

**Dislocated ‘Selves’ and Alienated ‘Souls’ in Eugene O’Neill’s  
*The Hairy Ape* and Girish Karnad’s *Hayavadana***

**Archana Dahiya<sup>1</sup>**

**Itika Dahiya<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1,2</sup>M. A. (English), UGC-NET

The Dept. of English and Foreign Languages

Maharshi Dayanand University, Rohtak, Haryana, India.

**Abstract:** *The present paper entitled “Dislocated ‘Selves’ and Alienated ‘Souls’ in Eugene O’Neill’s *The Hairy Ape* and Girish Karnad’s *Hayavadana*” is an attempt to exhibit the plight of modern man in this age of industrialization and technological advancements that has converted their whole selves into something more complex and distorted personalities. This imperfect and disorganized figure is represented by Yank in O’Neill’s *The Hairy Ape* and Devadatta, Kapila, Padmini and Hayavadana in Karnad’s *Hayavadana*. The blurred identity is also the end-product of the modern era of capitalism and entangled human relationships. The paper traces in these dramas an inherent affinity with Existentialism and Expressionism that concentrates on the dislocation and alienation of the modern protagonists that are having their existence in the void world ungoverned by the laws of God.*

**Keywords:** *Dislocation, Alienation, Capitalism, Imperfection, Existentialism, Expressionism.*

---

Modern-age dramas take up as their themes – the modern man’s inescapable predicament in the present-day society such as alienation, dislocation of personality, inanity, angst etc. The modern man in his attempt to free himself from this dilemma ends up disrupting the natural order who ultimately finds himself entrapped/entangled in a more labyrinthine situation that leaves him with no alternative other than suicide. This suicidal condition of the modern man is efficiently dealt with not only in Karnad’s *Hayavadana* (1975) but also in *The Hairy Ape* (1922) by Eugene O’Neill. The distinctive quality of the dramas – i.e. they are meant to be enacted on the stage and employ spectacular techniques – lends exotic or exquisite perfection and visual wonder in the depiction of the distorted psyche of the modern man. The stage setting also deepens the forcefulness of the passionate emotions expressed by the characters. These features conform to the expressionistic form of drama. Eugene O’Neill’s *The Hairy Ape* and Karnad’s *Hayavadana* both comply with the art-form of expressionism – a movement that began in Germany before the World War I.

Expressionism as a movement in the art-forms, especially in painting, began in the revolt of realism, naturalism and impressionism of the nineteenth century. According to J. W. Syed,

“expressionism, as a literary and artistic movement, flourished in Europe, particularly in Germany, between 1914 and 1924”. He further says:

Expressionism, like Romanticism, was a voice of protest against the whole materialistic and mechanical trend of modern technological and industrial civilization which reduces man to a 'robot', alienates him from his own essential nature and makes him a prey to purposeless, tedious and meaningless existence.... Rousseau, Blake and Wordsworth had already questioned the benefits of an artificial civilization, they believed that the progress of civilization and the accumulation of earthly goods had made man selfish and had taken him far from the purity and innocence of his real uncorrupted nature.

Expressionists are merely concerned with the explorations of the mysterious and dark recesses of the human soul enlivening it with the symbolic manifestations of the passions and emotions as well as the thought-processes of the individuals. Therefore, Expressionist drama becomes an assorted mix of reality and super-reality; there is no individual characterization in expressionist plays but merely types that express “the basic problems and issues peculiar to the modern society, such as bourgeois morality, sex, war, and the social problems resulting from mechanization and industrialization” (Syed). These writers endeavour to represent the anarchic state of the world by bringing it parallel to the chaotic and enigmatic situations manifested in the scenes that are interspersed with fantasy and reality and by portraying characters that are at once fantastic and eccentric not only in themselves but also in their thoughts, visions and moods.

The plays of both Eugene O'Neill and Girish Karnad border on the principles of the modernist movement of Expressionism but with a difference. While O'Neill's plays manifest a realistic touch with the ensemble of expressionism and existentialism, Karnad's plays mingle mythic tales with the expressionist techniques. Their plays employ the methods and techniques of expressionism in a distinctive manner although the spirit behind them is almost the same. The main characters in their plays suffer from dislocation of their personalities or 'selves' as well as alienation of their 'souls' or essence which is a distinctive feature of expressionism that brings this movement in a direct correlation with Existentialism. Existentialism is a modernist philosophy (derived from Martin Heidegger and Jean Paul Sartre) which is deeply concerned with the modern man's dilemmatic condition as well as his isolated and meaningless existence in a materialistic and capitalistic social order of this chaotic and anarchic modern age ungoverned by the laws of God.

In *The Hairy Ape* (1922) by Eugene O'Neill, the main protagonist is Yank who also suffers from a dislocated self and an alienated soul. In the very first scene of the drama the author in his stage directions acquaints us with the destined lot of the stokers of the ship. The setting of the first scene displays the distorted and inhumane conditioning of firemen who are destined to work in the abysmal surroundings of the forecastle below the deck of the ship where they feed the engine with the coals and make the ship get going. This forecastle of the firemen is

described as “crowded with men, shouting, cursing, laughing, singing – a confused, inchoate uproar swelling into a sort of unity, a meaning – the bewildered, furious, baffled, defiance of a beast in a cage” (O’Neill 5). This scene accentuates the forecastle’s cage-like appearance that has captivated the firemen in its gulf just like the beasts in a cage and that intensifies the sordidly mechanized world of Yank and his colleagues. O’Neill has argued in the stage direction of the opening scene of the play:

*The treatment of this scene, or of any other scene in the play, should by no means be naturalistic. The effect sought after is a cramped space in the bowels of a ship, imprisoned by white steel. The lines of bunks, the uprights supporting them, cross each other like the steel framework of a cage. The ceiling crushes down upon men’s heads. They cannot stand upright. This accentuates the natural stooping posture which shoveling coal and the resultant over-development of back and shoulder muscles have given them. The men themselves should resemble those pictures in which the appearance of Neanderthal man is guessed at. All are hairy chested, with long arms of tremendous power, and low, receding brows above their small, fierce, resentful eyes. (O’Neill 5)*

These directions of the author give a realistic picture of the environment under the deck of the ship which is as dismal and fiery as the abyss of the earth. It is unimaginable even to think of working in such an inimical surrounding that can easily crush one’s individuality and throw him off his mental peace and harmony. Although these firemen also belong to these so-called ‘civilized’ white races, but their work or job has made them lower to their high-class counterparts or the capitalistic class. Of these stokers, Yank seems to be “broader, fiercer, more truculent, more powerful, more sure of himself than the rest” (O’Neill 5), as the author himself asserts. He is a representative of self-governing personality and becomes a symbol of self-expression for the other stokers, “their most highly developed individual” (5) of all of them.

The play presents a faithful account of the oppression of the lower class of the stokers at the hands of the capitalistic class and its effects on the individualistic personality of the oppressed. In the play, the author’s main concern is to show how Yank, the protagonist of the play suffers from the loss of individuality, who in the beginning has been depicted as being the most assured of himself than the others. The fragmentation of his self occurs after the incident when Mildred, the daughter of a rich capitalistic owner of the ship visits the stokehole along with two Engineers, the dismal place symbolic of Yank’s and his colleagues’ inharmonious selves and savage personality. As she appears before them all clad in white that gives a contrastive view against the blackened backdrop of that stokehole as well as the blackened bodies of the stokers, all of them get dumbfounded after seeing her, while Yank who at this time is hurling abuses at the owner of the whistle in a loud voice, simultaneously swinging “his shovel murderously over his head in one hand, pounding on his chest, gorilla-like, with the other” (24), is standing with

his back towards her and has not yet seen her. Just as he becomes aware of someone standing behind him and turns around in a full sway –

*whirls defensively with a snarling murderous growl, crouching to spring, his lips drawn back over his teeth, his small eyes gleaming ferociously, he sees Mildred, like a white apparition in the full light from the open furnace doors. He glares into her eyes, turned to stone. As for her, during his speech she has listened, paralyzed with horror, terror, her whole personality crushed, beaten in, collapsed, by the terrific impact of this unknown, abysmal brutality, naked and shameless. (O'Neill 25)*

This view of his whole personality shakes the very constitution of Mildred who gets horrified by the very look of his eyes and his “gorilla face” and shuts out the view of his gorilla looks with her hands on her eyes. She makes him look much inferior before her exhibiting her vanity of being of a superior status by insulting him with the following words: “Take me away! Oh, the filthy beast” (25)! These derogatory remarks of hers not just leave him flabbergasted but explode away his idea of his own ‘self’. And he then in his “rage and bewildered fury” (25) swears to revenge himself upon her and her whole community. The impact of this insult on him is so enormous that it shatters him completely and makes him forgetful of his own free existence as a human being on this earth due to which he acts and behaves in an absurd manner like a ‘wild beast’ while wandering in the streets of Fifth Avenue, bumping violently into the men coming from the church congregation while simultaneously using an abusive language towards men and women alike. Because of such an attitude, he gets arrested by the patrolling police officers and is landed in the prison of Blackwell’s island where he likens his condition with that of a hairy ape locked up in a cage of ‘steel’. Here, he comes to know of I. W. W. (or Industrial Workers of the World) an organization that wants to bring a change in the society through fair means but are fabricated in warped words by the Senator misrepresenting the I. W. W. as “the Industrious Wreckers of the World”, a gang of “devil’s brew of rascals, jailbirds, murderers and cutthroats who libel all honest working men” (O'Neill 43), who

*plot with fire in one hand and dynamite in the other. They stop not before murder to gain their ends, nor at the outraging of defenseless womanhood. They would tear down society, put the lowest scum in the seats of the mighty, turn Almighty God’s revealed plan for the world topsy-turvy, and make of our sweet and lovely civilization a shambles, a desolation where man, God’s masterpiece, would soon degenerate back to the ape. (O'Neill 44)*

Being taken in by this fabricated speech of the Senator published in the newspaper about the workings of the I. W. W. and believing it to be true, he visits them to be a member of I. W. W. as he also wishes to take revenge upon the capitalists and to show it to them that he too belongs to ‘THIS WORLD’ as ‘a human being’. But when he comes to know of their real

activities that they wish to change the unequal conditions of the society not through dynamites nor through any secretive means but through a direct legitimate action and is thrown out by them, he realizes that he doesn't belong even to them. Thus rejected by the human world and dejected by his own miserable condition of "not-belongingness", he heads on towards the animal world i.e. to the Zoo. He is always being made conscious of his belonging to a lower strata and is constantly being likened to an "hairy ape" by the very human world to which he naturally belongs so much so that he himself becomes illusory about his real existence in this world and gets afflicted with the trauma of a fragmented and fractured individuality resulting in the dislocation and alienation of his 'self' and 'soul'. The last scene of the play (i.e. Scene VIII) takes him amidst a 'NEW WORLD' - the 'Zoo' where he walks up to the gorilla's cage and begins his last but long monologue addressing that 'hairy ape' to whose community he thinks he now belongs after being disowned by his own world. Through this monologue, he patters out his long caged thoughts and emotions that reveal the torments and tumult of mind he has been going through and the following words of him to the ape explain this that excites the chords of sympathy in the readers:

*And why wouldn't yuh get me? Ain't we both members of de same club—de Hairy Apes? [They stare at each other—a pause— then YANK goes on slowly and bitterly.] So yuh're what she seen when she looked at me, de white-faced tart! I was you to her, get me? On'y outa de cage—broke out—free to moider her, see? Sure! Dat's what she thought. She wasn't wise dat I was in a cage, too—worsen'n yours—sure—a damn sight—'cause you got some chanct to bust loose— but me—[He grows confused.] Aw, hell! It's all wrong, ain't it? (O'Neill 55-56)*

The capitalistic oppression has made him an unthinking and eccentric individual, the job he is indulged in i.e. of stoking the fiery engine of the ship with coals while being caged in the dark and steeled stokehole and 'the mark' of being a "filthy beast" left on him by that proud daughter of the ship-owner have put a question-mark on his identity as a free individual and as a human being. He exists in a kind of hellish situation as he himself admits in his monologue: "I ain't on oath and I ain't in heaven, get me? I'm in de middle tryin' to separate 'em, takin' all de woist punches from bot' of 'em. Maybe dat's what dey call hell, huh" (O'Neill 55-56)? He is so much obsessed with the idea of taking vengeance upon the human world that he absurdly calls the ape up for an action – for a fight against the capitalists – to "knock 'em down and keep bustin' 'em till dey croaks yuh wit a gat—wit steel (57)! And it is in this maddened rage that he opens up the lock of the gorilla's cage and beckons him to "step out and shake hands! I'll take yuh for a walk down Fif ' Avenoo. We'll knock 'em offen de oath and croak wit de band playin'. Come on, Brother" (57). At this the gorilla "scrambles gingerly out of his cage" (57). But for Yank whose talk still retains a mocking tone not only confounds the gorilla but also infuriates him so much that he enwraps him in a "murderous hug" crushing his ribs and afterwards throws

and shuts him up into the cage and leaves him in this painful and desolate condition. Even the gorilla disowns him and Yank utters a painful cry from his heart:

*Even him didn't tink I belonged. [Then, with sudden passionate despair.] Christ, where do I get off at? Where do I fit in? [Checking himself as suddenly.] Aw, what de hell! No squakin', see! No quittin', get me! Croak wit your boots on! [He grabs hold of the bars of the cage and hauls himself painfully to his feet—looks around him bewilderedly—forces a mocking laugh.] In de cage, huh? [In the strident tones of a circus barker.] Ladies and gents, step forward and take a slant at de one and only—[His voice weakening]—one and original—Hairy Ape from de wilds of—[He slips in a heap on the floor and dies. The monkeys set up a chattering, whimpering wail. . . .] (O'Neill 57-58)*

But when he is just dying he addresses himself as a Hairy Ape and as he dies, the monkeys from another cage let out a “whimpering wail” as if he belongs to none other than their own category if not to that of ‘the ape’. And thus “perhaps, the Hairy Ape at last belongs” (58) which, now, is of no consequence to him as his existence on this earth has come to an end. Eugene O'Neill has successfully portrayed the dismantling of Yank's spirit and hopes with as much vividness and vitality.

Girish Karnad, an Indian playwright, also uses these modern techniques of existentialism, expressionism, Brechtian techniques such as alienation effect and “epic theater”, deconstructionism, etc. in his plays. He is a modern dramatist and his plays display an assorted picture of all these techniques along with the use of mythic Indian folktales that not only lend uniqueness to his plays but also make his plays exciting and interesting to read. And it is through this unique variety of blending the mythic with the realistic techniques that he tends to obscure the issues taken in the play in order to exhibit the confused state of the modern man – his dislocated ‘self’ and his alienated ‘soul’ as also the disintegration of his personality both ethically and morally – in this modernistic society. In his play *Hayavadana* (1975), Karnad has used all of these techniques to intensify the enigma of the modern individuals living in an anarchic state in the unruly modern world satirizing the individuals' hankering after a ‘perfect’ life full of pleasures with a negation of all evil or odd things. The major characters of the play are Devadutta, Kapila and Padmini; the play has also a subplot and *Hayavadana* (i.e. a man with a horse's head), *Bhagavata* (the narrator) and an Actor are its main characters. According to M. K. Rukhaya:

*The narrative forms a Chinese box structure, where we have two stories within the main story. The first one of the *Bhagavata*, the second of *Hayavadana* and the main plot shuttles between the two. The *Bhagavata* becomes the essence permeating the two stories, functioning as a unifying force. The *Bhagavata* performs the role of the author,;he is very unlike the typical *Bhagavata* in Indian drama who appears only at the*

*beginning and end of the play and is very passive throughout. Like the Greek chorus, he initiates, concludes and comments upon the play. Songs are sung and criticisms are made. ("Style and Technique...")*

The drama opens with the invocation to Lord Ganesha whose "Self" is itself incomplete and a distorted combination of two contrary selves, is worshipped as the "the destroyer of incompleteness" (Rukhaya, "Girish..."). He is known as "the husband of Riddhi (style) and Siddhi (talent). Riddhi has no existence without siddhi, and siddhi forges its identity with the appropriate riddhi. The synchronization of these two aspects constitutes the ideal of aucitya (harmony or appropriateness) that Karnad endeavours to achieve throughout the play through his heroine Padmini. Nevertheless, the ideal is only a transient or ephemeral concept" (Rukhaya "Girish..."). The play begins with an homage to the Lord Ganesha, an Indian mythological God meant to be the destroyer of all obstacles and hurdles that come in the way towards success and that can perfect all imperfections. Bhagvata addresses him as "O single-tusked destroyer of incompleteness/ we pay homage to you and start our play" (Karnad 1). This signifies that the deity who crowns his devotees/worshippers with the gift of a perfect and successful life is himself imperfect as is evident from the words of Bhagavata:

*An elephant's head on a human body, a broken tusk and a cracked belly – whichever you look at him he seems the embodiment of imperfection, of incompleteness. How indeed can one fathom the mystery that this very Vakratunda-Mahakaya, with his crooked face and distorted body, is the Lord and Master of Success and Perfection? Could it be that this Image of Purity and Holiness, this Mangalamoorty, intends to signify any appearance that the completeness of God is something no poor mortal can comprehend? (Karnad 1)*

These words of Bhagavata sketch out the thematic implications of the play. In the play, Hayavadana, on whose name the play is entitled, slightly resembles Lord Ganesha in appearance having a horse's head on a human body. Hayavadana is a man with a horse's head that is a symbolical representation of the identity crisis that has to be endured at one time or the other by every human being who exists in the dim realities of this modern age. Hayavadana too seems to suffer this crisis of wanting to have one particular identity rather than two. He tried a lot to adjust himself to his destined situation by diverting his thoughts and interests towards "the social life of the Nation – Civics, Politics, Patriotism, Nationalism, Indianization, the Socialist Pattern of Society" (Karnad 9) and grappled with the ongoing internal conflicts but nothing resolved his problematic condition. He desperately wants to become a complete man so that he can attach himself to the society he is living in. He even visited several religious places to pray and make a vow to different religious Gods and visited various saints, mendicants and sadhus with a veil on his head but no cure came. He doesn't feel himself able enough to endure the reality of his predicament so that's why he puts up a veil wherever he goes. It also shows the trauma he's going through with the face of a horse and the body of a man revealing the incongruity of his present existence – the dislocated personality and the soul that feels itself alienated not only due

to the lack of its individuality but also from the world around as his soul neither wholly belongs to the animal world nor to the human world – the same predicament as that of the Yank who also like him doesn't belong entirely to one world whether it's of humans or that of 'hairy ape'. So how can he devote himself to the society of which he isn't a part and where he can't indulge himself in any socio-economic or political activities.

Similar enigmatic existential moods prevail in the relationships of the other major characters – Devadutta, Padmini and Kapila. Devadutta is a very close friend of Kapila despite having a lot of differences they are just like “one mind, one heart” (Karnad 11). While Devadutta, the only son of the Revered Brahmin Vidyasagara, is “comely in appearance, fair in colour, unrivalled in intelligence” (2) yet thinly-built, is “the apple of every eye in Dharampura, Kapila who is the only son of Lohita, the ironsmith, is “dark and plain to look at” (2), and physically a strong-built man yet weak in mind. However, both have no equals in their particular accomplishments – Devadutta in wit, poetry and debates on love and logic; Kapila in strength, daring and physical skills- like wrestling. The opposite qualities of the two do not hinder their intact friendship. And Padmini is the most beautiful woman and equally witty and sharp and “as fast as lightening” (Karnad 19). She is the daughter of a leading wealthy merchant in Dharampura and an altogether different character whose dichotomy is of distinct nature that is much beyond Head/Body dichotomy. She seems to be a perfect character in her outward appearance but in fact her imperfectness lies in her indecisiveness in making an apt and correct choice. The two-headed bird engraved at the door of her house is sprightly symbolic of her own two-mindedness or her dual personality. This ambiguous “two-headed” girl ensnares Devadutta in her charming looks who is not yet aware of her sharp nature that needs not a man with a witty mind but a man with a strong body, “a man of steel” as Kapila says who himself has fallen in love with her but can't express it as he thinks himself below it. However, he helps Devadutta in his marriage to Padmini. Devadutta loves and cares for Padmini very much whereas Padmini though she respects his feelings for her, has a deep interest for Kapila as well in her heart that comes to the fore when they are on their way towards Ujjain fair. Devadutta notices her utmost concern for Kapila and how much she delights in his ways and talks and decides to renounce her for his friend. He walks away from them to visit the temple of Goddess Kali in order to keep his oath he has taken before his marriage to Padmini that he will offer his head to the Lord Rudra and his hands to Maa Kali. But since Padmini and Kapila have insisted to see the temple of Lord Rudra he is unable to do the same he has vowed to do. So he cuts off his head with the sword of Maa Kali as an offering to the goddess. Kapila too does the same when he comes to the temple in his search and finds him in such a state. He kills himself partly because of his affection for his dear friend and partly because of his fear of the society that will blame him as a cause of his death. In these enigmatic circumstances, they entirely forget Padmini and left her alone during her pregnancy stage who after finding them dead gets hysterical and make complaints to the goddess and takes up the sword to kill herself too awakening the goddess off her sleep who stops her and fulfills her wishes telling her to “put these heads back properly. Attach them to their

bodies and then press that sword on their necks. They will come up alive” (Karnad 32). Padmini, however, in her excitement mistakenly joins the heads of Devadutta and Kapila with the bodies of Kapila and Devadutta respectively – i.e. Devadutta’s head being attached to Kapila’s body and Kapila’s head to Devadutta’s body. The consequences of which occur soon after they regain their new life and a new identity. Now both have the share of each other’s bodies. So in this respect Devadutta gets enriched whose intelligence gets wedded to the physical strength of the body of Kapila whereas Kapila becomes a loser in this game of life; he is already weak in mind and has now lost his body as well by which he is known in the whole village having attained the weak body of Devadutta. Padmini becomes the bone of contention between the two friends who vie with each other for her, nevertheless she chooses Devadutta as he has now become a possessor of both the things which Padmini has wanted – a perfect man as her husband.

Karnad has tried to emphasize a particular point that it is the body that reigns supreme over the head. Accordingly, both Devadutta and Kapila also prove this point when the confusion arises between their heads and bodies and start reacting to each other. Devadutta can’t keep up to a hectic schedule to maintain his bodily strength as it is against his real self. Similarly Kapila who is habitual of his work as an ironsmith and is adept in such activities that requires a strong body becomes incapable in doing so. Nevertheless both of them gradually recoup their earlier selves again enduring a lot of hardships and agonizing pains of their disoriented and disorganized selves. After their coming into their previous selves, Padmini leaves Devadutta for Kapila because she loves Kapila’s ‘Body’ but not the ‘Head’ of Devadutta thus here the Western binary of Head/ Body is contradicted against or is deconstructed into the binary of Body/Head.

Padmini waveringly and interchangeably chooses between Devadutta and Kapila due to which she always falls in a ditch bringing up troubles onto her head. Devadutta and Kapila again come face-to-face with each other, Devadutta having reached the jungle Kapila lives in, in search of his wife with two swords in his hands, where they engage themselves in a duel for the hand of Padmini and kill each other, thereby leaving her all alone again. After this havoc in her life, she becomes fed up of her life and performs sati with both of her loves leaving his child in the care of Bhagavata.

Padmini’s child appears to be affected with the ongoing existential crisis in the life of his parents who are always seen to be grappling with their own enigmatic existence and dilemmatic conditions. The play presents a contrast in the personality of the child and that of the dolls – while the child is unable to speak anything, dolls are endowed with speaking skills and are aware to every other activity that takes place in the lives of the major characters. However, the child helps Hayavadana in the restoration of his real and complete identity. Hayavadana is blessed with the body of a horse by Goddess Kali but he still has a human voice that gets rectified in his efforts to make the child speak and laugh and he begins to neigh like a horse and hence becomes

a complete horse. Now he really belongs to the animal world. The child also starts laughing with this abrupt change in him. As in the words of Rukhaya,

*The child biologically belongs to Devadutta's head and Devadutta's body; however, it exhibits qualities of Kapila in its violence and unintelligible activities. . . . Moreover, the child prefers the horse to human; bodily instinct reigns over human intelligence yet again. Therefore Karnad's primary motive in writing the play was to ponder upon the significance of the body in one's identity and hence reverses the dichotomy head/body in his title. This is the significance of the title that powerfully echoes the theme of the drama. ("Style and Technique...")*

The Expressionistic techniques are also employed in certain scenes especially when Dolls I and II are seen to be engaged in a ceaseless talk with each other reviewing the transformations happening in the lives of Devadutta and Padmini as also the inner workings of Padmini's mind.

Thus, Girish Karnad has made an effective presentation of the characters' existential 'selves' with an infusion of myth, fantasy, reality and symbolism along with the distorted stage-productions that coalesce with each other to give an outlook of expressionistic drama. However his use of myths and folk-tales endows a unique identity to his plays as compared to the typical expressionistic plays. This quality of Karnad's plays makes them slightly different from those of Eugene O'Neill's. Karnad's *Hayavadana* and O'Neill's *The Hairy Ape*, thus, present the absurd and impersonated forms of rowdy individuals sandwiched between their assorted identities and the faltering human relationships in a dilapidated world order.

### Works Cited

- Karnad, Girish. *Hayavadana*. Trans. Karnad. New Delhi: Oxford, 1975. Print.
- O'Neill, Eugene. *The Hairy Ape: A Comedy of Ancient and Modern Life in Eight Scenes*. 1922. Ed. Jim Manis. Hazelton: PSU-Hazelton, 2010-13. Electronic Classics Ser. Web. 10 Aug. 2013. <<http://www2.hn.psu.edu/faculty/jmanis/eugene-oneill/hairy-ape6x9.pdf>>
- Rukhaya, M. K. "Girish Karnad's *Hayavadana*." 18 Jan. 2009. Web. 12 Aug. 2013. <<http://voices.yahoo.com/girish-karnads-hayavadana-2525743.html?cat=72>>
- . -. "Style and Technique in Girish Karnad's *Hayavadana*." 30 July 2010. Web. 12 Aug. 2013. <<http://voices.yahoo.com/style-technique-girish-karnads-hayavadana-6494574.html?cat=2>>
- Syed, J. W. "Expressionism in the Twentieth Century Literature." N.d. Web. 11 Aug. 2013. <<http://www.allamaiqbal.com/publications/journals/review/apr70/3.html>>