Chapter V
Towards Alternative Gender Role

Gender is a social concept that assigns specific cultural and social roles to both men and women. As a result, it is the society that thrusts expectations of attitude and behaviour on men or women. Gender identity encompasses the mental construction of one’s place in society with respect to roles and responsibilities. The present chapter focuses on how the above statements are true with reference to the later plays of Sam Shepard.

*The Late Henry Moss*, coordinated by Shepard himself, was initially organized at the Magic Theatre in San Francisco in November 2000. The play uncovers the cumbersome state of the American family. “As found in such a variety of Shepard plays, inquiries of heredity, legacy, and authenticity enliven the stage, as do the status of the genuine and the routes in which the individual subjectivizes his or her claim rendition of reality” (Roudané 279). It depicts the blend of mythic authenticity with mystical rushes. The play offers a subversive assault on American myth and qualities. Extensively, the focal issues of the play are: an uncertain past, the brutal history between the father, mother, and child, and the overwhelming fear.

Two opposing siblings, Ray and Earl, are united after their dad, Henry Moss, is discovered dead in his undesirable New Mexico home. Henry was a pestering, presumptuous inebriated, and his children have acquired his most exceedingly bad qualities. Beam is resolved to reveal the puzzling conditions of
Henry’s passing. In three acts, the tale of the father’s last days unfurls in flashbacks.

*The Late Henry Moss* speaks to a defining moment inside Shepard’s work. The play manages demise. Shepard had not straightforwardly managed passing some time recently. The family catastrophe begins with two siblings who sit in a summary New Mexico adobe where their dad’s body lies decaying. The brutishly flighty senior sibling, Earl, evidently desensitized by distress recounts a strange story of the old man’s demise: of how he died after a tipsy angling trip with a local Indian lady called Coachella. Be that as it may, Ray, the doubtful kin, sees the story has neither rhyme nor reason. Having found the Albuquerque cab driver who took his dad on his fling, he reveals an account of aggressive behaviour at home and good weariness from which everyone is hurt.

*The Late Henry Moss* is Sam Shepard’s last work of the twentieth century. From 1990 onwards, Shepard’s advantage appears to move to some degree from male-female connections from that of between men. In *The Late Henry Moss* (2000), the attention is for the most part on the relationship between men particularly between father and his children and between siblings to depict the picture of father in emergency and kin contention.

*The Late Henry Moss* spins around the late passing of the play’s title character, Henry Moss and pulverization of his hegemonic manliness. His two isolated children are brought together after numerous years by the passing of their alcoholic father. They have gone to their dad’s straightforward adobe
situated close to the edges of Bernalillo, New Mexico. As the play starts, Earl takes a look at a family photo collection while Ray checks a torque in an old red apparatus mid-section. Their dad’s body lies in a little room. While discussing entombment courses of action, the siblings recall past occasions reconstituted through flashback groupings. It is revealed what may have happened to Henry Moss amid his last days and to the Moss family years back. “In this way spatially furthermore, transiently, the play now and again loosens up in a non-realistic, and nonlinear, shape” (281). Siblings immediately negate each other. They blame each other for recalling things incorrectly. There is a part between the signifier and the meant. The opposing exchanges, moving records of past activity and present result, the course of action of dialect and stage bearings depict postmodernist culture.

The significance of such souvenirs, particularly photos, is not lost in *The Late Henry Moss*. The play opens with Earl flipping through a family photograph collection while Ray scavenges through their late father’s device mid-section. The photograph collection and instruments are previous belonging of their dead father. The photograph collection is a record of the previous, an indication of their lives before the “huge victory.” The instruments serve as an indication of their dad’s accentuation on conventional manly parts. They likewise impart seek after the future as Earl propels Ray to keep the apparatuses, on the off chance that he ever has “The inclination to be valuable again!” (The *Late Henry Moss* 21). For Earl, Ray and Henry, the capacity to utilize devices is a pointer of manliness. The apparatuses, as things go down to children, serve as
an enduring indication of the desires upon a man inside the conventional parts of the patriarchy. Likewise, the instruments speak to the aptitudes and “helpfulness” a father would customarily show his children. That Ray gives these devices away shows the esteem he puts on his dad’s legacy as symbolized by the devices. It could be said, the instruments mirror a worry with repairing the over a wide span of time and working for what’s to come. The apparatuses additionally work to highlight the qualities their dad put on men’s apparent parts and their capacity to utilize their hands to “alter” objects. Incomprehensibly, neither one of the henrys, Ray nor Earl can “settle” themselves and their relationship to the past. Just at the finish of the work the two siblings move toward going up against their past injury and with that showdown, they start to “alter” their relationship and their selves.

The group of onlookers discovers that mementoes were sent through the resulting years from Earl to his sibling Ray after Earl left the family. These blessings included “Socks. Shirts. Rubbers. I sent you Camels once” (35), which all indicate the manliness attached to both Henry and Earl. Small, Earl has tried to pacify his sibling, yet likewise give material questions that appear to usher Ray into masculinity. However, Ray criticizes these powerless motions of giving, marking the endowments “Tokens. Tokens of blame” (35). These things sent to Ray were intended to move him into masculinity, yet they just served as indications of Earl’s nonattendance.

At the point when an emissary from the outside world lands in the pretence of Taxi, the driver who transported Henry Moss amid his most recent
couple of hours, both the photograph collection and the apparatuses get to be properties of conflict. At the point when Taxi enters, he quickly starts to handle both the photograph collection and the devices. Subsequently, Ray gets to be irritated, then angered at the man’s absence of behaviour. Beam discloses to Taxi that “When you’re an outsider in some person’s home, you don’t naturally accept you can take a seat at their table and mess around carelessly with their dad’s belonging” (41). Beam is currently defensive of these articles for they remain as material things that associate him to Henry. Before the passageway of Taxi, Ray appeared to be conflicted about the things, yet with an interloper upon family undertakings, these things are currently saturated with incredible significance. They remain as material associations that connection the children to their dad. After Taxi departs, the gathering of people and Earl discover that Ray has given both the photograph collection and the apparatuses to Taxi. Earl is stunned when he discovers that the photograph collection and devices are gone, for it was Ray who at first impacted Taxi for touching the mementoes. Earl asks “What the heck are you doing giving endlessly our dad’s possessions to an entire more peculiar?” (36). Ray reacts “I didn’t think they implied anything to you” (36). Earl lectures Ray much further, clarifying “There were photos in there backpedalling to the turn of the century. Those photos are essential. Presently some aggregate outsider has tightly to them. A pariah!” (36). Beam clarifies that Taxi “can simply make up some sort of a tale about them” (36). This uncovers Ray’s scorn for the veracity of stories and their powerlessness to verify past activities or occasions. Likewise with the photos in Simpatico, the pictures have an insecure relationship to reality of the past, for the account outlines and
contextualizes the pictures, giving them particular implications. These photos do not really need to be fixing to a particular story but instead they can be utilized to substantiate new implications, or accounts, in any case on the off chance that they are valid. Fundamentally, anybody can build a false individual account with memory items, be it Taxi or Earl.

What’s more, Ray has lost any sort of significant worth for the things. Beam holds the recollections of his dad, yet utilizes the cancelling of the memory things as a technique in which to outrage Earl, for Earl places incredible significance on material articles, as displayed through the blessings he has routinely sent Ray as the years progressed. Beam has disjoined the material associations with Henry, yet Earl is unwilling to do likewise. Through this activity, Ray is endeavouring to exorcize the traumatic encounters of his past by freeing himself of the indications of his dad. Thus, these articles serve as indications of the siblings’ traumatic past, yet these things additionally have the possibility to motivate an account. Beam oddly clarifies “Perhaps [Taxi] has no family. Perhaps he needs to make one up”(41) and the conclusion is that Taxi could utilize the collection as a sort of “authenticator” of a false family and the site for the formation of another, non-existent family. The apparatuses, additionally, can be executed truly in the creation or repair of a question. For Ray, the confirming properties of the photograph collection just dig up traumatic recollections. In spite of the fact that Earl grieves that the materials were given to an outsider with no association with Henry, the reality of the matter is that both Earl and Ray have no genuine association with their dad past the natural
and the traumatic. By relinquishing the collection and devices, Ray has effectively cut the siblings off from their familial history, an activity that apparently ends the inescapable reiteration of their dad’s activities. By surrendering the products, Ray has endeavoured to abstain from turning into his dad. With both Earl and Ray inevitably pretending as their dad inside the play, they both figure with their past and develop another familial future.

The unforgiving judgment in resounded in *The Late Henry Moss*, as Henry did for sure spend the last days before his demise contemplating what had happened to his life and how it had turned out to be so hopeless. Moreover, Henry’s children pretend the activities of their dad and it is this pretending permits them to disappear from the cycle of redundancy and mishandle.

In *The Late Henry Moss*, Earl chooses to backtrack Henry’s last night. This results in Earl going to an assortment of bars and watering openings frequented by his dad. At the point when Earl returns inebriated from this endeavour, Esteban discloses to the now inebriated Earl “You needed to go to those bars, Mr. Earl. You needed to visit the majority of Henry’s old bars. That is the thing that you let me know” (42). Esteban trusts that “Perhaps you thought you would – find something. . . Something about Henry” (43) through after his last outing in the town. In a kind of re-authorization – an element investigated later in this section – Earl follows his dad’s appearances and is changed into a halfway incarnation of Henry through inebriation. Earl cannot backtrack these means with the cadaver of his dad, yet Henry remains a nearness, not a long way from Earl’s brain. By the play’s decision, the significance of place – and its
association with memory – is apparent to Ray too. After Ray and Earl have encountered a kind of purgation and additionally a comprehension and compromise through re-authorizations and a flashback, Ray tells Earl “I’m going to stay for a spell . . . I feel – some sort of association here” (43). In spite of the fact that Ray has never gone by this home, he understands its essentialness in that his own dad lived and died there, additionally – maybe more vitally – this is the area in which he made peace both with his sibling and his past.

Once the characters of these works have gotten to the past, be it through the treatment of a memory question or communing with the substance of a place, they should definitely go up against traumatic recollections. A few characters basically “live before,” permitting the activities of the past to expend their considerations in present. Characters can deliberately inspire the past for nostalgic reasons, or as an endeavour to accommodate with a past occasion. Others may grieve the occasions that have happened. The idea of past additionally identifies with those characters who wish to overlook occasions. Characters can overlook occasions from the past. Others basically deny that episodes from the past even happened. Further, a few characters misremember the past. At long last, there are characters who urgently endeavour to overlook the past however are unsuccessful. They are frightened by the past, not able to stifle the traumatic recollections of occasions that have since a long time ago passed.

Beam and Earl in The Late Henry Moss must face their own recollections of the past to remake their characters. At present, they are both harmed people
during the time spent figuring with the “enormous victory.” Unfortunately, they frequently misremember occasions from their past. Memory is questionable, unsteady, short lived and can be loaded with irregularities as time between the occurrence and the present increments. The concentration of their contradiction is the “enormous victory.” This brutal scene included Henry violently beating his better half before their young children. As the gathering of people learns toward the end of the play, Earl fled amid the mishandle and Ray dislikes his more seasoned sibling for declining to secure him or their mom. At the point when Ray first declares his rendition of the occasions, to be specific that Earl fled amid the “enormous victory,” Earl rejects the recollections as being changed by time, for “things get adorned throughout the years” (43). To Ray, who saw the traumatic occasion and still experiences its resonances, the recollections are “still extremely distinctive with me” (42). Beam fights that Earl did in fact flee amid the episode, yet Earl will not or cannot admit to his flight years. The group of onlookers – and Ray – cannot know whether Earl genuinely does not left his sibling and mom to Henry’s brutality. It is conceivable that Earl, as an aftereffect of the shame about his powerlessness to shield his mom, has misremembered the past. At the point when Ray blames Earl for running, Earl reacts that “It’s awful bearing the wrong pictures with you whatever remains of your life. They’re at risk to get increasingly distorted over the long haul. Entirely soon you’ll overlook how it truly was” (44). Both Ray and the crowd are constrained to scrutinize the correct occasions of the “huge victory,” yet just in the finishing up demonstration of the play is reality of the injury uncovered through the siblings re-instituting the occasion.
Both siblings apparently misremember the past, offering showings of the subjective way of memory. After at first being brought together toward the beginning of the play, Ray and Earl have a discussion about an auto. Earl battles that Ray was constantly in the engine of auto, taking a shot at the autos motor. Beam reacts “I never had an auto . . . I never had an auto. You were the one with the auto” (50). This snapshot of perplexity uncovers Earl’s failure to precisely recollect occasions, yet this is additionally valid for Ray.

Beam tends to crumple his more established sibling (Earl) and their dad (Henry) into one substance. This is initially insinuated when Earl sings a base jingle that goes “Going to attach my pecker to a tree, to a tree. Going to attach my pecker to a tree” and asks, “You part that?” to which Ray reacts “I felt that was him. I recollect that him singing that.” Earl counters “That was me!”(41). At the point when the subject of the “huge victory” is initially examined, Ray expresses that he reviews Earl’s nearness and “I recollect windows detonating.” Frightened, Earl clarifies, “That was him, not me. That was him doing that . . . You’re getting me stirred up with him” (52). For Ray, who encountered the injury of both seeing physical viciousness against his mom and continuing surrender by his more established sibling, his own particular memory appears to be steady. Actually, Ray consistently misremembers the activities of Earl and their dad, regularly meshing them into one particular element.

However, Ray is by all account not the only character who starts to merge Earl and Henry into one figure. In Act III, Esteban cooks in the house as Earl dozes off a horrible aftereffect. At the point when Earl rises and shines, Esteban
lets him know “You weep for help – You pursue me away. You pursue me away – You weep for offer assistance. It’s the same as your dad” (53-4). This remark infuriates Earl, who reacts “I am in no way like the old man! Get that into your sear cerebrum little personality! We’re distinctive as chalk and cheddar! I am in no way like the old man!” (55). Earl refuses Esteban’s remark. Actually Earl’s liquor manhandle, blustering and potential for viciousness makes them turn out to be increasingly similar to Henry. This is literalized in the re-sanctioning of the “huge victory” when Ray assaults Earl. Amid the assault, Earl argues to his sibling, “That wasn’t me that was doing that! That wasn’t me! That was him!” (55). In light of Earl’s refusal to shield his mom from Henry, Earl has gotten to be complicit in the episode. At the time of lashing out, Ray is all the while physically rebuffing both his dad and his sibling. To Ray, Henry and Earl are in charge of the traumatic “enormous victory” and its resultant outcomes as both speak to strengths that damaged Ray’s initial life. This injury has waited in Ray and keeps on affecting his life.

In *The Late Henry Moss*, the fact of the matter is “exhibited” to the group of onlookers through flashbacks. In *The Late Henry Moss*, the story of the past gets to be fundamental to Ray’s understanding of his dad. As Earl touched base at Henry’s home only preceding his dad’s passing, Earl is the attendant of the account of Henry’s last days, yet Ray questions the veracity of Earl’s story. Towards the beginning of the play this suspicion is apparent and turns out to be more proclaimed as the activity advances. Beam does not trust Earl’s account of the “huge victory” injury and has his own particular questions about the
legitimacy of the story depicting the most recent days of Henry. Alluding to these last days, Ray asks, “Earl, would you mind doing a reversal through the entire story for me once again? . . . . Some stuff doesn’t bode well” (55).

Earl detests Ray’s endeavours to burrow further and further to uncover reality. Beam in the long run brings in Taxi as an observer to affirm in regards to Henry’s last days. Earl remarks to Ray that “you thought perhaps you’d get to the base of something – clear things up? Make some huge compromise” (56) to which Ray reacts “I needn’t bother with any compromise! I needn’t bother with it with you either!” (56). Beam appears to be less intrigued by compromise than getting a handle on a clarification of his dad. However, when Taxi unspools the account of Henry’s last day, it is Ray who detests the story. Beam sentences Taxi as being identified with liars, as “Your entire families a pack of liars. They were conceived liars. They couldn’t help themselves” (56). This allegation additionally uncovers Ray’s dread that one’s past (parentage) decides one’s future. For Ray, the individual cannot shake the foreordained qualities created through one’s ancestry, be it an inclination for manufacturing reality or a propensity toward liquor energized brutality. This is a wellspring of dread, also, for both Ray and Earl – like such a large number of other Shepardian children – are scared of changing into a variety of their dad, a figure dreaded and detested, yet incomprehensibly regarded. Taxi reacts to this cross examination by shouting “I don’t wanna be here! I need – I wanna leave now!” (60) however Ray battles “Definitely, yet you owe me something now, Taxi. You owe me a little story” (62). As yet, Ray has held quickly to all the material belonging of Henry and
now he craves for the account. The story remains as immaterial proof of Henry’s life, a declaration to his presence and demise. Like Simpatico, a story of a past occasion must be developed and imparted as a strategy for accommodating to the past.

At the point when Taxi shares the tale of Henry, Ray still denies its veracity, taking note of that there is “No real way to confirm this story by any means” (62). Beam thinks about Taxi to Earl, clarifying that “It resembles my sibling. Much the same as my sibling. He’s a fabricator as well. He makes something up out of nowhere, supposing I’ll get bulldozed by it. Simply gulp down it. No inquiries” (62). Beam trusts that there must be a certain, irrefutable truth that can be gotten to about the past, be it the far off past, the “enormous victory”, or the later past, Henry’s last days before death. At the point when Taxi portrays the occasions of Henry’s last hours on earth, these are re-sanctioned by the on-screen characters depicting Henry and his sweetheart Conchalla. The gathering of people must draw in the portrayal and the re-establishment by means of flashback and make a conclusion with respect to reality of what did for sure happen. In the wake of taking in Taxi’s story, Ray develops a “truth” about both Henry’s last hours and the “huge victory,” telling Earl “I have a major hint” (65). For Ray, the story has cemented his recognition of reality of the “enormous victory.” In Simpatico, the past is not exemplified, rather just described. Subsequently, the past stays shapeless to the gathering of people. In The Late Henry Moss, the portrayal of Taxi is exhibited and performed through a flashback, yet the characters are uncertain on the off chance that it is exclusively
Taxi’s translations of the occasions or that the portrayal precisely mirrors the past.

At the point when Earl returns after Taxi’s leave, he gets to be worried that Taxi’s story does not correspond to his own particular account of the occasions of Henry’s last night. Earl grumbles that Taxi would endeavour to “befuddle the issue . . . the predicament” (61) to which Ray smoothly reacts “I didn’t know there was a predicament here, Earl” (61-2). Beam clarifies that “He just let me know what happened, there’s nothing more to it. Basic story” (64). Beam trusts he now has “reality” of Henry’s last night. As this truth clashes with Earl’s portrayal of Henry’s last night, it undermines the honesty of Earl’s account of the traumatic occasion. As some time recently, Ray does not trust Earl’s story of the “enormous victory” or of Henry’s last days. In the wake of listening to Taxi’s declaration, Ray no longer alludes to his dad as “Henry” however now calls him “Father.” Through Taxi’s story, Ray has developed to encourage comprehend and maybe even relate to his dad. With this information of his dad, Ray now expects the power in the relationship. There is an inversion that happens, for Ray now holds information of their dad and the “huge victory.” Ray has “reality” with respect to the occasion. Earl is still jumpy about the account Taxi has shared, unnerved that reality might be uncovered. Earl asks “What’d this joker let you know? . . . He let you know something, isn’t that right? He put some thought in your mind” to which Ray reacts “I got my own particular thoughts, Earl. I needn’t bother with any new ones” (64). With the inversion of force and Ray having a private information of their dad, the more
youthful sibling now claims a closeness to Henry. As specified, this is the point in the play when Ray starts to allude to Henry as “Father.” This will in the long run prompt to hypothesis upon the way of pitilessness and its inheritability and the capacity of survivors of injury to figure with their past through re-authorization.

*The Late Henry Moss* draw towards its end with the below concluding exchange:

Ray: “You know me, Earl – I was never one to live in the past.
That was never my deal”
Earl: “Yeah. Yeah, right. I remember.” (66)

With this articulation, there is a verifiable seeing now between the siblings. They have reproduced and re-encountered the injury of their dad’s mishandle. Both Earl and Ray have alternated being “Henry” delivering savagery. They have landed at an affirmation about the story of the occasions. In view of this re-order, in which both men slipped all through the part of the father, they both make them comprehend of their dad’s savagery. Through the re-sanctioning of traumatic occasions, the two have developed to better know their dad and each other. It has permitted the occasion to be jolted open for further investigation and examination, which prompts to a compromise with the past, their dad and each other.

*The God of Hell* displays an elderly couple, Frank and Emma, who live in an “exceptionally basic Midwestern farmhouse” at Wisconsin. The episodes of the play happen in the kitchen which is a typical setting for a hefty portion of
Shepard’s plays. Inside the kitchen are “machines, pantries, and sink—all dating from the fifties” (*God of Hell* 5). Emma, wearing a blue terry-fabric wraparound and shoes, shows up watering her plants. Similar plants show up toward the beginning of *True West*, however swing to be dead toward the end. In *The God of Hell*, as well, Shepard incorporates the green plants towards the beginning of the play to demonstrate the nearness of life; be that as it may, before the end of the play, the plants bite the dust uncovering the demise of the qualities in the American country. Honest has quite recently come back from the field; “his life is his calves” says his significant other. Straight to the point’s association with his territory and the basic and tranquil life he lives with his better half is that of the conventional cowpoke; this kind of life is once in a while found in contemporary America.

Secret is a typical element in Shepard’s plays through which the fact of the matter is covered up. The play begins with Frankie and Emma debating about their guest Haynes who is by all accounts secretive:

Frank: He’s not a scientist. What made you think that?
Emma: I thought you said he was a scientist.
Frank: Nope.
Emma: Well, what is he then?
Frank: I’m not sure. I mean, I’m not sure about his official title.
Emma: Official? So, he’s working for the government or something? (6)

Haynes is an old companion of Frank’s, yet they have not seen each other for quite a while. Whether Haynes is a researcher doing an exploration or
working for the administration is not clear, something which makes Emma feel
that he is “Fleeing from something, possibly?” (7). Shepard tries to make a
secretive air towards the beginning of his play for behind this puzzle lies the
truth of the American country.

_The God of Hell_ opens on a Wisconsin cultivate. A wedded moderately
aged couple, Frank and Emma, lead an apparently non-memorable life. Honest
tends to his cherished dairy animals, while Emma keeps home and affectionately
raises plants. This peaceful scene is disturbed when a baffling figure from
Frank’s school years touches base at the homestead searching for impermanent
living arrangement. Straight to the point has not seen or got notification from the
guest Graig Haynes since school. Indeed, Frank uncovers that he trusted Graig to
be dead. At the point when Graig rises up out of the storm cellar for breakfast, he
hassles to the hosts the significance of his mystery – nobody must realize that he
is at the farmhouse. Soon after Graig arrives, a suited honourable man goes to
the entryway, endeavours to engage Emma and inevitably advances into the
farmhouse. Emma is exasperates by the interloper, for he appears to know
suggest insights in regards to both Emma and Frank. The man speculates that the
couple is harbouring a criminal. The gate crasher is uncovered to be Welch, an
unspecified operator from the administration who has touched base to return
Graig to the secretive and unpropitious Rocky Buttes (24). Welch battles that
Graig has been sullied and is a bearer or the like of radiation. Emma sees that
their houseguest sometimes radiates blue flashes from his fingers. In the long
run, Welch finds the outlaw and torments both the researcher and Frank. Straight
to the point changes into a supporter of Welch. The rancher now wears a suit, demonstrations in a way like Welch and has consented to offer his dairy animals. Welch uncovers an arrangement to drop the now debased bovines into a range in the United States, making a national crisis that will permit the legislature to seize considerably more control. Graig rises up out of the storm cellar drove by Welch on a chain. He is unshod and hooded with anodes appended to his private parts. The specialist walks both men from the farmhouse to their next mission. As Welch leads his two new enthusiasts, he encourages Emma to “Get in venture” (Shepard, *God of Hell* 98). As Emma watches them vanish, her plants start to shine a splendid blue, much the same as the flashes that shot from Graig’s hands.

*The God of Hell* works in a world much nearer to “authenticity,” yet this truth is brought into dissension through the presentation of a power or capacity that challenges ordinary human abilities. In that sense, *The God of Hell* fills in as a bit of sci-fi. Researchers have moved in the direction of Brecht to better clarify the impact the sci-fi sort has upon readers. Thus, this inspiration of sci-fi and Brecht are suitable while considering the progression of *The God of Hell*. At the point when drawing closer sci-fi as a scholarly kind, Istvan Csiscery-Ronay’s hypothesis of novum and Darko Suvin’s psychological alienation help in the deconstruction of the frame. The idea of the novum can be depicted as the “advancement or curiosity in [a science fiction] content from which the most vital refinements between the universe of the story from the world and the reader stem” (Csiscery-Ronay 119). For Suvin, sci-fi makes the remarkable impact of intellectual irritation. This can be portrayed as a reality made abnormal or
strange, however one that throws light on contemporary issues. Like Brecht’s removing or distance impact, sci-fi’s psychological offense “permits [the gathering of people or reader] to perceive a subject, however in the meantime make it appear to be new” (qtd. in Suvin, 60). This mode permits Shepard to arrange a cross examination of the legislative issues of torment by having the group of onlookers really witness re-authorizations of merciless techniques in front of an audience. The sci-fi components make the experience at the same time well known and new.

The God of Hell, similar to Shepard’s easily opinionated Geography of a Horse Dreamer (1974), takes a situation that apparently reflects reality, then presents a novum that destabilizes that comprehended thought of reality. For instance, a significant part of the occasions toward the beginning of Geography of a Horse Dreamer appear to happen in all actuality. The component brought into this the truth is the soothsaying power controlled by a young fellow, Cody. He can foresee with stunning precision the victor of stallion races. Therefore, he is being held hostage by a posse and compelled to share his dreams so they can put down winning wagers. In the end, the play degenerates into a deluge of ostentatious, Sam Peckinpah-enlivened brutality. Also, The God of Hell starts in all actuality, until an outcast (Graig) is presented. Graig has been contaminated with a kind of radiation and it has thus conceded him baffling forces showed through blue jolts that fly from his hands. Dissimilar to a large number of Shepard’s plays, where minor components of the play appear to conflict with suspicions of reality, the novum of The God of Hell (the baffling blue jolts)
quickly moves the work into a shaky domain that lives some place between sci-fi, joke and political parody. Similarly as with Shepard’s refusal to tolerate definitions and outlines between media, Shepard additionally opposes the dependability of a classification. Like Geography of a Horse Dreamer, The God of Hell degenerates into a situation of adapted and ridiculous conduct. As Geography of a Horse Dreamer starts with a “practical” scene and finishes up with a bloodbath, The God of Hell begins as a “homestead adventure” (like Curse of the Starving Class or Buried Child) and closes with hyper, military strides performed by men with terminals appended to their genitalia. With the novum presented, the destabilized desires of the gathering of people in connection to the prototype Shepard play are further problematized. The intertextual relations between Shepard’s work and impacts are permitted to resonate, making fascinating amalgams of symbolism and style that offer a flammable study of American arrangements.

As manliness and worries of the male show up all through Shepard’s work, maybe it is nothing unexpected that a considerable lot of the plays themselves incorporate references to phalluses. This is valid for the Late Style political plays. In reality, The God of Hell not just focuses upon political concerns. The pressures and clashes connected with codes of manliness are a very much treaded subject in Shepard’s corpus, yet they are sought after to an obscurely comic outrageous through investigations of the centrality of the phallus to one’s origination of manliness and the association between manliness and legislative issues.
In *The God of Hell*, Emma, being the sole lady of the play, is apparently resistant to the activities of Welch. He threateningly requests her to “Get in step,” yet Welch cannot drive her to authorize the manly codes of the ideologically moderate government. Welch can just control a male, for he compels the male to submit to manly codes by undermining the casualty’s personality and human signifier of manliness. Correspondingly, Glory Bee can oppose the manly codes of the Colonel and even helps with Stubbs’ usurping of the patriarchy. Key to the expansion and maintenance of the patriarchy is the instillation of dread upon subjects. The endeavour to compel Stubbs to surrender to male codes through debasement is turned around when a recently virile Stubbs seizes control from the Colonel. The conclusion is substantially more dismal in *The God of Hell*, for the manly code typified by the moderate belief system of the administration is by all accounts successful over men, yet women are left with a decision to either agree or oppose the patriarchy. Evidently, the way to holding the patriarchy and manly codes is through the expansion and propagation of manly codes that are authorized through ingraining dread in others. This proliferation of the code requires a kind of adherence and constant establishment of the codes of manliness, yet these codes can be challenged and opposed by women who decline to subscribe to such a belief system.

In *The God of Hell*, Welch undermines different types of strategies for extricating data. At the point when Emma offers imperviousness to Welch, he debilitates that “we could turn to high-need strategies on the off chance that we were compelled to” (*God of Hell* 63). When he finds Graig, Welch insults him,
rhyming Graig’s last name (Haynes) with “Brains, damages, blazes, chains” (67). These terms, as displayed in such an arrangement, allude to a portion of the cold-bloodedness Graig has already persevered. In the end, torment is used on both Frank and Graig as an approach to rebuff and alter or change them. The God of Hell additionally considers the bigger ramifications of the utilization of torment by Americans upon detainees. Truly, George W. Hedge, the Central Intelligence Agency and the Department of Justice utilized activities regarded by the Geneva Convention to be torment. The Bush Administration utilized the expression “improved cross examination,” yet these activities included waterboarding, lack of sleep and tactile over-burden which are to be sure comprehended to be torment. The God of Hell additionally uses visual components to summon an authentic occasion that was uncovered amid the Bush administration. At the point when Graig is walked out in front of an audience taking after his storm cellar session with Welch, Graig is portrayed as “now in T-shirt, uncovered feet, and old khaki jeans. He wears a dark hood on his head” and a “string runs straightforwardly into the fly of Haynes’ jeans” (90). Welch is utilizing the line as a kind of rope to lead the man around. This picture echoes the photos that went with Seymour Hersh’s journalistic uncover of the jail Abu Ghraib. In Abu Ghraib, detainees were stripped, hooded, embarrassed, wired to anodes and drove by rope. Shepard utilizes the symbolism of Abu Ghraib to attract regard for the eagerness of those speaking to an ideologically moderate government to utilize torment and related methods, maybe even against its own natives, particularly the individuals who address or restrict the administration’s
belief system. Further, Shepard’s portrayal of these systems through execution drives the group of onlookers to witness torment.

By and by, the torturer spoils the casualty. This corruption “changes” the casualty of torment into an obeying animal. Generally, torment serves to “prepare” the casualty. Welch is endeavouring to constrain Frank and Graig to consent to his requests and to “get in venture” with the belief system of the administration. This change of the subject is much the same as the “preparation” of a pooch. At the point when Emma sees the hooded and wired Graig, Welch offers her the “rope” that leads Graig and states “It’s much the same as holding the chain of an all-around acted puppy” (61). Despite the fact that torment is physically incurred on the person with the motivation behind extricating data or rebuffing, an auxiliary purpose behind its utilization is the show of the tormented. The person who experiences torment and cross examination serves as a suggestion to others of the results of contradicting the overwhelming force. Towards the beginning of Act II, Frank has been changed by Welch into an “adherent” through torment. Straight to the point can now subscribe to the belief system of Welch while the gathering of people witnesses the “change” through the torment of Graig.

The third scene of the play presents how the tranquil existence of Frank and Emma comes to detonate, for they have lost their actual American personality and are compelled to acknowledge another one. Straight to the point goes into the house as a very surprising character, dressed “in suit and tie
precisely like Welsh’s and conveying an attaché case precisely like Welsh’s”

(34); his external appearance has changed as well as his conduct:

Emma: What’s happened to you? What’s the matter?
Frank: I’ve sold the heifers.
Emma: What?
Frank: I’ve sold the heifers. Money’s in here.
Emma: Why’d you do that, Frank? Those were your replacement heifers.
Frank: Got a good price.
Emma: What’re you doing in that ridiculous suit?
Frank: Mr. Welsh gave it to me. (34)

Welsh, then, could change Frank from a customary rancher wearing boots and chipping away at the farm into another American man with a suit and a tie; by offering his calves, Frank had acknowledged to change his national personality. Emma, who knew from the earliest starting point that Welsh would debilitate their serene life, rejected such changes and cautioned her Welsh as well as from the entire government:

Emma: This guy is taking over our house! He’s taking over our whole life! Stringing up flags! Forcing cookies on me! Who is this guy? We don’t know him from Adam!

Frank: He’s from the government, Emma.

Emma: What government?

Frank: Our government.

Emma: I don’t know what our government is anymore. Do you? What does that mean “our government”? (35)
Emma needs to oppose the force of Welsh for she would not like to grasp the new national character that is constrained by the administration. Welsh’s mystery military exercises are puzzling, however Emma reveals the secret when she expresses that he will remove everything from them; their entire life. The administration itself has gotten to be secretive, along these lines Shepard, through Emma’s words, expresses that the importance of “government” is not clear any longer. Guiltless individuals, for example, Frank, are misinformed by the new American character, for Welsh can persuade him that the administration is more educated than they are.

Frank: That means he knows more than us. He’s smarter than us. He knows the big picture, Emma. He’s got a plan.

Emma: What big picture is that?

Frank: The Enemy. He knows who the Enemy is. (35)

Shepard is propelling a wild assault on Bush’s War on Terror through which the legislature is attempting to persuade individuals that they are battling the foe. Shepard taunts the nearness of an adversary and considers this war as an explanation behind the devastation of the American country itself. This turns out to be clear when Welsh, for the sake of majority rules system, begins to torment Haynes:

Emma: You’re not torturing him, are you? What are you doing?

Welsh: Torturing? Torturing! We’re not in a Third World nation here, Emma. This isn’t some dark corner of the Congo. Frank,
haven’t you told her about our new platform? Our design for the new century? (38)

Haynes is tormented by electric stuns; his state looks like that of the detainees in Abu Graib in Iraq. Notices assume a vital part in introducing America as a perfect country that is better than the nations of the Third World; Shepard needs to demonstrate reality of the new American character that denies the dread it dispatches upon others. Emma cannot trust any of Welsh’s words and considers his goes about as brutal: “This is supreme torment! I couldn’t care less what nation we’re in” (38). The quiet life that she and her significant other used to live vanished and turned into a fantasy that could never be accomplished again.

The play closes with Welsh undermining Frank who has ended up tainted same as Haynes; blue flashes exude from Frank and Haynes as well as even from Emma’s plants uncovering that everything in Wisconsin has been changed. Shepard is furious in his assault of the new government who changes opportunity into subjection and vote based system into autocracy. Through such childish strategy, the postmodern American man is compelled to change his national personality driving him to be completely lost and tormented in another outsider country. A less limit, yet more down to earth and sensible determination to the issue of traditionalist accounts and philosophy is offered by The God of Hell. Toward the end of the play, Emma remains untransformed. The men were simple prey, yet Emma still has the ability to oppose and subvert the preservationist belief system set forth by Welch. In this way, imperviousness to
such doctrine may live in the quality of women. The counterpoint to traditionalist belief system is the safe lady.

*Kicking a Dead Horse* portrays the “stupendous stay” of Hobart Struther into the western scenes of his past. The play starts as Hobart wraps up his dead steed’s grave, which serves as a visual indication of the focal clash in the play. Hobart is stranded in the desert because of the unforeseen demise of his stallion. Out of regard and devotion to the stallion and the rancher perfect, he burrows the steed an appropriate grave. All through whatever is left of the execution, Hobart battles to store the dead weight of the stallion into the grave, a physical fight that serves as a similitude for the mental and passionate fight that Hobart compensation against himself. Hobart, in his mid-sixties, has gone to the leave looking for what he calls “credibility,” a method for living or being that he feels he has lost, however had in his childhood when he functioned as a rancher in the Western abandon. Hobart clarifies his present circumstance at home as being hackneyed and desolate. His marriage is in a bad position, his children have moved away, and he discovers his vocation as a craftsmanship merchant not exactly fulfilling. While the play’s bigger story is installed in admissions and data gave by Hobart, the real occasions in front of an audience are moderately direct. Hobart battles and gets to be furious with the steed, rests while thinking back about his past, spotlights on survival sufficiently long to alleviate his burden or set up a portable shelter, gets a visit from a puzzling and noiseless lady who gives back his cattle rustler cap, and at last stores himself, the steed, and the cowpoke cap in the grave he has burrowed. The play depicts Hobart’s exacting,
figurative, gendered, and legendary passing. It exhibits a blueprint of his biography, the decisions that have driven him to this minute, lastly the acknowledgment that constrains him to enter his own particular grave.

Inside Hobart Struther, the principle character in *Kicking a Dead Horse*, Sam Shepard shows the American myth of the cowhand and the West, while in the meantime grilling the disappointments of mythic cattle rustler manliness in contemporary American culture. Hobart Struther’s trip into the Western abandon to rediscover his past “legitimacy” (or what Bly may allude to as his brilliant ball) appears to come up short in spite of all exertion. Maybe Hobart neglects to find “validness” since his past life is not especially charming. Hobart portrays his “‘more genuine’ days, hanging out useless in lost Wyoming bars, skunk plastered in Silver Dollar cantinas, gazing blurred up at the unbelievable Western paintings no one could perceive any longer through the heaped up years of grime, tobacco juice, and pub fight blood.” The “more genuine” days depicted by Hobart are not characteristic of the wholeness or solidarity that Bly or Jung would recommend we involvement in adolescence before being injured. Rather, Hobart misidentifies his time spent acting as a rancher with his “credible” self. As a general rule, this period would agree with the youthful ruler’s chance went through with Iron John. The beginning of Hobart’s introduction into masculinity is mixed up for his meaning of manliness, and the “legitimacy” he looks for. In his “more genuine” days, Hobart permits the shadow original to control his life, and leaves when he understands his “brilliant hair” potential by perceiving the value of the “breath-taking Western wall paintings.” Hobart does not shroud his
“brilliant hair,” but rather instantly sets to work building up himself in the craftsmanship world. This is standout case of the path in which Hobart misses his chances at advancing towards the “profound manly” or what the play marks “genuineness.”

An examination of Hobart’s past life in more prominent detail will take into consideration a more mind boggling enunciation of both what Hobart is scanning for and what he really had. Hobart reviews the past all through the play in short blasts of imperative, however effectively lost, data. It was a period “when work was work,” “when I worked for a fair living. Back in the times of AUTHENTICITY, when I rode for the brand, as is commonly said: retouching wall, doctoring calves, separating dairy animals” (Kicking a Dead Horse 7). Hobart goes ahead to depict this period as a period of being “absolutely alone [. . . ] It didn’t frighten me any longer. Finish aloneness. Dislike when you’re close to nothing and – oblivious, listening – shouts – far off – broken glass” (10). Especially, the shouts and broken glass show a rehashed local aggravation that denoted Hobart’s childhood.

He has carried on with his life in a condition of single presence, whether we allude to that presence as freedom or depression. From one perspective, Hobart experienced the perfect American long for diligent work and accomplishment by turning into a rich craftsmanship merchant. On alternate, his youth was loaded with dread and seclusion. Plainly, Hobart has been injured profoundly by his broken and brutal adolescence. His days of “validness” check the start of an endeavour to mend his injuries, yet come up short when he
prevails with regards to turning into a well off workmanship merchant. In light of the inability to finish the way to masculinity, and the missed plummet into destitution and lowliness, or what Bly calls “the street to cinders,” Hobart needs and yearnings to come back to his time went through with the wild man, nature, and his brilliant potential keeping in mind the end goal to finish his introduction and recuperate his injuries.

Hobart’s misidentification of the initial phase in the mending procedure with that of the arrangement assist bolts his personality inside the underlying stride. Hobart’s hunt down his “real” past self is undermined by memories that recommend anything besides a brought together, adjusted condition of being. One may contend then, that *Kicking a Dead Horse* misreads mythopoetic start customs that prompt to an adjusted personality. While the tale of Iron John tracks the improvement of a juvenile into his initial adulthood, Bly shows that in actuality the procedure sketched out in the myth can take the vast majority of a man’s life. I propose that the play offers a case of how certain means will every now and again be ignored by American culture for cash, control, esteem, love, and family. On the off chance that we acknowledge that men will experience a wild man stage – of eagerness, animosity, come back to nature, and disclosure of brilliant potential – then why might that same man, having now found his “goldenness,” drop into a condition of neediness? Inside contemporary society, one can perceive how the drop into neediness may be characteristic of any understudy’s excursion through school and into apprenticeship. Hobart’s position inside the underlying phase of male start and incite development to a
condition of riches by perceiving a part of his brilliant potential – recognizing, acquiring, and exchanging important Western craftsmanship – calls attention to the missed stage.

Resounding the way that Hobart’s vision of his past self neglects to experience the standards of “realness” that Hobart is hunting down is the essential picture of the play: the dead stallion. Hobart portrays his final stallion – a similar one that right now lies dead before him: “I had one great one cleared out, out in the Sand Hills on open range. Course, he was only a yearling in those days – enormous, great lookin’ child of a buck, as well” (21). A real remainder of Hobart’s past, the steed implies the “validness” that Hobart looks for. In this way, the demise of the stallion may demonstrate Hobart’s powerlessness to recover the “true” manliness he covets. Conversely, in the event that one looks at the stallion to the significance of steeds in the mythology of Iron John, one finds yet another missed opportunity at proceeding with towards the profound manly. Review that the sovereign in Iron John was compelled to ride out on a three-legged steed that Bly contended symbolized the injuries the ruler had gotten from others as disgrace. Hobart’s steed, while old, is recognized as “large” and “attractive.” The steed starts to connote disgrace when it encounters its own particular physical disease – passing. Not at all like the ruler who rides out on his three-legged stallion – tolerating and recuperating his injuries – Hobart’s response to the disgrace conveyed from a useless steed is to cover it. For Hobart the disgrace spoke in the demise of his steed nearly ties into his deserting and discount attacking of the West for important bits of workmanship. Hobart does
not have any kind of male good example to swing to when the disgrace of his
dead steed influences his capacity to proceed on the way to “legitimacy.” Truth
be told, Hobart straightforwardly causes the steed’s demise by “feed[ing] him a
nosebag brimming with oats,” something he asserts he ought to “have known
better” than to do. Thusly, Hobart really speaks to the reason for his own
particular disgrace, and conceivably the disappointment of his scan for
“credibility.” Hobart’s disgrace envelops losing his Western roots, offering
Western perfect works of art, moving to the city, lastly coincidentally executing
his stallion. Covering these wounds, which the stallion means, keeps the
recuperating and change of the injuries into brilliant potential and the “profound
manly.”

Hobart depicts his life as a hackneyed presence of only sitting on
couches, “steady pacing,” and “blasts of anger” or brutality. The reason for this
presence, Hobart appears to propose, is the way that the children are all raised
and that his association with his better half has weakened, however it appears to
be more probable that the absence of satisfaction his vocation has as of late
offered him makes his tension about his kids and spouse. In this way, as Hobart
endeavours to move from a provider and ferocious specialist into a familial
group, he gets to be baffled at the disclosure of his truant kids and despondent
marriage. As per Hobart, he and his significant other “got to be – tolerant, I
presume.... Except for those incidental times when she’d detonate and call me a
butt hole. Those were the minutes I all of a sudden understood the profundity of
her outrage. The amount she profoundly detested me.... Then we’d unavoidably
go noiseless” (15). A man’s life beforehand characterized by his position at work or in the public arena, yields openings in which Hobart has obviously been not able enjoy.

A fascinating correlation can be drawn between Hobart’s absence of satisfaction and the three stallions – red, white, and dark – that the youthful ruler rides inside Iron John. “As I’ve noted over, every steed speaks to a phase in the beginning of a young fellow. Hobart depicts his work as “the thrill of the kill” and “the ecstasy of power” (16). Hobart’s all-consuming purpose then encapsulates the principal phase of start: Hobart is a red knight. In spite of his prosperity, Hobart likewise takes note of that the energy he once felt for his vicious business has “evaded” (16) him. Bly would contend that since he did not proceed on his custom way, he does not have the capacity to advance, and turn out to be either a white or dark knight, which would furnish him with a feeling of satisfaction in his later years. Hobart’s vocation figures conspicuously in his view of self, yet has demonstrated hazardous by soiling him inside the principal phase of improvement towards getting a bound together self, or wholeness. In Hobart’s words he “removed truckloads of goods from that nation before anybody even started to pay heed” (16). Hobart sees his obtaining of overlooked and renowned Western workmanship as a demonstration of robbery that has polluted his past self’s character. As it were, it has secured him in the main phase of start and keeps him from moving towards genuine “credibility” as characterized by Iron John. June Singer’s Boundaries of the Soul: The Practice of Jung’s Psychology brings up that “if [a man is] sufficiently adaptable then to
turn [his] regard for exercises in which the anima has a chance to be communicated, [he] will discover different sorts of attempts that will keep on stimulating [him] and empower [him] to give of [his] long experience to guide others somehow” (Singer 191). Hobart’s failure to manage his declining satisfaction at work, has abandoned him doubting his self-realization, his “credibility”(191).

Kenneth Clatterbaugh states, “The man who is in congruity knows both his shadow and his anima, and acknowledges them as parts of himself. That acknowledgment, thusly, is self-learning, and it re-establishes the solidarity lost in youth” (Clatterbaugh 99). Hobart’s answer for discovering balance appears to concentrate on the shadow model, like Bly’s Iron John, which is connected with bestial male attributes like animosity, confidence, and strength, and which will prompt to a lopsided grown-up male. Indeed, Shepard attracts regard for the clashing prime examples inside Hobart’s mind by part the character and permitting Hobart to exchange with himself. The two personas obviously have varying personalities that perhaps check them as shadow and anima:

She? You’re not going to tell me you’re actually missing someone now, are you?
The wife? The kids. The mom. The Dead.
She was amazing to me. She was.
Was?
Is. Still. But then –
In the past?
Yes in the past. She was beyond belief. I thought I’d died and gone to heaven.
Oh please – spare me.
She was –
What? Authentic, I suppose?
Beyond –
What’s that? What’s beyond authentic?
More – more than you can imagine.
Don’t make me puke. You put yourself in this situation, now face the music. *(Kicking a Dead Horse 19)*

The primary persona to talk commands alternate, does all the scrutinizing, and questions the significance of individual associations that the second persona appears to feel for women, particularly his better half. Along these lines, the primary persona introduces the shadow original while the second uncovers the anima. The qualification between the two, particularly as for their objectives, makes it clear that Hobart’s separated self is in strife instead of congruity. The shadow is centred on survival and essential mortal needs, while the anima appears to be engrossed with the past, individual connections, and their significance to Hobart’s life. The anima recalls the injuries of Hobart’s past, while the shadow endeavours to urge Hobart into proceeding onward and overlooking all the torment he has encountered. Both of these points of view are imperative to the production of a bound together entirety. Shepard’s utilization of the divided and incoherent character of Hobart delineates the disappointment of conventional patriarchy to make a self-completed personality. On another level, it demonstrates the fight between the extraordinary manly and lady-like
methods of personality creation, and how conventional manliness’ inability to perceive and join forces with the anima – female – makes the issues of patriarchy.

Hobart’s failure to manage his injuries has prompted to this part in his own particular view of the world. Bly recommends there are two essential ways a man can take after as he adapts to his injuries; like the shadow, he can overlook and forego by “moving up over the injury and the disgrace” or, similar to the anima, he can “live inside the injury” and investigate his victimhood. An adjustment of both of these points of view is required for the self to exploit the injury and start to utilize it as an instrument. Hobart’s self – the binding together harmony between the anima and the shadow – tries to re-emerge at the times amid which Hobart is not talking with himself, but rather is obviously excessively powerless, making it impossible to influence any enduring reunification. In this mode Hobart scrutinizes himself for believing that his excursion into the wild would make him “some way or another vibe marvellously settled? One with the wild? All of a sudden – just from being over here, I’d gotten to be what? What? Entirety? After an entire lifetime of being broken, beat down, I’d all of a sudden turned out to be entirety?” (23). In this line Hobart remembers he is broken, and in his discussion with himself he sees that there is “all the more then [he or himself] can envision past the ‘genuineness’ he is looking for. Hobart knows the ‘legitimacy’ he looks for is just a lesser type of what is conceivable. Truth be told, Hobart’s arrangement to come back to the wild to recuperate his injuries places him at the beginning stage
of the mythopoetic custom to get the “profound manly” (23). While Hobart’s underlying activities are demonstrative of what the mythopoetic development may point towards, his inability to travel through the stage recommends the development’s powerlessness to make or restore the “profound manly.” Hobart’s battle and disappointment in the leave makes a disagreement of confidence in the manly personality epitomized in the steed, the rancher and the West, while at the same time proposing the failure, difficulty, and disappointment of original American manliness to adjust new types of character.

All through Kicking a Dead Horse, Shepard entangles the images of the colossal American West truly and figuratively, installing the idea of a characterized, “genuine” manliness inside the re-enacted playing space that is the theatre. Maybe the most noteworthy analogy in the show first shows up in the title – Kicking a Dead Horse – which flags the character’s outrage and dissatisfaction at having lost the solace and control he once kept up over his personality. The focal picture and the title of the play – joined with Hobart’s dismay with the exacting demise of his stallion – indicate a study of mythopoetic standards and their endeavoured restoration of “profound manly” attributes. Essentially, the play works with the motivation behind humanizing the sorts of manliness celebrated by mythopoetic inside the body of the steed. Typically then, the play contends that this sort of manliness is dead and communicates disappointment at its inability to give an important personality.

Towards the end of the play Hobart stops the exchange between his two personas and starts to talk straightforwardly to the dead steed: “Perhaps both of
us – huh? Perhaps that is it. The two of us were intended to go down worse than broke. Do you suspect as much? Perhaps that is precisely it. The two of us” (38). The move comes after a warmed wrath of kicks grounds on the stallion’s body and Hobart falls, physically and sincerely depleted. Along these lines, the steed and Hobart’s shadow persona are connected to the same being. They are both appearances of his longing to come back to the initial step of his manly start, and both betray him in his hour of need. Perceiving or anticipating his shadow into the body of the stallion permits Hobart to comprehend the vital passing of that a portion of him, and, with it, his own particular devastation. It appears that Hobart’s consistent fight to cover the steed was the same beyond reconciliation battle he confronted inside his own particular broke character. At last, Hobart declares: “Cap like that shouldn’t be down in an opening. Fresh out of the plastic new cap” (34). Barely even got an opportunity to break it in. Gradually, he moves down into the gap where he initially made his passageway, vanishing. Long interruption, then the dead stallion hammers forward, this time downstage, with a strong blast joined by bass timpani offstage, tidy surging up, filling the stage. The steed falls into the gap with simply its take staying off.

Hobart, basically, causes his own downfall and effectively covers himself. Truth be told, each part of the customary Western manliness is kept in the grave: the cap, the steed, and the cowhand. Hobart was not able fulfil the fundamental changes to his manly personality, which R.C. Peck recommends a man must do as he ages. Nor was he ready to come back to the initial step and advance
forward in the male start custom depicted by Robert Bly’s Iron John. At last, Hobart has no option yet beyond words.

With Hobart’s demise and the entombment of the cap, the stallion, and the cattle rustler, the play creates a picture of conventional manliness that has stand out option: passing. Along these lines, *Kicking a Dead Horse* proposes the need to move far from patriarchal control and hidden “otherworldly” endeavours to recapture manly power. Sadly, the play additionally neglects to give whatever other choices to a man like Hobart. The play asks and battles with the imperative question of how to start and keep up a solid manliness that conforms to the necessities of a man as he ages.

Despite the fact that *Kicking a Dead Horse* indicates similitudes to the mythopoetic development, it appears to evaluate and make unmistakable the issues and difficulties that the mythopoetic model of start and advancement contains. In the event of inability to modify and keep up one’s brought-together-self-personality demonstrates a physical or passionate demise, then achievement could mean a shot at self-completion and maybe another type of manliness. At last, the main answer gave is an inadmissible one: men who cannot change pass on.

Sam Shepard’s play *Kicking a Dead Horse* offers a one of a kind point of view on the emergency of manliness in American culture. It turns out to be obvious that even Hobart Struther, who has attempted to keep up a conventional manliness, knows about the need to change the American male; yet for him an
answer does not exist. By exhibiting the subject of contemporary men’s emergency of character and neglecting to discover an answer, the play challenges crowd individuals to connect with and discover a response for themselves. Through Hobart’s demise, *Kicking a Dead Horse*, in some courses endeavours to pick up the sensitivity of the gathering of people and revive or mend the misled manliness Hobart speaks to. The play echoes the thoughts of the mythopoetic development, which is a standout amongst the most prominent answers for the assumed emergency of manliness that has surfaced in the most recent a quarter century. *Kicking a Dead Horse* censures the manliness of the American West, however neglects to propose any option. Eventually, the play gives a glance at the American male toward the end of his life, after he has raised a family, get to be rich and effective, and lost his feeling of “credibility.”

The absence of satisfaction in the life of Hobart Struther asks for another model of manliness, and serves as both a notice to men who give their lives to manly standards that will demonstrate ruinous and a supplication to a similar society to have felt sorry for on the customary type of manliness. Notwithstanding whether the play endeavours to express sorry for or asks the making of another manliness, the reality remains that the steed is dead, and the need to supplant it is extraordinary.

*Ages of the Moon* possesses irregular domain in Sam Shepard’s assortment of work. Shockingly delicate and kind for the mind who composed *Curse of the Starving Class, True West*, and *Buried Child*, the Pulitzer Prize-winning play that got its Louisville debut from Bunbury and executive Steve
Woodring under two years back. Like Shepard’s earlier plays, this one investigates the force of recollections, regardless of how blemished. While recollections can associate individuals, Shepard demonstrates their energy to distance individuals.

The play *Ages of the Moon* (2009) is a one demonstration play by Sam Shepard. There are just two characters in the play – Ames and Byron who are companions to each other. At the point when the play opens, we come to realize that Ames has been expelled from his home by his significant other for his disloyalty. Ames then calls his deep-rooted companion Byron for good support and to give him organization in his division. Byron comes to give him organization in this circumstance. All through the play, these two characters discuss their past encounters, express their dissatisfactions in their lives, and discuss women, shroud of the moon and numerous different things. They additionally battle with each other, manhandle each other and after that get re-joined together. The play closes unexpectedly. Toward the end of the play, the characters simply gaze at the moon from a similar place where they meet towards the beginning of the play. There is no advancement in the activity of the play.

Sam Shepard has composed around fifty plays, every one of them manage the American family straightforwardly or in a roundabout way. As Roudane puts it, “American family is the focal subject of all his plays” (Roudane 4). In any case, the plays like *Buried Child, True West, A Lie of the Mind*, and *The Late Henry Moss* are called family plays and these plays have been only committed to
American family life in postmodern time. Shepard being one of the productive postmodern dramatists makes a study of the postmodern American family through his plays. In spite of the fact that the play *Ages of the Moon* does exclude in the hover of family plays, it demonstrates the method for American family life in a roundabout way.

The content is not an immediate representation of American family as there are no conventional connections of a family. The play portrays postmodern family in America through the crystal of how the absence of a conventional family tells upon the mind of the general population. In spite of the fact that the vast majority of the researchers have not considered it a family play, the appalling occasions that are being unfurled in the play by making lives of both the characters repetitive and sad have underlying drivers in family matters. Ames and Byron encounter a void in their lives as a result of the dismissal or the passing of their spouses. Aside from a few references to their spouses who are not effectively exhibit in the play, there are no different characters who come exuberant on the stage. So both the characters are tossed into disengagement to seek the importance of their lives. Ames and Byron are companions who meet following quite a while of partition and come to realize that both have endured misfortune and have been not able to scaffold that hole in their lives. Both have turned out to be exceptionally delicate now and get effectively affronted by a scarcest comment that is not planned to outrage. Both are in a path casualty of postmodern self-sufficiency to people in which adhering to family and its qualities is considered as snags in the method for the advance of a person.
Postmodern liberal individualistic structure puts stock in amplifying the self-rule of a person which comes at the field of breaking social texture in view of adoration to an option model of living in light of hired soldier interests. The representation of this disconnection is best found in the lives of Ames and Byron.

Ames and Byron are ludicrous characters whose life gets to be ridiculous and trivial in light of the fact that they do not have any customary family joins. They do not have any point and feel miserable as an aftereffect of broken family connections. Despite the fact that they are in the late sixties their life is not steady and they carry on like youngsters. They regularly battle each other, mishandle each other and get re-joined out of dissatisfaction. They discuss women, sex, and other indecent things and in the meantime having liquor all through the play. This demonstrates their feeling of distance and broken connection with the past: “Individuals who have a significant crave anything – the long for medications, the want sex – this appetite is an immediate reaction to a significant feeling of vacancy and aloneness, perhaps, or disconnectedness”(Bigsby 11).

Both characters in the play regret their past, which has made their lives lamentable and tedious, while offering their past encounters to each other. Ames feels miserable and offers path to a feeling of distance after he is exiled by his significant other. He feels distanced from his home and family and he does not prefer to carry on with an existence of estrangement and partition:
Ames: Maybe I’ve been out here on my own too much.
Byron: That’s quite possible.
Ames: Out of touch.
Byron: Could be.
Ames: It’s not good.
Byron: What.
Ames: Being so…remote, like this. *(Ages of the Moon 8)*

Despite the fact that Byron gives him organization after Ames’ expulsion, Byron himself feels destitute and encounters a feeling of distance after the demise of Lacey as he recounts the narrative of Lacey to his companion Ames:

Byron: (Still on knees) Funny, isn’t it? I never could’ve imagined I’d be out here like this. Some strange state. How’d you wind up out here anyway? Middle of some night – some moon – where the hell are we supposed to be? The East? The South? East of the Mississippi? Woods. Creeks. Frogs. Where is this? Doesn’t feel like home to me.

Ames: No.
Byron: Doesn’t feel anything like home to me.
Ames: No. Byron: ‘Course, nothing does anymore since Lacey died. (39)

After the demise of Lacey he feels estranged, disconnected and vagrancy from the outside world. Therefore, his life gets to be ludicrous and good for nothing.

Demise of Lacey all of a sudden turns into the focal concentration of both the characters. Lacey is one of those characters who let us know the importance
of social relations particularly the familial ones. Lacey is presented amidst the play by Byron as his better half or spouse who is as of now dead. Passing of Lacey is one of those episodes which convey inside the essentialness of family. Generally, the deplorability of both the characters emerges from their absence of having a place. Neither Byron nor Ames has a family or its individuals to partner themselves with. The absence of having a place and the disappointment thereof are expressed in the very demonstration of Byron conveying his dead spouse on his back for quite a long time without anyone seeing in the boulevards and the reasons he gives for individuals not seeing her being dead is that he had held her on his back which felt like he was giving her a piggyback ride. The institution of this dissatisfaction by Byron itself clarifies his separation and the shock he gets from the passing of his significant other. In a customary family, loss of one relative is misfortune for everybody and everybody has a similar distress. Be that as it may, in the mechanical world in which Byron lives, has no one to impart his misfortune but to the dead. The social distance of Byron and Ames can well be acknowledged from the way that there is no reference at all to their other relatives in the whole play. It is simply after Ames calls him for the good and passionate bolster that he uncovers about the demise of his better half:

I packaged her everything up. There was some snow left… I packaged her everything up in sweaters and her blue terry fabric robe. Sew top pulled down over her ears. I shut her eyelids and wrapped her arms around me so it appeared as though she was simply riding on my back. Embracing me. Piggy back. Like this…
I stuffed her frosty delivers my pockets and held them there and we strolled all over town like that. (38)

The characters in his plays are divided and their association with the past has been lost. They wind up in an intricate and centreless world. They feel distanced and separated from the outside world and are not part of any social world. As Bigsby puts it:

His characters live intermittent lives. Some association has been broken amongst themselves and the past (mythic and authentic), amongst themselves and their families, their sweethearts, even the dialect they talk. Encounter comes in sections. … .His is a universe of far off echoes, of stories that have lost their point, people who have streamlined their lives out of tension or energy. These are such a large number of Gatsbys survey life through a solitary window, blinded by the splendour of a fixation, rehashing themselves so that the general thought of character gets to be suspect. (Bigsby 27-28)

In Ages of the Moon, both characters have lost their touch with the past, their sweethearts and the general public also. They are divided and broken characters. They are not ready to recall their past encounters appropriately which comes just in discontinuity:

Byron: Minor?
Ames: Well, you know –
Byron: No, I don’t know. They’re all major, as far as I’m concerned. At this point.
Ames: Not something lasting – memorable.
Byron: Aha! Quickly forgotten.

Ames: Exactly. (*Ages of the Moon 7*)

Byron additionally neglects to recall the past. Despite the fact that Byron can recollect a few occasions of the past however in the meantime, he neglects to recall Ames to be there with him:

Byron: Went to the Derby one time and they were selling thousand dollar shots of this stuff in goldplated mint julep cups. Flowery engraving all around the rim. Remnants of the aristocracy.

Ames: I remember that.

Byron: I don’t remember you there. (16)

While portraying the anecdote about Roger Miller to Byron, Ames frequently overlooks the story and it is Byron who recalls that him where he was in the story. He lets it know in parts and it appears that it is difficult for Ames to relate the past encounters for he has lost the association with the past:

Ames: Now, where was I?

Byron: We were all drunk and stoned.

Ames: You weren’t! I was.

Byron: Okay. Okay. (21)

The loss of memory is the consequence of their broken association with their past and their friends and family which dependably possess their psyches and which make their lives purposeless, sad and appalling. Shepard really paints the photo of postmodern America where a man’s life has gotten to be ridiculous for he has lost his touch with his past and family.