges by casting them out into the id, the oldest and the most primitive agency of the psyche that preserves "*basic instinctual drives, particularly sexual (libidinal) drives, which motivate the organism to seek pleasure*"[50]. However, if these urges are repressed for an excessively long time, the individual might develop an obsessive attachment to them. In psychoanalytic theory, this obsession is referred to as "*fixation*":

> [The] concept originated by Sigmund Freud (1905a) to denote the persistence of anachronistic sexual traits […] Gradually, however, 'fixation' acquired a broader connotation. With the development of theory of libidinal stages (e.g., oral, anal, phallic), for instance, the term came to mean a persistent attachment not only to the specific instinctual aims of a particular era, but, instead, to the entire complex of self and object relations (and their attendant affects and fantasies) of that specific stage of life.[51]

Coined by Freud to outline the process in which the subject is stuck in one stage of psychosexual development, fixation is now used as an overarching term to describe the persistent desires towards any kind of repressed wishes or thoughts. These suppressed desires often lead the individual to fantasise about a fictitious existence in which the individual can freely perform their urges without any orders and restraints of society.

---

[49] Elizabeth Bott Spillius, "Freud and Klein on the Concept of Phantasy," **The International Journal of Psychoanalysis**, Vol.LXXXII, No:2, 2008, p.362.
[50] Lapsley, Stey, **op. cit.**, p.1.
[51] Salman Akhtar, **Comprehensive Dictionary of Psychoanalysis**, New York, Karnac Books Ltd, 2009, p.112.

In terms of employing phantasy to cope with the colonial trauma, Nora clings to her dreams of being in a romantic relationship with Doyle. This dream drives her to obsessively wait for Doyle to return to Ireland for eighteen years.[52] Yet, it also grants her motivation to resist the proposal of Broadbent, who aims to subjugate her via marriage. Through this resistance, she manages to subvert the power hierarchy between the coloniser and the colonised. This subversion can be observed when she asserts her dominance by rebuking him for seizing her arms as he insists on her responding to his love:

> NORA. I think you ought to be ashamed. I think if you were a gentleman, and me alone with you in this place at night, you would die rather than do such a thing.[53]

In this situation, Broadbent intends to confine her movement by seizing her arms until she accepts his offer. The act of seizing functions as an analogy to represent the coloniser's attempt to possess the colonised and confine their freedom. Nevertheless, she resists his goal of subjugating her by claiming that his tenacious attitude does not befit an honourable man.[54] Thus, she deprives him of his domineering attitude and confidence, which can be examined through the psychological concept of emasculation. In a figurative sense, the term suggests "*the reduction or removal of a man's sense of masculinity, as by depriving him of a culturally sanctioned male role or the exercise of male privilege*"[55]. Emasculation leads the male to lose his masculine, virile and dominant role against the passive female. In a similar fashion, Nora devalues Broadbent's masculinity by refusing to submit to his authoritative behaviour. This leads him to lose his overall dominant and masculine attitude, which can be observed when he "*submissively*" begs her to forgive his act of grasping her arms:

---

[52] Shaw, **op. cit.**, p.95.
[53] **Ibid.**, pp.46-47.
[54] **Ibid.**, p.47.
[55] "Emasculation," **APA Dictionary of Psychology**, (Online) https://dictionary.apa.org/emasculation#:~:text=n.,%E2%80%94emasculate%20vb, 28 October 2022.

> BROADBENT. [*submissively taking it*] I cant sufficiently apologize, Miss Reilly, or express my sense of your kindness when I am in such a disgusting state. How could I be such a bea— [*he trips again*] damn the heather! my foot caught in it.[56]

In this quotation, he adopts a submissive role by apologising for his actions and requesting her to carry him to bed since he is unable to walk due to his drunkenness. By carrying him to his room[57], Nora asserts her active and powerful position, which also subverts the gender hierarchy. It is also significant that he repeatedly trips over the items in the room. Thus, his failure to adapt to the environment can be read as a symbol that signifies his unfitting and unwelcomed presence in Ireland as a coloniser.

Yet, Nora's motivation to resist Broadbent's masculine and possessive attitude is abolished when Doyle does not respond to her unrequited love.[58] As a result, she abandons her assertive and powerful attitude and accepts Broadbent's proposal[59], which signifies her loss of empowerment. As she accepts to be his passive and silenced wife, he regains his dominant and masculine position. This recovery of masculinity is represented when he offers her to cry on his "*broad chest*," which he considers a sign of being a "*real man*," after Doyle declines her love:

> BROADBENT. […] Have your cry out: never mind me: trust me. [*Gathering her to him, and babbling consolatorily*] Cry on my chest: the only really comfortable place for a woman to cry is a man's chest: a real man, a real friend. A good broad chest, eh? not less than forty-two inches […] Come now, come, come! It's all right and comfortable and happy now, isnt it?[60]

[56] Shaw, **op. cit.**, p.49.
[57] **Ibid.**, p.49.
[58] **Ibid.**, pp.95-96.
[59] **Ibid.**, p.99.
[60] **Ibid.**, p.96.

In his statement, the broad chest functions as a symbol of masculinity, which can be read through Barnaby J. W. Dixson's theory. It scrutinises the socially ascribed normative definitions of manliness. Dixson advocates that the physical attributes which "*include craniofacial masculinity (i.e., enlarged brow ridge, thicker jaw, small eyes, and more robust midface), facial and body hair, vocal pitch, height, and muscularity*"[61] suggest dominance and power, two attributes that are socially associated with masculinity. As an appropriate illustration of Dixson's argument, Broadbent displays his masculine physique through his broad chest, which symbolises his reassertion of dominance and power against Nora.

Aside from Nora, the other person that utilises phantasy to manifest his subdued desires is Doyle, Broadbent's Irish business partner who wishes to be a member of English society by imitating their customs and behaviour. He left his country at a young age to settle down in England. This early departure enables him to detach himself from the romanticised beliefs of Irish nationalism and view his homeland from an objective perspective. This objective viewpoint is exemplified when he criticises the Irish for having an unrealistic perspective about life:

> DOYLE. […] Oh, the dreaming! the dreaming! the torturing, heartscalding, never satisfying dreaming, dreaming, dreaming, dreaming! [...] An Irishman's imagination never lets him alone, never convinces him, never satisfies him; but it makes him that he cant face reality nor deal with it nor handle it nor conquer it.[62]

Here, Doyle scolds the Irish for their tendency to disassociate themselves from reality by dwelling on their nationalistic dreams, in which Ireland is a strong and free nation. He believes that these dreams prevent them from finding rational solutions to their real-life problems of poverty and exploitation. Through his statement, the play highlights the dangers of employing phantasy to evade facing the struggles in real life.

---

[61] Barnaby J. Dixson, "Masculinity and Femininity," **Encyclopedia of Evolutionary Psychological Science**, w. Place, Springer International Publishing, 2016, p.3.
[62] Shaw, **op. cit.**, pp.17-18.

On this account, the delusional aspects of Irish nationalism lead Doyle to develop a deprecatory outlook against the concept of Irishness.

Another reason why he refuses to identify himself through Irishness is his belief in cooperation and understanding between all nations, which defies the restrictive aspects of nationalism. Thus, his mindset fits into Cecelia Lynch's specification of "*internationalism*," the notion that encourages economic and political cooperation among different countries:

> Internationalism in the twentieth-century West is seen by its advocates as the antithesis of both nationalism and isolationism. It denotes a cosmopolitan, nonparochial stance toward obligation beyond borders. […] Internationalism has been conditioned by philosophical debates regarding cosmopolitanism while it has confronted the political backlash against involvement beyond one's borders, usually termed isolationism.[63]

As remarked by Lynch, internationalism in the West, particularly in Europe, suggests that people should transcend national, cultural, and racial barriers to accomplish their mutual goals. In this sense, it stands out as the opposite of nationalism, which tends to emphasise the significance of borders of culture and ethnicity to establish a group feeling.[64] In the play, Doyle is specified as an internationalist who supports communication and tolerance among people from different cultures and ethnicities. His internationalist viewpoint is hinted at when he mentions his old dreams of leaving Ireland to travel around the world:

> LARRY. I can remember particular spots where I had long fits of thinking about the countries I meant to get to when I escaped from Ireland. America and London, and sometimes Rome and the east.[65]

---

[63] Cecelia Lynch, "The Promise and Problems of Internationalism," **Global Governance**, Vol.V, 1999, p.83.
[64] Thomas Hylland Eriksen, **Ethnicity and Nationalism: Anthropological Perspectives**, London, Pluto Press, 2002, p.7.
[65] Shaw, **op. cit.**, pp.93-94.

At a young age, Doyle seems to have an interest in visiting different countries to meet people from various ethnicities and cultures. This interest grants him an unbiased mindset that encourages interaction between countries regardless of their differences. For this reason, he aims to abolish the allegedly impractical nationalist politics of self-governance, which supposedly hinders this interaction. Instead, he suggests building a connection between Ireland and the rest of the world to thrive the land financially:

> LARRY. […] I'm a metallurgical chemist turned civil engineer. Now whatever else metallurgical chemistry may be, it's not national. It's international. And my business and yours [Broadbent] as civil engineers is to join countries, not to separate them. The one real political conviction that our business has rubbed into us is that frontiers are hindrances and flags confounded nuisances.[66]

According to Doyle, nationalism encourages bigotry and polarisation between people from different ethnic backgrounds. This irrational antagonism drives people to establish borders, which impedes progress. On the other hand, his internationalist viewpoint also encourages globalisation, which is considered a form of colonisation as it leads to the expansion of the communication tools of the hegemonic classes.[67] Accordingly, although Doyle claims to position himself in a neutral ground between the coloniser and the colonised, his pro-globalist perspective implies that he is also affected by the colonial discourse unconsciously.

As a result, he considers national identity as a socially constructed barrier that should be eliminated to create an interconnected and advanced world society. In this regard, he disavows his own Irish identity and adopts the English ideas and customs against the allegedly impractical and irrational notions of Irish nationalism.[68] He

---

[66] **Ibid.**, pp.21-22.
[67] Salikoko Mufwene, "Colonisation, Globalisation, and the Future of Languages in the Twenty-first Century," **International Journal on Multicultural Societies**, Vol.IV, No:2, 2002, pp.162-163.
[68] Shaw, **op. cit.**, p.18.

imitates the English cultural traits so minutely that people cannot distinguish him from other English people. For instance, when Broadbent introduces Doyle to Tim Haffigan, a Scottish person who pretends to be Irish, Haffigan thinks that he is an outstanding representative of "*the Anglo-Saxon race*":

> TIM. [*rising with effusion*] Sure it's meself thats proud to meet any friend o Misther Broadbent's. The top o the mornin to you, sir! Me heart goes out teeye both. It's not often I meet two such splendid speciments iv the Anglo-Saxon race.[69]

However, when Haffigan learns that Doyle is an Irishman, he has difficulty believing the reveal.[70] For this reason, his surprise suggests that Doyle manages to completely blend in the English society.

In this case, Doyle's imitation of English people fits into Bhabha's theory of "*mimicry.*" The term refers to the act of imitating the coloniser, which is used by the colonised to redefine their subjugated position and subvert the colonial hierarchy.[71] Bhabha asserts that by mimicking the coloniser, the otherised individual asserts their presence by dissociating themselves from the racial or cultural stereotypes that are imposed by the imperial forces. Fittingly, Doyle's mimicry allows him to save himself from the narrow-minded, overly sentimental, and uncivilised stereotype of Irishmen that is promoted by Broadbent. Instead, he asserts his own identity as an educated and pragmatic person, who tends to view Ireland's problems through an analytical lens.

In addition, Doyle also articulates his difference from the coloniser by criticising their strategy of pretending to be kind and helpful masters to justify colonial exploitation. To illustrate, when Broadbent claims that "*Home Rule will work wonders under English guidance*"[72], Doyle accuses him of pretending to support the home rule movement to gain the Irish's sympathy. Through his criticism, he reveals that he does

[69] **Ibid.**, p.11.
[70] **Ibid.**, p.11.
[71] Bhabha, **op. cit.**, p.86.
[72] Shaw, **op. cit.**, p.19.

not wish to fully adopt the coloniser's identity despite his imitation of their mannerisms and cultural habits. By mimicking the sociocultural traits of the English without blindly following their colonial policies, Doyle positions himself in what Bhabha refers to as "*the third space of enunciation*"[73], the hybrid identity between the coloniser and the colonised. Bhabha claims that this identity can be established only when the individual, who mimics the coloniser, voices their sociocultural "*difference*"[74] from their exploiters. This in-between identity gives the person an opportunity to evaluate both the coloniser and the colonised through an impartial viewpoint. As a result, the impartiality of the third space eliminates colonialism's discriminative discourses. Akin to Bhabha's notions, Doyle exerts his difference by rejecting to exploit Rosscullen like his business partner Broadbent. Unlike the other Irish and English characters, who tend to exclude the opposite side through their biased ideological notions, he employs an unprejudiced evaluation owing to his hybrid identity. In this sense, his act of criticising the Irish for being delusional nationalists[75] can also be interpreted as a piece of constructive feedback. Through this feedback, he aims to help them by warning them about the shortcomings of their own ideologies.

In addition to Doyle, the play offers another instance of mimicking through Tim Haffigan, a Scottish person who pretends to be an Irishman to please the coloniser for his personal benefit. Unlike Doyle who imitates the British, he mockingly mimics the essentialised traits of Irish people through his red hair and nose, distinctive Irish accent, excessive desire for alcohol, and a "*reckless geniality and high spirits*"[76]. When he is near Broadbent, he praises the English society for being highly competent and civilised while he belittles the Irish for being ignorant people that lack the knowledge and foresight to handle their own problems. He marginalises the Irish through his exaggerated imitation and insults to satisfy Broadbent's sense of superiority, which is pointed out by Doyle:

[73] Bhabha, **op cit.**, p.37.
[74] **Ibid.**, p.86.
[75] Shaw, **op. cit.**, pp.17-18.
[76] **Ibid.**, p.6.

> DOYLE. […] No Irishman ever talks like that in Ireland, or ever did, or ever will. But when a thoroughly worthless Irishman comes to England, and finds the whole place full of romantic duffers like you, who will let him loaf and drink and sponge and brag as long as he flatters your sense of moral superiority by playing the fool and degrading himself and his country.[77]

According to him, Haffigan exploits Broadbent's romantic vision towards the Irish to make him believe that he is Irish. In exchange for his imitation and flattery, Doyle grants him food, drink, and money.[78] Thus, Doyle's statement suggests a symbiotic relationship in which the colonised highlights their distinctive racial and cultural habits to market their foreignness to the imperial force. In return, the coloniser provisions the material needs of the colonised. This act of marketing cultural otherness for material benefit can be explored through Huggan's description of "*the commodification of a glamorised cultural difference*"[79]:

> Postcoloniality's regime of value is implicitly assimilative and market driven: it regulates the value-equivalence of putatively marginal products in the global marketplace. Postcolonialism […] implies a politics of value that stands in obvious opposition to global processes of commodification.[80]

The term explains the process of converting people that bear cultural foreignness into objects of desire to satisfy the coloniser's interest in cultural differences. Ashcroft,

---

[77] **Ibid.**, p.14.
[78] It should also be pointed out that through the absurd situation in which Haffigan, who also belongs to a colonised society as a Scottish man, mimics the subjugated Irish to cater to the coloniser Broadbent's sense of superiority, Shaw adds dark humour to the play. As Sarah W. Craun and Michael L. Bourke indicate in "The Use of Humor to Cope with Secondary Traumatic Stress," the use of humour is a common method of coping with distress as it counterbalances the disturbing and horrific nature of trauma. (2014: 840-842) In line with this argument, Shaw uses humour to deal with colonial trauma by offsetting the disquieting nature of the event.
[79] Graham Huggan, **The Postcolonial Exotic: Marketing the Margins**, London and New York, Routledge, 2002, p.110.
[80] **Ibid.**, p.6.

Griffiths, and Tiffin state that this interest in the culturally different other stems from the ambivalent relationship between the coloniser and the colonised.[81] While the colonised views the coloniser as superior but corrupted, the coloniser regards the colonised as inferior yet exotically attractive. This ambiguous interaction leads the imperial side to develop contradictory feelings of "*attraction*" and "*repulsion*"[82] towards the other. While this relationship oppresses the colonised by forcing them to behave in a stereotypical manner to satiate the coloniser's attraction, it also offers them an opportunity to undermine the colonial hierarchy temporarily. This subversion takes place when the colonised use the imperial forces' attraction for their own benefit.

As a fitting example of the theory, Broadbent demonstrates the coloniser's contradictory feelings of attraction and repulsion towards the Irish community. While he shows his attraction through his interest in Haffigan's imitation of the Irish, he displays repulsion by carrying a weapon to protect himself against the supposedly dangerous and untrustworthy Irish people. As for the subversion of colonial hierarchy, Haffigan markets the stereotypical attributes of Irish society to please Broadbent's apparent curiosity about Irish culture. Although Haffigan's degrading imitation cements the cultural otherness of the Irish, it also allows him to reverse the colonial power relations by exploiting Broadbent to obtain food, drink, and money.

Similarly, Doran and Cornelius also intend to subvert the colonial hierarchy by exploiting Broadbent's seemingly romantic attitude towards the Irish people. When Broadbent declares his wish to be a member of the parliament, they encourage him in his campaign.[83] The reason is that they consider him a person who can easily be manipulated because of his apparent romantic and gullible behaviour. To illustrate, they exploit Broadbent's gullibility by requesting him to transport Cornelius's pig to Haffigan's home in a car after the completed sale.[84] Thinking that it is an opportunity for him to promote his campaign by strengthening his bond with the townspeople, Broadbent accepts their request. However, his plan fails when the pig gets frightened

[81] Ashcroft, Griffiths, Tiffin, **op. cit.**, p.10.
[82] **Ibid.**, p.10.
[83] **Ibid.**, p.85.
[84] **Ibid.**, p.74.

on the back of the vehicle, which disrupts the car off the road and causes it to crash into Molly Ryan's crockery stall.[85] After the accident, it is revealed that they utilise him as a servant to have their errands done. When the Rosscullen community gathers in Cornelius's house to discuss the accident, Doran exposes their actual thoughts and sentiments about him. He ridicules the accident as well as Broadbent's overall naivety and incompetence while he "*is reeling in an ecstasy of mischievous mirth which has infected all his friends*"[86]. His friends also join his mockery by screaming with laughter, shouting, screeching, and crying. Nevertheless, when Broadbent arrives at the house, they suddenly become "*silent, solemn, concerned, sympathetic*"[87], indicating that their friendly and supportive approach is a façade to exploit him.

As the last instance of phantasy, the play introduces Father Keegan, who consoles himself by dreaming about a religious country where everyone can live in equality and peace.[88] Like Doyle, he shows a keen interest in different countries and their cultural customs. This interest encouraged him to visit cities around the world such as Salamanca, Rome, Paris, Oxford, Jerusalem, and Patmos Island to educate himself in the field of the priesthood.[89] Consequently, his experiences in different cities grant him a tolerant view of cultural differences and a wide knowledge of the histories of these places, including the imperial history of England. Owing to his prior knowledge, he realises that Broadbent is a coloniser who tries to moralise his aim of intervening Rosscullen's internal affairs through the excuse of bringing progress. Therefore, when Broadbent claims to establish order in Rosscullen, Keegan calls him an "*efficient devil*" whose covert goal is to bring orders to turn the town into a strictly controlled "*place of torment*"[90]. Although he recognises Broadbent's sinister aims, Keegan is aware that he is eventually going to accomplish his mission of colonising the land due to the townspeople's support of his campaign. To cope with the trauma

[85] **Ibid.**, p.82.
[86] **Ibid.**, p.80.
[87] **Ibid.**, p.83.
[88] **Ibid.**, p.116.
[89] **Ibid.**, p.34.
[90] **Ibid.**, p.110.

of colonisation, he attempts to find comfort in dreaming of a peaceful world country governed by the Church:

> KEEGAN. In my dreams it is a country where the State is the Church and the Church the people: three in one and one in three. It is a commonwealth in which work is play and play is life: three in one and one in three […] It is a godhead in which all life is human and all humanity divine: three in one and one in three. It is, in short, the dream of a madman.[91]

In this regard, he voices his unbiased view about people from different sociocultural backgrounds by wishing for a religious commonwealth in which people can live equally regardless of their differences. However, he accepts the impossibility of creating this theocratic, all-encompassing state by describing his idea as a "*dream of a madman.*" For this reason, he acknowledges this goal as an escape fantasy rather than a realistic plan that can be accomplished.

Aside from phantasy, the play also presents aggressive impulses as a means of coping with colonial oppression. Shaw delineates these urges in the forms of verbal and physical violence. The first instance of verbal violence is represented through Matthew Haffigan, an elderly farmer who blindly follows Irish nationalism. His irrational dedication leads him to develop a bigoted viewpoint that marginalises anyone who questions their traditional Irish values. As an example, as Doyle claims that Ireland should abolish their nationalist policy of self-governance to establish a modern industry, Haffigan insults him for being a "*turncoat*"[92] who challenges their cultural values. This exclusionary approach can be scrutinised in the light of William Graham Sumner's "*ethnocentrism.*" Introduced in 1916 by Sumner in **Folkways**, the concept deals with the process in which the individual puts their culture at the centre

[91] **Ibid.**, p.116.
[92] **Ibid.**, p.66.

of everything and evaluates each conception according to the standards of their own culture:

> Ethnocentrism is the technical name for this view of things in which one's own group is the center of everything, and all others are scaled and rated with reference to it […] Each group nourishes its own pride and vanity, boasts itself superior, exalts its own divinities, and looks with contempt on outsiders. Each group thinks its own folkways the only right ones, and if it observes that other groups have other folkways, these excite its scorn.[93]

Sumner asserts that the ethnocentric viewpoint drives societies to view their cultural values as righteous and superior and exclude the cultures of other societies as faulty and inferior. Fitting to Sumner's theory, Haffigan exhibits an ethnocentric perspective that only validates the Irish-related concepts. He is so dedicated to the Irish cultural ideals of independence and self-governance that he ignores the dysfunctionality of these concepts in a currently globalising world. For this reason, he misjudges Doyle's suggestion of modernising Ireland as a potential threat to their cultural identity.

Another character who exhibits bigotry against non-Irish concepts is the parish priest Father Dempsey. His prejudiced attitude is illustrated through his intolerance towards different cultures and religions. Unlike his tolerant colleague Keegan, who is educated in different countries, he received his education at "*Maynooth College*"[94], an ecclesiastical university established in Ireland to teach Catholic education.[95] Due to his seemingly limited experience in different countries and cultures, he lacks Keegan's unbiased perspective towards religious and cultural nuances. Instead, he displays a prejudiced attitude which is exposed when he is offended by Doyle's statement that compares the Irish people to the Jews:

---

[93] William Graham Sumner, **Folkways**, w. Place, Ginn and Company, 1906, p.13.
[94] Shaw, **op. cit.**, p.34.
[95] John Healy, **Maynooth College: Its Centenary History**, Dublin, Browne & Nolan, 1895, p.748.

> LARRY. […] we Irishmen were never made to be farmers; and we'll never do any good at it. We're like the Jews: the Almighty gave us brains, and bid us farm them, and leave the clay and the worms alone.
>
> FATHER DEMPSEY. [*with gentle irony*] Oh! is it Jews you want to make of us? I must catechize you a bit meself, I think. The next thing youll be proposing is to repeal the disestablishment of the so-called Irish Church.[96]

In this conversation, Dempsey's religious prejudice leads him to misinterpret his statement. Doyle makes a comparison between the Irish and the Jews to indicate that the Irish people should utilise their intelligence instead of engaging in physical work. Even though his analogy does not bear any religious comparison, Dempsey feels insulted to hear any resemblance between his community and the Jews due to their differences in faith. As a result of his bigoted attitude, he disdains Doyle's offer to focus on their mental abilities to implement a modern industry in Ireland.

The last example of aggressive impulses is portrayed through the abusive relationship between the landlords and the Rosscullen community. The play hints at the exploitation by landlords through Doyle, who claims that these lords restrict the economic independence of the local community. To illustrate, he mentions Matthew Haffigan and his brother Andy Haffigan, the hard-working farmers whose land was confiscated in the past. The reason was that they could not afford the annual rent demanded by their landlord.[97] To deal with the trauma of this abusive relationship, Andy showed aggressive impulses that appeared in the form of physical violence, which is mentioned by Larry's aunt Judy Doyle. She says that after the Haffigans had been banished from their land, Andy took his anger out on Byrne, the tenant who was offered to occupy their land after them:

[96] Shaw, **op. cit.**, pp.65-66.
[97] **Ibid.**, p.55.

> AUNT JUDY. […] Andy Haffigan hurt him with a brick so that he was never the same again. Andy had to run away to America for it.[98]

He injured Byrne by hitting him with a brick even though he does not appear to be responsible for their banishment from their land.

Instead of reflecting his frustration on his oppressive landlord, who was assigned to collect money as a representative of the British aristocracy[99], Andy misdirected it to seemingly innocent Byrne. This misdirection of frustration can be analysed through Roy F. Baumeister and Kathleen D. Vohs's explanation of "*displaced aggression.*" They define the term as the psychological defence mechanism through which the individual canalises their negative emotions from their original source to another target:

> Direct aggression follows the tit-for-tat rule that governs most social interaction: A provocation or frustration elicits verbally or physically aggressive behavior that is directed toward the source of that provocation or frustration, typically matching or slightly exceeding its intensity. In displaced aggression, an aggressive behavior is directed at a person or other target (e.g., a pet) that is not the source of the aggression arousing provocation or frustration. Displaced aggression occurs when it is impossible or unwise to respond aggressively toward the source of the provocation or frustration.[100]

Displaced aggression takes place when the source of provocation has more power than the frustrated individual. This power hierarchy makes it dangerous for the individual to channel their anger to the original source. As a result, the individual redirects their aggressive impulses to another target who is not directly responsible for their frustration. Through this redirection, they aim to relieve their negative feelings without facing the consequences of provoking the original source.[101] In some cases, the

[98] **Ibid.**, p.55.
[99] Marx, Engels, **op. cit.**, pp.69-70.
[100] Roy F. Baumeister, Kathleen D. Vohs (editors), **Encyclopedia of Social Psychology**, w. Place, SAGE Publications, 2007, p.257.
[101] **Ibid.**, pp.257-258.

individual demonstrates aggression through violent acts that physically harm other individuals, which leads them to be secluded by society as potentially dangerous individuals.

As a suitable example to Baumeister and Vohs's description, Andy abstained from reflecting his frustration towards the powerful colonial authorities, which were the original sources of his distress. Instead, he discharged his anger into Byrne, who stood out as a less dangerous target due to his lower status as an Irish tenant. He conveyed this frustration in the form of physical violence that inflicted permanent damage on him. Andy's aggressive outburst also brought about his own social seclusion by turning him into a criminal and forcing him to escape to America to evade his punishment.[102] Consequently, the play depicts the devastating results of displaced aggression through Andy, who not only inflicted harm on his innocent target Byrne but also on himself by converting himself into a rogue criminal.

In addition, Shaw also exposes the role of the English authorities in the landlord's unjust treatment of the tenants through Doyle's sarcastic remarks about Broadbent, who pretends to side with the tenants against the landlords.[103] When Broadbent condemns the landlord, Doyle accuses him of deliberately ignoring the fact that these landlords execute the laws enacted by the English:

> LARRY. Oh yes: youd have done great things; and a fat lot of good youd have got out of it, too! Thats an Englishman all over! make bad laws and give away all the land, and then, when your economic incompetence produces its natural and inevitable results, get virtuously indignant and kill the people that carry out your laws.[104]

In this case, he highlights that the English pretend to be virtuous masters, although they are responsible for the abuse of tenants by using the landlords as tools to exert

[102] Shaw, **op. cit.**, p.55.
[103] **Ibid.**, p.56.
[104] **Ibid.**, p.56.

their colonial agenda. They maintain their domination over the Irish community by keeping their land as divided sections, weakening their local solidarity by fostering enmity among them and governing this polarised community indirectly through the local rulers, the landlords. Therefore, their approach fits into the imperial policy of "*divide and conquer*"[105], which is scrutinised by Eric A. Posner, Kathryn Spier, and Adrian Vermeule. They outline the policy as the method utilised by empires to expand their territories by achieving and maintaining power divisively:

> We will stipulate that the following two conditions are essential to any divide and conquer mechanism. (1) A unitary actor bargains with or competes against a set of multiple actors. (2) The unitary actor follows an intentional strategy of exploiting problems of coordination or collective action among the multiple actors. Here, we will offer some general comments to clarify and justify the two conditions.[106]

According to Posner, Spier, and Vermeule, there are two conditions that divide and conquer technique exploits to overtake the land of the colonised. In the first situation, the coloniser, which is referred to as the "*unitary actor*," uses the promises of money or status to convince the multiple local authorities to cooperate with them. Secondly, the unitary actor either creates internal conflicts or abuses the pre-existing social problems to polarise the local society to prevent them from uniting and confronting the British Empire.[107] This system of indirect governance provides the coloniser an opportunity to eliminate the moral concern of inflicting oppression on the colonised society. They abolish this concern by showing the local authorities as the sole perpetrators of oppression, which allows them to deny any direct responsibility for their own exploitative acts.

---

[105] Eric A. Posner, Kathryn Spier, Adrian Vermeule, "Divide and Conquer," **Journal of Legal Analysis**, October 1, 2010, (Online) https://doi.org/10.1093/jla/2.2.417, 19 December 2022.
[106] **Ibid.**, p.419.
[107] Ilia Xypolia, "*Divide et Impera*: Vertical and Horizontal Dimensions of British Imperialism," **Critique**, July 28, 2016, (Online) https://doi.org/10.1080/03017605.2016.1199629, 03 December 2022.

Like Posner, Spier, and Vermeule state, the play portrays English authorities as the unitary actors that persuade the local landlords to execute their laws and take a share of their taxes. In exchange, they promise these lords that they remain the owners of their lands. Their systematic exploitation encourages antagonism in the Irish tenants as can be seen in the example of the hostility between Andy and Byrne. As a result, this local hostility weakens the unity that is needed to organise a resistance against the coloniser. Since the English authorities utilise landlords as servants to have the exploitation performed, they can exonerate themselves from the guilt of traumatising the local people. The play represents this exoneration through Broadbent, who views the landlords as the prime exploiter and disregards the role of British law in this abuse.[108]

One of the most exploitative aspects of the colonisation process is the imperial forces' aim to have financial gain from the country of the colonised by advertising their land as a tourist attraction. In **John Bull's Other Island**, Shaw epitomises this aspect of colonisation through the English civil engineer Broadbent, who aims to lure foreign capital to Rosscullen by building public institutions and turning its historical buildings into conspicuous landmarks to visit. Although he seems to be a generous and charitable gentleman, he is revealed to be an opportunist who uses the promises of bringing capital and modernising the town to justify his plan of achieving control over the land. The play portrays the psychological outcomes of this colonial conquest through the reactions of Rosscullen's community. To manage the traumatic effects of colonial exploitation, these characters either delude themselves through dreams that are unlikely to turn into reality or discharge their frustration through verbal or physical violence. These two approaches fit into the concepts of "*phantasy*" and "*aggressive impulses*"[109], the coping mechanisms through which the individual conveys their repressed emotions obliquely. Nevertheless, both approaches only offer a momentary delusion of solace and fail to provide a perpetual resolution to the distress inflicted by the coloniser's repressive acts and schemes. These self-destructive aspects of

[108] Shaw, **op. cit.**, p.56.
[109] Boag, **op. cit.**, pp.76-77.

phantasies and aggression are also delineated in O'Casey's **Juno and the Paycock**, whose analysis constitutes the second chapter of the thesis.

CHAPTER TWO
THE COLONIAL TRAUMA IN THE WAR-TORN SLUMS OF IRELAND: SEÁN O'CASEY'S JUNO AND THE PAYCOCK

2.1. THE CONFLICTS THAT LED UP TO THE IRISH CIVIL WAR

Since the second chapter scrutinises Seán O'Casey's **Juno and the Paycock**, which takes place during the Irish Civil War (1922-1923), this historical background section covers the details of the war and the events that paved the way for this particular event. For this reason, this part includes violent conflicts, wars, and uprisings which increased the tension and led up to this disastrous war.

The events that gave rise to Irish nationalism and led up to the Irish Civil War occurred after the unification of Ireland and Great Britain in 1801. This formed the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland under the laws entitled "*the Act of Union (1800)*"[1]. In this period, the right to hold institutional power in Ireland was strictly restricted to the Anglo-Irish Protestant minority, which caused constant tension and occasional rebellions held by the frustrated Irish Catholics. The Act of Union was enacted to decrease these sectarian-based conflicts.

As Kevin Whelan points out in "The Other Within: Ireland, Britain and the Act of Union," for the Empire, the union was also beneficial because it would potentially decrease the level of tension and uncertainty that was created by the French Revolution of 1789 and the Irish Rebellion of 1798.[2] Most of the British commentators considered these events as brutal, divisive, and misguided searches for liberty which allegedly threatened the cohesion and righteous policies of the Empire. Thus, Britain attempted

[1] Desmond Keenan, **Ireland Within the Union: 1800-1921**, w. Place, Xlibris Corporation, 2008, p.13.
[2] Kevin Whelan, "The Other Within: Ireland, Britain and the Act of Union," **Acts of Union: The Causes, Contexts and Consequences of the Act of Union**, w. Place, Four Courts Press, 2001, pp.16-17.

to justify the union as an altruistic decision that gathered people under the identity of Britishness unlike the supposedly divisive nature of the Revolution:

> The concept of Britishness therefore cloaked a strategic essentialism, masquerading as an universal civilisation, as opposed to the allegedly narrow nationalism of Ireland. This British civilisation – at once national and imperial – masked, moralised and mitigated its colonial thrust. Even in it most liberal forms, it endorsed imperialism by consigning cultural difference to erasure. Colonised cultures could only exist in a provisional form, destined to be cancelled by exposure to the superior civilisation.[3]

As Whelan asserts in the quotation above, the real goal of the Act of Union was to empower the British Empire by increasing its allies and sources. The Act also aimed to disempower Britain's colonies by systematically erasing their national identity. After the act had been passed, Ireland was assimilated into the British sociocultural structure by being forced to adopt the English language throughout the nineteenth century.[4]

After the suspension of the Home Rule policies, the nationalist set of principles that supported the self-government of Ireland, due to the outbreak of World War I (1914-1918), the tumultuous relationship between the Irish Republicans and the British government strained further. According to Féilim Ó Hadhmaill, this deep-seated tension paved the way for the violent republican uprising, the "*Easter Rising*"[5]. Launched against British rule on Easter Monday, April 24, 1916, it was organised by the Irish Republican Brotherhood under the political activist Patrick Pearse's leadership to establish an independent Irish republic:

[3] **Ibid.**, p.18.
[4] Keenan, **op. cit.**, p.13.
[5] Féilim Ó Hadhmaill, "Easter Rising (1916) in Ireland and Its Historical Context, Campaign for an Irish Democracy," **The Palgrave Encyclopedia of Imperialism and Anti-Imperialism**, Cham, Springer International Publishing, 2021, p.629.

> On Easter Monday morning 24 April 1916, armed bands of about 1200 men and women took control of a number of key buildings and areas of Dublin, the capital city and the center of British administration in Ireland […] Their leader, a man called Patrick Pearse, read out a document which was then posted on the General Post Office […] It proclaimed an independent Irish republic free from British rule.[6]

Around 1200 participants helped the organisation take over the buildings and areas of Dublin so that they could overthrow British rule and declare the independent Irish Republic. These groups were comprised of the Irish volunteers and the smaller Irish Citizen Army, which were commanded by Irish republican, socialist, and trade union leader James Connolly. This uprising caused multiple armed conflicts between the Irish Republican Brotherhood and British troops that aimed to recapture the seized areas. The uprising ended in failure when the leaders called "*the rebels*"[7] surrendered by the end of the week. While 15 leaders were executed, approximately 485 people were killed, and 3.000 were wounded during the uprising.[8] According to Richard B. Finnegan and Edward T. McCarron, although it failed in its goal to usurp British authority, it also fostered an aspiration for independence among the Irish.[9] Thus, it increased the popularity of the Republican movement that supported Irish independence.

The newly gained popularity of the independence movement boosted the power and influence of the Republican parties in Ireland. This caused the "*landslide victory*" of the Republican party "*Sinn Féin*" (English: "*Ourselves*") in the Irish general elections in 1918.[10] As indicated by Martin O'Donoghue, the party declared its manifesto after the election to create an independent Irish state: "*Ahead of the election, Nationality declared that 'Sinn Féin, as everybody knows, stands for an independent Ireland, an Ireland absolutely and wholly separate and separated from England – an*

[6] **Ibid.**, p.629.
[7] **Ibid.**, p.629.
[8] **Ibid.**, p.629.
[9] Richard B. Finnegan, Edward T. McCarron, **Ireland: Historical Echoes, Contemporary Politics**, w. Place, Westview Press, 2000, pp.53-54.
[10] Alan De Bromhead, Alan Fernihough, Enda Hargaden, "Representation of the People: Franchise Extension and the 'Sinn Féin Election' in Ireland, 1918," **The Journal of Economic History**, 2020, (Online) https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022050720000376, 28 January 2023.

Irish republic. ”[11] O’Donoghue adds that the British government was alarmed by the content of this manifesto and decided to censor it.

The censorship policies of Britain fed the resentment between the conflicting sides.[12] As a result, Sinn Féin members did not attend the British parliament in Westminster and founded their own parliament, “*Dáil Éireann*” (English: “*Assembly of Ireland*”), in Dublin, where they proclaimed the independence of the Irish Republic: “*Rather than attend Westminster, the party’s representative (who were not in jail) established a de facto parliament Dáil Éireann in Dublin on 21 January 1919 which included a message to the free nations of the world and a declaration of independence.*”[13]

This conflict led to “*the Irish War of Independence*” (1919-1921), the guerrilla war that took place between the Irish Republican Army (IRA) and the British forces.[14] It was regarded by the Irish nationalist groups as a natural result of the nationwide demand for independence, which was triggered by the tragic executions and casualties of the Easter Rising. In order to prevent further violent protests and uprisings, Britain commenced “*the Partition of Ireland*” in 1920, which separated Ireland into two self-governing states: Northern Ireland and Southern Ireland.[15] Even though the initial goal of the partition was to keep both the Northern and Southern parts of the country within the United Kingdom, Southern Ireland later decided to leave the Kingdom to become a free state.

In 1921, a truce occurred between these conflicting sides, which led to the signing of the legal agreement entitled “*the Anglo-Irish Treaty*” to conclude the Irish War of Independence.[16] One year after this treaty, Southern Ireland left the United

---

[11] Martin O’Donoghue, “‘Ireland’s Independence Day’: The 1918 Election Campaign in Ireland and the Wilsonian Moment,” **European Review of History: Revue Européenne d’Histoire**, July 25, 2019, (Online) https://doi.org/10.1080/13507486.2019.1634008, 02 March 2023.
[12] **Ibid.**, p.843.
[13] **Ibid.**, p.845.
[14] Joseph McKenna, **Guerrilla Warfare in the Irish War of Independence, 1919-1921**, North Carolina, McFarland, 2014, p.34.
[15] K. J. Rankin, “Theoretical Concepts of Partition and the Partitioning of Ireland,” **Working Papers in British-Irish Studies**, No:67, 2006, p.17.
[16] **Ibid.**, pp.14-15.

Kingdom and became "*the Irish Free State*," while Northern Ireland decided to remain within the borders of the Kingdom.[17] Yet, Britain also continued to control certain Irish ports, which were named the Treaty Ports, allegedly due to security purposes. Although the treaty granted Southern Ireland the right to leave the United Kingdom, it also forced the state to function as an autonomous member of the British Empire similar to the other dominions of Britain:

> The Anglo-Irish treaty gave Ireland the trappings of self-government, including a parliament (Dáil Éireann) in Dublin with jurisdiction over most nonimperial issues, significant financial autonomy, an autonomous military force, and the removal of British troops from the New Irish Free State. However, the Treaty also placed the Free State firmly within the British Empire, a development that was difficult to swallow for many advanced Irish nationalists. It also preserved a role, however nominal, for the king's representative in Ireland, the governor-general, and required members of the Dáil to swear an oath to the British monarch.[18]

The Anglo-Irish Treaty gave the Free State the right to self-govern its economy and maintain an autonomous military. It also granted the promise of removing British troops from the New Irish Free State as long as it remained a member of the British Empire. Having Dublin as its capital, the Free State was composed of twenty-six counties of Ireland[19] while the remaining six counties were governed by Northern Ireland.[20]

On the other hand, the Anglo-Irish treaty also created a conflict between the die-hard Republicans who were "*vociferously anti-Treaty*"[21], and the Irish Free State forces that accepted the conditions of the treaty. The main reason for this conflict was Britain's demand for the Free State to remain within the borders of the Empire and swear an oath of loyalty to the British monarch, which is indicated in the quotation

[17] **Ibid.**, pp.14-15.
[18] Jason K. Knirck, **Imagining Ireland's Independence: The Debates Over the Anglo-Irish Treaty of 1921**, Maryland, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2006, p.1.
[19] **Ibid.**, p.45.
[20] **Ibid.**, p.52.
[21] **Ibid.**, p.111.

above. Thus, the treaty had a negative impact on the Irish nationalist population as it weakened their solidarity by establishing a division between the pro-treaty and the anti-treaty communities.

The conflicts created by the Anglo-Irish Treaty led to "*the Irish Civil War*" (1922-1923) between the anti-Treaty Republicans and the Irish Free State forces, who are often considered "*two essentially compatible variants of Irish nationalism*"[22]. Both sides were close friends, comrades, and relatives before the civil war, which rendered the event more tragic. Won by the Free State forces, the socioeconomic results of the war were disastrous. In terms of the casualties, Pat McCarthy states that the number of deaths "*differ widely, ranging from 927 to in excess of 4,000*"[23]. As for the economic costs, the war inflicted heavy damage on the physical infrastructure of Ireland, which cost a minimum of £50 million:

> Both the Anglo-Irish War and subsequent Civil War led to enormous destruction of wealth both in terms of lives lost (human capital) and infrastructural damage (physical capital). A crude estimate of the cost of the Civil War alone made by Patrick Hogan in 1923 was of a minimum of £50m; a figure that equates to c. 32 per cent of estimated national output of the IFS in 1926. [24]

The economic and social damage inflicted by the Civil War further worsened the living conditions in Ireland, which was already suffering from poverty, malnutrition, widespread disease, high mortality rates, and cramped quarters during the early 1900s. In this period, most of Ireland's population lived in tenements, the set

---

[22] Bill Kissane, "Explaining the Intractability of the Irish Civil War," **Civil Wars**, Vol.III, No:2, 2000, p.65.

[23] Pat McCarthy, "The Irish Civil War: Some Reflections and Questions," (Online) https://www.midlandshistory.com/uploads/4/0/4/1/40413751/10_-_the_irish_civil_war_-_some_reflections_and_questions.pdf, 5 November 2022.

[24] Eoin McLaughlin, "Economic Impact of the Irish Revolution," 2015, (Online) https://research-repository.st-andrews.ac.uk/bitstream/handle/10023/23082/EML_Economic_impact_of_the_Irish_revolution_May_2015.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y, 20 November 2022.

of rooms within the blocks of flats that were located in the impoverished and undeveloped slums:

> The living conditions of many tenement dwellers were hellish. Their buildings were decayed, dangerous, and sometimes collapsed, killing occupants […] Some tenement areas had 800 people to the acre, as many as a hundred persons in one house, and fifteen to twenty family members in a single tiny room. A primitive toilet and water tap in the rear yard had to serve all the inhabitants of a house.[25]

As indicated by Kevin C. Kearns in the quotation above, Ireland, particularly Dublin, had the worst housing conditions in the United Kingdom. Most families lived in decayed, tiny, and overcrowded rooms located near unsanitary toilets and water taps, which caused the spread of various diseases and high mortality rates. The working conditions and the financial situation were equally bad for the Irish population. Mary E. Daly asserts that "*Late nineteenth-century Dublin experienced a considerable degree of economic stagnation*"[26] due to the decline in agricultural activity after the period of mass starvation known as the Great Irish Famine, which forced the Irish to immigrate to other countries to seek job opportunities.

During the early 1900s, economic stagnation continued to affect the Irish working class in the forms of high unemployment rates, inhumane working conditions, and poor wages. These difficult conditions created a state of unrest among the labourers, which Yann Béliard refers to as "*The Great Labour Unrest*" (1911-1914)[27]. Béliard argues that this state of restlessness drove the labourers to gather around the worker's syndicates to organise protests, riots, and strikes to demand better working conditions and wages.[28] During these events, they sabotaged the working areas and

[25] Kevin C. Kearns, **Dublin Tenement Life: An Oral History of the Dublin Slums**, w. Place, Gill & Macmillan Ltd, 2006, pp.2-3.
[26] Mary E. Daly, "Social Structure of the Dublin Working Class, 1871-1911," **Irish Historical Studies**, Vol.XXIII, No:90, 1982, p.121.
[27] Yann Béliard, "Introduction: Revisiting the Great Labour Unrest, 1911-1914," **Labour History Review**, Vol.LXXIX, No:1, 2014, p.1.
[28] **Ibid.**, pp.2-3.

occasionally engaged in violent acts in which people were injured and killed. As **Juno and the Paycock** mainly refers to the Irish Civil War and the other violent conflicts that led up to it, this historical information section ends here.

2.2. THE TRAUMATIC COLONIAL WAR IN THE IRISH SLUMS IN SEÁN O'CASEY'S JUNO AND THE PAYCOCK

O'Casey's **Juno and the Paycock** is a play in three acts that was staged in 1924.[29] It takes place in 1922, one year after the Irish Republican Army signed "*the Anglo-Irish Treaty*" with the British government to end "*the Irish War of Independence*" and govern 16 of 22 Irish counties[30]. The treaty gave rise to "*the Irish Civil War*" in 1922 between the anti-treaty Die-hards, who insisted on the independence of all of Ireland, and the pro-treaty Irish Free State forces[31]. The play depicts the destructive results of the bloody conflict between these sides by focusing on the local society of Dublin slums, who are traumatised by the constant tension and violence of the war.

Set in this ongoing strife, the play explores the psychologies of the impoverished Boyle family and their neighbours, who reside in Dublin's undeveloped slums. Jack Boyle, the self-centred father, spends his time drinking with his friend Joxer instead of trying to look for a job and take care of his family. His wife Juno, on the other hand, is a responsible woman who works hard to look after her family. Their traumatised son Johnny, who lost an arm during a violent colonial conflict, spends his days at home as he is unable to work. Mary, the daughter of the family, is an idealist woman who participates in a strike to protest the unjust treatment exerted by employers against the working class. After the family learn that they are going to inherit money from a deceased relative, Jack decides to show off his wealth by buying expensive items on credit. Yet, their short-lived welfare is interrupted when they learn that

[29] James Moran, **The Theatre of Sean O'Casey**, London and New York, A&C Black, 2013, p.33.
[30] Rankin, **op. cit.**, pp.14-15.
[31] Kissane, **op. cit.**, p.65.

Boyle's cousins are also eligible to take a part of the inheritance, which makes the legacy worthless. This revelation puts the family in a miserable condition as they are now unable to repay the borrowed money.

Being torn between the bloody conflicts of the war and the inadequate living standards of the slums, each character employs different methods to deal with the psychological effects of these traumatising conditions. Akin to the characters in **John Bull's Other Island**, the Boyle family often applies phantasy and aggressive impulses to repress their traumas. As for phantasy, the play introduces Jack, the 60-year-old nationalist patriarch of the family. He escapes from facing the harsh reality of colonial oppression by deluding himself through his fictitious identity as a sea captain. This identity is revealed to be fake by his wife, Juno: "*Everybody callin' you 'Captain', an' you only wanst on the wather, in an oul' collier from here to Liverpool, when anybody, to listen or look at you, ud take you for a second Christo For Columbus!*"[32] Juno exposes the artificiality of his stories by stating that he pretends to be a captain although he only travelled on the water once to go to Liverpool. He uses his glorified alternate past to avoid his real identity, a resident of the poor Irish slums. For him, the poor and undeveloped conditions of slums stand out as a reminder of the colonial subjugation of Ireland.[33] Instead of confronting this traumatic reality, he dwells on his own invented stories to find a temporary sense of relief through self-delusion.

By fabricating tales that glorify him, Jack utilises the act of story-making as a tool of psychological therapy to relieve his traumas, which can be examined through the theory of "*drama therapy*"[34]. Robert J. Landy asserts that drama therapy is a psychological treatment process in which the client plays fictional roles to discover their role in society and overcome their distress through catharsis.[35] According to him, one of the methods of creating these roles is fabricating stories about the individual: "*[An] approach [of drama therapy] is that of storytelling and storymaking (see Gersie, 1990 and 1991) which is based in a narrative model and helps clients make sense of*

[32] O'Casey, **op. cit.**, p.14.
[33] **Ibid.**, p.72.
[34] Robert J. Landy, "The Drama Therapy Role Method," **Dramatherapy**, Vol.XIV, No:1, 1992, p.7.
[35] **Ibid.**, p.7.

their lives through identifying with the themes and structures of classical and personal stories."[36] Fitting to Landy's statement, Jack invents stories which glorify both himself and his colonised country. Through these fake stories, he suppresses his feelings of inadequacy and subjugation.

Moreover, he also uses alcohol to avoid facing the traumatic conditions of war-torn slums by decreasing his mental faculties, which can be surveyed through Jouhki and Oksanen's definition of "*escape theory*"[37]. According to the theory, the desire to escape stems from the individual's inability or reluctance to take action against their problems. This inability pushes them to feel depressed, anxious, and socially insufficient.[38] To repress these feelings, they seek out ways to decrease their self-awareness. These ways aim at suppressing consciousness and focus on basic bodily experiences, such as pleasure and pain, which help the individual to evade self-evaluation and the feeling of incompetence. These methods generally include addictive substances and behaviours of alcohol, drugs, smoking, and gambling. They enable the individual to alienate themselves from the external world by reducing consciousness and the brain's activeness.[39]

Fitting into the explanation above, Jack spends his days drinking with his friend Joxer Daly[40] to escape from Juno's criticism and the traumatising conditions of the poor and undeveloped slums. In addition to his personal distress, he also drinks to temporarily forget the war-torn state of Ireland, which struggles for independence. The play demonstrates this attempt to escape from colonial trauma when he and Joxer return to Jack's apartment after they drink outside. In this scene, in a drunken state, they discuss the dire situation in their country:

> *Boyle.* The counthry'll have to steady itself … it's goin' … to hell. … Where'r all … the chairs … gone to … steady itself, Joxer. … Chairs'll … have to … steady

[36] **Ibid.**, p.7.
[37] Jouhki, Oksanen, **op. cit.**, p.202.
[38] **Ibid.**, pp.202-204.
[39] **Ibid.**, pp.202-203.
[40] O'Casey, **op. cit.**, p.6.

> themselves. … No matther … what any one may … say. … Irelan's sober … is Irelan' … free.
>
> *Joxer (stretching himself on the bed).* Chains … an' … slaveree … that's a darlin' motto … a daaarlin' … motto![41]

Here, Jack refers to the unsteady situation of Ireland, which suffers from the bloody conflicts of the Civil War and the British control that prevent the country from becoming a fully independent state. During his speech, he also undergoes the painful process of confronting the trauma of colonial subjugation. This agonising aspect of facing trauma is represented through the frequent pauses in his speech. He has difficulty while he is talking about his country's condition, which represents the psychological pain of facing the issue of Ireland's colonialisation.

Similar to Jack, Joxer also indicates Ireland's dependency and powerlessness by comparing it to the image of a chained slave. Nevertheless, he seems to be in a carefree state since he mentions Ireland's colonisation as if he sings a song while he is comfortably stretching himself on the bed. The play also delivers his carelessness when he suggests that they should put all of their troubles in an "*oul' kit-bag ... an' smile ... smile ... smile!*"[42] Consequently, this conversation indicates that alcohol grants him a momentary sense of ecstasy and relief by eliminating his ability to think clearly.

Aside from this, Jack also represses his trauma of being a member of the poor, undeveloped, and colonially subjugated slums through his recently gained inheritance. After he learns from Charles Bentham, Mary's fiancé, that he will inherit money from one of his deceased relatives[43], he borrows money from people to make purchases on credit. These purchases include plenty of furniture[44] and a gramophone.[45] He escapes

[41] **Ibid.**, p.72.
[42] **Ibid.**, **op. cit.**, p.72.
[43] **Ibid.**, p.29.
[44] **Ibid.**, p.31.
[45] **Ibid.**, p.34.

from the harsh realities of slums by isolating himself from his impoverished community through his money and belongings.

He buys these luxurious items to signal his wealth, power, and status to his neighbours. For this reason, he executes what Derek Rucker and Adam Galinsky's refer to as "*compensatory consumption*"[46]. They outline the theory as a coping process in which the individual tries to overcome their source of trauma by buying products not only for their functionality but also for their signalling value:

> We suggest that feeling powerless is often an aversive state that will lead consumers to attempt to attenuate or alter this state. Furthermore, prior theorizing suggests that status is one source of power, and thus feeling powerless might be compensated for by demonstrating or obtaining status. As a result, we predict that feeling powerless, relative to feeling powerful (or baseline conditions), will increase consumers' desire to acquire products associated with status as measured by their willingness to pay.[47]

According to them, the excessive desire to consume items and services often stems from the need of compensating for an underlying feeling of inadequacy or powerlessness. They suggest that the state of powerlessness is directly linked to the social circumstances of the individual. As Rucker and Galinsky adds, if they are put in socially "*nonpowerful roles*"[48] in which they are subjected to the orders of a superior force, they often feel distressed. On an unconscious level, this inferior social status might signal to the individual that they have insufficient freedom, which pushes the person to feel like they are in a state of danger. As a result of this feeling, the person develops an extreme urge to possess valuable items to elevate his social status. By elevating their social position, the individual aims to signal their authority and power. This authority and power establish a sense of security in the individual's mind.

---

[46] Derek D. Rucker, Adam D. Galinsky, "Desire to Acquire: Powerlessness and Compensatory Consumption," **Journal of Consumer Research**, April 18, 2008, (Online) https://doi.org/10.1086/588569, 25 May 2023.
[47] **Ibid.**, p.257.
[48] **Ibid.**, p.258.

As a relevant example of Rucker and Galinsky's argument, Jack ornaments his house with ostentatious items to display his newly gained wealth. Through this method, he aims to assert a fake sense of power and status over his poor and oppressed slum society. The play reveals his desire to flaunt his prosperity through the description of his overly decorated house:

> *The same* [house]*, but the furniture is more plentiful, and of a vulgar nature. A glaringly upholstered armchair and lounge; cheap pictures and photos everywhere. Every available spot is ornamented with huge vases filled with artificial flowers.*[49]

In this depiction, O'Casey emphasises the artificial and tawdry nature of the furniture to suggest Jack's shallow urge to show off through his material possessions, which indicates his underlying sense of insecurity and powerlessness. Despite being plentiful, these items appear "*cheap*" and "*vulgar.*" This lack of sophistication represents Jack's pretentious attempts to portray himself as an elegant and wealthy man. In this case, O'Casey delineates Jack's psychology through the image of the house, which serves as "*an analogy for the psyche*"[50] in Carl Jung's psychoanalytic theory. According to Jung, the intimate and personal space of the house represents the human mind, which hosts our deepest feelings, thoughts, and anxieties. Suitably, Friel uses the artificial space of Jack's house as an analogy to display the hollowness of his ostentatious identity, which he fabricated to repress his traumas of inadequacy and colonial subjugation.

Jack's phantasy of creating a fictitious identity is also conveyed through the drastic change of his manners after he inherited the money. This feigned identity is exhibited when Joxer visits him in his house. He immediately gets up from his sofa, where he smokes his pipe in a half-asleep state and pretends to work on the documents

---

[49] O'Casey, **op. cit.**, p.31.
[50] Raya A. Jones, "A Discovery of Meaning: The Case of CG Jung's House Dream," **Culture & Psychology**, Vol.XIII, No:2, 2007, p.209.

of the will to impress Joxer.[51] When Joxer asks him about how he feels as a wealthy man, he responds to him in a pretentious manner, claiming that he carries great responsibility as he has hundreds of documents to examine:

> *Joxer*. How d'ye feel now, as a man o' money?
>
> *Boyle* (*solemnly*). It's a responsibility, Joxer, a great responsibility.
>
> *Joxer*. I suppose 'tis now, though you wouldn't think it.
>
> *Boyle*. […] Ever since the Will was passed I've run hundreds o' dockyments through me han's – I tell you, you have to keep your wits about you.[52]

Through his newly achieved inheritance, Jack pretends to be a member of the aristocracy that is socially isolated from the socially inferior slum community. Like an aristocrat, he engages in mental work through his act of bookkeeping. Thus, he intends to appear different from the slum residents, who consist of working-class people that mostly engage in physical labour. He also displays an industrious and responsible attitude, which contradicts his previous indolent and irresponsible behaviour. This contradiction exposes that his new identity is a façade, through which he intends to impress the other slum residents. Ultimately, Jack is secretly aware that he is not different from his own ignorant and subjugated slum community. This covert sense of inferiority stands out as the root of his trauma. To cope with his trauma, he distances himself from his community through his forged aristocratic identity, which the play portrays as a futile escape phantasy.

Jack's aim of creating a pretentious identity to suppress his trauma of being a subjugated slum dweller is also delivered through his epithet, "*paycock*." In classical mythology, the animal peacock is used as the symbol of Hera[53], the Greek equivalent

[51] O'Casey, **op. cit.**, p.31.
[52] **Ibid.**, p.31.
[53] Pierre Grimal, **The Concise Dictionary of Classical Mythology**, Ed. by. Stephen Kershaw, Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1990, p.182.

of the Roman Goddess Juno. Its plumage is said to represent the eyes of Argos, the faithful servant of Hera.[54] Nevertheless, O'Casey subverts the positive mythological representation of this animal. In the play, Juno uses the colourful and flamboyant appearance of male peacocks to define the idle and showy personality of Jack, who spends his days strutting around without doing any work: "*I killin' meself workin', an' he sthruttin' about from mornin' till night like a paycock!*"[55] While Juno works hard to provide for her family, he refuses to apply for a job by using his fake leg pain as an excuse.[56] Accordingly, his epithet stands out as another indicator of his pretentious personality, which he utilises as a façade to cover his insecurity of being a repressed slum resident.

Additionally, the stark contrast between Juno and Jack in terms of their methods of dealing with the traumatising conditions of slums is also delivered in the context of classical mythology. As Errol Durbach suggests, the name, Juno, refers to the Goddess of childbirth and domesticity. Thus, it epitomises her compassionate, protective, and motherly nature:

> Juno Boyle comes to incarnate those life sustaining principles subsumed by her Roman counterpart: Goddess of childbirth who, by extension, ensures the multiplication of the race; protectress of the pregnant wife, [...] the Goddess who cares for the unborn child; [...] and above all the Goddess of domesticity, of the family hearth.[57]

In line with Durbach's argument, Juno copes with the distressing socioeconomic conditions of slums through her love and dedication to her family. She is the only member of the Boyles who works in a job to take care of her family.[58] Unlike the

[54] **Ibid.**, p.182.
[55] O'Casey, **op. cit.**, p.10.
[56] **Ibid.**, p.16.
[57] Errol Durbach, **Peacocks and Mothers: Theme and Dramatic Metaphor O'Casey**, London, Macmillan, 1985, p.114.
[58] O'Casey, **op. cit.**, p.6.

caring and hard-working Juno, the "*paycock*" Jack chooses to escape from the distress of slum life by distancing himself from his society through his ostentatious façade.

As another instance of coping with the destitution and ignorance of the slum society, O'Casey presents Mary, the 22-year-old daughter of Juno and Jack. Like Nora Reilly in **John Bull's Other Island**, Mary is subjugated by both colonialism and patriarchy, which renders her instance of Spivak's "*double displacement*"[59] theory. She is constantly limited by her own community, which the play indicates during her introduction:

> *Two forces are working in her mind – one, through the circumstances of her life, pulling her back; the other, through the influence of books she has read, pushing her forward. The opposing forces are apparent in her speech and her manners, both of which are degraded by her environment, and improved by her acquittance – slight though it be – with literature.*[60]

To transcend her social restrictions both as a colonised and a woman, she reads books and pushes the boundaries of her intellect. Yet, the residents of the undeveloped and war-torn slums are unable to comprehend her intellectual aspirations, which aggravates her social alienation and trauma. The patriarchal oppression she endures is also conveyed through Jack's belittling remarks when Joxer asks about Mary's books on the table:

> *Boyle.* Aw, one o' Mary's; she's always readin' lately – nothin' but trash, too. There's one I was lookin' at dh'other day: three stories, The Doll's House, Ghosts, an' The Wild Duck – buks only fit for chiselurs![61]

[59] Spivak, **op. cit.**, p.90.
[60] O'Casey, **op. cit.**, p.5.
[61] **Ibid.**, p.20-21.

As a representative of patriarchy, Jack displays a hostile approach towards Mary's desire for self-development by criticising her interest in books. This hostility reveals his opposition to women's liberation through education. Due to her father's sexist attitude and the coloniser's oppressive presence, Mary is socially trapped in a dull and restrictive life from which she desires to escape.

Mary's traumatising social entrapment as a colonised woman is also represented through the plays she reads: Henrik Ibsen's **A Doll's House**, **Ghosts**, and **The Wild Duck**. The first play focuses on Nora, a housewife who is economically and socially dependent on her husband, Torvald Helmer.[62] Feeling constrained by the patriarchal society, she decides to abandon her predetermined roles as a submissive wife and mother to seek independence and "*educate herself*"[63]. Therefore, Nora's feeling of entrapment resonates with Mary's trauma of being limited by her circumstances. Like Nora, Mary also aims to transcend her social limitations through self-education.

Similarly, **Ghosts** focuses on the strict patriarchal norms of "*the 19th century Scandinavian Bourgeois society*"[64] that limit personal freedom. Each female character is expected to play predetermined roles and behave in an appropriate way to evade public criticism. The last play, **The Wild Duck**, delivers the theme of entrapment by exposing the character's lies and deceit. Taking place during a dinner party at the home of the wealthy Norwegian businessman Werle[65], the play focuses on lies and the fake lives of attendants, which limits their freedom and authenticity. Therefore, these restrictive patriarchal norms delivered in Ibsen's plays parallel the limiting, oppressive, and male-dominated slums that traumatise Mary. Akin to the figures in Ibsen's works, Mary is forced by his father to play the predetermined role of the passive, obedient, and ignorant woman.

---

[62] Henrik Ibsen, **A Doll's House: A Play in Three Acts**, Trans. by. William Archer, Boston, W.H. Baker, 1890, pp.30-32.
[63] Unni Langås, "What Did Nora Do? Thinking Gender with A Doll's House," **Ibsen Studies**, Vol.V, No:2, 2005, p.148.
[64] Amir Hossain, et. al., "Power and Sexuality in Henrik Ibsen's Ghosts," **European Scientific Journal**, Vol.X, No:11, 2014, p.209.
[65] Henrik Ibsen, **The Wild Duck**, Boston, W.H. Baker, 1890, p.5.

As a result of the patriarchal oppression and the circumstances of the slum life that hinder her intellectual pursuits, Mary channels her interest in Bentham.[66] He is a schoolteacher that seems to have a broad knowledge of philosophy and science. In the play, his religious wisdom is given through his detailed description of "*theosophy*"[67], while his scientific knowledge is revealed through his answer when Juno asks him whether he believes in ghosts:

> *Bentham.* […] Scientists are beginning to think that what we call ghosts are sometimes seen by person of a certain nature. They say that sensational actions, such as the killing of a person, demand great energy, and that energy lingers in the place where the action occurred. People may live in the place and see nothing, when someone may come along whose personality has some peculiar connection with the energy of the place, and, in a flash, the person sees the whole affair.[68]

In this quotation, he gives a logical explanation for the ghosts by referring to scientific explorations.[69] Due to his apparent proficiency in philosophy and science, Mary develops an attraction towards him. She wants to marry the seemingly intellectual Bentham as she considers him an opportunity to escape from the ignorance of her society. This belief drives her to decline the marriage proposal of Jerry Devine, another slum resident and a member of the Union.[70] In this context, her decline of Devine's proposal also represents her rejection to live in the slums.

Furthermore, the play delivers another instance of Mary's double displacement through the male characters' exclusionary approach when she gets pregnant by Bentham[71], who cancels their engagement and escapes from Ireland. This illegitimate pregnancy leads her to be marginalized by the male slum residents, who label her as a

---

[66] O'Casey, **op. cit.**, p.25.
[67] **Ibid.**, pp.36-37.
[68] **Ibid.**, pp.37-38.
[69] In this case, Bentham's explanation also serves as a reference to the psychological pain of Johnny, whose guilt of betraying his comrade Robbie Tancred manifests itself in the form of Tancred's ghost and recalls him of his traumatic memory.
[70] O'Casey, **op. cit.**, p.17.
[71] **Ibid.**, p.60.

fallen woman that lost her innocence and dignity. Jack banishes her from their house.[72] Similarly, her former suitor Jerry pities and rejects her when he learns about her pregnancy, questioning how she has "*fallen as low as that*"[73]. Due to her extramarital affair with Bentham, she is victimised by the patriarchal discourse, which forces women to safeguard their "*purity*" by abstaining from any sexual activity outside of marriage.[74] The only character that decides to help her is Juno, another woman who can empathise with her traumatising condition:

> *Mrs. Boyle.* […] I've got a little room in me sisther's where we'll stop till your throuble is over, an' then we'll work together for the sake of the baby.
>
> *Mary.* My poor little child that'll have no father!
>
> *Mrs. Boyle.* It'll have what's far betther – it'll have two mothers.[75]

Juno offers to bring up the baby together without the presence of a father, who represents the patriarchy. Her caring and nurturing behaviour is also suggested by her own name, Juno, which is a reference to the Roman Goddess of childbirth, motherhood, and protection.[76] By depicting her feminine attributes as Godly traits, O'Casey empowers Juno in contrast to the male characters such as Jack and Johnny, who are portrayed as irresponsible, weak, and delusional figures that refuse to face their real-life problems and traumas. This female empowerment can also be observed in Mary, whose name functions as a reference to the Virgin Mary. Similar to the Virgin Mary, who brings up Jesus without the presence of a father, she decides to raise her baby without the help of a patriarchal figure, which empowers her as an independent woman. Ultimately, Juno and Mary decide to raise the baby despite the harsh conditions of war-torn slums and public criticism. This also emphasises the

[72] **Ibid.**, p.64.
[73] **Ibid.**, p.66.
[74] Patricia L. N. Donat, John D'Emilio, "A Feminist Redefinition of Rape and Sexual Assault: Historical Foundations and Change," **Journal of Social Issues**, Vol.XLVIII, No:1, 1992, p.9.
[75] O'Casey, **op. cit.**, p.71.
[76] Durbach, **op. cit.**, p.114.

significance of solidarity between women in dealing with colonial and patriarchal trauma.

To battle against the distressing socioeconomic conditions of slums, Mary also clings to the socialist principles of unity and equality, which she sees as a solution to the impoverished and oppressed state of Ireland. She supports the rights of the working-class people, most of whom consist of poor slum residents, against the oppression exerted by employers and authorities. As an idealist woman, she supports the Trades Union and participates in strikes to protest the unjust firing of a labourer.[77] This indicates her dedication to the principles of solidarity and equality among the labourers.

From a historical viewpoint, Mary's protest refers to the general state of unrest of the labourers of the period. During the late nineteenth century, Ireland experienced an economic decline as a result of England's insufficient measures during "*the Great Irish Famine*" (1846-1852) and the series of immigrations afterwards[78]. These deteriorating economic conditions led to "*The Great Labour Unrest*"[79]. In this period, the labourers joined protests, riots and strikes to increase the quality of the working conditions and demand higher salaries. Béliard suggests that the period lasted from 1911 to 1914. Yet, the unrest of labourers repeated itself through the periodic waves of strikes that dominated twentieth-century Ireland.[80] Taking place in 1922, when this general state of unrest was still prevalent, the play utilises Mary's protest to represent the frustration of labourers, who were traumatised by the country's debilitating financial conditions. Analogically, the oppressed and impoverished condition of the working class also represents the colonisation of Ireland. Akin to the labourers, who were forced to work under poor conditions by their employers, Ireland was coerced to operate under the oppressive authority of Britain. In this regard, the play utilises the

[77] O'Casey, **op. cit.**, pp.7-8.
[78] Daly, **op. cit.**, p.121.
[79] Béliard, **op. cit.**, p.1.
[80] **Ibid.**, p.2.

unrest of the working class to symbolise the anger and distress of the colonised Irish people.

However, Mary's dedication to her socialist principles is also challenged by Juno, who as David Waterman states, "*supports the status quo, and reveals herself to be both anti-nationalist and anti-socialist*"[81]. Unlike her nationalist husband, son, and socialist daughter that cope with their traumas through ideologies, she adopts a pragmatic viewpoint. This view undermines the use of ideological methods when dealing with traumatising real-life issues. For instance, when Mary highlights the significance of solidarity among the labourers, she criticises her approach for being impractical and harmful to their community:

> *Mary.* What's the use of belongin' to a Trades Union if you won't stand up for your principles? Why did they sack her? It was a clear case of victimization. We couldn't let her walk the streets, could we?
>
> *Mrs. Boyle.* No, of course yous couldn't – yous wanted to keep her company. Wan victim wasn't enough. When the employers sacrifice wan victim, the Trades Unions go wan betther be sacrificin' a hundred.[82]

Here, she challenges her socialist viewpoint by claiming that the Trades Union and the employers are similar in terms of their way of sacrificing the workers to execute their agenda. She also emphasises the irrationality of her excessive dedication to the Union, which will likely lead her to be fired as well. This dialogue indicates her pragmatic mindset that suggests dealing with socioeconomic issues through practical methods rather than ideological considerations. Thus, she regards individuals who are firmly devoted to ideologies as delusional people that avoid real-life troubles by clinging to the idealised notions envisioned by their ideologies.

---

[81] David Waterman, "The Performance of Masculinity and Nationalism: Sean O'Casey's The Plough and the Stars and Juno and the Paycock," **Etudes Irlandaises**, Vol.XXIII, No:2, 1998, p.64.
[82] O'Casey, **op. cit.**, pp.7-8.

Additionally, the play further elaborates on Juno's pragmatic standpoint in the context of the colonial conflict. It reveals her perspective through the scene where Juno introduces her son Johnny to Bentham. They discuss the Easter Rising and the other colonial conflicts, in which Johnny was shot in the hip and lost his arm to a bomb explosion:

> *Mrs. Boyle*. Come on Johnny, till I inthroduce you to Mrs. Bentham. […] My son, Mr. Bentham […] He was only a chiselur of a Boy Scout in Easter Week, when he got hit in the hip; and his arm was blew off in the fight in O'Connell Street.
>
> *Johnny (boastfully)*. I'd do it agen', ma, I'd do it agen'; for a principle's a principle.
>
> *Mrs. Boyle.* Ah, you lost your best principle, me boy, when you lost your arm; them's the only sort o' principles that's any good to a workin' man.[83]

Here, Johnny expresses his nationalist ideas by proudly mentioning his injuries as honourable sacrifices. Yet, Juno undermines this delusional nationalist notion by suggesting that he is severely disadvantaged in his ordinary life due to his injuries. Through Juno's anti-ideological perspective, the play conveys that extreme devotion to ideologies forces individuals to endure extreme physical and mental suffering for the benefit of their own group. In this sense, Juno's perspective conveys the impracticality of ideological dogmas in dealing with colonial trauma.

During their dialogue, Juno undermines Johnny's act of suppressing his war-related trauma by valorising his injuries as heroic sacrifices.[84] This glorification of war-related sacrifices can be surveyed through Oleg Smirnov, Holly Arrow, Douglas Kennett, and John Orbell's definition of "*heroism.*" They define the term as a notion that is employed to justify sacrificing people in war.[85] To protect their societies against

[83] **Ibid.**, p.27.
[84] **Ibid.**, p.27.
[85] Oleg Smirnov, et. al., "Ancestral War and the Evolutionary Origins of 'Heroism,'" **The Journal of Politics**, Vol.LXIX, No:4, 2007, p.927.

external threats, humans encourage risking one's life for the sake of their own group by defining the act as altruistic behaviour:

> There is no doubt that soldiers often do fight in this [sacrificial] manner; the history of warfare is, in large part, the history of ordinary men (and, in recent times, women) who willingly confronted the risk of death when fighting for their tribe, polis, country, or other group. In the present paper we call this behavior "heroism." Heroism is well recognized as a potential human behavior, but the existence of heroism is most commonly treated as a background assumption in examining the nature of war.[86]

According to Smirnov, Arrow, Kennett, and Orbell, heroism is a concept that is utilised throughout the history of warfare to convince people to participate in the violent acts of killing the enemy or sacrificing their own lives. These dangerous acts of confronting death and physical sacrifice on the battlefield often lead to "*shell-shock*"[87]. Tracey Louise Loughran states that the term originated during World War I to define post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) that soldiers experienced during the war, before PTSD was officially acknowledged.[88] The symptoms of shell-shock are listed as extreme anxiety, fear, hallucinations, and decreased ability of reasoning. Before it was recognised as a severe mental condition, shell-shock was regarded as a sign of cowardice and weakness.[89] To repress the effects of this psychological condition, societies portrayed the horrifying acts of war as heroic deeds demanded by a respected authority, such as the government, law, and God. These authorities ordered individuals to protect their "*ingroup*" against the marginalised "*outgroup*"[90].

As a relevant example of Smirnov, Arrow, Kennett, and Orbell's description of "*heroism*," Johnny justifies the loss of his arm as a necessary sacrifice to protect his

[86] **Ibid.**, p.927.
[87] Tracey Louise Loughran, **Shell-shock in First World War Britain: An Intellectual and Medical History, c. 1860-c. 1920**, w. Place, Diss, 2006, p.11.
[88] **Ibid.**, p.18.
[89] Ted Bogacz, "War Neurosis and Cultural Change in England, 1914-22: The Work of the War Office Committee of Enquiry into 'Shell-Shock,'" **Journal of Contemporary History**, Vol.XXIV, No:2, 1989, p.228.
[90] Smirnov, et. al., **op. cit.**, p.927.

ingroup, the Irish people, against the outgroup, the Free Staters and Britain. Through the glorification of his physical sacrifice, he aims to repress his shell-shock. Yet, O'Casey exposes his shell-shock by emphasising his weak physique as well as his overall anxious, fearful, and unhappy behaviour:

> Johnny *appears at the door on left. He can be plainly seen now; he is a thin, delicate fellow, something younger than* Mary. *He has evidently gone through a rough time. His face is pale and drawn; there is a tremulous look of indefinite fear in his eyes. The left sleeve of his coat is empty, and he walks with a slight halt.*[91]

In this quotation, O'Casey depicts his thin body and pale face, which appears unhappy and worried. The paleness, a metaphor used in art to portray deceased people and ghosts[92], emphasises the physical and mental damage the war inflicted on him. O'Casey also indicates this damage by highlighting the vague fear in his eyes. His debilitated appearance conveys that he is still haunted by the violent memories of the Easter Rising and the other colonial conflicts despite his efforts to suppress his trauma by glorifying his injuries as valorous offerings. By portraying himself as a war hero, he also defines his whole identity through his traumatic experience of sacrifice. This eliminates the possibility of healing his trauma since it prevents him from making any objective evaluation of colonial conflict.

In addition to his apparent dedication to nationalism, Johnny also intends to suppress his distress of colonial conflict by clinging to religious practises. He believes that he is safe from the colonial violence that occurs outside so long as the votive candle under the Virgin Mary's picture in his house continues to burn.[93] This extreme devotion to religious beliefs and rituals can be scrutinised through Elizabeth A. Nelson, Jonathan S. Abramowitz, Stephen P. Whiteside, and Brett J. Deacon's description of

[91] O'Casey, **op. cit.**, p.8.
[92] Peter Buse, Andrew Stott (editors), **Ghosts: Deconstruction, Psychoanalysis, History**, London, Palgrave Macmillan, 1999, p.248.
[93] O'Casey, **op. cit.**, p.9.

"*scrupulosity.*" They explicate the term as an obsessive-compulsive disorder characterised by a pathological obsession with religious doctrines and moral issues:

> Religious OCD symptoms, often referred to as *scrupulosity*, typically involve ''seeing sin where there is none'' and are frequently focused on minor details of the person's religion, to the exclusion of more important areas. Examples include unwanted sacrilegious obsessional thoughts (e.g., about the Devil), excessive doubt regarding whether one has committed a sin (e.g., daydreaming while praying), and religious behavior taken to extreme (e.g., excessive confession).[94]

In their research, they point out that individuals who suffer from scrupulosity are overly preoccupied with minor practises and principles of religion and morals. When these minute details are violated, they tend to display extreme aggression or fear due to their belief that they are going to be punished by an omnipotent authority, such as God.[95] They add that scrupulosity disorder generally emerges as a side effect of a traumatic experience that occurred in the individual's past. This experience leads the individual to believe that they have committed a sin and are spiritually contaminated by evil. As a result, they are excessively attached to religious practises and moral standards, which they consider a way of overcoming their trauma and cleansing their sins.

Fitting to Nelson, Abramowitz, Whiteside, and Deacon's argument, Johnny exhibits an extreme devotion to Christian doctrines and displays paranoia whenever he fails to perform its practises. As proof of his obsession, he experiences a panic attack and asserts that he is going to get shot by the soldiers when the votive candle extinguishes:

---

[94] Elizaeth A. Nelson, et. al., "Scrupulosity in Patients with Obsessive–Compulsive Disorder: Relationship to Clinical and Cognitive Phenomena," **Journal of Anxiety Disorders**, 2006, (Online) https://doi.org/10.1016/j.janxdis.2006.02.001, 27 November 2022.
[95] **Ibid.**, p.1082.

[*The votive light flickers for a moment, and goes out.*

Johnny (in a cry of fear). Mother o' God, the light's afther goin' out!

First Man. You put the win' up me the way you bawled that time. The oil's all gone, that's all.

Johnny (with an agonizing cry). Mother o' God, there's a shot I'm afther gettin'!

First Man. What's wrong with you, man? Is it a fit you're takin'?

Johnny. I'm afther feelin' a pain in me breast, like the tearin' by of a bullet![96]

In this scene, the door of Boyle's house knocks, and two labourers enter to carry the furniture out since they are not able to afford them as their family's inheritance becomes worthless. While they carry the furniture, the candlelight goes out, which causes Johnny to cry in fear. The scene demonstrates that he views the candle as a religious instrument of protection against the colonial threat. The pain in his chest, which he compares to the tearing of a bullet, also stands out as a reminder of how he got injured during the violent colonial conflicts, indicating his repressed trauma.

In line with the definition of scrupulosity, Johnny's obsession with religion roots back to his traumatic experiences of the past that still haunts his present. Aside from the physical injuries that debilitated his psychology, he is also traumatised by his own act of betraying his comrade, Robbie Tancred. He exposes information about the hiding place of the Die-hard member Tancred, which leads to his murder.[97] Due to his betrayal, he feels guilty and cannot stand when people mention his death: "*For God's sake, let us have no more o' this talk.*"[98] In this regard, his distress of causing harm to his comrade can be explicated through the "*perpetrator trauma*"[99] theory. It refers to the victimisers who suffer from distress due to their act of inflicting harm on their victims:

[96] O'Casey, **op. cit.**, p.68.
[97] **Ibid.**, p.69.
[98] **Ibid.**, p.47.
[99] Saira Mohamed, "Of Monsters and Men: Perpetrator Trauma and Mass Atrocity," **Colum. L. Rev**, No:115, 2015, p.1157.

> *In popular, scholarly, and legal discourse, psychological trauma is an experience that belongs to victims. While we expect victims of crimes to suffer trauma, we never ask whether perpetrators likewise experience those same crimes as trauma. […] We are loath to acknowledge that the commission of the crime itself may cause some perpetrators to experience their own psychological injury and scarring.*[100]

According to the theory, these victimisers feel deep remorse due to their own harmful actions. This feeling of remorse constitutes the root of their trauma. Fittingly, Johnny is a perpetrator who is psychologically scarred by his own wrongdoing of causing Tancred's execution. He feels contaminated by the sin of treason and searches for a method to cleanse himself. The play represents this desire for purification through his obsession with keeping the votive candle lit.[101] As Jean C. Cooper states, in Christianity, candles represent hope and purity since their spark represents the divine light of Jesus Christ that guides humans.[102] Similarly, the picture of the Virgin Mary stands out as another symbol of "*incandescent purity, [which] is the source of [...] power over darkness*"[103]. Accordingly, these items represent his urge to repress his traumatising sense of guilt by cleansing himself of his betrayal.

Despite his attempts to subdue his distress, Johnny's guilt and fear overwhelm him in the form of Tancred's ghost. According to Tiina Kirss, in trauma theories, the haunting of a ghost is associated with recalling a traumatic memory which is suppressed or unvoiced by the individual.[104] In alignment with Kirss's statement, Tancred haunts Johnny by appearing him in his house, which reminds him of his traumatic act of treason:

---

[100] **Ibid.**, p.1157.
[101] O'Casey, **op. cit.**, p.68.
[102] Jean C. Cooper, **An Illustrated Encyclopaedia of Traditional Symbols**, London, Thames & Hudson, 1987, p.28.
[103] Marina Warner, **Alone of All Her Sex: The Myth and the Cult of the Virgin Mary**, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2013, p.68.
[104] Tiina Kirss, "Seeing Ghosts: Theorizing Haunting in Literary Texts," **Haunted Narratives: Life Writing in an Age of Trauma**, Toronto, Toronto University Press, 2013, p.21.

> *Johnny* […]. I seen him … I seen Robbie Tancred kneelin' down before the statue … an' the red light shinin' on him … an' when I went in … he turned an' looked at me … an' I seen the woun's bleedin' in his breast … Oh, why did he look at me like that? … it wasn't my fault that he was done in … Mother o' God, keep him away from me![105]

Here, he alarms his family by claiming that he has seen Tancred's ghost kneeling in front of the statue. He adds that his chest was bleeding, which represents Tancred's position as a victim of colonial violence and his friend's betrayal. According to Johnny, there was also a red light that was shining on him. The colour red, which is often "*associated with failure and danger*"[106] in psychological theories, indicates that his presence reminds Johnny of his failure as a comrade and friend. Even though he is appalled by the ghost, the other people cannot see him.[107] For this reason, his presence symbolises Johnny's personal confrontation with his trauma of betraying his comrade.

In this sense, Johnny's hallucinations stand out as an instance of "*psychosis*," the severe mental condition that results in losing contact with reality[108]. In **Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders**, the primary symptoms of psychosis are listed as "*hallucinations, delusions, disorganized speech (except for substance/ medication-induced psychotic disorder and psychotic disorder due to another medical condition), abnormal psychomotor behavior, and negative symptoms, as well as dimensional assessments of depression and mania*"[109]. These symptoms often root back to a distressing experience that traumatised the patient. In line with the definition of psychosis, Johnny displays a partial disconnection from real life due to his hallucination of Tancred's ghost.[110] As can be observed in the quotation above, he also

---

[105] O'Casey, **op. cit.**, pp.38-39.
[106] Andrew J. Elliot, Markus A. Maier, "Color Psychology: Effects of Perceiving Color on Psychological Functioning in Humans," **Annual Review of Psychology**, Vol.LXV, No:1, 2014, p.102.
[107] O'Casey, **op. cit.**, p.39.
[108] David B. Arciniegas, "Psychosis," **Continuum: Lifelong Learning in Neurology**, Vol.XXI, No:3, 2015, pp.715-716.
[109] American Psychiatric Association, **Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders**, 2013, (Online) https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.books.9780890425596, 16 January 2023.
[110] Tancred is also the name of the knight in Torquato Tasso's poem, "*Gerusalemme Liberata*." In **Beyond the Pleasure Principle**, Freud uses Tancred to explain "*repetition-compulsion*" (1922: 15), the

demonstrates difficulty in speech when he sees the ghost. The other symptom of mania is indicated through his periods of agitation and severe mood changes whenever he confronts the source of his trauma. Normally a fearful and timid man, Johnny confidently shows his anger when his family mentions the funeral of Tancred. He irritably asks them to stop talking about him and start putting on the gramophone.[111] These sudden swings in Johnny's behaviour and mood suggest that his psychology is debilitated by his traumatic memory of betraying Tancred.

In a broader sense, Tancred's ghost also functions as a manifestation of Irish society's collective trauma of colonial violence. This representation of colonial trauma through the ghost image can be read through the "*postcolonial gothic*"[112] discourse. It explores the use of gothic tropes that signify the unresolved traumas of imperial violence.[113] One of the prominent tropes it focuses on is the invasive ghost, who serves as a reminder of colonial oppression. Emilie Cameron argues that these ghosts generally refer to the marginalised, trivialised, and excluded others whose suffering still haunts the present.[114] According to her, the ghosts of these victimised others disturb the apparent comfort and stability of the characters, reminding them of the unsettling reality of colonial oppression: "*Ghosts unsettle the assumed stability and integrity of western temporalities and spatialities and seem to embody the mismatch between the ideal and the real, the present and the absent.*"[115] Fitting to Cameron's argument, Tancred is depicted as a restless ghost who unsettles the Boyle family's cheerful and comfortable setting while they are savouring their recently discovered inheritance.[116] This contrast indicates the mismatch between the idealised lives of the family and the jarring reality of colonial violence. Therefore, Tancred's presence

---

urge to repeat the traumatic memory the patient is obsessed with. Similarly, Johnny displays repetition-compulsion by re-enacting the distressing murder of Robbie Tancred through hallucinations, which represents his fixation with his trauma.

[111] O'Casey, **op. cit.**, pp.47-48.

[112] Philip Holden, "The 'Postcolonial Gothic': Absent Histories, Present Contexts," **Textual Practice**, 2009, (Online) https://doi.org/10.1080/09502360902753013, 26 March 2023.

[113] **Ibid.**, p.353.

[114] Emilie Cameron, "Cultural Geographies Essay: Indigenous Spectrality and the Politics of Postcolonial Ghost Stories," **Cultural Geographies**, Vol.XV, No:3, 2008, p.383.

[115] **Ibid.**, p.383.

[116] O'Casey, **op. cit.**, pp.38-39.

recalls the collective trauma of colonialism, from which the family desperately tries to escape through their new lifestyle.

The Boyle family intends to create a fake, idealised lifestyle in their habitat to isolate themselves from the traumatising horrors of colonial strife that took place outside. They employ phantasy by feigning a peaceful and optimistic lifestyle in their house, which contrasts with the grim and oppressive setting of the streets of slums. This conveys their phantasy of evading colonialism by establishing an imaginary distance between their own private space and the public space of slum streets. Thus, it can be analysed through Henri Lefebvre's theory of "*social space*," which focuses on the dialectical relationship between space and social relations:

> Social space contains- and assigns (more or less) appropriate places to-(1) the social relations of reproduction, i.e. the bio-physiological relations between the sexes and between age groups, along with the specific organization of the family; and (2) the relations of production, i.e. the division of labour and its organization in the form of hierarchical social functions. These two sets of relations, production and reproduction, are inextricably bound up with one another.[117]

He outlines the concept of space as a socially constructed notion that functions as a hierarchical division between people from different social, economic, and political backgrounds. Suitable to Lefebvre's definition of social space, the Boyle family utilises their house, which is newly decorated with expensive items, to socially isolate themselves from their poor slums devastated by the colonial conflicts. Thus, their use of space asserts a social hierarchy between themselves and the war-torn slum streets. This hierarchy socially alienates their space from the outside. The contrast between the family's private setting and the streets' public space is also highlighted through their indifferent attitude towards Robbie Tancred's funeral taking place outside:

[117] Henri Lefebvre, **The Production of Space**, Trans. by. Donald Nicholson-Smith, Oxford, Blackwell Ltd, 1991, p.32.

> *Johnny.* Are yous goin' to put on th' gramophone to-night, or are yous not?
>
> *Mrs. Boyle.* Gwan, Jack, put on a record.
>
> […]
>
> *Nugent (loudly, above the noise of the gramophone).* Are yous goin' to have that thing bawlin' an' the funeral of Mrs. Tancred's son passin' the house? Have none of yous any respect for the Irish people's National regard for the dead?
>
> […]
>
> *Mrs. Boyle.* Maybe, Needle Nugent, it's nearly time we had a little less respect for the dead, an' a little more regard for the livin'.[118]

Here, the Boyle Family hosts Joxer and Mrs. Madigan in their house. After the introduction, they happily start drinking whiskey, singing, and putting on the gramophone. This cheerful setting is also enforced when Jack recites a humorous poem about the social injustice and the hypocrisy of the religious people.[119]

Despite their efforts to create an isolated setting, the family's space is invaded by the horrors of colonial violence. This invasion is executed by Needle Nugent, a tailor who criticises the family for playing music during Tancred's funeral.[120] Yet, Juno shows indifference by implying that they cannot mourn for the dead forever. Similarly, Jack rejects mourning over Tancred, claiming that it is the government's business to protect their citizens, not theirs:

> *Boyle.* […] We've nothin' to do with these things, one way or t'other. That's the Government's business, an' let them do what we're payin' them for doin'.[121]

[118] O'Casey, **op. cit.**, pp.48-49.
[119] **Ibid.**, p.48.
[120] **Ibid.**, pp.48-49.
[121] **Ibid.**, p.47.

Here, both Juno and Jack show an apparent lack of concern and interest towards Ireland's destruction, refusing to grieve over the victims of colonial violence. Therefore, their unconcerned behaviour can be scrutinised through the theory of apathy syndrome, which defines apathy as a result of trauma. According to American Psychological Association (APA), it refers to emotional indifference that develops in survivors of distressing events: "*[it is] the pattern of emotional insulation (indifference, detachment) adopted by many prisoners-of-war and victims of catastrophes in an effort to maintain their stability.*"[122] These individuals establish an emotional detachment instead of going through a healthy mourning process to heal their trauma.[123] They utilise this approach to protect their well-being and prevent further distress. In line with the definition of apathy syndrome, Juno and Jack detach themselves emotionally from the tragic death of Tancred. They also reject mourning over him to avoid confronting the traumatic reality of colonial violence.

Additionally, Nugent is revealed to be secretly content with the colonial violence despite his nationalist stance. His hypocrisy is indicated by Mrs. Madigan, who suggests that he is partly responsible for the brutality between the Die-hards and the Free Staters since he supports both sides. According to Madigan, he is a hypocrite who attends the Republican funerals during the day and makes suits for the Free State forces at night.[124] In this way, he indirectly encourages the conflict to continue so that he could make a material profit from it. To conceal his true intentions, he pretends to be a staunch nationalist who is grief-stricken by the casualties of colonial strife. Akin to Johnny, who depicts himself as a war hero, he builds his identity and position on the traumatic events of colonialism. Therefore, he does not want the conflict to end since he will lose his profitable position as soon as it is resolved.

Apart from this, the play delivers aggressive impulses in the form of physical violence that irreversibly damages the lives of the younger generations of Ireland. The

[122] "Apathy Syndrome," **APA Dictionary of Psychology**, (Online) https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1992-06104-001, 8 April 2023.
[123] Ralph R. Greenson, "The Psychology of Apathy," **The Psychoanalytic Quarterly**, Vol.XVIII, No:3, 1949, p.290.
[124] O'Casey, **op. cit.**, p.49.

first instance that demonstrates this irreversible outcome of aggression is exemplified through Johnny's disability. Having lost his arm during the violent colonial assaults, he is traumatised as he becomes a disabled person unable to work at a job.[125] Thus, he is economically dependent on his parents, who are burdened with the task of taking care of him. This dependence exemplifies colonial aggression's debilitating results on these younger generations' families.

In this regard, Johnny's disability and dependence on his parents stand out as an analogy that represents the subjugated status of Ireland. Akin to him, Ireland operates under the British Empire, which conveys the country's dependence on its coloniser. Therefore, the similarity between the disabled Johnny and the colonised Ireland fits into Marion Quirici's description of "*disability studies.*" Quirici asserts that disability is utilised in literature and history as a concept that represents subjugated societies. These communities are generally disempowered and oppressed by a powerful and despotic community:

> Disability studies is an interdisciplinary field founded on the principle that disability is not an individual affliction but a social category made meaningful by cultural ideals of normalcy, productivity and reproductivity, and progress. Originating in activism, the field invites us to observe how culture values and devalues human variations in order to regulate which bodies and which populations are deserving of rights and freedoms. A disability-studies methodology provides tools for understanding power and oppression: because disability is assumed to signify inferiority, to associate a given population with disability is to justify that group's disempowerment.[126]

In her paper, Quirici points out that disability is a concept that is socially associated with incompetence and inferiority, since it often limits the physical or mental capacity of the individual. This renders disability an analogy that is utilised to signify the

[125] **Ibid.**, p.27.
[126] Marion Quirici, "Cathleen ni Houlihan and the Disability Aesthetics of Irish National Culture," **Éire-Ireland**, 2015, (Online) https://muse.jhu.edu/article/604165, 22 May 2023.

societies whose rights and liberty are taken away from them by their colonisers.[127] Fittingly, O'Casey utilises Johnny's disability to represent the irreparably crippled state of Ireland. Debilitated both physically and mentally by the colonial aggression, Johnny is unable to be rehabilitated as his injuries remain as a reminder of his traumatic past. His spirit of patriotism is also ridiculed by Juno, who suggests that he has become crippled due to his blind devotion to his nationalist principles.[128] Therefore, the play exposes the traumatic results of patriotism's aggressive policies, which encourage people to sacrifice themselves for their nation, through the analogy of disability.

Additionally, the play demonstrates another instance of aggressive impulses through the execution of Johnny. The Irregulars enter his house and drag him away to execute him as a punishment for his act of exposing Tancred's hiding place.[129] The republicans' violent method of retribution not only eradicates the future of the Irish youth, but also traumatises their families. This trauma is indicated through the reactions of Juno and Mary, who lament over the loss of Johnny. After Mrs. Madigan comes to tell them that two policemen have found a man they think is Johnny, Mary grieves over her brother while embracing her mother. The trauma of her brother's loss drives her to question her belief in God. She exclaims that there could not be a God, since he would not let such a horrible thing happen if he was real:

> *Mary.* Oh, it' thrue, it's thrue what Jerry Devine says – there isn't a God, there isn't a God; if there was He wouldn't let these things happen!

[127] Quirici adds that this concept is also employed in Irish literature to portray the country as a disabled and traumatised nation. To exemplify her claim, she refers to Irish dramatists William Butler Yeats and Lady Gregory, who use the mysterious old woman as an example of disability in their play, **Cathleen Ni Houlihan**. Being symbolically disabled due to her old age, she represents the impoverished state of Ireland. However, as the story progresses, she is revealed to be Cathleen Ni Houlihan, the legendary warrior of Irish independence, who aims to reawaken the spirit of patriotism among the Irish people. As Quirici argues, "*The Old Woman's transformation from debility to capacity offers a revolutionary symbol of rejuvenation and rehabilitation*" (2015: 75).
[128] O'Casey, **op. cit.**, p.27.
[129] **Ibid.**, pp.68-69.

> *Mrs. Boyle.* […] We'll want all the help we can get from God an' His Blessed Mother now! These things have nothin' to do with the Will o' God. Ah, what can God do agen the stupidity o' men?[130]

Unlike Mary, Juno uses her religious faith as a source of consolation and power to repress the trauma of her son's murder. She also highlights the futility of colonial aggression by referring to the urge as the stupidity of men.

As a victim of this aggression, Juno also earns a broader sense of compassion, which allows her to challenge the socially constructed barriers of colonial discourse. Her newly earned compassion is indicated through the change in her thoughts about Tancred's murder. Initially, she voices her indifference by claiming that Mrs. Tancred deserves her son's death. According to her, Mrs. Tancred is guilty, as she had hosted the Die-hard members prior to Robbie's murder. This disturbed the comfort of the residents due to the frequent investigations carried out by the C.I.D., the Criminal Investigation Department: "*In wan way, she deserves all she got; for lately, she let th' Die-hards make an open house of th' place; an' for th' last couple of months, either when th' sun was risin' or when th' sun was settin', you had C.I.D. men burstin' into your room, assin' you where were you born, where were you christened, where were you married, an' where would you be buried!*"[131] Nevertheless, after the murder of her own son, Juno ceases to see Robbie Tancred as a Die-hard member and understands that he was "*only a poor dead son*"[132]. Consequently, her recently achieved concern for all humanity leads her to empathise with Mrs. Tancred's trauma.

To stop this "murdherin' hate"[133], Juno begs Jesus Christ to give all of them compassion so that they could end the polarisation between the Die-hards and the Free Staters and view themselves as equal human beings regardless of their differences. In

[130] **Ibid.**, p.70.
[131] **Ibid.**, p.47.
[132] **Ibid.**, p.71.
[133] **Ibid.**, p.72.

this case, her words echo Mrs. Tancred's prayers that she offers when she loses her son:

> *Mrs. Tancred.* Sacred Heart of the Crucified Jesus, take away our hearts o' stone … an' give us hearts o' flesh! … Take away this murdherin' hate … an' give us Thine own eternal love![134]

Like Juno, Mrs. Tancred implores Jesus to replace this aggression and "*murdherin' hate*" with compassion and love. In this case, the play draws attention to their shared trauma of loss through the image of Jesus Christ, another son that is murdered. Their paralleling prayers indicate that Juno becomes able to understand Tancred's agony due to their mutual tragedy. Accordingly, Juno's newly developed empathy towards her is a fitting instance of Brock Bastian, Jolanda Jetten, and Laura J. Ferris' description of "*social glue*" theory. They argue that shared feelings of pain function as a social glue that fosters bonding and cooperation among individuals:

> Our findings afford new insight into the ways in which pain interacts with human sociality. Evolved responses to pain serve to generate social support […]; when shared, however, pain may promote higher-order effects such as bonding and group formation. Pain, it seems, has the capacity to act as social glue, building cooperation within novel social collectives.[135]

According to them, painful and traumatic experiences are present in all social groups irrespective of their cultural and political differences.[136] This renders pain a collective feeling which brings people together, establishing a sense of empathy and solidarity

---

[134] **Ibid.**, p.46.
[135] Brock Bastian, Jolanda Jetten, Laura J. Ferris, "Pain as Social Glue: Shared Pain Increases Cooperation," **Psychological Science**, 2014, (Online) https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797614545886, 01 March 2023.
[136] **Ibid.**, p.2079.

among them. Likewise, Juno's loss of her son enables her to develop a feeling of bonding and empathy towards Mrs. Tancred's pain. Although she does not approve of the Tancred family's political stance, her similar traumatic experience pushes her to transcend their differences and establish an understanding of Mrs. Tancred's loss.

Similarly, the social glue theory can also be applied to the Easter Rising, which is another traumatic event that reinforced the social ties of Irish people. According to Patrick Mannion, the leaders of the rising were rather alone in their struggle prior to their rebellion and executions, not getting the support of most of the Irish community:

> There is significant historical debate as to how Irish popular opinion shifted following the Rising. Initially, most Irish people did not approve of the violent uprising, but that changed when General John Maxwell began executing the leaders. Over ten days beginning on 3 May, 15 rebel leaders were shot by firing squads. Judging by newspaper and police reports and private letters, the executions were deeply resented by most Irish people.[137]

Nevertheless, Mannion suggests that the Irish society's overall disapproval of the violent rising changed after the execution of the leaders. Their death awakened a spirit of nationalism and social change, which united the Irish people around the collective desire for independence.[138] For this reason, this shared tragic experience functioned as a social glue which fostered a sense of solidarity and understanding among them.

Aside from this, the aggression between the conflicting sides is also reflected through Robbie Tancred's murder at the hands of the Free Stater gangs. His death inflicts emotional pain both on his mother and the other slum residents, which makes it a representative of Ireland's collective trauma. These traumatic effects of his murder

[137] Patrick Mannion, "Newfoundland Responses to the Easter Rebellion and the Rise of Sinn Fein, 1916-1919," **Newfoundland Studies**, March 1, 2009, (Online) https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/nflds24_1art01, 19 January 2023.
[138] Finnegan, McCarron, **op. cit.**, pp.53-54.

can be scrutinised during the funeral process. In the scene, Mrs. Tancred mourns over the death of her son along with her neighbours that accompany her:

> *First Neighbour.* It's a sad journey we're goin' on, but God's good, an' the Republicans won't be always down.
>
> *Mrs. Tancred.* Ah, what good is that to me now? Whether they're up or down – it won't bring me darlin' boy from the grave.
>
> […]
>
> *First Neighbour.* Still an' all, he died a noble death, an' we'll bury him like a king.
>
> *Mrs. Tancred.* An' I'll go livin' like a pauper. Ah, what's the pains I suffered bringin' him into the world to carry him to his cradle, to the pains I'm sufferin' now, carryin' him out o' the world to bring him to his grave![139]

Here, akin to Juno, Mrs. Tancred displays a pragmatic perspective that disputes the validity of certain nationalist ideologies. She questions the method of justifying colonial aggression by praising the casualties as noble sacrifices. Her nationalist neighbour attempts to console her by stating that their ideological ingroup, the Republicans, will eventually defeat the outgroup, the Free Staters. Even though they claim to be sorry about Robbie's murder, they also glorify his death as a noble service to Ireland. However, Mrs. Tancred undermines this idea by emphasising the emotional suffering his murder inflicts on her. She also highlights the futility of protecting their ideological groups while losing their own family members. Thus, the play challenges the nationalist concept of encouraging violence by exposing the casualties' traumatic results on their families.

To sum up, O'Casey delineates the psychological impacts of colonial oppression in Irish slums, which are socially, politically, and economically affected by the conflict between the republican Die-hards and the Free State Forces. The conflict is epitomised through the historical events of the Easter Rising and the Irish Civil War.

---

[139] O'Casey, **op. cit.**, p.45.

These incidents not only hindered the development of the slums but also traumatised the slum occupants as they lost their friends and relatives during these clashes. In **Juno and the Paycock**, O'Casey portrays the psychological struggles of these individuals through the poor and dysfunctional Boyle family and their neighbours. Their lives are devastated by the violent assaults of the Easter Rising and the ongoing Civil War. To suppress the distress of these events, they mentally isolate themselves from their surroundings through wealth, knowledge, and ideological phantasies. They also intend to practise physical aggression against the Free Staters, who collaborate with coloniser Britain. O'Casey questions these approaches through the pragmatic viewpoints of Juno and Mrs. Tancred. They emphasise the impracticality of these phantasies and aggressive impulses as they foster colonial trauma by justifying the war as a necessary and noble act to protect Ireland.

CHAPTER THREE
THE TRAUMA OF ANGLICISATION: BRIAN FRIEL'S TRANSLATIONS

3.1. THE HISTORY OF IRELAND'S LINGUISTIC ASSIMILATION

As the third chapter focuses on Brian Friel's **Translations**, which explores the distressing results of the linguistic assimilation of Ireland, this historical background part provides information about Britain's assimilation policies that were exerted on Ireland and the conflicts caused by these policies. As stated by Kevin Whelan, the Act of Union (1800), which united the Kingdom of Great Britain and the Kingdom of Ireland[1], covertly aimed to assimilate the culture of Britain's colonies by justifying the Empire's assimilative policies through the excuse of creating an inclusive and coherent Empire.[2] This process of being assimilated by the English culture, customs, and language is referred to as "*anglicisation*"[3].

Tony Crowley claims that there were two factors that encouraged the anglicisation process in Ireland after the Act of Union, which were economics and cultural hegemony:

> There were two main aspects to this process. First […] the expansion of the Anglophone state (including measures which were, ironically, intended to meet nationalist demands), meant that English became the medium for a wide variety of forms of work, social mobility, and preference […] Second, the impact of the state's economic policies meant that English became a necessity for basic survival as the growth of the cities drew

[1] Keenan, **op. cit.**, p.13.
[2] Whelan, **op. cit.**, p.18.
[3] Tony Crowley, "Language, Politics and Identity in Ireland: A Historical Overview," **Sociolinguistics in Ireland**, London, Palgrave Macmillan, 2016, p.202.

> workers away from rural Ireland (where the majority of Irish speakers were born) to lives that were almost exclusively conducted in English.[4]

As Crowley points out, the British Empire expanded its boundaries around the world through its colonies. This expansion rendered English the global language of business, communication, and economic exchange. Thus, English was associated with material benefits as well as having an economically secure life. This worldwide popularity of the language forced Irish parents to send their children to state-funded national schools, which provided education in English with little reference to Irish culture, language, or tradition.[5] It also led them to immigrate to the English-speaking countries of Britain, Canada, Australia, and America to find a job and achieve financial stability.[6]

Apart from these indirect reasons, the Empire also directly encouraged the anglicisation process through its national mapping organisation, "*the Ordnance Survey.*" As the name indicates, the Ordnance Survey was initially founded for militaristic purposes, such as scrutinising the colonised countries and preventing any potential uprisings against the British Empire. As stated by Mary Burke, it aimed to anglicise the names of Ireland's geographical locations and collect scientific data about them: "*Under the direction of Captain Thomas Larcom and Colonel Thomas Colby, the Ordnance Survey simultaneously developed into an attempt to produce an encyclopedic series of county memoirs to accompany and supplement the scientific information provided by the maps.*"[7] Burke claims that the Irish regional names were comprised of Viking, Anglo-Norman, mediaeval, Elizabethan and Jacobean variants, whose modes of spelling were too erratic to keep consistent records about the land's

[4] **Ibid.**, p.203.
[5] Tom Walsh, "The National System of Education, 1831–2000," **Essays in the History of Irish Education**, London, Palgrave Macmillan, 2016, p.16.
[6] Mohamed Salah Harzallah, "Spaces of Irishness in Nineteenth-Century America," **History Studies**, Vol.II, 2010, pp.179-180.
[7] Mary Burke, "The Irish Ordnance Survey: History, Culture and Memory," **The Canadian Journal of Irish Studies**, 2004, (Online) https://www.jstor.org/stable/25515520, 2 May 2023.

topography.[8] Additionally, many of the Irish could not write or spell their own regional names.

Due to the reasons explained above, the Ordnance Survey decided to hire Irish language scholars. The main members of this group consisted of John O'Donovan, Thomas O'Conor, and Eugene O'Curry, who worked under Captain Thomas Larcom and Colonel Thomas Colby. Their main goal was to translate Ireland's place names into English and record memoirs and scientific data about the culture, language, history, genealogy, geology, zoology, botany, socioeconomic structures, and religious practises of its counties.[9]

The process of anglicisation modernised Ireland and helped it to integrate with the Empire socially and economically. Yet, this procedure also provided the British with extensive knowledge of Ireland's topography and sociocultural structure, which allowed them to strengthen their control over the country: "*It was an act of colonial domination – mapping was a means for Britain to maintain colonial control over Ireland, making the landscape, its people and past known and quantifiable.*"[10] This increased control and scrutiny caused a backlash by the Irish nationalists, who asserted that their culture had been systematically assimilated by the British. One of the most prominent characteristics of this backlash was the desire to keep Irish culture and language alive. This desire increased the popularity of the small and informal schools named "*hedge schools*"[11], which were operated illegally and secretly from the British government.

The hedge schools provided primary education to children in various subjects. These subjects included the "*non-conforming*" faiths of Catholicism and Presbyterianism, which were forbidden to practise publicly through "*the Penal Laws*": "*Since the Penal Laws forbade Catholics and Presbyterians from participating in an*

[8] **Ibid.**, p.89.
[9] **Ibid.,** p.89.
[10] Angèle Smith, "Landscape Representation: Place and Identity in Nineteenth-Century Ordnance Survey Maps of Ireland," **Landscape, Memory and History: Anthropological Perspectives**, Ed. by. Pamela J. Stewart, Andrew Strathern, London, Pluto Press, 2003, p.71.
[11] Peter Clarke, "The Teaching of Book-Keeping in the Hedge Schools of Ireland," **Estudios Irlandeses**, No:5, 2010, p.3.

educational system acceptable to them, the development of hedge schools was an automatic and understandable response in a quest to (illegally) educate young Catholics."[12] These laws were considered by the local society as a series of legal disabilities that are imposed on Ireland's Catholic majority. As these laws forbade these faith systems to practise and teach children, the locals formed the hedge schools, whose classes were held in tiny houses and barns not to gain the attention of British authorities. According to Peter Clarke, the topics of these classes included history, religion, mercantile arithmetic and bookkeeping along with English, French, and Irish.[13]

The hedge schools aimed to secure Ireland's culture by teaching local history, culture, and language like bardic schools, which were Ireland's earliest educational establishments.[14] As stated by Tom Walsh, many parents "*paid for their children to attend Hedge Schools and other private schools*"[15] until their popularity decreased when the British government established the national school system in 1831. Walsh suggests that this system was founded to increase the Empire's presence and control in Ireland:

> It was primarily a political response to the difficulties of the British Empire in controlling its closest colony and was envisaged as a means to socialise the Irish populace and strengthen Ireland's link with the Empire. It was also a social and economic response to the widespread poverty and the quest for education evident in Ireland, with the intention that basic literacy and numeracy would improve the position of Ireland's citizens in future generations. It was also a product of the endeavours of the various religious denominations within Ireland to use schools to imbue the upcoming generations with their particular religious beliefs and ensure the survival of their faith.[16]

[12] **Ibid.**, p.3.
[13] **Ibid.**, p.5.
[14] **Ibid.**, pp.2-3.
[15] Walsh, **op. cit.**, p.13.
[16] **Ibid.**, p.8.

Through the national schools, Britain attempted to increase the social and financial contribution of Ireland to the Empire by improving the poor literacy and numeracy rates among the local citizens, which would convert them into Britain's qualified members. Another reason for the foundation of the national schools was the Empire's intent to decrease the resentment of Irish Catholics and Presbyterians, who expected the Empire to acknowledge their religious beliefs instead of ignoring them.

In order to represent each sect equally, the newly established national school system included two Roman Catholics, two Presbyterians, and two members of the Anglican Church of Ireland to the National Board of Education, the department that controlled these schools. They added the teachings of these sects to their curriculum. This offered a space of representation to the Irish community's religious beliefs. Therefore, Walsh indicates that these schools intended to prevent any potential rebellions against the Empire through the "*socialisation and assimilation*"[17] of the Irish community.

In the nineteenth century, the enmity and tension caused by the anglicisation process was further aggravated by the British government's inadequacy in dealing with "*the Great Irish Famine*"[18], the period of mass starvation and disease. It took place in Ireland from 1846 to 1852 due to a blight that rendered potatoes inedible:

> The proximate cause of the Great Irish Famine (1846-52) was the fungus phythophtera infestans (or potato blight), which reached Ireland in the fall of 1845. The fungus destroyed about one-third of that year's crop, and nearly all that of 1846. After a season's remission, it also ruined most of the 1848 harvest. These repeated attacks made the Irish famine more protracted than most […] damage on the scale wrought by the ecological shock of potato blight was utterly unprecedented.[19]

[17] **Ibid.**, p.10.
[18] Cormac Ó'Gráda, **The Great Irish Famine**, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1995, p.1.
[19] **Ibid.**, p.1.

Approximately, the daily diet of a third of Ireland's population was heavily dependent on potatoes: 4-5 kilos daily per adult male equivalent for most of the year. For this reason, the potato blight led to the death of one million people, which was the equivalent of one-eighth of Ireland's entire population.[20] These deaths stemmed from either starvation or hunger-related diseases.

The British government, which held legislative power during the period of the famine, decided to enact inadequate "*relief efforts*" to minimise the starvation as well as the decrease in agricultural activity.[21] The initial precautions were restricted to granting loans to the local communities and institutions, authorising the import of maize, and putting an embargo on the export of foodstuffs from the country. These precautions failed to decrease both the deaths of famine and the nationwide economic struggles that took place after the famine because of the declined agricultural activity in the country.

Due to the government's limited interference to the famine, starvation, deaths, and economic struggles continued for years. Lori Henderson points out that these insufficient precautions worsened the relationship between the Irish population and the British government: "*The claims of genocide by the British government were a recurring theme of the Irish nationalist response to the ineffective and limited aid received during the famine.*"[22] Henderson advocates that the Irish nationalists viewed Britain's famine-related procedures as a deliberate tactic for committing an indirect genocide. This viewpoint further boosted the hostility between the Irish Republicans and the British government until departure of the Irish Free State from the Commonwealth.

In 1949, the Irish Free State departed the Commonwealth and became a fully independent state due to the enaction of "*The Ireland Act of 1949*"[23], the law that

[20] **Ibid.**, p.13.
[21] Christine Kinealy, **This Great Calamity: The Great Irish Famine: The Irish Famine 1845-52**, w. Place, Gill & Macmillan Ltd, 2006, pp.298-299.
[22] Lori Henderson, "The Irish Famine: A Historiographical Review," **Historia**, Vol.XIV, 2005, p.134.
[23] Ronan Fanning, "The Response of the London and Belfast Governments to the Declaration of the Republic of Ireland, 1948-49," **International Affairs (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1944-)**, Vol.LVIII, No:1, 1981, Oxford, Oxford University Press, p.105.

officially ended the country's status as a British Dominion. The act also declared and recognised the constitutional position of the Irish parliament. However, this act also paved the way for outrage among the Irish Republican groups because it ensured the continuation of Ireland's partition.[24] Unless Northern Ireland demanded otherwise, the act forbade the unification of the Southern and the Northern regions of the country. For this reason, it caused further conflicts between the Irish nationalists, Britain which encouraged the country's division, and Northern Ireland which hosted a majority favouring the partition of Ireland.

Since the plays cover the consequences of Ireland's colonisation until the first half of the twentieth century, the historical background section ends at this point. In order to examine how the strained relationship between England and Ireland developed from the second half of the twentieth century onwards, **The Oxford Illustrated History of Ireland** can be read.[25] The book includes various works of Irish historians who attempt to present a comprehensive background of Ireland's colonisation and its effects on both Irish and English society and literature until the twenty-first century. The book contains a double-sided analysis that discusses the results of morally ambiguous acts and policies of both sides to convey an objective assessment of the subject. It also provides a variety of historical documents, photographs, and maps that belong to the colonisation period. Therefore, it stands out as a detailed and reliable source that could be utilised to have a greater understanding of the entire history of Ireland's colonisation.

[24] **Ireland Act 1949**, June 2, 1949, (Online) https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/Geo6/12-13-14/41/enacted#:~:text=An%20Act%20to%20recognise%20and,and%20the%20territorial%20integrity%20of, 10 July 2023.
[25] Robert Fitzroy Foster (editor), **The Oxford Illustrated History of Ireland**, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2000.

3.2. THE TRAUMATIC RESULTS OF IRELAND'S ANGLICISATION IN BRIAN FRIEL'S TRANSLATIONS

Friel's **Translations** explores the distress and tension of linguistic imperialism performed by Britain on the Irish community. Although the play was first performed in 1980, the story takes place "*in late August 1833*"[26], when Ireland was under the influence of ongoing cultural assimilation carried out by "*the Ordnance Survey*"[27], Britain's national mapping agency. This agency commenced its projects in Ireland in the first half of the nineteenth century[28], the period in which the play takes place. Yet, their activities in the country continued until the twenty-first century. As the effects of the Ordnance Survey were also still prevalent in Friel's time, his play sheds light on how this distressing anglicisation process originated and conveys the Irish people's initial reactions to it.

This organisation sent scholars and military groups to the area to collect detailed geographical information about Ireland's counties and translate these place names into English. Completed in 1846[29], the survey led to tension among the local groups, particularly among the nationalists. They advocated that their culture and language were systematically assimilated by the translation process, which replaced the Gaelic region names with their English counterparts. Thus, the procedure led to a collective trauma among these communities that wished to protect their language from the English influence. In the play, the oppressive nature of the Ordnance Survey is represented through the British Captain Lancey's military squad, who are ordered to go to the fictional Irishtown Baile Beag to translate the Gaelic names and eliminate the people who oppose their plans. Their authoritative, marginalising, and violent attitude leads to distress in the local society, who attempt to cope with their negative feelings through phantasies and aggressive impulses.

[26] O'Casey, **op. cit.**, p.10.
[27] Burke, **op. cit.**, p.89.
[28] **Ibid.**, p.89.
[29] Brian Paul Hindle, **Maps for Historians**, Phillimore, 1998, p.114.

The play begins at a hedge school in Baile Beag. Manus, the "*lame*" son of the headmaster Hugh, teaches Sarah, the mute girl, to speak. The school is run by Hugh, the nationalist figure who teaches his students Irish, Latin, and Greek, but not English. During the course, Hugh's younger son Owen returns to the town after six years away in Dublin. He enters the school to announce that he will assist Captain Lancey and Lieutenant Yolland to create a map of the land and translate the Gaelic region names into English. When the soldiers arrive, they initially pretend to be benevolent towards the local community, claiming that the project will help to modernise their country. During the process of translation, Owen befriends Yolland. A romantic relationship also develops between Yolland and Maire, Manus's fiancée who wants to leave Ireland to go to America. Yet, these seemingly amiable connections between the British soldiers and the local people are destroyed when Yolland disappears. He is presumed to be murdered by the Irish Donnelly twins as a violent retaliation for Ireland's forced linguistic transformation at the hands of the British. This murder enrages Lancey, who orders his soldiers to destroy the local community's houses and kill their animals if Yolland is not found in the next forty-eight hours. Ultimately, the play ends in a hopeless tone as the relationship between the British army and the townspeople is devastated by the disappearance of Yolland and the violent orders of Lancey.

Translations demonstrates the Ordnance Survey's translation project as a systematic assimilation, which will be scrutinised through the concept of "*anglicisation*"[30]. The term refers to the process of cultural assimilation in which non-English concepts or individuals are either influenced or dominated by English culture, customs, and language.[31] According to Anne-Marie Fortier, it often functions as an oppressive procedure that eradicates linguistic differences and standardises English to establish a single and integrated nation:

> Implicit here is a 'one-nation-one-language' discourse that undermines multilingualism as a valuable national or individual asset. The idea of one-nation-one-language is widely

[30] Crowley, **op. cit.**, p.202.
[31] **Ibid.**, pp.201-202.

> linked to the birth of the modern European nation that required the standardisation of language as a means to create the imagined national community (Anderson, 1991; Balibar, 1991; Haugen, 1966). In the process, local languages were condemned as threats to national cohesion.[32]

Fortier states that the imperial discourse justifies the linguistic assimilation of the local communities through the seemingly altruistic aim of creating a cohesive community. Yet, she adds that the process favours the coloniser by centralising their tongue as a "*world language*"[33], while it excludes the language of the other. Thus, it renders the colonised disempowered and voiceless, which further cements the imperial hierarchy: "*The colonial legacies supporting the rise of English as a 'world language' cast it as the locus of a regime of audibility that establishes a hierarchy between 'the English' and the 'anglicised.'*"[34] The process also leads the imperial authority's language to become the global instrument of business, exchanging information, and trade. This forces the marginalised societies to abandon their minority language and learn the language of their oppressor.

Due to the reasons explained above, Friel portrays anglicisation as a forceful act that offers English as the only appropriate language, while it marginalises Gaelic as an "*archaic tongue*"[35] that hinders Ireland's modernisation. Therefore, he shows how much authority and influence Britain has over the Irish, who remember their subjugated status whenever they use the translated place names: "*The act of translation, of removing Gaelic and enforcing English as the only accepted verbal commerce, not only reenacts the master/slave relationship, but brings the hierarchical relationship to mind every time the newly instituted place name is articulated.*"[36] It should also be pointed out that removing these region names means erasing the

[32] Anne-Marie Fortier, "On (not) Speaking English: Colonial Legacies in Language Requirements for British Citizenship," **Sociology**, 2018, (Online) https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038517742854, 9 December 2023.
[33] **Ibid.**, p.1254.
[34] **Ibid.**, p.1254.
[35] Friel, **op. cit.**, p.29.
[36] Collin Meissner, "Words Between Worlds: The Irish Language, the English Army, and the Violence of Translation in Brian Friel's Translations," **Colby Quarterly**, Vol.XXVIII, No:3, 1992, p.171.

country's cultural memory since there is often a historical background behind these names. As Joseph Falaky Nagy suggests, Gaelic cultural heritage roots back to Ireland's oral tradition that has transmitted local myths, tales, language, and literature for centuries.[37] Therefore, assimilating the country's language eradicates the ancient Gaelic culture, which survived through oral transmission before the increased use of written records.[38]

In the play, Friel represents the oppressive intentions of the imperial forces through Lancey, the authoritative and violent British Captain who is defined by Yolland as "*the perfect colonial servant*"[39] due to his dedication to the empire's ideals and orders. Along with his military squad, he is ordered to Baile Beag to draw the map of the land and translate the Gaelic region names into English. Like the abusive civil engineer Tom Broadbent in **John Bull's Other Island**, Lancey initially conceals his exploitative intentions by introducing himself as an altruistic master who intends to develop the town through their projects. However, Friel exposes the artificiality of his benevolent personality through his prejudiced approach towards the Irish:

> LANCEY: […] *(He clears his throat. He speaks as if he were addressing children – a shade too loudly and enunciating excessively.)* You may have seen me – seen me – working in this section – section? – working. We are here – here – in this place – you understand? – to make a map – a map – a map and –
>
> […]
>
> LANCEY: A map is a representation on paper – a picture – you understand picture? – a paper picture – showing, representing this country – yes? – showing your country in miniature – a scaled drawing on paper of – of – of –[40]

[37] Joseph Falaky Nagy, "Orality in Medieval Irish Narrative: An Overview," **Oral Tradition**, 1986, p.272.
[38] **Ibid.**, p.276.
[39] Friel, **op. cit.**, p.39.
[40] **Ibid.**, p.30.

While he is explaining their mapping project to townspeople, Lancey uses oversimplified language and a loud tone "*as if he were addressing children.*" This belittling attitude demonstrates his condescending viewpoint that labels the Irish as ignorant and unintelligent.

Lancey's condescending perspective, which considers the colonised racially and culturally inferior, fits into Ashcroft, Griffiths, and Tiffin's definition of "*othering*"[41]. The term refers to the act of marginalising the subjugated groups as benighted and uncivilised to justify colonial oppression. Similarly, Lancey employs the approach of othering by viewing the Irish as an undeveloped and illiterate community. He also shows his army as charitable and civilised masters who intend to aid them. For example, he claims that they want to gather data on the land to create a detailed map, which will allow them to collect taxes from the Irish without excessive payments: "*All former surveys of Ireland originated in forfeiture and violent transfer of property; the present survey has for its object the relief which can be afforded to the proprietors and occupiers of land from unequal taxation.*"[42] Accordingly, he justifies their plan of assimilating the Gaelic language by depicting it as a necessary and helpful act to establish an equitable system of taxation.

However, Friel undermines Lancey's tactic of portraying the military as civilised, well-educated, and benevolent masters by exposing their own ignorance and cruelty. To illustrate, when Lancey is explaining their project to the Baile Beag's community, Jimmy attempts to speak to him in Latin, which Lancey confuses with Gaelic:

> JIMMY: *Nonne Latine loquitur?*
>
> […]
>
> LANCEY: (*To* JIMMY) I do not speak Gaelic, sir.[43]

[41] Ashcroft, Griffiths, Tiffin, **op. cit.**, p.156.
[42] Friel, **op. cit.**, p.31.
[43] **Ibid.**, p.30.

Here, Lancey cannot recognise a simple Latin sentence, which suggests that his well-educated and intelligent persona is a façade.[44] Through this fake personality, he aims to assert his superiority over the allegedly foolish and illiterate townspeople. While Friel undermines Lancey's sense of superiority by exhibiting his ignorance, he also challenges his negative perception of the Irish. To show the falsity of his perception, Friel presents the highly intellectual Hugh, Jimmy, and Manus. Both Jimmy and Hugh know Latin and ancient Greek[45], and have extensive knowledge of Greek mythology.[46] Likewise, Manus, being a hedge school teacher[47], knows Latin and Greek along with English, which he often refuses to use as an Irish nationalist.[48] By delineating the Irish as well-informed individuals and revealing Lancey's lack of knowledge, Friel subverts the colonial discourse that marginalises the colonised as ignorant and praises the coloniser as cultured.[49]

Apart from this, Friel also exposes the military's violent approach when Yolland disappears. He is speculated to be killed by the Donnelly twins out of resentment at the military's assimilation policies.[50] Infuriated by the missing of Yolland, Lancey orders his soldiers to kill the townspeople's farm animals and expel them from their homes if he is not found within forty-eight hours:

---

[44] Similar to Shaw, Friel adds a humorous tone to his play by depicting Lancey's inability to identify such a recognisable and simple Latin sentence, although he presents himself as an educated and knowledgeable person. Like Shaw, who uses humour in **John Bull's Other Island** to counterbalance the emotional weight of colonial trauma, Friel employs humour to deal with the distressing nature of Britain's linguistic imperialism.
[45] **Ibid.**, pp.23-25.
[46] **Ibid.**, pp.65-67.
[47] **Ibid.**, p.11.
[48] **Ibid.**, pp.36-37.
[49] Their devotion to Latin, the official language of the Catholic Church, can also be a reference to the sectarian conflict and hierarchy between England and Ireland. As Neal Frank mentions, being a predominantly Catholic community, the Irish were historically excluded as religious outcasts by the Church of England, an established Protestant church. (1988: 66)
[50] Friel, **op. cit.**, pp.58-59.

> LANCEY: Commencing twenty-four hours from now we will shoot all livestock in Ballybeg.
>
> […]
>
> LANCEY: If that doesn't bear results, commencing forty-eight hours from now we will embark on a series of evictions and levelling of every abode in the following selected areas.[51]

Despite his charitable façade, he is willing to perform physical violence against any potential resistance. This reveals that they anglicise Gaelic for their own selfish purpose of forcefully integrating Ireland into Britain rather than facilitating its development.

In addition to the military's anglicisation project, Britain also oppresses the Irish through the national schools. As Walsh states, initiated in Ireland in 1831[52], the national school system heavily prioritised the English language over Gaelic. In national schools, children are forced to learn their culture and history from the perspective of the British Empire. This led to the establishment of what Antonio Gramsci refers to as "*cultural hegemony*"[53]. The term outlines the dominance of a society by the ruling class, which holds the power to manipulate the culture, history, and beliefs of that society: "*[It is] the 'spontaneous' consent given by the great masses of the population to the general direction imposed on social life by the dominant fundamental group; this consent is 'historically' caused by the prestige (and consequent confidence) which the dominant group enjoys because of its position and function in the world of production.*"[54] According to Gramsci, the hegemonic group abuses their power to propagate a hierarchical discourse that only centralises the group's own aims and values. It also pushes the minorities' values and ideas into the margins, labelling them as dangerous, inappropriate, or obsolete. In the play, this cultural hegemony is constructed by the British Empire, which represents the ruling

[51] **Ibid.**, pp.61.
[52] Walsh, **op. cit.**, p.7.
[53] Antonio Gramsci, **Selections from the Prison Notebooks**, Ed. by. Quentin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith, London, The Electric Book Company Ltd, 1999, p.526.
[54] **Ibid.**, p.145.

class. They utilise the national schools to assert their dominance by centralising English and manipulating the culture, language, and history of Ireland.

In the play, Friel epitomises the traumatising results of these repressive British policies through Sarah, the Irish girl who has a speech disorder:

> SARAH's *speech defect is so bad that all her life she has been considered locally to be dumb and she has accepted this: when she wishes to communicate, she grunts and makes unintelligible nasal sounds.*[55]

In this quote, Friel emphasises Sarah's voicelessness, which symbolises the colonised Irish people whose language is taken away from them. Throughout her life, she is regarded as "*dumb*" as she cannot speak even though she wishes to. This leads her to be excluded and neglected by her community which is indicated by her "*waiflike appearance*"[56]. As a result, she is traumatised by this social exclusion. Friel shows her distress through her initial anxious attitude and stuttering speech when Manus teaches her to articulate her own name.

As a traumatised and voiceless individual marginalised by her community, Sarah stands out as an analogical representation of colonised Ireland. Akin to the voiceless Sarah, the Irish are muted by Britain, which deprives them of their own language. Like Sarah, who is labelled as "*dumb*" by her society, the Irish are also degraded as foolish and ignorant by Lancey. Therefore, Friel uses her voicelessness as a symbol of Ireland's subjugation, which can be explored through Spivak's definition of "*subaltern*"[57] theory. She utilises the term to refer to the communities that are socially and politically silenced by the hegemonic discourse:

[55] Friel, **op. cit.**, p.11.
[56] **Ibid.**, p.11.
[57] Spivak, **op. cit.**, p.66.

> Fundamental to Spivak's theory is the concept of Subaltern. The 'Subaltern' is a military term which means 'of lower rank'. She borrowed this term from Italian Marxist Antonio Gramsci. In her essay 'Can the Subaltern Speak?' shows the earliest political historiography shifted the voice of the subaltern groups (women, tribal people, Third world, orient).[58]

According to Spivak, hegemony holds the power of influence over the history and culture of the subaltern, the communities who are marginalised as "*lower rank*" people due to their race, class, gender, sexuality, ethnicity, or religion. Thus, these allegedly inferior communities are not given any space to represent their own opinions and values, which pushes "*the subaltern in the terrain of margin, the silent centre, the centre of voicelessness*"[59]. In this regard, Spivak views "*voicelessness*" as a theme that signifies the subaltern societies whose culture, identity, and rights are taken away by the privileged ruling class.[60]

In alignment with Spivak's theory, Sarah's voicelessness embodies the subaltern society of Ireland, whose culture, history, and language are muted by the anglicisation project. Despite being initially anxious and timid, Sarah becomes more confident and cheerful after she first articulates her name through Manus' help.[61] This achievement of articulating her own name signifies the Irish's wish to reassert their voice and cultural identity. In this context, her newly achieved confidence and happiness symbolise the hope of recovery from the colonial trauma by retaining the cultural roots of Ireland. This hopeful tone is also reinforced by Manus before he leaves the town. According to him, there is "*nothing to stop [...] [her] now – nothing in the wide world*"[62] as long as she voices her name and where she lives. Here, her

---

[58] Praveen V. Ambesange, "Postcolonialism: Edward Said & Gayatri Spivak," **Research Journal of Recent Sciences**, Vol.V, No:8, 2016, p.48.
[59] Benedict Binebai, "Voice Construction in the Postcolonial Text: Spivakian Subaltern Theory in Nigerian Drama," **African Research Review**, October 27, 2015, (Online) https://www.ajol.info/index.php/afrrev/article/view/124636, 9 April 2023.
[60] **Ibid.**, pp.208-210.
[61] Friel, **op. cit.**, p.12.
[62] **Ibid.**, p.56.

name and nationality represent the cultural values of Ireland. According to Manus, these values need to be reasserted to heal the colonial trauma of assimilation.

Aside from this, the play also displays the characters' different reactions to the process of anglicisation by exposing their phantasies and aggressive impulses. They utilise these methods as coping strategies to suppress the trauma of their country's assimilation. For example, Manus deals with this trauma through his nationalist phantasy of maintaining the purity of the Gaelic language by excluding all English influences. When Lancey explicates the anglicisation project, he voices his disapproval to Owen, who translates Lancey's words into Gaelic:

> MANUS: There was nothing uncertain about what Lancey said: it's a bloody military operation, Owen! […] What's 'incorrect' about the place-names we have here?
>
> OWEN: Nothing at all. They are just going to be standardised.
>
> MANUS: You mean changed into English?
>
> OWEN: Where there's ambiguity, they'll be Anglicised.[63]

Manus highlights the oppressive nature of their plan by calling it a "*bloody military operation,*" through which Britain aims to assert control over the area. He also claims that they should preserve their Gaelic place names, which signifies his refusal to the inclusion of English in their culture. Unlike Manus, Owen advocates anglicisation for the sake of standardisation, which will allegedly increase the efficiency of communication between England and Ireland. Thus, he embraces a hybrid identity by adopting the English language as an Irishman. On the other hand, Manus opposes this concept of hybridisation by refusing to use the coloniser's language and developing an exclusionary attitude towards the military. Friel exemplifies his opposing behaviour

[63] **Ibid.**, p.32.

when he refuses to speak English with Yolland[64], which represents his resistance against the coloniser's forceful act of anglicising their language.

To overcome his colonial trauma, Manus clings to his nationalistic phantasy of keeping Gaelic as the dominant means of communication in Ireland. Thus, his romanticised dedication to his native language fits into the concept of "*linguistic nationalism*"[65]. It defines the aim of keeping the national language alive and protecting its purity and "*elegance*" from external linguistic influences: "*The promotion of eloquence was associated with improving the 'elegance' of the language and with embellishing it with greater ornamentation (with the first of these tasks involving the protection of the 'purity' of the language, so that it does not get 'depraved by communication with other languages with which our conquests oblige us to mix').*"[66] In line with the concept, Manus desires to protect the purity of his language from English influences by advocating that they should maintain the old Gaelic place names. His desire is also indicated when he cheerfully announces that he has been offered a job by a hedge school on Inis Meadhon Island[67], which he is willing to accept. His eagerness to work in the hedge school, the institution that aims to keep Gaelic culture and language alive, suggests his devotion to protecting his language.

However, Manus also fails to adapt to the cultural transformation of Ireland due to his nationalist phantasy of safeguarding his language's purity. In this period, English was becoming the global language of communication and commerce due to the expansion policies of Britain.[68] Therefore, as Lionel Pilkington points out, Friel portrays "*the loss of the Irish language [...] [as] a regrettable, but insuperable, necessity*"[69] to adapt to the currently globalising world. In this case, Manus' extreme

[64] **Ibid.**, pp.36-37.
[65] Alan Patten, "The Humanist Roots of Linguistic Nationalism," **History of Political Thought**, Vol.XXVII, No:2, 2006, p.223.
[66] **Ibid.**, p.261.
[67] Friel, **op. cit.**, p.46.
[68] Crowley, **op cit.**, p.203.
[69] Lionel Pilkington, "Language and Politics in Brian Friel's 'Translations,'" **Irish University Review**, Vol.XX, No:2, Edinburgh, Edinburg University Press, 1990, p.298.

nationalist ideals hinder his orientation to this transformation. This hindering nature of his phantasy is symbolised through his physical disability:

> YOLLAND: Was he [Manus] lame from birth?
>
> OWEN: An accident when he was a baby: Father fell across his cradle.[70]

In this scene, Owen explains that Manus' father Hugh accidentally fell on his cradle when he was a baby, which made him lame for his life. His lameness restricts his movement and freedom. Thus, Friel utilises his disability as an analogy to represent the limiting nature of his nationalist beliefs, which prevents him from adapting to the continuing transformation of the country. As a result of his failure to adapt, he is abandoned by his fiancée Maire[71], who is eager to embrace Ireland's hybridisation. Resented at this abandonment, Manus leaves the town.[72] Ultimately, he loses both his fiancée and hometown due to his phantasy of resisting Ireland's cultural conversion.

On a symbolic level, Hugh's act of crippling Manus also represents his restrictive control over his son, which can be read as an analogy of colonial domination. Akin to Jack Boyle in **Juno and the Paycock**, the self-centred patriarch that exploits his family and limits his daughter's aspirations, Hugh stands out as an abusive father figure who controls Manus' life and hinders his professional ambitions for his personal benefit. Considering Hugh's overall authoritative and limiting attitude towards Manus, his "*accident*" of crippling his son might also be a deliberate action to restrict his life so that he will obey his father's ideals and wishes. This also suggests Hugh's fear for his familial legacy, which symbolises the older generation's worry about the future of their culturally transforming nation. The play indicates Hugh's oppressive presence during the introduction of Manus:

---

[70] Friel, **op. cit.**, p.37.
[71] **Ibid.**, p.52.
[72] **Ibid.**, pp.54-57.

> MANUS *is in his late twenties/early thirties; the master's older son. He is pale-faced, lightly built, intense, and works as an unpaid assistant – a monitor – to his father. His clothes are shabby; and when he moves we see that he is lame.*[73]

In this section, Friel indicates that Hugh limits his son's career by exploiting him as an unpaid assistant in his hedge school in the poor and undeveloped Baile Beag. Unlike Hugh's domineering attitude, Manus remains passive and submissive towards his father. The play exemplifies his submissive attitude when he refuses to apply to the new national school, which pays 56 pounds annually, since his father has already applied for it.[74] These restrictive conditions hamper Manus's professional and social life, which traumatises him. The play implies Manus's covert trauma through his debilitated and neglected appearance. Despite being in his "*late twenties/early thirties*," he looks pale and thin, which reflects his unhealthy psychology. His "*shabby*" clothes also indicate his "*self-neglect*," a distinctive sign of depression.[75] For this reason, the distressing relationship between the domineering Hugh and the passive Manus parallels the colonial hierarchy between England and Ireland. Like Hugh, Britain exercises oppressive control over Irish society, which impedes the development and freedom of the country. On the other hand, Manus, who is limited to the impoverished Baile Beag, represents the Irish society imprisoned to a life of poverty and misery by Britain.

Aside from Manus, another instance of phantasy is also delivered by Hugh, who develops a romanticised vision of Gaelic culture and past to repress the trauma of Ireland's assimilation. Like Manus, he displays linguistic nationalism through his

---

[73] **Ibid.**, p.11.
[74] **Ibid.**, pp.20-21.
[75] Marissa C. Hansen, et. al., "Correlates of Depression in Self-Neglecting Older adults: Across-sectional Study Examining the Role of Alcohol Abuse and Pain in Increasing Vulnerability," **Journal of Elder Abuse & Neglect**, February 3, 2016, (Online) https://doi.org/10.1080/08946566.2015.1136252, 20 November 2023.

commitment to keeping the Gaelic language alive.[76] The play hints at his dedication in the scene where he declares that he has turned down the position he has been offered to run the new national school. He adds that he would accept the position only if he was "*free to run it as […] [he has] run this hedge-school for the past thirty-five years*"[77]. Therefore, his loyalty to his hedge school, which focuses on the education of the Gaelic language and history, represents his nationalist stance. This stance is also indicated by his initial reluctance to teach English to Maire.[78] He adheres to his Gaelic language against the language of the coloniser, which stands out as an act of resistance against Britain's assimilation policies.

Hugh's bond with his own culture can also be observed in his conversation with Yolland, in which he highlights the richness of the Gaelic culture and language:

> YOLLAND: I understand it's enormously rich and ornate.
>
> […]
>
> HUGH: Yes, it is a rich language, Lieutenant, full of the mythologies of fantasy and hope and self-deception – a syntax opulent with tomorrows. It is our response to mud cabins and a diet of potatoes; our only method of replying to… inevitabilities.[79]

When Yolland discusses their language, Hugh claims that it contains a deep cultural heritage that contains "*the mythologies of fantasy and hope and self-deception.*" Even though Hugh appears to be proud of his culture's richness, he also confesses that they tend to romanticise their culture and history, which he defines as a form of "*self-deception.*" As Seamus Deane suggests, their urge to glorify the Irish past stems from their need to repress their trauma of disempowerment and subjugation:

---

[76] This similarity between Hugh and Manus also implies Hugh's manipulation of his son, whom he shapes his whole life and imposes his own nationalist ideals.
[77] Friel, **op. cit.**, p.26.
[78] **Ibid.**, pp.25-26.
[79] **Ibid.**, p.42.

> Despite the bleakness of the general situation, Friel manages to make his central victims appealing even in their futility and in their frequent bouts of self-pity. He still adheres to his fascination with the human capacity for producing consoling fictions to make life more tolerable. Although he destroys these fictions he does not, with that, destroy the motives that produced them – motives which are rooted in the human being's wish for dignity as well as in his tendency to avoid reality.[80]

Deane argues that the Irish characters of Friel's plays often apply to phantasy by fabricating a glorious Irish history. This romanticised past allows them to momentarily escape from the traumatising present of Ireland's colonisation. Akin to what Deane argues, Hugh states that their language hosts many mythologies and fantasies, which are the glorified version of the Irish past. They use these stories as a source of consolation and hope for a better future. This enables them to deal with the distress caused by the colonised and impoverished state of Ireland, which Hugh embodies through the images of the "*mud cabins and a diet of potatoes*"[81].

According to Hugh, clinging to the past is their only method of coping with the "*inevitabilities,*" which refers to the inescapable colonisation of Ireland. In this case, his choice of words points out that he is under the influence of the colonial discourse. By instilling the notion that the Irish are socially inferior, this discourse makes the colonised believe that their exploitation is inevitable. Despite being a nationalist, Hugh is subconsciously affected by this notion, which causes him to submissively accept Britain's authority and power over their community.

Apart from this, the Irish's urge to idealise their history to deal with the present traumas is a suitable example of Roland Barthes's myth theory.[82] According to Barthes, the myth-making process purifies the collective memory by removing any

[80] Seamus Deane, Introduction, **Selected Plays**, by Brian Friel, London, Faber and Faber, 1984, pp.17-18.
[81] Friel, **op. cit.**, p.42.
[82] Roland Barthes, **Mythologies**, Trans. by. Annette Lavers, New York, The Noonday Press, 1991, p.128.

human complexities and errors. This glorified version of the past consolidates the communities around a shared historical narrative:

> Myth does not deny things, on the contrary, its function is to talk about them; simply, it purifies them, it makes them innocent, it gives them a natural and eternal justification, it gives them a clarity which is not that of an explanation but that of a statement of fact […] myth acts economically: it abolishes the complexity of human acts, it gives them the simplicity of essences, it does away with all dialectics, with any going back beyond what is immediately visible, it organizes a world which is without contradictions.[83]

In the quotation above, Barthes defines myth as a political tool through which certain historical events are rewritten strategically to create a collective identity. The shared identity mobilises the communities by fostering a sense of belonging. These reinforced social ties create a feeling of protection and security, which assists people to overcome their collective traumas and struggles. Peter J. Verovšek also contributes to myth theory by arguing that influential people, such as politicians, also create myths to control the societies' memories.[84] They either draw historical analogies or manipulate the past to justify morally ambiguous actions.

In the play, Friel delivers an instance of the myth-making process through Hugh's exaggerated narration of "*the 1798 rebellion*"[85], the bloody uprising against British rule in Ireland. Despite the violent nature of the rebellion, Hugh glorifies the event as a heroic act in which he and Jimmy bravely protected their homeland against the oppressor Britain:

> HUGH: […] A spring morning. 1798. Going into battle. […] Two young gallants with pikes across their shoulders and the *Aeneid* in their pockets. Everything seemed to find definition that spring – a congruence, a miraculous matching of hope and past and

[83] **Ibid.**, p.143.
[84] Peter J. Verovšek, "Collective Memory, Politics and the Influence of the Past: The Politics of Memory as a Research Paradigm," **Politics, Groups and Identities**, Vol.IV, No:3, 2016, p.529.
[85] David George Boyce, **Nineteenth-Century Ireland: The Search for Stability**, Gill & Macmillan Ltd, 1990, pp.2-3.

> present and possibility. Striding across the fresh, green land. […] We were gods that morning, James; and I had recently married *my* Goddess, Caitlin Dubh Nic Reactainn, may she rest in peace. And to leave her and my infant son in his cradle – that was heroic, too.[86]

Here, he reminisces about the uprising, in which he and Jimmy were "*two young gallants.*" He delineates it with a bright, exhilarating, and hopeful tone, which contradicts the actual brutality of the historical event. He narrates the event through positive images such as "*a spring morning*" and "*the fresh, green land*" to repress the traumatic nature of the event. Fitting to Verovšek's definition of mythologisation, Hugh also draws historical analogies between the Irish rebels and the figures from Greek mythology. Through these analogies, he endows his Irish community with Godly and heroic qualities, which eliminates the moral ambiguity of their violent rebellion. To illustrate, he addresses her deceased wife as "*my Goddess*" while he mentions leaving her and his son as a "*heroic*" act. He also compares their homeland to "*Athens*," the city that is named after the Greek Goddess Athena. Therefore, this exaggerated and optimistic narration allows him to portray the event as an uplifting mythological tale, which conceals the distressing violence of the past.

Hugh immerses himself in this optimistic and mythologised version of Irish history to escape from the present colonial oppression. The play indicates how the current state of the country traumatises him when he confesses that he yearns for the past. In the scene, he portrays their former life as peaceful and quiet, which contrasts with the violent present of Ireland:

> HUGH: […] The *desiderium nostrorum* – the need for our own. Our *pietas*, James, was for older, quieter things.[87]

[86] Friel, **op. cit.**, p.67.
[87] **Ibid.**, p.67.

At the end of his narration of the 1798 rebellion, he describes his feelings for the past through the Latin words "*desiderium nostrorum*," the severe longing for their past selves. He adds that both he and Jimmy share "*pietas*," which means faithful devotion in Latin.[88] Here, the word refers to their attachment and yearning for the older days of their homeland before the country's current cultural change.

To deal with the trauma of Ireland's forceful transformation at the hands of the British, Hugh also consumes alcohol excessively, which renders him similar to Jack Boyle, the alcoholic father in **Juno and the Paycock**. Friel indicates his alcohol addiction in his introduction:

> *(A large man, with residual dignity, shabbily dressed, carrying a stick. He has, as always, a large quantity of drink taken, but he is by no means drunk.)*[89]

In this case, Friel highlights his addiction by stating that he drinks a large quantity of alcohol frequently. Despite his efforts to maintain his "*residual dignity*," his shabby clothes and walking stick also expose his debilitated appearance, which implies his debilitated psychology. Accordingly, Hugh's aim of avoiding reality through alcohol stands out as an instance of Jouhki and Oksanen's description of "*escape theory*"[90]. In their research, Jouhki and Oksanen point out that the desire to escape from reality might stem from a failure to adapt to a forced way of life:

> Another common approach to escapism, the need to escape from everyday life, may be understood as a disengagement-based stress coping strategy, where the individual escapes from the stressor or the emotions evoked by it (Carver & Connor-Smith, 2010).

[88] As Joanna E. Ziegler states, the Italian word "*pietà*," which is the Roman Catholic image of the Virgin Mary holding the dead body of Christ on her lap or in her arms, also derives from the Latin word "*pietas*" (1995: 28-31). In the context of the play, pietà can be read as a representation of the Irish, a predominantly Catholic society. Like Christ, who suffered and died for the sins of humankind, the Irish endured sectarian-based marginalisation and oppression by the Protestant Church of England.
[89] Friel, **op. cit.**, p.23.
[90] Jouhki, Oksanen, **op. cit.**, p.202.

> The root causes of stress and the subsequent need to escape from the daily course of life can be explained by an identity mismatch with prevailing constructions of society or forced adaptation to a uniform way of life.[91]

According to Jouhki and Oksanen, individuals often feel distressed when their thoughts and feelings do not match society's current rules and structures. This drives the person to feel alienated from their community, which is referred to as "*disengagement*"[92]. They argue that people drink alcohol excessively to escape from the traumatic feeling of disengagement. Similarly, Hugh experiences disengagement as he fails to adapt to the coerced cultural alteration of Ireland. As a nationalist who wishes to preserve the Gaelic culture and language, he feels alienated due to the anglicisation process. Thus, he utilises alcohol to numb his mind, which enables him to suppress his sense of disengagement.

Despite his initial resistance against his country's transformation, Hugh eventually abandons his nationalist phantasy of conserving Gaelic culture and accepts Ireland's hybridisation process. The play signals his acceptance when he looks up the "*Name-Book*"[93], which contains the anglicised versions of Irish regional names. He emphasises the necessity of learning those new place names to adapt to the hybridisation of their language:

> HUGH: *(Indicating Name-Book)* We must learn those new names.
>
> […]
>
> HUGH: We must learn where we live. We must learn to make them our own.[94]

[91] **Ibid.**, p.202.
[92] "Disengagement," **APA Dictionary of Psychology**, (Online) https://dictionary.apa.org/disengagement, 15 February 2023.
[93] Friel, **op. cit.**, p.66.
[94] **Ibid.**, p.66.

Here, Hugh embraces the notion of cultural change by asserting that they should integrate these English words into their own language and make them a part of their own culture. His suggestion of mixing the elements of English with Gaelic to reach a hybridised tongue can be explained through the "*creolization*" theory. It emerged as a concept that defines the process by which the elements of different languages blend to create a new tongue, which is referred to as "*creole*": "*Creolization [...] refers to the linguistic restructuring in the domains of grammar, phonology, lexicon, and syntax involved in the formation of creoles.*"[95] As a form of cultural fusion, creolization usually occurs when the two foreign societies engage in long-term contact. This contact brings about a new, hybridised language that allows communication and trade between these communities. Although creolization is traditionally used to explain the cultural hybridisation in the Caribbean, it is also utilised as a general term to represent the other cultural fusions that take place around the world.[96]

In a fitting way, Hugh embraces the creolization of their language to adapt to the currently globalising world. He also emphasises the inevitability of this cultural change in his dialogue with Owen, in which he mentions the outcomes of resisting the linguistic adaptation: "*We must never cease renewing those images; because once we do, we fossilise*."[97] According to him, their culture will become forgotten and obsolete if they refuse to mix the new English place names with Gaelic, which emphasises the necessity of linguistic hybridisation.

Hugh further acknowledges the notion of hybridisation when he agrees to teach Maire English.[98] However, he also shows scepticism about whether a complete reconciliation can be achieved between the coloniser and colonised merely through the process of hybridisation. He claims that even if he teaches her English, it might not be enough for her to "*interpret between privacies*"[99] of English and Gaelic cultures.

---

[95] Charles Stewart, **Creolization: History, Ethnography, Theory**, Walnut Creek (CA), Left Coast Press, 2007, p.2.
[96] Juan Flores, **The Diaspora Strikes Back: Caribeño Tales of Learning and Turning**, New York, Routledge, 2009, pp.27-30.
[97] Friel, **op. cit.**, p.66.
[98] **Ibid.**, p.67.
[99] **Ibid.**, p.67.

According to him, there will always be untranslatable differences between these languages. These insurmountable linguistic differences represent the failure of communication and mutual understanding, which impede the possibility of a compromise between the coloniser and the colonised.

Furthermore, the play also depicts the linguistic denial of colonial trauma through Jimmy, who copes with the distress of Britain's assimilative policies by clinging to Latin and ancient Greek languages and literatures.[100] His fascination with antiquity signifies his rootedness in the past, which he utilises as a way of escaping from the new and hybridised Ireland. Both Latin and ancient Greek are obsolete tongues of dead civilisations. For this reason, Jimmy's attachment to them symbolises his failure to adapt to the linguistic transformation in his country. As a result, he feels alienated and lonely in the currently modernising Ireland, which he confesses in his conversation with Hugh:

> JIMMY: You know what I'm looking for, Hugh, don't you? […] what I'm really looking for, Hugh – what I really want – companionship, Hugh – at any time of my life, companionship, company, someone to talk to. Away up in Beann na Gaoithe – you've no idea how lonely it is.[101]

In this scene, Jimmy voices his desire to find a companion that can relate to his thoughts and feelings. Shortly after he complains about his loneliness, he falls on the floor while he is crying in anguish.[102] This mental breakdown displays how much he is traumatised because of his cultural disengagement in anglicised Ireland.

To repress his trauma of alienation, Jimmy immerses himself in his phantasies, in which "*the world of the gods and the ancient myths is as real and as immediate as everyday life in the townland of Baile Beag*"[103]. He establishes an alternate reality

[100] Friel, **op. cit.**, p.11.
[101] **Ibid.**, p.65.
[102] **Ibid.**, p.66.
[103] **Ibid.**, p.11.

where the figures of Greek mythology accompany him. These psychotic visions are exemplified when he states that he is getting married to the Greek Goddess Athena on Christmas.[104] He also claims to know Athena's mother, "*Metis from Hellespont*," and adds that he is going to meet Zeus tomorrow. He utilises these imaginary figures to compensate for his loneliness, which emphasises his inability to establish a genuine relationship with the hybridised Irish society.

Akin to Hugh, Jimmy also makes use of alcohol to intoxicate his mind, which assists him to suppress his trauma of cultural disengagement. They get drunk to the point that they barely keep their balance, which indicates their shared need to escape from their distress of alienation.[105] The parallelism between these traumatised characters is also enforced through their scruffy appearance. Like Hugh, Jimmy wears filthy and shabby clothes that he never washes.[106] Their lack of care about their appearance and alcohol abuse indicate their "*self-neglect*," one of the definitive symptoms of depression.[107] In this regard, Friel exhibits their self-neglect to demonstrate how the forceful hybridisation of Ireland deteriorates their mental health by pushing them into a cultural estrangement.

Contrary to the disengaged Manus, Hugh, and Jimmy, Owen chooses to adapt to Ireland's cultural transformation. He considers hybridisation as a way of ending the ongoing colonial oppression and trauma by constructing a cultural bridge between England and Ireland. The play delivers his supportive attitude towards hybridisation through his anglicised appearance:

> OWEN *enters.* OWEN *is the younger son, a handsome, attractive young man in his twenties. He is dressed smartly – a city man. His manner is easy and charming: everything he does is invested with consideration and enthusiasm.*[108]

[104] **Ibid.**, p.65.
[105] **Ibid.**, p.64.
[106] **Ibid.**, p.11.
[107] Hansen, et. al., **op. cit.**, pp.41-43.
[108] Friel, **op. cit.**, p.26.

After six years of partition, Owen arrives at his hometown Baile Beag since he is hired by the military to help them to translate the Gaelic place names into English. He is portrayed as an attractive, charming, and well-dressed "*city man*," which contrasts with the shabby appearance of the townspeople. As it is revealed later, he is also wealthier than the Baile Beag's community.[109] Through his appearance, behaviour, and wealth, he is initially depicted as an individual who mimics the English. Yet, the play also indicates his Irishness through his congenital roots in Baile Beag, the place where he grew up. As an Irishman who bears the cultural traits of both sides, he stands out as an instance of hybridity. Friel also represents his hybrid identity through his extensive knowledge of both English and Gaelic languages. Thus, he functions as a mediator who establishes communication between England and Ireland by translating their words. In addition to his bilingualism, the play also conveys his double-sidedness through the different variations of his name. While the local community calls him by his original name, "*Owen*," the military mistakenly refers to him as "*Roland*"[110], which emphasises his hybrid identity.

As a supporter of hybridisation, Owen also displays a subversive approach towards the nationalist phantasies of Manus and Hugh, who aim to preserve Gaelic culture from the coloniser's influence. Unlike their distanced behaviour towards the British, Owen willingly assists them in their anglicisation project. While he is translating Lancey's words, Owen paraphrases his sentences to soften his belittling and imperious language.[111] During the translation, he also strategically omits the details about the project to conceal the military's imperialistic intentions and prevent the potential backlash from townspeople, which displays his supportive approach towards the coloniser. Owen's alliance with the military angers Manus, who considers the anglicisation an act of treason.[112] Unlike him, Owen views the project as an essential step to modernise Ireland by culturally integrating the country with Britain.

[109] **Ibid.**, p.56.
[110] **Ibid.**, p.30.
[111] **Ibid.**, pp.30-31.
[112] **Ibid.**, pp.32-33.

Thus, his pragmatic stance undermines Manus' nationalist ideal of safeguarding the purity of his native language, which Friel depicts as a phantasy that is improbable to be achieved in the currently hybridising world.

Unlike Manus, who antagonises Yolland as he views him as a repressive coloniser, Owen chooses to form a friendship with him, which also challenges Manus' exclusionary nationalism. He aims to end the traumatising colonial conflict by building a cultural bridge between the opposing sides. His desire to reach a compromise is exemplified in the scene where he translates the Gaelic place names with Yolland. Here, they share a bottle of "*poteen*"[113], which represents their camaraderie. As Sinéad Sturgeon asserts, poteen is a traditional alcoholic beverage that has a deep-seated significance in Ireland's history. Thus, it is employed as a common trope in Irish literature to represent Irish culture and identity.[114] Accordingly, Owen's act of offering poteen to Yolland functions as a symbol of hospitality, and reconciliation between the coloniser and the colonised. When Manus enters their room, he refuses to drink with them.[115] Symbolically, Manus' refusal indicates his rejection to reconcile with the coloniser through mutual communication and sharing.

Despite his support and affability towards the military, Owen also possesses covert signs of colonial trauma. The effects of his hidden trauma are exhibited through his underlying sense of inferiority. Friel epitomises his feelings of inadequacy and insecurity through the scene where he hesitates to correct Lancey and Yolland while they are wrongly referring to him as Roland. His passive attitude towards the coloniser enrages the nationalist Manus:

> MANUS: […] they call you Roland! They both call you Roland!
>
> OWEN: Shhhhh. Isn't it ridiculous? They seemed to get it wrong from the very beginning – or else they can't pronounce Owen.

[113] **Ibid.**, p.34.
[114] Sinéad Sturgeon, "The Politics of Poitín: Maria Edgeworth, William Carleton, and the Battle for the Spirit of Ireland," **Irish Studies Review**, Vol.XIV, No:4, 2006, p.431.
[115] Friel, **op. cit.**, p.46.

> MANUS: Aren't you going to tell them?
>
> OWEN: Yes – yes – soon – soon.
>
> MANUS: But they...
>
> OWEN: Easy, man, easy. Owen – Roland – what the hell. It's only a name. It's the same me, isn't it?[116]

By accepting the name attached to him by the military, he accepts the cultural assimilation performed by Britain. Instead of protesting their domineering act of naming him, he submissively lets them call him by his new name. This act of submission reveals his covert feelings of dependency and inadequacy as a member of a colonised community, which can be explained through Frantz Fanon's postcolonial theory. Fanon suggests that the colonised societies often suffer from an inferiority complex since the colonial discourse debases their cultural identity by distorting their culture and history through derogatory myths and stereotypes:

> Every colonized people – in other words, every people in whose soul an inferiority complex has been created by the death and burial of its local cultural originality – finds itself face to face with the language of the civilizing nation; that is, with the culture of the mother country. The colonized is elevated above his jungle status in proportion to his adoption of the mother country's cultural standards. He becomes whiter as he renounces his blackness, his jungle.[117]

According to Fanon, colonised individuals often display an urge to renounce their own identity and adopt the coloniser's culture and behaviour because of this sense of inferiority.[118] Although Fanon focuses on the inferiority complex of black

[116] **Ibid.**, p.33.
[117] Frantz Fanon, **Black Skin, White Masks**, Trans. by. Charles Lam Markmann, London, Pluto Press, 1986, p.18.
[118] Fanon exemplifies his argument through the experience of the black communities who go to France and become "*whiter*" by imitating the coloniser's culture and language. As a result, they are treated as superior when they go back to their homeland. (1986: 24) This excessive admiration of French culture exposes their underlying sense of inferiority.

communities in his research, his theory is also employed to examine other colonised societies.[119]

As a suitable example of Fanon's theory, Owen unveils his concealed inferiority complex when he accepts his anglicised name and position, which delivers his desire to adopt the coloniser's superior identity. He also shows an urge to renounce his own Irish identity, which is conveyed through his belittling thoughts about the Gaelic language. To illustrate, when he explains his mission to Manus, he claims that his "*job is to translate the quaint, archaic tongue […] [Irish] people persist in speaking into the King's good English*"[120]. For him, Gaelic is an inferior and obsolete tool of communication that should be upgraded through anglicisation. His degrading and essentialist views of the Gaelic language demonstrate that he is affected by the hegemonic colonial discourse, which labels the culture of the colonised as subpar. While he excludes his native language, he also praises "*the King's good English*," revealing his sense of inferiority as an Irishman.

However, Owen eventually decides to deal with his trauma of inferiority by embracing his national identity. The first instance of Owen's reconciliation with his Irish roots is conveyed when he angrily corrects Yolland as he mistakenly refers to him as Roland:

> OWEN: (*Explodes*) George! For God's sake! *My name is not Roland*!
>
> YOLLAND: What?
>
> OWEN: (*softly*) My name is Owen.[121]

Through his action of voicing his original name, Owen reasserts his Irish identity. Thus, it can be read as an act of resistance through which he depraves the coloniser of

[119] Pramod K. Nayar, **Frantz Fanon**, London, Routledge, 2013, p.36.
[120] Friel, **op. cit.**, p.29.
[121] **Ibid.**, p.44.

their authority and power over him. His newly achieved desire to protect his national identity is further reinforced when Lancey behaves in a distanced and oppressive way against the townspeople after Yolland disappears. When Lancey threatens the townspeople to kill their livestock and evict them from their homes if Yolland is not found, Owen voices his disapproval of Lancey's cruel orders.[122] Yet, he was confronted with Lancey's cold and aggressive answer, which functions as a reminder of the colonial hierarchy between them:

> LANCEY: […] (LANCEY *indicates to* OWEN *to translate.* OWEN *hesitates, trying to assess the change in* LANCEY's *manner and attitude*)
>
> I'm in a hurry, O'Donnell.
>
> […]
>
> LANCEY: Do your job. Translate.[123]

When Owen seems reluctant to translate his words, Lancey changes his tone into an imperative and intimidating style, which exposes the hollowness of Lancey's friendly and helpful personality. To further assert his dominance, he also refers to Owen through his surname, "*O'Donnell*," instead of casually calling him Owen. His distanced and oppressive behaviour indicates that Owen is no different from the other Irish in the eyes of the coloniser. As Fanon argues, no matter how desperately the colonised attempt to show their competence and intelligence, the coloniser always views them as inferior due to their predetermined social status.[124] Fitting to Fanon's argument, Lancey still considers Owen a colonial servant even though he is an anglicised and knowledgeable man.

Due to Lancey's violent treatment, Owen finally realises the authoritarian and exploitative intentions beneath the coloniser's altruistic façade, which further

[122] **Ibid.**, p.61.
[123] **Ibid.**, p.61.
[124] **Ibid.**, p.29.

traumatises him. As a result, he abandons his phantasy of being acknowledged by the English by mimicking their behaviour and culture. Instead, he clings to the concept of Irishness and rejects the coloniser's orders and influences. For example, he quits his job and defines his participation in the translation project as a "*mistake*"[125]. Therefore, Owen's act of resistance represents the renunciation of his Englishness and the notion of hybridity.

Similar to Owen, Maire is also traumatised by the colonial discourse which propagates the sociocultural inferiority of the colonised. To repress her sense of inferiority, she develops a phantasy of being assimilated by the coloniser. The play manifests this phantasy through her desire to mimic the British by learning their language and abandoning her allegedly obsolete Gaelic tongue.[126] Due to her wish to imitate the coloniser, Maire stands out as another representative of Fanon's theory, which argues that the colonised often shows an urge to adopt the imperial force's culture because of their feeling of inferiority.

From a historical lens, Maire's wish of mimicking the coloniser can also be read as a pragmatic intention of seeking socioeconomic security. As she points out, the main reason why she wants to learn English is that she wants to move from impoverished Ireland to America: "*I want to be able to speak English because I'm going to America as soon as the harvest's all saved*."[127] In this regard, Maire's desire alludes to the mass immigration of Irish people, who moved to Britain, Canada, Australia, and dominantly America in the nineteenth century to achieve financial stability.[128] Due to the worldwide effects of anglicisation, many Irish people left their homeland and immigrated to these English-speaking countries to seek job opportunities. The economic and social outcomes of the Great Irish Famine, which the play depicts through the sweet smell of rotting potatoes[129], also drove the Irish people to emigrate from poor and disease-stricken Ireland. In the play, Friel represents this

[125] **Ibid.**, p.66.
[126] **Ibid.**, pp.25-26.
[127] **Ibid.**, p.26.
[128] Harzallah, **op. cit.**, pp.175-176.
[129] Friel, **op. cit.**, p.21.

theme of immigration through Maire, who wishes to leave Ireland to provide economic and social welfare to her ten younger siblings.[130] Thus, Maire's desire to immigrate signifies the unavoidable cultural change of the Irish, who adapt to the coloniser's language to escape from the traumatising socioeconomic conditions of Ireland.

Maire's desire of imitating the coloniser also pushes her to renounce her own culture and language. This renunciation occurs when she talks to Hugh about the significance of learning English:

> MAIRE: I'm talking about the Liberator [Daniel O'Connell] […] And what he said was this: 'The old language is a barrier to modern progress.' […] And he's right. I don't want Greek. I don't want Latin. I want English.[131]

In this scene, she disregards the old languages of Gaelic, Greek, and Latin as useless and outdated. She also recites the words of Dan O'Connell, who, as Meissner mentions, is a "*radical lawyer and repealist*[132] *politician*"[133]. O'Connell viewed these languages as barriers that hinder the modernisation of Ireland. Through Maire's words, which are heavily influenced by O'Connell's ideas, Friel emphasises the role of political leaders in propagating colonial discourse. This method of propagation can be elucidated through Jane M. Howell and Bruce J. Avolio's description of the "*unethical charismatics*" theory. It explicates the charismatic leaders who utilise their power and influence to manipulate people and promote their own ideals:

> Many charismatic leaders incorporate their followers' hopes, dreams, and aspirations in their vision. […] We call these leaders 'ethical charismatics.' Other charismatic leaders are interested in pursuing their own personal vision. These charismatic leaders control and manipulate their followers, promote what is best for themselves rather than their

[130] **Ibid.**, p.20.
[131] **Ibid.**, p.25.
[132] Here, the word refers to the repeal movement, which was established by Daniel O'Connell in 1830 to campaign for the cancellation of the Acts of Union of 1800 between Great Britain and Ireland.
[133] Meissner, **op. cit.**, p.168.

> organizations, and have moral standards that promote self-interests. We call these leaders 'unethical charismatics.'[134]

In the play, O'Connell is portrayed as an instance of the "*unethical charismatics*" since he uses his political power to manipulate people and spread the coloniser's assimilationist policies. As a result of this manipulation, Maire develops a desire to abandon her language and adopt English. Friel conveys her desire in the scene where she gets excited about the military's arrival. Unlike the nationalist Manus, who displays distanced and sceptical behaviour against the army, Maire heartily welcomes their presence and falls in love with Yolland.[135] After she develops romantic feelings towards Yolland, she abandons Manus due to his nationalist phantasy of preserving Gaelic culture. Symbolically, this act of forsaking Manus for the British Yolland also symbolises her desire to abandon her Irishness to become anglicised.

Like Maire, Yolland is also traumatised by the imperial discourse, which forces them to perform oppression, despite being a coloniser himself. He feels guilty for his country's abusive and violent acts. His guilt is demonstrated when he mentions his father who once wanted him to serve Britain's exploitative policies in India, one of their colonies:

> YOLLAND: […] My father was at his wits end with me and finally he got me a job with the East India Company […] Unfortunately I – I – I missed the boat. Literally. And since I couldn't face Father and hadn't enough money to hang about until the next sailing, I joined the Army. And they stuck me into the Engineers and posted me to Dublin. […] And while I was washing this morning and looking across the Tre Bhan, I was thinking how very, very lucky I am to be here and not in Bombay.[136]

---

[134] Jane M. Howell, Bruce J. Avolio, "The Ethics of Charismatic Leadership: Submission or Liberation?", **Academy of Management Executive**, May 1, 1992, (Online) https://doi.org/10.5465/ame.1992.4274395, 7 June 2023.
[135] Friel, **op. cit.**, p.52.
[136] **Ibid.**, p.39.

In this case, he conveys his reluctance for working in Bombay for the East India Company, which acted as an agent of British imperialism in India.[137] His reluctance displays his remorse for being a member of a coloniser country. For this reason, his distress of exploiting the colonised fits into the definition of "*perpetrator trauma*"[138]. The term explicates the psychological pain of the perpetrators who feel extreme guilt because of their own cruel and violent actions that harm other people. Similarly, Yolland exposes the signs of his covert trauma and remorse. This emotional pain also pushes him to renounce his identity as a coloniser, which is indicated through his wish of settling down in Ireland with Maire so that he will never return to his imperialist country.[139]

Additionally, both Maire and Yolland demonstrate a phantasy to transcend the oppressive colonial hierarchy through communication and love. The play represents this desire through their dialogue that transgresses linguistic barriers. Even though they do not understand each other's language, they manage to get intimate by articulating the place names of Ireland:

> YOLLAND: Bun na hAbhann? (*He says the name softly, almost privately, very tentatively, as if he were searching for a sound she might respond to. He tries again.*) Druim Dubh?
>
> (MAIRE *stops. She is listening.* YOLLAND *is encouraged.*)
>
> Poll na gCaorach. Lis Maol.
>
> (MAIRE *turns towards him.*)
>
> Lis na nGall.
>
> MAIRE: Lis na nGradh.
>
> (*They are now facing each other and begin moving – almost imperceptibly – towards one another.*) [140]

[137] John R. Ward, "The Industrial Revolution and British Imperialism, 1750-1850," **Economic History Review**, Vol.XLVII, No:1, 1994, p.44.
[138] Mohamed, **op. cit.**, p.1157.
[139] Friel, **op. cit.**, p.52.
[140] **Ibid.**, p.51.

In this case, they get close to each other while they are voicing the place names, which substitutes for sexual intercourse. Friel reinforces this sexual tension by delineating their "*trembling*"[141] bodies and the music that reaches a "*crescendo*"[142] at the end of the scene, symbolising their sexual climax. This transgressive intimacy delivers the hope for reconciliation between the coloniser and the colonised.

The transcending relationship of Maire and Yolland develops during the dance event[143], an ecstatic setting that allows them to temporarily forget the colonial hierarchy between them. Thus, the setting of the dance event can be examined through Neil Ravenscroft and Paul Gilchrist's definition of "*spaces of transgression*"[144]. According to Ravenscroft and Gilchrist, the organised events of celebration and entertainment offer liminal spaces in which the participants can undermine the hierarchical social borders and identities for a brief period:

> What lies at the core of carnival is the knowing temporary inversion of the social order as a means of allowing ordinary people to feel that they have some freedoms and that they are valued members of the community: that when it comes to the celebration of the saints, or the end of harvest, they have licence to enjoy themselves in ways that would be inappropriate and disrespectful at other times. Through this licence they can explore different persona and different relationships to others, safe in the knowledge that this is a legitimate short-term activity after which 'normal' relations will be resumed.[145]

In their research, they elaborate on Mikhail Bakhtin's "*carnival*"[146] theory, which refers to the festivals, rituals, and other collective events that provide an environment

---

[141] **Ibid.**, p.52.
[142] **Ibid.**, p.53.
[143] **Ibid.**, p.49.
[144] Neil Ravenscroft, Paul Gilchrist, "Spaces of Transgression: Governance, Discipline and Reworking the Carnivalesque," **Leisure Studies**, January 21, 2009, (Online) https://doi.org/10.1080/02614360802127243, 17 July 2023.
[145] **Ibid.**, p.40.
[146] Mikhail Bakhtin, **Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics**, Ed. by. Caryl Emerson, London, Minnesota University Press, 1999, p.124.

of controlled chaos and freedom. This chaotic setting allows people to temporarily subvert the social orders and explore different relationships, which would be considered dangerous or inappropriate in daily life. In the play, the carnivalesque space of the dance event enables the colonised Maire and the coloniser Yolland to transgress the hierarchical borders. In this setting, they become equal as lovers, which would be deemed inappropriate by the colonial discourse. Therefore, this liberating setting gives them an opportunity to temporarily fulfil their phantasy of reconciliation without any dangerous or unpleasant real-life consequences.

Even though Maire and Yolland's relationship initially provides hints of hope about transcending the traumatising colonial dynamics, it ultimately fails to offer a permanent solution due to linguistic barriers. They do not know each other's language, which leads to miscommunication between these lovers:

> YOLLAND: I would tell you how I want to be here – to live here – always – with you – always, always.
>
> […]
>
> MAIRE: I want to live with you – anywhere – anywhere at all – always – always.
>
> […]
>
> MAIRE: Take me away with you, George.[147]

In a desperate attempt to communicate, Yolland speaks in English, whereas Maire speaks in Irish. While Yolland wants to stay in Ireland with Maire, she wants him to take her away from Ireland. However, they fail to understand each other's thoughts and feelings due to the language obstacle. Although their feelings seem genuine, they fail to build a bridge between the coloniser and the colonised because of their fundamental cultural and linguistic differences. Thus, their inability to understand each other serves as an analogy which represents the failure of communication between

[147] Friel, **op. cit.**, p.52.

England and Ireland. This failure is reinforced when their relationship ends tragically due to the supposed murder of Yolland. This tragic and violent end of their love indicates that the reconciliation between England and Ireland is a phantasy unlikely to be fulfilled due to their deep-seated hatred and lack of communication.

In addition to phantasies, the traumatised townspeople also employ aggressive impulses as a reaction against the coloniser's repressive orders and policies. Friel delineates these urges under the two categories of physical and verbal aggression. The first hint of physical aggression is delivered when Manus asks why the Donnelly twins have stopped coming to the hedge school.[148] While Doalty nervously attempts to dodge his question, Bridget blurts out about two of the soldiers' horses that were found last night, indicating that they might be stolen by the twins:

> BRIDGET: Our Seamus says two of the soldiers' horses were found last night at the foot of the cliffs at Machaire Buide and …
>
> (*She stops suddenly and begins writing with chalk on her slate.*)
>
> D'you hear the whistles of this aul slate? Sure nobody could write on an aul slippery thing like that.[149]

Realising that her confession might put herself in danger, Bridget suddenly decides to change the subject. Her anxious and suspicious behaviour reinforces the possibility that the twins had stolen these horses. Shortly after, Hugh also tells his student that he was speaking to Lancey, who informs him that some of their equipment is missing along with their two horses.[150] These acts of thievery heavily imply that the local people attempt to sabotage the military's projects, which reveals their underlying aggression and hatred against the imperial forces.

[148] **Ibid.**, pp.19-20.
[149] **Ibid.**, p.20.
[150] **Ibid.**, p.24.

The underlying tension between the coloniser and the colonised reaches its climax when Yolland is declared missing. His alleged murder at the hands of the Donnelly twins functions as another instance of physical aggression.[151] Nevertheless, their aggressive method provokes Lancey to execute oppressive procedures against the townspeople.[152] Thus, their act irreparably damages the relationship between the opposing sides and fuels colonial violence. The doom of the relationship between England and Ireland is indicated when townspeople realise that Lancey's camp is on fire.[153] Here, Bridget confuses the odour of Lancey's burning camp with the sweet smell of potatoes, which is a reference to the destructive event of the Great Irish Famine:

> BRIDGET: […] The sweet smell! Smell it! It's the sweet smell! Jesus, it's the potato blight!
>
> DOALTY: It's the army tents burning, Bridget.
>
> BRIDGET: Is it? Are you sure? […] God, I thought we were destroyed altogether.[154]

As indicated by Bridget's statement, these two smells become indistinguishable from each other. Friel intermingles these ominous smells of destruction and death to symbolise the devastating consequences of the twins' aggressive resistance, which eradicates the hope of reconciliation.

To represent the verbal aggression, Friel delivers Hugh's marginalising words towards the coloniser. As narrated by Bridget and Doalty, while the military was searching for the missing Yolland, Hugh stood out and called them through the derogatory words of "*Visigoths*," "*Huns*," and "*Vandals*"[155] due to their aggressive approach. To moralise his hatred against the coloniser, he labels them as barbaric and

[151] **Ibid.**, pp.58-59.
[152] **Ibid.**, pp.61-62.
[153] **Ibid.**, p.63.
[154] **Ibid.**, p.63.
[155] **Ibid.**, p.58.

wicked, which can be examined through Roger Giner-Sorolla, Bernhard Leidner, and Emanuele Castano's "*the positive moralization of violence*"[156]. It defines the act of marginalising the opposing side to reduce the moral concern of exerting aggression, prejudice, and violence against them.[157] One of the distinctive methods of moralising aggression and violence is "*demonization*":

> In demonization, victims are removed from moral consideration by painting them as [...] malefactors, deserving punishment and death. […] We believe that demonization goes beyond simple denial of humanity to an inferior group. If people are seen as non-human, they may freely be destroyed if they block a group's material interests – as in colonialism. They may be contemptuously excluded from participation in society. But there is no mandate to risk life and limb and spend precious resources just to seek out and destroy mere non-humans. Only painting the enemy as malignant and incapable of reform can justify mounting a crusade against them, even at great expense and with few material benefits.[158]

Demonization portrays the subject as irredeemably evil and threatening entities which lack any positive qualities. This method encourages aggression against these outgroups even if it might lead to destructive outcomes for both sides. Fittingly, Hugh demonises the military as a merciless, savage, and wicked group that is incapable of showing compassion. By employing demonization, he depicts aggression and hatred as necessary traits to protect Ireland, his own ingroup, from them.

Friel conveys another instance of verbal aggression when Hugh articulates his prejudice against the coloniser's culture. To illustrate, he degrades the English language by labelling it as a "*plebeian*"[159] tongue that lacks the richness of the Gaelic language. However, the play also demonstrates the hollowness of his prejudice by

---

[156] Roger Giner-Sorolla, Bernhard Leidner, Emanuele Castano, "Dehumanization, Demonization, and Morality Shifting: Paths to Moral Certainty in Extremist Violence," **Extremism and the Psychology of Uncertainty**, Ed. by. Michael A. Hogg, and Danielle L. Blaylock, w. Place, Blackwell, 2012, p.5.
[157] **Ibid.**, p.5.
[158] **Ibid.**, pp.9-10.
[159] Friel, **op. cit.**, p.41.

revealing his lack of knowledge about their literature. His lack of knowledge is shown when Yolland mentions William Wordsworth, the English poet:

> HUGH: Wordsworth? … no. I'm afraid we're not familiar with your literature, Lieutenant. […] We tend to overlook your island.[160]

Although he disparages English by labelling it as a crude and primal language, he confesses that he is not familiar with both Wordsworth and their literature. His ignorance exposes the biased nature of his opinions, which are influenced by his underlying enmity against the coloniser. Yet, Hugh's choice of overlooking the English culture and literature can also be read as an act of resistance against the British. As a response to the imperial forces that ignore and belittle the Gaelic culture and language, he disregards their tongue and literature, which stands out as a non-violent opposition against colonial oppression.

The play also points out the aggression and prejudice between the coloniser and the colonised through the scene where Jimmy warns Maire of the outcomes of marrying someone outside the "*tribe*":

> JIMMY: Do you know the Greek word *endogamein*? It means to marry within the tribe. And the word *exogamein* means to marry outside the tribe. And you don't cross those borders casually – both sides get very angry.[161]

In this case, Jimmy utilises the Greek words "*endogamein*" and "*exogamein*" to explain the ingroup and outgroup dynamics. These dynamics are used to preserve the cohesion of their community by creating a sense of belonging while they marginalise

[160] **Ibid.**, p.41.
[161] **Ibid.**, p.68.

the opposing side. Thus, Jimmy asserts that marrying outside of one's ingroup creates anger and violence due to prejudice against the outgroup. His statement alludes to the bigotry and hatred between England and Ireland that ends the relationship between Maire and Yolland, whose love symbolises the hope of healing the colonial trauma.

Ultimately, **Translations** reflects the historical event of Ireland's anglicisation at the hands of the British as an oppressive process that erases the culture, history, and language of the country. The play conveys this forced transformation's traumatising results through the reactions of the Baile Beag's community. They intend to cope with their trauma by either resisting or accepting the coloniser's influence over them. While Manus and Hugh establish a nationalist phantasy of preserving the Gaelic language from English influences, Jimmy clings to his fictitious reality where the dead languages and mythologies of Greek and Latin are alive. Unlike their approach of resisting cultural change, Owen and Maire embrace Ireland's hybridisation. They adapt to the process by mimicking the coloniser while disregarding their own language, which they label as obsolete and primal. Friel also delivers the traumatic effects of the military's translation plans through the characters that discharge their distress in the form of aggressive impulses. These figures employ either physical violence by stealing the military's equipment and killing their members or verbal aggression by voicing bigoted and hateful comments about the coloniser. However, this aggressive approach forces the military to execute violent and subjugating actions to suppress their opposition, which fuels the animosity between these communities and deepens the colonial trauma.

CONCLUSION

Between the sixteenth and twentieth centuries, the British Empire expanded its boundaries dramatically owing to its brutal and oppressive colonial policies.[1] In their colonies, the empire exploited the labour force and natural sources, exerted religious suppression, assimilated the local culture and language, and employed violence to eradicate opposing groups. As suggested by Lloyd, this systematic oppression and violence inflicted long-lasting personal and collective trauma on the colonised communities:

> Trauma entails violent intrusion and a sense of utter objectification that annihilates the person as subject or agent. This is no less apt as a description of the effects and mechanisms of colonization: the overwhelming technological, military and economic power of the colonizer, the violence and programmatically excessive atrocities committed in the course of putting down resistance to intrusion, the deliberate destruction of the symbolic and practical resources of whole populations. It would seem that we can map the psychological effects of trauma on to the cultures that undergo colonization. By the same token, the after-effects of colonization for a culture could be held to be identical with those for the traumatized individual.[2]

Lloyd adds that this deliberate destruction of the symbolic and practical resources of the colonised drives them to display two essentially opposite reactions: Acceptance or resistance against the coloniser's authority and influence. Fitting to Lloyd's argument, these three Irish plays portray these two contrary reactions to colonial trauma and show the devastating outcomes of these approaches. They take place in Ireland, Britain's first colony.[3] To delineate the debilitating psychological results of colonial violence, they convey the varied reactions of the local communities. They bear either a covert sense of inferiority due to their marginalised identity or hatred against their colonisers.

[1] Kenny (editor), **op. cit.**, p.4.
[2] Lloyd, **op. cit.**, p.214.
[3] Kenny, **op. cit.**, p.1.

They unconsciously expose their trauma in indirect ways, which fits into Freud's theory, the "*return of the repressed*"[4]. Defining the process in which the repressed emotions reappear in secondary or less recognizable ways, the theory is classified under two categories: "*Phantasy*" and "*aggressive impulses*"[5]. Phantasy defines the individual's urge to fabricate a fictitious reality to fulfil their repressed desires artificially. Aggressive impulses, on the other hand, refers to the act of discharging suppressed emotions through violence.

Shaw's **John Bull's Other Island** is one of the plays that conveys colonial oppression through Tom Broadbent, the British civil engineer who represents the coloniser's domineering control over Ireland. Similar to Lancey in **Translations**, the authoritarian and violent British Captain who pretends to be a helpful colonial master, Broadbent introduces himself as an altruistic person who wants to develop Rosscullen, the Irishtown. Yet, he is revealed to be a greedy opportunist who aims to make a financial and political profit over the town through the excuse of modernising it.[6] His exploitative control over the town traumatises the local community. They deal with the distress of their land's exploitation by escaping from reality through their phantasies that are unlikely to be fulfilled. Nora Reilly, the Irish heiress, copes with the colonial trauma through her phantasy of marrying the Irishman Larry Doyle, although her love remains unrequited.[7] This phantasy provides her strength to disrupt the exploitative plans of Broadbent, who wants to marry her to abuse her prestigious title and achieve political power.

Nora's exploitation as a woman and a colonised subject represents the double subjugation of women in colonised societies, which Spivak describes as "*double displacement*"[8]. Her doubly marginalised position forces her to obey Broadbent, who represents both colonial and patriarchal oppression. Correspondingly, O'Casey's **Juno and the Paycock** depicts Mary Boyle as another victim of double displacement. She

[4] Boag, **op. cit.**, p.75.
[5] **Ibid.**, pp.76-77.
[6] Shaw, **op. cit.**, p.110.
[7] **Ibid.**, p.95.
[8] Spivak, **op. cit.**, p.90.

is traumatised by the harsh conditions of war-torn slums, which she copes with by clinging to books and literature. Yet, her father criticises her interest in books and self-development.[9] Thus, she is socially restricted by both the colonial conflict and patriarchy, which is represented by her father's hostility towards her desire to develop herself. To escape from this social entrapment, she fantasises about marrying the intellectual schoolteacher, Charles Bentham. After Bentham leaves her pregnant, she is labelled by the male characters as a fallen woman, which also suggests her marginalised position as a woman.[10] The only figure that helps Mary is her mother Juno, another colonised woman whose doubly displaced position allows her to empathise with Mary's distressing condition.[11]

Akin to Boyle, Hugh in **Translations** is represented as a dysfunctional father figure. He exploits his son by using him as an unpaid assistant in his school, which limits his career and social freedom.[12] For this reason, Hugh's domineering control over his passive son stands out as an analogy that conveys Britain's oppressive influence on the disempowered Ireland.

Furthermore, the characters also fantasise about transcending their social inferiority by imitating the coloniser's mindset, appearance, and mannerisms.[13] Thus, their urge to imitate the coloniser is an instance of Bhabha's theory of "*mimicry*"[14]. According to Bhabha, the colonised intends to imitate the coloniser to establish a "*reformed, recognizable 'Other', as a subject of difference that is almost the same, but not quite*"[15]. Shaw displays mimicry through Doyle, who imitates the British through his appearance and mindset.[16] On the other hand, Tim Haffigan, the Scottish man, pretends to be a stereotypical Irish person to please Broadbent, who provides him with food in return.[17] He makes a profit over the marginalised identity of the colonised,

[9] O'Casey, **op. cit.**, p.20-21.
[10] **Ibid.**, p.66.
[11] **Ibid.**, p.71.
[12] Friel, **op. cit.**, p.11.
[13] Shaw, **op. cit.**, p.11.
[14] Bhabha, **op. cit.**, p.86.
[15] **Ibid.**, p.86.
[16] Shaw, **op. cit.**, p.11.
[17] **Ibid.**, p.14.

which fits into Huggan's theory, "*the commodification of a glamorised cultural difference*"[18].

Similarly, **Translations** conveys mimicry through Owen and Maire. While Owen adopts the coloniser's appearance, language, and assimilationist policies, Maire shows her desire to imitate by wanting to learn English. Their phantasy of redefining themselves through the coloniser's identity roots back to their "*inferiority complex*"[19]. This complex is created by the coloniser's manipulative discourse. As Fanon argues, colonial discourse distorts the past of the colonised to propagate their sociocultural inferiority:

> Perhaps we have not sufficiently demonstrated that colonialism is not simply content to impose its rule upon the present and the future of a dominated country. Colonialism is not satisfied merely with holding a people in its grip and emptying the native's brain of all form and content. By a kind of perverted logic, it turns to the past of the oppressed people, and distorts, disfigures, and destroys it.[20]

In line with Fanon's argument, Owen and Maire display an inferiority complex by renouncing their socially inferior Gaelic culture. This renunciation displays how they are manipulated by colonial discourse.

As for phantasy, the plays also present the nationalist figures who daydream about a powerful and independent Ireland that is free from British control and subjugation. **John Bull's Other Island** delivers this phantasy through Father Keegan. He copes with the colonial trauma by fantasising about a peaceful and theocratic world state free from the coloniser's control and oppression.[21]

---

[18] Huggan, **op. cit.**, p.110.
[19] Fanon, **op. cit.**, p.18.
[20] Frantz Fanon, **The Wretched of the Earth**, Trans. by. Constance Farrington, New York, Grove Press, 1963, p.210.
[21] Shaw, **op. cit.**, p.116.

In **Juno and the Paycock**, O'Casey presents the characters' phantasies in the contexts of the Irish Civil War and the Easter Rising, two of the most violent conflicts in Irish history. Set in the Dublin slums during the Civil War, it delivers the psychological effects of war-torn and impoverished Ireland through the Boyle family. They deal with these traumatic conditions through their phantasies. Jack, the nationalist patriarch of the family, utilises the method of phantasy as a tool of self-delusion. Akin to Father Keegan, he escapes from the traumatising reality of colonialism by fantasising about a free and powerful Ireland.[22] He also reimagines his entire past as a valiant sea captain who successfully served this independent state of Ireland.[23] He glorifies himself and his country to repress both his personal trauma as a poor slum dweller and his colonial trauma as an Irishman.

Boyle also attempts to cope with these traumas through his recently earned money. He ornaments his house with gaudy furniture that shows his elevated social status and wealth.[24] Through this method, he represses his trauma of being a colonised and impoverished slum dweller by isolating himself from his war-torn community. Therefore, Boyle's act of using money to overcome his distress is an instance of what Rucker and Galinsky define as "*compensatory consumption*"[25]. It refers to the process in which the individual compensates for their underlying senses of inadequacy and powerlessness by buying products that signal wealth and power. Traumatised by these senses of inadequacy and powerlessness as a colonised slum resident, Boyle uses his material possessions to suppress these distressing feelings. He also pretends to be a member of the aristocracy to escape from his socially inferior identity.[26] Yet, the play exposes the hollowness of his aristocratic façade, which renders his endeavour a futile escape phantasy.

Boyle also consumes alcohol to numb his mind, which aids him to escape from both his personal and colonial trauma.[27] This act of avoiding real-life struggles through

[22] O'Casey, **op. cit.**, p.72.
[23] **Ibid.**, p.14.
[24] **Ibid.**, p.31.
[25] Rucker, Galinsky, **op. cit.**, p.257.
[26] O'Casey, **op. cit.**, p.31.
[27] **Ibid.**, p.72.

alcohol is read through Jouhki and Oksanen's "*escape theory*"[28], which explains the traumatised individual's propensity for using addictive substances to subdue their distressing thoughts and feelings. Similar to Boyle, Hugh and Jimmy in **Translations** are addicted to alcohol as it assists them to immerse themselves in their nationalist phantasies. Like Boyle, they also cling to a glorified version of the Irish past.[29] They immerse themselves in this fantasy version of history to escape from the current cultural assimilation of Ireland under British influence.

Aside from this, O'Casey also portrays Johnny, another seemingly nationalist figure who copes with the trauma of his war injuries by justifying them as heroic sacrifices.[30] He is also traumatised by the fact that he causes his comrade Tancred's execution by exposing information about him.[31] Therefore, his distress is an example of "*perpetrator trauma*"[32], a traumatic stress disorder which occurs when the individual causes an act of killing or similar horrific violence. Overwhelmed by the trauma of participating in his comrade's murder, he represses his distress through religious practises.[33] He considers these practises as a tool for cleansing himself of his sin, namely his act of betraying Tancred.

On the other hand, his sister Mary adopts the socialist ideals of solidarity and equality to overcome the harsh realities of slums. She protests the exploitative treatment of the employees against the working-class[34], which is a reference to the historical event, "*The Great Labour Unrest*"[35]. This exploitative dynamic serves as an analogy that represents the oppressive hierarchy between the coloniser and the colonised. Yet, the play also challenges the nationalist and socialist principles through their mother, Juno. She claims that both Johnny and Mary use these ideologies as

[28] Jouhki, Oksanen, **op. cit.**, p.202.
[29] Friel, **op. cit.**, p.67.
[30] O'Casey, **op. cit.**, p.27.
[31] **Ibid.**, p.69.
[32] Mohamed, **op. cit**., p.1157.
[33] O'Casey, **op. cit.**, p.9.
[34] **Ibid.**, pp.7-8.
[35] Béliard, **op. cit.**, p.1.

escape phantasies to isolate themselves from the hardships of life, which aggravates their traumas rather than healing them.

As for aggressive impulses, these plays present Irish figures who apply verbal and physical violence against the coloniser to cope with their trauma. **John Bull's Other Island** portrays verbal violence through Matthew Haffigan and Father Dempsey, who demonstrate verbal aggression in the form of bigotry. They voice their prejudiced views against the coloniser and anyone who supports the mutual communication between Ireland and England, calling them traitors.[36] They advocate that their country should cut out its communication with Britain. However, the play challenges their extreme nationalism through Doyle's internationalist viewpoint, which defines their ideals as impractical and unrealistic in the currently globalising world.

To delineate physical violence, Shaw presents Andy Haffigan, the farmer who is exploited by his landlord. Traumatised by this oppressive treatment, he misdirects his anger by attacking Byrne, another farmer who was offered to occupy the land as Haffigan is unable to pay the excessive rent prices.[37] Accordingly, his misdirected aggression parallels Baumeister and Vohs's description of "*displaced aggression*"[38], which refers to the act of coping with trauma by channelling aggression from the dangerous original source of distress to another less risky target. Since his landlord is affiliated with the dangerous and powerful English aristocracy[39], Andy avoids showing aggression against him, although he is the original source of his trauma. Instead, he redirects his anger to Byrne, who stands out as a less risky target because of his lower social position as a farmer. However, the play conveys the ineffectiveness of aggression in dealing with trauma by displaying the social exclusion of Haffigan, whose violent assault rendered him a criminal.[40]

[36] Shaw, **op. cit.**, p.66.
[37] **Ibid.**, p.55.
[38] **Ibid.**, pp.20-21.
[39] Marx, Engels, **op. cit.**, pp.69-70.
[40] Shaw, **op. cit.**, p.55.

In **Juno and the Paycock**, O'Casey portrays aggressive impulses through the physical violence of war, which traumatises Ireland's younger generations and their families. It represents this war-related trauma through the casualties of Johnny and Robbie Tancred. Johnny, crippled and traumatised by his war injuries, is dependent on his family. The play uses his dependent and incapacitated status as an analogy that epitomises the colonised and disempowered Ireland. In addition, the play also delivers his execution as another instance of aggressive impulses. Murdered by the Irregulars as a punishment for his betrayal against the republicans, his death signifies the doom of Ireland's youth.[41] The play also demonstrates the debilitating outcomes of this colonial aggression through the reactions of Juno and Mary, who are traumatised by Johnny's death.[42] Similarly, Tancred is also killed by the imperial groups, which inflicts psychological pain on his mother, Mrs. Tancred.[43] Due to their shared trauma of loss, Juno develops compassion towards Mrs. Tancred, whom she previously condemns because of her support to the Die-hards.[44]

In this case, the shared experience of Juno and Mrs. Tancred functions as what Bastian, Jetten, and Ferris refer to as a "*social glue*"[45], a collective traumatic event which unifies the communities. The play also gives another instance of the social glue theory through the Easter Rising. As a bloody conflict that ended up in the failure of Irish republicans, the uprising is a tragic event in Irish history. Yet, the brutal deaths of the event also unified the Irish under the shared cause of independence and social change.[46] Accordingly, this traumatising experience can be interpreted as a social glue which gathered the Irish around their common desires.

Similarly, **Translations** also portrays aggressive impulses through the physical tension and violence between the local community and the British soldiers. One of the instances of this physical violence is delivered by the Donnelly twins, who are

[41] **Ibid.**, p.70.
[42] O'Casey, **op. cit.**, p.70.
[43] **Ibid.**, pp.45-46.
[44] **Ibid.**, p.47.
[45] Bastian, Jetten, Ferris, **op. cit.**, p.2084.
[46] Finnegan, McCarron, **op. cit.**, pp.53-54.

presumed to sabotage the soldier's activities by stealing their equipment and horses.[47] The play also heavily implies that they murder Yolland as a reaction to the coloniser's oppressive policies.[48] However, it also exposes the impracticality of these aggressive acts in coping with the colonial trauma by showing their destructive outcomes on both the local community and the army. These methods encourage colonial trauma by forcing the imperial power to take more oppressive measures to suppress their violent opposition, which eliminates the hope of reconciliation between the opposing sides. The play symbolises this destruction of hope through the ominous smells of the army's burning camp and the rotten potatoes.[49] Fitting to the theme of destruction, the smell of rotten potatoes serves as a reference to "*the Great Irish Famine*"[50], one of the most devastating events in Irish history.

Additionally, **Translations** also depicts aggressive impulses through bigotry and verbal violence that the local community displays as a reaction against the British military's assimilationist and oppressive policies. The play exemplifies verbal violence through the nationalist Hugh, who uses the marginalising labels of "*Visigoths*," "*Huns*," and "*Vandals*"[51] to address the soldiers. To justify his enmity, he portrays them as destructive and evil entities. Thus, his behaviour fits into Giner-Sorolla, Leidner, and Castano's definition of "*demonization*"[52], the method of portraying the enemy as wicked and dangerous others to moralise aggression and hatred against them. Furthermore, Hugh also exercises verbal aggression towards the coloniser by articulating his bigoted views about their culture and language. While he belittles the English language as being "*plebeian*"[53], he emphasises the richness of the Gaelic language. He refuses the coloniser's linguistic influence to cope with his underlying trauma, which stems from the anglicisation of Ireland.

[47] Friel, **op. cit.**, p.24.
[48] **Ibid.**, pp.58-59.
[49] **Ibid.**, p.63.
[50] Ó Gráda, **op. cit.**, p.1.
[51] Friel, **op. cit.**, p.58.
[52] Giner-Sorolla, Leidner, Castano, **op. cit.**, pp.9-10.
[53] Friel, **op. cit.**, p.41.

For each playwright, the colonial trauma continues to haunt Irish society as long as they insist on repressing it through phantasies and aggressive impulses. In these plays, repression of trauma is portrayed as a harmful method which prevents the individual's psychological healing by burying their distressing emotions untreated, as Freud argues:

> In 1893 a new construct was introduced in psychology: repression. As far as psychology was concerned, the term 'construct' still resided in the collective preconscious. Freud did not call it so but he described the phenomenon and how he thought this mechanism would work. 'The basis for repression itself can only be a feeling of unpleasure, the incompatibility between the single idea that is to be repressed and the dominant mass of ideas constituting the ego. The repressed idea takes its revenge however by becoming pathogenic.'[54]

In accordance with Freud's theory, the plays present suppressed trauma as a "*pathogenic*" phenomenon which often results in violent or harmful behaviour. These violent reactions of traumatised Irish characters increase the tension and hatred between Britain and Ireland. The plays portray the relationship between these opposing sides in a hopeless tone and without reconciliation. Thus, they indicate that the healing of trauma is impossible if the Irish and the British continue to deal with their anger, resentment, and distress through delusional phantasies and destructive aggression.

[54] Uwe Hentschel, Wolfram Ehlers, Rainer Peter, "The Measurement of Defense Mechanisms by Self-Report Questionnaires," **The Concept of Defense Mechanisms in Contemporary Psychology: Theoretical, Research, and Clinical Perspectives**, 1993, New York, Springer, p.53.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Akhtar, Salman: **Comprehensive Dictionary of Psychoanalysis**, New York, Karnac Books Ltd, 2009.

Allen, Kieran: "Catholicism and the Irish State-Time to Separate," **Irish Marxist Review**, 2017, (Online) https://marxists.architexturez.net/history/etol/newspape/irishmr/vol06/no18/allen.pdf, 17 June 2023.

Ambesange, Praveen V.: "Postcolonialism: Edward Said & Gayatri Spivak," **Research Journal of Recent Sciences**, Vol.V, No:8, 2016, pp.47-50.

American Psychiatric Association: **Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders**, 2013, (Online) https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.books.9780890425596, 16 January 2023.

"Apathy Syndrome," **APA Dictionary of Psychology**, (Online) https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1992-06104-001, 8 April 2023.

Arciniegas, David B.: "Psychosis," **Continuum: Lifelong Learning in Neurology**, Vol.XXI, No:3, 2015, pp.715-736.

Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths, Helen Tiffin: **Post-Colonial Studies: The Key Concepts**, London, Routledge, 2007.

Bakhtin, Mikhail: **Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics**, Ed. by. Caryl Emerson, London, Minnesota University Press, 1999.

Barthes, Roland: **Mythologies**, Trans. by. Annette Lavers, New York, The Noonday Press, 1991.

Bastian, Brock, Jolanda Jetten, Laura J. Ferris: "Pain as Social Glue: Shared Pain Increases Cooperation," **Psychological Science**, 2014, (Online) https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797614545886, 01 March 2023.

Baumeister, Roy F., Kathleen D. Vohs (editors): **Encyclopedia of Social Psychology**, w. Place, SAGE Publications, 2007.

Baumeister, Roy F.: **Escaping the Self: Alcoholism, Spirituality, Masochism, and Other Flights from the Burden of Selfhood**, w. Place, Basic Books, 1991.

Bew, Paul: "Ten Narrative and Graphic Panels," (Online) https://www.decadeofcentenaries.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/Bew-Home-Rule-exhibition-text.pdf, 19 November 2022.

Bhabha, Homi K.: "Of Mimicry and Man: The Ambivalence of Colonial Discourse," **The Location of Culture**, London, Routledge, 1994, pp.85-92.

Binebai, Benedict: "Voice Construction in the Postcolonial Text: Spivakian Subaltern Theory in Nigerian Drama," **African Research Review**, October 27, 2015, (Online) https://www.ajol.info/index.php/afrrev/article/view/124636, 9 April 2023.

Boag, Simon: "Freudian Repression, the Common View, and Pathological Science," **Review of General Psychology**, 2006, (Online) https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2680.10.1.74, 18 April 2023.

Bogacz, Ted: "War Neurosis and Cultural Change in England, 1914-22: The Work of the War Office Committee of Enquiry into 'Shell-Shock,'" **Journal of Contemporary History**, Vol.XXIV, No:2, 1989, pp.227-256.

Bott Spillius, Elizabeth: "Freud and Klein on the Concept of Phantasy," **The International Journal of Psychoanalysis**, Vol.LXXXII, No:2, 2001, pp.361-373.

Boyce, David George: **Nineteenth-Century Ireland: The Search for Stability**, Gill & Macmillan Ltd, 1990.

Burke, Mary: "The Irish Ordnance Survey: History, Culture and Memory," **The Canadian Journal of Irish Studies**, 2004,

(Online) https://www.jstor.org/stable/25515520, 2 May 2023.

Buse, Peter, Andrew Stott (editors): **Ghosts: Deconstruction, Psychoanalysis, History**, London, Palgrave Macmillan, 1999.

Butler, William F.: **Confiscation in Irish History**, Dublin, Talbot Press, 1917.

Béliard, Yann: "Introduction: Revisiting the Great Labour Unrest, 1911-1914," **Labour History Review**, Vol.LXXIX, No:1, 2014, pp.1-17.

Cameron, Emilie: "Cultural Geographies Essay: Indigenous Spectrality and the Politics of Postcolonial Ghost Stories," **Cultural Geographies**, Vol.XV, No:3, 2008, pp.383-393.

Campbell, Kenneth L.: **Ireland's History: Prehistory to the Present**, London, Bloomsbury Publishing, 2014.

Caruth, Cathy: **Unclaimed Experience: Trauma, Narrative, and History**, Baltimore, The John Hopkins University Press, 1996.

Clarke, Peter: "The Teaching of Book-Keeping in the Hedge Schools of Ireland," **Estudios Irlandeses**, No:5, 2010, pp.1-11.

Cooper, Jean C.: **An Illustrated Encyclopaedia of Traditional Symbols**, London, Thames & Hudson, 1987.

Craun, Sarah W., Michael L. Bourke: "The Use of Humor to Cope with Secondary Traumatic Stress," **Journal of Child Sexual Abuse**, August 1, 2014, (Online) https://doi.org/10.1080/10538712.2014.949395, 5 November 2022.

Crowley, Tony: "Language, Politics and Identity in Ireland: A Historical Overview," **Sociolinguistics in Ireland**, London, Palgrave Macmillan, 2016, pp.198-217.

Daly, Mary E.: "Social Structure of the Dublin Working Class, 1871-1911," **Irish Historical Studies**, Vol.XXIII, No:90, 1982, pp.121-133.

Darcy, Eamon: **The Irish Rebellion of 1641 and the Wars of the Three Kingdoms**, Vol.LXXXVI, Suffolk, The Boydell Press, 2013.

De Bromhead, Alan, Alan Fernihough, Enda Hargaden: "Representation of the People: Franchise Extension and the 'Sinn Féin Election' in Ireland, 1918," **The Journal of Economic History**, 2020, (Online) https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022050720000376, 28 January 2023.

Deane, Seamus: Introduction, **Selected Plays**, by Brian Friel, London, Faber and Faber, 1984.

"Disengagement," **APA Dictionary of Psychology**, (Online) https://dictionary.apa.org/disengagement, 15 February 2023.

Dixson, Barnaby J.: "Masculinity and Femininity," **Encyclopedia of Evolutionary Psychological Science**, w. Place, Springer International Publishing, 2016, pp.1-6.

Donat, Patricia L. N., John D'Emilio: "A Feminist Redefinition of Rape and Sexual Assault: Historical Foundations and Change," **Journal of Social Issues**, Vol.XLVIII, No:1, 1992, pp.9-22.

Durbach, Errol: **Peacocks and Mothers: Theme and Dramatic Metaphor O'Casey**, London, Macmillan, 1985.

Elliot, Andrew J., Markus A. Maier: "Color Psychology: Effects of Perceiving Color on Psychological Functioning in Humans," **Annual Review of Psychology**, Vol.LXV, No:1, 2014, pp.95-120.

Ellis, Caitlin: "The Other Invasion: The Anglo-Norman Invasion of Ireland in 1167 Sowed the Seeds for Centuries of Tension Between England and the Irish," **History Today**, Vol.LXVII, No:9, w. Place, 2017.

"Emasculation," **APA Dictionary of Psychology**, (Online) https://dictionary.apa.org/emasculation#:~:text=n.,%E2%80%94emasculate%20vb, 28 October 2022.

Eriksen, Thomas Hylland:	**Ethnicity and Nationalism: Anthropological Perspectives**, London, Pluto Press, 2002.
Fanning, Ronan:	"The Response of the London and Belfast Governments to the Declaration of the Republic of Ireland, 1948-49," **International Affairs (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1944**-), Vol.LVIII, No:1, 1981, Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp.95-114.
Fanon, Frantz:	**Black Skin, White Masks**, Trans. by. Charles Lam Markmann, London, Pluto Press, 1986.
Fanon, Frantz:	**The Wretched of the Earth**, Trans. by. Constance Farrington, New York, Grove Press, 1963.
Farrell, Gerard:	**The 'Mere Irish' and the Colonisation of Ulster 1570-1641**, London, Palgrave Macmillan, 2017.
Felman, Shoshana, Dori Laub:	**Testimony: Crises of Witnessing in Literature, Psychoanalysis, and History**, New York, Routledge, 1992.
Finnegan, Richard B., Edward T. McCarron:	**Ireland: Historical Echoes, Contemporary Politics**, w. Place, Westview Press, 2000.
Flores, Juan:	**The Diaspora Strikes Back: Caribeño Tales of Learning and Turning**, New York, Routledge, 2009.
Fortier, Anne-Marie:	"On (not) Speaking English: Colonial Legacies in Language Requirements for British Citizenship," **Sociology**, 2018, (Online) https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038517742854, 9 December 2023.
Foster, Robert Fitzroy (editor):	**The Oxford Illustrated History of Ireland**, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2000.
Freud, Sigmund:	**Beyond the Pleasure Principle**, Ed. by. Ernest Jones, w. Place, The International Psycho-Analytical Press, 1922.
Freud, Sigmund:	**Moses and Monotheism: Three Essays**, Vol.XXIII. London, Hogarth Press, 1939.
Freud, Sigmund:	**Repression**, Vol.XIV, London, Hogarth Press, 1915.

Friel, Brian: **Translations**, London, Faber and Faber, 1981.

Giner-Sorolla, Roger, Bernhard Leidner, Emanuele Castano: "Dehumanization, Demonization, and Morality Shifting: Paths to Moral Certainty in Extremist Violence," **Extremism and the Psychology of Uncertainty**, Ed. by. Michael A. Hogg, and Danielle L. Blaylock, w. Place, Blackwell, 2012, pp.165-182.

Gramsci, Antonio: **Selections from the Prison Notebooks**, Ed. by. Quentin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith, London, The Electric Book Company Ltd, 1999.

Greenson, Ralph R.: "The Psychology of Apathy," **The Psychoanalytic Quarterly**, Vol.XVIII, No:3, 1949, pp.290-302.

Grimal, Pierre: **The Concise Dictionary of Classical Mythology**, Ed. by. Stephen Kershaw, Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1990.

Gráda, Cormac Ó.: **The Great Irish Famine**, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Hansen, Marissa C., et. al.: "Correlates of Depression in Self-Neglecting Older Adults: Across-sectional Study Examining the Role of Alcohol Abuse and Pain in Increasing Vulnerability," **Journal of Elder Abuse & Neglect**, February 3, 2016, (Online) https://doi.org/10.1080/08946566.2015.1136252, 20 November 2023.

Harzallah, Mohamed Salah: "Spaces of Irishness in Nineteenth-Century America," **History Studies**, Vol.II, 2010, pp.179-192.

Healy, John: **Maynooth College: Its Centenary History**, Dublin, Browne & Nolan, 1895.

Henderson, Lori: "The Irish Famine: A Historiographical Review," **Historia**, Vol.XIV, 2005, pp.133-140.

Hentschel, Uwe, Wolfram Ehlers, Rainer Peter: "The Measurement of Defense Mechanisms by Self-Report Questionnaires," **The Concept of Defense Mechanisms in Contemporary Psychology: Theoretical, Research, and Clinical Perspectives**, 1993, New York, Springer, pp.53-86.

Hindle, Brian Paul: **Maps for Historians**, Phillimore, 1998.

Holden, Philip: "The 'Postcolonial Gothic': Absent Histories, Present Contexts," **Textual Practice**, 2009, (Online) https://doi.org/10.1080/09502360902753013, 26 March 2023.

Hossain, Amir, et. al.: "Power and Sexuality in Henrik Ibsen's Ghosts," **European Scientific Journal**, Vol.X, No:11, 2014, pp.209-226.

Howell, Jane M., Bruce J. Avolio: "The Ethics of Charismatic Leadership: Submission or Liberation?", **Academy of Management Executive**, May 1, 1992, (Online) https://doi.org/10.5465/ame.1992.4274395, 7 June 2023.

Huggan, Graham: **The Postcolonial Exotic: Marketing the Margins**, London and New York, Routledge, 2002.

Hutcheon, Linda: **A Poetics of Postmodernism: History, Theory, Fiction**, New York and London, Routledge, 2003.

Ibsen, Henrik: **A Doll's House: A Play in Three Acts**, Trans. by. William Archer, Boston, W.H. Baker, 1890.

Ibsen, Henrik: **The Wild Duck**, Boston, W.H. Baker, 1890.

Ireland Act 1949, June 2, 1949, (Online) https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/Geo6/12-13-14/41/enacted#:~:text=An%20Act%20to%20recognise%20and,and%20the%20territorial%20integrity%20of, 10 July 2023.

Jones, Raya A.: "A Discovery of Meaning: The Case of CG Jung's House Dream," **Culture & Psychology**, Vol.XIII, No:2, 2007, pp.203-230.

Jouhki, Hannu, Atte Oksanen: "To Get High or to Get Out? Examining the Link between Addictive Behaviors and Escapism," **Substance Use & Misuse**, November 23, 2021, (Online) https://doi.org/10.1080/10826084.2021.2002897, 28 May 2023.

Karadağ, Özlem: "Rewriting Women and Trauma: Zinnie Harris's This Restless House," **Tiyatro Eleştirmenliği ve Dramaturji**

Bölümü Dergisi, Vol.XXXIV, İstanbul, İstanbul University Press, 2022, pp.19-37.

Kearns, Kevin C.: **Dublin Tenement Life: An Oral History of the Dublin Slums**, w. Place, Gill & Macmillan Ltd, 2006.

Keenan, Desmond: **Ireland Within the Union: 1800-1921**, w. Place, Xlibris Corporation, 2008.

Kenny, Kevin (editor): **Ireland and the British Empire**, New York, Oxford University Press, 2004.

Kinealy, Christine: **This Great Calamity: The Great Irish Famine: The Irish Famine 1845-52**, w. Place Gill & Macmillan Ltd, 2006.

Kirss, Tiina: "Seeing Ghosts: Theorizing Haunting in Literary Texts," **Haunted Narratives: Life Writing in an Age of Trauma**, Toronto, Toronto University Press, 2013, pp.21-44.

Kissane, Bill: "Explaining the Intractability of the Irish Civil War," **Civil Wars**, Vol.III, No:2, 2000, pp.65-88.

Knirck, Jason K.: **Imagining Ireland's Independence: The Debates Over the Anglo-Irish Treaty of 1921**, Maryland, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2006.

LaCapra, Dominick: "Trauma, History, Memory, Identity: What Remains?", **History and Theory**, 2016, (Online) https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/hith.10817, 09 April 2023.

LaCapra, Dominick: **Writing History, Writing Trauma**, Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press, 2014.

Landy, Robert J.: "The Drama Therapy Role Method," **Dramatherapy**, Vol.XIV, No:1, 1992, pp.7-15.

Langås, Unni: "What Did Nora Do? Thinking Gender with A Doll's House," **Ibsen Studies**, Vol.V, No:2, 2005, pp.148-171.

Lapsley, Daniel K., Paul C. Stey: "Id, Ego, and Superego," **Encyclopedia of Human Behavior**, w. Place, 2011, pp.1-9.

Lefebvre, Henri: **The Production of Space**, Trans. by. Donald Nicholson-Smith, Oxford, Blackwell Ltd, 1991.

Lloyd, David: "Colonial Trauma/Postcolonial Recovery?", **Interventions**, June 1, 2011, (Online) https://doi.org/10.1080/136980100427324, 18 March 2023.

Loughran, Tracey Louise: **Shell-shock in First World War Britain: An Intellectual and Medical History, c. 1860-c. 1920**, w. Place, Diss, 2006.

Lowe, John: "Charles I and the Confederation of Kilkenny, 1643-9," **Irish Historical Studies**, Vol.XIV, No:53, 1964, pp.1-19.

Lynch, Cecelia: "The Promise and Problems of Internationalism," **Global Governance**, Vol.V, 1999, pp.83-101.

Mannion, Patrick: "Newfoundland Responses to the Easter Rebellion and the Rise of Sinn Fein, 1916-1919," **Newfoundland Studies**, March 1, 2009, (Online) https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/nflds24_1art01, 19 January 2023.

Marx, Karl, Friedrich Engels: **Ireland and the Irish Question**, w. Place, Progress Publishers, 1974.

McCarthy, Pat: "The Irish Civil War: Some Reflections and Questions," (Online) https://www.midlandshistory.com/uploads/4/0/4/1/40413751/10_-_the_irish_civil_war_-_some_reflections_and_questions.pdf, 5 November 2022.

McKenna, Joseph: **Guerrilla Warfare in the Irish War of Independence, 1919-1921**, North Carolina, McFarland, 2014.

McLaughlin, Eoin: "Economic Impact of the Irish Revolution," 2015, (Online) https://research-repository.st-andrews.ac.uk/bitstream/handle/10023/23082/EML_Economic_impact_of_the_Irish_revolution_May_2015.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y, 20 November 2022.

McNamara, Audrey: "John Bull's Other Island: Taking the Bull to Ireland," **SHAW Annual: The Annual of Bernard Shaw Studies**,

January 1, 2012, (Online) https://doi.org/10.5325/shaw.32.1.0133, 15 February 2023.

Meissner, Collin: "Words Between Worlds: The Irish Language, the English Army, and the Violence of Translation in Brian Friel's Translations," **Colby Quarterly**, Vol.XXVIII, No:3, 1992, pp.164-174.

Mikowski, Sylvie, Marie-Violaine Louvet: "Home Rule in Ireland: New Perspectives in History, Culture, Art and Literature," 2020, (Online) https://www.efacis.eu/sites/default/files/CFP%20Rise-2.pdf, 3 November 2022.

Mohamed, Saira: "Of Monsters and Men: Perpetrator Trauma and Mass Atrocity," **Colum. L. Rev**, No:115, 2015, pp.1157-1216.

Mohr, Thomas: "Irish Home Rule and Constitutional Reform in the British Empire, 1885-1914," **French Journal of British Studies**, 2019, (Online) https://doi.org/10.4000/rfcb.3900, 20 June 2023.

Moran, James: **The Theatre of Sean O'Casey**, London and New York, A&C Black, 2013.

Mufwene, Salikoko: "Colonisation, Globalisation, and the Future of Languages in the Twenty-first Century," **International Journal on Multicultural Societies**, Vol.IV, No:2, 2002, pp.162-193.

Murphy, Elaine: "The Navy and the Cromwellian Conquest of Ireland, 1649–53," **Journal for Maritime Research**, May 3, 2012, (Online) https://doi.org/10.1080/21533369.2012.672803, 16 April 2023.

Nagy, Joseph Falaky: "Orality in Medieval Irish Narrative: An Overview," **Oral Tradition,** 1986.

Nayar, Pramod K.: **Frantz Fanon**, London, Routledge, 2013.

Neal, Frank: **Sectarian Violence: the Liverpool Experience, 1819-1914: An Aspect of Anglo-Irish History**, Manchester, Manchester University Press, 1988.

Nelson, Elizabeth A., et. al.: "Scrupulosity in Patients with Obsessive–Compulsive Disorder: Relationship to Clinical and Cognitive Phenomena," **Journal of Anxiety Disorders**, 2006, (Online) https://doi.org/10.1016/j.janxdis.2006.02.001, 27 November 2022.

O'Casey, Seán: "Juno and the Paycock," **Three Plays: Juno and the Paycock, The Shadow of a Gunman, The Plough and the Stars**, London, Macmillan Press, 1966.

O'Donoghue, Martin: "'Ireland's Independence Day': The 1918 Election Campaign in Ireland and the Wilsonian Moment," **European Review of History: Revue Européenne d'Histoire**, July 25, 2019, (Online) https://doi.org/10.1080/13507486.2019.1634008, 02 March 2023.

Patten, Alan: "The Humanist Roots of Linguistic Nationalism," **History of Political Thought**, Vol.XXVII, No:2, 2006, pp.221-262.

Pilkington, Lionel: "Language and Politics in Brian Friel's 'Translations,'" **Irish University Review**, Vol.XX, No:2, Edinburgh, Edinburg University Press, 1990, pp.282-298.

Posner, Eric A., Kathryn Spier, Adrian Vermeule: "Divide and Conquer," **Journal of Legal Analysis**, October 1, 2010, (Online) https://doi.org/10.1093/jla/2.2.417, 19 December 2022.

Quirici, Marion: "Cathleen ni Houlihan and the Disability Aesthetics of Irish National Culture," **Éire-Ireland**, 2015, (Online) https://muse.jhu.edu/article/604165, 22 May 2023.

Rankin, K. J.: "Theoretical Concepts of Partition and the Partitioning of Ireland," **Working Papers in British-Irish Studies**, No:67, 2006, p.17.

Ravenscroft, Neil, Paul Gilchrist: "Spaces of Transgression: Governance, Discipline and Reworking the Carnivalesque," **Leisure Studies**, January 21, 2009, (Online) https://doi.org/10.1080/02614360802127243, 17 July 2023.

Rucker, Derek D., Adam D. Galinsky:	"Desire to Acquire: Powerlessness and Compensatory Consumption," **Journal of Consumer Research**, April 18, 2008, (Online) https://doi.org/10.1086/588569, 25 May 2023.
Shaw, George Bernard:	**John Bull's Other Island**, London, Constable and Company Ltd., 1912.
Slater, Eamonn, Terrence McDonough:	"Bulwark of Landlordism and Capitalism: The Dynamics of Feudalism in Nineteenth Century Ireland," **Research in Political Economy**, Vol.XIV, w. Place, JAI Press, 1994, pp.63-119.
Smirnov, Oleg, et. al.:	"Ancestral War and the Evolutionary Origins of 'Heroism,'" **The Journal of Politics**, Vol.LXIX, No:4, 2007, pp.927-940.
Smith, Angèle:	"Landscape Representation: Place and Identity in Nineteenth-Century Ordnance Survey Maps of Ireland," **Landscape, Memory and History: Anthropological Perspectives**, Ed. by. Pamela J. Stewart, Andrew Strathern, London, Pluto Press, 2003, pp.71-88.
Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty:	**Can the Subaltern Speak?**, Ed. by. Patrick Williams, Laura Chrisman, w. Place, Afterall Books, 2020.
Stewart, Charles:	**Creolization: History, Ethnography, Theory**, Walnut Creek (CA), Left Coast Press, 2007.
Sturgeon, Sinéad:	"The Politics of Poitín: Maria Edgeworth, William Carleton, and the Battle for the Spirit of Ireland," **Irish Studies Review**, Vol.XIV, No:4, 2006, pp.431-445.
Sumner, William Graham:	**Folkways**, w. Place, Ginn and Company, 1906.
Van der Kolk, Bessel:	**The Body Keeps the Score: Mind, Brain and Body in the Transformation of Trauma**, w. Place, Penguin Group, 2014.
Verovšek, Peter J.:	"Collective Memory, Politics and the Influence of the Past: The Politics of Memory as a Research Paradigm," **Politics, Groups and Identities**, Vol.IV, No:3, 2016, pp.529-543.

Von Ranke, Leopold: **A History of England: Principally in the Seventeenth Century**, Vol.III, w. Place, Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Walsh, Tom: "The National System of Education, 1831–2000," **Essays in the History of Irish Education**, London, Palgrave Macmillan, 2016, pp.7-43.

Ward, John R.: "The Industrial Revolution and British Imperialism, 1750-1850," **Economic History Review**, Vol.XLVII, No:1, 1994, pp.44-65.

Warner, Marina: **Alone of All Her Sex: The Myth and the Cult of the Virgin Mary**, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2013.

Waterman, David: "The Performance of Masculinity and Nationalism: Sean O'Casey's The Plough and the Stars and Juno and the Paycock," **Etudes Irlandaises**, Vol.XXIII, No:2, 1998, pp.53-69.

Whelan, Kevin: "The Other Within: Ireland, Britain and the Act of Union," **Acts of Union: The Causes, Contexts and Consequences of the Act of Union**, w. Place, Four Courts Press, 2001, pp.13-33.

Xypolia, Ilia: "*Divide et Impera*: Vertical and Horizontal Dimensions of British Imperialism," **Critique**, July 28, 2016, (Online) https://doi.org/10.1080/03017605.2016.1199629, 03 December 2022.

Yeats, William Butler, Lady Gregory: **Cathleen Ni Houlihan**, Macmillan Press, 1922.

Ó Hadhmaill, Féilim: "Easter Rising (1916) in Ireland and Its Historical Context, Campaign for an Irish Democracy," **The Palgrave Encyclopedia of Imperialism and Anti-Imperialism**, Cham, Springer International Publishing, 2021, pp.629-669.

Ziegler, Joanna E.: "Michelangelo and the Medieval Pietà: The Sculpture of Devotion or the Art of Sculpture?", **Gesta**, Vol.XXXIV, No:1, 1995, pp.28-36.