CHAPTER VI

Stylistic Layers (iv)

Facial Design

The last stylistic layer to be discussed is the mask inextricably bound with the actor’s role and personality.

Historical Convention

Masks were required in all plays written for the highly formal classical theatre of Athens. Historically, the use of masks in Greek Drama whether originating in the mere desire for a disguise of the ancient theatre. In the first place the masks enabled a small number of actors to carry a much larger number of parts. Secondly the mouthpiece magnified the sound of the actor’s voice, and thus helped to counteract the outstanding fact in the physical arrangement of ancient theatres viz. their huge size. But in particular they have a bearing upon another feature of the classic drama—a feature also highly appreciated by modern audiences i.e. the delicate play of expression on the mobile faces of the performers. In antiquity such refinements could scarcely have been seen outside of the orchestra. “Facial expression would have been lost in the vastness of the Athenian play house; the mask gave typical expression in more easily visible form.”¹ A partial substitute was occasionally found in a change of mask during the performance made possible by keeping the character off-stage at the time when his physical or mental state was supposed to be modified by some misfortune or accident e.g. some one’s eyes being put out behind the scenes as in Sophocles’ Oedipus the King.

Further, the use of masks in ancient plays made for the lack of a playbill. In old Comedy contemporaneous personages were often introduced and their masks were true enough to life for their identity to be recognisable
before the actors had uttered a word. According to a late anecdote, at the
presentation of Aristophanes' Clouds Socrates rose from his place and remained
standing during the whole performance so that strangers in attendance might
recognise the original of his double on the stage.\(^2\) But the playbill value
of masks was seen more fully in the case of more or less conventionalised
characters, especially in New Comedy. Pollux, a second century A.D. writer
describes 39 such masks for tragedy and 44 for New Comedy. In the Compendium
he details different masks of tragedy of six old men, eight young men, three
varieties of slave servants and eleven types of masks for women characters.\(^3\)

Like the tragic actors the performers in Comedy wore masks, although
without the onca, so typical of tragic grandeur. Onca was a lofty head-
dress which covered over the mask, reminding us at times of the feathery
headdress of Restoration heroes and of the typically dressed performers in
Chinese drama. This onca and ocaturnus, ("boots with a heavy wooden sole")
"must have raised an actor of 6 foot to well over 7 foot 6 inches.\(^4\) According
to Pollux, the New Comedy masks were: 9 for old and elderly persons; eleven
for youths; seven for slave servants and seventeeth for those of women servants -
both young & old.\(^5\)

Again, from the indications given by him in the catalogue of masks,
we come to know how age, class, birth, and nature of the wearer were symbolized
by special features. Colour of hair, for instance, indicated the first; while
nose-meases were ascribed to characters of low birth. Colour and ornaments
characterised the courtesans and hair-dress the married and unmarried women.
Eyebrows, lips, and complexion were freely used to indicate temperament and
mental condition, the object of these being to allow the spectators at a glance
to grasp the main features of the person represented.

In the O'Neillian dramaturgy the use of masks is perhaps the most
intriguing problem. O'Neill's use of masks, it may be observed, was not
conventionalised. In folk and faith have demonstrated in different ways, his use in an easy stunt. For is the idea underlying the device limited to mask plays proper. Figuratively speaking, nearly all O'Neill's protagonists wear a mask, hiding their true selves from the world and from themselves. His *Down for the Count* (1907) - "One's outer life passes in a solitude haunted by the masks of others; one's inner life passes in a solitude bounded by the masks of oneself" - applies to a great deal of his non-mask plays as well. As Van Dyke points out, borrowing a phrase from the playwright himself, the typical O'Neill play is an exercise in unmasking.

Background History in O'Neill

Nevertheless, there is a background history of the use of the mask as a visual device - our concern at present - in O'Neill himself.

It is in *Lazarus* (1901), that the word "mask" occurs twice in the dialogue for the first time and there the more conventional idea that we wear masks i.e. pose to one another appears than Mrs. Fraser tells Roylton about her husband:

> He never could see his business in all its hideousness as I came to see it, and I don't think he wore a mask just for my benefit; but you never can tell.

Ironically, the remark is truly applicable, not so much to her. Fraser as to Roylton, who hides an ugly emotion behind his 'mask' of upperclass, correct and maker of new values, Mrs. Fraser later discovers this. "Your cruel vanity has torn off the mask," she tells him. In *The Hairy Apes*, O'Neill felt in retrospect that from the opening of scene IV onwards all the faces York encounters should be masked. Actually, York's growing alienation from the world is suggested in the play by mask-like effects. Thus the stoker in scene 4 have a black coal make-up around their eyes, "giving them a queer, sinister expression," which they did not have in the opening scene, then York still felt not only that he belonged to them, but was, in fact, their leader. The "rouged, Calvinised, dyed, overdressed" Fifth Avenue women are virtually masked. And the I.W.W. Secretary's eyeshade modestly approximates a hiding mask.
In a number of plays the faces of the characters are compared to masks in the stage directions. This has the effect of invariably reducing the characters to being mere automatons or victims of extreme grief. Thus Mrs. Noyo's face in *Beyond the Horizon*, after the death of her husband and the failure of her beloved son Robert to keep the farm and his marriage prospering,

has lost all character, disintegrated, become a mask, a mask wearing a helmet, a helmet of superficial expression of being constantly on the verge of suffocating tears.”

Cutting Light's face in *Proser "In a mask of quicken longing*” after his wife's death and his son's desertion and disavowal of religion. Mrs. Leid's face in Act II of *Strange Interlude* is a pale expressionless mask, drained of all emotional response to human contact; the deaths of her lover and father and the crushing experience at the army hospital leave her less than alive. Lavinia's face, similarly, "becomes distorted into an ugly mask of grief" when he thinks of his recently dead mother, to whom he stood in an Oedipal relationship. In these cases the mask seems to express simply a deathly state of mind which effect was to be achieved on the stage with the help of make-up and facial expressions.

The mask in O'Neill is usually associated with death. Ben Greet's is different, finally realizing that she has wasted her own life as well as Caleb's, 'dies' before she takes her life: her face "in O'Neill into an expressionless mask, her eyes are dead-stared, pale and lifeless." "Ben Greet in *Three Plays*. Similarly, "strains above stonily" her face "a fatalistic mask of acceptance," before she voluntarily ends her life.

In *Buried* Death itself is masked; we see a tall mournful figure . . . shrouded in long draperies of a blue that is almost black. The face is a pale mask with a stare straight ahead with a stoic penetration . . . ."

This description recalls Ruth Noyo in Act III Scene of *Beyond the Horizon*.
A heavy shawl is wrapped about her shoulders, half concealing her face of deep mourning ... Her pale, deeply-lined face has the story.

This description gives us the picture of Ruth not as a mourning mother but of petrified grief, of death in life, wearing the mask of frozen emotions.

Raecher in Oedipus also momentarily wears the mask of death. In a need to assert himself against her despotic husband, she tells him dishonestly that she loves John; her face at this point is "deadly pale," a mask of hatred. In Act II, Scene I when her face "becomes mask-like, her body rigid, her eyes closed"21 under John's influence, it is an altogether truthful expression of her feelings of hatred, self-loathing and spiritual death. Her face representing a pose, the mask is an integral part of her character.

The same holds true, generally, about O'Neill's masked characters. In dealing with the mask-like symbols, we should not think so much in terms of surface and depth of persons and shadow as in terms of conflicting impulses of death and life, hatred and love, Nietzschean pride and Christian humility. In this context the mask-like faces - the "mask" consisting of heavy make-up, instead of masks proper in The Hairy Ape - Electra are significant. But before discussing it we would consider another function of the mask in O'Neill and also study the genesis of the masks in his case.

Mask is used by O'Neill in none of his plays as a defensive wall. When Caleb is rejected by Mama in Act I of HiJew, his face "gets its concealment mask of unmentionableness."22 And thirty years later we still find the same mask-like expression on his face, "belied only by his eyes," which "cannot conceal an inward struggle."23 Clearly Caleb's mask-like expression visualizes not merely the guilelessness of his fate but also his attempt to cope with it, to harden himself against it, which means to die a little. Thus, the "mask" designed to protect against disruptive emotions which would lead to self-annihilation, substitutes death-in-life for death, slow destruction for an instantaneous one. Similarly Sybilla Cole in Boeklo:คนนี้น่าๆ นกว่าคุณ, a staid like Caleb, "$page two

...
much" when he learn from Nibbie, that the child she has just mothered to death was not his but communications; and he explains the significance of the facial change himself when thinking aloud: "Isn't it be ... like a stone ... a rock 'o' judge-
ment?" 22

The genesis of the mask, as used by O'Neill in such plays as The Great
God Prom, All God's Chillun Got Rains, From Without 3rd, Journey's Began, etc.,
& Lonesome Land, is psychological and may be described as follows: Before the
discovery of sin, man enjoyed primordial unity with the "Old God" - Nature - and
there was no need for hiding i.e. no need to wear 'masks'. Then man was separated
from nature the situation changed. Unable to return to his harmonious origin,
unable likewise to accept his new, painful status, man became divided against
himself, one part of him - the open, naive, romantic side - longings to return to
the lost paradise, the other rational part of him trying to adjust to the earthly
hell. At times one side or the other becomes so predominant that the total
character becomes nearly fused with it. Thus the Lornson are almost identified with
the 'mask'; whereas Nibbie and Christine are closely related to the 'face'. Levinia
represents the fatal balance of the two forces and her development is from
the 'mask' to 'face' and back to 'mask'.

In view of this symbolic interpretation the characters cease to be
individuals but become types of the two dispositions of the human soul. By the
same token the marriage between Dan & Christine symbolizes the unhappy state
of men; her attempt to free herself from his control man's attempt to free himself
from his 'mask'; and her love for Grant, as like the young mama, , is an
ironical illustration of man's inability to escape his 'mask'. The man, similarly,
despite their longing to discard their 'mask' and revert to naked, primordial
unity, find life too hard to bear without this protective armour, and not until
they die, can they unmask themselves. Moreover - and this is really important
from our point of view - the mask, with its alienating effect, enables the audience
to see that the staged events are not to be taken at their realistic - often
self-deceptive - surface value, and that the real drama "takes place on a plane where outer reality is mask of true inner reality." 25

Subsequent usage.

A preliminary distinction, though blurred by later complications, will indicate the three different ways in which he employed masks: for stage crowds (The Ancient Mariner); as a central symbol for a piece of property (All God's Chillun Got Wings); and as symptoms of the divided personalities of individuals (From Without In). The Great God Brown, his real mask is in a study in a play in which different lines of development converge.

The mask, as a piece of property, is used for the first time in The Haunted House, where it is worn by the medicine man as a traditional part of his costume. In The Nibby Are, in the Fifth Avenue Scene, we have a usage "in the symbolic sense of the Greek theatre, as the Colle call it." 26 O'Neill, however, does not specify the masks which were employed in the production, and the resulting success gave him further incentive to continue experimenting with them. The group of masked choristers, resembling Frankenstein monsters, in fact, represent the mingling of the two connotations: those of lifelessness and of anonymity.

The relations between an individual and a crowd gathered more and more significance in O'Neill's imagination, first in realistic plays like The Age of the Caribbees and The Hairy Ape, then in all of his pageant plays for the Imaginative Theatre. An indication of O'Neill's sympathy for the individual is given by his depreciatory use of masks in Emperor Jones, and leaving the hero unmasked. Here, in the words of a critic, "a fantastic multiplication of masks . . . proved happily to be the flood-tide of this phase of O'Neill's experimentation." 27 It was preceded by The Fountain showing a veiled woman's face in its climax; and the crowning over Huia-Chin's death was solemnized by a masked chorus in House of Lilith.

The Ancient Mariner by Samuel Taylor Coleridge, the only poem O'Neill
over tried to adapt for the stage, is an interesting exercise in the use
of masks for stage crowds. Faced with the dilemma of identifying between the six
supernatural scenes, the crew of the ship, and the three realistic guests, O'Neill
resorted to the compromise solution of employing "mask-like faces" (a similar
solution was later used in *Theatrical Scenes Sketches*, though in different circum-
stances). The crew of the ship and their pantomime and recitation are used to
visualise and accentuate the strange adventures on the far-away sea. The major
speaking parts are those of the mariner himself and of the third wedding guest,
who acts as a mirror to the mariner by repeating his gestures and reflecting his
state of mind. This guest is, significantly enough, without a mask, "naturally
alive - a human being," while the other two "have mask-like faces of maya,
comparative stillness," and "walk like rameketters." The second mariner, who form
the chorus and the later wear the masks of holy spirits and of angels belong to
the sphere of the supernatural.

Yet keeping with his previous and later experiments O'Neill wanted to
establish another contrast with the masks: that between "the mariner and the
unthinking mass of masking," by showing the bride and groom calling "like the
happy dolls" and kissing "as dolls nightly," and the shadows of the dancing guests
"come and go on the window like shadowgraphs." This arrangement, however, did not
satisfy O'Neill and he apparently adopted the method of furnishing the first and
second guests with masks which would have resulted in confusion. Hence the
compromise solution referred to above.

There is another compromise to the play: among the apparitions Death
wears the mask of a black skull "a black skeleton - the mask of a black skull
on a role of ventilis and rust(*)", but the accompanying woman has a face "like
a white skull - (make up not mask) - vampirish and terrible in a role of pale
red like blood(?); dilute with water?"

This, it may be noted, is not mere whim
but a deliberate attempt to make her stand out among the apparitions, as she is
the only female ghost.

The masks in The Ancient Mariner also stress O'Neill's interest in "called life" spirituality. This belief in the expressiveness of the masks is echoed by James J. Light, a stage director associated with the Provincetown group:

"We are using masks in 'The Ancient Mariner' for this reason; 'the writer in the Playbill, that we wish to project certain dramatic motifs through that spiritual atmosphere which the mask peculiarly gives ... the mask cannot represent life ... but it can be used, as we are trying to use it, to show the eyes of tragedy and the face of exaltation." 24

By leaving the mariner and the third guest, his listeners unconvinced he, thus, "value clear the connection between genuine vitality and spiritual vision." 25

There are examples of the pure spiritual usage of light in the play: "a mystic halo surrounds it" (the Mysterious) with light. 26 There is moonlight and "too blinding the sun. 27 A mystic light proceeds from it" (the corpse of the Mysterious) 28 then disappears from it. Similarly there is "Blinding sunshine - terific heat!" 29 as in Pinter and Gold's "(there are lots of ghosts, of course). And as the sun rises to lift "A strange beautiful light comes (? from the sky and settles on the man's bodies. ... their masks are changed. They now have those of holy spirits with halos about their heads!" 30 The Chorus of spirits "have ... the masks of angels, while robins, haloes. A dazzling light surrounds them, needing to protect from them." 31

Robert E. West Jones, one of the triumvirate - Jones - Chapman - O'Neill in the first Provincetown Playbill of the 1923-24 season indicates some of the principles which doubtless influenced O'Neill in his novel treatment of the Coleridge poem. "Gradually ... we have arrived at the plastic theatre. The director of today thinks in terms of sculpture and arranges his actors in powerfully expressive groups as a sculptor might wish to arrange them. The playwright sees his characters in the round. The scene-designer models with.
light. O'Neill and the whole Provincetown group presumably believed in the
beautifying power of their theatre machinery: it was possible to realize to
visual images on the stage by approximating them though the masks and
lights. The visual images, however, cannot without damage be translated direc-
tly into scenic pictures. For instance, when moonlight is created on the stage
by the light technician, the result is just a naive demonstration, an over-
pictorialization, diametric to poetry. The Ancient Mariner is a suggestive
poem because of its twilight fusion of real and supernatural elements, whereas
O'Neill introduces the latter as well on the stage. The word "spirit" is more
awesome as a word in its proper context than as a figure rising beside a word
in its proper context than as a figure rising beside a stage ship, even if
it is "all in white places like a new crystal". The audience are hardly
unconscious of sitting in the theatre and looking at some one dressed as a
spirit, and seeing, in all probability, constantly similarly around. O'Neill
should have given the visual images of the poem a different kind of treatment
instead of literally translating them into a corresponding string of scenic
pictures. True, O'Neill's play is frankly an adaptation, his own additions (not
counting the stage directions) amount to fewer than a dozen words, plus an
occasional repetition of a phrase from the poem. But, as Bacon points out, the
adaptation suffers from an odd mixture of different scenic forms: the text is
partly dramatized, partly read aloud, and partly interpreted through pantomime.

May be, O'Neill was so much obsessed by the classical nature of the poem
that he considered it an act of sacrilege to make any departures from it. Hence
he's too heavy a reliance on the masks and other scenic means of expression which,
evertheless, is an experiment.

Several eminent artists both before and after 1920 shared O'Neill's
enthusiasm for masks. Marcel, in his extensive discussion on the sources of
The Great God Brown, refers to representative figures interested in primitive art,
ranging from Chocorou to Dostoevsky, from Wagner to Freud. Against this background
be placed Gordon Craig, whose roots were in the decadence of the 1890’s and in symbolism like Verhaeren, Marinetti, and Foster for. In The Theatre—
Ad鸾nium (1915), Craig laments the deterioration of dancing, pantomime, marionette, ballet, all of which had been esteemed by the ancients. Craig
saw in the finity of the mask a possibility of going beyond reality, beyond the
transitory expressions of a human face.

Craig was responsible for “the first completely non-psychological and
formalistic use of masks in theatrical production ... at least a decade and a
half before The Great God Brown” in a Western country — by designing masks
in 1911 for two plays by William Butler Yeats, The Hours, Done and On Baile’s
Head at the Abbey Theatre in Dublin. Formal masks were given by Yeats to his
characters of the latter-day one-act plays after 1917 on the inspiration of the
Japanese Noh plays and provide examples of special conventionalization. In A
Woman in a Bonnet, the Seanchaidh who is the hero of the piece wears a mask
over the upper part of his face, and the heroine, the Queen, is veiled. The
Japanese Noh plays were studied by Hermann Penelope and have been found in their
collaborative volume Noh or Accomplishment (1917). Luigi Pirandello achieved
international fame with his play Six Characters in Search of an Author in 1921;
it was followed by Henry IV a masque and play, in 1922. Even elsewhere, masks,
though not necessarily constrained on the stage, are a central concept in
Pirandello’s theatre. Similarly the Federal Theatre’s living newspaper Power,
and the Berliner Ensemble production of Brecht’s The Caucasian Circle of Masks
in Paris in the summer of 1955 were presented with masks. The motivation varied:
the mask helped to de-personalized characters for one purpose or another. In
Power, for instance, the motivation was plainly satirical, the nine masks represen-
ting the nine old men, the justices of the U.S. Supreme Court, when President
Franklin D. Roosevelt had denounced for obstructing New Deal legislation. In
some of Yeat’s plays the mask emphasized their ritualistic character. In general,
it could distance, elevate and dignify dramatic experience, freeing it from
the temporality and flux of realistic theatre. Craig sensed this, when he
designed the mask for the Blind Man in Yeats's On Baile's Strand: "The advantage
of a mask over a face," he wrote,

in that it is always repeating unceasingly
the poetic fancy. The theatre must learn
the lesson of "incarnality" from Egyptian
art and return to the ancient practice of
covering the actor's face "in order that
his expression - the visualised expression
of the poetic spirit shall be everlasting." 51

As practical theatre, masks were employed by Max Reinhardt, and by
Robert Edmond Jones in his production of Troilus in 1911; 52 and in The Thaw
Drama by Strindberg, produced by the Provincetown Playhouse in 1924. The
Gragger provides a connecting link with the expressionistic playwright in her
explanation of why she favoured masks. According to her O'Neill was concerned
with the basic situation of man, and that he did not try to present men as a
unique individual but in his significance. Vogel sees in the mask: "the symbol
of his (O'Neill's) year-saying years," 53 not a stage symbol.

With regard to those influential background figures that is noteworthy
that most of the enthusiasts for the masks early this century were not men of
the practical theatre. Their interests were literary or historical; even Craig
was more of a visionary of the theatre than a scene designer, and Reinhardt was
always willing to use any device for spectacular effects. The entire movement
for the reintroduction of masks was started to move on a new. It did not grow
out of a social revolution, as the idea of a fourth wall ultimately grew out of
industrialization, nor was it a result of improvement in technical facilities,
as the general in stage lighting was. Even if oriented toward history, the
advocates of masks looked historical perspectives in thinking they could jump
over thousands of years of cultural development. And there is an element of
aesthetics in the visions of Craig and Reinhardt, of Yeats and O'Neill.

All God's Chillun Got Wings" which shares with The Amateur Emo...
the finest Out of the Congo ... (Come) the finest
make in the world. An archipenko in
the ashes of Vode, an Epstein in ebony.
The jungle artist have carried in their
false faces a beauty they could not find
in their own. It is never a natural beauty.
... (The jungle artist) is not trying to
imitate man. He is trying to imitate God.
He reproduces emotions instead of people.
He is the creative artist, not the found
animal."54

Jim's Sister Nellie introduces this mask to Ella and to O'Neill's audiences:

**Nellie.** It's a Congo mask ... it is beautifully
made, a work of art by a real artist -
as real in his way as your Michelangelo
(forces Ella to take it) Nell. Just notice
the workmanship.

**Ella.** (Looking at it with disgust) Beautiful?
Well, some people certainly have queer
notions! It looks ugly to me and ape-like
like a kid's glove - taking faces.55

There is striking similarity between these two passages excepting only
the use by O'Neill of the better known "Michelangelo" instead of Archipenko
and Epstein. In addition to favouring anti-realism, *Uda in and down* reiterates
the religious origin of the masks: "as the mask goes out of the temple, so
religion goes out of the theatre."56 In writing *All God's Chillun Got Mangs*
O'Neill was taking first steps towards bringing religion back into the theatre.
In his stage direction he says of this mask that it is "conceived in a true
religious spirit." It is "hypoteneus face, inspiring obscure, six connotations
in one's mind, but beautifully done.... In this room, however, the mask acquires
an arbitrary accentuation. It dominates by a diabolical quality that constrains
imposes upon it.57

These "obscure, dim connotations" are employed all through Act II.
O'Neill's colloquies, at first disguised as an address to her former friend who
in offstage in the street, are later no longer disguised. The mask comes to
represent everything she cannot approve of in her husband, in her situation; and
she talks frankly to it, revealing her distracted, schizophrenic state of mind:

"I'll give you the laugh, wait a sec! ... 
(with sudden violence - flourishing her
knife) what're you grinning about, dirty
allegory, you? ... (Then appealingly) ...
What have I ever done wrong to you? What
have you got against me? I warned you,
didn't I? Why don't you let Jim alone? ... 
Oh, I hate you! I hate you! Why don't
you let Jim and me be happy?"58

The grinning mask of these scenes represents" But ole devil, see, fols,
whatever rationalization one can find.

In the integration of the mask and the soliloquy we find that the mask
is now entering the inner consciousness of a character. In All God's Chillum
Godshima it is visible, a mere piece of property; and it is similarly concrete
in The Great God Brown and Dawn Without End; but in Shenan Anthology, created
in the intervening years, the mask were written into "thought asides" and
integrated with the dialogue. Later, they were incorporated into the dialogue
proper, and expressed by stage directions within the speeches. O'Neill's early
inclination to write fluctuating speeches, and monologues was confirmed by his
interest in the mask. All God's Chillum Godshima represents, in fact, an
interesting phase of transition in O'Neill's stage technique: parallel to his
use of the mask for crowds he was developing, another, individual and psy collo-
logical usage. The mask's functions were subsequently taken over by the "thought
asides" and, ultimately by dialogue.

Jim kills the mask by "plunging the knife down through it" as she cannot
stand the idea of Jim's passing his examinations and becoming a lawyer, and has fled into illness to ensure his failure by her helplessness. These final revelations change the image with significance. This may be interpreted in terms of Adler's "individual psychology." The mask, in this triangle drama, is far from an unknown and malicious power. The mask belongs to the realm of hate and death, characterized, most markedly, by fear. It appears these masks are employed as pieces of property or as concepts, the stream of life is stopped.

Thus, out of O'Neill's plays employing masks in The Great God Brown come closest of occupying an extended place. For one thing, the device here is not overburdened and it fulfills its function well. There are, of course, dim constellations in the presence of the mask, but they are not exploited too heavily or explained away. The play may not be quite so consistently compelling or well-written as The Emperor Jones or The Hairy Ape or be "thinner in intellectual content" than either, yet according to Samuel Hulsen it has "a certain advantage over either of these plays in presenting the characters equally strong, in collision with one another, instead of one central character who only contends with himself."

The Great God Brown, written in January in 1923 & produced (partly at the author's own expense after Otto Kahn had declined to back it) at the Greenwich Village Theatre in January, 1926 is of fundamental importance for the use of masks.

As the author himself pointed out, referring to the scene where Brown steals Jim's mask, the mask device enabled him to dramatize the transference of personality. In his public explanation of the play he also spoke of the "background pattern of conflicting titles in the Soul of Man" and made it clear that he regarded The Great God Brown above all as a mystery play describing - to quote his words to Clark - "the mystery of personality and life." The masks were to suggest this mystery.

The degree of confusion involved in the use of masks in the play is
indicative of their various functions. At the beginning the spectateurs are led to approve of the assumption that the mask are protective walls used in social life. "Dion's mask of Pan which he put on as a boy", O'Neill explained "is not only a defence against the world for the super-sensitive soul underneath it, but also an integral part of his character as the artist." The artist, more sensitive than the average man, has a greater need for the mask.

In the case of Dion we learn that the genesis of his mask is in that there at the impressionable age of four the picture in mind drawn by him had been destroyed by Billy選则 whale he loved and trusted but whose artistic faculty he also envied. Dion took it as an act not unlike Cain's slaying of Abel.

Suddenly, Dion recalls

the god God was disapproved in his person and the evil and injustice of Pan was born! Every one called me Cry-baby, so I become silent for life and discarded a mask of the lad boy Pan in which to live and rebel against that other boy's God and protect myself from his cruelty.

Dion Anthony’s mask at the opening of the play worn by him for fourteen years, is a fixed forming of his own headship, spiritual poetic, passionately super-sensitive, helplessly unprotected in his child-like, religious faith in life - into the expression of a mocking, wailing, defying, gaily scoffing and scornful young Pan." Dion is looked upon by his father as a big fool, a rotting spendthrift, who is being sent to college to study architecture only through his mother's coaxing of his father. The father's suspicion of the son makes Dion hostile to him and as "he sits in his Father's place at center ... his mask stare with a frozen mockery before him." On the contrary when he appears immediately on the stage of the first reciting between Billy选则 and Margaret where the latter has accepted Dion by throwing Billy overboard, Dion’s real face without the mask is "shrink, shy and gentle, full of a deep sadness" as revealed in the bright moonlight. The monologue: Why am I afraid to dance ... Why was I born without a skin, O God that I must wear armor in order to touch or be touched?"
his suffering bewildement and explains the fact that the mask was given on him
the moment he was born.

He suddenly claps his mask over his
face again with a gesture of despair
... his voice becomes bitter and sarco-
ic. Oh, mother, old Combahee, why the
devil was I ever born at all? 71

Again, on Billy's telling him that Margaret is waiting for him,

he slowly removes his mask. His face is
turn and transfixed by joy. He dances
of establishing oneself with something
outside himself by reciprocating it in a
true and marital relationship with Mar-
get. He stared at the sky slyly. O God
in the moon, did you hear? She loves me
... I am strong! I can love! ... She is
my skin! She is my arms! How I am born...

"Her glance at his mask triumphantly
in tones of Sensengness. You are outworn!
I am beyond you." 72

The first encounter with Margaret further stresses the role of the mask as a
protective wall. To him, without the mask, "She speaks coldly and anxiously. Who
are you! ... I don't know you!" 73 Then, as he computer his mask on with a sudden
gesture and laughs wildly and bitterly; Margaret "with overcomeing passionite
longeur" declares: "Oh, Dian! Dian! I love you!" 74 Towards the end of the scene,
so "he suddenly turns off his mask - in a passionate agony he speaks to her;

"Let's to you! I love you with all my soul! Love me! Why can't you love me, Margaret?" 75
And as he tries to kiss her she holds up her mask before her face protectively
and treats him as a complete stranger. But as he again puts on his mask, he
speaks quietly and bitterly: "All's well. I'll never let you see again ... by
persy, I love you ..." 76 She does not recognize, or wish to recognize, his face.
Then Dian unmasks himself, she takes protection behind her mask; then he
replaces his mask she takes off hers.

This see-saw battle of the sudden clapping and unclapping of the mask
in the dialogue establishes the contrast between the real, naked face and the
face in mask. But more than this, it emphasizes the men that
the mask is a source of strength, self-confidence and love in the world to an otherwise hopeless creature inhibited by complacency. Originally, we might suppose, Man was undivided, unmasked, in harmony with "the good God". The unjust, evil act shook his faith in the benevolence of Man and God. With one part of himself, corresponding to the mask he sought to protect himself against the lovelessness in the new, callous world he had been initiated into; with another he sought to retain or recreate his old faith in a loving God. Falling in both he was bitterly torn within himself as indicated by the growing polarity between his mask and face; finally established as that between Satan and Saint. O'Neill universalised Man's inner struggle as a split stemming from "the creative pagan acceptance of life" (Olneye).

"fighting eternal war with the parochial, life-denying spirit of Christianity as represented by St. Anthony - the mask struggle resulting in this modern day in emotional exhaustion - creative joy in life for life's sake frustrated, rendered abortive, distorted by morality from Man into Satan, into a Hebrandophelen mocking himself in order to feel alive; Christianity, once heroic in martyrdom for its intense faith now pleading weakly for intense belief in anything, even God head itself."

In other words, in modern civilization neither the patience of

humane observers with life nor the Christian sense of success with God are

vitaly experienced. Deprived of the old sense of belonging to something outside

and spiritually more significant than himself, modern man has come to worship

himself. For "the Great God Pan" and for the Christian God he has substituted

"the visionless semi-god of our new materialistic myth," the Great God Atom.

Yet the artist, St. Anthony the painter poet, with his concern for spiritual

values cannot accept the materialistic demi-god and thus belongs neither to the

truly life-giving faiths that could render his art meaningful, nor to the faith

that rules his contemporaries. As an artist, he is an anomaly in the modern

world with which we like Cyriel can communicate only by prostituting himself, by

becoming a utilitarian artist, an architect, instead of adhering to the art for

art's sake principle.
This arrangement is dramaturgically both necessary and effective. Dion's mask is to be stolen by Brown, who gains Margaret's love by appearing in it. This idea would not work if Margaret were to love Dion's face. Psychologically also, the wife, who believes herself in love with her husband, actually does not know him and, like Brown, takes for drunken raving what he says when unmasked, while she accepts his masked rhetorics as his truthful emotions. Thus Dion's unmasked speeches - serious, tender and poetical - are understood by no one. The world hears only the mocking, abusive, harsh way in which he talks when masked.

After marriage, the mask of Dion Anthony becomes his inseparable companion, his ally; it "hangs on his breast below his neck, giving the effect of two faces."

Now that his real face has aged greatly, grown more strained and tortured, but at the same time, in some queer way, more selfless and ascetic, more fixed in its resolute withdrawal from life ... the mask, too, has changed. It is older, more defiant and mocking, its sneer more forced and bitter, its Pan quality becoming Mephistophelean. It has already begun to show the ravages of dissipation.

Henceforth he seldom confronts others - not even Margaret - without this armour unless when in a mood of self-revelation or self-analysis he launches on a monologue. On one occasion when "he prays like a Saint in the desert, exercising a demon," and "pulls the mask from his resigned, pale, suffering face, as if he were suffocating," he keeps his face averted from Margaret. In the drafting room in Brown's office (Act Two - Scene Two) Dion, with his face gentler, more spiritual, more saintlike and ascetic than ever before, has reached the end of the tether of hope and life, and reads "aloud from the Imitation of Christ by Thomas a Kempis to his mask, which is on the table before him", and addresses it "like to a priest, offering up prayers for the dying." He then raises his hand over the mask as if he were blessing it. ... He raises the mask in his hands and stares at it with a pitying tenderness. Peace, poor tortured one, brace pitiful pride of man, the hour of our deliverance comes. Tomorrow we may be with Him in Paradise! (He kisses it on the lips and sets it down again ...)
and claps it on the noise of Margaret's footsteps outside. The meeting - the last - between husband & wife is charged with bitterest irony: Dion talks remotely like a ghost of his own past self. The mask now provides no pretense, no protection against even Margaret & when he finally tears it from his face "which in answers a cruel must love for her and a cruel sentiment and tenderness" he does so deliberately to stress the merging of the real & the pretended self into the tune, higher self which in Death is above love or hatred. But it strikes the wife with mortal terror to make her raise her rank; "(to word off his face) Dion! Don't! I can't bear it! You're like a ghost! You're dead!" and she faints. Against Brown, however, he keeps up this protective wall till his last scene with him in his library. But "his naked face has a terrible Ardath-like intensity, the mocking irony because so cruelly wickedness to give him the appearance of a real demon, tortured into torturing others" the climax of the scene in struck when Dion "as if possessed", with excess of liquor and despair "throws on his knee by Brown's chair, his neck falling off, his short mustache a face at the point of death." Brown "stares at Dion's real face convertently" and says:

"So that's the poor talking you really were! Do wonder you hid! And I've always been afraid of you - yes, I'll confess it now, in one of you! ... (in picks up the mask from the floor) No, not of you! Of this! Say that you like, it's strong if it is bad! And this is what Margaret loved, not you! Not you!"

He then starts to put Dion's mask on, but lays it aside at the sound of knocking at the door, and before it resumes, diagnosis of the dead body.

Billy Brown who is "incredibly empty and resourceless, an uncreative creature of superficial preconceived social grooves" and has so far gone unchallenged now mysteriously inherits both Dion's mask and with it his talent. Also emphasizes the fact that Brown's feet after having condemned Brown to destruction by pulling his mask, but,
this mask falling off as he dies, it is the saint who kissed Jona's feet in
object contrition. In going without a mask, in the first half of the play, is
an indication of his obvious adjustment to the sterile modern life. He does not
need to wear a mask, because his face itself is a mask-paraphrased, lifeless.

In Jekyll-Hyde manner Billy Brown now plays a dual role — or to be more
apt, a triple role: his own mask is "an exact likeness of his face... an self
accounted idienne." In this role he impresses as a smooth, astute businessman, the
successful architect who talks uncertainly to the two craftsmen, to Margaret and to
the man who comes to discuss with him the plan of a building. He appears in
Mion's mask which is more than a mere piece of property for him. It is an insti-
tment to supplant Mion as the lover and husband of Margaret in which role it
toxicates him:

"That's that? She'll never believe?
She'll never see? She'll never under-
stand? You lie, devil!" But at the
same time it is source of strength
for him, "He teaches out" for it
"such a deep sleep after a drug. As
soon as he holds it, his power to take
strength and life to form a red
laugh. Now I am drinking your strength,
Mion — strength to love in this world
and die and sleep and become fertile
crude..."215

He mask gives him both stature and guide to face life with "cold self-masking"
even though he knows he is "a desperate criminal, pursued by God, and by
myself!"26 the burden of wearing the mask of sin towards Margaret (seeing her
by proxy) and towards himself i.e. self-delusion, is too heavy for poor Billy
to bear and in sheer agony he tears off his clothes and confronts Mion's mask:

"His eyes, his nose, his whole body shrank
upward, his muscles more with the man
in deep, slow agony. In those strained
expression, finally a voice rose from
out of him. "Curse, Compassionate Savior of
me! Out of my depths I cry to you! ..." Then
"I shall not cut out hand to touch the mask
like a frightened child reaching out for
an invisible hand — then with its mocking
Mion, I'm here! 4 His voice shook. Together
..."
suffer: let the whole world suffer
as I am suffering."97

The arrival of Syphile seems to relieve him of the torture and for once he
regains his boyish vivacity: "I am Billy."98 He has the key to his heart and
looking "from Aarum to the Zion rock... with a secret understanding" says:

"You are Zion Democrat!" "to which Democrats
(bitterly) "I am the man of William
Brown! (he points to the rack of Zion)
I am his murder and his murderer!"99

Dion's mask, a hidden tyrant, is, nevertheless, looked upon by Billy Brown as
a friend and an ally all along and in his last encounter with a Squad of Police
he feels strong enough to bare his breast to receive the volley of shots with
the pack on. Thus, Dion's mask inflected by Brown served the double purpose of
covering him with another personality and at the same time filing his true
self from the commissary.

This is revealed by Billy Brown appearing without either of the two
masks. In this guise he is "a suffering face that isスーパーランナーエンドレス..." awkwardly militant for the Zion of Zion's make.100 His face rebels against
and fills Brown himself with deep despair: "You're dead.

You're dead, William Brown, dead beyond
hope of resurrection! It's the Zion you buried in your garden who killed you, not
you him! It's Barrett's husband the...
Paradise by prophecy Love by anticipation
Identity! God!101 Similarly, with Dion's mask i.e. Zion's creative talent while pondering over
the plan for the Capitol, which he applauds as "a venerable fake Capitol!" and
upon which he laughs "with lusty abandon! Long Live Chief of Police Brown!...
President Brown!" and chants "Oh, how many persons in one make up the good
God Brow? Hehehehe!"102 It is also looked upon with "superstitious longing" by an
unmasked face which is "not sickly, tortured, by an unmasked face which
is "not sickly, fatigued, tortured, hollow-cheeked and feverish-eye." He further
describes the plan as "Ugly! Hideous! Despicable!" and asks: "Why must the
Saint in me pander to commonness... (so he was, but in 1888 but pleasingly.) Give
use the strength to destroy this! - and myself! - and him! - and I will believe
in Thee!"103

Again, the ranks of Billy Brown left behind in the office after Brown
has whispered to "the petrified Draftsman. They will find him in the little
room. Mr. Millan Brown is dead!" After which he vanishes down the stairs
"Samhain Jesra" is carried on "a body that has died, and shoulders"104 and
coldly laid down on the couch by the three Committee men and the younger
Draftsman, too on each side. Then, according to Folk, "looks to society like
the body of Billy Brown."105

As against the sudden and inexplicable change of function of Men's
mask in the middle of the play as described above, the masks of Cybel and
Margaret retain their social function throughout.

Cybel "a stumping, clum, sensual, blood
and of fortune, but no, her personation
hated and hateful . . . her personation slain
and mockery assumed, like an iron chain.
Her eyes were forever with the reflected
visions of severed and dislocated
means the rough neck of a hardened prostitute in token of the fact that she
is "doomed to starvation as a pencil in a world of unnatural love!" Beneath her
neck is her face of "Cybel, or the North Lother."107 then we first see her, she
is unshod, standing with large droopy eyes "For sitting time with an eternal one."
Her neck lies beside a cheap alarm clock which indicates that the prostitute is
the temporal, ρερειακος counterpart of the eternal, virtuous North Lother. By
giving her customers a heart, Cybel explains, she is able to keep her own virtue.
The mask serves as an armur.

For the most part, however, she goes unmasked. In this role she is
deeply sympathetic, compassionate, maternal, her real self, the Farm North Lother
Cybel. Her hand in Lien's words, "is a cool and poultice on the sting of
thought."108 She would be friends with Lien. Then we meet her after a passage
of seven years (act two - Scène one) she has
to a tortured. Marny Bien she speaks

"Exquisitely, - you're not weak. You were born with ghosts in your eyes and you have brave enough to go looking into your own death - and you get afraid."

She is stricken with grief on Bien's account and

"in a tone. Award roses - and just like a mother sudden to her little son"
speaks to him before he goes

"You mustn't forget to kiss me before you go, Bien. (She removes her mask)... she kisses him gently and having to say... she turns and goes. We really have you not to hurt. Remember, it's all a game... and after you're asleep I'll take you away..."

In the last scene, she again lives up to her role of a fond mother - this time to Silly Brown in his last moments. She goes to him as a confidant and after he

"turns her back and falls on the floor by the couch, partly covered" she "kisses his head... he will understand... she will go..." and says: "you can't take this to bed with you. You've got to go to sleep alone..."

Then, taking off her own mask, she helps him raise his head on to her shoulder and says "ostentously - the earth is warm" and a consentular to ask for not justice but just love: "I don't want justice. I want love..."

which she gives him. At this he shows his gratitude to her: "thank you, mother" and passes out of life... at this dead body she "stands like an angel of ruthlessness and even amidst all the people..." while there is no indication that Sybil's mask ever changes (although her increasing hatreds reflects the growth of the mask) beneath the mask, Margaret undergoes a certain alteration. On her entrance her mask is "an exact, almost transparent reproduction of her own features, but finer... she abstract..."
quality of a rich, instead of the individual,要素." However, she sends
it to Billy Brown, toward whom she "turns ... rather, modestly."
while for Mon, the man of her love, her face is "unshaded like that of a continuous visitor."
Yet, to him even when she wants to appear cold and angry she shows only the
mask tastily and then: "Who are you? Why are you calling me? I don't know you!"
Or she holds it up "before her from underlined: Don't! Please! I don't know
you! You frighten me!" Again, during her first interview with Billy Brown in
his office, she appears from "behind the mask of the satanic monotonous, still
blandly assumed the cultivated a mildly innocent and bravely honorable attitude.
toward things and acknowledges no sound to the world." In the presence of the
two craftsmen in the drafting room and private office of Brown (Act Three - Scene
one) she needs wearing no mask since "her face has no traces of the self-confident
spirit of its youth." Similarly when Brown in Mon's mask visits her in her
sitting room she appears unmasks. And at the end, she again presents an un-
masked face when she kisses Mon's mask for the last time ending with fame.
silent grief."
She is, in short, one person to Mon, the artist, and another
to the world: her mask is not the facade of the obvious hypocrisie and it is a
pose - in case, however, she strikes one - which has become a second nature with
her.
Thus it is obvious that both Cybel and Margaret are more businesslike
and practical in their use of the mask and its schematic in their case, is relati-
vely simpler.

The complicated features of the mask in The Great God Brown reflect
the varied interpretations of its theme. One most readily acceptable to
modern intellect is the explanation based on psychoanalysis as given by Louis
W. Buhl. According to this the mask corresponds to the Jungian "persona", and
Mon and Billy are ultimately halves of one and the same personality, recog-
ised as such by Cybel: "You are Mon Brown!" This theme of artist versus unsympa-
thetic surroundings - rather than a Jekyll - Hyde relationship - is, however, not
fully developed and contributed towards the total effect of chiaroscuro produced.
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by the play.

Secondly, **The Great God Brown** is a tragedy about the impossibility of
real Greek tragedy in modern times, with his capacity for the over-obvious,
and the satirical and his fondness for double meanings. O'Neill's Dionysus
(aka **Great God Brown**) is a god, "brought into physical contact"; perhaps
there is an ambiguity in the name. Dionysus is both the God of Dionysian
exaltation and a reincarnation of Dionysus. According to Langegan, "the peculiar
and dramatic thing about Dionysus was his story of death and rebirth. His
body has been rent apart and scattered like leaves in the fall, and he has
been reborn as the earth is reborn each spring." 127 Dion is reborn as Billy,
and the time is specified as spring. Moreover, his body is buried in the
garden, and Billy addresses the grave: "Now I am drinking your strength, Dion strengths to love in this world and die and slay and become fertile earth, as
you are becoming now in my garden." 128 Another reference to eternal resurrection
is sung by Ophel in the climax of the play. "Now it was the custom of early man
not only to deify his protectors chiefs after death, but to see that they were in
a proper state for delification by murdering them before their vigor failed...
the Chief's murder was often described more pleasantly as a going away." 129 Billy
Brown plans "going away" together with Margaret: "we must hustle off to Europe
now - and murder him there!" 130 The criminal melodrama and can only be explained
as a criticism against an American society which does not approve of ritual
murders. The dramatist pities the poor moderns who are so obsessed by old
Dion Christianities that they cannot even murder their deified chiefs in a delight-
ful pagan way. And a businessman is not fit to assume the personality of Dionysus.

Moreover, one of the ideas behind the play - behind O'Neill's total output
is, in fact, to arouse disquietude in the Babbitts, the masses of business. In
the words of Langegan: "George Babbitt, master of phonograph and radio, looks
with a certain disquietude upon a man." 131 William A Brown - a paraphrase of
George W. Babbitt - has inherited Babbitt's role; he can as well inherit the form
of the man. O'Neill, undoubtedly, must have read of the Dionysus cult and
George W. Schmitt elsewhere, but the parallels between Uncle Vanya and O'Neill's unique are too close and numerous to be purely coincidental. In fact, the volume as a whole seems to be in the background of The Great God Brown.

The aim of Iagosov's text is propagandistic:

The task of the artist of the theatre may be to seek out new symbols - the symbols, perhaps of beauty & pain, of salvation & pathos - and to make us feel them in one of the greatest of symbols, the ancient and mysterious mask. Furthermore: "All masks have some curious and expressive sense of the dead and the living, the spirit given flesh, the god or demon brought into physical contact... The mask is symbol per se." 133

Here we have the belief in the expressive power of the mask as such, without any scenic functions: "For the end of the mask is Drama." 134

It would be clear that Iagosov, the aesthete, in love with his own century picture of the wonderful world of primitive peoples cultivated the mask in an uncritical manner without explaining its mystery or without real knowledge. His belief that "sorcery flourishes very like a sport in West Africa," 135 and "takes the place of baseball among the young bucks" shows his utter lack of understanding of the holistic world of primitive peoples, analyzed by later psychology.

Psychoanalysis implies the dependence of our minds on fundamental impulses which completely governed the minds of primitive peoples also and masks were employed in early forms of drama around the world. The connecting link between the past and modern drama - with the twentieth century - is that O'Neill and Iagosov tried to grasp the essential significance of drama by returning to the time and place where drama originated i.e. to ancient Greece, with its masks and rituals. 136

Nevertheless, The Great God Brown with all its sequencnes is a mere hank of literary reminiscences, unorganized, undigested; it cannot - unlike the reminiscences of Thomas Mann, James Joyce, or Bertolt Brecht - stand solidly the burden of classical parallels without falling into pathos and pretentiousness.
The vast congregation of Dionysus and Pan, Lysistrata and St. Anthony, Faust and Marguerite, Cybele and Satan, George M. Cohan and John Brown employed to do service to his great soul Brown does little to help matters.

On top of all these intrusions lacking the theme of the Great God Brown comes O'Neill's own explanation of its symbolic overtones given in a letter to several New York newspapers after its original production, which was accepted uncritically by later interpreters. Yet the theme of Pan and Lysistrata stressed by the playwright is carried only by the stage directions and a few references in the dialogue, after which it devolves on the skill of the mask designer to develop it. And it is doubtful whether any mask can suggest a special image like the face of Pan, while at the same time retaining a certain similarity to the face of the actor. O'Neill also warned literary scholars against taking a too one-sided view of the play and wrote:

It was far from my idea in writing Down that this background pattern of conflicting tides in the soul of Pan should ever overshadow and thus throw out of proportion the living dream of the recognizable human beings." Also, that "the mystery why one man or woman can feel but not understand as the meaning of any event." 

is essentially that everyone is jealous of everyone else. The conspicuous triangles (MIon - Margaret - Billy, Mion-Cybele - Billy, Mion - Marguerite - their son) are not without a purpose.

Thus, as already pointed out, O'Neill is here retaining his notion of the mask as a scenic means of expression to elaborate his theme of the rebirth of Dion-antony, god and artist. Notwithstanding that "the importance on the mask is far too great", the idea of the mask play is dramaturgically and scenically cleverly shaped. And this despite the fact that, unlike all邮 a Chillon, where the device is more effective, because of its discretionary use, the gap in the play between the playwright's intentions and the director's and actor's conveyance of it and the audiences's reception...
of it is very wide. The conclusion in the use of слова reflects tensions of these. O'Neill's decision not to relate his explanation of the sense directly to Leavin and Breath (and to language, the concealed God Father) was partly due to his conscious avoidance of any suspicions of plagiarism on his part and more particularly to emphasize his own creative work, as, "the living drama of recognizable human beings". However, it is more than obvious that O'Neill is here experimenting with the idea of redefining the progress of man into something, a visionary of the theatre of tomorrow. That whatever the form of the play, the content will have a spiritual quality that gives us this religious sense of mysterious age-old processes alive in us today.134

In short, as already pointed out O'Neill in The Coast of Heaven seemed to have overstrained and devised of the work in his attempt to get away from the mere commonplace connotations aroused by it. And although the play was successful in the theatre, O'Neill could hardly have felt that the success was due to his work alone, since, as we have seen, he considered the production exceedingly faulty in carrying out his ideas. Neither his decision against employing masks in future in the same complex way was due to the unconscious feeling that the scheme, even if dramatically valid, did not work out in the theatre. Apart from the difficulty of getting the masks correctly designed - O'Neill's complaint to Benjamin de Casseres - there was the more fundamental problem of making them clearly visible to the audience. In the Coast of Heaven, he told Clark142 shortly after the play had been put on, he could not know in advance how the scheme would function in the theatre. For instance, he discovered during rehearsals that the masks were too realistic, that "living my back in the theatre you couldn't be sure if the audience saw much or not. I should have had them twice as large - and conventionalized then, so the audience could get the idea alone."143

In Lessons in the Art, on whose first draft O'Neill worked while these lines were written, he had "conventionalized" the mask scheme and made them double in size for the chances apparently to keep them distinct from the...
courage, which appears in ranks of normal size.

Lazanus is clearly distinguished from all the other characters of the play in so far as he is the only one who is not given a mask. His integrated, rounded personality born of his discovery that beyond the chase "there is only life"144 in his conquest of the fear of death which envelopes mankind does not need to hide behind a mask. All the other characters, on the other hand, fear not only death but hide from it in Lazanus. Their lives are spent in hiding."145

Yet there are moments in the story when the characters, reeling to the unmasked Lazanus, ecstatically advance his joyous gospel, only to collapse into their masked existence when left alone and then the dramatist could have repeated the technique of transforming the mask on used removable masks as in

_Jacques Fieschi._ But his compassionate evidence of the application in

_Lazanus_ against in a clear evidence of a distinct improvement upon and a fresh departure from the previous argument.

Instead, he now tries another interesting device for suggesting quality of character: giving all the main characters half-masks, covering the upper part of the face.146 his scheme which was constantly employed in the Council Cellarito suited O'Neill's psychological purposes.

Lazanus's half mask "even yellow of sector" corresponds with his skin "Belgium and earth-colours" and his lips which are "still green and brown"147 basically and originally showing his husband's healthy, life - affirming colour. Deadly yellow appears secondary with him. The half masks of the three sons - Calvina, Helvius, and Pepera - are respectively "viscera, filled with a lurid light white"148, "milk-white, matched with green,"149 and "alive-coloured with the red of blood-red and auburn."150, the fierce imperial colour, purple, is found also in dressers and lighting of the upper houses. The uneven, unnatural completion of these masks suggests the sickness of mind that characterises the normans, representatives of a decadent human race. Pepera's half-mask is characterised by her being a hardened imperial mistress. But beneath the mask,
her face with its "look of施工 youth" is not altogether unlike Minian's although the deeply yellow in Pompeia's case, belongs to her own skin rather than to her soul. While Minian still partially retains an affirmative attitude to life (her face), Pompeia's converted mask has distorted her face and left it with but a ghost of her past innocence. Like Pompeia, Caligula has a skin "of an amorous temperament milky". As her north is "Israel", his is "Oriental". At Caligula, it is even further removed from nature; there is nothing in his face to attract our sympathy; presumably, his south too could once have appealed to us, but long ago, its innocence was wiped out by military life. Likewise, finally, demonstrates the split between the "old soldier's face" and the "ruler's old countenance" on one hand (face) and the detached old rim, on the other (mask).

Thus all these characters are divided beings or schizophrenia on whom the mask has grown and the suppression of these natural, original selves has been accomplished in different degrees - Minian representing one antecedent and Caligula another.

The secondary characters wear full masks, which "indicate personality. Within our variation" and so do the erudite and elements the, however, follow a typological pattern. While commenting on his use of masked crowds in LECTUR, M still wrote:

I advocate masks for stage crowds, with - whenever a sense of impersonal, collective and psychology is wanted. This was one reason for such an extensive use of them in Greek drama. In writing the crowds in that play, I was visualizing an effect that, intensified by dramatic lighting, would give an audience visually the sense of the crowd, not as a massed collection of individuals, but as a collective whole, an entity. Then the crowd would, I wanted an audience to hear the voice of Greek mind, Greek emotion, as one voice of a body composed of, but quite distinct from its parts.

And for more practical reasons, I wanted to preserve the different crowds of modern time and country from the blinding illusion of characterizations by an audience of the actors on the stage.

The crowd masks suggest age and psychological type besides indicating race or nationality - Jewish, Oriental, Greek and Roman. M's boredom on
gildhood represents the simple, innocent type; youth the happy, eager type; 
younghood (downhill) the self-tortured, introspective type; middlehood (down-
hill) the moral, self-reliant type, the seraphic, cruel type; and old age 
the sorrowful, resigned type. By shuffling periods and types in various ways 
O'Neill could compose different kinds of oracles. Thus though the oracle 
Dream contains all seven types and periods, the Oracles are all of Period three, 
type four; the Poet contains one of Period five to seven, type three to 
seven, and the court scene surrounding Othello are of Period one to three, 
type three and five to six.

The dramatic effectiveness of this typological scheme has been 
questioned by several critics, who point out that in the theatre it would 
certainly detract attention from the chief characters. Nevertheless, these 
conceivably with theatre mechanics will at once visualize the impressive, 
spectacular effects of the wild riot of colour and costume in the play which 
keep shining constantly before our eyes, and deepen—more or less on the stage— 
giving us not a moment of dulness. Literary connotations apart, the entire 
action is supplemented by historical documents possessing imaginative 
production. But that is what O'Neill had in mind while composing the play.

O'Neill's interest in the masks was sustained over the years in four 
publications (produced 1924). This is evidenced by a series of three articles 
written by him and published in the American Invitation in November and December 
of 1922 and January of 1925. The first article was originally entitled "Imago-
ruminations."

The articles show O'Neill's belief in masks as such:

"Looked at from even the most practical standpoint of the practical playwright, the mask is dramatic in itself, has always been dramatic in itself, in a proven weapon of attack. At its best, it is more subtle, imaginativelyqueer, dramatically queer than any actor's face can be."

For the doubler: Masks have been worn in studies in Japanese, Chinese, or African 
masks although he fails to mention a certain book in which photographs of these
might be found. Secondly, he presents for not having used the masks very
frequently even in plays such as The Hairy Ape (for the opposition),
The Man (for Tynan's fellow scenes from the opening of Scene IV), All...
and We Have Seen the Future (for secondary figures) and Ave Maria (for the
people of the past) to fulfill different functions. Yet, the theme of these
plays comes through clearly enough without the special device those empleg
would have led only to over-elocuence.

O'Neill now shifts his enthusiasm toward a purely psychological use of
masks:

For I hold more and more strongly to the conviction that the
use of masks will be discovered, eventually, to be the direct
solution of an ancient dramatic problem as to how — with
the greatest possible dramatic clarity and economy of means —
by one means (neatre profound hidden conflicts of the mind)
this whole drama of psychology continues to unfold to us.
He must find one method to present this inner man in his
work, or confess himself incapable of portraying the most
characteristic perceptions and uniquely significant,
spiritual impulses of his time. 157

O'Neill's belief in psychoanalysis and in "spirituality" is persistent,

although he may have lost his faith in Nietzsche, in paganism. As revealed

by a critic, the German is

"...the hero in such plays as The Hairy Ape, Moony and Jerome
but the villain in Many Adventures. 158 In a manner, the
finished version of Moony (Moony) 146 in the antipodes of
Mormonism, Moony, despite the last line meaning of the middle of II of the hero... I'll grant you the

peace in America, because I just evolved out of my past
in an equally simple plot. Even in his case, we'd only need him to
be in the same parable for the sake that we should

have a noble aim for our lives than getting all four
feet in a trough of milk. 159"

But in the final scene we meet the victorious better half of the hero in a
church, in front of a crucifix with a life-size Christ. 160 This is not the place
and the situation for Jesus to laugh: "Life is hard with God's love again.
Life is hard with love!" 161

Even O'Neill still tries to handle the expression of "mental, hidden conflicts"
which O'Neill set as the task of modern dramatists in his Leopolda on Kanada:
the schematic conflict between John, the curious, unshaken, and loving, his tempter to nihilistic stasis; one as a mere repetition of the age-old controversy between heroes and villains. O'Neill's technique is unnecessarily deconstructive in the discharge of tension, not in its claiming. The play can also be taken as "O'Neill's version of the Faust legend," the theme used by Denis V. line; together with a reference to a passage in the "importance" of the name, for all its technical smoothness in employing just a few scenic units in a purposeful way, "John without God" is an interesting experiment in amalgamating the epic business of "Hamlet" and "God" with the technique of the "Longfellow." 152

In the first place the play is free from the confusion which complicates the functions of the saint in "Hamlet." After the proliferation of the name in "Longfellow's" O'Neill presents only one named character in this play. This time the playwright's agreement with the audience about the name is carefully articulated and remains unbroken throughout the play. The opening of the very first scene is obviously the decisive point. The lights are concentrated on the figure of John, and lovingly, then spread representatively to encompass the whole action. John is the base, loving his sunshine and shadow.

"John in a conviction, laughter, convincingly, his looking at John's face, 'the look of a John no. the same, with much of strength, respect on his line, and that nodding, gay, in mockery in the conception of it, on which seems like sky seen behind the moon. 155"

This "look of sorrow, mockery" is a persistent expression on his face. As a child, we learn, John loving was an integrated person, loved his face. But at the age of fifteen he had a traumatic experience. Despite his constant prayers, the God of love, both his parents, died. With his faith in a benevolent God, he became a disintegrated person. With one part of himself (John) he returns to return to his childhood faith, with another (Loving) he tries to go on living in an indifferent or malignant world. But life is not worth living without a loving God to trust and to identify oneself with. Hence Loving, as his death mask indicates, represents that part of John
Loving cut off when he was fifteen, the next which means are annihilation, not only because it is sick of life, but also perhaps, because in death loving sees a hope for reunion with the mother; he characteristicistically speaks of death as "the last, dark void of nothingness" and as a dream in which John and Alma—who is clearly a mother substitute—were asleep forever "beyond fear of separation." 

Psychologically, it is quite possible to see Loving as representing the strong attachment to the mother, the inability to accept any other love but hers, resulting in a desire to remove oneself on all other loves including Alma's. Thus viewed, his love seems not merely irrational. O'Hall is so careful with Loving's positions as he has with those of the entire cast in shaping the story. Aesthetically he usually places Loving behind John, in which he manages much more visibly to the audience. This is the strongest position, as on the stairs of the parson house. It is an indication of Loving's final defeat that he is compelled to relinquish this advantageous position in the church scene, where he enters.

First, retreating backward before John who has desperately but always without touching him, endeavors to keep him from entering the church. But John is strong, and, the same look of crossing resolution in his eye, he forces Loving back. 168

Loving correspondents to the arch of men, John to shut the church. Once the first few speeches:

John. I'm glad you, stay making us think -!

Loving. You supposeions? Well, I hope you realize I'm only trying to encourage you to make something of this plot of yours more significant - for your soul, shall I say? ...

John. You know It's more than that. You know I'm doing it to try and explain to myself, as well as to her.

Loving. (gently) To cause yourself to yourselves, you want to lie and go on admitting the obvious natural reason for —

John. You lie! ... 169

establish the controversy between these two. O'Hall finds it easy to introduce the last article of the agreement in the form of a third character, William.
Eliot, John Loving's partner, who asked his appearance to indicate how John & Loving are taken by the rest of the cast:

"He goes past over loving without seeing him. He does not see him you or know. He says and loves only John, even when loving speaks. And it will be so with all the characters." 173

At Loving's meeting with Nathan Seidel, John's uncle and former guardian, who is little more than another facet of his personality, a counterweight to Loving: "And what salvation does one see you presenting? The Second Coming?" the latter ruefully asks to John. Eliot also looks at loving standard and

"Eliot: What do you say about it?" 174 Similarly at Loving's meeting asking: "Do you know? Perhaps, in my soul, I love love! "Mary: Ullam atonien ad

"John: Do you not like that much?" 175 Again, since loving is not seen by the others, his presence and actions can have no effect on them. Acting by only using his voice he is the opposite of pantoine artist. Yet in one scene O'Neill employs him as a personification of evil, expressive because of his very presence. Loving's evil intentions are concentrated in his eyes. After John has told about the death of the wife in his novel, "he and Nathan Seidel leave the room but

"I leave my soul..." Nor was concentrated on the book of

"Longfellow's poem, "The Winged Horse."""...

"...In the mist of the smoke and the moon, etc."

Secondly, this now modified form as employed by O'Neill enables him to write externalized fluctuating monologues in these scenes where John & Loving are engaged in a tête-à-tête - in the other scenes Flat for a

"John: No!"... provides the requisite external. Fluctuation is furnished by monologic words from loving which supplemented by another innovation - his mask, results in modified monologues. The task of action ended in to listen to John's Congenial and to elucidate "Jack"

Loving. Suddenly. The romantic idealist up in spires

on to heaven! Not an inspiring slogan! (John is

"...standing aside for Sir Arthur John Seidel) But there is

still another end to my story - the one sensible

happy end!"
Father Kind ... Jack! Are you so blind you cannot see what your imagining his dimly gleam in the church reveals about the longing of your own soul. - the salvation from yourself it holds out to you? ...

Loving. Not! How can you believe such childlike superstition!

Father Kind. (Angrily) Jack! I've excluded all I can of your blasphemous notions to - 174

In fact, Father Kind attempts all gradations of reproof in his voice to cloud Loving's voice for his blasphemy remarks.

In one scene - end of Act IV, Scene I - shortly before John's final resolution to go to church and pray, then the conflict within him (on their) mind has become so intense and personal that O'Khill could no longer make it known to the other characters on the stage in the form of intertwined speeches like John & Loving, he employs the thought aside technique again.

On the level of unconscious motivation, Down a Dark Hill, might perhaps have been inspired by a clever, amusing, unpretentious and poignant little play Streetown by Alice Gerstenberg, first produced by the Washington Square Players in 1915, and published in 1921. In this one-act play the lady playwright uses expert knowledge to sketch the picture of Ireland, both with their social and private eyes. As in O'Khill's play, the roles are played by separate actors Harriet and her counterpart or evenstone; Campbell and her primitive self Margaret. Betty and夜里 are needed when they play their roles in public. As in Down a Dark Hill the temporary convention is carefully executed in the beginning of the play. Only Harriet is shown:

Betty: Harriet: (here in no stage).
Harriet, my other self? (here in no stage) my imagined self.

Harriet: (Quietly) Yes? (Standing)
Harriet: (column) Dear sister, dear sister.

Gerstenberg uses her overtones mainly for ironic effect. With two pairs of actresses on hand, she can apply the technique with greater variation than
O'Neill. Jeneration is possible on three levels: between the parts of the
same personality, between Hamlet and Macbeth, and between the lower halves - the
mask and the naked truth. The play proceeds continuously towards a more complicated
image.

Whether its technique influenced Experiment Still is, however, doubtful.

Nevertheless, O'Neill looked upon the mask not only as a stage symbol,
with all its framing and uncompletable possibilities, but also as a personal
tableau, concretizing something of his view of the world.

One's outer life stages in a solitude haunted by the
traces of others; one's inner life stages in solitude
haunted by the traces of one self, 176

He wrote in his HORMOZ. In the four main plays - *HORMOZ*, *The Myth
of the Two Nations*, *Maija* and *Dawn Without Break*, we come upon some
of the most personal (and therefore sentimental) writing in the whole O'Neill
canon. 177 There is more impression than distance, more raw feeling than self-
criticism in O'Neill's relations both to his themes and to the stage. O'Neill
was always trying to define his own relation to life in the entirety, and this
relation was just as constantly full of tensions, on many occasions coloured by
a violent love-hate. The conflict between mask and face is in a figurative
sense, felt everywhere in O'Neill's work which helps for its control than
the inner division of men, the longing for truth and need of illusions. *Maija
Without Break* points towards the *Italian Corso*. Loving sometimes forecasts
Loving's conclusion in the latter play: 'Human life is unimportant and mean-
less'; 178 and the relation between his and John verronk's *Hickey's marriage*.

And O'Neill had, in a typical way, a love-hate relation toward the mask.

Seen upon by the characters, they usually had a pejorative connotation usage
in the *American Born* where the mask was something forced upon the hero by
society. Here he indulges in a mask, as it were, in pitiful adulation to he
expressed his disgust elsewhere. But strong sympathies and antipathies have
inherent characteristics of O'Neill as a dramatist.
Days Without end, on the whole, notwithstanding its edgeless dialogue - especially in scenes where Loving is not present - (albeit he furnished the dialogue with ironic twists)\(^1\) and its dry and obvious use of the masked shadow emerges as an interesting experiment\(^2\) especially in view of the fact that experimenting with the device of the mask was a necessary phase in O'Neill's development toward dynamic realism, where the masks were incorporated into dialogue.

In Mourning Becomes Electra, O'Neill makes an interesting experiment by using mask-like faces ... the 'mask' consisting of heavy make-up ... rather than masks proper as in other plays. This device was arrived at after he had tried and discarded both full masks and half-masks.\(^3\) Undoubtedly the mask-like faces are better suited to the action in Mourning Becomes Electra. Without breaking the realistic illusion they suggest all that is essential about the underlying reality: the two basic impulses, hero identified with 'paganism' and puritanism; the fateful identity between the Hannons; their connection with the house; their isolation from the world; their puritan secretiveness and death-in-life.

The masks found on all the Hannons for generations as well as on those long and intimately connected with them - wives, servants - represent a life-denying "fate springing out of the family"\(^4\) and corrupting everyone who comes within its reach. Like the shining portico the 'masks' pretend purity but incarnate only death.

Despite the fact that the theme of the trilogy necessitates a far-going similarity among all the 'masks' O'Neill does indicate some differences among them as well as changes in them. Thus the mask-like look is "more pronounced" in Ezra, the son of Abe, than in the others; it is virtually a death-mask. Christine's, on the other hand, is initially "a wonderfully life-like pale mask"\(^5\) a thin, almost transparent veneer, we are asked to imagine, grown on her by the Hannons but foreign to her real nature. The moment she decides to murder Ezra, she ironically succumbs to the very spirit she fights - the Mannon one; her face is transformed into "a sinister evil mask".\(^6\) Shortly after the murder when she is haunted by the guilt feelings but still hoping to escape, we find that beneath the mask-like veneer of her face there
are deep lines about her mouth, and her eyes burn with a feverish light”. Here O'Neill approximates the half-mask in his description which suggests Christine's disintegration, her vacillation between hardened acceptance of her crime and anguished rejection of it, her dwindling hope for escape, and growing fear of retribution. As the Furies continue to torment her, her desire for life is weakened and the kannon semblance grows on her. Shortly before her suicide she finds herself "old and ugly and haunted by death", an incarnation of the kannon spirit and very like the house she tries to escape. A little later, her face, like Ezra's, has become "a tragic death mask".
References


2. Flickinger, p. 225.


4. Ibid., p. 27.

5. Ibid., Pp. 31-32.


9. Ibid., p. 123. The inspiration for this conception of the mask as a facade hiding and prettifying inner ugliness may well have come from The Portia of Snowdon Cary, which O'Neill declared, "made an indelible impression" on him in his youth. Owen, p. 128. It may have been taken from Mr. Jusbl and Mr. Hyde which is referred to in Portia, p. 195. Or it may have come from A Hole in the House, when Helme, in Act I talks about forgers who are forced to wear masks even before wife and children. Then's play has influenced Serendipity, in several respects. (Ol. Forsyth, "Irons and O'Neill: A study in Influence", Scandinavian studies, 27, (August 1969).

10. 01 January, 1985 quoted in Cargill et al., p. 119.


12. Ibid., p. 256.

13. Beyond the Horizon, p. 112.


16. Ibid., p. 98.

17. Different, p. 547.


20. Beyond the Horizon, p. 144.

21. Tender, p. 455.

22. Different, p. 518.

23. Ibid., p. 555.
26. *Celtic*, p. 495. The masks were suggested by Blanche Hayes, a costume designer and approved of by O'Neill.
33. *O'Neill, p. 73.
34. *O'Neill, p. 61. The play bill is quoted by Gallup.
40. *O'Neill, p. 76.
41. *O'Neill, p. 31.
43. Ac glancing remarks: "As a rule, too little attention is paid to the fact that damaged in a play require stage another mode of investigation than, say, drama in a lyric poem." p. 2.
47. *Harvard Boxen*, p. 38. Haywood in the *World* had called the adaptation, "barely noted from a crinkled text book in the Province town lib... (a) dandy occasion", quoted by Gallup in *The Ancient Mariner*, p. 61.
49. *Gasser, Directions in Modern Drama and Drama*, p. 167.
50. Dietrich devotes a whole chapter to "the theatre of masks and mirrors": Margaret Dietrich, "Pirandello and Pirandellism", Macmillan Drama (Stratford, 1951), 166-199. As one of the signs of "Pirandellism" she mentions a "renaissance of mask-consciousness" (p. 183). Her discussion of a wide range of both forerunners and followers of Pirandello are listed - among them O'Neill, Schnitzler, Benvenuti, Ionesco, and the Finish playwright Valentin Chawell. If the mask is taken as a concept, there seems to be no limit to the possible associations. Dietrich also finds several functions for the mask: Pirandello wanted to show "the relative truth" O'Neill to penetrate his figures as in a Roentgen apparatus" (p. 200). Cf. Koischitz, p. 42.


52. Angel, The Haunted Horses of Eugene O'Neill, p. 98.

53. Ibid., p. 94.


55. All Conan-Bynum Art Muses, p. 329-330.

56. Ibid., p. 141.

57. Ibid., p. 322.

58. Ibid., p. 338-339.


60. This "is compelled to accept her superiority to the Negro... Unable to surmise how Negro husband, she becomes appositionally determined that he shall not surpass her". Angel, The Haunted Horses of Eugene O'Neill, p. 121.

61. Jacob, Eugene O'Neill, p. 44.

62. Conzill et al., p. 436.


64. According to Johnson "the purpose of the crabs in The Great God Brown is instantly understandable... the difficulty... lies in the author's own confusion in regard to the use of the masks". John Howard Lumsden, Theory and Practice of Film Writing, with a new Introduction (New York, Hill and Wang, 1959, 1960), p. 294. Also compare Gmeser, Master of the Fears, p. 64.

65. Clark, Eugene O'Neill, the Man and his Plays, p. 105.


67. Ibid., p. 826.

68. Ibid., p. 251.

69. Ibid., p. 254.
Dion and Silly "are in one sense ... the conflicting aspects of the single character, 'Jon'." Carpenter, p. 111. Presenting a matter-of-fact analysis of O'Neill's entanglement with the male, he remarks: "And this grotesque mixture of incongruous metaphors suggests the confusion of the
modern world" (p. 112).

129. Macomber & Hesse, p. 51.
131. Macomber & Hesse, p. 55.
132. Ibid., p. 161.
133. Ibid., p. 45.
134. Ibid., p. xii.
135. Ibid., p. 41.


139. Ibid., 1928-1929, p. 156.

140. In a letter O'Neill stated his discontent with the handling of the masks in the original Broadway production: "When you sell that I wanted the - masks to get across - the abstract image of the bearer behind the people - as it is suggested in the script you will remember were already how much they were (in the production). They suggested only the broadside, hypocritical struggle - personality of picke in their personal relationship - - a thing I never could have needed much to convey. They became an unnecessarily trick. Perhaps I am demanding too much, but it can't be done - but I am sure with the right mask a boy evening would get across, that the play would be up and instead of confusing ..." (Letter to Be Casse's, May 22, 1927).

142. Ibid., Eugene O'Neill, the man and his plays, p. 116.
143. Ibid.
144. Eugene O'Neill, p. 279.
145. Ibid., p. 369.
146. Cf. Raleigh's comments on the half-masks, Raleigh, Pp. 44 ff.
147. Eugene O'Neill, p. 274.
171. Ibid., p. 501.
172. Ibid., p. 507.
173. Ibid., p. 541.
174. Ibid., p. 546.
176. "Cememne on Haile", Caryll et al., p. 117.
177. According to Raleigh, Jiddel and Down Without End are "both, significantly, dreadful plays, two of O'Neill's worst in basality, stale rhetoric, inconclusive characterisation, and a kind of ennuiressing, even at this data, outweighing of the author's own thoughts and desires". Raleigh, p. 132.
178. Down Without End, p. 525.
179. "A mystery play presupposes faith and a poetic language. Paul Claudel, the Frenchman, has both; O'Neill has neither". Nietzsche, p. 121.
180. In the absence of many instances of identical twins in the theatre world, O'Neill here had to rely on the mask (or the mask-like make-up) to bring about the likeness.
181. He felt make, O'Neill felt, demanded a language akin to that in Greek tragedy, which he considered himself unable to write (December 1932. Reprinted in Caryll et al., p. 120). The half-ready used in the first typewriter version introduced a "quality-of-character symbolism" outside his purpose in the trilogy. (O'Neill 1931. Reprinted in Poem, p. 11).
184. Ibid., p. 95.
185. Ibid., p. 71.
186. Ibid., p. 118.
187. Ibid., p. 122.

************