

A STUDY OF THE STRUGGLE
BETWEEN THE APOLLONIAN FACADE AND THE DIONYSIAN FACE
IN TEN PLAYS BY PETER SHAFFER

A THESIS

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS
IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THE
TEXAS WOMAN'S UNIVERSITY

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

BY

ROLAND JOSHUA DIAZ, B.A., M.A.

DENTON, TEXAS

DECEMBER 1990

Dedication

This thesis is dedicated to my wife, Lewanda, without whose love and constant support this work would not have been possible.

Acknowledgements

The author would like to acknowledge Dr. Vivian Casper, Dr. Frank Longoria, Dr. Joyce Palmer, and Dr. Suzanne Webb for their guidance and support.

Abstract

A Study of the Struggle Between the Apollonian Facade
and the Dionysian Face in Ten Plays by Peter Shaffer

This is a study of the struggle between the Apollonian facade and the Dionysian face in ten plays by Peter Shaffer. Chapter One focuses on the destruction of the Apollonian facade by the Dionysian face in Five Finger Exercise, Shrivings, and Lettice and Lovage. Chapter Two focuses on the impositions of the Apollonian facade on the Dionysian face in The White Liars, Black Comedy, The Private Ear, and The Public Eye. Chapter Three focuses on the destruction of the Dionysian face by the Apollonian facade in The Royal Hunt of the Sun, Equus, and Amadeus.

Roland Diaz
December 1990

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
ABSTRACT.....	v
INTRODUCTION.....	1
Chapter	
I. The Destruction of the Apollonian Facade by the Dionysian Face in <u>Five Finger Exercise</u> , <u>Shrivings</u> , and <u>Lettice and Lovage</u>	7
II. The Imposition of the Apollonian Facade upon the Dionysian Face in <u>The White Liars</u> , <u>Black Comedy</u> , <u>The Private Ear</u> , and <u>The Public Eye</u>	35
III. The Destruction of the Dionysian Face by the Apollonian Facade in <u>The Royal Hunt</u> <u>of the Sun</u> , <u>Equus</u> , and <u>Amadeus</u>	63
CONCLUSION.....	99
WORKS CITED.....	103

Introduction

A theme in the ten plays by Peter Shaffer discussed in this thesis is the struggle between the Apollonian facade and the Dionysian face. The term "Apollonian" is defined as having the quality of being controlled, rational, and logical, and "Dionysian" is defined as having the quality of being passionate, wild, and impudent (Nietzsche 821-22). The Apollonian qualities are the ones which society demands and expects, and the Dionysian qualities are the ones which society feels compelled to alter or destroy. This struggle between the controlled facade and the passionate face is the foundation on which the ten plays discussed in this study are built.

In Five Finger Exercise, Shrivings, and Lettice and Lovage the struggle between the facade and the face ends in the destruction of the facade. In Five Finger Exercise, although Clive Harrington wears a facade, he has the Dionysian face and is the catalyst of the destruction of the facade which Walter wears. Walter, the tutor, is the one character in the play whose facade is also most vulnerable to the destructive tendencies of the other characters. The relationship between these two is that Walter is the

Apollonian facade while Clive is the Dionysian face.

In Shrivings the struggle between the facade and the face is clear. Shaffer uses Gideon, the religious mentor, as the Apollonian facade. Although Mark, Gideon's old pupil, wears a facade at the opening of the play, he is the Dionysian face. He avenges himself against Gideon by destroying the religious and peaceful facade that he wears.

Lettice and Lovage presents the struggle between the Apollonian facade and the Dionysian face in the characters of Lotte and Lettice. Lotte is an authoritative and controlled individual who works for a historical foundation. Lettice is a passionate and wildly theatrical individual who feels compelled to add to, and in some cases fictionalize, the accounts of history she is supposed to present to tourists who visit the historic home where she is employed. Lotte is the Apollonian facade while Lettice is the Dionysian face.

In these three plays the confrontation between these two extremes leads to the destruction of the Apollonian facade by the Dionysian face. In Five Finger Exercise Clive knows about the past of each character and about the ramifications of the disclosure of this information and uses this knowledge to facilitate the destruction of the Apollonian facades worn by the characters. In Shrivings the revelation of the contradictions in Gideon's principles,

past and present, lead to the destruction of his facade. In Lettice and Lovage the revelation of Lotte's past rekindles her passion by giving her a cause to believe in, and her facade is destroyed. In these plays, then, the disclosure of the past reveals the Dionysian face, which destroys the Apollonian facade.

In The White Liars, Black Comedy, The Private Ear, and The Public Eye the struggle between the facade and the face consists of the constant imposition of the facade upon the face. In essence, the demands of the facade control the behavior of the face. The White Liars revolves around the imposition of Frank's demands and expectations on Tom in an attempt to dictate his actions. Frank is the oppressive Apollonian facade while Tom is the oppressed Dionysian face. The struggle between the Apollonian facade and the Dionysian face results in the destruction of the relationship between Tom and Frank.

In Black Comedy the struggle between the Apollonian facade and the Dionysian face revolves around Carol and Brindsley, Miss Furnival's father and Miss Furnival, and the reversal of the properties of light and shadow in the stage lighting of the play. Carol is established as the facade because she continues to impose her demands on Brindsley. Brindsley, Carol's fiance, is the Dionysian face because he is wild and impudent. Carol represents the Apollonian

because she wants Brindsley to fit the pattern of respectable husband that has been defined by society. Brindsley represents the Dionysian because he has the wild and passionate side but feels compelled to go along with Carol's expectations until his needs are met. Although Miss Furnival's father is only alluded to in the play, the effects of his presence on Miss Furnival's life are evident. The strict discipline imposed by her father acts as the catalyst for the actions that Miss Furnival takes in the course of the play. The struggle between the facade and the face results in the destruction of the relationship between Carol and Brindsley and between Brindsley and Harold, his neighbor. The struggle also results in the destruction of Miss Furnival's facade because, in her drunken state, she reveals the remorse that she has harbored for many years. The reversal of light and shadow in the stage lighting of the play results in the revelation of certain truths for the characters in the play. The characters take the opportunity to act in ways that they would usually avoid under normal, well-lighted circumstances. The audience is able to witness this Dionysian behavior because shadow to the characters is light to the audience.

The Private Ear presents a situation where the Dionysian facade is represented by Ted and the Apollonian face is represented by Bob. Ted, a self-proclaimed playboy,

is Dionysian. Bob is the Apollonian element in the play because he is controlled and lacks passion. The struggle between the Apollonian facade and the Dionysian face results in the destruction of the relationship between Ted and Bob.

The Public Eye revolves around Charles who is the Apollonian facade, Belinda who is the Dionysian face, and Julian, who acts as the intermediary between the two. Charles is a controlled individual who continually imposes his demands on Belinda. Belinda, Charles' young wife, is a passionate individual who feels threatened by her husband's constant demands. The struggle between the Apollonian facade and the Dionysian face results in a final effort to save the marriage by having Charles assume a certain amount of Dionysian behavior.

The White Liars, Black Comedy, The Private Ear, and The Public Eye depict situations where the Apollonian facade continues to impose its demands on the Dionysian face. In the first three plays this imposition leads to the destruction of the relationship between these two extremes. The Public Eye provides a situation where the imposition leads to a victory of Dionysian over Apollonian behavior.

In The Royal Hunt of the Sun, Equus, and Amadeus the Apollonian facade destroys the Dionysian face. The Royal Hunt of the Sun presents a situation where the Apollonian facade that Pizarro wears conflicts with and results in the

destruction of the Dionysian face that Atahualpa is. Equus again presents a situation where the Apollonian facade destroys the Dionysian face. In this case, Martin Dysart is the manifestation of the Apollonian facade while Alan Strang is the manifestation of the Dionysian face. The confrontation leads to the final destruction of the passionate nature of the Dionysian face by the controlled Apollonian facade. In Amadeus Salieri represents the Apollonian facade while Mozart represents the Dionysian face. The struggle between the cold, calculating Salieri and the wild, impudent Mozart leads to the destruction of Mozart. In The Royal Hunt of the Sun, Equus, and Amadeus the Apollonian facade destroys the Dionysian face. The confrontation between Pizarro and Atahualpa leads to Atahualpa's destruction. The confrontation between Martin Dysart and Alan Strang leads to the destruction of Alan's passion. The confrontation between Salieri and Mozart leads to the destruction of Mozart. In essence, the cold and calculating Apollonian behavior destroys the wild and passionate Dionysian nature.

The ten plays by Peter Shaffer discussed in this thesis, then, deal with the struggle between the Apollonian facade and the Dionysian face. In Five Finger Exercise, Shrivings, and Lettice and Lovage the Dionysian face destroys the Apollonian facade. In The White Liars, Black Comedy, The Private Ear, and The Public Eye the

Apollonian facade controls the Dionysian face. In The Royal Hunt of the Sun, Equus, and Amadeus the Apollonian facade destroys the Dionysian face. The central theme inherent in all of these plays is that the Apollonian facade continually struggles with the Dionysian face.

Chapter One:

The Destruction of the Apollonian Facade by the Dionysian Face in Five Finger Exercise, Shrivings, and Lettice and Lovage

The plays Five Finger Exercise, Shrivings, and Lettice and Lovage are united by a central theme: the destruction of the Apollonian facade by the Dionysian face. In Five Finger Exercise Peter Shaffer presents a family where every member wears a facade and whose sole purpose is to use whomever they can manage to get into their home as a pawn to destroy the facade of the other family members. Clive Harrington serves as the Dionysian face and acts as the catalyst for the destruction of Walter, the one individual who is new to the situation. Two characters in Shrivings have their facade of peace and tranquility destroyed as Mark reveals the past of Gideon, the one person around whom this harmony revolves. In Lettice and Lovage Lettice destroys the facade of authority that Lotte wears by helping her find something to believe in. In these three plays the Apollonian facade is destroyed by the Dionysian face.

In Five Finger Exercise every member of the Harrington family wears the Apollonian facade of normality. Beneath

this facade, however, lies the cannibalistic nature of each character. On the surface, Five Finger Exercise depicts a normal family situation at the beginning: a loving mother, a businessman father, a rebellious son, a flirting adolescent daughter, and a well-educated tutor (Hope-Wallace 70).

Beneath the facades the cannibalistic tendencies of human nature are revealed. All of these people have their needs and desires that must be met as the play progresses, but these needs are not rational. The basic need of each character is to destroy the facade of the rest of the characters in the play (Brien 69) despite the fact that they depend on their facades, which "are the principal means through which these characters find their identities" (Dean 298).

Clive Harrington tries to be the son who both loves and respects his parents. He is "to some extent a pawn between them, criticized by his father [Stanley] and fussed over by his mother [Louise], and needed as an ally by both of them" (Kerensky 33). Yet he is the one who has the ability to see exactly what the rest of the family members are doing. He recognizes that everyone is merely an ornament in the life of Louise Harrington. Clive Harrington is the only family member who is able to see and understand the truth. This ability becomes evident when he confesses to Walter, "You see, I've only one real talent--being able to see what's

true, and just what isn't. And that's an awful thing to have" (Five Finger Exercise 34). Here, Clive admits that he has the perception and the ability to see through the facades that people wear and recognize the truth. In seeing through his own facade, he sees the facades of those around him. He can see through Walter's eyes and recognize his loneliness. He can also see through the facades that every member of his own family wears and the cannibalistic nature that exists there.

In act two, scene two, when speaking to Stanley about Clive, Walter says, "When you look at him, he sees you are thinking, 'How useless he is'" (Five Finger Exercise 66). This statement reemphasizes the fact that Clive is the only one in the family with the ability to perceive the truth. He sees what those around him are thinking beneath the masks.

In the following passage Clive tells Stanley that he recognizes him for who and for what he is. He tells him that the facade and the face are parts of the individuals that they are and cannot be separated or torn away from each other. He goes on to say, "We live away in our skins from minute to minute, feeling everything quite differently, and any one minute is just as true about us as any other" (Five Finger Exercise 38).

Clive uses this information to destroy Walter's facade and uses this ability to perceive the truth to know and

understand the weaknesses that are inherent in the rest of the characters. He recognizes his mother's pomposity, his father's apathy, his sister's blossoming sensuality, and Walter's vulnerability and uses these characteristics against those around him.

Louise Harrington, the mother, feels compelled to destroy whatever facade of respectability that Stanley, her husband, manages to put forth, but she develops her facade as the ideal loving mother and adoring wife extremely well. On the surface she appears to be loving, yet distant in her affection. As the play progresses and the layers begin to peel away, the audience becomes aware of the cold and calculating person she really is (Worsley 69).

Stanley Harrington's objective is to destroy any pretenses of high society that Louise manages to create for herself. He also continues to remind Clive Harrington of the failure that he has made of his life, despite the fact that he is attending Cambridge University. Stanley also manages to destroy Walter's facade by undercutting the value of music and art. Throughout the play Stanley puts forth the facade of the stern, self-made father, who claims that his only real talent lies in his material possessions. However, Stanley enjoys "the cracks and bulges of his own jerry-built facade" (Brien 69).

Pamela Harrington, the youngest member of the family,

is competent in the destruction of the facades of the rest of the family. Even at the age of fourteen, she has come to develop her skills at playing the game well. She recognizes the fact that both Stanley and Louise are constantly at each other's throats and constantly pits them against each other. She also recognizes Clive's less desirable traits and does her best to bring them out into the open.

Walter acts as the ultimate pawn in this play. Every other character confides in him about the idiosyncracies of the rest of the family and, in turn, uses him to destroy each other. Louise uses him to define the traits of a cultured individual. Stanley uses him to undermine the advantages of music and art. Clive uses him to avenge himself against Stanley by accusing Louise and Walter of copulating in the living room. Pamela uses Walter as a confidant and as an object of desire. The irony lies in the fact that in the process of being used to destroy the facades of the rest, Walter's facade is revealed and thus destroyed.

In trying to destroy each other, the members of the Harrington family provide Clive with the means with which to expose Walter's facade and thus destroy the one individual they have been using. As Charles A. Pennel points out in "The Plays of Peter Shaffer: Experiments in Convention":

. . . it is Clive who precipitates the actual catastrophe. His latent homosexuality surfaces; when

Walter rejects him, he lies to his father about Walter and his mother, setting off a series of explosions that leads to Walter's attempted suicide. (102)

In the alleged affair between Walter and Louise, Walter's past is mentioned and his Apollonian facade revealed. The fact that he has never known a "normal" family and that this one family upon which he has placed his complete trust has betrayed him leads him to his suicide attempt at the end of the play.

The Harrington family, then, is engaged in a simple game: the destruction of the facades of those around them. The destruction of Walter's facade becomes Clive's objective when he finds his mother displaying more affection to Walter than Clive has ever known. This resentment also provides Clive with a reason to destroy his mother's facade.

Walter finds himself against this constant battle of wills. In his ignorance, he sees only the facades that the Harringtons put forth. He sees only the loving mother and well-to-do wife that Louise tries so desperately to be. He sees only the stern father in Stanley. He sees only the youth in need of some sort of purpose in Clive. In Pamela he sees the naive young girl in need of some sort of guidance.

In this play Shaffer effectively thrusts Walter into the proverbial lion's den. In this case, he puts him in the same environment that is inhabited by these cannibals of

pretension. Every member of the family has developed the abilities to deal with the manipulative characteristics of the rest of the family. As the newcomer to the situation, Walter has not yet developed these abilities and is thus consumed. The Harringtons have learned to withstand attacks on their facades, but Walter, not familiar with this kind of attack, has his facade revealed and thus destroyed.

The fact that the facade of Walter is revealed and destroyed supports the idea that he does not have the ability to successfully sustain a facade. In his constant struggle with the rest of the family Clive learns from Walter's confession that the latter's parents were Nazis. Clive uses this information against Walter to facilitate the crumbling of his facade. Clive knows that Walter has always dreamed of having a normal family and that he believes he has found what he has been looking for. The irony is that in trying to get away from his Nazi past, Walter finds himself living with a family that can be equally as cruel as the one he left behind. Walter's facade, then, is not of the same nature as the ones worn by the rest of the family.

Five Finger Exercise presents a situation where the revelation of the facade leads to the destruction of it for the characters. Peter Shaffer uses the struggle between Walter and Clive to create the necessary conflict in the play. First, he thrusts each member of the Harrington family

against each other. Second, he pits the Harrington family against Walter. Finally, he provides Clive, the Dionysian element, with the means to destroy Walter's Apollonian facade. In the process of using Walter as a pawn to destroy the facades of the rest, Clive destroys Walter's facade.

The destruction of the facade after its revelation can also be found in Shrivings "in which a hypocritical humanist philosopher [Gideon] is constantly challenged by a raucous bawdy poet [Mark]" (Chambers 12). In this play Mark is the Dionysian face, and Gideon is the Apollonian mask. At the opening of the play the audience is introduced to an ideal place where peace can be found by those who strive to seek it out. This place is Shrivings. From the start, the ideal nature of the place is established. With respect to the facade of peace that Shrivings is, Lois, Gideon's pupil and secretary, naively says, "Shrivings is a place of quiet, and we like to keep it that way. Peace" (Shrivings 124).

In essence, Gideon, Lois, and David, Mark's son, choose to lead a peaceful existence and strive to keep this kind of lifestyle. Referring to the ideal situation of peace that can be found at Shrivings, Gideon says, "Let's offer him [Mark] Shrivings, with all its tradition of Peace" (Shrivings 128). Gideon affirms what Shrivings has come to be. He wholeheartedly believes that Shrivings helps the people who come there find peace.

Aware of the kind of place that it is supposed to be, Mark sets out from the start to bring about the destruction of it. In his allusion to the ideal nature of Shrivings in act one, scene one, Mark begins to challenge Gideon, "Is that what Shriving means? Confession and penance?" (Shrivings 132). Mark has come to Shrivings to find the inner peace that he has been longing for since the death of his wife. In essence, "Mark has come to Shrivings to be shriven" (Dean 301). This inner peace, however, means the destruction of the facade that Gideon has worn for so long. In challenging Gideon's peaceful nature, Mark alludes to loyalty. His point is that Shrivings is a facade as much as the loyalty that the characters claim to feel for each other is a facade (Shrivings 139).

Mark, then, is the Dionysian face. In the eleven years that have passed since he and Gideon last saw each other, Mark has basically had his Apollonian facade destroyed. Even though Mark's wife has had a son whom Mark believes to have been fathered by Gideon, he has inexplicably also elevated her to the point of sainthood since her death. His objective in coming to Shrivings is to destroy the facade of the man who first led him to develop the philosophies that he had when his facade was still intact.

Since David was born, Mark has always been cold and unfeeling toward him because Mark has always suspected that

his wife and Gideon had an affair that resulted in David's birth. Mark feels that Gideon's paternal behavior toward David confirms his suspicions, which are neither confirmed nor denied in the play. Throughout the years, Mark has chosen to keep David at a distance. In reference to how Mark never let him come home when he was a child away at school, David reveals the face beneath the facade that Mark wears, "Six years' silence punctuated by telegrams. 'Regret still not convenient you return. Father'" (Shrivings 128). The audience sees that Mark is not the peaceful, loving creature that Gideon thinks him to be. Beneath the facade of peace, there exists the face of callous egocentricity.

When he first arrives at Shrivings, Mark lets the rest of the characters see what they expect to see. In the stage directions describing Mark's entrance for the first time, Shaffer writes, "A mass of hair falls from a massive head: eyes stare from an eroded face. He wears a Greek shepherd's cloak with a hood" (Shrivings 129). Gideon and the other characters expect to see Mark in this fashion. He enters wearing the facade that they expect. However, he quickly removes this pretense of humble tranquility and begins his attack on Gideon.

From his arrival at Shrivings, Mark notices that Lois sees only the facade that Gideon wears and proceeds to destroy her illusion. Mark realizes that Lois is most

susceptible to his own will and so begins his manipulation. Mark asks Lois to justify her perceptions of Gideon as a saint. According to Lois, the definition of a saint is one who does not know how to reject people. Mark's sarcastic facetiousness is evident when he asks her if she really believes Gideon is a saint. Later in the scene Mark mocks the Apollonian facade that Gideon wears when he says, "Hail, Gideon! First Pope of Reason! Hail!" (Shrivings 136). Here again, Mark is facetious in his statement. He hails Gideon as the "First Pope of Reason" knowing well that reason is not the only motivation in Gideon's life. Mark knows the Dionysian face that exists beneath the Apollonian facade: behind all of Gideon's actions is an essentially primitive desire for self-aggrandizement.

When speaking of the peace movements that Mark was once a part of, he alludes to the primitive but true nature of man:

If those daffodils could speak, which those flower boys handed out to policemen--if they could tell them about their birth, through layers of icy spring soil, d'you know what they'd say? They'd open their yellow mouths and yell Violence! Violence! at the top of their stalks. (Shrivings 137)

The acceptance of this violence has essentially destroyed Mark's facade. Past experience has proven to him that man is

still a primitive and violent creature. Even in peaceful protest, man uses the destruction of nature (daffodils) to cry out against war.

In recounting the first time that he felt his faith in society shaken, Mark reveals the crumbling of his own facade. He remembers how peaceful protesters against the Vietnam war were brutally beaten by construction workers:

Dreadful-looking thugs, with faces like huge steaks, wearing hard yellow hats. And then we watched their protest: their statement of human dignity. For fifteen minutes, they beat the children into pulp. They bashed them with their fists. They kicked them in the balls and in the breasts with steel toes. They tore cheeks from faces. They danced on vomiting girls. And then they swept on, shouting 'America! America!'--round the corner to the next gang-bang. And all the while, not doing anything stood policemen,--their Irish potato faces barely concealing smiles. (Shrivings 140)

In this soliloquy, Mark expresses his disgust at the inhumanity of present-day society. Here, two ideals are being spoken for, one with peaceful protest, the other with vicious personal attacks. The first ideal, spoken for peacefully, is man's harmony with himself. The other, spoken for violently, is man's egocentricity. This idea of being self-centered becomes clear when Mark speaks about one of

the people injured in the riot who was bleeding on a street below him and says that he simply raised his cocktail glass in toast to the victim. He says that he could have called an ambulance, but he simply "wanted another drink" (Shrivings 141).

Later in the play, Mark rethinks his experience with the victim of the riot. Here again he alludes to the inherently violent and primitive nature of man. He alleges that man has changed little in all of the time that has passed between the time he was a cave dweller to the present, ". . . I saw him transformed to an earlier time, five hundred years at least, . . . Five hundred years and no change. Five hundred years and still the identical horror" (Shrivings 153). This "identical horror" is the naked face of mankind: primitive violence at every level.

Mark goes on to elaborate on the unalterable human condition throughout the centuries. He alludes to man's constant quest for something to believe in when he states, "Isn't it amazing how the fashions in inquisition stay the same! They all have one thing in common. A passion for invisible Gods" (Shrivings 169).

This passion has created the situation and the conflict that exist in the structure of the play. Gideon has effectively used man's search for "invisible Gods" as a means to elevate himself to their level. He has seen the opportunity

to place himself in a position to be revered as an almost holy man and taken advantage of those who praise him.

This is the facade that Mark strives to destroy. At the end of act one Mark finally reveals to Gideon his feelings on the nature of man--Mark reveals Gideon's face:

. . . the Gospel according to Saint Gideon is a lie. That we as men cannot alter for the better in any particular that matters. That we are totally and forever unimproveable [sic]. . . . We will kill forever. We will persecute forever. We will break our lust forever on enemies we invent for that purpose.

(Shrivings 156)

In this passage, Mark openly challenges everything for which Gideon stands. He labels everything that Gideon believes a lie and stresses that man is a creature that cannot be improved upon.

At the end of act two, scene one, Mark completely reveals Gideon's facade. He brings back painful memories that Gideon would rather not remember:

Enid Petrie never cared about sex. To her it was always "nasties"! She's much happier now with her middle-aged accountant. One dry kiss at night before they skin the Ovaltine! She didn't leave Shrivings for that! . . . It was the hypocrisy she couldn't take. . . . Why do you imagine, Miss Neal, that your employer gave up sex?

. . . Don't you know that the only sex he ever really enjoyed was with boys? . . . In the end he gave everything up. . . All she [Enid] saw was a self-accusing pederast, pretending to be Ghandi! (Shrivings 177)

Mark mentions Gideon's wife, Enid, who has divorced him because of the hypocrisy that she perceived at Shrivings. Mark also reveals the true nature that exists beneath the holy man's facade that Gideon wears. According to Mark, Gideon at one time chose to become celibate not because he felt it was the right thing to do but because he simply stopped caring about the relationship he shared with Enid. She was also fully aware of the fact that Gideon preferred the male sex. In essence, she saw the hypocritical face beneath the religious facade.

In act two, scene two, after Mark has totally exposed the true nature of Gideon, he asks Lois, "What was my real crime? Showing your saint in a real light?" (Shrivings 187). At this point in the play, Mark realizes that he has met his objective of destroying Gideon's facade. He has deprived him of the sainthood that his followers have bestowed upon him by bringing to light those things about him which contradict that for which he is supposed to stand.

Gideon finally alludes to the destruction of the facade by the face, "Answer me this! How could we throw him out,

and live here afterwards ourselves?" (Shrivings 204). Gideon comes to the realization that now that the truth is known, he will never be able to claim his sanctity again. By throwing Mark out he will admit to the things of which Mark accuses him. The very act of dismissing him will destroy the benevolent foundation on which Shrivings is built: hope and peace" (Shrivings 152).

Mark finally manages to turn Lois completely against Gideon and leads her to deliver the fatal blow to Gideon's facade at the end of the play. Here, she vividly describes her perceptions of Gideon and provides the support for them:

Do you know what a phoney is, Giddy? A person who says the family is obsolete, and all he really wishes is that David Askelon was his own son! . . . Do you know what a phoney is? Someone who says Peace because there's no war in him. . . . It's easy to give up bloodshed, if you've no blood to shed! Right? . . . No wonder she got out, poor stupid Enid. She found out what a phoney she was hitched to. What a phoney!

(Shrivings 208)

She sarcastically asks Gideon for his definition of the word "phoney" and then quickly provides him with her own, using him as an illustration. Lois attacks Gideon's beliefs and undercuts them with what she knows to be the truth. She also alludes to his lack of passion in that he has no fight left

in him. He chooses peace because he has lost the ability to feel anything. Lois makes her final point by referring to Enid's departure. As stated earlier, Enid became fully aware of the kind of individual Gideon really is and felt that she could not live with the hypocrisy.

This entire revelation is ironic in that the audience sees Lois' character grow from that of a blind follower to that of an insightful individual on the true nature of man as represented by Gideon. At the beginning the audience is made aware of Lois' naive perception of the ideal:

D'you know the last thing I'd see at night when I was a kid? A beautiful plastic Jesus, like the ones they have in taxis to prevent crashes, only bigger. It had these great big ruby tears on its face, and I'd have to pray to it before turning out the light: "Dear Lord, make me a Good Catholic and a Good American. Amen!" (Shrivings 127).

Here the audience sees the uneducated Lois and the ideals in which she believes. In the time that has passed, she has grown relatively little. She still perceives a beautiful plastic image: Gideon.

In act two, scene one, however, the audience sees a more mature Lois. Here she alludes to facades:

If they could ever get their heads on straight,
ordinary people would realise what history is all

about. How it's just the story of a great big lie factory, where we're all being made to work every day, printing up labels: Serf. Heretic. Catholic. Communist. Middle-class. And when we're through, we're made to paste them over each other till the original person disappears and nobody knows who the hell he is anymore!

(Shrivings 165)

By this point in the play, Lois has become independent in her thinking. She has grown to take on more responsibility for her own thoughts and their effects on those around her. She has come to realize that everything that she was ever taught, including religion, has been a lie. Finally, she evolves as an individual by merely acknowledging a society where compliance is rewarded and individuality is restrained. With respect to how Lois has dropped her facade, Mark states, ". . . it is only a game after all. That's why Miss Neal could afford to reveal herself so completely"

(Shrivings 175).

At the beginning of act three Mark points out the contradiction in Lois' character; he points out the struggle between the facade and the face, "Look at your eyes. It's a joke. . . . Your mouth all day long shouts Equality! But your eyes keep singing Uniqueness! You won't hear them demanding Equal Eyes For All Women!" (Shrivings 192). It is this contradiction within Lois' character that eventually

destroys her illusion completely. Lois's illusion is finally destroyed by her realization, "Well, you live and you learn. Or do you? I didn't learn a damn thing, except that everyone's full of shit, and that's not much to learn. Every classroom cynic you meet in college tells you that. It's funny to find out they're right" (Shrivings 206).

In Shrivings, then, Mark represents the Dionysian face because he has dropped his sense of pretension and developed a passionate hatred for Gideon. Gideon, however, still wears the Apollonian facade that he wore when he was Mark's mentor. Lois and David are naive enough to believe the rhetoric that Gideon speaks and thus wear the facade of the ideal as well. At the end of the play Mark meets his objective of destroying the facade that Gideon has worn for so long. He proves that Gideon is a fraud and shows that Lois does not really believe in the illusion of peace that Shrivings represents. The tragedy lies in the fact that, for Gideon's pupils, the destruction of his facade means "the destruction of that force and conviction on which the worshippers had placed all their hopes and beliefs" (Dean 304). Here, the wild nature of man, the Dionysian face, destroys the pretension that man creates for himself, the Apollonian facade.

In Lettice and Lovage Shaffer once again explores the struggle between the Apollonian facade and the Dionysian

face, but this time he takes a lighter, comic approach. This approach allows the audience the opportunity to "concentrate on ordinary people sustaining their integrity in a modern cosmos . . ." (Gianakaris "Fountainhead" 22). Shaffer uses Lettice and Lotte to depict "two very opposite personalities" which are somehow parts of a whole (Gianakaris "Fountainhead" 23).

Lettice is the Dionysian face, and Lotte is the Apollonian facade. Lettice is depicted as the eccentric, spirited, and passionate individual who elaborates on historical events to make them more interesting than they really are. She is the one who dares to be passionate, to make history interesting, and to make an existence as mundane and mediocre as hers exciting and relevant by pretending.

Lotte is presented as a proper individual who works for a historical foundation. She is the one who puts forth a great facade of proper behavior. Lotte hides her true nature, but she does have a face beneath that facade. Once she is made aware of the mediocrity of her own life, Lotte realizes that she will never be able to return to this way of life again.

Lettice's Dionysian face is first introduced at the opening of the play as she conducts a tour of a historical house in England. At first she simply reiterates the facts

that she has been taught. As each group of tourists is shown, she elaborates on the facts more and more. Finally, she recounts a tale that only vaguely resembles the one which she first told. With each retelling of the story she adds more flair to what would otherwise be a boring tale. Her eccentric mannerisms become extravagant and her voice dramatic. The manner in which she recounts the history of the house takes on a dramatic and exciting flair. In her eccentricity she is shown as passionate in certain details of history (Morley 16).

Lotte's Apollonian facade is first introduced in act one, scene one, as she openly questions Lettice's interpretations of the historical events she has just recounted. To catch Lettice in the act of elaborating on the stories, Lotte poses as a tourist and takes part in one of the tours conducted by Lettice. Aggravated by Lettice's dramatic flair and outrageous presentations, Lotte reprimands Lettice in front of the tour group. Lettice is quick to point out the ruse that Lotte has used to catch her:

I don't mean your rudeness in interrupting my talk, unpleasant as that was. I mean coming here at all in the way you have. . . . Pretending to join my group as a simple member of the public. I find that quite despicable. (Lettice and Lovage 15)

By the end of this scene, the struggle between Lotte's wild and passionate Dionysian nature and Lotte's rigid and controlled Apollonian nature becomes apparent. In "Placing Shaffer's Lettice and Lovage in Perspective" C.J. Gianakaris states that "The battle of wills between Lotte (the Apollonian authority figure) and Lettice (the Dionysian free spirit) eventually is reduced to opposing views on the sanctity of historical 'fact'" (150).

In act one, scene two, Lettice's Dionysian behavior is once again demonstrated. After she has been fired from her job, she recounts a few facts about Queen Mary's execution: Queen Mary appeared in a dress of deepest black. But when the ladies removed this from her--what do you imagine was revealed? . . . A full-length shift was seen. A garment the colour of the whoring of which she had been accused! The colour of martyrdom--and defiance! Blood red! Yes--all gasped at the shock of it! All watched with unwilling admiration--that good old word again--all watched with wonder as that frail captive, crippled from her long confinement, stepped out of the darkness of her nineteen years' humiliation and walked into eternity--a totally self-justified woman! (Lettice and Lovage 31-32)

Lettice's odd behavior is accented by the fact that after this speech, she removes her cloak to reveal a dress of deep

red, much like the one worn by Queen Mary. She feels that this theatrical act is necessary because just as Queen Mary was sentenced to death, so she has been sentenced to a life of poverty. Although the two sentences are not equal, in Lettice's mind they are at least comparable. This sense of martyrdom leads to her identify with Queen Mary. She feels that if she must lose her job, she, too, must become a martyr. Lettice also believes her cause to be justified despite Lotte's allegations. Her stand thus taken, Lettice walks triumphantly out of the room.

Act two opens several weeks later in Lettice's run-down apartment, which is filled with a variety of stage props. Lotte pays Lettice a visit and reveals that she would like to help her find another form of employment. Touched by Lotte's kind gesture, Lettice is moved to tears and offers her a goblet of Quaff, an alcoholic beverage, with which to toast their new-found friendship. As they drink, Lotte's stern facade begins to slip. She reveals her passionate hatred for the modern world and for the modern day "ghosts" to whom she is exposed day after day. She confesses that she has been cursed with the ability to perceive the true nature of modern people. She recalls a past lover with whom she once tried to blow up a modern building as a form of retaliation against modern architecture. She recounts, however, that she was never able to go through with the plan and that

her life has since been wasted. Despite her success at work, Lotte reveals that she is not content with her life.

The Quaff acts as the catalyst in the shedding of Lotte's Apollonian facade. She reveals the bittersweet memories she has about her father, the regret she feels for her former lover, and the remorse she feels about the position in life where she presently finds herself, "among the ghosts"--the rest of the members of society who choose to wear the Apollonian facades and continue in the tasks as "Non-Doers" (Lettice and Lovage 54). As Lettice and Lotte continue to drink, the contrast between the two personalities becomes apparent:

Lotte's life is built on scientific objectivity and certitude [Apollonian]; Lettice's life is oriented toward the arts and humanistic learning embedded in past history [Dionysian]. Lotte exhibits a cold, analytical temperament [Apollonian] which contrasts with Lettice's impetuous and emotional eclecticism [Dionysian]. Lotte weighs her words with care, while Lettice delights in garnishing each thought with colorful verbiage. (Gianakaris "Placing" 153)

At the end of act two, Lettice discusses the last laugh Mary Queen of Scots had on English society. She explains that the queen wore a wig to her execution. As the executioner attempted to pick up her head he was left holding the

queen's wig, revealing the "cropped grey hairs" (Lettice and Lovage 57) which were the result of the many years of imprisonment. Lotte kneels and commands Lettice to remove Lotte's wig, revealing a headful of grey hair. Here, the audience witnesses the final destruction of Lotte's Apollonian facade and sees a parallel between the cloak, which covered Lettice's red dress, and the wig Lotte wears, which covers her grey hair. By recognizing the parallels that exist between her and Lettice, Lotte comes to realize that she shares some basic values with Lettice. Just as Lettice removes her cloak to reveal the red dress, which symbolizes her passion and determination, Lotte removes her wig to reveal her "cropped grey hairs", which symbolize the effect that a life of control and rigidity has had on her.

Act three opens six months later. Lettice stands accused of attempted murder. In her discussion with her lawyer she reveals that she and Lotte have been recreating the executions of famous people and that one such recreation led to the accident in which Lotte was hurt. Lotte enters as Lettice is recounting the events of that evening and is too embarrassed to let her continue. Faced with a little embarrassment or having Lettice go to prison for attempted murder, Lotte even agrees to take part in the recreation of the events of that night. The lawyer is convinced that Lotte's injury was an accident and leaves but not before

letting them know that they must testify about their charades in court, a testimony which will receive a certain amount of publicity. Lotte expresses feelings of regret over soon becoming the laughing stock of London because of the negative publicity that will jeopardize her career (Apollonian facade) and exits. However, she returns a few hours later with a new-found purpose and ambition after thinking about the situation. She enters and reveals that she is relieved that she will not have to sit at the "Non-Doer's desk" and that she plans to leave it forever. She convinces Lettice to help her revive the movement whose sole purpose was to attack modern architecture. The play ends as Lettice and Lotte go forth to destroy buildings which they have deemed loathsome and worthy of destruction.

In the process of this play Lotte's Apollonian facade is destroyed, and her Dionysian face is revealed. By the end of the play, the audience sees Lotte's wholeheartedly believing in a cause: she and Lettice find themselves "bent on demolishing modern London landmarks in order to reassert the supremacy of the romantic historical past over a present of urban and spiritual blight" (Morley 16). According to Margaret Tyzack, who originated the role, "In the course of the play she [Lotte] goes on a journey, back to what she was . . . [S]he goes back to being the person who wouldn't compromise" (Qtd. in Greene 27). Because of her resurrected

Dionysian behavior, Lotte becomes obsessed with the attacks against the modern world which is filled with horrid architecture and peopled with insensitive individuals. Finally, as C.J. Gianakaris points out in "Placing Shaffer's Lettice and Lovage in Perspective":

Essential in plays by Shaffer--comedy or serious drama--is the energy generated by the collision of opposed protagonists. Lettice and Lovage is no exception.

Moreover, the playwright here turns once again to the Apollonian-Dionysian opposition utilized so effectively in the epic dramas. . . . Because comedy is dominant in Lettice and Lovage, we expect Dionysian elements to predominate. (149)

In Five Finger Exercise, Shrivings, and Lettice and Lovage Peter Shaffer has incorporated the struggle between the Apollonian facade and the Dionysian face. In these three plays the Dionysian face has destroyed the Apollonian facade. In Five Finger Exercise Clive represents the wild Dionysian face which destroys Walter's well-educated Apollonian facade. In Shrivings Mark represents the passionate Dionysian face which destroys Gideon's spiritless Apollonian facade. In Lettice and Lovage Lettice represents the carefree Dionysian face which destroys Lotte's encumbered Apollonian facade.

Chapter Two:

The Imposition of the Apollonian Facade Upon the Dionysian Face in The White Liars, Black Comedy, The Private Ear, and The Public Eye

In Peter Shaffer's shorter plays, The White Liars, Black Comedy, The Private Ear, and The Public Eye, the struggle between the Apollonian facade and the Dionysian face consists of the imposition of the facade upon the face. In essence, the demands of the facade control the behavior of the face. The persistent struggle between the facade and the face can be understood by examining the characters in groups: Frank tries to control Tom and Sophie tries to control Vassi in The White Liars; Carol tries to dictate Brindsley's life and Miss Furnival's father continues to affect Miss Furnival in Black Comedy; Bob tries to put Doreen on a pedestal in The Private Ear; and Charles tries to dominate Belinda's life in The Public Eye.

The premise of The White Liars is that human beings are constantly under the domination of other people's expectations to the point that those who are subjugated lose their identity and assume the one created by their oppressors. It is a play about "people who are trying to fool the

rest of the world about their true status and emotions" (Kerensky 47). This is the story of two friends (Frank and Tom) who have sought the help of a fortune teller (Sophie). Frank wins the coin toss which decides who gets to see Sophie first. He claims that he fears that Tom has been intimate with his girlfriend, Sue, and would like to bribe Sophie into scaring Tom enough to leave Sue alone. He provides her with a few facts about Tom's life and exits. When Tom enters, Sophie, under the guise of fortune telling, gives him what she believes are a few facts about his life. Tom is amused by this information and confesses that everything she thinks she knows is a lie. He stresses, however, that the lies are not his, but are, in fact, Frank's. Frank and Sue have fabricated Tom's entire life and believe that he is the son of a working-class family. Tom admits that he comes from a well-to-do family, not at all what Frank believes. Finally, Tom stresses the fact that Frank and Sue are not lovers and that she is not the one that Frank wants. Frank is a homosexual in love with Tom. Frank's face thus revealed, Tom states that the relationship that exists between Frank, Sue, and himself will be coming to an end and exits. Frank enters and admits that he really did not want Tom to leave, just to leave Sue alone, but it is too late.

The imposition of Frank's demands and expectations on Tom in an attempt to dictate his actions is the premise of

The White Liars. Frank is the imposing Apollonian facade. When he first enters, he is described as "middle-class, soft-spoken and gentle" (White Liars 12). His face is revealed when he deliberately cheats on the coin toss to see which of them will see Sophie first. To appear fair, Frank tosses the coin into the air, catches it, declares himself the winner, and asks Sophie to confirm his victory. Later in the scene Frank's deception becomes clear as Sophie declares that the coin did not come up tails. Frank goes on to reveal that he has saved Tom from a menial existence and has provided him with a place to live, the opportunity to succeed as a musician, and plenty of money. Despite all of this generosity, Tom has made advances to Sue. Frank claims that his own objective is merely to have Tom leave Sue alone.

All of the information that Frank provides is completely undercut when Tom speaks to Sophie. Frank claimed to be a reporter when he first met Tom and asked to stay around for a month while he wrote an article on Tom's band. Tom notes that his band already existed. Later, when he moved in with Frank, he found that Frank owed three months back rent which Tom paid. In essence, Tom shatters the illusion under which Frank lives. Sophie, however, defends his way of life:

All right, lies, so what? So what? So he tells a couple of--tales just to make himself a little more important--just to shield himself a little from the sordidness of

life! What a crime, mister! What a terrible crime!

(White Liars 33)

Tom even provides an explanation for Frank's reservations about the relationship that exists between Tom and Sue--Frank is a homosexual. In the following dialogue the truth of the situation becomes clear:

Sophie: It's very simple, mister. You had a friend, he had a girl. You stole her. That's all.

Tom: (Quietly) Can you think that? After all I've told you? Can you really believe they were lovers? (Pause) Oh, love, you really are in the wrong business, aren't you?

Sophie: I saw his pain here. Pain. In here. Pain!

Tom: For who? Do you think it's her he wants?

(A pause. She nods, in Teutonic comprehension.)

Sophie: And if he can't have you, she must not. I see. Poor idiot. (White Liars 37)

Tom is dominated by Frank's will. Frank has created a facade which he has placed over Tom's face. When Tom first enters, he is described as being "dressed like a parakeet in brilliant colors, [wearing] his hair very long and [speaking] in a heavy Midlands accent" (White Liars 12). Tom informs Sophie that everything that Frank believes he knows about Tom's past is just a lie which Frank and Sue have fabricated because of their own erotic desires. He confesses

that he has always been under the imposition of the demands set forth by Frank and Sue, "If I said they'd made me up, would you get it? . . . If I said--they'd made me make me up. That's nearer. . . . I don't know" (White Liars 34).

Tom explains that these are not the only people who are trying to dictate his life. When referring to the lies his parents tell about his way of life, Tom confesses to Sophie:

They abolished me, after all. How real am I to them? Dad calls me "Minstrel Boy" whenever I go home, because he finds it embarrassing to have a singer for a son. And Mother tells her bridge club I'm in London studying music--because studying is a more respectable image for her than performing in a cellar. Both of them are talking about themselves, not me. And that's fine, because that's what everybody's doing all the time, everywhere. (White Liars 28)

Finally, Tom speaks about the anguish of having to live by the standards that have been set by another person:

You just can't imagine it, can you? To be a prisoner of someone else's dream. Because that's what it's really like with your beautiful Givers. They give you your role. That's what they give. They make you up, till you're just acting in a film projected out of their eyes. I was a prisoner on Wet Dream Island! (White Liars 36)

This constant imposition of the facade upon the face is how Shaffer creates the conflict in The White Liars. It is important to note, however, that the conflict that exists between Tom and Frank is paralleled in the conflict that still exists in Sophie's mind between her and her memory of her fiance. In this case, Sophie is placed in the role of the facade, and Vassi is placed in the role of the face.

At the opening of the play the audience is made aware of the constant demands that Sophie used to put on Vassi, her fiance, when she states, "You know, my dear, if you are going to keep company with a baroness, you'd better learn how. Also, you wear too much oil on your hair. Oil's common. You're not a grocer" (White Liars 9). This imposition remains constant throughout the play. Later in the scene Sophie's objective becomes clear when she states, "It's obvious. Why do you fight me, darling? Why do you resist all the time my training? I only give it for your good. Can't you understand, I know what I'm talking about! It takes one aristocrat to recognize another" (White Liars 10).

The irony lies in the fact that Sophie is not an aristocrat. She simply wants to be aristocratic so much that she has deluded herself into believing that she is. Unfortunately for Sophie, Vassi knows what his station in life is and does not succumb to Sophie's demands. Her justification for her facade is established as she remembers the moment

that Vassi left her, "All right. Go! But when you look back on this moment--just ask yourself this. Is it really such a crime to want to make yourself seem a little important? To try to shield yourself just a little from the sordidness of everyday life? Is it?" (White Liars 11).

Interestingly, the imposition of the facade upon the face ultimately results in the destruction of the relationship between Tom and Frank and Sophie and Vassi. Toward the end of the play Frank confesses that he really did not want Tom to leave, just to leave Sue alone:

But all I wanted was, well, just for him to lay off Sue, that's all. I mean, it wasn't even that, really. It wasn't that I regarded him as a threat or anything, not as a threat to me. I'm--I'm just worried about Sue: you know. She's not absolutely mature yet--she's easily impressed. I don't want her to get hurt. (White Liars 41)

This regret is also paralleled by Sophie's monologue at the end of the play:

Oh, Vassi, come back. I didn't mean it. I was angry-- I'm stupid--you know me, my tongue goes off with me, always away. I don't know what I say. . . . I promise-- there won't be a baroness anymore. Just Weinberg. Awful old Weinberg, Fraulien No-One. . . . (White Liars 40)

The White Liars, then, reflects the struggle between

the Apollonian facade and the Dionysian face in Peter Shaffer's plays and "links several of Shaffer's favourite themes--role-playing as a way of life [facades], the revolt of a middle-class son against his family background, and the pain and loneliness of people groping for emotional relationships, especially unconventional ones" (Kerensky 48). In this instance, there are two different stories intertwined within the script. The first story concerns Frank as the imposing Apollonian facade and Tom as the succumbing Dionysian face. The second story presents Sophie as the imposing Apollonian facade and Vassi as the succumbing Dionysian face.

In Black Comedy, a farce, Carol, the Apollonian facade, struggles against Brindsley, the Dionysian face, and Miss Furnival's father, the Apollonian influence, dictates Miss Furnival's behavior. The reversal of the use of stage lighting (light replaces shadow and shadow replaces light) allows the audience to see the truth beneath the Apollonian facades worn by the characters. By altering the reality of the world of the characters, Peter Shaffer provides a means for the audience to see the characters behave under what they believe to be the veil of darkness. Carol, "a young debutante" (47), represents the Apollonian idea because she wants Brindsley, "a young sculptor" (47) and her fiance, to fit the pattern of respectable husband that has been defined

by her father, Colonel Melkett. Brindsley represents the Dionysian face because he has the wild and passionate side but feels compelled to go along with Carol's expectations until his materialistic needs and ambitions as an artist are met.

At the opening of the play the audience is made aware that Carol and Brindsley have "borrowed" the furniture of Harold Gorringe, Brindsley's neighbor, in an attempt to make Colonel Melkett, Carol's father, believe that Brindsley is a successful artist and will be able to provide for Carol after they are married. It is important to note that the idea for the acquisition of the furniture is Carol's. It becomes evident that Carol is imposing her demands on Brindsley by having him put forth a facade of success. Brindsley clearly defines his position with respect to the favorable impression that his apartment will have on Georg Bamberger, the millionaire art collector, but Carol quickly reminds him that Bamberger is not the only one they are trying to impress:

Brindsley. If you ask me, it would look much better to him if he found me exactly as I really am: a poor artist. It might touch his heart.

Carol. It might--but it certainly won't impress Daddy. Remember he's coming too. (Black Comedy 52)

Here, the audience witnesses the facade that Carol places

upon Brindsley's face.

However, Brindsley's face becomes apparent soon after the blackout when he receives a phone call from Clea, his former lover, and tries to convince her not to come over that evening. This deceit undercuts Brindsley's behavior. He believes he convinces Clea to stay away and hangs up the phone. When Carol asks who was on the phone, Brindsley claims that it was just an old chum.

Carol's imposition upon Brindsley becomes evident when she confesses his situation to Miss Furnival:

Because Brindley's got nothing, Miss Furnival. Nothing at all. He's as poor as a church mouse. If Daddy had seen this place as it looks normally, he'd have forbidden our marriage on the spot. (Black Comedy 63)

Despite all of Carol's impositions, Brindsley never changes. He continues to exhibit wild, impudent, and egocentric behavior. Brindlsey's self-saving characteristic is reflected by the cowardice to which he admits. This cowardice is evident because he simply will not contradict anything Carol says. The stealing of the furniture, which sets up many of the funnier moments in the play, is, after all, Carol's idea. He is also afraid of Carol's father, Colonel Melkett. Brindsley desperately tries to please him even though the colonel is clearly not fond of him.

Brindsley is also dishonest with Carol. He lies to her

about his past relationship with Clea. He claims that the affair is over. He even refers to Clea as being "about as cozy as a steel razor blade" (Black Comedy 53). He tries to establish the fact that he is in love with Carol, but his Dionysian actions contradict his Apollonian words.

Brindsley is also dishonest with Harold. He never tells him that the furniture that they are sitting on happens to be Harold's. Brindsley even tries to put all of the furniture back in Harold's apartment, an attempt to keep Harold from finding out that his furniture has been stolen. An intimate relationship between Brindsley and Harold is also alluded to but never really established. Harold's reaction to the news that Carol and Brindsley are engaged to be married seems to indicate an unrequited homosexual interest that Harold feels for Brindsley. Brindsley's relationships with women, however, support the idea that he is clearly heterosexual.

Finally, Brindsley is dishonest with Clea. He claims that the relationship that he and Carol share is nothing more than a friendship. He even claims that Carol's father is merely a business acquaintance. Despite the situation, Brindsley hurries Clea upstairs and agrees to let her stay until all of the guests are gone. When Clea comes downstairs posing as Brindsley's housekeeper, she finally learns that Brindsley is indeed engaged to Carol. At this point the

audience becomes aware of the paradox that exists in Brindsley's mind; he must choose between Carol, an Apollonian woman who will be a source of financial security in his artistic life but who will lack the passionate creativity that he desires, and Clea, a Dionysian woman who will provide him with a passionate and wild lifestyle but who will be a source of financial instability.

The facade that Carol has tried to place over Brindsley's face is finally shattered when Clea reveals who she really is. The facade is also shattered when Harold finds out that his apartment is in a state of chaos because his furniture is scattered throughout. The shattered facade results in the end of Carol and Brindsley's engagement as well as the relationship that exists between Brindsley and Harold. Despite the state of confusion at the end of the play, Brindsley chooses to abandon any kind of Apollonian pretension and chooses to follow his own Dionysian course with Clea.

The audience also witnesses the destruction of Miss Furnival's facade. Although Miss Furnival's father is only alluded to in the play, his presence in Miss Furnival's life dictates her actions throughout the play. She is described as "a middle-aged spinster. Prissy; and refined . . . [who] reveals only the repressed gestures of the middle-class spinster" (47). The impositions of her father, a Baptist

minister, on her life are briefly mentioned when she states, "I don't drink, thank you. My dear father, being a Baptist minister, strongly disapproved of alcohol" (Black Comedy 61). However, the audience witnesses the face beneath the facade when she is mistakenly given, but deliberately drinks, a glass of Scotch.

From this point on, she continues to drink heavily under the veil of stage darkness until she becomes intoxicated. Once she finishes her lemonade that is given to her after the Scotch, she gets up and fixes herself another alcoholic drink. The stage directions read, "Miss Furnival rises in agitation and gropes her way to the drinks table. . . . She finds the open bottle of gin, lifts it and sniffs it. . . . She pours more gin into her glass and returns slowly to sit upstage of the rostrum" (Black Comedy 85).

Later in the play, Miss Furnival collapses onto the sofa that Brindsley is desperately trying to pull out of the room. When he does manage to remove the sofa, he carries Miss Furnival with it:

Brindsley stealthily pulls the sofa into the studio, bearing in it the supine Miss Furnival, who waves good-bye to the company with the vague grandeur of a first-class passenger departing on an ocean liner. (Black Comedy 103)

In her drunken state, Miss Furnival then proceeds to sing

the song "Rock of Ages" from Brindsley's art studio.

Toward the end of the play, Miss Furnival drunkenly lets her facade slip and reveals the bitter feelings that she has harbored for so long:

(Off: in the studio.) Prams! (She staggers out carrying Clea's air-bag [luggage]. She speaks quickly, haughtily, in a flood of outrage and resentment. All freeze.) Prams! Prams in the Supermarket! All those hideous wire prams, full of babies and bottles! Corn flakes over there is all they say, and then they leave you to yourself! Bisquits over there! (Pointing in different directions, like a mad sign post.) cat food over there! fish-cakes over there! Airwick over there! Pink stamps, green stamps, television dinners, pay as you go out,--oh, Daddy it's awful! . . . And then the Godless ones, Heathens in their leather jackets, laughing me to scorn! But not for long, oh no! Who shall stand when He appeareth? He'll strike them from their motorcycles! He'll dash their helmets to the ground. Yea, verily, I say unto thee--There shall be an end to gasoline! An end to petroleum! An end to cigarette puffing and jostling with hips. Keep off! . . . Keep off! . . . Keep off! . . . It's shameful! . . . Off! . . . Off! . . . Offf! (She strikes out with the air-bag, moving rapidly across the stage until she

collides with Harold. He steadies her.) (Black Comedy
111-12)

In the first half of her speech, she refers to the baby carriages at the supermarket. She also refers to the lack of direction both at the supermarket and in life in general and to the signs in life which are supposed to point people in the right direction. Her father dead, however, she seems to have lost her ability to distinguish the good signs from the bad. In the second half of her speech she seems resentful for the scorn and ridicule that she has had to endure because of the righteous manner in which she lives. These memories, then, seem to be the catalyst for her drunken behavior. The destruction of Miss Furnival's facade is clearly shown. It begins with her first drink and continues until she drunkenly reveals the feelings that she has been hiding for many years. Interestingly, Miss Furnival sheds her Apollonian facade and pursues the Dionysian release that alcohol provides. In this instance, the character abandons Apollo, the god of reason, and follows Dionysus, the god of wine.

The struggle between the facade and the face is also evident in the manner in which Shaffer has chosen to present his play. He first came to this idea after "visiting a Chinese theatre company, with the actors in bright light pretending to be in the dark. . . . Unlike most farces, it

also occasionally touches our feelings and indicates the unhappiness lurking in superficially ludicrous people, so that the comedy is indeed 'black'" (Kerensky 46).

The premise is that when the characters see light, the audience sees complete darkness and vice versa. At the opening of the play, the audience hears Carol and Brindsley carrying on normally. After the apartment in which they live blows a main fuse, the characters experience a complete blackout, but the lights come on for the audience. In essence, when the world of the characters is in light, the audience sees nothing but darkness. When it is in darkness, the audience sees the characters in light. Shaffer uses this reversal of shadow and light to let the audience see the faces that exist beneath the masks. Ironically, in complete darkness the truth of the lives of the characters is brought to light.

In a play where the rules of nature are reversed, it seems only fair that Schuppanzigh, the repairman from the London Electric Board, the least likely character, is gifted with the ability to recognize the truth in Brindsley's art and to unknowingly state the truth about the situation at hand, "Don't listen!--look! Witness! Revere! . . . Here--amazingly--I feel the passionate [Dionysian] embrace of Similarities to create an orgasm of Opposites" (Black Comedy 99).

In Black Comedy, then, Peter Shaffer presents a farce where the imposition of the Apollonian facade upon the Dionysian face results in the ultimate destruction of the relationship that exists between the two. From the start, Carol tries to force Brindsley into becoming the kind of person that he is not. Fortunately for him, Clea comes in to help him shed this imposition on his character. Miss Furnival also sheds her prudish facade by continuing to drink heavily throughout the play. By reversing the traits of light and shadow, Shaffer lets the audience witness the characters' idiosyncracies that are hidden under the veil of darkness. Here again, the struggle between the facade and the face is clear.

The Private Ear presents a situation where the struggle between the Dionysian face and the Apollonian facade concerns three people. Ted tries to impose his Dionysian ideas on Bob, who tries to impose his Apollonian facade on Doreen, who chooses to be Dionysian. Ted is a self-proclaimed playboy who seems to personify the Dionysian elements in the play. Because Bob is the Apollonian character in the play, he has an appreciation for classical music. He is also constantly under Ted's scrutiny and domination. Doreen is Dionysian by nature but becomes subject to Bob's impositions. The struggle between the facade and the face results in the destruction of the

relationship between Ted and Bob and between Bob and Doreen.

The premise of The Private Ear involves three characters: Ted, an English playboy; Bob, an introverted lover of music; and Doreen, a somewhat shy young woman who agreed to come for dinner at Bob's apartment only because she had nothing better to do. As Ted and Bob await the arrival of Doreen, Ted displays an arrogant and self-assured demeanor. Bob, on the other hand, is uncertain about the outcome of the evening and has thus asked Ted to come over to help him deal with the situation.

Early on in the play, Ted's impositions on Bob become evident. Bob is simply too shy and insecure to be able to handle the idea of actually having a woman over to his apartment. This insecurity sets up the situation for Ted to impose his own values on Bob. Ted tries to make Bob into a Dionysian playboy, but Bob simply does not fit the pattern. Ted indirectly informs Bob that he expects him to make some kind of advances toward Doreen, a clear demonstration of Ted's Dionysian imposition on Bob:

Ted. . . . You're not going to let me down tonight, are you?

Bob. What do you mean?

Ted. You know what you're going to do this evening? I mean, you know what I'm expecting you to do, don't you?

Bob. Look, Ted. it's not that way at all.

Ted. No?

Bob. No, not at all.

Ted. Well then, I'm wasting my time here, aren't I?

(The Private Ear 16)

Just as Ted has tried to impose his own values on Bob, so Bob tries to impose his own values on Doreen. He believes he has found the incarnation of Venus in Doreen. He has placed her on a pedestal and imagines her to be the ideal woman of which he has always dreamed. When Doreen is a little late in arriving, Ted recognizes the trick, but Bob tries to account for her late arrival:

Ted. Oh, don't be silly. Most girls think it's chic to be a little late. They think it makes them more desirable. It's only a trick.

Bob. No, that's not her. She doesn't play tricks. That's why all that stuff is so silly--all this plotting. I say this, and she says that. I think things should just happen between people. . . . This isn't the sort of girl you can make plots about. It would be all wrong. Because she's sort of inaccessible. Pure--but not cold. Very warm. (The Private Ear 21)

Bob goes so far as to compare Doreen to Venus in her perfection. He seems to be infatuated with the ideal beauty he thinks she possesses:

What I mean is, that look of hers is ideal beauty, Ted. It means she's got grace inside her. Really beautiful people are beautiful inside them. . . . I mean . . . well, what you called carriage, for instance. I mean real carriage, the way you see some girls walk, sort of pulling the air around them like clothes--you can't practice that. You've got to love the world. Then it comes out. (The Private Ear 21-22)

When Doreen arrives, however, it is clear that she is not as ideal as Bob imagines her to be. The stage directions read, "It is at once obvious that she is as nervous as he is and has no real pleasure in being there. Her reactions are anxious and tight, and these, of course, do nothing to reassure Bob" (The Private Ear 24). After dinner, as Bob puts away the dinner plates in the kitchen, Doreen confesses to Ted that she is not really a music-lover and that the concert at which she and Bob met was boring to her.

At this point Doreen discovers Bob's true feelings which dwell beneath his Apollonian facade. Ted describes him as one of "nature's gentlemen" (The Private Ear 44). Ted goes on to discuss the emotions that Bob chooses not to reveal to anyone, "He's got feelings inside him I wouldn't know anything about--and you neither. . . . Real deep feelings. They're no use to him, of course. They're in his way" (The Private Ear 45).

Ted goes on to explain the vision of Doreen that Bob has created, "Dreams. Ideas about perfect women. He's got one about you. . . . You're a vision. You've got a long neck like Venus coming out of the sea. . . . He thinks you are the living image of her" (The Private Ear 45).

After Bob finds out that Doreen is turning out to be just another one of Ted's conquests, he becomes aware of the impositions to which Ted has subjected him, "I'm just someone to look down on, aren't I? Teach tricks to. Like a bloody monkey. You're the organ grinder, and I'm the monkey! And that's the way you want people" (The Private Ear 50). Unfortunately, it becomes clear that Bob's "sensibilities are all pretense--or if not, they only serve to protect him against having to compete against the Teds of the world" (Pennel 103). The audience finally becomes aware of the Dionysian feelings that Bob has but is never able to express, "There's something inside me that can be excited. And that means that I can excite other people, if I only knew what way. . . . I never met anyone to show me that way" (The Private Ear 54). After his advances to Doreen fail, he tries to slip his Apollonian facade back onto his face by claiming that he has brought her to his apartment under false pretenses. He claims that he is engaged to be married and shows her a picture of one of Ted's girl friends, pretending that she is his fiancee.

Bob's facade, however, has been damaged. After Doreen exits, he plays one of his favorite records, takes the needle and makes two deep scratches on the record, and continues to play it, with the scratches deeply interfering with the music that is heard. The damaged record, then, parallels the damaged facade that Bob must now wear. In essence, Bob is not ready to accept who he is and what he wants "until the events of the play force him, and then he can understand and explain himself in terms of stage business, not language" (Pennel 103).

In The Private Ear, then, Shaffer once again presents the struggle between the Apollonian facade and the Dionysian face. Ted and Doreen are the Dionysian faces, and Bob is the Apollonian facade. The relationship that exists between the characters seems to complete a circle in that Ted tries to impose his expectations on Bob, who tries to impose his expectations on Doreen, who finds herself inclined to the Dionysian demeanor. Much like the struggles between the facade and the face found in The White Liars and Black Comedy, the struggle in The Private Ear results in the destruction of the relationship that exists between Ted and Bob.

The Public Eye is a play about Charles, the Apollonian facade; Belinda, the Dionysian face; and Julian, the intermediary between the two. Charles is a controlled

Apollonian individual who continually imposes his demands on Belinda. Belinda, Charles' young wife, is a passionate, Dionysian individual who feels threatened by her husband's constant demands on her social life. Julian is the private detective hired by Charles to spy on Belinda. The struggle between the Apollonian facade and the Dionysian face results in the Apollonian succumbing to the Dionysian.

The premise of The Public Eye is that Charles, a middle-aged accountant, fears that Belinda, his young wife, is unfaithful to him and thus hires a private detective to follow her around and attain proof of her infidelity. As Julian follows Belinda around, however, the two characters begin to develop an odd but exciting relationship. When Charles and Julian meet at the opening of the play, Julian explains that Belinda does indeed have a relationship with another man but refuses to say who the man is. When Belinda enters, she immediately recognizes Julian as the man who has been following her around London for the past month. Julian confesses that he has been hired by her husband to spy on her, and she becomes furious. In a last-minute effort to save the marriage, Julian orders the couple to play the same sort of cat-and-mouse game that he and Belinda have been playing. By not allowing them to speak to each other for a month, Julian hopes to establish solid means of communication between Charles and Belinda. At the play's end,

Julian declares that he will be taking over Charles' job at the accounting office as he and Belinda begin their month-long game.

It is important to note that Charles is older than Belinda. This difference in ages sets up the Apollonian demands that Charles makes. First, Charles assumes the role of educator. He tries to educate her on how to spend her time efficiently. Later he claims that he tried to teach her everything he knows. Finally, he explains that he tried to teach her about her place in life:

Belinda is the wife of a professional man in a highly organized city in the twentieth century. That is her place as I have often explained to her. This would undoubtedly be different if she were wedded to a jazz trumpeter in New Orleans, which she seems to think she is. There is no such thing as a perfectly independent person. (The Public Eye 82)

Belinda, however, is aware of the role as educator that Charles has taken and has grown resentful of it. When accused of not being an adult capable of giving her husband the attention he needs, Belinda retaliates:

Well, if I'm not, whose damn fault is it? This isn't my home. It's my school. . . . Just look at the way you're holding that ruler! . . . When you first met me, I'd have said or done anything just to join in. I thought

people would like me more if I liked what they liked. So I pretended all the time. In the end I couldn't tell what I really liked from what I said I liked.

(Frankly.) You released me from all that. You gave me facts, ideas, reasons for things. You let me out of that hot, black burrow of feeling. . . . I don't know. Living with you has taught me to respect my feelings--not alter them under pressure. (The Public Eye 93-94)

Interestingly, Belinda's insight seems to surpass that of Charles. When he claims that he is still very much in love with her, she addresses the lack of Dionysian passion that their marriage is currently suffering:

Then why the hell don't I feel it? "I'm burning," says the fire. But my cold hands say, "No you're not." Love with me is a great burst of joy that someone exists. Just that. Breathes. And with that joy comes great need to go out and greet them. Yes, that's the word: greet. I used to greet you, inside me, anyway, forty times a day. Now it's once a fortnight. And always when you're not looking. When you've got your hat on at an angle trying to look jaunty, which you can never manage anyway. It's all dead with us now. (The Public Eye 95)

However, Belinda is still in love with Charles. She fondly recollects the way in which he used to behave when

they first met and compares it with the facade that he has placed over his feelings:

If you'd known him before, you'd have adored him. He used to be gay--really gay. He'd say hundreds of funny things and then laugh at them himself, which I think is a marvelous sign, to laugh at your own jokes. It means you're in life. Now he's out of it: he's watching all the time; sarcastic, as if something's drying him up. (The Public Eye 109)

Julian, as intermediary, recognizes the truth:

Most husbands want to create their wives in their own image and resent all changes they haven't caused, all experiences they haven't shared, and--with wives brighter than they are--all new things they can't keep up with. (The Public Eye 110)

Julian goes on to describe the facade which Charles has created for himself:

He's so afraid of being touched by life, he hardly exists. He's so scared of looking foolish, he puts up words against it for barriers: Good Taste, Morality. What you "should" do. What you "should" feel. He's walled up in Should like a tomb. (The Public Eye 110-11)

Finally, Julian recognizes the Apollonian/Dionysian relationship which Charles and Belinda share, "You're

Spirit, and he's Letter. You've got passion where all he's got is pronouncement" (The Public Eye 111). In the end, Julian forces Charles and Belinda to play the same cat-and-mouse game that he and Belinda played before. The logic behind the game is that in following each other around London for a month without ever speaking one word to each other, they will develop a better understanding of each other's likes and dislikes and thus develop a good understanding of the kind of people they really are. In essence, Belinda will make Charles develop the Dionysian side of his personality.

In The Public Eye, then, the struggle between the Apollonian facade and the Dionysian face results in the destruction of Charles' Apollonian facade and the development of his Dionysian face. Acting as intermediary, Julian creates a situation whereby the marriage of Charles and Belinda can be saved. In this play "The modulation occurs as Shaffer displays the depths of Belinda's character [Dionysian face] and the shallows of Charles' response to life [Apollonian facade]" (Pennel 104).

The White Liars, Black Comedy, The Private Ear, and The Public Eye depict situations where the Apollonian facade continues to impose its demands on the Dionysian face. In the first three plays this imposition leads to the destruction of the relationship between these two extremes. The

Public Eye provides a situation where the imposition leads to a final attempt to save this relationship. Even in Peter Shaffer's shorter plays the struggle between the Apollonian and Dionysian elements can be found. Whether in short, small-cast plays such as The White Liars, The Private Ear, and The Public Eye or in the long, large-cast farce Black Comedy, the struggle between such two extremes leaves little room for compromise between the two. In these four plays the struggle ends in some form of destruction: the destruction of Frank and Tom's relationship in The White Liars, the destruction of Carol and Brindsley's relationship in Black Comedy, the destruction of Ted and Bob's relationship in The Private Ear, and the destruction of Charles' extreme Apollonian behavior in The Public Eye.

Chapter Three:

The Destruction of the Dionysian Face by the Apollonian Facade in The Royal Hunt of the Sun, Equus, and Amadeus

In The Royal Hunt of the Sun, Equus, and Amadeus the Apollonian facade destroys the Dionysian face. The Royal Hunt of the Sun is a play about the Apollonian facades that Pizarro and Martin wear and the Dionysian face of Atahualpa. Equus presents a situation where Martin Dysart, Dora Strang, and Frank Strang, the Apollonian facades, destroy the passion of Alan Strang, the Dionysian face. In Amadeus Salieri, the Apollonian facade, struggles to destroy Mozart's Dionysian face. In these plays, the cold and calculating Apollonian behavior destroys the wild and passionate Dionysian nature.

The Royal Hunt of the Sun is a play about the struggle between Pizarro, a Spanish general, Young Martin, a page to Pizarro, and Atahualpa, an Inca man-god. The facades that Pizarro and Young Martin put forth represent the hypocritical Apollonian behavior of the Spanish crown. Atahualpa, who represents the Dionysian face, is destroyed by the hypocritical and ruthless nature of the Spaniards. Young Martin and Pizarro are the Apollonian facades which

destroy Atahualpa, the Dionysian face (Hinden "Trying to Like Shaffer" 18).

A triangle is established with Pizarro, the first Apollonian facade, Young Martin, the second Apollonian facade, and Atahualpa, the Dionysian face (Dean 298). Pizarro's Apollonian facade is first discussed by Old Martin: "I saw him closer than anyone, and had cause only to love him. He was my altar, my bright image of salvation. Francisco Pizarro! Time was when I'd have died for him, or for any worship" (Royal Hunt 17). However, Pizarro himself reveals to Young Martin the face that exists beneath his facade as he admits to his own limitations:

Look at you [Young Martin], if you served me you'd be a page to an old slogger: no titles, no traditions. I learnt my trade as a mercenary, going with who best paid me. It's a closed book to me, all that Chivalry. But then, not reading or writing, all books are closed to me. (Royal Hunt 20)

In this passage, Pizarro lets Young Martin see the man he is beneath the facade. He admits his ignorance and stresses that he does not really believe in the facade of Chivalry.

It is the quest for gold and the search for God that brings about the ruin of Pizarro (Stacy 326). He travels to Peru to bring back a fortune in gold for the Spanish crown, yet his main objective seems to be to fill the emptiness

with which the absence of a sincere religion and a significant and respectable place in society has left him. He feels bitterness and resentment for the Spanish crown and for the ways of the Catholic church because of the hypocrisy that it epitomizes (Kerensky 42). When he finally captures Atahualpa, he desperately tries to have him fill the emptiness with which this lack of worship has left him. When the Inca man-god proves to be nothing more than a man, Pizarro is outraged at himself for even thinking that this man might fulfill his spiritual needs (Pennel 108). As he sits next to the body of the sun-king, he states, "Cheat. You cheated me!" (Royal Hunt 137). In essence, Pizarro is deprived of the fulfillment that he seeks.

In creating the character of Martin Ruiz, Shaffer has chosen to split him into two entities. The one seen as narrator throughout the play has the benefit of experience. His ability to see the story in retrospect allows him to objectively recount what happened. His objective is to elaborate on the idiosyncrasies of a society which places so much importance on wealth and power under the facade of hope and glory.

Old Martin has the perspective that the passage of time has allowed him. Now, some forty years later, he is not very different from Pizarro himself. He, too, is bitter. His one purpose in life is to recount the tales of Pizarro's con-

quest of Peru to anyone who will listen (Stacy 330). His bitterness is reflected in his opening monologue:

Most of my life I've spent fighting for land, treasure, and the cross. I'm worth millions. Soon I'll be dead and they'll bury me out here in Peru, the land I helped ruin as a boy. This story is about ruin. Ruin and gold. (Royal Hunt 17)

Young Martin is full of pretensions because he does not know better. The audience sees him as an idealist who has a head full of romantic notions and naive visions of glory. He puts Pizarro upon a pedestal as the absolute depiction of the Spanish crown, not knowing that he is anything but ideal. This exaltation is illustrated by the fact that he refers to Pizarro as "sir" and "my lord" and bows to him "every ten seconds" (Royal Hunt 20). When asked why he wants to join the expedition, Young Martin simply states, "It's going to be glorious, sir" (20). Despite Young Martin's naive perceptions, Pizarro senses a certain relationship between him and the young boy--he, too, was once an idealist, but the experiences in his life have made him aware of the hypocrisy of Spain.

The young version of Martin is full of hope and dreams of glory. Young Martin is driven by these hopes and dreams. He strives for the ideal. He believes in the codes of honor that have been established by the crown of Spain. The irony

lies in the fact that he does not know better. He dreams of traveling to unknown lands and returning with unimaginable wealth but does not take into account the dangers that are involved in such a pursuit.

Young Martin is the embodiment of innocence. He has yet to learn the bitter lessons that await him. At the opening of the play, he cannot seem to stop bowing to Pizarro. He pleads with the general to let him accompany him on the expedition and graciously accepts the position as a page to Pizarro. As the play progresses, however, Young Martin evolves into a man. There comes a time, before the death of Atahualpa, when he has to be reminded that he must bow as he exits the presence of his general.

Atahualpa, the Dionysian face, finds himself against these two extreme representations of the Spanish Apollonian facade. In his ignorance, he confuses the white men with gods when he first hears about them. Ironically, he believes that they have come to give him their blessing.

Although Atahualpa wears a mask of gold when he is first seen, he is nonetheless the Dionysian face because he has no pretensions. He actually believes that he is the son of the sun and that he will return to his father's side after his life on earth has ended. Atahualpa believes that he has no human nature and that he can actually "swallow up death and spit it out . . ." (Royal Hunt 133). He also

believes that he can survive any attack upon him and rise at the dawn of the new day. He is a generous king who has established an ideal state for his people. Despite his position, he proves to be somewhat naive about the hypocritical nature of the Spaniards. Even after thousands of his people are killed in the massacre, Atahualpa believes the Spaniards' word that he will be released as soon as they receive all of the gold in his kingdom.

The bitterness that Pizarro feels for the Spanish crown and for the ideals Young Martin believes in is established in act one, scene one. In this scene Pizarro reveals the face beneath the Apollonian facade that he must wear, and Young Martin reveals the naive romantic ideals for which he believes the Spanish crown stands.

In scene two the audience is made aware of the truth that exists beneath the facades that people wear. Young Martin is full of hopes and dreams of glory, but Pizarro quickly informs him that honor and glory are not what they seem. However, Pizarro recognizes the naive sense of hope that Young Martin has and that he will learn, not from him, but from the forest that they will encounter.

Atahualpa is introduced in scene three. Here he mistakes the white man for an ancient god. He believes that "the White God" has returned and that "if he comes, it is with blessing" (Royal Hunt 33). He goes on to say that his

people will see that it was right for him to take the crown because he has brought the blessing of the "White God." Yet he tests Pizarro's claims to be a god by setting the first meeting between them on a high mountain that is quite inaccessible. He believes that if Pizarro is a god, he will find him; if not, then he will die.

Pizarro makes an important statement in scene five, which once again reveals the face beneath the facade. The audience is made aware of the contempt with which Pizarro views the Catholic religion and the Spanish crown it controls. In addressing De Candia, Commander of Artillery, Pizarro captures the truth of the struggle between the Spanish Apollonian facade and the Inca Dionysian face, "The clothed hunt the naked; the legitimates hunt the bastards, and put down the word Gentleman to blot up the blood" (Royal Hunt 40).

The frivolous pomposity of the Spanish society of the time also fuels the passionate hatred of Pizarro for hypocrisy. He recognizes Young Martin as the epitome of what he despises most--the hypocrisy of the church:

You belong to hope. To faith. To priests and pretenses. To dipping flags and ducking heads; to laying hands and licking rings; to powers and parchments; and to the whole vast stupid congregation of crowners and cross-kissers. You're a worshipper, Martin. A groveller. You

were born with feet but you prefer your knees. . . .

You own everything I've lost. (Royal Hunt 41)

Pizarro is a man who has been seasoned with experience and thus knows better than to believe the notions of a young man. Yet the traits of bitterness and hopelessness of Pizarro become painfully clear when he tells Young Martin that he owns everything Pizarro has lost.

Pizarro expresses his admiration for the civilization of the Inca people in scene six. Here again, the Dionysian, unpretentious face of the Inca people is revealed:

Oh, it's not difficult to shame Spain. Here shames every country which teaches we are born greedy for possessions. Clearly we're made greedy when we're assured it's natural. But there's a picture for a Spanish eye! There's nothing to covet, so covetousness dies at birth. (Royal Hunt 45)

In this statement, the tragedy of the "clash between the Catholic and Pagan visions of the world" (Hinden "When Playwrights Talk to God" 50) is alluded to because the Inca people live a peaceful life in a society where everyone is provided for. The Spanish hypocrisy is once again alluded to and its lack of principles put to shame.

In scene seven, Pizarro comes to the realization that unless he and his army wear the facade of gods, Atahualpa will surely put his entire company to death. Thus, he orders

them to pretend to be gods:

You're not men any longer, you're Gods now. Eternal Gods, each one of you. . . . He must see Gods walk on earth. Indifferent! Uncrushable! . . . You can grant prayers now--no need to answer them. . . . Get up you God-boys--march! (Royal Hunt 50-51)

In scene nine, Pizarro again speaks of Young Martin's sense of hope with admiration. This time, however, his tone appears more distant and romantic, "Hope, lovely hope. A sword's no mere bar of metal for him. His world still has sacred objects" (Royal Hunt 60). He notes that Young Martin does not just see a "bar of metal" when he comes upon a sword. Rather, he perceives the glory, honor, magic, and the rest of the abstract concepts which mean so much to a young man. Pizarro's bitterness toward the church is once again noticeable when he mentions the "sacred objects" which can still be found in the young man's world.

The face beneath the facade is once again seen in scene ten when Pizarro speaks of his own past. Here, the parallel between him and Young Martin becomes evident:

Fame is long. Death is longer. . . . Does anyone ever die for anything? I thought so once. Life was fierce with feeling. It was all hope, like that boy. Swords shone and armour sang, and cheese bit you, and kissing burned and Death--ah, death was going to make an

exception in my case. I couldn't believe I was ever going to die. But once you know it--really know it--it's all over. You know you've been cheated, and nothing's the same again. (Royal Hunt 62-63)

Here again, hope seems to be the major trait that is missing beneath Pizarro's Apollonian facade. Pizarro compares himself to Martin but notices the extreme difference that exists. He, too, had hope once, but experience has shown him that hope gives way to the hard and bitter lessons in life. Pizarro's past intrudes on the present, and he believes he sees things clearly now. These perceptions lead him to feel bitter and rejected and to develop a callous view of life because of the fact that his illegitimate origin has always caused him to be an outcast in Catholic Spain. (Royal Hunt viii).

Atahualpa finally meets the Spaniards at the opening of scene twelve. He first meets Valverde, Chaplain to the expedition, who tries to explain creation and Christianity to Atahualpa. Here the audience witnesses the confrontation between the ideologies of the two civilizations, "Christianity, with its emphasis on suffering, confronts Inca religion, which hallows happiness. The Church, with its hypocrisies and its rigid certainties, faces the high priest of the Incas, with his own certainty" (Nightingale 126). When Atahualpa is not impressed by Valverde's claims, he

demands to see the god whom he has come to meet. Realizing that the time for attack is at hand, Pizarro appears with his sword drawn and the great Indian massacre begins.

The face beneath Young Martin's facade begins to emerge at the opening of act two as he becomes aware of the corruption that is overcoming his sense of hope as the implications of the Indian massacre come crashing down on his ideals. His speech reflects the passing of the years and the shame that he feels, even in retrospect, "Three thousand Indians we killed in that square. . . . That night I knelt vomiting into a canal, the empire of the Incas stopped" (Royal Hunt 79).

Corruption continues to destroy Young Martin's ideals in act two, scene four. Here the audience is also made aware of the greed that eventually overpowers not only Young Martin's comrades on the expedition but also himself:

The first gold arrived. Much of it was in big plates weighing up to seventy-five pounds, the rest in objects of amazing skill. Knives of ceremony; collars and fretted crowns; funeral gloves, and red-stained death masks, goggling at us with profound enamel eyes. Some days there were things worth thirty or forty gold pesos--but we weren't satisfied with that. (Royal Hunt 96)

The fact that he counts himself with those who were not

satisfied with the immense treasures proves that he has lost the magic with which he perceived the ideals of the crown earlier in the play. He no longer sees the ceremony of the knives or the majesty of the crowns; he merely perceives every golden object as treasure to be valued for the wealth that it will bring. The "red-stained death masks" are symbolic of the hypocritical, murderous Apollonian facades worn by the Spaniards.

The final destruction of Young Martin's ideals is seen in act two, scene six. The Spanish ideals are all cast aside by Young Martin and the rest of the men, and their corrupt nature becomes evident as he remembers, "Slowly the pile increased. The army waited nervously and licked its lips. Greed began to rise in us like a tide of sea" (Royal Hunt 103). Once again Young Martin counts himself among those who licked their lips in the presence of the Inca gold. Here he recognizes the absolute corruption of his own ideals. At this point, he comes to understand the hypocrisy of the facade which he wears. Young Martin is much like the rest of the men in his search for wealth and power.

The barbaric nature that envelops the Spaniards becomes clear in act two, scene eight when De Candia states, "Spanish justice reigns supreme. They hang Indians for everything. How's your royal friend? When do we hang him?" (Royal Hunt 117). Under the auspices of the Spanish crown

Pizarro and his army savagely destroy the Inca civilization and claim its treasures. They achieve their victory by reverting to savagery and bloodshed. By establishing themselves as supreme, they claim the right to the treasures of the conquered people. The Dionysian nature that exists under the facade of the Spanish crown is thus revealed.

Finally, Atahualpa is executed in act two, scene twelve. Pizarro, fearing that his men will be killed by Atahualpa's followers and pressured by his own army, orders the execution to proceed. As the lifeless body of the Inca king is placed at Pizarro's feet, he waits with some degree of expectancy for Atahualpa to fulfill his prophesy and overcome death. The dawn of the new day comes, the rays of the sun fall on Atahualpa's body, but he does not stir. Pizarro realizes the tragedy of what he has done--under the Apollonian facade of the Spanish crown he has destroyed the one creature who could have absolved him from his own emptiness (Hinden 18).

Old Martin brings the audience around in a full circle at the end of the play. He alludes to the joy that comes with innocence and the pain that comes with insight, ". . . there's no joy in the world could match for me what I had when I first went with you [Pizarro] across the water to find the gold country. And no pain like losing it" (Royal Hunt 139). The futility of life finally leaves Martin with

the same facade which Pizarro once wore (Pennel 108). He is left wealthy but alone, as the last survivor of the expedition which took place some forty years earlier. He is left as the one person who could truthfully recount what transpired. The bitterness that he has come to feel is evident in his next-to-last speech:

I'm the only one left now of that company: landowner--slaveowner--and forty years from any time of hope. It put out a good blossom, but it was shaken off rough. After that I reckon the fruit always comes sour, and doesn't sweeten up much with age. (Royal Hunt 139)

The Royal Hunt of the Sun, then, employs the struggle between the Apollonian facade and the Dionysian face. In this case the Apollonian facade, or Pizarro acting on behalf of the Spanish crown, destroys the Dionysian face, or Atahualpa. Within the context of the play, the audience sees the gradual destruction of Young Martin's ideals by the Apollonian facade represented by the Spanish crown. In this play, the human nature of man destroys the ideal nature of belief. Pizarro sees the hypocrisy of the Spanish church but continues to act in its name. Ironically, the facade that he wears forces him to destroy the one man who could deliver him from this hypocrisy.

The Dionysian face is also destroyed by the Apollonian facade in Equus. According to Edwin Wilson, a drama critic,

it is a play about "the Nietzschean conflict between the Dionysian and Apollonian impulses, . . ." (Qtd. in Plunka 87). At the opening of the play, the audience sees the Dionysian passion of Alan as he embraces Nugget, the horse. The controlled world of Martin Dysart is evident because the action of the play takes place "inside a sparse rectangular room representing the orderly world of the psychiatrist" (Billington 191). Here Alan Strang's Dionysian behavior is destroyed by the illusion of Martin Dysart's Apollonian obligation to society (Walls 315). The facade of Apollonian behavior as defined by Dysart at the beginning of the play replaces the passion of unfeigned worship. Alan Strang is the Dionysian face because he does not have the sense to put forth an Apollonian facade of normality. Shaffer uses a narrator, Dysart, to give the audience a point of reference from which to know and understand the truth that exists beneath his, Dora Strang's, and Frank Strang's facades. The characters are forced inward away from the facade in the search for truth (Plunka 95).

Equus is the story of a young man who blinds six horses with a metal spike and of the psychiatrist who must help him deal with, and regretfully destroy, the passion that drove him to it. It is an ardent and bitter play about the facades that society expects from the individuals who compose it and agree with it and the naked faces, or truths, of those who

rebel against it by committing acts which contradict the established values. Martin Dysart, the psychiatrist, envies the fact that Alan Strang, the young boy, has managed to create this passion not because, but in spite of, his upbringing. Beneath the facade of psychiatrist, Dr. Dysart longs to feel even the most minute portion of what Alan felt at the time of his hideous act. Dr. Dysart is remorseful about what his occupation forces upon him. In essence, he envies Alan's passionate and all-consuming faith manifested in the god Equus.

Alan Strang is the Dionysian face. He represents the instinctual nature of mankind. The fact that his sexuality is activated by his relationship with the horse supports the idea that he does not know better than to put his complete faith in the first thing that he perceives as being divine. Alan Strang is the epitome of innocence. He does not know why he worships the way he does. He has simply pulled all of the information that his mother has fed him throughout his life and fused it with what he learned while working at the appliance store and once again fused all of these experiences with his deep adoration for horses and the passion they symbolize and created the god known as Equus.

When put in proper perspective, Alan Strang's actions can be understood. From the time Alan was a young boy, his parents have pulled him from opposite directions: his mother

from the religious perspective and his father from the atheistic perspective. This struggle ultimately results in the boy's search for identity and his accidental discovery of horses. In an attempt to make any sense of the world in which he lives, Alan brings together the different elements that he has learned, resulting in a horse god (the search for god) who lives for the sins of the world (the influence of the Bible), whose enemies are the hosts of Philco and Pifco (the influence of the modern world).

Martin Dysart is the Apollonian facade. Yet beneath this facade, Dysart is cursed with his ability to see things for what they are and for what they mean and is thus hounded "with self-doubts . . . and self-questioning" (Gianakaris "Theatre of the Mind" 38). In curing Alan, Dysart is forced to contend "with his own demons of frustration and despair" (Beaufort 1091). He knows what he is doing and is aware of the fact that he is internally destroying Alan Strang. At the end of the play, he states, "Passion, you see, can be destroyed by a doctor. It cannot be created" (108). In essence, the Apollonian facade destroys the Dionysian face.

Martin Dysart is a dreamer beneath his Apollonian facade. He longs for a life somewhere in Greece, where he can wholeheartedly worship the Greek gods, who represent a more simplistic and natural existence. He wants to worship without any kind of holds or bars. This ability is what he

envies in Alan, who is innocent enough not to know better. His innocence gives him the freedom to worship, no matter what the worship calls for. Dysart, however, has an educated head which does not allow him to feel such things.

Act one, scene one, begins with Alan Strang standing lovingly next to Nugget the horse. From the start, the audience is made aware that there is something more between Dysart and Alan than a mere doctor-patient relationship. Ironically, Dysart notices that the thing he thinks about is not the boy but the horse and the things that may be going through its mind:

--I keep thinking about the horse! Not the boy: the horse, and what it may be trying to do. I keep seeing its huge head kissing him with its chained mouth. Nudging through the metal some desire absolutely irrelevant to filling its belly or propagating its own kind. What desire could that be? Not to stay a horse any longer? Not to remain reined up for ever in those particular genetic strings? Is it possible, at certain moments we cannot imagine, a horse can add its sufferings together--the non-stop jerks and jabs that are its daily life--and turn them into grief? What use is grief to a horse? (Eguus 17)

Interestingly, Dysart feels that a certain relationship exists between him and the horse. He, too, longs to break

free from the expectations of the society that he was born into, these "genetic strings," and actually know the passion that he knows will always be beyond his reach (Riedel 31). This idea is supported by what he says later on in the same speech, "You see, I'm wearing the horse's head myself. That's the feeling. All reined up in old language and old assumptions, straining to jump cleaned-hoofed on to a whole new track of being I only suspect is there" (18). From the beginning, the audience is shown the Dionysian face which exists beneath Dysart's Apollonian facade. He longs to break free from these "old assumptions" and jump to a whole new level of existence he only suspects is there. The irony is that the artificial horseheads worn by the actors in the chorus are paralleled by the Apollonian facade worn by Dysart.

The audience is made explicitly aware of the facade of the psychiatrist that Dysart wears and the face of the man that exists beneath in his speech in scene five:

That night, I had a very explicit dream. In it I'm a chief priest in Homeric Greece. I'm wearing a wide gold mask, . . . I'm officiating at some immensely important ritual sacrifice, . . . The sacrifice is a herd of children, . . . On either side of me stand two assistant priests, wearing masks as well, . . . The only thing is, unknown to them, I've started to feel

distinctly nauseous. And with each victim, it's getting worse. My face is getting green behind the mask, . . . And then, of course--the damn mask begins to slip, . . . they see the green sweat running down my face, . . . they tear the knife from my hand . . . and I wake up. (Equus 24-25)

In this soliloquy, Dysart reveals the feelings that exist beneath the facade of psychiatrist. The facade that he wears in everyday life manifests itself in his dream as the "wide gold mask." His practice of turning disturbed individuals into "normal" people manifests itself as the "immensely important ritual sacrifice." The people that he has cured in the past appear as the "herd of children." It is important to note that Dysart later reveals that it is Alan's face he sees on every child that he sacrifices. The fact that the children in Dysart's dream all wear Alan's face supports the idea that Alan is just one among the many who have been subjected to this modification towards normality (Hobson 190). The disgust with which Dysart views his profession is shown by the fact that he begins to feel nauseous. The fear of being discovered appears when his mask begins to slip, and his two priests see the "green sweat" running down his face. The fact that he refers to his sweat as green insinuates the lack of maturity or professionalism that he fears.

The sacrificial knife takes on phallic overtones because it represents Dysart's unfulfilled sexual potency. With this powerful tool Dysart performs his duty in his dream. The act reflects what he believes he does to children in real life. He feels that he destroys the passion (Dionysian face) of each child and attempts to place the mask of normality (Apollonian facade) in its place. In reality, Dysart is sexually impotent because there is no passion in the relationship that exists between him and his wife, yet he dreams of having children. In Dysart's dream the sacrificial knife is the tool of destruction for the children. In real life his sexual impotence is what prevents him from having the children he longs for.

The sacrificial knife used by Dysart is paralleled by the hoofpick used by Alan, representing his sexual potency with Equus in the Field of Ha-Ha, where Alan performs acts of worship. When he finds that he is unable to have sexual intercourse with Jill, the girl who works at the stable, Alan uses the hoofpick to blind Equus, the equivalent of Dionysus. Then in reenacting this scene for Dysart, Alan mimes blinding himself in an attempted self-sacrifice because Equus has witnessed the sacrilege that has been committed in his "Holy of Holies." Much as Dysart destroys the Dionysian element in children, Alan destroys his own Dionysian perception.

Ironically, while Dysart destroys Dionysian faces and attempts to replace them with the Apollonian facade, he maintains his own Dionysian face beneath the Apollonian facade that he wears. Dysart's fear is that the standards with which he has judged his patients will be used on him and that he will not measure up to the standards of normality. This trepidation is never answered because he always wakes up before the conclusion is reached and the mask is allowed to remain intact. The audience is again made aware of the face that lies behind Dysart's facade in scene seventeen. As the scene progresses, Alan mocks the absence of passion from Dysart's marriage and his life. Dysart then sends him to his room knowing that the boy has managed to peek behind the facade and pick up on his most vulnerable area.

Dysart's lack of passion is also shown in scene eighteen when he admits that his marriage has no passion in it. In his fantasies he lives in the times of the Greek gods. His wife, however, lives in present-day mediocrity. He wishes he could take a young boy to Greece and show him the wonders that exist there (Barnes 1092). Dysart knows, however, that if he ever had a son, he would turn out just like his mother--an individual without any sort of passion (Stacy 331).

This notion of having a son who does not have any sort

of feeling or passion leads Dysart to think about what he is doing, or attempting to do, to Alan. Dysart questions the concept of normality, but Hesther Salomon, Alan's magistrate, cannot seem to give him any sort of answer. The scene ends as Dysart once again questions either himself or the audience about normality. In this scene, Dysart is seen taking his facade off and examining it for what it is: a false pretense put forth to be one among many, without feeling or passion (Stacy 335).

Dysart's address at the opening of act two leads him to question his own existence just as he is trying to explain that of Equus. Dysart wonders how he can account for Alan's horse-god when he can not even account for himself. In the speech, the audience is made aware of the deep admiration that Dysart feels for the loyalty, innocence, and, above all, passion that Alan feels for his god. Unknowingly, this boy has achieved what Dysart has never been able to do.

In scene twenty-two, the audience sees the Dionysian face beneath the Apollonian facade which Alan's mother, Dora Strang, wears. Up to this point in the play, she has appeared to be in control. In this scene, however, she reveals herself to be an insecure individual who is still "loving and well-intentioned" (Stacy 329). Her insecurity also becomes clear in scene twenty-three:

And me? What about me? . . . What do you think I am?

. . . I'm a parent, of course--so it doesn't count. That's a dirty word in here, isn't it, "parent"? . . . It's our fault. Whatever happens, we did it. Alan's just a little victim. . . . What do you have to do in this world to get any sympathy--blind animals? (Equus 77)

In this speech, Dora reveals the confusion and anger that she has been hiding throughout the entire ordeal. She feels that she is as much a victim as Alan, but everyone blames her and Frank, Alan's father, for what has happened. At the end of the scene, though, the audience knows that although Dora has revealed her face, she will continue to wear the religious facade as soon as she leaves Dysart's office (Stacy 329).

The crumbling of Dysart's facade continues in scene twenty-five. He tells Hesther that he is thinking about giving the boy a placebo in the place of a non-existent truth drug. Ironically, he confesses that he envies the boy for the passion that he feels. He almost condemns himself for having to destroy this Dionysian passion in the name of normal Apollonian behavior. He then goes on about how there is no passion in his own life. He states that he has not even kissed his wife in six years. In the end, however, Hesther reminds him that Alan is still in pain and that it is his duty to relieve him of it.

The audience actually witnesses Dysart taking off his Apollonian facade for Alan as he sits there waiting for the truth drug to work. Dysart confesses that he does not like being a psychiatrist and that he would rather live in a small village by a lake where the old gods used to bathe. Alan then begins to speak more freely as he feels what he thinks are the effects of the drug. Dysart then asks Alan to recount and even act out the occurrences of the night he blinded the six horses.

During Alan's confession, the audience is made aware of the facade that Frank Strang wears. Alan speaks of having run into his father at the adult cinema and describes him as he rides off in the bus:

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

For the first time, Alan sees Frank as a human being with the same basic needs and sexual desires that he has, not just as a tyrant. He comes to realize that the same sexual need that he fulfills when he rides Equus in the field of Ha-Ha is what drives Frank to go to the adult cinema. Alan

sees behind the facade that Frank wears and realizes that there is no difference between him and his father. Later on in the scene he states, "He goes off by himself at night, and does his own secret thing which no one'll know about, just like me! There's no difference--he's just the same as me--just the same!" (Equus 97). In this passage, Alan begins to establish a relationship with his father because he at least has something in common with him: this urge to experience his own sexual desires. He realizes that Frank is not as unreachable as he thought he was and that they are both guilty of Dionysian behavior.

The destruction of Alan's passion, the Dionysian face, occurs in scene thirty-four. Alan hears Equus speaking to him, telling him that he has seen his sexual impotence in his encounter with Jill and that no matter what he does, he will always fail. Alan describes the horse's eyes as rolling and full of flames, symbolizing burning passion. He approaches Nugget with the hoofpick (a parallel to the sacrificial knife in Dysart's dream) behind his back, lovingly caresses him, and suddenly stabs the horse's eyes out to keep him from seeing anything more. He then goes to the other horses in the stable and blinds them. Finally, as the horses disappear offstage, Alan is left alone with Dysart. The boy screams in agony as he cries for Equus to find him and kill him.

Dysart tells Alan that he will take away the pain but that he will also take away the passion. He will make him normal, but he will feel nothing. At the end of the play, Dysart looks out into the audience and confesses that he still cannot account for himself. He has destroyed the boy's Dionysian face but wonders why it is such a socially unacceptable thing (Kerensky 53). Alan's Dionysian face is destroyed, and Dysart attempts to replace it with an Apollonian facade.

Although Martin Dysart is the Apollonian representation in this play, he is also a man in search of passion. He longs to be able to live outside of the everyday formalities that his occupation calls for. He wishes that he could take off his facade and simply feel passion for at least one moment in his life. He envies the children who are sent to him because he feels that they are the ones who have at least found some sort of passion (Walls 322). He holds himself accountable for turning them into nothing more than plastic replicas of spiritless people. Interestingly, he says that if it had not been Alan, then it would have been someone else who would have driven him to his present state.

In this play, Alan's Dionysian face is destroyed by Dysart's Apollonian facade. The human passion that Alan feels is destroyed, and the remains are covered up by the facade of normality that society demands from him. Alan's

mistake is in choosing instinct instead of reason (Billington 190). Instead of choosing the normality that society prescribes, he chooses the passion which Equus represents. Not only is Dysart used as the tool of destruction for Alan's Dionysian face but also as the epitome of the societal conscience which dictates this destruction.

In Amadeus Peter Shaffer once again juxtaposes the Apollonian facade with the Dionysian face. Salieri is the facade of respectability, and Mozart is the face of impudence. The struggle leads to the destruction of the Dionysian face. In this case, Salieri serves as narrator and point of reference for the audience between the facade that he puts forth and the motivation that exists beneath.

Salieri's facade is a manifestation of the pleasantries and social formalities that were used in eighteenth-century Vienna. Yet he still has the face beneath the facade, which he reveals to the audience: "He is at one moment a delightfully wicked and dying old man with a piping, quavering voice, and at the next a middle-aged, sophisticated, and urbane dissembler . . ." (Bost 523). In his interaction with the characters in the play, he wears the different facades that are necessary for particular situations. He is a man driven by his quest to be God's manifestation on earth (Mikels 50). Underneath the pretentious Apollonian facade,

Salieri is driven to be God's faithful servant. The omniscient presence of God, as imagined by Salieri, is felt throughout the play. It is present when Salieri makes his deal with the "God of Bargains." Salieri recounts how he knelt before God and begged to be a composer. This revelation establishes his burning desire to serve God and his inability to serve him to his own satisfaction (Scott 40). In Salieri's imagination, the omniscient presence of God is also evident in all of Mozart's music. And finally, according to Salieri, the will of God seems to mock him at the end of the play by denying him any sort of fame even as the murderer of Mozart. In Salieri's mind, then, God is the omniscient force which makes the final outcome inevitable (Mikels 51).

Mozart's Dionysian face is the true nature of man or a representation of it: unbridled, uncontrolled, and undirected. Mozart seems to embody the egocentricity and arrogance that supreme talent can sometimes bring. Socially he is a "shit-talking" (Amadeus 74) child with few social graces, but he possesses the God-given talent to create music. Although Mozart has the ability to create God's music, he lacks the social graces to deal with society. The inability to interact successfully with those around him makes Mozart vulnerable to Salieri's vengeance. Salieri would not have been so successful in his revenge if Mozart had been able to

fit in with society.

According to Salieri, this undeserved talent of Mozart sets up the conflict between Salieri and Mozart because Salieri wants the passion and the talent to create God's music but is too controlled to be able to compose in a manner in which he would like. Salieri's mortification lies in his ability to hear and recognize musical masterpieces but not to be able to produce them to his own satisfaction (Esslin 20). He can only bear witness to Mozart's work and envy it as work under divine guidance (Mikels 48). This perception leads Salieri to deceive Mozart and plot his ultimate destruction in an attempt to silence God's musical manifestation on earth.

Salieri shows his face to the audience and then proceeds to put on his facade as he interacts with the characters in his past. The audience is fully aware of the true feelings that Salieri has as he hears Mozart's music for the first time:

It hung there, unwavering, piercing me through, till breath could hold it no longer, and a clarinet withdrew it out of me, and sweetened it into a phrase of such delight it had me trembling. The light flickered in the room. My eyes clouded. (Amadeus 28)

This moment is what sets the rest of the play into motion. Salieri cannot imagine how such a juvenile individual is

able to create such beautiful masterpieces (Jones 149). When he says that his "eyes clouded," he refers to both the physical and the abstract. Not only do his eyes fill with tears, but his ability to think logically is clouded as well. From this point on Salieri lives only to avenge himself against God by stopping the manifestation of His voice on earth.

Mozart's own lack of any sort of facade, or social grace, is seen when Salieri is first forced to witness the childish behavior of this man who has been blessed by God with the ability to capture His own great beauty. Salieri lurks in the shadows as Mozart and Constanze play a childish, yet seductive game of cat and mouse. After this incident, as Mozart is heard playing his beautiful music offstage, Salieri runs out into the streets asking God how such a creature could ever be blessed with His divine influence, "I was suddenly frightened. It seemed to me that I heard a voice of God--and that it issued from a creature whose own voice I had also heard--and it was the voice of an obscene child!" (Amadeus 24-29).

This "obscene child" manages to create even more hysteria behind the facade of Salieri. With the Emperor Joseph present, Salieri plays a march of welcome which Mozart has the gall to improve. Here again is an example of the "boorish mannerisms and ineptly conducted relationships

with his colleagues" (Gianakaris "Shaffer's Revisions of Amadeus" 88) which eventually facilitate Mozart's destruction. At this point, the seeds of Salieri's vengeful murder are planted: "Was it then--so early--that I began to have thoughts of murder? . . . Of course not: not in life. In art it was a different matter. . . . In reality, of course the man was in no danger from me at all. Not yet" (Amadeus 42). Mozart's continued arrogance, however, adds to Salieri's bitterness and resentment. Mozart continues to create masterpieces which only Salieri can recognize, yet this "obscene child" continues in his offensive behavior. Salieri's plans become evident when he states, "Barely one month later, that thought of revenge became more than thought!" (Amadeus 53).

At this point Salieri begins to plot against Mozart for his continued offenses against him. First, Salieri tries to seduce Constanze, Mozart's wife. He tells her that he will recommend her husband for the position of tutor to the Princess Elizabeth but deserves "a little recompense in return" (Amadeus 67). Just as he is about to seduce her, he pulls himself back because he is still loyal to his own Apollonian ideals. He then asks her to leave the sheet music that she has brought with her so that he might study it overnight. Salieri's objective in doing so is to determine whether the serenade he hears earlier is merely an accident

of chance or if Mozart is indeed divinely gifted. In examining the sheets of music, Salieri experiences Mozart's genius. Salieri realizes that Mozart does indeed have the ability to capture the voice of God in his music because Mozart composes entire works in his head, then merely transposes onto sheets of paper. The climax of the first act is reached as Salieri finally realizes that he must stop Mozart at any cost. Beneath his Apollonian facade, Salieri declares war on God by plotting the destruction of "His preferred Creature" (Amadeus 75).

At the opening of act two, Salieri sets into motion the elements which will dominate the rest of the play. Once Salieri's objective is established, the audience becomes aware of the motivations that exist beneath the facade of kindness that Salieri shows Mozart. From this point on, Salieri's Apollonian facade begins to destroy Mozart's Dionysian face. Salieri begins by destroying Mozart's opportunity and then proceeds to destroy his health and finally his sanity.

The tragic irony lies in the fact that Mozart is too naive to suspect that Salieri is the instrument of his destruction. He considers him to be a dear friend through every stage of his downfall. The irony also lies in the fact that while Salieri builds up his own facade of success, Mozart literally makes no attempt to make any sort of

restitution to Salieri. Mozart continues to be as rude and arrogant as ever: he continues to be "a menace to the very foundations of the then current intellectual thought" (Gianakaris "A Playwright" 40) by insulting Leopold Mozart (his own father), Salieri, and the standards of the music of the time. The destruction of Mozart's Dionysian face by Salieri's Apollonian mask occurs when Salieri appears to Mozart as the Messenger of Death. Salieri gets this idea when he hears Mozart speak of the dream where a dark figure appears to him and asks him to write a requiem mass. Salieri's appearance as this creature finally drives Mozart insane because of the associations he makes between this figure and his own father.

The climax of the play finally occurs when Salieri sheds his disguise and confronts Mozart. Insisting that God does not love Mozart, Salieri begs Mozart to die. The psychological impact of this statement, combined with his ill health, finally destroys Mozart. Salieri achieves short-term success, but the same society which dictates the necessity of the facade changes in the thirty years that pass, and Mozart achieves the ultimate victory. His works go on to be remembered whereas those of Salieri become less and less popular until they are almost lost to oblivion. In Salieri's mind, God finally answers his challenge by making Mozart the ultimate victor (Mikel 48).

In this play Salieri's Apollonian facade destroys Mozart's Dionysian face. Salieri represents all of the established values of the time and feels that he has the right to capture the voice of God in his music. Mozart, on the other hand, displays an egocentric and child-like demeanor, yet he is the one who is blessed with the talent to capture the voice of God. Salieri is a controlled, righteous, and dedicated individual and thus feels that he has the right to create beautiful music. When a seemingly undeserving, self-centered man creates what Salieri has always aspired to create, the conflict begins. In the end, Salieri's Apollonian facade destroys Mozart's Dionysian face, but the victory is short-term and inconclusive as to which of the two men is deserving of God's preference according to Salieri's demented state of mind.

In The Royal Hunt of the Sun, Equus, and Amadeus the struggle of the Apollonian facade and the Dionysian face is again evident. Each play is essentially about "a confrontation between two people: Inca sun . . . Atahualpa [Dionysian] . . . [and self-proclaimed] god Francisco Pizarro [Apollonian]; the passionless psychiatrist Martin Dysart [Apollonian] and his adolescent patient Alan [Dionysian]; Viennese court composer Salieri [Apollonian] and Mozart [Dionysian]" (Chambers 12). Peter Shaffer uses the Apollonian facade of the ideal against the Dionysian

face to create the conflict between his characters. The Apollonian facade of the Spanish crown for which Pizarro and Young Martin fight destroys the Dionysian Atahualpa. The Apollonian facade for which Martin Dysart works destroys the Dionysian passion of Alan Strang. The Apollonian facade for which Salieri composes destroys the Dionysian Mozart. In these three plays, then, the "pillaging Pizarro, . . . the lost Dysart, . . . and the mediocre Salieri" (Chambers 13), serving as the Apollonian facades, destroy Atahualpa, Alan Strang's passion, and Mozart, the Dionysian faces, whose lives are "expressions of some divinity that is not reducible to any time or place nor to any moral or religious system" (Chambers 13). The Apollonian facades confront the Dionysian manifestations of three different gods. In The Royal Hunt of the Sun Pizarro is confronted with the sun-god Atahualpa. In Eguus Dysart is confronted with the horse-god Eguus. In Amadeus Salieri is confronted with his own twisted perception of God in the "God of Bargains." Even though the Dionysian characters are destroyed, either physically or psychologically, the Apollonian characters are left with a bitter victory that is overshadowed by their own mediocrity or disillusionment.

Conclusion

In the ten plays that have been studied in this thesis the struggle between the Apollonian facade and the Dionysian face is clear. Five Finger Exercise, Shrivings, and Lettice and Lovage are united by the fact that in each play the Dionysian face destroys the Apollonian facade. In Five Finger Exercise Clive is the Dionysian character who destroys Walter, the Apollonian character, and the facade worn by the rest of the Harrington family. In Shrivings Mark is the Dionysian character who destroys Gideon, the Apollonian. In Lettice and Lovage Lettice is the Dionysian who shatters Lotte's Apollonian facade.

Peter Shaffer's shorter plays are united by the fact that the Apollonian facades impose upon the Dionysian faces. Frank's Apollonian facade imposes upon Tom's Dionysian face in The White Liars. Carol's Apollonian facade imposes upon Brindsley's Dionysian face in Black Comedy. Bob's Apollonian facade imposes upon Doreen's Dionysian face in The Private Ear. Charles' Apollonian facade imposes upon Belinda's Dionysian face in The Public Eye at the beginning of the play. In the end, however, Charles is persuaded to be Dionysian in nature.

The Royal Hunt of the Sun, Equus, and Amadeus are united by the fact that in each play the Apollonian facade destroys the Dionysian face. In The Royal Hunt of the Sun Pizarro and Young Martin represent the hypocritical Apollonian facade of the Spanish crown which destroys Atahualpa's simplistic Dionysian face. In Equus Martin Dysart represents the Apollonian societal facade which destroys Alan Strang's Dionysian passion. In Amadeus Salieri represents the reserved Apollonian facade which destroys Mozart's impudent Dionysian face. The hypocrisy of society as depicted in each of the three plays is represented by the fact that "Pizarro sees Atahualpa as a symbol of life and himself as the shadow of a man. Dr. Dysart envies the passion that Alan felt to bring him to his crime. Salieri reaches the heights of ecstasy in the presence of Mozart's music" (Klein 69).

In the struggle between the Apollonian facade and the Dionysian face there is little or no room for compromise. One must reign over the other. As seen in Chapter One the Dionysian face destroys the Apollonian facade if the Dionysian character is the stronger of the two. As seen in Chapter Two the Apollonian facade imposes upon the Dionysian face if the Dionysian character is not strong enough to oppose this imposition. As seen in Chapter Three the Apollonian facade will destroy the Dionysian face if it

deems it a threat to the maintainance of the facade.

However, Peter Shaffer chooses to end each of these plays before the actions that he sets into motion are firmly concluded. Five Finger Exercise ends just as the Apollonian facades of Walter and the Harrington family are destroyed. This destruction is never revealed to be permanent. Shrivings ends as Gideon's Apollonian facade is destroyed. The permanence of this destruction is never stated. Lettice and Lovage ends as Lettice and Lotte go off to destroy modern architecture, an action whose success is never revealed. The White Liars concludes as Frank and Sophie realize the effects of their actions, but this realization is never revealed to make a permanent change in their behavior. Black Comedy ends as Brindsley chooses to be Dionysian rather than Apollonian, moments before the lights are restored. The enduring effects of his actions throughout the play are never addressed. The Private Ear ends as Bob restores his Apollonian facade, an action which is never revealed to be successful. The Public Eye ends as Charles agrees to be Dionysian. The question of whether or not he is successful is never answered. The Royal Hunt of the Sun ends as Old Martin wonders whether the Inca way of life is better than the Spanish way of life. This question is never answered. Equus ends as Dysart completes his first attempt to place an Apollonian facade over Alan's Dionysian face.

The question of whether or not he succeeds in turning Alan into a normal individual is never answered. Amadeus ends as Salieri cries out for absolution. Whether or not he meets his objective is never addressed. Peter Shaffer has chosen to conclude each of these plays at a point from which the audience must interpret for itself what the conclusion should be. In essence, the ultimate victory of the Apollonian facade over the Dionysian face or vice versa is left for the audience to decide.

In all of these plays, then, Peter Shaffer thrusts the elements of the Apollonian against the elements of the Dionysian to create the necessary conflict in each play:

Whether he is opposing Christian and Aztec culture in Royal Hunt of the Sun or a philosopher and an anarchist poet in The Battle of Shrivings, Shaffer is repeatedly mounting a tournament between Apollo and Dionysus under various coats of arms. (Wardle 189)

Works Cited

- Armistead, Claire. "Shaffer's Pen." Plays and Players 410 (1987): 6-8.
- Barnes, Clive. Rev. of Equus by Peter Shaffer. Stages of Drama: Classical To Contemporary Masterpieces of the Theater. ed. Carl H. Klaus, Miriam Gilbert, and Bradford S. Field, Jr. Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1981: 1092.
- Beaufort, John. Rev. of Equus by Peter Shaffer. Stages of Drama: Classical To Contemporary Masterpieces of the Theater. ed. Carl H. Klaus, Miriam Gilbert, and Bradford S. Field, Jr. Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1981: 1091.
- Billington, Michael. Rev. of Equus by Peter Shaffer. The Guardian 27 July 1973: Rpt. in Plays In Review 1956-1980: British Drama and the Critics. ed. Gareth and Barbara Lloyd Evans. New York: Methuen, 1985. 190-91.
- Bost, James S. Rev. of Amadeus by Peter Shaffer. Theatre Journal 32 (1980): 521-23.
- Brien, Alan. Rev. of Five Finger Exercise by Peter Shaffer. The Spectator 25 July 1958: Rpt. in Plays In Review 1956-1980: British Drama and the Critics. ed. Gareth

and Barbara Lloyd Evans. New York: Methuen, 1985. 69-70.

Chambers, Collin. "Psychic Energy Peter Shaffer in an Interview with Collin Chambers." Plays and Players 27 (1980): 11-13.

Dean, Joan F. "Peter Shaffer's Recurrent Character Type." Modern Drama 21 (1978): 297-305.

Esslin, Martin. Rev. of Amadeus by Peter Shaffer. Plays and Players 27 (1979): 20.

Gianakaris, C.J. "A Playwright Looks at Mozart: Peter Shaffer's Amadeus." Comparative Drama 15 (1981): 37-53.

---. "Lettice and Lovage: Fountainhead of Delight." Theatre Week 2 April 1990: 22-25.

---. "Placing Shaffer's Lettice and Lovage in Perspective." Comparative Drama 22 (1988): 145-61.

---. "Shaffer's Revisions in Amadeus." Theatre Journal March 1983: 88-101.

---. "Theatre of the Mind in Miller, Osborne, and Shaffer." Renascence 30 (1977): 30-42.

Greene, Alexis. "Margaret Takes Manhattan." Theatre Week 2 April 1990: 26-28.

Hinden, Michael. "Trying to Like Shaffer." Comparative Drama 19 (1985): 14-29.

---. "When Playwrights Talk To God: Peter Shaffer and the Legacy of O'Neill." Comparative Drama 16 (1982): 49-

63.

- Hobson, Harold. Rev. of Eguus by Peter Shaffer. The Sunday Times 29 July 1973: Rpt. in Plays In Review 1956-1980: British Drama and the Critics. ed. Gareth and Barbara Lloyd Evans. New York: Methuen, 1985. 190.
- Hope-Wallace, Philip. Rev. of Five Finger Exercise by Peter Shaffer. The Guardian 17 July 1958: Rpt. in Plays In Review 1956-1980: British Drama and the Critics. ed. Gareth and Barbara Lloyd Evans. New York: Methuen, 1985. 70.
- Jones, Daniel R. "Peter Shaffer's Continued Quest for God in Amadeus." Comparative Drama 21 (1987): 145-55.
- Kerensky, Oleg. The New British Drama. New York: Taplinger Publishing Company, 1977.
- Mikels, Frank X. and James Rurak. "Finishing Salieri." Soundings 67.1 (1984): 42-54.
- Morley, Sheridan. Rev. of Lettice and Lovage by Peter Shaffer. Plays and Players 410 (1987): 16-17.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. The Birth of Tragedy. Rpt. in Dramatic Theory and Criticism. ed. Bernard F. Dukore. Dallas: Holt, Rhinehart and Winston, 1974. 820-27.
- Nightingale, Benedict. Rev. of The Royal Hunt of the Sun by Peter Shaffer. The Guardian 8 July 1964: Rpt. in Plays In Review 1956-1980: British Drama and the Critics. ed. Gareth and Barbara Lloyd Evans. New York:

- Methuen, 1985. 126-27.
- Pennel, Charles A. "The Plays of Peter Shaffer: Experiment In Convention." Kansas Quarterly 3.2 (1971): 100-09.
- Plunka, Gene A. "The Existential Ritual: Peter Shaffer's Equus." Kansas Quarterly 12.4 (1980): 87-97.
- Riedel, Michael. "The Royal Hunt of the Playwright." Theatre Week 2 April 1990: 30-34.
- Scott, Matthew. "Amadeus: A Glimpse of the Absolute Theatre." Plays and Players 27 (1980): 40-41.
- Shaffer, Peter. Amadeus. 1980. New York: Signet, 1984.
- . Equus. 1973. New York: Penguin, 1987.
- . Equus and Shrivings: Two Plays by Peter Shaffer. New York: Atheneum, 1976.
- . Five Finger Exercise. New York: Samuel French, 1958.
- . Lettice and Lovage. London: Andre Deutsch Ltd., 1988.
- . The Private Ear The Public Eye: Two Plays By Peter Shaffer. New York: Stein and Day, 1962.
- . The Royal Hunt of the Sun. New York: Ballantine Books, 1966.
- . The White Liars and Black Comedy: Two One-Act Plays by Peter Shaffer. New York: Samuel French, 1967.
- Stacy, John R. "The Sun and the Horse: Peter Shaffer's Search for Worship." Educational Theatre Journal 28 (1976): 325-37.
- Walls, Doyle W. "Equus: Shaffer, Nietzsche, and the Neuroses

of Health." Modern Drama 27 (1984): 314-23.

Wardle, Irving. Rev. of Equus by Peter Shaffer. The Times 27 July 1973: Rpt. in Plays In Review 1956-1980: British Drama and the Critics. ed. Gareth and Barbara Lloyd Evans. New York: Methuen, 1985. 189.

Worsley, T.C. Rev. of Five Finger Exercise by Peter Shaffer. New Statesman 26 July 1958: Rpt. in Plays In Review 1956-1980: British Drama and the Critics. ed. Gareth and Barbara Lloyd Evans. New York: Methuen, 1985. 68-69.