

"A Crippled Trust": The Wounded Body in Irish Drama

*For my mother, a woman whose strength, heart, and mind will forever inspire my life.*

A thesis submitted to the faculty of the Department of English in candidacy for the  
Degree of Bachelor of Arts with honors in English

Jennifer E. Backe  
Washington and Lee University  
Lexington, VA  
May 2004

"There is a great deal to learn, we say, and a great deal can be made out of you. The more  
you learn to say, the way he is, the more that he light upon us, only as he is now, but  
also as he may become. We must not start with him, we must start on his. The more,

*For my mother, a woman whose strength, heart, and mind will forever shape my life.*

represent us all? - 1950

“There is a great deal to man, we say; so a great deal can be made out of him. He does not have to stay the way he is now, nor does he have to be seen only as he is now, but also as he might become. We must not start with him; we must start on him. This means, however that I must not simply set myself in his place, but must set myself facing him to represent us all.” –Brecht

**“A CRIPPLED TRUST”: THE WOUNDED BODY IN IRISH DRAMA**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Acknowledgements-----iv

Introduction:  
In Search of a Fifth Province -----1

1. Mapping the Body:  
Language, Landscape, and Identity in Brian Friel’s *Translations*-----8

2. Revising Ireland: Wounds and Cures in Seamus Heaney’s  
*The Cure at Troy: A Version of Sophocles’ Philoctetes*-----29

Conclusion:  
The Healed Body in Irish Drama-----59

Works Cited -----64

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis would not have been written without the help of many people and two individuals in particular, Professor Marc Conner and Professor Eric Wilson. I owe Professor Conner my deepest thanks for his guidance as my thesis advisor and support throughout this project. More than that though, I am grateful for the spring term I spent in Ireland in 2002 under Professor Conner's direction. In my only experience abroad, Professor Conner taught me Irish literature and inspired a dedication to Irish studies that stayed with me even as I left the Irish landscape behind. These pages would not be here if those six weeks had not been a part of my life.

My experiences the following spring term further shaped this work as I studied Irish drama with Professor Wilson, who first taught me the two primary texts in my thesis. Professor Wilson always encouraged my passion for learning and I am ever appreciative that our time at Washington and Lee overlapped. I am also indebted to him for his helpful advice during the drafting stage.

Additionally, I must thank Professor Theresa Braunschneider because this work grounds itself in women's studies as well. I enrolled in Professor Braunschneider's introduction to women's studies concurrently with Irish drama. Professor Braunschneider's class enabled me to see the human body in new ways, as I began to understand it as a potential site of control and a place where power relationships mark themselves on human bodies. I took this feminist consciousness of the body as a starting point but decided to use the category of nationality rather than gender to investigate the appearance of wounded bodies in Irish drama.

I am also grateful to Professor Lesley Wheeler who, despite her burdens, willingly took on another by becoming my second reader.

Many thanks to Lessie Calhoun and Kara Harbert, friends and fellow thesis writers under Professor Conner's tutelage. Their bright minds and impeccable character have shaped the growth of this work and the development of my own self.

I also must recognize the constant encouragement of my dear friends, Allyn Milojevich, Caroline McKinney, and Amanda Lueders.

Lastly, I am indebted to my family for their enduring love and support.

## In Search of a Fifth Province

### INTRODUCTION

Wounds appear everywhere in Irish drama, on the Abbey's stage and abroad, in the examples of J. M. Synge's *The Playboy of the Western World* (1907), in which Christy Mahon beats his father over the head with a spade, to Estragon's aching feet in Samuel Beckett's *Waiting for Godot* (1956). For another example, take the character of Johnny in Sean O'Casey's *Juno and the Paycock* (1924). O'Casey's stage directions slowly reveal Johnny's abused state: "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" (1, 203). Additionally, the wounded body manifests in Brian Friel's *Translations* (1980) and Seamus Heaney's *The Cure at Troy: A Version of Sophocles' Philoctetes* (1990), both productions by the Field Day Theater Company. The recurring use of the wounded body by Irish dramatists throughout the twentieth century begs the student of Irish literature to question how these authors are using this image to debate national character. Because of its limited scope, however, this project cannot begin to address all the Irish plays that stage the wounded body, those previously mentioned and left nameless. Two plays are fodder enough. Thus, this work focuses upon wounded bodies in *Translations* and *The Cure at Troy*, in part because they are two of the most recent plays but also because Field Day, in its attention to questions of national identity, lends a useful frame for looking at Irish drama.

In Northern Ireland, Field Day's home, people are very attentive to the scars of history. Historically, Ireland was divided into four provinces, Munster, Leinster,

Connaught, and Ulster. The Anglo-Irish Treaty of 1921 separated the protestant-dominated Ulster, which remained part of the United Kingdom as Northern Ireland, from the other three provinces, today called the Republic of Ireland. This act resulted in the Irish Civil War, and debates, often violent, over the status of Northern Ireland continue to this day. Field Day aims to overcome these political wounds by creating a fifth province of the mind:

Adopted from the cultural journal *The Crane Bag*, the fifth province was described by Mark Patrick Hederman, one of the journal's co-editors, as "the secret centre...the place where all oppositions are resolved" ... The essence of the image, then, is the idea of unity; the fifth province defined in 1984 by Seamus Deane, one of Field Day's directors, and Richard Kearney, one of its contributors, as "an equivalent centre from which the four broken and fragmented pieces of contemporary Ireland might be seen as coherent." (Richards 140)

In the simplest terms, the boundary line between Northern Ireland and the Republic is a line on a map, imaginary and up to politicians and cartographers to decide. What is more, despite the apparent separation, the people on both sides of the border share a history that transcends the divide. Field Day hopes to create a unity of the mind capable of healing the wounds created by the border, thus encouraging the Irish to start seeing themselves as members of a wider community. In other words, the Irish do not have to see themselves strictly as Catholic or Protestant, Unionist or Republican, or in the stereotypical roles of victims or oppressors. Nevertheless, history proves that the problem of the border is serious and that the creation of a more suitable political entity is not simple; Field Day, however, insists on making space for discussion with the aim of

creating a “cultural state” that may one day suggest answers to the seemingly perpetual Irish question. Friel summarizes Field Day’s mission, “I think it should lead to a cultural state, not a political state. And I think out of that cultural state, a possibility of a political state follows. That is always the sequence” (Murray 209). In other words, before a political solution can arise, the people of Northern Ireland and the Republic must heal the wounds left behind by history and see themselves in new ways culturally.

Founded in 1980 by Brian Friel and Stephen Rea, Field Day Theater Company hoped to address the political crisis in the wounded North and its political and cultural echoes throughout Northern Ireland, the Republic of Ireland and the entire United Kingdom. Seamus Heaney, Tom Paulin, Seamus Deane, and David Hammond, all from Northern Ireland, quickly came onto the project as fellow directors and Thomas Kilroy, a novelist and playwright from the south, joined their ranks in 1986 (Murray 207).

Believing in art as one way to awaken the Irish audience from numbness to the political situation, the company opened with Friel’s *Translations*, which premiered in Derry in Northern Ireland and continued to tour throughout the island, a production strategy embraced by the company until it ceased operations in 1993.

In the thirteen years of Field Day’s existence, it staged twelve plays, several of which were translations and many that were contributed by the directors themselves.

After *Translations*, Friel immediately produced two more of his own plays, first his version of Chekhov’s *Three Sisters* (1981) and then his *Communication Cord* in 1982.

Field Day then dramatized Athol Fugard’s *Boesman and Lena* in 1983, following that with two translations in 1984, Paulin’s adaptation of Sophocles’ *Antigone* entitled *The Riot Act* and Derek Mahon’s *High Time*, a version of Moliere’s *L’École des maris*. Next

were Kilroy's *Double Cross* (1986), Stewart Parker's *Pentecost* (1987), Friel's *Making History* (1988), and Terry Eagleton's *Pentecost* (1987). Heaney contributed *The Cure at Troy: A Version of Sophocles' Philoctetes* in 1990, and Kilroy authored *Madame MacAdam Traveling Theater* (1991), the final play produced by the company (Murray 208).

Field Day's project, not limited to the stage, also established a pamphlet series, focusing upon issues such as language, myth, and constructions of Englishness and Irishness in their writing. By the end, the number of pamphlets totaled fifteen with the last three contributed by Eagleton, Fredric Jameson, and Edward W. Said. In the preface to the collection of these three, *Nationalism, Colonialism, and Literature*, Deane emphatically states, "Field Day's analysis of the situation derives from the conviction that it is, above all, a colonial crisis. This is not a popular view in the political and academic establishment in Ireland" (Introduction 6). Through drama, essays, and the *Field Day Anthology of Irish Writing* (1991), Field Day questions what it means to be Irish in a post-colonial context.

With the question of Irish identity at the center of Friel and Rea's ambitious project, drama serves as Field Day's most successful tool, in part because it can visually represent the Irish body on the stage. To speak from an anthropological perspective, the body represents the intersection between personal and communal identity (Burton 31). Society continually shapes how a person presents his or her own body, most obviously through dress or, to use a theatrical term, costume. However, as a metonymic representation of an entire society, an individual's body becomes an important way for authorities to demonstrate control over less powerful individuals; take for example

debates over women's reproductive rights or parental attempts to prevent their children from getting tattoos or piercings. The fact that many teenagers defy their parents' rules about their bodily appearance suggests that the body holds subversive potential as people negotiate relationships of power. On the stage, a wounded Irish body has implications that extend beyond the historical scarring of the Troubles or the Famine. The wounded, disfigured, or crippled body does not conform to traditional notions of the "correct" body. In this way, the wounded body causes anxiety and highlights difference, thereby working to defy a dominant power. Therefore, in its attempt to address a "colonial crisis," the staging of the wound body manifests as an especially meaningful technique for Field Day (Introduction 6)

Brian Friel's *Translations* and Seamus Heaney's *The Cure at Troy* are two Field Days plays that stage Irish identity through the image of the wounded body. In addition to subverting colonial attempts at control, the wounded body also suggests wider cultural scars on the stage. Among these are the loss of the Irish language and the fracturing of the Irish landscape through borders, rendering language, landscape, and the body as useful figures for Friel and Heaney to discuss the wounds left behind by colonialism in addition to the potential healing of these wounds. Moreover, language, landscape and the body all contribute to an understanding of identity and community as individuals define their bodies through speech and their relationship to place.

Set in 1833, *Translations* depicts a community in transition. The play takes place in a hedge-school in the Irish-speaking town of Baile Beag (Ballybeg) located in County Donegal. A peasant system of education that first arose during the years of Oliver Cromwell, the hedge school continued to flourish in the face of the Penal Codes. It used

the Irish language to teach mathematics, reading, writing and often Latin and Greek but became obsolete with the introduction of a system of National Education by the British in 1831 (Harrington 551-2). The National School, free to all and mandatory from the ages of six to twelve, contributed significantly to the demise of the Irish language through its sole reliance upon the English tongue. Additionally, *Translations* centers upon the Ordinance Survey of the 1830s and dramatizes a pivotal moment in the colonial relationship between England and Ireland (Flanagan 107). The goal of the survey was to standardize Irish placenames into anglicized versions, an “imperial project of territorial expansion, surveillance and control,” as Michael Cronin describes it (HTP 34). Beyond its military implications, the survey held serious cultural repercussions due to its erasure of the Irish language. The play therefore focuses mostly on the relationship between language and landscape in constructing identity, focusing as well upon the schoolmaster’s lame son Manus, whose body becomes a representation of resistance to the colonial project. Furthermore, by the end of the play, Manus flees Baile Beag and his lost body symbolizes a broken community.

In adapting Sophocles, Heaney chooses a play about Philoctetes, a Greek soldier with a horrible, festering foot wound. Odysseus and his other compatriots feel forced to abandon Philoctetes on the island of Lemnos after his screaming disrupts their religious rituals. In addition to the wound, however, Philoctetes also possesses Hercules’ magical bow, a device needed to end the Trojan War. Thus, the play begins with Odysseus’ successful attempt to convince Neoptolemus, the son of Achilles, to steal the bow from the wounded man. Heaney, as does Friel, uses language, landscape and the image of the wound to construct Irish identity, using the wounded body primarily as a symbol of

resistance to the colonial view of the Irish subject. At the same time, Philoctetes' wound indicates the loss of community and serves as a constant reminder of the betrayal of Philoctetes' fellow Greeks.

Both plays deal with communities and their struggle to remain intact. In *Translations* this means a violent attempt to exclude outsiders when the Donnelly twins murder Yolland. In contrast, betrayal from within the community threatens the Greeks of Heaney's play. Both Friel and Heaney, however, use the wound to suggest that healing needs to take place. Healing is possible, Friel and Heaney argue, if the Irish people embrace forgiveness and more generous behavior. In *Translations*, the Donnelly twins are never staged and their actions are not admirable. Instead, the love relationship between the Irish woman Maire and British Yolland stands out as the most beautiful moment in Friel's play. Maire and Yolland communicate through a litany of Irish placenames and their bodies come together as one in a kiss, a gesture that invokes the unity that Field Day hopes to achieve. Likewise, Heaney stresses the cure rather than the wound in the title to his version of Sophocles' play. Beyond the magical bow, Philoctetes' cure rests in his reintegration into the community, enabled through forgiveness. Heaney writes in the final lines of the play, "I leave / half-ready to believe / that a crippled trust might walk" (81). Calling trust crippled, Heaney suggests that betrayal paralyzes people more than physical wounds. He nevertheless suggests that the community can overcome crippling. Both authors seem to hope for completeness and a community no longer marked by divisions, which they aim to achieve through art or, more specifically, drama's ability to stage the wounded body.

**Mapping the Body: Language, Landscape and Identity**  
**in Brian Friel's *Translations***

**CHAPTER ONE**

There are many noteworthy dramatists who identify Ireland as their homeland including Lady Gregory, W. B. Yeats, John Millington Synge, Sean O'Casey, and Brian Friel. These authors are some of the most famous Irish writers, to speak of the craft more generally, which may indicate that drama has a special lure as an art form for the Irish. Robert O'Driscoll finds that "In times of acute national consciousness the theatre is the form of literature which makes the most direct impact on the people, becoming at times a means for propaganda, but ultimately the means by which the deeper life of the people is expressed" (12). The power of theater in Ireland, for O'Driscoll, lies in its ability to reveal the "deeper life of the people," a statement that appears simple enough but does not fully take into account that the notion of "the people" in Ireland often begs particular scrutiny. Irish theater finds its roots in this very debate over what defines the Irish people and arose, in the hands of Lady Gregory and W. B. Yeats, from nationalist concerns over the highly caricatured figure of the Irishman on Britain's stage. "We will show that Ireland is not the home of buffoonery and of easy sentiment," proposes Lady Gregory in *Our Irish Theater*, "as it has been represented, but the home of an ancient idealism" (Harrington 378). Gregory's "ancient idealism" resonates with O' Driscoll's "deeper life" since both statements regard theater as an instrument to uncover and display certain truths about Irish identity.

To summarize Gregory and O'Driscoll in one word, theater has the potential to reveal "Irishness." Due to the colonial relationship between England and Ireland, however, this term is freighted with significance. It insists upon definition through comparison since "Irishness" cannot be understood without assuming that it is substantially different from "Englishness." Understanding identity in this way establishes a binary between England and Ireland, colonizer versus colonized, and often, to use the colonizer's language, civilian against barbarian. Seamus Deane, one of the directors of the Field Day Theater Company, objects to reading Irish texts with any fixed sense of "Irishness" in mind. He understands it as a myth and a political tool that cripples Irish writers:

A literature predicated on an abstract idea of essence – Irishness or Ulsterness – will inevitably degenerate into whimsy and provincialism... The point is not simply that the Irish are different. It is that they are absurdly different because of the disabling, if fascinating, separation between their notion of reality and that of everybody else. (58)

Deane views the obsession with "Irishness" as dangerous because it insists on a construction of the Irish as "Others," a garrulous, quaint people who are not taken altogether seriously. This strategy, according to Deane, perpetuates the view that "Irishness" is not only different from "Englishness" but in many ways inferior. In other words, the colonial gaze continues to define the Irish as long as this term is in use. Therefore Deane proposes reading Irish literature without reasserting the myth of "Irishness," yet offers little clue of how to ignore this "mystique" (58).

Currently teaching at the University of Notre Dame, Deane holds the titles professor, critic and poet but is not a dramatist. Although he writes for the Field Day pamphlet series and is the general editor of the *Field Day Anthology of Irish Writing*, his essay ignores the power of the theater to contest traditional notions of "Irishness." Any representation of the Irish body on the stage yields an opportunity to discuss and debate national character. For example, the Abbey Theater's production of J. M. Synge's *The Playboy of the Western World* in 1907 incited serious riots because of its representation of Irish women, suggesting that "Irishness" is a concept constantly being constructed by the dialogic relationship between the audience, performers and playwright. In the words of Helen Gilbert and Joanne Tompkins, "The colonial subject's body contests its stereotyping and representation by others to insist on self-representation by its physical presence on the stage" (204). Gilbert and Tompkins' argument supplements Lady Gregory's reasons behind forming a national theater. By enabling the Irish to represent themselves to their fellow countrymen, a national drama is a powerful tool of display that can resist stereotypical and hurtful images, such as the Irish buffoon on Britain's stage. Friel and Heaney, as contributors to Field Day's drama, demonstrate a greater understanding of the theater's potential than Deane and use their art to negotiate "Irishness." Specifically, they explore the colonial relationship between the English and the Irish by staging the wounded body, further questioning national identity by looking at the body's relationship to language and place.

Speaking broadly about disability, Rosemarie Garland Thomson writes, "Constructed as the embodiment of corporeal insufficiency and deviance, the physically disabled body becomes a repository for social anxieties about such troubling concerns as

vulnerability, control, and identity” (6). These are all serious preoccupations for Ireland, vulnerable by proximity to Britain’s control and often forced to see themselves as insufficient or lesser people in the eyes of the colonial power. Historically, the bodily presence of the British on the island registers as an important aspect of Ireland’s relationship to colonialism, particularly in Northern Ireland where the majority of the English settled, thus creating a place where conflicts still arise over the question of national identification. Furthermore, as the English “civilize the Irish,” the body becomes a site of colonial control. Friel uses the crippled body in *Translations* to suggest the scars of colonialism and links the body to two more readily recognized examples of colonial influence, the landscape and the Irish language. Friel focuses on the Ordinance Survey of the 1830s and the replacement of the hedge schools in Ireland with the National School where English was taught. By dramatically linking these events, Friel demonstrates colonialism’s influence in shaping Irish identity by controlling language and its relationship to place. At the same time, however, Friel uses the crippled body to undermine colonial control; in short, the wounded body insists on difference and defies control. Therefore land, language, and the crippled body all yield equally important sites for the expression of colonialism and its subversion. All three work on the stage to create a more fluid understanding of Irish identity.

The exploitative nature of colonialism characterizes the colonized land as a site of oppression, as the Ordinance Survey suggests. The land, however, is not simply a passive geographical region, comprised of bogs and fields. Indeed, as both Tim Robinson and Friel understand, the Irish language holds a special relationship to the land, incorporating human beings into the landscape through Irish placenames. Robinson writes, “This is

because placenames are semantically two-pronged; they not only have a referent, like any proper name, *i. e.* the place they denote, but most of them also have a connotation; they make a condensed or elliptical remark about the place, a description, a claim of ownership, a historical anecdote, even a joke or a curse on it” (156). Take for example Friel’s use of the placename “Tobair Vree,” which Owen explains to Yolland:

And we call that crossroads Tobair Vree. And why do we call it Tobair Vree? I’ll tell you why. Tobair means a well. But what does Vree mean? It’s a corruption of the name Brian – [*Gaelic pronunciation*] Brian – an erosion of Tobair Bhriain. Because a hundred-and-fifty years ago there used to be a well there, not at the crossroads, mind you, that would be too simple –but in a field close to the crossroads. And an old man called Brian, whose face was disfigured by an enormous growth, got it into his head that the water in that well was blessed; and every day for seven months he went there and bathed his face in it. But the growth didn’t go away; and one morning Brian was found drowned in that well. And ever since that crossroads is known as Tobair Vree – even though that well has long since dried up. (2, 352)

Owen asks, “Do we scrap Tobair Vree altogether and call it what? – The Cross? Crossroads? Or do we keep piety with a man long dead, long forgotten, his name ‘eroded’ beyond recognition, whose trivial little story nobody in the parish remembers?” (2, 352). Friel’s description of Tobair Vree supports Robinson’s argument and emphasizes that a placename reveals more than a location: the loss of the name Tobair Vree would eliminate Brian’s ownership of the well, destroying the human connection to the land.

Furthermore, Tobair Vree indicates a disfigured man and suggests that the link between the land and colonial oppression can also mark itself on the body. This is particularly relevant to drama because it foregrounds the body on stage. Margaret Llewellyn-Jones writes, "Argument extends the idea of mapping identity on to landscape by examining ways in which the performing body may be a privileged site, bearing traces of both culture and identity. The body may be seen as both a literal and metaphorical site of colonial power and the struggle against it" (21). Llewellyn-Jones cites the Great Famine to demonstrate colonialism's power over the body, also providing twentieth century hunger strikes as an instance of the body's subversive work against empire (22). The execution of the 1916 rebels represents another powerful example of the body's integral role in the political struggle. After they were put to death, Patrick Pearse and the other leaders of the rebellion quickly became martyrs in the eyes of many of the Irish people. Historian Mike Cronin explains the historical repercussions of the executions: "The rising had posthumously lit the torchpaper that would, in part, lead to the destruction of constitutional nationalism, and the beginnings of a sustained campaign of violence against British rule in Ireland" (History of Ireland 195). Continued Irish resistance, to put it simply, stemmed directly from the wounding of these Irish bodies by the imperial power.

Metonymically speaking, the struggle against colonialism appears in Manus' crippled body. Manus's limp in *Translations* may seem like a minor character detail when reading the play text; the stage, on the other hand, lends a permanent focus to Manus's condition, demonstrating that disability is in fact an important tool in Friel's work. Primarily, the limp becomes a manifestation of Manus's vulnerable position in the

community. Manus quotes the words of a local woman in a letter to her sister who, forgetting that Manus is taking down the dictation for her, states, "The aul drunken schoolmaster and that lame son of his are still footering about in the hedge-school, wasting people's good time and money" (1, 325). Privileging his disability as a defining characteristic, the woman constructs Manus's identity as the "lame son." In addition to calling him lame, Friel chooses the word "footering" to draw attention to the limp, linking it explicitly with the nearly defunct hedge-school.

The old woman understands the hedge-school in much the same way as Maire who criticizes it for neglecting the English language: "We should all be learning to speak English. That's what my mother says. That's what I say. That's what Dan O'Connell said last month in Ennis. He said the sooner we all learn to speak English the better" (1, 334). According to these women, the hedge-school is a waste of time and money, a crippled institution. By conflating Manus's lameness with the hedge-school, and consequently the newly imposed national schools, Friel suggests a link between the body's impairment and colonial influence.

Again Maire realistically asserts, "When it opens, this is finished: nobody's going to pay to go to a hedge-school" (1, 329). With his entire identity at stake, the repercussions of the hedge-school's arrival are severe for Manus. The loss of the hedge-school means the end of his lifestyle, income (albeit slight), and chances with Maire, who will not marry a jobless cripple. While leaving Manus vulnerable, the arrival of the national school does not paralyze him completely. He can still pursue a job within the new system. Manus, though, despite his qualifications and Maire's urging, refuses to apply and compete with his father. Ruth Neil notices that emotional or physical

crippling by a father figure recurs in Friel's drama. "In general, father figures have no real authority any more," states Neil, "but most fathers still act out of a need for dominance over their offspring" (Neil 146). Manus plays into this, acting out his own subservience to Hugh in his refusal to apply for the job. Here Hugh symbolically disables his son; more emblematically, perhaps, Hugh also serves as the cause of Manus's physical impairment. Owen explains Manus's limp to Yolland saying, "An accident when he was a baby: Father fell across his cradle. That's why Manus feels so responsible for him" (2, 345). Friel suggests that the past possesses the power to cripple future generations. Moreover, Manus cannot escape his father's mistakes because of the wounds that they have left on Manus's body. Similarly, Synge's Christy Mahon, despite his "gallous story," does not successfully murder his father (3, 116). Old Mahon comes back to haunt him, preventing Christy from marrying Pegeen Mike, in much the same way that Hugh's presence makes it impossible for Manus to marry Maire. Friel therefore finds precedence for fatherly crippling within the Irish dramatic tradition

Owen, working again as a translator, interprets Manus for Yolland. By characterizing the limp as the reason Manus cares for his father, Owen frees himself from any responsibility towards his father or guilt towards his older brother. Owen makes a good living working for the British, all the while recognizing Manus's own meager existence: "All he gets is the odd shilling Father throws him – and that's seldom enough. I got out in time, didn't I?" (2, 345). Owen admits, "I got out in time," which suggests that the limp does not actually make Manus feel any more responsible for his father than Owen. Timing and luck are much more important factors. Friel supplements this by reversing the roles of the two characters at the end of the play as Manus flees, leaving

Owen to assume responsibility for his father. The wound therefore serves as an excuse, a way for Owen to refuse his own responsibility.

As a symbol of the dying hedge-school, Manus's limp functions as a site of colonial oppression. He lacks control in the face of his father's presumed authority and finds his identity threatened by the changes surrounding him. Simultaneously, though, the limp serves as a symbol of subversion. David T. Mitchell and Sharon L. Snyder argue that the presence of a disabled body is unsettling: "The inherent vulnerability and versatility of bodies serves literary narratives as a metonym for that which refuses to conform to the mind's desire for order and rationality. Within this schema, disability acts as a metaphor and fleshly example of the body's unruly resistance to the cultural desire to 'enforce normalcy'" (Mitchell and Snyder 48). Manus's limp on the stage appears as a bodily resistance to enforced normalcy, or in other words, colonial control. Manus's resistance appears in other ways as well.

Thomson identifies disability as "the embodiment of corporeal insufficiency and deviance" (6). While she may merely be choosing the word "deviance" to denote "otherness", the word also suggests criminality (6). Significantly Manus functions as the presumed murderer and even links his disability to violence, labeling himself, "The lame scholar turned violent" (3, 362). Even though Manus looks after his father, leads the hedge-school, and gently helps Sarah to speak, he is a much edgier and more resistant character than Owen. Friel displays this most through Manus's refusal to speak English to Yolland:

*Owen.* Can't you speak English before your man?

*Manus.* Why?

Owen. Out of courtesy.

Manus. Doesn't he want to learn Irish? [To Yolland] Don't you want to learn Irish?

Yolland. Sorry –Sorry? I – I –

Manus. I understand the Lancey's perfectly but people like you puzzle me.

Owen. Manus for God's sake! (2, 344)

Manus understands Lancey's military mindset because it does not assert any care for the Irish culture; Yolland, on the contrary, attempts to embrace the language while working towards its destruction, a puzzling situation indeed. Manus treats Yolland abrasively and acts defiantly by being rude to the British soldier. Even though Yolland remains oblivious to the literal insults behind his Irish tongue, both Owen and Manus recognize that Manus's use of Irish shows resistance to the colonial power.

Like Friel's character Yolland, Robinson is an outsider who discovers something wonderful in the Irish placenames. Robinson and Friel, however, approach the issue of placenames from two different historical standpoints. While Friel points to a past moment of erasure, Robinson works to reinstate the names in the present. Robinson labors out of love: "My excuse must be that I came to that narrow island and that dying language from the great cities and the great languages of Europe, and found in them something that I am still trying to understand, and am anxious to pass on" (151). In contrast, locating his play in the 1830s, Friel does not fetishize the placename in the same way. *Translations*, instead, emphasizes adaptability in addition along with the economic benefits of English. Not only does Owen enjoy his job, but when Yolland insists on maintaining the name

Tobair Vree for the sake of Owen's personal memory, Owen bluntly counters, "I've left here" (2, 352).

Writing English onto the land has serious implications for the Irish language, but means even more for the Irish themselves. Owen professes to Manus that a name does not necessarily matter: "Easy man, easy, Owen—Roland what the hell. It's only a name. It's the same me, isn't it? Well, isn't it?" (1, 342). The repetition of the question, "isn't it?" suggests serious doubts despite Owen's attempt to sound nonchalant. Seamus Heaney writes, "His brother Manus sees him as a betrayer, his father, more cautiously, sees him as a kind of success, and he cannot quite manage to see himself. Significantly he cannot settle on a name: he is Owen to the natives but his soldier friends call him Roland and he does not quite deny them their mistake" (Harrington 558). Waffling over his identity, Owen's body becomes a site of translation. According to Llewellyn-Jones, "Mapping / translation is shown as a strategy for fixing and controlling both physical and verbal discourse – and thus identity – within ideological limits" (23). Yolland's insistence on using "Tobair Vree" for the crossroads incites Owen to reclaim his own Irish name:

*Yolland.* Tobair Vree

*Owen.* That's what you want?

*Yolland.* Yes.

*Owen.* You're certain?

*Yolland.* Yes?

*Owen.* Fine. Fine. That's what you'll get.

*Yolland.* That's what you want, too, Roland.

[Pause]

Owen [explodes]. George, for God's sake! *My name is not Roland!* (2, 352)

This exclamation suggests that there is indeed a difference between the name Owen and Roland. By claiming his name, Owen demands control over his own identity.

Robinson refers to the Ordinance Survey as the "second fall" and invokes the image of the expulsion from Eden (160). Similarly, Friel uses the image of Eden to raise questions about the power of naming: "Eden's right! We name a thing and—bang! —it leaps into existence!" (2, 353). Following this Edenic view, a name creates reality, a statement that Robinson seems to affirm: "The most immediate connection between language and reality, the one first made by children and by language learners, is that of naming things. Placenames are the interlock of landscape and language" (155). Only stretching Robinson's argument slightly further, one can understand placenames as a repository of landscape, language and reality. In other words, the Ordinance Survey not only possesses the power to modify placenames, it concurrently alters the reality of Irish existence. Friel's character Hugh understands this:

*Owen.* I'll take that. [*In apology*] It's only a catalogue of names.

*Hugh.* I know what it is.

*Owen.* A mistake—my mistake—nothing to do with us...

*Hugh.* We must learn where we live. We must learn to make them our own. We must make them our new home. (3, 372)

The book of placenames indicates a new reality, one that has everything to do with the Irish people. With the physical mapping of Englishness onto the Irish landscape, an overlap of identity also occurs; the binary between English and Irish no longer seems as relevant and the Irish must learn to embrace their hybrid nature. In this historical moment

the Irish are at a crossroads, suggested by Friel's use of *Tobair Vree*. The Irish cannot stop the soldiers from conducting the Ordinance Survey or the English language from being taught in school. English will be the dominant language in the land and the Irish must learn to incorporate it into their definitions of themselves.

At the same time, though, the Irish do not have to embrace colonialism's influence enthusiastically even if they accept the English language. In addition to Manus's wound, the staged body acts in other subversive ways in *Translations*. Doalty, for example, contributes significantly to a subversive undercurrent in the play. In one instance he brags about tampering with the surveying equipment of the British workers, moving the instrument twenty or thirty feet to ruin their calculations. Manus links Doalty's deed directly to the body:

*Maire*. That was a very clever piece of work.

*Manus*. It was a gesture.

*Maire*. What sort of gesture?

*Manus*. Just to indicate... a presence. (1, 327)

According to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, a gesture is "a manner of placing the body, position, posture, attitude." A powerful dramatic tool, Brecht's epic theater relies heavily upon gesture to alienate the audience. Beyond this, Brecht writes, "The object of the A-effect is to alienate the social gest underlying every incident. By social gest is meant the mimetic and gestural expression of the social relationships prevailing between people of a given period (139). By re-positioning the Theodolite, Doalty not only frustrates the colonial aims of the soldiers, he positions his own body on the land. He demands recognition of his presence and, without words, voices his opposition to the colonial

presence. Doalty, to use Brecht's terms, makes the spectator question the social relationship between the Irish and the English.

Doalty, however, indicates another presence by bringing news of the Donnelly twins who presumably murder the soldier's horses and are responsible for George's disappearance. They never appear on the stage. Friel, thereby, links their subversion to the body by withholding their bodily presence. As Gilbert and Tompkins write, "In post colonial theatre, that revision of the spectacle's meaning materializes from, among other things, an attempt to subvert or escape – or at least to compromise – the usual patronizing and objectifying gaze of the coloniser over the colonised" (249). The most blatantly subversive and threatening elements of the play, the Donnelly twins, escape a potentially objectifying view. Additionally, they never speak, thereby refusing the colonizer's language.

Sarah's bodily presence, like Manus's limp, also functions as a site of colonial oppression and its subversion. Friel writes, "Sarah's speech is so bad that all her life she has been considered locally to be dumb and she has accepted this" (1, 320). Therefore Sarah's muteness rests on society's assumptions and is not entirely dependent on her physical ability. In a similar way, Thomson insists that disability is a "representation" and a "cultural interpretation," more dependent on perception than physicality (6). Manus attempts to empower Sarah to defy this paralyzing identification: "Raise your head. Shout it out. Nobody's listening" (1, 321). Ironically, Manus emphasizes that nobody hears her, ignoring the spying ears and penetrating gaze of the theater audience.

In a play obsessed with the power of language, Sarah's muteness is not insignificant. Notably, as a female character, her wound does not appear as a leg wound

but rather eliminates her voice. Although she succeeds at naming herself under Manus's guiding hand, Lancey, an unyielding figure of the imperial presence effectively silences her. She does not tell Lancey her name. In Friel's stage direction, he writes, "But Sarah cannot. And she knows she cannot. She closes her mouth. Her head goes down" (3, 368). Relying upon the traditional identification of Ireland with a woman, Seamus Heaney relates Sarah's disability explicitly to her gender:

It is as if some symbolic figure of Ireland from an eighteenth-century vision poem, the one who once confidently called herself Cathleen Ni Houlihan, has been struck dumb by the shock of modernity. Friel's work, not just here but in his fourteen preceding plays, constitutes a powerful therapy, a set of imaginative exercises that give her the chance to know and say herself properly to herself again. (Harrington 559)

Heaney believes that the symbolic figure of Ireland can speak again through the healing power of Friel's art. Friel's stage directions, however, do not make this entirely clear:

*Owen.* Don't worry. It will come back to you again.

[Sarah shakes her head.]

*Owen.* It will. You're upset now. He frightened you. That's all's wrong.

[Again Sarah shakes her head, slowly, emphatically, and smiles at Owen.

Then she leaves...] (3, 370)

Friel's use of the word "emphatically" and the deliberate slowness of the movement suggest that Sarah does not believe that she will regain the ability to speak. Her smile complicates this argument. The way this scene appears on the stage depends mostly upon the director's interpretation. Perhaps she smiles to help reassure Owen despite her own

continued pessimism. At the same time, she may smile to herself, recognizing her own refusal to speak as a subversive choice, not a disability at all. “As Gilbert and Tompkins argue, silence is what defines the postcolonial subject—both in the silence of a tongue lost and in the refusal to speak the language of the conqueror” (Doyle 182). By withholding her name from Lancey, Sarah frustrates his actions. Her lack of speech becomes a way to resist the colonial power in order to save Manus from harm.

Maria-Elena Doyle, in contrast, understands the silence in the play as destructive, where the Donnelly twins are concerned, and at least non-constructive in Sarah’s case (182). She values language as a tool of connection, highlighting Friel’s use of a hybrid language. Like silence, Hiberno-English also serves as a linguistic method of subversion: “Contemporary Irish plays therefore are likely to use ‘voice’ in a way that challenges past hierarchies through the use of Hiberno-English as a positive hybrid language” (Llewellyn-Jones 13). In other words, Hiberno-English defies hierarchies by refusing the simple binary of colonizer and colonized, creating a positive alternative in its combination of the two. Llewellyn-Jones adds, “The use of a hybrid language such as Hiberno-English can have potential for subversion. This challenging quality may be enriched through kinesics (gesture) and proxemics (the spatial relationships between bodies and items on stage)” (22).

One of the most compelling uses of proxemics in *Translations* occurs at the end of the second act when Yolland and Maire’s bodies come together as they embrace Irish placenames. Writes Friel, “They are now facing each other and begin moving—almost imperceptibly—towards one another” (2, 359). More than proxemics, Friel relies also on kinesics in the kiss, “that moment of border-crossing” (Llewellyn-Jones 24). This

positive moment of union may be one of the greatest gestures in the play. As the play slows down from the bustling activity of the hedge-school, Yolland and Maire hold attention on the stage. In combination with Friel's use of Hiberno-English, this scene advocates a less binding understanding of Irishness, incorporating Englishness into its definition.

Manus attempts to reclaim Maire by hurting Yolland. Their bodily union, however, prevents him:

But when I saw him standing there at the side of the road—smiling—and her face buried in his shoulder—I couldn't even go close to them. I just shouted something stupid—something like, 'You're a bastard, Yolland.' If I'd even said it in English... 'cos he kept saying 'Sorry-sorry?' The wrong gesture in the wrong language. (3, 362)

Once again Friel focuses upon gesture by having Manus invoke the term. Unlike Doalty's repositioning of the Theodolite, Manus's gesture fails because he does not make his presence known: the language barrier impedes Manus's curse. Beyond the cursing, however, Manus does, in fact, enact a powerful gesture by dropping the stone he means to throw at Yolland. Functioning symbolically as a gesture of peace, Manus does not use language but his action resonates for the spectator.

Despite this, the Donnelly twins take over and murder Yolland in an attempt to regulate their society. By preventing the permanent union of Maire and Yolland, they inhibit a move towards hybridity between the Irish and the English. Even though the play does not glorify the Donnelly twins, their actions imply that it is not a simple feat to join Englishness and Irishness when many people adhere to strict national identifications. In

the words of Jimmy Jack, “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 angry” (3, 374). Thwarting Yolland and Maire’s union, the Donnelly twins insist on *endogamein* and defend Manus’s prior claim to Maire. The twins attempt to preserve community by acting violently towards an outsider. Their actions, however, only result in its destruction since Lancey threatens to murder all the livestock and to evict the people if Yolland is not found.

Friel uses Jimmy Jack to stress the necessity of incorporating the English and Irish cultures, despite the significant difficulties imposed by characters such as the Donnelly twins. Entirely immersed in the dead languages of Latin and Greek, Jimmy Jack cannot ground himself in reality. Friel writes, “For Jimmy the world of the gods and the ancient myths is as real and as immediate as everyday life in the townland of Baile Beag” (320). By the end of the play and spurred by drunkenness, Jimmy Jack has retreated into this ancient world, asking Hugh whole heartedly to be the best man at his wedding to the goddess Athena. Friel calls particular attention to Jimmy Jack in his stage directions: “He attempts the gesture he has made before: standing to attention, the momentary spasm, the salute, the face raised in pained ecstasy—but the body does not respond efficiently this time. The gesture is grotesque” (3, 371). The differences here, in comparison to the humorous parallel gesture in the opening scene, reveal the dramatic changes in Baile Beag, threatened by destruction and eviction.

Unable to submit to the English presence, Jimmy Jack and Manus are similar characters. Manus’s name derives from Latin and Jimmy Jack lives in this dead language, making them both symbols of a lost tongue and time. To add to this, they are both

crippled in their own way and rely on the hedge-school. There does not seem to be a place in the world for them without Irish. Returning explicitly to the wounded body, Ruth Neil quotes Friel as saying, "You have on stage the representatives of a certain community—one is dumb, one is lame and one is an alcoholic, a physical maiming which is a public representation of their spiritual deprivation" (145). Richard Harp contests this viewpoint and argues that Manus has a great spiritual wealth, demonstrated vividly in the kiss he gives to Sarah. He asks, "Might not this act of bestowing a blessing upon one who has wronged him be Friel's indication that Manus has a real spiritual stature at the end, just as the utterly abased and humiliated Oedipus is said by Creon to be more than that 'cursed, naked, holy thing'?" (29). Harp makes a valid point that applies to the other disabled characters as well. Despite Hugh's alcoholism, Sarah's muteness, and Jimmy Jack's mental confusion, they all display a "perverse type of nobility" (Wilson 234).

Above all, their crippled states represent the human condition:

Disability here is not merely a symbol of the human condition in an age which has lost its faith; on the contrary, the loss of conventional faith is a cornerstone of Friel's thought. Disability is part of the system, part of life; above all it cannot be redeemed. Friel's drama constantly moves against any striving for wholeness, any attempt to promote a simplistic, unified system of meaning. The faith he affirms is in one's ability to recognize and accept one's own infirmity without hope of reprieve... The life that shines through his plays is more convincing for not being an absolute: it is a broken, crippled thing and is affirmed as such (Neil 156-7).

This reading, however, may be more negative than *Translations* actually suggests.

Although wholeness does not seem immediately possible, Hugh embraces the name

book, encouraging the members of his community to reinvent themselves. Moreover, in the face of the Donnelly twins' uncompromising attitudes, the beautiful unity of Maire of Yolland generated through placenames is something to strive for in the Irish community.

By setting the play in the 1830s, Friel employs the Brechtian device of historicization:

The actor must play the incidents as historical ones. Historical incidents are unique, transitory incidents associated with particular periods. The conduct of the persons involved in them is not fixed and 'universally human'; it includes elements that have been or may be overtaken by the course of history, and is subject to criticism from the immediately following period's point of view. The conduct of those born before us is alienated from us by an incessant evolution.

(Brecht 140)

Through historicization, Friel looks to create dialogue rather than glorify the past. If Friel presents Ireland as a lost Eden, he simultaneously undercuts this view to emphasize the evolutionary necessity of the English language. Friel, in this way, enables his audience to view *Translations*, the 1830s, and themselves more critically. Eric Binne argues that Field Day follows in the footsteps of Brecht's theater. He writes, "As yet, Brian Friel's plays are too diverse in form to be compared to Brecht's later works, yet they may be comparable, in terms of their similar origins on border locations, which are, by their very nature, dialectical" (Harrington 565). Binne suggests that the border does not entirely cut people off from each other but rather encourages a back and forth dialogue. Field Day furthers this dialogue by staging the wounded body, a physical representation of the land scarred by borders. The wounded body on Field Day's stage pushes the Irish audience

from the North and South to question the border, while reconsidering Irish identity. The word "always," as the old schoolmaster Hugh tells Maire, is a silly word (3, 374). There is room for change. In this way, the fifth province of the mind promises healing in its hope that Irish identity that can move beyond strict and paralyzing identities.

## Revising Ireland: Wounds and Cures in Seamus Heaney's

### *The Cure at Troy: A Version of Sophocles' Philoctetes*

#### CHAPTER TWO

Brian Friel ends *Translations* with Hugh's attempt to quote lines from *The Aeneid*. He stumbles, "Such was – such was the course – such was the course ordained – ordained by fate ... What the hell's wrong with me? Sure I know it backways. I'll begin again. *Urbs antiqua fuit* – there was an ancient city which 'tis said, Juno loved above all the lands" (3, 374). Here Hugh finds himself caught in an attempt to recite a Latin myth that describes the fated destruction of Carthage by the Romans. Brian Arkins suggests that Hugh's ineloquence stems from his final acceptance of the devastating power of empire. What is more, according to Arkins, Hugh's repetition parallels the cyclical nature of empire in history, from Roman to British and beyond (65). The scene also contrasts the final scene of Sean O'Casey's *Juno and the Paycock*, as Seamus Heaney explains:

What the end of *Translations* does is to disallow too much sentimental indulgence for those two old tragic-comic codgers in the earlier play: their beloved theatrical images are being ironized, and certain stereotypes from the historical memory are also being revised – stereotypes of the learned hedge-schoolmaster and prodigiously educated country scholar, the wild earth of whose speech is richly stored with the fragmented ware of classical literature. (For Liberation 238)

Heaney highlights Friel's use of revision in *Translations*, both of O'Casey's play and stereotypes from the Irish past. Thus Friel reconstructs Irish identity by translating *Juno and the Paycock*. Contrary to some readings, Friel does not transform Gaelic-speaking

Ireland into a lost Eden; on the contrary, his play suggests the dangers of idealizing the past. Jimmy Jack, a pitiful character who dissociates from reality because of his immersion in dead languages, stands out most powerfully as an example of Friel's pragmatic outlook. For Heaney, "The characters in the play may be indulged in their nostalgia, but the play itself is intent upon liberating the audience and the playwright himself from any consolation in the backward look" (For Liberation 239). Like Janus, the Roman God of beginnings and endings, Friel looks backwards at Ireland of the 1830s while simultaneously looking ahead at a future that can, somehow, accommodate Irish and English in a hybridized form.

Brian Friel is not alone in his preoccupation with translation and desire to use old myths to structure and further his own ends. In October of 1990, ten years after the Field Day Theater Company opened with Friel's *Translations*, Seamus Heaney contributed to the Field Day enterprise with *The Cure at Troy: A Version of Sophocles' Philoctetes*. Winner of the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1995 and the Whitbread Prize for his translation of *Beowulf* in 2000, Seamus Heaney is a household name in the literary world. In addition to these remarkable credits, Heaney also held a position as one of the six directors of the Field Day Theater Company, giving the group a perspective "informed by a poet's intimate negotiations with language, his knowledge that language is slippery, obdurate and coercive" (Flanagan 107).

Heaney's interest in language, like Friel's own, centers upon translation. Both writers work towards revision, in hopes of freeing Irish identity from "a linguistic contour that no longer matches the landscape of ... fact" (Friel 2, 351). In other words, both writers want to break a tendency towards paralysis in Irish self-definition through

translation, particularly in the North where names are still a problem, as Deane indicates in "Heroic Styles: The Tradition of an Idea," a Field Day pamphlet:

The terms of the dispute are outmoded but they linger on. The most obvious reason for this is the continuation of the Northern 'problem', where 'unionism' and 'nationalism' still compete for supremacy in relation to ideas of identity racially defined as either 'Irish' or 'British' in communities which are deformed by believing themselves to be the historic inheritors of those identities and the traditions presumed to go with them. (54)

Here Deane uses the word "deformed" to describe the communities of Northern Ireland, recognizing the way a strict adherence to the past cripples the Irish, as the character of Jimmy Jack suggests in *Translations*. Friel and Heaney hope to investigate alternative roles and identities for the Irish, turning to drama because of its emphasis on fluidity and continual interpretation. Antonin Artaud aptly describes this theatrical transience:

Let us leave textual criticism to graduate students, formal criticism to esthetes, and recognize that what has been said is not still to be said; that an expression does not have the same value twice, does not live two lives; that all words, once spoken, are dead and function only at the moment when they are uttered, that a form, once it has served, cannot be used again and asks only to be replaced by another, and that the theater is the only place in the world where a gesture, once made, can never be made the same way twice. (75)

More simply, every performance is an opportunity for translation and change, a chance to reframe the past and free Irish identity from paralyzing historical stereotypes. Both *Translations* and *The Cure at Troy* negotiate history and challenge colonial discourse by

creating dialogues with the past. Friel and Heaney retell stories through translation, altering understandings of the present by reframing the past. Like drama and translation, Irish identity is fluid and capable of changing with time, interpretation, and even directorial flair.

While Friel looks to a moment of translation within Ireland, Heaney looks abroad to adapt Sophocles' *Philoctetes*. Notably, in the eyes of both Sophocles and Lady Gregory, the theater is a venue where politics and art can mingle: "It is no accident that it is Irish settings which have given these Greek classics a new dimension: for Ireland has the last English-speaking contemporary drama that still sees the theater as the natural place to juggle ideas" (Walton 8). Working within the Field Day Theater Company and thereby claiming a political agenda, Heaney turns to Greek drama as an appropriate space for invoking political ideas.

Additionally, Greek myths provide a structure and a story while supporting varied interpretations. In the words of J. Michael Walton, "It becomes powerful by virtue of its universality, inviting decodings tied to each new occasion or circumstance. Myth can reveal you to yourself. And, as Irish writers have turned to ancient Greek material as translators, adapters, commentators, or what you will, so in the process through myth they have tended to unmask themselves" (4). This generalization, however, does not begin to address the subversive potential of using a Greek veneer to address Irish material. Marianne McDonald emphasizes this point and recognizes that most governments and societies value the classics, thus enabling the oppressed to voice their discontent through that guise: "The Irish could conceal the direct statement of their desires behind the mask of Greek tragedy. Greek tragedy in Irish hands became social

critique, not only of the occupiers, but of their own comedic acquiescence or bloody squabbling among themselves” (38). As McDonald suggests, Heaney safely criticizes the internal strife in his own Northern Irish community by using Greek drama.

*Philoctetes*, a play that does not stage any deaths, lends Heaney two vital images, the wound and the cure. As Hugh Denard explains, this play becomes a useful mirror for reflecting Northern Ireland’s fixations:

To the Sophoclean representation of a wounded, embittered Philoctetes, Heaney brought the experience of suffering in Northern Ireland. To the Northern Irish crisis, the Sophoclean model brought a vision of miraculous redemption which, in Heaney’s version, avoided merely aestheticizing “The Troubles” by the toughness and realism of its tenor, and the long shadows of irony with which it concludes.

(2)

In other words, *Philoctetes* gives Heaney an opportunity to speak to Northern Ireland’s wounds while simultaneously incorporating an image of hope. Although Heaney insists that Philoctetes is “first and foremost a character in the Greek play” and “not meant to be understood as a trimly allegorical representation of hardline unionism,” the play reverberates in the Irish context (Production Notes 175). Heaney’s text does not stray very far from Sophocles’ original in content: the only notable addition is the chorus’ opening speech, which has no Sophoclean precedent. Despite Heaney’s strong disavowal, however, his heritage bleeds into the play as he translates the body of the text into a Northern Irish dialect. What is more, by writing the piece for Field Day, Heaney aligns *The Cure at Troy* and Philoctetes’ plight with Northern Irish politics, appealing directly

to audiences in both Northern Ireland and the Republic through the company's touring route.

Beyond Friel and Heaney, translation functions as a basic tool for discussion within the Field Day Theater Company's apparatus. "Producing at the conjunction of colonial and postcolonial," writes W. B. Worthen, "of the Republic of Ireland and the United Kingdom, or Ireland north and south, of Protestant and Catholic, Field Day takes 'translation' as its central image of political change" (137). Translation works best for Field Day because it is a tool of revision. Simply, it can ground a Greek play in the Irish context but, what is more, it encourages change, culturally and therefore politically as well. In Heaney's production notes to *The Cure at Troy*, he writes, "The essential travail is change" (175). Even though Heaney attributes the central conflict to Neoptolemus and his wavering between "the truth of institution and the demands of solidarity," the word "travail" suggests physical labor and alludes to Philoctetes' wound as well as Neoptolemus' mental suffering (Production Notes 175).

Additionally, "travail" suggests the metaphor of birth. There are several moments in the play when Philoctetes meditates upon death because of the pain of his physical and spiritual wounds. At the end of the play, feeling abandoned and doubly betrayed by Neoptolemus, Philoctetes asks the chorus for an ax:

*Philoctetes.* What for? What do you think for?

For foot and head and hand. For the relief of cutting myself off. I want away

*Chorus.* How away?

*Philoctetes.* Away to the house of death.

To my father, sitting waiting there

Under the clay roof. I'll come back in to him  
Out of the light, out of his memory  
Of the day I left.  
We'll be on the riverbank  
Again, and see the Greeks arriving  
And me setting out for Troy, in all good faith. (64)

Philoctetes imagines relief in death, in a way, destroying his wounded body piece by piece; however, the phrase "cutting myself off" is not usually meant literally. Here it also implies a final separation from the community that betrayed Philoctetes. More than death, though, Philoctetes craves a complete community, symbolized by his desire to return to his father and a moment when he felt like an integrated member of the Greek society, when everything was still in "good faith." Heaney gives Philoctetes a chance to share in this type of community once again by becoming the conqueror of Troy. This reintegration into the community, or rebirth, is a difficult process and takes the intervention of Hercules, complete with "full thunderclap and eruption-effects" (78). Notably, the volcano, emblematic of Hercules in this plays, also functions as a symbol of rebirth. This climactic and theatrical moment highlights Philoctetes' struggle and suggests, despite Heaney's appreciation for Neoptolemus, that Philoctetes is in fact the principal character of the play. His wound becomes a symbol of the need to work towards a spirit of translation in Northern Ireland that embraces change and encourages flexibility.

Heaney gives Northern Ireland a voice by translating the play into dialect. More importantly perhaps, the stage lends a vision of Irish identity to Northern Ireland through its use of the actor's body. The body is a necessary part of identity, both individually and

collectively. John W. Burton puts identity into theatrical terms. He writes, "Building upon this tradition, that the individual is a product of the collective, Terrance Turner (1980) argues that the 'social skin' is the common frontier between the individual and society at large. He asserts that the surface of the body is the stage upon which the drama of socialization is enacted" (31). In this way, Philoctetes' wound represents more than a personal injury. It also represents the wounds of the Northern Irish community at large, wounds which extend beyond intercommunity strife to incorporate the repercussions of colonialism as well: "In a more general way the 'fact' of the body is a central feature of the post-colonial, standing as it does metonymically for all the 'visible' signs of difference, and their varied forms of cultural and social inscription, forms often either undervalued, over-determined, or even totally invisible to the dominant political discourse" (Ashcroft 321). The festering wound in *The Cure at Troy* stage difference but, more than this, incites a reaction to the Irish body, often "totally invisible to the dominant political discourse" (Ashcroft 321). Thus, Heaney, following Artaud's example, creates a theater that "will shake the organism to its foundations and leave an ineffaceable scar" (Artaud 77).

By way of Philoctetes' wound, Heaney discusses the political situation in Northern Ireland, displaying the wounds of British colonialism through Odysseus' attempt to exploit Philoctetes. Furthermore, Philoctetes associates his wound with betrayal and a lack of communication and trust within the Greek community. Isolated by the island landscape, Philoctetes fixates on the betrayal. He identifies himself as a victim and cannot see himself any other way, despite the fact that he owns a triumphant bow that could make him the hero of Troy. Neoptolemus pushes Philoctetes to bend slightly and

forgive. Bluntly, he exhorts, "Stop just licking your wounds. Start seeing things" (74).

Heaney, as translator, urges revision. Philoctetes' inability to open his heart and see himself as more than a victim becomes the central problem of the text and his final reintegration into the community becomes the cure.

Philoctetes' wound disrupts community, symbolized most vividly by the way it interrupts the religious rites of the Greeks: "We couldn't even get peace at the altar / Without him breaking out in these howling fits/ slabbering and cursing" (3-4). Heaney makes the problem of the wound incredibly physical. For example, Philoctetes rages, "Has the bad smell left me? Will you not start vomiting all over the altar now again? Will I not make you get sick into the holy vessels this time? That was your excuse, don't you forget. That was why you dumped me" (57). The physical reality of the wound makes it an undeniable problem, which Odysseus attempts to ignore by separating Philoctetes from the rest of the community. This recalls the Anglo-Irish Treaty of 1921 and Northern Ireland's situation ever since. Odysseus admits, "Everybody's nerves were getting raw" and, like many of the leading powers in 1921, understands his actions as the best solution possible (4). Odysseus argues, "My main concern is to keep things moving in the right direction" (57). Valuing political expediency, Odysseus ignores the way Philoctetes' wound festers.

Philoctetes' pain transcends the physical injury to encompass the betrayal of his compatriots:

Let me tell you, son, the way they abandoned me.

The sea and the sea-swell had me all worn out,

So I dozed and fell asleep under a rock

Down on the shore.

And there and then, just like that,

They headed off.

And they were delighted.

And the only thing

They left me was a bundle of old rags. (17-18)

They leave Philoctetes while he sleeps without a word of explanation. He interprets his fellow Greeks as “delighted” and ignores Odysseus’ argument that it was, “Only because I had been ordered to” (3). In this way, Heaney aligns the wound with a failure in communication.

Neoptolemus’ duplicity also disrupts communication. Philoctetes can hardly believe what he hears and struggles with language to express this horrible blow. He stutters, “What? / What? What sort of talk is this?” (59). Worse than this, language loses all meaning in the face of betrayal. Philoctetes cannot make sense of Neoptolemus. He asks, “Meaning? / What meaning? / How could there be meaning?” (59). Without the bonds of community, words are idle and hold no meaning. Once his initial confusion passes, Philoctetes puts the pain of betrayal back in terms of the wound:

Burnt bones!

Sears and blisters!

There was more left

Of Hercules on the pyre than’s left of me.

The salamanders have me. I’m scorched to nothing. (51)

The betrayal hurts Philoctetes beyond wounding to the point of death. Thus, he imagines himself upon his own funeral pyre.

Additionally language falters in the face of the physicality of the wound. When Neoptolemus first sees the disgusting bandage he shouts, "Aww! Look at this. / Aw! Rotten, rotten stuff. Bandage-rags. / Nothing but old dry pus and dirty clouts" (5). His words come slowly as he tries to express what he sees, moving from "stuff" to "bandage-rags" to the definitive and sturdy "clouts." He repeats rotten as if the word itself creates an obstacle to get over instead of merely the sight or the smell. These lines are remarkably evocative in contrast to translator E. F. Waitling's interpretation: "Here's something else: rags hanging out to dry, / Stained, it appears, with the flux of a nasty wound" (164). In Waitling's translation the rags serve simply as an indicator of Philoctetes' presence; in contrast, the wound in Heaney's version is a reality whose existence is difficult to handle. In response to the Chorus's prodding, Neoptolemus responds, "Be sure this isn't all loose talk. / Take care that you aren't going to change your tune / When he's stinking up the boat, and your stomach's turning" (28). The reality of the wound makes pity difficult for Neoptolemus.

Although not as explicit as Friel's depiction of the Ordinance Survey, there is a colonial aspect to this play: Neoptolemus and Odysseus arrive for the purpose of exploiting the resident of the island. The discourse of the play furthers this aspect by attributing animalistic qualities to the colonized figure, all of which derive from the wound itself or Philoctetes' abandonment, a deep psychological wound. The play begins with Odysseus and Neoptolemus hunting Philoctetes. Odysseus says, "Somewhere here he has a sort of den." Beyond the word "den," Odysseus likens Philoctetes to a wolf,

always howling (4). Neoptolemus picks up this language and says to the chorus, “Keep on the lookout for the creature” (12). The Chorus, however, calls this characterization into question – “Does he live in a den or a house?” – and reasserts a human aspect to the “wild man” (12). Neoptolemus does not answer them with either term, indicating rather that “His shake-down is up there / In a sort of roofed-in place under the rocks” (12).

Marked by bodily disfigurement and described as a beast, Philoctetes easily compares with *The Tempest*'s Caliban. Notably, Heaney was reading this Shakespearean comedy as he composed *The Cure at Troy* (McDonald 68). *The Tempest* uses the language of imperialism throughout the text to mark the differences between Prospero and Caliban. Even though Prospero acts as the duke of Milan, Shakespeare's heritage links the character of Prospero more to England than to the Mediterranean, in part because of the magical role Prospero and Shakespeare share as creator figures. Likewise, Caliban, a native and unruly islander, serves as a representative of the Irish. In this way, Shakespeare reinforces the stereotypical characterizations of the English and the Irish by contrasting the civilized Prospero with Caliban, barbarian and thwarted rapist. In the words of Stephen Greenblatt, “Shakespeare does not shrink from the darkest European fantasies about the Wild Man. Indeed, he exaggerates them: Caliban is deformed, lecherous, evil smelling, treacherous, naïve, drunken, lazy, rebellious, violent, and devil worshipping” (3052). By reinforcing these categories of civilian and barbarian, Shakespeare turns Caliban into an appalling figure, thereby framing the Irish in the same way.

In a similar way, the chorus attributes beastly qualities to Philoctetes: “Behaving like a savage...Howling wild like a wolf” (13). Notably, though, the chorus does not

explicitly label Philoctetes as a savage or wolf. Through his use of simile, Heaney acts out comparison, drawing attention to the politics behind the animalistic portrayal of Philoctetes. In this way, Heaney recognizes language's role in constructing Englishness and Irishness. Heaney does not depict Philoctetes physically as an animal or monster, despite images of the hunt and Philoctetes' howling. This contrasts significantly with the way Shakespeare uses Caliban:

In *The Cure at Troy* Philoctetes is physically represented as a "wild man," although he has not a Caliban's fins or fangs to lend credence to the colonist's definition of him as an animal. Even when Philoctetes supposes that he looks "like a wild animal," he is referring only to his unkempt state. In *The Cure at Troy*, therefore (unlike Shakespeare's *The Tempest*) the audience is physically confronted with the fictionality of the colonists' constructions of the colonized. (Denard 7)

By staging Philoctetes' similarities to Odysseus and Neoptolemus, Heaney reveals that the barbarian and civilian are quite similar, rather than entirely distinct as *The Tempest* implies. Thus, Heaney shows that the stereotypical identification of the Irish as barbarians does not render the Irish fairly. In many ways, the British and the Irish are more similar than they often like to admit.

Hugh Denard also points to how Heaney inverts colonial discourse to subvert the colonialist's linguistic oppression. He writes, "Philoctetes turns the colonists' terms against them, and defines *them*, rather than himself, as animals – a reversal of the application of the animal stigma which is not present in Sophocles" (10). Heaney pushes this even further and emphasizes that, while wounded, Philoctetes is also "Him, the

master bowman, the great name” (13). He has undeniable status. Caliban, on the other hand, tells Stefano, “Do that good mischief which may make this island / Thine own for ever, and I thy Caliban / For aye thy foot licker” (4.1 216-18). Caliban gives himself to Stefano as a lowly subject, willing to lick his feet; Philoctetes, master bowman, would never submit to such a degrading action.

Significantly, Caliban and Philoctetes have a different relationship with language. In highlighting the colonial implications of *The Tempest*, Barbara Fuchs writes, “Caliban meanwhile, recalls the second model developed by the English to justify colonization: the Irish subject in need of civilization. Miranda’s speech presents the colonizer’s story of attempts to civilize the native and locates the supposed intractability of Caliban in his lack of language” (275-6). Caliban responds bitterly to Miranda, “You taught me language, and my profit on’t / Is I know how to curse. The red plague rid you / For learning me your language!” (1.2 366- 368). Although Philoctetes frequently curses like his Shakespearean counterpart, Philoctetes seeks community and looks for it in a shared language: “Your clothes look Greek and that warms my heart / But I need to hear your voices” (15). After Neoptolemus affirms that he is a fellow Greek, Philoctetes gushes with joy:

Ohh! Hearing you talk,

just hearing you

And seeing you –

you have no idea

How much that means. (15-16)

The search for communication and community along with it humanizes Philoctetes at the same time that it subverts the anticipations of the colonizer.

Heaney, beyond his use of language, also uses the staged body to subvert colonialism. As mentioned in chapter one, Mitchell and Snyder argue that disabled bodies operate as metaphors for resistance to the “cultural desire to ‘enforce normalcy’” (48). In a colonial context this enforced normalcy refers to the colonizer’s construction of the colonized as the “Other” and the presumed right to exploit this inferior being. In *The Cure at Troy*, Neoptolemus and Odysseus attempt to control Philoctetes through force and manipulate him through language; however, Philoctetes’ uncontrollable spasms symbolize his resistance to their efforts. They cannot control his body. In Heaney’s text, Philoctetes language is even more unrestrained. As his body writhes and twists, so do Philoctetes’ words. They are even laid out on the page in a form that imitates this fact:

Promise. What use is promise?

Swear it to me.

But no, swear nothing.

Son,

I am astray. What am I saying?

Philoctetes’ linguistic raving and confusion along with his bodily difference defy traditional notions of order and control. His language and body are equal affronts to the colonial mission.

Gilbert and Tompkins further highlight the unique power of staging the wounded body:

Most often, the personal site of the body becomes a sign of the political fortunes of the collective culture, a sign which must be actively reassigned to a more productive representation through embodiments on the post-colonial stage. In the theatre, the derogated body is a potent site of representation since the constraints and oppressions it endures can be visually displayed rather than simply described.

(221)

Philoctetes' anticipated cure supports Gilbert and Tompkins' argument. The cure suggests the transformation of the derogated body into a "more productive representation" since the cure will enable Philoctetes to overcome his paralysis and start over. Additionally, Gilbert and Tompkins stress the power of visual representation and its great potential for subversion. "Moreover," they assert, "this body plays out a performative contradiction which can be used subversively when the presumably powerful physicality of the actor is harnessed in order to convey the disempowered body of the fictional character as colonial subject" (221-222). Philoctetes' wound suggests his oppression in the hands of a colonial power; at the same time, however, theatrical devices, such as make-up and costuming, create the injury for the eyes of the audience. It is not real. Behind this apparent crippling is a powerful human who controls his body to such a great degree that he can imitate being maimed.

Philoctetes further defies colonial expectations by bonding with Neoptolemus. Despite their initial difference, Philoctetes and Neoptolemus find a shared history through their lost Greek war heroes. Neoptolemus, however, denies any knowledge of Philoctetes' name and story. This erasure makes Philoctetes cry out in a pain near equal to that of his foot spasms: "And haven't you even heard my name...? / Och ho! / Or

heard about the way I am afflicted?" (17). Adding actual shrieks of pain to his version, Heaney puts them into the Irish dialect by using the exclamation "Och." Heaney explains, "This is a very Irish monosyllable, Scottish too, and meant to make the play at home in the deep ear of the its first audience. But I would want an American actor to stick to *Aw*" (Production Notes 174). Strikingly, *Philoctetes* trails off into an ellipsis. David B. Morris explains the serious implications of this silence:

Suffering is voiceless in the metaphorical sense that silence becomes a sign of something ultimately unknowable. It implies an experience not just repugnant but inaccessible to understanding. In this sense, suffering encompasses an irreducible nonverbal dimension that we cannot know – not at least in any normal mode of knowing – because it happens in a realm beyond language. (27)

As Heaney shows, language cannot describe the pain behind the loss of *Philoctetes*' name and story; he must resort to cries of pain to express it. In Morris's words, "A scream is not speech but the most intense possible negation of language: sound and terror approaching the limits of absolute muteness. Like the ceremonial wailing of grief, it seems to come from a region where words fail" (27). *Philoctetes*, in this way, keens in traditional Irish fashion for the loss of his name. This loss becomes one more curse on *Philoctetes*, one more festering point. He says, "But it's me the gods have cursed. / They've let my name and story be wiped out" (17). Burton explains the importance of a name from an anthropological perspective: "Like many other aspects of human culture, personal names initially appear arbitrary. But the fact that naming is a universal dimension of human culture points to our need to be distinctly and discretely recognized. The personal name is a key marker of personal and cultural identity" (Burton 55).

Philoctetes, therefore has not only lost his name, he has lost his place in culture.

Similarly, both Friel's *Translations* and Robinson's *Listening to the Landscape* affirm Philoctetes' trauma. It is not just the name, as Heaney reminds the reader, but the erasure of the accompanying story that hits hardest.

Philoctetes loses his relationship to community in part because of his isolation from the Greek community. Because of the psychological pain brought on by the betrayal of his friends, loneliness becomes an integral part of the wound, leaving Philoctetes to define himself through both his foot wound and the isolated landscape. The Chorus emphasizes the isolation on the island by drawing attention to the uncultivated land. Using anaphora, Heaney's chorus echoes the word "No" and highlights the emptiness surrounding Philoctetes: "No cultivated ground, / No field where crops abound / No milled grain or bread" (38). Moreover, Heaney, by linking the landscape to Philoctetes' wound, makes the pain of isolation physical: "Absolute loneliness. Nothing there except / the beat of the waves and the beat of my raw wound" (18). Here Heaney's stylistic choices say everything. The line, "the beat of the waves and the beat of my raw wound," is symmetrical with near equal emphasis on both parts, with the wound receiving slightly more attention because of the adjective "raw." What is more, "raw" and "wave" and "wound" and "wave" are alliterative, which reinforces Heaney's paring of the foot sore with the isolation of the landscape.

Heaney also relies upon repetition to indicate the beat of isolation on the island of Lemnos:

This island is a nowhere. Nobody

Would ever put in here. There's nothing.

Nothing to attract a lookout's eye.

Nobody in his right mind would come near it. (18)

Not only do the negative words echo one another, their placement creates a chiasmic structure. "Nobody" ends the first line and begins the last while "nothing" functions in a similar way in the second and third lines. This crossing and repetition suggest Philoctetes' intense preoccupation with his isolation and the inability of language to adequately describe his pain. He can only cross back and forth from one type of isolation to another, from the people who never arrive to the emptiness of the island itself. Without any company, he remains fixated on his pain. He tells Neoptolemus, "Every day has been a weeping wound" (19). He describes his sad existence most succinctly by putting his life back into the terms of his foot sore.

David Wood argues, "To dwell in a place is to engage in a continuing exchange of meaning through which one's identity becomes, at least in part, a kind of symbiotic relationship with where one dwells. This is true not just of those places of which people speak fondly, but of bleak, inhospitable places too" (198). In other words, landscape and the human body are continually in dialogue with each other, working to construct identity. Robinson states, "Thus, we, personally, cumulatively, communally, create and recreate landscapes – a landscape being not just the terrain but also the human perspectives on it, the land plus its overburden of meanings" (162). In other words, as people create landscapes through language, they create themselves as well. Therefore the island geography of Lemnos and its inherent isolation mark Philoctetes' character. This applies more broadly to the people of Ireland as well. In Csilla Bertha's astute words, "Living *like* an island, and even more so, living *on* islands, as the Irish do physically and

geographically, naturally offers both the advantages and the dangers of insularity: the possibility for preserving intrinsic cultural traditions and values untouched by ephemeral fashions but also the danger of turning too much inwards and fossilizing” (Bertha 242). In the beginning of *The Cure at Troy*, Heaney focuses on the negative aspects of living on and like an island. Philoctetes does not become a symbol of a culture preserved; instead, he appears as a dangerous man incapable of forgiveness.

Heaney, however, does not fault only Philoctetes for fossilizing and includes a broad range of characters: “Heroes. Victims. Gods and human beings... People so staunch and true, they’re fixated, / Shining with self-regard like polished stones”(1). Here Heaney invokes Ireland’s rocky landscape to describe the isolation of all of his characters. Narrowing the comparison, Seamus Deane focuses on the provincialism of the North. He writes, “Both communities in the North pride themselves on being the lone and true inheritors of their respective traditions. Their vision of themselves is posited on this conviction of fidelity, even though this is slightly flawed by the simultaneous recognition that the fidelity might also be a product of isolation and provincialism” (53). Deane does not unabashedly declare that isolation is the root of the Northern Irish problem but he does understand it as a contributing factor; it allows people to become cemented in their beliefs, while embracing disabling myths. “The communities have become stereotyped into their roles of oppressor and victim,” Deane continues, “to such an extent that the notion of a Protestant or Catholic sensibility is now assumed to be a fact of nature rather than a product of these very special and ferocious characteristics” (54). Here Deane echoes Friel’s *Translations* which insists, “It is not the literal past, the ‘facts’ of history, that shape us, but images of the past embodied in language... we must never cease

renewing these images because once we do we fossilize" (3, 373). Deane, Friel, and Heaney all work against this fossilization as directors of the Field Day Theater Company.

Heaney's use of Greek drama suggests that communities are constructed through collective myths that can be renewed and re-imagined. *The Cure at Troy*, however, to acknowledge Deane's concerns, enacts a troubling plot since it affirms the crippling roles of victim and oppressor. Despite Heaney's warnings not to read the play as a strict rendering of Irish politics, Philoctetes' acceptance of bloodshed has serious implications in a society dominated by the IRA and similar groups that foster mentalities and loyalties that breed violence. Heaney, however, puts the war itself in terms of the wound in need of a miraculous end. This prevents the play from unequivocally endorsing violence as a solution: "Go with your bow. Conclude the sore / and cruel stalemate of our war" (79). Philoctetes' bow will create a conclusion that will enable both sides to move out of the paralyzing stalemate, for better or worse. By rhyming "sore" and "war" at the end of the lines, Heaney emphasizes the pain inherent in war and lends his translation a tone that is dramatically different from Watling's version, which glorifies violence and destruction: "You are to be the chosen champion / of that great army; you are to seek out Paris, / First cause of all this wickedness and destroy him" (211). Heaney, on the other hand, urges Philoctetes to "Win by fair combat. But know to shun / Reprisal killings when that's done" (79). Heaney cannot ignore that the plot of *Philoctetes* ends with the imminent siege of Troy. Realizing that war is an undeniable part of history, past and future, Heaney acknowledges some violence in *The Cure at Troy*. Thus Heaney seems to share Friel's cyclical view of empire, expressed through Hugh's retelling of *The Aeneid*. At the same time, though, Heaney favors actions that will create change and avoid paralysis.

In the opening chorus created by Heaney, all stand accused of fossilizing, conquerors, and victims, even the divine. Heaney's sweeping gesture brings in all of embittered humanity, suggesting that all are guilty and all can change. He expounds upon this idea in his production notes:

Still, Philoctetes is not meant to be understood as a trimly allegorical representation of hardline Unionism. He is first and foremost a character in the Greek play, himself alone with his predicament, just as he is also an aspect of every intransigence, victimhood, the righteous refusal, the wounded one whose identity depends on the wound, the betrayed one whose energy and pride is a morbid symptom. (175)

Indeed Heaney's call, "Stop just licking your wounds. Start seeing things," functions as an exhortation for all. At the same time, though, Heaney addresses the Irish audience explicitly through Field Day, challenging them to construct Irish identity without relying upon the wounds left behind by the British Empire.

Heaney's chorus, as a dramatic signifier of community, works to include the Irish audience by breaking the fourth wall of the stage:

Licking their wounds  
And flashing them around like decorations  
I hate it, I always hated it, and I am  
A part of it myself.  
And a part of you,  
For my part is the chorus, and the chorus  
Is more or less a borderline between

The you and the me of it. (2)

This moment, according to Brecht, alienates the members of the audience, making them conscious that they are watching a performance: "The first condition for the achievement of the A-effect is that the actor must invest what he has to show with a definite gest of showing. It is of course necessary to drop the assumption that there is a fourth wall cutting the audience off from the stage and the consequent illusion that the stage action is taking place in reality without an audience" (31). Alienation serves as a political tool of the theater, enabling the audience to view the production critically, rather than being transported into a fantasy world. Heaney not only uses this technique to push his audience to analyze Philoctetes' intransigence but to force the spectator to think critically about Troy's destruction as well. Moreover, few audience members would be ignorant of the word "borderline" and its implications within Ireland. By challenging borders on the stage, Heaney encourages the audience to break down boundary lines in their own lives and to stop seeing Ireland as four provinces, favoring healing and a fifth province of the mind.

At the same time that Field Day campaigns for this imaginary realm, Heaney simultaneously credits the Irish landscape for its ability to create an empowering identity. For Heaney the land is a symbol of stability: "We are dwellers, we are namers, we are lovers, we make homes and search for our histories. And when we look for the history of our sensibilities I am convinced, as Professor J. C. Beckett was convinced about the history of Ireland generally, that it is to what he called the stable element, the land itself that we must look for continuity" (Preoccupations 149). Although the landscape may be desolate, Philoctetes often receives comfort from it. For example, after a horrible spasm,

Philoctetes imagines himself sinking into the earth. "From now on, I am going to belong / Entirely to the earth. Be earth's for the taking. / I'll lie on top here first, and then lie under" (45). The Chorus follows up these lines by acknowledging, "Sleep is the god-sent cure. / Deep-reaching, painless, sure" (45). By using the phrase "god-sent cure," the chorus foreshadows Hercules's invention and the conclusion of the play. This suggests that a union with the landscape is an important aspect of that cure.

Heaney's understanding of the land differs from other translations of Sophocles' text. McDonald notes, "In Sophocles, Philoctetes delivered a mournful farewell to his island, but objectified it" (71). Watling's translation supports her reading. Here Philoctetes makes the island his possession by frequently using the possessive pronoun, saying farewell to "my cave," "my watchtower," "my very roof," and "my island" (212). In contrast, Heaney links Philoctetes' identity to the landscape, showing how the two are inextricably bound together: "I'm like a fossil that's being carried away, I'm nothing but cave stones and an old mush of dead leaves. The sound of waves in draughty passages. A cliff that's wet with spray on winter's morning" (80). Significantly, Heaney moves from the base description of "old mush and dead leaves" to the potent image of a cliff on a wintry morning, leaving the reader with an image of Philoctetes that suggests strength and endurance despite pain and suffering.

In this situation, Heaney's use of the word "fossil" does not hold the negative connotations of fossilizing related to Philoctetes' intransigence; instead, it becomes an image of endurance and continuity with the past, an image that Heaney associates with his own craft. Referring to William Wordsworth's *The Prelude*, Heaney characterizes his own poetry as an archaeological find:

Implicit in those lines is a view of poetry which I think is implicit in the few lines I have written that give me any right to speak: poetry as divination, poetry as revelation of the self, as restoration of the culture to itself; poems as elements of continuity, with the aura and authenticity of archaeological finds, where the buried shard has an importance that is not diminished by the importance of the buried city; poetry as a dig, a dig for finds that end up being plants.

(Preoccupations 41)

Beyond giving Philoctetes a heartfelt connection to the past, Heaney lends Philoctetes' many of the other characteristics that he values within his own poetry. For example, Hercules' intervention highlights the divine, simultaneously functioning as a moment of self-realization for Philoctetes. In Heaney's own words, "Hercules' speech at the end (which I transpose to the Chorus) is an expression of recognition which Philoctetes has repressed: in other words, the Chorus is the voice of his unconscious" (Production notes 173). Moreover, by re-establishing himself as a member of the community, Philoctetes appears as a "restoration of the culture to itself" (41). In this way, the end of the play makes poetry part of the solution to the wounds of Northern Ireland, thus supporting Field Day's understanding that art can heal.

Heaney believes in the power of art to conquer pain and fear. Philoctetes must allow himself to give credit to healing powers of art, which Heaney emphasizes in "Crediting Poetry," his Nobel Prize acceptance speech:

Only the very stupid or the very deprived can any longer help knowing that the documents of civilizations have been written in blood and tears, blood and tears no less real for being very remote. And when this intellectual predisposition

coexists with the actualities of Ulster and Israel and Bosnia and Rwanda and host of other wounded spots on the face of the earth, the inclination is not only not to credit human nature with much constructive potential but not to credit anything too positive in the work of art. (423)

Heaney understands the desire to give up in the face of troubles but will not refuse the power of art, which may not be able to change the world but can function as a “momentary stay against confusion” (Frontiers 194).

Philoctetes’ cure lies in the mystical bow. As one of the only props in the play, it holds incredible significance. Primarily, the bow bends and counters the stone-link fixation that paralyzes Philoctetes. At the same time, however, it is also a representation of art: it is a man-made tool that requires skill to operate. Like art, the bow can restore Philoctetes’ name and story. Neoptolemus attests,

This is the summer of the Fall of Troy.

It’ll be talked about for ever and you’re to be

The hero that was healed and then went on

To heal the wound of the Trojan war itself. (73)

It is time for the war to end and Philoctetes must end it. Despite Odysseus’ claims that Philoctetes is “only another archer among archers,” (58) Philoctetes manifests as an integral member of the community, necessary to defeat Troy. First, though, he must learn to bend.

In addition to being a symbol of art, the bow represents ritual. Significantly, it rests in Philoctetes hands because of his dutiful attention to Hercules’ funeral pyre.

Greek tragedy finds its roots in ritual, making ritual a powerful force in *The Cure at Troy*:

The findings of the anthropologists about the origins of tragedy are not irrelevant here. Even though they cannot be verified historically, they seem psychologically true. The religious ritual out of which it is thought tragedy grew – the dance of mourning in the fall festival at the death of the old year or (as some think) the ritual sacrifice of propitiation – was in itself an action, a response to a condition, a kind of answer to the question of existence. It was an answer in terms of gesture and action rather than language, and represents, perhaps, man's first attempt to deal creatively with pain and fear. (Sewall 38)

Greek theater functions as one way to deal with the wounds of living. It uses art, as Heaney himself stresses, to confront pain. Ritual therefore becomes a positive way to deal with the problems of existence. Claudia Clausius makes Beckett's wounded characters in *Waiting for Godot* a striking example of this: "While scanning the horizon for Godot, the tramps must still contend with their fellowmen, their own discomforts, and the world around them... Their hopes may be mystical, but their reality remains social and worldly. Ritual then, grounds man on earth – lending support and deflecting anxiety" (125). In addition, ritual helps overcome wounds because it emphasizes communication, not only between the heavens and the earth but also among the people who share and recognize the ritual (Clausius 125).

Philoctetes shares the bow with Neoptolemus through ritualized gesture. Heaney writes, "The bow is proffered, elevated and held significantly before them" (37).

Appearing at the center of the drama, this moment holds great significance, especially since *The Cure at Troy* does not stage much action. Moreover, the play seems to slow down here, as Philoctetes eloquently speaks instead of raving in pain:

You and you alone can tell the world

You touched this weapon, and the reason why

Is the reason I got it from Hercules

In the first place: generous behavior. (37)

The passing of the bow serves as a gesture of good will, a movement that demonstrates Philoctetes sincere trust in Neoptolemus. Later, this makes Neoptolemus' betrayal even more painful for Philoctetes. "Any kind of trust is a mistake," asserts Philoctetes (52). At the same time, though, Philoctetes desperately wants to trust again. He immediately counters his cynical claim by recognizing how much Neoptolemus means to him:

Oh, but son, you don't want to believe

That's how it is. Change things back again

And change your mind. My tongue could hardly bear

To curse you after all I felt for you. (52)

When Neoptolemus attempts to return the bow to Philoctetes, the wounded man will not believe his words, meaningless after so much betrayal. He proclaims, "Swear, oh, you'll swear! It's only words to you" (70). To prove his integrity, Neoptolemus reenacts the ritual from before, insisting, "It is more than words. Hold your hand out. Take it," and gives the bow back to Philoctetes (70). Philoctetes needs gesture and ritual to fully embrace Neoptolemus' generosity. By sharing in the ritual again, the two men communicate and overcome prior wounding. Generous behavior, practiced by both Philoctetes and Neoptolemus, becomes the real cure of the play. It takes a leap of faith for Philoctetes to first hand the bow to Neoptolemus. The bow's power rests in its exchange, from Philoctetes to Neoptolemus and back again. In the initial ritual, Neoptolemus

answers Philoctetes statement about generous behavior by recognizing kindness:

“There’s a whole economy of kindness / Possible in the world; befriend a friend / And the chance of it’s increased and multiplied” (37). Heaney uses the word “economy” to emphasize a system of exchange; both sides must bend and embrace each other to heal the wounds of Northern Ireland.

Friel also recognizes the power of generous behavior. He states, “We’ve got to keep questioning until we can find ... some kind of generosity that can embrace the whole island” (Richtarik 49). Field Day’s fifth province hopes to create a space that enables an all-encompassing generosity. Although Friel’s *Translations* does not provide an easy solution and the final mood is one of anxiety, Friel does not cast the play in an entirely depressing light:

In *Translations* Friel presents a version of the past which, though ultimately tragic, captures for a brief moment a vision of how two opposed groups could learn to appreciate each other. This possibility of mutual respect is undermined by violent men on both sides. It is in this sense that *Translations* may best be taken to be what Seamus Deane has called it: “a parable of events in the present day.”

(Richtarik 49)

Manus, like Philoctetes, enacts a gesture of forgiveness and significantly drops the stone he intends to use to attack Yolland. He generously leaves the two lovers together. Likewise, Doalty, who works to thwart the surveyors by moving their equipment, performs a noble gesture for Yolland: “I was washing outside my tent this morning and he was passing with a scythe across his shoulder and he came up to me and pointed to the

long grass and then cut a pathway round my tent from the tent down to the road—so that my feet won't get wet with the dew. Wasn't that kind of him?" (2, 347). Yolland attempts to thank Doalty for this kindness but Doalty cuts him off saying, "Wasting your time. I don't know a word you're saying" (3, 347). It is not that gestures speak louder than words. It is just, in this case, that words cannot speak at all. "That is to say: instead of continuing to rely upon texts considered definitive and sacred," writes Artaud, "it is essential to put an end to subjugation of the theater to the text, and to recover the notion of a kind of unique language half-way between gesture and thought" (89). Drama, through its ability to stage gesture, has healing power.

In the final lines of *Translations*, Hugh stutters on the lines about fate. Rather than indicating a cyclical history, this may suggest that fate is not really set in stone. Richard Kearney writes, "*Finnegans Wake* teaches us that Dublin is 'Doublin' – itself and not itself. It teaches us that our sense of tradition is not some pre-ordained continuity which makes us all the same. Myth is revealed as history and history as myth" (Myth and Motherland 74). The Irish can choose their future, by looking critically at the past and deciding who they want to become. Hugh and Philoctetes must decide their own fates. Their bodies, intimately connected with the landscape and language, can subvert disabling myths on the stage and encourage new ones. Philoctetes possesses both the wound and the cure, which implies that there is room to start over, room for generous behavior and perhaps even room for a fifth province.

## THE HEALED BODY IN IRISH DRAMA

### CONCLUSION

*The Norton Anthology of English Literature* first approached Seamus Heaney to translate *Beowulf* in the mid 1980s (*Beowulf* xxii). Heaney battled with this epic Anglo-Saxon poem for several years before publishing his translation in 1999. In addition to the sheer difficulty of the work, Heaney faced the problem of finding a voice and the authority to speak for a text originally written in Old English. Heaney writes in the introduction, "And yet to persuade myself that I was born into its language and that its language was born into me took a while: for somebody who grew up in the political and cultural conditions of Lord Brookeborough's Northern Ireland, it could hardly have been otherwise" (*Beowulf* xiv.) Heaney objected loudly to the label "British" only a few years earlier in 1983. In "An Open Letter," a Field Day pamphlet published in verse, he challenged his incorporation within *The Penguin Book of Contemporary British Poetry*:

A British one, is characterized  
As British. But don't be surprised  
If I demur, for, be advised  
My passport's green.  
No glass of ours was every raised  
To toast *The Queen*. (25)

Currently residing in the republic, Heaney resists any identification as British, despite his heritage in Northern Ireland. Northern Ireland's political affiliation with the United Kingdom means little to Heaney's self identification, who names "Traumatic Ireland!"

his home instead (26). He thinks of his inclusion in *The Penguin Book of Contemporary Poetry* as a robbery of his rightful name, notably publishing this piece only three years after Friel's *Translations* forced the loss of the Irish language onto the stage. In translating *Beowulf*, however, Heaney discovers words in the Old English text that corresponded to those spoken by the residents of Derry. This mixture of Irish and English, once very separate languages in his mind, forces Heaney to see his own identity less rigidly:

For a long time, therefore, the little word was—to borrow a simile from Joyce—a rapier point of consciousness pricking me with an awareness of language-loss and cultural dispossession, and tempting me into binary thinking about language. I tended to conceive of English and Irish as adversarial tongues, as either/or conditions rather than both/ands, and this was an attitude which for a long time hampered the development of a more confident and creative way of dealing with the whole vexed question—the question, that is, of the relationship between nationality, language, history and literary tradition in Ireland. (*Beowulf* xiv)

Here Heaney gives up the binary categories he stressed in “An Open Letter,” for a more flexible understanding of language and thus identity. Notably, *The Cure at Troy* was one of Heaney's projects as he worked on *Beowulf*. The play reveals Heaney's turn of thought, embracing a more hybrid understanding of identity than “An Open Letter.”

By focusing on Philoctetes' position as both a representative of the “Other” and member of the community, Heaney gestures towards the dual nature of the citizens of Northern Ireland, simultaneously Irish and British. At the same time, Heaney uses the lighting in the play to underscore a need for compromise. As the chorus enters, ushering

in Hercules, the play changes to “Darker stage, a kind of purpled twilight” (76). Heaney emphasizes the half-light even further when Hercules makes his appearance to Philoctetes. Here it lingers: “The full thunderclap and eruption-effects occur. Then a lingering, wavering aftermath of half-light” (78). This contrasts with the way Philoctetes describes light earlier in the play. Stuck in his hard-bitten attitudes, he tells Neoptolemus, “You’re making me see things in such a brilliant light I can’t bear it...The past’s only a scar, but the future – Never. Never again can I see myself eye to eye with the sons of Atreus” (73). Philoctetes can only see himself as a part of the community in a half-light, gentle on the eyes.

Heaney relies heavily upon the use of the word half in the conclusion of the play in the final words of the chorus. Reincorporating Philoctetes back into the community, a huge gesture, does not happen all at once:

It was a fortunate wind  
That blew me here. I leave  
Half-ready to believe  
That a crippled trust might walk  
And that the half-true rhyme is love. (81)

Instead Heaney emphasizes that Philoctetes is only “half-ready to believe” that he can rejoin the Greeks. Despite Hercules’ divine commandment, Philoctetes’ internal change requires effort. Even though Philoctetes cannot fully trust, he takes a necessary step in the right direction by believing in the possibility of healing. This corresponds to Field Day’s project, which aims to create a cultural state, or in other words, a way for the Irish to start seeing themselves as united despite political or geographical separations.

For both Friel and Heaney the crux of the matter is translation. These authors hope to embrace change by gesturing at solutions through theater. Drama, according to Worthen, shares the same methods as translation:

Like performance, translation is engaged in a complex project of identification, an elaborate encoding of personal and cultural identity and history through the negotiation of alterity. To claim translation as a theatrical politics is to keep that alterity visible, to prevent 'translation' from gathering the other uncritically into the authorizing narrative of the self, to see translation performing the differences between languages, cultures, agents, histories, mythologies. (150)

By performing difference, drama and translation question identity. On stage, the body asks for the same kind of critical attention, vividly encoding both personal and cultural identity. Bodily difference manifests as one way for the Irish to present themselves on the stage, making the wounded body a meaning laden place for highlighting the differences between cultures. While suggesting the wounds of history, *Manus* and *Philoctetes* wounded bodies also functions as agents of subversion, breaking down disabling myths about Irish identity.

Furthermore, in presenting the wounded body, Friel and Heaney work as translators of the Irish tradition. Finding wounded bodies in Synge's *The Playboy of the Western World* and O'Casey's *Juno and the Paycock*, Friel and Heaney modify this Abby precedent in their own national theater. At the same time, the image of the wounded body also appears outside national theater projects, as Beckett's *Waiting for Godot*, originally written in French, reveals. Moreover, the stage technique does not end with Heaney's *The Cure at Troy*. Martin McDonagh, a playwright with Irish heritage who resides in Britain,

forecasts these concerns in his play, *The Cripple of Inishmaan* (1997), boldly making the wound a part of the title.

Although Brecht and Artaud use different techniques, both men hope to create a theater that can wake up their audiences to the world around them. Furthermore, the wounded body, by making men see themselves as crippled beings, works for Friel and Heaney in much the same way as the plague does in Artaud's theater of cruelty:

It invites the mind to share a delirium which exalts its energies; and we can see, to conclude, that from the human point of view, the action of theater, like that of plague, is beneficial, for, impelling men to see themselves as they are, it causes the mask to fall, reveals the lie, the slackness, baseness, and hypocrisy of our world; it shakes off the asphyxiating inertia of matter which invades even the clearest testimony of the senses; and in revealing to collectivities of men their dark power, their hidden force, it invites them to take, in the face of destiny, a superior and heroic attitude that they never would have assumed without it. (32)

As Artaud does, Friel and Heaney hope to prevent "asphyxiating inertia" through Field Day. By creating a discussion around Irish identity, Friel and Heaney challenge their Irish spectators in the North and South to overcome numbness to the political situation in Northern Ireland.

## WORKS CITED

- Arkins, Brian. "Thucydides in a Traffic Jam: Greek and Roman Themes in Modern Irish Drama." Serpillo and Badin, 52-68.
- Artaud, Antonin. The Theater and Its Double. Trans. Mary Caroline Richards. New York: Grove Press, 1958.
- Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin, eds. The Post-Colonial Studies Reader. New York: Routledge, 1995.
- Bertha, Csilla. "Insularity and Its Transcendence in Brian Friel's Island Plays." Serpillo and Badin, 242-249.
- Binne, Eric. "Friel and Field Day." Harrington 564-570.
- Burton, John W. Culture and the Human Body: An Anthropological Perspective. Prospect Heights, Illinois: Waveland Press, Inc., 2001.
- Clausius, Claudia. "Bad Habits While Waiting for Godot." Myth and Ritual in the Plays of Samuel Beckett. Ed. Katherine H. Burkman. London: Associated University Presses, 1987.
- Cronin, Michael. A History of Ireland. New York: Palgrave, 2001.
- . "History, Translation, Postcolonialism." Simon and St. Pierre 33-52.
- Deane, Seamus. "Heroic Styles: The Tradition of an Idea." Ireland's Field Day. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1985.
- . "Introduction." Nationalism, Colonialism, and Literature. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1990.
- Denard, Hugh. "Seamus Heaney, Colonialism, and the Cure: Sophoclean Re-Visions." PAJ: A Journal of Performance and Art. 22.3 (2000): 1-18.
- Doyle, Maria-Elena. "A Gesture to Indicate a Presence: Translation, Dialect, and Field Day Theater Company's Quest for Irish Identity." Simon and St. Pierre 167-186.
- Field Day Theater Company. "Program Notes for *Translations*." Harrington 551-554.
- Flanagan, Thomas. "Afterword." Ireland's Field Day. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1985.
- Friel, Brian. Translations. Harrington 319-374.

- Fuchs, Barbara. "Conquering Islands: Contextualizing The Tempest." The Tempest. By William Shakespeare. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 2004."
- Gilbert, Helen and Joanne Tompkins. Postcolonial Drama: Theory, Practice, Politics. London: Routledge, 1996.
- Gregory, Lady Augusta. Our Irish Theater. Harrington 377- 386.
- Harp, Richard. "Manus and Oedipus the King." A Companion to Brian Friel. Eds. Richard Harp and Robert C. Evans. West Cornwall, CT: Locust Hill Press, 2002.
- Harrington, John P. Ed. Modern Irish Drama. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1991.
- Heaney, Seamus. "An Open Letter." Ireland's Field Day. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1985.
- . Beowulf: A New Verse Translation. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2000.
- . "Crediting Poetry: The Noble Lecture." Opened Ground: Selected Poems 1966-1996. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1998.
- . The Cure at Troy: A Version of Sophocles' Philoctetes. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1991.
- . "For Liberation: Brian Friel and the Use of Memory." The Achievement of Brian Friel. Ed. Alan J. Peacock. Gerald's Cross: Colin Smythe, 1993.
- . "Frontiers of Writing." The Redress of Poetry. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1995.
- . Preoccupations: Selected Prose, 1965-1975. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1980.
- . "Review of Translations." Harrington 557-559.
- Kearney, Richard. "Myth and Motherland." Ireland's Field Day. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1985.
- . "Translations." Harrington 559-564.
- Llewellyn-Jones, Margaret. Contemporary Irish Drama and Cultural Identity. Great Britain: Intellect Books, 2002.

- McDonald, Marianne and J. Michael Walton, eds. Amid our Troubles. London: Methuen Publishing Limited, 2002.
- Mitchell, David T. and Sharon L. Snyder. Narrative Prosthesis: Disability and the Dependencies of Discourse. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2000.
- Morris, David B. "About Suffering: Voice, Genre and Moral Community." Social Suffering. Eds. Arthur Kleinman, Veena Das, and Margaret Lock. Berkely: University of California Press, 1997.
- Murray, Christopher. Twentieth-Century Irish Drama: Mirror Up to Nation. Manchester University Press: Manchester, 1997.
- Neil, Ruth. "Disability as Motif and Meaning in Friel's Drama." Hungarian Journal of English and American Studies. 5.1 (1999): 143-159.
- O'Casey, Sean. "Juno and the Paycock." Modern and Contemporary Drama. Eds. Miriam Gilbert, Carl H. Klaus, and Bradford S. Field, Jr. Boston: St. Martin's Press, 1994.
- O'Driscoll, Robert. Theater and Nationalism in Twentieth-Century Ireland. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1971.
- Richards, Shaun. "Field Day's Fifth Province: Avenue or Impasse?" Culture and Politics in Northern Ireland 1960-1990. Milton Keynes: Open University Press, 1991.
- Richtarik, Marilyn. Acting Between the Lines: The Field Day Theatre Company and Irish Cultural Politics 1980-1984. Washington, DC: Catholic U. of P., 2001.
- Robinson, Tim. Setting Foot on the Shores of Connemara & Other Writings. Dublin: Lilliput, 1996.
- Serpillo, Giuseppe and Donatella Badin, Eds. The Classical World and the Mediterranean. Università di Sassari: Tema, 1996.
- Sewall, Richard B. "The Vision of Tragedy." Tragedy: Vision and Form. Ed. Robert W. Corrigan. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1965.
- Shakespeare, William. "The Tempest." The Norton Shakespeare Based on the Oxford Edition. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt. New York: W. W. Norton Company, 1997.
- Simon, Sherry and Paul St. Pierre. Eds. Changing the Terms: Translating in the Post Colonial Era. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 2000.

- Sophocles. Electra and Other Plays. Trans. E. F. Waitling. London: Penguin Books, 1953.
- Synge, J. M. The Playboy of the Western World. Harrington 73-118.
- Thomson, Rosemarie Garland. Extraordinary Bodies: Figuring Disability in American Culture and Literature. New York: Columbia University Press, 1997.
- Walton, J. Michael. "Hit or Myth: the Greeks and Irish Drama." McDonald and Walton 3-36.
- Willet, John. Ed. and Trans. Brecht on Theatre: The Development of an Aesthetic. New York: Hill and Wang, 1964.
- Wilson, Edmund. "Philoctetes: The Wound and the Bow." The Book of Twentieth Century Essays. Ed. Ian Hamilton. New York: From International, 1999.
- Wood, David. "Identity and Violence." Cultural Readings of Imperialism: Edward Said and the Gravity of History. Eds. Keith Ansell-Pearson, Benita Parry, and Judith Squires. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997.
- Worthen, W. B. "Homeless Words: Field Day and the Politics of Translation." Brian Friel: A Casebook. Ed. William Kerwin. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1997.

**HECKMAN**  
BINDERY, INC.  
Bound-To-Please®

**JAN 05**

N. MANCHESTER, INDIANA 46962