

VOLUME VII  
NUMBER 2

JULY 1972 & JANUARY 1973

VOLUME VIII  
NUMBER 1

# JOURNAL OF RESEARCH [HUMANITIES]

*Edited by Siraj-ud-Din*



UNIVERSITY OF THE PUNJAB  
LAHORE



## EDITORIAL BOARD

### Chief Editor

Siraj-ud-Din, Professor Emeritus, Department of English Language and Literature, University of the Punjab.

### Members

Sh. Imtiaz Ali, Principal, Law College, University of the Punjab.

Ebadat Brelvi, Principal, Oriental College, University of the Punjab.

Muhammad Murtaza Khan, Principal, Hailey College of Commerce, University of the Punjab.

Abdus Shakoor Ahsan, Professor and Chairman, Department of Persian, Oriental College, University of the Punjab.

A. Waheed Qureshi, Professor and Chairman, Department of Urdu, Oriental College, University of the Punjab.

Munir-ud-Din Chughtai, Professor and Chairman, Department of Political Science, University of the Punjab.

Zulfiqar Ali Malik, Associate Professor and Chairman, Department of Arabic, Oriental College, University of the Punjab.

M.T. Ahmad, Associate Professor and Chairman, Department of Sociology, University of the Punjab.

Muhammad Aslam, Associate Professor and Chairman, Department of History, University of the Punjab.

Kh. Ghulam Sadiq, Associate Professor and Chairman, Department of Philosophy, University of the Punjab.

Mrs. Qamar Ata Ullah, Associate Professor and Chairman, Department of Social Work, University of the Punjab.

Mrs. Anwar Afzal, Associate Professor and Chairman, Department of Fine Arts, University of the Punjab.

Muhammad Azam Ali Khan Aurakzai, Associate Professor and Chairman, Department of Economics, University of the Punjab.

Kh. Amjad Saeed, Associate Professor and Chairman, Department of Business Administration, University of the Punjab.

Mujib A. Sheikh, Associate Professor and Chairman, Department of Administrative Science, University of the Punjab.

Shamsul Islam, Associate Professor and Chairman, Department of English Language and Literature, University of the Punjab.

Bashir Ahmad Siddiqui, Assistant Professor and Chairman, Department of Islamic Studies, University of the Punjab.

Miskeen Ali Hajazi, Assistant Professor and Chairman, Department of Journalism, University of the Punjab.

### Secretary

Iqbal Husain, Deputy Registrar, University of the Punjab.

VOLUME VII  
NUMBER 2

JULY 1972 & JANUARY 1973

VOLUME VIII  
NUMBER 1

# JOURNAL OF RESEARCH [HUMANITIES]

*Edited by Siraj-ud-Din*



UNIVERSITY OF THE PUNJAB  
LAHORE



# JOURNAL OF RESEARCH IN LITERATURE

Edited by Siraj-ud-Din



UNIVERSITY OF THE PUNJAB  
LAHORE

## CONTENTS

	Page
I. ذوالفقار علی ملک ابوالحسن المدائنی اور اسکی کتاب التعازی	1
II. SHAKESPEARE—"THE INVISIBLE POET"	
Imdad Husain	39
III. DRAMA AND THE BREAKDOWN OF LANGUAGE: A STUDY OF SOME TWENTIETH CENTURY PLAYS (PINTER, IONESCO, PIRANDELLO)	
Shaista Siraj-ud-Din	61



## CONTRIBUTORS

1. Zulfiqar Ali Malik, M.A. (Punjab), Ph.D. (Punjab), Ph.D. (Cantab.), Associate Professor and Chairman, Department of Arabic, Oriental College, University of the Punjab.
2. Imdad Husain, M.A. (Punjab), Ph.D. (Edinburgh), Professor Emeritus, Department of English Language and Literature, University of the Punjab.
3. Shaista Siraj-ud-Din, B.A. Hons. (Cantab.), Lecturer, Department of English Language and Literature, University of the Punjab.

## ابوالحسن المدائنی اور اس کی کتاب التعازی

ذوالفقار علی ملک

دور جاہلیت کے عرب علم تاریخ سے کماحقہ آشنا نہیں تھے۔ ان کا تاریخی سرمایہ اقوام و ملل قدیمہ کے بارے میں چند منتشر روایات پر مشتمل تھا۔ ظہور اسلام کے بعد جب فتوحات کا عظیم الشان دور شروع ہوا تو عربوں کو فتوحات اور فاتحین کے احوال و کوائف منضبط کرنے کی ضرورت محسوس ہوئی اور اس طرح عربی زبان میں تاریخ نگاری کی ابتداء ہوئی۔

مزید برآں اموی خلفاء نے قدیم اقوام مثلاً رومیوں اور یونانیوں کی تاریخ کے واقعات میں گہری دلچسپی کا اظہار کیا۔ المسعودی نے بیان کیا ہے کہ امیر معاویہ نماز عشاء کے بعد ایک تہائی رات گزرنے تک قصہ گوؤں کی مجلس میں بیٹھا کرتے تھے جو انہیں اخبار عرب اور عجمی بادشاہوں کے قصے اور کہانیاں اور ان کی سیاسی حکمت عملی کے بارے میں واقعات سناتے۔ پھر خلیفہ ایک تہائی رات سونے کے بعد بیدار ہوتا تو نوجوان لڑکے سیر الملوک اور سیاست پر کتابیں لے کر آجاتے اور اسے پڑھ کر سناتے۔ جرجی زیدان نے بیان کیا ہے کہ یہ کتابیں غالباً یونانی اور لاطینی زبان میں تھیں اور ان میں ابطال روم و یونان مثلاً اسکندر، یولیوس اور ہنی بال کے قصے مذکور تھے، یہ لڑکے عربی زبان میں ان قصوں کی توضیح کیا کرتے تھے۔

خلفاء کو دیکھ کر امراء و عمائدین سلطنت نے بھی اس طرح کی قصہ گوئی کی مجلسوں کا اہتمام کرنا شروع کر دیا۔ اس طرح عجمی اقوام کی تاریخ کی جانب بھی عربوں کی توجہ مبذول ہو گئی۔

- ۱۔ المسعودی ۲: ۵۲، ۵۳
- ۲۔ تاریخ آداب اللغة العربیة ۱: ۲۵۲



عباسی دور اول میں (۱۳۲ھ-۲۳۲ھ) علم تاریخ کی تدریجی ترقی جاری رہی اور اس دور کے مورخین مثلاً ابواسماعیل الازدی، الواقدی (م ۲۵۷ھ)، ابن سعد (م ۲۴۰ھ)، ہشام الکلبی اور ابن اسحاق وغیرہ نے تاریخ کے مختلف موضوعات مثلاً سیرت، انساب اور فتوح پر متعدد رسائل و کتب تحریر کیں۔ لیکن یہ ساری علمی سرگرمیاں ایک طرح ان عظیم ”تواریخ عامہ“ کے لیے ایک تمہید کی حیثیت رکھتی تھیں جو عباسی دور کے دوسرے حصے میں تحریر کی جانے والی تھیں۔

عباسی دور ثانی (۲۳۲ھ-۳۳۴ھ) میں علم تاریخ اپنے معراج کمال کو پہنچ گیا اور اس دور کے مورخین البلاذری (م ۲۷۹ھ)، محمد بن حبیب (م ۳۷۵ھ) الزبیر بن بکار (م ۲۵۶ھ)، الیعقوبی (م ۲۷۸ھ)، ابو حنیفہ الدینوری (م ۲۸۲ھ) اور ابن جریر الطبری (م ۳۱۵ھ) نے عربی زبان میں تاریخ کی مشہور ترین کتابیں تالیف کیں جو اقوام عالم کے ذخیرہ تاریخ میں عظیم النظیر امتیازی حامل ہیں۔

عباسی دور اول کے مورخین میں ابوالحسن علی بن عبداللہ بن ابی سیف المدائنی بہت اہمیت کا حامل ہے۔ وہ علم الانساب، مغازی اور تاریخ کا ماہر کامل تھا۔ تصنیف و تالیف اور مصنفات کی کثرت تعداد کی بنا پر وہ اپنے جملہ ہم عصر مورخین پر گوئے سبقت لے گیا۔

المدائنی ۱۳۵ھ میں بصرہ میں پیدا ہوا۔ بصرہ میں اس کے بچپن اور ابتدائی زندگی کے بارے میں تاریخیں بالکل خاموش ہیں۔ الفہرست میں صرف اتنا مذکور ہے کہ بچپن میں وہ علم الکلام کا طالب علم تھا اور اس کا شمار معمر بن الاشعث کے حاشیہ نشینوں میں ہوتا تھا جس میں پانچ دیگر نوجوان بھی شامل تھے ۹ تاہم یہ ثابت کرنے کے لیے کافی شہادت موجود ہے کہ اس نے اپنی تعلیم کی تکمیل بصرہ میں ہی

Lectures on Muslims Historians 55

۸- الفہرست ۱: ۱۰۰

۹- الفہرست ۱: ۱۰۰

قدیم مصادر کے مطالعے سے معلوم ہوتا ہے کہ عربوں نے اپنی حروب و فتوح پر کتابیں تالیف کرنے کی نسبت دیگر اقوام کی تاریخ پر کتابیں پہلے تالیف کیں ۳ غالباً اس کی وجہ دیگر اقوام کی تاریخ میں خلفاء و عمائدین سلطنت کی گہری دلچسپی تھی جس کا اوپر تذکرہ کیا جا چکا ہے۔

عربی زبان میں تاریخ پر پہلی کتاب غالباً عبید بن شریہ نے امیر معاویہ کے لیے ”کتاب الملوک و اخبار الماضیین“ کے نام سے تالیف کی۔ ابن الندیم نے الفہرست میں اس کا تذکرہ کیا ہے، لیکن بدقسمتی سے یہ کتاب مفقود الخبر ہو چکی ہے۔ اس دور میں وہب بن منبہ نے بھی اخبار الماضیین پر ایک کتاب تالیف کی جو غالباً ضائع ہو چکی ہے۔ ابن الندیم نے الفہرست ۴ میں اموی دور کے چند دیگر مورخین کا بھی تذکرہ کیا ہے۔ مثلاً ابو مخنف الازدی نے جو حضرت علی کے مصاحبین میں سے تھا تاریخ پر متعدد کتابیں لکھیں۔ عوانہ بن الحکم نے بھی ایک کتاب تاریخ پر اور ایک دوسری کتاب امیر معاویہ کے حالات زندگی پر تحریر کی۔ اموی دور میں تاریخ پر جو کچھ لکھا گیا اس میں سے صرف ”کتاب اخبار عبید بن شریہ اور وہب بن منبہ کی کتاب التیجان فی ملوک حمیر ہم تک پہنچی ہیں ۵۔

مختصر یہ کہ عربی زبان میں تاریخ نگاری کی ابتداء اموی دور میں ہوئی۔ عربوں کے اس شرف کا کوئی شریک و سہم نہیں کہ انہوں نے تہذیب و حضارت سے آشنا ہونے کے فوراً بعد تاریخ کی طرف توجہ دی۔ اس کے برعکس رومیوں نے متمدن ہونے کے سات سو برس بعد تاریخ نگاری شروع کی۔ ان کا اولین مورخ یولیوس قیصر تھا۔ یونانیوں نے بھی اپنی سلطنت کے قیام کے کئی صدیوں بعد ”تاریخ عام“ کی طرف توجہ دی ۶

۳- تاریخ آداب اللغة العربیة ۱: ۲۵۷

۴- الفہرست

۵- یہ دونوں کتابیں ۱۳۴۷ھ میں حیدرآباد (دکن) سے طبع ہو چکی ہیں

۶- تاریخ آداب اللغة العربیة ۲۵۸



بغداد آنا مناسب سمجھا۔ چنانچہ وہ بغداد منتقل ہو گیا اور اپنی وفات تک وہیں مقیم رہا ۱۳۔

بغداد آکر اسے تاریخ دان اور ماہر علم نساب کی حیثیت سے بہت شہرت حاصل ہوئی۔ اسے اخبار الاسلام (یعنی زمانہ بعد از اسلام کی تاریخ) کا خصوصی ماہر تسلیم کیا جانے لگا۔ ابو العباس احمد بن یحییٰ نے اسی کا تذکرہ کرتے ہوئے کہا ہے: من اراد اخبار الجاہلیۃ فعلیہ بکتب ابی عبیدۃ و من اراد اخبار الاسلام فعلیہ بکتب المدائنی ۱۴۔

بغداد میں مشہور علماء اور اعیان سلطنت کی ایک کثیر تعداد کے ساتھ اس کے دوستانہ تعلقات قائم ہو گئے۔ لیکن اس کا خصوصی دوست اور مربی اسحق بن ابراہیم الموصلی المغنی تھا ۱۵۔ الموصلی علم الغناء کا ماہر کامل ہونے کے ساتھ ساتھ شعر و ادب میں بھی کامل دسترس رکھتا تھا۔ المدائنی کے اس کے ساتھ اتنے گہرے تعلقات استوار ہو گئے تھے کہ وہ اپنا بیشتر وقت اس کی معیت میں گزارتا۔ حتیٰ کہ اس کی وفات بھی الموصلی کے گھر میں ہوئی ۱۶۔

الموصلی خلیفہ ہارون اور مامون کا مقرب ہونے کے باعث بہت امیر ہو گیا تھا اور اپنی اس ثروت سے اپنے دوستوں کو بھی نوازا کرتا تھا۔ تاریخ بغداد ۱۷ میں ایک روایت ہے جس سے پتہ چلتا ہے کہ المدائنی کو بھی الموصلی کی سخاوت و سماحت سے بہرہ وافر ملا کرتا تھا۔ ”احمد بن زھر بن حرب بیان کرتا ہے کہ میرا والد، یحییٰ بن معین اور مصعب الزیبری رات کے وقت مصعب کے گھر کے باہر مجلس جمایا کرتے تھے۔“

۱۳۔ الفہرست ۱: ۱۰۰؛ تاریخ بغداد ۱۲: ۵۳، معجم الادباء ۱۳: ۱۲۵، ہدیۃ العارفین ۶۰۔

۱۴۔ تاریخ بغداد ۱۲: ۵۵۔

۱۵۔ تاریخ بغداد ۱۲: ۵۵؛ ارشاد العریب ۵: ۳۱۰۔

۱۶۔ الفہرست ۱: ۱۰۰۔

۱۷۔ تاریخ بغداد ۱۲: ۵۵۔

کی جو اس دور میں علماء و فضلاء کا مرکز تھا اور جہاں کے مدارس میں حصول تعلیم کے لیے لوگ اطراف و اکناف عالم سے آیا کرتے تھے۔ یاقوت ۱۰ نے بیان کیا ہے کہ المدائنی نے اپنی معلومات کا بیشتر حصہ عوانہ اور مشہور راوی اور ادیب الاصمعی سے حاصل کیا۔ عوانہ اور الاصمعی بصری الاصل تھے اور المدائنی کے طالب علمی کے زمانے میں وہیں قیام پذیر تھے اس لیے گمان غالب یہ ہے کہ المدائنی نے بصرے میں ہی ان دو استادوں سے استفادہ کیا ہو گا ۱۱۔

یاقوت نے مزید لکھا ۱۲ ہے کہ الاصمعی بذات خود بعض اوقات المدائنی کے حلقہ درس میں شرکت کیا کرتا تھا۔ اس سے یہ ثابت ہوتا ہے کہ حصول تعلیم سے فراغت کے بعد المدائنی نے بصرے میں درس و تدریس کا سلسلہ بھی شروع کر دیا تھا۔

ابوالحسن المدائنی بصرہ چھوڑ کر مدائن چلا گیا اور کچھ عرصہ وہاں مقیم رہا۔ اس کی مدائن کی زندگی کے بارے میں بھی تذکرے بالکل خاموش ہیں۔ یوں محسوس ہوتا ہے کہ ابھی اس نے اتنی اہمیت اور شہرت حاصل نہیں کی تھی کہ تذکرہ نگار اس کے احوال و واقعات سے اپنی کتابوں کو مزین کرتے۔ مدائن میں قیام کی بنا پر اسے المدائنی کی نسبت دی گئی جو بعد میں اس کے نام کا جزو بن گئی۔ اس سے یہ واضح ہوتا ہے کہ مدائن میں اس کا قیام خاصہ طویل تھا۔

خلیفہ المامون کے ایام حکومت میں جب بغداد دنیا کا اہم ترین علمی مرکز بن چکا تھا اور خلیفہ کی علم دوستی اور ادب پروری کی بنا پر علماء بغداد کھنچے چلے آ رہے تھے ابوالحسن نے بھی مدائن چھوڑ کر

۱۰۔ معجم الادباء ۱۳: ۱۲۵۔

۱۱۔ الاصمعی ہارون الرشید کے دور میں بصرہ چھوڑ کر بغداد گیا تھا اور

ہارون الرشید ۱۷۰ھ میں تخت نشین ہوا تھا۔ تاریخ آداب اللغة العربیہ ۲: ۱۱۵۔

۱۲۔ معجم الادباء ۱۳: ۱۲۶۔



طالب کے بارے میں گفتگو شروع کی ۲۰۔ خلیفہ اور المدائنی کے مابین جو گفتگو ہوئی اسے المدائنی کے الفاظ میں ہی درج کیا جاتا ہے: ”جب میں خلیفہ کے ہاں گیا تو اس نے حضرت علی بن ابی طالب کا تذکرہ کیا اور اور میں نے اسے ان کے بارے میں کچھ باتیں بتائیں۔ پھر اس نے حضرت علی کو بنی امیہ کے دور میں سب و شتم کیے جانے کا تذکرہ کیا تو میں نے کہا ”مجھے ابو سلمۃ المثنی بن عبد اللہ نے جو محمد بن عبد اللہ الانصاری کا بھائی تھا ایک شخص سے روایت کر کے بتایا کہ وہ ایک دفعہ شام گیا اور اس نے دیکھا کہ وہاں علی، حسن اور حسین نام سے موسوم کوئی شخص نہ تھا۔ اس کی ملاقات صرف معاویہ، یزید اور ولید نام کے لوگوں سے ہوئی۔ اس نے ایک شخص کو دیکھا جو اپنے گھر کی دھلیز پر بیٹھا ہوا تھا۔ اسے اس وقت شدید پیاس لگی ہوئی تھی۔ چنانچہ اس نے اس شخص سے پانی کی فرمائش کی اور اس نے اپنے پیٹے کو آواز دی اور کہا ”اے حسن اس مسافر کو پانی پلا دو“۔ یہ نام سن کر وہ بہت حیران ہوا اور اس نے اس شخص سے سوال کیا کہ تو نے اپنے پیٹے کا نام حسن رکھا ہے۔ اس نے جواباً کہا کہ میں نے اپنی ساری اولاد کے نام حسن، حسین، جعفر وغیرہ رکھے ہیں۔ شامی لوگ اپنی اولاد کے نام خلفاء اللہ کے ناموں پر رکھتے ہیں، بچوں کو تو ان کے والدین سخت سست کہتے رہتے ہیں۔ اس طرح خلفاء کی توہین ہوتی ہے۔ اس بنا پر میں نے اپنی اولاد کے نام اعداء اللہ کے ناموں پر رکھے ہیں تاکہ جب میں انہیں لعن طعن کروں تو یہ ادبی نہ ہو۔ کیوں کہ درحقیقت ایسا کرتے ہوئے میں اعداء اللہ کو لعن طعن کر رہا ہوں گا۔ یہ سن کر راوی نے اس شخص کو کہا کہ میں نے تو تمہیں شامیوں میں سے بہترین انسان سمجھا تھا لیکن اب معلوم ہوا ہے کہ تم اس خطے کے بدترین شخص ہو اور جہنم میں تم سے بڑھ کر کوئی شریر داخل نہیں ہو گا۔

ایک شام ایک شخص زرق برق لباس میں ملبوس، اعلیٰ نسل کے گدھے پر سوار وہاں سے گزرا۔ اس نے سلام کہا اور یحییٰ بن معین سے گفتگو شروع کر دی۔ یحییٰ بن معین نے کہا: ”ابوالحسن کدھر کا رخ ہے“ اس نے جواب دیا: ”میں اس سخی شخص کے ہاں جا رہا ہوں جو میری آستین کو اوپر سے نیچے تک درہموں اور دیناروں سے بھر دیتا ہے۔ یحییٰ نے جب پوچھا کہ وہ کون شخص ہے تو اس نے جواب دیا: ”اسحاق بن ابراہیم“ جب وہ شخص وہاں سے چلا گیا تو یحییٰ بن معین نے تین دفعہ دہرایا: ”یہ شخص ثقہ راوی ہے“۔ احمد بن زہر بیان کرتا ہے کہ بعد میں میں نے اپنے والد سے پوچھا کہ وہ کون شخص تھا تو اس نے بتایا کہ وہ ابوالحسن المدائنی تھا۔

یحییٰ بن معین جو اپنے دور میں حدیث کے امام تسلیم کیے جاتے تھے، کے بھی المدائنی کے ساتھ خصوصی تعلقات قائم ہو گئے تھے اور وہ المدائنی کے ہاں جا کر اس کی کتابیں اپنے لیے نقل کیا کرتے تھے ۱۸

اس دور کے ایک دوسرے نامور محدث ابن عائشہ کی بھی المدائنی کے ساتھ شناسائی تھی۔ المدائنی ابن عائشہ کے ہاں آیا جاتا کرتے تھے۔ ایک دفعہ المدائنی نے ابن عائشہ کی موجودگی میں حضرت خالد بن الولید کے شام پر حملے کے بارے میں ایک روایت بیان کی جس میں حضرت خالد کے رہبر رافع کے بارے میں ایک شعر تھا۔ المدائنی نے اس شعر میں ایک لفظ کا اعراب غلط پڑھا تو ابن عائشہ سخت ناراض ہوئے اور کہا ”تمہارا یہ علم تحریری یاد داشتوں سے ماخوذ ہے اور تمہیں ابھی علماء کی صحبت کی ضرورت ہے ۱۹۔“

رفقہ رفتہ المدائنی کی شہرت خلیفہ المامون تک پہنچی اور اس نے احمد بن یوسف کے ذریعے اسے دربار میں طلب کیا اور حضرت علی بن ابی



واقعات پر ۲۸ کتابیں درج ہیں ان میں سے چند کے اسماء درج ذیل ہیں :

کتاب امہات النبی، کتاب صفۃ النبی، کتاب عہود النبی، کتاب تسمیۃ الذین يؤذون النبی، کتاب صلح النبی، کتاب خطب النبی۔

(۲) اخبار قریش

اس عنوان کے تحت نسب قریش اور احوال اکابر قریش پر ۳۴ کتابیں درج ہیں۔ ان میں سے چند کے اسماء درج ذیل ہیں :

کتاب نسب قریش و اخبارها، کتاب اخبار علی بن ابی طالب، کتاب خطب علی بن ابی طالب، کتاب خطب الحکم بن ابی العاص۔

(۳) کتبہ فی اخبار مناکح الاشراف و اخبار النساء

اس موضوع کے تحت ۳۳ کتابوں کے نام درج ہیں۔

(۴) کتبہ فی اخبار الخلفاء

اس عنوان کے تحت پانچ کتابوں کے نام درج ہیں مثلاً کتاب من تزوج من نساء الخلفاء، کتاب اخبار الخلفاء الکبیر۔

(۵) کتبہ فی الاحداث

اس عنوان کے تحت ۲۸ کتابوں کے نام مندرج ہیں۔

(۶) کتبہ فی الفتوح

اس موضوع پر ۳۳ کتابوں کے نام درج ہیں جن میں سے بعض یہ ہیں۔

فتوح الشام، فتوح العراق، فتوح السجستان

(۷) کتبہ فی اخبار العرب

اس موضوع پر ۱۰ کتابوں کے نام دیے گئے ہیں۔

(۸) کتبہ فی اخبار الشعراء

اس موضوع پر ۲۹ کتابوں کا تذکرہ کیا گیا ہے۔

ماموں نے میری یہ روایت سن کر بنی امیہ سے سخت بے زاری کا اظہار کیا اور کہا کہ اللہ تعالیٰ نے ان کے اعمال شنیعہ کی سزا دینے کے لیے ان پر ایسے لوگ مسلط کر دیے ہیں جو ان کے زندوں اور مردوں سب پر لعنت کرتے ہیں۔

### درس و تدریس

پیشتر ازیں تذکرہ کیا جا چکا ہے کہ المدائنی نے قیام بصرہ کے دوران میں ہی درس و تدریس کا سلسلہ شروع کر دیا تھا۔ بغداد میں علماء کی ایک کثیر تعداد نے اس سے استفادہ کیا۔ اس کے شاگردوں کی فہرست میں الزبیر بن بکر، احمد بن ابی خیشمہ، الحارث بن ابی اسامہ اور الحسن بن علی ایسے فضلاء کا نام آتا ہے۔ مشہور عرب تاریخ نگار مثلاً البلاذری، الطبری اور ابن الاثیر نے اپنی کتابوں میں ان فضلاء سے کثیر روایات نقل کی ہیں جو انہوں نے اپنے استاد المدائنی سے سنی تھیں۔ اس سے واضح ہو جاتا ہے کہ اپنی مصنفات کے ساتھ ساتھ اپنے شاگردوں کے ذریعے بھی المدائنی نے عربی تاریخ نگاری پر گہرا اثر ڈالا۔

### المدائنی کی تصنیفات :

المدائنی نے غالباً بصرہ میں ہی تصنیف و تالیف کا سلسلہ شروع کر دیا تھا۔ ابن الندیم کی روایت کے مطابق اس نے سیرت النبی، آثار النبی، تاریخ قریش، تاریخ الخلفاء، تاریخ ابطال اور فتوح وغیرہ پر ۲۳۸ کتابیں اور رسالے تالیف کیے۔ ابن الندیم نے ان کتابوں کے اسماء درج ذیل موضوعات کے تحت درج کیے ہیں :

(۱) کتبہ فی اخبار النبی صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم

اسی عنوان کے تحت رسول کریم کی سیرت اور زندگی کے مختلف

۲۱۔ تاریخ بغداد ۱۲ : ۵۴، معجم الادباء ۱۴ : ۱۲۵

۲۲۔ الفہرست ۱ : ۱۰۰



میں قاہرہ سے نوادر المخطوطات میں طبع کروا دیا۔ اس کی کتاب التعازی کے دو اجزاء (جز اول اور جز ثانی) بھی بیچ گئے ہیں جو دمشق کے المكتبة الظاهرية میں (نمبر ۲۸ الف) محفوظ ہیں۔

کتاب المردفات من قریش اور کتاب التعازی کے دو اجزاء کے علاوہ المدائنی کی بعض دیگر تصانیف سے کچھ اقتباسات بھی متاخر علماء کی کتابوں میں ملتے ہیں۔ ذیل میں المدائنی کی ان تصنیفات اور ان میں سے اقتباسات کے محل وقوع کا تذکرہ کیا جاتا ہے۔

### المدائنی کی تصنیف اقتباس

کتاب النساء الفوارک	خزانة الادب ۱ : ۳۶۶ س ۵
کتاب النساء الناشرات	خزانة الادب ۱ : ۳۶۶ س ۵
کتاب المغربین	۱ : ۴۷۹ س ۱۵
کتاب الجوابات	خزانة الادب ۲ : ۱۰۹
	الاجانی ۱۰ (بولاق) : ۸۶ س ۱۲
	(ساسی) ۸۱ س ۱۷
کتاب السمیر	الفرج بعد الشدة للتونخی ۲ : ۱۷۴
	۲ س
اخبار القلاع	مروج الذهب للمسعودی ۷۰ س ۲
کتاب زکن ایاس	مجمع الامثال للمیدانی ۱ : ۲۲۰ س
	۱۲
الفرج بعد الشدة	الفرج بعد الشدة (للتونخی) ۱ : ۵
التونخی نے اپنی کتاب (۱ : ۵) میں تذکرہ کیا ہے کہ المدائنی کی	
یہ کتاب صرف ۶ اوراق پر مشتمل تھی۔ تاہم وہ اس موضوع پر قلم اٹھانے	
والا پہلا شخص تھا۔ بعض تذکرہ نگار قاضی محمد بن یوسف بن درہم	
(المتوفی ۹۳۹م) کو اس موضوع کا پہلا مصنف قرار دیتے ہیں جو غلط	
ہے ملاحظہ ہو ارشاد العریب ۴ : ۵۲ اور بغیة الوعاة ۳۶۴ س ۲۳۔	

### (۹) کتبہ المؤلفہ

اس عنوان کے تحت ۳۸ کتابوں کے نام درج ہیں مثلاً کتاب الاوائل کتاب المیمین، کتاب التعازی، کتاب قضاة المدينة، کتاب قضاة البصرة، کتاب النوادر۔

یوں معلوم ہوتا ہے کہ ابن النديم نے ان کتابوں کا تذکرہ علیحدہ اس عنوان کے تحت کر دیا ہے جن کا زیادہ تر مدار المدائنی کی ذاتی تحقیق و کاوش پر تھا اور جن کی تدوین کے سلسلہ میں اس نے روایت پر کم بھروسہ کیا۔ اس لیے ان کتابوں کو کتبہ المؤلفہ کہا گیا۔

مندرجہ بالا عناوین کے تحت مذکورہ مختلف کتابوں کے اسماء پر غور کرنے کے بعد ہم اس نتیجے پر پہنچے ہیں کہ ہر عنوان کے تحت مذکورہ کتابیں دراصل اس عنوان پر ایک مفصل اور ضخیم کتاب کے مختلف باب یا اجزاء ہیں جنہیں علیحدہ علیحدہ کتاب شمار کر لیا گیا اور اس طرح المدائنی کی تالیفات کی تعداد کو بڑھا کر ۲۳۸ کر دیا گیا۔

المدائنی کی ان تصنیفات سے متاخر مورخین مثلاً البلاذری، الطبری یاقوت اور تاریخ الخلفاء اور مغازی پر لکھنے والے دیگر علماء نے بہت فائدہ اٹھایا۔ مشہور اندلسی ادیب ابن عبد ربہ بھی المدائنی کے خوشہ چینوں میں سے تھا۔ العقد الفرید میں حضرت علی کی تقاریر کا مجموعہ المدائنی ہی سے نقل کیا گیا ہے۔ العقد الفرید میں موجود وہ خطوط بھی جو حضرت علی اور امیر معاویہ نے ایک دوسرے کو لکھے غالباً المدائنی ہی سے منقول ہیں۔

بدقسمتی سے المدائنی کی اکثر مصنفات دستبرد زمانہ کے ہاتھوں نابود و نادر الوجود ہو چکی ہیں۔ اس کی ان کثیر التعداد تصنیفات میں سے صرف ایک رسالہ ”کتاب المردفات من قریش“ (ایسی عورتوں کا تذکرہ جنہوں نے بار بار شادیاں کیں) بچا ہے جسے عبدالسلام ہارون نے ۱۳۷۰ھ



قال : و عزى بعض المشيخه أخاله فقال : فى ثواب الله عز و جل عوض مما أصبتم به وفيما استقر عندكم من نفاذ الدنيا عزاء عن ما به فجعتم فعظم الله ثوابكم وأحسن عزاءكم -

أخبرنا عبد الله قال : حدثنا الحسن بن علي قال : أخبرنا أبو الحسن عن أبي علي عمر بن غياث قال : حدثني محمد بن حرب قال : عزى ٢٣ محمد بن الوليد بن عتبة عمر بن عبد العزيز علي ابنه عبد الملك فقال : يا أمير المؤمنين اعد لماتري عدة تكون لك جنة من الحزن و ستر من النار ، قال عمر : هل رایت حزنا يحتجب له او غفلة ابنه عليها ، قال : يا أمير المؤمنين لو ان رجلا ترك تعزية رجل لعلمه و انتباهه لكنت ، لكن الله قضى "ان الذكري تنفع المؤمنين ٢٥" قال عمر بن غياث فى حديثه ليشغلك ما اقبل من الموت اليك عن من هو فى شغل عن ما دخل عليك و اعدد لماتري عدة ٢٦

أخبرنا عبد الله قال : أخبرنا الحسن بن علي بن المتوكل قال : أخبرنا أبو الحسن عن أبي القاسم بن قيس العامري قال : لما دفن علي بن أبي طالب رضى الله عنه فاطمة بنت رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم تمثل عند قبرها : ٢٤ (طويل)

و ان افتقادی واحد بعد واحد

دليل على ان لا يدوم الخليل

أخبرنا عبد الله قال : أخبرنا الحسن بن علي قال : أخبرنا أبو الحسن المدائني عن عامر بن الأسود وغيره : ان الحجاج رأى كان عينيه ذهبتا فلما طلق هند بنت اسماء و هند بنت المهلب ظن انها تاويل رويها فلما مات ابنه محمد

٢٣- أخبرني كتاب التعازي و المراثي ٣٩ و فى العقد ٨٥/٣ ، و فى الارتياح ١٨٦ ، و فى العيون ٥٨/٣ ان محمد بن الوليد قال هذا فى تعزية الوليد بن عبد الملك -

٢٥- ماخوذ من قوله تعالى "فان الذكري تنفع المؤمنين" ٥١ : ٥٥

٢٦- أخبرني كتاب التعازي و المراثي ٣٩ -

٢٧- راجع كتاب التعازي و المراثي ١٥٤ و العقد ٢ : ٤ و النويري ٥ : ١٦٥

اوپر بیان کیا جا چکا ہے کہ المدائنی کی کتاب التعازی کے دو اجزاء (جزا اول و دوم) دمشق کے المكتبة الظاهرية میں موجود ہیں (نمبر ٢٨ الف)۔ کیمبرج میں قیام کے دوران (١٩٦٣-١٩٦٤) مجھے بعض ذرائع سے اس کتاب کے جز ثانی کی مائکرو فلم حاصل ہو گئی۔ المدائنی ایسے عظیم فاضل اور کثیر التعداد کتابوں کے مصنف کے باقی ماندہ آثار کو محفوظ کرنے کی خاطر میں نے اس جز کو ایڈٹ کر دیا ہے جو اس مختصر سی تمہید کے ساتھ پیش خدمت ہے۔

### الجزء الثاني من كتاب التعازی

تالیف

أبي الحسن علي بن محمد بن أبي سيف المدائني مما رواه أبو طالب عبد الله بن محمد العكبري عن أبي محمد الحسن بن علي بن المتوكل عن رواية أبي سهل محمود بن عمر بن جعفر بن اسحاق بن محمود العكبري رواية الشيخ أبي القاسم علي بن أحمد بن محمد البصري البندار عنه

أخبرنا الشيخ أبو القاسم علي بن أحمد بن محمد البصري البندار قال : أخبرنا أبو سهل محمود بن عمرو بن محمود العكبري قراءة عليه قال : أخبرنا أبو طالب عبد الله بن محمد العكبري قال : أخبرنا أبو محمد الحسن بن علي بن المتوكل ببغداد قال : أخبرنا أبو الحسن بن محمد المدائني قال : قيل للشمر دل ٢٣ اى بيت قلته اشفى لقلبك قال : (طويل)

و كنت اعير الدمع قبلك من مضى

فانت على من مات بعدك شاغله

٢٣- الشمر دل بن شريك بن عبد الله بن رؤبة ، و يعرف بابن الخريطة -

شاعر معسن فى القصيد و فى الرجز - و قبل هذا الشعر :

أبى الصبر أن العين بعدك لم تزل

يخالط جفنيها قذى ما تزاوله المؤلف ٢٠٥



لئن جزع الحجاج مامن مصيبة  
تكون لمحزون اجل و اوجعا

من المصطفى والمصطفى من خيارهم  
جناحيه لما فارقاه فودعا

اخ كان اغنى ايمن الارض كلها  
واغنى ابنه امر العراقيين اجمعا

جناحا عقاب فارقاه كلاهما

ولو قطعا من غيره لتضعضا

قال : وكتب اليه الوليد يعزيه عن محمد بن يوسف و يحثه على الصبر  
فكتب اليه الحجاج : كتب الى امير المؤمنين يعزيني عن محمد بن يوسف  
ويذكر رضاه عنه و يامرني بالصبر عليه ، ورضاء امير المؤمنين شهيد لمحمد  
رضي الله عنه بمغفرة الله و رضائه عنه ، و يأمر بالصبر و كيف لا أصبر وقد أبقي  
الله لي امير المؤمنين ٣٢

أخبرنا عبدالله قال : أخبرنا الحسن بن علي قال : أخبرنا ابو الحسن  
يونس بن حبيب قال : كان الحجاج اذا سمع نوحا في دار هدمها فلما مات ابنه  
واخوه كان يعجبه ان يسمع ٣٥ النوح و كان يتمثل بشعر الفرزدق ٣٦ قاله  
لامرأة جزعت على ابنها :  
(طويل)

هل ابنك الا ابن من الناس فاصبري

فلن يرجع الموتى حنين الماتم

وتمثل بشعر يزيد بن الحكم الثقفي ٣٧ :

ان تحتسب توجروا ان تبكه

تكن كبا كية لم يحي ميتا بكأوها

٣٨- الخبر في كتاب التعازي والمراثي ١٥٣

٣٩- الخبر في كتاب التعازي والمراثي ١٥٣

٣٦- ديوانه ٢ : ٢٠٦

٣٧- كتاب التعازي والمراثي ١٥٣ ، الارتجاع ١٤٢

واتاه موت اخيه محمد قال : هذا تاويل روي ٢٨

أخبرنا عبدالله قال أخبرنا الحسن قال أخبرنا ابو الحسن عن ابي محمد  
بن عمرو الثقفي قال لمات محمد بن الحجاج جزع عليه الحجاج ، فقال : اذا  
غسلتموه فاذنوني ، فاعلموه فاقبل ، فدخل البيت ، فنظر اليه فقال متمثلا : ٢٩  
(كامل)

الان لما كنت أكمل من مشي

و افترنابك على شباب القادح

و تكملت فيك المرأة كلها

وأعنت ذلك بالفعال الصالح

ف قيل له : اتق الله فاسترجع ، فقال : "انا لله وانا اليه راجعون" ، ٣٠ وقرأ  
الذين اذا اصابتهم مصيبة قالوا انا لله وانا اليه راجعون ، اولئك عليهم صلوات  
من ربهم ورحمة واولئك هم المهتدون ٣١ و أتاه موت محمد بن يوسف وكان  
بينهما جمعة فقال ٣٢ :

حسبي حياة الله من كل ميت

و حسبي بقاء الله من كل هالك

اذا ما لقيت الله ربي مسلما

فان سرور النفس فيما هنالك

وقال الفرزدق ٣٣ :

٢٨- الخبر في كتاب التعازي والمراثي ١٥٢

٢٩- الشعر لزياد الاعجم ، القالي ٣ : ٩ و بلاعزو في كتاب التعازي والمراثي

١٥٢ - وفي البيان ٣٥ : ٣ وفي العقد ٢ : ٣ وفي الارتجاع ١١٦ ، ١٤٢ ، وفي

ديوان المعاني ٢ : ١٤٥ ، وانظر للخبر القالي ، البيان ، العقد ، الارتجاع

٣٠- القرآن ٢ : ١٥٦

٣١- القرآن ٢ : ١٥٦ ، ١٥٤

٣٢- راجع كتاب التعازي والمراثي ١٥٣ ، البيان ٣ : ٢٥٠ ، الارتجاع ١١٦

ولكن في العمون ٢ : ١٥٣ ، ٥٣ : ٣ "توفي سهل بن عبدالعزيز بن مروان فكتب الى

عمر بن عبدالعزيز بعض عماله و أطنب في كتابه فكتب اليه عمر البيهقي -

٣٣- كتاب التعازي والمراثي ١٥٣ ، ديوانه ١ : ٣٩٤



وهيج صوت النائحات عشية  
بوادر امثال البغال النوافر  
تمخطن اطراف الانوف حواسرا  
يضاهين بالشواث هدل المشافر  
بكي الشجو ما دون الله من خلوقها  
ولم تبك شجوا ما وراء الحناجر

وقال الفرزدق: ٣٣

(بسيط)

اني لباك على ابني يوسف عمري  
ومثل هلكهما للدين يبكي  
ما ساد حي و لاميت مسدهما  
الا الخلائف بعد النبين

وقال الفرزدق ايضا ٣٣

(كامل)

ان الرزية لا رزية مثلها  
فقدان مثل محمد و محمد  
ملكين قد خلت المنابر منهما  
اخذ المنون عليها بالمرصد

اخبرنا عبدالله قال: اخبرنا الحسن بن علي: قال ابو الحسن: اعزهم  
عظم الله اجرهم والهمكم الصبر فان الصبر محمود العاقبة وليس في  
الجزع عصمة من النائبة.

اخبرنا عبدالله قال: اخبرنا الحسن بن علي: قال ابو الحسن: استعن  
على مصيبتك بالصبر على ما فات ولا تبغض نصيبك من ثواب الله  
بالجزع الذي لا يجدي عليك ولا يغني عنك.

٣٣- الشعر في كتاب التعازي والمراثي ١٥٥ ولكن لم يوجد في ديوانه -

٣٣- ديوانه ١ : ١٦١

و من شر حظي مسلم من حميمه  
بكاء و احزان قليل جداؤها  
اخبرنا عبدالله قال: اخبرنا الحسن بن علي قال: اخبرنا ابو الحسن عن  
عوانة قال ارسل الحجاج الى ثابت بن قيس الانصاري فقال: انشدني مرثيتك  
ابنك فانشدته ٣٨ وقال:

(منسرح)

يا كذب الله من نعي حسنا  
ليس لتكذيب قوله ثمن  
أجول في الدار لا أراه  
و في الدار اناس جوارهم غبن  
كنت خليلى و كنت خالصى  
لكل حى من اهله سكن  
بدلتهم منك ليت أنهم  
امسوا و بينى و بينهم عدن ٣٩

فقال له الحجاج ارث ابني محمدا فرثاه فقال الحجاج: مرثية ابنك  
اجود - قال: ان قلبى وجد على ابني مالم يجد على ابنك - قال كيف حبك  
له قال: لم امل من النظر اليه ولم يغب عني الا اشتقت اليه قال:  
كذلك كنت اجد بابنى محمد ٣٠ وقوم ينشدون هذا الشعر لسليمان ٣١ بن  
قتة رثى به الحسن بن علي بن ابي طالب رضوان الله عليه -  
وقال الا قيس ٣٢ يرثى محمد بن الحجاج :-

(طويل)

٣٨- الخبر والشعر في كتاب التعازي والمراثي ١٥٣ و في القالى ٣ : ٩

٣٩-

٣٠- الخبر في كتاب التعازي والمراثي ١٥٥

٣١- هو اول من رثى اهل البيت، انظر بعض شعره في الطبرى ٨ : ٢٣٨-٢٣٩

٣٢- الا قيس: هو المغيرة بن عبدالله، من بنى اسد - كان كوفيا خليعا ماجنا

انظر الاصابة ج ٣، المؤتلف ٥٦، المرزبانى ٣٦٩



قال رجل من باهلة عن عبدالوهاب عن ابن جريح قال : من لم يتعز عن مصيبتة بالصبر والا حستاب سلا كما تسلو البهالم ٥٠

اخبرنا عبدالله قال : اخبرنا الحسن قال : اخبرنا ابوالحسن المدائني قال : وعزى رجل سليمان عن ابنه ايوب فقيل له : يا امير المؤمنين ان رايت ان يجعل اخر امرك ثوبا له فافعل، فكان ذلك هون عليه -

اخبرنا عبدالله قال : اخبرنا الحسن قال : اخبرنا ابوالحسن المدائني قال : ورأى ابن جبير رجلا يطوف بالبيت متقنعا فعال سعيد (ابن جبير) : مالك، قال، نعى الى ابي قال : الا ستكانه من الجزع -

اخبرنا عبدالله قال : اخبرنا الحسن بن علي : قال ابوالحسن : قال القاسم بن محمد : الجزع الكلام السيء -

اخبرنا عبدالله قال : اخبرنا الحسن بن علي : قال ابوالحسن : وكتب غيلان الى صديق له يعزيه على ابن له : اعلم ان كل مصيبة لم يذهب فرح ثوابها حزنها، ان ذلك الحزن الدائم ٥١ -

اخبرنا عبدالله : قال اخبرنا الحسن بن علي قال : اخبرنا ابوالحسن : ومات اخ لمطرف بن عبدالله بن الشخير او امرأته فلبس حلة و تبخر وقال : كرهت ان استكين -

اخبرنا عبدالله قال : اخبرنا الحسن بن علي قال : اخبرنا ابوالحسن عن شيخ من اهل البصرة عن ابي بردة عن ايان بن تغلب قال : رأيت اعرابية غمضت ميتا وترحمت عليه وقالت : يا ايان ما احق من البس العافية واطيلت له النظرة الا يعجز عن النظر لنفسه قبل الحلول بساحته والحيالة بينه وبين نفسه ٥٢ -

٥٠ - الخبر في الارتياح ٢٣٨ وفي المعنى قول محمد بن سلام الجمحي :

اذا انت لم تسلا اصطبارا وحسبة

سلوت على الايام مثل البهائم راجع الارتياح ٢٣٨

٥١ - الخبر في كتاب التعازي والمراثي ٥٢

٥٢ - نفس المرجع ١١١

اخبرنا عبدالله قال : اخبرنا الحسن بن علي قال : اخبرنا ابوالحسن قال : ابو محمد بن المبارك قال : دفن عبدالله بن عمر ابنا له وضحك عند قبره فقيل له أتضحك عند القبر، قال : اردت ان ارغم الشيطان -

اخبرنا عبدالله قال : اخبرنا الحسن قال : اخبرنا ابوالحسن : قال محمد بن عامر : قال رجل نصراني لرجل مسلم : ان مثلي لا يعزى مثلك، ولكن انظر ما زهد فيه الجاهل فارغب فيه ٣٥

اخبرنا عبدالله قال : اخبرنا الحسن قال : اخبرنا ابوالحسن عن محمد بن مغوية قال : عزى رجل رجلا فقال : ان الماضي قبلك الباقي لك و ان الباقي بعدك الماجور فيك و اجر الصابرين فيما يصابون به من اعظم النعمة عليهم فيما يعافون فيه ٣٦

اخبرنا عبدالله قال : اخبرنا الحسن بن علي قال : اخبرنا ابوالحسن عن ابراهيم بن سعد قال : سمع علي بن الحسين رضوان الله عليه واعية في بيته فنهض الى بيته فسكتهم ثم رجع الى مجلسه، فقيل له : أمن حدث كانت الواعية، قال : نعم، فعزوه و تعجبوا من صبره قال انا اهل البيت نطيع الله فيما نحب ونحمده فيما نكره ٣٧ -

اخبرنا عبدالله قال : اخبرنا الحسن بن علي قال : ابوالحسن قال : لما استشهد مجزأة بن ثور لم يجزع شقيق ولم ير ذلك فيه، وقال : اخبرنا الله انا كلنا نموت ٣٨ -

و قال شعيب بن الحبحاب : الحزن ينقص كما ينقص صبغ الثوب ولو بقي الحزن على احد قتله ٣٩ -

اخبرنا عبدالله قال : اخبرنا الحسن قال : اخبرنا ابوالحسن قال :

٣٥ - الخبر في كتاب التعازي والمراثي ١٥١

٣٦ - نفس المرجع ١٥١

٣٧ - الخبر في كتاب التعازي والمراثي ١٥٢

٣٨ - راجع كتاب التعازي والمراثي ١٥١

٣٩ - راجع كتاب التعازي والمراثي ١٥١



اخبرنا عبدالله قال : اخبرنا الحسن قال : اخبرنا ابوالحسن : قال موسى بن المهدي لابيراهيم بن سلم وعزاه عن ابنه فقال : أسرك وهو بلية وفتنة واحزنك وهو صلوات ورحمة ٥٦ -

اخبرنا عبدالله قال : اخبرنا الحسن بن علي قال : اخبرنا ابوالحسن قال : قيل لهرم بن حيان أوص قال : قد صدقتني في الحياة نفسي، مالي مال أوصيكم به، ولكن أوصيكم بخواتيم سورة النحل ٥٧ -

اخبرنا عبدالله قال : اخبرنا الحسن قال : اخبرنا ابوالحسن قال : قال الحسن لرجل عزاه عن ابنه : انما استوجب على الله من صبر لحقه وعده فلا تجمع الى ما اصاب به، الفجيعة بالاجر، فانها اعظم المصيبتين عليك وانكاه المرزئتين لك ٥٨ -

اخبرنا عبدالله قال : اخبرنا الحسن بن علي قال : اخبرنا ابوالحسن قال : عزى اياس بن معاوية رجلا عن ابنه فقال : لا ينقص الله عددك ولا يزيل نعمه عنك، وعجل الله عز وجل لك من الخلف خيرا مما رزيت -

اخبرنا عبدالله قال : اخبرنا الحسن بن علي قال : اخبرنا ابوالحسن قال : وقال الآخر : ان فيما عوضك الله من الاجر ان صبرت خيرا مما فجعت به من الرزية ٥٩ -

اخبرنا عبدالله قال : اخبرنا الحسن قال : اخبرنا ابوالحسن : راي اعرابي رجلا يعزیه عن ابنه فقال : ان كان ابوك الشديد الكاهل، ثم جلس فلم يقل غير هذا -

اخبرنا عبدالله قال : اخبرنا الحسن قال : اخبرنا ابوالحسن قال : قيل لاعرابية : ما احسن عزاءك عن ابنك فقالت : ان فقدانیه آمنی من المصائب بعده ٦٠ -

٥٦ - راجع كتاب التعازي والمراثي ١٥٨ والارتياح ١٨٤

٥٧ - انظر كتاب التعازي والمراثي ١٥٨

٥٨ - كتاب التعازي والمراثي ١٥٨

٥٩ - كتاب التعازي والمراثي ١٥٨

٦٠ - كتاب التعازي والمراثي ١٥٨، النويري ٥ : ١٦٣، الارتياح ١٣٨

اخبرنا عبدالله قال : اخبرنا الحسن قال : اخبرنا ابوالحسن قال : ومات ابن لامرأة فحسن عزاءها وصبرت فقال لها رجل : كنا نرى الجزع في النساء ولقد صبرت وكرمت، قالت : يا عبدالله! ما ميز احد بين صبر وجزع الا وجد بينهما منهاجا غير متقارب، اما الصبر فحسن العلانية، محمود العاقبة واما الجزع فصاحبه غير معوض عوضا، ولو كانا رجلين في صورة لكان الصبر اولاهما، بالغلبة على الحسن في خلقه والكرم في الطبيعة ٥٣ -

اخبرنا عبدالله قال : اخبرنا الحسن قال : اخبرنا ابوالحسن تعزية : ان لك في العزاء عن رزيتك عاجل الروح وأجل الثواب وفي الجزع بخس الثواب وتخوف العقاب -

### تعزية :

التمس ما وعد الله من ثوابه بالتسليم لقضائه والانتهاه الى امره فان ما فات غير مستدرک وعوض الله لك بالصبر عن مصيبتك خير لك من الجزع على رزيتك -

اخبرنا عبدالله قال : اخبرنا الحسن قال : اخبرنا ابوالحسن قال : قالت اعرابية وقفت على ابنها فترحمت عليه وقالت : واييك ما كان مالك لبطنك وما كان امرك الى عرسك ٥٤ -

قال : وقال علي بن ابي طالب رضي الله عنه للأشعث وعزاه عن ابن له فقال : يا اشعث ان تجزع على ابنك فقد استحقت ذلك منك الرحم وان تصبر ففي الله خلف - يا اشعث انك ان صبرت جرى عليك القدر وانت ماجور وان جزعت جرى عليك القدر وانت مازور ٥٥ -

٥٣ - نفس المرجع ١١١

٥٤ - راجع كتاب التعازي والمراثي ١٨٥

٥٥ - الخبر في كتاب التعازي والمراثي ١٥٨ والارتياح ٤٣ وفي النويري

١٦٥/٥ وقد نظم ابو تمام هذا فقال :

وقال علي في التعازي لأشعث

أصبر للبوى عزاء وحسبة

خلفتنا رجلا للمتجلد والعزاء

وحاف عليه بعض تلك المائم

فتوجر أم تسلو سلو البهائم

وتلك الأياشي للبكاء والمائم

وفي الكامل ٤٠٣ وفي برد الاكباد و ٩٩ راجع الارتياح ٤٣



أخبرنا عبدالله قال : أخبرنا الحسن قال : أخبرنا أبو الحسن : وعزى رجل رجلا فقال : ان من كان لك في الآخرة خير ممن كان لك في الدنيا سرورا -  
أخبرنا عبدالله قال : أخبرنا الحسن قال : أخبرنا أبو الحسن قال :  
وقال الوليد بن عبد الملك وخطب الناس : رزئت اعظم الرزئة و اعطيت اعظم العطية ، فالحمد لله على العطية وانا لله وانا اليه راجعون على المصيبة -  
أخبرنا عبدالله قال : أخبرنا الحسن قال : أخبرنا أبو الحسن عن محمد بن كناسة عن خشاف قال : حدثني امي قالت : دخلت علينا عجوز للحى واخوتي ثمانية فقالت : لقد ولدت لك امك حزنا طويلا ، وقد صدقت العجوز ، ذهبت نفسى قطعاً عليهم حين اصببت بهم ٦٣

أخبرنا عبدالله قال : أخبرنا الحسن بن علي قال : أخبرنا أبو الحسن قال : رأى هاني بن قبيصة ابنة النعمن تبكي ، فقال : ما ها لك قالت : رأيت في اهلكم غضرا ، قالت يا هاني لم تمتلى دار فرحا الا امتلئت حزنا -  
أخبرنا عبدالله قال : أخبرنا الحسن قال : أخبرنا أبو الحسن عن سعيد بن عثمان : ان رجلا قال خرجت الى اليمن فزلت منزل امرأة فرأيت لها مالا كثيرا و رقيقا ولدا وحالا حسنة ، فاقمت حتى قضيت حوائجي ، فلما اردت الرجوع قلت لها : لك حاجة ، قالت : نعم ، كلما قدمت هذه البلاد فانزل على ، فغبرت اعواما ثم اتيت اليمن فاتيت منزل المرأة فاذا حالها قد تغير و ذهب رقيقها ومات ولدها وباعت منزلها واذا هي تضحك ، فقلت لها : أتضحكين مع ما قد نزل بك ، قالت : يا عبدالله كنت في حال النعمة ولى احزان كثيرة ، فعلمت ان ذلك كان لقلة الشكر : فانا اليوم في هذه النعمة اضحك شكرا لله عز وجل على ما اعطاني من الصبر ، فقلت لعبد الله بن عمر فقال : ما كان صبر ايوب عند صبر هذه بشى ٦٥

٦٣- الخبر في كتاب التعازي والمراثي ١٨٢  
٦٥- راجع كتاب التعازي والمراثي ١٥٩ ، نقل السخاوي هذا الخبر في الارتياح عن المبرد راجع الارتياح ١٢٨

أخبرنا عبدالله قال : أخبرنا الحسن قال : أخبرنا أبو الحسن : مر رجل على امرأة وهي تحذب على رأس اخيها وهو يجود بنفسه ، ثم رجع الرجل و قد قضى ، و المرأة تاكل ، فقال لها : رأيته قبل تبكين وانت الان تأكلين غير مكترثة فقالت :

(طويل)

على كل حال يا كل الناس زادهم

على الضر و السراء والحدثان

أخبرنا عبدالله قال : أخبرنا الحسن قال : وعزى رجل رجلا فقال : ذهب ابوك و هو اصلك و ذهب ابنك و هو فرعك ، فما حال الباقي بعد اصله و فرعه ٦١

و عزى رجل رجلا فقال عليك بتقوى الله و الصبر ، فان به ياخذ المحتسب و اليه يرجع الجازع ٦٢

أخبرنا عبدالله قال : أخبرنا الحسن بن علي قال أخبرنا أبو الحسن قال : قال ابن السماك : المصيبة واحدة فان جزع صاحبها فهما ثنتان ٦٣ ، و ما من مصيبة الا و معها اعظم منها ، ان صبر فالثواب و ان جزع فسوء الخلف ، ما فاتته من ثواب الله اعظم من المصيبة -

أخبرنا عبدالله قال : أخبرنا الحسن بن علي قال : أخبرنا أبو الحسن قال : قالت اعرابية لزوجها ومات ابنها : ارث ابني فانشأ يقول : (وافر)

لتبك الباقيات ابا حبيب

لريب الدهر او لناثبه تنوب

وقعب وحية بليت بما

يكون اداها لبن حليب

و تيس قد خصيت فلم تفزه

بمنحقه على حجر صليب

٦١- كتاب التعازي والمراثي ١٥٨  
٦٢- الخبر منسوب الى علي بن ابي طالب في كتاب التعازي والمراثي ٨  
٦٣- الخبر منسوب الى ابن المبارك في الارتياح ٩٠



اخبرنا عبدالله قال : اخبرنا الحسن بن علي قال : اخبرنا ابوالحسن :  
قال ابوشير التميمي عن ابي ابراهيم بن رباح قال : قال عمر بن الخطاب رضي  
الله عنه : لو أتيت براحتين : راحلة شكر و راحلة صبر لم ابالي ايهما ركبت -  
اخبرنا عبدالله قال : اخبرنا الحسن بن علي قال : اخبرنا ابوالحسن  
عن علي بن عبدالله بن ابي عياش التميمي قال : قال عبدالله بن مسعود :  
ما ابالي بالغنا بليت او بالفقر، ان حق الله فيهما لواجب، في الغنا البر و  
العطف وفي الفقر الصبر -

اخبرنا عبدالله قال : اخبرنا الحسين بن علي قال : اخبرنا ابوالحسن  
المدائني عن علي بن سليمان عن الحسن قال : الخير الذي لا شرفيه الشكر مع  
العافية و الصبر عند المصيبة، فكم من منعم عليه غير شاكر و متبلى غير  
صابر -

اخبرنا عبدالله قال : اخبرنا الحسن بن علي قال : اخبرنا ابوالحسن قال :  
قال ابو حارثة بن يزيد يرثي زياداً ٦٩ :

(بسيط)

الصبر أجمل والدنيا مفاجئة

من ذا الذي لم يجزع مرة حزناً  
اخبرنا عبدالله قال : اخبرنا الحسن بن علي قال : اخبرنا ابوالحسن قال :  
و كانوا يحشون على الصبر و كان اهل الجاهلية يامرون بالصبر و يعيرون  
بالجزع ٤٠

و قال دريد بن الصمة ٤١

(طويل)

قليل التشكي للمصيبات حافظ

من اليوم اعقاب الاحاديث في عدد

- ٦٩- الشعر في كتاب التعازي والمراثي ٦  
٤٠- الخبر في كتاب التعازي والمراثي ٣  
٤١- المراثية في الاصمعيات ١١١-١١٦، الجمهرة ٢١١-٢١٣، الاغاني ٥/٩،  
البيت الاول في الشعر ٣٤١، المروزقي ٢ : ٨١٩، التبريزي ٢ : ١٥٨، العقد  
١ : ٣٣٥، ٣ : ٦٣، كتاب التعازي والمراثي ٥ -

اخبرنا عبدالله قال : اخبرنا الحسن بن علي قال : اخبرنا ابوالحسن قال :  
قال عمر بن ذر و مات ابن له فقال : يا بني ما علينا من موتك غضاضة  
و ما بنا الى احد سوى الله من حاجة، فلما دفنه قال : رحمك الله يا بني لقد  
شغلنا الحزن لك عن الحزن عيلك، لانا لاندرى ما قلت و لا ما قيل لك،  
اللهم قد وهبت له ما ضيع مما اقترضت عليه من برى فهم له ما قصر فيه من  
طاعتك واجعل ثوابك لي عليه و زدني من فضلك فاني اليك من الراغبين ٦٦ -  
اخبرنا عبدالله قال : اخبرنا الحسن بن علي قال : اخبرنا ابوالحسن : قيل  
للضحاك بن قيس : من قال عند المصيبة انا لله و انا اليه راجعون، كان  
ممن اخذ بالتقوى و ادى الفرائض اولئك عليهم صلوات من ربهم و رحمة  
قال : نعم ٦٤ -

اخبرنا عبدالله قال : اخبرنا الحسن بن علي قال : اخبرنا ابوالحسن عن  
سفيان بن عيينة عن بعض ان عبدالله بن محمد قال : ما رأيت ابن عمر دمعت  
عينه في مصيبه قط .

اخبرنا عبدالله قال : اخبرنا الحسن بن علي قال : اخبرنا ابوالحسن قال : قال  
سفيان : شكى ربيع بن ابي راشد الى محارب بن دثار ابطاء خبر أخيه فقال :  
قد أبطأ على خبر جامع، قال له : ان لم يكن وطنت نفسك على فراق  
الاحبة فانك عاجز ٦٨ -

اخبرنا عبدالله قال : اخبرنا الحسن بن علي قال : اخبرنا ابوالحسن عن  
محمد بن عامر قال : قال عبدالله بن عباس ما قيل لقوم طوبى الاخياء الدهر بهم  
يوم سوء، فالصبر خير مغبه -

اخبرنا عبدالله قال : اخبرنا الحسن بن علي قال : اخبرنا ابوالحسن : قال  
سفيان بن عيينة عن مالك بن مغول قال : قال عمر بن الخطاب رضي الله عنه :  
خير عيشنا الصبر -

٦٦- راجع كتاب التعازي والمراثي ٥٢

٦٤- راجع كتاب التعازي والمراثي ٤

٦٨- النظر كتاب التعازي والمراثي ١٥٩



وقال عمر بن معدى كرب ٤٥

(كامل)

كم من اخ لي صالح  
بواته ييدى لحد

وقالت اخت ربيعة بن مكرم ترثي اخاها

(بسيط)

ما بال عينك منها الدمع مهراق

سجا فلا عازب منها ولا راق

فاذهب فلا يبعدنك الله من رجل

لاقى الذى كل حى بعده لاق

لو كان يبقى سليما وجد ذى رحم

ابقى سليما له وجدى واشفاق

او كان يفدى لكان الاهل كلهم

وما اثمر من مال له واق

لكن سهام المنايا من قصدن له

لم يشفه طب ذى طب ولا راق

لابكيك مانا حت مطوقة

وما سریت مع السارى على ساق

وقال حارث بن بدر يرثي اخاه درعا :

(بسيط)

أست ديار بنى بدر معطلة

من طامع كان يغشاها و زوار

يايها الشامت المبدى عداوته

ما بالمنايا التى عيرت من عار

اربع عليك فانا معشر صبر

على المصيبات قدما غير اغمار

٤٥- المرزوقي ١ : ٢٩٠ ، التبريزي ١ : ٩٠-٩٣ ، كتاب التعازي والمراثي ٣ -

وقال ابو خراش الهذلى ٤٢

(طويل)

تقول أراه بعد عروة لاهيا

و ذلك رز لو علمت جليل

فلا تحسبى انى تناسيت عهده

ولكن صبرى يا اميم جميل

اخبرنا عبدالله قال : اخبرنا الحسن قال : اخبرنا ايوالحسن عن عامر

الاسود قال : نعى الى ابى قحافة ابنه ابوبكر رضى الله عنه فقال رزعه جليل -

وقال ابو ذؤيب ٤٣

(طويل)

وانى صبرت النفس بعد ابن عنبس

و قد لج من امر الشئون لجوج

لاحسب جلدا اولينيا شامت

وللشر بعد القارعات فروج

(خفيف)

وقال عمير الحنفى :

ربما يجرع النفوس من الامر

له فرجة كحل العقل

وقال اوس بن حجر ٤٤ :

(منسرح)

ايتها النفس اجملى جزعا

ان الذى تحذرين قد وقعا

٤٢- القصيدة فى مجموعة اشعار الهذلىين ٢ : ٣٩ ، البيتان فى الارتياح ١٣٩

٤٣- ديوانه ١٨ ، اللسان ٢ : ٣٥٣

٤٤- ديوانه ٥٣ ، الاغانى ١٠ : ٨ ، الكامل ٤٣٠ ، العيون ٢ : ١٩٢ ، الشعر

١٠٢ ، العقد ١ : ٢٣١



من حيث أخذتها قال : فبكي مسلمة وقال : رحمك الله، لقد ألنت منا قلوباً قاسية وزرعت في قلوب الناس مودة وأبقيت لنا فن الصالحين ذكراء -

أخبرنا عبدالله قال : أخبرنا الحسن قال : أبو الحسن عن الضحاك بن زمل قال : كنا عند خالد بن عبدالله حين أتاه نعي اسد فبكي حتى اخضلت لحيته، ثم قال : رحم الله أخى كان والله براً واصلًا، والله ما مشيت ليلة قط الا مشى امامي ولا مشيت نهارة قط الا مشى خلفي، ولا على بيت قط أنا تحته -

أخبرنا عبدالله قال : أخبرنا الحسن قال : أخبرنا أبو الحسن عن محمد بن أبي محمد قال : مر الاسكندر بمدينة قد ملكها املاك سبعة وبادوا، فقال : هل بقي من نسل الاملاك الذين ملكوا هذه المدينة فقالوا : رجل في المقابر، فدعى به فقال : ما دعاك الى لزوم المقابر قال : اردت ان اعزل عظام الملوك من عظام عبيدهم فوجدت عظامهم و عظام عبيدهم سواء، قال : فهل لك ان تتبعني فأحى شرف آبائك، ان كان لك همة، قال : ان همتي لعظيمة ان كان بغيتي عندك - قال : وما بغيتك؟ قال حياة لا موت فيها وشباب ليس معه هرم وغنى لا فقر معه، وسرور بغير مكروه - قال : لا، قال : فامض لشأنك ودعني اطلب ذلك ممن هو عنده يملكه - قال الاسكندر وهذا : احكم من رايت -

أخبرنا عبدالله قال : أخبرنا الحسن بن علي : قال أخبرنا أبو الحسن المدائني قال : وعزى عمرو بن ميمون رجلاً فقال : عز نفسك بما كنت معزياً به غيرك، وانا واياك ومن ترى و ان تراخت بنا مدة الى اجل نحن بالغوه، فكان الموت قد حل بنا وبك، لا مدفع له ولا محيص عنه، فنسئل الله عز وجل ان يجعل بقاءنا وبقاءك مسارعة لنا في الخيرات، واقتداء بمن

٢٤ - الخبر في كتاب التعازي والمراثي ٢٩ -

٢٥ - راجع كتاب التعازي والمراثي ٥٢ والارتياح ١٢٢، وانظر البيان

١ : ٢٥٩ والعقد ١ : ٢٢٢ - ٢ : ٨

٢٦ - الخبر في كتاب التعازي والمراثي ١٥٩

قال المدائني : ورثت اخت مسعود بن شداد اخاها فقال لها رجل : رثيت اخاك بما ليس فيه، فقالت : ان كنت كما ذبا فاسل الله عسرك وداوم فقرك - كان والله أخى يابس الجنين، ندى الكفين، لا يكسر اذا وجد ولا يلوم اذا فقد -

أخبرنا عبدالله قال : أخبرنا الحسن : قال أبو الحسن ومات أخ لاعرابي فقيل له : صف لنا اخاك فقال : كان والله شديد العقدة لين العطفة، يرضيه اقل مما يسخطه -

أخبرنا عبدالله قال : أخبرنا الحسن قال : أخبرنا أبو الحسن عن عمرو بن غياث عن محمد بن حرب قال : كتب ابراهيم بن أبي يحيى الى بعض الخلفاء : ان احق من عرف حق الله فيما اخذ منه من عظم الله عنده فيما ابقى له - فاعلم ان الماضي قبلك الباقي لك، والباقي بعدك الماحور فيك، و ان اجر الصابرين يصابون به اعظم من النعمة عليهم فيما يعافون منه -

أخبرنا عبدالله قال : قال أخبرنا الحسن قال : أخبرنا أبو الحسن عن محمد بن أبي علي قال : قال زياد لرجل : اين منزلك قال : اوسط المنازل البصرة، قال : كم لك من الولد؟ قال : تسعة - فقيل لزياد ما له من الولد غير ابن واحد و داره اقصى دار بالبصرة، فقال له زياد : الم تخبرني ان دارك اوسط منازل البصرة، قال : بلى - قال : لقد انبئت انها اقصى دور البصرة قال : هي بين بين الدنيا والاخرة - قال وقلت لي تسع بنين - قال : نعم كانوا عشرة، قدمت تسعة بقي لي واحد، فلا ادري اناله ام هو لي -

أخبرنا عبدالله قال : أخبرنا الحسن قال : أخبرنا أبو الحسن عن مسلمة بن محارب قال : دخل مسلمة بن عبد الملك على عمر بن عبدالعزيز في مرضه قال : يا امير المؤمنين أ لا توصي قال وهل من مال أوصى فيه، فقال مسلمة : هذه مائة الف أبعث بها اليك فهي لك، فامض فيها - قال : فهلا غير ذلك يا مسلمة - قال وما ذاك يا امير المؤمنين، قال : ترددها

٢٦ - الخبر في كتاب التعازي والمراثي ٢٩ والعقد ٢ : ٢٨٥



اخبرنا عبدالله قال : اخبرنا الحسن قال : اخبرنا ابوالحسن المدائني قال : وقف محمد بن سليمان على قبر ابنه فقال : اللهم اني ارجوك له واخافك عليه فحقق رجائي وامن خوفي انك على ذلك قدير .

اخبرنا عبدالله قال : اخبرنا الحسين قال : اخبرنا ابوالحسن قال : لقي رجل رجلا قد اصيب بمصيبة فأبطأ عن تعزيته فقال : لو لا ان تجديد التعزية يجدد جزعا في المصيبة لعزيناك عن من رضى الله عنه .

اخبرنا عبدالله قال : اخبرنا الحسن قال : اخبرنا ابوالحسن قال : جاور عبدالله بن جعفر عاماً بمكة فمات له مملوك كان مجرباً ذا موضع منه فأثناه ابن عباس يعزيه فقال : لا تعدم الاجر على الرزية والخلف من الفقيد، ثقل الله به ميزانك وغفر لنا ولفتناك .

اخبرنا عبدالله قال : اخبرنا الحسن قال : اخبرنا ابوالحسن عن خالد بن خداش قال : حدثني سعيد بن عامر عن شعبة بن الحجاج بن ابو بسطام الازدي عن اياس بن معاوية بن قرة المري عن ابيه قال : كنا نختلف الى رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ومعنا صاحب لنا معه ابن له قال : فقال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم لابنه : أتجبه، قال : اى والله يا رسول الله انى لاحبه فاحبك الله كما أحبه، قال : فضحك رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم . قال : ثم ان ابنه مات فجزع عليه ابوه جزعا شديداً، فقال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم : اما يسرك ان لا تأتي بابا من ابواب الجنة الا وجدته قد سبقك قال : بلى يا رسول الله . قال : فسرى عنه .

اخبرنا عبدالله قال : اخبرنا الحسن قال : اخبرنا ابوالحسن عن سفيان عن منصور بن صفية عن ابيه قال : دخل عبدالله بن عمر المسجد فقيل له : يا ابا عبد الرحمن لو اتيت اسماء بنت ابي بكر فعزيتها عن ابنها عبدالله بن الزبير فاتاها فجلس اليها فقال لها : ان هذه الجثث ليست بشيء و انما الامر في الروح و انى لارجوان يكون روح عبدالله قد أفاضت الى خير فاصبرى، قالت : وكيف يمنعنى ان اصبر وقد حمل راس يحيى بن ذكربا النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم الى ابنه فصبر .

امرنا ان نقتدى بهده من المصطفين الاخيار .  
اخبرنا عبدالله قال : اخبرنا الحسن قال : اخبرنا ابوالحسن قال : لما حضرت عبدالملك الوفاة قال : اصعدوني فلما اصعد تسطح على فراشه ثم قال : يا دنيا ما اطيب ريحك، يا اهل العافية لا تستقلوا شيئا منها حتى سمع ذلك منه خارج القصر .

اخبرنا عبدالله قال : اخبرنا الحسن قال : اخبرنا ابوالحسن عن عاصم في اسناد له قال : قال الطاعون انا الحق بالشام ، فقال الخصب : انا معك قال : و قال الجوع : انا الحق بارض البادية، قال : فقالت الصحة : انا معك، قال : وقالت النعمة : انا الحق بارض العراق، فقال السقم : انا معك .  
اخبرنا عبدالله قال : اخبرنا الحسن قال : اخبرنا ابوالحسن عن آدم بن عيينة قال : رأيت الى امرأه تتبع جنازة وهى تقول :  
(طويل)

رحيب ذراع بالتى لاتشينه  
و ان كانت الفحشاء ضاق بهاذرعا  
قال : وقال اويس عند وفاته : ان حق الله لم يترك عند اويس او قال عند المسلم دينارا ولا درهما .

قال : وذكروا ان عمر بن عبدالعزيز لما مات ابنه رجع من الجنازة فرأى قوماً يرمون، فلما رآوه امسكوا فقال : ارموا و وقف عليهم فرمى احد الرامين فاخرج، فقال له عمر : أخرجت فقصر، ثم قال لا آخر : ارم فرمى، فقصر، فقال له عمر : قصرت فبلغ، فقال له مسلمة : يا امير المؤمنين أ يفرغ قلبك لما يفرغ له، و انما نفضت يدك من تراب قبر ابنك الساعة ، لم تصل الى منزلك بعد . فقال له عمر انما الجزع قبل المصيبة، فاذا وقعت المصيبة فانه عما فاتك .  
٨٠ . الخير في الارتياح ١٤٤  
٨١ . كتاب التعازي والمراثي ٣ : ٥٤



اخبرنا عبدالله قال : اخبرنا الحسن قال : اخبرنا ابوالحسن : قال ابن ربيعة : عزى محمد بن الفرات الشيباني رجلاً فقال : لو ان جزعا على رزية وفي حلول نائبة أوتى رجع فائت لتقدم فيه العاقل واعتصم به الخائف ولكن الصبر طوعاً وكرهاً -

اخبرنا عبدالله قال : اخبرنا الحسن قال : اخبرنا ابوالحسن قال : عزى رجل من بكر بن وائل رجلاً فقال : ليس في الجزع عقيب تفيد راحة الاماء، لو تعجل افاد راحة و اجرا، ومن اعظم الجزع على مصيبتيه بفقد المحبوب فقد استدعى اخرى بفوت الاخرة -

اخبرنا عبدالله قال : اخبرنا الحسن قال : اخبرنا ابوالحسن عن ابي عمرو الهلالي قال : كتب رجل الى بعض اخوانه يعزيه عن ابنه : اما بعد فان الولد على والده ماعاش حزن و فتنه، فاذا قدمه فصلوة و رحمة ولا تجزع على ما فاتك من حزنه و فتنته و لا تضع ماعوضك الله من صلواته و رحمته -

اخبرنا عبدالله قال : اخبرنا الحسن قال : اخبرنا ابوالحسن عن ابي عمرو الهلالي عن السهمي قال : كتب رجل الى بعض اخوانه يعزيه اما بعد فعليك بتقوى الله و الصبر، فان به ياخذ المحتسب و اليه يرجع الجازع ٨٢ -

اخبرنا عبدالله قال : اخبرنا الحسن بن علي قال : اخبرنا ابوالحسن عن ابي عمرو الصابي عن يحيى بن عثمان قال : سمعت يحيى بن خالد يقول : والله لو ان الله عز و جل كلف العباد الجزع دون الصبر لكلفهم اشد المصيبتين على القلوب -

اخبرنا عبدالله قال : اخبرنا الحسن قال : اخبرنا ابوالحسن قال : عزى رجل من بكر وائل رجلاً عن ابنه، ويقال ان المعزى هو و انه كتب اليه : يا بني ان احتمال المضاضة في اول الصبر حتى ينقطع الحزن ايسر نكايمة من آخر الجزع، وان امراً لا يتعقب مقدره الا بالندم و لا تخلص منه الا الى الاثم لتحقيق ان لا يستقبل مورده الا بالقمع و القذع و السلام -

اخبرنا عبدالله قال : اخبرنا الحسن بن علي قال : اخبرنا ابوالحسن عن ابن علية : قال ايوب السخيتاني عن الحسن قال : قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم : انما الصبر عند الصدمة الاولى و العبرة لا يملكها احد صبي به المرء الى اخيه -

اخبرنا عبدالله قال : اخبرنا الحسن قال : اخبرنا ابوالحسن قال : حدثنا ابن علية قال : حدثنا ابن عون قال : كان محمد بن سيرين يكون عند المصيبة كما يكون قبل ذلك الا يوم ماتت حفصة بنت سيرين فانه جعل يكشر و انت تعرف فيه -

و بكى عبدالله بن مسعود على أخيه فقيل له : يا ابا عبد الرحمن تبكي، قال : كان اخي في النسب و صاحبي مع رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم، ما يسرنى اني كنت قبله، لان يموت فاحتسبه احب الى من ان اموت فيحتسبني -

قال : و لما مات مغلد بن يزيد بن المهلب اتى ابنه بمائدته اتى كانت يؤتى بها فقبض اصحابه ايديهم عن الطعام فقال : مضى مغلد لشأنه فعليكم بشأنكم من كان ياكل في غد فلياكل اليوم -

اخبرنا عبدالله قال : اخبرنا الحسن : قال ابوالحسن لما قتل محمد بن عبدالله بن خازم و اتاه ناس يعزونه فكان فيمن اتاه رجل من الازد يقال له صلاح فقال :

(طويل)

أبا الصبر لي ان الشكاوى تغادرت

بأسياؤها فردا وحيدا محمدا

فلو في عراق غادرت مجدلا

لقلت كمن قد راح بالسيف واغتدى

و لاقى المنايا والمنايا حياه

تغادر كهلا للجبين و امردا

فقال الازدي : يرحمك الله يا صلاح، ما اراد الله بمحمد خيرا مما اردت - قتل مظلوما في الله، و عقابه ثكل لا ثكل مثله، فاحتسب و اصبر تجز ثواب الصابرين، فقال : اللهم ان اخا الازد قد نصحتني و قال بما اعرف فهب لي صبرا -



يجئ بعاقبة او يوم لا يستأخر بما فيه عن اوان مجيئه، او يوم لا يأتي بما في غيره، فانظر الى ايام الدهر تجدها ثلاثة، يوم مضى لا ترجوه، و يوما بقي لا بد منه و يوما يجي لا تأمنه، ان اكمل الاداة عند المصائب الصبر و اليقين، لان الهارب لا بد له مما هو كائن و انما يتقلب في كف طالبه، فاين المهرب ان امس موعظة، و اليوم غنيمة و غدا لا تدري امن اهله انت او من غير اهله، فامس شاهد مقبول و امين مودى و حكيم مودب قد فجعت بنفسك من يدى حكمته، و اليوم صديق مودع كان طويل الغيبة وهو قد فجعت بنفسه و خلف في يدك حكمته، شريع الظعن آتاك ولم تأت و قد مضى قبله شاهد عدل فان كان ما فيه لك فاشفعه بمثله و الا فاتق اجتماع شهادتهما عليك - ان اهل هذه الدار سفر لا يحلون عقد الرجال الا في غيرها، و انما ينتقلون منها في العواري، فما احسن الشكر للمنعم و التسليم للمغير، من احق بالتسليم ممن لا يجد مهربا ولا معيناً بل الاعوان عليه، انظر مما جزعت و ما استكرهت و ما تتحاول فان ردك الجزع الى ثقة من درك الطلب فما اولاك به، و ان كنت قويا على رد ما كرهت فكيف تعجز عن الغلبة على ما اجبت، و ان كنت حاولت مغلوبا فمن افنى القرون قبلك، و ان اعظم من المصيبة سوء الخلف منها، و من تناول ثمرة ما لا يكون استقرت في يديه الخيبة، فمن هذا المعدن ترجو درك الغنيمة، فان العلم لا ينال الا بالتعلم، فما رجوت تعلم ما لا تعلم، و درك ما لا يكون ولم يكون، لذلك معلم فيمن كان قبلك و لا متعلم سواك، و ما عناك لطلب من هو في طلبك، ام كيف رجوت رجعة مالك اليك و انت سابق اليه، ام ما جزعك عن الظاعنين عنك اليوم فانت مرتحل اليه غدا، ام ما طمعك في رد ما هو كائن بما لا يكون فأفق و المرجع قريب، ولا تعم تبصر لك العمى و تتوهل الجعالة، و أنت ذوالحظ الكثير من الدنيا في قسمك و اخو الملك العظيم في قرابتك، و اين الملوك المنعمين في نسبك فقد اتاك الخير من كل باب كانت، كما قيل فيك، فلا تكونن في الشكر دون الحق عليك، و انما ابتلاك بالمصيبة المنعم واخذ منك المعطى، و ما ترك اكثر، فان انسييت الصبر فلا تغفل

اخبرنا عبدالله قال : اخبرنا الحسن قال : اخبرنا ابوالحسن قال : ذكروا ان النعمن بن المنذر ٨٣ كان له ثلاثة اخوة، عمرو و مالك و كانا اخوين لاب و ام و كانا ابني مهيرة، وكان النعمن و اخ له يسمى علقمة لام ولد، فهلك مالك فجزع عليه عمرو، وكان مالك من حول - عند اهل مملكتهم - لحوادث الايام و بوائق الدهر، فمات مالك فدخل على اخيه عمرو من الحزن ما كاد يقضى عليه، فلما راي علقمة ما باخيه استأذن النعمن في تعزية عمرو و موعظته و سأله ان يجمع له رؤسا اهل مملكته، و حلماهم و علماؤهم فاجابه الى ذلك، فلما اجتمع الناس اذن لهم النعمن على قدر منازلهم فقام علقمة بن المنذر فثنيت له نمرقة الشرف على منبر الكرامة عن يمين النعمن و هو مقام عظماء المتكلمين فقال : يا عمرو يا ثمرة الراى و معدن الملك انما الخلق ٨٤ للخالق و الشكر للمنعم و انما التسليم للقادر و لا بد مما هو كائن و انه لا اضعف من مخلوق، ولا اقوى من خالق، ولا اقدر ممن طلبته في يديه، ولا اعجز ممن هو في يد طالبه، و التفكر نور، و الغفلة ظلمة، و الجهالة ضلالة، و قد ورد الاول و الآخر، سابق متعب، و في الاشياء غير، و السعيد من وعظ بغيره، و قد جاء ما لا يرد، و لا سبيل الى رجوع ما قد فات، و ذهب عنك ما لا يرجع اليك، و اقام معك ما سيذهب عنك، فما الجزع مما لا بد منه، و ما الطمع فيما لا يرجي، و ما الحيلة لبقاء ما سيفنى، و انما الشئ من مثله، و قد مضت قبلنا اصول نحن فروعها، فما بقاء الفرع بعد اصله - انظر الى طبقات حالاتك من لدن كنت في صلب ابيك الى ان بلغت منزلة الشرف و حد العقل و غاية الكرامة، هل قدرت ان تنتقل عن طبقة قبل انقضائها و تتعجل نعمه قبل اوان محلها، و انظر يا عمرو الى ابائك الذين كانوا اهل الملك و الشرف الكبير و الاحلام المحموده هل وجدوا سبيلا، او وجد لهم، الى بقاء ما احبوا، ا بقو بعده - فاي ايام الدهر ترتجى، يوم

٨٣- ابو قابوس النعمان الثالث بن المنذر الرابع راجع الاغانى ١٩ : ٨٢،

٢٢ : ٢

٨٣- راجع كتاب التعازى والمراثى ٣٦، والإرتياح ١٨٩



ثم نعود، الا وانما العواري اليوم والهبات غدا، الا وانا قد ورثنا من قبلنا و لنا وارثون، وقد كان رحيل عن محل نازل، الا وقد تقارب سلب فنقلب، فأحسنوا اعطاء جزيل فاستصلحوا ما تقدمون عليه بما تظعنون عنه واسلكوا سبيل الخير ولا تستوحشوا منها لقلة اهلها و اذكروا حميد الصحبة لكم فيها. يا ايها الناس اني اعظلكم و أبدأ بنفسي، واستبدلوا العواري بالهبات و ارضوا بالباقي خلقا من الفاني، واستقبلوا المصيبات بالحسبة تسخلفوا بها نعمة، واستديموا الكرامة بالشكر تستحقوا الزيادة، واعرفوا فضل البقاء في النعم و الغناء في السلامة قبل الفتنة الملبسة بالمثلثة السيئة و قبل انتقال النعم و زوال الايام و تصرف الخطوب -

يا ايها الناس انما انتم في هذه الدنيا اعراض تنتضل فيكم المنايا، و انتم فيها نهب للمصيبات، مع كل جرعة لكم شرق و في كل اكلة لكم عصص، لا تنالون نعمة الا بفراق اخرى و لا يستقبل معمر يوما من عمره الا بهدم اخر من اجله و لا تجد لذة زيادة في اكله الا بنفاد ما قبله من رزقه لا يحى له اثرا الامات له اثر فانتهم اعوان الحتوف و اسباب مناياكم، لا يمنعكم شيئا منها و لا يعينكم شيء عليها، لها بكل سبب صريع مجترم، و متقرب منتظر، لا ينجو من حبالها الحذر و لا يرفع عن مقاتله الارب، فهذه انفسكم تسوقكم، فمن اين تطلبون البقاء و هذا الليل و النهار لم يرفعا من شيء شرفا الا اسرعا في هدم ما بنيا و تفريق ما جمعا، يا ايها الناس اطلبوا الخير و وليه و احذروا الشر و وليه واعلموا ان خيرا من الخير معطيه و ان شرا من الشر فاعله -

آخر الجزء الثاني من املاء الشيخ

يتلوه ان شاء الله به القوة في الجزء الثالث: حدثنا الحسن بن علي بن المتوكل: قال ابو الحسن علي بن محمد المدائني قال حدثني شيخ من اهل البصرة عن جعفر بن سليمان الصيفي - والحمد لله رب العالمين و صلى الله و ملائكته على السيد المصطفى بنبيه محمد و على آله الطيبين الطاهرين و سلم تسليما -

الشكر و كلا فلا تدع، ولا اغنى عنك من المنعم و لا احوج من منعم عليه فاحذر من الغفلة استلاب النعمة و طول الندامة، واعلم انه لا اضيع ممن غفل عن نفسه و لم يغفل عنه طالبه، و ان اخاك عظيم قد برر تعظيم ما بررته لصلتك و استكمال كرامتك و لطف بما ترى لموعظتك -

و هذا يوم بقاء عظيم و بقاء ما فيه بعدنا طويل، سيحظى به اليوم السعيد، ويستكثر منافعه اللبيب، و انما جمعت منافع هذا اليوم و جنوده لدفع فتن الجاهلية عنك، و انما اوقدت مصابيح الهدى فيه ليتبين خيرك و سهلت سبيل الخير اليك لو جاء رجعتك، فلم ار كاليوم مع فوزه متحيزا و لا اعيى مداويه سقيم، و ما اصغر المصيبة اليوم مع عظيم الغنيمة غدا، و اكثر فيه خيبة الخائب، و ان ابت نفسك الى علم رأى من جمع لك فقد كفيت، هذا جوابهم فاسمع يا عمرو، و زعم فرسان الحروب و قادة الجنود ان غلب على ملك آبائك اهل التسويج و الملك الكبير، و ان غالبهم لا يغلب و زعم الاطباء ان مالكا هلك بداء معلمهم الذي هلكوا به فانه لا دواء لداءهم ذلك، و زعمت حفظة الخزائن انها عواري عندكم اهل البيت، و ان العواري لا يقبل في فكاك الرهان - و زعم اهل الحيل و التجارب و الجماعة الكبرى ان اصحاب ملك قد شغلهم انفسهم عنك فان فرغوا اتوك، وقد اسمعك الداعي و اعذر فيك الطالب و انتهى اليك الامر فيك الى حد الرجاء، و لا احد اعظم رزية في عقله ممن ضيع اليقين و اخطأ الامل - ثم التفت الى الملك فقال:

ايها الملك المنعم ان اعظم العطية ما اعطينا بجمعك ايانا، و اذنك في الكلام لنا، و خير الهدية ما حملتنا، و انا ايها الملك الرفيع جده، مع معرفتنا بفضلك لم نر فضل فوق منزلتك و لنحسبك ان لا يكون الا الخالق فوقك، و نعم المخلوق انت، ترد المدبر الى حظه، و تكف المستعجل الى حتفه، و تترك مبتغى الخير الى بغيته و تمثل دوائك يشفى السقيم، فدام يجي الخير منك لنا، و الانعام علينا و الشكر منا -

ثم اقبل على الناس كافة بالموعظة فقال: يا ايها الناس انما البقاء بعد الفناء و قد خلقنا و لم نك شيئا، و سنبل



IMDAD HUSAIN

\*This paper was read at the Tricentenary of Shakespeare's death arranged by the British Council, Lahore.



that is I see", answers Gertrude. "Nor did you nothing hear?" enquires Hamlet again and Gertrude replies, "No, nothing but ourselves." There are literal-minded critics who according to their light, or darkness, say "yet all that is I see"; and others, with a finely developed narcissistic sense see only themselves in Shakespeare's plays. We wonder, whether Shakespeare, who saw so many ironies in life, and struck so many variations on the theme of "seeing" and the theme of Appearance and Reality, in his plays, was conscious of the supreme irony of the interpretations of his plays by posterity. He was highly conscious of the immortality of his verse:

"Not marble, nor the gilded monument of Princes shall outlast this powerful rime" he said about his sonnets. But did he know, or care, what his work would mean to posterity?

Critics have looked for Shakespeare's 'poetics' in his plays and perhaps the most famous passage is the one in which he speaks of the purpose of 'playing' (which should include dramatic writing also) "as holding, as it were, the mirror up to nature, to show virtue her own feature and scorn her own image and very age and body of the time his form and pressure." This is the classical mimetic theory of art being an imitation of life, according to which Shakespeare's plays continued to be interpreted till the 19th century. Before we look at the implications of the mirror image and its link with the theme of Shakespeare's 'invisibility' through the ages, let us make a short excursion into the impenetrability of Shakespeare's biography. It is not only Lewis Carroll's Humpty Dumpty who said, "Impenetrability! That's what I say." Shakespeare could have said it too.

Shakespeare was born 400 years ago at Stratford at Avon (which, by the way, through Shakespeare Industry, is now Stratford on Petrol), but his exact date of birth, like so many other aspects of his life, is not known. There is dispute about his father's profession, whether he was a butcher, a wool-dealer, or a "Whittawez", which means a glover. No record of his schooling at Stratford Grammar School exists and we do not know what exactly Ben Jonson's gibe about Shakespeare's "small Latin and less Greek" amounts to. In what circumstances, of haste, did Shakespeare, at the age of 18, marry the already pregnant, and 8 years older than himself, Ann Hathaway? Or, was

she Ann Whately? "When, alas, I came to wive", he wrote many years later and perhaps that 'alas' was deeply felt. Did Shakespeare, in equal haste, leave Stratford, at the age of 20, in order to avoid punishment for poaching deer on the estate of Sir Thomas Lucy? What did he do there? Was he a scrivener, an apothecary, a dyer, a printer or a soldier? Did he in London hold horses at the doors before he was admitted into a Company as an actor? The first contemporary mention of the Bard, who was to enjoy world-wide idolatry, was vitriolic. The dying play-wright Robert Greene called him "an upstart crow beautified with our feathers, but with his Tiger's skin wrapt in a player's hide, (who) supposes he is as well able to bombast out a blank verse as the best of you and being an absolute *Johannus Factotum*, is in his own concept the only Shakescene in the country." Then the Sonnets. Utter impenetrability surrounds Shakespeare's Sonnets and hundreds of books have been written on their mystery, as on the mystery of Hamlet. This is understandable. As a writer of plays Shakespeare wears a mask of invisibility and the critics hope to pluck the heart of his mystery through his lyrical sonnet-sequences.

Literary sleuths, particularly those with a morbid streak in themselves, have been at it, trying to identify the Dark Lady, the *femme fatale*, with raven brows and mourning eyes. Was she Mary Fitton, or some other, a woman married, faithless to her husband in her liaison with the poet and faithless to them both in her affairs with others? And Shakespeare cannot understand why he thinks her "several (that is, private) plot, while his heart knows her to be the "wide world's commonplace." Under the stress of this experience he could write, startlingly, of "Lilies that fester smell far worse than weeds." — an image, says L.C. Knights, "suggesting less the excesses of sensuality than the 'distortions of ingrown virginity'". In an almost Strindbergian poem he writes of the power of lust:

"The expense of spirit in a waste of shame

Is lust in action —

Prejudured, murderous, bloody, full of blame none knows well

To shun the heaven that leads men to hell."



Shakespeare seems to have been simultaneously attracted and repelled by the Dark Lady. In Sonnet no 130, with Shakespeare's intense sensibility to smell, she is accused even of halitosis! To the biographer Frank Harris, Shakespeare appeared as "an outsize among inspired cry-babies." Gloating almost like a Hollywood producer, or a writer in the *News of the World*, Harris wrote: "The sonnets give us the story, the whole terrible, sinful, magical story of Shakespeare's passion." The eloquent chapters in which Frank Harris melts out Shakespeare's personal history from the poetic alloy are merely an exotic development among more eminent critics. More temperately and almost impersonally, to T.S. Eliot the Sonnets are "full of some stuff that the writer could not drag into light, contemplate or manipulate into art.—The more perfect the artist, the more completely separate in him will be the man who suffers and the man which creates: the more perfectly will the mind digest and transmute the passions which are its material." How literary fashions about speaking about the life of a writer have changed!

However, to get back to the biographical invisibility. If we are not sure of the identity of the Dark Lady, who is the lovely boy of the Sonnets, the son of a lovely mother, the boy whose hair was like the auburn buds of marjoram? And was Shakespeare homo-sexual? What is the mystery of W.H.? Is he the Earl of Southampton or the Earl of Pembroke? From such fertile material for the 'creative' biographer, we pass on to the still more promising Anti-Shakespeare theories. How could the Stratford butcher-boy write the great works ascribed to Shakespeare? Logic demands that it must be Francis Bacon, or the Earl of Oxford or the Earl of Derby. And why cannot it be John Marlowe? C. Hoffman in the *Murder of the Man who Was Shakespeare* (1955) has identified Shakespeare with Marlowe. Logan Pearshall Smith says in a delicious foot note: "I do not wish, however, to speak with any disrespect of that view of the authorship of Shakespeare's plays which is so firmly held by officers in the Navy and the Army, by one of His Majesty's Judges, and the manager of more than one drapery establishment and is corroborated by the authority of Mark Twain, Mrs.

Henry Pott, Prince Bismarck, John Bright, the late Mr. Crump K. C. and several thoughtful boronets."

As Conan Doyle would have said, the Shakespeare mystery deepens and the antiquated pastime of bard-baiting and bard-questing continues. Biographical Sherlock Holmes write chapters on Shakespeare Fabricated, Shakespeare Unmasked and Shakespeare Identified. Says L.P. Smith again: "Of the inhabitants of the insane asylums of Great Britain, it has been calculated that after the religious maniacs, the two next largest class consist of these who rave about the Royal Family or those who, by thinking about Shakespeare, have unhinged their minds."

The uncertainty about the man Shakespeare seems, as if by infection, to spread also to the portraits of Shakespeare. The two portraits that can be accepted as authentic likenesses are the bust (really a half-length statue) in Holy Trinity church, Stratford on Avon, and the copperplate engraved by Martin Droeshout as Frontispiece to the First Folio of Shakespeare's plays. J. Dover Wilson's romantic sensibility is hurt and he takes exception even to the Stratford bust. This might, he says, "suit well enough with an affluent and retired butcher but does gross wrong to the dead poet." As for the Folio engraving Sir John Squire has called it the "pudding-faced effigy of Droeshout". The portrait that has made the most popular appeal is that called the Chandos which is in the National Portrait Gallery, London. The romantic Italianate looking head suits the Bardolater's conception of what Shakespeare should look like. It would be a pity indeed if Shakespeare did not look a little like Shelley or Keats! The newly discovered portraits of Shakespeare arrive, we are told, at the National Portrait Gallery at least one a year.

Thus, from the point of view of records, the image of Shakespeare the man is delightfully, or shall we say, desirably, vague and we are at liberty to construct our images to suit our convenience. Summing up the position John Crow says: "When the apposite records had been discovered, inspected and interpreted, when the works had been stared at and assessed, critics of an earlier age turned to the elaboration of their portraits of Shakespeare the man. We have been shown Shakespeare the demigod, Shakespeare



the shrewd businessman, the woodnotes-wild warbler (hardly distinguishable from Shakespeare the idiot boy), the preacher, the prophet, the sergeant, the sea-man, the school-master, the solicitor's Clerk, the syndicate, the psycho-ravaged sibling, the Oedipus *de ses jours*, the play-patcher, the self-effacing peer, the cipher expert, the man with the nervous break down—there was no end to the possibilities.”

If Shakespeare the man is invisible on account of lack of authentic light that the biographical records throw on him, he has become invisible as a writer on account of too much light of comment that the critics have cast on him. We fail to see things in darkness but excess of light is also blinding. One might say that Shakespeare has been buried under the mountain of his greatness and the task of the critics today is to dig him out. Shakespeare Mystery and the Shakespeare Bore (of the class room) are later creations. The audiences of his day, we have every reason to think, were in their favourite phrase ‘ravished’ by him. As Prof. Coghill says, he must have kept them on the edge of their seats, to make them catch their breath to make them ‘coo’, in the expressive phrase of Kipling. Even today untrammelled by the hair-splitting critics Shakespeare’s plays are what Hollywood calls “Super-duper Box Office.”

Before we come to the critics, let us look at another aspect of Shakespeare’s invisibility. It is said that God created man in His image and man returned the compliment by creating God in his image. It is, therefore, no wonder, that Shakespeare who, according to Alexander Dumas, is the poet who created most after God, should in turn be converted by his readers into their image. Shakespeare, of all writers, is the poet of Everyman, and in the mirror of his art, Everyman sees his own image. “It seems to be a form of incurable human vanity,” says Ivor Brown, “that the worshipper should always see the hero, in this case the supreme writer, as a reflection of himself. Coleridge wanted a Coleridgean Shakespeare ‘I have a smack of Hamlet myself’) just as the young student, perplexed with the yearnings of his years and indulging the melancholy often so dear to the salad days, will have nothing of Shakespeare the sage and is rapt, like Digges, by “Passions of Juliet and her Romeo” the Poet hangs upon the poetry, the actor on the roles, which

being immortal can immortalise, the sensuous man upon the sensuous beauty, the patriot on the trumpet call, the High Tory on the contempt of the slippery crowd and the common curs and stinkards, who are as treacherous or odorous, the Radical on the bitter abuse of servile courtiers of hypocritical rulers and of unjust judges, the sports-man on the delight in horse and hawk and hound and the fretful youth upon the sweetness to which Shakespeare so often gave most exquisite utterance. The pessimist can quote the Dark Period tragedies to the top of his bent, while the optimist is happy with the lark that *tirra lirra* chants and will echo Bernard Shaw’s query, ‘Is it not clear that there was to the last in Shakespeare an incorrigible divine levity, inexhaustible joy that derided sorrow.’ The problem for the ordinary reader and play-goer today is somehow to fight through this tangle of contradiction to discover for himself a reading of Shakespeare’s mind and character that will agree with the known facts of his life and the general tenor of his work.”

Thus, there is an image of Shakespeare which is the outcome of the reader’s personal whim, his reading into the poet his favourite philosophy, a compensatory dream-fulfilment. But there is another, less arbitrary aspect of the reincarnation of a new Shakespeare in each age. Shakespeare criticism of a period, we are told, evinces the temper of an age or a people. Thus T.S. Eliot is able to say: “The criticism of Shakespeare at any epoch is a most useful means of inducting us into the way in which people of that time enjoyed their contemporary poetry and the approval which they express of Shakespeare indicates that he possessed some of the qualities that they cultivated in their own verse and perhaps other qualities that they would have liked to find there.”

Please do not think that in this paper I am going to put before you all the Protean Shakespeares of the last four hundred years! However, let me make a rough and ready *gestalt* or pattern, in order to illustrate the hypothesis of invisibility or impenetrability of Shakespeare. Let us look at a few manifestations of the Shakespeare phenomenon through the ages.

Ben Johnson saw bombast and lack of art in Shakespeare, but it was Milton, who spoke of him as “a warbler of wood notes wild,” and introduc-



ed the word 'wonder', to the lexicon of what was later called Bardolatry, the worship of the Avonian Bard. The implication that nature had guided the unscholarly pen of the poet dogged criticism for two centuries. So the anonymous author of the Prologue to *Julius Caesar in Covent Garden Drolery* (1672) wrote :

"His excellences came and were not sought  
His words like casual Atoms made a thought  
Drew up themselves in Rank and File and Writ  
He wondering how the Devil it were such wit."

The easily accepted Platonic notion of a poet possessed by the Muse continued to militate against a recognition of Shakespeare's conscious artistry. Early criticism of Shakespeare, apart from the fine tribute of Dryden, is the saddest of sad stuff, the repetition of ancient formulae of Neoclassicism and the rattling of Aristotle's dry bones. The 'barbaric' Shakespeare was reformed and refined and perfumed to fit in with the taste of the age. Poetic justice was generally meted out to the characters and happy endings, galore, were arranged. Typical of the age was Thomas Rymer, who was charmingly ironical about *Othello* or the Tragedy of the Handkerchief. ('Had it been Desdemona's Garter the sagacious Moor might have smelt a rat'). And this famous piece about the moral of *Othello* which we Pakistanis may take note of.

"First this may be caution to all maidens of quality, how without their parent's consent they run away with blackamoors—secondly this may be a warning to all good wives that they look well to their linen. Thirdly, this may be a lesson to husbands that before their jealousy be tragical the proof may be mathematical."

Dr Johnson's great Preface is in some ways the culmination of the Shakespeare criticism of the previous hundred years. Like his contemporaries he tends to summarise faults and beauties of Shakespeare. The quibble, so dear to the heart of Mr. Empson and the School of Ambiguism of today, Johnson regarded as the "fatal Cleopatra, for which Shakespeare lost the world and was content to lose it." But his grand contention is that Shakespeare gives us Nature; Shakespeare's world is our world in concentration.

Perhaps the best way to see the transition from the Neoclassical image of

Shakespeare to the romantic image of the 19th century, is to notice, with the help of the American critic, M.H. Abrams, the two common and antithetical metaphors of the mind—one comparing the mind to a reflector of external objects (the mirror) and the other to a radiant projector which makes a contribution to the objects it perceives (the lamp). The first of these (Shakespeare's holding the mirror up to nature) was characteristic of much of the thinking from Plato to the 18th century. The second typifies the prevailing romantic conception which is exemplified in Shakespeare's well known lines on the imagination. Significantly, Shakespeare groups together the lunatic, the lover and the poet :

"The lunatic the lover and the poet,  
Are of imagination all compact.  
The poet's eye in a fine frenzy rolling  
Doth glance from heaven to earth, from earth to heaven  
And as imagination bodies forth  
The forms of things unknown, the poets pen  
Turns them to shapes and gives to airy nothing  
A local habitation and a name."

The key event in this development was the replacement of the metaphor of the poem or play as imitation, 'a mirror of nature', by that of the play as heterocosm, 'a second nature', a world of its own, created by the poet in an act analogous to God's creation of the world. From the analogue of the mirror, Coleridge and Hazlitt and Lamb pass on to the lamp as the analogue of the poetic mind. "The light of poetry", Hazlitt said, "is not only a direct but also reflected light, that while it shows us the object, throws a sparkling radiance on all around it." It is at this stage that a great debate begins on the subjective and objective in poetry, and the paradox of Shakespeare being both subjective and objective becomes the major critical issue, particularly with the German critics. Shakespeare, according to Coleridge, is "the Spinozistic diety—an omnipresent creativeness—Shakespeare's poetry is characterless i.e. that it does not reflect the individual Shakespeare" "Shakespeare darts himself forth and passes into all the forms of human character and passion—Shakespeare becomes all things, yet forever remaining



himself." Similarly Hazlitt said that Shakespeare was "the Proteus of human intellect." And Keats, we know, spoke of Shakespeare's 'negative capability'. To resolve the paradox of the mirror and the lamp, of subjectivity and objectivity of Shakespeare, the German critic Schiller was compelled to resort to theology. He compares the poet to the "Diety behind this universe, who stands behind his work yet is himself the work." Thus, in contemplating we reach the mysterious and mystic oxymoron of the 'visibly invisible'. And, at this point, I must remind myself of the dangers of lunacy in talking about Shakespeare and retreat hastily from the dizzy precipice of abstruse speculation.

The image of the impersonal Shakespeare continues to linger in modern criticism and so does the image of personal Shakespeare. We have already seen how the Sonnets have been regarded as one chink in Shakespeare's chain-mail of impersonality. The other assumption is that he is self-revealed in all his writings. Carlyle said that Shakespeare's works were "so many windows through which we see the glimpse of the world that was in him." From this view there has developed a mass of conjectural biography. As the chronology of Shakespeare's writings was clearly established there developed, what we may call, 'developmental biography', in which Shakespeare's plays are regarded as single episodes in the immense drama of Shakespeare's inner life—"the tragedy of tragedies", as Frank Harris called it, "in which Lear is only one scene." Later Edward Dowden formulated the biographical stereotype of 'In the Workshop', 'In the World', 'Out of the Depths', 'On the Heights'—Shakespeare's life being rounded with the *Tempest*.

The unriddling of Shakespeare continued with other critics like David Mason and Dover Wilson. The romantic war over the question whether we are justified in reading Shakespeare out of his plays is far from settled. Such formidable antagonists as G.L. Kitteridge and E.E. Stoll still maintain that Shakespeare's writings reveal only the artist and that Shakespeare the man must remain a mystery. The more modern trend is expressed by L.C. Knights: "The 'new' Shakespeare, I should say, is much less personal than the old. Whereas in the older view Shakespeare was the God-like creator of

a peopled world, projecting, it is true, his own spirit into the inhabitants, but remaining essentially the analyst of 'their' passions, he is now felt as much more immediately engaged in the action he puts before us." The lamp seems to have ousted the mirror. Even Eliot's view is neo-romantic on this. The plays, he says, "are now felt to be united by one significant, constant and developing personality—we feel the plays, though in no obvious form, are somehow dramatising an action or struggle for harmony in the soul of the poet."

In England the impact of the great romantic critics was two-fold, both good and bad. However romanticism may have rolled its eyes and rhapsodized on Shakespeare's infinity, it did, at any rate, stand on this: that Shakespeare is to be regarded first and foremost as an artist and his compositions as works of art. The romantics succeeded in communicating to others something of the ecstasy they experienced themselves in their discovery of Shakespeare. On the debit side, they supplied later critics with a vicious model and the 19th century is full of what Croce called "exclamatory criticism", which instead of understanding a poet in his particularity, his finite infinity, drowns him beneath a flood of superlatives. Our students, who are predominantly romantic in their temperament, remain addicted to 'exclamatory criticism', all their lives.

Typical of the Victorian image is Arnold's Shakespeare:

"Others abide our question. Thou art free.

We ask and ask: Thou smilest and art still

Out-topping knowledge."

A kind of male Mona Lisa, "foiling searching of mortality" who "didst walk on earth unguessed at"—a sort of mobile sphinx. But this serene and seraphic Shakespeare of Arnold, deserving nothing but sentimental veneration, was soon out-dated. Perhaps the change came with Sir Walter Raleigh in 1909. "Our sin," Raleigh said, "is not indifference but superstition. Shakespeare's poetry has been used like a wedding cake, not to eat but to dream upon. Let us make an end to this and do justice to Shakespeare the craftsman."



This challenge was answered by A.C. Bradley's great, but now controversial, book *The Shakespearean Tragedy*. He carried on the investigation of 'spiritual biography' and his work is the culmination of all character-analysis, whose ancestry extends through the romantics to Morgan's famous Essay on Falstaff. Bradley's very greatness and the finality with which some of his statements were received have irked later critics and, one feels, that they have over-insisted on his obsession with character, neglect of poetry and unawareness of stage conditions. Bradley's Shakespeare is the closet-Shakespeare par excellence. He irritated most when he pursued characters far beyond the circumstances of the play or subordinated plot and action to psychological study, or was pre-occupied with moral order at the root of the tragedy, or sentimentalized some of the issues. Bradley's type of criticism was described by Croce as 'objectivistic criticism', legitimate up to a point, but "what is known as *Hamlet Litteratur*, is the most appalling of all these manifestations and it is daily on the increase. Historians, psychologists, lovers of amorous adventures, gossips, police spies, criminologists investigate the character, the intentions, the thoughts, the affections, the temperament, the previous life, the tricks they played, the secrets they had, their family and social relations and so on, and crowd, without any real claim to do so, round the characters of Shakespeare, detaching them from their creative centre of the play and transferring them into a pretended objective field, as though they were made of flesh and blood."

If the early 19th century regarded Shakespeare's writings as lyrical outbursts, self-revelations of great personality, for the Victorians, down to Bradley, whose dominant literary form was the serious moralising novel, the plays were assumed to be as objects of *criticism*, something like *Middlemarch* or *Anna Karenina*. Yet another instance of the custom-tailored Shakespeare. The plays and characters Bradley offers us are his own creation as much as Shakespeare's. As J.I.M. Stewart, who is, on the whole, sympathetic towards character-treatment of Shakespeare, says of Bradley: "Perhaps he is a little too good to be true, this severe and timeless Shakespeare, with Aristotle and Hegel in one pocket, the Oxford of 1904 in the other and the sacred coal ever at his lips."

This roll-call of critics, ladies and gentlemen, is not for their promotion or demotion. Nor is there any intention to pronounce a last judgement on them. This very intelligent audience must, by now, have gathered that our intention simply is to see Shakespeare through the mirrors of the ages—convex, concave and some grotesquely distorting. Twentieth century criticism put up several new Shakespeares. Mr. Eliot, in his essay on Shakespeare and the Stoicism of Seneca, called these "a number of re-crudescences of Shakespeare." "There is", he counted, "the fatigued Shakespeare, a retired Anglo Indian, presented by Mr. Lytton Strachey; there is a messianic Shakespeare bringing a new philosophy and a new system of yoga presented by Mr. Middleton Murray, and there is the ferocious Shakespeare, a furious Samson presented by Mr. Wyndham Lewis." This last Shakespeare, I venture to think, would have resented his manhandling through the ages and said with Hamlet: "Unhand me gentleman, I'll make a ghost of him who lets me." However, to continue with Mr. Eliot—"The last conventional Shakespeare is banished from the scene and a variety of unconventional Shakespeares take his place. About any one so great as Shakespeare, it is probable that we can never be right, it is better that we should from time to time change our way of being wrong. Whether truth ultimately prevails is doubtful and has never been proved but it is certain that nothing is more effective in driving error than a new error".

This is the wisest and the sanest comment on the subject of our essay, which the exponents of the various upto date and 'copyright' Shakespeares of the 20th century do not seem to have heeded.

Readers of Shakespeare criticism know that there was what is called the Disintegration of Shakespeare. It was argued that there was the hand of others in his work and many of his plays e.g. *Hamlet* were stratifications. Answering the disintegrators like J.H. Robertson, Professor Abercrombie, in his lecture of 1930, pleaded for the Liberty of Interpretation. By this Abscrombie did not mean the liberty "to read into a play of Shakespeare whatever feeling or idea a modern reader may loosely and accidentally associate with the subject" but rather "anything which may be found in that art, even if it is only the modern reader who can find it there, may legitimately be



taken as its meaning." This is to open the door wide for cranks of all kinds, but if reasonable discretion is maintained Abercrombie's is, at least, a useful antidote to those critics who would circumscribe Shakespeare's genius by the poetasters of his own day—an image of a too, too Elizabethan Shakespeare.

As if in response to Abercrombie we have a series of 'interpretations' of Shakespeare in recent times, some, at least, of which may be mentioned in our context. Following the scholarly works of E.K. Chambers, on the medieval and Elizabethan stage and a study of the dramatic conventions of that age, we have the 'Primitive' school of Schucking and the realistic school of Stoll. Dramatic realism, they rightly argued, was not that of actual life and inconsistencies of character were best explained in terms of Elizabethan practice and convention. It was Stoll who added to the vocabulary of Shakespeare criticism the vigorous word "blatherskite" which means a talker of blatant nonsense. How 'blatherskite' has flourished! According to Stoll even Bradley was a 'blatherskite' because his realism was based on techniques of the 19th century novel.

The man who was instrumental in rescuing Shakespeare from the "blatherskite" of the closet critics and rehabilitate him in the true element of the theatre, was the actor, producer, playwright and critic, Harley Granville Barker, whose tradition has been carried on by Professor Coghill and George Rylands. This theatre was not the theatre of spectacle of the 19th century, for which Lamb found *Lear* unactable, but a theatre corresponding in its simplicity and fluidity to the Elizabethan theatre, where poetry mattered most and whose drama was more word-based than ours. "I do not pretend", Granville Barker said, "that I have fathomed Shakespeare's secret, my contention is that it has not been fathomed yet and that it cannot be given to the world by such means as we have now at hand. The scholar, at best, will be in the case of a man reading the score of a symphony, humming the themes. He may study and re-study a play and ever find something new—yet who will not confess with me that at any performance some quite unsuspected effect (unsuspected even by the interpreters themselves) may suddenly flow into life before him?"

Scholar critics "reading the score of a symphony humming the themes"

have continued to interpret Shakespeare in the study. Granville Barker, despite his strong theatrical sense, was himself a Bradleyite interpreter in terms of character.

The strongest attack against character interpretation was launched, as every one knows, by L.C. Knights in 1932 in his trenchant pamphlet ironically named after a foot-note of Bradley, *How Many Children Had Lady Macbeth?* This was a veritable 'communistic manifesto' of the new movement. L.C. Knights owed a great deal to G. Wilson Knight and they, along with some other critics, have evolved the new image of the imagistic, symbolistic, esoteric, metaphysical Shakespeare. Knights argued that "we start with so many lines of verse of the printed page and that we have to unravel ambiguities, give full consideration to imagery and allow full weight to each word, exploring its 'tentacular roots'" (Eliot's word). Wilson Knight saw the plays as 'expanded metaphors', constituting a single vast design held together by symbols and re-iterative imagery (à la Caroline Spurgeon). This direction of Shakespearian criticism should be seen against the critical and poetical background of the 1920's and 1930's with its emphasis on the image and on ambiguity, its interpretations of the Metaphysical Poets and its response to the poetry of T.S. Eliot. During the 1930's, Shakespeare the playwright was drowned in Shakespeare the poet. As Browning's age saw in Shakespeare a great delineator of character, so the age of Eliot and Yeats saw him as the poet of tempests and music, of the king and the beggarman, of blood and sunlight, his creed expressed in Ulysses' speech on order and degree in *Troilus and Cressida*, but his practice more amply mirrored in the scenes upon the blasted heath in *King Lear*. 'Paradox', 'dichotomy', 'polarity' and 'integration' were favourite terms of the new critical diction. The lines 'reverberate' and there is 'interanimation'. Shakespeare's linguistic vitality is now felt to be the chief clue to the urgent personal themes that not only shape the poetic-dramatic structure of each play but form the figure in the carpet of the canon as a whole. So again Shakespeare has been cast into the mould of the age. Although many of us in the universities here are content with this 'major shift' of Shakespearian criticism which took place in the 1930's, for many years the school of Knight, as it is called, has been



under fire in Britain and America. The opponents of this approach refuse to believe that Shakespeare wrote like the French Symbolists or English and American Imagists, giving to certain words an arbitrary symbolical value. They question the preoccupation of the school with verbal analysis and the technique of close reading of a play as if it was a short lyric, a cryptogram of words. It must, however, be said to the credit of L.C. Knights that, under the influence of two other critics, J.I.M. Stewart and Arther Sewell, he has in a later essay admitted the relevance of character interpretation, provided it is not carried to excess.

Along with the image and metaphor school of critics we have had in the 20th century, the other symbolist school, who emphasize the intellectual background of the Elizabethan period and talk of the Elizabethan 'world picture'. Professor Levejoy with his Great Chain of Being, Theodore Spencer, Tillyard and Gordon Craig are the main exponents of this background school. But here also there is a fascinating, or shall we say exasperating, relativity of judgement. As Helen Gardner has noted, "in the last hundred years the conception of the Elizabethans has been as unstable as the conception of Hamlet. To Froude and Kingsley they were God-fearing, Protestant and patriotic. In the nineties they were Italianate and much less manly and God-fearing. In the twenties they were subtle, sensual and sceptical. Recently they have become pious again but in a different way, obsessed with the idea of hierarchy, the Great Chain of Being and Natural Law, Crypto Catholics and heirs to the Middle Ages. If I read the signs of the times rightly they are now becoming rather vigorous, adventurous and Protestant again." So we cut the cloth of the Elizabethan world picture too according to the requirements of our contemporary coat. The critics of this symbolic school (Tillyard, Danby, Vyvyan and Ribner and several others) explore the Shakespearean 'background' and claim that he was making a series of statements of order—order in the cosmos, order in the state, order within the human psyche. Therefore, the plays have 'themes' or rather that each one is an individual variation on one grand theme. Critics of both these schools have found everywhere in Shakespeare a fundamental idea and they value each play as they present

symbols of that idea. Falstaff for example is "bodily grossness personified and his excessive fleshiness is eventually punished by spirits and fairies, in vindication of spiritual values." Similarly for the too, too Platonising Vyvyan, Cordelia is a symbol of Christ who must die and make possible her father's redemption. What Falstaff would have liked to say about this interpretation of him we shudder to think! To read the plays through theme and imagery has been an invitation to all kinds of doctrinal irrelevencies. The *Winters Tale* as a vegetation myth, *Hamlet* as a dramatisation of the Oedipus Complex (an example of psychogenesis of imaginative creation), the resolution of Problem Plays as if they were dreams of a patient undergoing psychoanalysis and of the Romances as the fine flower of a World Congress of Faiths—such are some of the aberrations of the wilder disciples of the symbolist approach.

The New Critics of Chicago, also called the Aristotlian critics, strongly object to this approach and reemphasize the value of the plot and narrative. In England the work of John Holloway is strongly critical of the symbolic school which, he says, has rigidified and lost the insights it once commanded. He calls their cult of unlimited complexity "the more the merrier school." If 'character', he argues, was an abstraction of memory from the total response of the play, so is the 'theme'. The word 'theme', Holloway says, "is the real villain—it is tempting us to accept a surreptitious transformation of imaginative literature into what I am inclined to call a non-imaginative dimension, the dimension of general moral reflection on life." Literature may be described as general moral insight plus concreteness. Even if we pay lipservice to that catch phrase 'in the concrete', the danger, according to Holloway, persists. "To say that a literary masterpiece is a studied explication of the moral nature of man, done in the concrete, is not much better than saying something like, 'poetry is music but played on the dictionary' or 'sculpture is drawing but you can walk round it.'" According to Holloway, a radical, the total transformation is hidden away in a phrase. "It is as if we got in such a muddle that we called the dog its tail and tail the dog." Danger signs of lunacy again displayed!



It is not possible to speak here about John Holloway's book *The Story of the Night* (1961) which asks us to be baptised into a new way of interpreting Shakespeare. According to him "the reason for the insufficiency of the thematic school is that critics have, in effect, made use of Shakespeare for preaching their own writing of his work and venting their personal moralities." This we know is the old story. "Before it is a source of insight", says Holloway, "great literature is a source of power." Witnessing a play leaves us with a sense of having passed through a great experience; moralist criticism should give way to a kind of criticism which is capable of describing and accounting for the momentous and energising experience provided by the whole action of the play. Holloway seems to subscribe to the mythopoetic nature of Shakespeare's work which is also the view of John Wain. According to Wain "the most profitable approach to Shakespeare's work is not backwards from the 20th century but forward from antiquity and the immemorial." Shakespeare uses both pagan and Christian myths and his tragedies are about the myth in crisis. In Bonamy Dobree's phrase, here we have "the Gospel according to St. William." Is this a new promise or a new threat, one wonders. Says one writer "Surely the hugest cloudy symbol, the most threatening in our last ten or fifteen years in criticism, is the principle of criticism by myth and ritual origins." Cloudy symbols indeed; the visibility (as they say about the weather) is practically nil.

Thus the critics' "raids on the marticulate" of Shakespeare's work continue and he continues to elude us. Recently John Russel Brown has written two instructive articles in the *Critical Quarterly* on Harold Pinter's Shakespeare and Samuel Becket's Shakespeare, criticising the modern trend of reading Shakespeare as the Comedy of Menace, Theatre of the Absurd or Theatre of Non-communication. As Martin Esslin has pointed out, the writers of the Theatre of the Absurd have "devalued" language or shall we say "demoted" it and have generally sought to emphasize the visual aspect of drama. They are not so much dissatisfied with the language itself as with the contemporary anaemia of language both in the conventional theatre and in the world outside. Shakespearean drama, on the other hand, is almost

entirely word-based and believes in the power and eloquence of poetry to create the dramatic illusion. Some critics have, of course, found the philosophy of Absurdity, particularly in *Lear*—"the absurdity of the human condition itself in a world where the decline of religious belief has deprived man of certainties." It is likely that these interpretations will bring their privileges of insight too and help us to understand Shakespeare's pessimism in plays like *Timon of Athens* or *King Lear*. Renaissance pessimism might well serve to qualify and refine our own, with Shakespeare supplying the most instant points of contact; some pessimisms are more vital than others.

John Russell Brown's conclusion about Shakespeare's technique as compared to Becket and others is that "whatever symbolic force a character may have momentarily, he can seldom be wholly known in symbolic terms. Shakespeare wrote to satisfy his conscious and unconscious mind, his dramatic form was not solely dependent on definite ideologies, his explicit meanings co-exist with those for which he himself had not discovered suitable words." Therefore, Falstaff and Cordelia can be "credible characters" and at the same time symbolise an "idea". The theatre of Shakespeare's day can invoke symbolism without being limited by it and can represent human beings who are measured by an "idea" but not restricted by it.

Summing up this part of our discussion, we can say that the recent debate on the nature and function of poetic imagery has made us aware of a new dimension in Shakespeare. However, through the excessive zeal of these explanations there is developing a dangerous separation between poetry and drama, with the result that the uniqueness of Shakespeare's work is being obscured. In view of this, V.Y. Katak has submitted two propositions which, I think, are highly pertinent:

"(1) The 'character' approach obviously erroneous in the form it took during the 19th century is still a legitimate approach basically related to the dramatic form.

(2) The poetry that a character speaks in an important sense 'belongs' to and is revelatory of character. It cannot simply be regarded as though it 'belonged' only to Shakespeare in the way lyric poetry belongs to an author."



We have talked so long of Shakespearean impenetrability. But for John Wain, in a recent article in the *Encounter*, the reign of Shakespeare's impenetrability has ended. He proclaims dramatically—"Good news. Shakespeare is no longer impenetrable. There is no need any more for the playgoer or reader to tolerate fantastically absurd interpretations stemming from the vanity of critics and producers rather than from a concern to bring Shakespeare to his natural audience, on the ground that no one knows what Shakespeare means and, therefore, it is all right to make his work an echo-chamber for one's own bright ideas. The bottomless "obscurity" of Shakespeare has for centuries been accepted as a blank cheque for any self-preening ingenuity, particularly in the theatre. Such ingenuity is blatantly Phillistine. It exhausts its own bag of tricks above the wisdom of Shakespeare."

Wain is certainly right about the self-preening ingenuity of some modern experimental producers, but has the heart of Shakespeare mystery been plucked? Have we found an 'open sesame' to Shakespeare's work? Have we arrived at the positively last interpretation and broken with the past? Are no critical judgements reliable or safe? A.E. Dyson has a wise and, I believe, final reply to these fundamental questions of our paper:

"Fortunately the answer to both of these questions can be 'no'. By the nature of things criticism is a living debate between the present and the past. Though emphases shift and change, nothing truly perceptive is abandoned on the way. Johnson in the 18th century, Coleridge in the early 19th, Bradley in the late 19th, all spoke from their own place in history, from assumptions which remain interesting and fruitful, even though such assumptions may be no longer our own. For a time each might have seemed to have said the last word on Shakespeare; and for a time again each might have seemed superseded by the next shift of judgement and taste. Each, however, is now a classic in his own right and will remain so. The same will, in the end, be true of Wilson Knight and L.C. Knights and Tillyard even though a reaction against them is now under way.

"Such reactions are necessary for the health of criticism itself. As the insights of one generation first lose their freshness and then harden towards

the kind of orthodoxy, they were never meant to be, the debate must move off another way. There can be no permanent co-opting of a writer as great as Shakespeare to the sensibility of one critic, or of any age. The purpose of criticism is not to 'place' Shakespeare once and for all, as one might on a tombstone. It is to celebrate his endless vitality, his power to excite and shape us and then to elude us in the end."

So let us celebrate him in his own words describing Antony through Cleopatra:

"His voice was propertyed  
As all the tuned spheres, and that to friends:  
But when he meant to quail and shake the orb  
He was a rattling thunder. For his bounty  
There was no winter in't, and autumn 'twas  
That grew the more by reaping; his delights  
Were dolphin-like, they showed his back  
Above the element they lived in; in his livery  
Walk'd crowns and crownets; realms and islands were  
As plates dropped from his pocket."

And let us see him invisible, eluding the violence of his critics. Remember, Shakespeare is reported to have played the Ghost in *Hamlet*, of whom it is said:

'Tis here'  
'Tis here'  
'Tis gone'  
'We do it wrong being so majestic  
To offer it the show of violence  
For it is as the air, invulnerable  
And our vain blows malicious mockery.'



**DRAMA AND THE BREAKDOWN OF LANGUAGE :  
A STUDY OF SOME TWENTIETH CENTURY PLAYS**

(Pinter, Ionesco, Pirandello)

SHAISTA SIRAJ-UD-DIN

The inability of human beings to relate to each other meaningfully is amongst the major concerns of three modern playwrights, Pinter, Ionesco and Pirandello. This dilemma has various aspects which are manifested in the use of an enclosed and reductive form of language, and closely related to the assumption of social roles by people, within highly subjective worlds. The interaction of these factors results in non communication.

In this brief survey I have been helped by a study of sociology, which traces in particular the breakdown of language to a post-industrial world, dominated by economic rationality. It considers the consequences of the growing complexity of society, which has led to a dichotomy between public and private levels of individual consciousness, and communication. I have discussed the dramatists non chronologically, because in recent drama like Pinter's these elements have culminated in an expression of total despair, while in the work of an older playwright such as Pirandello the overall vision is not an entirely negative one.

The mood of Pinter's plays corresponds with the depressing observations made by recent sociology on modern society, where a virtual standstill of rapport between human beings seems inevitable, and man is doomed to perpetuate his absurdity and defeat. His ability to survive in these conditions is low powered and unheroic. Yet he persists in his efforts, mainly through his use of language. This is developed by Pinter. Verbal communication in Pinter's plays is surrounded by a number of paradoxes. An economy of form is accompanied by an exceptionally accurate rendering of everyday speech—mainly of the working and lower middle class, but the end product is a very oblique dialogue. The accuracy makes nothing explicit. The weight of what is said lies hidden beneath the utterance. The



apparently banal articulateness of his characters covers the basic inability to communicate directly with people. "The speech we hear is an indication of what we don't hear. It is a necessary avoidance, a violent, sly, or anguished or mocking smoke screen which keeps the other in place . . . . To disclose to others the poverty within us is too fearsome a possibility." (Esslin, 1970, p. 46).

This mental and spiritual poverty that the characters find within themselves corresponds with, and comments on their environment. The small, basically uniform, lower middle class world they inhabit, with its very limited aspirations, and social mobility, provides a considerably comprehensive view, seeing them both in their uniformity and eccentricity.

One finds an inability, or deliberate unwillingness to communicate which turns into a persistent rejection of the external situation. Davies, the tramp in *The Caretaker*, is homeless, unemployable, and without any social security. Reduced to a state of absurdly pathetic belly crawling, he appears to relate meaningfully only to certain inanimate objects: his identification papers, his bag, a pair of shoes, a bed. These become the focal points of his existence. He cannot face the reality of his condition, let alone combat it. Instead he builds up a largely fictitious world, in which he can assert himself. The dialogue that ensues is punctuated by "I've had dinner with the best", "I've eaten off the best plates . . . . They don't take any liberties with me . . ." (*The Caretaker*, Act I, p. 9). When they do get the better of him they are either "Blacks", or "Scotsmen", or "bastard monks" (pages 8, 10, 14), and he feels threatened by 'that Scotch git' (p. 10), to whom he refers with psychopathic fear.

The attitude of Pinter's characters to the outside world is invariably one of fear and hostility. According to certain sociologists this is a particular aspect of the modern mentality. Gunter Remmling traces it to the 'violent social, and political eruptions of recent history', which have destroyed the possibility of emotional, and intellectual 'unity and trust' between individuals and social groups (Remmling, *Road to Suspicion*, p. 3). People retreat into their own private worlds, attempting to either ignore the

existence of other human beings, or regarding them as hostile intruders. The whole external environment is potentially threatening to the security and solidarity of their localized group code, and they are consequently alienated from it, and left to fall back on the pitifully inadequate resources of their own systems.

In *The Birthday Party*, Stanley Webber, the nondescript boarding house lodger, boasts to his landlady of a fictitious night club job that will take him round the world. He drops exotic names of places to impress her in a Prufrockian effort to bring a touch of vicarious glamour to the drabness of his own existence. The account he gives her of his grand piano playing career is completely his version of what he would like to believe. But the fabric does not hold: talking of his last concert he suddenly breaks out with 'They carved me up. Carved me up. It was all arranged, it was all worked out' (Act I, p. 23). He later recovers sufficiently to fill in the rest of his past life, for the benefit of the indifferent and uncommunicative McCann, making a point of telling him of the 'quiet thriving community' he was born in, and how he lived 'well away from the main road' (Act III, p. 39). The main road, and indeed everything outside the boarding house is dangerous.

Stanley's last detail reminds one of Rose Hudd in *The Room*. She tries to convince herself, and her listeners of the comfort and security of her room, as opposed to the cold, damp basement. This is how she chooses to think of it. Curious about what it is really like, and what is going on in the rest of the house, she still shies away from any relevant information, as that would endanger her precarious equilibrium. The only reality she is in touch with is a purely subjective one, and is shattered when the outside does intrude upon it.

Characters shut in their own worlds, follow their own line of thoughts, hardly taking into account what others may be thinking or saying. Dramatic dialogue is hence reduced to a fragmented monologue, while others contribute to the conversation in occasional monosyllables (Petey in *The Birthday Party*) or lapse into a brutal silence (Bert in *The Room*). The desire to speak and get a response suggests intricate patterns that lie beneath



the trivial chatter, and relate closely to the hidden fears and obsessions of the characters, expressed obliquely through what they say. There is a desperate need for further communication, and yet when there is such an opportunity it is warded off.

Meg Boles (*The Birthday Party*) answers most of her own questions like Rose Hudd (*The Room*) reinforced by 'I know its so', 'I know I do', 'Oh its true I was' (pages 12-87). The repetition of the phrases gives her a sense of confidence, and seems to affirm her very identity, while shutting out the possibility of a reply, or a contradiction.

The desire for dialogue persists together with a desire for isolation. Davies (*The Caretaker*) is genuinely troubled by indifference to companionable chit chat, and speaks of this to Nick, the younger brother: 'I mean we don't have any conversation you see' (Pause) 'You cant live in the same room with someone who . . . who dont have any conversation with you . . . I just can't get a hang of him' (Act III, p. 60). Later when Aston gives an unusually lengthy and rambling account of his recent past in a mental home, Davies complains that he seemed to be talking to himself. He resents this, and yet the audience gets the impression that he was not really listening either. Language provides an inward bolstering up of the person. However atrophied, for the character at least it has a quality of affirmation, which they seek in order to exist at all.

The paranoid response of Pinter's characters to the external world, results in verbal enclosures which limit and restrict the degree to which they can communicate with other people. Gunter Remmling and Basil Bernstein in their separate observations of twentieth century society try to define the breaking down of inter-personal contact between people through language, by studying the phenomenon in its sociological context. This has happened at a particular time with the increasing sophistication of an industrialized and economic rationality, which has completely absorbed modern man, and left him little choice but to function within a restricted code of thought and discourse. Simultaneously the growing complexity of society has led to the creation of a particular kind of impersonal, non-specific language. Bernstein terms this a 'public' language (*Class, Codes and Control*, p. 42), that

discourages individual differentiation, concerning itself with the immediate experience, taken at its most literal level rather than with its significance in inter-relationships. While lacking all communicative energy it has a protective function, in that by using it people can avoid individual opinions and expression. Pinter's characters speak a 'public' language, which is recorded with great accuracy. His dramatic processing, however, makes the plays more than just a linguistic study. The way he arranges the dialogue full of repetitious, verbal fumbling, tautologies and meaningless questions that go unanswered, produces the effect of a brilliantly contrived caricature. What characters say to one another sounds familiar not because it is a 'tape recording' (Esslin, 1970, p. 48) of how one speaks ordinarily, but because it reflects the basic characteristics of communication, or rather non-communication. The combination of accuracy and caricature forcefully presents words as incapsulating habits, and people who cannot escape them.

Another aspect of the impersonal public language is the way in which, in spite of it, characters assume different roles. This is partly in an attempt to withdraw from the external world, and create one of their own, and partly to raise themselves in the existing social hierarchy. Assuming a role for protection results in an alienation from the external because of the fear and suspicion with which it is regarded. 'The uncertainty with which the world threatens the characters, is modified by the conviction that it is *their* conceptions that are true. Rose Hudd centres such a belief around her room, and the basement. Stanley does so from within the security of the boarding house. Their conceptions are also extended to what they think of other people. For Davies, the Blacks and the Scots are offensive and hostile. Meg Boles convinces herself that 'he's the only Stanley I know, and I know him better than all the world, although he doesn't think so' (Act II, p. 55). She herself both mothers him, and flirts with him.

Davies constantly changes his behaviour with the two brothers. Initially he is cringing in his acceptance of the shelter Aston offers. Then, slowly consolidating himself in the room, he takes on a different attitude trying to get on with both brothers, and then proceeding to play off one against



the other. At the close of the play his behaviour and language pattern reaches full circle, with him cringing and inarticulate once more.

Goldberg in *The Birthday Party* impresses his social superiority upon the others by assuming middle class pretensions to respectability and prosperity. There is an imitation of fluency in the way he rolls out accounts of his childhood and upbringing and appears to socially adjust to behaving differently with the other characters. He bullies Stanley; flirts disarmingly with Meg; and blatantly accosts Lulu. The contrast between his easy role playing, and Stanley's ineffectual and fumbling hostility, together with Meg's idiotic naivete is both apprehended by the characters, and projected externally. Unlike Pirandello's characters, they are not always conscious of the conflict between their self and their social image. However, the fact that they constantly need bolstering up through an affirmation of their words and deeds, suggests that the roles they have adopted, and now got fixed in are not fulfilling enough. There exists at some level, although obstructed and disguised, the desire for security through more direct communication. Meg realizes the threat Goldberg and McCann pose to Stanley, and does not want to face the possibility of losing him. In Davies there is the same clinging on to the brothers, not only because his material and physical welfare depends on them, but because he also needs human contact. The unspoken bond between Ben and Gus in *The Dumb Waiter*, before the sudden revelation at the end, has some similarity with the dogged companionship of Vladimir and Estragon in Becket's *Waiting for Godot*.

Once characters are assured of the protection of role playing, and have created highly subjective worlds, they then feel confident enough to move outwards, aggressively. Language is now transformed into a weapon. The bullying tone of Stanley's conversation with Meg turns into a more positive attempt at impressing his superiority upon her when he throws the names 'Constantinople, Zagreb, Vladivostock' at her (*The Birthday Party*, Act I, p. 22). Previously in a half serious - half mock dramatic gesture he had questioned her about himself (See Act I, p. 21). It is serious because it exposes his need to have his identity affirmed and defined, but coupled with mock drama can only be absurd—a combination of pain and the ridiculous. Later

in the play the facile volubility and sentimental hypocrisy of Goldberg, combined with the surly monosyllables of McGann, form a verbal weapon. Stanley is savagely attacked by a volley of questions and statements that make no sense within the context, but touch every aspect of the man. They range from accusations of political guilt, sex and incest, to socially unacceptable habits, the verbal torture reaching a crescendo with 'You're dead . . . You're nothing but an odour' (Act II, pages 51-52). The victim is broken down physically and mentally, fit to produce only inarticulate animal sounds. As Martin Esslin points out, through language one's attention has been focused on what the two men have been 'doing' to him rather than 'what they have been saying.' Words have been transformed into pure action (Esslin, 1970, p. 198).

In *The Caretaker*, jargon is used by Mick to torment Davies. The tramp is exposed to a torrent of interior decoration terms. His inability to comprehend teal blue copper and parchment linoleum squares, tables in afromosia teak veneer . . . (Act III, p. 60) virtually seals his fate. When the play ends Davies' language has been reduced to a desperate babble without coherence or syntax (Act III, p. 78).

Silence seems to be the alternative Pinter poses to language. But silence reveals too much both to others and to the characters themselves, who are aware of the abyss within them. In desperation a constant flow of trivialities has to be kept up. This creates a rhythm of its own. There is the suggestion of an unconscious understanding between people, to continue the verbal parrying match so long as the participants scrupulously observe the rule of avoiding close contact with each other. The characters' spontaneous volubility is juxtaposed with a crippling inarticulateness, often taking the form of verbal knots, misuse of words, and confusion. As words lose the power of direct communication and response, speaking takes on an almost ritual significance. This artificially created activity is sharply contrasted with the more real energy and movement that fills Pinter's pauses and silences. These often connote the intense building up of thought processes, and the time when people engage in a direct confrontation with the truth of a situation, usually avoided during speech. Silence, in fact, can be taken at two levels.



It is what reverberates in the midst of a flow of words, which have little connection with the given moment, and are oblivious of those of anyone else. At the second level it is used literally, occasionally accompanied by physical activity. Stanley hysterically beating the drum; Davies whimpering and crouching on the floor; Aston and Mick throwing his bag to each other in a game without words. All this builds up to present the failure of human communication—a view echoed by contemporary Sociologists as well. Going further back in the dramatic tradition, the work of Eugene Ionesco affirms this failure, and forms a bridge between Pinter and Pirandello.

Ionesco once said ('Words fall like stones, like corpses' (Coe. Ionesco, p. 50). The negative quality of language is related to the void in which modern man is seen to exist. Communication of any emotional and intellectual value, has been made impossible by the restricting norms of material, and scientific rationality. In his comment on dialogue he touches on the same issues that preoccupy Pinter. He writes: 'Conversation being made up, as it was of ready made expressions, of the most threadbare platitudes imaginable, revealed to me, by this very fact, the secret and 'talking and saying nothing', the secret and talking and saying nothing because there is nothing personal to say'. This has been caused by 'the absence of any inner life', and 'the mechanical soullessness of daily routine'. (Coe. Ionesco, p. 47).

Ionesco's characters speak a 'public' language which not only prevents them from relating to one another significantly, but also ultimately alienates them from the external world. This world as interpreted by the dramatist, has possibly even less to offer in terms of communication, than the completely absurd and irrational one the characters operate within. The so called external reality shares in destroying all that is imaginatively truthful, and emotionally more valuable than its own limited rationality. From this arises the miserable dilemma of *The Victims of Duty*. The narrow, middle class, social and ethical principles of doing one's 'duty' alone is conveniently used by the characters in this play to dissociate themselves from more generalised and human responsibility. But their conventional retreat collapses around them, as one by one they are bullied and battered by each other, reduced to

infantile, and finally sub-human states. The tormenter in each case, discovering that he himself has next to be cast in the role of the victim. What is more through their withdrawal they are doomed to emotional isolation, as they cease to feel just as they fail to express feeling. Madeleine confronted with the death of the Detective at the hands of Nicholas d'Eu can only respond with the supreme understatement: 'Its such a pity it had to happen in our flat' (*The Victims of Duty*, Vol. II). In *The Lesson*, after the pupil has been murdered, the Maid scolds the guilty Professor like a naughty school boy, and concludes with 'I can't help feeling sorry for you . . .' (*The Lesson*, Vol. I, p. 36).

When language is not conveying a positive lack of feeling, it is used aggressively as in Pinter. In *The Lesson*, the Professor uses academic and linguistic jargon, to brainwash and devitalise his pupil. Mick with his interior decorator's terms does the same to Davies. (*The Caretaker*, Act II, p. 60). The student is bombarded with verbal complexities that amount to illogical nonsense. The mathematical problems, and 'neo Spanish' language have neither meaning nor significance. As the lesson progresses, it is punctuated by an increasingly harsh tone with which the girl is sharply reprimanded: 'Be quiet. I don't want to hear a word from you!' in spite of her persistent wail: 'I have a tooth ache' (*The Lesson*, Vol. I, p. 36). As this reaches a climax the girl eager and confident of a 'total doctorate' (p. 18) is stripped down to a complete nonentity, a weak, hysterical mass of pain, moaning: 'No! No! No more. Thats enough! I've had enough. . . .' (p. 32). The Professor then pulls out an imaginary knife and kills her. It is literally the word 'knife' that drains her of all life and personality.

In Pinter the subjective worlds created by people act as positions of defence and attack, and result in a plurality with which individuals invariably collide. In Ionesco plurality combines with a faceless uniformity—thus 'all words in all languages . . . are always the same as are all flexional endings, . . . all suffixes, all roots . . .' (*The Lesson*, Vol. I, p. 24). The indistinguishability of language, however, does not enlighten the Professor about his own ridiculous distinctions, which are in fact exactly similar. This is presented in



his reminiscences of a childhood friend, who according to him had a 'rather serious speech defect', being unable to pronounce the letter 'f'. 'Instead of saying "f", he used to say "f" (p. 23). He then proceeds to illustrate this with a string of identical sentences, which he thinks are different. But plurality exists as well, and fulfilling communication is made impossible. Each person thinks he is speaking a language which in fact he is not, and further believes that everyone else is also using the same language. The answer to the Professor's question: 'How does it come about that . . . they some how manage to communicate satisfactorily with one another?' is that they do not. (p. 30). This is best supported by the growing inattentiveness of his own pupil, and her inability to comprehend anything he is saying.

The juxtaposition of plurality with the identical is extended in the characters. They assume, and cast off roles with an amazing speed—the Professor's behaviour changes from being cringingly apologetic to his pupil, to one of complete domination as he lashes her verbally. With the Maid he begins by being the querulous master, and ends up snivelling and whimpering like a child before her.

In *Rhinoceros*, Berenger's unconventional behaviour is sharply contrasted with the brisk, cliché ridden respectability of Jean, who does his best to convert him. But as the play proceeds everyone around him undergoes a fantastic transformation—being turned into rhinoceri. Berenger, in the meantime, becomes increasingly conventional, taking over the unimaginative, humourless, superficial, though socially acceptable, behaviour of Jean, Botard and Dudard. Left as the only one resisting the transformation, he does not emerge as the heroic, nonconforming individual, having already become the opposite-stilted and selfrighteous.

The changing behaviour and role also implies a fusion of diverse aspects in the same person. Madeleine, in *The Victims of Duty*, changes from a nagging, middle aged wife to an amorous coquette, and then from a beggar woman back to her original domineering role. The multiformity of the individual has to be seen in the context of sameness.

Returning to the theme of non-communication, one finds that language in order to survive at all has to become completely irrational, and without cognitive substance, as the Professor explains (*The Lesson*, Vol. I, pages 21-22). At the same time words have become as indispensable as 'clothes' in the covering up of the absence of people (Ionesco, *Notes and Counter Notes*, p. 195).

In *The Chairs*, the old couples make endless and fragmentary conversations with imaginary people, while being driven further and further from one another. The necessity of words is challenged by the growing domination of objects. The inanimate world of chairs, coffee cups, and corpses is seen taking over the world of living men and women. The intellectual and emotional significance of verbal communication is either replaced by animal sounds, as in the case of Chaubert in *The Victims of Duty*, after he has been battered by the Detective's interrogation, or replaced by impersonal and absurd physical movements. In *The Chairs*, as the stage gets increasingly more crowded with furniture, the husband and wife are physically separated, and able to only wave and gesticulate to one another over a sea of objects. The play closes with them finally united in the act of suicide as they both leap out of the window. In *The Victims of Duty*, as the coffee cups pile up, Madeleine's presence on the stage, or participation in the action becomes increasingly insignificant.

In Ionesco, absurdity and the irrational taken to an extreme as dramatic devices, tend to become as dogmatic as the tyranny of logic and rationality they seek to replace. Our apprehension of the characters is circumscribed by the fact that one can only take them at the levels of the absurd and the irrational. As in Pinter, instead of widening the area of imaginative sympathy and dramatic vision, this interpretation of human beings, related to a most depressing view of the world, rebounds in a sense of limitedness. One can only feel sorry for the characters—if that, as the element of the ridiculous totally dominates their presentation. Furthermore a release from the traditional conventions of form and attitude to man in general, results in not more freedom but in the sense of a void. In this people are reduced to the significance, and self-determination of 'marionettes', to use a term



of Ionesco's. Both his work and Pinter's has a limited quality, leading to a dead end rather than opening out into more fulfilling modes of expression. It is with a certain glibness that these two dramatists present the appalling condition of non-communication which men are entrenched in and perpetuating aided by society. The characters themselves do not seem greatly moved by the negative existence, and this ultimately narrows the range of their creators. Although sociological analysis reinforces from time to time these playwrights' interpretation of the world, not all literature arrives at such pessimistic conclusions. Pirandello deals differently with the dilemma of non-communication, caused by the antagonism between the individual as (multiform) and 'public' language as (reductive). His dramatic presentation has a depth and range which one misses in Pinter and Ionesco.

Pirandello's basic preoccupation is with the very fact of plurality, which radically effects the possibility of interpersonal contact between people. As in Pinter, the individual withdraws into a self-conceived world which provides him with both protective isolation, and the power to attack and manipulate other human beings. He believes in the validity and reality of only this subjective world. Extending its sphere, he then imposes roles and personalities upon others, which invariably clash with the conceptions they have of themselves. Peoples' convictions of the unity and certainty of their own self, and of the truth of their conception of others necessarily lead to human alienation outwardly, and self-illusion inwardly.

In *Six Characters in Search of an Author*, the family of Characters is totally estranged, because each person has his or her own opinion about how, and why things went wrong between them all. This breeds a mutual hostility which makes any move for reconciliation and understanding impossible. The dilemma of the Producer: 'I am very well aware that everyone carries a complete life within himself and he wants to put it before the whole world... and at the same time, of course, to take into account all the other characters', goes to the heart of the matter. (*Six Characters...*, *Naked Masks*, Ed. Bentley, Act II, p. 259). The Characters themselves are not always aware of their own plurality—let alone being able to cope with it, and so leaving open the possibility of communication. As the father points out: 'We

believe conscience to be a single thing, but it is many-sided. There is one for this person, and another for that. Diverse consciences. So we have this illusion of being one person for all, of having a personality that is unique in all our acts. But it isn't true'. (*Six Characters...*, Act I, p. 231). The tragedy arises when they are trapped in this single fixity, and judged by actions in which the whole of them has not participated. Thus the Daughter can only see her father as the arch villain, responsible for the sordid life she has been forced into. She takes none of his arguments, and pleas of ignorance into account. He is branded and condemned by the single act of coming to her as a prostitute's customer, irrespective of the fact that he did not know who she was.

The imposition of personality and motives succeeds not only in driving people apart, but also in wrecking the mental and emotional equilibrium of the victims. The highly selective view of their context is either seriously threatened, or wholly shattered as happens with Mrs. Frola, and her son-in-law Mr. Ponza in *Right You Are (If You Think So)* after the others have tried their hand at establishing the truth.

Pirandello's characters are also fatally threatened by language, as Henry IV himself comments: 'all our life is crushed by the weight of words.... Words, words which anyone can interpret in their own manner' (*Henry IV, Naked Masks*, Ed. Bentley, Act II, p. 190). Language is used to label people permanently, and regulate social response to them. Henry has been labelled mad, and can survive only by acting as if he were because the people surrounding him are convinced of his insanity. They can only relate to him as a madman, and their play acting for his benefit which follows batters precariously on a reality unknown to them. There is a parallel movement in his own compliance to play act back with tortured relish, and this in itself becomes a form of madness. Human communication has been drastically narrowed down with the most terrible consequences.

Yet, while presenting us with the profoundly disturbing phenomenon of non-communication and alienation, and the destructive quality of words, Pirandello differs in certain major aspects from Pinter and Ionesco. To begin with he belongs to an older tradition in which language as one of the



means of human contact still has communicative vitality. However much words have been turned into weapons against men, Pirandello's people have managed to escape the reductive, impersonal and often meaningless 'public' language. His characters become more aware of what they are threatened by, or what has already befallen them while they speak of it. The fact that they still can articulate what they feel and are troubled by, in a way allows them to structure and control their experience. The unselfconsciousness with which the father in *Six Characters in Search of an Author* can discourse philosophically upon his domestic antagonisms, is a release in itself denied to Pinter's and Ionesco's characters. The agony is endurable because still communicable. But because they are more articulate they are possibly more exposed to the external world. They disclose their torment even while seeking shelter behind a role. The language of Pinter's characters in being 'public' makes them less vulnerable. Underneath the cover of meaningless chatter, they are able to work out an elaborate social strategy of defence and enclosure. This advantage exists even though the security of their discourse is temporary and fraught with tension and inadequacy. But in another sense, the ability of Pirandello's characters to translate their cognitive and emotional processes into a language that does not restrict, gives them more freedom than Pinter's. The fact that the plot is constructed so as to give them full verbal expression divides them from the fate of Pinter's characters.

Here perhaps one could contrast Pirandello's use of language with Pinter's. In the older dramatist there is still a dialogue in the traditional sense, giving a more coherent and rounded aspect to the experience of his characters, and in doing so it also develops character. Pinter uses language intensively, yet the cumulative effect is one of negation. The possibilities of his extremely oblique use of dialogue are not inexhaustible. The fact that so little is said when people are actually speaking and virtually everything has to be inferred, conveys a sense of dramatic and imaginative impoverishment. The very undergroundness of verbal communication begins to wear thin. In Pirandello the associative and suggestive patterns emerging out of dialogue, and a given situation are richer and more varied.

This is partly because they are given further expression. One cannot ignore Pinter's technical brilliance, economy, and linguistic discipline, nor the accuracy of his recording genius, but one also cannot help feeling that the more accurate he is, the narrower his range of dramatic presentation. Furthermore, language, as Pirandello shows us, can be used in a more direct and positive way which Pinter does not seem to develop.

Besides the difference in the way these two dramatists have used language and dialogue, there is another aspect of their diversity. This basically deals with the degree of involvement one feels in a play of Pirandello's, which is greater than is any one of Pinter's. I am afraid I have to be very subjective here, and argue through the specific example of *Henry IV*. One's involvement is related to a sense of concern and genuine anxiety in the dramatist, when he is confronted by the spectre of non-communication, and a puppet quality that endangers human beings. This is fully conveyed, and can be contrasted with the near complacent pessimism of Pinter and Ionesco's interpretation.

In *Henry IV* one is sympathetically drawn mainly by the way Pirandello presents manipulation by characters of characters which assumes terrible proportions at times. This is also expressed through the despair of the individual himself, at his inability to contact his social image by a sufficient assertion of the self. There is a growing 'absorption in the dream' at the levels of awareness and non-awareness, feelingly conveyed by the dialogue.

Henry has the lucidity of mind to perceive and qualify the actions and attitudes of others towards himself, and recognize how these have formed a certain set of responses from him. But his acute awareness rebounds on the audience in taking on another dimension. One realizes that he is completely a part of the role he has consciously tried to dissociate from his 'real' self. His developing and perpetuating of a fantasy has enchanted him, together with his sheep like 'Private Counsellors'. His so called madness afflicts in varying degrees and forms all the other characters, including the jargon ridden Doctor who comes to cure him. This remains unknown to them although they are most perceptive about his insanity. They have unwittingly placed him in the position, when he can silence them with



Malvolio's: 'I am no more mad than you are' (*Twelfth Night*, Act IV, Sc.ii, ll. 48-49). What is more as Belcrudi realizes this madness is 'catching'. Not only does the play open with the recognition of this general condition, but it continues and grows as the action progresses. There is a shared madness through interaction, and at a different level, the assumption of various roles by people. This is expressed through the merging of different identities—the Marchioness and her daughter, De Nolli and Henry, the portraits and the real people.

Taken on the whole the dramatic and emotional range of Pirandello, is greater than Pinter's or Ionesco's. There is a sense of the affirmative in his interpretation of men in their relationships with one another, which one does not find in the other two dramatists. While fully presenting the terror and despair inherent in a breakdown of meaningful rapport between people, he enlarges the area of his concerns by relating this to a variety of themes and dimensions of a single situation. In so doing he indicates an ability to transcend the bleakness of the modern dilemma. Pinter is restricted by the persistence of a 'local' quality about his dramatic situations. He seems unable to make very much more out of what he presents, or through it enlarge the concerns of his drama. Pinter's often wilful and rather selfconscious obscurity inhibits a fuller presentation of the various possibilities of a situation. The very open-endedness of the plays, rather than increasing the range of what might be said imposes a deliberate limitation on what they have to offer in human and intellectual terms.

One of the main elements that influences one in this conclusion is the difference in the treatment of character by the two dramatists. Pinter limits himself to exposing the emotional, spiritual and intellectual poverty of his people. This is simply one aspect of the modern personality, and as such a self-conclusive dead end. There is a void in both Pinter and Ionesco's characters because of the lack of a tragic dimension. Henry IV, however, bizarre and even comic from time to time, is able to fuse his tragic situation with his personality and place it in a large human context. Likewise the Father in *Six Characters in Search of an Author* has a gravity and dignity, which neither the debasing disclosures by the daughter, nor the stressed theatricality of

their problems can entirely reduce. Stanley Webber and Davies, Chaubert, the Pupil and Berenger, are merely pitiable, and one's emotive response to them remains in this key. They are low powered and emasculated people included in a large group of similar beings. They are exhausted by their diagnosis. Pinter and Ionesco accepting merely the absurd, shy away from acknowledging characters whose individual vitality, and tragic potential escapes their pessimism. Dramatists like Pirandello are able to envisage greater possibilities in man. This is manifested in the ability of the individual to survive and transcend the social roles, self-deceptions, and linguistic clichés forced upon him. Pirandello affirms that it is not only in terms of a wearily disenchanted vision that the modern human condition, and the fact of communication can be regarded.



## NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS

The two issues of the Journal of the University of the Punjab relating to the Humanities, entitled *Journal of Research (Humanities)*, are published in January and July and the other two issues of the Journal dealing with Sciences, entitled *Journal of Scientific Research*, in April and October. The volumes of *Journal of Research (Humanities)* and *Journal of Scientific Research* are numbered separately.

The subscription, including postage, for a single issue is Rs. 2.50 in Pakistan (\$1.00 or 7s.6d. in foreign countries), for two issues in a year of *Journal of Research (Humanities)* or *Journal of Scientific Research* is Rs. 5.00 (\$2.00 or 15s.), and annual subscription, including postage, for four issues is Rs. 10.00 (\$4.00 or 30s.)

All correspondence should be addressed to Mr. Iqbal Husain, Secretary, Editorial Board, *Journal of Research (Humanities)*/*Journal of Scientific Research*, University of the Punjab, Lahore (Pakistan).

Printed by A. R. Minhas at the Punjab University Press, Lahore,  
and published by Iqbal Husain for the University of the Punjab.



## CONTENTS

	Page
I. ابوالحسن المداثنی اور اسکی کتاب التعازی	ذوالفقار علی ملک 1
II. SHAKESPEARE—"THE INVISIBLE POET"	<i>Imdad Husain</i> 39
III. DRAMA AND THE BREAKDOWN OF LANGUAGE: A STUDY OF SOME TWENTIETH CENTURY PLAYS (PINTER, IONESCO, PIRANDELLO)	<i>Shaista Siraj-ud-Din</i> 61