

Beyond the Unconscious: “Gaze” in Peter Shaffer’s *Equus*

Shaowen Emily Su

ABSTRACT

This paper looks into Peter Shaffer’s famous play, *Equus*, from a psychological point of view. The mysteriously unconscious human minds of the characters in the play and those of the audience are anatomized by an application of Lacanian “Gaze” and, where necessary, the theories of Freudian psychoanalysis. The main task of this study is to explore Lacan’s algorithmic mechanism of signifier-signified/conscious-unconscious systems, examine the recursive shifting of the identities between subject and object of the “Gaze” as well as unveil the bar in between the conscious and the unconscious or the mask of the unconscious, so as to probe into the unconscious of the protagonists, Alan and Dysart, and the audience, and thereby to retrieve the whole textual unconscious. In the retrieving process, the author ultimately renders the play in a fashion of productive creativity, adding subtexts to the play alongside facilitating demystifying the seemingly unexplainable mystery and unraveling the repressed and unconscious state of minds of the characters.

KEY WORDS

the unconscious, repression, Freud’s psychotherapy, Lacanian “Gaze,” psychoanalysis, theatricalism



I. Introduction

Equus is one of Shaffer's finest plays besides *Amadeus*, first presented in July 26, 1973. It is a psychological study of a horrifying crime committed by a quiet and well-behaved stable boy. It is the crime of blinding six horses with a long steel spike. The whole play is well devised to investigate gradually the process of this insidious crime of the boy, Alan Strang with an ingenious stage setting that serves to create an atmosphere of mythical mystery and brings out the complex psychological motivations of the characters. The complexity is intensified by "the endless ambiguity of the human situation, of the conflict between two different kinds of right" in life (Riley 381). The dramatic tension is built up on the clash between two philosophical principles in life--the instinctive and the rational--the violence of instinct and the desire for order and restraint (Connell). Shaffer's plays, which often involve such themes as love, death, and salvation, explore the moral values and psychological motivations of his characters.

The ingenious and innovative use of masks, music and dance in *Equus*, as well as in *The Royal Hunt of the Sun*, conjures up mythical and ritual atmosphere that contributes to Peter Shaffer's thematic theatricalism and the intensification of the psychological complexity and conflict in the protagonists, Alan Strang and the doctor. With the help of the imaginative and ingenious theatre designer, John Dexter, *Equus* is conceived of as an artistic exploration into the profound mystery of the human mind. The horses are played by actors wearing stylized masks and elevated hooves which are made of silver wires. The

results are rewarding. The metal lines express their characteristic toughness, power, and awe. The metallic sounds of trampling against the floor, attributed to the metallic nature of the horses, not only threaten the protagonist, Alan, but also strikes a resonance in the psychiatrist's and the audience's minds. They are so striking that the audience is likely to be shaken and moved. Writing in *Time* (Nov. 1974) critic Richard Schickel observes that many of the audience at *Equus* have even claimed that they have seen the horses' eyes roll (117). Shaffer writes that "the audience invested so much emotion in the play that it looked as if they had" (Schickel 117). It is also Dexter's idea to have all the actors remain visible onstage when they were not engaged in the action, by seating them at the edge of the lighted area. In addition, he designed "the conventional proscenium stage into something of an arena" (Weintraub 465) intended to establish an intimate connection between the characters and the audience. It was Dexter's suggestion, too, that the seduction scene should be played in the nude, a startling and sensational innovation at that time (Weintraub 465). Dexter's suggested design has made the play realistic, sensational and compelling.

The play is about psychotherapy conducted by Dysart, the psychiatrist on Alan, the patient. The whole treatment, including the abreaction, hypnotism, and transference, on the patient falls within the framework of Freud's psychotherapy. Through Freudian psychoanalytic techniques, we can also examine the phenomena of Oedipus complex¹, castration fear², fixation³ of infantile sexuality, the dynamics of guilt, the symbolic and sexual interpretation of dreams, resistance and the process of repression and the state of the unconscious in *Equus*. Psychoanalysis can help to open up the mysterious human mind and enhance one's comprehension of his own mind necessary for an understanding of the play. As a mysterious play with uncertainty and disintegration, *Equus* can be doubtlessly integrated by the help of psychological analysis. After Freud, the father of psychoanalytic criticism, the Post-Freudian Jacques Lacan has made certain significant changes in Freud's theory and has postulated that the unconscious is structured like a language. Lacan's idea of the "Gaze"

which flows from this concept is also made use of in this study.

The “Gaze” is more than a visual phenomenon. It has a function of language in expressing the seers’ desire:

Seeing’s true aim cannot be visual in any immediate sense: seeing is but a function in a largely unconscious discourse that can be glimpsed in what Lacan calls (extending Freud’s discussion) the “Gaze”—the functioning of the whole system of shifts. (Davis 249)

There are three stages of shifts in the process of the “Gaze”. At the beginning of the process the subject is so preoccupied with the act of seeing the object that he finds himself later on getting involved unconsciously in the object. To the subject, the viewer, the object of the “Gaze” becomes an expression of his unconscious desire, which as Lacan suggests is “the phallus”⁴, the signifier of desire (Lacan, *Language* 187). The object is the signifier of the subject’s unconscious desire, or his mirror image. At the culmination of meditating on and seeing the object, the subject dispossesses himself, and becomes the object. According to Lacan, the “Gaze” not only terminates the movement of the subject who is fascinated by the object and the lapse of time, but also freezes them (Lacan, *Four* 118). There is no line of demarcation between the object and the subject. However, in reality it is impossible not to have a split in between. He may now and then be interrupted by the disturbance of the other external subjects or objects. His becoming the object could be cut short or intervened and then he may come around partially to himself, in which case the subject again sees itself as the object. These shifts between being the subject and being the object would happen several times. The first stage of the “Gaze” and the second keep shifting recursively, in so far as the subject is dangling between the conscious and the unconscious, and between awareness and unawareness in the process of recognizing himself as a subject. The shifting continues till it comes to the third stage of the “Gaze” when the whole process comes to a stop. At this final stage, though he draws himself from being the object back to being the subject, he is no longer the one he was at the first stage of the “Gaze”

because he has undergone the whole experience of seeing.

As *Equus* is a probe into human psychology, the play is approached here from a psychological point of view. In this study, the Lacanian concept of the "Gaze" is applied in order to anatomy and unfold the repressed and unconscious state of minds underlying in the relationships between Alan and Equus, between Dysart and Alan as well as between the characters, especially Dysart, and the audience.

The "Gaze," repression and unconscious are closely related to one another. The "Gaze" is attributed largely to the unconscious. The unconscious is like a reservoir for all the repressed desires while repression is the prelude to the unconscious. The main task of this study is to explore Lacan's algorithmic mechanism of signifier and signified, or conscious and unconscious, systems, examine the recursive shifting of the identities between subject and object of the "Gaze" as well as unveil the bar in between the conscious and the unconscious or the mask of the unconscious, so as to probe into the unconscious of the protagonists, Alan and Dysart, and the audience, and thereby to retrieve the whole textual unconscious. In the retrieving process, the author ultimately renders the play in a fashion of productive creativity, adding subtexts to the play alongside facilitating demystifying the seemingly unexplainable mystery and unraveling the repressed and unconscious state of minds of the characters.

II. Relationship between Alan and Equus

Alan's feelings towards Equus are ambiguous and complex. At first, he identifies himself with Equus. After a long affectionate relationship with Equus, then, Alan hates Equus so much that he blinds the horse's eyes. The affection and hatred are in their extremes. In addition, Alan projects Equus into many figures. Originally he sees Equus as the image of his mother. Then in his developmental process of identity formation Alan views Equus as his God and even his father. Alan sometimes acts like God suffering for mankind. The confused identities of Alan and the horse are constantly shifting and there seems to be no easy logic or reasons to justify for the identities shifting.

However, it is evident that the shifts of the confused identities are made possible and credible through the “Gaze”.

According to Lacan’s theory of the “Gaze,” we can find different stages of the “Gaze” in Alan, which are associated with the changing of the identities. At the time when Alan has changed himself into Equus, he has shifted from subject to object. Originally he as a subject likes to hear everything about the horse and sees the horse in the picture that Mr. Strang gave him to replace the former one in his bedroom—“a horse looking over a gate” (Shaffer 236). In the first stage of the “Gaze,” Alan is controlling and mastering Equus, as he is looking instead of being seen. According to Lacan, “At first looking is a gesture toward control, visual ‘possession’ or master’ of an object. It is discrete and without any reciprocal response, a frozen act” (Davis 248). As the process of the “Gaze” goes on, Alan substitutes the picture for another kind of picture—a picture of “Our Lord on his way to Calvary,” hung at the foot of his bed where he could see it the last thing at night (Shaffer 236). Afterwards Alan is given a picture of a horse taken from an angle of its head, looking as if it is staring straight at anyone who looks at it, to replace the picture of the Lord which was torn off Alan’s wall by his father. The horse stares straight ahead as if it is alive and sensitive to the thoughts of the beholder (Berman 414). The stares, like charms, are very compelling and fascinating to Alan. By the invisible charms, at this stage Alan has gradually and unconsciously identified himself with Equus. At the culmination of meditating on and seeing the horse, Alan dispossesses himself, and becomes the object. According to Lacan, “there is a reversal, a seemingly impossible shift from a subject’s viewpoint to an object’s. This shift entails a virtual ‘giving up of the object’ as a thing to be seen and mastered and a repositioning of ‘seeing’ from a different position” (Davis 248). That is, Alan changes his subject position as a looker to be seen by Equus. The relation can be shown by the equation:

$$\text{Alan} = \text{Equus}$$

To Alan, the viewer, the object of the “Gaze” becomes an

expression of his unconscious desire, which, as Lacan's psychological theory in terms of language postulates, is "the phallus," (see note 4) the signifier of desire (*Language* 187). In this sense, the horse is the signifier of the Alan's unconscious desire, or his mirror image. In the process of contemplating himself before *Equus*, the mirror as a 'signifier'—something capable of bestowing meaning—and the image he sees in the mirror is as the 'signified'. The image Alan sees is somehow the 'meaning' of himself. Here the signifier and the signified are harmoniously united. Alternatively we could read the mirror situation as a kind of metaphor: one item (Alan) discovers a likeness of itself in another (the reflection). For Lacan, this is an appropriate image of the imagery as a whole; in this mode of being, objects ceaselessly reflect themselves in each other in a sealed circuit, and no real differences or divisions are apparent. It is a world of "plenitude" (Eagleton 166). There is no lack of exclusion of any kind. No gap has yet opened up between the signifier and the signified, the subject and object. Alan has now come to the second stage of the "Gaze." In Act One Alan himself reveals the grafted identity of the unconscious in the state of hypnosis induced by doctor Dysart's tapping the pencil.

ALAN: 'Bear you away. Two shall be one.

DYSART: Horse and rider shall be one beast?

ALAN: One person! (Shaffer 259)

Alan and the horse, Nugget, are like "a necking couple" (Shaffer 209), sharing an intimate relationship. An overtone of sexual fusion of Alan with the horse is obviously suggested in the play. There is sweat on Alan's legs from the horse's neck when Alan rides on Nugget. The sweat permeates into the pores of Alan and the horse. It symbolically interlocks them firmly together. To Alan's psyche it means nothing other than the real fusion. Alan strives to be with horses in actuality or in fantasy. The riding is the actualization of Alan's striving towards oneness with horses, the twin of his fantasy.

The riding also symbolizes Alan's homosexual activity. That is, Alan has libidinal attachment with his mirror image or his double. Alan

likes to touch horses, to groom, to muck out and to smell the scent of them. Every action, including combing and touching, shows suppressed excitement. Alan prefers “to ride by himself at night, when he could go off with others during the day” (Shaffer 239). Even Alan himself admits that his relationship with the horse “was sexy” (Shaffer 239). In the last scene of Act one, Alan cries out his sexual relationship and oneness with Nugget.

ALAN: (Shouting.) WEE! . . . WAA! . . . WONDERFUL! I'm stiff!
 Stiff in the wind! My mane, stiff in the wind! My flanks! My
 hooves! Mane on my legs, on my flanks, like whips!
 Raw!
 I'm raw! Raw!
 Feel me on you! On you! On you! On you!
 I want to be in you!
 I want to BE you forever and ever!—
 Equus, I love you! (Shaffer 266)

The grafted identity of Alan and the horse can also be explained by the effect of narcissism. Alan, as a child who is still physically uncoordinated, finds himself reflected back to himself in the mirror, a gratifying unified image of himself. This self, as the mirror situation suggest, is essentially narcissistic: Alan arrives at a sense of an “I” by finding that “I” is reflected back himself by some object of person in the world (Eagleton 164–65). Owing to Alan’s narcissism of mirror effect, he loves his own refection, Equus, an extension of himself. Equus is the mirror reflection of his own self.

Even from the name of Equus we can observe the significance of the doubling relationship between Alan and the horses and the effect of the mirror stage on Alan. As Mrs. Strang reports Alan has been attracted to Equus, the word he uses as a generic name for horses, “because he’d never come across one with two u’s together before” (Shaffer 224). It is shown that Alan and Equus are doubles, twins, or mirror stage of each other. According to Glenn, there is an intense affectionate tie between the twins; they love each other narcissistically

as they consider themselves part of a complete person (Glenn, "Twins" 375). As other twins would do, Alan considers himself part of a complete person with *Equus* and loves horses narcissistically. It is possible to consider the two eyes of the horses signify the two "I's" though this may be stretching the psychology of twinship a bit far (Weintraub 453). The fact that the eyes of horses keep in pairs suggests two I's in juxtaposition (Glenn, "Anthony" 277).

At the second stage of the seeing where the mechanism of the "Gaze" reaches its culmination, Alan's superego is also totally awakened. He behaves virtuously as he is Jesus suffering for all human beings. Alan's father, Frank tells Dysart what he has seen about Alan, acting like *Equus* in chain and suffering as if he is in pain like Jesus on his way to Calvary.

FRANK: I looked through the door, and he was standing in the moonlight in his pajamas, right in front of that big photograph.

DYSART: The horse with the huge eyes?

FRANK: Right.

ALAN: Flankus begat Spankus. And Spankus begat Spunkus the Great, who lived three score years!

FRANK: It was all like that. I can't remember the exact names, of course. Then suddenly he (Alan) knelt down.

DYSART: In front of the photograph?

FRANK: Yes. Right there at the foot of his bed.

ALAN [Kneeling]: And Legwus begat Neckwus. And Neckwus begat Fleckwus, the kind of Spit. And Fleckwus spoke out of his chinkle-chankle!

[He bows himself to the ground.]

DYSART: What?

FRANK: I'm sure that was the word. I've never forgotten it. Chinkle-chankle.

[Alan raises his head and extends his hands up in glory.]

ALAN: And he said 'Behold – I give you *Equus*, my only begotten son!

DYSART: *Equus*?

FRANK: Yes. No doubt of that. He repeated that word several times.

‘Equus my only begotten son.’

ALAN [reverently]: Ek . . . wus! (Shaffer 242–43)

Alan’s identification of Equus with God is attributed to his mother’s influence. Mrs. Strang tried to imbue him with Christian fervor by reading to him the Bible and stories about a horse, Prince, that only one child could ride. She also repeatedly talked of her grandfather’s attachment to horses and encouraged him to continue in the aristocratic equestrian tradition. Alan identified himself with her and her values. He links religion and horses together in his unconscious because of the inculcation of religion in him and his fervent love for horses.

The unconscious transformation of his fidelity of religion into love for horses and the intention of repression of the unconscious act are traced to a traumatic incident. That occurred when Alan was twelve years old. Alan’s father, opposed to his wife’s religious indoctrination, tore away from the wall in front of Alan’s bed a portrait of the chained Jesus being beaten as he carried the cross to Calvary, a picture that the boy had bought with his own pocket-money. For a few days thereafter Alan cried constantly. His father soothed him by replacing the picture of Christ with a photograph of a staring horse, due to which Alan recovered his composure. From that time on Alan, though accepting his mother’s religious teaching, found it unaccepted and prohibited by his father. He, finding a compromising point, invented his own personal religious system which included in a disguised form both his mother’s religious passion and the family tradition (Glenn, “Alan” 479–80). The system, nevertheless, is of myth and mystery and not completely in agreement to his mother’s Christianity. Equus became the god with whom he is fused. This substituted for the Christian God, Jesus with whom Alan had identified (Glenn, “Alan” 480). Fearing parental disapproval, Alan has found it necessary to conceal this invented perverse religious mode from them.

By this act Alan’s libidinous desire for horses has transformed into a perverse religious fidelity or a “higher” spiritual or cultural

activity (Nuttin 70). Since *Equus* is the very image of that fidelity, it, however, cannot practically be the object of Alan's sexual desire. His unsatisfied desire thus repressed remains active and surges in his unconscious.

According to Lacan's narrative theory about repression, "there is an economy of conscious and unconscious systems in various stages of disunity—a text/system governed by metaphor. The words in the text exist only in a 'conscious' system where signifiers in one constellation (or chain) of association continually stand in for signifiers in another. While we cannot examine these substitutions directly, we can see what the words mean, if we set in motion a few linguistic changes and observe the results" (Davis 250–51). In Lacan's notation,

"the unconscious chain can be designated as (S/S)—the merely metonymic relationship of a signifier to another signifier (the special sense of unconscious signifiers—in Lacan's term—as non-signifying 'thing representations'). To the formula for repression, Lacan includes this specific notation for the unconscious chain:

$$\frac{S'}{S} \cdot \frac{S}{s} = \frac{\overline{S'}}{S}$$

The formula shows a notation for three systems: in the quotient, S' stands for the manifest (conscious) system; s stands for the preconscious system (capable of becoming conscious), and (S/S) stands for the unconscious. The bar in each part of the formula is a sign of the prior existence of repression as a function and of a chain of unconscious signifiers" (Davis 252).

According to Lacan's metaphorical signifier-signified system, *Equus*, Nugget is signified by Alan, the signifier, and God is signified by *Equus*. From this point of view, a new relationship can be sorted out

from these two pairs of relations:

$$\frac{\text{Alan}}{\text{horse}} \cdot \frac{\text{horse}}{\text{God}} = \frac{\text{Alan}}{\text{God}}$$

A new equation results from the previous two:

$$\text{Alan} = \text{God}$$

Alan becomes God, Jesus. At this time, Alan undergoes a psychological change—a “sliding away of the subject” (Lacan, *Four* 75). Davis in his article, “Lacan, Poe, and Narrative Repression” also explains this psychological change:

After this initial look takes place, there is a reversal, a seemingly impossible shift from a subject’s viewpoint to an object’s. This shift entails a virtual “giving up of the object” as a thing to be seen and mastered and a repositioning of “seeing” from a different position. The looker, in effect, becomes an object. In one sense, what happens here is that the looker first looks and, as a part of looking, as a kind of culmination of possessing the object, becomes that object. This is the second stage of “Gaze.” (248)

As we have seen, language and reality are not so smoothly synchronized as this situation would suggest. In other words, in reality it is impossible not to have a split in between the object and subject. Alan is now and then interrupted by the disturbance of the other external subjects or objects. At the moment when the other object, Jill, appears the situation is changed and interrupted. The former order formed in Alan starts to change. Here comes what the deconstructural critics say of a movement of “Aporia”⁵ at the third stage of the “Gaze.” At this stage there is a gap in the relationship between Alan and Equus. The fullness of identity begins to split, dissect and generate. The sealed union of Alan and Equus is to split. The psyche of Alan undergoes a drastic change when seeing comes to the third stage. Alan’s becoming

the object, *Equus*, is cut short and intervened and then Alan comes around partially to himself. Alan and *Equus* become part subject and part object. Alan straddles the subject-object relationship by becoming a partial object of contemplation (Davis 248). Other than Alan and *Equus*, there is another subject, becoming the looker, the voyeur. The new subject is similar to omniscient God who watches from the hidden recesses and is present everywhere.

At the moment when Alan meets the girl, Jill who introduces him to Harry Dalton, the stable owner, and helps Alan in his work in the stable, his libidinal id is awakened and it spreads into his superego. The former almost takes the place of the latter in Alan's psyche. Alan has a libidinal desire for Jill. This desire is different from what Dora, Alan's mother, taught him, the spiritual love. It is "just a biological matter" (Shaffer 227) to Alan. As Berman postulates, the possible reason for Alan's drawing himself to Jill away from horses is:

Alan seems to rage a furious conflict between a repressed homosexual love, in the form of his reverence for the horses, and a newly awakened heterosexual attraction that draws him toward Jill. (415)

The attachment to Jill is encouraged by the disillusion or demystification of his father when Alan most unexpectedly meets him in the movie. Alan sees him now less godlike and more human (Berman 418). He thinks that he need not any longer obey the hypocritical, authoritarian, godlike father. These factors make it possible for Alan to develop an interest in Jill. Nevertheless, Alan becomes restless, anxious, and very much afraid of being seen by the subject represented by *Equus* as his id leads him nearly to a fusion with Jill.

The failure of Alan in his attempt to have a mature relationship with Jill has several possible reasons: the tyrannical family headed by his father, the diametrically opposed views on child-raising of father and mother, and his repressed conflicting libidinous desires. All these have turned him into a neurotic. His desires seeking their gratification have aroused a sense of guilt in him as they violated the superego's

conception of virtue. Alan’s libidinal urges could be attributed to the bodily changes and the increase in hormones that occur at puberty. With the increase in these drives, there is both great attraction and antagonism to his parents. Since the possibility of actually achieving tabooed and dangerous Oedipal wishes is so great, the teen-ager must mobilize potent defenses to stem their power. One such mechanism is to turn away from the parents, to find new objects for gratification; the mechanism obviously contains an adaptive value. Alan tries this in his romance with Jill. But his love for her is clouded by Oedipal images and prohibitions and is accompanied by intense anxiety (Glenn, “Alan” 477). Consequently, Alan is afflicted with a conflict between superego and id, that is, between religious admonition, social taboo, and father’s order on one hand and adolescent desire on the other. Impotence and the tragic mutilation of the horses as gods occur as a consequence. Alan has failed to establish a meaningful sexual relationship with a non-incestuous object. His sexual orientation and his encounter with his father in the theatre have turned Jill into a tabooed object (Glenn, “Alan” 478). Here we also can make a formula to analyze Alan’s unconscious repression toward Equus at the third stage of the “Gaze”.

$$\frac{\text{(Alan) Voyeur (S')}}{\text{fear of being seen (S)}} \cdot \frac{\text{Fear of being seen (S)}}{\text{boy's obsession with the horse (s)}}$$

$$= \frac{\text{Voyeur (Alan) (S')}}{\text{boy's obsession with horse (God) (s)}}$$

$$\frac{\text{fear of being seen (S)}}{\text{fear of being seen (S)}}$$

From the right hand side of the formula, we can find the result—Alan’s obsession with the horse is due to his fear of being seen by God of his “deviated” desire for Jill. As Alan has always been obsessed by the fear of being seen, he has been aware of the noise of Equus—the protest—of its hooves smashing on wood (Shaffer 293). Alan is extremely disturbed by it. He hardly finds ease in contact with Jill.

ALAN (to DYSART): Only Him. Every time I kissed her—He was

in the way.

DYSART: Who? (ALAN turns on his back)

ALAN: (to DYSART): You know who! . . . When I touched her, I felt Him. Under me . . . His side, waiting for my hand . . . His flanks . . . I refused him. I looked right at her . . . and I couldn't do it. When I shut my eyes, I saw Him at once. The streaks on his belly . . . [With more desperation.] I couldn't feel her flesh at all! I wanted the foam off his neck. His sweaty hide. Not flesh. Hide Horse-hide! . . . Then I couldn't even kiss her. (Shaffer 294–95)

To Alan the only way to get rid of his anxiety is to blind the six horses present around him. This is the way to prevent him from being seen of the deviation by the eyes of God everywhere, which, to Alan, exist in the horses. Alan reifies God as a presence in the horse.

ALAN (to DYSART: whispering): 'Mine! . . . You're mine! . . . I am yours and you are mine!' . . . Then I see his eyes. They are rolling!

(NUGGET begins to advance slowly, with relentless hooves, down the central tunnel.) . . .

DYSART: And you will fail! Forever and ever you will fail! You will see ME—and you will FALL!

(The boy turns round, hugging himself in pain. From the sides two more horses converge with NUGGET on the rails. Their hooves stamp angrily. The EQUUS noise is heard more terribly.)

The Lord thy God is a jealous God. He sees you. He sees you forever and ever, Alan. He sees you! . . . He sees you!

ALAN: (in terror): Eyes! . . . White eyes—never closed! Eyes like flames—coming—coming! . . . God seest! God seest! . . . NO! . . .

(Pause. He steadies himself. The stage begins to blacken.)

(Quieter.) No more. No more, Equus.

(He gets up. He goes to the bench. He takes up the invisible

pick. He moves slowly upstage towards NUGGET, concealing the weapon behind his naked back, in the growing darkness. He stretches out his hand and fondles NUGGET's mask.)
 (Gently) Equus . . . Nobel Equus . . . Faithful and True . . .
 God-salve . . . Thou—God—Seest—NOTHING!
 (He stabs out NUGGET's eyes. The horse stamps in agony . . .)
 (Shaffer 297)

The action of blinding the six horses is also the way that Alan fights against his father's watch as Freud's study of Oedipus complex reveals. It should be recalled that Alan's father is a tyrant in his family. He has prohibited Alan from watching TV, believing in his mother's brand of religion, riding horses, and having any date with Jill. At this time of id's guidance, Alan identifies God with his authoritarian father who prevents him from contact with Jill. A new formula which is different from the previous ones, can be envisioned like this:

God = father

To Alan in his unconscious God is a "new Dad" and his father is a "new God" (Shaffer 275). As Alan lapses into a state of schizophrenia, we notice a struggle in him between his desire for the horse and his newly awakened desire for Jill. Unable to bear any longer the pervasive presence of the horses, and in a desperate attempt at a reversal of repression Alan blinds the horses. The violence results in Alan's sense of guilt that aggravates his schizophrenia.

The thematic rendering of this play is sufficient to establish several shifting positions within the text. We glimpse the text in a stage of productivity when we retrieve the unconscious chain in association of two positions marked as "the fear of being seen" (S/S). Alan seeks mastery of his fear in the action of blinding the six horses. In seeking that mastery, Alan—a double of Equus, blinds the six horses to cover up the witness; yet ironically he simultaneously blinds himself and gains pain from the blinding action. Alan is both mastering and is being mastered. He is conscience-stricken, self-tortured, and pursued by the

law.

III. Relationship between Dysart and Alan

In addition to the repositioning of relationship between Alan and the horses, another repositioning happens between Alan and Dysart. The alternated shift of subject and object of the "Gaze" also works in the relation of Dysart and Alan—the doctor and the patient. The shift of their identities is constantly circling and revolving along with the process of the "Gaze" of Dysart on Alan. Nevertheless, Dysart's gaze on Alan is not attributed to the desire of possession of the latter, but due to the identification of the former with the latter. Thus after Dysart is conscious of himself as a subject as he is at the first stage of Lacanian "Gaze," hence, by resemblance with and introjections of Alan's ego and id into his psyche he comes nearly to the second stage of the "Gaze." Afterwards, jumping fully over it into the third stage of the "Gaze," he contemplates himself as part subject and part object. Half intellectual and half neurotic, Dysart is dangling between the first, the second, and the third stage of the "Gaze" through the whole play though the second stage is rather short.

Originally, Dysart is the doctor who is to cure his patient's psychic problem, the subject to see into Alan's psyche, and a listener, listening to Alan's recalling of what happened to him. Alan, on the other hand, is the patient to get cured, the object and exhibitioner in the clinic office to be seen by the doctor, Dysart. While Alan, according to Freud, unconsciously transfers his obsession and perplexity to Dysart, Dysart through the transference gets insights into Alan's psychic life. In the process of treatment Alan unconsciously takes Dysart for his tyrannous father/*Equus*, and relieves his perplexed feeling by revealing all what he has done and been obsessed with. In the play we can observe that Alan, at this time, accuses Dysart of being "Nosey Parker" and shows his uncooperative and unfriendly attitude toward Dysart's questioning:

Tell me, tell me, tell me, tell me! . . . On and on, sitting there! Nosey

Parker! That's all you are! Bloody Nosey Parker! Just like Dad.
(Shaffer 251)

It is obvious to see now that in the office Dysart is the doctor and Alan is the patient. They both remain their own real identities; the shift of their identities has not yet happened in the first stage of the "Gaze" at this time.

The identity of Dysart as the doctor and that of Alan as the patient are reversed when Alan is absent and Dysart leaves his office. Owing to the influence of Alan's transference, Dysart receives and is affected by Alan's obsession. It seems that as Alan is shot by the treatment of the doctor, Dysart is also unconsciously injected by the side effect of the treatment of the Alan aftermath. He, then, becomes the one who is perplexed, the patient who is troubled by his own problem.

The identities shift back to the former state when Dysart goes back to his office with Alan, having Alan tell Dysart of his memory through hypnotism. At this time Dysart goes back to the first stage of the "Gaze." Dysart taps a pencil on the desk and has Alan close and open eyes according to the rhythm of the tapping sound. Dysart is the observer to look at Alan's acting out his night fusion with Equus, Nugget, and his creative fancy of stable-temple and worship of Equus-God in front of him. Alan, without doubt, is the object examined by the viewer, the doctor, Dysart.

Yet, once more the situation takes another turn when Dysart is left alone; unconsciously identified with Alan, he turns again to be, instead of the subject who sees, the object like Alan who is seen by Equus, or by his conscience, or by his superego which is omnisciently present. In Dysart's unconscious, at this time, Equus becomes the representative of his superego to censor the plausibility of his treatment on Alan. Though at this time Dysart reaches approximately the second stage of the "Gaze," Dysart is not, yet, unaware of this shift. He knows the effect of the identification affected by Alan's transference and his own counter-transference working in his mind. He addresses himself melancholically after he is left behind without Alan:

Now he's gone off to rest, leaving me alone with *Equus*. I can hear the creature's voice. It's calling me out of the black cave of the Psyche. I shove in my dim little torch, and there he stands—waiting for me. He raises his matted head. He opens his great square teeth, and says—[Mocking.] 'Why? . . . Why Me? . . . Why—ultimately—Me? . . . Do you really imagine you can account for Me? Totally, infallibly, inevitably account for me? . . . poor Doctor Dysart!' [He enters the square.] Of course I've stared at by them, whichever way you look at it. And weirdly often now with me the feeling is that they are staring at us—that in some quite palpable way they precede us. . . . This is the feeling more and more with—No Place. Displacement . . . 'Account for me,' says staring *Equus*. 'First account for Me! . . . ' I fancy this is more than menopause. (Shaffer 267–68)

It is observed too that there is, again, another shift of identity between Dysart and Alan revolving back to the original state as to be at the first stage of Dysart's "Gaze" when Dysart applies the drug on Alan to have Alan reveal more of his past. At this time Alan is the exhibitioner to exhibit barely under the eyes of Dysart his encounter with his father in the theater, the sexual enticement of Jill, and the crime of his blinding six horses.

The situation has been changing several times as the play unfolds. There is a constant shift from subject to object and from object to subject, coinciding with the change from the first stage of the "Gaze" to the second, and vice versa. Dysart's recursive resemblance of himself with Alan is derived from his fantasy as Alan, his twin, which remains in his unconscious (Laplanche 206). In Dysart's unconscious Alan is the signified of Dysart, the signifier. Dysart sees similar self in Alan as if in a mirror. He loves Alan as he loves narcissistically his own reflection and half of himself. Dysart's feeling of incompleteness can only be compensated by Alan's complement; then he gets a sense of fullness and completeness of himself. This can be evidenced by that Dysart feels himself passionate only when he observes Alan's passionate religious belief, his fantasy, and libidinal desire though, in

fact, he does not ordinarily feel so.

Ultimately, coming nearly to the end of the play, Dysart reads all the text of Alan's story and abreacts Alan's pain by having him relive his past and understand his past psyche. At this time, the third stage of the "Gaze" arrives at that Dysart is fully affected by Alan and is fused spiritually with him. Dysart becomes part subject and part object, who contemplates his plight of and his obsession with a repressed conflict between his sense of duty and desire. On the one hand as part object he unconsciously resembles his patient with the sharp chain in his mouth and never comes out of it (Shaffer 301), but on the other hand as part subject he is conscious of himself as a psychiatrist performing his own duty. Dysart is inflicted with his neurosis resulting from the inability of his ego to balance the social demand and his inner conviction; he is torn between his unwillingness to cure his patient and the social requirement to perform it.

And now for me it never stops: that voice of Equus out of the cave—"Why Me? . . . Why Me? . . . Account for Me . . . All right—I surrender! I say it! . . . In an ultimate sense I cannot know what I do in this place—yet I do ultimate things. Essentially I cannot know what I do—yet I do essential things. Irreversible, terminal things. I stand in the dark with a pick in my hand, striking at heads! (Shaffer 300)

Jules Glenn, a child psychiatrist, has similar observations on the ultimate process of the "Gaze" that by the end of the play it is difficult to distinguish between the psychiatrist and the patient (Weintraub 462). In the end the doctor feels impotent and stagnant, as if he is having the "male menopause" because he is so caught up in the process of analysis that he is no longer capable of making choices in life, acting on them by himself (Posner 124).

IV. Relationship between the Characters and Audience

A study of the play reveals that the relationship between the

characters in the play and the audience is intended to be very intimate, an understanding of which is necessary for a deeper appreciation of the play. The narrator-actor, psychiatrist Dysart, is closely related to the audience. He acts not only as the pivot of the whole play, but also as the agent between actors and the audience. The audience, directed by him is trained to empathize with the characters in the play.

The attachment of the characters to the audience is greatly attributed to the arrangement of the characters' positions on the stage and the deliberate adoption of an ingenious design for the stage setting.

The set is so designed that all the actors remain visible onstage even when some of them are not engaged in the action, by seating them at the edge of the lighted area. For example, when the psychiatrist addresses the audience from time to time, the other characters that are not addressed are also visibly present on the stage. The action could be viewed from various levels. While the unanimated actors watch the actors in action, the audience too could watch not only the active but also the inactive actors. The motionless sluggishness of the inactive actors, the dynamic performance of actors in action, and the interaction between both the inactive and the active actors are all distinctly within the ocular vision of the audience.

The stage design as given in the play largely contributes to diminishing the distance between the characters and the audience, permitting greater association, and the characters' close communication with the audience, and vice versa. It is also intended to arouse and enhance the audience's imagination. As Shaffer describes the setting for the play, a "square of wood set on a circle of wood" (204) resembles a railed boxing ring or a courtroom. Shaffer goes on describing:

. . . It is perforated on each side by an opening. Under the rail are a few vertical slats, as if in a fence. . . . The whole square is set on ball bearings, so that by slight pressure from actors standing round it on the circle, it can be made to turn round smoothly by hand.

On the square are set three little plain benches, also of wood.

They are placed parallel with the rail, against the slats, but can be moved out by the actors to stand at right angles to them.

Set into the floor of the square, and flush with it, is a thin metal pole, about a yard high. This can be raised out of the floor, to stand upright. It acts as a support for the actor playing Nugget, when he is ridden.

In the area outside the circle stand benches. Two downstage left and right are curved to accord with the circle. The left one is used by Dysart as a listening and observing post when he is out of the square, and also by Alan as his hospital bed. The right one is used by Alan's parents, who sit side by side on it. (Viewpoint is from the main body of the audience.)

Further benches stand upstage, and accommodate the other actors. All the cast of *Equus* sits on stage the entire evening. They get up to perform their scenes, and return when they are done to their places around the set. They are witnesses, assistants—and especially a Chorus. (204)

The stage is made into “something of an arena by placing some of the audience behind the action, giving the lighted area the semblance of a clinic where surgical operations are performed under the eyes of medical students” (Weintraub 465). The square of wood looks like an operation table. Alan Strang is the object to be carved, observed, and operated upon. The doctor is like the professor of a medical school, lecturing on and demonstrating the entire operation before the students, who include not only the inactive, motionless characters on the stage but also the audience, all surrounding the circle listening and learning. The line between the audience and the characters is blurred; actually the line seems to disappear. Unconsciously the audience seem to learn with the characters on the stage. As they are present on the stage, they are likely to unconsciously get a feeling of their presence in the happening of the play. They seem to be actors or actresses, getting involved in the play, observing the play, or the surgical operations performed before their eyes.

Moreover, the seemingly redundant but specially designed blocks

where members of the audience sit as a backdrop are also functional:

Upstage, forming a backdrop to the whole, are tiers of seats in the fashion of a dissecting theatre, formed into two railed-off blocks, pierced by a central tunnel. In these blocks sit members of the audience. During the play, Dysart addresses them directly from time to time, as he addresses the main body of the theatre. No other actor ever refers to them. (Shaffer 204–205)

The backdrop design grants the audience a somewhat illusive and unconscious feeling that they, like the other characters, are witnesses of Dysart's action. Because of the design, the distance between the psychiatrist and the audience is contracted. It also leads us to fancy that whenever the psychiatrist addresses the audience, he is in fact confessing his conscience and arguing his life "case" as if before a jury. He is doing self-examination before the audience who appears to be a "spectator-jury" (Gianakaris 34) in front of him. And the whole theater would seem to resemble a judicial chamber where there are the "main body of the audience" as the jury and the "members of the audience" as spectators or auditors. Each one is called upon to formulate and reserve his or her judgment (Gianakaris 33). The psychiatrist too, like a modern day Hamlet, through a reevaluation of his past life and his way of dealing with his patient, Alan, seeks a better understanding of himself and possibly as a consequence convinces himself as much as his audience-jury that his judgments and deeds may have been proper (Gianakaris 33). Although there is no real sentence upon Dysart after his self-censure, a sense of psychic catharsis appears at the end of the play for both the confessor and audience.

As the psychiatrist is engaged in the psychotherapeutic treatment of his patient on the stage, and watching Alan acting out his memory, the audience is also, at the same time, having a three-dimensional view of the whole action on the stage from an omniscient and omnipotent perspective. What is more, as the psychiatrist delivers his monologues and turns his attention from his patient to the audience, he is making a direct and overt contact with the audience. The stage through Shaffer's

art now becomes the real world. There is a story line found expanded to and connected with the reality. The story of Dysart and Alan on the stage leaves an indelible impression on the audience and becomes part of the human experience.

By, at first, appreciating the play and, then, by identifying with the characters of the play through empathy, the audience would forget their own real life identities and unconsciously get into the play itself. A three-stage process, but not complete, somewhat similar to Lacan's "Gaze," which has been previously discussed in this study, works in the audience.

At the beginning, as they come into the theater, sit, and wait for the first stage light to be on, they are aware very well of themselves as the viewers present in the theater to watch the play. As the observers they are outsiders to the plot of the play.

It is not long before the audience, step by step, without knowing, gets further involved in the play as the play unfolds. Arriving at the second stage, which is different from that of the "Gaze," the audience would identify with the characters—Dysart at first and then Alan, and vice versa. Like the characters, the audience unconsciously become the objects on the stage to be seen rather than the subjects who see the play.

This transformation, however, is not because of "the desire of possession" as Lacan says about the "Gaze," but due to what Aristotle says in his *Poetics*, the empathy, resulting in identification of the audience with the characters and the introjections of characters' ego and id into theirs. They temporally forget their identities and transpose the characters to themselves. Thus, it is not identical with the Lacanian second stage of the "Gaze," at which the subject would constantly remain becoming the object. Another difference is that the subject, the audience, gets identified rather than becomes totally the object. The identification is not, yet, complete and persistent. It happens periodically, at intervals; the audience would now and then awake themselves from the unconscious identification to the conscious and return to their real identities. Occasionally when through his monologues the psychiatrist addresses the audience, or, as we can imagine, the medical teacher on the stage teaches the audience-students,

they would be reminded of their real identities and come to their own as the lookers, the subjects; otherwise, as the play goes on, they identify themselves with Dysart who brings out his situations and guides the audience's identification with him, and then afterward with Alan while Dysart explores Alan's psyche and has him act out his past.

Yet, Dysart's monologues, functioning to call back the audience's real identity, would soon again lead the audience to their unconscious fantasy. They, hence, would fancy themselves even as the character, Dysart, instead of the audience. The whole process of the doctor curing Alan, then, turns into that of another doctor, the audience, dealing with the psychotherapeutic treatment of the patient, Dysart, and listening to and analyzing the symptom described by the patient.

At the end of the play, hereafter, coming to the third stage of the "Gaze," the audience, the lookers, are partial objects, in turn, not physically, but philosophically and psychologically looking at themselves. They, thus, are part subject and part object. After undergoing the experience of the character, Dysart, the audience become partial subjects who contemplate their own situations in reality related to Dysart's in art. At this time the audience experience what Aristotle implies in his *Poetics*, an emotional catharsis resulting from pity and fear toward Dysart, or, in psychoanalytic terms, an abreaction (Glenn, "Anthony" 290). Seemingly infected with the psychological problems of Alan Strang, the audience experience the same psychological problems. As Alan is cured, the audience are also cured by understanding and reliving Alan's troubled mental state. At the end of the play Alan is abreacted and so are the audience.

After Dysart's guidance of the audience through his opening monologue at the beginning of the play, the audience, potentially, are prepared to absorb the plot of the play and identify themselves with Dysart, though being conscious lookers. It is because the monologue is so fascinating to the audience that they are likely to draw their attentions to the play. The fascination lies in the fact that Dysart, at this time, acts as a narrator, narrating the story of the play, or, as a chorus, resembling that of Greek plays, giving background information of the play, and foreshadowing the events of the latter part of the play. Besides

he talks as if he is in a dream to the audience about his doubt in his life and in this career:

You see, I'm lost. What use, I should be asking, are questions like these to an overworked psychiatrist in a provincial hospital? They're worse than useless; they are, in fact, subversive. . . .
The thing is, I'm desperate. You see, I'm wearing that horse's head myself. That's the feeling. All reined up in old language and old assumptions, straining to jump clean-hoofed on to a whole new track of being I only suspect is there. I can't see it, because my educated, average head is being held at the wrong angle. I can't jump because the bit forbids it, and my own basic force—my horse-power, if you like—is too little. (Shaffer 210)

In the monologue the frequent appearance of addressee “you,” the audience, makes the audience draw much attention to the addresser “I,” the psychiatrist. A kind of curious attention is kindled in the heart of the audience and starts to permeate from this time on by the leading of this monologue.

While the psychiatrist relates his distressing dream, the audience partly share the doctor's misery and, meanwhile, partly examine the significance of the dream to their protagonist-hero's life. The stream of mind of the audience is again completely led by the doctor. The audience is like a psychiatrist, listening to the description of Dysart's dream and trying to find out the latent content of the dream and his symptom through free-association. The sources of free-association are to be obtained and traced from the way Dysart deals with Alan, the talks with his good friend, Hesther, his relationship with his wife, and all the other pieces of information provided in the play.

As the psychiatrist, layer by layer, has been probing into the riddle-like mystery of the boy, Alan, his nightly riding on Equus, Nugget, and his fusion with the horse, the audience outside of the stage, together with the doctor on the stage, see the vivid and compelling riding-fusion scene. Afterwards, similar to Dysart's, the audience's id is awakened. The id, like yeast, swells in the audience's psychic zone.

The same voice (*Equus*'s voice) is calling not only Dysart, but also the audience "out of the black cave of the Psyche" (Shaffer 267). They not only admire Alan's distinguishing passion and zealous worship just in the same way as the doctor does, but also seem to experience the similar perverse passion out of Oedipal fear lying in audience's unconscious.

It is the doctor's remark to the audience, rather than the shift of scene at the beginning of Act II, that cuts short the identification of the audience with Dysart. The break of the identification and, then hereafter, the retrieval of the identity of the audience are so short that the audience create another identity other than that of Dysart or themselves. That is the audience unconsciously fancy themselves as a psychiatrist facing and curing their patient, Dysart who is originally a psychiatrist.

Through the process of watching the play, the audience's psychic zone undergoes a great change. The audience's id would occupy larger area in their psyche while they observe Alan's fervent passion toward horses. The audience's repressed desire, somewhat similar to Alan's, is awakened, emerging out of their unconscious by viewing Alan's performance. The audience identifying with Dysart would feel sorry for him in their ego.

At the end of the play and, moreover, after the play is ended, the audience's superego would exalt itself and it is likely that the libidinal desires, instead of getting repressed, would be partially, if not fully, relieved by appreciating the play as a work of art.⁶ The audience through an understanding the plight of Dysart and the passion of Alan gain a new insight into their lives. They gain, too, a new value by which they could judge their lives. Each member of the audience creates his or her own interpretation of the play and finds a new interpretation of his or her own life. In doing so, the audience virtually creatively participate in the play during the entire process of viewing the whole play.

To the audience the play is a reflection of themselves in the mirror. The play is the signified of the audience. Through viewing it the audience can get a sense of fullness and a compensation for their sense of incompleteness.

V. Conclusion

The present study is unlike those of James Stacy and Barbara Lounsberry who both have been concerned with the religious passion in Shaffer's plays and that of several others like John M. Clum who are mainly preoccupied with the religious elements through a study of human conflicts. It also differs from that of Gene A. Plunka who concentrates on the existential ritual in *Equus*. The attempt here has been to focus on the psycho-analytic process of Shaffer's multi-layered, mysterious *Equus* with ingenious theatricalism.

A close study of the play has revealed a changing, uncontrolled but productive phenomenon, "aporia," pervading the whole play. The text itself has several incoherent and doubtful points and turns, especially the behavior of Alan and the reactions of Dysart to Alan. Whether the undecidable situation can be explained by the fact that human mind, not to speak of the neurotic mind, is hard to be understood even by oneself, we are not absolutely sure. In spite of the ambiguity, this study has studied the trait of "aporia" that more or less undergirds the phenomena of the "Gaze" between Alan and *Equus*, Dysart and Alan, and the audience and the whole play; the identification of Alan with *Equus* and the repressed desire for *Equus*; the shift of identity between the doctor, Dysart and the patient, Alan and the complementary but rival relationship of twins between Alan and Dysart; and the shift of identification of the audience with the characters, Dysart and Alan. The study, therefore, is a result of a creative ongoing process of encountering a series of aporias or "impasses" (Miller 421) and trying to resolve them one after the other.

The present study has rendered the play in an architectural fashion. The play has been observed as if it is like a mansion having three floors—the basement, the ground floor, and the upper floor. Taking note of the architectural feature of the play, the study has been designed to have three levels: the ground floor resembles the text itself, the surface layer whereas the basement, the layer below, is, metaphorically, the unconscious of the protagonists and of the play.

The response of audience sitting on the elevated, sublime level beyond the play likens the first floor. Both the basement (the unconscious part) and the upper floor (the audience's response) are the sub-texts to the play itself. The study thus presents two subtexts to the play. It is hoped that such an interpretation not only would facilitate demystifying the seemingly unexplainable mystery in the play and unraveling the repressed and unconscious state of minds of the characters. What is more, as a productive process, the rendering in the study also presents creative subtexts as a result of projection of the text further into the unconscious mind of audience with the help of Peter Shaffer's theatricalism.

NOTES

¹ Oedipus complex: a stage of development of a boy, between age five and seven, when he wants to replace his father in his mother's affections. Girls go through the same stage of rivalry with the mother. When a grown man remains in an immature relationship to or dependence on his mother, we mean that he has not developed beyond the Oedipal stage and has had an Oedipus complex. (Stoutenbury 186)

² Castration complex: it is closely linked with the Oedipus complex. This is the result of the paternal threat of being deprived of his penis as an instrument of his sexual desire for his mother. This leads to an intense castration anxiety. The pain of this traumatic experience is traced back to that of weaning, the loss of the breast in the routine of feeding. For the little boy, the castrating agent is the father, to whom he attributes all the threats made by other people. Another characteristic of the castration complex is its impact upon narcissism. The phallus is an essential component of the child's self-image. So any threat to the phallus is a threat to this image. In childhood the penis is the leading erotogenic zone and the chief auto-erotic object. The boy's estimate of its value, therefore, is logically reflected in his inability to imagine a person like himself who is without this essential constituent. The castration phantasy is identified behind a variety of symbols: the threatened object can be displaced (the blinding of Oedipus, extraction of teeth); the act may be distorted or replaced by other types of attack upon the wholeness of the body (accidents, syphilis, surgical

operations) or even of the mind (madness as the result of masturbation). (Laplanche 56–59)

³ Fixation: in ordinary psychological terms, the formation of a habit or association. In psychoanalysis, a condition in which the psyche is “fixed” or arrested at a certain stage. A person whose development toward maturity was arrested by too strong an attachment to a parent would be said to have mother or father fixation. (Stoutenburg 184)

⁴ The phallus, according to Lacan, is neither a fantasy, nor an object, nor an organ (whether penis or clitoris), but a signifier—indeed the signifier of all signifiers, “intended to designate as a whole the effects of the signified, in that the signifier conditions them by its presence as a signifier” (qtd. in Muller 336).

The phallus is the signifier of desire precisely in so far as desire undergoes repression and is henceforth marked with unconscious signification. The phallus is designated by Lacan in this way because it is the most tangible element in sexual copulation, and is equivalent to the copula (Muller 336).

⁵ Aporia: a difficulty, impasse, or point of doubt and indecision; a self-contradictory technique in a literary work. It does not have a solid ground of truth; it keeps shifting its ground of truth and cannot be controlled. The deconstructural aporia emphasizes the way in which a text becomes problematic and confused. According to deconstructural criticism, aporia is a point of “undecidability” in a text which indicates the site at which the text most obviously dismantles or deconstructs itself (Holman 34). The feeling of reader’s encountering the impasse is described vividly by J. Hillis Miller.

⁶ This psychological reaction is somewhat similar to the phenomena of sublimation that, according to Stoutenburg and Baker’s book, *Explorer of the Unconscious: Sigmund Freud*, channels sexual energy away from a sexual object into other spheres such as social service, artistic creation, scientific discovery, sports, etc (188). Dreams, for example, “are psychical phenomena of complete validity-fulfillments of wishes” (Freud 155).

Works Cited

- Aristotle. *Poetics*. New York: Norton, 1982.
- Berman, Jeffrey. “Equus: ‘After Such Little Forgiveness, What Knowledge?’” *The Psychoanalytic Review* 66 (1979): 407–22.

- Clum, John M. "Religion and Five Contemporary Plays: the Quests for God in a Godless World." *South Atlantic Quarterly* 177.4 (1978): 418-32.
- Connell, Brian. "Peter Shaffer: the Two Sides of Theatre's Agonized Perfectionist." *The London Times* 28 April, 1980.
- Davis, Robert Con. "Lacan, Poe, and Narrative Repression." *Contemporary Literary Criticism*. Ed. Robert Con Davis. New York: Longman, 1986. 246-61.
- Eagleton, Terry. *Literary Theory: an Introduction*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd., 1983.
- Freud, Sigmund. *The Interpretation of Dreams*. Trans. and Ed. James Strachey. New York: Avon Books, 1955.
- Gianakaris, C. J. "Theatre of the Mind in Miller, Osborne and Shaffer." *Renascence* 30 (1977): 33-42.
- Glenn, Jules. "Alan Strang as an Adolescent: a Discussion of Peter Shaffer's *Equus*." *International Journal of Psychoanalysis and Psychotherapy* 5 (1976): 473-88.
- . "Anthony and Peter Shaffer's Plays: the Influence of Twinship on Creativity." *American Imago* 31(1974): 270-93.
- . "Twins in Disguise. II: Content, Style and Form in Plays by Anthony and Peter Shaffer." *International Review Psychoanalysis* 1(1974): 373-81.
- Holman, C. Hugh and William Harmon, eds. *A Handbook to Literature*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., 1986.
- Lacan, Jacques. *The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psychoanalysis*. Ed. Jacques-Alain Miller. Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: Norton, 1978.
- . *The Language of The Self*. Trans. Anthony Wilden. New York: Dell Publishing Co., 1968.
- Laplanche, Jean and Leclaire Serge. "The Unconscious: a Psychoanalytic Study." *Yale French Studies* 48(1972): 118-75.
- Lounsberry, Barbara. "God-hunting: the Chaos of Worship in Peter Shaffer's *Equus* and *Royal Hunt of the Sun*." *Modern Drama* 21(1978): 13-28.
- Miller, J. Hillis. "Stevens' Rock and Criticism as Cure, II."

- Contemporary Literary Criticism*. New York: Longman, 1986. 416–27.
- Muller, John P., and William J. Richardson. *Lacan and Language: A Reader's Guide to Ecrits*. New York: International UP, Inc., 1982.
- Nuttin, Joseph. *Psychoanalysis and Personality: A Dynamic Theory of Normal Personality*. Trans. George Lamb. New York: The New American Library, 1953.
- Plunka, Gene Alan. "The Existential Ritual: Peter Shaffer's *Equus*." *Kansas Quarterly* 12 (1980): 87–97.
- Posner, Jeanne. "Equus: the Other Side of Fanaticism." *ETC* 34 (1977): 123–25.
- Riley, Carolyn, and Phyllis Carmel, Mendelson. eds. *Contemporary Literary Criticism*. 53 vols. Detroit, Michigan: Gale Research Company, 1976. 5: 386–90. 14: 484–88. 18: 476–78. 37: 381, 388–89.
- Schickel, Richard. "Showman Shaffer." *Time* 11 (November 1974): 117, 119.
- Shaffer, Peter. *Three Plays: Five Finger Exercise, Shrivings, Equus*. New York: Penguin Books, 1978. 197–301.
- Stacy, James R. "The Sun and the Horse: Peter Shaffer's Search for Worship." *Education Theatre Journal* 28 (1976): 325–37.
- Stoutenburg, Adrien and Laura Nelson Baker. *Explorer of the Unconscious: Sigmund Freud*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965.
- Weintraub, Stanley, ed. *British Dramatists Since World War II Part 2: M-Z*. Vol. 13 of *Dictionary of Literary Biography*. Detroit and Michigan: Gale Research Company, 1982. 451–69.

CONTRIBUTORS

Lingchei Letty Chen is currently Assistant Professor of Modern Chinese Language and Literature in Washington University in St. Louis, U.S.A. She received doctorate in Comparative Literature from Columbia University, New York, in 2001.

Her research interests include: Modern Chinese Literature (including Literature from Taiwan and Hong Kong), Chinese American Literature, Theories of Postmodernism and Postcolonialism, Identity Politics, Globalization Studies, Memory and History Writing.

Her first book, *Writing Chinese: Reshaping Chinese Cultural Identity*, will be published by Palgrave Macmillan. In addition to this monograph, she also have a few articles published in both English and Chinese.

Kevin Lawrence is currently the Administrative Associate of the External Affairs Department in the Asia Societ Organization (AsiaSoc.org).

Tsung-yi Michelle Huang is an Assistant Professor of English at National Taiwan Normal University. Her works on cinema, literature, cultural studies, and global cities have been published in the *Quarterly Review of Film and Video*, *Journal of Narrative Theory*, *Concentric: Literary and Cultural Studies*, *Taiwan: A Radical Quarterly in Social Studies*, *Router: A Journal of Cultural Studies*, among others. In 2004 her book *Walking Between Slums and Skyscrapers: Illusions of Open Space in Hong Kong, Tokyo and Shanghai* was published by Hong Kong University Press. Huang received Academia Sinica Research Award for Junior Research Investigators in 2005.

Wei Qingqi is the Vice Director of the English Department and a lecturer in School of Foreign Languages and Cultures, Nanjing NormalUniversity.

Jia-yan Mi (Ph. D. UC Davis) is currently an assistant professor in the departments of English and Modern languages & literatures at The College of New Jersey. He is the author of *Self-Fashioning and Reflexive Modernity in Modern Chinese Poetry, 1919-1949* (Mellen Press, 2004). He specializes in East-West comparative poetics, visual and cinematic culture, globalization and cultural consumption, and gender and postcolonial politics.

Kien Ket Lim earned his Ph.D. in comparative literature at the University of Rochester, New York. He is assistant professor at the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures at National Chiao Tung University, Taiwan.

Shaowen Emily Su is currently teaching at Cheng Shiu University.

After obtaining her PhD Degree in August, 2003, she promoted her teaching career into the status of an associate professor, certified by the Ministry of Education in the December of the same year.

She has published a few research papers and articles in journals and seminars. Particularly, she was greatly honored to get funds from the Ministry of Education to engage in two large projects (respective NT\$2 million dollars and NT\$1.5 million dollars), aiming to improve students' level of English competency in the two consecutive years of 2004 and 2005. Besides, she personally took part in two small projects with grants obtained from Yung Ta Institute of Technology and Commerce in the years of 2001 and 2004 respectively.