

Original Research Article

The Role of the Fool in W.B.YEATS' Play on Baile's Strand.

Kamal Almas Walee

University of Baghdad-ibn-Rashid college of Education

Accepted 15st August, 2020.

Abstract

This paper is a study to prove that W.B.Yeats' drama is not only a lyrical drama as some critics presume but there are theatrical elements in his drama. Thus the present study concentrates on the role of the Fool in Yeats' play On Baile's Strand to demonstrate that Yeats' drama contains many theatrical elements. The Fool is not only a minor character but he is more than that. The Fool foreshadows the action and he is a commentator. The study shows that a fool is a wise person. Also, the paper shows how the Fool parodies the action in the drama.

Keywords: Fool, Blind man, Cuhlain, Conchubar, chicken, appetite

The role of the fool in Yeats' *On Bailed Strand* (1904)

In 1903 Yeats wrote an essay entitled "Emotion of Multitude". In this essay, Yeats expressed his ideas about the basic structure of a play. Yeats stressed the necessity of a subplot "which is the main plot working itself out in more ordinary men and women and so galling before us the image of the multitude. (Yeats, 1961; 215) Yeats, in this essay, rendered the chorus in Greek drama, the subplots in Shakespeare's plays, and the symbols of Henrik Ibsen (1828 - 1906) as examples of "emotion of multitude". Besides, Yeats criticized the well-made plays of Prance on the basis that in these plays an element of reality, i.e., the emotion of multitude was excluded for the sake of a clear and forceful structure. (Yeats, 1961:2160)

The principal reason that motivated Yeats to use the subplot with ordinary men and women was to create an element of contrast to his heroic characters and their heroic actions. The figures of the subplot are not from the middle class which was the model for social drama. They are peasant characters. Hence the use of the Fool and the Blind Man in, *On Baile's Strand*. The main plot of this play is based upon "The Only Son of Aoife" an episode in Lady Gregory's (1852-1932) book *Cuchulain of Moirthemne* (1920)". (Boyd, 1917:83) The main characters are Cuchulain, King of Muirthemne "the warrior hero of the Tain Bo Cualnge, or 'the Cattle Raid of Cooley' a Gaelic epic contained in the Red Branch, or Ulster Cycle of tales"(Boyd, 1917:83), Conchubar, King of Uladh or Ulster and a young warrior called in the play the Young Man who is Cuchulain's Son by Aoife(Jeffares, 1963:257).

The play begins with the Fool praising the Blind Man: "what a clever man you are though you are blind! There is nobody with two eyes in his head that is as clever as you are."(Jeffares and Knowland, 1975:93) An examination of the play clarifies the inter-dependence of the Fool and the Blind Man. The Fool needs the Blind Man's cleverness or wit and the Blind Man needs the Fool's eyesight and strong body. Moreover, the Fool and the Blind Man set a kind of collaboration between them. The Blind Man instructs the Fool how to steal a chicken and the Fool carries out his plan. Again it is the Blind Man who is a good cook. Describing their collaboration the Fool says: "You take the fowl out of my hands after I have stolen it and plucked it, and you put it into the big pot at the fire there," (Yeats, 1959: pp. 247-48). The fool thinks that he is lucky in having the Blind Man with him.

The personages of *On Baile's Strand*, as Richard Taylor demonstrates, "are symbolic and draw their meaning directly from their actions and interrelationships."(Taylor, 1976:22) The inter-dependence of the Fool and the Blind Man is an integral

aspect of the play and it is dramatically functional. As John Rees Moore puts it," the alliance between the Blind Man and the Fool mirrors in a distorting glass the bonds linking Conchubar to Cuchulain." (Moore, 1971:119) Whereas the co-operation of the Fool and the Blind Man is unheroic and it is in terms of kitchen, the alliance of Cuchulain and Conchubar is heroic and it is in terms of the kingdom. Conchubar puts forth the concept of their interdependence as:

You are but half a king and I but half;

I need your might of hand and burning heart,

And you my wisdom. (p. 260).

In a letter written in January of 1904 to Frank Fay, the Irish actor, and producer, Yeats writes;

He [Cuchulain] is the fool-wandering passive, houseless, and almost loveless. Conchubar is the reason that it is blind. It can only reason because it is cold. Are they not the cold moon and the hot sun? (Yeats, 1954:424)

Yeats's letter sheds great light on his characterization. His characters are personified ideas. Cuchulain represents inspired intuition and instinctive action. The role that Conchubar plays is that of abstract reason with no intuition. Thus Yeats's figures are aspects of a character. Furthermore, his concept of characterization is anti-realistic.

The letter also reveals that as a dramatic method Yeats sets opposites: Cuchulain and Conchubar, Fool, and Blind Man.

In fact, even the values of the Fool are different from those of the Blind Man. For instance, when the Fool suggests dividing equally the chicken between them the Blind Man thinking of his plan to cheat the Fool replies that it is not prepared yet. It is also noteworthy that the Fool, like the Blind Man, is not given a personal name, but is referred to simply as a Fool. This emphasizes the archetypal significance of the Fool.

The letter also sums up the similarities between the Fool and Cuchulain. Actually, a close reading of the play reveals that the Fool appears only to Cuchulain and the audience especially in the beginning and the end of the play which shall be discussed later. Before discussing the technical functions of the play it will be helpful to realize the nature of the Fool and his similarity to Cuchulain.

The Fool is always anxious about filling his stomach. But his hunger or appetite is mysterious. The Fool works out his

hunger in a rather strange manner: "and I can go out and run races, with the witches at the edge of the waves and get an appetite, and when I've got it, there is the hen, waiting inside for me." (p. 248). Again as they wait for their dinner to be prepared the Fool suddenly remembers the witches. He asks the Blind Man not to lock the door of the assembly-house so that the witches are able to come in and find him. This reflects that the Fool is mentally preoccupied with the witches and they are precious to him. But then the Fool renounces the witches lest they come in and eat his share of the chicken.

Then the Fool recounts to the Blind Man that he consorts with witches: "Boann herself and Fand out of the deep sea, witches they are and they come by in the wind, and they cry, "Give a kiss, Fool, give a kiss." (p. 248). In his speech, the Fool refers to the Celtic goddesses Boann and Fand (Jeffares and Knowland, 1975:110) as witches. The two terms "witch" and "goddess" are inter-changeably used in the play in connection with supernatural power.

Barton R. Friedman points out that "the Fool is foolish chiefly by the standards of the bourgeois world embodied in the Blind Man." More important the bourgeois world is embodied in Conchubar whose shadow is the Blind Man". (Friedman, 1971:2) The Fool is foolish because he is imaginative and believes in the witches which are idle tales from the viewpoint of the bourgeois people. But on the contrary, the Fool like Cuchulain is endowed with an intuitive imagination and what he senses is right.

It is not a matter of accident that the Fool several times refers to the witches as representative of supernatural power. The preoccupation of the Fool with the supernatural is related to the main theme of the play. The supernatural does affect the action of the play. Hence we cite some instances from the play where the effect of the supernatural is evident with reference to the role of the Fool as far as this point is concerned.

The Fool's talk about witches, door, and sea paves the way for the oath-taking ceremony in which Cuchulain is to swear an oath of obedience to Conchubar. Unlike the Fool who opens the door to the witches, Conchubar while awaiting Cuchulain's agreement about the oath orders to shut the door of the assembly-house to keep the witches out. Thus Yeats "frames the play's serious action with a parodic subplot." (Friedman, 1971:29)

In the scene in question, Conchubar summons three women to sing a song to keep the witches away from the fire over which the oath is to be taken. In their song, the three women comment on the nature of the witches. They state that the witches are female in their attractiveness and they tempt the men of Ulster to seek possession of what is impossible. Hence they call on their gods to exorcise the witches out. The three women also demonstrate that the witches come by in the wind and change their shapes out of love or hate. So the witches

are known as idle Shape-Changers. The women sum up the fate of those pursued by witches as:

Emptied, ruined, wracked, and lost,

That they will follow for at most

They will give him a kiss for a kiss. (p. 262).

This clearly mirrors the situation of the Fool pursued by the witches for a kiss. In fact, the three women describe destiny as a fearful mystery, mainly in the control of hostile supernatural beings who beguile men out of love and hate.

Cuchulain also makes many references to witches. In his debate with Conchubar about the oath of obedience, Cuchulain expresses his passions for fierce and wild women. Cuchulain ridicules the domestic, cautious, and practical life of Conchubar as the latter accuses Cuchulain of being childless and houseless. Furthermore, Conchubar says to Cuchulain: "You should have overtaken on the hills / some daughter of the air," (p. 258). This reminds Cuchulain of Aoife, the woman he had overcome in battle and made love to. Consequently, when Conchubar describes Aoife as "that fierce woman of the camp" (p. 258) Cuchulain becomes angry. Defending Aoife, Cuchulain tells Conchubar that had Conchubar seen her, he would not have been able to resist her charm.

Thus Cuchulain makes it clear that he loves a witch, i.e., Aoife who is a woman of the Sidhe: "the faery people" and "the people of the wind." (Jeffares and Knowland, 1975:11) Besides, according to folk tradition, if anyone becomes too interested in the Sidhe he will have no more any interest in ordinary life. Consequently, Cuchulain is torn between what he considers conservative women and the wild and fierce women. Cuchulain's conflict echoes the conflict the Fool faces between his desire for the witches and the chicken. The consequence of Cuchulain's love for Aoife is that she sends her son - and Cuchulain's - to revenge on Cuchulain. She sends her son under the bond not to reveal his name and to challenge the greatest champion of Ulster, namely, Cuchulain.

Here are two more instances of how the supernatural affects the action, or rather the life of the hero. The same witches, earlier welcomed by the Fool and spoken of with dread by the three women, are the cause of Cuchulain's tragic killing of his son. When Cuchulain first meets the Young Man he discerns in his face a likeness to Aoife. Cuchulain's heart warms to the Young Man. They exchange gifts and thus Cuchulain wants to befriend him. Here Conchubar points out that Cuchulain is overcome by the witches and this is why Cuchulain avoids the challenge of the Young Man and befriends him. Cuchulain gets angry and seizes Conchubar. When Cuchulain finds himself attacking Conchubar and remembers his oath of obedience to Conchubar, he cries "Yes, witchcraft! Witchcraft! Witches of the air 1" (p. 270). Consequently, Cuchulain accepts the challenge

and drives the Young Man out for single combat on the strand. When he kills the Young Man, Cuchulain boasts of his victory "over the witches of the air."

Yeats suggests the supernatural even in the last moment of the hero's life. T.R. Henn notices that "the Fool is the friend of the witches who work out the final madness upon Cuchulain." 14(Henn, 1961:207) In fact, Cuchulain's irrational fight with the sea is also an implication of the effect of supernatural beings. And the Fool's mentioning of the witches with whom he runs races at the edge of the waves foreshadows Cuchulain's fight with the waves. Thus Yeats shows the effect of the supernatural on the natural.

To sum up this point, Teats' fool is supernaturally possessed. The supernatural beings seem very natural to him and he even expresses his desire for their companionship. Yeats's aim, as Nathan points out, "is to have the Fool's contact with the supernatural echo and reinforce Cuchulain's." (Nathan, 1965:115)

To turn to the technical function, the Fool, and the Blind Man, as Taylor puts it, "provides both a perfect induction and a frame for the dramatic action, as well as comic detachment." (Skenne, 1971:166) In fact, the curiosity and naivety of the Fool serve to use the Fool as a device for the sake of exposition.

As the Blind Man senses the leg of the big chair he says "Ah, ah." Then the Fool asks him why they have brought out the big chair. The Blind Man explains that Conchubar is coming today and he will be Cuchulain's master. The Fool wonders if there is anything capable of mastering Cuchulain. To the Fool, Cuchulain is the most superior man. Furthermore, the Blind Man tells the Fool that Conchubar is coming "to put an oath upon him [Cuchulain] that will stop his rambling and make him as biddable as a house-dog and keep him always at his hand." (p. 249). This again puzzles the Fool. He thinks that Conchubar will achieve his end by magic or witchcraft. In all this, the Fool reveals the spiritual kinship between him and Cuchulain - as it is made clear in the above, quoted letter of Yeats.

The exposition of the play given by the Fool and the Blind Man takes the form of a mock play. In this mock play, the Fool plays the part of Cuchulain and the Blind Man that of Conchubar. The Blind Man sits in the big chair prepared for Conchubar and asks the Fool - the mock-hero, to take an oath of allegiance. The Blind Man in his role as Conchubar argues that since the mock-hero lacks intelligence, riches, and heirs he is a useless creature and must submit to these who do possess these things. The Fool parodying the role of the hero refuses: "I will not, I'll take no oath. I want my dinner." (p. 249).

The comic mock play of the Fool and the Blind Man is dramatically functional as far as foreshadowing the coming

action. The Fool and the Blind Man are also symbolic of the opposition between Cuchulain and Conchubar.

In resisting the Blind Man's demand to take the oath the Fool externalizes the conflict Cuchulain will face when he meets Conchubar. Cuchulain is Yeats's spokesman for the reckless, exuberant and wild spirit of heroism. Hence he denounces the oath because it puts an end to his spontaneous and heroic nature. Cuchulain sums this up when he says: "I'll dance or hunt, or quarrel or make love, / Wherever and whenever I have a mind to." (p. 255). Cuchulain wants to remain free of all bonds that would domesticate his nature. The oath to Cuchulain is a device that will bring subordination and humiliation to his heroic nature.

Conchubar's leading motive behind the oath is personal "to leave a strong and settled country to [his] children." (p. 255). Utilizing the oath, Conchubar wants to subdue Cuchulain's heroic energy so that he can use Cuchulain in the service of his own personal and practical purposes. It is important to know that Cuchulain eventually takes the oath as a noble act and not out of fear or anything else.

As the Blind Man asks the Fool to give him his allegiance, the Fool tries to bring him back to the subject of the chicken in the pot. The Fool insists on getting his dinner and describes his hanger in a rather funny way "My teeth are growing longer with the hanger." (p. 250). Actually, the scene between the two characters is very comic. Thus the Blind Man tries to calm the Fool promising that he will satisfy his hunger. Then the Blind Man attempts to divert the attention of the Fool from the chicken. He begins to tell the Fool a story. In fact, the story is the background information concerning Cuchulain's relation with his former mistress Aoife, her subsequent enmity for him, and the existence of an unknown son who has vowed to kill Cuchulain.

But instead, the Fool's appetite is increased. The Fool even realizes for a moment that the Blind Man is diverting his attention from the chicken. Consequently, every now and then the Fool interrupts the Blind Man's narrative. Eventually, the Fool becomes interested in the Blind Man's story. The irony is that the curiosity of the Fool, like: "who is that? Who is he coming to kill?", "Go on. Tell me about the fight." and "Tell me the secret." (pp. 250-51) determine the narrative of the Blind Man.

The importance of the Blind Man's story lies in the fact that Yeats keeps the knowledge of the Young Man's parentage from all except the Blind Man; this has its dramatic effect. The tragedy of the son's death by his father depends on this technique, i.e., the Young Man and Cuchulain do not know each other.

The Blind Man gives the Fool many clues concerning the identity of the Young Man like: "That Young Man is Aoife's

son.", "he was to be brought up to kill Cuchulain,", and "Listen. I know who the young man's father is, but I won't say." (pp. 252-53). But the Fool is unable to grasp all these clues. In fact, he grasps one point from all that the Blind Man says to him. It is the Blind Man's claim that the Young Man will kill Cuchulain. The Fool considers it a challenge to Cuchulain's prowess. Thus the Fool does not grasp, as Reg Skene remarks, "the knowledge which if properly understood could avert tragedy." (Skenne, 1971:166) This certainly increases the significance of the Fool.

So far we gather from the Blind Man's story to the Fool that the Young Man is coming from Aoife's country under an obligation not to reveal his name and to challenge Cuchulain.

It is not worthy that up till now only the Fool and his companion are on the stage. Thus we first hear about the main characters before their actual appearance.

As the Fool sees Cuchulain passing by outside the big door, the Blind Man tells the Fool that Cuchulain is going to meet Conchubar to swear the oath of allegiance to Conchubar. The sudden to return to the idea of the oath confuses the Fool and he objects: "What a mix up you make of everything Blind Man! You were telling me one story, and now you are telling me another story." (p. 252).

The plot of the play consists of two episodes which are interconnected. The arrival of the Young Man from Aoife's country on the shore which Cuchulain leaves unguarded is the reason behind Conchubar's summoning of Cuchulain. The point is that the Fool cannot see the link between the two episodes because of his mental inability to analyse or because he takes everything literally. But we have to keep in mind that the play is a one-act play. Hence the Fool here probably enables the audience to cope with the condensed form of the play.

Therefore, Yeats reviews the plot and delineates the relationship of the main character by a comic device, as James W. Flannery observes "of having the Fool puzzle out the story

again, in strongly histrionic terms appropriate to his character." (Flannery, 1976:30) The Fool gives what amounts, to an allegory by referring to one of his feet to represent Cuchulain and one the Young Man and Conchubar are represented by the Fool's money bag. He throws his hat up in the air to represent Aoife in the high mountains in Scotland.

On the one hand, the Fool's comic recapitulation of the story amuses the audience, on the other hand, it compensates for the lack of dramatic action. Obviously, a great part of the play passes in a conversation between the Fool and the Blind Man relating to the background. None of the main characters: Cuchulain, Conchubar, and the Young Man make his entrance.

The Blind Man irritates his companion by saying, "Listen. I know who the Young Man's father is, but I won't say." (p. 253). Consequently, the Fool seizes the Blind Man to tell him his secret. Meanwhile, they hear the voices of Cuchulain and Conchubar outside. The Blind Man stimulates the Fool to go and ask Cuchulain this question. Then the Blind Man exits by the side door.

Alone on the stage, the Fool delivers what amounts to a soliloquy. In fact, his soliloquy has its comic effect. The Fool decides that he will ask Cuchulain, then that he dares not. He goes up the stage to the big door through which Cuchulain is about to enter and then turns downstage. His hesitation ends, in a direct address to Cuchulain: "No, no, Cuchulain, I'm not going to ask you." (p. 254).

The soliloquy of the Fool is not just a comic decoration. It becomes clear from the very hesitation of the Fool that he does not ask Cuchulain out of cowardice. But the Fool, as Reg Skene demonstrates, "is in some sense Cuchulain's spirit or imagination." (Skenne, 1974; 166) Later on, in the play Cuchulain finds himself in a parallel situation. When the Young Man arrives at court to challenge him he sees a likeness to Aoife in the face of the Young Man and partially recognizes him. But it is not clear why Cuchulain does not ask the Young Man this important question. Certainly, it is not out of cowardice. Thus the failure of the Fool to ask Cuchulain this question anticipates Cuchulain's situation.

Upon Cuchulain's entrance, the Fool sings a song. The Fool celebrates Cuchulain's exploits. He portrays Cuchulain as a supreme hero who has defeated many supernatural and natural enemies. Then the Fool goes out by the side door. Cuchulain enters, angrily he points out that Conchubar has summoned him because of such actions which have brought him fame.

The Fool makes his second entrance at the appointed time of the duel between father and son, i.e., Cuchulain and the Young Man, which takes place offstage. The Fool enters in a state of rage, dragging the Blind Man behind him. He throws the Blind Man down by the big chair threatening to tell Cuchulain and Conchubar that the Blind Man has left him nothing of the stolen chicken. During the time of this brawl between the Fool and the Blind Man over the chicken, the stage direction indicates that [There is the sound of clashing swords from time to time during what follows] (p. 272). Because of the sound of swords, the Fool cannot concentrate while he is talking hence he closes the door of the assembly house. Thus Yeats excludes the heroic battle and replaces it by the babbling of the Fool about the chicken.

When Cuchulain enters with his bloody sword after he kills his rival, the Fool continues his quarrel with the Blind Man. Completely unimpressed by this event the Fool asks Cuchulain to judge their case. Irritated "by their noise Cuchulain asks

what is between them that is worth a quarrel. Here the Fool complains that the Blind Man is always cheating him.

Thus Yeats puts, as Balachandra Rajan says, "heroic and low life into a juxtaposition in which each underwrites the validity of the other." (Rajan, 1965:55) The indifference and the greed of the Fool are set against Cuchulain's concept of ideal honour. Cuchulain fights the duel with the Young Man in defence of the honour of his kingdom. Basically, the Young Man declares that he is coming to challenge the foremost of Ulster men. Here the comic subplot interlocks with the tragedy of the main plot and greatly sharpens it.

The dispute of the Fool with the Blind Man reiterates and reflects the issue between Cuchulain and Conchubar. The Fool's admiration of his companion's cleverness, the quality he lacks, makes him subject to the tricks of his companion. Hence the Blind Man cheats him out of the chicken. Similarly, because of the oath imposed on Cuchulain, he cannot make his choice. He is forced to fight the duel that brings about the death of his son.

Conchubar and the Blind Man are, respectively spongers from the viewpoints of Cuchulain and the Fool. We hear the Fool saying: "He left me nothing but the bones and feathers. Nothing but the feathers, though I have stolen it." (p. 274). Cuchulain stresses the same point. He compares Conchubar to a Petty thief "a magpie" and then to "a maggot". Finally, Cuchulain and the Fool are represented as sympathetic and good and the other two as unsympathetic and bad.

While defending himself against the accusation made by the Fool, the Blind Man gives his account of the Fool: 'I gave him what he likes best. You do not know how vain this Fool is. He likes nothing so well as a feather.' (p. 273).

The keyword in the Blind Man's account of his companion is "feather". Keeping this word in mind we move to a scene of utter silence or a dumb show. In this scene, the Fool sits on the bench playing with the feathers left to him by the Blind Man. He sticks some of the feathers into his hair. Then Cuchulain sits beside the Fool. Indiscriminately Cuchulain takes a handful of feathers from the heap beside the Fool and from those on the Fool's hair to wipe the blood from his sword. Certainly, here the humour is grim. It is the opposition of the blood of Cuchulain's son and the worthless feathers. Similarly, the hero sitting beside the Fool playing with the same feathers is an element of black farce. However, Moore suggests that this is an indication that they "both have a kinship neither would consciously be aware of." (Moore, 1971:120)

Afterward, as a continuation of his appeal to Cuchulain, against the Blind Man, the Fool informs Cuchulain of the Blind Man's claim that the Young Man would kill him. Next, the Fool discloses to Cuchulain what the Blind Man has said before: that the Young Man is Aoife's son, that the Blind Man had been

in Aoife's country and that he knows the father of the Young Man. Consequently, Cuchulain seizes the Blind Man with force to reveal his secret. The Blind Man out of fear denies everything.

Eventually, the Fool with indifference and naivety "strips bare the Blind Man's hidden and terrifying knowledge (Rajan, 1965:56) that the Young Man is the idle son of "the one lover, and ... the only man that had overcome her [Aoife] in battle." (p. 276). So it is the Fool who gives Cuchulain the knowledge he seeks and which ironically leads to his destruction. Therefore, the Fool does not merely parody the action or set the scene but he does determine the main action.

The Fool in this play is more than a character of low comedy or one who provides comic relief. While the Fool and the Blind are offstage one of the three women in the oath-taking ceremony remarks that "life drifts between a fool and a blind man To the end and nobody can know his end." (p. 271). These lines are given scenic support in the play, that the Fool and the Blind Man are the two main determinants of Cuchulain's death. These lines not only increase the symbolic significance of the Fool but also ascertain that the Fool is not the mere shadow of Cuchulain.

The Fool's final function is when Yeats represents Cuchulain's madness on the stage. When Cuchulain learns whom he has killed he furiously strikes the empty chair of Conchubar. As he learns that Conchubar is between the big door and the sea he rushes out. Immediately the Fool creeps to the big door, watches, and describes to the Blind Man what Cuchulain is doing.

He tells him that Cuchulain has run past Conchubar into the sea and now he is striking the waves with his sword.

Thus Yeats removes the actual fight with the sea from the stage and turns it to a story narrated by the Fool to the Blind Man and the audience. The Fool, Friedman thinks, "acts out the response Yeats hopes to elicit from his audience." (Friedman, 1971; 199)

Noticeably, the Fool is the only one who witnesses the developing madness of Cuchulain, Hence he does not only report the events which happen on the shore. But he does participate in Cuchulain's tragedy. As Skene writes "the tragic Joy of Cuchulain in that final intense moment when all is unmixed passion is reflected in the excitement of the fool." (Skene, 1974:199) The language the Fool uses reflects that he is absorbed in describing the spectacle before him:

There, he is down! He is up again. He is going out in the deep water. There is a big wave. It has gone over him. I cannot see him now. He has killed kings and giants, but the waves have mastered him, the waves have mastered him! (p. 278).

To verify the above claim that the Fool participates in Cuchulain's tragedy and he is identified with the hero we turn to the dialogue of the Fool and the Blind Man in this scene.

As the Fool tells the Blind Man that all the people are leaving their houses to watch Cuchulain's fight with the sea. The Blind Man says that it is time to go and steal the full ovens of the empty houses: "You say they are running out of the houses? There will be nobody left in the houses, listen, Fool!" (p. 278). But does the Fool listen? The Blind Man repeats his command of "come here", to the Fool three times. But, the Fool keeps on saying: "the waves have mastered him", (p. 278).

Thus the Blind Man fails to break the contemplation of the Fool. As such, the Fool proves to be no beggar or thief manipulated by the Blind Man. She Fool resists the insistence of the Blind Man and this, as Friedman demonstrates "implies its potential as a defense against the abasing, materialistic will." (Friedman, 1971:43) Only when Cuchulain is overcome by the waves the excitement of the Fool ends and he obeys the Blind Man.

The play ends when the Fool and the Blind Man going out. Thus the sublime death of the hero is followed by the Blind Man's exploitation of the tragic situation.

In line with the significant role of the Fool, Yeats allows the Fool and the Blind to speak in prose to achieve verisimilitude. C.M. Bowra remarks that the prose of the Fool and the Blind Man "gives some variety of tone." (Bowra, 1959:196) Nevertheless, for the sake of a consistent style, the Fool sings.

To this Flannery says that the songs of the Fool "serve as an ironic casual counterpoint to the heroic personages and the lefty poetic diction." (Flannery, 1976:93)

الخلاصة

مسرح في المسرحية العناصر على الضوء تسلط الدراسة هذه تحاول الذين الناقد بعض اراء لتفنيد وذلك ييتس باتر ولوليام الكاتب من خالي مسرحي شعير مجرد ييتس باتر ولوليام مسرحي بأن يزعمون ييتس باتر ولوليام مسرحية دراسة خلال من وذلك الدرامية العناصر الاب له او المهرج على الدور الضوء تسلط لكوبديل شواطئ على فقط ليس المسرحية هذه في المهرج شخصية ان. المسرحية هذه في المهرج ان حديث المسرحية وثيمة بنية في دور له وانما ثانوية شخصية الاحداث بمحاكاة المسرحية في المهرج يقوم وكذلك للاحداث تمهيد يقدم ورؤية حكمة يمتلك بل بأعمق ليس المهرج وان سخرية بطريقة

Conclusion

This study tries to shed light on the theatrical elements in the theater of writer William Butler Yeats in order to refute the opinions of some critics who claim that the William Butler Yeats theater is just theatrical poetry devoid of dramatic elements, through the study of William Butler Yeats's play on the beaches of Bell by highlighting the role of the clown Or the goof in this play. The character of the clown in this play is not only a secondary character, but rather has a role in the structure of the theatrical theme, as the clown provides a prelude to the events, and the clown in the play simulates the events in a sarcastic way, and the clown is not a fool but has wisdom and vision.

Works cited

- Bowra, C. M. The Heritage of Symbolism. London :Macmilan and co. Ltd, 1956 .
- Boyd, Ernst A. The Contemporary Drama of Ireland. Boston: Little Brown, and company, 1917.
- Flannery, James W. B. Yeats, and the Idea of a Theatre. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1967.
- Friedman, Barton R. Adventures in the Deeps of Mind the Chulain plays of W.B. Yeats. Princeton University Press, 1971.
- Henn, T. R. The Harvest of Tragedy. London: Methuen and co. Ltd, 1961.
- Jeffares, A. Norman, and Knowland, A. S. eds. A Commentary on the Collected Plays of W. B. Yeats. London: The Macmillan Press, 1963.
- Jeffares, A. Norman. Introduction and Notes to Selected plays by W. B. Yeats. London: Macmillan ,1963.
- Moore, John, Rees. Masks of Love Death: Yeats as Dramatist. Ithaca: Yale University Press, 19671.
- Nathan, Leonard E The Tragic Drama of W.B. Yeats: Figures in a Dance. New York: Columbia university press, 1965.
- Rajan, Balachandra. W. B. Yeats: A Critical Introduction. London: Hutchinson University Press, 1965.
- Skene, Reg. The Cuchulain Plays of W. B. Yeats. London: The Macmillan Press Ltd, 1974.
- Taylor, Richard. The drama of W. B. Yeats Irish Myth and Japanese NO. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1976 .
- Yeats. W. B. The Collected Plays of W. B. Yeats. London: Macmillan and co. Ltd, 1961.
- Yeats .W. B. Essays and Introductions. London: Macmillan and co. Ltd, 1961.
- Letters of W. B. Yeats .ed. Allan Wade. London: Rupert Hart Davis, 1954.